

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 civic 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 classrepresentative 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 (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.

Country		National pe	-	s of students a I, nearly all, or			ls reported
		Elect their o	class repr	esentatives		chool cound ament elec	· ·
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)	\bigtriangleup	45	(4.2)	▼
Colombia	(r)	99	(1.0)		99	(0.9)	
Croatia		100	(0.0)		98	(1.1)	
Denmark [†]		91	(2.1)	\bigtriangleup	92	(2.0)	
Dominican Republic		95	(1.9)	\bigtriangleup	95	(1.6)	
Estonia ¹	(s)	76	(4.9)	\bigtriangledown	79	(4.4)	
Finland		98	(1.1)		93	(1.7)	
Italy		22	(3.5)	▼	1	(0.7)	▼
Latvia ¹		88	(3.1)		73	(5.0)	
Lithuania		93	(2.1)	\bigtriangleup	79	(3.1)	
Malta		85	(0.3)		80	(0.3)	\triangle
Mexico		98	(1.2)		81	(2.7)	\triangle
Netherlands [†]	(r)	46	(4.4)	▼	34	(5.2)	▼
Norway (9) ¹		99	(0.8)		95	(2.0)	
Peru		93	(1.5)	Δ	85	(2.3)	
Russian Federation		82	(3.2)		74	(3.6)	
Slovenia		99	(0.8)		81	(3.7)	
Sweden1		92	(2.4)	Δ	78	(3.6)	
ICCS 2016 average		85	(0.6)		74	(0.7)	

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

Countries not meeting sample participation requirements

Hong Kong SAR	87 (3.6)	86 (3.6)
Korea, Republic of ²	100 (0.0)	100 (0.0)

Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements

North Rhine-Westphalia	100 (0.0)	75 (6.3)
(Germany) ¹ (r)		

National percentage:

- △ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average
 ▽ Significantly below ICCS 2014 ▲ More than 10 percentage points 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.
- National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
- Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year. 2
- 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

