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## Exhibit M1. Description of PISA proficiency levels on mathematics literacy scale: 2012

| Proficiency level and lower cut 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, and can use their knowledge in relatively non-standard contexts. 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 understanding, 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 reflect on their actions, and 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 begin to reflect on their work and can formulate and communicate their interpretations and reasoning. |
| Level 4 <br> 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, linking them directly to aspects of real-world situations. Students at this level can utilize their limited range of skills and can reason with some insight, in straightforward contexts. They can construct and communicate explanations and arguments based on their interpretations, arguments, and actions. |
| Level 3 <br> 482 | At level 3 , students can execute clearly described procedures, including those that require sequential decisions. Their interpretations are sufficiently sound to be a base for building a simple model or for selecting and applying simple problem-solving strategies. Students at this level can interpret and use representations based on different information sources and reason directly from them. They typically show some ability to handle percentages, fractions and decimal numbers, and to work with proportional relationships. Their solutions reflect that they have engaged in basic interpretation and reasoning. |
| Level 2 <br> 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 to solve problems involving whole numbers. They are capable of 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 almost always 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. Cut scores in the exhibit are rounded; exact cut scores are provided in table AA1. 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), 2012.

National Center for Education Statistics
Figure M1a. Percentage of 15-year-old students performing at PISA mathematics literacy proficiency levels 5 and above and below level 2, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Below level 2 |  | Levels 5 and above | Education system | Below level 2 |  | Levels 5 and above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average | 23 * |  | 13* |  |  |  |  |
| Shanghai-China | 4 * |  | 55 * | Sweden | 27 |  | 8 |
| Singapore | 8 * |  | 40 * | Spain | 24 |  | 8 |
| Chinese Taipei | 13 * |  | 37 * | Latvia | 20 * |  | 8 |
| Hong Kong-China | 9 * |  | 34 * | Russian Federation | 24 |  | 8 |
| Korea, Republic of | 9 * |  | 31 * | Croatia | 30 |  | 7 |
| Liechtenstein | 14 * |  | 25 * | Turkey | 42* |  | 6 * |
| Macao-China | 11* |  | 24 * | Serbia, Republic of | 39* |  | 5 * |
| Japan | 11* |  | 24 * | Bulgaria | 44* |  | 4 * |
| Switzerland | 12* |  | 21 * | Greece | 36* |  | 4* |
| Belgium | 19 * |  | 20 * | Cyprus | 42* |  | 4 * |
| Netherlands | 15 * |  | 19 * | United Arab Emirates | 46* |  | 3 * |
| Germany | 18 * |  | 17 * | Romania | 41* |  | 3 * |
| Poland | 14 * |  | 17 * | Thailand | 50 * |  | 3 * |
| Canada | 14 * |  | 16 * | Qatar | 70* |  | 2* |
| Finland | 12 * |  | 15 * | Chile | 52 * |  | 2 * |
| New Zealand | 23 * |  | 15 * | Uruguay | 56 * |  | 1 * |
| Australia | 20 * |  | 15 * | Malaysia | 52* |  | 1* |
| Estonia | 11* |  | 15 * | Montenegro, Republic of | 57* |  | 1 * |
| Austria | 19 * |  | 14 * | Kazakhstan | 45* |  | $1!^{*}$ |
| Slovenia | 20 * |  | 14 * | Albania | 61 * |  | 1* |
| Vietnam | 14 * |  | 13 * | Tunisia | 68 * |  | $1!^{*}$ |
| France | 22* |  | 13 * | Brazil | $67^{*}$ |  | 1 * |
| Czech Republic | 21 * |  | 13 * | Mexico | 55* |  | 1 * |
| United Kingdom | 22 * |  | 12 * | Peru | 75* |  | 1 !* |
| Luxembourg | 24 |  | 11 * | Costa Rica | 60 * |  | $1!^{*}$ |
| Iceland | 21* |  | 11 * | Jordan | 69 * |  | + |
| Slovak Republic | 27 |  | 11 | Colombia | 74* |  | \# ! |
| Ireland | 17 * |  | 11 * | Indonesia | 76* |  | $\ddagger$ |
| Portugal | 25 |  | 11 | Argentina | 66 * |  | \# ! ${ }^{\text {* }}$ |
| Denmark | 17 * |  | 10 |  | 02 | 4060 | 80100 |
| Italy | 25 |  | 10 |  |  | Percent |  |
| Norway | 22 * |  | 9 | U.S. state |  |  |  |
| Israel | 34 * |  | 9 | education systems |  |  |  |
| Hungary | 28 |  | 9 | Massachusetts | 18 * |  | 19* |
| United States | 26 |  | 9 | Connecticut | 21 * |  | 16 * |
| Lithuania | 26 |  | 8 | Florida | 30 |  | 6* |
|  | Percent |  |  |  | 020 | $\begin{array}{cc} 40 & 60 \\ \text { Percent } \end{array}$ | 80100 |

## Below level 2

Levels 5 and above
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* $p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. percentage at the .05 level of significance.

NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 percentages of 15 -year-olds in levels 5 and above. To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into mathematics proficiency levels according to their scores. Cut scores for each proficiency level can be found in table A-1 in appendix A. The OECD average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. The standard errors of the estimates are shown in table M1b available at http://nces.ed.gov/ pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2014024.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

National Center for Education Statistics
Table M1b. Percentage of 15 -year-old students performing at PISA mathematics literacy proficiency levels 5 and above and below level 2 , by education system: 2012

| Education system | Below level 2 |  | Levels 5 and above |  | Education system | Below level 2 |  | Levels 5 and above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 23.0 * | 0.19 | 12.6 * | 0.15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shanghai-China | 3.8 * | 0.55 | 55.4 * | 1.37 | Sweden | 27.1 | 1.12 | 8.0 | 0.52 |
| Singapore | 8.3 * | 0.48 | 40.0 * | 0.71 | Spain | 23.6 | 0.85 | 8.0 | 0.43 |
| Chinese Taipei | 12.8 * | 0.84 | 37.2 * | 1.24 | Latvia | 19.9 * | 1.13 | 8.0 | 0.78 |
| Hong Kong-China | 8.5 * | 0.79 | 33.7 * | 1.35 | Russian Federation | 24.0 | 1.13 | 7.8 | 0.85 |
| Korea, Republic of | 9.1 * | 0.95 | 30.9 * | 1.83 | Croatia | 29.9 * | 1.36 | 7.0 | 1.15 |
| Liechtenstein | 14.1 * | 2.02 | 24.8 * | 2.55 | Turkey | 42.0 * | 1.93 | 5.9 * | 1.13 |
| Macao-China | 10.8 * | 0.49 | 24.3 * | 0.56 | Serbia, Republic of | 38.9 * | 1.54 | 4.6 * | 0.71 |
| Japan | 11.1 * | 0.98 | 23.7 * | 1.46 | Bulgaria | 43.8 * | 1.78 | 4.1 * | 0.62 |
| Switzerland | 12.4 * | 0.70 | 21.4 * | 1.19 | Greece | 35.7 * | 1.34 | 3.9 * | 0.43 |
| Belgium | 19.0 * | 0.82 | 19.5 * | 0.76 | Cyprus | 42.0 * | 0.63 | 3.7 * | 0.27 |
| Netherlands | 14.8 * | 1.28 | 19.3 * | 1.21 | United Arab Emirates | 46.3 * | 1.22 | 3.5 * | 0.29 |
| Germany | 17.7 * | 1.03 | 17.5 * | 0.94 | Romania | 40.8 * | 1.93 | 3.2 * | 0.61 |
| Poland | 14.4 * | 0.89 | 16.7 * | 1.33 | Thailand | 49.7 * | 1.74 | 2.6 * | 0.51 |
| Canada | 13.8 * | 0.55 | 16.4 * | 0.64 | Qatar | 69.6 * | 0.46 | 2.0 * | 0.21 |
| Finland | 12.3 * | 0.67 | 15.3 * | 0.74 | Chile | 51.5 * | 1.67 | 1.6 * | 0.22 |
| New Zealand | 22.6 * | 0.80 | 15.0 * | 0.88 | Uruguay | 55.8 * | 1.31 | 1.4 * | 0.32 |
| Australia | 19.7 * | 0.60 | 14.8 * | 0.64 | Malaysia | 51.8 * | 1.68 | 1.3 * | 0.30 |
| Estonia | 10.5 * | 0.63 | 14.6 * | 0.76 | Montenegro, Republic of | 56.6 * | 1.02 | 1.0 * | 0.20 |
| Austria | 18.7 * | 0.96 | 14.3 * | 0.95 | Kazakhstan | 45.2 * | 1.70 | 0.9 !* | 0.29 |
| Slovenia | 20.1 * | 0.65 | 13.7 * | 0.55 | Albania | 60.7 * | 0.95 | 0.8 * | 0.19 |
| Vietnam | 14.2 * | 1.75 | 13.3 * | 1.47 | Tunisia | 67.7 * | 1.83 | 0.8 !* | 0.37 |
| France | 22.4 * | 0.87 | 12.9 * | 0.77 | Brazil | 67.1 * | 1.03 | 0.8 * | 0.20 |
| Czech Republic | 21.0 * | 1.20 | 12.9 * | 0.82 | Mexico | 54.7 * | 0.82 | 0.6 * | 0.08 |
| United Kingdom | 21.8 * | 1.30 | 11.8 * | 0.81 | Peru | 74.6 * | 1.75 | 0.6 !* | 0.21 |
| Luxembourg | 24.3 | 0.54 | 11.2 * | 0.42 | Costa Rica | 59.9 * | 1.87 | 0.6 * | 0.19 |
| Iceland | 21.5 * | 0.74 | 11.2 * | 0.69 | Jordan | 68.6 * | 1.50 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Slovak Republic | 27.5 | 1.28 | 11.0 | 0.94 | Colombia | 73.8 * | 1.43 | 0.3 !* | 0.11 |
| Ireland | 16.9 * | 0.99 | 10.7 * | 0.54 | Indonesia | 75.7 * | 2.05 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Portugal | 24.9 | 1.52 | 10.6 | 0.79 | Argentina | 66.5 * | 2.03 | 0.3 !* | 0.10 |
| Denmark | 16.8 * | 0.98 | 10.0 | 0.66 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Italy | 24.7 | 0.76 | 9.9 | 0.57 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Norway | 22.3 * | 1.06 | 9.4 | 0.67 | U.S. state education |  |  |  |  |
| Israel | 33.5 * | 1.68 | 9.4 | 0.99 | systems |  |  |  |  |
| Hungary | 28.1 | 1.31 | 9.3 | 1.12 | Massachusetts | 17.8 * | 1.46 | 18.5 * | 2.47 |
| United States | 25.8 | 1.39 | 8.8 | 0.78 | Connecticut | 20.6 * | 2.14 | 16.4 * | 1.91 |
| Lithuania | 26.0 | 1.18 | 8.1 | 0.60 | Florida | 30.4 | 2.65 | 5.8 * | 1.18 |

## $\dagger$ Not applicable. <br> \# 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. percentage at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 percentages of 15 -year-olds in levels 5 and above. To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into mathematics proficiency levels according to their scores. Exact cut 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 o Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. This table corresponds to figure 1 in Performance of U.S. 15-Year-Old Students in Mathematics, Science, and Reading Literacy in an Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

National Center for Education Statistics
Table M2. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy content subscales, by proficiency level and education system: 2012

| Education system | Quantity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 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 | 9.2 | 0.13 | 14.3 | 0.14 | 21.1 | 0.14 | 22.9 | 0.15 | 18.5 | 0.14 | 10.1 | 0.11 | 3.9 | 0.08 |
| Albania | 36.4 | 1.22 | 26.2 | 0.98 | 21.2 | 0.90 | 11.4 | 0.65 | 3.9 | 0.43 | 0.8 | 0.18 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 34.0 | 2.00 | 29.4 | 1.38 | 22.9 | 1.22 | 10.5 | 0.90 | 2.6 | 0.36 | 0.5 | 0.15 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Australia | 8.4 | 0.35 | 13.8 | 0.45 | 21.2 | 0.60 | 22.8 | 0.60 | 18.3 | 0.49 | 10.5 | 0.47 | 4.9 | 0.39 |
| Austria | 5.0 | 0.54 | 12.4 | 0.90 | 20.9 | 0.98 | 24.6 | 0.83 | 22.3 | 0.97 | 11.3 | 0.78 | 3.5 | 0.49 |
| Belgium | 6.9 | 0.51 | 11.2 | 0.68 | 17.9 | 0.69 | 21.8 | 0.69 | 21.2 | 0.62 | 14.5 | 0.60 | 6.6 | 0.38 |
| Brazil | 36.5 | 1.13 | 27.0 | 0.81 | 20.2 | 0.60 | 10.5 | 0.53 | 4.3 | 0.42 | 1.3 | 0.27 | 0.2 ! | 0.08 |
| Bulgaria | 20.2 | 1.39 | 21.7 | 0.99 | 23.4 | 1.00 | 18.2 | 0.93 | 10.9 | 0.80 | 4.3 | 0.62 | 1.2 | 0.28 |
| Canada | 5.9 | 0.32 | 11.0 | 0.40 | 19.7 | 0.71 | 24.2 | 0.60 | 20.9 | 0.59 | 12.6 | 0.51 | 5.8 | 0.40 |
| Chile | 24.6 | 1.44 | 26.7 | 0.95 | 23.9 | 0.93 | 15.5 | 0.80 | 7.1 | 0.60 | 1.9 | 0.28 | 0.3 | 0.06 |
| Chinese Taipei | 5.1 | 0.57 | 9.2 | 0.57 | 14.0 | 0.65 | 19.3 | 0.77 | 22.1 | 0.83 | 18.7 | 0.98 | 11.6 | 0.71 |
| Colombia | 43.1 | 1.43 | 27.2 | 0.98 | 18.0 | 0.85 | 8.3 | 0.58 | 2.7 | 0.39 | 0.6 | 0.15 | 0.1 ! | 0.05 |
| Costa Rica | 27.2 | 1.64 | 30.8 | 1.14 | 25.8 | 1.10 | 11.3 | 0.84 | 3.9 | 0.57 | 0.9 ! | 0.29 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 9.1 | 0.70 | 18.0 | 0.78 | 24.9 | 1.27 | 23.4 | 1.27 | 15.3 | 0.91 | 7.0 | 0.80 | 2.3 | 0.57 |
| Cyprus | 21.6 | 0.54 | 21.2 | 0.67 | 23.8 | 0.72 | 18.5 | 0.64 | 10.3 | 0.51 | 3.7 | 0.29 | 0.9 | 0.18 |
| Czech Republic | 7.7 | 0.77 | 12.4 | 0.84 | 20.6 | 1.02 | 23.5 | 1.07 | 19.8 | 0.92 | 11.0 | 0.71 | 4.9 | 0.51 |
| Denmark | 5.5 | 0.47 | 12.9 | 0.71 | 22.9 | 0.78 | 26.1 | 0.90 | 20.0 | 0.84 | 9.7 | 0.59 | 2.9 | 0.30 |
| Estonia | 2.7 | 0.40 | 8.5 | 0.57 | 19.8 | 0.78 | 27.8 | 0.91 | 24.0 | 0.89 | 12.4 | 0.84 | 4.7 | 0.50 |
| Finland | 2.9 | 0.36 | 8.1 | 0.45 | 19.3 | 0.90 | 27.7 | 0.68 | 24.3 | 0.74 | 12.7 | 0.68 | 5.0 | 0.51 |
| France | 9.4 | 0.80 | 14.1 | 0.78 | 20.7 | 0.81 | 22.3 | 0.76 | 18.9 | 0.76 | 10.7 | 0.72 | 4.0 | 0.47 |
| Germany | 6.1 | 0.71 | 11.6 | 0.69 | 17.7 | 0.76 | 23.4 | 1.01 | 22.1 | 0.85 | 13.5 | 0.79 | 5.6 | 0.59 |
| Greece | 16.4 | 1.00 | 19.3 | 1.23 | 24.4 | 1.10 | 21.5 | 0.81 | 12.7 | 0.78 | 4.5 | 0.39 | 1.1 | 0.20 |
| Hong Kong-China | 3.3 | 0.44 | 5.3 | 0.50 | 11.4 | 0.72 | 18.6 | 0.72 | 24.6 | 0.89 | 22.1 | 0.97 | 14.6 | 0.85 |
| Hungary | 11.7 | 0.88 | 18.1 | 0.99 | 23.5 | 0.95 | 21.6 | 1.11 | 15.3 | 0.89 | 7.5 | 0.76 | 2.4 | 0.43 |
| Iceland | 9.3 | 0.62 | 13.3 | 0.69 | 20.8 | 0.85 | 24.1 | 0.79 | 18.5 | 0.67 | 10.2 | 0.58 | 3.9 | 0.35 |
| Indonesia | 50.0 | 2.14 | 27.1 | 1.57 | 14.8 | 1.18 | 5.8 | 0.86 | 2.0 ! | 0.64 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Ireland | 5.9 | 0.56 | 12.0 | 0.68 | 21.8 | 0.86 | 26.0 | 0.72 | 20.6 | 0.72 | 10.4 | 0.58 | 3.3 | 0.34 |
| Israel | 15.6 | 1.22 | 15.2 | 0.86 | 19.1 | 0.95 | 19.8 | 0.81 | 16.2 | 0.80 | 9.4 | 0.76 | 4.8 | 0.61 |
| Italy | 9.6 | 0.44 | 14.6 | 0.47 | 21.7 | 0.47 | 23.6 | 0.54 | 18.0 | 0.49 | 9.2 | 0.39 | 3.3 | 0.23 |
| Japan | 4.9 | 0.64 | 10.3 | 0.75 | 19.5 | 0.80 | 25.2 | 1.02 | 22.3 | 0.93 | 12.7 | 0.83 | 5.1 | 0.62 |
| Jordan | 47.2 | 1.63 | 26.0 | 0.76 | 16.7 | 0.95 | 7.4 | 0.58 | 2.1 | 0.39 | 0.6 ! | 0.29 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | 18.5 | 1.01 | 29.5 | 1.22 | 28.1 | 1.05 | 16.1 | 1.09 | 6.2 | 0.84 | 1.4 | 0.38 | 0.2 ! | 0.09 |
| Korea, Republic of | 3.4 | 0.50 | 7.4 | 0.85 | 16.2 | 0.96 | 23.9 | 1.14 | 25.1 | 0.90 | 17.1 | 0.91 | 6.8 | 0.86 |
| Latvia | 5.9 | 0.61 | 15.4 | 0.99 | 26.5 | 1.34 | 26.6 | 0.98 | 17.8 | 0.96 | 6.5 | 0.65 | 1.2 | 0.25 |
| Liechtenstein | 4.6 | 1.19 | 8.2 | 1.70 | 16.6 | 2.55 | 19.1 | 2.78 | 23.1 | 2.60 | 19.9 | 2.14 | 8.4 | 1.53 |
| Lithuania | 9.1 | 0.66 | 16.1 | 1.01 | 25.1 | 1.24 | 24.1 | 0.93 | 16.0 | 0.78 | 7.4 | 0.52 | 2.2 | 0.35 |
| Luxembourg | 9.2 | 0.48 | 14.5 | 0.76 | 20.8 | 0.61 | 22.8 | 0.79 | 19.3 | 0.76 | 9.8 | 0.64 | 3.6 | 0.36 |
| Macao-China | 3.4 | 0.24 | 8.4 | 0.43 | 17.7 | 0.62 | 24.6 | 0.65 | 25.0 | 0.78 | 15.0 | 0.81 | 5.8 | 0.43 |
| Malaysia | 30.4 | 1.39 | 26.0 | 0.97 | 21.9 | 0.94 | 13.1 | 0.90 | 6.4 | 0.69 | 1.9 | 0.34 | 0.3 ! | 0.13 |
| Mexico | 25.9 | 0.67 | 27.5 | 0.53 | 25.3 | 0.42 | 14.5 | 0.52 | 5.4 | 0.28 | 1.3 | 0.11 | 0.2 | 0.04 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 28.5 | 0.73 | 27.5 | 0.76 | 23.8 | 0.98 | 13.7 | 0.81 | 4.9 | 0.51 | 1.3 | 0.26 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Netherlands | 4.2 | 0.69 | 10.3 | 0.82 | 16.4 | 0.97 | 21.3 | 1.28 | 24.0 | 1.08 | 16.9 | 1.06 | 6.9 | 0.70 |
| New Zealand | 8.8 | 0.64 | 14.6 | 0.79 | 21.0 | 0.76 | 21.9 | 0.83 | 18.0 | 0.86 | 10.8 | 0.57 | 4.8 | 0.40 |
| Norway | 7.8 | 0.73 | 14.2 | 0.64 | 23.3 | 0.79 | 25.6 | 0.84 | 18.0 | 0.69 | 8.1 | 0.54 | 3.0 | 0.37 |
| Peru | 47.9 | 1.74 | 24.8 | 0.84 | 15.9 | 0.88 | 7.5 | 0.75 | 2.9 | 0.59 | 0.9 ! | 0.26 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Poland | 3.1 | 0.40 | 10.5 | 0.80 | 21.1 | 1.00 | 26.9 | 1.33 | 21.6 | 0.95 | 12.2 | 0.91 | 4.4 | 0.68 |
| Portugal | 10.4 | 0.94 | 16.4 | 0.91 | 23.0 | 0.76 | 23.5 | 0.94 | 17.2 | 0.96 | 7.5 | 0.70 | 2.0 | 0.38 |
| Qatar | 48.5 | 0.43 | 21.6 | 0.46 | 14.8 | 0.45 | 8.8 | 0.35 | 4.4 | 0.22 | 1.6 | 0.13 | 0.3 | 0.06 |
| Romania | 18.5 | 1.44 | 24.1 | 1.05 | 24.8 | 0.94 | 18.3 | 1.04 | 9.5 | 0.86 | 3.7 | 0.59 | 1.1 ! | 0.37 |
| Russian Federation | 9.6 | 0.67 | 16.7 | 1.01 | 25.9 | 1.18 | 24.4 | 0.89 | 15.0 | 0.94 | 6.6 | 0.67 | 1.9 | 0.35 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 15.4 | 1.26 | 21.2 | 0.99 | 25.2 | 1.14 | 19.9 | 1.13 | 11.8 | 0.74 | 4.8 | 0.54 | 1.6 | 0.45 |
| Shanghai-China | 1.3 | 0.25 | 3.7 | 0.48 | 8.8 | 0.55 | 16.3 | 0.80 | 23.7 | 0.92 | 25.3 | 1.05 | 20.9 | 1.00 |
| Singapore | 2.5 | 0.24 | 6.3 | 0.37 | 11.9 | 0.55 | 18.5 | 0.59 | 23.3 | 0.57 | 20.5 | 0.70 | 16.9 | 0.45 |
| Slovak Republic | 11.4 | 1.14 | 15.5 | 1.08 | 21.6 | 0.99 | 21.6 | 1.04 | 17.0 | 0.91 | 9.0 | 0.57 | 3.9 | 0.45 |
| Slovenia | 6.0 | 0.58 | 13.3 | 0.94 | 22.7 | 0.64 | 24.1 | 0.87 | 19.2 | 0.84 | 10.7 | 0.63 | 4.1 | 0.41 |
| Spain | 9.7 | 0.64 | 14.3 | 0.59 | 21.4 | 0.55 | 23.7 | 0.62 | 18.5 | 0.66 | 9.2 | 0.39 | 3.2 | 0.25 |
| Sweden | 10.2 | 0.68 | 15.9 | 0.78 | 23.5 | 0.76 | 23.9 | 0.88 | 16.6 | 0.83 | 7.5 | 0.56 | 2.4 | 0.26 |
| Switzerland | 4.0 | 0.36 | 8.9 | 0.52 | 17.3 | 0.86 | 23.7 | 0.75 | 23.9 | 0.89 | 15.0 | 0.79 | 7.1 | 0.72 |
| Thailand | 24.6 | 1.33 | 28.5 | 1.11 | 24.9 | 0.96 | 13.8 | 0.93 | 5.8 | 0.69 | 2.0 | 0.41 | 0.4 ! | 0.16 |
| Tunisia | 42.4 | 2.09 | 26.4 | 1.14 | 19.0 | 1.18 | 8.4 | 0.67 | 2.8 | 0.67 | 0.7 ! | 0.34 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Turkey | 19.6 | 1.32 | 24.8 | 1.22 | 23.3 | 1.12 | 16.4 | 1.08 | 10.1 | 1.09 | 4.8 | 0.81 | 1.0 ! | 0.34 |
| United Arab Emirates | 24.3 | 0.96 | 22.9 | 0.83 | 22.3 | 0.70 | 16.4 | 0.58 | 9.4 | 0.68 | 3.6 | 0.31 | 1.0 | 0.18 |
| United Kingdom | 9.4 | 0.95 | 14.3 | 0.96 | 21.2 | 0.78 | 23.0 | 0.91 | 18.4 | 0.79 | 9.8 | 0.60 | 3.8 | 0.41 |
| United States | 10.9 | 1.01 | 18.3 | 1.06 | 24.0 | 0.78 | 21.5 | 0.97 | 14.7 | 0.93 | 7.6 | 0.66 | 3.0 | 0.41 |
| Uruguay | 29.9 | 1.27 | 24.0 | 0.95 | 22.3 | 0.81 | 14.7 | 0.77 | 6.8 | 0.56 | 2.0 | 0.30 | 0.3 ! | 0.11 |
| Vietnam | 5.4 | 1.04 | 11.2 | 1.09 | 22.4 | 1.40 | 26.1 | 1.38 | 20.3 | 1.20 | 10.5 | 1.03 | 4.2 | 0.85 |
| U.S. state education system |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut | 9.4 | 1.43 | 13.5 | 1.29 | 19.2 | 1.24 | 22.0 | 1.18 | 19.4 | 1.59 | 11.5 | 1.47 | 5.1 | 1.01 |
| Florida | 14.6 | 1.83 | 20.8 | 1.73 | 25.1 | 1.31 | 21.4 | 1.78 | 12.1 | 1.12 | 4.9 | 0.96 | 1.1 ! | 0.38 |
| Massachusetts | 7.9 | 1.00 | 12.6 | 1.12 | 19.9 | 1.89 | 23.7 | 1.45 | 18.5 | 1.14 | 11.8 | 1.59 | 5.6 | 1.08 |
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| Education system | Space and shape |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 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 | 10.0 | 0.13 | 15.8 | 0.14 | 22.3 | 0.15 | 22.2 | 0.16 | 16.3 | 0.14 | 8.9 | 0.11 | 4.5 | 0.10 |
| Albania | 27.0 | 0.98 | 23.9 | 1.06 | 22.8 | 0.86 | 15.3 | 0.85 | 7.3 | 0.54 | 2.6 | 0.28 | 1.0 | 0.21 |
| Argentina | 36.5 | 2.04 | 31.6 | 1.10 | 21.4 | 1.29 | 8.4 | 0.75 | 1.9 | 0.30 | 0.3 ! | 0.09 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Australia | 8.1 | 0.39 | 15.3 | 0.50 | 21.9 | 0.55 | 23.5 | 0.49 | 16.9 | 0.53 | 9.3 | 0.46 | 5.0 | 0.42 |
| Austria | 7.3 | 0.69 | 13.7 | 0.85 | 21.8 | 0.88 | 23.7 | 0.98 | 19.0 | 0.85 | 10.2 | 0.69 | 4.3 | 0.68 |
| Belgium | 8.4 | 0.67 | 12.7 | 0.71 | 19.4 | 0.90 | 21.7 | 0.99 | 18.4 | 0.75 | 12.4 | 0.48 | 6.9 | 0.42 |
| Brazil | 40.3 | 1.02 | 30.6 | 0.71 | 18.8 | 0.63 | 7.3 | 0.42 | 2.4 | 0.34 | 0.6 ! | 0.18 | 0.1 ! | 0.05 |
| Bulgaria | 19.1 | 1.46 | 23.2 | 1.00 | 24.9 | 1.00 | 18.0 | 0.95 | 10.1 | 0.79 | 3.8 | 0.52 | 0.9 | 0.24 |
| Canada | 5.3 | 0.33 | 12.0 | 0.50 | 22.0 | 0.57 | 24.7 | 0.58 | 19.9 | 0.61 | 11.0 | 0.49 | 5.1 | 0.38 |
| Chile | 25.0 | 1.35 | 28.4 | 0.90 | 24.1 | 0.97 | 14.3 | 0.80 | 6.2 | 0.53 | 1.7 | 0.23 | 0.3 | 0.08 |
| Chinese Taipei | 4.6 | 0.47 | 7.2 | 0.50 | 10.9 | 0.57 | 13.3 | 0.72 | 16.0 | 0.66 | 16.9 | 0.68 | 31.1 | 1.14 |
| Colombia | 45.7 | 1.79 | 29.3 | 0.92 | 16.5 | 1.13 | 6.3 | 0.70 | 1.8 | 0.27 | 0.2 ! | 0.11 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Costa Rica | 29.9 | 1.75 | 34.9 | 1.04 | 23.4 | 1.22 | 8.5 | 0.91 | 2.5 | 0.58 | 0.6 ! | 0.23 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 11.2 | 0.81 | 23.2 | 0.97 | 28.2 | 0.95 | 20.8 | 0.97 | 10.9 | 0.68 | 4.1 | 0.66 | 1.7 ! | 0.67 |
| Cyprus | 19.8 | 0.88 | 24.4 | 1.03 | 25.8 | 0.73 | 17.9 | 0.65 | 8.7 | 0.71 | 2.9 | 0.32 | 0.6 | 0.15 |
| Czech Republic | 8.3 | 0.77 | 14.2 | 1.04 | 21.4 | 1.06 | 23.2 | 1.01 | 18.1 | 0.93 | 10.2 | 0.77 | 4.7 | 0.48 |
| Denmark | 5.1 | 0.54 | 13.1 | 0.65 | 24.3 | 0.73 | 29.0 | 0.80 | 18.9 | 0.71 | 7.6 | 0.60 | 1.9 | 0.28 |
| Estonia | 4.3 | 0.44 | 11.6 | 0.79 | 22.0 | 0.87 | 25.9 | 0.99 | 20.1 | 1.13 | 10.8 | 0.80 | 5.2 | 0.48 |
| Finland | 4.7 | 0.44 | 12.0 | 0.59 | 23.1 | 0.69 | 27.1 | 0.75 | 19.5 | 0.65 | 10.0 | 0.50 | 3.8 | 0.35 |
| France | 9.5 | 0.67 | 15.9 | 0.98 | 22.1 | 0.92 | 23.1 | 0.89 | 17.0 | 0.91 | 8.8 | 0.56 | 3.4 | 0.49 |
| Germany | 6.5 | 0.66 | 12.6 | 0.73 | 20.8 | 0.96 | 24.2 | 1.01 | 20.1 | 0.78 | 11.2 | 0.70 | 4.7 | 0.52 |
| Greece | 18.9 | 1.04 | 24.2 | 1.02 | 26.6 | 0.82 | 18.7 | 0.71 | 8.7 | 0.62 | 2.5 | 0.32 | 0.4 | 0.11 |
| Hong Kong-China | 3.2 | 0.47 | 6.4 | 0.65 | 12.2 | 0.80 | 18.1 | 1.13 | 22.6 | 0.97 | 20.3 | 0.86 | 17.1 | 1.23 |
| Hungary | 10.8 | 0.91 | 19.2 | 1.25 | 25.7 | 1.24 | 21.9 | 1.09 | 13.0 | 0.81 | 6.5 | 0.80 | 2.9 | 0.67 |
| Iceland | 7.4 | 0.50 | 14.4 | 0.76 | 24.8 | 0.90 | 26.9 | 0.96 | 17.3 | 0.91 | 7.7 | 0.66 | 1.6 | 0.32 |
| Indonesia | 38.8 | 1.92 | 30.4 | 1.26 | 19.8 | 1.00 | 7.8 | 0.89 | 2.8 | 0.69 | 0.4 ! | 0.18 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Ireland | 10.2 | 0.79 | 16.5 | 0.66 | 24.7 | 1.03 | 24.5 | 0.99 | 15.7 | 0.73 | 6.5 | 0.46 | 1.8 | 0.27 |
| Israel | 19.4 | 1.39 | 20.1 | 0.93 | 22.4 | 0.84 | 19.5 | 0.85 | 11.8 | 0.86 | 5.1 | 0.54 | 1.6 | 0.34 |
| Italy | 10.7 | 0.46 | 15.9 | 0.50 | 22.4 | 0.57 | 21.7 | 0.65 | 15.7 | 0.51 | 9.0 | 0.45 | 4.6 | 0.37 |
| Japan | 2.3 | 0.40 | 6.1 | 0.58 | 14.4 | 0.90 | 22.4 | 0.94 | 23.1 | 0.90 | 17.9 | 0.86 | 13.8 | 1.14 |
| Jordan | 37.4 | 1.43 | 30.8 | 0.92 | 20.6 | 1.00 | 8.5 | 0.68 | 2.1 | 0.44 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | 13.6 | 1.02 | 24.2 | 1.27 | 28.6 | 1.15 | 19.8 | 0.96 | 10.0 | 1.12 | 3.1 | 0.58 | 0.7 ! | 0.33 |
| Korea, Republic of | 2.8 | 0.46 | 5.9 | 0.54 | 12.7 | 0.81 | 18.6 | 1.03 | 20.9 | 0.90 | 18.5 | 0.89 | 20.6 | 1.62 |
| Latvia | 5.2 | 0.63 | 13.7 | 0.95 | 25.4 | 1.18 | 26.7 | 0.89 | 18.2 | 1.06 | 8.0 | 0.72 | 2.8 | 0.39 |
| Liechtenstein | 3.9 ! | 1.22 | 7.6 | 1.83 | 16.2 | 2.12 | 23.9 | 2.71 | 21.7 | 2.69 | 16.9 | 2.25 | 9.8 | 2.40 |
| Lithuania | 12.2 | 0.85 | 18.3 | 0.89 | 24.1 | 1.09 | 22.0 | 0.89 | 14.6 | 0.78 | 6.5 | 0.53 | 2.2 | 0.37 |
| Luxembourg | 8.7 | 0.49 | 16.9 | 0.50 | 23.5 | 0.78 | 22.9 | 0.79 | 17.0 | 0.59 | 8.2 | 0.42 | 2.7 | 0.24 |
| Macao-China | 3.7 | 0.28 | 7.0 | 0.35 | 13.8 | 0.60 | 19.9 | 0.76 | 21.8 | 0.67 | 18.2 | 0.59 | 15.6 | 0.56 |
| Malaysia | 19.1 | 1.26 | 26.4 | 1.04 | 26.1 | 0.85 | 17.5 | 0.94 | 8.2 | 0.75 | 2.4 | 0.36 | 0.3 ! | 0.15 |
| Mexico | 25.0 | 0.72 | 29.4 | 0.51 | 26.2 | 0.49 | 13.7 | 0.50 | 4.6 | 0.25 | 1.0 | 0.10 | 0.1 | 0.02 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 25.2 | 0.71 | 30.8 | 1.04 | 25.2 | 0.92 | 13.0 | 0.68 | 4.8 | 0.46 | 0.9 | 0.17 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Netherlands | 5.8 | 0.76 | 12.5 | 0.82 | 20.9 | 1.14 | 25.1 | 1.39 | 21.1 | 1.41 | 10.6 | 0.90 | 4.1 | 0.66 |
| New Zealand | 8.5 | 0.73 | 16.3 | 0.78 | 23.4 | 1.00 | 22.8 | 1.06 | 15.8 | 1.07 | 8.6 | 0.94 | 4.4 | 0.44 |
| Norway | 11.1 | 0.79 | 16.5 | 0.73 | 23.4 | 0.69 | 23.0 | 1.06 | 15.4 | 0.85 | 7.5 | 0.51 | 3.2 | 0.42 |
| Peru | 45.4 | 1.87 | 26.5 | 0.98 | 17.0 | 0.95 | 7.5 | 0.71 | 2.7 | 0.46 | 0.8 ! | 0.26 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Poland | 3.7 | 0.50 | 11.7 | 0.82 | 21.1 | 0.91 | 23.2 | 0.78 | 19.0 | 0.74 | 12.9 | 0.86 | 8.5 | 1.06 |
| Portugal | 11.1 | 0.98 | 15.9 | 0.91 | 20.7 | 0.83 | 20.2 | 1.05 | 17.2 | 0.81 | 10.0 | 0.71 | 5.0 | 0.50 |
| Qatar | 44.7 | 0.52 | 23.4 | 0.41 | 16.0 | 0.53 | 9.2 | 0.36 | 4.5 | 0.20 | 1.8 | 0.14 | 0.3 | 0.08 |
| Romania | 16.2 | 1.19 | 24.0 | 1.12 | 26.9 | 1.01 | 18.5 | 1.15 | 9.4 | 0.94 | 3.8 | 0.57 | 1.2 ! | 0.39 |
| Russian Federation | 6.9 | 0.60 | 14.8 | 0.89 | 23.9 | 0.82 | 24.2 | 1.24 | 17.3 | 1.01 | 9.0 | 0.72 | 3.8 | 0.70 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 18.6 | 1.32 | 22.7 | 1.08 | 24.4 | 1.08 | 18.3 | 1.04 | 10.1 | 1.08 | 4.2 | 0.62 | 1.7 | 0.41 |
| Shanghai-China | 0.7 | 0.18 | 2.4 | 0.36 | 5.5 | 0.55 | 9.8 | 0.72 | 14.9 | 0.79 | 20.8 | 0.87 | 45.9 | 1.37 |
| Singapore | 3.2 | 0.30 | 6.4 | 0.36 | 11.2 | 0.48 | 16.7 | 0.59 | 19.7 | 0.63 | 19.4 | 0.90 | 23.4 | 0.74 |
| Slovak Republic | 11.2 | 1.01 | 15.1 | 0.89 | 21.6 | 1.00 | 21.4 | 0.94 | 16.0 | 1.01 | 9.6 | 0.74 | 5.1 | 0.70 |
| Slovenia | 6.5 | 0.45 | 14.0 | 0.70 | 22.8 | 0.96 | 22.8 | 0.97 | 17.9 | 0.79 | 10.7 | 0.62 | 5.2 | 0.42 |
| Spain | 10.1 | 0.52 | 17.7 | 0.65 | 24.7 | 0.75 | 23.4 | 0.80 | 15.6 | 0.54 | 6.6 | 0.36 | 2.0 | 0.16 |
| Sweden | 12.0 | 0.73 | 18.4 | 0.86 | 25.4 | 1.01 | 22.8 | 0.75 | 14.3 | 0.81 | 5.4 | 0.50 | 1.6 | 0.25 |
| Switzerland | 3.5 | 0.44 | 7.9 | 0.64 | 16.0 | 0.76 | 22.3 | 0.79 | 23.1 | 0.76 | 16.1 | 0.80 | 11.1 | 0.86 |
| Thailand | 21.7 | 1.20 | 25.8 | 1.10 | 25.1 | 1.05 | 15.5 | 1.02 | 7.4 | 0.76 | 3.3 | 0.49 | 1.4 | 0.36 |
| Tunisia | 40.8 | 1.84 | 28.4 | 1.19 | 18.9 | 1.01 | 8.2 | 0.67 | 2.6 | 0.59 | 0.8 ! | 0.35 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Turkey | 22.5 | 1.32 | 23.0 | 1.18 | 21.6 | 1.15 | 14.9 | 1.02 | 9.4 | 0.84 | 5.7 | 0.84 | 2.9 | 0.74 |
| United Arab Emirates | 25.5 | 0.99 | 24.7 | 0.62 | 22.5 | 0.68 | 15.9 | 0.68 | 7.9 | 0.48 | 2.8 | 0.28 | 0.7 | 0.13 |
| United Kingdom | 12.0 | 0.95 | 17.5 | 0.75 | 23.8 | 0.65 | 22.5 | 0.95 | 14.5 | 0.79 | 7.0 | 0.64 | 2.7 | 0.41 |
| United States | 13.5 | 1.02 | 20.9 | 0.98 | 25.0 | 0.87 | 20.6 | 0.91 | 12.4 | 0.84 | 5.4 | 0.54 | 2.2 | 0.36 |
| Uruguay | 28.5 | 1.24 | 25.5 | 1.08 | 22.6 | 0.86 | 14.8 | 0.81 | 6.7 | 0.60 | 1.6 | 0.32 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Vietnam | 6.4 | 0.94 | 12.8 | 1.02 | 21.8 | 1.10 | 24.2 | 1.14 | 18.6 | 0.99 | 10.7 | 0.89 | 5.5 | 0.87 |
| U.S. state education systems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut | 11.6 | 1.55 | 16.7 | 1.31 | 20.4 | 1.42 | 21.1 | 1.48 | 15.8 | 1.21 | 9.6 | 1.19 | 4.7 | 0.83 |
| Florida | 16.4 | 1.90 | 22.5 | 2.02 | 26.5 | 1.38 | 20.5 | 1.62 | 9.6 | 1.07 | 3.9 | 0.88 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Massachusetts | 9.2 | 0.90 | 15.3 | 1.44 | 21.2 | 1.54 | 21.4 | 1.57 | 16.4 | 1.31 | 10.5 | 1.69 | 6.0 | 1.43 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
$!$ Interpret data with caution. Estin
$\ddagger$ 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 content subscale scores. Exact cut scores are as follows: below level 1 ( 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 percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for
husetts are for public school students only
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012
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Table M3. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy process subscales, by proficiency level and education system: 2012-Continued

