Civic Participation at School

and

School-based Community Participation

Elisa Caponera,
National Institute for the Evaluation of Educational System
Italy
elisa.caponera@invalsi.it

Bruno Losito
Roma Tre University
Italy
losito@uniroma3.it

Paola Mirti
Roma Tre University
Italy
paola.mirti@uniroma3.it

Introduction

The idea of civic and citizenship education underpinning ICCS recognizes that civic and citizenship knowledge, dispositions to engage and attitudes related to civic and citizenship education are linked to the variety of contexts where students live, including family background, classrooms, schools, and the wider community (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, Kerr, 2008; Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, Losito, 2010). Particular importance is given to the actual opportunities students have to actively participate in school life and in the community where the school is located.

The first part of this paper will provide a general overview of how schools in the countries participating in ICCS enhance and support student civic participation, both within the school and in the local communities where schools are located.

It also illustrates if and how schools encourage participation of teachers, parents and students in the running of the school and the extent to which they can be considered as "democratic learning environment" open to student participation both at a school and at a classroom level.

Furthermore, it attempts to clarify the role of school and teachers in student participation in civic related activities in the local community, providing an overview of the differences existing across the 38 countries participating in ICCS.

In the second part, we will be presenting a selection of analyses aiming at exploring these results in depth, investigating the relationships between the openness of schools to students' participation and civic engagement at school and in the wider community.

We drew on data from ICCS student, teacher, and school questionnaire to perform these analyses.

1. Students' civic participation at school

Among the research questions that guided the ICCS study, two questions refer to student participation and the role of schools in fostering said participation.

The first one is related to the factors that may affect "the interest and disposition to engage in public and political life among adolescents", both at a school level and at a classroom level.

The second one, referring to "what aspects of schools and education systems are related to knowledge about, and attitudes to, civics and citizenship", made explicit reference to "aspects of school organization, including opportunities to contribute to conflict resolution, participate in governance processes, and be involved in decision-making".

A number of the questions included in the student, teacher and school questionnaires had the objective of helping to gather the information which could help to answer these research questions.

In the ICCS questionnaires (student, school, and teacher questionnaires) constructs and variables that previous studies and researches showed as having, in broad terms, an impact on student learning were included (Scheerens 1990; Hanushek, 1994; Schereens, Glas, Thomas, 2003; Birzea et al., 2004; Cox et al., 2005; Reezigt & Creemers, 2005), and more specifically on civic and citizenship education (Torney, Oppenheim, & Farnen, 1975; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, and Schulz 2001; Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt, e Nikolova's 2002).

In particular, it was taken into consideration both the way in which a school enables and supports students' active participation – as well as teachers' and parents' participation – in decision-making process at school and classroom levels and the quality of the relationships within the school itself (between teachers and students and among students).

Several studies show that what students experience daily at school, and the quality of relationships inside school itself may influence student knowledge and attitudes (Dürr, 2004).

The establishment and experience of relationships and behaviors based on openness and mutual respect, active contributions to school decision-making and participation in formal or informal governance processes provide student with an opportunity to practice a democratic lifestyle (Reilly, Niens, & McLaughlin, 2005; Homana, Barber, & Torney-Purta, 2006).
The ICCS report also pointed out that previous studies had provided some evidence that more open and democratic forms of school governance may contribute to higher levels of political efficacy among students (Mosher, Kenny & Garrod, 1994; Pasek, Feldman, Romer & Jamieson, 2008).

The ICCS Student Questionnaire included a question that required students to report whether they had participated in any of the civic related activities "within the last 12 months", "more than one year ago", or "never". Among the activities listed in this questions:voluntary participation in school-based music or drama activities outside regular lessons; active participation in a debate; voting for class representative or school parliament; taking part in decision-making about how the school is run; taking part in discussions at a student assembly; becoming a candidate for class representative or school parliament. Table 10 shows the percentages of students who said they had participated in each of these activities in the past.

Table 1 Percentage of students' reported participation in different civic activities at school

Country	Voluntary participation in school-based music or drama activities outside of regular lessons		Active participation in a debate		Voting for class representative or school parliament		Taking part in decision-making about how the school is run		Taking part in discussions at a student assembly		Becoming a candidate for class representative or school parliament		No participation in any of these activities	
Austria	52 (1.4)	▽	25 (1.1)	▼	81 (0.9)	△	30 (1.2)	▼	38 (1.1)	▽	57 (1.1)	▲	8 (0.7)	
Belgium (Flemish) †	47 (1.8)	▼	31 (1.2)	▼	68 (2.0)	▽	36 (1.3)	▽	24 (0.9)	▼	34 (1.2)	▽	16 (1.2)	△
Bulgaria	66 (1.2)	△	52 (1.4)	△	52 (1.9)	▼	31 (1.2)	▽	40 (1.2)	▽	34 (1.1)	▽	12 (0.9)	△
Chile	70 (1.0)	△	49 (1.7)	△	89 (0.7)	▲	39 (1.1)		35 (1.0)	▽	47 (1.0)	△	3 (0.3)	▽
Chinese Taipei	56 (0.8)	▽	17 (0.8)	▼	67 (0.9)	▽	43 (0.7)	△	84 (0.7)	▲	32 (0.9)	▽	7 (0.4)	
Colombia	71 (0.9)	▲	49 (1.3)	△	90 (0.5)	▲	57 (0.9)	▲	41 (0.9)	▽	44 (0.8)	△	3 (0.3)	▽
Cyprus	69 (0.9)	△	55 (0.9)	▲	71 (0.8)	▽	35 (1.2)	▽	39 (0.9)	▽	67 (1.0)	▲	9 (0.5)	△
Czech Republic †	52 (1.2)	▽	54 (1.0)	△	74 (1.9)		21 (0.9)	▼	29 (0.9)	▼	31 (1.0)	▼	9 (0.8)	△
Denmark †	43 (1.4)	▼	57 (1.2)	▲	73 (1.1)	▽	44 (1.0)	△	20 (0.8)	▼	49 (1.0)	△	9 (0.6)	△
Dominican Republic	62 (1.3)		66 (1.5)	▲	61 (1.5)	▼	59 (1.1)	▲	49 (1.2)	△	58 (1.2)	▲	6 (0.4)	▽
England ‡	62 (1.3)		48 (1.5)	△	79 (1.2)	△	55 (1.5)	▲	37 (1.4)	▽	40 (1.2)		8 (0.6)	
Estonia	73 (1.2)	▲	36 (1.2)	▽	75 (1.8)		24 (1.2)	▼	25 (1.3)	▼	32 (1.5)	▼	7 (0.6)	
Finland	61 (1.2)		59 (1.2)	▲	83 (1.3)	△	15 (0.7)	▼	23 (1.0)	▼	35 (1.4)	▽	6 (0.6)	▽
Greece	61 (1.4)		40 (1.1)	▽	85 (1.0)	△	57 (1.1)	▲	74 (1.4)	▲	68 (1.5)	▲	4 (0.4)	▽
Guatemala[1]	76 (1.0)	▲	56 (2.0)	▲	94 (0.8)	▲	63 (1.0)	▲	51 (1.2)	△	56 (1.2)	▲	1 (0.2)	▽
Indonesia	55 (1.4)	▽	41 (1.2)	▽	72 (1.4)	▽	57 (1.3)	▲	85 (1.0)	▲	26 (1.0)	▼	3 (0.4)	▽
Ireland	58 (1.2)	▽	66 (1.3)	▲	76 (2.2)		38 (1.3)		28 (1.1)	▼	25 (0.9)	▼	6 (0.7)	
Italy	67 (1.1)	△	50 (1.3)	△	49 (2.3)	▼	34 (1.5)	▽	24 (1.5)	▼	21 (1.3)	▼	8 (0.6)	
Korea, Republic of[1]	23 (0.7)	▼	33 (0.9)	▼	76 (0.7)		33 (0.9)	▽	26 (0.6)	▼	33 (0.7)	▽	18 (0.6)	▲
Latvia	77 (1.2)	▲	55 (1.6)	▲	67 (2.5)	▽	31 (1.3)	▽	31 (1.5)	▼	39 (1.6)		6 (0.6)	
Liechtenstein	48 (2.9)	▼	54 (2.6)	△	74 (2.5)		27 (2.6)	▼	42 (2.5)		49 (2.5)	△	8 (1.4)	
Lithuania	63 (1.1)	△	23 (0.9)	▼	84 (0.9)	△	35 (1.1)	▽	38 (1.2)	▽	30 (1.1)	▼	6 (0.5)	▽
Luxembourg	46 (0.7)	▼	19 (0.6)	▼	63 (0.8)	▼	25 (0.6)	▼	31 (0.7)	▼	36 (0.8)	▽	17 (0.8)	▲
Malta	70 (1.3)	△	30 (1.1)	▼	62 (1.2)	▼	29 (1.0)	▼	*		24 (0.9)	▼	12 (0.9)	△
Mexico	59 (0.8)		48 (1.1)	△	74 (0.9)	▽	54 (0.9)	▲	41 (1.0)	▽	36 (0.7)	▽	8 (0.4)	
New Zealand †	64 (1.2)	△	42 (1.4)		75 (1.4)		48 (1.3)	△	43 (1.1)		38 (1.1)	▽	10 (0.7)	△
Norway †	61 (1.3)		62 (1.3)	▲	90 (0.8)	▲	58 (1.6)	▲	52 (1.3)	△	62 (1.0)	▲	4 (0.4)	▽
Paraguay[1]	73 (0.9)	▲	39 (1.3)	▽	87 (1.0)	▲	56 (1.2)	▲	54 (1.4)	▲	58 (1.3)	▲	3 (0.5)	▽
Poland	60 (1.3)		32 (1.2)	▼	95 (0.5)	▲	57 (1.1)	▲	67 (1.1)	▲	59 (0.9)	▲	2 (0.3)	▽

Russian Federation	67	(1.0)	△	34	(1.2)	▼	76	(1.4)		32	(1.2)	▽	45	(1.1)		28	(1.1)	▼	8	(0.6)	
Slovak Republic[2]	60	(1.2)		49	(1.5)	△	73	(2.3)		28	(1.2)	▼	81	(1.0)	▲	43	(1.5)		5	(0.6)	▽
Slovenia	65	(1.3)	△	41	(1.2)	▽	84	(0.8)	△	28	(1.2)	▼	35	(1.4)	▽	59	(1.1)	▲	6	(0.5)	▽
Spain	65	(1.0)	△	50	(1.5)	△	87	(1.0)	▲	48	(1.2)	△	38	(1.3)	▽	55	(1.2)	▲	4	(0.4)	▽
Sweden	59	(1.4)		42	(1.6)		85	(0.9)	△	54	(1.1)	▲	53	(1.1)	△	40	(1.0)		6	(0.5)	▽
Switzerland †	56	(1.3)	▽	56	(1.5)	▲	60	(2.0)	▼	28	(1.3)	▼	40	(1.4)	▽	34	(1.4)	▽	9	(0.8)	△
Thailand †	64	(1.1)	△	36	(1.3)	▽	79	(0.9)	△	46	(1.1)	△	52	(1.1)	△	36	(1.0)	▽	6	(0.5)	▽
ICCS average	61	(0.2)		44	(0.2)		76	(0.2)		40	(0.2)		43	(0.2)		42	(0.2)		7	(0.1)	
Countries not meeting sampling requirements																					
Hong Kong SAR	70	(1.4)		35	(1.3)		74	(1.5)		28	(1.3)		34	(1.2)		32	(1.3)		10	(0.8)	
Netherlands	47	(2.1)		20	(2.8)		52	(4.5)		27	(2.5)		11	(0.9)		22	(2.5)		24	(2.7)	

National percentage

more than 10 percentage\ points above ICCS average	▲
significantly above ICCS average	△
significantly below ICCS average	▽
more than 10 percentage points below ICCS average	▼

* Data not available.

( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.

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

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

Source: ICCS International report

These results indicate that only 7.6 percent of students said they had not participated in any of these activities. On average, 76 percent of students reported having voted for class representative or school parliament. Lower percentages of students became candidate for class representative or school parliament. Only in Austria, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Slovenia, and Spain these percentages were higher than 50 percent.
61 percent of students reported voluntary participation in school-based music or drama activities outside regular lessons. Lower percentages of students reported ever having been involved in any of the other activities listed in the question (less than 50%).
However, there are differences between countries. In Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Latvia Liechtenstein, Norway, Spain, and Switzerland the percentages of students that reported having been actively involved in debates are equal to or above 50 percent. We have the same figures in the percentages of students that reported participation in discussions at student assemblies in Chile, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Slovak Republic, Sweden, and Switzerland. Only in eleven countries (Colombia, Dominican Republic, England, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Mexico, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, and Sweden), majorities of students said that they had taken part in decision-making about how their school was run.

ICCS also used the following five items to measure students' perceptions of the value of student participation at school ("strongly agree", "agree", "disagree", "strongly disagree") :

- Lots of positive changes can happen in schools when students work together
- Organizing groups of students to express their opinions could help solve problems in schools
- Students can have more influence on what happens in schools if they act together rather than alone
- Student participation in how schools are run can make schools better
- All schools should have a school parliament

Table 2 shows the average scale scores across countries.