Tacaches are involved in decision-making procession Students are given the decision-making procession Students are given the attripate in accurdin procession Students are given the decision-making procession Students are given the attripate in accurdin procession Students are given the decision-making procession 1 2 3 3 5 3 5 5 7 12 2.6. 1 2 3	Parents are involved in decision-making processes Students' opinions are taken into account in decision-making processes Rules and regulations are indecision-making attracting staff, processes 8 (2.1) ∇ 8 (2.1) ∇ 8 (2.1) ∇ 52 (5.0) ∇ 8 (2.1) ∇ 8 (2.1) ∇ 8 (2.1) ∇ 52 (5.0) ∇ 10 (2.9) ∇ 23 (3.3) ∇ 52 (3.4) Δ 1 10 (2.9) ∇ 28 (4.5) Δ 56 (3.4) Δ 1 23 (3.9) Δ 38 (4.5) Δ 56 (4.4) Δ 1 23 (3.9) Δ 26 (4.5) Δ 56 (4.4) Δ 1 21 (2.0) $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 26 (3.4) $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 26 (4.4) Δ 1 23 (3.8) $\mathbf{\Delta}$ 27 23 23.9 $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 23 23.9 $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 21.0 23 23.9 $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 23 23.9 $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 24 23 23 23.9			National percentage	s of students at schools v	lational percentages of students at schools where principals reported that to a large extent:	nat to a large extent:	
8 (2.1) 8 (2.1) 8 (2.1) 8 (2.1) 8 (2.1) 8 (2.1) 8 (2.1) 8 (2.1) 8 (2.1) (2.1) (2.2) (2.3) (2.1) (2.2) (2.3) (2.1) (2.2) (2.3) (2.2) (2.3) (2.2) (2.3) (2.2) (2.3) (2.2) (2.3) (2.2) (2.3) (2.2) <th>∇ 8 (2.1) ▼ 52 (5.0) ▼ 12 (2.6) ∇ 32 (4.3) ∇ 66 (3.9) 17 (3.0) ∇ 26 (3.8) 72 (3.4) ∞ 27 (4.0) 7 18 (3.3) ∇ 66 (3.9) 17 (3.0) 8 45.5 ★ 60 (4.5) 46 (4.4) 48 (4.5) ★ 60 (4.5) 46 (4.4) 9 38 (4.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 ★ 38 (4.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 46 (4.4) ★ 38 (4.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 46 (4.4) ★ 38 (4.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 46 (4.4) ★ 53 (3.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 46 (4.4) ★ 53 (3.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 46 (4.5) ★ 7 (2.1) ★ 27 (3.2) 7 47 (3.2) ★ 5 (3.9) ★ 5 (3.9) 7 46 (4.1) ★</th> <th>Country</th> <th>Teachers are involved in decision-making processes</th> <th>Parents are involved in decision-making processes</th> <th>Students' opinions are taken into account in decision-making processes</th> <th>Rules and regulations are followed by teaching and non-teaching staff, students, and parents</th> <th>Students are given the opportunity to actively participate in school decisions</th> <th>Parents are provided with information on the school and student performance</th>	∇ 8 (2.1) ▼ 52 (5.0) ▼ 12 (2.6) ∇ 32 (4.3) ∇ 66 (3.9) 17 (3.0) ∇ 26 (3.8) 72 (3.4) ∞ 27 (4.0) 7 18 (3.3) ∇ 66 (3.9) 17 (3.0) 8 45.5 ★ 60 (4.5) 46 (4.4) 48 (4.5) ★ 60 (4.5) 46 (4.4) 9 38 (4.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 ★ 38 (4.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 46 (4.4) ★ 38 (4.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 46 (4.4) ★ 38 (4.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 46 (4.4) ★ 53 (3.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 46 (4.4) ★ 53 (3.2) ★ 66 (3.9) 7 46 (4.5) ★ 7 (2.1) ★ 27 (3.2) 7 47 (3.2) ★ 5 (3.9) ★ 5 (3.9) 7 46 (4.1) ★	Country	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
8 (2.3) ∇ 32 (4.3) 80 3.5 \sim 27 (4.0) 83 (3.2) 10 2.9 ∇ 26 3.8) 72 3.4 2.7 2.8 (3.5) 8.3 (3.2) 75 (3.7) 84 (3.0) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7)	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Belgium (Flemish)		(2.1)		(2.0)	(2.6)	
10 2.9 72 (3.4) 72 (3.4) 84 (3.0) 75 (3.7) 19 2.7 18 (3.3) 7 (6.3) 17 (3.0) 75 (3.7) 23 (3.9) 48 (4.5) 66 (4.5) 46 (4.4) 86 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 75 (3.7) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.8) 71 (3.9) 71 (3.9) 71 (3.9) 71 $(3$	∇ 26 (38) 72 (34) Δ 28 (4.0) 18 (3.3) ∇ 66 (3.9) ∇ 46 (4.4) 48 (4.5) \bullet 60 (4.5) 46 (4.4) 46 (4.4) \bullet 38 (4.2) \bullet 56 (3.9) ∇ 43 (4.3) \bullet 55 (4.5) \bullet 56 (3.4) 48 (4.4) 58 (4.4) \bullet 55 (4.5) \bullet 57 (4.4) 58 (4.4) 58 (4.4) \bullet 57 (4.5) \bullet 57 (4.4) 58 (4.4) 49 (5.1) \bullet 57 (4.5) \bullet 57 (4.4) 58 (4.4) 49 (5.1) \bullet 72 (3.2) \bullet 83 (2.7) \bullet 21 (3.2) ∇ 72 (3.2) \bullet 83 (2.1) 42 (4.1) ∇ 72 (3.2) \bullet 51 (4.3) ∇ 72 (3.2) \bullet 31 (3.2) ∇ 72 (3.2) \bullet 72 (3.2) ∇ 72 (3.1) \bullet	Bulgaria		(2.3)		(3.5)		
19 (2.7) 18 (3.3) ∇ 66 (3.9) 17 (3.0) 75 (3.7) 23 (3.9) Δ (4.5) Δ (6.0 (4.5) $A6$ (4.4) Δ 75 (3.7) 30 (3.9) Δ (3.2) ∇ 72 (3.5) Δ 46 (4.4) Δ 75 222 7 (2.0) Δ 657 4.44 Δ 657 222 7 (2.0) Δ 657 4.44 Δ 72 339 46 (5.0) Δ 553 543 Δ 71 339 421 Δ 72 339 20 311 92 541 Δ 86 (4.3) Δ 72 339 210 (2.5) ∇ 232 333 (4.1) Δ 72 339 210 (2.5)	18 (3.3) ∇ 66 (39) 17 (30) $48 (4.5)$ $60 (4.5)$ $46 (4.4)$ $38 (4.2)$ $55 (3.9)$ 7 $45 (4.4)$ $20 (3.2)$ 7 $55 (3.9)$ 7 $43 (4.3)$ $\sqrt{2}$ $20 (3.2)$ 7 $57 (4.4)$ $58 (4.4)$ $\sqrt{2}$ $55 (4.5)$ $6 (5,4)$ $7 (2.1)$ $7 (2.1)$ $\sqrt{7}$ $7 (2.1)$ $\sqrt{2}$ $83 (2.7)$ $49 (5.1)$ $\sqrt{7}$ $7 (2.1)$ $\sqrt{2}$ $83 (2.7)$ $42 (4.1)$ $\sqrt{7}$ $7 (2.1)$ $\sqrt{2}$ $83 (2.7)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.5)$ $\sqrt{7}$ $21 (4.3)$ $22 (4.3)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.3)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$ $\sqrt{7}$ $24 (3.9)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$ $\sqrt{7}$ $23 (4.1)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$ $\sqrt{7}$ $24 (3.9)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$ $\sqrt{7}$ $23 (4.1)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$ $\sqrt{7}$ $23 (4.1)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$ $\sqrt{2} (4.1)$	Chile			26 (3.8)	(3.4)	28 (4.0)	84 (3.0)
23 (3.9) $48 (4.5)$ $60 (4.5)$ $46 (4.4)$ $85 (3.2)$ $95 (2.2)$ $30 (3.9)$ $38 (4.2)$ $56 (3.9)$ $7 (3.9)$ $85 (3.2)$ $85 (3.2)$ $7 (2.0)$ $20 (3.2)$ $7 (3.5)$ $7 (3.5)$ $7 (3.5)$ $7 (3.8)$ $7 (3.8)$ $46 (5.0)$ $65 (4.5)$ $66 (5.4)$ $83 (2.7)$ $89 (3.2)$ $88 (3.2)$ $28 (5.6)$ $37 (5.3)$ $66 (5.4)$ $83 (2.7)$ $89 (3.5)$ $71 (3.8)$ $2 (1.1)$ $9 (2.2)$ $83 (2.7)$ $83 (2.7)$ $88 (3.5)$ $71 (3.8)$ $2 (1.1)$ $9 (2.5)$ $7 (2.1)$ $7 (2.1)$ $8 (3.2)$ $71 (3.8)$ $2 (1.1)$ $7 (2.1)$ $7 (2.1)$ $8 (4.8)$ $67 (4.5)$ $89 (3.2)$ $2 (3.1)$ $2 (4.1)$ $2 (4.1)$ $2 (4.1)$ $2 (4.1.5)$ $7 (3.3)$ $2 (3.1)$ $2 (4.1)$ $2 (4.1)$ $2 (4.1)$ $2 (3.2)$ $7 (3.3)$ $2 (3.1)$ $2 (4.1)$ $2 (4.1)$ $2 (4.1)$ $2 (4.1.5)$ $7 (4.1.5)$ <td>48 4.5 \bullet 60 4.5 \bullet 4.6 4.4 \bullet 38 4.2 \bullet 5.6 3.9 ∇ 4.3 4.3 \bullet 20 3.2 ∇ 5.6 3.9 ∇ 4.3 4.3 \bullet 5.5 4.4 5.5 5.5 2.9 5.4 4.9 5.1 \bullet 5.2 5.3 \bullet 5.7 4.4 5.8 4.4 ∇ 7.2 5.3 5.4 5.4 4.9 5.1 ∇ 7.2 5.3 5.4 5.2 5.4 4.9 5.1 ∇ 7.2 5.3 5.4 5.2 3.3 5.4 4.2 5.1 ∇ 7.2 5.3 5.4 5.2 3.3 5.4 4.2 4.1 ∇ 7.2 3.2 5.2 3.2 5.2 4.2 4.1 ∇ 2.1 3.2 2.2 3.2 3</td> <td>Chinese Taipei</td> <td></td> <td>19 (2.7)</td> <td>(3.3)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	48 4.5 \bullet 60 4.5 \bullet 4.6 4.4 \bullet 38 4.2 \bullet 5.6 3.9 ∇ 4.3 4.3 \bullet 20 3.2 ∇ 5.6 3.9 ∇ 4.3 4.3 \bullet 5.5 4.4 5.5 5.5 2.9 5.4 4.9 5.1 \bullet 5.2 5.3 \bullet 5.7 4.4 5.8 4.4 ∇ 7.2 5.3 5.4 5.4 4.9 5.1 ∇ 7.2 5.3 5.4 5.2 5.4 4.9 5.1 ∇ 7.2 5.3 5.4 5.2 3.3 5.4 4.2 5.1 ∇ 7.2 5.3 5.4 5.2 3.3 5.4 4.2 4.1 ∇ 7.2 3.2 5.2 3.2 5.2 4.2 4.1 ∇ 2.1 3.2 2.2 3.2 3	Chinese Taipei		19 (2.7)	(3.3)			
30 (39) 38 (4.2) 56 (3.9) \vee 43 (4.3) 85 (3.2) 7 (2.0) 20 (3.2) \vee 72 (3.5) \wedge 19 (3.2) \vee 71 (38) 46 (5.0) 65 (4.5) \wedge 67 (4.4) 58 (4.4) \wedge 96 (2.2) 28 (5.6) 37 (5.3) 66 (5.4) 49 (5.1) \wedge 89 (3.6) 2 (11) \vee 9 (2.2) \vee 83 (2.7) \sim 21 (2.9) \vee 71 (38) 2 (11) \vee 9 (2.2) \vee 83 (2.7) \sim 21 (2.9) \vee 72 (3.8) 2 (11) \vee 9 (2.2) \vee 83 (2.7) \sim 21 (2.9) \vee 72 (3.8) 2 (11) \vee 7 (3.1) \vee 83 (2.7) \vee 73 (3.2) \vee 72 (3.8) 2 (3.1) \vee 33 (3.1) \vee 33 (3.4) \vee 73 (3.2) 2 (3.1) \vee 33 (3.4) \vee 33 (3.4) \vee 71 (3.0)	• 38 (4.2) • 56 (3.9) ∇ 43 (4.3) • 20 (3.2) ∇ 72 (3.5) Δ 19 (3.2) • 55 (4.5) ∇ 65 (4.5) Δ 49 (5.1) • 37 (5.3) 66 (5.4) 49 (5.1) • 9 (2.2) Ψ 83 (2.7) 21 (2.9) • 7 (2.1) Ψ 29 (3.6) 49 (5.1) • 7 (2.1) Ψ 29 (3.6) 49 (5.1) • 7 (2.1) Ψ 29 (3.6) 49 (5.1) • 51 (4.3) Δ 83 (2.7) 21 (2.9) • 24 (3.9) 28 (4.1) 42 (4.1) 42 (4.1) • 37 (4.0) Δ 88 (4.1) 42 (4.1) • 37 (4.0) Δ 88 (4.1) 42 (4.1) • 37 (4.0) Δ 33 (3.4) 42 (4.1) • 37 (4.0) Δ 33 (3.4) 42 (4.1) • 37 (4.0) Δ 33 (3.1) 42 (4.1)			23 (3.9)				
7 (2.0) (\checkmark 20 (3.2) \lor 72 (3.5) \bigtriangleup 19 (5.1) (\checkmark 71 (3.8) 46 (5.0) (\checkmark 65 (4.5) (\checkmark 67 (4.4) 58 (4.4) (\checkmark 96 (2.2) 96 (2.2) 28 (5.6) 37 (5.3) 66 (5.4) 49 (5.1) (\checkmark 99 (3.6) 2 (1.1) (\checkmark 9 (2.2) (\checkmark 83 (2.7) (\checkmark 21 (2.9) (\lor 78 (3.6) 2 (1.1) (\bullet 9 (2.2) (\checkmark 83 (2.7) (\bullet 21 (2.9) (\lor 71 (3.8) 2 (1.1) (\bullet 9 (2.5) (\checkmark 83 (2.5) (\bullet 23 (3.6) (\bullet 71 (3.8) 2 (1.1) (2.5) \lor 71 (3.9) 25 (3.9) (\checkmark 31 (3.6) (\bullet 97 (1.5) ($.5$) 32 (3.1) 21 (3.7) (4.2) 88 (0.4) (\bullet 33 (0.4) (\bullet 97 (1.5) ($.5$) 20 (3.1) 24 (3.9) 25 (3.9) (\bullet 31 (3.6) (\bullet 82 (3.4) 88 (3.2) 32 (4.1) 42 (4.1) 42 (4.1) (52 (4.1) 97 (1.5) (2.7) 71 (3.7) 32 (4.1) 42 (4.1) 42 (4.1) 88 (3.2) 88 (3.2) 88 (3.2) 33 (4.1) </td <td>\checkmark 20 (3.2) ∇ 72 (3.5) Δ 19 (3.2) \checkmark 65 (4.5) \checkmark 67 (4.4) 58 (4.4) \Im 37 (5.3) 66 (5.4) 49 (5.1) \checkmark 9 (2.2) \ast 83 (2.7) 21 (2.9) \checkmark 7 (2.1) \checkmark 29 (3.6) 49 (5.1) \checkmark 51 (4.3) \checkmark 83 (2.7) \sim 21 (2.9) \checkmark 7 (2.1) \checkmark 29 (3.6) 49 (5.1) 49 (5.1) \checkmark 51 (4.3) \checkmark 83 (2.7) \sim 21 (3.9) \checkmark 51 (4.3) \sim 83 (3.4) 9 (3.4) 42 (4.1) \checkmark 24 (3.9) \sim 31 (3.2) 42 (4.1) \checkmark 37 (4.0) Δ 58 (4.1) 42 (4.1) \checkmark 37 (4.0) Δ 33 (3.4) 73 (3.7) \checkmark 37 (4.0) Δ 33 (3.7) 42 (4.1) \checkmark 53 (3.5) Δ 42 (4.1) 42 (4.1) \checkmark 53 (3.4)</td> <td>Croatia</td> <td></td> <td>30 (3.9)</td> <td></td> <td>(3.9)</td> <td>43 (4.3)</td> <td>85 (3.2)</td>	\checkmark 20 (3.2) ∇ 72 (3.5) Δ 19 (3.2) \checkmark 65 (4.5) \checkmark 67 (4.4) 58 (4.4) \Im 37 (5.3) 66 (5.4) 49 (5.1) \checkmark 9 (2.2) \ast 83 (2.7) 21 (2.9) \checkmark 7 (2.1) \checkmark 29 (3.6) 49 (5.1) \checkmark 51 (4.3) \checkmark 83 (2.7) \sim 21 (2.9) \checkmark 7 (2.1) \checkmark 29 (3.6) 49 (5.1) 49 (5.1) \checkmark 51 (4.3) \checkmark 83 (2.7) \sim 21 (3.9) \checkmark 51 (4.3) \sim 83 (3.4) 9 (3.4) 42 (4.1) \checkmark 24 (3.9) \sim 31 (3.2) 42 (4.1) \checkmark 37 (4.0) Δ 58 (4.1) 42 (4.1) \checkmark 37 (4.0) Δ 33 (3.4) 73 (3.7) \checkmark 37 (4.0) Δ 33 (3.7) 42 (4.1) \checkmark 53 (3.5) Δ 42 (4.1) 42 (4.1) \checkmark 53 (3.4)	Croatia		30 (3.9)		(3.9)	43 (4.3)	85 (3.2)
46 (5.0) 65 (4.5) 67 (4.4) 58 (4.4) 68 (5.2) 9 (2.2) 7 (3.3) 28 (5.6) 37 (5.3) 66 (5.4) 49 (5.1) 89 (3.6) 2 (1.1) 9 (2.2) 83 (2.7) 21 (2.9) 7 89 (3.6) 2 (1.1) 9 (2.2) 83 (2.7) 21 (2.9) 7 78 (3.2) 2 (1.1) 9 (2.2) 83 (2.7) 21 (2.9) 7 78 (3.2) 32 (3.8) 51 (4.3) 68 (4.8) 67 (4.5) 89 (3.6) 97 (1.5) 32 (3.1) 24 (3.9) 25 (3.9) 85 (0.4) 31 (3.6) 82 (3.4) 20 (3.1) 24 (3.9) 25 (3.4) 33 (0.4) 2 94 (1.5) 33 (4.1) 237 (4.0) 2 58 (4.1) 42 (4.1) 94 (1.5) 31 (3.7) 37 (4.0) 2 44 (3.1) 42 (4.1) 94 (1.5) 71 (3.0) 31 (3.5) 24 (3.5) 24 (3.4) 33 (3.4) 2 94 (1.5) 71 (3.0) 31 (3.5) 24 (3.5) 24 (3.4) 31 (3.2) <	• 65 (4.5) • 67 (4.4) 58 (4.4) 58 (4.4) • 7 (5.3) 66 (5.4) 49 (5.1) ∇ 7 (2.1) • 29 (3.6) • 49 (5.1) ∇ 51 (4.3) 66 (5.4) 49 (5.1) ∇ 51 (4.3) 66 (5.4) 49 (5.1) ∇ 51 (4.3) 68 (4.8) 65 (4.8) ∇ 51 (4.3) 88 (4.8) 67 (4.5) ∇ 24 (3.9) 85 (0.4) 31 (3.6) ∇ 29 (0.3) 85 (0.4) 31 (3.6) ∇ 29 (0.3) 85 (0.4) 31 (3.2) ∇ 137 (4.0) 58 (4.1) 42 (4.1) ∇ 24 (3.6) 73 (3.7) 14 (3.1) ∇ 15 (3.4) 73 (3.7) 14 (3.1) ∇ 15 (3.4) 73 (3.7) 14 (3.1) ∇ 15 (3.4) 73 (3.7) 43 (3.7) ∇ 15 (3.4) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) ∇ 17 (3.8) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) ∇ 24 (3.6) 23 (0.9) 21 (3.9) ∇ 23 (0.8)	Denmark [†]		7 (2.0)	(3.2)	(3.5)	(3.2)	
28 5.6) 37 5.3) 66 $(5,4)$ 49 (5.1) \bullet 89 (3.6) 2 (1.1) 9 2.2) \bullet 83 (27) \bullet 89 (3.6) 2 (1.1) \bullet 9 (2.2) \bullet 83 (27) \bullet 78 (3.2) 32 (3.8) \bullet (1.3) \bullet (8) (8) (8) (7.5) 97 (1.5) 72 (3.8) 20 (3.1) 24 (3.9) 25 (3.9) 97 (1.5) 72 (3.8) 72 (3.8) 72 (3.8) 72 (3.8) 71 (3.7) 82 (3.4) 83 (2.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7) 71 (3.7)	37 (5.3) 66 (5.4) 49 (5.1) ∇ 7 (2.1) 83 2.7 49 5.1 ∇ 7 (2.1) 83 2.7 221 2.9 ∇ 51 (4.3) 6 6.7 4.5 5.1 $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 51 (4.3) 83 2.7 9 51 (3.9) 7 51 (3.9) ∇ 24 (3.9) 85 (0.4) 8 31 (3.6) 33 (3.4) ∇ 229 (0.3) 85 (0.4) 8 31 (3.6) ∇ 229 (0.3) 85 (0.4) 8 31 (3.6) ∇ 229 (0.3) 85 (4.1) 42 (4.1) 42 (4.1) ∇ 37 (4.0) Δ 33 (3.7) 14 (3.1) 31 (3.2) ∇ 15 (3.4) ∇ 73 (3.7) 21 (3.9) 31 (3.2) ∇ 15 (3.4) 73 (3.7) 21 (3.1) 21 (3.2) 21 (3.9) ∇ 15 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 42 (4.1) 21 (3.9) </td <td>Dominican Republic</td> <td></td> <td>46 (5.0) 🔺</td> <td>65 (4.5)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Dominican Republic		46 (5.0) 🔺	65 (4.5)			
2 (11) (1) 9 (2.2) (1) 83 (2.7) (1) 21 (2.9) (7) 78 (3.2) 10 (2.5) ∇ 7 (2.1) (1) 29 (3.6) (1) 5 (1.8) (1) 72 (3.8) 32 (3.8) (1) 51 (4.3) 68 (4.8) 67 (4.5) 97 (1.5) 72 (3.8) 20 (3.1) 24 (3.9) 25 (3.9) (1) 31 (3.6) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 20 (3.1) 24 (3.9) 25 (3.9) (1) 31 (3.6) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 20 (3.1) 29 (0.3) 85 (0.4) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 92 (3.1) 94 (1.5) 94 (1.5) 94 (1.5) 94 (1.5) 94 (1.5) 94 (1.5) 94 (1.5) 94 (1.5) 94 (1.5) 92 (3.4) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7) 92 (3.7)	\checkmark 9 (2.2) \checkmark 83 (2.7) \simeq 21 (2.9) \bigtriangledown 7 (2.1) \checkmark 29 (3.6) \checkmark 51 (1.8) \checkmark 51 (4.3) \checkmark 68 (4.8) 67 (1.8) \checkmark 24 (3.9) 25 (3.9) 31 (3.6) \checkmark 22 (3.9) 25 (3.9) 31 (3.6) \checkmark 27 (3.7) 25 (3.9) 31 (3.6) \checkmark 37 (4.0) Δ 58 (0.4) ∞ 31 (3.6) \checkmark 37 (4.1) Δ 31 (3.6) 32 (3.1) \checkmark 37 41 53 31 31 32 31 32 \checkmark 15 33 37 41 42 (4.1) 31 32 \checkmark 15 33 33 33 31 32			28 (5.6)	37 (5.3)		49 (5.1) 🔺	89 (3.6)
10 $(2.5) \nabla$ 7 $(2.1) \checkmark$ 29 $(3.6) \checkmark$ 5 $(1.8) \checkmark$ 72 (3.8) 32 $(3.8) \checkmark$ 51 (4.3) 68 (4.8) 67 $(4.5) \checkmark$ 97 (1.5) 20 (3.1) 24 (3.9) 25 $(3.9) \checkmark$ 31 $(4.5) \checkmark$ 97 (1.5) 8 $(0.2) \nabla$ 29 (0.3) 85 $(0.4) \checkmark$ 33 $(0.4) \triangle$ 83 (0.3) 8 $(0.2) \nabla$ 27 $(0.3) \triangle$ 85 $(0.4) \checkmark$ 33 $(0.4) \triangle$ 82 $(1.5) \frown$ 37 $(4.1) \checkmark$ 57 47 $52.9 \lor$ 47 $52.9 \lor$ 94 $(1.5) \frown$ 71 $(3.7) \frown$ 82 $(3.1) \bullet$ 71 $(3.7) \bullet$	$ \nabla \qquad 7 (2.1) \checkmark 9 (3.6) \checkmark 5 (1.8) $ $ 51 (4.3) \checkmark 68 (4.8) $ $ 51 (4.3) \checkmark 29 (0.3) $ $ 22 (0.3) \otimes 85 (0.4) \checkmark 31 (3.6) $ $ 37 (4.0) \land 29 (0.3) $ $ 37 (4.0) \land 29 (3.7) \land 14 (3.1) $ $ 51 (3.4) \lor 73 (3.7) \land 14 (3.1) $ $ 51 (3.4) \lor 73 (3.7) \land 14 (3.1) $ $ 51 (3.4) \lor 73 (3.7) \land 14 (3.1) $ $ 51 (3.4) \lor 73 (3.7) \land 14 (3.1) $ $ 51 (3.4) \lor 73 (3.7) \land 14 (3.1) $ $ 51 (3.4) \lor 73 (3.7) \land 14 (3.1) $ $ 51 (3.2) \land 70 (4.2) \land 43 (3.7) $ $ 22 (3.5) \land 70 (4.2) \land 43 (3.7) $ $ 22 (3.6) \lor 68 (5.9) $ $ 21 (3.9) $ $ 32 (4.1) \lor 68 (5.9) $ $ 32 (4.1) \lor 68 (5.9) $ $ 32 (4.1) \lor 68 (5.9) $ $ 33 (4.9) $ $ 33 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.9) $ $ 31 (4.7) $ $ 31 (4.9) $	Finland		2 (1.1)			(2.9)	
32 (3.8) 51 (4.3) 68 (4.8) 67 (4.5) 7 97 1.5 20 (3.1) 24 (3.9) 25 (3.9) 82 (3.4) 82 (3.4) 20 (3.1) 24 (3.9) 85 (3.4) 82 (3.4) (3.4) (3.4) (3.4) (3.4) (3.4) (3.4) (3.4) (3.4) (3.4) (3.2) (3.7) (3.7) (3.7) (3.7) (3.7) (3.7) (3.7) (3.7)	▲ 51 (4.3) ▲ 68 (4.8) 67 (4.5) 24 (3.9) 25 (3.9) 31 (3.6) 31 (3.6) ∇ 29 (0.3) 85 (0.4) 42 (4.1) \bullet 37 (4.0) Δ 58 (4.1) 42 (4.1) \bullet 58 (4.1) 42 (4.1) 42 (4.1) \bullet 58 (4.1) 42 (4.1) 42 (4.1) \bullet 53 (3.5) Δ 44 (5.2) Ψ 9 (2.8) ∇ 15 (3.4) \forall 73 (3.7) 14 (3.1) 31 (3.2) ∇ 15 (3.4) \forall 73 (3.7) \bullet 14 (3.1) ∇ 15 (3.4) \forall 73 (3.7) \bullet 14 (3.1) ∇ 15 (3.4) \forall 73 (3.7) \bullet 14 (3.1) ∇ 17 (3.8) \checkmark 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \uparrow 17 (3.8) \checkmark 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \bullet 24 (3.6) 53 (0.9) 21 (3.9) \bullet 24 (3.6) 53 (0.8) 21 (3.9) \bullet <	Italy		(2.5)		(3.6)		
20 (3.1) 24 (39) 25 (39) 31 (3.6) 82 (3.4) 8 (0.2) 29 (0.3) 85 (0.4) 33 (0.4) 83 (0.3) 39 (4.1) 37 (4.0) 25 (8.1) 42 (4.1) 94 (1.5) 39 (4.1) 37 (4.0) 2 58 (4.1) 42 (4.1) 83 (0.3) 39 (4.1) $37 (4.0)$ $28 (4.1)$ 42 (4.1) 88 (3.2) $3 (1.7)$ $4 (2.5)$ $47 (5.2)$ $47 (5.2)$ $9 (2.8)$ $71 (3.7)$ $3 (1.7)$ $4 (2.5)$ $7 (2.1)$ $7 (2.3)$ $7 (2.3)$ $7 (2.3)$ $7 (2.3)$ $3 (1.7)$ $4 (2.5)$ $7 (3.6)$ $7 (3.7)$ $43 (3.7)$ $8 (3.2)$ $7 (3.7)$	24 (3.9) 25 (3.9) 31 (3.6) ∇ 29 (0.3) 85 (0.4) 33 (0.4) 4 37 (4.0) Δ 58 (4.1) 42 (4.1) 4 6 (2.2) 4 47 (5.2) 4 9 (2.8) ∇ 15 (3.4) 4 5.2) 4 9 (3.1) ∇ 15 (3.4) 4 5.2) 4 9 (3.1) ∇ 15 (3.4) 4 73 (3.7) 4 14 (3.1) ∇ 15 (3.4) 7 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) 15 (3.5) Δ 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) 17 (3.8) 7 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) 17 (3.8) 7 70 (4.2) 21 (3.9) 7 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) 7 33 (0.9) 33 (0.8) 33 (0.8) 7 33 (0.9) 33 (0.9) 30 (0.8) 7 33 (0.9) 33 (0.9) 30 (0.9) 7 33 (4.9) 31 (4.7) <td>Latvia¹</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>51 (4.3)</td> <td></td> <td>(4.5)</td> <td></td>	Latvia ¹			51 (4.3)		(4.5)	
8 (0.2) 29 (0.3) 85 (0.4) $\mathbf{\Delta}$ 33 (0.4) $\mathbf{\Delta}$ 83 (0.3) 39 (4.1) $\mathbf{\Delta}$ 37 (4.0) $\mathbf{\Delta}$ 58 (4.1) $\mathbf{\Delta}$ 94 (1.5) 3 (1.7) $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 52 $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 58 (4.1) $\mathbf{\Delta}$ 94 (1.5) 3 (1.7) $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 52 $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 52 $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 94 (1.5) 94 (1.5) 71 (3.7) $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 94 (1.5) 71 (3.7) $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 92 (2.7) $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 71 (3.7) $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 71 (3.7) $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 71 (3.0) 71 (3.7) $\mathbf{\nabla}$ 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 (3.0) 71 $(3$	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Lithuania		20 (3.1)		(3.9)		
39 (4.1) 37 (40) Δ 58 (4.1) 42 (4.1) \bullet 94 (1.5) 3 (1.7) 6 (2.2) \bullet 47 (5.2) \bullet 9 (2.8) \bullet 94 (1.5) 8 (2.5) T 15 (3.4) \bullet 73 (3.7) 14 (3.1) \bullet 71 (3.7) 21 (2.9) 35 (3.5) Δ 48 (3.4) \bullet 31 (3.2) 71 (3.0) 31 (3.9) 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \bullet 92 (2.7) 31 (3.9) 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \bullet 92 (2.7) 31 (3.9) 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \bullet 92 (2.7) 31 (3.9) 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \bullet 92 (2.7) 31 (3.9) 24 (3.7) 21 (3.9) 70 (4.2) 21 (3.9) 70 (2.8) 31 (3.0) 17 (3.0) 21 (3.9) 70 (3.7) 21 (3.9) 70 (2.8) 70 (2.8) 12 (3.0) 28 (0.8) 28 (0.9)	 37 (4.0) 6 (2.2) 9 (4.1) 6 (2.2) 9 (2.8) 15 (3.4) 73 (3.7) 14 (3.1) 35 (3.5) 235 (3.5) 24 (3.4) 73 (3.7) 14 (3.1) 14 (3.1) 14 (3.1) 12 (3.2) 13 (3.2) 14 (3.1) 17 (3.8) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) 13 (3.2) 13 (3.2) 17 (3.8) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) 21 (3.9) 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) 23 (0.9) 30 (0.8) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) 40 (4.9) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9)	Malta	(0.4)	(0.2)	29 (0.3)	(0.4)	(0.4)	
$3 (1.7) \checkmark$ $6 (22) \checkmark$ $47 (52) \checkmark$ $9 (2.8) \checkmark$ $8 (3.2)$ $8 (2.5) \lor$ $15 (3.4) \checkmark$ $73 (3.7) \checkmark$ $14 (3.1) \checkmark$ $71 (3.0)$ $21 (2.9)$ $35 (3.5) \vartriangle$ $48 (3.4) \checkmark$ $73 (3.7) \checkmark$ $14 (3.1) \checkmark$ $71 (3.0)$ $21 (2.9)$ $35 (3.5) \bigtriangleup$ $48 (3.4) \checkmark$ $73 (3.7) \checkmark$ $92 (2.7) \checkmark$ $31 (3.9) \checkmark$ $24 (3.6)$ $70 (4.2)$ $43 (3.7) \checkmark$ $92 (2.7) \lor$ $31 (3.9) \checkmark$ $24 (3.6)$ $70 (4.2)$ $43 (3.7) \checkmark$ $92 (2.7) \lor$ $31 (3.9) \checkmark$ $24 (3.6)$ $70 (4.2)$ $43 (3.7) \checkmark$ $92 (2.7) \lor$ $12 (3.0)$ $17 (3.8) \checkmark$ $79 (3.7) \blacktriangle$ $21 (3.9) \bigtriangledown$ $92 (2.7) \lor$ $2 (1.9) \checkmark$ $35 (4.1)$ $68 (5.9)$ $21 (3.9) \lor$ $92 (2.7) \lor$ $2 (1.9) \checkmark$ $35 (4.1)$ $68 (5.9)$ $21 (3.9) \lor$ $90 (2.8) \lor$ $18 (0.7)$ $28 (0.8)$ $63 (0.9)$ $30 (0.8)$ $84 (0.7)$ $4 (2.2)$ $33 (4.9)$ $81 (4.7)$ $15 (3.9) \leftarrow$ $68 (4.5)$ $2 (5.2)$ $40 (4.9)$ $67 (5.7)$ $67 (5.7)$ $67 (5.7)$ <td>\checkmark 6 (2.2) \checkmark 47 (5.2) \checkmark 9 (2.8) \bigtriangledown 15 (3.4) \checkmark 73 3.7 \checkmark 14 (3.1) \checkmark 35 (3.5) \bigtriangleup 48 (3.4) \checkmark 31 (3.2) \checkmark 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \checkmark 17 (3.8) \checkmark 79 21 (3.9) \checkmark 17 (3.8) 79 (3.7) \checkmark 21 (3.9) \checkmark 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \checkmark 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \checkmark 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \checkmark 35 (4.9) 63 (0.9) 30 (0.8) \checkmark 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) \checkmark 33 (4.9)</td> <td>Mexico</td> <td></td> <td>39 (4.1) 🔺</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	\checkmark 6 (2.2) \checkmark 47 (5.2) \checkmark 9 (2.8) \bigtriangledown 15 (3.4) \checkmark 73 3.7 \checkmark 14 (3.1) \checkmark 35 (3.5) \bigtriangleup 48 (3.4) \checkmark 31 (3.2) \checkmark 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \checkmark 17 (3.8) \checkmark 79 21 (3.9) \checkmark 17 (3.8) 79 (3.7) \checkmark 21 (3.9) \checkmark 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \checkmark 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \checkmark 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \checkmark 35 (4.9) 63 (0.9) 30 (0.8) \checkmark 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) \checkmark 33 (4.9)	Mexico		39 (4.1) 🔺				
8 (2.5) 15 (3.4) 73 (3.7) 14 (3.1) 71 (3.7) 21 (2.9) 35 (3.5) Δ 48 (3.4) 7 31 (3.2) 71 (3.0) 31 (3.9) 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) 92 (2.9) 92 (2.9) 92 (2.9) 92 (2.9) 92 <td>$\nabla 15 (3.4) \checkmark 15 (3.4) \checkmark 14 (3.1)$ $35 (3.5) \Delta 48 (3.4) \checkmark 31 (3.2)$ $24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7)$ $17 (3.8) \checkmark 79 (3.7) \checkmark 21 (3.9)$ $35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9)$ $35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9)$ $33 (4.9) 68 (5.9) 30 (0.8)$ $33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9)$</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>3 (1.7)</td> <td></td> <td>(5.2)</td> <td></td> <td></td>	$ \nabla 15 (3.4) \checkmark 15 (3.4) \checkmark 14 (3.1) $ $ 35 (3.5) \Delta 48 (3.4) \checkmark 31 (3.2) $ $ 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) $ $ 17 (3.8) \checkmark 79 (3.7) \checkmark 21 (3.9) $ $ 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) $ $ 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) $ $ 33 (4.9) 68 (5.9) 30 (0.8) $ $ 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) $			3 (1.7)		(5.2)		
21 (2.9) 35 (3.5) Δ 48 (3.4) \checkmark 31 (3.2) 71 (3.0) 31 (3.9) 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \diamond 92 (2.7) 2 12 (3.0) 17 (3.8) \checkmark 79 (3.7) \diamond 21 (3.9) \heartsuit 92 (2.7) 2 12 (3.0) 17 (3.8) \checkmark 79 (3.7) \bullet 21 (3.9) \heartsuit 92 (2.7) 2 12 (3.0) 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \bigtriangledown 92 (2.7) 2 12 (1.9) 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \bigtriangledown 92 (2.7) 2 18 (0.7) 28 (0.8) 63 (0.9) 63 (0.9) 30 (0.8) 84 (0.7) 4 (2.2) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) $68 (4.5)$ 2 (5.2) 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9) $67 (5.7)$	35 (3.5) Δ 48 (3.4) \checkmark 31 (3.2) \bullet 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \bullet 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \bullet 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \bullet 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \bullet 33 (4.9) 63 (0.9) 30 (0.8) \bullet 33 (4.9) 61 (4.7) 15 (3.9) \bullet 33 (4.9) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9)	Norway (9) ¹		(2.5)	(3.4)	(3.7)	(3.1)	
31 (3.9) \blacktriangle 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \checkmark 92 (2.7) 12 (3.0) 17 (3.8) \checkmark 79 (3.7) \bigstar 21 (3.9) \triangledown 98 (1.0) 2 (1.9) \checkmark 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \triangledown 98 (1.0) 2 (1.9) \checkmark 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \triangledown 98 (1.0) 18 (0.7) 28 (0.8) 63 (0.9) 30 (0.8) 84 (0.7) 4 (2.2) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) 68 (4.5) 2 (5.2) 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9) 67 (5.7)	\bullet 24 (3.6) 70 (4.2) 43 (3.7) \bullet 17 (3.8) \bullet 79 (3.7) \bullet 21 (3.9) \bullet 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) 21 (3.9) \bullet 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) \bullet 33 (4.9) 63 (0.9) 30 (0.8) \bullet 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) \bullet 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9)	Peru		21 (2.9)	(3.5)	(3.4)		
12 (3.0) 17 (3.8) 79 (3.7) 21 (3.9) 7 98 (1.0) 2 (1.9) 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) 7 98 (1.0) 18 (0.7) 28 0.8) 63 (0.9) 30 0.8) 84 (0.7) 4 (2.2) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) 68 (5.7) 27 (5.2) 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9) 67 (5.7)	17 (3.8) 79 (3.7) 21 (3.9) 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) 28 0.8 63 (0.9) 30 0.8 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9)	Russian Federation		31 (3.9) 🔺				
2 $(1.9) \checkmark$ 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 $(3.9) \lor$ 90 (2.8) 18 0.7 28 (0.8) 63 (0.9) 30 (0.8) 84 (0.7) 4 (2.2) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) 68 (4.5) 27 (5.2) 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9) 67 (5.7)	▼ 35 (4.1) 68 (5.9) 21 (3.9) 28 (0.8) 63 (0.9) 30 (0.8) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9)	Slovenia	(4.2)	12 (3.0)	(3.8)	(3.7)	(3.9)	
18 0.7 28 0.8 63 0.9 30 0.8 84 4 (2.2) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) 68 27 (5.2) 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9) 67	28 (0.8) 63 (0.9) 30 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40	Sweden ¹		(1.9)			(3.9)	
4 (2.2) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) 68 27 (5.2) 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 67) 67	33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40	ICCS 2016 average						
42 (5.5) 4 (2.2) 33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 (3.9) 68 81 (4.1) 27 (5.2) 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9) 67	33 (4.9) 81 (4.7) 15 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40	Countries not meeting sample	participation requirements					
81 (4.1) 27 (5.2) 46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40 (4.9) 67	46 (5.7) 70 (4.2) 40	Hong Kong SAR		0				4
		Korea, Republic of ²		27 (5.2)	46 (5.7)		40 (4.9)	

