## Annex A

## TECHNICAL NOTES

Annex A1: Technical Background<br>Annex A2: Summary descriptions of the five levels of reading proficiency.

## Annex A1. Construction of indices and other derived measures from the student and school context questionnaires

This section explains the indices derived from the student and school context questionnaires that are used in this report.
Several of PISA's measures reflect indices that summarise responses from students or school representatives (typically principals) to a series of related questions. The questions were selected from larger constructs on the basis of theoretical considerations and previous research. Structural equation modelling was used to confirm the theoretically expected behaviour of the indices and to validate their comparability across countries. For this purpose, a model was estimated separately for each country and collectively for all OECD countries.
For a detailed description of other PISA indices and details on the methods see the PISA 2000 Technical Report (OECD, 2002) or the PISA 2003 Technical Report (OECD 2005b).

Unless otherwise indicated, where an index involves multiple questions and student responses, the index was scaled using a weighted maximum likelihood estimate (WLE) (see Warm, 1985), using a one-parameter item response model, which in the case of items with more than two categories was the Partial Credit Model. The scaling was done in three stages:

- The item parameters were estimated from equal-sized sub-samples of students from each OECD country.
- The estimates were computed for all students and all schools by anchoring the item parameters obtained in the preceding step.
- The indices were then standardised so that the mean of the index value for the OECD student population was zero and the standard deviation was one (countries being given equal weight in the standardisation process).

To illustrate the meaning of the international scores on the index, item maps were constructed that relate the index value to typical student responses to the questions asked. These item maps can be found on the website www.pisa.oecd. org. The vertical lines on the maps indicate for each of the index scores at the top of the figure which response a student is most likely to give, with zero representing the average student response across OECD countries.
It is important to note that negative values for an index do not necessarily imply that students responded negatively to the underlying questions. A negative value merely indicates that a group of students (or all students, collectively, in a single country) or principals responded less positively than all students or principals did on average across OECD countries. Likewise, a positive value on an index indicates that a group of students or principals responded more favourably, or more positively, than students or principals did, on average, in OECD countries.
Terms enclosed in brackets $<>$ in the following descriptions were replaced in the national versions of the student and school questionnaires by the appropriate national equivalent. For example, the term <qualification at ISCED level 5A> was translated in the United States into "Bachelor's degree, post-graduate certificate program, Master's degree program or first professional degree program". Similarly the term <classes in the language of assessment> in Luxembourg was translated into "German classes" or "French classes" depending on whether students received the German or French version of the assessment instruments.
For additional information on how these indices were constructed, see the PISA 2000 Technical Report (OECD, 2002) or the PISA 2003 Technical Report (OECD, 2005b).

## Student level variables

## Student background

## Family structure

Students were asked to report who usually lived at home with them. The response categories were then grouped into four categories: i) single-parent family (students who reported living with one of the following: mother, father, female guardian or male guardian); ii) nuclear family (students who reported living with a mother and a father); iii) mixed family (students who reported living with a mother and a guardian, a father and a guardian, or two guardians); and iv) other response combinations. Non responses are maintained as missing.

## Parental occupations

Students were asked to report their mothers' and fathers' occupations, and to state whether each parent was in fulltime paid work; part-time paid work; not working but looking for a paid job; or "other". The open-ended responses for occupations were then coded in accordance with the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO 1988).

The PISA international socio-economic index of occupational status (ISEI) was derived from students' responses on parental occupation. The index captured the attributes of occupations that convert parents' education into income. The index was derived by the optimal scaling of occupation groups to maximise the indirect effect of education on income through occupation and to minimise the direct effect of education on income, net of occupation (both effects being net of age). For more information on the methodology, see Ganzeboom et al. (1992). The highest international socio-economic index of occupational status (HISEI) corresponds to the highest ISEI of either the father or the mother.

## Index of economic, social and cultural status

The index of economic, social and cultural status was created to capture wider aspects of a student's family and home background in addition to occupational status and is a variation of the index used in PISA 2000. It was derived from the following variables: i) the highest international socio-economic index of occupational status of the father or mother; ii) the highest level of education of the father or mother converted into years of schooling (for the conversion of levels of education into years of schooling see Table A1.1); and iii) the number of books at home as well as access to home educational and cultural resources, obtained by asking students whether they had at their home: a desk to study at, a room of their own, a quiet place to study, a computer they can use for school work, educational software, a link to the Internet, their own calculator, classic literature, books of poetry, works of art (e.g. paintings), books to help with their school work, and a dictionary. The rationale for the choice of these variables was that socio-economic status is usually seen as being determined by occupational status, education and wealth. As no direct measure on parental wealth was available from PISA, access to relevant household items was used as a proxy. The student scores on the index are factor scores derived from a Principal Component Analysis which are standardised to have an OECD mean of zero and a standard deviation of one.

The Principal Component Analysis was also performed for each participating country to determine to what extent the components of the index operate in similar ways across countries. The analysis revealed that patterns of factor loadings were very similar across countries, with all three components contributing to a similar extent to the index. For the occupational component, the average factor loading was 0.81 , ranging from 0.72 to 0.86 across countries. For the educational component, the average factor loading was 0.80 , ranging from 0.70 to 0.87 across countries. For the wealth component, the average factor loading was 0.76 , ranging from 0.65 to 0.80 across countries. The reliability of the index ranged from 0.56 to 0.77 . These results support the cross-national validity of the index of economic, social and cultural status.
The correlation between the average value on the index and the Gross Domestic Product of countries is 0.62 (increasing to 0.69 when Luxembourg is removed).
The index used in PISA 2000 (OECD, 2001b) was similar to the one used for PISA 2003. However, some adjustments were made. First of all, only 11 questions on home educational resources were common to both surveys. Second, for the question on parental levels of education no distinction had been made in PISA 2000 between university-level and non-university tertiary education. Where comparisons between 2000 and 2003 data are made, the index for PISA 2000 was recomputed on the basis of a common methodology used for both assessments. Results may therefore differ slightly
from those reported in PISA 2000. This being said, the correlation between the PISA 2000 and PISA 2003 indices is very high ( R of 0.96 ). This shows that different methods of computation of the indices did not have a major impact on the results. For more information on this index see the PISA 2003 Technical Report (OECD, 2005b).

Table A1.1
Levels of parental education converted into years of schooling

|  | Did not go to school | Completed ISCED Level 1 (primary education) | Completed ISCED Level 2 (lower secondary education) | Completed ISCED <br> Levels 3B or 3C (upper secondary education providing direct access to the labour market or to ISCED 5B programmes) | Completed ISCED Level 3A (upper secondary education providing access to ISCED 5A and 5B programmes) | Completed ISCED <br> Level 5A (university <br> level tertirary education) | Completed ISCED <br> Level 5B (nonuniversity tertiary education) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Australia | 0.0 | 6.5 | 10.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 14.0 |
| Austria | 0.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 13.0 | 17.0 | 15.0 |
| Belgium | 0.0 | 6.0 | 8.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 16.0 | 15.0 |
| Canada | 0.0 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 17.0 | 15.0 |
| Denmark | 0.0 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 14.0 |
| France | 0.0 | 5.0 | 9.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Germany | 0.0 | 4.0 | 10.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 17.0 | 15.0 |
| Luxembourg | 0.0 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 |
| Netherlands | 0.0 | 6.0 | 8.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 | 15.0 | 13.0 |
| New Zealand | 0.0 | 6.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| Norway | 0.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 16.0 | 14.0 |
| Sweden | 0.0 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 13.5 |
| Switzerland | 0.0 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 14.0 |
| United States | 0.0 | 6.0 | 9.0 | a | 12.0 | 15.0 | 14.0 |
| Hong Kong-China | 0.0 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 17.0 | 16.0 |
| Russian Federation | 0.0 | 4.0 | 9.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 15.0 | 13.0 |

## Educational level of parents

Parental education is a family background variable that is often used in the analysis of educational outcomes. Indices were constructed using information on the educational level of the father, the educational level of the mother, and the highest level of education between the two parents, referred to as the highest educational level of parents. Students were asked to identify the highest level of education of their mother and father on the basis of national qualifications, which were then coded in accordance with the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED 1997, see OECD, 1999) in order to obtain internationally comparable categories of educational attainment. The resulting categories were: (0) for no education; (1) for the completion of $<$ ISCED Level $1>$ (primary education); (2) for completion of <ISCED Level 2> (lower secondary education); (3) for the completion of <ISCED Level 3B or 3C> (vocational/pre-vocational upper secondary education, aimed in most countries at providing direct entry into the labour market); (4) for completion of <ISCED Level 3A> (upper secondary education, aimed in most countries at gaining entry into tertiary-type A (university level) education) and/or <ISCED Level 4> (non-tertiary post-secondary); (5) for qualifications in <ISCED 5B> (vocational tertiary); and (6) for completion of $<$ ISCED Level 5A, 6> (tertiary-type A and advanced research programmes)

As noted above, the highest level of educational attainment of the parents was also converted into years of schooling using the conversion coefficients shown in Table A1.1.

## Immigration background

The index on immigrant background was derived from students' responses to questions about whether or not their mother and their father were born in the country of assessment or in another country. The response categories were then grouped into three categories: i) "native" students (those students born in the country of assessment or who had at least one parent born in that country); ii) "second-generation" students (those born in the country of assessment but whose parents were born in another country); and iii) "first-generation" students (those born outside the country of assessment and whose parents were also born in another country). For some comparisons, first-generation and secondgeneration students were grouped together.

## Language used at home

Students were asked if the language spoken at home most of the time or always was the language of assessment, another official national language, other national dialect or language, or another language. The index on language spoken at home distinguishes between students who report using the language of assessment, another official national language, a national dialect or another national language always or most of the time at home and those who report using another language always or most of the time at home.
In most countries, the languages were individually identified and were coded internationally to allow for further research and analysis in this area.

## School climate (students'views)

## Attitudes towards school

The PISA index of attitudes towards school was derived from students' reported agreement with the following statements: i) school has done little to prepare me for adult life when I leave school; ii) school has been a waste of time; iii) school helped give me confidence to make decisions; and iv) school has taught me things which could be useful in a job. A four-point scale with the response categories "strongly agree" (=1), "agree" (=2), "disagree" $(=3)$ and "strongly disagree" (=4) was used. As items iii) and iv) were inverted for scaling, positive values on this index indicate positive attitudes towards school. Scale construction was done using IRT scaling.

## Sense of belonging at school

The PISA index of sense of belonging at school was derived from students' reported agreement that school is a place where: i) I feel like an outsider (or left out of things); ii) I make friends easily; iii) I feel like I belong; iv) I feel awkward and out of place; v) other students seem to like me; and vi) I feel lonely. A four-point scale with the response categories "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" was used. Items ii), iii), and v) are inverted for scaling and positive values indicate positive feelings about the students' school. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## Self-related cognitions in mathematics

## Interest in and enjoyment of mathematics

The PISA index of interest in and enjoyment of mathematics was derived from students' reported agreement with the following statements: i) I enjoy reading about mathematics; ii) I look forward to my mathematics lessons; iii) I do mathematics because I enjoy it; and iv) I am interested in the things I learn in mathematics. A four-point scale with the response categories "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" was used. All items were inverted for IRT scaling and positive values on this index indicate higher levels of interest in and enjoyment of mathematics. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## Instrumental motivation in mathematics

The PISA index of instrumental motivation in mathematics was derived from students' reported agreement with the following statements: i) making an effort in mathematics is worth it because it will help me in the work that I want to do later on; ii) learning mathematics is important because it will help me with the subjects that I want to study further on in school; iii) mathematics is an important subject for me because I need it for what I want to study later on; and iv) I will learn many things in mathematics that will help me get a job. A four-point scale with the response categories "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" was used. All items were inverted for scaling and positive values on this index indicate higher levels of instrumental motivation to learn mathematics. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## Self-efficacy in mathematics

The PISA index of self-efficacy in mathematics was derived from students' reported level of confidence with the following calculations: i) using a <train timetable>, how long it would take to get from Zedville to Zedtown; ii) calculating how much cheaper a TV would be after a 30 per cent discount; iii) calculating how many square metres of tiles you need to cover a floor; iv) understanding graphs presented in newspapers; solving an equation like $3 \mathrm{x}+5=17$; v) finding the actual distance between two places on a map with a $1: 10,000$ scale; vi) solving an equation like $2(x+3)=$ $(\mathrm{x}+3)(\mathrm{x}-3)$; and vii) calculating the petrol consumption rate of a car. A four-point scale with the response categories "very confident", "confident", "not very confident", "not at all confident" was used. All items were inverted for scaling and positive values on this index indicate higher levels of self-efficacy in mathematics. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## Anxiety in mathematics

The PISA index of anxiety in mathematics was derived from students' reported agreement with the following statements: i) I often worry that it will be difficult for me in mathematics classes; ii) I get very tense when I have to do mathematics homework; iii) I get very nervous doing mathematics problems; iv) I feel helpless when doing a mathematics problem; and v) I worry that I will get poor <marks> in mathematics. A four-point scale with the response categories "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" was used. All items were inverted for scaling and positive values on this index indicate higher levels of mathematics anxiety. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## Self-concept in mathematics

The PISA index of self-concept in mathematics was derived from students' level of agreement with the following statements: i) I am just not good at mathematics; ii) I get good < marks> in mathematics; iii) I learn mathematics quickly; iv) I have always believed that mathematics is one of my best subjects; and $v$ ) in my mathematics class, I understand even the most difficult work. A four-point scale with the response categories "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" was used. Items ii), iii), iv), and v) were inverted for scaling and positive values on this index indicate a positive self-concept in mathematics. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## Expected educational level

In PISA 2003 students were asked about their educational aspirations. Educational levels were classified according to International Standard Classification of Education (OECD, 1999).

An index on the expected educational level was developed with the following categories: i) did not go to school; ii) completed ISCED Level 1 (primary education); iii) completed ISCED Level 2 (lower secondary education); iv) completed ISCED Levels 3B or 3C (upper secondary education providing direct access to the labour market or to ISCED 5B programmes); v) completed ISCED Level 3A (upper secondary education providing access to ISCED 5A and 5B programmes); vi) completed ISCED Level 5A (university level tertiary education); and vii) completed ISCED Level 5B (non-university level education).

## Classroom climate

## Teacher support

The PISA index of teacher support was derived from students' reports on the frequency with which: i) the teacher shows an interest in every student's learning; ii) the teacher gives extra help when students need it; iii) the teacher helps students with their learning; iv) the teacher continues teaching until the students understand; and $v$ ) the teacher gives students an opportunity to express opinions. A four-point scale with the response categories "every lesson", "most lessons", "some lessons' and "never or hardly ever" was used. All items were inverted for scaling and positive values on this PISA 2003 index indicate perceptions of higher levels of teacher support. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## Disciplinary climate

The PISA index of disciplinary climate was derived from students' reports on the frequency with which, in their mathematics lessons: i) students don't listen to what the teacher says; ii) there is noise and disorder; iii) the teacher has to wait a long time for students to <quieten down>; iv) students cannot work well; and v) students don't start working for a long time after the lesson begins. A four-point scale with the response categories "every lesson", "most lessons", "some lessons", and "never or hardly ever" was used. Positive values on this PISA 2000/2003 index indicate perceptions
of a more positive disciplinary climate whereas low values indicate a more negative disciplinary climate. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## School level variables

## Indicators of school resources

## Quantity of teaching staff at school

School principals reported the number of full-time and part-time teachers in total, of full-time and part-time teachers fully certified by <the appropriate authority>, of full-time and part-time teachers with an <ISCED 5A> qualification in <pedagogy>. From this an index of total student-teacher ratio is obtained by dividing the school size by the total number of teachers. The number of part-time teachers contributes 0.5 and the number of full-time teachers contributes 1.0 to the total number of teachers.

## School resources

## Quality of the school's physical infrastructure

The PISA index of the quality of the school's physical infrastructure was derived from three items measuring the school principals' perceptions of potential factors hindering instruction at school: i) school buildings and grounds; ii) heating/cooling and lighting systems; and iii) instructional space (e.g. classrooms). A four-point scale with the response categories "not at all", "very little", "to some extent", and "a lot" was used. All items were inverted for scaling and positive values indicate positive evaluations of this aspect. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## Quality of the school's educational resources

The PISA index of the quality of the school's educational resources was derived from seven items measuring the school principals' perceptions of potential factors hindering instruction at school: i) instructional materials (e.g. textbooks); ii) computers for instruction; iii) computer software for instruction; iv) calculators for instruction; v) library materials; vi) audio-visual resources; and vii) science laboratory equipment and materials. A four-point scale with the response categories "not at all", "very little", "to some extent", and "a lot" was used. All items were inverted for scaling and positive values indicate positive evaluations of this aspect. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## Teacher shortage

The PISA index on teacher shortage was derived from items measuring the school principal's perceptions of potential factors hindering instruction at school. These factors are a shortage or inadequacy of: i) qualified mathematics teachers; ii) qualified science teachers; iii) qualified <test language> teachers; iv) qualified foreign language teachers; and v) experienced teachers. For PISA 2003 these items were administered together with the items on the quality of physical environment and educational resources. A four-point scale with the response categories "not at all", "very little", "to some extent" and "a lot" is used. The items were not inverted for scaling and positive values indicate school principal's reports of teacher shortage at a school. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## School climate (school principals'views)

## School principals' perceptions of teacher morale and commitment

The PISA index of teacher morale and commitment was derived from items measuring the school principals' perceptions of teachers with the following statements: i) the morale of teachers in this school is high; ii) teachers work with enthusiasm; iii) teachers take pride in this school; and iv) teachers value academic achievement. A four-point scale with the response categories "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" was used. All items were inverted for scaling and the categories "disagree" and "strongly disagree" were combined into one category. Positive values indicate principals' reports of higher levels of teacher morale and commitment. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## School principals' perceptions of teacher-related factors affecting school climate

The index of teacher-related factors affecting school climate was derived from items measuring the school principals' reports of potential factors hindering the learning of students at school with the following statements: i) teachers' low expectations of students; ii) poor student-teacher relations; iii) teachers not meeting individual students' needs; iv)
teacher absenteeism; v) staff resisting change; vi) teachers being too strict with students; and vii) students not being encouraged to achieve their full potential. A four-point scale with the response categories "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" was used. All items were inverted for scaling and positive values indicate positive evaluations of this aspect. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

## School principals' perceptions of student-related factors affecting school climate

The index of student-related factors affecting school climate was derived from items measuring the school principals' perceptions of potential factors hindering the learning of students at school with the following statements: i) student absenteeism; ii) disruption of classes by students; iii) students skipping classes; iv) students lacking respect for teachers; v) students' use of alcohol or illegal drugs; and vi) students intimidating or bullying other students. A fourpoint scale with the response categories "strongly agree", "agree", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" was used. All items were inverted for Iscaling and positive values indicate positive evaluations of this aspect. This index was constructed using IRT scaling.

Figure A2.1■ Combined Reading Literacy Scale

## Level <br> Distinguishing features of tasks at each level:

Level 5 The reader must: sequence or combine several pieces of deeply embedded information, possibly drawing on information from outside the main body of the text; construe the meaning of linguistic nuances in a section of text; or make evaluative judgements or hypotheses, drawing on specialised knowledge. The reader is generally required to demonstrate a full, detailed understanding of a dense, complex or unfamiliar text, in content or form, or one that involves concepts that are contrary to expectations. The reader will often have to make inferences to determine which information in the text is relevant, and to deal with prominent or extensive competing information.
Level 4 The reader must: locate, sequence or combine several pieces of embedded information; infer the meaning of a section of text by considering the text as a whole; understand and apply categories in an unfamiliar context; or hypothesise about or critically evaluate a text, using formal or public knowledge. The reader must draw on an accurate understanding of long or complex texts in which competing information may take the form of ideas that are ambiguous, contrary to expectation, or negatively worded.
Level 3 The reader must: recognise the links between pieces of information that have to meet multiple criteria; integrate several parts of a text to identify a main idea, understand a relationship or construe the meaning of a word or phrase; make connections and comparisons; or explain or evaluate a textual feature. The reader must take into account many features when comparing, contrasting or categorising. Often the required information is not prominent but implicit in the text or obscured by similar information.
Level 2 The reader must: locate one or more pieces of information that may be needed to meet multiple criteria; identify the main idea, understand relationships or construe meaning within a limited part of the text by making low-level inferences; form or apply simple categories to explain something in a text by drawing on personal experience and attitudes; or make connections or comparisons between the text and everyday outside knowledge. The reader must often deal with competing information.
Level 1 The reader must: locate one or more independent pieces of explicitly stated information according to a single criterion; identify the main theme or author's purpose in a text about a familiar topic; or make a simple connection between information in the text and common, everyday knowledge. Typically, the requisite information 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.
Below There is insufficient information to describe features of tasks at this level. Level 1

## Annex $\mathbf{B}$

## DATA TABLES FOR CHAPTERS 1,2,3 AND 4

Table 1.1 populations

|  | Percentage of total population that: |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Is foreign-born | Has foreign nationality |
| Australia | 23.0 | 7.4 |
| Austria | 12.5 | 8.8 |
| Belgium | 10.7 | 8.2 |
| Canada | 19.3 | 5.3 |
| Denmark | 6.8 | 5.0 |
| France | 10.0 | 5.6 |
| Germany | 12.5 | 8.9 |
| Luxembourg | 32.6 | 36.9 |
| Netherlands | 10.1 | 4.2 |
| New Zealand | 19.5 | m |
| Norway | 7.3 | 4.3 |
| Sweden | 12.0 | 5.3 |
| Switzerland | 22.4 | 20.5 |
| United States | 12.3 | 6.6 |

Source: Census data except for foreign nationality data for Germany (register of foreigners, 2002) and the United Kingdom (Labour force survey).

Table 1.2
Distribution of permanent or long-term immigration flows into selected OECD countries in 2002, by main immigration categories ${ }^{1}$

|  | Percentage of permanent or long-term <br> immigration flows in immigration category: |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Workers | Family <br> reunification | Refugees |
| Australia $^{2}$ | 54.5 | 35.3 | 10.2 |
| Canada | 25.8 | 63.1 | 11.1 |
| Denmark | 23.0 | 57.5 | 19.4 |
| France $^{3}$ | 16.2 | 75.1 | 8.7 |
| Norway $^{4}$ | 8.2 | 68.4 | 23.3 |
| Sweden $^{5}$ | 1.3 | 57.7 | 41.0 |
| Switzerland $^{\text {United States }}{ }^{6}$ | 45.4 | 52.4 | 2.2 |

1. For Australia, Canada, Norway, Sweden and the United States, data concern acceptances for settlement. For Denmark, France and Switzerland, entries correspond to residence permits usually delivered for longer than one year. For Australia, category "Workers" includes accompanying dependents who are included in the category "Family reunification" for all other countries.
2. Data refer to fiscal year (July 2001 to June 2002). Category "Workers" includes accompanying dependents. Citizens from New Zealand do not need a visa to enter the country. They are therefore excluded.
3. Entries of EU family members are estimated. Visitors are excluded. Among those who benefited from the regularisation programme, only those who received a permit under the family reunification procedure are counted. The "Family" category also includes spouses of French citizens and scientists, parents of French children and those with family relationships who received the permit "vie privée et familiale". 4. Category "Workers" includes specialists and other permits that constitute grounds for permanent residence in Norway. Nonrenewable permits are not included. Category "Refugees" includes refugees and individuals granted residence permits on humanitarian grounds on a permanent basis.
4. Excluding Nordic and EEA citizens.
5. Data refer to fiscal year (October 2001 to September 2002).

Immigrants who obtained a permanent residence permit following the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) are excluded.
Sources: National Statistical Offices, OECD calculations.

Table 1.3
Distribution of native- and foreign-born populations (aged 15 years and older) by level of education in selected OECD countries (circa 2000)

|  | Below upper secondary education (ISCED 0/1/2) |  | Upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education (ISCED 3/4) |  | Tertiary education (ISCED 5A/5B/6) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Native-born population | Foreign-born population | Native-born population | Foreign-born population | Native-born population | Foreign-born population |
| Australia | 45,8 | 38,3 | 15,7 | 18,8 | 38,6 | 42,9 |
| Austria | 33,4 | 49,4 | 55,7 | 39,3 | 10,9 | 11,3 |
| Belgium | 46,8 | 54,2 | 30,3 | 24,2 | 22,9 | 21,6 |
| Canada | 31,6 | 30,1 | 36,9 | 31,9 | 31,5 | 38,0 |
| Denmark | 41,0 | 48,6 | 40,2 | 31,9 | 18,8 | 19,5 |
| France | 45,8 | 54,8 | 37,4 | 27,2 | 16,9 | 18,1 |
| Germany | 23,6 | 43,4 | 57,0 | 41,0 | 19,4 | 15,7 |
| Luxembourg | 28,7 | 36,7 | 58,6 | 41,6 | 12,8 | 21,7 |
| Netherlands | 40,7 | 53,0 | 39,8 | 29,4 | 19,5 | 17,6 |
| New Zealand | 30,1 | 18,7 | 42,7 | 50,4 | 27,2 | 31,0 |
| Norway | 21,2 | 18,3 | 55,6 | 50,6 | 23,2 | 31,1 |
| Sweden | 25,0 | 29,6 | 52,2 | 46,2 | 22,8 | 24,2 |
| Switzerland | 25,6 | 41,6 | 56,3 | 34,7 | 18,1 | 23,7 |
| United States | 21,9 | 39,8 | 51,2 | 34,3 | 26,9 | 25,9 |

Note: Data are from the 2000 round of censuses.
Source: OECD (2005), Trends in International Migration (SOPEMI 2004), OECD, Paris.

