# Enhancing PISA 2022 Mathematics Performance in Slovenia: A Gender Analysis Approach to Additional Instruction Methods

### Abstract

Background

The PISA 2022 datasets offer valuable opportunities to deepen our understanding of the additional factors influencing students’ performance on mathematics assessments. In Slovenia, there is growing interest in how various instructional methods beyond the classroom impact student outcomes.

Methods

This study employs an exploratory design to investigate the impact of supplementary mathematics instruction on Slovenian students' performance in the 2022 PISA assessment. The research analyzes the prevalence and perceived effectiveness of different instructional approaches, including one-on-one tutoring, digital resources (such as video instruction), and group study sessions. Chi-square tests were used to examine gender differences and compare distributions between Slovenian and international student samples. Additionally, we conducted a regression for mathematics performance to assess the effect of various instructional methods on students' math literacy in Slovenia, using Rubin's rules for pooling estimates.

Results

The analysis revealed that most students reported not receiving additional instruction. Among those who did, Slovenian students showed a preference for video instruction, while one-on-one tutoring was more common globally. Significant gender differences were observed: in Slovenia, females preferred one-on-one tutoring, while males favored video instruction. Internationally, gender differences were significant across all methods except for large group instruction. Regression results showed that one-on-one and large group instruction were negatively associated with math scores, while video and small group instruction had positive effects. Notably, students who received no additional instruction performed significantly better than those who participated in one-on-one or large group formats.

Conclusions

The findings highlight the diverse instructional preferences among students and the role these preferences may play in shaping educational outcomes. This study emphasizes the need for a balanced integration of digital and traditional learning methods and provides insights that can inform educational practices and policymaking aimed at enhancing mathematics instruction and student achievement.
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## Introduction

As nations strive to elevate educational standards and outcomes, the assessment of student performance on an international scale becomes increasingly pivotal (Kirsch et al., 2013; Ramirez et al., 2018). The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), coordinated by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), serves as a crucial benchmark in evaluating the efficacy of educational systems worldwide (Hopfenbeck et al., 2018). This triennial assessment measures 15-year-old students' abilities in reading, mathematics, and science, providing valuable insights into how educational policies and practices can be refined to better support student learning.

The significance of PISA extends beyond mere assessment; countries value the results so highly that they have prompted changes in school network legislation and policy adjustments aimed at enhancing educational outcomes (Bieber & Martens, 2011; Hopfenbeck et al., 2018). Slovenia, like many other countries, participates in PISA to gauge its educational progress and identify areas needing improvement. Particularly, mathematics education has been an area of focus due to its critical role in fostering analytical and problem-solving skills essential for the 21st century (Cuder et al., 2023; Piccirilli et al., 2023). The 2022 PISA results offers a fresh dataset to explore the impacts of educational strategies implemented across Slovenia and globally.

However, the influence of PISA is not without its controversies (see Jerrim et al., 2024 for all of the below cons of such international assessments). The focus on PISA scores has led some countries to craft narratives that may not fully reflect the broader educational context, potentially leading to a narrowed curriculum that prioritizes PISA-related subjects at the expense of a more holistic educational approach. Furthermore, the involvement of private companies in the administration and development of PISA assessments raises concerns about commercial interests possibly overriding educational objectives (Lingard & Sellar, 2013; Seppänen et al., 2020). This, coupled with a lack of transparency in data handling and result interpretation, poses significant ethical and operational challenges.

In the 2022 mathematics PISA assessment, specific questions about students' instructional methods were asked (OECD, 2023a). In particular, participants were asked whether, during the school year, they participated in additional mathematics instruction in the form of (1) one-on-one tutoring with a person, (2) internet or computer tutoring with a program or application, (3) video-recorded instruction by a person, (4) small group study or practice (2 to 7 students), (5) large group study or practice (8 or more students), or (6) did not participate in additional mathematics instruction. Students had the possibility of selecting more than one option. Therefore, the question arises whether there are differences in the usage of these instructional methods across different countries and whether the usage patterns vary by gender. This prompts an investigation into the cross-national variations and gender disparities in the adoption of additional mathematics instructional methods, providing insights into potential educational inequalities and informing targeted interventions. Thus, the aim of the present paper is to shed light on the distribution of Slovenian participants in the PISA 2022 assessment among the instructional methods, compare them to international data, and verify whether the results differ with gender.

