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## Introduction

In the spring of 2006, Canadian students participated in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) which seeks to measure how well young adults, at age 15 , are prepared to meet the challenges of today's knowledge societies. PISA was first conducted in 2000 with an emphasis on reading achievement and again in 2003 with an emphasis on mathematics achievement. The third survey of PISA conducted in 2006 completes the first set of three-yearly assessment surveys of knowledge and skills with a focus on science achievement. This report summarizes the results for Canada and the provinces in an international context.

## The Programme for International Student Assessment

The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is a collaborative effort among member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). PISA is designed to provide policy-oriented international indicators of the skills and knowledge of 15 -year-old students ${ }^{1}$ and sheds light on a range of factors that contribute to successful students, schools and education systems. It measures skills that are generally recognized as key outcomes of the educational process. The assessment focuses on young people's ability to use their knowledge and skills to meet real life challenges. These skills are believed to be prerequisites to efficient learning in adulthood and for full participation in society.

PISA has brought significant public and educational attention to international assessment and
related studies by generating data to enhance the ability of policy makers to make decisions based on evidence. In Canada, it is carried out through a partnership consisting of Human Resources and Social Development Canada, the Council of Ministers of Education Canada and Statistics Canada.

The project began in 2000 and focuses on the capabilities of 15 -year-olds as they near the end of compulsory education. It reports on reading literacy, mathematical literacy and scientific literacy every three years and provides a more detailed look at each domain in the years when it is the major focus. For example, science was the major domain of PISA in 2006 when the focus was on both overall (or combined) scientific literacy and three scientific sub-domains (identifying scientific issues, explaining phenomena scientifically and using scientific evidence). As minor domains in PISA 2006, only single measures of reading and mathematics were available. On the other hand, more detailed information was available on reading and reading subdomains in 2000 and mathematics and mathematics sub-domains in 2003.

Box 1
The PISA Assessment Domains
PISA measures three domains: mathematical literacy, reading literacy, and scientific literacy. The domains were defined as follows by international experts who agreed that the emphasis should be placed on functional knowledge and skills that allow active participation in society.

Scientific literacy (hereafter referred to as science):
An individual's scientific knowledge and use of that knowledge to identify questions, to acquire new knowledge, to explain scientific phenomena, and to draw evidence based conclusions about sciencerelated issues, understanding of the characteristic features of science as a form of human knowledge and enquiry, awareness of how science and technology shape our material, intellectual, and cultural environments, and willingness to engage in sciencerelated issues, and with the ideas of science, as a reflective citizen.
Reading literacy (hereafter referred to as reading):
An individual's capacity to understand, use and reflect on written texts, in order to achieve one's goals, to develop one's knowledge and potential and to participate in society.
Mathematical literacy (hereafter referred to as mathematics):
An individual's capacity to identify and understand the role that mathematics plays in the world, to make wellfounded judgements and to use and engage with mathematics in ways that meet the needs of that individual's life as a constructive, concerned and reflective citizen.

## Why do PISA?

The skills and knowledge that individuals bring to their jobs, to further studies and to our society, plays an important role in determining our economic success and our overall quality of life. The importance of skills and knowledge is expected to continue to grow. The shift to knowledge and information intensive industries, to communication and production technologies, to falling trade barriers and to the globalization of markets have precipitated increases in the knowledge and skills that the present and future economy requires. These include a rising demand for a strong set of foundation skills upon which further learning is built.

Elementary and secondary education systems play a central role in laying a solid base upon which subsequent knowledge and skills can be developed. Students leaving secondary education without a strong foundation may experience difficulty accessing the postsecondary education system and the labour market and they may benefit less when learning opportunities are presented later in life. Without the tools needed to be effective learners throughout their lives, these individuals with limited skills risk economic and social marginalization.

Governments in industrialized countries have devoted large portions of their budgets to provide high quality universal elementary and secondary schooling. Given these investments, governments are interested in the relative effectiveness of their education systems. To address these issues, member governments of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) developed a common tool to improve their understanding of what makes young people-and education systems as a whole-successful. This tool is the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA).

Information gathered through PISA enables a thorough comparative analysis of the performance of students near the end of their compulsory education. PISA also permits exploration of the ways that achievement varies across different social and economic groups and the factors that influence their level and distribution within and among countries.

## Why did Canada participate?

Canada's participation in PISA 2006 stems from many of the same questions motivating other participating countries. Canada invests significant public resources in the provision of elementary and secondary education. Canadians are interested in the quality of education provided to their youth by elementary and secondary schools. How can expenditures be directed to the achievement of higher levels of knowledge and skills upon which lifelong learning is founded and to potentially reduce social inequality in life outcomes?

Canada's economy is also evolving rapidly. Between 2006 and 2015, the fastest labour market growth is among occupations requiring higher skills. ${ }^{2}$ Even employees in traditional occupations are expected to upgrade their knowledge and skills to meet the rising demands of new organisational structures and production technologies. Elementary and secondary education systems play a key role in generating the supply of skills to meet this demand. The competencies acquired by the end of compulsory schooling provide individuals with the essential foundation necessary to further develop human capital.

Questions about educational effectiveness can be partly answered with data on the average performance of Canada's youth. However, two other questions with respect to equity can only be answered by examining the distribution of competencies: Who are the students at the lowest levels? Do certain groups or regions appear
to be at greater risk? These are important questions because, among other things, acquisition of knowledge and skills during compulsory schooling influences access to postsecondary education, eventual success in the labour market and the effectiveness of continuous, lifelong learning.

## What is PISA 2006?

Fifty-seven countries participated in PISA 2006, including all 30 OECD countries ${ }^{3}$. Between 5,000 and 10,000 students aged 15 from at least 150 schools were typically tested in each country. In Canada, approximately 22,00015 -year-olds from about 1,000 schools participated across the ten provinces ${ }^{4}$. The large Canadian sample was required to produce reliable estimates representative of each province and for both

French and English language school systems in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba.

The 2006 PISA assessment was administered in schools, during regular school hours in April and May 2006. This assessment was a two hour paper-and-pencil lasting. Students also completed a 20 -minute student background questionnaire providing information about themselves and their home and a 10 -minute questionnaire on information technology and communications, while school principals completed a 20-minute questionnaire about their schools. As part of PISA 2006, national options could also be implemented. Canada chose to add a 5 -minute student questionnaire to collect more information on the school experiences of 15 -year-olds, their work activities and their relationships with others.

## Box 2

Overview of PISA 2006

|  | International | Canada |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Participating countries/provinces | - 57 countries | - 10 provinces |
| Population | - Youth aged 15 | - Same |
| Number of participating students | - Between 5,000 and 10,000 per country with some exceptions for a total of close to 400,000 students | - Approximately 22,000 students |
| Domains | - Major: science <br> - Minor: reading and mathematics | - Same |
| Amount of testing time devoted to domains | - 390 minutes of testing material organized into different combinations of test booklets <br> 120 minutes in length <br> - 210 minutes devoted to science <br> - 60 minutes each devoted to reading, mathematics | - Same |
| Languages in which the test was administered | - 43 languages | - English and French |
| International assessment | - Two hours of direct assessment of science, reading and mathematics <br> - Twenty minute contextual questionnaire administered to youth <br> - A school questionnaire administered to school principals | - Same |
| International options | - Ten-minute optional questionnaire on information technology and communications administered to students <br> - Ten-minute optional questionnaire on educational career administered to students | - Ten-minute optional questionnaire on information technology and communication administered to students |
| National options | - Grade based assessment <br> - Other options were undertaken in a limited number of countries | - Five minutes of additional questions administered to students regarding their school experiences, work activities and relationships with others. |

## Objectives and organization of the report

This report provides the first pan-Canadian results of the PISA 2006 assessment of science, reading and mathematics by presenting at the national and provincial results in order to complement the information presented in "Learning for Tomorrow's World - First Results from PISA 2006"5. Results are compared to other participating countries and across Canadian provinces.

Chapter 1 provides information on the relative performance of Canadian 15 -year-old students on the PISA 2006 assessment in science. It presents the average level of performance on the combined science scale as well as the three science sub-domains; the distribution of achievement scores and proficiency levels in science for Canada as a whole and for the provinces; and results for the English-language and French-language school systems. Chapter 2 discusses information on the mean performance of Canada and the provinces in reading and mathematics, compares results for the Englishlanguage and French-language school systems and examines change in performance over time. Chapter 3 examines the relationship between performance and selected student characteristics. Chapters 4 provides an overview of three key themes explored in PISA 2006 student engagement in science, science and the environment and contexts for the learning of science. Finally, the major findings and opportunities for further study are discussed in the conclusion.

## Notes

1. OECD (1999), Measuring Student Knowledge and Skills: A New Framework for Assessment, Paris.
2. Lapointe, Mario, Kevin Dunn, Nicolas Tremblay-Côté, LouisPhilippe Bergeron, and Luke Ignaczak (May 2007) LookingAhead: A 10-Year Outlook for the Canadian Labour Market (20062015), HRSDC, SP-615-10-06E .
3. OECD countries include Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States. Partner countries are: Argentina, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Chinese Taipei, Columbia, Croatia, Estonia, Hong Kong - China, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Macao - China, Montenegro, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, Thailand, Tunisia, and Uruguay.
4. No data were collected in the three territories and on First Nations schools.
5. OECD (2007), PISA 2006: Science competencies for tomorrow's world. Paris.

## Chapter 1

## The performance of Canadian students in science in an international context

This chapter compares the Canadian results of the PISA 2006 assessment in terms of average scores, variation in performance and proficiency levels. First, the performance of Canadian 15-year-old students is compared to the performance of 15 -year-old students from other countries that participated in PISA 2006. Second, the results of student performance in the ten Canadian provinces are analyzed. Following this, the performance of students enrolled in English-language and French-language school systems are compared for the five provinces in which the two groups were sampled separately.

## Defining science

The definition of science in PISA 2006 focuses on the competencies that clarify what 15-year old students know, value and are able to do within personal, social and global contexts.

In addition to reporting on combined science performance through a combined science scale, PISA 2006 reports on three scientific competencies that underpin the PISA 2006 definition of scientific literacy. The features of each of these three competencies are described in Box $3^{6}$.

## Box 3

## PISA 2006 scientific competencies

Identifying scientific issues

- Recognizing issues that are possible to investigate scientifically
- Identifying keywords to search for scientific information
- Recognizing the key features of a scientific investigation
Explaining phenomena scientifically
- Applying knowledge of science in a given situation
- Describing or interpreting phenomena scientifically and predicting changes
- Identifying appropriate descriptions, explanations and predictions
Using scientific evidence
- Interpreting scientific evidence and making and communicating conclusions
- Identifying the assumptions, evidence and reasoning behind conclusions
- Reflecting on the societal implications of science and technological developments

The combined science score is expressed on a scale with an average of 500 points for the OECD countries ${ }^{7}$ and about two-thirds of the students scoring between 400 and 600 (i.e. a standard deviation of 100).

While PISA is a not a test of learned curriculum, the points on the science scale can be interpreted in the context of the school environment. For example, 28 of the 30 OECD countries that participated in PISA 2006 had a sizable number of 15 -year-olds in the sample who were enrolled in at least two different, but consecutive grades. For these 28 countries combined, the OECD analyses revealed that one additional school year corresponds to an increase of 34 score points on the PISA 2006 combined science scale ${ }^{8}$.

One way to summarize student performance and to compare the relative standing of countries is by examining their average test scores. However, simply ranking countries based on their average scores can be misleading because there is a margin of error associated with each average score. This margin of error should be taken into account in order to identify whether differences in average scores exist when comparing countries (see text box 4 'A note on statistical comparisons').

## Box 4

## A note on statistical comparisons

The averages were computed from the scores of random samples of students from each country and not from the population of students in each country. Consequently it cannot be said with certainty that a sample average has the same value as the population average that would have been obtained had all 15-year-old students been assessed. Additionally, a degree of error is associated with the scores describing student performance as these scores are estimated based on student responses to test items. A statistic, called the standard error, is used to express the degree of uncertainty associated with sampling error and measurement error. The standard error can be used to construct a confidence interval, which provides a means of making inferences about the population averages and proportions in a manner that reflects the uncertainty associated with sample estimates. A 95\% confidence interval is used in this report and represents a range of plus or minus about two standard errors around the sample average. Using this confidence interval it can be inferred that the population mean or proportion would lie within the confidence interval in 95 out of 100 replications of the measurement, using different samples randomly drawn from the same population.

When comparing scores among countries, provinces, or population subgroups the degree of error in each average should be considered in order to determine if averages are different from each other. Standard errors and confidence intervals may be used as the basis for performing these comparative statistical tests. Such tests can identify, with a known probability, whether there are actual differences in the populations being compared.

For example, when an observed difference is significant at the 0.05 level, it implies that the probability is less than 0.05 that the observed difference could have occurred because of sampling or measurement error. When comparing countries and provinces, extensive use is made of this type of test to reduce the likelihood that differences due to sampling or measurement errors will be interpreted as real.

Only statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level are noted in this report, unless otherwise stated. This means averages did not differ when the $95 \%$ confidence intervals for the averages being compared do not overlap. Where confidence intervals did overlap an additional t-test was conducted to test for differences.

## Canadian students performed well in science

Overall, Canadian students performed well in science, as illustrated in Chart 1.1. Listed in Table 1.1 are the countries that performed significantly better than Canada or equally as well as Canada on the combined science scale and the three science competency sub-domains. The average scores of students in the remaining countries that took part in PISA 2006 were statistically below that of Canada. Among 57 countries, only Finland and Hong Kong-China performed better than Canada on the combined science scale.

Canadian students also performed well in the three science competency sub-domains (Charts 1.2 to 1.4; Table 1.1). Only Finland outperformed Canadian 15-year-olds in 'identifying scientific issues' and 'using scientific evidence' while four countries outperformed Canadian 15-year-olds in 'explaining phenomena scientifically'.

As the full assessment of science took place for the first time in 2006 and was only measured as a minor domain previously, it is not possible to directly compare science performance over time since PISA 2000. However, insights can be provided by looking at Canada's relative position across the assessments. In PISA 2003, four countries outperformed Canadian 15-year-olds in combined science compared to only two countries in PISA 2006. The relative change in ranking for Canada between 2003 and 2006 may be attributable to an improvement in performance in Canada, a decrease in performance in other countries or a combination of both factors.

|  | Table 1.1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Countries performing <br> Or the same as Canada |  |
|  | Countries performing <br> significantly better <br> than Canada | Countries <br> performing as <br> well as Canada |
| Science - <br> combined scale | Finland, <br> Hong Kong-China | Chinese Taipei, Estonia, <br> Japan, New Zealand |
| Science - <br> identifying <br> scientific issues | Finland | New Zealand, Australia, <br> Netherlands, <br> Hong Kong-China |
| Science - <br> explaining <br> phenomena <br> scientifically | Finland, <br> Hong Kong-China, <br> Chinese Taipei, <br> Estonia | Czech Republic, <br> Japan |
| Science - using <br> scientific evidence | Finland |  |

## Chart 1.1

Average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Combined science
300

Note: The OECD average is 500 with a standard error of 0.5 .

## Chart 1.2

## Average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Identifying scientific issues



Note: The OECD average is 500 with a standard error of 0.5 .

## Chart 1.3

## Average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Explaining phenomena scientifically



Note: The OECD average is 500 with a standard error of 0.5 .

## Chart 1.4 <br> Average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Using scientific evidence



Note: The OECD average is 499 with a standard error of 0.6.

## All provinces performed at or above the OECD average

Fifteen year-old students in all the Canadian provinces performed well in science which contributed to Canada's standing in international comparisons (Charts 1.1 to 1.4). All provinces performed at or above the OECD mean in the combined science scale and science competency sub-scales.

Generally, provinces fell into one of three groups when compared to the Canadian averages for combined
science and the three science sub-domains (Table 1.2). The average performance of students in Alberta was significantly above the Canadian average. Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia performed about the same as the Canadian average while students in Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and Saskatchewan performed significantly below the Canadian average. Students in Newfoundland and Labrador performed at the Canadian average in the sub-domain of 'identifying scientific issues' and below the Canadian average on the combined science scales and the other two science sub-domains.

Table 1.2
Provincial results in science in relation to the Canadian average

|  | Provinces performing significantly better than the Canadian average | Provinces performing as well as the Canadian average | Provinces performing significantly lower than the Canadian average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Science - combined scale | Alberta | Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia | Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan |
| Science - identifying scientific issues | Alberta | Newfoundland and Labrador, Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia | Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan |
| Science - explaining phenomena scientifically | Alberta | Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia | Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan |
| Mathematics - using scientific evidence | Alberta | Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia | Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan |

Note: Provinces within each cell are ordered from east to west.

## Canada has more equity in performance compared to all OECD countries combined

While mean performance is useful in assessing the overall performance of students, it can mask significant variation within a country/province. Further light on the performance within countries/provinces can be shed by examining the relative distribution of scores or the gap that exists between students with the highest and lowest levels of performance within each jurisdiction. This is an important indicator of the equity of educational outcomes in science. Chart 1.5 shows the difference in average scores between those in the lowest quarter (25th percentile) of student achievement and those in the
highest quarter ( 75 th percentile) of student achievement on the combined science scale. While in Canada, those in the highest quarter scored 127 points higher than those in the lowest quarter, this variation ranged from approximately 124 to 134 points across the provinces.

The amount of within-country variation in performance in science varied widely among OECD countries (Appendix tables B.1.5 to B.1.8). Both Canada and the majority of the provinces were among the few jurisdictions with above-average science performance and below-average level of disparity in student performance (as measured by score point differences between the 75 th and 25 th percentile) - both of these outcomes being desirable.

## Chart 1.5

Difference in average scores in science between students who performed in the bottom quarter of performance and students who performed in the top quarter of performance


## Canada has a high percentage of high achievers in science

The average scores reported in the previous section provide a useful but limited way of comparing performance of different groups of students. Another way to compare performance is to examine the proportions of students who can accomplish tasks at various proficiency levels. This kind of analysis allows a further breakdown of average scores and an examination of groups of students who show similar abilities. In PISA, science proficiency is a continuum - that is, science proficiency is not something a student has or does not have, but rather every 15 -year-old shows a certain level of proficiency. The science proficiency levels used in

PISA 2006 are described in the text box 5 'Science Proficiency levels'.

Chart 1.6 (based on data from Appendix table B.1.9) shows the distribution of students by proficiency level by country and includes the Canadian provinces. Results for countries and provinces are presented in descending order according to the proportion of 15 -year-olds who performed at Level 2 or higher. The OECD defined Level 2 proficiency as a baseline as it represents a critical level of science literacy on the PISA test. It is at Level 2 that students begin to demonstrate the kind of science knowledge and skills that enable them to actively and effectively use science competencies.
Chart 1.6

Percentage of students at each level of proficiency on the combined science scale


## Box 5

## Science proficiency levels

Science achievement was divided into six proficiency levels representing a group of tasks of increasing difficulty with Level 6 as the highest and Level 1 as the lowest. Students performing below Level 1 (science score below 334.5) are not able to demonstrate routinely the most basic type of knowledge and skills that PISA seeks to measure. Such students have serious difficulties in using science literacy as a tool to advance their knowledge and skills in other areas. Placement at this level does not mean that these students have no science knowledge and skills. Most of these students are able to correctly complete some of the PISA items. Their pattern of responses to the assessment is such that they would be expected to solve less than half of the tasks from a test composed of only Level 1 items.

In PISA 2006, Level 2 has been identified as the 'baseline proficiency' level or the level of achievement on the PISA scale at which students begin to demonstrate the scientific competencies that will enable full participation in life situations related to science and technology.

Students were assigned to a proficiency level based on their probability of answering correctly the majority of items in that range of difficulty. A student at a given level could be assumed to be able to correctly answer questions at all lower levels. To help in interpretation, these levels were linked to specific score ranges on the combined science scale. Below is a description of the abilities associated with each proficiency level. (Source: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Programme for International Student Assessment, PISA 2006).

## Level 6 (score above 707.81)

At Level 6, students can consistently identify, explain and apply scientific knowledge and knowledge about science in a variety of complex life situations. They can link different information sources and explanations and use evidence from those sources to justify decisions. They clearly and consistently demonstrate advanced scientific thinking and reasoning, and they are willing to use their scientific understanding in support of solutions to unfamiliar scientific and technological situations. Students at this level can use scientific knowledge and develop arguments in support of recommendations and decisions that centre on personal, social or global situations.
Level 5 (score from 633.14 to 707.81 )
At Level 5, students can identify the scientific components of many complex life situations, apply both scientific concepts and knowledge about science to these situations, and can compare, select and evaluate appropriate scientific evidence for responding to life situations. Students at this level can use well-developed inquiry abilities, link knowledge appropriately and bring critical insights to these situations. They can construct evidence-based explanations and arguments based on their critical analysis.

Level 4 (score from 558.48 to 633.14 )
At Level 4, students can work effectively with situations and issues that may involve explicit phenomena requiring them to make inferences about the role of science or technology. They can select and integrate explanations from different disciplines of science or technology and link those explanations directly to aspects of life situations. Students at this level can reflect on their actions and they can communicate decisions using scientific knowledge and evidence.

Level 3 (score from 483.81 to 558.48 )
At Level 3, students can identify clearly described scientific issues in a range of contexts. They can select facts and knowledge to explain phenomena and apply simple models or inquiry strategies. Students at this level can interpret and use scientific concepts from different disciplines and can apply them directly. They can develop short communications using facts and make decisions based on scientific knowledge.

Level 2 (score from 409.14 to 483.81 )
At Level 2, students have adequate scientific knowledge to provide possible explanations in familiar contexts or draw conclusions based on simple investigations. They are capable of direct reasoning and making literal interpretations of the results of scientific inquiry or technological problem solving.
Level 1 (score from 334.48 to 409.14)
At Level 1, students have such a limited store of scientific knowledge that it can only be applied to a few, familiar situations. They can present scientific explanations that are obvious and follow concretely from given evidence.

Using these proficiency levels, students with high and low levels of proficiency can be identified. Listed in Table 1.3 are the percentages of students who performed at Level 1 or below and the percentages of students who performed at Level 5 or 6 for each country and the ten provinces.

Students performing at Level 1 or below would have great difficulty continuing studies in science and in daily life activities involving the application of science skills. In contrast, the students performing at Level 5 or above are likely to be well qualified to do so.

Compared to the OECD average, a significantly smaller proportion of Canadian students performed at Level 1 or below in science. The Canadian proportion at Level 1 or below was almost half the proportion of the OECD average ( $10 \%$ versus $19 \%$ respectively). Only Finland and Estonia had a significantly smaller proportion of students at Level 1 or below than Canada.

In contrast, a significantly higher proportion of Canadian students performed at Level 5 or above in science. The OECD average was approximately $9 \%$, six percentage points lower than the average of $15 \%$ for Canada. Two countries (Finland and New Zealand) had significantly greater percentages of students with higher skills than Canada.

Turning to the provinces, the percentages of students who performed at Level 1 or below on the combined science scale were similar to the percentage for Canada in six of the Canadian provinces (Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia). The percentages of students in Alberta who performed at Level 1 or below was significantly lower than the Canadian average. While the percentage of students who performed at Level 1 or below was higher that the Canadian average in Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, the percentage was below the OECD average.

The percentages of students in Alberta at Level 5 or higher ( $18 \%$ ) were significantly greater than the Canadian percentage ( $15 \%$ ). The percentages of students in Newfoundland and Labrador, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia who performed at Levels 5 or higher were comparable to the percentage for Canada.

Lower percentages of students in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan performed at Level 5 or higher compared to the Canadian percentage (Table 1.3). However, the provincial percentages were statistically the same or higher than as the OECD average.
$\overline{\text { Table } 1.3}$

Percentage of students with high and low proficiency levels in science, by country and province

| Percentage significantly higher than the Canadian percentage | Percentage not significantly different from the Canadian percentage |  | Percentage significantly lower than the Canadian percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of students with Iow Ievel proficiency (level 1 or below) | Percentage of students with high level proficiency (level 5 or above) |  |  |
| Country and province | percentage | Country and province | percentage |
| Finland | 4 | Finland | 21 |
| Alberta | 6 | Alberta | 18 |
| Estonia | 8 | New Zealand | 18 |
| Hong Kong-China | 9 | British Columbia | 16 |
| British Columbia | 9 | Hong Kong-China | 16 |
| Ontario | 9 | Japan | 15 |
| Canada | 10 | Australia | 15 |
| Macao-China | 10 | Chinese Taipei | 15 |
| Korea | 11 | Canada | 15 |
| Quebec | 11 | Ontario | 14 |
| Chinese Taipei | 12 | Quebec | 14 |
| Nova Scotia | 12 | United Kingdom | 14 |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 12 | Newfoundland and Labrador | 14 |
| Japan | 12 | Netherlands | 13 |
| Manitoba | 12 | Slovenia | 13 |
| Australia | 13 | Manitoba | 13 |
| Netherlands | 13 | Liechtenstein | 12 |
| Liechtenstein | 13 | Germany | 12 |
| Saskatchewan | 14 | Czech Republic | 12 |
| New Zealand | 14 | Estonia | 12 |
| Slovenia | 14 | Saskatchewan | 11 |
| Hungary | 15 | Switzerland | 11 |
| New Brunswick | 15 | Korea | 10 |
| Germany | 15 | Belgium | 10 |
| Ireland | 15 | Nova Scotia | 10 |
| Czech Republic | 15 | Austria | 10 |
| Switzerland | 16 | Prince Edward Island | 10 |
| Prince Edward Island | 16 | Ireland | 10 |
| Austria | 16 | United States | 9 |
| Sweden | 16 | France | 8 |
| United Kingdom | 17 | New Brunswick | 8 |
| Croatia | 17 | Sweden | 8 |
| Poland | 17 | Denmark | 7 |
| Belgium | 17 | Hungary | 7 |
| Latvia | 17 | Poland | 7 |
| Denmark | 18 | Iceland | 6 |
| Spain | 20 | Norway | 6 |
| Slovak Republic | 20 | Luxembourg | 6 |
| Lithuania | 20 | Slovak Republic | 6 |
| Iceland | 20 | Macao-China | 5 |
| Norway | 21 | Croatia | 5 |
| France | 21 | Israel | 5 |
| Luxembourg | 22 | Lithuania | 5 |
| Russian Federation | 22 | Spain | 5 |
| Greece | 24 | Italy | 5 |

Table 1.3 (concluded)
Percentage of students with high and low proficiency levels in science, by country and province

| Percentage significantly higher than the Canadian percentage | Percentage not significantly different from the Canadian percentage |  | Percentage significantly lower than the Canadian percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of students with low level proficiency (level 1 or below) | Percentage of students with high level proficiency (level 5 or above) |  |  |
| Country and province | percentage | Country and province | percentage |
| United States | 24 | Russian Federation | 4 |
| Portugal | 24 | Latvia | 4 |
| Italy | 25 | Greece | 3 |
| Israel | 36 | Portugal | 3 |
| Serbia | 38 | Bulgaria | 3 |
| Chile | 39 | Chile | 2 |
| Uruguay | 42 | Uruguay | 2 |
| Bulgaria | 43 | Turkey | 1 |
| Jordan | 44 | Serbia | 1 |
| Thailand | 46 | Brazil | 1 |
| Turkey | 46 | Jordan | 1 |
| Romania | 47 | Argentina | 1 |
| Montenegro | 50 | Romania | 1 |
| Mexico | 51 | Thailand | 0 |
| Argentina | 56 | Mexico | 0 |
| Colombia | 60 | Montenegro | 0 |
| Brazil | 61 | Qatar | 0 |
| Indonesia | 61 | Colombia | 0 |
| Tunisia | 63 | Tunisia | 0 |
| Azerbaijan | 72 | Azerbaijan | 0 |
| Qatar | 79 | Indonesia | 0 |
| Kyrgyzstan | 86 | Kyrgyzstan | 0 |

## Students in minority language school systems had lower performance in combined science compared to those in majority language school systems

This section examines the science performance of students in the French-language and English-language school systems for the five Canadian provinces in which these populations were separately sampled. The performance of the minority language group (students in French-language school systems in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba, and students in the English-language school system in Quebec) are compared to the majority group.

Results from PISA 2006 found that for science in the combined scale, students enrolled in the French-
language school systems in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba performed significantly lower than students in the English-language school systems. The differences ranged from 29 to 46 score points. In Quebec there was a small but statistically significant difference with results favouring the French-language system.

With respect to science performance in the three science sub-domains, significant differences favouring the English-language school system were observed in the four provinces where the French-language school systems are found in minority settings. In Quebec, there was a small but statistically significant difference with results favouring the French-language system in the subdomains of 'explaining phenomena scientifically' while no significant difference was observed in the other two sub-domains.

| Table 1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average science scores by province and language of the school system |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | English-language school system |  | French-language school system |  | Difference between French-language and English language school system |  |
|  | average | standard error | average | standard error | difference ${ }^{1}$ | standard error |
| Science - combined scale |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nova Scotia | 521* | (2.5)* | 475* | (5.6)* | 46* | (6.1) * |
| New Brunswick | 516* | (3.0)* | 482* | (3.1)* | 34* | (4.4) * |
| Quebec | 519* | (3.2)* | $532 *$ | (4.7)* | -13* | (5.7) * |
| Ontario | 538* | (4.3)* | 498* | (3.5)* | 40* | (5.4) * |
| Manitoba | $524 *$ | (3.3)* | 495* | (5.7)* | 29* | (6.7) * |
| Science - identifying scientific issues |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nova Scotia | 517* | (3.6)* | 465* | (6.1)* | 52* | (7.0) * |
| New Brunswick | 524* | (3.0) * | 483* | (3.3)* | 41* | (4.7) * |
| Quebec | 523 | (3.7) | 532 | (5.3) | -9 | (6.6) |
| Ontario | 534* | (5.1)* | 495* | (3.8)* | 40* | (6.3)* |
| Manitoba | 520* | (3.4)* | 485* | (5.7)* | 35* | (6.7) * |
| Science - explaining phenomena scientifically |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nova Scotia | 520* | (3.4)* | 474* | (6.3)* | 46* | (7.4) * |
| New Brunswick | 510* | (3.4)* | 479* | (3.3)* | 31* | (4.8) * |
| Quebec | 509* | (3.6)* | 524* | (4.5)* | -16* | (6.0) * |
| Ontario | 534* | (4.6)* | 492* | (3.5)* | 42* | (5.8) * |
| Manitoba | 523* | (3.6)* | 496* | (5.6)* | $27 *$ | (6.7) * |
| Science - using scientific evidence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nova Scotia | 525* | (2.5)* | 481* | (6.1)* | 45* | (6.8) * |
| New Brunswick | 521* | (3.0)* | 487* | (3.6)* | 35* | (4.7) * |
| Quebec | 531 | (3.4) | 543 | (5.3) | -12 | (6.3) |
| Ontario | 547* | (4.5)* | $508 *$ | (3.9)* | 39* | (5.8) * |
| Manitoba | 531* | (3.5)* | 502* | (6.0)* | 29* | (7.1)* |

[^0]
## Summary

In this chapter performance in combined science and in the three science sub-scales of identifying scientific issues, explaining phenomena scientifically and using scientific evidence are presented for Canada and the provinces.

In an increasingly technology-based society, knowledge and skills in science are critical to economic progress. Canada's performance in PISA 2006 suggests that, on the whole, Canadian 15-year-olds are equipped with the science knowledge and skills to participate in a society in which science and technology play a significant role.

However, while all provinces scored above the OECD average, there were differences in performance among provinces. While the comparative approach taken in this chapter does not lend itself to developing explanations for these differences, further analysis could explore how resources, schools and classroom conditions, as well as individual and family circumstances, affect variation in achievement.

## Notes

6. Further detail on scientific literacy and the scientific competencies are available in the PISA 2006 framework: 'Assessing Scientific, Reading and Mathematical Literacy, A Framework for PISA 2006. OECD (2007).
7. The OECD average for the combined score was established with the data weighted so that each OECD country contributed equally. As the anchoring of the scale was done for the combination of the three competency sub-domain scales, the average mean and standard deviation for the sub-domain scales differ from 500 and 100 score points.
8. OECD (2007), Learning for Tomorrow's World - First results from PISA 2006. Paris.

## Chapter 2

## The performance of Canadian students in reading and mathematics in an international context

This chapter presents the overall results of the PISA 2006 assessments in the minor domains of reading and mathematics. First, the average performance of Canadian 15 -year-old students is compared to the performance of 15 -year-old students from countries that participated in PISA 2006. Second, students' performance in the ten Canadian provinces are presented and discussed. Third, the performance of students enrolled in English-language and French-language school systems are compared for the five provinces in which the two groups were separately sampled. Lastly, the results of PISA 2006 are compared with those of PISA 2003 and PISA 2000 for reading and mathematics.

## Defining reading and mathematics

Both reading and mathematics were minor domains in PISA 2006. On the other hand, reading was the major domain of PISA 2000 while mathematics was the major domain in PISA 2003. Definitions for both domains are provided in the Introduction.

The scores for reading and mathematics are expressed on a scale with an average or mean of 500 points and a standard deviation of 100 . This average was established in the year in which the domain became the main focus of the assessment - 2000 for reading and 2003 for mathematics. Approximately two-thirds of the
students scored between 400 and 600 (i.e. within one standard deviation of the average) for the OECD countries. Due to change in performance over time, the OECD average scores for mathematics and reading in PISA 2006 differ slightly from 500.

## Canadian students performed well in reading and mathematics

One way to summarize student performance and to compare the relative standing of countries is by examining their average test scores. However, simply ranking countries based on their average scores can be misleading because there is a margin of error associated with each score. As discussed in Chapter 1, when interpreting average performances, only those differences between countries that are statistically significant should be taken into account. Table 2.1 shows the countries that performed significantly better than or the same as Canada in reading and mathematics. The averages of the students in all of the remaining countries were significantly below those of Canada. Overall, Canadian students performed well. Among the countries that participated in PISA 2006, only Korea, Finland and Hong Kong-China performed better than Canada in reading and mathematics. Additionally Chinese Taipei performed better than Canada in mathematics.


Note: The OECD average in 2006 is 492 with a standard error of 0.6.

## Chart 2.2

## Average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Mathematics



Note: The OECD average in 2006 is 498 with a standard error of 0.5.

## Table 2.1

Countries performing better than, or the same as Canada

|  | Countries performing <br> significantly better than Canada | Countries performing <br> the same as Canada |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Reading | Korea, Finland, Hong Kong-China | New Zealand |
| Mathematics | Chinese Taipei, Finland, Korea, <br> Hong Kong-China | Netherlands, Switzerland, Macao-China, <br> Liechtenstein, Japan, New Zealand, Belgium |

## All provinces performed at or above the OECD average in reading and mathematics

Across the two minor domains of PISA 2006 the performance of students in all provinces was, with a few exceptions, above the OECD average. Students in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick performed at the OECD average in reading while students in Prince Edward Island performed at the OECD average in mathematics.

As shown in Table 2.2, students in Quebec performed above the Canadian average in mathematics and at the Canadian average in reading. Students in Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia performed at the Canadian average in both minor domains. Students in Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan performed below the Canadian average in both minor domains. Students in Manitoba performed below the Canadian average in Reading and at the Canadian average in mathematics.

| Table 2.2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Provincial results in reading and mathematics in relation to the Canadian average |  |  |  |
|  | Provinces performing significantly better than the Canadian average | Provinces performing the same as the Canadian average | Provinces performing significantly lower than the Canadian average |
| Reading |  | Quebec, Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia | Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan |
| Mathematics | Quebec | Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta, <br> British Columbia | Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan |

Note: Provinces within each cell are ordered from east to west.

## Canada has more equity in performance compared to all OECD countries combined

While mean performance is useful in assessing the overall performance of students, it can mask significant variation within a jurisdiction. Further light on the performance within jurisdictions can be shed by examining the relative distribution of scores or the gap that exists between students with the highest and lowest levels of performance within each jurisdiction. This is an important indicator of the equity of educational outcomes in reading and mathematics. Chart 2.3 shows the difference in average scores between those in the lowest quarter ( 25 th percentile) of student achievement and
those in the highest quarter (75th percentile) of student achievement in reading and mathematics. For Canada overall, those in the highest quarter scored 124 points higher on reading and 117 points higher in mathematics compared to those in the lowest quarter. This compares to 147 and 127 points respectively for reading and mathematics across all OECD countries

The amount of within-country variation in performance in reading and mathematics varied widely among countries (Appendix tables B.2.3 and B.2.4). Canada was one of the few countries with above-average performance and below-average disparity in student performance (as measured by score point differences between the 75 th and 25 th percentile) - both of these outcomes being desirable.

## Chart 2.3

Difference in average scores in reading and mathematics between students who performed in the bottom quarter of performance and students who performed in the top quarter of performance


Across the provinces, differences between the lowest and highest quarter ranged from 112 to 123 in mathematics and 116 to 140 in reading. All provinces had below-average levels of variation in mathematics
performance compared to the OECD average. Generally speaking, provinces that performed better in reading and mathematics tended to have less variation between the highest and lowest quartile of student performance.

## Achievement of Canadian students in reading and mathematics differ by language of the school system

This section examines the performance of students in the English-language and French-language school systems for the five Canadian provinces that sampled these population groups separately. The performance of the minority language group (students in Frenchlanguage school systems in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba and students in the Englishlanguage school system in Quebec) are compared to he majority language group.

A comparison of PISA 2006 results within each province is given in Table 2.3. As was the case in PISA

2000 and PISA 2003, students enrolled in the Frenchlanguage school systems in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba performed significantly lower in reading than did students in the English-language system in the same province. In Quebec, student performance did not differ between the English-language and Frenchlanguage school systems.

For mathematics, there were significant differences favouring the English-language system in New Brunswick and Ontario however these differences were much less pronounced than those observed for reading. There were significant differences favouring the Frenchlanguage school system in Quebec. No significant differences in mathematics were observed in Nova Scotia and Manitoba.

## Table 2.3

Average reading and mathematics scores by province and language of the school system

|  | English-language school system |  | French-language school system |  | Difference between French-language and English-Ianguage school system |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | average | standard error | average | standard error | difference ${ }^{1}$ | standard error |
| Reading |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nova Scotia | 506* | (3.6)* | 442* | (5.7)* | $64 *$ | (6.5)* |
| New Brunswick | $510 *$ | (2.6)* | 465* | (3.7)* | 45* | (4.2)* |
| Quebec | 520 | (3.2) | 522 | (5.7) | -3 | (6.8) |
| Ontario | 536* | (4.8)* | 485* | (3.3)* | $51 *$ | (5.9)* |
| Manitoba | 518* | (3.6)* | 465* | (5.8)* | 53* | (6.8)* |
| Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nova Scotia | 506 | (2.3) | 496 | (5.3) | 11 | (5.8) |
| New Brunswick | $509 *$ | (2.8)* | 499* | (3.2)* | 10* | (4.4)* |
| Quebec | $530 *$ | (2.8)* | 541* | (4.8)* | -12* | (5.6)* |
| Ontario | $527 *$ | (3.8)* | 507* | (3.0)* | 19* | (4.9)* |
| Manitoba | 521 | (3.4) | 516 | (5.0) | 4 | (6.2) |

[^1]
## Student performance in reading and mathematics remained stable since 2000 for Canada overall and for most provinces

PISA 2006 provides the third assessment of reading since 2000 when the first full assessment of reading took place, and the second assessment of mathematics since 2003 when the first full assessment of mathematics took place. While this section looks at change over time, performance differences should be interpreted with caution for several reasons. First, while the measurement approach used in PISA is consistent across cycles, small refinements were made so small changes should be interpreted prudently. Secondly, since data is available for three points in time for reading and two points in time for mathematics since being assessed fully in 2003, it is not possible to determine the extent to which observed differences are indicative of longer-term changes.

The OECD average of 492 points in reading in 2006 represents a decrease in the average score of 500 for the OECD countries that participated in $2000^{\circ}$. In Canada, as well as across OECD countries, reading performance did not change between 2003 and 2006. Reading performance also remained stable in Canada
between 2000 and 2006. In comparing change between 2000 and 2006, reading performance remained stable in 16 countries including Canada, decreased in 15 countries and increased in 8 countries. The improvement in reading performance observed in Hong Kong-China and Korea explains why these two countries, for the first time, outperformed Canada in 2006.

Mathematics performance remained unchanged across all countries between PISA 2003 and PISA 2006 and the OECD average change of 2 score points was not statistically significant.

Tables 2.4 and 2.5 show the confidence intervals for performance in reading and mathematics for Canada and the provinces. The confidence intervals take into account the sampling, linkage and measurement errors that are introduced when assessments are linked with a limited number of common assessment tasks over time. Changes are only statistically significant when the confidence intervals around scores do not overlap.

Performance in reading and mathematics remained stable across jurisdictions with the following exceptions: reading performance decreased between 2000 and 2006 in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan while mathematics performance decreased between 2003 and 2006 in Alberta and British Columbia.

