



## CHAPTER 6:

# School contexts for civic and citizenship education

### Chapter highlights

Students and teachers were actively participating in school life.

- In most of the ICCS 2016 participating countries, students had participated in classroom and school elections. ([Table 6.1](#))
- The opportunities students had to actively participate in decisions about their respective schools differed across countries. ([Table 6.2](#))
- Teachers were actively involved in decision-making processes. ([Table 6.2](#))
- Although parents were involved in discussion about students' learning achievement, their broader involvement in decision-making processes was not substantial. ([Table 6.2](#))

Schools were paying attention to social interactions.

- Students in the participating countries were positive about classroom climates that are open. ([Table 6.3](#))
- Students' interest in social and political issues, their expected level of education, and their civic knowledge were positively associated with this perception. ([Table 6.4](#))
- Verbal bullying was taking place in most of the participating countries, but principals and teachers had adopted initiatives to counter various forms of bullying at school. ([Tables 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, 6.11](#))

Schools were interacting with the local community when developing civic-related activities.

- Target-grade students had opportunity to participate in civic-related activities that their schools carried out in the local community. ([Tables 6.12, 6.13](#))

Schools had developed activities related to environmental sustainability.

- Most of the schools in the participating countries had developed at least some initiatives related to environmental sustainability, such as differential waste collection, recycling and waste reduction, and energy saving. ([Table 6.14](#))
- According to teachers, the target-grade students were participating in activities pertaining to the environment mainly inside their schools. ([Table 6.15](#))

Countries differed in relation to civic learning processes and activities at school and in relation to teachers' preparedness for teaching civic-related topics.

- Students' civic learning at school was positively associated with students' interest in social and political issues, the level of education they expected to attain, and their civic knowledge. ([Tables 6.16, 6.17](#))
- Civic and citizenship teaching and learning activities in classrooms varied considerably across countries. ([Table 6.18](#))
- Teachers of subjects related to civic and citizenship education felt prepared to teach a variety of topics and skills. ([Table 6.19](#))

## Conceptual background and prior research

The ICCS 2016 assessment framework (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, & Agrusti, 2016) identified several contexts that have the potential to influence not only students' learning outcomes in the field of civic and citizenship education but also their civic engagement. These contexts include the wider community, the school and classroom, the home and peer environment, and characteristics of individual students.

In this chapter, we explore aspects of the ICCS 2016 school and classroom contexts and their association with the participating students' learning experience. The chapter addresses ICCS 2016 Research Question 5: *How are schools in the participating countries organized with regard to civic and citizenship education and what is its association with students' learning outcomes?* In particular, the chapter focuses on the following specific research questions:

- To what extent do schools in participating countries have participatory processes in place that facilitate civic engagement?
- To what extent do schools and communities interact to foster students' civic engagement and learning?

Some aspects related to this general research question were discussed in Chapter 2 of this report. It provided information about contexts for civic and citizenship education at the national level. Examples of these aspects include the ICCS countries' general approaches to civic and citizenship education, curriculum, and/or program content structure and delivery, and schools' and teachers' perceptions of the role of civic and citizenship education. The results presented in this sixth chapter of the ICCS 2016 international report draw on data from the school, teacher, and student questionnaires.

In keeping with ICCS 2009, ICCS 2016 considered students' civic learning outcomes as the result of not only teaching and learning processes but also of students' more general experiences in their schools. What students experience daily at school is deemed of particular relevance for the development of their attitudes and dispositions. As the authors of the ICCS 2016 assessment framework pointed out, a large number of countries emphasize the non-formal aspects of civic learning that occur through participation and engagement or social interaction at school (see also Ainley, Schulz, and Friedman, 2013; Eurydice, 2005, 2012; Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010). Research also stresses the importance of informal learning at school for students' civic engagement (Scheerens, 2009). Students' participation at the school level, the interpersonal climate of the school and classroom, and the quality of the relationships between students and teachers and among students are also of vital importance (Bäckman & Trafford, 2007; Huddleston, 2007; Trafford, 2003).

## Participatory processes and social interactions at school

The ICCS 2016 school questionnaire included a question on students' participation in class-representative elections and school elections (e.g., for student council/parliament). This question was included in both CIVED and ICCS 2009. In the current study, principals were asked to indicate how many of the target-grade students participate in these elections ("all or nearly all," "most of them," "some of them," "none or hardly any"). The response categories for this question also included a "not applicable" option so that we could take into consideration different school regulations relating to this type of participation in the ICCS 2016 countries.

In almost all countries, the percentages of students in schools where principals reported a high level of participation ("all or nearly all"/"most of them") in elections for class representatives were higher than 80 percent; in several countries, percentages were as high as 95 percent (see [Table 6.1](#)). Only five countries recorded percentages lower than 80 percent—Belgium (Flemish), 73 percent; Bulgaria, 68 percent; Estonia, 76 percent; Italy, 22 percent; and the Netherlands, 46 percent. The results for students' participation in school elections showed a somewhat greater

variation across countries, with 10 countries recording percentages lower than 80 percent: Belgium (Flemish), Bulgaria, Chinese Taipei, Estonia, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, and Sweden.

These findings are relatively consistent with the answers students gave to the question included in the student questionnaire on their participation in civic activities at school. On average, 77 percent of students across countries said they had voted in class or school elections. The national percentages ranged from 50 to 93 percent; four countries recorded percentages of 90 percent or greater, and three countries recorded percentages under 60 percent (see also Chapter 4 of this report).

Students', teachers', and parents' participation in school decision-making processes can be regarded not only as a part of democratic governance processes at school but also as a factor characteristic of schools that have a democratic learning environment (Torrance, 2013). The different strategies and procedures that principals adopt when exercising their role may also have an impact on school climate and culture (Edmonds, 1979; Eurydice, 2013; Ishimaru, 2013; Marzano, 2003; Sammons, Gu, Day, & Ko, 2011; Scheerens, Glas, & Thomas, 2003). Teachers who participate in school governance can contribute to a better understanding of different student learning needs and improve their own commitment to supporting school educational activities (Ranson, Farrell, Peim, & Smith, 2005).

The ICCS 2016 school questionnaire asked principals about the extent to which teachers, parents, and students engaged in various school processes ("to a large extent," "to a moderate extent," "to a small extent," "not at all"). The processes covered in the question were denoted by the following statements: (a) "Teachers are involved in decision-making processes;" (b) "Parents are involved in decision-making processes;" (c) "Students' opinions are taken into account in decision-making processes;" (d) "Rules and regulations are followed by teaching and non-teaching staff, students, and parents;" (e) "Students are given the opportunity to actively participate in school decisions;" and (f) "Parents are provided with information on the school and student performance."

Across countries, the highest national percentages of students in schools where principals reported a high level of engagement of students, teachers, and parents in school processes were registered for parents' involvement in communication processes related to students' performance (84%), respect for school regulations (63%), and teachers' involvement in decision-making processes (61%). The lowest percentages (see [Table 6.2](#)) were observed for parents' involvement in decision-making processes (18%), consideration given to students' opinions during decision-making processes (28%), and students' opportunities to participate in school decisions (30%). Eight countries recorded percentages above the international average for student participation in school decisions. They were Colombia, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Malta, Mexico, and the Russian Federation.

When we looked at the responses for the two positive answer categories combined (i.e., "to a large extent" and "to a moderate extent"), we recorded an international average of 80 percent or above for almost all the question items. We observed slightly lower percentages for parents' and students' involvement in decision-making processes at school. We also noted that variation across countries tended to be greater for these two items than for the other items.

Table 6.1: Percentages of students at schools where principals reported students' participation in school elections

Country	National percentages of students at schools where principals reported that all, nearly all, or most of the students:			
	Elect their class representatives		Vote in school council, school parliament elections	
Belgium (Flemish)	73 (4.1)	▼	55 (4.5)	▼
Bulgaria	68 (3.8)	▼	50 (4.1)	▼
Chile	98 (1.1)	▲	86 (3.1)	▲
Chinese Taipei	92 (2.4)	△	45 (4.2)	▼
Colombia (r)	99 (1.0)	▲	99 (0.9)	▲
Croatia	100 (0.0)	▲	98 (1.1)	▲
Denmark <sup>†</sup>	91 (2.1)	△	92 (2.0)	▲
Dominican Republic	95 (1.9)	△	95 (1.6)	▲
Estonia <sup>1</sup> (s)	76 (4.9)	▽	79 (4.4)	
Finland	98 (1.1)	▲	93 (1.7)	▲
Italy	22 (3.5)	▼	1 (0.7)	▼
Latvia <sup>1</sup>	88 (3.1)		73 (5.0)	
Lithuania	93 (2.1)	△	79 (3.1)	
Malta	85 (0.3)		80 (0.3)	△
Mexico	98 (1.2)	▲	81 (2.7)	△
Netherlands <sup>†</sup> (r)	46 (4.4)	▼	34 (5.2)	▼
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	99 (0.8)	▲	95 (2.0)	▲
Peru	93 (1.5)	△	85 (2.3)	▲
Russian Federation	82 (3.2)		74 (3.6)	
Slovenia	99 (0.8)	▲	81 (3.7)	
Sweden <sup>1</sup>	92 (2.4)	△	78 (3.6)	
<b>ICCS 2016 average</b>	<b>85 (0.6)</b>		<b>74 (0.7)</b>	
<b>Countries not meeting sample participation requirements</b>				
Hong Kong SAR	87 (3.6)		86 (3.6)	
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	100 (0.0)		100 (0.0)	
<b>Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements</b>				
North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) <sup>1</sup> (r)	100 (0.0)		75 (6.3)	

**National percentage:**

- ▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

**Notes:**

( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

<sup>1</sup> National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

<sup>2</sup> Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.

An "(r)" indicates that data are available for at least 70% but less than 85% of students.

An "(s)" indicates that data are available for at least 50% but less than 70% of students.

Table 6.2: Percentages of students at schools where principals reported engagement of the school community

Country	National percentages of students at schools where principals reported that to a large extent:					
	Teachers are involved in decision-making processes	Parents are involved in decision-making processes	Students' opinions are taken into account in decision-making processes	Rules and regulations are followed by teaching and non-teaching staff, students, and parents	Students are given the opportunity to actively participate in school decisions	Parents are provided with information on the school and student performance
Belgium (Flemish)	32 (4.5) ▼	8 (2.1) ▽	8 (2.1) ▼	52 (5.0) ▼	12 (2.6) ▼	62 (4.4) ▼
Bulgaria	86 (3.0) ▲	8 (2.3) ▽	32 (4.3)	80 (3.5) ▲	27 (4.0)	83 (3.2)
Chile	50 (3.7) ▼	10 (2.9) ▽	26 (3.8)	72 (3.4) △	28 (4.0)	84 (3.0)
Chinese Taipei	60 (3.9)	19 (2.7)	18 (3.3) ▽	66 (3.9)	17 (3.0) ▼	75 (3.7) ▽
Colombia (r)	64 (4.4)	23 (3.9)	48 (4.5) ▲	60 (4.5)	46 (4.4) ▲	95 (2.2) ▲
Croatia	79 (3.7) ▲	30 (3.9) ▲	38 (4.2) ▲	56 (3.9) ▽	43 (4.3) ▲	85 (3.2)
Denmark <sup>†</sup>	56 (3.8)	7 (2.0) ▼	20 (3.2) ▽	72 (3.5) △	19 (3.2) ▼	71 (3.8) ▼
Dominican Republic	84 (3.8) ▲	46 (5.0) ▲	65 (4.5) ▲	67 (4.4)	58 (4.4)	96 (2.2) ▲
Estonia <sup>1</sup>	77 (3.7) ▲	28 (5.6)	37 (5.3)	66 (5.4)	49 (5.1) ▲	89 (3.6)
Finland	73 (3.1) ▲	2 (1.1) ▼	9 (2.2) ▼	83 (2.7) ▲	21 (2.9) ▽	78 (3.2)
Italy	39 (3.8) ▼	10 (2.5) ▽	7 (2.1) ▼	29 (3.6) ▼	5 (1.8) ▼	72 (3.8) ▼
Latvia <sup>1</sup>	88 (3.0) ▲	32 (3.8) ▲	51 (4.3) ▲	68 (4.8)	67 (4.5) ▲	97 (1.5) ▲
Lithuania	46 (4.0) ▼	20 (3.1)	24 (3.9)	25 (3.9) ▼	31 (3.6)	82 (3.4)
Malta	66 (0.4) △	8 (0.2) ▽	29 (0.3)	85 (0.4) ▲	33 (0.4) △	83 (0.3)
Mexico	78 (3.3) ▲	39 (4.1) ▲	37 (4.0) △	58 (4.1)	42 (4.1) ▲	94 (1.5) ▲
Netherlands <sup>†</sup>	23 (4.0) ▼	3 (1.7) ▼	6 (2.2) ▼	47 (5.2) ▼	9 (2.8) ▼	88 (3.2)
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	50 (3.8) ▼	8 (2.5) ▽	15 (3.4) ▼	73 (3.7) ▲	14 (3.1) ▼	71 (3.7) ▼
Peru	42 (3.6) ▼	21 (2.9)	35 (3.5) △	48 (3.4) ▼	31 (3.2)	71 (3.0) ▼
Russian Federation	60 (3.6)	31 (3.9) ▲	24 (3.6)	70 (4.2)	43 (3.7) ▲	92 (2.7) △
Slovenia	70 (4.2) △	12 (3.0)	17 (3.8) ▼	79 (3.7) ▲	21 (3.9) ▽	98 (1.0) ▲
Sweden <sup>1</sup>	63 (5.1)	2 (1.9) ▼	35 (4.1)	68 (5.9)	21 (3.9) ▽	90 (2.8) △
ICCS 2016 average	61 (0.8)	18 (0.7)	28 (0.8)	63 (0.9)	30 (0.8)	84 (0.7)
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements						
Hong Kong SAR	42 (5.5)	4 (2.2)	33 (4.9)	81 (4.7)	15 (3.9)	68 (4.5)
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	81 (4.1)	27 (5.2)	46 (5.7)	70 (4.2)	40 (4.9)	67 (5.7)
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements						
North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) <sup>1</sup> (r)	78 (5.9)	24 (7.1)	43 (6.5)	67 (8.1)	44 (6.9)	89 (2.4)

**National percentage:**

- ▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

**Notes:**

- 0 Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
- (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
- † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
- <sup>1</sup> National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
- <sup>2</sup> Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.
- An "(r)" indicates that data are available for at least 70% but less than 85% of students.
- An "(s)" indicates that data are available for at least 50% but less than 70% of students.

## School and classroom climate

School climate generally refers to “the shared beliefs, the relations between individuals and groups in the organization, the physical surroundings, and the characteristics of individuals and groups participating in the organization” (Van Houtte, 2005, p. 85). Another framing refers to school climate as the “impressions, beliefs, and expectations held by members of the school community about their school as a learning environment, their associated behavior, and the symbols and institutions that represent the patterned expressions of the behavior” (Homana, Barber, & Torney-Purta, 2006, p. 3).

