**7 December 2010**

**Abstract**

**Initial findings from the PISA 2009 study**

**An international study for testing 15 year old students in reading, mathematics, and science literacy**

The National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation in Education (RAMA) is pleased to present a summary of the findings from the PISA 2009 study.

The study was directed and operated by the staff of the **National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation in Education (RAMA) (Dr. Inbal Ron-Kaplan, Dr. Joel Rapp, and Ms. Iman Awadie).** The translation of the materials and their adaptation for students in Israel was carried out in consultation with academic language experts, **Prof. Sulaiman Jubran**, Tel Aviv University, and **Prof. Elite Olstein**, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The study was supervised by a steering committee led by **Prof. Orit Zaslavsky**, the Technion. This committee included academic experts in the fields of language, mathematics, and sciences, experts in measurement and evaluation, and representatives of the Ministry of Education.

**General background**

**About the PISA study**

* **PISA‏** **–** ‏**Program for International Student Assessment‏** – is an international study conducted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and which Israel has recently joined. The study is carried out **in a three-yearly cycle** and was first conducted in 2000.
* **Research goal** – to examine the extent to which 15 year olds who are “ready for adult life” have acquired general thinking tools and understanding that enable them to deal satisfactorily and effectively with their surroundings.
* The study examines literacy levels in three key subjects – reading, mathematics, and science. Each study focuses on one subject (but the other two subjects are also tested). In the **2009 PISA** study, emphasis was placed on **reading literacy**.
* The PISA study defines literacy as follows: “The students’ ability to apply knowledge and skills which they acquired in primary fields, as well as to effectively analyze, draw conclusions, and explain the ways they approach problems, understand them, and solve them, in a variety of situations.”
  + - **Reading literacy** – is the individual’s ability to understand, use, and critically evaluate a written text, so as to achieve the individual’s goals, develop his knowledge and potential, and contribute to society.
    - **Mathematics literacy** – is the ability to identify and understand the role of mathematics in the world, make well-based judgments, use mathematics, and utilize it in a manner which will meet the needs of the individual as a useful, interested, and critical citizen.
    - **Science literacy** – is the ability to identify questions, acquire new knowledge, explain science phenomena, and draw evidence-based conclusions regarding topics connected with science; to understand what makes science unique, be aware of the manner in which science and technology shape our environment; and aspire to be involved with science topics in a critical manner.
* In the PISA 2009 study, around 470,000 fifteen year old students, from 64 countries around the world and from one city (Shanghai, China), participated in the study.

**The PISA 2009 study in Israel**

* The study was carried out during March 2009.
* The students and schools were sampled in a manner which was representative of the student population and a range of school types (including three- and six-year schools, schools which are part of various networks, apprenticeship schools, etc.).
* A sample of 5,761‏ students aged 15 (**born in 1993**) from 176 schools participated in the study (approximately 40 students from each school). This sample consisted primarily of tenth grade students (81%), partially of ninth grade students (18%), and a minority of students from other grades (1%).
* **From the total sample, 95% of schools and 89% of students participated,** (with the exception of boys’ schools in Ultra-Orthodox sector; these schools generally refused to participate in the study).
* The study used **achievement tests** in the three subjects, and **questionnaires** about the **learning environment**. The students took the tests (120 minutes) and responded to the questionnaire (30 minutes). The principals in the same schools completed the questionnaire which examined various topics related to organizational and pedagogic aspects of their schools.

