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Figure 1. PISA administration cycle

| Assessment year | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subjects |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| assessed | READING | Reading | Reading | READING | Reading | Reading |
|  | Mathematics | MATHEMATICS | Mathematics | Mathematics | MATHEMATICS | Mathematics |
|  | Science | Science <br> Problem solving | SCIENCE | Science | Science | SCIENCE |
|  |  |  |  |  | Problem solving |  |

NOTE: Reading, mathematics, and science literacy are all assessed in each assessment cycle of the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA). A separate problem-solving assessment was administered in 2003 and is planned for 2012. The subject in all capital letters is the major subject area for that cycle. SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Figure 2. Countries that participated in PISA 2009


SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table 1. Participation in PISA, by country: 2000, 2003, 2006, and 2009

| Country | 2000 | 2003 | 2006 | 2009 | Country | 2000 | 2003 | 2006 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  | Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | - | - | - | - | Albania | - |  |  | - |
| Austria | - | - | - | - | Argentina | - |  | - | - |
| Belgium | - | - | - | - | Azerbaijan |  |  | - | - |
| Canada | - | - | - | - | Brazil | - | - | - | - |
| Chile | - |  | - | - | Bulgaria | - |  | - | - |
| Czech Republic | - | - | - | - | Chinese Taipei |  |  | - | - |
| Denmark | - | - | - | - | Colombia |  |  | - | - |
| Estonia |  |  | - | - | Croatia |  |  | - | - |
| Finland | - | - | - | - | Dubai-UAE |  |  |  | - |
| France | - | - | - | - | Hong Kong-China | - | - | - | - |
| Germany | - | - | - | - | Indonesia | - | - | - | - |
| Greece | - | - | - | - | Jordan |  |  | - | - |
| Hungary | - | - | - | - | Kazakhstan |  |  |  | - |
| Iceland | - | - | - | - | Kyrgyz Republic |  |  | - | - |
| Ireland | - | - | - | - | Latvia | - | - | - | - |
| Israel | - |  | - | - | Liechtenstein | - | - | - | - |
| Italy | - | - | - | - | Lithuania |  |  | - | - |
| Japan | - | - | - | - | Macao-China |  | - | - | - |
| Korea, Republic of | - | - | - | - | Macedonia | - |  |  |  |
| Luxembourg | - | - | - | - | Montenegro, Republic of ${ }^{1}$ |  | - | - | - |
| Mexico | - | - | - | - | Panama |  |  |  | - |
| Netherlands | - | - | - | - | Peru | - |  |  | - |
| New Zealand | - | - | - | - | Qatar |  |  | - | - |
| Norway | - | - | - | - | Romania | - |  | - | - |
| Poland | - | - | - | - | Russian Federation | - | - | - | - |
| Portugal | - | - | - | - | Serbia, Republic of ${ }^{1}$ |  | - | - | - |
| Slovak Republic |  | - | - | - | Shanghai-China |  |  |  | - |
| Slovenia |  |  | - | - | Singapore |  |  |  | - |
| Spain | - | - | - | - | Thailand | - | - | - | - |
| Sweden | - | - | - | - | Trinidad and Tobago |  |  |  | - |
| Switzerland | - | - | - | - | Tunisia |  | - | - | - |
| Turkey |  | - | - | - | Uruguay |  | - | - | - |
| United Kingdom | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| United States | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ The Republics of Montenegro and Serbia were a united country under the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2003 assessment.
NOTE: A "•" indicates that the country participated in PISA in the specific year. Because PISA is principally an Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) study, non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Eleven non-OECD countries and other education systems—Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Chile, Hong Kong-China, Indonesia, Israel, Macedonia, Peru, Romania, and Thailand—administered PISA 2000 in 2001. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2000, 2003, 2006, and 2009.

Table 2. Percentage distribution of U.S. 15-year-old students, by grade level: 2009

| Grade level | Percent | s.e. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Grade 7 | $\#$ | $\dagger$ |
| Grade 8 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Grade 9 | 10.9 | 0.77 |
| Grade 10 | 68.5 | 0.98 |
| Grade 11 | 20.3 | 0.73 |
| Grade 12 | $0.1!$ | 0.06 |
| Total | 100.0 | $\dagger$ |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Standard error is noted by s.e. SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table 3. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students, by grade level and country: 2009

| Country | Grade 7 |  | Grade 8 |  | Grade 9 |  | Grade 10 |  | Grade 11 |  | Grade 12 |  | Ungraded/ unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average ${ }^{1}$ OECD countries | 0.8 | 0.04 | 5.8 | 0.08 | 36.8 | 0.15 | 52.7 | 0.16 | 9.9 | 0.06 | 0.5 | 0.01 | 2.7 | 0.03 |
| Australia | \# | $\dagger$ | 0.1 | 0.03 | 10.4 | 0.59 | 70.8 | 0.61 | 18.6 | 0.61 | 0.1 ! | 0.03 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Austria | 0.7! | 0.25 | 6.2 | 1.02 | 42.4 | 0.95 | 50.7 | 1.02 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | , |
| Belgium | 0.4 ! | 0.15 | 5.4 | 0.48 | 31.4 | 0.60 | 59.8 | 0.74 | 1.2 | 0.14 | \# | $\dagger$ | 1.8 | 0.27 |
| Canada | \# | $\dagger$ | 1.2 | 0.17 | 13.6 | 0.45 | 84.1 | 0.53 | 1.1 | 0.11 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Chile | 1.0 | 0.18 | 3.9 | 0.47 | 20.5 | 0.80 | 69.4 | 0.99 | 5.2 | 0.27 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Czech Republic | 0.5 ! | 0.15 | 3.8 | 0.32 | 48.9 | 1.05 | 46.7 | 1.08 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Denmark | 0.1 | 0.03 | 14.7 | 0.64 | 83.5 | 0.76 | 1.7 | 0.49 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Estonia | 1.6 | 0.29 | 24.0 | 0.72 | 72.4 | 0.87 | 1.8 | 0.25 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Finland | 0.5 | 0.12 | 11.8 | 0.51 | 87.3 | 0.54 | \# | $\dagger$ | 0.4 | 0.11 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| France | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 3.6 | 0.67 | 34.4 | 1.22 | 56.6 | 1.54 | 4.0 | 0.68 | 0.1 ! | 0.04 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Germany | 1.2 | 0.16 | 10.5 | 0.47 | 52.6 | 0.76 | 31.3 | 0.82 | 0.4 | 0.11 | \# | $\dagger$ | 4.0 | 0.54 |
| Greece | 0.4 ! | 0.19 | 1.4 ! | 0.47 | 5.5 | 0.82 | 92.7 | 1.05 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Hungary | 2.8 | 0.64 | 7.6 | 1.12 | 67.1 | 1.42 | 22.4 | 0.92 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Iceland | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | 98.3 | 0.12 | 1.7 | 0.10 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Ireland | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 2.4 | 0.34 | 59.1 | 1.03 | 24.0 | 1.44 | 14.4 | 1.10 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Israel | \# | $\dagger$ | 0.3 ! | 0.11 | 17.9 | 0.96 | 81.3 | 0.97 | 0.5 ! | 0.18 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Italy | 0.1 ! | 0.07 | 1.4 | 0.28 | 16.9 | 0.44 | 78.4 | 0.55 | 3.2 | 0.25 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Japan | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | 100.0 | \# | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Korea, Republic of | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | 4.2 | 0.85 | 95.1 | 0.88 | 0.7 | 0.12 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Luxembourg | 0.6 | 0.10 | 11.6 | 0.19 | 51.6 | 0.28 | 36.0 | 0.24 | 0.3 | 0.05 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Mexico | 1.7 | 0.12 | 7.4 | 0.35 | 34.4 | 0.86 | 55.4 | 0.94 | 0.7 | 0.20 | \# | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Netherlands | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 2.7 | 0.29 | 46.2 | 1.14 | 50.5 | 1.15 | 0.5 | 0.13 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| New Zealand | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | 5.9 | 0.36 | 88.8 | 0.48 | 5.3 | 0.33 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Norway | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | 0.5 | 0.10 | 99.3 | 0.16 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Poland | 1.0 | 0.22 | 4.5 | 0.38 | 93.6 | 0.56 | 0.9 ! | 0.29 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | , |
| Portugal | 2.2 | 0.25 | 8.4 | 0.70 | 25.8 | 1.53 | 56.0 | 2.07 | 0.4 | 0.07 | \# | $\dagger$ | 7.2 | 0.83 |
| Slovak Republic | 1.0 | 0.22 | 2.6 | 0.31 | 35.7 | 1.45 | 56.9 | 1.58 | 3.8 | 0.76 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Slovenia | \# | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 3.0 | 0.74 | 90.7 | 0.75 | 6.2 | 0.22 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Spain | 0.1 | 0.04 | 9.9 | 0.44 | 26.5 | 0.57 | 63.4 | 0.68 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Sweden | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 3.2 | 0.30 | 95.1 | 0.57 | 1.6 | 0.47 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Switzerland | 0.6 | 0.11 | 15.5 | 0.94 | 61.7 | 1.28 | 21.0 | 1.10 | 1.2 ! | 0.50 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Turkey | 0.7 | 0.14 | 3.5 | 0.76 | 25.2 | 1.29 | 66.6 | 1.52 | 3.8 | 0.26 | 0.2 ! | 0.07 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| United Kingdom | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | 1.2 | 0.13 | 98.0 | 0.14 | 0.8 | 0.04 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| United States | \# | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 10.9 | 0.77 | 68.5 | 0.98 | 20.3 | 0.73 | 0.1 ! | 0.06 | \# | $\dagger$ |

See notes at end of table.
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Table 3. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students, by grade level and country: 2009—Continued

| Country | Grade 7 |  | Grade 8 |  | Grade 9 |  | Grade 10 |  | Grade 11 |  | Grade 12 |  | Ungraded/ unknown |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 0.4 ! | 0.12 | 2.2 | 0.32 | 50.9 | 1.97 | 46.4 | 1.99 | 0.1 ! | 0.05 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 4.6 | 0.93 | 12.6 | 1.30 | 20.0 | 1.26 | 56.7 | 2.12 | 4.2 | 0.48 | \# | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Azerbaijan | 0.6 | 0.17 | 5.3 | 0.46 | 49.4 | 1.26 | 44.3 | 1.27 | 0.4 | 0.10 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Brazil | 6.8 | 0.44 | 18.0 | 0.67 | 37.5 | 0.76 | 35.7 | 0.84 | 2.1 | 0.15 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Bulgaria | 1.5 | 0.28 | 6.1 | 0.62 | 88.7 | 0.90 | 3.8 | 0.59 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Chinese Taipei | \# | $\dagger$ | 0.1 ! | 0.03 | 34.4 | 0.88 | 65.5 | 0.89 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Colombia | 4.4 | 0.52 | 10.3 | 0.69 | 22.1 | 0.85 | 42.3 | 0.99 | 21.0 | 0.95 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | \# | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 77.5 | 0.45 | 22.3 | 0.43 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Dubai-UAE | 1.1 | 0.09 | 3.4 | 0.15 | 14.8 | 0.36 | 56.9 | 0.51 | 22.9 | 0.45 | 0.9 | 0.12 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Hong Kong-China | 1.7 | 0.23 | 7.2 | 0.48 | 25.2 | 0.55 | 65.9 | 0.85 | 0.1 ! | 0.03 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Indonesia | 1.5! | 0.49 | 6.5 | 0.78 | 46.0 | 3.13 | 40.5 | 3.19 | 5.0 | 0.82 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Jordan | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 1.3 | 0.24 | 7.0 | 0.52 | 91.6 | 0.65 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | 0.4 | 0.10 | 6.4 | 0.41 | 73.3 | 1.92 | 19.7 | 2.05 | 0.1 ! | 0.04 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 0.2 ! | 0.07 | 7.9 | 0.54 | 71.4 | 1.29 | 19.8 | 1.42 | 0.7 | 0.13 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Latvia | 2.6 | 0.49 | 15.3 | 0.70 | 78.7 | 0.98 | 2.3 | 0.35 | 0.1 ! | 0.05 | \# | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Liechtenstein | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 17.5 | 1.12 | 71.3 | 0.79 | 10.4 | 0.96 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Lithuania | 0.5 | 0.11 | 10.2 | 0.88 | 80.9 | 0.84 | 8.4 | 0.60 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Macao-China | 6.7 | 0.13 | 19.2 | 0.16 | 34.9 | 0.15 | 38.7 | 0.14 | 0.5 | 0.08 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Montenegro, Republic of | \# | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 82.7 | 1.46 | 14.8 | 0.34 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Panama | 2.9 | 0.78 | 10.6 | 1.64 | 30.6 | 3.28 | 49.8 | 4.48 | 6.1 | 1.38 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Peru | 4.0 | 0.41 | 8.9 | 0.57 | 17.1 | 0.72 | 44.6 | 1.06 | 25.4 | 0.83 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Qatar | 1.7 | 0.07 | 3.6 | 0.13 | 13.5 | 0.17 | 62.6 | 0.17 | 18.2 | 0.17 | 0.4 | 0.07 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Romania | \# | $\dagger$ | 7.2 | 0.96 | 88.6 | 1.09 | 4.3 | 0.61 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Russian Federation | 0.9 | 0.18 | 10.0 | 0.74 | 60.1 | 1.80 | 28.1 | 1.64 | 0.9 | 0.19 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Serbia, Republic of | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 2.1 | 0.53 | 96.0 | 0.62 | 1.7 | 0.18 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Shanghai-China | 1.0 | 0.25 | 4.1 | 0.45 | 37.4 | 0.77 | 57.1 | 0.89 | 0.4 ! | 0.18 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Singapore | 1.0 | 0.16 | 2.6 | 0.21 | 34.7 | 0.38 | 61.6 | 0.31 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Thailand | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 0.5 | 0.11 | 23.2 | 1.15 | 73.5 | 1.14 | 2.7 | 0.41 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 2.1 | 0.21 | 8.8 | 0.37 | 25.3 | 0.40 | 56.1 | 0.38 | 7.7 | 0.31 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Tunisia | 6.4 | 0.41 | 13.4 | 0.60 | 23.9 | 0.93 | 50.9 | 1.40 | 5.4 | 0.43 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Uruguay | 7.1 | 0.76 | 10.6 | 0.57 | 21.5 | 0.75 | 56.2 | 1.09 | 4.6 | 0.44 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
${ }^{1}$ In computing the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average, the average for each column (grade in this case) is computed by averaging the estimates in the column but excluding those instances where no cases were reported (shown here as '\#': rounds to zero). Therefore, the percentage distribution sums to greater than 100 (i.e., 109.2 ).
NOTE: The OECD average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries and are not included in the OECD average. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates. SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.
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Table R1. Average scores of 15 -year-old students on combined reading literacy scale and reading literacy subscales, by country: 2009

| Combined reading literacy scale |  | Reading literacy subscales |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Access and retrieve |  | Integrate and interpret |  | Reflect and evaluate |  |
| Country | Score s.e. | Country | Score s.e. | Country | Score s.e. | Country | Score s.e. |
| OECD average | 4930.5 | OECD average | 4950.5 | OECD average | 4930.5 | OECD average | 4940.5 |
| OECD countries |  | OECD countries |  | OECD countries |  | OECD countries |  |
| Korea, Republic of | 5393.5 | Korea, Republic of | 5423.6 | Korea, Republic of | 5413.4 | Korea, Republic of | 5423.9 |
| Finland | 5362.3 | Finland | 5322.7 | Finland | 5382.3 | Finland | 5362.2 |
| Canada | 5241.5 | Japan | 5303.8 | Canada | 5221.5 | Canada | 5351.6 |
| New Zealand | 5212.4 | New Zealand | 5212.4 | Japan | 5203.5 | New Zealand | 5312.5 |
| Japan | 5203.5 | Netherlands | 5195.1 | New Zealand | 5172.4 | Australia | 5232.5 |
| Australia | 5152.3 | Canada | 5171.5 | Australia | 5132.4 | Japan | 5213.9 |
| Netherlands | 5085.1 | Belgium | 5132.4 | Netherlands | 5045.4 | United States | 5124.0 |
| Belgium | 5062.3 | Australia | 5132.4 | Belgium | 5042.5 | Netherlands | 5105.0 |
| Norway | 5032.6 | Norway | 5122.8 | Poland | 5032.8 | Belgium | 5052.5 |
| Estonia | 5012.6 | Iceland | 5071.6 | Iceland | 5031.5 | Norway | 5052.7 |
| Switzerland | 5012.4 | Switzerland | 5052.7 | Norway | 5022.7 | United Kingdom | 5032.4 |
| Poland | 5002.6 | Sweden | 5052.9 | Switzerland | 5022.5 | Estonia | 5032.6 |
| Iceland | 5001.4 | Estonia | 5033.0 | Germany | 5012.8 | Ireland | 5023.1 |
| United States | 5003.7 | Denmark | 5022.6 | Estonia | 5002.8 | Sweden | 5023.0 |
| Sweden | 4972.9 | Hungary | 5013.7 | France | 4973.6 | Poland | 4982.8 |
| Germany | 4972.7 | Germany | 5013.5 | Hungary | 4963.2 | Switzerland | 4972.7 |
| Ireland | 4963.0 | Poland | 5002.8 | United States | 4953.7 | Portugal | 4963.3 |
| France | 4963.4 | Ireland | 4983.3 | Sweden | 4943.0 | Iceland | 4961.4 |
| Denmark | 4952.1 | United States | 4923.6 | Ireland | 4943.0 | France | 4953.4 |
| United Kingdom | 4942.3 | France | 4923.8 | Denmark | 4922.1 | Denmark | 4932.6 |
| Hungary | 4943.2 | United Kingdom | 4912.5 | United Kingdom | 4912.4 | Germany | 4912.8 |
| Portugal | 4893.1 | Slovak Republic | 4913.0 | Italy | 4901.6 | Greece | 4894.9 |
| Italy | 4861.6 | Slovenia | 4891.1 | Slovenia | 4891.1 | Hungary | 4893.3 |
| Slovenia | 4831.0 | Portugal | 4883.3 | Czech Republic | 4882.9 | Spain | 4832.2 |
| Greece | 4834.3 | Italy | 4821.8 | Portugal | 4873.0 | Israel | 4834.0 |
| Spain | 4812.0 | Spain | 4802.1 | Greece | 4844.0 | Italy | 4821.8 |
| Czech Republic | 4782.9 | Czech Republic | 4793.2 | Slovak Republic | 4812.5 | Turkey | 4734.0 |
| Slovak Republic | 4772.5 | Austria | 4773.2 | Spain | 4812.0 | Luxembourg | 4711.1 |
| Israel | 4743.6 | Luxembourg | 4711.3 | Luxembourg | 4751.1 | Slovenia | 4701.2 |
| Luxembourg | 4721.3 | Greece | 4684.4 | Israel | 4733.4 | Slovak Republic | 4662.9 |
| Austria | 4702.9 | Turkey | 4674.1 | Austria | 4712.9 | Austria | 4633.4 |
| Turkey | 4643.5 | Israel | 4634.1 | Turkey | 4593.3 | Czech Republic | 4623.1 |
| Chile | 4493.1 | Chile | 4443.4 | Chile | 4523.1 | Chile | 4523.2 |
| Mexico | 4252.0 | Mexico | 4332.1 | Mexico | 4182.0 | Mexico | 4321.9 |

Average is higher than the U.S. averageAverage is not measurably different from the U.S. average
Average is lower than the U.S. average

See notes at end of table.

Table R1. Average scores of 15 -year-old students on combined reading literacy scale and reading literacy subscales, by country: 2009-Continued

| Combined reading literacy scale |  |  | Reading literacy subscales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Access and retrieve |  |  | Integrate and interpret |  | Reflect and evaluate |  |  |
| Country | Score | s.e. | Country | Score | s.e. | Country | Score s.e. | Country | Score | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  | Non-OECD countries |  |  | Non-OECD countries |  | Non-OECD countries |  |  |
| Shanghai-China | 556 | 2.4 | Shanghai-China | 549 | 2.9 | Shanghai-China | 5582.5 | Shanghai-China | 557 | 2.4 |
| Hong Kong-China | 533 | 2.1 | Hong Kong-China | 530 | 2.7 | Hong Kong-China | 5302.2 | Hong Kong-China | 540 | 2.5 |
| Singapore | 526 | 1.1 | Singapore | 526 | 1.4 | Singapore | 5251.2 | Singapore | 529 | 1.1 |
| Liechtenstein | 499 | 2.8 | Liechtenstein | 508 | 4.0 | Chinese Taipei | 4992.5 | Liechtenstein | 498 | 3.2 |
| Chinese Taipei | 495 | 2.6 | Chinese Taipei | 496 | 2.8 | Liechtenstein | 4984.0 | Chinese Taipei | 493 | 2.8 |
| Macao-China | 487 | 0.9 | Macao-China | 493 | 1.2 | Macao-China | 4880.8 | Latvia | 492 | 3.0 |
| Latvia | 484 | 3.0 | Croatia | 492 | 3.1 | Latvia | 4842.8 | Macao-China | 481 | 0.8 |
| Croatia | 476 | 2.9 | Lithuania | 476 | 3.0 | Croatia | 4722.9 | Croatia | 47 | 3.5 |
| Lithuania | 468 | 2.4 | Latvia | 476 | 3.6 | Lithuania | 4692.4 | Dubai-UAE | 466 | 1.1 |
| Dubai-UAE | 459 | 1.1 | Russian Federation | 469 | 3.9 | Russian Federation | 4673.1 | Lithuania | 463 | 2.5 |
| Russian Federation | 459 | 3.3 | Dubai-UAE | 458 | 1.4 | Dubai-UAE | 4571.3 | Russian Federation | 441 | 3.7 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 442 | 2.4 | Serbia, Republic of | 449 | 3.1 | Serbia, Republic of | 4452.4 | Uruguay | 436 | 2.9 |
| Bulgaria | 429 | 6.7 | Thailand | 431 | 3.5 | Bulgaria | 4366.4 | Serbia, Republic of | 430 | 2.6 |
| Uruguay | 426 | 2.6 | Bulgaria | 430 | 8.3 | Romania | 4254.0 | Tunisia | 427 | 3.0 |
| Romania | 424 | 4.1 | Uruguay | 424 | 2.9 | Uruguay | 4232.6 | Romania | 426 | 4.5 |
| Thailand | 421 | 2.6 | Romania | 423 | 4.7 | Montenegro, Republic of | 4201.6 | Brazil | 424 | 2.7 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 416 | 1.2 | Trinidad and Tobago | 413 | 1.6 | Trinidad and Tobago | 4191.4 | Colombia | 422 | 4.2 |
| Colombia | 413 | 3.7 | Montenegro, Republic of | 408 | 2.3 | Thailand | 4162.6 | Thailand | 420 | 2.8 |
| Brazil | 412 | 2.7 | Brazil | 407 | 3.3 | Colombia | 4113.8 | Bulgaria | 417 | 7.1 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 408 | 1.7 | Colombia | 404 | 3.7 | Jordan | 4103.1 | Trinidad and Tobago | 413 | 1.3 |
| Jordan | 405 | 3.3 | Indonesia | 399 | 4.7 | Brazil | 4062.7 | Indonesia | 409 | 3.8 |
| Tunisia | 404 | 2.9 | Kazakhstan | 397 | 3.7 | Argentina | 3984.7 | Jordan | 407 | 3.4 |
| Indonesia | 402 | 3.7 | Argentina | 394 | 4.8 | Indonesia | 3973.5 | Argentina | 402 | 4.8 |
| Argentina | 398 | 4.6 | Jordan | 394 | 4.0 | Kazakhstan | 3973.0 | Montenegro, Republic of | 383 | 1.9 |
| Kazakhstan | 390 | 3.1 | Tunisia | 393 | 3.3 | Tunisia | 3932.7 | Panama | 377 | 6.3 |
| Albania | 385 | 4.0 | Albania | 380 | 4.7 | Albania | 3933.8 | Albania | 376 | 4.6 |
| Qatar | 372 | 0.8 | Peru | 364 | 4.3 | Qatar | 3790.9 | Qatar | 376 | 1.0 |
| Panama | 371 | 6.5 | Panama | 363 | 7.7 | Azerbaijan | 3732.9 | Kazakhstan | 373 | 3.4 |
| Peru | 370 | 4.0 | Azerbaijan | 361 | 4.5 | Panama | 3725.9 | Peru | 368 | 4.2 |
| Azerbaijan | 362 | 3.3 | Qatar | 354 | 1.0 | Peru | 3714.0 | Azerbaijan | 335 | 3.8 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 314 | 3.2 | Kyrgyz Republic | 299 | 4.0 | Kyrgyz Republic | 3272.9 | Kyrgyz Republic | 300 | 4.0 |

Average is higher than the U.S. average
Average is not measurably different from the U.S. average
Average is lower than the U.S. average
NOTE: The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries and are not included in the OECD average. Countries are ordered on the basis of average scores, from highest to lowest within the OECD countries and non-OECD countries. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Score differences as noted between the United States and other countries (as well as between the United States and the OECD average) are significantly different at the .05 level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Exhibit R1. Description of PISA proficiency levels on combined reading literacy scale: 2009

## Proficiency level and lower cut

| point score | Task descriptions |
| :--- | :--- |


| Level 6 | At level 6, tasks typically require the reader to make multiple inferences, comparisons and contrasts that are both detailed and <br> precise. They require demonstration of a full and detailed understanding of one or more texts and may involve integrating <br> information from more than one text. Tasks may require the reader to deal with unfamiliar ideas, in the presence of prominent <br> competing information, and to generate abstract categories for interpretations. Reflect and evaluate tasks may require the reader <br> to hypothesize about or critically evaluate a complex text on an unfamiliar topic, taking into account multiple criteria or <br> perspectives, and applying sophisticated understandings from beyond the text. There is limited data about access and retrieve <br> tasks at this level, but it appears that a salient condition is precision of analysis and fine attention to detail that is inconspicuous in <br> the texts. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 698 | Level 5 <br> 626 |
| At level 5, tasks involve retrieving information require the reader to locate and organize several pieces of deeply embedded <br> information, inferring which information in the text is relevant. Reflective tasks require critical evaluation or hypothesis, drawing on <br> specialized knowledge. Both interpretative and reflective tasks require a full and detailed understanding of a text whose content or <br> form is unfamiliar. For all aspects of reading, tasks at this level typically involve dealing with concepts that are contrary to <br> expectations. |  |


| Level 4 | At level 4, tasks involve retrieving information require the reader to locate and organize several pieces of embedded information. <br> Some tasks at this level require interpreting the meaning of nuances of language in a section of text by taking into account the text <br> as a whole. Other interpretative tasks require understanding and applying categories in an unfamiliar context. Reflective tasks at <br> this level require readers to use formal or public knowledge to hypothesize about or critically evaluate a text. Readers must <br> demonstrate an accurate understanding of long or complex texts whose content or form may be unfamiliar. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 553 |  |

At level 3 , tasks require the reader to locate, and in some cases recognize the relationship between, several pieces of information that must meet multiple conditions. Interpretative tasks at this level require the reader to integrate several parts of a text in order to identify a main idea, understand a relationship or construe the meaning of a word or phrase. They need to take into account many features in comparing, contrasting or categorizing. Often the required information is not prominent or there is much competing information; or there are other text obstacles, such as ideas that are contrary to expectation or negatively worded. Reflective tasks at this level may require connections, comparisons, and explanations, or they may require the reader to evaluate a feature of the text. Some reflective tasks require readers to demonstrate a fine understanding of the text in relation to familiar, everyday knowledge. Other tasks do not require detailed text comprehension but require the reader to draw on less common knowledge.

| Level 2 | At level 2, some tasks require the reader to locate one or more pieces of information, which may need to be inferred and may need <br> to meet several conditions. Others require recognizing the main idea in a text, understanding relationships, or construing meaning <br> within a limited part of the text when the information is not prominent and the reader must make low level inferences. Tasks at this <br> level may involve comparisons or contrasts based on a single feature in the text. Typical reflective tasks at this level require <br> readers to make a comparison or several connections between the text and outside knowledge, by drawing on personal <br> experience and attitudes. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 407 | At level 1a, tasks require the reader to locate one or more independent pieces of explicitly stated information; to recognize the <br> main theme or author's purpose in a text about a familiar topic, or to make a simple connection between information in the text and <br> common, everyday knowledge. Typically the required information in the text is prominent and there is little, if any, competing <br> information. The reader is explicitly directed to consider relevant factors in the task and in the text. |
| 335 | At level 1b, tasks require the reader to locate a single piece of explicitly stated information in a prominent position in a short, <br> syntactically simple text with a familiar context and text type, such as a narrative or a simple list. The text typically provides support <br> to the reader, such as repetition of information, pictures or familiar symbols. There is minimal competing information. In tasks <br> requiring interpretation the reader may need to make simple connections between adjacent pieces of information. |
| 262 | Level 1b |

NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 b (a score less than or equal to 262.04 ); level 1 b (a score greater than 262.04 and less than or equal to 334.75); level 1a (a score greater than 334.75 and less than or equal to 407.47); level 2 (a score greater than 407.47 and less than or equal to 480.18 ); level 3 (a score greater than 480.18 and less than or equal to 552.89 ); level 4 (a score greater than 552.89 and less than or equal to 625.61 ); level 5 (a score greater than 625.61 and less than or equal to 698.32); and level 6 (a score greater than 698.32). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 .
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Figure R1. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students in the United States and OECD countries on combined reading literacy scale, by proficiency level: 2009