Table 1.4
Unemployment rates among national and foreign-nationality or native-born and foreign-born individuals in selected OECD countries ${ }^{1}$

|  | Unemployment rate (\%) by immigrant background |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | National |  |  |  | Foreign-nationality |  |  |  | Native-born |  |  |  | Foreign-born |  |  |  |
|  | 1993 | 1995 | 2000 | 2003 | 1993 | 1995 | 2000 | 2003 | 1993 | 1995 | 2000 | 2003 | 1993 | 1995 | 2000 | 2003 |
| Australia | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | 10.4 | 8.1 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 12.9 | 10.2 | 6.7 | 6.5 |
| Austria | m | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.4 | m | 6.8 | 8.8 | 8.3 | m | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.2 | m | 6.9 | 8.0 | 8.3 |
| Belgium | 7.1 | 8.2 | 5.8 | 6.9 | 19.4 | 23.5 | 15.6 | 18.2 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 5.6 | 6.4 | 16.0 | 19.5 | 15.8 | 17.8 |
| Canada | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | 9.2 | 8.4 | 5.6 | 6.0 | 8.9 | 10.6 | 6.8 | 8.0 |
| Denmark | 10.9 | 7.5 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 30.9 | 24.2 | 10.6 | 9.2 | m | 7.3 | 3.9 | 4.0 | m | 20.6 | 9.5 | 8.7 |
| France | 10.8 | 11.3 | 9.6 | 8.5 | 20.7 | 21.7 | 20.9 | 18.8 | 10.8 | 11.2 | 9.4 | 8.2 | 16.4 | 17.6 | 16.7 | 15.8 |
| Germany | 7.2 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 9.2 | 12.5 | 15.1 | 12.9 | 16.7 | m | m | 7.4 | 9.1 | m | m | 12.6 | 15.7 |
| Luxembourg | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 5.2 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 4.8 |
| Netherlands | 5.8 | 6.5 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 19.7 | 23.6 | 7.2 | 9.5 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 16.2 | 19.6 | 6.3 | 8.9 |
| Norway | m | m | 3.4 | 4.1 | m | m | m | 10.1 | m | m | 3.3 | 3.9 | m | m | 6.1 | 9.0 |
| Sweden | m | 7.7 | 5.1 | 5.3 | m | 19.7 | 14.6 | 13.2 | m | 7.3 | 4.7 | 4.8 | m | 21.7 | 11.6 | 11.1 |
| Switzerland | m | m | 1.9 | 2.9 | m | m | 5.6 | 8.8 | m | m | m | 2.9 | m | m | m | 8.0 |
| United States | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | m | 5.8 | 4.4 | 6.4 | m | 8.0 | 4.9 | 7.5 |

1.The categories national and foreign-nationality are defined on the basis of nationality; the categories native-born and foreign-born are defined on the basis of country of birth.
Source: OECD (2005), Trends in International Migration (SOPEMI 2004), OECD, Paris.

Table 1.5
Number and weighted percentage of participating students in PISA 2003, by immigrant status

|  | Native students |  | Second-generation students |  | First-generation students |  | Students with missing values on immigrant status variable |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of participating students | ```Percentage of all participating students``` | Number of participating students | ```Percentage of all participating students``` | Number of participating students |  | Number of participating students | Percentage <br> of all <br> participating <br> students |
| Australia | 9682 | 75.5 | 1342 | 11.5 | 1258 | 10.8 | 269 | 2.2 |
| Austria | 3966 | 85.7 | 174 | 4.1 | 403 | 9.1 | 54 | 1.2 |
| Belgium | 7584 | 85.8 | 486 | 6.2 | 497 | 5.3 | 229 | 2.7 |
| Canada | 23481 | 70.8 | 1365 | 8.2 | 1411 | 9.6 | 1696 | 11.4 |
| Denmark | 3891 | 92.0 | 137 | 3.4 | 126 | 3.0 | 64 | 1.6 |
| France | 3639 | 84.0 | 442 | 10.6 | 133 | 3.4 | 86 | 2.1 |
| Germany | 3685 | 77.3 | 281 | 6.3 | 349 | 7.8 | 345 | 8.7 |
| Luxembourg | 2554 | 64.9 | 600 | 15.4 | 658 | 16.9 | 111 | 2.8 |
| Netherlands | 3434 | 85.0 | 265 | 6.8 | 147 | 3.7 | 146 | 4.6 |
| New Zealand | 3534 | 78.5 | 284 | 6.4 | 602 | 13.0 | 91 | 2.1 |
| Norway | 3773 | 92.9 | 95 | 2.2 | 133 | 3.3 | 63 | 1.6 |
| Sweden | 4048 | 87.2 | 241 | 5.6 | 271 | 5.8 | 64 | 1.5 |
| Switzerland | 6477 | 78.9 | 787 | 8.8 | 1034 | 10.9 | 122 | 1.4 |
| United States | 4523 | 82.9 | 442 | 8.1 | 319 | 5.9 | 172 | 3.2 |
| Hong Kong-China | 2507 | 55.6 | 1038 | 22.5 | 848 | 20.0 | 85 | 2.0 |
| Macao-China | 300 | 23.5 | 700 | 57.1 | 231 | 17.9 | 19 | 1.5 |
| Russian Federation | 5093 | 85.2 | 367 | 6.3 | 417 | 6.9 | 97 | 1.5 |
| Belgium (Flemish Community) | 4572 | 90.4 | 185 | 3.7 | 141 | 2.8 | 161 | 3.0 |
| Belgium (French Community) | 2377 | 79.8 | 282 | 9.5 | 239 | 8.4 | 60 | 2.3 |

Source: OECD PISA 2003 database.

Table 1.6
Average age of first-generation students in PISA 2003 at the time of immigration


[^0]Table 1.7
Comparison of percentage of immigrant students in PISA 2003 with data on total immigrant populations


1. Source: OECD (2005), Trends in International Migration (SOPEMI 2004), OECD, Paris.
2. Data for Germany from 2002 .

Table 1.8

## Comparison of the three most frequent countries of origin for immigrant students

 in PISA 2003 and for total immigrant populations|  | Three most frequent countries of origin (mother's country of birth) for immigrant students in PISA 2003 | Three most frequent countries of origin for total foreign-born population (SOPEMI) | Immigrant students in PISA 2003 |  | Stock of foreign-born population by country of birth in SOPEMI 2004 (reference year: 2002) ${ }^{1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number of immigrant students | Percentage of immigrant students | Number of immigrants (thousands) | Percentage of total immigrant population ${ }^{2}$ |
| Australia | 1. England and Scotland ${ }^{2}$ <br> 2. New Zealand <br> 3. China | 1. United Kingdom <br> 2. New Zealand <br> 3. Italy | $\begin{array}{r} 419 \\ 189 \\ 130 \\ 68 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.9 \\ 7.0 \\ 5.0 \\ 2.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1123.9 \\ 413.7 \\ 164.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24.6 \\ 9.1 \\ 3.6 \\ 5.2 \end{array}$ |
| Austria | 1. Former Yugoslavia ${ }^{2,3}$ <br> 2. Turkey <br> 3. Romania | 1. Former Yugoslavia ${ }^{2,4}$ <br> 2. Turkey <br> 3. Germany | $\begin{array}{r} 276 \\ 141 \\ 19 \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 47.2 \\ 25.9 \\ 3.6 \\ m \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 330.4 \\ 127.3 \\ 39.9 \\ 120.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 35.7 \\ 13.7 \\ 4.3 \\ 13.1 \end{array}$ |
| Belgium | 1. France <br> 2. Turkey <br> 3. Netherlands | 2. France <br> 3. Netherlands <br> 1. Italy | $\begin{array}{r} 184 \\ 140 \\ 54 \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16.3 \\ 14.8 \\ 5.8 \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 113.0 \\ 42.6 \\ 9.6 \\ 187.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.3 \\ 5.0 \\ 11.4 \\ 22.0 \end{array}$ |
| Canada | m | 1. United Kingdom <br> 2. China <br> 3. Italy | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 606.0 \\ & 332.8 \\ & 315.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.1 \\ 6.1 \\ 5.8 \end{array}$ |
| Denmark | 1. Turkey <br> 2. Pakistan <br> 3. Former Yugoslavia | 1.Turkey <br> 2. Former Yugoslavia ${ }^{2,5}$ <br> 3. Germany | $\begin{aligned} & 53 \\ & 31 \\ & 23 \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32.1 \\ 11.6 \\ 9.4 \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.9 \\ & 10.7 \\ & 30.5 \\ & 22.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.1 \\ & 3.2 \\ & 9.0 \\ & 6.7 \end{aligned}$ |
| France | m | 1. Portugal <br> 2. Morocco <br> 3. Algeria | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 553.7 \\ & 504.1 \\ & 477.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.0 \\ & 15.4 \\ & 14.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| Germany | 1. Turkey <br> 2. Former Soviet <br> Republic <br> 3. Poland <br> Former Yugoslavia ${ }^{2,6}$ | 1.Turkey <br> 2. Former Yugoslavia ${ }^{2,7}$ <br> 3. Italy | $\begin{array}{r} 197 \\ 180 \\ 100 \\ 45 \\ 27 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32.1 \\ 28.3 \\ 16.1 \\ 7.0 \\ 4.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1912.2 \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ 317.6 \\ 986.3 \\ 609.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26.1 \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ 4.3 \\ 13.4 \\ 8.3 \end{array}$ |
| Luxembourg | 1. Portugal <br> 2. Italy <br> 3. Former Yugoslavia | 1. Portugal <br> 3. Italy <br> 2. France | $\begin{array}{r} 595 \\ 99 \\ 92 \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 47.3 \\ 7.9 \\ 7.3 \\ \mathrm{~m} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 41.7 \\ 12.3 \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ 18.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 28.8 \\ 8.5 \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ 13.0 \end{array}$ |
| Netherlands | m | 1. Turkey <br> 2. Suriname <br> 3. Morocco | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 190.5 \\ & 189.0 \\ & 163.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.1 \\ 11.0 \\ 9.5 \end{array}$ |
| New Zealand | 1. Samoa <br> 2. United Kingdom <br> 3. China | 2. Samoa <br> 1. United Kingdom <br> 3. Australia | $\begin{array}{r} 124 \\ 103 \\ 76 \\ 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14.6 \\ 11.2 \\ 8.4 \\ 2.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 47.1 \\ 218.4 \\ 38.9 \\ 56.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.7 \\ 31.3 \\ 5.6 \\ 8.1 \end{array}$ |
| Norway | m | 1. Sweden <br> 2. Denmark <br> 3. Pakistan | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.0 \\ & 22.3 \\ & 14.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.9 \\ & 6.7 \\ & 4.4 \end{aligned}$ |
| Sweden | m | 1. Finland <br> 2. Former Yugoslavia ${ }^{2,8}$ <br> 3. Iraq | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 189.3 \\ 139.0 \\ 67.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.6 \\ 12.9 \\ 6.3 \end{array}$ |
| Switzerland | 1. Former Yugoslavia <br> 2. Albania/Kosovo <br> 3. Italy | 1. Former Yugoslavia ${ }^{2,9}$ <br> 2. Italy <br> 3. Portugal | $\begin{aligned} & 408 \\ & 257 \\ & 245 \\ & 200 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 23.0 \\ 16.2 \\ 11.7 \\ 8.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 347.3 \\ \mathrm{~m} \\ 308.3 \\ 141.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24.0 \\ m \\ 21.3 \\ 9.7 \end{array}$ |
| United States | m | 1. Mexico <br> 2. Philippines <br> 3. India | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10237.2 \\ 1457.5 \\ 1183.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 29.6 \\ 4.2 \\ 3.4 \end{array}$ |
| Hong Kong-China | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Macao-China | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Russian Federation | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| Belgium (Flemish Community) | 1.Turkey <br> 2. Netherlands |  | $\begin{aligned} & 87 \\ & 54 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.6 \\ & 18.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |
| Belgium (French Community) | 1. France <br> 2. Turkey |  | $\begin{array}{r} 113 \\ 49 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 23.6 \\ 8.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |

[^1]Table 1.9
Number and weighted percentage of students participating in PISA 2003 who speak a different language at home from the language of instruction

|  | Students who speak a different language at home from the language of instruction |  | Students with missing values on the "language spoken at home" variable |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of students | Percentage of students | Number of students | Percentage of students |
| Australia | 968 | 8.7 | 299 | 2.3 |
| Austria | 376 | 8.7 | 156 | 3.3 |
| Belgium | 399 | 4.2 | 1009 | 11.5 |
| Canada | 1688 | 10.0 | 1693 | 11.2 |
| Denmark | 156 | 3.8 | 138 | 3.4 |
| France | 228 | 5.9 | 160 | 3.9 |
| Germany | 296 | 6.7 | 544 | 13.0 |
| Luxembourg | 920 | 23.7 | 212 | 5.4 |
| Netherlands | 166 | 4.2 | 275 | 7.7 |
| New Zealand | 405 | 8.9 | 54 | 1.2 |
| Norway | 178 | 4.4 | 134 | 3.4 |
| Sweden | 288 | 6.5 | 285 | 6.0 |
| Switzerland | 873 | 8.8 | 607 | 7.6 |
| United States | 480 | 8.6 | 207 | 4.1 |
| Hong Kong-China | 183 | 4.3 | 150 | 3.5 |
| Macao-China | 54 | 4.5 | 35 | 2.2 |
| Russian Federation | 289 | 5.4 | 77 | 1.2 |
| Belgium (Flemish Community) | 159 | 3.1 | 558 | 11.0 |
| Belgium (French Community) | 168 | 5.6 | 337 | 12.0 |

Source: OECD PISA 2003 database.

Table 1.10
Number and weighted percentage of students who speak a different language at home from the language of instruction in PISA 2003, by immigrant status


[^2]Table 1.11
Number and weighted percentage of most common languages spoken at home, as reported by immigrant students in PISA 2003

|  | Australia | Test language or other national language |  |  | Languages other than the language of instruction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | First most common language |  |  | Second most common language |  |  | Third most common language |  |  |
|  |  | Language ${ }^{1}$ |  | Percentage of students | Language ${ }^{1}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { students } \end{array} \\ \hline 87 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Percentage of students | Language ${ }^{1}$ |  | Percentage of students | Language ${ }^{1}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { students }\end{array}$ | Percentage of students |
|  |  | English Indigenous Australian language | $\begin{array}{r} 11258 \\ 26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 89.0 \\ 0.1 \end{array}$ |  |  | 0.8 | Arabic |  | 0.8 | Vietnamese | 71 | 0.7 |
|  | Austria | German | 4065 | 88.0 | Serbo- <br> Croat | 166 | 3.7 | Turkish | 104 | 2.5 | Albanian | 20 | 0.4 |
|  | Belgium | Dutch <br> French <br> German <br> Flemish dialect | $\begin{array}{r} 3468 \\ 2625 \\ 482 \\ 813 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 40.0 \\ 35.9 \\ 0.6 \\ 8.7 \end{array}$ | Turkish | 98 | 1.2 | Wallon | 76 | 0.3 | Arabic | 58 | 0.7 |
|  | Canada | English <br> French | $\begin{array}{r} 20951 \\ 3621 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60.0 \\ & 18.9 \end{aligned}$ | Other languages | 1688 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Denmark | Danish | 3924 | 92.8 | Arabic | 26 | 0.6 | Turkish | 19 | 0.5 | SerboCroatian | 12 | 0.3 |
|  | France | French <br> Other national dialects or languages | $\begin{array}{r} 3886 \\ 26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89.7 \\ & 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | Other languages | 228 | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Germany | German | 3820 | 80.3 | Russian | 81 | 1.8 | Turkish | 71 | 1.7 | Polish | 26 | 0.6 |
|  | Luxembourg | Luxembourgian <br> French German | $\begin{array}{r} 2460 \\ 260 \\ 71 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 62.4 \\ 6.7 \\ 1.8 \end{array}$ | Portuguese | 518 | 13.3 | Italian | 89 | 2.3 | Yugoslavian and others | 71 | 2.0 |
|  | Netherlands | Dutch <br> Dutch regional languages or dialects | $\begin{array}{r} 3173 \\ 378 \end{array}$ | 78.9 9.2 | Foreign languages | 166 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | New Zealand | English <br> Te Reo Maori | $\begin{array}{r} 4043 \\ 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 89.6 \\ 0.2 \end{array}$ | Samoan | 58 | 1.4 | Cantonese | 58 | 1.2 | Mandarin | 42 | 0.8 |
|  | Norway | Norwegian <br> Sami | $\begin{array}{r} 3726 \\ 26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 91.7 \\ 0.6 \end{array}$ | Other languages | 162 | 4 | Swedish | 10 | 0.3 | Danish | 6 | 0.1 |
|  | Sweden | Swedish <br> Finnish,Yiddish, <br> Romanian and others | $\begin{array}{r} 4022 \\ 29 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 86.9 \\ 0.7 \end{array}$ | Foreign languages | 288 | 6.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Switzerland | Swiss German <br> French <br> Italian <br> Swiss Italian <br> German <br> Romance | $\begin{array}{r} 3995 \\ 2014 \\ 672 \\ 170 \\ 72 \\ 17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 60.3 \\ 17.9 \\ 3.5 \\ 0.6 \\ 0.9 \\ 0.3 \end{array}$ | Albanian | 237 | 2.4 | Portuguese | 125 | 1.1 | Turkish | 66 | 0.8 |
|  | United States | English | 4769 | 87.3 | Spanish | 327 | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hong Kong-China | Cantonese <br> English Oth. nat. dial. or lang. | $\begin{array}{r} 3961 \\ 25 \\ 159 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 87.9 \\ 0.5 \\ 3.8 \end{array}$ | Other <br> languages | 183 | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Macao-China | Cantonese <br> Portuguese Other national dialects | $\begin{array}{r} 1090 \\ 1 \\ 68 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 87.4 \\ 0.0 \\ 5.8 \end{array}$ | Other <br> languages | 53 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\tau}}$ | Russian Federation | Russian | 5608 | 93.5 | Other languages | 289 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Belgium (Flemish Community) | Dutch <br> French <br> German <br> Flemish dialect | $\begin{array}{r} 3431 \\ 95 \\ 3 \\ 813 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 38.8 \\ 1.0 \\ 0.0 \\ 8.7 \end{array}$ | Turkish | 70 | 0.8 | Arabic | 22 | 0.2 | English | 13 | 0.1 |
|  | Belgium (French Community) | French Dutch German | $\begin{array}{r} 2506 \\ 30 \\ 15 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34.9 \\ 0.2 \\ 0.2 \end{array}$ | Arabic | 35 | 0.5 | Turkish | 28 | 0.4 | Wallon | 25 | 0.3 |

1. Language categories in questionnaire were chosen by participating countries.

Source: OECD PISA 2003 database.

Table 2.1a
Differences in mathematics performance by immigrant status

|  |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  |  |  |  |  | Difference in the mathematics score |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Native students |  | Second-generation students |  | First-generation students |  | Second-generation students minus native students |  | First-generation students minus native students |  | First-generation students minus second-generation students |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Mean } \\ & \text { score } \end{aligned}$ | S.E. | Difference | S.E. | Difference | S.E. | Difference | S.E. |
| \# | Australia | 527 | (2.1) | 522 | (4.7) | 525 | (4.9) | -5 | (4.7) | -2 | (4.9) | 3 | (4.8) |
|  | Austria | 515 | (3.3) | 459 | (8.8) | 452 | (6.0) | -56 | (9.3) | -63 | (6.0) | -7 | (9.5) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 546 | (2.5) | 454 | (7.5) | 437 | (10.8) | -92 | (7.6) | -109 | (10.9) | -17 | (12.4) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 537 | (1.6) | 543 | (4.3) | 530 | (4.7) | 6 | (4.4) | -7 | (4.8) | -13 | (5.1) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | 520 | (2.5) | 449 | (11.2) | 455 | (10.1) | -70 | (11.1) | -65 | (9.8) | 5 | (13.5) |
|  | France | 520 | (2.4) | 472 | (6.1) | 448 | (15.0) | -48 | (6.6) | -72 | (15.0) | -25 | (15.5) |
|  | Germany | 525 | (3.5) | 432 | (9.1) | 454 | (7.5) | -93 | (9.6) | -71 | (7.9) | 22 | (11.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | 507 | (1.3) | 476 | (3.3) | 462 | (3.7) | -31 | (3.7) | -45 | (4.1) | -14 | (5.6) |
|  | Netherlands | 551 | (3.0) | 492 | (10.3) | 472 | (8.4) | -59 | (11.1) | -79 | (8.8) | -19 | (10.8) |
|  | New Zealand | 528 | (2.6) | 496 | (8.4) | 523 | (4.9) | -32 | (9.1) | -5 | (5.6) | 27 | (8.0) |
|  | Norway | 499 | (2.3) | 460 | (11.7) | 438 | (9.3) | -39 | (11.3) | -61 | (9.4) | -22 | (13.8) |
|  | Sweden | 517 | (2.2) | 483 | (9.8) | 425 | (9.6) | -34 | (9.1) | -92 | (9.7) | -58 | (10.9) |
|  | Switzerland | 543 | (3.3) | 484 | (5.0) | 453 | (6.1) | -59 | (4.9) | -89 | (6.0) | -31 | (6.4) |
| , | United States | 490 | (2.8) | 468 | (7.6) | 453 | (7.5) | -22 | (7.2) | -36 | (7.5) | -14 | (7.4) |
|  | OECD average | 523 | (0.7) | 483 | (2.1) | 475 | (1.9) | -40 | (2.0) | -48 | (2.1) | -8 | (2.4) |
| $0$ | Hong Kong-China | 557 | (4.5) | 570 | (4.6) | 516 | (5.3) | 13 | (4.3) | -41 | (4.5) | -54 | (5.2) |
| $E$ | Macao-China | 528 | (5.9) | 532 | (4.1) | 517 | (9.2) | 4 | (7.9) | -11 | (10.4) | -15 | (10.4) |
| - | Russian Federation | 472 | (4.4) | 457 | (7.2) | 452 | (5.9) | -14 | (7.2) | -20 | (5.4) | -6 | (8.3) |
|  | Belgium (Flemish Community) | 567 | (2.9) | 445 | (10.7) | 472 | (10.0) | -122 | (11.3) | -95 | (9.9) | 27 | (13.5) |
|  | Belgium (French Community) | 514 | (4.3) | 458 | (9.6) | 419 | (14.4) | -56 | (9.3) | -94 | (14.4) | -39 | (15.2) |

Table 2.1b
Differences in reading performance by immigrant status


[^3]Table 2．1c
Differences in science performance by immigrant status


Note：Differences that are statistically significant are indicated in bold．

Table 2．1d
Differences in problem－solving performance by immigrant status

|  |  | Performance on the problem－solving scale |  |  |  |  |  | Difference in the problem－solving score |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Native students |  | Second－ generation students |  | First－ generation students |  | Second－generation students minus native students |  | First－generation students minus native students |  | First－generation students minus second－generation students |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Difference | S．E． | Difference | S．E． | Difference | S．E． |
| ข | Australia | 534 | （2．1） | 521 | （4．0） | 523 | （4．8） | －14 | （4．3） | －12 | （4．7） | 2 | （5．1） |
| 㙃 | Austria | 515 | （3．2） | 465 | （9．9） | 453 | （5．9） | －50 | （10．2） | －62 | （5．8） | －12 | （9．7） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 540 | （2．5） | 445 | （7．5） | 447 | （8．5） | －95 | （7．5） | －93 | （8．8） | 2 | （10．1） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 535 | （1．6） | 532 | （4．0） | 533 | （4．7） | －3 | （4．2） | －2 | （4．7） | 1 | （4．9） |
| $\stackrel{\text { U }}{ }$ | Denmark | 522 | （2．4） | 443 | （10．5） | 464 | （8．8） | －79 | （10．5） | －58 | （8．7） | 21 | （13．0） |
|  | France | 529 | （2．5） | 482 | （6．2） | 445 | （14．8） | －47 | （6．5） | －84 | （14．9） | －37 | （14．3） |
|  | Germany | 534 | （3．4） | 443 | （9．3） | 461 | （7．4） | －90 | （9．6） | －73 | （7．8） | 18 | （11．6） |
|  | Luxembourg | 507 | （1．8） | 475 | （3．7） | 463 | （3．9） | －33 | （4．2） | －44 | （4．4） | －11 | （5．6） |
|  | Netherlands | 532 | （3．1） | 463 | （9．7） | 462 | （8．8） | －69 | （10．4） | －70 | （9．5） | －1 | （10．5） |
|  | New Zealand | 537 | （2．5） | 500 | （7．5） | 534 | （4．6） | －38 | （8．1） | －3 | （5．3） | 35 | （7．7） |
|  | Norway | 494 | （2．6） | 452 | （11．7） | 417 | （10．3） | －43 | （11．5） | －78 | （10．7） | －35 | （14．9） |
|  | Sweden | 516 | （2．2） | 483 | （8．9） | 434 | （10．1） | －33 | （8．3） | －82 | （10．4） | －49 | （11．5） |
|  | Switzerland | 538 | （3．0） | 480 | （4．8） | 447 | （5．8） | －58 | （4．7） | －91 | （5．9） | －33 | （6．2） |
| \％ | United States | 483 | （2．9） | 464 | （8．5） | 446 | （8．3） | －19 | （8．1） | －37 | （8．1） | －18 | （8．4） |
|  | OECD average | 522 | （0．8） | 480 | （2．0） | 476 | （1．9） | －42 | （2．0） | －46 | （2．1） | －4 | （2．3） |
| 8 | Hong Kong－China | 556 | （4．1） | 572 | （4．0） | 505 | （5．0） | 17 | （3．8） | －51 | （4．4） | －68 | （5．0） |
| 亦 | Macao－China | 536 | （5．1） | 533 | （3．3） | 531 | （8．9） | －4 | （6．5） | －6 | （10．0） | －2 | （9．6） |
| 市 | Russian Federation | 482 | （4．7） | 473 | （6．7） | 451 | （7．4） | －9 | （6．9） | －31 | （6．2） | －22 | （9．4） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 559 | （2．8） | 436 | （10．8） | 475 | （10．4） | －123 | （11．4） | －84 | （10．5） | 39 | （14．4） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 512 | （4．1） | 449 | （9．7） | 433 | （11．3） | －63 | （9．3） | －79 | （11．5） | －16 | （12．4） |