**How the findings are reported**

* The **PISA scale** was determined in 2000, so that the **mean** for the OECD countries would be **500**, and the **standard deviation** would be **100**. The scores usually range between 200 and 800.
* The scores in reading literacy, mathematics literacy, and science literacy are each reported separately on such a scale.
* The scores in each three-year cycle of PISA are calibrated and translated into this scale. In this way, it is possible to examine long-term trends.
* The scores for reading literacy in 2009 are reported as a general score, and also according to secondary subscales: according to reading processes (information retrieval, providing interpretation, and evaluation and criticism) and according to types of text (continuous or non-continuous).
* The test scores are also reported according to **proficiency levels**, as defined by PISA. There are 7‏ proficiency levels for reading literacy and 6‏ proficiency levels for mathematics and science literacy. Students who correctly answered questions of a high level of difficulty were categorized as outstanding (proficiency levels 5-6), whereas those students who only succeeded in answering questions of a low level of difficulty were categorized as not demonstrating the science knowledge and skills that would enable them to participate actively in life situations related to science and technology (below proficiency level 2).
* Israel’s achievements in the 2009 PISA study are presented below:
  + - From an international perspective – **in comparison with the OECD average**[[1]](#footnote-1) and several countries: **Finland, Canada, New Zealand, Spain, and Mexico**[[2]](#footnote-2)
    - Regarding the aspect of within Israel – **according to language sectors, gender, and socioeconomic background**
    - Regarding the long-term aspect – **comparing Israel’s achievements across all the PISA cycles**

**Main Findings – The PISA 2009 Study and Long-Term Trends**

**Achievements in Reading literacy**

* The **average score** for reading literacy in Israel was **474** (**OECD** average was **493**). Israel ranked **36** out of the 64 participating countries.
* **Average reading literacy scores in countries for comparison**: Finland – 536, Canada – 524, New Zealand – 521, Spain – 481, Mexico – 425.
* **The distribution in student achievements in Israel is one of the largest** among the participating countries (distribution being larger in only Qatar, Bulgaria, and Trinidad and Tobago.)
* **Distribution according to proficiency levels**: the rate of students in Israel with **high proficiency levels** (levels 5 and 6) is **7%**, which is similar to their average rate in OECD countries (8%). **Israel is one of the only countries which has an average score lower than the OECD average, but has students with a proficiency level of 6 (1%)** – the highest. The rate of students in Israel with the **lowest proficiency levels** (under level 2) is **relatively high – 27%** (as compared with a 19% average in the OECD countries), including 12% with the lowest proficiency level and below.
* **The scores of the best students:** the (lowest) threshold of the **best 5% of students in Israel is higher** than the threshold for scores of the **best 5% of students in the OECD average** (643 as against 637, respectively).
* **The scores of the weakest students:** the (highest) threshold of the **weakest 5% of students in Israel is lower** than the threshold for scores of the **weakest 5% of students in the OECD average** (227 as against 332, respectively).
* **Scores in the subscales of reading literacy in Israel**: Students have higher achievement in the aspect of “evaluation and criticism” (average 483), as against “providing interpretation” (average 473), and “information retrieval” (average 463). In Israel students cope somewhat better with “continuous texts”, such as paragraphs and passages of speech (average 477), than with “non-continuous texts” such as tables, graphs, maps, and illustrations (average 467).
* **Trends in achievements over the years**: from 2006 to 2009, Israeli students’ scores in reading literacy **rose by 35 score points** (and, in total, by 22 score points since 2002). **Israel is in third place for improving achievements**, from among all participating countries. The improvement between 2006 and 2009 is also expressed in the distribution of the students over proficiency levels: the rate of students with high proficiency levels rose by 2% (in addition to a 1% increase from 2002), and the rate of students with low proficiency levels fell by 12% (after a 6% rise between 2002 and 2006).
* **Achievements according to language sector and gender in Israel:**
  + - The achievements of **Hebrew speaking students are clearly higher** (approximately 100 score points, which are one standard deviation) than those of the **Arabic speaking** students’ achievements (498 as against 392, respectively). These achievements theoretically place the Hebrew speakers, in position 17a in the ranking of countries, and the Arabic speakers, theoretically, in position 57a. The achievements of the **Hebrew speakers** (498) **surpass the OECD average** (493).
    - **9% of the Hebrew speakers** are at the **high proficiency levels** (5-6), but only **1% of the Arabic speakers**. **18% of the Hebrew speakers** are at the **low proficiency levels** (below level 2), as opposed to **55% of the Arabic speakers**.
    - **The girls’ achievements are higher than those of the boys in both sectors**, and particularly among Arabic speakers: 515 as against 480 among the Hebrew speakers, and 424 as against 359 among the Arabic speakers.
    - Between 2006 and 2009, there was **a rise of approximately 42 score points among the Hebrew speakers** (and a total rise of 33 points since 2002), and **a rise of 20 score points among the Arabic speakers** (and a total rise of 14 points since 2002).
* **Achievements according to socioeconomic status in Israel:**
  + - Students from a high socioeconomic status **had higher achievements than** students from a middle or low socioeconomic status.
    - The average score for Hebrew speaking students from a high, middle and low socioeconomic status is 552, 491, and 458, respectively.
    - The average score for Arabic speaking students, from a high, middle and low socioeconomic status is 452 and 386, respectively.
    - **The performance gaps between the language sectors are smaller when segmented according to socioeconomic status**: with regard to a middle socioeconomic status, there is a performance gap of 39 score points between the Hebrew speakers and the Arabic speakers. **With regard to a low socioeconomic status there is a greater performance gap between the sectors – a gap of 72 points.**