This study offers a unique contribution to the existing body of PISA research by specifically examining the usage of diverse instructional methods among Slovene and international students in the 2022 assessment. Unlike previous studies that often focus on general educational outcomes, this research focuses on the effects of various supplementary learning strategies. In particular, gender differences in preferred additional instructional methods in mathematics are analysed. The findings mostly highlight the current trends and preferences in mathematics education. This is particularly significant as it addresses the gap in understanding the specific instructional practices that can enhance mathematics learning, thereby contributing to the ongoing efforts to optimize educational strategies and improve student performance.

### Instructional methods

In the pursuit of educational excellence, educators continuously seek innovative instructional methods to enhance student learning outcomes (Raj Sharma et al., 2023), particularly in subjects like mathematics (Ogbuehi & Fraser, 2007). Additional mathematics instruction plays a pivotal role in providing students with supplemental support and opportunities for enrichment beyond the traditional setting (Satsangi & Sigmon, 2023; Slavin & Lake, 2008). These supplementary methods encompass a diverse range of approaches, from personalized one-on-one tutoring to collaborative group study sessions, facilitated by both human instructors and digital resources.

Understanding the effectiveness of these instructional methods is essential for educators and policymakers aiming to optimize educational practices and improve student performance. By examining the prevalence and impact of various instructional approaches, educators can tailor their strategies to better meet the diverse needs of learners and foster a deeper understanding of mathematical concepts.

Additional instructional methods in mathematics encompass a variety of approaches aimed at enhancing students' understanding and proficiency in the subject. These methods may include:

1. One-on-one tutoring with a person (Kochmanski & Cobb, 2023): Individualized instruction provided by a tutor, tailored to the specific needs and learning styles of the student. Previous PISA study by Liao & Huang (2018) concluded that science-related private tutoring did not significantly improve the overall scientific literacy scores of students, and that tutoring has widened the performance gap among students from different socioeconomic backgrounds, with students from socioeconomically advantaged family experiencing more significant gains from tutoring.
2. Internet or computer tutoring with a program or application (Hussein et al., 2022; Saha et al., 2020): Utilization of online platforms or software designed to deliver interactive and personalized mathematics instruction.
3. Video-recorded instruction by a person (Ndungo & Nazziwa, 2023): Accessing pre-recorded video lessons or tutorials delivered by an instructor, allowing students to review content at their own pace. Some studies however found that access to recorded video lectures have a detrimental effect on student performance (cf. Trenholm, 2022).
4. Small group study or practice (2 to 7 students) (Bonesrønning et al., 2022): Collaborative learning environments where students work together in small groups, engaging in problem-solving activities and discussions often under the guidance of a facilitator. It is a common practice during school lessons but is also used as an additional instructional method.
5. Large group study or practice (8 or more students) (Jerez et al., 2021): Group-based instruction involving a larger number of students, typically led by a teacher or instructor, focusing on reinforcing mathematical concepts through collective participation.
6. Non-participation in additional mathematics instruction: Students who do not engage in any supplementary mathematics instruction beyond regular classroom activities. Data on the number of students who do not participate in additional instruction is limited.

In the context of the PISA 2022 research, these instructional practices were measured to evaluate their impact on student performance in mathematics (OECD, 2023a).

### Gender differences between usage of additional instructional methods

Understanding gender differences in the use of additional instructional methods in mathematics education is crucial for developing effective, inclusive teaching strategies. Differences in physiology, mindset, upbringing, and psychological phenomena significantly influence male and female students' performance in mathematics (Xu, 2023). For instance, Armah et al. (2020) revealed that male distance learners outperformed their female counterparts in mathematics, underscoring the necessity for gender-sensitive strategies in distance education. Conversely, in a study by Kaldo & Õun (2020), female students have demonstrated superior organizational skills and more effective repetition strategies in mathematics learning compared to male students. These findings suggest that tailored instructional methods that account for these differences could enhance mathematics learning outcomes for both genders.

The influence of gender on these methods and their usage is multifaceted. Research indicates that gender stereotypes and societal expectations can affect students' confidence and participation in math-related activities (cf. Hawrot, 2024). Some studies indicated that boys are more likely to participate in additional tutoring (Liao & Huang, 2018), while others (Guill et al., 2020; Hawrot, 2024) found the opposite. Additionally, girls may benefit more from one-on-one tutoring and small group studies due to a more supportive and less intimidating environment (cf. Deutsch et al., 2017; Stoeger et al., 2017), while boys might engage more in larger groups due to competitive and social dynamics. Additionally, the use of ICT in teaching can bridge gender gaps by providing neutral, unbiased content delivery, though ICT usage as an additional instructional method in mathematics might be more used by boys than girls (Zhu & Mok, 2020). Thus, understanding and addressing gender influences is crucial in optimizing the effectiveness of these instructional methods.