Table 2 **National averages for students' perceptions of the value of participation at school overall and by gender**

Perceptions of the value of participation at school by gender

Country	All students		Females	Males	Differences (males - females)*
Austria	46 (0.2)	▼	46 (0.3)	45 (0.3)	-1 (0.4)
Belgium (Flemish) †	50 (0.2)		50 (0.3)	50 (0.3)	0 (0.3)
Bulgaria	49 (0.3)	▽	50 (0.4)	47 (0.4)	-2 (0.4)
Chile	56 (0.2)	▲	57 (0.3)	55 (0.3)	-2 (0.3)
Chinese Taipei	51 (0.2)	△	51 (0.3)	51 (0.3)	0 (0.4)
Colombia	54 (0.2)	▲	54 (0.2)	54 (0.3)	0 (0.3)
Cyprus	51 (0.2)	△	53 (0.3)	48 (0.3)	-5 (0.4)
Czech Republic †	47 (0.2)	▼	48 (0.2)	46 (0.3)	-1 (0.3)
Denmark †	50 (0.2)		50 (0.2)	50 (0.3)	0 (0.4)
Dominican Republic	54 (0.3)	▲	55 (0.3)	54 (0.3)	-1 (0.4)
England ‡	48 (0.3)	▽	49 (0.4)	47 (0.3)	-1 (0.5)
Estonia	50 (0.3)		52 (0.4)	48 (0.3)	-4 (0.4)

Finland	50	(0.2)		51	(0.2)	48	(0.3)	-3	(0.3)
Greece	53	(0.3)	△	54	(0.3)	51	(0.4)	-3	(0.4)
Guatemala[1]	56	(0.2)	▲	56	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	-1	(0.4)
Indonesia	52	(0.2)	△	52	(0.3)	51	(0.2)	-1	(0.3)
Ireland	51	(0.2)	△	53	(0.3)	50	(0.3)	-3	(0.4)
Italy	49	(0.2)	▽	50	(0.2)	49	(0.2)	-1	(0.3)
Korea, Republic of[1]	46	(0.2)	▼	47	(0.2)	45	(0.3)	-2	(0.4)
Latvia	48	(0.3)	▽	50	(0.3)	47	(0.3)	-3	(0.4)
Liechtenstein	47	(0.6)	▽	48	(0.7)	47	(0.8)	-1	(0.9)
Lithuania	48	(0.2)	▽	49	(0.2)	46	(0.3)	-2	(0.3)
Luxembourg	47	(0.2)	▼	48	(0.2)	46	(0.3)	-2	(0.4)
Malta	51	(0.3)	△	52	(0.5)	50	(0.3)	-2	(0.6)
Mexico	51	(0.2)	△	52	(0.2)	50	(0.2)	-2	(0.3)
New Zealand †	48	(0.3)	▽	50	(0.4)	47	(0.4)	-3	(0.5)
Norway †	52	(0.2)	△	52	(0.3)	52	(0.3)	-1	(0.4)
Paraguay[1]	54	(0.2)	▲	54	(0.3)	53	(0.3)	-1	(0.3)
Poland	51	(0.3)	△	52	(0.3)	49	(0.3)	-3	(0.4)
Russian Federation	50	(0.3)		51	(0.3)	49	(0.3)	-2	(0.4)
Slovak Republic[2]	47	(0.2)	▼	47	(0.3)	46	(0.3)	-1	(0.4)
Slovenia	50	(0.3)		51	(0.3)	49	(0.4)	-3	(0.4)
Spain	51	(0.2)	△	52	(0.3)	50	(0.3)	-2	(0.4)
Sweden	49	(0.2)	▽	50	(0.3)	48	(0.3)	-2	(0.4)
Switzerland †	46	(0.3)	▼	47	(0.4)	46	(0.4)	-1	(0.4)
Thailand †	51	(0.2)	△	52	(0.2)	50	(0.3)	-2	(0.3)
ICCS average	50	(0.0)		51	(0.1)	49	(0.1)	-4	(0.1)

Countries not meeting sampling requirements

Hong Kong SAR	48	(0.3)		48	(0.4)	48	(0.4)	0	(0.6)
Netherlands	47	(0.5)		47	(0.5)	47	(0.7)	1	(0.7)

National average

more than 3 score points above ICCS average	▲
significantly above ICCS average	△
significantly below ICCS average	▽
more than 3 score points below ICCS average	▼

* Statistically significant (p<.05) gender differences in **bold**.

() 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.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

Source: ICCS International report

The highest country averages were found in Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Guatemala and Paraguay. In Austria, Czech Republic, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Slovak Republic and Switzerland the national averages were more than 3 score points below ICCS average. In most countries females tended to agree more than males that participation at school is valuable. This result is similar to that of CIVED.

Students were also asked to rate the extent to which their opinions were taken into consideration when it was needed to make decisions about the school and if and the extent to which they considered important their taking part in the decision-making about how their school was run.
Students were also asked about the extent ("to a large extent", "to a moderate extent", "to a small extent", "not at all") to which their opinion was taken into account when decisions were made about the following issues: what is taught in classes, teaching and learning materials, the timetable, classroom rules, school rules.
Table 3 shows the average scale scores across countries.

Table 3 **National scale score averages for student perceptions of influence on decisions about school overall and by gender**

Country	All students		Females	Males	Differences (males - females)*	
Austria	47 (0.2)	▽	48 (0.3)	47 (0.3)	**-1**	(0.3)
Belgium (Flemish) †	48 (0.3)	▽	47 (0.3)	48 (0.4)	**1**	(0.4)
Bulgaria	50 (0.3)		49 (0.4)	50 (0.5)	**1**	(0.5)
Chile	53 (0.2)	▲	53 (0.3)	54 (0.3)	0	(0.3)
Chinese Taipei	52 (0.2)	△	52 (0.2)	52 (0.2)	**1**	(0.2)
Colombia	56 (0.2)	▲	56 (0.2)	56 (0.2)	0	(0.2)
Cyprus	49 (0.2)	▽	49 (0.3)	49 (0.3)	**1**	(0.4)
Czech Republic †	46 (0.2)	▼	46 (0.3)	46 (0.3)	0	(0.4)
Denmark †	45 (0.2)	▼	45 (0.2)	45 (0.2)	0	(0.2)
Dominican Republic	58 (0.2)	▲	58 (0.3)	59 (0.2)	**1**	(0.3)
England ‡	46 (0.3)	▼	45 (0.3)	46 (0.4)	**1**	(0.4)
Estonia	47 (0.2)	▽	46 (0.3)	48 (0.3)	**2**	(0.4)
Finland	46 (0.2)	▼	45 (0.2)	47 (0.2)	**2**	(0.3)
Greece	47 (0.3)	▽	47 (0.3)	48 (0.4)	**1**	(0.4)
Guatemala[1]	57 (0.3)	▲	57 (0.4)	57 (0.3)	0	(0.3)
Indonesia	59 (0.3)	▲	60 (0.3)	59 (0.3)	**-1**	(0.3)
Ireland	44 (0.3)	▼	44 (0.4)	44 (0.5)	0	(0.6)
Italy	51 (0.2)	△	51 (0.3)	51 (0.2)	-1	(0.3)
Korea, Republic of[1]	43 (0.2)	▼	43 (0.2)	44 (0.2)	**1**	(0.3)
Latvia	49 (0.3)	▽	49 (0.4)	49 (0.3)	0	(0.5)
Liechtenstein	46 (0.4)	▼	45 (0.5)	46 (0.7)	0	(0.8)
Lithuania	52 (0.2)	△	51 (0.3)	53 (0.3)	**2**	(0.4)
Luxembourg	50 (0.1)	▽	50 (0.2)	50 (0.2)	0	(0.3)
Malta	51 (0.2)	△	50 (0.3)	51 (0.4)	1	(0.5)
Mexico	55 (0.1)	▲	55 (0.2)	55 (0.2)	0	(0.2)

New Zealand †	47	(0.3)	▽	47	(0.3)	48	(0.4)	1	(0.4)
Norway †	52	(0.2)	△	52	(0.3)	52	(0.3)	0	(0.3)
Paraguay[1]	55	(0.2)	▲	55	(0.3)	56	(0.3)	**1**	(0.4)
Poland	45	(0.2)	▼	45	(0.3)	45	(0.3)	0	(0.3)
Russian Federation	57	(0.4)	▲	56	(0.5)	57	(0.4)	1	(0.4)
Slovak Republic[2]	49	(0.3)	▽	48	(0.3)	50	(0.4)	**1**	(0.4)
Slovenia	47	(0.3)	▼	46	(0.3)	47	(0.3)	**2**	(0.4)
Spain	48	(0.3)	▽	48	(0.4)	48	(0.4)	0	(0.4)
Sweden	49	(0.2)	▽	49	(0.2)	50	(0.2)	0	(0.3)
Switzerland †	46	(0.3)	▼	46	(0.3)	46	(0.4)	0	(0.4)
Thailand †	58	(0.1)	▲	59	(0.2)	58	(0.2)	0	(0.2)
ICCS average	**50**	**(0.0)**		**50**	**(0.1)**	**50**	**(0.1)**	**1**	**(0.1)**
Countries not meeting sampling requirements									
Hong Kong SAR	52	(0.2)		52	(0.2)	52	(0.3)	0	(0.3)
Netherlands	49	(0.3)		49	(0.3)	49	(0.5)	1	(0.5)

National average

more than 3 score points above ICCS average	▲
significantly above ICCS average	△
significantly below ICCS average	▽
more than 3 score points below ICCS average	▼

* Statistically significant (p<.05) gender differences in **bold**.
() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
† Met guidelines for sampling paticipation rates only after replacement schools were included.
‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.
[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

Source:ICCS International report

The highest country averages were found in Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Indonesia, Mexico, Paraguay, Russian Federation, and Thailand. The average scale scores for the Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Finland, Ireland, the Republic of Korea, Liechtenstein, Poland, Slovenia, and Switzerland were three or more points lower than the ICCS average.

A similar set of items was included in the Teacher Questionnaire[1]. The highest country averages were found in Colombia, Czech Republic, Lithuania, Paraguay, Poland and Thailand whereas in Chile, Cyprus, Finland, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Malta, the Slovak Republic, and Spain the national averages were more than 3 score points below ICCS average.

The above findings show the presence of significant differences across the ICCS countries. Data on student perceptions of their capacity to engage in decisions about school and on the importance they give to participation at school seem to show higher self-confidence in a number

[1] The four-item scale proved to have a reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of 0.76. Here are the four items: teaching/learning materials, timetable, classroom rules, school rules.

of Latin American countries (Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, and Paraguay). In two of them (Colombia and Paraguay) student and teacher perception were found to be consistent.

2. Students' participation in civic related activities in the community

ICCS investigated the extent to which students were engaged in civic related activities in the local community. The assumption was that the involvement in these activities may be seen not only as an indicator of civic engagement, but also as a resource for future engagement because of its "social network" facility – accordingly with Putnam theory of social capital (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, Losito, 2010). Students were asked to to state whether they had participated in the following organizations or activities ("within the last 12 months," "more than a year ago," or "never"): political youth organizations; environmental organizations; human rights organizations; voluntary groups to help the community; charitable organizations; cultural organizations based on ethnicity; groups campaigning for an issue.

Table 4 shows the percentages of students who reported they participated in these groups or organisations.

Table 4	Percentage of students' reported participation in different civic activities outside of school																							
	Percentages of students reporting to have been involved in:																							
Country	Youth organisation affiliated with a political party or union			Environmental organisation			Human Rights organisation			A voluntary group doing something to help the community			An organisation collecting money for a social cause			A cultural organisation based on ethnicity			A group of young people campaigning for an issue			None of these activities		
Austria	11	(0.6)	□	19	(0.9)	▼	13	(0.8)	▽	35	(1.2)	□	51	(1.6)	▲	14	(0.8)	□	33	(1.0)	△	30	(1.3)	▽
Belgium (Flemish) †	5	(0.5)	▽	15	(0.9)	▼	7	(0.5)	▽	23	(0.9)	▼	60	(1.1)	▲	11	(0.6)	▽	17	(0.8)	▼	32	(1.0)	▽
Bulgaria	9	(0.7)	□	41	(1.3)	▲	21	(1.0)	△	37	(1.3)	△	40	(1.6)	□	17	(1.0)	△	37	(1.3)	△	27	(1.5)	▽
Chile	9	(0.7)	□	31	(1.2)	□	16	(0.9)	□	40	(1.1)	△	40	(0.9)	□	10	(0.6)	▽	42	(0.9)	▲	29	(1.1)	▽
Chinese Taipei	4	(0.3)	▽	9	(0.5)	▼	3	(0.3)	▼	20	(0.7)	▼	17	(0.7)	▼	10	(0.6)	▽	6	(0.4)	▼	65	(0.9)	▲
Colombia	14	(0.6)	△	55	(1.1)	▲	36	(1.2)	▲	57	(0.8)	▲	41	(0.9)	△	17	(0.9)	△	45	(0.9)	▲	17	(0.8)	▼
Cyprus	18	(0.7)	△	38	(1.0)	△	22	(0.9)	△	26	(1.0)	▽	53	(1.1)	▲	18	(0.7)	△	25	(0.9)	▽	29	(1.0)	▽
Czech Republic †	4	(0.3)	▽	21	(1.2)	▽	9	(0.6)	▽	13	(0.7)	▼	29	(1.1)	▼	6	(0.4)	▽	19	(0.8)	▼	50	(1.2)	▲
Denmark †	4	(0.5)	▽	3	(0.3)	▼	3	(0.3)	▼	12	(0.7)	▼	36	(1.0)	▽	6	(0.5)	▽	13	(0.7)	▼	55	(1.1)	▲
Dominican Republic	25	(0.9)	▲	58	(1.1)	▲	50	(1.1)	▲	70	(0.9)	▲	54	(1.0)	▲	33	(1.0)	▲	58	(1.1)	▲	9	(0.7)	▼
England ‡	15	(0.9)	△	18	(1.1)	▼	8	(0.7)	▽	39	(1.4)	△	46	(1.3)	△	12	(1.0)	▽	17	(1.0)	▼	36	(1.4)	□
Estonia	9	(0.8)	▽	19	(1.0)	▼	8	(0.7)	▽	44	(1.3)	▲	15	(0.6)	▼	10	(0.7)	▽	30	(1.0)	□	37	(1.3)	□
Finland	3	(0.3)	▽	9	(0.5)	▼	1	(0.2)	▼	14	(0.6)	▼	20	(0.9)	▼	2	(0.3)	▼	10	(0.6)	▼	64	(0.9)	▲
Greece	8	(0.6)	▽	43	(1.6)	▲	17	(1.1)	□	21	(0.9)	▼	37	(1.2)	□	16	(0.8)	△	27	(1.2)	▽	35	(1.3)	□
Guatemala[1]	22	(1.0)	▲	55	(1.3)	▲	34	(1.4)	▲	64	(1.0)	▲	55	(1.4)	▲	28	(1.4)	▲	62	(1.4)	▲	11	(0.7)	▼
Indonesia	14	(0.7)	△	61	(1.0)	▲	31	(1.2)	▲	40	(1.0)	△	50	(1.1)	▲	24	(0.9)	△	21	(0.8)	▽	18	(0.9)	▼
Ireland	8	(0.6)	▽	10	(0.7)	▼	9	(0.7)	▽	50	(1.1)	▲	43	(1.3)	△	10	(0.7)	▽	20	(0.8)	▽	33	(1.1)	□
Italy	5	(0.4)	▽	26	(1.2)	▽	14	(0.7)	▽	23	(1.0)	▼	24	(0.9)	▼	11	(0.7)	▽	23	(1.0)	▽	43	(1.3)	△
Korea, Republic of[1]	4	(0.3)	▽	5	(0.3)	▼	2	(0.2)	▼	18	(0.7)	▼	8	(0.7)	▼	2	(0.2)	▼	10	(0.6)	▼	74	(0.9)	▲
Latvia	9	(0.8)	□	33	(1.5)	△	13	(0.8)	▽	38	(1.2)	△	22	(1.3)	▼	14	(0.8)	□	38	(1.5)	△	32	(1.2)	▽
Liechtenstein	11	(1.6)	□	17	(2.2)	▼	14	(1.8)	□	26	(2.4)	▽	58	(2.7)	▲	11	(1.7)	□	35	(2.6)	△	28	(2.4)	▽
Lithuania	11	(0.6)	□	35	(1.3)	△	15	(0.8)	□	23	(0.9)	▼	31	(1.2)	▽	17	(0.9)	△	25	(0.9)	▽	34	(1.2)	□
Luxembourg	11	(0.4)	□	26	(0.7)	▽	17	(0.6)	□	28	(0.7)	▽	52	(0.9)	▲	14	(0.4)	□	35	(0.8)	△	31	(0.9)	▽
Malta	14	(0.9)	△	23	(1.0)	▽	9	(0.7)	▽	36	(1.3)	□	28	(1.3)	▼	16	(0.9)	□	17	(1.0)	▼	38	(1.4)	△
Mexico	15	(0.7)	△	40	(1.1)	▲	25	(0.8)	△	46	(1.0)	▲	44	(1.1)	△	22	(0.9)	△	39	(0.9)	△	23	(0.8)	▼
New Zealand †	13	(0.9)	△	21	(1.0)	▽	7	(0.6)	▽	40	(1.4)	△	47	(1.2)	△	23	(1.1)	△	14	(0.8)	▼	32	(1.2)	▽