**Achievements in Mathematics literacy**

* The **average score** for mathematics literacy in Israel was **447** (OECD average is 496). Israel ranked **41** out of the 64 participating countries.
* **Average mathematics literacy scores in countries for comparison**: Finland – 541, Canada – 527, New Zealand – 519, Spain – 483, Mexico – 419.
* **Distribution according to proficiency levels**: the rate of students with **high proficiency levels** (levels 5 and 6) is **6%**, lower than their average rate in OECD countries (13%). The rate of students in Israel with the **lowest proficiency levels** (under level 2) is **39%** (as compared with a 22% average in the OECD countries).
* **The scores of the best students:** the (lowest) threshold of the **best 5% of students in Israel is lower** than the threshold for scores of the **best 5% of students in the OECD average** (615 as against 643, respectively).
* **The scores of the weakest students:** the (highest) threshold of the **weakest 5% of students in Israel is lower** than the threshold for scores of the **weakest 5% of students in the OECD average** (272 as against 343, respectively).
* **Trends in achievements over the years**: from 2006 to 2009, there was a moderate rise (5 score points) in Israeli students’ scores in mathematics literacy (and, in total, in 14 score points since 2002). The rate of students with **high proficiency levels** (levels 5 and 6) has not changed, and the rate of students at low proficiency levels (below 2) fell by 3%.
* **Achievements according to language sector and gender in Israel:**
  + - The achievements of **Hebrew speaking students are clearly higher** (approximately 100 score points, which are one standard deviation) than those of the **Arabic speaking** students’ achievements (470 as against 367, respectively). These achievements theoretically place the Hebrew speakers in position 36a in the ranking of countries, and the Arabic speakers, theoretically, in position 61a in the ranking of the countries.
    - **8% of the Hebrew speakers** are at the **high proficiency levels** (5-6), as opposed to **around zero among the Arabic speakers** (0.2%). **30% of the Hebrew speakers** are at the **low proficiency levels** (below level 2), as opposed to **73% of the Arabic speakers**.
    - Among the **Hebrew speakers, the boys’ achievements are higher than those of the girls** (477 as against 463, respectively), a pattern common among most of the countries participating in the study, whereas among the **Arabic speakers, the girls’ achievements are higher than those of the boys** (373 as against 361, respectively).
    - Between 2006 and 2009, there was **a rise of 10 score points among the Hebrew speakers** (and a total rise of 21 score points since 2002), and **a drop of 5 score points among the Arabic speakers** (and a total rise of 23 score points since 2002).
* **Achievements according to socioeconomic status in Israel:**
  + - Students from a high socioeconomic status **had higher achievements than** students from a middle or low socioeconomic status.
    - The average score for Hebrew speakers from a high, middle and low socioeconomic stauts is 523, 464, and 428, respectively.
    - The average score for Arabic speakers from a middle and low socioeconomic status is 432 and 358, respectively.
    - **The performance gaps between the language sectors are smaller when segmented according to socioeconomic status**: with regard to a middle socioeconomic status, there is a performance gap of 32 points between the Hebrew speakers and the Arabic speakers. **With regard to a low socioeconomic status, there is a greater performance gap between the sectors – a gap of 70 score points.**

