PISA 2018 Results

COMBINED EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES

VOLUME I, II & III

OECD

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document, as well as any data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

Note by Turkey
The information in this document with reference to "Cyprus" relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognises the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of the United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the "Cyprus issue".

Note by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union
The Republic of Cyprus is recognised by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

Executive Summary
VOLUME I

Reading proficiency is essential for a wide variety of human activities – from following instructions in a manual; to finding out the who, what, when, where and why of an event; to communicating with others for a specific purpose or transaction. PISA recognises that evolving technologies have changed the ways people read and exchange information, whether at home, at school or in the workplace. Digitalisation has resulted in the emergence and availability of new forms of text, ranging from the concise (text messages; annotated search-engine results) to the lengthy (tabbed, multipage websites; newly accessible archival material scanned from microfiches). In response, education systems are increasingly incorporating digital (reading) literacy into their programmes of instruction.

Reading was the main subject assessed in PISA 2018. The PISA 2018 reading assessment, which was delivered on computer in most of the 79 countries and economies that participated, included new text and assessment formats made possible through digital delivery. The test aimed to assess reading literacy in the digital environment while retaining the ability to measure trends in reading literacy over the past two decades. PISA 2018 defined reading literacy as understanding, using, evaluating, reflecting on and engaging with texts in order to achieve one's goals, to develop one's knowledge and potential, and to participate in society.

WHAT STUDENTS KNOW AND CAN DO: MAIN FINDINGS

In reading

- Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang (China) and Singapore scored significantly higher in reading than all other countries/economies that participated in PISA 2018. Estonia, Canada, Finland and Ireland were the highest-performing OECD countries in reading.

- Some 77% of students, on average across OECD countries, attained at least Level 2 proficiency in reading. At a minimum, these students are able to identify the main idea in a text of moderate length, find information based on explicit, though sometimes complex, criteria, and reflect on the purpose and form of texts when explicitly directed to do so. Over 85% of students in Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang (China), Canada, Estonia, Finland, Hong Kong (China), Ireland, Macao (China), Poland and Singapore performed at this level or above.

- Around 8.7% of students, on average across OECD countries, were top performers in reading, meaning that they attained Level 5 or 6 in the PISA reading test. At these levels, students are able to comprehend lengthy texts, deal with concepts that are abstract or counterintuitive, and establish distinctions between fact and opinion, based on implicit cues pertaining to the content or source of the information. In 20 education systems, including those of 15 OECD countries, over 10% of 15-year-old students were top performers.

In mathematics and science

- On average across OECD countries, 76% of students attained Level 2 or higher in mathematics. At a minimum, these students can interpret and recognise, without direct instructions, how a (simple) situation can be represented mathematically (e.g. comparing the total distance across two alternative routes, or converting prices into a different currency). However, in 24 countries and economies, more than 50% of students scored below this level of proficiency.

- Around one in six 15-year-old students in Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang (China) (16.5%), and about one in seven students in Singapore (13.8%), scored at Level 6 in mathematics, the highest level of proficiency that PISA describes. These students are capable of advanced mathematical thinking and reasoning. On average across OECD countries, only 2.4% of students scored at this level.

- On average across OECD countries, 78% of students attained Level 2 or higher in science. At a minimum, these students can recognise the correct explanation for familiar scientific phenomena and can use such knowledge to identify, in simple cases, whether a conclusion is valid based on the data provided. More than 90% of students in Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang (China) (97.9%), Macao (China) (94.0%), Estonia (91.2%) and Singapore (91.0%) achieved this benchmark.

Trends in performance

- On average across OECD countries, mean performance in reading, mathematics and science remained stable between 2015 and 2018.

- There were large differences between individual countries and economies in how their performance changed between 2015 and 2018. For example, mean performance in mathematics improved in 13 countries/economies (Albania, Iceland, Jordan, Latvia, Macao [China], Montenegro, Peru, Poland, Qatar, the Republic of North Macedonia, the Slovak Republic, Turkey and the United Kingdom), declined in 3 countries/economies (Malta, Romania and Chinese Taipei), and remained stable in the remaining 47 participating countries/economies.

- Seven countries/economies saw improvements, on average, in the reading, mathematics and science performance of their students throughout their participation in PISA: Albania, Colombia, Macao (China), the Republic of Moldova, Peru, Portugal and Qatar. Seven countries saw declining mean performance across all three subjects: Australia, Finland, Iceland, Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the Slovak Republic.

- Between 2003 and 2018, Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Turkey and Uruguay enrolled many more 15-year-olds in secondary education without sacrificing the quality of the education provided.

Around the world, the share of 15-year-old students, in grade 7 and above, who reached a minimum level of proficiency in reading (at least Level 2 on the PISA scale) ranged from close to 90% in Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang (China), Estonia, Macao (China) and Singapore, to less than 10% in Cambodia, Senegal and Zambia (countries that participated in the PISA for Development assessment in 2017). The share of 15-year-old students who attained minimum levels of proficiency in mathematics (at least Level 2) varied even more – between 98% in Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang (China) and 2% in Zambia. On average across OECD countries, around one in four 15-year-olds did not attain a minimum level of proficiency in reading or mathematics. These numbers show that all countries still have some way to go towards reaching the global goals for quality education, as defined in the UN Sustainable Development Goal for education, by 2030.

Table I.1 [1/2] **Snapshot of performance in reading, mathematics and science**

Countries/economies with a mean performance/share of **top performers above** the OECD average
Countries/economies with a share of **low achievers below** the OECD average

Countries/economies with a mean performance/share of top performers/share of low achievers **not significantly different** from the OECD average

Countries/economies with a mean performance/share of **top performers below** the OECD average
Countries/economies with a share of **low achievers above** the OECD average

	Mean score in PISA 2018			Long-term trend: Average rate of change in performance, per three-year-period			Short-term change in performance (PISA 2015 to PISA 2018)			Top-performing and low-achieving students	
	Reading	Mathematics	Science	Reading	Mathematics	Science	Reading	Mathematics	Science	Share of top performers in at least one subject (Level 5 or 6)	Share of low achievers in all three subjects (below Level 2)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	%	%
OECD average	487	489	489	0	-1	-2	-3	2	-2	15.7	13.4
Estonia	523	523	530	**6**	**2**	0	4	4	-4	22.5	4.2
Canada	520	512	518	-2	**-4**	**-3**	-7	-4	**-10**	24.1	6.4
Finland	520	507	522	**-5**	**-9**	**-11**	-6	-4	**-9**	21.0	7.0
Ireland	518	500	496	0	0	**-3**	-3	-4	-6	15.4	7.5
Korea	514	526	519	**-3**	**-4**	**-3**	-3	2	3	26.6	7.5
Poland	512	516	511	**5**	**5**	2	6	**11**	**10**	21.2	6.7
Sweden	506	502	499	**-3**	-2	-1	6	8	6	19.4	10.5
New Zealand	506	494	508	**-4**	**-7**	**-6**	-4	-1	-5	20.2	10.9
United States	505	478	502	0	-1	2	8	9	6	17.1	12.6
United Kingdom	504	502	505	2	1	-2	6	**9**	-5	19.4	9.0
Japan	504	527	529	1	0	-1	**-12**	-5	**-9**	23.3	6.4
Australia	503	491	503	**-4**	**-7**	**-7**	0	-3	**-7**	18.9	11.2
Denmark	501	509	493	1	-1	0	1	-2	**-9**	15.8	8.1
Norway	499	501	490	1	2	1	**-14**	-1	**-8**	17.8	11.3
Germany	498	500	503	**3**	0	**-4**	-11	-6	-6	19.1	12.8
Slovenia	495	509	507	2	2	**-2**	**-10**	-1	**-6**	17.3	8.0
Belgium	493	508	499	-2	**-4**	**-3**	-6	1	-3	19.4	12.5
France	493	495	493	0	**-3**	-1	-7	2	-2	15.9	12.5
Portugal	492	492	492	**4**	**6**	**4**	-6	1	**-9**	15.2	12.6
Czech Republic	490	499	497	0	**-4**	**-4**	3	7	4	16.6	10.5
Netherlands	485	519	503	**-4**	**-4**	**-6**	**-18**	7	-5	21.8	10.8
Austria	484	499	490	-1	-2	**-6**	0	2	-5	15.7	13.5
Switzerland	484	515	495	-1	**-2**	**-4**	-8	-6	**-10**	19.8	10.7
Latvia	479	496	487	2	2	-1	**-9**	14	-3	11.3	9.2
Italy	476	487	468	0	**5**	-2	-8	-3	**-13**	12.1	13.8
Hungary	476	481	481	-1	**-3**	**-7**	6	4	4	11.3	15.5
Lithuania	476	481	482	2	-1	**-3**	3	3	7	11.1	13.9
Iceland	474	495	475	**-4**	**-5**	**-5**	-8	**7**	2	13.5	13.7
Israel	470	463	462	**6**	**6**	3	-9	-7	-4	15.2	22.1
Luxembourg	470	483	477	-1	-2	-2	**-11**	-2	**-6**	14.4	17.4
Turkey	466	454	468	2	**4**	6	37	33	43	6.6	17.1
Slovak Republic	458	486	464	**-3**	**-4**	**-8**	5	**11**	3	12.8	16.9
Greece	457	451	452	-2	0	**-6**	-10	-2	-3	6.2	19.9
Chile	452	417	444	**7**	1	1	-6	-5	-3	3.5	23.5
Mexico	420	409	419	2	**3**	2	-3	1	3	1.1	35.0
Colombia	412	391	413	**7**	**5**	**6**	**-13**	1	-2	1.5	39.9
Spain	m	481	483	m	0	-1	m	-4	**-10**	m	m

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).

Long-term trends are reported for the longest available period since PISA 2000 for reading, PISA 2003 for mathematics and PISA 2006 for science.

Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9). The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.

Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the mean reading score in PISA 2018.

Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables I.B1.10, I.B1.11, I.B1.12, I.B1.26 and I.B1.27.

StatLink https://doi.org/10.1787/888934028140

• • •

Table I.1 [2/2] **Snapshot of performance in reading, mathematics and science**

Countries/economies with a mean performance/share of **top performers above** the OECD average
Countries/economies with a share of **low achievers below** the OECD average

Countries/economies with a mean performance/share of top performers/share of low achievers **not significantly different** from the OECD average

Countries/economies with a mean performance/share of **top performers below** the OECD average
Countries/economies with a share of **low achievers above** the OECD average

	Mean score in PISA 2018			Long-term trend: Average rate of change in performance, per three-year-period			Short-term change in performance (PISA 2015 to PISA 2018)			Top-performing and low-achieving students	
	Reading	Mathematics	Science	Reading	Mathematics	Science	Reading	Mathematics	Science	Share of top performers in at least one subject (Level 5 or 6)	Share of low achievers in all three subjects (below Level 2)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	%	%
OECD average	487	489	489	0	-1	-2	-3	2	-2	15.7	13.4
B-S-J-Z (China)	555	591	590	m	m	m	m	m	m	49.3	1.1
Singapore	549	569	551	**6**	1	**3**	**14**	5	-5	43.3	4.1
Macao (China)	525	558	544	**6**	**6**	**8**	**16**	**14**	**15**	32.8	2.3
Hong Kong (China)	524	551	517	2	0	**-8**	-2	3	-7	32.3	5.3
Chinese Taipei	503	531	516	1	**-4**	-2	6	**-11**	**-17**	26.0	9.0
Croatia	479	464	472	1	0	**-5**	-8	0	-3	8.5	14.1
Russia	479	488	478	**7**	**5**	0	**-16**	-6	**-9**	10.8	11.2
Belarus	474	472	471	m	m	m	m	m	m	9.0	15.9
Ukraine	466	453	469	m	m	m	m	m	m	7.5	17.5
Malta	448	472	457	2	**4**	-1	2	**-7**	**-8**	11.3	22.6
Serbia	439	448	440	**8**	**3**	1	m	m	m	6.7	24.7
United Arab Emirates	432	435	434	-1	4	-2	-2	7	-3	8.3	30.1
Romania	428	430	426	**7**	**5**	2	-6	**-14**	-9	4.1	29.8
Uruguay	427	418	426	1	-2	0	-9	0	**-10**	2.4	31.9
Costa Rica	426	402	416	**-7**	-3	**-6**	-1	2	-4	0.9	33.5
Cyprus	424	451	439	**-12**	**6**	1	**-18**	**14**	6	5.9	25.7
Moldova	424	421	428	**14**	**9**	**6**	8	1	0	3.2	30.5
Montenegro	421	430	415	**8**	**8**	2	-6	**12**	4	2.3	31.5
Bulgaria	420	436	424	1	**6**	-1	-12	-5	**-22**	5.5	31.9
Jordan	419	400	429	**4**	3	1	11	**20**	**21**	1.4	28.4
Malaysia	415	440	438	2	**13**	**7**	m	m	m	2.7	27.8
Brazil	413	384	404	3	**5**	2	6	6	3	2.5	43.2
Brunei Darussalam	408	430	431	m	m	m	m	m	m	4.3	37.6
Qatar	407	414	419	**22**	**23**	**18**	5	**12**	2	4.8	37.4
Albania	405	437	417	**10**	**20**	**11**	0	**24**	**-10**	2.5	29.7
Bosnia and Herzegovina	403	406	398	m	m	m	m	m	m	1.0	41.3
Argentina	402	379	404	-1	-1	3	m	m	m	1.2	41.4
Peru	401	400	404	**14**	**12**	**13**	3	**13**	8	1.4	42.8
Saudi Arabia	399	373	386	m	m	m	m	m	m	0.3	45.4
Thailand	393	419	426	**-4**	0	1	**-16**	3	4	2.7	34.6
North Macedonia	393	394	413	1	**23**	**29**	**41**	**23**	**29**	1.7	39.0
Baku (Azerbaijan)	389	420	398	m	m	m	m	m	m	2.1	38.9
Kazakhstan	387	423	397	-1	**5**	-3	m	m	m	2.2	37.7
Georgia	380	398	383	4	**8**	6	**-22**	-6	**-28**	1.2	48.7
Panama	377	353	365	2	-2	-4	m	m	m	0.3	59.5
Indonesia	371	379	396	1	2	3	**-26**	-7	-7	0.6	51.7
Morocco	359	368	377	m	m	m	m	m	m	0.1	60.2
Lebanon	353	393	384	m	m	m	7	-3	-3	2.6	49.1
Kosovo	353	366	365	m	m	m	6	4	**-14**	0.1	66.0
Dominican Republic	342	325	336	m	m	m	**-16**	-3	4	0.1	75.5
Philippines	340	353	357	m	m	m	m	m	m	0.2	71.8