School climate and the quality of the relationships within the school (between students and teachers and among students) have the potential to influence student achievement (Bear, Yang, Pell, & Gaskins, 2014) and may also reflect issues such as bullying at school (Powell, Powell, & Petrosko, 2015). More generally, recent research has shown associations between student–teacher relationships and a comprehensive range of indicators of student engagement in school (Quin, 2017).

Some studies point out that students’ perceptions of classroom climate may play a significant role in helping students understand the advantages of democratic values and practices (see, for example, Hooghe & Quintelier, 2013). The CIVED survey included a set of six items that asked students how open they thought their classroom was open to discussion during their civic education lessons (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001). The derived index was a positive predictor of civic knowledge and of students’ expectations to vote as an adult (Schulz, 2005). The ICCS 2009 survey used a similar instrument, and the results of multivariate analyses confirmed the association between this construct and civic-related learning outcomes (Schulz et al., 2010). This association between a classroom climate receptive to discussion and positive civic outcomes has been one of the most stable findings across the IEA studies related to civic education since 1971. The many researchers who have conducted secondary analyses of the data have also confirmed the association.

We included the same question, consisting of the items used for scaling in the previous cycle, in the ICCS 2016 student questionnaire. When responding to the question (which read, “When discussing political or social issues during regular lessons, how often do the following things happen?”), students were asked to consider any classes in which or teachers with whom they discussed political and social issues. The six question items were in the form of statements: (a) “Teachers encourage students to make up their own minds” (ICCS 2016 average of students reporting this occurred sometimes or often: 75%); (b) “Teachers encourage students to express their opinions” (85%); (c) “Students bring up current political events for discussion in class” (44%); (d) “Students express opinions in class even when their opinions are different from most of the other students” (74%); (e) “Teachers encourage students to discuss the issues with people having different opinions” (59%); and (f) “Teachers present several sides of the issues when explaining them in class” (72%).

We used the items to derive an IRT-based scale with an average reliability across countries (Cronbach’s  $\alpha = 0.77$ ). The higher scores on the scale reflect stronger perceptions of a more open classroom climate (see [Figure 6.1](#), Appendix D, for a description of this scale). We were also able to equate the 2016 IRT scale with the 2009 scale, so that the value of 50 reflected the average score of equally weighted countries in the previous cycle. This process allowed us to identify changes in scale scores for the countries that participated in both the 2009 and 2016 ICCS cycles.

[Table 6.3](#) presents a comparison of the average scale scores for the ICCS 2016 students’ perceptions and the ICCS 2009 students’ perceptions of openness during classroom discussion. We recorded national scale scores above the international average in Chile, Chinese Taipei, Croatia, Denmark, Italy, Mexico, Norway, Peru, and Sweden. Of these countries, Denmark recorded the highest score. When we compared the results from the two ICCS cycles, we found no significant difference between the international average scores of the countries participating in both surveys. However, we did observe significantly higher scores between the two cycles ( $p < 0.05$ ) in four

Table 6.3: National averages of students' perception of openness in classroom discussions



Country	2016	2009	Differences (2016–2009)	40	45	50	55	60
Belgium (Flemish)	50 (0.3) ▽	49 (0.3)	0.6 (0.5)					
Bulgaria	48 (0.3) ▽	48 (0.4)	0.2 (0.6)					
Chile	52 (0.3) △	52 (0.3)	-0.1 (0.6)					
Chinese Taipei	52 (0.3) △	50 (0.3)	<b>1.7</b> (0.6)					
Colombia	49 (0.3) ▽	50 (0.2)	-0.9 (0.5)					
Croatia	51 (0.3) △	–	–					
Denmark <sup>†</sup>	54 (0.3) ▲	55 (0.3)	-0.9 (0.6)					
Dominican Republic	48 (0.4) ▽	47 (0.3)	0.9 (0.6)					
Estonia <sup>1</sup>	49 (0.3) ▽	50 (0.3)	-1.0 (0.5)					
Finland	49 (0.2) ▽	49 (0.2)	-0.3 (0.5)					
Italy	53 (0.3) △	54 (0.3)	<b>-1.1</b> (0.5)					
Latvia <sup>1</sup>	49 (0.2) ▽	51 (0.3)	<b>-1.6</b> (0.5)					
Lithuania	49 (0.3) ▽	50 (0.3)	-0.3 (0.5)					
Malta	49 (0.2) ▽	46 (0.2)	<b>3.6</b> (0.4)					
Mexico	51 (0.2) △	50 (0.2)	<b>0.9</b> (0.5)					
Netherlands <sup>†</sup>	47 (0.3) ▽	–	–					
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	52 (0.3) △	53 (0.5)	-0.5 (0.6)					
Peru	53 (0.3) △	–	–					
Russian Federation	48 (0.4) ▽	49 (0.3)	<b>-1.4</b> (0.6)					
Slovenia	50 (0.3) ▽	50 (0.3)	-0.2 (0.5)					
Sweden	52 (0.4) △	51 (0.3)	<b>1.5</b> (0.6)					
ICCS 2016 average	50 (0.1)							
Common countries average	50 (0.1)	50 (0.3)	0.1 (0.1)					

## Countries not meeting sample participation requirements

Hong Kong SAR	53 (0.5)	–	–					
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	42 (0.4)	–	–					

## Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements



North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) <sup>1</sup>	50 (0.5)	–	–					
---	----------	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

 2016 average score +/- Confidence interval  
 2009 average score +/- Confidence interval

## National average:

- ▲ More than 3 score points above ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 3 score points below ICCS 2016 average

On average across items, students with a score in the range with this color have more than a 50% probability of indicating:

	Never or rarely
	Sometimes or often

## Notes:

- ( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses. Statistically significant changes ( $p < 0.05$ ) between 2009 and 2016 are displayed in **bold**.
- (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
- † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
- <sup>1</sup> National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
- <sup>2</sup> Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.
- No comparable data available.

countries (Chinese Taipei, Malta, Mexico, Sweden), and significantly lower scores in Italy, Latvia, and the Russian Federation.

Table 6.4 shows the associations between students' perceptions of openness in classroom discussions and (dichotomized) variables reflecting students' interest in civic issues (quite or very interested in political or social issues versus little interest), students' expected educational attainment (students who expected to complete a university degree versus others), and civic knowledge (students at or above Level B versus others). The columns show the average scores in each comparison group (e.g., for males and females), while the bar chart in between graphically





illustrates the direction and size of the score point difference for each association: the red bars to the left of the zero line indicate score point differences where the students in the first (left-hand side) group had significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) higher values; the green bars indicate score point differences in which the other group had significantly higher averages.

In all of the participating countries, students' perceptions of openness in classroom discussions had, on average, positive and statistically significant associations with students' interest in political and social (civic) issues (a two-point difference), students' expected level of educational attainment (university degree or no degree) (a two-point difference), and students' civic knowledge (below or above Level B) (a four-point difference).

To measure students' perceptions of student–teacher relationships at school, the ICCS 2016 student questionnaire included the same set of five items that were used to measure this construct during ICCS 2009. The items were again in the form of statements (with students asked to give their level of agreement with each one): (a) “Most of my teachers treat me fairly” (ICCS 2016 average of students' agreement: 87%); (b) “Students get along well with most teachers” (74%); (c) “Most teachers are interested in students' wellbeing” (83%); (d) “Most of my teachers listen to what I have to say” (81%); and (e) “If I need extra help, I receive it from my teachers” (88%).

These items formed an IRT-based scale with an average reliability across countries (Cronbach's alpha = 0.81). The higher values on the scale, which is described in [Figure 6.2](#) in Appendix D, indicate more positive perceptions of student–teacher relationships. We equated the scale with the 2009 scale so that the value of 50 reflected the average score of equally weighted countries in the previous cycle.

In general, students' perceptions of student–teacher relationships changed significantly between 2009 and 2016 (see [Table 6.5](#)). The ICCS 2016 international average was significantly higher than the 2009 international average, and the national averages between the two cycles were significantly higher in 12 countries out of 21. The scale scores for 2016 showed eight countries—Bulgaria, Chile, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Peru—scoring significantly above the international average. Two of these countries—Chinese Taipei and the Dominican Republic—recorded scale scores more than three points above the ICCS 2016 international average.

We also found significant associations between students' perceptions of student–teacher relations at school and gender, expected education (students expecting to complete a university degree versus those not holding this expectation), and civic knowledge (students at or above Level B versus those below this level) ([Table 6.6](#)). On average across the participating countries, females' scale scores were slightly higher than the males' scores (a one-point difference), students expecting to complete a university degree scored higher than other students (a one-point difference), and those students at or above Level B on the civic knowledge scale had scores higher than the students with lower levels of civic knowledge (a difference of two points).

Table 6.5: National averages of students' perception of student-teacher relations at school

Country	2016	2009	Differences (2016-2009)	35	40	45	50	55	60	65
Belgium (Flemish)	51 (0.2) ▽	49 (0.3)	<b>2.5</b> (0.6)				■	■		
Bulgaria	53 (0.3) △	51 (0.3)	<b>2.0</b> (0.6)				■	■		
Chile	54 (0.3) △	51 (0.3)	<b>2.7</b> (0.6)				■	■		
Chinese Taipei	56 (0.3) ▲	51 (0.3)	<b>5.2</b> (0.6)				■	■		
Colombia	54 (0.3) △	54 (0.3)	-0.4 (0.6)					■	■	
Croatia	51 (0.4) ▽	–	–				■			
Denmark <sup>†</sup>	54 (0.3) △	52 (0.3)	<b>2.6</b> (0.6)				■	■		
Dominican Republic	60 (0.3) ▲	59 (0.3)	<b>1.6</b> (0.6)						■	■
Estonia <sup>1</sup>	49 (0.3) ▼	48 (0.3)	1.2 (0.6)				■			
Finland	53 (0.3)	48 (0.2)	<b>4.9</b> (0.6)				■	■		
Italy	53 (0.3)	51 (0.3)	<b>1.3</b> (0.6)					■		
Latvia <sup>1</sup>	46 (0.3) ▼	45 (0.3)	1.0 (0.6)			■				
Lithuania	50 (0.3) ▽	50 (0.3)	0.2 (0.6)				■	■		
Malta	52 (0.2)	52 (0.3)	0.4 (0.6)					■		
Mexico	55 (0.2) △	53 (0.2)	<b>1.8</b> (0.5)					■	■	
Netherlands <sup>†</sup>	50 (0.3) ▽	–	–				■			
Norway (9)	52 (0.3)	50 (0.4)	<b>2.7</b> (0.7)				■	■		
Peru	55 (0.2) △	–	–					■		
Russian Federation	50 (0.3) ▽	51 (0.3)	-1.0 (0.6)				■	■		
Slovenia	48 (0.3) ▼	47 (0.3)	<b>1.6</b> (0.6)			■				
Sweden <sup>1</sup>	53 (0.4)	51 (0.3)	<b>1.5</b> (0.7)				■	■		
ICCS 2016 average	52 (0.1)									
Common countries average	52 (0.1)	50 (0.3)	<b>1.8</b> (0.1)							

## Countries not meeting sample participation requirements

Hong Kong SAR	51 (0.4)	–	–					■		
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	53 (0.2)	–	–					■		

## Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements

North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) <sup>1</sup>	50 (0.5)	–	–					■		
---	----------	---	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

■ 2016 average score +/- Confidence interval  
 ■ 2009 average score +/- Confidence interval

## National average:

- ▲ More than 3 score points above ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 3 score points below ICCS 2016 average

On average across items, students with a score in the range with this color have more than a 50% probability of indicating:

	Disagreement with positive statements
	Agreement with positive statements

## Notes:

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Statistically significant changes ( $p < 0.05$ ) between 2009 and 2016 are displayed in **bold**.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

<sup>1</sup> National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

<sup>2</sup> Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.

– No comparable data available.

Table 6.6: National average scale scores of students' perception of student-teacher relations at school by gender, expected education, and level of civic knowledge

Country	Scale score average by gender group										Scale score average by expected university degree										Scale score average by level of civic knowledge																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																													
	Male students					Female students					Not expecting university score higher					Expecting university score higher					Civic knowledge below Level B (below 479)					Civic knowledge at or above Level B (479 and above)																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																															
Belgium (Flemish)	50 (0.3)																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	

■ Difference between comparison groups statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

□ Difference between comparison groups not statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

#### Notes:

0 Standard errors appear in parentheses.

Score averages that are significantly larger ( $p < 0.05$ ) than those in the comparison group are displayed in **bold**.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

<sup>1</sup> National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

<sup>2</sup> Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.

## Different forms of bullying at school

Bullying is defined as aggressive behaviors intended to hurt someone either physically, emotionally, verbally, or through use of the internet (American Educational Research Association, 2013; Olweus, 1973; Wade & Beran, 2011). Scholars and other commentators generally consider bullying a symptom of dysfunctional social interaction at school (see, for example, Olweus, 1973). In many countries, schools currently face the problem of bullying both in the school itself and in a cyber context (American Educational Research Association, 2013; Corcoran & McGuckin, 2014; Fisher, Gardella, & Teurbe-Tolon, 2016). Considerable variation in the incidence and type of bullying can exist within a school (Atria, Strohmeier, & Spiel, 2007; Salmivalli, 2012).

The ICCS 2016 questionnaires included several questions on this topic as part of the more general area of social relations at school. Despite the slight differences in the wording of the items included in each question and the differences in the response categories, this set of questions explored the bullying phenomenon from various perspectives and took into consideration likely dissimilarities in the perceptions of students, principals, and teachers. Students were asked about their experience of situations of verbal or physical abuse at school. The school questionnaire contained two questions about bullying. The first asked principals for their perceptions of bullying at school and the second asked them about the activities their school had in place to counteract bullying (including cyber-bullying). Teachers were also asked to record their perceptions of different forms of bullying within their schools.

The questionnaire for schools participating in the ICCS 2009 Latin American option included items measuring students' experience of verbal or physical aggression at school. Many students in the participating countries of this region reported physical aggression at school (Schulz, Ainley, Friedman, & Lietz, 2011). The ICCS 2016 international student questionnaire therefore included a question asking students about the level of verbal or physical bullying they had personally experienced at school.

More specifically, this question asked students to respond to the situations depicted in each of the question's items by indicating how often they had experienced these situations within the past three months: (a) "A student called you by an offensive nickname;" (b) "A student said things about you to make others laugh;" (c) "A student threatened to hurt you;" (d) "You were physically attacked by another student;" (e) "A student broke something belonging to you on purpose;" and (f) "A student posted offensive pictures or text about you on the internet." We used the question's six items to derive an IRT scale that had average reliability (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.75$ ), and on which the higher scale scores indicated higher frequencies of experiencing verbal or physical abuse (see item map in [Figure 6.3](#), Appendix D, for a description of this scale).