Norway †	8	(0.6)	▽	13	(0.9)	▼	10	(0.7)	▽	20	(0.9)	▼	52	(1.1)	▲	12	(0.7)	▽	23	(0.7)	▽	38	(1.2)	△
Paraguay[1]	19	(1.0)	△	49	(1.2)	▲	31	(1.2)	▲	69	(1.0)	▲	52	(1.0)	▲	22	(1.2)	△	54	(1.0)	▲	11	(0.7)	▼
Poland	4	(0.4)	▽	50	(1.3)	▲	17	(0.9)	□	36	(1.3)	□	47	(1.4)	△	15	(0.6)	□	27	(1.0)	▽	28	(1.2)	▽
Russian Federation	11	(0.8)	□	39	(1.6)	△	23	(1.3)	△	30	(1.5)	▽	28	(1.2)	▼	18	(1.0)	△	62	(1.3)	▲	22	(1.1)	▼
Slovak Republic[2]	6	(0.6)	▽	19	(1.4)	▼	12	(1.0)	▽	27	(1.3)	▽	26	(1.7)	▼	9	(1.0)	▽	24	(1.5)	▽	44	(1.7)	△
Slovenia	6	(0.5)	▽	28	(1.3)	□	10	(0.6)	▽	24	(1.0)	▽	44	(1.2)	△	13	(0.7)	▽	35	(1.0)	△	34	(1.2)	□
Spain	5	(0.5)	▽	18	(0.8)	▼	14	(0.8)	▽	26	(0.9)	▽	32	(1.0)	▽	7	(0.5)	▽	22	(0.9)	▽	46	(1.0)	▲
Sweden	7	(0.5)	▽	8	(0.5)	▼	7	(0.5)	▽	14	(0.7)	▼	23	(1.0)	▼	6	(0.4)	▽	14	(0.6)	▼	63	(1.1)	▲
Switzerland †	6	(0.7)	▽	21	(1.4)	▽	13	(1.0)	▽	26	(1.1)	▽	49	(1.4)	△	8	(0.8)	▽	23	(0.9)	▽	34	(1.2)	□
Thailand †	23	(1.1)	▲	71	(0.8)	▲	39	(1.0)	▲	57	(1.0)	▲	56	(1.0)	▲	38	(1.2)	▲	59	(1.0)	▲	11	(0.5)	▼
ICCS average	10	(0.1)		29	(0.2)		16	(0.1)		34	(0.2)		39	(0.2)		14	(0.1)		29	(0.2)		35	(0.2)	
Countries not meeting sampling requirements																								
Hong Kong SAR	8	(0.6)		29	(1.3)		6	(0.6)		33	(1.4)		34	(1.4)		8	(0.6)		9	(0.6)		46	(1.6)	
Netherlands	6	(1.3)		14	(1.6)		7	(0.8)		24	(2.3)		60	(2.6)		7	(1.6)		12	(0.9)		31	(2.6)	

National percentage

more than 10 percentage\ points above ICCS average	▲
significantly above ICCS average	△
significantly below ICCS average	▽
more than 10 percentage points below ICCS average	▼

() 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.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

Source: ICCS International report

On average, in the ICCS countries as a whole, 35 percent of students reported ever having participated in the groups and associations/organizations listed in the question. Nevertheless, the highest rate of participation was found in organizations collecting money for a social cause (39 percent), voluntary groups doing something to help the community (34 percent), environmental organizations (29 percent) and in groups of young people campaigning for an issue (29 percent). The findings show that only small minorities of students reported participation in formal political organizations, such as youth groups of parties or unions (10 percent). Larger numbers of students reported their civic engagement in a number of Latin American countries (Colombia, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Mexico, and Paraguay) as well as in Indonesia and in Thailand.
It is likely that the low rate of student engagement across the ICCS countries may be credited to the age group studied in ICCS. Similar findings were found also in CIVED '99 (Torney-Purta et al., 2001).

Principals and teachers[2] were asked about target grade students' participation in civic related activities organized by the school in the community (activities related to the environment, geared to the local area; human rights projects; activities related to underprivileged people or groups; cultural activities; multicultural and intercultural activities within the local community; campaigns to raise people's awareness, such as AIDS World Day, World No Tobacco Day; activities related to improving facilities for the local community; participating in sport events).
The response categories were "all or nearly all," "most of them," "some of them," "none or hardly any"[3].
Principals' answers are generally consistent with those of teachers. The slight differences that we observed between the data obtained from the teacher questionnaire and those obtained from the school questionnaire were probably related to the subjects the teachers taught. Some teachers, because of their subject specialties, may have had few, if any, opportunities, to participate with their students in civic-related activities in the community.

According to teachers and principals (see Tables A1 e A2 in the Appendix), the participation of target grade students in civic-related activities in the community turned out to be quite widespread across ICCS countries. In most of the participating countries, less than 10 percent of the participating teachers said that they had not participated in any of these initiatives with their target-grade classes.
Among the listed activities, the most common were found to be participation in sport events and cultural activities.
Besides, participation in national campaigns on specific issues (such as AIDS World Day, No Tobacco Day) and activities in the local area related to the environment appeared, as well, to be fairly widespread.
Only minorities of teachers and principals reported school-based student involvement in human rights projects or activities to help the underprivileged.
In this case as well, it is likely that the outcomes are associated with target grade and students' age (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, Losito, 2010).

The student questionnaire asked students about their expected participation in informal political activities. One of the items included in this question asked students about their willingness, in the future, to volunteer time to help people in the local community.
Table 5 shows the national percentages of students who reported that they would "certainly" or "probably" volunteer their time in this way.

[2] The questions included in both questionnaires were basically the same in content, even though partially different in layout.
[3] For principals an additional category was made available: activity "not offered at school."

Table 5 Student expectations to volunteer time to help people in the local community overall and by gender

Percentages of students who will certainly/problably volunteer time to help people in the local community

Country	All students			Females		Males		Differences (males - females)	
Austria	56	(1.1)	▼	57	(1.7)	54	(1.4)	-3	(2.2)
Belgium (Flemish) †	51	(1.1)	▼	58	(1.4)	44	(1.7)	**-13**	(2.3)
Bulgaria	81	(1.0)	▲	84	(1.2)	78	(1.4)	**-6**	(1.7)
Chile	76	(0.9)	△	80	(1.1)	72	(1.2)	**-8**	(1.5)
Chinese Taipei	75	(0.8)	△	80	(0.9)	70	(1.0)	**-10**	(1.2)
Colombia	89	(0.6)	▲	91	(0.6)	85	(1.0)	**-6**	(1.0)
Cyprus	77	(1.0)	▲	80	(1.1)	75	(1.5)	**-5**	(1.7)
Czech Republic †	44	(0.9)	▼	48	(1.3)	40	(1.0)	**-8**	(1.6)
Denmark †	36	(1.1)	▼	42	(1.4)	29	(1.4)	**-13**	(1.7)
Dominican Republic	93	(0.6)	▲	94	(0.7)	92	(0.8)	**-2**	(0.9)
England ‡	59	(1.0)	▽	66	(1.2)	51	(1.6)	**-14**	(2.1)
Estonia	61	(1.2)	▽	66	(1.5)	56	(1.6)	**-10**	(2.0)
Finland	29	(0.9)	▼	34	(1.3)	24	(1.2)	**-10**	(1.7)
Greece	78	(0.8)	▲	82	(1.1)	75	(1.2)	**-7**	(1.5)
Guatemala[1]	91	(0.6)	▲	93	(0.7)	88	(0.9)	**-4**	(1.0)
Indonesia	96	(0.4)	▲	96	(0.5)	95	(0.6)	-1	(0.7)
Ireland	68	(1.1)		78	(1.2)	59	(1.6)	**-19**	(1.8)
Italy	69	(1.0)	△	77	(1.4)	61	(1.3)	**-17**	(1.8)
Korea, Republic of[1]	62	(0.9)	▽	66	(1.1)	59	(1.2)	**-8**	(1.5)
Latvia	65	(1.3)		68	(1.4)	62	(1.7)	**-6**	(1.9)
Liechtenstein	41	(2.5)	▼	43	(3.6)	40	(3.8)	-2	(5.1)
Lithuania	69	(0.8)	△	72	(1.0)	66	(1.3)	**-6**	(1.7)
Luxembourg	54	(0.8)	▼	56	(1.2)	53	(1.3)	-3	(1.9)
Malta	63	(1.4)	▽	60	(2.2)	65	(1.7)	5	(2.7)
Mexico	85	(0.6)	▲	86	(0.7)	84	(0.7)	**-2**	(1.0)
New Zealand †	60	(1.2)	▽	66	(1.8)	53	(1.7)	**-12**	(2.6)
Norway †	51	(1.0)	▼	56	(1.8)	47	(1.4)	**-9**	(2.6)
Paraguay[1]	87	(0.7)	▲	89	(0.9)	85	(1.0)	**-4**	(1.3)
Poland	66	(1.1)		71	(1.5)	62	(1.5)	**-9**	(2.0)
Russian Federation	86	(0.7)	▲	89	(0.9)	82	(0.9)	**-8**	(1.2)
Slovak Republic[2]	59	(1.2)	▽	63	(1.5)	55	(1.4)	**-7**	(1.7)
Slovenia	72	(1.1)	△	76	(1.3)	69	(1.6)	**-7**	(1.9)
Spain	67	(1.0)		71	(1.4)	62	(1.2)	**-10**	(1.7)
Sweden	47	(1.0)	▼	52	(1.3)	43	(1.5)	**-9**	(2.0)
Switzerland †	44	(1.0)	▼	49	(1.7)	39	(1.7)	**-10**	(2.7)
Thailand †	90	(0.5)	▲	89	(0.6)	91	(0.7)	1	(0.8)
ICCS average	**67**	**(0.2)**		**70**	**(0.2)**	**63**	**(0.2)**	**-7**	**(0.3)**
Countries not meeting sampling requirements									
Hong Kong SAR	71	(1.2)		75	(1.5)	67	(1.5)	**-8.2**	(2.0)
Netherlands	52	(2.3)		62	(2.9)	41	(2.2)	**-22**	(2.4)

National average

more than 3 score points above ICCS average	▲
significantly above ICCS average	△
significantly below ICCS average	▽
more than 3 score points below ICCS average	▼

* Statistically significant (p<.05) gender differences in **bold**.

() 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.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

Source: ICCS International report

In almost all countries, majorities of students said they were willing to volunteer. In Bulgaria, Colombia, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Paraguay, the Russian Federation, and Thailand, the percentages were more than 10 percentage points above the international average.
These findings appear to confirm what found with regard to a number of Latin American countries, Indonesia and in Thailand.

The findings presented so far appear to indicate a certain degree of openness of the schools towards civic related activities in the local community. The types of activities the students have the opportunity to engage in refer to their age and target grade. Not unexpectedly, differences between countries emerged. It is worthy investigating the socio-political and cultural context of the Latin American and Asian countries in which the highest percentages of student participation in civic related activities outside school were found. It is to be noted that in some of these countries, a larger opportunity to participate in civic related activities is linked to a higher student self-confidence in influencing decisions about school.

3. Civic participation at school and in the community, and student attitudes and dispositions towards participation

We performed several types of analyses on data from student, school and teacher questionnaire in order to better understand which school characteristics are associated, on the one hand, with higher or lower levels of student participation in civic related activities at school and in the wider community and, on the other hand, with student perceptions of their influence, through direct participation, on decision-making at school.

1. First, we attempted to investigate the relationship between student perceptions of their influence on decisions about school and different levels of the openness of schools to student participation in decision-making as measured by principals' answers to a few questions included in the school questionnaire. Following the same type of analysis used in the ICCS International report, we identified three tertile groups of schools in each country. The same analyses were carried out for student participation at school and in the wider community.
2. Secondly, we performed a multi-level analysis (at student and school levels) with the aim to investigate the factors which, at the school level, could possibly influence student perceptions of their influence on decisions about school.
3. Lastly, we analyzed at a school aggregate level correlations between student perceptions of their influence on decisions about school and a number of constructs and variables used for the teacher questionnaire.

We tried to identify (through different types of analyses) whether and the extent to which it would be possible to associate student participation with some features of a higher or lower degree of openness of schools to students' active participation (measured by principals' and teachers'

answers). Of course, we are aware that these features correspond to principal and teacher perceptions (with any implied limits deriving from this).