| Education system | Interpreting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 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 | 8.8 | 0.12 | 14.3 | 0.13 | 21.1 | 0.15 | 22.9 | 0.15 | 18.5 | 0.14 | 10.2 | 0.11 | 4.2 | 0.08 |
| Albania | 39.5 | 1.18 | 26.6 | 1.33 | 19.3 | 1.05 | 10.4 | 0.95 | 3.3 | 0.49 | 0.7 | 0.18 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 35.3 | 2.02 | 28.9 | 1.37 | 22.4 | 1.29 | 10.2 | 0.92 | 2.6 | 0.44 | 0.5 ! | 0.17 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Australia | 6.0 | 0.38 | 11.8 | 0.49 | 20.2 | 0.68 | 23.5 | 0.62 | 20.4 | 0.43 | 11.9 | 0.39 | 6.3 | 0.40 |
| Austria | 8.3 | 0.76 | 13.0 | 0.81 | 19.1 | 0.79 | 20.6 | 0.80 | 20.0 | 0.82 | 12.9 | 0.75 | 6.0 | 0.62 |
| Belgium | 7.6 | 0.55 | 12.4 | 0.59 | 18.4 | 0.58 | 21.4 | 0.65 | 20.4 | 0.65 | 13.2 | 0.49 | 6.6 | 0.41 |
| Brazil | 30.0 | 0.95 | 31.0 | 0.74 | 23.3 | 0.77 | 11.3 | 0.56 | 3.6 | 0.44 | 0.7 | 0.16 | 0.1 ! | 0.03 |
| Bulgaria | 20.6 | 1.54 | 21.7 | 0.99 | 23.1 | 1.02 | 19.3 | 0.85 | 10.6 | 0.79 | 3.9 | 0.51 | 0.8 ! | 0.24 |
| Canada | 4.2 | 0.28 | 9.8 | 0.41 | 19.7 | 0.60 | 26.0 | 0.58 | 22.2 | 0.51 | 12.8 | 0.69 | 5.3 | 0.39 |
| Chile | 17.9 | 1.24 | 28.0 | 0.93 | 27.2 | 1.02 | 17.7 | 0.88 | 7.3 | 0.67 | 1.8 | 0.26 | 0.2 ! | 0.06 |
| Chinese Taipei | 4.2 | 0.46 | 7.9 | 0.62 | 14.2 | 0.70 | 19.6 | 0.69 | 22.9 | 0.76 | 18.9 | 0.92 | 12.3 | 0.90 |
| Colombia | 34.7 | 1.41 | 32.8 | 1.03 | 22.2 | 0.91 | 7.8 | 0.62 | 2.1 | 0.28 | 0.3 | 0.08 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Costa Rica | 19.7 | 1.41 | 32.3 | 1.13 | 30.5 | 1.18 | 13.7 | 1.01 | 3.3 | 0.50 | 0.5 ! | 0.14 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 9.9 | 0.78 | 18.1 | 1.03 | 25.1 | 1.02 | 23.1 | 0.98 | 14.9 | 0.81 | 6.8 | 0.69 | 2.1 | 0.47 |
| Cyprus | 22.4 | 0.63 | 21.2 | 0.81 | 23.4 | 0.69 | 18.8 | 0.74 | 9.8 | 0.51 | 3.5 | 0.28 | 0.9 | 0.16 |
| Czech Republic | 8.6 | 0.78 | 14.3 | 0.83 | 21.4 | 0.92 | 24.1 | 1.02 | 18.4 | 1.00 | 9.5 | 0.66 | 3.7 | 0.34 |
| Denmark | 4.8 | 0.49 | 11.9 | 0.71 | 22.1 | 0.80 | 26.7 | 0.81 | 20.4 | 0.86 | 10.8 | 0.69 | 3.3 | 0.42 |
| Estonia | 3.5 | 0.38 | 10.8 | 0.68 | 22.3 | 0.83 | 28.0 | 0.95 | 21.4 | 1.04 | 10.3 | 0.62 | 3.7 | 0.36 |
| Finland | 3.2 | 0.34 | 7.7 | 0.53 | 18.2 | 0.71 | 27.8 | 0.79 | 24.5 | 0.67 | 13.6 | 0.59 | 5.0 | 0.44 |
| France | 8.2 | 0.73 | 11.7 | 0.89 | 18.7 | 0.90 | 22.0 | 0.87 | 20.0 | 1.11 | 13.1 | 0.87 | 6.2 | 0.58 |
| Germany | 7.1 | 0.74 | 11.6 | 0.78 | 17.6 | 1.07 | 21.8 | 0.86 | 21.7 | 0.91 | 13.5 | 0.88 | 6.7 | 0.65 |
| Greece | 13.3 | 1.02 | 18.6 | 0.76 | 23.6 | 0.85 | 22.5 | 0.91 | 14.4 | 0.93 | 6.0 | 0.59 | 1.6 | 0.24 |
| Hong Kong-China | 2.7 | 0.39 | 6.4 | 0.70 | 13.2 | 0.83 | 21.7 | 0.94 | 27.4 | 1.10 | 19.2 | 0.90 | 9.4 | 0.91 |
| Hungary | 12.4 | 0.93 | 15.9 | 0.94 | 23.5 | 0.93 | 22.6 | 0.94 | 16.0 | 0.83 | 7.3 | 0.66 | 2.2 | 0.40 |
| Iceland | 9.7 | 0.53 | 14.1 | 0.77 | 20.7 | 0.99 | 24.2 | 1.18 | 18.6 | 0.84 | 9.3 | 0.72 | 3.4 | 0.34 |
| Indonesia | 39.3 | 2.07 | 34.0 | 1.45 | 19.2 | 1.29 | 6.0 | 0.94 | 1.3 ! | 0.47 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Ireland | 5.5 | 0.61 | 11.3 | 0.76 | 22.2 | 0.96 | 26.3 | 0.87 | 21.2 | 0.79 | 10.0 | 0.56 | 3.5 | 0.32 |
| Israel | 19.3 | 1.32 | 17.1 | 0.78 | 19.9 | 1.14 | 19.2 | 0.87 | 13.9 | 0.77 | 7.4 | 0.70 | 3.2 | 0.62 |
| Italy | 9.7 | 0.45 | 13.6 | 0.52 | 20.3 | 0.47 | 22.3 | 0.53 | 18.2 | 0.48 | 10.6 | 0.42 | 5.2 | 0.34 |
| Japan | 3.4 | 0.49 | 8.5 | 0.71 | 17.6 | 0.95 | 25.1 | 1.07 | 24.3 | 1.06 | 15.0 | 0.83 | 6.1 | 0.70 |
| Jordan | 36.6 | 1.53 | 32.3 | 0.84 | 21.8 | 1.14 | 7.3 | 0.58 | 1.7 | 0.43 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | 16.1 | 0.96 | 34.7 | 1.26 | 32.3 | 1.00 | 14.0 | 1.27 | 2.7 | 0.49 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Korea, Republic of | 3.7 | 0.49 | 7.6 | 0.64 | 15.7 | 0.82 | 22.9 | 0.88 | 24.6 | 0.87 | 17.0 | 0.93 | 8.6 | 0.97 |
| Latvia | 7.0 | 0.70 | 16.0 | 0.89 | 25.2 | 1.12 | 26.0 | 0.99 | 17.1 | 0.84 | 6.9 | 0.62 | 1.8 | 0.37 |
| Liechtenstein | 5.2 | 1.47 | 9.4 | 2.00 | 15.1 | 2.72 | 19.3 | 3.40 | 21.2 | 2.78 | 19.1 | 2.48 | 10.6 | 1.72 |
| Lithuania | 10.7 | 0.73 | 18.6 | 0.86 | 26.1 | 1.02 | 23.3 | 0.84 | 14.3 | 0.82 | 5.7 | 0.50 | 1.3 | 0.27 |
| Luxembourg | 10.4 | 0.52 | 14.7 | 0.70 | 19.9 | 0.70 | 21.6 | 0.61 | 18.2 | 0.57 | 10.7 | 0.49 | 4.6 | 0.27 |
| Macao-China | 3.6 | 0.40 | 8.4 | 0.63 | 17.7 | 0.70 | 25.1 | 0.87 | 25.0 | 0.66 | 14.7 | 0.72 | 5.6 | 0.36 |
| Malaysia | 21.5 | 1.33 | 30.2 | 1.06 | 28.6 | 0.98 | 14.8 | 0.92 | 4.4 | 0.65 | 0.5 ! | 0.18 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Mexico | 22.0 | 0.66 | 32.1 | 0.62 | 29.2 | 0.55 | 13.1 | 0.46 | 3.2 | 0.21 | 0.4 | 0.07 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 27.7 | 0.88 | 26.6 | 1.08 | 23.5 | 1.19 | 14.4 | 0.87 | 5.9 | 0.55 | 1.5 | 0.37 | 0.3 ! | 0.10 |
| Netherlands | 5.1 | 0.83 | 11.1 | 0.83 | 17.2 | 1.01 | 21.8 | 1.23 | 22.8 | 1.21 | 15.2 | 1.00 | 6.9 | 0.62 |
| New Zealand | 7.9 | 0.58 | 13.0 | 0.65 | 19.2 | 0.96 | 21.1 | 0.93 | 19.3 | 0.68 | 12.5 | 0.76 | 7.0 | 0.52 |
| Norway | 7.6 | 0.65 | 13.3 | 0.84 | 21.7 | 0.82 | 24.8 | 0.94 | 19.2 | 0.78 | 9.3 | 0.63 | 3.9 | 0.44 |
| Peru | 46.6 | 1.82 | 27.4 | 1.04 | 16.2 | 1.09 | 7.1 | 0.83 | 2.1 | 0.36 | 0.5 ! | 0.16 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Poland | 3.9 | 0.36 | 10.9 | 0.74 | 21.5 | 0.90 | 26.2 | 0.78 | 22.2 | 0.84 | 11.1 | 0.72 | 4.2 | 0.75 |
| Portugal | 8.2 | 0.90 | 15.1 | 0.97 | 23.0 | 0.86 | 24.4 | 1.00 | 18.4 | 0.89 | 8.7 | 0.59 | 2.3 | 0.32 |
| Qatar | 46.7 | 0.45 | 22.0 | 0.54 | 15.3 | 0.48 | 9.2 | 0.32 | 4.6 | 0.23 | 1.8 | 0.13 | 0.4 | 0.08 |
| Romania | 13.9 | 1.29 | 27.3 | 1.40 | 31.8 | 1.06 | 19.1 | 1.07 | 6.6 | 0.78 | 1.2 | 0.30 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Russian Federation | 10.1 | 0.78 | 18.1 | 0.90 | 26.9 | 0.97 | 24.2 | 1.04 | 14.2 | 0.83 | 5.2 | 0.47 | 1.2 | 0.20 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 17.0 | 1.34 | 22.7 | 1.14 | 26.4 | 0.97 | 19.6 | 1.08 | 10.3 | 0.84 | 3.3 | 0.51 | 0.8 | 0.22 |
| Shanghai-China | 1.5 | 0.30 | 4.3 | 0.48 | 10.9 | 0.64 | 18.4 | 1.01 | 24.4 | 1.44 | 22.8 | 0.96 | 17.7 | 1.02 |
| Singapore | 3.3 | 0.28 | 7.7 | 0.46 | 14.0 | 0.62 | 19.8 | 0.75 | 22.7 | 0.97 | 18.6 | 0.99 | 14.0 | 0.55 |
| Slovak Republic | 13.6 | 0.98 | 16.8 | 0.88 | 22.3 | 1.08 | 22.0 | 0.87 | 15.4 | 0.86 | 7.3 | 0.54 | 2.5 | 0.40 |
| Slovenia | 6.6 | 0.47 | 14.9 | 0.64 | 23.5 | 1.02 | 23.0 | 0.96 | 18.6 | 0.73 | 10.2 | 0.55 | 3.3 | 0.42 |
| Spain | 8.5 | 0.43 | 13.6 | 0.63 | 21.8 | 0.83 | 24.4 | 0.65 | 18.9 | 0.60 | 9.6 | 0.41 | 3.1 | 0.22 |
| Sweden | 10.1 | 0.71 | 15.7 | 0.63 | 22.7 | 0.78 | 23.6 | 0.98 | 17.0 | 0.88 | 8.2 | 0.51 | 2.8 | 0.34 |
| Switzerland | 5.0 | 0.43 | 9.4 | 0.58 | 16.8 | 0.82 | 23.3 | 0.76 | 22.8 | 0.65 | 15.2 | 0.80 | 7.5 | 0.81 |
| Thailand | 16.9 | 1.11 | 28.5 | 1.11 | 30.0 | 1.04 | 16.3 | 0.97 | 6.0 | 0.66 | 1.9 | 0.38 | 0.4 ! | 0.15 |
| Tunisia | 36.8 | 1.90 | 31.5 | 1.26 | 21.3 | 1.37 | 7.7 | 0.78 | 2.2 | 0.58 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Turkey | 17.1 | 1.08 | 25.2 | 1.30 | 25.4 | 1.15 | 16.6 | 1.00 | 9.9 | 1.17 | 4.2 | 0.73 | 1.7 ! | 0.54 |
| United Arab Emirates | 22.3 | 0.90 | 26.3 | 0.84 | 24.7 | 0.63 | 16.2 | 0.71 | 7.5 | 0.48 | 2.5 | 0.28 | 0.5 | 0.13 |
| United Kingdom | 8.2 | 0.82 | 13.2 | 0.80 | 20.7 | 0.76 | 23.6 | 0.99 | 19.2 | 0.82 | 10.4 | 0.62 | 4.7 | 0.45 |
| United States | 8.1 | 0.83 | 16.3 | 0.88 | 24.0 | 0.97 | 23.0 | 0.90 | 17.0 | 1.02 | 8.4 | 0.62 | 3.2 | 0.43 |
| Uruguay | 28.5 | 1.19 | 27.4 | 0.83 | 24.0 | 1.13 | 13.2 | 0.73 | 5.6 | 0.58 | 1.3 | 0.34 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Vietnam | 4.5 | 0.82 | 13.0 | 1.28 | 25.3 | 1.18 | 29.7 | 1.22 | 18.8 | 1.21 | 7.0 | 0.82 | 1.8 | 0.43 |
| U.S. state education systems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut | 7.2 | 1.29 | 11.6 | 1.18 | 18.2 | 1.35 | 23.1 | 1.64 | 20.4 | 1.73 | 12.7 | 1.39 | 6.7 | 1.05 |
| Florida | 10.0 | 1.43 | 18.8 | 1.59 | 25.1 | 1.70 | 23.7 | 1.84 | 13.9 | 1.29 | 6.3 | 1.09 | 2.2 ! | 0.81 |
| Massachusetts | 5.7 | 0.73 | 11.2 | 0.97 | 18.7 | 1.53 | 22.0 | 1.59 | 20.3 | 1.49 | 13.6 | 1.39 | 8.6 | 1.54 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
! 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 process subscale scores. Exact cut 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 percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Cource: Onization forsachor
SOURCE• Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Table M4. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Average score | s.e. | Education system | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average | 4940 | 0.5 |  |  |  |
| Shanghai-China | 6130 | 3.3 | Lithuania | 479 | 2.6 |
| Singapore | 5730 | 1.3 | Sweden | 478 | 2.3 |
| Hong Kong-China | 5610 | 3.2 | Hungary | 477 | 3.2 |
| Chinese Taipei | 560 | 3.3 | Croatia | 471 ( | 3.5 |
| Korea, Republic of | 5540 | 4.6 | Israel | 466 | 4.7 |
| Macao-China | 5380 | 1.0 | Greece | 453 - | 2.5 |
| Japan | 5360 | 3.6 | Serbia, Republic of | 449 | 3.4 |
| Liechtenstein | 5350 | 4.0 | Turkey | 448 | 4.8 |
| Switzerland | 5310 | 3.0 | Romania | 445 | 3.8 |
| Netherlands | 5230 | 3.5 | Cyprus | 440 | 1.1 |
| Estonia | 5210 | 2.0 | Bulgaria | 439 ( | 4.0 |
| Finland | 5190 | 1.9 | United Arab Emirates | 434 | 2.4 |
| Canada | 5180 | 1.8 | Kazakhstan | 432 | 3.0 |
| Poland | 5180 | 3.6 | Thailand | 427 - | 3.4 |
| Belgium | 5150 | 2.1 | Chile | 423 | 3.1 |
| Germany | 5140 | 2.9 | Malaysia | 421 - | 3.2 |
| Vietnam | 5110 | 4.8 | Mexico | 413 ( | 1.4 |
| Austria | 5060 | 2.7 | Montenegro, Republic of | 410 - | 1.1 |
| Australia | 5040 | 1.6 | Uruguay | 409 | 2.8 |
| Ireland | 5010 | 2.2 | Costa Rica | 407 - | 3.0 |
| Slovenia | 5010 | 1.2 | Albania | 394 | 2.0 |
| Denmark | 5000 | 2.3 | Brazil | 391 - | 2.1 |
| New Zealand | 500 | 2.2 | Argentina | 388 | 3.5 |
| Czech Republic | 4990 | 2.9 | Tunisia | 388 ( | 3.9 |
| France | 4950 | 2.5 | Jordan | 386 | 3.1 |
| United Kingdom | 4940 | 3.3 | Colombia | 376 | 2.9 |
| Iceland | 4930 | 1.7 | Qatar | 376 | 0.8 |
| Latvia | 4910 | 2.8 | Indonesia | 375 | 4.0 |
| Luxembourg | 4900 | 1.1 | Peru | 368 - | 3.7 |
| Norway | 489 | 2.7 |  |  |  |
| Portugal | 487 | 3.8 |  |  |  |
| Italy | 485 | 2.0 | U.S. state education |  |  |
| Spain | 484 | 1.9 | systems |  |  |
| Russian Federation | 482 | 3.0 | Massachusetts | 5140 | 6.2 |
| Slovak Republic | 482 | 3.4 | Connecticut | 5060 | 6.2 |
| United States | 481 | 3.6 | Florida | 467 (1) | 5.8 |

DAverage score is higher than U.S. average score.
( ) Average score is lower than U.S. average score.
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 average score. 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 . All average scores reported as higher or lower than the U.S. average score are different at the .05 level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate nonOECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. This table corresponds to table 1 in Performance of U.S. 15-Year-Old Students in Mathematics, Science, and Reading Literacy in an International Context (NCES 2014-024).
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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| Quantity |  |  | Uncertainty and data |  |  | Change and relationships |  |  | Space and shape |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Education system | Average score | s.e. | Education system | Average score | s.e. | Education system | Average score | s.e. | Education system | Average score | . |
| OECD average | 4950 | 0.5 | OECD average | 493 | 0.5 | OECD average | 493 | 0.6 | OECD average | 4900 | 0.5 |
| Shanghai-China | 5910 | 3.2 | Shanghai-China | 5920 | 3.0 | Shanghai-China | 6240 | 3.6 | Shanghai-China | 6490 | 3.6 |
| Singapore | 569 | 1.2 | Singapore | 559 | 1.5 | Singapore | 580 | 1.5 | Chinese Taipei | 5920 | 3.8 |
| Hong Kong-China | 5660 | 3.4 | Hong Kong-China | 5530 | 3.0 | Hong Kong-China | 5640 | 3.6 | Singapore | 5800 | 1.5 |
| Chinese Taipei | 5430 | 3.1 | Chinese Taipei | 5490 | 3.2 | Chinese Taipei | 5610 | 3.5 | Korea, Republic of | 5730 | 5.2 |
| Liechtenstein | 538 | 4.1 | Korea, Republic of | 5380 | 4.2 | Korea, Republic of | 5590 | 5.2 | Hong Kong-China | 5670 | 4.0 |
| Korea, Republic of | 537 | 4.1 | Netherlands | 5320 | 3.8 | Macao-China | 5420 | 1.2 | Macao-China | 5580 | 1.4 |
| Netherlands | 5320 | 3.6 | Japan | 528 | 3.5 | Japan | 5420 | 4.0 | Japan | 558 | 3.7 |
| Switzerland | 5310 | 3.1 | Liechtenstein | 5260 | 3.9 | Liechtenstein | 5420 | 4.0 | Switzerland | 5440 | 3.1 |
| Macao-China | 5310 | 1.1 | Macao-China | 5250 | 1.1 | Estonia | 5300 | 2.3 | Liechtenstein | 5390 | 4.5 |
| Finland | 527 | 1.9 | Switzerland | 5220 | 3.2 | Switzerland | 5300 | 3.4 | Poland | 5240 | 4.2 |
| Estonia | 525 | 2.2 | Vietnam | 5190 | 4.5 | Canada | 5250 | 2.0 | Estonia | 5130 | 2.5 |
| Belgium | 5190 | 2.0 | Finland | 5190 | 2.4 | Finland | 5200 | 2.6 | Canada | 5100 | 2.1 |
| Poland | 519 | 3.5 | Poland | 5170 | 3.5 | Netherlands | 5180 | 3.9 | Belgium | 509 | 2.4 |
| Japan | 5180 | 3.6 | Canada | 5160 | 1.8 | Germany | 5160 | 3.8 | Netherlands | 5070 | 3.5 |
| Germany | 5170 | 3.1 | Estonia | 5100 | 2.0 | Belgium | 5130 | 2.6 | Germany | 5070 | 3.2 |
| Canada | 5150 | 2.2 | Germany | 5090 | 3.0 | Vietnam | 5090 | 5.1 | Vietnam | 5070 | 5.1 |
| Austria | 5100 | 2.9 | Ireland | 5090 | 2.5 | Poland | 5090 | 4.1 | Finland | 5070 | 2.1 |
| Vietnam | 509 | 5.5 | Belgium | 5080 | 2.5 | Australia | 5090 | 1.7 | Slovenia | 5030 | 1.4 |
| Ireland | 5050 | 2.6 | Australia | 5080 | 1.5 | Austria | 5060 | 3.4 | Austria | 5010 | 3.1 |
| Czech Republic | 5050 | 3.0 | New Zealand | 5060 | 2.6 | Ireland | 5010 | 2.6 | Czech Republic | 499 | 3.4 |
| Slovenia | 504 | 1.2 | Denmark | 5050 | 2.4 | New Zealand | 5010 | 2.5 | Latvia | 4970 | 3.3 |
| Denmark | 5020 | 2.4 | United Kingdom | 5020 | 3.0 | Czech Republic | 4990 | 3.5 | Denmark | 4970 | 2.5 |
| Australia | 5000 | 1.9 | Austria | 499 | 2.7 | Slovenia | 4990 | 1.1 | Australia | 4970 | 1.8 |
| New Zealand | 499 | 2.4 | Norway | 497 | 3.0 | France | 497 | 2.7 | Russian Federation | 4960 | 3.9 |
| Iceland | 496 | 1.9 | Slovenia | 4960 | 1.2 | Latvia | 496 | 3.4 | Portugal | 4910 | 4.2 |
| France | 4960 | 2.6 | Iceland | 496 | 1.8 | United Kingdom | 496 | 3.4 | New Zealand | 4910 | 2.4 |
| Luxembourg | 4950 | 1.0 | France | 492 | 2.7 | Denmark | 494 | 2.7 | Slovak Republic | 490 | 4.1 |
| United Kingdom | 4940 | 3.8 | United States | 488 | 3.5 | Russian Federation | 491 | 3.4 | France | 489 | 2.7 |
| Norway | 492 | 2.9 | Czech Republic | 488 | 2.8 | United States | 488 | 3.5 | Iceland | 4890 | 1.5 |
| Spain | 4910 | 2.3 | Spain | 487 | 2.3 | Luxembourg | 488 | 1.0 | Italy | 4870 | 2.5 |
| Italy | 4910 | 2.0 | Portugal | 486 | 3.8 | Iceland | 487 | 1.9 | Luxembourg | 4860 | 1.0 |
| Latvia | 487 | 2.9 | Luxembourg | 483 | 1.0 | Portugal | 486 | 4.1 | Norway | 4800 | 3.3 |
| Slovak Republic | 486 | 3.5 | Sweden | 483 | 2.5 | Spain | 482 | 2.0 | Ireland | 4780 | 2.6 |
| Lithuania | 483 | 2.8 | Italy | 482 | 2.0 | Hungary | 481 | 3.5 | Spain | 4770 | 2.0 |
| Sweden | 482 | 2.5 | Latvia | 478 ( | 2.8 | Lithuania | 479 | 3.2 | United Kingdom | 4750 | 3.5 |
| Portugal | 481 | 4.0 | Hungary | 476 | 3.3 | Norway | 478 ( | 3.1 | Hungary | 474 | 3.4 |
| Croatia | 480 | 3.7 | Lithuania | 474 ( | 2.7 | Italy | 477 ( | 2.1 | Lithuania | 472 | 3.1 |
| Israel | 480 | 5.2 | Slovak Republic | 472 | 3.6 | Slovak Republic | 474 | 4.0 | Sweden | 469 | 2.5 |
| United States | 478 | 3.9 | Croatia | 468 | 3.5 | Sweden | 469 ( | 2.8 | United States | 463 | 4.0 |
| Russian Federation | 478 | 3.0 | Israel | 465 | 4.7 | Croatia | 468 | 4.2 | Croatia | 460 | 3.9 |
| Hungary | 476 | 3.4 | Russian Federation | 463 | 3.3 | Israel | 462 | 5.3 | Kazakhstan | 450 ( | 3.9 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 456 ( | 3.7 | Greece | 460 | 2.6 | Turkey | 448 | 5.0 | Israel | 449 ( | 4.8 |
| Greece | 455 | 3.0 | Serbia, Republic of | 448 | 3.3 | Greece | 446 | 3.2 | Romania | 447 (1) | 4.1 |
| Romania | 443 | 4.5 | Turkey | 447 | 4.6 | Romania | 446 | 3.9 | Serbia, Republic of | 446 | 3.9 |
| Bulgaria | 443 | 4.3 | Cyprus | 442 | 1.1 | United Arab Emirates | 442 | 2.6 | Turkey | 443 ( | 5.5 |
| Turkey | 442 | 5.0 | Romania | 437 ( | 3.3 | Serbia, Republic of | 442 | 4.1 | Bulgaria | 442 | 4.3 |
| Cyprus | 439 | 1.1 | Thailand | 433 | 3.1 | Cyprus | 440 | 1.2 | Greece | 436 | 2.6 |
| United Arab Emirates | 431 ¢ | 2.7 | United Arab Emirates | 432 | 2.4 | Bulgaria | 434 | 4.5 | Cyprus | 436 ( | 1.1 |
| Kazakhstan | 428 ( | 3.5 | Bulgaria | 432 | 3.9 | Kazakhstan | 433 | 3.2 | Malaysia | 434 | 3.4 |
| Chile | 421 \% | 3.3 | Chile | 430 ( | 2.9 | Thailand | 414 | 3.9 | Thailand | 432 | 4.1 |
| Thailand | 419 | 3.7 | Malaysia | 422 | 3.0 | Chile | 411 ( | 3.5 | United Arab Emirates | 425 | 2.4 |
| Mexico | 414 | 1.5 | Montenegro, Republic of | 415 | 1.0 | Mexico | 405 | 1.6 | Chile | 419 ( | 3.2 |
| Uruguay | 411 \% | 3.2 | Costa Rica | 414 ( | 2.9 | Costa Rica | 402 | 3.5 | Albania | 418 (1) | 2.6 |
| Malaysia | 409 ( | 3.6 | Kazakhstan | 414 | 2.6 | Uruguay | 401 (1) | 3.2 | Uruguay | 413 | 3.1 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 409 | 1.2 | Mexico | 413 | 1.2 | Malaysia | 401 \% | 4.0 | Mexico | 413 | 1.6 |
| Costa Rica | 406 ( | 3.6 | Uruguay | 407 (\%) | 2.7 | Montenegro, Republic of | 399 | 1.3 | Montenegro, Republic of | 412 | 1.1 |
| Brazil | 393 | 2.5 | Brazil | 402 ( | 2.0 | Albania | 388 | 2.1 | Costa Rica | 397 | 3.2 |
| Argentina | 391 | 3.7 | Tunisia | 399 | 3.6 | Jordan | 387 | 3.7 | Jordan | 385 | 3.1 |
| Albania | 386 © | 2.7 | Jordan | 394 | 3.2 | Tunisia | 379 ( | 4.5 | Argentina | 385 | 3.5 |
| Tunisia | 378 | 4.6 | Argentina | 389 | 3.5 | Argentina | 379 | 4.2 | Indonesia | 383 | 4.2 |
| Colombia | 375 | 3.4 | Colombia | 388 | 2.4 | Brazil | 372 | 2.7 | Tunisia | 382 | 3.9 |
| Qatar | 371 | 0.9 | Albania | 386 | 2.4 | Indonesia | 364 \% | 4.3 | Brazil | 381 (\%) | 2.0 |
| Jordan | 367 ¢ | 3.4 | Indonesia | 384 | 3.9 | Qatar | 363 | 0.9 | Qatar | 380 ( | 1.0 |
| Peru | 365 \% | 4.1 | Qatar | 382 ( | 0.8 | Colombia | 357 (\%) | 3.7 | Peru | 370 | 4.1 |
| Indonesia | 362 © | 4.7 | Peru | 373 | 3.3 | Peru | 349 ( | 4.5 | Colombia | 369 ( | 3.5 |
| U.S. state education systems |  |  | U.S. state education systems |  |  | U.S. state education systems |  |  | U.S. state education systems |  |  |
| Massachusetts | 5060 | 6.0 | Massachusetts | 5230 | 6.4 | Massachusetts | 5180 | 6.7 | Massachusetts | 498 © | 7.2 |
| Connecticut | 5020 | 6.5 | Connecticut | 5120 | 5.8 | Connecticut | 5150 | 7.0 | Connecticut | 4870 | 7.0 |
| Florida | 458 | 6.4 | Florida | 475 | 5.9 | Florida | 476 | 5.6 | Florida | 446 * | 6.4 |
| 0 Average score is higher than U.S ( $)$ Average score is lower than U.S. NOTE: Education systems are order lower than the U.S. average score a SOURCE: Organization for Economic | re. <br> 2012 average subs erent at the .05 sign operation and Deve | le score ment (C | The OECD average is the average of l of statistical significance. Standard $E D$ ), Program for International Stude | national averages of the is noted by s.e. Italic sessment (PISA), 20 | OECD indicat 2. | ember countries, with each country w on-OECD countries and education sy | ed equally. Scores s. Results for Conne | reported icut, Flo | on a scale from 0 to 1,000. All a | es reported as higher |  |
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Table M6. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy process subscales, by education system: 2012

