

## Appendix 8A: Characteristics of National Samples

### Albania

#### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 3), special needs schools, schools with language of instruction other than Albanian, and special curriculum
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

#### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (public, private) and urbanization (urban, rural) for public schools stratum only
- Implicit stratification by urbanization (urban, rural) for private schools stratum
- Sampled two classes in large schools (measure of size > 99)
- Private schools stratum was oversampled

#### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Public - Urban	83	0	81	0	0	2	1
Public - Rural	66	0	66	0	0	0	0
Private	30	0	30	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

## Australia

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), very remote schools, and special and non-mainstream schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by state or territory (8)
- Implicit stratification by school type (catholic, government, independent, all), geographic location (metropolitan, provincial, remote), and socioeconomic index (low socioeconomic status, high socioeconomic status)
- Sampled one classroom in most cases but more where pseudo-classes are required (e.g., composite classes)
- Schools were oversampled at the state/territory level

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Australian Capital Territory	30	0	29	0	0	1	0
New South Wales	45	0	45	0	0	0	0
Northern Territory	13	0	8	1	1	3	2
Queensland	45	0	45	0	0	0	0
South Australia	40	0	39	1	0	0	0
Tasmania	30	0	30	0	0	0	0
Victoria	45	0	42	0	0	3	0
Western Australia	40	0	40	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>

## Austria

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 3), special needs schools, and schools with foreign curriculum
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by urbanization (densely-populated area, intermediate area, thinly-populated area) and achievement level (4)
- Implicit stratification by region (9)
- Sampled two classrooms per school whenever possible

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Densely-populated area - Level 1	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Densely-populated area - Level 2	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Densely-populated area - Level 3	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Densely-populated area - Level 4	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Intermediate area - Level 1	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Intermediate area - Level 2	20	0	19	1	0	0	0
Intermediate area - Level 3	16	0	16	0	0	0	0
Intermediate area - Level 4	8	0	7	1	0	0	0
Thinly-populated area - Level 1	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Thinly-populated area - Level 2	22	0	22	0	0	0	0
Thinly-populated area - Level 3	22	0	21	1	0	0	0
Thinly-populated area - Level 4	8	0	7	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Azerbaijan

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), special needs schools, and schools with language instruction other than Azerbaijani or Russian
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by language of instruction (Azerbaijani, Russian or bilingual), urbanization (urban, rural) within Azerbaijani stratum, and city (Baku, other) within urban stratum
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in schools with five or more classrooms and in bilingual schools
- Class group option was used in bilingual schools

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Azerbaijani - Urban - Baku	30	0	28	0	0	2	0
Azerbaijani - Urban - Other cities	44	0	40	0	0	4	0
Azerbaijani - Rural	72	0	66	0	0	6	0
Russian or Bilingual	54	0	50	0	0	4	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>

## Bahrain

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools, students taught in French, and students taught in Japanese
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by governorate (Public Muharraq, Public Capital, Public Northern, Public Southern, Private) and gender (boys, girls) within public schools
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 149)
- All schools were selected
- Schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates, when all classes within a school were sampled

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Public Muharraq - Boys	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public Muharraq - Girls	9	0	9	0	0	0	0
Public Capital - Boys	19	0	19	0	0	0	0
Public Capital - Girls	19	0	19	0	0	0	0
Public Northern - Boys	17	0	17	0	0	0	0
Public Northern - Girls	22	0	22	0	0	0	0
Public Southern - Boys	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Public Southern - Girls	11	0	11	0	0	0	0
Private	67	0	67	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Belgium (Flemish)

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), special needs schools, and schools with language of instruction other than Dutch
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (special, official, private) and school composition (low, medium and high) within official and private schools
- Implicit stratification by five provinces and Brussels Capital Region
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- The school composition variable has a continuous value ranging from 0 to 1, 1 being the most challenging population
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Special - All	8	1	4	1	0	2	0
Private - Low Composition	38	0	27	3	0	8	0
Private - Medium Composition	32	0	24	1	0	7	0
Private - High Composition	28	0	26	0	0	2	0
Official - Low Composition	14	0	13	0	0	1	0
Official - Medium Composition	24	0	20	2	0	2	0
Official - High Composition	24	0	20	0	0	4	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Special - All	4	0	3	0	0	1	0
Private - Low Composition	12	0	11	0	0	1	0
Private - Medium Composition	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Private - High Composition	8	0	7	0	0	1	0
Official - Low Composition	4	0	3	0	0	1	0
Official - Medium Composition	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Official - High Composition	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

## Belgium (French)

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (public at state level, public at local level, private sectarian) and socio-economic index (very disadvantaged SES, disadvantaged SES, advantaged SES, very advantaged SES)
- Implicit stratification by region (6)
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 45)
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap



### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Public at state level - Very disadvantaged and disadvantaged SES	10	0	9	1	0	0	0
Public at state level - Advantaged and very advantaged SES	8	0	7	1	0	0	0
Public at local level - Very disadvantaged SES	22	0	22	0	0	0	0
Public at local level - Disadvantaged SES	18	0	17	1	0	0	0
Public at local level - Advantaged SES	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public at local level - Very advantaged SES	16	0	16	0	0	0	0
Private sectarian - Very disadvantaged SES	12	0	9	3	0	0	0
Private sectarian - Disadvantaged SES	16	0	14	2	0	0	0
Private sectarian - Advantaged SES	16	0	15	1	0	0	0
Private sectarian - Very advantaged SES	20	0	17	2	1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Brazil

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), indigenous schools, and schools in geographically inaccessible areas
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities and students with functional disabilities

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (4) and region (5)
- Implicit stratification by state (27) and SES level (4)
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 159)
- All Public Federal schools were selected
- In the census stratum, schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Public Federal	24	0	2	0	0	22	0
North - Public State	14	1	10	1	0	2	0
North - Public Municipal	12	0	10	1	0	1	0
North - Private	12	0	9	2	1	0	0
Northeast - Public State	12	1	6	1	0	4	0
Northeast - Public Municipal	32	0	19	9	0	4	0
Northeast - Private	10	0	5	3	1	1	0
Southeast - Public State	10	1	9	0	0	0	0
Southeast - Public Municipal	36	0	24	2	2	8	0
Southeast - Private	12	0	6	2	0	4	0
South - Public State	11	0	10	1	0	0	1
South - Public Municipal	14	0	9	2	0	3	0
South - Private	10	0	7	2	0	1	0
Midwest - Public State	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Midwest - Public Municipal	12	0	10	0	0	2	0
Midwest - Private	10	0	8	0	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>1</b>

## Bulgaria

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4) and special needs schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (elementary, basic, general) and location (capital, regional city, city, village)
- Implicit stratification by national test score (low, medium, high)
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 75)
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Elementary School - Capital and Large Cities	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Elementary School - Other	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Basic School - Capital	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Basic School - Large Cities	30	0	30	0	0	0	0
Basic School - Other	34	0	34	0	0	0	0
General School - Capital	16	0	16	0	0	0	0
General School - Large Cities	18	0	18	0	0	0	0
General School - Other	25	0	25	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Chinese Taipei

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by region (north, middle, south, east/isolated Islands) and school size (large, small) within north, middle and south regions
- Large schools are schools with more than 3 fourth grade classrooms and at least 55 students
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 209)
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 73.4%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
East and Island	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
North - Large	74	0	73	1	0	0	0
North - Small	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Middle - Large	32	0	32	0	0	0	0
Middle - Small	14	0	13	1	0	0	0
South - Large	30	0	30	0	0	0	0
South - Small	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
East and Island	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
North - Large	28	0	28	0	0	0	0
North - Small	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Middle - Large	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Middle - Small	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
South - Large	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
South - Small	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Croatia

