

ADDITIONAL FIGURES AND ROBUSTNESS CHECKS

Figure B. 1 - Equity in reading performance and school admissions based on residence


Note: All analyses are restricted to schools with the modal ISCED level for 15 -year-old students.
Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database, Table B.4.


Figure B. 2 - Reading performance and school admissions based on academic performance


Note: All analyses are restricted to schools with the modal ISCED level for 15 -year-old students
Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database, Table B.5.
StatLink 苟ilst https://doi.org/10.1787/888933971765

Figure B. 3 - Percentage of students in schools whose parents/principal reported school competition, 2012
Percentage of students whose parents/school principal reported a certain number of schools competing for students in the same area

*Parents' reports for Flemish Community only.
Notes: All analyses are restricted to schools with the modal ISCED level for 15 -year-old students.
Only countries and economies with available data are shown.
Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of students in schools that compete with at least two other schools in the area, according to school principals.
Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database, Table B. 6.


## Table B. 1 - Reading performance, by school practices and social segregation

 Robustness checks|  | Admissions criteria (main) |  | Admissions criteria (student weights) |  | Admissions criteria (with average school socio-economic status) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Segregation } \\ & (2009-2015) \end{aligned}$ |  | Segregation (2003-2015) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boy | -35.094 | (0.259) | -29.464 | (0.507) | -32.982 | (0.233) | -35.121 | (0.257) | -35.871 | (0.210) |
| Immigrant | -5.214 | (0.520) | -11.844 | (1.426) | -4.312 | (0.494) | -5.231 | (0.518) | -10.147 | (0.496) |
| Disadvantaged | -46.575 | (1.132) | -45.126 | (1.943) | -18.298 | (1.088) | -31.740 | (1.303) | -28.507 | (1.109) |
| Advantaged | 53.704 | (1.370) | 45.558 | (2.807) | 25.049 | (1.224) | 27.391 | (1.263) | 27.302 | 1.089) |
| School admissions based on academic performance (\%) | -0.252 | (0.035) | -0.376 | (0.069) | -0.368 | (0.034) |  |  |  |  |
| x Disadvantaged | 0.023 | (0.014) | 0.129 | (0.027) | -0.008 | (0.012) |  |  |  |  |
| x Advantaged | -0.050 | (0.013) | -0.058 | (0.032) | -0.062 | (0.012) |  |  |  |  |
| School admissions based on residence (\%) | 0.204 | (0.042) | 0.315 | (0.094) | 0.163 | (0.041) |  |  |  |  |
| x Disadvantaged | 0.137 | (0.016) | 0.104 | (0.030) | -0.029 | (0.017) |  |  |  |  |
| x Advantaged | -0.127 | (0.021) | 0.038 | (0.041) | 0.030 | (0.019) |  |  |  |  |
| No-diversity index |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.095 | (0.165) | 0.301 | (0.134) |
| x Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.484 | (0.078) | -0.621 | (0.069) |