**Achievements in Science literacy**

* The **average score** for science literacy in Israel was **455** (OECD average was 501). Israel ranked **41**out of the 64 participating countries.
* **Average science literacy scores in countries for comparison**: Finland – 554, Canada – 529, New Zealand – 532, Spain – 488, Mexico – 416.
* **Distribution according to proficiency levels**: the rate of students in Israel with **high proficiency levels** (levels 5 and 6) is **4%**, lower than their average rate in OECD countries (8%). The rate of students in Israel with the **lowest proficiency levels** (under level 2) is **33%** (as compared with an 18% average in the OECD countries).
* **The scores of the best students:** the (lowest) threshold of the **best 5% of students in Israel is lower** than the threshold for scores of the **best 5% of students in the OECD average** (623 as against 649, respectively).
* **The scores of the weakest students:** the (highest) threshold of the **weakest 5% of students in Israel is lower** than the threshold for scores of the **weakest 5% of students in the OECD average** (275 as against 341, respectively).
* **Trends in achievements over the years**: from 2006 to 2009, there was a rise of only one score point in the average scores of Israeli students in science literacy (and, in total, by 21 score points since 2002). Between 2006 and 2009, the rate of students with high proficiency levels (levels 5 and 6) has dropped by 1%, and the rate of students at low proficiency levels (below 2) fell by 3%.
* **Achievements according to language sector and gender in Israel:**
  + - The achievements of **Hebrew speaking students are clearly higher** (approximately 100 score points, which are one standard deviation) than those of the **Arabic speaking** students’ achievements (476 as against 382, respectively). These achievements theoretically place the Hebrew speakers, in position 38a in the ranking of countries, and the Arabic speakers, theoretically, in position 59a in the ranking of the countries.
    - **5% of the Hebrew speakers** are at the **high proficiency levels** (5-6), as compared to **close to zero percent** (0.1%) **of the Arabic speakers**. **25% of the Hebrew speakers** are at the **low proficiency levels** (below level 2), as opposed to approximately **62% of the Arabic speakers**.
    - Among the Hebrew speakers, the girls’ scores are only slightly lower than those of the boys (474 as opposed to 478), while **among the Arabic speakers, the girls’ scores are much higher than those of the boys** (392 as opposed to 371, respectively).
    - Between 2006 and 2009 there was **a rise of 9 score points** among the **Hebrew speakers** (and a total rise of 32 score points since 2002). There was **a drop of 21 score points** among the **Arabic speakers** between 2006 and 2009 (and a total rise of 8 score points since 2002).
* **Achievements according to socioeconomic status in Israel:**
  + - Students from a **high socioeconomic status had higher achievements than** students from a middle or low socioeconomic status.
    - The average score for Hebrew speakers from a high, middle and low socioeconomic status is 526, 474, and 430, respectively.
    - The average score for Arabic speakers with a socioeconomically medium or disadvantaged background is 439 and 375, respectively.
    - **The performance gaps between the language sectors are smaller when segmented according to socioeconomic status**: with regard to a middle socioeconomic status there is a performance gap of 35 score points between the Hebrew speakers and the Arabic speakers. With a regard to a low socioeconomic status there is a performance gap of 55 score points between the Hebrew speakers and the Arabic speakers.

**Learning environment data from student questionnaires – in a nutshell**

On completion of the test, the students responded to a questionnaire which examined, among other things, various topics connected with their learning environment, such as the time they spent reading, what they read for pleasure, the time spend on reading on the Internet, their perceptions of how much their teachers’ encourage them to read and ofthe quality of their relationship with their teachers, etc.