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).

Long-term trends are reported for the longest available period since PISA 2000 for reading, PISA 2003 for mathematics and PISA 2006 for science.

Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9). The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.

Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the mean reading score in PISA 2018.

Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables I.B1.10, I.B1.11, I.B1.12, I.B1.26 and I.B1.27.

StatLink ⌘⚙ https://doi.org/10.1787/888934028140

600 000 students

representing about **32 million** 15-year-olds in the schools of the **79 participating countries and economies** sat the **2-hour** PISA test in 2018

Mean performance in the following subjects did not change over the past 2 decades

READING   **MATHS**   **SCIENCE**

But Albania, Estonia, Macao (China), Peru and Poland **saw improvements in at least 2 subjects**

Between 2003 and 2018, Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Turkey and Uruguay **enrolled many more 15-year-olds** in secondary education **without** sacrificing the quality of the education provided

1/10

students mastered complex reading tasks, such as distinguishing between **fact** and **opinion** when reading about an unfamiliar topic

1 in 4

students had difficulty with basic aspects of reading, such as identifying the **main idea** in a text of moderate length or **connecting pieces of information** provided by different sources

All data refer to OECD average unless otherwise indicated

Executive Summary
VOLUME II

The principle that every person has a fair chance to improve his or her life, whatever his or her personal circumstances, lies at the heart of democratic political and economic institutions. Ensuring that all students have access to the best education opportunities is also a way of using resources effectively, and of improving education and social outcomes in general.

Equity in education is a central and long-standing focus of PISA and a major concern of countries around the world. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals for 2030 advocate for "ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all" (United Nations, 2015).

Equity does not mean that all students have equal outcomes; rather it means that whatever variations there may be in education outcomes, they are not related to students' background, including socio-economic status, gender or immigrant background.

PISA measures equity by whether education outcomes, such as access to schooling, student performance, students' attitudes and beliefs, and students' expectations for their future, are related to student's personal background. The weaker the relationship, the more equitable the school system, as all students can flourish in such a system, regardless of their background.

WHERE ALL STUDENTS CAN SUCCEED: MAIN FINDINGS

Equity related to socio-economic status

- In 11 countries and economies, including the OECD countries Australia, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Japan, Korea, Norway and the United Kingdom, average performance was higher than the OECD average while the relationship between socio-economic status and reading performance was weaker than the OECD average.

- In spite of socio-economic disadvantage, some students attain high levels of academic proficiency. On average across OECD countries, one in ten disadvantaged students was able to score in the top quarter of reading performance in their countries (known as academic resilience), indicating that disadvantage is not destiny. In Australia, Canada, Estonia, Hong Kong (China), Ireland, Macao (China) and the United Kingdom, all of which score above the OECD average, more than 13% of disadvantaged students were academically resilient.

- Disadvantaged students are more or less likely to attend the same schools as high achievers, depending on the school system. In Argentina, Bulgaria, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Israel, Luxembourg, Peru, Romania, the Slovak Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Switzerland, a typical disadvantaged student has less than a one-in-eight chance of attending the same school as high achievers (those who scored in the top quarter of reading performance in PISA. By contrast, in Baku (Azerbaijan), Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Kosovo, Macao (China), Norway, Portugal, Spain and Sweden, disadvantaged students have at least a one-in-five chance of having high-achieving schoolmates.

- On average across OECD countries, 40% of teachers in disadvantaged schools compared with 48% of teachers in advantaged schools had at least a master's degree.

- In 42 countries and economies, principals of disadvantaged schools were significantly more likely than those of advantaged schools to report that their school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered by a shortage of education staff. In 46 countries and economies, principals of disadvantaged schools were also more likely to report that a lack or inadequacy of educational material and physical infrastructure hinders instruction.

- Many students, especially disadvantaged students, hold lower ambitions than would be expected given their academic achievement. On average across OECD countries, only seven in ten high-achieving disadvantaged students reported that they expect to complete tertiary education, while nine in ten high-achieving advantaged students reported so. In Austria, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, the Republic of Moldova, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland, the difference between the two groups was larger than 25 percentage points.

- On average across OECD countries, more than two in five disadvantaged students reported that they do not know how to find information about student financing (e.g. student loans or grants).

Equity related to gender

- In all countries and economies that participated in PISA 2018, girls significantly outperformed boys in reading – by 30 score points, on average across OECD countries. The narrowest gender gaps (less than 20 score points) were observed in Argentina, Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang (China), Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Panama and Peru; the widest (more than 50 score points) were observed in Finland, Jordan, the Republic of North Macedonia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

- In Estonia, Ireland, Macao (China), Peru and Singapore, the gender gap in reading performance narrowed between 2009 and 2018; and both boys and girls scored higher in 2018 than their counterparts did in 2009.

- Boys outperformed girls – by five score points – in mathematics, on average across OECD countries, but girls outperformed boys in science by two score points. While boys significantly outperformed girls in mathematics in 31 countries and economies, in 12 countries/economies the opposite pattern was observed. Only in Argentina, Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang (China), Colombia, Costa Rica Mexico and Peru did boys significantly outperform girls in science, while the opposite was true in 34 countries and economies.

- In all countries and economies, girls reported much greater enjoyment of reading than boys. The largest gender gap in enjoyment of reading was observed in Germany, Hungary and Italy and the smallest in Indonesia and Korea. On average across OECD countries in 2018, both boys and girls reported significantly less enjoyment of reading than their counterparts did in 2009.

- Only 1% of girls, on average across OECD countries, reported that they want to work in ICT-related occupations, compared with 8% of boys who so reported. In some countries, including Bulgaria, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Serbia and Ukraine, more than 15% of boys reported that they expect to work in an ICT-related profession; but in no PISA-participating country or economy did more than 3% of girls report so.

Equity related to immigrant background

- On average across OECD countries, 13% of students in 2018 had an immigrant background, up from 10% in 2009. In most countries, immigrant students tended to be socio-economically disadvantaged; in Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia and Sweden, at least two out of five immigrant students were disadvantaged.

- Some 17% of immigrant students scored in the top quarter of reading performance in the country where they sat the PISA test, on average across OECD countries. In Brunei Darussalam, Jordan, Panama, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, more than 30% of immigrant students performed at that level.

- In 21 out of the 43 countries and economies where a relatively large proportion of students had an immigrant background, immigrant students were more likely than their native-born peers to report a goal-oriented attitude.

Table II.1 [1/2] **Snapshot of socio-economic disparities in academic performance**

	Countries/economies with a mean performance/strength of socio-economic gradient/share of resilient students above the OECD average
	Countries/economies with a mean performance/strength of socio-economic gradient/share of resilient students not significantly different from the OECD average
	Countries/economies with a mean performance/strength of socio-economic gradient/share of resilient students below the OECD average

	Mean reading score in PISA 2018	Coverage Index 3: Coverage of 15-year-old population	Strength: Percentage of variance in reading performance explained by ESCS[1] (R^2)	Difference between advantaged[2] and disadvantaged students in reading	Percentage of disadvantaged students who are academically resilient[3]
	Mean		%	Score dif.	%
OECD average	487	m	12.0	**89**	11
B-S-J-Z (China)	555	0.81	12.6	**82**	12
Singapore	549	0.95	13.2	**104**	10
Macao (China)	525	0.88	1.7	**31**	20
Hong Kong (China)	524	0.98	5.1	**59**	16
Estonia	523	0.93	6.2	**61**	16
Canada	520	0.86	6.7	**68**	14
Finland	520	0.96	9.2	**79**	13
Ireland	518	0.96	10.7	**75**	13
Korea	514	0.88	8.0	**75**	13
Poland	512	0.90	11.6	**90**	11
Sweden	506	0.86	10.7	**89**	11
New Zealand	506	0.89	12.9	**96**	12
United States	505	0.86	12.0	**99**	10
United Kingdom	504	0.85	9.3	**80**	14
Japan	504	0.91	8.0	**72**	12
Australia	503	0.89	10.1	**89**	13
Chinese Taipei	503	0.92	11.4	**89**	12
Denmark	501	0.88	9.9	**78**	12
Norway	499	0.91	7.5	**73**	12
Germany	498	0.99	17.2	**113**	10
Slovenia	495	0.98	12.1	**80**	12
Belgium	493	0.94	17.2	**109**	9
France	493	0.91	17.5	**107**	10
Portugal	492	0.87	13.5	**95**	10
Czech Republic	490	0.95	16.5	**105**	9
Netherlands	485	0.91	10.5	**88**	13
Austria	484	0.89	13.0	**93**	10
Switzerland	484	0.89	15.6	**104**	9
Croatia	479	0.89	7.7	**63**	15
Latvia	479	0.89	7.2	**65**	12
Russia	479	0.94	7.3	**67**	13
Italy	476	0.85	8.9	**75**	12
Hungary	476	0.90	19.1	**113**	8
Lithuania	476	0.90	13.2	**89**	11
Iceland	474	0.92	6.6	**72**	13
Belarus	474	0.88	19.8	**102**	9
Israel	470	0.81	14.0	**121**	8
Luxembourg	470	0.87	17.8	**122**	8
Ukraine	466	0.87	14.0	**90**	12
Turkey	466	0.73	11.4	**76**	15
Slovak Republic	458	0.86	17.5	**106**	9
Greece	457	0.93	10.9	**84**	12

1. ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.
2. A socio-economically advantaged (disadvantaged) student is a student in the top (bottom) quarter of ESCS in his or her own country/economy.
3. Academically resilient students are disadvantaged students who scored in the top quarter of performance in reading amongst students in their own country. **Notes:** Values that are statistically signi cant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).
Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9 from *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do*).
The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the mean reading score in PISA 2018.
Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables I.B1.10, II.B1.2.1, II.B1.2.3 and Table II.B1.3.1.