| x Advantaged |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.245 | (0.083) | 1.273 | (0.071) |
| Private schools (\%) | 0.237 | (0.051) | 0.235 | (0.061) | 0.127 | (0.047) | 0.196 | (0.051) | 0.268 | (0.041) |
| x Disadvantaged | 0.136 | (0.014) | 0.170 | (0.033) | 0.063 | (0.013) | 0.095 | (0.013) | 0.069 | (0.010) |
| x Advantaged | -0.199 | (0.014) | -0.055 | (0.037) | -0.177 | (0.012) | -0.173 | (0.012) | -0.157 | (0.011) |
| Vocational programmes (\%) | 0.179 | (0.079) | -0.649 | (0.187) | 0.128 | (0.078) | 0.115 | (0.075) | 0.014 | (0.038) |
| x Disadvantaged | 0.080 | (0.020) | 0.114 | (0.032) | -0.040 | (0.020) | 0.003 | (0.018) | -0.038 | (0.014) |
| x Advantaged | 0.039 | (0.022) | -0.050 | (0.047) | 0.160 | (0.019) | 0.107 | (0.016) | 0.067 | (0.013) |
| Grade repetition (\%) | -0.013 | (0.015) | -0.083 | (0.030) | -0.017 | (0.014) | -0.001 | (0.013) | 0.050 | (0.010) |
| x Disadvantaged | -0.020 | (0.010) | -0.053 | (0.017) | 0.006 | (0.009) | -0.015 | (0.010) | -0.018 | (0.007) |
| x Advantaged | 0.026 | (0.009) | 0.084 | (0.022) | -0.069 | (0.008) | 0.017 | (0.009) | 0.007 | (0.008) |
| Mean school ESCS |  |  |  |  | 57.550 | (0.418) |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 405.906 | (3.270) | 409.321 | (6.186) | 460.651 | (2.917) | 402.838 | (2.912) | 401.019 | (2.679) |
| Number of observations | 1,175 | ,972 | 1,17 | ,972 | 1,17 | ,972 | 1,175 | ,972 | 1,77 | ,706 |
| $\mathbf{R}^{2}$ | 0.2 |  | 0.3 |  | 0.35 |  | 0.2 |  | 0.3 |  |
| Country fixed effects | ye |  | ye |  | ye |  | ye |  |  |  |
| Cycle fixed effects | y |  |  |  | ye |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: All analyses are restricted to schools with the modal ISCED level. The results above may thus differ from those estimated on the entire sample of 15 -year-old students.
Disadvantaged students are students in the bottom quarter of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) in their own country.
In the second column, individual student weights are used, otherwise they are normalised in such a way that the contributions of all countries are equal, regardless of the size of their population
The strength of the social gradient corresponds to the variation in student performance in one country that is explained by socio-economic status; the slope refers to the score-point difference in performance associated with one-unit increase in ESCS (the R² and coefficient, respectively, of a regression of individual performance on socio-economic status).
For the sake of readability, the strength of the social gradient and the segregation indices have been rescaled from 0 to 100 . Standard errors are indicated in parentheses.
Values that are statistically significant at the 10\% level are indicated in italics and those at the $5 \%$ level are indicated in bold.
Source: OECD, PISA 2003, PISA 2009 and PISA 2015 Databases.
StatLink 䓂ist https://doi.org/10.1787/888933971898