Hong Kong SAR	42 (5.5)	4 (2.2)	33 (4.9)	81 (4.7)	15 (3.9)	(c.4) 89
Korea, Republic of ²	81 (4.1)	27 (5.2)	46 (5.7)	70 (4.2)	40 (4.9)	67 (5.7)
Benchmarking participant not meetin	g sample participa	ation requirements				
North Rhine-Westphalia	78 (5.9)	24 (7.1)	43 (6.5)	67 (8.1)	44 (6.9)	89 (2.4)

Nort (Ger

טו נו ו האווו וכ- ע עכאניטי ומוומ	(2.C) O/	Z'+ \/ .1/	10.0) 0+	(T'O) /O	44 (0.7)	
iermany) ¹ (r)						
tional parcentage.		Notec.				

- 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.
1 Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement adjacent upper grade.
2 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.

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

Country	2016		2009	Differences						
				(2016-2009)	4	10	45	50	55	60
Belgium (Flemish)	50 (0.3)	\bigtriangledown	49 (0.3)	0.6 (0.5)				-		
Bulgaria	48 (0.3)	\bigtriangledown	48 (0.4)	0.2 (0.6)						
Chile	52 (0.3)	\bigtriangleup	52 (0.3)	-0.1 (0.6)					•	
Chinese Taipei	52 (0.3)	\bigtriangleup	50 (0.3)	1.7 (0.6)						
Colombia	49 (0.3)	\bigtriangledown	50 (0.2)	-0.9 (0.5)				-		
Croatia	51 (0.3)	\bigtriangleup	-	-						
Denmark [†]	54 (0.3)		55 (0.3)	-0.9 (0.6)						
Dominican Republic	48 (0.4)	\bigtriangledown	47 (0.3)	0.9 (0.6)						
Estonia ¹	49 (0.3)	\bigtriangledown	50 (0.3)	-1.0 (0.5)						
Finland	49 (0.2)	\bigtriangledown	49 (0.2)	-0.3 (0.5)						
Italy	53 (0.3)	\bigtriangleup	54 (0.3)	-1.1 (0.5)						
Latvia ¹	49 (0.2)	\bigtriangledown	51 (0.3)	-1.6 (0.5)						
Lithuania	49 (0.3)	\bigtriangledown	50 (0.3)	-0.3 (0.5)				-		
Malta	49 (0.2)	\bigtriangledown	46 (0.2)	3.6 (0.4)						
Mexico	51 (0.2)	\bigtriangleup	50 (0.2)	0.9 (0.5)				F		
Netherlands [†]	47 (0.3)	\bigtriangledown	-	-						
Norway (9)1	52 (0.3)	\triangle	53 (0.5)	-0.5 (0.6)						
Peru	53 (0.3)	\triangle	-	-						
Russian Federation	48 (0.4)	\bigtriangledown	49 (0.3)	-1.4 (0.6)						
Slovenia	50 (0.3)	\bigtriangledown	50 (0.3)	-0.2 (0.5)						
Sweden	52 (0.4)	\triangle	51 (0.3)	1.5 (0.6)						
ICCS 2016 average	50 (0.1)									
Common countries average	50 (0.1)		50 (0.3)	0.1 (0.1)						

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

Countries not meeting sample participation requirements

Hong Kong SAR	53 (0.5)	-	-			
Korea, Republic of ²	42 (0.4)	-	-			

Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements

010010	0.000	Provense					
North Rhine-Westphalia	50 (0.5)	-	-				
(Germany) ¹							
				2016 av	erage score	+/- Confider	ice 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

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.

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.