${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from the corresponding Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average percentage at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 b (a score less than or equal to 262.04 ); level 1 b (a score greater than 262.04 and less than or equal to 334.75 ); level 1a (a score greater than 334.75 and less than or equal to 407.47 ); level 2 (a score greater than 407.47 and less than or equal to 480.18 ); level 3 (a score greater than 480.18 and less than or equal to 552.89 ); level 4 (a score greater than 552.89 and less than or equal to 625.61 ); level 5 (a score greater than 625.61 and less than or equal to 698.32); and level 6 (a score greater than 698.32). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table R2. Average scores of 15 -year-old female and male students on combined reading
literacy scale, by country: 2009

| Country | Female |  | Male |  | Female-male difference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score difference* | s.e. |
| OECD average | 513 | 0.5 | 474 | 0.6 | 39 | 0.6 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chile | 461 | 3.6 | 439 | 3.9 | 22 | 4.1 |
| Netherlands | 521 | 5.3 | 496 | 5.1 | 24 | 2.4 |
| United States | 513 | 3.8 | 488 | 4.2 | 25 | 3.4 |
| Mexico | 438 | 2.1 | 413 | 2.1 | 25 | 1.6 |
| United Kingdom | 507 | 2.9 | 481 | 3.5 | 25 | 4.5 |
| Belgium | 520 | 2.9 | 493 | 3.4 | 27 | 4.4 |
| Denmark | 509 | 2.5 | 480 | 2.5 | 29 | 2.9 |
| Spain | 496 | 2.2 | 467 | 2.2 | 29 | 2.0 |
| Canada | 542 | 1.7 | 507 | 1.8 | 34 | 1.9 |
| Korea, Republic of | 558 | 3.8 | 523 | 4.9 | 35 | 5.9 |
| Australia | 533 | 2.6 | 496 | 2.9 | 37 | 3.1 |
| Hungary | 513 | 3.6 | 475 | 3.9 | 38 | 4.0 |
| Portugal | 508 | 2.9 | 470 | 3.5 | 38 | 2.4 |
| Switzerland | 520 | 2.7 | 481 | 2.9 | 39 | 2.5 |
| Japan | 540 | 3.7 | 501 | 5.6 | 39 | 6.8 |
| Ireland | 515 | 3.1 | 476 | 4.2 | 39 | 4.7 |
| Luxembourg | 492 | 1.5 | 453 | 1.9 | 39 | 2.3 |
| Germany | 518 | 2.9 | 478 | 3.6 | 40 | 3.9 |
| France | 515 | 3.4 | 475 | 4.3 | 40 | 3.7 |
| Austria | 490 | 4.0 | 449 | 3.8 | 41 | 5.5 |
| Israel | 495 | 3.4 | 452 | 5.2 | 42 | 5.2 |
| Turkey | 486 | 4.1 | 443 | 3.7 | 43 | 3.7 |
| Iceland | 522 | 1.9 | 478 | 2.1 | 44 | 2.8 |
| Estonia | 524 | 2.8 | 480 | 2.9 | 44 | 2.5 |
| Sweden | 521 | 3.1 | 475 | 3.2 | 46 | 2.7 |
| New Zealand | 544 | 2.6 | 499 | 3.6 | 46 | 4.3 |
| Italy | 510 | 1.9 | 464 | 2.3 | 46 | 2.8 |
| Greece | 506 | 3.5 | 459 | 5.5 | 47 | 4.3 |
| Norway | 527 | 2.9 | 480 | 3.0 | 47 | 2.9 |
| Czech Republic | 504 | 3.0 | 456 | 3.7 | 48 | 4.1 |
| Poland | 525 | 2.9 | 476 | 2.8 | 50 | 2.5 |
| Slovak Republic | 503 | 2.8 | 452 | 3.5 | 51 | 3.5 |
| Slovenia | 511 | 1.4 | 456 | 1.6 | 55 | 2.3 |
| Finland | 563 | 2.4 | 508 | 2.6 | 55 | 2.3 |

$\square$
Female-male difference is smaller than U.S. differenceFemale-male difference is not measurably different from U.S. difference
Female-male difference is larger than U.S. difference

[^0]Table R2. Average scores of 15 -year-old female and male students on combined reading literacy scale, by country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Female |  | Male |  | Female-male difference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score difference* | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colombia | 418 | 4.0 | 408 | 4.5 | 9 ! | 3.8 |
| Peru | 381 | 4.9 | 359 | 4.2 | 22 | 4.7 |
| Azerbaijan | 374 | 3.3 | 350 | 3.7 | 24 | 2.4 |
| Brazil | 425 | 2.8 | 397 | 2.9 | 29 | 1.7 |
| Tunisia | 418 | 3.0 | 387 | 3.2 | 31 | 2.2 |
| Singapore | 542 | 1.5 | 511 | 1.7 | 31 | 2.3 |
| Liechtenstein | 516 | 4.5 | 484 | 4.5 | 32 | 7.1 |
| Hong Kong-China | 550 | 2.8 | 518 | 3.3 | 33 | 4.4 |
| Panama | 387 | 7.3 | 354 | 7.0 | 33 | 6.7 |
| Macao-China | 504 | 1.2 | 470 | 1.3 | 34 | 1.7 |
| Indonesia | 420 | 3.9 | 383 | 3.8 | 37 | 3.3 |
| Argentina | 415 | 4.9 | 379 | 5.1 | 37 | 3.8 |
| Chinese Taipei | 514 | 3.6 | 477 | 3.7 | 37 | 5.3 |
| Thailand | 438 | 3.1 | 400 | 3.3 | 38 | 3.8 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 462 | 2.5 | 422 | 3.3 | 39 | 3.0 |
| Shanghai-China | 576 | 2.3 | 536 | 3.0 | 40 | 2.9 |
| Uruguay | 445 | 2.8 | 404 | 3.2 | 42 | 3.1 |
| Romania | 445 | 4.3 | 403 | 4.6 | 43 | 4.4 |
| Kazakhstan | 412 | 3.4 | 369 | 3.2 | 43 | 2.7 |
| Russian Federation | 482 | 3.4 | 437 | 3.6 | 45 | 2.7 |
| Latvia | 507 | 3.1 | 460 | 3.4 | 47 | 3.2 |
| Qatar | 397 | 1.0 | 347 | 1.3 | 50 | 1.8 |
| Dubai-UAE | 485 | 1.5 | 435 | 1.7 | 51 | 2.3 |
| Croatia | 503 | 3.7 | 452 | 3.4 | 51 | 4.6 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 434 | 2.1 | 382 | 2.1 | 53 | 2.6 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 340 | 3.2 | 287 | 3.8 | 53 | 2.7 |
| Jordan | 434 | 4.1 | 377 | 4.7 | 57 | 6.2 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 445 | 1.6 | 387 | 1.9 | 58 | 2.5 |
| Lithuania | 498 | 2.6 | 439 | 2.8 | 59 | 2.8 |
| Bulgaria | 461 | 5.8 | 400 | 7.3 | 61 | 4.7 |
| Albania | 417 | 3.9 | 355 | 5.1 | 62 | 4.4 |

Female-male difference is smaller than U.S. differenceFemale-male difference is not measurably different from U.S. difference
Female-male difference is larger than U.S. difference

[^1]Table R3. Average scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on combined reading literacy scale, by race/ethnicity: 2009

| Race/ethnicity | Score | s.e. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| U.S. average | 500 | 3.7 |
| White, non-Hispanic | $525^{*}$ | 3.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | $441^{*}$ | 7.2 |
| Hispanic | $466^{*}$ | 4.3 |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | $541^{*}$ | 9.4 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Hispanic | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Two or more races, non-Hispanic | 502 | 6.4 |
| OECD average | 493 | 0.5 |
| $\dagger$ Not applicable. |  |  |
| $\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met. |  |  |
| *p <.05. Significantly different from the U.S. and Organization for Economic Cooperation and |  |  |
| Development (OECD) averages at the .05 level of statistical significance. |  |  |
| NOTE: Black includes African American, and Hispanic includes Latino. Students who identified |  |  |
| themselves as being of Hispanic origin were classified as Hispanic, regardless of their race. |  |  |
| Although data for some racelethnicities are not shown separately because the reporting |  |  |
| standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. totals shown throughout the report. The |  |  |
| OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with |  |  |
| each country weighted equally. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. Standard |  |  |
| error is noted by s.e. |  |  |
| SOURC: Organation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for |  |  |
| International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009. |  |  |

Table R4. Average scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on combined reading literacy scale, by percentage of students in public school eligible for free or reduced-price lunch: 2009

| Percent of students eligible |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| for free or reduced-price lunch | Score | s.e. |
| U.S. average | 500 | 3.7 |
| Less than 10 percent | $551^{*}$ | 7.6 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | $527^{*}$ | 6.5 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | $502^{* *}$ | 4.1 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | $471^{*}$ | 6.5 |
| 75 percent or more | $446^{*}$ | 6.9 |
| OECD average | 493 | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ |

[^2]Figure R2. Average scores of 15-year-old students in the United States and OECD countries on reading literacy scale: 2000, 2003, and 2009


NOTE: The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) trend scores are based on the averages of the 27 OECD countries with comparable data for 2000 and 2009 and with each country weighted equally. OECD trend scores are not reported for 2003 and 2006 because data were not available for all 27 comparable countries. The seven current OECD members not included in the OECD averages used to report on trends in reading literacy include the Slovak Republic and Turkey, which joined the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) in 2003; Estonia and Slovenia, which joined PISA in 2006; Luxembourg, which experienced substantial changes in its assessment conditions between 2000 and 2003; and the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, which did not meet the PISA response-rate standards in 2000. PISA 2006 reading literacy results are not reported for the United States because of an error in printing the test booklets. For more details, see Baldi et al. 2007 (available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008016). The OECD excluded the data for Austria from the trend analysis in its report (OECD, PISA 2009 Results: Learning Trends - Changes in Student Performance Since 2000 (Volume V), available at http://www.pisa.oecd.org) because of a concern over a data collection issue in 2009; however, after consultation with Austrian officials, NCES kept the Austrian data in the U.S. trend reporting. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . There were no statistically significant differences between the U.S. average score and the OECD average score in 2000 or in 2009.

SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2000, 2003, and 2009.

Table R5. Average scores of 15-year-old students on reading literacy scale, by country: 2000,

| Country | 2000 |  | 2003 |  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | .e. |
| OECD trend score ${ }^{1}$ | 496 | 0.7 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 495 | 0.5 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Austraia | 528 | 3.5 | 525 | 2.1 | 513 | 2.1 | 515 | 2.3 |
| Austria | 492 | 2.7 | 491 | 3.8 | 490 | 4.1 | 470 | 2.9 |
| Belgium | 507 | 3.6 | 507 | 2.6 | 501 | 3.0 | 506 | 2.3 |
| Canada | 534 | 1.6 | 528 | 1.7 | 527 | 2.4 | 524 | 1.5 |
| Chile | 410 | 3.6 | - | $\dagger$ | 442 | 5.0 | 449 | 3.1 |
| Czech Republic | 492 | 2.4 | 489 | 3.5 | 483 | 4.2 | 478 | 2.9 |
| Denmark | 497 | 2.4 | 492 | 2.8 | 494 | 3.2 | 495 | 2.1 |
| Estonia | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 501 | 2.9 | 501 | 2.6 |
| Finland | 546 | 2.6 | 543 | 1.6 | 547 | 2.1 | 536 | 2.3 |
| France | 505 | 2.7 | 496 | 2.7 | 488 | 4.1 | 496 | 3.4 |
| Germany | 484 | 2.5 | 491 | 3.4 | 495 | 4.4 | 497 | 2.7 |
| Greece | 474 | 5.0 | 472 | 4.1 | 460 | 4.0 | 483 | 4.3 |
| Hungary | 480 | 4.0 | 482 | 2.5 | 482 | 3.3 | 494 | 3.2 |
| Iceland | 507 | 1.5 | 492 | 1.6 | 484 | 1.9 | 500 | 1.4 |
| Ireland | 527 | 3.2 | 515 | 2.6 | 517 | 3.5 | 496 | 3.0 |
| Israel | 452 | 8.5 | - | $\dagger$ | 439 | 4.6 | 474 | 3.6 |
| Italy | 487 | 2.9 | 476 | 3.0 | 469 | 2.4 | 486 | 1.6 |
| Japan | 522 | 5.2 | 498 | 3.9 | 498 | 3.6 | 520 | 3.5 |
| Korea, Republic of | 525 | 2.4 | 534 | 3.1 | 556 | 3.8 | 539 | 3.5 |
| Luxembourg | 441 | 1.6 | 479 | 1.5 | 479 | 1.3 | 472 | 1.3 |
| Mexico | 422 | 3.3 | 400 | 4.1 | 410 | 3.1 | 425 | 2.0 |
| Netherlands ${ }^{2}$ | - | $\dagger$ | 513 | 2.9 | 507 | 2.9 | 508 | 5.1 |
| New Zealand | 529 | 2.8 | 522 | 2.5 | 521 | 3.0 | 521 | 2.4 |
| Norway | 505 | 2.8 | 500 | 2.8 | 484 | 3.2 | 503 | 2.6 |
| Poland | 479 | 4.5 | 497 | 2.9 | 508 | 2.8 | 500 | 2.6 |
| Portugal | 470 | 4.5 | 478 | 3.7 | 472 | 3.6 | 489 | 3.1 |
| Slovak Republic | - | $\dagger$ | 469 | 3.1 | 466 | 3.1 | 477 | 2.5 |
| Slovenia | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 494 | 1.0 | 483 | 1.0 |
| Spain | 493 | 2.7 | 481 | 2.6 | 461 | 2.2 | 481 | 2.0 |
| Sweden | 516 | 2.2 | 514 | 2.4 | 507 | 3.4 | 497 | 2.9 |
| Switzerland | 494 | 4.3 | 499 | 3.3 | 499 | 3.1 | 501 | 2.4 |
| Turkey | - | $\dagger$ | 441 | 5.8 | 447 | 4.2 | 464 | 3.5 |
| United Kingdom ${ }^{3}$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 495 | 2.3 | 494 | 2.3 |
| United States ${ }^{4}$ | 504 | 7.0 | 495 | 3.2 | - | $\dagger$ | 500 | 3.7 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R5. Average scores of 15-year-old students on reading literacy scale, by country: 2000, 2003, 2006, and 2009-Continued

| Country | 2000 |  | 2003 |  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 349 | 3.3 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 385 | 4.0 |
| Argentina | 418 | 9.9 | - | $\dagger$ | 374 | 7.2 | 398 | 4.6 |
| Azerbaijan | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 353 | 3.1 | 362 | 3.3 |
| Brazil | 396 | 3.1 | 403 | 4.6 | 393 | 3.7 | 412 | 2.7 |
| Bulgaria | 430 | 4.9 | - | $\dagger$ | 402 | 6.9 | 429 | 6.7 |
| Chinese Taipei | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 496 | 3.4 | 495 | 2.6 |
| Colombia | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 385 | 5.1 | 413 | 3.7 |
| Croatia | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 477 | 2.8 | 476 | 2.9 |
| Dubai-UAE | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 459 | 1.1 |
| Hong Kong-China | 525 | 2.9 | 510 | 3.7 | 536 | 2.4 | 533 | 2.1 |
| Indonesia | 371 | 4.0 | 382 | 3.4 | 393 | 5.9 | 402 | 3.7 |
| Jordan | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 401 | 3.3 | 405 | 3.3 |
| Kazakhstan | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 390 | 3.1 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 285 | 3.5 | 314 | 3.2 |
| Latvia | 458 | 5.3 | 491 | 3.7 | 479 | 3.7 | 484 | 3.0 |
| Liechtenstein | 483 | 4.1 | 525 | 3.6 | 510 | 3.9 | 499 | 2.8 |
| Lithuania | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 470 | 3.0 | 468 | 2.4 |
| Macao-China | - | $\dagger$ | 498 | 2.2 | 492 | 1.1 | 487 | 0.9 |
| Macedonia | 373 | 1.9 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ |
| Montenegro, Republic of ${ }^{5}$ | - | $\dagger$ | 412 | 3.6 | 392 | 1.2 | 408 | 1.7 |
| Panama | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 371 | 6.5 |
| Peru | 327 | 4.4 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 370 | 4.0 |
| Qatar | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 312 | 1.2 | 372 | 0.8 |
| Romania ${ }^{6}$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 396 | 4.7 | 424 | 4.1 |
| Russian Federation | 462 | 4.2 | 442 | 3.9 | 440 | 4.3 | 459 | 3.3 |
| Serbia, Republic of ${ }^{5}$ | - | $\dagger$ | 412 | 3.6 | 401 | 3.5 | 442 | 2.4 |
| Shanghai-China | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 556 | 2.4 |
| Singapore | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 526 | 1.1 |
| Thailand | 431 | 3.2 | 420 | 2.8 | 417 | 2.6 | 421 | 2.6 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 416 | 1.2 |
| Tunisia | - | $\dagger$ | 375 | 2.8 | 380 | 4.0 | 404 | 2.9 |
| Uruguay | - | $\dagger$ | 434 | 3.4 | 413 | 3.4 | 426 | 2.6 |

-Not available.
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
${ }^{1}$ The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) trend scores are based on the averages of the 27 OECD countries with comparable data for 2000 and 2009 and with each country weighted equally. The seven current OECD members not included in the OECD averages used to report on trends in reading literacy include the Slovak Republic and Turkey, which joined the Program for International
Student Assessment (PISA) in 2003; Estonia and Slovenia, which joined PISA in 2006; Luxembourg, which experienced substantial changes in its assessment conditions between 2000 and 2003; and the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, which did not meet the PISA response-rate standards in 2000. The OECD excluded the data for Austria from the trend analysis in its report (OECD, PISA 2009 Results: Learning Trends Changes in Student Performance Since 2000 (Volume V), available at http://www.pisa.oecd.org) because of a concern over a data collection issue in 2009; however, after consultation with Austrian officials, NCES kept the Austrian data in the U.S. trend reporting.
${ }^{2}$ Although the Netherlands participated in PISA 2000, technical problems with its sample prevent its results from being included.
${ }^{3}$ Although the United Kingdom participated in 2000 and 2003, low response rates prevent its results from being included.
${ }^{4}$ PISA 2006 reading literacy results are not reported for the United States because of an error in printing the test booklets. For more details, see Baldi et al. 2007 (available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008016).
${ }^{5}$ The Republics of Montenegro and Serbia were a united country under the PISA 2003 assessment.
${ }^{6}$ The 2000 results for Romania were not reported by OECD due to delayed submission of data. Romania did not participate in PISA in 2003.
NOTE: Because PISA is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2000, 2003, 2006, and 2009.

Table R6. Scores of 15-year-old students on combined reading literacy scale at selected percentiles, by country: 2009

| Country | Percentile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5^{\text {th }}$ |  | $10^{\text {th }}$ |  | 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  | $50^{\text {th }}$ |  | $75^{\text {th }}$ |  | 90 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OECD average } \\ & \text { OECD countries } \end{aligned}$ | 332 | 1.0 | 369 | 0.8 | 432 | 0.7 | 499 | 0.6 | 560 | 0.5 | 610 | 0.6 | 637 | 0.7 |
| Australia | 343 | 3.8 | 384 | 3.1 | 450 | 2.9 | 521 | 2.4 | 584 | 2.7 | 638 | 3.2 | 668 | 3.9 |
| Austria | 299 | 5.2 | 334 | 6.1 | 399 | 4.3 | 476 | 3.8 | 545 | 3.3 | 596 | 3.4 | 625 | 4.3 |
| Belgium | 326 | 6.1 | 368 | 4.3 | 436 | 3.8 | 516 | 2.9 | 583 | 2.2 | 631 | 2.7 | 657 | 2.9 |
| Canada | 368 | 2.9 | 406 | 2.7 | 464 | 1.9 | 529 | 1.8 | 588 | 1.7 | 637 | 1.9 | 664 | 2.1 |
| Chile | 310 | 5.1 | 342 | 5.0 | 393 | 4.1 | 451 | 3.4 | 506 | 3.3 | 556 | 3.6 | 584 | 5.1 |
| Czech Republic | 325 | 4.8 | 357 | 4.9 | 413 | 4.2 | 479 | 3.3 | 545 | 3.3 | 598 | 3.2 | 627 | 3.6 |
| Denmark | 350 | 3.8 | 383 | 3.7 | 440 | 2.9 | 500 | 2.3 | 554 | 2.8 | 599 | 3.0 | 624 | 2.9 |
| Estonia | 359 | 5.3 | 392 | 4.4 | 446 | 3.3 | 504 | 2.9 | 559 | 2.8 | 605 | 3.6 | 633 | 4.1 |
| Finland | 382 | 3.4 | 419 | 3.6 | 481 | 2.7 | 542 | 2.9 | 597 | 2.2 | 642 | 2.6 | 666 | 2.6 |
| France | 305 | 8.2 | 352 | 7.0 | 429 | 4.7 | 505 | 3.8 | 572 | 4.0 | 624 | 3.9 | 651 | 4.6 |
| Germany | 333 | 4.8 | 367 | 5.1 | 432 | 4.5 | 505 | 3.3 | 567 | 2.8 | 615 | 3.2 | 640 | 3.1 |
| Greece | 318 | 7.8 | 355 | 8.0 | 420 | 6.3 | 488 | 4.4 | 550 | 3.1 | 601 | 3.7 | 630 | 3.7 |
| Hungary | 332 | 7.4 | 371 | 6.9 | 435 | 4.3 | 501 | 3.5 | 559 | 3.6 | 607 | 3.5 | 632 | 4.0 |
| Iceland | 331 | 4.9 | 371 | 4.1 | 439 | 2.9 | 507 | 1.8 | 567 | 2.0 | 619 | 2.6 | 648 | 3.9 |
| Ireland | 330 | 7.8 | 373 | 4.7 | 435 | 3.9 | 503 | 3.5 | 562 | 2.8 | 611 | 2.8 | 638 | 3.2 |
| Israel | 277 | 8.8 | 322 | 7.8 | 401 | 4.4 | 483 | 3.9 | 554 | 3.4 | 611 | 4.0 | 643 | 4.3 |
| Italy | 320 | 3.7 | 358 | 2.6 | 422 | 2.3 | 493 | 2.0 | 556 | 1.7 | 604 | 1.7 | 631 | 2.1 |
| Japan | 339 | 9.8 | 386 | 7.1 | 459 | 4.8 | 530 | 3.2 | 590 | 3.0 | 639 | 3.6 | 667 | 4.6 |
| Korea, Republic of | 400 | 7.6 | 435 | 5.9 | 490 | 4.1 | 545 | 3.7 | 595 | 3.4 | 635 | 3.0 | 658 | 3.8 |
| Luxembourg | 288 | 3.6 | 332 | 3.5 | 403 | 2.4 | 480 | 1.8 | 547 | 1.7 | 600 | 2.0 | 630 | 3.7 |
| Mexico | 281 | 3.9 | 314 | 2.9 | 370 | 2.4 | 429 | 2.1 | 485 | 1.9 | 531 | 2.2 | 557 | 2.4 |
| Netherlands | 365 | 4.7 | 390 | 5.0 | 442 | 6.1 | 510 | 7.0 | 575 | 5.4 | 625 | 4.6 | 650 | 4.0 |
| New Zealand | 344 | 5.8 | 383 | 4.5 | 452 | 3.1 | 528 | 3.0 | 595 | 2.8 | 649 | 2.7 | 678 | 3.7 |
| Norway | 346 | 4.5 | 382 | 4.0 | 443 | 3.6 | 507 | 3.0 | 568 | 2.9 | 619 | 3.9 | 647 | 4.4 |
| Poland | 346 | 5.6 | 382 | 4.2 | 441 | 3.4 | 504 | 2.7 | 565 | 3.2 | 613 | 3.3 | 640 | 3.6 |
| Portugal | 338 | 4.8 | 373 | 4.9 | 432 | 4.4 | 493 | 3.6 | 551 | 3.4 | 599 | 3.5 | 624 | 3.6 |
| Slovak Republic | 324 | 6.1 | 358 | 5.2 | 416 | 4.1 | 480 | 3.3 | 543 | 2.7 | 594 | 3.2 | 621 | 4.3 |
| Slovenia | 326 | 2.9 | 359 | 2.1 | 421 | 1.9 | 488 | 1.8 | 550 | 1.7 | 598 | 2.9 | 623 | 3.9 |
| Spain | 326 | 4.2 | 364 | 3.5 | 426 | 3.3 | 488 | 2.5 | 543 | 2.0 | 588 | 2.0 | 613 | 2.4 |
| Sweden | 326 | 5.3 | 368 | 5.5 | 437 | 3.3 | 502 | 2.8 | 565 | 3.1 | 620 | 3.7 | 651 | 3.9 |
| Switzerland | 337 | 4.1 | 374 | 4.0 | 437 | 3.6 | 506 | 2.6 | 569 | 3.1 | 617 | 3.3 | 645 | 4.4 |
| Turkey | 325 | 5.1 | 356 | 4.3 | 409 | 3.8 | 466 | 3.6 | 522 | 4.5 | 569 | 5.2 | 596 | 5.4 |
| United Kingdom | 334 | 4.1 | 370 | 3.1 | 430 | 2.8 | 497 | 3.0 | 561 | 3.2 | 616 | 2.6 | 646 | 3.7 |
| United States | 339 | 4.2 | 372 | 3.9 | 433 | 4.0 | 501 | 4.2 | 569 | 4.6 | 625 | 5.0 | 656 | 5.8 |

See notes at end of table.
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Table R6. Scores of 15 -year-old students on combined reading literacy scale at selected percentiles, by country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Percentile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5^{\text {th }}$ |  | $10^{\text {th }}$ |  | $25^{\text {th }}$ |  | $50^{\text {th }}$ |  | $75^{\text {th }}$ |  | $90^{\text {th }}$ |  | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 212 | 6.9 | 254 | 5.4 | 319 | 4.9 | 389 | 4.8 | 458 | 4.8 | 509 | 4.9 | 538 | 5.5 |
| Argentina | 209 | 11.3 | 257 | 8.3 | 329 | 5.8 | 403 | 5.3 | 473 | 6.3 | 535 | 7.1 | 568 | 6.7 |
| Azerbaijan | 235 | 5.7 | 263 | 4.7 | 311 | 4.3 | 363 | 3.7 | 413 | 4.0 | 458 | 4.4 | 485 | 6.2 |
| Brazil | 262 | 3.0 | 293 | 3.2 | 348 | 2.7 | 409 | 3.2 | 474 | 3.9 | 537 | 4.2 | 572 | 4.6 |
| Bulgaria | 234 | 8.4 | 276 | 7.8 | 351 | 8.5 | 436 | 8.5 | 512 | 6.5 | 572 | 7.3 | 603 | 6.7 |
| Chinese Taipei | 343 | 4.7 | 380 | 3.9 | 439 | 3.2 | 502 | 2.7 | 555 | 2.9 | 600 | 4.6 | 627 | 6.3 |
| Colombia | 269 | 6.4 | 302 | 5.2 | 355 | 4.4 | 414 | 4.3 | 473 | 3.9 | 524 | 4.1 | 554 | 4.0 |
| Croatia | 327 | 4.9 | 359 | 3.6 | 416 | 4.5 | 481 | 3.5 | 539 | 3.1 | 586 | 3.5 | 611 | 3.8 |
| Dubai-UAE | 277 | 3.4 | 317 | 2.8 | 386 | 2.4 | 463 | 1.5 | 536 | 2.4 | 596 | 2.7 | 628 | 3.1 |
| Hong Kong-China | 380 | 5.5 | 418 | 4.5 | 482 | 3.1 | 541 | 2.3 | 592 | 2.5 | 634 | 2.9 | 659 | 3.1 |
| Indonesia | 291 | 5.8 | 315 | 5.0 | 357 | 4.1 | 402 | 3.6 | 447 | 4.6 | 487 | 5.0 | 510 | 5.8 |
| Jordan | 243 | 6.6 | 284 | 5.0 | 350 | 4.1 | 412 | 3.8 | 468 | 3.5 | 515 | 3.9 | 542 | 4.7 |
| Kazakhstan | 245 | 3.8 | 275 | 3.8 | 327 | 3.1 | 387 | 3.8 | 452 | 4.2 | 513 | 5.0 | 545 | 5.2 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 155 | 5.6 | 190 | 4.7 | 249 | 4.1 | 312 | 2.9 | 377 | 4.2 | 441 | 6.4 | 483 | 7.5 |
| Latvia | 348 | 6.3 | 379 | 4.2 | 429 | 3.8 | 488 | 3.7 | 541 | 3.3 | 584 | 3.2 | 610 | 4.3 |
| Liechtenstein | 355 | 12.1 | 385 | 10.6 | 442 | 6.5 | 508 | 5.5 | 560 | 4.5 | 600 | 8.4 | 626 | 11.8 |
| Lithuania | 324 | 4.5 | 353 | 4.1 | 409 | 3.3 | 471 | 2.5 | 530 | 3.1 | 580 | 3.4 | 608 | 4.1 |
| Macao-China | 357 | 2.7 | 388 | 1.8 | 437 | 1.4 | 489 | 1.2 | 540 | 1.4 | 582 | 1.8 | 608 | 1.8 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 254 | 4.2 | 288 | 3.8 | 345 | 2.6 | 409 | 2.5 | 473 | 2.4 | 526 | 2.7 | 558 | 4.1 |
| Panama | 209 | 12.0 | 246 | 10.0 | 304 | 7.4 | 368 | 7.2 | 436 | 7.7 | 502 | 9.3 | 540 | 10.0 |
| Peru | 209 | 5.0 | 241 | 3.9 | 302 | 4.3 | 370 | 4.2 | 437 | 5.2 | 496 | 6.4 | 530 | 7.0 |
| Qatar | 196 | 2.4 | 228 | 2.2 | 288 | 1.4 | 365 | 1.6 | 450 | 1.4 | 529 | 2.1 | 573 | 2.8 |
| Romania | 271 | 6.9 | 304 | 5.7 | 365 | 6.0 | 429 | 4.7 | 488 | 4.7 | 537 | 4.0 | 564 | 4.6 |
| Russian Federation | 310 | 5.8 | 344 | 5.5 | 401 | 3.6 | 461 | 3.3 | 519 | 3.2 | 572 | 4.5 | 607 | 5.6 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 299 | 4.9 | 331 | 3.8 | 388 | 3.2 | 446 | 2.9 | 501 | 2.5 | 547 | 2.7 | 573 | 3.3 |
| Shanghai-China | 417 | 5.2 | 450 | 4.8 | 504 | 3.5 | 562 | 2.8 | 613 | 2.8 | 654 | 2.7 | 679 | 3.3 |
| Singapore | 357 | 3.4 | 394 | 3.1 | 460 | 2.0 | 532 | 2.1 | 597 | 2.1 | 648 | 2.8 | 676 | 2.7 |
| Thailand | 305 | 4.9 | 331 | 3.8 | 373 | 3.2 | 420 | 3.0 | 469 | 2.6 | 514 | 4.0 | 542 | 5.5 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 220 | 5.8 | 265 | 3.9 | 339 | 2.5 | 423 | 2.0 | 496 | 2.3 | 559 | 2.5 | 594 | 3.0 |
| Tunisia | 258 | 4.4 | 293 | 3.8 | 348 | 3.4 | 407 | 3.2 | 462 | 3.4 | 510 | 4.8 | 538 | 5.2 |
| Uruguay | 257 | 5.2 | 297 | 4.2 | 359 | 3.5 | 428 | 3.2 | 495 | 3.1 | 552 | 3.3 | 584 | 4.5 |

NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut point) score for the following: (a) $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 5 percent of students; (b) $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 10 percent of students; (c) $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom quarter of students; (d) $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the median (half the students scored below the cut point and half scored above it); (e) $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top quarter of students; (f) $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 10 percent of students; and (g) $95^{5 t h}$ percentile - the top 5 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each country's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut points across countries and over time. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Figure R3. Scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on combined reading literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2000, 2003, and 2009

*p<.05. Significantly different from the 2009 score at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: This figure shows the threshold (or cut point) score for the following: (a) $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 5 percent of students; (b) $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 10 percent of students; (c) $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom quarter of students; (d) $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the median (half the students scored below the cut point and half scored above it); (e) $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top quarter of students; (f) $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 10 percent of students; and (g) $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 5 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each country's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut points across countries and over time. The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2006 reading literacy results are not reported for the United States because of an error in printing the test booklets. For more details, see Baldi et al. 2007 (available at
http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008016). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2000, 2003, and 2009.

