Education at a Glance 2026

OECD Indicators



Education at a Glance 2026

OECD INDICATORS



This work is issued under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD, and does not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD Member countries.

This document, as well as any data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

Note by the Republic of Türkiye
The information in this document with reference to "Cyprus" relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Türkiye recognises the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of the United Nations, Türkiye shall preserve its position concerning the "Cyprus issue".

Note by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union
The Republic of Cyprus is recognised by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Türkiye. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

Please cite this publication as:
OECD (2026), *Education at a Glance 2026: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b4968bbc-en.

ISBN 978-92-64-79294-4 (print)
ISBN 978-92-64-71037-5 (PDF)
ISBN 978-92-64-39078-2 (HTML)

Education at a Glance
ISSN 1563-051X (print)
ISSN 1999-1487 (online)

Photo credits: Cover © Rawpixel.com/Shutterstock.com.

Corrigenda to OECD publications may be found at: https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/support/corrigenda.html.

© OECD 2026



Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence. By using this work, you accept to be bound by the terms of this licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Attribution – you must cite the work.

Translations – you must cite the original work, identify changes to the original and add the following text: *In the event of any discrepancy between the original work and the translation, only the text of the original work should be considered valid.*

Adaptations – you must cite the original work and add the following text: *This is an adaptation of an original work by the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed in this adaptation should not be reported as representing the official views of the OECD or of its Member countries.*

Third-party material – the licence does not apply to third-party material in the work. If using such material, you are responsible for obtaining permission from the third party and for any claims of infringement.

You must not use the OECD logo, visual identity or cover image without express permission or suggest the OECD endorses your use of the work.

Any dispute arising under this licence shall be settled by arbitration in accordance with the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) Arbitration Rules 2012. The seat of arbitration shall be Paris (France). The number of arbitrators shall be one.

Editorial

Education systems are only as strong as their teachers. Across the OECD, it is becoming harder to attract, develop and retain high-quality teachers. This year's *Education at a Glance* looks at how teacher shortages are evolving, and what can be done to tackle them.

Teacher shortages affect most OECD education systems to varying degrees. In Latvia and Luxembourg, the countries with the highest vacancy rates, around 4% of all teaching positions in secondary education, were unfilled at the start of the 2024/25 school year. In most other countries, the share was below 3%.

Recruitment challenges are often more acute in rural, remote and disadvantaged communities. Our data show that shortages are especially pronounced in subjects such as mathematics and the natural sciences, where education systems compete directly with other sectors for highly skilled professionals.

Unfilled positions are only one measure of teacher shortages. Education systems are also relying on teachers who do not yet meet all national qualification requirements: in 2024/25, 9% of primary and secondary teachers were not fully qualified on average across OECD countries.

The ageing of the teaching workforce will only make shortages more acute. Across the OECD, one in four secondary teachers is aged 55 or older, raising the prospect of substantial workforce losses in the coming decades. Education systems will need to replace departing teachers and ensure that new hires are available in the subjects and regions where they are most needed.

More broadly, teacher shortages also reflect economy-wide shortages of skilled workers and competition among employers for a limited supply of qualified staff. Indeed, vacancy rates are higher across the wider economy than in teaching in more than half of the countries with available data. Education systems are therefore facing similar labour market pressures as healthcare, technology and other professions that rely on highly trained staff. As education systems cannot fully address these broader labour market constraints on their own, they also need to focus on making more effective use of available teaching capacity.

Competitive salaries and manageable workloads can help alleviate teacher shortages by making the profession more attractive, but they are not enough. Professional autonomy, supportive leadership, positive working relationships, career development and public recognition also shape the attractiveness of teaching. Although 85% of teachers report being satisfied with their jobs, only 22% believe that teaching is valued by society.

Beyond efforts to attract and retain more teachers, education systems also need to adapt to a future in which fewer teachers may be available. This means finding ways to use teachers' time and expertise more productively, so they can focus on the activities that have the greatest impact on student learning. Greater use of digital tools and AI, improved workforce planning, and redesigned school structures can help reduce administrative burdens and enable teachers to work more effectively.

Widening entry into the profession is a further lever, alongside more productive use of existing staff. Well-designed pathways for second-career teachers can expand the recruitment pool and bring valuable professional experience into schools. In Australia and the Netherlands, where over 15% of teachers are second-career entrants, flexible pathways recognise prior experience and combine training with employment.

Declining student numbers create an opportunity to reallocate resources to the schools, subjects and communities where shortages are most acute. The number of children aged 5-14 across the OECD is projected to fall by 9% between 2024 and 2033, but teacher numbers and classes have not always declined as enrolment has fallen. This gives policy makers room to redirect teachers and resources to where shortages bite hardest, protecting access while easing shortages in specific subjects, schools and regions, rather than spreading an already stretched workforce more thinly still.



Mathias Cormann,
OECD Secretary-General

Acknowledgements

Education at a Glance is the product of a long-standing collaborative effort between the governments of OECD member countries, the experts and institutions working within the framework of the OECD Indicators of Educational Systems (INES) programme, and the OECD Secretariat. It was prepared within the Innovation and Measuring Progress Division of the OECD Directorate for Education and Skills, under the overall responsibility of Edmund Misson.

The production of Education at a Glance 2026 was led by Abel Schumann. The thematic chapter on teacher shortages was prepared by Éric Charbonnier. Gara Rojas González coordinated the production of Part A and provided analytical and statistical contributions together with Darien DiNaro, Giovanni Maria Semeraro and Melik Topçi. Corinne Heckman coordinated the production of Part B and Chapters D2 and D5 and provided analytical and statistical contributions together with Maria Paula Caldas, Qi Kuang, Bernardo Mayorga and Özge Özcan Sahin. Viktoria Kis coordinated the production of Part C and provided analytical and statistical contributions together with Erika Lee and Simon Normandeau. Etienne Albiser coordinated the production of Chapters D3, D4, D6 and D7 and provided analytical and statistical contributions together with Théodore Bérut and Carsten Dolle. Maria Paula Caldas coordinated the production of the Country Notes.

Administrative support was provided by Spencer Matthews. Rachel Linden supported the editorial and production process. Alicja Gogół, Océane Kanté, Sara Sofía Otavo Peña, Maïa Pécaut, Talia Sander and Anna Tozser contributed to the team as interns.

The development of the publication was guided by INES member countries through the INES Working Party and facilitated by the INES networks. The delegates to the various bodies, as well as the individual experts who contributed to this publication and to the INES programme more generally, are listed at the end of the publication.

Table of contents

Editorial 3

Acknowledgements 5

Readers Guide 10

Executive Summary 18

Chapter 1. Teacher shortages and the attractiveness of the teaching profession 21

Part A. The output of educational institutions and the impact of learning 70

Chapter A1. To what level have adults studied? 71

Chapter A2. Transition from education to work: Where are today's youth? 88

Chapter A3. How does educational attainment affect participation in the labour market? 105

Chapter A4. What are the earnings advantages to education? 125

Chapter A5. To what extent do adults participate in education and training? 145

Chapter A6. How are social outcomes related to education? 161

Part B. Access to education, participation and progression 179

Chapter B1. How has participation in early childhood education and care evolved across age groups and countries? 180

Chapter B2. How is school provision organised across education levels? 204

Chapter B3. How do students transition into upper secondary education and what are their outcomes afterwards? 228

Chapter B4. What is the profile of international students and how is mobility evolving? 261

Part C. Financial resources invested in education 284

Chapter C1. Key system-level indicators of education finance 285

Chapter C2. How is early childhood education financed? 305

Chapter C3. How are primary and lower secondary education financed? 317

Chapter C4. How is upper secondary education financed? 332

Chapter C5. How is tertiary education financed? 346

Part D. Teachers, the learning environment and organisation of schools 362

Chapter D2. How do student-teacher ratios and class sizes vary across education levels? 364

Chapter D3. How much are teachers and school heads paid? 383

Chapter D4. How much time do teachers spend teaching and working? 412

Chapter D5. What are the main characteristics of the teaching workforce across levels of education? 432

Chapter D6. What school evaluation mechanisms are in place? 456

Chapter D7. What teacher and school head appraisal systems are in place? 480

Annex 1. Characteristics of education systems 511

Annex 2: Reference statistics 514

Contributors to this publication 547

Tables

Table 1. Trends in the share of non-fully qualified teachers, by level of education (2017/18 and 2024/25) 57
Table 2. Trends in the share of unfilled teaching vacancies (2017/18 and 2024/25) and share of successful teaching candidates (2024/25) 59
Table 3. Share of fully qualified teachers who left the profession, by level of education (2024/25) and trends in teacher resignations (2017/18 and 2024/25) 61
Table 4. Trends in the share of teachers aged under 35 or 55 and over, by level of education (2015 and 2024), and comparison with the wider workforce (2024) 63
Table 5. Employment conditions of lower secondary teachers and job satisfaction (2024) 65
Table 6. Comparing teachers' job satisfaction, work pressure, workload and participation in and unmet demand for professional development with other workers (2023) 67
Table 7. Changes in the number of teachers, classrooms and student enrolment between 2015 and 2024, and projected changes in the number of children between 2024 and 2033 68
Table A1.1. Educational attainment of adults (2025) 82
Table A1.2. Trends in the educational attainment of 25-34 year-olds, by gender (2015 and 2025) 84
Table A1.3. Educational attainment, by programme orientation and age group (2025) 86
Table A2.1. Share of young adults in education/not in education, by age group and labour-force status (2025) 100
Table A2.2. Trends in the share of 18-24 year-olds in education/not in education, by work status and gender (2015 and 2025) 102

Table A2.3. Distribution of 18-29 year-olds by education and labour-force status, by literacy proficiency level (2023) 104
Table A3.1. Employment rates of adults, by educational attainment and programme orientation (2025) 118
Table A3.2. Trends in employment rates of 25-34 year-olds, by educational attainment and gender (2015 and 2025) 120
Table A3.3. Trends in unemployment rates and shares of 25-34 year-olds outside the labour force, by educational attainment and gender (2015 and 2025) 122
Table A4.1. Relative earnings of workers compared to those with upper secondary attainment, by educational attainment and age group (2024) 139
Table A4.2. Distribution of workers by educational attainment and level of earnings relative to the median (2024) 141
Table A4.3. Women's earnings as a percentage of men's earnings, by educational attainment and age group (2024) 143
Table A5.1. Share of adults participating in non-formal education or training, by reference period, educational attainment, recency of highest qualification and age group (2023) 158
Table A5.2. Share of adults participating in non-formal education or training, by labour force status and age group (2023) 159
Table A5.3. Share of adults reporting having never participated in non-formal education or training, by educational attainment and gender (2023) 160
Table A6.1. Share of employed adults reporting high or very high flexibility of working hours in their main job, by numeracy proficiency level, educational attainment, gender and age group (2023) 172
Table A6.2. Indicators of work-life balance among employed adults, by educational attainment (2023) 173
Table A6.3. Prevalence of work-life balance difficulties, by educational attainment (2024) 176
Table B1.1. Trends in enrolment rates of children under 3, by type of provision (2015 and 2024) 198
Table B1.2. Enrolment rates of children over 2, by age and type of provision (2024) 200
Table B1.3. Duration of parental leave (2025) and trends in starting ages for legal ECEC entitlement and compulsory education (2015 and 2024) 202
Table B2.1. Trends in the number of institutions and students, and average institution size (students per grade), by level of education (2015 and 2024) 220
Table B2.2. Trends in the ratio of primary schools to lower secondary schools, by type of institution (2015 and 2024) 224
Table B2.3. School sizes, by education level and percentile, and ratio of primary schools to lower secondary schools, by type of institution (2024) 226
Table B3.1. Distribution of students in the year after the last grade of lower secondary education (2024) 252
Table B3.2. Share of upper secondary students completing their studies within the theoretical duration, by gender and programme orientation at graduation (2024) 254
Table B3.3. Distribution of upper secondary students by outcome and timeframe (2022-2024) 256
Table B3.4. Distribution of upper secondary graduates in the year after their graduation, by gender (2023) 259
Table B4.1. Trends in the profile of international new entrants, by tertiary education level (2015 and 2024) 275
Table B4.2. Distribution of national and international tertiary graduates, by field of education (2024) 277
Table B4.3. Trends in inbound and outbound internationally mobile tertiary students (2015 and 2024) 279
Table B4.4. Top five origins and destinations for inbound and outbound international students (2015 and 2024) 281
Table C1.1. Expenditure on educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023) 297
Table C1.2. Distribution of expenditure within educational institutions (2023) 299
Table C1.3. Trends in expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (2015 and 2023) 301
Table C1.4. Expenditure on educational institutions as a percentage of GDP (2023) 303
Table C2.1. Expenditure on early childhood education per child (2023) 311
Table C2.2. Distribution of expenditure within public early childhood educational institutions (2023) 313
Table C2.3. Trends in expenditure on early childhood education per child (2015 and 2023) 315
Table C3.1. Expenditure on primary and lower secondary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023) 326
Table C3.2. Distribution of expenditure within public primary and lower secondary educational institutions (2023) 328
Table C3.3. Trends in expenditure in primary and lower secondary educational institutions on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (2015 and 2023) 330
Table C4.1 Expenditure on upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023) 340
Table C4.2. Distribution of expenditure within public upper secondary educational institutions (2023) 342
Table C4.3. Trends in expenditure in upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary educational institutions on staff compensation (2015 and 2023) 344
Table C5.1. Expenditure on tertiary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023) 356
Table C5.2. Distribution of expenditure within public tertiary educational institutions (2023) 358
Table C5.3. Trends in expenditure in tertiary educational institutions on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (2015 to 2023) 360
Table D2.1. Ratio of children to staff in early childhood education (ECE), by level of education and type of institution (2024) 377

Table D2.2. Trends in the ratio of students to teaching staff, by level of education (2015 and 2024) 379
Table D2.3. Trends in average class size in primary and lower secondary education, by type of institution (2015 and 2024) 381
Table D3.1. Teachers' statutory salaries, based on the most prevalent qualifications at different points in teachers' careers (2025) 403
Table D3.2. Teachers' and school heads' actual salaries relative to earnings of tertiary-educated workers (2025) 406
Table D3.3. Teachers' and school heads' average actual salaries (2025) 410
Table D4.1. Organisation of teachers' teaching time (2025) 427
Table D4.2. Organisation of teachers' working time (2025) 430
Table D5.1. Trends in the share of women among classroom teachers, by level of education (2015 and 2024) 448
Table D5.2. Trends in the share of women among school management personnel, by level of education (2015 and 2024) 450
Table D5.3. Trends in the average working-time intensity of teachers, by level of education and gender (2015 and 2024) 452
Table D5.4. Minimum educational attainment required for teachers and share of teachers who meet the minimum national attainment requirements, by level of education taught (2024) 454
Table D6.1. Organisation of school inspections and school self-evaluations (2025) 470
Table D6.2. Areas addressed in school inspections and self-evaluations (2025) 472
Table D6.3. Influence of school inspections and self-evaluations on school management (2025) 474
Table D6.4. Domains addressed in school compliance reports, by type of institution (2025) 478
Table D7.1. Types of teacher and school head appraisals (2025) 497
Table D7.2. Eligibility for and circumstances of teacher appraisals (2025) 499
Table D7.3. Aspects appraised and use of results from teacher appraisals (2025) 501
Table D7.4. Use of teacher appraisals and their influence on various decisions (2025) 503
Table D7.5 Eligibility for and circumstances of school head appraisals (2025) 507
Table D7.6. Aspects appraised and use of results from school head appraisals (2025) 509
Table X1.1. School year and financial year used for the calculation of indicators, OECD countries 512
Table X1.2. School year and financial year used for the calculation of indicators, partner and accession countries 513
Table X2.1. Basic reference statistics in current prices (reference period: calendar year, 2015, 2020, 2022, 2023, 2024) 515
Table X2.2. Basic reference statistics (reference period: calendar year, 2015, 2020, 2022, 2023, 2024) 517
Table X2.3 Pre-primary and primary teachers' statutory salaries, in national currencies, based on the most prevalent qualifications at different points in teachers' careers (2025) 519
Table X2.4. Secondary teachers' statutory salaries, in national currencies, based on the most prevalent qualifications at different points in teachers' careers (2025) 521
Table X2.5. Trends in teachers' statutory starting salaries, in national currencies (2000 and 2005 to 2025) 523
Table X2.6. Trends in teachers' statutory salaries after 15 years of experience, in national currencies (2000 and 2005 to 2025) 527
Table X2.7. Trends in teachers' average actual salaries, in national currencies (2000, 2005 and 2010 to 2025 531
Table X2.8. Distribution of school heads aged 25-64, by educational attainment and level of education (2025) 535
Table X2.9. Distribution of teachers, by minimum or most prevalent qualifications and level of education (2025) 537
Table X2.10. Distribution of teachers aged 25-64, by educational attainment and level of education (2025) 541
Table X2.11. Distribution of school heads aged 25-64, by educational attainment and level of education (2025) 544


Readers Guide

The organising framework

Education at a Glance 2026: OECD Indicators offers a rich, comparable and up-to-date array of indicators that reflect a consensus among professionals on how to measure the current state of education internationally. The indicators provide information on the human and financial resources invested in education, how education and learning systems operate and evolve, and the returns to investments in education. They are organised thematically in chapters, each accompanied by information on the policy context and interpretation of the data.

The indicators are organised within a framework that distinguishes between the actors in education systems, groups them according to the types of issues they address and examines contextual factors that influence policy (Figure A). In addition to these dimensions, the time perspective makes it possible to visualise dynamic aspects of the development of education systems.

Figure A. Organising framework of indicators in *Education at a Glance*



Actors in education systems

The OECD Indicators of Education Systems (INES) programme seeks to gauge the performance of national education systems as a whole, rather than to compare individual institutional or other subnational entities. However, there is increasing recognition that many important features of the development, functioning and impact of education systems can only be assessed through an understanding of learning outcomes and their relationships to inputs and processes at the level of individuals and institutions.

To account for this, the first dimension of the organising framework distinguishes the three levels of actors in education systems:

- Education systems as a whole.

- Providers of educational services (institutions, schools), as well as the instructional setting within those institutions (classrooms, teachers).
- Individual participants in education and learning, the students. These can be either children or young adults undergoing initial schooling and training, or adults pursuing lifelong learning programmes.

Indicator groups

The second dimension of the organising framework further groups the indicators into three categories:

- *Indicators on the output, outcomes and impact of education systems:* Output indicators analyse the characteristics of those exiting the system, such as their educational attainment. Outcome indicators examine the direct effects of the output of education systems, such as the employment and earning benefits of pursuing higher education. Impact indicators analyse the long-term indirect effects of the outcomes, such as the knowledge and skills acquired, contributions to economic growth and societal well-being, and social cohesion and equity.
- *Indicators on the participation and progression within education entities*: These indicators assess the likelihood of students accessing, enrolling in and completing different levels of education, as well as the various pathways followed between types of programmes and across education levels.
- *Indicators on the input into education systems or the learning environment*: These indicators provide information on the policy levers that shape the participation, progression, outputs and outcomes at each level. Such policy levers relate to the resources invested in education, including financial, human (such as teachers and other school staff) or physical resources (such as buildings and infrastructure). They also relate to policy choices regarding the instructional setting of classrooms, pedagogical content and delivery of the curriculum. Finally, they analyse the organisation of schools and education systems, including governance, autonomy and specific policies to regulate the participation of students in certain programmes.

Contextual factors that influence policy

Policy levers typically have antecedents: external factors that define or constrain policy but are not directly connected to the policy topic at hand. Demographic, socio-economic and political factors are all important national characteristics to take into account when interpreting indicators. The characteristics of the students themselves, such as their gender, age, socio-economic status or cultural background, are also important contextual factors that influence the outcomes of education policy.

The structure and content of *Education at a Glance*

Education at a Glance 2026 is structured into four parts that are preceded by a special chapter on teacher shortages, the theme of the 2026 edition.

Teacher shortages This chapter provides new indicators on teacher shortages, such as the number of unfilled vacancies and the share of non-fully qualified teachers. It compares teacher shortages to shortages of skilled workers in other parts of the economy and discusses how education systems can attract more teachers.

Part A *The output of educational institutions and the impact of learning*, contains indicators on the output, outcomes and impact of education in the form of the overall attainment of the population, as well as the learning, economic and social outcomes. Through this analysis, the indicators in this chapter provide context, for example, to shape policies on lifelong learning. They also provide insights into the policy levers needed to address areas where outcomes and impact may not be aligned with national strategic objectives.

Part B *Access to education, participation and progression*, considers the full education system from early childhood to tertiary education and provides indicators on the enrolment, progression and completion of students at each level of education. These indicators can be considered a mixture of output and outcome, to the extent that the output of each education level serves as input to the next and that progression is the result of policies and practices at

classroom, institution and system levels. But they can also provide context to identify areas where policy intervention is necessary to address issues of inequity, for example, or to encourage international mobility.

Part C *Financial resources invested in education*, provides indicators on expenditure in education and educational institutions, how that expenditure is shared between public and private sources, the tuition fees charged by institutions, and the financial mechanisms to support students. These indicators are mainly policy levers, but they also help to explain specific learning outcomes. For example, expenditure on educational institutions per student is a key policy measure that most directly affects individual learners, but it also acts as a constraint on the learning environment in schools and learning conditions in the classroom.

Part D *Teachers, the learning environment and organisation of schools*, provides indicators on instruction time, teachers' and school heads' working time, and teachers' and school heads' salaries. These indicators not only represent policy levers that can be adjusted, but also provide context for the quality of instruction and for the outcomes of individual learners. This part also presents data on the profile of teachers.

Sustainable Development Goal 4

In September 2015, world leaders gathered to set ambitious goals for the future of the global community. Goal 4 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) seeks to ensure "inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all". Each target of the SDG 4 framework has at least one global indicator and a number of related thematic indicators designed to complement the analysis and the measurement of the target.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) oversees the education SDG agenda in the context of the United Nations-led SDG framework. As the custodian agency for most of the SDG 4 indicators, the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) is co-ordinating global efforts to develop the indicator framework to monitor progress towards SDG 4 targets. In addition to collecting data, the UIS works with partners to develop new indicators, statistical approaches and monitoring tools to better assess progress across the education-related SDG targets.

In this context, the OECD's education statistics have a key role to play in the achievement of – and measuring progress towards – SDG 4 and its targets. There is a high level of complementarity between the SDG 4 agenda and the data collected and analysed by the OECD. The OECD is working with the UIS, the SDG 4 Steering Committee and the technical working groups that have been put in place to help build a comprehensive data system for global reporting, agree on the data sources and formulae used for reporting on the SDG 4 global indicators, and on selected thematic indicators for OECD and partner countries.

Statistical coverage

Although a lack of data still limits the scope of the indicators in many countries, the coverage extends, in principle, to the entire national education system (within the national territory), regardless of who owns or sponsors the institutions concerned and regardless of how education is delivered. With one exception (described below), all types of students and all age groups are included: children (including students with special needs), adults, nationals, foreigners and students in distance learning, in special education programmes or in education programmes organised by ministries other than the ministry of education, provided that the main aim of the programme is to broaden or deepen an individual's knowledge. Vocational and technical training in the workplace is not included in the basic education expenditure and enrolment data, with the exception of combined school- and work-based programmes that are explicitly deemed to be part of the education system.

Educational activities classified as "adult" or "non-regular" are covered, provided that the activities involve the same or similar content as "regular" education studies, or that the programmes of which they are a part lead to qualifications similar to those awarded in regular education programmes. Courses for adults that are primarily for general interest, personal enrichment, leisure or recreation are excluded.

More information on the coverage of the indicators presented in *Education at a Glance* can be found in the *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparable Statistics on Education 2018* (OECD, 2018[1]).

Comparability over time

The indicators in *Education at a Glance* are the result of a continuous process of methodological improvement aimed at improving the robustness and international comparability of the indicators. As a result, data across different editions of *Education at a Glance* may not be comparable. To analyse time trends, it is preferable to use the data for different time periods from the latest edition of *Education at a Glance* or the data available online. All comparisons over time presented in this report and on the *Education at a Glance Database* (http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s) are based on annual revisions of historical data and the methodological improvements which have been implemented in this edition.

Country coverage

This publication features data on education from all OECD countries and Brazil, a partner country that participates in the INES programme, as well as other G20 and OECD accession countries that are not INES members (Argentina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Peru, Romania, Saudi Arabia and South Africa). Data sources for the non-INES participating countries come from the regular INES data collections or from other international or national sources.