StatLink https://doi.org/10.1787/888934037013

Table II.1 [2/2] **Snapshot of socio-economic disparities in academic performance**

	Countries/economies with a mean performance/strength of socio-economic gradient/share of resilient students above the OECD average
	Countries/economies with a mean performance/strength of socio-economic gradient/share of resilient students not significantly different from the OECD average
	Countries/economies with a mean performance/strength of socio-economic gradient/share of resilient students below the OECD average

	Mean reading score in PISA 2018	Coverage Index 3: Coverage of 15-year-old population	Strength: Percentage of variance in reading performance explained by ESCS[1] (R^2)	Difference between advantaged[2] and disadvantaged students in reading	Percentage of disadvantaged students who are academically resilient[3]
	Mean		%	Score dif.	%
Chile	452	0.89	12.7	87	11
Malta	448	0.97	7.6	85	13
Serbia	439	0.88	7.8	73	13
United Arab Emirates	432	0.92	11.1	105	7
Romania	428	0.71	18.1	109	9
Uruguay	427	0.77	16.0	99	9
Costa Rica	426	0.63	15.6	83	10
Cyprus	424	0.92	6.8	69	13
Moldova	424	0.95	17.3	102	8
Montenegro	421	0.95	5.8	55	14
Mexico	420	0.66	13.7	81	11
Bulgaria	420	0.72	15.0	106	6
Jordan	419	0.57	7.7	64	12
Malaysia	415	0.72	16.3	89	10
Brazil	413	0.56	14.0	97	10
Colombia	412	0.62	13.7	86	10
Brunei Darussalam	408	0.97	16.0	103	9
Qatar	407	0.92	8.6	93	9
Albania	405	0.46	7.8	61	12
Bosnia and Herzegovina	403	0.82	7.3	58	13
Argentina	402	0.81	17.1	102	8
Peru	401	0.73	21.5	110	6
Saudi Arabia	399	0.85	11.5	74	11
Thailand	393	0.72	12.0	69	13
North Macedonia	393	0.95	10.2	80	13
Baku (Azerbaijan)	389	0.46	4.3	41	17
Kazakhstan	387	0.92	4.3	40	16
Georgia	380	0.83	9.4	68	12
Panama	377	0.53	17.0	95	9
Indonesia	371	0.85	7.8	52	14
Morocco	359	0.64	7.1	51	13
Lebanon	353	0.87	12.2	103	9
Kosovo	353	0.84	4.9	40	17
Dominican Republic	342	0.73	8.9	65	12
Philippines	340	0.68	18.0	88	8
Spain	m	0.92	m	m	m

1. ESCS refers to the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.
2. A socio-economically advantaged (disadvantaged) student is a student in the top (bottom) quarter of ESCS in his or her own country/economy.
3. Academically resilient students are disadvantaged students who scored in the top quarter of performance in reading amongst students in their own country. **Notes:** Values that are statistically signi icant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).
Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9 from *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do*).
The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the mean reading score in PISA 2018.
Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables I.B1.10, II.B1.2.1, II.B1.2.3 and Table II.B1.3.1.

StatLink https://doi.org/10.1787/888934037013

Table II.2 [1/2] **Snapshot of expectations for the future, by gender and socio-economic status**

	Countries/economies with share of top performers who do not expect to complete tertiary education below the OECD average or a share of top performers who expect to work in STEM occupations above the OECD average
	Countries/economies with a share of students not significantly different from the OECD average
	Countries/economies with share of top performers who do not expect to complete tertiary education above the OECD average or a share of top performers who expect to work in STEM occupations below the OECD average

	Percentage of students who do not expect to complete tertiary education amongst those who have attained at least minimum academic proficiency (Level 2) in the three core PISA subjects and are high performers (Level 4) in at least one subject			Percentage of top performers in science or mathematics who expect to work as...					
				... science and engineering professionals when they are 30			... health professionals when they are 30		
	Advantaged students	Disadvantaged students	Difference between advantaged and disadvantaged students	Boys	Girls	Difference between girls and boys	Boys	Girls	Difference between girls and boys
	%	%	% dif.	%	%	% dif.	%	%	% dif.
OECD average	7.9	28.4	**-20.3**	26.0	14.5	**-11.5**	12.3	29.9	**17.4**
Germany	27.1	66.0	**-38.9**	22.6	12.4	**-10.2**	6.3	23.7	**17.4**
Poland	8.4	47.0	**-38.5**	14.0	11.9	-2.1	10.8	30.4	**19.6**
Hungary	7.8	46.0	**-38.3**	26.7	16.5	**-10.1**	10.3	23.1	**12.8**
Finland	13.5	43.5	**-30.1**	11.6	9.1	-2.5	15.2	35.9	**20.7**
New Zealand	12.1	41.7	**-29.6**	26.4	14.3	**-12.1**	14.8	35.1	**20.3**
Switzerland	15.4	44.9	**-29.5**	23.8	11.2	**-12.6**	8.9	27.1	**18.2**
Austria	20.8	50.2	**-29.4**	20.3	8.9	**-11.4**	10.7	24.5	**13.8**
Latvia	8.6	37.7	**-29.1**	20.4	12.2	**-8.3**	9.2	24.9	**15.7**
Italy	11.7	40.5	**-28.9**	26.0	12.5	**-13.6**	10.7	22.7	**12.0**
Norway	7.1	35.4	**-28.3**	32.7	11.6	**-21.0**	6.7	26.8	**20.1**
Kazakhstan	7.3	35.0	**-27.6**	28.3	14.2	**-14.1**	10.4	16.7	6.3
Sweden	5.7	31.5	**-25.8**	36.7	20.4	**-16.4**	6.6	22.2	**15.6**
Moldova	9.9	35.3	**-25.3**	6.3	11.0	4.6	11.9	21.3	9.4
Slovak Republic	5.4	30.0	**-24.6**	12.6	10.7	-1.9	14.7	33.2	**18.5**
United Kingdom	8.0	32.3	**-24.3**	27.7	20.0	**-7.6**	10.9	26.2	**15.2**
Czech Republic	5.3	29.6	**-24.3**	14.5	8.2	-6.2	11.2	28.0	**16.8**
Bulgaria	7.3	31.5	**-24.1**	14.1	11.5	-2.7	14.7	22.7	8.0
Slovenia	8.1	31.7	**-23.6**	22.8	14.5	-8.3	11.8	31.3	**19.6**
Jordan	6.0	29.1	**-23.1**	27.1	11.1	-16.0	44.2	67.5	23.3
Russia	9.6	31.9	**-22.3**	20.3	12.3	-8.0	8.5	16.3	**7.8**
Iceland	14.1	36.2	**-22.1**	21.1	14.1	-7.0	9.6	32.9	**23.3**
Portugal	3.1	25.0	**-21.9**	47.9	15.1	**-32.8**	15.0	46.6	**31.6**
Japan	7.3	28.0	**-20.8**	7.5	3.4	**-4.0**	12.0	25.0	**12.9**
Australia	6.2	26.9	**-20.7**	33.2	19.2	**-14.0**	17.5	34.1	**16.6**
Albania	5.1	25.6	**-20.5**	37.8	23.2	-14.6	24.9	34.7	9.8
Croatia	12.9	33.3	**-20.4**	20.1	16.5	-3.6	12.9	32.0	**19.1**
Estonia	8.0	27.7	**-19.8**	17.3	15.2	-2.0	11.2	21.3	**10.1**
Romania	3.1	22.7	**-19.6**	13.4	11.4	-2.0	8.1	34.5	**26.4**
Hong Kong (China)	5.5	24.9	**-19.4**	19.7	6.4	**-13.3**	13.7	23.7	**10.1**
B-S-J-Z (China)	3.8	22.7	**-18.9**	15.1	9.1	**-6.0**	11.1	12.3	1.2
Brunei Darussalam	8.0	25.8	**-17.8**	36.6	18.4	**-18.2**	21.6	29.6	8.0
Luxembourg	14.0	31.7	**-17.8**	25.0	14.6	**-10.5**	10.0	25.2	**15.2**
Thailand	0.8	17.6	**-16.9**	19.4	14.5	-4.9	20.5	45.2	**24.7**
Chinese Taipei	4.8	21.4	**-16.6**	23.8	8.7	**-15.0**	12.4	24.0	**11.6**
Malta	8.6	24.5	**-15.9**	26.6	14.6	**-12.0**	17.2	31.0	**13.8**
Belgium	6.2	22.1	**-15.9**	30.9	16.3	**-14.6**	13.3	25.0	**11.7**
Macao (China)	7.8	23.5	**-15.6**	15.1	7.7	**-7.4**	10.5	26.3	**15.9**

Notes: Values that are statistically signi icant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).

Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9 from *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do*).

The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.

Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the difference between advantaged and disadvantaged students.

Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables II.B1.6.7, II.B1.8.22 and II.B1.8.23.

StatLink 🔗 https://doi.org/10.1787/888934037032

Table II.2 [2/2] **Snapshot of expectations for the future, by gender and socio-economic status**

| | Countries/economies with share of top performers who do not expect to complete tertiary education below the OECD average or a share of top performers who expect to work in STEM occupations above the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with a share of students not significantly different from the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with share of top performers who do not expect to complete tertiary education above the OECD average or a share of top performers who expect to work in STEM occupations below the OECD average |

	Percentage of students who do not expect to complete tertiary education amongst those who have attained at least minimum academic proficiency (Level 2) in the three core PISA subjects and are high performers (Level 4) in at least one subject			Percentage of top performers in science or mathematics who expect to work as...					
				... science and engineering professionals when they are 30			... health professionals when they are 30		
	Advantaged students	Disadvantaged students	Difference between advantaged and disadvantaged students	Boys	Girls	Difference between girls and boys	Boys	Girls	Difference between girls and boys
	%	%	% dif.	%	%	% dif.	%	%	% dif.
Netherlands	8.6	22.8	**-14.2**	19.0	8.2	**-10.7**	9.5	28.7	**19.2**
Uruguay	10.1	24.1	-14.1	47.0	31.3	-15.8	11.4	c	c
Denmark	12.5	26.2	**-13.7**	32.3	16.9	**-15.4**	10.6	29.8	**19.2**
France	7.5	20.5	**-13.0**	33.1	16.9	**-16.2**	12.6	27.6	**15.0**
Lithuania	3.3	15.9	**-12.7**	17.9	13.5	-4.4	6.7	31.8	**25.1**
Canada	2.6	15.0	**-12.4**	31.4	14.1	**-17.3**	18.5	39.4	**20.9**
Belarus	4.7	16.7	**-12.0**	14.1	10.9	-3.2	11.0	19.9	**9.0**
Qatar	3.1	14.9	**-11.9**	34.9	22.3	**-12.6**	22.2	37.1	**14.9**
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2.9	13.7	-10.8	29.9	21.1	-8.9	7.3	c	c
Ireland	2.6	13.4	**-10.8**	29.6	16.7	**-12.9**	17.0	30.4	**13.4**
Israel	9.5	20.0	**-10.4**	23.6	16.2	-7.3	10.2	26.7	**16.5**
Serbia	2.2	12.1	**-9.9**	14.8	16.9	2.1	14.1	21.5	7.3
North Macedonia	5.3	14.8	-9.6	14.0	20.0	5.9	6.4	14.0	7.6
Korea	1.6	11.0	**-9.5**	18.5	7.2	**-11.3**	10.3	15.2	**4.9**
United States	1.4	10.5	**-9.1**	27.8	10.4	**-17.4**	14.5	37.7	**23.1**
Greece	2.1	11.0	**-8.9**	23.1	23.4	0.3	15.4	27.7	12.3
Argentina	4.6	10.6	-6.0	42.2	27.0	-15.2	7.3	19.3	12.0
Mexico	1.4	7.3	-5.9	43.2	27.0	-16.2	10.7	c	c
Chile	3.1	8.9	-5.8	38.1	22.7	-15.4	25.6	46.4	20.8
Cyprus	1.1	6.6	-5.6	26.3	21.6	-4.8	22.2	26.7	4.6
Brazil	3.5	9.1	-5.6	34.2	20.2	-14.0	22.9	39.5	16.6
Montenegro	3.4	8.5	-5.1	9.8	17.5	7.8	13.3	17.0	3.7
United Arab Emirates	3.0	6.8	-3.8	31.5	16.2	**-15.3**	19.3	38.5	**19.3**
Turkey	1.8	5.1	**-3.3**	32.7	21.7	**-11.0**	27.4	52.3	**25.0**
Malaysia	6.4	9.5	-3.1	38.2	14.7	**-23.5**	9.7	39.0	**29.2**
Baku (Azerbaijan)	9.7	12.0	-2.3	13.4	13.2	-0.2	15.5	27.7	12.2
Singapore	1.8	2.8	-1.0	27.0	11.9	**-15.1**	15.4	29.9	**14.6**
Ukraine	10.5	8.6	1.9	11.2	5.0	-6.2	5.2	14.5	**9.3**
Morocco	37.6	c	c	40.4	45.2	4.8	c	c	c
Lebanon	16.5	c	c	46.6	26.7	-20.0	21.1	42.5	21.4
Kosovo	10.7	c	c	19.9	m	m	c	m	m
Saudi Arabia	9.0	c	c	30.0	11.7	-18.3	c	c	c
Costa Rica	2.8	c	c	39.1	29.8	-9.3	c	c	c
Peru	2.7	c	c	34.2	12.5	-21.7	8.3	c	c
Colombia	2.5	c	c	36.2	9.0	-27.3	8.4	c	c
Georgia	1.8	c	c	22.2	16.3	-5.9	6.9	c	c
Indonesia	0.5	c	c	12.5	5.0	-7.5	17.7	33.0	15.3
Panama	6.0	m	m	9.8	m	m	c	m	m
Philippines	4.8	m	m	35.8	17.3	-18.5	c	c	c
Dominican Republic	2.9	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Spain	m	m	m	34.2	19.4	**-14.7**	11.9	28.3	**16.4**

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).

Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9 from *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do*).

The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.

Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the difference between advantaged and disadvantaged students.

Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables II.B1.6.7, II.B1.8.22 and II.B1.8.23.

StatLink 🔗 https://doi.org/10.1787/888934037032

Table II.3 [1/2] **Snapshot of immigrant students**

| | Countries/economies with a mean score in reading or a share of students above the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with a mean score in reading or a share of students not significantly different from the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with a mean score in reading or a share of students below the OECD average |

	Percentage of immigrant students	Performance in reading			Score-point difference in reading performance associated with immigrant background	Academically resilient immigrant students[1]
		Non-immigrant students	Second-generation immigrant students	First-generation immigrant students	After accounting for gender, and students' and schools' socio-economic profile	
	%	Mean score	Mean score	Mean score	Score dif.	%
OECD average	13.0	494	465	440	**-24**	16.8
Macao (China)	62.9	512	528	540	**26**	27.3
Qatar	56.8	368	423	454	**63**	36.4
United Arab Emirates	55.8	386	465	484	**64**	38.5
Luxembourg	54.9	491	450	461	**-17**	21.8
Hong Kong (China)	37.9	529	533	502	**9**	24.0
Canada	35.0	525	535	508	-1	26.2
Switzerland	33.9	503	453	448	**-25**	15.7
Australia	27.7	504	523	501	**7**	29.1
New Zealand	26.5	510	518	500	**-8**	26.5
Singapore	24.8	546	587	554	**-9**	28.9
United States	23.0	510	512	479	**16**	24.5
Austria	22.7	500	446	421	**-33**	11.2
Germany	22.2	519	477	405	**-17**	16.0
Sweden	20.5	525	471	410	**-54**	10.3
United Kingdom	19.8	511	493	488	-4	20.5
Belgium	18.1	506	459	427	**-21**	12.0
Ireland	17.9	522	509	508	**-9**	21.6
Israel	16.4	481	493	398	6	24.3
Cyprus	14.8	426	420	436	9	27.9
France	14.3	502	461	425	**-13**	13.4
Netherlands	13.8	498	433	399	**-23**	8.9
Norway	12.4	509	463	451	**-33**	13.9
Saudi Arabia	11.9	400	435	437	**32**	38.8
Greece	11.7	465	420	397	**-22**	12.1
Jordan	11.6	421	433	434	**14**	31.3
Denmark	10.7	509	447	435	**-34**	9.3
Estonia	10.4	528	492	453	**-35**	13.6
Italy	10.0	482	445	433	**-22**	14.1
Costa Rica	10.0	430	408	404	**-12**	17.5
Serbia	9.3	441	447	449	2	26.9
Croatia	9.1	481	473	464	-3	21.2
Slovenia	8.9	502	464	422	**-28**	8.8
Malta	8.8	452	433	457	**-12**	27.6
Kazakhstan	8.2	389	389	366	-3	20.3
Brunei Darussalam	8.2	403	460	485	**25**	53.3
Portugal	7.0	495	483	436	**-26**	17.1
Lebanon	6.0	364	306	316	**-44**	14.6
Panama	6.0	381	375	426	**-12**	41.4

1. Immigrant students who scored in the top quarter of performance in reading amongst students in their own country.

Notes: Values that are statistically signi cant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).

Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9 from *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do*).
The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.

Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of immigrant students.

Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables II.B1.9.1 and II.B1.9.3.

StatLink 🔗 https://doi.org/10.1787/888934037051

Table II.3 [2/2] **Snapshot of immigrant students**

	Countries/economies with a mean score in reading or a share of students above the OECD average
	Countries/economies with a mean score in reading or a share of students not significantly different from the OECD average
	Countries/economies with a mean score in reading or a share of students below the OECD average

	Percentage of immigrant students	Performance in reading			Score-point difference in reading performance associated with immigrant background	Academically resilient immigrant students[1]
		Non-immigrant students	Second-generation immigrant students	First-generation immigrant students	After accounting for gender, and students' and schools' socio-economic profile	
	%	Mean score	Mean score	Mean score	Score dif.	%
Montenegro	5.8	422	438	415	-7	29.6
Finland	5.8	527	456	420	**-74**	7.9
Russia	5.8	480	491	457	-7	25.8
Iceland	5.6	481	412	402	**-55**	7.0
Baku (Azerbaijan)	5.2	393	386	369	**-13**	19.8
Argentina	4.6	404	414	395	**12**	23.0
Latvia	4.4	480	467	515	-7	27.5
Belarus	4.1	475	461	447	-9	22.6
Czech Republic	4.1	493	459	421	**-34**	12.3
Chile	3.4	456	447	435	**-14**	18.6
Dominican Republic	2.9	347	323	322	-17	20.0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2.8	405	403	369	**-23**	20.1
Hungary	2.6	477	510	468	-7	31.0
Ukraine	2.3	468	456	419	**-25**	15.3
Malaysia	1.6	417	413	c	-3	25.7
North Macedonia	1.6	397	372	c	**-27**	18.7
Mexico	1.6	424	332	324	**-80**	7.3
Lithuania	1.6	478	454	469	**-27**	20.3
Moldova	1.4	428	433	c	-14	31.5
Georgia	1.4	384	328	c	**-47**	12.5
Uruguay	1.3	429	399	404	**-42**	22.3
Slovak Republic	1.2	460	424	387	**-40**	12.6
Bulgaria	1.1	425	c	c	**-34**	16.8
Kosovo	1.1	355	339	c	**-31**	14.6
Thailand	1.1	394	348	c	-2	17.4
Philippines	1.0	344	c	261	**-64**	11.9
Turkey	0.9	467	474	c	**-27**	25.1
Morocco	0.8	361	c	c	**-55**	7.6
Romania	0.8	431	c	c	c	m
Chinese Taipei	0.7	504	c	c	-82	17.3
Poland	0.6	514	c	c	c	m
Japan	0.6	w	w	w	w	w
Albania	0.6	407	c	c	**-68**	3.0
Brazil	0.6	418	332	c	**-74**	4.6
Colombia	0.6	414	c	c	**-46**	13.5
Peru	0.5	403	c	c	c	m
Indonesia	0.3	373	c	c	**-89**	0.6
Korea	0.2	515	c	c	c	m
B-S-J-Z (China)	0.2	556	c	c	c	m
Spain	12.2	m	m	m	m	m

1. Immigrant students who scored in the top quarter of performance in reading amongst students in their own country.

Notes: Values that are statistically signi cant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).

Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9 from *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do*).

The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.

Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of immigrant students.

Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables II.B1.9.1 and II.B1.9.3.

StatLink ⟨≋⟩ https://doi.org/10.1787/888934037051

Table II.4 [1/2] **Snapshot of enrolment and resources allocated to schools**

	Countries/economies with segregation across schools below the OECD average or resources allocated above the OECD average
	Countries/economies with segregation across schools or resources allocated to schools not significantly different from the OECD average
	Countries/economies with segregation across schools above the OECD average or resources allocated below the OECD average

	Index of social inclusion[1]	Isolation[2] of disadvantaged students[3] from high-achieving students[4] in reading	Segregation of immigrant students (isolation index)[2]	Proportion of students in schools whose teachers hold at least a master's degree			Proportion of students in schools whose principal reported a lack in educational material		
				Advantaged students	Disadvantaged students	Difference between advantaged and disadvantaged students	Advantaged students	Disadvantaged students	Difference between advantaged and disadvantaged students
	%	Mean index	Mean index	%	%	% dif.	%	%	% dif.
OECD average	76.1	0.67	0.45	47.8	40.1	7.7	20.6	34.0	**-13.5**
Norway	91.4	0.56	0.36	m	m	m	16.7	24.0	-7.3
Kosovo	88.4	0.59	0.66	36.6	52.5	**-15.9**	75.3	94.1	**-18.8**
Finland	87.5	0.56	0.49	84.5	92.4	-7.9	20.6	19.2	1.4
Iceland	87.3	0.59	0.40	15.5	19.4	**-4.0**	10.9	21.6	**-10.7**
Montenegro	85.7	0.65	0.31	12.1	3.8	8.3	43.7	31.7	**12.0**
Sweden	85.6	0.60	0.39	49.9	30.7	19.2	5.8	11.6	-5.8
Denmark	85.6	0.59	0.49	5.8	2.7	3.1	2.7	13.9	**-11.2**
Cyprus	84.9	0.61	0.34	54.2	45.0	**9.1**	0.0	53.4	**-53.4**
Canada	84.9	0.58	0.38	19.7	18.9	0.8	3.1	21.1	**-18.1**
Bosnia and Herzegovina	83.8	0.64	0.47	15.4	4.7	**10.7**	47.4	66.8	-19.3
Ireland	83.0	0.60	0.26	31.1	29.8	1.3	15.3	40.9	**-25.6**
New Zealand	82.4	0.62	0.32	15.4	17.4	-2.0	4.4	16.7	-12.4
Switzerland	82.3	0.70	0.24	78.2	63.9	14.3	14.2	21.0	-6.9
Malta	81.9	0.61	0.47	20.1	20.9	-0.8	0.7	40.6	**-39.9**
Croatia	81.5	0.66	0.32	93.5	85.0	**8.5**	52.8	56.2	-3.4
Baku (Azerbaijan)	80.9	0.58	0.37	39.4	43.6	-4.3	15.1	17.8	-2.7
Georgia	80.7	0.67	0.77	58.7	65.2	-6.4	32.6	47.8	-15.2
Russia	80.6	0.66	0.41	58.1	40.2	17.9	26.2	55.0	**-28.9**
North Macedonia	80.2	0.67	0.50	6.2	4.8	1.4	48.8	81.9	**-33.2**
Chinese Taipei	80.0	0.68	0.83	56.9	51.5	5.4	5.5	15.7	-10.3
Estonia	79.5	0.60	0.48	84.0	78.1	5.9	19.8	39.3	**-19.5**
Korea	78.9	0.66	0.00	44.1	35.4	8.6	41.8	53.7	-11.9
Kazakhstan	78.7	0.64	0.48	46.1	32.7	13.4	35.2	57.4	**-22.2**
Brunei Darussalam	78.4	0.70	0.52	41.0	18.4	22.5	37.8	44.0	**-6.1**
Poland	78.3	0.64	0.00	98.3	95.4	2.9	18.0	27.2	-9.2
Greece	78.2	0.66	0.33	38.3	19.1	**19.2**	46.3	62.6	-16.3
Netherlands	78.2	0.72	0.44	41.9	14.6	**27.3**	20.9	7.1	13.8
Italy	78.1	0.72	0.41	63.5	72.3	-8.9	15.2	40.8	**-25.7**
Qatar	77.5	0.69	0.22	39.4	19.0	20.3	5.3	0.0	**5.3**
Latvia	77.1	0.67	0.61	56.3	46.6	**9.7**	15.1	22.8	-7.7
Japan	76.8	0.72	w	m	m	m	42.2	67.4	**-25.2**
France	76.8	0.67	0.43	44.7	42.4	2.3	11.0	16.3	-5.3
Portugal	76.7	0.60	0.48	19.3	16.7	2.6	34.8	39.7	-4.9
United Kingdom	76.6	0.62	0.45	27.0	13.5	**13.5**	18.5	26.3	-7.8
Serbia	76.6	0.70	0.32	44.7	26.0	18.6	40.0	68.3	**-28.3**
Belgium	76.1	0.72	0.42	52.1	31.6	**20.5**	18.0	36.7	**-18.7**
Spain	75.8	m	0.38	36.9	40.6	-3.7	22.6	53.0	**-30.4**
Australia	75.6	0.63	0.34	24.3	12.6	**11.7**	1.3	20.9	-19.6

1. The index of social inclusion is calculated as 100*(1-rho), where rho stands for the intra-class correlation of socio-economic status. The intra-class correlation, in turn, is the variation in student socio-economic status between schools, divided by the sum of the variation in student socio-economic status between schools and the variation in student socio-economic status within schools, and multiplied by 100.

2. The isolation index measures whether students of type (a) are more concentrated in some schools. The index is related to the likelihood of a representative type (a) student to be enrolled in schools that enrol students of another type. It ranges from 0 to 1, with 0 corresponding to no segregation and 1 to full segregation.

3. A socio-economically disadvantaged student is a student in the bottom quarter of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) in his or her own country/economy.