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 3) and private schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (mother/single building, satellite) and by region (6)
- Implicit stratification by urbanization (urban, rural)
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
All Regions - Satellite School	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Central Croatia - Mother/Single Building School	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Eastern Croatia - Mother/Single Building School	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Northern Croatia - Mother/Single Building School	4	0	3	0	0	1	0
Western Croatia - Mother/Single Building School	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Southern Croatia - Mother/Single Building School	10	0	7	0	0	3	0
City of Zagreb - Mother/Single Building School	10	0	9	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status - Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
All Regions - Satellite School	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Central Croatia - Mother/Single Building School	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Eastern Croatia - Mother/Single Building School	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Northern Croatia - Mother/Single Building School	4	0	3	0	0	1	0
Western Croatia - Mother/Single Building School	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Southern Croatia - Mother/Single Building School	10	0	7	0	0	3	0
City of Zagreb - Mother/Single Building School	10	0	9	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>



## Cyprus

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), special needs schools, and schools with language of instruction other than Greek or English
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (public, private), curriculum (national curriculum, other), and district (4)
- Implicit stratification by urbanization (urban, rural) and language of instruction (English, Greek)
- Sampled all classrooms
- The Main Data Collection sample was selected using the Chowdhury approach to maximize the sample overlap with TIMSS 2019

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Public and Private with national curriculum - Nicosia	55	0	55	0	0	0	0
Public and Private with national curriculum - Limassol	40	0	40	0	0	0	0
Public and Private with national curriculum) - Famagusta-Larnaca	36	0	36	0	0	0	0
Public and Private with national curriculum - Paphos	19	0	18	0	0	1	0
Private with other curriculum	12	0	11	0	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

## Czech Republic

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4), special needs schools, schools with polish as language of instruction
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by region (14), plus one additional stratum created for schools with no fourth grade students on the frame but expected to have some during the Main Data Collection
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- Schools were oversampled in Karlovarský, Ústecký, Liberecký, Jihomoravský, Olomoucký, Zlínský and Moravskoslezský
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Praha	19	0	19	0	0	0	0
Stredočeský	21	0	21	0	0	0	0
Jihočeský	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Plzeňský	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Karlovarský	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Ústecký	23	0	23	0	0	0	0
Liberecký	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Královéhradecký	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Pardubický	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Vysocina	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Jihomoravský	20	0	19	0	0	1	0
Olomoucký	11	0	11	0	0	0	0
Zlínský	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Moravskoslezský	29	0	29	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Praha	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Stredočeský	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Jihočeský	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Plzeňský	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Karlovarský	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Ústecký	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Liberecký	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Královéhradecký	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Pardubický	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Vysocina	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Jihomoravský	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Olomoucký	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Zlínský	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Moravskoslezský	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Denmark

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), special needs schools, treatment schools/therapeutic boarding schools, and schools with non-native language of instruction
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (public, private) and school size (large, small) within public schools
- Large schools are schools with at least 3 fourth grade classrooms and at least 65 students
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 69); in schools sampled for digitalPIRLS and Bridge, one classroom sampled for either digitalPIRLS or Bridge; in schools selected for Bridge only, two classrooms sampled in large schools (measure of size > 50)
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from DigitalPIRLS schools is 34.3%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Public - Small	102	0	84	10	3	5	0
Public - Large	78	0	63	11	0	4	0
Private	37	0	19	5	2	11	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Public - Small	30	0	24	6	0	0	0
Public - Large	24	0	19	2	0	3	0
Private	12	0	4	5	0	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

## Egypt

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 20), special needs schools, schools in North Sinai Governorate, schools in South Sinai Governorate, international schools, and al-Azhar schools
- No within-school exclusions

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school sponsor (5), geographical sector (Capital, North, South, Canal) within governmental schools, urbanization (urban, rural) within Governmental Schools - Capital, Governmental Schools – North, and Governmental Schools - South strata
- Implicit stratification by school shift (full day, morning, afternoon, double)
- Sampled one classroom per school
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Governmental Schools - Capital - Urban	22	0	22	0	0	0	0
Governmental Schools - Capital - Rural	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Governmental Schools - North - Urban	16	0	16	0	0	0	0
Governmental Schools - North - Rural	46	0	46	0	0	0	0
Governmental Schools - South - Urban	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Governmental Schools - South - Rural	34	0	34	0	0	0	0
Governmental Schools - Canal	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Governmental Language Schools	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Private Funded Schools (without fees)	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Private Schools (with fees)	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Private Language Schools	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## England

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Target population is the fifth grade
- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 8), special needs schools, and pupil referral units
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (academy, all other state funded, independent) and attainment level (5)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 91)
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap



### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
All Other State Funded - Low	12	0	11	1	0	0	0
All Other State Funded - Low to Medium	20	0	19	0	0	1	0
All Other State Funded - Medium and N/A	22	0	17	1	2	2	0
All Other State Funded - Medium to High	20	0	19	1	0	0	0
All Other State Funded - High	17	0	14	2	0	1	1
Academy - Low	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Academy - Low to Medium	14	0	12	2	0	0	0
Academy - Medium and N/A	16	0	13	1	0	2	0
Academy - Medium to High	14	0	12	2	0	0	0
Academy - High	12	0	11	0	1	0	0
Independent - N/A	10	0	8	1	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>

## Finland

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools and schools with language of instruction other than Finnish or Swedish
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by major region (Helsinki and Uusimaa, southern, western, northern and eastern, Swedish speaking) and urbanization (urban and semi-urban, rural)
- Implicit stratification by regional state administrative agency (6)
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- Schools were oversampled in Swedish speaking region
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Helsinki / Uusimaa - Urban and Semi-Urban	42	0	42	0	0	0	0
Helsinki / Uusimaa - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Southern - Urban and Semi-Urban	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
Southern - Rural	8	1	7	0	0	0	0
Western - Urban and Semi-Urban	32	0	32	0	0	0	0
Western - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Northern & Eastern - Urban and Semi-Urban	29	0	29	0	0	0	0
Northern & Eastern - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Swedish Speaking - Urban and Semi-Urban	44	0	44	0	0	0	0
Swedish Speaking Region - Rural	16	1	15	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Helsinki / Uusimaa - Urban and Semi-Urban	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Helsinki / Uusimaa - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Southern - Urban and Semi-Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Southern - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Western - Urban and Semi-Urban	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Western - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Northern & Eastern - Urban and Semi-Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Northern & Eastern - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Swedish Speaking - Urban and Semi-Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Swedish Speaking Region - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## France

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 3), special needs schools, overseas territories, Mayotte, and private schools without a contract
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by (public – other, public – priority education zone, private)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Public - Other	132	0	130	0	0	2	0
Public - Priority Education Zone	30	0	28	0	0	2	0
Private	28	0	26	0	0	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

## Georgia

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 92.5%; restricted to students taught in Georgian
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4)
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school location (urban, rural), legal status (public, private) and school region (Tbilisi, Other) for the urban stratum
- Implicit stratification by legal status (public private) for the rural stratum
- Sampled two classes in large schools (measure of size > 99)
- Urban-Private stratum was oversampled

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Rural	50	0	50	0	0	0	0
Urban - Public - Tbilisi	56	0	56	0	0	0	0
Urban - Public - Other	58	0	55	0	0	3	0
Urban - Private - Tbilisi	20	0	16	2	1	1	0
Urban - Private - Other	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