- 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

2009 average score +/- Confidence interval

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

	g
-	õ
-	ē.
	8
	ŝ
1	C C
•	ž
	5
	0
-	ē
	S.
-	- 0
	ž
	a,
	00
1	Ĕ
	2
	gr
	9
-	σ
	cte
	ŏ
	d Xa
1	ŝt,
	2
	÷
	Ξ
	Š
	lent
-	
	Ξ
	<
	â
	ns
	0
•	SSI
	ž
	SC
-	0
	Ē
	8
	5
	JS:
•	~
	s in clas
	ess in clas
	nness in clas
	enness in clas
	openness in clas
	penness in clas
	n of openness in clas
	of openness in clas
	tion of openness in clas
	ception of openness in clas
	erception of openness in clas
	perception of openness in clas
•	ts' perception of openness in clas
	ents' perception of openness in clas
-	dents' perception of openness in clas
-	tudents' perception of openness in clas
	t students' perception of openness in clas
-	s of students' perception of openness in clas
	res of students' perception of openness in clas
	ores of students' perception of openness in clas
	scores of students' perception of openness in clas
	le scores of students' perception of openness in clas
	cale scores of students' perception of openness in clas
- - - -	scale scores of students' perception of openness in clas
-	ge scale scores of students' perception of openness in clas
	rage scale scores of students' perception of openness in cla
	verage scale scores of students' perception of openness in cla
	l average scale scores of students' perception of openness in cla
	al average scale scores of students' perception of openness in cla
	onal average scale scores of students' perception of openness in clas
	tional average scale scores of students' perception of openness in clas
	tional average scale scores of students' perception of openness in clas
	tional average scale scores of students' perception of openness in clas
	tional average scale scores of students' perception of openness in clas
	6.4: National average scale scores of students' perception of openness in cla
	ble 6.4: National average scale scores of students' perception of openness in cla
	ile 6.4: National average scale scores of students' perception of openness in cla

Notinterested inductistues Out interested inductistues Out interested inductisties Out interested inductisties Out interested inductisties Out interested inductistinterested Out interested inductistinterested </th <th>Country</th> <th>Scale sc</th> <th>Scale score average by students' interest</th> <th>interest</th> <th>Scale score average by expected university degree</th> <th>ersity degree</th> <th>Scale score average by level of civic knowledge</th> <th>y level of civic know</th> <th>rledge</th>	Country	Scale sc	Scale score average by students' interest	interest	Scale score average by expected university degree	ersity degree	Scale score average by level of civic knowledge	y level of civic know	rledge
ϕ <th></th> <th>Not interested in civic issues</th> <th></th> <th>Quite or very interested in civic issues</th> <th>Not expecting university score higher</th> <th>Expecting university score higher</th> <th>Civic knowledge below Level B (below 479)</th> <th>Civic k or ab</th> <th>Civic knowledge at or above Level B (479 and above)</th>		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 k or ab	Civic knowledge at or above Level B (479 and above)
um (Flemich) 47 (0.3) 1 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 47 (0.5) 50 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 53 (0.4) 53 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) 44 (0.5) <		6	63036	6	6303	6	9 6 3	0369	
rial 18 0.3 1 50 0.5 50 0.4 6 70 75 rest 12 0.3 1 55 0.5 50 0.4 54 0.3 74 rest 12 0.3 1 55 0.3 57 0.5 50 0.4 50 0.3 74 rest 52 0.3 1 53 0.3 53 0.3 54 0.3 74 rest 52 0.3 1 53 0.3 53 0.3 53 0.3 44 0.3 rest 52 0.3 1 53 0.3 53 0.3 44 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 44 43 44 43 44 43 44 43 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 <th< th=""><th>Belgium (Flemish)</th><th></th><th></th><th>51 (0.4)</th><th>49 (0.5)</th><th>50 (0.3)</th><th></th><th></th><th>50 (0.3)</th></th<>	Belgium (Flemish)			51 (0.4)	49 (0.5)	50 (0.3)			50 (0.3)
S2 (0.3) (0.4) S5 (0.5) 51 (0.4) S4 (0.4) S3 (0.3) S4 (0	Bulgaria			50 (0.5)	45 (0.5)	49 (0.3)	45 (0.5)		51 (0.3)
Sec Talpei 51 (0.3) 1 54 (0.5) 51 (0.4) 7 64 53 (0.4) 43 Inia 52 (0.3) 1 53 (0.4) 53 (0.4) 53 (0.3) 1 55 (0.3) 44 Inia 52 (0.3) 1 53 (0.4) 53 (0.4) 53 (0.3) 1 53 (0.3) 44 Inia 52 (0.3) 1 53 (0.3) 53 (0.3) 1 55 (0.3) 44 Inia 48 (0.3) 1 49 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 50 (0.3) 44 Inia 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 50 (0.4) 44 Inia 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 50 (0.4) 44 Inia 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 1 1 1 1 Inia 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 1 1 1 1	Chile			55 (0.5)	50 (0.4)	54 (0.4)	50 (0.4)		54 (0.4)
nbia 49 0.3) 1 51 0.4) 57 0.4) 50 0.3) 67 0.3) 67 0.3) 67 0.3) 67 0.3) 67 0.3) 67 0.3) 67 0.3) 63 0.3) 63 0.3) 63 0.3) 63 0.3) 63 0.3) 63 0.3) 63 0.3) 63 0.3) 63 0.3) 63 0.3) 64 73 0.3) 74 73 74 nican Republic 48 0.3) 1 49 0.3) 1 49 0.3) 47 0.4) 48 0.3 47 nican Republic 48 0.3) 1 49 0.3) 1 49 0.3 47 47 nican Republic 48 0.3) 1 48 0.3) 1 48 43 44 nican Republic 48 0.3) 1 48 0.3) 1 <td< td=""><td>Chinese Taipei</td><td></td><td></td><td>54 (0.5)</td><td>51 (0.4)</td><td>53 (0.4)</td><td></td><td></td><td>53 (0.4)</td></td<>	Chinese Taipei			54 (0.5)	51 (0.4)	53 (0.4)			53 (0.4)
tia (a) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	Colombia			51 (0.4)	47 (0.4)	50 (0.3)			51 (0.3)
marktimetric 52 (0.3) 1 57 (0.3) 53 (0.3) 66 (0.3) 66 (0.3) 48 nican Republic 48 (0.4) 1 49 (0.6) 47 (0.4) 1 56 (0.3) 47 nican Republic 48 (0.3) 1 49 (0.3) 47 (0.4) 1 50 (0.3) 47 nican Republic 48 (0.2) 1 51 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 1 50 (0.3) 47 nican Republic 48 (0.2) 1 51 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 1 50 (0.3) 47 nican Republic 48 (0.2) 1 52 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 1 50 (0.4) 48 (0.3) 46 nican Metric 48 (0.3) 1 56 (0.4) 52 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 44 47 nican Metric 48 (0.3) 1 51 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 1 50 (0.4) 48 44 48 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44	Croatia			53 (0.4)	50 (0.3)	52 (0.5)			52 (0.4)
nican Republic 48 0.43 1 47 0.43 47 0.43 47 0.43 47 0.43 47 0.43 47 0.43 47 0.43 47 0.43 47 0.43 47 47 60 35 0.43 47 50 0.33 47 47 50 0.33 47 50 0.33 47 50 0.33 47 50 0.33 47 50 0.33 47 50 0.33 48 43 43 43 000000	Denmark†			57 (0.3)	53 (0.3)	56 (0.3)			55 (0.3)
ii ¹ 49 (0.3) 1 49 (0.3) 51 (0.4) 49 (0.3) 6 50 (0.3) 47 id 48 (0.2) 1 56 (0.4) 52 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 6 55 (0.4) 55 64 a ¹ 52 (0.3) 1 56 (0.4) 52 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 6 55 (0.4) 48 a ¹ 49 (0.3) 1 50 (0.4) 48 (0.3) 1 50 (0.4) 48 48 a ¹ 49 (0.3) 1 50 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 6 50 (0.4) 48 48 a ¹ 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 1 48 48 a ¹ 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 48 63 48 63 48 48 a ¹ 48 (0.3) 1 48 (0.3) 48 63 48	Dominican Republic			49 (0.6)	47 (0.4)	50 (0.5)	47 (0.4)		54 (0.5)
dd 48 (0.2) 48 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 48 (0.3) 48 55 (0.4) 52 (0.3) 49 50 (0.4) 48 (0.3) 49 50 (0.4) 48 50 (0.4) 48 50 (0.4) 48 60 55 (0.4) 48 60 55 60 47 47 ania 48 (0.3) 1 50 (0.4) 48 (0.3) 48 60 47 48 <td< td=""><td>Estonia¹</td><td></td><td></td><td>51 (0.4)</td><td>49 (0.3)</td><td>50 (0.3)</td><td></td><td></td><td>50 (0.3)</td></td<>	Estonia ¹			51 (0.4)	49 (0.3)	50 (0.3)			50 (0.3)
1 2	Finland			51 (0.3)	48 (0.3)	50 (0.3)	46 (0.6)		50 (0.2)
a^1 a_1 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_1 a_1 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_1 a_2 a_1 a_1 <t< td=""><td>Italy</td><td></td><td></td><td>56 (0.4)</td><td>52 (0.3)</td><td>55 (0.4)</td><td>50 (0.4)</td><td></td><td>54 (0.3)</td></t<>	Italy			56 (0.4)	52 (0.3)	55 (0.4)	50 (0.4)		54 (0.3)
ania 48 0.3 49 0.4 0.3 49 0.4 0.3 10 <td>Latvia¹</td> <td>49 (0.3)</td> <td></td> <td>50 (0.4)</td> <td>48 (0.3)</td> <td>50 (0.4)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>50 (0.3)</td>	Latvia ¹	49 (0.3)		50 (0.4)	48 (0.3)	50 (0.4)			50 (0.3)
a b co co <td>Lithuania</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>51 (0.4)</td> <td>49 (0.4)</td> <td>50 (0.4)</td> <td>48 (0.4)</td> <td></td> <td>50 (0.3)</td>	Lithuania			51 (0.4)	49 (0.4)	50 (0.4)	48 (0.4)		50 (0.3)
00 50 0.2) 0 0 54 0.3) 50 0.4) 0 51 0.2) 51 0.2) 50 av (9) ¹ 51 0.3) 50 0.5) 47 0.3) 7 49 0.4) 45 av (9) ¹ 51 0.3) 52 0.4) 51 0.3) 54 0.3) 54 av Federation 46 0.5) 7 0.3) 52 0.3) 52 0.3) 54 0.3) 54 av Federation 46 0.5) 7 6.3 52 0.3) 52 0.3) 54 0.3) 54 0.3) 54 0.3) 54 0.3) 54 0.3) 54 0.3 54 0.3) 54 0.3 54 0.3) 54 0.3 54 0.3) 54 0.3 54 0.3) 54 0.3 54 0.3) 54 0.3 54 0.3) 54 0.3 54 0.3 54 0.3 54 0.3 54 0.3 54 <	Malta			50 (0.3)	48 (0.2)	51 (0.3)			51 (0.2)
erlands [†] 47 (0.3) 47 (0.3) 47 (0.3) 49 (0.4) 49 (0.4) 49 (0.4) 49 (0.4) 49 (0.4) 49 (0.4) 49 (0.4) 49 (0.4) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.3) 49 (0.5) 40 (0.5)	Mexico			54 (0.3)	50 (0.4)	51 (0.2)	50 (0.3)		52 (0.3)
ay (9) ¹ 51 (0.3) 51 (0.3) 51 (0.3) 54 (0.3) 54 (0.3) 54 (0.3) 54 (0.3) 54 (0.3) 54 (0.3) 54 (0.3) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 51 (0.1) 48 cold a^{1} a^{2} a	Netherlands†			50 (0.5)	47 (0.3)	49 (0.4)	45 (0.5)		48 (0.3)
an Federation 52 0.3 52 0.3 54 0.3 54 0.3 54 0.3 54 0.3 54 0.3 54 0.3 54 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3 51 0.3	Norway (9) ¹			55 (0.4)	51 (0.3)	54 (0.3)			53 (0.3)
ion 46 (0.5) ion 46 (0.5) ion 49 (0.5) 48 (0.5)	Peru			54 (0.3)	52 (0.3)	54 (0.3)	51 (0.2)		56 (0.4)
49 0.3) m 52 0.4) 49 0.3) m 51 0.4) 47 age 51 0.5) m 54 0.4) 51 0.4) m 51 0.4) 48 age 50 0.1) m 52 0.1) 49 0.1) m 51 0.1) 48 age 50 0.1) 49 0.1) 49 m 51 0.1) 48 age 50 0.1) m 52 0.1) 49 10 10 48 age 50 0.1) 49 0.1) 49 10 10 48 age 52 0.1) 49 0.1) 49 10 10 48 age 52 0.5) 52 0.5) 52 0.5) 51	Russian Federation			50 (0.4)	46 (0.5)	49 (0.5)			48 (0.5)
51 (0.5) 54 (0.4) 51 (0.4) 53 (0.5) 48 age 50 (0.1) 52 (0.1) 49 10 51 0.1) 48 age 50 0.1) 52 0.1) 49 0.1) 49 51 0.1) 48 age 52 0.1) 49 0.1) 49 51 51 11 age 52 0.5) 52 0.5) 52 0.5) 51 51 acting sample 52 0.6) 52 0.5) 52 0.6) 52 52	Slovenia			52 (0.4)	49 (0.3)	51 (0.4)			51 (0.3)
age 50 (0.1) m 52 (0.1) 49 (0.1) m 51 (0.1) 48 leeting sample participation requirements participation requirements participation	Sweden ¹			54 (0.4)	51 (0.4)	53 (0.5)			53 (0.4)
The set ing sample participation requirements 55 (0.5) 52 (0.6) 54 (0.5) 51 (0.5) </td <td>ICCS 2016 average</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>52 (0.1)</td> <td>49 (0.1)</td> <td>51 (0.1)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>52 (0.1)</td>	ICCS 2016 average			52 (0.1)	49 (0.1)	51 (0.1)			52 (0.1)
52 (0.6) 55 (0.5) 52 (0.6) 54 (0.5) 51 </td <td>Countries not meeting sample</td> <td>s participation re</td> <td>quirements</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Countries not meeting sample	s participation re	quirements						
	Hong Kong SAR			55 (0.5)	52 (0.6)	54 (0.5)			55 (0.5)
	Korea, Republic of ²	40 (0.5)		44 (0.4)	40 (0.6)	42 (0.5)	40 (0.8)		42 (0.4)

55 (0.5)	42 (0.4)
51 (0.6)	40 (0.8)
54 (0.5)	42 (0.5)
	(
52 (0.6	40 (0.6
55 (0.5)	44 (0.4)
	-
(9	5)
52 (0.6	40 (0.5
Hong Kong SAR	Korea, Republic of ²

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.
 Score averages that are significantly larger (*p* < 0.05) than those in the comparison group are displayed in **bold**.
 Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
 Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
 National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
 Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.

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).

65

Country	2016		2009	Differences (2016-2009)	35	40	45	50	55	60	
Belgium (Flemish)	51 (0.2)	\bigtriangledown	49 (0.3)	2.5 (0.6)							
Bulgaria	53 (0.3)	\triangle	51 (0.3)	2.0 (0.6)							
Chile	54 (0.3)	\triangle	51 (0.3)	2.7 (0.6)							
Chinese Taipei	56 (0.3)		51 (0.3)	5.2 (0.6)					•		
Colombia	54 (0.3)	\triangle	54 (0.3)	-0.4 (0.6)							
Croatia	51 (0.4)	\bigtriangledown	-	-				•			
Denmark [†]	54 (0.3)	\triangle	52 (0.3)	2.6 (0.6)							
Dominican Republic	60 (0.3)		59 (0.3)	1.6 (0.6)							
Estonia ¹	49 (0.3)	▼	48 (0.3)	1.2 (0.6)							
Finland	53 (0.3)		48 (0.2)	4.9 (0.6)					1		
Italy	53 (0.3)		51 (0.3)	1.3 (0.6)					1		
Latvia ¹	46 (0.3)	▼	45 (0.3)	1.0 (0.6)			-				
Lithuania	50 (0.3)	\bigtriangledown	50 (0.3)	0.2 (0.6)							
Malta	52 (0.2)		52 (0.3)	0.4 (0.6)							
Mexico	55 (0.2)	\triangle	53 (0.2)	1.8 (0.5)							
Netherlands [†]	50 (0.3)	\bigtriangledown	-	-							
Norway (9)	52 (0.3)		50 (0.4)	2.7 (0.7)							

alatic . . *, ,* . . - + + ,

Countries not meeting sample participation requirements

Hong Kong SAR	51 (0.4)	-	-				
Korea, Republic of ²	53 (0.2)	-	-				

51 (0.3)

47 (0.3)

51 (0.3)

50 (0.3)

-1.0 (0.6)

1.6 (0.6)

1.5 (0.7)

1.8 (0.1)

Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements

55 (0.2)

50 (0.3)

48 (0.3)

53 (0.4)

52 (0.1)

52 (0.1)

 \triangle

 ∇

▼

North Rhine-Westphalia	50 (0.5)	-	-			
(Germany)1						
	-			_		-

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

On average across items, students with a score in the range with this color

Disagreement with positive statements

Agreement with positive statements

have more than a 50% probability of indicating:

National average:

▲ More than 3 score points above ICCS 2016 average

Significantly above ICCS 2016 average Significantly below ICCS 2016 average \triangle

 ∇

More than 3 score points below ICCS 2016 average ▼

Notes:

Peru

Slovenia

Sweden¹

Russian Federation

ICCS 2016 average

Common countries average

() 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.