## Methods

### Study design

This study employs an empirical causal non-experimental exploratory design, utilizing a quantitative research approach to assess the impact of additional mathematics instruction on the 2022 PISA results in Slovenia. The primary objective is to explore whether there are differences in the usage of additional instructional methods in mathematics on a local, national level (using the case of Slovenia) and on an international level. We will also explore whether there are differences in preference for the selected methods between genders, both locally and globally. The general hypotheses based on the theoretical framework established above are therefore the following:

H1: There are significant differences in the usage and preference of additional instructional methods in mathematics between genders, both at the national level in Slovenia and at the international level.

H2: There are significant differences in the usage and preference of additional instructional methods in mathematics between countries.

### Data collection

The dataset for this research was derived from the 2022 PISA results in Slovenia. The Slovenian sample for the 2022 assessment was selected through a multi-stage stratified sampling technique (OECD, 2023b). This method involved selecting a representative cohort of schools followed by a random sampling of students within those schools. The sampling procedure aimed to ensure a broad representation across different regions and school types, including both public and private institutions. Schools participated on a voluntary basis, and no institution was financially compensated for their participation.

### Participants

Following data cleaning procedures to remove incomplete or inconsistent entries, the initial sample included 6,355 Slovenian students with 2,999 male (47.19%) and 3,356 female (52.81%) participants. Most participants (96.85%) were in Grade 10, corresponding to the first grade of high school or gymnasium in the Slovene educational system. For international data, we included 613,665 students with 307,906 males (50.17%) and 305,759 (49.83%) females.

### Ethical Considerations

All participants provided informed consent, with minors obtaining consent from their guardians. Participation was strictly voluntary, and no financial incentives were offered. The study strictly adhered to the ethical standards laid out in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki, complied with the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR UE 2016/67), and followed the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. These frameworks ensured the protection of participant data and the integrity of research practices.

### Data analysis

Data analysis was conducted using the *Python* programming language (version 3.12.4). The *pandas* library (version 2.2.2) was utilized for data manipulation and cleaning, while the *scipy* library (version 1.14.0) was used to perform chi-squared tests.

Due to the multiple-choice nature of the questionnaire, the total number of responses exceeds the number of participants. Each participant was allowed to select more than one method, resulting in a higher overall response count compared to the number of unique respondents. While this characteristic does not invalidate the use of chi-square tests for analyzing associations between gender and method preferences, it is crucial to interpret the results with caution. Specifically, we must recognize that the assumptions of independence inherent in chi-square tests may be somewhat compromised. Despite this, the tests remain a useful tool for detecting significant associations, though the observed associations should be considered in the context of the potential overlap in responses.

Furthermore, to evaluate the effectiveness of the different instructional methods on mathematics literacy, we performed a multiple linear regression using “PV1MATH” to “PV10MATH” as outcome variables, consistent with the OECD's recommendations for plausible value analysis (Aparicio et al., 2022). In PISA, these plausible values represent multiple imputed estimates of a student's unobserved true proficiency, used to account for measurement uncertainty in large-scale assessments. Rubin’s Rules were applied to pool the estimates from these ten models. The model included instructional method indicators (one-on-one, IKT, video, small group, large group, none), gender, and grade level as covariates.

## Results

For preliminary analysis, the histogram distribution of learning method usage can be found in Figure 1. We can observe that most of the Slovenian participants employ no additional instruction methods, and that group learning practices are badly represented. We performed the same analysis for participants worldwide as can be seen in Figure 2. While the extrinsic picture is the same, the main difference lies in Slovene students prioritizing video instructional methods, while other participants in the study mostly do not. A chi-squared test was conducted to assess the observed differences in the proportions of various methods between the two datasets (i.e., Slovenia and all participants). The results indicated no significant difference in the proportion of one-on-one methods (*p* > .05). However, significant differences were found for ICT, video, small, and large groups, and 'none' methods (*p* < .05). In particular, the most commonly used additional instruction method by Slovenian students is video recordings by an instructor. In the sample of all participants, however, the most used additional instruction method is one-on-one tutoring. Large group sessions are the least used method both in Slovenia and among the students in the entire sample, but the proportions differ.
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Figure : Comparison of selected learning method usage using Slovene participants.
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Figure : Comparison of selected learning method usage using participants worldwide.