The students' responses to this question showed some variation across countries ([Table 6.7](#)), with the highest percentages of students being those who said they had experienced verbal forms of bullying at school at least once in the past three months: "A student called you by an offensive nickname" (international average: 55%), with national averages ranging from 36 to 70 percent; and "A student said things about you that made others laugh" (international average: 56%), with national averages ranging from 42 to 67 percent. The lowest percentages were for cyber-bullying (international average: 10%) and physical attack (16%), with national averages ranging from six to 13 percent and from nine to 27 percent, respectively.

National average scale scores for students' reports of forms of verbal and physical abuse were significantly higher than the ICCS 2016 average in Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Peru, and Slovenia. National average scale scores for these forms of bullying were lower than the ICCS 2016 average in Denmark, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, and Sweden. Chinese Taipei recorded the lowest scale score (about four points below the ICCS 2016 average).

Table 6.7: National percentages and average scale scores of students' experiences of physical and verbal abuse at school

Country	Percentages of students who reported experiencing the following at least once in the past three months:							Average scale scores for students' reports on physical or verbal abuse
	A student called you by an offensive nickname (%)	A student said things about you to make others laugh (%)	A student threatened to hurt you (%)	You were physically attacked by another student (%)	A student broke something belonging to you on purpose (%)	A student posted offensive pictures or text about you on the internet (%)		
Belgium (Flemish)	58 (1.5) Δ	53 (1.2) ▽	21 (1.1) Δ	17 (0.9)	14 (0.8) ▽	6 (0.7) ▽	50 (0.2)	
Bulgaria	53 (1.3)	60 (1.3) Δ	20 (1.0)	17 (1.1)	17 (1.1) ▽	12 (1.0)	51 (0.3) Δ	
Chile	52 (0.9) ▽	59 (0.7) Δ	16 (0.7) ▽	15 (0.5) ▽	23 (0.8) Δ	10 (0.5)	50 (0.2)	
Chinese Taipei	36 (1.0) ▼	42 (1.0) ▼	5 (0.4) ▼	11 (0.6) ▽	8 (0.5) ▼	6 (0.5) ▽	46 (0.2) ▼	
Colombia	61 (1.2) Δ	61 (1.3) Δ	15 (0.6) ▽	17 (0.6)	31 (1.1) ▲	8 (0.5) ▽	51 (0.3) Δ	
Croatia	70 (1.1) ▲	63 (1.2) Δ	25 (1.1) Δ	20 (1.1) Δ	23 (1.1) Δ	8 (0.7)	52 (0.3) Δ	
Denmark <sup>†</sup>	44 (1.1) ▼	60 (1.1) Δ	14 (0.6) ▽	12 (0.6) ▽	14 (0.7) ▽	9 (0.5)	49 (0.2) ▽	
Dominican Republic	54 (1.2)	66 (0.9) Δ	27 (1.0) Δ	27 (1.0) ▲	31 (1.0) ▲	10 (0.6)	52 (0.2) Δ	
Estonia <sup>1</sup>	55 (1.4)	64 (1.2) Δ	19 (1.1)	14 (0.8) ▽	16 (0.7) ▽	11 (0.8)	50 (0.3)	
Finland	42 (1.1) ▼	51 (1.0) ▽	15 (0.8) ▽	14 (0.8) ▽	8 (0.6) ▼	7 (0.5) ▽	48 (0.2) ▽	
Italy	52 (1.1) ▽	42 (1.0) ▼	17 (0.9) ▽	11 (0.7) ▽	29 (1.2) Δ	6 (0.5) ▽	49 (0.2) ▽	
Latvia <sup>1</sup>	60 (1.0) Δ	44 (1.1) ▼	23 (1.1) Δ	19 (0.9) Δ	24 (1.2) Δ	10 (0.7)	50 (0.2)	
Lithuania	59 (1.1) Δ	67 (1.0) ▲	21 (1.0)	14 (0.9) ▽	19 (1.2)	14 (0.9) Δ	51 (0.2) Δ	
Malta	58 (0.8) Δ	65 (0.8) Δ	29 (0.8) ▲	24 (0.6) Δ	20 (0.7)	13 (0.6) Δ	52 (0.2) Δ	
Mexico	63 (1.1) Δ	64 (1.0) Δ	19 (0.8)	20 (0.8) Δ	28 (1.0) Δ	11 (0.6) Δ	52 (0.3) Δ	
Netherlands <sup>†</sup>	48 (1.4) ▽	43 (1.3) ▼	13 (0.7) ▽	11 (0.7) ▽	13 (0.8) ▽	6 (0.6) ▽	47 (0.3) ▽	
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	56 (1.1)	59 (1.0) Δ	19 (1.0)	18 (0.8) Δ	19 (1.0)	13 (0.5) Δ	50 (0.3)	
Peru	64 (0.9) Δ	60 (0.9) Δ	20 (0.9)	20 (0.8) Δ	27 (0.9) Δ	11 (0.7) Δ	51 (0.2) Δ	
Russian Federation	61 (1.2) Δ	49 (1.0) ▽	21 (0.9) Δ	9 (0.5) ▽	25 (1.1) Δ	13 (0.8) Δ	49 (0.3) ▽	
Slovenia	58 (1.3) Δ	59 (1.0) Δ	20 (0.9)	17 (0.9)	27 (0.9) Δ	11 (0.8)	51 (0.2) Δ	
Sweden <sup>1</sup>	44 (1.4) ▼	54 (1.3) ▽	17 (1.2)	16 (1.2)	15 (1.1) ▽	9 (0.6)	49 (0.4) ▽	
ICCS 2016 average	55 (0.3)	56 (0.2)	19 (0.2)	16 (0.2)	20 (0.2)	10 (0.1)	50 (0.1)	
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements								
Hong Kong SAR	52 (1.6)	66 (1.2)	19 (1.2)	27 (1.3)	18 (1.3)	14 (1.0)	52 (0.3)	
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	45 (1.7)	28 (1.4)	5 (0.5)	13 (0.8)	10 (0.7)	5 (0.6)	46 (0.3)	

**National percentage or average:**

- ▲ More than 10 percentage points or 3 score points above ICCS 2016 average  
 Δ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average  
 ▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average  
 ▽ More than 10 percentage points or 3 score points below ICCS 2016 average
- Notes:**  
 (†) Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.  
 (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.  
 † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.  
 1 National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.  
 2 Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.

We identified statistically significant associations between students' experiences of physical or verbal abuse and each of the following three variables: gender, expected education (students expecting to complete a university degree versus those who did not), and civic knowledge (students at or above Level B versus those below this level) (see [Table 6.8](#)). Males scored higher than females on the IRT scale in all of the participating countries, with the difference amounting to four scale score points above the ICCS average. Nearly every country also showed significantly higher scores for students not expecting to complete a university degree (a one-point difference in the ICCS average) and for those with civic knowledge below Level B (a two-point difference in the ICCS average).

ICCS 2016 asked school principals to report on the frequency of specified aggressive behaviors within their school. The question included six items and had two response categories denoting occurrence—"one to five times a month" and "more than five times a month." The items were: (a) "A student reported to <the principal, the head-teacher, the school head> aggressive or destructive behaviors by other students;" (b) "A student reported to <the principal, the head-teacher, the school head> that s/he was <bullied> by a teacher;" (c) "A teacher reported to <the principal, the head-teacher, the school head> that a student was <bullied> by other students;" (d) "A teacher reported to <the principal, the head-teacher, the school head> that a student helped another student who was being <bullied>;" (e) "A teacher reported to <the principal, the head-teacher, the school head> that s/he was being <bullied> by students;" and (f) "A parent reported to <the principal, the head-teacher, the school head> that his/her son/daughter was being <bullied> by other students."

According to the principals, the most common forms of bullying at school were those amongst students. The principals also advised that teachers and parents were the people most likely to report these incidents to them. [Table 6.9](#) summarizes the principals' responses in terms of percentages of students in schools where principals reported the different aspects of bullying.

In Chinese Taipei, Croatia, Denmark, Italy, Latvia, the Russian Federation, and Slovenia, national average percentages were below the international average with respect to student-reported incidents of students engaged in aggressive or destructive behaviors. The opposite pattern (percentages above the international average) was evident with regard to parent-reported bullying among students in five countries: Belgium (Flemish), Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Malta, and Mexico. In addition, the principals' responses suggest that, in almost all countries, teachers themselves were rarely being bullied.

Another question in the ICCS 2016 school questionnaire asked principals about the initiatives their schools had implemented to prevent bullying (response categories: "yes"/"no"). The initiatives specified in the question's eight items included activities implemented at both the school and the classroom level. Among the activities were meetings with students and parents, training activities for teachers, conferences led by experts, and training activities for responsible internet use.

[Table 6.10](#) shows the percentages of students in schools where principals reported activities undertaken to prevent bullying. Nearly every country recorded higher percentages for activities carried out at the classroom level (international average: 94%) and for school-based activities directly addressed to students, such as training sessions designed to foster responsible internet use (international average: 77%). Meetings with parents were also common across countries (international average: 72%). On average across countries, the lowest percentages recorded were those for expert-led school conferences (international average: 41%) and the development of systems for reporting cyber-bullying (international average: 25%). However, we noted considerable variation in percentages across countries for several of the activities.

Teachers, too, were asked for their perceptions of bullying at school. The items used in the teacher questionnaire were similar to those included in the school questionnaire and provided the same response categories ("one to five times a month"/"more than five times a month"). Teachers seemed to perceive the occurrence of instances of aggressive or destructive behaviors among students at

Table 6.8: National average scale scores of students' experiences of physical and verbal abuse at school by gender, expected education, and level of civic knowledge

Country	Scale score average by gender group										Scale score average by expected university degree										Scale score average by level of civic knowledge									
	Male students					Female students					Not expecting university score higher					Expecting university score higher					Civic knowledge below Level B (below 479)					Civic knowledge at or above Level B (479 and above)				
	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9		
Belgium (Flemish)	52 (0.3)																													
Bulgaria	52 (0.4)																													
Chile	51 (0.2)																													
Chinese Taipei	47 (0.3)																													
Colombia	53 (0.3)																													
Croatia	54 (0.3)																													
Denmark <sup>†</sup>	51 (0.3)																													
Dominican Republic	53 (0.3)																													
Estonia <sup>†</sup>	52 (0.3)																													
Finland	50 (0.4)																													
Italy	50 (0.3)																													
Latvia <sup>†</sup>	51 (0.3)																													
Lithuania	52 (0.3)																													
Malta	55 (0.3)																													
Mexico	54 (0.3)																													
Netherlands <sup>†</sup>	48 (0.4)																													
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	52 (0.3)																													
Peru	53 (0.2)																													
Russian Federation	50 (0.3)																													
Slovenia	52 (0.3)																													
Sweden <sup>†</sup>	51 (0.4)																													
ICCS 2016 average	52 (0.1)																													
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements																														
Hong Kong SAR	54 (0.4)																													
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	47 (0.3)																													

Difference between comparison groups statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .  
 Difference between comparison groups not statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

## Notes:

- ( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.  
 Scores that are significantly larger ( $p < 0.05$ ) than those in the comparison group are displayed in **bold**.  
 (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.  
 † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.  
<sup>1</sup> National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.  
<sup>2</sup> Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.



Table 6.9: Percentages of students at schools where principals reported bullying at school

Country	National percentages of students at schools where principals reported occurrence of the following at least once a month:						
	A student reported to <the principal, the headteacher, the school head> aggressive or destructive behaviors	A student reported to <the principal, the school headteacher, the school head> that s/he was <bullied> by a teacher	A student reported to <the principal, the school headteacher, the school head> that a student was <bullied> by other students	A teacher reported to <the principal, the school headteacher, the school head> that a student helped another student who was being <bullied>	A student reported to <the principal, the school headteacher, the school head> being <bullied> by students	A student reported to <the principal, the school headteacher, the school head> that his/her son/daughter was being bullied by other students	
Belgium (Flemish)	42 (4.3) ▲	3 (1.4)	50 (4.2) ▲	25 (3.9) ▲	7 (2.3)	38 (4.0) ▲	
Bulgaria	19 (3.3)	3 (1.5)	11 (2.7) ▽	5 (2.0) ▽	2 (1.2)	7 (2.3) ▽	
Chile	26 (3.4)	4 (1.6)	10 (2.6) ▼	8 (2.5)	2 (1.1)	14 (3.1)	
Chinese Taipei	1 (0.9) ▼	1 (0.8) ▽	3 (1.5) ▼	2 (1.0) ▽	1 (0.8) ▽	2 (1.3) ▼	
Colombia (r)	32 (4.0) △	6 (2.3)	12 (2.5) ▽	7 (2.0) ▽	4 (1.8)	10 (2.8)	
Croatia	11 (2.5) ▼	1 (0.7) ▽	10 (1.9) ▼	5 (1.5) ▽	2 (1.1)	5 (1.7) ▽	
Denmark <sup>1</sup>	16 (2.8) ▽	2 (1.1) ▽	12 (2.7) ▽	12 (2.6)	1 (1.0) ▽	10 (2.2)	
Dominican Republic	51 (3.8) ▲	8 (2.5)	24 (3.7)	20 (3.9) △	11 (2.7) △	25 (3.9) ▲	
Estonia <sup>1</sup>	28 (4.6)	5 (3.6)	27 (4.8)	13 (3.8)	1 (1.1) ▽	15 (3.6)	
Finland	27 (3.3)	4 (1.4)	42 (4.0) ▲	17 (2.5) △	2 (1.0) ▽	15 (2.3)	
Italy	3 (1.3) ▼	0 ▽	5 (1.7) ▼	1 (0.9) ▽	0 ▽	4 (1.5) ▽	
Latvia <sup>1</sup>	14 (2.0) ▽	2 (1.7)	13 (2.6) ▽	3 (1.7) ▽	12 (2.9) △	5 (2.1) ▽	
Lithuania	23 (3.3)	4 (1.7)	19 (3.0)	11 (2.9)	6 (1.9)	6 (1.7) ▽	
Malta	32 (0.4) △	7 (0.3) △	34 (0.4) ▲	32 (0.4) ▲	0 ▽	39 (0.4) ▲	
Mexico	42 (3.5) ▲	9 (2.1)	20 (2.9)	8 (2.1)	10 (2.4) △	17 (2.9)	
Netherlands <sup>†</sup>	26 (4.7)	20 (4.2) ▲	27 (4.7)	16 (3.9)	3 (1.6)	16 (3.9)	
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	26 (3.8)	8 (2.2)	26 (3.6)	12 (2.8)	2 (1.1)	20 (3.7)	
Peru	29 (3.5)	6 (1.9)	12 (2.5) ▽	8 (2.1)	3 (1.2)	12 (2.3)	
Russian Federation	7 (1.9) ▼	0 ▽	1 (0.7) ▼	3 (1.5) ▽	2 (0.5) ▽	3 (1.6) ▼	
Slovenia	7 (2.5) ▼	0 ▽	29 (4.4) △	7 (2.6)	3 (1.5)	7 (2.6) ▽	
Sweden <sup>1</sup>	31 (3.8)	5 (1.9)	40 (4.9) ▲	19 (5.3)	2 (0.9) ▽	15 (3.5)	
ICCS 2016 average	23 (0.7)	5 (0.5)	20 (0.7)	11 (0.6)	4 (0.4)	14 (0.6)	
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements							
Hong Kong SAR	0	0	3 (2.2)	2 (1.7)	0	1 (1.4)	
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	4 (1.8)	1 (1.1)	4 (1.9)	7 (2.8)	0	2 (1.4)	
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements							
North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) <sup>1</sup>	38 (4.2)	1 (0.7)	31 (5.8)	17 (2.9)	1 (0.7)	21 (6.5)	

**National percentage:**

- ▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

**Notes:**

- 0 Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
- (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
- † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
- 1 National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
- 2 Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.
- An "(r)" indicates that data are available for at least 70% but less than 85% of students.
- An "(s)" indicates that data are available for at least 50% but less than 70% of students.