Note on terminology: "partner countries" and "economies"

Education at a Glance reports data on non-OECD countries. In particular, data on Brazil, which is a member of the Indicators of Educational System (INES) programme, are reported throughout the publication. Data on other G20 countries are reported when available. These countries are referred to as "partner countries".

In some instances, data on some subnational entities, such as England (United Kingdom), are included in country-level data. In line with the agreed upon OECD terminology, these subnational entities are referred to as "economies" throughout the publication. The Flemish Community of Belgium and the French Community of Belgium are abbreviated in the tables and figures as "Flemish Comm. (Belgium)" and "French Comm. (Belgium)".

Calculation of international means

For many indicators, an OECD average is presented; for some, an OECD total is shown. The OECD average is calculated as the unweighted mean of the data values of all OECD countries for which data are available or can be estimated. The OECD average therefore refers to an average of data values at the level of the national systems and can be used to answer the question of how an indicator value for a given country compares with the value for a typical or average country. It does not take into account the absolute size of the education system in each country.

If data from subnational entities are reported for some countries in an indicator, the subnational data are included in the calculation of the OECD average. If data from only one subnational region of a country are available, the data point will be used in the calculation of the OECD average as if the subnational region represents the entire country. If data for more than one subnational region from a country are reported in an indicator, the unweighted average of all subnational regions from the country is calculated. This unweighted average is then treated as the corresponding country value for the calculation of the OECD average.

The OECD total is calculated as the weighted mean of the data values of all OECD countries for which data are available or can be estimated. It reflects the value for a given indicator when OECD countries are considered as a

whole. This approach is taken for the purpose of comparing, for example, expenditure charts for individual countries with those of all of the OECD countries for which valid data are available, considered as a single entity.

For tables using time series, the OECD average is calculated for countries providing data for all reference years used. This allows the OECD average to be compared over time with no distortion due to the exclusion of some countries in the different years.

For many indicators, an EU25 average is also presented. It is calculated as the unweighted mean of the data values of the 25 countries that are members or accession countries of both the European Union and the OECD for which data are available or can be estimated. The 25 countries are Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden.

The EU25 total is calculated as the weighted mean of the data values of all OECD-EU countries for which data are available or can be estimated. It reflects the value for a given indicator when the OECD-EU area is considered as a single entity.

For some indicators, a G20 average is presented. The G20 average is calculated as the unweighted mean of the data values of all G20 countries for which data are available or can be estimated (Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Republic of Türkiye, the United Kingdom and the United States; the European Union is the 20th member of the G20 but is not included in the calculation). The G20 average is not computed if data for both China and India are not available.

OECD, EU25 and G20 averages and totals can be significantly affected by missing data. In the case of some countries, data may not be available for specific indicators, or specific categories may not apply. Therefore, readers should keep in mind that the term “OECD/EU25/G20 average” refers to the OECD, EU25 or G20 countries included in the respective comparisons. OECD, EU25 and G20 averages are not calculated if more than 40% of countries have missing information or have information included in other columns. In this case, a regular average is presented, which corresponds to the arithmetic mean of the estimates included in the table or figure.

Classification of levels of education

The classification of levels of education is based on the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED), an instrument for compiling statistics on education internationally. ISCED 2011 was formally adopted in November 2011 and is the basis of the levels presented in this publication.

Table A lists the ISCED 2011 levels used in *Education at a Glance 2026* (OECD/Eurostat/UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2015[2]).

Table A. Education levels under the ISCED 2011 classification

Terms used in this publication	ISCED classification
Early childhood education Refers to early childhood programmes that have an intentional education component and aim to develop cognitive, physical and socio-emotional skills necessary for participation in school and society. Programmes at this level are often differentiated by age.	ISCED 0 (sub-categories: 01 for early childhood educational development and 02 for pre-primary education)
Primary education Designed to provide a sound basic education in reading, writing and mathematics and a basic understanding of some other subjects. Entry age: between 5 and 7. Typical duration: six years.	ISCED 1
Lower secondary education Completes provision of basic education, usually in a more subject-oriented way with more specialist teachers. Programmes may differ by orientation, general or vocational, though this is less common than at upper secondary level. Entry follows completion of primary education and typical duration is three years. In some countries, the end of this level marks the end of compulsory education.	ISCED 2

Terms used in this publication	ISCED classification
Upper secondary education Stronger specialisation than at lower secondary level. Programmes offered are differentiated by orientation: general or vocational. Typical duration is three years.	ISCED 3
Post-secondary non-tertiary education Serves to broaden rather than deepen the knowledge, skills and competencies gained in upper secondary level. Programmes may be designed to increase options for participants in the labour market, for further studies at tertiary level or both. Programmes at this level are usually vocationally oriented.	ISCED 4
Short-cycle tertiary education Often designed to provide participants with professional knowledge, skills and competencies. Typically, they are practically based, occupation-specific and prepare students to enter the labour market directly. They may also provide a pathway to other tertiary education programmes (ISCED levels 6 or 7). The minimum duration is two years.	ISCED 5
Bachelor's or equivalent level Designed to provide participants with intermediate academic and/or professional knowledge, skills and competencies, leading to a first degree or equivalent qualification. Typical duration: three to four years full-time study. This level is referred to as "bachelor's" in the publication.	ISCED 6
Master's or equivalent level Stronger specialisation and more complex content than bachelor's level. Designed to provide participants with advanced academic and/or professional knowledge. May have a substantial research component. Programmes of at least five years' duration preparing for a long-first degree/qualification are included at this level if they are equivalent to a master's level programme in terms of their complexity and content. This level is referred to as "master's" in the publication.	ISCED 7
Doctoral or equivalent level Designed to lead to an advanced research qualification. Programmes at this level are devoted to advanced study and original research and exist in both academic and professional fields. This level is referred as "doctoral" in the publication.	ISCED 8

In some indicators, intermediate programmes are also used. These correspond to recognised qualifications from ISCED 2011 level programmes which are not considered as sufficient for ISCED 2011 completion and are classified at a lower ISCED 2011 level.

Fields of education and training

Within ISCED, programmes and related qualifications can be classified by field of education and training as well as by level. Following the adoption of ISCED 2011, a separate review and global consultation process took place on the ISCED fields of education. The ISCED fields were revised, and the UNESCO General Conference adopted the ISCED 2013 Fields of Education and Training classification (ISCED-F 2013) (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2014[3]) in November 2013 at its 37th session. The broad ISCED-F fields considered in this publication are education; arts and humanities; social sciences, journalism and information; business, administration and law; natural sciences, mathematics and statistics; information and communication technologies; engineering, manufacturing and construction; and health and welfare. Throughout this publication, the term "field of study" is used to refer to the different fields of this classification. The term STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) refers to the aggregation of the broad fields of natural sciences, mathematics and statistics; information and communication technologies; and engineering, manufacturing and construction.

Standard error (S.E.)

Some of the statistical estimates presented in this report are based on samples of adults, rather than values that could be calculated if every person in the target population in every country had answered every question. Therefore, each estimate has a degree of uncertainty associated with sampling and measurement error, which can be expressed as a standard error. The use of confidence intervals is a way to make inferences about the population means and proportions in a manner that reflects the uncertainty associated with the sample estimates. In this report, confidence intervals are stated at a 95% level. In other words, the result for the corresponding population would lie within the

confidence interval in 95 out of 100 replications of the measurement on different samples drawn from the same population.

In tables showing standard errors, the column with the heading "%" indicates the average percentage, and the column with the heading "S.E." indicates the standard error. Given the survey method, there is a sampling uncertainty in the percentages (%) of twice the standard error (S.E.). For example, for the values % = 10 and S.E. = 2.6, 10% has a 95% confidence interval of approximately twice (1.96) the standard error of 2.6. Thus, the true percentage would probably (error risk of 5%) be somewhere between 5% and 15% ("confidence interval"). The confidence interval is calculated as: $\% +/-1.96 * S.E.$, i.e. for the previous example, $10\% - 1.96 * 2.6 = 5\%$ and $10\% + 1.96 * 2.6 = 15\%$.

Flags for missing data and abbreviations

These statistical flags and abbreviations are used in the tables and figures:

a	Data are not applicable because the category does not apply.
b	There is a break in the series.
c	There are too few observations to provide reliable estimates.
d	Includes data from another category.
m	Data are not available – either missing or the indicator could not be computed due to low respondent numbers.
q	Data have been withdrawn at the request of the country concerned.
r	Values are below a certain reliability threshold and should be interpreted with caution.
u	Partial data
x	Data are included in another category or column of the table (e.g. x(2) means that data are included in Column 2 of the table).

Further resources

Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en) provides information on the methods used to calculate the indicators, on the interpretation of the indicators in the respective national contexts, and on the data sources involved. All post-production changes to this publication are listed at: https://www.oecd.org/about/publishing/corrigenda.htm (corrections).

Education at a Glance uses the OECD's *StatLink* service. A URL at the end of each chapter leads to a corresponding Excel file containing the underlying data for the chapter. These URLs are stable and will not change. In addition, readers of the *Education at a Glance* e-book will be able to click directly on these links and the workbook will open in a separate window.

The *Education Database* on the OECD Data Explorer (http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s/) provides the raw data and indicators presented in *Education at a Glance*, as well as the metadata that provide context and explanations for countries' data. It allows users to break down data in more ways than is possible in this publication in order to conduct their own analyses of education systems in participating countries. It is also updated at regular intervals.

Layout of tables

In all tables, the numbers in parentheses at the top of the columns are used for reference. When a consecutive number does not appear, that column is available online through the *StatLink* indicated at the end of the chapter.

Abbreviations used in this report

Acronym	Definition
AES	Adult Education Survey

Acronym	Definition
ECEC	Early childhood education and care
EEA	European Economic Area
ESS	European Social Survey
GDP	Gross domestic product
ICT	Information and communication technologies
ISCED	International Standard Classification of Education
LFD	Master's long-first degree
NEET	Neither employed nor in education or training
NPV	Net present value
PIAAC	Survey of Adult Skills
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
PPP	Purchasing power parity
R&D	Research and development
S.E.	Standard error
STEM	Science, technology, engineering and mathematics
TALIS	Teaching and Learning International Survey
UIS	UNESCO Institute of Statistics
UOE	Refers to the data collection managed by the three organisations, UNESCO, OECD, Eurostat
VET	Vocational education and training

References

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [1]

OECD/Eurostat/UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2015), *ISCED 2011 Operational Manual: Guidelines for Classifying National Education Programmes and Related Qualifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264228368-en. [2]

UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2014), *ISCED Fields of Education and Training 2013 (ISCED-F 2013): Manual to Accompany the International Standard Classificiation of Education 2011*, UNESCO Institute for Statistics, Montreal, https://doi.org/10.15220/978-92-9189-150-4-en. [3]



Executive Summary

Education at a Glance provides internationally comparable data on education systems across the world, covering attainment, enrolment, finance and the organisation of education systems. The 2026 edition has a special focus on teacher shortages, examining their impact across countries and how education systems can respond.

Teacher shortages are a widespread concern

Labour shortages in high-skilled professions are common across OECD countries and the teaching profession is no exception. In some countries, teacher shortages show up through high numbers of unfilled positions: in Latvia and Luxembourg, around 4% of all teaching positions in secondary education were unfilled at the start of the 2024/25 school year. However, in most other countries with available data, the share of unfilled vacancies is below 3% and often below 1%. More commonly, teacher shortages are reflected in the share of teachers who are not fully qualified, as education systems recruit teachers without the standard teaching qualifications to fill open positions. On average across OECD countries, 9.1% of all teachers in primary and secondary education were not fully qualified in 2024/25. In some systems, staffing pressures are exacerbated by high levels of temporary absences among teachers. For example, the share of teachers who were absent for more than two months during the 2024/25 school year reached 11% in Austria and 9% in Korea.

Although most education systems in the OECD face some teacher shortages, they are not evenly distributed. In some countries, such as Norway, shortages are particularly acute in remote rural regions, while in others they predominantly affect individual schools, often in disadvantaged areas. Almost everywhere, shortages are more pronounced in some subjects than in others, with mathematics and natural sciences particularly affected. In contrast, teacher shortages are less widespread in arts, social studies and physical education.

Education systems have tools to increase the supply of teachers

Education systems can attract strong candidates to the teaching profession in multiple ways. Working conditions, including salaries and working hours, matter, but the attractiveness of the profession depends on a much broader range of factors. Relationships with students, parents and school leaders, the school climate, professional autonomy and public recognition of the profession all influence the job satisfaction of teachers.

On average across the OECD, 85% of teachers express satisfaction with their jobs, similar to those in other professions. However, there are significant differences across countries. In Japan, one of the countries with the lowest number of unfilled vacancies, primary, secondary and vocational teachers are 20 percentage points more likely to be satisfied with their jobs than workers in other professions, while in Chile, one of the country with the highest share of vacancies, they are 21 percentage points less likely than other workers to be satisfied with their jobs.

Another means of addressing shortages is to offer mid-career professionals in other sectors well-designed pathways into teaching, which can also help to diversify the teaching profession. Countries such as Australia and the Netherlands, where more than 15% of lower secondary teachers are second-career teachers, offer flexible entry

routes that combine employment-based training and recognition of prior experience. However, other countries lack any such structured pathways, and in many the share of second-career teachers is in the low single digits.

Teacher shortages reflect broader labour-market pressures

Even if they use all the levers available to increase teacher supply, education systems are unlikely to eliminate shortages altogether. Teacher shortages partly reflect economy-wide shortages of skilled workers driven by a combination of structural and cyclical factors, such as population ageing and the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. Recruiting teachers becomes more challenging if fewer people are entering the labour market and employment opportunities outside of education are plentiful.

Indeed, labour shortages in other sectors are often more severe than in teaching. Although vacancy rates are difficult to compare across sectors, the data suggest that they are higher in the overall economy than in the teaching profession in more than half the countries with available data. As long as economy-wide skills shortages persist, education systems are likely to face challenges in recruiting staff as they compete with other sectors for a limited number of workers. Like other sectors, education will therefore also face growing pressure to improve productivity and make more effective use of its workforce. Technology, greater use of specialised support staff and new ways of organising teaching may help teachers to devote a larger share of their time to the tasks where their expertise adds the greatest value.

Declining enrolment will not automatically ease shortages

Education systems must also respond to staffing challenges by becoming more flexible in how they allocate teachers. This will become even more important as demographic trends reshape both the demand for and supply of teachers. Across the OECD, the number of children aged 5-14 is projected to fall by 9% between 2024 and 2033. This decline in student numbers might alleviate teacher shortages and offer education systems an opportunity to reassess teacher deployment. However, trends over the past decade have shown that declining enrolment does not always reduce demand for teachers, as many countries have maintained or even increased the number of teachers and classes as student numbers fell.

It will also be important to align teaching positions with changing student numbers to prevent teacher shortages from worsening in the face of an ageing workforce, as 25% of secondary teachers across the OECD are aged 55 or older and therefore close to retirement. Unless managed effectively, declining student numbers and teacher retirements could deepen shortages in some regions or schools while leading to class sizes that are financially unsustainable in others.

Changing labour markets create challenges beyond teacher shortages

Labour markets shape education systems not only through their ability to recruit teachers but also through the value they place on qualifications. Education systems must ensure that the qualifications they provide remain relevant as the demand for skills evolves in response to technological change. In this context, recent developments in unemployment rates by educational attainment warrant attention.

Between 2023 and 2025, the unemployment rate among tertiary-educated young adults (25-34 year-olds) rose by 0.4 percentage points on average across the OECD. Over the same period, the average unemployment rate among young adults with upper secondary attainment fell by 0.2 percentage points, narrowing the gap between the two from 2.4 to 1.8 percentage points. This is notable because it is the first period since the data series began in 2000 in which average unemployment rose among tertiary-educated young adults but fell among those with upper secondary qualifications.

These trends are sometimes attributed to artificial intelligence reducing labour-market demand for young tertiary graduates. However, tertiary qualifications still provide substantial labour-market benefits, and the evidence for a lasting AI-driven shift in the demand for skills remains limited. Given the potentially far-reaching implications of such a shift, education systems need to monitor labour-market indicators closely and be prepared to respond if there are signs that the labour-market advantage of tertiary qualifications is weakening.

Chapter 1. Teacher shortages and the attractiveness of the teaching profession

Highlights

Teacher shortages and alternative staffing arrangements

- As national regulations and teacher certification systems differ across countries, the status and qualification levels of non-fully qualified teachers also vary. On average across OECD countries, 9.1% of teachers in primary and secondary education are non-fully qualified, with shares exceeding 18% in Chile, Denmark, Estonia and Germany. Between 2017/18 and 2024/25, around two-thirds of countries with available trend data recorded increases in the share of non-fully qualified teachers, although these were often only moderate.
- Reliance on non-fully qualified teachers tends to be greater in secondary than in primary education, likely reflecting greater recruitment difficulties linked to subject specialisation requirements. Among the 16 countries with available data, 11 reported shortages in mathematics and natural sciences teachers at secondary level. The available data suggest no systematic relationship between the stringency of qualification requirements and the prevalence of non-fully qualified teachers across countries.
- Second-career teachers - defined here as teachers with at least 10 years of work experience outside education before entering teaching - represent an important complementary recruitment pool in some countries. On average, they account for 8% of lower secondary teachers across OECD countries, with shares exceeding 16% in Australia, Bulgaria, Iceland, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United States, compared to less than 1% in Korea, Japan, Saudi Arabia and Türkiye.
- Institution-level data reveal strong regional disparities in teacher shortages within countries. Particularly high shares of non-fully qualified teachers are observed in some regions, including Chañaral in Chile (40.2%), the Brussels region in the Flemish Community of Belgium (20.2%) and the Jerusalem District in Israel (18.1%).
- Although a high share of non-fully qualified teachers often reflects recruitment challenges, alternative certification routes and second-career entrants can also diversify the teaching workforce and bring valuable professional expertise, particularly in shortage subjects and upper secondary vocational education.

Measuring and managing staffing pressures

- Measuring teacher shortages remains complex, as countries use different methodologies and observe shortages at different stages of the recruitment process. Some systems estimate shortages before or at the start of the school year based on projected staffing needs, the expected supply of new teachers or the results of competitive examinations in centralised recruitment systems. Others measure shortages more directly through positions that remain vacant at or shortly after the school year has begun. Despite growing recruitment difficulties, unfilled vacancies in primary and secondary education combined still represent less than 4% of total teaching positions in all participating countries and economies.

- Teacher absenteeism during the school year and difficulties replacing absent teachers can also create significant staffing pressures and disrupt continuity of instruction. School principals in PISA 2022 reported that 27% of students across the OECD attended schools where learning was hindered by teacher absenteeism "to some extent" or "a lot". In 2024/25, more than 8% of fully qualified teachers were temporarily absent for more than two months in Austria, Korea and Ireland, compared to less than 2% in Estonia, the Flemish Community of Belgium and the Slovak Republic.

Teacher retention, attrition and ageing

- On average across OECD countries and economies, 6.4% of fully qualified teachers in primary and secondary education left the profession in 2024/25, with particularly high attrition rates in Denmark (14.5%, upper secondary data are not available), Latvia (12.0%), the French Community of Belgium (11.6%), Brazil (10.3%) and Finland (9.1%).
- Teacher attrition tends to be higher in pre-primary education than in primary and secondary education combined (8.6% versus 6.4% on average), possibly reflecting lower salaries, different working conditions and greater competition with other sectors employing early childhood education staff.
- Early-career attrition represents an important workforce challenge in several education systems, although some turnover during the first years of a career is not unusual. Teachers with less than five years of experience account for more than one-third of resignations in primary and secondary education on average across OECD countries and economies, reaching 77% in Israel, 69% in Austria, 66% in the French Community of Belgium and 64% in Luxembourg.
- The teaching workforce is ageing in many countries. Between 2015 and 2024, the share of teachers aged 55 and over increased from 20% to 23% in primary and secondary education across OECD countries. In 2024, ageing pressures were particularly strong in Estonia, Italy, Lithuania, Latvia and Portugal, where the share of teachers aged 55 and over was among the highest.

Teacher shortages and wider labour-market dynamics

- Comparisons between teacher vacancy rates and overall labour market vacancy rates suggest that teacher shortages are often linked to broader labour-market tensions affecting the economy as a whole. In several countries, including for instance Austria, Belgium, Canada, and the Netherlands, labour shortages are more severe in the wider economy than in the teaching profession.
- Some countries nevertheless face more acute recruitment difficulties in teaching than in the overall labour market, notably Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg and Romania, highlighting the continuing importance of teaching-specific factors such as qualification requirements, working conditions and the attractiveness of the profession.
- Teachers are often older than similarly highly educated workers in the wider labour market. This pattern is particularly pronounced in countries such as France, Greece and Hungary, where the share of secondary teachers who are aged 55 and over substantially exceeds the share of employed adults holding at least a master's degree who are in that age group.
- Countries with lower turnover in the labour market also tend to see fewer teachers aged 30-49 years old who say they intend to leave teaching in the next five years. This pattern is particularly obvious in Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Italy, Portugal, Romania and Spain, where above-average levels of long-term job tenure in the overall workforce are combined with below-average shares of teachers intending to leave the profession.

Factors shaping teacher supply and the attractiveness of the profession

- How teachers enter the teaching profession varies considerably across countries, with systems ranging from centralised competitive examinations in countries such as Korea, France and Romania to more decentralised school-level recruitment in countries and economies such as England (United Kingdom), Latvia and Lithuania.

- Working conditions shape teaching's attractiveness and retention rates. For example, between 2018 and 2024, the share of lower secondary teachers working in schools where more than 10% of students have special education needs increased from 30% to 45% across OECD countries, while the share reporting frequent classroom disruption also increased substantially.
- Teachers' perceptions of the profession reveal a strong contrast between their negative perceptions of how society values them and relatively positive perceptions of their employment conditions. Across OECD countries, only 22% of teachers feel that teaching is valued in society.
- Teachers often report substantially higher satisfaction with their employment conditions than with their salaries. Across OECD countries, 68% of lower secondary teachers are satisfied with their employment conditions excluding salaries, compared to only 39% who are satisfied with their salaries.
- Although many teachers report low satisfaction with their salaries, TALIS 2024 shows that the vast majority nevertheless believe that the advantages of being a teacher outweigh the disadvantages. This suggests that the attractiveness of the profession depends on a broader set of factors than salary alone.
- Teachers' working conditions are broadly comparable to those of other highly educated workers in several dimensions, including working hours and time pressure. Teachers participate more frequently in professional development, while also reporting greater unmet demand for training opportunities.

Demographic change, staffing adjustments and future pressures

- OECD countries are facing contrasting demographic trends among children aged 5-14, corresponding broadly to the compulsory school-age population in many countries. While some countries, such as Israel and Luxembourg, continue to experience growth in this age group, many others – including Korea, Greece, Japan and Italy – are already facing substantial demographic declines.
- Changes in student populations do not automatically translate into proportional reductions in teacher numbers. Between 2015 and 2024, the number of students in primary education remained broadly stable across OECD countries (+2%), while the number of teachers increased by around 13%, leading to a decline of around 9% in the number of students per teacher. Many countries also maintained stable or increasing numbers of classes over this period, reflecting efforts to preserve smaller classes, maintain geographical access to education or increase inclusion.
- Demographic change is expected to have an increasing impact on education systems over the coming decade. On average across OECD countries, the population aged 5-14 is projected to decline by around 9% between 2024 and 2033, compared to around 3% among children aged 4 years or younger. While some countries are expected to continue experiencing demographic growth, most will experience declining school-age populations. Demographic change may ease recruitment pressures in some systems but will also require difficult decisions about the allocation of education resources and the organisation of education provision.

Context

Teacher shortages have become a major policy concern across OECD and partner countries, but the nature, intensity and underlying causes of these shortages vary considerably across education systems. Teacher shortages are multidimensional and extend beyond unfilled vacancies alone. Their effects can also be seen through increasing reliance on non-fully qualified teachers, difficulties replacing absent staff, territorial and subject-specific disparities, rising early-career attrition, workforce ageing and growing challenges in retaining experienced teachers. In some contexts, persistent shortages may also reduce selectivity in teacher recruitment, leading schools or education systems to recruit candidates with lower levels of preparation, experience or subject-specific expertise than would otherwise be expected. When persistent, teacher shortages can affect both the quality and equity of education by limiting students' access to fully qualified teachers and increasing disparities between schools, subjects and regions. In several countries, shortages are particularly acute in secondary education and in subjects related to science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM), while disadvantaged and remote schools often face the greatest recruitment difficulties.

