

Appendix C.1: Average Percent Correct in the Comprehension Processes

Note: Results based on students who participated in both PIRLS and ePIRLS.

Country	Overall ePIRLS Online Informational Reading	Comprehension Processes		3LS 2016		
		Retrieving and Straightforward Inferencing	Interpreting, Integrating, and Evaluating	SOURCE: IEA's Progress in International Reading Literacy Study – PIRLS 2016		
Canada	59 (0.8)	64 (0.8)	51 (0.9)	itera		
Chinese Taipei	60 (0.5)	66 (0.5)	50 (0.5)	J G		
Denmark	62 (0.6)	69 (0.5)	53 (0.7)	adir		
Georgia	39 (0.8)	49 (0.9)	30 (0.8)	al Re		
Ireland	65 (0.7)	70 (0.6)	58 (0.7)	tion		
Israel	56 (0.6)	63 (0.6)	48 (0.6)	rna		
Italy	55 (0.6)	63 (0.6)	46 (0.6)	Inte		
Norway (5)	65 (0.6)	71 (0.5)	58 (0.7)	ssin		
Portugal	52 (0.6)	60 (0.6)	43 (0.6)	gre		
Singapore	70 (0.7)	76 (0.7)	62 (0.8)	Pro		
Slovenia	53 (0.5)	60 (0.5)	44 (0.5)	EA's		
Sweden	63 (0.6)	69 (0.6)	54 (0.7)	ij		
United Arab Emirates	41 (0.5)	48 (0.5)	33 (0.5))UR		
United States	62 (0.7)	67 (0.6)	56 (0.7)	Š		
International Avg.	57 (0.2)	64 (0.2)	49 (0.2)			
Benchmarking Participants						

Abu Dhabi, UAE	34 (0.8)	40 (0.9)	26 (0.8)
Dubai, UAE	55 (0.3)	61 (0.4)	47 (0.3)

 $^{(\)\} Standard\ errors\ appear\ in\ parentheses.\ Because\ of\ rounding\ some\ results\ may\ appear\ inconsistent.$