Table 6.10: Percentages of students at schools where principals reported activities to reduce bullying at school

Country	National percentages of students at schools where principals reported the existence of:							
	Meetings aiming at informing parents about <bullying> at school	Specific training to provide teachers with knowledge, skills, and confidence to make students aware of <bullying>	Teacher training sessions on safe and responsible internet use to avoid <cyber-bullying>	Student training sessions for responsible internet use to avoid <cyber-bullying>	Meetings aiming at raising parents' awareness on <cyber-bullying>	Development of a system to report anonymously incidents of <cyber-bullying> among students	Classroom activities aiming at raising students' awareness of <bullying>	<Anti-bullying> conferences held by experts and/or by local authorities on <bullying> at school
Belgium (Flemish)	42 (4.3) ▼	38 (3.7) ▼	36 (4.2) ▼	78 (3.9)	41 (4.3) ▼	21 (3.4)	99 (0.9) Δ	45 (4.4)
Bulgaria	84 (3.4) ▲	77 (3.9) ▲	56 (4.0)	87 (2.9) ▲	48 (4.7) ▼	24 (3.2)	98 (0.7) Δ	33 (4.3)
Chile	81 (3.1) Δ	75 (3.4) ▲	52 (4.3)	63 (4.2) ▼	62 (4.2)	30 (3.5)	89 (3.1)	40 (4.1)
Chinese Taipei	89 (2.5) ▲	97 (1.6) ▲	92 (2.0) ▲	91 (2.4) ▲	75 (3.5) ▲	54 (3.2) ▲	98 (1.1) Δ	72 (3.2) ▲
Colombia (r)	86 (3.4) ▲	81 (3.6) ▲	58 (4.4)	80 (3.9)	72 (3.8) Δ	30 (4.6)	95 (1.7)	72 (3.8) ▲
Croatia	88 (2.5) ▲	73 (3.1) ▲	69 (4.0) ▲	93 (2.8) ▲	80 (3.5) ▲	37 (3.7) ▲	96 (2.2)	27 (3.6) ▼
Denmark <sup>1</sup>	80 (2.8) Δ	43 (4.2) ▼	37 (4.2) ▼	83 (2.8) Δ	65 (3.8)	2 (1.4) ▼	93 (2.2)	42 (3.6)
Dominican Republic	61 (4.7) ▼	65 (4.7)	47 (4.5)	59 (4.3) ▼	64 (3.8)	17 (3.6) ▽	77 (3.9) ▼	38 (4.6)
Estonia <sup>1</sup> (s)	65 (4.2)	70 (4.7)	66 (5.1) ▲	76 (3.6)	47 (5.5) ▼	10 (2.5) ▼	97 (2.0)	23 (5.4) ▼
Finland	49 (4.6) ▼	46 (3.9) ▼	39 (3.9) ▼	85 (2.6) Δ	46 (3.9) ▼	13 (2.6) ▼	98 (1.2) Δ	46 (3.7)
Italy	52 (4.2) ▼	40 (3.8) ▼	37 (3.9) ▼	71 (3.5)	49 (4.1) ▼	12 (3.2) ▼	91 (2.8)	62 (3.8) ▲
Latvia <sup>1</sup>	62 (4.3) ▼	67 (4.5)	56 (4.6)	62 (4.3) ▼	53 (3.9) ▽	20 (3.8)	84 (3.2) ▽	12 (3.3) ▼
Lithuania	90 (2.7) ▲	81 (3.6) ▲	63 (4.7) Δ	84 (3.1) Δ	74 (3.7) ▲	19 (3.3)	98 (1.2) Δ	33 (4.1) ▽
Malta	80 (0.2) Δ	62 (0.5)	68 (0.3) ▲	97 (0.0) ▲	74 (0.3) ▲	35 (0.4) Δ	94 (0.1)	48 (0.4) Δ
Mexico	82 (2.9) ▲	66 (3.7)	44 (3.6) ▽	60 (3.6) ▼	64 (3.8)	33 (3.4) Δ	96 (1.5)	68 (3.9) ▲
Netherlands <sup>†</sup> (r)	48 (4.9) ▼	37 (5.1) ▼	31 (5.0) ▼	68 (4.3) ▽	49 (5.3) ▼	32 (5.1)	98 (1.3) Δ	36 (5.1)
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	87 (3.1) ▲	78 (4.0) ▲	34 (4.0) ▼	70 (4.2)	77 (3.7) ▲	25 (3.9)	96 (1.6)	43 (3.9)
Peru	87 (2.2) ▲	63 (3.7)	38 (3.4) ▼	49 (3.6) ▼	69 (3.1) Δ	36 (3.5) ▲	94 (1.9)	54 (3.3) ▲
Russian Federation	78 (3.9)	63 (4.1)	80 (3.1) ▲	94 (1.7) ▲	84 (2.7) ▲	33 (3.2) Δ	94 (1.8)	27 (3.5) ▼
Slovenia	55 (4.8) ▼	42 (4.8) ▼	73 (4.1) ▲	86 (3.3) Δ	64 (4.2)	27 (3.7)	95 (1.9)	31 (4.1) ▼
Sweden <sup>1</sup>	66 (4.6)	53 (5.0) ▼	45 (5.2)	72 (3.9)	52 (4.6) ▽	10 (2.6) ▼	99 (0.9) Δ	17 (3.4) ▼
ICCS 2016 average	72 (0.8)	63 (0.9)	53 (0.9)	77 (0.7)	62 (0.9)	25 (0.7)	94 (0.4)	41 (0.8)
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements								
Hong Kong SAR	11 (3.5)	53 (6.0)	39 (6.2)	58 (5.7)	23 (5.1)	7 (3.0)	70 (5.4)	39 (5.1)
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	79 (4.5)	91 (3.4)	91 (3.0)	96 (2.1)	71 (5.2)	73 (5.9)	92 (3.2)	65 (5.3)
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements								
North-Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) <sup>1</sup> (r)	53 (7.8)	46 (8.2)	64 (6.1)	93 (3.6)	47 (8.0)	9 (2.9)	97 (2.4)	50 (7.3)

## Notes:

- (0) Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
- (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
- † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
- <sup>1</sup> National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
- <sup>2</sup> Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.
- An "(r)" indicates that data are available for at least 70% but less than 85% of students.
- An "(s)" indicates that data are available for at least 50% but less than 70% of students.

## National percentage:

- ▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

school as less frequent than principals did. However, we observed relatively large discrepancies in how often the teachers witnessed each of the behaviors in some countries (Belgium/Flemish, Chile, Dominican Republic, Finland, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Norway, Peru, and Sweden) and less discrepancy in other countries (Bulgaria, Chinese Taipei, Croatia, Italy, Latvia, and Slovenia) (Table 6.11). Few teachers reported being bullied by students.

It is difficult to “quantify” the actual presence of bullying at school and the frequency of situations in which different forms of bullying occur. Among other reasons for this difficulty is the “culture of silence” that often persists among victims (Smith & Shu, 2000). Nevertheless, the ICCS 2016 results confirmed the presence of different aspects of bullying at school, as well as the presence of activities undertaken by schools to prevent them. Verbal bullying was more frequently present than other types of aggression.

### Implementation of civic and citizenship education at schools

Several studies illustrate the important role that students’ activities in the community play in students’ construction and development of knowledge and skills for active citizenship (Annette, 2008; Henderson, Pancer, & Brown, 2013). Links between the school and its local community represent an opportunity for involving students in activities related to positive civic outcomes and that thereby contribute to the enhancement of civic engagement. ICCS 2009 showed that in nearly every participating country most of the students had at least some opportunities to participate in such activities (Schulz et al., 2010). Furthermore, in 2009, results were generally consistent across the questionnaires that principals and teachers answered (Schulz et al., 2010).

The ICCS 2016 school and teacher questionnaires included a modified version of the ICCS 2009 questions that asked principals and teachers for their perceptions of the opportunities their target-grade students had to participate in activities carried out in the local community but organized by the school in cooperation with external groups or organizations.

The nine items were (a) “activities related to environmental sustainability (e.g. <energy and water saving, recycling>);” (b) “human rights projects;” (c) “activities for underprivileged people or groups;” (d) “cultural activities (e.g. theater, music);” (e) “multicultural and intercultural activities within the <local community> (e.g. <promotion and celebration of cultural diversity, food/street market>);” (f) “campaigns to raise people’s awareness (about social issues, of environmental issues);” (g) “activities aimed at protecting cultural heritage within the <local community>,” (h) “visits to political institutions (e.g. <parliament house, prime minister’s/president’s official residence>);” and (i) “sports events.”

As in ICCS 2009, the two sets of items differed in format. Also, although the answer categories for principals in the 2016 questionnaire were the 2009 ones of “all or nearly all,” “most of them,” “some of them,” and “none or hardly any,” we added the new option of “not offered at school.” The response categories for teachers were a simple “yes” or “no.”

Most of the students in the participating countries were attending schools where, according to their principals, they had opportunities to participate in at least some civic- and citizenship-related activities in the community (Table 6.12). On average, the highest percentages (expressed in terms of students attending schools where principals reported the various activities) were for sports events (88%), cultural activities (80%), and activities related to environmental sustainability (61%). On average, the lowest percentages were for visits to political institutions (20%) and for activities aimed at protecting the cultural heritage (38%).

The results from the teachers’ responses to the participation question (see Table 6.13) were relatively consistent with the principals’ responses. On average, the highest percentages of teachers reporting they had carried out civic and citizenship activities in the local communities pertained to cultural activities (75%) and sports events (73%). The lowest percentages recorded were those

Table 6.1.1: Teachers' perceptions of bullying at school

Country	National percentages of teachers who reported the following situations occurring at least once a month:							
	A student informed you about aggressive or destructive behaviors by other students	A student informed you that s/he was <bullied> by another student	A teacher informed you that a student was <bullied> by other students	A teacher informed you that a student helped another student who was being <bullied>	A student informed you that s/he was <bullied> by a teacher	A parent informed you that his/her son/daughter was <bullied> by other students	A teacher informed you that s/he was <bullied> by students	You witnessed students' <bullying> behaviors
Belgium (Flemish) <sup>†</sup>	11 (0.8) ▽	16 (1.0) △	17 (1.2) △	6 (0.7) △	2 (0.4) △	3 (0.5) △	3 (0.6)	12 (1.1) △
Bulgaria	18 (1.7) △	13 (1.0) △	8 (0.8)	6 (0.8) △	1 (0.2) ▽	2 (0.4)	0 ▽	7 (1.0)
Chile	14 (1.8)	8 (1.2)	6 (0.9) ▽	4 (0.9)	2 (0.6)	4 (0.8)	3 (0.6)	7 (1.3)
Chinese Taipei	7 (0.7) ▽	6 (0.7) ▽	4 (0.6) ▽	2 (0.4) ▽	1 (0.3)	1 (0.2) ▽	2 (0.4) ▽	5 (0.7) ▽
Colombia	18 (1.4) △	11 (1.1)	8 (1.1)	6 (1.1)	3 (0.5) △	5 (0.9) △	2 (0.5)	7 (1.0) ▽
Croatia	10 (0.9) ▽	8 (0.8) ▽	6 (0.7) ▽	3 (0.5)	1 (0.3)	3 (0.6)	3 (0.5)	6 (0.7) ▽
Dominican Republic	22 (2.6) △	11 (1.6)	6 (1.5)	5 (1.1)	1 (0.7)	4 (1.3)	1 (0.4) ▽	4 (0.7) ▽
Finland <sup>†</sup>	15 (1.2)	14 (1.1) △	19 (1.4) ▲	5 (0.5)	1 (0.4)	2 (0.3)	3 (0.3)	22 (1.1) ▲
Italy	6 (0.7) ▽	4 (0.5) ▽	4 (0.5) ▽	1 (0.3) ▽	0	2 (0.3)	1 (0.2) ▽	1 (0.3) ▽
Latvia	10 (1.6)	8 (1.6)	7 (1.3)	3 (0.9)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.7)	5 (1.0) △	9 (1.4)
Lithuania	12 (1.0)	12 (1.1) △	8 (0.9)	5 (0.7) △	2 (0.5)	2 (0.4)	6 (0.7) △	24 (1.5) ▲
Malta	11 (1.3)	13 (1.2) △	11 (1.3) △	4 (0.7)	1 (0.5)	3 (0.6)	5 (0.9) △	16 (1.5) △
Mexico	17 (1.2) △	9 (1.0)	6 (0.7) ▽	4 (0.5)	1 (0.3)	2 (0.4)	2 (0.4) ▽	5 (0.6) ▽
Norway	14 (1.1)	6 (1.1) ▽	8 (1.0)	4 (0.8)	1 (0.3) ▽	2 (0.5)	2 (0.4) ▽	3 (0.7) ▽
Peru	15 (1.3)	9 (1.0)	5 (0.7) ▽	5 (0.8)	2 (0.3)	3 (0.5)	1 (0.3) ▽	5 (0.7) ▽
Slovenia	13 (1.0)	12 (0.9) △	8 (0.7)	3 (0.4)	0	1 (0.3) ▽	3 (0.5)	5 (0.6) ▽
Sweden	12 (1.3)	5 (0.8) ▽	5 (0.6) ▽	2 (0.4) ▽	0	1 (0.2) ▽	1 (0.3) ▽	11 (1.0)
ICCS 2016 average	13 (0.3)	10 (0.3)	8 (0.2)	4 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	2 (0.1)	3 (0.1)	9 (0.2)
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements for teacher survey								
Denmark	12 (2.0)	5 (0.9)	5 (0.9)	2 (0.7)	0	2 (0.8)	0	4 (1.1)
Estonia	17 (2.7)	16 (2.0)	14 (2.3)	7 (1.9)	3 (0.9)	3 (1.1)	5 (1.5)	13 (2.2)
Korea, Republic of	10 (0.9)	7 (0.8)	4 (0.5)	3 (0.5)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.3)	4 (0.7)
Netherlands	9 (1.2)	13 (1.3)	10 (1.2)	4 (0.6)	1 (0.3)	2 (0.5)	1 (0.4)	11 (1.4)
Russian Federation	2 (0.5)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.9)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	2 (0.4)