A chi-squared test was used to determine whether there are differences by gender in the usage of various instructional methods, both at the Slovenian and international levels.

In Table 1 and Table 2, we present the contingency table of the count of method selections by gender on Slovene and international data.

Table : Contingency table for method distribution by gender on Slovene data.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender \ Method | ICT | Large group | None | One-on-one | Small group | Video |
| Male | 726 | 211 | 1,308 | 813 | 661 | 959 |
| Female | 642 | 409 | 1,658 | 808 | 671 | 802 |

Table : Contingency table for method distribution by gender on international data.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender \ Method | ICT | Large group | None | One-on-one | Small group | Video |
| Male | 35,855 | 8,712 | 97,414 | 108,421 | 19,167 | 20,346 |
| Female | 29,253 | 8,657 | 91,046 | 131,189 | 16,689 | 15,085 |

Based on the chi-squared test, we conclude that there is a significant association between gender and method preference (*p* < .05) both on Slovene and international data.

Examining the methods individually, the test reveals that (1) in the Slovene case, there were significant gender differences in the usage of one-on-one tutoring, with more females participating, and video instruction, with more males participating, and (2) in the international case, differences were presented in all methods but the large group instructional method (*p* > .05).

To complement our descriptive and inferential analyses, we assessed the effect of different instructional methods on students' mathematics performance. The analysis revealed that one-on-one tutoring had a significant negative association with math performance in Slovene sample (β = -28.03, SE = 2.90, 95% CI [-33.71, -22.35]), as did IKT (β = -8.51, SE = 3.26). Conversely, video instruction (β = 9.11, SE = 3.16) and small group learning (β = 6.61, SE = 2.90) showed positive effects. The largest negative effect was associated with large group instruction (β = -38.63, SE = 4.05), while students who reported no additional instruction showed a positive average effect (β = 24.16, SE = 2.38). Grade level was the strongest positive predictor (β = 39.82, SE = 5.82), while gender had no significant effect. A visual summary of these effects is presented in Figure 3.
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Figure : Average Effect of Teaching Methods on Math Performance.

These findings indicate that passive or self-directed strategies like video and small group learning are more effective than one-on-one or large group instruction, contradicting traditional assumptions about personalized tutoring in mathematics.

## Discussion

In this paper we have explored the results of PISA 2022 results in Slovenia, focusing on instruction methods in learning mathematics and their usage among students. Our analysis revealed several key findings. First, the majority of participants, both in Slovenia and globally, do not employ additional instructional methods, with group learning practices being notably underrepresented. However, a significant distinction was observed in the preference for video instructional methods among Slovene students, in contrast to the global trend where one-on-one tutoring was more prevalent. The chi-squared test confirmed significant differences in the proportions of various methods between the two datasets, specifically highlighting ICT, video, small groups, large groups, and 'none' methods. Gender differences were also significant in both Slovene and international data. In Slovenia, male students preferred video instruction more, whereas female students were more inclined towards one-on-one tutoring. On the international level, significant gender differences were found across all methods except for large-group instruction.

When comparing the Slovenian results with those from the international dataset, several differences emerged. Internationally, there was a notable preference for one-on-one and small-group learning methods that were not as prominent in the Slovenian sample. This difference highlights a potential divergence in educational practices and cultural attitudes towards collaborative learning. Slovenian students showed a higher tendency towards ICT and video methods, whereas the international data revealed a more balanced engagement across different instructional methods. This suggests that, globally, there is a growing recognition of the benefits of group learning in fostering essential skills such as teamwork, communication, and critical thinking. In Slovenia, this divergence could be attributed to the now prevailing learning network called ASTRA, which provides video lectures of mathematics for high school students (Škraba, n.d.). Despite the lack of literature analyzing the popularity of this network, making it difficult to assess its presence among students, observational data from the researchers' experience confirm its spread among young people. Internationally, several online video and ICT tools and platforms are available for learning mathematics. However, these tools might not be as well-known in local communities, resulting in students not fully relying on them to deeply understand mathematics. Additional studies are necessary to fully understand the reasons underlying this difference between the Slovenian and international prevalence of additional mathematics instruction.

Gender preferences in learning methodologies often vary, with males showing a marked inclination towards ICT and video-based learning. This preference can be attributed to the interactive and visually engaging nature of these tools, which cater to the exploratory and problem-solving tendencies commonly observed in male learners (Borgonovi & Greiff, 2020; Utz & Wolfers, 2022). Conversely, females tend to prefer traditional learning practices without additional technological enhancements, potentially valuing the interpersonal elements that these methods offer (Chang et al., 2020). This distinction highlights the importance of tailoring educational approaches to accommodate different learning preferences based on gender.