The attractiveness of teaching is shaped by factors, such as workload, student-teacher relationships, classroom complexity, working conditions and professional recognition, but teacher shortages also need to be analysed within the broader labour-market context. In many countries, recruitment difficulties in education reflect economy-wide shortages of skilled workers, driven by a combination of structural and cyclical factors, such as population ageing and the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. Recruiting teachers becomes more challenging if fewer people are entering the labour market and employment opportunities outside of education are plentiful. Like other sectors, education will therefore also face growing pressure to improve productivity and make more effective use of its workforce. Technology, greater use of specialised support staff and new ways of organising teaching may help teachers to devote a larger share of their time to the tasks where their expertise adds the greatest value.

Alongside these labour-market pressures, demographic change is adding further complexity to these challenges. Although student numbers have remained roughly stable on average across the OECD in the past decade, they are projected to decline in many countries over the coming decade. Falling enrolment is not always systematically translated into lower teacher numbers or fewer classes. Many education systems have instead maintained or expanded staffing levels in order to reduce class sizes, strengthen inclusion policies or preserve territorial access to education. These patterns highlight that teacher demand is shaped not only by demographic trends, but also by policy choices, territorial constraints and educational objectives.

Analysis

Teacher shortages: Current manifestations and long-term pressures

Teacher shortages arise when the supply of teachers is insufficient to meet the demand for teachers in schools. This mismatch may concern not only the overall number of teachers required, but also the availability of teachers with the appropriate qualifications, subject specialisations or geographical distribution to meet education system needs. Because these imbalances cannot always be observed directly, they may manifest themselves in different ways across education systems. Some are reflected in recruitment difficulties, unfilled vacancies or reliance on non-fully qualified teachers. Others stem from longer-term challenges related to workforce ageing, teacher attrition and difficulties renewing the profession. This section examines both the immediate manifestations of shortages and the structural pressures affecting teacher supply over time.

Reliance on non-fully qualified teachers

Most education systems rely at least partly on non-fully qualified teachers, substitute teachers and teachers who have joined via non-traditional routes. The growing use of these staffing arrangements illustrates how education systems adapt to recruitment difficulties and maintain continuity of instruction despite shortages of fully qualified teachers.

Non-fully qualified teachers refer to individuals who do not yet meet all national requirements to be considered fully qualified teachers. This category includes teachers lacking the required academic qualifications, certification or pedagogical training; or individuals enrolled in alternative certification routes who have not yet obtained full teacher qualifications (see also Chapter D6 of *Education at a Glance 2022* (OECD, 2022[1])). Teachers who are still in the process of acquiring full qualification are considered a subset of non-fully qualified teachers and are also identified separately in Table 1. As national regulations and teacher certification systems differ across countries, the status and qualification levels of non-fully qualified teachers also vary. Cross-country comparisons should therefore be interpreted with caution (see *Definitions* section).

The share of non-fully qualified teachers in the teaching workforce, measured in full-time equivalents, varies considerably across public primary and secondary education across OECD countries. In 2024/25, the category of non-fully qualified teachers did not exist in Japan and Korea, where teachers must be fully qualified before entering the profession. In contrast, non-fully qualified teachers accounted for more than 18% of the teaching workforce in Chile, Denmark, Estonia and Germany, compared to an OECD average of 9.1% across both levels of education. In Denmark, the large proportion partly reflects the fact that many non-fully qualified teachers are university students taking a sabbatical year. They are often employed part time to help address staffing needs within a relatively flexible recruitment system (Figure 1 and Table 1).

Although a high share of non-fully qualified teachers often reflects recruitment challenges, in some systems it also reflects deliberate recruitment policies aimed at diversifying the profiles of the teaching workforce. This is particularly the case in upper secondary vocational education, where recruitment practices facilitate the entry of experienced professionals from industry into

vocational teaching. In countries such as Austria, Chile and the Flemish Community of Belgium, some of these professionals may complete their pedagogical training after entering the profession. While these pathways can help address teacher shortages, they also broaden the range of professional profiles within the teaching workforce and strengthen the links between vocational education and the labour market (INES database).

In Germany, however, the relatively high share of non-fully qualified teachers in upper secondary vocational education, compared to upper secondary general education, largely reflects the composition of the teaching workforce in vocational schools. In addition to teachers with a master's degree (ISCED level 7 qualification), subject-specific teachers and teachers of practical subjects are hired for certain subjects or types of vocational schools. In most Länder, the term *Fachlehrkräfte* refers to teachers of specific general education and vocational subjects, primarily in the arts or technical fields. The term *Lehrkräfte für Fachpraxis* refers to teachers at vocational schools who come from relevant occupational backgrounds and provide practical instruction. Depending on the applicable regulations, both *Fachlehrkräfte* and *Lehrkräfte für Fachpraxis* may complete a preparatory service. Although both generally hold a bachelor's degree (ISCED level 6 qualification), they are considered fully qualified under national standards.


In 17 out of the 25 countries and economies with available trend data, the proportion of non-fully qualified teachers in primary and secondary education increased between 2017/18 and 2024/25, suggesting that education systems have become more reliant on alternative staffing arrangements to address recruitment difficulties. These increases were particularly marked (more than 5 percentage points) in Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland and the French Community of Belgium. In contrast, a few countries recorded declining shares over the period, including Costa Rica, Hungary, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden (Figure 1 and Table 1).

Across countries and economies, a significant share of non-fully qualified teachers in primary and secondary education are in the process of acquiring a full teaching qualification, suggesting that they will not necessarily remain outside qualification pathways in the longer term. All non-fully qualified teachers in public institutions are in this category in Hungary, Latvia and the Republic of Türkiye, where they account for 100% of non-fully qualified teachers in primary and secondary education. Expressed in full-time equivalents, the corresponding shares are 91% in Poland, 57% in Romania and 55% in Luxembourg. At the other end of the scale, the share is much lower in Lithuania (5%), Ireland (19%), England (United Kingdom) (10%) and Norway (14%) (Table 1). In Ireland, however, this share rises to 33% when teachers are measured by headcount rather than in full-time equivalents, reflecting differences in working patterns between the two groups of teachers. These differences suggest that the profile of non-fully qualified teachers varies substantially across education systems. In some countries, non-fully qualified teachers are primarily prospective fully qualified teachers completing the practical or pedagogical components of their initial teacher education, reflecting the organisation of teacher preparation rather than teacher shortages. In others, a larger share of non-fully qualified teachers may reflect greater reliance on alternative entry routes or other recruitment arrangements to meet staffing needs.

The share of non-fully qualified teachers in public institutions also tends to increase between primary and secondary education. However, this overall pattern masks substantial differences across countries. Around 50% of countries and economies with comparable data report a higher share of non-fully qualified teachers at secondary level than at primary. The differences are particularly large in France (2.6% in primary education compared to 11.1% in secondary education), the French Community of Belgium (5.9% compared to 20.6%), Lithuania (11.1% compared to 17.6%) and Sweden (11.1% compared to 16.4%). This pattern likely reflects greater recruitment difficulties at higher levels of education, where subject specialisation requirements are more demanding. Competition from other sectors may also be stronger, particularly in STEM-related fields. However, there are some countries, such as Costa Rica, Czechia, Finland, Germany, Israel, Luxembourg and Poland, where the shares are higher in primary education than in secondary, suggesting that shortages may affect levels of education differently across countries and economies (Table 1).

Figure 1. Trends in the share of non-fully qualified teachers in primary and secondary education (2017/18 and 2024/25)

In per cent, full-time equivalents, public institutions



1. Year of reference differs from 2024/25: academic year 2023/24 for Denmark, Finland, France, Germany and Switzerland; calendar year 2024 for Chile and Costa Rica; calendar year 2025 for New Zealand; academic year 2025/26 for Japan.
2. Pre-primary and primary education are combined in France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. Upper secondary education is excluded in Denmark, Israel and Switzerland. Upper secondary vocational education is excluded in Finland, Hungary and the Netherlands.
3. Teacher data are based on headcounts instead of full-time equivalents.
4. Year of reference differs from 2017/18: academic year 2018/19 for Bulgaria, the Netherlands, and Switzerland; 2019/20 for Luxembourg and Poland; calendar year 2020 for New Zealand.
5. Including government-dependent private institutions.
6. Teachers classified as non-fully qualified in these countries are in the process of acquiring full qualification.
The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw. For data, see Table 1.

The reliance on non-fully qualified teachers is even more widespread in pre-primary education. On average across OECD countries, 11.0% of teachers in public institutions at this level are non-fully qualified, compared to 8.2% in primary education and 9.2% in secondary education. In Chile, Denmark, Finland, Germany and New Zealand, more than 20% of teachers in pre-primary education are non-fully qualified (Table 1).

These findings raise important questions about how non-fully qualified teachers are trained, supported and integrated into the profession across all levels of education, particularly when they are recruited to teach specialised subjects or fill persistent staffing gaps. The prevalence of non-fully qualified teachers reflects not only recruitment difficulties but also differences across countries in qualification requirements, training pathways and workforce regulations. However, it should be noted that the available data do not suggest a systematic relationship between the stringency of qualification requirements and the share of non-fully qualified teachers. For example, Denmark, Estonia and Finland, where teachers are generally required to hold a master's degree, combine relatively demanding qualification requirements with comparatively high shares of non-fully qualified teachers. By contrast, Japan and Korea also have highly demanding qualification systems, but require all teachers to obtain a full teaching qualification before entering the profession. As a result, non-fully qualified teachers are not employed in these two countries (Chapter D5 and Table 1).


Complementing traditional recruitment with second-career teachers

As well as relying on non-fully qualified teachers, many education systems have also expanded recruitment to encompass new profiles of entrants into the profession, particularly individuals with prior professional experience outside education who enter teaching through flexible or accelerated pathways. Depending on the education system, these second-career teachers may enter the profession directly with the status of fully qualified teachers, or may first need to obtain full qualification through traditional or alternative certification routes (OECD, 2026[2]; OECD, 2025[3]). They may help broaden the pool of potential recruits in areas where there are persistent shortages, while also bringing valuable professional experience and practical perspectives into the classroom.

The prevalence of second-career teachers in public and private institutions varies substantially across countries. Figure 2 shows that, on average across the OECD, 8.4% of lower secondary teachers are second-career teachers, defined as those with at least ten years of work experience outside teaching and for whom teaching was not a first career choice. However, the share varies considerably across countries. The highest proportions are observed in Iceland (20.9%), New Zealand (17.2%), Australia (16.9%), the Netherlands (16.9%), Bulgaria (16.4%) and the United States (16.3%), where at least one in six teachers entered teaching after another career. In contrast, second-career teachers remain rare in Korea (0.9%), Japan (0.9%), Türkiye (0.9%) and Saudi Arabia (0.2%) (Figure 2). Korea, Japan and Türkiye are also among the countries reporting relatively limited recruitment difficulties for fully qualified teachers, as measured by the indicators presented in Table 2, which may partly explain the lower need to attract second-career entrants into the profession. More generally, the importance of second-career entry and alternative pathways into teaching varies across education systems and depends, among other factors, on the availability of fully qualified teachers and the extent of teacher shortages.

Figure 2. Share of second-career teachers among all lower secondary teachers (2024)

In per cent, results based on teachers' responses, Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS)



Note: Second-career teachers are teachers for whom teaching was not a first career choice and who have at least 10 years of work experience in non-education roles.
1. Estimates should be interpreted with caution due to higher risk of non-response bias.
The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Over half of the countries and economies with available data (16 out of 28) have introduced structured pathways tailored to second-career teachers (OECD, 2026[2]; OECD, 2025[3]). These pathways generally combine employment-based routes, accelerated pedagogical training, recognition of prior professional experience or special certification procedures.

Countries with relatively high shares of second-career teachers, such as Australia and the Netherlands, often combine flexible entry routes with employment-based training and recognition of prior experience. In Australia, for example, the High Achieving Teachers Program provides employment-based pathways into teaching for individuals, including professionals from other sectors,

enabling them to complete their teacher training while being paid and working in schools experiencing teacher workforce shortages. Similar models exist in Latvia, the Flemish Community of Belgium and Switzerland. Other countries, such as Denmark and Switzerland, recognise prior professional experience to shorten or adapt teacher preparation programmes (OECD, 2026[2]; OECD, 2025[3]).

The effectiveness of these pathways depends not only on attracting candidates, but also on the quality of preparation and support provided to entrants. Many programmes combine accelerated pedagogical preparation with supervised teaching practice, mentoring and induction support during the first years in the profession (OECD, 2026[2]; OECD, 2025[3]). This is particularly important for second-career teachers, who may bring strong professional expertise but less classroom experience. Several countries also use these pathways selectively to address shortages in hard-to-staff subjects, disadvantaged schools or rural areas.

Despite growing interest in attracting professionals from other sectors, many countries still do not systematically identify second-career teachers in their education statistics. Strengthening data collection in this area could help countries better understand the contribution of second-career entrants to addressing teacher shortages and diversifying the teaching workforce.

Recruitment difficulties, vacancies and territorial disparities

Another important way to assess teacher shortages is to examine the extent to which systems are unable to recruit teachers to fill available positions. Indicators such as the share of unfilled teacher vacancies provide more direct insight into staffing pressures and the capacity of education systems to attract qualified teachers.

The unfilled teacher vacancy rate measures the number of vacant teaching positions relative to the total number of teaching positions in public institutions, regardless of whether occupied posts are filled by fully or non-fully qualified teachers. Based on the data available for primary and secondary education combined, the extent of teacher shortages varies considerably across countries and according to the methodology used to estimate staffing needs (see Box 1).

Box 1. Comparing teacher vacancy rates across countries: Methodological considerations

Cross-country comparisons of unfilled vacancies in public institutions should be interpreted with caution, as countries do not necessarily measure recruitment difficulties using the same methodologies or at the same stage of the recruitment process (see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Broadly speaking, countries and economies can be divided into two groups based on their approaches to recording teacher vacancies. The first (Group 1) estimates shortages before or at the start of the school year based on projected recruitment needs. In countries with competitive examinations for entry into the teaching profession, shortages may be estimated using the results of these examinations and the number of available positions determined in advance. This is the case in France, Korea, Luxembourg, Romania and Türkiye. Other countries and economies, such as Argentina, Austria and the French Community of Belgium, estimate potential shortages based on the expected number of graduates from teacher education programmes relative to anticipated staffing needs. In both cases, education systems may anticipate shortages and recruit non-fully qualified teachers or implement alternative staffing arrangements before the beginning of the school year.

The second approach is to measure shortages more directly through the number of positions that remain vacant at the start of the school year or shortly after it begins (Group 2). Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, England (United Kingdom), the Flemish Community of Belgium, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, the Netherlands, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Sweden take this approach. In most of these systems, teachers are recruited directly by schools and shortages are measured based on advertised vacancies or positions that schools were unable to fill.


However, a few of the countries in Group 2 use alternative approaches to estimate staffing needs, particularly where data on advertised vacancies are not systematically available. In Sweden, shortages are estimated through a workplace survey conducted in the third quarter of 2024, broadly corresponding to the beginning of the school year, in which respondents report the number of staff lacking in each occupation regardless of recruitment efforts. In Chile, shortages are estimated based on the number of required teaching hours that remain unfilled because of a lack of teachers, rather than on the number of vacant positions.

Among countries and economies in Group 1, the share of unfilled teaching positions in 2024/25 in primary and secondary education combined ranges from 0% in Korea and Türkiye to 3.6% in Luxembourg. Relatively high shares compared to other

participating countries and economies are also observed in Romania (2.8%) and the French Community of Belgium (2.3%), while France reports comparatively low levels (0.4%). In Group 2, vacancy rates range from 0.3% in Bulgaria to 3.0% in Latvia. Chile (2.9%), Ireland (2.2%), the Flemish Community of Belgium (2.1%) and the Netherlands (2.0%) also report comparatively elevated levels of unfilled positions. In absolute terms, the number of unfilled vacancies ranges from fewer than 200 positions in Bulgaria to over 5 000 in Canada. Although such figures may appear substantial and are often highlighted in media coverage, expressed as a share of total teaching positions, vacancy levels remain below 4% in all participating countries and economies (Figure 3 and Table 2).

Figure 3. Unfilled teaching vacancies in primary and secondary education (2024/25)

In per cent, full-time and part-time, public institutions



1. Pre-primary and primary education are combined in France, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. Primary and lower secondary education are combined in Chile. Excluding upper secondary vocational education in the Netherlands.
2. Year of reference differs from 2024/25: academic year 2022/23 for Argentina and French Community of Belgium; academic year 2023/24 for France; calendar year 2024 for Chile; academic year 2025/26 for Japan.
3. Expressed in full-time equivalents. In the Netherlands, excluding hidden shortages, i.e. positions that were filled in undesired ways (6 006 positions in primary education and 2 538 in secondary education).
4. Including government-dependent private institutions.
The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Among countries and economies with trend data for unfilled teaching vacancies at primary and secondary level combined, both the number and the share generally increased between 2017/18 and 2024/25. These increases were particularly marked in Latvia, where vacancy rates rose from 1.0% to 3.0%, and in the Flemish Community of Belgium, where they increased from 0.6% to

2.1%. Canada, England (United Kingdom), France and Japan also recorded increases in both absolute terms and relative to all teaching posts over the period. Korea and Türkiye are the two only countries reporting no unfilled vacancies in either year. Luxembourg is the only country with available comparable data showing a decline, with the share of shortages falling from 4.6% in 2017/18 to 3.6% in 2024/25 (Table 2). These trends suggest that recruitment difficulties have intensified in two-thirds of the countries and economies with available information (6 out of 9) over recent years, despite the increasing use of alternative staffing arrangements described in the previous section.

The data also reveal notable differences between primary and secondary education (Figure 3). In a majority of countries and economies with available data by level, vacancy rates in public institutions are higher in secondary education than in primary education, pointing to greater recruitment difficulties at higher levels of schooling. This pattern is particularly visible in Latvia (3.9% in secondary education compared to 1.9% in primary education), Chile (3.6% versus 2.6%), the French Community of Belgium (3.1% versus 1.8%) and Romania (3.3% versus 1.5%). As well as reflecting greater difficulties attracting and retaining teachers at the higher level of education, this may also be due to subject-specific shortages in secondary education, particularly in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields (Box 2).

In contrast, a smaller number of countries report lower vacancy rates at secondary level. This is the case in Ireland (1.0% in secondary education compared to 3.2% in primary education), Sweden (0.4% versus 1.7%) and Japan (0.3% versus 0.4%). Meanwhile, England (United Kingdom), France, Korea and Türkiye report similar vacancy rates, of below 1%, across education levels (Figure 3).

Unfilled teaching vacancies in public institutions are also rarely distributed uniformly across education systems. Country-level averages may mask important disparities between regions, school types or local labour markets, with shortages often concentrated in disadvantaged, rural or remote schools. These differences highlight the importance of going beyond aggregate national indicators in examining shortages and developing targeted policy responses adapted to local staffing challenges (Box 2).

Although unfilled vacancies provide one important indicator of recruitment difficulties at the beginning of the school year, they do not fully capture the staffing pressures experienced by schools throughout the year. In particular, vacancy rates generally do not capture the impact of temporary teacher absences during the school year, such as long-term sick leave, parental leave or temporary secondments. In systems facing shortages of qualified teachers, schools may experience significant difficulties replacing absent staff, especially in specific subjects, disadvantaged schools or remote areas (see Box 3 for details of cross-country differences in teacher absenteeism and the resulting challenges during the school year).


Box 2. Teacher shortages by subject and territory

Teacher shortages are not evenly distributed across education systems and often affect specific subjects or geographical areas rather than the education system as a whole. For the purposes of this box, a shortage in a given subject or territory means at least 5% of all available teaching positions (or advertised vacancies) remain unfilled.

Of the 16 countries and economies with available data for secondary education, Estonia was the only one reporting shortages across all subjects and all territories, with most other countries identifying shortages only in selected fields or in certain regions. Shortages tend to be particularly pronounced in STEM-related subjects, with 11 countries and economies reporting shortages of fully qualified teachers in mathematics and natural sciences. Shortages were also frequently reported in second and other languages (9 countries) and in reading, writing and literature (8 countries). Shortages in arts and social studies subjects such as history and geography were reported by respectively 6 and 5 countries, while physical education and health was the least affected field, with shortages reported in only 4 countries. These differences may partly reflect stronger competition from other sectors offering more attractive salaries or career opportunities for graduates in STEM-related fields (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Reported shortages of fully qualified teachers in secondary education, by subject (2024/25)

Number of countries, public institutions




Note: A subject is considered to have teacher shortages if at least 5% of available teaching positions or advertised vacancies for the subject remain unfilled after the competitive examination or at the start of the school year.
For data, see OECD/INES database. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Another way to examine differences in teacher shortages is to analyse the concentration of non-fully qualified teachers. In Chile, over three-quarters of primary students (77%) and around seven in ten lower secondary students (69%) attended public schools where more than 10% of teachers were non-fully qualified. High shares were also observed in Israel, particularly at primary level (46%). By contrast, the shares were much lower in Ireland (4% at primary and 3% at lower secondary level), while England (United Kingdom) and Bulgaria also reported relatively limited shares. In some systems, lower secondary schools saw greater concentrations than primary schools. In the Flemish Community of Belgium, for example, 31% of lower secondary students attended schools where more than 10% of teachers were non-fully qualified, compared to 15% at primary level, possibly reflecting greater recruitment difficulties in certain secondary subjects (Figure 5).

Institution-level data also reveal strong regional differences within countries. In Chile, there were several regions where over one-third of teachers were non-fully qualified on average across primary and lower secondary education, reaching 40.2% in Chañaral and 37.5% in Última Esperanza. High shares were also observed in the Brussels-Capital Region in the Flemish Community of Belgium (20.2%) and in the Jerusalem District in Israel (18.1%). In Norway, northern and more remote regions such as Troms (11.1%), Finnmark (10.9%) and Nordland (10.5%) also reported comparatively high shares. In contrast, regional disparities appeared much smaller in Ireland, where even the regions with the highest shares remained below 3%, while no non-fully qualified teachers were reported in Latvia (Figure 5).

Figure 5. Share of students in schools with more than 10% non-fully qualified teachers and subnational regions with the highest share of non-fully qualified teachers, by education level (2024)

Based on institution-level (school register) data



Note: The colour scale in each of the maps is adjusted to the range of non-fully qualified teachers in the depicted countries and economies. This allows regional variations to be clearly distinguished. In the chart, teachers who were in the process of acquiring full qualification are excluded from the category of non-fully qualified teachers. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

These findings reinforce the view that teacher shortages are often concentrated in particular subjects, schools and regions rather than affecting education systems uniformly. This is consistent with OECD evidence showing that recruitment difficulties are often more acute in disadvantaged, rural and remote schools (OECD, 2025[4]). As a result, many countries have introduced targeted measures rather than system-wide policies. These include financial incentives for teachers working in disadvantaged or remote schools, salary supplements for shortage subjects, alternative certification pathways, targeted recruitment campaigns and incentives encouraging teachers to work in hard-to-staff schools or regions ((OECD, 2024[5]) and Table D3.10 in Chapter D3). For instance, several states and territories in Australia provide relocation support, housing assistance or financial

incentives for teachers working in remote schools (Government of South Australia, 2025[6]). In France, additional salary allowances and career incentives are available for teachers working in disadvantaged schools under the *éducation prioritaire* framework (Government of France, 2025[7]). In England (United Kingdom), bursaries and scholarship schemes have been developed to attract graduates into shortage subjects such as mathematics, chemistry, physics and computing (UK Government, 2025[8]).

Box 3. Teacher absenteeism, replacement difficulties and lost instructional time

Although teacher shortages are often measured through unfilled vacancies, another important issue concerns schools' ability to cope with teacher absences during the school year. Figure 6 shows that more than one in four 15-year-old students across the OECD (27%) attended schools whose principal reported that student learning was hindered by teacher absenteeism "to some extent" or "a lot". These results reflect principals' perceptions of the impact of teacher absenteeism on learning rather than administrative measures of teacher absence. The issue was reported more frequently in public institutions (29% on average across the OECD) than in private ones (16%), a gap of around 13 percentage points. Difficulties replacing absent teachers may further intensify staffing pressures in systems already facing recruitment challenges (Figure 6 and Table 8, available online).

The share of 15-year-old students attending schools whose principals reported that learning is hindered by teacher absenteeism varies widely across countries. Among OECD countries, the highest shares were observed in Belgium (60%), Germany (55%), Estonia (52%) and the Netherlands (51%), while levels were much lower in Lithuania (1%), Korea (3%), Japan (6%), Türkiye (6%) and Spain (7%). In most countries, 15-year-old students in public schools were more likely than those in private schools to attend schools seen as impacted by teacher absenteeism. Particularly large public-private gaps were observed in Chile (43 percentage points), Estonia (41), New Zealand (39), Slovenia (39), Australia and Costa Rica (both 31), Ireland (26), Brazil (25) and Portugal (24). These figures suggest the public sector faces greater difficulties in replacing absent teachers or ensuring instructional continuity. The gap was even wider in Argentina, a partner country, where it exceeded 50 percentage points (Figure 6 and Table 8, available online).