Note：Differences that are statistically significant are indicated in bold．

Correlations between mathematics, reading, science and problem-solving performance, by immigrant status
Native students
Correlation between the performance in:


Second-generation students


First-generation students
Correlation between the performance in:

Germany
Luxembourg
Netherlands
New Zealand
\% Sweden
Sweden
United States
Hong Kong-China
Macao-China
$\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\varnothing}$ Russian Federation
Belgium (Flemish community)
Belgium (French community)

| First-generation students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Correlation between the performance in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mathematics and reading |  | Mathematics and science |  | Mathematics and problem-solving |  | Reading and science |  | Reading and problem-solving |  | Science and problem-solving |  |
| Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. |
| 0.81 | (0.02) | 0.86 | (0.02) | 0.91 | (0.01) | 0.87 | (0.01) | 0.84 | (0.02) | 0.85 | (0.02) |
| 0.79 | (0.02) | 0.86 | (0.01) | 0.88 | (0.01) | 0.83 | (0.02) | 0.80 | (0.02) | 0.82 | (0.02) |
| 0.84 | (0.03) | 0.88 | (0.02) | 0.89 | (0.01) | 0.88 | (0.02) | 0.85 | (0.02) | 0.84 | (0.02) |
| 0.79 | (0.02) | 0.83 | (0.02) | 0.89 | (0.01) | 0.87 | (0.01) | 0.85 | (0.02) | 0.83 | (0.02) |
| 0.74 | (0.05) | 0.80 | (0.05) | 0.89 | (0.03) | 0.80 | (0.04) | 0.79 | (0.04) | 0.76 | (0.06) |
| 0.81 | (0.04) | 0.83 | (0.03) | 0.89 | (0.02) | 0.86 | (0.03) | 0.86 | (0.03) | 0.80 | (0.03) |
| 0.81 | (0.02) | 0.88 | (0.01) | 0.92 | (0.01) | 0.86 | (0.02) | 0.86 | (0.02) | 0.86 | (0.02) |
| 0.82 | (0.02) | 0.87 | (0.01) | 0.91 | (0.01) | 0.88 | (0.01) | 0.86 | (0.01) | 0.86 | (0.01) |
| 0.82 | (0.04) | 0.85 | (0.03) | 0.93 | (0.01) | 0.88 | (0.02) | 0.83 | (0.04) | 0.84 | (0.04) |
| 0.80 | (0.02) | 0.87 | (0.01) | 0.91 | (0.01) | 0.87 | (0.01) | 0.85 | (0.02) | 0.84 | (0.02) |
| 0.77 | (0.04) | 0.82 | (0.05) | 0.86 | (0.03) | 0.80 | (0.03) | 0.82 | (0.04) | 0.74 | (0.06) |
| 0.78 | (0.04) | 0.79 | (0.03) | 0.85 | (0.03) | 0.88 | (0.02) | 0.81 | (0.03) | 0.76 | (0.04) |
| 0.81 | (0.03) | 0.85 | (0.02) | 0.90 | (0.01) | 0.83 | (0.02) | 0.83 | (0.02) | 0.83 | (0.02) |
| 0.85 | (0.02) | 0.87 | (0.02) | 0.93 | (0.01) | 0.88 | (0.02) | 0.86 | (0.02) | 0.86 | (0.02) |
| 0.82 | (0.01) | 0.87 | (0.00) | 0.91 | (0.00) | 0.87 | (0.00) | 0.85 | (0.00) | 0.85 | (0.01) |
| 0.80 | (0.02) | 0.85 | (0.02) | 0.90 | (0.01) | 0.82 | (0.02) | 0.84 | (0.02) | 0.83 | (0.02) |
| 0.63 | (0.06) | 0.70 | (0.05) | 0.82 | (0.03) | 0.75 | (0.03) | 0.72 | (0.05) | 0.69 | (0.05) |
| 0.60 | (0.04) | 0.68 | (0.04) | 0.81 | (0.03) | 0.75 | (0.03) | 0.75 | (0.04) | 0.62 | (0.04) |
| 0.79 | (0.04) | 0.89 | (0.04) | 0.97 | (0.06) | 0.95 | (0.06) | 1.00 | (0.06) | 0.92 | (0.07) |
| 0.72 | (0.05) | 0.79 | (0.06) | 0.87 | (0.04) | 0.89 | (0.06) | 0.92 | (0.07) | 0.87 | (0.09) |

Table2.3a
Distribution of student performance on the mathematics scale by immigrant status


First-generation students

| Mean score |  | Percentiles of the mathematics performance distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $5^{\text {th }}$ |  | $25^{\text {th }}$ |  | $75^{\text {th }}$ |  | $95^{\text {th }}$ |  |
| Mean | S.E. | Score | S.E. | Score | S.E. | Score | S.E. | Score | S.E. |
| 525 | (4.9) | 357 | (9.3) | 455 | (6.8) | 596 | (5.8) | 687 | (10.1) |
| 452 | (6.0) | 321 | (7.7) | 391 | (7.2) | 506 | (8.8) | 608 | (13.4) |
| 437 | (10.8) | 245 | (19.9) | 357 | (19.7) | 513 | (8.7) | 625 | (10.4) |
| 530 | (4.7) | 377 | (7.8) | 468 | (6.2) | 596 | (6.1) | 674 | (7.5) |
| 455 | (10.1) | 296 | (33.6) | 396 | (12.9) | 516 | (12.6) | c | C |
| 448 | (15.0) | 283 | (21.6) | 367 | (16.7) | 526 | (23.6) | 621 | (18.1) |
| 454 | (7.5) | 297 | (9.8) | 379 | (8.5) | 528 | (9.1) | 609 | (9.5) |
| 462 | (3.7) | 302 | (6.3) | 391 | (5.0) | 532 | (5.6) | 632 | (8.0) |
| 472 | (8.4) | 344 | (16.6) | 415 | (9.1) | 526 | (11.6) | 611 | (24.4) |
| 523 | (4.9) | 351 | (11.5) | 455 | (7.4) | 595 | (5.5) | 677 | (6.9) |
| 438 | (9.3) | 292 | (25.2) | 370 | (9.2) | 499 | (10.2) | 599 | (19.7) |
| 425 | (9.6) | 253 | (19.6) | 361 | (12.6) | 492 | (9.5) | 587 | (15.5) |
| 453 | (6.1) | 297 | (8.7) | 380 | (6.9) | 514 | (6.4) | 634 | (13.5) |
| 453 | (7.5) | 287 | (12.4) | 374 | (11.5) | 527 | (7.8) | 619 | (9.9) |
| 475 | (1.9) | 306 | (3.4) | 401 | (2.5) | 547 | (2.6) | 647 | (2.8) |
| 516 | (5.3) | 355 | (10.9) | 457 | (6.1) | 583 | (4.9) | 662 | (7.1) |
| 517 | (9.2) | 367 | (13.5) | 452 | (11.1) | 575 | (12.6) | 672 | (14.5) |
| 452 | (5.9) | 302 | (11.2) | 394 | (7.1) | 507 | (7.8) | 606 | (12.0) |
| 472 | (10.0) | c | c | 406 | (16.8) | 537 | (9.4) | 630 | (20.7) |
| 419 | (14.4) | 233 | (20.5) | 332 | (25.0) | 496 | (11.6) | 622 | (12.6) |

Table2．3b
Distribution of student performance on the reading scale by immigrant status


Second－generation students

|  |  |  |  |  |  | nd－gen | tion stu |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ntiles | he read | rform | distrib |  |  |
|  |  | Me | score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean | S．E． | Score | S．E． | Score | S．E． | Score | S．E． | Score | S．E． |
| \％ | Australia | 525 | （4．6） | 351 | （10．1） | 462 | （5．9） | 596 | （5．2） | 673 | （7．5） |
| 京 | Austria | 428 | （13．5） | c | c | 355 | （16．1） | 512 | （12．6） | 591 | （14．1） |
| $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | Belgium | 439 | （7．5） | 253 | （14．1） | 365 | （12．4） | 519 | （7．3） | 606 | （10．1） |
| O | Canada | 543 | （4．2） | 403 | （8．0） | 488 | （5．0） | 600 | （4．3） | 679 | （7．8） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | 440 | （13．8） | c | c | 383 | （20．8） | 506 | （15．5） | 589 | （21．2） |
| U | France | 458 | （6．9） | 287 | （15．6） | 400 | （9．5） | 523 | （7．2） | 599 | （8．7） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Germany | 420 | （9．9） | 254 | （20．8） | 349 | （16．2） | 486 | （12．2） | 596 | （12．3） |
|  | Luxembourg | 454 | （4．0） | 281 | （8．1） | 388 | （6．0） | 524 | （4．9） | 607 | （6．1） |
|  | Netherlands | 475 | （8．2） | 353 | （9．9） | 418 | （11．5） | 527 | （8．4） | 598 | （15．9） |
|  | New Zealand | 506 | （8．3） | 326 | （14．9） | 430 | （11．0） | 580 | （9．8） | 687 | （13．6） |
|  | Norway | 446 | （11．1） | 260 | （26．3） | 375 | （15．3） | 517 | （12．8） | c | ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
|  | Sweden | 502 | （8．7） | 333 | （19．4） | 439 | （10．8） | 566 | （11．0） | 649 | （13．2） |
| 롳 | Switzerland | 462 | （5．2） | 303 | （11．6） | 398 | （6．5） | 529 | （5．7） | 617 | （7．1） |
| ¢ | United States | 481 | （8．7） | 308 | （14．7） | 410 | （10．6） | 550 | （9．5） | 641 | （11．7） |
| $\bigcirc$ | OECD average | 475 | （2．1） | 295 | （4．3） | 407 | （2．6） | 546 | （2．4） | 637 | （2．6） |
| 亠 | Hong Kong－China | 522 | （3．8） | 364 | （10．7） | 479 | （5．1） | 577 | （3．2） | 632 | （4．7） |
| $\pm$ | Macao－China | 497 | （2．9） | 380 | （5．7） | 455 | （4．4） | 543 | （4．2） | 599 | （4．2） |
| 市 | Russian Federation | 426 | （6．9） | 265 | （15．6） | 368 | （8．7） | 491 | （8．2） | 569 | （7．3） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 440 | （10．2） | 268 | （17．3） | 363 | （11．8） | 513 | （13．1） | 608 | （19．0） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 439 | （10．4） | 246 | （22．6） | 365 | （18．9） | 521 | （9．2） | 604 | （12．4） |

First－generation students

|  |  | First－generation student |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean score |  | Percentiles of the reading performance distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $5^{\text {th }}$ | $25^{\text {th }}$ |  | $75^{\text {th }}$ |  | $95^{\text {th }}$ |  |
|  |  | Mean | S．E． | Score | S．E． | Score | S．E． | Score | S．E． | Score | S．E． |
| \％ | Australia |  |  | 517 | （5．0） | 331 | （11．2） | 452 | （7．7） | 590 | （5．9） | 675 | （7．2） |
| 妾 | Austria | 425 | （8．0） | 254 | （15．9） | 354 | （9．8） | 497 | （8．0） | 597 | （12．7） |
| $\stackrel{3}{0}$ | Belgium | 407 | （11．9） | 193 | （24．0） | 321 | （21．2） | 492 | （10．1） | 610 | （13．9） |
| O | Canada | 515 | （4．7） | 353 | （8．3） | 457 | （6．1） | 579 | （4．1） | 654 | （6．3） |
| U | Denmark | 454 | （9．5） | 291 | （25．0） | 389 | （13．1） | 526 | （11．1） | c | c |
| － | France | 426 | （15．3） | 223 | （18．5） | 339 | （25．5） | 508 | （14．4） | 593 | （18．1） |
|  | Germany | 431 | （8．9） | 248 | （14．7） | 351 | （10．5） | 514 | （9．1） | 599 | （12．3） |
|  | Luxembourg | 431 | （4．4） | 253 | （9．0） | 355 | （5．6） | 511 | （6．0） | 600 | （7．2） |
|  | Netherlands | 463 | （8．1） | 349 | （16．6） | 409 | （8．2） | 514 | （11．0） | 602 | （17．5） |
|  | New Zealand | 503 | （5．3） | 310 | （10．2） | 430 | （7．4） | 580 | （5．6） | 675 | （6．4） |
|  | Norway | 436 | （11．5） | 250 | （31．3） | 363 | （15．0） | 512 | （12．8） | 609 | （21．2） |
| ． | Sweden | 433 | （11．3） | 232 | （29．3） | 362 | （17．1） | 516 | （10．6） | 602 | （11．9） |
| ＋ | Switzerland | 422 | （6．3） | 255 | （8．5） | 349 | （9．0） | 492 | （7．6） | 594 | （14．6） |
| \％ | United States | 453 | （8．3） | 267 | （11．5） | 369 | （12．1） | 538 | （9．4） | 629 | （10．6） |
|  | OECD average | 456 | （2．1） | 265 | （4．0） | 379 | （2．9） | 538 | （2．1） | 634 | （2．5） |
| F | Hong Kong－China | 494 | （4．8） | 349 | （11．8） | 442 | （5．5） | 550 | （3．9） | 611 | （5．2） |
| $\frac{t}{\text { co }}$ | Macao－China | 499 | （7．1） | 382 | （18．7） | 451 | （6．5） | 548 | （7．3） | 609 | （10．1） |
| － | Russian Federation | 413 | （7．5） | 251 | （13．7） | 346 | （9．3） | 479 | （6．3） | 561 | （9．9） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 450 | （10．6） | 253 | （25．3） | 379 | （16．3） | 527 | （13．8） | 633 | （19．8） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 385 | （15．8） | 180 | （19．8） | 291 | （28．7） | 472 | （12．0） | 586 | （20．8） |

Table 2.4a
Percentage of native students at each level of proficiency on the mathematics scale
Native students - Proficiency levels

| Below Level 1 (below 358 score points) |  | Level 1 <br> (from 358 to 420 score points) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Level } 2 \\ \text { (from } 421 \text { to } 482 \\ \text { score points) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Level 3 } \\ \text { (from } 483 \text { to } 544 \\ \text { score points) } \end{gathered}$ |  | Level 4 <br> (from 545 to 606 <br> score points) |  | Levels 5 and 6 (above 606 score points) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| 3.7 | (0.4) | 9.5 | (0.5) | 18.5 | (0.7) | 24.4 | (0.7) | 23.9 | (0.6) | 20.0 | (0.7) |
| 4.0 | (0.7) | 11.6 | (0.9) | 20.6 | (1.0) | 25.9 | (1.3) | 21.9 | (0.9) | 16.0 | (1.1) |
| 4.0 | (0.4) | 7.4 | (0.5) | 15.2 | (0.7) | 20.8 | (0.8) | 22.9 | (0.7) | 29.7 | (1.0) |
| 2.1 | (0.3) | 7.1 | (0.4) | 17.3 | (0.6) | 26.0 | (0.8) | 25.8 | (0.6) | 21.7 | (0.7) |
| 3.8 | (0.5) | 9.8 | (0.7) | 20.0 | (0.9) | 26.6 | (0.9) | 22.8 | (0.9) | 17.0 | (1.0) |
| 3.8 | (0.6) | 9.7 | (0.9) | 19.5 | (1.0) | 26.5 | (1.1) | 23.7 | (1.2) | 16.8 | (1.0) |
| 3.6 | (0.6) | 9.4 | (0.8) | 18.9 | (1.3) | 24.8 | (1.0) | 23.9 | (1.1) | 19.4 | (1.1) |
| 4.5 | (0.5) | 11.8 | (1.0) | 21.6 | (1.4) | 28.2 | (1.0) | 21.7 | (1.1) | 12.2 | (0.8) |
| 0.9 | (0.3) | 6.0 | (0.7) | 16.3 | (1.2) | 23.4 | (1.2) | 24.3 | (1.4) | 29.0 | (1.5) |
| 4.0 | (0.5) | 9.4 | (0.7) | 19.0 | (0.7) | 23.4 | (0.9) | 22.7 | (0.9) | 21.5 | (0.9) |
| 6.1 | (0.5) | 13.2 | (0.8) | 23.5 | (1.1) | 25.7 | (1.1) | 19.6 | (1.1) | 11.8 | (0.7) |
| 3.8 | (0.4) | 10.5 | (0.6) | 21.2 | (0.9) | 26.2 | (0.9) | 21.1 | (0.9) | 17.2 | (0.8) |
| 2.6 | (0.4) | 6.7 | (0.6) | 15.8 | (0.8) | 25.3 | (1.1) | 25.3 | (0.8) | 24.2 | (1.6) |
| 8.4 | (0.7) | 14.5 | (0.9) | 24.0 | (0.8) | 24.8 | (0.9) | 17.5 | (0.8) | 10.9 | (0.8) |
| 3.5 | (0.8) | 5.8 | (0.8) | 12.8 | (1.0) | 19.6 | (1.4) | 25.0 | (1.4) | 33.2 | (1.8) |
| 1.5 | (0.9) | 7.8 | (3.2) | 21.1 | (4.1) | 27.3 | (3.6) | 23.8 | (3.6) | 18.5 | (2.6) |
| 10.9 | (1.1) | 18.2 | (1.2) | 25.9 | (1.1) | 23.6 | (1.0) | 13.9 | (1.0) | 7.5 | (0.8) |
| 2.1 | (0.4) | 5.2 | (0.5) | 12.3 | (0.6) | 19.1 | (0.7) | 24.1 | (0.7) | 37.3 | (1.1) |
| 6.9 | (0.9) | 10.6 | (0.9) | 19.4 | (1.0) | 23.3 | (1.1) | 21.2 | (1.1) | 18.6 | (1.4) |

Table 2.4b
Percentage of second-generation students at each level of proficiency on the mathematics scale

|  |  | Second-generation students - Proficiency levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Below Level 1 (below 358 score points) |  | Level 1(from 358 to 420score points) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Level } 2 \\ \text { (from } 421 \text { to } 482 \\ \text { score points) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Level 3 } \\ \text { (from } 483 \text { to } 544 \\ \text { score points) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Level } 4 \\ \text { (from } 545 \text { to } 606 \\ \text { score points) } \end{gathered}$ |  | Levels 5 and 6 (above 606 score points) |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| U | Australia | 4.7 | (1.0) | 10.4 | (1.0) | 19.7 | (1.6) | 23.1 | (2.0) | 22.4 | (2.3) | 19.7 | (2.0) |
| ᄃ | Austria | 13.2 | (3.4) | 20.6 | (3.6) | 27.0 | (3.9) | 20.6 | (3.5) | 15.7 | (3.6) | 2.9 | (1.5) |
| - | Belgium | 17.4 | (2.5) | 20.7 | (2.0) | 23.1 | (2.4) | 19.0 | (3.1) | 11.9 | (2.4) | 7.8 | (2.0) |
| u | Canada | 1.4 | (0.6) | 5.9 | (1.0) | 16.3 | (1.7) | 28.0 | (2.3) | 25.5 | (2.3) | 22.9 | (9.0) |
|  | Denmark | 15.7 | (3.9) | 20.4 | (4.6) | 28.0 | (6.9) | 23.5 | (6.7) | 8.2 | (3.6) | 4.2 | (2.6) |
|  | France | 10.9 | (2.3) | 17.1 | (2.3) | 24.8 | (3.5) | 26.7 | (2.8) | 14.5 | (2.6) | 5.9 | (2.3) |
|  | Germany | 23.5 | (4.2) | 23.3 | (3.3) | 23.8 | (3.4) | 16.3 | (2.7) | 8.4 | (2.3) | 4.8 | (1.4) |
|  | Luxembourg | 9.3 | (1.3) | 17.4 | (2.1) | 27.3 | (2.3) | 24.5 | (2.0) | 13.1 | (1.7) | 8.5 | (1.1) |
|  | Netherlands | 4.2 | (1.5) | 16.4 | (4.2) | 27.9 | (4.3) | 23.9 | (4.2) | 18.6 | (3.2) | 9.0 | (2.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 8.7 | (3.3) | 15.6 | (3.1) | 21.8 | (3.4) | 22.2 | (3.1) | 17.4 | (2.7) | 14.4 | (2.7) |
|  | Norway | 15.2 | (4.9) | 19.5 | (4.8) | 25.0 | (7.9) | 17.7 | (5.8) | 13.6 | (4.2) | 9.0 | (3.6) |
|  | Sweden | 9.6 | (2.4) | 14.8 | (3.4) | 26.5 | (3.2) | 23.5 | (4.9) | 14.4 | (3.7) | 11.2 | (3.3) |
| ひ | Switzerland | 8.8 | (1.6) | 17.6 | (2.3) | 25.6 | (2.7) | 21.3 | (2.4) | 15.3 | (1.7) | 11.4 | (2.3) |
| 5 | United States | 12.5 | (2.5) | 21.0 | (3.0) | 23.3 | (2.3) | 21.0 | (2.4) | 14.2 | (2.2) | 8.0 | (2.0) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Hong Kong-China | 2.9 | (0.8) | 4.9 | (0.9) | 10.2 | (1.4) | 16.3 | (1.5) | 27.8 | (1.9) | 37.9 | (2.2) |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ \pm}$ | Macao-China | 2.4 | (0.7) | 7.9 | (1.2) | 18.2 | (1.8) | 26.9 | (2.4) | 24.6 | (2.2) | 20.0 | (2.1) |
| - | Russian Federation | 10.0 | (2.4) | 21.9 | (3.1) | 31.0 | (4.1) | 22.8 | (3.7) | 10.3 | (2.5) | 4.0 | (2.0) |
|  | Belgium (Flemish Community) | 21.3 | (3.4) | 21.0 | (3.1) | 25.0 | (2.9) | 15.6 | (2.9) | 9.1 | (2.3) | 8.1 | (2.3) |
|  | Belgium (French Community) | 15.4 | (2.9) | 20.6 | (2.4) | 22.1 | (2.5) | 20.8 | (2.7) | 13.4 | (2.5) | 7.6 | (1.7) |

Table 2．4c
Percentage of first－generation students at each level of proficiency on the mathematics scale


Table 2．4d
Percentage of native students at each level of proficiency on the reading scale

| そ0000000 |  | Native students－Proficiency levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Below Level 1 （below 335 score points） |  | Level 1 <br> （from 335 to 407 score points） |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Level 2 } \\ \text { (from } 408 \text { to } 480 \\ \text { score points) } \end{gathered}$ |  | Level 3 <br> （from 481 to 552 <br> score points） |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Level 4 } \\ \text { (from } 553 \text { to } 626 \\ \text { score points) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Level 5 <br> （above 626 score points） |  |
|  |  | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． | \％ | S．E． |
|  | Australia | 3.1 | （0．4） | 7.7 | （0．5） | 17.9 | （0．7） | 28.6 | （0．8） | 27.8 | （0．8） | 14.9 | （0．7） |
|  | Austria | 5.4 | （0．8） | 11.7 | （1．0） | 22.1 | （1．0） | 28.6 | （1．2） | 22.9 | （1．1） | 9.3 | （0．9） |
|  | Belgium | 4.5 | （0．6） | 8.2 | （0．6） | 17.6 | （0．7） | 27.3 | （0．8） | 28.2 | （0．9） | 14.1 | （0．6） |
|  | Canada | 1.8 | （0．2） | 6.6 | （0．4） | 17.1 | （0．6） | 30.7 | （0．8） | 29.9 | （0．6） | 13.9 | （0．6） |
|  | Denmark | 3.9 | （0．6） | 11.2 | （0．7） | 24.4 | （1．2） | 34.3 | （1．2） | 20.8 | （1．0） | 5.5 | （0．5） |
|  | France | 4.6 | （0．7） | 10.1 | （0．6） | 22.0 | （0．9） | 30.4 | （1．0） | 24.6 | （0．9） | 8.3 | （0．7） |
|  | Germany | 3.3 | （0．5） | 10.3 | （1．0） | 19.5 | （1．1） | 29.3 | （0．9） | 25.9 | （1．2） | 11.6 | （0．8） |
|  | Luxembourg | 4.5 | （0．4） | 10.4 | （0．7） | 23.8 | （0．9） | 31.9 | （1．3） | 22.9 | （1．4） | 6.6 | （0．5） |
|  | Netherlands | 1.0 | （0．3） | 6.9 | （0．8） | 21.8 | （1．2） | 31.7 | （1．4） | 28.7 | （1．3） | 10.0 | （0．8） |
|  | New Zealand | 3.9 | （0．5） | 8.6 | （0．7） | 18.1 | （1．0） | 26.7 | （1．1） | 25.2 | （1．1） | 17.5 | （0．8） |
|  | Norway | 5.5 | （0．5） | 11.0 | （0．8） | 21.1 | （1．3） | 29.5 | （1．1） | 22.4 | （0．9） | 10.4 | （0．8） |
|  | Sweden | 2.6 | （0．4） | 8.3 | （0．7） | 20.2 | （1．0） | 30.5 | （1．6） | 26.1 | （1．3） | 12.3 | （0．7） |
| ひ | Switzerland | 2.5 | （0．3） | 8.5 | （0．8） | 21.5 | （1．1） | 33.4 | （1．5） | 25.1 | （1．1） | 9.1 | （0．9） |
| $\bigcirc$ | United States | 4.8 | （0．6） | 11.8 | （0．9） | 22.7 | （1．1） | 28.6 | （1．1） | 22.2 | （0．9） | 9.9 | （0．7） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Hong Kong－China | 3.1 | （0．7） | 8.2 | （1．0） | 20.1 | （1．6） | 34.5 | （1．6） | 27.7 | （1．5） | 6.5 | （0．7） |
| 衰 | Macao－China | 0.8 | （0．9） | 9.5 | （2．9） | 25.9 | （4．1） | 43.6 | （3．8） | 18.3 | （2．7） | 2.0 | （0．9） |
| С๐ | Russian Federation | 11.7 | （1．0） | 20.7 | （1．0） | 30.5 | （1．0） | 25.4 | （1．1） | 9.8 | （0．9） | 2.0 | （0．3） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 2.1 | （0．5） | 6.2 | （0．5） | 15.3 | （0．7） | 26.7 | （0．8） | 31.8 | （0．9） | 17.9 | （0．7） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 8.2 | （1．1） | 11.2 | （1．0） | 21.1 | （1．0） | 28.2 | （1．2） | 23.0 | （1．1） | 8.4 | （0．9） |