Table R6A. Scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on combined reading literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2000, 2003, and 2009

| Selected percentiles | 2000 |  | 2003 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| 95 th percentile | 669 | 6.8 | 651 | 4.5 | 656 | 5.8 |
| 90th percentile | 636 | 6.5 | 622 | 3.5 | 625 | 5.0 |
| 75th percentile | 577 | 6.8 | 568 | 3.6 | 569 | 4.6 |
| 50th percentile | 511 | 7.0 | 501 | 3.6 | 501 | 4.2 |
| 25th percentile | 436 | 8.8 | 429 | 4.1 | 433 | 4.0 |
| 10th percentile | 363 | 11.4 | 361 | 5.2 | 372 | 3.9 |
| 5 th percentile | 320 | 11.7 | 319* | 6.6 | 339 | 4.2 |
| Mean | 504 | 7.1 | 495 | 3.2 | 500 | 3.7 |

*p<.05. Significantly different from the 2009 score at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut point) score for the following: (a) $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 5 percent of students; (b) $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 10 percent of students; (c) $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom quarter of students; (d) $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the median (half the students scored below the cut point and half scored above it); (e) $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top quarter of students; (f) $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 10 percent of students; and $(\mathrm{g}) 95^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 5 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each country's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut points across countries and over time. The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2006 reading literacy results are not reported for the United States because of an error in printing the test booklets. For more details, see Baldi et al. 2007 (available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008016). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. Standard error is noted by s.e.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2000, 2003, and 2009.

Table R7. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on combined reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and country: 2009

| Country | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | Level 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average OECD countries | 1.1 | 0.05 | 4.6 | 0.08 | 13.1 | 0.13 | 24.0 | 0.16 |
| Australia | 1.0 | 0.12 | 3.3 | 0.27 | 10.0 | 0.39 | 20.4 | 0.57 |
| Austria | 1.9 | 0.42 | 8.1 | 0.81 | 17.5 | 0.99 | 24.1 | 0.96 |
| Belgium | 1.1 | 0.25 | 4.7 | 0.46 | 11.9 | 0.64 | 20.3 | 0.67 |
| Canada | 0.4 | 0.06 | 2.0 | 0.19 | 7.9 | 0.34 | 20.2 | 0.61 |
| Chile | 1.3 | 0.24 | 7.4 | 0.77 | 21.9 | 0.95 | 33.2 | 1.11 |
| Czech Republic | 0.8 ! | 0.29 | 5.5 | 0.60 | 16.8 | 1.06 | 27.4 | 0.99 |
| Denmark | 0.4 | 0.11 | 3.1 | 0.30 | 11.7 | 0.72 | 26.0 | 0.94 |
| Estonia | 0.3 ! | 0.13 | 2.4 | 0.38 | 10.6 | 0.86 | 25.6 | 1.26 |
| Finland | 0.2 | 0.07 | 1.5 | 0.20 | 6.4 | 0.44 | 16.7 | 0.62 |
| France | 2.3 | 0.52 | 5.6 | 0.53 | 11.8 | 0.84 | 21.1 | 1.03 |
| Germany | 0.8 | 0.23 | 4.4 | 0.46 | 13.3 | 0.79 | 22.2 | 0.87 |
| Greece | 1.4 | 0.38 | 5.6 | 0.86 | 14.3 | 1.07 | 25.6 | 1.06 |
| Hungary | 0.6 ! | 0.23 | 4.7 | 0.82 | 12.3 | 0.95 | 23.8 | 1.24 |
| Iceland | 1.1 | 0.18 | 4.2 | 0.43 | 11.5 | 0.71 | 22.2 | 0.80 |
| Ireland | 1.5 | 0.36 | 3.9 | 0.47 | 11.8 | 0.71 | 23.3 | 1.00 |
| Israel | 3.9 | 0.66 | 8.0 | 0.66 | 14.7 | 0.63 | 22.5 | 0.96 |
| Italy | 1.4 | 0.23 | 5.2 | 0.32 | 14.4 | 0.45 | 24.0 | 0.54 |
| Japan | 1.3 | 0.36 | 3.4 | 0.49 | 8.9 | 0.66 | 18.0 | 0.84 |
| Korea, Republic of | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 0.9 ! | 0.30 | 4.7 | 0.63 | 15.4 | 1.01 |
| Luxembourg | 3.1 | 0.27 | 7.3 | 0.45 | 15.7 | 0.59 | 24.0 | 0.70 |
| Mexico | 3.2 | 0.34 | 11.4 | 0.48 | 25.5 | 0.56 | 33.0 | 0.57 |
| Netherlands | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 1.8 | 0.31 | 12.5 | 1.36 | 24.7 | 1.53 |
| New Zealand | 0.9 | 0.22 | 3.2 | 0.45 | 10.2 | 0.58 | 19.3 | 0.75 |
| Norway | 0.5 | 0.14 | 3.4 | 0.39 | 11.0 | 0.66 | 23.6 | 0.84 |
| Poland | 0.6 | 0.15 | 3.1 | 0.35 | 11.3 | 0.66 | 24.5 | 1.08 |
| Portugal | 0.6 | 0.14 | 4.0 | 0.41 | 13.0 | 0.97 | 26.4 | 1.09 |
| Slovak Republic | 0.8 ! | 0.28 | 5.6 | 0.62 | 15.9 | 0.83 | 28.1 | 1.04 |
| Slovenia | 0.8 | 0.09 | 5.2 | 0.34 | 15.2 | 0.49 | 25.6 | 0.71 |
| Spain | 1.2 | 0.18 | 4.7 | 0.39 | 13.6 | 0.64 | 26.8 | 0.84 |
| Sweden | 1.5 | 0.25 | 4.3 | 0.38 | 11.7 | 0.71 | 23.5 | 0.99 |
| Switzerland | 0.7 | 0.15 | 4.1 | 0.38 | 12.1 | 0.62 | 22.7 | 0.70 |
| Turkey | 0.8 | 0.19 | 5.6 | 0.63 | 18.1 | 0.98 | 32.2 | 1.16 |
| United Kingdom | 1.0 | 0.20 | 4.1 | 0.35 | 13.4 | 0.64 | 24.9 | 0.72 |
| United States | 0.6 | 0.13 | 4.0 | 0.45 | 13.1 | 0.84 | 24.4 | 0.86 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R7. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on combined reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 28.9 | 0.16 | 20.7 | 0.16 | 6.8 | 0.10 | 0.8 | 0.03 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 28.5 | 0.73 | 24.1 | 0.65 | 10.7 | 0.54 | 2.1 | 0.31 |
| Austria | 26.0 | 0.92 | 17.4 | 0.85 | 4.5 | 0.45 | 0.4! | 0.13 |
| Belgium | 25.8 | 0.85 | 24.9 | 0.75 | 10.1 | 0.51 | 1.1 | 0.19 |
| Canada | 30.0 | 0.69 | 26.8 | 0.58 | 11.0 | 0.41 | 1.8 | 0.17 |
| Chile | 25.6 | 1.15 | 9.3 | 0.71 | 1.3 | 0.25 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Czech Republic | 27.0 | 1.00 | 17.4 | 0.97 | 4.7 | 0.45 | 0.4! | 0.12 |
| Denmark | 33.1 | 1.21 | 20.9 | 1.11 | 4.4 | 0.45 | 0.3 ! | 0.12 |
| Estonia | 33.8 | 1.00 | 21.2 | 0.81 | 5.4 | 0.52 | 0.6 ! | 0.20 |
| Finland | 30.1 | 0.85 | 30.6 | 0.88 | 12.9 | 0.74 | 1.6 | 0.24 |
| France | 27.2 | 1.04 | 22.4 | 1.07 | 8.5 | 0.83 | 1.1 | 0.25 |
| Germany | 28.8 | 1.09 | 22.8 | 0.88 | 7.0 | 0.57 | 0.6 | 0.15 |
| Greece | 29.3 | 1.20 | 18.2 | 0.98 | 5.0 | 0.54 | 0.6 | 0.17 |
| Hungary | 31.0 | 1.25 | 21.6 | 1.11 | 5.8 | 0.67 | 0.3 ! | 0.13 |
| Iceland | 30.6 | 0.94 | 21.9 | 0.84 | 7.5 | 0.62 | 1.0 | 0.19 |
| Ireland | 30.6 | 0.91 | 21.9 | 0.91 | 6.3 | 0.50 | 0.7 ! | 0.22 |
| Israel | 25.5 | 0.95 | 18.1 | 0.73 | 6.4 | 0.54 | 1.0 | 0.16 |
| Italy | 28.9 | 0.55 | 20.2 | 0.48 | 5.4 | 0.30 | 0.4 | 0.10 |
| Japan | 28.0 | 0.88 | 27.0 | 0.95 | 11.5 | 0.71 | 1.9 | 0.36 |
| Korea, Republic of | 33.0 | 1.23 | 32.9 | 1.42 | 11.9 | 0.96 | 1.0 | 0.20 |
| Luxembourg | 27.0 | 0.65 | 17.3 | 0.61 | 5.2 | 0.43 | 0.5 ! | 0.15 |
| Mexico | 21.2 | 0.59 | 5.3 | 0.39 | 0.4 | 0.07 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Netherlands | 27.6 | 1.24 | 23.5 | 1.66 | 9.1 | 1.00 | 0.7 | 0.22 |
| New Zealand | 25.8 | 0.76 | 24.8 | 0.81 | 12.9 | 0.76 | 2.9 | 0.38 |
| Norway | 30.9 | 0.86 | 22.1 | 1.16 | 7.6 | 0.87 | 0.8 | 0.20 |
| Poland | 31.0 | 0.98 | 22.3 | 0.99 | 6.5 | 0.55 | 0.7 | 0.15 |
| Portugal | 31.6 | 1.09 | 19.6 | 0.92 | 4.6 | 0.48 | 0.2 ! | 0.10 |
| Slovak Republic | 28.5 | 1.14 | 16.7 | 0.79 | 4.2 | 0.48 | 0.3 ! | 0.11 |
| Slovenia | 29.2 | 0.86 | 19.3 | 0.80 | 4.3 | 0.54 | 0.3 ! | 0.12 |
| Spain | 32.6 | 0.95 | 17.7 | 0.68 | 3.2 | 0.29 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Sweden | 29.8 | 0.98 | 20.3 | 0.92 | 7.7 | 0.59 | 1.3 | 0.25 |
| Switzerland | 29.7 | 0.78 | 22.6 | 0.82 | 7.4 | 0.68 | 0.7 ! | 0.22 |
| Turkey | 29.1 | 1.07 | 12.4 | 1.11 | 1.8 | 0.38 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| United Kingdom | 28.8 | 0.84 | 19.8 | 0.79 | 7.0 | 0.47 | 1.0 | 0.19 |
| United States | 27.6 | 0.83 | 20.6 | 0.90 | 8.4 | 0.75 | 1.5 | 0.42 |

See notes at end of table.
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Table R7. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on combined reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | Level 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 11.3 | 0.92 | 18.7 | 1.32 | 26.6 | 1.18 | 25.6 | 1.33 |
| Argentina | 10.8 | 1.10 | 15.8 | 1.25 | 25.0 | 1.30 | 25.4 | 1.22 |
| Azerbaijan | 9.7 | 1.05 | 26.1 | 1.14 | 36.9 | 1.21 | 21.5 | 1.17 |
| Brazil | 5.0 | 0.38 | 16.0 | 0.67 | 28.6 | 0.81 | 27.1 | 0.78 |
| Bulgaria | 8.0 | 1.09 | 12.9 | 1.36 | 20.1 | 1.35 | 23.4 | 1.15 |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.7 | 0.18 | 3.5 | 0.35 | 11.4 | 0.63 | 24.6 | 0.80 |
| Colombia | 4.2 | 0.71 | 13.9 | 0.99 | 29.0 | 1.22 | 30.6 | 1.11 |
| Croatia | 1.0 | 0.21 | 5.0 | 0.45 | 16.5 | 0.97 | 27.4 | 1.02 |
| Dubai-UAE | 3.7 | 0.23 | 9.4 | 0.45 | 17.9 | 0.50 | 25.4 | 0.71 |
| Hong Kong-China | 0.2 ! | 0.08 | 1.5 | 0.30 | 6.6 | 0.59 | 16.1 | 0.75 |
| Indonesia | 1.7 | 0.38 | 14.1 | 1.31 | 37.6 | 1.64 | 34.3 | 1.38 |
| Jordan | 6.9 | 0.62 | 13.6 | 0.78 | 27.6 | 0.96 | 31.8 | 0.98 |
| Kazakhstan | 7.5 | 0.65 | 20.4 | 0.99 | 30.7 | 0.88 | 24.1 | 0.93 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 29.8 | 1.25 | 29.7 | 0.91 | 23.8 | 0.94 | 11.5 | 0.83 |
| Latvia | 0.4 ! | 0.15 | 3.3 | 0.57 | 13.9 | 1.00 | 28.8 | 1.45 |
| Liechtenstein | \# | $\dagger$ | 2.8 ! | 1.15 | 12.8 | 1.83 | 24.0 | 2.85 |
| Lithuania | 0.9 | 0.26 | 5.5 | 0.56 | 17.9 | 0.87 | 30.0 | 1.03 |
| Macao-China | 0.3 ! | 0.09 | 2.6 | 0.25 | 12.0 | 0.43 | 30.6 | 0.63 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 5.9 | 0.53 | 15.8 | 0.80 | 27.8 | 0.81 | 28.0 | 0.88 |
| Panama | 13.3 | 1.83 | 23.1 | 1.78 | 28.9 | 1.79 | 20.7 | 1.43 |
| Peru | 14.1 | 0.93 | 22.0 | 1.01 | 28.7 | 1.10 | 22.1 | 0.94 |
| Qatar | 17.8 | 0.33 | 22.4 | 0.48 | 23.2 | 0.63 | 18.3 | 0.44 |
| Romania | 4.1 | 0.69 | 12.7 | 1.08 | 23.6 | 1.25 | 31.6 | 1.31 |
| Russian Federation | 1.6 | 0.35 | 6.8 | 0.58 | 19.0 | 0.79 | 31.6 | 0.97 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 2.0 | 0.36 | 8.8 | 0.67 | 22.1 | 0.87 | 33.2 | 1.02 |
| Shanghai-China | 0.1 ! | 0.04 | 0.6 | 0.14 | 3.4 | 0.47 | 13.3 | 0.86 |
| Singapore | 0.4 | 0.11 | 2.7 | 0.26 | 9.3 | 0.50 | 18.5 | 0.60 |
| Thailand | 1.2 | 0.29 | 9.9 | 0.82 | 31.7 | 1.12 | 36.8 | 1.15 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 9.6 | 0.51 | 14.2 | 0.61 | 21.0 | 0.81 | 25.0 | 0.94 |
| Tunisia | 5.5 | 0.52 | 15.0 | 0.78 | 29.6 | 1.10 | 31.5 | 1.22 |
| Uruguay | 5.5 | 0.58 | 12.5 | 0.68 | 23.9 | 0.70 | 28.0 | 0.73 |

Table R7. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on combined reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 14.4 | 1.18 | 3.1 | 0.48 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 16.0 | 1.04 | 6.0 | 0.83 | 0.9 | 0.23 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Azerbaijan | 5.3 | 0.77 | 0.5 ! | 0.15 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Brazil | 15.9 | 0.86 | 6.1 | 0.53 | 1.2 | 0.21 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Bulgaria | 21.8 | 1.43 | 11.0 | 1.14 | 2.6 | 0.50 | 0.2 ! | 0.08 |
| Chinese Taipei | 33.5 | 1.09 | 21.0 | 0.97 | 4.8 | 0.76 | 0.4 ! | 0.20 |
| Colombia | 17.1 | 1.03 | 4.6 | 0.48 | 0.5! | 0.16 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 30.6 | 1.21 | 16.4 | 0.97 | 3.1 | 0.40 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Dubai-UAE | 23.5 | 0.77 | 14.8 | 0.71 | 4.8 | 0.49 | 0.5 ! | 0.18 |
| Hong Kong-China | 31.4 | 0.90 | 31.8 | 0.89 | 11.2 | 0.70 | 1.2 | 0.26 |
| Indonesia | 11.2 | 1.35 | 1.0 ! | 0.34 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Jordan | 16.5 | 0.99 | 3.4 | 0.44 | 0.2 ! | 0.09 | \# |  |
| Kazakhstan | 13.1 | 0.87 | 3.7 | 0.49 | 0.4! | 0.12 | \# |  |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 4.2 | 0.57 | 1.0 | 0.28 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# |  |
| Latvia | 33.5 | 1.21 | 17.2 | 1.01 | 2.9 | 0.44 | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Liechtenstein | 31.1 | 2.76 | 24.6 | 2.34 | 4.2 ! | 1.39 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Lithuania | 28.6 | 0.94 | 14.1 | 0.80 | 2.8 | 0.38 | 0.1 ! | 0.06 |
| Macao-China | 34.8 | 0.67 | 16.9 | 0.50 | 2.8 | 0.25 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 16.8 | 0.85 | 5.0 | 0.46 | 0.6 | 0.17 | \# |  |
| Panama | 10.1 | 1.36 | 3.4 | 0.68 | 0.5 ! | 0.23 | \# |  |
| Peru | 10.1 | 0.86 | 2.6 | 0.51 | 0.4 ! | 0.21 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Qatar | 11.1 | 0.48 | 5.4 | 0.27 | 1.5 | 0.16 | 0.2 ! | 0.07 |
| Romania | 21.2 | 1.31 | 6.1 | 0.71 | 0.7 | 0.17 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Russian Federation | 26.8 | 0.88 | 11.1 | 0.66 | 2.8 | 0.43 | 0.3 ! | 0.11 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 25.3 | 0.96 | 7.9 | 0.56 | 0.8 | 0.16 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Shanghai-China | 28.5 | 1.16 | 34.7 | 1.04 | 17.0 | 0.99 | 2.4 | 0.45 |
| Singapore | 27.6 | 0.81 | 25.7 | 0.73 | 13.1 | 0.54 | 2.6 | 0.34 |
| Thailand | 16.7 | 0.82 | 3.3 | 0.52 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 19.0 | 0.86 | 8.9 | 0.51 | 2.1 | 0.27 | 0.2 ! | 0.07 |
| Tunisia | 15.1 | 1.04 | 3.1 | 0.52 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Uruguay | 20.3 | 0.73 | 8.1 | 0.51 | 1.7 | 0.26 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level $1 b$ (a score less than or equal to 262.04); level 1 b (a score greater than 262.04 and less than or equal to 334.75); level 1a (a score greater than 334.75 and less than or equal to 407.47 ); level 2 (a score greater than 407.47 and less than or equal to 480.18); level 3 (a score greater than 480.18 and less than or equal to 552.89 ); level 4 (a score greater than 552.89 and less than or equal to 625.61 ); level 5 (a score greater than 625.61 and less than or equal to 698.32 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 698.32). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table R7A. Percentage of 15-year-old students on combined reading literacy scale within selected proficiency level ranges, by country: 2009

| Country | Below level 2 |  | Level 4 and above |  | Level 5 and above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average OECD countries | 18.8 | 0.18 | 28.3 | 0.20 | 7.6* | 0.11 |
| Australia | 14.2* | 0.58 | 36.8* | 0.98 | 12.8* | 0.77 |
| Austria | 27.6* | 1.28 | 22.3* | 1.09 | 4.9* | 0.50 |
| Belgium | 17.7 | 0.90 | 36.1* | 0.93 | 11.2 | 0.58 |
| Canada | 10.3* | 0.46 | 39.5* | 0.76 | 12.8* | 0.48 |
| Chile | 30.6* | 1.53 | 10.6* | 0.86 | 1.3* | 0.25 |
| Czech Republic | 23.1* | 1.32 | 22.5* | 1.09 | 5.1* | 0.45 |
| Denmark | 15.2 | 0.88 | 25.7* | 1.16 | 4.7* | 0.47 |
| Estonia | 13.3* | 1.03 | 27.3 | 1.10 | 6.1 * | 0.61 |
| Finland | 8.1* | 0.52 | 45.1* | 1.23 | 14.5* | 0.76 |
| France | 19.8 | 1.20 | 31.9 | 1.42 | 9.6 | 0.96 |
| Germany | 18.5 | 1.07 | 30.5 | 1.14 | 7.6* | 0.62 |
| Greece | 21.3 | 1.82 | 23.8* | 1.14 | 5.6* | 0.54 |
| Hungary | 17.6 | 1.39 | 27.6 | 1.45 | 6.1 * | 0.69 |
| Iceland | 16.8 | 0.64 | 30.4 | 0.77 | 8.5 | 0.59 |
| Ireland | 17.2 | 1.05 | 28.9 | 1.16 | 7.0* | 0.53 |
| Israel | 26.5* | 1.23 | 25.5* | 1.14 | 7.4* | 0.62 |
| Italy | 21.0* | 0.59 | 26.1* | 0.63 | 5.8* | 0.30 |
| Japan | 13.6* | 1.14 | 40.4* | 1.28 | 13.4* | 0.86 |
| Korea, Republic of | 5.8* | 0.84 | 45.8* | 1.99 | 12.9* | 1.08 |
| Luxembourg | 26.0* | 0.64 | 23.0* | 0.54 | 5.7 * | 0.45 |
| Mexico | 40.1* | 0.97 | 5.7* | 0.40 | 0.4* | 0.07 |
| Netherlands | 14.3 | 1.54 | 33.3 | 2.33 | 9.8 | 1.08 |
| New Zealand | 14.3* | 0.75 | 40.6* | 0.97 | $15.7 *$ | 0.81 |
| Norway | 15.0 | 0.83 | 30.5 | 1.16 | 8.4 | 0.90 |
| Poland | 15.0 | 0.84 | 29.5 | 1.26 | 7.2* | 0.58 |
| Portugal | 17.6 | 1.21 | 24.4* | 1.17 | 4.8* | 0.53 |
| Slovak Republic | 22.2* | 1.18 | 21.2* | 0.92 | 4.5* | 0.51 |
| Slovenia | 21.2* | 0.58 | 23.9* | 0.67 | 4.6* | 0.53 |
| Spain | 19.6 | 0.88 | 21.0* | 0.74 | 3.3* | 0.26 |
| Sweden | 17.4 | 0.94 | 29.3 | 1.20 | 9.0 | 0.69 |
| Switzerland | 16.8 | 0.86 | 30.8 | 1.08 | 8.1 | 0.73 |
| Turkey | 24.5* | 1.39 | 14.2* | 1.38 | 1.9* | 0.38 |
| United Kingdom | 18.4 | 0.76 | 27.9 | 0.98 | 8.0 | 0.51 |
| United States | 17.6 | 1.05 | 30.4 | 1.49 | 9.9 | 0.92 |

[^3]Table R7A. Percentage of 15 -year-old students on combined reading literacy scale within selected proficiency level ranges, by country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Below level 2 |  | Level 4 and above |  | Level 5 and above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | $56.7 *$ | 1.87 | 3.3* | 0.51 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 51.6* | 1.93 | 7.0* | 0.96 | 1.0 | 0.24 |
| Azerbaijan | 72.8* | 1.62 | 0.5!* | 0.16 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Brazil | 49.6* | 1.28 | 7.4* | 0.66 | 1.3 * | 0.22 |
| Bulgaria | 41.0* | 2.61 | 13.7* | 1.49 | 2.8 * | 0.51 |
| Chinese Taipei | 15.6 | 0.87 | 26.2* | 1.27 | 5.2 * | 0.85 |
| Colombia | 47.1* | 1.94 | 5.2* | 0.56 | 0.6 !* | 0.17 |
| Croatia | 22.4* | 1.27 | 19.6* | 1.11 | 3.2 * | 0.43 |
| Dubai-UAE | 31.0* | 0.52 | 20.1* | 0.57 | 5.3 * | 0.45 |
| Hong Kong-China | 8.3* | 0.69 | 44.3* | 1.11 | 12.4 * | 0.75 |
| Indonesia | 53.4* | 2.28 | 1.0!* | 0.34 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Jordan | 48.0* | 1.60 | 3.7 * | 0.49 | 0.2 !* | 0.09 |
| Kazakhstan | $58.7 *$ | 1.50 | 4.1* | 0.54 | 0.4 !* | 0.12 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 83.2* | 1.19 | 1.1* | 0.28 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Latvia | 17.6 | 1.23 | 20.1* | 1.28 | 2.9 * | 0.44 |
| Liechtenstein | 15.7 | 1.80 | 29.3 | 2.52 | 4.6 !* | 1.44 |
| Lithuania | 24.4* | 1.15 | 17.0* | 0.92 | 2.9 * | 0.40 |
| Macao-China | 14.9* | 0.52 | 19.7* | 0.50 | 2.9 * | 0.24 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 49.5* | 0.97 | 5.6* | 0.44 | 0.6 * | 0.17 |
| Panama | 65.3* | 2.60 | 3.9* | 0.72 | 0.5 !* | 0.23 |
| Peru | 64.8 * | 1.70 | 3.1 * | 0.62 | 0.5 !* | 0.21 |
| Qatar | 63.5* | 0.46 | 7.1* | 0.27 | 1.7 * | 0.16 |
| Romania | 40.4* | 2.02 | $6.8 *$ | 0.78 | 0.7 * | 0.17 |
| Russian Federation | 27.4* | 1.34 | 14.3* | 0.94 | 3.2 * | 0.48 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 32.8* | 1.25 | 8.7* | 0.62 | 0.8 * | 0.16 |
| Shanghai-China | 4.1 * | 0.54 | 54.2* | 1.31 | 19.5* | 1.09 |
| Singapore | 12.5* | 0.47 | 41.4* | 0.76 | 15.7 * | 0.52 |
| Thailand | 42.9* | 1.53 | 3.6* | 0.64 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 44.8* | 0.67 | 11.2* | 0.47 | 2.3 * | 0.28 |
| Tunisia | 50.2* | 1.55 | 3.3* | 0.60 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Uruguay | 41.9* | 1.16 | 9.9* | 0.63 | 1.8* | 0.27 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 b (a score less than or equal to 262.04); level 1 b (a score greater than 262.04 and less than or equal to 334.75); level 1 a (a score greater than 334.75 and less than or equal to 407.47); level 2 (a score greater than 407.47 and less than or equal to 480.18); level 3 (a score greater than 480.18 and less than or equal to 552.89 ); level 4 (a score greater than 552.89 and less than or equal to 625.61 ); level 5 (a score greater than 625.61 and less than or equal to 698.32); and level 6 (a score greater than 698.32 ). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates. SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table R8. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students on the access and retrieve reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009

