

Exhibit 2.4: Intermediate International Benchmark (475)

Exhibit 2.4 presents the description of student achievement at the Intermediate Benchmark, which is based on passages and items from both PIRLS and PIRLS Literacy. Because the scale anchoring descriptions are cumulative, with students' comprehension processes building on skills demonstrated at the lower levels, as anticipated students at the Intermediate Benchmark demonstrated greater facility in retrieving explicitly stated information and making inferences as well as in interpreting and integrating story events and information. When reading literary texts, they showed an emerging ability to recognize language choices.

Exhibits 2.4.1 through 2.4.12 present seven example items based on literary texts ("The Pearl," "Flowers on the Roof," and "Macy") and five example items based on informational texts ("Rhinos" and "The Green Sea Turtle's Journey"). All five texts and their accompanying items and scoring guides are presented in Appendix H. Each exhibit shows achievement results either for the countries that participated in PIRLS Literacy (items from "The Pearl" or "Rhinos"), all the countries participating in PIRLS Literacy and PIRLS (items from "Flowers on the Roof"), or the countries that participated in PIRLS (for "Macy" and "The Green Sea Turtle's Journey"). Up and down arrows indicate a significantly higher or lower percentage of success for the country compared to the international average on the item. The reading purpose, comprehension process, and scale anchoring description are provided above the item. For multiple-choice items, the correct response is indicated. Constructed response questions were worth 1, 2, or 3 points. Each constructed response item is shown with an illustrative student response and the amount of credit awarded the response is shown across the bottom of the exhibit, usually full credit.

Example Items 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 show that fourth grade students at the Intermediate International Benchmark could provide two details in a constructed response format when asked about each of two different story events in "The Pearl." Example Item 2.4.3 shows they could provide one example out of two from the longer "Flowers on the Roof." They also could interpret and integrate information across "Flowers on the Roof" to identify the narrator of the story (Example 2.4.4). Based on the "Macy" story, they recognized the reason for a character's action (Example Item 2.4.5), integrated evidence about a character's action (Example Item 2.4.6), and recognized how the author demonstrated a character's traits (Example 2.4.7).

In reading the "Rhinos" PIRLS Literacy text, students reproduced an explicitly stated action from toward the end of the text (Example Item 2.4.8), made an inference about an explanation (Example 2.4.9), and interpreted information to provide a full explanation of why ticks cause a problem for rhinos (Example 2.4.10). In reading the PIRLS text about sea turtles, students made inferences to answer a multiple-choice item about the content of the first section of the text (Example 2.4.11) and to answer a constructed response question about how people are making the sea more dangerous for turtles (Example Item 2.4.12).



Exhibit 2.4: Description of the PIRLS 2016 Intermediate International Benchmark (475) of Reading Achievement



Intermediate International Benchmark

475

When reading a mix of simpler and relatively complex Literary Texts, students can:

- · Independently locate, recognize, and reproduce explicitly stated actions, events, and feelings
- · Make straightforward inferences about the attributes, feelings, and motivations of main characters
- Interpret obvious reasons and causes, recognize evidence, and give examples
- Begin to recognize language choices

When reading a mix of simpler and relatively complex Informational Texts, students can:

- Locate and reproduce two or three pieces of information from text
- Make straightforward inferences to provide factual explanations
- Begin to interpret and integrate information to order events



Exhibit 2.4.1: Intermediate International Benchmark – Literary Example Item 1*

Full Cred	it
60 (2.3)	٥
52 (2.4)	0
51 (2.4)	٥
46 (0.9)	
38 (1.4)	ூ
30 (1.9)	lacktriangledown
	60 (2.3) 52 (2.4) 51 (2.4) 46 (0.9) 38 (1.4)

Purpose: Literary Experience Process: Focus on and Retrieve Explicitly Stated Information	PIRI S 2016
Description: Locate and reproduce 2 explicitly stated details	- X
13. Reuben offers to give Josh two things. What are they?	dina Literacy Stur
1. New house	
2. Big shiny boat	100
	Olipre. IEA's Drogresse in International Boading History Chuly.
	Ö

The answer shown illustrates the type of student response that would receive full credit (2 points).

Percent significantly higher than international average

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3.

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

Percent significantly lower than international average

 $[\]ensuremath{^*}$ Item administered only in PIRLS Literacy.