| Formulating |  |  | Employing |  |  | Interpreting |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Education system | Average score | s.e. | Education system | Average score | s.e. | Education system | Average score | s.e. |
| OECD average | 4920 | 0.5 | OECD average | 4930 | 0.5 | OECD average | 497 | 0.5 |
| Shanghai-China | 6240 | 4.1 | Shanghai-China | 6130 | 3.0 | Shanghai-China | 5790 | 2.9 |
| Singapore | 5820 | 1.6 | Singapore | 5740 | 1.2 | Singapore | 5550 | 1.4 |
| Chinese Taipei | 5780 | 4.0 | Hong Kong-China | 5580 | 3.1 | Hong Kong-China | 5510 | 3.4 |
| Hong Kong-China | 5680 | 3.7 | Korea, Republic of | 5530 | 4.3 | Chinese Taipei | 5490 | 3.0 |
| Korea, Republic of | 5620 | 5.1 | Chinese Taipei | 5490 | 3.1 | Liechtenstein | 5400 | 4.1 |
| Japan | 5540 | 4.2 | Liechtenstein | 5360 | 3.7 | Korea, Republic of | 5400 | 4.2 |
| Macao-China | 5450 | 1.4 | Macao-China | 5360 | 1.1 | Japan | 5310 | 3.5 |
| Switzerland | 5380 | 3.1 | Japan | 5300 | 3.5 | Macao-China | 5300 | 1.0 |
| Liechtenstein | 5350 | 4.4 | Switzerland | 5290 | 2.9 | Switzerland | 5290 | 3.4 |
| Netherlands | 5270 | 3.8 | Estonia | 5240 | 2.1 | Finland | 5280 | 2.2 |
| Finland | 5190 | 2.4 | Vietnam | 5230 | 5.1 | Netherlands | 5260 | 3.6 |
| Estonia | 5170 | 2.3 | Poland | 5190 | 3.5 | Canada | 5210 | 2.0 |
| Canada | 5160 | 2.2 | Netherlands | 5180 | 3.4 | Germany | 5170 | 3.2 |
| Poland | 5160 | 4.2 | Canada | 5170 | 1.9 | Poland | 5150 | 3.5 |
| Belgium | 5120 | 2.4 | Germany | 5160 | 2.8 | Australia | 5140 | 1.7 |
| Germany | 5110 | 3.4 | Belgium | 5160 | 2.1 | Belgium | 5130 | 2.4 |
| Denmark | 5020 | 2.4 | Finland | 5160 | 1.8 | Estonia | 5130 | 2.1 |
| Iceland | 5000 | 1.7 | Austria | 5100 | 2.5 | New Zealand | 5110 | 2.5 |
| Austria | 4990 | 3.2 | Slovenia | 5050 | 1.2 | France | 5110 | 2.5 |
| Australia | 4980 | 1.9 | Czech Republic | 5040 | 2.9 | Austria | 5090 | 3.3 |
| Vietnam | 4970 | 5.1 | Ireland | 5020 | 2.4 | Denmark | 5080 | 2.5 |
| New Zealand | 4960 | 2.5 | Australia | 5000 | 1.7 | Ireland | 5070 | 2.5 |
| Czech Republic | 4950 | 3.4 | France | 4960 | 2.3 | United Kingdom | 5010 | 3.5 |
| Ireland | 4920 | 2.4 | Latvia | 4950 | 2.8 | Norway | 499 | 3.1 |
| Slovenia | 4920 | 1.5 | New Zealand | 4950 | 2.2 | Italy | 4980 | 2.1 |
| Norway | 4890 | 3.1 | Denmark | 4950 | 2.4 | Slovenia | 4980 | 1.4 |
| United Kingdom | 4890 | 3.7 | Luxembourg | 4930 | 0.9 | Vietnam | 497 | 4.5 |
| Latvia | 4880 | 3.0 | United Kingdom | 4920 | 3.1 | Spain | 495 | 2.2 |
| France | 483 | 2.8 | Iceland | 4900 | 1.6 | Luxembourg | 495 | 1.1 |
| Luxembourg | 482 | 1.0 | Portugal | 489 | 3.7 | Czech Republic | 494 | 3.0 |
| Russian Federation | 481 | 3.6 | Russian Federation | 487 | 3.1 | Iceland | 492 | 1.9 |
| Slovak Republic | 480 | 4.1 | Norway | 486 | 2.7 | Portugal | 490 | 4.0 |
| Sweden | 479 | 2.7 | Italy | 485 | 2.1 | United States | 490 | 3.9 |
| Portugal | 479 | 4.3 | Slovak Republic | 485 | 3.4 | Latvia | 486 | 3.0 |
| Lithuania | 477 | 3.1 | Lithuania | 482 | 2.7 | Sweden | 485 | 2.4 |
| Spain | 477 | 2.2 | Spain | 481 | 2.0 | Croatia | 477 ® | 3.5 |
| United States | 476 | 4.1 | Hungary | 481 | 3.2 | Hungary | 477 ® | 3.1 |
| Italy | 475 | 2.2 | United States | 480 | 3.5 | Slovak Republic | 473 | 3.3 |
| Hungary | 469 | 3.6 | Croatia | 478 | 3.7 | Russian Federation | 471 ( | 2.9 |
| Israel | 465 | 4.7 | Sweden | 474 | 2.5 | Lithuania | 471 ® | 2.8 |
| Croatia | 453 ( | 4.0 | Israel | 469 - | 4.6 | Greece | 467 ( ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 3.1 |
| Turkey | 449 - | 5.2 | Serbia, Republic of | 451 - | 3.4 | Israel | 462 ( | 5.2 |
| Greece | 448 | 2.3 | Greece | 449 | 2.7 | Turkey | 446 ( | 4.6 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 447 ( | 3.8 | Turkey | 448 | 5.0 | Serbia, Republic of | 445 | 3.4 |
| Romania | 445 - | 4.1 | Romania | 446 - | 4.1 | Bulgaria | 441 ( | 4.2 |
| Kazakhstan | 442 ( | 3.8 | Cyprus | 443 ( | 1.1 | Romania | 438 ( | 3.1 |
| Bulgaria | 437 ( ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | 4.2 | United Arab Emirates | 440 ( | 2.4 | Cyprus | 436 ( | 1.3 |
| Cyprus | 437 ® | 1.2 | Bulgaria | 439 - | 4.1 | Chile | 433 - | 3.1 |
| United Arab Emirates | 426 | 2.7 | Kazakhstan | 433 ( | 3.2 | Thailand | 432 - | 3.4 |
| Chile | 420 ( | 3.2 | Thailand | 426 ( ${ }^{\text {( }}$ | 3.5 | United Arab Emirates | 428 - | 2.4 |
| Thailand | 416 | 4.0 | Malaysia | 423 ( | 3.3 | Kazakhstan | 420 | 2.6 |
| Mexico | 409 | 1.7 | Chile | 416 | 3.3 | Malaysia | 418 ( | 3.1 |
| Uruguay | 406 | 3.2 | Mexico | 413 ( | 1.4 | Costa Rica | 418 | 2.9 |
| Malaysia | 406 | 3.6 | Montenegro, Republic of | 409 | 1.1 | Montenegro, Republic of | 413 ¢ | 1.4 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 404 | 1.3 | Uruguay | 408 ( | 2.9 | Mexico | 413 ® | 1.3 |
| Costa Rica | 399 | 3.5 | Costa Rica | 401 ( | 3.4 | Uruguay | 409 | 2.7 |
| Albania | 398 | 1.9 | Albania | 397 | 2.2 | Brazil | 401 ® | 2.1 |
| Jordan | 390 ® | 3.4 | Tunisia | 390 | 4.3 | Argentina | 390 | 4.1 |
| Argentina | 383 ( | 3.5 | Brazil | 388 ( | 2.1 | Colombia | 388 ( | 2.5 |
| Qatar | 378 | 0.9 | Argentina | 387 | 3.4 | Tunisia | 385 | 3.9 |
| Brazil | 376 | 2.5 | Jordan | 383 | 3.4 | Jordan | 383 ( | 3.0 |
| Colombia | 375 | 3.3 | Qatar | 373 | 0.8 | Indonesia | 379 | 4.0 |
| Tunisia | 373 - | 4.1 | Indonesia | 369 | 4.2 | Albania | 379 | 2.4 |
| Peru | 370 | 3.7 | Peru | 368 ( | 3.9 | Qatar | 375 | 0.8 |
| Indonesia | 368 ( | 4.6 | Colombia | 368 ( | 3.2 | Peru | 368 ( | 3.8 |
| U.S. state education systems |  |  | U.S. state education systems |  |  | U.S. state education sys |  |  |
| Massachusetts | 5120 | 7.4 | Massachusetts | 5090 | 5.8 | Massachusetts | 5240 | 6.4 |
| Connecticut | 5040 | 7.3 | Connecticut | 5020 | 6.1 | Connecticut | 5150 | 6.4 |
| Florida | 458 ( | 6.5 | Florida | 466 ( | 5.4 | Florida | 475 | 6.5 |

OAverage score is higher than U.S. score
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 average subscale score. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. All average scores reported as higher or lower than the U.S. average score are different at the . 05 significance level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Table M7. Cut scores of 15 -year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale at selected percentiles and percentile cut score gaps, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Percentile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10th |  | 25th |  | 50th |  | 75th |  | 90th |  | 90th to 10th |  |
|  | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score gap | s.e. |
| OECD average | 375 | 0.7 | 430 | 0.6 | 494 | 0.6 | 558 | 0.6 | 614 | 0.7 | 239 | 1.0 |
| Costa Rica | 323 | 3.8 | 361 | 3.6 | 403 | 3.1 | 449 | 3.9 | 496 | 5.1 | 172 ( ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 6.4 |
| Indonesia | 288 | 4.2 | 327 | 3.8 | 370 | 3.6 | 418 | 5.2 | 469 | 7.8 | 181 ( | 8.8 |
| Kazakhstan | 343 | 2.5 | 383 | 2.8 | 429 | 3.1 | 478 | 4.4 | 527 | 5.7 | 183 - | 6.2 |
| Colombia | 285 | 4.0 | 326 | 2.8 | 373 | 2.9 | 423 | 3.6 | 474 | 4.8 | 189 (-) | 6.3 |
| Mexico | 320 | 1.9 | 362 | 1.6 | 411 | 1.6 | 462 | 1.7 | 510 | 2.0 | 191 ( | 2.7 |
| Jordan | 290 | 4.0 | 335 | 3.2 | 383 | 3.1 | 435 | 3.3 | 485 | 4.3 | 195 ( | 5.8 |
| Argentina | 292 | 4.6 | 337 | 3.8 | 388 | 4.2 | 440 | 4.5 | 488 | 4.1 | 196 ( | 6.2 |
| Tunisia | 292 | 4.3 | 334 | 3.7 | 384 | 3.8 | 437 | 4.5 | 488 | 7.3 | 196 ( | 8.5 |
| Brazil | 298 | 2.0 | 337 | 1.9 | 385 | 2.0 | 440 | 2.7 | 495 | 4.5 | 197 | 4.9 |
| Thailand | 328 | 3.1 | 372 | 2.6 | 421 | 3.3 | 476 | 4.8 | 535 | 7.3 | 207 | 7.9 |
| Estonia | 417 | 3.0 | 465 | 2.7 | 519 | 2.6 | 576 | 2.7 | 626 | 3.2 | 209 | 4.4 |
| Romania | 344 | 3.5 | 386 | 3.8 | 439 | 4.0 | 497 | 4.8 | 553 | 6.1 | 209 ( | 7.1 |
| Chile | 323 | 3.7 | 365 | 3.5 | 417 | 3.4 | 476 | 4.2 | 532 | 4.2 | 209 ( | 5.6 |
| Malaysia | 319 | 3.2 | 363 | 3.1 | 417 | 3.4 | 474 | 4.3 | 530 | 4.9 | 211 (1) | 5.9 |
| Latvia | 387 | 4.4 | 434 | 3.3 | 489 | 3.4 | 546 | 3.8 | 597 | 3.7 | 211 ( | 5.8 |
| Denmark | 393 | 4.0 | 444 | 3.3 | 501 | 2.7 | 556 | 2.7 | 607 | 3.1 | 214 (1) | 5.1 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 306 | 2.0 | 352 | 1.7 | 406 | 2.1 | 465 | 2.0 | 520 | 2.7 | 214 | 3.4 |
| Peru | 264 | 3.4 | 311 | 3.6 | 364 | 3.8 | 421 | 4.9 | 478 | 6.7 | 214 - | 7.5 |
| Ireland | 391 | 3.6 | 445 | 3.2 | 503 | 2.9 | 559 | 2.4 | 610 | 2.5 | 219 | 4.4 |
| Finland | 409 | 3.3 | 463 | 2.5 | 520 | 2.4 | 577 | 2.4 | 629 | 3.1 | 219 | 4.5 |
| Vietnam | 401 | 7.4 | 454 | 5.3 | 510 | 5.0 | 568 | 5.5 | 623 | 6.8 | 222 | 10.1 |
| Russian Federation | 371 | 3.9 | 423 | 3.1 | 481 | 3.3 | 540 | 3.6 | 595 | 4.7 | 224 | 6.1 |
| Spain | 370 | 3.1 | 424 | 2.6 | 486 | 2.3 | 546 | 2.1 | 597 | 2.4 | 228 | 3.9 |
| Greece | 338 | 3.8 | 393 | 3.6 | 453 | 3.2 | 513 | 2.8 | 567 | 3.1 | 228 | 4.9 |
| Uruguay | 297 | 4.1 | 347 | 3.0 | 407 | 3.2 | 470 | 3.6 | 526 | 3.8 | 228 | 5.6 |
| Croatia | 360 | 3.3 | 408 | 3.6 | 468 | 3.5 | 531 | 4.5 | 589 | 7.3 | 229 | 8.0 |
| Norway | 373 | 3.9 | 428 | 2.9 | 490 | 2.9 | 552 | 3.3 | 604 | 3.4 | 231 | 5.2 |
| Canada | 402 | 2.4 | 457 | 2.1 | 518 | 2.2 | 580 | 2.3 | 633 | 2.3 | 231 | 3.3 |
| Albania | 278 | 4.8 | 338 | 3.0 | 397 | 2.3 | 454 | 2.4 | 510 | 3.5 | 231 | 5.9 |
| United Arab Emirates | 323 | 2.5 | 370 | 2.9 | 429 | 2.8 | 494 | 2.9 | 555 | 3.9 | 232 | 4.6 |
| Lithuania | 364 | 3.5 | 418 | 3.1 | 478 | 3.2 | 540 | 3.3 | 596 | 3.5 | 232 | 4.9 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 335 | 4.1 | 386 | 3.7 | 445 | 3.6 | 508 | 4.4 | 567 | 5.8 | 233 | 7.1 |
| United States | 368 | 3.9 | 418 | 3.7 | 477 | 4.0 | 543 | 4.4 | 600 | 4.3 | 233 | 5.8 |
| Poland | 402 | 2.8 | 454 | 3.3 | 514 | 3.8 | 580 | 4.9 | 636 | 6.0 | 234 | 6.7 |
| Sweden | 360 | 3.5 | 415 | 2.9 | 478 | 2.6 | 543 | 2.7 | 596 | 2.9 | 236 | 4.6 |
| Turkey | 339 | 3.3 | 382 | 3.6 | 438 | 4.8 | 507 | 8.0 | 577 | 9.7 | 238 | 10.3 |
| Iceland | 372 | 2.8 | 431 | 2.6 | 494 | 2.3 | 557 | 3.0 | 612 | 3.3 | 239 | 4.3 |
| Austria | 384 | 3.9 | 440 | 3.2 | 506 | 3.3 | 572 | 3.5 | 624 | 3.8 | 240 | 5.5 |
| Cyprus | 320 | 2.6 | 376 | 1.6 | 439 | 1.7 | 503 | 2.0 | 561 | 2.1 | 240 | 3.3 |
| Slovenia | 384 | 2.5 | 434 | 2.0 | 498 | 2.2 | 566 | 2.1 | 624 | 2.9 | 240 | 3.8 |
| Italy | 366 | 2.2 | 421 | 2.3 | 485 | 2.4 | 550 | 2.7 | 607 | 3.0 | 241 | 3.7 |
| Macao-China | 415 | 2.8 | 476 | 1.7 | 542 | 1.7 | 605 | 1.7 | 657 | 2.3 | 242 | 3.7 |
| Netherlands | 397 | 5.5 | 457 | 5.1 | 529 | 4.7 | 591 | 4.3 | 638 | 3.7 | 242 | 6.6 |
| Japan | 415 | 5.1 | 473 | 4.2 | 538 | 3.9 | 603 | 4.4 | 657 | 5.1 | 242 | 7.2 |
| Switzerland | 408 | 3.3 | 466 | 3.4 | 534 | 3.5 | 597 | 3.6 | 651 | 4.3 | 243 | 5.4 |
| Czech Republic | 377 | 4.9 | 432 | 3.9 | 500 | 3.4 | 566 | 3.3 | 621 | 3.6 | 244 | 6.1 |
| Hungary | 358 | 4.2 | 411 | 3.3 | 474 | 3.6 | 540 | 4.8 | 603 | 6.4 | 245 | 7.6 |
| United Kingdom | 371 | 5.0 | 429 | 4.2 | 495 | 3.5 | 560 | 3.7 | 616 | 4.1 | 245 | 6.5 |
| Bulgaria | 320 | 4.8 | 372 | 4.7 | 436 | 4.4 | 503 | 5.2 | 565 | 5.6 | 245 | 7.4 |
| Portugal | 363 | 4.2 | 421 | 5.0 | 488 | 4.7 | 554 | 4.3 | 610 | 3.9 | 247 | 5.8 |
| Australia | 382 | 2.3 | 437 | 2.0 | 503 | 1.9 | 571 | 2.3 | 630 | 3.0 | 2490 | 3.8 |
| Hong Kong-China | 430 | 6.2 | 499 | 4.7 | 569 | 3.8 | 629 | 3.5 | 679 | 4.2 | 249 | 7.5 |
| Luxembourg | 363 | 3.0 | 422 | 1.5 | 491 | 1.7 | 558 | 1.6 | 613 | 2.2 | 250 | 3.7 |
| Germany | 385 | 4.7 | 447 | 3.6 | 516 | 3.3 | 583 | 3.6 | 637 | 3.8 | 252 | 6.0 |
| Liechtenstein | 403 | 11.2 | 470 | 8.0 | 540 | 5.9 | 606 | 5.0 | 656 | 9.2 | 253 | 14.5 |
| Korea, Republic of | 425 | 5.8 | 486 | 4.8 | 557 | 4.8 | 624 | 5.1 | 679 | 6.0 | 254 | 8.3 |
| France | 365 | 4.7 | 429 | 2.7 | 497 | 2.9 | 565 | 3.4 | 621 | 3.5 | 256 | 5.8 |
| Qatar | 257 | 1.7 | 306 | 1.3 | 365 | 1.1 | 440 | 1.7 | 514 | 1.9 | 257 | 2.5 |
| New Zealand | 371 | 3.6 | 428 | 3.2 | 499 | 2.8 | 570 | 2.8 | 632 | 3.0 | 2610 | 4.7 |
| Slovak Republic | 352 | 6.2 | 413 | 4.2 | 481 | 3.8 | 553 | 4.7 | 613 | 5.3 | 2610 | 8.1 |
| Shanghai-China | 475 | 5.8 | 546 | 4.4 | 622 | 3.7 | 685 | 3.5 | 737 | 3.5 | 262 | 6.7 |
| Belgium | 378 | 3.9 | 443 | 3.4 | 518 | 2.6 | 589 | 2.8 | 646 | 2.5 | 268 | 4.6 |
| Israel | 328 | 5.7 | 393 | 5.1 | 468 | 5.2 | 541 | 5.3 | 603 | 6.0 | 275 | 8.2 |
| Singapore | 432 | 3.6 | 501 | 2.7 | 579 | 2.5 | 650 | 1.9 | 707 | 2.3 | 2750 | 4.3 |
| Chinese Taipei | 402 | 4.8 | 478 | 4.8 | 567 | 4.2 | 645 | 3.4 | 703 | 4.9 | 3010 | 6.9 |
| U.S. state education systems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida | 359 | 7.3 | 406 | 6.2 | 464 | 7.0 | 524 | 6.8 | 581 | 8.9 | 222 | 11.5 |
| Massachusetts | 387 | 4.8 | 445 | 6.3 | 512 | 7.1 | 583 | 9.7 | 643 | 9.4 | 255 | 10.6 |
| Connecticut | 376 | 7.1 | 435 | 9.0 | 506 | 6.8 | 577 | 8.0 | 636 | 8.3 | 2600 | 10.9 |

Cut score gap is larger than the U.S. percentile cut score gap.
Cut score gap is smaller than the U.S. percentile cut score gap.
NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut) scores for the following: (a) 10th percentile- the bottom 10 percent of students; (b) 25 th percentile-the bottom 25 percent of students; (c) 50 th percentile- the median (half the students scored below the cut score and half scored above it); (d) 75 th percentile-the top 25 percent of students; (e) 90 th percentile- the top 10 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each education system's distribution of scores, enabling users to compare cut scores across education systems. Education systems are ordered by cut score gap. 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. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and
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Figure M2a. Difference in average scores of 15-year-old female and male students on PISA mathematics literacy scale, by education system: 2012
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Table M2b. Difference in average scores of 15-year-old female and male

| students on PISA mathematics literacy scale, by education system: 2012 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Education system | Male-female difference | s.e. |

OECD av
Montenegren
Lithuania
Cyprus
Kazakhstan
Russian Federation
Norway
Bulgaria
Sweden
Macao-China
Singapore
Slovenia
Romania
Latvia
Poland
Indonesia
United States
United Arab Emirates
United Ar
Estonia
Chinese Taipei
Shanghai-China
Iceland
Malaysia
Turkey
Greece
France
Hungary
Serbia, Republic of
Slovak Republic
Vietnam
Canada
Netherlands
Netherlands
Belgium
Portugal
Uruguay
Croatia
Israel
Czech Republic
Australia
United Kingdom
Switzerland
Germany
Thailand
Argentina
Denmark
Mexico
New Zealand
Tunisia
Ireland
Hong Kong-China
Qatar
Spain
Brazil
Japan
Korea, Republic of
Italy
Peru
Jordan
Austria
Liechtenstein
Costa Rica
Chile
Luxembourg
Colombia
U.S. state education systems

| Massachusetts | $10^{*}$ | 4.9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Florida | $14^{*}$ | 4.1 |
| Connecticut | $14^{*}$ | 4.4 |

Connecticut
$14^{*} \quad 4.4$
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.

* $p<.05$. All differences between males and females are significantly different at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by absolute male-female difference in 2012 average score. Differences were computed using unrounded numbers. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 The OECD average is the average of the national average differences of the OECD member countries with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012
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Table M8. Average scores of 15 -year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale, by national quarters of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) and education system: 2012

| Education system | National quarters of the ESCS index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | All students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom quarter |  | Second quarter |  | Third quarter |  | Top quarter |  |  |  |
|  | Average score | s.e. | Average score | s.e. | Average score | s.e. | Average score | s.e. | Average score | s.e. |
| OECD average | 452 | 0.7 | 482 | 0.6 | 506 | 0.7 | 542 | 0.8 | 494 | 0.5 |
| Albania | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 394 | 2.0 |
| Argentina | 355 | 4.1 | 379 | 4.4 | 394 | 4.6 | 433 | 4.3 | 388 | 3.5 |
| Australia | 463 | 2.2 | 492 | 2.0 | 521 | 2.9 | 550 | 2.6 | 504 | 1.6 |
| Austria | 458 | 4.2 | 495 | 4.2 | 519 | 3.8 | 552 | 4.2 | 506 | 2.7 |
| Belgium | 468 | 4.0 | 497 | 3.2 | 534 | 3.0 | 567 | 2.9 | 515 | 2.1 |
| Brazil | 360 | 2.0 | 377 | 2.1 | 395 | 2.9 | 437 | 5.2 | 391 | 2.1 |
| Bulgaria | 384 | 5.1 | 424 | 4.1 | 449 | 6.1 | 501 | 5.9 | 439 | 4.0 |
| Canada | 486 | 2.3 | 509 | 2.5 | 529 | 2.5 | 558 | 2.9 | 518 | 1.8 |
| Chile | 378 | 4.0 | 409 | 3.8 | 429 | 3.6 | 477 | 5.4 | 423 | 3.1 |
| Chinese Taipei | 497 | 5.2 | 546 | 4.5 | 572 | 4.0 | 626 | 5.2 | 560 | 3.3 |
| Colombia | 343 | 4.1 | 365 | 3.7 | 382 | 3.2 | 417 | 5.2 | 376 | 2.9 |
| Costa Rica | 373 | 4.0 | 394 | 3.7 | 412 | 3.8 | 450 | 5.4 | 407 | 3.0 |
| Croatia | 438 | 3.5 | 459 | 3.9 | 471 | 4.9 | 517 | 5.9 | 471 | 3.5 |
| Cyprus | 398 | 2.5 | 428 | 2.5 | 448 | 2.8 | 492 | 2.8 | 440 | 1.1 |
| Czech Republic | 450 | 4.4 | 486 | 4.6 | 508 | 4.3 | 552 | 4.0 | 499 | 2.9 |
| Denmark | 460 | 3.4 | 489 | 3.5 | 513 | 2.9 | 545 | 3.4 | 500 | 2.3 |
| Estonia | 496 | 3.0 | 508 | 3.2 | 523 | 3.6 | 559 | 2.9 | 521 | 2.0 |
| Finland | 488 | 3.1 | 509 | 2.5 | 529 | 3.2 | 555 | 2.6 | 519 | 1.9 |
| France | 442 | 3.5 | 476 | 3.1 | 511 | 4.1 | 561 | 4.0 | 495 | 2.5 |
| Germany | 467 | 5.1 | 502 | 3.9 | 540 | 3.8 | 569 | 4.3 | 514 | 2.9 |
| Greece | 413 | 4.0 | 439 | 3.9 | 460 | 3.5 | 502 | 3.7 | 453 | 2.5 |
| Hong Kong-China | 532 | 4.8 | 554 | 3.7 | 567 | 4.4 | 600 | 5.8 | 561 | 3.2 |
| Hungary | 422 | 4.8 | 464 | 3.6 | 486 | 4.6 | 539 | 6.6 | 477 | 3.2 |
| Iceland | 464 | 2.9 | 481 | 3.1 | 508 | 3.2 | 526 | 3.7 | 493 | 1.7 |
| Indonesia | 356 | 4.3 | 363 | 3.9 | 374 | 4.5 | 408 | 9.7 | 375 | 4.0 |
| Ireland | 462 | 4.3 | 489 | 3.1 | 512 | 2.9 | 545 | 3.3 | 501 | 2.2 |
| Israel | 409 | 5.3 | 452 | 5.6 | 490 | 6.3 | 524 | 5.7 | 466 | 4.7 |
| Italy | 447 | 2.4 | 475 | 2.7 | 498 | 2.6 | 522 | 2.8 | 485 | 2.0 |
| Japan | 500 | 5.2 | 528 | 4.1 | 551 | 4.3 | 575 | 5.9 | 536 | 3.6 |
| Jordan | 361 | 3.0 | 375 | 2.9 | 395 | 3.9 | 419 | 5.8 | 386 | 3.1 |
| Kazakhstan | 405 | 4.0 | 427 | 3.4 | 437 | 3.7 | 458 | 5.2 | 432 | 3.0 |
| Korea, Republic of | 516 | 4.9 | 538 | 4.8 | 567 | 6.2 | 595 | 6.6 | 554 | 4.6 |
| Latvia | 453 | 4.5 | 472 | 3.4 | 508 | 4.6 | 532 | 4.8 | 491 | 2.8 |
| Liechtenstein | 490 | 9.6 | 552 | 11.7 | 542 | 12.0 | 564 | 11.5 | 535 | 4.0 |
| Lithuania | 439 | 3.8 | 465 | 3.6 | 491 | 4.2 | 522 | 3.4 | 479 | 2.6 |
| Luxembourg | 438 | 2.9 | 470 | 2.7 | 508 | 2.5 | 546 | 2.7 | 490 | 1.1 |
| Macao-China | 521 | 2.6 | 535 | 2.6 | 543 | 2.3 | 558 | 2.4 | 538 | 1.0 |
| Malaysia | 388 | 3.1 | 406 | 3.7 | 425 | 4.7 | 465 | 5.4 | 421 | 3.2 |
| Mexico | 385 | 1.9 | 407 | 1.9 | 417 | 1.9 | 447 | 2.4 | 413 | 1.4 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 375 | 2.0 | 401 | 2.8 | 413 | 2.6 | 453 | 2.8 | 410 | 1.1 |
| Netherlands | 484 | 5.3 | 513 | 3.8 | 537 | 4.8 | 565 | 5.1 | 523 | 3.5 |
| New Zealand | 444 | 3.2 | 493 | 4.0 | 514 | 3.9 | 559 | 3.6 | 500 | 2.2 |
| Norway | 459 | 4.2 | 479 | 3.7 | 504 | 3.9 | 522 | 3.6 | 489 | 2.7 |
| Peru | 317 | 3.3 | 352 | 3.8 | 382 | 5.3 | 421 | 7.4 | 368 | 3.7 |
| Poland | 473 | 3.6 | 501 | 4.2 | 526 | 5.3 | 571 | 6.3 | 518 | 3.6 |
| Portugal | 441 | 4.5 | 474 | 5.0 | 495 | 4.8 | 548 | 5.2 | 487 | 3.8 |
| Qatar | 338 | 1.8 | 377 | 1.8 | 399 | 2.1 | 401 | 2.2 | 376 | 0.8 |
| Romania | 407 | 4.5 | 428 | 3.9 | 444 | 4.0 | 501 | 7.8 | 445 | 3.8 |
| Russian Federation | 445 | 4.9 | 468 | 4.3 | 496 | 3.6 | 521 | 5.1 | 482 | 3.0 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 416 | 4.4 | 436 | 3.8 | 450 | 4.7 | 495 | 5.0 | 449 | 3.4 |
| Shanghai-China | 562 | 6.3 | 602 | 4.8 | 627 | 3.8 | 660 | 5.3 | 613 | 3.3 |
| Singapore | 523 | 2.9 | 557 | 3.3 | 588 | 3.2 | 627 | 2.8 | 573 | 1.3 |
| Slovak Republic | 416 | 6.5 | 473 | 3.7 | 496 | 4.3 | 545 | 6.2 | 482 | 3.4 |
| Slovenia | 458 | 2.6 | 486 | 3.1 | 511 | 3.1 | 552 | 3.2 | 501 | 1.2 |
| Spain | 442 | 2.8 | 471 | 2.4 | 495 | 2.8 | 533 | 2.5 | 484 | 1.9 |
| Sweden | 443 | 2.9 | 470 | 4.0 | 495 | 3.4 | 518 | 3.9 | 478 | 2.3 |
| Switzerland | 488 | 4.0 | 519 | 4.0 | 543 | 3.9 | 576 | 4.6 | 531 | 3.0 |
| Thailand | 407 | 4.7 | 412 | 3.0 | 421 | 3.9 | 468 | 7.1 | 427 | 3.4 |
| Tunisia | 362 | 3.8 | 370 | 4.7 | 393 | 4.1 | 430 | 8.9 | 388 | 3.9 |
| Turkey | 412 | 4.5 | 436 | 4.2 | 447 | 6.0 | 498 | 8.3 | 448 | 4.8 |
| United Arab Emirates | 391 | 3.2 | 427 | 2.4 | 454 | 3.6 | 466 | 4.2 | 434 | 2.4 |
| United Kingdom | 458 | 4.1 | 477 | 4.1 | 508 | 4.1 | 545 | 4.0 | 494 | 3.3 |
| United States | 442 | 3.9 | 462 | 4.6 | 494 | 5.4 | 532 | 4.6 | 481 | 3.6 |
| Uruguay | 364 | 3.3 | 390 | 3.8 | 414 | 4.1 | 472 | 5.5 | 409 | 2.8 |
| Vietnam | 473 | 6.1 | 499 | 4.9 | 518 | 5.8 | 555 | 8.2 | 511 | 4.8 |
| U.S. state education systems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut | 450 | 6.1 | 482 | 6.5 | 529 | 5.6 | 570 | 5.6 | 506 | 6.2 |
| Florida | 430 | 4.8 | 455 | 6.7 | 465 | 7.0 | 521 | 7.1 | 467 | 5.8 |
| Massachusetts | 459 | 6.0 | 491 | 5.3 | 533 | 6.6 | 576 | 8.8 | 514 | 6.2 |
| - Not available. <br> $\dagger$ Not applicable. <br> NOTE: The PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) was created using student reports on parental occupation, the highest level of parental education, and an index of home possessions related to family wealth, home educational resources and possessions related to "classical" culture in the family home. The home possessions relating to "classical" culture in the family home included possessions such as works of classical literature, books of poetry, and works of art (e.g. paintings). The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table M9. Percentage distribution of U.S. 15-year-old public school students on PISA mathematics literacy scale, by proficiency level and percentage of students in enrolled
schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, based on principals' reports: 2012

| Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch | 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. |
| U.S. average | 8.0 | 0.73 | 17.9 ** | 0.98 | 26.3 ** | 0.84 | 23.3 | 0.93 | 15.8 ** | 0.91 | 6.6 ** | 0.61 | 2.2 ** | 0.34 |
| Less than 10 percent | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 4.8 !* | 2.01 | 18.9 | 3.92 | 27.2 | 4.07 | 25.8 * | 3.20 | 15.3 * | 3.01 | 6.4 ! | 2.69 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | 3.1 !* | 0.96 | 11.6 * | 1.59 | 22.3 *** | 1.86 | 26.0 | 2.31 | 23.2 * | 1.97 | 10.2 *** | 1.48 | 3.6 | 0.98 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | 3.9 * | 0.87 | 12.8 *** | 1.46 | 23.9 | 1.87 | 26.1 | 1.55 | 19.7 *** | 2.10 | 10.1 *** | 1.31 | 3.6 | 0.94 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 9.3 | 1.30 | 22.2 * | 1.69 | 28.8 * | 1.47 | 22.3 | 1.68 | 13.0 * | 1.38 | 3.5 * | 0.96 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| 75 percent or more | 17.9 * | 2.43 | 28.0 * | 2.48 | 28.9 ** | 2.36 | 16.8 * | 2.07 | 6.4 * | 1.34 | 1.6 !* | 0.78 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| OECD average | 8.0 | 0.12 | 15.0 *** | 0.13 | 22.5 *** | 0.15 | 23.7 | 0.15 | 18.1 *** | 0.14 | 9.3 *** | 0.11 | 3.3 *** | 0.08 |

$\dagger$ Not apple average
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
$\ddagger$ Reporting stand

* $p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
$p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
${ }^{* * *} p<0$. 0 . 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 mathematics literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut 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 equa 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 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. Data in this table are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. 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. Free or reduced price-lunch data are for public schools only. Detail may not sum to totals because of average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Free or reduced price-lunch 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), 2012


## National Center for Education Statistics

Table M10. Average scores of U.S. 15 -year-old public school students on PISA mathematics literacy scale, by percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, based on principals' reports: 2012

| Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. average | 481 ** | 3.6 |
| Less than 10 percent | 540 * | 7.8 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | 513 * | 5.7 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | 506 *** | 6.4 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 464 * | 4.6 |
| 75 percent or more | 432 * | 7.2 |
| OECD average | 494 *** | 0.5 |

* $p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the . 05 level of statistical significance.
** $p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
${ }^{* * *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: 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. Data in this table are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. 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. Free or reduced-price lunch data are for public schools only.

SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table M11. Percentage distribution of U.S. 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale, by proficiency level and race/ethnicity: 2012

| Race/ethnicity | 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. |
| U.S. average | 8.0 | 0.73 | 17.9 ** | 0.98 | 26.3 ** | 0.84 | 23.3 | 0.93 | 15.8 ** | 0.91 | 6.6 ** | 0.61 | 2.2 ** | 0.34 |
| White | 3.6 * | 0.65 | 11.5 * | 1.06 | 25.0 ** | 1.29 | 27.8 * | 1.22 | 20.3 *** | 1.21 | 8.8 *** | 0.90 | 3.0 *** | 0.57 |
| Black | 21.0 * | 2.21 | 32.0 * | 2.37 | 25.3 | 2.04 | 14.0 * | 1.99 | 6.7 !* | 2.04 | 1.0 !* | 0.47 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Hispanic | 10.8 | 1.87 | 24.2 * | 1.93 | 30.2 * | 1.59 | 20.3 | 1.97 | 10.2 * | 1.28 | 3.5 * | 0.86 | 0.7 !* | 0.31 |
| Asian | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 5.4 !* | 2.20 | 15.6 *** | 4.16 | 23.6 | 4.12 | 28.1 * | 3.76 | 16.1 * | 3.03 | 9.0 * | 2.47 |
| Multiracial | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 17.1 | 3.23 | 29.6 | 4.33 | 23.3 | 4.08 | 16.4 | 3.66 | 7.7 | 2.25 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| OECD average | 8.0 | 0.12 | 15.0 *** | 0.13 | 22.5 *** | 0.15 | 23.7 | 0.15 | 18.1 *** | 0.14 | 9.3 *** | 0.11 | 3.3 *** | 0.08 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met
\# Rounds to zero.