| Country | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | Level 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 2.0 | 0.06 | 5.0 | 0.08 | 12.6 | 0.13 | 22.4 | 0.15 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 1.3 | 0.14 | 3.5 | 0.26 | 9.7 | 0.49 | 19.8 | 0.56 |
| Austria | 2.7 | 0.39 | 8.2 | 0.68 | 15.7 | 1.12 | 22.5 | 1.24 |
| Belgium | 1.7 | 0.26 | 4.3 | 0.44 | 10.9 | 0.62 | 18.6 | 0.62 |
| Canada | 0.9 | 0.10 | 2.7 | 0.21 | 9.0 | 0.36 | 20.7 | 0.59 |
| Chile | 2.7 | 0.45 | 8.6 | 0.74 | 22.2 | 1.23 | 31.6 | 1.00 |
| Czech Republic | 1.6 | 0.37 | 6.3 | 0.71 | 15.7 | 0.75 | 25.8 | 0.87 |
| Denmark | 1.0 | 0.17 | 3.7 | 0.39 | 11.6 | 0.64 | 22.4 | 0.71 |
| Estonia | 0.6 ! | 0.20 | 3.3 | 0.46 | 11.4 | 0.78 | 23.5 | 1.00 |
| Finland | 0.8 | 0.15 | 2.5 | 0.27 | 7.8 | 0.54 | 17.2 | 0.95 |
| France | 3.0 | 0.60 | 5.5 | 0.58 | 12.5 | 0.88 | 21.8 | 0.99 |
| Germany | 1.5 | 0.33 | 5.4 | 0.61 | 12.8 | 0.83 | 20.6 | 0.96 |
| Greece | 3.3 | 0.68 | 7.5 | 0.86 | 16.0 | 0.81 | 25.3 | 0.81 |
| Hungary | 2.1 | 0.52 | 4.7 | 0.60 | 10.8 | 0.77 | 21.0 | 0.94 |
| Iceland | 2.0 | 0.23 | 4.5 | 0.32 | 11.2 | 0.65 | 19.6 | 0.78 |
| Ireland | 2.2 | 0.46 | 3.7 | 0.43 | 10.6 | 0.66 | 22.6 | 0.94 |
| Israel | 6.2 | 0.93 | 8.8 | 0.57 | 15.2 | 0.76 | 21.8 | 0.89 |
| Italy | 2.8 | 0.28 | 6.3 | 0.33 | 13.9 | 0.39 | 22.9 | 0.48 |
| Japan | 1.9 | 0.42 | 3.2 | 0.48 | 8.0 | 0.67 | 16.2 | 0.70 |
| Korea, Republic of | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 1.2 | 0.32 | 5.5 | 0.67 | 15.9 | 0.99 |
| Luxembourg | 4.7 | 0.36 | 7.6 | 0.40 | 15.6 | 0.60 | 22.4 | 0.86 |
| Mexico | 4.3 | 0.38 | 10.3 | 0.44 | 22.8 | 0.58 | 30.7 | 0.59 |
| Netherlands | 0.2 ! | 0.10 | 2.1 | 0.43 | 10.0 | 0.95 | 21.4 | 1.69 |
| New Zealand | 1.3 | 0.22 | 3.4 | 0.35 | 10.0 | 0.59 | 18.4 | 0.67 |
| Norway | 1.0 | 0.23 | 3.5 | 0.41 | 10.2 | 0.64 | 20.5 | 0.75 |
| Poland | 1.5 | 0.25 | 4.3 | 0.42 | 11.9 | 0.74 | 22.7 | 0.79 |
| Portugal | 1.2 | 0.20 | 4.6 | 0.52 | 12.8 | 0.80 | 25.7 | 1.16 |
| Slovak Republic | 1.8 | 0.39 | 5.6 | 0.57 | 13.1 | 0.73 | 23.2 | 0.97 |
| Slovenia | 1.8 | 0.14 | 5.5 | 0.38 | 12.8 | 0.68 | 23.3 | 0.65 |
| Spain | 2.5 | 0.29 | 5.5 | 0.36 | 13.7 | 0.60 | 25.4 | 0.72 |
| Sweden | 1.8 | 0.32 | 4.4 | 0.54 | 10.3 | 0.70 | 21.5 | 0.83 |
| Switzerland | 1.0 | 0.16 | 4.3 | 0.43 | 11.0 | 0.61 | 21.1 | 0.72 |
| Turkey | 2.3 | 0.51 | 6.4 | 0.58 | 16.6 | 0.93 | 28.8 | 1.14 |
| United Kingdom | 1.7 | 0.25 | 4.8 | 0.40 | 13.6 | 0.63 | 23.4 | 0.87 |
| United States | 1.2 | 0.26 | 4.9 | 0.44 | 13.8 | 0.83 | 24.8 | 0.76 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R8. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on the access and retrieve reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average OECD countries | 27.5 | 0.16 | 20.9 | 0.16 | 8.1 | 0.11 | 1.4 | 0.05 |
| Australia | 29.0 | 0.61 | 24.5 | 0.58 | 10.2 | 0.55 | 2.0 | 0.27 |
| Austria | 24.5 | 1.00 | 18.1 | 0.86 | 7.2 | 0.68 | 1.0 | 0.29 |
| Belgium | 25.5 | 0.75 | 24.7 | 0.74 | 11.9 | 0.64 | 2.5 | 0.30 |
| Canada | 29.8 | 0.61 | 24.9 | 0.50 | 10.1 | 0.41 | 1.8 | 0.20 |
| Chile | 23.5 | 1.02 | 9.3 | 0.72 | 1.9 | 0.30 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Czech Republic | 26.3 | 0.83 | 17.9 | 1.03 | 5.6 | 0.48 | 0.7 | 0.19 |
| Denmark | 30.4 | 1.03 | 22.6 | 1.24 | 7.3 | 0.64 | 1.0 | 0.25 |
| Estonia | 31.0 | 1.22 | 21.7 | 0.85 | 7.5 | 0.67 | 0.9 | 0.27 |
| Finland | 27.0 | 0.85 | 27.4 | 0.78 | 14.2 | 0.70 | 3.1 | 0.36 |
| France | 26.3 | 1.19 | 20.9 | 1.17 | 8.5 | 0.86 | 1.4 | 0.29 |
| Germany | 26.1 | 0.95 | 22.7 | 1.02 | 9.4 | 0.75 | 1.5 | 0.30 |
| Greece | 27.0 | 1.08 | 15.6 | 0.92 | 4.6 | 0.40 | 0.6 | 0.12 |
| Hungary | 27.6 | 1.15 | 23.6 | 1.07 | 9.0 | 0.75 | 1.2 | 0.27 |
| Iceland | 28.1 | 0.87 | 22.1 | 1.12 | 10.3 | 0.79 | 2.3 | 0.31 |
| Ireland | 30.2 | 0.97 | 22.6 | 1.07 | 7.2 | 0.78 | 0.9 | 0.19 |
| Israel | 24.3 | 0.79 | 16.3 | 0.73 | 6.2 | 0.50 | 1.1 | 0.24 |
| Italy | 27.6 | 0.54 | 19.7 | 0.47 | 6.1 | 0.31 | 0.7 | 0.10 |
| Japan | 25.4 | 0.96 | 27.0 | 0.99 | 14.1 | 0.74 | 4.2 | 0.50 |
| Korea, Republic of | 30.1 | 0.98 | 30.3 | 1.22 | 13.9 | 1.08 | 2.7 | 0.42 |
| Luxembourg | 24.9 | 0.84 | 17.1 | 0.67 | 6.7 | 0.42 | 1.1 | 0.16 |
| Mexico | 23.0 | 0.63 | 7.6 | 0.37 | 1.2 | 0.13 | 0.1 ! | 0.02 |
| Netherlands | 27.4 | 1.25 | 26.7 | 1.48 | 10.8 | 1.23 | 1.4 | 0.29 |
| New Zealand | 26.0 | 0.80 | 24.6 | 0.76 | 13.3 | 0.66 | 3.0 | 0.33 |
| Norway | 29.6 | 0.84 | 23.4 | 0.91 | 9.9 | 0.62 | 1.9 | 0.31 |
| Poland | 28.6 | 0.78 | 21.0 | 0.78 | 8.3 | 0.53 | 1.8 | 0.26 |
| Portugal | 30.5 | 1.28 | 19.3 | 1.05 | 5.3 | 0.59 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Slovak Republic | 28.0 | 1.17 | 19.6 | 0.86 | 7.5 | 0.63 | 1.2 | 0.34 |
| Slovenia | 28.6 | 0.86 | 21.3 | 0.81 | 6.2 | 0.53 | 0.4 ! | 0.16 |
| Spain | 29.2 | 0.68 | 17.7 | 0.60 | 5.2 | 0.35 | 0.7 | 0.10 |
| Sweden | 28.6 | 0.81 | 22.3 | 1.07 | 9.2 | 0.88 | 1.9 | 0.32 |
| Switzerland | 29.1 | 0.82 | 23.8 | 0.72 | 8.6 | 0.86 | 1.1 | 0.27 |
| Turkey | 27.3 | 0.96 | 14.9 | 1.10 | 3.4 | 0.55 | 0.3! | 0.15 |
| United Kingdom | 28.3 | 0.93 | 19.8 | 0.93 | 7.1 | 0.57 | 1.2 | 0.24 |
| United States | 27.5 | 1.03 | 19.2 | 0.88 | 7.2 | 0.67 | 1.3 | 0.29 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R8. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students on the access and retrieve reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | Level 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 14.8 | 1.20 | 17.9 | 1.27 | 24.6 | 1.07 | 23.4 | 1.07 |
| Argentina | 12.9 | 1.10 | 16.0 | 1.02 | 24.0 | 1.27 | 23.8 | 1.16 |
| Azerbaijan | 16.9 | 1.40 | 22.5 | 1.08 | 27.6 | 1.03 | 20.7 | 1.04 |
| Brazil | 8.7 | 0.60 | 16.5 | 0.63 | 25.3 | 0.85 | 24.9 | 0.79 |
| Bulgaria | 12.6 | 1.52 | 11.5 | 0.93 | 16.6 | 1.07 | 20.1 | 1.24 |
| Chinese Taipei | 2.0 | 0.31 | 5.0 | 0.50 | 12.4 | 0.59 | 22.2 | 0.77 |
| Colombia | 6.3 | 0.83 | 15.5 | 1.03 | 29.3 | 1.08 | 28.4 | 1.00 |
| Croatia | 1.7 | 0.26 | 5.1 | 0.48 | 13.2 | 0.80 | 23.6 | 0.99 |
| Dubai-UAE | 5.3 | 0.42 | 9.9 | 0.76 | 17.1 | 0.53 | 23.1 | 0.75 |
| Hong Kong-China | 0.8 | 0.20 | 2.3 | 0.33 | 7.4 | 0.58 | 17.5 | 0.74 |
| Indonesia | 6.8 | 0.92 | 17.0 | 1.17 | 29.3 | 1.27 | 28.4 | 1.08 |
| Jordan | 11.7 | 0.84 | 15.3 | 0.80 | 26.0 | 1.03 | 25.4 | 0.82 |
| Kazakhstan | 10.8 | 0.78 | 18.1 | 0.84 | 25.0 | 0.92 | 23.0 | 0.86 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 38.1 | 1.32 | 23.7 | 0.89 | 19.7 | 0.77 | 11.4 | 0.77 |
| Latvia | 1.6 | 0.32 | 5.2 | 0.63 | 15.4 | 0.97 | 27.0 | 1.03 |
| Liechtenstein | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 3.9 | 1.14 | 9.8 | 1.92 | 23.0 | 2.94 |
| Lithuania | 2.1 | 0.34 | 6.7 | 0.63 | 16.0 | 0.84 | 25.1 | 0.94 |
| Macao-China | 0.7 | 0.14 | 3.7 | 0.26 | 12.1 | 0.53 | 26.3 | 0.63 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 11.2 | 0.65 | 15.7 | 0.96 | 21.7 | 0.74 | 23.8 | 0.68 |
| Panama | 19.4 | 2.15 | 21.3 | 1.73 | 24.2 | 1.47 | 18.4 | 1.23 |
| Peru | 16.9 | 1.12 | 21.7 | 1.25 | 26.8 | 1.16 | 21.4 | 1.06 |
| Qatar | 26.0 | 0.45 | 19.8 | 0.47 | 19.9 | 0.56 | 16.1 | 0.60 |
| Romania | 6.8 | 0.88 | 12.3 | 1.09 | 22.5 | 1.07 | 28.3 | 1.10 |
| Russian Federation | 2.6 | 0.44 | 6.8 | 0.67 | 16.9 | 1.03 | 27.7 | 0.93 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 3.2 | 0.50 | 8.5 | 0.62 | 19.3 | 0.89 | 29.9 | 1.18 |
| Shanghai-China | 0.5 | 0.14 | 1.5 | 0.31 | 5.7 | 0.59 | 14.8 | 0.77 |
| Singapore | 0.9 | 0.19 | 3.3 | 0.36 | 9.0 | 0.59 | 17.7 | 0.96 |
| Thailand | 2.6 | 0.48 | 10.2 | 0.93 | 26.1 | 1.07 | 33.0 | 1.08 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 12.1 | 0.59 | 13.7 | 0.66 | 19.7 | 0.88 | 23.1 | 0.70 |
| Tunisia | 9.9 | 0.73 | 17.7 | 0.95 | 27.4 | 0.95 | 25.1 | 0.95 |
| Uruguay | 7.6 | 0.63 | 12.8 | 0.75 | 22.2 | 1.03 | 25.7 | 0.79 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R8. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on the access and retrieve reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 14.7 | 1.22 | 4.3 | 0.70 | 0.3! | 0.16 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 15.6 | 1.16 | 6.4 | 0.83 | 1.2 | 0.31 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Azerbaijan | 9.3 | 0.74 | 2.6 | 0.41 | 0.4 ! | 0.15 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Brazil | 15.4 | 0.66 | 6.9 | 0.64 | 1.9 | 0.32 | 0.2 ! | 0.09 |
| Bulgaria | 20.0 | 1.29 | 12.9 | 1.17 | 5.0 | 0.74 | 1.2 | 0.34 |
| Chinese Taipei | 27.3 | 1.00 | 21.2 | 0.75 | 8.3 | 0.69 | 1.6 | 0.31 |
| Colombia | 15.6 | 0.91 | 4.3 | 0.45 | 0.6 ! | 0.21 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 27.8 | 1.31 | 20.6 | 0.96 | 7.1 | 0.60 | 1.0 | 0.24 |
| Dubai-UAE | 22.3 | 0.75 | 15.5 | 0.59 | 6.0 | 0.39 | 0.8 | 0.16 |
| Hong Kong-China | 28.3 | 0.92 | 29.5 | 0.91 | 12.2 | 0.69 | 2.0 | 0.38 |
| Indonesia | 14.1 | 1.09 | 3.9 | 0.66 | 0.5! | 0.15 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Jordan | 15.2 | 0.81 | 5.2 | 0.50 | 1.0 | 0.22 | 0.2 ! | 0.08 |
| Kazakhstan | 14.9 | 0.81 | 6.5 | 0.73 | 1.5 | 0.29 | 0.2! | 0.08 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 5.0 | 0.60 | 1.7 | 0.32 | 0.4 ! | 0.16 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Latvia | 30.2 | 1.17 | 16.7 | 1.08 | 3.5 | 0.46 | 0.3 ! | 0.10 |
| Liechtenstein | 28.5 | 2.98 | 25.3 | 2.50 | 7.8 | 1.48 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Lithuania | 26.7 | 0.87 | 16.9 | 0.77 | 5.6 | 0.45 | 0.9 | 0.18 |
| Macao-China | 31.7 | 0.77 | 19.6 | 0.52 | 5.3 | 0.33 | 0.5 | 0.11 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 16.8 | 0.69 | 8.0 | 0.49 | 2.4 | 0.25 | 0.4 ! | 0.21 |
| Panama | 10.6 | 1.25 | 4.7 | 0.88 | 1.1 | 0.32 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Peru | 9.8 | 0.85 | 2.7 | 0.52 | 0.6 ! | 0.22 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Qatar | 10.2 | 0.42 | 5.5 | 0.24 | 2.0 | 0.18 | 0.5 | 0.08 |
| Romania | 21.1 | 1.24 | 7.8 | 0.79 | 1.1 | 0.29 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Russian Federation | 25.8 | 0.78 | 14.0 | 0.78 | 5.0 | 0.47 | 1.1 | 0.26 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 26.0 | 0.94 | 11.0 | 0.90 | 2.1 | 0.34 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Shanghai-China | 26.1 | 0.92 | 29.5 | 1.07 | 17.3 | 0.89 | 4.6 | 0.45 |
| Singapore | 25.8 | 0.71 | 26.8 | 0.86 | 13.5 | 0.62 | 3.0 | 0.27 |
| Thailand | 20.5 | 1.08 | 6.5 | 0.67 | 1.1 | 0.29 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 18.8 | 0.64 | 9.3 | 0.45 | 2.8 | 0.28 | 0.5 | 0.13 |
| Tunisia | 14.3 | 1.00 | 4.7 | 0.64 | 0.9 | 0.24 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Uruguay | 19.9 | 0.75 | 9.2 | 0.60 | 2.4 | 0.31 | 0.3 ! | 0.13 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 b (a score less than or equal to 262.04); level 1 b (a score greater than 262.04 and less than or equal to 334.75 ); level 1a (a score greater than 334.75 and less than or equal to 407.47 ); level 2 (a score greater than 407.47 and less than or equal to 480.18); level 3 (a score greater than 480.18 and less than or equal to 552.89); level 4 (a score greater than 552.89 and less than or equal to 625.61); level 5 (a score greater than 625.61 and less than or equal to 698.32 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 698.32). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries.
Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table R9. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on the integrate and interpret reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009

| Country | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | Level 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average OECD countries | 1.1 | 0.04 | 4.6 | 0.08 | 13.6 | 0.13 | 24.2 | 0.16 |
| Australia | 1.0 | 0.13 | 3.7 | 0.25 | 10.9 | 0.49 | 20.7 | 0.47 |
| Austria | 1.8 | 0.32 | 7.5 | 0.64 | 17.6 | 0.91 | 25.2 | 1.32 |
| Belgium | 1.4 | 0.27 | 5.1 | 0.43 | 12.6 | 0.57 | 20.5 | 0.66 |
| Canada | 0.4 | 0.09 | 2.3 | 0.21 | 9.1 | 0.41 | 20.7 | 0.61 |
| Chile | 1.3 | 0.22 | 7.5 | 0.69 | 21.2 | 1.10 | 32.6 | 1.15 |
| Czech Republic | 0.6 ! | 0.20 | 4.5 | 0.53 | 15.5 | 0.88 | 26.3 | 1.07 |
| Denmark | 0.5 | 0.13 | 3.1 | 0.34 | 12.3 | 0.64 | 26.8 | 0.87 |
| Estonia | 0.2 ! | 0.12 | 2.4 | 0.39 | 11.6 | 0.80 | 25.4 | 1.07 |
| Finland | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 1.3 | 0.20 | 6.3 | 0.40 | 16.8 | 0.65 |
| France | 2.6 | 0.54 | 5.8 | 0.56 | 12.3 | 0.76 | 20.4 | 0.97 |
| Germany | 0.7 ! | 0.24 | 4.2 | 0.45 | 12.8 | 0.77 | 22.4 | 0.87 |
| Greece | 1.0 | 0.29 | 5.0 | 0.72 | 14.7 | 1.08 | 26.5 | 0.94 |
| Hungary | 0.5 ! | 0.16 | 3.7 | 0.63 | 12.8 | 0.88 | 24.3 | 1.30 |
| Iceland | 1.1 | 0.17 | 4.1 | 0.47 | 11.9 | 0.83 | 21.5 | 0.72 |
| Ireland | 1.5 | 0.39 | 4.1 | 0.55 | 12.6 | 0.76 | 24.0 | 0.87 |
| Israel | 3.5 | 0.56 | 8.2 | 0.65 | 15.2 | 0.69 | 22.9 | 0.95 |
| Italy | 1.1 | 0.24 | 4.6 | 0.29 | 13.9 | 0.44 | 24.4 | 0.60 |
| Japan | 1.2 | 0.28 | 3.4 | 0.46 | 9.3 | 0.69 | 18.9 | 0.77 |
| Korea, Republic of | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 0.9 ! | 0.35 | 4.8 | 0.56 | 15.7 | 1.05 |
| Luxembourg | 2.6 | 0.27 | 7.2 | 0.39 | 16.2 | 0.62 | 23.8 | 0.79 |
| Mexico | 4.0 | 0.38 | 13.0 | 0.56 | 26.9 | 0.62 | 31.3 | 0.59 |
| Netherlands | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 2.7 | 0.44 | 14.1 | 1.54 | 24.4 | 1.24 |
| New Zealand | 1.0 | 0.25 | 3.6 | 0.50 | 10.9 | 0.54 | 20.3 | 0.69 |
| Norway | 0.6 | 0.16 | 3.7 | 0.45 | 11.9 | 0.66 | 23.7 | 1.10 |
| Poland | 0.5 | 0.14 | 3.1 | 0.40 | 11.5 | 0.71 | 24.5 | 0.92 |
| Portugal | 0.5 | 0.15 | 3.9 | 0.43 | 14.4 | 0.94 | 27.2 | 0.91 |
| Slovak Republic | 0.6 ! | 0.26 | 4.7 | 0.59 | 16.0 | 0.81 | 28.1 | 1.04 |
| Slovenia | 0.4 | 0.08 | 4.5 | 0.40 | 15.0 | 0.74 | 25.2 | 0.96 |
| Spain | 1.1 | 0.15 | 4.5 | 0.51 | 14.0 | 0.68 | 27.5 | 0.69 |
| Sweden | 1.9 | 0.30 | 4.6 | 0.57 | 12.7 | 0.90 | 23.4 | 1.02 |
| Switzerland | 0.8 | 0.17 | 4.3 | 0.37 | 12.5 | 0.66 | 22.4 | 0.69 |
| Turkey | 0.4! | 0.13 | 5.3 | 0.57 | 20.5 | 1.04 | 33.8 | 1.10 |
| United Kingdom | 1.0 | 0.18 | 4.5 | 0.44 | 14.6 | 0.73 | 25.0 | 0.76 |
| United States | 0.7! | 0.22 | 4.7 | 0.46 | 14.5 | 0.80 | 24.9 | 0.83 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R9. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on the integrate and interpret reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 28.1 | 0.17 | 20.2 | 0.16 | 7.2 | 0.10 | 1.1 | 0.04 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 27.6 | 0.72 | 22.9 | 0.56 | 10.5 | 0.49 | 2.7 | 0.44 |
| Austria | 25.7 | 0.98 | 17.1 | 0.96 | 4.7 | 0.47 | 0.4 | 0.12 |
| Belgium | 24.9 | 0.70 | 23.3 | 0.79 | 10.6 | 0.64 | 1.5 | 0.29 |
| Canada | 28.8 | 0.61 | 25.0 | 0.48 | 11.4 | 0.44 | 2.3 | 0.24 |
| Chile | 25.5 | 0.98 | 9.9 | 0.77 | 1.9 | 0.42 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Czech Republic | 27.3 | 1.10 | 18.7 | 1.18 | 6.4 | 0.60 | 0.7 | 0.17 |
| Denmark | 33.0 | 0.90 | 19.8 | 0.89 | 4.4 | 0.48 | 0.2! | 0.09 |
| Estonia | 33.2 | 1.07 | 20.9 | 0.88 | 5.6 | 0.51 | 0.6 ! | 0.23 |
| Finland | 29.7 | 0.83 | 30.0 | 0.85 | 13.6 | 0.72 | 2.2 | 0.28 |
| France | 25.7 | 1.06 | 21.6 | 1.02 | 9.9 | 0.80 | 1.8 | 0.32 |
| Germany | 27.9 | 1.18 | 22.7 | 1.15 | 8.3 | 0.69 | 0.9 | 0.22 |
| Greece | 28.5 | 1.05 | 18.5 | 1.10 | 5.1 | 0.49 | 0.6 | 0.17 |
| Hungary | 30.7 | 1.22 | 21.7 | 1.24 | 6.0 | 0.69 | 0.4 | 0.11 |
| Iceland | 29.4 | 0.93 | 22.2 | 0.81 | 8.5 | 0.60 | 1.3 | 0.25 |
| Ireland | 29.3 | 1.12 | 20.9 | 0.88 | 6.9 | 0.62 | 0.8 | 0.17 |
| Israel | 25.4 | 0.97 | 17.7 | 0.74 | 6.2 | 0.47 | 0.9 | 0.17 |
| Italy | 29.2 | 0.58 | 20.4 | 0.54 | 5.9 | 0.30 | 0.6 | 0.09 |
| Japan | 27.1 | 0.87 | 26.2 | 1.08 | 11.3 | 0.67 | 2.6 | 0.45 |
| Korea, Republic of | 31.7 | 1.07 | 32.4 | 1.28 | 12.9 | 1.15 | 1.4 | 0.24 |
| Luxembourg | 26.0 | 0.75 | 17.7 | 0.62 | 5.9 | 0.43 | 0.7 | 0.17 |
| Mexico | 19.1 | 0.60 | 5.1 | 0.37 | 0.5 | 0.07 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Netherlands | 26.2 | 1.24 | 21.7 | 1.67 | 9.6 | 0.93 | 1.3 | 0.29 |
| New Zealand | 25.2 | 0.84 | 23.3 | 0.81 | 12.5 | 0.81 | 3.1 | 0.42 |
| Norway | 30.0 | 1.08 | 20.9 | 1.04 | 8.2 | 0.64 | 1.1 | 0.20 |
| Poland | 29.9 | 0.97 | 22.0 | 0.92 | 7.5 | 0.55 | 1.0 | 0.21 |
| Portugal | 30.6 | 1.16 | 18.1 | 0.84 | 4.8 | 0.55 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Slovak Republic | 28.6 | 1.22 | 17.2 | 0.92 | 4.5 | 0.51 | 0.4! | 0.14 |
| Slovenia | 29.2 | 0.85 | 20.0 | 0.80 | 5.4 | 0.53 | 0.4! | 0.14 |
| Spain | 32.2 | 0.86 | 17.2 | 0.64 | 3.3 | 0.21 | 0.2 | 0.05 |
| Sweden | 28.5 | 1.01 | 19.4 | 1.03 | 8.1 | 0.64 | 1.5 | 0.27 |
| Switzerland | 28.0 | 0.93 | 22.7 | 0.95 | 8.2 | 0.69 | 1.2 | 0.26 |
| Turkey | 27.8 | 1.19 | 11.0 | 1.14 | 1.2 | 0.32 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| United Kingdom | 28.1 | 0.80 | 18.5 | 0.71 | 7.1 | 0.45 | 1.2 | 0.19 |
| United States | 26.0 | 0.78 | 19.1 | 0.88 | 8.2 | 0.73 | 1.8 | 0.38 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R9. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on the integrate and interpret reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | Level 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 9.6 | 0.80 | 17.4 | 1.02 | 26.6 | 1.34 | 27.1 | 1.03 |
| Argentina | 10.9 | 1.14 | 16.4 | 1.02 | 25.0 | 1.10 | 25.0 | 1.29 |
| Azerbaijan | 5.3 | 0.70 | 23.4 | 1.35 | 40.0 | 1.20 | 25.8 | 1.36 |
| Brazil | 5.5 | 0.39 | 17.4 | 0.68 | 29.3 | 0.79 | 26.3 | 0.76 |
| Bulgaria | 5.6 | 0.81 | 12.8 | 1.32 | 20.5 | 1.39 | 24.9 | 1.36 |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.4 ! | 0.20 | 3.2 | 0.38 | 11.6 | 0.62 | 24.5 | 0.85 |
| Colombia | 4.7 | 0.75 | 14.7 | 1.06 | 28.9 | 1.19 | 29.8 | 1.06 |
| Croatia | 0.6 | 0.15 | 4.9 | 0.61 | 16.9 | 1.08 | 29.3 | 0.97 |
| Dubai-UAE | 3.5 | 0.31 | 9.7 | 0.59 | 19.3 | 0.60 | 25.5 | 0.91 |
| Hong Kong-China | 0.4 ! | 0.15 | 2.0 | 0.29 | 7.0 | 0.59 | 17.8 | 0.94 |
| Indonesia | 1.8 | 0.40 | 15.4 | 1.29 | 39.0 | 1.59 | 33.3 | 1.51 |
| Jordan | 4.8 | 0.59 | 13.0 | 0.92 | 28.2 | 1.14 | 33.9 | 0.97 |
| Kazakhstan | 5.2 | 0.44 | 19.3 | 1.31 | 31.8 | 1.13 | 26.0 | 0.87 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 22.5 | 1.34 | 32.0 | 1.41 | 28.1 | 0.95 | 13.0 | 0.83 |
| Latvia | 0.4! | 0.14 | 2.7 | 0.49 | 14.2 | 1.03 | 29.8 | 1.17 |
| Liechtenstein | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 4.4 | 1.20 | 12.2 | 2.12 | 23.5 | 2.54 |
| Lithuania | 0.8 | 0.22 | 4.9 | 0.52 | 18.5 | 0.87 | 31.2 | 1.25 |
| Macao-China | 0.2! | 0.06 | 2.5 | 0.24 | 12.4 | 0.45 | 30.4 | 0.74 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 3.7 | 0.32 | 12.8 | 0.66 | 27.8 | 0.88 | 30.6 | 0.78 |
| Panama | 11.3 | 1.56 | 23.7 | 1.85 | 30.8 | 1.83 | 21.2 | 1.57 |
| Peru | 14.0 | 0.99 | 22.4 | 1.05 | 27.9 | 1.12 | 21.9 | 0.89 |
| Qatar | 12.9 | 0.44 | 23.7 | 0.56 | 26.3 | 0.61 | 19.6 | 0.70 |
| Romania | 3.4 | 0.52 | 12.4 | 1.04 | 25.1 | 1.27 | 32.2 | 1.27 |
| Russian Federation | 1.2 | 0.28 | 6.0 | 0.56 | 17.9 | 0.91 | 31.0 | 1.02 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 1.7 | 0.34 | 8.4 | 0.61 | 22.3 | 0.88 | 32.7 | 0.84 |
| Shanghai-China | \# | $\dagger$ | 0.5 | 0.15 | 3.4 | 0.50 | 13.3 | 0.75 |
| Singapore | 0.6 | 0.14 | 3.0 | 0.27 | 9.9 | 0.54 | 19.2 | 0.69 |
| Thailand | 1.4 | 0.26 | 11.1 | 0.89 | 33.5 | 1.09 | 35.6 | 1.23 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 8.2 | 0.58 | 14.3 | 0.60 | 22.0 | 0.80 | 25.9 | 1.04 |
| Tunisia | 5.6 | 0.62 | 17.2 | 1.03 | 32.9 | 1.27 | 30.3 | 1.29 |
| Uruguay | 5.1 | 0.58 | 13.1 | 0.83 | 24.8 | 0.84 | 29.0 | 0.91 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R9. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on the integrate and interpret reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 15.1 | 1.23 | 3.9 | 0.51 | 0.3! | 0.12 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 15.5 | 1.08 | 6.0 | 0.83 | 1.2 | 0.27 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Azerbaijan | 5.1 | 0.70 | 0.3! | 0.15 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Brazil | 14.7 | 0.84 | 5.5 | 0.46 | 1.1 | 0.22 | 0.1! | 0.05 |
| Bulgaria | 21.8 | 1.54 | 11.4 | 1.14 | 2.7 | 0.50 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Chinese Taipei | 32.7 | 1.02 | 21.3 | 0.90 | 5.9 | 0.73 | 0.5 ! | 0.21 |
| Colombia | 16.5 | 1.04 | 4.7 | 0.53 | 0.6 | 0.16 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 30.9 | 1.13 | 15.0 | 0.95 | 2.2 | 0.32 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Dubai-UAE | 22.7 | 0.84 | 14.1 | 0.57 | 4.6 | 0.47 | 0.6 | 0.15 |
| Hong Kong-China | 30.2 | 1.01 | 29.3 | 1.22 | 11.5 | 0.73 | 1.8 | 0.24 |
| Indonesia | 9.5 | 1.17 | 0.9 ! | 0.31 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Jordan | 17.1 | 1.01 | 3.0 | 0.41 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | 13.7 | 0.90 | 3.6 | 0.50 | 0.4 ! | 0.11 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 3.7 | 0.44 | 0.7 | 0.17 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Latvia | 32.7 | 1.11 | 17.1 | 1.00 | 3.0 | 0.38 | 0.1! | 0.06 |
| Liechtenstein | 30.5 | 3.19 | 23.2 | 2.68 | 5.2 ! | 1.84 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Lithuania | 27.7 | 1.00 | 13.8 | 0.79 | 2.9 | 0.39 | 0.1 ! | 0.07 |
| Macao-China | 33.7 | 0.67 | 17.5 | 0.48 | 3.3 | 0.32 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 18.8 | 0.74 | 5.7 | 0.40 | 0.7! | 0.26 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Panama | 9.9 | 1.42 | 2.7 | 0.62 | 0.4 ! | 0.14 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Peru | 10.1 | 0.82 | 3.1 | 0.54 | 0.6 ! | 0.19 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Qatar | 11.3 | 0.32 | 4.8 | 0.28 | 1.2 | 0.16 | 0.1 ! | 0.05 |
| Romania | 20.6 | 1.30 | 5.7 | 0.73 | 0.7 | 0.20 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Russian Federation | 27.0 | 1.09 | 13.0 | 0.97 | 3.6 | 0.47 | 0.4 ! | 0.14 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 25.4 | 0.82 | 8.4 | 0.60 | 1.1 | 0.23 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Shanghai-China | 28.3 | 1.15 | 33.2 | 0.90 | 18.0 | 0.93 | 3.1 | 0.40 |
| Singapore | 26.2 | 0.72 | 24.8 | 0.94 | 12.9 | 0.55 | 3.5 | 0.33 |
| Thailand | 15.2 | 0.81 | 3.0 | 0.52 | 0.2! | 0.11 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 18.5 | 0.81 | 8.6 | 0.63 | 2.2 | 0.26 | 0.2 ! | 0.07 |
| Tunisia | 11.9 | 0.78 | 1.9 | 0.36 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Uruguay | 19.1 | 0.72 | 7.3 | 0.50 | 1.5 | 0.25 | $\ddagger$ | † |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 b (a score less than or equal to 262.04); level 1 b (a score greater than 262.04 and less than or equal to 334.75 ); level 1a (a score greater than 334.75 and less than or equal to 407.47 ); level 2 (a score greater than 407.47 and less than or equal to 480.18); level 3 (a score greater than 480.18 and less than or equal to 552.89 ); level 4 (a score greater than 552.89 and less than or equal to 625.61); level 5 (a score greater than 625.61 and less than or equal to 698.32 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 698.32). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table R10. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on the reflect and evaluate reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009