4. High-achieving students are students who score amongst the top 25% of students, within their country or economy, on the PISA test.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).

Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9 from *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do*).

The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.

Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the index of social inclusion.

Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables II.B1.4.6, II.B1.4.8, II.B1.5.4, II.B1.5.15 and II.B1.9.11.

StatLink ᵃˢ˃ https://doi.org/10.1787/888934037070

Table II.4 [2/2] **Snapshot of enrolment and resources allocated to schools**

		Countries/economies with segregation across schools below the OECD average or resources allocated above the OECD average
		Countries/economies with segregation across schools or resources allocated to schools not significantly different from the OECD average
		Countries/economies with segregation across schools above the OECD average or resources allocated below the OECD average

	Index of social inclusion[1]	Isolation[2] of disadvantaged students[3] from high-achieving students[4] in reading	Segregation of immigrant students (isolation index)[2]	Proportion of students in schools whose teachers hold at least a master's degree			Proportion of students in schools whose principal reported a lack in educational material		
				Advantaged students	Disadvantaged students	Difference between advantaged and disadvantaged students	Advantaged students	Disadvantaged students	Difference between advantaged and disadvantaged students
	%	Mean index	Mean index	%	%	% dif.	%	%	% dif.
Slovenia	75.5	0.73	0.43	13.2	7.2	**6.0**	12.3	41.0	**-28.6**
Ukraine	75.2	0.68	0.56	73.7	68.8	5.0	73.4	80.8	-7.4
Saudi Arabia	75.1	0.65	0.52	4.5	3.1	1.4	25.6	50.5	**-24.9**
Singapore	74.9	0.70	0.23	37.1	17.6	**19.5**	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lithuania	74.6	0.71	0.79	53.8	37.4	**16.4**	31.9	21.9	**10.0**
United States	74.2	0.64	0.43	67.5	43.1	**24.4**	13.1	17.6	-4.4
Dominican Republic	74.1	0.69	0.61	15.5	5.5	10.0	19.8	69.7	**-49.9**
Germany	74.0	0.72	0.33	91.3	80.7	10.6	37.5	42.9	-5.4
Belarus	73.4	0.71	0.42	2.3	2.2	0.1	25.6	49.0	**-23.4**
Jordan	73.0	0.62	0.38	11.7	10.0	1.8	34.5	62.1	**-27.6**
Czech Republic	72.3	0.76	0.54	98.3	80.9	**17.4**	25.0	37.9	-12.9
Luxembourg	72.2	0.74	0.15	85.0	74.6	10.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Moldova	72.1	0.70	0.73	30.4	10.2	**20.2**	58.9	65.3	-6.4
Israel	71.6	0.75	0.39	32.4	36.5	-4.1	31.8	37.2	-5.4
Macao (China)	71.3	0.56	0.10	m	m	m	16.2	10.6	**5.6**
Romania	70.5	0.75	0.00	69.1	40.8	28.4	22.6	51.6	**-29.0**
Albania	70.0	0.68	0.88	56.8	57.0	-0.2	40.7	70.7	**-30.0**
United Arab Emirates	69.4	0.78	0.30	26.4	34.8	-8.4	4.5	30.6	**-26.1**
Malaysia	69.0	0.69	0.72	10.0	5.4	**4.6**	13.5	27.8	-14.3
Lebanon	67.8	0.73	0.50	24.8	20.9	3.9	5.2	39.8	**-34.6**
Hong Kong (China)	67.4	0.67	0.18	56.9	44.7	**12.1**	6.5	24.1	-17.6
Turkey	67.2	0.69	0.77	11.1	18.9	-7.9	2.7	27.0	**-24.3**
Philippines	66.8	0.72	0.70	24.1	14.2	10.0	15.9	70.0	**-54.1**
Morocco	66.0	0.70	0.76	8.4	9.6	-1.2	54.3	75.1	-20.9
Uruguay	64.2	0.73	0.75	2.9	0.8	**2.1**	14.5	35.8	**-21.3**
Argentina	63.7	0.77	0.59	39.5	24.5	15.0	23.0	58.2	**-35.2**
Hungary	63.6	0.80	0.53	89.2	58.9	**30.2**	45.8	52.6	-6.8
B-S-J-Z (China)	63.2	0.72	0.00	17.8	3.5	**14.3**	12.5	32.4	**-19.9**
Costa Rica	63.1	0.73	0.42	26.1	27.9	-1.8	51.1	56.7	-5.6
Slovak Republic	63.0	0.76	0.83	98.0	91.4	**6.6**	49.8	63.2	-13.4
Bulgaria	62.9	0.82	0.79	88.3	81.8	6.4	17.2	29.5	-12.3
Indonesia	62.3	0.70	0.95	13.7	5.5	**8.2**	36.9	69.4	**-32.5**
Thailand	62.1	0.73	0.88	27.8	34.5	-6.7	23.9	84.3	**-60.4**
Mexico	61.7	0.70	0.81	28.9	21.8	7.1	24.7	69.2	**-44.5**
Panama	61.0	0.73	0.57	13.2	17.5	-4.3	26.6	71.3	**-44.7**
Brazil	60.8	0.69	0.92	16.5	4.6	**11.9**	6.2	52.0	**-45.8**
Colombia	59.5	0.74	0.85	12.5	9.8	2.7	29.0	85.2	**-56.2**
Chile	56.3	0.74	0.60	14.5	8.2	**6.2**	18.0	25.6	-7.6
Peru	48.8	0.82	0.00	12.4	9.5	2.9	19.6	74.6	**-55.0**

1. The index of social inclusion is calculated as 100*(1-rho), where rho stands for the intra-class correlation of socio-economic status. The intra-class correlation, in turn, is the variation in student socio-economic status between schools, divided by the sum of the variation in student socio-economic status between schools and the variation in student socio-economic status within schools, and multiplied by 100.

2. The isolation index measures whether students of type (a) are more concentrated in some schools. The index is related to the likelihood of a representative type (a) student to be enrolled in schools that enrol students of another type. It ranges from 0 to 1, with 0 corresponding to no segregation and 1 to full segregation.

3. A socio-economically disadvantaged student is a student in the bottom quarter of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) in his or her own country/economy.

4. High-achieving students are students who score amongst the top 25% of students, within their country or economy, on the PISA test.

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).

Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9 from *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do*).

The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.

Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the index of social inclusion.

Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables II.B1.4.6, II.B1.4.8, II.B1.5.4, II.B1.5.15 and II.B1.9.11.

StatLink ⟐ https://doi.org/10.1787/888934037070

Table II.5 [1/2] **Snapshot of gender gaps in performance**

| | Countries/economies with a mean score above the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with a mean score not significantly different from the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with a mean score below the OECD average |

	Reading performance			Mathematics performance			Science performance		
	Boys	Girls	Difference between girls and boys	Boys	Girls	Difference between girls and boys	Boys	Girls	Difference between girls and boys
	Mean score	Mean score	Score dif.	Mean score	Mean score	Score dif.	Mean score	Mean score	Score dif.
OECD average	472	502	**30**	492	487	**-5**	488	490	**2**
Colombia	407	417	**10**	401	381	**-20**	420	407	**-12**
Peru	395	406	**11**	408	392	**-16**	411	397	**-13**
Mexico	415	426	**11**	415	403	**-12**	424	415	**-9**
B-S-J-Z (China)	549	562	**13**	597	586	**-11**	596	584	**-12**
Panama	370	384	**14**	357	349	**-8**	365	364	0
Costa Rica	419	434	**14**	411	394	**-18**	420	411	**-9**
Argentina	393	409	**16**	387	372	**-15**	409	399	**-10**
Chile	442	462	**20**	421	414	**-7**	445	442	-3
United Kingdom	494	514	**20**	508	496	**-12**	506	503	-2
Japan	493	514	**20**	532	522	**-10**	531	528	-3
Belgium	482	504	**22**	514	502	**-12**	501	496	-5
Chinese Taipei	492	514	**22**	533	529	-4	516	515	-1
Macao (China)	514	536	**22**	560	556	-4	543	545	2
Belarus	463	486	**23**	475	469	-6	473	470	-3
Uruguay	415	438	**23**	422	414	**-8**	428	424	-3
Singapore	538	561	**23**	571	567	-4	553	549	-4
Ireland	506	530	**23**	503	497	-6	495	497	1
United States	494	517	**24**	482	474	**-9**	503	502	-1
Korea	503	526	**24**	528	524	-4	521	517	-4
Portugal	480	504	**24**	497	488	**-9**	494	489	-5
Italy	464	489	**25**	494	479	**-16.**	470	466	-3
France	480	505	**25**	499	492	**-6**	493	493	1
Kosovo	340	366	**25**	368	364	-4	362	368	**6**
Russia	466	491	**25**	490	485	**-5**	477	478	1
Turkey	453	478	**25**	456	451	-5	465	472	**7**
Indonesia	358	383	**25**	374	383	**10**	393	399	**7**
Baku (Azerbaijan)	377	403	**26**	423	416	**-8**	395	400	**5**
Brazil	400	426	**26**	388	379	**-9**	403	404	2
Germany	486	512	**26**	503	496	**-7**	502	504	1
Morocco	347	373	**26**	368	367	-1	372	381	**9**
Malaysia	402	428	**26**	437	443	**7**	434	441	**6**
Hungary	463	489	**26**	486	477	**-9**	484	478	-6
Kazakhstan	374	401	**27**	424	422	-1	394	401	**7**
Philippines	325	352	**27**	346	358	**12**	355	359	3
Lebanon	338	366	**28**	394	393	0	381	386	5
Austria	471	499	**28**	505	492	**-13**	491	489	-2
New Zealand	491	520	**29**	499	490	**-9**	509	508	-2
Netherlands	470	499	**29**	520	519	-1	499	508	**8**

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).
Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9 from Volume I). The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.
Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the gender gap in reading performance.
Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables II.B1.7.1, II.B1.7.3 and II.B1.7.5.
StatLink ⧉ https://doi.org/10.1787/888934037089

Table II.5 [2/2] **Snapshot of gender gaps in performance**

▨ (blue)	Countries/economies with a mean score above the OECD average				
▨ (grey)	Countries/economies with a mean score not significantly different from the OECD average				
▢ (white)	Countries/economies with a mean score below the OECD average				

	Reading performance			Mathematics performance			Science performance		
	Boys	Girls	Difference between girls and boys	Boys	Girls	Difference between girls and boys	Boys	Girls	Difference between girls and boys
	Mean score	Mean score	Score dif.	Mean score	Mean score	Score dif.	Mean score	Mean score	Score dif.
Canada	506	535	**29**	514	510	**-5**	516	520	3
Luxembourg	456	485	**29**	487	480	**-7**	475	479	5
Denmark	486	516	**29**	511	507	-4	492	494	2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	389	418	**30**	408	405	-3	398	399	1
Brunei Darussalam	393	423	**30**	426	434	**8**	427	435	**7**
Montenegro	407	437	**30**	434	425	**-8**	413	418	5
Switzerland	469	500	**31**	519	512	**-7**	495	495	0
Estonia	508	538	**31**	528	519	**-8**	528	533	**5**
Dominican Republic	326	357	**31**	324	327	3	331	340	**10**
Australia	487	519	**31**	494	488	**-6**	504	502	-2
Poland	495	528	**33**	516	515	-1	511	511	0
Latvia	462	495	**33**	500	493	**-7**	483	491	**8**
Croatia	462	495	**33**	469	460	**-9**	470	474	4
Czech Republic	474	507	**33**	501	498	-4	496	498	2
Ukraine	450	484	**33**	456	449	-7	470	468	-2
Romania	411	445	**34**	432	427	-5	425	426	1
Sweden	489	523	**34**	502	503	1	496	503	**8**
Slovak Republic	441	475	**34**	488	484	-5	461	467	6
Hong Kong (China)	507	542	**35**	548	554	6	512	521	**9**
Serbia	422	458	**36**	450	447	-3	437	442	5
Albania	387	425	**38**	435	440	5	409	425	**16**
Georgia	362	399	**38**	396	400	4	376	390	**14**
Lithuania	457	496	**39**	480	482	2	479	485	**6**
Thailand	372	411	**39**	410	426	**16**	415	435	**20**
Moldova	404	445	**40**	420	422	2	423	434	**11**
Bulgaria	401	441	**40**	435	437	2	417	432	**15**
Iceland	454	494	**41**	490	500	**10**	471	479	**8**
Slovenia	475	517	**42**	509	509	-1	502	512	**10**
Greece	437	479	**42**	452	451	0	446	457	**11**
Norway	476	523	**47**	497	505	**7**	485	496	**11**
Cyprus	401	448	**47**	447	455	**8**	429	450	**21**
Israel	445	493	**48**	458	467	9	452	471	**19**
Malta	425	474	**49**	466	478	**13**	447	468	**21**
Jordan	393	444	**51**	397	403	6	414	444	**29**
Finland	495	546	**52**	504	510	**6**	510	534	**24**
North Macedonia	368	420	**52**	391	398	**7**	404	423	**19**
Saudi Arabia	373	427	**54**	367	380	**13**	372	401	**29**
United Arab Emirates	403	460	**57**	430	439	**9**	420	447	**26**
Qatar	375	440	**65**	402	426	**24**	400	439	**39**
Spain	m	m	m	485	478	**-6**	484	482	-2

Notes: Values that are statistically significant are marked in bold (see Annex A3).