3.1 Students' perceptions of influence on decisions about schools and principals' perceptions of participation at school

In Table 6, student perceptions of their influence on decisions about school are compared with principal perceptions of student perception and with principal perception of teacher participation in school governance. Here the assumption is that what has been detected by principals may be considered "a measure" of the level of openness of the school to students' and teachers' active participation (from principals' perspective).
In order to explore the relations between student and principal perceptions we calculated national tertiles for schools with low, medium, or high average of principal perceptions on both students' influence on decision about school and teacher participation in school governance. We, then, compared the student average scale scores across the tertile groups .
Table 6 shows the average scale score for student perceptions of their influence on decisions about school in schools where principal perceptions of said student influence is high, medium or low and in school where principal perceptions of teacher participation in school governance is low, medium, or high. As it can be seen in Table 6, on average, across the ICCS participating countries no overall association was found in either cases. When comparing differences across tertile groups within countries, we found a statistically significant difference between the lowest and the highest tertile for principal perceptions of teacher participation in school governance in Estonia and in Sweden.

Table 6. "Student perception of influence on decisions about school" by national tertile groups of schools with low, medium, high average of

	Principals' perceptions of student influence on decisions about school						Principals' perceptions of teacher participation in school governance					
	Low		Medium		High		Low		Medium		High	
Country	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)
Austria	47	(0.5)	48	(0.5)	47	(0.4)	47	(0.4)	48	(0.6)	47	(0.5)
Belgium (Flemish) †	47	(0.4)	47	(0.5)	48	(0.6)	48	(0.5)	47	(0.5)	47	(0.4)
Bulgaria	49	(0.7)	50	(0.8)	50	(0.6)	48	(0.6)	50	(0.6)	51	(1.0)
Chile	53	(0.4)	54	(0.4)	53	(0.4)	53	(0.4)	53	(0.4)	54	(0.4)
Chinese Taipei	52	(0.3)	52	(0.4)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.2)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.4)
Colombia	56	(0.3)	56	(0.3)	56	(0.3)	56	(0.3)	57	(0.3)	56	(0.3)
Cyprus	49	(0.5)	49	(0.6)	48	(0.5)	49	(0.7)	48	(0.7)	49	(0.3)
Czech Republic †	46	(0.4)	46	(0.4)	46	(0.5)	46	(0.5)	46	(0.4)	46	(0.4)
Denmark †	45	(0.3)	45	(0.3)	46	(0.3)	45	(0.3)	46	(0.3)	46	(0.4)
Dominican Republic	59	(0.2)	59	(0.3)	58	(0.5)	59	(0.3)	58	(0.4)	59	(0.3)
England ‡	46	(0.6)	46	(0.5)	45	(0.4)	46	(0.5)	45	(0.5)	46	(0.4)
Estonia	47	(0.5)	47	(0.5)	47	(0.5)	47	(0.6)	47	(0.5)	47	(0.5)
Finland	46	(0.3)	46	(0.3)	47	(0.4)	**45**	**(0.3)**	47	(0.4)	**47**	**(0.3)**
Guatemala [1]	57	(0.4)	57	(0.3)	57	(1.0)	57	(0.3)	57	(0.4)	57	(0.9)
Indonesia	59	(0.7)	60	(0.3)	59	(0.6)	60	(0.5)	59	(0.5)	59	(0.6)
Ireland	43	(0.5)	45	(0.4)	45	(0.7)	45	(0.7)	44	(0.4)	44	(0.7)

Italy	51	(0.4)	51	(0.3)	52	(0.4)	52	(0.4)	51	(0.4)	51	(0.3)
Korea, Republic of [1]	43	(0.3)	44	(0.3)	43	(0.3)	43	(0.3)	43	(0.3)	44	(0.3)
Latvia	49	(0.6)	49	(0.7)	49	(0.6)	49	(0.6)	49	(0.5)	50	(0.6)
Liechtenstein	47	(3.3)	44	(0.5)	49	(2.1)	44	(0.0)	47	(1.9)	46	(2.4)
Lithuania	51	(0.5)	52	(0.4)	53	(0.4)	51	(0.4)	52	(0.4)	52	(0.4)
Luxembourg	50	(0.9)	51	(1.2)	49	(1.4)	49	(1.6)	50	(1.1)	50	(1.0)
Malta	51	(0.9)	51	(0.6)	50	(0.6)	51	(0.6)	51	(0.8)	50	(0.7)
Mexico	55	(0.4)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	56	(0.3)
New Zealand †	47	(0.8)	47	(0.5)	49	(0.5)	47	(0.6)	48	(0.5)	48	(0.7)
Norway †	51	(0.4)	52	(0.6)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.3)	51	(0.7)	53	(0.4)
Paraguay [1]	55	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	56	(0.4)	55	(0.4)	55	(0.3)	56	(0.3)
Poland	45	(0.5)	45	(0.4)	44	(0.4)	45	(0.4)	44	(0.4)	45	(0.4)
Russian Federation	57	(0.5)	56	(0.8)	57	(0.6)	57	(0.6)	56	(0.5)	58	(0.8)
Slovak Republic [2]	48	(0.6)	50	(0.6)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.6)	49	(0.6)	49	(0.6)
Slovenia	47	(0.5)	46	(0.4)	47	(0.4)	47	(0.4)	46	(0.5)	47	(0.4)
Spain	47	(0.7)	47	(0.5)	49	(0.6)	48	(0.6)	48	(0.5)	48	(0.7)
Sweden	49	(0.4)	50	(0.4)	50	(0.3)	**49**	**(0.4)**	50	(0.3)	**50**	**(0.3)**
Switzerland †	46	(0.5)	45	(0.6)	46	(0.8)	46	(0.6)	46	(0.6)	45	(1.1)
Thailand †	58	(0.2)	59	(0.2)	59	(0.2)	59	(0.2)	58	(0.2)	58	(0.3)
ICCS Average	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)

Countries not meeting sampling requirements

Honk Kong SAR

Netherlands

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.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

We decided to carry out the same type of analyses on principal perceptions of students, teachers, and no-teaching staff sense of belonging to the school. In this case, as well, a statistically significant difference across tertile groups for principal perceptions of student sense of belonging to school was found only in three countries (Czech Republic, Ireland, and Switzerland). The association seems to be negative (average scale scores are bigger in the lowest tertile groups)[4].

3.2 Students' civic participation at school and in the wider community and teachers' perceptions

As for this analysis, we used data from the Teacher Questionnaire. We calculated national tertiles for schools with low, medium, or high average of teacher participation in school governance and of teacher reports of student participation in class activities. We, then, compared across the tertile groups the average scale scores for the two following scales:

[4] See Table A3 in the Appendices.

student civic participation at school and student civic participation in the wider community. The results are shown in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7. "Students' civic participation at school" by national tertile groups of schools with low, medium, high average of

	Teachers' participation in school governance						Teacher reports of student participation in class activities					
	Low		Medium		High		Low		Medium		High	
Country	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)
Bulgaria	48	(0.5)	47	(0.6)	47	(0.9)	47	(0.7)	48	(0.5)	48	(0.6)
Chile	52	(0.4)	52	(0.3)	53	(0.4)	**51**	**(0.4)**	52	(0.4)	**53**	**(0.4)**
Chinese Taipei	49	(0.3)	50	(0.3)	50	(0.5)	**49**	**(0.3)**	50	(0.3)	**50**	**(0.3)**
Colombia	53	(0.4)	53	(0.4)	54	(0.4)	**52**	**(0.4)**	54	(0.4)	**54**	**(0.4)**
Cyprus	51	(0.6)	52	(0.5)	52	(0.6)	52	(0.4)	52	(0.6)	52	(0.6)
Czech Republic †	48	(0.7)	48	(0.6)	47	(0.6)	47	(0.7)	47	(0.6)	49	(0.6)
Dominican Republic	53	(0.5)	53	(0.3)	54	(0.6)	53	(0.3)	53	(0.6)	53	(0.5)
Estonia	47	(0.7)	47	(0.4)	49	(0.9)	46	(0.6)	47	(0.6)	49	(0.7)
Finland	47	(0.4)	49	(0.3)	49	(0.5)	**48**	**(0.4)**	48	(0.5)	**49**	**(0.3)**
Guatemala [1]	55	(0.3)	56	(0.4)	56	(0.7)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.5)	56	(0.6)
Indonesia	52	(0.4)	53	(0.3)	52	(0.4)	52	(0.4)	52	(0.4)	53	(0.4)
Ireland ‡	50	(0.5)	50	(0.5)	51	(0.8)	**49**	**(0.6)**	50	(0.7)	**51**	**(0.5)**
Italy	47	(0.5)	48	(0.6)	47	(0.7)	46	(0.7)	48	(0.6)	48	(0.6)
Korea, Republic of [1]	46	(0.4)	45	(0.4)	45	(0.4)	45	(0.3)	45	(0.4)	46	(0.4)
Latvia	49	(0.6)	48	(0.6)	50	(0.7)	49	(0.6)	48	(0.5)	50	(0.9)
Liechtenstein	48	(1.1)	50	(0.7)	48	(1.2)	**48**	**(0.9)**	47	(0.3)	**51**	**(0.5)**
Lithuania	48	(0.5)	49	(0.4)	48	(0.6)	49	(0.6)	48	(0.4)	49	(0.3)
Malta	**45**	**(0.8)**	46	(1.0)	**49**	**(1.0)**	46	(0.9)	45	(1.1)	48	(0.7)
Mexico	**49**	**(0.3)**	50	(0.4)	**52**	**(0.7)**	50	(0.3)	50	(0.4)	50	(0.6)
Paraguay [1]	55	(0.4)	54	(0.5)	55	(0.5)	54	(0.3)	55	(0.4)	54	(0.6)
Poland	54	(0.4)	54	(0.4)	54	(0.5)	54	(0.3)	54	(0.4)	55	(0.5)
Russian Federation	48	(0.5)	49	(0.5)	50	(0.7)	**48**	**(0.5)**	49	(0.6)	**51**	**(0.6)**
Slovak Republic [2]	52	(0.5)	51	(0.7)	53	(0.7)	51	(0.5)	53	(0.8)	52	(0.6)
Slovenia	51	(0.5)	50	(0.4)	52	(0.6)	51	(0.4)	50	(0.4)	52	(0.5)
Spain	52	(0.4)	53	(0.4)	53	(0.7)	52	(0.5)	53	(0.5)	52	(0.4)
Sweden †	**50**	**(0.5)**	50	(0.7)	**52**	**(0.6)**	**50**	**(0.5)**	50	(0.4)	**53**	**(0.7)**
Thailand †	49	(0.4)	50	(0.5)	51	(0.6)	50	(0.5)	50	(0.4)	50	(0.5)
ICCS Average	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	49	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	51	(0.1)
Countries not meeting sampling requirements												
Austria	50	(0.6)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.7)	50	(0.4)
Belgium (Flemish) †	45	(1.1)	47	(0.6)	46	(0.5)	**45**	**(0.7)**	45	(0.7)	**48**	**(0.5)**
Denmark †	48	(0.6)	48	(0.5)	50	(0.6)	48	(0.6)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.6)
England ‡	**49**	**(0.6)**	50	(0.7)	**52**	**(0.8)**	50	(0.6)	49	(0.6)	52	(0.8)
Luxembourg	46	(1.7)	45	(0.7)	46	(1.4)	44	(0.4)	46	(0.7)	45	(1.0)
New Zealand †	**48**	**(0.6)**	49	(0.7)	**51**	**(0.8)**	49	(0.6)	49	(0.6)	52	(1.0)
Norway †	53	(0.5)	55	(1.3)	54	(0.5)	55	(0.6)	53	(0.4)	55	(1.1)

Switzerland †	48	(0.6)	48	(0.7)	47	(0.9)	47	(0.7)	47	(0.6)	49	(0.8)

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.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

Table 8. "Students' civic participation in the wider community" by national tertile groups of schools with low, medium, high average of

	Teachers' participation in school governance						Teacher reports of student participation in class activities					
	Low		Medium		High		Low		Medium		High	
Country	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)
Bulgaria	52	(0.4)	52	(0.6)	50	(0.8)	52	(0.5)	52	(0.6)	52	(0.5)
Chile	51	(0.3)	51	(0.4)	52	(0.4)	51	(0.3)	51	(0.4)	52	(0.5)
Chinese Taipei	44	(0.3)	44	(0.2)	44	(0.4)	43	(0.3)	44	(0.3)	44	(0.3)
Colombia	55	(0.5)	56	(0.5)	54	(0.5)	54	(0.4)	56	(0.5)	56	(0.5)
Cyprus	52	(0.5)	51	(0.5)	51	(0.5)	51	(0.4)	52	(0.5)	51	(0.8)
Czech Republic †	46	(0.4)	46	(0.3)	47	(0.4)	46	(0.3)	46	(0.4)	47	(0.5)
Dominican Republic	59	(0.4)	60	(0.5)	60	(0.7)	60	(0.3)	59	(0.5)	60	(0.6)
Estonia	48	(0.4)	48	(0.4)	49	(0.7)	48	(0.5)	48	(0.4)	48	(0.6)
Finland	43	(0.3)	43	(0.2)	43	(0.3)	43	(0.2)	44	(0.3)	44	(0.3)
Guatemala [1]	57	(0.3)	58	(0.7)	59	(0.4)	58	(0.4)	57	(0.7)	59	(0.6)
Indonesia	54	(0.6)	55	(0.4)	55	(0.4)	54	(0.5)	55	(0.4)	55	(0.4)
Ireland ‡	49	(0.4)	49	(0.4)	50	(0.6)	49	(0.5)	50	(0.5)	50	(0.4)
Italy	47	(0.4)	47	(0.4)	48	(0.5)	47	(0.4)	48	(0.5)	48	(0.4)
Korea, Republic of [1]	42	(0.2)	42	(0.2)	43	(0.5)	42	(0.2)	42	(0.3)	43	(0.3)
Latvia	49	(0.5)	49	(0.5)	50	(0.4)	50	(0.5)	49	(0.4)	50	(0.5)
Liechtenstein	49	(0.6)	52	(1.0)	48	(1.9)	**48**	**(1.2)**	49	(0.8)	**53**	**(0.4)**
Lithuania	49	(0.4)	49	(0.4)	49	(0.6)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.4)
Malta	48	(0.5)	50	(0.5)	49	(0.7)	48	(0.5)	49	(0.6)	49	(0.7)
Mexico	52	(0.3)	53	(0.3)	55	(1.4)	53	(0.3)	53	(0.5)	53	(0.5)
Paraguay [1]	58	(0.5)	57	(0.5)	56	(0.5)	57	(0.5)	57	(0.4)	58	(0.7)
Poland	51	(0.5)	52	(0.4)	51	(0.6)	51	(0.5)	51	(0.5)	52	(0.5)
Russian Federation	52	(0.6)	53	(0.5)	53	(0.6)	**52**	**(0.4)**	52	(0.5)	**54**	**(0.5)**
Slovak Republic [2]	47	(0.7)	48	(0.5)	48	(0.7)	**46**	**(0.4)**	47	(0.7)	**49**	**(0.5)**
Slovenia	50	(0.4)	49	(0.4)	50	(0.5)	50	(0.4)	49	(0.4)	50	(0.5)