| Country | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | Level 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 1.6 | 0.05 | 4.9 | 0.09 | 12.8 | 0.13 | 23.0 | 0.16 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 1.0 | 0.15 | 3.2 | 0.26 | 9.3 | 0.46 | 18.9 | 0.58 |
| Austria | 4.2 | 0.64 | 9.0 | 0.73 | 16.5 | 0.82 | 22.7 | 1.00 |
| Belgium | 2.2 | 0.32 | 5.0 | 0.42 | 11.3 | 0.67 | 18.8 | 0.75 |
| Canada | 0.3 | 0.05 | 1.8 | 0.14 | 6.5 | 0.38 | 17.6 | 0.48 |
| Chile | 1.3 | 0.33 | 7.4 | 0.71 | 20.6 | 0.91 | 32.4 | 1.04 |
| Czech Republic | 2.6 | 0.35 | 8.0 | 0.72 | 18.8 | 0.89 | 26.7 | 0.96 |
| Denmark | 0.7 ! | 0.21 | 3.4 | 0.41 | 12.6 | 0.68 | 25.7 | 0.86 |
| Estonia | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 2.7 | 0.40 | 10.4 | 0.72 | 25.3 | 1.11 |
| Finland | 0.4 | 0.09 | 1.3 | 0.24 | 6.3 | 0.56 | 16.9 | 0.71 |
| France | 2.4 | 0.47 | 5.8 | 0.61 | 12.0 | 0.87 | 21.0 | 1.14 |
| Germany | 1.5 | 0.28 | 5.5 | 0.60 | 12.6 | 0.74 | 22.6 | 0.93 |
| Greece | 2.2 | 0.59 | 5.9 | 0.86 | 13.0 | 0.84 | 22.7 | 0.78 |
| Hungary | 0.9 ! | 0.27 | 4.9 | 0.73 | 14.1 | 1.08 | 24.4 | 1.35 |
| Iceland | 1.1 | 0.19 | 4.5 | 0.44 | 12.0 | 0.69 | 22.8 | 0.68 |
| Ireland | 1.3 | 0.34 | 4.2 | 0.56 | 11.5 | 0.66 | 21.5 | 0.80 |
| Israel | 4.0 | 0.68 | 7.3 | 0.63 | 13.0 | 0.71 | 21.4 | 0.78 |
| Italy | 2.6 | 0.31 | 6.3 | 0.30 | 14.5 | 0.45 | 22.8 | 0.52 |
| Japan | 1.9 | 0.48 | 3.9 | 0.51 | 9.1 | 0.69 | 17.8 | 0.83 |
| Korea, Republic of | 0.3 ! | 0.12 | 1.1! | 0.40 | 5.3 | 0.70 | 15.5 | 1.06 |
| Luxembourg | 3.5 | 0.33 | 7.5 | 0.48 | 15.5 | 0.64 | 23.9 | 0.76 |
| Mexico | 3.3 | 0.32 | 10.3 | 0.43 | 23.8 | 0.58 | 31.9 | 0.55 |
| Netherlands | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 1.6 | 0.29 | 11.2 | 1.43 | 24.8 | 1.53 |
| New Zealand | 0.9 ! | 0.29 | 3.4 | 0.45 | 9.5 | 0.57 | 17.5 | 0.61 |
| Norway | 0.7 | 0.17 | 3.6 | 0.44 | 10.9 | 0.63 | 22.6 | 0.75 |
| Poland | 0.9 | 0.23 | 3.6 | 0.38 | 11.4 | 0.76 | 24.3 | 0.94 |
| Portugal | 0.7 | 0.17 | 4.2 | 0.48 | 12.5 | 0.85 | 23.7 | 0.87 |
| Slovak Republic | 2.1 | 0.44 | 7.8 | 0.71 | 17.5 | 0.79 | 26.6 | 1.17 |
| Slovenia | 2.3 | 0.22 | 7.6 | 0.45 | 16.9 | 0.63 | 24.2 | 0.92 |
| Spain | 1.9 | 0.26 | 5.3 | 0.44 | 13.0 | 0.67 | 24.9 | 0.73 |
| Sweden | 1.5 | 0.25 | 4.2 | 0.42 | 10.8 | 0.72 | 22.6 | 0.83 |
| Switzerland | 1.0 | 0.19 | 4.7 | 0.48 | 12.4 | 0.70 | 23.0 | 0.76 |
| Turkey | 1.4 | 0.28 | 6.0 | 0.66 | 17.3 | 0.97 | 27.5 | 1.20 |
| United Kingdom | 0.9 | 0.17 | 3.8 | 0.37 | 12.2 | 0.60 | 23.5 | 0.78 |
| United States | 0.5 | 0.14 | 3.3 | 0.55 | 11.1 | 1.11 | 22.2 | 1.15 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R10. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on the reflect and evaluate reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average OECD countries | 28.2 | 0.16 | 20.8 | 0.16 | 7.6 | 0.10 | 1.2 | 0.04 |
| Australia | 26.8 | 0.61 | 25.0 | 0.59 | 12.6 | 0.59 | 3.2 | 0.45 |
| Austria | 26.2 | 1.12 | 16.7 | 0.84 | 4.3 | 0.45 | 0.4! | 0.11 |
| Belgium | 25.9 | 0.84 | 24.9 | 0.77 | 10.7 | 0.64 | 1.4 | 0.27 |
| Canada | 29.4 | 0.57 | 28.5 | 0.62 | 13.2 | 0.43 | 2.7 | 0.28 |
| Chile | 26.8 | 0.98 | 10.0 | 0.70 | 1.4 | 0.27 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Czech Republic | 24.8 | 0.98 | 14.4 | 0.92 | 4.2 | 0.39 | 0.4 | 0.10 |
| Denmark | 31.9 | 0.83 | 20.0 | 0.99 | 5.3 | 0.48 | 0.5 | 0.13 |
| Estonia | 32.4 | 1.21 | 21.9 | 1.10 | 6.1 | 0.53 | 0.7 | 0.16 |
| Finland | 30.5 | 0.91 | 30.0 | 0.88 | 12.8 | 0.73 | 1.8 | 0.27 |
| France | 26.7 | 1.02 | 21.8 | 1.02 | 9.1 | 0.82 | 1.1 | 0.30 |
| Germany | 29.3 | 1.14 | 22.0 | 0.92 | 6.0 | 0.50 | 0.5 ! | 0.21 |
| Greece | 27.7 | 1.02 | 20.2 | 0.90 | 7.0 | 0.53 | 1.3 | 0.23 |
| Hungary | 29.7 | 1.11 | 19.7 | 0.97 | 5.9 | 0.55 | 0.5 ! | 0.15 |
| Iceland | 31.4 | 0.91 | 21.1 | 0.76 | 6.4 | 0.52 | 0.7 | 0.22 |
| Ireland | 29.2 | 0.96 | 22.8 | 1.01 | 8.5 | 0.67 | 1.1 | 0.28 |
| Israel | 25.1 | 0.96 | 19.5 | 0.94 | 8.0 | 0.72 | 1.6 | 0.25 |
| Italy | 27.1 | 0.55 | 19.7 | 0.55 | 6.2 | 0.40 | 0.7 | 0.09 |
| Japan | 25.9 | 0.89 | 25.0 | 0.88 | 12.7 | 0.70 | 3.6 | 0.41 |
| Korea, Republic of | 30.1 | 1.35 | 31.7 | 1.30 | 14.0 | 1.10 | 2.0 | 0.38 |
| Luxembourg | 26.8 | 0.67 | 16.9 | 0.82 | 5.3 | 0.46 | 0.5 | 0.14 |
| Mexico | 23.2 | 0.61 | 6.8 | 0.35 | 0.7 | 0.11 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Netherlands | 29.1 | 1.28 | 23.7 | 1.71 | 8.8 | 0.83 | 0.7 ! | 0.23 |
| New Zealand | 24.0 | 0.73 | 25.0 | 0.74 | 14.9 | 0.81 | 4.7 | 0.47 |
| Norway | 30.7 | 0.78 | 22.4 | 0.90 | 8.0 | 0.64 | 1.1 | 0.26 |
| Poland | 31.3 | 0.74 | 21.4 | 0.86 | 6.5 | 0.55 | 0.6 | 0.17 |
| Portugal | 30.2 | 0.94 | 20.9 | 0.93 | 7.0 | 0.57 | 0.6 | 0.17 |
| Slovak Republic | 26.4 | 1.17 | 15.4 | 0.89 | 3.9 | 0.40 | 0.3 ! | 0.13 |
| Slovenia | 27.2 | 1.17 | 17.0 | 0.98 | 4.4 | 0.56 | 0.4 ! | 0.18 |
| Spain | 30.9 | 0.75 | 19.1 | 0.71 | 4.5 | 0.30 | 0.4 | 0.07 |
| Sweden | 29.6 | 0.81 | 21.2 | 0.86 | 8.5 | 0.66 | 1.6 | 0.31 |
| Switzerland | 29.1 | 0.87 | 21.7 | 0.99 | 7.1 | 0.59 | 1.1 | 0.27 |
| Turkey | 27.5 | 1.08 | 15.8 | 1.06 | 3.9 | 0.54 | 0.5 ! | 0.23 |
| United Kingdom | 28.2 | 0.71 | 20.9 | 1.05 | 8.8 | 0.63 | 1.8 | 0.28 |
| United States | 27.4 | 0.88 | 23.1 | 1.04 | 10.2 | 0.93 | 2.2 | 0.41 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R10. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on the reflect and evaluate reading
literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | Level 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 14.6 | 1.16 | 18.7 | 0.95 | 26.2 | 0.97 | 23.6 | 1.05 |
| Argentina | 10.7 | 1.10 | 15.6 | 1.11 | 23.5 | 1.16 | 25.2 | 1.12 |
| Azerbaijan | 21.5 | 1.45 | 28.1 | 1.03 | 28.9 | 1.07 | 16.2 | 0.91 |
| Brazil | 3.8 | 0.36 | 13.1 | 0.65 | 26.6 | 0.75 | 29.6 | 0.75 |
| Bulgaria | 11.3 | 1.44 | 13.4 | 1.13 | 19.4 | 1.22 | 23.0 | 1.12 |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.9 | 0.23 | 3.8 | 0.41 | 11.7 | 0.78 | 24.8 | 1.05 |
| Colombia | 4.0 | 0.75 | 13.2 | 1.04 | 26.3 | 0.98 | 30.1 | 1.29 |
| Croatia | 2.1 | 0.45 | 7.4 | 0.72 | 17.0 | 1.03 | 25.6 | 1.18 |
| Dubai-UAE | 3.6 | 0.28 | 8.4 | 0.49 | 17.8 | 0.70 | 23.8 | 0.79 |
| Hong Kong-China | 0.2! | 0.11 | 1.6 | 0.27 | 6.2 | 0.50 | 14.7 | 0.74 |
| Indonesia | 1.9 | 0.50 | 12.2 | 1.11 | 35.1 | 1.45 | 35.8 | 1.33 |
| Jordan | 7.6 | 0.74 | 13.5 | 0.92 | 26.3 | 1.15 | 29.8 | 0.88 |
| Kazakhstan | 13.5 | 0.89 | 23.0 | 0.90 | 27.5 | 1.21 | 20.6 | 1.02 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 37.2 | 1.59 | 26.8 | 1.15 | 19.2 | 0.87 | 10.5 | 0.73 |
| Latvia | 0.4! | 0.19 | 2.9 | 0.45 | 11.6 | 0.90 | 27.6 | 1.22 |
| Liechtenstein | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 4.4 | 1.31 | 12.0 | 2.09 | 23.0 | 3.23 |
| Lithuania | 1.4 | 0.26 | 6.9 | 0.62 | 18.7 | 0.84 | 29.3 | 1.15 |
| Macao-China | 0.4 | 0.11 | 3.4 | 0.34 | 13.9 | 0.56 | 30.6 | 0.76 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 11.7 | 0.62 | 20.2 | 0.97 | 26.3 | 0.77 | 24.8 | 0.89 |
| Panama | 11.9 | 1.83 | 23.1 | 2.00 | 27.9 | 1.98 | 21.5 | 1.82 |
| Peru | 15.2 | 1.12 | 22.5 | 1.22 | 26.9 | 1.16 | 21.4 | 0.84 |
| Qatar | 19.0 | 0.46 | 20.7 | 0.47 | 21.6 | 0.46 | 17.9 | 0.50 |
| Romania | 5.3 | 0.81 | 12.2 | 1.00 | 22.7 | 1.21 | 29.5 | 1.35 |
| Russian Federation | 3.6 | 0.57 | 10.1 | 0.67 | 22.1 | 0.97 | 29.7 | 1.07 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 3.5 | 0.45 | 11.4 | 0.61 | 24.3 | 0.89 | 30.3 | 0.97 |
| Shanghai-China | 0.2! | 0.05 | 0.6 | 0.15 | 4.2 | 0.51 | 13.2 | 0.66 |
| Singapore | 0.6 | 0.11 | 2.8 | 0.25 | 9.0 | 0.54 | 18.0 | 0.76 |
| Thailand | 2.1 | 0.44 | 12.3 | 0.79 | 29.3 | 0.92 | 33.3 | 1.12 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 11.1 | 0.64 | 14.6 | 0.67 | 20.0 | 0.76 | 24.1 | 0.97 |
| Tunisia | 4.3 | 0.47 | 11.0 | 0.86 | 24.0 | 1.08 | 32.2 | 1.10 |
| Uruguay | 5.2 | 0.55 | 11.9 | 0.67 | 21.8 | 0.95 | 26.9 | 0.82 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R10. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on the reflect and evaluate reading literacy subscale, by proficiency level and country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 13.2 | 1.08 | 3.3 | 0.50 | 0.3 ! | 0.11 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 17.0 | 1.09 | 6.6 | 0.84 | 1.3 | 0.28 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Azerbaijan | 4.6 | 0.64 | 0.7 | 0.18 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Brazil | 18.5 | 0.91 | 7.0 | 0.56 | 1.4 | 0.24 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Bulgaria | 19.9 | 1.38 | 10.0 | 0.99 | 2.6 | 0.37 | 0.4 ! | 0.17 |
| Chinese Taipei | 33.2 | 1.17 | 20.7 | 0.93 | 4.5 | 0.58 | 0.4 ! | 0.16 |
| Colombia | 19.2 | 1.16 | 6.3 | 0.67 | 0.9 | 0.22 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 26.4 | 1.07 | 16.2 | 0.86 | 4.8 | 0.49 | 0.5 | 0.13 |
| Dubai-UAE | 24.2 | 0.72 | 16.0 | 0.59 | 5.7 | 0.40 | 0.7! | 0.23 |
| Hong Kong-China | 29.9 | 1.33 | 32.0 | 1.24 | 13.5 | 0.86 | 1.9 | 0.24 |
| Indonesia | 13.3 | 1.34 | 1.7 | 0.44 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Jordan | 17.6 | 0.91 | 4.7 | 0.49 | 0.5 | 0.15 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | 11.3 | 0.87 | 3.6 | 0.50 | 0.4 ! | 0.14 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 4.8 | 0.55 | 1.3 | 0.26 | 0.2 ! | 0.07 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Latvia | 34.1 | 1.28 | 19.2 | 1.31 | 4.0 | 0.43 | 0.2 ! | 0.11 |
| Liechtenstein | 31.5 | 3.09 | 22.9 | 2.41 | 5.7 | 1.38 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Lithuania | 27.3 | 1.02 | 13.5 | 0.74 | 2.8 | 0.46 | 0.2 ! | 0.09 |
| Macao-China | 33.6 | 0.93 | 15.6 | 0.77 | 2.4 | 0.26 | 0.1! | 0.05 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 12.6 | 0.85 | 3.9 | 0.45 | 0.5 ! | 0.16 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Panama | 10.8 | 1.35 | 4.1 | 0.74 | 0.7 | 0.21 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Peru | 10.7 | 0.90 | 2.8 | 0.49 | 0.4 ! | 0.15 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Qatar | 12.1 | 0.32 | 6.1 | 0.29 | 2.2 | 0.18 | 0.4 | 0.10 |
| Romania | 21.6 | 1.26 | 7.4 | 0.90 | 1.2 | 0.26 | 0.1 ! | 0.04 |
| Russian Federation | 22.5 | 0.94 | 9.5 | 0.69 | 2.2 | 0.37 | 0.3! | 0.10 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 22.3 | 0.99 | 7.2 | 0.56 | 1.0 | 0.20 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Shanghai-China | 27.6 | 0.91 | 32.9 | 0.81 | 17.9 | 0.83 | 3.4 | 0.39 |
| Singapore | 27.3 | 0.80 | 25.3 | 0.90 | 13.6 | 0.70 | 3.5 | 0.48 |
| Thailand | 18.0 | 0.84 | 4.3 | 0.52 | 0.5 ! | 0.22 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 18.9 | 1.03 | 8.7 | 0.50 | 2.4 | 0.29 | 0.3 ! | 0.09 |
| Tunisia | 21.0 | 0.97 | 6.5 | 0.71 | 0.9 ! | 0.27 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Uruguay | 21.1 | 0.73 | 10.3 | 0.86 | 2.6 | 0.39 | 0.3! | 0.10 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level $1 b$ (a score less than or equal to 262.04); level 1b (a score greater than 262.04 and less than or equal to 334.75); level 1a (a score greater than 334.75 and less than or equal to 407.47 ); level 2 (a score greater than 407.47 and less than or equal to 480.18); level 3 (a score greater than 480.18 and less than or equal to 552.89 ); level 4 (a score greater than 552.89 and less than or equal to 625.61 ); level 5 (a score greater than 625.61 and less than or equal to 698.32 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 698.32). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries.
Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table R11. Percentage distribution of U.S. 15-year-old students on combined reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and race/ethnicity: 2009

| Race/ethnicity | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | Level 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| United States | 0.6 | 0.13 | 4.0 | 0.45 | 13.1 | 0.84 | 24.4 | 0.86 |
| White, non-Hispanic | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 1.8** | 0.42 | 8.5* | 0.77 | 20.3** | 1.34 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1.9 ! | 0.85 | 10.0 * | 1.69 | 24.7 * | 3.00 | 30.9* | 2.44 |
| Hispanic | 0.9 ! | 0.40 | 5.8 | 0.94 | 18.4* | 1.41 | 32.6* | 2.04 |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $6.5!^{*}$ | 2.43 | 15.9* | 2.93 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Hispanic | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Two or more races, non-Hispanic | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 3.6! | 1.59 | 13.3 | 3.08 | 22.3 | 3.70 |
| OECD average | 1.1 | 0.05 | 4.6 | 0.08 | 13.1 | 0.13 | 24.0 | 0.16 |

[^4]Table R11. Percentage distribution of U.S. 15-year-old students on combined reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and race/ethnicity: 2009-Continued

| Race/ethnicity | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| United States | 27.6 | 0.83 | 20.6 | 0.90 | 8.4 | 0.75 | 1.5 | 0.42 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 29.4 | 1.01 | 26.2* | 1.07 | 11.5* | 1.11 | $2.2{ }^{\text {** }}$ | 0.67 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 20.6* | 2.71 | 8.8* | 1.64 | 2.9 !* | 1.03 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Hispanic | 26.5 | 1.61 | 11.9* | 1.35 | 3.5* | 0.69 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Asian, non-Hispanic | 29.4 | 4.18 | 29.4* | 3.85 | 13.5 *** | 3.58 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Hispanic | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Two or more races, non-Hispanic | 29.8 | 4.18 | 21.9 | 3.52 | $7.4{ }^{1 * * *}$ | 3.00 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| OECD average | 28.9 | 0.16 | 20.7 | 0.16 | 6.8 | 0.10 | 0.8 | 0.03 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) averages at the . 05 level of statistical significance.
${ }^{* *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance, but not significantly different from the U.S. average.
${ }^{* * *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the .05 level of statistical significance, but not significantly different from the OECD average.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 b (a score less than or equal to 262.04 ); level 1 b (a score greater than 262.04 and less than or equal to 334.75 ); level 1a (a score greater than 334.75 and less than or equal to 407.47); level 2 (a score greater than 407.47 and less than or equal to 480.18 ); level 3 (a score greater than 480.18 and less than or equal to 552.89 ); level 4 (a score greater than 552.89 and less than or equal to 625.61 ); level 5 (a score greater than 625.61 and less than or equal to 698.32); and level 6 (a score greater than 698.32). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . The OECD average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Reporting standards were not met for American Indian/Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander. Black includes African American, and Hispanic includes Latino. Students who identified themselves as being of Hispanic origin were classified as Hispanic, regardless of their race. Although data for some race/ethnicities are not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. totals shown throughout the report. Students who identified themselves as being of Hispanic origin were classified as Hispanic, regardless of their race. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table R12. Percentage distribution of U.S. 15-year-old students on combined reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and percentage of students in public school eligible for free or reduced-price lunch: 2009

| Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | Level 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| U.S. average | 0.6 | 0.13 | 4.0 | 0.45 | 13.1 | 0.84 | 24.4 | 0.86 |
| Less than 10 percent | \# | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 4.2!* | 1.63 | 14.7* | 2.45 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 2.0!* | 0.83 | 7.6* | 1.81 | 19.9*** | 2.15 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 2.7* | 0.63 | 12.7 | 1.18 | 25.6 | 1.31 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 5.8 | 1.17 | 18.5* | 1.72 | 29.5* | 1.76 |
| 75 percent or more | $1.9{ }^{* * *}$ | 0.56 | $9.4 *$ | 1.55 | $22.7 *$ | 2.79 | 30.1* | 2.28 |
| OECD average | 1.1 | 0.05 | 4.6 | 0.08 | 13.1 | 0.13 | 24.0 | 0.16 |

See notes at end of table.

Table R12. Percentage distribution of U.S. 15-year-old students on combined reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and percentage of students in public school eligible for free or reduced-price lunch: 2009-Continued

| Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| U.S. average | 27.6 | 0.83 | 20.6 | 0.90 | 8.4 | 0.75 | 1.5 | 0.42 |
| Less than 10 percent | 30.2 | 2.96 | 30.4 * | 3.16 | 15.9* | 2.64 | 3.7 !* | 1.37 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | 29.4 | 2.03 | 27.5* | 2.12 | 11.5* | 1.72 | 2.0 ! | 0.64 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | 29.1 | 1.27 | 21.1 | 1.34 | 7.3 | 0.89 | 1.2! | 0.39 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 26.0 | 1.76 | 14.7 * | 1.73 | 4.3* | 0.76 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| 75 percent or more | 23.6* | 2.17 | 9.9* | 1.52 | 2.2 ! ${ }^{*}$ | 0.76 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| OECD average | 28.9 | 0.16 | 20.7 | 0.16 | 6.8 | 0.10 | 0.8 | 0.03 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) averages at the .05 level of statistical significance. ${ }^{* * *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the .05 level of statistical significance, but not significantly different from the OECD average.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1b (a score less than or equal to 262.04 ); level 1 b (a score greater than 262.04 and less than or equal to 334.75 ); level 1 a (a score greater than 334.75 and less than or equal to 407.47); level 2 (a score greater than 407.47 and less than or equal to 480.18 ); level 3 (a score greater than 480.18 and less than or equal to 552.89); level 4 (a score greater than 552.89 and less than or equal to 625.61 ); level 5 (a score greater than 625.61 and less than or equal to 698.32 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 698.32). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . The National School Lunch Program provides free or reduced-price lunch for students meeting certain income guidelines. The percentage of students receiving such lunch is an indicator of the socioeconomic level of families served by the school. The OECD average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Data are for public schools only. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table M1. Average scores of 15 -year-old students on mathematics literacy scale, by country: 2009

| Mathematics literacy scale |  |  | Mathematics literacy scale |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country | Score | s.e. | Country | Score | .e. |
| OECD average | 496 | 0.5 |  |  |  |
| OECD countries |  |  | Non-OECD countries |  |  |
| Korea, Republic of | 546 | 4.0 | Shanghai-China | 600 | 2.8 |
| Finland | 541 | 2.2 | Singapore | 562 | 1.4 |
| Switzerland | 534 | 3.3 | Hong Kong-China | 555 | 2.7 |
| Japan | 529 | 3.3 | Chinese Taipei | 543 | 3.4 |
| Canada | 527 | 1.6 | Liechtenstein | 536 | 4.1 |
| Netherlands | 526 | 4.7 | Macao-China | 525 | 0.9 |
| New Zealand | 519 | 2.3 | Latvia | 482 | 3.1 |
| Belgium | 515 | 2.3 | Lithuania | 477 | 2.6 |
| Australia | 514 | 2.5 | Russian Federation | 468 | 3.3 |
| Germany | 513 | 2.9 | Croatia | 460 | 3.1 |
| Estonia | 512 | 2.6 | Dubai-UAE | 453 | 1.1 |
| Iceland | 507 | 1.4 | Serbia, Republic of | 442 | 2.9 |
| Denmark | 503 | 2.6 | Azerbaijan | 431 | 2.8 |
| Slovenia | 501 | 1.2 | Bulgaria | 428 | 5.9 |
| Noway | 498 | 2.4 | Romania | 427 | 3.4 |
| France | 497 | 3.1 | Uruguay | 427 | 2.6 |
| Slovak Republic | 497 | 3.1 | Thailand | 419 | 3.2 |
| Austria | 496 | 2.7 | Trinidad and Tobago | 414 | 1.3 |
| Poland | 495 | 2.8 | Kazakhstan | 405 | 3.0 |
| Sweden | 494 | 2.9 | Montenegro, Republic of | 403 | 2.0 |
| Czech Republic | 493 | 2.8 | Argentina | 388 | 4.1 |
| United Kingdom | 492 | 2.4 | Jordan | 387 | 3.7 |
| Hungary | 490 | 3.5 | Brazil | 386 | 2.4 |
| Luxembourg | 489 | 1.2 | Colombia | 381 | 3.2 |
| United States | 487 | 3.6 | Albania | 377 | 4.0 |
| Ireland | 487 | 2.5 | Tunisia | 371 | 3.0 |
| Portugal | 487 | 2.9 | Indonesia | 371 | 3.7 |
| Spain | 483 | 2.1 | Qatar | 368 | 0.7 |
| Italy | 483 | 1.9 | Peru | 365 | 4.0 |
| Greece | 466 | 3.9 | Panama | 360 | 5.2 |
| Israel | 447 | 3.3 | Kyrgyz Republic | 331 | 2.9 |

Average is higher than the U.S. averageAverage is not measurably different from the U.S. average
Average is lower than the U.S. average

NOTE: The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries and are not included in the OECD average. Countries are ordered on the basis of average scores, from highest to lowest within the OECD countries and non-OECD countries. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Score differences as noted between the United States and other countries (as well as between the United States and the OECD average) are significantly different at the .05 level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Exhibit M1. Description of PISA proficiency levels on mathematics literacy scale: 2009
Proficiency level
and lower cut point
score

## Task descriptions

| Level 6 669 | At level 6, students can conceptualize, generalize, and utilize information based on their investigations and modeling of complex problem situations. They can link different information sources and representations and flexibly translate among them. Students at this level are capable of advanced mathematical thinking and reasoning. These students can apply this insight and understandings along with a mastery of symbolic and formal mathematical operations and relationships to develop new approaches and strategies for attacking novel situations. Students at this level can formulate and precisely communicate their actions and reflections regarding their findings, interpretations, arguments, and the appropriateness of these to the original situations. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level 5 607 | At level 5 , students can develop and work with models for complex situations, identifying constraints and specifying assumptions. They can select, compare, and evaluate appropriate problem solving strategies for dealing with complex problems related to these models. Students at this level can work strategically using broad, well-developed thinking and reasoning skills, appropriate linked representations, symbolic and formal characterizations, and insight pertaining to these situations. They can reflect on their actions and formulate and communicate their interpretations and reasoning. |
| Level 4 545 | At level 4, students can work effectively with explicit models for complex concrete situations that may involve constraints or call for making assumptions. They can select and integrate different representations, including symbolic ones, linking them directly to aspects of real-world situations. Students at this level can utilize well-developed skills and reason flexibly, with some insight, in these contexts. They can construct and communicate explanations and arguments based on their interpretations, arguments, and actions. |
| Level 3 482 | At level 3 , students can execute clearly described procedures, including those that require sequential decisions. They can select and apply simple problem solving strategies. Students at this level can interpret and use representations based on different information sources and reason directly from them. They can develop short communications reporting their interpretations, results and reasoning. |
| Level 2 420 | At level 2 , students can interpret and recognize situations in contexts that require no more than direct inference. They can extract relevant information from a single source and make use of a single representational mode. Students at this level can employ basic algorithms, formulae, procedures, or conventions. They are capable of direct reasoning and making literal interpretations of the results. |
| Level 1 358 | At level 1 , students can answer questions involving familiar contexts where all relevant information is present and the questions are clearly defined. They are able to identify information and to carry out routine procedures according to direct instructions in explicit situations. They can perform actions that are obvious and follow immediately from the given stimuli. |

NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into mathematics literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 (a score less than or equal to 357.77 ); level 1 (a score greater than 357.77 and less than or equal to 420.07); level 2 (a score greater than 420.07 and less than or equal to 482.38 ); level 3 (a score greater than 482.38 and less than or equal to 544.68 ); level 4 (a score greater than 544.68 and less than or equal to 606.99 ); level 5 (a score greater than 606.99 and less than or equal to 669.30 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 669.30). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 .
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Figure M1. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students in the United States and OECD countries on mathematics literacy scale, by proficiency level: 2009


* $p<.05$. Significantly different from the corresponding Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average percentage at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into mathematics literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 (a score less than or equal to 357.77); level 1 (a score greater than 357.77 and less than or equal to 420.07); level 2 (a score greater than 420.07 and less than or equal to 482.38 ); level 3 (a score greater than 482.38 and less than or equal to 544.68 ); level 4 (a score greater than 544.68 and less than or equal to 606.99 ); level 5 (a score greater than 606.99 and less than or equal to 669.30 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 669.30 ). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Figure M2. Average scores of 15-year-old students in the United States and OECD countries on mathematics literacy scale: 2003, 2006, and 2009

${ }^{*} p<.05$. U.S. average is significantly different from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) trend score at the .05 level of statistical significance. ${ }^{* *} p<.05$. U.S. average in 2006 is significantly different from the U.S. average in 2009 at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: The OECD trend scores are based on the averages of the 29 OECD countries with comparable data for 2003 and 2009 and with each country weighted equally. The OECD trend score is not reported for 2006 because data were not available for all 29 comparable countries. The five current OECD members not included in the OECD averages used to report on trends in mathematics literacy include Chile, Estonia, Israel, and Slovenia, which did not participate in 2003; and the United Kingdom, which did not meet Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) response-rate standards for the 2003 assessment. The OECD excluded the data for Austria from the trend analysis in its report (OECD, PISA 2009 Results: Learning Trends - Changes in Student Performance Since 2000 (Volume V), available at http://www.pisa.oecd.org) because of a concern over a data collection issue in 2009; however, after consultation with Austrian officials, NCES kept the Austrian data in the U.S. trend reporting. The PISA mathematics framework was revised in 2003. Because of changes in the framework, it is not possible to compare mathematics learning outcomes from PISA 2000 with those from PISA 2003, 2006, and 2009. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to $1,000$. SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2003, 2006, and 2009.