Results based on reading performance are reported as missing for Spain (see Annex A9 from Volume I). The OECD average does not include Spain in these cases.

Countries and economies are ranked in ascending order of the gender gap in reading performance.

Source: OECD, PISA 2018 Database, Tables II.B1.7.1, II.B1.7.3 and II.B1.7.5.

StatLink 🔗 https://doi.org/10.1787/888934037089

Equity in education

Around **1/10** disadvantaged students scored in the top quarter of reading performance in their country

&

Around **2/10** immigrant students scored in the top quarter of reading performance in their country

In 23 countries more than **1 in 3** disadvantaged boys did not attain a minimum level of proficiency in reading

The following number of high-achieving students reported that they expect to **complete higher education**

9 in 10 high-achieving **advantaged students**

compared to only **7 in 10** high-achieving **disadvantaged students**

Disadvantaged students have only a **1 in 6** chance to be **enrolled in a school with high-achieving students**

Students in disadvantaged schools were **twice as likely** as students in advantaged schools to attend a school where **a lack of teaching staff hinders instruction** at least to some extent

In 11 countries and economies

⬆ **average reading performance was higher** than the OECD average

⬇ while the **relationship between socio-economic status and performance was weaker** than the OECD average

Executive Summary
VOLUME III

A positive school climate is one of those things that is difficult to define and measure, but everyone – including parents – recognises it when they see it. The state of the school's facilities, the tone of the conversations in corridors, the enthusiasm of the school staff and the way students interact during breaks are some of the signs that visitors can read to quickly and broadly assess a school's climate. PISA indicators of school climate – the disciplinary climate, students' sense of belonging at school and teacher support – can be analysed in relation to other PISA data on important student outcomes, such as academic achievement, student misbehaviour and students' well-being, and to key factors that shape students' learning, such as teachers' practices and parental involvement.

Measuring the well-being of 15-year-old students, the target PISA population, is particularly important, as students at this age are in a key transition phase of physical and emotional development. Asking students about themselves gives adolescents the opportunity to express how they feel, what they think of their lives and whether they believe they have the capacity to grow and improve. Even if the well-being indicators examined in this volume do not refer specifically to the school context – for instance, students are asked how satisfied they feel about their lives in general – adolescents spend a large part of their time at school and their peers play a pre-eminent role in their social lives. In fact, students who sat the 2018 PISA test cited three main aspects of their lives that influence how they feel: how satisfied they are with the way they look, with their relationships with their parents, and with life at school.

WHAT SCHOOL LIFE MEANS FOR STUDENTS' LIVES: MAIN FINDINGS

School climate

- Co-operation amongst students was more prevalent than competition, on average across OECD countries in 2018. Some 62% of students reported that students co-operate with each other while only 50% of students reported that their schoolmates compete with each other.

- On average across OECD countries and in three out of four education systems, students scored higher in reading when they reported greater co-operation amongst their peers. By contrast, there was no clear relationship between the competitiveness of a school environment and student performance.

Teachers' attitudes and practices

- On average across OECD countries and in 43 education systems, students who perceived greater support from teachers scored higher in reading, after accounting for the socio-economic profile of students and schools.

- Teacher enthusiasm and teachers' stimulation of reading engagement were the teaching practices most strongly (and positively) associated with students' enjoyment of reading.

Student misbehaviour

- According to students, disciplinary climate in language-of-instruction lessons improved between 2009 and 2018, especially in Albania, Korea and the United Arab Emirates.

- Some 23% of students reported being bullied at least a few times a month, on average across OECD countries.

- Some 88% of students across OECD countries agreed that it is a good thing to help students who cannot defend themselves and it is wrong to join in bullying. Girls and students who were not frequently bullied were more likely to report stronger anti-bullying attitudes than boys and frequently bullied students.

- On average across OECD countries, 21% of students had skipped a day of school and 48% of students had arrived late for school in the two weeks prior to the PISA test. In Georgia, Montenegro, Saudi Arabia and Turkey, at least one in five students had skipped school at least three times during that period.

- The countries and economies where fewer students had skipped a whole day of school were also the countries/economies with higher average reading performance, such as Beijing, Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang (China), Estonia, Finland, Hong Kong (China), Japan, Korea, Macao (China), Singapore, Sweden and Chinese Taipei.

Students' well-being

- On average across OECD countries, 67% of students reported being satisfied with their lives (students who reported between 7 and 10 on the 10-point life-satisfaction scale). Between 2015 and 2018, the share of satisfied students shrank by 5 percentage points.

- More than 80% of students reported sometimes or always feeling happy, cheerful, joyful or lively, and about 6% of students reported always feeling sad, on average across OECD countries.

- In almost every education system, girls expressed greater fear of failure than boys, and this gender gap was considerably wider amongst top-performing students.

- In a majority of school systems, students who expressed a greater fear of failure scored higher in reading, but reported less satisfaction with life, than students expressing less concern about failing, after accounting for the socio-economic profile of students and schools.

Students' belief that their ability and intelligence can develop over time (growth mindset)

- A majority of students disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "Your intelligence is something about you that you can't change very much", on average across OECD countries. However, at least 60% of students in the Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Kosovo, the Republic of North Macedonia, Panama and the Philippines agreed or strongly agreed with that statement.

- On average across OECD countries, having a growth mindset was positively associated with students' motivation to master tasks, general self-efficacy, setting learning goals and perceiving the value of school; it was negatively associated with their fear of failure.

Parents' involvement in school activities

- Parents overwhelmingly cited school safety, school climate and school reputation as the most important criteria when choosing a school for their child, followed closely by students' academic achievement and the offering of specific subjects or courses.

- According to school principals, about 41% of students' parents discussed their child's progress with a teacher on their own initiative and 57% did so on the initiative of teachers, on average across OECD countries. However, only 17% of parents participated in local school government and 12% volunteered for physical or extracurricular activities.

- On average across the nine OECD countries that distributed the parent questionnaire, the obstacles that parents most commonly cited as hindering their participation in school activities were time-related, and included the need to work (34%) and the inconvenience of meeting times (33%).

Table III.1 [1/4] **Snapshot of school climate**

	Countries/economies with values **above** the OECD average
	Countries/economies with values not statistically different from the OECD average
	Countries/economies with values **below** the OECD average

	Percentage of students who reported being victims of any type of bullying act at least a few times a month	Difference between frequently[1] and not frequently bullied students who reported feeling sometimes or always sad, after accounting for student and school characteristics[2]	Percentage of students who agreed or strongly agreed that "It is a wrong thing to join in bullying"	Difference in the index of sense of belonging between advantaged and disadvantaged students[3]	Difference in the percentage of students' parents who discussed their child's progress with a teacher on their own initiative between advantaged and disadvantaged schools[4]
	%	% dif.	%	Dif.	% dif.
OECD average	23	**20**	88	**0.23**	**11**
Australia	30	m	92	**0.27**	**13**
Austria	23	**19**	87	**0.19**	m
Belgium	19	m	94	0.06	**16**
Canada	25	**22**	92	**0.31**	**13**
Chile	24	**15**	86	**0.24**	4
Colombia	32	**10**	68	**0.25**	25
Czech Republic	30	**12**	88	**0.20**	4
Denmark	21	**26**	94	**0.22**	7
Estonia	25	**19**	89	**0.21**	4
Finland	18	**30**	93	**0.23**	2
France	20	**28**	93	**0.19**	19
Germany	23	**22**	90	**0.23**	14
Greece	27	**12**	85	**0.25**	20
Hungary	23	**21**	75	**0.32**	19
Iceland	17	**32**	88	**0.34**	1
Ireland	23	**24**	94	**0.08**	7
Israel	m	m	84	m	11
Italy	24	**12**	85	**0.15**	27
Japan	17	**17**	93	**0.12**	8
Korea	9	m	93	**0.37**	26
Latvia	35	**19**	83	**0.25**	-10
Lithuania	23	**17**	81	**0.20**	5
Luxembourg	21	**24**	89	**0.41**	25
Mexico	23	**12**	82	**0.31**	3
Netherlands	12	**21**	95	**0.14**	12
New Zealand	32	m	92	**0.23**	9
Norway	19	m	94	**0.33**	0
Poland	26	**18**	80	**0.09**	**10**
Portugal	14	**23**	86	**0.32**	18
Slovak Republic	28	**11**	80	**0.30**	**11**
Slovenia	21	**16**	84	**0.21**	14
Spain	17	m	90	**0.25**	13
Sweden	19	**26**	92	**0.27**	7
Switzerland	22	**21**	86	**0.21**	-9
Turkey	24	**16**	80	0.08	**18**
United Kingdom	27	**23**	95	**0.18**	9
United States	26	**23**	93	**0.27**	**24**

1. A student is frequently bullied if he or she is in the top 10% of the index of exposure to bullying across all countries/economies.

2. Student and school characteristics include the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) at the student and school levels, gender and reading performance.

3. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) student is a student in the bottom (top) quarter of the index of ESCS in his or her own country/economy.

4. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) school is a school in the bottom (top) quarter of the index of ESCS in the relevant country/economy.

5. The regression model accounts for students' and schools' socio-economic profile. The socio-economic profile is measured by the index of ESCS.

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

Source: OECD PISA 2018 Database, Tables III.B1.2.1, III.B1.2.13, III.B1.2.15, III.B1.3.8, III.B1.4.12, III.B1.6.10, III.B1.8.10, III.B1.8.14, III.B1.9.4 and III.B1.10.3.

StatLink https://doi.org/10.1787/888934029147

Table III.1 [2/4] **Snapshot of school climate**

| | Countries/economies with values **above** the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with values not statistically different from the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with values **below** the OECD average |

	Percentage of students who reported being victims of any type of bullying act at least a few times a month	Difference between frequently[1] and not frequently bullied students who reported feeling sometimes or always sad, after accounting for student and school characteristics[2]	Percentage of students who agreed or strongly agreed that "It is a wrong thing to join in bullying"	Difference in the index of sense of belonging between advantaged and disadvantaged students[3]	Difference in the percentage of students' parents who discussed their child's progress with a teacher on their own initiative between advantaged and disadvantaged schools[4]
	%	% dif.	%	Dif.	% dif.
Partners					
Albania	25	**7**	86	**0.36**	**13**
Argentina	32	**18**	79	**0.41**	4
Baku (Azerbaijan)	36	2	76	0.09	-2
Belarus	19	**17**	76	**0.18**	**11**
Bosnia and Herzegovina	25	**13**	86	**0.19**	5
Brazil	29	**12**	83	**0.30**	**12**
Brunei Darussalam	50	**8**	87	**0.10**	**14**
B-S-J-Z (China)	18	**10**	96	**0.29**	**17**
Bulgaria	34	**16**	77	**0.33**	**18**
Costa Rica	24	**18**	86	**0.26**	**16**
Croatia	18	**16**	89	**0.14**	2
Cyprus	34	**12**	79	**0.15**	**9**
Dominican Republic	44	**12**	74	**0.33**	**15**
Georgia	24	**15**	80	**0.24**	4
Hong Kong (China)	29	**10**	91	**0.13**	**19**
Indonesia	41	**4**	57	0.07	**22**
Jordan	38	**6**	70	**0.27**	**16**
Kazakhstan	32	**10**	72	**0.17**	5
Kosovo	32	**9**	76	**0.22**	**17**
Lebanon	m	m	m	m	8
Macao (China)	27	**18**	93	**0.19**	**6**
Malaysia	36	**13**	84	**0.16**	7
Malta	32	**14**	90	**0.10**	**-1**
Moldova	24	**13**	74	**0.33**	5
Montenegro	25	**16**	83	**0.11**	**7**
Morocco	44	**9**	67	**0.27**	10
North Macedonia	m	m	m	m	**4**
Panama	33	**10**	74	**0.27**	3
Peru	22	**13**	81	**0.24**	**12**
Philippines	65	**6**	79	**0.21**	9
Qatar	33	**13**	79	**0.24**	**26**
Romania	34	**17**	75	**0.34**	12
Russia	37	**17**	84	**0.16**	**11**
Saudi Arabia	30	**12**	71	**0.32**	**14**
Serbia	26	**20**	83	**0.22**	**15**
Singapore	26	m	96	**0.23**	**21**
Chinese Taipei	13	**20**	92	**0.23**	**17**
Thailand	27	**8**	72	**0.20**	11
Ukraine	22	**18**	78	**0.26**	**17**
United Arab Emirates	31	**17**	77	**0.16**	**8**
Uruguay	26	**14**	84	**0.52**	0
Viet Nam	27	m	82	0.07	10

1. A student is frequently bullied if he or she is in the top 10% of the index of exposure to bullying across all countries/economies.