* $p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance
** $p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD 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 mathematics literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut 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 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. 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), 2012

| National Center for Education Statistics |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table M12. Average scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale, by race/ethnicity: 2012 |  |  |
| Race/ethnicity | Average score | s.e. |
| U.S. average | 481 ** | 3.6 |
| White | 506 * | 3.7 |
| Black | 421 * | 6.2 |
| Hispanic | 455 * | 4.8 |
| Asian | 549 * | 9.0 |
| Multiracial | 492 | 7.4 |
| OECD average | 494 *** | 0.5 |
| * $p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance. |  |  |
| ${ }^{* *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance. |  |  |
| ${ }^{* * *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the . 05 level of statistical significance. |  |  |
| NOTE: Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. |  |  |
| Standard error is noted by s.e. |  |  |
| SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for InternationalStudent Assessment (PISA), 2012. |  |  |

## Exhibit S1. Description of PISA proficiency levels on science literacy scale: 2012

| Proficiency level and lower cut score | Task descriptions |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level 6 708 | 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 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 center on personal, social, or global situations. |
| Level 5 633 | 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 4 559 | 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 3 484 | 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 2 410 | 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 $335$ | 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. Cut scores in the exhibit are rounded; exact cut scores are provided in table AA1. 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), 2012.

National Center for Education Statistics
Table S1. Percentage distribution of 15-year-old students on PISA science literacy scale, by proficiency level and education system: 2012

| Education system | 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 | 4.8 | 0.09 | 13.0 | 0.14 | 24.5 | 0.16 | 28.8 | 0.17 | 20.5 | 0.15 | 7.2 | 0.10 | 1.1 | 0.04 |
| Albania | 23.5 | 1.04 | 29.6 | 0.94 | 28.5 | 1.19 | 14.4 | 0.78 | 3.6 | 0.41 | 0.4 ! | 0.14 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 19.8 | 1.39 | 31.0 | 1.46 | 31.1 | 1.33 | 14.8 | 1.20 | 3.0 | 0.43 | 0.2 ! | 0.10 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Australia | 3.4 | 0.25 | 10.2 | 0.41 | 21.5 | 0.47 | 28.5 | 0.68 | 22.8 | 0.63 | 10.9 | 0.47 | 2.6 | 0.25 |
| Austria | 3.6 | 0.54 | 12.2 | 0.92 | 24.3 | 1.05 | 30.1 | 0.85 | 21.9 | 0.81 | 7.0 | 0.62 | 0.8 | 0.20 |
| Belgium | 5.9 | 0.53 | 11.8 | 0.58 | 21.5 | 0.63 | 28.7 | 0.71 | 23.0 | 0.66 | 8.1 | 0.42 | 0.9 | 0.16 |
| Brazil | 18.6 | 0.78 | 35.1 | 0.79 | 30.7 | 0.78 | 12.5 | 0.68 | 2.8 | 0.37 | 0.3 ! | 0.10 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Bulgaria | 14.4 | 1.34 | 22.5 | 1.15 | 26.3 | 1.07 | 22.5 | 1.09 | 11.2 | 0.84 | 2.8 | 0.50 | 0.3 ! | 0.12 |
| Canada | 2.4 | 0.24 | 8.0 | 0.38 | 21.0 | 0.65 | 32.0 | 0.54 | 25.3 | 0.58 | 9.5 | 0.47 | 1.8 | 0.20 |
| Chile | 8.1 | 0.80 | 26.3 | 1.11 | 34.6 | 1.06 | 22.4 | 0.96 | 7.5 | 0.60 | 1.0 | 0.15 | \#! | $\dagger$ |
| Chinese Taipei | 1.6 | 0.25 | 8.2 | 0.64 | 20.8 | 0.89 | 33.7 | 0.97 | 27.3 | 1.00 | 7.8 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.13 |
| Colombia | 19.8 | 1.36 | 36.3 | 1.10 | 30.8 | 1.08 | 11.0 | 0.83 | 1.9 | 0.25 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Costa Rica | 8.6 | 0.79 | 30.7 | 1.30 | 39.2 | 1.25 | 17.8 | 1.12 | 3.4 | 0.57 | 0.2 ! | 0.11 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 3.2 | 0.38 | 14.0 | 0.74 | 29.1 | 0.99 | 31.4 | 1.19 | 17.6 | 1.16 | 4.3 | 0.75 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Cyprus | 14.4 | 0.47 | 23.7 | 0.66 | 30.3 | 0.89 | 21.3 | 0.73 | 8.4 | 0.43 | 1.8 | 0.29 | 0.2 ! | 0.08 |
| Czech Republic | 3.3 | 0.62 | 10.5 | 1.03 | 24.7 | 0.99 | 31.7 | 1.23 | 22.2 | 0.96 | 6.7 | 0.53 | 0.9 | 0.18 |
| Denmark | 4.7 | 0.55 | 12.0 | 0.69 | 25.7 | 0.80 | 31.3 | 0.90 | 19.6 | 0.79 | 6.1 | 0.67 | 0.7 | 0.17 |
| Estonia | 0.5 | 0.14 | 4.5 | 0.43 | 19.0 | 0.87 | 34.5 | 0.87 | 28.7 | 0.96 | 11.1 | 0.66 | 1.7 | 0.25 |
| Finland | 1.8 | 0.28 | 5.9 | 0.48 | 16.8 | 0.69 | 29.6 | 0.77 | 28.8 | 0.73 | 13.9 | 0.62 | 3.2 | 0.38 |
| France | 6.1 | 0.67 | 12.6 | 0.71 | 22.9 | 1.08 | 29.2 | 1.12 | 21.3 | 0.87 | 6.9 | 0.68 | 1.0 | 0.21 |
| Germany | 2.9 | 0.46 | 9.3 | 0.73 | 20.5 | 0.82 | 28.9 | 0.89 | 26.2 | 1.05 | 10.6 | 0.80 | 1.6 | 0.28 |
| Greece | 7.4 | 0.70 | 18.1 | 1.14 | 31.0 | 1.10 | 28.8 | 1.02 | 12.2 | 0.81 | 2.3 | 0.40 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Hong Kong-China | 1.2 | 0.23 | 4.4 | 0.52 | 13.0 | 0.72 | 29.8 | 1.06 | 34.9 | 0.99 | 14.9 | 0.91 | 1.8 | 0.36 |
| Hungary | 4.1 | 0.61 | 14.0 | 1.04 | 26.4 | 1.08 | 30.9 | 1.16 | 18.7 | 0.98 | 5.5 | 0.73 | 0.5 ! | 0.18 |
| Iceland | 8.0 | 0.56 | 16.0 | 0.72 | 27.5 | 0.87 | 27.2 | 0.86 | 16.2 | 0.74 | 4.6 | 0.60 | 0.6 | 0.17 |
| Indonesia | 24.7 | 1.96 | 41.9 | 1.42 | 26.3 | 1.54 | 6.5 | 1.02 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Ireland | 2.6 | 0.40 | 8.5 | 0.76 | 22.0 | 1.15 | 31.1 | 1.03 | 25.0 | 0.94 | 9.3 | 0.63 | 1.5 | 0.25 |
| Israel | 11.2 | 1.08 | 17.7 | 0.93 | 24.8 | 0.93 | 24.4 | 1.19 | 16.1 | 1.12 | 5.2 | 0.58 | 0.6 ! | 0.22 |
| Italy | 4.9 | 0.35 | 13.8 | 0.52 | 26.0 | 0.58 | 30.1 | 0.66 | 19.1 | 0.59 | 5.5 | 0.37 | 0.6 | 0.08 |
| Japan | 2.0 | 0.39 | 6.4 | 0.61 | 16.3 | 0.79 | 27.5 | 0.92 | 29.5 | 1.06 | 14.8 | 0.93 | 3.4 | 0.49 |
| Jordan | 18.2 | 1.21 | 31.4 | 0.96 | 32.2 | 1.04 | 15.0 | 0.86 | 3.0 | 0.57 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | 11.3 | 0.99 | 30.7 | 1.49 | 36.8 | 1.16 | 17.8 | 1.19 | 3.3 | 0.45 | 0.2 ! | 0.09 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Korea, Republic of | 1.2 | 0.25 | 5.5 | 0.60 | 18.0 | 1.02 | 33.6 | 1.11 | 30.1 | 1.24 | 10.6 | 0.93 | 1.1 ! | 0.39 |
| Latvia | 1.8 | 0.39 | 10.5 | 0.90 | 28.2 | 1.20 | 35.1 | 1.02 | 20.0 | 1.05 | 4.0 | 0.47 | 0.3 ! | 0.13 |
| Liechtenstein | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 9.6 | 1.94 | 22.0 | 3.94 | 30.8 | 3.79 | 26.7 | 2.58 | 9.1 | 1.47 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Lithuania | 3.4 | 0.48 | 12.7 | 0.84 | 27.6 | 1.00 | 32.9 | 1.08 | 18.3 | 0.88 | 4.7 | 0.47 | 0.4 | 0.09 |
| Luxembourg | 7.2 | 0.42 | 15.1 | 0.67 | 24.2 | 0.63 | 26.2 | 0.60 | 19.2 | 0.53 | 7.0 | 0.49 | 1.2 | 0.17 |
| Macao-China | 1.4 | 0.20 | 7.4 | 0.49 | 22.2 | 0.60 | 36.2 | 0.81 | 26.2 | 0.73 | 6.2 | 0.35 | 0.4 | 0.10 |
| Malaysia | 14.5 | 1.13 | 31.0 | 1.21 | 33.9 | 1.10 | 16.5 | 1.07 | 3.7 | 0.54 | 0.3 ! | 0.13 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Mexico | 12.6 | 0.52 | 34.4 | 0.58 | 37.0 | 0.59 | 13.8 | 0.52 | 2.1 | 0.16 | 0.1 ! | 0.04 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 18.7 | 0.74 | 32.0 | 0.98 | 29.7 | 0.94 | 15.4 | 0.76 | 3.8 | 0.47 | 0.4 ! | 0.14 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Netherlands | 3.1 | 0.53 | 10.1 | 0.83 | 20.1 | 1.35 | 29.1 | 1.28 | 25.8 | 1.24 | 10.5 | 0.98 | 1.3 | 0.28 |
| New Zealand | 4.7 | 0.39 | 11.6 | 0.76 | 21.7 | 0.94 | 26.4 | 0.95 | 22.3 | 0.85 | 10.7 | 0.62 | 2.7 | 0.25 |
| Norway | 6.0 | 0.63 | 13.6 | 0.71 | 24.8 | 0.80 | 28.9 | 0.91 | 19.0 | 0.79 | 6.4 | 0.56 | 1.1 | 0.24 |
| Peru | 31.5 | 1.61 | 37.0 | 1.26 | 23.5 | 1.29 | 7.0 | 0.85 | 1.0 | 0.28 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Poland | 1.3 | 0.32 | 7.7 | 0.70 | 22.5 | 0.98 | 33.1 | 0.92 | 24.5 | 0.96 | 9.1 | 0.76 | 1.7 | 0.35 |
| Portugal | 4.7 | 0.66 | 14.3 | 1.09 | 27.3 | 0.96 | 31.4 | 1.25 | 17.8 | 1.06 | 4.2 | 0.55 | 0.3 ! | 0.11 |
| Qatar | 34.6 | 0.38 | 28.0 | 0.58 | 19.6 | 0.71 | 11.2 | 0.39 | 5.1 | 0.40 | 1.3 | 0.11 | 0.1 | 0.04 |
| Romania | 8.7 | 0.77 | 28.7 | 1.32 | 34.6 | 1.23 | 21.0 | 1.12 | 6.2 | 0.77 | 0.9 | 0.26 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Russian Federation | 3.6 | 0.39 | 15.1 | 0.96 | 30.1 | 1.08 | 31.2 | 0.89 | 15.7 | 0.98 | 3.9 | 0.51 | 0.3 ! | 0.16 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 10.3 | 0.99 | 24.7 | 1.15 | 32.4 | 1.21 | 22.8 | 1.06 | 8.1 | 0.63 | 1.6 | 0.35 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Shanghai-China | 0.3 ! | 0.11 | 2.4 | 0.36 | 10.0 | 0.86 | 24.6 | 0.87 | 35.5 | 1.11 | 23.0 | 1.09 | 4.2 | 0.57 |
| Singapore | 2.2 | 0.27 | 7.4 | 0.48 | 16.7 | 0.73 | 24.0 | 0.73 | 27.0 | 0.87 | 16.9 | 0.94 | 5.8 | 0.41 |
| Slovak Republic | 9.2 | 0.95 | 17.6 | 1.14 | 27.0 | 1.30 | 26.2 | 1.62 | 15.0 | 1.02 | 4.3 | 0.58 | 0.6 ! | 0.25 |
| Slovenia | 2.4 | 0.19 | 10.4 | 0.55 | 24.5 | 1.00 | 30.0 | 1.02 | 23.0 | 0.92 | 8.4 | 0.71 | 1.2 | 0.24 |
| Spain | 3.7 | 0.33 | 12.0 | 0.51 | 27.3 | 0.64 | 32.8 | 0.60 | 19.4 | 0.53 | 4.5 | 0.26 | 0.3 | 0.08 |
| Sweden | 7.3 | 0.62 | 15.0 | 0.80 | 26.2 | 0.84 | 28.0 | 0.84 | 17.2 | 0.77 | 5.6 | 0.45 | 0.7 | 0.14 |
| Switzerland | 3.0 | 0.31 | 9.8 | 0.62 | 22.8 | 0.82 | 31.3 | 0.74 | 23.7 | 0.86 | 8.3 | 0.70 | 1.0 | 0.22 |
| Thailand | 7.0 | 0.64 | 26.6 | 1.33 | 37.5 | 1.07 | 21.6 | 1.14 | 6.4 | 0.74 | 0.9 ! | 0.27 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Tunisia | 21.3 | 1.45 | 34.0 | 1.07 | 31.1 | 1.36 | 11.7 | 1.00 | 1.8 | 0.49 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Turkey | 4.4 | 0.50 | 21.9 | 1.27 | 35.4 | 1.43 | 25.1 | 1.28 | 11.3 | 1.28 | 1.8 | 0.34 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| United Arab Emirates | 11.3 | 0.76 | 23.8 | 0.99 | 29.9 | 0.83 | 22.3 | 0.88 | 10.1 | 0.60 | 2.3 | 0.25 | 0.3 | 0.07 |
| United Kingdom | 4.3 | 0.48 | 10.7 | 0.86 | 22.4 | 1.00 | 28.4 | 0.98 | 23.0 | 0.91 | 9.3 | 0.70 | 1.8 | 0.34 |
| United States | 4.2 | 0.54 | 14.0 | 1.08 | 26.7 | 1.08 | 28.9 | 1.07 | 18.8 | 1.07 | 6.3 | 0.64 | 1.1 | 0.20 |
| Uruguay | 19.7 | 1.06 | 27.2 | 0.92 | 29.3 | 1.00 | 17.1 | 0.95 | 5.6 | 0.53 | 1.0 | 0.24 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Vietnam | 0.9 ! | 0.26 | 5.8 | 0.90 | 20.7 | 1.40 | 37.5 | 1.48 | 27.0 | 1.50 | 7.1 | 0.90 | 1.0 ! | 0.32 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| U.S. state education systems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut | 3.3 | 0.82 | 10.2 | 1.36 | 21.4 | 1.58 | 29.4 | 1.69 | 22.8 | 1.46 | 10.7 | 1.13 | 2.2 | 0.60 |
| Florida | 5.1 | 0.96 | 16.1 | 1.61 | 28.4 | 1.61 | 28.2 | 2.00 | 16.6 | 1.64 | 4.9 | 1.01 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Massachusetts | 2.6 | 0.65 | 8.9 | 1.03 | 21.2 | 1.96 | 29.4 | 1.50 | 23.8 | 1.84 | 11.3 | 1.48 | 2.9 | 0.73 |

$\dagger$ 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 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 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. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Figure S1a. Percentage of 15 -year-old students performing at PISA science literacy proficiency levels 5 and above and below level 2, by education system: 2012


## Below level 2

Levels 5 and above
\# Rounds to zero.
! Interpret with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. percentage at the .05 level of significance.
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 percentages of 15 -year-olds in levels 5 and above. To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into science proficiency levels according to their scores. Cut scores for each proficiency level can be found in table A-1 in appendix A. The OECD average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. The standard errors of the estimates are shown in table S1b available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.
asp?pubid=2014024.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Table S1b. Percentage of 15 -year-old students performing at PISA science literacy proficiency levels 5 and above and below level 2 , by education system: 2012

| Education system | Below level 2 |  | Levels 5 and above |  | Education system | Below level 2 |  | Levels 5 and above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 17.8 | 0.18 | 8.4 | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shanghai-China | 2.7 * | 0.41 | 27.2 * | 1.32 | Spain | 15.7 | 0.71 | 4.8 * | 0.29 |
| Singapore | 9.6 * | 0.51 | 22.7 * | 0.81 | Croatia | 17.3 | 0.93 | 4.6 * | 0.79 |
| Japan | 8.5 * | 0.88 | 18.2 * | 1.21 | Portugal | 19.0 | 1.44 | 4.5 * | 0.55 |
| Finland | 7.7 * | 0.58 | 17.1 * | 0.66 | Latvia | 12.4 * | 0.96 | 4.4 * | 0.51 |
| Hong Kong-China | 5.6 * | 0.62 | 16.7 * | 1.05 | Russian Federation | 18.8 | 1.15 | 4.3 * | 0.59 |
| Australia | 13.6 * | 0.48 | 13.6 * | 0.55 | Bulgaria | 36.9 * | 2.02 | 3.1 * | 0.58 |
| New Zealand | 16.3 | 0.86 | 13.4 * | 0.69 | United Arab Emirates | 35.2 * | 1.30 | 2.5 * | 0.27 |
| Estonia | 5.0 * | 0.45 | 12.8 * | 0.73 | Greece | 25.5 * | 1.47 | 2.5 * | 0.40 |
| Germany | 12.2 * | 0.90 | 12.2 * | 0.95 | Cyprus | 38.0 * | 0.67 | 2.0 * | 0.29 |
| Netherlands | 13.1 * | 1.12 | 11.8 * | 1.06 | Turkey | 26.4 * | 1.50 | 1.8 * | 0.36 |
| Korea, Republic of | 6.6 * | 0.77 | 11.7 * | 1.13 | Serbia, Republic of | 35.0 * | 1.81 | 1.7 * | 0.36 |
| Canada | 10.4 * | 0.47 | 11.3 * | 0.55 | Qatar | 62.6 * | 0.53 | 1.5 * | 0.12 |
| United Kingdom | 15.0 | 1.07 | 11.2 * | 0.79 | Uruguay | 46.9 * | 1.25 | 1.0 * | 0.25 |
| Poland | 9.0 * | 0.75 | 10.8 * | 1.01 | Chile | 34.5 * | 1.58 | 1.0 * | 0.15 |
| Ireland | 11.1 * | 0.88 | 10.7 * | 0.58 | Thailand | 33.6 * | 1.56 | 0.9 * | 0.27 |
| Liechtenstein | 10.4 * | 1.96 | 10.1 | 1.80 | Romania | 37.3 * | 1.64 | 0.9 !* | 0.29 |
| Slovenia | 12.9 * | 0.56 | 9.6 * | 0.72 | Albania | 53.1 * | 1.20 | 0.4 !* | 0.13 |
| Switzerland | 12.8 * | 0.72 | 9.3 | 0.77 | Montenegro, Republic of | 50.7 * | 0.72 | 0.4 !* | 0.14 |
| Belgium | 17.7 | 0.86 | 9.1 | 0.43 | Malaysia | 45.5 * | 1.55 | 0.3 !* | 0.12 |
| Chinese Taipei | 9.8 * | 0.77 | 8.3 | 0.61 | Brazil | 53.7 * | 1.14 | 0.3 !* | 0.10 |
| Luxembourg | 22.2 * | 0.63 | 8.2 | 0.54 | Jordan | 49.6 * | 1.55 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Vietnam | 6.7 * | 1.09 | 8.1 | 1.09 | Argentina | 50.9 * | 2.21 | 0.2 !* | 0.10 |
| France | 18.7 | 1.01 | 7.9 | 0.77 | Costa Rica | 39.3 * | 1.75 | 0.2 !* | 0.10 |
| Austria | 15.8 | 1.00 | 7.9 | 0.70 | Kazakhstan | 41.9 * | 1.83 | 0.2 !* | 0.09 |
| Czech Republic | 13.8 * | 1.13 | 7.6 | 0.58 | Mexico | 47.0 * | 0.81 | 0.1 !* | 0.04 |
| Norway | 19.6 | 1.10 | 7.5 | 0.57 | Colombia | 56.2 * | 1.61 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| United States | 18.1 | 1.33 | 7.5 | 0.74 | Tunisia | 55.3 * | 1.87 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Denmark | 16.7 | 0.97 | 6.8 | 0.70 | Indonesia | 66.6 * | 2.20 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Macao-China | 8.8 * | 0.46 | 6.7 | 0.36 | Peru | 68.5 * | 1.95 | $\ddagger$ | t |
| Sweden | 22.2 * | 1.11 | 6.3 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Italy | 18.7 | 0.68 | 6.1 | 0.41 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hungary | 18.0 | 1.14 | 5.9 | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Israel | 28.9 * | 1.67 | 5.8 | 0.65 | U.S. state education systems |  |  |  |  |
| Iceland | 24.0 * | 0.78 | 5.2 * | 0.61 | Massachusetts | 11.5 * | 1.18 | 14.2 * | 1.94 |
| Lithuania | 16.1 | 1.08 | 5.1 * | 0.49 | Connecticut | 13.5 * | 1.70 | 12.9 * | 1.34 |
| Slovak Republic | 26.9 * | 1.58 | 4.9 * | 0.72 | Florida | 21.3 | 2.15 | 5.5 | 1.05 |

## $\dagger$ Not applicable.

! 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. percentage at the .05 level of statistical significance
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 percentages of 15 -year-olds in levels 5 and above. To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into science proficiency levels according to their scores. Exact cut 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 han 707.93 ). Scores are repor 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. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education Reading Literacy in an International Context (NCES 2014-024)
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Table S2. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA science literacy scale, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Average score | s.e. | Education system | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average | 501 | 0.5 |  |  |  |
| Shanghai-China | 5800 | 3.0 | Russian Federation | 486 | 2.9 |
| Hong Kong-China | 5550 | 2.6 | Sweden | 485 | 3.0 |
| Singapore | 5510 | 1.5 | Iceland | 478 | 2.1 |
| Japan | 5470 | 3.6 | Slovak Republic | 471 ( | 3.6 |
| Finland | 5450 | 2.2 | Israel | 470 | 5.0 |
| Estonia | 5410 | 1.9 | Greece | 467 | 3.1 |
| Korea, Republic of | 5380 | 3.7 | Turkey | 463 | 3.9 |
| Vietnam | 5280 | 4.3 | United Arab Emirates | 448 | 2.8 |
| Poland | 5260 | 3.1 | Bulgaria | 446 | 4.8 |
| Canada | 5250 | 1.9 | Chile | 445 | 2.9 |
| Liechtenstein | 5250 | 3.5 | Serbia, Republic of | 445 | 3.4 |
| Germany | 5240 | 3.0 | Thailand | 444 | 2.9 |
| Chinese Taipei | 5230 | 2.3 | Romania | 439 ( | 3.3 |
| Netherlands | 5220 | 3.5 | Cyprus | 438 | 1.2 |
| Ireland | 5220 | 2.5 | Costa Rica | 429 | 2.9 |
| Australia | 5210 | 1.8 | Kazakhstan | 425 | 3.0 |
| Macao-China | 5210 | 0.8 | Malaysia | 420 | 3.0 |
| New Zealand | 5160 | 2.1 | Uruguay | 416 | 2.8 |
| Switzerland | 5150 | 2.7 | Mexico | 415 | 1.3 |
| Slovenia | 5140 | 1.3 | Montenegro, Republic of | 410 | 1.1 |
| United Kingdom | 5140 | 3.4 | Jordan | 409 | 3.1 |
| Czech Republic | 5080 | 3.0 | Argentina | 406 | 3.9 |
| Austria | 506 | 2.7 | Brazil | 405 | 2.1 |
| Belgium | 505 | 2.2 | Colombia | 399 | 3.1 |
| Latvia | 502 | 2.8 | Tunisia | 398 | 3.5 |
| France | 499 | 2.6 | Albania | 397 | 2.4 |
| Denmark | 498 | 2.7 | Qatar | 384 | 0.7 |
| United States | 497 | 3.8 | Indonesia | 382 | 3.8 |
| Spain | 496 | 1.8 | Peru | 373 | 3.6 |
| Lithuania | 496 | 2.6 |  |  |  |
| Norway | 495 | 3.1 |  |  |  |
| Hungary | 494 | 2.9 | U.S. state education |  |  |
| Italy | 494 | 1.9 | systems |  |  |
| Croatia | 491 | 3.1 | Massachusetts | 5270 | 6.0 |
| Luxembourg | 491 | 1.3 | Connecticut | 5210 | 5.7 |
| Portugal | 489 | 3.7 | Florida | 485 | 6.4 |

D Average score is higher than U.S. average score
( Average score is lower than U.S. average score.
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 average score. 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 . All average scores reported as higher or lower than the U.S. average score are different at the .05 level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate nonOECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. This table corresponds to table 2 in Performance of U.S. 15-Year-Old Students in Mathematics, Science, and Reading Literacy in an International Context (NCES 2014-024).
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Figure S2a. Difference in average scores of 15-year-old female and male students on PISA science literacy scale, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Difference in favor of males | Difference in favor of females | U.S. state education systems | Difference in favor of males | Differen of fe | in favor les |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average |  |  | Massachusetts |  |  |  |
| Germany |  | 1 | Florida | $13$ |  |  |
| Singapore Israel |  | 1 | Connecticut | 14 |  |  |
| Czech Republic |  |  |  | 2010 | 10 | 2030 |
| Chinese Taipei |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tunisia |  |  |  | Difference in avera | ience lite | y scores |
| Vietnam |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uruguay |  | 1 | Male-female difference in | average science literac | cores is st | ically |
| Macao-China |  | 1 | different. |  |  |  |
| Brazil |  |  | $\square$ Male-female difference in | average science literac | cores is not | easurably |
| United States |  | 2 | different. |  |  |  |
| Portugal |  | 2 | \# Rounds to zero. |  |  |  |
| Croatia |  | 2 | NOTE: Education systems are ord | red by absolute male-fem | erence in 20 | average score. |
| Estonia |  | 2 | Differences were computed using | nrounded numbers. Scores | reported on | ale from 0 to |
| France Poland |  | 2 | 1,000 . Score differences as noted level of statistical significance. Tis | etween males and females OECD average is the avera | significantly the nationa | rent at the .05 |
| Italy |  |  | differences of the OECD membe | untries, with each country | hted equally | s indicate |
| Canada |  |  | non-OECD countries and educatio | systems. Results for Conn | ut, Florida, | Massachusetts |
| Iceland |  | 3 | are for public school students only |  |  |  |
| Indonesia |  | 3 | SOURCE: Organization for Econo | ic Cooperation and Develo | nt (OECD), | ram for |
| Hungary |  |  | Intemational Student Assessment | (ISA), 2012. |  |  |
| Netherlands |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Korea, Republic of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Norway |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Belgium |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ireland |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Serbia, Republic of |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| New Zealand |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Australia |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shanghai-China |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Romania |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Russian Federation |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Peru |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Switzerland |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hong Kong-China |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina |  | $\square 7$ |  |  |  |  |
| Chile |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albania |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slovak Republic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sweden |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spain |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kazakhstan |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Austria |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slovenia |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denmark | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turkey |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| Japan |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Malaysia |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| Costa Rica | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyprus |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| United Kingdom | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greece |  | -13 |  |  |  |  |
| Lithuania |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| Luxembourg | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Latvia |  | -15 |  |  |  |  |
| Finland |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Montenegro, Republic of |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| Liechtenstein | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colombia | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Thailand |  | $\square 19$ |  |  |  |  |
| Bulgaria |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |
| United Arab Emirates |  | - 28 |  |  |  |  |
| Qatar |  | 135 |  |  |  |  |
| Jordan |  | - |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{lllll}50 & 40 & 30 & 20 & 10\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}10 & 20 & 30 & 40\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Difference in average science literacy scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Table S2b. Difference in average scores of 15 -year-old female and male students
on PISA science literacy scale, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Male-female difference | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average | 1 * | 0.6 |
| Germany | -1 | 3.0 |
| Singapore | -1 | 2.6 |
| Israel | -1 | 7.6 |
| Czech Republic | 1 | 4.0 |
| Chinese Taipei | 1 | 6.4 |
| Tunisia | 1 | 2.9 |
| Vietnam | 1 | 2.8 |
| Uruguay | -1 | 3.4 |
| Macao-China | -1 | 1.7 |
| Brazil | 2 | 1.7 |
| United States | -2 | 2.7 |
| Portugal | -2 | 2.6 |
| Croatia | -2 | 3.8 |
| Estonia | -2 | 2.7 |
| France | -2 | 3.7 |
| Poland | -3 | 3.0 |
| Italy | 3 | 2.5 |
| Canada | 3 | 2.1 |
| Iceland | -3 | 3.6 |
| Indonesia | -3 | 3.1 |
| Hungary | 3 | 3.3 |
| Netherlands | 3 | 2.9 |
| Korea, Republic of | 3 | 5.1 |
| Norway | -4 | 3.2 |
| Belgium | 4 | 3.6 |
| Ireland | 4 | 4.4 |
| Serbia, Republic of | -4 | 3.9 |
| New Zealand | 5 | 4.9 |
| Australia | 5 | 3.0 |
| Shanghai-China | 5 | 2.7 |
| Romania | -5 | 3.2 |
| Russian Federation | -6 | 2.9 |
| Peru | 6 | 4.0 |
| Switzerland | 6 * | 2.6 |
| Mexico | 6 * | 1.1 |
| Hong Kong-China | 7 | 4.2 |
| Argentina | -7 | 3.4 |
| Chile | 7 * | 3.3 |
| Albania | -7 * | 3.2 |
| Slovak Republic | 7 | 4.5 |
| Sweden | -7 * | 3.3 |
| Spain | 7 * | 2.1 |
| Kazakhstan | -9 * | 2.9 |
| Austria | 9 | 5.0 |
| Slovenia | -9 * | 2.8 |
| Denmark | 10 * | 2.7 |
| Turkey | -10 * | 4.2 |
| Japan | 11 * | 4.3 |
| Malaysia | -11* | 3.5 |
| Costa Rica | 12 * | 3.2 |
| Cyprus | -13 * | 2.5 |
| United Kingdom | 13 * | 4.7 |
| Greece | -13 * | 3.1 |
| Lithuania | -15 * | 2.3 |
| Luxembourg | 15 * | 2.2 |
| Latvia | -15 * | 3.6 |
| Finland | -16 * | 3.0 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | -17* | 2.4 |
| Liechtenstein | 17 | 9.1 |
| Colombia | 18 * | 3.4 |
| Thailand | -19 * | 3.4 |
| Bulgaria | -20 * | 4.5 |
| United Arab Emirates | -28* | 5.1 |
| Qatar | -35* | 1.7 |
| Jordan | -43 * | 6.4 |

U.S. state education systems

| Massachusetts | 3 | 4.6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Florida | 13 * | 4.8 |
| Connecticut | 14 * | 4.5 |
| *p<.05. All differences between males and females are significantly different at the .05 level of statistical |  |  |
| significance. |  |  |
| NOTE: Education systems are ordered by absolute male-female difference in 2012 average score. |  |  |
| Differences were computed using unrounded numbers. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to $1,000$. |  |  |
| The OECD average is the average of the national average differences of the OECD member countries, |  |  |
| with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries |  |  |
| and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students |  |  |
| only. |  |  |
| SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International |  |  |
| Student Assessment (PISA), 2012. |  |  |
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Table S4. Percentage distribution of U.S. 15 -year-old public school students on PISA science literacy scale, by proficiency level and percentage of students in enrolled schools
eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, based on principals' reports: 2012

| Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch | 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. |
| U.S. average | 4.2 | 0.54 | 14.0 | 1.08 | 26.7 | 1.08 | 28.9 | 1.07 | 18.8 | 1.07 | 6.3 | 0.64 | 1.1 | 0.20 |
| Less than 10 percent | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 3.2 !* | 1.45 | 16.1 * | 3.01 | 31.7 | 2.89 | 30.0 * | 3.54 | 15.7 * | 3.39 | 2.9 ! | 1.26 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | 2.0 !* | 0.71 | 8.7 * | 1.56 | 20.1 * | 1.46 | 30.8 | 2.26 | 26.5 * | 2.25 | 10.0 | 1.99 | 1.9 ! | 0.76 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | 1.5 !* | 0.57 | 8.5 * | 1.25 | 24.4 | 1.80 | 30.6 | 1.69 | 24.2 *** | 2.03 | 9.1 *** | 1.28 | 1.7 ! | 0.55 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 4.6 | 0.94 | 16.0 | 1.85 | 30.0 * | 2.13 | 30.0 | 1.78 | 15.5 * | 1.65 | 3.3 * | 0.60 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| 75 percent or more | 10.2 * | 1.98 | 26.4 * | 2.97 | 33.2 * | 2.20 | 21.5 * | 2.99 | 6.7 * | 1.38 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| OECD average | 4.8 | 0.09 | 13.0 | 0.14 | 24.5 | 0.16 | 28.8 | 0.17 | 20.5 | 0.15 | 7.2 | 0.10 | 1.1 | 0.04 |

F Not applicable
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met

* $p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
$p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
*** $p<.05$. 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 science literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut 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 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. Data in this table are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. 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. Free or reduced-price lunch data are for public schools only. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
rounding. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Table S5. Average scores of U.S. 15-year-old public school students on PISA science literacy scale, by percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, based on principals' reports: 2012

| Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch | Average score | s.e. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

U.S. average
497

Less than 10 percent 556 * 7.0
10 to 24.9 percent 528 * 6.5

25 to 49.9 percent 523 * 5.6
50 to 74.9 percent 483 * 5.0
75 percent or more 442 * 8.1
OECD average $501 \quad 0.5$
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: 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. Data in this table are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. 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. Free or reduced-price lunch data are for public schools only.

SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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| Race/ethnicity | 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. |
| U.S. average | 4.2 | 0.54 | 14.0 | 1.08 | 26.7 | 1.08 | 28.9 | 1.07 | 18.8 | 1.07 | 6.3 | 0.64 | 1.1 | 0.20 |
| White | 1.2 !* | 0.41 | 7.5 * | 0.84 | 21.9 * | 1.19 | 33.0 * | 1.23 | 25.6 * | 1.28 | 9.1 * | 0.93 | 1.6 *** | 0.35 |
| Black | 11.6 * | 1.82 | 26.4 * | 2.41 | 33.3 * | 2.67 | 18.5 * | 2.21 | 9.0 * | 1.97 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Hispanic | 6.4 *** | 1.14 | 20.7 * | 1.96 | 34.5 * | 1.66 | 26.0 *** | 2.00 | 9.9 * | 1.13 | 2.2 !* | 0.75 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Asian | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 5.7 * | 1.67 | 15.6 * | 3.50 | 31.8 | 4.32 | 29.1 *** | 5.21 | 12.3 | 3.55 | 3.8 ! | 1.85 |
| Multiracial | 2.0 !* | 0.94 | 11.1 ! | 3.65 | 25.0 | 4.60 | 33.1 | 4.02 | 18.7 | 3.52 | 9.4 | 2.22 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| OECD average | 4.8 | 0.09 | 13.0 | 0.14 | 24.5 | 0.16 | 28.8 | 0.17 | 20.5 | 0.15 | 7.2 | 0.10 | 1.1 | 0.04 |

† Not applicable.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Interpret data with caution. Est
${ }^{\ddagger} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
${ }_{* *}^{* *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the . 05 level of statistical significance.
${ }_{* * *} p<.05$. 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 science literacy levels according to their scores. Exact cut 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 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 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. Standard error is noted by s.e . Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. data for some race/ethnicities were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and sta
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Table S7. Average scores of U.S. 15 -year-old students on PISA science literacy scale, by race/ethnicity: 2012

| Race/ethnicity | Average score | s.e. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. average | $\mathbf{4 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 8}$ |
| White | $528^{*}$ | 3.7 |
| Black | $439^{*}$ | 6.8 |
| Hispanic | $4622^{*}$ | 4.7 |
| Asian | $5466^{*}$ | 8.6 |
| Multiracial | $511^{* * *}$ | 7.8 |
| OECD average | $\mathbf{5 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ |

${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and 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.
NOTE: Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## Exhibit R1. Description of PISA proficiency levels on reading literacy scale: 2012

| Proficiency level and lower cut score | Task descriptions |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level 6 698 | At level 6 , tasks typically require the reader to make multiple inferences, comparisons, and contrasts that are both detailed and precise. They require demonstration of a full and detailed understanding of one or more texts and may involve integrating information from more than one text. Tasks may require the reader to deal with unfamiliar ideas, in the presence of prominent competing information, and to generate abstract categories for interpretations. Reflect and evaluate tasks may require the reader to hypothesize about or critically evaluate a complex text on an unfamiliar topic, taking into account multiple criteria or perspectives, and applying sophisticated understandings from beyond the text. A salient condition for access and retrieve tasks at this level is precision of analysis and fine attention to detail that is inconspicuous in the texts. |
| Level 5 626 | At level 5 , tasks that involve retrieving information require the reader to locate and organize several pieces of deeply embedded information, inferring which information in the text is relevant. Reflective tasks require critical evaluation or hypothesis, drawing on specialized knowledge. Both interpretative and reflective tasks require a full and detailed understanding of a text whose content or form is unfamiliar. For all aspects of reading, tasks at this level typically involve dealing with concepts that are contrary to expectations. |
| Level 4 553 | At level 4 , tasks that involve retrieving information require the reader to locate and organize several pieces of embedded information. Some tasks at this level require interpreting the meaning of nuances of language in a section of text by taking into account the text as a whole. Other interpretative tasks require understanding and applying categories in an unfamiliar context. Reflective tasks at this level require readers to use formal or public knowledge to hypothesize about or critically evaluate a text. Readers must demonstrate an accurate understanding of long or complex texts whose content or form may be unfamiliar. |
| Level 3 480 | 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 2 407 | 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 to meet several conditions. Others require recognizing the main idea in a text, understanding relationships, or construing meaning within a limited part of the text when the information is not prominent and the reader must make low level inferences. Tasks at this level may involve comparisons or contrasts based on a single feature in the text. Typical reflective tasks at this level require readers to make a comparison or several connections between the text and outside knowledge, by drawing on personal experience and attitudes. |
| Level 1a 335 | At level 1a, tasks require the reader to locate one or more independent pieces of explicitly stated information; to recognize the 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 common, everyday knowledge. Typically, the required information in the text is prominent and there is little, if any, competing information. The reader is explicitly directed to consider relevant factors in the task and in the text. |
| Level 1b 262 | At level 1 b , tasks require the reader to locate a single piece of explicitly stated information in a prominent position in a short, syntactically simple text with a familiar context and text type, such as a narrative or a simple list. The text typically provides support to the reader, such as repetition of information, pictures, or familiar symbols. There is minimal competing information. In tasks requiring interpretation the reader may need to make simple connections between adjacent pieces of information. |

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. Cut scores in the exhibit are rounded; exact cut scores are provided in table AA1. 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), 2012.
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Table R1. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on PISA reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and education system: 2012

| Education system | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | 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. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 1.3 | 0.05 | 4.4 | 0.08 | 12.3 | 0.13 | 23.5 | 0.16 | 29.1 | 0.17 | 21.0 | 0.16 | 7.3 | 0.10 | 1.1 | 0.04 |
| Albania | 12.0 | 0.84 | 15.9 | 1.00 | 24.4 | 1.23 | 24.7 | 1.01 | 15.9 | 0.73 | 5.9 | 0.61 | 1.1 | 0.24 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Argentina | 8.1 | 0.80 | 17.7 | 1.20 | 27.7 | 1.34 | 27.3 | 1.12 | 14.6 | 0.91 | 4.0 | 0.57 | 0.5 ! | 0.15 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Australia | 0.9 | 0.11 | 3.1 | 0.21 | 10.2 | 0.42 | 21.6 | 0.47 | 29.1 | 0.53 | 23.3 | 0.51 | 9.8 | 0.46 | 1.9 | 0.19 |
| Austria | 0.8 | 0.24 | 4.8 | 0.64 | 13.8 | 0.84 | 24.2 | 0.89 | 29.6 | 0.92 | 21.2 | 0.94 | 5.2 | 0.59 | 0.3 | 0.10 |
| Belgium | 1.6 | 0.31 | 4.1 | 0.40 | 10.4 | 0.55 | 20.4 | 0.62 | 27.3 | 0.70 | 24.4 | 0.71 | 10.4 | 0.54 | 1.4 | 0.17 |
| Brazil | 4.0 | 0.36 | 14.8 | 0.64 | 30.4 | 0.79 | 30.1 | 0.77 | 15.8 | 0.63 | 4.4 | 0.37 | 0.5 | 0.12 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Bulgaria | 8.0 | 1.07 | 12.8 | 1.15 | 18.6 | 1.10 | 22.2 | 1.16 | 21.4 | 1.10 | 12.7 | 1.03 | 3.8 | 0.56 | 0.5 ! | 0.18 |
| Canada | 0.5 | 0.09 | 2.4 | 0.19 | 8.0 | 0.36 | 19.4 | 0.55 | 31.0 | 0.72 | 25.8 | 0.59 | 10.8 | 0.53 | 2.1 | 0.22 |
| Chile | 1.0 | 0.19 | 8.1 | 0.79 | 23.9 | 1.08 | 35.1 | 1.08 | 24.3 | 1.06 | 6.9 | 0.62 | 0.6 | 0.11 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Chinese Taipei | 0.6 | 0.15 | 2.5 | 0.32 | 8.4 | 0.65 | 18.1 | 0.83 | 29.9 | 0.92 | 28.7 | 1.01 | 10.4 | 0.73 | 1.4 | 0.32 |
| Colombia | 5.0 | 0.76 | 15.4 | 0.98 | 31.0 | 1.29 | 30.5 | 1.22 | 14.5 | 0.91 | 3.2 | 0.50 | 0.3 ! | 0.12 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Costa Rica | 0.8 ! | 0.24 | 7.3 | 1.02 | 24.3 | 1.25 | 38.1 | 1.40 | 22.9 | 1.42 | 6.0 | 0.78 | 0.6 ! | 0.19 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Croatia | 0.7 ! | 0.25 | 4.0 | 0.59 | 13.9 | 0.97 | 27.8 | 1.07 | 31.2 | 1.24 | 17.8 | 1.09 | 4.2 | 0.66 | 0.2 ! | 0.11 |
| Cyprus | 6.1 | 0.32 | 9.7 | 0.44 | 17.0 | 0.61 | 25.1 | 0.78 | 24.9 | 0.75 | 13.2 | 0.64 | 3.5 | 0.34 | 0.5 | 0.12 |
| Czech Republic | 0.6 ! | 0.27 | 3.5 | 0.56 | 12.7 | 0.94 | 26.4 | 1.30 | 31.3 | 1.23 | 19.4 | 1.13 | 5.3 | 0.49 | 0.8 | 0.16 |
| Denmark | 0.8 ! | 0.30 | 3.1 | 0.39 | 10.7 | 0.77 | 25.8 | 0.92 | 33.6 | 0.85 | 20.5 | 0.86 | 5.1 | 0.58 | 0.4 ! | 0.12 |
| Estonia | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 1.3 | 0.28 | 7.7 | 0.61 | 22.7 | 0.94 | 35.0 | 1.06 | 24.9 | 1.08 | 7.5 | 0.71 | 0.9 | 0.18 |
| Finland | 0.7 | 0.16 | 2.4 | 0.38 | 8.2 | 0.57 | 19.1 | 0.81 | 29.3 | 0.70 | 26.8 | 0.84 | 11.3 | 0.60 | 2.2 | 0.26 |
| France | 2.1 | 0.40 | 4.9 | 0.43 | 11.9 | 0.70 | 18.9 | 0.85 | 26.3 | 0.84 | 23.0 | 0.67 | 10.6 | 0.62 | 2.3 | 0.41 |
| Germany | 0.5 ! | 0.18 | 3.3 | 0.40 | 10.7 | 0.67 | 22.1 | 0.93 | 29.9 | 0.86 | 24.6 | 0.88 | 8.3 | 0.64 | 0.7 ! | 0.23 |
| Greece | 2.6 | 0.40 | 5.9 | 0.60 | 14.2 | 0.83 | 25.1 | 1.06 | 30.0 | 1.02 | 17.2 | 1.19 | 4.6 | 0.59 | 0.5 | 0.13 |
| Hong Kong-China | 0.2 ! | 0.09 | 1.3 | 0.24 | 5.3 | 0.61 | 14.3 | 0.79 | 29.2 | 1.21 | 32.9 | 1.39 | 14.9 | 1.00 | 1.9 | 0.39 |
| Hungary | 0.7 ! | 0.24 | 5.2 | 0.64 | 13.8 | 0.88 | 24.3 | 1.17 | 29.9 | 1.00 | 20.4 | 1.05 | 5.3 | 0.68 | 0.4 ! | 0.13 |
| Iceland | 2.3 | 0.33 | 5.4 | 0.47 | 13.3 | 0.63 | 24.7 | 0.92 | 29.9 | 1.09 | 18.6 | 1.12 | 5.2 | 0.41 | 0.6 ! | 0.21 |
| Indonesia | 4.1 | 0.81 | 16.3 | 1.28 | 34.8 | 1.56 | 31.6 | 1.54 | 11.5 | 1.28 | 1.5 ! | 0.53 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Ireland | 0.3 ! | 0.13 | 1.9 | 0.35 | 7.5 | 0.69 | 19.6 | 1.19 | 33.4 | 1.17 | 26.0 | 0.90 | 10.1 | 0.67 | 1.3 | 0.35 |
| Israel | 3.8 | 0.59 | 6.9 | 0.74 | 12.9 | 0.96 | 20.8 | 0.87 | 25.3 | 0.81 | 20.6 | 1.03 | 8.1 | 0.77 | 1.5 | 0.30 |
| Italy | 1.6 | 0.15 | 5.2 | 0.29 | 12.7 | 0.48 | 23.7 | 0.57 | 29.7 | 0.53 | 20.5 | 0.62 | 6.1 | 0.33 | 0.6 | 0.07 |
| Japan | 0.6 | 0.16 | 2.4 | 0.37 | 6.7 | 0.67 | 16.6 | 0.89 | 26.7 | 0.98 | 28.4 | 1.08 | 14.6 | 0.99 | 3.9 | 0.59 |
| Jordan | 7.5 | 0.84 | 14.9 | 0.79 | 28.3 | 1.01 | 30.8 | 1.14 | 15.5 | 0.83 | 2.9 | 0.63 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | 4.2 | 0.47 | 17.3 | 1.24 | 35.6 | 1.15 | 31.3 | 1.12 | 10.4 | 0.87 | 1.2 | 0.24 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Korea, Republic of | 0.4 | 0.13 | 1.7 | 0.39 | 5.5 | 0.60 | 16.4 | 0.94 | 30.8 | 1.00 | 31.0 | 1.06 | 12.6 | 1.05 | 1.6 | 0.32 |
| Latvia | 0.7 ! | 0.24 | 3.7 | 0.54 | 12.6 | 0.96 | 26.7 | 1.31 | 33.1 | 1.05 | 19.1 | 0.88 | 3.9 | 0.56 | 0.3 ! | 0.11 |
| Liechtenstein | \# | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 10.5 | 1.85 | 22.4 | 3.44 | 28.6 | 4.53 | 25.7 | 2.44 | 10.4 | 2.44 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Lithuania | 1.0 | 0.19 | 4.6 | 0.49 | 15.6 | 1.06 | 28.1 | 1.13 | 31.1 | 0.94 | 16.3 | 0.78 | 3.1 | 0.35 | 0.2 ! | 0.07 |
| Luxembourg | 2.0 | 0.21 | 6.3 | 0.33 | 13.8 | 0.81 | 23.4 | 0.71 | 25.8 | 0.64 | 19.7 | 0.64 | 7.5 | 0.35 | 1.4 | 0.20 |
| Macao-China | 0.3 ! | 0.11 | 2.1 | 0.22 | 9.0 | 0.42 | 23.3 | 0.58 | 34.3 | 0.67 | 24.0 | 0.60 | 6.4 | 0.48 | 0.6 ! | 0.21 |
| Malaysia | 5.8 | 0.59 | 16.4 | 1.03 | 30.5 | 0.99 | 31.0 | 1.09 | 13.6 | 1.11 | 2.5 | 0.45 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Mexico | 2.6 | 0.22 | 11.0 | 0.53 | 27.5 | 0.70 | 34.5 | 0.62 | 19.6 | 0.54 | 4.5 | 0.25 | 0.4 | 0.08 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 4.4 | 0.53 | 13.2 | 0.62 | 25.7 | 0.94 | 29.2 | 0.77 | 19.9 | 0.76 | 6.6 | 0.53 | 0.9 | 0.19 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Netherlands | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 2.8 | 0.49 | 10.3 | 0.93 | 21.0 | 1.27 | 29.2 | 1.32 | 26.1 | 1.36 | 9.0 | 0.72 | 0.8 | 0.19 |
| New Zealand | 1.3 | 0.28 | 4.0 | 0.46 | 11.0 | 0.67 | 20.8 | 0.76 | 26.3 | 1.06 | 22.7 | 1.06 | 10.9 | 0.62 | 3.0 | 0.37 |
| Norway | 1.7 | 0.31 | 3.7 | 0.36 | 10.8 | 0.69 | 21.9 | 1.03 | 29.4 | 1.35 | 22.3 | 1.21 | 8.5 | 0.61 | 1.7 | 0.31 |
| Peru | 9.8 | 0.87 | 20.6 | 1.11 | 29.5 | 0.98 | 24.9 | 1.02 | 11.4 | 0.96 | 3.3 | 0.61 | 0.5 ! | 0.21 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Poland | 0.3 ! | 0.11 | 2.1 | 0.35 | 8.1 | 0.74 | 21.4 | 0.90 | 32.0 | 0.89 | 26.0 | 0.96 | 8.6 | 0.76 | 1.4 | 0.37 |
| Portugal | 1.3 | 0.30 | 5.1 | 0.53 | 12.3 | 0.98 | 25.5 | 1.16 | 30.2 | 1.46 | 19.7 | 1.07 | 5.3 | 0.57 | 0.5 ! | 0.15 |
| Qatar | 13.6 | 0.32 | 18.9 | 0.48 | 24.6 | 0.44 | 21.9 | 0.50 | 13.5 | 0.43 | 5.8 | 0.21 | 1.4 | 0.13 | 0.2 | 0.05 |
| Romania | 2.5 | 0.38 | 10.3 | 0.82 | 24.4 | 1.28 | 30.6 | 1.12 | 21.8 | 1.17 | 8.7 | 0.88 | 1.5 | 0.35 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Russian Federation | 1.1 | 0.18 | 5.2 | 0.49 | 16.0 | 1.03 | 29.5 | 1.08 | 28.3 | 1.05 | 15.3 | 0.93 | 4.2 | 0.51 | 0.5 | 0.12 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 2.6 | 0.40 | 9.3 | 0.73 | 21.3 | 1.09 | 30.8 | 1.20 | 23.3 | 1.15 | 10.5 | 0.81 | 2.0 | 0.39 | 0.2 ! | 0.08 |
| Shanghai-China | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 0.3 ! | 0.11 | 2.5 | 0.34 | 11.0 | 0.85 | 25.3 | 0.85 | 35.7 | 1.07 | 21.3 | 0.98 | 3.8 | 0.65 |
| Singapore | 0.5 | 0.12 | 1.9 | 0.27 | 7.5 | 0.41 | 16.7 | 0.65 | 25.4 | 0.66 | 26.8 | 0.79 | 16.2 | 0.73 | 5.0 | 0.43 |
| Slovak Republic | 4.1 | 0.77 | 7.9 | 0.80 | 16.2 | 1.06 | 25.0 | 1.08 | 26.8 | 1.38 | 15.7 | 0.96 | 4.1 | 0.60 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Slovenia | 1.2 | 0.14 | 4.9 | 0.37 | 15.0 | 0.71 | 27.2 | 0.77 | 28.4 | 0.94 | 18.2 | 0.63 | 4.7 | 0.45 | 0.3 ! | 0.12 |
| Spain | 1.3 | 0.17 | 4.4 | 0.38 | 12.6 | 0.47 | 25.8 | 0.81 | 31.2 | 0.68 | 19.2 | 0.62 | 5.0 | 0.30 | 0.5 | 0.10 |
| Sweden | 2.9 | 0.39 | 6.0 | 0.64 | 13.9 | 0.72 | 23.5 | 0.88 | 27.3 | 0.73 | 18.6 | 0.93 | 6.7 | 0.53 | 1.2 | 0.20 |
| Switzerland | 0.5 | 0.14 | 2.9 | 0.34 | 10.3 | 0.59 | 21.9 | 0.86 | 31.5 | 0.71 | 23.8 | 0.84 | 8.2 | 0.60 | 1.0 | 0.25 |
| Thailand | 1.2 | 0.29 | 7.7 | 0.77 | 24.1 | 0.98 | 36.0 | 1.12 | 23.5 | 1.13 | 6.7 | 0.79 | 0.8 | 0.21 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Tunisia | 6.2 | 0.91 | 15.5 | 1.20 | 27.6 | 1.31 | 31.4 | 1.43 | 15.6 | 1.15 | 3.5 | 0.69 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Turkey | 0.6 | 0.15 | 4.5 | 0.57 | 16.6 | 1.07 | 30.8 | 1.39 | 28.7 | 1.34 | 14.5 | 1.39 | 4.1 | 0.79 | 0.3 ! | 0.13 |
| United Arab Emirates | 3.3 | 0.34 | 10.4 | 0.65 | 21.8 | 0.72 | 28.6 | 0.72 | 24.0 | 0.77 | 9.7 | 0.58 | 2.1 | 0.28 | 0.2 ! | 0.06 |
| United Kingdom | 1.5 | 0.27 | 4.0 | 0.54 | 11.2 | 0.79 | 23.5 | 1.01 | 29.9 | 1.08 | 21.3 | 1.14 | 7.5 | 0.59 | 1.3 | 0.24 |
| United States | 0.8 ! | 0.24 | 3.6 | 0.49 | 12.3 | 0.89 | 24.9 | 0.99 | 30.5 | 0.88 | 20.1 | 1.08 | 6.9 | 0.59 | 1.0 | 0.22 |
| Uruguay | 6.4 | 0.70 | 14.7 | 0.84 | 25.9 | 0.88 | 28.9 | 1.00 | 17.4 | 0.71 | 5.7 | 0.62 | 0.9 | 0.26 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Vietnam | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 1.5 ! | 0.48 | 7.8 | 1.10 | 23.7 | 1.40 | 39.0 | 1.47 | 23.4 | 1.47 | 4.2 | 0.71 | 0.4 ! | 0.16 |
| U.S. state education systems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 3.2 | 0.87 | 9.7 | 1.26 | 19.6 | 1.49 | 28.2 | 1.32 | 24.4 | 1.83 | 11.7 | 1.38 | 2.9 | 0.54 |
| Florida | 0.7 ! | 0.31 | 3.6 | 0.75 | 13.2 | 1.46 | 25.8 | 1.56 | 30.9 | 1.50 | 20.4 | 2.06 | 4.9 | 1.00 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Massachusetts | $\pm$ | $\dagger$ | 2.3 | 0.55 | 8.6 | 1.19 | 18.5 | 1.76 | 29.8 | 1.52 | 24.2 | 1.82 | 12.9 | 1.59 | 3.2 | 0.86 |

Massachusetts
$\dagger$ 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 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 698.3 ); 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. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-OECD from 0 to 1,000 . The OECD average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each
countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Figure R1a. Percentage of 15-year-old students performing at PISA reading literacy proficiency levels 5 and above and below leve 2, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Below level 2 |  | Levels 5 and above | Education system | Below level 2 |  | Levels 5 and above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average | 18 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Shanghai-China | 3* |  | 25 * | Russian Federation | 22 * |  | 5* |
| Singapore | 10* |  | 21 * | Vietnam | 9* |  | 5* |
| Japan | 10* |  | 18 * | Croatia | 19 |  | 4 * |
| Hong Kong-China | 7 * |  | 17 * | Slovak Republic | 28 * |  | $4 *$ |
| Korea, Republic of | 8 * |  | 14 * | Turkey | 22 * |  | 4 * |
| New Zealand | 16 |  | 14 * | Bulgaria | 39* |  | 4 * |
| Finland | 11* |  | 13* | Latvia | 17 |  | 4 * |
| France | 19 |  | 13 * | Cyprus | 33 * |  | 4 * |
| Canada | 11* |  | 13 * | Lithuania | 21* |  | 3* |
| Chinese Taipei | 11* |  | 12 * | Serbia, Republic of | 33 * |  | 2 * |
| Belgium | 16 |  | 12 * | United Arab Emirates | 36 * |  | 2 * |
| Australia | 14 |  | 12 * | Qatar | 57* |  | 2 * |
| Ireland | 10* |  | 11 * | Romania | 37 * |  | 2* |
| Liechtenstein | 12 |  | 11 | Albania | 52 * |  | 1* |
| Norway | 16 |  | 10 * | Montenegro, Republic of | 43* |  | 1* |
| Poland | 11* |  | 10 | Uruguay | 47* |  | 1 * |
| Netherlands | 14 |  | 10 | Thailand | 33 * |  | 1* |
| Israel | 24 * |  | 10 | Chile | 33* |  | 1 * |
| Switzerland | 14 * |  | 9 | Costa Rica | 32 * |  | 1 ! |
| Germany | 14 |  | 9 | Argentina | 54 * |  | 1* |
| Luxembourg | 22 * |  | 9 | Brazil | 49 * |  | 1* |
| United Kingdom | 17 |  | 9 | Peru | 60 * |  | \# ! |
| Estonia | 9 * |  | 8 | Mexico | 41* |  | \#* |
| United States | 17 |  | 8 | Colombia | 51* |  | \# ! ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Sweden | 23 * |  | 8 | Tunisia | 49* |  | $\ddagger$ |
| Macao-China | 11* |  | 7 | Jordan | 51 * |  | $\ddagger$ |
| Italy | 20 * |  | 7 | Malaysia | 53 * |  | $\ddagger$ |
| Czech Republic | 17 |  | 6 * | Indonesia | 55* |  | $\ddagger$ |
| Iceland | 21* |  | 6 * | Kazakhstan | 57 * |  | $\ddagger$ |
| Portugal | 19 |  | 6 * |  | 020 | 4060 | 80100 |
| Hungary | 20 |  | 6 * |  |  | Percent |  |
| Spain | 18 |  | 6 * | U.S. state |  |  |  |
| Austria | 19 |  | 6 * | education systems |  |  |  |
| Denmark | 15 |  | 5* | Massachusetts | 11* |  | 16 * |
| Greece | 23 * |  | 5* | Connecticut | 13 |  | 15* |
| Slovenia | 21* |  | 5* | Florida | 17 |  | 6* |
|  | Percent |  |  |  | 020 | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 40 & 60 \\ \text { Percent } \end{array}$ | 80100 |

[^0]National Center for Education Statistics
Table R1b. Percentage of 15 -year-old students performing at PISA reading literacy proficiency levels 5 and above and below level 2, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Below level 2 |  | Levels 5 and above |  | Education system | Below level 2 |  | Levels 5 and above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 18.0 | 0.18 | 8.4 | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shanghai-China | 2.9 * | 0.39 | 25.1 | 1.19 | Russian Federation | 22.3 * | 1.29 | 4.6 * | 0.58 |
| Singapore | 9.9 * | 0.42 | 21.2 * | 0.60 | Vietnam | 9.4 * | 1.43 | 4.5 * | 0.81 |
| Japan | 9.8 * | 0.92 | 18.5 * | 1.27 | Croatia | 18.7 | 1.29 | 4.4 * | 0.69 |
| Hong Kong-China | 6.8 * | 0.72 | 16.8 | 1.16 | Slovak Republic | 28.2 * | 1.78 | 4.4 * | 0.68 |
| Korea, Republic of | 7.6 * | 0.89 | 14.1 | 1.24 | Turkey | 21.6 * | 1.43 | 4.3 * | 0.85 |
| New Zealand | 16.3 | 0.83 | 14.0 * | 0.77 | Bulgaria | 39.4 * | 2.21 | 4.3 * | 0.64 |
| Finland | 11.3 * | 0.71 | 13.5 * | 0.64 | Latvia | 17.0 | 1.14 | 4.2 * | 0.55 |
| France | 18.9 | 0.98 | 12.9 | 0.85 | Cyprus | 32.8 * | 0.67 | 4.0 * | 0.32 |
| Canada | 10.9 * | 0.45 | 12.9 * | 0.62 | Lithuania | 21.2 * | 1.18 | 3.3 * | 0.37 |
| Chinese Taipei | 11.5 * | 0.87 | 11.8 * | 0.84 | Serbia, Republic of | 33.1 * | 1.66 | 2.2 * | 0.41 |
| Belgium | 16.1 | 0.81 | 11.8 * | 0.60 | United Arab Emirates | 35.5 * | 1.08 | 2.2 * | 0.29 |
| Australia | 14.2 | 0.46 | 11.7 | 0.54 | Qatar | 57.1 * | 0.42 | 1.6 * | 0.14 |
| Ireland | 9.6 * | 0.88 | 11.4 * | 0.65 | Romania | 37.3 * | 1.87 | 1.6 * | 0.38 |
| Liechtenstein | 12.4 | 1.88 | 10.9 | 2.89 | Albania | 52.3 * | 1.28 | 1.2 * | 0.25 |
| Norway | 16.2 | 1.03 | 10.2 * | 0.74 | Montenegro, Republic of | 43.3 * | 0.75 | 1.0 * | 0.19 |
| Poland | 10.6 * | 0.80 | 10.0 | 0.93 | Uruguay | 47.0 * | 1.42 | 0.9 * | 0.27 |
| Netherlands | 14.0 | 1.23 | 9.8 | 0.82 | Thailand | 33.0 * | 1.40 | 0.8 * | 0.22 |
| Israel | 23.6 * | 1.64 | 9.6 | 0.84 | Chile | 33.0 * | 1.67 | 0.6 * | 0.10 |
| Switzerland | 13.7 * | 0.76 | 9.1 | 0.68 | Costa Rica | 32.4 * | 1.81 | 0.6 !* | 0.19 |
| Germany | 14.5 | 0.91 | 8.9 | 0.70 | Argentina | 53.6 * | 1.73 | 0.5 * | 0.14 |
| Luxembourg | 22.2 * | 0.74 | 8.9 | 0.39 | Brazil | 49.2 * | 1.13 | 0.5 * | 0.12 |
| United Kingdom | 16.6 | 1.30 | 8.8 | 0.74 | Peru | 59.9 * | 1.95 | 0.5 !* | 0.21 |
| Estonia | 9.1 * | 0.65 | 8.3 | 0.72 | Mexico | 41.1 * | 0.90 | 0.4 * | 0.09 |
| United States | 16.6 | 1.26 | 7.9 | 0.67 | Colombia | 51.4 * | 1.78 | 0.3 !* | 0.13 |
| Sweden | 22.7 * | 1.15 | 7.9 | 0.64 | Tunisia | 49.3* | 2.24 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Macao-China | 11.5 * | 0.42 | 7.0 | 0.41 | Jordan | 50.7 * | 1.57 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Italy | 19.5 * | 0.67 | 6.7 | 0.35 | Malaysia | 52.7 * | 1.71 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Czech Republic | 16.9 | 1.21 | 6.1 * | 0.55 | Indonesia | 55.2 * | 2.18 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Iceland | 21.0 * | 0.72 | 5.8 * | 0.51 | Kazakhstan | 57.1 * | 1.56 | $\ddagger$ | t |
| Portugal | 18.8 | 1.42 | 5.8 * | 0.61 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hungary | 19.7 | 1.22 | 5.6 * | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spain | 18.3 | 0.76 | 5.5 * | 0.30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Austria | 19.5 | 1.07 | 5.5 * | 0.61 | U.S. state education systems |  |  |  |  |
| Denmark | 14.6 | 1.07 | 5.4 * | 0.62 | Massachusetts | 11.5 * | 1.37 | 16.1 * | 1.98 |
| Greece | 22.6 * | 1.24 | 5.1 * | 0.61 | Connecticut | 13.2 | 1.76 | 14.5 * | 1.68 |
| Slovenia | 21.1 * | 0.68 | 5.0 * | 0.43 | Florida | 17.5 | 2.00 | 5.5 * | 1.02 |

## $\dagger$ Not applicable.

! 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. percentage at the .05 level of statistical significance.

NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 percentages of 15 -year-olds in levels 5 and above. To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading proficiency levels according to their scores. Exact cut 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 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. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. This table corresponds to figure 3 in Performance of U.S. 15-Year-Old Students in Mathematics, Science, and Reading Literacy in an International Context (NCES 2014-024).
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table R2. Average scores of 15 -year-old students on PISA reading literacy scale, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Average score | s.e. | Education system | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average | 496 | 0.5 |  |  |  |
| Shanghai-China | 5700 | 2.9 | Iceland | 483 ( | 1.8 |
| Hong Kong-China | 5450 | 2.8 | Slovenia | 481 ( | 1.2 |
| Singapore | 5420 | 1.4 | Lithuania | 477 (7) | 2.5 |
| Japan | 5380 | 3.7 | Greece | 477 ( | 3.3 |
| Korea, Republic of | 5360 | 3.9 | Turkey | 475 ( | 4.2 |
| Finland | 5240 | 2.4 | Russian Federation | 475 ( | 3.0 |
| Ireland | 5230 | 2.6 | Slovak Republic | 463 ( | 4.2 |
| Canada | 5230 | 1.9 | Cyprus | 449 ( | 1.2 |
| Chinese Taipei | 5230 | 3.0 | Serbia, Republic of | 446 ( | 3.4 |
| Poland | 5180 | 3.1 | United Arab Emirates | 442 ( | 2.5 |
| Estonia | 5160 | 2.0 | Chile | 441 ( | 2.9 |
| Liechtenstein | 5160 | 4.1 | Thailand | 441 ( | 3.1 |
| New Zealand | 5120 | 2.4 | Costa Rica | 441 ( | 3.5 |
| Australia | 5120 | 1.6 | Romania | 438 ( | 4.0 |
| Netherlands | 5110 | 3.5 | Bulgaria | 436 ( | 6.0 |
| Switzerland | 5090 | 2.6 | Mexico | 424 ( | 1.5 |
| Macao-China | 5090 | 0.9 | Montenegro, Republic of | 422 ( | 1.2 |
| Belgium | 5090 | 2.3 | Uruguay | 411 ( | 3.2 |
| Vietnam | 508 | 4.4 | Brazil | 410 ( | 2.1 |
| Germany | 5080 | 2.8 | Tunisia | 404 ( | 4.5 |
| France | 505 | 2.8 | Colombia | 403 ( | 3.4 |
| Norway | 504 | 3.2 | Jordan | 399 | 3.6 |
| United Kingdom | 499 | 3.5 | Malaysia | 398 ( | 3.3 |
| United States | 498 | 3.7 | Indonesia | 396 | 4.2 |
| Denmark | 496 | 2.6 | Argentina | 396 (7) | 3.7 |
| Czech Republic | 493 | 2.9 | Albania | 394 | 3.2 |
| Italy | 490 | 2.0 | Kazakhstan | 393 | 2.7 |
| Austria | 490 | 2.8 | Qatar | 388 | 0.8 |
| Latvia | 489 | 2.4 | Peru | 384 (1) | 4.3 |
| Hungary | 488 | 3.2 |  |  |  |
| Spain | 488 | 1.9 |  |  |  |
| Luxembourg | 488 | 1.5 | U.S. state education |  |  |
| Portugal | 488 | 3.8 | systems |  |  |
| Israel | 486 | 5.0 | Massachusetts | 5270 | 6.1 |
| Croatia | 485 | 3.3 | Connecticut | 5210 | 6.5 |
| Sweden | 483 ( | 3.0 | Florida | 492 | 6.1 |

© Average score is higher than U.S. average score.
( Average score is lower than U.S. average score.
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 average score. 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 . All average scores reported as higher or lower than the U.S. average score are different at the .05 level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. This table corresponds to table 3 in Performance of U.S. 15-Year-Old Students in Mathematics, Science, and Reading Literacy in an International Context (NCES 2014-024),
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

National Center for Education Statistics
Figure R2a. Difference in average scores of 15-year-old female and male students on PISA reading literacy scale, by education system: 2012

$\left.\begin{array}{lllllllll}\begin{array}{l}\begin{array}{l}\text { U.S. state } \\ \text { education systems }\end{array}\end{array} & & \text { Difference in favor of females }\end{array}\right]$

Female-male difference in average reading literacy scores is statistically different.
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by female-male difference in 2012 average score. Differences were computed using unrounded numbers. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Score differences as noted between females and males are significantly different at the . 05 level of statistical significance. The OECD average is the average of the national average differences of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

National Center for Education Statistics
Table R2b. Difference in average scores of 15-year-old female and male
students on PISA reading literacy scale, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Female-male difference | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average | 38 * | 0.6 |
| Albania | 15 * | 4.0 |
| Colombia | 19 * | 3.5 |
| Peru | 22 * | 4.3 |
| Chile | 23 * | 3.3 |
| Korea, Republic of | 23 * | 5.4 |
| Mexico | 24 * | 1.4 |
| Shanghai-China | 24 * | 2.5 |
| Japan | 24 * | 4.1 |
| Liechtenstein | 24 * | 8.7 |
| United Kingdom | 25 * | 4.6 |
| Costa Rica | 25 * | 2.6 |
| Hong Kong-China | 25 * | 4.7 |
| Netherlands | 26 * | 3.1 |
| Indonesia | 28 * | 3.4 |
| Ireland | 29 * | 4.2 |
| Spain | 29 * | 2.0 |
| Luxembourg | 30 * | 2.0 |
| Brazil | 31 * | 1.9 |
| Tunisia | 31 * | 3.1 |
| Denmark | 31 * | 2.8 |
| United States | 31 * | 2.6 |
| Vietnam | 31 * | 2.6 |
| Belgium | 32 * | 3.5 |
| Singapore | 32 * | 2.6 |
| Chinese Taipei | 32 * | 6.4 |
| New Zealand | 34 * | 5.0 |
| Australia | 34 * | 2.9 |
| Canada | 35 * | 2.1 |
| Uruguay | 35 * | 3.5 |
| Macao-China | 36 * | 1.7 |
| Switzerland | 36 * | 2.6 |
| Kazakhstan | 37 * | 2.9 |
| Austria | 37 * | 5.0 |
| Argentina | 38 * | 3.6 |
| Czech Republic | 39 * | 3.7 |
| Italy | 39 * | 2.6 |
| Portugal | 39 * | 2.7 |
| Slovak Republic | 39 * | 4.6 |
| Hungary | 40 * | 3.6 |
| Russian Federation | 40 * | 3.0 |
| Malaysia | 40 * | 3.1 |
| Romania | 40 * | 4.1 |
| Poland | 42 * | 2.9 |
| Estonia | 44 * | 2.4 |
| France | 44 * | 4.2 |
| Israel | 44 * | 7.9 |
| Germany | 44 * | 2.5 |
| Turkey | 46 * | 4.0 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 46 * | 3.8 |
| Norway | 46 * | 3.3 |
| Croatia | 48 * | 4.0 |
| Greece | 50 * | 3.7 |
| Iceland | 51 * | 3.3 |
| Sweden | 51 * | 3.6 |
| Latvia | 55 * | 4.0 |
| Thailand | 55 * | 3.2 |
| Lithuania | 55 * | 2.3 |
| United Arab Emirates | 55 * | 4.8 |
| Slovenia | 56 * | 2.7 |
| Finland | 62 * | 3.1 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 62 * | 3.1 |
| Cyprus | 64 * | 3.0 |
| Bulgaria | 70 * | 5.2 |
| Qatar | 70 * | 1.6 |
| Jordan | 75 * | 6.3 |

U.S. state education systems

| Florida | 22 * | 4.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Connecticut | 22 * | 5.0 |
| Massachusetts | 32 * | 4.2 |

${ }^{*} p<.05$. All differences between females and males are significantly different at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by female-male difference in 2012 average score. Differences were computed using unrounded numbers. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . The OECD average is the average of the national average differences of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Table R4. Percentage distribution of U.S. 15-year-old public school students on PISA reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reducedprice lunch, based on principals' reports: 2012

| Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | 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. | Percent | s.e. |
| U.S. average | $0.8{ }^{\text {! ** }}$ | 0.24 | 3.6 | 0.49 | 12.3 | 0.89 | 24.9 | 0.99 | 30.5 | 0.88 | 20.1 | 1.08 | 6.9 | 0.59 | 1.0 | 0.22 |
| Less than 10 percent | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 12.9 * | 2.64 | 29.2 | 3.22 | 33.2 * | 4.24 | 17.2 * | 2.99 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 2.1 !* | 0.69 | 6.9 * | 1.12 | 21.1 *** | 2.22 | 32.2 | 1.96 | 25.8 * | 1.75 | 10.2 *** | 1.50 | $1.7{ }^{\text {! *** }}$ | 0.76 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 1.8 !* | 0.57 | 8.7 * | 1.34 | 22.1 *** | 2.14 | 30.9 | 1.60 | 24.9 *** | 2.29 | 9.9 *** | 1.34 | 1.4 ! ${ }^{\text {*** }}$ | 0.58 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 0.8 !*** | 0.31 | 4.7 *** | 1.04 | 15.0 *** | 1.70 | 28.1 * | 1.55 | 32.2 | 1.71 | 15.7 * | 1.60 | 3.1 * | 0.62 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| 75 percent or more | $2.4!^{\text {*** }}$ | 1.06 | 6.7 *** | 1.32 | 21.1 * | 2.59 | 31.8 * | 2.51 | 25.6 | 2.42 | 10.3 * | 2.03 | 2.0 !* | 0.98 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| OECD average | 1.3 *** | 0.05 | 4.4 | 0.08 | 12.3 | 0.13 | 23.5 | 0.16 | 29.1 | 0.17 | 21.0 | 0.16 | 7.3 | 0.10 | 1.1 | 0.04 | OECD average

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
II Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* $p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the . 05 level of statistical significance.
** $p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the . 05 level of statistical significance.
** $p<0.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the . 05 level of statistical significance. 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. Data in this table are based on principals' responses to question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. 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. Free or reduced-price lunch 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), 2012.
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| Table R5. Average scores of U.S. 15-year-old public school students on PISA reading literacy scale, |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| by percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, based on |  |  |
| principals' reports: $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ |  |  |
| Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch | Average score | s.e. |
| U.S. average | 498 | $\mathbf{3 . 7}$ |
| Less than 10 percent | $5599^{*}$ | 8.6 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | $524^{*}$ | 5.3 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | $519^{*}$ | 6.7 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | $479^{*}$ | 4.7 |
| 75 percent or more | $452 *$ | 8.5 |
| OECD average | $\mathbf{4 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ |

${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: 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. Data in this table are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. 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. Free or reduced-price lunch data are for public schools only.

SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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| Race/ethnicity | Below level 1b |  | Level 1b |  | Level 1a |  | 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. | Percent | s.e. |
| U.S. average | 0.8 !** | 0.24 | 3.6 | 0.49 | 12.3 | 0.89 | 24.9 | 0.99 | 30.5 | 0.88 | 20.1 | 1.08 | 6.9 | 0.59 | 1.0 | 0.22 |
| White | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 1.7 * | 0.47 | 7.8 * | 0.96 | 21.4 *** | 1.09 | 33.6 * | 1.07 | 25.0 * | 1.42 | 9.0 * | 0.82 | 1.3 | 0.33 |
| Black | 2.8 ! | 1.35 | 9.2 * | 1.54 | 23.5 * | 2.44 | 30.8 * | 2.40 | 20.7 * | 2.50 | 10.5 * | 2.09 | 2.4 !* | 0.97 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Hispanic | 0.5 !** | 0.23 | 4.0 | 0.81 | 16.2 * | 1.97 | 30.0 * | 1.76 | 30.4 | 1.68 | 15.2 * | 1.52 | 3.5 * | 0.95 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Asian | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 12.7 * | 2.89 | 31.2 | 4.97 | 31.5 * | 4.78 | 13.8 * | 3.06 | 4.9 !* | 1.80 |
| Multiracial | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ | 7.3 ! | 3.45 | 24.1 | 4.41 | 35.5 | 4.05 | 18.7 | 3.45 | 11.7 | 2.98 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| OECD average | 1.3 *** | 0.05 | 4.4 | 0.08 | 12.3 | 0.13 | 23.5 | 0.16 | 29.1 | 0.17 | 21.0 | 0.16 | 7.3 | 0.10 | 1.1 | 0.04 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

* $p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance
"* $p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD 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 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 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. 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) 2012.
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Table R7. Average scores of U.S. 15 -year-old students on PISA reading literacy scale, by race/ethnicity: 2012

| Race/ethnicity | Average score | s.e. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. average | 498 | 3.7 |
| White | $519^{*}$ | 4.1 |
| Black | $443^{*}$ | 8.3 |
| Hispanic | $478^{*}$ | 4.5 |
| Asian | $550^{*}$ | 8.1 |
| Multiracial | $517^{*}$ | 7.6 |
| OECD average | 496 | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ |

* $p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Table T1. Average scores and changes in average scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics, science, and reading literacy scales: 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009, and 2012

| Subject | 2000 |  | 2003 |  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  | 2012 |  | Change in average score |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average score | s.e. | Average score | s.e. | Average score | s.e. | Average score | s.e. | Average score | s.e. | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 2000- \\ 2012 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2003- \\ 2012 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 2006- \\ 2012 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 2009- \\ 2012 \end{array}$ |
| Mathematics | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ | 483 | 2.9 | 474 | 4.0 | 487 | 3.6 | 481 | 3.6 | $\dagger$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Science | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ | 489 | 4.2 | 502 | 3.6 | 497 | 3.8 | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Reading | 504 | 7.0 | 495 | 3.2 | - | $\dagger$ | 500 | 3.7 | 498 | 3.7 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ |

O Average score in 2012 is not measurably different than in comparison year

- Not available. PISA 2006 reading literacy results are not reported for the United States because of an error in printing the test booklets and comparisons are not possible. $\dagger$ Not applicable. Although mathematics was assessed in 2000 and science was assessed in 2000 and 2003, because the mathematics framework was revised for PISA 2003 and the science framework was revised for 2006, it is possible to look at changes in mathematics only from 2003 forward and in science only from 2006 forward.
NOTE: All average scores reported as higher or lower than the comparison year are different at the .05 level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. This table corresponds to table 4 in Performance of U.S. 15-Year-Old Students in Mathematics, Science, and Reading Literacy in an International Context (NCES 2014-024). SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2000, 2003, 2006, $2009,2012$.
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Figure T1a. Cut scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2003, 2006, 2009, and 2012


NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut) score for the following: (a) 10th percentile- the bottom 10 percent of students; (b) 25 th percentile- the bottom 25 percent of students; (c) 50 th percentile- the median (half the students scored below the cut score and half scored above it); (d) 75th percentile- the top 25 percent of students; (e) 90th percentile- the top 10 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each education system's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut scores across education systems and over time. 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, 2009, and 2012. 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, 2009, 2012.
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Table T1b. Cut scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2003, 2006, 2009, and 2012

| Selected percentiles | 2003 |  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  | 2012 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. |
| 90th percentile | 607 | 3.9 | 593 | 4.8 | 607 | 4.6 | 600 | 4.3 |
| 75th percentile | 550 | 3.4 | 537 | 5.0 | 551 | 4.9 | 543 | 4.4 |
| 50th percentile | 483 | 3.1 | 472 | 4.4 | 488 | 3.8 | 477 | 4.0 |
| 25th percentile | 418 | 3.7 | 411 | 4.8 | 425 | 3.9 | 418 | 3.7 |
| 10th percentile | 356 | 4.5 | 358 | 5.8 | 368 | 4.3 | 368 | 3.9 |

NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut) score for the following: (a) 10th percentile- the bottom 10 percent of students; (b) 25th percentile-the bottom 25 percent of students; (c) 50 th percentile- the median (half the students scored below the cut score and half scored above it); (d) 75 th percentile- the top 25 percent of students; (e) 90 th percentile- the top 10 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each education system's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut scores across education systems and over time. 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, 2009, and 2012. 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, 2009, 2012.
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Figure T2a. Cut scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on PISA science literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2006, 2009, and 2012


* $p<.05$. Significantly different from the 2012 score at the .05 level of statistical significance.

NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut) score for the following: (a) 10th percentile- the bottom 10 percent of students; (b) 25th percentile- the bottom 25 percent of students; (c) 50th percentile- the median (half the students scored below the cut score and half scored above it); (d) 75th percentile- the top 25 percent of students; (e) 90th percentile- the top 10 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each education system's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut scores across education systems and over time. The 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, 2009, and 2012. 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, 2009, 2012.
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Table T2b. Cut scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on PISA science literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2006, 2009, and 2012

| Selected percentiles | 2006 |  | 2009 |  | 2012 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. |
| 90th percentile | 628 | 4.3 | 629 | 5.1 | 619 | 4.5 |
| 75th percentile | 567 | 4.6 | 572 | 4.7 | 563 | 4.2 |
| 50th percentile | 488 | 4.7 | 502 | 4.6 | 498 | 4.3 |
| 25th percentile | 412 * | 5.4 | 433 | 3.9 | 431 | 4.4 |
| 10th percentile | 349 * | 5.9 | 374 | 4.5 | 377 | 4.9 |

* $p<.05$. Significantly different from the 2012 score at the .05 level of statistical significance.

NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut) score for the following: (a) 10th percentile- the bottom 10 percent of students;
(b) 25 th percentile- the bottom 25 percent of students; (c) 50 th percentile- the median (half the students scored below the cut score and half scored above it); (d) 75 th percentile- the top 25 percent of students; (e) 90 th percentile- the top 10 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each education system's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut scores across education systems and over time. The 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, 2009, and 2012. 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), 2006, 2009, 2012.
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Figure T3a. Cut scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on PISA reading literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009, and 2012


* $p<.05$. Significantly different from the 2012 score at the .05 level of statistical significance.

NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut) score for the following: (a) 10th percentile- the bottom 10 percent of students; (b) 25th percentile- the bottom 25 percent of students; (c) 50th percentile- the median (half the students scored below the cut score and half scored above it); (d) 75th percentile- the top 25 percent of students; (e) 90th percentile- the top 10 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each education system's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut scores across education systems and over time. The 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, 2009, 2012.
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Table T3b. Cut scores of U.S. 15-year-old students on PISA reading literacy scale at selected percentiles: 2000, 2003, 2009, and 2012

| Selected percentiles | 2000 |  | 2003 |  | 2009 |  | 2012 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. | Cut score | s.e. |
| 90th percentile | 636 * | 6.5 | 622 | 3.5 | 625 | 5.0 | 614 | 4.0 |
| 75th percentile | 577 | 6.8 | 568 | 3.6 | 569 | 4.6 | 561 | 3.9 |
| 50th percentile | 511 | 7.0 | 501 | 3.6 | 501 | 4.2 | 500 | 3.9 |
| 25th percentile | 436 | 8.8 | 429 | 4.1 | 433 | 4.0 | 436 | 4.5 |
| 10th percentile | 363 | 11.4 | 361 | 5.2 | 372 | 3.9 | 378 | 4.8 |

${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from the 2012 score at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: This table shows the threshold (or cut) score for the following: (a) 10th percentile- the bottom 10 percent of students; (b) 25th percentile- the bottom 25 percent of students; (c) 50th percentile- the median (half the students scored below the cut score and half scored above it); (d) 75 th percentile- the top 25 percent of students; (e) 90th percentile- the top 10 percent of students. The percentile ranges are specific to each education system's distribution of scores and to each assessment administration, enabling users to compare scores at the cut scores across education systems and over time. The 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, 2009, 2012.
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Table T2. Average scores and changes in average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale, by education system: 2003, 2006 , 2009 , and 2012

| Education system | Average score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in average score |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2003 |  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  | 2012 |  | 2012-2003 |  | 2012-2006 |  | 2012-2009 |  |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| OECD trend score ${ }^{1}$ | 500 | 0.6 | 498 | 0.5 | 499 | 0.6 | 496 | 0.5 | -3 * | 0.9 | -1 | 0.9 | -3 * | 0.9 |
| Shanghai-China | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 600 | 2.8 | 613 | 3.3 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 13 * 0 | 4.9 |
| Singapore | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 562 | 1.4 | 573 | 1.3 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 11 * 0 | 3.0 |
| Hong Kong-China | 550 | 4.5 | 547 | 2.7 | 555 | 2.7 | 561 | 3.2 | 11 | 5.9 | 14 * | 4.7 | 7 | 4.8 |
| Chinese Taipei | - | $\dagger$ | 549 | 4.1 | 543 | 3.4 | 560 | 3.3 | - | $\dagger$ | 10 | 5.7 | 17 * 0 | 5.3 |
| Korea, Republic of | 542 | 3.2 | 547 | 3.8 | 546 | 4.0 | 554 | 4.6 | 12 | 5.9 | 6 | 6.3 | 8 | 6.5 |
| Macao-China | 527 | 2.9 | 525 | 1.3 | 525 | 0.9 | 538 | 1.0 | 11 * 0 | 3.6 | 13 * | 2.6 | 13 * 0 | 2.7 |
| Japan | 534 | 4.0 | 523 | 3.3 | 529 | 3.3 | 536 | 3.6 | 2 | 5.7 | 13 * | 5.3 | 7 | 5.4 |
| Liechtenstein | 536 | 4.1 | 525 | 4.2 | 536 | 4.1 | 535 | 4.0 | -1 | 6.0 | 10 | 6.1 | -1 | 6.1 |
| Switzerland | 527 | 3.4 | 530 | 3.2 | 534 | 3.3 | 531 | 3.0 | 4 | 4.9 | 1 | 4.9 | -3 | 5.0 |
| Netherlands | 538 | 3.1 | 531 | 2.6 | 526 | 4.7 | 523 | 3.5 | -15 * | 5.1 | -8 | 4.8 | -3 | 6.3 |
| Estonia | - | $\dagger$ | 515 | 2.7 | 512 | 2.6 | 521 | 2.0 | - | $\dagger$ | 6 | 4.0 | 8 * 0 | 4.0 |
| Finland | 544 | 1.9 | 548 | 2.3 | 541 | 2.2 | 519 | 1.9 | -26 * | 3.3 | -30 * ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 3.7 | -22 * ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | 3.7 |
| Canada | 532 | 1.8 | 527 | 2.0 | 527 | 1.6 | 518 | 1.8 | -14 * | 3.2 | -9 * | 3.4 | -9 * | 3.4 |
| Poland | 490 | 2.5 | 495 | 2.4 | 495 | 2.8 | 518 | 3.6 | 27 * 0 | 4.8 | 22 * 0 | 4.8 | 23 * 0 | 5.1 |
| Belgium | 529 | 2.3 | 520 | 3.0 | 515 | 2.3 | 515 | 2.1 | -15 * ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 3.7 | -6 | 4.2 | -1 | 3.9 |
| Germany | 503 | 3.3 | 504 | 3.9 | 513 | 2.9 | 514 | 2.9 | 11 * | 4.8 | 10 | 5.3 | 1 | 4.7 |
| Vietnam | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 511 | 4.8 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ |
| Austria | 506 | 3.3 | 505 | 3.7 | 496 | 2.7 | 506 | 2.7 | \# | $\dagger$ | \# | $\dagger$ | 10 * 0 | 4.4 |
| Australia | 524 | 2.1 | 520 | 2.2 | 514 | 2.5 | 504 | 1.6 | -20 * ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 3.3 | $-16 * *$ | 3.5 | -10 * | 3.8 |
| Ireland | 503 | 2.4 | 501 | 2.8 | 487 | 2.5 | 501 | 2.2 | -1 | 3.8 | \# | $\dagger$ | 14 * 0 | 4.1 |
| Slovenia | - | $\dagger$ | 504 | 1.0 | 501 | 1.2 | 501 | 1.2 | - | $\dagger$ | -3 | 2.6 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Denmark | 514 | 2.7 | 513 | 2.6 | 503 | 2.6 | 500 | 2.3 | -14 * ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 4.1 | -13 * ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 4.1 | -3 | 4.2 |
| New Zealand | 523 | 2.3 | 522 | 2.4 | 519 | 2.3 | 500 | 2.2 | -24* | 3.7 | -22 * ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 3.9 | $-20 * *$ | 3.9 |
| Czech Republic | 516 | 3.5 | 510 | 3.6 | 493 | 2.8 | 499 | 2.9 | -17 * | 4.9 | -11 * ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 5.0 | 6 | 4.6 |
| France | 511 | 2.5 | 496 | 3.2 | 497 | 3.1 | 495 | 2.5 | -16 * ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 4.0 | -1 | 4.5 | -2 | 4.6 |
| United Kingdom ${ }^{2}$ | - | $\dagger$ | 495 | 2.1 | 492 | 2.4 | 494 | 3.3 | - | $\dagger$ | -2 | 4.4 | 2 | 4.7 |
| Iceland | 515 | 1.4 | 506 | 1.8 | 507 | 1.4 | 493 | 1.7 | -22 * ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | 2.9 | -13 * ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 3.2 | -14* | 3.2 |
| Latvia | 483 | 3.7 | 486 | 3.0 | 482 | 3.1 | 491 | 2.8 | 7 | 5.0 | 4 | 4.6 | 90 | 4.7 |
| Luxembourg | 493 | 1.0 | 490 | 1.1 | 489 | 1.2 | 490 | 1.1 | -3 | 2.4 | \# | $\dagger$ | 1 | 2.8 |
| Norway | 495 | 2.4 | 490 | 2.6 | 498 | 2.4 | 489 | 2.7 | -6 | 4.1 | \# | $\dagger$ | -9 * | 4.3 |
| Portugal | 466 | 3.4 | 466 | 3.1 | 487 | 2.9 | 487 | 3.8 | 21 * 0 | 5.5 | 21 * | 5.3 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Italy | 466 | 3.1 | 462 | 2.3 | 483 | 1.9 | 485 | 2.0 | 20 * 0 | 4.2 | 24 * 0 | 3.7 | 2 | 3.6 |
| Spain | 485 | 2.4 | 480 | 2.3 | 483 | 2.1 | 484 | 1.9 | -1 | 3.6 | 4 | 3.7 | 1 | 3.6 |
| Russian Federation | 468 | 4.2 | 476 | 3.9 | 468 | 3.3 | 482 | 3.0 | 14 * 0 | 5.5 | 6 | 5.3 | 14 * 0 | 5.0 |
| Slovak Republic | 498 | 3.3 | 492 | 2.8 | 497 | 3.1 | 482 | 3.4 | -17 * ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 5.2 | -10 * ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 4.9 | -15 * | 5.1 |
| United States | 483 | 2.9 | 474 | 4.0 | 487 | 3.6 | 481 | 3.6 | -2 | 5.0 | 7 | 5.8 | -6 | 5.6 |
| Lithuania | - | f | 486 | 2.9 | 477 | 2.6 | 479 | 2.6 | - | $\dagger$ | -8 | 4.5 | 2 | 4.4 |
| Sweden | 509 | 2.6 | 502 | 2.4 | 494 | 2.9 | 478 | 2.3 | -31* ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 3.9 | $-24 *$ * | 3.9 | -16* | 4.3 |
| Hungary | 490 | 2.8 | 491 | 2.9 | 490 | 3.5 | 477 | 3.2 | -13 * | 4.7 | -14 * ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | 4.8 | -13 * | 5.2 |
| Croatia | - | $\dagger$ | 467 | 2.4 | 460 | 3.1 | 471 | 3.5 | - | $\dagger$ | 4 | 4.7 | 11 * 0 | 5.2 |
| Israel | - | $\dagger$ | 442 | 4.3 | 447 | 3.3 | 466 | 4.7 | - | $\dagger$ | 25 * 0 | 6.7 | 20 * 0 | 6.2 |
| Greece | 445 | 3.9 | 459 | 3.0 | 466 | 3.9 | 453 | 2.5 | 8 | 5.0 | -6 | 4.4 | -13 * | 5.2 |
| Serbia, Republic of ${ }^{3}$ | - | $\dagger$ | 435 | 3.5 | 442 | 2.9 | 449 | 3.4 | - | $\dagger$ | 13 * | 5.3 | 6 | 5.0 |
| Turkey | 423 | 6.7 | 424 | 4.9 | 445 | 4.4 | 448 | 4.8 | 25 * 0 | 8.5 | 24 * | 7.2 | 3 | 7.0 |
| Romania | - | $\dagger$ | 415 | 4.2 | 427 | 3.4 | 445 | 3.8 | - | $\dagger$ | 30 * 0 | 6.0 | 17 * 0 | 5.6 |
| Cyprus | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 440 | 1.1 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ |
| Bulgaria | - | $\dagger$ | 413 | 6.1 | 428 | 5.9 | 439 | 4.0 | - | $\dagger$ | 25 * | 7.6 | 11 | 7.5 |
| United Arab Emirates | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 434 | 2.4 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ |
| Kazakhstan | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 405 | 3.0 | 432 | 3.0 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 27 * 0 | 4.9 |
| Thailand | 417 | 3.0 | 417 | 2.3 | 419 | 3.2 | 427 | 3.4 | 10 * | 5.0 | 10 * | 4.7 | 8 | 5.3 |
| Chile | - | $\dagger$ | 411 | 4.6 | 421 | 3.1 | 423 | 3.1 | - | $\dagger$ | 11 | 5.9 | 2 | 4.9 |
| Malaysia ${ }^{4}$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 404 | 2.7 | 421 | 3.2 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 16 * 0 | 4.8 |
| Mexico | 385 | 3.6 | 406 | 2.9 | 419 | 1.8 | 413 | 1.4 | 28 * 0 | 4.3 | 8 * | 3.8 | -5 | 3.2 |
| Montenegro, Republic of ${ }^{3}$ | - | $\dagger$ | 399 | 1.4 | 403 | 2.0 | 410 | 1.1 | - | $\dagger$ | 10 * | 2.7 | 7*0 | 3.2 |
| Uruguay | 422 | 3.3 | 427 | 2.6 | 427 | 2.6 | 409 | 2.8 | -13 * | 4.7 | -18 * ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | 4.3 | -17* | 4.4 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{4}$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 409 | 3.0 | 407 | 3.0 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | -2 | 4.8 |
| Albania | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 377 | 4.0 | 394 | 2.0 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 17 * 0 | 5.0 |
| Brazil | 356 | 4.8 | 370 | 2.9 | 386 | 2.4 | 391 | 2.1 | 35 * 0 | 5.6 | 22 * 0 | 4.1 | 6 | 3.9 |
| Argentina | - | $\dagger$ | 381 | 6.2 | 388 | 4.1 | 388 | 3.5 | - | $\dagger$ | 7 | 7.5 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Tunisia | 359 | 2.5 | 365 | 4.0 | 371 | 3.0 | 388 | 3.9 | 29 * 0 | 5.0 | 22 * | 5.9 | 16 * 0 | 5.4 |
| Jordan | - | $\dagger$ | 384 | 3.3 | 387 | 3.7 | 386 | 3.1 | - | $\dagger$ | 2 | 5.0 | -1 | 5.4 |
| Colombia | - | $\dagger$ | 370 | 3.8 | 381 | 3.2 | 376 | 2.9 | - | $\dagger$ | 7 | 5.2 | -4 | 4.9 |
| Qatar | - | $\dagger$ | 318 | 1.0 | 368 | 0.7 | 376 | 0.8 | - | $\dagger$ | 58 * 0 | 2.4 | 8 * 0 | 2.5 |
| Indonesia | 360 | 3.9 | 391 | 5.6 | 371 | 3.7 | 375 | 4.0 | 15 * 0 | 5.9 | -16 * $\nabla$ | 7.2 | 4 | 5.9 |
| Peru | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 365 | 4.0 | 368 | 3.7 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 3 | 5.9 |

Change in average score is greater than the U.S. change in average score

- Not available.
- Not avaliable.
\# Rounds to zero.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Change in average score is significant at a .05 level of statistical significance.
${ }^{1}$ The OECD trend scores are based on the averages of the 29 OECD countries with comparable data for 2003 and 2012 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 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.
${ }^{4}$ For Costa Rica and Malaysia the change between PISA 2009 and PISA 2012 represents change between 2010 and 2012 because these education systems implemented the PISA 2009 assessment in 2010 as part of PISA 2009. NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 average score. 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, 2009, and 2012. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . All average scores reported as higher or lower than the comparison year are different at the .05 significance level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2003, 2006, $2009,2012$.
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Table T3. Average scores and changes in average scores of 15 -year-old students on PISA science literacy scale, by education system: 2006, 2009, and 2012

| Education system | Average score |  |  |  |  |  | Change in average score |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  | 2012 |  | 2012-2006 |  | 2012-2009 |  |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| OECD trend score ${ }^{1}$ | 498 | 0.5 | 501 | 0.5 | 501 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.9 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Shanghai-China | - | $\dagger$ | 575 | 2.3 | 580 | 3.0 | - | $\dagger$ | 6 | 4.3 |
| Hong Kong-China | 542 | 2.5 | 549 | 2.8 | 555 | 2.6 | 13 * | 5.0 | 6 | 4.3 |
| Singapore | - | $\dagger$ | 542 | 1.4 | 551 | 1.5 | - | $\dagger$ | 10 * 0 | 2.9 |
| Japan | 531 | 3.4 | 539 | 3.4 | 547 | 3.6 | 15 * | 6.1 | 7 | 5.4 |
| Finland | 563 | 2.0 | 554 | 2.3 | 545 | 2.2 | $-18{ }^{*}$ | 4.6 | -9 * | 3.8 |
| Estonia | 531 | 2.5 | 528 | 2.7 | 541 | 1.9 | 10 * | 4.7 | 14 * 0 | 3.9 |
| Korea, Republic of | 522 | 3.4 | 538 | 3.4 | 538 | 3.7 | 16 * | 6.1 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Vietnam | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 528 | 4.3 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ |
| Poland | 498 | 2.3 | 508 | 2.4 | 526 | 3.1 | 28 * 0 | 5.3 | 18 * 0 | 4.4 |
| Canada | 534 | 2.0 | 529 | 1.6 | 525 | 1.9 | -9 * | 4.5 | -3 | 3.2 |
| Liechtenstein | 522 | 4.1 | 520 | 3.4 | 525 | 3.5 | 3 | 6.5 | 5 | 5.3 |
| Germany | 516 | 3.8 | 520 | 2.8 | 524 | 3.0 | 8 | 6.0 | 4 | 4.5 |
| Chinese Taipei | 532 | 3.6 | 520 | 2.6 | 523 | 2.3 | -9 | 5.5 | 3 | 4.0 |
| Netherlands | 525 | 2.7 | 522 | 5.4 | 522 | 3.5 | -3 | 5.7 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Ireland | 508 | 3.2 | 508 | 3.3 | 522 | 2.5 | 14 * | 5.3 | 14*0 | 4.5 |
| Australia | 527 | 2.3 | 527 | 2.5 | 521 | 1.8 | -5 | 4.5 | -6 | 3.7 |
| Macao-China | 511 | 1.1 | 511 | 1.0 | 521 | 0.8 | 10 * | 3.8 | 10 * 0 | 2.4 |
| New Zealand | 530 | 2.7 | 532 | 2.6 | 516 | 2.1 | -15 * | 4.9 | -16 * | 3.9 |
| Switzerland | 512 | 3.2 | 517 | 2.8 | 515 | 2.7 | 4 | 5.4 | -1 | 4.4 |
| Slovenia | 519 | 1.1 | 512 | 1.1 | 514 | 1.3 | -5 | 3.9 | 2 | 2.6 |
| United Kingdom | 515 | 2.3 | 514 | 2.5 | 514 | 3.4 | -1 | 5.4 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Czech Republic | 513 | 3.5 | 500 | 3.0 | 508 | 3.0 | -5 | 5.8 | 8 | 4.7 |
| Austria | 511 | 3.9 | 494 | 3.2 | 506 | 2.7 | -5 | 5.9 | 11 * 0 | 4.7 |
| Belgium | 510 | 2.5 | 507 | 2.5 | 505 | 2.2 | -5 | 4.8 | -2 | 3.9 |
| Latvia | 490 | 3.0 | 494 | 3.1 | 502 | 2.8 | 13 * | 5.4 | 8 | 4.6 |
| France | 495 | 3.4 | 498 | 3.6 | 499 | 2.6 | 4 | 5.5 | 1 | 4.9 |
| Denmark | 496 | 3.1 | 499 | 2.5 | 498 | 2.7 | 3 | 5.4 | -1 | 4.2 |
| United States | 489 | 4.2 | 502 | 3.6 | 497 | 3.8 | 9 | 6.7 | -5 | 5.6 |
| Spain | 488 | 2.6 | 488 | 2.1 | 496 | 1.8 | 8 | 4.7 | 8 * | 3.4 |
| Lithuania | 488 | 2.8 | 491 | 2.9 | 496 | 2.6 | 8 | 5.1 | 4 | 4.4 |
| Norway | 487 | 3.1 | 500 | 2.6 | 495 | 3.1 | 8 | 5.6 | -5 | 4.5 |
| Hungary | 504 | 2.7 | 503 | 3.1 | 494 | 2.9 | -10 | 5.3 | -8 | 4.8 |
| Italy | 475 | 2.0 | 489 | 1.8 | 494 | 1.9 | 18 * | 4.5 | 5 | 3.3 |
| Croatia | 493 | 2.4 | 486 | 2.8 | 491 | 3.1 | -2 | 5.3 | 5 | 4.7 |
| Luxembourg | 486 | 1.1 | 484 | 1.2 | 491 | 1.3 | 5 | 3.9 | 7 * | 2.7 |
| Portugal | 474 | 3.0 | 493 | 2.9 | 489 | 3.7 | 15 * | 6.0 | -4 | 5.1 |
| Russian Federation | 479 | 3.7 | 478 | 3.3 | 486 | 2.9 | 7 | 5.8 | 8 | 4.8 |
| Sweden | 503 | 2.4 | 495 | 2.7 | 485 | 3.0 | -19 * | 5.2 | -10 * | 4.5 |
| Iceland | 491 | 1.6 | 496 | 1.4 | 478 | 2.1 | -13 * | 4.4 | -17 * $\nabla$ | 3.2 |
| Slovak Republic | 488 | 2.6 | 490 | 3.0 | 471 | 3.6 | $-17{ }^{*}$ - | 5.7 | -19* | 5.1 |
| Israel | 454 | 3.7 | 455 | 3.1 | 470 | 5.0 | 16 * | 7.1 | 15 * 0 | 6.2 |
| Greece | 473 | 3.2 | 470 | 4.0 | 467 | 3.1 | -7 | 5.7 | -3 | 5.5 |
| Turkey | 424 | 3.8 | 454 | 3.6 | 463 | 3.9 | 40 * 0 | 6.5 | 10 | 5.7 |
| United Arab Emirates | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 448 | 2.8 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ |
| Bulgaria | 434 | 6.1 | 439 | 5.9 | 446 | 4.8 | 12 | 8.5 | 7 | 7.8 |
| Chile | 438 | 4.3 | 447 | 2.9 | 445 | 2.9 | 7 | 6.3 | -3 | 4.6 |
| Serbia, Republic of ${ }^{2}$ | 436 | 3.0 | 443 | 2.4 | 445 | 3.4 | 9 | 5.8 | 2 | 4.6 |
| Thailand | 421 | 2.1 | 425 | 3.0 | 444 | 2.9 | 23 * | 5.1 | 19 * 0 | 4.6 |
| Romania | 418 | 4.2 | 428 | 3.4 | 439 | 3.3 | 20 * | 6.4 | 11 * 0 | 5.1 |
| Cyprus | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 438 | 1.2 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{3}$ | - | $\dagger$ | 430 | 2.8 | 429 | 2.9 | - | $\dagger$ | -1 | 4.5 |
| Kazakhstan | - | $\dagger$ | 400 | 3.1 | 425 | 3.0 | - | $\dagger$ | 24 * 0 | 4.8 |
| Malaysia ${ }^{3}$ | - | $\dagger$ | 422 | 2.7 | 420 | 3.0 | - | $\dagger$ | -3 | 4.5 |
| Uruguay | 428 | 2.7 | 427 | 2.6 | 416 | 2.8 | -12 * | 5.2 | -11 * | 4.3 |
| Mexico | 410 | 2.7 | 416 | 1.8 | 415 | 1.3 | 5 | 4.6 | -1 | 3.0 |
| Montenegro, Republic of ${ }^{2}$ | 412 | 1.1 | 401 | 2.0 | 410 | 1.1 | -2 | 3.8 | 9 * 0 | 3.0 |
| Jordan | 422 | 2.8 | 415 | 3.5 | 409 | 3.1 | -13 * | 5.5 | -6 | 5.1 |
| Argentina | 391 | 6.1 | 401 | 4.6 | 406 | 3.9 | 14 | 8.0 | 5 | 6.3 |
| Brazil | 390 | 2.8 | 405 | 2.4 | 405 | 2.1 | 14 * | 5.0 | -1 | 3.8 |
| Colombia | 388 | 3.4 | 402 | 3.6 | 399 | 3.1 | 11 | 5.7 | -3 | 5.2 |
| Tunisia | 386 | 3.0 | 401 | 2.7 | 398 | 3.5 | 13 * | 5.7 | -3 | 4.8 |
| Albania | - | $\dagger$ | 391 | 3.9 | 397 | 2.4 | - | $\dagger$ | 7 | 5.1 |
| Qatar | 349 | 0.9 | 379 | 0.9 | 384 | 0.7 | 34 * 0 | 3.7 | 4 | 2.3 |
| Indonesia | 393 | 5.7 | 383 | 3.8 | 382 | 3.8 | -12 | 7.7 | -1 | 5.7 |
| Peru | - | $\dagger$ | 369 | 3.5 | 373 | 3.6 | - | $\dagger$ | 4 | 5.4 |

0 Change in average score is greater than the U.S. change in average score.
Change in average score is lower than the U.S. change in average score.