**National percentage:**

▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average

△ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average

▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average

▼ More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

**Notes:**

0 Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

Table 6.12: Percentages of students at schools where principals reported students' opportunity to participate in civic-related activities

Country	National percentages of students at school where principals reported that all, nearly all, or most of the students participated in the following activities in the community								
	Activities related to environmental sustainability	Human rights projects	Activities for underprivileged people or groups	Cultural activities (eg. theater, music)	Multicultural and intercultural activities within the <local community>	Campaigns to raise people's awareness	Activities aimed at protecting the cultural heritage within the <local community>	Visits to political institutions	Sports events
Belgium (Flemish)	66 (4.8)	48 (4.1)	74 (3.5) ▲	97 (1.4) ▲	39 (4.2)	62 (4.1)	5 (2.0) ▼	12 (2.9) ▽	88 (3.0)
Bulgaria	45 (4.5) ▼	15 (3.3) ▼	31 (4.2) ▼	71 (3.6) ▽	43 (4.2)	77 (3.3) ▲	50 (4.3) ▲	9 (2.6) ▼	90 (2.7)
Chile	39 (4.6) ▼	20 (3.1) ▼	45 (4.6)	70 (4.2) ▼	66 (4.1) ▲	48 (3.9) ▽	31 (3.8)	17 (3.2)	77 (3.5) ▼
Chinese Taipei	59 (4.4)	32 (3.8) ▼	48 (4.7)	56 (3.4) ▼	44 (4.3)	51 (4.0)	31 (3.9)	15 (2.9) ▽	93 (2.1)
Colombia (r)	56 (4.4)	46 (4.2)	30 (3.8) ▼	52 (4.2) ▼	42 (3.8)	53 (4.1)	41 (4.2)	5 (1.5) ▼	84 (3.4)
Croatia	76 (3.5) ▲	65 (3.6) ▲	44 (4.1)	84 (2.7)	43 (4.1)	40 (3.5) ▼	51 (3.9) ▲	17 (2.6)	88 (2.5)
Denmark <sup>†</sup>	50 (3.8) ▼	53 (3.9) ▲	33 (3.8) ▽	90 (2.4) ▲	23 (3.2) ▼	23 (3.2) ▼	9 (2.3) ▼	38 (4.1) ▲	90 (2.3)
Dominican Republic (r)	76 (3.9) ▲	60 (4.4) ▲	49 (4.9)	66 (4.6) ▼	67 (4.6) ▲	69 (4.0) ▲	66 (4.6) ▲	25 (4.2)	84 (3.1)
Estonia <sup>†</sup> (s)	63 (5.4)	27 (5.0) ▼	18 (4.3) ▼	92 (2.9) ▲	32 (5.6) ▼	79 (4.6) ▲	53 (5.2) ▲	35 (5.4) ▲	98 (1.1) △
Finland	71 (3.5) △	34 (3.9) ▽	56 (4.0) ▲	91 (2.1) ▲	35 (3.5) ▼	95 (1.5) ▲	30 (3.3) ▽	11 (2.0) ▽	92 (2.0)
Italy	70 (3.7) △	62 (3.5) ▲	47 (3.9)	87 (2.6) △	47 (4.1)	64 (4.0)	47 (4.1) △	27 (3.7)	74 (4.3) ▼
Latvia <sup>†</sup>	67 (3.6)	31 (4.5) ▼	28 (3.7) ▼	95 (1.8) ▲	61 (4.4) ▲	60 (4.6)	56 (4.8) ▲	31 (4.7) ▲	99 (0.5) ▲
Lithuania	68 (3.9)	27 (3.9) ▼	30 (3.8) ▼	85 (2.8)	46 (3.6)	59 (4.6)	39 (3.7)	28 (3.5) △	89 (2.9)
Malta	48 (0.4) ▼	20 (0.2) ▼	24 (0.3) ▼	59 (0.5) ▼	33 (0.4) ▼	44 (0.4) ▼	30 (0.3) ▽	32 (0.4) ▲	98 (0.1) △
Mexico	73 (3.3) ▲	65 (3.2) ▲	44 (4.0)	60 (4.2) ▼	53 (3.7) △	67 (3.4) ▲	55 (3.9) ▲	9 (2.0) ▼	84 (2.7)
Netherlands <sup>†</sup> (r)	32 (4.4) ▼	31 (4.7) ▼	52 (5.4) ▲	83 (3.8)	28 (5.0) ▼	24 (4.6) ▼	8 (2.4) ▼	13 (2.9) ▽	91 (3.0)
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	49 (4.4) ▼	54 (4.4) ▲	23 (3.6) ▼	92 (2.5) ▲	19 (3.5) ▼	52 (3.9)	27 (3.9) ▼	34 (4.5) ▲	87 (3.0)
Peru	62 (3.3)	44 (3.5)	41 (3.3)	70 (3.1) ▼	62 (3.4) ▲	62 (3.5)	38 (3.6)	14 (2.3) ▽	91 (2.3)
Russian Federation	68 (4.6)	48 (3.4)	49 (4.6)	94 (1.4) ▲	95 (1.6) ▲	48 (4.6) ▽	62 (4.5) ▲	17 (2.4)	99 (0.8) ▲
Slovenia	83 (3.2) ▲	48 (4.7)	54 (4.8) ▲	94 (1.8) ▲	46 (4.2)	78 (3.9) ▲	55 (4.3) ▲	7 (2.4) ▼	90 (2.8)
Sweden <sup>1</sup>	61 (4.9)	64 (5.9) ▲	41 (4.7)	95 (2.0) ▲	27 (3.8) ▼	44 (5.1) ▼	21 (3.4) ▼	33 (4.7) ▲	70 (4.1) ▼
ICCS 2016 average	61 (0.9)	43 (0.9)	41 (0.9)	80 (0.6)	45 (0.9)	57 (0.8)	38 (0.8)	20 (0.7)	88 (0.6)
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements									
Hong Kong SAR	43 (5.7)	14 (3.7)	27 (4.9)	77 (4.2)	12 (3.8)	36 (5.3)	9 (3.2)	9 (2.6)	91 (3.3)
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	51 (5.2)	37 (5.9)	23 (4.8)	50 (5.0)	36 (4.6)	40 (5.9)	26 (4.6)	9 (3.0)	72 (5.1)
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements									
North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) <sup>1</sup> (r)	37 (7.8)	41 (5.7)	40 (7.6)	69 (7.2)	17 (6.2)	49 (8.5)	5 (3.2)	11 (4.1)	85 (6.2)

**National percentage:**

- ▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

**Notes:**

- ( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
- (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
- † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
- 1 National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
- 2 Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.
- An "(r)" indicates that data are available for at least 70% but less than 85% of students.
- An "(s)" indicates that data are available for at least 50% but less than 70% of students.

Table 6.13: Teachers' perceptions of student activities in the community

Country	National percentages of teachers who reported having taking part with their target-grade classes in ...								
	Activities related to environmental sustainability	Human rights projects	Activities for underprivileged people or groups	Cultural activities (e.g. theater, music)	Multicultural and intercultural activities within the <local community>	Campaigns to raise people's awareness	Activities aimed at protecting the cultural heritage in the <local community>	Visits to political institutions	Sports events
Belgium (Flemish) <sup>†</sup>	50 (2.1) ▽	31 (1.8) ▽	54 (2.2) ▲	84 (1.6) △	35 (1.9) ▽	47 (1.9) ▽	9 (0.9) ▼	10 (1.3) ▽	76 (1.3) △
Bulgaria	54 (2.8)	15 (1.3) ▼	36 (2.0)	69 (2.8) ▽	51 (1.9) △	72 (2.2) ▲	52 (2.3) ▲	8 (1.9) ▽	79 (1.5) △
Chile	43 (2.3) ▼	21 (1.8) ▼	45 (2.3) △	69 (1.7) ▽	58 (1.8) ▲	51 (2.4)	34 (2.3) ▽	18 (1.9)	70 (1.7) ▽
Chinese Taipei	41 (1.5) ▼	19 (1.1) ▼	33 (1.2) ▽	62 (1.3) ▼	33 (1.3) ▼	40 (1.3) ▼	13 (0.9) ▼	7 (0.8) ▽	70 (1.3) ▽
Colombia	72 (2.4) ▲	54 (3.0) ▲	41 (2.0)	79 (1.6) △	63 (2.2) ▲	75 (2.1) ▲	58 (2.2) ▲	10 (1.6) ▽	85 (1.4) ▲
Croatia	62 (1.9) △	43 (1.6) △	30 (1.5) ▽	65 (1.7) ▽	38 (2.1) ▽	33 (1.7) ▼	52 (1.6) ▲	10 (1.0) ▽	63 (1.9) ▼
Dominican Republic	84 (3.0) ▲	62 (3.7) ▲	52 (4.5) ▲	80 (3.1) ▲	68 (3.1) ▲	73 (3.6) ▲	66 (3.1) ▲	40 (3.9) ▲	80 (3.2) △
Finland <sup>†</sup>	45 (1.6) ▼	15 (1.4) ▼	31 (1.3) ▽	56 (1.6) ▼	17 (1.2) ▼	61 (1.8) △	14 (1.1) ▼	2 (0.3) ▼	48 (2.1) ▼
Italy	54 (2.0)	48 (1.7) ▲	44 (1.9) △	84 (1.4) △	38 (1.9) ▽	62 (1.4) △	41 (1.6)	22 (1.5) △	65 (1.6) ▽
Latvia	46 (2.5) ▼	17 (1.3) ▼	17 (1.2) ▼	72 (1.5)	48 (1.6) △	39 (1.5) ▼	43 (1.4) △	14 (1.2) ▽	72 (1.6)
Lithuania	68 (1.8) ▲	36 (1.5)	42 (1.9)	86 (1.1) ▲	54 (1.6) △	62 (1.6) △	54 (1.4) ▲	31 (2.1) ▲	84 (1.3) ▲
Malta	58 (2.1)	27 (1.7) ▽	36 (1.8)	63 (2.0) ▼	32 (1.8) ▼	33 (1.7) ▼	35 (2.1) ▽	32 (1.8) ▲	74 (1.7)
Mexico	76 (1.5) ▲	63 (1.6) ▲	41 (2.1)	72 (1.2) ▽	58 (2.0)	59 (2.2) ▲	50 (1.9) ▲	8 (0.8) ▽	76 (1.5) △
Norway	35 (1.8) ▼	37 (1.9)	26 (1.3) ▼	83 (1.2) △	16 (2.3) ▼	43 (2.6) ▼	32 (2.0) ▽	23 (1.6) △	72 (1.7)
Peru	70 (2.2) ▲	40 (1.8) △	48 (1.9) △	77 (1.6)	74 (2.2) ▲	67 (1.8) ▲	56 (1.8) ▲	11 (1.1) ▽	91 (0.8) ▲
Slovenia	70 (1.6) ▲	39 (1.3) △	49 (1.4) ▲	87 (1.0) ▲	40 (1.3) ▽	56 (1.3)	48 (1.8) △	14 (1.3)	82 (1.1) △
Sweden	39 (1.7) ▼	46 (2.0) ▲	33 (1.7) ▽	80 (1.9) △	29 (2.0) ▼	33 (1.9) ▼	15 (1.2) ▼	20 (1.8)	58 (1.9) ▼
ICCS2016 average	57 (0.5)	36 (0.5)	39 (0.5)	75 (0.4)	44 (0.5)	53 (0.5)	39 (0.4)	16 (0.4)	73 (0.4)
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements for teacher survey									
Denmark	39 (3.5)	32 (3.9)	16 (2.4)	73 (3.3)	15 (2.4)	16 (2.1)	9 (2.5)	22 (3.1)	60 (3.4)
Estonia	60 (3.0)	12 (1.6)	14 (2.1)	91 (1.7)	44 (3.5)	72 (3.5)	67 (3.0)	35 (4.7)	95 (1.0)
Korea, Republic of	57 (2.2)	34 (1.8)	41 (1.6)	75 (1.6)	36 (1.6)	48 (1.7)	32 (1.6)	14 (1.3)	74 (1.5)
Netherlands	20 (1.5)	15 (1.3)	39 (2.4)	60 (2.0)	16 (1.2)	19 (1.7)	9 (1.0)	8 (0.8)	61 (1.8)
Russian Federation	74 (2.9)	39 (3.0)	52 (3.9)	75 (3.1)	76 (3.1)	55 (2.9)	71 (3.6)	21 (2.7)	82 (2.8)

**National percentage:**

▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average

△ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average

▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average

▼ More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

**Notes:**

0 Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

for visits to political institutions (16%), human rights projects (36%), activities aimed at protecting cultural heritage (39%), and activities for underprivileged people or groups (39%).

### ***Activities related to environmental sustainability at school***

Education for sustainable development endeavors to develop learners' competence as community members and global citizens. This area of education "empowers learners to take informed decisions and responsible actions for environmental integrity, economic viability and a just society, for present and future generations, while respecting cultural diversity" (UNESCO, 2014, p.12). For at least 10 years, various scholars and educationalists have viewed education for sustainable development as an important aspect of citizenship education (Huckle, 2008). They also tend to see it as an interdisciplinary and holistic learning area, and to argue that it needs to involve the whole school community (Henderson & Tilbury, 2004).

The ICCS 2016 school questionnaire included a question asking principals about any environment-friendly practices their schools had implemented in order to further the principles of sustainable development ("sustainable schools") and to enable students to have direct experience of these principles. The question contained five items reflecting these practices: (a) "differential waste collection;" (b) "waste reduction (e.g. <encouraging waste-free lunches, limiting the use of plastic disposable products>);" (c) "purchasing environment-friendly items (e.g. <recycled paper for printing, biodegradable cutlery and dishes>);" (d) "energy-saving practices;" and (e) "posters to encourage students' environment-friendly behaviors." Response categories were "to a large extent," "to a moderate extent," "to a small extent," and "not at all."

Table 6.14 sets out the percentages of students in schools where principals reported having adopted (to a "large extent/to a moderate extent") the environment-friendly practices listed in the question. The most common practices across participating countries were those related to energy saving (international average: 81%) and to differential waste collection (international average: 74%). The use of posters within the school to support students' environment-friendly practices was also common across participating countries (international average: 74%). Lower but still substantial percentages were recorded for waste reduction (international average: 67%) and for purchasing environment-friendly items (international average: 60%).

The principals' responses to the question also revealed considerable cross-national variation with respect to the environment-friendly practices schools had in place. National percentages for differential waste collection were more than 10 percentage points above the ICCS 2016 average in Belgium (Flemish), Chinese Taipei, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, and Slovenia. We observed similar patterns (i.e., national percentages 10 scale score points or more above the international average) with respect to waste reduction (in Chinese Taipei, Finland, Lithuania, Malta, Slovenia, Sweden); purchase of environment-friendly items (Chinese Taipei, Malta, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden); energy-saving practices (Chinese Taipei, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Lithuania, Malta, Slovenia); and poster use (Bulgaria, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Slovenia).