## Table 2.4

Comparison of performance confidence intervals in reading, PISA 2000, 2003 and 2006, Canada and the provinces

|  | PISA score with 95\% confidence interval |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 |  | 2003 |  | 2006 |  |
|  | average score | standard error | average score | standard error with linkage error | average score | standard error with linkage error |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 517 | (2.8) | 521 | (4.9) | 514 | (5.4) |
| Prince Edward Island | 517* | (2.4) | 495* | (4.4) | 497* | (5.1) |
| Nova Scotia | 521* | (2.3) | 513 | (4.4) | 505* | (5.7) |
| New Brunswick | 501 | (1.8) | 503 | (4.3) | 497 | (5.0) |
| Quebec | 536 | (3.0) | 525 | (5.7) | 522 | (6.7) |
| Ontario | 533 | (3.3) | 530 | (5.1) | 535 | (6.4) |
| Manitoba | 529 | (3.5) | 520 | (5.0) | 516 | (5.7) |
| Saskatchewan | 529* | (2.7) | 512 * | (5.6)* | 507* | (6.3)* |
| Alberta | 550 | (3.3) | 543 | (5.7) | 534 | (6.1) |
| British Columbia | 538 | (2.9) | 535 | (4.5) | 528 | (7.1) |
| Canada | 534 | (1.6) | 528 | (4.1) | 527 | (5.1) |

[^2]
## Table 2.5

Comparison of performance confidence intervals in mathematics, PISA, 2003 and 2006, Canada and the provinces

|  | PISA score with 95\% confidence interval |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2003 |  | 2006 |  |
|  | average score | standard error with linkage error | average score | standard error with linkage error |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 517 | (2.5) | 507 | (3.1) |
| Prince Edward Island | 500 | (2.0) | 501 | (2.7) |
| Nova Scotia | 515 | (2.2) | 506 | (2.8) |
| New Brunswick | 512 | (1.8) | 506 | (2.5) |
| Quebec | 537 | (4.7) | 540 | (4.4) |
| Ontario | 530 | (3.6) | 526 | (4.0) |
| Manitoba | 528 | (3.1) | 521 | (3.6) |
| Saskatchewan | 516 | (3.9) | 507 | (3.7) |
| Alberta | 549* | (4.3)* | 530* | (4.0)* |
| British Columbia | 538* | (2.4)* | 523* | (4.7)* |
| Canada | 532 | (1.8) | 527 | (2.4) |

* Statistically significant differences.

Note: The linkage error is incorporated into the standard error for 2006.

## Summary

Because reading and mathematics were considered to be minor domains in PISA 2006, a smaller proportion of students were assessed in those domains compared to the science assessment, which was the major focus of the 2006 assessment. Additionally, a smaller number of items were included in each of these assessments than were included in the science assessment. Consequently, this chapter focuses on providing an update on overall performance in these two domains.

While performance in reading remained stable in Canada since PISA 2000, improved performance in reading in Hong Kong-China and Korea resulted in these two countries outperforming Canada for the first time since PISA was implemented. This suggests that although Canada's performance in reading is strong, in order to maintain its' competitive edge in the future Canadian 15-year-olds will need to improve at the rate of the top performing countries, rather than simply maintain their competencies in reading.

## Note

9. Three OECD countries (The Netherlands, the Slovak Republic and Turkey) were not included in the PISA 2000 assessment.

## Chapter 3

## Differences in performance by selected student characteristics

## Introduction

As shown in Chapter 1, the science performance of students differed considerably across countries and across provinces. In this Chapter, selected student characteristics that are related to performance are explored beginning with an examination of performance by gender and immigrant status followed by an examination analysis of the impact of parental education and of socio-economic status.

## Boys outperform girls in 'explaining phenomena scientifically' while girls outperform boys in 'identifying scientific issues'

Policy makers have an interest in reducing gender disparities in educational performance. Such performance coupled with their motivation and attitudes towards learning influence both educational and occupational pathways of boys and girls.

PISA 2006 shows that gender differences on the combined science scale, which varied across countries, were small in absolute terms when compared with the large gender gap in reading. In Canada, no gender
difference was observed on the combined science scale with the exception of Newfoundland and Labrador where girls performed better than boys by 12 score points. Across all countries participating in PISA 2006, ten countries showed an advantage of boys over girls while thirteen countries showed an advantage of girls over boys. For the remaining countries there were no significant gender differences on the combined science scale.

In Canada, although overall there were no gender differences on the combined science scale or on the subscale of using scientific evidence, there were substantial gender differences on the other two science sub-scales as summarized in Table 3.1. In Canada, most countries and eight of the ten provinces, boys out performed girls in the sub-domain of 'explaining phenomena scientifically'. Canadian boys outperformed girls by 17 score points and this difference ranged from 0 to 21 points across provinces (Appendix table B.3.1) while across all OECD countries boys outperformed girls by 15 score points. In contrast, in Canada, most countries and all of the provinces, girls outperformed boys in the sub-domain 'identifying scientific issues'. The magnitude of this difference was 14 points for Canada overall, 17 points across all OECD countries and ranged from 12 to 36 score points across provinces.

The performance patterns on these two sub-scales suggest that boys and girls have very different levels of performance in different areas of science. It appears that boys demonstrate better performance at mastering
scientific knowledge whereas girls demonstrate better performance at seeing the larger picture that enables them to identify scientific questions that arise from a given situation.

## Table 3.1

Summary of gender differences for Canada and the provinces

|  | Girls performed significantly higher than boys | Boys performed significantly higher than girls | No significant differences between boys and girls |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Science - combined scale | Newfoundland and Labrador |  | Canada, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia |
| Science - using scientific evidence | Newfoundland and Labrador, Saskatchewan |  | Canada, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia |
| Science - explaining phenomena scientifically |  | Canada, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia | Newfoundland and Labrador, Saskatchewan |
| Science- identifying scientific issues | Canada, All provinces |  |  |
| Reading | Canada, All provinces |  |  |
| Mathematics |  | Canada, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia | Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan |

Note: Provinces within each cell are ordered from east to west.

Gender differences across the minor domains of mathematics and reading were consistent with results from previous PISA assessments with boys outperforming girls in mathematics and girls outperforming boys in reading. As was also the case in previous PISA assessments, the gap between girls and boys in reading was much larger than the gap between boys and girls in mathematics. In Canada, while boys outperformed girls by 14 points in mathematics, girls outperformed boys by 33 points in reading. At the provincial level, boys outperformed girls in mathematics in six of the ten provinces while girls outperformed boys in reading in all provinces.

When examining patterns of gender differences for the domains across provinces, some interesting patterns emerge. In contrast to that observed for Canada overall and the remaining provinces, in Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan, no
gender differences were observed in mathematics or on the sub-scale of 'explaining phenomena scientifically'. In three of the largest provinces, Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia, the magnitude of the gender differences across domains were more pronounced in domains where boys outperformed girls and less pronounced in domains where girls outperformed boys (Appendix tables B.3.1 and B.3.2).

## Immigrant students perform lower in science than non-immigrant students

Immigration has long been integral to Canada's social, cultural and economic development and it is expected that immigrants will constitute a larger share of the growth of Canada's labour force in the future. Results of the 2003 International Adult Literacy and Skills Survey ${ }^{10}$ revealed that a larger proportion of adult immigrants
performed at a lower level in literacy, numeracy and problem solving than Canadian-born. PISA data can also be explored to see if performance differences exist between immigrant and non-immigrant students.

PISA identifies two groups of immigrants: secondgeneration immigrants are those born in Canada from immigrant parents; and first generation immigrants are those born outside of Canada. Students born in Canada from parents also born in Canada are defined as nonimmigrant students.

Twenty one percent of the Canadian youth that participated in PISA 2006 were immigrants. Ten percent were first generation and $11 \%$ second generation. Immigrant youth represent $10 \%$ or more of the 15 -yearold youth in five provinces: Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia (Appendix table B.3.3). Detailed results about immigrant youth are presented only for these five provinces.

## Table 3.2

Distribution of 15-year olds by immigrant status and difference in performance on the combined science scale. PISA 2006

|  | Percentage of Students by Immigrant Status |  |  | Performance on the combined science score |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nonimmigrants | Secondgeneration immigrants | Firstgeneration immigrants | Nonimmigrants | Secondgeneration immigrants | First- <br> generation immigrants |
|  | percentage |  |  | average score |  |  |
| Quebec | 87 | 7 | 6 | 540 | 501 | 483 |
| Ontario | 69 | 16 | 15 | 546 | 538 | 520 |
| Manitoba | 88 | 7 | 5 | 529 | 509 | 496 |
| Alberta | 83 | 10 | 6 | 553 | 543 | 548 |
| British Columbia | 72 | 15 | 14 | 544 | 519 | 536 |
| Canada | 79 | 11 | 10 | 541 | 528 | 519 |
| OECD Average | 91 | 5 | 5 | 506 | 468 | 450 |

Second-generation immigrants completed all their education in Canada, having been born in this country. However this is not necessarily the case for firstgeneration immigrants depending on their age of arrival to Canada. Even if PISA is not measuring knowledge and skills specifically acquired in school, one would expect that the differences in scores between secondgeneration immigrants and non-immigrant students would be small, particularly in an area like science, where youth are more likely to develop their knowledge and skills in school rather than in their family or community. However, as shown in Table 3.2, non-immigrant students outperformed second generation immigrants who were born and educated in Canada. In three provinces (Manitoba, Quebec and British Columbia) the performance differences between non-immigrant youth and their second generation peers were significant.

Within Canada, the difference ranged from 20 points in Manitoba to 39 points for Quebec.

A similar pattern is observed when looking at differences in performance between first generation immigrants and non-immigrant students. In Canada, non-immigrant youth outperformed their firstgeneration peers by 23 points in science. Performance differences were significant in Ontario (27 points) and Manitoba ( 32 points) and were most pronounced in Quebec at 57 points.

When comparing performance between first and second generation immigration youth, there were similar levels of performance in four provinces. However, for Canada overall and Ontario second generation immigrant students outperformed first generation immigrant students by 10 points and 19 points respectively.

It should be noted that immigrant youth in Canada have much higher performance than immigrants across all OECD countries (Appendix table B.3.3) and also perform above the OECD average of 500 . In addition, the magnitude of performance differences of immigrant students compared to non-immigrant students is less pronounced in Canada compared to across all OECD countries as whole. The only exception is observed in Quebec where the difference in scores is at the OECD average. In contrast, in Alberta there were no differences in performance between immigrant and non-immigrant students.

## Higher levels of parental education are associated with higher performance in science

Parents play an important role in how students learn. Aside from being actively involved in their children's education, parents also provide a home environment that can impact on learning. Parents serve as a model for learning, determine the educational resources available in the home and hold particular attitudes and values towards education.

Parental education is a factor that has been shown to be related to important transitions in youth life. For example, Knighton and Bussière (2006) found that youth whose parents highest level of education was high school or less were less likely to complete high school or to go to post-secondary education by age 19 .

Thirty percent of the Canadian youth that participated in PISA 2006 had parents whose highest level of education was high school or less while $70 \%$ of students had a parent with at least some post secondary education. Parental education varied across provinces (Appendix table B.3.4): students whose parents had some postsecondary education ranged from 56\% (Newfoundland and Labrador) to 77\% (Ontario).

Youth with at least one parent who had postsecondary education outperformed their peers whose parents had high school education or less (Chart 3.1). In Canada, this difference amounted to 32 score points which is roughly equivalent to one year of education. While differences existed across all of the provinces the magnitude of this difference varied, ranging from 21 and 22 points in British Columbia and Manitoba respectively to 41 points in Quebec and Newfoundland and Labrador.

## Chart 3.1

Difference in score points of the combined science scale between students whose parents had some post secondary education and students whose parents had high school or less


## Socioeconomic status is related to performance but to a lesser extent in Canada when compared to other countries

How equitable the benefits of schooling are to students from different socio-economic backgrounds can be understood from the relationship between socioeconomic background and student performance. Socioeconomic status (SES) is a term used to summarize a variety of factors, including parental education and occupation, which influence student performance. In PISA 2006, SES was measured by an index that includes information describing family structure, parental education and occupation, parental labour market participation and whether a student's family has specific educational and cultural possessions at home. This index
is standardized to have an average of 0 and standard deviation of 1 across all OECD countries.

The averages of SES for Canada and the provinces are reported in Table 3.3. As was the case in previous PISA assessments, the average student in Canada had a relative socio-economic advantage compared to 15 -yearolds in all OECD countries with a score on the mean index being higher than the OECD average of 0 . Students in the four Atlantic provinces had scores below the Canadian average while the remaining provinces had scores that did not differ significantly from the Canadian average. Though the differences were not significant, Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia had higher scores than Canada. While students in all provinces tend to be more advantaged than 15 -year-olds in other OECD countries, the differences across provinces suggest that all students in Canada may not have access to the same resources or opportunities.

## Table 3.3

Socio-economic status in Canadian provinces

|  | Mean index score |  | Performance on the science scale, by national and provincial quarters of Socioeconomic status |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | mean <br> index | standard error | bottom quarter | second <br> quarter | third quarter | $\begin{array}{r} \text { top } \\ \text { quarter } \end{array}$ |
|  | percentage |  | average score |  |  |  |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 0.11 | (0.02) | 481 | 511 | 538 | 574 |
| Prince Edward Island | 0.21 | (0.02) | 481 | 499 | 522 | 536 |
| Nova Scotia | 0.24 | (0.03) | 484 | 504 | 531 | 555 |
| New Brunswick | 0.20 | (0.04) | 472 | 495 | 517 | 545 |
| Quebec | 0.21 | (0.03) | 495 | 522 | 537 | 574 |
| Ontario | 0.48 | (0.05) | 506 | 530 | 557 | 567 |
| Manitoba | 0.34 | (0.04) | 494 | 516 | 534 | 556 |
| Saskatchewan | 0.28 | (0.04) | 479 | 508 | 530 | 550 |
| Alberta | 0.43 | (0.05) | 519 | 541 | 560 | 584 |
| British Columbia | 0.40 | (0.04) | 507 | 538 | 545 | 563 |
| Canada | 0.37 | (0.02) | 501 | 527 | 548 | 569 |
| OECD average | 0.00 | (0.00) | 430 | 481 | 512 | 549 |

The relationship between SES and performance can be measured by the average performance levels by quarter of the index. Table 3.3 shows the relationship between student performance and SES; students are grouped into 4 quarters based on their score on the SES index, those in the bottom quarter have lower levels of SES while those in the highest quarter have higher levels of SES.

As shown in Table 3.3 there is a positive relationship between SES and science performance. In Canada, those in the top quarter of SES score 68 points higher, equivalent to one proficiency level higher, than those in the lowest SES quarter. The effect of SES on performance is much lower than that observed across all OECD countries where the difference between those in the top and bottom quarter was 119 points.

At the provincial level, the SES performance gap between the bottom and top quarters ranged from 55 and 56 points in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia respectively to 93 points in Newfoundland and Labrador. The fact that all provinces had SES performance gaps below the OECD average and average performance above the OECD average in science can be an indication that jurisdictions are able to mitigate the effects of SES and achieve relative equity in the distribution of learning performance. However, as seen by provincial differences in performance related to SES, it appears that there is still room for improvement. Across jurisdictions, British Columbia represents an example of a jurisdiction that has minimized the relationship between student SES and performance while still maintaining high levels of student performance.

## Summary

This chapter examined the relationship between various student background characteristics and achievement.

While no gender differences exist on the combined science scale, the performance patterns on two sub-scales suggest that boys and girls have very different levels of performance in different areas of science. It appears that boys may be better at mastering scientific knowledge whereas girls may be better at seeing the larger picture that enables them to identify scientific questions that arise from a given situation. Additionally, girls continue to outperform boys in reading while boys outperform girls in math.

Immigrant status, parental education and socioeconomic background are all related to performance but to a lesser extent in Canada compared to OECD countries as a whole. However, differences observed across the jurisdictions, suggest that further improvements are possible. For example, Alberta represents a jurisdiction with higher performance and no differences in performance between immigrants and non-immigrant Canadians and British Columbia represents an example of a jurisdiction that has minimized the relationship between student SES and performance while still maintaining high levels of student performance.

While this chapter has only looked at the relationship between student background characteristics examined individually on performance, further multivariate research can determine the relative performance of student background characteristics impacting performance.

## Note

10. Building on our Competencies: Canadian Results of the International Adult Literacy and Skills Survey, HRSDC and Statistics Canada 2005.

## Chapter 4

## Themes explored through PISA 2006

## Introduction

In addition to assessing student performance, PISA also collected data on student, family and institutional factors that can help to explain differences in performance. These factors are organized around themes or research areas that will be further expanded upon in future thematic reports released by the OECD and can be further explored nationally through subsequent analysis with PISA 2006 data.

In this chapter, three key themes related to science are explored. First an examination of students' engagement in science and its relationship to science achievement is presented. Next, science and the environment are explored. This is followed by a look at the contexts for the learning of science.

The focus of this chapter is to provide a first glance at the breadth of information collected through PISA 2006. While this chapter does not explore these themes in depth, it does provide an overview of the relationships of these themes with student achievement and provides detailed data tables summarizing these results at the provincial level in the Appendix tables that can be further used by policy makers for informing decisions.

## Box 6

## Reporting PISA indices

Several themes presented in this chapter are based on questions collected through the student and school questionnaire and on indices that were derived based on these questions. A description of each index is provided in the text and each index was constructed so that the average score across the OECD countries is 0 and so that two-thirds of the scores are between -1.0 and 1.0 (i.e. a standard deviation of 1 ). Positive scores on each index are associated with higher levels of the attribute being measured whereas negative scores on each index are associated with lower levels of the attribute being measured.

In this section, relationships between indices and performance are presented in terms of differences in average performance between the top quarter and bottom quarter on the indices. In addition, the Appendix tables present the difference in student performance per unit (one standard deviation) of the index.

## Science engagement

The level of student engagement in science is important for acquiring skills and knowledge in science. Students who are engaged in the learning process will tend to learn more and be more receptive to the pursuit of knowledge. Further, student engagement in science has an impact upon course selection, educational pathways and career choices.

PISA 2006 collected information on a variety of dimensions of student engagement relating to thier belief that they can succeed in science, their value of science, their interest in science and their perceptions and attitudes regarding environmental issues. Based on student responses to a series of questions, PISA 2006 constructed the following engagement indices:

## Students' belief that they can success in science:

- Science self-efficacy measures confidence to perform science-related tasks
- Science self-concept measures their perception of their ability to learn science


## Students' value of science:

- General value of science measures their general appreciation of science as important and valuable to society at large.
- Personal value of science measures their appreciation of science as being relevant and useful for their own purposes.


## Students' interest in science:

- General interest in science refers to interest in learning about broad science topics.
- Enjoyment of science measures enjoyment in learning and reading about science, solving science problems and acquiring new knowledge in science.
- Instrumental motivation to learn science measures their belief that science will be useful for future employment or education.
- Future-oriented science motivation measures their belief that they will study and work in the field of science as an adult.
- Science activities outside school measure the extent to which they participate in activities outside of the school.

Student engagement results are summarized in Table 4.1 which shows the mean index score and relationship to science performance and in Table 4.2 which summarizes provincial differences in relationship to the Canadian average. Detailed results are presented in Appendix tables B.4.1 to B.4.9.

## Students believe that they can

 succeed in scienceThe belief in their ability to succeed in science is an important outcome of education and highly relevant to successful learning by the student. Canadian youth more strongly believe that they can succeed in science compared to the beliefs of their international peers. As indicated by the average index scores compared to the OECD average of 0 (Table 4.1), Canadian 15-year-olds reported higher levels of confidence in performing science-related tasks (science self-efficacy) and a higher perception of their ability to learn science (science self concept). Compared to Canadian 15 -year-olds as a whole, students in Newfoundland and Labrador and Alberta reported higher levels of confidence in performing science-related tasks while students in New Brunswick, Quebec and Saskatchewan reported levels lower than the Canadian average (Appendix table B.4.1). Students in Manitoba and Saskatchewan reported lower levels of perception of their ability to learn science (science self concept) compared to the Canadian average (Table 4.1, Appendix table B.4.2).

Table 4.1 shows the relationship between the engagement indices and science performance. Students are grouped into four quarters based on their score on each index, those in the bottom quarter reported lower levels while those in the top quarter reported higher levels of the respective index. Among all the student engagement indices, the two indices relating to a student's belief that they can succeed in science had the strongest relationship with science achievement. Those with higher levels of belief that they can succeed in science ( i.e. those in the top quarter in the index of science self-efficacy and science self-concept) had much higher average scores, equivalent to more than one proficiency level higher, relative to those with lower levels of belief that the can succeed in science (i.e. those in the bottom quarter on these indices). This relationship also held true across the provinces (Appendix tables B.4.1 and B.4.2).

## Students' value of science

The value that students place on science concerns their general appreciation of science as being important and valuable to society at large and that they personally value of science as being relevant and useful for their own purposes. Compared to 15 -year-olds across all OECD countries, Canadian youth believed more strongly that science is important and valuable to society at large as
well as for their own purpose (Table 4.1). Compared to the Canadian average, youth in Quebec were less likely to believe that science is relevant and useful for them personally while students in Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island and Alberta were more likely to believe that science is relevant and useful for them personally. Youth in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan were less likely to believe in the value of science for the society (Table 4.2).

There was a relationship between students' value of science and their science performance. Youth in the top quarter on the indices of general value of science and personal value of science scored 62 and 69 points higher respectively than their counterparts who scored in the bottom quarter of each index. This relationship also held true across the provinces (Appendix tables B.4.3 to B.4.4).

## Students' interest in science

Students' general interest in science was included in PISA because of its established relationship with achievement, course selection, career choice and lifelong learning ${ }^{11}$ Five scales measured various aspects of their interest in science. Compared to students across all OECD countries, as shown in Table 4.1, Canadian students reported higher levels of general interest in science, higher levels of enjoyment of science, higher levels of belief that science will be useful for future employment or education (instrumental motivation) and higher levels of belief that they will study and work in the field of science as an adult (future oriented science motivation). In contrast, Canadian youth were less likely to participate in science
activities outside of the school than their peers in other OECD countries.

Relative to the Canadian average, scores on the indices of general interest in science varied across provinces (Table 4.2). Youth in New Brunswick had higher scores than the Canadian average on four scales and youth in Newfoundland and Labrador had higher scores than the Canadian average on three scales. In contrast, youth in Saskatchewan and Manitoba had scores below the Canadian average on three scales.

Two of the indices - Instrumental motivation and Future-oriented science motivation - had particularly high provincial variation. While youth in Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island believed more strongly that science will be useful for future employment or education or that they will study and work in the field of science, youth in Quebec held these beliefs less strongly compared to the Canadian average. However, youth from Quebec and from New Brunswick were more likely than their other Canadian peers to participate in science activities outside of the school.

The relationship between students' interest of science and their science performance is summarized in Table 4.1. Youth in the top quarter on the indices of interest in science scored between 54 to 88 points higher than their counterparts in the bottom quarter of the indices. This relationship between interest in science and science performance also held true across the provinces and tended to be more pronounced in Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island (Appendix tables B.4.5 to B.4.9).

| Table 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean index score of science engagement and relationship of science performance in Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science performance by indices quarter |  |  |  |  |  | Difference in science performance between students in the top quarter versus students in the bottom quarter |
|  | mean index <br> score | bottom quarter | second quarter | third quarter | $\begin{array}{r} \text { top } \\ \text { quarter } \end{array}$ |  |
| index |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students' belief that they can succeed in science |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science self efficacy | 0.21 | 480 | 523 | 551 | 589 | 109 |
| Science self-concept | 0.27 | 494 | 519 | 553 | 592 | 98 |
| Students' value of science |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General value of science | 0.14 | 502 | 526 | 552 | 565 | 62 |
| Personal value of science | 0.20 | 504 | 529 | 538 | 575 | 69 |
| Students' interest in science |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General interest in science | 0.11 | 502 | 532 | 551 | 560 | 58 |
| Enjoyment of science | 0.17 | 493 | 523 | 548 | 581 | 88 |
| Instrumental motivation to learn science | 0.32 | 514 | 527 | 540 | 578 | 64 |
| Future oriented science motivation | 0.20 | 508 | 518 | 547 | 573 | 65 |
| Science activities outside school | -0.15 | 507 | 528 | 548 | 561 | 54 |


|  |  | Table 4.2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Provincial scores on indices of student engagement in |  |
| science relative to the Canadian average |  |  |  |

Note: Provinces within each cell are ordered from east to west.

## Science and the environment

Science and the environment is a key theme explored in PISA 2006. PISA 2006 collected information on the learning context for environmental issues and on students' perceptions and attitudes regarding environmental issues.

PISA 2006 provides insight into how environmental topics are taught to 15-year-olds in school. As shown in Appendix table B.4.10 and summarized in Table 4.3, environmental education was reported as a part of the science curriculum. In Canada and in all OECD countries combined, teaching of environmental topics most frequently occurred in a natural science course. Strategies for teaching about the environment vary across jurisdictions as summarized in Table 4.3.

## Table 4.3

## School reports on the teaching of environmental topics

|  | OECD <br> percent | Canada <br> percent | Provinces above the <br> Canadian percent | Provinces at the <br> Canadian percent | Provinces below <br> the Canadian percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| In a specific environmental <br> studies course | 21 | 27 | Newfoundland and Labrador, <br> Prince Edward Island, <br> New Brunswick | Quebec, Ontario, <br> British Columbia | Nova Scotia, Manitoba, <br> Saskatchewan, Alberta |
| In the natural sciences courses | 94 | 92 | Newfoundland and Labrador, <br> Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, <br> Saskatchewan, Alberta | Nova Scotia, <br> New Brunswick, Ontario, <br> British Columbia | Quebec |

Note: Provinces within each cell are ordered from east to west.

Students may also acquire knowledge through environmental education opportunities that take place outside the classroom as summarized shown in Table 4.4. The majority of students participated in school activities to promote the learning of environmental topics while the mix of activities varied from the OECD. Canadian students were less likely to participate in outdoor
education activities and trips to museums and were more likely to participate in trips to science/technology centres, extracurricular environmental projects, and lectures and seminars. Within Canada, the mix of activities also varied across jurisdictions as summarized Table 4.4 and Appendix table B.4.11.

## Table 4.4

Percentage of students participating in school activities to promote the learning of environmental topics

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { OECD } \\ \text { percent } \end{gathered}$ | Canada percent | Provinces above the Canadian percent | Provinces at the Canadian percent | Provinces below the Canadian percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Outdoor education | 77 | 61 | Newfoundland and Labrador, Saskatchewan | Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia | New Brunswick, Quebec |
| Trips to museums | 75 | 68 |  | Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia | Newfoundland and Labrador, New Brunswick, Quebec |
| Trips to science and/or technology centres | 67 | 76 |  | Newfoundland and Labrador, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia | Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec |
| Extracurricular environmental projects | 45 | 65 |  | Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia | New Brunswick, Saskatchewan |
| Lectures and/or seminars | 53 | 73 | Prince Edward Island, Ontario | Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia | Quebec |

Note: Provinces within each cell are ordered from east to west.

PISA 2006 also collected information on students' perceptions and attitudes regarding environmental issues from which the following four indices were created:

- Awareness of environmental issues measures students' awareness of environmental issues such as genetically modified organisms, acid rain, nuclear waste, deforestation and greenhouse gases.
- Perception of the importance of environmental issues measures students' perception of the importance of environmental issues such as air pollution, energy shortages, extinction of plant and animals, deforestation, acid rain and nuclear waste.
- Optimism regarding environmental issues measures students' belief that problems associated
with environmental issues will improve over the next 20 years.
- Responsibility for sustainable development measures students' responsibility for sustainable development.

As seen in Table 4.5, compared to the OECD average of zero, Canadian students reported higher levels of awareness of environmental issues and lower levels of optimism regarding environmental issues. Canadian students reported similar levels of perception of the importance of environmental issues and responsibility for sustainable development as students across all OECD countries.

## Table 4.5

Provincial results on indices of students' perceptions and attitudes regarding environmental issues relative to the Canadian average

|  | Mean index score | Provinces above the Canadian mean | Provinces at the Canadian mean | Provinces below Canadian mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Awareness of environmental issues | 0.27 | Ontario, Alberta | Newfoundland and Labrador, Manitoba | Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Saskatchewan, British Columbia |
| Perception of the importance of environmental issues | -0.10 | Quebec | Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario | Newfoundland and Labrador, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia |
| Optimism regarding environmental issues | -0.22 | Newfoundland and Labrador, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, British Columbia | Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, Alberta | Quebec |
| Responsibility for sustainable development | 0.02 | Quebec | Ontario | Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia |

Note: Provinces within each cell are ordered from east to west.

Table 4.6 shows the relationship between the various indices on environmental issues and science performance. Students are grouped into four quarters based on their score on the respective index where those in the bottom quarter reported lower levels while those in the top quarter reported higher levels of the respective index. There was a strong association between science achievement and students' level of awareness of environmental issues and responsibility for sustainable
development. Those in the top quarter of these indices had much higher average scores compared to those in the bottom quarter of these indices. In contrast, there was a negative relationship between science performance and environmental optimism: those with higher science performance tended to have lower levels of environmental optimism. No relationship existed between perception of environmental issues and science performance.

| Table 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Relationship between indices on environmental issues and science performance |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Science performance, by quarter on the indices of environmental issues |  |  |  | Difference in science performance between students in the top quarter versus students in the bottom quarter |
|  | bottom quarter | second quarter | third quarter | $\begin{array}{r} \text { top } \\ \text { quarter } \end{array}$ |  |
| Index of awareness of environmental issues | 482 | 529 | 554 | 580 | 98 |
| Index of perception of environmental issues | 527 | 541 | 545 | 533 | , |
| Index of environmental optimism | 540 | 545 | 542 | 520 | -20 |
| Index of responsibility for sustainable development | 508 | 519 | 549 | 570 | 62 |

## Contexts for the learning of science

For the first time, PISA 2006 collected details about science-teaching and learning in order to shed light on the learning environment in which students have the opportunity to engage in science activities and to develop scientific literacy. Principals were asked questions about the availability of science teachers and laboratory equipment, activities to promote science learning, teaching of environmental topics at schools, activities to promote the learning of environmental topics and teacher emphasis on science-related careers. Students reported on how science was taught to them, the amount of time they spend learning science through in-school lessons, out of school lessons and homework and study. Students also reported on their perceptions of the usefulness of schooling for preparing them for science-related careers and for keeping them informed on science-related careers.

It should be noted that the characteristics of the current learning environment of 15 -year-olds which is reported in this section may differ from that in their earlier school years and thus may not necessarily reflect their cumulative learning environment. Nonetheless, the breadth of information collected from both principals and students provides unique insights into the ways in which jurisdictions implement their educational objectives.

## Science learning time

As shown in Chart 4.1, the majority of Canadian 15-year-olds (79\%) were enrolled in a compulsory general science course while at least one-quarter of students were enrolled in a specific (chemistry, physics, biology) compulsory science course. A much smaller percentage of Canadian students were enrolled in optional science courses. Patterns of participation varied across jurisdictions as shown in Appendix table B.4.16.


Table 4.7 shows the amount of time dedicated to learning science. It should be noted that science learning time is also associated with grade levels. With the exception of students in Quebec, the majority of Canadian students spend at least 4 hours or more a week learning science in school. The amount of time spent
learning science in school was significantly related to science achievement. For Canada as a whole, students who spent 4 or more hours a week in science lessons performed 65 points higher, equivalent to almost one proficiency level than those who spent less than 2 hours. This difference varied by province ranging from 48 points in New Brunswick to 90 points in Quebec.

## Table 4.7

Percentage of students and performance on the science scale, by time spent on learning

|  | Less than 2 <br> hours a week | Four hours a <br> week or more | Performance difference <br> (4 hours or more-less than 2 hours $)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | percentage | percentage | difference |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | 15 | 63 | 80 |
| Prince Edward Island | 26 | 61 | 62 |
| Nova Scotia | 19 | 66 | 55 |
| New Brunswick | 30 | 60 | 48 |
| Quebec | 28 | 39 | 90 |
| Ontario | 24 | 63 | 53 |
| Manitoba | 26 | 58 | 63 |
| Saskatchewan | 28 | 54 | 63 |
| Alberta | 19 | 69 | 60 |
| British Columbia | 17 | 59 | 67 |
| Canada | 24 | 57 | 65 |

## How science is taught in schools

Students were asked about a variety of practices used when learning science at school; these questions were used to create the following four indices in science teaching:

Interaction measures students' reports on interactive teaching practices such as giving students the opportunity to explain their ideas, involving students' opinions, having class debates or discussion and having student discussions.
Hands-on-activities measures students' reports on the frequency of hands-on activities in science lessons such as doing practical experiments in the laboratory, drawing conclusions from conducted experiments, observing teacher experiments and doing experiments following teacher instructions.
Student Investigations measures students' reports on the frequency of student investigations in science lessons such as designing science questions, designing experiments, choosing their own investigation and doing investigations to test out their own ideas.
Focus on models or applications measures students' reports on the frequency of teaching science lessons with a focus on models and applications such as
students being asked to apply a science concept to everyday topics, teachers using science to help students understand the world outside school, teachers explaining the relevance of science concepts to one's life and teachers using examples of technology application to show how school science is relevant to society.

As shown in Table 4.8, Canadian students were more likely to engage in each of the science teaching practices - interaction, hands-on activities, student investigations and focus on models or applications compared to the OECD as a whole. Compared to Canada, scores on the science teaching interaction practices index were higher in Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island and Alberta and lower in Quebec. Scores for the index of hands-on activities were lower than the Canadian average in Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba. Scores on the index of student investigation were higher than the Canadian average in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick and lower than the Canadian average in Quebec.

Table 4.8
Summary of scores on teaching and learning practices in school

| Index | Canadian <br> mean | Provinces above the <br> Canadian mean | Provinces at the <br> Canadian mean | Provinces below <br> the Canadian mean |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Interaction | 0.17 | Newfoundland and Labrador, <br> Prince Edward Island, <br> Alberta | Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, <br> Ontario, Manitoba, <br> Saskatchewan, British Columbia | Quebec |
| Hands-on activities | 0.46 |  | Quebec, Ontario, <br> Saskatchewan, Alberta, <br> British Columbia | Newfoundland and Labrador, <br> Prince Edward Island, <br> Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, <br> Manitoba |
| Student investigations | 0.13 | Prince Edward Island, <br> New Brunswick | Newfoundland and Labrador, <br> Nova Scotia, Ontario, Manitoba, | Quebec |
| Focus on models or application | 0.39 |  | Saskatchewan, Alberta, <br> British Columbia |  |

Note: Provinces within each cell are ordered from east to west. The OECD average is 0 .

With the exception of student investigation practices there was no relationship between the various teaching and learning practices and science achievement. The relationship between student investigation practices and science achievement was negative. As shown in Appendix table B.4.20, the average score for students who were in the bottom quarter of this index was 568 compared to 503 for students who scored high on this index.

In addition to science teaching practices, a variety of school activities were used to promote the learning of science. As show in Table 4.9, excursions and field trips
were most commonly used, followed by science competitions and extracurricular science projects. The mix of school activities varied across jurisdictions (Appendix table B.4.22, summarized in Table 4.9). Compared to the Canadian average, in general students in the eastern provinces were more likely to participate in science fairs and extracurricular science projects and less likely to participate in science clubs. Students in Saskatchewan were less likely to participate in four of the five school activities to promote the learning of science; students in Manitoba were less likely to participate in science fairs and science competitions.

## Table 4.9

Percentage of students participating in school activities to promote the learning of science

| Index | Canadian <br> percent | Provinces above the <br> Canadian percent | Provinces at the <br> Canadian percent | Provinces below <br> the Canadian percent |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Science clubs | 48 |  | Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, <br> Manitoba, Alberta, <br> British Columbia | Newfoundland and Labrador, <br> Prince Edward Island, <br> New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, |  |
| Science fairs | 55 | Newfoundland and Labrador, <br> Prince Edward Island, <br> Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, <br> Quebec | Ontario, Saskatchewan, <br> Alberta, British Columbia | Manitoba |  |
| Science competitions | 65 | Newfoundland and Labrador, <br> Prince Edward Island | Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, <br> Quebec, Ontario, Alberta, <br> British Columbia | Manitoba, <br> Saskatchewan |  |
| Extracurricular science projects | 64 | Newfoundland and Labrador | Prince Edward Island, <br> Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, <br> Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, | Saskatchewan |  |
| Alberta, British Columbia |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: Provinces within each cell are ordered from east to west.

## Preparation for science-related careers

How well prepared are students for taking up sciencerelated careers? To investigate this question, two indices were created based on student responses. The school preparation index measures students' perceptions of the usefulness of schooling for preparing them for sciencerelated careers. The student information index measures students' perceptions of being informed about sciencerelated careers.

Compared to all 15 -year-olds from all OECD countries, Canadian 15-year-olds reported higher levels
of preparedness in terms of both the usefulness of schooling as preparation for science-related careers and of being informed about science-related careers (Table 4.10). Compared to the Canadian average, students in Alberta reported higher levels of preparedness on both indices, students in Quebec reported lower levels of preparedness on both indices, students in Prince Edward Island and Ontario reported higher level of preparedness in being informed about science-related careers and Saskatchewan reported lower levels of preparedness in being informed about science-related careers. Students in Manitoba reported higher levels of preparedness in school preparation.

| Table 4.10 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary of scores on the indices of school preparation and student information |  |  |  |  |
| Index | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mean } \\ \text { index score } \end{array}$ | Provinces above the Canadian mean | Provinces at the Canadian mean | Provinces below the Canadian mean |
| School preparation | 0.33 | Manitoba, Alberta | Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, Saskatchewan, British Columbia | Quebec |
| Student information | 0.28 | Prince Edward Island, Ontario, Alberta | Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, British Columbia | Quebec, Saskatchewan |

Note: Provinces within each cell are ordered from east to west.

Being prepared for a science-related career was associated with science achievement. Canadian students who were in the bottom quartile in terms of being informed about science-related careers scored 58 points lower than those who were in the top quartile (Appendix table B.4.23). Canadian students who were in the bottom quarter in terms of usefulness of schooling as preparation for science-related careers scored 20 points lower than those in the top quarter (Appendix table B.4.24).

## Summary

This chapter has provided an overview of science related themes included in PISA 2006. While this chapter does not explore these themes in depth, it does reveal that differences exist in student engagement in science, the environment and science and the contexts for learning science both between Canada compared with students across all OECD countries and across provinces. There are strong relationships between these themes, in
particular student engagement in science and science performance. These themes will be further expanded upon in future thematic reports released by the OECD and can be further explored through subsequent Canadian analysis with PISA 2006 data.

## Note

11. OECD 2006. Assessing scientific, reading and mathematical literacy. A Framework for PISA 2006.

## Conclusion

Ensuring that Canadian students acquire the skills and knowledge to participate fully in a knowledge-based economy and society is a goal shared by all levels of government and by the Canadian population. Will Canadian youth be well equipped to compete in tomorrow's economy? Have they developed a foundation of knowledge and skills for lifelong learning?

The OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) was first conducted in 2000. It compares how 15-year-old students from Canada perform in three domains - mathematics, reading and science - in comparison with their peers from other countries. Each PISA assessment provides more detailed information on one of the three domains. Reading was the major domain in 2000, mathematics in 2003 and science in 2006.

When the PISA 2000 and 2003 results were released, the performances of Canadian students were among the highest. Results from this report on PISA 2006 also show that 15-year-old students in Canada performed well in all three domains assessed relative to their international peers. In other words, Canada has retained its high standards over the six year period relative to other participating countries.

## Canadian 15-year-olds performed well in science

Science was the main focus of the PISA 2006 assessment and was measured on a combined science scale as well as three sub-scales corresponding to three science competencies. Students from only Finland and Hong Kong-China outperformed Canadian 15-year-olds in combined science. Relative to their performance in the science sub-scales of 'identifying scientific issues' and 'using scientific evidence', Canadian students performed less well on the science sub-scale of 'explaining phenomena scientifically'. They were outperformed by four countries in 'explaining phenomena scientifically' compared to only one country in the other two sub-scales.

The scientific abilities of students are also described using six proficiency levels where higher proficiency levels indicate a higher level of science knowledge and skills. A higher proportion of Canadian students performed at the two highest proficiency levels (Levels 5 and 6) in combined science compared to the OECD average. Furthermore, a lower proportion of 15-year-old Canadians performed at Level 1 or below. Additionally, Canadian 15-year-old students scored almost one-half of a proficiency level above the OECD average. Although Canada is one of the leading countries in science performance, there is a large difference in performance between Canada and the leading country, Finland, equivalent to almost one-half of a proficiency level.

At the provincial level, all provinces performed above the OECD average in science. Furthermore, students from Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec were only out-performed by students in Finland. Examining provincial results in science by proficiency levels reveals some important differences. Students from Alberta performed almost two thirds of a proficiency level higher than students from Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick on the combined science scale.

## Between 2003 and 2006, Canadian performance remained unchanged in reading and mathematics however more countries outperformed Canada

Canadian 15-year-old students maintained their level of achievement in reading as compared to PISA 2003; however, they were outperformed by Finland, Hong Kong-China and Korea as opposed to only one country in previous assessments. This suggests that although Canada's performance in reading is strong, in order to maintain its competitive edge in the future Canadian 15 -year-olds will need to improve at pace with other leading countries, rather than simply maintain their competencies in reading.

In 2006 in mathematics Canadian students continued to perform well though they were outperformed by students in Chinese Taipei, Finland, Korea and Hong Kong-China. All provinces performed
at or above the OECD average in the two minor domains of reading and mathematics. However differences in performance among the provinces in all three PISA domains raise interesting questions of equity.