Spain	47	(0.3)	47	(0.4)	48	(0.5)	47	(0.4)	48	(0.5)	47	(0.4)
Sweden †	44	(0.4)	44	(0.4)	45	(0.4)	44	(0.4)	44	(0.4)	45	(0.3)
Thailand †	58	(0.4)	58	(0.4)	58	(0.5)	59	(0.5)	58	(0.3)	59	(0.5)
ICCS Average	50	(0.1)	50	(0.4)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	51	(0.1)
Countries not meeting sampling requirements												
Austria	51	(0.5)	51	(0.4)	50	(0.7)	51	(0.4)	51	(0.7)	51	(0.5)
Belgium (Flemish) †	48	(0.4)	50	(0.3)	49	(0.4)	49	(0.4)	49	(0.4)	48	(0.4)
Denmark †	45	(0.6)	45	(0.3)	45	(0.5)	45	(0.3)	45	(0.4)	45	(0.7)
England ‡	50	(0.6)	49	(0.5)	50	(0.5)	49	(0.6)	49	(0.4)	50	(0.6)
Luxembourg	50	(1.4)	50	(0.9)	51	(0.3)	**49**	**(0.5)**	50	(1.0)	**51**	**(0.2)**
New Zealand †	49	(0.5)	50	(0.6)	50	(0.6)	50	(0.4)	49	(0.8)	51	(0.6)
Norway †	48	(0.5)	49	(0.6)	48	(0.5)	49	(0.7)	48	(0.5)	48	(0.6)
Switzerland †	49	(0.4)	49	(0.5)	48	(0.4)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.4)	48	(0.5)

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.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

The tables show that, on average, across ICCS no association was found for any of the scales taken into consideration. When comparing the differences across tertile groups within countries the following results were found.

As for *student civic participation at school*:
- only in Malta, Mexico, and Sweden a statistically significant difference could be observed between schools with a low and a high average of teacher participation in school governance score;
- a statistically significant difference could be observed between schools with a low and a high average of teacher reports of student participation in class activities score in Chile, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Finland, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Russian Federation, and Sweden.

As for *student civic participation in the wider community*:
- only in Liechtenstein, Russian Federation, Slovak Republic a statistically significant difference was observed between schools with a low and a high average of teacher reports of student participation in class activities score.

3.3 A multi-level analysis of student perceptions of their influence on decisions about school

The two previous surveys on civic and citizenship education carried out by IEA allowed the recognition of the factors associated with student civic knowledge.
Multilevel analyses carried out for the ICCS international report[5] showed that a number of variables related to the learning context at school are associated with student knowledge. There was some evidence that there is a positive association with student perception of openness in classroom discussions (about a third of the ICCS participating countries). As for school-level variables, indicators for school characteristics, the existence of issues of social tension in the local community was negatively associated with student knowledge, exclusively for two countries (Czech Republic and Estonia).
No significant associations were found in any other country. Principal perceptions of students sense of belonging to the school had a significant positive association with student knowledge in five countries (Bulgaria, the Dominican Republic, the Republic of Korea, Malta, and Poland) and a significant negative association in one country (Mexico).
The average student socioeconomic background was the most important school characteristic in term of effect on civic knowledge.
In general, student attitudes and dispositions are not considered as dependent variables when considered for analysis, even though the building and development of attitudes and dispositions consistent with a democratic society and its principles are part of the objectives of civic and citizenship education (Birzea et al., 2004; Eurydice, 2005).
The ICCS framework also underlines that both student knowledge and student attitudes and dispositions are influenced both by the wider community (at local, national, and supra-national levels) and by school and classroom contexts (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, Kerr 2008).

We, therefore, opted to investigate whether and the extent to which student perceptions of their influence on decisions about school are associated with other variables, especially school context variables.
The assumption is that the belief in the ability to influence the life of the school may in itself be a result of the experience that students have at school (school and classroom) and the opportunity

[5] See Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, Losito, 2010, chapter 8.

they have to actively participate in the school life. In turn, this may also have an impact on the willingness of students to engage in civic and citizenship activities in the wider community.
The analysis took place in three steps.
Firstly, it was estimated the variance between schools and within schools[6] in relation to the attitudes identified as dependent variables (Model 0, with no explanatory variables).
Secondly, the model was modified by introducing student level variables (Model 1, where the effects on student level were treated as a fixed, assuming no variation across schools).
The following step consisted in introducing school-level variables in the model (Model 2).
The model was completed by adding the school average index of socio-economic background (Model 3).
The variables used at a student level were as follows:

- Gender (individual student level)
- Student socio-economic background (student home background). The index of socio-economic background was standardized to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 within each country (as in ICCS).

The variables used at a school level were as follows:

- Principals' perceptions of teacher participation in school governance
- Principals' perceptions of student opportunities to participate in community activities
- Principals' perceptions of student influence on decision about school
- Principals' perceptions of teachers' sense of belonging to the school
- Principals' perceptions' of student sense of belonging to the school
- Principals' perceptions' of non-teaching staff sense of belonging to the school

We used the software package HLM 6.0 to estimate the models and data. Countries not meeting ICCS sample requirements or countries where there were less than 50 schools were excluded from the analyses.[7]

[6] Given the sample design adopted in ICCS, it is not possible to make a distinction between classroom-level and school-level variance.
[7] The adopted criterion applies to the one adopted for the multilevel analyses carried out for the International Report. Hong Kong SAR, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg and the Netherlands were excluded. Data were weighted according to the criteria adopted in the analyses carried out for the International Report. The tables indicate the countries reporting a missing data percentage above 15%.

Table 9. Results from multilevel analysis of students' perceptions of influence on decision about school (full model)

	Student level				School level													
Country	Gender (female)		Index of socio-economic background		Teacher participation in school governance		Student opportunities to participate in community activities		Principals' perception of student influence at school		Principals' perceptions of teachers' sense of belonging to school		Principals' perceptions of students' sense of belonging to school		Principals' perceptions of non-teaching staff's sense of belonging to school		Index of socio-economic background	
Austria <	**-1.0**	**(0.4)**	**0.9**	**(0.3)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**2.7**	**(0.5)**
Belgium (Flemish) +	1.2	**(0.4)**	**0.5**	**(0.3)**	0.0	(0.1)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	4.0	(0.7)
Bulgaria BGR?	0.4	(0.5)	**0.9**	**(0.3)**	0.1	(0.0)	0.1	(0.0)	0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.1)	-0.1	(0.0)	-0.1	(0.1)	**5.4**	**(0.5)**
Chile (CHL)	**0.7**	**(0.3)**	**0.6**	**(0.2)**	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**0.0**	**(0.0)**	3.0	(0.3)
Chinese Taipei	**0.8**	**(0.3)**	**0.7**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.7	(0.4)
Colombia	**0.5**	**(0.2)**	**0.3**	**(0.1)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**2.0**	**(0.3)**
Cyprus^ <	**1.0**	**(0.5)**	**1.3**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**-0.1**	**(0.0)**	0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.1)	**2.2**	**(1.0)**
Czech Republic +	0.4	(0.3)	**0.8**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	**0.0**	**(0.0)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	-0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**2.2**	**(0.7)**
Denmark + <	0.0	(0.3)	0.0	(0.2)	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.5)
Dominican Republic <	0.5	(0.3)	0.1	(0.2)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.5	(0.4)
England ++ <	**1.1**	**(0.5)**	**0.8**	**(0.3)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.1)	0.1	(0.0)	-0.1	(0.0)	**2.8**	**(0.5)**
Estonia	**1.9**	**(0.4)**	**0.8**	**(0.3)**	-0.1	(0.1)	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**3.5**	**(0.9)**
Finland	**2.1**	**(0.3)**	**1.0**	**(0.2)**	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.9	(0.5)
Greece	**1.1**	**(0.4)**	**1.3**	**(0.2)**	-0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	-0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**1.4**	**(0.6)**
Guatemala[1]	-0.2	(0.3)	**0.6**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**2.8**	**(0.6)**
Indonesia	**-1.3**	**(0.3)**	0.0	(0.2)	-0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.7	(0.7)
Ireland	0.7	(0.6)	**1.2**	**(0.3)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.1)	-0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**3.1**	**(0.7)**
Italy	**-0.5**	**(0.3)**	**0.4**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**0.0**	**(0.0)**	0.0	(0.0)	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	**-0.1**	**(0.0)**	**2.4**	**(0.4)**
Korea, Republic of[1]	**1.9**	**(0.4)**	**0.7**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**1.2**	**(0.5)**
Latvia	-0.1	(0.5)	0.4	(0.3)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.1)	0.1	(0.0)	-0.1	(0.1)	**4.0**	**(0.9)**
Lithuania (LTU)	**1.8**	**(0.4)**	**1.1**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**3.3**	**(0.4)**
Malta	-0.9	(2.5)	0.1	(0.4)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**0.0**	**(0.0)**	**4.4**	**(0.5)**
Mexico	0.1	(0.3)	**0.5**	**(0.1)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**2.0**	**(0.2)**

New Zeland + <	**1.5**	**(0.4)**	**0.8**	**(0.3)**	0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.1)	0.0	(0.1)	0.0	(0.0)	**4.2**	**(0.9)**
Norway + <	0.0	(0.4)	**1.1**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.1	(0.0)	**0.2**	**(0.1)**	**1.9**	**(0.6)**
Paraguay[1] <	0.9	(0.6)	0.1	(0.2)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**-0.1**	**(0.0)**	**0.0**	**(0.0)**	**0.6**	**(0.3)**
Poland	-0.1	(0.4)	**0.6**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.1)	**1.5**	**(0.4)**
Russian Federation	0.5	(0.4)	**1.3**	**(0.3)**	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.1)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**4.9**	**(0.8)**
Slovak Republic[2]	**1.0**	**(0.4)**	**1.1**	**(0.2)**	0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.1	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**4.9**	**(0.5)**
Slovenia	**1.6**	**(0.5)**	**1.5**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.9	(0.9)
Spain	0.2	(0.3)	**1.5**	**(0.2)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**3.2**	**(0.5)**
Sweden	0.6	(0.3)	**1.0**	**(0.2)**	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.8	(0.5)
Switzerland + (CHE)	0.0	(0.4)	**1.5**	**(0.3)**	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.1	(0.1)	**0.1**	**(0.0)**	**-0.1**	**(0.0)**	**-0.1**	**(0.0)**	**4.5**	**(0.6)**
Thailand +	-0.2	(0.2)	0.1	(0.2)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)	**0.7**	**(0.3)**
ICCS average	**0.5**	(0.1)	**0.8**	(0.0)	**0.0**	(0.0)	**0.0**	**(0.0)**	**0.0**	(0.0)	**0.0**	(0.0)	**0.0**	(0.0)	**0.0**	(0.0)	**2.5**	(0.1)

Notes:

Statistically significant (p <0.05) coefficient in **bold**

( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses

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

++ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included

The percentage of cases included in the analysis was below 85 percent

^School census data with two classrooms per school

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population

In Table 9 the full model is presented. As can be seen from the table, at the student level gender and socio-economic background are positively (alto very moderately) associated with student perception in fourteen countries. In Austria this association is a negative one.
Only negligeable associations can be observed for the school variables in a very limited number of countries. For most of the countries no association can be observed. A (very) moderate positive association is observed for the school index of socio-economic background in a majority of countries.

3.4 Results of the analyses carried out at an aggregate school level
Un terzo tipo di analisi che abbiamo provato a realizzare è stato a livello aggregato scuola.
We also tried to explore the relation between
- student perception of influence on decision about school
- student civic participation at school
- student participation in the wider community

and two school context variables as measured by the Teacher Questionnaire:
- teachers' participation in school governance
- teacher report of student participation in class activities.

These analyses aimed at investigating whether and the extent to which student perceptions of their influence on decisions about school were, at the individual school level, associated with some features related to teacher and student participation measured by the Teacher Questionnaire.
In particular, with reference to the considered variables, the student average score was associated with the teacher average score.
Results are shown in Tables 10, 11, 12.

Table 10. Correlation between "Student perceptions of influence on decisions about school" and

	Teachers' participation in school governance		Teacher reports of student participation in class activities	
Bulgaria	**0.55**	**(0.1)**	-0.18	(0.1)
Chile	0.10	(0.1)	-0.09	(0.1)
Chinese Taipei	**0.12**	**(0.1)**	**0.09**	**(0.0)**
Colombia	0.09	(0.0)	**0.08**	**(0.0)**
Cyprus	**-0.09**	**(0.0)**	**-0.20**	**(0.0)**
Czech Republic †	**0.17**	**(0.0)**	**-0.14**	**(0.0)**
Dominican Republic	-0.01	(0.1)	**0.14**	**(0.0)**
Estonia	0.07	(0.1)	-0.20	(0.1)
Finland	**0.11**	**(0.0)**	0.09	(0.1)
Guatemala [1]	0.08	(0.0)	**0.21**	**(0.1)**
Indonesia	**-0.15**	**(0.0)**	0.01	(0.0)
Ireland	0.08	(0.1)	-0.02	(0.1)
Italy	**0.09**	**(0.0)**	**-0.07**	**(0.0)**
Korea, Republic of [1]	**0.27**	**(0.1)**	**0.20**	**(0.1)**
Latvia	**-0.19**	**(0.0)**	0.03	(0.1)
Liechtenstein	**0.31**	**(0.0)**	**-0.05**	**(0.0)**
Lithuania	-0.04	(0.1)	0.11	(0.2)

Malta	**-0.36**	**(0.1)**	**-0.48**	**(0.0)**
Mexico	-0.04	(0.1)	0.09	(0.1)
Paraguay [1]	0.12	(0.1)	0.10	(0.1)
Poland	**0.34**	**(0.0)**	**0.15**	**(0.0)**
Russian Federation	0.10	(0.1)	**0.18**	**(0.1)**
Slovak Republic [2]	**0.15**	**(0.1)**	**0.14**	**(0.0)**
Slovenia	0.04	(0.1)	0.04	(0.1)
Spain	-0.09	(0.1)	-0.08	(0.1)
Sweden	**0.20**	**(0.1)**	**0.26**	**(0.1)**
Thailand †	**0.29**	**(0.1)**	-0.03	(0.1)
ICCS Average	**0.09**	**(0.0)**	0.01	(0.0)

Countries not meeting sampling requirements

Austria	**0.16**	**(0.0)**	**0.14**	**(0.1)**
Belgium (Flemish) †	-0.01	(0.0)	-0.04	(0.0)
Denmark †	**-0.14**	**(0.1)**	**-0.33**	**(0.0)**
England ‡	**-0.14**	**(0.0)**	**-0.11**	**(0.0)**
Luxembourg	-0.32	(0.0)	-0.59	(0.0)
New Zealand †	0.00	(0.0)	**0.19**	**(0.0)**
Norway †	-0.04	(0.1)	**-0.55**	**(0.1)**
Switzerland †	**0.18**	**(0.0)**	**0.23**	**(0.1)**

Notes:

Statistically significant (p <0.05) coefficient in **bold**

( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.