Another of the questions in the teacher questionnaire asked teachers whether their target-grade students participated at school in initiatives and activities related to environmental issues, such as writing letters to newspapers or magazines, signing a petition, posting comments on social networks, organizing activities promoting limiting water or energy consumption, and contributing to environment-based enterprises in the community. All of these activities have the potential not only to enhance students' direct involvement and engagement in environment-friendly activities within the school and the local community but also to raise students' awareness of the impact of their behavior on the environment (Kyburz-Graber, 2013; Lundholm, Hopwood, & Kelsey, 2013).



Table 6.14: Percentages of students at schools where principals reported environment-friendly practices

Country	National percentages of students in schools where principals reported that the school had adapted the following environment-friendly practices to a large or a moderate extent:				
	Differential waste collection	Waste reduction	Purchase of environment-friendly items	Energy-saving practices	Posters to encourage students' environment-friendly behaviors
Belgium (Flemish)	95 (1.9) ▲	71 (4.1)	61 (4.1)	77 (3.6)	61 (4.4) ▼
Bulgaria	65 (3.7) ▽	62 (3.7)	58 (4.6)	80 (2.9)	87 (3.3) ▲
Chile	30 (4.2) ▼	42 (4.6) ▼	34 (4.1) ▼	54 (4.4) ▼	63 (4.4) ▼
Chinese Taipei	100 ▲	99 (0.8) ▲	99 (0.9) ▲	100 ▲	98 (1.2) ▲
Colombia (r)	72 (4.1)	54 (5.1) ▼	58 (4.4)	71 (3.7) ▽	86 (2.9) ▲
Croatia	88 (2.3) ▲	71 (3.3)	53 (3.3) ▽	89 (2.3) △	94 (1.9) ▲
Denmark <sup>†</sup>	62 (3.9) ▼	38 (3.5) ▼	66 (3.4)	94 (2.0) ▲	57 (3.6) ▼
Dominican Republic	72 (4.1)	75 (4.0) △	67 (4.4)	91 (2.6) ▲	91 (2.8) ▲
Estonia <sup>1</sup> (s)	55 (4.4) ▼	70 (4.8)	40 (5.5) ▼	85 (3.9)	75 (4.7)
Finland	96 (1.5) ▲	96 (1.4) ▲	66 (3.7)	79 (2.9)	67 (3.3) ▽
Italy	88 (2.6) ▲	57 (4.0) ▽	51 (4.6) ▽	64 (3.8) ▼	66 (3.9) ▽
Latvia <sup>1</sup>	66 (4.8)	55 (4.6) ▼	59 (4.3)	87 (3.7)	85 (4.0) ▲
Lithuania	86 (2.6) ▲	82 (3.4) ▲	46 (4.4) ▼	98 (1.4) ▲	95 (2.1) ▲
Malta	84 (0.3) ▲	78 (0.4) ▲	75 (0.4) ▲	92 (0.3) ▲	91 (0.4) ▲
Mexico	59 (4.0) ▼	72 (3.5)	65 (3.8)	74 (3.3) ▽	89 (2.5) ▲
Netherlands <sup>†</sup> (r)	51 (5.3) ▼	26 (4.7) ▼	37 (5.1) ▼	61 (4.8) ▼	27 (4.7) ▼
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	78 (3.5)	63 (4.3)	73 (3.9) ▲	74 (4.0)	40 (4.1) ▼
Peru	68 (3.2)	64 (3.5)	51 (3.9) ▽	76 (2.8)	74 (3.0)
Russian Federation	51 (4.8) ▼	44 (4.5) ▼	35 (3.7) ▼	91 (2.7) △	80 (2.4) △
Slovenia	99 (0.5) ▲	99 (0.5) ▲	88 (3.0) ▲	99 (0.5) ▲	95 (2.2) ▲
Sweden <sup>1</sup>	78 (3.8)	81 (3.6) ▲	77 (4.1) ▲	66 (5.9) ▼	39 (5.4) ▼
ICCS 2016 average	74 (0.8)	67 (0.8)	60 (0.9)	81 (0.7)	74 (0.7)

## Countries not meeting sample participation requirements

Hong Kong SAR	84 (4.0)	85 (4.0)	71 (5.1)	84 (4.3)	76 (4.4)
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	99 (0.9)	94 (3.2)	95 (2.0)	99 (1.2)	86 (4.0)

## Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements

North-Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) <sup>1</sup> (r)	67 (6.9)	61 (6.9)	55 (6.3)	66 (6.6)	36 (7.5)
---	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

## National percentage:

▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average

△ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average

▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average

▼ More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

## Notes:

( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

<sup>1</sup> National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.<sup>2</sup> Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.

An "(r)" indicates that data are available for at least 70% but less than 85% of students.

An "(s)" indicates that data are available for at least 50% but less than 70% of students.

Across participating countries, the most commonly reported activities were those related to water and energy consumption (with an international average of 46% and 48%, respectively) (Table 6.15). Lower percentages were recorded for signing a petition (8%), writing letters to a magazine/newspaper (12%), and posting on social networks (15%). Countries with national averages significantly above the ICCS average for all the activities were Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Peru. Those with national averages significantly below the ICCS average were Belgium (Flemish), Malta, and Sweden.

Table 6.15: Teachers' reports on students' environmental activities at school

Country	National percentages of teachers who reported conducting the following environmental initiatives with their target-grade students:							
	Writing letters to the newspapers or magazines to support actions about the environment	Signing a petition on environmental issues	Posting on social network, forum, or blog to support actions about the environment	Activities to make students aware of the environmental impact of excessive water consumption	Activities to make students aware of the environmental impact of excessive energy consumption	<Cleanup activities> outside the school	Recycling and waste collection in the <local community>	
Belgium (Flemish) <sup>†</sup>	2 (0.4) ▽	2 (0.4) ▽	6 (0.8) ▽	28 (1.5) ▼	40 (1.7) ▽	9 (1.7) ▼	25 (1.7) ▼	
Bulgaria	4 (0.7) ▽	2 (0.4) ▽	22 (1.9) △	44 (2.0)	47 (1.8)	53 (2.5) ▲	38 (2.7)	
Chile	12 (1.4)	8 (1.2)	16 (1.5)	46 (2.1)	47 (2.1)	26 (1.8) ▽	29 (2.1) ▼	
Chinese Taipei	8 (0.7) ▽	4 (0.5) ▽	18 (1.0) △	38 (1.4) ▽	43 (1.4) ▽	22 (1.7) ▼	13 (1.0) ▼	
Colombia	22 (2.0) △	16 (1.5) △	23 (1.9) △	71 (2.2) ▲	62 (2.6) ▲	61 (2.5) ▲	69 (1.8) ▲	
Croatia	8 (0.7) ▽	5 (0.7) ▽	15 (1.1)	57 (1.2) ▲	61 (1.7) ▲	40 (2.2) △	49 (2.0) △	
Dominican Republic	42 (2.9) ▲	45 (3.8) ▲	38 (2.9) ▲	83 (2.2) ▲	72 (2.5) ▲	68 (3.4) ▲	64 (3.7) ▲	
Finland <sup>†</sup>	1 (0.2) ▼	1 (0.3) ▽	2 (0.3) ▼	37 (1.2) ▽	50 (1.2)	20 (1.3) ▼	31 (1.5) ▼	
Italy	5 (0.6) ▽	3 (0.4) ▽	7 (0.5) ▽	54 (1.4) △	59 (1.3) ▲	20 (1.3) ▼	53 (1.6) ▲	
Latvia	4 (0.6) ▽	2 (0.5) ▽	13 (1.2)	21 (1.1) ▼	27 (1.1) ▼	32 (1.5) ▽	29 (1.4) ▼	
Lithuania	5 (0.6) ▽	6 (0.6) ▽	18 (1.0) △	38 (1.1) ▽	41 (1.2) ▽	53 (1.4) ▲	51 (1.6) △	
Malta	9 (1.1) ▽	4 (0.8) ▽	12 (1.3) ▽	37 (2.1) ▽	37 (2.1) ▼	9 (1.4) ▼	30 (1.9) ▼	
Mexico	24 (1.3) ▲	12 (0.9) △	27 (1.7) ▲	72 (1.4) ▲	65 (1.7) ▲	39 (2.0) △	54 (1.6) ▲	
Norway	1 (0.3) ▼	1 (0.6) ▽	3 (0.7) ▼	15 (1.3) ▼	26 (1.2) ▼	49 (1.9) ▲	37 (1.5) ▽	
Peru	46 (1.5) ▲	26 (1.5) ▲	22 (1.5) △	69 (1.8) ▲	61 (1.7) ▲	55 (2.0) ▲	53 (2.1) ▲	
Slovenia	9 (0.8) ▽	3 (0.4) ▽	13 (1.1)	44 (1.5)	48 (1.4)	29 (1.6) ▽	61 (1.6) ▲	
Sweden	5 (0.7) ▽	1 (0.2) ▽	2 (0.4) ▼	24 (1.3) ▼	29 (1.6) ▼	7 (1.0) ▼	14 (1.2) ▼	
ICCS 2016 average	12 (0.3)	8 (0.3)	15 (0.3)	46 (0.4)	48 (0.4)	35 (0.5)	41 (0.5)	
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements for teacher survey								
Denmark	2 (0.8)	1 (0.3)	3 (0.9)	24 (2.8)	31 (2.8)	14 (3.1)	14 (2.0)	
Estonia	2 (0.7)	1 (0.6)	7 (1.5)	28 (2.7)	37 (2.8)	17 (2.2)	13 (2.8)	
Korea, Republic of	27 (1.5)	7 (1.0)	16 (1.2)	51 (1.6)	70 (1.3)	52 (2.1)	40 (1.4)	
Netherlands	2 (0.5)	1 (0.3)	3 (0.4)	14 (0.8)	20 (1.2)	9 (1.1)	7 (1.0)	
Russian Federation	16 (3.2)	9 (1.8)	21 (2.9)	67 (2.8)	67 (3.0)	88 (2.2)	45 (4.2)	

**National percentage:**

▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average

△ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average

▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average

▼ More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

**Notes:**

0 Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.



### *Civic and citizenship activities in classrooms and teacher preparation*

Chapter 2 of this report described the general approaches that the ICCS 2016 schools were taking to deliver civic and citizenship education in their classrooms. The chapter also reported principals' and teachers' perceptions of the most important aims of this area of school education, and documented the types of pre-service and in-service training that teachers in the ICCS countries experience. In this section of the current chapter, we look at the activities carried out within participating schools' classrooms during civic and citizenship education lessons from two perspectives—students' and teachers'. We also consider teachers' responses to a question about their level of preparedness for teaching topics related to civic and citizenship education.

The question in the ICCS 2016 student questionnaire on civic topics taught in school required students to indicate the extent to which they had learned about each of the following at their school: (a) "how citizens can vote in local or national election;" (b) "how laws are introduced and changed in <country of test>;" (c) "how to protect the environment (e.g. through energy-saving or recycling);" (d) "how to contribute to solving problems in the <local community>;" (e) "how citizen rights are protected in <country of test>;" and (f) "political issues and events in other countries."

We used these items to derive an IRT-based scale called civic learning at school. It had an average reliability across countries (Cronbach's alpha = 0.80). The higher scale scores indicate higher levels of reported learning of civic issues at school. (For a description of this scale, see the item map in [Figure 6.4](#), Appendix D.)

On average across the participating countries, the highest percentages of students who said they had learned about the listed topics to a moderate or large extent were for how to protect the environment (81%), how citizens can vote in local and national elections (64%), and how citizen rights are protected in <country of test> (61%). The lowest percentages were for political issues and events in other countries (52%) and how to contribute to solving problems in the <local community> (55%). Significant differences emerged across the countries for all six topics (see [Table 6.16](#)), suggesting that students in different countries experience different degrees of emphasis on the civic-related topics they study at school.

[Table 6.16](#) also shows the national average scale scores for students' learning of civic issues at school. Countries with the highest national average scale scores (three or more points above the ICCS 2016 average) were Chinese Taipei, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Peru. Those with the lowest national averages were Belgium (Flemish), Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Netherlands.

Our analyses of students' responses to the civic-topics question included looking for possible associations between the students' learning of these topics and (dichotomous) variables reflecting students' interest in civic issues (quite or very interested versus little interest), students' expected educational attainment (a university degree versus no such degree), and civic knowledge (scores at or above Level B versus scores below this level). [Table 6.17](#) presents the findings of these analyses.

Positive and statistically significant associations were evident in all of the ICCS 2016 countries between students' reports of civic learning at school and students' interest in social and political issues. The average difference between the national scores for students who were quite or very interested in the itemized civic issues was three scale score points above the ICCS average. We also registered in most participating countries higher scale scores for students who anticipated completing a university degree. Here, the difference was two points on average across the participating countries. Students at or above Level B of civic knowledge scored higher than students below this level, with an ICCS average difference of three points.