## Germany

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools and international schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (regular, special needs), by the percentage of foreign students (very low, low, medium, high) within regular schools, and school size (small, large) within regular schools
- Implicit stratification by state (16 federal states) and urbanization (urban, medium, rural)
- Sampled one classroom per school
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 72.9%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Regular school - High percentage of foreign students - Large	45	0	42	1	0	2	0
Regular school - Low percentage of foreign students - Small	32	0	28	2	0	2	0
Regular school - Low percentage of foreign students - Large	78	0	78	0	0	0	0
Regular school - Medium percentage of foreign students - Large	80	0	78	0	0	2	0
Regular school - Very low percentage of foreign students - Small	20	0	17	1	0	2	0
Special Needs Schools	6	0	5	0	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Regular school - High percentage of foreign students - Large	14	0	12	0	0	2	0
Regular school - Low percentage of foreign students - Small	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Regular school - Low percentage of foreign students - Large	24	0	24	0	0	0	0
Regular school - Medium percentage of foreign students - Large	25	0	25	0	0	0	0
Regular school - Very low percentage of foreign students - Small	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Special Needs Schools	3	0	3	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

## Hong Kong SAR

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools and international schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (government, aided, direct-subsidy and Private, single gender)
- Implicit stratification by gender (co-educational, boys, girls)
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 209)

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Single Gender	10	0	7	2	0	1	0
Aided	118	1	92	18	4	3	0
Direct Subsidy or Private	14	0	11	0	0	3	0
Government	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>



## Hungary

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), special needs schools, and schools with language of instruction other than Hungarian
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by type of community (capital and county town, town, rural) and national assessment score (low, medium, high, missing)
- Implicit stratification by geographical region (7)
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Capital and Country Town - Low or Medium score	18	0	17	1	0	0	0
Capital and Country Town - High Score	34	0	31	1	0	2	0
Capital and Country Town - Missing Score	8	0	5	3	0	0	0
Town - Low Score	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Town - Medium Score	28	0	27	1	0	0	0
Town - High Score	16	0	16	0	0	0	0
Town - Missing Score	10	0	8	0	0	2	0
Rural - Low Score	8	0	7	0	0	1	0
Rural - Medium Score	18	0	17	1	0	0	0
Rural - High Score	9	0	8	1	0	0	0
Rural - Missing Score	8	1	3	2	0	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Capital and Country Town - Low or Medium score	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Capital and Country Town - High Score	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Capital and Country Town - Missing Score	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Town - Low Score	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Town - Medium Score	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Town - High Score	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Town - Missing Score	4	0	3	0	0	1	0
Rural - Low Score	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Rural - Medium Score	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Rural - High Score	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Rural - Missing Score	4	1	2	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

## Iran, Islamic Rep. of

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4)
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with functional disabilities

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (public, private), gender (boys, girls, mixed) within public schools, and province or grouped provinces (7) within public schools
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled one classroom per school
- Schools were oversampled in Esfehan, Khorasan Razavi, Khozestan, Tehran City and Tehran province

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Private - All - All	18	0	18	0	0	0	0
Public - Boys - Esfahan	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Boys - Fars	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Boys - Khorasan Razavi	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Boys - Khozestan	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Boys - Other Provinces	30	0	30	0	0	0	0
Public - Boys - Tehran City	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Boys - Tehran Province	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Girls - Esfahan	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Girls - Fars	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Girls - Khorasan Razavi	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Girls - Khozestan	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Girls - Other Provinces	30	0	30	0	0	0	0
Public - Girls - Tehran City	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Girls - Tehran Province	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Mixed - All	22	2	20	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Ireland

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 3), special needs schools, and non-aided (private) schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by language of instruction (ordinary, all Irish, Gaeltacht), DEIS (DEIS 1, DEIS 2, DEIS R, non-DEIS) within ordinary schools, and gender (boys/girls/mixed) within non-DEIS schools
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
All Irish School	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Gaeltacht School	8	1	7	0	0	0	0
DEIS 1 - Ordinary School	11	0	11	0	0	0	0
DEIS 2 - Ordinary School	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
DEIS R - Ordinary School	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Non-DEIS - Ordinary School - Boys	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Non-DEIS - Ordinary School - Girls	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Non-DEIS - Ordinary School - Mixed	88	2	86	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Israel

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), special needs schools, ultra-Orthodox schools, and schools with language instruction other than Hebrew or Arabic
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school sector (Hebrew-Secular, Hebrew-Religious, Arabic), socioeconomic status (high, medium, low), subgroups within Arab sector (Arab, Druze, Bedouin), and school size (small, large)
- Implicit stratification by gender (male, female, mixed) and region (north, south, all)
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 119); in schools that are selected to do both digitalPIRLS and Bridge, one class is selected for each assessment
- Only the Main Data Collection sample was selected as Israel did not conduct the Field Test
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 94.6%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Arabic-Arabs - Low - Large	17	0	17	0	0	0	0
Arabic-Arabs - Medium - Large	9	0	9	0	0	0	0
Arabic-Bedouin - ALL - Large	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Arabic-Druze - ALL - Large	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Religious - High - Large	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Religious - Low - Large	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Religious - Low - Small	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Religious - Medium - Large	25	0	24	0	0	1	0
Hebrew-Secular - High - Large	54	0	54	0	0	0	1
Hebrew-Secular - Low - Large	14	0	13	1	0	0	0
Hebrew-Secular - Medium - Large	36	0	36	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Arabic-Arabs - Low - Large	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Arabic-Arabs - Medium - Large	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Arabic-Bedouin - ALL - Large	7	0	7	0	0	0	0
Arabic-Druze - ALL - Large	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Religious - High - Large	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Religious - Low - Large	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Religious - Low - Small	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Religious - Medium - Large	7	0	7	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Secular - High - Large	18	0	18	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Secular - Low - Large	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Hebrew-Secular - Medium - Large	11	0	11	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>



## Italy

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 3), special needs schools, and schools with Slovenian, Ladin, or German as language of instruction
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with functional disabilities

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (private, public) and region (north west, north east, center, south, south islands)
- Implicit stratification by national test results (low, medium, high)
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Private	10	0	7	3	0	0	0
Public - Center	30	0	29	1	0	0	0
Public - North East	30	0	29	1	0	0	0
Public - North West	42	3	35	4	0	0	0
Public - South	32	1	30	0	0	1	0
Public - South Islands	25	0	25	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Private	4	0	3	1	0	0	0
Public - Center	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - North East	10	0	9	1	0	0	0
Public - North West	14	0	13	1	0	0	0
Public - South	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Public - South Islands	8	0	7	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Jordan

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- No school level exclusions
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (5) and achievement (4) for all school types except for Ministry of Defence schools
- Implicit stratification by school gender (female, male, mixed)
- Sampled one classroom per school
- All Ministry of Defense schools were selected
- In the census stratum, schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Private - Low	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Private - Medium	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Private - High	12	1	11	0	0	0	0
Private - Very High	10	1	9	0	0	0	0
UNRWA - Low	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
UNRWA - Medium	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
UNRWA - High	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
UNRWA - Very High	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Ministry of Defense - All Achievement Scores	25	0	25	0	0	0	0
Syrian - Low	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Syrian - Medium	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Syrian - High	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Syrian - Very High	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Ministry of Education - Low Achievement Score	22	1	21	0	0	0	0
Ministry of Education - Medium Achievement Score	24	0	24	0	0	0	0
Ministry of Education - High Achievement Score	22	1	21	0	0	0	0
Ministry of Education - Very High Achievement Score	24	0	23	0	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