Exhibit 2.4.2: Intermediate International Benchmark – Literary Example Item 2*

64 (2.1)

Country	Percent Full Credit					
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	55 (2.9)					
Kuwait	44 (1.8)					
International Avg.	37 (0.9)					
Egypt	36 (1.8)					
Morocco	28 (2.1) 🐨					
South Africa	23 (1.4) 🐨					
Benchmarking Participants						

² Denmark (3)

What does Reuben do differently after he gets the pearl?

Write two things.

1. He doesn't play with his friends.
2. He reads about pearls.

The answer shown illustrates the type of student response that would receive full credit (2 points).

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3.

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

Percent significantly higher than international average

Percent significantly lower than international average

^{*} Item administered only in PIRLS Literacy.

Exhibit 2.4.3: Intermediate International Benchmark – Literary Example Item 3

	Percent At	Purpose: Literary Experience	
Country	Least 1 Point	Process: Focus on and Retrieve	Explicitly Stated Information explicitly stated character action
² Latvia	96 (0.9)	Description: Reproduce 1 (of 2)	explicitly stated character action
² Austria	96 (0.8)		
Belgium (Flemish)	95 (0.7)		
Norway (5)	95 (1.0)	-	which Granny Gunn made her new flat feel like
Ireland	95 (1.0)	home.	
Poland	95 (0.9)	She br	rought her cat
† Netherlands	94 (1.0)	1. 0,10	
Hungary	94 (1.3)	+0 +0	
Czech Republic	94 (1.0)		<u></u>
Sweden	93 (1.2)	(\mathcal{I}_1) 2.	
Northern Ireland	92 (1.2)		
Lithuania	92 (1.7)		
Finland	91 (1.1)		
Russian Federation	91 (1.1)		
² Denmark	91 (1.3)		
Slovenia	90 (1.3)		
Slovak Republic	90 (1.4)		
² Portugal	90 (1.5)		
^{1 2} Canada	90 (0.9)		
Australia	89 (1.3)		
^{2 †} Hong Kong SAR	88 (1.6)		
France	88 (1.2)		
† United States	88 (1.6)		
Bulgaria	87 (1.5)		
Spain	87 (1.1)		
England	87 (1.4)		
Chinese Taipei	87 (1.7)		
Macao SAR	87 (1.2)		
³ Singapore	86 (1.2)		
Italy	85 (1.6)		
³ Israel	84 (1.3)		
New Zealand	84 (1.3)		
² Belgium (French)	84 (1.6)	The answer shown illustrates the type	e of student response that would receive partial credit (1 of 2
Kazakhstan	82 (1.6)	points).	
Germany	82 (1.7)		
International Avg.	79 (0.2)		
Chile	77 (2.0)	Country	Percent At
¹ Georgia	75 (2.0) ▼		Least 1 Point
Trinidad and Tobago	74 (2.1) 🐨		
Azerbaijan	68 (2.5) 🐨	Benchmarking Participants	
² Malta	66 (2.0) ▼	Moscow City, Russian Fed.	97 (0.6)
Bahrain	64 (1.5) 🐨	² Madrid, Spain	92 (1.1)
Saudi Arabia	59 (2.5) ⊙	Ontario, Canada	90 (1.5)
United Arab Emirates	56 (1.6) ▼	Norway (4)	89 (1.5)
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	52 (2.0) ●	≡ Quebec, Canada	85 (2.1)
Qatar	49 (1.2) 🐨	Andalusia, Spain	84 (1.5)
Oman	46 (1.7) ▼	² Denmark (3)	80 (2.1)
Kuwait	44 (2.0) 🐨	Dubai, UAE	76 (1.2) ⊙
Morocco	36 (1.6) ▼	Buenos Aires, Argentina	71 (2.5) ⊙
Egypt	29 (1.6) 🐨	Abu Dhabi, UAE	47 (2.7) ⊙
South Africa	22 (1.4) 🐨	Eng/Afr/Zulu - RSA (5)	42 (2.6)

٥ Percent significantly higher than international average Percent significantly lower than international average

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix C.4 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes \uparrow , \downarrow , and \equiv .