## Girls and boys do equally well in science though they excel in different science competencies

In science, across all participating countries gender differences varied. In Canada and most provinces no gender difference was observed on the combined science scale or in the sub-domain of using scientific evidence. However, it should be noted that there were significant gender differences for two of the science sub-domains with boys outperforming girls in 'explaining phenomena scientifically' and girls outperforming boys in identifying scientific issues'. The performance patterns in these two sub-domains suggest that boys and girls have very different levels of performance in different areas of science. It appears that boys may demonstrate better performance at mastering scientific knowledge whereas girls may demonstrate better performance at seeing the larger picture that enables them to identify scientific questions that arise from a given situation.

As was the case in PISA 2000 and 2003, there was a relatively large difference in average scores favouring girls in reading while there was a somewhat lesser difference favouring boys in mathematics. The patterns of gender differences in both reading and mathematics remain areas of interest and concern since these differences can have an impact on future learning and career planning.

## Students in minority language school systems

 had lower performance in science compared to those in majority language school systemsIn the five provinces in which students in the Frenchlanguage and English-language systems were sampled, there were differences in the performance between students in the two language school systems. In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba, students in the French-language school system performed less well in science and in reading than their peers in the Englishlanguage school system while in Quebec students in the English-language school system performed less well in science than their peers in the French-language school system. There were no differences in performance between language school systems in reading and mathematics in Quebec and in mathematics in Nova Scotia and Manitoba.

## Family background characteristics are related to student performance

Immigrant status, parental education and socio-economic background were all related to performance but to a lesser extent in Canada compared to OECD countries as a whole.

In Canada, non-immigrant students (those born in Canada whose parents were also born in Canada) had higher science performance than first generation immigrant students (those born outside Canada) and second-generation immigrant students (those born in Canada with at least one parent born outside of Canada). Non-immigrant students outperformed first-generation and second-generation immigrant students in three of the five provinces that had $10 \%$ or more 15 -year olds who were immigrants.

In all provinces, 15 -year-old students whose parents had postsecondary education performed about twothirds of a proficiency level higher than those whose parents had high school education or less. Students from families with higher socio-economic status (SES) also tended to perform better in science. However, socioeconomic status had a smaller impact on science achievement in Canada than in all OECD countries as a whole and Canada is therefore held as a model for achieving both excellence and equity. The relationship between education and socioeconomic background and performance was less pronounced in Canada and the provinces than for all OECD countries as a whole. While the relationship between SES and performance was found to be less pronounced in provinces than for the OECD on average, average performance was above the OECD average in science. This fact indicates that provincial ministries and departments of education have been able to lessen the effects of SES and provide relative equity in learning opportunities across schools for their students.

The performance of Canadian 15 -year-old students is praiseworthy. Nonetheless there is also reason for some concern. Overall, when compared with their peers in other participating countries, Canadian students continue to do well on the PISA assessment; however, the top performing country in each of the domains has a much higher performance than Canada. Furthermore, significant provincial differences across domains continue to exist. It is important to note, nevertheless, that the performance of Canadian youth in the PISA 2006 assessment and in an international context is most promising to their future and the future of Canada.

## Appendix A

## PISA 2006 sampliing procedures and response rates

The accuracy of PISA survey results depends on the quality of the information on which the sample is based as well as the sampling procedures. The PISA 2006 sample for Canada was based on a two-stage stratified sample. The first stage consisted of sampling individual schools in which 15 -year-old students were enrolled. Schools were sampled systematically with probabilities proportional to size, the measure of size being a function of the estimated number of eligible ( 15 -year-old) students enrolled. While a minimum of 150 schools were required to be selected in each country, in Canada, a much larger sample of schools was selected in order to produce reliable estimates for each province and for each of the language systems in the five provinces where these populations were separately sampled (Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba).

The second stage of the selection process sampled students within sampled schools. Once schools were selected, a list of 15 -year-old students in each sampled school was prepared. From this list, up to 35 students were then selected with equal probability. All 15-year old students were selected if fewer than 35 were enrolled. Additionally, in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and in the French-language school system in Manitoba more than 35 students were selected in order to meet sample size requirements.

In order to minimize the potential for response bias, data quality standards in PISA require minimum participation rates for schools and students. At the
national level, a minimum response rate of $85 \%$ was required for schools initially selected. School response rates were also considered acceptable where the initial school response rate was between $65 \%$ and $85 \%$ and replacement schools were used to achieve a school response rate of $85 \%$ or higher. Schools with student participation rates between $25 \%$ and $50 \%$ were not counted as participating schools, but data for these schools were included in the database. Schools with student participation rates of less than $25 \%$ were not counted as participating and their data were excluded from the database.

PISA 2006 also requires a minimum student participation rate of $80 \%$ within all participating schools combined (original sample and replacements) at the national level.

Table A. 1 shows the response rates for schools and students, before and after replacement for Canada and the 10 provinces. At the national level 941 schools were selected to participate in PISA 2006 and 850 of these initially selected schools participated. Rather than calculating school participation rates by dividing the number of participating schools by the total number of schools, school response rates were weighted based on 15 -year-old enrolment numbers in each school.

With the exception of Quebec and Ontario, school response rates across the provinces were $94 \%$ or higher and student response rates were $84 \%$ or higher.

| Table A. 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PISA 2006 school and student response rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provinces | Total number of selected schools (participating and not participating) | School response rate before replacement |  | School response rate after replacement |  | Total number of students sampled (participating and not participating) |  | Total number of students participating |  | Weighted student participation rate after replacement (percent) |
|  |  | number | weighted percentage ${ }^{1}$ | number | weighted percentage ${ }^{1}$ | weighted | weighted | weighted | weighted |  |
| Newfoundland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and Labrador | 75 | 74 | 99.8 | 75 | 100 | 1,960 | 6,167 | 1,741 | 5,481 | 88.9 |
| Prince Edward Island | d 26 | 26 | 100 | 26 | 100 | 1,863 | 1,863 | 1,573 | 1,573 | 84.4 |
| Nova Scotia | 87 | 86 | 100 | 86 | 100 | 2,441 | 10,097 | 2,114 | 8,682 | 86.0 |
| New Brunswick | 68 | 67 | 100 | 67 | 100 | 2,671 | 8,331 | 2,443 | 7,641 | 91.7 |
| Québec | 187 | 159 | 82.9 | 159 | 83.2 | 4,942 | 72,201 | 3,695 | 53,243 | 73.7 |
| Ontario | 151 | 112 | 72.2 | 120 | 78.5 | 3,573 | 130,409 | 2,928 | 105,095 | 80.6 |
| Manitoba | 92 | 84 | 93.9 | 84 | 94.2 | 2,285 | 12,358 | 1,990 | 10,695 | 86.5 |
| Saskatchewan | 87 | 83 | 95.3 | 83 | 95.7 | 2,046 | 11,788 | 1,851 | 10,715 | 90.9 |
| Alberta | 90 | 86 | 96.0 | 87 | 97.6 | 2,349 | 37,460 | 1,984 | 31,676 | 84.6 |
| British Columbia | 78 | 73 | 94.6 | 73 | 94.9 | 2,198 | 46,911 | 1,884 | 40,238 | 85.8 |
| Canada | 941 | 850 | 83.2 | 860 | 86.2 | 26,328 | 337,585 | 22,203 | 275,038 | 81.5 |

1. School response rates were weighted based on 15 -year-old enrolment.

## Appendix B

## Tables

The enclosed tables are based on the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development Programme for International Student Assessment, 2006.

The standard error associated with the estimates presented is included in parenthesis. The confidence interval, when presented, represents the range within which the score for the population is likely to fall, with $\mathbf{9 5 \%}$ probability.

Only statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level are noted in this report, unless otherwise stated. This means averages did not differ when that the $95 \%$ confidence intervals for the averages being compared do not overlap. Where confidence intervals did overlap an additional $t$-test was conducted to test for differences.

In some tables the performance of countries and provinces relative to Canada has been indicated as being higher, the same, or lower using the following legend.

```
Performed significantly
higher than Canada
Performed the
higher than Canada
```same as Canada

\section*{Performed significantly \\ lower than Canada}

\section*{Table B.1.1}

Estimated average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Combined science
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Country and province & stimated average score & standard error & confidence interval 95\% lower limit & confidence interval 95\% upper limit \\
\hline Finland & 563 & (2.0) & 559 & 567 \\
\hline Alberta & 550 & (3.8) & 543 & 558 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 542 & (2.5) & 537 & 547 \\
\hline British Columbia & 539 & (4.7) & 529 & 548 \\
\hline Ontario & 537 & (4.2) & 529 & 545 \\
\hline Canada & 534 & (2.0) & 530 & 538 \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 532 & (3.6) & 525 & 539 \\
\hline Estonia & 531 & (2.5) & 526 & 536 \\
\hline Japan & 531 & (3.4) & 525 & 538 \\
\hline Quebec & 531 & (4.2) & 522 & 539 \\
\hline New Zealand & 530 & (2.7) & 525 & 536 \\
\hline Australia & 527 & (2.3) & 522 & 531 \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & lor 526 & (2.5) & 521 & 530 \\
\hline Netherlands & 525 & (2.7) & 519 & 530 \\
\hline Manitoba & 523 & (3.2) & 517 & 530 \\
\hline Korea & 522 & (3.4) & 516 & 529 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 522 & (4.1) & 514 & 530 \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 520 & (2.5) & 515 & 525 \\
\hline Slovenia & 519 & (1.1) & 517 & 521 \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 517 & (3.6) & 509 & 524 \\
\hline Germany & 516 & (3.8) & 508 & 523 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 515 & (2.3) & 510 & 519 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 513 & (3.5) & 506 & 520 \\
\hline Switzerland & 512 & (3.2) & 505 & 518 \\
\hline Austria & 511 & (3.9) & 503 & 519 \\
\hline Macao-China & 511 & (1.1) & 509 & 513 \\
\hline Belgium & 510 & (2.5) & 505 & 515 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 509 & (2.7) & 503 & 514 \\
\hline Ireland & 508 & (3.2) & 502 & 515 \\
\hline New Brunswick & 506 & (2.3) & 502 & 511 \\
\hline Hungary & 504 & (2.7) & 499 & 509 \\
\hline Sweden & 503 & (2.4) & 499 & 508 \\
\hline OECD average & 500 & (0.5) & 499 & 501 \\
\hline Poland & 498 & (2.3) & 493 & 502 \\
\hline Denmark & 496 & (3.1) & 490 & 502 \\
\hline France & 495 & (3.4) & 489 & 502 \\
\hline Croatia & 493 & (2.4) & 488 & 498 \\
\hline Iceland & 491 & (1.6) & 488 & 494 \\
\hline Latvia & 490 & (3.0) & 484 & 495 \\
\hline United States & 489 & (4.2) & 481 & 497 \\
\hline Lithuania & 488 & (2.8) & 483 & 493 \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 488 & (2.6) & 483 & 494 \\
\hline Spain & 488 & (2.6) & 483 & 493 \\
\hline Norway & 487 & (3.1) & 480 & 493 \\
\hline Luxembourg & 486 & (1.1) & 484 & 488 \\
\hline Russian Federation & 479 & (3.7) & 472 & 487 \\
\hline Italy & 475 & (2.0) & 471 & 479 \\
\hline Portugal & 474 & (3.0) & 468 & 480 \\
\hline Greece & 473 & (3.2) & 467 & 480 \\
\hline Israel & 454 & (3.7) & 447 & 461 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table B.1.1 (concluded)

\section*{Estimated average scores and confidence} intervals for provinces and countries: Combined science
\(\left.\begin{array}{lrrrr}\hline & & & \begin{array}{r}\text { confidence } \\ \text { interval - }\end{array} & \begin{array}{r}\text { confidence } \\ \text { interval - }\end{array} \\ \text { Country and } & \begin{array}{r}\text { estimated } \\ \text { average } \\ \text { province }\end{array} & \begin{array}{r}\text { standard } \\ \text { error }\end{array} & \begin{array}{r}95 \%\end{array} & \begin{array}{r}95 \% \\ \text { lower limit }\end{array} \\ \text { upper limit }\end{array}\right]\)

Note: The OECD average is 500 with a standard error of 0.5 .


Estimated average scores and confidence
intervals for provinces and countries:
Science - identifying scientific issues
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Country and province & stimated average score & standard error & confidence interval 95\% lower limit & confidence interval 95\% upper limit \\
\hline Finland & 555 & (2.3) & 550 & 559 \\
\hline Alberta & 546 & (3.9) & 538 & 553 \\
\hline British Columbia & 536 & (5.2) & 526 & 546 \\
\hline New Zealand & 536 & (2.9) & 531 & 542 \\
\hline Australia & 535 & (2.3) & 531 & 540 \\
\hline Netherlands & 533 & (3.3) & 526 & 539 \\
\hline Ontario & 533 & (4.9) & 523 & 543 \\
\hline Canada & 532 & (2.3) & 527 & 536 \\
\hline Quebec & 531 & (4.6) & 521 & 540 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 528 & (3.2) & 522 & 534 \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & or 525 & (3.2) & 519 & 531 \\
\hline Japan & 522 & (4.0) & 514 & 530 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 522 & (3.7) & 515 & 530 \\
\hline Korea & 519 & (3.7) & 512 & 526 \\
\hline Manitoba & 519 & (3.3) & 512 & 525 \\
\hline Slovenia & 517 & (1.4) & 514 & 520 \\
\hline Estonia & 516 & (2.6) & 511 & 521 \\
\hline Ireland & 516 & (3.3) & 509 & 522 \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 516 & (3.5) & 509 & 523 \\
\hline Belgium & 515 & (2.7) & 510 & 520 \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 515 & (4.1) & 507 & 523 \\
\hline Switzerland & 515 & (3.0) & 509 & 521 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 514 & (2.3) & 509 & 518 \\
\hline New Brunswick & 512 & (2.3) & 508 & 517 \\
\hline Germany & 510 & (3.8) & 502 & 517 \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 509 & (3.7) & 501 & 516 \\
\hline Austria & 505 & (3.7) & 498 & 512 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 505 & (2.5) & 500 & 510 \\
\hline OECD average & 500 & (0.5) & 499 & 501 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 500 & (4.2) & 492 & 509 \\
\hline France & 499 & (3.5) & 492 & 506 \\
\hline Sweden & 499 & (2.6) & 494 & 504 \\
\hline Croatia & 494 & (2.6) & 488 & 499 \\
\hline Iceland & 494 & (1.7) & 491 & 497 \\
\hline Denmark & 493 & (3.0) & 487 & 499 \\
\hline United States & 492 & (3.8) & 485 & 500 \\
\hline Macao-China & 490 & (1.2) & 488 & 492 \\
\hline Latvia & 489 & (3.3) & 482 & 495 \\
\hline Norway & 489 & (3.1) & 483 & 495 \\
\hline Spain & 489 & (2.4) & 484 & 494 \\
\hline Portugal & 486 & (3.1) & 480 & 493 \\
\hline Hungary & 483 & (2.6) & 478 & 488 \\
\hline Luxembourg & 483 & (1.1) & 481 & 485 \\
\hline Poland & 483 & (2.5) & 478 & 488 \\
\hline Lithuania & 476 & (2.7) & 471 & 481 \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 475 & (3.2) & 469 & 481 \\
\hline Italy & 474 & (2.2) & 470 & 478 \\
\hline Greece & 469 & (3.0) & 463 & 475 \\
\hline Russian Federation & 463 & (4.2) & 455 & 471 \\
\hline Israel & 457 & (3.9) & 449 & 465 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table B.1.2 (concluded)

\section*{Estimated average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: \\ Science - identifying scientific issues}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrr}
\hline & & & \begin{tabular}{r} 
confidence \\
interval -
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
confidence \\
interval -
\end{tabular} \\
Country and & \begin{tabular}{r} 
estimated \\
average \\
score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{rlrr} 
standard \\
error
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r}
\(95 \%\) \\
lower limit
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
upper limit
\end{tabular} \\
province & & \((4.1)\) & 436 & 452 \\
\hline Chile & 444 & \((3.0)\) & 425 & 436 \\
Serbia & 431 & \((3.0)\) & 423 & 435 \\
Uruguay & 429 & \((3.0\) & \((6.3)\) & 415 \\
Bulgaria & 427 & \((3.4)\) & 421 & 440 \\
Turkey & 427 & 434 \\
Mexico & 421 & \((2.6)\) & 416 & 426 \\
Thailand & 413 & \((2.5)\) & 408 & 418 \\
Jordan & 409 & \((2.8)\) & 403 & 414 \\
Romania & 409 & \((3.6)\) & 402 & 417 \\
Colombia & 402 & \((3.4)\) & 396 & 409 \\
Montenegro & 401 & \((1.2)\) & 399 & 403 \\
Brazil & 398 & \((2.8)\) & 393 & 404 \\
Argentina & 395 & \((5.7)\) & 384 & 406 \\
Indonesia & 393 & \((5.6)\) & 382 & 404 \\
Tunisia & 384 & \((3.8)\) & 376 & 391 \\
Azerbaijan & 353 & \((3.1)\) & 347 & 359 \\
Qatar & 352 & \((0.8)\) & 351 & 354 \\
Kyrgyzstan & 321 & \((3.2)\) & 315 & 328 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: The OECD average is 500 with a standard error of 0.5 .


Estimated average scores and confidence
intervals for provinces and countries: Science - explaining phenomena scientifically
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Country and province & stimated average score & standard error & confidence interval 95\% lower limit & confidence interval 95\% upper limit \\
\hline Finland & 566 & (2.0) & 562 & 570 \\
\hline Alberta & 553 & (4.1) & 545 & 561 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 549 & (2.5) & 544 & 554 \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 545 & (3.7) & 538 & 552 \\
\hline Estonia & 541 & (2.6) & 535 & 546 \\
\hline British Columbia & 538 & (4.9) & 528 & 547 \\
\hline Ontario & 533 & (4.4) & 524 & 542 \\
\hline Canada & 531 & (2.1) & 527 & 535 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 527 & (3.5) & 521 & 534 \\
\hline Japan & 527 & (3.1) & 521 & 533 \\
\hline Quebec & 523 & (4.0) & 515 & 531 \\
\hline Slovenia & 523 & (1.5) & 520 & 526 \\
\hline Manitoba & 522 & (3.5) & 515 & 529 \\
\hline Netherlands & 522 & (2.7) & 517 & 527 \\
\hline New Zealand & 522 & (2.8) & 517 & 528 \\
\hline Australia & 520 & (2.3) & 516 & 525 \\
\hline Macao-China & 520 & (1.2) & 518 & 522 \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 520 & (3.4) & 513 & 526 \\
\hline Germany & 519 & (3.7) & 512 & 526 \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & or 519 & (3.0) & 513 & 524 \\
\hline Hungary & 518 & (2.6) & 513 & 523 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 517 & (2.3) & 512 & 521 \\
\hline Austria & 516 & (4.0) & 509 & 524 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 516 & (4.1) & 508 & 524 \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 516 & (4.4) & 507 & 525 \\
\hline Korea & 512 & (3.3) & 505 & 518 \\
\hline Sweden & 510 & (2.9) & 504 & 515 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 509 & (2.7) & 504 & 515 \\
\hline Switzerland & 508 & (3.3) & 501 & 514 \\
\hline Poland & 506 & (2.5) & 501 & 511 \\
\hline Ireland & 505 & (3.2) & 499 & 512 \\
\hline Belgium & 503 & (2.5) & 498 & 508 \\
\hline Denmark & 501 & (3.3) & 495 & 508 \\
\hline New Brunswick & 501 & (2.6) & 496 & 506 \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 501 & (2.7) & 496 & 506 \\
\hline OECD average & 500 & (0.5) & 499 & 501 \\
\hline Norway & 495 & (3.0) & 489 & 501 \\
\hline Lithuania & 494 & (3.0) & 489 & 500 \\
\hline Croatia & 492 & (2.5) & 487 & 497 \\
\hline Spain & 490 & (2.4) & 486 & 495 \\
\hline Iceland & 488 & (1.5) & 485 & 491 \\
\hline Latvia & 486 & (2.9) & 481 & 492 \\
\hline United States & 486 & (4.3) & 478 & 495 \\
\hline Luxembourg & 483 & (1.1) & 481 & 485 \\
\hline Russian Federation & 483 & (3.4) & 477 & 490 \\
\hline France & 481 & (3.2) & 475 & 487 \\
\hline Italy & 480 & (2.0) & 476 & 484 \\
\hline Greece & 476 & (3.0) & 471 & 482 \\
\hline Portugal & 469 & (2.9) & 464 & 475 \\
\hline Bulgaria & 444 & (5.8) & 433 & 456 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table B.1.3 (concluded)
Estimated average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Science - explaining phenomena scientifically
\begin{tabular}{lrrrr}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{r} 
estimated \\
average \\
score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
standard \\
error
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
confidence \\
interval- \\
lower limit
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
confidence \\
interval - \\
upper limit
\end{tabular} \\
Country and & 443 & \((3.6)\) & 436 & 450 \\
province & 441 & \((3.1)\) & 435 & 447 \\
\hline Israel & 438 & \((3.1)\) & 431 & 444 \\
Serbia & 432 & \((4.1)\) & 424 & 440 \\
Jordan & 426 & \((4.0)\) & 418 & 434 \\
Chile & 423 & \((4.1)\) & 415 & 431 \\
Romania & 423 & \((2.9)\) & 417 & 429 \\
Turkey & 420 & \((2.1)\) & 416 & 424 \\
Uruguay & 417 & \((1.1)\) & 415 & 419 \\
Thailand & 412 & \((3.0)\) & 406 & 418 \\
Montenegro & 406 & \((2.7)\) & 401 & 412 \\
Azerbaijan & 395 & \((5.1)\) & 385 & 405 \\
Mexico & 390 & \((2.7)\) & 385 & 396 \\
Indonesia & 386 & \((6.0)\) & 375 & 398 \\
Brazil & 383 & \((2.9)\) & 378 & 389 \\
Argentina & 379 & \((3.4)\) & 372 & 386 \\
Tunisia & 356 & \((1.0)\) & 354 & 358 \\
Colombia & 334 & \((3.1)\) & 328 & 340 \\
\hline Qatar & & & & \\
Kyrgyzstan & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: The OECD average is 500 with a standard error of 0.5 .

\section*{Table B.1.4}

Estimated average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Science - issuing scientific evidence
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Country and province & estimated average score & standard error & confidence interval 95\% lower limit & confidence interval 95\% upper limit \\
\hline Finland & 567 & (2.3) & 563 & 572 \\
\hline Alberta & 552 & (4.1) & 544 & 560 \\
\hline Ontario & 546 & (4.4) & 537 & 554 \\
\hline Japan & 544 & (4.2) & 536 & 552 \\
\hline Canada & 542 & (2.2) & 537 & 546 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 542 & (2.7) & 537 & 548 \\
\hline Quebec & 542 & (4.7) & 532 & 551 \\
\hline British Columbia & 541 & (5.1) & 531 & 551 \\
\hline Korea & 538 & (3.7) & 531 & 546 \\
\hline New Zealand & 537 & (3.3) & 530 & 543 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 535 & (4.3) & 526 & 543 \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & dor 533 & (2.9) & 527 & 538 \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 532 & (3.7) & 525 & 539 \\
\hline Australia & 531 & (2.4) & 527 & 536 \\
\hline Estonia & 531 & (2.7) & 526 & 536 \\
\hline Manitoba & 530 & (3.4) & 523 & 537 \\
\hline Netherlands & 526 & (3.3) & 519 & 532 \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 524 & (2.4) & 519 & 529 \\
\hline Switzerland & 519 & (3.4) & 512 & 526 \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 517 & (3.7) & 510 & 524 \\
\hline Belgium & 516 & (3.0) & 510 & 522 \\
\hline Slovenia & 516 & (1.3) & 513 & 519 \\
\hline Germany & 515 & (4.6) & 506 & 524 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 514 & (2.5) & 509 & 518 \\
\hline Macao-China & 512 & (1.2) & 509 & 514 \\
\hline France & 511 & (3.9) & 503 & 519 \\
\hline New Brunswick & 511 & (2.4) & 507 & 516 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 509 & (2.7) & 504 & 514 \\
\hline Ireland & 506 & (3.4) & 499 & 513 \\
\hline Austria & 505 & (4.7) & 496 & 514 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 501 & (4.1) & 493 & 509 \\
\hline OECD average & 499 & (0.6) & 498 & 500 \\
\hline Hungary & 497 & (3.4) & 490 & 504 \\
\hline Sweden & 496 & (2.6) & 491 & 501 \\
\hline Poland & 494 & (2.7) & 489 & 499 \\
\hline Luxembourg & 492 & (1.1) & 490 & 494 \\
\hline Iceland & 491 & (1.7) & 488 & 494 \\
\hline Latvia & 491 & (3.4) & 484 & 497 \\
\hline Croatia & 490 & (3.0) & 485 & 496 \\
\hline Denmark & 489 & (3.6) & 482 & 496 \\
\hline United States & 489 & (5.0) & 479 & 498 \\
\hline Lithuania & 487 & (3.1) & 480 & 493 \\
\hline Spain & 485 & (3.0) & 479 & 491 \\
\hline Russian Federation & 481 & (4.2) & 473 & 489 \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 478 & (3.3) & 471 & 484 \\
\hline Norway & 473 & (3.6) & 466 & 480 \\
\hline Portugal & 472 & (3.6) & 465 & 479 \\
\hline Italy & 467 & (2.3) & 462 & 472 \\
\hline Greece & 465 & (4.0) & 458 & 473 \\
\hline Israel & 460 & (4.7) & 451 & 470 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table B.1.4 (concluded)

Estimated average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries:
Science - issuing scientific evidence
\begin{tabular}{lrrrr}
\hline & & & \begin{tabular}{r} 
confidence \\
interval -
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
confidence \\
interval -
\end{tabular} \\
Country and & \begin{tabular}{r} 
estimated \\
average \\
score
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{rlr} 
standard \\
error
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r}
\(95 \%\) \\
lower limit
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{r} 
upper limit
\end{tabular} \\
province & & & \\
\hline Chile & 440 & \((5.1)\) & 430 & 450 \\
Uruguay & 429 & \((3.1)\) & 423 & 435 \\
Serbia & 425 & \((3.7)\) & 418 & 432 \\
Thailand & 423 & \((2.6)\) & 418 & 428 \\
Bulgaria & 417 & \((7.5)\) & 402 & 431 \\
Turkey & 417 & \((4.3)\) & 409 & 426 \\
Montenegro & 407 & \((1.3)\) & 404 & 409 \\
Romania & 407 & \((6.0)\) & 396 & 419 \\
Jordan & 405 & \((3.3)\) & 398 & 411 \\
Mexico & 402 & \((3.1)\) & 396 & 408 \\
Indonesia & 386 & \((7.3)\) & 371 & 400 \\
Argentina & 385 & \((7.0)\) & 372 & 399 \\
Colombia & 383 & \((3.9)\) & 375 & 391 \\
Tunisia & 382 & \((3.7)\) & 375 & 389 \\
Brazil & 378 & \((3.6)\) & 371 & 385 \\
Azerbaijan & 344 & \((4.0)\) & 336 & 352 \\
Qatar & 324 & \((1.2)\) & 322 & 326 \\
Kyrgyzstan & 288 & \((3.8)\) & 280 & 296 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: The OECD average is 499 with a standard error of 0.6.

\section*{Table B.1.5}

Variation in performance: Combined science


\section*{Table B.1.5 (concluded)}

Variation in performance: Combined science
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Difference \\
in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{95th} & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{rr}
\hline & standard \\
score
\end{tabular}}} & \\
\hline & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & & & \\
\hline Japan & 356 & (6.1) & 396 & (6.2) & 465 & (5.1) & 603 & (3.1) & 654 & (3.1) & 685 & (3.6) & 137 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 346 & (5.7) & 383 & (5.6) & 440 & (4.3) & 578 & (4.0) & 632 & (4.4) & 664 & (6.6) & 138 \\
\hline Australia & 358 & (3.5) & 395 & (3.4) & 459 & (2.6) & 598 & (2.5) & 653 & (2.9) & 685 & (3.4) & 138 \\
\hline Switzerland & 340 & (5.0) & 378 & (4.9) & 445 & (3.9) & 584 & (3.5) & 636 & (3.8) & 665 & (4.6) & 139 \\
\hline Austria & 341 & (9.3) & 378 & (6.2) & 443 & (5.4) & 582 & (4.1) & 633 & (3.6) & 663 & (4.1) & 139 \\
\hline Slovenia & 358 & (3.8) & 391 & (2.8) & 449 & (2.7) & 589 & (2.1) & 647 & (3.3) & 680 & (3.0) & 140 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 350 & (6.0) & 385 & (5.2) & 443 & (4.6) & 583 & (3.9) & 641 & (4.3) & 672 & (4.7) & 140 \\
\hline Netherlands & 362 & (5.9) & 395 & (5.4) & 456 & (4.7) & 596 & (2.6) & 646 & (3.4) & 675 & (3.6) & 140 \\
\hline Germany & 345 & (8.1) & 381 & (7.0) & 447 & (5.3) & 587 & (3.6) & 642 & (3.2) & 672 & (3.6) & 141 \\
\hline Belgium & 336 & (7.3) & 374 & (5.4) & 442 & (3.8) & 584 & (2.4) & 634 & (2.3) & 660 & (2.7) & 142 \\
\hline France & 320 & (6.3) & 359 & (5.5) & 424 & (5.3) & 570 & (4.0) & 623 & (4.0) & 653 & (3.8) & 146 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 337 & (5.4) & 376 & (4.3) & 441 & (3.2) & 590 & (3.1) & 652 & (2.9) & 685 & (3.5) & 150 \\
\hline Bulgaria & 266 & (8.1) & 300 & (7.1) & 358 & (6.4) & 509 & (7.8) & 577 & (8.2) & 612 & (8.3) & 152 \\
\hline New Zealand & 347 & (5.2) & 389 & (4.5) & 455 & (3.6) & 608 & (2.9) & 667 & (3.3) & 699 & (3.1) & 153 \\
\hline United States & 318 & (4.5) & 349 & (5.9) & 412 & (5.4) & 567 & (4.6) & 628 & (4.3) & 662 & (4.8) & 155 \\
\hline Israel & 275 & (5.7) & 310 & (5.2) & 374 & (4.8) & 535 & (4.6) & 601 & (4.5) & 636 & (5.5) & 160 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Countries and provinces in ascending order by the difference in score points between the 75 th and 25 th percentiles.

\section*{Table B.1.6}

Variation in performance: Science - identifying scientific issues
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Difference in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{95th} & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{lr}
\hline & standard \\
score & error
\end{tabular}}} & \\
\hline & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & & & \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 247 & (4.5) & 271 & (4.1) & 310 & (3.5) & 395 & (3.3) & 435 & (4.3) & 461 & (5.0) & 84 \\
\hline Qatar & 234 & (2.5) & 258 & (1.8) & 300 & (1.6) & 398 & (2.2) & 453 & (2.6) & 495 & (2.7) & 98 \\
\hline Indonesia & 269 & (5.2) & 297 & (3.9) & 342 & (4.2) & 444 & (7.1) & 495 & (10.5) & 522 & (9.2) & 103 \\
\hline Romania & 284 & (6.2) & 311 & (5.1) & 357 & (4.2) & 461 & (4.9) & 510 & (6.4) & 539 & (6.4) & 104 \\
\hline Estonia & 387 & (5.3) & 415 & (4.0) & 464 & (3.7) & 570 & (2.9) & 613 & (2.9) & 639 & (3.5) & 105 \\
\hline Turkey & 304 & (5.1) & 330 & (3.8) & 374 & (3.2) & 480 & (4.7) & 531 & (6.7) & 561 & (8.5) & 106 \\
\hline Macao-China & 358 & (3.5) & 388 & (2.5) & 437 & (2.4) & 545 & (2.0) & 591 & (2.5) & 615 & (3.1) & 108 \\
\hline Hungary & 347 & (5.7) & 378 & (4.4) & 430 & (3.6) & 539 & (3.3) & 583 & (3.6) & 610 & (4.4) & 109 \\
\hline Serbia & 289 & (6.9) & 323 & (4.9) & 377 & (3.6) & 487 & (3.0) & 533 & (3.4) & 560 & (3.4) & 110 \\
\hline Finland & 411 & (4.0) & 446 & (3.5) & 501 & (3.1) & 612 & (2.9) & 659 & (2.8) & 686 & (3.2) & 111 \\
\hline Thailand & 276 & (4.6) & 307 & (3.7) & 358 & (3.4) & 469 & (3.4) & 520 & (4.2) & 551 & (4.6) & 111 \\
\hline Latvia & 346 & (6.1) & 377 & (5.2) & 434 & (4.2) & 547 & (3.4) & 594 & (3.5) & 621 & (4.1) & 112 \\
\hline Mexico & 280 & (6.1) & 312 & (4.7) & 365 & (3.4) & 479 & (2.8) & 529 & (3.0) & 559 & (3.9) & 113 \\
\hline Montenegro & 263 & (3.1) & 294 & (2.1) & 344 & (2.0) & 460 & (1.9) & 508 & (2.5) & 537 & (3.4) & 115 \\
\hline Lithuania & 336 & (4.5) & 366 & (3.2) & 419 & (3.4) & 535 & (3.4) & 583 & (3.5) & 609 & (4.5) & 116 \\
\hline Poland & 344 & (3.9) & 374 & (3.2) & 425 & (3.0) & 542 & (3.2) & 591 & (2.7) & 619 & (3.7) & 117 \\
\hline Croatia & 354 & (5.2) & 384 & (4.1) & 435 & (3.2) & 552 & (2.8) & 604 & (3.5) & 634 & (4.9) & 117 \\
\hline Tunisia & 240 & (6.0) & 271 & (3.7) & 324 & (4.2) & 442 & (4.7) & 499 & (7.1) & 532 & (8.2) & 118 \\
\hline Jordan & 262 & (5.3) & 297 & (3.6) & 351 & (3.0) & 470 & (3.5) & 522 & (3.5) & 550 & (4.0) & 118 \\
\hline Spain & 341 & (4.1) & 374 & (3.2) & 431 & (2.7) & 550 & (2.4) & 599 & (2.7) & 627 & (3.1) & 119 \\
\hline Kyrgyzstan & 167 & (6.2) & 203 & (4.4) & 263 & (4.4) & 382 & (3.3) & 436 & (4.2) & 473 & (5.8) & 119 \\
\hline Korea & 361 & (7.6) & 400 & (6.0) & 461 & (4.4) & 583 & (4.1) & 630 & (4.1) & 657 & (5.0) & 121 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.1.6 (concluded)}

Variation in performance: Science - identifying scientific issues
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Difference in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{95th} & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{score \(\begin{array}{r}\text { standard } \\ \text { error }\end{array}\)}} & \\
\hline & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & & & \\
\hline Chile & 300 & (6.1) & 330 & (3.9) & 383 & (4.1) & 505 & (5.0) & 561 & (5.4) & 594 & (6.8) & 122 \\
\hline Slovenia & 372 & (3.1) & 402 & (4.0) & 457 & (2.3) & 579 & (1.9) & 627 & (2.6) & 655 & (3.3) & 122 \\
\hline Russian Federation & 315 & (5.8) & 348 & (5.7) & 402 & (4.6) & 524 & (4.7) & 576 & (4.9) & 607 & (4.5) & 122 \\
\hline Greece & 309 & (6.1) & 347 & (5.3) & 411 & (4.4) & 533 & (2.9) & 581 & (3.4) & 608 & (3.2) & 122 \\
\hline Denmark & 341 & (5.5) & 375 & (4.5) & 432 & (4.0) & 556 & (3.2) & 607 & (3.2) & 637 & (4.4) & 124 \\
\hline Colombia & 234 & (8.6) & 274 & (6.9) & 343 & (4.7) & 468 & (4.1) & 519 & (4.7) & 551 & (5.1) & 124 \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 315 & (8.5) & 356 & (4.9) & 416 & (3.6) & 541 & (3.6) & 592 & (3.6) & 622 & (3.7) & 125 \\
\hline Brazil & 249 & (4.6) & 281 & (2.8) & 334 & (3.1) & 459 & (3.8) & 520 & (5.5) & 555 & (5.5) & 125 \\
\hline Alberta & 389 & (9.9) & 426 & (6.2) & 484 & (4.9) & 610 & (4.0) & 665 & (5.0) & 694 & (5.3) & 126 \\
\hline Ontario & 365 & (9.9) & 406 & (8.3) & 472 & (6.6) & 599 & (5.0) & 649 & (5.7) & 680 & (6.3) & 127 \\
\hline Luxembourg & 329 & (2.9) & 362 & (2.3) & 421 & (2.0) & 548 & (2.3) & 600 & (2.4) & 628 & (2.5) & 127 \\
\hline British Columbia & 377 & (12.4) & 416 & (8.7) & 475 & (6.3) & 602 & (4.5) & 651 & (5.4) & 678 & (4.5) & 127 \\
\hline Portugal & 336 & (5.4) & 367 & (4.3) & 423 & (4.1) & 551 & (3.4) & 603 & (3.7) & 632 & (4.9) & 128 \\
\hline Austria & 351 & (6.8) & 383 & (6.7) & 443 & (4.8) & 571 & (3.8) & 618 & (4.1) & 644 & (4.0) & 128 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 366 & (11.2) & 405 & (11.7) & 461 & (6.6) & 589 & (7.1) & 634 & (12.1) & 667 & (9.1) & 129 \\
\hline Norway & 333 & (7.6) & 368 & (5.7) & 426 & (3.6) & 555 & (3.1) & 608 & (4.0) & 640 & (4.1) & 129 \\
\hline Manitoba & 350 & (9.6) & 390 & (6.7) & 456 & (3.9) & 585 & (4.6) & 642 & (6.3) & 674 & (6.9) & 129 \\
\hline Uruguay & 271 & (7.9) & 308 & (5.2) & 365 & (4.2) & 494 & (3.2) & 552 & (3.7) & 584 & (5.1) & 129 \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 355 & (8.0) & 391 & (6.2) & 452 & (5.2) & 582 & (5.4) & 636 & (4.5) & 665 & (7.2) & 129 \\
\hline Canada & 363 & (4.9) & 404 & (4.1) & 469 & (2.9) & 599 & (2.3) & 652 & (2.5) & 683 & (2.9) & 130 \\
\hline OECD average & 339 & (1.1) & 375 & (0.9) & 436 & (0.7) & 565 & (0.6) & 618 & (0.6) & 648 & (0.8) & 130 \\
\hline Argentina & 219 & (13.2) & 263 & (10.2) & 334 & (6.9) & 464 & (5.4) & 518 & (6.0) & 552 & (7.3) & 130 \\
\hline New Brunswick & 353 & (6.1) & 387 & (4.1) & 448 & (3.8) & 578 & (3.3) & 631 & (4.3) & 664 & (6.0) & 130 \\
\hline Switzerland & 350 & (4.9) & 387 & (4.4) & 452 & (3.9) & 583 & (3.1) & 633 & (3.7) & 661 & (4.6) & 131 \\
\hline Sweden & 338 & (4.5) & 374 & (4.2) & 435 & (3.2) & 566 & (3.2) & 619 & (3.1) & 653 & (3.3) & 131 \\
\hline Australia & 368 & (4.3) & 406 & (3.1) & 471 & (2.7) & 604 & (2.8) & 658 & (3.2) & 689 & (3.6) & 133 \\
\hline Ireland & 357 & (5.7) & 391 & (4.9) & 450 & (4.0) & 584 & (3.3) & 638 & (3.4) & 668 & (4.4) & 133 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 346 & (6.3) & 381 & (4.2) & 439 & (3.3) & 572 & (4.0) & 627 & (4.1) & 659 & (5.4) & 134 \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 353 & (11.4) & 390 & (7.6) & 450 & (4.8) & 584 & (4.5) & 634 & (5.1) & 661 & (6.3) & 134 \\
\hline Italy & 310 & (4.7) & 347 & (3.5) & 409 & (3.0) & 543 & (2.8) & 600 & (2.7) & 632 & (3.4) & 134 \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 344 & (5.7) & 379 & (5.9) & 444 & (5.5) & 578 & (3.2) & 628 & (3.7) & 655 & (3.8) & 135 \\
\hline Germany & 341 & (8.3) & 381 & (6.6) & 444 & (5.0) & 579 & (3.4) & 630 & (3.5) & 660 & (4.0) & 135 \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 369 & (5.6) & 401 & (4.0) & 458 & (4.5) & 594 & (4.5) & 647 & (5.3) & 675 & (7.2) & 135 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 341 & (8.2) & 376 & (5.9) & 434 & (4.7) & 570 & (4.5) & 625 & (5.2) & 656 & (5.2) & 136 \\
\hline Quebec & 348 & (10.1) & 393 & (9.2) & 465 & (5.8) & 602 & (4.3) & 660 & (5.7) & 694 & (6.4) & 136 \\
\hline Belgium & 340 & (8.6) & 382 & (6.6) & 449 & (3.7) & 587 & (2.9) & 639 & (2.9) & 668 & (3.5) & 138 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 352 & (6.6) & 393 & (5.4) & 461 & (4.4) & 599 & (3.8) & 652 & (4.5) & 683 & (4.4) & 138 \\
\hline Iceland & 318 & (5.0) & 358 & (4.8) & 426 & (2.5) & 566 & (2.2) & 625 & (3.1) & 656 & (3.7) & 141 \\
\hline United States & 330 & (5.8) & 362 & (5.3) & 420 & (4.7) & 563 & (4.2) & 621 & (4.9) & 654 & (5.2) & 143 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 337 & (6.1) & 377 & (4.3) & 443 & (2.9) & 587 & (2.8) & 648 & (2.8) & 682 & (3.2) & 144 \\
\hline Japan & 337 & (8.2) & 381 & (6.9) & 453 & (5.6) & 597 & (3.9) & 652 & (4.0) & 682 & (4.0) & 144 \\
\hline Netherlands & 360 & (7.3) & 397 & (5.7) & 462 & (4.5) & 606 & (3.5) & 662 & (4.0) & 694 & (4.5) & 144 \\
\hline New Zealand & 356 & (4.8) & 396 & (4.8) & 465 & (4.3) & 612 & (3.0) & 668 & (3.0) & 701 & (3.5) & 147 \\
\hline France & 319 & (7.0) & 358 & (5.9) & 427 & (5.5) & 576 & (3.5) & 629 & (3.7) & 659 & (4.5) & 148 \\
\hline Bulgaria & 251 & (8.2) & 289 & (8.7) & 350 & (7.3) & 504 & (7.6) & 571 & (7.4) & 607 & (8.4) & 155 \\
\hline Israel & 272 & (6.4) & 311 & (5.5) & 378 & (4.2) & 538 & (4.7) & 604 & (5.4) & 641 & (5.6) & 161 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Countries and provinces in ascending order by the difference in score points between the 75 th and 25 th percentiles.