Table 2.4e
Percentage of second-generation students at each level of proficiency on the reading scale

|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Australia | 3.7 | (0.9) | 8.7 | (1.1) | 17.7 | (1.4) | 28.9 | (1.8) | 26.0 | (1.9) | 15.0 | (1.9) |
|  | Austria | 18.7 | (4.5) | 20.6 | (3.6) | 25.0 | (5.0) | 23.7 | (3.9) | 10.3 | (2.8) | 1.7 | (1.1) |
|  | Belgium | 18.6 | (2.5) | 17.9 | (2.2) | 24.5 | (3.0) | 24.3 | (2.6) | 11.4 | (2.1) | 3.2 | (1.2) |
|  | Canada | 1.0 | (0.3) | 4.5 | (0.9) | 16.5 | (1.7) | 31.6 | (2.2) | 31.1 | (2.2) | 15.4 | (2.1) |
|  | Denmark | 15.3 | (4.9) | 17.2 | (4.1) | 34.1 | (6.4) | 22.3 | (5.4) | 9.4 | (4.1) | 1.7 | (1.7) |
|  | France | 10.6 | (2.2) | 16.8 | (2.4) | 29.6 | (3.2) | 27.6 | (4.6) | 12.8 | (2.3) | 2.6 | (0.9) |
|  | Germany | 21.6 | (4.4) | 22.5 | (3.8) | 28.9 | (4.0) | 15.9 | (2.7) | 8.7 | (2.1) | 2.5 | (1.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | 12.8 | (1.4) | 18.5 | (1.9) | 27.1 | (2.2) | 25.5 | (1.9) | 12.9 | (1.7) | 3.1 | (0.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 3.0 | (1.4) | 17.4 | (4.0) | 31.1 | (3.8) | 33.3 | (4.2) | 12.2 | (2.6) | 3.0 | (1.3) |
|  | New Zealand | 5.7 | (1.7) | 13.0 | (3.0) | 21.0 | (3.2) | 25.2 | (3.2) | 22.6 | (4.5) | 12.5 | (2.6) |
|  | Norway | 14.3 | (4.8) | 20.7 | (5.5) | 26.4 | (6.2) | 23.4 | (5.6) | 10.7 | (3.4) | 4.5 | (2.4) |
|  | Sweden | 4.9 | (1.8) | 10.6 | (3.0) | 22.7 | (3.7) | 31.7 | (4.0) | 20.7 | (3.9) | 9.4 | (2.8) |
|  | Switzerland | 9.6 | (2.0) | 19.5 | (2.6) | 28.6 | (2.7) | 24.7 | (3.4) | 13.6 | (1.7) | 4.0 | (1.4) |
|  | United States | 8.0 | (2.1) | 16.3 | (2.6) | 24.6 | (3.3) | 26.4 | (2.8) | 16.6 | (3.0) | 8.0 | (2.1) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 3.0 | (0.8) | 6.0 | (1.1) | 16.3 | (1.5) | 35.7 | (1.9) | 32.6 | (2.0) | 6.4 | (0.9) |
|  | Macao-China | 1.1 | (0.5) | 8.8 | (1.3) | 27.0 | (2.4) | 42.0 | (2.3) | 19.6 | (2.3) | 1.4 | (0.6) |
|  | Russian Federation | 15.4 | (2.7) | 25.1 | (3.3) | 30.5 | (4.1) | 20.5 | (3.2) | 8.1 | (2.1) | 0.4 | c |
|  | Belgium (Flemish Community) | 16.4 | (3.2) | 22.2 | (3.2) | 25.3 | (3.1) | 22.1 | (3.4) | 10.3 | (2.3) | 3.7 | (1.5) |
|  | Belgium (French Community) | 19.7 | (3.4) | 15.7 | (2.6) | 24.1 | (3.2) | 25.4 | (3.0) | 12.0 | (2.2) | 3.0 | (1.2) |

Table 2.4f
Percentage of first-generation students at each level of proficiency on the reading scale

|  |  | First-generation students - Proficiency levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Below Level 1(below 335 scorepoints) |  | Level 1(from 335 to 407score points) |  | Level 2(from 408 to 480score points) |  | Level 3(from 481 to 552score points) |  | Level 4 <br> (from 553 to 626 score points) |  | Level 5(above 626 scorepoints) |  |
|  |  | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. | \% | S.E. |
| \% | Australia | 5.3 | (0.9) | 9.5 | (1.1) | 19.3 | (1.6) | 26.8 | (2.5) | 24.5 | (2.2) | 14.7 | (1.8) |
| $\stackrel{\text { c }}{ }$ | Austria | 18.9 | (3.2) | 24.7 | (3.2) | 25.9 | (2.6) | 19.6 | (2.3) | 8.6 | (1.5) | 2.3 | (1.0) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 27.5 | (4.6) | 21.3 | (2.5) | 22.9 | (3.6) | 16.9 | (2.2) | 7.7 | (1.8) | 3.8 | (1.1) |
| u | Canada | 3.4 | (0.8) | 9.3 | (1.7) | 20.3 | (2.0) | 31.1 | (2.3) | 25.5 | (2.1) | 10.5 | (1.4) |
|  | Denmark | 11.5 | (3.0) | 19.9 | (4.9) | 27.5 | (5.6) | 24.9 | (5.6) | 13.8 | (5.1) | 2.5 | (1.6) |
|  | France | 23.3 | (6.0) | 17.8 | (5.2) | 22.9 | (4.5) | 23.3 | (4.9) | 10.0 | (2.9) | 2.7 | (1.8) |
|  | Germany | 20.1 | (3.6) | 21.8 | (4.2) | 21.4 | (3.6) | 22.8 | (2.6) | 11.4 | (2.6) | 2.5 | (1.3) |
|  | Luxembourg | 18.7 | (1.6) | 22.9 | (1.8) | 23.8 | (2.3) | 20.3 | (2.2) | 11.8 | (1.7) | 2.5 | (0.7) |
|  | Netherlands | 2.8 | (2.0) | 21.5 | (4.5) | 36.8 | (5.5) | 26.4 | (5.3) | 9.7 | (3.0) | 2.8 | (1.6) |
|  | New Zealand | 7.4 | (1.4) | 12.2 | (1.5) | 19.8 | (2.3) | 25.6 | (2.0) | 21.7 | (2.5) | 13.2 | (1.9) |
|  | Norway | 17.7 | (4.4) | 21.8 | (4.5) | 25.3 | (4.2) | 20.7 | (4.4) | 10.9 | (3.9) | 3.6 | (2.2) |
|  | Sweden | 19.6 | (4.4) | 19.1 | (2.9) | 24.6 | (4.2) | 21.3 | (3.2) | 12.9 | (3.2) | 2.5 | (1.4) |
| ๕ | Switzerland | 21.7 | (3.0) | 22.8 | (2.4) | 26.2 | (3.1) | 18.7 | (3.0) | 7.7 | (1.9) | 2.8 | (1.0) |
| 5 | United States | 16.5 | (3.0) | 18.8 | (2.7) | 20.1 | (2.7) | 24.5 | (3.1) | 14.5 | (2.7) | 5.5 | (1.5) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Hong Kong-China | 3.5 | (1.1) | 11.7 | (1.5) | 24.1 | (2.2) | 37.1 | (2.2) | 20.5 | (1.9) | 3.2 | (0.7) |
| ¢ | Macao-China | 1.0 | (1.2) | 7.7 | (2.4) | 32.1 | (5.9) | 36.1 | (6.5) | 20.8 | (5.5) | 2.2 | (1.7) |
| 市 | Russian Federation | 21.2 | (3.6) | 24.0 | (2.4) | 30.2 | (3.0) | 18.6 | (2.2) | 5.4 | (1.2) | 0.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Belgium (Flemish Community) | 14.7 | (3.4) | 19.4 | (3.2) | 26.4 | (4.9) | 22.9 | (3.0) | 10.2 | (2.7) | 6.4 | (2.0) |
|  | Belgium (French Community) | 33.7 | (6.2) | 22.3 | (3.1) | 21.3 | (3.1) | 13.8 | (2.4) | 6.3 | (1.7) | 2.5 | (1.0) |

Table 2.5a
Performance on the mathematics scale by immigrant status and language spoken at home

|  |  | Performance on the mathematics scale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Language spoken at home most of the time IS THE SAME as the language of assessment, other official languages or another national dialects |  |  |  |  |  | Language spoken at home most of the time IS <br> DIFFERENT from the language of assessment, from other official languages or from other national dialects |  |  |  |
|  |  | Native students |  | Second-generation students |  | First-generation students |  | Second-generation students |  | First-generation students |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. |
|  | Australia | 528 | (2.1) | 528 | (4.5) | 527 | (5.4) | 514 | (7.5) | 523 | (7.5) |
|  | Austria | 515 | (3.3) | 471 | (13.9) | 468 | (9.8) | 460 | (11.2) | 453 | (7.8) |
|  | Belgium | 551 | (2.4) | 473 | (11.4) | 443 | (16.4) | 454 | (11.7) | 425 | (11.4) |
|  | Canada | 538 | (1.6) | 551 | (5.0) | 530 | (6.0) | 531 | (6.2) | 533 | (5.4) |
|  | Denmark | 520 | (2.6) | 455 | (15.3) | 446 | (15.5) | 438 | (17.4) | 458 | (14.3) |
|  | France | 521 | (2.4) | 488 | (5.9) | 461 | (19.6) | 455 | (9.8) | 441 | (21.6) |
|  | Germany | 528 | (3.5) | 458 | (9.8) | 480 | (10.5) | 427 | (15.5) | 435 | (9.0) |
|  | Luxembourg | 509 | (1.5) | 482 | (6.6) | 513 | (11.1) | 480 | (5.2) | 455 | (3.8) |
|  | Netherlands | 553 | (3.1) | 508 | (11.4) | 486 | (14.1) | 470 | (13.1) | 462 | (10.4) |
|  | New Zealand | 528 | (2.6) | 502 | (9.4) | 528 | (6.2) | 478 | (13.4) | 523 | (6.8) |
|  | Norway | 501 | (2.3) | 445 | (19.8) | 418 | (24.3) | 483 | (15.2) | 442 | (10.8) |
|  | Sweden | 519 | (2.2) | 499 | (9.4) | 445 | (19.3) | 484 | (16.2) | 427 | (10.1) |
|  | Switzerland | 545 | (3.5) | 495 | (7.3) | 480 | (10.2) | 487 | (8.6) | 447 | (7.8) |
|  | United States | 492 | (2.8) | 493 | (8.4) | 481 | (11.3) | 447 | (9.7) | 449 | (8.0) |
|  | OECD average | 525 | (0.7) | 500 | (2.4) | 495 | (3.4) | 474 | (3.2) | 470 | (2.5) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 561 | (4.4) | 573 | (4.7) | 521 | (5.3) | 508 | (23.3) | 442 | (14.5) |
|  | Macao-China | 531 | (6.1) | 534 | (4.2) | 522 | (9.6) | 491 | (21.8) | 468 | (20.2) |
|  | Russian Federation | 474 | (4.2) | 460 | (7.4) | 460 | (5.5) | 419 | (21.1) | 400 | (15.9) |
|  | Belgium (Flemish Community) | 571 | (2.8) | 501 | (18.1) | 499 | (9.6) | 431 | (15.0) | 441 | (18.4) |
|  | Belgium (French Community) | 519 | (4.1) | 466 | (13.2) | 422 | (20.0) | 475 | (14.4) | 410 | (15.5) |

Difference in the mathematics score

|  |  | Difference in the mathematics score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Second-generation minus native students |  |  |  | First-generation minus native students |  |  |  |
|  |  | Both sub-groups speak language of assessment at home |  | Second-generation students speak a different language at home |  | Both sub-groups speak language of assessment at home |  | First-generation students speak a different language at home |  |
|  |  | Difference. | S.E. | Difference. | S.E. | Difference. | S.E. | Difference. | S.E. |
| \% | Australia | -1 | (4.6) | -14 | (7.4) | -1 | (5.1) | -6 | (7.6) |
| $\stackrel{+}{\square}$ | Austria | -44 | (14.3) | -55 | (11.5) | -48 | (9.1) | -62 | (7.9) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | -77 | (11.7) | -96 | (11.4) | -107 | (16.5) | -126 | (11.3) |
| U | Canada | 13 | (5.0) | -8 | (6.6) | -8 | (6.2) | -5 | (5.5) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | -65 | (15.1) | -81 | (17.7) | -74 | (15.3) | -61 | (14.3) |
|  | France | -33 | (6.3) | -66 | (10.1) | -60 | (19.4) | -80 | (21.9) |
|  | Germany | -71 | (10.2) | -102 | (15.7) | -48 | (11.0) | -93 | (8.9) |
|  | Luxembourg | -27 | (7.0) | -30 | (5.4) | 4 | (11.2) | -54 | (4.3) |
|  | Netherlands | -45 | (12.2) | -83 | (13.8) | -67 | (14.5) | -92 | (10.8) |
|  | New Zealand | -27 | (9.9) | -50 | (13.8) | -1 | (6.4) | -5 | (7.4) |
|  | Norway | -55 | (19.7) | -17 | (14.9) | -83 | (24.2) | -58 | (10.9) |
|  | Sweden | -20 | (9.4) | -36 | (15.7) | -75 | (18.9) | -92 | (10.5) |
|  | Switzerland | -50 | (6.9) | -58 | (8.6) | -65 | (9.3) | -98 | (7.6) |
| 포 | United States | 2 | (8.1) | -45 | (9.8) | -11 | (10.9) | -43 | (8.4) |
| $\bigcirc$ | OECD average | -25 | (2.3) | -51 | (3.2) | -29 | (3.4) | -54 | (2.7) |
| $\pm$ | Hong Kong-China | 12 | (4.5) | -53 | (22.9) | -39 | (4.5) | -119 | (13.8) |
| $\pm$ | Macao-China | 3 | (7.9) | -40 | (22.8) | -9 | (11.1) | -63 | (21.4) |
| - | Russian Federation | -14 | (7.4) | -55 | (21.5) | -14 | (5.4) | -74 | (15.2) |
|  | Belgium (Flemish Community) | -70 | (18.4) | -140 | (15.7) | -72 | (9.5) | -130 | (18.2) |
|  | Belgium (French Community) | -53 | (13.3) | -44 | (13.1) | -98 | (20.2) | -110 | (15.4) |

[^4]Table 2．5b
Performance on the reading scale by immigrant status and language spoken at home
Results based on students＇self－reports

|  |  | Performance on the reading scale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Language spoken at home most of the time IS THE SAME as the language of assessment，other official languages or another national dialects |  |  |  |  |  | Language spoken at home most of the time IS <br> DIFFERENT from the language of assessment，from other official languages or from other national dialects |  |  |  |
|  |  | Native students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． |
| ๗ | Australia | 530 | （2．2） | 531 | （5．1） | 524 | （5．6） | 516 | （7．0） | 508 | （7．5） |
| 俈 | Austria | 502 | （3．9） | 461 | （16．5） | 460 | （12．7） | 413 | （21．5） | 421 | （9．4） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 529 | （2．6） | 462 | （12．0） | 412 | （18．6） | 436 | （12．8） | 403 | （15．1） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 535 | （1．6） | 553 | （4．3） | 527 | （6．1） | 527 | （7．0） | 512 | （5．7） |
| $\stackrel{\text { U }}{ }$ | Denmark | 497 | （2．8） | 443 | （18．5） | 452 | （14．6） | 443 | （22．8） | 458 | （13．8） |
|  | France | 507 | （2．7） | 477 | （6．3） | 450 | （21．8） | 435 | （12．0） | 412 | （19．4） |
|  | Germany | 520 | （3．5） | 457 | （9．5） | 463 | （11．4） | 404 | （17．0） | 404 | （11．8） |
|  | Luxembourg | 503 | （1．8） | 466 | （6．9） | 487 | （10．7） | 452 | （5．8） | 422 | （4．7） |
|  | Netherlands | 527 | （3．0） | 489 | （9．1） | 477 | （13．4） | 458 | （11．7） | 459 | （10．0） |
|  | New Zealand | 529 | （2．9） | 522 | （10．0） | 535 | （6．9） | 465 | （12．8） | 481 | （6．8） |
|  | Norway | 506 | （2．6） | 440 | （22．0） | 429 | （27．3） | 457 | （17．1） | 435 | （12．6） |
|  | Sweden | 524 | （2．1） | 512 | （9．9） | 466 | （21．5） | 507 | （16．3） | 431 | （12．4） |
|  | Switzerland | 517 | （3．3） | 473 | （7．9） | 455 | （10．6） | 464 | （8．1） | 412 | （8．3） |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{ \pm}$ | United States | 505 | （3．0） | 507 | （8．6） | 494 | （11．7） | 462 | （11．8） | 443 | （8．8） |
| ᄃ | OECD average | 516 | （0．8） | 496 | （2．4） | 488 | （3．7） | 460 | （3．4） | 446 | （2．6） |
| － | Hong Kong－China | 516 | （3．4） | 525 | （3．9） | 498 | （4．9） | 460 | （21．5） | 436 | （13．2） |
| F | Macao－China | 502 | （5．3） | 498 | （3．0） | 502 | （7．7） | 470 | （13．5） | 470 | （20．9） |
| ロナ | Russian Federation | 449 | （3．6） | 430 | （7．1） | 420 | （7．6） | 377 | （24．5） | 367 | （13．8） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 547 | （2．9） | 493 | （17．5） | 479 | （15．5） | 423 | （14．7） | 427 | （22．2） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 501 | （4．5） | 454 | （14．8） | 387 | （22．6） | 447 | （19．1） | 382 | （20．9） |

Difference in the reading score

| Second－generation minus native students |  |  |  | First－generation minus native students |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Both sub－groups speak language of assessment at home |  | Second－generation students speak a different language at home |  | Both sub－groups speak language of assessment at home |  | First－generation students speak a different language at home |  |
| Difference | S．E． | Difference | S．E． | Difference | S．E． | Difference | S．E． |
| 1 | （5．2） | －14 | （7．2） | －6 | （5．4） | －22 | （7．6） |
| －41 | （17．0） | －90 | （21．4） | －42 | （12．5） | －81 | （10．0） |
| －67 | （11．9） | －93 | （12．3） | －117 | （18．6） | －125 | （15．1） |
| 18 | （4．2） | －8 | （7．2） | －8 | （6．3） | －23 | （5．7） |
| －54 | （18．4） | －53 | （23．2） | －45 | （14．8） | －39 | （14．1） |
| －31 | （7．0） | －72 | （12．1） | －57 | （21．8） | －95 | （19．6） |
| －63 | （9．9） | －115 | （17．3） | －57 | （11．9） | －116 | （11．5） |
| －36 | （7．2） | －51 | （6．1） | －16 | （11．1） | －81 | （5．0） |
| －38 | （9．6） | －69 | （12．1） | －49 | （13．8） | －68 | （10．5） |
| －7 | （10．7） | －64 | （12．9） | 6 | （7．3） | －48 | （7．5） |
| －67 | （22．0） | －49 | （17．0） | －78 | （26．9） | －71 | （12．4） |
| －11 | （9．8） | －17 | （16．1） | －58 | （21．3） | －93 | （12．8） |
| －45 | （7．2） | －53 | （8．1） | －63 | （9．3） | －105 | （8．0） |
| 2 | （8．3） | －43 | （11．8） | －12 | （11．7） | －62 | （9．1） |
| －20 | （2．4） | －56 | （3．4） | －28 | （3．7） | －70 | （2．8） |
| 8 | （3．6） | －57 | （21．2） | －18 | （4．2） | －80 | （13．4） |
| －4 | （5．6） | －33 | （14．9） | 0 | （10．1） | －32 | （20．7） |
| －20 | （6．8） | －72 | （24．5） | －29 | （7．0） | －82 | （13．2） |
| －54 | （18．0） | －124 | （15．5） | －69 | （15．7） | －120 | （22．3） |
| －47 | （14．4） | －53 | （17．6） | －114 | （22．5） | －119 | （20．6） |

[^5]Table 2.6a
Comparison of differences in mathematics scores between immigrant and native students accounting for language differences

|  | Difference in the mathematics score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WITHOUT accounting for language differences |  |  |  | WITH accounting for language differences |  |  |  |
|  | Second-generation students minus native students |  | First-generation students minus native students |  | Second-generation students minus native students |  | First-generation students minus native students |  |
|  | Difference | S.E. | Difference | S.E. | Difference | S.E. | Difference | S.E. |
| Australia | -5 | (4.4) | 0 | (5.0) | -3 | (4.2) | 4 | (4.5) |
| Austria | -43 | (10.1) | -56 | (6.9) | -33 | (11.1) | -44 | (8.5) |
| Belgium | -76 | (8.4) | -104 | (11.0) | -62 | (9.1) | -90 | (12.5) |
| Canada | 7 | (4.5) | -1 | (4.6) | 13 | (4.5) | 11 | (5.5) |
| Denmark | -70 | (13.2) | -61 | (10.9) | -71 | (13.0) | -63 | (11.6) |
| France | -42 | (5.9) | -64 | (17.6) | -34 | (6.6) | -50 | (18.1) |
| Germany | -86 | (11.4) | -58 | (8.9) | -68 | (10.8) | -40 | (9.3) |
| Luxembourg | -28 | (4.2) | -44 | (4.0) | -13 | (6.3) | -25 | (7.5) |
| Netherlands | -56 | (11.7) | -77 | (10.5) | -45 | (11.4) | -57 | (12.5) |
| New Zealand | -36 | (10.4) | -7 | (6.4) | -30 | (10.6) | 4 | (7.7) |
| Norway | -32 | (13.2) | -54 | (10.6) | -33 | (16.5) | -55 | (18.2) |
| Sweden | -25 | (9.6) | -79 | (9.2) | -18 | (8.0) | -67 | (11.8) |
| Switzerland | -50 | (5.9) | -80 | (6.0) | -42 | (6.3) | -65 | (7.8) |
| United States | -16 | (7.4) | -32 | (7.6) | 2 | (7.5) | -4 | (8.0) |
| OECD average | -33 | (2.2) | -42 | (2.1) | -22 | (2.2) | -25 | (2.4) |
| Hong Kong-China | 14 | (4.6) | -40 | (4.7) | 13 | (4.6) | -39 | (4.5) |
| Macao-China | 5 | (8.0) | -9 | (10.8) | 4 | (8.0) | -10 | (10.7) |
| Russian Federation | -14 | (7.2) | -20 | (5.6) | -14 | (7.2) | -17 | (5.4) |
| Belgium (Flemish Community) | -98 | (14.8) | -90 | (11.3) | -70 | (16.1) | -66 | (12.9) |
| Belgium (French Community) | -45 | (9.5) | -93 | (14.8) | -36 | (9.7) | -84 | (15.6) |

Note: Differences that are statistically significant are indicated in bold.

Table 2.6b
Comparison of differences in reading scores between immigrant and native students accounting for language differences


Note: Differences that are statistically significant are indicated in bold.