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



Exhibit 2.4.4: Intermediate International Benchmark – Literary Example Item 4

		Purpose: Literary Experience		
Country	Percent	Process: Interpret and Integ		
Correct		Description: Identify the nat and confirmed by the pictur		son story) from a range of clues in the te
Ireland	94 (1.3)			
Russian Federation	93 (1.2)			
Northern Ireland	93 (1.3)	1. Who is telling the	story?	
Poland	91 (1.4)		v	
England	90 (1.0)	(A) a granny		
² Denmark	90 (1.4)			
Czech Republic	90 (1.2)	a child		
Bulgaria	90 (1.5)	C a dagtan		
Hungary	89 (1.7)	© a doctor		
Slovenia	89 (1.6)	a farmer		
[†] Netherlands	89 (1.4)	a farmer		
[†] United States	88 (1.5)			
² Austria	87 (1.4)			
³ Singapore	87 (1.2)			
² Latvia	87 (1.4)			
Australia	87 (1.2)			
Italy	86 (1.6)			
Finland	86 (1.2)			
Belgium (Flemish)	86 (1.4)			
² Canada	85 (1.1)			
³ Israel	85 (1.2)			
Norway (5)	85 (1.8)			
Germany	85 (1.4)			
Slovak Republic	84 (1.5)			
² Portugal	83 (1.5)			
Lithuania	83 (2.3)			
Azerbaijan	82 (1.9)			
Spain	82 (1.3)			
New Zealand	81 (1.4)			
Sweden	80 (2.0)			
Kazakhstan	80 (1.8)			
France	78 (1.9)			
Georgia	77 (1.7)			
† Hong Kong SAR	77 (1.9)			
Chile	77 (1.9)			
International Avg.	75 (0.2)		Percent	
Macao SAR	75 (1.6)	Country	Correct	
Malta	73 (1.8)		correct	
² Belgium (French)	70 (2.0) 🐨			
Chinese Taipei		Benchmarking Participants		
Trinidad and Tobago	66 (2.6) 🐨	Moscow City, Russian Fed.	96 (0.8)	
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	57 (2.0) 🐨	≡ Quebec, Canada	87 (1.7)	
United Arab Emirates	54 (1.4) 🐨	Ontario, Canada	86 (1.8)	
Qatar	53 (1.2) 🐨	² Madrid, Spain	85 (1.4)	
Bahrain	51 (1.9) 🐨	Andalusia, Spain	79 (1.8)	
Oman	44 (1.8) 🐨	Norway (4)	79 (1.7)	
Morocco	39 (1.5) 🐨	² Denmark (3)	79 (1.8)	
Kuwait	38 (2.7) ▼	Dubai, UAE	75 (1.4)	
Saudi Arabia	27 (1.9) 🐨	Buenos Aires, Argentina	67 (2.2) 🐨	
South Africa	25 (1.4) 🐨	Eng/Afr/Zulu - RSA (5)	44 (3.1) 🐨	
Egypt	25 (1.8) 🐨	Abu Dhabi, UAE	43 (2.7) 🐨	

• Percent significantly higher than international average

Percent significantly lower than international average

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix C.4 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes †, ‡, and ≡.