\section*{Table B.1.7}

Variation in performance: Science - explaining phenomena scientifically
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Difference \\
in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{95th} & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{lr}
\hline & standard \\
score & error
\end{tabular}}} & \\
\hline & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & & & \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 314 & (2.8) & 334 & (2.9) & 368 & (2.9) & 452 & (3.6) & 494 & (5.3) & 523 & (8.1) & 83 \\
\hline Indonesia & 284 & (4.1) & 307 & (4.1) & 345 & (3.2) & 440 & (7.7) & 492 & (9.9) & 521 & (9.5) & 95 \\
\hline Thailand & 304 & (3.8) & 327 & (2.7) & 368 & (2.5) & 468 & (2.7) & 519 & (4.0) & 551 & (4.2) & 100 \\
\hline Kyrgyzstan & 199 & (5.2) & 228 & (4.2) & 279 & (3.3) & 386 & (3.4) & 438 & (5.0) & 475 & (5.5) & 107 \\
\hline Tunisia & 253 & (3.4) & 281 & (3.0) & 327 & (3.1) & 437 & (3.8) & 491 & (6.8) & 526 & (9.5) & 109 \\
\hline Qatar & 226 & (2.5) & 252 & (1.8) & 296 & (2.2) & 406 & (1.8) & 472 & (2.5) & 515 & (2.5) & 110 \\
\hline Montenegro & 289 & (2.3) & 314 & (2.2) & 359 & (2.0) & 471 & (1.8) & 526 & (2.7) & 559 & (4.6) & 111 \\
\hline Turkey & 297 & (3.8) & 321 & (2.9) & 363 & (2.7) & 475 & (6.5) & 542 & (11.2) & 584 & (12.5) & 112 \\
\hline Mexico & 274 & (4.8) & 301 & (3.7) & 349 & (3.2) & 462 & (2.9) & 514 & (3.5) & 545 & (4.1) & 113 \\
\hline Romania & 297 & (5.7) & 321 & (5.3) & 367 & (6.0) & 481 & (4.8) & 535 & (7.2) & 567 & (7.2) & 114 \\
\hline Macao-China & 381 & (4.3) & 413 & (3.1) & 464 & (2.0) & 578 & (2.3) & 626 & (2.5) & 652 & (2.8) & 115 \\
\hline Latvia & 340 & (4.8) & 373 & (3.8) & 427 & (3.6) & 546 & (4.0) & 599 & (3.7) & 631 & (4.1) & 119 \\
\hline Brazil & 252 & (4.5) & 280 & (3.1) & 328 & (2.5) & 447 & (4.2) & 512 & (5.4) & 551 & (6.5) & 119 \\
\hline Colombia & 230 & (5.8) & 264 & (5.2) & 319 & (4.5) & 439 & (4.5) & 495 & (4.6) & 528 & (4.1) & 120 \\
\hline Finland & 420 & (4.8) & 452 & (3.3) & 506 & (2.6) & 626 & (2.5) & 679 & (2.8) & 709 & (4.0) & 120 \\
\hline Croatia & 351 & (4.1) & 380 & (3.8) & 432 & (3.5) & 552 & (3.3) & 606 & (3.8) & 638 & (4.1) & 121 \\
\hline Portugal & 329 & (4.7) & 357 & (4.5) & 409 & (3.8) & 530 & (2.7) & 581 & (2.9) & 610 & (3.7) & 122 \\
\hline Serbia & 295 & (5.6) & 326 & (4.7) & 380 & (3.6) & 502 & (3.9) & 557 & (3.8) & 589 & (4.2) & 122 \\
\hline Russian Federation & 335 & (5.1) & 367 & (4.3) & 422 & (4.5) & 544 & (3.8) & 600 & (4.2) & 634 & (4.3) & 122 \\
\hline Korea & 359 & (6.3) & 392 & (5.0) & 450 & (3.9) & 576 & (4.1) & 627 & (5.1) & 656 & (5.9) & 126 \\
\hline Estonia & 393 & (5.1) & 422 & (3.1) & 477 & (3.2) & 604 & (3.2) & 658 & (3.5) & 688 & (3.7) & 127 \\
\hline Greece & 321 & (6.5) & 356 & (5.4) & 413 & (4.1) & 541 & (3.6) & 596 & (3.5) & 626 & (4.2) & 127 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 387 & (7.0) & 423 & (5.0) & 488 & (3.4) & 615 & (2.7) & 667 & (3.3) & 695 & (3.9) & 127 \\
\hline Iceland & 335 & (4.3) & 369 & (3.3) & 425 & (2.3) & 553 & (2.4) & 606 & (2.9) & 636 & (4.3) & 128 \\
\hline Chile & 284 & (4.3) & 314 & (4.0) & 366 & (4.0) & 495 & (5.7) & 560 & (6.1) & 597 & (6.7) & 129 \\
\hline Hungary & 365 & (3.8) & 398 & (4.0) & 453 & (3.2) & 583 & (3.4) & 639 & (4.3) & 674 & (5.5) & 130 \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 342 & (4.5) & 377 & (5.5) & 435 & (3.0) & 568 & (3.6) & 626 & (3.8) & 660 & (5.1) & 132 \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 364 & (8.5) & 396 & (6.2) & 452 & (5.1) & 585 & (4.4) & 643 & (6.1) & 680 & (7.4) & 133 \\
\hline Uruguay & 260 & (7.0) & 295 & (4.9) & 357 & (4.2) & 490 & (3.3) & 550 & (3.8) & 586 & (5.4) & 133 \\
\hline Lithuania & 338 & (4.3) & 370 & (4.1) & 428 & (3.5) & 561 & (3.8) & 617 & (5.1) & 651 & (6.3) & 134 \\
\hline Denmark & 342 & (5.1) & 376 & (5.0) & 435 & (4.0) & 568 & (3.6) & 627 & (3.8) & 658 & (4.2) & 134 \\
\hline Jordan & 278 & (4.9) & 314 & (3.7) & 371 & (3.5) & 505 & (4.1) & 563 & (5.3) & 597 & (5.9) & 134 \\
\hline Alberta & 394 & (8.4) & 428 & (6.2) & 487 & (5.8) & 620 & (4.4) & 675 & (5.9) & 709 & (6.3) & 134 \\
\hline Japan & 362 & (6.5) & 399 & (5.3) & 462 & (4.2) & 595 & (2.9) & 649 & (3.6) & 680 & (3.9) & 134 \\
\hline Poland & 353 & (4.4) & 384 & (3.8) & 438 & (2.8) & 572 & (3.3) & 630 & (3.2) & 664 & (3.8) & 134 \\
\hline Manitoba & 350 & (8.6) & 388 & (7.5) & 456 & (5.1) & 590 & (4.6) & 650 & (6.5) & 685 & (7.2) & 134 \\
\hline Sweden & 346 & (7.2) & 382 & (5.6) & 443 & (3.6) & 578 & (3.3) & 636 & (3.6) & 669 & (3.4) & 134 \\
\hline Netherlands & 360 & (5.3) & 394 & (5.6) & 455 & (4.7) & 589 & (2.7) & 643 & (3.3) & 673 & (3.5) & 134 \\
\hline New Brunswick & 344 & (5.1) & 378 & (5.2) & 433 & (3.9) & 567 & (3.7) & 624 & (4.5) & 657 & (6.0) & 134 \\
\hline Spain & 329 & (4.0) & 364 & (3.2) & 423 & (2.7) & 558 & (3.1) & 616 & (2.6) & 649 & (2.9) & 135 \\
\hline Quebec & 351 & (9.0) & 392 & (7.3) & 458 & (4.6) & 592 & (4.4) & 648 & (5.2) & 680 & (5.7) & 135 \\
\hline Ontario & 367 & (8.6) & 402 & (7.4) & 467 & (6.2) & 602 & (5.0) & 657 & (4.9) & 688 & (4.9) & 135 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 357 & (10.1) & 390 & (10.5) & 450 & (7.3) & 586 & (7.2) & 640 & (8.7) & 670 & (12.2) & 136 \\
\hline Luxembourg & 321 & (2.9) & 357 & (2.5) & 416 & (2.2) & 552 & (1.8) & 608 & (2.4) & 639 & (4.2) & 136 \\
\hline OECD average & 339 & (1.0) & 374 & (0.8) & 433 & (0.7) & 568 & (0.6) & 626 & (0.7) & 658 & (0.9) & 136 \\
\hline Italy & 315 & (3.7) & 350 & (3.2) & 411 & (2.8) & 548 & (2.6) & 608 & (2.6) & 642 & (2.6) & 137 \\
\hline Canada & 362 & (4.4) & 400 & (3.4) & 464 & (2.8) & 601 & (2.5) & 657 & (2.4) & 689 & (2.6) & 137 \\
\hline Norway & 327 & (8.2) & 366 & (5.1) & 427 & (3.6) & 565 & (3.2) & 624 & (3.3) & 656 & (4.0) & 138 \\
\hline Argentina & 207 & (12.8) & 252 & (8.4) & 320 & (6.3) & 459 & (6.6) & 516 & (5.5) & 552 & (6.9) & 139 \\
\hline Ireland & 340 & (6.1) & 377 & (5.0) & 436 & (4.1) & 575 & (3.9) & 635 & (3.9) & 668 & (4.4) & 139 \\
\hline France & 313 & (5.6) & 349 & (5.5) & 412 & (4.7) & 552 & (3.3) & 609 & (3.9) & 640 & (3.6) & 140 \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 349 & (8.9) & 385 & (8.2) & 447 & (5.7) & 588 & (4.7) & 647 & (4.4) & 675 & (6.6) & 141 \\
\hline Australia & 351 & (3.2) & 388 & (3.0) & 450 & (2.7) & 592 & (2.8) & 650 & (3.1) & 683 & (3.1) & 141 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.1.7 (concluded)}

Variation in performance: Science - explaining phenomena scientifically
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Difference in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{95th} & \\
\hline & & standard & & ndard & & ndard & & adard & & ndard & & standard & \\
\hline & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & \\
\hline Switzerland & 333 & (5.3) & 373 & (4.6) & 438 & (4.1) & 580 & (3.4) & 635 & (4.8) & 667 & (4.7) & 142 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 360 & (6.3) & 395 & (5.1) & 456 & (4.5) & 598 & (3.8) & 659 & (4.6) & 694 & (4.7) & 142 \\
\hline Austria & 343 & (7.5) & 382 & (7.3) & 447 & (4.9) & 590 & (4.0) & 642 & (3.5) & 672 & (3.9) & 142 \\
\hline British Columbia & 366 & (10.7) & 406 & (7.3) & 467 & (6.4) & 610 & (5.3) & 666 & (5.9) & 698 & (5.8) & 143 \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 357 & (4.6) & 387 & (5.0) & 446 & (5.0) & 590 & (4.6) & 646 & (5.0) & 678 & (6.1) & 144 \\
\hline Germany & 345 & (6.8) & 381 & (6.2) & 448 & (5.5) & 592 & (3.8) & 651 & (3.6) & 684 & (4.6) & 144 \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 373 & (4.5) & 407 & (5.0) & 474 & (5.7) & 619 & (3.9) & 673 & (3.4) & 702 & (3.4) & 145 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 343 & (6.6) & 375 & (4.3) & 435 & (3.8) & 580 & (5.1) & 645 & (4.1) & 680 & (7.5) & 145 \\
\hline Bulgaria & 276 & (9.4) & 312 & (6.1) & 370 & (5.6) & 516 & (6.9) & 583 & (8.0) & 618 & (8.8) & 146 \\
\hline Belgium & 328 & (6.5) & 365 & (5.8) & 432 & (4.0) & 578 & (2.3) & 632 & (2.4) & 661 & (2.5) & 146 \\
\hline Slovenia & 353 & (4.7) & 388 & (3.9) & 449 & (2.0) & 595 & (2.6) & 661 & (3.3) & 698 & (5.4) & 146 \\
\hline Israel & 269 & (6.0) & 304 & (5.6) & 366 & (4.2) & 520 & (4.7) & 587 & (4.2) & 625 & (4.2) & 154 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 340 & (4.5) & 375 & (3.4) & 439 & (3.0) & 594 & (2.9) & 660 & (3.4) & 696 & (3.9) & 154 \\
\hline New Zealand & 339 & (5.9) & 378 & (4.3) & 445 & (3.6) & 601 & (3.2) & 664 & (3.1) & 700 & (4.1) & 156 \\
\hline United States & 311 & (5.5) & 345 & (5.2) & 404 & (5.5) & 565 & (4.8) & 632 & (4.6) & 670 & (6.0) & 160 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Countries and provinces in ascending order by the difference in score points between the 75 th and 25 th percentiles.

\section*{Table B.1.8}

Variation in performance: Science - using scientific evidence
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Difference \\
in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{95th} & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \\
\hline & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 226 & (5.3) & 250 & (4.6) & 292 & (4.2) & 391 & (5.2) & 446 & (7.2) & 483 & (8.2) & 100 \\
\hline Indonesia & 255 & (6.5) & 282 & (5.8) & 328 & (5.9) & 440 & (9.1) & 498 & (14.3) & 532 & (13.8) & 112 \\
\hline Macao-China & 367 & (3.8) & 401 & (2.9) & 456 & (1.7) & 571 & (2.0) & 618 & (2.4) & 645 & (3.4) & 115 \\
\hline Colombia & 233 & (8.2) & 266 & (6.3) & 324 & (5.1) & 445 & (4.7) & 497 & (4.3) & 529 & (4.4) & 121 \\
\hline Thailand & 280 & (4.5) & 309 & (4.1) & 361 & (3.2) & 483 & (3.7) & 544 & (4.9) & 581 & (5.1) & 122 \\
\hline Latvia & 332 & (6.7) & 370 & (5.5) & 429 & (4.5) & 555 & (3.5) & 606 & (3.4) & 636 & (3.2) & 126 \\
\hline Turkey & 271 & (4.6) & 302 & (3.7) & 352 & (3.3) & 479 & (6.9) & 548 & (9.2) & 589 & (10.5) & 127 \\
\hline Estonia & 374 & (5.3) & 409 & (3.9) & 468 & (3.3) & 595 & (3.2) & 650 & (3.4) & 681 & (3.8) & 128 \\
\hline Montenegro & 258 & (2.7) & 288 & (3.1) & 342 & (1.9) & 469 & (2.4) & 529 & (3.0) & 565 & (4.3) & 128 \\
\hline Qatar & 174 & (2.8) & 203 & (2.4) & 254 & (1.9) & 382 & (1.8) & 462 & (2.8) & 515 & (3.0) & 128 \\
\hline Mexico & 248 & (6.0) & 280 & (5.4) & 339 & (3.8) & 467 & (3.3) & 523 & (3.0) & 554 & (3.6) & 129 \\
\hline Finland & 406 & (5.4) & 442 & (4.0) & 504 & (2.9) & 633 & (2.7) & 690 & (2.9) & 722 & (3.9) & 130 \\
\hline Tunisia & 227 & (4.9) & 260 & (5.1) & 317 & (3.9) & 447 & (4.9) & 506 & (6.4) & 541 & (7.7) & 130 \\
\hline Manitoba & 356 & (7.8) & 395 & (6.7) & 467 & (4.8) & 598 & (4.1) & 652 & (5.1) & 685 & (8.0) & 131 \\
\hline Alberta & 394 & (8.2) & 431 & (7.6) & 488 & (5.6) & 619 & (4.1) & 673 & (4.0) & 703 & (6.2) & 131 \\
\hline Ontario & 377 & (7.8) & 415 & (7.5) & 482 & (5.7) & 614 & (4.8) & 664 & (5.0) & 695 & (6.4) & 132 \\
\hline Croatia & 333 & (5.8) & 367 & (4.3) & 424 & (3.8) & 557 & (3.5) & 614 & (3.8) & 645 & (3.4) & 133 \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 362 & (7.0) & 400 & (5.9) & 460 & (5.2) & 593 & (4.8) & 644 & (4.5) & 675 & (6.6) & 133 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 367 & (6.0) & 408 & (4.7) & 479 & (4.4) & 613 & (3.1) & 663 & (3.2) & 691 & (3.3) & 134 \\
\hline British Columbia & 370 & (11.0) & 409 & (9.8) & 476 & (6.6) & 611 & (4.9) & 662 & (5.0) & 690 & (4.7) & 134 \\
\hline Kyrgyzstan & 125 & (6.7) & 160 & (4.9) & 218 & (4.3) & 352 & (4.0) & 424 & (6.8) & 473 & (9.1) & 134 \\
\hline Jordan & 235 & (6.6) & 277 & (4.4) & 339 & (3.6) & 474 & (4.2) & 532 & (5.1) & 566 & (5.8) & 135 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.1.8 (concluded)}

Variation in performance: Science - using scientific evidence
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Difference \\
in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{95th} & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{lr}
\hline & standard \\
score & error
\end{tabular}}} & \\
\hline & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & & & \\
\hline Canada & 370 & (4.3) & 408 & (4.3) & 477 & (2.9) & 612 & (2.2) & 664 & (2.5) & 695 & (3.1) & 135 \\
\hline New Brunswick & 346 & (5.1) & 384 & (4.5) & 443 & (4.2) & 581 & (4.1) & 634 & (3.9) & 666 & (5.0) & 138 \\
\hline Russian Federation & 311 & (6.5) & 350 & (5.6) & 413 & (4.9) & 551 & (4.7) & 611 & (5.1) & 647 & (4.7) & 138 \\
\hline Poland & 330 & (4.7) & 365 & (3.7) & 425 & (3.4) & 563 & (3.5) & 621 & (3.5) & 652 & (4.0) & 138 \\
\hline Spain & 315 & (5.5) & 355 & (3.6) & 418 & (3.6) & 556 & (3.2) & 610 & (3.2) & 641 & (3.8) & 138 \\
\hline Serbia & 260 & (5.4) & 295 & (4.5) & 357 & (4.8) & 495 & (4.6) & 554 & (4.4) & 589 & (4.8) & 138 \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 345 & (9.4) & 386 & (8.1) & 451 & (5.3) & 589 & (4.3) & 641 & (5.4) & 672 & (7.0) & 138 \\
\hline Lithuania & 321 & (5.2) & 357 & (3.8) & 418 & (4.0) & 557 & (3.9) & 612 & (4.3) & 643 & (4.9) & 139 \\
\hline Korea & 359 & (9.1) & 402 & (7.6) & 473 & (5.4) & 611 & (4.1) & 664 & (4.3) & 694 & (5.0) & 139 \\
\hline Hungary & 325 & (7.6) & 362 & (6.3) & 429 & (4.2) & 568 & (4.4) & 628 & (4.8) & 661 & (4.4) & 139 \\
\hline Greece & 279 & (9.9) & 325 & (7.9) & 399 & (5.8) & 539 & (3.8) & 596 & (4.3) & 630 & (4.3) & 139 \\
\hline Slovenia & 351 & (4.3) & 386 & (3.1) & 447 & (2.0) & 586 & (2.6) & 647 & (3.2) & 679 & (3.1) & 139 \\
\hline Brazil & 215 & (7.5) & 250 & (5.2) & 307 & (3.3) & 446 & (4.6) & 518 & (6.0) & 557 & (7.0) & 140 \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 356 & (5.8) & 393 & (5.9) & 464 & (6.0) & 605 & (3.3) & 656 & (3.5) & 683 & (3.2) & 141 \\
\hline Quebec & 357 & (11.9) & 401 & (8.9) & 475 & (5.6) & 616 & (4.4) & 672 & (5.6) & 704 & (5.3) & 142 \\
\hline Ireland & 331 & (5.4) & 370 & (5.0) & 437 & (4.5) & 579 & (3.1) & 635 & (3.8) & 666 & (4.5) & 142 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 332 & (7.5) & 373 & (5.9) & 439 & (4.4) & 582 & (3.3) & 637 & (5.3) & 670 & (6.0) & 143 \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 365 & (5.4) & 401 & (5.5) & 462 & (5.1) & 605 & (4.6) & 658 & (4.7) & 686 & (6.4) & 144 \\
\hline Chile & 275 & (5.2) & 309 & (5.3) & 367 & (5.4) & 511 & (6.7) & 576 & (5.9) & 613 & (6.5) & 144 \\
\hline Romania & 239 & (7.5) & 273 & (6.8) & 335 & (7.9) & 480 & (6.8) & 541 & (7.0) & 576 & (8.2) & 145 \\
\hline Sweden & 318 & (6.4) & 359 & (4.9) & 425 & (3.5) & 570 & (3.0) & 630 & (3.3) & 664 & (3.2) & 146 \\
\hline Portugal & 297 & (6.9) & 337 & (6.0) & 401 & (5.2) & 547 & (3.4) & 602 & (3.5) & 634 & (4.3) & 147 \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 294 & (8.1) & 336 & (5.8) & 407 & (4.6) & 554 & (4.2) & 615 & (4.1) & 647 & (4.1) & 148 \\
\hline Australia & 348 & (3.8) & 390 & (3.3) & 459 & (2.8) & 607 & (2.7) & 665 & (2.7) & 698 & (3.5) & 148 \\
\hline Denmark & 310 & (6.6) & 349 & (4.8) & 416 & (4.3) & 564 & (3.9) & 624 & (4.6) & 658 & (5.3) & 148 \\
\hline Uruguay & 249 & (5.2) & 287 & (5.1) & 355 & (4.6) & 504 & (2.9) & 566 & (3.8) & 602 & (4.0) & 149 \\
\hline OECD average & 316 & (1.3) & 357 & (1.1) & 427 & (0.8) & 576 & (0.7) & 635 & (0.8) & 668 & (0.9) & 149 \\
\hline Norway & 294 & (7.9) & 334 & (5.8) & 398 & (4.5) & 549 & (3.8) & 613 & (3.4) & 649 & (4.7) & 151 \\
\hline Italy & 279 & (5.0) & 323 & (3.5) & 393 & (3.0) & 545 & (2.8) & 606 & (2.8) & 642 & (2.9) & 151 \\
\hline Switzerland & 325 & (6.4) & 368 & (5.0) & 445 & (4.4) & 597 & (3.5) & 656 & (4.5) & 691 & (5.5) & 152 \\
\hline Iceland & 303 & (5.3) & 345 & (4.1) & 414 & (3.1) & 570 & (2.4) & 632 & (3.3) & 666 & (3.3) & 155 \\
\hline Argentina & 181 & (12.3) & 229 & (12.3) & 311 & (8.2) & 467 & (6.4) & 533 & (6.9) & 571 & (6.9) & 156 \\
\hline Belgium & 312 & (9.8) & 360 & (7.2) & 442 & (4.5) & 599 & (2.4) & 652 & (2.6) & 680 & (3.3) & 157 \\
\hline Luxembourg & 296 & (4.3) & 341 & (3.1) & 415 & (2.5) & 572 & (1.9) & 635 & (2.8) & 668 & (3.0) & 157 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 312 & (8.6) & 353 & (6.6) & 423 & (5.1) & 581 & (4.7) & 644 & (5.4) & 681 & (5.9) & 157 \\
\hline Germany & 317 & (11.2) & 361 & (8.1) & 440 & (6.8) & 597 & (3.9) & 658 & (4.2) & 691 & (4.4) & 158 \\
\hline Japan & 340 & (8.6) & 388 & (7.9) & 468 & (5.9) & 627 & (3.6) & 685 & (3.4) & 719 & (4.8) & 159 \\
\hline Netherlands & 346 & (6.5) & 382 & (6.5) & 446 & (5.3) & 606 & (3.4) & 662 & (2.9) & 691 & (3.0) & 159 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 354 & (19.1) & 388 & (11.3) & 458 & (10.1) & 619 & (7.6) & 681 & (12.4) & 710 & (12.4) & 161 \\
\hline Austria & 305 & (11.2) & 350 & (9.0) & 428 & (6.2) & 589 & (4.6) & 649 & (4.7) & 680 & (4.7) & 162 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 316 & (6.2) & 361 & (4.3) & 434 & (3.6) & 597 & (2.9) & 661 & (3.2) & 699 & (3.8) & 163 \\
\hline France & 311 & (7.9) & 359 & (6.7) & 432 & (5.9) & 595 & (4.2) & 654 & (4.1) & 685 & (4.3) & 164 \\
\hline United States & 296 & (10.1) & 335 & (8.8) & 405 & (7.0) & 573 & (5.1) & 640 & (5.2) & 677 & (5.9) & 168 \\
\hline New Zealand & 331 & (7.1) & 377 & (5.2) & 453 & (4.4) & 624 & (3.4) & 687 & (4.5) & 725 & (4.9) & 171 \\
\hline Bulgaria & 216 & (10.2) & 256 & (8.8) & 325 & (8.1) & 506 & (8.7) & 585 & (9.3) & 624 & (8.7) & 182 \\
\hline Israel & 241 & (7.4) & 286 & (6.5) & 366 & (6.0) & 558 & (5.5) & 635 & (4.6) & 676 & (5.2) & 192 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Countries and provinces in ascending order by the difference in score points between the 75 th and 25 th percentiles.

\section*{Table B.1.9 (concluded)}

Percent of students at each level for provinces and countries:

\section*{Combined science}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Below level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 2} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 3} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 4} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 5} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 6} \\
\hline & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) \\
\hline Jordan & 16.0 & (0.9) & 28.1 & (0.9) & 30.8 & (0.8) & 18.8 & (0.8) & 5.6 & (0.7) & 0.6 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Thailand & 12.4 & (0.8) & 33.4 & (1.0) & 33.3 & (0.9) & 16.4 & (0.8) & 4.1 & (0.4) & 0.4 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Turkey & 12.7 & (0.8) & 33.6 & (1.3) & 31.4 & (1.4) & 15.1 & (1.0) & 6.2 & (1.1) & 0.9 & (0.3) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Romania & 15.8 & (1.5) & 30.8 & (1.5) & 31.9 & (1.6) & 16.7 & (1.2) & 4.3 & (0.8) & 0.5 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Montenegro & 17.0 & (0.8) & 32.9 & (1.2) & 31.1 & (0.9) & 15.0 & (0.7) & 3.7 & (0.4) & 0.3 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Mexico & 18.0 & (1.2) & 32.7 & (0.9) & 30.8 & (1.0) & 14.9 & (0.7) & 3.2 & (0.3) & 0.3 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Argentina & 28.2 & (2.3) & 27.8 & (1.4) & 25.7 & (1.3) & 13.7 & (1.3) & 4.1 & (0.6) & 0.4 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Colombia & 25.9 & (1.7) & 34.0 & (1.4) & 27.4 & (1.5) & 10.6 & (1.0) & 1.9 & (0.3) & 0.2 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Brazil & 27.7 & (1.0) & 33.2 & (0.9) & 23.9 & (0.9) & 11.3 & (0.9) & 3.4 & (0.4) & 0.5 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Indonesia & 20.1 & (1.7) & 41.3 & (2.2) & 27.7 & (1.4) & 9.6 & (2.0) & 1.4 & (0.5) & 0.0 & (0.0) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Tunisia & 27.4 & (1.1) & 35.1 & (0.9) & 25.1 & (1.0) & 10.3 & (1.0) & 2.0 & (0.5) & 0.1 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 19.0 & (1.5) & 53.2 & (1.5) & 22.7 & (1.4) & 4.7 & (0.9) & 0.4 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Qatar & 47.3 & (0.6) & 31.7 & (0.6) & 13.9 & (0.5) & 5.1 & (0.3) & 1.7 & (0.2) & 0.3 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Kyrgyzstan & 57.9 & (1.6) & 28.2 & (1.2) & 10.2 & (0.8) & 2.9 & (0.4) & 0.7 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

0 true zero or a value rounded to zero
(SE) Standard error
Note: Countries and provinces have been sorted by the total percentage of students who attained level 2 or higher.

\section*{Table B.1.10}

Percent of students at each level for provinces and countries:
Science - identifying scientific issues
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Below level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 2} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 3} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 4} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 5} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 6} \\
\hline & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) \\
\hline Finland & 0.9 & (0.2) & 4.0 & (0.4) & 14.4 & (0.7) & 30.5 & (0.9) & 33.0 & (1.1) & 14.7 & (0.7) & 2.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline Alberta & 1.6 & (0.5) & 5.7 & (0.9) & 17.7 & (1.3) & 29.7 & (1.5) & 27.6 & (1.8) & 14.2 & (1.3) & 3.6 & (0.6) \\
\hline Estonia & 1.1 & (0.2) & 7.7 & (0.8) & 24.5 & (0.9) & 36.8 & (0.9) & 24.1 & (1.0) & 5.6 & (0.6) & 0.3 & (0.1) \\
\hline British Columbia & 2.2 & (0.7) & 6.6 & (0.9) & 19.3 & (1.2) & 29.4 & (1.2) & 27.9 & (1.6) & 12.6 & (1.4) & 2.1 & (0.5) \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 2.6 & (0.8) & 7.8 & (1.5) & 23.1 & (2.7) & 30.5 & (2.7) & 25.7 & (3.0) & 8.7 & (1.9) & 1.6 & (0.8) \\
\hline Ontario & 2.7 & (0.6) & 7.8 & (0.9) & 18.0 & (1.4) & 29.4 & (1.2) & 28.4 & (1.3) & 11.3 & (1.1) & 2.4 & (0.6) \\
\hline Australia & 2.5 & (0.2) & 8.0 & (0.4) & 18.6 & (0.5) & 28.4 & (0.6) & 26.7 & (0.6) & 12.6 & (0.5) & 3.1 & (0.4) \\
\hline Canada & 2.8 & (0.3) & 7.9 & (0.5) & 18.8 & (0.7) & 29.2 & (0.7) & 26.8 & (0.7) & 11.7 & (0.6) & 2.7 & (0.3) \\
\hline Slovenia & 2.0 & (0.2) & 9.4 & (0.7) & 23.4 & (0.7) & 31.8 & (1.0) & 24.9 & (1.1) & 7.6 & (0.6) & 0.9 & (0.2) \\
\hline Korea & 3.0 & (0.5) & 8.7 & (0.8) & 21.2 & (0.9) & 32.1 & (1.1) & 25.6 & (1.1) & 8.2 & (0.8) & 1.1 & (0.3) \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 2.1 & (0.5) & 9.9 & (0.8) & 21.2 & (1.4) & 29.0 & (1.6) & 24.5 & (1.5) & 11.3 & (1.1) & 2.1 & (0.4) \\
\hline Netherlands & 3.2 & (0.6) & 9.0 & (0.8) & 19.4 & (1.1) & 26.0 & (1.2) & 25.5 & (1.1) & 13.6 & (0.8) & 3.5 & (0.4) \\
\hline New Zealand & 3.4 & (0.4) & 8.8 & (0.6) & 18.5 & (0.8) & 25.5 & (0.9) & 25.2 & (0.9) & 14.3 & (0.8) & 4.3 & (0.4) \\
\hline Quebec & 3.8 & (0.8) & 8.5 & (1.0) & 18.5 & (1.0) & 28.2 & (1.2) & 25.0 & (1.5) & 12.2 & (0.9) & 3.7 & (0.6) \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 3.7 & (0.5) & 9.2 & (0.6) & 18.6 & (0.8) & 28.2 & (1.0) & 25.8 & (0.9) & 12.0 & (0.8) & 2.5 & (0.4) \\
\hline Manitoba & 3.8 & (0.7) & 9.3 & (0.8) & 21.1 & (1.4) & 30.6 & (1.4) & 23.5 & (1.5) & 9.6 & (1.0) & 2.0 & (0.4) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 3.1 & (0.7) & 10.3 & (1.1) & 21.9 & (1.6) & 31.2 & (2.0) & 22.8 & (1.3) & 9.1 & (1.0) & 1.7 & (0.4) \\
\hline Ireland & 3.0 & (0.4) & 10.6 & (0.8) & 23.1 & (1.1) & 29.3 & (0.9) & 23.0 & (0.9) & 9.3 & (0.7) & 1.8 & (0.3) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 3.3 & (0.8) & 10.3 & (1.0) & 23.0 & (1.3) & 28.9 & (1.5) & 24.4 & (1.2) & 8.7 & (0.9) & 1.3 & (0.3) \\
\hline Switzerland & 3.6 & (0.4) & 10.5 & (0.6) & 21.4 & (0.9) & 29.8 & (0.8) & 24.6 & (1.0) & 9.0 & (0.7) & 1.0 & (0.2) \\
\hline Japan & 4.8 & (0.8) & 9.7 & (0.7) & 19.4 & (0.9) & 27.0 & (1.0) & 25.1 & (1.0) & 11.5 & (0.8) & 2.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 3.3 & (0.5) & 11.0 & (0.8) & 23.1 & (1.3) & 30.0 & (1.3) & 22.9 & (1.3) & 8.0 & (1.0) & 1.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline Belgium & 4.5 & (0.8) & 10.5 & (0.7) & 21.1 & (0.8) & 28.5 & (0.8) & 24.1 & (0.7) & 9.8 & (0.5) & 1.5 & (0.2) \\
\hline Austria & 3.3 & (0.6) & 12.1 & (0.9) & 23.9 & (1.2) & 30.7 & (1.2) & 23.2 & (1.1) & 6.5 & (0.8) & 0.4 & (0.1) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.1.10 (concluded)}

Percent of students at each level for provinces and countries:

\section*{Science - identifying scientific issues}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Below level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 2} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 3} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 4} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 5} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 6} \\
\hline & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) \\
\hline Macao-China & 2.7 & (0.3) & 12.9 & (0.8) & 30.3 & (0.9) & 34.0 & (0.9) & 17.3 & (0.7) & 2.7 & (0.4) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Germany & 4.4 & (0.8) & 11.2 & (0.8) & 22.2 & (0.8) & 29.1 & (1.0) & 23.8 & (1.0) & 7.9 & (0.6) & 1.3 & (0.2) \\
\hline United Kingdom & 4.7 & (0.5) & 11.2 & (0.6) & 22.4 & (0.6) & 26.6 & (0.8) & 22.1 & (0.7) & 10.2 & (0.6) & 2.7 & (0.3) \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 4.1 & (0.6) & 12.1 & (0.9) & 21.8 & (0.8) & 29.5 & (1.0) & 23.6 & (0.9) & 8.0 & (0.6) & 0.9 & (0.2) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 3.8 & (0.6) & 12.6 & (1.2) & 24.8 & (1.3) & 28.5 & (1.3) & 21.6 & (1.2) & 7.6 & (0.7) & 1.1 & (0.3) \\
\hline Croatia & 3.0 & (0.4) & 13.3 & (0.8) & 29.0 & (0.9) & 31.7 & (1.0) & 17.8 & (0.8) & 4.5 & (0.5) & 0.6 & (0.1) \\
\hline Latvia & 3.8 & (0.6) & 13.5 & (1.0) & 29.1 & (1.0) & 33.0 & (1.2) & 17.3 & (1.0) & 3.1 & (0.4) & 0.2 & (0.1) \\
\hline Czech Republic & 4.4 & (0.8) & 13.2 & (0.9) & 24.8 & (1.2) & 28.4 & (1.2) & 20.6 & (1.0) & 7.3 & (0.7) & 1.2 & (0.3) \\
\hline Sweden & 4.6 & (0.4) & 13.0 & (0.8) & 25.3 & (1.1) & 29.6 & (1.1) & 19.8 & (0.9) & 6.6 & (0.5) & 1.0 & (0.2) \\
\hline Hungary & 3.8 & (0.6) & 14.1 & (0.8) & 31.1 & (1.0) & 33.7 & (1.0) & 14.9 & (0.8) & 2.3 & (0.4) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Denmark & 4.3 & (0.5) & 13.6 & (0.9) & 26.2 & (1.0) & 31.5 & (0.9) & 18.8 & (0.8) & 5.1 & (0.6) & 0.4 & (0.2) \\
\hline Spain & 4.4 & (0.3) & 13.7 & (0.7) & 27.9 & (0.7) & 32.1 & (0.6) & 17.6 & (0.7) & 4.0 & (0.4) & 0.3 & (0.1) \\
\hline OECD average & 5.2 & (0.1) & 13.5 & (0.1) & 24.6 & (0.2) & 28.3 & (0.2) & 20.0 & (0.2) & 7.1 & (0.1) & 1.3 & (0.0) \\
\hline Poland & 3.9 & (0.4) & 15.6 & (0.9) & 30.4 & (0.8) & 30.8 & (0.9) & 15.8 & (0.8) & 3.2 & (0.4) & 0.2 & (0.1) \\
\hline Norway & 5.2 & (0.7) & 14.4 & (0.8) & 27.1 & (0.9) & 29.6 & (1.0) & 17.8 & (0.9) & 5.3 & (0.6) & 0.6 & (0.2) \\
\hline France & 6.7 & (0.7) & 13.6 & (0.9) & 21.9 & (1.0) & 27.1 & (1.2) & 21.5 & (0.9) & 8.0 & (0.7) & 1.2 & (0.3) \\
\hline Portugal & 4.8 & (0.6) & 15.6 & (0.9) & 27.6 & (1.0) & 29.5 & (1.1) & 17.7 & (1.0) & 4.6 & (0.5) & 0.3 & (0.1) \\
\hline Iceland & 6.5 & (0.6) & 13.9 & (0.8) & 24.6 & (0.8) & 27.1 & (0.8) & 19.4 & (0.7) & 7.3 & (0.5) & 1.1 & (0.2) \\
\hline Luxembourg & 5.7 & (0.4) & 15.7 & (0.6) & 27.6 & (0.7) & 29.5 & (0.9) & 17.1 & (0.7) & 4.1 & (0.3) & 0.3 & (0.1) \\
\hline United States & 5.6 & (0.7) & 15.9 & (1.1) & 25.2 & (0.9) & 26.7 & (0.9) & 18.5 & (0.9) & 6.9 & (0.6) & 1.2 & (0.3) \\
\hline Lithuania & 4.8 & (0.5) & 16.9 & (1.0) & 30.6 & (1.0) & 31.1 & (1.0) & 14.2 & (1.0) & 2.3 & (0.3) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 6.9 & (0.7) & 15.7 & (1.1) & 29.5 & (1.2) & 29.0 & (1.1) & 15.3 & (1.2) & 3.5 & (0.4) & 0.2 & (0.1) \\
\hline Greece & 8.1 & (0.8) & 16.4 & (0.8) & 29.3 & (0.9) & 30.0 & (0.9) & 13.8 & (0.9) & 2.2 & (0.3) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Italy & 8.0 & (0.5) & 17.0 & (0.6) & 27.8 & (0.7) & 27.0 & (0.7) & 15.4 & (0.7) & 4.4 & (0.4) & 0.5 & (0.1) \\
\hline Russian Federation & 7.5 & (0.8) & 19.9 & (1.2) & 31.4 & (0.8) & 26.9 & (1.1) & 11.8 & (1.0) & 2.3 & (0.3) & 0.2 & (0.1) \\
\hline Israel & 14.7 & (1.0) & 19.9 & (0.7) & 24.3 & (0.8) & 21.5 & (0.9) & 13.8 & (0.9) & 4.7 & (0.5) & 1.1 & (0.2) \\
\hline Chile & 11.0 & (0.9) & 24.2 & (1.2) & 32.3 & (0.9) & 22.0 & (1.1) & 8.8 & (0.9) & 1.6 & (0.4) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Serbia & 12.4 & (1.0) & 25.6 & (1.0) & 35.5 & (1.0) & 21.2 & (1.2) & 5.0 & (0.5) & 0.3 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Uruguay & 15.8 & (1.2) & 26.2 & (1.0) & 29.5 & (1.2) & 19.7 & (0.9) & 7.5 & (0.6) & 1.2 & (0.3) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Turkey & 11.0 & (0.9) & 31.1 & (1.2) & 34.4 & (1.3) & 18.1 & (1.2) & 4.9 & (0.9) & 0.5 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Mexico & 15.0 & (1.0) & 28.9 & (0.8) & 32.9 & (0.9) & 18.2 & (0.7) & 4.6 & (0.4) & 0.5 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Bulgaria & 20.6 & (2.0) & 23.8 & (1.3) & 24.5 & (1.2) & 18.8 & (1.2) & 9.4 & (1.0) & 2.5 & (0.6) & 0.3 & (0.1) \\
\hline Thailand & 16.9 & (0.9) & 31.4 & (1.0) & 31.7 & (1.0) & 15.9 & (0.9) & 3.8 & (0.5) & 0.3 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Jordan & 19.6 & (0.9) & 29.5 & (1.0) & 30.8 & (1.2) & 16.1 & (1.0) & 3.7 & (0.5) & 0.3 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Romania & 16.5 & (1.4) & 33.8 & (1.6) & 32.8 & (1.4) & 14.2 & (1.4) & 2.6 & (0.6) & 0.1 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Colombia & 22.2 & (1.4) & 28.2 & (1.1) & 30.3 & (1.2) & 15.2 & (1.1) & 3.6 & (0.5) & 0.5 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Argentina & 25.2 & (2.0) & 28.4 & (1.2) & 27.8 & (1.3) & 14.2 & (1.2) & 4.0 & (0.6) & 0.4 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Montenegro & 21.4 & (0.8) & 32.6 & (1.1) & 29.3 & (0.9) & 14.0 & (0.7) & 2.6 & (0.4) & 0.2 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Brazil & 25.1 & (1.1) & 30.1 & (1.3) & 27.2 & (1.2) & 13.0 & (0.9) & 4.0 & (0.5) & 0.6 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Indonesia & 22.0 & (1.7) & 37.0 & (1.7) & 28.7 & (1.3) & 10.5 & (1.8) & 1.5 & (0.5) & 0.2 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Tunisia & 28.7 & (1.5) & 33.6 & (1.1) & 24.8 & (1.0) & 10.3 & (0.9) & 2.4 & (0.5) & 0.2 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Qatar & 43.5 & (0.6) & 35.5 & (1.1) & 14.9 & (0.7) & 4.6 & (0.3) & 1.2 & (0.2) & 0.2 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 38.5 & (2.1) & 42.9 & (1.6) & 15.9 & (1.2) & 2.4 & (0.4) & 0.2 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Kyrgyzstan & 55.1 & (1.5) & 28.8 & (1.1) & 12.2 & (0.7) & 3.3 & (0.5) & 0.6 & (0.2) & 0.1 & (0.0) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

0 true zero or a value rounded to zero
(SE) Standard error
Note: Countries and provinces have been sorted by the total percentage of students who attained level 2 or higher.