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

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

Table 10 shows
- a significant correlation between student perception and teachers participation in school governance in 13 countries. The overall correlation is, however, rather weak (both when negative and positive). It is stronger in Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Liechtenstein, Malta, Poland, Slovak Republic, Sweden, andThailand. In Indonesia, Latvia and Malta the correlation is negative;
- a significant correlation was found in fourteen countries. The correlation is stronger in Cyprus (negative correlation), Guatemala, Republic of Korea (negative correlation), Malta, Poland, Russian Federation, and Sweden.

Table 11. Correlation between "Students' civic participation at school" and

	Teachers' participation in school governance		**Teacher reports of student participation in class activities**	
Bulgaria	-0.01	(0.1)	0.10	(0.1)
Chile	0.09	(0.1)	0.26	(0.2)
Chinese Taipei	**0.26**	**(0.1)**	**0.13**	**(0.0)**

Colombia	**0.14**	**(0.0)**	0.05	(0.0)
Cyprus	**0.19**	**(0.1)**	**0.10**	**(0.0)**
Czech Republic †	-0.04	(0.0)	**0.19**	**(0.0)**
Dominican Republic	**0.24**	**(0.1)**	-0.01	(0.1)
Estonia	**0.10**	**(0.0)**	-0.06	(0.1)
Finland	**0.10**	**(0.0)**	**0.20**	**(0.0)**
Guatemala [1]	**0.23**	**(0.1)**	**0.18**	**(0.1)**
Indonesia	**-0.07**	**(0.0)**	-0.04	(0.0)
Ireland	0.08	(0.1)	**0.13**	**(0.1)**
Italy	0.05	(0.1)	0.08	(0.2)
Korea, Republic of [1]	-0.07	(0.0)	**0.14**	**(0.0)**
Latvia	**0.15**	**(0.1)**	**0.20**	**(0.1)**
Liechtenstein	-0.09	(0.1)	**0.43**	**(0.1)**
Lithuania	0.06	(0.1)	0.16	(0.1)
Malta	**0.36**	**(0.1)**	**0.23**	**(0.1)**
Mexico	0.08	(0.1)	-0.03	(0.1)
Paraguay [1]	**-0.13**	**(0.1)**	-0.12	(0.1)
Poland	-0.03	(0.1)	**0.25**	**(0.1)**
Russian Federation	**0.20**	**(0.1)**	0.08	(0.1)
Slovak Republic [2]	**0.16**	**(0.1)**	-0.03	(0.0)
Slovenia	0.10	(0.1)	0.01	(0.1)
Spain	**0.26**	**(0.1)**	-0.07	(0.1)
Sweden	0.19	(0.1)	**0.15**	**(0.0)**
Thailand †	0.01	(0.1)	0.11	(0.1)
ICCS Average	**0.10**	**(0.0)**	**0.10**	**(0.0)**

Countries not meeting sampling requirements

Austria	**-0.05**	**(0.0)**	**0.11**	**(0.0)**
Belgium (Flemish) †	**0.25**	**(0.1)**	0.06	(0.0)
Denmark †	**-0.21**	**(0.1)**	0.06	(0.0)
England ‡	**0.32**	**(0.0)**	0.10	(0.1)
Luxembourg	-0.45	(0.0)	-0.14	(0.0)
New Zealand †	0.06	(0.0)	-0.13	(0.1)
Norway †	-0.14	(0.1)	**-0.24**	**(0.1)**
Switzerland †	**0.19**	**(0.0)**	**0.13**	**(0.1)**

Notes:

Statistically significant (p <0.05) coefficient in **bold**

( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.

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

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

Table 11 shows
- a significant correlation between student civic participation at school and teacher participation in school governance in twelve countries. The correlation is stronger in Chinese Taipei, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Latvia, Malta, Russian Federation, Slovak Republic, and Spain;
- a significant correlation between students' civic participation at school and teacher reports of student participation in class activities in twelve countries. The correlation is stronger in Czech Republic, Finland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Malta, Poland, and Sweden.

Table 12. Correlation between "Students' civic participation in the wider community" and

	Teachers' participation in school governance		Teacher reports of student participation in class activities	
Bulgaria	**-0.17**	**(0.1)**	-0.02	(0.1)
Chile	0.11	(0.1)	0.06	(0.2)
Chinese Taipei	**0.16**	**(0.0)**	**0.17**	**(0.1)**
Colombia	0.09	(0.1)	-0.02	(0.1)
Cyprus	-0.02	(0.0)	**-0.10**	**(0.0)**
Czech Republic †	**0.16**	**(0.0)**	**0.05**	**(0.0)**
Dominican Republic	0.08	(0.0)	0.11	(0.1)
Estonia	0.05	(0.0)	**-0.26**	**(0.1)**
Finland	**0.12**	**(0.0)**	**0.10**	**(0.0)**
Guatemala [1]	**0.21**	**(0.1)**	**0.25**	**(0.1)**
Indonesia	**-0.06**	**(0.0)**	**-0.14**	**(0.0)**
Ireland	**0.14**	**(0.1)**	0.03	(0.0)
Italy	**0.10**	**(0.0)**	0.07	(0.0)
Korea, Republic of [1]	0.03	(0.0)	**0.24**	**(0.0)**
Latvia	-0.08	(0.1)	-0.18	(0.1)
Liechtenstein	**-0.45**	**(0.0)**	**0.66**	**(0.0)**
Lithuania	0.03	(0.1)	0.06	(0.1)
Malta	0.10	(0.1)	-0.06	(0.1)
Mexico	**0.11**	**(0.1)**	**0.17**	**(0.1)**
Paraguay [1]	0.00	(0.1)	0.04	(0.1)
Poland	-0.05	(0.1)	**0.24**	**(0.0)**
Russian Federation	0.14	(0.1)	**0.18**	**(0.1)**
Slovak Republic [2]	**0.15**	**(0.0)**	**0.31**	**(0.0)**
Slovenia	0.06	(0.1)	-0.01	(0.0)
Spain	**0.43**	**(0.0)**	0.04	(0.1)
Sweden	0.00	(0.1)	0.03	(0.1)
Thailand †	-0.17	(0.1)	0.14	(0.1)
ICCS Average	**0.05**	**(0.0)**	**0.08**	**(0.0)**
Countries not meeting sampling requirements				
Austria	**-0.19**	**(0.06)**	**0.27**	**(0.07)**
Belgium (Flemish) †	**0.24**	**(0.03)**	**-0.13**	**(0.02)**
Denmark †	**-0.28**	**(0.08)**	**-0.31**	**(0.03)**

England ‡	**0.33**	**(0.04)**	-0.03	(0.05)
Luxembourg	0.50	(0.00)	0.29	(0.00)
New Zealand †	-0.02	(0.05)	**-0.09**	**(0.03)**
Norway †	-0.03	(0.15)	**-0.33**	**(0.11)**
Switzerland †	0.03	(0.13)	0.11	(0.10)

Notes:

Statistically significant (p <0.05) coefficient in **bold**

( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.

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

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

Table 12 shows
- a significant correlation between student civic participation in the wider community and teachers' participation in school governance in 12 countries. The correlation is stronger in Bulgaria (negative), Chinese Taipei, Czech Republic, Guatemala, Liechtenstein (negative), Slovak Republic, and Spain;
- a significant correlation between student civic participation in the wider community and teacher reports of student participation in class activities in 13 countries. The correlation is higher in Chinese Taipei, Estonia (negative), Guatemala, Republic of Korea, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Poland, Russian Federation, and Slovak Republic.

4. Discussion

The results presented in this paper show significant differences among the ICCS participating countries in relation to the characteristics and the extent of student participation in civic related activities at school and in the wider community.

As for participation at school, the results related to student perceptions of influence on decision about school and the importance given by students to their participation at school show significant differences among the ICCS participation countries. This finding appears to show that in a few Latin American countries students has a higher degree of self-confidence in exercising influence on decisions about school. There were no results allowing to associate the countries belonging to the other two "regions" within which we can group the ICCS participating countries (Europe and Asia).

As for student participation in civic related activities in the wider community, findings show a certain degree of openness of schools in relation to civic related activities in the wider community. The types of activities students have the opportunity to engage in are associated with target grade and their age. The ICCS findings show that the opportunity to engage in civic related activities at school is likely to be particularly widespread in a number of Latin American countries and in two Asian countries (Indonesia and Thailand). This finding, however, should be investigated with reference to the social, political and cultural contexts of each country. Particularly noteworthy is that, in those countries, a greater opportunity to participate in civic related activities is associated with a higher level of self-confidence in the ability to influence decisions about school.

With regard to the findings illustrated in the second part of this paper, the clear-cut result is the difficulty of identifying strong enough associations between students' attitudes and dispositions towards participation at school and in the wider community and school context variables.
As it was highlighted with regard to civic knowledge, (see ICCS International report), school context variables seem to have a partial effect – or even negligible – on student outcomes related to attitudes and dispositions[8].

There is a need to investigate this aspect, even by means of secondary research studies based on data from a number of International comparative surveys. Subsequent analyses could be concerned with the types of variables and constructs related to school context that are actually used in those surveys and with their relationship with student outcomes, even in association with the findings on school effectiveness.

[8] Similar to the findings from the study we presented at 2011 AERA Annual Conference (Caponera, Losito, 2011).

References

Amadeo, J., Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Husfeldt, V., & Nikolova, R. (2002). *Civic knowledge and engagement: An IEA study of upper secondary students in sixteen countries*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Birzea, C., Kerr, D., Mikkelsen, R., Pol, M., Froumin, I., Losito, B., & Sardoc, M. (2004). *All-European Study on Education for Democratic Citizenship Policies*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Caponera, E., Losito, B. (2011). *The roles of schools and communities in civic and citizenships education*. Paper presented at AERA Annual Conference, New Orleans.

Cox, C., Jaramillo, R. & Reimers, F. (2005). *Education for Citizenship and Democracy in the Americas: An Agenda for Action.* Washington D. C.: Inter-American Development Bank.

EURYDICE (2005). *Citizenship Education at School in Europe.* Brussels: EURYDICE.

Hanushek, E.A. (1994). Money might matter somewhere: A response to Hedges, Laine, & Greenwald. Educational Researcher, 23, 5-8.

Homana, G., Barber, C., & Torney-Purta, J. (2006). Assessing school citizenship education climate: Implications for social studies (CIRCLE Working Paper 48).Retrived from http://www.civcyouth.org/PopUps/workingPapers/WP48Homana.pdf.

Mosher, R., Kenny, R.A., & Garrod, A. (1994). *Preparing for citizenship: Teaching youth to live democratically*. Westport/London:Praeger.

Pasek, J., Feldman, L., Romer, D. & Jamieson, K. (2008). Schools as incubators of democratic participation: Building long-term political efficacy with civic education. *Applied Developmental Science*, *12*(1), 236-237.

Reezigt, Gerry J. & Creemers, Bert P. M. (2005). A comprehensive framework for effective school improvement. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 16:4, 407- 424.

Reilj, J., Niens, U., & McLaughlin, R. (2005). Education for a Bil of Rights in Northern Ireland. In A. Osler (Ed.), *Teachers, human rights and diversity: Educating citizens in multicultural societies* (pp.53-72). Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham.

Scheerens, J. (1990). School effectiveness and the development of process indicators of school functioning. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 1, 61-80.

Schereens, J., Glas, C., S. Thomas M. (2003).*Educational Evaluation, Assessment, and Monitoring. A systemic Approach.* London and New York: Taylor and Francis.

Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Losito, B., Kerr, D. (2008). *International Civic and Citizenship Education Study: Assessment Framework*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Kerr, D., Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower-secondary school students in 38*

countries. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Torney, J. V., Oppenheim, A. N., & Farnen, R. F. (1975). *Civic education in ten countries: An empirical study*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries. Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*. Amsterdam: IEA

Appendices

ICCS scales

PARTCOM **Students' civic participation in the wider community**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IS2P14A	Youth organisation affiliated with a political party or union
IS2P14B	Environmental organisation
IS2P14C	Human Rights organisation
IS2P14D	A voluntary group doing something to help the community
IS2P14E	An organisation collecting money for a social cause
IS2P14F	A cultural organisation based on ethnicity
IS2P14H	A group of young people campaigning for an issue

PARTSCHL **Students' civic participation at school**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IS2G15A	Voluntary participation in school-based music or drama activities outside of regular lessons
IS2G15B	Active participation in a debate
IS2G15C	Voting for <class representative> or <school parliament>
IS2G15D	Taking part in decision-making about how the school is run
IS2G15E	Taking part in discussions at a <student assembly>
IS2G15F	Becoming a candidate for <class representative> or <school parliament>

STUDINF **Student perceptions of influence on decisions about school**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IS2G17A	The way classes are taught
IS2G17B	What is taught in classes
IS2G17C	Teaching and learning materials
IS2G17D	The timetable
IS2G17E	Classroom rules
IS2G17F	School rules

VALPARTS **Students' perceptions of the value of participation at school**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IS2P19A	Student participation in how schools are run can make schools better
IS2P19B	Lots of positive changes can happen in schools when students work together
IS2P19C	Organising groups of students to express their opinions could help solve problems in schools
IS2P19D	All schools should have a <school parliament>
IS2P19E	Students can have more influence on what happens in schools if they act together rather than alone

SCTCPART **Principals' perceptions of teacher participation in school governance**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IC2G05B	make their own contribution to solving school problems?
IC2G05C	put forward useful suggestions for improving school governance?
IC2G05E	contribute to establishing school priorities?
IC2G05F	support good discipline throughout the school even with students not belonging to their own class or classes?
IC2G05G	act to resolve conflict situations arising among the students in the school?
IC2G05H	actively take part in school <development/improvement activities>?
IC2G05I	encourage students' active participation in school life?