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



Exhibit 2.4.5: Intermediate International Benchmark – Literary Example Item 5

	D		Purpose: Literary Experience	<u> </u>		
Country	Percent		Process: Make Straightforwa	rd Inferen	ces	
	Correct		Description: Infer and recog	nize the re	asoı	n for a cha
Russian Federation	92 (0.9)	٥				
Hungary	91 (1.2)	0				
Ireland	91 (1.3)		11. Why does Macy make	white wing	s on	ı a pole?
Northern Ireland	90 (1.3)	0	(A) to look like hen's	Footbore		
Finland	90 (1.1)		to look like lien's	leathers		
Netherlands	90 (1.4)	0	B to make a decision	ı		
Singapore	90 (1.2)	٥	to look like an ow	ı		
Norway (5)	89 (1.3)	0	to look like all ow	l,		
United States	89 (1.6)	٥	D to impress Sam			
Czech Republic	89 (1.2)	0				
England	88 (1.2)	٥				
Poland	87 (1.4)	0				
Austria	87 (1.3)	٥				
Australia	87 (1.3)	0				
Slovak Republic	87 (1.7)					
Denmark	87 (1.4)					
Hong Kong SAR	86 (1.7)	٥				
Sweden	86 (1.7)	0				
Chinese Taipei	85 (1.3)					
Canada	85 (1.1)					
Italy	85 (1.6)					
Belgium (Flemish)	84 (1.7)					
Slovenia	84 (1.7)					
New Zealand	84 (1.5)					
Latvia	84 (1.8)					
Bulgaria	84 (1.8)					
Lithuania	83 (2.0)					
Germany	83 (1.6)					
Macao SAR	81 (1.8)	_				
Spain	79 (1.6)					
International Avg.	79 (0.2)					
Kazakhstan	78 (1.7)					
France	78 (1.8)					
Portugal	76 (1.7)					
Israel	76 (1.8)		Country	Percent	t	
Azerbaijan		•	Country	Correct		
Chile	72 (2.0)					
Trinidad and Tobago	71 (1.8)		Benchmarking Participants			
Belgium (French)	70 (2.1)		Moscow City, Russian Fed.	94 (0.9)	٥	-
Malta	64 (2.1)		Ontario, Canada	84 (2.0)		
Georgia			■ Quebec, Canada		J	
	63 (2.7)		- '	84 (2.5)		
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	62 (2.7)		² Madrid, Spain	82 (1.8)		
Qatar	59 (1.5)		Norway (4)	80 (1.5)		
United Arab Emirates	58 (1.5)		Andalusia, Spain	78 (1.8)		
Bahrain	58 (1.9)		Dubai, UAE Buenos Aires, Argentina	78 (1.5)	6	
	51 (1.7)	(V)	Buenos Aires, Argentina	63 (2.2)	\bigcirc	
Oman Canadi Amalaia			~			
Oman Saudi Arabia Morocco	50 (2.1)		Eng/Afr/Zulu - RSA (5) Abu Dhabi, UAE	57 (2.7) 49 (2.5)	◉	

Percent significantly lower than international average

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix C.4 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes †, ‡, and ≡.

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



Exhibit 2.4.6: Intermediate International Benchmark – Literary Example Item 6

Pero		Purpose: Literary Experienc	
Country	Correct	Process: Interpret and Integ	
Dussian Foderation	00 (1.3)	Description: Integrate evide	ence to recognize the reason for a character's act
Russian Federation	88 (1.3) 3 87 (1.3) 3		
Chinese Taipei Hong Kong SAR	87 (1.3) 6 87 (1.6) 6	12. Macy "hit the wings wi	ith her hands and pushed the wings away."
Macao SAR	84 (1.7)		
Singapore	83 (1.2)	What does Macy want	the hen to think?
² Latvia	82 (1.7)	that Macy is savin	g the hen
Poland	82 (1.5)		
Ireland	82 (1.7)	(B) that Macy is angry	with the hen
Finland	81 (1.5)	(c) that Macy is terrif	fied of the owl
† United States	81 (2.0)		
Sweden	81 (2.0)	that Macy is playing	ng with the owl
England	80 (1.4)		
Lithuania	79 (2.2)		
Bulgaria	79 (2.2)		
² Austria	79 (1.3)		
Australia	79 (1.7) O		
Italy	77 (1.9)		
Northern Ireland	76 (2.0) O		
Germany	75 (1.8) O		
Slovak Republic	75 (1.8) O		
Canada	75 (2.1)		
Slovenia			
New Zealand	74 (2.3) 74 (1.8) •		
Hungary	74 (1.8)		
Czech Republic	74 (1.9)		
Kazakhstan	72 (1.0)		
² Denmark	72 (2.0)		
Belgium (Flemish)	71 (2.4)		
International Avg.	70 (0.3)		
† Netherlands	70 (0.3)		
Norway (5)	68 (2.2)		
Israel	68 (1.5)		
Chile	65 (1.9)		
Spain	64 (1.7)		
Trinidad and Tobago	63 (2.1)	Country	Percent
Georgia	63 (2.3)		Correct
France	61 (2.1)		
Portugal	61 (2.0)	Benchmarking Participants	
Azerbaijan	59 (2.7) 🐨	Moscow City, Russian Fed.	93 (1.1)
Belgium (French)	57 (2.2) 🐨	Ontario, Canada	74 (2.2)
Qatar	57 (1.3) 🐨	≡ Quebec, Canada	72 (2.6)
² Malta	56 (2.0) ⊙	² Madrid, Spain	71 (1.8)
Bahrain	56 (1.9) 🐨	Dubai, UAE	71 (1.6)
United Arab Emirates	56 (1.4) 🐨	Norway (4)	64 (2.1) •
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	52 (2.4) ⊙	Andalusia, Spain	63 (2.4) •
Saudi Arabia	51 (2.0) 🐨	Buenos Aires, Argentina	62 (2.2) ©
Oman	41 (1.8) 🐨	Abu Dhabi, UAE	46 (2.5) ▼
Morocco	39 (2.8) ▼	Eng/Afr/Zulu - RSA (5)	44 (2.3)
	(2.0,		

Percent significantly lower than international average

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix C.4 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes †, ‡, and ≡.