National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year. 2

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 scor	Scale score average by gender group	tender group	Scale score ave	Scale score average by expected university degree	versity degree	Scale score av	Scale score average by level of civic knowledge	c knowledge
	Male students		Female students	Not expecting university score [*]		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	6	63036	6	6	6 3 0 3 6	6
Belgium (Flemish)	50 (0.3)		52 (0.4)	50 (0.3)		52 (0.3)	51 (0.4)		51 (0.3)
Bulgaria	52 (0.4)		54 (0.4)	52 (0.5)		53 (0.4)	52 (0.4)		54 (0.4)
Chile	55 (0.4)		53 (0.4)	53 (0.4)		55 (0.3)	53 (0.4)		55 (0.4)
Chinese Taipei	55 (0.4)		57 (0.3)	55 (0.4)		56 (0.4)	53 (0.6)		56 (0.3)
Colombia	53 (0.3)		54 (0.3)	54 (0.4)		54 (0.3)	55 (0.3)		53 (0.3)
Croatia	50 (0.4)		51 (0.4)	51 (0.4)		51 (0.4)	50 (0.5)		51 (0.4)
Denmarkt	54 (0.3)	_	55 (0.4)	54 (0.3)		56 (0.4)	51 (0.6)		55 (0.3)
Dominican Republic	60 (0.3)		60 (0.3)	59 (0.3)		61 (0.4)	60 (0.3)		61 (0.6)
Estonia ¹	49 (0.4)		48 (0.4)	48 (0.3)		49 (0.4)	48 (0.5)		49 (0.3)
Finland	52 (0.4)		53 (0.3)	52 (0.3)		54 (0.3)	49 (0.6)		53 (0.3)
Italy	52 (0.3)		53 (0.3)	52 (0.3)		54 (0.4)	52 (0.5)		53 (0.3)
Latvia ¹	46 (0.4)		46 (0.3)	46 (0.3)		47 (0.4)	46 (0.4)		47 (0.4)
Lithuania	50 (0.4)		50 (0.4)	50 (0.3)		50 (0.4)	50 (0.4)		50 (0.4)
Malta	52 (0.3)		52 (0.2)	51 (0.3)		53 (0.3)	51 (0.3)		53 (0.2)
Mexico	54 (0.3)		56 (0.2)	54 (0.4)		55 (0.2)	55 (0.3)		56 (0.3)
Netherlands†	49 (0.4)	_	50 (0.4)	49 (0.4)		50 (0.5)	48 (0.5)		50 (0.4)
Norway (9) ¹	52 (0.3)	_	53 (0.4)	51 (0.3)		54 (0.3)	50 (0.4)		53 (0.3)
Peru	55 (0.3)		56 (0.3)	54 (0.3)		56 (0.3)	55 (0.3)		56 (0.4)
Russian Federation	50 (0.3)		50 (0.3)	50 (0.3)		50 (0.3)	50 (0.5)		50 (0.3)
Slovenia	48 (0.4)		49 (0.3)	48 (0.3)		49 (0.4)	48 (0.5)		49 (0.3)
Sweden ¹	53 (0.5)		52 (0.5)	51 (0.5)		54 (0.4)	51 (0.8)		53 (0.4)
ICCS 2016 average	52 (0.1)		53 (0.1)	52 (0.1)		53 (0.1)	51 (0.1)		53 (0.1)
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements	le participation requir	ements							
			17 (0 1)			CO 10 41			

Hong Kong SAR 52	2 (0.5)	51 (0.4)	50 (0.5)		52 (0.4)	49 (0.5)	52 (0.4)
Korea, Republic of ² 54	1 (0.3)	52 (0.3)	51 (0.4)		54 (0.3)	51 (0.6)	54 (0.3)

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

Notes:

Standard errors appear in parentheses.
 Score averages that are significantly larger (*p* < 0.05) than those in the comparison group are displayed in **bold**.
 Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
 Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
 National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
 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 cyberbullying). 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).

at school
and verbal abuse a
eriences of physical
of students' exp
average scale sco
al percentages and
Table 6.7: Nation

	Percenta	Percentages of students w	vho repor	rted experiencir	lents who reported experiencing the following at least once in the past three months:	once in the past three	e months:	
Country	A student called you by an offensive nickname (%)	A student said things about you to make others laugh (%)	d u to ugh	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 (%)	Average scale scores for students' reports on physical or verbal abuse
Belgium (Flemish)	58 (1.5) Δ	53 (1.2)		21 (1.1) \triangle	17 (0.9)	14 (0.8) ∇	6 (0.7) \(\nequal \)	50 (0.2)
Bulgaria	53 (1.3)	60 (1.3)		20 (1.0)	17 (1.1)	17 (1.1) ∇	12 (1.0)	51 (0.3) Δ
Chile	52 (0.9) ∇	9			15 (0.5) ∇	23 (0.8) Δ		
Chinese Taipei	36 (1.0)	42 (1.0)		5 (0.4)	11 (0.6) ∇		6 (0.5) V	46 (0.2)
Colombia	61 (1.2) Δ	61 (1.3)		15 (0.6) ∇	17 (0.6)	31 (1.1)	8 (0.5) V	51 (0.3) Δ
Croatia	70 (1.1)	63 (1.2)	<	25 (1.1) D	20 (1.1) Δ	23 (1.1) Δ	8 (0.7)	52 (0.3) A
Denmark⁺	44 (1.1)	60 (1.1)	<	14 (0.6) ∇	12 (0.6) ∇	14 (0.7) ∇	9 (0.5)	49 (0.2) V
Dominican Republic	54 (1.2)	66 (0.9)	4	27 (1.0) Δ	27 (1.0)	31 (1.0)	10 (0.6)	52 (0.2) A
Estonia ¹	55 (1.4)	64 (1.2)	<	19 (1.1)	14 (0.8) ∇	16 (0.7) ∇	11 (0.8)	50 (0.3)
Finland	42 (1.1)			15 (0.8) ∇	14 (0.8) ∇	8 (0.6)	7 (0.5) $ abla$	48 (0.2) V
Italy	52 (1.1) V	42 (1.0)		17 (0.9) ∇	11 (0.7) ∇	29 (1.2) A	6 (0.5) V	49 (0.2) V
Latvia ¹	60 (1.0) Δ	44 (1.1)	•	23 (1.1) Δ	19 (0.9) Δ	24 (1.2) A	10 (0.7)	50 (0.2)
Lithuania	59 (1.1) \triangle	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)		29 (0.8)	24 (0.6) Δ	20 (0.7)	13 (0.6) Δ	52 (0.2) A
Mexico	63 (1.1) \triangle	64 (1.0)	\triangleleft	19 (0.8)	20 (0.8) Δ	28 (1.0) Δ	11 (0.6) Δ	52 (0.3) A
Netherlands [†]	48 (1.4) ∇	43 (1.3)	•	13 (0.7) ∇	11 (0.7) ∇	13 (0.8) ∇	6 (0.6) ∇	47 (0.3) V
Norway (9) ¹	56 (1.1)	59 (1.0)	\bigtriangledown	19 (1.0)	18 (0.8) Δ	19 (1.0)	13 (0.5) $ riangle$	50 (0.3)
Peru	64 (0.9) Δ	60 (0.9)	\bigtriangledown	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) 🛆	9 (0.5) $ abla$	25 (1.1) $ riangle$	13 (0.8) Δ	49 (0.3) ∇
Slovenia	58 (1.3) Δ	(1.0)	\bigtriangledown	20 (0.9)	17 (0.9)	27 (0.9) 🛆	11 (0.8)	51 (0.2) Δ
Sweden ¹	44 (1.4)	(1		17 (1.2)	16 (1.2)	15 (1.1) $ abla$	9 (0.6)	49 (0.4) V
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	participation requireme	nts						
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 ²	45 (1.7)	28 (1.4)		5 (0.5)	13 (0.8)	10 (0.7)	5 (0.6)	46 (0.3)
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requi	meeting sample particip	ation requirements	ts					
North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) ¹	43 (1.8)	50 (1.6)		17 (1.2)	17 (1.1)	18 (1.1)	8 (0.8)	49 (0.3)
 National percentage or average: ▲ More than 10 percentage points or 3 score points above ICCS 2016 average △ Significantly above ICCS 2016 average ▼ Significantly below ICCS 2016 average ▼ More than 10 percentage points or 3 score points below ICCS 2016 average 	or 3 score points above ICCS rerage or 3 score points below ICCS	s 2016 average S 2016 average	Notes: () Stanc (9) Courr (9) Met j 1 Natic	dard errors appear i ttry deviated from Ir guidelines for sampl onal Defined Popula rtry surveyed target	stes: Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent. Standard deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade. Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included. National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population. Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.	is are rounded to the neares on and surveyed adjacent ur cer replacement schools wer tional Target Population. chool year.	: whole number, some total per grade. e included.	ls may appear inconsistent.

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 was <bullied> by other students;" (d) "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 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 s/he 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

(Flemish)	Male students		Female students	Nict expecting					
52 52 51 51 53 53	م (0.3)			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)
52 52 53 54 54 55 53 55 53 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55	1 1	3 0 3	6 9	6	3 9 3 9	6	6	¢ 3	6 9
ria 52 51 52 53 53 53			48 (0.3)	51 (0.4)		49 (0.3)	51 (0.6)		49 (0.3)
51 se Taipei 61 hbia 53	(0.4)		49 (0.4)	52 (0.5)		50 (0.4)	53 (0.5)		49 (0.4)
53 53	(0.2)		49 (0.3)	51 (0.3)		49 (0.2)	51 (0.3)		48 (0.3)
53	(0.3)		44 (0.3)	47 (0.3)		46 (0.2)	48 (0.7)		46 (0.2)
L	(0.3)		49 (0.3)	52 (0.4)		51 (0.3)	52 (0.3)		51 (0.4)
	(0.3)		51 (0.4)	53 (0.3)		52 (0.4)	54 (0.5)		52 (0.3)
Denmark [†] 51	(0.3)		47 (0.3)	49 (0.2)		49 (0.3)	51 (0.5)		49 (0.2)
Dominican Republic 53	(0.3)		51 (0.3)	52 (0.3)		51 (0.3)	52 (0.3)		51 (0.6)
Estonia ¹ 52	(0.3)		49 (0.4)	51 (0.3)		50 (0.3)	52 (0.6)		50 (0.3)
Finland 50	(0.4)		45 (0.3)	48 (0.3)		47 (0.3)	49 (0.7)		48 (0.3)
Italy 50	(0.3)		48 (0.3)	49 (0.3)		48 (0.3)	50 (0.4)		48 (0.3)
Latvia ¹ 51	(0.3)		48 (0.3)	50 (0.3)		49 (0.4)	51 (0.3)		49 (0.3)
Lithuania 52	(0.3)		50 (0.3)	51 (0.4)		50 (0.3)	52 (0.5)		50 (0.3)
Malta 55	(0.3)		49 (0.3)	53 (0.3)		51 (0.3)	54 (0.3)		51 (0.3)
Mexico 54	(0.3)		50 (0.3)	52 (0.5)		51 (0.2)	52 (0.4)		51 (0.3)
Netherlands [†] 48	(O.4)		46 (0.3)	48 (0.3)		47 (0.4)	48 (0.5)		47 (0.3)
Norway (9) ¹ 52	(0.3)		49 (0.4)	51 (0.4)		50 (0.3)	52 (0.5)		50 (0.3)
Peru 53	(0.2)		50 (0.3)	52 (0.3)	-	51 (0.3)	52 (0.2)		50 (0.3)
Russian Federation 50	(0.3)		49 (0.3)	50 (0.3)		49 (0.3)	51 (0.5)		49 (0.3)
Slovenia 52	(0.3)		49 (0.4)	51 (0.3)		51 (0.4)	52 (0.4)		51 (0.3)
Sweden ¹ 51	(0.4)		48 (0.5)	50 (0.5)		49 (0.4)	51 (0.8)		49 (0.4)
ICCS 2016 average 52	(0.1)		48 (0.1)	51 (0.1)		50 (0.1)	51 (0.1)		49 (0.1)
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements	ipation require	ements							
Hong Kong SAR 54	(0.4)		50 (0.3)	53 (0.6)		51 (0.4)	53 (0.5)		51 (0.4)
Korea, Republic of ² 47	(0.3)		44 (0.4)	46 (0.4)		46 (0.4)	47 (0.6)		46 (0.4)

	har reparent						
Hong Kong SAR	54 (0.4)		50 (0.3)	53 (0.6)	51 (0.4)	53 (0.5)	51 (0.4)
Korea, Republic of²	47 (0.3)		44 (0.4)	46 (0.4)	46 (0.4)	47 (0.6)	46 (0.4)

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

Notes: () 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.
 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.

0	
õ	
5	
0	
Ś	
at	
~	
b D D)
·÷	
2	-
3	
Ā	
σ	
0)	
orte	
õ	
ã	
e.	
5	
S	
0	
.ã	-
.i2	
ring	
2	
Q	-
e,	
P	
Ę	
~	
S	
8	
ž	
0	
S	
s at si	
B	
ذ	
i Li	
e	
\overline{o}	
tu	
S	
4	-
0	
S	
196)
ntí	
Ð	
Ğ	
5	
ď	
<u>6</u>	
0	
e	
9	
5	
F	

	Nationa	National percentages of students at schools where principals reported occurrence of the following at least once a month:	at schools where principal	s reported occurrence of t	he following at least once	a month:
Country	A student reported to	A student reported to <the principal,="" the<br="">headteacher, the school head> that s/he was <builted> by a teacher</builted></the>	A student reported to	A teacher reported to < the principal, the headteacher, the school head > that a student helped another student who was being < bulllied>	A student reported to	A student reported to 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) $ abla$	2 (1.2)	7 (2.3) $ abla$
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) V	1 (0.8) ∇	2 (1.3)
Colombia (r)	32 (4.0) Δ	6 (2.3)	12 (2.5) ∇	7 (2.0) $ abla$	4 (1.8)	10 (2.8)
Croatia	11 (2.5)	1 (0.7) $ abla$	10 (1.9)	5 (1.5) $ abla$	2 (1.1)	5 (1.7) $ abla$
Denmark [†]	16 (2.8) ∇	2 (1.1) V	12 (2.7) $ abla$	12 (2.6)	1 (1.0) $ abla$	10 (2.2)
Dominican Republic	51 (3.8)	8 (2.5)	24 (3.7)	20 (3.9) Δ	11 (2.7) Δ	25 (3.9)
Estonia ¹ (s)	28 (4.6)	5 (3.6)	27 (4.8)	13 (3.8)	1 (1.1) $ abla$	15 (3.6)
Finland	27 (3.3)	4 (1.4)	42 (4.0)	17 (2.5) Δ	2 (1.0) V	15 (2.3)
Italy	3 (1.3)	0	5 (1.7)	1 (0.9) $ abla$	0	4 (1.5) V
Latvia ¹	14 (2.0) ∇	2 (1.7)	13 (2.6) ∇	3 (1.7) ∇	12 (2.9) Δ	5 (2.1) ∇
Lithuania	23 (3.3)	4 (1.7)	19 (3.0)	11 (2.9)	6 (1.9)	6 (1.7) V
Malta	32 (0.4) Δ	7 (0.3) Δ	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) Δ	17 (2.9)
Netherlands† (r)	26 (4.7)	20 (4.2)	27 (4.7)	16 (3.9)	3 (1.6)	16 (3.9)
Norway (9) ¹	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) $ abla$	2 (0.5) $ abla$	3 (1.6)
Slovenia	7 (2.5)	∆ 0	29 (4.4) Δ	7 (2.6)	3 (1.5)	7 (2.6) $ abla$
Sweden ¹	31 (3.8)	5 (1.9)	40 (4.9)	19 (5.3)	2 (0.9) $ abla$	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	articipation requirements					
Hong Kong SAR	0	0	3 (2.2)	2 (1.7)	0	1 (1.4)
Korea, Republic of ²	4 (1.8)	1 (1.1)	4 (1.9)	7 (2.8)	0	2 (1.4)
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requi	neeting sample participatic	on requirements				
North Rhine-Westphalia	38 (4.2)	1 (0.7)	31 (5.8)	17 (2.9)	1 (0.7)	21 (6.5)
(Germany) ¹ (r)						
National percentage:		Notes:				
▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average	bove ICCS 2016 average	() Standard err	ors appear in parentheses. Becc	() Standard errors appear in parenthese. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.	earest whole number, some tot:	als may appear inconsistent.