## Kazakhstan

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4), special needs schools, and schools with Uighur, Uzbek, Tadjik, or English as language of instruction
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by region (17) and urbanization (urban, rural)
- Implicit stratification by language (4)
- Sampled one classroom per school
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
AKMOLA - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
AKMOLA - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
AKTOBE - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
AKTOBE - Rural	8	1	7	0	0	0	0
ALMATY - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
ALMATY - Rural	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
ALMATY CITY - Urban	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
ATYRAU - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
ATYRAU - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
EAST - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
EAST - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
KARAGANDA - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
KARAGANDA - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
KOSTANAY - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
KOSTANAY - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
KYZYLORDA - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
KYZYLORDA - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
MANGYSTAU - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
MANGYSTAU - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
NORTH - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
NORTH - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
NUR-SULTAN CITY - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
PAVLODAR - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
PAVLODAR - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
SHYMKENT CITY - Urban	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
TURKISTAN - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
TURKISTAN - Rural	16	0	16	0	0	0	0
WEST - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
WEST - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
ZHAMBYL - Urban	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
ZHAMBYL - Rural	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
AKMOLA - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
AKMOLA - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
AKTOBE - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
AKTOBE - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
ALMATY - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
ALMATY - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
ALMATY CITY - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
ATYRAU - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
ATYRAU - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
EAST - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
EAST - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
KARAGANDA - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
KARAGANDA - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
KOSTANAY - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
KOSTANAY - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
KYZYLORDA - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
KYZYLORDA - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
MANGYSTAU - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
MANGYSTAU - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
NORTH - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
NORTH - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
NUR-SULTAN CITY - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
PAVLODAR - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
PAVLODAR - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
SHYMKENT CITY - Urban	3	0	3	0	0	0	1
TURKISTAN - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
TURKISTAN - Rural	3	0	3	0	0	0	1
WEST - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
WEST - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
ZHAMBYL - Urban	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
ZHAMBYL - Rural	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>

## Kosovo

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of Bosnian schools and Serbian schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (urban, rural, Serbian) and shifts (one, two or more)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 69)

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Rural - One	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Rural - Two or more	56	0	56	0	0	0	0
Urban - One	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Urban - Two or more	70	0	70	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Latvia

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools and schools with language of instruction other than Latvian or Russian
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by urbanization (Riga, city, town-rural), language (Latvian, Russian), and school type (basic-beginners, secondary) within Latvian schools
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 84) and in bilingual schools
- Class group option was used in bilingual schools
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection PIRLS samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Riga - Latvian - Basic/Beginners	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Riga - Latvian - Secondary	22	1	21	0	0	0	0
Riga - Russian - None	22	0	21	1	0	0	0
City - Latvian - Basic/Beginners	10	1	8	0	0	1	0
City - Latvian - Secondary	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
City - Russian - None	12	0	10	2	0	0	0
Town-Rural - Latvian - Basic/Beginners	28	0	27	0	0	1	0
Town-Rural - Latvian - Secondary	40	0	40	0	0	0	0
Town-Rural - Russian - None	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>



## Lithuania

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4), special needs schools, schools with language of instruction other than Lithuanian, Russian, or Polish, and schools providing remote learning
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by language (Lithuanian, Russian, Polish, mixed) and urbanization (capital, cities, other major cities, small cities or village) within Lithuanian schools
- Implicit stratification by type (private, public) and school level (primary, basic, progymnasium, gymnasium).
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 74)
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Lithuanian - Capital	36	1	34	0	0	1	0
Lithuanian - Other Major City	48	0	45	0	0	3	0
Lithuanian - Cities	58	1	55	0	0	2	0
Lithuanian - Small City or Village	38	3	35	0	0	0	0
Russian	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Polish	8	0	6	0	0	2	0
Mixed	8	0	7	0	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Lithuanian - Capital	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Lithuanian - Other Major City	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Lithuanian - Cities	18	0	18	0	0	0	0
Lithuanian - Small Coty or Village	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Russian	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Polish	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Mixed	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Macao SAR

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by education association (Chinese Educators Association, Catholic Schools Association, public schools, others)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled all classrooms
- All schools were selected
- Classes were used as variance estimation strata and half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Chinese Educators Association	30	0	30	0	0	0	0
Catholic Schools Association	22	0	21	0	0	1	0
Public Schools	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Other	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

## Malta

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools and language schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (church, independent, state)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled all classrooms
- Classes were used as variance estimation strata and half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Church	19	0	19	0	0	0	0
Independent	7	0	7	0	0	0	0
State	52	0	52	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Church	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Independent	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
State	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Montenegro

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 2) and schools with language of instruction other than Montenegrin
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by region (north, central, south)
- Implicit stratification by urbanization (urban, suburban, rural)
- Sampled three classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 39) and two classrooms elsewhere
- All schools were selected
- Schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
North	67	0	67	0	0	0	0
Central	47	0	47	0	0	0	0
South	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Morocco

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 6)
- No within-school exclusions

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (public, private) and regions (12); private schools from Grand Casablanca area were set aside to form two strata in the private sector
- Implicit stratification by urbanization (urban, rural)
- Sampled two classrooms in schools with at least 2 classrooms
- Oversampling of private schools and public schools within each region
- All public schools were selected in the region of Eddakhla-Oued Eddahab; two classrooms were selected per school, and schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Private Schools - All other regions	16	0	16	0	0	0	0
Private Schools - Casablanca-Settat	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Tanger-Tetouan-Al Hoceima	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Oriental	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Fès-Meknès	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Rabat-Salé-Kénitra	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Béni Mellal-Khénifra	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Casablanca-Settat	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Marrakech-Safi	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Drâa-Tafilalet	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Souss-Massa	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Guelmim-Oued Noun	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Laayoune-Sakia El Hamra	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public Schools - Eddakhla-Oued Eddahab	22	0	22	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## The Netherlands

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5) and special needs schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by socioeconomic status (low, medium, high) and urbanization density (5)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled all classrooms



### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
High SES - Very high population density	12	0	6	1	1	4	0
High SES - High population density	14	0	5	4	3	2	0
High SES - Moderate population density	10	0	6	1	2	1	0
High SES - Low population density	8	0	4	2	0	2	0
High SES - Very low population density	8	0	5	2	1	0	0
Medium SES - Very high population density	8	0	4	1	1	2	0
Medium SES - High population density	16	0	7	4	2	3	0
Medium SES - Moderate population density	14	0	5	4	2	3	0
Medium SES - Low population density	14	0	5	3	1	5	0
Medium SES - Very low population density	14	0	7	3	2	2	0
Low SES - Very high population density	12	0	4	6	0	2	0
Low SES - High population density	10	1	3	2	1	3	0
Low SES - Moderate population density	8	0	3	3	1	1	0
Low SES - Low population density	8	1	4	3	0	0	0
Low SES - Very low population density	8	0	4	3	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>