CSTUDINF **Principals' perceptions of student influence on decisions about school**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IC2G10A Teaching/learning materials
IC2G10B The timetable
IC2G10C Classroom rules
IC2G10D School rules

SCSTUDOP **Principals' perceptions of student opportunities to participate in community activities**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IC2G06A Activities related to the environment, geared to the local area
IC2G06B Human rights projects
IC2G06C Activities related to underprivileged people or groups
IC2G06D Cultural activities (for example, theatre, music, cinema)
IC2G06E Multicultural and intercultural initiatives within the <local community>
IC2G06F Campaigns to raise people's awareness, such as <AIDS World Day, World No Tobacco Day>
IC2G06G Activities related to improving facilities for the <local community> (for example, public gardens, libraries, health centres, recreation centres, community hall)

TSCSBEL **Principals' perceptions of teachers' sense of belonging to school**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IC2G12A The teachers have a positive attitude towards the school
IC2G12B The teachers feel they belong to the school community
IC2G12C Teachers work with enthusiasm
IC2G12D Teachers take pride in this school

SSCSBEL **Principals' perceptions of students' sense of belonging to school**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IC2G12E Students enjoy being in school
IC2G12F Students work with enthusiasm
IC2G12G Students take pride in this school
IC2G12H Students feel part of the school community

NSCSBEL **Principals' perceptions of non-teaching staff's sense of belonging to school**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IC2G12I Non-teaching staff feel part of the school community
IC2G12J Non-teaching staff care about how well the school operates
IC2G12K Non-teaching staff work with enthusiasm
IC2G12L Non-teaching staff have a positive attitude towards the school

TCHPART **Teachers' participation in school governance**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IT2G11A support good discipline throughout the school even with students not belonging to their own class or classes?
IT2G11B work collaboratively with one another in devising teaching activities?
IT2G11C act to resolve conflict situations arising among students in the school?
IT2G11D take on tasks and responsibilities in addition to teaching (tutoring, school projects, etc.)?
IT2G11E actively take part in school <development/improvement activities>?
IT2G11F encourage students' active participation in school life?
IT2G11G cooperate in defining and drafting the <school development plan>?

TSTCLACT **Teacher reports of student participation in class activities**
(IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10 for equally weighted countries)

IT2G19A	suggest class activities?
IT2G19B	negotiate the learning objectives with the teacher?
IT2G19C	propose topics/issues for class discussion?
IT2G19D	freely state their own views on school problems?
IT2G19E	know how to listen to and respect opinions even if different from their own?
IT2G19F	freely express their opinion even if different from those of the majority?
IT2G19G	feel comfortable during class discussions because they know their views will be respected?
IT2G19H	discuss the choice of teaching/learning materials?

Table A.1 Teachers' reports on participation of target grade classes in community activities

Percentages of teachers reporting to have taken part with their target grade classes in:

Country	Activities related to the environment, geared to the local area		Human rights projects		Activities related to underprivileged people or groups		Cultural activities (for example, theatre, music, cinema)		Multicultural and intercultural activities within the <local community>		Campaigns to raise people's awareness, such as <AIDS World Day, World No Tobacco Day>		Activities related to improving facilities for the <local community>		Participating in sports events		not in any of these activities	
Bulgaria	43	(2.4) ▽	9	(1.0) ▼	23	(2.1) ▽	73	(2.2) △	44	(2.6) △	70	(2.0) ▲	37	(2.4) △	79	(1.6) △	7	(0.8) ▽
Chile	35	(2.3) ▼	15	(1.5) ▼	27	(2.0) ▽	50	(1.8) ▼	27	(1.8) ▽	34	(2.1) ▼	14	(1.7) ▼	49	(2.2) ▼	20	(1.4) ▲
Chinese Taipei	19	(1.5) ▼	10	(0.8) ▼	23	(1.3) ▽	52	(1.4) ▼	17	(1.0) ▼	38	(1.5) ▼	16	(1.0) ▼	67	(1.1) ▽	19	(1.0) △
Colombia	60	(1.7) ▲	43	(2.0) ▲	33	(1.7)	76	(1.9) △	59	(2.1) ▲	39	(1.7) ▼	33	(1.6)	82	(1.5) ▲	4	(0.7) ▽
Cyprus	28	(1.6) ▼	22	(1.4) ▽	25	(1.4) ▽	50	(1.8) ▼	27	(1.5) ▽	22	(1.7) ▼	19	(1.5) ▼	44	(1.7) ▼	21	(1.5) ▲
Czech Republic †	35	(1.7) ▼	22	(1.2) ▽	16	(1.2) ▼	71	(1.4)	31	(1.5) ▽	46	(2.0)	19	(1.3) ▼	54	(1.3) ▼	14	(1.0) △
Dominican Republic	75	(2.7) ▲	58	(3.3) ▲	52	(2.9) ▲	74	(2.4) △	75	(2.2) ▲	73	(3.2) ▲	55	(2.5) ▲	78	(2.5) △	2	(0.5) ▽
Estonia	54	(1.9) △	8	(1.0) ▼	6	(0.8) ▼	80	(1.3) ▲	24	(1.8) ▼	54	(1.7) △	45	(1.7) ▲	87	(1.0) ▲	6	(0.8) ▽
Finland	16	(1.1) ▼	5	(0.7) ▼	19	(1.0) ▼	50	(1.3) ▼	13	(1.1) ▼	60	(1.3) ▲	20	(1.7) ▼	56	(1.4) ▼	14	(0.8) △
Guatemala	45	(2.0)	31	(2.3)	30	(2.2)	61	(2.8) ▽	42	(2.5) △	34	(1.7) ▼	35	(2.6)	78	(1.9) △	9	(1.7)
Indonesia	75	(2.0) ▲	54	(2.0) ▲	73	(2.6) ▲	52	(2.4) ▼	43	(2.2) △	42	(2.3) ▽	44	(1.7) ▲	89	(1.2) ▲	3	(0.8) ▽
Ireland ‡	29	(1.3) ▼	24	(1.2) ▽	25	(1.2) ▽	41	(1.3) ▼	13	(0.9) ▼	21	(1.1) ▼	12	(0.8) ▼	57	(1.4) ▼	24	(1.2) ▲
Italy	40	(1.9) ▽	40	(2.0) △	39	(1.6) △	80	(1.4) ▲	34	(1.6)	44	(1.6) ▽	19	(1.3) ▼	65	(1.6) ▽	7	(0.7) ▽
Korea, Republic of	58	(1.8) △	13	(0.8) ▼	39	(1.6) △	57	(2.0) ▼	23	(1.2) ▼	43	(1.6) ▽	33	(1.7)	55	(1.5) ▼	15	(0.8) △
Latvia	59	(2.2) ▲	21	(1.5) ▽	22	(2.0) ▼	80	(1.3) ▲	37	(2.2)	39	(2.2) ▽	56	(2.4) ▲	81	(1.5) ▲	7	(0.8) ▽
Liechtenstein	23	(4.2) ▼	23	(4.4)	20	(4.6) ▼	54	(5.1) ▼	2	(1.2) ▼	29	(4.0) ▼	9	(2.7) ▼	55	(4.5) ▼	21	(4.3) ▲
Lithuania	46	(1.8)	26	(1.7) ▽	28	(1.9) ▽	76	(1.4) △	50	(1.8) ▲	65	(1.9) ▲	54	(1.6) ▲	72	(1.1)	7	(0.7) ▽
Malta	45	(1.9)	29	(1.8)	41	(1.8) △	75	(1.9) △	29	(1.5) ▽	39	(2.1) ▼	19	(1.4) ▼	78	(1.8) △	8	(1.3)
Mexico	65	(1.9) ▲	47	(1.8) ▲	32	(2.7)	66	(1.8)	41	(2.4) △	55	(1.7) △	36	(1.9) △	74	(1.5) △	5	(0.5) ▽
Paraguay	73	(2.5) ▲	35	(2.3) △	42	(2.7) △	80	(2.0) ▲	59	(2.8) ▲	59	(2.3) ▲	59	(2.0) ▲	89	(1.4) ▲	2	(0.7) ▽
Poland	46	(1.5)	28	(1.8)	41	(1.5) △	65	(1.7) ▽	24	(1.2) ▼	65	(1.5) ▲	16	(1.0) ▼	56	(1.4) ▼	10	(0.9)
Russian Federation	66	(2.2) ▲	38	(1.9) △	43	(2.5) ▲	70	(1.8)	42	(2.2) △	70	(1.6) ▲	36	(2.3)	69	(1.7)	7	(0.9) ▽
Slovak Republic[1]	77	(1.7) ▲	50	(2.0) ▲	30	(1.7)	96	(0.7) ▲	57	(2.1) ▲	72	(1.6) ▲	48	(2.1) ▲	96	(0.9) ▲	1	(0.2) ▽
Slovenia	46	(1.5)	27	(1.1) ▽	23	(1.5) ▽	74	(1.1) △	38	(1.2)	47	(1.3)	17	(0.9) ▼	70	(1.3)	10	(0.7)
Spain	41	(2.1) ▽	42	(1.6) ▲	41	(1.8) △	74	(1.5) △	27	(1.5) ▽	50	(1.7)	12	(1.0) ▼	55	(2.1) ▼	10	(0.8)
Sweden †	19	(1.5) ▼	27	(2.0)	17	(1.4) ▼	80	(1.5) ▲	16	(1.3) ▼	18	(1.2) ▼	16	(1.4) ▼	69	(1.4)	11	(1.1)
Thailand †	94	(0.8) ▲	71	(1.5) ▲	66	(2.3) ▲	91	(1.3) ▲	79	(1.8) ▲	96	(0.7) ▲	87	(1.4) ▲	98	(0.4) ▲	0	(0.2) ▽
ICCS average	**49**	**(0.4)**	**30**	**(0.4)**	**32**	**(0.4)**	**68**	**(0.4)**	**36**	**(0.4)**	**49**	**(0.4)**	**32**	**(0.3)**	**70**	**(0.3)**	**10**	**(0.2)**

Countries not meeting sampling requirements

Austria	31	(1.5)	22	(1.8)	23	(2.1)	64	(2.0)	16	(1.5)	27	(1.6)	19	(1.6)	56	(2.0)	16	(1.3)
Belgium (Flemish)	49	(2.5)	35	(2.2)	51	(2.0)	83	(1.3)	32	(1.7)	51	(2.6)	14	(1.2)	78	(1.3)	6	(0.8)
Denmark	12	(1.2)	14	(1.4)	15	(1.9)	55	(2.3)	6	(0.8)	14	(1.4)	13	(1.5)	43	(2.1)	27	(1.8)
England	32	(1.7)	27	(1.4)	37	(1.6)	51	(1.7)	21	(1.2)	35	(1.5)	17	(1.3)	60	(1.6)	17	(1.2)
Hong Kong SAR	36	(1.7)	10	(1.0)	27	(1.4)	59	(1.7)	36	(1.8)	38	(1.7)	27	(1.4)	59	(1.6)	21	(1.4)
Luxembourg	17	(2.8)	22	(2.6)	21	(2.7)	34	(3.4)	17	(2.3)	40	(3.4)	12	(2.7)	35	(3.5)	32	(3.4)
New Zealand	36	(1.9)	20	(1.2)	32	(1.7)	49	(1.3)	29	(1.4)	40	(1.5)	17	(1.3)	68	(1.6)	15	(0.9)
Norway	15	(2.6)	17	(2.7)	22	(2.6)	87	(1.5)	17	(2.1)	45	(4.9)	23	(3.8)	74	(4.4)	8	(1.0)
Switzerland	18	(2.0)	11	(1.5)	11	(1.1)	47	(1.9)	8	(0.9)	22	(1.6)	8	(1.1)	55	(3.3)	25	(2.0)

National percentage

more than 10 percentage points above ICCS average	▲
significantly above ICCS average	△
significantly below ICCS average	▽
more than 10 percentage points below ICCS average	▼

() 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.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.
Source: ICCS International report

Table A.2 Principals' reports on participation of target grade classes in community activities (in national percentages of students)

Percentages of students at schools where principals reported that all, nearly all or most students at their school had the opportunity to take part in:

Country	Activities related to the environment, geared to the local area		Human rights projects		Activities related to underprivileged people or groups		Cultural activities (for example, theatre, music, cinema)		Multicultural and intercultural initiatives within the <local community>		Campaigns to raise people's awareness, such as <AIDS World Day, World No Tobacco Day>		Activities related to improving facilities for the <local community>		Participating in sports events	
Austria	32 (4.2)	▼	27 (4.3)		33 (4.6)		87 (3.2)	▲	18 (3.6)	▼	65 (4.3)		11 (3.0)	▼	84 (3.5)	
Belgium (Flemish)†	63 (4.1)	▲	45 (4.8)	▲	68 (4.7)	▲	95 (1.5)	▲	33 (4.8)		73 (3.5)	▲	12 (2.5)	▼	88 (2.6)	△
Bulgaria	46 (4.6)		8 (2.6)	▼	24 (3.5)	▼	75 (3.7)		36 (4.8)		76 (3.4)	▲	37 (4.2)	△	85 (3.1)	
Chile	40 (3.8)	▼	15 (2.8)	▼	35 (3.7)		57 (3.7)	▼	31 (3.5)		40 (4.1)	▼	9 (1.9)	▼	74 (3.5)	▽
Chinese Taipei	34 (4.1)	▼	24 (3.9)	▼	31 (4.1)		53 (4.1)	▼	30 (4.1)		53 (4.8)		35 (4.3)		75 (3.6)	▽
Colombia	57 (4.0)		40 (3.3)		16 (2.7)	▼	55 (3.4)	▼	36 (3.4)		41 (3.3)	▼	22 (3.2)		76 (3.3)	▽
Cyprus	21 (0.2)	▼	19 (0.2)	▼	11 (0.1)	▼	41 (0.3)	▼	26 (0.2)	▽	19 (0.2)	▼	13 (0.2)	▼	46 (0.3)	▼
Czech Republic †	74 (4.1)	▲	42 (5.0)		34 (4.7)		98 (1.0)	▲	51 (4.8)	▲	77 (4.1)	▲	29 (4.3)		87 (2.9)	
Denmark†	22 (3.7)	▼	24 (3.8)	▼	25 (3.8)	▼	80 (3.1)		18 (3.6)	▼	18 (3.5)	▼	26 (3.8)		74 (3.9)	▽
Dominican Republic	66 (6.7)	▲	38 (5.3)		41 (4.7)		53 (6.2)	▼	52 (6.3)	▲	74 (4.3)	▲	30 (4.1)		77 (3.9)	
England ‡	49 (5.3)		47 (5.1)	▲	70 (3.9)	▲	89 (3.3)	▲	40 (5.5)		66 (4.7)		24 (4.6)		96 (2.2)	▲
Estonia	76 (3.8)	▲	23 (3.7)	▼	15 (2.9)	▼	99 (1.1)	▲	40 (3.9)		78 (3.5)	▲	56 (4.7)	▲	99 (0.9)	▲
Finland	39 (3.3)	▼	15 (3.2)	▼	48 (4.2)	▲	82 (2.9)	△	28 (3.7)		88 (2.6)	▲	32 (3.9)		86 (2.5)	
Greece	25 (3.5)	▼	10 (2.8)	▼	13 (3.4)	▼	41 (4.1)	▼	11 (2.8)	▼	22 (3.4)	▼	6 (2.1)	▼	50 (4.9)	▼
Guatemala[1]	59 (4.6)		40 (4.8)		30 (4.1)		69 (4.3)		46 (4.8)	▲	44 (4.7)	▼	37 (4.7)	△	90 (2.1)	△
Indonesia	67 (4.2)	▲	18 (3.1)	▼	47 (4.5)	▲	34 (4.1)	▼	17 (3.4)	▼	19 (3.6)	▼	34 (4.0)		79 (3.9)	
Ireland	40 (3.7)	▼	39 (4.6)		33 (4.3)		52 (4.4)	▼	18 (3.4)	▼	21 (3.5)	▼	10 (2.7)	▼	79 (3.9)	
Italy	60 (4.3)	△	66 (3.6)	▲	44 (3.8)	△	82 (3.1)	△	47 (3.7)	▲	56 (3.8)		24 (3.6)		81 (2.8)	
Korea, Republic of[1]	32 (3.6)	▼	22 (3.4)	▼	32 (3.9)		28 (3.8)	▼	16 (3.0)	▼	42 (3.8)	▼	24 (3.4)		38 (4.3)	▼
Latvia	43 (4.2)		30 (4.1)		31 (4.9)		96 (1.8)	▲	47 (4.4)	▲	53 (4.8)		65 (4.2)	▲	98 (1.2)	▲
Liechtenstein	32 (0.4)	▼	59 (0.4)	▲	59 (0.4)	▲	87 (0.3)	▲	0 (0.0)	▼	75 (0.4)	▲	13 (0.3)	▼	87 (0.4)	△
Lithuania	55 (4.3)		28 (4.2)		20 (3.3)	▼	76 (3.4)		51 (3.5)	▲	67 (4.1)	△	63 (3.9)	▲	97 (1.5)	▲
Luxembourg	23 (1.4)	▼	32 (2.2)		39 (2.3)		63 (2.2)	▼	35 (2.2)		74 (1.9)	▲	0 (0.0)	▼	75 (2.3)	▽
Malta	42 (0.9)	▽	38 (0.9)	△	48 (0.9)	▲	65 (1.0)	▽	19 (0.6)	▼	39 (0.9)	▼	13 (0.4)	▼	94 (0.1)	▲
Mexico	66 (3.4)	▲	47 (3.7)	▲	32 (3.0)		54 (3.4)	▼	40 (3.6)		60 (3.2)		32 (3.0)		67 (3.5)	▼
New Zealand†	46 (5.1)		40 (5.2)		54 (5.7)	▲	81 (4.2)		51 (4.5)	▲	62 (4.5)		17 (3.9)	▽	97 (0.6)	▲
Norway †	38 (4.8)	▼	31 (4.1)		37 (4.5)		90 (2.8)	▲	21 (3.6)	▼	57 (5.2)		21 (4.1)		80 (3.3)	

Paraguay[1]	82	(3.0)	▲	49	(5.0)	▲	50	(4.2)	▲	84	(3.0)	▲	59	(4.3)	▲	61	(4.2)		53	(4.4)	▲	94	(2.0)	▲
Poland	63	(4.1)	▲	51	(4.3)	▲	50	(4.1)	▲	88	(2.7)	▲	33	(4.3)		92	(2.1)	▲	22	(3.6)		92	(2.2)	▲
Russian Federation	80	(3.1)	▲	36	(3.0)		49	(2.8)	▲	91	(1.9)	▲	42	(3.2)	△	81	(2.8)	▲	32	(3.6)		95	(1.2)	▲
Slovak Republic[2]	74	(3.6)	▲	50	(4.5)	▲	34	(4.1)		93	(2.2)	▲	53	(4.5)	▲	63	(4.2)		36	(4.3)	△	94	(1.9)	▲
Slovenia	68	(3.4)	▲	49	(4.6)	▲	39	(4.4)		90	(2.2)	▲	46	(3.7)	▲	85	(2.8)	▲	31	(3.4)		89	(2.7)	△
Spain	63	(4.3)	▲	52	(4.2)	▲	44	(3.9)		86	(2.3)	▲	34	(4.1)		72	(4.0)	▲	14	(2.9)	▼	76	(3.9)	
Sweden	35	(4.1)	▼	47	(4.1)	▲	34	(4.1)		92	(2.2)	▲	27	(3.3)	▽	30	(4.2)	▼	20	(3.5)	▽	81	(3.3)	
Switzerland †	38	(6.1)	▼	15	(3.2)	▼	12	(3.2)	▼	85	(3.0)	▲	13	(2.5)	▼	52	(4.8)		13	(2.8)	▼	94	(2.1)	▲
Thailand†	66	(4.3)	▲	45	(4.1)	▲	46	(4.7)	□	71	(3.5)	□	59	(4.1)	▲	82	(3.4)	▲	69	(4.4)	▲	92	(2.2)	▲
ICCS average	**50**	**(0.7)**		**35**	**(0.6)**		**37**	**(0.6)**		**74**	**(0.5)**		**34**	**(0.6)**		**58**	**(0.6)**		**27**	**(0.6)**		**82**	**(0.5)**	
Countries not meeting sampling requirements																								
Hong Kong SAR	38	(6.5)		14	(5.1)		34	(6.5)		67	(6.4)		34	(5.5)		45	(7.4)		29	(6.2)		87	(4.9)	
Netherlands	25	(9.4)		24	(7.2)		42	(8.8)		82	(7.7)		23	(9.3)		29	(10.3)		16	(5.2)		82	(5.1)	

National percentage

more than 10 percentage points above ICCS average	▲
significantly above ICCS average	△
significantly below ICCS average	▽
more than 10 percentage points below ICCS average	▼

() 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.
‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population

Table A3. "Student perception of influence on decisions about school" by national tertile groups of schools with low, medium, high average of

	Principals' perceptions of teachers' sense of belonging to school						Principals' perceptions of students' sense of belonging to school						Principals' perceptions of non-teaching staff's sense of belonging to school					
	Low		Medium		High		Low		Medium		High		Low		Medium		High	
Country	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)	Mean score	(S.E.)
Austria	48	(0.5)	47	(0.4)	47	(0.5)	48	(0.4)	48	(0.6)	47	(0.4)	48	(0.5)	47	(0.4)	47	(0.4)
Belgium (Flemish) †	48	(0.5)	48	(0.4)	47	(0.4)	48	(0.4)	48	(0.7)	47	(0.5)	48	(0.6)	48	(0.4)	47	(0.5)
Bulgaria	50	(0.6)	49	(0.7)	49	(0.7)	52	(1.1)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.7)	49	(0.6)	50	(0.7)	49	(0.7)
Chile	53	(0.5)	54	(0.3)	53	(0.4)	53	(0.4)	54	(0.3)	53	(0.6)	53	(0.4)	53	(0.3)	53	(0.6)
Chinese Taipei	52	(0.3)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.3)	53	(0.4)	52	(0.3)
Colombia	57	(0.3)	56	(0.4)	56	(0.3)	56	(0.4)	56	(0.3)	56	(0.3)	57	(0.3)	56	(0.4)	56	(0.3)
Cyprus	49	(0.7)	48	(0.6)	50	(0.4)	49	(0.5)	48	(0.7)	50	(0.4)	48	(0.7)	49	(0.7)	50	(0.4)
Czech Republic †	46	(0.4)	46	(0.4)	45	(0.5)	**47**	**(0.4)**	46	(0.4)	**45**	**(0.4)**	46	(0.3)	45	(0.8)	45	(0.4)
Denmark †	46	(0.2)			45	(0.3)	45	(0.2)	46	(0.4)	45	(0.3)	46	(0.3)	46	(0.4)	45	(0.3)
Dominican Republic	59	(0.3)	58	(0.3)			58	(0.4)			59	(0.2)	58	(0.3)	58	(0.6)	59	(0.2)
England ‡	45	(0.6)	46	(0.3)			45	(0.6)			46	(0.3)	46	(0.6)	46	(0.3)	46	(0.3)
Estonia	47	(0.5)	47	(0.5)	47	(0.4)	47	(0.7)	47	(0.4)	47	(0.6)	47	(0.5)	47	(0.5)	47	(0.6)
Finland	46	(0.3)	46	(0.3)	46	(0.3)	46	(0.4)	46	(0.3)	46	(0.3)	46	(0.4)	46	(0.2)	46	(0.3)
Guatemala [1]	57	(0.3)	57	(0.4)			57	(0.4)	55	(1.4)	58	(0.3)	57	(0.3)	57	(0.5)	58	(0.3)
Indonesia	59	(0.3)	60	(0.9)	59	(0.4)	59	(0.5)	59	(0.5)	59	(0.5)	59	(0.4)	59	(0.8)	59	(0.5)
Ireland	45	(0.8)	44	(0.3)			**46**	**(0.8)**	44	(0.5)	**43**	**(0.5)**	45	(0.6)	44	(1.0)	43	(0.5)
Italy	51	(0.3)	51	(0.6)	51	(0.3)	51	(0.4)	51	(0.4)	51	(0.3)	51	(0.3)	51	(0.4)	51	(0.3)
Korea, Republic of [1]	44	(0.4)	43	(0.3)	43	(0.2)	43	(0.3)	44	(0.6)	43	(0.2)	43	(0.3)	43	(0.3)	43	(0.2)
Latvia	49	(0.7)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.5)	49	(0.6)	51	(0.6)	49	(0.6)	50	(0.8)	50	(0.6)	49	(0.6)
Liechtenstein	45	(2.7)	47	(0.4)	46	(1.5)	45	(0.7)	47	(1.8)	43	(2.1)	46	(5.1)	46	(1.4)	43	(2.1)
Lithuania	52	(0.6)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.5)	52	(0.4)	52	(0.4)	53	(0.5)	52	(0.6)	52	(0.4)	53	(0.5)
Luxembourg	50	(0.5)	47	(1.6)	50	(0.9)	50	(0.6)	50	(2.9)	49	(0.9)	50	(1.0)	50	(1.5)	49	(0.9)
Malta	52	(0.6)	50	(0.9)	49	(0.5)	52	(0.7)	49	(0.6)	51	(0.6)	52	(0.6)	50	(0.9)	51	(0.6)
Mexico	55	(0.2)	54	(0.5)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.2)	55	(0.3)	54	(0.3)	55	(0.2)

New Zealand †	47	(0.6)	49	(1.0)	47	(0.6)	48	(0.6)	48	(0.5)	46	(0.8)	47	(0.7)	49	(0.8)	46	(0.8)
Norway †	52	(0.5)	53	(0.4)	52	(0.3)	51	(0.6)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.4)	51	(0.6)	52	(0.3)	52	(0.4)
Paraguay [1]	55	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	56	(0.4)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.3)	55	(0.4)	55	(0.3)
Poland	45	(0.5)	44	(0.4)	45	(0.4)	45	(0.5)	45	(0.3)	44	(0.4)	44	(0.6)	45	(0.6)	44	(0.4)
Russian Federation	57	(0.6)	57	(0.8)	56	(0.5)	57	(0.6)	57	(0.8)	56	(0.5)	57	(0.5)	57	(0.7)	56	(0.5)
Slovak Republic [2]	49	(0.6)	49	(0.6)	49	(0.5)	50	(0.8)	49	(0.5)	48	(0.5)	49	(0.6)	49	(0.5)	48	(0.5)
Slovenia	47	(0.6)	46	(0.3)	47	(0.5)	47	(0.5)	47	(0.4)	46	(0.5)	47	(0.4)	46	(0.4)	46	(0.5)
Spain	48	(0.5)	47	(0.9)	47	(0.6)	48	(0.5)	48	(0.7)	48	(0.6)	48	(0.6)	48	(0.6)	48	(0.6)
Sweden	49	(0.3)	50	(0.4)	50	(0.3)	49	(0.3)	49	(0.3)	50	(0.3)	49	(0.3)	50	(0.4)	50	(0.3)
Switzerland †	46	(0.6)	46	(0.7)	45	(1.0)	**48**	**(0.8)**	46	(0.5)	**45**	**(0.7)**	47	(0.8)	46	(0.5)	45	(0.7)
Thailand †	59	(0.2)	60	(0.4)	58	(0.2)	59	(0.3)	58	(0.2)	58	(0.2)	59	(0.2)	59	(0.4)	58	(0.2)
ICCS Average	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.2)	50	(0.1)	50	(0.1)

Countries not meeting sampling requirements

Honk Kong SAR

Netherlands

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.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.

[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.