- Not available.
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero
* $p<.05$. Change in average score is significant at a .05 level of statistical significance
${ }^{1}$ 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 ${ }^{2}$ The Republics of Montenegro and Serbia were a united country under the PISA 2003 assessment.
${ }^{3}$ For Costa Rica and Malaysia the change between PISA 2009 and PISA 2012 represents change between 2010 and 2012 because these education systems implemented the PISA 2009 assessment in 2010 as part of PISA 2009
NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 average score. The 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, 2009, and 2012. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . All average scores reported as higher or lower than the comparison year are different at the .05 significance level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2006, 2009, 2012
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Table T4. Average scores and changes in average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA reading literacy scale, by education system: 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009, and 2012

| Education system | Average score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change in average score |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 |  | 2003 |  | 2006 |  | 2009 |  | 2012 |  | 2012-2000 |  | 2012-2003 |  | 2012-2009 |  |
|  | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. | Score | s.e. |
| OECD trend score ${ }^{1}$ | 496 | 0.7 | 497 | 0.6 | 490 | 0.7 | 496 | 0.5 | 498 | 0.6 | 2 | 1.5 | 4.1 * | 1.4 | 2 * | 0.9 |
| Shanghai-China | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 556 | 2.4 | 570 | 2.9 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 14*0 | 4.5 |
| Hong Kong-China | 525 | 2.9 | 510 | 3.7 | 536 | 2.4 | 533 | 2.1 | 545 | 2.8 | 19 * 0 | 7.2 | 35 * 0 | 7.3 | 11 * | 4.4 |
| Singapore | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 526 | 1.1 | 542 | 1.4 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 16 * 0 | 3.1 |
| Japan | 522 | 5.2 | 498 | 3.9 | 498 | 3.6 | 520 | 3.5 | 538 | 3.7 | 16 | 8.7 | 40 * 0 | 7.8 | 18 * 0 | 5.7 |
| Korea, Republic of | 525 | 2.4 | 534 | 3.1 | 556 | 3.8 | 539 | 3.5 | 536 | 3.9 | 11 | 7.5 | 2 | 7.5 | -3 | 5.9 |
| Finland | 546 | 2.6 | 543 | 1.6 | 547 | 2.1 | 536 | 2.3 | 524 | 2.4 | -22 * | 6.9 | $-19 *$ * | 6.3 | -12 * | 4.2 |
| Ireland | 527 | 3.2 | 515 | 2.6 | 517 | 3.5 | 496 | 3.0 | 523 | 2.6 | -3 | 7.2 | 8 | 6.7 | 28 * 0 | 4.7 |
| Canada | 534 | 1.6 | 528 | 1.7 | 527 | 2.4 | 524 | 1.5 | 523 | 1.9 | -11 | 6.4 | -5 | 6.2 | -1 | 3.6 |
| Chinese Taipei |  | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 496 | 3.4 | 495 | 2.6 | 523 | 3.0 |  | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ | 28 * 0 | 4.8 |
| Poland | 479 | 4.5 | 497 | 2.9 | 508 | 2.8 | 500 | 2.6 | 518 | 3.1 | 39 * 0 | 8.0 | 22 * | 7.0 | 18 * 0 | 4.8 |
| Estonia | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 501 | 2.9 | 501 | 2.6 | 516 | 2.0 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 15 * 0 | 4.2 |
| Liechtenstein | 483 | 4.1 | 525 | 3.6 | 510 | 3.9 | 499 | 2.8 | 516 | 4.1 | 33 * 0 | 8.3 | -10 | 7.8 | 16 * 0 | 5.6 |
| New Zealand | 529 | 2.8 | 522 | 2.5 | 521 | 3.0 | 521 | 2.4 | 512 | 2.4 | -17* | 7.0 | -9 | 6.6 | -9 * | 4.2 |
| Australia | 528 | 3.5 | 525 | 2.1 | 513 | 2.1 | 515 | 2.3 | 512 | 1.6 | -16* | 7.1 | -14* | 6.2 | -3 | 3.8 |
| Netherlands ${ }^{2}$ | - | $\dagger$ | 513 | 2.9 | 507 | 2.9 | 508 | 5.1 | 511 | 3.5 | - | $\dagger$ | -2 | 7.2 | 3 | 6.7 |
| Switzerland | 494 | 4.2 | 499 | 3.3 | 499 | 3.1 | 501 | 2.4 | 509 | 2.6 | 15 | 7.7 | 10 | 7.0 | 9 | 4.4 |
| Macao-China | - | $\dagger$ | 498 | 2.2 | 492 | 1.1 | 487 | 0.9 | 509 | 0.9 | - | $\dagger$ | 11 | 6.1 | 22 * 0 | 2.9 |
| Belgium | 507 | 3.6 | 507 | 2.6 | 501 | 3.0 | 506 | 2.3 | 509 | 2.3 | 1 | 7.3 | 2 | 6.6 | 3 | 4.2 |
| Vietnam | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | , | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 508 | 4.4 | - | $\dagger$ | 2 | $\dagger$ | , | $\dagger$ |
| Germany | 484 | 2.5 | 491 | 3.4 | 495 | 4.4 | 497 | 2.7 | 508 | 2.8 | $24 * 0$ | 7.0 | 16 * | 7.1 | 10 * | 4.7 |
| France | 505 | 2.7 | 496 | 2.7 | 488 | 4.1 | 496 | 3.4 | 505 | 2.8 | 1 | 7.1 | 9 | 6.8 | 10 | 5.2 |
| Norway | 505 | 2.8 | 500 | 2.8 | 484 | 3.2 | 503 | 2.6 | 504 | 3.2 | -1 | 7.3 | 4 | 7.0 | 1 | 4.9 |
| United Kingdom ${ }^{3}$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 495 | 2.3 | 494 | 2.3 | 499 | 3.5 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 5 | 4.9 |
| United States ${ }^{4}$ | 504 | 7.0 | 495 | 3.2 | - | $\dagger$ | 500 | 3.7 | 498 | 3.7 | -7 | 9.9 | 2 | 7.5 | -2 | 5.8 |
| Denmark | 497 | 2.4 | 492 | 2.8 | 494 | 3.2 | 495 | 2.1 | 496 | 2.6 | -1 | 6.9 | 4 | 6.8 | 1 | 4.3 |
| Czech Republic | 492 | 2.4 | 489 | 3.5 | 483 | 4.2 | 478 | 2.9 | 493 | 2.9 | 1 | 7.0 | 4 | 7.2 | 15 * 0 | 4.8 |
| Italy | 487 | 2.9 | 476 | 3.0 | 469 | 2.4 | 486 | 1.6 | 490 | 2.0 | 2 | 6.9 | 14 * | 6.7 | 4 | 3.6 |
| Austria | 492 | 2.7 | 491 | 3.8 | 490 | 4.1 | 470 | 2.9 | 490 | 2.8 | -2 | 7.1 | -1 | 7.3 | 19 * 0 | 4.8 |
| Latvia | 458 | 5.3 | 491 | 3.7 | 479 | 3.7 | 484 | 3.0 | 489 | 2.4 | 31 * 0 | 8.3 | -2 | 7.1 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Hungary | 480 | 4.0 | 482 | 2.5 | 482 | 3.3 | 494 | 3.2 | 488 | 3.2 | 8 | 7.8 | 7 | 6.9 | -6 | 5.2 |
| Spain | 493 | 2.7 | 481 | 2.6 | 461 | 2.2 | 481 | 2.0 | 488 | 1.9 | -5 | 6.8 | 7 | 6.5 | 7 | 3.8 |
| Luxembourg | - | $\dagger$ | 479 | 1.5 | 479 | 1.3 | 472 | 1.3 | 488 | 1.5 | - | $\dagger$ | 8 | 6.0 | 16 * 0 | 3.3 |
| Portugal | 470 | 4.5 | 478 | 3.7 | 472 | 3.6 | 489 | 3.1 | 488 | 3.8 | 18 * | 8.3 | 10 | 7.7 | -2 | 5.5 |
| Israel | 452 | 8.5 | - | $\dagger$ | 439 | 4.6 | 474 | 3.6 | 486 | 5.0 | $34 * 0$ | 11.5 | - | $\dagger$ | 12 | 6.7 |
| Croatia | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 477 | 2.8 | 476 | 2.9 | 485 | 3.3 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 9 | 5.1 |
| Sweden | 516 | 2.2 | 514 | 2.4 | 507 | 3.4 | 497 | 2.9 | 483 | 3.0 | $-33 *$ - | 7.0 | $-31 *$ * | 6.8 | -14* | 4.9 |
| Iceland | 507 | 1.5 | 492 | 1.6 | 484 | 1.9 | 500 | 1.4 | 483 | 1.8 | -24* | 6.4 | -9 | 6.1 | -18* ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | 3.5 |
| Slovenia | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 494 | 1.0 | 483 | 1.0 | 481 | 1.2 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | -2 | 3.1 |
| Lithuania | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 470 | 3.0 | 468 | 2.4 | 477 | 2.5 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 9 * | 4.3 |
| Greece | 474 | 5.0 | 472 | 4.1 | 460 | 4.0 | 483 | 4.3 | 477 | 3.3 | 3 | 8.4 | 5 | 7.7 | -6 | 6.0 |
| Turkey | - | $\dagger$ | 441 | 5.8 | 447 | 4.2 | 464 | 3.5 | 475 | 4.2 | - | $\dagger$ | 35 * 0 | 9.1 | 11 | 6.1 |
| Russian Federation | 462 | 4.2 | 442 | 3.9 | 440 | 4.3 | 459 | 3.3 | 475 | 3.0 | 13 | 7.8 | 33 * 0 | 7.5 | 16 * 0 | 5.2 |
| Slovak Republic | - | $\dagger$ | 469 | 3.1 | 466 | 3.1 | 477 | 2.5 | 463 | 4.2 | - | $\dagger$ | -6 | 7.7 | -15* | 5.5 |
| Cyprus | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 449 | 1.2 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ |
| Serbia, Republic of ${ }^{5}$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 401 | 3.5 | 442 | 2.4 | 446 | 3.4 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 4 | 5.0 |
| United Arab Emirates | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 442 | 2.5 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ |
| Chile | 410 | 3.6 | - | $\dagger$ | 442 | 5.0 | 449 | 3.1 | 441 | 2.9 | 32 * 0 | 7.5 | - | $\dagger$ | -8 | 5.0 |
| Thailand | 431 | 3.2 | 420 | 2.8 | 417 | 2.6 | 421 | 2.6 | 441 | 3.1 | 11 | 7.4 | 21 * | 7.0 | 20 * 0 | 4.8 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{6}$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 443 | 3.2 | 441 | 3.5 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | -2 | 5.4 |
| Romania ${ }^{7}$ | 428 | 3.5 | - | $\dagger$ | 396 | 4.7 | 424 | 4.1 | 438 | 4.0 | 10 | 7.9 | - | † | 13 * | 6.3 |
| Bulgaria | 430 | 4.9 | - | $\dagger$ | 402 | 6.9 | 429 | 6.7 | 436 | 6.0 | 6 | 9.8 | - | $\dagger$ | 7 | 9.4 |
| Mexico | 422 | 3.3 | 400 | 4.1 | 410 | 3.1 | 425 | 2.0 | 424 | 1.5 | 2 | 7.0 | 24 * 0 | 7.1 | -2 | 3.6 |
| Montenegro, Republic of ${ }^{5}$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 392 | 1.2 | 408 | 1.7 | 422 | 1.2 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 15 * 0 | 3.3 |
| Uruguay | - | $\dagger$ | 434 | 3.4 | 413 | 3.4 | 426 | 2.6 | 411 | 3.2 | - | $\dagger$ | -23 * ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | 7.3 | -14* | 4.8 |
| Brazil | 396 | 3.1 | 403 | 4.6 | 393 | 3.7 | 412 | 2.7 | 410 | 2.1 | 14 * | 7.0 | 7 | 7.5 | -2 | 4.3 |
| Tunisia | - | $\dagger$ | 375 | 2.8 | 380 | 4.0 | 404 | 2.9 | 404 | 4.5 | - | $\dagger$ | 29 * 0 | 7.7 | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Colombia | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 385 | 5.1 | 413 | 3.7 | 403 | 3.4 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | -10 | 5.7 |
| Jordan | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 401 | 3.3 | 405 | 3.3 | 399 | 3.6 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | -6 | 5.5 |
| Malaysia ${ }^{6}$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 414 | 2.9 | 398 | 3.3 | - | $\dagger$ | $\overline{15}$ | $\dagger$ | -16 * | 5.1 |
| Indonesia | 371 | 4.0 | 382 | 3.4 | 393 | 5.9 | 402 | 3.7 | 396 | 4.2 | 26 * 0 | 8.3 | 15 | 7.8 | -6 | 6.2 |
| Argentina | 418 | 9.9 | - | $\dagger$ | 374 | 7.2 | 398 | 4.6 | 396 | 3.7 | -22 | 12.1 | - | $\dagger$ | -2 | 6.5 |
| Albania | 349 | 3.3 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 385 | 4.0 | 394 | 3.2 | $45 * 0$ | 7.5 | - | $\dagger$ | 9 | 5.8 |
| Kazakhstan | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 390 | 3.1 | 393 | 2.7 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 2 | 4.8 |
| Qatar | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 312 | 1.2 | 372 | 0.8 | 388 | 0.8 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 16 * 0 | 2.8 |
| Peru | 327 | 4.4 | - | $\dagger$ | - | $\dagger$ | 370 | 4.0 | 384 | 4.3 | 57 * 0 | 8.6 | - | $\dagger$ | 14 * | 6.4 |

Change in average score is greater than the U.S. change in average score.

- Not available.
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero
* 05 . Change in average score is significant at a .05 level of statistical significance
${ }^{1}$ The OECD trend scores for 2000, 2003, 2009, and 2012 are based on the averages of the 27 OECD countries with comparable data for 2000 and 2012 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 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 he real analysis in its reper a reporting. The OECD trend score for 2006 is based on the averages of 26 OECD countries, as PISA 2006 reading literacy results were not reported for the United States.
${ }^{2}$ 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 PISA 2000, technical problems with its sample prevent its results from being included. Because of low response rates, 2003 data for the United Kingdom are not presented
${ }^{4}$ PISA 2006 reading literacy results are not reported for the United States because of an error in printing the test booklets. PISA 2006 reading literacy results are therefore not compared to PISA 2012 reading literacy results. For more details, see Baldi et al. 2007 (available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008016).
The Republics of Montenegro and Serbia were a united country under the PISA 2000 and 2003 assessments.
${ }^{6}$ For Costa Rica and Malaysia the change between PISA 2009 and PISA 2012 represents change between 2010 and 2012 because these education systems implemented the PISA 2009 assessment in 2010 as part of PISA 2009,
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: Education systems are ordered by 2012 average score. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . All average scores reported as higher or lower than the comparison year are different at the .05 significance level of statistical significance. Standard
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009, 2012
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| Education system | 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 | 6.9 | 0.16 | 13.1 | 0.17 | 22.7 | 0.19 | 26.3 | 0.21 | 19.8 | 0.19 | 8.7 | 0.15 | 2.6 | 0.09 |
| Australia | 5.0 | 0.35 | 11.6 | 0.49 | 22.1 | 0.65 | 26.8 | 0.59 | 20.9 | 0.55 | 10.2 | 0.40 | 3.4 | 0.31 |
| Austria | 5.1 | 0.74 | 12.3 | 0.90 | 20.4 | 0.94 | 26.2 | 0.98 | 23.2 | 1.03 | 10.4 | 0.90 | 2.4 | 0.37 |
| Belgium | 6.8 | 0.53 | 11.0 | 0.60 | 18.9 | 0.63 | 24.5 | 0.75 | 21.9 | 0.64 | 12.4 | 0.59 | 4.5 | 0.37 |
| Brazil | 22.6 | 1.85 | 28.4 | 1.22 | 27.3 | 1.69 | 13.9 | 0.96 | 6.0 | 1.05 | 1.6 | 0.48 | 0.2 ! | 0.10 |
| Canada | 4.1 | 0.35 | 8.6 | 0.41 | 18.8 | 0.62 | 26.9 | 0.65 | 24.3 | 0.77 | 12.8 | 0.67 | 4.5 | 0.45 |
| Chile | 18.2 | 1.40 | 26.9 | 1.21 | 28.0 | 0.98 | 18.3 | 1.06 | 7.1 | 0.63 | 1.4 | 0.20 | 0.2 ! | 0.06 |
| Chinese Taipei | 2.8 | 0.42 | 7.5 | 0.63 | 16.2 | 0.89 | 25.0 | 0.88 | 26.4 | 0.96 | 16.1 | 0.88 | 6.0 | 0.64 |
| Colombia | 28.9 | 1.58 | 35.5 | 1.22 | 23.8 | 1.04 | 9.2 | 0.77 | 2.2 | 0.42 | 0.3 ! | 0.12 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Denmark | 6.0 | 0.61 | 13.0 | 0.77 | 23.4 | 0.97 | 27.5 | 1.18 | 20.8 | 0.86 | 7.7 | 0.56 | 1.6 | 0.26 |
| Estonia | 2.9 | 0.42 | 9.3 | 0.55 | 22.1 | 0.85 | 29.1 | 0.96 | 23.3 | 1.00 | 10.6 | 0.68 | 2.8 | 0.41 |
| France | 5.6 | 0.84 | 10.8 | 0.71 | 20.1 | 0.95 | 27.1 | 0.93 | 23.3 | 0.95 | 10.5 | 0.83 | 2.5 | 0.42 |
| Germany | 6.5 | 0.66 | 11.4 | 0.78 | 19.7 | 0.85 | 25.3 | 0.99 | 21.7 | 0.80 | 11.5 | 0.76 | 4.0 | 0.49 |
| Hong Kong-China | 2.6 | 0.48 | 5.2 | 0.76 | 12.1 | 0.81 | 24.5 | 1.01 | 30.3 | 1.14 | 18.7 | 1.02 | 6.7 | 0.65 |
| Hungary | 11.3 | 1.20 | 17.4 | 0.99 | 26.0 | 1.23 | 24.4 | 1.14 | 14.4 | 0.98 | 5.5 | 0.69 | 1.0 | 0.31 |
| Ireland | 5.3 | 0.66 | 12.5 | 0.83 | 25.2 | 0.85 | 30.3 | 1.11 | 19.5 | 0.99 | 6.1 | 0.50 | 0.9 | 0.20 |
| Israel | 20.7 | 1.60 | 18.0 | 1.13 | 21.9 | 0.95 | 20.1 | 0.89 | 13.0 | 0.99 | 5.3 | 0.77 | 1.1 | 0.26 |
| Italy | 4.8 | 0.81 | 12.8 | 1.05 | 24.1 | 1.28 | 28.8 | 1.24 | 20.3 | 1.14 | 7.5 | 0.95 | 1.8 | 0.42 |
| Japan | 2.4 | 0.44 | 6.6 | 0.61 | 16.3 | 0.85 | 26.5 | 1.17 | 26.9 | 1.07 | 14.8 | 0.89 | 6.6 | 0.87 |
| Korea, Republic of | 1.8 | 0.29 | 5.4 | 0.62 | 14.3 | 0.96 | 23.9 | 1.03 | 26.9 | 1.28 | 18.7 | 1.22 | 9.0 | 1.23 |
| Macao-China | 1.7 | 0.19 | 5.9 | 0.40 | 15.3 | 0.53 | 26.4 | 0.66 | 28.5 | 0.82 | 16.6 | 0.63 | 5.6 | 0.42 |
| Norway | 5.5 | 0.61 | 13.2 | 0.76 | 24.4 | 0.89 | 27.0 | 1.01 | 19.7 | 0.79 | 8.3 | 0.59 | 2.0 | 0.30 |
| Poland | 6.6 | 0.79 | 14.3 | 0.94 | 25.7 | 1.00 | 27.2 | 0.88 | 18.0 | 1.03 | 6.8 | 0.75 | 1.5 | 0.31 |
| Portugal | 6.4 | 0.64 | 14.9 | 0.94 | 25.2 | 0.93 | 27.2 | 1.04 | 18.4 | 0.97 | 6.5 | 0.65 | 1.5 | 0.25 |
| Russian Federation | 5.2 | 0.51 | 13.8 | 0.82 | 27.3 | 0.91 | 29.3 | 1.05 | 17.7 | 0.94 | 5.7 | 0.54 | 1.1 | 0.21 |
| Shanghai-China | 1.8 | 0.35 | 5.1 | 0.56 | 13.2 | 0.84 | 20.8 | 0.92 | 25.8 | 0.99 | 21.0 | 1.01 | 12.3 | 0.88 |
| Singapore | 2.0 | 0.27 | 5.7 | 0.40 | 12.4 | 0.53 | 19.7 | 0.60 | 24.7 | 1.00 | 21.2 | 0.86 | 14.4 | 0.62 |
| Slovak Republic | 6.1 | 0.83 | 11.8 | 0.88 | 23.0 | 1.06 | 29.1 | 1.27 | 20.9 | 1.06 | 7.6 | 0.76 | 1.5 | 0.39 |
| Slovenia | 7.1 | 0.40 | 15.8 | 0.67 | 25.3 | 0.85 | 25.3 | 0.99 | 17.9 | 0.79 | 7.4 | 0.47 | 1.3 | 0.31 |
| Spain | 8.5 | 0.92 | 16.4 | 0.85 | 27.1 | 0.98 | 27.7 | 1.02 | 15.9 | 0.91 | 4.0 | 0.43 | 0.4 ! | 0.13 |
| Sweden | 6.2 | 0.53 | 14.7 | 0.77 | 25.2 | 0.78 | 28.0 | 0.78 | 17.5 | 0.79 | 6.8 | 0.59 | 1.6 | 0.33 |
| United Arab Emirates | 18.2 | 0.88 | 25.5 | 0.80 | 28.5 | 0.83 | 18.3 | 0.69 | 7.3 | 0.48 | 2.0 | 0.28 | 0.2 ! | 0.08 |
| United States | 5.9 | 0.84 | 12.4 | 0.99 | 24.7 | 1.09 | 26.9 | 0.89 | 19.3 | 1.05 | 8.2 | 0.78 | 2.5 | 0.51 |

† Not applicable.
! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
$!$ Interpret data with caution. Estim
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
NOTE: The computer-based mathematics literacy assessment was an optional assessment for education systems in 2012. 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 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 percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Table CM2. Average scores of 15 -year-old students on PISA computer-based mathematics literacy scale, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Average score | s.e. | Education system | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average | 497 | 0.7 |  |  |  |
| Singapore | 5660 | 1.3 | Norway | 498 | 2.8 |
| Shanghai-China | 5620 | 3.4 | Slovak Republic | 497 | 3.5 |
| Korea, Republic of | 5530 | 4.5 | Denmark | 496 | 2.7 |
| Hong Kong-China | 5500 | 3.4 | Ireland | 493 | 2.9 |
| Macao-China | 5430 | 1.1 | Sweden | 490 | 2.9 |
| Japan | 5390 | 3.3 | Russian Federation | 489 | 2.6 |
| Chinese Taipei | 5370 | 2.8 | Poland | 489 | 4.0 |
| Canada | 5230 | 2.2 | Portugal | 489 | 3.1 |
| Estonia | 5160 | 2.2 | Slovenia | 487 ( | 1.2 |
| Belgium | 5120 | 2.4 | Spain | 475 | 3.2 |
| Germany | 5090 | 3.3 | Hungary | 470 | 3.9 |
| France | 508 | 3.3 | Israel | 447 ( | 5.6 |
| Australia | 5080 | 1.6 | United Arab Emirates | 434 | 2.2 |
| Austria | 507 | 3.5 | Chile | 432 | 3.3 |
| Italy | 499 | 4.2 | Brazil | 421 ( | 4.7 |
| United States | 498 | 4.1 | Colombia | 397 | 3.2 |

© Average score is higher than U.S. average score.
Average score is lower than U.S. average score.
NOTE: The computer-based mathematics literacy assessment was an optional assessment for education systems in 2012. Education systems are ordered by 2012 average score. 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 . All average scores reported as higher or lower than the U.S. average score are different at the . 05 level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. This table corresponds to table 5 in Performance of U.S. 15-Year-Old Students in Mathematics, Science, and Reading Literacy in an International Context (NCES 2014-024).
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.
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Figure CM1a. Difference in average scores of 15-year-old female and male students on PISA computer-


[^1]
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## Table CM1b. Difference in average scores of 15-year-old female and male students on PISA computer-based mathematics literacy scale, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Male-female difference | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average | 13 * | 0.8 |
| United States | \# | $\dagger$ |
| Singapore | 1 | 2.3 |
| Slovenia | 3 | 3.0 |
| Israel | 3 | 8.9 |
| Norway | 3 | 2.8 |
| Estonia | 9 * | 2.5 |
| Australia | 9 * | 2.8 |
| Germany | 10 * | 2.7 |
| Poland | 11 * | 3.2 |
| Slovak Republic | 11 * | 3.9 |
| Hungary | 12 * | 3.8 |
| Colombia | 12 * | 3.3 |
| Spain | 12 * | 2.5 |
| United Arab Emirates | -13* | 4.4 |
| Macao-China | 13 * | 2.0 |
| Sweden | 13 * | 2.8 |
| Russian Federation | 14 * | 2.8 |
| Belgium | 14 * | 3.1 |
| Japan | 15 * | 3.8 |
| France | 15 * | 3.0 |
| Chinese Taipei | 15 * | 6.7 |
| Hong Kong-China | 17 * | 4.3 |
| Canada | 17 * | 1.9 |
| Korea, Republic of | 18 * | 6.7 |
| Shanghai-China | 18 * | 2.9 |
| Italy | 18 * | 5.0 |
| Ireland | 19 * | 3.7 |
| Chile | 19 * | 3.9 |
| Denmark | 20 * | 2.5 |
| Portugal | 20 * | 2.3 |
| Austria | 21 * | 4.9 |
| Brazil | 22 * | 2.4 |

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
\# Rounds to zero.

* $p<.05$. Differences between males and females are significantly different at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: The computer-based mathematics literacy assessment was an optional assessment for education systems in 2012. Education systems are ordered by absolute male-female difference in 2012 average score. Differences were computed using unrounded numbers. 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. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.


## Exhibit CR1. Description of PISA proficiency levels on computer-based reading literacy scale: 2012

| Proficiency level and lower cut score | Task descriptions |
| :---: | :---: |
| Level 5 or above $626$ | At level 5 or above, tasks typically require the reader to locate, analyze, and critically evaluate information, related to an unfamiliar context, in the presence of ambiguity. They require generating criteria to evaluate the text. Tasks may require navigation across multiple sites without explicit direction, and detailed interrogation of texts in a variety of formats. |
| Level 4 553 | At level 4, tasks may require the reader to evaluate information from several sources, navigating across several sites comprising texts in a variety of formats, and generating criteria for evaluation in relation to a familiar, personal, or practical context. Other tasks at this level demand that the reader interpret complex information according to welldefined criteria in a scientific or technical context. |
| Level 3 <br> 480 | At level 3 , tasks require that the reader integrate information, either by navigating across several sites to find welldefined target information, or by generating simple categories when the task is not explicitly stated. Where evaluation is called for, only the information that is most directly accessible or only part of the available information is required. |
| Level 2 <br> 407 | At level 2 , tasks typically require the reader to locate and interpret information that is well-defined, usually relating to familiar contexts. They may require navigation across a limited number of sites and the application of web-based navigation tools such as drop-down menus, where explicit directions are provided or only low-level inference is called for. Tasks may require integrating information presented in different formats, recognizing examples that fit clearly defined categories. |

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. Cut scores in the exhibit are rounded; exact cut scores are provided in table AA1. Proficiency levels 1 b and 1 a have been omitted from this table, and levels 5 and 6 have been collapsed in order to provide descriptive and meaningful proficiency levels for the computer-based reading assessment. 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), 2012.
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Table CR1. Percentage distribution of 15 -year-old students on PISA computer-based reading literacy scale, by proficiency level and education system: 2012

| Education system | Below level 2 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  | Above level 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. | Percent | s.e. |
| OECD average | 17.6 | 0.26 | 22.5 | 0.21 | 29.9 | 0.24 | 22.1 | 0.22 | 7.9 | 0.17 |
| Australia | 12.5 | 0.50 | 19.8 | 0.48 | 29.4 | 0.64 | 24.9 | 0.72 | 13.4 | 0.67 |
| Austria | 20.2 | 1.43 | 26.3 | 1.16 | 30.0 | 1.31 | 18.4 | 1.04 | 5.1 | 0.72 |
| Belgium | 17.2 | 0.87 | 20.2 | 0.71 | 29.3 | 0.86 | 24.4 | 0.81 | 9.0 | 0.64 |
| Brazil | 37.2 | 2.17 | 30.4 | 1.35 | 22.8 | 1.38 | 8.3 | 1.01 | 1.4 | 0.36 |
| Canada | 8.5 | 0.53 | 17.3 | 0.56 | 31.3 | 0.71 | 29.4 | 0.76 | 13.6 | 0.70 |
| Chile | 29.3 | 1.73 | 32.9 | 1.22 | 27.1 | 1.24 | 9.6 | 0.85 | 1.1 | 0.16 |
| Chinese Taipei | 11.1 | 0.85 | 19.3 | 0.80 | 31.8 | 0.98 | 27.6 | 1.06 | 10.3 | 0.92 |
| Colombia | 54.9 | 1.82 | 27.5 | 1.05 | 13.4 | 0.86 | 3.7 | 0.50 | 0.5 ! | 0.19 |
| Denmark | 14.2 | 0.98 | 26.7 | 0.94 | 34.2 | 1.02 | 20.3 | 1.27 | 4.5 | 0.62 |
| Estonia | 11.4 | 0.92 | 19.8 | 0.87 | 30.0 | 1.01 | 25.7 | 1.09 | 13.1 | 0.91 |
| France | 13.8 | 1.15 | 19.6 | 0.87 | 30.6 | 1.30 | 26.3 | 1.02 | 9.7 | 0.97 |
| Germany | 19.1 | 1.54 | 21.7 | 0.96 | 29.9 | 1.26 | 21.9 | 1.16 | 7.4 | 0.80 |
| Hong Kong-China | 7.6 | 0.81 | 13.8 | 0.82 | 26.5 | 1.15 | 31.0 | 1.16 | 21.1 | 1.31 |
| Hungary | 32.5 | 1.38 | 24.6 | 1.24 | 24.8 | 1.13 | 14.1 | 0.98 | 4.0 | 0.60 |
| Ireland | 9.4 | 0.86 | 19.8 | 0.92 | 34.9 | 0.85 | 26.8 | 0.96 | 9.0 | 0.75 |
| Israel | 31.0 | 1.84 | 22.3 | 1.19 | 23.5 | 1.21 | 16.9 | 1.30 | 6.2 | 0.93 |
| Italy | 15.7 | 1.42 | 20.9 | 1.32 | 31.4 | 1.34 | 23.8 | 1.26 | 8.2 | 0.87 |
| Japan | 4.9 | 0.76 | 14.4 | 0.96 | 32.3 | 1.18 | 34.1 | 1.18 | 14.2 | 1.14 |
| Korea, Republic of | 3.9 | 0.48 | 11.7 | 0.83 | 30.8 | 1.28 | 35.3 | 1.23 | 18.3 | 1.64 |
| Macao-China | 7.0 | 0.47 | 22.8 | 0.71 | 39.8 | 0.66 | 25.3 | 0.78 | 5.1 | 0.51 |
| Norway | 16.6 | 1.06 | 22.0 | 0.82 | 29.9 | 0.98 | 22.8 | 0.93 | 8.6 | 0.69 |
| Poland | 22.4 | 1.54 | 26.3 | 0.99 | 29.4 | 1.14 | 17.4 | 1.27 | 4.5 | 0.72 |
| Portugal | 19.2 | 1.62 | 25.7 | 1.06 | 31.3 | 1.39 | 19.7 | 1.31 | 4.1 | 0.62 |
| Russian Federation | 24.6 | 1.63 | 31.2 | 1.24 | 28.5 | 1.05 | 13.0 | 1.00 | 2.6 | 0.42 |
| Shanghai-China | 7.9 | 1.11 | 18.1 | 1.11 | 32.6 | 1.35 | 28.9 | 1.40 | 12.5 | 1.16 |
| Singapore | 4.3 | 0.31 | 12.5 | 0.49 | 26.0 | 0.75 | 30.3 | 0.72 | 26.8 | 0.68 |
| Slovak Republic | 22.6 | 1.50 | 25.9 | 1.09 | 31.1 | 1.45 | 16.9 | 0.99 | 3.5 | 0.61 |
| Slovenia | 25.1 | 0.66 | 26.1 | 1.01 | 26.9 | 1.16 | 17.6 | 0.80 | 4.3 | 0.53 |
| Spain | 26.2 | 1.52 | 27.1 | 1.06 | 27.9 | 1.12 | 15.2 | 0.90 | 3.7 | 0.43 |
| Sweden | 16.7 | 1.11 | 23.2 | 0.86 | 30.2 | 0.98 | 21.8 | 0.90 | 8.1 | 0.70 |
| United Arab Emirates | 50.5 | 1.35 | 24.2 | 0.82 | 15.7 | 0.75 | 7.3 | 0.49 | 2.3 | 0.28 |
| United States | 12.6 | 1.42 | 22.3 | 1.21 | 31.5 | 1.03 | 24.6 | 1.31 | 9.0 | 0.90 |

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
NOTE: The computer-based reading literacy assessment was an optional assessment for education systems in 2012. To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must NOTE: The computer-based reading literacy assessment was an optional assessment for education systems in 2012 . 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 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 greate 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 ). Proficiency levels below 1 b, level 1 b , and level 1a have been collapsed for this table, as have levels 5 and 6 , in order to provide descriptive and meaningful proficiency levels for the computer based reading assessment. 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, wi each country weighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table CR2. Average scores of 15 -year-old students on PISA computer-based reading literacy scale, by education system: 2012

| Education system | Average score | s.e. | Education system | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD average | 497 ( | 0.7 |  |  |  |
| Singapore | 5670 | 1.2 | Sweden | 498 | 3.4 |
| Korea, Republic of | 5550 | 3.6 | Denmark | 495 | 2.9 |
| Hong Kong-China | 550 | 3.6 | Germany | 494 | 4.0 |
| Japan | 5450 | 3.3 | Portugal | 486 | 4.4 |
| Canada | 5320 | 2.3 | Austria | 480 | 3.9 |
| Shanghai-China | 5310 | 3.7 | Poland | 477 | 4.5 |
| Estonia | 5230 | 2.8 | Slovak Republic | 474 | 3.5 |
| Australia | 521 | 1.7 | Slovenia | 471 | 1.3 |
| Ireland | 520 | 3.0 | Spain | 466 | 3.9 |
| Chinese Taipei | 519 | 3.0 | Russian Federation | 466 | 3.9 |
| Macao-China | 515 | 0.9 | Israel | 461 - | 5.1 |
| United States | 511 | 4.5 | Chile | 452 | 3.6 |
| France | 511 | 3.6 | Hungary | 450 | 4.4 |
| Italy | 504 | 4.3 | Brazil | 436 | 4.9 |
| Belgium | 502 | 2.6 | United Arab Emirates | 407 | 3.3 |
| Norway | 500 | 3.5 | Colombia | 396 | 4.0 |

© Average score is higher than U.S. average score.
Average score is lower than U.S. average score.
NOTE: The computer-based reading literacy assessment was an optional assessment for education systems in 2012. Education systems are ordered by 2012 average score. 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 . All average scores reported as higher or lower than the U.S. average score are different at the . 05 level of statistical significance. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. This table corresponds to table 6 in Performance of U.S. 15-Year-Old Students in Mathematics, Science, and Reading Literacy in an International Context (NCES 2014-024).
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Figure CR1a. Difference in average scores of 15-year-old female and male students on PISA computerbased reading literacy scale, by education system: 2012


Female-male difference in average computer-based reading literacy scores is statistically different. $\square$ Female-male difference in average computer-based reading literacy scores is not measurably different. NOTE: The computer-based reading literacy assessment was an optional assessment for education systems in 2012. Education systems are ordered by female-male difference in 2012 average score. Differences were computed using unrounded numbers. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Score differences as noted between males and females are significantly different at the .05 leve of statistical significance. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table CR1b. Difference in average scores of 15-year-old female and male
students on PISA computer-based reading literacy scale, by education system:
2012

| Education system | Female-male difference | s.e. |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| OECD average | $26^{*}$ | 0.8 |

Colombia $\quad 4 \quad 4.3$
Korea, Republic of 7 ..... 5.1
Chile 9 * 4.4
Shanghai-China ..... 10 * 2.8
Japan ..... 16 * 3.8
Chinese Taipei ..... 17 * 5.3
Portugal ..... 17 * 3.0
Singapore ..... 18 * 2.2
Russian Federation ..... 18 * 3.0
Macao-China ..... 18 * 1.7
Slovak Republic ..... 4.3
Hong Kong-China ..... 5.0
Brazil ..... 3.2
Canada ..... 1.8
Italy ..... 6.0
France ..... 3.6
Denmark ..... 2.4
Ireland ..... 4.3
Belgium ..... 4.0
Austria ..... 6.1
Spain ..... 3.1
Israel ..... 6.4
United States ..... 2.6
Germany ..... 3.0
Australia ..... 2.9
Hungary ..... 4.9
Sweden ..... 3.3
Poland ..... 3.4
Estonia ..... 2.8
Slovenia ..... 2.7
Norway ..... 3.1
United Arab Emirates ..... 6.5
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Differences between males and females are significantly different at the .05 level of statisticalsignificance.
NOTE: The computer-based reading literacy assessment was an optional assessment for educationsystems in 2012. Education systems are ordered by female-male difference in 2012 average score.Differences were computed using unrounded numbers. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000. TheOECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each countryweighted equally. Standard error is noted by s.e. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and educationsystems.SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for InternationalStudent Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A1. Average scores of 15 -year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale in Connecticut public schools compared with other participating education systems: 2012

|  | Education systems higher than Connecticut |
| :--- | :--- |
| Shanghai-China | Japan |
| Singapore | Liechtenstein |
| Hong Kong-China | Switzerland |
| Chinese Taipei | Netherlands |
| Korea, Republic of | Estonia |
| Macao-China | Finland |
|  | Education systems not measurably different from Connecticut |
| Canada | Ireland |
| Poland | Slovenia |
| Belgium | Denmark |
| Germany | New Zealand |
| Massachusetts | Czech Republic |
| Vietnam | France |
| Austria | OECD average |
| Australia | United Kingdom |
|  |  |
| Iceland | Education systems lower than Connecticut |
| Latvia | Cyprus |
| Luxembourg | Bulgaria |
| Norway | United Arab Emirates |
| Portugal | Kazakhstan |
| Italy | Thailand |
| Spain | Chile |
| Russian Federation | Malaysia |
| Slovak Republic | Mexico |
| United States | Montenegro, Republic of |
| Lithuania | Uruguay |
| Sweden | Costa Rica |
| Hungary | Albania |
| Croatia | Brazil |
| Florida | Argentina |
| Israel | Tunisia |
| Greece | Jordan |
| Serbia, Republic of | Colombia |
| Turkey | Qatar |
| Romania | Indonesia |
| Peru |  |