Complementing this, our regression model revealed that one-on-one and large group instruction were associated with significantly lower mathematics scores, while video instruction and small group learning yielded positive effects. This finding challenges commonly held views about the benefits of personalized tutoring (cf. Ku & Sullivan, 2002) and points to the effectiveness of learner-centered, flexible instruction formats.

The insights into the contemporary landscape of learning methods underscores the increasing integration of digital resources in education, driven by their accessibility, flexibility, and the enhanced learning experience they offer through multimedia content (Cheng et al., 2009; Nusir et al., 2013). ICT's prominence can be attributed to the convenience it provides, allowing students to learn at their own pace and revisit complex topics multiple times. Furthermore, the digitalization of education has been accelerated by recent global events, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, which necessitated a swift transition to online learning environments (Carrillo & Flores, 2020). However, this shift towards ICT-based methods raises critical concerns regarding the quality of social interactions among students (Xiao & Hew, 2022). Traditional group learning practices, which are poorly represented in our data, play a vital role in developing collaborative skills, critical thinking, and the ability to work effectively in teams (Andrade, 2020; Pervaz Iqbal et al., 2020). The lack of such interactions may hinder the development of these essential skills, suggesting a need to balance digital and face-to-face learning modalities. Moreover, the big preference for one-on-one tutoring and small preference for small group study reveals a subset of students who value personalized attention and tailored instruction. These methods cater to individual learning styles and provide immediate feedback, which can significantly enhance understanding and retention of material (Pardo et al., 2019). This individualized approach can be particularly beneficial for students who struggle with self-paced learning or those who require additional support beyond standard classroom instruction (Shemshack et al., 2021; Tetzlaff et al., 2021). The choice of one-on-one and small group settings also reflects the desire for a more intimate and focused learning environment, which can be less intimidating and more conducive to asking questions and engaging deeply with the content. On the other hand, students who do not participate in supplementary instructional methods, highlight a potential area of concern. This group's disengagement could be due to a lack of awareness, resources, or motivation, pointing to the need for interventions that encourage the utilization of diverse learning methods to support all students effectively (Ramos et al., 2023; Ronksley-Pavia & Neumann, 2020). While ICT and video instruction offer significant benefits and are becoming increasingly integral to modern education, it is crucial to address the challenges they pose to social learning and to ensure that complementary instructional methods, such as group practices and one-on-one tutoring, are also promoted to provide a holistic educational experience.

When considering the evolution of education, it is crucial to take into account not only the needs of students but also the perspectives of teachers. Educators are increasingly recognizing the need to adapt and compete with eLearning possibilities to maintain the relevance of their profession (Rojko, 2020). This shift in mindset involves viewing their role as an enhancement and complement to what students can achieve through eLearning platforms. By integrating their expertise with digital tools, teachers can add significant value and facilitate a more comprehensive learning experience. A study by Lipovec et al., (2023) found that, while video lectures generally adhered well to pedagogical principles across various countries including Slovenia and 4 others included in PISA 2022 research, the level of interactivity was lacking. To ensure effective education, teachers must embrace the dual role of content experts and facilitators of interactive, technology-enhanced learning environments. This approach not only preserves the essence of traditional teaching but also leverages the strengths of modern eLearning.

## Limitations and future directions

The study is not without limitations. Firstly, it explores a novel question in PISA research, specifically focusing on the impact of additional instructional methods in mathematics, which presents a limitation as the data are not directly comparable to those from previous years. Secondly, caution must be exercised in interpreting PISA results; further research at the national level is essential to validate and expand upon our findings. Lastly, while our study successfully examined the direct impact of additional instructional methods on student performance, it is important to note that the approach remains correlational rather than causal. As such, more robust longitudinal or experimental studies are needed to determine the effectiveness of specific instructional methods with greater confidence.

However, despite the aforementioned limitations, the present study offers novel insights into PISA data, particularly regarding additional mathematics instruction methods. Interestingly, the distribution of these instructional methods differs between Slovenia and other participating countries. Additional research should address whether the adoption of various mathematics instruction methods and their usage impacts students' mathematics achievements. Specifically, future research might investigate whether one method is more efficient than another, which could, in turn, significantly influence how additional mathematics instruction is delivered. Longitudinal studies would allow us to understand the long-term effects of specific methods of delivering additional instruction.
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