## New Zealand

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4), special needs schools, Westmount closed Brethren, and correspondence schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by language (Maori, English high immersion, bilingual, English-other), socioeconomic status level (5), and urbanization (major, small)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms per school
- The Main Data Collection sample was selected using the Chowdhury approach to control the overlap with the NMSSA schools sampled to participate in August 2020
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Maori-medium schools	11	0	2	2	1	6	0
English-medium schools (High immersion)	8	0	3	2	2	1	0
Bilingual schools	8	0	5	2	0	1	0
English-medium(other) - Independent schools	8	0	7	0	0	1	0
English-medium(other) - Low SES schools	25	0	18	2	1	4	0
English-medium(other) - Moderately low SES schools - from major urban centers	27	0	21	4	0	2	0
English-medium(other) - Moderately low SES schools - from smaller centers	14	0	10	3	0	1	0
English-medium(other) - Moderately high SES schools - from major urban centers	34	0	30	3	0	1	0
English-medium(other) - Moderately high SES schools - from smaller centers	15	0	10	4	0	1	0
English-medium(other) - High SES schools - from major urban centers	44	0	40	2	0	2	0
English-medium(other) - High SES schools - from smaller centers	11	0	9	1	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Maori-medium schools	4	0	0	0	0	4	0
English-medium schools (High immersion)	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Bilingual schools	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
English-medium(other) - Independent schools	4	0	3	1	0	0	0
English-medium(other) - Low SES schools	8	0	4	3	0	1	0
English-medium(other) - Moderately low SES schools - from major urban centers	10	0	9	1	0	0	0
English-medium(other) - Moderately low SES schools - from smaller centers	4	0	3	0	1	0	0
English-medium(other) - Moderately high SES schools - from major urban centers	12	0	9	3	0	0	0
English-medium(other) - Moderately high SES schools - from smaller centers	4	0	3	1	0	0	0
English-medium(other) - High SES schools - from major urban centers	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
English-medium(other) - High SES schools - from smaller centers	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>

## North Macedonia

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools and schools with Turkish as language of instruction
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by urbanization (urban, rural, mixed) and language (Macedonian, Albanian, mixed)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 70)

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Urban - Macedonian	42	0	41	0	0	1	0
Urban - Albanian	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Urban - Albanian and Macedonian	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Rural - Macedonian	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Rural - Albania	24	0	23	0	1	0	0
Rural -Albanian and Macedonian	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Urban and Rural - Macedonian	30	0	29	0	0	1	0
Urban and Rural - Albanian, Albanian and Macedonian	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

## Northern Ireland

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 6) and special needs schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by region (Belfast, western, north eastern, south eastern, southern) and combinations of deprivation levels (5)
- Implicit stratification by deprivation (5)
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 61) and in schools with both non-composite classes and large composite classes; all classrooms were sampled in schools with composite classes only

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Belfast - 1st to 4th quintiles of deprivation	8	0	6	2	0	0	0
Belfast - 5th quintile of deprivation	16	0	12	2	0	2	0
Western - 1st to 3rd quintiles of deprivation	10	0	7	0	1	2	0
Western - 4th quintile of deprivation	10	0	8	0	0	2	0
Western - 5th quintile of deprivation	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
North Eastern - 1st quintile of deprivation	10	0	7	2	0	1	0
North Eastern - 2nd quintile of deprivation	10	0	9	1	0	0	0
North Eastern - 3rd to 5th quintiles of deprivation	16	0	11	1	1	3	0
South Eastern - 1st quintile of deprivation	10	0	8	2	0	0	0
South Eastern - 2nd and 3rd quintiles of deprivation	12	0	10	1	0	1	0
South Eastern - 4th and 5th quintiles of deprivation	12	0	8	2	1	1	0
Southern - 1st and 2nd quintiles of deprivation	14	0	11	2	0	1	0
Southern - 3rd quintile of deprivation	10	0	5	4	0	1	0
Southern - 4th and 5th quintiles of deprivation	14	0	10	1	0	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>

## Norway (5)

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Target population is the fifth grade
- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), special needs schools, schools with Sami as language of instruction, pure introductory schools for minority students, and international schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by written language (Bokmål, Nynorsk) and size of municipality (small, middle, large) within Bokmål schools
- Implicit stratification by reading level (low, medium, high, missing)
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible; in schools selected for the Bridge assessment, sampled only one classroom in small schools (measure of size < 50)
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Bokmål - Small municipalities	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Bokmål - Medium municipalities	31	0	31	0	0	0	0
Bokmål - Large municipalities	92	0	90	1	0	1	0
Nynorsk - All municipalities	30	1	28	0	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>



### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Bokmål - Small municipalities	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Bokmål - Medium municipalities	12	0	11	0	0	1	0
Bokmål - Large municipalities	32	0	32	0	0	0	0
Nynorsk - All municipalities	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

## Oman

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 7), special needs schools, and evening shift schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by governorate (11) and school type (private, international)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled one classroom per school
- All schools in Musadam Governorate were selected
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap
- In the census stratum, schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Muscat Governorate	28	0	28	0	0	0	0
Ash Sharqiyah North Governorate	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Ash Sharqiyah South Governorate	16	0	15	0	0	1	0
Ad Dakhliyah Governorate	24	0	24	0	0	0	0
Ad Dhahirah Governorate	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Al Batinah North Governorate	36	0	36	0	0	0	0
Al Batinah South Governorate	22	0	22	0	0	0	0
Al Buraimi Governorate	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Musandam Governorate	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Dhofar Governorate	13	0	12	0	0	1	1
Al wusta Governorate	8	0	7	0	0	1	0
Private schools	18	1	16	1	0	0	0
International Schools	16	0	12	0	0	4	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>

## Poland

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), special needs schools, and schools with language of instruction other than Polish
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by urbanization (4)
- Implicit stratification by aggregated regions (7)
- Sampled two classrooms per school
- No overlap control was done with the Field Test sample when selecting the Main Data Collection sample

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Village	54	0	53	1	0	0	0
Town (Up to 20 Thousand Inhabitants)	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
City (20 to 100 Thousand Inhabitants)	32	0	31	1	0	0	0
City (Over 100 Thousand Inhabitants)	38	0	30	6	2	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Portugal

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5) and schools with language of instruction other than Portuguese
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (public, private), aggregated regions within public schools (8), and school size (2) within private schools
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 88.2%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Private - All Regions - Small	16	1	9	6	0	0	0
Private - All Regions - Large	8	0	6	2	0	0	0
Public - Alentejo - Large	12	0	11	1	0	0	0
Public - Algarve - Large	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Public - Centro - Large	34	0	31	3	0	0	0
Public - Lisboa - Large	46	0	38	8	0	0	0
Public - Norte - Other - Large	30	0	24	5	1	0	0
Public - Norte - Porto - Large	28	0	23	4	1	0	0
Public - R. A. Açores - Large	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Public - R. A. Madeira - Small	8	1	4	3	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Private - All Regions - Small	8	0	6	2	0	0	0
Private - All Regions - Large	4	0	3	1	0	0	0
Public - Alentejo - Large	6	0	5	1	0	0	0
Public - Algarve - Large	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Public - Centro - Large	14	0	12	2	0	0	0
Public - Lisboa - Large	20	0	17	3	0	0	0
Public - Norte - Other - Large	13	0	9	4	0	0	0
Public - Norte - Porto - Large	12	0	9	2	1	0	0
Public - R. A. Açores - Large	4	0	3	0	0	1	0
Public - R. A. Madeira - Small	4	0	3	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

## Qatar

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools and schools with language of instruction other than English or Arabic
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by gender (boys, girls, mixed)
- Implicit stratification by school type (community, private, international, government)
- Sampled one classroom per school
- All schools were selected
- Schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. In the large school stratum, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. In the small school stratum, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 98.6%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Boys	46	0	45	0	0	1	0
Girls	58	0	58	0	0	0	0
Mixed	159	1	156	0	0	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Boys	13	0	12	0	0	1	0
Girls	15	0	15	0	0	0	0
Mixed	41	0	39	0	0	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>