Percent significantly higher than international average

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



Exhibit 2.4.7: Intermediate International Benchmark – Literary Example Item 7

	D	Purpose: Literary Experience	<u> </u>	
Country	Percent	Process: Evaluate and Critiq	ue Content and Textual Elements	
	Correct		an author demonstrates a character's traits	
Russian Federation	96 (0.8)			
Hungary	94 (1.0)			
Ireland	90 (1.3)	2. How does the author s	now you what the red hen is like?	
Norway (5)	89 (1.4)	(A) by describing what	the red hen looks like	
² Latvia	89 (1.2)	by describing what	the red hen looks like	
Poland	89 (1.5)	\bigcirc by describing the r	ed hen's favorite food	
Finland	88 (1.7)	(c) by describing when	on the wed her lives	
Chinese Taipei	88 (1.2)	by describing when	e the red hen rives	
Lithuania	88 (1.3)	by describing how	the red hen behaves	
[†] Hong Kong SAR	87 (1.8)			
Sweden	87 (1.6)			
Italy	87 (1.4)			
² Denmark	87 (1.6)			
Macao SAR	87 (1.6)			
² Austria	86 (1.5)			
† United States	86 (1.6)			
England	86 (1.2)			
Slovak Republic	86 (1.7)			
³ Israel	85 (1.4)			
³ Singapore	85 (1.1)			
Bulgaria	85 (1.8)			
Australia	84 (1.7)			
Northern Ireland	84 (1.4)			
† Netherlands	84 (1.7)			
² Canada	84 (1.1)			
Germany	84 (1.6)			
New Zealand	83 (1.5)			
France	82 (1.7)			
Czech Republic	82 (1.7)			
Spain	82 (1.2)			
¹ Georgia	82 (1.9)			
Slovenia	80 (2.0)			
Kazakhstan	80 (1.6)			
International Avg.	79 (0.2)		Percent	
Portugal	75 (1.7) 🐨	Country	Correct	
Belgium (French)	72 (2.0) 🐨			
Azerbaijan	72 (2.2) 🐨			
Belgium (Flemish)		Benchmarking Participants	07 (0.7)	
Chile	69 (1.6) 🐨	Moscow City, Russian Fed.	97 (0.7)	
Trinidad and Tobago	66 (2.1) 🐨	² Madrid, Spain	85 (1.5)	
² Malta	63 (2.4) 🐨	■ Quebec, Canada	84 (2.5)	
Saudi Arabia	63 (2.1) 🐨	Ontario, Canada	83 (2.3)	
Bahrain	62 (1.7) 🐨	Andalusia, Spain	81 (1.9)	
Qatar	62 (1.5) 🐨	Norway (4)	77 (2.1)	
United Arab Emirates	61 (1.3) 🐨	Dubai, UAE	76 (1.6)	
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	59 (3.0) ©	Abu Dhabi, UAE	54 (2.2) ©	
Oman	54 (1.6) 🐨	Buenos Aires, Argentina	52 (2.3) ⊙	
Morocco	34 (2.2) 🐨	Eng/Afr/Zulu - RSA (5)	51 (2.1) 👽	

Percent significantly lower than international average

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix C.4 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes †, ‡, and ≡.

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



Exhibit 2.4.8: Intermediate International Benchmark – Informational

83 (1.5)

Example Item 1*

² Denmark (3)

Country	Percent Full Credit					
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	62 (3.0)	٥				
Kuwait	52 (2.7)	0				
Morocco	47 (2.1)					
International Avg.	45 (1.0)					
Egypt	40 (1.8)	◉				
South Africa	24 (1.3)	lacktriangledown				
Benchmarking Participants						

16.	What does the oxpecker do to warn the rhino
	of danger?

Process: Focus on and Retrieve Explicitly Stated Information
Description: Retrieve and reproduce an explicitly stated action

Purpose: Acquire and Use Information

it makes loud noises and hisses

The answer shown illustrates the type of student response that would receive full credit (1 point).