Table 2.7
Mean score and gender differences in student performance on the mathematics and reading scales，by immigrant status

|  |  |  | orman | on the | mathe | atics s |  |  | rform | nce on | e rea | ng sca |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Native | dents |  |  |  |  | Native | dents |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Differen | （F－M） |  |  |  |  | Differe | （F－M） |
|  |  | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． |
| ๕ | Australia | 529 | （2．9） | 525 | （2．5） | 4 | （3．3） | 509 | （2．8） | 550 | （2．2） | －41 | （3．2） |
| 产 | Austria | 520 | （4．2） | 510 | （4．0） | 10 | （4．8） | 479 | （4．8） | 523 | （4．3） | －44 | （5．9） |
| $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | Belgium | 550 | （3．8） | 540 | （2．8） | 10 | （4．6） | 507 | （4．0） | 541 | （2．9） | －34 | （4．7） |
| － | Canada | 543 | （2．0） | 531 | （1．9） | 12 | （2．3） | 518 | （2．1） | 549 | （1．9） | －31 | （2．3） |
| 岕 | Denmark | 528 | （3．2） | 512 | （2．8） | 17 | （3．2） | 484 | （3．2） | 509 | （3．0） | －25 | （3．1） |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | France | 525 | （3．5） | 515 | （2．8） | 10 | （4．2） | 486 | （3．6） | 524 | （3．0） | －38 | （4．2） |
|  | Germany | 532 | （4．1） | 520 | （4．0） | 12 | （4．0） | 497 | （4．3） | 537 | （3．8） | －39 | （4．2） |
|  | Luxembourg | 518 | （2．4） | 497 | （2．0） | 22 | （3．7） | 486 | （2．9） | 514 | （2．3） | －28 | （3．8） |
|  | Netherlands | 553 | （4．0） | 549 | （3．4） | 4 | （4．2） | 513 | （3．8） | 536 | （3．1） | －22 | （3．9） |
|  | New Zealand | 536 | （3．2） | 521 | （3．4） | 15 | （4．0） | 514 | （3．8） | 543 | （3．5） | －29 | （4．6） |
|  | Norway | 503 | （2．8） | 495 | （2．8） | 7 | （3．1） | 480 | （3．2） | 529 | （3．2） | －50 | （3．4） |
| ® | Sweden | 520 | （2．8） | 515 | （2．9） | 5 | （3．4） | 503 | （2．6） | 541 | （2．7） | －39 | （3．3） |
| 产 | Switzerland | 552 | （4．7） | 533 | （3．8） | 18 | （5．2） | 498 | （4．5） | 533 | （3．0） | －34 | （5．0） |
| $\bigcirc$ | United States | 494 | （3．2） | 486 | （3．2） | 8 | （3．0） | 488 | （3．6） | 518 | （3．5） | －30 | （3．5） |
| $\bigcirc$ | OECD average | 529 | （1．0） | 517 | （0．8） | 11 | （1．0） | 497 | （1．0） | 531 | （0．8） | －34 | （1．0） |
| ＝ | Hong Kong－China | 558 | （6．5） | 556 | （4．9） | 2 | （7．0） | 496 | （5．3） | 529 | （3．7） | －33 | （5．8） |
| 者 | Macao－China | 548 | （8．1） | 512 | （7．6） | 37 | （10．9） | 493 | （6．9） | 503 | （6．5） | －10 | （8．8） |
| － | Russian Federation | 478 | （5．5） | 465 | （4．4） | 13 | （4．4） | 433 | （4．7） | 459 | （4．0） | －27 | （4．1） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 574 | （4．6） | 559 | （3．2） | －15 | （5．4） | 529 | （4．5） | 557 | （3．3） | 28 | （5．4） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 516 | （6．6） | 512 | （4．7） | －4 | （7．8） | 475 | （7．0） | 515 | （5．3） | 40 | （8．8） |


|  |  | Second－generation students |  |  |  |  |  | Second－generation students |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Males |  | Females |  | Difference（F－M） |  | Males |  | Females |  | Difference（F－M） |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． |
| ๕ | Australia | 526 | （7．3） | 518 | （6．3） | 8 | （9．9） | 505 | （7．3） | 544 | （6．4） | －38 | （9．9） |
| ＋ | Austria | 470 | （10．9） | 444 | （13．2） | 26 | （16．5） | 410 | （11．7） | 452 | （22．6） | －42 | （22．1） |
| $\stackrel{5}{0}$ | Belgium | 458 | （9．5） | 450 | （8．4） | 8 | （10．1） | 419 | （10．0） | 460 | （9．4） | －41 | （12．2） |
| － | Canada | 553 | （5．9） | 534 | （4．7） | 19 | （6．2） | 532 | （5．4） | 554 | （4．7） | －22 | （5．7） |
| ¢ | Denmark | 470 | （16．3） | 432 | （12．5） | 38 | （17．8） | 425 | （17．6） | 452 | （15．6） | －28 | （18．7） |
| $\stackrel{\text { O }}{ }$ | France | 470 | （10．0） | 474 | （7．1） | －5 | （11．8） | 433 | （10．2） | 476 | （7．4） | －43 | （12．4） |
|  | Germany | 441 | （11．2） | 429 | （10．4） | 12 | （11．9） | 396 | （11．9） | 446 | （10．2） | －50 | （12．3） |
|  | Luxembourg | 481 | （5．2） | 472 | （4．2） | 10 | （6．7） | 433 | （5．9） | 474 | （4．9） | －41 | （7．3） |
|  | Netherlands | 510 | （12．7） | 476 | （10．8） | 34 | （12．5） | 478 | （11．4） | 472 | （8．8） | 5 | （12．0） |
|  | New Zealand | 490 | （10．7） | 502 | （10．3） | －12 | （12．6） | 481 | （11．0） | 532 | （10．3） | －51 | （14．7） |
|  | Norway | 476 | （15．3） | 443 | （17．6） | 33 | （23．6） | 446 | （15．8） | 446 | （17．5） | 1 | （24．6） |
| － | Sweden | 495 | （12．1） | 472 | （11．8） | 23 | （14．4） | 491 | （11．9） | 511 | （10．0） | －20 | （13．0） |
| 호 | Switzerland | 491 | （7．1） | 475 | （6．8） | 16 | （9．5） | 447 | （7．2） | 479 | （6．8） | －32 | （9．8） |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ }$ | United States | 474 | （9．7） | 461 | （8．8） | 13 | （10．7） | 471 | （9．8） | 493 | （10．9） | －22 | （11．6） |
| 8 | OECD average | 489 | （2．6） | 477 | （2．5） | 12 | （2．8） | 458 | （2．8） | 491 | （2．6） | －33 | （3．2） |
| む | Hong Kong－China | 572 | （7．1） | 568 | （5．6） |  | （9．0） | 507 | （6．0） | 538 | （4．7） | －31 | （7．7） |
| $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ | Macao－China | 540 | （6．3） | 524 | （5．0） | 16 | （7．9） | 491 | （4．6） | 503 | （3．9） | －12 | （6．2） |
| － | Russian Federation | 455 | （8．3） | 461 | （9．9） | －5 | （11．1） | 414 | （8．7） | 445 | （7．1） | －31 | （10．0） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 455 | （15．9） | 436 | （11．2） | －18 | （17．7） | 423 | （16．9） | 454 | （11．8） | 31 | （19．5） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 459 | （11．5） | 458 | （12．0） | －2 | （13．4） | 417 | （12．6） | 463 | （13．7） | 47 | （16．5） |


|  |  | First－generation students |  |  |  |  |  | First－generation students |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Males |  | Females |  | Difference（F－M） |  | Males |  | Females |  | Difference（F－M） |  |
|  |  | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score <br> dif． | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Mean score | S．E． | Score dif． | S．E． |
| ๕ | Australia | 531 | （7．6） | 519 | （8．1） | 12 | （12．3） | 504 | （7．9） | 531 | （7．5） | －27 | （11．5） |
| き | Austria | 451 | （8．6） | 452 | （7．1） | －1 | （10．6） | 400 | （10．0） | 455 | （9．5） | －55 | （12．6） |
| $\stackrel{5}{0}$ | Belgium | 437 | （14．0） | 436 | （12．6） | 0 | （16．5） | 387 | （14．7） | 437 | （14．2） | －50 | （17．0） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 533 | （6．5） | 528 | （5．3） | 5 | （7．2） | 498 | （6．5） | 532 | （6．0） | －34 | （8．5） |
| ¢ | Denmark | 450 | （12．5） | 459 | （13．5） | －9 | （16．6） | 437 | （13．7） | 472 | （12．9） | －35 | （19．1） |
| $\bigcirc$ | France | 449 | （16．8） | 446 | （18．3） | 3 | （18．4） | 403 | （18．0） | 449 | （19．3） | －46 | （20．9） |
|  | Germany | 466 | （9．3） | 446 | （9．0） | 21 | （10．5） | 420 | （11．3） | 443 | （10．6） | －23 | （12．9） |
|  | Luxembourg | 472 | （5．7） | 451 | （4．8） | 22 | （7．6） | 418 | （6．7） | 446 | （5．4） | －27 | （8．6） |
|  | Netherlands | 482 | （10．9） | 463 | （11．4） | 19 | （14．7） | 458 | （10．8） | 469 | （10．1） | －11 | （13．2） |
|  | New Zealand | 537 | （5．9） | 510 | （7．3） | 26 | （9．2） | 498 | （7．6） | 508 | （7．9） | －10 | （11．3） |
|  | Norway | 431 | （12．5） | 446 | （12．3） | －15 | （16．5） | 406 | （14．6） | 468 | （14．1） | －62 | （17．9） |
| ๕ | Sweden | 427 | （14．0） | 424 | （9．4） | 3 | （14．1） | 416 | （15．4） | 449 | （10．9） | －33 | （14．0） |
| 혿 | Switzerland | 459 | （8．1） | 447 | （7．3） | 12 | （9．6） | 405 | （7．9） | 441 | （7．9） | －37 | （9．9） |
| $\stackrel{5}{\square}$ | United States | 460 | （8．6） | 445 | （10．8） | 15 | （12．2） | 440 | （9．3） | 469 | （12．7） | －29 | （14．6） |
| $\bigcirc$ | OECD average | 479 | （2．8） | 470 | （2．3） | 10 | （3．4） | 440 | （3．0） | 474 | （2．8） | －34 | （4．0） |
| ジ | Hong Kong－China | 520 | （9．4） | 512 | （4．9） | 8 | （10．2） | 480 | （8．2） | 507 | （4．3） | －27 | （9．0） |
| 此 | Macao－China | 523 | （14．5） | 510 | （8．2） | 13 | （15．1） | 487 | （11．5） | 512 | （7．3） | －26 | （13．1） |
| － | Russian Federation | 454 | （8．2） | 449 | （8．3） | 6 | （11．5） | 401 | （9．6） | 429 | （9．6） | －28 | （12．4） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 483 | （11．4） | 459 | （14．6） | －25 | （18．0） | 437 | （13．2） | 464 | （15．3） | 27 | （18．7） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 418 | （17．2） | 421 | （17．5） |  | （20．2） | 368 | （18．1） | 418 | （20．5） | 50 | （21．6） |

[^6]Table 2.8
Three most common countries of origin for immigrant students in each case country


Note: Differences that are statistically significant are indicated in bold.

1. These categories are chosen by countries.
2. Authors' calculations.

Table 2.9
Comparison of performance levels for immigrant students whose families came from Turkey and the former Yugoslavia

|  |  |  |  | migran | stud |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Differ | in |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tur |  |  |  | Former Y | goslavia |  |  |  | Differen | e in | mathem | atics |
|  |  | icipating <br> udents | Perform the mat |  |  | icipating <br> udents | Perform the mat |  | Native | udents | perform between student Turkish im stude | ance <br> native and aigrant ts | between student immigrant from the Yugos | native <br> and <br> tudents <br> ormer <br> via |
|  | N | $\begin{gathered} \text { Weighted } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Mean score | S.E. | N | $\begin{gathered} \text { Weighted } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. | Difference | S.E. | Difference | S.E. |
| Austria | 141 | 25.9 | 423 | (8.9) | 276 | 47.2 | 456 | (6.7) | 515 | (3.3) | -92 | (9.1) | -59 | (7.6) |
| Belgium | 140 | 14.8 | 421 | (13.1) | c | c | c | c | 546 | (2.5) | -125 | (12.8) | c | c |
| Denmark | 53 | 32.1 | 424 | (12.4) | c | c | c | c | 520 | (2.5) | -95 | (12.3) | c | c |
| Germany | 197 | 32.1 | 405 | (10.8) | 45 | 7.0 | 448 | (17.0) | 525 | (3.5) | -120 | (11.6) | -78 | (17.0) |
| Luxembourg | c | c | c | c | 92 | 7.3 | 421 | (10.2) | 507 | (1.3) | c | c | -86 | (10.2) |
| Switzerland | 142 | 8.5 | 436 | (10.4) | 408 | 23.0 | 460 | (7.3) | 543 | (3.3) | -106 | (10.3) | -82 | (8.0) |

[^7]Table 3.1
Highest level of parental education (in years of schooling) by immigrant status

|  | Highest level of parental education in years of schooling ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Native students |  | Second-generation students |  | First-generation students |  |
|  | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. | Mean | S.E. |
| \% Australia | 13.1 | (0.04) | 12.6 | (0.13) | 13.5 | (0.15) |
| $\stackrel{\text { F }}{\text { ¢ }}$ Austria | 13.2 | (0.06) | 11.1 | (0.31) | 12.3 | (0.24) |
| O Belgium | 13.8 | (0.05) | 10.7 | (0.33) | 12.1 | (0.30) |
| 岂 Canada | 14.5 | (0.04) | 14.4 | (0.13) | 15.2 | (0.14) |
| Denmark | 14.6 | (0.07) | 11.8 | (0.64) | 13.3 | (0.50) |
| France | 12.4 | (0.05) | 9.3 | (0.29) | 9.7 | (0.54) |
| Germany | 13.9 | (0.06) | 9.0 | (0.47) | 8.7 | (0.43) |
| Luxembourg | 14.5 | (0.06) | 11.4 | (0.26) | 11.2 | (0.25) |
| Netherlands | 13.1 | (0.06) | 10.0 | (0.39) | 11.6 | (0.46) |
| New Zealand | 13.5 | (0.07) | 12.1 | (0.33) | 13.8 | (0.18) |
| Norway | 14.6 | (0.04) | 13.7 | (0.43) | 13.7 | (0.39) |
| Sweden | 13.6 | (0.05) | 12.2 | (0.37) | 12.3 | (0.36) |
| Switzerland | 12.6 | (0.06) | 10.7 | (0.17) | 10.9 | (0.19) |
| $\because$ United States | 13.8 | (0.05) | 11.9 | (0.32) | 12.1 | (0.27) |
| OECD average | 13.7 | (0.02) | 11.4 | (0.09) | 12.3 | (0.08) |
| ¢ Hong Kong-China | 10.3 | (0.12) | 9.2 | (0.11) | 8.7 | (0.12) |
| 义 Macao-China | 10.0 | (0.31) | 9.3 | (0.16) | 9.3 | (0.31) |
| гণ Russian Federation | 13.3 | (0.04) | 13.2 | (0.10) | 13.3 | (0.09) |
| Belgium (Flemish Community) | 13.7 | (0.06) | 10.2 | (0.41) | 12.0 | (0.58) |
| Belgium (French Community) | 14.0 | (0.08) | 11.0 | (0.48) | 12.2 | (0.37) |

Note: Statistically significant differences from native students' scores are indicated in bold.

1. Table A1.1 in Annex A1 shows conversions used for years of schooling.

Table 3.2
Distribution of the index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) by immigrant status (scores standardised within each country sample)


[^8]Table 3.3
Differences between native and immigrant students in mathematics performance and
highest level of parental education (in years of schooling)


Note: Statistically significant differences are indicated in bold.

1. Table A1.1 in Annex A1 shows conversions used for years of schooling.

Table 3.4
Differences between native and immigrant students in mathematics performance and parents' economic, social and cultural status (ESCS)

|  |  | Difference in mathematics score |  |  |  | Difference in the index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Second-generation students minus native students |  | First-generation students minus native students |  | Second-generation students minus native students |  | First-generation students minus native students |  |
|  |  | Difference | S.E. | Difference | S.E. | Difference | S.E. | Difference | S.E. |
| \# | Australia | -5 | (4.7) | -2 | (4.9) | -0.20 | (0.04) | 0.00 | (0.05) |
| 衰 | Austria | -56 | (9.3) | -63 | (6.0) | -0.64 | (0.09) | -0.59 | (0.05) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | -92 | (7.6) | -109 | (10.9) | -0.85 | (0.07) | -0.65 | (0.07) |
|  | Canada | 6 | (4.4) | -7 | (4.8) | -0.06 | (0.04) | 0.13 | (0.04) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | -70 | (11.1) | -65 | (9.8) | -0.75 | (0.12) | -0.55 | (0.10) |
|  | France | -48 | (6.6) | -72 | (15.0) | -0.83 | (0.07) | -0.74 | (0.13) |
|  | Germany | -93 | (9.6) | -71 | (7.9) | -1.08 | (0.09) | -1.07 | (0.08) |
|  | Luxembourg | -31 | (3.7) | -45 | (4.1) | -0.64 | (0.06) | -0.84 | (0.05) |
|  | Netherlands | -59 | (11.1) | -79 | (8.8) | -0.78 | (0.10) | -0.58 | (0.11) |
|  | New Zealand | -32 | (9.1) | -5 | (5.6) | -0.37 | (0.08) | 0.08 | (0.05) |
|  | Norway | -39 | (11.3) | -61 | (9.4) | -0.33 | (0.12) | -0.47 | (0.10) |
|  | Sweden | -34 | (9.1) | -92 | (9.7) | -0.50 | (0.07) | -0.61 | (0.08) |
|  | Switzerland | -59 | (4.9) | -89 | (6.0) | -0.57 | (0.05) | -0.70 | (0.05) |
| , | United States | -22 | (7.2) | -36 | (7.5) | -0.52 | (0.10) | -0.59 | (0.08) |
|  | OECD average | -40 | (2.0) | -48 | (2.1) | -0.58 | (0.02) | -0.47 | (0.02) |
| - | Hong Kong-China | 13 | (4.3) | -41 | (4.5) | -0.31 | (0.03) | -0.55 | (0.04) |
| \# | Macao-China | 4 | (7.9) | -11 | (10.4) | -0.28 | (0.07) | -0.37 | (0.09) |
| $\bigcirc$ | Russian Federation | -14 | (7.2) | -20 | (5.4) | -0.03 | (0.05) | -0.03 | (0.05) |
|  | Belgium (Flemish Community) | -122 | (11.3) | -95 | (9.9) | -0.99 | (0.09) | -0.55 | (0.13) |
|  | Belgium (French Community) | -56 | (9.3) | -94 | (14.4) | -0.77 | (0.10) | -0.70 | (0.08) |

[^9]Table 3.5
Regression estimates of mathematics performance on immigrant status, parental education (in years of schooling), parents' occupational status (HISEI), language spoken at home and age at immigration

| थ Australia <br> 产  <br> 0  <br> 0  <br> 0  <br> 0  <br> 0  |  | Regression |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Explained } \\ \text { variance } \\ \text { (unique) } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | Missing <br> (un- <br> weighted) <br> Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Model 1 |  | Model 2 |  | Model 3 |  | Model 4 |  | Model 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | B | S.E. | B | S.E. | B | S.E. | B | S.E. | B | S.E. |  |  |
|  | Second-generation | -5.2 | (4.43) | -1.9 | (4.12) | 1.8 | (4.01) | 1.9 | (3.80) | 1.6 | (3.73) | 0.0 |  |
|  | First-generation | 0.1 | (5.01) | -5.4 | (4.86) | -4.7 | (4.84) | -4.4 | (4.43) | 2.6 | (6.42) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 8.5 | (0.62) | 4.1 | (0.57) | 4.1 | (0.57) | 4.1 | (0.58) | 0.8 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.6 | (0.07) | 1.6 | (0.07) | 1.6 | (0.07) | 6.1 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.6 | (5.05) | 0.8 | (5.18) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.5 | (0.63) | 0.1 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.00 |  | 0.04 |  | 0.10 |  | 0.10 |  | 0.11 |  | 9.8 |
| Austria | Second-generation | -42.6 | (10.11) | -27.6 | (9.80) | -25.3 | (10.00) | -23.5 | (10.74) | -23.9 | (10.74) | 0.2 |  |
|  | First-generation | -55.6 | (6.90) | -48.1 | (6.82) | -38.4 | (6.83) | -36.3 | (7.72) | -29.2 | (9.99) | 0.2 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 7.1 | (0.85) | 3.3 | (0.80) | 3.3 | (0.80) | 3.4 | (0.80) | 0.8 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | (0.13) | 1.4 | (0.13) | 1.4 | (0.13) | 5.2 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -2.9 | (7.97) | -2.3 | (8.01) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.3 | (1.56) | 0.2 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.03 |  | 0.07 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.13 |  | 8.5 |
| Belgium | Second-generation | -75.8 | (8.41) | -55.0 | (7.95) | -50.6 | (7.51) | -40.9 | (7.92) | -40.7 | (8.05) | 0.6 |  |
|  | First-generation | -103.6 | (10.99) | -89.0 | (10.38) | -83.0 | (9.54) | -73.7 | (10.55) | -25.4 | (9.98) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 7.9 | (0.51) | 3.0 | (0.49) | 2.9 | (0.49) | 2.9 | (0.48) | 0.6 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.8 | (0.11) | 1.8 | (0.11) | 1.8 | (0.11) | 7.2 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -30.6 | (9.07) | -32.1 | (9.14) | 0.3 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -5.2 | (1.05) | 0.8 |  |
|  | R -squared |  | 0.06 |  | 0.11 |  | 0.18 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.19 |  | 19.1 |
| Canada | Second-generation | 7.4 | (4.47) | 8.0 | (4.27) | 10.6 | (4.09) | 14.1 | (4.23) | 13.9 | (4.25) | 0.2 |  |
|  | First-generation | -1.1 | (4.65) | -6.4 | (4.68) | -6.0 | (4.53) | 1.9 | (5.43) | 7.0 | (7.38) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 6.8 | (0.45) | 3.3 | (0.43) | 3.3 | (0.43) | 3.3 | (0.43) | 0.7 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | (0.07) | 1.2 | (0.08) | 1.2 | (0.08) | 4.1 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -11.9 | (5.18) | -11.4 | (5.18) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.7 | (0.77) | 0.1 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.00 |  | 0.04 |  | 0.08 |  | 0.08 |  | 0.08 |  | 10.8 |
| Denmark | Second-generation | -69.6 | (13.24) | -49.4 | (13.98) | -45.3 | (13.13) | -47.4 | (12.89) | -48.2 | (12.77) | 0.7 |  |
|  | First-generation | -60.9 | (10.89) | -55.3 | (12.21) | -52.5 | (12.04) | -55.3 | (12.77) | -18.0 | (13.53) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 8.2 | (0.74) | 5.1 | (0.70) | 5.1 | (0.70) | 5.2 | (0.69) | 1.9 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | (0.11) | 1.3 | (0.11) | 1.3 | (0.11) | 4.5 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.6 | (10.06) | 7.2 | (9.72) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -6.5 | (1.53) | 0.5 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.03 |  | 0.08 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.13 |  | 9.0 |
| France | Second-generation | -42.3 | (5.94) | -20.8 | (6.10) | -18.4 | (5.90) | -15.6 | (6.31) | -15.9 | (6.33) | 0.2 |  |
|  | First-generation | -64.4 | (17.56) | -45.9 | (14.61) | -47.4 | (14.35) | -42.5 | (15.21) | -13.7 | (14.65) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 7.6 | (0.68) | 3.2 | (0.67) | 3.1 | (0.69) | 3.1 | (0.69) | 0.7 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | (0.13) | 1.5 | (0.13) | 1.5 | (0.13) | 6.2 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -9.6 | (9.52) | -8.8 | (9.22) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -4.3 | (1.81) | 0.3 |  |
|  | R -squared |  | 0.03 |  | 0.08 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.15 |  | 12.0 |
| Germany | Second-generation | -86.0 | (11.37) | -57.2 | (10.31) | -51.3 | (9.26) | -35.9 | (9.89) | -40.5 | (9.20) | 0.7 |  |
|  | First-generation | -58.0 | (8.88) | -24.9 | (9.36) | -24.5 | (8.98) | -9.1 | (9.05) | 13.6 | (11.51) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 6.6 | (0.63) | 3.3 | (0.61) | 3.2 | (0.59) | 3.2 | (0.60) | 1.1 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.8 | (0.11) | 1.8 | (0.11) | 1.8 | (0.11) | 7.7 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -35.6 | (9.20) | -25.3 | (9.80) | 0.2 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -5.7 | (1.85) | 0.4 |  |
|  | R -squared |  | 0.07 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.20 |  | 0.20 |  | 20.8 |
| Luxembourg | Second-generation | -28.3 | (4.23) | -13.2 | (4.43) | -10.1 | (4.36) | -9.9 | (5.95) | -10.3 | (6.05) | 0.1 |  |
|  | First-generation | -44.3 | (4.03) | -28.4 | (4.21) | -20.9 | (4.19) | -20.7 | (7.28) | -11.9 | (8.30) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 4.7 | (0.32) | 1.8 | (0.38) | 1.8 | (0.39) | 1.8 | (0.39) | 0.6 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.7 | (0.13) | 1.7 | (0.13) | 1.7 | (0.13) | 6.5 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.3 | (7.42) | 0.1 | (7.58) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.9 | (1.08) | 0.1 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.04 |  | 0.09 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.16 |  | 21.1 |

Note: Statistically significant coefficients are indicated in bold. For the variable Age at immigration the number of missing values is particularly high, therefore mean substitution is used and a dummy variable indicating whether or not the age at immigration is missing was included in the regression model. Table A1.1 in Annex A1 shows the conversions used for the variable Parental education in years of schooling.