Table 6.16: National percentages and average scale scores for students' reports on civic learning at school

Country	Percentages of students who reported having learned the following to a moderate or large extent:								Average scale scores for students' reports on learning of civic issues at school
	How citizens can vote in local or national elections (%)	How laws are introduced and changed in <country of test> (%)	How to protect the environment (e.g. through energy-saving or recycling) (%)	How to contribute to solving problems in the <local community> (%)	How citizen rights are protected in <country of test> (%)	Political issues and events in other countries (%)	How the economy works (%)		
Belgium (Flemish)	50 (1.6) ▼	41 (1.7) ▼	85 (0.8) △	39 (0.9) ▼	36 (1.2) ▼	50 (1.2)	66 (2.1) △	46 (0.3) ▼	
Bulgaria	64 (1.1)	53 (1.3) ▽	84 (1.0) △	57 (1.2)	55 (1.3) ▽	40 (1.2) ▼	45 (1.1) ▼	48 (0.2) ▽	
Chile	71 (1.0) △	64 (1.1) △	81 (0.8)	63 (0.9) △	64 (1.0) △	49 (0.9) ▽	60 (0.9) △	51 (0.3) △	
Chinese Taipei	88 (0.7) ▲	86 (0.7) ▲	90 (0.6) △	71 (0.9) ▲	86 (0.6) ▲	64 (1.0) ▲	59 (1.0) △	56 (0.3) ▲	
Colombia	78 (1.4) ▲	58 (1.2)	92 (0.5) ▲	74 (0.9) ▲	83 (0.8) ▲	47 (1.4) ▽	73 (1.0) ▲	54 (0.2) ▲	
Croatia	69 (1.6) △	61 (1.5)	91 (0.7) ▲	60 (1.3) △	67 (1.4) △	52 (1.5)	36 (1.4) ▼	50 (0.3)	
Denmark <sup>†</sup>	61 (1.2) ▽	73 (1.2) ▲	61 (1.2) ▼	42 (1.0) ▼	56 (1.0) ▽	67 (1.1) ▲	68 (1.2) ▲	49 (0.2) ▽	
Dominican Republic	73 (1.2) △	69 (1.0) △	84 (0.8) △	74 (1.0) ▲	81 (0.8) ▲	60 (1.1) △	73 (1.0) ▲	56 (0.3) ▲	
Estonia <sup>1</sup>	41 (1.4) ▼	48 (1.6) ▼	72 (1.4) ▽	51 (1.1) ▽	53 (1.6) ▽	44 (1.4) ▽	41 (1.9) ▼	46 (0.3) ▼	
Finland	57 (0.9) ▽	40 (1.0) ▼	85 (0.8) △	41 (1.0) ▼	45 (1.3) ▼	42 (1.1) ▼	31 (1.0) ▼	45 (0.2) ▼	
Italy	70 (1.9) △	68 (1.6) △	85 (0.9) △	54 (1.2)	71 (1.6) △	64 (1.1) ▲	70 (0.9) ▲	52 (0.3) △	
Latvia <sup>1</sup>	44 (1.3) ▼	47 (1.3) ▼	84 (0.9) △	43 (1.2) ▼	43 (1.2) ▼	43 (1.2) ▽	51 (1.6) ▽	47 (0.3) ▼	
Lithuania	44 (1.4) ▼	46 (1.6) ▼	84 (1.0) △	41 (1.2) ▼	46 (1.5) ▼	45 (1.0) ▽	36 (1.0) ▼	46 (0.3) ▼	
Malta	55 (0.8) ▽	46 (0.9) ▼	81 (0.7)	51 (0.8) ▽	63 (0.8)	44 (0.8) ▽	50 (0.9) ▽	48 (0.1) ▽	
Mexico	72 (1.0) △	69 (0.8) ▲	85 (0.6) △	73 (0.9) ▲	78 (0.8) ▲	48 (0.8) ▽	68 (0.9) ▲	53 (0.2) ▲	
Netherlands <sup>†</sup>	44 (1.2) ▼	37 (1.5) ▼	66 (1.3) ▼	35 (1.2) ▼	34 (1.2) ▼	53 (1.3)	64 (2.1) △	44 (0.3) ▼	
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	65 (0.9) △	42 (1.2) ▼	69 (1.0) ▼	45 (1.0) ▼	46 (1.0) ▼	56 (1.0) △	47 (1.2) ▼	48 (0.2) ▽	
Peru	81 (0.8) ▲	75 (0.9) ▲	86 (0.7) △	71 (0.9) ▲	79 (0.9) ▲	52 (1.2)	71 (0.8) ▲	55 (0.3) ▲	
Russian Federation	55 (1.6) ▽	62 (1.4) △	81 (0.9)	50 (1.1) ▽	74 (1.2) ▲	48 (1.1) ▽	63 (1.2) △	50 (0.3)	
Slovenia	76 (1.5) ▲	75 (1.2) ▲	76 (0.9) ▽	60 (1.4) △	70 (1.3) △	58 (1.3) △	68 (1.5) ▲	52 (0.3) △	
Sweden <sup>†</sup>	80 (1.5) ▲	82 (2.0) ▲	84 (1.0) △	56 (1.8)	61 (2.2)	75 (1.7) ▲	59 (1.8)	53 (0.5) △	
ICCS 2016 average	64 (0.3)	59 (0.3)	81 (0.2)	55 (0.2)	61 (0.3)	52 (0.3)	57 (0.3)	50 (0.1)	
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements									
Hong Kong SAR	52 (1.6)	58 (1.6)	80 (1.0)	59 (0.9)	64 (1.3)	48 (1.1)	48 (1.3)	48 (0.3)	
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	58 (1.2)	44 (1.2)	85 (1.1)	55 (1.3)	48 (1.1)	46 (1.1)	42 (1.1)	47 (0.3)	
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements									
North-Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) <sup>1</sup>	63 (3.1)	64 (2.7)	70 (2.2)	42 (2.2)	52 (2.3)	73 (1.8)	67 (2.2)	50 (0.7)	

## National percentage or average:

- ▲ More than 10 percentage or 3 score points above ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 10 percentage or 3 score points below ICCS 2016 average

## Notes:

- 0 Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
- (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
- † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
- <sup>1</sup> National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
- <sup>2</sup> Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.

Table 6.17: National average scale scores of students' reports on civic learning at school by students' interest, expected education, and level of civic knowledge

Country	Scale score average by students' interest										Scale score average by expected university degree										Scale score average by level of civic knowledge															
	Not interested in civic issues					Quite or very interested in civic issues					Not expecting university score higher					Expecting university score higher					Civic knowledge below Level B (below 479)					Civic knowledge at or above Level B (479 and above)										
	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	
Belgium (Flemish)	46 (0.3)						48 (0.4)	46 (0.5)							47 (0.3)						46 (0.5)															46 (0.3)
	47 (0.3)						50 (0.4)	47 (0.4)							48 (0.3)						48 (0.4)														48 (0.3)	
Bulgaria	50 (0.3)						55 (0.4)	49 (0.4)							52 (0.3)						50 (0.3)														53 (0.4)	
Chile	55 (0.3)						58 (0.3)	53 (0.4)							57 (0.3)						49 (0.8)														57 (0.3)	
Chinese Taipei	53 (0.3)						57 (0.3)	52 (0.5)							54 (0.2)						53 (0.3)														55 (0.3)	
Colombia	49 (0.3)						52 (0.4)	50 (0.4)							50 (0.4)						49 (0.4)														51 (0.4)	
Croatia	48 (0.2)						51 (0.2)	49 (0.2)							51 (0.3)						46 (0.5)														50 (0.2)	
Denmark <sup>†</sup>	55 (0.3)						59 (0.4)	56 (0.4)							57 (0.4)						56 (0.3)														60 (0.7)	
Dominican Republic	45 (0.3)						48 (0.4)	46 (0.4)							47 (0.4)						44 (0.6)														47 (0.3)	
Estonia <sup>†</sup>	44 (0.2)						48 (0.3)	45 (0.2)							46 (0.3)						45 (0.6)														45 (0.2)	
Finland	50 (0.3)						54 (0.4)	51 (0.3)							53 (0.3)						50 (0.4)														52 (0.3)	
Italy	46 (0.3)						49 (0.5)	47 (0.3)							47 (0.4)						46 (0.4)														47 (0.3)	
Latvia <sup>†</sup>	45 (0.3)						48 (0.4)	46 (0.3)							47 (0.4)						46 (0.4)														46 (0.3)	
Lithuania	47 (0.2)						50 (0.2)	48 (0.2)							48 (0.2)						48 (0.3)														48 (0.2)	
Malta	52 (0.2)						56 (0.3)	51 (0.3)							54 (0.2)						52 (0.3)														55 (0.3)	
Mexico	44 (0.3)						48 (0.5)	44 (0.3)							44 (0.4)						44 (0.6)														45 (0.3)	
Netherlands <sup>†</sup>	46 (0.2)						50 (0.3)	47 (0.2)							48 (0.2)						46 (0.4)														48 (0.2)	
Norway (9) <sup>1</sup>	53 (0.3)						56 (0.3)	53 (0.3)							55 (0.3)						53 (0.2)														57 (0.4)	
Peru	48 (0.4)						53 (0.4)	50 (0.3)							51 (0.4)						49 (0.6)														51 (0.4)	
Russian Federation	51 (0.3)						54 (0.4)	51 (0.3)							52 (0.4)						50 (0.4)														52 (0.3)	
Slovenia	51 (0.6)						55 (0.4)	51 (0.5)							53 (0.6)						50 (1.3)														53 (0.4)	
Sweden <sup>1</sup>	49 (0.1)						52 (0.1)	49 (0.1)							51 (0.1)						48 (0.1)														51 (0.1)	
ICCS 2016 average																																				
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements																																				
Hong Kong SAR	46 (0.3)						51 (0.3)	46 (0.4)							49 (0.3)						45 (0.4)														50 (0.3)	
Korea, Republic of <sup>2</sup>	45 (0.4)						50 (0.3)	46 (0.5)							48 (0.3)						44 (0.8)														48 (0.3)	

Difference between comparison groups statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .  
 Difference between comparison groups not statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

■ Difference between comparison groups statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

□ Difference between comparison groups not statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

#### Notes:

0 Standard errors appear in parentheses.

Score averages that are significantly larger ( $p < 0.05$ ) than those in the comparison group are displayed in **bold**.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

<sup>1</sup> National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

<sup>2</sup> Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.

The ICCS 2016 teacher questionnaire also asked teachers who were teaching subjects labelled at the national level as “civic and citizenship education” how often (“never,” “sometimes,” “often,” “very often”) they used specific teaching methods during their lessons. This question was included in the “international option” of the questionnaire, which meant that only those teachers who were teaching these specifically identified subjects were to answer these questions. (The national research centers were responsible for identifying the subjects related to civic and citizenship education.)

The question on teaching methods included eight statements (items): (a) “Students work on projects that involve gathering information outside school” (e.g. interviews in the neighborhood, small scale surveys); (b) “Students work in small groups on different topics/issues;” (c) “Students participate in role plays;” (d) “Students take notes during teacher’s lectures;” (e) “Students discuss current issues;” (f) “Students research and/or analyze information gathered from multiple web sources (e.g. wikis, online newspapers);” (g) “Students study textbooks;” and (h) “Students propose topics/issues for the following lessons.”

Table 6.18 displays the percentages of teachers reporting on activities that they very often or often used during their lessons. On average, use of textbooks, lectures (with students taking notes), and discussion on current issues were the three activities for which we recorded the relatively highest percentages in nearly all of the participating countries (67%, 58%, and 74%, respectively). Group work was a relatively common activity across countries (international average: 52%), with the exception of Chinese Taipei. Less frequent, on average, were the more interactive activities such as project work (16%), role playing (26%), and the direct involvement of students in terms of proposing topics for discussion during lessons (18%).

Several studies have shown that teacher preparation is one of the most important factors influencing student achievement (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009, 2014; Torney-Purta, Richardson, & Barber, 2005). ICCS 2009 therefore asked teachers of civic and citizenship education subjects to state how confident they felt about teaching specific civic-related topics and skills. Results showed that teachers of these subjects tended to be most confident about teaching “human rights” and “citizens’ rights and responsibilities” and less confident about teaching topics relating to the economy, business, and legal institutions (Schulz et al., 2010).

ICCS 2016 included a similar question in the international option of the teacher questionnaire. However, this time, the question asked teachers to report how well prepared (“very well prepared,” “quite well prepared,” “not very well prepared,” “not prepared at all”) they felt to teach the question’s 11 civic- and citizenship-related topics and skills set down in Table 6.19.<sup>1</sup>

Responses to this question revealed that, on average, most teachers felt very well prepared or quite well prepared to teach almost all of the topics and skills included in the question. The highest average percentages we recorded across the participating countries were those for “citizens’ rights and responsibilities” (90%) and “equal opportunities for men and women” (also 90%). The lowest percentages recorded were those for “the global community and international organizations” (67%) and “the constitution and political systems” (73%). Large variation across countries was evident not only for these two items but also for “emigration and immigration.” These differences may reflect the rapidly changing political and social situations of the participating countries and the fact that many teachers completed their education before some of these issues took on their current importance.

1 These same items were included in the question on teachers’ initial preparation and in-service training reported in Chapter 2. One item (“the European Union”) was optional for teachers from the European countries.

Table 6.18: Teachers' reports on civic and citizenship education activities in the classroom

Country	National percentages of teachers of civic-related subjects who reported having conducted often or very often the following civic and citizenship education-related activities in their classrooms:								Students propose topics/issues for the following lessons
	Students work on projects that involve gathering information outside school	Students work in small groups on different topics/issues	Students participate in role plays	Students take notes during teacher's lectures	Students discuss current issues	Students research and/or analyze information gathered from multiple web sources	Students study textbooks		
Belgium (Flemish) <sup>†</sup>	5 (0.9) ▼	36 (2.1) ▼	16 (1.6) ▽	66 (2.4) △	62 (1.6) ▼	37 (1.8) ▽	46 (2.1) ▼	5 (0.9) ▼	
Bulgaria	15 (4.3)	34 (4.5) ▼	28 (4.8)	70 (4.7) ▲	63 (5.1) ▼	28 (5.2) ▼	86 (3.3) ▲	9 (2.7) ▽	
Chile	14 (2.8)	55 (3.2)	22 (3.0)	50 (3.1) ▽	54 (4.6) ▼	38 (3.2)	63 (3.4)	23 (3.4)	
Chinese Taipei	4 (1.7) ▼	11 (3.1) ▼	11 (2.9) ▼	86 (2.8) ▲	62 (4.0) ▼	18 (2.8) ▼	84 (3.1) ▲	16 (3.5)	
Colombia	18 (1.9)	69 (2.5) ▲	46 (2.4) ▲	47 (3.1) ▼	72 (2.0)	56 (2.9) ▲	43 (2.9) ▼	25 (3.0) △	
Croatia	10 (1.1) ▽	41 (1.3) ▼	25 (1.2)	42 (1.4) ▼	69 (1.6) ▽	41 (1.3)	49 (1.3) ▼	19 (1.3)	
Dominican Republic	41 (5.6) ▲	84 (4.3) ▲	44 (4.8) ▲	79 (4.4) ▲	88 (3.1) ▲	71 (4.5) ▲	84 (3.8) ▲	41 (5.8) ▲	
Finland <sup>†</sup>	6 (1.4) ▽	50 (3.1)	5 (1.1) ▼	42 (2.6) ▼	67 (1.9) ▽	33 (2.3) ▼	69 (2.3)	13 (1.9) ▽	
Italy	9 (1.5) ▽	38 (2.6) ▼	11 (1.2) ▼	56 (2.4)	87 (1.6) ▲	65 (2.3) ▲	83 (2.1) ▲	26 (2.0) △	
Latvia	22 (3.0)	59 (3.9)	27 (4.3)	55 (4.3)	76 (3.0)	45 (4.0)	65 (3.7)	17 (3.6)	
Lithuania	8 (1.4) ▽	47 (4.2)	15 (3.4) ▼	51 (4.3)	87 (2.5) ▲	51 (4.4)	85 (2.3) ▲	19 (2.7)	
Malta	9 (2.3) ▽	57 (4.0)	39 (4.1) ▲	26 (3.4) ▼	83 (4.3) △	32 (4.5) ▼	24 (4.5) ▼	9 (2.1) ▽	
Mexico	52 (5.1) ▲	88 (1.8) ▲	52 (3.3) ▲	74 (5.3) ▲	87 (3.8) ▲	57 (5.1) ▲	89 (2.3) ▲	19 (3.3)	
Norway	10 (2.4) ▽	59 (4.0)	5 (1.0) ▼	61 (3.6)	60 (3.2) ▼	34 (3.0) ▽	75 (3.1) △	5 (0.9) ▼	
Peru	32 (4.7) ▲	64 (4.5) ▲	55 (5.1) ▲	78 (3.6) ▲	78 (4.5)	43 (3.2)	77 (3.5) △	24 (3.5)	
Slovenia	10 (1.5) ▽	36 (2.9) ▼	33 (2.2) △	49 (2.3) ▽	74 (2.0)	35 (2.7) ▽	58 (2.1) ▽	11 (1.4) ▽	
Sweden	6 (2.0) ▼	57 (4.6)	8 (2.0) ▼	60 (4.1)	89 (2.4) ▲	47 (3.8)	62 (4.1)	17 (2.7)	
ICCS 2016 average	16 (0.7)	52 (0.8)	26 (0.8)	58 (0.9)	74 (0.8)	43 (0.9)	67 (0.7)	18 (0.7)	
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements for teacher survey									
Denmark	15 (3.9)	86 (4.7)	6 (2.4)	63 (5.9)	74 (6.2)	55 (6.4)	50 (6.8)	10 (4.4)	
Estonia	6 (3.2)	35 (6.8)	7 (3.7)	40 (6.6)	55 (6.0)	49 (6.3)	78 (5.2)	5 (3.5)	
Korea, Republic of	12 (1.9)	31 (4.1)	12 (2.8)	46 (4.0)	36 (3.7)	31 (3.4)	79 (3.6)	30 (3.0)	
Netherlands	3 (1.0)	33 (2.7)	4 (1.1)	59 (3.1)	47 (3.0)	38 (2.8)	89 (2.1)	4 (1.2)	
Russian Federation	26 (5.6)	53 (7.7)	28 (6.1)	54 (6.3)	85 (3.9)	46 (5.7)	73 (7.2)	20 (3.9)	