Percent significantly higher than international average
 Percent significantly lower than international average

^{*} Item administered only in PIRLS Literacy.

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3.

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



Exhibit 2.4.9: Intermediate International Benchmark – Informational

Example Item 2*

Country	Percent Correct						
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	62 (2.4)						
Kuwait	51 (2.3)						
International Avg.	47 (0.9)						
South Africa	43 (1.3) 🐨						
Egypt	39 (1.7) 🐨						
Morocco	38 (2.0) 🐨						
Benchmarking Participants							
² Denmark (3)	78 (2.0)						

Pur	pose: Acquire and Use Information
Pro	cess: Make Straightforward Inferences
Des	cription: Make a straightforward inference to recognize an explanation
0	Why are troop and bushes a good place for tielre to

- 8. Why are trees and bushes a good place for ticks to hide?
 - (A) because ticks eat grass and leaves
 - because rhinos come there to eat
 - © because the birds want to eat the ticks
 - Decause the leaves protect their skin

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3.

[•] Percent significantly higher than international average

Percent significantly lower than international average

^{*} Item administered only in PIRLS Literacy.

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



Exhibit 2.4.10: Intermediate International Benchmark – Informational

Example Item 3*

Country	Percent Full Credit
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	52 (2.2)
Kuwait	38 (2.3)
International Avg.	33 (0.9)
Egypt	29 (2.0) 🐨
Morocco	28 (1.8) 🐨
South Africa	19 (1.2) 🐨

Benchmarking Participants		
² Denmark (3)	39 (1 9)	•

Purpose: Acquire and Use Information
Process: Interpret and Integrate Ideas and Information
Description: Interpret information to provide a full explanation

9. Explain why ticks are a problem for rhinos.

The ticks suck the rhinos'
blood and make the rhinos
feel itchy.

The answer shown illustrates the type of student response that would receive full credit (2 points).

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3.

Percent significantly higher than international average

 $[\]label{eq:percent} \ensuremath{\widehat{\Psi}} \quad \text{Percent significantly lower than international average} \\ \text{* Item administered only in PIRLS Literacy.}$

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



Exhibit 2.4.11: Intermediate International Benchmark – Informational

Example Item 4

	Percent	Purpose: Acquire and Use Ir		
ountry	Correct	Process: Make Straightforw	ard Inferences	
	Correct	Description: Recognize the	main idea of a specified section	of the text
ussian Federation	96 (0.9)			
enmark	94 (1.2)		****	
weden	94 (0.9)	1. What is the first section	n "Out From the Sand" about?	
Zech Republic	94 (0.9)	(A) what different sea	turtles look like	
Netherlands	93 (1.0)			
Germany	93 (1.1)	(B) how sea turtles lea	arn to swim	
elgium (Flemish)	93 (1.1)	(C) what sea turtles li	ke to eat	
Slovenia	93 (1.0)	•		
Latvia	93 (1.2)	how sea turtles' eg	gs hatch	
Austria	93 (1.1)			
Poland	92 (1.0)			
Ireland	92 (1.4)			
England	92 (1.0)			
Finland	92 (1.0)			
Hong Kong SAR	91 (1.2)			
Norway (5)	91 (1.4)			
Australia	91 (1.2)			
Chinese Taipei	90 (1.2)			
Slovak Republic	90 (1.6)			
Lithuania	90 (1.4)			
Bulgaria	90 (1.6)			
Singapore	89 (1.1)			
Macao SAR	89 (1.2)			
Hungary	88 (1.5)			
Kazakhstan	88 (1.4)			
New Zealand	87 (1.3)			
Northern Ireland	87 (1.8)			
Canada	87 (1.1)			
France	87 (1.5)			
Spain	87 (1.3)			
Portugal	86 (1.3)			
United States	86 (1.5)			
Israel	85 (1.5)			
International Avg.	84 (0.2)		Percent	
taly	84 (1.6)	Country	Correct	
Azerbaijan	81 (2.1)		Confect	
Trinidad and Tobago	80 (1.9) 💿			
Chile	78 (1.5) 💿	Benchmarking Participants		
Belgium (French)	75 (1.8) 💿	Moscow City, Russian Fed.	94 (0.9)	
Georgia	74 (2.5) 💿	² Madrid, Spain	89 (1.4)	
Inited Arab Emirates	69 (1.0) 🐨	Ontario, Canada	89 (1.5)	
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	68 (2.5) ▼	Norway (4)	87 (1.8)	
Qatar	68 (1.4) 💿	≡ Quebec, Canada	85 (2.3)	
Bahrain	65 (1.6) 💿	Andalusia, Spain	83 (1.8)	
Oman	64 (1.8) 🐨	Dubai, UAE	82 (1.3)	
Malta	64 (1.9) 💿	Abu Dhabi, UAE	60 (2.3) 🐨	
Morocco	56 (2.4) ▼	Buenos Aires, Argentina	58 (1.9) 🐨	
audi Arabia	56 (2.2) ▼	Eng/Afr/Zulu - RSA (5)	56 (2.3) 🐨	