Table 3.5 (continued)
Regression estimates of mathematics performance on immigrant status, parental education (in years of schooling), parents' occupational status (HISEI), language spoken at home and age at immigration

|  |  | Regression |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Explained } \\ \text { variance } \\ \text { (unique) } \end{array}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|c}\text { Missing } \\ \text { (un- } \\ \text { weighted) }\end{array}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Model 1 |  | Model 2 |  | Model 3 |  | Model 4 |  | Model 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | B | S.E. | B | S.E. | B | S.E. | B | S.E. | B | S.E. |  |  |
| Netherlands | Second-generation | -55.6 | (11.69) | -40.3 | (10.96) | -38.1 | (9.85) | -32.1 | (9.84) | -33.0 | (9.88) | 0.7 |  |
|  | First-generation | -77.3 | (10.48) | -69.7 | (10.47) | -66.3 | (9.95) | -54.6 | (11.83) | -36.4 | (13.99) | 0.2 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 7.1 | (0.71) | 2.5 | (0.77) | 2.4 | (0.77) | 2.4 | (0.76) | 0.4 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.6 | (0.13) | 1.6 | (0.13) | 1.6 | (0.13) | 6.6 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -21.4 | (10.92) | -19.0 | (11.03) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -3.2 | (1.60) | 0.2 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.04 |  | 0.08 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.15 |  | 15.0 |
| New Zealand | Second-generation | -35.9 | (10.39) | -25.8 | (10.47) | -22.8 | (9.44) | -20.0 | (9.51) | -20.4 | (9.46) | 0.3 |  |
|  | First-generation | -7.5 | (6.43) | -9.5 | (6.22) | -14.9 | (6.13) | -8.9 | (7.07) | 2.4 | (10.66) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 6.8 | (0.58) | 4.4 | (0.58) | 4.3 | (0.59) | 4.4 | (0.59) | 2.0 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | (0.11) | 1.5 | (0.11) | 1.5 | (0.11) | 5.7 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -12.0 | (8.63) | -10.7 | (8.72) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.3 | (0.91) | 0.1 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.01 |  | 0.06 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.12 |  | 26.3 |
| Norway | Second-generation | -32.1 | (13.23) | -22.5 | (11.88) | -25.6 | (11.17) | -28.2 | (15.07) | -29.7 | (15.16) | 0.1 |  |
|  | First-generation | -53.9 | (10.61) | -47.1 | (10.27) | -40.3 | (9.97) | -44.5 | (16.61) | -30.2 | (17.04) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 8.2 | (0.74) | 3.2 | (0.77) | 3.2 | (0.77) | 3.3 | (0.77) | 0.4 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | (0.11) | 1.5 | (0.11) | 1.5 | (0.11) | 5.4 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | (15.75) | 7.6 | (15.99) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -2.6 | (1.45) | 0.1 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.01 |  | 0.04 |  | 0.10 |  | 0.10 |  | 0.10 |  | 8.6 |
| Sweden | Second-generation | -25.2 | (9.59) | -20.1 | (9.27) | -12.5 | (9.70) | -4.8 | (8.36) | -5.3 | (8.63) | 0.0 |  |
|  | First-generation | -78.8 | (9.15) | -74.7 | (9.06) | -69.3 | (8.37) | -56.2 | (11.54) | -48.8 | (11.74) | 0.5 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 5.3 | (0.61) | 2.2 | (0.58) | 2.2 | (0.59) | 2.2 | (0.60) | 0.4 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | (0.12) | 1.5 | (0.12) | 1.5 | (0.12) | 5.9 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -17.7 | (10.36) | -16.1 | (10.59) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.6 | (1.75) | 0.2 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.04 |  | 0.06 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.12 |  | 12.4 |
| Switzerland | Second-generation | -49.9 | (5.92) | -35.9 | (6.00) | -31.0 | (5.84) | -28.7 | (6.06) | -29.7 | (6.04) | 0.6 |  |
|  | First-generation | -79.9 | (6.00) | -65.3 | (5.58) | -56.7 | (5.50) | -52.2 | (6.67) | -34.9 | (10.64) | 0.4 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 8.9 | (0.77) | 6.3 | (0.71) | 6.3 | (0.71) | 6.4 | (0.71) | 2.6 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | (0.10) | 1.1 | (0.10) | 1.1 | (0.10) | 2.7 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -7.3 | (7.48) | -4.5 | (7.48) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -3.7 | (1.21) | 0.4 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.07 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.16 |  | 12.3 |
| United States | Second-generation | -16.1 | (7.43) | -3.0 | (6.61) | -0.4 | (6.06) | 8.8 | (6.21) | 8.3 | (6.17) | 0.0 |  |
|  | First-generation | -32.1 | (7.58) | -19.8 | (7.36) | -14.7 | (6.58) | 0.1 | (7.32) | 13.5 | (10.16) | 0.0 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 8.2 | (0.60) | 4.4 | (0.59) | 4.2 | (0.58) | 4.3 | (0.59) | 1.1 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | (0.10) | 1.5 | (0.10) | 1.5 | (0.10) | 5.9 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -22.2 | (7.13) | -21.0 | (7.27) | 0.2 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -2.2 | (1.38) | 0.1 |  |
|  | R-squared |  | 0.01 |  | 0.06 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.12 |  | 11.2 |
| OECD average | Second-generation | -32.9 | (2.16) | -20.4 | (2.19) | -17.3 | (2.11) | -11.5 | (2.10) | -11.8 | (2.09) | 0.1 |  |
|  | First-generation | -42.1 | (2.08) | -34.0 | (2.10) | -30.4 | (1.94) | -21.1 | (2.13) | -14.1 | (2.83) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Parental education in years of schooling |  |  | 6.3 | (0.14) | 2.9 | (0.15) | 2.8 | (0.15) | 2.9 | (0.15) | 0.7 |  |
|  | Parents' occupational status |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | (0.03) | 1.5 | (0.03) | 1.5 | (0.03) | 5.6 |  |
|  | Foreign language spoken at home |  |  |  |  |  |  | -15.3 | (2.01) | -14.5 | (2.02) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Age at immigration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.3 | (0.36) | 0.1 |  |
|  | $R$-squared |  | 0.02 |  | 0.06 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.12 |  | 14.1 |

Note: Statistically significant coefficients are indicated in bold. For the variable Age at immigration the number of missing values is particularly high, therefore mean substitution is used and a dummy variable indicating whether or not the age at immigration is missing was included in the regression model. Table A1.1 in Annex A1 shows the conversions used for the variable Parental education in years of schooling.

Table 3.5 (continued)
Regression estimates of mathematics performance on immigrant status, parental education (in years of schooling), parents' occupational status (HISEI), language spoken at home and age at immigration


Note: Statistically significant coefficients are indicated in bold. For the variable Age at immigration the number of missing values is particularly high, therefore mean substitution is used and a dummy variable indicating whether or not the age at immigration is missing was included in the regression model. Table A1.1 in Annex A1 shows the conversions used for the variable Parental education in years of schooling.

Table 3.6
Between- and within-school variance in student performance in mathematics


Note: The variance components were estimated for all students with data on immigrant status.

1. Accounting for immigrant student status slightly increases the school-level variance in Canada, thus resulting in a negative estimate for explained between-school variance.

Table 3.7a
Percentage of second-generation students attending schools with different sized immigrant student populations (first- and second-generation students combined)

|  |  | Proportion of immigrant students within the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \% \text { to } \\ & <10 \% \end{aligned}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 10 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <20 \% \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 20 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <30 \% \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 30 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <40 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 40 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <50 \% \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 50 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <60 \% \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 60 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <70 \% \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ \text { or } \\ \text { higher } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | Total |
|  | Australia | 7.6 | (1.07) | 14.0 | (2.23) | 17.3 | (3.04) | 15.1 | (3.06) | 10.2 | (3.49) | 9.4 | (3.06) | 6.5 | (2.84) | 19.8 | (5.01) | 100.0 |
| + | Austria | 12.6 | (3.11) | 14.3 | (3.96) | 16.9 | (6.08) | 11.6 | (5.17) | 3.6 | (3.50) | 15.9 | (6.13) | 9.8 | (6.96) | 15.3 | (5.56) | 100.0 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 17.6 | (2.76) | 21.3 | (3.91) | 19.9 | (4.81) | 10.7 | (3.18) | 5.5 | (3.43) | 7.1 | (4.38) | 2.1 | (1.30) | 15.8 | (7.24) | 100.0 |
| Uي山 | Canada | 9.5 | (1.20) | 8.9 | (1.47) | 13.2 | (2.05) | 12.1 | (3.02) | 9.6 | (2.25) | 14.9 | (3.52) | 6.9 | (2.72) | 24.9 | (4.38) | 100.0 |
|  | Denmark | 25.1 | (5.35) | 25.7 | (6.81) | 7.6 | (4.48) | 7.2 | (4.11) | 5.3 | (3.60) | 3.7 | (3.67) | 4.9 | (4.87) | 20.6 | (11.64) | 100.0 |
|  | France | 10.4 | (2.22) | 21.9 | (4.52) | 13.6 | (3.56) | 14.8 | (3.87) | 20.9 | (5.93) | 4.5 | (3.13) | 6.5 | (4.43) | 7.5 | (4.22) | 100.0 |
|  | Germany | 7.9 | (1.85) | 11.1 | (3.06) | 18.3 | (4.31) | 12.9 | (3.77) | 13.4 | (4.97) | 13.3 | (5.46) | 10.5 | (5.22) | 12.7 | (6.96) | 100.0 |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.6 | (0.32) | 15.1 | (1.29) | 23.2 | (1.39) | 9.7 | (1.02) | 26.1 | (1.72) | 6.5 | (0.89) | 6.1 | (0.82) | 12.7 | (1.05) | 100.0 |
|  | Netherlands | 15.6 | (3.68) | 25.9 | (6.07) | 11.8 | (4.76) | 0.0 | c | 3.9 | (3.92) | 16.4 | (7.83) | 5.0 | (4.91) | 21.3 | (8.90) | 100.0 |
|  | New Zealand | 9.3 | (2.11) | 12.7 | (2.50) | 8.4 | (2.50) | 17.5 | (4.87) | 14.4 | (4.13) | 9.9 | (2.95) | 2.7 | (2.64) | 25.3 | (7.98) | 100.0 |
|  | Norwa | 26.3 | (6.63) | 23.9 | (7.42) | 12.4 | (6.80) | 6.4 | (4.48) | 24.4 | (12.0 | 6.7 | (6.39) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | C | 100.0 |
|  | Sweden | 14.4 | (2.58) | 22.4 | (4.76) | 23.4 | (5.88) | 12.1 | (5.31) | 11.3 | (5.2 | 0.6 | (0.58) | 9.2 | (5.80) | 6.6 | (2.38) | 100.0 |
|  | Switzerland | 5.0 | (1.14) | 25.3 | (3.59) | 25.0 | (3.67) | 10.7 | (2.80) | 6.1 | (1.5) | 17.0 | (3.73) | 4.4 | (1.40) | 6.5 | (2.87) | 100.0 |
| ๕ | United States | 7.6 | (1.62) | 12.1 | (2.55) | 11.5 | (3.38) | 13.5 | (3.48) | 19.5 | (4.64) | 6.7 | (2.84) | 9.6 | (4.22) | 19.5 | (6.39) | 100.0 |
|  | OECD average | 9.6 | (0.48) | 17.5 | (0.99) | 16.5 | (1.13) | 12.1 | (0.94) | 14.1 | (1.2 | 8.7 | (0.97) | 6.2 | (1.03) | 15. | (1.54) | 100.0 |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.0 | c | 2.5 | (0.93) | 7.4 |  | 23.7 | (3.65) | 29.4 | (4.12) | 20.6 | (3.7 | 11.2 | (3.24) | 5.1 | (2.33) | 100.0 |
| $\underset{ \pm}{E}$ | Macao-China | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.6 | (0.17) | 0.0 |  | 2.0 | (0.48) | 9.6 | (0.90) | 17.8 | (0.95) | 70.1 | (1.11) | 100.0 |
| - | Russian Federation | 20.1 | (3.43) | 33.5 | (4.97) | 32.1 | (5.47) | 10.6 | (4.31) | 0.0 | C | 3.6 | (2.73) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 |
|  | Belgium (Flemish | 30.7 | (5.64) | 14.9 | (4.25) | 21.2 | (5.64) | 17.1 | (6.42) | 7.2 | (6.88) | 2.6 | (2.35) | 0.5 | (0.54) | 5.6 | (5.41) | 100.0 |
|  | Community) <br> Belgium (French Community) | 10.9 | (2.64) | 24.7 | (5.63) | 19.0 | (6.62) | 7.3 | (3.52) | 4.6 | (3.89) | 9.4 | (6.48) | 2.9 | (1.98) | 21.1 | (10.30) | 100.0 |

Table 3.7b
Percentage of first-generation students attending schools with different sized immigrant student populations (first- and second-generation students combined)

|  |  | Proportion of immigrant students within the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \% \text { to } \\ & <10 \% \end{aligned}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 10 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <20 \% \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 20 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <30 \% \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 30 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <40 \% \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 40 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <50 \% \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 50 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <60 \% \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <70 \% \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ \text { or } \\ \text { higher } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | Total |
| ¢ | Australia | 5.4 | (0.86) | 14.2 | (2.14) | 19.3 | (3.06) | 15.6 | (3.24) | 9.4 | (3.70) | 11.0 | (2.84) | 5.0 | (2.19) | 20.1 | (4.20) | 100.0 |
| 寺 | Austria | 19.2 | (2.77) | 26.5 | (4.49) | 15.0 | (4.34) | 10.6 | (3.76) | 2.2 | (2.11) | 10.3 | (4.35) | 4.6 | (3.24) | 11.7 | (3.53) | 100.0 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 15.4 | (2.57) | 15.5 | (2.84) | 20.8 | (4.72) | 9.9 | (3.04) | 4.3 | (3.43) | 3.6 | (2.31) | 18.8 | (7.11) | 11.6 | (5.16) | 100.0 |
| U | Canada | 6.6 | (1.02) | 7.0 | (1.26) | 10.3 | (2.03) | 7.7 | (1.94) | 8.5 | (2.25) | 15.8 | (3.46) | 9.4 | (3.25) | 34.7 | (5.35) | 100.0 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | 38.1 | (5.76) | 29.5 | (7.61) | 6.4 | (3.86) | 7.5 | (4.41) | 6.8 | (6.42) | 0.8 | (0.83) | 2.9 | (2.94) | 8.1 | (5.11) | 100.0 |
|  | France | 11.6 | (3.17) | 17.8 | (5.24) | 14.9 | (4.52) | 17.2 | (4.93) | 17.3 | (6.56) | 0.0 | c | 3.5 | (2.46) | 17.7 | (9.92) | 100.0 |
|  | Germany | 16.3 | (2.95) | 13.2 | (3.13) | 20.0 | (3.90) | 17.8 | (4.64) | 6.8 | (3.05) | 10.2 | (6.78) | 6.1 | (3.35) | 9.5 | (3.89) | 100.0 |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.0 | c | 11.0 | (1.02) | 19.5 | (1.31) | 10.2 | (0.99) | 25.7 | (1.62) | 6.6 | (0.87) | 13.1 | (0.88) | 13.9 | (1.02) | 100.0 |
|  | Netherlands | 31.1 | (6.25) | 25.9 | (5.81) | 11.6 | (4.81) | 0.0 | c | 0.6 | (0.64) | 12.2 | (6.01) | 1.7 | (1.67) | 17.0 | (7.41) | 100.0 |
|  | New Zealand | 10.3 | (1.55) | 13.2 | (2.20) | 12.1 | (2.43) | 21.2 | (3.20) | 19.5 | (2.84) | 12.5 | (2.29) | 0.7 | (0.66) | 10.7 | (2.91) | 100.0 |
|  | Norway | 41.0 | (6.52) | 31.7 | (7.13) | 3.4 | (2.17) | 11.6 | (4.98) | 6.5 | (3.76) | 5.8 | (5.55) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 |
|  | Sweden | 13.7 | (2.73) | 23.1 | (4.00) | 13.3 | (4.32) | 15.6 | (6.16) | 3.1 | (2.19) | 1.1 | (0.78) | 6.1 | (3.58) | 24.0 | (7.96) | 100.0 |
|  | Switzerland | 6.9 | (1.70) | 21.4 | (3.64) | 28.1 | (4.20) | 11.1 | (2.01) | 5.2 | (1.14) | 14.8 | (3.64) | 4.6 | (1.44) | 7.9 | (2.94) | 100.0 |
|  | United States | 8.2 | (1.93) | 21.1 | (3.13) | 10.4 | (3.05) | 19.6 | (5.14) | 13.8 | (3.59) | 9.2 | (4.11) | 7.2 | (3.61) | 10.5 | (3.63) | 100.0 |
| $\frac{\text { N }}{\underline{I}}$ | OECD average | 11.5 | (0.64) | 17.1 | (0.99) | 16.1 | (0.99) | 13.4 | (0.86) | 11.8 | (0.93) | 9.0 | (0.87) | 6.4 | (0.79) | 14.8 | (1.25) | 100.0 |
|  | Hong Kong-China | 0.0 | C | 1.0 | (0.55) | 7.1 | (2 | 15. | (2.89) | 29.1 | (05) | 24.1 | (31) | 13.9 | (5.02) | 9.2 | (4.21) | 100.0 |
| $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\#}}{\stackrel{~}{ \pm}}$ | Macao-China | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 0.5 | (0.33) | 0.0 | c | 0.9 | (0.64) | 6.9 | (1.67) | 10.0 | (2.12) | 81.8 | (2.58) | 100.0 |
| ᄃ | Russian Federation | 15.7 | (2.88) | 41.2 | (4.96) | 26.9 | (4.16) | 11.0 | (3.95) | 0.0 | c | 5.3 | (3.91) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 |
|  | Belgium (Flemish | 32.7 | (7.19) | 17.6 | (5.04) | 19.7 | (4.69) | 12.7 | (4.88) | 0.0 | c | 1.5 | (1.39) | 13.6 | (12.02) | 2.2 | (2.21) | 100.0 |
|  | Community) <br> Belgium (French Community) | 8.0 | (2.49) | 14.1 | (3.53) | 20.6 | (6.67) | 8.3 | (3.82) | 6.4 | (5.01) | 4.7 | (3.35) | 21.8 | (9.06) | 16.2 | (7.54) | 100.0 |

Table 3.7c
Percentage of native students attending schools with different sized immigrant student populations
(first- and second-generation students combined)

|  |  | Proportion of immigrant students within the school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \% \text { to } \\ & <10 \% \end{aligned}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 10 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <20 \% \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 20 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <30 \% \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 30 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <40 \% \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 40 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <50 \% \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 50 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <60 \% \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 60 \% \\ \text { to } \\ <70 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | S.E. | $\begin{gathered} 70 \% \\ \text { or } \\ \text { higher } \end{gathered}$ | S.E. | Total |
| U | Australia | 42.8 | (2.49) | 24.0 | (2.86) | 16.1 | (2.28) | 8.5 | (1.53) | 3.6 | (1.32) | 2.6 | (0.68) | 1.0 | (0.44) | 1.3 | (0.37) | 100.0 |
| - | Austria | 66.3 | (3.57) | 20.1 | (3.30) | 7.5 | (1.92) | 3.4 | (1.20) | 0.5 | (0.48) | 1.4 | (0.60) | 0.4 | (0.31) | 0.5 | (0.21) | 100.0 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 70.7 | (2.77) | 15.5 | (2.12) | 8.5 | (1.67) | 2.8 | (0.83) | 0.9 | (0.49) | 0.6 | (0.38) | 0.7 | (0.30) | 0.3 | (0.15) | 100.0 |
| u | Canada | 65.5 | (1.99) | 12.5 | (1.59) | 9.2 | (1.30) | 4.5 | (1.01) | 2.8 | (0.60) | 3.5 | (0.75) | 1.1 | (0.31) | 1.1 | (0.25) | 100.0 |
|  | Denmark | 84.9 | (2.47) | 11.3 | (2.35) | 1.7 | (0.90) | 1.1 | (0.59) | 0.5 | (0.37) | 0.1 | (0.14) | 0.2 | (0.16) | 0.1 | (0.14) | 100.0 |
|  | France | 61.0 | (3.79) | 21.2 | (3.56) | 7.1 | (1.81) | 5.0 | (1.25) | 4.3 | (1.37) | 0.5 | (0.38) | 0.5 | (0.34) | 0.5 | (0.29) | 100.0 |
|  | Germany | 63.5 | (3.31) | 14.1 | (2.70) | 11.5 | (2.04) | 5.4 | (1.39) | 2.3 | (0.84) | 2.0 | (1.10) | 0.8 | (0.44) | 0.5 | (0.30) | 100.0 |
|  | Luxembourg | 1.7 | (0.11) | 35.0 | (0.38) | 32.5 | (0.47) | 8.5 | (0.30) | 16.6 | (0.50) | 2.3 | (0.26) | 2.4 | (0.21) | 0.9 | (0.18) | 100.0 |
|  | Netherlands | 74.0 | (3.94) | 19.0 | (3.52) | 4.3 | (1.66) | 0.0 | c | 0.4 | (0.40) | 1.7 | (0.90) | 0.3 | (0.29) | 0.4 | (0.19) | 100.0 |
|  | New Zealand | 54.8 | (3. | 18.9 | (2. | 7.6 | (1.69) | 9.5 | (1.50) | 5.8 | (1.05) | 2.3 | (0.58) | 0.2 | (0.16) | 1.0 | (0.35) | 100.0 |
|  | Norway | 85.8 | (2. | 10.4 | (2. | 1.4 | (0.82) | 1.1 | (0.58) | 1.0 | (0.59) | 0.3 | (0.30) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 |
|  | Sweden | 68.0 | (3.12) | 19.0 | (2.89) | 7.2 | (1.78) | 3.5 | (1.44) | 1.4 | (0.66) | 0.1 | (0.08) | 0.6 | (0.35) | 0.2 | (0.13) | 100.0 |
|  | Switzerland | 34.7 | (4.03) | 33.1 | (4.08) | 20.7 | (2.82) | 5.3 | (1.03) | 1.8 | (0.40) | 3.4 | (0.82) | 0.6 | (0.22) | 0.5 | (0.20) | 100.0 |
|  | United States | 67.2 | (2.35) | 15.2 | (2.18) | 6.2 | (1.55) | 5.1 | (1.25) | 3.8 | (0.91) | 1.1 | (0.45) | 0.9 | (0.41) | 0.6 | (0.21) | 100.0 |
|  | OECD average | 61.7 | (0.87) | 18.9 | (0.83) | 9.4 | (0.50) | 4.5 | (0.29) | 3.0 | (0.23) | 1.4 | (0.14) | 0.6 | (0.09) | 0.5 | (0.07) |  |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ | Hong Kong-China | 0.0 | c | 6.5 | (2.39) | 17.5 | (3.65) | 27.7 | (3.85) | 26.9 | (3.93) | 14.3 | (2.54) | 5.3 | (1.78) | 1.7 | (0.84) | 100.0 |
| $\frac{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\stackrel{~}{y}}}{\stackrel{1}{y}}$ | Macao-China | 0.0 | c | 0.0 |  | 4.5 | (0.48) | 0.0 | c | 6.1 | (1.12) | 23.9 | (2.23) | 26.6 | (2.41) | 38.9 | (3.14) | 100.0 |
| ® | Russian Federation | 46.6 | (4.37) | 34.9 | (3.96) | 14.8 | (2.57) | 3.1 | (1.14) | 0.0 | c | 0.6 | (0.43) | 0.0 | c | 0.0 | c | 100.0 |
|  | Belgium (Flemish Community) | 84.9 | (2.38) | 7.6 | (1.77) | 4.5 | (0.98) | 2.1 | (0.83) | 0.3 | (0.33) | 0.2 | (0.14) | 0.3 | (0.30) | 0.1 | (0.09) | 100.0 |
|  | Community) <br> Belgium (French Community) | 50.4 | (5.87) | 26.9 | (4.61) | 14.1 | (3.92) | 3.7 | (1.70) | 1.8 | (1.14) | 1.3 | (0.93) | 1.3 | (0.61) | 0.6 | (0.36) | 100.0 |

Table 3.8
Differences between native and immigrant students in mathematics performance and percentage of immigrant students within countries


[^10]Table 3.9 (scores standardised within each country sample)

Characteristics of schools attended by native students and immigrant students


Characteristics of schools attended by native students and immigrant students


Note: Statistically significant differences from native students' scores are indicated in bold.