Table M2. Average scores of 15 -year-old students on mathematics literacy scale, by country: 2003, 2006, and 2009

| Country | 2003 |  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| OECD trend score ${ }^{1}$ | 500 | 0.6 | 498 | 0.5 | 499 | 0.5 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 524 | 2.1 | 520 | 2.2 | 514 | 2.5 |
| Austria | 506 | 3.3 | 505 | 3.7 | 496 | 2.7 |
| Belgium | 529 | 2.3 | 520 | 3.0 | 515 | 2.3 |
| Canada | 532 | 1.8 | 527 | 2.0 | 527 | 1.6 |
| Chile | - | $\dagger$ | 411 | 4.6 | 421 | 3.1 |
| Czech Republic | 516 | 3.6 | 510 | 3.6 | 493 | 2.8 |
| Denmark | 514 | 2.7 | 513 | 2.6 | 503 | 2.6 |
| Estonia | - | $\dagger$ | 515 | 2.7 | 512 | 2.6 |
| Finland | 544 | 1.9 | 548 | 2.3 | 541 | 2.2 |
| France | 511 | 2.5 | 496 | 3.2 | 497 | 3.1 |
| Germany | 503 | 3.3 | 504 | 3.9 | 513 | 2.9 |
| Greece | 445 | 3.9 | 459 | 3.0 | 466 | 3.9 |
| Hungary | 490 | 2.8 | 491 | 2.9 | 490 | 3.5 |
| Iceland | 515 | 1.4 | 506 | 1.8 | 507 | 1.4 |
| Ireland | 503 | 2.4 | 501 | 2.8 | 487 | 2.5 |
| Israel | - | $\dagger$ | 442 | 4.3 | 447 | 3.3 |
| Italy | 466 | 3.1 | 462 | 2.3 | 483 | 1.9 |
| Japan | 534 | 4.0 | 523 | 3.3 | 529 | 3.3 |
| Korea, Republic of | 542 | 3.2 | 547 | 3.8 | 546 | 4.0 |
| Luxembourg | 493 | 1.0 | 490 | 1.1 | 489 | 1.2 |
| Mexico | 385 | 3.6 | 406 | 2.9 | 419 | 1.8 |
| Netherlands | 538 | 3.1 | 531 | 2.6 | 526 | 4.7 |
| New Zealand | 523 | 2.3 | 522 | 2.4 | 519 | 2.3 |
| Norway | 495 | 2.4 | 490 | 2.6 | 498 | 2.4 |
| Poland | 490 | 2.5 | 495 | 2.4 | 495 | 2.8 |
| Portugal | 466 | 3.4 | 466 | 3.1 | 487 | 2.9 |
| Slovak Republic | 498 | 3.3 | 492 | 2.8 | 497 | 3.1 |
| Slovenia | - | $\dagger$ | 504 | 1.0 | 501 | 1.2 |
| Spain | 485 | 2.4 | 480 | 2.3 | 483 | 2.1 |
| Sweden | 509 | 2.6 | 502 | 2.4 | 494 | 2.9 |
| Switzerland | 527 | 3.4 | 530 | 3.2 | 534 | 3.3 |
| Turkey | 423 | 6.7 | 424 | 4.9 | 445 | 4.4 |
| United Kingdom² | - | $\dagger$ | 495 | 2.1 | 492 | 2.4 |
| United States | 483 | 2.9 | 474 | 4.0 | 487 | 3.6 |

See notes at end of table.

Table M2. Average scores of 15-year-old students on mathematics literacy scale, by country: 2003, 2006, and 2009-Continued

| Country | 2003 |  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score |  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 377 | 4.0 |
| Argentina | - | $\dagger$ | 381 | 6.2 | 388 | 4.1 |
| Azerbaijan | - | $\dagger$ | 476 | 2.3 | 431 | 2.8 |
| Brazil | 356 | 4.8 | 370 | 2.9 | 386 | 2.4 |
| Bulgaria | - | $\dagger$ | 413 | 6.1 | 428 | 5.9 |
| Chinese Taipei | - | $\dagger$ | 549 | 4.1 | 543 | 3.4 |
| Colombia | - | $\dagger$ | 370 | 3.8 | 381 | 3.2 |
| Croatia | - | $\dagger$ | 467 | 2.4 | 460 | 3.1 |
| Dubai-UAE | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 453 | 1.1 |
| Hong Kong-China | 550 | 4.5 | 547 | 2.7 | 555 | 2.7 |
| Indonesia | 360 | 3.9 | 391 | 5.6 | 371 | 3.7 |
| Jordan | - | $\dagger$ | 384 | 3.3 | 387 | 3.7 |
| Kazakhstan | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 405 | 3.0 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | - | $\dagger$ | 311 | 3.4 | 331 | 2.9 |
| Latvia | 483 | 3.7 | 486 | 3.0 | 482 | 3.1 |
| Liechtenstein | 536 | 4.1 | 525 | 4.2 | 536 | 4.1 |
| Lithuania | - | $\dagger$ | 486 | 2.9 | 477 | 2.6 |
| Macao-China | 527 | 2.9 | 525 | 1.3 | 525 | 0.9 |
| Montenegro, Republic of ${ }^{3}$ | 437 | 3.8 | 399 | 1.4 | 403 | 2.0 |
| Panama | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 360 | 5.2 |
| Peru | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 365 | 4.0 |
| Qatar | - | $\dagger$ | 318 | 1.0 | 368 | 0.7 |
| Romania | - | $\dagger$ | 415 | 4.2 | 427 | 3.4 |
| Russian Federation | 468 | 4.2 | 476 | 3.9 | 468 | 3.3 |
| Serbia, Republic of ${ }^{3}$ | 437 | 3.8 | 435 | 3.5 | 442 | 2.9 |
| Shanghai-China | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 600 | 2.8 |
| Singapore | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 562 | 1.4 |
| Thailand | 417 | 3.0 | 417 | 2.3 | 419 | 3.2 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 414 | 1.3 |
| Tunisia | 359 | 2.5 | 365 | 4.0 | 371 | 3.0 |
| Uruguay | 422 | 3.3 | 427 | 2.6 | 427 | 2.6 |

- Not available.
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
${ }^{1}$ The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) trend scores are based on the averages of the 29 OECD countries with comparable data for 2003 and 2009 and with each country weighted equally. The five current OECD members not included in the OECD averages used to report on trends in mathematics literacy include Chile, Estonia, Israel, and Slovenia, which did not participate in 2003; and the United Kingdom, which did not meet Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) response-rate standards for the 2003 assessment. The OECD excluded the data for Austria from the trend analysis in its report (OECD, PISA 2009 Results: Learning Trends - Changes in Student Performance Since 2000 (Volume V), available at http://www.pisa.oecd.org) because of a concern over a data collection issue in 2009; however, after consultation with Austrian officials, NCES kept the Austrian data in the U.S. trend reporting.
${ }^{2}$ Because of low response rates, 2003 data for the United Kingdom are not presented.
${ }^{3}$ The Republics of Montenegro and Serbia were a united country under the PISA 2003 assessment.
NOTE: The PISA mathematics framework was revised in 2003. Because of changes in the framework, it is not possible to compare mathematics learning outcomes from PISA 2000 with those from PISA 2003, 2006, and 2009. Because PISA is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries and are not included in the OECD average. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2003, 2006, and 2009.

Table M3. Scores of 15-year-old students on mathematics literacy scale at selected percentiles, by country:

| Country | Percentile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5^{\text {th }}$ |  | $10^{\text {th }}$ |  | $25^{\text {th }}$ |  | $50^{\text {th }}$ |  | $75^{\text {th }}$ |  | 90th |  | $95^{\text {th }}$ |  |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| OECD average | 343 | 0.9 | 376 | 0.7 | 433 | 0.6 | 497 | 0.6 | 560 | 0.6 | 613 | 0.7 | 643 | 0.8 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 357 | 3.3 | 393 | 2.8 | 451 | 2.5 | 516 | 2.5 | 580 | 3.1 | 634 | 3.9 | 665 | 5.0 |
| Austria | 338 | 6.6 | 370 | 4.4 | 425 | 3.5 | 497 | 3.6 | 566 | 3.5 | 620 | 3.5 | 650 | 3.5 |
| Belgium | 335 | 5.3 | 373 | 4.9 | 444 | 3.1 | 522 | 2.9 | 593 | 2.4 | 646 | 3.0 | 675 | 3.2 |
| Canada | 379 | 3.0 | 413 | 2.7 | 468 | 2.0 | 530 | 2.0 | 588 | 1.9 | 638 | 2.2 | 665 | 2.2 |
| Chile | 293 | 4.6 | 322 | 3.8 | 366 | 3.1 | 418 | 3.3 | 473 | 4.2 | 527 | 5.1 | 559 | 5.8 |
| Czech Republic | 342 | 5.6 | 374 | 4.3 | 428 | 3.5 | 490 | 3.3 | 557 | 3.8 | 615 | 4.3 | 649 | 4.6 |
| Denmark | 358 | 4.4 | 390 | 4.0 | 445 | 3.1 | 505 | 2.9 | 564 | 3.3 | 614 | 3.4 | 644 | 4.6 |
| Estonia | 378 | 6.0 | 409 | 3.5 | 458 | 3.7 | 513 | 2.9 | 567 | 2.7 | 616 | 3.6 | 643 | 3.6 |
| Finland | 399 | 4.4 | 431 | 3.7 | 487 | 3.0 | 544 | 2.7 | 599 | 2.5 | 644 | 2.6 | 669 | 3.6 |
| France | 321 | 5.8 | 361 | 6.3 | 429 | 4.8 | 502 | 3.9 | 570 | 3.7 | 622 | 3.9 | 652 | 5.4 |
| Germany | 347 | 5.0 | 380 | 4.7 | 443 | 4.4 | 517 | 3.5 | 585 | 3.1 | 638 | 3.5 | 666 | 3.7 |
| Greece | 319 | 7.3 | 352 | 5.9 | 406 | 4.4 | 467 | 4.1 | 527 | 3.6 | 580 | 4.1 | 613 | 4.4 |
| Hungary | 334 | 8.4 | 370 | 7.1 | 428 | 4.6 | 493 | 4.2 | 554 | 4.5 | 608 | 5.6 | 637 | 5.6 |
| Iceland | 352 | 4.1 | 388 | 3.4 | 447 | 2.0 | 509 | 1.7 | 569 | 2.0 | 623 | 2.8 | 652 | 3.3 |
| Ireland | 338 | 5.7 | 376 | 4.4 | 432 | 3.1 | 493 | 3.0 | 548 | 2.8 | 591 | 3.1 | 617 | 4.3 |
| Israel | 272 | 6.7 | 310 | 6.1 | 374 | 4.6 | 450 | 3.5 | 520 | 4.2 | 581 | 5.2 | 615 | 5.2 |
| Italy | 330 | 3.1 | 363 | 2.4 | 420 | 1.9 | 485 | 2.2 | 548 | 2.5 | 602 | 2.5 | 632 | 2.8 |
| Japan | 370 | 6.4 | 407 | 5.4 | 468 | 4.4 | 532 | 3.4 | 595 | 3.7 | 648 | 4.8 | 677 | 5.4 |
| Korea, Republic of | 397 | 8.4 | 430 | 6.8 | 486 | 5.3 | 549 | 4.3 | 609 | 4.3 | 659 | 4.6 | 689 | 6.5 |
| Luxembourg | 324 | 3.9 | 360 | 3.1 | 423 | 1.7 | 491 | 1.8 | 560 | 2.2 | 613 | 2.5 | 643 | 2.5 |
| Mexico | 289 | 3.2 | 318 | 2.6 | 366 | 2.2 | 419 | 1.9 | 472 | 2.1 | 520 | 2.8 | 547 | 3.3 |
| Netherlands | 378 | 5.6 | 406 | 5.6 | 460 | 6.8 | 529 | 6.0 | 593 | 4.4 | 640 | 4.4 | 665 | 3.9 |
| New Zealand | 355 | 4.9 | 392 | 4.4 | 454 | 2.8 | 523 | 2.9 | 589 | 3.1 | 642 | 3.9 | 671 | 3.4 |
| Norway | 354 | 4.1 | 386 | 3.6 | 441 | 3.2 | 499 | 2.9 | 557 | 2.9 | 608 | 3.4 | 636 | 4.0 |
| Poland | 348 | 5.2 | 380 | 3.8 | 434 | 3.3 | 495 | 3.0 | 557 | 3.2 | 609 | 4.1 | 638 | 4.6 |
| Portugal | 334 | 3.8 | 367 | 3.5 | 424 | 3.4 | 488 | 3.4 | 551 | 3.4 | 605 | 4.4 | 635 | 5.1 |
| Slovak Republic | 342 | 6.3 | 376 | 4.7 | 432 | 3.7 | 497 | 3.7 | 561 | 3.8 | 621 | 5.4 | 654 | 6.4 |
| Slovenia | 345 | 3.6 | 379 | 2.4 | 435 | 2.5 | 501 | 1.8 | 569 | 2.3 | 628 | 3.5 | 659 | 3.6 |
| Spain | 328 | 4.0 | 364 | 2.9 | 424 | 2.5 | 488 | 2.4 | 546 | 2.3 | 597 | 2.3 | 625 | 2.9 |
| Sweden | 339 | 4.4 | 374 | 4.2 | 432 | 3.1 | 496 | 3.5 | 560 | 3.3 | 613 | 3.9 | 643 | 4.1 |
| Switzerland | 363 | 4.8 | 401 | 3.6 | 468 | 4.2 | 539 | 3.6 | 604 | 3.9 | 658 | 4.1 | 689 | 4.8 |
| Turkey | 304 | 5.2 | 331 | 3.6 | 378 | 3.8 | 439 | 4.7 | 506 | 6.3 | 574 | 9.0 | 613 | 12.2 |
| United Kingdom | 348 | 3.4 | 380 | 3.1 | 434 | 3.0 | 493 | 2.9 | 552 | 3.2 | 606 | 3.9 | 635 | 3.2 |
| United States | 337 | 4.3 | 368 | 4.3 | 425 | 3.9 | 488 | 3.8 | 551 | 4.9 | 607 | 4.6 | 637 | 5.9 |

See notes at end of table.

Table M3. Scores of 15 -year-old students on mathematics literacy scale at selected percentiles, by country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Percentile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5^{\text {th }}$ |  | $10^{\text {th }}$ |  | $25^{\text {th }}$ |  | $50^{\text {th }}$ |  | $75^{\text {th }}$ |  | 90 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 226 | 7.0 | 261 | 5.0 | 317 | 5.2 | 380 | 4.1 | 438 | 4.8 | 493 | 5.7 | 526 | 6.5 |
| Argentina | 231 | 7.9 | 271 | 6.0 | 327 | 4.3 | 388 | 4.4 | 451 | 5.0 | 509 | 7.1 | 543 | 7.0 |
| Azerbaijan | 334 | 3.0 | 354 | 2.7 | 387 | 2.9 | 427 | 2.8 | 469 | 3.2 | 512 | 5.2 | 541 | 7.0 |
| Brazil | 261 | 3.0 | 287 | 2.7 | 331 | 2.3 | 381 | 2.6 | 435 | 3.3 | 493 | 4.7 | 531 | 5.9 |
| Bulgaria | 269 | 6.9 | 302 | 5.8 | 359 | 6.2 | 428 | 6.5 | 496 | 6.6 | 555 | 9.0 | 593 | 12.3 |
| Chinese Taipei | 366 | 5.0 | 405 | 3.8 | 471 | 3.6 | 547 | 4.2 | 618 | 4.6 | 675 | 5.4 | 709 | 6.6 |
| Colombia | 259 | 5.8 | 286 | 5.1 | 330 | 4.0 | 379 | 3.4 | 431 | 3.4 | 479 | 4.2 | 509 | 4.2 |
| Croatia | 315 | 4.8 | 347 | 4.1 | 399 | 3.5 | 460 | 3.6 | 521 | 3.8 | 574 | 5.4 | 606 | 5.6 |
| Dubai-UAE | 294 | 3.1 | 326 | 2.6 | 381 | 2.3 | 450 | 1.7 | 523 | 2.1 | 584 | 3.3 | 619 | 3.6 |
| Hong Kong-China | 390 | 5.1 | 428 | 4.9 | 492 | 3.5 | 559 | 3.0 | 622 | 3.1 | 673 | 3.9 | 703 | 4.7 |
| Indonesia | 260 | 4.9 | 284 | 4.6 | 324 | 3.7 | 369 | 3.8 | 416 | 4.6 | 462 | 6.4 | 493 | 8.6 |
| Jordan | 249 | 7.8 | 281 | 4.8 | 333 | 3.5 | 389 | 3.7 | 443 | 4.4 | 490 | 5.5 | 520 | 6.9 |
| Kazakhstan | 276 | 4.3 | 303 | 3.3 | 347 | 3.5 | 401 | 3.3 | 458 | 4.3 | 514 | 5.3 | 548 | 7.0 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 204 | 4.9 | 231 | 3.9 | 278 | 3.2 | 328 | 3.0 | 382 | 3.8 | 436 | 5.3 | 473 | 7.0 |
| Latvia | 352 | 4.9 | 379 | 4.5 | 427 | 3.7 | 483 | 3.8 | 537 | 3.8 | 584 | 3.8 | 612 | 3.7 |
| Liechtenstein | 384 | 17.8 | 421 | 8.9 | 484 | 7.9 | 543 | 6.5 | 593 | 5.4 | 637 | 11.4 | 670 | 14.9 |
| Lithuania | 332 | 5.3 | 363 | 4.2 | 417 | 3.0 | 477 | 2.9 | 537 | 3.1 | 590 | 4.0 | 621 | 5.4 |
| Macao-China | 382 | 2.6 | 415 | 2.7 | 468 | 1.6 | 527 | 1.9 | 584 | 1.3 | 634 | 1.6 | 663 | 2.5 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 263 | 4.0 | 295 | 4.4 | 346 | 2.8 | 403 | 2.3 | 458 | 2.2 | 509 | 2.7 | 543 | 3.9 |
| Panama | 235 | 8.2 | 261 | 7.0 | 306 | 5.6 | 355 | 5.5 | 408 | 6.8 | 466 | 8.6 | 503 | 8.8 |
| Peru | 222 | 4.5 | 252 | 4.0 | 303 | 3.7 | 363 | 4.2 | 424 | 5.2 | 480 | 6.3 | 516 | 9.0 |
| Qatar | 227 | 2.4 | 255 | 1.5 | 300 | 1.2 | 355 | 1.3 | 425 | 1.5 | 506 | 2.4 | 557 | 3.5 |
| Romania | 299 | 4.4 | 326 | 4.1 | 372 | 4.0 | 426 | 3.8 | 481 | 3.6 | 530 | 5.4 | 560 | 6.5 |
| Russian Federation | 329 | 5.1 | 360 | 4.5 | 411 | 4.2 | 467 | 3.5 | 524 | 3.8 | 576 | 5.3 | 609 | 7.2 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 295 | 4.8 | 327 | 4.3 | 380 | 3.7 | 441 | 3.5 | 504 | 3.2 | 560 | 4.3 | 592 | 5.3 |
| Shanghai-China | 421 | 7.1 | 462 | 5.0 | 531 | 4.0 | 608 | 3.4 | 674 | 3.2 | 726 | 4.2 | 757 | 4.6 |
| Singapore | 383 | 3.0 | 422 | 4.1 | 490 | 2.9 | 568 | 2.4 | 638 | 2.0 | 693 | 2.5 | 725 | 3.8 |
| Thailand | 295 | 4.5 | 321 | 4.2 | 365 | 3.5 | 415 | 3.2 | 469 | 3.7 | 522 | 5.4 | 554 | 6.8 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 252 | 3.9 | 287 | 2.7 | 342 | 2.5 | 412 | 2.1 | 484 | 2.5 | 546 | 1.8 | 580 | 2.4 |
| Tunisia | 247 | 4.8 | 273 | 4.3 | 318 | 3.7 | 371 | 3.1 | 423 | 3.4 | 471 | 4.9 | 499 | 6.6 |
| Uruguay | 278 | 3.9 | 310 | 4.0 | 364 | 3.4 | 426 | 3.2 | 490 | 3.1 | 546 | 4.1 | 578 | 4.5 |

NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut point) score for the following: (a) $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 5 percent of students; (b) $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 10 percent of students; (c) $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom quarter of students; (d) $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the median (half the students scored below the cut point and half scored above it); (e) $7^{5 \text { th }}$ percentile - the top quarter of students; (f) $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 10 percent of students; and ( g ) $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 5 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each country's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut points across countries and over time. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Figure M3. Scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on mathematics literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2003, 2006, and 2009

*p<.05. Significantly different from the 2009 score at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: This figure shows the threshold (or cut point) score for the following: (a) $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 5 percent of students; (b) $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 10 percent of students; (c) $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom quarter of students; (d) $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the median (half the students scored below the cut point and half scored above it); (e) $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top quarter of students; (f) $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 10 percent of students; and (g) $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 5 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each country's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut points across countries and over time. The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) mathematics framework was revised in 2003. Because of changes in the framework, it is not possible to compare mathematics learning outcomes from PISA 2000 with those from PISA 2003, 2006, and 2009. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2003, 2006, and 2009.

Table M3A. Scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on mathematics literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2003, 2006, and 2009

| Selected percentiles | 2003 |  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| 95th percentile | 638 | 5.1 | 625 | 4.8 | 637 | 5.9 |
| 90th percentile | 607 | 3.9 | 593* | 4.8 | 607 | 4.6 |
| 75th percentile | 550 | 3.4 | 537 | 5.0 | 551 | 4.9 |
| 50th percentile | 483 | 3.1 | 472* | 4.4 | 488 | 3.8 |
| 25th percentile | 418 | 3.7 | 411* | 4.8 | 425 | 3.9 |
| 10th percentile | 356 | 4.5 | 358 | 5.8 | 368 | 4.3 |
| 5th percentile | 323* | 4.9 | 328 | 7.6 | 337 | 4.3 |
| Mean | 483 | 2.9 | 474* | 4.4 | 487 | 3.6 |

*p<.05. Significantly different from the 2009 score at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut point) score for the following: (a) $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 5 percent of students; (b) $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 10 percent of students; (c) $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom quarter of students; (d) $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the median (half the students scored below the cut point and half scored above it); (e) $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top quarter of students; (f) $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 10 percent of students; and $(\mathrm{g}) 95^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 5 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each country's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut points across countries and over time. The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) mathematics framework was revised in 2003. Because of changes in the framework, it is not possible to compare mathematics learning outcomes from PISA 2000 with those from PISA 2003, 2006, and 2009. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Standard error is noted by s.e.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2003, 2006, and 2009.

Table M4. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students on mathematics literacy scale, by proficiency level and country: 2009

| Country | Below level 1 |  | Level 1 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average OECD countries | 8.0 | 0.12 | 14.0 | 0.13 | 22.0 | 0.15 | 24.3 | 0.17 | 18.9 | 0.15 | 9.6 | 0.12 | 3.1 | 0.08 |
| Australia | 5.1 | 0.33 | 10.7 | 0.53 | 20.3 | 0.61 | 25.8 | 0.54 | 21.7 | 0.56 | 11.9 | 0.54 | 4.5 | 0.56 |
| Austria | 7.8 | 0.75 | 15.4 | 0.90 | 21.2 | 0.88 | 23.0 | 0.89 | 19.6 | 0.93 | 9.9 | 0.70 | 3.0 | 0.35 |
| Belgium | 7.7 | 0.63 | 11.3 | 0.54 | 17.5 | 0.69 | 21.8 | 0.73 | 21.3 | 0.76 | 14.6 | 0.56 | 5.8 | 0.44 |
| Canada | 3.1 | 0.25 | 8.3 | 0.42 | 18.8 | 0.48 | 26.5 | 0.86 | 25.0 | 0.68 | 13.9 | 0.45 | 4.4 | 0.27 |
| Chile | 21.7 | 1.19 | 29.4 | 1.09 | 27.3 | 0.98 | 14.8 | 0.96 | 5.6 | 0.59 | 1.2 | 0.29 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Czech Republic | 7.0 | 0.83 | 15.3 | 0.83 | 24.2 | 1.00 | 24.4 | 1.09 | 17.4 | 0.81 | 8.5 | 0.64 | 3.2 | 0.39 |
| Denmark | 5.0 | 0.49 | 12.1 | 0.78 | 23.0 | 0.91 | 27.4 | 1.06 | 21.0 | 0.89 | 9.1 | 0.83 | 2.5 | 0.47 |
| Estonia | 3.0 | 0.42 | 9.6 | 0.67 | 22.7 | 0.86 | 29.9 | 0.94 | 22.7 | 0.81 | 9.8 | 0.79 | 2.2 | 0.43 |
| Finland | 1.7 | 0.25 | 6.1 | 0.45 | 15.6 | 0.83 | 27.1 | 0.95 | 27.8 | 0.87 | 16.7 | 0.79 | 4.9 | 0.53 |
| France | 9.5 | 0.88 | 13.1 | 1.06 | 19.9 | 0.94 | 23.8 | 1.12 | 20.1 | 1.01 | 10.4 | 0.72 | 3.3 | 0.48 |
| Germany | 6.4 | 0.63 | 12.2 | 0.72 | 18.8 | 0.88 | 23.1 | 0.87 | 21.7 | 0.92 | 13.2 | 0.87 | 4.6 | 0.46 |
| Greece | 11.3 | 1.22 | 19.0 | 1.01 | 26.4 | 1.25 | 24.0 | 1.05 | 13.6 | 0.78 | 4.9 | 0.56 | 0.8 | 0.16 |
| Hungary | 8.1 | 0.99 | 14.2 | 0.95 | 23.2 | 1.18 | 26.0 | 1.24 | 18.4 | 1.02 | 8.1 | 0.79 | 2.0 | 0.45 |
| Iceland | 5.7 | 0.43 | 11.2 | 0.52 | 21.3 | 0.88 | 27.3 | 0.90 | 20.9 | 0.90 | 10.5 | 0.67 | 3.1 | 0.40 |
| Ireland | 7.3 | 0.64 | 13.5 | 0.74 | 24.5 | 1.09 | 28.6 | 1.20 | 19.4 | 0.92 | 5.8 | 0.59 | 0.9 | 0.20 |
| Israel | 20.6 | 1.17 | 18.9 | 0.90 | 22.5 | 0.92 | 20.1 | 0.87 | 12.0 | 0.71 | 4.7 | 0.51 | 1.2 | 0.28 |
| Italy | 9.1 | 0.45 | 15.9 | 0.48 | 24.2 | 0.59 | 24.6 | 0.48 | 17.3 | 0.57 | 7.4 | 0.40 | 1.6 | 0.15 |
| Japan | 4.0 | 0.57 | 8.5 | 0.65 | 17.4 | 0.90 | 25.7 | 1.08 | 23.5 | 1.04 | 14.7 | 0.88 | 6.2 | 0.78 |
| Korea, Republic of | 1.9 | 0.49 | 6.2 | 0.72 | 15.6 | 0.99 | 24.4 | 1.21 | 26.3 | 1.30 | 17.7 | 0.97 | 7.8 | 0.96 |
| Luxembourg | 9.6 | 0.53 | 14.3 | 0.57 | 22.7 | 0.72 | 23.1 | 0.98 | 19.0 | 0.82 | 9.0 | 0.61 | 2.3 | 0.36 |
| Mexico | 21.9 | 0.79 | 28.9 | 0.59 | 28.3 | 0.61 | 15.6 | 0.56 | 4.7 | 0.36 | 0.7 | 0.11 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Netherlands | 2.8 | 0.60 | 10.6 | 1.33 | 19.0 | 1.37 | 23.9 | 0.98 | 23.9 | 1.25 | 15.4 | 1.18 | 4.4 | 0.52 |
| New Zealand | 5.3 | 0.52 | 10.1 | 0.54 | 19.1 | 0.84 | 24.4 | 0.88 | 22.2 | 0.98 | 13.6 | 0.74 | 5.3 | 0.45 |
| Norway | 5.5 | 0.50 | 12.6 | 0.83 | 24.3 | 0.93 | 27.5 | 1.02 | 19.7 | 0.86 | 8.4 | 0.58 | 1.8 | 0.34 |
| Poland | 6.1 | 0.55 | 14.3 | 0.74 | 24.0 | 0.88 | 26.1 | 0.77 | 19.0 | 0.85 | 8.2 | 0.61 | 2.2 | 0.41 |
| Portugal | 8.4 | 0.62 | 15.3 | 0.83 | 23.9 | 0.93 | 25.0 | 1.03 | 17.7 | 0.79 | 7.7 | 0.63 | 1.9 | 0.35 |
| Slovak Republic | 7.0 | 0.68 | 14.0 | 0.79 | 23.2 | 1.08 | 25.0 | 1.54 | 18.1 | 1.24 | 9.1 | 0.69 | 3.6 | 0.63 |
| Slovenia | 6.5 | 0.40 | 13.8 | 0.61 | 22.5 | 0.67 | 23.9 | 0.69 | 19.0 | 0.79 | 10.3 | 0.57 | 3.9 | 0.36 |
| Spain | 9.1 | 0.48 | 14.6 | 0.58 | 23.9 | 0.58 | 26.6 | 0.63 | 17.7 | 0.62 | 6.7 | 0.39 | 1.3 | 0.16 |
| Sweden | 7.5 | 0.64 | 13.5 | 0.71 | 23.4 | 0.81 | 25.2 | 0.75 | 19.0 | 0.88 | 8.9 | 0.64 | 2.5 | 0.35 |
| Switzerland | 4.5 | 0.41 | 9.0 | 0.64 | 15.9 | 0.63 | 23.0 | 0.92 | 23.5 | 0.80 | 16.3 | 0.78 | 7.8 | 0.75 |
| Turkey | 17.7 | 1.35 | 24.4 | 1.11 | 25.2 | 1.18 | 17.4 | 1.07 | 9.6 | 0.90 | 4.4 | 0.91 | 1.3! | 0.46 |
| United Kingdom | 6.2 | 0.47 | 13.9 | 0.72 | 24.9 | 0.88 | 27.2 | 1.10 | 17.9 | 0.96 | 8.1 | 0.63 | 1.8 | 0.27 |
| United States | 8.1 | 0.72 | 15.3 | 0.98 | 24.4 | 0.97 | 25.2 | 0.95 | 17.1 | 0.93 | 8.0 | 0.85 | 1.9 | 0.46 |

See notes at end of table.

