## High International Benchmark

550
Summary
Students can apply their understanding and knowledge in a variety of relatively complex situations. They can solve problems with fractions, decimals, ratios, and proportions. Students at this level show basic procedural knowledge related to algebraic expressions and equations. They can solve a variety of problems with angles, including problems involving triangles, parallel lines, rectangles, and congruent and similar figures. Students can interpret data in a variety of graphs and solve simple problems involving outcomes and probabilities.

Students can solve problems with fractions, decimals, ratios, and proportions.

Students at this level show basic procedural knowledge related to algebraic expressions. They can simplify expressions with integers. They can evaluate a variety of expressions and formulas, including those with exponents. They can identify algebraic expressions that represent real world situations. Students can identify the solutions of linear equations, a pair of simultaneous linear equations in two variables, and identify the values that satisfy two inequalities. They can determine a specific term of a numerical or geometric pattern.

Students can solve a variety of problems with angles, including problems involving triangles, parallel lines, rectangles, and congruent and similar figures. They can identify points in the Cartesian plane to draw lines and shapes. They can visualize rectangular solids.

Students can interpret data from pie charts, line graphs, and bar graphs to solve problems and provide explanations. They can calculate means. They can solve simple problems involving outcomes and probabilities.

Exhibit 3.12.1: High International Benchmark of Mathematics Achievement - Example Item 1

| Country | Percent Correct |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Singapore | 87 (1.4) | - |
| Japan | 82 (1.6) | $\triangle$ |
| Korea, Rep. of | 81 (1.9) | $\Delta$ |
| Chinese Taipei | 80 (1.7) | $\triangle$ |
| ${ }^{+}$Hong Kong SAR | 72 (2.1) | $\triangle$ |
| ${ }^{3}$ Israel | 70 (2.0) | $\Delta$ |
| Ireland | 68 (2.3) | A |
| England | 67 (2.4) | $\Delta$ |
| Australia | 67 (2.0) | $\Delta$ |
| Hungary | 66 (2.1) | $\triangle$ |
| Lithuania | 61 (2.1) | $\Delta$ |
| † United States | 61 (1.7) | A |
| ${ }^{2}$ Russian Federation | 60 (2.5) | $\Delta$ |
| $\dagger$ New Zealand | 57 (2.2) |  |
| International Average | 54 (0.3) |  |
| $2{ }^{2}$ Kazakhstan | 54 (2.5) |  |
| Qatar | 53 (2.2) |  |
| Finland | 52 (2.0) |  |
| $\dagger$ Norway (9) | 52 (2.3) |  |
| Cyprus | 52 (2.4) |  |
| United Arab Emirates | 52 (1.1) |  |
| Romania | 52 (2.3) |  |
| Iran, Islamic Rep. of | 51 (2.1) |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Georgia | 51 (2.8) |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Sweden | 50 (2.6) |  |
| Malaysia | 49 (1.9) | $\nabla$ |
| France | 49 (2.3) | $\nabla$ |
| Chile | 47 (3.3) | $\nabla$ |
| Bahrain | 46 (2.1) | $\nabla$ |
| Italy | 46 (2.5) | $\nabla$ |
| Jordan | 43 (2.1) | $\nabla$ |
| ${ }^{2}$ Egypt | 43 (1.9) | $\nabla$ |
| Portugal | 43 (2.3) | $\nabla$ |
| Kuwait | 40 (2.3) | $\nabla$ |
| ${ }^{2}$ Saudi Arabia | 40 (1.9) | $\nabla$ |
| South Africa (9) | 38 (1.3) | $\nabla$ |
| Turkey | 35 (1.9) | $\nabla$ |
| Morocco | 33 (1.4) | $\nabla$ |
| Oman | 33 (1.8) | $\nabla$ |
| Lebanon | 29 (2.1) | $\nabla$ |
| Benchmarking Participants |  |  |
| Moscow City, Russian Fed. | 67 (2.3) | - |
| ${ }^{2}$ Dubai, UAE | 66 (2.1) | A |
| Ontario, Canada | 63 (2.3) | A |
| Western Cape, RSA (9) | 49 (2.2) | $\nabla$ |
| Abu Dhabi, UAE | 46 (1.8) | $\nabla$ |
| $\ddagger$ Quebec, Canada | 43 (2.4) | $\nabla$ |
| Gauteng, RSA (9) | 41 (1.7) | $\nabla$ |

A Percent significantly higher than international average
Percent significantly lower than international average
See Appendix B. 7 for population coverage notes 1,2 , and 3 . See Appendix B .10 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes $\dagger, \ddagger$, and $\equiv$.
() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

