

Appendix D.1: Percentage of Students with Achievement Too Low for Estimation*

Country	Combined PIRLS and PIRLS Literacy Percent of Students with Achievement Too Low For Estimation	PIRLS Percent of Students with Achievement Too Low for Estimation	PIRLS Literacy Percent of Students with Achievement Too Low for Estimation	PIRLS Average Percent Correct	PIRLS Literacy Average Percent Correct
Australia	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	--	64 (0.6)	--
Austria	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	63 (0.6)	--
Azerbaijan	3 (0.5)	3 (0.5)	--	47 (0.8)	--
Bahrain	5 (0.4)	5 (0.4)	--	42 (0.4)	--
Belgium (Flemish)	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	59 (0.5)	--
Belgium (French)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	--	52 (0.5)	--
Bulgaria	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	--	66 (1.0)	--
Canada	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	--	64 (0.4)	--
Chile	2 (0.3)	2 (0.3)	--	51 (0.6)	--
Chinese Taipei	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	68 (0.5)	--
Czech Republic	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	--	64 (0.5)	--
Denmark	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	--	65 (0.5)	--
Egypt	10 (0.9)	--	10 (0.9)	--	45 (1.1)
England	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	--	67 (0.4)	--
Finland	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	69 (0.4)	--
France	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	--	55 (0.5)	--
Georgia	2 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	--	50 (0.6)	--
Germany	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	--	62 (0.7)	--
Hong Kong SAR	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	70 (0.6)	--
Hungary	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	66 (0.7)	--
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	5 (0.6)	8 (0.8)	3 (0.7)	38 (0.6)	64 (1.0)
Ireland	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)	--	69 (0.6)	--
Israel	2 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	--	61 (0.6)	--
Italy	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	65 (0.5)	--
Kazakhstan	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	62 (0.6)	--
Kuwait	3 (0.4)	--	3 (0.4)	--	57 (0.9)
Latvia	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	67 (0.4)	--
Lithuania	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	65 (0.6)	--
Macao SAR	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	64 (0.2)	--
Malta	5 (0.3)	5 (0.3)	--	42 (0.3)	--
Morocco	10 (0.7)	16 (1.1)	4 (0.4)	25 (0.5)	51 (0.8)
Netherlands	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	64 (0.4)	--
New Zealand	2 (0.3)	2 (0.3)	--	59 (0.5)	--
Northern Ireland	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	--	69 (0.5)	--
Norway (5)	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	68 (0.5)	--
Oman	8 (0.4)	8 (0.4)	--	37 (0.6)	--
Poland	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	69 (0.5)	--
Portugal	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	59 (0.6)	--
Qatar	7 (0.3)	7 (0.3)	--	42 (0.3)	--
Russian Federation	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	--	73 (0.5)	--
Saudi Arabia	7 (0.5)	7 (0.5)	--	38 (0.8)	--
Singapore	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	--	71 (0.7)	--
Slovak Republic	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)	--	62 (0.7)	--
Slovenia	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	--	63 (0.5)	--
South Africa	8 (0.6)	--	8 (0.6)	--	41 (0.9)
Spain	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	60 (0.4)	--
Sweden	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	66 (0.6)	--
Trinidad and Tobago	4 (0.3)	4 (0.3)	--	48 (0.7)	--
United Arab Emirates	6 (0.3)	6 (0.3)	--	43 (0.7)	--
United States	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	--	65 (0.7)	--

SOURCE: IEA's Progress in International Reading Literacy Study – PIRLS 2016

* Students were considered to have achievement too low for estimation if their performance on the assessment was no better than could be achieved by simply guessing on the multiple choice assessment items. However, such students were assigned scale scores (plausible values) by the achievement scaling procedure, despite concerns about their reliability.

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

A dash (-) indicates comparable data not available.

Appendix D.1: Percentage of Students with Achievement Too Low for Estimation*
(Continued)

Country	Combined PIRLS and PIRLS Literacy Percent of Students with Achievement Too Low For Estimation	PIRLS Percent of Students with Achievement Too Low for Estimation	PIRLS Literacy Percent of Students with Achievement Too Low for Estimation	PIRLS Average Percent Correct	PIRLS Literacy Average Percent Correct
Benchmarking Participants					
Buenos Aires, Argentina	3 (0.4)	3 (0.4)	--	48 (0.7)	--
Ontario, Canada	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	--	64 (0.8)	--
Quebec, Canada	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	65 (0.7)	--
Denmark (3)	0 (0.1)	--	0 (0.1)	--	80 (0.4)
Norway (4)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	--	57 (0.4)	--
Moscow City, Russian Fed.	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	--	80 (0.4)	--
Eng/Afr/Zulu - RSA (5)	9 (0.8)	9 (0.8)	--	34 (1.2)	--
Andalusia, Spain	0 (0.2)	0 (0.2)	--	59 (0.5)	--
Madrid, Spain	0 (0.1)	0 (0.1)	--	65 (0.5)	--
Abu Dhabi, UAE	10 (0.7)	10 (0.7)	--	36 (0.9)	--
Dubai, UAE	2 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	--	57 (0.4)	--

SOURCE: IEA's Progress in International Reading Literacy Study – PIRLS 2016