Following are several findings from the analysis of the questionnaires:

* **How much time each day do the students devote to reading for pleasure?** In Israel, over one third of students (35%) reported that they never read for pleasure, and over one quarter (27%) reported reading only up to half an hour a day. The rest of the students (less than half) read over half an hour a day for pleasure. Similar rates were found on average in the OECD countries. **In segmentation according to gender in Israel,** it was found that the rate of boys who do not read at all (45%), is greater than the rate of girls (25%), whereas the rate of girls who read for at least an hour each day (30%) is double that of the boys (15%).
* **What do the students read for pleasure?** In examining what was read for pleasure, it emerges that among the readers, large numbers reported that they read newspapers (75%), and less read journals or magazines (39%), fiction (30%), and reference books (26%). The average rates of the OECD are 61%, 58%, 31%, and 18%, respectively. **In segmentation according to gender in Israel,** it was found that the girls report greater frequency of reading of all the reading materials examined, with the largest gaps in reading fiction (39% of the girls as opposed to 19% of the boys), and journals and magazines (47% of the girls as opposed to 30% of the boys).
* **Frequency of computer use in the school.** As a rule, there is low frequency of computer use among students at school, both in Israel and in the OECD. Around 10% to 20% of students in Israel report that they are involved with online activities once or several times a week. For example, 8% of students in Israel report that they participate in online chats, and 13% use email, 17% read material on the school website, and 14% use a computer for their homework. The most popular computer activity among students in schools, in both Israel and the OECD, is surfing the Internet for study purposes (28% in Israel, and 39% in the OECD).
* **To what extent do teachers encourage their students to spend time reading?** Less than half the students in Israel (45%) reported that their teachers encourage them to express their views on a text, ask challenging questions (46%), or ask for an explanation regarding the meaning of a text (41%), and only one quarter (26%) reported that the teachers recommend books or authors which are worth reading. These results are a little lower than the OECD average (55%, 59%, 52%, and 36% respectively).
* **How do the students view the relationship with their teachers?** In Israel, a high percentage of students report that they have a good relationship with their teachers. For example, 83% of the students agreed that they get on well with most of their teachers, and around 80% report that most of their teachers behave fairly towards them (this is similar to the OECD countries average, 85% and 79%, respectively). 61% of the students in Israel noted that most of their teachers showed interest in their lives (66% on average in the OECD countries).