- 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
- $\triangleleft \lhd \triangleright \blacktriangleright$

- An and a crrors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole num
 (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.

-	0	
	200	
	Ĕ	
	0	
	S	
	H	
	2	
	g	2
•	1	
-	\geq	•
	3	
	ğ	
	0)	
	Ŭ	
	3	
	0	
	'n	
	2	
	4	
	S	
	Ð	
	Ľ	
	>	
	1 L	
	g	
-	2	
	20	
	5	
	bor	
	2	
	ē	
	2	
	S	
	5	
	ğ	
•	0	
	ž	
•	L	
	\sim	
	0	
	ne L	
	Jere r	
-		
-		
-		
-		
-	IS whe	
-	hools whe	
-	IS whe	
-	chools whe	
-	chools whe	
-	chools whe	
-	chools whe	
-	chools whe	
-	chools whe	
-	ents at schools whe	
-	idents at schools whe	
-	idents at schools whe	
-	idents at schools whe	
-	s of students at schools whe	
-	es of students at schools whe	
	ges of students at schools whe	
	ges of students at schools whe	
	ntages of students at schools whe	
	ntages of students at schools whe	
	rcentages of students at schools whe	
	ntages of students at schools whe	
	rcentages of students at schools whe	
	: Percentages of students at schools whe	
	 Percentages of students at schools when 	
	: Percentages of students at schools whe	
	 Percentages of students at schools when 	
	6.1U: Percentages of students at schools whe	
	e 6.1U: Percentages of students at schools whe	
	e 6.1U: Percentages of students at schools whe	
	ble 6.1U: Percentages of students at schools whe	

		Natio	nal percentages of	National percentages of students at schools where principals reported the existence of:	where principals re	ported the existen	ce of:	
Country	Meetings aiming at informing parents about <bullying> at school</bullying>	Specific training to provide teachers with knowledge, skills, and confidence to make students aware of volullying>	Teacher training sessions on safe and responsible internet use to avoid <cyber-bullying></cyber-bullying>	Student training sessions for responsible internet use to avoid <cyber-bullying></cyber-bullying>	Meetings aiming at raising parents' awareness on <cyber-bullying></cyber-bullying>	Development of a system to report anonymously incidents of <cyber-bullying> among students</cyber-bullying>	Classroom activities aiming at raising students' awareness of <bullying></bullying>	<pre><anti-bullying> conferences held by experts and/or by local authorities on < bullying> at school</anti-bullying></pre>
Belgium (Flemish)	42 (4.3)	38 (3.7)	36 (4.2) 🕈	78 (3.9)	41 (4.3) 🔻	21 (3.4)	99 (0.9) 🛆	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) A	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) 🔻
Denmarkt	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) $ abla$	77 (3.9) 🔻	38 (4.6)
Estonia ¹ (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) A	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 ¹	62 (4.3)	67 (4.5)	56 (4.6)	62 (4.3) 🔻	53 (3.9) $ abla$	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) A	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 [†] (r)	48 (4.9)	37 (5.1)	31 (5.0)	68 (4.3) V	49 (5.3)	32 (5.1)	98 (1.3) A	36 (5.1)
Norway (9) ¹	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) $ riangle$	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 ¹	66 (4.6)	53 (5.0) 🔻	45 (5.2)	72 (3.9)	52 (4.6) ∇	10 (2.6) 🔻	99 (0.9) 🛆	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	varticipation require	ments						
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 ²	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	neeting sample parti	cipation requirement	ts					

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 ²	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 r	meeting sample parti	cipation requirements	ts					
North-Rhine-Westphalia	53 (7.8)	46 (8.2)	64 (6.1)	93 (3.6)	47 (8.0)	9 (2.9)	97 (2.4)	50 (7.3)
(Germany) ¹ (r)								
		2	lotoc.					

- 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
 Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
 Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
 National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
 Country surveyed target grade in the first half of the school year.
 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.

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 targetgrade 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. cpromotion 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. cparliament 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 6.11: Teachers' perceptions of bullying at school

Astudent informed student would structure agressive of eherotrocity and student student agressive of eherotrocity and student student agressive of authet student agressive of eherotrocity and student would as student agressive of authet student agressive of agressive of a			National perce	al percentages of teachers who reported the following situations occurring at least once a month:	who reported the f	ollowing situations	occurring at least o	nce a month:	
un (Flemish) [†] 11 (0.8) 16 (1.0) A 17 (1.2) A 2 (0.4) A 3 (0.5) riable 13 (1.0) A 13 (1.0) A 8 (0.8) A 1 (0.2) V 2 (0.4) A 3 (0.5) riable 13 (1.1) 8 (1.1) 8 (1.1) 5 5 1 (0.2) A 1 (0.2) bilition 13 (1.4) A 11 (1.1) 8 1 3 0.5 1 1 2 0.4 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 0.3 3 0.6 bilition 13 (1.1) A 19 (1.4) A 10.3 3 0.5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 <th1< td=""><td>Country</td><td>A student informed you about aggressive or destructive behaviors by other students</td><td>A student informed you that s/he was <buillied> by another student</buillied></td><td>A teacher informed you that a student was sbullied>by other students</td><td>A teacher informed you that a student helped another student who was being bullied ></td><td>A student informed you that s/he was <builted> by a teacher</builted></td><td>A parent informed you that his/her son/daughter was <buillied> by other students</buillied></td><td>A teacher informed you that s/he was <builted> by students</builted></td><td>You witnessed students' <buillying> behaviors</buillying></td></th1<>	Country	A student informed you about aggressive or destructive behaviors by other students	A student informed you that s/he was <buillied> by another student</buillied>	A teacher informed you that a student was sbullied>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 <builted> by a teacher</builted>	A parent informed you that his/her son/daughter was <buillied> by other students</buillied>	A teacher informed you that s/he was <builted> by students</builted>	You witnessed students' <buillying> behaviors</buillying>
nia 18 (17) 13 (10) 0 8 (0.2) 7 0.03 3 0.05 1 0.03 7 0.03 3 0.05 1 0.03 3 0.05 1 0.03 3 0.05 1 0.03 0 0.03 0 0.03 0 0.03 0 0.03 0 0.03 0 0.03 0 0.03 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Belgium (Flemish) [†]		(1.0)	(1.2)	(0.7)	(0.4)	(0.5)	3 (0.6)	12 (1.1) Δ
item 14 (18) 8 (12) 6 (0.9) V 4 (0.9) 2 (0.6) 4 (0.8) Se Taipei 7 (0.7) 6 (0.7) V 4 (0.6) V 2 (0.4) V 1 (0.2) mbia 18 (1.4) 11 (1.1) 8 (1.1) 6 (1.1) 3 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 3 (0.5) mbia 18 (1.4) 11 (1.1) 6 (0.7) 6 (0.7) 7 (1.3) 3 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 3 (0.4) mbia 15 (1.2) 14 (1.1) 0 1 (1.4) 1 (0.3) 3 (0.4) 2 (0.4) mbia 12 (1.0) 12 (1.1) 0 1 (1.4) 2 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 2 (0.4) mbia 12 (1.0) 12 (1.1) 0 1 (1.4) 2 (0.5) 2 (0.4) 2 (0.4) mbia 11 (1.3) 13 (1.2) 14 (1.1) 0 1 (1.3) 2 (0.5) 2 (0.4) mbia 11 (1.3) 13 (1.2) 13 (1.1) 13 (1.1) 2 (0.5) 2 (0.4) 2 (0.5) mbia 11 (1.3) 1 (1.1)	Bulgaria	(1.7)	(1.0)		(0.8)	(0.2)	2 (0.4)	0	7 (1.0)
See Taipeti 7 0.7) 6 0.7) 4 0.6) 7 0.3) 2 0.4) 7 1 0.3 0.5 4 5 0.3 1 0.03 1 1 0.03 1 1 0.03 0 5 0.03 1 0.03 0 5 0.03 1 0.03 0 5 0.03 1 0.03 0 5 0.03 1 0.03 0 1 0.03 0 0 0.03 0 0 0.03 0 <th0< th=""> 0 0</th0<>	Chile	14 (1.8)		(0.9)	4 (0.9)		4 (0.8)	3 (0.6)	7 (1.3)
mbia 18 (1.4) Δ 11 (1.1) 8 (1.1) 6 (1.1) 3 0.55 Δ 5 0.00 tia 10<(0.9) ∇ 8<(0.8) ∇ 6<(0.7) ∇ 3 0.55 Δ 5 0.11 nican Republic 15<(1.2) 11<(1.4) 6<(1.1) Δ 5<(0.5) Δ 1 0.01 Δ 0.05 Δ 5 0.01 nita 15<(1.2) 14<(1.1) Δ 10<(1.5) 10<(1.5) Δ 10<(0.7) Δ 4<(0.5) Δ 3 0.05 nita 12<(1.0) 12<(1.1) Δ 11<(1.3) Δ 10<(0.7) Δ 2<(0.3) nita 12<(1.0) 13<(1.2) Δ 11<(1.3) Δ 10<(0.7) Δ 2<(0.3) nita 12<(1.3) 13<(1.2) Δ 11<(1.3) Δ 10 Δ 2<(0.4) 2<(0.4) nita 13<	Chinese Taipei		(0.7)	(0.6)	(0.4)		(0.2)	2 (0.4) ∇	5 (0.7) ∇
tial 10 (0?) 8 (0.8) ∇ 6 (0.7) Z (0.7)	Colombia		11 (1.1)			(0.5)	(0.9)	2 (0.5)	7 (1.0) $ abla$
Inican Republic 22 (2.6) 11 (1.6) 6 (1.7) 1 1 (1.7) 4 (1.3) odf 15 (1.2) 14 (1.1) Δ 19 (1.4) Δ 5 (0.5) 7 2 (0.3) adi 15 (1.2) 14 (1.1) Δ 19 (1.4) Δ 5 (0.5) 1 (0.4) 2 (0.3) adia 10 10 16 8 1.0 7 1 0.3 3 (0.9) 1	Croatia		(0.8)	(0.7)			3 (0.6)	3 (0.5)	6 (0.7) \bigtriangledown
ndt 15 (1.2) 14 (1.1) Δ 19 (1.4) Δ 5 (0.5) 1 (0.4) 2 (0.3) ania 10 (1.6) 8 (1.6) 7 (1.3) 7 (1.3) Δ 1 (0.2) 1 (0.3) Δ 2 (0.3) ania 11 (1.3) 12 (1.0) 12 (1.1) Δ 8 (0.9) 5 (0.7) Δ 2 (0.5) 2 (0.3) ania 12 (1.0) 12 (1.1) Δ 8 (0.9) 5 (0.7) Δ 2 (0.5) 2 (0.3) ania 12 (1.2) Δ 9 (1.0) δ $11 (1.3)$ Δ $4 (0.7)$ $11 (0.2)$ $2 (0.3)$ ania 11 (1.3) 13 (1.2) Δ $11 (1.3)$ Δ $4 (0.7)$ $2 (0.5)$ $2 (0.5)$ Δ $11 (1.3)$ $12 (1.2)$ $9 (1.0)$ $6 (0.7)$ Δ $4 (0.5)$ $1 (0.2)$ $2 (0.3)$ Δ $11 (1.3)$ $0 (1.1)$ $0 (1.1)$ $0 (1.1)$ $0 (0.7)$ $0 (0.7)$ $0 (0.7)$ $0 (0.7)$ $0 (0.7)$	Dominican Republic						4 (1.3)	1 (0.4) ∇	4 (0.7) ∇
aniation b (0.7) V (0.5) (0.7) (0.7) ania 12<(10)	Finland [†]	15 (1.2)		(1.4)			2 (0.3)	3 (0.3)	22 (1.1)
at (0.1) 10 (1.6) 8 (1.6) 7 (1.3) 3 (0.9) 5 (0.7) Δ 1 (0.2) 1 (0.7) ati (1.1) 12 (1.0) 12 (1.1) Δ 8 (0.9) 5 (0.7) Δ 2 (0.5) 2 (0.4) ati (1.3) 13 (1.2) Δ 11 (1.3) Δ 4 (0.7) 1 (0.5) 2 (0.4) ave 17 (1.2) 9 (1.0) 6 (1.1) ∇ 8 (0.7) ∇ 4 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 2 (0.4) ave 13 (1.0) 12 (1.1) δ 11 (1.3) Δ 4 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 2 (0.4) ave 14 (1.1) δ (1.1) ∇ 8 (0.7) Δ 4 (0.8) 1 (0.3) 2 (0.4) ave 13 (1.0) 12 (0.9) Δ B (0.7) Δ	Italy		(0.5)	(0.5)	. (0.3)		2 (0.3)	1 (0.2) ∇	1 (0.3) ∇
ania 12 (1.0) 12 (1.1) Δ 8 (0.9) 5 (0.7) Δ 2 (0.5) 2 (0.5) 2 (0.5) 2 (0.4) and 11 (1.3) 13 (1.2) Δ 11 (1.3) Δ 4 (0.7) 1 (0.5) 3 (0.4) co 17 (1.2) Δ 9 (1.0) 6 (0.7) ∇ 4 (0.5) 1 (0.3) ∇ 2 (0.4) ave 14 (1.1) 6 (1.1) ∇ 8 (1.0) 4 (0.5) 1 (0.3) ∇ 2 (0.4) ave 13 (1.0) 12 (1.3) 9 (1.0) 5 (0.7) ∇ 5 (0.8) ∇ 1 (0.3) ∇ 1 (0.3) ave 13 (1.0) 12 (1.3) 5 (0.8) ∇ 8 (0.7) Δ	Latvia	10 (1.6)					1 (0.7)	5 (1.0) Δ	9 (1.4)
a 11 (13) 13 (12) Δ 11 (1.3) Δ 4 (0.7) 1 (0.5) 3 (0.6) co 17 (1.2) Δ 9 (1.0) 6 (0.7) ∇ 4 (0.5) 1 (0.3) Σ 2 (0.4) co 14 (1.1) 6 (1.1) ∇ 8 (0.0) 4 (0.5) 1 (0.3) Σ 2 (0.4) a) 15 (1.3) 9 (1.0) 5 (0.7) ∇ 4 (0.8) 1 (0.3) 2 (0.4) nia 13 (10) 12 (1.3) 9 (1.0) 5 (0.7) ∇ 5 (0.8) ∇ 2 (0.3) 2 (0.3) nia 13 (10) 12 (1.3) 5 (0.8) ∇ 5 (0.4) ∇ 2 (0.3) 2 (0.3) cin 13 (10) 12 (1.3) 5 (0.8) ∇ 2 (0.4) 2 (0.3) 2 (0.3) cin 13 (0.3) 10 (0.3) 8 (0.2) ∇ 2 (0.4) 2 (0.3) 2 (0.1) cin 13 (0.3) 10 (0.3) $10 (0.3)$ $10 (0.3)$	Lithuania	12 (1.0)		1	(0.7)		2 (0.4)	6 (0.7) A	24 (1.5)
co 17 (12) 9 (1.0) 6 (0.7) V 4 (0.5) 1 (0.3) V 2 (0.4) ay 14 (11) 6 (11) V 8 (1.0) 4 (0.8) 1 (0.3) V 2 (0.5) nia 15 (1.3) 9 (1.0) 5 (0.7) V 5 (0.8) 2 (0.3) V 2 (0.5) nia 13 (10) 12 (0.9) A 8 (0.7) V 5 (0.8) V 1 (0.3)	Malta	11 (1.3)		(1.3)			3 (0.6)	5 (0.9) Δ	16 (1.5) \bigtriangleup
ay 14 (11) 6 (11) ∇ 8 (1.0) 4 (0.8) 1 (0.3) ∇ 2 (0.5) nia 15 (13) 9 (1.0) 5 (0.7) ∇ 5 (0.8) 2 (0.3) ∇ 3 (0.5) nia 13 (10) 12 (0.9) Δ 8 (0.7) ∇ 5 (0.8) 2 (0.3) 2 (0.3) 2 (0.3) 2 (0.3) na 13 (10) 12 (13) 5 (0.8) ∇ 8 (0.7) 2 (0.4) ∇ 2 (0.1) 2016 average 13 (0.3) 10 (0.3) 8 (0.2) 4 (0.2) 1 (0.1) 2 (0.1) 2016 average 13 (0.3) 10 (0.3) 8 (0.2) 4 (0.2) 1 (0.1) 2 (0.1) ark 12 (2.0) 5 (0.9) 5 (0.9) 2 (0.7) 2 (0.7) 2 (0.7) 2 (0.1) ark 12 (2.0) 5 (0.9) 2 (0.5) 2 (0.4) ∇ 2 (0.1) ark 12 (0.3) 10 (0.3) 8 (0.2) 2 (0.4) ∇ 2 (0.1) ark <td>Mexico</td> <td>(1.2)</td> <td></td> <td>(0.7)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2 (0.4) V</td> <td>5 (0.6) $abla$</td>	Mexico	(1.2)		(0.7)				2 (0.4) V	5 (0.6) $ abla$
iii 15 (13) 9 (1.0) 5 (0.7) ∇ 5 (0.8) 2 (0.3) 3 (0.5) inia 13 (10) 12 (0.9) Δ 8 (0.7) Z (0.4) ∇ Z (0.3) Z (0.4) <	Norway	14 (1.1)	(1.1)			(0.3)	2 (0.5)	2 (0.4) $ abla$	3 (0.7) $ abla$
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Peru	15 (1.3)	9 (1.0)	(0.7)				1 (0.3) ∇	5 (0.7) $ abla$
12 14 12 14 16	Slovenia	13 (1.0)					(0.3)	3 (0.5)	5 (0.6) $ abla$
e 13 (0.3) 10 (0.3) 8 (0.2) 4 (0.2) 1 (0.1) ting sample participation requirements for teacher survey 2 (0.2) 5 (0.9) 5 (0.9) 5 (0.7) 0 17 (2.7) 16 (2.0) 14 (2.3) 7 (1.9) 3 (0.9) 1 10 (0.9) 7 (0.8) 4 (0.5) 3 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 1 </td <td>Sweden</td> <td>12 (1.3)</td> <td>(0.8)</td> <td>(9.0)</td> <td>(0.4)</td> <td></td> <td>(0.2)</td> <td>1 (0.3) ∇</td> <td>11 (1.0)</td>	Sweden	12 (1.3)	(0.8)	(9.0)	(0.4)		(0.2)	1 (0.3) ∇	11 (1.0)
ting sample participation requirements for teacher survey 12 (2.0) 5 (0.9) 5 (0.9) 0 17 (2.7) 16 (2.0) 14 (2.3) 7 1.9) 3 0.9) 10 (0.9) 7 (0.8) 4 (0.5) 3 0.5) 1 (0.3) 2 (1.2) 13 (1.3) 10 (1.2) 4 (0.5) 1 1	ICCS 2016 average	13 (0.3)	10 (0.3)			<u>0</u>		3 (0.1)	9 (0.2)
12 (2.0) 5 (0.9) 5 (0.9) 2 0.7) 17 (2.7) 16 (2.0) 14 (2.3) 7 7 (1.9) 3 (0.9) 10 (0.9) 7 (0.8) 4 (0.5) 3 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 9 (1.2) 13 (1.3) 10 (1.2) 4 0.6) 1 (0.3) 7 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 1 0.3 (0.3) 1 (0.3)	Countries not meeting sample p	varticipation requirer	ments for teacher sui	rvey					
17 (2.7) 16 (2.0) 14 (2.3) 7 (1.9) 3 (0.9) 10 (0.9) 7 (0.8) 4 (0.5) 3 1 (0.3) 9 (1.2) 13 (1.3) 10 (1.2) 4 (0.6) 1 (0.3) 2 (0.5) 1 10 (1.2) 4 (0.6) 1 (0.3)	Denmark	12 (2.0)				0		0	4 (1.1)
10 (0.9) 7 (0.8) 4 (0.5) 3 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 9 (1.2) 13 (1.3) 10 (1.2) 4 (0.6) 1 (0.3) 7 (0.5) 1 (0.2) 4 (0.6) 1 (0.3) 7 (0.5) 1 (0.2) 4 (0.6) 1 (0.3) 7 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 1 (0.4) 1 (0.4)	Estonia	17 (2.7)	16 (2.0)		7 (1.9)		3 (1.1)	5 (1.5)	13 (2.2)
9 (1.2) 13 10 (1.2) 4 0.6) 1 (0.3) 2 (0.5) 1 (0.3) 1 (0.3) 1 (0.4)	Korea, Republic of	10 (0.9)					1 (0.2)	2 (0.3)	4 (0.7)
2 (02) 1 (03) 1 (03) 1 (06) 1 (07) 1	Netherlands	9 (1.2)	13 (1.3)				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)