While the PISA data reflect principals' perceptions of the extent to which absenteeism affects learning, new data on temporary absences among teachers in public institutions collected for the first time in 2024/25 provide a more direct measure of long-term absences. Temporarily absent teachers are teachers who retain their contractual position but are not available to teach for a temporary period because they are on authorised leave (e.g. short- or long-term sick leave, maternity or parental leave, administrative leave, or temporary secondment). They are expected to return to their teaching position within the same school year or at the end of the leave period.


Some countries also monitor the extent to which absences translate into lost instructional time when schools are unable to recruit replacement teachers. For instance, the Cour des comptes in France estimated that around 9% of teaching hours were lost in public lower secondary education in 2023/24, with most of these losses linked to non-replaced teacher absences . Similar concerns have been documented in several other countries. In the United States, survey evidence indicates that difficulties in recruiting substitute teachers increased significantly following the COVID-19 pandemic, with many schools reporting instructional disruption linked to teacher absences and challenges finding replacement staff.

These findings suggest that the analysis of teacher shortages should not focus on vacant posts only, but also consider the duration of teacher absences and schools' ability to replace absent teachers and maintain stable teaching throughout the school year. Long-term teacher absences may also affect the interpretation of student-to-teaching-staff ratios, especially when absent teachers remain included in staff counts despite reduced teaching capacity during the school year (Chapter D2).

Figure 7shows the share of fully qualified teachers absent for at least two months during the school year. These data reveal substantial cross-country differences. Austria, Ireland and Korea reported the highest shares, with at least 8% of teachers temporarily absent in 2024/25, followed by Luxembourg (5.9%), the French Community of Belgium (5.8%) and Hungary (4.8%). In contrast, absenteeism rates were below 2% in Estonia, the Flemish Community of Belgium and the Slovak Republic. In Austria, the relatively high share of temporary absences is mainly attributable to parental leave. However, more than 20% are due to unpaid leave and around 10% to sabbaticals, both of which are provided for under Austrian law.

Figure 6. Share of students in schools whose principals report that learning is hindered by teacher absenteeism, by type of school (2022)


In per cent, 15-year-old students, Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)



Note: Learning is considered to be hindered in schools whose principals reported that students' learning was being hindered by teacher absenteeism "to some extent" or "a lot".
1. Differences between public and private institutions are not statistically significant.
2. Too few observations to provide reliable estimates by type of institutions.
For data, see Table 8, available online. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Figure 7. Share of fully qualified teachers in primary and secondary education who were absent for at least two months (2024/25)

In per cent, full-time and part-time, public institutions



1. The reference point is a specific moment in time (October in Sweden and November in Ireland) and therefore does not cover the full academic year. In the Flemish Community of Belgium, a temporarily absent teacher is defined as a teacher who was in service in January 2024, out of service in January 2025, and back in service in January 2026.
2. Including government-dependent private institutions. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Long-term workforce pressure

Two ways to assess long-term workforce pressures are to examine the extent to which teachers are leaving the profession (teacher attrition) and the capacity of education systems to renew their teaching workforce over time (workforce ageing).


Teachers leaving the profession

Data on teacher attrition in public institutions reveal considerable cross-country differences in the share of fully qualified teachers leaving the profession in primary and secondary education, reflecting differences in age structures, retirement patterns, working conditions and the overall attractiveness of teaching careers. On average across OECD countries and economies with available data for primary and secondary education combined, 6.4% of fully qualified teachers in public institutions left the profession in 2024/25. The highest shares were observed in in Denmark (14.5%, upper secondary data are not available), Latvia (12.0%), the French Community of Belgium (11.6%), Brazil (10.3%) and Finland (9.1%), while the lowest shares were reported in France, Ireland, Israel, Korea and Luxembourg (around 2.5% or less). These differences suggest that some systems face stronger challenges in retaining teachers and ensuring workforce continuity over time (Table 3).

The share of teachers leaving the profession also differs across levels of education. On average across OECD countries and economies with available data, the share of fully qualified teachers leaving the profession in public institutions was higher in pre-primary education (8.6%) than in primary and secondary education combined (6.%). The difference was particularly large in Lithuania, where 25.8% of fully qualified pre-primary teachers left the profession compared to 6.4% primary and secondary teachers, as well as in Norway (10.7% compared to 5.2%) and Sweden (10.5% compared to 5.7%). Higher turnover in pre-primary education may partly reflect lower salaries, different working conditions, lower qualification requirements in some systems, or stronger competition with other sectors employing early childhood education staff (Figure 8).

Figure 8. Fully qualified teachers who left the profession as a percentage of the total teaching workforce, by level of education (2024/25)

In per cent, full-time and part-time, public institutions



1. Year of reference differs from 2024/25: calendar year 2022 for Brazil; academic year 2023/24 for Denmark, Finland and France; calendar year 2024 for Chile and for New Zealand (primary and secondary education); calendar year 2025 for New Zealand (pre-primary education).
2. Pre-primary and primary education are combined in France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. Upper secondary education is excluded in Denmark and Israel. Upper secondary vocational education is excluded in Finland, Hungary and the Netherlands.
3. Including government-dependent private institutions.
The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Across OECD countries and economies with available data, the majority of teachers leaving the profession in public institutions resigned rather than retiring or finding another assignment within the education sector. As the analysis focuses on public institutions (with a few exceptions), teachers moving from public to private institutions are also counted as leaving the profession. In some countries, this may account for a significant share of departures, as observed for example in Norway (OECD/INES data collection on teacher shortages). On average across the OECD, 54% of primary and secondary teachers' departures were due to resignations, compared to 34% to retirement and 12% to moves to other roles within the public education sector. In several countries and economies, resignations accounted for a particularly large share of departures, including England (United Kingdom) (91%). However, for England (United Kingdom), the data collection period ends before many teachers reach the statutory retirement age. As a result, while the reported figures accurately reflect the observation period, they are likely to underestimate the share of departures due to retirement relative to resignations. Other countries with high shares of resignations in primary and secondary education combined include the French Community of Belgium (83%), Finland (80%) and Estonia (76%). In contrast, retirement was the main reason for leaving in France (83%), Ireland (68%), Israel (67%) and Luxembourg (66%), suggesting that workforce ageing plays a greater role in these systems than retention difficulties among active teachers. Some countries also reported relatively high shares of teachers moving to other assignments within the public sector in primary and secondary education, notably Latvia (37%), Luxembourg (30%), Chile (29%), Sweden (27%) and Lithuania (26%) (Table 3).

When interpreting data on teachers leaving the profession, it is important to consider that, in many countries, teaching qualifications remain valid and there are limited administrative barriers to re-entering the profession. This is the case, for instance, in Denmark, England (United Kingdom), Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway and Switzerland, where teachers can generally return whenever vacancies are available. In England (United Kingdom), for example, returners accounted for 41% of new teachers, illustrating that exits from the profession do not always represent permanent losses from the teacher workforce. These flexible re-entry pathways are important to consider when analysing teacher attrition data, especially in countries reporting relatively high shares of teachers leaving the profession, as some of these departures may reflect temporary mobility rather than permanent exits from teaching (OECD/INES data collection on teacher shortages and (OECD, 2026[2]; OECD, 2025[3])).

Early-career attrition

Early-career departures represent another important challenge for workforce stability and renewal. On average across OECD countries and economies with available data, 38% of all primary and secondary teachers in public institutions who resigned from the profession had less than five years of experience. Particularly high shares were observed in Israel (77%), Austria (69%), the French Community of Belgium (66%), Luxembourg (64%) and Chile (46%), suggesting difficulties retaining teachers during the first years of their career. In contrast, lower shares were reported in Korea (8%), Denmark (15%) and Sweden (21%). High levels of early-career attrition may raise concerns about working conditions, workload, induction support and the overall attractiveness of teaching careers for new entrants (Table 3).

Similar patterns are also found when considering the proportion of early-career teachers leaving the profession relative to the total stock of such teachers, rather than among all teachers who resigned from the profession. Among countries and economies with available data, at primary and secondary level, less than 1% of all fully qualified early career teachers resigned in Korea and Luxembourg, compared with around 9% in Austria, Hungary and the Slovak republic, 20% in Chile, 24% in Finland and 49% in the French Community of Belgium (OECD/INES data collection on teacher shortages).

Although data coverage remains limited, available trend data suggest that resignation rates have increased in recent years. Among countries and economies with comparable data for both 2017/18 and 2024/25, the share of fully qualified teachers resigning from the profession in public institutions increased in around two-thirds of countries. Particularly strong increases were observed in the French Community of Belgium, where the resignation rate rose from 3.1% to 9.6%, and in Estonia, where it more than doubled from 3.2% to 6.6%. Increases were also recorded in Chile, Finland, the Flemish Community of Belgium, France and Hungary. In contrast, resignation rates remained relatively stable or declined in Latvia, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden (Table 3).

Ageing of the teaching workforce

The age structure of teachers provides important insight into the capacity of education systems to renew the profession and replace teachers leaving the workforce. Across OECD countries, the teaching workforce has aged over the past decade. In primary and secondary education, the share of teachers aged under 35 in public and private institutions declined slightly from 23% in 2015 to 22% in 2024, while the share aged 55 and over increased from 20% to 23%. In Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, around four in ten teachers in primary and secondary education are now aged 55 and over, up from around three in ten in 2015, while Portugal and Greece also report rapidly ageing workforces between 2015 and 2024. In Greece, for example, the share of teachers aged 55 and over more than doubled from 15% in 2015 to 33% in 2024. In addition, several countries, including Luxembourg, Ireland and Poland, also experienced substantial declines (between 8 and 9 percentage points) in the share of younger teachers over the past decade, suggesting increasing difficulties renewing the profession (Table 4).

Secondary education also tends to have an older workforce than primary education in public and private institutions in a majority of countries. On average across the OECD, 25% of secondary teachers were aged 55 and over in 2024, compared to 21% of those in primary education. This pattern may partly reflect longer qualification pathways, stronger subject specialisation requirements and greater recruitment difficulties in some secondary subjects, particularly STEM-related fields (Table 4 and Box 2).

These trends suggest that, even in countries where student numbers are projected to decline, education systems may continue to face recruitment pressures as growing numbers of teachers reach retirement age.


Teacher shortages in the wider labour-market context

Recruitment difficulties in education and the broader labour market

Teacher shortages have emerged in a broader context of labour and skill shortages affecting many OECD countries. Following the COVID-19 pandemic, labour markets tightened considerably as economic activity recovered, leading to increased recruitment difficulties across a wide range of occupations and sectors. More recently, labour-market pressures have eased somewhat as economic growth has moderated and job vacancy rates have declined from their post-pandemic peaks, particularly in the European Union and the euro area (Eurostat, 2025[9]). Nevertheless, many employers continue to report difficulties recruiting workers with the required qualifications and skills. OECD analyses suggest that, beyond cyclical fluctuations, structural factors such as population ageing, demographic change, digitalisation and the green transition are increasingly shaping labour shortages across advanced economies (OECD, 2025[10]).

Figure 9. Comparing unfilled teaching positions in primary and secondary education with economy-wide job vacancy rates (2024)

In per cent, full-time and part-time, public institutions



Note: The job vacancy rate, as defined by Eurostat, is calculated by dividing the number of posts that are currently open (vacant jobs) by the total number of posts in the economy (occupied jobs + vacant jobs) in 2024, as a percentage. For the Flemish and French communities of Belgium, the vacancy rate for all jobs applies to the entire country (Belgium).

1. Unfilled teaching positions exclude upper secondary vocational education in the Netherlands. Unfilled teaching positions include pre-primary education in France, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands.

2. Year of reference differs from 2024/25: academic year 2022/23 for Argentina and French Community of Belgium; academic year 2023/24 for France; calendar year 2024 for Chile; academic year 2025/26 for Japan.

3. Expressed in full-time equivalents. In the Netherlands, unfilled teaching vacancies exclude hidden shortages, i.e. positions that were filled in undesired ways (6006 positions in primary education and 2 538 in secondary education).

5. Including government-dependent private institutions.

The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw and (Eurostat, 2025[9]).

Unlike many private-sector occupations, demand for teachers is influenced primarily by demographic trends, educational participation and public policy decisions. However, the supply of potential teachers remains sensitive to broader labour-market

conditions. When employment opportunities outside education are plentiful, recruitment may become more difficult, whereas teaching may become relatively more attractive during periods of weaker labour-market conditions (Falch and Strøm, 2025[11]).

Comparing teacher vacancy rates with economy-wide job vacancy rates can therefore help assess whether recruitment difficulties in teaching reflect broader labour market pressures or are specific to the education sector. The overall job vacancy rate, as defined by Eurostat, measures the share of all posts (occupied and vacant) in the economy that are vacant at a given point in time. Figure 9 shows that overall job vacancy rates in 2024 were often similar to, or higher than, teacher vacancy rates in primary and secondary education, regardless of how teacher vacancy rates were measured (see Box 1). This suggests that recruitment difficulties are not unique to the teaching profession and, in many countries, reflect broader labour-market tightness affecting multiple sectors.

Workforce ageing and demographic renewal

The age structure of secondary teachers also differs in important ways from that of the wider labour market. Since a master's degree is often the minimum qualification required for secondary teachers in many countries, comparing teachers with similarly highly educated workers provides additional insight into workforce renewal patterns, although qualification requirements vary across education systems. In most countries with available data, secondary teachers are older than both employed individuals holding at least a master's degree and the employed population as a whole. On average across countries with available data, 25% of secondary teachers are aged 55 and over, compared to 19% of employed individuals holding at least a master's degree and 21% of the overall employed population (Figure 10 and Table 4).


This difference is particularly pronounced in France, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania and Portugal, where the share of secondary teachers aged 55 and over exceeds that of employed individuals holding at least a master's degree by more than 15 percentage points. In France, for example, 23% of secondary teachers are aged 55 and over, compared to only 6% of all employees holding at least a master's degree. The corresponding figures are 40% and 14% in Greece, 43% and 24% in Lithuania, 34% and 16% in Hungary, and 38% and 22% in Portugal. These differences may partly reflect the expansion of tertiary education over recent decades. In many countries, teaching was already a relatively highly qualified profession before the broader expansion of tertiary education, whereas the share of workers holding a master's degree has increased more recently among younger generations (top chart, Figure 10).

When comparing teachers to the workforce overall (bottom chart, Figure 10), in Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Switzerland, the share of those aged 55 and over differs by less than one percentage point between the teaching and the wider workforce. In some countries the concentration of older adults is stronger in the workforce overall. This is particularly apparent in Korea – where only 12% of secondary teachers are aged 55 and over compared to 24% of employees – as well as in Costa Rica and Türkiye. These patterns may reflect more recent waves of teacher recruitment, stronger workforce renewal or faster replacement of older teachers. In contrast, some countries face particularly pronounced ageing among teachers, with much higher shares of older secondary teachers than in the labour force overall, including Lithuania (43% compared to 25%), Latvia (42% versus 27%), Estonia (40% versus 25%) and Greece (40% versus 22%).

An ageing teaching workforce may create additional pressures on education systems, particularly where large cohorts of teachers are expected to retire in the coming years. Combined with existing recruitment difficulties in some countries and subjects, this could further intensify shortages unless sufficient numbers of new teachers enter and remain in the profession.

Figure 10. Comparing the share of secondary teachers and the wider workforce who are aged 55 and over, by educational attainment (2024)

In per cent, full-time and part-time, public and private institutions.



1. Including primary teachers who are aged 55 or over.
.For data, see Table 4. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw

Teacher attrition and job tenure dynamics


Patterns of job mobility vary considerably across countries. In some labour markets, workers tend to remain with the same employer for long periods, reflecting factors such as strong employment protection, relatively stable career paths, lower labour-market dynamism or workplace cultures that value long-term employment relationships. In others, workers change jobs more frequently, encouraged by greater labour-market flexibility, stronger external employment opportunities or career advancement through mobility. Economic conditions also play an important role, as workers may be less willing to change jobs during periods of uncertainty or high unemployment, while tighter labour markets often increase job mobility by expanding alternative employment opportunities (OECD, 2025[12]).

These differences in labour-market behaviour may also influence teacher retention. In countries where workers tend to remain longer in the same job, teachers may be more likely to remain in the profession over time. Conversely, labour markets characterised by higher mobility and shorter job tenure may also experience higher teacher attrition, as teachers face stronger incentives and opportunities to move to other occupations.

Figure 11 compares the share of employees with at least ten years of job tenure with the share of lower secondary teachers aged 30-49 who report intending to leave teaching within the next five years. Focusing on this age group makes it possible to analyse retention difficulties while limiting the influence of retirement intentions. On average across OECD countries, 35% of employed individuals report job tenure of at least ten years, while 15% of 30-49 year-old teachers intend to leave teaching within the next five years.

Figure 11. Relationship between long-term tenure in the wider workforce and teachers' intentions to leave the profession (2024)

In per cent; based on responses from full-time and part-time lower secondary teachers aged 30-49 years old in public and private institutions; Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS)



For data, see Table 5 and OECD Employment Database (ELS) by job tenure intervals and OECD-TALIS 2024The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

In countries where the share of employed persons with 10 years or more of job tenure is above the OECD average, teachers also tend to express lower-than-average intentions to leave the profession, whereas countries characterised by greater labour-market mobility often report higher levels of intended teacher attrition. A similar pattern emerges when job tenure is compared with actual teacher attrition (Table 3). Countries with longer average job tenure tend to report lower shares of fully qualified teachers resigning from the profession in primary and secondary education, while countries characterised by greater labour market mobility often

experience higher resignation rates among primary and secondary teachers. The relationship is moderately strong (R = -0.55), with differences in job tenure explaining around one-quarter of the cross-country variation in teacher resignation rates (R^2 = 0.30).

Figure 11 shows that the alignment between intention to leave the profession for teachers and long-term tenure for workers is particularly marked in Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechia, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Romania and Spain. These countries combine above-average levels of long-term job tenure with below-average shares of teachers intending to leave the profession. In Italy, for example, 49% of employed individuals report long-term job tenure and only 3% of 30-49 year-old teachers intend to leave teaching. By contrast, New Zealand combines below-average levels of long-term job tenure with above-average shares of teachers intending to leave the profession: only 24% of employed individuals report long-term job tenure, while 26% of teachers intend to leave teaching within the next five years.

Some countries appear more atypical, suggesting that teacher retention is not solely determined by broader labour-market dynamics. Croatia and Slovenia, for example, combine relatively high long-term job tenure among employed persons (43% and 45%) with comparatively large shares of teachers intending to leave the profession (18% in both countries). Conversely, Colombia combines relatively low long-term job tenure (20%) with moderate teacher attrition intentions (10%). These differences suggest that factors specific to the teaching profession, including employment conditions and the perceived attractiveness of teaching careers, also play an important role in shaping teacher retention.

Factors shaping teacher supply and attractiveness

Entry pathways and access to the profession

Entry into teaching and initial teacher education

The process for entering the teaching profession in public institutions varies considerably across countries and influences both recruitment mechanisms and how teacher shortages are measured. In several countries and economies, entry into teaching is regulated through competitive examinations for a limited and fixed number of positions. Successful candidates are then certified and assigned to available teaching posts. In other systems, graduates who obtain a teaching qualification apply directly to schools or local authorities to fill available vacancies (Table 2).

These different arrangements also influence how recruitment outcomes are measured and should therefore be taken into account when interpreting cross-country differences. In countries relying on competitive examinations, the reported success rate generally reflects the share of candidates passing an examination that determines access to teaching positions. In countries where recruitment occurs directly at school level, the indicator typically reflects the share of graduates from teacher education programmes or applicants who successfully obtain a teaching position. These measures are therefore not directly comparable, as they capture different stages of the recruitment process and are based on different populations. As a result, these indicators are best interpreted within each recruitment model rather than compared directly across models.

In education systems using competitive examinations, a fixed number of teaching positions is typically determined before the start of the school year. Success rates in primary and secondary education - defined as the share of successful applicants in the recruitment cycle as a percentage of all applicants who sat the examination - vary considerably, ranging from 19% in Korea to 28% in France, 36% in Japan, 42% in Luxembourg and 73% in Romania. These differences may reflect the number of positions available relative to the number of candidates, the selectivity of the examinations and the attractiveness of teaching careers. In countries and economies where recruitment occurs at school level, a larger proportion of graduates or applicants may ultimately obtain teaching positions. This is the case, for example, in the Flemish Community of Belgium (84%), Hungary (85%), Bulgaria and Latvia (87%), England (United Kingdom) (91%), Lithuania (93%) and the Slovak Republic (95%). In these systems, the reported figures represent the share of students who graduated with a teaching qualification at the end of the reference academic year as a percentage of those enrolled in the final year of teacher education programmes at the start of that academic year. However, these figures do not necessarily imply that these systems are less selective than those using competitive examinations, as the two measures are not directly comparable (Table 2).

The teaching workforce is also highly heterogeneous in terms of qualification levels. Although most countries require at least a bachelor's degree for teaching at primary level, the actual composition of the workforce includes teachers with a wide range of educational attainment, from upper secondary qualifications to master's and doctoral degrees. In secondary education, a master's degree is increasingly becoming the minimum qualification requirement, although substantial cross-country differences remain. Compared with several decades ago, many countries have increased qualification requirements for secondary teachers, often

extending the duration of teacher preparation programmes and, in some cases, introducing master's-level qualifications as the standard route into the profession (Chapter D5).

Employment stability and contract arrangements

Employment stability is an important dimension of the attractiveness of the teaching profession and may influence both recruitment and retention. However, the implications of different contractual arrangements vary considerably across countries. In some education systems, permanent contracts provide high levels of employment protection and career security, while in others the differences between permanent and temporary contracts may be less pronounced. Similarly, fixed-term contracts can range from short-term and highly precarious arrangements to longer-term contracts that offer relatively stable employment conditions. Nevertheless, permanent contracts are generally associated with greater job security, career predictability and access to professional development opportunities, whereas extensive reliance on temporary contracts may contribute to uncertainty and professional instability, particularly among early-career teachers. OECD/TALIS analyses have shown that teachers on fixed-term contracts often report lower levels of job security and stronger intentions to leave the profession or move between schools, especially when temporary employment persists over several years (see Chapter 7 in (OECD, 2025[4])).

Across OECD countries, the majority of lower secondary teachers are employed on permanent contracts. On average, 81% of teachers report having permanent employment, compared to 6% on fixed-term contracts longer than one school year and 14% on contracts of one school year or less. However, the use of temporary contracts varies substantially across countries. Teachers have particularly high levels of permanent employment in Denmark (97%), Latvia (96%), France (94%), New Zealand (93%), Lithuania and Norway (92%). In these systems, teaching generally offers relatively stable employment conditions once teachers enter the profession. In contrast, permanent employment is less prevalent in Costa Rica (56%), Brazil (63%), the United States (66%), Portugal (67%) and Spain (69%), where a larger proportion of teachers work on temporary contracts (Table 5).

Short-term contracts of one school year or less are especially common in some countries and economies. More than one in five teachers are employed on such short-term contracts in the United States (26%), the French Community of Belgium (25%), Spain (25%), Costa Rica (22%), Italy (21%), Colombia (21%) and Portugal (21%). In some education systems, these contracts may reflect probationary periods or temporary replacement arrangements, but extensive reliance on short-term employment may also indicate difficulties stabilising the workforce or recruiting teachers into permanent positions. (Table 5). OECD and European Commission analyses suggest that employment insecurity and temporary contracts may be associated with lower job satisfaction, weaker professional commitment and higher risks of attrition, particularly among younger teachers and those working in more challenging school environments (Eurydice, 2021[13]; OECD, 2020[14]). This pattern is also reflected in TALIS 2024, where second-career teachers are significantly more likely than first-career teachers to hold fixed-term contracts and less likely to hold permanent positions. They are also significantly less likely to perceive teaching as a secure job, suggesting that contractual differences are reflected in teachers' own perceptions of employment security (OECD, 2026[2]; OECD, 2025[3]).

Longer fixed-term contracts are comparatively less widespread but remain significant in some countries. Costa Rica (22%), Brazil (19%), Korea (12%), Portugal (12%) and Chile (10%) report comparatively high shares of teachers employed on fixed-term contracts lasting more than one school year. Prolonged periods of such employment may delay career stabilisation and affect teachers’ attachment to schools and the profession (Table 5).