2. Student and school characteristics include the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) at the student and school levels, gender and reading performance.

3. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) student is a student in the bottom (top) quarter of the index of ESCS in his or her own country/economy.

4. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) school is a school in the bottom (top) quarter of the index of ESCS in the relevant country/economy.

5. The regression model accounts for students' and schools' socio-economic profile. The socio-economic profile is measured by the index of ESCS.

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

Source: OECD PISA 2018 Database, Tables III.B1.2.1, III.B1.2.13, III.B1.2.15, III.B1.3.8, III.B1.4.12, III.B1.6.10, III.B1.8.10, III.B1.8.14, III.B1.9.4 and III.B1.10.3.

StatLink ⟨⟨⟩⟩ https://doi.org/10.1787/888934029147   • • •

Table III.1 [3/4] **Snapshot of school climate**

| | Countries/economies with values **above** the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with values not statistically different from the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with values **below** the OECD average |

	Change in reading performance when students reported that there is noise and disorder "in every lesson" in their language-of-instruction class (reference category: "never or hardly ever")[5]	Change in reading performance when students reported that they had arrived late for school "five or more times" in the two weeks prior to the PISA test (reference: "never")[5]	Change in reading performance associated with a one-unit increase in the index of student co-operation[5]	Change in reading performance associated with a one-unit increase in the index of attitudes towards competition[5]	Change in enjoyment of reading per one-unit increase in the index of teacher enthusiasm, after accounting for reading performance and other teaching practices
	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	Dif.
OECD average	**-35**	**-23**	**6**	**5**	**0.08**
Australia	**-28**	**-40**	**4**	**4**	**0.07**
Austria	**-37**	**-20**	**13**	**7**	0.01
Belgium	**-17**	**-36**	2	1	**0.11**
Canada	**-17**	**-31**	m	**3**	m
Chile	**-29**	**-23**	**5**	2	0.03
Colombia	**-30**	-16	**4**	**8**	**0.08**
Czech Republic	**-39**	**-26**	**5**	**5**	**0.07**
Denmark	**-29**	**-17**	**6**	**5**	0.04
Estonia	**-37**	**-30**	**12**	**9**	0.03
Finland	-15	**-46**	**6**	**6**	**0.17**
France	**-14**	**-39**	2	2	**0.08**
Germany	**-44**	**-31**	**6**	**6**	**0.07**
Greece	**-42**	2	**6**	2	**0.15**
Hungary	**-27**	**-17**	**6**	2	**0.06**
Iceland	**-41**	**-28**	**14**	**11**	**0.11**
Ireland	**-24**	**-34**	1	**5**	**0.10**
Israel	**-35**	-6	2	**10**	**0.10**
Italy	**-46**	**-21**	**5**	**6**	**0.11**
Japan	**-56**	**-42**	**3**	**5**	0.05
Korea	**-45**	**-26**	**-6**	0	0.03
Latvia	**-33**	-2	**9**	**10**	0.03
Lithuania	**-43**	**-12**	**12**	**8**	**0.07**
Luxembourg	**-45**	**-15**	**7**	**4**	**0.11**
Mexico	**-29**	0	**8**	**8**	0.04
Netherlands	**-46**	**-37**	**4**	3	**0.09**
New Zealand	**-31**	**-18**	**6**	2	**0.07**
Norway	**-55**	**-21**	**14**	**6**	0.03
Poland	**-28**	**-18**	**6**	**4**	0.03
Portugal	**-28**	-5	**4**	**-3**	**0.11**
Slovak Republic	**-56**	**-31**	**11**	1	**0.08**
Slovenia	**-38**	-2	**10**	1	**0.13**
Spain	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden	**-33**	**-23**	0	**5**	**0.10**
Switzerland	**-31**	**-20**	**9**	2	**0.10**
Turkey	**-48**	**-23**	**5**	**6**	**0.08**
United Kingdom	**-37**	**-37**	2	**5**	**0.13**
United States	**-42**	**-37**	-1	**5**	**0.06**

1. A student is frequently bullied if he or she is in the top 10% of the index of exposure to bullying across all countries/economies.

2. Student and school characteristics include the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) at the student and school levels, gender and reading performance.

3. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) student is a student in the bottom (top) quarter of the index of ESCS in his or her own country/economy.

4. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) school is a school in the bottom (top) quarter of the index of ESCS in the relevant country/economy.

5. The regression model accounts for students' and schools' socio-economic profile. The socio-economic profile is measured by the index of ESCS.

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

Source: OECD PISA 2018 Database, Tables III.B1.2.1, III.B1.2.13, III.B1.2.15, III.B1.3.8, III.B1.4.12, III.B1.6.10, III.B1.8.10, III.B1.8.14, III.B1.9.4 and III.B1.10.3.

StatLink https://doi.org/10.1787/888934029147

Table III.1 [4/4] **Snapshot of school climate**

	Countries/economies with values **above** the OECD average
	Countries/economies with values not statistically different from the OECD average
	Countries/economies with values **below** the OECD average

	Change in reading performance when students reported that there is noise and disorder "in every lesson" in their language-of-instruction class (reference category: "never or hardly ever")[5]	Change in reading performance when students reported that they had arrived late for school "five or more times" in the two weeks prior to the PISA test (reference: "never")[5]	Change in reading performance associated with a one-unit increase in the index of student co-operation[5]	Change in reading performance associated with a one-unit increase in the index of attitudes towards competition[5]	Change in enjoyment of reading per one-unit increase in the index of teacher enthusiasm, after accounting for reading performance and other teaching practices
	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	Score dif.	Dif.
Albania	**-35**	**-18**	**10**	**11**	**0.18**
Argentina	**-17**	-4	1	-1	0.02
Baku (Azerbaijan)	**-29**	-8	**5**	**9**	**0.07**
Belarus	**-41**	**-11**	**9**	**6**	**0.13**
Bosnia and Herzegovina	**-53**	**-29**	**4**	**3**	**0.11**
Brazil	**-23**	**-22**	2	**5**	**0.10**
Brunei Darussalam	**-42**	**-9**	**13**	**14**	**0.10**
B-S-J-Z (China)	**-44**	**-15**	0	**7**	**0.13**
Bulgaria	**-43**	**-12**	**10**	**9**	0.02
Costa Rica	**-14**	0	1	**7**	0.03
Croatia	**-48**	**-11**	**7**	**2**	**0.10**
Cyprus	**-51**	**-12**	**8**	**6**	**0.07**
Dominican Republic	**-20**	**-26**	2	**6**	**0.08**
Georgia	**-45**	**-13**	**7**	**10**	**0.10**
Hong Kong (China)	**-50**	**-47**	**10**	**9**	0.02
Indonesia	**-16**	**14**	**10**	**16**	**0.15**
Jordan	**-37**	**-11**	**7**	**22**	**0.10**
Kazakhstan	**-47**	**-12**	**9**	**-8**	**0.15**
Kosovo	**-41**	**-26**	**15**	**9**	**0.16**
Lebanon	m	m	**25**	**25**	m
Macao (China)	**-57**	**-44**	**8**	**12**	**0.13**
Malaysia	**-47**	**-21**	**14**	**22**	**0.12**
Malta	**-34**	**-58**	4	**12**	**0.08**
Moldova	**-34**	2	**16**	**6**	**0.14**
Montenegro	**-61**	**-19**	**6**	2	**0.10**
Morocco	**-9**	**-33**	-1	**17**	**0.10**
North Macedonia	m	m	**9**	**8**	m
Panama	**-23**	-6	-2	**6**	**0.05**
Peru	**-21**	-2	**8**	**12**	**0.08**
Philippines	-7	**26**	**16**	**12**	**0.11**
Qatar	**-43**	**-47**	**7**	**17**	**0.05**
Romania	**-48**	**-25**	**8**	2	**0.11**
Russia	**-46**	**-12**	**7**	**6**	**0.11**
Saudi Arabia	**-24**	**-16**	**5**	**17**	0.02
Serbia	**-49**	-6	**7**	**3**	**0.10**
Singapore	**-34**	**-44**	**9**	-2	**0.05**
Chinese Taipei	**-49**	**-13**	**6**	**9**	**0.11**
Thailand	**-33**	**-10**	**10**	**7**	**0.11**
Ukraine	**-52**	-7	**8**	**6**	m
United Arab Emirates	**-49**	**-46**	**10**	**17**	**0.06**
Uruguay	**-33**	6	1	**4**	0.04
Viet Nam	m	m	m	m	m

1. A student is frequently bullied if he or she is in the top 10% of the index of exposure to bullying across all countries/economies.

2. Student and school characteristics include the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) at the student and school levels, gender and reading performance.

3. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) student is a student in the bottom (top) quarter of the index of ESCS in his or her own country/economy.

4. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) school is a school in the bottom (top) quarter of the index of ESCS in the relevant country/economy.

5. The regression model accounts for students' and schools' socio-economic profile. The socio-economic profile is measured by the index of ESCS.

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

Source: OECD PISA 2018 Database, Tables III.B1.2.1, III.B1.2.13, III.B1.2.15, III.B1.3.8, III.B1.4.12, III.B1.6.10, III.B1.8.10, III.B1.8.14, III.B1.9.4 and III.B1.10.3.

StatLink 🔗 https://doi.org/10.1787/888934029147

Table III.2 [1/4] **Snapshot of student well-being**

	Countries/economies with values **above** the OECD average
	Countries/economies with values not statistically different from the OECD average
	Countries/economies with values **below** the OECD average

	Percentage of students who are satisfied with life[1]	Gender difference in the percentage of students who are satisfied with life (G-B)	Percentage of students who reported sometimes or always feeling happy	Percentage of students who reported always feeling sad	Difference between heavy and low Internet users[2] in the percentage of students who reported sometimes or always feeling sad
	%	% dif.	%	%	% dif.
OECD average	67	**-11**	91	6	**10**
Australia	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	70	**-12**	91	5	**14**
Belgium[5]	m	m	m	m	m
Canada	m	m	93	9	m
Chile	64	**-11**	94	8	**9**
Colombia	73	**-6**	93	6	m
Czech Republic	65	**-12**	86	7	**7**
Denmark	m	m	91	3	4
Estonia	70	**-11**	89	9	**18**
Finland	78	**-12**	91	4	**16**
France	70	**-9**	94	5	**6**
Germany	67	**-12**	92	4	m
Greece	65	**-10**	89	6	**11**
Hungary	68	**-12**	92	5	**9**
Iceland	72	**-14**	91	6	**22**
Ireland	61	**-12**	96	5	**12**
Israel	m	m	m	m	m
Italy	67	**-14**	91	6	**11**
Japan	50	-1	91	11	1
Korea	57	**-18**	87	10	**11**
Latvia	69	**-7**	87	8	**13**
Lithuania	75	**-8**	90	6	**12**
Luxembourg	68	**-10**	91	6	4
Mexico	83	**-4**	96	6	4
Netherlands	79	**-12**	97	3	m
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m
Norway	m	m	m	m	m
Poland	62	**-16**	87	8	**11**
Portugal	69	**-9**	96	3	m
Slovak Republic	70	**-13**	87	10	**5**
Slovenia	64	**-18**	83	5	**12**
Spain	74	**-7**	96	4	**8**
Sweden	67	**-15**	88	5	7
Switzerland	73	**-11**	95	3	3
Turkey	44	**-4**	81	13	**11**
United Kingdom	53	**-17**	93	9	**10**
United States	61	**-11**	93	11	**8**

1. A student is classified as "satisfied" with life if he or she reported between 7 and 10 on the life-satisfaction scale. The life-satisfaction scale ranges from 0 to 10.

2. Based on the cumulated time spent on the Internet on weekdays and weekend days. Low Internet users: 0-9 hours(h)/week(w); and Heavy Internet users: More than 40 h/w.

3. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) student is a student in the bottom (top) quarter of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) in his or her own country/economy.