Table M4. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students on mathematics literacy scale, by proficiency level and country: 2009— Continued

| Country | Below level 1 |  | Level 1 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | $\overline{\text { Percent }}$ | s.e. | $\overline{\text { Percent }}$ | s.e |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 40.5 | 1.76 | 27.2 | 1.22 | 20.2 | 1.25 | 9.1 | 0.85 | 2.6 | 0.58 | 0.4 ! | 0.16 | \# |  |
| Argentina | 37.2 | 1.75 | 26.4 | 1.11 | 20.8 | 1.09 | 10.9 | 0.95 | 3.9 | 0.66 | 0.8! | 0.26 | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Azerbaijan | 11.5 | 0.96 | 33.8 | 1.24 | 35.3 | 1.29 | 14.8 | 1.04 | 3.6 | 0.51 | 0.9 ! | 0.34 | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Brazil | 38.1 | 1.25 | 31.0 | 0.91 | 19.0 | 0.75 | 8.1 | 0.64 | 3.0 | 0.32 | 0.7 | 0.19 | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Bulgaria | 24.5 | 1.91 | 22.7 | 1.08 | 23.4 | 1.11 | 17.5 | 1.36 | 8.2 | 0.90 | 3.0 | 0.70 | 0.8! | 0.36 |
| Chinese Taipei | 4.2 | 0.48 | 8.6 | 0.65 | 15.5 | 0.68 | 20.9 | 0.88 | 22.2 | 0.86 | 17.2 | 0.92 | 11.3 | 1.16 |
| Colombia | 38.8 | 2.02 | 31.6 | 1.30 | 20.3 | 1.28 | 7.5 | 0.66 | 1.6 | 0.33 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# |  |
| Croatia | 12.4 | 0.85 | 20.8 | 0.95 | 26.7 | 0.83 | 22.7 | 0.97 | 12.5 | 0.84 | 4.3 | 0.51 | 0.6 ! | 0.22 |
| Dubai-UAE | 17.6 | 0.49 | 21.2 | 0.59 | 23.0 | 0.79 | 19.6 | 0.63 | 12.1 | 0.55 | 5.3 | 0.39 | 1.2 | 0.19 |
| Hong Kong-China | 2.6 | 0.40 | 6.2 | 0.53 | 13.2 | 0.67 | 21.9 | 0.84 | 25.4 | 0.91 | 19.9 | 0.82 | 10.8 | 0.78 |
| Indonesia | 43.6 | 2.21 | 33.0 | 1.53 | 16.9 | 1.14 | 5.4 | 0.91 | 0.9 ! | 0.32 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# |  |
| Jordan | 35.4 | 1.67 | 29.9 | 1.20 | 22.9 | 1.03 | 9.5 | 0.94 | 2.1 | 0.44 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# |  |
| Kazakhstan | 29.6 | 1.31 | 29.6 | 0.94 | 23.5 | 0.88 | 12.0 | 0.80 | 4.2 | 0.48 | 0.9 ! | 0.29 | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 64.8 | 1.43 | 21.8 | 0.98 | 9.3 | 0.76 | 3.3 | 0.51 | 0.7 ! | 0.24 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# |  |
| Latvia | 5.8 | 0.69 | 16.7 | 1.15 | 27.2 | 1.04 | 28.2 | 1.08 | 16.4 | 1.01 | 5.1 | 0.50 | 0.6 | 0.15 |
| Liechtenstein | 3.0 ! | 0.99 | 6.5 | 1.61 | 15.0 | 2.18 | 26.2 | 2.26 | 31.2 | 3.25 | 13.0 | 2.45 | 5.0 | 1.42 |
| Lithuania | 9.1 | 0.79 | 17.3 | 0.84 | 26.1 | 1.10 | 25.3 | 0.98 | 15.4 | 0.77 | 5.7 | 0.56 | 1.3 | 0.26 |
| Macao-China | 2.8 | 0.25 | 8.2 | 0.47 | 19.6 | 0.58 | 27.8 | 0.90 | 24.5 | 0.78 | 12.8 | 0.43 | 4.3 | 0.28 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 29.7 | 1.07 | 28.7 | 1.01 | 24.6 | 1.04 | 12.2 | 0.68 | 3.8 | 0.35 | 0.9 | 0.20 | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Panama | 51.5 | 2.90 | 27.3 | 1.72 | 13.9 | 1.51 | 5.6 | 0.92 | 1.4 | 0.36 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# |  |
| Peru | 47.6 | 1.81 | 25.9 | 1.16 | 16.9 | 1.26 | 6.8 | 0.70 | 2.1 | 0.43 | 0.5 ! | 0.18 | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Qatar | 51.1 | 0.56 | 22.7 | 0.64 | 13.1 | 0.48 | 7.2 | 0.35 | 4.2 | 0.25 | 1.5 | 0.17 | 0.3 | 0.08 |
| Romania | 19.5 | 1.42 | 27.5 | 1.15 | 28.6 | 1.39 | 17.3 | 1.02 | 5.9 | 0.77 | 1.2 | 0.33 | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Russian Federation | 9.6 | 0.92 | 19.0 | 1.16 | 28.5 | 1.03 | 25.0 | 1.00 | 12.7 | 0.87 | 4.3 | 0.57 | 1.0 | 0.27 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 17.6 | 1.04 | 22.9 | 0.84 | 26.5 | 1.07 | 19.9 | 0.97 | 9.5 | 0.62 | 2.9 | 0.41 | 0.6 | 0.18 |
| Shangha-China | 1.4 | 0.26 | 3.4 | 0.38 | 8.7 | 0.63 | 15.2 | 0.79 | 20.8 | 0.79 | 23.8 | 0.80 | 26.6 | 1.19 |
| Singapore | 3.0 | 0.26 | 6.8 | 0.57 | 13.1 | 0.56 | 18.7 | 0.80 | 22.8 | 0.62 | 20.0 | 0.87 | 15.6 | 0.63 |
| Thailand | 22.2 | 1.37 | 30.3 | 0.92 | 27.3 | 1.09 | 14.0 | 0.85 | 4.9 | 0.57 | 1.0 | 0.27 | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 30.1 | 0.79 | 23.1 | 0.97 | 21.2 | 0.89 | 15.4 | 0.63 | 7.7 | 0.44 | 2.1 | 0.25 | 0.3 ! | 0.15 |
| Tunisia | 43.4 | 1.66 | 30.2 | 1.46 | 18.7 | 0.90 | 6.1 | 0.69 | 1.3 ! | 0.44 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# |  |
| Uruguay | 22.9 | 1.16 | 24.6 | 1.08 | 25.1 | 0.99 | 17.0 | 0.73 | 7.9 | 0.55 | 2.1 | 0.34 | $0.3!$ | 0.12 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into mathematics literacy levels according to their scores.
Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 (a score less than or equal to 357.77); level 1 (a score greater than 357.77 and less than or equal to 420.07 ); level 2 (a score greater than 420.07 and less than or equal to 482.38 ); level 3 (a score greater than 482.38 and less than or equal to 544.68 ); level 4 (a score greater than 544.68 and less than or equal to 606.99 ); level 5 (a score greater than 606.99 and less than or equal to 669.30); and level 6 (a score greater than 669.30). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries and are not included in the OECD average. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table M4A. Percentage of 15 -year-old students on mathematics literacy scale within selected proficiency level ranges, by country: 2009

| Country | Below level 2 |  | Level 4 and above |  | Level 5 and above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 22.0 | 0.19 | 31.6* | 0.22 | 12.7* | 0.15 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 15.9* | 0.67 | 38.1* | 1.10 | 16.4* | 0.91 |
| Austria | 23.2 | 1.15 | 32.5* | 1.20 | 12.9* | 0.87 |
| Belgium | 19.1* | 0.82 | 41.7* | 1.00 | 20.4* | 0.74 |
| Canada | 11.5* | 0.53 | 43.3* | 0.93 | 18.3* | 0.58 |
| Chile | 51.0* | 1.74 | 6.9* | 0.74 | 1.3 * | 0.35 |
| Czech Republic | 22.3 | 1.14 | 29.1 | 1.19 | 11.6 | 0.87 |
| Denmark | 17.1* | 0.92 | 32.5* | 1.33 | 11.6 | 0.81 |
| Estonia | 12.6* | 0.88 | $34.7 *$ | 1.19 | 12.1 | 0.82 |
| Finland | 7.8* | 0.54 | 49.5* | 1.18 | 21.7* | 0.91 |
| France | 22.5 | 1.25 | 33.8* | 1.45 | 13.7* | 0.96 |
| Germany | 18.6* | 1.10 | 39.5* | 1.31 | 17.8* | 0.92 |
| Greece | 30.3* | 1.77 | 19.3* | 1.15 | $5.7 *$ | 0.58 |
| Hungary | 22.3 | 1.48 | 28.5 | 1.53 | 10.1 | 1.07 |
| Iceland | 17.0* | 0.64 | 34.5* | 0.81 | 13.6* | 0.59 |
| Ireland | 20.8 | 0.97 | 26.1 | 1.20 | $6.7 *$ | 0.65 |
| Israel | 39.5* | 1.34 | 17.9* | 1.14 | 5.9* | 0.66 |
| Italy | 24.9 | 0.63 | 26.3 | 0.88 | 9.0 | 0.50 |
| Japan | 12.5* | 1.03 | 44.4* | 1.48 | 20.9* | 1.24 |
| Korea, Republic of | 8.1* | 1.02 | 51.9* | 1.88 | 25.6* | 1.60 |
| Luxembourg | 23.9 | 0.61 | 30.3 | 0.76 | 11.4 | 0.65 |
| Mexico | 50.8* | 0.96 | 5.4* | 0.44 | $0.7 *$ | 0.12 |
| Netherlands | 13.4* | 1.44 | 43.8* | 2.36 | 19.9* | 1.52 |
| New Zealand | 15.4* | 0.86 | 41.1* | 1.10 | 18.9* | 0.88 |
| Norway | 18.2* | 0.92 | 29.9 | 1.16 | 10.2 | 0.71 |
| Poland | 20.5 | 1.06 | 29.4 | 1.19 | 10.4 | 0.87 |
| Portugal | 23.7 | 1.12 | 27.3 | 1.24 | 9.6 | 0.84 |
| Slovak Republic | 21.0 | 1.16 | 30.8 | 1.57 | 12.7* | 0.99 |
| Slovenia | 20.3* | 0.55 | 33.2* | 0.81 | 14.2* | 0.57 |
| Spain | 23.7 | 0.83 | 25.7 | 0.88 | 8.0 | 0.46 |
| Sweden | 21.1 | 1.04 | 30.3 | 1.23 | 11.4 | 0.83 |
| Switzerland | 13.5* | 0.84 | 47.6* | 1.45 | 24.1* | 1.36 |
| Turkey | 42.1* | 1.82 | 15.3* | 1.65 | 5.6* | 1.22 |
| United Kingdom | 20.2* | 0.90 | 27.7 | 1.25 | 9.8 | 0.71 |
| United States | 23.4 | 1.34 | 27.0 | 1.63 | 9.9 | 0.97 |

[^5]Table M4A. Percentage of 15 -year-old students on mathematics literacy scale within selected proficiency level ranges, by country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Below level 2 |  | Level 4 and above |  | Level 5 and above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 67.7* | 1.91 | 3.1* | 0.60 | 0.4!* | 0.16 |
| Argentina | 63.6* | 1.95 | 4.8* | 0.76 | 0.9!* | 0.29 |
| Azerbaijan | 45.3* | 1.82 | 4.6* | 0.78 | 1.11* | 0.42 |
| Brazil | 69.1* | 1.22 | 3.8* | 0.49 | 0.8* | 0.22 |
| Bulgaria | 47.1* | 2.51 | 12.0* | 1.64 | 3.8* | 0.98 |
| Chinese Taipei | 12.8* | 0.76 | 50.8* | 1.41 | 28.6* | 1.46 |
| Colombia | 70.4* | 1.59 | $1.7 *$ | 0.37 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 33.2* | 1.44 | 17.4* | 1.18 | 4.9* | 0.66 |
| Dubai-UAE | 38.8* | 0.57 | 18.5* | 0.49 | $6.5 *$ | 0.43 |
| Hong Kong-China | 8.8* | 0.70 | 56.0* | 1.26 | 30.7* | 1.18 |
| Indonesia | 76.7* | 1.91 | 1.0 ! | 0.34 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Jordan | 65.3* | 1.89 | $2.4 *$ | 0.50 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | 59.1* | 1.50 | 5.4* | 0.76 | 1.2!* | 0.44 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 86.6* | 1.15 | 0.7!* | 0.23 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Latvia | 22.6 | 1.42 | 22.1* | 1.36 | 5.7* | 0.57 |
| Liechtenstein | 9.5* | 1.78 | 49.3* | 2.79 | 18.1* | 2.42 |
| Lithuania | 26.3 | 1.19 | 22.3* | 1.06 | 7.0* | 0.69 |
| Macao-China | 11.0* | 0.49 | 41.7* | 0.73 | 17.1* | 0.45 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 58.4* | 1.08 | 4.8* | 0.41 | 1.0* | 0.20 |
| Panama | 78.8* | 2.18 | 1.8* | 0.52 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Peru | 73.5* | 1.81 | 2.7 * | 0.61 | 0.6!* | 0.20 |
| Qatar | 73.8* | 0.43 | 6.0 * | 0.25 | 1.8* | 0.15 |
| Romania | 47.0* | 1.95 | 7.2* | 1.03 | 1.3* | 0.34 |
| Russian Federation | 28.6* | 1.52 | 17.9* | 1.29 | 5.2* | 0.76 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 40.6* | 1.39 | 13.0* | 0.85 | 3.5* | 0.53 |
| Shanghai-China | 4.9* | 0.54 | 71.2* | 1.09 | 50.4* | 1.23 |
| Singapore | 9.8* | 0.57 | 58.4* | 0.70 | 35.6* | 0.77 |
| Thailand | 52.5* | 1.61 | 6.1 * | 0.85 | 1.3!* | 0.43 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 53.2* | 0.73 | 10.2* | 0.37 | 2.5* | 0.30 |
| Tunisia | 73.6* | 1.45 | 1.6!* | 0.56 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Uruguay | 47.6* | 1.26 | 10.3* | 0.75 | 2.4* | 0.36 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 (a score less than or equal to 357.77 ); level 1 (a score greater than 357.77 and less than or equal to 420.07); level 2 (a score greater than 420.07 and less than or equal to 482.38); level 3 (a score greater than 482.38 and less than or equal to 544.68 ); level 4 (a score greater than 544.68 and less than or equal to 606.99); level 5 (a score greater than 606.99 and less than or equal to 669.30 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 669.30). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table S1. Average scores of 15-year-old students on science literacy scale, by country: 2009

| Science literacy scale |  |  | Science literacy scale |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country | Score | s.e. | Country | Score | s.e. |
| OECD average | 501 | 0.5 |  |  |  |
| OECD countries |  |  | Non-OECD countries |  |  |
| Finland | 554 | 2.3 | Shanghai-China | 575 | 2.3 |
| Japan | 539 | 3.4 | Hong Kong-China | 549 | 2.8 |
| Korea, Republic of | 538 | 3.4 | Singapore | 542 | 1.4 |
| New Zealand | 532 | 2.6 | Chinese Taipei | 520 | 2.6 |
| Canada | 529 | 1.6 | Liechtenstein | 520 | 3.4 |
| Estonia | 528 | 2.7 | Macao-China | 511 | 1.0 |
| Australia | 527 | 2.5 | Latvia | 494 | 3.1 |
| Netherlands | 522 | 5.4 | Lithuania | 491 | 2.9 |
| Germany | 520 | 2.8 | Croatia | 486 | 2.8 |
| Switzerland | 517 | 2.8 | Russian Federation | 478 | 3.3 |
| United Kingdom | 514 | 2.5 | Dubai-UAE | 466 | 1.2 |
| Slovenia | 512 | 1.1 | Serbia, Republic of | 443 | 2.4 |
| Poland | 508 | 2.4 | Bulgaria | 439 | 5.9 |
| Ireland | 508 | 3.3 | Romania | 428 | 3.4 |
| Belgium | 507 | 2.5 | Uruguay | 427 | 2.6 |
| Hungary | 503 | 3.1 | Thailand | 425 | 3.0 |
| United States | 502 | 3.6 | Jordan | 415 | 3.5 |
| Czech Republic | 500 | 3.0 | Trinidad and Tobago | 410 | 1.2 |
| Norway | 500 | 2.6 | Brazil | 405 | 2.4 |
| Denmark | 499 | 2.5 | Colombia | 402 | 3.6 |
| France | 498 | 3.6 | Montenegro, Republic of | 401 | 2.0 |
| Iceland | 496 | 1.4 | Argentina | 401 | 4.6 |
| Sweden | 495 | 2.7 | Tunisia | 401 | 2.7 |
| Austria | 494 | 3.2 | Kazakhstan | 400 | 3.1 |
| Portugal | 493 | 2.9 | Albania | 391 | 3.9 |
| Slovak Republic | 490 | 3.0 | Indonesia | 383 | 3.8 |
| Italy | 489 | 1.8 | Qatar | 379 | 0.9 |
| Spain | 488 | 2.1 | Panama | 376 | 5.7 |
| Luxembourg | 484 | 1.2 | Azerbaijan | 373 | 3.1 |
| Greece | 470 | 4.0 | Peru | 369 | 3.5 |
| Israel | 455 | 3.1 | Kyrgyz Republic | 330 | 2.9 |

[^6]$\square$Average is not measurably different from the U.S. average
$\square$ Average is lower than the U.S. average
NOTE: The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries and are not included in the OECD average. Countries are ordered on the basis of average scores, from highest to lowest within the OECD countries and non-OECD countries. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Score differences as noted between the United States and other countries (as well as between the United States and the OECD average) are significantly different at the .05 level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Exhibit S1. Description of PISA proficiency levels on science literacy scale: 2009
Proficiency level
and lower cut point
score
Task descriptions

| Level 6 <br> 708 | At level 6, students can consistently identify, explain and apply scientific knowledge and knowledge about science in a variety of complex life situations. They can link different information sources and explanations and use evidence from those sources to justify decisions. They clearly and consistently demonstrate advanced scientific thinking and reasoning, and they demonstrate willingness to use their scientific understanding in support of solutions to unfamiliar scientific and technological situations. Students at this level can use scientific knowledge and develop arguments in support of recommendations and decisions that centre on personal, social or global situations. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level 5 <br> 633 | At level 5 , students can identify the scientific components of many complex life situations, apply both scientific concepts and knowledge about science to these situations, and can compare, select and evaluate appropriate scientific evidence for responding to life situations. Students at this level can use well-developed inquiry abilities, link knowledge appropriately and bring critical insights to situations. They can construct explanations based on evidence and arguments based on their critical analysis. |
| Level 4 <br> 559 | At level 4 , students can work effectively with situations and issues that may involve explicit phenomena requiring them to make inferences about the role of science or technology. They can select and integrate explanations from different disciplines of science or technology and link those explanations directly to aspects of life situations. Students at this level can reflect on their actions and they can communicate decisions using scientific knowledge and evidence. |
| Level 3 <br> 484 | At level 3 , students can identify clearly described scientific issues in a range of contexts. They can select facts and knowledge to explain phenomena and apply simple models or inquiry strategies. Students at this level can interpret and use scientific concepts from different disciplines and can apply them directly. They can develop short statements using facts and make decisions based on scientific knowledge. |
| Level 2 <br> 410 | At level 2, students have adequate scientific knowledge to provide possible explanations in familiar contexts or draw conclusions based on simple investigations. They are capable of direct reasoning and making literal interpretations of the results of scientific inquiry or technological problem solving. |
| Level 1 <br> 335 | At level 1, students have such a limited scientific knowledge that it can only be applied to a few, familiar situations. They can present scientific explanations that are obvious and follow explicitly from given evidence. |

NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into science literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 (a score less than or equal to 334.94); level 1 (a score greater than 334.94 and less than or equal to 409.54); level 2 (a score greater than 409.54 and less than or equal to 484.14 ); level 3 (a score greater than 484.14 and less than or equal to 558.73 ); level 4 (a score greater than 558.73 and less than or equal to 633.33 ); level 5 (a score greater than 633.33 and less than or equal to 707.93); and level 6 (a score greater than 707.93). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 .
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Figure S1. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students in the United States and OECD countries on science literacy scale, by proficiency level: 2009


NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into science literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 (a score less than or equal to 334.94); level 1 (a score greater than 334.94 and less than or equal to 409.54); level 2 (a score greater than 409.54 and less than or equal to 484.14); level 3 (a score greater than 484.14 and less than or equal to 558.73 ); level 4 (a score greater than 558.73 and less than or equal to 633.33); level 5 (a score greater than 633.33 and less than or equal to 707.93 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 707.93). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. There were no statistically significant differences between U.S. students and the OECD average in the percentages of students at each proficiency level.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Figure S2. Average scores of 15-year-old students in the United States and OECD countries on science literacy scale: 2006 and 2009

${ }^{*} p<.05$. U.S. average is significantly different from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) trend score at the .05 level of statistical significance. ${ }^{* *} p<.05$. U.S. average in 2006 is significantly different from the U.S. average in 2009 at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: The OECD trend scores are based on the averages of the 34 OECD countries with each country weighted equally. The OECD excluded the data for Austria from the trend analysis in its report (OECD, PISA 2009 Results: Learning Trends - Changes in Student Performance Since 2000 (Volume V), available at http://www.pisa.oecd.org) because of a concern over a data collection issue in 2009; however, after consultation with Austrian officials, NCES kept the Austrian data in the U.S. trend reporting. The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) science framework was revised in 2006. Because of changes in the framework, it is not possible to compare science learning outcomes from PISA 2000 and 2003 with those from PISA 2006 and 2009. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2006 and 2009.

Table S2. Average scores of 15-year-old students on science literacy scale, by country: 2006 and 2009

| Country | 2006 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| OECD trend score ${ }^{1}$ | 498 | 0.5 | 501 | 0.5 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 527 | 2.3 | 527 | 2.5 |
| Austria | 511 | 3.9 | 494 | 3.2 |
| Belgium | 510 | 2.5 | 507 | 2.5 |
| Canada | 534 | 2.0 | 529 | 1.6 |
| Chile | 438 | 4.3 | 447 | 2.9 |
| Czech Republic | 513 | 3.5 | 500 | 3.0 |
| Denmark | 496 | 3.1 | 499 | 2.5 |
| Estonia | 531 | 2.5 | 528 | 2.7 |
| Finland | 563 | 2.0 | 554 | 2.3 |
| France | 495 | 3.4 | 498 | 3.6 |
| Germany | 516 | 3.8 | 520 | 2.8 |
| Greece | 473 | 3.2 | 470 | 4.0 |
| Hungary | 504 | 2.7 | 503 | 3.1 |
| Iceland | 491 | 1.6 | 496 | 1.4 |
| Ireland | 508 | 3.2 | 508 | 3.3 |
| Israel | 454 | 3.7 | 455 | 3.1 |
| Italy | 475 | 2.0 | 489 | 1.8 |
| Japan | 531 | 3.4 | 539 | 3.4 |
| Korea, Republic of | 522 | 3.4 | 538 | 3.4 |
| Luxembourg | 486 | 1.1 | 484 | 1.2 |
| Mexico | 410 | 2.7 | 416 | 1.8 |
| Netherlands | 525 | 2.7 | 522 | 5.4 |
| New Zealand | 530 | 2.7 | 532 | 2.6 |
| Norway | 487 | 3.1 | 500 | 2.6 |
| Poland | 498 | 2.3 | 508 | 2.4 |
| Portugal | 474 | 3.0 | 493 | 2.9 |
| Slovak Republic | 488 | 2.6 | 490 | 3.0 |
| Slovenia | 519 | 1.1 | 512 | 1.1 |
| Spain | 488 | 2.6 | 488 | 2.1 |
| Sweden | 503 | 2.4 | 495 | 2.7 |
| Switzerland | 512 | 3.2 | 517 | 2.8 |
| Turkey | 424 | 3.8 | 454 | 3.6 |
| United Kingdom | 515 | 2.3 | 514 | 2.5 |
| United States | 489 | 4.2 | 502 | 3.6 |

See notes at end of table.

Table S2. Average scores of 15 -year-old students on science literacy scale, by
country: 2006 and 2009-Continued

| Country | 2006 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | - | $\dagger$ | 391 | 3.9 |
| Argentina | 391 | 6.1 | 401 | 4.6 |
| Azerbaijan | 382 | 2.8 | 373 | 3.1 |
| Brazil | 390 | 2.8 | 405 | 2.4 |
| Bulgaria | 434 | 6.1 | 439 | 5.9 |
| Chinese Taipei | 532 | 3.6 | 520 | 2.6 |
| Colombia | 388 | 3.4 | 402 | 3.6 |
| Croatia | 493 | 2.4 | 486 | 2.8 |
| Dubai-UAE | - | $\dagger$ | 466 | 1.2 |
| Hong Kong-China | 542 | 2.5 | 549 | 2.8 |
| Indonesia | 393 | 5.7 | 383 | 3.8 |
| Jordan | 422 | 2.8 | 415 | 3.5 |
| Kazakhstan | - | $\dagger$ | 400 | 3.1 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 322 | 2.9 | 330 | 2.9 |
| Latvia | 490 | 3.0 | 494 | 3.1 |
| Liechtenstein | 522 | 4.1 | 520 | 3.4 |
| Lithuania | 488 | 2.8 | 491 | 2.9 |
| Macao-China | 511 | 1.1 | 511 | 1.0 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 412 | 1.1 | 401 | 2.0 |
| Panama | - | $\dagger$ | 376 | 5.7 |
| Peru | - | $\dagger$ | 369 | 3.5 |
| Qatar | 349 | 0.9 | 379 | 0.9 |
| Romania | 418 | 4.2 | 428 | 3.4 |
| Russian Federation | 479 | 3.7 | 478 | 3.3 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 436 | 3.0 | 443 | 2.4 |
| Shanghai-China | - | $\dagger$ | 575 | 2.3 |
| Singapore | - | $\dagger$ | 542 | 1.4 |
| Thailand | 421 | 2.1 | 425 | 3.0 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | - | $\dagger$ | 410 | 1.2 |
| Tunisia | 386 | 3.0 | 401 | 2.7 |
| Uruguay | 428 | 2.7 | 427 | 2.6 |

- Not available.
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
${ }^{1}$ The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) trend scores are based on the averages of the 34 OECD countries with each country weighted equally. The OECD excluded the data for Austria from the trend analysis in its report (OECD, PISA 2009 Results: Learning Trends - Changes in Student Performance Since 2000 (Volume V), available at http://www.pisa.oecd.org) because of a concern over a data collection issue in 2009; however, after consultation with Austrian officials, NCES kept the Austrian data in the U.S. trend reporting.
NOTE: The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) science framework was revised in 2006. Because of changes in the framework, it is not possible to compare science learning outcomes from PISA 2000 and 2003 with those from PISA 2006 and 2009. Because PISA is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries and are not included in the OECD average. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2006 and 2009.

Table S3. Scores of 15-year-old students on science literacy scale at selected percentiles, by country: 2009

| Country | Percentile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5^{\text {th }}$ |  | $10^{\text {th }}$ |  | $25^{\text {th }}$ |  | $50^{\text {th }}$ |  | $75^{\text {th }}$ |  | 90 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| OECD average | 341 | 1.0 | 377 | 0.8 | 438 | 0.7 | 504 | 0.6 | 567 | 0.6 | 619 | 0.6 | 649 | 0.7 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 355 | 4.0 | 395 | 4.0 | 461 | 2.8 | 531 | 2.7 | 597 | 2.8 | 655 | 3.9 | 688 | 5.0 |
| Austria | 321 | 6.8 | 358 | 6.2 | 424 | 4.8 | 499 | 3.9 | 569 | 3.6 | 623 | 3.3 | 653 | 3.4 |
| Belgium | 321 | 6.2 | 364 | 4.8 | 438 | 3.6 | 516 | 3.1 | 583 | 2.8 | 634 | 3.1 | 661 | 3.2 |
| Canada | 377 | 2.8 | 412 | 2.7 | 469 | 2.0 | 531 | 2.1 | 593 | 1.7 | 642 | 1.7 | 669 | 2.6 |
| Chile | 315 | 4.3 | 343 | 4.1 | 392 | 3.5 | 447 | 3.1 | 502 | 3.6 | 553 | 3.8 | 583 | 5.0 |
| Czech Republic | 338 | 6.5 | 375 | 5.6 | 437 | 3.9 | 502 | 3.5 | 568 | 3.4 | 624 | 4.0 | 657 | 4.4 |
| Denmark | 343 | 4.1 | 379 | 3.9 | 438 | 3.1 | 502 | 2.8 | 564 | 2.9 | 615 | 3.7 | 645 | 3.8 |
| Estonia | 388 | 5.0 | 419 | 4.7 | 472 | 3.8 | 528 | 3.1 | 586 | 3.1 | 635 | 3.5 | 665 | 4.3 |
| Finland | 400 | 4.2 | 437 | 4.2 | 496 | 3.3 | 559 | 3.0 | 617 | 2.9 | 665 | 3.0 | 694 | 3.6 |
| France | 314 | 8.1 | 358 | 7.1 | 433 | 5.6 | 507 | 4.2 | 572 | 3.8 | 624 | 4.2 | 653 | 4.6 |
| Germany | 345 | 7.0 | 383 | 6.2 | 452 | 4.1 | 527 | 3.8 | 594 | 3.3 | 645 | 3.5 | 675 | 3.8 |
| Greece | 318 | 7.6 | 353 | 6.3 | 409 | 5.3 | 472 | 4.3 | 535 | 3.8 | 586 | 3.6 | 616 | 3.4 |
| Hungary | 348 | 11.4 | 388 | 7.6 | 446 | 4.6 | 508 | 3.0 | 564 | 3.7 | 609 | 3.6 | 636 | 4.4 |
| Iceland | 330 | 4.3 | 370 | 4.3 | 435 | 2.6 | 499 | 2.0 | 561 | 2.2 | 616 | 2.8 | 647 | 4.4 |
| Ireland | 341 | 8.3 | 382 | 4.9 | 445 | 3.7 | 514 | 3.5 | 576 | 3.3 | 627 | 4.0 | 656 | 4.4 |
| Israel | 275 | 8.1 | 314 | 5.5 | 382 | 4.5 | 458 | 3.5 | 531 | 3.3 | 590 | 4.0 | 623 | 4.2 |
| Italy | 325 | 3.8 | 362 | 2.6 | 424 | 2.3 | 494 | 2.1 | 557 | 2.0 | 609 | 2.0 | 639 | 2.3 |
| Japan | 361 | 8.7 | 405 | 7.3 | 477 | 4.8 | 550 | 3.3 | 610 | 3.2 | 659 | 3.5 | 686 | 4.1 |
| Korea, Republic of | 399 | 6.5 | 431 | 5.2 | 485 | 4.2 | 542 | 3.6 | 595 | 3.7 | 640 | 3.7 | 665 | 4.8 |
| Luxembourg | 304 | 4.6 | 345 | 3.2 | 415 | 3.1 | 489 | 2.0 | 558 | 2.3 | 615 | 2.1 | 646 | 4.0 |
| Mexico | 291 | 2.8 | 318 | 2.1 | 364 | 1.7 | 415 | 1.9 | 468 | 2.1 | 517 | 2.8 | 544 | 2.8 |
| Netherlands | 362 | 6.8 | 395 | 7.0 | 453 | 7.6 | 525 | 7.7 | 594 | 5.1 | 645 | 4.8 | 673 | 4.9 |
| New Zealand | 348 | 5.6 | 390 | 4.3 | 461 | 4.1 | 539 | 2.9 | 608 | 3.0 | 667 | 3.3 | 697 | 3.6 |
| Norway | 346 | 4.4 | 382 | 3.3 | 440 | 3.0 | 502 | 2.9 | 563 | 2.9 | 615 | 3.7 | 644 | 4.0 |
| Poland | 364 | 3.9 | 396 | 3.3 | 448 | 2.7 | 509 | 3.0 | 569 | 2.7 | 621 | 2.9 | 650 | 3.8 |
| Portugal | 354 | 4.0 | 384 | 3.7 | 436 | 3.7 | 494 | 3.5 | 551 | 3.0 | 601 | 3.3 | 627 | 3.8 |
| Slovak Republic | 335 | 6.0 | 371 | 4.9 | 427 | 3.9 | 492 | 3.7 | 556 | 3.4 | 612 | 4.1 | 643 | 4.6 |
| Slovenia | 355 | 2.9 | 387 | 2.3 | 446 | 2.0 | 514 | 2.1 | 580 | 2.4 | 633 | 3.0 | 661 | 4.3 |
| Spain | 338 | 3.5 | 373 | 3.2 | 431 | 3.0 | 493 | 2.3 | 549 | 2.2 | 597 | 2.2 | 625 | 2.3 |
| Sweden | 327 | 4.7 | 367 | 4.6 | 429 | 3.8 | 497 | 3.0 | 564 | 3.4 | 622 | 3.9 | 654 | 4.8 |
| Switzerland | 352 | 4.2 | 388 | 3.6 | 452 | 3.5 | 521 | 3.3 | 585 | 3.4 | 637 | 3.8 | 667 | 4.3 |
| Turkey | 322 | 5.0 | 350 | 4.2 | 397 | 3.3 | 452 | 3.9 | 510 | 4.6 | 560 | 5.8 | 587 | 6.4 |
| United Kingdom | 348 | 4.3 | 385 | 3.6 | 447 | 3.7 | 517 | 3.2 | 583 | 3.1 | 640 | 3.3 | 672 | 3.9 |
| United States | 341 | 4.8 | 374 | 4.5 | 433 | 3.9 | 502 | 4.6 | 572 | 4.7 | 629 | 5.1 | 662 | 6.7 |