At the same time, the relationship between contract type and teacher attractiveness is not always straightforward and depends partly on wider labour-market institutions and career structures. In some countries, temporary contracts are more concentrated among early-career teachers before they gain a permanent position. For example, in France, teachers enter the profession through competitive examinations and probationary phases before obtaining full permanent status. In some other systems, a relatively high share of teachers are employed on fixed-term contracts. This is particularly evident in Costa Rica, Portugal, Spain and the United States, where at least 30% of lower secondary teachers are employed on fixed-term contracts, indicating a relatively high reliance on temporary employment arrangements. However, the meaning of such contracts varies across countries and does not necessarily imply precarious employment arrangements. In the United States, for instance, fixed-term contracts may take the form of annually renewed contracts and therefore do not necessarily indicate insecure employment (Table 5).

School environments, disciplinary climate and stress at work

Working conditions are another important factor shaping both the attractiveness of the teaching profession and teachers’ decisions to enter and remain in the profession. Teachers’ day-to-day working environments, the composition of their classes, disciplinary climates and workload all influence job satisfaction, stress levels and retention. In many education systems, teachers find themselves increasingly expected to respond simultaneously to a wider range of learning needs, growing linguistic and cultural

diversity, more frequent behavioural challenges and substantial administrative demands, requiring stronger pedagogical, behavioural and socio-emotional support capacities. When these evolving demands are not matched by sufficient preparation, induction or professional support, they may contribute to growing stress and difficulties retaining teachers, particularly during the early years of the profession.

TALIS data suggest that the composition of schools has changed significantly between 2018 and 2024 in most countries. On average across OECD countries, the share of teachers working in public and private schools where more than 10% of students have special education needs increased from 30% to 45%, while the share who are teaching in schools where at least 1% of students are refugees almost doubled, from 25% to 47%. Estimates should be interpreted with caution due to a higher risk of non-response bias in some countries. It should also be noted that, in some countries, the terminology has shifted from "special education needs" to "learning support needs". This change may affect comparability over time and should therefore be taken into account when interpreting trends. With these caveats in mind, there were large increases in the share of teachers working in schools with substantial numbers of students with special education needs in New Zealand (+58 percentage points), the Netherlands (+36), the French Community of Belgium (+36), France (+32) and Australia (+30). Strong increases in the share of teachers working with refugee students were reported in Czechia (+71 percentage points), Estonia (+56), Lithuania (+57), Iceland (+50) and the Slovak Republic (+45). These developments reflect broader demographic, migration and inclusion trends affecting education systems across OECD countries (Table 9, available online).

These changes may increase the complexity of teaching and require teachers to adapt instruction to increasingly heterogeneous classrooms. Although greater inclusion can bring important educational and social benefits, it may also create additional challenges if teachers do not receive sufficient initial preparation, specialised support staff, training or professional development opportunities to address diverse learning and behavioural needs. TALIS surveys have repeatedly highlighted that teachers often report feeling insufficiently prepared to teach students with special education needs or students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, particularly at the start of their careers (OECD, 2025[4]).

At the same time, indicators related to classroom climate suggest that behavioural and disciplinary challenges in public and private schools have also intensified in many education systems. On average across OECD countries and economies, the share of teachers reporting that they "frequently" or "always" need to calm disruptive students in class increased from 64% in 2018 to 72% in 2024. Particularly large increases were observed in Latvia (+36 percentage points), Japan (+14), Norway (+14), Sweden (+13), Denmark (+12) and Croatia (+11). In several countries and economies, very high shares of teachers report regularly dealing with disruptive behaviour, including Saudi Arabia (93%, Portugal (91%), Chile (91%), Brazil and South Africa (89%), the Netherlands (88%) and the French Community of Belgium (87%) (Table 9, available online).

Growing classroom complexity and behavioural challenges may also contribute to higher levels of stress among teachers. Across OECD countries, the share of teachers reporting experiencing "a lot" of stress in their work increased slightly from 17% in 2018 to 19% in 2024, while more than half of teachers (52%) report that excessive administrative work is a significant source of stress (see more details in Box D4.3). These trends suggest that teachers increasingly face more complex pedagogical, behavioural and administrative demands in their daily work.

These findings suggest that addressing teacher shortages is not only a matter of recruitment, but also helping teachers cope with increasingly complex classroom environments. Policies that provide specialised support staff, strengthen induction and mentoring, expand training for inclusive education and reduce unnecessary administrative tasks may therefore play an important role in improving teacher retention and the long-term sustainability of the profession (OECD, 2025[4]).

Professional recognition and teachers' perceptions of their employment conditions

The attractiveness of teaching can be viewed from both an external and an internal perspective. The external perspective relates to how the profession is perceived and valued by society, as reflected in teachers' views on the social status and recognition of teaching. The internal perspective concerns how teachers assess their own professional situation, including their satisfaction with salaries, employment conditions and other aspects of their work. Examining both dimensions provides a more comprehensive picture of teacher attractiveness, as teachers may value their own working conditions while simultaneously perceiving that the profession lacks broader societal recognition.

Professional recognition

Teachers' perceptions of the way their profession is valued in society provide important insight into the attractiveness and sustainability of teaching careers. Across OECD countries and economies, relatively few teachers feel that the teaching profession

is valued in society. On average, only 22% of teachers in public and private schools report that they “agree” or “strongly agree” that teaching is valued in society, suggesting a widespread perception of limited social recognition of the profession. Particularly low levels are observed in France (4%), the French Community of Belgium (6%), the Slovak Republic (7%), Slovenia (7%), Hungary (8%) and Portugal (9%). Higher levels of perceived recognition are reported in Saudi Arabia (77%), South Africa (63%), Colombia (54%), Finland (48%), Bulgaria (42%) and Romania (42%) (Table 5).

The low levels observed in many countries are noteworthy because perceptions of the status of the profession may influence both recruitment and retention. Feeling valued in society matters not only for attracting high-calibre candidates to the profession, but also for retaining existing teachers. TALIS 2024 data (OECD, 2025[4]) show that teachers who agree that their profession is valued in society are more than 10 percentage points less likely to report intending to leave teaching within the next five years, on average, even after controlling for teacher and school characteristics, intrinsic motivation, contract modalities, and satisfaction with employment conditions, including salary. This suggests that the perceived status of the teaching profession influences teachers' career intentions independently of other important factors affecting retention (Table 5 and Table 7.30 in OECD (2025[4])).

Satisfaction with employment conditions


Interestingly, the generally low levels of perceived recognition observed across many countries are not always mirrored in teachers’ assessments of their own jobs. Although many teachers report that teaching is not highly valued in society, they often express considerably more positive views about their own employment conditions. However, satisfaction with employment conditions is considerably higher than satisfaction with salaries, at least among lower secondary teachers. On average across OECD countries, 68% of lower secondary teachers report being satisfied with their terms of employment, excluding salaries, while only 39% report being satisfied with the salary they receive for their work (Table 5). Figure 12 shows that satisfaction with salary and satisfaction with employment conditions tend to be positively correlated across countries, although the relationship remains only moderate ($R = +0.55$, $R^2 = 0.30$). This suggests that salaries matter for teachers’ perceptions of the profession, but that it is far from the only dimension shaping job satisfaction.

A particularly important finding is that teachers can report being broadly satisfied with their employment conditions while simultaneously expressing dissatisfaction with their salaries. This pattern highlights that teachers often distinguish between pay and other dimensions of their professional experience. In Poland, for example, 80% of teachers report being satisfied with their terms of employment (barring salaries), while only 21% are satisfied with their salaries. Similar gaps are observed in the Slovak Republic (81% versus 27%), Lithuania (77% versus 28%), Estonia (73% versus 30%) and Iceland (72% versus 19%) (Figure 12).

In contrast, in some countries lower secondary teachers have similar levels of satisfaction with both their salaries and their overall employment conditions. In Austria, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands and Saudi Arabia, teachers report high levels of satisfaction with both. In the Netherlands, for example, 80% of lower secondary teachers are satisfied with their employment conditions and 74% with their salaries, although these estimates should be interpreted with caution due to a higher risk of non-response bias. The corresponding figures are 82% and 72% in Austria. Conversely, Portugal stands out for particularly low levels of satisfaction on both dimensions (39% for employment conditions and 13% for salary satisfaction), suggesting broader dissatisfaction with the profession. Japan also stands out for especially low satisfaction regarding employment conditions overall (37%), indicating that concerns may extend beyond salaries alone to issues such as workload, working time and stress (Figure 12).

Figure 12. Teachers' satisfaction with employment terms and salaries at lower secondary level (2024)

Results based on responses from lower secondary teachers, Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS)



Note: Figure reflects the share of teachers who agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied.
1. Estimates should be interpreted with caution due to higher risk of non-response bias.
For data, see Table 5. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw .

Interestingly, with the exception of Iceland, all other OECD countries where lower secondary teachers' satisfaction with salaries is at least 40 percentage points lower than their satisfaction with employment conditions - Estonia, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia - also report starting teacher salaries below the OECD average. Conversely, the four OECD countries where at least 65% of lower secondary teachers are satisfied with both their salaries and their employment conditions - Austria, Belgium, Denmark and the Netherlands - report above-average starting teacher salaries (Chapter D3). Although no direct relationship can be inferred, this pattern is consistent with the suggestion that salary levels contribute to teachers' satisfaction with their salaries, even when broader employment conditions are assessed separately.

The contrast between low levels of perceived social recognition and comparatively higher satisfaction with employment conditions (barring salaries) in many countries is also striking. In Slovenia, for example, only 7% of teachers feel that the profession is valued in society, while 73% report satisfaction with their terms of employment (barring salaries). Similar patterns are observed in Czechia, French community of Belgium, Latvia, Poland and the Slovak Republic. These findings suggest that teachers may remain attached to some aspects of their working conditions despite feeling that the profession lacks broader societal recognition (Table 5).

These results suggest that improving teacher supply is not solely a question of increasing salaries. Although remuneration remains important, teachers' perceptions of the profession are also influenced by broader working conditions, workload, school climate, professional autonomy and the overall quality of the working environment. This interpretation is consistent with TALIS 2024, which shows that around three-quarters of lower secondary teachers report that the advantages of being a teacher clearly outweigh the disadvantages. TALIS also suggests that teachers' decisions to remain in the profession are influenced not only by salaries but also by their employment and working conditions. Policies aimed at improving working conditions, reducing excessive workload and strengthening professional recognition may therefore complement salary policies in supporting teacher attractiveness and retention, particularly in countries where teachers report low levels of societal recognition (Table 2.6 and Chapter 7 in OECD (2025[3])).

Teachers' working conditions compared with other highly educated professions

Comparing teachers' working conditions with those of other highly educated workers provides insights into the relative attractiveness of the profession. Although indicators such as working hours, workload and professional development opportunities describe key dimensions of job quality, measures of job satisfaction and well-being help assess the outcomes associated with these conditions.

These comparisons should nevertheless be interpreted with caution, as they are based on samples from the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) comparing teachers in pre-primary, primary and secondary education with employed adults aged 16-65 with bachelor's or master's or equivalent attainment (Table 6). In some countries, relatively small sample sizes for teachers may limit the precision and comparability of the estimates. In addition, some observed differences may partly reflect differences in occupational structures, working arrangements and labour-market contexts across countries.


Working hours among teachers are slightly lower than those observed among other employed adults aged 16-65 with bachelor's or master's attainment. Across OECD countries, teachers work on average 40.8 hours per week, compared to 41.5 hours among these highly educated workers. In some countries, teachers report substantially fewer working hours, such as Ireland (-5.3 hours), Israel (-6.2 hours) and Portugal (-3.9 hours). In contrast, teachers work longer hours in Japan (+6.3 hours), New Zealand (+3.7 hours), England (United Kingdom) (+3.7 hours) and Sweden (+2.6 hours). These differences may partly reflect variations in teaching time, administrative responsibilities, lesson preparation and expectations regarding work outside classrooms (Figure 13).

Teachers also generally report lower exposure to time pressure and tight deadlines than similarly educated employees. On average across OECD countries, 35% of teachers report working to tight deadlines or at very high speed more than half of the time, compared to 42% among highly educated workers. Particularly large differences are observed in Denmark (-23 percentage points), Spain (-21), France (-18) and Germany (-18). However, some countries show the opposite pattern, with teachers reporting greater time pressure than other professions, notably Chile (+21 percentage points), England (United Kingdom) (+12) and Czechia (+8) (Table 6). These results should nevertheless be interpreted carefully, as the indicator mainly captures deadlines and work intensity and may not fully reflect other important sources of stress specific to teaching, such as classroom management, emotional demands or dealing with increasingly heterogeneous student populations, as discussed above.

One area where teachers stand out more clearly from other workers concerns participation in professional development. Across OECD countries, 73% of teachers participated in at least one training activity during the previous 12 months, compared to 63% of other employed 16-65 year-olds with bachelor's or master's attainment. Particularly large positive gaps are observed in Austria (+23 percentage points), Korea (+23), Croatia (+21), Estonia (+21), Portugal (+20) and Latvia (+18). This reflects the strong emphasis placed on continuing professional development in many education systems. At the same time, teachers also report that there were training activities they wanted to participate in but could not more frequently than their peers. On average across OECD countries, 34% of teachers report unmet training demand, compared to 24% among similarly educated workers. Particularly large gaps are observed in Chile (+25), Austria (+21 percentage points), Finland (+20), Lithuania (+19), Japan (+18) and Croatia (+18) (Table 6).

Figure 13. Comparing the working hours per week of teachers and the wider workforce with bachelor's or master's or equivalent attainment (2023)

Full-time, results based on responses of 16-65 year-olds in full-time employment, Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)



Note: The value in parentheses refers to the difference between the weekly working hours of teachers and those of the wider workforce with bachelor's, master's or equivalent attainment. Full-time workers are those working 30 hours or more per week.
1. In Sweden, most teachers have a so-called "ferietjänst", meaning their annual working time is concentrated to school terms - often resulting in slightly longer workweeks - but includes extended continuous holidays when students are off.
2. Differences are not statistically significant.
For data, see Table 6. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw

Although no single indicator can fully capture the attractiveness of a profession, overall job satisfaction provides a useful summary measure of how workers assess their employment situation. Teachers' levels of job satisfaction appear similar to those observed among other highly educated workers. Across OECD countries participating in the PIAAC survey, 85% of teachers report being "satisfied" or "extremely satisfied" with their jobs, the same share as among other 16-65 year-old employees with bachelor's or master's attainment. In several countries, teachers report higher levels of job satisfaction, notably in Japan (+20 percentage points), Spain (+8), Czechia (+8), Sweden (+7) and New Zealand (+7). In contrast, levels of satisfaction are lower among teachers in Hungary (-23 percentage points), Chile (-21), Latvia (-16), Lithuania (-13) and France (-10) (Table 6 and (OECD, 2024[15])).

Demographic changes, staffing adjustments and future pressures on education systems

Teacher shortages and the attractiveness of the profession have attracted considerable policy attention in recent years. At the same time, many education systems are facing another important challenge: demographic change. Falling birth rates and changing population structures are affecting the size and distribution of school-age populations, with implications for teacher demand, school organisation and the allocation of education resources.

Changes in school-age populations

Demographic trends among school-age populations have evolved differently across different age groups since 2015, with important implications for education planning, school infrastructure and teacher demand. Across OECD countries, the number of children aged 5-9 enrolled in public and private institutions remained broadly stable between 2015 and 2024, increasing by around

1%, while the number of 10-14 year-olds increased more substantially, by around 8%. As a result, the overall enrolled population aged 5-14 increased by around 4% over this period on average across OECD countries (Table 7).

These average trends nevertheless mask considerable cross-country variation. Several countries experienced substantial growth in both age groups (more than 10 percentage points), including Israel, Luxembourg, the Slovak Republic and Switzerland. In Israel, the number of 5-9 year-olds increased by 18% and that of 10-14 year-olds by 19% between 2015 and 2024, while Luxembourg recorded similarly strong growth (Table 7).

In most countries, however, growth was considerably stronger among 10-14 year-olds than among 5-9 year-olds, reflecting the gradual effects of declining fertility rates on younger cohorts. This pattern is particularly visible in Czechia, Estonia, Iceland, Ireland, Slovenia and South Africa, where the growth rate for 10-14 year-olds exceeded that for 5-9 year-olds by at least 20 percentage points. In Czechia, for example, the number of 10-14 year-olds increased by 26% between 2015 and 2024, compared to only 5% among 5-9 year-olds. Ireland also illustrates this demographic shift well: the younger age group declined slightly by around 3%, whereas the number of 10-14 year-olds increased by around 19% (Table 7). In some countries, migration may also have contributed to sustaining or increasing the size of school-age populations, particularly among older age groups, partly offsetting the effects of lower fertility rates.

By contrast, a large group of countries - 12 out of 43 with available data - have already experienced declines across both age groups over this period. Among them, Japan, Korea, Mexico and Romania recorded declines of at least 5% in both age groups. Korea experienced particularly sharp declines, with the population aged 5-9 falling by 13% and the population aged 10-14 by 9% between 2015 and 2024. In these systems, demographic decline may progressively reduce pressure on enrolment and educational infrastructure needs, although it may also create territorial challenges, particularly in rural and remote areas where maintaining school networks becomes more difficult as student populations shrink (Table 7).

These challenges may be further amplified by population movements within countries (see Box 1 in Chapter B2). OECD analyses show that population growth has been concentrated in cities over the past two decades. Between 2000 and 2020, the population living in cities across OECD countries increased by 24%, compared to 8% in towns and semi-dense areas and 6% in rural areas. OECD projections suggest that this trend is likely to continue over the coming decade. As a result, some rural and remote communities face a double pressure of declining fertility and population outflows, leading to faster declines in school-age populations than national averages would suggest. This can increase the costs of maintaining local schools and make it more difficult to attract and retain teachers (OECD, 2025[16]).

Student enrolment, teacher numbers and staffing adjustments


Analysing demographic trends together with changes in student enrolment and teacher numbers in public and private institutions is important for understanding how education systems will need to adjust staffing provision as student populations evolve. Given that staff compensation represents the largest component of education expenditure in most countries, changes in teacher numbers also have important resource implications. Understanding how staffing adjusts to demographic change is therefore relevant not only for workforce planning, but also for the efficient allocation of education resources (see Chapter C1).

Changes in the number of school-age children do not automatically translate into proportional changes in teacher demand, as policy choices regarding class size, curriculum provision, inclusion policies or support services may also influence staffing needs. On average across OECD countries, teacher numbers grew much faster than student enrolment between 2015 and 2024. The number of students enrolled in primary education, measured in full-time equivalents, increased by around 2%, while the number of teachers in primary education, also measured in full-time equivalents, increased by around 13%, resulting in a decline of around 9% in the number of students per teacher over the period (Figure 14).

Several broad adjustment patterns can be observed across countries between 2015 and 2024. First, in around one-third of countries with available data for primary education (17 out of 40), student numbers increased while teacher numbers increased even faster, resulting in fewer students per teacher despite demographic growth. This was notably the case in Luxembourg, where the number of students increased by 20% while the number of teachers increased by 57%, leading to a reduction of around 24% in the number of students per teacher between 2015 and 2024. Similar patterns are observed in Chile, Israel and the Slovak Republic, where teacher numbers increased substantially faster than student enrolment, reducing the student-teacher ratio by at least 15% (Figure 14).

Figure 14. Changes in the number of students and teachers in primary education between 2015 and 2024

Full-time equivalents, public and private institutions, index of change (2015 = 100)



1. Year of reference 2016 instead of 2015.
2. Public institutions only.
3. The 2024 value on classroom teachers is based on a more precise methodology than the 2015 value. While the figures are not fully comparable in strict methodological terms, the earlier data are considered sufficiently robust to support an approximate comparison.
For data, see Table 7. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw .

Second, contrary to what might be expected, declining enrolment was often not associated with a reduction in teacher numbers. In 17 out of 40 countries with available data, declining or broadly stable enrolment in primary education (defined as changes within ±1% of the 2015 level) was accompanied by continued growth in the teaching workforce between 2015 and 2024. In Greece, for example, the number of students declined by around 12% while the number of teachers increased by 16%, leading to a reduction of around 24% in the number of students per teacher.

The third pattern was much less common. Only four out of 40 countries - Austria, Latvia, Lithuania and the United Kingdom - recorded an increase in the number of primary students per teacher between 2015 and 2024, as teacher numbers did not keep pace with changes in student enrolment. Lithuania provides the most striking example: the number of students increased by around 12%, while the number of teachers declined by around 16%, resulting in an increase of around 34% in the number of students per teacher (Figure 14).

Demography and class sizes

Beyond teacher numbers, demographic change also affects the organisation of teaching through changes in the number of classes and average class size. However, declining enrolment does not necessarily lead to fewer classes, as education systems may choose to maintain or expand class provision to preserve local access to education, reduce class sizes or support inclusion policies.

On average across OECD countries, the number of classes increased by around 4% in primary education and by around 8% in lower secondary education between 2015 and 2024, despite broadly stable or declining student populations in many countries. This suggests that many education systems maintained or expanded class provision rather than consolidating classes in response to demographic change.

This pattern is particularly visible in countries such as Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Sweden and the United States. In lower secondary education, the number of classes increased by around 30% in Czechia, 27% in the United States, 25% in Denmark and Estonia, and 23% in Sweden. Similar increases are observed in primary education in Israel (+22%) and Luxembourg and Slovenia (+19%). These developments may reflect policy choices to reduce class sizes, preserve local school provision or strengthen inclusion policies (Table 7).

Only a minority of countries experienced declines in the number of classes between 2015 and 2024. In primary education, the number of classes decreased in 12 out of 32 OECD countries, with the most pronounced decline observed in Mexico (around 11%). In lower secondary education, declines were less common, occurring in only seven OECD countries. Among these, Japan, Lithuania and the United Kingdom recorded the largest reductions (Table 7).

These organisational changes were accompanied by a modest decline in average student-teacher ratios. Across OECD countries, average student-teacher ratios in primary education fell from 15 students in 2015 to 14 in 2024. Particularly marked declines were observed in Bulgaria, Chile, Ireland, Israel, Slovenia and South Africa (see Table D2.2).


Long-term demographic decline and strategic resource allocation

Projections suggest that demographic decline is likely to affect an increasing number of education systems over the coming decade. On average across OECD countries, the population aged 5-14 is projected to decline by around 9% between 2024 and 2033, compared to around 3% among children aged 4 years or less. Similar trends are expected across EU25 countries, with corresponding declines of around 10% and 5%, respectively. These projections suggest that declining school-age populations will become an increasingly important policy issue across many education systems (Figure 15).

Nevertheless, around one-quarter of countries with available data are projected to continue experiencing demographic growth among school-age populations. Israel again stands out with projected increases of 16% among those aged 5-14. Luxembourg and South Africa are also projected to experience sustained growth (+10% among 5-14 year-olds), while Iceland and Saudi Arabia are expected to record increases of around 5% to 7% among the 5-14 age group. (Figure 15). In contrast, around half of countries with available data are projected to experience declines of at least 9% in their populations aged 5-14 over the coming decade. Particularly sharp decreases are projected in Korea (-40%), Argentina and Costa Rica (-28%), Latvia (-23%), Lithuania (-22%), Japan (-19%), Italy (-18%) and Poland (-17%). Several Southern and Eastern European countries, including Spain, Greece, Bulgaria, Estonia and Romania, are also expected to experience significant declines. In a number of countries, the projected decrease among children aged 4 years or less will still be very pronounced, notably in Latvia (-23%), Lithuania (-18%), Poland (-17%), the Slovak Republic and Costa Rica (-16%), Croatia (-15%) and Bulgaria (-14%). This suggests that the decline in compulsory school-age population may continue well beyond the coming decade in several education systems (Figure 15).

Figure 15. Projected changes in the population of children between 2024 and 2033, by age group

Index of change (2024 = 100)



For data, see Table 7. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw,

These projections suggest that demographic pressures on education systems will increasingly diverge across countries and in some systems, declining enrolments may gradually ease recruitment pressures.

More broadly, demographic decline may offer governments an important opportunity to rethink the allocation of education resources. Some countries may choose to maintain staffing levels despite falling enrolments in order to reduce class sizes, strengthen inclusion policies or improve support for students with special educational needs. However, where student populations decline substantially and persistently, maintaining current staffing levels and school networks may become increasingly difficult. Governments may therefore face difficult decisions regarding school consolidation, workforce adjustments and the long-term sustainability of education spending, while also considering how available resources can be redeployed to improve educational quality and equity.