	10.2) 21		12.01 0	<pre>///) ></pre>	5	(0.0) Z	2	(1.1.1)
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 	ibove ICCS 2016 avera; erage erage below ICCS 2016 avera	80 80 91						

Notes:
 O 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.

	S
	e S
	5
	Ę
	2
-	2
	ĕ
	g
	ē
	5
	2
	5
	_
	5
	ņ
	ğ
	ã
	E
	5
	g
	$\tilde{\circ}$
-	Ľ
	녿
•	Ē
	5
1	Ę
	8
	2
	0
	S
	Sht
	ģ
-	Stl
-	5
	9
1	Ľ
	0
	ep 0
-	JIS
	ыр
	rincipc
	ыр
	re principo
	e principo
	re principo
	re principo
	re principo
	Is where principo
	chools where principa
	Is where principo
	chools where principa
	s at schools where principo
	chools where principa
· · · ·	s at schools where principo
· · · ·	ents at schools where principo
· · · ·	ents at schools where principo
· · · ·	ents at schools where principo
	s of students at schools where principo
	s of students at schools where principo
· · · · · ·	iges of students at schools where principo
· · · · · ·	tages of students at schools where principo
	ntages of students at schools where principo
	centages of students at schools where principo
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ercentages of students at schools where principo
	centages of students at schools where principo
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ercentages of students at schools where principo
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	: Percentages of students at schools where principo
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Percentages of students at schools where principo
	e 6.12: Percentages of students at schools where principo
	e 6.12: Percentages of students at schools where principo
	6.12: Percentages of students at schools where principol

Country	National	percentages of stu	Idents at school w	here principals r activ	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	early all, or most nity	of the students p	articipated in the	following
	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=""></local>	Campaigns to raise people's awareness	Activities aimed at protecting the cultural heritage within the <local community=""></local>	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⁺	50 (3.8)	53 (3.9) 🔺	33 (3.8) $ abla$	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 ¹ (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) Δ
Finland	71 (3.5) Δ	34 (3.9) $ abla$	56 (4.0)	91 (2.1) 🔺	35 (3.5) 🔻	95 (1.5)	30 (3.3) $ abla$	11 (2.0) ∇	92 (2.0)
Italy	70 (3.7) Δ	62 (3.5) 🔺	47 (3.9)	87 (2.6) Δ	47 (4.1)	64 (4.0)	47 (4.1) \bigtriangleup	27 (3.7)	74 (4.3)
Latvia ¹	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) Δ	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) Δ
Mexico	73 (3.3) 🔺	65 (3.2) 🔺	44 (4.0)	60 (4.2) 🕈	53 (3.7) Δ	67 (3.4) 🔺	55 (3.9)	9 (2.0)	84 (2.7)
Netherlands [†] (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) $ abla$	91 (3.0)
Norway (9) ¹	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 ¹	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	participation red	uirements							
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 ²	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	meeting sample p	articipation requi	rements						
North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) ¹ (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	s above ICCS 2016 av	erage	Notes: () Standard errc	rs appear in parenth	Notes: () Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.	re rounded to the ne	arest whole number,	some totals may appe	ar inconsistent.

North Rhine-Westphalia	37 (7.8)	41 (5.7)	40 (7.6)	69 (7.2)	17 (6.2)	49 (8.5)	5 (3.2)	11 (4.1)
(Germany) ¹ (r)								

Ž

- $\triangleleft \lhd \triangleright \blacktriangleright$
- More than 10 percentage points above ILCD ZU to average Significantly above ICCS 2016 average Significantly below ICCS 2016 average More than 10 percentage points below ICCS 2016 average

- Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole num
 Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
 Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
 National Defined Population covers 90% to 55% of National Target Population.
 Country surveyed arget grade in the first half of the school year.
 Country surveyed are available for at least 70% but less than 85% of students.
 An "(r)" indicates that data are available for at least 50% but less than 70% of students.

:	community
	in the c
	vities
	activ
	udeni
	f St
	hers' perceptions of student activities in the co
-	leachers
	lable 6.13: lead

			- 1000000000000000000000000000000000000						
	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></local 	Campaigns to raise people's awareness	Activities aimed at protecting the cultural heritage in the <local community=""></local>	Visits to political institutions	Sports events
Belgium (Flemish) [†]	50 (2.1) $ abla$	31 (1.8) $ abla$	54 (2.2) 🔺	84 (1.6) \triangle	35 (1.9) ∇	47 (1.9) ∇	9 (0.9)	10 (1.3) ∇	76 (1.3) Δ
Bulgaria	54 (2.8)	15 (1.3)	36 (2.0)	69 (2.8) ∇	51 (1.9) Δ	72 (2.2) 🔺	52 (2.3)	8 (1.9) ∇	79 (1.5) \triangle
Chile	43 (2.3)	21 (1.8)	45 (2.3) Δ	69 (1.7) V	58 (1.8)	51 (2.4)	34 (2.3) 0	18 (1.9)	70 (1.7) ∇
Chinese Taipei	41 (1.5)	19 (1.1)	33 (1.2) V	62 (1.3) 🔻	33 (1.3)	40 (1.3)	13 (0.9)	7 (0.8) 7	70 (1.3) ∇
Colombia	72 (2.4)	54 (3.0)	41 (2.0)	79 (1.6) \triangle	63 (2.2) 🔺	75 (2.1) 🔺	58 (2.2)	10 (1.6) ∇	85 (1.4)
Croatia	62 (1.9) Δ	43 (1.6) Δ	30 (1.5) V	65 (1.7) V	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) Δ
Finland [†]	45 (1.6)	15 (1.4)	31 (1.3) ∇	56 (1.6) 🔻	17 (1.2) 🔻	61 (1.8) D	14 (1.1)	2 (0.3)	48 (2.1)
Italy	54 (2.0)	48 (1.7) 🔺	44 (1.9) Δ	84 (1.4) \bigtriangleup	38 (1.9) ∇	62 (1.4) \bigtriangleup	41 (1.6)	22 (1.5) Δ	65 (1.6) V
Latvia	46 (2.5)	17 (1.3)	17 (1.2) 🔻	72 (1.5)	48 (1.6) Δ	39 (1.5) 🔻	43 (1.4) Δ	14 (1.2) ∇	72 (1.6)
Lithuania	68 (1.8)	36 (1.5)	42 (1.9)	86 (1.1) 🔺	54 (1.6) Δ	62 (1.6) Δ	54 (1.4)	31 (2.1)	84 (1.3)
Malta	58 (2.1)	27 (1.7) V	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) Δ	50 (1.9)	8 (0.8) 0	76 (1.5) Δ
Norway	35 (1.8)	37 (1.9)	26 (1.3) 🔻	83 (1.2) Δ	16 (2.3)	43 (2.6) 🔻	32 (2.0) ∇	23 (1.6) Δ	72 (1.7)
Peru	70 (2.2)	40 (1.8) Δ	48 (1.9) Δ	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) Δ	49 (1.4)	87 (1.0) 🔺	40 (1.3) ∇	56 (1.3)	48 (1.8) Δ	14 (1.3)	82 (1.1) Δ
Sweden	39 (1.7) 🔻	46 (2.0) 🔺	33 (1.7) V	80 (1.9) Δ	29 (2.0)	33 (1.9) 🔻	15 (1.2)	20 (1.8)	58 (1.9)
ICCS 2016 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)

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:

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 environmentfriendly 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).

		0		Ils reported that the s a large or a moderate	
Country	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 [†]	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 ¹ (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 ¹	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 [†] (r)	51 (5.3) 🔻	26 (4.7) 🔻	37 (5.1) 🔻	61 (4.8) 🔻	27 (4.7) 🔻
Norway (9) ¹	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 ¹	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 samp	· · · · ·		1	1	1
Hong Kong SAR	84 (4.0)	85 (4.0)	71 (5.1)	84 (4.3)	76 (4.4)
Korea, Republic of ²	99 (0.9)	94 (3.2)	95 (2.0)	99 (1.2)	86 (4.0)
Benchmarking participant no	1 1				
North-Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) ¹ (r)	67 (6.9)	61 (6.9)	55 (6.3)	66 (6.6)	36 (7.5)
National percentage:					

Table 6.14: Percentages of students at	schools where principals report	ed environment-friendly practices
	serie e principais repert	ea environmente frienary praetiees

▲ More than 10 percentage points above ICCS 2016 average

 $\stackrel{\triangle}{\nabla}$ 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.

National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

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.

-	
	_
	0
	0
	5
	\overline{O}
	S.
	iles at sch
	5
	~
	~
	9
	÷
	\leq
•	<
	5
	R
	aci
	-
	environmental
	5
	à
	ž
	5
	2
	ñ.
	2
•	=
	>
	2
	υ
-	·
	nts
	2
	ent
-	8
	$\underline{\circ}$
	2
	5
	S
	2
	0
	rts o
	Ľ.
	5
	5
	por
	epor
	repor
	s repor
	's' repor
-	ers' repor
-	ners' repor
-	chers' repor
-	hers' repo
-	eachers' repor
	leachers' repor
-	leachers' repor
	: leachers repor
	 leachers' report
	15: leachers repor
	.15: leachers repor
	6.15: leachers repor
	6.15: lea

	National per	centages of teachers	National percentages of teachers who reported conducting the following environmental initiatives with their target-grade students:	cting the following en	vironmental initiative	s with their target-gr	ade students:
Country	Writing letters to the newspapers or magazines to support actions about the 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</cleanup>	Recycling and waste collection in the <local community=""></local>
Belgium (Flemish)†	2 (0.4) V	2 (0.4) V	6 (0.8) ∇	28 (1.5)	40 (1.7) V	9 (1.7)	25 (1.7)
Bulgaria	4 (0.7) ∇	2 (0.4) V	22 (1.9) Δ	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) $ abla$	29 (2.1)
Chinese Taipei	8 (0.7) 0	4 (0.5) V	18 (1.0) Δ	38 (1.4) V	43 (1.4) ∇	22 (1.7) 🔻	13 (1.0)
Colombia	22 (2.0) Δ	16 (1.5) Δ	23 (1.9) Δ	71 (2.2) 🔺	62 (2.6)	61 (2.5) 🔺	69 (1.8)
Croatia	8 (0.7) 0	5 (0.7) ∇	15 (1.1)	57 (1.2)	61 (1.7)	40 (2.2) A	49 (2.0) A
Dominican Republic	42 (2.9)	45 (3.8)	38 (2.9) 🔺	83 (2.2)	72 (2.5) 🔺	68 (3.4)	64 (3.7)
Finland [†]	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) \triangle	59 (1.3)	20 (1.3)	53 (1.6)
Latvia	4 (0.6) \(\neq \)	2 (0.5) V	13 (1.2)	21 (1.1)	27 (1.1)	32 (1.5) $ abla$	29 (1.4)
Lithuania	5 (0.6) ∇	6 (0.6) 0	18 (1.0) Δ	38 (1.1) V	41 (1.2) ∇	53 (1.4) 🔺	51 (1.6) Δ
Malta	9 (1.1) V	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) Δ	27 (1.7)	72 (1.4)	65 (1.7)	39 (2.0) Δ	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) A	69 (1.8)	61 (1.7)	55 (2.0) 🔺	53 (2.1)
Slovenia	9 (0.8) 0	3 (0.4) ∇	13 (1.1)	44 (1.5)	48 (1.4)	29 (1.6) V	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	articipation requiremen	its for teacher survey					
					1007 00		() () () ()

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:

 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.