Percent significantly higher than international average
 Percent significantly lower than international average

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix C.4 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes †, ‡, and ≡.

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



Exhibit 2.4.12: Intermediate International Benchmark – Informational

Example Item 5

	Percent Full Credit	Purpose: Acquire and Use Information			
Country		Process: Make Straightforward Inferences			
		Description: Make a straightforward inference about the cause of a situation			
Russian Federation	92 (1.2)				
Chinese Taipei	91 (1.2)				
² † Hong Kong SAR	90 (1.3)	6. According to the article, what is one way people have made the sea			
Finland	90 (1.1)	more dangerous for turtles?			
³ Singapore	87 (1.2)	@ People put plastic in the sea			
Norway (5)	86 (1.7)				
Sweden	86 (1.7)				
Ireland	85 (1.7)				
Macao SAR	85 (1.7)				
Germany	83 (1.6)				
Australia	82 (1.5)				
Bulgaria	81 (2.4)				
Hungary	81 (1.8)				
² Denmark	81 (2.1)				
† Netherlands	81 (1.6)				
² Austria	81 (1.7)				
² Latvia	80 (2.0)				
^{1 2} Canada	80 (1.2)				
Slovenia	79 (2.0)				
Spain	79 (1.7)				
England	79 (1.3)				
Czech Republic	79 (1.9)				
Kazakhstan	79 (1.8)				
New Zealand	78 (1.4)				
Italy	78 (1.8)				
² Portugal	78 (1.9)				
† United States	78 (1.8)				
Northern Ireland	77 (1.8)				
³ Israel	77 (1.6)				
Lithuania	77 (2.1)				
France	77 (1.8)				
Belgium (Flemish)	76 (1.6)	The answer shown illustrates the type of student response that would receive full credit (1 point).			
International Avg.	72 (0.3)				
Slovak Republic	71 (2.1)	Percent			
Poland	71 (1.8)	Country Full Credit			
Trinidad and Tobago	64 (2.1) 🐨				
² Malta	63 (2.0) 🐨				
² Belgium (French)	59 (2.3) 🐨	Benchmarking Participants			
Chile	57 (2.1) 🐨	Moscow City, Russian Fed. 94 (0.9)			
¹ Georgia	54 (2.3) 🐨	² Madrid, Spain 83 (1.7)			
Azerbaijan	52 (2.4) 🐨	■ Quebec, Canada 80 (1.9) •			
United Arab Emirates	49 (1.4) 🐨	Andalusia, Spain 80 (2.2)			
Qatar	47 (1.5) ⊙	Ontario, Canada 77 (2.4)			
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	44 (2.3) 🐨	Norway (4) 75 (2.1)			
Bahrain	38 (2.0) ▼	Dubai, UAE 66 (1.4)			
Oman	37 (1.8) 🐨	Buenos Aires, Argentina 45 (2.2) 💿			
Morocco	35 (2.2) ▼	Abu Dhabi, UAE 41 (2.6)			
Saudi Arabia	31 (2.4) 🐨	Eng/Afr/Zulu - RSA (5) 30 (2.4) ⊙			
	_				

Percent significantly lower than international average

See Appendix C.1 for target population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix C.4 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes †, ‡, and ≡.

Percent significantly higher than international average

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