\section*{Table B.1.11}

Percent of students at each level for provinces and countries:
Science - explaining phenomena scientifically
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Below level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 2} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 3} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 4} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 5} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 6} \\
\hline & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) \\
\hline Finland & 0.5 & (0.1) & 3.4 & (0.3) & 13.8 & (0.6) & 28.1 & (0.9) & 31.5 & (1.0) & 17.5 & (0.8) & 5.1 & (0.5) \\
\hline Alberta & 1.2 & (0.4) & 5.5 & (0.9) & 17.4 & (1.3) & 27.2 & (1.5) & 27.8 & (1.4) & 15.6 & (1.0) & 5.2 & (0.7) \\
\hline Estonia & 1.0 & (0.2) & 6.5 & (0.6) & 20.0 & (0.9) & 29.4 & (1.2) & 27.2 & (1.2) & 12.9 & (0.8) & 2.9 & (0.3) \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 1.5 & (0.4) & 6.3 & (0.6) & 16.0 & (0.8) & 28.2 & (1.0) & 29.1 & (0.8) & 15.5 & (0.7) & 3.5 & (0.4) \\
\hline Macao-China & 1.5 & (0.3) & 7.9 & (0.5) & 23.3 & (1.0) & 33.9 & (0.9) & 25.1 & (0.9) & 7.5 & (0.6) & 0.8 & (0.2) \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 1.7 & (0.3) & 8.7 & (0.7) & 17.1 & (0.9) & 25.3 & (0.9) & 26.8 & (1.0) & 16.1 & (0.9) & 4.3 & (0.4) \\
\hline British Columbia & 2.5 & (0.6) & 8.1 & (1.1) & 19.6 & (1.3) & 25.6 & (1.5) & 26.5 & (1.5) & 14.0 & (1.1) & 3.8 & (0.6) \\
\hline Ontario & 2.4 & (0.6) & 8.9 & (1.2) & 19.1 & (1.3) & 28.0 & (1.3) & 26.4 & (1.7) & 12.3 & (1.2) & 3.0 & (0.5) \\
\hline Canada & 2.7 & (0.3) & 8.9 & (0.5) & 19.8 & (0.7) & 27.9 & (0.7) & 25.4 & (0.8) & 12.2 & (0.6) & 3.1 & (0.2) \\
\hline Japan & 2.8 & (0.4) & 8.9 & (0.7) & 20.4 & (1.0) & 28.5 & (0.8) & 25.9 & (1.0) & 11.1 & (0.9) & 2.4 & (0.3) \\
\hline Hungary & 2.5 & (0.3) & 9.9 & (1.0) & 23.6 & (1.0) & 30.2 & (1.0) & 22.8 & (1.0) & 9.0 & (0.6) & 2.1 & (0.3) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 2.6 & (0.5) & 10.0 & (1.1) & 23.1 & (1.4) & 29.3 & (1.9) & 22.9 & (1.7) & 9.5 & (0.8) & 2.5 & (0.5) \\
\hline Czech Republic & 2.8 & (0.5) & 10.1 & (0.8) & 20.9 & (1.0) & 27.4 & (1.0) & 23.2 & (1.0) & 12.1 & (0.9) & 3.5 & (0.4) \\
\hline Quebec & 3.6 & (0.7) & 9.4 & (0.8) & 20.7 & (1.1) & 28.7 & (1.3) & 24.2 & (1.2) & 11.0 & (0.9) & 2.4 & (0.5) \\
\hline Netherlands & 2.6 & (0.4) & 10.4 & (0.8) & 21.2 & (1.0) & 28.6 & (1.2) & 25.0 & (0.9) & 10.3 & (0.6) & 1.9 & (0.3) \\
\hline Korea & 2.7 & (0.4) & 10.8 & (0.7) & 24.0 & (0.9) & 30.9 & (1.2) & 22.8 & (0.8) & 7.6 & (0.9) & 1.2 & (0.4) \\
\hline Manitoba & 3.7 & (0.6) & 10.2 & (1.0) & 19.5 & (1.3) & 30.4 & (1.3) & 22.7 & (1.6) & 10.4 & (0.9) & 3.0 & (0.6) \\
\hline Australia & 3.5 & (0.3) & 10.6 & (0.4) & 21.8 & (0.5) & 27.6 & (0.6) & 23.0 & (0.7) & 10.8 & (0.5) & 2.7 & (0.3) \\
\hline Slovenia & 3.5 & (0.4) & 10.6 & (0.6) & 22.0 & (1.1) & 27.0 & (0.9) & 21.5 & (0.7) & 11.5 & (0.7) & 3.9 & (0.4) \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 3.2 & (1.0) & 10.8 & (1.9) & 22.5 & (3.4) & 28.9 & (4.3) & 23.3 & (3.1) & 9.4 & (1.8) & 1.8 & (0.9) \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 2.5 & (0.5) & 12.0 & (1.0) & 22.3 & (1.6) & 27.2 & (1.5) & 23.1 & (2.0) & 10.7 & (1.3) & 2.2 & (0.6) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 3.6 & (0.8) & 11.2 & (1.3) & 22.6 & (1.5) & 27.9 & (1.6) & 22.0 & (1.3) & 10.5 & (1.1) & 2.2 & (0.4) \\
\hline Austria & 4.1 & (0.7) & 11.0 & (0.9) & 21.4 & (1.0) & 27.5 & (1.0) & 23.9 & (1.0) & 10.3 & (0.8) & 1.8 & (0.2) \\
\hline Germany & 3.9 & (0.6) & 11.4 & (0.9) & 20.6 & (0.9) & 27.6 & (1.0) & 22.6 & (1.0) & 11.1 & (0.9) & 2.8 & (0.3) \\
\hline Sweden & 4.0 & (0.6) & 11.5 & (0.8) & 23.4 & (1.0) & 29.2 & (0.9) & 21.4 & (0.8) & 8.7 & (0.6) & 1.8 & (0.3) \\
\hline New Zealand & 4.6 & (0.5) & 11.3 & (0.7) & 21.0 & (0.8) & 24.7 & (1.1) & 22.0 & (0.9) & 12.2 & (0.6) & 4.2 & (0.4) \\
\hline Poland & 3.1 & (0.4) & 12.9 & (0.7) & 25.6 & (1.0) & 28.8 & (1.0) & 20.1 & (0.8) & 7.9 & (0.5) & 1.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline Ireland & 4.5 & (0.5) & 12.5 & (0.7) & 24.6 & (1.0) & 28.0 & (1.1) & 19.9 & (0.9) & 8.6 & (0.7) & 1.9 & (0.3) \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 4.1 & (0.6) & 12.9 & (0.8) & 26.0 & (1.3) & 28.7 & (1.0) & 19.6 & (0.9) & 7.2 & (0.6) & 1.4 & (0.3) \\
\hline United Kingdom & 4.5 & (0.4) & 12.6 & (0.6) & 21.7 & (0.7) & 25.2 & (0.7) & 20.8 & (0.6) & 11.4 & (0.6) & 3.8 & (0.3) \\
\hline Switzerland & 5.1 & (0.6) & 12.2 & (0.6) & 21.8 & (0.9) & 28.0 & (0.9) & 22.6 & (0.8) & 8.6 & (0.7) & 1.8 & (0.3) \\
\hline Denmark & 4.1 & (0.5) & 13.4 & (0.8) & 25.2 & (0.8) & 29.0 & (0.9) & 19.6 & (0.8) & 7.5 & (0.7) & 1.3 & (0.3) \\
\hline Croatia & 3.1 & (0.4) & 14.3 & (0.8) & 29.4 & (1.1) & 30.1 & (1.2) & 17.5 & (0.9) & 4.8 & (0.4) & 0.7 & (0.1) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 4.1 & (0.5) & 13.7 & (0.9) & 25.5 & (1.4) & 28.3 & (1.5) & 20.0 & (1.1) & 7.0 & (0.7) & 1.4 & (0.3) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 4.2 & (0.5) & 13.6 & (1.0) & 22.5 & (1.2) & 27.0 & (1.3) & 20.5 & (1.2) & 9.5 & (1.0) & 2.6 & (0.6) \\
\hline Latvia & 4.3 & (0.6) & 14.9 & (0.9) & 29.5 & (1.1) & 30.6 & (0.9) & 16.0 & (0.9) & 4.2 & (0.4) & 0.5 & (0.1) \\
\hline Lithuania & 4.5 & (0.5) & 14.9 & (0.7) & 26.1 & (0.9) & 28.4 & (1.0) & 18.8 & (0.8) & 6.2 & (0.6) & 1.2 & (0.3) \\
\hline Belgium & 5.8 & (0.8) & 13.5 & (0.7) & 21.9 & (0.7) & 27.2 & (0.7) & 21.8 & (0.7) & 8.5 & (0.4) & 1.2 & (0.2) \\
\hline Norway & 5.7 & (0.7) & 13.7 & (0.7) & 25.4 & (0.9) & 27.9 & (0.8) & 18.9 & (0.9) & 7.2 & (0.6) & 1.2 & (0.2) \\
\hline OECD average & 5.4 & (0.1) & 14.2 & (0.1) & 24.0 & (0.2) & 27.0 & (0.2) & 19.7 & (0.2) & 8.0 & (0.1) & 1.7 & (0.0) \\
\hline Iceland & 4.9 & (0.5) & 14.9 & (0.8) & 27.5 & (0.9) & 29.7 & (0.8) & 17.5 & (0.7) & 4.9 & (0.5) & 0.5 & (0.1) \\
\hline Spain & 5.6 & (0.4) & 15.1 & (0.7) & 26.1 & (0.7) & 28.2 & (0.7) & 17.9 & (0.7) & 6.2 & (0.4) & 0.9 & (0.1) \\
\hline Russian Federation & 4.9 & (0.5) & 15.7 & (1.0) & 29.6 & (0.9) & 29.2 & (1.1) & 15.4 & (0.9) & 4.5 & (0.4) & 0.6 & (0.1) \\
\hline Luxembourg & 6.7 & (0.4) & 16.3 & (0.7) & 26.3 & (1.0) & 27.7 & (0.9) & 17.3 & (0.7) & 5.0 & (0.4) & 0.6 & (0.2) \\
\hline Greece & 6.6 & (0.8) & 17.0 & (0.9) & 28.8 & (1.0) & 28.4 & (1.1) & 15.1 & (0.9) & 3.6 & (0.4) & 0.5 & (0.1) \\
\hline France & 7.6 & (0.7) & 16.6 & (1.0) & 25.5 & (0.9) & 27.4 & (0.9) & 17.0 & (0.8) & 5.4 & (0.5) & 0.6 & (0.2) \\
\hline Italy & 7.4 & (0.5) & 16.8 & (0.6) & 27.0 & (0.7) & 26.9 & (0.6) & 15.8 & (0.6) & 5.2 & (0.3) & 0.8 & (0.1) \\
\hline Portugal & 5.7 & (0.7) & 19.4 & (1.1) & 31.0 & (0.8) & 28.0 & (1.1) & 13.3 & (0.7) & 2.5 & (0.3) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline United States & 8.3 & (0.8) & 17.9 & (1.0) & 23.6 & (0.9) & 23.5 & (0.9) & 17.0 & (0.9) & 7.8 & (0.6) & 2.0 & (0.3) \\
\hline Serbia & 11.7 & (0.9) & 25.1 & (1.0) & 31.3 & (1.0) & 22.1 & (1.1) & 8.2 & (0.6) & 1.5 & (0.2) & 0.1 & (0.0) \\
\hline Bulgaria & 14.9 & (1.5) & 23.3 & (1.3) & 26.4 & (1.2) & 20.8 & (1.2) & 10.9 & (1.1) & 3.1 & (0.6) & 0.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline Jordan & 14.3 & (0.8) & 24.3 & (0.9) & 29.1 & (0.9) & 21.3 & (0.8) & 8.9 & (0.7) & 1.9 & (0.3) & 0.2 & (0.1) \\
\hline Israel & 16.2 & (1.2) & 23.2 & (0.8) & 24.7 & (1.0) & 20.2 & (0.9) & 11.5 & (0.8) & 3.6 & (0.3) & 0.6 & (0.2) \\
\hline Chile & 14.7 & (1.0) & 27.7 & (1.3) & 29.1 & (0.9) & 18.3 & (1.1) & 8.1 & (0.8) & 1.9 & (0.4) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.1.11 (concluded)}

Percent of students at each level for provinces and countries:
Science - explaining phenomena scientifically
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Below level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 2} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 3} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 4} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 5} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 6} \\
\hline & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) \\
\hline Romania & 13.7 & (1.5) & 29.9 & (1.5) & 32.5 & (1.3) & 17.7 & (1.2) & 5.3 & (0.8) & 0.8 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Uruguay & 18.7 & (1.1) & 26.3 & (1.0) & 27.9 & (1.2) & 18.4 & (0.8) & 7.0 & (0.5) & 1.5 & (0.3) & 0.2 & (0.1) \\
\hline Thailand & 12.2 & (0.9) & 34.4 & (1.3) & 34.0 & (1.2) & 15.2 & (0.9) & 3.8 & (0.4) & 0.4 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Turkey & 14.1 & (0.8) & 33.3 & (1.2) & 30.0 & (1.3) & 14.9 & (0.9) & 6.2 & (1.1) & 1.4 & (0.5) & 0.1 & (0.0) \\
\hline Montenegro & 15.7 & (0.7) & 32.2 & (0.8) & 31.2 & (0.8) & 15.7 & (0.8) & 4.7 & (0.5) & 0.4 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 10.3 & (0.9) & 39.7 & (1.6) & 37.2 & (1.7) & 10.8 & (1.1) & 1.8 & (0.5) & 0.1 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Mexico & 19.3 & (1.2) & 33.2 & (0.9) & 29.8 & (1.0) & 14.0 & (0.7) & 3.3 & (0.4) & 0.4 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Argentina & 29.7 & (2.1) & 28.0 & (1.2) & 24.6 & (1.3) & 13.3 & (1.2) & 3.8 & (0.6) & 0.5 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Indonesia & 20.0 & (1.4) & 40.5 & (2.3) & 27.5 & (1.5) & 10.4 & (2.0) & 1.5 & (0.5) & 0.0 & (0.0) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Brazil & 27.8 & (1.0) & 33.3 & (0.9) & 23.7 & (0.8) & 11.0 & (0.8) & 3.5 & (0.4) & 0.7 & (0.2) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Tunisia & 28.1 & (1.3) & 35.4 & (1.1) & 25.2 & (1.1) & 9.1 & (0.8) & 2.1 & (0.5) & 0.1 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Colombia & 30.5 & (1.7) & 33.1 & (1.4) & 24.2 & (1.3) & 10.0 & (0.9) & 1.9 & (0.3) & 0.2 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Qatar & 43.2 & (0.6) & 32.7 & (0.7) & 15.8 & (0.5) & 5.9 & (0.3) & 1.8 & (0.2) & 0.5 & (0.1) & 0.1 & (0.0) \\
\hline Kyrgyzstan & 51.0 & (1.7) & 32.0 & (1.2) & 12.9 & (0.8) & 3.3 & (0.4) & 0.8 & (0.2) & 0.1 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

0 true zero or a value rounded to zero
(SE) Standard error
Note: Countries and provinces have been sorted by the total percentage of students who attained level 2 or higher.

\section*{Table B.1.12}

Percent of students at each level for provinces and countries: Science - using scientific evidence
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Below level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 2} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 3} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 4} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 5} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 6} \\
\hline & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) \\
\hline Finland & 1.0 & (0.2) & 4.3 & (0.4) & 13.9 & (0.7) & 25.9 & (0.7) & 29.8 & (0.8) & 18.3 & (0.7) & 6.8 & (0.5) \\
\hline Alberta & 1.4 & (0.6) & 5.4 & (0.9) & 16.7 & (1.4) & 27.3 & (1.3) & 28.9 & (1.6) & 15.8 & (1.1) & 4.4 & (0.6) \\
\hline Ontario & 1.9 & (0.5) & 7.2 & (1.0) & 16.3 & (1.4) & 26.8 & (1.6) & 29.5 & (1.5) & 14.7 & (1.3) & 3.6 & (0.6) \\
\hline British Columbia & 2.5 & (0.7) & 7.5 & (1.0) & 17.3 & (1.2) & 27.0 & (1.2) & 28.5 & (1.4) & 14.3 & (1.3) & 3.0 & (0.6) \\
\hline Estonia & 1.9 & (0.3) & 8.1 & (0.6) & 20.2 & (0.8) & 30.5 & (1.1) & 25.3 & (1.1) & 11.7 & (0.7) & 2.3 & (0.3) \\
\hline Canada & 2.5 & (0.3) & 7.6 & (0.5) & 17.1 & (0.7) & 27.0 & (0.8) & 27.9 & (0.7) & 14.3 & (0.6) & 3.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 2.6 & (0.4) & 7.6 & (0.6) & 16.1 & (0.7) & 26.7 & (1.0) & 29.0 & (0.9) & 15.0 & (0.8) & 3.0 & (0.3) \\
\hline Korea & 3.1 & (0.6) & 7.9 & (0.8) & 17.0 & (0.6) & 27.3 & (1.2) & 26.8 & (0.9) & 14.4 & (1.0) & 3.4 & (0.5) \\
\hline Quebec & 3.4 & (0.7) & 8.0 & (0.9) & 16.4 & (1.0) & 26.3 & (1.0) & 26.3 & (1.1) & 15.0 & (1.0) & 4.6 & (0.6) \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 2.5 & (0.4) & 9.0 & (0.9) & 19.8 & (1.6) & 26.2 & (1.4) & 26.1 & (1.4) & 13.7 & (1.2) & 2.7 & (0.6) \\
\hline Macao-China & 2.3 & (0.3) & 9.3 & (0.5) & 24.7 & (0.8) & 33.6 & (0.9) & 23.2 & (1.0) & 6.4 & (0.5) & 0.5 & (0.2) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 2.8 & (0.5) & 8.8 & (1.1) & 21.1 & (1.4) & 29.8 & (1.9) & 24.9 & (1.4) & 10.4 & (0.9) & 2.1 & (0.4) \\
\hline Manitoba & 3.1 & (0.6) & 8.9 & (0.8) & 17.8 & (1.2) & 29.4 & (1.7) & 26.2 & (1.6) & 11.8 & (1.2) & 2.8 & (0.6) \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 3.1 & (0.5) & 9.8 & (0.8) & 17.5 & (0.8) & 26.6 & (0.9) & 27.2 & (1.0) & 13.5 & (0.7) & 2.3 & (0.3) \\
\hline Australia & 3.9 & (0.3) & 9.4 & (0.6) & 18.8 & (0.7) & 26.2 & (0.6) & 24.5 & (0.6) & 13.4 & (0.6) & 4.0 & (0.4) \\
\hline Japan & 4.6 & (0.6) & 8.6 & (0.7) & 15.5 & (0.8) & 22.8 & (0.8) & 25.5 & (1.0) & 16.8 & (0.9) & 6.2 & (0.5) \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 3.9 & (1.1) & 9.7 & (1.7) & 19.2 & (3.1) & 24.5 & (2.5) & 22.0 & (2.7) & 15.3 & (2.1) & 5.4 & (1.4) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 4.1 & (0.7) & 10.1 & (1.0) & 21.5 & (1.2) & 27.9 & (1.3) & 24.6 & (1.7) & 9.9 & (1.2) & 1.8 & (0.4) \\
\hline Slovenia & 3.4 & (0.3) & 11.5 & (0.5) & 22.7 & (0.7) & 27.5 & (0.7) & 22.4 & (0.7) & 10.2 & (0.5) & 2.2 & (0.4) \\
\hline New Zealand & 5.3 & (0.7) & 10.0 & (0.7) & 17.7 & (0.7) & 22.0 & (0.8) & 22.5 & (0.8) & 15.5 & (0.8) & 6.9 & (0.6) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 3.8 & (0.5) & 11.7 & (0.9) & 23.1 & (1.4) & 28.1 & (1.1) & 23.2 & (1.1) & 8.6 & (0.8) & 1.5 & (0.4) \\
\hline Netherlands & 3.7 & (0.6) & 12.0 & (1.0) & 19.5 & (0.8) & 23.9 & (1.2) & 23.9 & (1.4) & 13.8 & (1.0) & 3.2 & (0.3) \\
\hline Switzerland & 5.9 & (0.6) & 11.0 & (0.5) & 19.2 & (0.8) & 25.7 & (0.7) & 23.3 & (0.8) & 11.5 & (0.6) & 3.4 & (0.4) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.1.12 (concluded)}

Percent of students at each level for provinces and countries:
Science - using scientific evidence
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Below level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 1} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 2} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Level 3} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 4} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Level 5} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level 6} \\
\hline & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) & \% & (SE) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 5.1 & (0.6) & 11.8 & (0.9) & 21.8 & (1.3) & 28.3 & (1.4) & 22.1 & (1.2) & 9.2 & (0.9) & 1.7 & (0.4) \\
\hline Ireland & 5.4 & (0.6) & 12.4 & (0.7) & 22.5 & (0.8) & 27.6 & (1.0) & 21.7 & (1.1) & 8.8 & (0.7) & 1.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline Belgium & 7.0 & (0.8) & 10.8 & (0.6) & 18.0 & (0.7) & 24.6 & (0.7) & 24.8 & (0.7) & 12.6 & (0.6) & 2.1 & (0.2) \\
\hline Germany & 6.7 & (1.0) & 11.5 & (0.9) & 18.8 & (0.9) & 25.3 & (0.9) & 22.8 & (1.0) & 11.6 & (0.8) & 3.3 & (0.4) \\
\hline Latvia & 5.2 & (0.7) & 13.9 & (1.0) & 26.2 & (1.0) & 30.9 & (1.0) & 18.5 & (1.0) & 5.0 & (0.5) & 0.4 & (0.1) \\
\hline United Kingdom & 6.7 & (0.5) & 12.4 & (0.6) & 20.1 & (0.6) & 23.9 & (0.8) & 21.2 & (0.8) & 11.7 & (0.5) & 4.0 & (0.4) \\
\hline Hungary & 6.0 & (0.7) & 13.7 & (0.9) & 24.2 & (1.1) & 28.0 & (1.1) & 19.0 & (0.9) & 7.8 & (0.7) & 1.4 & (0.3) \\
\hline France & 7.1 & (0.8) & 12.5 & (0.8) & 19.5 & (1.0) & 23.5 & (1.1) & 22.7 & (1.0) & 12.0 & (0.8) & 2.6 & (0.5) \\
\hline Croatia & 5.2 & (0.6) & 15.0 & (0.8) & 26.8 & (1.0) & 28.4 & (1.0) & 17.9 & (0.9) & 5.9 & (0.5) & 0.9 & (0.2) \\
\hline Poland & 5.5 & (0.6) & 14.8 & (0.8) & 25.4 & (0.7) & 27.7 & (0.9) & 18.9 & (1.0) & 6.6 & (0.6) & 1.0 & (0.2) \\
\hline Austria & 8.0 & (1.2) & 12.5 & (1.1) & 20.5 & (1.0) & 24.0 & (0.9) & 21.9 & (0.9) & 10.7 & (0.9) & 2.4 & (0.4) \\
\hline Sweden & 6.6 & (0.6) & 14.0 & (0.8) & 23.4 & (1.0) & 27.1 & (0.8) & 19.6 & (0.8) & 7.8 & (0.5) & 1.6 & (0.2) \\
\hline Czech Republic & 7.4 & (0.9) & 13.5 & (0.9) & 22.4 & (1.1) & 24.8 & (1.1) & 19.8 & (1.0) & 9.3 & (0.8) & 2.8 & (0.4) \\
\hline OECD average & 7.9 & (0.1) & 14.1 & (0.1) & 21.7 & (0.2) & 24.8 & (0.2) & 19.8 & (0.2) & 9.3 & (0.1) & 2.4 & (0.1) \\
\hline Lithuania & 6.6 & (0.6) & 15.6 & (0.9) & 25.2 & (0.9) & 28.0 & (0.9) & 18.2 & (0.9) & 5.6 & (0.6) & 0.8 & (0.2) \\
\hline Spain & 7.1 & (0.5) & 15.2 & (0.7) & 25.5 & (0.6) & 28.0 & (0.6) & 18.2 & (0.7) & 5.3 & (0.4) & 0.7 & (0.1) \\
\hline Denmark & 7.7 & (0.7) & 15.4 & (0.7) & 23.9 & (0.9) & 26.1 & (0.9) & 18.3 & (0.8) & 7.1 & (0.6) & 1.4 & (0.3) \\
\hline Iceland & 8.5 & (0.6) & 15.0 & (0.7) & 22.3 & (0.8) & 25.6 & (0.9) & 18.9 & (0.7) & 7.8 & (0.6) & 1.9 & (0.3) \\
\hline Luxembourg & 9.2 & (0.4) & 14.4 & (0.7) & 21.7 & (0.7) & 25.4 & (0.7) & 19.1 & (0.7) & 8.5 & (0.5) & 1.8 & (0.3) \\
\hline Russian Federation & 7.6 & (0.8) & 16.2 & (1.0) & 27.2 & (1.1) & 26.4 & (0.9) & 15.9 & (1.0) & 5.5 & (0.5) & 1.1 & (0.2) \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 9.7 & (0.9) & 15.9 & (1.1) & 25.4 & (1.1) & 25.2 & (1.0) & 16.9 & (0.9) & 6.1 & (0.6) & 0.9 & (0.2) \\
\hline United States & 9.9 & (1.4) & 16.0 & (0.8) & 22.0 & (1.2) & 22.9 & (0.9) & 17.9 & (0.8) & 8.7 & (0.8) & 2.5 & (0.4) \\
\hline Portugal & 9.6 & (0.9) & 17.9 & (0.9) & 25.4 & (1.1) & 25.7 & (1.1) & 16.3 & (0.9) & 4.6 & (0.4) & 0.5 & (0.2) \\
\hline Greece & 11.2 & (1.1) & 16.5 & (0.9) & 26.3 & (1.1) & 27.2 & (1.1) & 14.2 & (0.9) & 4.1 & (0.5) & 0.5 & (0.1) \\
\hline Norway & 10.0 & (0.9) & 18.3 & (0.9) & 25.5 & (1.0) & 23.8 & (1.2) & 15.6 & (0.9) & 5.6 & (0.5) & 1.2 & (0.2) \\
\hline Italy & 11.8 & (0.6) & 17.7 & (0.6) & 24.9 & (0.6) & 24.6 & (0.6) & 15.0 & (0.6) & 5.2 & (0.3) & 0.8 & (0.1) \\
\hline Israel & 18.1 & (1.3) & 18.1 & (0.9) & 20.3 & (0.8) & 18.6 & (0.8) & 14.6 & (0.9) & 7.7 & (0.6) & 2.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline Chile & 15.8 & (1.3) & 23.9 & (1.3) & 26.9 & (1.3) & 20.1 & (1.3) & 10.1 & (0.9) & 2.8 & (0.4) & 0.3 & (0.1) \\
\hline Uruguay & 19.7 & (1.1) & 22.2 & (1.0) & 26.4 & (0.9) & 20.1 & (0.9) & 9.2 & (0.6) & 2.1 & (0.4) & 0.3 & (0.1) \\
\hline Serbia & 18.6 & (1.2) & 25.4 & (1.0) & 27.5 & (1.0) & 19.4 & (1.2) & 7.6 & (0.7) & 1.5 & (0.3) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Thailand & 16.2 & (0.9) & 29.2 & (1.0) & 30.0 & (0.9) & 16.9 & (0.7) & 6.5 & (0.7) & 1.1 & (0.2) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Bulgaria & 27.5 & (2.3) & 20.7 & (1.2) & 21.0 & (1.2) & 16.6 & (1.2) & 10.0 & (1.0) & 3.2 & (0.7) & 0.9 & (0.3) \\
\hline Turkey & 18.9 & (1.1) & 30.3 & (1.4) & 27.1 & (1.4) & 15.3 & (1.0) & 6.8 & (1.0) & 1.6 & (0.5) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Romania & 24.9 & (2.4) & 25.6 & (1.4) & 25.7 & (1.8) & 16.6 & (1.9) & 5.9 & (0.8) & 1.2 & (0.3) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Jordan & 23.4 & (1.2) & 27.3 & (1.2) & 27.5 & (1.2) & 15.9 & (0.9) & 5.2 & (0.6) & 0.8 & (0.3) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Montenegro & 22.5 & (0.6) & 29.5 & (0.9) & 27.3 & (0.8) & 15.0 & (0.7) & 5.0 & (0.5) & 0.7 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Mexico & 23.5 & (1.4) & 29.1 & (0.9) & 27.6 & (0.9) & 15.3 & (0.7) & 4.1 & (0.4) & 0.5 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Argentina & 31.7 & (2.4) & 24.5 & (1.2) & 23.5 & (1.2) & 13.8 & (1.1) & 5.5 & (0.7) & 0.9 & (0.3) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Colombia & 28.9 & (2.0) & 31.9 & (1.3) & 26.2 & (1.3) & 10.5 & (0.9) & 2.3 & (0.3) & 0.2 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Tunisia & 31.5 & (1.4) & 29.8 & (1.0) & 24.2 & (1.0) & 11.3 & (0.9) & 3.0 & (0.6) & 0.3 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Indonesia & 27.7 & (2.6) & 35.1 & (1.7) & 24.5 & (1.5) & 10.2 & (1.9) & 2.4 & (1.0) & 0.1 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Brazil & 34.7 & (1.3) & 28.4 & (1.1) & 21.0 & (0.9) & 11.0 & (0.8) & 4.0 & (0.5) & 0.8 & (0.3) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 47.6 & (2.1) & 33.4 & (1.4) & 14.1 & (1.2) & 4.2 & (0.8) & 0.7 & (0.2) & 0.0 & (0.0) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline Qatar & 59.1 & (0.6) & 22.5 & (0.6) & 10.9 & (0.6) & 4.8 & (0.3) & 1.9 & (0.2) & 0.6 & (0.1) & 0.1 & (0.1) \\
\hline Kyrgyzstan & 69.6 & (1.3) & 18.2 & (0.8) & 7.9 & (0.6) & 3.0 & (0.5) & 1.1 & (0.3) & 0.1 & (0.1) & 0.0 & (0.0) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

0 true zero or a value rounded to zero
(SE) Standard error
Note: Countries and provinces have been sorted by the total percentage of students who attained level 2 or higher.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Table B.2.1} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Estimated average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Reading} \\
\hline Country and province & estimated average score & standard error & confidence interval 95\% lower limit & confidence interval 95\% upper limit \\
\hline Korea & 556 & (3.8) & 549 & 563 \\
\hline Finland & 547 & (2.1) & 543 & 551 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 536 & (2.4) & 531 & 541 \\
\hline Alberta & 535 & (4.2) & 527 & 543 \\
\hline Ontario & 534 & (4.6) & 525 & 543 \\
\hline British Columbia & 528 & (5.7) & 517 & 539 \\
\hline Canada & 527 & (2.4) & 522 & 532 \\
\hline Quebec & 522 & (5.0) & 512 & 532 \\
\hline New Zealand & 521 & (3.0) & 515 & 527 \\
\hline Ireland & 517 & (3.5) & 510 & 524 \\
\hline Manitoba & 516 & (3.5) & 510 & 523 \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & dor 514 & (3.2) & 507 & 520 \\
\hline Australia & 513 & (2.1) & 509 & 517 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 510 & (3.9) & 503 & 518 \\
\hline Poland & 508 & (2.8) & 502 & 513 \\
\hline Netherlands & 507 & (2.9) & 501 & 512 \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 507 & (4.2) & 498 & 515 \\
\hline Sweden & 507 & (3.4) & 501 & 514 \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 505 & (3.5) & 498 & 512 \\
\hline Belgium & 501 & (3.0) & 495 & 507 \\
\hline Estonia & 501 & (2.9) & 495 & 506 \\
\hline Switzerland & 499 & (3.1) & 493 & 505 \\
\hline Japan & 498 & (3.6) & 491 & 505 \\
\hline New Brunswick & 497 & (2.3) & 493 & 502 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 497 & (2.8) & 492 & 502 \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 496 & (3.4) & 490 & 503 \\
\hline Germany & 495 & (4.4) & 486 & 504 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 495 & (2.3) & 491 & 500 \\
\hline Denmark & 494 & (3.2) & 488 & 501 \\
\hline Slovenia & 494 & (1.0) & 492 & 496 \\
\hline Macao-China & 492 & (1.1) & 490 & 494 \\
\hline OECD average & 491 & (0.6) & 490 & 492 \\
\hline Austria & 490 & (4.1) & 482 & 498 \\
\hline France & 488 & (4.1) & 480 & 496 \\
\hline Iceland & 484 & (1.9) & 481 & 488 \\
\hline Norway & 484 & (3.2) & 478 & 491 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 483 & (4.2) & 475 & 491 \\
\hline Hungary & 482 & (3.3) & 476 & 489 \\
\hline Latvia & 479 & (3.7) & 472 & 487 \\
\hline Luxembourg & 479 & (1.3) & 477 & 482 \\
\hline Croatia & 477 & (2.8) & 472 & 483 \\
\hline Portugal & 472 & (3.6) & 465 & 479 \\
\hline Lithuania & 470 & (3.0) & 464 & 476 \\
\hline Italy & 469 & (2.4) & 464 & 473 \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 466 & (3.1) & 460 & 472 \\
\hline Spain & 461 & (2.2) & 456 & 465 \\
\hline Greece & 460 & (4.0) & 452 & 468 \\
\hline Turkey & 447 & (4.2) & 439 & 455 \\
\hline Chile & 442 & (5.0) & 432 & 452 \\
\hline Russian Federation & 440 & (4.3) & 431 & 448 \\
\hline Israel & 439 & (4.6) & 430 & 448 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Table B.2.1 (concluded)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Estimated average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Reading} \\
\hline Country and province & estimated average score & standard error & confidence interval 95\% lower limit & confidence interval 95\% upper limit \\
\hline Thailand & 417 & (2.6) & 412 & 422 \\
\hline Uruguay & 413 & (3.4) & 406 & 419 \\
\hline Mexico & 410 & (3.1) & 404 & 416 \\
\hline Bulgaria & 402 & (6.9) & 388 & 415 \\
\hline Jordan & 401 & (3.3) & 394 & 407 \\
\hline Serbia & 401 & (3.5) & 394 & 408 \\
\hline Romania & 396 & (4.7) & 387 & 405 \\
\hline Brazil & 393 & (3.7) & 386 & 400 \\
\hline Indonesia & 393 & (5.9) & 381 & 405 \\
\hline Montenegro & 392 & (1.2) & 390 & 394 \\
\hline Colombia & 385 & (5.1) & 375 & 395 \\
\hline Tunisia & 380 & (4.0) & 372 & 388 \\
\hline Argentina & 374 & (7.2) & 360 & 388 \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 353 & (3.1) & 347 & 359 \\
\hline Qatar & 312 & (1.2) & 310 & 315 \\
\hline Kyrgyzstan & 285 & (3.5) & 278 & 292 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Data for the United States are not available for reading.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Table B.2.2} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Table B.2.2 (concluded)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Estimated average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Mathematics} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Estimated average scores and confidence intervals for provinces and countries: Mathematics} \\
\hline Country and province & estimated average score & standard error & confidence interval 95\% lower limit & confidence interval 95\% upper limit & Country and province & estimated average score & standard error & confidence interval 95\% lower limit & confidence interval 95\% upper limit \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 549 & (4.1) & 541 & 557 & Serbia & 435 & (3.5) & 428 & 442 \\
\hline Finland & 548 & (2.3) & 544 & 553 & Uruguay & 427 & (2.6) & 422 & 432 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 547 & (2.7) & 542 & 553 & Turkey & 424 & (4.9) & 414 & 434 \\
\hline Korea & 547 & (3.8) & 540 & 555 & Thailand & 417 & (2.3) & 412 & 422 \\
\hline Quebec & 540 & (4.2) & 532 & 548 & Romania & 415 & (4.2) & 407 & 423 \\
\hline Netherlands & 531 & (2.6) & 526 & 536 & Bulgaria & 413 & (6.1) & 401 & 425 \\
\hline Alberta & 530 & (3.8) & 522 & 537 & Chile & 411 & (4.6) & 402 & 420 \\
\hline Switzerland & 530 & (3.2) & 523 & 536 & Mexico & 406 & (2.9) & 400 & 411 \\
\hline Canada & 527 & (2.0) & 523 & 531 & Montenegro
Indonesia & 399
391 & (1.4)
(5.6) & 397
380 & 402 \\
\hline Ontario & 526 & (3.7) & 519 & 533 & Jordan & 384 & (3.3) & 378 & 391 \\
\hline Macao-China & 525 & (1.3) & 522 & 528 & Argentina & 381 & (6.2) & 369 & 393 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 525 & (4.2) & 517 & 533 & Brazil & 370 & (2.9) & 364 & 375 \\
\hline British Columbia & 523 & (4.4) & 514 & 531 & Colombia & 370 & (3.8) & 363 & 377 \\
\hline Japan & 523 & (3.3) & 517 & 530 & Tunisia & 365 & (4.0) & 358 & 373 \\
\hline New Zealand & 522 & (2.4) & 517 & 527 & Qatar & 318 & (1.0) & 316 & 320 \\
\hline Manitoba & 521 & (3.3) & 514 & 527 & Kyrgyzstan & 311 & (3.4) & 304 & 317 \\
\hline Belgium & 520 & (3.0) & 515 & 526 & & & & & \\
\hline Australia & 520 & (2.2) & 516 & 524 & & & & & \\
\hline Estonia & 515 & (2.7) & 509 & 520 & & & & & \\
\hline Denmark & 513 & (2.6) & 508 & 518 & & & & & \\
\hline Czech Republic & 510 & (3.6) & 503 & 517 & & & & & \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & dor 507 & (2.5) & 502 & 512 & & & & & \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 507 & (3.3) & 500 & 513 & & & & & \\
\hline Iceland & 506 & (1.8) & 502 & 509 & & & & & \\
\hline New Brunswick & 506 & (2.1) & 502 & 510 & & & & & \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 506 & (2.3) & 502 & 511 & & & & & \\
\hline Austria & 505 & (3.7) & 498 & 513 & & & & & \\
\hline Germany & 504 & (3.9) & 496 & 511 & & & & & \\
\hline Slovenia & 504 & (1.0) & 502 & 506 & & & & & \\
\hline Sweden & 502 & (2.4) & 498 & 507 & & & & & \\
\hline Ireland & 501 & (2.8) & 496 & 507 & & & & & \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 501 & (2.3) & 496 & 505 & & & & & \\
\hline OECD average & 498 & (0.5) & 497 & 499 & & & & & \\
\hline France & 496 & (3.2) & 489 & 502 & & & & & \\
\hline Poland & 495 & (2.4) & 491 & 500 & & & & & \\
\hline United Kingdom & 495 & (2.1) & 491 & 500 & & & & & \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 492 & (2.8) & 487 & 498 & & & & & \\
\hline Hungary & 491 & (2.9) & 485 & 497 & & & & & \\
\hline Luxembourg & 490 & (1.1) & 488 & 492 & & & & & \\
\hline Norway & 490 & (2.6) & 485 & 495 & & & & & \\
\hline Latvia & 486 & (3.0) & 480 & 492 & & & & & \\
\hline Lithuania & 486 & (2.9) & 481 & 492 & & & & & \\
\hline Spain & 480 & (2.3) & 475 & 485 & & & & & \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 476 & (2.3) & 472 & 480 & & & & & \\
\hline Russian Federation & 476 & (3.9) & 468 & 483 & & & & & \\
\hline United States & 474 & (4.0) & 466 & 482 & & & & & \\
\hline Croatia & 467 & (2.4) & 463 & 472 & & & & & \\
\hline Portugal & 466 & (3.1) & 460 & 472 & & & & & \\
\hline Italy & 462 & (2.3) & 457 & 466 & & & & & \\
\hline Greece & 459 & (3.0) & 453 & 465 & & & & & \\
\hline Israel & 442 & (4.3) & 433 & 450 & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.2.3}