## Russian Federation

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4) and special needs schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by region (43)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools in Moscow City (measure of size > 249)
- An extra sampling stage (regions) was required prior to sampling schools. 43 regions out of 85 were selected with probability proportional to the region size. The 17 bigger regions were selected with certainty. Each certainty region made up an explicit stratum. The other sampled regions made up one other large explicit stratum for variance purposes. In this latter stratum of sampled regions, a sample of schools was selected within each region.
- Within regions, schools were selected with probability proportional to school size systematic sampling; schools were sorted by location (up to 7 levels) before being sorted by school size
- Special treatment is required for variance calculation due to the first sampling stage by region; within each explicit stratum made up from a certainty region, schools were paired together as in the standard procedure; in the larger explicit stratum composed of sampled regions, regions were paired for variance calculation purposes
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
78.The City of Sankt-Petersburg	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
77.The City of Moscow	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
50.Moscow region	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
52.Nizhni Novgorod region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
59.Perm territory	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
63.Samara region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
16.Republic of Tatarstan	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
02.Republic of Bashkortostan	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
23.Krasnodar territory	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
61.Rostov region	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
74.Chelyabinsk region	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
66.Sverdlovsk region	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
24.Krasnoyarsk territory	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
54.Novosibirsk region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
38.Irkutsk region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
42.Kemerovo region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
05.Republic of Dagestan	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
51.Murmansk region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
29.Arkhangelsk region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
47.Leningrad region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
31.Belgorod region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
71.Tula region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
69.Tver region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
46.Kursk region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
37.Ivanovo region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
44.Kostroma region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
73.Ulyanovsk region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
21.Chuvashi Republic	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
64.Saratov region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
56.Orenburg region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
34.Volgograd region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
30.Astrakhan region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
45.Kurgan region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
86.Khanty-Mansijsk autonomous district - Yugra	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
22.Altai territory	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
55.Omsk region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
17.Republic of Tuva	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
14.Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)	4	0	3	1	0	0	0
27.Khabarovsk territory	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
25.Primorsky territory	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
20.Chechen Republic	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
26.Stavropol territory	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
06.Republic of Ingushetia	4	0	3	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

\* Certainty Regions

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
78.The City of Sankt-Petersburg	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
77.The City of Moscow	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
50.Moscow region	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
52.Nizhni Novgorod region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
59.Perm territory	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
63.Samara region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
16.Republic of Tatarstan	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
02.Republic of Bashkortostan	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
23.Krasnodar territory	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
61.Rostov region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
74.Chelyabinsk region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
66.Sverdlovsk region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
24.Krasnoyarsk territory	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
54.Novosibirsk region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
38.Irkutsk region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
42.Kemerovo region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
05.Republic of Dagestan	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
51.Murmansk region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
29.Arkhangelsk region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
47.Leningrad region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
31.Belgorod region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
71.Tula region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
69.Tver region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
46.Kursk region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
37.Ivanovo region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
44.Kostroma region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
73.Ulyanovsk region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
21.Chuvashi Republic	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
64.Saratov region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
56.Orenburg region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
34.Volgograd region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
30.Astrakhan region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
45.Kurgan region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
86.Khanty-Mansijsk autonomous district - Yugra	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
22.Altai territory	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
55.Omsk region	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
17.Republic of Tuva	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
14.Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
27.Khabarovsk territory	2	0	1	1	0	0	0
25.Primorsky territory	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
20.Chechen Republic	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
26.Stavropol territory	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
06.Republic of Ingushetia	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

\* Certainty Regions

## Saudi Arabia

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 6), special needs schools, schools with language of instruction other than Arabic or English, and schools in the war zone
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities and students with functional disabilities

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by gender (boys, girls), school type (public, private, international) and school size (large, small) within boys' public, boys private and girls public schools
- Large schools are schools with at least 70 students and more than 2 classrooms
- Implicit stratification by region (11)
- Sampled one classroom per school
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 31.8%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Boys - Public - Large	22	11	11	0	0	0	0
Boys - Public - Small	42	18	24	0	0	0	0
Boys - Private - Large	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Boys - Private - Small	12	0	9	2	1	0	0
Boys - International/Foreign - Small	14	0	6	5	2	1	0
Girls - Public - Large	24	0	24	0	0	0	0
Girls - Public - Small	44	14	30	0	0	0	0
Girls - Private - Small	10	2	5	2	1	0	0
Girls - International/Foreign - Small	14	2	5	3	4	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Boys - Public - Large	8	4	4	0	0	0	0
Boys - Public - Small	14	4	10	0	0	0	0
Boys - Private - Large	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Boys - Private - Small	4	1	3	0	0	0	0
Boys - International/Foreign - Small	4	0	2	0	2	0	0
Girls - Public - Large	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Girls - Public - Small	14	3	11	0	0	0	0
Girls - Private - Small	4	1	1	2	0	0	0
Girls - International/Foreign - Small	4	0	2	0	2	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Serbia

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 2), special needs schools, and schools with language of instruction other than Serbian
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by region (Belgrade, Vojvodina, Central Serbia), urbanization (city, other), and school hierarchy (main school, branch department) within the Central Serbia - Other stratum
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 99)
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Belgrade - City - All schools	36	0	36	0	0	0	0
Belgrade - Other - All schools	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Vojvodina - City - All schools	28	0	28	0	0	0	0
Vojvodina - Other - All schools	16	0	16	0	0	0	0
Central Serbia - City - All schools	52	0	52	0	0	0	0
Central Serbia - Other - Main School	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Central Serbia - Other - Branch Department	16	1	15	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>



# Singapore

## Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools and private schools
- Singapore took a census of all public schools with fourth grade students. The sampling frame excluded private schools, which are largely foreign-system schools operating in Singapore and which serve predominantly international students. These foreign-system schools are fundamentally different from the public schools in many respects (e.g., language of instruction; school-calendar year).
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

## Sample Design

- No explicit stratification
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms per school
- Census of all schools and within schools, two half classrooms were sampled with probability proportional to the size of the classroom
- Within selected classrooms, 19 students were randomly sampled for digitalPIRLS; the remaining students were selected for the Bridge sample
- Schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates
- The Bridge sample was selected using the Chowdhury approach to minimize the overlap with the Field Test sample
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 100%

## School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Singapore	183	0	183	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Singapore	60	0	60	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Slovak Republic

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 3), special needs schools, special education schools for students with physical disabilities, and schools with language of instruction other than Slovak or Hungarian
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (Slovak, Hungarian, special), fifth grade national Slovak language assessment (low, medium, high) within Slovak schools, and school size (large, small) within Slovak schools
- Large schools are schools with at least 3 fourth grade classes or more than 50 students
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 35.4%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Slovak - Low - Small	28	0	18	1	0	9	0
Slovak - Low - Large	12	0	4	5	0	3	0
Slovak - Medium - Small	41	0	35	5	1	0	0
Slovak - Medium - Large	14	0	12	2	0	0	0
Slovak - High - Small	40	0	31	8	0	1	0
Slovak - High - Large	37	0	32	2	1	2	0
Special Schools	4	0	2	0	0	2	0
Hungarian	10	0	6	2	2	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Slovak - Low - Small	10	0	7	3	0	0	0
Slovak - Low - Large	4	0	1	2	0	1	0
Slovak - Medium - Small	18	0	15	2	1	0	0
Slovak - Medium - Large	6	0	5	1	0	0	0
Slovak - High - Small	16	0	15	0	0	1	0
Slovak - High - Large	16	0	13	1	1	1	0
Special Schools	2	0	1	1	0	0	0
Hungarian	4	0	3	0	1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>