Table 4.1
Index of interest in and enjoyment of mathematics and student performance on the mathematics scale
Results based on students＇self－reports

|  | Index of interest in and enjoyment of mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Native students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  |
|  | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． |
| ๕ Australia | －0．06 | （0．02） | 0.22 | （0．04） | 0.30 | （0．04） |
| ㄹ．Austria | －0．32 | （0．02） | －0．15 | （0．08） | －0．09 | （0．06） |
| ¢ Belgium | －0．20 | （0．02） | －0．01 | （0．05） | 0.16 | （0．07） |
| $\bigcirc$ Canada | －0．09 | （0．01） | 0.13 | （0．04） | 0.49 | （0．05） |
| $\bigcirc$ Denmark | 0.40 | （0．02） | 0.58 | （0．09） | 0.66 | （0．10） |
| $\bigcirc$ France | 0.04 | （0．02） | 0.07 | （0．05） | 0.32 | （0．10） |
| Germany | 0.00 | （0．02） | 0.24 | （0．07） | 0.27 | （0．07） |
| Luxembourg | －0．34 | （0．02） | －0．21 | （0．04） | 0.04 | （0．04） |
| Netherlands | －0．25 | （0．02） | 0.19 | （0．06） | 0.23 | （0．11） |
| New Zealand | 0.03 | （0．02） | 0.35 | （0．07） | 0.54 | （0．04） |
| Norway | －0．19 | （0．02） | 0.17 | （0．11） | 0.14 | （0．08） |
| थ Sweden | 0.05 | （0．02） | 0.20 | （0．08） | 0.45 | （0．06） |
| 产 Switzerland | 0.08 | （0．02） | 0.16 | （0．05） | 0.38 | （0．04） |
| $\bigcirc$ United States | 0.00 | （0．02） | 0.23 | （0．06） | 0.40 | （0．07） |
| $\bigcirc$ OECD average | －0．05 | （0．01） | 0.12 | （0．02） | 0.29 | （0．02） |
| む Hong Kong－China | 0.19 | （0．03） | 0.27 | （0．03） | 0.26 | （0．02） |
| \＃Macao－China | 0.05 | （0．05） | 0.11 | （0．05） | 0.27 | （0．06） |
| ® Russian Federation | 0.25 | （0．02） | 0.21 | （0．05） | 0.23 | （0．06） |
| Belgium（Flemish Community） | －0．24 | （0．02） | －0．04 | （0．07） | 0.04 | （0．11） |
| Belgium（French Community） | －0．12 | （0．03） | 0.00 | （0．07） | 0.24 | （0．08） |



Regression estimates of the index of interest in and enjoyment of mathematics

|  |  | Regression estimates <br> Accounting for ESCS |  |  |  | ， | men | hematic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Accounting for mathematics performance |
|  |  | Second－generation students | First－generation students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  |
|  |  | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． |
| ひ <br> 言 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 | Australia |  |  |  |  | 0.29 | （0．04） | 0.36 | （0．04） | 0.29 | （0．04） | 0.36 | （0．04） |
|  | Austria | 0.17 | （0．08） | 0.21 | （0．07） | 0.26 | （0．08） | 0.32 | （0．07） |
|  | Belgium | 0.26 | （0．06） | 0.39 | （0．07） | 0.35 | （0．06） | 0.52 | （0．08） |
|  | Canada | 0.23 | （0．04） | 0.57 | （0．05） | 0.20 | （0．04） | 0.60 | （0．05） |
|  | Denmark | 0.30 | （0．09） | 0.33 | （0．10） | 0.43 | （0．10） | 0.49 | （0．10） |
|  | France | 0.09 | （0．06） | 0.34 | （0．11） | 0.15 | （0．06） | 0.46 | （0．10） |
|  | Germany | 0.27 | （0．08） | 0.32 | （0．08） | 0.45 | （0．08） | 0.41 | （0．09） |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.16 | （0．05） | 0.40 | （0．05） | 0.19 | （0．05） | 0.45 | （0．05） |
|  | Netherlands | 0.47 | （0．06） | 0.52 | （0．12） | 0.55 | （0．06） | 0.65 | （0．11） |
|  | New Zealand | 0.33 | （0．07） | 0.51 | （0．05） | 0.37 | （0．07） | 0.52 | （0．05） |
|  | Norway | 0.46 | （0．11） | 0.46 | （0．08） | 0.55 | （0．12） | 0.63 | （0．09） |
|  | Sweden | 0.22 | （0．09） | 0.50 | （0．07） | 0.27 | （0．08） | 0.72 | （0．07） |
|  | Switzerland | 0.09 | （0．06） | 0.31 | （0．06） | 0.20 | （0．06） | 0.47 | （0．06） |
|  | United States | 0.24 | （0．07） | 0.41 | （0．08） | 0.26 | （0．06） | 0.44 | （0．08） |
|  | OECD average | 0.21 | （0．02） | 0.37 | （0．02） | 0.27 | （0．02） | 0.45 | （0．02） |
|  | Hong Kong－China | 0.10 | （0．03） | 0.10 | （0．04） | 0.03 | （0．03） | 0.19 | （0．04） |
|  | Macao－China | 0.07 | （0．08） | 0.23 | （0．07） | 0.06 | （0．07） | 0.24 | （0．07） |
|  | Russian Federation | －0．04 | （0．05） | －0．02 | （0．06） | －0．03 | （0．05） | 0.01 | （0．06） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 0.35 | （0．08） | 0.36 | （0．11） | 0.55 | （0．08） | 0.55 | （0．12） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 0.14 | （0．08） | 0.34 | （0．09） | 0.18 | （0．09） | 0.42 | （0．09） |

[^11]Table 4.2 Index of instrumental motivation in mathematics and student performance on the mathematics scale

Results based on students' self-reports


Regression estimate of the index of instrumental motivation in mathematics Accounting for ESCS Accounting for mathematics performance

| Accounting for ESCS |  |  |  | Accounting for mathematics performance |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Second-generation students |  | First-generation students |  | Second-generation students |  | First-generation students |  |
| Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. | Coef. | S.E. |
| 0.18 | (0.04) | 0.19 | (0.03) | 0.17 | (0.04) | 0.19 | (0.03) |
| 0.14 | (0.10) | 0.16 | (0.07) | 0.20 | (0.10) | 0.22 | (0.08) |
| 0.24 | (0.07) | 0.43 | (0.07) | 0.29 | (0.08) | 0.51 | (0.07) |
| 0.19 | (0.05) | 0.33 | (0.04) | 0.17 | (0.05) | 0.36 | (0.04) |
| 0.12 | (0.09) | 0.06 | (0.10) | 0.18 | (0.10) | 0.14 | (0.10) |
| 0.19 | (0.06) | 0.48 | (0.11) | 0.23 | (0.06) | 0.55 | (0.12) |
| 0.16 | (0.06) | 0.24 | (0.07) | 0.22 | (0.07) | 0.29 | (0.07) |
| 0.21 | (0.06) | 0.48 | (0.06) | 0.24 | (0.05) | 0.51 | (0.05) |
| 0.42 | (0.07) | 0.30 | (0.09) | 0.44 | (0.07) | 0.36 | (0.09) |
| 0.24 | (0.07) | 0.20 | (0.04) | 0.25 | (0.07) | 0.22 | (0.04) |
| 0.27 | (0.12) | 0.25 | (0.07) | 0.32 | (0.11) | 0.32 | (0.08) |
| 0.30 | (0.08) | 0.39 | (0.05) | 0.31 | (0.07) | 0.53 | (0.05) |
| 0.10 | (0.05) | 0.25 | (0.05) | 0.15 | (0.05) | 0.31 | (0.05) |
| 0.14 | (0.05) | 0.21 | (0.06) | 0.14 | (0.05) | 0.23 | (0.06) |
| 0.29 | (0.02) | 0.28 | (0.04) | 0.20 | (0.02) | 0.31 | (0.02) |
| 0.07 | (0.03) | 0.22 | (0.03) | 0.00 | (0.03) | 0.26 | (0.03) |
| 0.09 | (0.07) | 0.10 | (0.08) | 0.09 | (0.06) | 0.13 | (0.08) |
| -0.01 | (0.06) | 0.02 | (0.06) | 0.01 | (0.06) | 0.05 | (0.06) |
| 0.26 | (0.09) | 0.30 | (0.08) | 0.42 | (0.09) | 0.44 | (0.08) |
| 0.11 | (0.10) | 0.38 | (0.08) | 0.14 | (0.10) | 0.47 | (0.09) |

[^12]Table 4.3a
Performance in mathematics and reading by students' expected level of education
Results based on students' self-reports


Table 4.3a (continued)
Performance in mathematics and reading by students' expected level of education
Results based on students' self-reports

|  | Australia |  | Students expecting to complete a non-university tertiary-level programme <br> (ISCED Level 5B) |  |  |  |  |  | Students expecting to complete a university-level programme <br> (ISCED Levels 5A and 6) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | S.E. | Performance on the mathematics scale |  | Performance on the reading scale |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { " } \\ & \text { 品 } \\ & \text { تn } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | S.E. | Performance on the mathematics scale |  | Performance on the reading scale |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Mean score | S.E. | Mean score | S.E. |  |  | Mean score | S.E. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean } \\ & \text { score } \end{aligned}$ | S.E. |
|  |  | Native | 8.5 | (0.3) | 504 | (4.1) | 508 | (4.7) | 58.9 | (0.8) | 559 | (2.1) | 565 | (2.1) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 7.2 | (0.8) | 483 | (11.8) | 481 | (13.7) | 74.5 | (1.6) | 541 | (4.9) | 547 | (4.5) |
|  |  | First-generation | 5.2 | (0.6) | 489 | (12.8) | 489 | (15.9) | 77.4 | (1.5) | 543 | (5.4) | 535 | (5.2) |
|  | Austria | Native | 17.7 | (0.9) | 487 | (4.7) | 460 | (5.3) | 24.7 | (1.4) | 583 | (3.8) | 572 | (3.7) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 5.2 | (1.5) | 450 | (26.3) | 426 | (35.0) | 25.4 | (3.4) | 536 | (12.1) | 516 | (14.9) |
|  |  | First-generation | 10.4 | (1.5) | 442 | (13.5) | 406 | (17.7) | 18.7 | (2.4) | 520 | (12.0) | 507 | (11.6) |
|  | Belgium | Native | 23.2 | (0.7) | 562 | (2.7) | 545 | (2.5) | 36.4 | (1.0) | 609 | (2.4) | 582 | (2.2) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 19.4 | (2.4) | 486 | (12.6) | 481 | (12.4) | 25.5 | (2.5) | 522 | (11.9) | 508 | (12.8) |
|  |  | First-generation | 14.3 | (1.8) | 487 | (14.9) | 460 | (16.3) | 28.7 | (2.7) | 505 | (13.1) | 487 | (13.7) |
|  | Canada | Native | 24.8 | (0.6) | 514 | (2.1) | 517 | (2.3) | 58.3 | (0.8) | 562 | (1.8) | 559 | (1.6) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 15.6 | (1.3) | 496 | (6.6) | 502 | (7.5) | 76.2 | (1.8) | 561 | (4.5) | 560 | (4.2) |
|  |  | First-generation | 13.1 | (1.3) | 474 | (10.3) | 472 | (10.4) | 81.9 | (1.5) | 544 | (5.0) | 527 | (4.6) |
|  | Denmark | Native | 18.3 | (0.7) | 538 | (3.6) | 518 | (3.7) | 24.5 | (0.9) | 574 | (3.2) | 547 | (3.3) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 9.1 | (2.8) | 472 | (27.9) | 467 | (20.4) | 36.4 | (5.4) | 474 | (16.7) | 473 | (18.8) |
|  |  | First-generation | 12.2 | (3.2) | 462 | (24.4) | 468 | (26.7) | 41.9 | (5.0) | 473 | (13.8) | 482 | (12.9) |
|  | France | Native | 16.7 | (0.8) | 517 | (3.5) | 501 | (3.6) | 34.3 | (1.0) | 575 | (3.0) | 562 | (2.8) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 19.4 | (2.0) | 463 | (10.3) | 444 | (8.0) | 38.1 | (3.0) | 520 | (6.4) | 506 | (7.5) |
|  |  | First-generation | 15.1 | (3.6) | 447 | (22.3) | 419 | (25.2) | 30.9 | (4.6) | 536 | (15.7) | 515 | (17.1) |
|  | Germany | Native | 2.1 | (0.2) | 547 | (12.1) | 537 | (10.5) | 19.8 | (1.0) | 598 | (3.1) | 588 | (3.0) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 1.0 | (0.7) | 537 | (27.8) | 519 | (43.7) | 12.4 | (2.2) | 518 | (22.8) | 500 | (23.7) |
|  |  | First-generation | 0.7 | (0.4) | 523 | (18.8) | 555 | (31.1) | 14.8 | (2.1) | 533 | (14.6) | 517 | (14.2) |
|  | Luxembourg | Native | 15.2 | (0.7) | 517 | (4.4) | 521 | (4.6) | 40.9 | (0.8) | 554 | (2.2) | 545 | (2.8) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 10.0 | (1.3) | 494 | (8.7) | 481 | (9.2) | 41.3 | (1.8) | 527 | (6.0) | 510 | (6.6) |
|  |  | First-generation | 6.7 | (0.9) | 484 | (14.0) | 467 | (15.1) | 41.2 | (2.0) | 524 | (5.3) | 496 | (6.1) |
|  | Netherlands | Native | a | a | a | a | a | a | 40.6 | (1.5) | 610 | (2.8) | 576 | (2.6) |
|  |  | Second-generation | a | a | a | a | a | a | 44.2 | (4.9) | 529 | (13.3) | 507 | (9.8) |
|  |  | First-generation | a | a | a | a | a | a | 39.9 | (4.5) | 512 | (13.1) | 504 | (12.0) |
|  | New Zealand | Native | 13.5 | (0.6) | 545 | (4.1) | 559 | (4.0) | 35.3 | (1.1) | 576 | (3.0) | 579 | (3.3) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 13.0 | (1.9) | 491 | (17.4) | 510 | (17.9) | 48.8 | (2.7) | 526 | (10.5) | 534 | (12.3) |
|  |  | First-generation | 12.3 | (1.5) | 502 | (10.5) | 492 | (13.0) | 56.3 | (2.2) | 556 | (6.4) | 540 | (6.7) |
|  | Norway | Native | 29.9 | (0.8) | 517 | (3.2) | 528 | (3.8) | 25.3 | (0.9) | 546 | (3.5) | 559 | (4.0) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 24.6 | (3.8) | 449 | (20.6) | 430 | (26.7) | 39.8 | (4.2) | 485 | (19.3) | 476 | (15.9) |
|  |  | First-generation | 24.2 | (3.3) | 431 | (17.8) | 438 | (18.3) | 27.6 | (3.9) | 497 | (15.0) | 503 | (19.7) |
|  | Sweden | Native | 24.7 | (0.7) | 538 | (2.6) | 546 | (2.8) | 31.4 | (1.1) | 558 | (3.2) | 562 | (2.8) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 24.4 | (3.0) | 504 | (12.0) | 528 | (12.7) | 43.8 | (3.9) | 506 | (16.3) | 525 | (13.3) |
|  |  | First-generation | 16.2 | (2.5) | 448 | (14.6) | 458 | (17.2) | 47.0 | (4.0) | 457 | (9.2) | 473 | (10.4) |
|  | Switzerland | Native | 7.5 | (0.5) | 564 | (5.9) | 518 | (6.0) | 17.9 | (1.5) | 616 | (5.1) | 576 | (4.5) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 4.6 | (0.8) | 542 | (14.6) | 511 | (23.3) | 15.9 | (1.7) | 564 | (10.3) | 538 | (10.3) |
|  |  | First-generation | 6.3 | (1.8) | 460 | (12.6) | 425 | (17.5) | 16.3 | (2.1) | 558 | (14.1) | 525 | (12.9) |
|  | United States | Native | 12.6 | (0.6) | 486 | (4.5) | 497 | (4.4) | 64.7 | (0.9) | 510 | (2.8) | 526 | (3.0) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 8.2 | (1.3) | 469 | (17.1) | 485 | (16.1) | 67.8 | (2.7) | 492 | (7.9) | 508 | (8.4) |
|  |  | First-generation | 9.5 | (1.9) | 465 | (18.7) | 466 | (23.7) | 58.4 | (2.9) | 490 | (7.5) | 497 | (8.6) |
|  | Hong Kong-China | Native | 12.1 | (0.6) | 553 | (7.1) | 510 | (6.3) | 53.8 | (1.8) | 597 | (3.8) | 546 | (2.8) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 9.3 | (0.9) | 560 | (7.8) | 519 | (7.0) | 55.2 | (1.9) | 608 | (4.6) | 553 | (3.3) |
|  |  | First-generation | 10.4 | (1.0) | 526 | (9.5) | 499 | (9.0) | 46.3 | (1.5) | 558 | (5.3) | 531 | (4.2) |
|  | Macao-China | Native | 16.7 | (2.4) | 517 | (12.9) | 500 | (11.9) | 48.9 | (2.9) | 556 | (7.4) | 522 | (5.9) |
|  |  | Second-generation | 18.2 | (1.7) | 535 | (7.4) | 500 | (6.9) | 49.2 | (1.9) | 557 | (6.6) | 522 | (3.8) |
|  |  | First-generation | 11.7 | (2.6) | 544 | (23.8) | 529 | (18.0) | 48.1 | (4.2) | 547 | (10.1) | 523 | (6.4) |
|  | Russian Federation | Native | a | a | a |  | a | a | 64.4 | (2.0) | 499 | (3.9) | 475 | (3.6) |
|  |  | Second-generation | a | a | a | a | a | a | 59.8 | (3.3) | 479 | (7.9) | 455 | (9.0) |
|  |  | First-generation | a | a | a | a | a | a | 57.0 | (3.5) | 480 | (7.2) | 441 | (7.2) |
|  | Belgium | Native | 26.6 | (0.9) | 575 | (3.1) | 556 | (2.5) | 38.3 | (1.3) | 629 | (2.2) | 598 | (2.3) |
|  | (Flemish Community) | Second-generation | 23.5 | (3.5) | 460 | (18.3) | 466 | (16.1) | 24.5 | (3.7) | 530 | (19.2) | 521 | (17.2) |
|  |  | First-generation | 18.2 | (3.6) | 507 | (16.2) | 494 | (18.6) | 33.3 | (4.2) | 508 | (14.1) | 496 | (17.3) |
|  |  | Native | 18.0 | (1.0) | 532 | (6.1) | 520 | (6.2) | 33.6 | (1.5) | 575 | (5.0) | 554 | (4.5) |
|  | (French Community) | Second-generation | 17.2 | (3.3) | 505 | (16.3) | 491 | (18.3) | 26.0 | (3.0) | 518 | (14.5) | 502 | (16.4) |
|  |  | First-generation | 12.4 | (2.2) | 472 | (23.3) | 434 | (25.3) | 26.3 | (3.8) | 503 | (20.1) | 479 | (22.5) |

Table 4.3b
Index of instrumental motivation in mathematics by students' expected level of education
Results based on students' self-reports


Table 4.4
Odds ratios of immigrant students expecting to complete a university-level programme (ISCED 5a, 6) compared to native students


Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold.

Table 4.5
Index of self－concept in mathematics and student performance on the mathematics scale
Results based on students＇self－reports

|  |  | Index of self－concept in mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Native students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． |
| U | Australia | 0.10 | （0．02） | 0.23 | （0．03） | 0.28 | （0．03） |
| 돋 | Austria | 0.07 | （0．02） | 0.10 | （0．07） | 0.09 | （0．06） |
| 5 | Belgium | －0．04 | （0．02） | 0.02 | （0．04） | 0.07 | （0．05） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 0.16 | （0．01） | 0.20 | （0．05） | 0.42 | （0．05） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | 0.25 | （0．02） | 0.03 | （0．09） | 0.21 | （0．10） |
| 山 | France | －0．17 | （0．02） | －0．20 | （0．06） | 0.02 | （0．10） |
| － | Germany | 0.12 | （0．02） | 0.18 | （0．07） | 0.30 | （0．05） |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.05 | （0．02） | 0.05 | （0．04） | 0.17 | （0．04） |
|  | Netherlands | －0．01 | （0．03） | 0.01 | （0．07） | 0.04 | （0．10） |
|  | New Zealand | 0.12 | （0．02） | 0.11 | （0．05） | 0.38 | （0．04） |
|  | Norway | －0．18 | （0．02） | 0.06 | （0．14） | －0．21 | （0．08） |
| O | Sweden | 0.12 | （0．02） | 0.12 | （0．08） | 0.22 | （0．06） |
| 폳 | Switzerland | 0.13 | （0．02） | 0.09 | （0．04） | 0.26 | （0．05） |
| $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | United States | 0.26 | （0．02） | 0.27 | （0．06） | 0.33 | （0．06） |
| $\bigcirc$ | OECD average | 0.07 | （0．01） | 0.09 | （0．02） | 0.23 | （0．02） |
| む | Hong Kong－China | －0．27 | （0．03） | －0．24 | （0．04） | －0．25 | （0．03） |
| ¢ | Macao－China | －0．40 | （0．06） | －0．16 | （0．04） | －0．07 | （0．07） |
| ธ๐ | Russian Federation | 0.14 | （0．02） | 0.07 | （0．04） | 0.08 | （0．05） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | －0．07 | （0．02） | －0．02 | （0．06） | 0.05 | （0．08） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 0.01 | （0．03） | 0.04 | （0．06） | 0.08 | （0．07） |

Change in the mathematics score per unit of the index of self－concept in mathematics


Regression estimate of the index of self－concept in mathematics

|  |  | Accounting for ESCS |  |  |  | Accounting for mathematics performance |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  |
|  |  | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． |
| 0 | Australia | 0.16 | （0．04） | 0.18 | （0．03） | 0.15 | （0．03） | 0.19 | （0．03） |
| 产 | Austria | 0.09 | （0．07） | 0.08 | （0．07） | 0.24 | （0．07） | 0.26 | （0．07） |
| $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | Belgium | 0.09 | （0．04） | 0.13 | （0．06） | 0.27 | （0．05） | 0.32 | （0．06） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 0.05 | （0．05） | 0.24 | （0．05） | 0.00 | （0．04） | 0.30 | （0．05） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | －0．01 | （0．10） | 0.11 | （0．10） | 0.21 | （0．11） | 0.35 | （0．10） |
| 山 | France | 0.06 | （0．07） | 0.29 | （0．10） | 0.14 | （0．07） | 0.46 | （0．09） |
| ， | Germany | 0.14 | （0．08） | 0.28 | （0．06） | 0.41 | （0．07） | 0.43 | （0．06） |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.04 | （0．05） | 0.18 | （0．05） | 0.10 | （0．05） | 0.26 | （0．04） |
|  | Netherlands | 0.05 | （0．08） | 0.07 | （0．10） | 0.18 | （0．07） | 0.29 | （0．10） |
|  | New Zealand | 0.06 | （0．06） | 0.24 | （0．04） | 0.12 | （0．06） | 0.27 | （0．04） |
|  | Norway | 0.38 | （0．12） | 0.17 | （0．09） | 0.52 | （0．12） | 0.40 | （0．09） |
| ¢ | Sweden | 0.12 | （0．07） | 0.25 | （0．06） | 0.19 | （0．06） | 0.60 | （0．06） |
| 돋 | Switzerland | －0．02 | （0．04） | 0.16 | （0．06） | 0.16 | （0．04） | 0.44 | （0．06） |
| 5 | United States | 0.10 | （0．06） | 0.18 | （0．06） | 0.10 | （0．06） | 0.22 | （0．06） |
| $\bigcirc$ | OECD average | 0.10 | （0．02） | 0.23 | （0．02） | 0.18 | （0．02） | 0.35 | （0．02） |
| む | Hong Kong－China | 0.05 | （0．03） | 0.07 | （0．04） | －0．02 | （0．03） | 0.15 | （0．04） |
| 頻 | Macao－China | 0.23 | （0．08） | 0.33 | （0．09） | 0.22 | （0．07） | 0.36 | （0．08） |
| ர๐ | Russian Federation | －0．06 | （0．05） | －0．05 | （0．05） | －0．03 | （0．04） | 0.00 | （0．05） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 0.13 | （0．06） | 0.18 | （0．08） | 0.41 | （0．07） | 0.40 | （0．09） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 0.02 | （0．07） | 0.05 | （0．08） | 0.14 | （0．07） | 0.22 | （0．08） |

[^13]Table 4.6
Index of self－efficacy in mathematics and student performance on the mathematics scale
Results based on students＇self－reports

|  |  | Index of self－efficacy in mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Native students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． |
| \％ | Australia | 0.08 | （0．02） | 0.21 | （0．04） | 0.24 | （0．04） |
| 폳 | Austria | 0.20 | （0．02） | －0．17 | （0．09） | －0．10 | （0．05） |
| $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | Belgium | －0．04 | （0．02） | －0．03 | （0．06） | －0．19 | （0．06） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 0.24 | （0．02） | 0.23 | （0．04） | 0.40 | （0．04） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | －0．06 | （0．02） | －0．23 | （0．07） | －0．10 | （0．07） |
| 山 | France | 0.01 | （0．03） | －0．13 | （0．05） | －0．09 | （0．11） |
| － | Germany | 0.19 | （0．02） | －0．09 | （0．07） | 0.01 | （0．06） |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.19 | （0．02） | －0．05 | （0．04） | －0．07 | （0．04） |
|  | Netherlands | －0．08 | （0．02） | －0．15 | （0．06） | －0．17 | （0．08） |
|  | New Zealand | －0．02 | （0．02） | －0．07 | （0．05） | 0.23 | （0．04） |
|  | Norway | －0．04 | （0．03） | 0.13 | （0．13） | －0．18 | （0．08） |
| ．0 | Sweden | 0.03 | （0．03） | 0.16 | （0．08） | －0．04 | （0．07） |
| 产 | Switzerland | 0.38 | （0．03） | 0.13 | （0．04） | 0.13 | （0．04） |
| 5 | United States | 0.29 | （0．02） | 0.22 | （0．07） | 0.24 | （0．07） |
| $\bigcirc$ | OECD average | 0.09 | （0．01） | 0.02 | （0．02） | 0.07 | （0．02） |
| む | Hong Kong－China | 0.15 | （0．03） | 0.18 | （0．03） | －0．05 | （0．03） |
| $\pm$ | Macao－China | 0.00 | （0．06） | 0.09 | （0．05） | 0.17 | （0．07） |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | Russian Federation | －0．07 | （0．02） | －0．14 | （0．05） | －0．13 | （0．05） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | －0．15 | （0．02） | －0．25 | （0．06） | －0．36 | （0．07） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 0.13 | （0．03） | 0.08 | （0．08） | －0．11 | （0．09） |