Variation in performance: Reading
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Difference \\
in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{95th} & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{lr}
\hline & standard \\
score & error
\end{tabular}}} & \\
\hline & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & & & \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 243 & (4.4) & 266 & (3.9) & 305 & (3.6) & 397 & (3.7) & 441 & (5.0) & 472 & (6.0) & 92 \\
\hline Macao-China & 359 & (4.3) & 394 & (2.5) & 445 & (1.9) & 545 & (1.6) & 587 & (1.8) & 610 & (2.4) & 100 \\
\hline Indonesia & 270 & (5.3) & 298 & (5.0) & 342 & (5.3) & 444 & (8.4) & 490 & (8.6) & 517 & (8.6) & 101 \\
\hline Finland & 410 & (4.8) & 441 & (3.8) & 494 & (2.9) & 603 & (2.2) & 649 & (2.5) & 675 & (2.8) & 109 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 390 & (6.2) & 426 & (5.8) & 484 & (3.7) & 594 & (2.4) & 636 & (2.9) & 660 & (2.7) & 110 \\
\hline Thailand & 280 & (5.9) & 312 & (3.9) & 363 & (3.3) & 472 & (2.9) & 522 & (3.7) & 549 & (3.6) & 110 \\
\hline Estonia & 353 & (7.2) & 389 & (5.4) & 448 & (3.8) & 560 & (2.8) & 606 & (3.2) & 632 & (3.8) & 112 \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 346 & (5.8) & 381 & (5.9) & 442 & (4.9) & 556 & (3.0) & 598 & (3.0) & 624 & (4.0) & 114 \\
\hline Korea & 399 & (9.7) & 440 & (7.9) & 503 & (4.8) & 617 & (3.4) & 663 & (4.3) & 688 & (5.0) & 115 \\
\hline Ontario & 375 & (9.5) & 418 & (8.3) & 479 & (5.2) & 596 & (5.1) & 644 & (5.2) & 671 & (6.5) & 116 \\
\hline Spain & 304 & (4.6) & 343 & (4.1) & 405 & (2.9) & 523 & (2.3) & 569 & (2.7) & 594 & (2.8) & 118 \\
\hline Denmark & 339 & (6.4) & 378 & (5.0) & 437 & (3.9) & 557 & (2.9) & 604 & (3.7) & 633 & (5.1) & 119 \\
\hline Slovenia & 340 & (4.2) & 377 & (2.6) & 437 & (1.8) & 558 & (2.2) & 603 & (2.1) & 627 & (2.7) & 121 \\
\hline Turkey & 291 & (5.9) & 330 & (6.4) & 388 & (4.4) & 510 & (5.2) & 564 & (6.5) & 594 & (7.8) & 122 \\
\hline Croatia & 324 & (6.6) & 359 & (5.4) & 418 & (4.1) & 540 & (3.0) & 589 & (3.4) & 615 & (3.3) & 122 \\
\hline Montenegro & 243 & (3.7) & 276 & (3.2) & 331 & (2.1) & 454 & (1.9) & 506 & (2.6) & 536 & (3.7) & 123 \\
\hline Alberta & 380 & (9.3) & 416 & (8.0) & 476 & (5.6) & 599 & (4.7) & 647 & (4.2) & 674 & (5.1) & 123 \\
\hline Latvia & 325 & (6.7) & 361 & (5.4) & 419 & (4.9) & 543 & (4.2) & 593 & (4.0) & 622 & (4.8) & 124 \\
\hline Jordan & 233 & (7.3) & 277 & (6.1) & 342 & (3.7) & 467 & (3.8) & 514 & (4.5) & 541 & (4.9) & 124 \\
\hline New Brunswick & 335 & (5.9) & 376 & (4.5) & 437 & (3.5) & 562 & (3.4) & 612 & (3.3) & 639 & (4.1) & 124 \\
\hline Ireland & 358 & (6.3) & 395 & (5.5) & 457 & (4.7) & 582 & (3.9) & 633 & (3.5) & 661 & (4.3) & 125 \\
\hline Canada & 357 & (4.8) & 402 & (3.9) & 468 & (3.0) & 593 & (2.6) & 644 & (2.7) & 674 & (3.9) & 125 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 337 & (14.0) & 379 & (10.6) & 452 & (9.9) & 578 & (6.5) & 623 & (10.5) & 658 & (11.5) & 126 \\
\hline Australia & 349 & (3.4) & 388 & (3.4) & 453 & (2.4) & 579 & (2.3) & 628 & (2.9) & 656 & (2.6) & 126 \\
\hline Switzerland & 331 & (6.5) & 373 & (5.1) & 440 & (3.5) & 566 & (3.1) & 615 & (3.6) & 642 & (4.3) & 126 \\
\hline Hungary & 318 & (9.1) & 359 & (5.0) & 422 & (4.8) & 549 & (3.6) & 595 & (4.4) & 623 & (4.6) & 127 \\
\hline Manitoba & 350 & (7.2) & 391 & (7.6) & 456 & (4.4) & 583 & (4.4) & 633 & (5.8) & 662 & (6.7) & 127 \\
\hline Serbia & 246 & (5.7) & 282 & (4.6) & 339 & (4.5) & 466 & (3.9) & 518 & (3.7) & 546 & (3.9) & 127 \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 353 & (7.5) & 385 & (5.3) & 443 & (5.4) & 570 & (4.3) & 619 & (5.2) & 647 & (5.3) & 127 \\
\hline Russian Federation & 281 & (7.3) & 316 & (6.0) & 377 & (5.7) & 505 & (4.2) & 556 & (3.6) & 586 & (4.9) & 128 \\
\hline Romania & 243 & (6.6) & 274 & (7.2) & 333 & (7.3) & 461 & (5.2) & 512 & (5.6) & 541 & (6.1) & 128 \\
\hline Iceland & 314 & (4.7) & 356 & (4.1) & 423 & (3.0) & 552 & (2.8) & 603 & (3.2) & 633 & (3.9) & 129 \\
\hline Mexico & 247 & (7.5) & 285 & (6.2) & 348 & (4.2) & 478 & (2.8) & 530 & (3.1) & 559 & (3.0) & 130 \\
\hline Sweden & 335 & (7.7) & 378 & (5.6) & 445 & (3.8) & 575 & (3.3) & 629 & (4.0) & 658 & (4.9) & 130 \\
\hline Netherlands & 332 & (10.0) & 379 & (6.4) & 446 & (4.3) & 578 & (2.5) & 622 & (2.4) & 649 & (3.5) & 132 \\
\hline Lithuania & 309 & (4.4) & 343 & (3.9) & 405 & (4.0) & 538 & (3.9) & 591 & (3.9) & 621 & (4.0) & 133 \\
\hline Greece & 272 & (11.6) & 321 & (8.5) & 398 & (5.2) & 531 & (3.8) & 583 & (4.2) & 613 & (4.5) & 133 \\
\hline Quebec & 339 & (13.4) & 386 & (10.1) & 460 & (6.8) & 593 & (4.8) & 647 & (5.9) & 678 & (5.6) & 133 \\
\hline Kyrgyzstan & 123 & (7.2) & 159 & (5.3) & 216 & (3.8) & 349 & (4.1) & 419 & (5.9) & 462 & (7.6) & 133 \\
\hline OECD average & 317 & (1.4) & 360 & (1.1) & 428 & (0.8) & 561 & (0.6) & 613 & (0.7) & 642 & (0.7) & 133 \\
\hline Brazil & 224 & (10.1) & 264 & (6.0) & 326 & (4.2) & 460 & (4.0) & 523 & (5.3) & 562 & (6.8) & 134 \\
\hline British Columbia & 346 & (10.3) & 394 & (8.9) & 464 & (7.9) & 598 & (5.9) & 651 & (7.4) & 684 & (6.2) & 134 \\
\hline Tunisia & 217 & (7.3) & 252 & (5.3) & 315 & (4.4) & 450 & (5.0) & 502 & (5.3) & 532 & (6.8) & 135 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 318 & (5.2) & 359 & (4.0) & 431 & (2.8) & 566 & (2.5) & 621 & (3.1) & 653 & (3.6) & 135 \\
\hline Portugal & 299 & (7.6) & 339 & (6.3) & 408 & (5.3) & 543 & (3.6) & 594 & (3.7) & 622 & (4.5) & 135 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 315 & (7.8) & 358 & (7.1) & 434 & (5.1) & 569 & (3.2) & 626 & (5.0) & 657 & (8.4) & 136 \\
\hline Japan & 317 & (6.8) & 361 & (6.6) & 433 & (6.1) & 569 & (3.4) & 623 & (3.5) & 654 & (3.8) & 136 \\
\hline Luxembourg & 302 & (5.1) & 344 & (3.3) & 415 & (2.3) & 552 & (1.8) & 602 & (2.5) & 630 & (2.8) & 136 \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 335 & (9.2) & 376 & (7.2) & 448 & (5.6) & 585 & (4.9) & 642 & (4.7) & 673 & (8.5) & 137 \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 324 & (10.7) & 370 & (7.4) & 442 & (5.7) & 579 & (4.5) & 634 & (5.4) & 665 & (9.3) & 137 \\
\hline Poland & 335 & (4.8) & 374 & (4.6) & 441 & (3.5) & 579 & (3.2) & 633 & (3.4) & 663 & (4.0) & 138 \\
\hline Chile & 271 & (7.5) & 310 & (5.8) & 373 & (5.4) & 513 & (6.4) & 575 & (6.7) & 609 & (6.6) & 140 \\
\hline Norway & 301 & (7.3) & 346 & (5.5) & 416 & (4.6) & 558 & (3.0) & 613 & (4.1) & 643 & (3.6) & 142 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.2.3 (concluded)}

\section*{Variation in performance: Reading}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Difference in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{95th} & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{standard} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} & \\
\hline & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & & & \\
\hline New Zealand & 339 & (5.8) & 381 & (4.6) & 453 & (4.5) & 595 & (2.9) & 651 & (2.8) & 683 & (4.5) & 142 \\
\hline France & 298 & (9.7) & 346 & (7.5) & 421 & (6.1) & 564 & (3.8) & 614 & (4.0) & 639 & (4.1) & 143 \\
\hline Qatar & 148 & (3.7) & 181 & (2.7) & 237 & (1.8) & 380 & (1.9) & 456 & (3.6) & 506 & (3.7) & 144 \\
\hline Italy & 276 & (5.9) & 325 & (4.8) & 402 & (3.6) & 546 & (2.3) & 599 & (2.9) & 627 & (2.8) & 144 \\
\hline Germany & 299 & (9.7) & 350 & (8.0) & 429 & (5.9) & 573 & (3.4) & 625 & (3.7) & 657 & (3.7) & 144 \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 281 & (7.1) & 326 & (6.6) & 398 & (4.3) & 542 & (3.4) & 597 & (3.8) & 628 & (3.3) & 144 \\
\hline Colombia & 200 & (9.1) & 243 & (7.0) & 316 & (7.2) & 462 & (5.6) & 518 & (5.2) & 550 & (5.9) & 146 \\
\hline Austria & 298 & (11.9) & 348 & (9.4) & 421 & (5.5) & 568 & (3.7) & 621 & (3.1) & 651 & (3.7) & 147 \\
\hline Belgium & 297 & (10.1) & 347 & (8.3) & 433 & (4.7) & 581 & (2.3) & 631 & (2.2) & 657 & (2.8) & 148 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 290 & (10.5) & 335 & (7.0) & 408 & (6.2) & 564 & (3.8) & 621 & (4.2) & 653 & (4.3) & 156 \\
\hline Uruguay & 204 & (7.8) & 253 & (5.8) & 333 & (5.0) & 497 & (3.8) & 565 & (4.3) & 604 & (5.7) & 164 \\
\hline Bulgaria & 210 & (11.4) & 251 & (9.0) & 321 & (8.5) & 486 & (7.6) & 554 & (7.8) & 589 & (8.5) & 165 \\
\hline Israel & 237 & (10.1) & 280 & (8.0) & 356 & (6.2) & 526 & (4.8) & 588 & (4.9) & 626 & (5.0) & 170 \\
\hline Argentina & 155 & (14.8) & 209 & (10.7) & 291 & (9.0) & 464 & (7.1) & 527 & (7.0) & 560 & (5.9) & 172 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Notes: Countries and provinces in ascending order by the difference in score points between the 75 th and 25 th percentiles.
Data for the United States are not available for reading.

\section*{Table B.2.4}

Variation in performance: Mathematics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Difference in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{95th} & \\
\hline & score & standard error & score & standard error & score & standard error & score & standard error & score & standard error & score & standard error & \\
\hline Azerbaijan & 403 & (2.4) & 419 & (2.2) & 443 & (2.5) & 505 & (3.0) & 536 & (3.6) & 556 & (5.2) & 62 \\
\hline Indonesia & 265 & (5.6) & 293 & (3.9) & 336 & (4.2) & 444 & (9.3) & 498 & (9.4) & 528 & (10.3) & 107 \\
\hline Thailand & 289 & (4.8) & 317 & (3.5) & 362 & (3.3) & 470 & (2.9) & 524 & (3.7) & 558 & (4.6) & 107 \\
\hline Estonia & 381 & (5.9) & 411 & (4.3) & 461 & (3.5) & 570 & (3.3) & 618 & (3.2) & 646 & (4.1) & 109 \\
\hline Latvia & 347 & (5.6) & 378 & (5.2) & 432 & (3.6) & 542 & (3.2) & 590 & (3.4) & 619 & (4.2) & 110 \\
\hline Qatar & 187 & (2.9) & 212 & (2.2) & 257 & (1.3) & 368 & (1.7) & 438 & (2.7) & 486 & (3.0) & 111 \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 371 & (5.5) & 400 & (5.2) & 451 & (3.9) & 561 & (2.8) & 611 & (5.2) & 641 & (7.5) & 111 \\
\hline Kyrgyzstan & 175 & (5.1) & 204 & (5.0) & 253 & (3.6) & 363 & (4.2) & 423 & (5.9) & 465 & (7.6) & 111 \\
\hline Finland & 411 & (5.0) & 444 & (3.4) & 494 & (2.6) & 605 & (2.6) & 652 & (2.8) & 678 & (3.0) & 111 \\
\hline Jordan & 244 & (5.7) & 279 & (4.3) & 330 & (3.4) & 441 & (3.9) & 489 & (5.0) & 519 & (5.8) & 112 \\
\hline Romania & 278 & (6.5) & 307 & (7.4) & 358 & (5.5) & 470 & (4.9) & 523 & (7.1) & 557 & (7.7) & 112 \\
\hline Ontario & 387 & (8.9) & 419 & (6.8) & 471 & (5.0) & 583 & (4.1) & 629 & (4.4) & 656 & (4.0) & 113 \\
\hline Alberta & 392 & (8.6) & 424 & (6.2) & 475 & (4.8) & 588 & (4.7) & 637 & (3.8) & 665 & (5.4) & 113 \\
\hline New Brunswick & 369 & (4.7) & 399 & (3.7) & 451 & (3.7) & 564 & (3.6) & 611 & (2.9) & 638 & (3.8) & 113 \\
\hline Montenegro & 261 & (3.3) & 291 & (3.0) & 342 & (2.0) & 456 & (2.4) & 510 & (2.4) & 543 & (3.6) & 114 \\
\hline Croatia & 332 & (4.3) & 361 & (3.3) & 410 & (3.0) & 524 & (3.3) & 576 & (3.6) & 605 & (3.8) & 114 \\
\hline Mexico & 268 & (6.6) & 299 & (4.9) & 349 & (3.7) & 463 & (2.8) & 514 & (3.3) & 546 & (4.2) & 114 \\
\hline Ireland & 366 & (4.6) & 396 & (4.4) & 445 & (4.1) & 559 & (3.1) & 608 & (3.2) & 634 & (2.9) & 114 \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 359 & (9.7) & 395 & (7.2) & 453 & (4.4) & 567 & (3.5) & 613 & (5.2) & 641 & (6.6) & 114 \\
\hline British Columbia & 387 & (6.0) & 416 & (6.3) & 466 & (5.3) & 581 & (5.6) & 629 & (5.4) & 656 & (5.6) & 115 \\
\hline Denmark & 371 & (5.0) & 404 & (4.3) & 456 & (3.4) & 572 & (2.8) & 621 & (3.4) & 649 & (4.3) & 115 \\
\hline Manitoba & 374 & (6.8) & 405 & (5.2) & 464 & (4.9) & 580 & (4.5) & 629 & (5.8) & 658 & (6.7) & 116 \\
\hline Canada & 383 & (4.0) & 416 & (3.3) & 470 & (2.4) & 587 & (2.3) & 635 & (2.3) & 664 & (3.3) & 116 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.2.4 (concluded)}

Variation in performance: Mathematics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Country and province} & \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percentile} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Difference in score points between the 75th and 25th percentile} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{5th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{10th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{25th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{75th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{90th} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{95th} & \\
\hline & & standard & & standard & & standard & & standard & & standard & & standard & \\
\hline & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & score & error & \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 373 & (5.9) & 401 & (4.9) & 449 & (3.9) & 566 & (3.9) & 614 & (5.3) & 640 & (5.9) & 117 \\
\hline Colombia & 226 & (8.4) & 258 & (5.6) & 311 & (4.9) & 428 & (4.6) & 482 & (3.8) & 515 & (6.1) & 117 \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 362 & (4.4) & 393 & (3.8) & 442 & (3.9) & 559 & (2.9) & 609 & (4.3) & 636 & (5.4) & 117 \\
\hline Turkey & 287 & (6.1) & 316 & (4.0) & 360 & (3.3) & 477 & (7.2) & 550 & (12.4) & 595 & (15.8) & 117 \\
\hline Macao-China & 384 & (3.6) & 416 & (3.1) & 467 & (2.1) & 585 & (2.0) & 632 & (2.4) & 660 & (3.3) & 118 \\
\hline Russian Federation & 331 & (5.4) & 363 & (4.8) & 416 & (4.2) & 535 & (5.1) & 592 & (5.3) & 625 & (5.5) & 119 \\
\hline Brazil & 225 & (6.4) & 255 & (4.5) & 308 & (3.0) & 427 & (3.7) & 487 & (5.8) & 530 & (8.3) & 119 \\
\hline Hungary & 343 & (5.6) & 377 & (3.9) & 431 & (2.9) & 551 & (4.1) & 609 & (5.0) & 643 & (5.8) & 120 \\
\hline Chile & 273 & (5.6) & 302 & (4.3) & 350 & (4.4) & 470 & (5.1) & 527 & (6.6) & 561 & (7.7) & 120 \\
\hline Australia & 375 & (3.2) & 406 & (2.7) & 460 & (2.3) & 581 & (2.5) & 633 & (3.3) & 663 & (4.0) & 121 \\
\hline Spain & 332 & (4.4) & 366 & (2.8) & 421 & (3.2) & 542 & (2.5) & 593 & (2.9) & 622 & (3.3) & 121 \\
\hline Iceland & 357 & (3.5) & 391 & (3.6) & 446 & (2.4) & 567 & (2.4) & 618 & (3.2) & 646 & (4.4) & 121 \\
\hline Poland & 353 & (3.3) & 384 & (3.4) & 435 & (2.8) & 557 & (3.3) & 610 & (3.7) & 638 & (3.5) & 122 \\
\hline United Kingdom & 351 & (5.0) & 381 & (3.3) & 434 & (2.7) & 557 & (2.5) & 612 & (3.2) & 643 & (3.8) & 122 \\
\hline Greece & 304 & (7.3) & 341 & (5.6) & 399 & (3.9) & 522 & (4.0) & 575 & (4.1) & 607 & (4.5) & 123 \\
\hline Quebec & 380 & (9.3) & 418 & (8.7) & 482 & (4.9) & 604 & (4.2) & 656 & (5.5) & 686 & (6.1) & 123 \\
\hline Serbia & 282 & (6.2) & 318 & (5.0) & 375 & (4.4) & 498 & (3.8) & 553 & (3.9) & 584 & (4.4) & 123 \\
\hline Sweden & 354 & (5.6) & 387 & (4.2) & 442 & (3.5) & 565 & (3.2) & 617 & (2.8) & 649 & (4.2) & 123 \\
\hline Lithuania & 338 & (4.9) & 369 & (4.3) & 426 & (3.3) & 549 & (3.6) & 602 & (4.9) & 632 & (4.6) & 123 \\
\hline Liechtenstein & 367 & (9.7) & 402 & (11.1) & 464 & (10.0) & 588 & (5.2) & 643 & (9.5) & 677 & (10.6) & 124 \\
\hline Norway & 339 & (6.0) & 373 & (3.8) & 428 & (3.9) & 552 & (2.8) & 609 & (3.3) & 638 & (2.8) & 124 \\
\hline Japan & 370 & (6.4) & 404 & (5.5) & 463 & (4.6) & 587 & (3.0) & 638 & (3.6) & 668 & (4.2) & 124 \\
\hline Slovenia & 361 & (2.7) & 390 & (2.1) & 441 & (2.4) & 566 & (2.1) & 623 & (2.7) & 654 & (3.8) & 125 \\
\hline Slovak Republic & 333 & (7.0) & 370 & (5.1) & 433 & (3.6) & 558 & (3.5) & 611 & (4.4) & 640 & (4.8) & 125 \\
\hline OECD average & 346 & (1.1) & 380 & (0.8) & 436 & (0.7) & 561 & (0.6) & 615 & (0.8) & 646 & (0.9) & 125 \\
\hline Portugal & 315 & (6.5) & 348 & (5.2) & 404 & (4.2) & 530 & (3.0) & 583 & (2.8) & 612 & (3.8) & 126 \\
\hline Tunisia & 219 & (4.9) & 250 & (3.9) & 301 & (3.7) & 427 & (5.5) & 488 & (7.8) & 522 & (7.7) & 126 \\
\hline United States & 328 & (7.6) & 358 & (5.8) & 411 & (4.8) & 537 & (5.0) & 593 & (4.8) & 625 & (4.8) & 126 \\
\hline Korea & 392 & (7.1) & 426 & (6.1) & 485 & (4.3) & 612 & (4.4) & 664 & (6.9) & 694 & (8.2) & 127 \\
\hline Hong Kong-China & 386 & (6.1) & 423 & (6.4) & 486 & (4.5) & 614 & (3.1) & 665 & (3.5) & 692 & (4.8) & 128 \\
\hline Luxembourg & 332 & (4.4) & 368 & (3.5) & 426 & (1.9) & 555 & (1.9) & 610 & (2.7) & 641 & (3.6) & 129 \\
\hline Italy & 305 & (4.4) & 341 & (3.3) & 398 & (2.7) & 527 & (2.8) & 584 & (4.2) & 616 & (3.8) & 129 \\
\hline Netherlands & 382 & (6.0) & 412 & (5.0) & 467 & (4.6) & 596 & (2.7) & 645 & (3.3) & 672 & (4.3) & 129 \\
\hline New Zealand & 368 & (3.6) & 401 & (4.1) & 458 & (3.2) & 587 & (3.0) & 643 & (4.0) & 674 & (3.6) & 129 \\
\hline Argentina & 209 & (11.2) & 249 & (9.8) & 316 & (7.9) & 451 & (6.9) & 508 & (7.6) & 543 & (9.2) & 135 \\
\hline Uruguay & 261 & (4.1) & 296 & (4.4) & 360 & (3.5) & 495 & (3.5) & 551 & (5.5) & 587 & (5.6) & 135 \\
\hline Switzerland & 362 & (5.5) & 401 & (4.7) & 464 & (4.1) & 600 & (3.7) & 652 & (3.7) & 682 & (4.2) & 136 \\
\hline France & 334 & (5.5) & 369 & (5.4) & 429 & (4.7) & 565 & (3.8) & 617 & (3.8) & 646 & (4.0) & 136 \\
\hline Bulgaria & 251 & (8.3) & 287 & (7.2) & 345 & (6.1) & 481 & (6.8) & 543 & (8.4) & 583 & (11.0) & 136 \\
\hline Germany & 339 & (8.5) & 375 & (6.8) & 437 & (4.9) & 574 & (3.9) & 632 & (3.8) & 664 & (4.6) & 136 \\
\hline Austria & 338 & (6.8) & 373 & (6.3) & 438 & (5.5) & 577 & (4.0) & 630 & (3.8) & 657 & (4.0) & 139 \\
\hline Czech Republic & 340 & (5.2) & 376 & (4.7) & 441 & (4.3) & 582 & (4.7) & 644 & (4.8) & 677 & (6.0) & 141 \\
\hline Belgium & 337 & (8.9) & 381 & (6.6) & 451 & (4.0) & 598 & (2.5) & 650 & (2.4) & 678 & (2.7) & 148 \\
\hline Chinese Taipei & 373 & (7.2) & 409 & (6.2) & 477 & (6.1) & 625 & (3.3) & 677 & (3.4) & 707 & (3.9) & 148 \\
\hline Israel & 266 & (11.2) & 304 & (6.9) & 368 & (5.4) & 518 & (4.7) & 581 & (5.0) & 615 & (4.7) & 149 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Countries and provinces in ascending order by the difference in score points between the 75 th and 25 th percentiles.

\section*{Table B.3.1}

Mean score and gender differences in student performance:
Science combined and subscales
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{All students} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gender differences} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Mean score} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Females} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Males} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Difference } \\
\text { (Female - Male) }
\end{gathered}
\]} \\
\hline & mean & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { mean } \\
& \text { score }
\end{aligned}
\] & standard error & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { score } \\
\text { difference }
\end{array}
\] & standard error \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{Combined science} \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 526 & (2.5) & 531 & (3.1) & 519 & (3.8) & 12 & (4.9) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 509 & (2.7) & 510 & (3.4) & 507 & (4.0) & 3 & (5.0) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 520 & (2.5) & 519 & (3.0) & 521 & (3.9) & -1 & (4.9) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 506 & (2.3) & 505 & (3.2) & 507 & (2.9) & -1 & (4.1) \\
\hline Quebec & 531 & (4.2) & 527 & (4.3) & 534 & (5.1) & -8 & (4.2) \\
\hline Ontario & 537 & (4.2) & 535 & (4.6) & 539 & (4.8) & -4 & (4.1) \\
\hline Manitoba & 523 & (3.2) & 522 & (4.0) & 525 & (4.4) & -4 & (5.3) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 517 & (3.6) & 519 & (4.4) & 514 & (4.8) & 5 & (5.7) \\
\hline Alberta & 550 & (3.8) & 548 & (3.9) & 552 & (4.9) & -4 & (4.7) \\
\hline British Columbia & 539 & (4.7) & 536 & (4.9) & 541 & (5.8) & -5 & (5.4) \\
\hline Canada & 534 & (2.0) & 532 & (2.1) & 536 & (2.5) & -4 & (2.2) \\
\hline OECD average & 500 & (0.5) & 499 & (0.6) & 501 & (0.7) & -2 & (0.7) \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{Science - identifying scientific issues} \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 525 & (3.2) & 541 & (3.8) & 508 & (4.0) & 33 & (4.8) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 505 & (2.5) & 516 & (3.3) & 494 & (3.6) & 22 & (4.9) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 516 & (3.5) & 523 & (3.5) & 509 & (4.8) & 15 & (4.9) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 512 & (2.3) & 519 & (3.1) & 505 & (3.0) & 14 & (4.0) \\
\hline Quebec & 531 & (4.6) & 537 & (4.7) & 524 & (5.5) & 12 & (4.4) \\
\hline Ontario & 533 & (4.9) & 540 & (5.8) & 527 & (5.0) & 13 & (4.7) \\
\hline Manitoba & 519 & (3.3) & 526 & (4.3) & 511 & (4.0) & 15 & (5.1) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 515 & (4.1) & 528 & (4.6) & 503 & (5.0) & 25 & (5.3) \\
\hline Alberta & 546 & (3.9) & 552 & (4.2) & 539 & (4.9) & 13 & (4.7) \\
\hline British Columbia & 536 & (5.2) & 543 & (4.7) & 529 & (6.8) & 15 & (5.3) \\
\hline Canada & 532 & (2.3) & 539 & (2.4) & 525 & (2.7) & 14 & (2.4) \\
\hline OECD average & 500 & (0.5) & 508 & (0.6) & 491 & (0.7) & 17 & (0.7) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Science - explaining
\begin{tabular}{lllllllll} 
phenomena scientifically & \multicolumn{7}{l}{} \\
Newfoundland and Labrador & 519 & \((3.0)\) & 517 & \((3.7)\) & 520 & \((4.4)\) & -3 & \((5.5)\) \\
Prince Edward Island & 509 & \((2.7)\) & 504 & \((3.7)\) & 515 & \((4.2)\) & -11 & \((5.7)\) \\
Nova Scotia & 520 & \((3.4)\) & 512 & \((3.5)\) & 527 & \((4.7)\) & -16 & \((5.1)\) \\
New Brunswick & 501 & \((2.6)\) & 493 & \((3.2)\) & 509 & \((3.5)\) & -15 & \((4.4)\) \\
Quebec & 523 & \((4.0)\) & 512 & \((4.2)\) & 533 & \((5.0)\) & -21 & \((4.4)\) \\
Ontario & 533 & \((4.4)\) & 525 & \((5.1)\) & 541 & \((5.0)\) & -16 & \((4.7)\) \\
Manitoba & 522 & \((3.5)\) & 515 & \((4.3)\) & 530 & \((4.4)\) & -15 & \((5.3)\) \\
Saskatchewan & 516 & \((4.4)\) & 511 & \((5.2)\) & 521 & \((5)\) & -10 & \((5.9)\) \\
Alberta & 553 & \((4.1)\) & 547 & \((4.4)\) & 559 & \((5.2)\) & -13 & \((5.0)\) \\
British Columbia & 538 & \((4.9)\) & 528 & \((5.3)\) & 548 & \((5.9)\) & -21 & \((5.8)\) \\
\hline Canada & 531 & \((2.1)\) & 522 & \((2.3)\) & 539 & \((2.6)\) & -17 & \((2.5)\) \\
\hline OECD average & 500 & \((0.5)\) & 492 & \((0.6)\) & 507 & \((0.7)\) & -15 & \((0.7)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.3.1 (concluded)}

Mean score and gender differences in student performance: Science combined and subscales
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{All students} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gender differences} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Mean score} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Females} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Males} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Difference } \\
\text { (Female - Male) }
\end{gathered}
\]} \\
\hline & mean & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & score
difference & standard error \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{Science - using scientific evidence} \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 533 & (2.9) & 540 & (3.5) & 524 & (4.4) & 16 & (5.4) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 509 & (2.7) & 514 & (3.5) & 504 & (4.1) & 10 & (5.5) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 524 & (2.4) & 524 & (3.0) & 524 & (3.7) & 0 & (4.8) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 511 & (2.4) & 513 & (3.5) & 509 & (3.3) & 4 & (4.9) \\
\hline Quebec & 542 & (4.7) & 541 & (4.8) & 542 & (5.6) & -2 & (4.6) \\
\hline Ontario & 546 & (4.4) & 546 & (4.9) & 545 & (4.8) & 0 & (4.2) \\
\hline Manitoba & 530 & (3.4) & 531 & (4.0) & 528 & (4.6) & 3 & (5.3) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 517 & (3.7) & 523 & (4.3) & 511 & (4.9) & 12 & (5.6) \\
\hline Alberta & 552 & (4.1) & 553 & (4.1) & 551 & (5.3) & 2 & (4.7) \\
\hline British Columbia & 541 & (5.1) & 542 & (5.4) & 540 & (6.3) & 2 & (5.7) \\
\hline Canada & 542 & (2.2) & 542 & (2.3) & 541 & (2.7) & 1 & (2.3) \\
\hline OECD average & 499 & (0.6) & 500 & (0.7) & 498 & (0.8) & 3 & (0.8) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.3.2}

Mean score and gender differences in student performance:

\section*{Reading and mathematics}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{All students} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gender differences} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Mean \\
score
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Females} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Males} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Difference (Female - Male)} \\
\hline & mean & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & score difference & standard error \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{Reading} \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 514 & (3.2) & 542 & (3.6) & 483 & (4.4) & 59 & (5.4) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 497 & (2.8) & 522 & (3.3) & 471 & (4.3) & 51 & (5.4) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 505 & (3.5) & 522 & (3.4) & 489 & (4.6) & 33 & (5.1) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 497 & (2.3) & 516 & (3.3) & 477 & (2.9) & 39 & (4.1) \\
\hline Quebec & 522 & (5.0) & 536 & (4.9) & 508 & (6.1) & 28 & (4.8) \\
\hline Ontario & 534 & (4.6) & 549 & (5.2) & 520 & (4.8) & 29 & (4.3) \\
\hline Manitoba & 516 & (3.5) & 533 & (4.2) & 499 & (4.5) & 34 & (5.3) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 507 & (4.2) & 534 & (4.7) & 482 & (5.2) & 52 & (6.0) \\
\hline Alberta & 535 & (4.2) & 549 & (4.4) & 521 & (5.2) & 27 & (4.7) \\
\hline British Columbia & 528 & (5.7) & 549 & (5.6) & 506 & (7.2) & 42 & (5.7) \\
\hline Canada & 527 & (2.4) & 543 & (2.5) & 511 & (2.8) & 32 & (2.3) \\
\hline OECD average & 492 & (0.6) & 511 & (0.7) & 473 & (0.7) & 38 & (0.8) \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{Mathematics} \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 507 & (2.5) & 505 & (3.1) & 509 & (3.8) & -4 & (4.7) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 501 & (2.3) & 497 & (3.0) & 505 & (3.5) & -7 & (4.7) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 506 & (2.3) & 500 & (2.8) & 511 & (3.2) & -11 & (4.0) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 506 & (2.1) & 502 & (3.1) & 510 & (2.8) & -8 & (4.2) \\
\hline Quebec & 540 & (4.2) & 533 & (4.5) & 547 & (4.8) & -13 & (3.8) \\
\hline Ontario & 526 & (3.7) & 517 & (3.9) & 534 & (4.3) & -17 & (3.5) \\
\hline Manitoba & 521 & (3.3) & 515 & (3.8) & 526 & (4.4) & -11 & (4.9) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 507 & (3.3) & 503 & (3.7) & 510 & (4.7) & -7 & (5.2) \\
\hline Alberta & 530 & (3.8) & 523 & (4.0) & 537 & (4.8) & -14 & (4.4) \\
\hline British Columbia & 523 & (4.4) & 516 & (4.4) & 530 & (5.3) & -14 & (4.2) \\
\hline Canada & 527 & (2.0) & 520 & (2.0) & 534 & (2.4) & -14 & (1.9) \\
\hline OECD average & 498 & (0.5) & 492 & (0.6) & 504 & (0.7) & -11 & (0.7) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.3.3}

Differences in student performance in science by immigrant status
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Province} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Non-immigrants} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second-generation immigrants} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{First-generation immigrants} \\
\hline & percentage of students & standard error & percentage of students & standard error & percentage of students & standard error \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Percentage of students by immigrant status} \\
\hline Quebec & 87.0 & (1.7) & 7.4 & (1.0) & 5.7 & (0.9) \\
\hline Ontario & 69.4 & (2.6) & 15.8 & (1.3) & 14.9 & (1.8) \\
\hline Manitoba & 87.6 & (0.9) & 7.1 & (0.7) & 5.3 & (0.6) \\
\hline Alberta & 83.2 & (1.9) & 10.4 & (1.5) & 6.3 & (0.8) \\
\hline British Columbia & 71.5 & (2.9) & 14.7 & (1.8) & 13.7 & (1.9) \\
\hline Canada & 78.9 & (1.2) & 11.2 & (0.7) & 9.9 & (0.7) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{OECD average} & 90.7 & (0.1) & 4.6 & (0.1) & 4.8 & (0.1) \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Non-immigrants} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second-generation immigrants} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{First-generation immigrants} \\
\hline & mean & standard & mean & standard & mean & standard \\
\hline Province & score & error & score & error & score & error \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Performance on the science scale} \\
\hline Quebec & 540 & (4.1) & 501 & (7.8) & 483 & (11.4) \\
\hline Ontario & 546 & (3.9) & 538 & (8.4) & 520 & (7.8) \\
\hline Manitoba & 529 & (3.4) & 509 & (9.2) & 496 & (11.5) \\
\hline Alberta & 553 & (3.9) & 543 & (7.8) & 548 & (13.1) \\
\hline British Columbia & 544 & (4.8) & 519 & (8.5) & 536 & (11.2) \\
\hline Canada & 541 & (1.8) & 528 & (4.8) & 519 & (5.2) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{OECD average} & 506 & (0.5) & 468 & (3.7) & 450 & (3.4) \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second-generation immigrants minus non-immigrants} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{First-generation immigrants minus non-immigrants} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{First-generation immigrants minus secondgeneration immigrants} \\
\hline & difference & standard error & difference & standard error & difference & standard error \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{Difference in the science score} \\
\hline Quebec & -39 & (8.4) & -57 & (11.5) & -18 & (11.1) \\
\hline Ontario & -8 & (8.6) & -26 & (8.2) & -18 & (6.3) \\
\hline Manitoba & -20 & (10.1) & -33 & (11.7) & -14 & (13.6) \\
\hline Alberta & -11 & (7.6) & -5 & (13.2) & 6 & (14.2) \\
\hline British Columbia & -25 & (8.9) & -8 & (11.2) & 17 & (10.8) \\
\hline Canada & -12 & (4.9) & -22 & (5.3) & -9 & (4.6) \\
\hline OECD average & -39 & (3.7) & -56 & (3.2) & -14 & (4.7) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.3.4}

Differences in student performance by highest level of parental education attainment
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{percentage of students} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{standard error} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Performance} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Science} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Reading} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Mathematics} \\
\hline & & & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{Parents with high school or below} \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 44 & (1.2) & 502 & (3.2) & 493 & (4.1) & 490 & (3.6) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 30 & (1.0) & 490 & (4.0) & 479 & (4.4) & 486 & (3.8) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 38 & (1.3) & 498 & (4.5) & 482 & (4.7) & 486 & (4.6) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 35 & (1.0) & 483 & (4.2) & 475 & (4.1) & 487 & (3.7) \\
\hline Quebec & 36 & (1.3) & 505 & (4.9) & 500 & (6.4) & 518 & (5.0) \\
\hline Ontario & 23 & (1.3) & 520 & (7.1) & 513 & (7.4) & 514 & (6.3) \\
\hline Manitoba & 36 & (1.5) & 510 & (4.7) & 500 & (4.6) & 509 & (4.9) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 41 & (1.3) & 499 & (4.6) & 490 & (5.2) & 492 & (4.0) \\
\hline Alberta & 32 & (2.1) & 529 & (6.2) & 512 & (6.7) & 510 & (6.3) \\
\hline British Columbia & 31 & (1.8) & 525 & (6.3) & 513 & (6.5) & 512 & (5.4) \\
\hline Canada & 30 & (0.6) & 514 & (2.7) & 505 & (3.2) & 511 & (2.5) \\
\hline OECD average & 52 & (0.4) & 468 & (1.0) & 462 & (1.1) & 463 & (1.1) \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{Parents with post-secondary education} \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 56 & (1.2) & 545 & (3.5) & 532 & (4.2) & 522 & (3.7) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 70 & (1.0) & 518 & (3.4) & 507 & (3.3) & 508 & (2.8) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 62 & (1.3) & 534 & (3.2) & 519 & (3.7) & 519 & (2.9) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 65 & (1.0) & 519 & (2.6) & 510 & (2.8) & 517 & (2.5) \\
\hline Quebec & 64 & (1.3) & 547 & (4.6) & 536 & (5.4) & 554 & (4.5) \\
\hline Ontario & 77 & (1.3) & 546 & (4.0) & 543 & (4.3) & 532 & (3.6) \\
\hline Manitoba & 64 & (1.5) & 533 & (3.7) & 527 & (3.8) & 529 & (3.5) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 59 & (1.3) & 531 & (4.3) & 522 & (4.9) & 519 & (3.9) \\
\hline Alberta & 68 & (2.1) & 562 & (3.9) & 547 & (4.5) & 541 & (3.7) \\
\hline British Columbia & 69 & (1.8) & 546 & (4.8) & 536 & (6.0) & 529 & (4.6) \\
\hline Canada & 70 & (0.6) & 546 & (2.0) & 539 & (2.4) & 536 & (2.0) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{OECD average} & 48 & (0.4) & 521 & (1.6) & 507 & (1.7) & 511 & (1.5) \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Difference in performance} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Science} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Reading} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Mathematics} \\
\hline & & & mean & standard & mean & standard & mean & standard \\
\hline & & & score & error & score & error & score & error \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Difference in scores: Parents with
high school or less - parents with
\begin{tabular}{lllllll} 
posi-secondary education & & & \((5.5)\) & -33 & \((5.2)\) \\
Newfoundland and Labrador & -43 & \((4.6)\) & -39 & \((5.5)\) & -22 & \((4.8)\) \\
Prince Edward Island & -27 & \((5.2)\) & -27 & \((4.7)\) & -33 & \((5.9)\) \\
Nova Scotia & -35 & \((5.9)\) & -38 & \((5.0)\) & -30 & \((4.4)\) \\
New Brunswick & -36 & \((5.0)\) & -35 & \((6.4)\) & -36 & \((4.8)\) \\
Quebec & -41 & \((5.0)\) & -36 & \((6.7)\) & -18 & \((5.9)\) \\
Ontario & -26 & \((6.9)\) & -30 & \((4.8)\) & -20 & \((5.1)\) \\
Manitoba & -22 & \((5.3)\) & -27 & \((6.1)\) & -27 & \((4.6)\) \\
Saskatchewan & -33 & \((5.6)\) & -32 & \((7.7)\) & -31 & \((7.0)\) \\
Alberta & -32 & \((7.0)\) & -35 & \((6.2)\) & -17 & \((5.2)\) \\
British Columbia & -22 & \((6.2)\) & -23 & \((2.9)\) & -25 & \((2.4)\) \\
\hline Canada & -32 & \((2.7)\) & -34 & \((1.4)\) & -48 & \((1.4)\) \\
\hline OECD average & -53 & \((1.6)\) & -44 & \((1)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Table B.3.5}