Table B. 2 - Variation in the main variables

|  | Standard deviation |  | Range |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Within country | Total | Within country |
| No-diversity index | 4.0 | 1.2 | 22.0 | 2.4 |
| Academic segregation | 9.0 | 3.0 | 42.2 | 5.7 |
| School admissions based on <br> academic performance (\%) | 26.4 | 7.3 | 95.6 | 14.0 |
| School admissions based on <br> residence (\%) | 21.9 | 5.0 | 88.2 | 9.5 |
| Vocational programmes (\%) | 19.6 |  |  |  |
| Grade repetition (\%) | 29.7 | 1.9 | 75.6 | 3.5 |
| Private schools (\%) | 23.1 | 25.1 | 99.5 | 44.2 |

Notes: All analyses are restricted to schools with the modal ISCED level. The results above may thus differ from those estimated on the entire sample of 15-year-old students.
The standard deviation and range (maximum value - minimum value) are calculated in the total sample (Total) or separately within each country (Within).
Source: OECD, PISA 2009, PISA 2012 and PISA 2015 Databases.
StatLink ज्ता डाए https://doi.org/10.1787/888933971917
Table B. 3 [1/2] • Modal grade by country/economy

|  | Modal ISCED level | Students in the modal ISCED level in the sample | Students in a modal ISCED school in the sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OECD |  | \% | \% |
| Australia | 2 | 86.0 | 99.4 |
| Austria | 3 | 97.9 | 98.5 |
| Belgium | 3 | 90.7 | 97.1 |
| Canada | 3 | 88.4 | 98.4 |
| Chile | 3 | 94.2 | 96.2 |
| Czech Republic | 2 | 54.4 45.6 | 100.0 |
| Denmark | 2 | 99.3 | 99.3 |
| Estonia | 2 | 98.7 | 99.5 |
| Finland | 2 | 99.8 | 99.8 |
| France | 3 | 75.9 | 79.6 |
| Germany | 2 | 96.2 | 98.5 |
| Greece | 3 | 95.3 | 95.4 |
| Hungary | 3 | 89.8 | 90.2 |
| Iceland | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Ireland | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62.4 \\ & 37.6 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Israel | 3 | 89.1 | 97.4 |
| Italy | 3 | 98.9 | 98.9 |
| Japan | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Korea | 3 | 90.9 | 90.9 |
| Latvia | 2 | 96.3 | 99.0 |
| Luxembourg | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 56.5 \\ & 43.5 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Mexico | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39.0 \\ & 61.0 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Netherlands | 2 | 70.5 | 100.0 |
| New Zealand | 3 | 93.8 | 100.0 |
| Norway | 2 | 99.9 | 99.9 |
| Poland | 2 | 99.4 | 99.4 |
| Portugal | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.7 \\ & 65.3 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Slovak Republic | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47.4 \\ & 52.6 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Slovenia | 3 | 94.9 | 94.9 |
| Spain | 2 | 99.9 | 100.0 |
| Sweden | 2 | 98.1 | 98.1 |
| Switzerland | 2 | 77.0 | 84.5 |
| Turkey | 3 | 96.8 | 96.8 |
| United Kingdom | 3 | 99.8 | 100.0 |
| United States | 3 | 89.8 | 99.5 |

Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database.
*Argentina, Kazakhstan and Malaysia: Coverage is too small to ensure comparability in 2015.
StatLink ज्ञात्रा https://doi.org/10.1787/888933971936

Table B. 3 [2/2] Modal grade by country/economy

|  | Modal ISCED level | Students in the modal ISCED level in the sample | Students in a modal ISCED school in the sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Partners |  | \% | \% |
| Albania | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 37.0 \\ & 63.0 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Algeria | 2 | 76.9 | 76.9 |
| Brazil | 3 | 77.7 | 86.4 |
| B-S-J-G (China) | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 63.0 37.0 | 100.0 |
| Bulgaria | 3 | 96.9 | 97.8 |
| CABA (Argentina) | 2 | 92.5 | 96.6 |
| Colombia | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 40.3 \\ & 59.7 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Costa Rica | 2 3 | 53.2 46.8 | 100.0 |
| Croatia | 3 | 99.8 | 99.8 |
| Dominican Republic | 3 | 79.1 | 80.3 |
| Georgia | 3 | 77.5 | 99.3 |
| Hong Kong (China) | 3 | 67.3 | 99.9 |
| Indonesia | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52.2 \\ & 47.8 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Jordan | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Kosovo | 3 | 74.4 | 74.5 |
| Lebanon | 3 | 71.4 | 77.9 |
| Lithuania | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Macao (China) | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 44.9 55.1 | 100.0 |
| Malta | 3 | 99.7 | 99.8 |
| Moldova | 2 | 92.4 | 96.0 |
| Montenegro | 3 | 97.4 | 97.4 |
| North Macedonia | 3 | 99.8 | 99.8 |
| Peru | 3 | 74.7 | 97.2 |
| Qatar | 3 | 79.3 | 88.0 |
| Romania | 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Russia | 2 | 86.5 | 95.5 |
| Singapore | 3 | 97.9 | 100.0 |
| Chinese Taipei | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.4 \\ & 64.6 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Thailand | 3 | 75.4 | 92.2 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41.3 \\ & 58.7 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Tunisia | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.5 \\ & 65.5 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| United Arab Emirates | 3 | 86.5 | 96.0 |
| Uruguay | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37.9 \\ & 62.1 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Viet Nam | 3 | 90.9 | 91.4 |
| Argentina* | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.7 \\ & 61.3 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Kazakhstan* | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63.3 \\ & 36.7 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 |
| Malaysia* | 3 | 96.8 | 100.0 |
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