TIMSS \& PIRLS

Exhibit 3.12.2: High International Benchmark of Mathematics Achievement - Example Item 2

| Country | Percent Full Credit |  | Content Domain: Algebra |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Cognitive Domain: Applying |
|  |  |  | Description: Solves a word problem involving evaluating a formula with exponents |
| ${ }^{2}$ Singapore | 73 (2.1) | A |  |
| Chinese Taipei | 66 (2.0) | A |  |
| $\dagger$ Hong Kong SAR | 66 (2.3) | A | The stopping distance (d) meters depends on the speed ( $V$ ) meters |
| ${ }^{2}$ Russian Federation | 60 (2.6) | A | per second of the car when the brakes are applied. A formula for |
| Korea, Rep. of | 55 (2.3) | A | lating this distance is: |
| Ireland | 48 (2.4) | $\triangle$ | $d=\frac{2 v+v^{2}}{20}$ |
| Lithuania | 48 (2.4) | A | $d=\frac{2 v+v^{2}}{20}$ |
| ${ }^{2}$ Kazakhstan | 47 (2.7) | A |  |
| ${ }^{3}$ Israel | 46 (2.4) | A | What is the stopping distance when $v=20$ ? |
| Japan | 44 (1.9) | A |  |
| $\dagger$ United States | 43 (2.3) | A | $d=22 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Hungary | 43 (2.5) | $\Delta$ |  |
| Romania | 41 (2.3) | $\triangle$ |  |
| England | 40 (2.9) |  |  |
| Cyprus | 39 (1.9) | A | The answer shown illustrates the type of response that would receive full credit (1 point). |
| Australia | 37 (2.1) |  |  |
| United Arab Emirates | 36 (1.2) |  |  |
| International Average | 35 (0.3) |  |  |
| Italy | 35 (2.7) |  |  |
| 1 Georgia | 34 (2.6) |  |  |
| Portugal | 34 (2.3) |  |  |
| Turkey | 32 (2.2) |  |  |
| Bahrain | 31 (1.7) |  |  |
| Oman | 28 (1.7) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Qatar | 28 (2.1) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Lebanon | 27 (2.0) | $\nabla$ |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Egypt | 27 (2.0) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Finland | 25 (1.8) | $\nabla$ |  |
| France | 23 (2.0) | $\nabla$ |  |
| + Norway (9) | 23 (1.9) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Iran, Islamic Rep. of | 22 (1.5) | $\nabla$ |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Sweden | 22 (2.0) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Malaysia | 22 (1.5) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Jordan | 21 (1.8) | $\nabla$ |  |
| † New Zealand | 19 (1.5) | $\nabla$ |  |
| South Africa (9) | 17 (1.1) | $\nabla$ |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Saudi Arabia | 15 (1.6) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Chile | 14 (1.5) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Kuwait | 12 (1.8) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Morocco | 6 (1.0) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Benchmarking Participants |  |  |  |
| Moscow City, Russian Fed. | 73 (2.1) | - |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Dubai, UAE | 52 (2.5) | - |  |
| $\ddagger$ Quebec, Canada | 44 (3.1) | A |  |
| Ontario, Canada | 44 (3.2) | A |  |
| Western Cape, RSA (9) | 28 (2.5) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Abu Dhabi, UAE | 28 (1.3) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Gauteng, RSA (9) | 20 (2.0) | $\nabla$ |  |

Percent significantly higher than international average
$\nabla$ Percent significantly lower than international average

See Appendix B. 7 for population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix B. 10 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes $\dagger$, $\ddagger$, and $\equiv$. () Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Exhibit 3.12.3: High International Benchmark of Mathematics Achievement - Example Item 3

| Country | Percent Full Credit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Japan | 79 (1.7) | 4 |
| ${ }^{2}$ Singapore | 70 (1.7) | A |
| † Hong Kong SAR | 66 (2.5) | A |
| Korea, Rep. of | 64 (2.5) | $\Delta$ |
| Italy | 59 (2.7) | A |
| Lithuania | 58 (2.6) | $\Delta$ |
| Hungary | 57 (2.4) | $\Delta$ |
| Chinese Taipei | 53 (2.2) | $\Delta$ |
| ${ }^{2}$ Russian Federation | 52 (2.5) | A |
| $\dagger$ United States | 51 (2.3) | 4 |
| ${ }^{3}$ Israel | 49 (2.2) | A |
| England | 48 (2.5) | A |
| Portugal | 48 (2.7) | $\Delta$ |
| Turkey | 47 (2.0) | A |
| Finland | 44 (2.0) |  |
| Malaysia | 42 (1.9) |  |
| France | 42 (2.0) |  |
| International Average | 41 (0.3) |  |
| $\dagger$ Norway (9) | 41 (2.5) |  |
| Bahrain | 40 (2.0) |  |
| Cyprus | 40 (2.2) |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Kazakhstan | 39 (2.3) |  |
| Chile | 39 (2.2) |  |
| Romania | 39 (2.4) |  |
| United Arab Emirates | 38 (1.1) | $\nabla$ |
| ${ }^{2}$ Sweden | 38 (2.5) |  |
| Ireland | 35 (2.2) | $\nabla$ |
| Qatar | 33 (2.1) | $\nabla$ |
| Iran, Islamic Rep. of | 32 (2.0) | $\nabla$ |
| Oman | 28 (1.8) | $\nabla$ |
| Australia | 28 (1.7) | $\nabla$ |
| ${ }^{1}$ Georgia | 27 (2.3) | $\nabla$ |
| Jordan | 27 (2.1) | $\nabla$ |
| Kuwait | 26 (2.1) | $\nabla$ |
| ${ }^{2}$ Egypt | 23 (1.8) | $\nabla$ |
| Morocco | 22 (1.4) | $\nabla$ |
| † New Zealand | 21 (1.4) | $\nabla$ |
| South Africa (9) | 21 (0.9) | $\nabla$ |
| Lebanon | 20 (2.1) | $\nabla$ |
| ${ }^{2}$ Saudi Arabia | 10 (1.2) | $\nabla$ |
| Benchmarking Participants |  |  |
| Moscow City, Russian Fed. | 64 (1.9) | A |
| Ontario, Canada | 60 (2.9) | $\triangle$ |
| ${ }^{2}$ Dubai, UAE | 49 (2.9) | A |
| $\ddagger$ Quebec, Canada | 46 (3.0) |  |
| Abu Dhabi, UAE | 35 (1.5) | $\nabla$ |
| Western Cape, RSA (9) | 27 (1.9) | $\nabla$ |
| Gauteng, RSA (9) | 27 (1.7) | $\nabla$ |