Definitions

Competitive examinations refer to examinations organised by local, regional or national authorities in order to select the applicants with the best results to fill a limited and fixed number of places for student teachers and/or for teachers in the public education system.

Fully qualified teachers refer to teachers who have fulfilled all the training and administrative requirements for teaching at a given grade and subject, according to the formal policy of a country. The administrative requirements can include formal qualifications and attainment level, specific pedagogical training or practical experience, succeeding in competitive examinations, and the successful completion of a probation period or induction programme. This definition also includes teachers who do not have the minimum attainment for teachers currently, because they started teaching before the requirements changed (see Chapter D5).

Fully qualified teachers leaving the profession: A leaving teacher refers to any teacher who is leaving the profession in the reference year and who is not expected to come back the year after (i.e. someone who is permanently leaving the profession). Teachers who leave due to resignation or retirement are counted as leaving teachers. As the analysis focuses on public institutions (with a few exceptions), teachers moving from public to private institutions are also counted as leaving the profession. Teachers temporarily absent from work (e.g. due to illness, injury, maternity or parental leave, vacation, or early retirement leave) are not

considered leaving teachers. In most countries, however, teachers who leave the profession may still return after more than one year.

Non-fully qualified teachers refer to teachers entering the profession through alternative pathways. In most countries, they either possess the required academic qualifications but lack mandatory certification or teacher training, have completed the required teacher training but do not hold the required academic qualifications, or lack both. In a few countries, the category also includes fully qualified teachers who are teaching subjects or levels other than those for which they were originally trained or certified.

This category includes:

- Teachers who do not meet the minimum qualification requirements for teaching.
- Teachers who have not passed the examinations or competitions required to obtain civil servant or tenured teacher status.
- Teachers who have completed mandatory teacher training but do not hold the required academic qualifications.
- Teachers who lack both the required academic qualifications and mandatory certification or teacher training.
- Individuals who have recently graduated from upper secondary or tertiary education and are temporarily teaching, for example during a gap year.
- Individuals enrolled in alternative certification routes who are teaching before completing all qualification requirements.
- In a few countries, such as Switzerland, the category also includes fully qualified teachers who are teaching subjects or education levels other than those for which they were originally trained or certified.

Second-career teachers are teachers for whom teaching was not a first career choice and who have at least 10 years of work experience in non-education roles.

Teachers in the process of acquiring full qualifications refer to individuals who are already teaching but have not yet completed all the requirements necessary to be recognised as fully qualified teachers under national regulations. Although they are actively employed in schools and often meet some of the qualification requirements, they are still completing probationary periods, induction programmes, certification procedures or other mandatory requirements leading to full qualification status. These teachers are considered a subset of non-fully qualified teachers and are also identified separately in Table 1. Any country-specific exceptions to this classification are described in the table. This category includes:

- Teacher trainees (i.e. new teachers who will become fully qualified upon successful completion of a probationary period, induction programme or similar entry-to-profession requirements).
- Teachers who possess the required academic qualifications but are still in the process of obtaining mandatory certification, registration or teacher training credentials.
- Teachers who have passed the competitive examinations required to enter the profession and are teaching while completing the pedagogical or practical requirements necessary to obtain full qualification status.

Temporarily absent teachers are teachers who retain their contractual position but are not available to teach for a temporary period because they are on authorised leave (e.g. short- or long-term sick leave, maternity/parental leave, administrative leave, or temporary secondment). They are expected to return to their teaching position within the same school year or at the end of the leave period.

Methodology

In Table 2, teacher shortages are assessed based on the number of unfilled teaching vacancies. The methodology underlying these estimates is presented in Box 1 of this chapter.

Sources

Data included in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 refer to the 2024/25 academic year and are based on the INES special data collection on teacher shortages administered by the OECD in 2025. The questionnaires cover public institutions from pre-primary

to upper secondary education. Their scope is limited to initial education and excludes adult education (including second-chance education and other forms of lifelong learning) as well as special education programmes and schools for children with disabilities.

Data on teachers by age (Table 4) refer to the 2023/24 academic year and are drawn from the UNESCO-UIS/OECD/EUROSTAT data collection on education statistics administered by the OECD in 2025. They cover both public and private institutions.

OECD TALIS (Teaching and Learning International Survey) data presented in Table 5 and Table 9 (available online) refer to the 2024 survey cycle, with data collected in 2024 and results published by the OECD in 2025. TALIS is an international survey of teachers and school leaders conducted every five years.

OECD PIAAC (Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies) data presented in Table 6 refer to the second cycle of the Survey of Adult Skills, with data collected between 2022 and 2023 and results released in December 2024.

Demographic data covering the period 2015-24 (Table 7) refer to the 2023/24 academic year and are drawn from the UNESCO-UIS/OECD/EUROSTAT data collection on education statistics administered by the OECD in 2025. They cover both public and private institutions.

Population projection data presented in Table 7 are sourced from the OECD Data Explorer database. The dataset provides annual population projections up to 2070 by sex and five-year age groups, as well as indicators such as the shares of children, youth and older adults, and old-age and total dependency ratios. The data refer to mid-year population estimates.

OECD PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) data presented in Table 8 (available online) refer to the 2022 assessment cycle, with data collected in 2022 and results published by the OECD in 2023. PISA is an international survey of 15-year-old students conducted every three years.

References

Cour des comptes (2025), *Lost teaching time for pupils in french middle schools*, https://www.ccomptes.fr/en/publications/lost-teaching-time-pupils-french-middle-schools. [17]

Eurostat (2025), *Job vacancy statistics*, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Job_vacancy_statistics. [9]

Eurydice (2021), *Teachers in Europe: Careers Development and Well-being*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, https://eurydice.ba/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Teachers-in-Europe-Careers-Development-and-Well-being.pdf. [13]

Falch, T. and B. Strøm (2025), "Teacher shortages, the business cycle, and teacher demand: A long-run perspective", *Explorations in Economic History*, Vol. 98, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eeh.2025.101714. [11]

Government of France (2025), *Revalorisation du régime indemnitaire spécifique en faveur des personnels exerçant dans les écoles ou établissements relevant du programme Réseau d'éducation prioritaire renforcé (REP+)*, https://www.education.gouv.fr/bo/21/Hebdo26/MENE2120129C.htm. [7]

Government of South Australia (2025), *Incentives and support for country teachers and leaders*, Department of Education, https://www.education.sa.gov.au/working-us/careers-education/opportunities-country-south-australia/teaching-opportunities-country-south-australia/incentives-and-support-country-teachers-and-leaders. [6]

OECD (2026), "A second career in teaching: Exploring practices and evidence for training, supporting and retaining second-career teachers", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 347, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/37722003-en. [2]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en. [3]

OECD (2025), *OECD Employment Outlook 2025: Can We Get Through the Demographic Crunch?*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/194a947b-en. [12]

OECD (2025), *Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en. [4]

OECD (2025), *Shrinking Smartly and Sustainably: Strategies for Action*, OECD Rural Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/f91693e3-en. [16]

OECD (2025), *The Global Forum on Productivity at 10: Past and Future Perspectives on Reviving Productivity Growth*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/ca7295d9-en. [10]

OECD (2024), *Do Adults Have the Skills They Need to Thrive in a Changing World?: Survey of Adult Skills 2023*, OECD Skills Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b263dc5d-en. [15]

OECD (2024), *Education at a Glance 2024: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/c00cad36-en. [5]

OECD (2022), *Education at a Glance 2022: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/3197152b-en. [1]

OECD (2020), *TALIS 2018 Results (Volume II): Teachers and School Leaders as Valued Professionals*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/19cf08df-en. [14]

Ordway, D. (2023), "The substitute teacher shortage: Research reveals why it warrants more news coverage", *The Journalist's Resource*, https://journalistsresource.org/education/substitute-teacher-pay-student-achievement-research/. [18]

UK Government (2025), *Funding: Initial teacher training (ITT), academic year 2025 to 2026*, Department for Education, https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/funding-initial-teacher-training-itt/funding-initial-teacher-training-itt-academic-year-2025-to-2026. [8]

Tables Chapter 1

Tables and notes

Table 1	Trends in the share of non-fully qualified teachers, by level of education (2017/18 and 2024/25)
Table 2	Trends in the share of unfilled teaching vacancies (2017/18 and 2024/25) and share of successful teaching candidates (2024/25)
Table 3	Share of fully qualified teachers who left the profession, by level of education (2024/25) and trends in teacher resignations (2017/18 and 2024/25)
Table 4	Trends in the share of teachers aged under 35 or 55 and over, by level of education (2015 and 2024), and comparison with the wider workforce (2024)
Table 5	Employment conditions of lower secondary teachers and job satisfaction (2024)
Table 6	Comparing teachers' job satisfaction, work pressure, workload and participation in and unmet demand for professional development with other workers (2023)
Table 7	Changes in the number of teachers, classrooms and student enrolment between 2015 and 2024, and projected changes in the number of children between 2024 and 2033
WEB Table 8	Share of students who are in schools where students' learning is hindered by teacher absenteeism, by type of school (2022)
WEB Table 9	Trends in school composition, disciplinary climate and work-related stress (2018 and 2024)

StatLink https://stat.link/es84jw

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 13 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Table 1. Trends in the share of non-fully qualified teachers, by level of education (2017/18 and 2024/25)

Full-time equivalents, public institutions

	2024/25 (or 2025)								2017/18 (or 2018)	
	Pre-primary		Primary		Secondary		Primary and secondary		Pre-primary	Primary and secondary
	Fully qualified teachers	Non-fully qualified teachers	Fully qualified teachers	Non-fully qualified teachers	Fully qualified teachers	Non-fully qualified teachers	Fully qualified teachers	Non-fully qualified teachers	Non-fully qualified teachers	
OECD countries	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(13)	(14)
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	m	m	93.2	6.8	93.4	6.6	93.3	6.7	m	3.2
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile[1]	83.3	16.7	75.2	24.8	78.4	21.6	76.6	23.4	10.8	16.8
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica[1]	94.6	5.4	95.6	4.4	98.8	1.2	97.1	2.9	4.1	3.8
Czechia	94.4	5.6	89.7	10.3	92.2	7.8	91.5	8.5	4.2	5.2
Denmark[1, 2]	62.4	37.6	81.1[d]	18.9[d]	m	m	81.1	18.9	21.6	10.4
Estonia	84.0	16.0	x(10)	x(11)	x(10)	x(11)	79.7	20.3	13.6	10.7
Finland[1, 2]	78.1	21.9	86.7	13.3	87.7	12.3	87.1	12.9	20.8	6.9
France[1, 2]	x(4)	x(5)	97.4[d]	2.6[d]	88.9	11.1	92.9[d]	7.1[d]	x(14)	5.0[d]
Germany[1, 3]	71.1	28.9	76.5	23.5	83.8	16.2	81.4	18.6	m	m
Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary[2]	99.8	0.2	99.9	0.1	99.9	0.1	99.9	0.1	1.4	0.4
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland	m	m	99.7[d]	0.3	99.7	0.3	99.7	0.3	m	m
Israel[2, 3]	94.3	5.7	91.8	8.2	94.8	5.2	92.8	7.1	m	m
Italy	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Japan[1]	100.0	a	100.0	a	100.0	a	100.0	a	a	a
Korea	100.0	a	100.0	a	100.0	a	100.0	a	a	a
Latvia	91.9	8.1	95.7	4.3	97.3	2.7	96.5	3.5	9.6	1.7
Lithuania[4]	87.2	12.8	88.9	11.1	82.4	17.6	84.2	15.8	8.7	12.3
Luxembourg[2, 4]	x(4)	x(5)	82.1[d]	17.9[d]	89.2	10.8	85.4[d]	14.6[d]	x(14)	17.5[d]
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands[2, 4]	x(4)	x(5)	98.1[d]	1.9	97.7	2.3	98.0	2.0	x(14)	2.2[d]
New Zealand[1, 3, 4]	71.7	28.3	91.2	8.8	92.7	7.3	91.8	8.2	31.7	6.1
Norway	88.6	11.4	83.1	16.9	81.7	18.3	82.4	17.6	10.8	18.2
Poland[4]	91.2	8.8	94.7	5.3	95.1	4.9	95.0	5.0	10.5	4.4
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovak Republic	91.6	8.4	93.6[d]	6.4	88.6	11.4	90.0	10.0		
Slovenia	m	m	a	a	a	a	m	m	m	m
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden	91.2	8.8	88.9	11.1	83.6	16.4	86.1	13.9	12.7	19.2
Switzerland[1, 2, 4]	93.9	6.1	91.3[d]	8.7[d]	m	m	88.5	11.5	3.7	9.2
Türkiye	99.7	0.3	98.3[d]	1.7	98.2	1.8	98.2	1.8	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Other economies										
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)[5]	95.2	4.8	96.3	3.7	90.9	9.1	92.9	7.1	1.0	2.7
French Comm. (Belgium)	98.8	1.2	94.1	5.9	79.4	20.6	85.0	15.0	0.2	10.0
England (UK)	98.1	1.9	97.9	2.1	96.4	3.6	97.1	2.9	3.5	2.8
OECD average	**89.6**	**10.4**	**91.9**	**8.1**	**91.6**	**8.4**	**90.9**	**9.1**	**8.9**	**7.3**

Partner and/or accession countries	2024/25 (or 2025)								2017/18 (or 2018)	
	Pre-primary		Primary		Secondary		Primary and secondary		Pre-primary	Primary and secondary
	Fully qualified teachers	Non-fully qualified teachers	Fully qualified teachers	Non-fully qualified teachers	Fully qualified teachers	Non-fully qualified teachers	Fully qualified teachers	Non-fully qualified teachers	Non-fully qualified teachers	
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	93.4	6.6	93.2	6.8	89.5	10.5	91.0	9.0	5.4	8.5
Bulgaria[4]	96.2	3.8	97.7	2.3	96.7	3.3	97.1	2.9	1.6	2.2
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	97.4	2.6	98.0	2.0	97.6	2.4	97.7	2.3	m	m
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**89.3**	**10.7**	**92.5**	**7.5**	**91.6**	**8.4**	**91.0**	**9.0**	**8.4**	**6.9**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Notes: Some columns with data on the share of non-fully qualified teachers who are in the process of acquiring full qualification are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2024/25: academic year 2023/24 for Denmark, Finland, France, Germany and Switzerland; calendar year 2024 for Chile and Costa Rica; calendar year 2025 for New Zealand; academic year 2025/26 for Japan.
2. Pre-primary and primary education are combined in France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. Primary and lower secondary education are combined in Denmark. Upper secondary education is excluded in Denmark, Israel and Switzerland. Upper secondary vocational education is excluded in Finland, Hungary and the Netherlands.
3. Teacher data are based on headcounts instead of full-time equivalents.
4. Year of reference differs from 2017/18: academic year 2018/19 for Bulgaria, Lithuania, the Netherlands and Switzerland; and 2019/20 for Luxembourg and Poland; calendar year 2020 for New Zealand (only primary and secondary education).
5. Including government-dependent private institutions.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Table 2. Trends in the share of unfilled teaching vacancies (2017/18 and 2024/25) and share of successful teaching candidates (2024/25)

Full-time and part-time, public institutions

	Competitive examination for a limited and fixed number of places for certifying new teachers	Pre-primary education		Primary			Secondary			Primary and secondary		
		Unfilled teaching vacancies (2024/25)…		Share of successful teaching candidates in 2023/24[1]	Unfilled teaching vacancies (2024/25)…		Share of successful teaching candidates in 2023/24[1]	Unfilled teaching vacancies (2024/25)…		Share of successful teaching candidates in 2023/24[1]	Unfilled teaching vacancies (2024/25)…	
		… in absolute numbers	…as a percentage of the total number of teaching positions (whether filled by fully qualified teachers or not)		… in absolute numbers	…as a percentage of the total number of teaching positions (whether filled by fully qualified teachers or not)		… in absolute numbers	…as a percentage of the total number of teaching positions (whether filled by fully qualified teachers or not)		… in absolute numbers	…as a percentage of the total number of teaching positions (whether filled by fully qualified teachers or not)
	(1)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Group 1 – Shortage of fully qualified teachers before the start of the school year (pre-start stock measure)												
OECD countries												
Austria	No	m	m	m	x(12)	x(13)	m	x(12)	x(13)	m	1 133	1.0
France[2, 3]	Yes	x(6)	x(7)	34 [d]	1 416 [d]	0.4 [d]	24	1 518	0.4	28	2 934	0.4
Korea	Yes	0	0.0	44	0	0.0	14	0	0.0	19	0	0.0
Luxembourg[2, 4]	Yes	x(6)	x(7)	100 [d]	212 [d]	3.1 [d]	24	244	4.1	42	456	3.6
Türkiye	Yes	0	0.0	m	0	0.0	m	0	0.0	m	0	0.0
Other economies												
French Comm. (Belgium)[3]	No	357	2.2	m	590	1.8	m	1,571	3.1	m	2,161	2.3
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina[3]	No	353	0.5	m	3 259	1.3	m	1 091	1.7	m	4 350	1.4
Romania	Yes	517	1.6	76	671	1.5	72	4 094	3.3	73	4 765	2.8
Group 2 – Unfilled teaching vacancies at or shortly after the start of the school year (post-start stock measure)												
OECD countries												
Canada	No	x(12)	x(13)	m	x(12)	x(13)	m	x(12)	x(13)	m	5 050	0.9
Chile[2, 3, 5]	No	m	m	m	1 418 [d]	2.6 [d]	m	628	3.6	m	2 046	2.9
Ireland[5]	No	m	m	m	1 258	3.2	m	344	1.0	m	1 603	2.2
Japan[3, 4, 5]	Yes	m	m	50	1 699	0.4	27	1 539	0.3	36	3 238	0.4
Latvia[5]	No	53	0.6	m	134	1.9	m	324	3.9	87	458	3.0
Netherlands[2, 5]	No	x(6)	x(7)	m	1 723 [d]	1.9 [d]	m	1 233	2.0	m	2 956	2.0
Poland	No	x(12)	x(13)	m	x(12)	x(13)	m	x(12)	x(13)		1 675	0.4
Slovak Republic[4]	No	222	1.4	92	176	0.9	95	523	1.2	95	699	1.1
Sweden	No	m	m	m	1 100	1.7	m	300	0.4	m	1 400	1.0
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)[6]	No	276	1.2	83	581	1.5	85	1 679	2.5	84	2 260	2.1

	Competitive examination for a limited and fixed number of places for certifying new teachers	Pre-primary education		Primary			Secondary			Primary and secondary		
		Unfilled teaching vacancies (2024/25)…		Share of successful teaching candidates in 2023/24[1]	Unfilled teaching vacancies (2024/25)…		Share of successful teaching candidates in 2023/24[1]	Unfilled teaching vacancies (2024/25)…		Share of successful teaching candidates in 2023/24[1]	Unfilled teaching vacancies (2024/25)…	
		… in absolute numbers	…as a percentage of the total number of teaching positions (whether filled by fully qualified teachers or not)		… in absolute numbers	…as a percentage of the total number of teaching positions (whether filled by fully qualified teachers or not)		… in absolute numbers	…as a percentage of the total number of teaching positions (whether filled by fully qualified teachers or not)		… in absolute numbers	…as a percentage of the total number of teaching positions (whether filled by fully qualified teachers or not)
	(1)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Partner and/or accession countries												
England (UK)	No	241	20.0	89 [d]	364	0.2	93	1 325	0.6	91	1 689	0.4
Bulgaria	No	65	0.4	m	x(9)	x(10)	m	184 [d]	0.3 [d]	87	184	0.3

1. In countries with a competitive examination, this refers to the share of successful applicants in 2023/24 as a percentage of all applicants who took the exam in 2023/24 (2024/25 for Japan). In countries without a competitive examination, this refers to the share of students graduating with a teaching diploma at the end of 2023/24 as a percentage of those enrolled in the final year of teacher education programmes in 2023/24.
2. Pre-primary and primary education are combined in France, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. Primary and lower secondary education are combined in Chile. Upper secondary vocational education is excluded in the Netherlands.
3. Year of reference differs from 2024/25: academic year 2022/23 for Argentina and French Community of Belgium; academic year 2023/24 for France; calendar year 2024 for Chile; academic year 2025/26 for Japan.
4. Year of reference differs from 2017/18: academic year 2019/20 for the Slovak Republic; academic year 2020/21 for Luxembourg; academic year 2021/22 for Japan
5. Expressed in full-time equivalents. In the Netherlands, excluding hidden shortages, i.e. positions that were filled in undesired ways (6 006 positions in primary education and 2 538 in secondary education).
6. Including government-dependent private institutions.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Table 3. Share of fully qualified teachers who left the profession, by level of education (2024/25) and trends in teacher resignations (2017/18 and 2024/25)

Full-time and part-time, public institutions

	2024/25										Trends	
	Pre-primary					Primary and secondary					Primary and secondary	
		Of which:					Of which:				2017/18	2024/25
	Fully qualified teachers who left the profession as a percentage of the total teaching workforce	Resigned from the profession	Retired from the profession	Switched to another assignment within the public education sector	Fully qualified teachers who resigned and had less than 5 years of experience as a percentage of all fully qualified teachers who resigned	Fully qualified teachers who left the profession as a percentage of the total teaching workforce	Resigned from the profession	Retired from the profession	Switched to another assignment within the public education sector	Fully qualified teachers who resigned and had less than 5 years of experience as a percentage of all fully qualified teachers who resigned	Fully qualified teachers who resigned from the profession as a percentage of the total teaching workforce	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(23)	(24)
OECD countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	m	m	m	m	m	5.8	55	45	m	69	2.3	3.2
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile[1]	6.5	49	27	24	47	8.4	51	20	30	46	4.2	4.3
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Denmark[1, 2]	10.4	58	42	m	2	14.5	55	45	m	15	7.9	8.0
Estonia	11.1	79	21	m	m	8.7	76	24	m	m	3.2	6.6
Finland[1, 2]	8.7	82	17	1	33	9.1	80	13	6	30	6.4	7.3
France[1, 2]	x(6)	x(7)	x(8)	x(9)	x(10)	1.9 [d]	17 [d]	83 [d]	m	41 [d]	0.2 [d]	0.3 [d]
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary[2]	6.9	52	20	27	18	5.4	72	15	14	29	3.1	3.9
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland	m	m	m	m	m	2.1	32	68	m	35	m	0.7
Israel[2]	2.1	19	82	m	86	2.5	33	67	m	77	m	m
Italy	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	1.0	80	20	m	11	1.9	73	27	m	8	m	1.4
Latvia	10.1	59	11	30	m	12.0	49	14	37	m	9.1	5.9
Lithuania	25.8	18	5	77	22	6.4	52	21	26	27	5.3	3.3
Luxembourg[2, 3]	x(6)	x(7)	x(8)	x(9)	x(10)	1.9 [d]	4 [d]	66 [d]	30 [d]	64 [d]	0.0 [d]	0.1 [d]
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands[2]	x(6)	x(7)	x(8)	x(9)	x(10)	6.9 [d]	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Zealand[1, 3]	2.6	m	m	m	m	6.0	m	m	m	m	6.2	6.0
Norway	10.7	78	8	13	m	5.2	69	21	11	m	3.6	3.6
Poland[3]	5.1	69	29	2	26	4.2	55	43	2	23	2.2	2.3
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovak Republic	7.3	44	41	15	26	6.0	46	32	22	25	m	2.8
Slovenia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden[3]	10.5	43	10	47	38	5.7	59	14	27	21	4.0	3.4

	2024/25										Trends	
	Pre-primary					Primary and secondary					Primary and secondary	
		Of which:					Of which:				2017/18	2024/25
	Fully qualified teachers who left the profession as a percentage of the total teaching workforce	Resigned from the profession	Retired from the profession	Switched to another assignment within the public education sector	Fully qualified teachers who resigned and had less than 5 years of experience as a percentage of all fully qualified teachers who resigned	Fully qualified teachers who left the profession as a percentage of the total teaching workforce	Resigned from the profession	Retired from the profession	Switched to another assignment within the public education sector	Fully qualified teachers who resigned and had less than 5 years of experience as a percentage of all fully qualified teachers who resigned	Fully qualified teachers who resigned from the profession as a percentage of the total teaching workforce	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(23)	(24)
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)[4]	5.6	38	42	20	26	7.8	46	29	25	25	3.1	3.6
French Comm. (Belgium)	13.2	85	13	2	76	11.6	83	15	2	66	3.1	9.6
England (UK)	x(16)	x(17)	x(18)	x(19)	x(20)	7.9 d	91 d	9 d	m	m	7.7 d	7.2 d
OECD average	**8.6**	**57**	**26**	**17**	**34**	**6.4**	**55**	**34**	**12**	**38**	**4.2**	**4.2**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[1]	10.6	m	m	m	m	10.3	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	5.3	m	m	m	m	6.3	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**10.0**	**57**	**23**	**20**	**30**	**6.9**	**54**	**34**	**12**	**32**	**4.3**	**4.3**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Some columns with data for primary and secondary education, reported separately, are available for consultation online. Only teachers who did not appear in public institutions in the following year were considered in this table as having "resigned from the profession". Some may nevertheless have remained in education by moving to another type of institution (e.g. private or government-dependent private schools).