NOTE: All average scores reported as higher or lower than the Connecticut average score are different at the .05 level of statistical significance. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

| Reporting groups | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Connecticut average | 506 *** | 6.2 |
| U.S. average | 481 ** | 3.6 |
| OECD average | 494 *** | 0.5 |
| Sex |  |  |
| Female | 499 *** | 6.3 |
| Male | 513 * | 6.9 |
| Race/ethnicity |  |  |
| White | 534 * | 5.5 |
| Black | 421 * | 7.3 |
| Hispanic | 442 * | 8.3 |
| Asian | 534 * | 11.8 |
| Multiracial | 496 | 11.8 |
| Percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch |  |  |
| Less than 10 percent | 567 * | 7.0 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | 526 * | 6.7 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | 491 | 5.1 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 440 * | 15.0 |
| 75 percent or more | 427 * | 13.9 |

${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
** $p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
*** $p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: The OECD average is the average of the national averages 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. Data on free or reduced-price lunch are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. Standard error is noted by s.e.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A3. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA science literacy scale in Connecticut public schools compared with other participating education systems: 2012


## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A4. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA science literacy scale in Connecticut public
schools, by various subgroups: 2012 schools, by various subgroups: 2012


## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A5. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA reading literacy scale in Connecticut public schools compared with other participating education systems: 2012

|  | Education systems higher than Connecticut |
| :--- | :--- |
| Shanghai-China | Singapore |
| Hong Kong-China | Education systems not measurably different from Connecticut |
|  | New Zealand |
| Korea, Republic of | Australia |
| Massachusetts | Netherlands |
| Finland | Switzerland |
| Ireland | Macao-China |
| Canada | Belgium |
| Chinese Taipei | Vietnam |
| Poland | Germany |
| Estonia |  |
| Liechtenstein |  |
|  |  |
| France | Education systems lower than Connecticut |
| Norway | Slovak Republic |
| United Kingdom | Cyprus |
| United States | Serbia, Republic of |
| OECD average | United Arab Emirates |
| Denmark | Chile |
| Czech Republic | Thailand |
| Florida | Costa Rica |
| Italy | Romania |
| Austria | Bulgaria |
| Latvia | Mexico |
| Hungary | Montenegro, Republic of |
| Spain | Uruguay |
| Luxembourg | Brazil |
| Portugal | Tunisia |
| Israel | Colombia |
| Croatia | Jordan |
| Sweden | Malaysia |
| Iceland | Indonesia |
| Slovenia | Argentina |
| Lithuania | Albania |
| Greece | Kazakhstan |
| Turkey | Qatar |
| Russian Federation | Peru |
| NOTE: All average scores reported as higher or lower than the Connecticut average score are different at the .05 level of |  |
| statistical significance. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each |  |
| country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. |  |
| Source: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment |  |
| (PISA), 2012. |  |
|  |  |

## National Center for Education Statistics

| Reporting groups | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Connecticut average | 521 * | 6.5 |
| U.S. average | 498 | 3.7 |
| OECD average | 496 | 0.5 |
| Sex |  |  |
| Female | 532 * | 6.7 |
| Male | 510 | 7.1 |
| Race/ethnicity |  |  |
| White | 546 * | 5.5 |
| Black | 447 * | 10.2 |
| Hispanic | 463 * | 9.8 |
| Asian | 558 * | 12.9 |
| Multiracial | 521 ** | 11.9 |
| Percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch |  |  |
| Less than 10 percent | 578 * | 9.7 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | 542 * | 7.1 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | 508 | 6.1 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 459 * | 13.7 |
| 75 percent or more | 443 * | 12.1 |

${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
** $p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: The OECD average is the average of the national averages 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. Data on free or reduced-price lunch are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. Standard error is noted by s.e.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A7. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale in Florida public schools compared with other participating education systems: 2012

|  | Education systems higher than Florida |
| :--- | :--- |
| Shanghai-China | Australia |
| Singapore | Ireland |
| Hong Kong-China | Slovenia |
| Chinese Taipei | Denmark |
| Korea, Republic of | New Zealand |
| Macao-China | Czech Republic |
| Japan | France |
| Liechtenstein | OECD average |
| Switzerland | United Kingdom |
| Netherlands | Iceland |
| Estonia | Latvia |
| Finland | Luxembourg |
| Canada | Norway |
| Poland | Portugal |
| Belgium | Italy |
| Germany | Spain |
| Massachusetts | Russian Federation |
| Vietnam | Slovak Republic |
| Connecticut | United States |
| Austria |  |

Austria

# Education systems not measurably different from Florida 

| Lithuania <br> Sweden <br> Hungary | Croatia |
| :--- | :--- |
| Israel |  |
| Greece |  |
| Serbia, Republic of | Montenegro, Republic of |
| Turkey | Uruguay |
| Romania | Costa Rica |
| Cyprus | Albania |
| Bulgaria | Brazil |
| United Arab Emirates | Argentina |
| Kazakhstan | Tunisia |
| Thailand | Jordan |
| Chile | Colombia |
| Malaysia | Qatar |
| Mexico | Indonesia |
| NoTE Alana | Peru |

NOTE: All average scores reported as higher or lower than the Florida average score are different at the .05 level of statistica significance. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

| Reporting groups | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Florida average | 467* | 5.8 |
| U.S. average | 481 ** | 3.6 |
| OECD average | 494 *** | 0.5 |
| Sex |  |  |
| Female | 460 * | 6.0 |
| Male | 474 ** | 6.3 |
| Race/ethnicity |  |  |
| White | 499 *** | 5.7 |
| Black | 413 * | 5.7 |
| Hispanic | 458 * | 5.7 |
| Asian | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Multiracial | 467 ** | 6.4 |
| Percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch |  |  |
| Less than 10 percent | 548 * | 23.9 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | 533 * | 15.3 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | 481 ** | 6.0 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 453 * | 4.9 |
| 75 percent or more | 417 * | 9.0 |

$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
${ }^{* *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
${ }^{* * *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: The OECD average is the average of the national averages 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. Data on free or reduced-price lunch are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. Standard error is noted by s.e.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A9. Average scores of $\mathbf{1 5}$-year-old students on PISA science literacy scale in Florida public schools compared with other participating education systems: 2012

|  | Education systems higher than Florida |
| :--- | :--- |
| Shanghai-China | Ireland |
| Hong Kong-China | Australia |
| Singapore | Connecticut |
| Japan | Macao-China |
| Finland | New Zealand |
| Estonia | Switzerland |
| Korea, Republic of | Slovenia |
| Vietnam | United Kingdom |
| Massachusetts | Czech Republic |
| Poland | Austria |
| Canada | Belgium |
| Liechtenstein | Latvia |
| Germany | OECD average |
| Chinese Taipei | France |
| Netherlands |  |

Netherlands
Education systems not measurably different from Florida

| Denmark | Luxembourg |
| :--- | :--- |
| United States | Portugal |
| Spain | Russian Federation |
| Lithuania | Sweden |
| Norway | Iceland |
| Hungary | Slovak Republic |
| Italy | Israel |
| Croatia |  |


|  | Education systems lower than Florida |
| :--- | :--- |
| Greece | Uruguay |
| Turkey | Mexico |
| United Arab Emirates | Montenegro, Republic of |
| Bulgaria | Jordan |
| Chile | Argentina |
| Serbia, Republic of | Brazil |
| Thailand | Colombia |
| Romania | Tunisia |
| Cyprus | Albania |
| Costa Rica | Qatar |
| Kazakhstan | Indonesia |
| Malaysia | Peru |
| NOTE: All average scores reported as higher or lower than the Florida average score are different at the .05 level of statistical |  |
| significance. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country |  |
| weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. |  |
| SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment |  |
| (PISA), 2012. |  |

## National Center for Education Statistics

## Table A10. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA science literacy scale in Florida public schools, by various subgroups: 2012

| Reporting groups | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Florida average | 485 ** | 6.4 |
| U.S. average | 497 | 3.8 |
| OECD average | 501 | 0.5 |
| Sex |  |  |
| Female | 478 * | 6.2 |
| Male | 491 | 7.4 |
| Race/ethnicity |  |  |
| White | 520 * | 6.6 |
| Black | 425 * | 5.9 |
| Hispanic | 475 * | 6.3 |
| Asian | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Multiracial | 500 | 8.5 |
| Percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch |  |  |
| Less than 10 percent | 573 * | 15.0 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | 545 * | 19.1 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | 499 | 7.6 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 474 * | 5.2 |
| 75 percent or more | 429 * | 8.2 |

## $\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.

$\dagger$ Not applicable.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
** $p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: The OECD average is the average of the national averages 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. Data on free or reduced-price lunch are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. Standard error is noted by s.e.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A11. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA reading literacy scale in Florida public schools compared with other participating education systems: 2012

|  | Education systems higher than Florida |
| :--- | :--- |
| Shanghai-China | Estonia |
| Hong Kong-China | Liechtenstein |
| Singapore | New Zealand |
| Japan | Australia |
| Korea, Republic of | Netherlands |
| Massachusetts | Switzerland |
| Finland | Macao-China |
| Ireland | Belgium |
| Canada | Vietnam |
| Chinese Taipei | Germany |
| Connecticut | France |
| Poland |  |

Poland
Education systems not measurably different from Florida

| Norway | Hungary |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| United Kingdom | Spain |  |  |
| United States | Luxembourg |  |  |
| OECD average | Portugal |  |  |
| Denmark | Israel |  |  |
| Czech Republic | Croatia |  |  |
| Italy | Sweden |  |  |
| Austria | Iceland |  |  |
| Latvia | Slovenia |  |  |
|  |  |  | Education systems lower than Florida |
| Lithuania | Montenegro, Republic of |  |  |
| Greece | Uruguay |  |  |
| Turkey | Brazil |  |  |
| Russian Federation | Tunisia |  |  |
| Slovak Republic | Colombia |  |  |
| Cyprus | Jordan |  |  |
| Serbia, Republic of | Malaysia |  |  |
| United Arab Emirates | Indonesia |  |  |
| Chile | Argentina |  |  |
| Thailand | Albania |  |  |
| Costa Rica | Kazakhstan |  |  |
| Romania | Qatar |  |  |
| Bulgaria | Peru |  |  |
| Mexico |  |  |  |
| NOTE: All average scores reported as higher or lower than the Florida average score are different at the .05 level of statistical |  |  |  |
| significance. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country |  |  |  |
| weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. |  |  |  |
| SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment |  |  |  |
| (PISA), 2012. |  |  |  |

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A12. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA reading literacy scale in Florida public schools, by various subgroups: 2012
Reporting groups
Average score s.e.
Florida average ..... 492 ..... 6.1
U.S. average ..... 498 ..... 3.7
OECD average ..... 0.5
Sex
Female ..... 503 ..... 5.9
Male ..... 481 * ..... 7.0
Race/ethnicity
White ..... 518 * 6.7
Black ..... 449 * ..... 6.7
Hispanic ..... 489 ..... 7.2
Asian ..... $\ddagger$ ..... $\dagger$
Multiracial ..... 8.1
Percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch Less than 10 percent ..... 568 * 17.6
10 to 24.9 percent ..... 555 * 25.6
25 to 49.9 percent ..... 500 ..... 7.7
50 to 74.9 percent ..... 484 * ..... 5.4
75 percent or more ..... 449 * ..... 8.5
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Reportingstandards were not met for American Indian/Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander. Black includes African American, andHispanic 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S.and state totals. Data on free or reduced-price lunch are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked theapproximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. Standard error is noted by s.e.SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A13. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale in Massachusetts public schools compared with other participating education systems: 2012

|  | Education systems higher than Massa |
| :--- | :---: |
| Shanghai-China | Macao-China |
| Singapore | Japan |
| Hong Kong-China | Liechtenstein |
| Chinese Taipei | Switzerland |
| Korea, Republic of |  |


|  | Education systems not measurably different from Massachusetts |
| :--- | :--- |
| Netherlands | Vietnam |
| Estonia | Connecticut |
| Finland | Austria |
| Canada | Australia |
| Poland | Ireland |
| Belgium | Slovenia |
| Germany |  |


|  | Education systems lower than Massachusetts |
| :--- | :--- |
| Denmark | Serbia, Republic of |
| New Zealand | Turkey |
| Czech Republic | Romania |
| France | Cyprus |
| OECD average | Bulgaria |
| United Kingdom | United Arab Emirates |
| Iceland | Kazakhstan |
| Latvia | Thailand |
| Luxembourg | Chile |
| Norway | Malaysia |
| Portugal | Mexico |
| Italy | Montenegro, Republic of |
| Spain | Uruguay |
| Russian Federation | Costa Rica |
| Slovak Republic | Albania |
| United States | Brazil |
| Lithuania | Argentina |
| Sweden | Tunisia |
| Hungary | Jordan |
| Croatia | Colombia |
| Florida | Qatar |
| Israel | Indonesia |
| Greece | Peru |
| NOTE: All average scores reported as higher or lower than the Massachusetts average score are different at the .05 level of |  |
| statistical significance. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each |  |
| country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. |  |
| SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment |  |
| (PISA), 2012. |  |

## National Center for Education Statistics

## Table A14. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA mathematics literacy scale in Massachusetts public schools, by various subgroups: 2012

Reporting groups

Average score s.e.
Massachusetts averageU.S. average481 ** 3.6
OECD average ..... 494 *** ..... 0.5
Sex
Female ..... 509 * 7.1
Male ..... 518 * ..... 6.3
Race/ethnicity
White ..... 530 * 6.7
Black ..... 458 ** 15.9
Hispanic ..... 446 * 9.5
Asian 569 * ..... 16.9
Multiracial ..... $\ddagger$ ..... $\dagger$
Percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch
Less than 10 percent ..... 583 * 11.0
10 to 24.9 percent ..... 514 * ..... 6.6
25 to 49.9 percent 493 *** ..... 4.5
50 to 74.9 percent ..... 465 ** 11.9
75 percent or more 457 ** ..... 16.9
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
** $p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
*** $p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Reportingstandards were not met for American Indian/Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander. Black includes African American, andHispanic 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S.and state totals. Data on free or reduced-price lunch are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked theapproximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. Standard error is noted by s.e.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A15. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA science literacy scale in Massachusetts public schools compared with other participating education systems: 2012

Education systems higher than Massachusetts

| Shanghai-China | Japan |
| :--- | :--- |
| Hong Kong-China | Finland |
| Singapore | Estonia |

Korea, Republic of Ireland
Vietnam Australia
Poland Connecticut
Canada Macao-China
Liechtenstein New Zealand

Germany Switzerland
Chinese Taipei United Kingdom
Netherlands

|  | Education systems lower than Massachusetts |
| :--- | :--- |
| Slovenia | Turkey |
| Czech Republic | United Arab Emirates |
| Austria | Bulgaria |
| Belgium | Chile |
| Latvia | Serbia, Republic of |
| OECD average | Thailand |
| France | Romania |
| Denmark | Cyprus |
| United States | Costa Rica |
| Spain | Kazakhstan |
| Lithuania | Malaysia |
| Norway | Uruguay |
| Hungary | Mexico |
| Italy | Montenegro, Republic of |
| Croatia | Jordan |
| Luxembourg | Argentina |
| Portugal | Brazil |
| Russian Federation | Colombia |
| Florida | Tunisia |
| Sweden | Albania |
| Iceland | Qatar |
| Slovak Republic | Indonesia |
| Israel | Peru |
| Greece |  |
| NOTE: All average scores reported as higher or lower than the Massachusetts average score are different at the .05 level of |  |
| statistical significance. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each |  |
| country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. |  |
| source: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment |  |
| (PISA), 2012. |  |

## National Center for Education Statistics

| Reporting groups | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Massachusetts average | 527 * | 6.0 |
| U.S. average | 497 | 3.8 |
| OECD average | 501 | 0.5 |
| Sex |  |  |
| Female | 526 * | 6.8 |
| Male | 529 * | 6.1 |
| Race/ethnicity |  |  |
| White | 545 * | 6.5 |
| Black | 466 ** | 16.2 |
| Hispanic | 460 * | 10.3 |
| Asian | 580 * | 15.7 |
| Multiracial | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch |  |  |
| Less than 10 percent | 596 * | 9.4 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | 531 * | 4.3 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | 510 | 6.2 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 481 | 13.5 |
| 75 percent or more | 461 * | 17.9 |

$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance.
** $p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance.
NOTE: The OECD average is the average of the national averages 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 were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. Data on free or reduced-price lunch are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. Standard error is noted by s.e.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table A17. Average scores of 15-year-old students on PISA reading literacy scale in Massachusetts public schools compared with other participating education systems: 2012

|  | Education systems higher than Massachusetts |
| :--- | :---: |
| Shanghai-China | Singapore |
| Hong Kong-China | Education systems not measurably different from Massachusetts |
|  | Chinese Taipei |
| Japan | Connecticut |
| Korea, Republic of | Poland |
| Finland | Estonia |
| Ireland | Liechtenstein |
| Canada |  |

Education systems lower than Massachusetts

| New Zealand | Lithuania |
| :--- | :--- |
| Australia | Greece |

Netherlands Turkey

Switzerland
Russian Federation
Macao-China
Slovak Republic
Belgium
Cyprus
Vietnam Serbia, Republic of
Germany United Arab Emirates
France Chile
Norway Thailand

United Kingdom Costa Rica
United States Romania
OECD average
Bulgaria
Denmark
Czech Republic
Mexico

Florida
Montenegro, Republic of

Italy
Uruguay

Austria
Brazil
Tunisia
Latvia
Colombia
Hungary
Jordan
Spain
Malaysia
Luxembourg
Indonesia
Portugal
Argentina
Israel
Albania
Croatia
Kazakhstan
Sweden
Qatar
Iceland
Peru
Slovenia
NOTE: All average scores reported as higher or lower than the Massachusetts average score are different at the .05 level of statistical significance. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

| Reporting groups | Average score | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Massachusetts average | 527 * | 6.1 |
| U.S. average | 498 | 3.7 |
| OECD average | 496 | 0.5 |
| Sex |  |  |
| Female | 542 * | 6.6 |
| Male | 511 ** | 6.2 |
| Race/ethnicity |  |  |
| White | 540 * | 6.8 |
| Black | 476 | 16.7 |
| Hispanic | 475 | 12.1 |
| Asian | 584 * | 13.5 |
| Multiracial | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Percentage of students in enrolled schools eligible for free or reduced-price lunch |  |  |
| Less than 10 percent | 590 * | 8.8 |
| 10 to 24.9 percent | 527 * | 7.7 |
| 25 to 49.9 percent | 507 | 6.7 |
| 50 to 74.9 percent | 488 | 11.3 |
| 75 percent or more | 477 | 19.0 |
| $\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met. $\dagger$ Not applicable. |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| * $p<.05$. Significantly different from both the U.S. and OECD averages at the .05 level of statistical significance. |  |  |
| ${ }^{* *} p<.05$. Significantly different from the OECD average at the .05 level of statistical significance. |  |  |
| NOTE: The OECD average is the average of the national averages 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 |  |  |
| Although data for some race/ethnicities were not shown separately because the reporting standards were not met, they are included in the U.S. and state totals. Data on free or reduced-price lunch are based on principals' responses to a question in the school questionnaire that asked the approximate percentage of eligible students in the school during the previous school year. Standard error is noted by s.e. |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table AA1. Percentage distribution of U.S. 15-year-old students, by grade level: 2012

| Grade level | Percent | s.e. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Grade 7 | $\#$ | $\dagger$ |
| Grade 8 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Grade 9 | 11.7 | 1.06 |
| Grade 10 | 71.2 | 1.10 |
| Grade 11 | 16.6 | 0.83 |
| Grade 12 | $\ddagger$ | $\dagger$ |
| Total | 100.0 |  |

\# Rounds to zero.
$\dagger$ Not applicable.
$\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
NOTE: Standard error is noted by s.e.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

## National Center for Education Statistics

Table AA2. Cut scores for proficiency levels for mathematics, science, and reading literacy: 2012

| Proficiency level | Mathematics | Science | Reading $^{1}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Below level 1 | $0-358$ | $0-335$ | $0-262$ |
| Level 1 | greater than 358-420 | greater than 335-410 | greater than 262-335 (1b) |
|  |  |  | greater than 335-407 (1a) |
| Level 2 | greater than 420-482 | greater than 410-484 | greater than 407-480 |
| Level 3 | greater than 482-545 | greater than 484-559 | greater than 480-553 |
| Level 4 | greater than 545-607 | greater than 559-633 | greater than 553-626 |
| Level 5 | greater than 607-669 | greater than 733-708 | greater than 626-698 |
| Level 6 | greater than 669-1000 | greater than 708-1000 | greater than 698-1000 |

${ }^{1}$ The first reading literacy proficiency level is composed of levels 1 a and 1 b . The score range for below level 1 refers to scores below 1b.
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

National Center for Education Statistics
Table AB1. Number of schools and weighted participation rates, by education

| Education system | Percent |  | Number of participating schools after replacemen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weighted school participation before replacement | Weighted school participation after replacement |  |
| Albania | 100.0 | 100.0 | 204 |
| Argentina | 95.5 | 95.9 | 219 |
| Australia | 97.9 | 97.9 | 757 |
| Austria | 100.0 | 100.0 | 191 |
| Belgium | 84.4 | 96.6 | 282 |
| Brazil | 92.7 | 95.4 | 837 |
| Bulgaria | 99.2 | 99.8 | 187 |
| Canada | 91.3 | 92.9 | 840 |
| Chile | 91.9 | 98.8 | 221 |
| Chinese Taipei | 100.0 | 100.0 | 163 |
| Colombia | 86.6 | 97.4 | 352 |
| Costa Rica | 98.9 | 98.9 | 191 |
| Croatia | 98.7 | 99.9 | 163 |
| Cyprus | 96.6 | 96.6 | 117 |
| Czech Republic | 98.1 | 99.6 | 295 |
| Denmark | 87.0 | 95.5 | 339 |
| Estonia | 100.0 | 100.0 | 206 |
| Finland | 99.0 | 99.3 | 311 |
| France | 96.6 | 96.6 | 223 |
| Germany | 97.7 | 98.0 | 228 |
| Greece | 93.2 | 98.9 | 188 |
| Hong Kong-China | 78.7 | 94.1 | 147 |
| Hungary | 97.6 | 99.4 | 204 |
| Iceland | 99.3 | 99.3 | 133 |
| Indonesia | 94.9 | 98.0 | 206 |
| Ireland | 98.7 | 99.3 | 183 |
| Israel | 91.1 | 93.8 | 172 |
| Italy | 89.1 | 97.4 | 1,186 |
| Japan | 86.3 | 95.5 | 191 |
| Jordan | 100.0 | 100.0 | 233 |
| Kazakhstan | 100.0 | 100.0 | 218 |
| Korea, Republic of | 99.9 | 99.9 | 156 |
| Latvia | 87.9 | 99.9 | 211 |
| Liechtenstein | 100.0 | 100.0 | 12 |
| Lithuania | 98.2 | 100.0 | 216 |
| Luxembourg | 100.0 | 100.0 | 42 |
| Macao-China | 100.0 | 100.0 | 45 |
| Malaysia | 100.0 | 100.0 | 164 |
| Mexico | 91.8 | 95.3 | 1,468 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 100.0 | 100.0 | 51 |
| Netherlands | 75.3 | 89.4 | 177 |
| New Zealand | 80.9 | 89.3 | 177 |
| Norway | 85.2 | 94.7 | 197 |
| Peru | 97.9 | 98.6 | 240 |
| Poland | 85.4 | 97.9 | 182 |
| Portugal | 95.4 | 95.8 | 187 |
| Qatar | 99.9 | 99.9 | 157 |
| Romania | 100.0 | 100.0 | 178 |
| Russian Federation | 100.0 | 100.0 | 227 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 90.0 | 95.4 | 152 |
| Shanghai-China | 100.0 | 100.0 | 155 |
| Singapore | 97.5 | 98.2 | 172 |
| Slovak Republic | 87.5 | 99.0 | 231 |
| Slovenia | 98.1 | 98.1 | 335 |
| Spain | 99.7 | 99.7 | 902 |
| Sweden | 98.9 | 99.8 | 209 |
| Switzerland | 94.5 | 98.3 | 410 |
| Thailand | 98.0 | 100.0 | 239 |
| Tunisia | 99.3 | 99.3 | 152 |
| Turkey | 97.5 | 99.9 | 169 |
| United Arab Emirates | 99.4 | 99.4 | 453 |
| United Kingdom | 80.1 | 89.2 | 505 |
| United States | 67.1 | 77.2 | 161 |
| Uruguay | 99.4 | 100.0 | 180 |
| Vietnam | 100.0 | 100.0 | 162 |
| U.S. state education systems |  |  |  |
| Connecticut | 98.0 | 98.0 | 50 |
| Florida | 100.0 | 100.0 | 54 |
| Massachusetts | $100.0$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $49$ |

NOTE: In calculating school participation rates, each school received a weight equal to the product of its base weight (the reciprocal of its probability of selection) and the number of age-eligible students enrolled in the school, as indicated on the sampling frame. Weighted school participation before replacement refers to the sum of weights of the original sample schools with PISA-assessed students and a student response rate of at least 50 percent over the sum of weights of all original sample schools. Weighted school participation after replacement refers to the sum of weights of the original and replacement schools with PISA-assessed
students and a student response rate of at least 50 percent over the sum of weights of responding original students and a student response rate of at least 50 percent over the sum of weights of responding original
sample schools, responding replacement schools, and eligible refusing original sample schools. Italics sample schools, responding replacement schools, and eligible refusing original sample schools. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts
are for public schools only. This table corresponds to table B-1 in Performance of U.S. 15-Year-Old Students are for public schools only. This table corresponds in Mathematics, Science, and Reading Literacy in an International Context (NCES 2014-024). SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

National Center for Education Statistics
Table AB2. Coverage of target population, student exclusion and weighted participation rates, and number of students, by education
system: 2012

| Education system | Total population of 15-year-olds (number) | Percent |  |  |  | Number of participating students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Coverage of 15-year-old population | Coverage of national desired population | Overall student exclusion rate | Weighted student participation after replacement |  |
| Albania | 76,910 | 55.2 | 99.9 | 0.1 | 92.5 | 4,743 |
| Argentina | 684,879 | 79.7 | 99.3 | 0.7 | 88.0 | 5,908 |
| Australia | 291,967 | 85.9 | 96.0 | 4.0 | 86.8 | 17,774 |
| Austria | 93,537 | 87.9 | 98.7 | 1.3 | 91.7 | 4,756 |
| Belgium | 123,469 | 95.5 | 98.6 | 1.4 | 90.9 | 9,690 |
| Brazil | 3,574,928 | 69.1 | 98.6 | 1.4 | 90.1 | 20,091 |
| Bulgaria | 70,188 | 77.3 | 97.4 | 2.6 | 95.7 | 5,282 |
| Canada | 417,873 | 83.3 | 93.6 | 6.4 | 80.8 | 21,548 |
| Chile | 274,803 | 83.4 | 98.7 | 1.3 | 94.6 | 6,857 |
| Chinese Taipei | 328,356 | 89.1 | 98.8 | 1.2 | 96.3 | 6,046 |
| Colombia | 889,729 | 63.0 | 99.9 | 0.1 | 93.1 | 11,173 |
| Costa Rica | 81,489 | 49.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 89.0 | 4,602 |
| Croatia | 48,155 | 94.5 | 97.8 | 2.2 | 92.2 | 6,153 |
| Cyprus | 9,956 | 96.9 | 96.7 | 3.3 | 93.3 | 5,078 |
| Czech Republic | 96,946 | 84.7 | 98.2 | 1.8 | 90.1 | 6,535 |
| Denmark | 72,310 | 90.8 | 93.8 | 6.2 | 89.1 | 7,481 |
| Estonia | 12,649 | 92.0 | 94.2 | 5.8 | 92.9 | 5,867 |
| Finland | 62,523 | 96.0 | 98.1 | 1.9 | 90.7 | 8,829 |
| France | 792,983 | 88.5 | 95.6 | 4.4 | 89.5 | 5,682 |
| Germany | 798,136 | 94.8 | 98.5 | 1.5 | 93.2 | 5,001 |
| Greece | 110,521 | 87.4 | 96.4 | 3.6 | 96.7 | 5,125 |
| Hong Kong-China | 84,200 | 83.9 | 98.2 | 1.8 | 93.1 | 4,670 |
| Hungary | 111,761 | 81.6 | 97.4 | 2.6 | 92.7 | 4,810 |
| Iceland | 4,505 | 92.5 | 96.2 | 3.8 | 84.7 | 3,508 |
| Indonesia | 4,174,217 | 63.4 | 99.7 | 0.3 | 95.2 | 5,622 |
| Ireland | 59,296 | 91.1 | 95.5 | 4.5 | 84.1 | 5,016 |
| Israel | 118,953 | 90.6 | 95.9 | 4.1 | 90.0 | 6,061 |
| Italy | 605,490 | 86.1 | 96.7 | 3.3 | 92.8 | 38,142 |
| Japan | 1,241,786 | 90.9 | 97.9 | 2.1 | 96.1 | 6,351 |
| Jordan | 129,492 | 85.8 | 99.6 | 0.4 | 95.0 | 7,038 |
| Kazakhstan | 258,716 | 80.6 | 96.6 | 3.4 | 98.9 | 5,808 |
| Korea, Republic of | 687,104 | 87.9 | 99.2 | 0.8 | 98.7 | 5,033 |
| Latvia | 18,789 | 85.4 | 96.0 | 4.0 | 90.9 | 5,276 |
| Liechtenstein | 417 | 75.3 | 95.8 | 4.2 | 93.3 | 293 |
| Lithuania | 38,524 | 85.8 | 96.0 | 4.0 | 92.1 | 4,618 |
| Luxembourg | 6,187 | 89.3 | 87.2 | 8.4 | 95.2 | 5,260 |
| Macao-China | 6,600 | 81.3 | 99.8 | 0.2 | 99.4 | 5,335 |
| Malaysia | 544,302 | 79.4 | 99.8 | 0.2 | 94.0 | 5,197 |
| Mexico | 2,114,745 | 62.7 | 99.3 | 0.7 | 93.9 | 33,806 |
| Montenegro, Republic of | 8,600 | 89.7 | 99.7 | 0.3 | 93.8 | 4,744 |
| Netherlands | 194,000 | 101.2 | 95.6 | 4.4 | 85.0 | 4,460 |
| New Zealand | 60,940 | 87.6 | 95.4 | 4.6 | 84.7 | 5,248 |
| Norway | 64,917 | 91.6 | 93.9 | 6.1 | 90.9 | 4,686 |
| Peru | 584,294 | 71.9 | 99.8 | 0.2 | 96.0 | 6,035 |
| Poland | 425,597 | 89.1 | 95.4 | 4.6 | 87.6 | 5,662 |
| Portugal | 108,728 | 88.3 | 98.4 | 1.6 | 87.4 | 5,722 |
| Qatar | 11,667 | 94.3 | 97.5 | 2.5 | 99.7 | 10,966 |
| Romania | 146,243 | 96.4 | 96.5 | 3.5 | 97.8 | 5,074 |
| Russian Federation | 1,272,632 | 92.1 | 97.6 | 2.4 | 97.3 | 6,418 |
| Serbia, Republic of | 80,089 | 84.8 | 97.1 | 2.9 | 93.4 | 4,684 |
| Shanghai-China | 108,056 | 78.8 | 98.5 | 1.5 | 98.5 | 6,374 |
| Singapore | 53,637 | 95.2 | 98.8 | 1.2 | 94.3 | 5,546 |
| Slovak Republic | 59,723 | 91.2 | 97.1 | 2.9 | 93.8 | 5,737 |
| Slovenia | 19,471 | 94.0 | 98.4 | 1.6 | 90.5 | 7,229 |
| Spain | 423,444 | 88.4 | 95.7 | 4.3 | 89.9 | 25,335 |
| Sweden | 102,087 | 93.0 | 94.6 | 5.4 | 92.2 | 4,739 |
| Switzerland | 87,200 | 91.4 | 95.8 | 4.2 | 92.0 | 11,234 |
| Thailand | 982,080 | 71.6 | 98.7 | 1.3 | 98.9 | 6,606 |
| Tunisia | 132,313 | 91.3 | 99.8 | 0.2 | 90.3 | 4,407 |
| Turkey | 1,266,638 | 68.4 | 98.5 | 1.5 | 98.2 | 4,848 |
| United Arab Emirates | 48,824 | 83.2 | 97.9 | 2.1 | 94.7 | 11,500 |
| United Kingdom | 738,066 | 93.2 | 94.6 | 5.4 | 86.1 | 12,659 |
| United States | 3,985,714 | 88.7 | 94.6 | 5.4 | 88.9 | 6,111 |
| Uruguay | 54,638 | 72.8 | 99.7 | 0.3 | 90.0 | 5,315 |
| Vietnam | 1,717,996 | 55.7 | 99.3 | 0.7 | 99.9 | 4,959 |
| $\underline{\text { U.S. state education systems }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut | 48,970 | 75.7 | 95.9 | 4.1 | 87.5 | 1,697 |
| Florida | 226,434 | 77.0 | 91.7 | 8.3 | 90.0 | 1,896 |
| Massachusetts | 81,580 | 69.9 | 95.6 | 4.4 | 90.0 | 1,723 |

NOTE: In calculating student participation rates, each student received a weight (student base weight) equal to the product of the school base weight-for the school in which the student
was enrolled-and the reciprocal of the student selection probability within the school. Coverage of 15 -year-old population refers to the extent to which the weighted participants covered the target population of all enrolled students in grades 7 and above. Coverage of national desired population refers to the extent to which the weighted participants covered the national population of 15 -year-olds under the nonexcluded portion of the student sample. Overall student exclusion rate is the percentage of students excluded for intellectual or functional disabilities, or insufficient assessment language experience at either the school level or within schools. Weighted student participation after replacement refers to the sum of weights of students in original and replacement schools with PISA-assessed students and a student response rate of at least 50 percent over the sum of weights of students in responding original sample schools, responding replacement schools, and eligible refusing original sample schools. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. This table is an expanded version of table B-2 in Performance of U.S. 15-Year-Old Students in Mathematics, Science, and Reading Literacy in an International Context (NCES 2014-024).
SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.


[^0]:    Below level 2
    Levels 5 and above
    \# Rounds to zero.
    ! Interpret with caution. Estimate is unstable due to high coefficient of variation.
    $\ddagger$ Reporting standards not met.
    ${ }^{*} p<.05$. Significantly different from the U.S. percentage at the .05 level of significance.
    NOTE: Education systems are ordered by 2012 percentages of 15 -year-olds in levels 5 and above. To reach a particular proficiency level, a student must correctly answer a majority of items at that level. Students were classified into reading proficiency levels according to their scores. Cut scores for each proficiency level can be found in table A-1 in appendix A. The OECD average is the average of the national percentages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems. Results for Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts are for public school students only. The standard errors of the estimates are shown in table R1b available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo. asp?pubid=2014024.
    SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

[^1]:    Male-female difference in average computer-based mathematics literacy scores is statistically different.
    $\square$ Male-female difference in average computer-based mathematics literacy scores is not measurably different.
    NOTE: The computer-based mathematics literacy assessment was an optional assessment for education systems in 2012. Education systems are ordered by absolute male-female difference in 2012 average score. Differences were computed using unrounded numbers. Scores are reported on a scale from 0 to 1,000 . Score differences as noted between males and females are significantly different at the .05 level of statistical significance. The OECD average is the average of the national averages of the OECD member countries, with each country weighted equally. Italics indicate non-OECD countries and education systems.
    SOURCE: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2012.