**Country Ranking – PISA 2009**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Reading |  |  |  | Mathematics |  |  |  | Science |  |
| Ranking | Country | Score |  | Ranking | Country | Score |  | Ranking | Country | Score |
| - | Shanghai (China) | 556 |  | - | Shanghai (China) | 600 |  | - | Shanghai (China) | 575 |
| 1 | Korea\* | 539 |  | 1 | Singapore | 562 |  | 1 | Finland\* | 554 |
| 2 | Finland\* | 536 |  | 2 | Hong Kong (China) | 555 |  | 2 | Hong Kong (China) | 549 |
| 3 | Hong Kong (China) | 533 |  | 3 | Korea\* | 546 |  | 3 | Singapore | 542 |
| 4 | Singapore | 526 |  | 4 | Taiwan | 543 |  | 4 | Japan\* | 539 |
| 5 | Canada\* | 524 |  | 5 | Finland\* | 541 |  | 5 | Korea\* | 538 |
| 6 | New Zealand\* | 521 |  | 6 | Liechtenstein | 536 |  | 6 | New Zealand\* | 532 |
| 7 | Japan\* | 520 |  | 7 | Switzerland\* | 534 |  | 7 | Canada\* | 529 |
| 8 | Australia\* | 515 |  | 8 | Japan\* | 529 |  | 8 | Estonia | 528 |
| 9 | Holland\* | 508 |  | 9 | Canada\* | 527 |  | 9 | Australia\* | 527 |
| 10 | Belgium\* | 506 |  | 10 | Holland\* | 526 |  | 10 | Holland\* | 522 |
| 11 | Norway\* | 503 |  | 11 | Macau (China) | 525 |  | 11 | Taiwan | 520 |
| 12 | Estonia | 501 |  | 12 | New Zealand\* | 519 |  | 12 | Germany\* | 520 |
| 13 | Switzerland\* | 501 |  | 13 | Belgium\* | 515 |  | 13 | Liechtenstein | 520 |
| 14 | Poland\* | 500 |  | 14 | Australia\* | 514 |  | 14 | Switzerland\* | 517 |
| 15 | Iceland\* | 500 |  | 15 | Germany\* | 513 |  | 15 | Britain\* | 514 |
| 16 | USA\* | 500 |  | 16 | Estonia | 512 |  | 16 | Slovenia\* | 512 |
| 17 | Liechtenstein | 499 |  | 17 | Iceland\* | 507 |  | 17 | Macau (China) | 511 |
| (17a) | Israel – Hebrew speakers | 498 |  | 18 | Denmark\* | 503 |  | 18 | Poland\* | 508 |
| 18 | Sweden\* | 497 |  | 19 | Slovenia\* | 501 |  | 19 | Ireland\* | 508 |
| 19 | Germany\* | 497 |  | 20 | Norway\* | 498 |  | 20 | Belgium\* | 507 |
| 20 | Ireland\* | 496 |  | 21 | France\* | 497 |  | 21 | Hungary\* | 503 |
| 21 | France\* | 496 |  | 22 | Slovakia\* | 497 |  | 22 | USA\* | 502 |
| 22 | Taiwan | 495 |  | 23 | Austria\* | 496 |  |  | OECD average | 501 |
| 23 | Denmark\* | 495 |  |  | OECD average | 496 |  | 23 | Czech\* | 500 |
| 24 | Britain\* | 494 |  | 24 | Poland\* | 495 |  | 24 | Norway\* | 500 |
| 25 | Hungary\* | 494 |  | 25 | Sweden\* | 494 |  | 25 | Denmark\* | 499 |
|  | OECD average | 493 |  | 26 | Czech\* | 493 |  | 26 | France\* | 498 |
| 26 | Portugal\* | 489 |  | 27 | Britain\* | 492 |  | 27 | Iceland\* | 496 |
| 27 | Macau (China) | 487 |  | 28 | Hungary\* | 490 |  | 28 | Sweden\* | 495 |
| 28 | Italy\* | 486 |  | 29 | Luxembourg\* | 489 |  | 29 | Austria\* | 494 |
| 29 | Latvia | 484 |  | 30 | USA\* | 487 |  | 30 | Latvia | 494 |
| 30 | Slovenia\* | 483 |  | 31 | Ireland\* | 487 |  | 31 | Portugal\* | 493 |
| 31 | Greece\* | 483 |  | 32 | Portugal\* | 487 |  | 32 | Lithuania | 491 |
| 32 | Spain\* | 481 |  | 33 | Spain\* | 483 |  | 33 | Slovakia\* | 490 |
| 33 | Czech\* | 478 |  | 34 | Italy\* | 483 |  | 34 | Italy\* | 489 |
| 34 | Slovakia\* | 477 |  | 35 | Latvia | 482 |  | 35 | Spain\* | 488 |