Index of economic, social and cultural status, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of economic, social and cultural status} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.11 & (0.02) & -0.95 & (0.01) & -0.19 & (0.01) & 0.41 & (0.01) & 1.20 & (0.02) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.21 & (0.02) & -0.77 & (0.02) & -0.04 & (0.01) & 0.49 & (0.01) & 1.16 & (0.01) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.24 & (0.03) & -0.78 & (0.02) & -0.06 & (0.01) & 0.52 & (0.01) & 1.29 & (0.02) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.2 & (0.02) & -0.83 & (0.02) & -0.06 & (0.01) & 0.48 & (0.01) & 1.20 & (0.02) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.21 & (0.03) & -0.83 & (0.02) & -0.06 & (0.01) & 0.51 & (0.01) & 1.24 & (0.02) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.48 & (0.04) & -0.57 & (0.03) & 0.26 & (0.01) & 0.79 & (0.01) & 1.44 & (0.02) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.34 & (0.03) & -0.71 & (0.02) & 0.08 & (0.01) & 0.65 & (0.01) & 1.33 & (0.02) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.28 & (0.03) & -0.75 & (0.02) & 0.04 & (0.01) & 0.57 & (0.01) & 1.25 & (0.02) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.43 & (0.05) & -0.58 & (0.03) & 0.18 & (0.01) & 0.72 & (0.01) & 1.40 & (0.02) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.40 & (0.04) & -0.62 & (0.03) & 0.17 & (0.01) & 0.69 & (0.01) & 1.37 & (0.02) \\
\hline Canada & 0.37 & (0.02) & -0.69 & (0.01) & 0.12 & (0.00) & 0.68 & (0.00) & 1.36 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.45 & (0.01) & -0.36 & (0.00) & 0.30 & (0.00) & 1.17 & (0.01) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale, by national and provincial quarters of this index Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{d} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 480 & (4.3) & 511 & (4.0) & 538 & (5.5) & 576 & (5.0) & 43.8 & (2.7) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 480 & (4.6) & 499 & (5.3) & 523 & (4.9) & 535 & (5.1) & 29.5 & (3.2) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 484 & (4.8) & 509 & (5.0) & 532 & (4.7) & 559 & (4.8) & 35.5 & (3.2) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 472 & (4.8) & 494 & (4.2) & 516 & (4.2) & 544 & (4.0) & 37.1 & (2.7) \\
\hline Quebec & 495 & (5.5) & 522 & (4.9) & 537 & (5.7) & 574 & (5.7) & 36.8 & (3.4) \\
\hline Ontario & 506 & (5.9) & 531 & (5.7) & 557 & (4.7) & 568 & (5.1) & 30.6 & (3.0) \\
\hline Manitoba & 494 & (5.7) & 517 & (5.3) & 534 & (5.1) & 556 & (4.9) & 30.0 & (3.3) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 480 & (5.4) & 509 & (5.5) & 531 & (5.1) & 550 & (5.7) & 34.9 & (3.5) \\
\hline Alberta & 519 & (7.3) & 541 & (4.6) & 560 & (4.7) & 584 & (4.4) & 33.2 & (4.1) \\
\hline British Columbia & 508 & (6.4) & 539 & (5.7) & 545 & (6.4) & 564 & (5.3) & 27.5 & (4.0) \\
\hline Canada & 501 & (2.7) & 527 & (2.4) & 548 & (2.3) & 569 & (2.5) & 33.1 & (1.4) \\
\hline OECD average & 430 & (1.3) & 481 & (1.7) & 512 & (1.4) & 549 & (1.3) & 45.0 & (0.6) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.1}

Index of science self efficacy,
by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of science self efficacy} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.30 & (0.03) & -0.95 & (0.03) & -0.01 & (0.01) & 0.57 & (0.01) & 1.57 & (0.04) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.15 & (0.03) & -1.24 & (0.04) & -0.16 & (0.01) & 0.42 & (0.01) & 1.58 & (0.04) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.17 & (0.03) & -1.16 & (0.04) & -0.16 & (0.01) & 0.46 & (0.01) & 1.54 & (0.04) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.00 & (0.03) & -1.39 & (0.04) & -0.27 & (0.01) & 0.32 & (0.01) & 1.33 & (0.03) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.08 & (0.03) & -1.16 & (0.03) & -0.25 & (0.01) & 0.37 & (0.01) & 1.37 & (0.03) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.26 & (0.03) & -1.00 & (0.04) & -0.07 & (0.01) & 0.50 & (0.01) & 1.60 & (0.03) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.16 & (0.02) & -1.15 & (0.03) & -0.19 & (0.01) & 0.42 & (0.01) & 1.56 & (0.04) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.07 & (0.03) & -1.20 & (0.04) & -0.26 & (0.01) & 0.35 & (0.01) & 1.39 & (0.04) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.39 & (0.03) & -0.79 & (0.02) & 0.03 & (0.01) & 0.59 & (0.01) & 1.73 & (0.03) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.27 & (0.04) & -0.97 & (0.04) & -0.09 & (0.01) & 0.53 & (0.01) & 1.63 & (0.04) \\
\hline Canada & 0.21 & (0.01) & -1.05 & (0.02) & -0.12 & (0.00) & 0.47 & (0.00) & 1.55 & (0.02) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.17 & (0.00) & -0.29 & (0.00) & 0.26 & (0.00) & 1.21 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean score & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 468 & (4.0) & 509 & (4.4) & 548 & (5.3) & 582 & (5.0) & 42.2 & (2.2) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 453 & (4.9) & 493 & (4.3) & 523 & (4.9) & 569 & (4.9) & 38.3 & (2.3) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 465 & (4.7) & 512 & (4.4) & 536 & (5.2) & 570 & (5.1) & 36.9 & (2.3) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 450 & (3.7) & 492 & (3.9) & 519 & (3.6) & 565 & (3.9) & 39.3 & (1.5) \\
\hline Quebec & 478 & (4.6) & 518 & (4.2) & 550 & (4.8) & 581 & (6.2) & 37.2 & (2.0) \\
\hline Ontario & 484 & (5.6) & 527 & (4.9) & 556 & (5.1) & 594 & (4.8) & 39.7 & (2.6) \\
\hline Manitoba & 468 & (5.2) & 517 & (4.5) & 539 & (5.2) & 578 & (5.6) & 36.9 & (2.4) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 462 & (5.5) & 495 & (5.3) & 535 & (5.0) & 575 & (5.6) & 39.4 & (2.5) \\
\hline Alberta & 502 & (5.6) & 537 & (4.8) & 560 & (4.8) & 603 & (4.9) & 35.9 & (2.1) \\
\hline British Columbia & 485 & (6.8) & 519 & (4.5) & 560 & (5.8) & 592 & (5.3) & 40.6 & (1.8) \\
\hline Canada & 480 & (2.8) & 523 & (2.3) & 552 & (2.5) & 589 & (2.9) & 39.0 & (1.1) \\
\hline OECD average & 452 & (0.7) & 489 & (0.6) & 513 & (0.7) & 551 & (0.7) & 37.7 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.2}

Index of science self concept, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of science self concept} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.27 & (0.03) & -1.05 & (0.04) & 0.00 & (0.01) & 0.58 & (0.01) & 1.54 & (0.03) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.34 & (0.04) & -1.12 & (0.03) & 0.03 & (0.01) & 0.66 & (0.01) & 1.80 & (0.03) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.23 & (0.03) & -1.23 & (0.03) & -0.10 & (0.01) & 0.57 & (0.01) & 1.66 & (0.03) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.28 & (0.03) & -1.14 & (0.03) & -0.04 & (0.01) & 0.59 & (0.01) & 1.70 & (0.03) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.33 & (0.03) & -1.27 & (0.03) & 0.00 & (0.01) & 0.73 & (0.01) & 1.85 & (0.01) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.24 & (0.03) & -1.10 & (0.03) & -0.08 & (0.01) & 0.56 & (0.01) & 1.59 & (0.03) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.17 & (0.03) & -1.20 & (0.03) & -0.15 & (0.01) & 0.55 & (0.01) & 1.48 & (0.03) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.15 & (0.03) & -1.21 & (0.04) & -0.15 & (0.01) & 0.54 & (0.01) & 1.42 & (0.03) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.28 & (0.03) & -1.04 & (0.03) & -0.01 & (0.01) & 0.57 & (0.01) & 1.59 & (0.02) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.28 & (0.04) & -1.09 & (0.03) & -0.05 & (0.01) & 0.58 & (0.01) & 1.67 & (0.03) \\
\hline Canada & 0.27 & (0.02) & -1.15 & (0.02) & -0.05 & (0.01) & 0.59 & (0.00) & 1.68 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.19 & (0.00) & -0.28 & (0.00) & 0.29 & (0.00) & 1.20 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{unit of this index} \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 471 & (3.6) & 501 & (5.5) & 550 & (5.5) & 589 & (4.5) & 45.1 & (2.0) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 453 & (4.8) & 487 & (5.1) & 521 & (4.3) & 574 & (6.3) & 40.2 & (2.4) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 478 & (4.3) & 501 & (4.9) & 533 & (5.2) & 577 & (5.2) & 32.9 & (2.4) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 452 & (4.7) & 482 & (4.6) & 525 & (4.5) & 564 & (5.1) & 39.0 & (2.3) \\
\hline Quebec & 490 & (4.8) & 521 & (5.7) & 551 & (4.8) & 594 & (5.9) & 32.7 & (1.8) \\
\hline Ontario & 502 & (6.8) & 517 & (6.3) & 559 & (5.7) & 593 & (5.3) & 33.1 & (2.5) \\
\hline Manitoba & 474 & (5.7) & 512 & (6.3) & 547 & (6.3) & 572 & (6.3) & 36.1 & (2.7) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 467 & (6.2) & 496 & (5.4) & 538 & (6.1) & 568 & (7.8) & 38.7 & (2.9) \\
\hline Alberta & 513 & (5.1) & 534 & (5.4) & 562 & (6.4) & 603 & (5.7) & 33.9 & (2.7) \\
\hline British Columbia & 494 & (5.4) & 514 & (6.7) & 564 & (6.1) & 597 & (6.8) & 37.4 & (2.2) \\
\hline Canada & 494 & (2.9) & 519 & (3.0) & 553 & (2.6) & 592 & (2.9) & 34.3 & (1.0) \\
\hline OECD average & 471 & (0.6) & 492 & (0.7) & 514 & (0.7) & 537 & (0.8) & 26.8 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.3}

Index of general value of science, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of general value of science} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & index & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.18 & (0.03) & -1.04 & (0.03) & -0.25 & (0.01) & 0.43 & (0.01) & 1.57 & (0.03) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.09 & (0.03) & -1.17 & (0.03) & -0.35 & (0.01) & 0.34 & (0.01) & 1.54 & (0.03) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.06 & (0.03) & -1.15 & (0.03) & -0.37 & (0.01) & 0.28 & (0.01) & 1.48 & (0.03) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.07 & (0.02) & -1.15 & (0.02) & -0.35 & (0.01) & 0.31 & (0.01) & 1.47 & (0.03) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.13 & (0.03) & -1.15 & (0.02) & -0.26 & (0.01) & 0.42 & (0.01) & 1.53 & (0.02) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.15 & (0.03) & -1.03 & (0.02) & -0.29 & (0.01) & 0.41 & (0.01) & 1.51 & (0.02) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.10 & (0.03) & -1.15 & (0.03) & -0.34 & (0.00) & 0.35 & (0.01) & 1.55 & (0.03) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.02 & (0.03) & -1.13 & (0.03) & -0.36 & (0.00) & 0.26 & (0.01) & 1.33 & (0.03) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.20 & (0.03) & -0.91 & (0.02) & -0.26 & (0.01) & 0.41 & (0.01) & 1.54 & (0.03) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.18 & (0.03) & -0.97 & (0.02) & -0.24 & (0.01) & 0.42 & (0.01) & 1.52 & (0.03) \\
\hline Canada & 0.14 & (0.01) & -1.06 & (0.01) & -0.28 & (0.00) & 0.40 & (0.01) & 1.51 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.15 & (0.00) & -0.37 & (0.00) & 0.24 & (0.00) & 1.28 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 482 & (5.3) & 514 & (5.1) & 546 & (4.7) & 562 & (5.2) & 30.6 & (2.6) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 467 & (5.2) & 489 & (4.6) & 533 & (5.3) & 549 & (5.3) & 32.2 & (2.4) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 484 & (4.5) & 510 & (4.8) & 536 & (4.6) & 554 & (4.3) & 26.0 & (2.3) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 467 & (4.4) & 495 & (4.0) & 521 & (4.3) & 544 & (4.1) & 29.4 & (1.7) \\
\hline Quebec & 492 & (6.1) & 522 & (4.8) & 549 & (4.9) & 566 & (5.0) & 29.1 & (2.3) \\
\hline Ontario & 508 & (6.2) & 535 & (5.2) & 552 & (5.6) & 567 & (5.1) & 22.4 & (2.3) \\
\hline Manitoba & 493 & (6.2) & 519 & (5.2) & 542 & (5.0) & 550 & (5.2) & 22.0 & (2.2) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 485 & (4.9) & 509 & (4.9) & 529 & (5.0) & 544 & (6.2) & 26.5 & (2.5) \\
\hline Alberta & 526 & (5.1) & 536 & (5.7) & 564 & (6.1) & 577 & (5.6) & 21.3 & (2.3) \\
\hline British Columbia & 506 & (6.6) & 525 & (5.0) & 554 & (5.8) & 571 & (5.3) & 26.1 & (2.0) \\
\hline Canada & 502 & (2.9) & 526 & (2.6) & 552 & (2.2) & 565 & (2.7) & 25.3 & (1.1) \\
\hline OECD average & 464 & (0.7) & 495 & (0.7) & 515 & (0.7) & 533 & (0.7) & 28.1 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.4}

Index of personal value of science, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of personal value of science} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & index & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.36 & (0.03) & -0.87 & (0.03) & 0.04 & (0.01) & 0.62 & (0.01) & 1.68 & (0.03) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.33 & (0.03) & -1.02 & (0.03) & 0.01 & (0.01) & 0.61 & (0.01) & 1.71 & (0.03) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.26 & (0.03) & -1.04 & (0.03) & -0.05 & (0.02) & 0.51 & (0.01) & 1.63 & (0.03) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.24 & (0.03) & -1.12 & (0.03) & -0.11 & (0.01) & 0.55 & (0.01) & 1.65 & (0.02) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.03 & (0.02) & -1.30 & (0.02) & -0.30 & (0.01) & 0.36 & (0.01) & 1.36 & (0.02) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.22 & (0.03) & -1.12 & (0.02) & -0.17 & (0.01) & 0.51 & (0.01) & 1.65 & (0.02) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.21 & (0.03) & -1.13 & (0.03) & -0.14 & (0.01) & 0.48 & (0.01) & 1.63 & (0.03) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.20 & (0.03) & -1.02 & (0.03) & -0.09 & (0.01) & 0.47 & (0.01) & 1.43 & (0.03) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.34 & (0.03) & -0.89 & (0.02) & 0.04 & (0.01) & 0.56 & (0.01) & 1.67 & (0.03) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.27 & (0.03) & -0.97 & (0.02) & -0.09 & (0.01) & 0.54 & (0.01) & 1.61 & (0.03) \\
\hline Canada & 0.20 & (0.01) & -1.11 & (0.01) & -0.16 & (0.00) & 0.49 & (0.00) & 1.57 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.18 & (0.00) & -0.32 & (0.00) & 0.26 & (0.00) & 1.23 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 482 & (4.6) & 507 & (6.4) & 544 & (4.9) & 572 & (4.7) & 35.8 & (2.3) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 468 & (4.9) & 496 & (5.5) & 517 & (4.6) & 557 & (5.6) & 31.5 & (2.3) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 481 & (4.3) & 513 & (5.8) & 524 & (4.3) & 565 & (4.1) & 28.4 & (2.3) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 464 & (4.1) & 496 & (4.3) & 513 & (4.2) & 554 & (4.4) & 29.9 & (1.8) \\
\hline Quebec & 498 & (5.0) & 524 & (5.5) & 537 & (5.3) & 569 & (5.3) & 25.0 & (1.9) \\
\hline Ontario & 511 & (4.7) & 533 & (5.1) & 538 & (6.1) & 580 & (5.8) & 22.9 & (2.1) \\
\hline Manitoba & 491 & (5.5) & 520 & (5.6) & 527 & (5.5) & 565 & (5.1) & 24.0 & (2.3) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 479 & (5.0) & 513 & (4.1) & 527 & (5.1) & 548 & (6.8) & 28.5 & (2.9) \\
\hline Alberta & 523 & (5.0) & 542 & (4.7) & 555 & (6.3) & 583 & (5.5) & 22.5 & (2.4) \\
\hline British Columbia & 501 & (5.9) & 532 & (5.4) & 544 & (6.6) & 579 & (5.7) & 27.8 & (1.9) \\
\hline Canada & 504 & (2.5) & 529 & (2.4) & 538 & (2.9) & 575 & (2.9) & 24.8 & (1.0) \\
\hline OECD average & 477 & (0.7) & 495 & (0.7) & 506 & (0.7) & 528 & (0.8) & 20.4 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.5}

Index of general interest in science, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of general interest in science} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.17 & (0.03) & -1.00 & (0.05) & 0.02 & (0.01) & 0.48 & (0.01) & 1.17 & (0.02) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.09 & (0.03) & -1.31 & (0.05) & -0.05 & (0.01) & 0.47 & (0.01) & 1.25 & (0.03) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.08 & (0.02) & -1.21 & (0.05) & -0.07 & (0.01) & 0.44 & (0.01) & 1.17 & (0.03) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.18 & (0.02) & -1.16 & (0.04) & 0.01 & (0.01) & 0.54 & (0.01) & 1.32 & (0.02) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.13 & (0.02) & -1.14 & (0.03) & -0.07 & (0.01) & 0.47 & (0.01) & 1.25 & (0.02) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.09 & (0.02) & -1.12 & (0.04) & -0.09 & (0.01) & 0.42 & (0.01) & 1.15 & (0.03) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.00 & (0.02) & -1.34 & (0.05) & -0.12 & (0.01) & 0.36 & (0.01) & 1.10 & (0.03) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.03 & (0.03) & -1.22 & (0.04) & -0.13 & (0.01) & 0.37 & (0.01) & 1.10 & (0.03) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.14 & (0.03) & -1.00 & (0.04) & -0.02 & (0.01) & 0.44 & (0.01) & 1.13 & (0.02) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.13 & (0.03) & -1.01 & (0.04) & -0.05 & (0.01) & 0.42 & (0.01) & 1.14 & (0.02) \\
\hline Canada & 0.11 & (0.01) & -1.11 & (0.02) & -0.07 & (0.00) & 0.44 & (0.00) & 1.17 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.23 & (0.00) & -0.17 & (0.00) & 0.32 & (0.00) & 1.08 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 478 & (4.9) & 527 & (5.5) & 544 & (4.6) & 556 & (4.6) & 32.5 & (2.0) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 459 & (4.5) & 505 & (4.6) & 524 & (5.0) & 549 & (5.1) & 31.8 & (1.9) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 484 & (4.6) & 508 & (4.5) & 542 & (5.4) & 549 & (4.8) & 24.9 & (2.0) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 461 & (3.4) & 502 & (4.2) & 524 & (4.2) & 540 & (4.6) & 27.7 & (2.0) \\
\hline Quebec & 495 & (4.6) & 526 & (5.1) & 549 & (5.0) & 559 & (6.3) & 24.2 & (2.2) \\
\hline Ontario & 510 & (5.3) & 533 & (5.4) & 552 & (5.9) & 566 & (6.2) & 23.0 & (2.4) \\
\hline Manitoba & 488 & (5.6) & 526 & (5.8) & 541 & (5.3) & 544 & (5.0) & 22.2 & (2.5) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 482 & (4.6) & 517 & (6.6) & 531 & (4.6) & 537 & (6.8) & 22.7 & (2.5) \\
\hline Alberta & 513 & (4.9) & 554 & (4.7) & 565 & (5.2) & 571 & (5.7) & 23.8 & (2.2) \\
\hline British Columbia & 510 & (8.1) & 534 & (5.1) & 551 & (6.1) & 561 & (5.9) & 22.0 & (3.0) \\
\hline Canada & 502 & (2.7) & 532 & (2.3) & 551 & (2.8) & 560 & (3.2) & 23.6 & (1.1) \\
\hline OECD average & 466 & (0.7) & 494 & (0.7) & 514 & (0.7) & 529 & (0.8) & 25.0 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.6}

Index of enjoyment of science,
by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of enjoyment of science} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.27 & (0.03) & -0.95 & (0.03) & -0.01 & (0.01) & 0.55 & (0.01) & 1.49 & (0.02) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.10 & (0.03) & -1.32 & (0.03) & -0.19 & (0.01) & 0.43 & (0.01) & 1.48 & (0.02) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.18 & (0.03) & -1.23 & (0.03) & -0.08 & (0.01) & 0.54 & (0.01) & 1.50 & (0.02) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.22 & (0.03) & -1.17 & (0.03) & -0.06 & (0.01) & 0.54 & (0.01) & 1.56 & (0.02) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.19 & (0.03) & -1.15 & (0.02) & -0.13 & (0.01) & 0.50 & (0.01) & 1.54 & (0.01) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.14 & (0.03) & -1.20 & (0.02) & -0.13 & (0.01) & 0.43 & (0.01) & 1.49 & (0.02) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.04 & (0.03) & -1.30 & (0.03) & -0.27 & (0.01) & 0.37 & (0.01) & 1.37 & (0.03) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & -0.01 & (0.03) & -1.28 & (0.03) & -0.29 & (0.01) & 0.32 & (0.01) & 1.21 & (0.03) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.22 & (0.03) & -1.04 & (0.03) & -0.02 & (0.01) & 0.48 & (0.01) & 1.46 & (0.02) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.25 & (0.03) & -1.08 & (0.03) & -0.03 & (0.01) & 0.55 & (0.01) & 1.57 & (0.02) \\
\hline Canada & 0.17 & (0.01) & -1.17 & (0.01) & -0.11 & (0.01) & 0.46 & (0.00) & 1.50 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.22 & (0.00) & -0.32 & (0.00) & 0.30 & (0.00) & 1.25 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{unit of this index} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean score & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 476 & (4.4) & 508 & (5.6) & 537 & (4.6) & 585 & (4.3) & 42.8 & (2.3) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 449 & (4.0) & 494 & (5.0) & 524 & (5.2) & 570 & (4.9) & 42.7 & (2.0) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 470 & (3.7) & 511 & (4.2) & 536 & (5.0) & 567 & (4.3) & 33.8 & (1.8) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 457 & (3.6) & 490 & (3.7) & 521 & (5.0) & 558 & (4.3) & 37.1 & (1.9) \\
\hline Quebec & 490 & (5.1) & 519 & (4.6) & 545 & (5.5) & 574 & (5.5) & 31.2 & (1.9) \\
\hline Ontario & 499 & (5.5) & 526 & (5.1) & 553 & (5.8) & 584 & (6.7) & 31.4 & (2.3) \\
\hline Manitoba & 483 & (5.5) & 510 & (4.9) & 541 & (5.1) & 566 & (6.0) & 30.6 & (2.5) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 472 & (4.6) & 503 & (5.8) & 529 & (4.9) & 563 & (6.5) & 34.6 & (2.4) \\
\hline Alberta & 511 & (4.8) & 542 & (4.6) & 555 & (5.7) & 595 & (5.9) & 32.2 & (2.5) \\
\hline British Columbia & 490 & (5.8) & 525 & (5.6) & 551 & (6.2) & 589 & (5.2) & 36.3 & (1.8) \\
\hline Canada & 493 & (2.9) & 523 & (2.4) & 548 & (2.9) & 581 & (3.1) & 32.6 & (1.0) \\
\hline OECD average & 465 & (0.7) & 488 & (0.7) & 511 & (0.7) & 539 & (0.8) & 29.5 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.7}

Index of instrumental motivation to learn science, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of instrumental motivation to learn science} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.59 & (0.03) & -0.64 & (0.03) & 0.27 & (0.01) & 0.92 & (0.02) & 1.80 & (0.00) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.57 & (0.03) & -0.75 & (0.03) & 0.27 & (0.01) & 0.93 & (0.02) & 1.82 & (0.00) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.45 & (0.03) & -0.83 & (0.03) & 0.16 & (0.02) & 0.73 & (0.02) & 1.76 & (0.01) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.50 & (0.03) & -0.83 & (0.03) & 0.21 & (0.01) & 0.84 & (0.02) & 1.78 & (0.01) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.11 & (0.03) & -1.30 & (0.02) & -0.30 & (0.01) & 0.48 & (0.01) & 1.57 & (0.01) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.34 & (0.03) & -0.98 & (0.03) & -0.02 & (0.02) & 0.63 & (0.02) & 1.75 & (0.01) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.39 & (0.03) & -0.88 & (0.03) & 0.10 & (0.01) & 0.64 & (0.02) & 1.72 & (0.01) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.38 & (0.04) & -0.79 & (0.03) & 0.16 & (0.01) & 0.57 & (0.02) & 1.60 & (0.02) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.48 & (0.03) & -0.75 & (0.03) & 0.20 & (0.01) & 0.75 & (0.02) & 1.75 & (0.01) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.39 & (0.03) & -0.86 & (0.03) & 0.07 & (0.01) & 0.65 & (0.01) & 1.71 & (0.01) \\
\hline Canada & 0.32 & (0.02) & -1.01 & (0.01) & -0.02 & (0.01) & 0.62 & (0.01) & 1.70 & (0.00) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.20 & (0.00) & -0.33 & (0.00) & 0.27 & (0.00) & 1.27 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 489 & (5.0) & 508 & (5.4) & 537 & (5.8) & 577 & (5.0) & 35.5 & (2.8) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 471 & (5.1) & 492 & (5.3) & 511 & (5.2) & 562 & (6.2) & 33.7 & (2.9) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 488 & (4.9) & 526 & (4.2) & 527 & (4.9) & 548 & (5.3) & 23.2 & (2.6) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 475 & (5.3) & 487 & (4.6) & 515 & (5.4) & 545 & (4.3) & 27.8 & (2.7) \\
\hline Quebec & 507 & (4.9) & 533 & (5.5) & 542 & (5.7) & 578 & (5.8) & 23.4 & (1.8) \\
\hline Ontario & 517 & (5.9) & 531 & (6.8) & 541 & (6.4) & 583 & (5.1) & 22.2 & (2.5) \\
\hline Manitoba & 506 & (6.7) & 512 & (7.2) & 523 & (5.9) & 565 & (6.0) & 23.8 & (3.3) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 485 & (4.6) & 512 & (6.5) & 523 & (6.5) & 551 & (9.3) & 29.6 & (4.3) \\
\hline Alberta & 523 & (6.1) & 543 & (5.5) & 554 & (6.9) & 594 & (5.6) & 26.4 & (2.4) \\
\hline British Columbia & 520 & (7.1) & 534 & (7.1) & 542 & (7.8) & 573 & (6.5) & 19.5 & (2.9) \\
\hline Canada & 514 & (2.8) & 527 & (2.9) & 540 & (3.1) & 578 & (2.5) & 22.8 & (1.1) \\
\hline OECD average & 485 & (0.7) & 498 & (0.7) & 502 & (0.7) & 529 & (0.8) & 17.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.8}

Index of future-oriented science motivation, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of future-oriented science motivation} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.43 & (0.03) & -0.85 & (0.03) & 0.14 & (0.01) & 0.77 & (0.01) & 1.68 & (0.02) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.45 & (0.03) & -0.98 & (0.02) & 0.13 & (0.01) & 0.83 & (0.01) & 1.80 & (0.02) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.32 & (0.03) & -1.08 & (0.02) & 0.00 & (0.01) & 0.69 & (0.01) & 1.67 & (0.03) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.33 & (0.03) & -1.08 & (0.02) & 0.03 & (0.01) & 0.71 & (0.01) & 1.64 & (0.02) \\
\hline Quebec & -0.01 & (0.02) & -1.38 & (0.00) & -0.40 & (0.01) & 0.32 & (0.01) & 1.45 & (0.01) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.26 & (0.03) & -1.20 & (0.01) & -0.08 & (0.01) & 0.65 & (0.01) & 1.66 & (0.02) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.22 & (0.02) & -1.15 & (0.02) & -0.09 & (0.01) & 0.57 & (0.01) & 1.55 & (0.02) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.15 & (0.03) & -1.15 & (0.02) & -0.11 & (0.01) & 0.49 & (0.01) & 1.36 & (0.02) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.33 & (0.03) & -1.03 & (0.02) & 0.06 & (0.01) & 0.71 & (0.01) & 1.59 & (0.03) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.24 & (0.03) & -1.10 & (0.02) & -0.06 & (0.01) & 0.55 & (0.01) & 1.57 & (0.02) \\
\hline Canada & 0.20 & (0.01) & -1.22 & (0.01) & -0.14 & (0.00) & 0.58 & (0.01) & 1.59 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.24 & (0.00) & -0.30 & (0.00) & 0.27 & (0.00) & 1.27 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 484 & (4.9) & 498 & (3.9) & 542 & (5.0) & 582 & (4.9) & 39.4 & (2.4) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 479 & (4.1) & 489 & (5.0) & 514 & (5.5) & 558 & (5.4) & 29.5 & (2.2) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 496 & (4.5) & 503 & (4.8) & 525 & (5.1) & 561 & (4.2) & 24.5 & (2.1) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 470 & (3.8) & 487 & (4.1) & 518 & (4.3) & 551 & (4.2) & 30.0 & (1.7) \\
\hline Quebec & 500 & (4.7) & 525 & (4.2) & 528 & (5.3) & 578 & (6.1) & 27.0 & (1.7) \\
\hline Ontario & 516 & (6.4) & 520 & (5.1) & 551 & (5.6) & 576 & (5.9) & 22.5 & (2.2) \\
\hline Manitoba & 501 & (5.5) & 506 & (4.8) & 538 & (5.7) & 558 & (5.4) & 24.1 & (2.7) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 488 & (4.6) & 497 & (5.1) & 526 & (5.5) & 558 & (6.5) & 29.1 & (2.7) \\
\hline Alberta & 524 & (5.4) & 533 & (4.3) & 567 & (4.9) & 580 & (6.8) & 24.0 & (2.3) \\
\hline British Columbia & 511 & (6.3) & 523 & (5.7) & 548 & (5.6) & 575 & (6.0) & 26.9 & (2.5) \\
\hline Canada & 508 & (2.8) & 518 & (2.3) & 547 & (2.6) & 573 & (3.1) & 25.0 & (1.1) \\
\hline OECD average & 482 & (0.6) & 494 & (0.7) & 499 & (0.7) & 533 & (0.9) & 19.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.9}

Index of science activities, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of science activities} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & -0.10 & (0.03) & -1.35 & (0.02) & -0.39 & (0.01) & 0.31 & (0.01) & 1.05 & (0.02) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & -0.24 & (0.03) & -1.53 & (0.02) & -0.58 & (0.01) & 0.16 & (0.01) & 1.02 & (0.02) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & -0.15 & (0.03) & -1.41 & (0.02) & -0.50 & (0.01) & 0.26 & (0.01) & 1.04 & (0.02) \\
\hline New Brunswick & -0.09 & (0.02) & -1.41 & (0.02) & -0.44 & (0.01) & 0.34 & (0.01) & 1.13 & (0.02) \\
\hline Quebec & -0.09 & (0.02) & -1.4 & (0.01) & -0.41 & (0.01) & 0.35 & (0.01) & 1.09 & (0.01) \\
\hline Ontario & -0.16 & (0.03) & -1.5 & (0.02) & -0.51 & (0.01) & 0.27 & (0.01) & 1.12 & (0.02) \\
\hline Manitoba & -0.29 & (0.03) & -1.61 & (0.01) & -0.62 & (0.01) & 0.06 & (0.01) & 1.00 & (0.02) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & -0.29 & (0.03) & -1.56 & (0.02) & -0.61 & (0.01) & 0.08 & (0.02) & 0.93 & (0.02) \\
\hline Alberta & -0.16 & (0.03) & -1.46 & (0.02) & -0.48 & (0.02) & 0.28 & (0.01) & 1.05 & (0.02) \\
\hline British Columbia & -0.17 & (0.03) & -1.48 & (0.02) & -0.50 & (0.01) & 0.25 & (0.01) & 1.04 & (0.02) \\
\hline Canada & -0.15 & (0.01) & -1.47 & (0.01) & -0.50 & (0.01) & 0.29 & (0.01) & 1.08 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.25 & (0.00) & -0.28 & (0.00) & 0.37 & (0.00) & 1.16 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{unit of this index} \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean & standard error & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { mean } \\
& \text { score }
\end{aligned}
\] & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 496 & (4.8) & 511 & (4.6) & 536 & (5.7) & 562 & (5.1) & 27.5 & (2.6) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 471 & (4.5) & 497 & (4.2) & 520 & (5.6) & 550 & (5.3) & 29.5 & (2.5) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 489 & (4.0) & 509 & (4.6) & 530 & (5.1) & 555 & (4.5) & 26.8 & (2.3) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 470 & (4.1) & 500 & (4.3) & 520 & (4.2) & 536 & (4.7) & 25.1 & (2.4) \\
\hline Quebec & 499 & (4.5) & 526 & (4.9) & 547 & (5.2) & 556 & (5.9) & 22.1 & (2.1) \\
\hline Ontario & 511 & (5.3) & 534 & (5.9) & 555 & (4.6) & 562 & (6.4) & 19.2 & (2.8) \\
\hline Manitoba & 497 & (5.6) & 514 & (4.7) & 542 & (5.1) & 548 & (6.0) & 20.8 & (2.7) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 487 & (4.8) & 513 & (5.0) & 522 & (5.9) & 546 & (5.7) & 22.3 & (2.6) \\
\hline Alberta & 521 & (5.5) & 545 & (5.3) & 562 & (4.9) & 574 & (6.5) & 21.3 & (2.7) \\
\hline British Columbia & 507 & (6.4) & 536 & (5.2) & 545 & (6.0) & 568 & (6.6) & 22.5 & (2.4) \\
\hline Canada & 507 & (2.5) & 528 & (2.5) & 548 & (2.6) & 561 & (3.1) & 21.1 & (1.3) \\
\hline OECD average & 472 & (0.7) & 497 & (0.6) & 513 & (0.7) & 521 & (0.9) & 19.3 & (0.4) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.10}

\section*{School reports on the teaching of environmental topics}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Percentage of students whose principals report where topics on the environment sit in the curriculum received by students} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{In a specific environmental studies course} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{In the natural sciences courses} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{As part of a geography course} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{As part of another course} \\
\hline & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 53.9 & (2.90) & 98.1 & (1.40) & 86.1 & (1.90) & 50.4 & (3.20) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 71.1 & (0.30) & 96.2 & (0.20) & 74.0 & (0.40) & 50.0 & (0.30) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 10.0 & (1.80) & 92.3 & (1.50) & 77.7 & (2.20) & 51.5 & (3.40) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 44.2 & (0.80) & 93.8 & (0.20) & 34.8 & (0.90) & 30.2 & (0.60) \\
\hline Quebec & 26.0 & (3.90) & 81.5 & (2.30) & 59.9 & (4.30) & 55.8 & (4.40) \\
\hline Ontario & 32.3 & (4.20) & 95.4 & (1.90) & 82.5 & (4.20) & 59.6 & (5.50) \\
\hline Manitoba & 15.8 & (2.00) & 97.0 & (0.60) & 94.8 & (1.20) & 53.1 & (3.40) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 14.6 & (3.00) & 97.2 & (1.10) & 13.5 & (4.10) & 48.8 & (4.10) \\
\hline Alberta & 11.6 & (2.80) & 99.8 & (0.20) & 16.4 & (4.30) & 50.0 & (5.30) \\
\hline British Columbia & 22.0 & (4.80) & 92.2 & (3.80) & 79.0 & (5.10) & 56.1 & (5.10) \\
\hline Canada & 26.5 & (2.00) & 92.2 & (1.00) & 67.0 & (2.10) & 55.6 & (2.60) \\
\hline OECD average & 20.9 & (0.51) & 94.0 & (0.30) & 74.7 & (0.50) & 63.4 & (0.61) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on reports from school principals and reported proportionate to the number of 15-year-olds enrolled in the school.