1. Year of reference differs from 2024/25: calendar year 2022 for Brazil; academic year 2023/24 for Denmark, Finland and France; calendar year 2024 for Chile and for New Zealand (primary and secondary education); calendar year 2025 for New Zealand (pre-primary education).

2. Pre-primary and primary education are combined in France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. Primary and lower secondary education are combined in Denmark. Upper secondary education is excluded in Denmark and Israel. Upper secondary vocational education is excluded in Finland, Hungary and the Netherlands.

3. Year of reference differs from 2017/18: academic year 2019/20 for Sweden; academic year 2019/20 for Luxembourg and Poland; Calendar year 2020 for New Zealand.

4. Including government-dependent private institutions.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Table 4. Trends in the share of teachers aged under 35 or 55 and over, by level of education (2015 and 2024), and comparison with the wider workforce (2024)

Full-time and part-time, public and private institutions

	Percentage of teachers aged under 35				Percentage of teachers aged 55 or over				Percentage of workers aged 55 and over among the employed population with:		
	Pre-primary	Primary	Secondary	Primary and secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Secondary	Primary and secondary	At least a bachelor's degree or equivalent	At least a master's degree or equivalent	All education levels
	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024
	(2)	(4)	(6)	(8)	(10)	(12)	(14)	(16)	(19)	(20)	(21)
OECD countries											
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	15	16	19
Austria	40	32	27	28	11	20	25	24	16	19	20
Belgium	29	33	25	28	16	15	19	17	18	17	20
Canada	x(4)	22[d]	x(4)	22[d]	x(12)	14[d]	x(12)	14[d]	16	18	20
Chile	31	31	33	32	13	15	17	16	11	15	21
Colombia	38	21	23	22	15	28	25	26	m	m	m
Costa Rica[1]	18	19	21	20	13	12	9	11	14	21	19
Czechia	25	14	14	14	27	31	31	31	19	23	21
Denmark[1]	25	29	22	25	26	21	25	23	3	15	24
Estonia[2, 3]	19	18	16	16	33	35	40	38	22	32	25
Finland	29	24	18	21	22	24	29	27	17	22	24
France[1]	20	22	18	19	16	13	23	19	12	6	20
Germany	34	20	18	19	18	21	24	24	25	24	27
Greece	25	28	6	17	22	27	40	33	18	14	22
Hungary	25	14	11	12	25	32	34	34	19	16	20
Iceland[3]	50	19	13	16	13	26	32	29	m	m	m
Ireland[2]	m	29	27	28	m	8	15	11	15	14	19
Israel	29	31	22	26	14	13	21	17	20	25	20
Italy[3]	8	9	14	12	37	40	36	37	20	23	23
Japan[3]	56	38	31	34	7	15	22	19	m	m	m
Korea	56	29	28	28	4	8	12	10	15	20	24
Latvia	22	17	14	15	26	33	42	38	25	39	27
Lithuania	15	13	9	10	33	38	43	42	19	24	25
Luxembourg	31	37	24	30	6	7	14	11	11	11	14
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	12	20	17
Netherlands	30	28	27	27	20	21	25	23	27	28	26
New Zealand	38	22	21	21	14	26	30	28	19	23	23
Norway	37	36	27	31	11	16	23	20	19	18	22
Poland	31	13	10	11	15	27	24	25	12	13	17
Portugal[3]	8	6	6	6	41	35	38	37	17	22	24
Slovak Republic	32	20	18	19	20	19	23	22	15	17	19
Slovenia	29	x(6)	22[d]	20	12	x(14)	20[d]	23	m	m	m
Spain	22	21	17	18	17	18	23	21	16	18	20
Sweden	23	20	15	17	24	24	28	26	17	19	23
Switzerland[3]	28	35	21	28	19	18	23	21	21	22	23
Türkiye[1]	m	32	32	32	m	9	5	6	6	8	13
United Kingdom[1, 3]	36	42	33	37	11	8	15	12	13	13	18
United States	m	28	25	27	m	17	20	19	m	m	m
OECD average	**29**	**24**	**20**	**22**	**19**	**21**	**25**	**23**	**17**	**19**	**21**

	Percentage of teachers aged under 35				Percentage of teachers aged 55 or over				Percentage of workers aged 55 and over among the employed population with:		
	Pre-primary	Primary	Secondary	Primary and secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Secondary	Primary and secondary	At least a bachelor's degree or equivalent	At least a master's degree or equivalent	All education levels
	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024
	(2)	(4)	(6)	(8)	(10)	(12)	(14)	(16)	(19)	(20)	(21)
Partner and/or accession countries											
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	26	22	24	23	11	14	15	15	m	m	m
Bulgaria	19	16	15	15	25	33	32	32	20	25	25
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	35	21	22	22	15	23	18	19	15	16	19
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	25	14	19	16	15	28	22	25	14	27	20
Romania	34	21	16	17	12	16	19	18	11	11	16
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	15	26	8
Thailand	35	38	32	36	13	13	14	13	m	m	m
EU25 average	**25**	**21**	**17**	**19**	**22**	**24**	**28**	**26**	**17**	**19**	**22**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Some columns with data for 2015 are available for consultation online. The data cover all classroom teachers, with no distinction between fully and non-fully qualified teachers. Data on the shares of teachers aged under 35 or 55 and over for 2015 and data on percentage of those aged under 35 among the employed population are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Costa Rica, France and the United Kingdom; 2018 for Denmark; and 2019 for Türkiye.
2. Pre-primary education includes early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01).
3. Secondary education includes post-secondary non-tertiary education.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Table 5. Employment conditions of lower secondary teachers and job satisfaction (2024)

Results based on teachers' responses, Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS)

	Employment conditions						Value of the profession and job satisfaction					
	Percentage of teachers with the following employment status						Value of the profession		Job satisfaction with terms of employment and salary			
	Permanent employment[1]		Fixed-term contract: more than one school year		Fixed-term contract: one school year or less		Percentage of teachers who "agree" or "strongly agree" that the teaching profession is valued in society		Percentage of teachers who "agree" or "strongly agree" that they are satisfied with their terms of employment (barring salaries)[3]		Percentage of teachers who "agree" or "strongly agree" that they are satisfied with the salary they receive for their work	
	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
OECD countries												
Australia	88.7	(0.9)	2.9	(0.4)	8.3	(0.8)	33.2	(1.1)	68.5	(1.6)	54.5	(1.8)
Austria	77.5	(1.0)	4.4	(0.4)	18.1	(0.9)	21.4	(0.7)	81.6	(0.8)	71.9	(0.9)
Chile	71.4	(1.8)	10.2	(1.1)	18.4	(1.5)	16.7	(1.2)	65.3	(1.8)	45.7	(2.3)
Colombia	70.3	(2.3)	8.4	(1.3)	21.3	(2.2)	54.0	(1.6)	87.2	(1.1)	63.1	(1.7)
Costa Rica	55.8	(1.7)	22.2	(1.3)	22.1	(1.4)	23.3	(1.1)	76.5	(1.2)	44.8	(2.0)
Czechia	80.9	(0.8)	4.7	(0.4)	14.4	(0.7)	22.3	(0.7)	84.4	(0.7)	46.8	(1.0)
Denmark	97.0	(0.5)	0.5	(0.2)	2.5	(0.5)	37.6	(1.3)	71.0	(1.4)	69.5	(1.2)
Estonia	79.4	(1.0)	2.8	(0.4)	17.8	(1.0)	20.3	(0.7)	73.4	(1.2)	30.0	(1.1)
Finland	76.8	(0.9)	4.5	(0.5)	18.7	(0.9)	48.1	(1.0)	68.3	(1.1)	49.3	(1.4)
France	93.7	(0.7)	1.2	(0.3)	5.2	(0.6)	3.8	(0.5)	58.7	(1.5)	26.6	(1.2)
Hungary	88.0	(0.8)	3.7	(0.4)	8.3	(0.7)	8.4	(0.6)	55.1	(1.3)	25.6	(1.2)
Iceland	81.4	(1.3)	4.7	(0.7)	13.9	(1.1)	18.7	(1.2)	72.2	(1.6)	19.3	(1.5)
Israel	81.8	(1.1)	5.1	(0.6)	13.0	(1.0)	30.1	(1.2)	61.2	(1.4)	33.9	(1.5)
Italy	78.8	(1.0)	0.0	(0.0)	21.2	(1.0)	14.1	(0.6)	66.7	(1.0)	22.6	(0.9)
Japan	73.8	(1.1)	9.8	(0.7)	16.3	(1.0)	29.6	(0.8)	37.3	(0.9)	28.6	(1.0)
Korea	75.0	(1.1)	12.3	(0.8)	12.7	(0.7)	35.2	(1.1)	51.5	(1.3)	28.6	(1.1)
Latvia	96.2	(0.4)	2.2	(0.3)	1.6	(0.3)	21.0	(0.8)	81.7	(0.9)	38.9	(1.5)
Lithuania	92.4	(0.7)	5.2	(0.5)	2.4	(0.4)	20.5	(0.8)	77.4	(1.0)	28.4	(1.2)
Netherlands[4]	82.1	(1.7)	3.6	(0.9)	14.3	(1.4)	37.1	(1.7)	79.7	(2.0)	74.1	(1.9)
New Zealand[4]	92.9	(0.9)	1.8	(0.5)	5.3	(0.7)	34.5	(2.0)	72.8	(2.2)	51.5	(2.5)
Norway[4]	92.1	(0.9)	2.3	(0.4)	5.6	(0.8)	18.3	(1.5)	69.8	(1.9)	34.1	(2.3)
Poland	87.6	(1.0)	3.6	(0.6)	8.9	(0.9)	10.4	(0.7)	80.3	(1.2)	20.5	(1.3)
Portugal	67.4	(1.0)	11.9	(0.7)	20.7	(1.0)	8.7	(0.5)	39.1	(1.3)	13.4	(0.9)
Slovak Republic	82.2	(1.0)	5.4	(0.6)	12.4	(0.7)	6.5	(0.5)	80.8	(0.9)	27.3	(1.1)
Slovenia	88.2	(0.9)	3.3	(0.5)	8.5	(0.8)	7.4	(0.6)	72.7	(1.3)	32.7	(1.2)
Spain	69.2	(1.0)	6.2	(0.4)	24.6	(0.8)	15.6	(0.6)	71.5	(1.0)	54.2	(1.0)
Sweden	91.0	(0.9)	1.8	(0.4)	7.2	(0.8)	14.7	(0.9)	71.3	(1.4)	40.1	(1.5)
Türkiye	87.4	(1.0)	5.5	(0.6)	7.1	(0.9)	22.3	(0.8)	50.0	(0.9)	21.3	(1.0)
United States	65.6	(2.4)	8.9	(1.3)	25.5	(2.3)	26.4	(1.7)	75.4	(2.0)	38.9	(2.6)
Other economies												
Alberta (Canada)[4]	80.4	(2.3)	2.8	(0.6)	16.9	(2.3)	34.8	(1.7)	73.8	(1.8)	49.9	(2.2)
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	87.2	(1.0)	2.8	(0.4)	10.0	(0.9)	21.3	(0.9)	62.2	(1.0)	71.2	(1.1)

	Employment conditions						Value of the profession and job satisfaction					
	Percentage of teachers with the following employment status						Value of the profession		Job satisfaction with terms of employment and salary			
	Permanent employment[1]		Fixed-term contract: more than one school year		Fixed-term contract: one school year or less		Percentage of teachers who "agree" or "strongly agree" that the teaching profession is valued in society		Percentage of teachers who "agree" or "strongly agree" that they are satisfied with their terms of employment (barring salaries)[3]		Percentage of teachers who "agree" or "strongly agree" that they are satisfied with the salary they receive for their work	
	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
French Comm. (Belgium)	75.1	(1.3)	0.0	(0.0)	24.9	(1.3)	5.8	(0.4)	76.5	(1.5)	66.1	(1.7)
OECD average	**80.7**	**(0.2)**	**5.7**	**(0.1)**	**13.6**	**(0.2)**	**21.7**	**(0.2)**	**68.4**	**(0.2)**	**38.7**	**(0.3)**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Brazil	63.5	(2.0)	18.7	(1.7)	17.8	(1.4)	14.1	(0.9)	44.3	(1.9)	22.3	(1.6)
Bulgaria	90.7	(0.9)	3.8	(0.5)	5.5	(0.7)	42.4	(1.3)	80.9	(1.1)	64.6	(1.5)
Croatia	92.2	(0.7)	3.8	(0.5)	4.0	(0.6)	9.5	(0.7)	51.9	(1.3)	22.5	(1.2)
Romania	73.2	(1.3)	6.9	(0.6)	19.9	(1.1)	42.0	(0.9)	81.1	(0.9)	57.2	(1.2)
Saudi Arabia	89.9	(0.9)	3.7	(0.6)	6.4	(0.7)	77.1	(1.0)	76.9	(1.0)	72.3	(1.2)
South Africa	88.5	(0.9)	4.9	(0.6)	6.6	(0.6)	63.0	(1.3)	57.7	(1.6)	26.4	(1.4)
EU average	**82.3**	**(0.3)**	**3.5**	**(0.1)**	**14.2**	**(0.3)**	**15.4**	**(0.2)**	**69.8**	**(0.4)**	**37.3**	**(0.4)**

Note: Some columns with data on percentage of second-career teachers are available for consultation online.
1. Permanent employment refers to an ongoing contract with no fixed endpoint before the age of retirement.
2. Second-career teachers are teachers for whom teaching was not a first career choice and who have at least 10 years of work experience in non-education roles.
3. Terms of employment refer to the terms of teaching contracts or employment, for example benefits and work schedule, excluding salary.
4. Estimates should be interpreted with caution due to higher risk of non-response bias.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Table 6. Comparing teachers' job satisfaction, work pressure, workload and participation in and unmet demand for professional development with other workers (2023)

Results based on adults' responses, Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)

	Percentage of adults who report being "satisfied" or "extremely satisfied" with their jobs						Percentage of adults reporting that in the last 12 months there were training activities they wanted to participate in but did not (i.e., "unmet demand")					
	By occupation						By occupation					
	Primary school, secondary education and vocational education teachers (a)		Other employed adults aged 16-65 who have bachelor's or master's or equivalent attainment (b)		Difference (a) - (b)		Primary school, secondary education and vocational education teachers (a)		Other employed adults aged 16-65 with bachelor's or master's or equivalent attainment (b)		Difference (a) - (b)	
	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	pp. dif.	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	pp dif.	S.E.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)
OECD countries												
Austria	88.9	(5.3)	87.7	(2.2)	1.2	(6.3)	41.2	(6.6)	20.4	(0.8)	**20.8**	(6.6)
Canada	89.7	(2.8)	84.7	(1.9)	5.0	(3.4)	42.5	(6.0)	28.0	(0.8)	**14.5**	(6.2)
Chile	60.4	(9.4)	81.8	(2.1)	**-21.4**	(9.5)	62.5	(6.1)	36.9	(1.0)	**25.5**	(6.2)
Croatia	92.1	(3.7)	88.0	(1.8)	4.1	(3.7)	30.9	(6.5)	13.1	(0.9)	**17.8**	(6.4)
Czechia	88.6	(4.1)	81.2	(1.9)	7.5	(4.8)	34.1	(6.5)	24.7	(0.9)	9.4	(6.5)
Denmark	88.1	(4.0)	89.8	(1.2)	-1.7	(4.0)	43.6	(4.9)	32.1	(1.0)	**11.5**	(5.0)
Estonia	86.4	(3.4)	89.7	(0.9)	-3.3	(3.4)	43.5	(4.2)	36.7	(0.6)	6.8	(4.3)
Finland	91.3	(4.3)	86.8	(1.3)	4.6	(4.5)	52.9	(5.9)	32.9	(0.8)	**19.9**	(6.0)
France	73.5	(4.2)	83.6	(1.4)	**-10.1**	(4.4)	28.6	(3.3)	21.7	(0.7)	**7.0**	(3.4)
Germany	78.5	(6.3)	80.4	(1.3)	-1.9	(6.6)	32.3	(5.7)	20.3	(0.8)	**12.0**	(5.8)
Hungary	59.8	(7.1)	83.1	(1.7)	**-23.4**	(7.1)	18.8	(4.2)	14.8	(0.7)	4.0	(4.1)
Ireland	85.5	(4.8)	85.7	(1.3)	-0.2	(4.9)	36.0	(5.2)	23.8	(0.9)	**12.2**	(5.5)
Israel	83.8	(4.7)	91.2	(1.4)	-7.4	(4.9)	26.2	(3.2)	22.7	(0.7)	3.5	(3.4)
Italy	c	c	86.5	(2.7)	c	c	30.3	(8.3)	19.0	(1.3)	11.3	(8.4)
Japan	85.7	(4.2)	66.1	(2.1)	**19.6**	(4.7)	42.2	(5.5)	24.1	(0.7)	**18.1**	(5.3)
Korea	c	c	72.8	(3.8)	c	c	27.0	(5.7)	19.9	(0.8)	7.1	(5.7)
Latvia	71.3	(6.6)	86.8	(1.5)	**-15.5**	(6.8)	30.6	(4.7)	27.3	(0.9)	3.3	(4.7)
Lithuania	71.6	(6.1)	84.8	(2.0)	**-13.2**	(6.3)	38.8	(4.6)	20.0	(0.8)	**18.8**	(4.6)
Netherlands	92.5	(3.5)	89.7	(1.2)	2.8	(3.9)	37.1	(6.1)	20.7	(0.9)	**16.5**	(5.9)
New Zealand	85.6	(4.4)	79.2	(2.3)	6.5	(4.8)	37.8	(7.8)	32.5	(1.3)	5.4	(7.8)
Norway	83.9	(3.6)	89.2	(1.0)	-5.4	(3.5)	28.3	(3.3)	28.8	(0.9)	-0.5	(3.5)
Poland	96.9	(3.1)	94.7	(1.2)	2.2	(3.1)	12.4	(4.0)	6.2	(0.5)	6.2	(4.0)
Portugal	c	c	78.7	(2.1)	c	c	44.4	(9.8)	29.7	(1.1)	14.7	(10.0)
Slovak Republic	90.0	(3.7)	86.9	(2.1)	3.1	(4.5)	15.9	(3.5)	8.8	(0.7)	7.1	(3.6)
Spain	92.5	(2.5)	84.9	(1.5)	**7.6**	(3.0)	36.5	(4.7)	27.2	(0.7)	9.3	(4.9)
Sweden[3]	95.2	(2.9)	88.1	(1.6)	**7.0**	(3.1)	27.0	(4.8)	28.2	(0.9)	-1.2	(4.6)
Switzerland	90.9	(2.6)	90.2	(0.9)	0.7	(2.9)	30.5	(3.7)	23.2	(0.7)	7.3	(3.7)
United States	92.8	(3.0)	86.5	(1.3)	**6.3**	(3.1)	23.3	(6.6)	30.5	(1.2)	-7.2	(7.0)
Other economies												
England (UK)	86.5	(4.2)	82.5	(1.6)	4.0	(4.5)	27.9	(6.0)	20.9	(0.8)	7.0	(5.9)
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	89.3	(3.8)	89.8	(1.2)	-0.5	(3.8)	25.4	(4.2)	23.0	(1.0)	2.4	(4.4)
OECD PIAAC average-29	**84.6**	**(0.9)**	**84.9**	**(0.3)**	**-1.0**	**(1.0)**	**33.7**	**(1.0)**	**24.3**	**(0.2)**	**9.4**	**(1.0)**

Note: Differences that are statistically significant are indicated in bold. Code "c" indicates that there are too few observations to provide reliable estimates. Some columns with data are available for consultation online.

1. Full-time workers are those working 30 hours or more per week.

2. Including any usual paid or unpaid overtime, but excluding lunch breaks or other breaks.

3. In Sweden, most teachers have a so-called “ferietjänst”, meaning their annual working time is concentrated to school terms - often resulting in slightly longer workweeks - but includes extended continuous holidays when students are off.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Table 7. Changes in the number of teachers, classrooms and student enrolment between 2015 and 2024, and projected changes in the number of children between 2024 and 2033

Public and private institutions

	Index of change in the number of students enrolled in education between 2015 and 2024 (2015 = 100)					Index of change in the number of full-time equivalent classroom teachers between 2015 and 2024 (2015 = 100)		Index of change in the number of school classrooms between 2015 and 2024 (2015 = 100)		Index of change in the projected number of children between 2024 and 2033 (2024 = 100)			
	By age, full-time and part-time			By level of education, in full-time equivalents		By level of education		By level of education		By age			
	5-9	10-14	5-14	Primary	Lower secondary	Primary	Lower secondary	Primary	Lower secondary	0 to 4	5-9	10-14	5-14
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
OECD countries													
Australia	104	116	110	106	m	117	m	93	100	104	102	101	101
Austria	112	105	109	112	106	111	105	111	104	102	92	103	97
Belgium	99	113	106	103	99	111	103	m	m	103	94	92	93
Canada	106	118	112	110	m	114	m	m	m	96	91	95	93
Chile	98	109	103	101	108	124	124	102	105	93	95	92	93
Colombia[1]	96	94	95	90	93	98	110	93	100	89	88	94	91
Costa Rica[2]	100	102	101	97	92	108	95	102	107	84	71	74	72
Czechia	104	126	114	109	130	116	123	114	130	87	88	93	90
Denmark[3]	93	96	95	92	101	93	100	110	125	105	99	99	99
Estonia	101	124	112	112	133	126	124	111	125	88	84	87	86
Finland	94	108	101	101	111	114	108	102	110	99	89	83	86
France[2,4]	95	105	100	96	102	106	101	107	101	101	97	89	93
Germany	117	104	110	115	104	117	107	111	111	95	97	108	103
Greece	84	99	91	88	105	116	105	90	99	90	89	85	87
Hungary	98	94	96	97	93	99	89	92	97	95	98	102	100
Iceland	97	117	107	106	121	116	116	106	118	113	114	101	107
Ireland[4]	96	119	107	99	m	127	m	111	m	98	84	83	83
Israel	118	119	119	118	117	197	115	122	119	114	115	117	116
Italy	84	96	90	89	95	104	105	92	100	99	84	80	82
Japan	92	92	92	93	92	107	100	93	92	96	82	80	81
Korea	87	91	89	92	85	108	104	102	98	100	59	61	60
Latvia	103	107	105	106	112	90	91	96	97	77	70	86	77
Lithuania	109	109	109	112	99	84	71	96	90	82	78	78	78
Luxembourg	119	118	118	120	116	157	135	119	116	112	113	107	110
Mexico	91	95	93	92	98	107	m	89	102	90	92	92	92
Netherlands	96	94	95	94	95	95	98	m	m	116	107	96	101
New Zealand	103	118	110	104	118	105	111	m	m	97	93	95	94
Norway	96	107	101	101	112	106	137	m	m	108	95	88	91
Poland	106	120	113	m	m	m	m	m	m	83	79	86	83
Portugal	98	95	97	92	91	101	96	98	103	98	96	92	94
Slovak Republic	115	114	114	113	122	135	88	111	111	84	86	97	91
Slovenia	103	126	114	m	m	m	m	119	118	91	84	86	85
Spain	90	109	99	95	110	109	123	99	114	104	90	84	87
Sweden	108	121	114	107	124	111	136	105	123	93	83	91	87
Switzerland[4]	114	113	113	115	108	121	109	114	107	101	97	103	100
Türkiye	113	107	110	104	104	108	129	96	112	98	101	104	102
United Kingdom[2]	100	116	108	101	115	87	100	103	73	99	91	91	91

	Index of change in the number of students enrolled in education between 2015 and 2024 (2015 = 100)					Index of change in the number of full-time equivalent classroom teachers between 2015 and 2024 (2015 = 100)		Index of change in the number of school classrooms between 2015 and 2024 (2015 = 100)		Index of change in the projected number of children between 2024 and 2033 (2024 = 100)			
	By age, full-time and part-time			By level of education, in full-time equivalents		By level of education		By level of education		By age			
	5-9	10-14	5-14	Primary	Lower secondary	Primary	Lower secondary	Primary	Lower secondary	0 to 4	5-9	10-14	5-14
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
United States	94	100	97	96	101	107	108	101	127	101	95	93	94
OECD average	**101**	**108**	**104**	**102**	**106**	**113**	**108**	**104**	**108**	**97**	**91**	**92**	**91**
Partner and/or accession countries													
Argentina	m	m	m	m	M	m	m	m	m	99	71	74	72
Brazil	101	92	97	93	89	104	98	113	108	91	94	100	97
Bulgaria	88	99	93	89	84	153	118	m	m	86	81	85	83
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
Croatia	91	98	95	89	98	113	112	m	m	85	87	89	88
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	97	94	91	92
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	96	102	102	102
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	89	91	90	93	91	97	95	m	m	91	84	87	86
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	113	110	100	105
South Africa	92	113	103	m	m	m	m	m	m	95	108	112	110
EU25 average	**100**	**108**	**103**	**101**	**106**	**112**	**106**	**105**	**110**	**95**	**89**	**91**	**90**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Columns 6 and 7 cover all classroom teachers, with no distinction between fully and non-fully qualified teachers.
1. The 2024 values on classroom teachers (Columns 6 and 7) are based on a more precise methodology than the 2015 values. While the figures are not fully comparable in strict methodological terms, the earlier data are considered sufficiently robust to support an approximate comparison.
2.Year of reference 2016 instead of 2015.
3. Year of reference 2023 instead of 2024 for data on number of classes in Denmark.
4. Data on students, teachers and the number of classes (by level of education) refer to public institutions only.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/es84jw.