| 35 | Croatia | 476 |  | 36 | Lithuania | 477 |  | 36 | Croatia | 486 |
| **36** | **Israel\*** | **474** |  | (36a) | Israel – Hebrew speakers | 470 |  | 37 | Luxembourg\* | 484 |
| 37 | Luxembourg\* | 472 |  | 37 | Russia | 468 |  | 38 | Russia | 478 |
| 38 | Austria\* | ‎470‎ |  | 38 | Greece\* | ‎466‎ |  | (‏38a‏) | Israel – Hebrew speakers | 476 |
| 39 | Lithuania | 468 |  | 39 | Croatia | ‎460‎ |  | 39 | Greece\* | ‎470‎ |
| 40 | Turkey\* | ‎464‎ |  | 40 | Dubai | ‎453‎ |  | 40 | Dubai | ‎466‎ |
| 41 | Dubai | ‎459‎ |  | **41** | **Israel\*** | **447** |  | **41** | **Israel\*** | **455** |
| 42 | Russia | ‎459‎ |  | 42 | Turkey\* | ‎445‎ |  | 42 | Turkey\* | ‎454‎ |
| 43 | Chile\* | ‎449‎ |  | 43 | Serbia | ‎442‎ |  | 43 | Chile\* | ‎447‎ |
| 44 | Serbia | ‎442‎ |  | 44 | Azerbaijan | ‎431‎ |  | 44 | Serbia | ‎443‎ |
| 45 | Bulgaria | ‎429‎ |  | 45 | Bulgaria | ‎428‎ |  | 45 | Bulgaria | ‎439‎ |
| 46 | Uruguay | ‎426‎ |  | 46 | Romania | ‎427‎ |  | 46 | Romania | ‎428‎ |
| 47 | Mexico\* | ‎425‎ |  | 47 | Uruguay | ‎427‎ |  | 47 | Uruguay | ‎427‎ |
| 48 | Romania | ‎424‎ |  | 48 | Chile\* | ‎421‎ |  | 48 | Thailand | ‎425‎ |
| 49 | Thailand | ‎421‎ |  | 49 | Thailand | ‎419‎ |  | 49 | Mexico\* | ‎416‎ |
| 50 | Trinidad and Tobago | ‎416‎ |  | 50 | Mexico\* | ‎419‎ |  | 50 | Jordan | ‎415‎ |
| 51 | Columbia | ‎413‎ |  | 51 | Trinidad and Tobago | ‎414‎ |  | 51 | Trinidad and Tobago | ‎410‎ |
| 52 | Brazil | ‎412‎ |  | 52 | Kazakhstan | 405 |  | 52 | Brazil | 405 |
| 53 | Montenegro | ‎408‎ |  | 53 | Montenegro | ‎403‎ |  | 53 | Columbia | ‎402‎ |
| 54 | Jordan | 405 |  | 54 | Argentina | ‎388‎ |  | 54 | Montenegro | ‎401‎ |
| 55 | Tunisia | ‎404‎ |  | 55 | Jordan | ‎387‎ |  | 55 | Argentina | ‎401‎ |
| 56 | Indonesia | ‎402‎ |  | 56 | Brazil | 386 |  | 56 | Tunisia | ‎401‎ |
| 57 | Argentina | ‎398‎ |  | 57 | Columbia | ‎381‎ |  | 57 | Kazakhstan | ‎400‎ |
| (‏57a‏) | Israel – Arabic speakers | 392 |  | 58 | Albania | ‎377‎ |  | 58 | Albania | ‎391‎ |
| 58 | Kazakhstan | ‎390‎ |  | 59 | Tunisia | ‎371‎ |  | 59 | Indonesia | ‎383‎ |
| 59 | Albania | ‎385‎ |  | 60 | Indonesia | ‎371‎ |  | (‏59a‏‏) | Israel – Arabic speakers | 382 |
| 60 | Qatar | ‎372‎ |  | 61 | Qatar | ‎368‎ |  | 60 | Qatar | ‎379‎ |
| 61 | Panama | ‎371‎ |  | (‏61‏a) | Israel – Arabic speakers | 367 |  | 61 | Panama | ‎376‎ |
| 62 | Peru | ‎370‎ |  | 62 | Peru | ‎365‎ |  | 62 | Azerbaijan | ‎373‎ |
| 63 | Azerbaijan | ‎362‎ |  | 63 | Panama | ‎360‎ |  | 63 | Peru | ‎369‎ |
| 64 | Kirghizstan | ‎314‎ |  | 64 | Kirghizstan | ‎331‎ |  | 64 | Kirghizstan | ‎330‎ |

Remarks:

1. The countries marked in grey are not noticeably different from Israel.
2. \*OECD member states

1. The OECD average is calculated as a simple average of the scores for the OECD countries (with each country having equal weight). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The countries selected for comparison were: Finland and Canada which had the highest ranks on the achievement ranking and the provision of social services; New Zealand and Spain, which have a similar GNP to Israel; Mexico, which ranked the lowest on the achievement ranking. . [↑](#footnote-ref-2)