**National percentage:**

▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average

▴ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average

▽ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average

▼ More than 10 percentage points or below ICCS 2016 average

**Notes:**

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

Table 6.19: Teachers' preparedness for teaching civic and citizenship education topics and skills

Country	Percentages of teachers who felt very well or quite well prepared to teach the following topics and skills:											
	Human rights	Voting and elections	The global community and international organizations	The environment and environmental sustainability	Emigration and immigration	Equal opportunities for men and women	Citizens' rights and responsibilities	"The constitution and political systems"	Responsible internet use (e.g., privacy, source reliability, social media)	Critical and independent thinking	Conflict resolution	The European Union
Belgium (Flemish) <sup>†</sup>	68 (2.5) ▼	64 (2.1) ▼	56 (2.3) ▼	80 (1.6) ▼	68 (1.9) ▼	80 (1.6) ▼	68 (1.7) ▼	43 (2.1) ▼	83 (1.7)	92 (1.2) Δ	79 (1.7) ▼	48 (2.2) ▼
Bulgaria	90 (3.1)	92 (2.4) ▲	82 (2.5) ▲	83 (3.4)	82 (3.8)	88 (2.8)	89 (2.9)	85 (3.2) ▲	80 (3.2)	88 (3.0)	88 (2.7)	96 (1.8) ▲
Chile	84 (2.3)	77 (4.0)	56 (4.6) ▼	72 (3.2) ▼	66 (3.0) ▼	87 (2.1)	88 (2.3)	65 (3.5) ▼	75 (3.7)	86 (2.6)	81 (3.1) ▼	–
Chinese Taipei	86 (2.7)	96 (1.7) ▲	84 (2.3) ▲	88 (2.2) Δ	44 (5.1) ▼	95 (1.2) Δ	96 (1.7) Δ	94 (1.9) Δ	84 (2.6)	85 (2.7)	87 (2.5)	–
Colombia	77 (2.9) ▼	73 (2.9) ▼	52 (3.2) ▼	81 (3.0)	62 (2.8) ▼	85 (2.7) ▼	83 (2.2) ▼	65 (2.4) ▼	67 (2.1) ▼	82 (1.8) ▼	86 (1.7)	–
Croatia	81 (1.2) ▼	67 (1.5) ▼	50 (1.4) ▼	78 (1.2) ▼	52 (1.6) ▼	79 (1.1) ▼	78 (1.5) ▼	53 (1.3) ▼	82 (1.4)	87 (1.0)	88 (1.0)	58 (1.2) ▼
Dominican Republic	93 (3.3)	86 (4.3)	64 (5.1)	92 (2.3) Δ	92 (2.5) ▲	97 (1.6) Δ	96 (2.2) Δ	90 (3.2) ▲	72 (5.6)	95 (2.1) Δ	96 (1.7) Δ	–
Finland <sup>†</sup>	85 (1.6)	60 (1.9) ▼	63 (2.9)	84 (2.1)	70 (2.0) ▼	93 (1.1) Δ	86 (1.4) ▼	47 (1.8) ▼	82 (1.8)	94 (1.1) Δ	83 (2.0) ▼	51 (2.4) ▼
Italy	96 (0.8) Δ	80 (2.3)	81 (1.9) ▲	87 (1.6)	94 (1.1) ▲	93 (1.3)	98 (0.8) Δ	90 (1.5) ▲	72 (2.3) ▼	91 (1.1)	83 (1.9) ▼	91 (1.7) ▲
Latvia	88 (3.8)	91 (1.9) Δ	67 (3.4)	89 (2.0) Δ	68 (4.6)	89 (2.7)	94 (1.9) Δ	70 (4.7)	87 (2.9) Δ	93 (1.3) Δ	93 (2.3) Δ	82 (3.3) Δ
Lithuania	89 (2.4)	89 (2.2) Δ	87 (3.5) ▲	84 (2.6)	94 (1.8) ▲	88 (2.5)	94 (1.3) Δ	84 (2.6) ▲	80 (2.8)	82 (2.8) ▼	89 (2.0)	98 (0.7) ▲
Malta	88 (2.6)	72 (4.4) ▼	61 (4.7)	86 (2.9)	79 (4.4)	94 (1.8) Δ	92 (3.0)	56 (4.6) ▼	87 (3.4) Δ	84 (3.0)	83 (3.0)	57 (5.2) ▼
Mexico	89 (2.4)	81 (3.7)	52 (4.3) ▼	87 (2.8)	87 (2.0) ▲	95 (1.7) Δ	97 (1.1) Δ	73 (4.7)	65 (4.5) ▼	84 (2.9)	93 (1.8) Δ	–
Norway	95 (1.3) Δ	96 (0.8) ▲	80 (3.7) ▲	80 (3.6)	94 (2.0) ▲	94 (1.4) Δ	93 (1.1) Δ	92 (1.4) ▲	90 (1.7) ▲	95 (0.9) Δ	85 (1.7)	70 (3.7)
Peru	88 (2.4)	92 (1.7) ▲	66 (3.9)	86 (3.1)	86 (2.6) ▲	96 (1.3) Δ	94 (1.6) Δ	80 (3.9)	71 (3.4) ▼	87 (3.0)	86 (3.0)	–
Slovenia	87 (1.6)	67 (2.2) ▼	52 (1.9) ▼	73 (1.8) ▼	61 (2.4) ▼	80 (1.8) ▼	86 (1.9)	65 (2.2) ▼	80 (1.8)	92 (1.4) Δ	87 (1.6)	67 (1.9) ▼
Sweden	98 (1.0) ▲	94 (1.9) ▲	94 (1.7) ▲	92 (2.2) Δ	95 (1.4) ▲	99 (0.8) Δ	98 (1.2) Δ	93 (2.1) ▲	93 (2.0) ▲	95 (1.8) Δ	91 (2.5)	79 (3.4)
<b>ICCS 2016 average</b>	<b>87 (0.6)</b>	<b>81 (0.6)</b>	<b>67 (0.8)</b>	<b>84 (0.6)</b>	<b>76 (0.7)</b>	<b>90 (0.4)</b>	<b>90 (0.4)</b>	<b>73 (0.7)</b>	<b>79 (0.7)</b>	<b>89 (0.5)</b>	<b>87 (0.5)</b>	<b>73 (0.8)</b>
<b>Countries not meeting sample participation requirements for teacher survey</b>												
Denmark	95 (1.9)	97 (1.6)	81 (5.8)	77 (4.6)	86 (5.1)	91 (4.1)	94 (4.0)	95 (3.8)	70 (6.4)	93 (4.1)	88 (3.1)	76 (5.3)
Estonia	62 (7.5)	64 (5.2)	49 (6.6)	84 (4.8)	56 (7.4)	51 (9.3)	79 (5.4)	57 (7.0)	70 (7.6)	72 (8.1)	69 (5.1)	73 (5.8)
Korea, Republic of	64 (3.9)	66 (4.1)	43 (3.9)	65 (3.6)	32 (3.4)	77 (4.5)	78 (3.3)	54 (3.3)	81 (3.6)	77 (3.5)	80 (3.9)	–
Netherlands	75 (2.7)	69 (2.8)	63 (3.0)	77 (2.5)	73 (2.9)	85 (2.1)	73 (2.7)	56 (2.8)	90 (1.8)	96 (1.1)	78 (2.4)	60 (2.2)
Russian Federation	97 (1.7)	92 (4.2)	86 (4.1)	96 (2.0)	79 (5.7)	99 (0.6)	99 (0.4)	99 (0.5)	79 (5.0)	77 (6.0)	94 (2.4)	–

**National percentage:**

▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average

Δ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average

▼ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average

▼ More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

**Notes:**

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

– Not administered.



## References

- Ainley, J., Schulz, W., & Friedman, T. (Eds.). (2013). *ICCS 2009 encyclopedia: Approaches to civic and citizenship education around the world*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- American Educational Research Association (AERA). (2013). *Prevention of bullying in schools, colleges, and universities: Research report and recommendations*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Annette, J. (2008). Community involvement, civic engagement and service learning. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 388–397). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Atria, M., Strohmeier, D., & Spiel, C. (2007). The relevance of the school class as social unit for the prevalence of bullying and victimization. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 4(4), 372–387.
- Bäckman, E., & Trafford, B. (2007). *Democratic governance of schools*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Bear, G., Yang, C., Pell, M., & Gaskins, C. (2014). Validation of a brief measure of teachers' perceptions of school climate: Relations to student achievement and suspensions. *Learning Environments Research*, 17(3), 339–354.
- Corcoran, L., & McGuckin, C. (2014). Addressing bullying problems in Irish schools and in cyberspace: A challenge for school management. *Educational Research*, 56(1), 48–64.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(10), 15–24.
- Eurydice. (2005). *Citizenship education at school in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: Author.
- Eurydice. (2012). *Citizenship education in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: Author.
- Eurydice. (2013). *Key data on teachers and school leaders in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: Author.
- Fisher, B. W., Gardella, J. H., & Teurbe-Tolon, A. R. (2016). Peer cybervictimization among adolescents and the associated internalizing and externalizing problems: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(9), 1727–1743.
- Henderson, A., Pancer, S. M., & Brown, S. D. (2013). Creating effective civic engagement policy for adolescents: Quantitative and qualitative evaluations of compulsory community service. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 29(1), 120–154.
- Henderson, K., & Tilbury, D. (2004). *Whole school approaches to sustainability: An international review of sustainable school programs*. Sydney, Australia: Australian Research Institute in Education for Sustainability (ARIES).
- Homana, G., Barber, C., & Torney-Purta, J. (2006). *Assessing school citizenship education climate: Implications for the social studies* (Circle Working Paper 48). Retrieved from [http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP48\\_Homana.pdf](http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP48_Homana.pdf)
- Hooghe, M., & Quintelier, E. (2013). The relationship between political participation intentions of adolescents and a participatory democratic climate at school in 35 countries. *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(5), 567–589.
- Huckle, J. (2008). Sustainable development. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 342–354). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Huddleston, T. (2007). *From student voice to shared responsibility: Effective practice in democratic school governance in European schools*. London, UK: Citizenship Foundation.
- Ishimaru, A. (2013). From heroes to organizers: Principals and education organizing in urban school reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(1) 3–51.
- Kyburz-Graber, R. (2013). Socioecological approaches to environmental education and research: A paradigmatic response to behavioral change orientations. In R. B. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), *International handbook of research on environmental education* (pp. 23–32). New York, NY and London, UK: American Educational Research Association (AERA) and Routledge.
- Lundholm, C., Hopwood, N., & Kelsey, E. (2013). Environmental learning: *Insights from research into the student experience*. In R. B. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), *International handbook of research on environmental education* (pp. 243–252). New York, NY and London, UK: American Educational Research Association (AERA) and Routledge.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, Egypt: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

- Olweus, D. (1973). *Hackkycklingar och översittare: Forskning om skolmobbing* [Chopper chicks and bullies: Research on school bullying]. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wicksell.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from TALIS*. Paris, France: Author.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2014). *TALIS 2013 results: An international perspective on teaching and learning*. Paris, France: Author.
- Powell, J. E., Powell, A. I., & Petrosko, J. M. (2015). School climate as a predictor of incivility and bullying among public school employees: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of School Violence*, 14(2), 217–244.
- Quin, D. (2017). Longitudinal and contextual associations between teacher–student relationships and student engagement: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(2), 345–387.
- Ranson, S., Farrell, C., Peim, N., & Smith, P. (2005). Does governance matter for school improvement? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 16(3), 305–325.
- Salmivalli, C. (2012). KiVa antibullying program: Overview of evaluation studies based on a randomized controlled trial and national rollout in Finland. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 6(2), 294–302.
- Sammons, P., Gu, Q., Day, C., & Ko, J. (2011). Exploring the impact of school leadership on pupil outcomes: Results from a study of academically improved and effective schools in England. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(1) 83–101.
- Scheerens, J. (Ed.). (2009). *Informal learning of active citizenship at school: An international comparative study in seven European countries*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer-Verlag.
- Scheerens J., Glas, C., & Thomas, M. S. (2003). *Educational evaluation, assessment, and monitoring: A systematic approach*. London, UK and New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Schulz, W. (2005). *Political efficacy and expected political participation among lower and upper secondary students*. Paper presented at the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) General Conference, Budapest, September 8–10, 2005.
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 international report: Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower secondary school students in thirty-eight countries*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., & Agrusti, G. (2016). *IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016: Assessment framework*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Friedman, T., & Lietz, P. (2011). *ICCS 2009 Latin American report: Civic knowledge and attitudes among lower secondary students in six Latin American countries*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Smith, P. K., & Shu, S. (2000). What good schools can do about bullying: Findings from a survey in English schools after a decade of research and action. *Childhood*, 7(2), 193–212.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Torney-Purta, J., Richardson, W. K., & Barber, C. (2005). Teachers' educational experience and confidence in relation to students' civic knowledge cross-nationally. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education*, 1(1), 32–57.
- Torrance, D. (2013). Distributed leadership: Still in the gift of the headteacher. *Scottish Educational Review*, 45(2), 50–63.
- Trafford, B. (2003). *School councils, school democracy, school improvement: Why, what, how*. Leicester, UK: Secondary Heads Association.
- UNESCO. (2014). *UNESCO roadmap for implementing the Global Action Programme on Education for Sustainable Development*. Paris, France: Author.
- Van Houtte, M. (2005). Climate or culture? A plea for conceptual clarity in school effectiveness research. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 16(1), 71–89.
- Wade, A., & Beran, T. (2011). Cyberbullying: The new era of bullying. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 26(1), 44–61.

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