Change in the mathematics score per unit of the index of self－efficacy in mathematics

| Native students |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Explained variance } \\ & \text { in student } \\ & \text { performance } \\ & \text { (r-squared x 100) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Second－ generation students |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Explained variance } \\ \text { in student } \\ \text { performance } \\ (\mathrm{r} \text {-squared } \times 100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | First－ generation students |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Explained variance } \\ & \text { in student } \\ & \text { performance } \\ & (\mathrm{r} \text {-squared } \times 100) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Effect | S．E． | \％ | Effect | S．E． | \％ | Effect | S．E． | \％ |
| 49.5 | （1．2） | 27.4 | 47.6 | （3．3） | 24.2 | 52.2 | （3．7） | 29.2 |
| 45.7 | （1．8） | 26.6 | 38.9 | （6．8） | 18.8 | 29.4 | （5．9） | 9.3 |
| 45.9 | （1．3） | 19.5 | 39.2 | （4．6） | 15.9 | 34.8 | （5．9） | 12.9 |
| 42.8 | （0．9） | 28.4 | 47.5 | （2．6） | 33.9 | 48.1 | （2．8） | 30.3 |
| 50.7 | （1．9） | 28.6 | 43.5 | （9．8） | 15.3 | 41.8 | （10．9） | 14.8 |
| 46.1 | （1．6） | 25.8 | 44.2 | （5．1） | 22.7 | 62.8 | （9．0） | 31.0 |
| 48.2 | （1．8） | 26.5 | 42.8 | （6．2） | 23.8 | 51.5 | （6．1） | 26.1 |
| 37.0 | （1．6） | 20.6 | 40.8 | （3．8） | 20.4 | 49.0 | （3．4） | 25.3 |
| 44.4 | （2．2） | 22.4 | 36.2 | （6．2） | 11.7 | 45.4 | （9．9） | 21.1 |
| 52.8 | （1．6） | 28.4 | 57.4 | （6．6） | 28.7 | 46.4 | （4．6） | 22.9 |
| 46.8 | （1．6） | 30.9 | 49.0 | （5．3） | 36.7 | 41.1 | （6．7） | 20.8 |
| 53.7 | （1．7） | 35.0 | 52.1 | （6．0） | 29.6 | 41.3 | （6．1） | 22.0 |
| 50.7 | （2．2） | 31.5 | 46.0 | （5．9） | 21.8 | 53.9 | （5．2） | 24.3 |
| 45.9 | （1．4） | 27.2 | 53.1 | （4．5） | 37.7 | 43.4 | （5．2） | 22.6 |
| 45.9 | （0．5） | 25.1 | 47.2 | （1．4） | 24.0 | 49.8 | （1．5） | 24.1 |
| 53.7 | （2．5） | 31.5 | 51.5 | （2．8） | 31.3 | 52.6 | （4．2） | 25.3 |
| 40.1 | （6．3） | 16.9 | 43.4 | （3．8） | 19.3 | 45.8 | （7．2） | 22.8 |
| 49.1 | （2．0） | 20.5 | 28.5 | （5．6） | 8.1 | 39.3 | （5．9） | 13.3 |
| 54.1 | （1．8） | 23.8 | 44.2 | （11．7） | 11.8 | 35.2 | （11．2） | 11.0 |
| 47.3 | （2．3） | 26.4 | 37.8 | （5．0） | 17.8 | 36.6 | （7．4） | 15.6 |

Regression estimate of the index of self－efficacy in mathematics

| Accounting for ESCS |  |  |  | Accounting for mathematics performance |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  |
| Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． |
| 0.20 | （0．04） | 0.17 | （0．04） | 0.16 | （0．03） | 0.17 | （0．03） |
| －0．17 | （0．09） | －0．12 | （0．05） | －0．07 | （0．08） | 0.05 | （0．06） |
| 0.28 | （0．05） | 0.04 | （0．06） | 0.39 | （0．05） | 0.23 | （0．06） |
| 0.01 | （0．04） | 0.13 | （0．04） | －0．05 | （0．03） | 0.20 | （0．03） |
| 0.08 | （0．07） | 0.15 | （0．07） | 0.22 | （0．07） | 0.31 | （0．07） |
| 0.13 | （0．06） | 0.16 | （0．09） | 0.12 | （0．05） | 0.29 | （0．07） |
| 0.06 | （0．08） | 0.18 | （0．06） | 0.24 | （0．06） | 0.20 | （0．05） |
| －0．11 | （0．05） | －0．06 | （0．05） | －0．08 | （0．04） | －0．02 | （0．04） |
| 0.12 | （0．06） | 0.05 | （0．08） | 0.22 | （0．06） | 0.30 | （0．08） |
| 0.08 | （0．05） | 0.23 | （0．04） | 0.12 | （0．05） | 0.27 | （0．04） |
| 0.32 | （0．11） | 0.08 | （0．08） | 0.43 | （0．09） | 0.27 | （0．08） |
| 0.33 | （0．07） | 0.17 | （0．07） | 0.34 | （0．05） | 0.51 | （0．07） |
| －0．06 | （0．05） | －0．01 | （0．04） | 0.11 | （0．05） | 0.28 | （0．04） |
| 0.13 | （0．06） | 0.18 | （0．06） | 0.06 | （0．05） | 0.15 | （0．07） |
| 0.12 | （0．02） | 0.13 | （0．02） | 0.15 | （0．01） | 0.23 | （0．01） |
| 0.12 | （0．03） | －0．04 | （0．04） | －0．04 | （0．04） | 0.04 | （0．03） |
| 0.12 | （0．08） | 0.20 | （0．08） | 0.07 | （0．07） | 0.21 | （0．08） |
| －0．06 | （0．05） | －0．05 | （0．05） | －0．01 | （0．05） | 0.03 | （0．04） |
| 0.17 | （0．06） | －0．05 | （0．08） | 0.41 | （0．05） | 0.20 | （0．08） |
| 0.24 | （0．06） | 0.00 | （0．09） | 0.26 | （0．07） | 0.16 | （0．08） |

Note：Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold．

Table 4.7
Index of anxiety in mathematics and student performance on the mathematics scale
Results based on students' self-reports
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[^14]Table 4.8
Index of attitudes towards school and student performance on the mathematics scale
Results based on students＇self－reports

|  |  | Index of attitudes towards school |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Native students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． |
| O | Australia | 0.24 | （0．02） | 0.33 | （0．03） | 0.29 | （0．04） |
| 产 | Austria | 0.09 | （0．02） | 0.20 | （0．09） | 0.31 | （0．06） |
| \％ | Belgium | －0．21 | （0．02） | －0．01 | （0．05） | 0.03 | （0．08） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 0.02 | （0．01） | 0.14 | （0．04） | 0.25 | （0．04） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | －0．04 | （0．02） | 0.09 | （0．09） | 0.05 | （0．10） |
| 山 | France | 0.12 | （0．02） | 0.26 | （0．06） | 0.35 | （0．08） |
| － | Germany | －0．12 | （0．02） | 0.08 | （0．08） | 0.13 | （0．07） |
|  | Luxembourg | －0．33 | （0．02） | －0．09 | （0．04） | 0.05 | （0．04） |
|  | Netherlands | －0．22 | （0．02） | －0．02 | （0．06） | 0.19 | （0．08） |
|  | New Zealand | 0.05 | （0．02） | 0.39 | （0．06） | 0.20 | （0．04） |
|  | Norway | －0．22 | （0．02） | －0．15 | （0．16） | 0.04 | （0．09） |
| \％ | Sweden | 0.00 | （0．02） | 0.17 | （0．08） | 0.27 | （0．06） |
| 폳 | Switzerland | 0.00 | （0．02） | 0.13 | （0．06） | 0.21 | （0．04） |
| 5 | United States | 0.09 | （0．02） | 0.16 | （0．05） | 0.17 | （0．08） |
| 8 | OECD average | －0．04 | （0．00） | 0.13 | （0．02） | 0.18 | （0．02） |
| 亠 | Hong Kong－China | －0．52 | （0．02） | －0．54 | （0．02） | －0．50 | （0．02） |
| $\ddagger$ | Macao－China | －0．35 | （0．04） | －0．37 | （0．05） | －0．41 | （0．07） |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | Russian Federation | 0.20 | （0．03） | 0.09 | （0．05） | 0.18 | （0．05） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | －0．27 | （0．02） | －0．03 | （0．07） | －0．13 | （0．10） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | －0．11 | （0．03） | 0.00 | （0．07） | 0.11 | （0．11） |

Change in the mathematics score per unit of the index of attitudes towards school

|  |  |  Explained variance <br> in student <br> Native performance <br> students （r－squared x 100） |  |  |  | p |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Second－ generation students | Explained variance in student performance （r－squared x 100） | First－ generation students |  | Explained variancein studentperformance（r－squared x 100）$\%$ |
|  |  | Effect | S．E． | \％ | Effect |  | S．E． | \％ | Effect | S．E． |
| U | Australia |  |  |  | 15.4 | （1．2） | 3.1 | 5.0 | （2．2） | 0.3 | 11.0 | （3．5） | 1.4 |
| 亡 | Austria | 0.6 | （1．6） | 0.0 | －15．6 | （6．9） | 4.8 | －10．4 | （5．1） | 1.7 |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ | Belgium | －1．3 | （2．0） | 0.0 | －6．4 | （5．5） | 0.4 | －0．6 | （6．8） | 0.0 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 8.2 | （0．9） | 1.0 | 11.1 | （3．7） | 1.8 | －2．7 | （3．3） | 0.1 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | 8.6 | （1．9） | 0.8 | 10.1 | （12．4） | 1.4 | －12．1 | （8．0） | 2.4 |
| 山 | France | 9.7 | （1．9） | 1.2 | 1.2 | （4．8） | 0.0 | －13．9 | （6．6） | 2.4 |
| － | Germany | －4．6 | （1．8） | 0.3 | －7．8 | （7．0） | 0.7 | －18．1 | （5．8） | 4.1 |
|  | Luxembourg | －4．9 | （1．9） | 0.3 | －9．2 | （4．1） | 1.1 | －11．7 | （3．6） | 1.6 |
|  | Netherlands | 9.0 | （2．6） | 0.6 | －4．2 | （8．9） | 0.2 | －8．8 | （7．4） | 1.1 |
|  | New Zealand | 16.8 | （1．8） | 3.1 | 3.7 | （5．8） | 0.2 | 13.3 | （5．2） | 1.9 |
|  | Norway | 17.0 | （1．9） | 3.2 | 12.1 | （10．5） | 2.3 | 17.0 | （7．8） | 4.1 |
| U | Sweden | 17.1 | （1．5） | 3.3 | 4.1 | （9．4） | 0.2 | 16.4 | （7．1） | 3.4 |
| 돋 | Switzerland | 5.7 | （1．9） | 0.4 | －10．3 | （4．5） | 1.3 | －4．1 | （6．1） | 0.2 |
| － | United States | 5.7 | （1．4） | 0.4 | －1．0 | （5．4） | 0.0 | 15.8 | （7．2） | 2.8 |
| $\bigcirc$ | OECD average | 7.2 | （0．4） | 0.6 | 0.1 | （1．4） | 0.0 | 0.1 | （1．6） | 0.0 |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | Hong Kong－China | 11.4 | （3．3） | 0.8 | 20.7 | （5．1） | 2.6 | 13.3 | （4．4） | 1.0 |
| $\underset{\square}{\text { ¢ }}$ | Macao－China | 4.6 | （7．2） | 0.2 | 2.1 | （7．0） | 0.0 | －2．5 | （14．2） | 0.3 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Russian Federation | 5.4 | （1．8） | 0.3 | －0．5 | （5．6） | 0.1 | 3.1 | （5．4） | 0.1 |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 0.7 | （3．0） | 0.0 | －8．3 | （8．6） | 0.6 | －23．7 | （10．0） | 5.4 |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 1.4 | （2．5） | 0.0 | －5．7 | （6．8） | 0.3 | 11.4 | （9．0） | 1.2 |

Regression estimate of the index of attitudes towards school

| Accounting for ESCS |  |  |  | Accounting for mathematics performance |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  |
| Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． |
| 0.13 | （0．03） | 0.05 | （0．04） | 0.09 | （0．03） | 0.05 | （0．04） |
| 0.11 | （0．09） | 0.21 | （0．07） | 0.11 | （0．09） | 0.21 | （0．07） |
| 0.27 | （0．06） | 0.30 | （0．07） | 0.19 | （0．06） | 0.23 | （0．07） |
| 0.13 | （0．04） | 0.22 | （0．04） | 0.11 | （0．04） | 0.24 | （0．04） |
| 0.24 | （0．10） | 0.16 | （0．10） | 0.20 | （0．09） | 0.15 | （0．10） |
| 0.20 | （0．07） | 0.30 | （0．09） | 0.20 | （0．07） | 0.31 | （0．10） |
| 0.22 | （0．08） | 0.26 | （0．07） | 0.15 | （0．08） | 0.21 | （0．07） |
| 0.21 | （0．05） | 0.34 | （0．05） | 0.22 | （0．05） | 0.34 | （0．05） |
| 0.24 | （0．06） | 0.44 | （0．09） | 0.23 | （0．06） | 0.46 | （0．08） |
| 0.40 | （0．07） | 0.13 | （0．05） | 0.39 | （0．07） | 0.15 | （0．05） |
| 0.13 | （0．17） | 0.37 | （0．08） | 0.14 | （0．17） | 0.37 | （0．09） |
| 0.28 | （0．09） | 0.40 | （0．06） | 0.23 | （0．09） | 0.44 | （0．05） |
| 0.19 | （0．07） | 0.27 | （0．05） | 0.16 | （0．07） | 0.26 | （0．06） |
| 0.15 | （0．06） | 0.16 | （0．09） | 0.09 | （0．05） | 0.11 | （0．08） |
| 0.22 | （0．02） | 0.26 | （0．02） | 0.20 | （0．02） | 0.26 | （0．02） |
| 0.01 | （0．03） | 0.07 | （0．03） | －0．03 | （0．03） | 0.05 | （0．03） |
| －0．01 | （0．06） | －0．04 | （0．09） | －0．01 | （0．06） | －0．05 | （0．08） |
| －0．11 | （0．06） | －0．02 | （0．05） | －0．10 | （0．06） | －0．01 | （0．05） |
| 0.29 | （0．08） | 0.16 | （0．10） | 0.25 | （0．08） | 0.14 | （0．10） |
| 0.20 | （0．07） | 0.32 | （0．10） | 0.12 | （0．07） | 0.25 | （0．10） |

[^15]Table 4.9
Index of sense of belonging at school and student performance on the mathematics scale
Results based on students＇self－reports

|  |  | Index of sense of belonging at school |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Native students |  | Second－generation students |  | First－generation students |  |
|  |  | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． | Mean index | S．E． |
| \％ | Australia | 0.04 | （0．02） | 0.20 | （0．04） | －0．04 | （0．03） |
| 号 | Austria | 0.46 | （0．02） | 0.29 | （0．11） | 0.36 | （0．06） |
| $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | Belgium | －0．28 | （0．01） | －0．22 | （0．04） | －0．42 | （0．08） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 0.02 | （0．01） | 0.05 | （0．04） | －0．06 | （0．04） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | 0.02 | （0．02） | 0.03 | （0．08） | －0．11 | （0．09） |
| － | France | －0．19 | （0．02） | －0．10 | （0．05） | －0．13 | （0．08） |
|  | Germany | 0.24 | （0．02） | 0.38 | （0．09） | 0.12 | （0．05） |
|  | Luxembourg | 0.36 | （0．02） | －0．01 | （0．04） | －0．04 | （0．04） |
|  | Netherlands | －0．05 | （0．02） | －0．07 | （0．07） | －0．11 | （0．08） |
|  | New Zealand | 0.01 | （0．02） | 0.21 | （0．06） | －0．21 | （0．04） |
|  | Norway | 0.25 | （0．02） | 0.02 | （0．12） | 0.04 | （0．11） |
| U | Sweden | 0.24 | （0．02） | 0.22 | （0．08） | 0.30 | （0．07） |
|  | Switzerland | 0.22 | （0．03） | 0.14 | （0．05） | 0.09 | （0．04） |
| $\bigcirc$ | United States | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| $\bigcirc$ | OECD average | 0.10 | （0．01） | 0.07 | （0．02） | －0．01 | （0．02） |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square}$ | Hong Kong－China | －0．57 | （0．02） | －0．59 | （0．02） | －0．70 | （0．02） |
| $\frac{ \pm}{t}$ | Macao－China | －0．64 | （0．06） | －0．57 | （0．03） | －0．71 | （0．06） |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ | Russian Federation | －0．29 | （0．02） | －0．31 | （0．04） | －0．22 | （0．05） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | －0．27 | （0．01） | －0．30 | （0．08） | －0．35 | （0．09） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | －0．31 | （0．03） | －0．18 | （0．04） | －0．46 | （0．11） |

Change in the mathematics score per unit of the index of sense of belonging at school

|  |  | Change in the mathematics score per unit of the index of sense of belonging at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Native students |  | Explained variance in student performance （r－squared x 100） | Second－ generation students |  | Explained variance in student performance （r－squared x 100） | First－ generation students |  | Explained variance in student performance （r－squared x 100） |
|  |  | Effect | S．E． | \％ | Effect | S．E． | \％ | Effect | S．E． | \％ |
| \％ | Australia | 3.7 | （1．6） | 0.2 | －5．9 | （3．1） | 0.4 | 3.8 | （3．6） | 0.2 |
| ＋ | Austria | 1.7 | （1．5） | 0.0 | 2.1 | （6．7） | 0.2 | 2.5 | （5．3） | 0.1 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Belgium | 5.3 | （1．7） | 0.2 | 6.0 | （4．8） | 0.3 | 10.0 | （8．8） | 0.8 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | －0．6 | （1．0） | 0.0 | －2．2 | （2．6） | 0.1 | －7．8 | （2．9） | 0.8 |
| － | Denmark | 3.1 | （1．9） | 0.1 | 2.9 | （11．1） | 0.1 | 5.0 | （8．6） | 0.6 |
| $\stackrel{\text { U }}{ }$ | France | 3.3 | （1．4） | 0.1 | －5．1 | （5．3） | 0.4 | －5．9 | （9．3） | 0.4 |
|  | Germany | －0．7 | （1．9） | 0.0 | －2．7 | （6．1） | 0.1 | －3．6 | （7．0） | 0.2 |
|  | Luxembourg | 3.3 | （1．7） | 0.2 | 3.8 | （3．7） | 0.2 | 3.3 | （4．3） | 0.1 |
|  | Netherlands | 7.9 | （2．6） | 0.6 | －5．2 | （5．7） | 0.3 | 3.8 | （7．4） | 0.2 |
|  | New Zealand | 2.6 | （1．6） | 0.1 | －6．4 | （5．7） | 0.5 | 12.9 | （4．9） | 1.5 |
|  | Norway | －0．6 | （1．6） | 0.0 | －8．4 | （9．0） | 1.1 | 2.3 | （6．2） | 0.1 |
| ． | Sweden | －0．3 | （1．5） | 0.0 | －2．3 | （9．2） | 0.1 | 15.1 | （6．3） | 3.2 |
| 듣 | Switzerland | 6.7 | （1．9） | 0.6 | －0．3 | （5．2） | 0.0 | 14.5 | （5．0） | 2.3 |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ | United States | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| － | OECD average | 0.7 | （0．5） | 0.0 | －1．4 | （1．5） | 0.0 | 2.1 | （1．7） | 0.0 |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | Hong Kong－China | 12.4 | （2．8） | 0.8 | 14.6 | （4．4） | 1.2 | 19.3 | （5．3） | 1.7 |
| ＋ | Macao－China | 12.4 | （9．1） | 1.2 | 8.4 | （6．9） | 0.6 | －8．2 | （10．9） | 0.6 |
| $\bigcirc$ | Russian Federation | 11.5 | （1．5） | 1.2 | 5.0 | （6．4） | 0.3 | 8.8 | （5．4） | 0.9 |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 2.8 | （1．9） | 0.1 | 8.4 | （7．7） | 0.6 | 6.7 | （8．6） | 0.4 |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 7.1 | （2．8） | 0.4 | 4.1 | （5．4） | 0.2 | 9.4 | （11．0） | 0.7 |

Regression estimate of the index of sense of belonging at school

| Accounting for ESCS |  | Accounting for mathematics performance |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |


|  |  | students |  | First－generation students |  | students |  | First－generation students |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． | Coef． | S．E． |
| U | Australia | 0.18 | （0．04） | －0．07 | （0．04） | 0.16 | （0．01） | －0．07 | （0．01） |
| 茞 | Austria | －0．11 | （0．11） | －0．06 | （0．07） | －0．16 | （0．02） | －0．09 | （0．01） |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3}$ | Belgium | 0.13 | （0．04） | －0．09 | （0．09） | 0.10 | （0．01） | －0．09 | （0．02） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Canada | 0.03 | （0．04） | －0．09 | （0．04） | 0.03 | （0．01） | －0．08 | （0．01） |
| $\bigcirc$ | Denmark | 0.11 | （0．08） | －0．06 | （0．10） | 0.04 | （0．02） | －0．10 | （0．02） |
| － | France | 0.16 | （0．05） | 0.14 | （0．09） | 0.10 | （0．01） | 0.09 | （0．02） |
|  | Germany | 0.22 | （0．09） | －0．05 | （0．06） | 0.13 | （0．02） | －0．13 | （0．01） |
|  | Luxembourg | －0．32 | （0．04） | －0．33 | （0．05） | －0．35 | （0．01） | －0．37 | （0．01） |
|  | Netherlands | 0.05 | （0．08） | 0.00 | （0．09） | 0.02 | （0．02） | 0.00 | （0．02） |
|  | New Zealand | 0.26 | （0．06） | －0．21 | （0．04） | 0.21 | （0．01） | －0．21 | （0．01） |
|  | Norway | －0．20 | （0．14） | －0．15 | （0．11） | －0．24 | （0．03） | －0．22 | （0．03） |
| ひ | Sweden | 0.03 | （0．08） | 0.13 | （0．07） | －0．02 | （0．02） | 0.07 | （0．02） |
| 产 | Switzerland | 0.03 | （0．08） | －0．06 | （0．05） | －0．03 | （0．01） | －0．04 | （0．01） |
| $\bigcirc$ | United States | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m |
| － | OECD average | 0.04 | （0．02） | －0．05 | （0．02） | －0．02 | （0．02） | －0．10 | （0．02） |
| む | Hong Kong－China | 0.02 | （0．03） | －0．07 | （0．03） | －0．02 | （0．01） | －0．10 | （0．01） |
| \＃ | Macao－China | 0.09 | （0．07） | －0．06 | （0．08） | 0.07 | （0．02） | －0．07 | （0．02） |
| ®๐ | Russian Federation | －0．02 | （0．05） | 0.06 | （0．05） | －0．01 | （0．01） | 0.08 | （0．01） |
|  | Belgium（Flemish Community） | 0.05 | （0．09） | －0．03 | （0．09） | 0.00 | （0．08） | －0．06 | （0．09） |
|  | Belgium（French Community） | 0.19 | （0．06） | －0．11 | （0．12） | 0.16 | （0．05） | －0．10 | （0．11） |
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## READER'S GUIDE

## Data underlying the figures

The data referred to in Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this report are presented in Annex B. In these tables, as well as in data tables included in Chapter 5, the following symbols are used to denote missing data:
a The category does not apply in the country concerned. Data are therefore missing.
c There are too few observations to provide reliable estimates (i.e. there are fewer than $3 \%$ of students for this cell or too few schools for valid inferences). However, these statistics were included in the calculation of cross-country averages.
$m$ Data are not available. These data were collected but subsequently removed from the publication for technical reasons.
$n$ Data are negligible i.e. they do not occur in any significant numbers.
w Data have been withdrawn at the request of the country concerned.

## Calculation of the OECD average

An OECD average was calculated for most indicators presented in this report. The OECD average takes the OECD countries as a single entity, to which each country contributes with equal weight. The OECD average corresponds to the arithmetic mean of the respective country statistics and for this report only applies to the selection of OECD case countries (see definition below).

## Rounding of figures

Because of rounding, some figures in tables may not exactly add up to the totals. Totals, differences and averages are always calculated on the basis of exact numbers and are rounded only after calculation. When standard errors in this publication have been rounded to one or two decimal places and the value 0.0 or 0.00 is shown, this does not imply that the standard error is zero, but that it is smaller than 0.05 or 0.005 respectively.

## Reporting of student data

The report uses " 15 -year-olds" as shorthand for the PISA target population. In practice, this refers to students who were aged between 15 years and 3 (complete) months and 16 years and 2 (complete) months at the beginning of the assessment period and who were enrolled in an educational institution, regardless of the grade level or type of institution, and of whether they were attending full-time or part-time.

## Abbreviations used in this report

The following abbreviations are used in this report:
ESCS Index of economic, social and cultural status (see Annex A1 for definition)
HISEI Highest international socio-economic index of occupational status (corresponds to the highest occupational status of either the mother or father)

ISCED International Standard Classification of Education (the ISCED levels are explained in Annex A1)

SE Standard error
SD Standard deviation
SOPEMI Système d'Observation Permanente des Migrations (Continuous Reporting System on Migration). This was established in 1973 by the OECD to provide its European member states a mechanism for sharing of information on international migration.

## Terminology used in this report

Native students or non-immigrant students: Students with at least one parent born in the country of assessment. Students born in the country who have one foreign-born parent (children of "combined" families) are included in the native category, as previous research indicates that these students perform similarly to native students.

Immigrant students: This group includes both first-generation students and second-generation students (see definitions below).

First-generation students: Students born outside of the country of assessment whose parents are also foreign-born.

Second-generation students: Students born in the country of assessment with foreign-born parents.

Case countries: This includes the 17 countries covered in this report. Fourteen OECD countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States; as well as three partner countries: Hong Kong-China, Macao-China and the Russian Federation.

## Further documentation

For further information on the PISA assessment instruments and the methods used in PISA, see the PISA 2003 Technical Report (OECD, 2005) and the PISA Web site (www.pisa.oecd.org).
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