Percent significantly higher than international average
Percent significantly lower than international average
See Appendix B. 7 for population coverage notes 1,2 , and 3 . See Appendix B. 10 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes $\dagger, \ddagger$, and $\equiv$.
() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

TIMSS \& PIRLS
SOURCE: IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study - TIMSS 2019 Downloaded from http://timss2019.org/download

Exhibit 3.12.4: High International Benchmark of Mathematics Achievement - Example Item 4


Percent significantly higher than international average
$\nabla$ Percent significantly lower than international average

See Appendix B. 7 for population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix B. 10 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes $\dagger, \ddagger$, and $\equiv$. ( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Exhibit 3.12.5: High International Benchmark of Mathematics Achievement - Example Item 5

| Country | Percent Correct |  | Content Domain: Data and Cognitive Domain: Applying Description: Estimates the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Korea, Rep. of | 70 (2.0) | - |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Singapore | 69 (1.9) | A |  |
| Japan | 65 (1.8) | A | A bag contai |
| Chinese Taipei | 63 (2.1) | A | arble is |
| Ireland | 57 (2.4) | A |  |
| Australia | 56 (2.0) | A |  |
| Turkey | 55 (2.2) | - | appears 70 |
| Bahrain | 52 (2.1) | A | How many w |
| + United States | 52 (2.2) | A |  |
| England | 50 (2.2) | A |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ Hong Kong SAR | 49 (2.9) | $\Delta$ |  |
| Finland | 49 (2.1) | $\Delta$ |  |
| Italy | 48 (2.5) | $\Delta$ | (B) |
| + New Zealand | 48 (2.3) | $\Delta$ |  |
| $\dagger$ Norway (9) | 48 (2.8) |  |  |
| Lithuania | 46 (2.7) |  | (c) 12 |
| ${ }^{3}$ Israel | 46 (2.7) |  |  |
| Iran, Islamic Rep. of | 45 (2.8) |  |  |
| International Average | 43 (0.4) |  |  |
| Hungary | 43 (2.3) |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Russian Federation | 42 (2.6) |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Sweden | 42 (2.7) |  |  |
| Cyprus | 41 (2.4) |  |  |
| Portugal | 41 (2.6) |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Kazakhstan | 39 (2.7) |  |  |
| France | 38 (2.4) | $\nabla$ |  |
| United Arab Emirates | 38 (1.0) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Chile | 36 (1.9) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Malaysia | 35 (1.4) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Jordan | 34 (2.0) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Oman | 34 (1.6) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Qatar | 32 (2.3) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Romania | 30 (2.4) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Kuwait | 30 (2.0) | $\nabla$ |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Egypt | 27 (1.8) | $\nabla$ |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Saudi Arabia | 27 (1.9) | $\nabla$ |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Georgia | 27 (2.2) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Morocco | 26 (1.8) | $\nabla$ |  |
| South Africa (9) | 25 (1.2) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Lebanon | 22 (1.8) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Benchmarking Participants |  |  |  |
| Moscow City, Russian Fed. | 53 (2.3) | - |  |
| Ontario, Canada | 50 (3.0) | $\Delta$ |  |
| $\ddagger$ Quebec, Canada | 50 (2.4) | A |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Dubai, UAE | 48 (2.1) | $\Delta$ |  |
| Western Cape, RSA (9) | 35 (1.9) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Abu Dhabi, UAE | 34 (1.5) | $\nabla$ |  |
| Gauteng, RSA (9) | 28 (1.5) | $\nabla$ |  |

- Percent significantly higher than international average
$\nabla$ Percent significantly lower than international average

See Appendix B. 7 for population coverage notes 1, 2, and 3. See Appendix B. 10 for sampling guidelines and sampling participation notes $\dagger, \ddagger$, and $\equiv$. () Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