4. The linear regression model accounts for the students' and schools' socio-economic profile. The socio-economic profile is measured by the index of ESCS.

5. Data related to the index of self-efficacy, the index of fear of failure and growth mindset only include the Flemish Community of Belgium.

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

Source: OECD PISA 2018 Database, Tables III.B1.11.1, III.B1.11.4, III.B1.12.1, III.B1.12.2, III.B1.12.16, III.B1.13.5, III.B1.13.14, III.B1.14.1 and III.B1.14.7.

StatLink https://doi.org/10.1787/888934029166

Table III.2 [2/4] **Snapshot of student well-being**

	Countries/economies with values **above** the OECD average
	Countries/economies with values not statistically different from the OECD average
	Countries/economies with values **below** the OECD average

	Percentage of students who are satisfied with life[1]	Gender difference in the percentage of students who are satisfied with life (G-B)	Percentage of students who reported sometimes or always feeling happy	Percentage of students who reported always feeling sad	Difference between heavy and low Internet users[2] in the percentage of students who reported sometimes or always feeling sad
	%	% dif.	%	%	% dif.
Albania	86	-1	95	4	-2
Argentina	70	**-9**	92	11	m
Baku (Azerbaijan)	67	**-5**	85	11	m
Belarus	83	**-5**	92	6	m
Bosnia and Herzegovina	76	**-7**	92	5	m
Brazil	65	**-11**	90	13	**8**
Brunei Darussalam	42	**-3**	93	19	**6**
B-S-J-Z (China)	59	**-3**	98	11	m
Bulgaria	65	**-6**	87	8	**7**
Costa Rica	79	**-8**	95	6	**9**
Croatia	76	**-13**	94	5	**13**
Cyprus	63	**-7**	88	7	m
Dominican Republic	79	**-6**	92	10	3
Georgia	74	-2	74	9	4
Hong Kong (China)	52	-2	96	13	2
Indonesia	70	**-3**	91	8	m
Jordan	62	**7**	81	10	m
Kazakhstan	87	**-2**	93	5	**20**
Kosovo	82	**-3**	94	4	m
Lebanon	59	3	82	8	m
Macao (China)	50	**-7**	89	16	**8**
Malaysia	63	-3	94	16	m
Malta	60	**-14**	94	9	**13**
Moldova	77	**3**	92	5	m
Montenegro	75	**-8**	93	6	m
Morocco	62	**-3**	88	10	**5**
North Macedonia	81	**-3**	94	4	m
Panama	77	**-4**	95	7	4
Peru	68	**-5**	96	6	m
Philippines	66	**7**	95	8	m
Qatar	61	**-3**	88	12	m
Romania	80	-2	93	4	m
Russia	69	**-9**	85	10	**20**
Saudi Arabia	71	**4**	85	8	m
Serbia	74	**-7**	90	7	5
Singapore	m	m	m	m	m
Chinese Taipei	56	**-8**	94	7	**7**
Thailand	73	-1	92	12	**6**
Ukraine	82	0	91	6	m
United Arab Emirates	61	**-7**	90	10	m
Uruguay	73	**-11**	94	7	**11**
Viet Nam	73	-2	85	13	m

1. A student is classified as "satisfied" with life if he or she reported between 7 and 10 on the life-satisfaction scale. The life-satisfaction scale ranges from 0 to 10.

2. Based on the cumulated time spent on the Internet on weekdays and weekend days. Low Internet users: 0-9 hours(h)/week(w); and Heavy Internet users: More than 40 h/w.

3. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) student is a student in the bottom (top) quarter of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) in his or her own country/economy.

4. The linear regression model accounts for the students' and schools' socio-economic profile. The socio-economic profile is measured by the index of ESCS.

5. Data related to the index of self-efficacy, the index of fear of failure and growth mindset only include the Flemish Community of Belgium.

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

Source: OECD PISA 2018 Database, Tables III.B1.11.1, III.B1.11.4, III.B1.12.1, III.B1.12.2, III.B1.12.16, III.B1.13.5, III.B1.13.14, III.B1.14.1 and III.B1.14.7.

StatLink 🔗📈 https://doi.org/10.1787/888934029166

• • •

Table III.2 [3/4] **Snapshot of student well-being**

	Countries/economies with values **above** the OECD average
	Countries/economies with values not statistically different from the OECD average
	Countries/economies with values **below** the OECD average

	Difference in the index of self-efficacy between advantaged and disadvantaged students[3]	Difference in the index of fear of failure between girls and boys who scored at Level 5 or above in reading (top performers, G-B)	Percentage of students who disagreed or strongly disagreed that "your intelligence is something about you that you can't change very much"	Change in the index of fear of failure when students disagreed or strongly disagreed that "your intelligence is something about you that you can't change very much"[4]
	Dif.	Dif.	%	Dif.
OECD average	**0.29**	**0.51**	63	**-0.04**
Australia	**0.39**	**0.55**	68	**-0.03**
Austria	**0.22**	**0.32**	72	**-0.04**
Belgium[5]	**0.12**	**0.40**	56	-0.01
Canada	**0.38**	**0.59**	68	**-0.03**
Chile	**0.22**	**0.45**	60	**-0.05**
Colombia	**0.24**	0.41	61	**-0.07**
Czech Republic	**0.21**	**0.47**	52	**-0.05**
Denmark	**0.36**	**0.57**	75	**-0.03**
Estonia	**0.43**	**0.63**	77	**-0.03**
Finland	**0.51**	**0.68**	67	**-0.02**
France	**0.25**	**0.50**	54	**-0.03**
Germany	**0.27**	**0.55**	74	-0.01
Greece	**0.32**	**0.43**	48	**-0.03**
Hungary	**0.36**	**0.56**	62	**-0.04**
Iceland	**0.47**	**0.52**	73	**-0.04**
Ireland	**0.21**	**0.52**	74	**-0.05**
Israel	**0.29**	m	63	m
Italy	0.06	**0.45**	59	**-0.07**
Japan	**0.31**	**0.21**	67	**-0.10**
Korea	**0.49**	**0.36**	53	**-0.13**
Latvia	**0.36**	**0.61**	73	**-0.05**
Lithuania	**0.32**	**0.55**	72	**-0.06**
Luxembourg	**0.37**	**0.53**	62	**-0.04**
Mexico	**0.31**	c	45	**-0.07**
Netherlands	0.05	**0.56**	51	**-0.03**
New Zealand	**0.36**	**0.63**	67	**-0.03**
Norway	m	m	m	m
Poland	**0.37**	**0.52**	41	**-0.02**
Portugal	**0.19**	**0.50**	66	**-0.06**
Slovak Republic	**0.22**	**0.43**	57	**-0.05**
Slovenia	**0.23**	**0.59**	51	**-0.04**
Spain	**0.32**	m	62	**-0.06**
Sweden	**0.38**	**0.64**	63	**-0.02**
Switzerland	**0.20**	**0.42**	63	**-0.03**
Turkey	**0.23**	**0.43**	60	**-0.04**
United Kingdom	**0.25**	**0.64**	70	**-0.05**
United States	**0.19**	**0.53**	68	**-0.03**

1. A student is classified as "satisfied" with life if he or she reported between 7 and 10 on the life-satisfaction scale. The life-satisfaction scale ranges from 0 to 10.

2. Based on the cumulated time spent on the Internet on weekdays and weekend days. Low Internet users: 0-9 hours(h)/week(w); and Heavy Internet users: More than 40 h/w.

3. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) student is a student in the bottom (top) quarter of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) in his or her own country/economy.

4. The linear regression model accounts for the students' and schools' socio-economic profile. The socio-economic profile is measured by the index of ESCS.

5. Data related to the index of self-efficacy, the index of fear of failure and growth mindset only include the Flemish Community of Belgium.

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

Source: OECD PISA 2018 Database, Tables III.B1.11.1, III.B1.11.4, III.B1.12.1, III.B1.12.2, III.B1.12.16, III.B1.13.5, III.B1.13.14, III.B1.14.1 and III.B1.14.7.

StatLink https://doi.org/10.1787/888934029166

Table III.2 [4/4] **Snapshot of student well-being**

| | Countries/economies with values **above** the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with values not statistically different from the OECD average |
| Countries/economies with values **below** the OECD average |

	Difference in the index of self-efficacy between advantaged and disadvantaged students[3]	Difference in the index of fear of failure between girls and boys who scored at Level 5 or above in reading (top performers, G-B)	Percentage of students who disagreed or strongly disagreed that "your intelligence is something about you that you can't change very much"	Change in the index of fear of failure when students disagreed or strongly disagreed that "your intelligence is something about you that you can't change very much"[4]
	Dif.	Dif.	%	Dif.
Albania	0.37	c	41	-0.06
Argentina	0.25	0.46	49	-0.05
Baku (Azerbaijan)	0.29	c	52	-0.06
Belarus	0.37	**0.41**	55	-0.06
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.29	c	51	-0.06
Brazil	0.17	0.43	63	-0.04
Brunei Darussalam	0.32	**0.48**	47	-0.08
B-S-J-Z (China)	0.48	**0.23**	56	-0.13
Bulgaria	0.43	0.41	59	-0.07
Costa Rica	0.21	c	54	-0.07
Croatia	0.24	**0.47**	56	-0.06
Cyprus	0.42	0.34	55	-0.07
Dominican Republic	0.28	m	35	-0.11
Georgia	0.39	c	50	-0.10
Hong Kong (China)	0.28	**0.28**	43	-0.13
Indonesia	0.10	c	29	-0.06
Jordan	0.34	c	47	-0.07
Kazakhstan	0.26	**0.65**	55	-0.07
Kosovo	0.28	m	28	-0.09
Lebanon	0.48	c	41	-0.08
Macao (China)	0.33	**0.29**	49	-0.09
Malaysia	0.20	c	41	-0.06
Malta	0.23	**0.36**	54	-0.05
Moldova	0.29	c	43	-0.09
Montenegro	0.30	c	45	-0.05
Morocco	0.32	m	42	-0.07
North Macedonia	0.45	c	24	-0.03
Panama	0.34	c	29	-0.04
Peru	0.23	c	52	-0.10
Philippines	0.43	m	31	-0.08
Qatar	0.37	**0.51**	50	-0.08
Romania	0.38	c	43	-0.05
Russia	0.28	**0.54**	60	-0.06
Saudi Arabia	0.44	m	43	-0.08
Serbia	0.32	**0.43**	52	-0.07
Singapore	0.16	**0.53**	60	-0.06
Chinese Taipei	0.31	**0.28**	60	-0.11
Thailand	0.32	c	43	-0.07
Ukraine	0.43	**0.45**	66	-0.06
United Arab Emirates	0.18	**0.44**	46	-0.07
Uruguay	0.31	0.37	54	-0.08
Viet Nam	m	m	53	-0.09

Partners

1. A student is classified as "satisfied" with life if he or she reported between 7 and 10 on the life-satisfaction scale. The life-satisfaction scale ranges from 0 to 10.

2. Based on the cumulated time spent on the Internet on weekdays and weekend days. Low Internet users: 0-9 hours(h)/week(w); and Heavy Internet users: More than 40 h/w.

3. A socio-economically disadvantaged (advantaged) student is a student in the bottom (top) quarter of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) in his or her own country/economy.

4. The linear regression model accounts for the students' and schools' socio-economic profile. The socio-economic profile is measured by the index of ESCS.

5. Data related to the index of self-efficacy, the index of fear of failure and growth mindset only include the Flemish Community of Belgium.

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).

Source: OECD PISA 2018 Database, Tables III.B1.11.1, III.B1.11.4, III.B1.12.1, III.B1.12.2, III.B1.12.16, III.B1.13.5, III.B1.13.14, III.B1.14.1 and III.B1.14.7.

StatLink ᠁ https://doi.org/10.1787/888934029166

Well-being at school and at home

23% of students reported being **victims of an act of bullying** at least a few times a month

Less than **15%** of students in Korea, the Netherlands, Portugal and Chinese Taipei reported this

8 in 10 **students expressed anti-bullying attitudes,** such as

☑ It is a wrong thing to join in bullying

or

☑ It is a good thing to help students who can't defend themselves

Around **6%** of students reported *always feeling sad*

Around **90%** of students reported *sometimes or always feeling happy*

Students whose peers co-operate the most scored about **50 points higher** in reading than students whose peers co-operate the least

Most students believe that **ability and intelligence can be developed over time**

But at least **60% of students**

in the Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Kosovo, the Republic of North Macedonia, Panama and the Philippines agreed or strongly agreed **that intelligence is something that cannot change very much**

1 in 3 parents

reported that their participation in school activities was hindered because of **inconvenient meeting times**

All data refer to OECD average unless otherwise indicated.