## Slovenia

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of schools with Italian as language of instruction and private schools with different pedagogy
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school organization (main school, dislocated unit) and school size (large, small)
- Within the main schools, large schools are schools with more than 2 fourth grade classrooms and at least 55 students
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 34.3%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Main schools - Large	58	0	53	0	0	5	0
Main schools - Small	84	0	83	1	0	0	0
Dislocated schools	24	0	21	1	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Main schools - Large	20	0	17	0	0	3	0
Main schools - Small	28	0	25	1	0	2	0
Dislocated schools	8	0	6	2	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>

## South Africa

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 10), special needs schools, foreign language schools, and schools with language of instruction unknown
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by language of instruction in the third grade (11)
- Implicit stratification by province (9)
- Sampled one classroom per school; in schools with more than one language of instruction, classrooms were grouped by language of instruction prior to sampling and one classroom was sampled per class group
- Oversampling in some language strata to have a minimum of 26 schools sampled by language

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Afrikaans	28	0	28	0	0	0	0
English	44	0	40	2	0	2	0
isiNdebele	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
isiXhosa	34	1	31	0	0	2	0
isiZulu	42	0	42	0	0	0	0
Sepedi	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
Sesotho	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
Setswana	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
siSwati	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
Tshivenda	26	2	24	0	0	0	0
Xitsonga	26	0	24	0	0	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

## Spain

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4), special needs schools, and international schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by aggregated regions (12) and school size (2)
- Implicit stratification by region within the aggregate regions (11) and school type (public, private)
- Sampled one classroom per school; in schools sampled for digitalPIRLS and Bridge, one classroom sampled per assessment; in schools selected for the Bridge only, two classrooms sampled in large schools (measure of size > 48)
- Schools were oversampled in Andalusia, Asturias, Canary Island, Castile/Leon, Catalonia, Madrid, Navarre, Ceuta and Melilla
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 53.1%



### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Andalusia - Small < 3 classes	24	0	24	0	0	0	0
Andalusia - Large > 2 classes	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
Asturias - Small < 3 classes	28	0	28	0	0	0	0
Asturias - Large > 2 classes	22	0	22	0	0	0	0
Basque country - Small < 3 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Basque country - Large > 2 classes	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Canary Islands - Small < 3 classes	30	0	30	0	0	0	0
Canary Islands - Large > 2 classes	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Castile and Leon - Small < 3 classes	30	0	28	2	0	0	0
Castile and Leon - Large > 2 classes	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Catalonia - Small < 3 classes	24	0	24	0	0	0	0
Catalonia - Large > 2 classes	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
Madrid - Small < 3 classes	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Madrid - Large > 2 classes	36	0	36	0	0	0	0
Navarre - Small < 3 classes	24	0	24	0	0	0	0
Navarre - Large > 2 classes	26	0	25	1	0	0	0
Ceuta	23	0	23	0	0	0	0
Melilla	17	0	17	0	0	0	0
Other larger regions - Small < 3 classes	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Other larger regions - Large > 2 classes	18	0	18	0	0	0	0
Other smaller regions - Small < 3 classes	8	0	8	0	0	0	0

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Other smaller regions - Large > 2 classes	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Andalusia - Small < 3 classes	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Andalusia - Large > 2 classes	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Asturias - Small < 3 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Asturias - Large > 2 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Basque country - Small < 3 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Basque country - Large > 2 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Canary Islands - Small < 3 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Canary Islands - Large > 2 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Castile and Leon - Small < 3 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Castile and Leon - Large > 2 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Catalonia - Small < 3 classes	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Catalonia - Large > 2 classes	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Madrid - Small < 3 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Madrid - Large > 2 classes	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Navarre - Small < 3 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Navarre - Large > 2 classes	2	0	2	0	0	0	0

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Ceuta	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Melilla	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Other larger regions - Small < 3 classes	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Other larger regions - Large > 2 classes	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Other smaller regions - Small < 3 classes	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Other smaller regions - Large > 2 classes	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Sweden

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), special needs schools, schools for students with learning disabilities, Saami schools, and international schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with functional disabilities

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (public, private) and percentage of students with parents that have tertiary education (low, medium, high, missing)
- Implicit stratification by ninth grade achievement (low, medium, high, missing)
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- Separate samples of schools for digitalPIRLS and Bridge were selected so there was no overlap between the samples

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Public - Low	31	1	27	0	0	3	1
Public - Medium	50	1	48	1	0	0	0
Public - High	44	1	41	0	0	2	0
Private - Low	8	1	7	0	0	0	0
Private - Medium	8	0	7	1	0	0	0
Private - High	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Public - Low	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Public - Medium	16	1	15	0	0	0	0
Public - High	14	0	13	0	0	1	0
Private - Low	3	0	3	0	0	0	1
Private - Medium	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Private - High	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

## Turkiye

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of special needs schools, schools with a different structure or curriculum, and very small schools (measure of size < 9)
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (public, private) and region (13) within the public stratum
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 179)

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Private - All Regions	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public - Rural Regions	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Public - TR1: Istanbul	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
Public - TR2: West Marmara	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Public - TR3: Aegean	16	0	16	0	0	0	0
Public - TR4: East Marmara	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Public - TR5: West Anatolia	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
Public - TR6: Mediterranean	22	0	22	0	0	0	0
Public - TR7: Central Anatolia	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Public - TR8: West Black Sea	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Public - TR9: East Black Sea	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Public - TRA: Northeast Anatolia	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Public - TRB: Centraleast Anatolia	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
Public - TRC: Southeast Anatolia	24	0	24	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## United Arab Emirates

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of schools with language of instruction other than English or Arabic, and very small schools (measure of size < 7 in all emirates except Dubai)
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by emirate (Dubai, Abu Dhabi, all other emirates), school type (public, private, charter), and by the main curriculum taught (UK/US/CAD/AUS/International, other) within private schools in all emirates, with the exception of Dubai
- Implicit stratification by test language (Arabic, English) and school type (private, public) within Arabic schools; curriculum (10) within English schools in Dubai; region (8) within the rest of the emirates
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- The United Arab Emirates was divided into three areas: Abu Dhabi, Dubai, and the rest of the emirates; all schools were selected in Dubai; all public schools as well as all private schools with UK/US/CAD/AUS/International/SABIS curriculum and charter schools were selected in the other emirates
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- In census strata, schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 98.9%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
ADU - Private	179	8	170	0	0	1	0
ADU - Public	25	5	20	0	0	0	0
AAD - Private - Ministry of Education	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
AAD - Private - UK/US/CAD/IB/SABIS	130	0	130	0	0	0	0
AAD - Private - Others	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
AAD - Public - Ministry of Education	92	4	88	0	0	0	1
AAD - Charter - American	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Other - Private - Ministry of Education	9	0	9	0	0	0	0
Other - Private - UK/US/AUS/Int.	82	2	80	0	0	0	0
Other - Private - Others	16	0	16	0	0	0	0
Other - Public - Ministry of Education	106	0	106	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>683</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>663</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>



### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
ADU - Private	19	0	18	0	0	1	0
ADU - Public	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
AAD - Private - Ministry of Education	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
AAD - Private - UK/US/CAD/IB/SABIS	14	0	14	0	0	0	0
AAD - Private - Others	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
AAD - Public - Ministry of Education	9	0	9	0	0	0	0
AAD - Charter - American	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Other - Private - Ministry of Education	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Other - Private - UK/US/AUS/Int.	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Other - Private - Others	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Other - Public - Ministry of Education	9	0	9	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

## United States

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- No school level exclusions
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by poverty level (high, low), school type (private, public), census region of the country (Northeast, Midwest, South, West) within public schools, and school funding (Catholic, other) within private schools
- Implicit stratification by state (52)
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- The Field Test and Main Data Collection samples were selected sequentially using the Chowdhury approach to minimize sample overlap
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- The weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 92.9%

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
High poverty level - Public - Northeast	8	0	1	1	0	6	0
High poverty level - Public - Midwest	7	1	3	1	0	2	0
High poverty level - Public - South	24	0	20	1	1	2	0
High poverty level - Public - West	14	1	6	0	1	6	0
Low poverty level - Private - Other	6	2	1	0	0	3	0
Low poverty level - Private - Catholic	6	0	2	2	2	0	0
Low poverty level - Public - Northeast	12	0	1	1	1	9	0
Low poverty level - Public - Midwest	14	0	8	0	0	6	0
Low poverty level - Public - South	19	0	12	3	1	3	0
Low poverty level - Public - West	12	0	7	0	2	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>

## Uzbekistan

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5), special needs schools, private schools, and schools with language of instruction other than Uzbek, Russian, or Karakalpak
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by language of instruction (Uzbek, Karakalpak, Russian, mixed) and urbanization (urban, rural)
- Implicit stratification by school shift (multiple, single) in Uzbek and mixed schools strata
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 249) and two or three classrooms in multilingual schools
- Class group option was used in multilingual schools

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Uzbek - Urban	32	0	31	0	1	0	0
Uzbek - Rural	84	0	83	1	0	0	0
Mixed - Urban	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
Mixed - Rural	9	0	9	0	0	0	1
Karakalpak - Urban	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Karakalpak - Rural	10	0	10	0	0	0	0
Russian	10	1	9	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

## British Columbia, Canada

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4), special needs schools, and international schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school-level language of instruction (English, French) and school type within English schools (English only, immersion, dual track)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 59)
- All French schools were selected
- In the census stratum, schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
English - English	120	1	115	2	1	1	0
English - Immersion	8	0	8	0	0	0	0
English - Dual Track	26	0	26	0	0	0	0
French	27	0	27	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

## Alberta, Canada

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4), special needs schools, First Nation schools/federal schools, special schools (e.g., institutional), heritage schools, and special program schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by language of instruction (English, French) and school type (private, public)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 59)
- All French schools were selected
- In the census stratum, schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
English - Public	140	1	77	14	5	43	0
English - Private	8	0	3	1	0	4	0
French	31	0	16	0	0	15	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>0</b>

## Newfoundland & Labrador, Canada

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4), remote or difficult to access schools, First Nation schools/federal schools, and schools with French as language of instruction
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- No explicit stratification
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 59)
- All schools were selected
- Schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Newfoundland	136	2	133	0	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

## Quebec, Canada

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 4), First Nation schools/federal schools, international schools, school boards with special status, and special schools (e.g., institutional)
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by language of instruction (French, English) and school type (public, private)
- No implicit stratification
- Sampled two classrooms in large schools (measure of size > 59)

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
English - Public	28	0	11	0	0	17	0
English - Private	8	0	3	2	0	3	0
French - Public	128	0	83	8	0	37	0
French - Private	8	1	3	2	0	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>0</b>



## Moscow City, Russian Federation

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 5) and special needs schools
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school size (large, small)
- Large schools are schools with at least 3 fourth grade classes or more than 60 students
- No implicit stratification
- The Bridge sample was obtained using a combination of strategies. Among the larger schools, the Bridge sample was selected as a subset of the digitalPIRLS school sample and classes were randomly assigned to either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge samples. Among the smaller schools, a distinct sample of schools was selected for the Bridge sample. During data collection, schools with only one class selected for both the digitalPIRLS and Bridge samples were randomly assigned to administer either the digitalPIRLS or Bridge assessment, and school weights were adjusted accordingly during the weighting process.
- the weighted percentage of students from the Bridge sample that come from digitalPIRLS schools is 97%

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Large	166	0	166	0	0	0	0
Small	8	0	7	1	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### School Participation Status – Bridge

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Large	62	0	62	0	0	0	0
Small	4	0	3	0	1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## South Africa (6)

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Target population is the sixth grade
- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of very small schools (measure of size < 10), special needs schools, and foreign language schools
- No within-school exclusions

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by language of instruction (Afrikaans, English, Bilingual), language track (4), and province size (larger provinces, smaller provinces); languages of instruction and all provinces were grouped for the mixed track stratum
- Implicit stratification by province (9) and poverty quintile (5)
- Sampled one classroom per school; in schools with more than one language, classrooms were grouped by language prior to sampling and one classroom was sampled per class group
- The sixth grade sample was selected using the Chowdhury approach to maximize the overlap with the fourth grade sample
- Oversampled in the smaller provinces strata to allow for provincial estimates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Afrikaans - Track: Afrikaans > Afrikaans - Larger provinces	28	0	27	1	0	0	0
Afrikaans - Track: Afrikaans > Afrikaans - Smaller provinces	17	0	17	0	0	0	0
Afrikaans English - Mixed tracks Afrikaans and English - Larger provinces	27	0	26	0	0	1	0
Afrikaans English - Mixed tracks Afrikaans and English - Smaller provinces	17	0	16	1	0	0	0
English - Track: English > English - Larger provinces	32	0	29	2	0	1	0
English - Track: English > English - Smaller provinces	9	0	9	0	0	0	0
English - Track: African language > English - Larger provinces	68	0	68	0	0	0	0
English - Track: African language > English - Smaller provinces	51	0	51	0	0	0	0
All - All other mixed tracks - All	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

## Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of schools with language of instruction other than English or Arabic
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (private, public and charter) and main curriculum (Ministry of Education, UK/US/CAD/IB, others) within private stratum
- Implicit stratification by region (Abu Dhabi, Al Ain, Al Dhafra)
- Sampled two classrooms whenever possible
- All public schools and private schools with UK/US/CAD/AUS/International main curriculum were selected
- In census strata, schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Private - Ministry of Education	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
Private - UK/US/CAD/IB/SABIS	130	0	130	0	0	0	0
Private - Others	20	0	20	0	0	0	0
Public - Ministry of Education	92	4	88	0	0	0	1
Charter - American	12	0	12	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

## Dubai, United Arab Emirates

### Coverage and Exclusions

- Coverage is 100 percent
- School-level exclusions consisted of schools with language of instruction other than English or Arabic
- Within-school exclusions consisted of students with intellectual disabilities, students with functional disabilities, and non-native language speakers

### Sample Design

- Explicit stratification by school type (private, public)
- Implicit stratification by language of instruction (Arabic, English)
- Sampled at least two classrooms per school
- All schools were selected
- Schools or classes were used as variance estimation strata and classes or half classes were used to build Jackknife replicates

### School Participation Status

Explicit Strata	Total Sampled Schools	Ineligible Schools	Participating Schools			Refusal Schools	Excluded Schools
			Original Schools	1 <sup>st</sup> Replacements	2 <sup>nd</sup> Replacements		
Private	179	8	170	0	0	1	0
Public	25	5	20	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>