0
8
2
scl
at
bn
Ē.
Ē
л
ഖ്
/ic le
·5
. <
ИC
5
6
orts (
Ю
Ω
Ð
<u>`</u> (
ents'
eh
de
stu
r stu
.Ö
4
cores
or
8
SC
cale scor
cal
SC
ŝ
g
5
/eru
d a
g
2
sa
0 í
13(
Ę,
C
S
<u>v</u>
ы
7
a
ы
tic
at
Ž
 0
16
_
ab
79

-)		-	þ				
		Percentages of stud	Percentages of students who reported having learned the following to a moderate or large extent:	having learned the f	ollowing to a mode	rate or large extent	ť	
Country	How citizens can vote in local or national elections (%)	How laws are introduced and changed in <country of="" test=""> (%)</country>	How to protect the environment (e.g. through energy- saving or recycling) (%)	How to contribute to solving problems in the <local community=""> (%)</local>	How citizen rights are protected in <country of="" test=""> (%)</country>	Political issues and events in other countries (%)	How the economy works (%)	Average scale scores for students' reports on learning of civic issues at school
Belgium (Flemish)	50 (1.6)	41 (1.7)	85 (0.8) Δ	39 (0.9) ◀	36 (1.2)	50 (1.2)	66 (2.1) A	46 (0.3)
Bulgaria	64 (1.1)	53 (1.3) ∇	84 (1.0) Δ	57 (1.2)	55 (1.3) V	40 (1.2) 🕈	45 (1.1) 🕈	48 (0.2) V
Chile	71 (1.0) Δ	64 (1.1) \triangle	81 (0.8)	63 (0.9) Δ	64 (1.0) Δ	49 (0.9) ∇	60 (0.9) Δ	51 (0.3) Δ
Chinese Taipei	88 (0.7)	86 (0.7)	90 (0.6) Δ	71 (0.9) 🔺	86 (0.6) 🔺	64 (1.0)	59 (1.0) A	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) \triangle	61 (1.5)	91 (0.7) 🔺	60 (1.3) Δ	67 (1.4) \bigtriangleup	52 (1.5)	36 (1.4)	50 (0.3)
Denmark [†]	61 (1.2) V	73 (1.2)	61 (1.2)	42 (1.0)	56 (1.0) V	67 (1.1) 🔺	68 (1.2) 🔺	49 (0.2) ∇
Dominican Republic	73 (1.2) Δ	69 (1.0) A	84 (0.8) Δ	74 (1.0) 🔺	81 (0.8) 🔺	60 (1.1) \triangle	73 (1.0) 🔺	56 (0.3) 🔺
Estonia ¹	41 (1.4)	48 (1.6)	72 (1.4) ∇	51 (1.1) V	53 (1.6) ∇	44 (1.4) ∇	41 (1.9) 🔻	46 (0.3)
Finland	57 (0.9) ∇	40 (1.0)	85 (0.8) Δ	41 (1.0)	45 (1.3)	42 (1.1)	31 (1.0)	45 (0.2) ◀
Italy	70 (1.9) Δ	68 (1.6) \triangle	85 (0.9) Δ	54 (1.2)	71 (1.6) Δ	64 (1.1)	70 (0.9) 🔺	52 (0.3) A
Latvia ¹	44 (1.3)	47 (1.3)	84 (0.9) Δ	43 (1.2)	43 (1.2)	43 (1.2) ∇	51 (1.6) $ abla$	47 (0.3)
Lithuania	44 (1.4)	46 (1.6)	84 (1.0) Δ	41 (1.2)	46 (1.5)	45 (1.0) V	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) Δ	▲ (0.8) ▲	85 (0.6) Δ	73 (0.9) 🔺	78 (0.8) 🔺	48 (0.8) 🗸	68 (0.9)	53 (0.2) 🔺
Netherlands [†]	44 (1.2) 🔻	37 (1.5) 🔻	66 (1.3)	35 (1.2) 🔻	34 (1.2) 🔻	53 (1.3)	64 (2.1) $ riangle$	44 (0.3) 🕈
Norway (9) ¹	65 (0.9) Δ	42 (1.2)	69 (1.0)	45 (1.0)	46 (1.0)	56 (1.0) Δ	47 (1.2)	48 (0.2) ∇
Peru	81 (0.8) 🔺	75 (0.9)	86 (0.7) Δ	71 (0.9) 🔺	79 (0.9) 🔺	52 (1.2)	71 (0.8) 🔺	55 (0.3) 🔺
Russian Federation	55 (1.6) ∇	62 (1.4) \bigtriangleup	81 (0.9)	50 (1.1) $ abla$	74 (1.2) 🔺	48 (1.1) $ abla$	63 (1.2) Δ	50 (0.3)
Slovenia	76 (1.5) 🔺	75 (1.2)	76 (0.9) ∇	60 (1.4) Δ	70 (1.3) Δ	58 (1.3) Δ	68 (1.5) 🔺	52 (0.3) Δ
Sweden ¹	80 (1.5)	82 (2.0)	84 (1.0) Δ	56 (1.8)	61 (2.2)	75 (1.7) 🔺	59 (1.8)	53 (0.5) Δ
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	participation require	ments						
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 ²	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	neeting sample parti	cipation requireme	nts					
North-Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) ¹	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:			Notes:					

- 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:

 Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
 Country theorised from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
 Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
 National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

 ² 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	by students' int	terest	Scale score average by expected university degree	by expected univ	ersity degree	Scale score aver	Scale score average by level of civic knowledge	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	0369		6	3 ¢ 3 0	6	9 6	3 0 3	6
Belgium (Flemish)	46 (0.3)		48 (0.4)	46 (0.5)		47 (0.3)	46 (0.5)		46 (0.3)
Bulgaria	47 (0.3)		50 (0.4)	47 (0.4)		48 (0.3)	48 (0.4)		48 (0.3)
Chile	50 (0.3)		55 (0.4)	49 (0.4)		52 (0.3)	50 (0.3)		53 (0.4)
Chinese Taipei	55 (0.3)		58 (0.3)	53 (0.4)		57 (0.3)	49 (0.8)		57 (0.3)
Colombia	53 (0.3)		57 (0.3)	52 (0.5)		54 (0.2)	53 (0.3)		55 (0.3)
Croatia	49 (0.3)		52 (0.4)	50 (0.4)		50 (0.4)	49 (0.4)		51 (0.4)
Denmark [†]	48 (0.2)		51 (0.2)	49 (0.2)		51 (0.3)	46 (0.5)		50 (0.2)
Dominican Republic	55 (0.3)		59 (0.4)	56 (0.4)		57 (0.4)	56 (0.3)		60 (0.7)
Estonia ¹	45 (0.3)		48 (0.4)	46 (0.4)		47 (0.4)	44 (0.6)		47 (0.3)
Finland	44 (0.2)		48 (0.3)	45 (0.2)		46 (0.3)	45 (0.6)		45 (0.2)
Italy	50 (0.3)		54 (0.4)	51 (0.3)		53 (0.3)	50 (0.4)		52 (0.3)
Latvia ¹	46 (0.3)		49 (0.5)	47 (0.3)		47 (0.4)	46 (0.4)		47 (0.3)
Lithuania	45 (0.3)		48 (0.4)	46 (0.3)		47 (0.4)	46 (0.4)		46 (0.3)
Malta	47 (0.2)		50 (0.2)	48 (0.2)		48 (0.2)	48 (0.3)		48 (0.2)
Mexico	52 (0.2)		56 (0.3)	51 (0.3)		54 (0.2)	52 (0.3)		55 (0.3)
Netherlands†	44 (0.3)		48 (0.5)	44 (0.3)		44 (0.4)	44 (0.6)		45 (0.3)
Norway (9) ¹	46 (0.2)		50 (0.3)	47 (0.2)		48 (0.2)	46 (0.4)		48 (0.2)
Peru	53 (0.3)		56 (0.3)	53 (0.3)		55 (0.3)	53 (0.2)		57 (0.4)
Russian Federation	48 (0.4)		53 (0.4)	50 (0.3)		51 (0.4)	49 (0.6)		51 (0.4)
Slovenia	51 (0.3)		54 (0.4)	51 (0.3)		52 (0.4)	50 (0.4)		52 (0.3)
Sweden ¹	51 (0.6)		55 (0.4)	51 (0.5)		53 (0.6)	50 (1.3)		53 (0.4)
ICCS 2016 average	49 (0.1)		52 (0.1)	49 (0.1)		51 (0.1)	48 (0.1)		51 (0.1)
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements	e participation requirement	S							
Hong Kong SAR	46 (0.3)		51 (0.3)	46 (0.4)		49 (0.3)	45 (0.4)		50 (0.3)
Korea, Republic of ²	45 (0.4)		50 (0.3)	46 (0.5)		48 (0.3)	44 (0.8)		48 (0.3)
	-					-			

	par uciparion of	3						
Hong Kong SAR	46 (0.3)		51 (0.3)	46 (0.4)		49 (0.3)	45 (0.4)	50 (0.3)
Korea, Republic of ²	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.

Standard errors appear in parentheses. Notes:

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.
 1 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.

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 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 6.19.¹

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

	Nati	ional percentages of	f teachers of civic-r civic and citize	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:	reported having conted activities in the	onducted often or ve eir classrooms:	ery often the follow	ing
Country	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	Students propose topics/issues for the following lessons
Belgium (Flemish) [†]	5 (0.9)	36 (2.1)	16 (1.6) ∇	66 (2.4) Δ	62 (1.6) 🔻	37 (1.8) $ abla$	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) \bigtriangledown
Chile	14 (2.8)	55 (3.2)	22 (3.0)	50 (3.1) $ abla$	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) A
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 [†]	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) V	38 (2.6)	11 (1.2)	56 (2.4)	87 (1.6)	65 (2.3) 🔺	83 (2.1)	26 (2.0) Δ
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) $ abla$	57 (4.0)	39 (4.1) 🔺	26 (3.4)	83 (4.3) Δ	32 (4.5) 🔻	24 (4.5) 🔻	9 (2.1) $ abla$
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) $ abla$	75 (3.1) Δ	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) Δ	24 (3.5)
Slovenia	10 (1.5) ∇	36 (2.9) 🔻	33 (2.2) Δ	49 (2.3) V	74 (2.0)	35 (2.7) ∇	58 (2.1) V	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	articipation requiren	nents for teacher su	rvey	-			-	

countri ico nocune cantolic par riciparioni i chan cunciles i al co	מו ההוףמהוסוו ו כלמוו כוו							
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.

	S
3	Ξ
-	×
-	5
	topics and
	0
	S
•	8
	8
	4
	tion
	2
-	Зt
	2
	hip educat
	8
	õ
•	¥
-	and citizenshi
	ns
	2
3	2
	Ħ
-	~
	2
	6
	Ú
•	5
•	5
	20
	Buir
	בר
	saching
	teac
	aredness for teac
	aredness for teac
	aredness for teac
	aredness for teac
	aredness for teac
	rs' preparedness for teac
	hers' preparedness for teac
	hers' preparedness for teac
-	eachers' preparedness for teac
	eachers' preparedness for teac
-	eachers' preparedness for teac
-	eachers' preparedness for teac
-	eachers' preparedness for teac
- - - -	6.19: leachers' preparedness for tead
- - - -	6.19: leachers' preparedness for tead
- - - -	6.19: leachers' preparedness for tead
-	6.19: leachers' preparedness for tead

Country			Percentage	s of teachers	who felt very	well or quite v	vell prepared t	to teach the f	es of teachers who felt very well or quite well prepared to teach the following topics and skills:	s 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) [†]	68 (2.5) ◀	64 (2.1)	56 (2.3) 🔻	80 (1.6) \bigtriangledown	68 (1.9) \bigtriangledown	80 (1.6)	68 (1.7) ♥	43 (2.1) 🔻	83 (1.7)	92 (1.2) Δ	79 (1.7) \bigtriangledown	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) \bigtriangledown	75 (3.7)	86 (2.6)	81 (3.1) \bigtriangledown	1
Chinese Taipei	86 (2.7)	96 (1.7) 🔺	84 (2.3) 🔺	88 (2.2) Δ	44 (5.1)	95 (1.2) \triangle	96 (1.7) Δ	94 (1.9) 🔺	84 (2.6)	85 (2.7)	87 (2.5)	T
Colombia	77 (2.9) 🕈	73 (2.9) \triangledown	52 (3.2) 🔻	81 (3.0)	62 (2.8) 🔻	85 (2.7) \bigtriangledown	83 (2.2) ∇	65 (2.4) \bigtriangledown	67 (2.1) 🔻	82 (1.8) \bigtriangledown	86 (1.7)	1
Croatia	81 (1.2) \bigtriangledown	67 (1.5) 🔻	50 (1.4) 🔻	78 (1.2) \triangledown	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) \triangle	96 (2.2) Δ	90 (3.2) 🔺	72 (5.6)	95 (2.1) \triangle	96 (1.7) 🛆	I
Finland [†]	85 (1.6)	60 (1.9)	63 (2.9)	84 (2.1)	70 (2.0) 🗸	93 (1.1) \triangle	86 (1.4) \bigtriangledown	47 (1.8) 🔻	82 (1.8)	94 (1.1) \triangle	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) $ abla$	91 (1.1)	83 (1.9) $ abla$	91 (1.7)
Latvia	88 (3.8)	91 (1.9) \triangle	67 (3.4)	89 (2.0) Δ	68 (4.6)	89 (2.7)	94 (1.9) \triangle	70 (4.7)	87 (2.9) Δ	93 (1.3) \triangle	93 (2.3) 🛆	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) \bigtriangleup	84 (2.6) 🔺	80 (2.8)	82 (2.8) \bigtriangledown	89 (2.0)	98 (0.7) 🔺
Malta	88 (2.6)	72 (4.4) \bigtriangledown	61 (4.7)	86 (2.9)	79 (4.4)	94 (1.8) \triangle	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) \bigtriangleup	97 (1.1) \bigtriangleup	73 (4.7)	65 (4.5) 🔻	84 (2.9)	93 (1.8) 🛆	1
Norway	95 (1.3) \bigtriangleup	96 (0.8) 🔺	80 (3.7) 🔺	80 (3.6)	94 (2.0) 🔺	94 (1.4) \bigtriangleup	93 (1.1) \bigtriangleup	92 (1.4) 🔺	90 (1.7) 🔺	95 (0.9) \triangle	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) \bigtriangleup	94 (1.6) \triangle	80 (3.9)	71 (3.4) $ abla$	87 (3.0)	86 (3.0)	1
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) \triangledown	80 (1.8)	92 (1.4) \bigtriangleup	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) \triangle	91 (2.5)	79 (3.4)
ICCS 2016 average	87 (0.6)	81 (0.6)	67 (0.8)	84 (0.6)	76 (0.7)	90 (0.4)	90 (0.4)	73 (0.7)	79 (0.7)	89 (0.5)	87 (0.5)	73 (0.8)
Countries not meeting sample participation requirements for teacher survey	ample particip	ation requireme	snts for teache.	r survey								
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)
	() () ()	() L)			; [, i	() () 	; 	() () ()	; ; ;	10 01	() L ()	10 (1 0)

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)	I
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)	(9.0) 66	99 (0.4)	99 (0.5)	79 (5.0)	77 (6.0)	94 (2.4)	Ι

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.
() 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

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: Almquist & 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.