\section*{Table B.4.11}

Percentage of students participating in school activities to promote the learning of environmental topics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Percentage of students whose principals report the following school activities to promote the learning of environmental topics} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Outdoor education} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Trips to museums} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Trips to science and/or technology centers} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Extracurricular environmental projects} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Lectures } \\
& \text { and/or } \\
& \text { seminars }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 75.8 & (1.50) & 57.9 & (2.60) & 70.4 & (1.90) & 72.8 & (2.50) & 81.1 & (2.70) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 63.0 & (0.30) & 72.6 & (0.30) & 66.0 & (0.30) & 67.6 & (0.40) & 84.3 & (0.20) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 64.1 & (2.60) & 70.7 & (2.30) & 58.1 & (2.70) & 60.8 & (2.70) & 80.4 & (2.70) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 53.3 & (0.90) & 43.0 & (0.90) & 48.9 & (1.20) & 50.4 & (0.90) & 76.1 & (1.00) \\
\hline Quebec & 42.2 & (5.00) & 53.9 & (3.90) & 65.1 & (3.60) & 56.1 & (4.20) & 51.4 & (4.40) \\
\hline Ontario & 74.1 & (4.60) & 77.1 & (4.40) & 84.6 & (3.80) & 73.5 & (4.00) & 83.7 & (3.30) \\
\hline Manitoba & 62.8 & (3.60) & 76.1 & (3.10) & 76.9 & (2.40) & 71.6 & (3.30) & 75.9 & (2.60) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 74.7 & (4.00) & 66.4 & (3.60) & 74.6 & (4.00) & 36.1 & (4.30) & 65.6 & (3.70) \\
\hline Alberta & 51.7 & (5.40) & 69.0 & (4.30) & 84.3 & (3.40) & 64.0 & (5.20) & 76.1 & (4.30) \\
\hline British Columbia & 55.4 & (5.50) & 67.5 & (4.80) & 75.4 & (4.40) & 60.7 & (5.80) & 74.1 & (5.70) \\
\hline Canada & 60.9 & (2.40) & 68.0 & (2.10) & 76.4 & (1.90) & 64.7 & (2.00) & 73.0 & (1.90) \\
\hline OECD average & 77.0 & (0.49) & 74.8 & (0.53) & 66.7 & (0.6) & 44.8 & (0.62) & 52.5 & (0.60) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Note: Results based on reports from school principals and reported proportionate to the number of 15 -year-olds enrolled in the school.
}

\section*{Table B.4.12}

Index of awareness of environmental issues, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of awareness of environmental issues} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.31 & (0.03) & -0.76 & (0.03) & 0.04 & (0.01) & 0.54 & (0.01) & 1.42 & (0.03) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.08 & (0.02) & -1.14 & (0.03) & -0.26 & (0.01) & 0.34 & (0.01) & 1.37 & (0.03) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.13 & (0.02) & -1.06 & (0.03) & -0.17 & (0.01) & 0.40 & (0.01) & 1.36 & (0.03) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.00 & (0.02) & -1.16 & (0.02) & -0.31 & (0.01) & 0.25 & (0.01) & 1.21 & (0.03) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.19 & (0.03) & -0.98 & (0.02) & -0.14 & (0.01) & 0.43 & (0.01) & 1.45 & (0.03) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.37 & (0.03) & -0.84 & (0.03) & 0.04 & (0.01) & 0.63 & (0.01) & 1.67 & (0.04) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.29 & (0.03) & -1.06 & (0.05) & -0.01 & (0.01) & 0.58 & (0.01) & 1.67 & (0.05) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.07 & (0.03) & -1.08 & (0.02) & -0.24 & (0.01) & 0.32 & (0.01) & 1.26 & (0.04) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.48 & (0.03) & -0.70 & (0.03) & 0.16 & (0.01) & 0.71 & (0.01) & 1.75 & (0.03) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.08 & (0.03) & -1.08 & (0.03) & -0.23 & (0.01) & 0.31 & (0.01) & 1.31 & (0.03) \\
\hline Canada & 0.27 & (0.01) & -0.93 & (0.01) & -0.05 & (0.00) & 0.52 & (0.00) & 1.55 & (0.02) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.19 & (0.00) & -0.29 & (0.00) & 0.27 & (0.00) & 1.21 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{unit of this index} \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { mean } \\
& \text { score }
\end{aligned}
\] & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 473 & (4.2) & 526 & (4.4) & 546 & (5.0) & 561 & (5.4) & 35.3 & (2.6) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 449 & (4.7) & 509 & (4.4) & 526 & (5.0) & 553 & (5.3) & 34.6 & (2.4) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 477 & (5.2) & 512 & (4.5) & 536 & (4.5) & 559 & (4.6) & 30.1 & (2.9) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 449 & (3.9) & 504 & (3.8) & 524 & (4.0) & 550 & (4.5) & 37.1 & (2.3) \\
\hline Quebec & 471 & (4.4) & 526 & (4.5) & 551 & (4.5) & 581 & (5.4) & 40.4 & (2.4) \\
\hline Ontario & 486 & (5.3) & 536 & (5.1) & 558 & (6.2) & 583 & (4.8) & 34.5 & (2.3) \\
\hline Manitoba & 462 & (6.0) & 526 & (5.5) & 544 & (4.8) & 570 & (5.6) & 37.0 & (2.4) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 463 & (5.1) & 509 & (5.9) & 538 & (3.9) & 558 & (5.0) & 38.0 & (3.0) \\
\hline Alberta & 502 & (7.0) & 541 & (4.7) & 572 & (4.1) & 589 & (5.0) & 30.7 & (2.7) \\
\hline British Columbia & 484 & (5.8) & 536 & (6.1) & 555 & (5.3) & 582 & (5.9) & 37.6 & (2.2) \\
\hline Canada & 482 & (2.6) & 530 & (2.2) & 554 & (2.5) & 580 & (2.7) & 36.2 & (1.2) \\
\hline OECD average & 439 & (0.7) & 492 & (0.6) & 522 & (0.6) & 553 & (0.7) & 43.8 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4. 13}

Index of perception of environmental issues, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of perception of environmental issues} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & -0.28 & (0.03) & -1.43 & (0.04) & -0.59 & (0.01) & -0.07 & (0.01) & 0.98 & (0.03) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & -0.17 & (0.03) & -1.49 & (0.05) & -0.53 & (0.01) & 0.08 & (0.01) & 1.25 & (0.02) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & -0.17 & (0.05) & -1.46 & (0.05) & -0.52 & (0.01) & 0.08 & (0.01) & 1.21 & (0.02) \\
\hline New Brunswick & -0.07 & (0.02) & -1.24 & (0.03) & -0.44 & (0.01) & 0.15 & (0.01) & 1.24 & (0.01) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.06 & (0.02) & -0.98 & (0.02) & -0.29 & (0.01) & 0.25 & (0.01) & 1.24 & (0.01) \\
\hline Ontario & -0.08 & (0.03) & -1.30 & (0.05) & -0.43 & (0.01) & 0.16 & (0.01) & 1.25 & (0.01) \\
\hline Manitoba & -0.27 & (0.03) & -1.53 & (0.04) & -0.60 & (0.01) & -0.06 & (0.01) & 1.11 & (0.02) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & -0.25 & (0.03) & -1.41 & (0.03) & -0.60 & (0.01) & -0.06 & (0.01) & 1.08 & (0.02) \\
\hline Alberta & -0.21 & (0.03) & -1.48 & (0.05) & -0.51 & (0.01) & 0.03 & (0.01) & 1.13 & (0.02) \\
\hline British Columbia & -0.25 & (0.03) & -1.49 & (0.04) & -0.55 & (0.01) & -0.05 & (0.01) & 1.09 & (0.02) \\
\hline Canada & -0.10 & (0.01) & -1.29 & (0.02) & -0.45 & (0.00) & 0.13 & (0.01) & 1.20 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.14 & (0.00) & -0.32 & (0.00) & 0.26 & (0.00) & 1.20 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 516 & (5.2) & 538 & (4.7) & 527 & (5.9) & 526 & (4.5) & 5.9 & (2.4) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 492 & (5.5) & 518 & (6.0) & 521 & (4.1) & 507 & (5.4) & 7.6 & (2.5) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 518 & (5.4) & 523 & (4.6) & 527 & (5.4) & 516 & (4.4) & 3.6 & (2.3) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 490 & (4.0) & 514 & (4.8) & 518 & (3.6) & 504 & (3.9) & 7.9 & (1.9) \\
\hline Quebec & 522 & (5.6) & 540 & (4.4) & 539 & (4.3) & 530 & (5.4) & 5.0 & (2.1) \\
\hline Ontario & 531 & (6.9) & 546 & (5.0) & 550 & (5.9) & 538 & (4.5) & 5.4 & (2.5) \\
\hline Manitoba & 521 & (5.2) & 533 & (6.0) & 531 & (4.8) & 518 & (4.4) & 2.4 & (2.1) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 510 & (6.0) & 519 & (5.2) & 526 & (6.3) & 513 & (6.1) & 4.3 & (2.7) \\
\hline Alberta & 549 & (6.4) & 551 & (5.2) & 555 & (5.8) & 548 & (4.8) & 2.6 & (2.2) \\
\hline British Columbia & 531 & (7.3) & 539 & (5.6) & 549 & (5.2) & 537 & (5.8) & 5.1 & (2.7) \\
\hline Canada & 527 & (2.8) & 541 & (2.3) & 545 & (2.6) & 533 & (2.5) & 4.6 & (1.2) \\
\hline OECD average & 490 & (0.8) & 509 & (0.7) & 509 & (0.7) & 500 & (0.7) & 5.9 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.14}

Index of environmental optimism, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of environmental optimism} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & -0.03 & (0.03) & -1.33 & (0.02) & -0.28 & (0.01) & 0.31 & (0.01) & 1.19 & (0.04) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & -0.15 & (0.03) & -1.59 & (0.01) & -0.46 & (0.01) & 0.24 & (0.01) & 1.21 & (0.03) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & -0.17 & (0.02) & -1.57 & (0.01) & -0.45 & (0.01) & 0.20 & (0.01) & 1.13 & (0.04) \\
\hline New Brunswick & -0.17 & (0.02) & -1.50 & (0.01) & -0.40 & (0.01) & 0.18 & (0.01) & 1.06 & (0.03) \\
\hline Quebec & -0.31 & (0.02) & -1.55 & (0.01) & -0.54 & (0.01) & 0.03 & (0.01) & 0.84 & (0.02) \\
\hline Ontario & -0.23 & (0.03) & -1.59 & (0.01) & -0.50 & (0.01) & 0.15 & (0.01) & 1.03 & (0.03) \\
\hline Manitoba & -0.11 & (0.03) & -1.51 & (0.01) & -0.39 & (0.01) & 0.25 & (0.01) & 1.23 & (0.04) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & -0.14 & (0.03) & -1.49 & (0.01) & -0.39 & (0.01) & 0.23 & (0.01) & 1.10 & (0.03) \\
\hline Alberta & -0.17 & (0.03) & -1.50 & (0.01) & -0.47 & (0.01) & 0.18 & (0.01) & 1.09 & (0.04) \\
\hline British Columbia & -0.15 & (0.02) & -1.46 & (0.02) & -0.42 & (0.01) & 0.20 & (0.01) & 1.07 & (0.04) \\
\hline Canada & -0.22 & (0.01) & -1.54 & (0.00) & -0.49 & (0.00) & 0.15 & (0.00) & 1.02 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.27 & (0.00) & -0.25 & (0.00) & 0.31 & (0.00) & 1.20 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 538 & (4.4) & 533 & (4.9) & 531 & (4.8) & 503 & (5.7) & -14.4 & (2.5) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 519 & (5.0) & 524 & (5.0) & 516 & (5.0) & 479 & (5.1) & -13.9 & (2.5) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 525 & (4.5) & 532 & (4.7) & 521 & (5.8) & 506 & (6.2) & -9.6 & (2.8) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 510 & (4.7) & 515 & (4.1) & 512 & (4.8) & 491 & (4.6) & -7.5 & (2.3) \\
\hline Quebec & 537 & (5.5) & 547 & (4.8) & 535 & (5.1) & 513 & (4.2) & -10.4 & (2.0) \\
\hline Ontario & 542 & (4.9) & 547 & (5.8) & 551 & (5.3) & 524 & (6.1) & -6.1 & (1.9) \\
\hline Manitoba & 532 & (5.2) & 537 & (5.3) & 536 & (5.6) & 498 & (6.9) & -12.9 & (2.7) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 521 & (4.9) & 525 & (5.3) & 527 & (5.8) & 496 & (8.5) & -8.8 & (3.3) \\
\hline Alberta & 551 & (4.9) & 555 & (5.5) & 557 & (4.7) & 540 & (6.2) & -6.1 & (2.5) \\
\hline British Columbia & 553 & (6.5) & 545 & (6.0) & 538 & (5.3) & 521 & (6.9) & -13.6 & (2.8) \\
\hline Canada & 540 & (2.5) & 545 & (2.6) & 542 & (2.2) & 520 & (2.8) & -8.6 & (1.0) \\
\hline OECD average & 517 & (0.7) & 515 & (0.6) & 503 & (0.7) & 472 & (0.8) & -17.8 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4. 15}

Index of responsibility for sustainable development, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of responsibility for sustainable development} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & -0.22 & (0.03) & -1.18 & (0.02) & -0.54 & (0.01) & -0.10 & (0.01) & 0.95 & (0.04) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & -0.20 & (0.02) & -1.30 & (0.02) & -0.55 & (0.01) & -0.07 & (0.01) & 1.12 & (0.04) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & -0.30 & (0.03) & -1.38 & (0.03) & -0.63 & (0.01) & -0.18 & (0.01) & 0.98 & (0.04) \\
\hline New Brunswick & -0.13 & (0.02) & -1.24 & (0.03) & -0.50 & (0.00) & 0.02 & (0.01) & 1.19 & (0.03) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.45 & (0.03) & -0.84 & (0.02) & 0.01 & (0.01) & 0.73 & (0.01) & 1.90 & (0.02) \\
\hline Ontario & -0.05 & (0.03) & -1.14 & (0.02) & -0.48 & (0.01) & 0.09 & (0.01) & 1.32 & (0.03) \\
\hline Manitoba & -0.20 & (0.02) & -1.22 & (0.03) & -0.51 & (0.01) & -0.08 & (0.01) & 1.02 & (0.03) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & -0.32 & (0.03) & -1.30 & (0.02) & -0.61 & (0.01) & -0.21 & (0.01) & 0.83 & (0.04) \\
\hline Alberta & -0.16 & (0.02) & -1.20 & (0.02) & -0.51 & (0.00) & -0.03 & (0.01) & 1.11 & (0.03) \\
\hline British Columbia & -0.14 & (0.03) & -1.21 & (0.03) & -0.53 & (0.01) & 0.01 & (0.01) & 1.18 & (0.03) \\
\hline Canada & 0.02 & (0.02) & -1.13 & (0.01) & -0.42 & (0.00) & 0.20 & (0.01) & 1.42 & (0.02) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.10 & (0.00) & -0.36 & (0.00) & 0.20 & (0.00) & 1.25 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this inclex
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{unit of this index} \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 489 & (4.9) & 510 & (5.6) & 536 & (5.2) & 571 & (4.9) & 34.9 & (3.0) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 473 & (4.8) & 486 & (4.8) & 528 & (5.8) & 553 & (5.4) & 29.5 & (3.1) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 490 & (5.0) & 508 & (5.6) & 524 & (5.1) & 562 & (4.3) & 27.9 & (2.6) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 474 & (4.4) & 490 & (3.9) & 520 & (4.3) & 544 & (5.2) & 27.0 & (2.5) \\
\hline Quebec & 490 & (4.9) & 524 & (4.9) & 550 & (4.8) & 566 & (4.9) & 27.0 & (2.0) \\
\hline Ontario & 514 & (5.7) & 528 & (5.4) & 549 & (5.9) & 572 & (5.1) & 21.6 & (2.2) \\
\hline Manitoba & 501 & (5.3) & 506 & (5.6) & 537 & (5.1) & 561 & (5.0) & 24.9 & (2.3) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 489 & (6.2) & 503 & (5.1) & 527 & (5.1) & 551 & (5.7) & 28.9 & (2.8) \\
\hline Alberta & 525 & (6.0) & 525 & (4.3) & 563 & (5.6) & 590 & (4.9) & 27.7 & (2.2) \\
\hline British Columbia & 504 & (6.3) & 521 & (5.9) & 551 & (5.2) & 581 & (4.7) & 30.7 & (2.7) \\
\hline Canada & 508 & (2.2) & 519 & (2.3) & 549 & (2.9) & 570 & (2.6) & 23.8 & (1.1) \\
\hline OECD average & 466 & (0.7) & 493 & (0.7) & 514 & (0.7) & 534 & (0.7) & 26.5 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4. 16}

\section*{Percentage of students taking various science courses}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{} & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{All students} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{General science course} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Biology course} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Compulsory} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Optional} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Compulsory} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Optional} \\
\hline & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 83.7 & (1.0) & 33.3 & (1.2) & 24.1 & (1.3) & 23.6 & (1.2) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 67.9 & (1.1) & 18.3 & (1.0) & 24.4 & (1.1) & 12.8 & (0.7) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 82.1 & (1.3) & 34.6 & (1.3) & 26.6 & (1.4) & 25.0 & (1.0) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 81.4 & (0.8) & 19.6 & (1.0) & 27.7 & (0.9) & 16.3 & (0.9) \\
\hline Quebec & 68.8 & (1.0) & 12.8 & (0.8) & 32.8 & (1.1) & 10.4 & (1.0) \\
\hline Ontario & 82.6 & (1.4) & 15.0 & (1.0) & 23.1 & (1.3) & 9.2 & (0.6) \\
\hline Manitoba & 85.1 & (0.9) & 16.1 & (1.0) & 25.0 & (0.9) & 10.0 & (0.8) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 79.7 & (1.1) & 24.1 & (1.1) & 17.6 & (1.3) & 12.7 & (1.1) \\
\hline Alberta & 84.3 & (1.2) & 19.7 & (0.9) & 40.9 & (2.0) & 13.9 & (0.9) \\
\hline British Columbia & 80.1 & (1.2) & 17.6 & (1.0) & 34.7 & (1.8) & 10.0 & (0.8) \\
\hline Canada & 79.1 & (0.6) & 16.6 & (0.5) & 28.8 & (0.6) & 11.0 & (0.4) \\
\hline OECD average & 62.0 & (0.2) & 20.9 & (0.2) & 54.9 & (0.3) & 14.8 & (0.2) \\
\hline & \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{All students} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Physics course} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Chemistry course} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Compulsory} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Optional} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Compulsory} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Optional} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{percentage \(\begin{array}{r}\text { standard } \\ \text { error }\end{array}\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{percentage \(\begin{array}{r}\text { standard } \\ \text { error }\end{array}\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{percentage \(\begin{array}{r}\text { standard } \\ \text { error }\end{array}\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{percentage \(\begin{array}{r}\text { standard } \\ \text { error }\end{array}\)} \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 22.7 & (1.3) & 11.0 & (1.1) & 24.2 & (1.4) & 14.6 & (1.1) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 26.5 & (1.0) & 11.5 & (0.7) & 30.8 & (1.1) & 14.2 & (0.8) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 18.6 & (1.5) & 7.6 & (0.7) & 21.4 & (1.5) & 10.6 & (1.0) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 27.2 & (1.0) & 8.1 & (0.7) & 31.2 & (0.9) & 14.3 & (0.8) \\
\hline Quebec & 40.7 & (1.2) & 7.1 & (0.5) & 10.6 & (0.8) & 3.1 & (0.3) \\
\hline Ontario & 24.2 & (1.2) & 6.5 & (0.5) & 25.4 & (1.3) & 7.8 & (0.8) \\
\hline Manitoba & 27.8 & (1.1) & 7.7 & (0.7) & 31.5 & (1.2) & 9.8 & (0.7) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 14.8 & (1.3) & 8.4 & (0.7) & 19.1 & (1.7) & 9.2 & (0.8) \\
\hline Alberta & 38.6 & (1.7) & 10.2 & (0.7) & 41.2 & (1.6) & 11.9 & (0.8) \\
\hline British Columbia & 34.6 & (1.8) & 8.8 & (0.6) & 36.4 & (1.7) & 9.1 & (0.8) \\
\hline Canada & 30.6 & (0.6) & 7.6 & (0.3) & 25.0 & (0.6) & 7.8 & (0.4) \\
\hline OECD average & 59.9 & (0.2) & 14.9 & (0.1) & 58.1 & (0.2) & 14.7 & (0.1) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.17}

Percentage of students and performance on the science scale, by time spent on learning


Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.18}

Index of science teaching: Interaction, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of science teaching: Interaction} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.37 & (0.03) & -0.82 & (0.03) & 0.10 & (0.01) & 0.61 & (0.01) & 1.58 & (0.03) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.29 & (0.03) & -0.92 & (0.03) & 0.05 & (0.01) & 0.55 & (0.01) & 1.50 & (0.03) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.20 & (0.03) & -1.04 & (0.03) & -0.04 & (0.01) & 0.51 & (0.01) & 1.39 & (0.02) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.23 & (0.03) & -0.96 & (0.04) & 0.01 & (0.01) & 0.50 & (0.01) & 1.38 & (0.03) \\
\hline Quebec & -0.07 & (0.03) & -1.36 & (0.03) & -0.31 & (0.01) & 0.27 & (0.01) & 1.13 & (0.03) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.26 & (0.04) & -0.92 & (0.05) & 0.02 & (0.01) & 0.52 & (0.01) & 1.40 & (0.03) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.22 & (0.03) & -1.09 & (0.04) & -0.03 & (0.01) & 0.53 & (0.01) & 1.47 & (0.03) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.24 & (0.04) & -0.98 & (0.03) & -0.01 & (0.01) & 0.50 & (0.01) & 1.44 & (0.03) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.35 & (0.03) & -0.85 & (0.03) & 0.10 & (0.01) & 0.63 & (0.01) & 1.53 & (0.04) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.17 & (0.04) & -1.07 & (0.04) & -0.07 & (0.01) & 0.45 & (0.01) & 1.36 & (0.03) \\
\hline Canada & 0.17 & (0.02) & -1.07 & (0.02) & -0.07 & (0.00) & 0.47 & (0.00) & 1.36 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.16 & (0.00) & -0.24 & (0.00) & 0.29 & (0.00) & 1.13 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 523 & (5.4) & 525 & (5.6) & 527 & (6.4) & 536 & (4.8) & 4.7 & (2.6) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 518 & (6.7) & 508 & (5.2) & 494 & (6.5) & 514 & (6.0) & -3.1 & (3.4) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 524 & (5.5) & 527 & (6.0) & 511 & (5.7) & 526 & (6.3) & 0.3 & (3.5) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 509 & (5.0) & 504 & (4.8) & 505 & (4.5) & 503 & (4.7) & -2.0 & (2.9) \\
\hline Quebec & 547 & (5.1) & 542 & (5.6) & 538 & (5.8) & 530 & (6.8) & -5.3 & (2.6) \\
\hline Ontario & 545 & (6.2) & 537 & (6.5) & 545 & (5.9) & 543 & (5.5) & -2.2 & (2.7) \\
\hline Manitoba & 540 & (6.7) & 524 & (6.9) & 524 & (5.4) & 516 & (5.9) & -7.9 & (3.2) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 524 & (5.7) & 514 & (6.4) & 515 & (6.1) & 517 & (7.6) & -2.1 & (3.7) \\
\hline Alberta & 553 & (5.3) & 552 & (6.1) & 547 & (6.9) & 562 & (6.0) & 4.3 & (2.6) \\
\hline British Columbia & 552 & (7.0) & 540 & (6.2) & 534 & (6.9) & 539 & (6.3) & -7.0 & (2.5) \\
\hline Canada & 545 & (3.0) & 536 & (2.7) & 537 & (2.9) & 539 & (2.9) & -2.7 & (1.3) \\
\hline OECD average & 513 & (0.7) & 507 & (0.7) & 501 & (0.7) & 492 & (0.8) & -8.5 & (0.4) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4. 19}

Index of science teaching: Hands-on activities, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of science teaching: Hands-on activities} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.14 & (0.03) & -0.91 & (0.03) & -0.07 & (0.01) & 0.36 & (0.01) & 1.17 & (0.03) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.26 & (0.03) & -0.89 & (0.03) & 0.02 & (0.01) & 0.52 & (0.01) & 1.41 & (0.04) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.29 & (0.03) & -0.81 & (0.04) & 0.05 & (0.01) & 0.57 & (0.01) & 1.37 & (0.03) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.29 & (0.02) & -0.76 & (0.03) & 0.04 & (0.01) & 0.54 & (0.01) & 1.34 & (0.03) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.46 & (0.02) & -0.52 & (0.03) & 0.23 & (0.01) & 0.70 & (0.01) & 1.43 & (0.03) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.53 & (0.03) & -0.40 & (0.03) & 0.30 & (0.01) & 0.73 & (0.01) & 1.49 & (0.03) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.36 & (0.04) & -0.76 & (0.05) & 0.12 & (0.01) & 0.61 & (0.01) & 1.45 & (0.04) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.45 & (0.03) & -0.55 & (0.03) & 0.18 & (0.01) & 0.69 & (0.01) & 1.47 & (0.03) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.47 & (0.03) & -0.60 & (0.03) & 0.26 & (0.01) & 0.73 & (0.01) & 1.46 & (0.03) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.44 & (0.03) & -0.54 & (0.03) & 0.23 & (0.01) & 0.66 & (0.01) & 1.42 & (0.04) \\
\hline Canada & 0.46 & (0.01) & -0.53 & (0.01) & 0.24 & (0.00) & 0.69 & (0.00) & 1.45 & (0.02) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.01 & (0.00) & -1.16 & (0.00) & -0.23 & (0.00) & 0.31 & (0.00) & 1.11 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 524 & (5.8) & 529 & (5.4) & 546 & (4.8) & 513 & (5.0) & -4.7 & (2.9) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 521 & (6.4) & 525 & (5.7) & 502 & (5.8) & 486 & (6.0) & -13.8 & (3.5) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 515 & (5.3) & 531 & (4.3) & 529 & (5.7) & 513 & (6.4) & -1.2 & (3.7) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 503 & (5.6) & 514 & (4.8) & 507 & (4.3) & 498 & (5.1) & -5.4 & (3.0) \\
\hline Quebec & 532 & (5.8) & 541 & (5.0) & 548 & (6.2) & 537 & (7.2) & 6.5 & (4.1) \\
\hline Ontario & 536 & (7.0) & 552 & (6.5) & 550 & (5.7) & 532 & (6.5) & -4.3 & (3.8) \\
\hline Manitoba & 544 & (8.3) & 532 & (5.7) & 526 & (5.8) & 503 & (6.6) & -15.0 & (3.9) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 501 & (7.7) & 525 & (6.1) & 535 & (5.0) & 508 & (9.1) & 4.0 & (5.2) \\
\hline Alberta & 548 & (5.0) & 559 & (6.2) & 559 & (5.5) & 547 & (6.5) & -0.4 & (2.6) \\
\hline British Columbia & 554 & (7.9) & 538 & (6.0) & 541 & (6.0) & 531 & (7.5) & -9.3 & (4.3) \\
\hline Canada & 537 & (3.1) & 541 & (3.3) & 548 & (3.1) & 532 & (3.3) & -1.3 & (1.9) \\
\hline OECD average & 499 & (0.8) & 510 & (0.7) & 510 & (0.7) & 495 & (0.8) & -1.1 & (0.4) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.20}

Index of science teaching: Student investigations, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of science teaching: Student investigations} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.11 & (0.03) & -1.18 & (0.01) & -0.17 & (0.01) & 0.47 & (0.01) & 1.31 & (0.03) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.25 & (0.03) & -1.11 & (0.02) & -0.08 & (0.02) & 0.63 & (0.01) & 1.58 & (0.04) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.19 & (0.04) & -1.11 & (0.02) & -0.13 & (0.01) & 0.59 & (0.01) & 1.43 & (0.03) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.24 & (0.02) & -0.99 & (0.02) & -0.08 & (0.01) & 0.58 & (0.01) & 1.43 & (0.03) \\
\hline Quebec & -0.02 & (0.03) & -1.26 & (0.00) & -0.44 & (0.02) & 0.32 & (0.01) & 1.30 & (0.02) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.21 & (0.04) & -1.04 & (0.02) & -0.09 & (0.02) & 0.56 & (0.01) & 1.43 & (0.03) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.17 & (0.03) & -1.21 & (0.01) & -0.17 & (0.02) & 0.58 & (0.01) & 1.48 & (0.03) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.21 & (0.04) & -1.07 & (0.02) & -0.10 & (0.02) & 0.57 & (0.01) & 1.46 & (0.03) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.16 & (0.04) & -1.15 & (0.02) & -0.14 & (0.01) & 0.52 & (0.01) & 1.43 & (0.03) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.06 & (0.03) & -1.26 & (0.00) & -0.26 & (0.01) & 0.41 & (0.01) & 1.36 & (0.03) \\
\hline Canada & 0.13 & (0.02) & -1.18 & (0.01) & -0.18 & (0.01) & 0.48 & (0.01) & 1.39 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.15 & (0.00) & -0.40 & (0.00) & 0.32 & (0.00) & 1.23 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this inclex
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{unit of this index} \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 552 & (5.0) & 544 & (6.1) & 520 & (4.9) & 496 & (5.5) & -23.1 & (2.6) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 549 & (5.2) & 526 & (5.8) & 497 & (5.7) & 464 & (5.2) & -31.0 & (2.5) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 549 & (4.6) & 536 & (4.6) & 518 & (6.1) & 487 & (6.3) & -23.6 & (2.9) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 531 & (5.8) & 517 & (4.8) & 506 & (4.4) & 467 & (4.7) & -26.2 & (2.8) \\
\hline Quebec & 567 & (4.4) & 554 & (5.1) & 534 & (5.1) & 504 & (7.2) & -24.0 & (2.7) \\
\hline Ontario & 570 & (4.7) & 559 & (4.6) & 534 & (6.3) & 507 & (5.6) & -26.7 & (2.6) \\
\hline Manitoba & 562 & (6.5) & 541 & (5.5) & 526 & (5.7) & 476 & (6.1) & -31.6 & (2.6) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 535 & (5.6) & 526 & (6.8) & 528 & (5.3) & 482 & (6.4) & -19.6 & (2.8) \\
\hline Alberta & 577 & (5.2) & 560 & (5.8) & 553 & (5.5) & 524 & (6.0) & -18.8 & (2.4) \\
\hline British Columbia & 580 & (5.9) & 553 & (5.4) & 532 & (6.3) & 501 & (7.8) & -28.8 & (2.4) \\
\hline Canada & 568 & (2.3) & 552 & (2.6) & 536 & (3.0) & 503 & (3.2) & -25.1 & (1.2) \\
\hline OECD average & 526 & (0.7) & 517 & (0.7) & 502 & (0.7) & 469 & (0.9) & -23.9 & (0.4) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.21}

Index of science teaching: Focus on models or application, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of science teaching: Focus on models or application} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.35 & (0.04) & -0.86 & (0.03) & 0.06 & (0.01) & 0.63 & (0.01) & 1.57 & (0.03) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.32 & (0.03) & -0.91 & (0.04) & 0.01 & (0.01) & 0.59 & (0.01) & 1.58 & (0.04) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.31 & (0.03) & -0.92 & (0.03) & 0.01 & (0.01) & 0.60 & (0.01) & 1.56 & (0.03) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.37 & (0.03) & -0.86 & (0.04) & 0.09 & (0.01) & 0.65 & (0.01) & 1.62 & (0.03) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.37 & (0.03) & -0.92 & (0.03) & 0.09 & (0.01) & 0.67 & (0.01) & 1.65 & (0.02) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.40 & (0.04) & -0.85 & (0.04) & 0.14 & (0.01) & 0.69 & (0.01) & 1.63 & (0.04) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.40 & (0.03) & -0.88 & (0.03) & 0.11 & (0.01) & 0.66 & (0.01) & 1.70 & (0.04) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.31 & (0.04) & -0.91 & (0.03) & 0.01 & (0.01) & 0.60 & (0.01) & 1.56 & (0.03) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.45 & (0.03) & -0.84 & (0.03) & 0.18 & (0.01) & 0.75 & (0.01) & 1.72 & (0.04) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.39 & (0.03) & -0.75 & (0.03) & 0.06 & (0.01) & 0.64 & (0.01) & 1.62 & (0.03) \\
\hline Canada & 0.39 & (0.02) & -0.86 & (0.02) & 0.11 & (0.00) & 0.67 & (0.00) & 1.64 & (0.02) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.01 & (0.00) & -1.20 & (0.00) & -0.27 & (0.00) & 0.30 & (0.00) & 1.19 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{unit of this index} \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { mean } \\
& \text { score }
\end{aligned}
\] & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 508 & (4.8) & 529 & (5.5) & 534 & (5.6) & 540 & (4.9) & 12.0 & (2.5) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 502 & (6.1) & 510 & (5.9) & 511 & (5.8) & 512 & (6.5) & 5.5 & (3.3) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 519 & (5.8) & 516 & (5.4) & 527 & (5.7) & 527 & (6.5) & 4.3 & (3.3) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 494 & (5.3) & 505 & (4.8) & 510 & (4.1) & 512 & (4.8) & 7.3 & (2.7) \\
\hline Quebec & 519 & (5.2) & 542 & (5.5) & 543 & (6.2) & 555 & (6.3) & 13.5 & (2.5) \\
\hline Ontario & 534 & (6.9) & 541 & (5.3) & 543 & (5.9) & 552 & (6.1) & 3.7 & (2.7) \\
\hline Manitoba & 521 & (5.7) & 529 & (7.8) & 522 & (5.9) & 534 & (5.9) & 4.3 & (2.9) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 507 & (6.1) & 514 & (8.0) & 529 & (5.4) & 521 & (8.1) & 6.4 & (3.5) \\
\hline Alberta & 542 & (5.1) & 548 & (6.9) & 553 & (5.8) & 571 & (6.2) & 11.6 & (2.5) \\
\hline British Columbia & 536 & (7.5) & 544 & (6.3) & 543 & (6.1) & 544 & (6.6) & 1.6 & (2.9) \\
\hline Canada & 527 & (3.0) & 539 & (2.9) & 543 & (2.9) & 549 & (3.2) & 7.5 & (1.3) \\
\hline OECD average & 494 & (0.7) & 507 & (0.7) & 508 & (0.7) & 505 & (0.8) & 5.1 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{11}{|c|}{Table B.4.22} \\
\hline \multicolumn{11}{|c|}{Percentage of students participating in school activities to promote the learning of science} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Percentage of students whose principals report the following school activities to promote the learning of science} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Science clubs} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Science fairs} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Science competitions} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Extracurricular science projects} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Excursions and field trips} \\
\hline & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error & percentage & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 31.2 & (3.00) & 76.1 & (1.60) & 76.5 & (2.90) & 73.6 & (2.40) & 97.6 & (1.40) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 27.6 & (0.40) & 95.7 & (0.20) & 70.7 & (0.40) & 64.9 & (0.40) & 94.3 & (0.20) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 42.3 & (1.90) & 68.1 & (1.60) & 60.4 & (2.70) & 59.8 & (2.80) & 97.9 & (0.20) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 32.8 & (1.10) & 74.5 & (0.90) & 63.1 & (1.20) & 69.6 & (1.60) & 88.0 & (0.40) \\
\hline Quebec & 45.4 & (4.60) & 68.5 & (4.10) & 58.2 & (4.60) & 65.2 & (4.00) & 84.8 & (3.30) \\
\hline Ontario & 59.0 & (5.30) & 46.2 & (5.30) & 70.9 & (4.90) & 65.7 & (4.80) & 99.6 & (0.00) \\
\hline Manitoba & 42.7 & (2.90) & 39.6 & (2.70) & 49.7 & (2.90) & 66.3 & (2.80) & 94.3 & (0.40) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 24.2 & (2.50) & 57.8 & (4.40) & 43.4 & (3.80) & 43.7 & (4.50) & 84.1 & (2.90) \\
\hline Alberta & 42.5 & (4.80) & 49.3 & (5.70) & 55.6 & (4.80) & 65.4 & (4.80) & 93.6 & (2.70) \\
\hline British Columbia & 36.5 & (6.00) & 59.6 & (6.50) & 70.6 & (5.90) & 60.0 & (5.50) & 98.5 & (1.60) \\
\hline Canada & 47.9 & (2.40) & 55.3 & (2.50) & 64.5 & (2.20) & 64.1 & (2.30) & 94.6 & (0.80) \\
\hline OECD average & 38.4 & (0.51) & 39.2 & (0.59) & 54.1 & (0.54) & 45.1 & (0.61) & 89.3 & (0.38) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on reports from school principals and reported proportionate to the number of 15 -year-olds enrolled in the school.

\section*{Table B.4.23}

Index of school preparation for science-related careers, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of school preparation for science-related careers} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error & mean index & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.40 & (0.03) & -0.67 & (0.03) & 0.05 & (0.00) & 0.52 & (0.02) & 1.70 & (0.02) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.30 & (0.02) & -0.81 & (0.03) & 0.05 & (0.00) & 0.34 & (0.02) & 1.61 & (0.02) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.29 & (0.03) & -0.89 & (0.02) & 0.03 & (0.01) & 0.43 & (0.02) & 1.61 & (0.02) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.34 & (0.02) & -0.82 & (0.03) & 0.05 & (0.00) & 0.49 & (0.01) & 1.65 & (0.02) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.24 & (0.03) & -1.02 & (0.03) & -0.05 & (0.01) & 0.48 & (0.01) & 1.58 & (0.02) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.35 & (0.03) & -0.80 & (0.02) & 0.05 & (0.00) & 0.48 & (0.02) & 1.67 & (0.02) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.39 & (0.02) & -0.73 & (0.03) & 0.05 & (0.00) & 0.53 & (0.02) & 1.71 & (0.02) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.31 & (0.03) & -0.79 & (0.03) & 0.05 & (0.00) & 0.42 & (0.02) & 1.58 & (0.02) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.42 & (0.03) & -0.71 & (0.03) & 0.05 & (0.00) & 0.60 & (0.02) & 1.76 & (0.01) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.31 & (0.03) & -0.79 & (0.03) & 0.05 & (0.00) & 0.43 & (0.02) & 1.54 & (0.02) \\
\hline Canada & 0.33 & (0.01) & -0.86 & (0.01) & 0.04 & (0.00) & 0.48 & (0.01) & 1.64 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.19 & (0.00) & -0.30 & (0.00) & 0.21 & (0.00) & 1.28 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index
Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
score
\end{tabular} & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 495 & (5.7) & 513 & (4.8) & 534 & (5.6) & 563 & (4.6) & 29.5 & (2.8) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 480 & (4.8) & 507 & (5.8) & 514 & (5.4) & 538 & (4.8) & 24.1 & (2.5) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 494 & (4.7) & 510 & (4.1) & 528 & (4.8) & 553 & (5.6) & 24.5 & (3.0) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 474 & (4.3) & 502 & (4.2) & 513 & (3.7) & 537 & (3.8) & 24.5 & (2.0) \\
\hline Quebec & 505 & (4.4) & 527 & (5.6) & 538 & (5.1) & 563 & (5.3) & 23.4 & (2.0) \\
\hline Ontario & 513 & (5.4) & 537 & (4.9) & 544 & (6.0) & 569 & (5.6) & 21.8 & (2.6) \\
\hline Manitoba & 498 & (6.3) & 522 & (5.5) & 531 & (5.3) & 553 & (4.5) & 24.2 & (2.9) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 490 & (5.0) & 520 & (5.0) & 515 & (5.6) & 544 & (7.3) & 23.0 & (3.3) \\
\hline Alberta & 520 & (5.3) & 540 & (4.3) & 558 & (6.5) & 585 & (5.4) & 26.7 & (2.4) \\
\hline British Columbia & 512 & (7.4) & 531 & (5.6) & 550 & (4.6) & 564 & (5.8) & 23.1 & (2.5) \\
\hline Canada & 508 & (2.6) & 530 & (2.3) & 543 & (2.7) & 566 & (2.8) & 23.5 & (1.3) \\
\hline OECD average & 487 & (0.7) & 499 & (0.7) & 505 & (0.7) & 518 & (0.8) & 13.2 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.

\section*{Table B.4.24}

Index of student information on science-related careers, by national and provincial quarters of the index
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{Index of student information on science-related careers} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{All students} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Top quarter} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error & \begin{tabular}{l}
mean \\
index
\end{tabular} & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 0.34 & (0.03) & -0.88 & (0.04) & 0.07 & (0.01) & 0.67 & (0.01) & 1.52 & (0.03) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 0.42 & (0.02) & -0.84 & (0.03) & 0.14 & (0.01) & 0.76 & (0.01) & 1.61 & (0.02) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 0.35 & (0.03) & -0.94 & (0.03) & 0.07 & (0.01) & 0.73 & (0.01) & 1.56 & (0.02) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 0.32 & (0.02) & -1.00 & (0.03) & 0.05 & (0.01) & 0.68 & (0.01) & 1.56 & (0.02) \\
\hline Quebec & 0.07 & (0.02) & -1.20 & (0.03) & -0.23 & (0.01) & 0.44 & (0.01) & 1.30 & (0.02) \\
\hline Ontario & 0.39 & (0.03) & -0.90 & (0.03) & 0.09 & (0.01) & 0.71 & (0.01) & 1.66 & (0.02) \\
\hline Manitoba & 0.22 & (0.03) & -1.11 & (0.03) & -0.10 & (0.01) & 0.62 & (0.01) & 1.46 & (0.03) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 0.14 & (0.03) & -1.08 & (0.03) & -0.16 & (0.01) & 0.49 & (0.01) & 1.30 & (0.02) \\
\hline Alberta & 0.36 & (0.03) & -0.92 & (0.02) & 0.04 & (0.01) & 0.70 & (0.01) & 1.60 & (0.03) \\
\hline British Columbia & 0.28 & (0.03) & -1.06 & (0.03) & -0.02 & (0.01) & 0.67 & (0.01) & 1.55 & (0.02) \\
\hline Canada & 0.28 & (0.01) & -1.03 & (0.01) & -0.03 & (0.00) & 0.65 & (0.00) & 1.53 & (0.01) \\
\hline OECD average & 0.00 & (0.00) & -1.22 & (0.00) & -0.28 & (0.00) & 0.31 & (0.00) & 1.18 & (0.00) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Performance on the science scale,
by national and provincial quarters of this index Change in the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{science score per unit of this index}} \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bottom quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Second quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Third quarter} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Top quarter} & & \\
\hline & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & mean score & standard error & effect & standard error \\
\hline Newfoundland and Labrador & 521 & (5.1) & 529 & (4.6) & 524 & (5.3) & 532 & (5.7) & 3.8 & (3.2) \\
\hline Prince Edward Island & 503 & (5.3) & 516 & (5.8) & 499 & (4.9) & 523 & (5.6) & 4.0 & (2.8) \\
\hline Nova Scotia & 516 & (4.2) & 527 & (5.0) & 515 & (5.4) & 528 & (4.9) & 2.7 & (2.1) \\
\hline New Brunswick & 495 & (3.8) & 510 & (4.4) & 504 & (4.1) & 517 & (4.3) & 7.5 & (1.8) \\
\hline Quebec & 514 & (4.7) & 531 & (4.2) & 542 & (4.7) & 544 & (5.8) & 11.9 & (2.2) \\
\hline Ontario & 536 & (6.1) & 542 & (5.3) & 536 & (5.7) & 549 & (5.3) & 4.7 & (2.3) \\
\hline Manitoba & 515 & (5.9) & 539 & (6.0) & 532 & (4.8) & 519 & (4.7) & 3.5 & (2.6) \\
\hline Saskatchewan & 510 & (4.6) & 522 & (4.4) & 516 & (5.2) & 520 & (7.9) & 3.8 & (3.4) \\
\hline Alberta & 544 & (5.3) & 555 & (4.4) & 547 & (4.6) & 558 & (7.4) & 5.6 & (2.4) \\
\hline British Columbia & 524 & (6.5) & 546 & (5.4) & 542 & (6.1) & 544 & (6.2) & 6.5 & (2.1) \\
\hline Canada & 524 & (2.7) & 542 & (2.0) & 537 & (2.7) & 544 & (2.8) & 7.1 & (1.0) \\
\hline OECD average & 493 & (0.7) & 505 & (0.7) & 506 & (0.7) & 505 & (0.8) & 5.6 & (0.3) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Results based on students' self-reports.```


[^0]:    * Statistically significant differences.

    1. This difference may be slightly different from that obtained by subtracting the averages due to rounding.
[^1]:    * Statistically significant differences.

    1. This difference may be slightly different from that obtained by subtracting the averages due to rounding.
[^2]:    * Statistically significant differences compared to PISA 2000.

    Note: The linkage error is incorporated into the standard error for 2003 and 2006.