See notes at end of table.
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Table S3. Scores of 15-year-old students on science literacy scale at selected percentiles, by country: 2009— Continued

| Country | Percentile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5^{\text {th }}$ |  | $10^{\text {th }}$ |  | 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  | $50^{\text {th }}$ |  | $75^{\text {th }}$ |  | 90 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ |  |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 242 | 5.4 | 276 | 4.7 | 331 | 4.5 | 393 | 4.7 | 454 | 4.8 | 504 | 4.9 | 532 | 4.8 |
| Argentina | 228 | 10.6 | 271 | 7.6 | 334 | 5.5 | 404 | 5.0 | 471 | 5.5 | 530 | 6.6 | 564 | 7.9 |
| Azerbaijan | 257 | 4.9 | 281 | 4.0 | 321 | 3.6 | 370 | 3.3 | 421 | 3.7 | 471 | 5.1 | 502 | 5.6 |
| Brazil | 275 | 3.5 | 302 | 3.1 | 348 | 2.3 | 401 | 2.7 | 458 | 3.4 | 517 | 4.0 | 554 | 4.8 |
| Bulgaria | 263 | 7.6 | 302 | 7.0 | 367 | 7.6 | 441 | 7.2 | 514 | 6.8 | 575 | 5.7 | 607 | 7.1 |
| Chinese Taipei | 370 | 4.4 | 404 | 3.6 | 464 | 3.1 | 525 | 2.9 | 581 | 3.3 | 628 | 4.3 | 654 | 4.4 |
| Colombia | 268 | 6.6 | 298 | 6.2 | 348 | 4.7 | 401 | 3.8 | 457 | 3.6 | 506 | 3.6 | 536 | 4.1 |
| Croatia | 348 | 4.7 | 377 | 4.0 | 429 | 3.7 | 488 | 3.5 | 546 | 3.5 | 595 | 4.0 | 624 | 5.0 |
| Dubai-UAE | 294 | 2.5 | 330 | 2.5 | 391 | 1.6 | 465 | 2.1 | 542 | 1.9 | 606 | 3.0 | 638 | 3.3 |
| Hong Kong-China | 393 | 7.3 | 432 | 4.9 | 494 | 3.9 | 556 | 2.9 | 610 | 2.9 | 655 | 2.9 | 681 | 3.3 |
| Indonesia | 272 | 5.4 | 296 | 4.0 | 336 | 3.7 | 380 | 4.0 | 428 | 4.6 | 472 | 6.2 | 499 | 5.4 |
| Jordan | 264 | 6.2 | 301 | 5.4 | 357 | 4.4 | 420 | 3.9 | 477 | 3.9 | 526 | 4.4 | 556 | 5.0 |
| Kazakhstan | 262 | 4.9 | 293 | 4.3 | 342 | 3.4 | 397 | 3.6 | 458 | 3.8 | 515 | 5.1 | 549 | 6.1 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 183 | 4.9 | 215 | 4.6 | 269 | 3.9 | 329 | 2.9 | 388 | 3.4 | 444 | 5.0 | 482 | 6.1 |
| Latvia | 365 | 5.7 | 392 | 4.5 | 440 | 4.1 | 497 | 3.3 | 548 | 3.2 | 593 | 4.0 | 619 | 3.3 |
| Liechtenstein | 373 | 10.4 | 402 | 9.3 | 457 | 7.4 | 523 | 6.9 | 583 | 6.2 | 631 | 9.3 | 659 | 7.3 |
| Lithuania | 351 | 6.1 | 382 | 4.9 | 434 | 3.7 | 493 | 3.0 | 549 | 3.2 | 600 | 3.9 | 630 | 3.7 |
| Macao-China | 381 | 2.5 | 411 | 1.9 | 461 | 2.0 | 514 | 1.9 | 564 | 1.7 | 608 | 2.5 | 632 | 3.2 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 257 | 4.8 | 290 | 4.1 | 343 | 3.0 | 402 | 2.5 | 461 | 1.9 | 512 | 3.0 | 543 | 3.9 |
| Panama | 232 | 7.5 | 260 | 7.9 | 315 | 7.7 | 373 | 7.0 | 436 | 6.7 | 495 | 8.0 | 527 | 6.3 |
| Peru | 225 | 5.3 | 256 | 4.5 | 310 | 3.7 | 368 | 3.4 | 428 | 4.2 | 484 | 6.4 | 519 | 7.8 |
| Qatar | 228 | 2.4 | 257 | 1.7 | 306 | 1.5 | 368 | 1.5 | 443 | 1.7 | 524 | 2.5 | 572 | 2.8 |
| Romania | 301 | 5.0 | 327 | 4.2 | 373 | 4.4 | 428 | 4.4 | 483 | 4.0 | 530 | 4.2 | 558 | 4.2 |
| Russian Federation | 331 | 5.8 | 364 | 4.7 | 418 | 4.0 | 478 | 3.7 | 539 | 3.5 | 594 | 4.6 | 628 | 5.2 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 302 | 5.0 | 334 | 4.4 | 387 | 3.1 | 444 | 2.5 | 501 | 3.0 | 548 | 3.3 | 579 | 3.2 |
| Shanghai-China | 430 | 4.9 | 467 | 4.4 | 523 | 3.0 | 580 | 2.7 | 632 | 2.8 | 674 | 3.4 | 700 | 3.3 |
| Singapore | 362 | 3.5 | 401 | 3.1 | 471 | 2.0 | 547 | 2.2 | 617 | 2.0 | 673 | 3.0 | 704 | 4.1 |
| Thailand | 297 | 5.6 | 326 | 4.8 | 373 | 3.2 | 424 | 3.0 | 477 | 3.3 | 527 | 4.1 | 559 | 5.7 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 234 | 3.6 | 271 | 3.2 | 335 | 3.1 | 410 | 1.9 | 484 | 2.9 | 552 | 2.6 | 592 | 3.2 |
| Tunisia | 265 | 4.1 | 296 | 3.6 | 345 | 3.2 | 402 | 3.0 | 458 | 3.3 | 504 | 4.5 | 531 | 5.4 |
| Uruguay | 268 | 5.2 | 303 | 3.6 | 362 | 3.4 | 427 | 2.8 | 493 | 3.5 | 551 | 3.8 | 584 | 4.2 |

NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut point) score for the following: (a) $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 5 percent of students; (b) $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 10 percent of students; (c) $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom quarter of students; (d) $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the median (half the students scored below the cut point and half scored above it); (e) $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top quarter of students; (f) $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 10 percent of students; and (g) $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 5 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each country's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut points across countries and over time. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Figure S3. Scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on science literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2006 and 2009


* $p<.05$. Significantly different from the 2009 score at the .05 level of statistical significance.

NOTE: This figure shows the threshold (or cut point) score for the following: (a) $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 5 percent of students; (b) $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 10 percent of students; (c) $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom quarter of students; (d) $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the median (half the students scored below the cut point and half scored above it); (e) $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top quarter of students; (f) $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 10 percent of students; and (g) $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 5 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each country's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut points across countries and over time. The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) science framework was revised in 2006. Because of changes in the framework, it is not possible to compare science learning outcomes from PISA 2000 and 2003 with those from PISA 2006 and 2009. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2006 and 2009.

Table S3A. Scores of U.S. 15 -year-old students on science literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2006 and 2009

|  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selected percentiles | Score | s.e. | Score | S.e |
| 95th percentile | 662 | 4.8 | 662 | 6. |
| 90th percentile | 628 | 4.3 | 629 | 5. |
| 75th percentile | 567 | 4.6 | 572 | 4. |
| 50th percentile | 488* | 4.7 | 502 | 4.6 |
| 25th percentile | 412* | 5.4 | 433 | 3. |
| 10th percentile | 349* | 5.9 | 374 | 4.5 |
| 5th percentile | 318* | 4.5 | 341 | 4.8 |
| Mean | 489* | 4.2 | 502 | 3.6 |
| ${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from the 2009 score at the . 05 level of statistical significance. |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut point) score for the following: (a) $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 5 percent of students; (b) $10^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the bottom 10 percent of students; (c) $25^{\text {th }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| scored below the cut point and half scored above it); (e) $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top quarter of students; (f) $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 10 percent of students; and (g) $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile - the top 5 |  |  |  |  |
| percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each country's distribution of scores and |  |  |  |  |
| countries and over time. The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) science |  |  |  |  |
| compare science learning outcomes from PISA 2000 and 2003 with those from PISA 2006 and |  |  |  |  |
| SOURCE: Organization fo | omic Coo | and De | CD), Pro |  |

Table S4. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students on science literacy scale, by proficiency level and country: 2009

|  | Below level 1 |  | Level 1 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average OECD countries | 5.0 | 0.10 | 13.0 | 0.14 | 24.4 | 0.16 | 28.6 | 0.17 | 20.6 | 0.16 | 7.4 | 0.10 | 1.1 | 0.04 |
| Australia | 3.4 | 0.27 | 9.2 | 0.48 | 20.0 | 0.59 | 28.4 | 0.65 | 24.5 | 0.66 | 11.5 | 0.58 | 3.1 | 0.50 |
| Austria | 6.7 | 0.83 | 14.3 | 0.99 | 23.8 | 1.00 | 26.6 | 1.04 | 20.6 | 1.03 | 7.1 | 0.61 | 1.0 | 0.19 |
| Belgium | 6.4 | 0.57 | 11.7 | 0.61 | 20.7 | 0.65 | 27.2 | 0.76 | 24.0 | 0.82 | 9.0 | 0.59 | 1.1 | 0.19 |
| Canada | 2.0 | 0.21 | 7.5 | 0.37 | 20.9 | 0.49 | 31.2 | 0.62 | 26.2 | 0.65 | 10.5 | 0.45 | 1.6 | 0.15 |
| Chile | 8.4 | 0.83 | 23.9 | 1.07 | 35.2 | 0.94 | 23.6 | 1.07 | 7.9 | 0.69 | 1.1 | 0.22 | \# |  |
| Czech Republic | 4.7 | 0.57 | 12.6 | 0.90 | 25.6 | 0.97 | 28.8 | 1.25 | 19.9 | 0.87 | 7.2 | 0.58 | 1.2 | 0.22 |
| Denmark | 4.1 | 0.42 | 12.5 | 0.65 | 26.0 | 0.77 | 30.6 | 1.07 | 20.1 | 0.85 | 5.9 | 0.55 | 0.9 | 0.23 |
| Estonia | 1.3 | 0.31 | 7.0 | 0.72 | 21.3 | 1.07 | 34.3 | 1.10 | 25.7 | 1.07 | 9.0 | 0.63 | 1.4 | 0.26 |
| Finland | 1.1 | 0.19 | 4.9 | 0.41 | 15.3 | 0.73 | 28.8 | 0.95 | 31.2 | 1.08 | 15.4 | 0.74 | 3.3 | 0.34 |
| France | 7.1 | 0.82 | 12.2 | 0.83 | 22.1 | 1.25 | 28.8 | 1.32 | 21.7 | 1.02 | 7.3 | 0.70 | 0.8 | 0.22 |
| Germany | 4.1 | 0.51 | 10.7 | 0.81 | 20.1 | 0.86 | 27.3 | 1.08 | 25.0 | 1.18 | 10.9 | 0.68 | 1.9 | 0.29 |
| Greece | 7.2 | 1.07 | 18.1 | 1.04 | 29.8 | 0.96 | 27.9 | 1.20 | 14.0 | 0.95 | 2.8 | 0.31 | 0.3 ! | 0.11 |
| Hungary | 3.8 | 0.93 | 10.4 | 0.86 | 25.5 | 1.13 | 33.2 | 1.32 | 21.8 | 1.19 | 5.1 | 0.55 | 0.3 ! | 0.13 |
| Iceland | 5.5 | 0.48 | 12.5 | 0.63 | 25.8 | 0.75 | 30.4 | 0.94 | 18.8 | 0.84 | 6.1 | 0.43 | 0.8 | 0.19 |
| Ireland | 4.4 | 0.69 | 10.7 | 1.01 | 23.3 | 1.17 | 29.9 | 0.99 | 22.9 | 0.95 | 7.5 | 0.68 | 1.2 | 0.23 |
| Israel | 13.9 | 1.06 | 19.2 | 0.72 | 26.0 | 1.04 | 24.1 | 0.76 | 12.8 | 0.72 | 3.5 | 0.36 | 0.5 | 0.13 |
| Italy | 6.1 | 0.39 | 14.5 | 0.50 | 25.5 | 0.63 | 29.5 | 0.54 | 18.6 | 0.53 | 5.3 | 0.29 | 0.5 | 0.07 |
| Japan | 3.2 | 0.52 | 7.5 | 0.68 | 16.3 | 0.87 | 26.6 | 0.83 | 29.5 | 0.98 | 14.4 | 0.73 | 2.6 | 0.39 |
| Korea, Republic of | 1.1 | 0.32 | 5.2 | 0.68 | 18.5 | 1.15 | 33.1 | 1.13 | 30.4 | 1.14 | 10.5 | 0.90 | 1.1 | 0.31 |
| Luxembourg | 8.4 | 0.52 | 15.3 | 0.88 | 24.3 | 0.69 | 27.1 | 0.87 | 18.2 | 0.91 | 6.0 | 0.49 | 0.7 | 0.12 |
| Mexico | 14.5 | 0.60 | 32.8 | 0.64 | 33.6 | 0.60 | 15.8 | 0.61 | 3.1 | 0.27 | 0.2 | 0.05 | \# |  |
| Netherlands | 2.6 | 0.53 | 10.6 | 1.33 | 21.8 | 1.53 | 26.9 | 1.07 | 25.3 | 1.69 | 11.2 | 1.10 | 1.5 | 0.30 |
| New Zealand | 4.0 | 0.53 | 9.4 | 0.52 | 18.1 | 1.01 | 25.8 | 0.88 | 25.1 | 0.74 | 14.0 | 0.72 | 3.6 | 0.36 |
| Norway | 3.8 | 0.48 | 11.9 | 0.92 | 26.6 | 0.95 | 31.1 | 0.71 | 20.1 | 0.82 | 5.9 | 0.65 | 0.5 ! | 0.16 |
| Poland | 2.3 | 0.33 | 10.9 | 0.69 | 26.1 | 0.80 | 32.1 | 0.81 | 21.2 | 0.97 | 6.8 | 0.49 | 0.8 | 0.19 |
| Portugal | 3.0 | 0.35 | 13.5 | 0.92 | 28.9 | 1.08 | 32.3 | 1.08 | 18.1 | 1.00 | 3.9 | 0.51 | 0.3 ! | 0.13 |
| Slovak Republic | 5.0 | 0.58 | 14.2 | 0.89 | 27.6 | 1.03 | 29.2 | 0.95 | 17.7 | 0.85 | 5.6 | 0.53 | 0.7 | 0.20 |
| Slovenia | 3.1 | 0.22 | 11.7 | 0.45 | 23.7 | 0.66 | 28.7 | 1.05 | 23.0 | 0.72 | 8.7 | 0.61 | 1.2 | 0.27 |
| Spain | 4.6 | 0.37 | 13.6 | 0.75 | 27.9 | 0.67 | 32.3 | 0.69 | 17.6 | 0.57 | 3.7 | 0.26 | 0.2 | 0.05 |
| Sweden | 5.8 | 0.51 | 13.4 | 0.75 | 25.6 | 0.80 | 28.4 | 0.84 | 18.7 | 0.86 | 7.1 | 0.56 | 1.0 | 0.22 |
| Switzerland | 3.5 | 0.31 | 10.6 | 0.58 | 21.3 | 1.09 | 29.8 | 1.02 | 24.1 | 1.03 | 9.2 | 0.73 | 1.5 | 0.23 |
| Turkey | 6.9 | 0.81 | 23.0 | 1.13 | 34.5 | 1.16 | 25.2 | 1.24 | 9.1 | 1.13 | 1.1 | 0.29 | \# |  |
| United Kingdom | 3.8 | 0.34 | 11.2 | 0.68 | 22.7 | 0.73 | 28.8 | 0.97 | 22.2 | 0.83 | 9.5 | 0.61 | 1.9 | 0.25 |
| United States | 4.2 | 0.54 | 13.9 | 0.93 | 25.0 | 0.87 | 27.5 | 0.80 | 20.1 | 0.94 | 7.9 | 0.78 | 1.3 | 0.28 |

See notes at end of table.
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Table S4. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students on science literacy scale, by proficiency level and country: 2009— Continued

| Country | Below level 1 |  | Level 1 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Level 5 |  | Level 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 26.3 | 1.55 | 31.0 | 1.28 | 27.7 | 1.24 | 12.9 | 1.34 | 2.0 | 0.38 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 25.2 | 1.70 | 27.2 | 1.37 | 26.7 | 1.20 | 15.4 | 1.12 | 4.8 | 0.69 | 0.6 | 0.18 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Azerbaijan | 31.5 | 1.68 | 38.5 | 1.13 | 22.4 | 1.07 | 6.7 | 0.76 | 0.8 | 0.22 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Brazil | 19.7 | 0.90 | 34.5 | 0.99 | 28.8 | 0.90 | 12.6 | 0.81 | 3.9 | 0.38 | 0.6 | 0.11 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Bulgaria | 16.5 | 1.63 | 22.3 | 1.55 | 26.6 | 1.31 | 21.0 | 1.36 | 10.9 | 1.01 | 2.4 | 0.48 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Chinese Taipei | 2.2 | 0.34 | 8.9 | 0.60 | 21.1 | 0.91 | 33.3 | 1.04 | 25.8 | 1.10 | 8.0 | 0.74 | 0.8 | 0.22 |
| Colombia | 20.4 | 1.81 | 33.7 | 1.23 | 30.2 | 1.40 | 13.1 | 1.04 | 2.5 | 0.34 | 0.1! | 0.05 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 3.6 | 0.47 | 14.9 | 0.99 | 30.0 | 1.07 | 31.1 | 1.03 | 16.7 | 0.98 | 3.5 | 0.57 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Dubai-UAE | 11.0 | 0.47 | 19.5 | 0.57 | 26.0 | 0.78 | 22.9 | 0.73 | 14.9 | 0.59 | 4.8 | 0.35 | 0.8 | 0.21 |
| Hong Kong-China | 1.4 | 0.31 | 5.2 | 0.61 | 15.1 | 0.73 | 29.4 | 0.99 | 32.7 | 0.99 | 14.2 | 0.94 | 2.0 | 0.30 |
| Indonesia | 24.6 | 1.77 | 41.0 | 1.54 | 27.0 | 1.55 | 6.9 | 1.01 | 0.5 ! | 0.22 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Jordan | 18.0 | 1.20 | 27.6 | 1.13 | 32.2 | 1.21 | 17.6 | 1.12 | 4.1 | 0.51 | 0.5 ! | 0.18 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | 22.4 | 1.31 | 33.0 | 1.08 | 27.9 | 1.14 | 12.8 | 0.82 | 3.6 | 0.62 | 0.3 ! | 0.16 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 52.9 | 1.32 | 29.0 | 0.94 | 13.3 | 0.76 | 4.0 | 0.54 | 0.7 | 0.20 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Latvia | 2.3 | 0.56 | 12.5 | 1.00 | 29.1 | 1.07 | 35.5 | 1.16 | 17.6 | 1.06 | 3.0 | 0.47 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Liechtenstein | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 9.9 | 1.94 | 23.8 | 3.07 | 29.8 | 3.67 | 25.4 | 2.67 | 9.0 | 1.74 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Lithuania | 3.5 | 0.65 | 13.5 | 0.77 | 28.9 | 1.02 | 32.4 | 1.18 | 17.0 | 0.84 | 4.3 | 0.41 | 0.4 ! | 0.13 |
| Macao-China | 1.5 | 0.21 | 8.1 | 0.36 | 25.2 | 0.77 | 37.8 | 0.74 | 22.7 | 0.98 | 4.5 | 0.47 | 0.2! | 0.08 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 22.2 | 1.01 | 31.4 | 0.98 | 29.4 | 1.04 | 13.6 | 0.79 | 3.1 | 0.39 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Panama | 32.8 | 2.74 | 32.4 | 1.96 | 23.2 | 1.93 | 9.3 | 1.19 | 2.2 | 0.46 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Peru | 35.3 | 1.50 | 33.0 | 1.29 | 21.7 | 1.21 | 8.0 | 0.79 | 1.8 | 0.37 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Qatar | 36.4 | 0.58 | 28.8 | 0.54 | 18.8 | 0.56 | 9.8 | 0.30 | 4.8 | 0.23 | 1.3 | 0.14 | 0.1! | 0.05 |
| Romania | 11.9 | 1.13 | 29.5 | 1.57 | 34.1 | 1.73 | 19.7 | 1.18 | 4.4 | 0.59 | 0.4 ! | 0.12 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Russian Federation | 5.5 | 0.67 | 16.5 | 1.06 | 30.7 | 1.14 | 29.0 | 1.15 | 13.9 | 0.91 | 3.9 | 0.50 | 0.41 | 0.17 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 10.1 | 0.82 | 24.3 | 0.96 | 33.9 | 1.17 | 23.6 | 0.75 | 7.1 | 0.57 | 1.0 | 0.18 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Shanghai-China | 0.4 | 0.11 | 2.8 | 0.36 | 10.5 | 0.66 | 26.0 | 0.99 | 36.1 | 1.12 | 20.4 | 0.96 | 3.9 | 0.45 |
| Singapore | 2.8 | 0.24 | 8.7 | 0.52 | 17.5 | 0.58 | 25.4 | 0.83 | 25.7 | 0.70 | 15.3 | 0.67 | 4.6 | 0.50 |
| Thailand | 12.2 | 1.10 | 30.6 | 1.01 | 34.7 | 1.34 | 17.5 | 0.95 | 4.4 | 0.51 | 0.6 ! | 0.27 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 25.1 | 0.87 | 24.9 | 0.92 | 25.2 | 0.88 | 16.0 | 0.79 | 7.1 | 0.40 | 1.8 | 0.23 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Tunisia | 21.3 | 1.17 | 32.4 | 1.08 | 30.9 | 1.00 | 13.0 | 0.85 | 2.2 | 0.43 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Uruguay | 17.0 | 0.94 | 25.6 | 0.86 | 29.3 | 1.01 | 19.5 | 1.02 | 7.1 | 0.51 | 1.4 | 0.22 | 0.1! | 0.04 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into science literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 (a score less than or equal to 334.94 ); level 1 (a score greater than 334.94 and less than or equal to 409.54 ); level 2 (a score greater than 409.54 and less than or equal to 484.14); level 3 (a score greater than 484.14 and less than or equal to 558.73); level 4 (a score greater than 558.73 and less than or equal to 633.33); level 5 (a score greater than 633.33 and less than or equal to 707.93 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 707.93 ). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries and are not included in the OECD average. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

Table S4A. Percentage of 15 -year-old students on science literacy scale within selected proficiency level ranges, by country: 2009

| Country | Below level 2 |  | Level 4 and above |  | Level 5 and above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 18.0 | 0.18 | 29.1 | 0.20 | 8.5 | 0.12 |
| OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia | 12.6* | 0.62 | 39.0* | 0.99 | 14.5* | 0.82 |
| Austria | 20.9 | 1.35 | 28.6 | 1.26 | 8.0 | 0.63 |
| Belgium | 18.0 | 0.85 | 34.1* | 1.04 | 10.1 | 0.69 |
| Canada | 9.6* | 0.45 | 38.3* | 0.79 | 12.1* | 0.48 |
| Chile | 32.3* | 1.42 | 8.9* | 0.75 | 1.1* | 0.23 |
| Czech Republic | 17.3 | 1.16 | 28.3 | 1.17 | 8.4 | 0.68 |
| Denmark | 16.6 | 0.79 | 26.8 | 1.08 | $6.7{ }^{*}$ | 0.62 |
| Estonia | 8.3* | 0.82 | 36.1* | 1.29 | 10.4 | 0.77 |
| Finland | $6.0^{*}$ | 0.48 | 49.9* | 1.18 | 18.7* | 0.91 |
| France | 19.3 | 1.28 | 29.8 | 1.49 | 8.1 | 0.80 |
| Germany | 14.8* | 1.03 | 37.8* | 1.31 | 12.8* | 0.77 |
| Greece | 25.3* | 1.60 | 17.0* | 1.08 | 3.1* | 0.35 |
| Hungary | 14.1* | 1.38 | 27.2 | 1.39 | 5.4* | 0.61 |
| Iceland | 17.9 | 0.72 | 25.8* | 0.83 | 7.0* | 0.43 |
| Ireland | 15.2 | 1.10 | 31.6 | 1.28 | 8.7 | 0.77 |
| Israel | 33.1* | 1.23 | 16.8* | 0.84 | 3.9* | 0.42 |
| Italy | 20.6* | 0.62 | 24.4* | 0.68 | 5.8* | 0.31 |
| Japan | 10.7* | 1.05 | 46.4* | 1.33 | 16.9* | 0.94 |
| Korea, Republic of | $6.3 *$ | 0.85 | 42.0* | 1.70 | 11.6 | 1.06 |
| Luxembourg | 23.7* | 0.78 | 24.9* | 0.69 | $6.7^{*}$ | 0.48 |
| Mexico | 47.4* | 0.95 | 3.3* | 0.29 | 0.2* | 0.05 |
| Netherlands | 13.2* | 1.57 | 38.1* | 2.36 | 12.7* | 1.23 |
| New Zealand | 13.4* | 0.72 | 42.8* | 1.07 | 17.6* | 0.79 |
| Norway | 15.8 | 0.94 | 26.5 | 1.10 | $6.4 *$ | 0.63 |
| Poland | 13.1* | 0.84 | 28.7 | 1.12 | 7.5 | 0.49 |
| Portugal | 16.5 | 1.06 | 22.2* | 1.19 | 4.2* | 0.54 |
| Slovak Republic | 19.3 | 1.15 | 24.0* | 1.12 | $6 .{ }^{*}$ | 0.59 |
| Slovenia | 14.8* | 0.48 | 32.8* | 0.85 | 9.9 | 0.62 |
| Spain | 18.2 | 0.86 | 21.5* | 0.71 | 4.0* | 0.28 |
| Sweden | 19.1 | 1.04 | 26.8 | 1.03 | 8.1 | 0.59 |
| Switzerland | 14.0* | 0.76 | 34.9* | 1.43 | 10.7 | 0.85 |
| Turkey | 30.0 * | 1.45 | 10.3* | 1.30 | 1.1* | 0.31 |
| United Kingdom | 15.0* | 0.82 | 33.6* | 1.14 | 11.4 | 0.71 |
| United States | 18.1 | 1.10 | 29.3 | 1.37 | 9.2 | 0.97 |
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Table S4A. Percentage of 15 -year-old students on science literacy scale within selected
proficiency level ranges, by country: 2009-Continued

| Country | Below level 2 |  | Level 4 and above |  | Level 5 and above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| Non-OECD countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania | 57.3* | 1.96 | 2.1* | 0.39 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 52.4* | 1.93 | 5.5* | 0.78 | 0.7* | 0.19 |
| Azerbaijan | 70.0* | 1.50 | 0.8* | 0.22 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Brazil | 54.2 * | 1.30 | 4.4* | 0.46 | 0.6* | 0.11 |
| Bulgaria | 38.8* | 2.50 | 13.6* | 1.35 | 2.6 * | 0.52 |
| Chinese Taipei | 11.1* | 0.71 | 34.6* | 1.40 | 8.8 | 0.87 |
| Colombia | $54.1 *$ | 1.93 | 2.6* | 0.36 | 0.1 !* | 0.05 |
| Croatia | 18.5 | 1.12 | 20.4* | 1.15 | 3.7 * | 0.61 |
| Dubai-UAE | 30.5* | 0.61 | 20.5* | 0.57 | 5.6* | 0.32 |
| Hong Kong-China | 6.6* | 0.74 | 48.9* | 1.30 | 16.2* | 0.99 |
| Indonesia | 65.6* | 2.31 | $0.5!^{*}$ | 0.22 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Jordan | 45.6* | 1.67 | 4.6* | 0.57 | 0.5 ! | 0.18 |
| Kazakhstan | $55.4 *$ | 1.59 | 3.9* | 0.63 | 0.3 !* | 0.15 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 82.0* | 1.11 | 0.8* | 0.19 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Latvia | 14.7* | 1.21 | 20.7* | 1.23 | 3.1 * | 0.46 |
| Liechtenstein | 11.3* | 1.91 | 35.1* | 2.24 | 9.7 | 1.75 |
| Lithuania | 17.0 | 1.14 | 21.6* | 1.05 | 4.6* | 0.46 |
| Macao-China | 9.6* | 0.42 | 27.4 | 0.73 | 4.8* | 0.46 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 53.6* | 1.05 | 3.4* | 0.42 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Panama | $65.1 *$ | 2.81 | $2.4 *$ | 0.47 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Peru | 68.3* | 1.67 | 2.0* | 0.44 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Qatar | $65.2 *$ | 0.56 | $6.2 *$ | 0.23 | 1.4* | 0.14 |
| Romania | 41.4* | 2.11 | 4.8* | 0.62 | $0.4 *$ | 0.11 |
| Russian Federation | 22.0* | 1.39 | 18.3* | 1.10 | 4.4* | 0.54 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 34.4* | 1.25 | 8.1 * | 0.64 | 1.0* | 0.18 |
| Shanghai-China | 3.2* | 0.40 | 60.3* | 1.18 | 24.3* | 1.17 |
| Singapore | 11.5* | 0.50 | 45.6* | 0.81 | 19.9* | 0.61 |
| Thailand | 42.8* | 1.60 | 5.0* | 0.64 | 0.6 !* | 0.28 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 49.9* | 0.67 | 9.0* | 0.42 | 1.9* | 0.23 |
| Tunisia | 53.7* | 1.42 | 2.3* | 0.50 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Uruguay | 42.6* | 1.12 | 8.6* | 0.63 | 1.5* | 0.23 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut point scores are as follows: below level 1 (a score less than or equal to 334.94 ); level 1 (a score greater than 334.94 and less than or equal to 409.54 ); level 2 (a score greater than 409.54 and less than or equal to 484.14); level 3 (a score greater than 484.14 and less than or equal to 558.73); level 4 (a score greater than 558.73 and less than or equal to 633.33); level 5 (a score greater than 633.33 and less than or equal to 707.93 ); and level 6 (a score greater than 707.93). Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.


[^0]:    See notes at end of table.

[^1]:    ! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.

    * $p<.05$. All differences between females and males are significantly different at the .05 level of statistical significance. Differences were computed using unrounded numbers.
    NOTE: The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Because the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is principally an OECD study, the results for non-OECD countries are displayed separately from those of the OECD countries. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-national entities. UAE refers to United Arab Emirates. SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

[^2]:    * $p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
    ${ }^{* *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance, but not significantly different from the U.S. average.
    NOTE: The National School Lunch Program provides free or reduced-price lunch for students meeting certain income guidelines. The percentage of students receiving such lunch is an indicator of the socioeconomic level of families served by the school. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Standard error is noted by s.e. Data are for public schools only.
    SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2009.

[^3]:    See notes at end of table.

[^4]:    See notes at end of table.

[^5]:    See notes at end of table.

[^6]:    Average is higher than the U.S. average