Part A. The output of educational institutions and the impact of learning


Chapter A1. To what level have adults studied?

Highlights

- In most OECD and partner countries, young men are more likely than young women to lack an upper secondary qualification. On average across OECD countries, 14% of men aged 25-34 have not completed upper secondary education, compared to 11% of women of that age.
- As tertiary education has expanded over the past decade, vocational upper secondary attainment has become less common. On average across OECD countries, 25% of 55-64 year-olds have this as their highest educational qualification, compared to 19% of 25-34 year-olds.
- The most common level of tertiary educational attainment is a bachelor's or equivalent, with about 48% of tertiary-educated 25-64 year-olds having a bachelor's degree as their highest level of education.

Figure A1.1. Distribution of educational attainment of adults (2025)

In per cent, 25-64 year-olds



1. Year of reference differs from 2025.
For data, see Table A1.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tcxh4.

Context

Educational attainment is a key indicator of human capital and plays an important role in shaping labour-market outcomes and broader well-being. Higher levels of educational attainment are generally associated with stronger employment prospects (see Chapter A3) and higher earnings (see Chapter A4), and have implications for an individual's work-life balance (see Chapter A6). As economies evolve and skill demands change, education systems face the challenge of equipping learners with the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in both work and society.

Over recent decades, tertiary attainment has increased substantially across OECD countries, while vocational education and training (VET) at the upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary levels remains an important component of education systems. Historically, vocational education at the upper secondary and post-secondary levels and tertiary education have often been viewed as distinct or alternative pathways to the labour market, reflecting the fact that most students entering tertiary education follow a general programme at the upper secondary level in many OECD countries. In practice, however, vocational and tertiary pathways often respond to different learner preferences, labour-market needs and institutional contexts, rather than representing competing alternatives. At the same time, the distinction between these pathways is becoming less pronounced in many countries, as tertiary programmes increasingly incorporate applied and work-based learning components and vocationally oriented programmes at the short-cycle tertiary level expand opportunities for progression to higher levels of education (OECD, 2022[1]). Overall, it is imperative to ensure that higher attainment is accompanied by corresponding improvements in skills.

Understanding educational attainment patterns requires moving beyond the assumption that tertiary education is always "better", and furthermore beyond the idea that vocational and tertiary education are mutually exclusive. Educational pathways differ in their objectives, content and expected outcomes, and their value depends on individual aspirations, further learning opportunities and labour-market conditions. As education systems adapt to changing skill demands, expanding progression opportunities between different levels and orientations of education has become an increasingly important policy objective.

This chapter examines educational attainment across OECD countries, covering below upper secondary, upper secondary and tertiary education and paying particular attention to the distribution of qualifications across different educational levels and programme orientations. Educational attainment statistics provide an important indicator of the skills and qualifications available within a population, helping to inform assessments of educational and labour-market outcomes, economic competitiveness, and social inclusion.

Other findings

- Educational attainment and skills proficiency are closely linked across OECD countries. Across OECD countries, more than four in five adults demonstrating high skills across literacy, numeracy and adaptive problem solving hold a tertiary qualification. Meanwhile adults with below upper secondary education make up less than 1% of this high-skilled group.
- Although most people with high skills hold a tertiary qualification, not everyone with tertiary attainment has high skills. Around 18% of adults with low skills in all domains hold tertiary qualifications, indicating that formal qualifications alone do not fully capture adults' proficiency levels.
- Regional data reveal significant differences in access to education. In Mexico, the share of adults with below upper secondary attainment ranges from 32% in México D.C. to 69% in Chiapas, a gap of 37 percentage points. In Spain, the difference between the Basque Country (20%) and Ceuta (49%) reaches 29 percentage points, while in the Republic of Türkiye the share ranges from 36% in Ankara to 69% in Southeast Anatolia - Middle, corresponding to a gap of 33 percentage points.

Analysis

Below upper secondary attainment

Completing upper secondary education has become a baseline requirement for successful participation in many modern economies and societies. Adults without an upper secondary qualification face higher risks of unemployment, lower earnings and less flexible working arrangements than their more educated peers (see Chapters A3, A4 and A6). Adults with low educational

attainment are also less likely to participate in adult learning and training opportunities, limiting their ability to adapt to changing skill demands throughout their working lives (see Chapter A5).

Despite the expansion of education systems over recent decades, on average across OECD countries, 18% of adults aged 25-64 had not attained an upper secondary qualification in 2025. In Costa Rica and Mexico about 50% of adults or more lack upper secondary attainment (Table A1.1).

Educational attainment has continued to improve among younger generations. Across OECD countries, the share of 25-34 year-olds without upper secondary attainment has fallen from 17% in 2015 to 12% in 2025. Among OECD countries, Mexico recorded the highest share of young adults with below upper secondary attainment in both 2015 and 2025, although it has fallen from 55% in 2015 to 40% in 2025 showing significant progress. At the other end of the scale, Korea recorded the lowest share in both years, with 2% in 2015 and 1% in 2025 (Table A1.2).

In most OECD and partner countries, young men are more likely than young women to lack an upper secondary qualification. On average across OECD countries, 14% of young men aged 25-34 have not completed upper secondary education, compared to 11% of young women. Gender gaps of 8 percentage points or more are observed in Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Estonia, Spain and Portugal. Only in Türkiye, Bulgaria, India, Indonesia, Peru and Romania (among OECD and partner countries) does the share of young women without upper secondary attainment exceed that of young men (Table A1.2).

Reducing the share of adults without upper secondary education remains a key policy priority across OECD countries. Governments have continued to implement policies aimed at preventing early leaving from education and training, supporting second-chance opportunities and strengthening pathways between education, training and employment (see Box A2.1. in Chapter A2 and Chapter B3).

Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment

Upper secondary attainment can be considered a baseline for favourable labour market outcomes, as adults with only below upper secondary often face high unemployment and low earnings over the lifetime (see Chapters A3 and A4). While some countries have achieved very high levels of at least upper secondary attainment and therefore focus on expanding access to tertiary education, other countries have a continued need to expand access to education at both the upper secondary and tertiary levels.


Figure A1.2 shows that trends in the share of younger adults (25-34 year-olds) whose highest qualification is upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education varied across countries between 2015 and 2025. On average across OECD countries, the share of young adults with this level of attainment declined slightly, from 41% in 2015 to 39% in 2025. In some countries, the share increased markedly, particularly in Costa Rica (from 20% to 31%), Mexico (from 24% to 31%), Portugal (from 34% to 43%) and South Africa (from 39% to 49%). By contrast, sizeable declines were observed for example in Croatia (from 64% to 54%), France (from 42% to 34%), Germany (from 58% to 45%), Ireland (from 39% to 29%) and the United Kingdom (from 36% to 28%).

In all OECD countries where upper secondary attainment rates declined over the past decade, tertiary attainment rates increased, suggesting that the drop is due to learners continuing their education beyond upper secondary rather than because of reduced access to educational opportunities. At the same time, in most countries where upper secondary attainment rates increased, below upper secondary attainment rates have been falling, with more people continuing into upper secondary education. Taken together, these trends point to a broad expansion of educational participation at different levels and across programme orientations across almost all OECD and partner countries over the last decade, (Table A1.2). In many countries, the role of upper secondary education, particularly through vocational education and training (VET) pathways, is closely linked to labour market outcomes; this relationship is explored further in Figure A1.3.

Gender gaps in upper secondary attainment have remained fairly consistent among 25-34 year-olds over the last ten years. Across OECD countries, on average, 44% of young men had upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment in 2025, 10 percentage points more than the rate for young women (34%). The gap was similar in 2015, at about 9 percentage points (46% for young men and 37% for young women). The gap is the other way round for tertiary attainment, where the average difference between the share of 25-34 year-old women and men with tertiary attainment is 13 percentage points in favour of women (Table A1.2).

Figure A1.2. Trends in the share of 25-34 year-olds with an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary qualification as their highest qualification (2015 and 2025)

In per cent




1. Year of reference differs from 2025.
2. Year of reference differs from 2015.
3. A break in 2020 affects the continuity of the data for Switzerland. Please see the Sources, methodologies and technical notes for more information.
For data, see Table A1.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tcxh4.

Countries also differ in the extent to which upper secondary education is offered with a vocational orientation and there are substantial differences across countries in the share of adults whose highest attainment is upper secondary vocational education (Table A1.1). As Figure A1.3 shows, older adults are more likely than younger ones to have an upper secondary vocational qualification as their highest level of education in most OECD and partner countries. On average across OECD countries, 25% of 55-64 year-olds have vocational upper secondary attainment, compared to 19% of 25-34 year-olds. The differences are particularly wide in Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic, where the share of older adults exceeds that of younger adults by over 20 percentage points. These differences may reflect a combination of factors, including changes in the provision and attractiveness of vocational programmes, as well as expanded opportunities for progression to higher levels of education. Only a few countries show the opposite pattern, with younger adults more likely than older adults to have upper secondary vocational attainment. This is particularly the case in Portugal (19% among 25-34 year-olds compared to 2% among 55-64 year-olds) and Türkiye (12% compared to 6%). In Portugal this pattern is consistent with national reforms expanding the provision of vocational upper secondary education in recent decades (OECD, 2018[2]).

Figure A1.3. Share of adults whose highest attainment is upper secondary vocational education, by age group (2025)

In per cent



1. Year of reference differs from 2025.
For data, see Table A1.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tcxh4.

Furthermore, trends suggest that policy priorities, participation patterns and attainment outcomes have evolved over recent years. Recent OECD work has highlighted VET as a key component of education systems and an important pathway for developing skills relevant to the labour market, reflecting increasing policy efforts to strengthen the attractiveness and status of vocational education (OECD, 2023[3]). At the same time, the share of young adults with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary vocational attainment as the highest level attained declined from 25% in 2015 to 23% in 2025 on average across OECD countries. This trend has been consistent for both men and women, with the gender gap at this level remaining at 7 percentage points (Table A1.2, web columns). While this reflects changes in the share of individuals whose highest qualification is vocational education at the upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary levels, this is not a clear indication in the overall importance of vocational education. In some countries, declining attainment at upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary vocational levels may partly reflect increasing progression into tertiary education, including professionally oriented, applied and higher vocational programmes.

Tertiary attainment

The most common level of tertiary attainment is a bachelor's degree, with about 48% tertiary-educated 25-64 year-olds having a bachelor's or equivalent qualification as their highest level of education. This is followed by master's attainment, with around 34% of tertiary-educated adults holding this degree as their highest qualification. This pattern of attainment reflects strong labour-market demand for highly skilled workers, with bachelor's and master's degrees serving as key pathways to employment in knowledge-intensive sectors. In contrast, a relatively low share of tertiary educated adults hold short-cycle tertiary qualifications as their highest educational attainment (16%), while an even smaller share (about 3%) have attained a doctorate (Table A1.1). Although doctoral graduates represent a relatively small share of the population, doctoral education remains essential for research, innovation and the development of advanced skills. Recent OECD analysis also highlights the growing complexity and diversification of academic and research careers, as well as the increasing importance of advanced research and digital competencies across sector (OECD, 2024[4]).

The share of tertiary-educated 25-34 year-olds increased between 2015 and 2025 in almost all OECD countries with comparable data. On average across OECD countries, the share rose from 42% in 2015 to 49% in 2025. Particularly large increases – of 12 percentage points or more – were observed in Chile, Ireland, Luxembourg, Spain, and Türkiye. More moderate increases were recorded in most other OECD countries, while Hungary, Israel and Finland were the only OECD countries to experience either no growth or a slight decrease in tertiary attainment rates over the period (Table A1.2).

Gender differences in tertiary attainment among 25-34 year-olds have seen little improvement over the past ten years. On average across OECD countries, 56% of younger women held a tertiary qualification in 2025, compared to 43% of men. This 13 percentage-point gap favouring women is slightly larger than the 12 percentage-point gap in 2015 (Table A1.2).

Although the overall gender gap has remained relatively stable across OECD countries, trends vary considerably at the national level. In some countries, the tertiary attainment gap between young men and women has widened further over the past decade, increasing by 11 percentage points in Iceland between 2015 and 2024, 9 percentage points in Türkiye and 8 percentage points in Korea. In Türkiye, men and women had almost identical tertiary attainment rates in 2015, but women pulled ahead markedly over the following decade. In contrast, some countries have seen the gap narrow. In Latvia, for example, the gender gap fell by about 9 percentage points, driven mostly by rising tertiary attainment rates among men. However, Latvia had an exceptionally large gender gap in 2015 and still had one of the largest gaps in tertiary attainment across OECD countries by 2025 (Table A1.2).


Educational attainment and skills

Educational attainment is closely associated with the skills adults possess, although higher attainment does not guarantee greater proficiency levels. Drawing on data from the OECD Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) (OECD, 2026[5]), Figure A1.4 shows the distribution of the OECD average adults' educational attainment by skill proficiency using a combined measure of proficiency in literacy, numeracy and adaptive problem solving. For more information on the construction of the combined skills measure, see

Methodology section below.

Figure A1.4. OECD average educational attainment of adults, by combined skill level (2023)

In per cent; 25-64 year-olds; Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)



Note: The estimates in this figure are derived from the OECD Survey of Adult Skills. Differences in underlying sources, country composition and population coverage may result in small discrepancies compared to Table A1.1, which is based on the NEAC questionnaire.
For data, see Table A1.4., available online. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tcxh4.

Across OECD countries, more than four out of five adults demonstrating high skills across literacy, numeracy and adaptive problem solving hold a tertiary qualification, while adults with below upper secondary education account for less than 1% of this group. The share of adults holding a tertiary qualification rises sharply when comparing those with medium proficiency levels and those with high levels in at least one domain, increasing from 48% among adults with medium skills in all domains to almost 72% among those demonstrating high skills in at least one domain (Figure A1.4).

Meanwhile, adults with below upper secondary attainment are the least likely to have high skills in at least one domain. Although they make up only 15% of the total population, adults with below upper secondary attainment make up 38% of the population with low skills in all domains. Adults with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment make up the largest share of adults with low skills in all domains, accounting for 44% of this group (Figure A1.4).

Although most people with high skills hold a tertiary qualification, not everyone with tertiary attainment has high skills. Around 18% of adults with low skills in all domains hold tertiary qualifications, indicating that formal qualifications alone do not fully capture adults' proficiency levels (Figure A1.4). In Canada, Denmark, Finland, Israel and Korea, tertiary-educated adults make up more than 25% of the population with low skills across domains – all countries with among the highest levels of tertiary attainment (Table A1.1) and Table A1.4, available online). Together, these results suggest that higher educational attainment does not in itself guarantee high proficiency in foundational skills in adulthood, highlighting the importance of strengthening opportunities for the acquisition and maintenance of these skills across the life course.

Subnational variation in educational attainment

Educational attainment can vary substantially within countries, and these differences often reflect long-standing economic, demographic and geographic disparities within countries. Large cities tend to attract more highly educated individuals because they offer greater access to tertiary education institutions, higher-skilled employment opportunities and more diversified labour markets. By contrast, rural and remote regions often face more limited access to educational opportunities, weaker labour-market demand for highly skilled workers and higher rates of population ageing (OECD, 2024[6]).

Internal migration patterns can further reinforce these regional differences. Younger adults and tertiary graduates are more likely to move towards urban centres in search of education and employment opportunities, contributing to the concentration of highly educated populations in capital regions. Meanwhile, lower educational attainment levels in some rural and economically disadvantaged regions are partly linked to lower incomes, fewer educational pathways and more limited access to services and infrastructure.

The organisation of education systems and labour markets also plays an important role in shaping regional attainment patterns. Countries with strong vocational education and training systems and more balanced regional economic development often exhibit smaller regional disparities, while countries with highly concentrated economic activity may experience larger educational gaps between regions. Regional inequalities in educational attainment are therefore closely linked to broader territorial inequalities in employment opportunities, productivity and economic development (OECD, 2024[6]).

In most OECD countries, overall tertiary attainment rates among 25-64 year-olds vary considerably across subnational regions, with particularly large regional differences in Czechia, Canada and Hungary. The widest differences are in Czechia, where tertiary attainment ranges from 16% in Northwest to 55% in Prague, a gap of 39 percentage points. In Canada, it is 38 percentage points, ranging from 33% in Nunavut to 71% in Ontario, while in Hungary, it ranges from 21% in Northern Hungary to 59% in Budapest, also a difference of 38 percentage points. By contrast, some countries have a more even distribution of tertiary attainment, with narrower gaps between regions. In Slovenia, the gap is only 9 percentage points, ranging from 31% in Eastern Slovenia to 40% in Western Slovenia. In Ireland, it is 10 percentage points, ranging from 53% in Northern and Western to 63% in Eastern and Midland, while in Italy it is 12 percentage points, between Sicily (17%) and Lazio (29%) (Table A1.5, available online).

There are also substantial regional differences in the share of adults with below upper secondary attainment in several OECD countries. Particularly large regional disparities are observed in Canada, Mexico, Portugal and Türkiye. In Canada, the share ranges from 5% in Ontario to 43% in Nunavut, a 38 percentage point difference. Similarly, in Mexico, the share ranges from 32% in México D.C. to 69% in Chiapas, a gap of 37 percentage points. In Türkiye the share ranges from 36% in Ankara to 69% in Southeast Anatolia - Middle, corresponding to a gap of 34 percentage points while in Portugal, the difference between Greater Lisbon (25%) and Autonomous Region of the Azores (57%) is 32 percentage points. Conversely, some countries see more limited regional variation in below upper secondary attainment rates. In Finland, the gap between Northern and Eastern Finland (10%) and Helsinki-Uusimaa (12%) is only 3 percentage points. Similarly, in Lithuania, the difference between the Capital Region (2%) and Central and Western Lithuania Region (5%) is 3 percentage points, similar to that in Slovenia between Western Slovenia (9%) and Eastern Slovenia (12%) (Table A1.5, available online).

Definitions

Age groups: Adults refer to 25-64 year-olds; younger adults refer to 25-34 year-olds.

Educational attainment refers to the highest level of education successfully completed by an individual.

Levels of education: See the *Reader's Guide* at the beginning of this publication for a presentation of all ISCED 2011 levels.

The cognitive skill domains on which PIAAC data are based are literacy, numeracy and adaptive problem-solving:

- **Literacy** in PIAAC Cycle 2 is defined as the ability to access, understand, evaluate and reflect on written texts to achieve one's goals, develop knowledge and potential, and participate in society. This encompasses both traditional print-based texts and digital texts, acknowledging the growing importance of navigating and interpreting information in digital environments. Tasks may involve multiple sources and formats, including continuous (e.g. sentences, paragraphs), non-continuous (e.g. charts, tables) and mixed texts, reflecting a range of genres and contexts.
- **Numeracy** in PIAAC Cycle 2 is accessing, using and reasoning critically with mathematical content, information and ideas represented in multiple ways in order to engage in and manage the mathematical demands of a range of situations in adult life. The assessment covers engagement with mathematical information in both traditional and digital environments, including tasks that require understanding and applying mathematical concepts in real-life contexts. An additional assessment of numeracy components focuses on skills essential for achieving automaticity and fluency in managing mathematical and numerical information.
- Replacing the previous domain of problem solving in technology-rich environments, Cycle 2 introduced **adaptive problem solving**, defined as the capacity to achieve one's goals in dynamic situations where a solution method is not immediately apparent. This requires engaging in cognitive and metacognitive processes to define the problem, search for information and apply a solution across various information environments and contexts. This broader construct reflects the evolving nature of the problem-solving skills needed in today's complex and digital world.

Proficiency levels: In each of the three domains assessed in the OECD Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC), proficiency is considered as a continuum of ability involving the mastery of information-processing tasks of increasing complexity. The results are represented on a 500-point scale. To help interpret the results, the reporting scales have been divided into "proficiency levels" defined by particular score-point ranges. Six proficiency levels are defined for literacy and numeracy (Levels 1 through 5 plus below Level 1). Each proficiency level is described in terms of the characteristics of the types of tasks that can be successfully completed by adults with proficiency scores in the range of scores that defines a level. Short descriptions of the types of tasks related to each level are provided below, while more details can be found in Tables 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 in the PIAAC international report (OECD, 2024[7]).

- Below Level 1: Basic tasks involving simple text or numerical information.
- Level 1 (scores equal to or higher than 176 points): Tasks requiring the identification of information in short texts or simple mathematical operations.
- Level 2 (scores equal to or higher than 226 points): Tasks involving integration of information from multiple sources or application of basic mathematical concepts.
- Level 3 (scores equal to or higher than 276 points): Tasks requiring interpretation and evaluation of complex texts or more advanced mathematical reasoning.
- Level 4 (scores equal to or higher than 326 points): Tasks involving complex reasoning and problem-solving with intricate texts or mathematical information.
- Level 5 (scores equal to or higher than 376 points): Tasks requiring the synthesis and critical evaluation of complex information or advanced mathematical concepts.

Table A1.4 (available online) and Figure A1.4 featured the use of combined skills domains. These composite skill profiles were constructed using respondents' plausible values in the three PIAAC cognitive domains: literacy, numeracy and adaptive problem solving. For each of the plausible values, scores were first classified into three proficiency levels using standard PIAAC thresholds: low (below 226 points), medium (226–325 points) and high (326 points or above). The three domain-specific proficiency levels were then combined to create a detailed 8-category skills profile capturing the distribution of low, medium and high proficiency across domains. The categories ranged from respondents with low skills in all three domains to those with high skills in all three domains, with intermediate categories distinguishing different combinations of skill strengths and weaknesses (e.g. low skills in two domains and medium skills in one domain or medium skills in two domains and high skills in one domain).

Methodology

Educational attainment profiles are based on annual data on the percentage of the adult population (25-64 year olds) in specific age groups who have successfully completed a specified level of education.

In OECD statistics, recognised qualifications from ISCED 2011 level 3 programmes that are not of sufficient duration for ISCED 2011 level 3 completion are classified at ISCED 2011 level 2 (see the Reader's Guide). Where countries have been able to demonstrate equivalencies in the labour-market value of attainment formally classified as the "completion of intermediate upper secondary programmes" – such as achieving five good General Certificates of Secondary Education (GCSEs) or equivalent in the United Kingdom (note that each GCSE is offered in a specific school subject) – and "full upper secondary attainment", attainment of these programmes is reported as ISCED 2011 level 3 completion in the tables that show three aggregate levels of educational attainment (UNESCO-UIS, 2012[8]).

Most OECD countries include people without formal education under the international classification ISCED 2011 level 0. Averages for the category "less than primary educational attainment" are therefore likely to be influenced by this inclusion.

See the *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics* (OECD, 2018[9]) and *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources Methodologies and Technical Notes* ([link to be added]) for more information.

With regard to PIAAC data, the educational attainment variable is based on education levels (EDLEVEL3), following the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) 2011, and grouped into below upper secondary (ISCED 1, 2 and 3 short), upper secondary (ISCED 3 and 4) and tertiary (ISCED 5, 6, 7 and 8). Where possible, foreign qualifications are included as the closest corresponding level in the respective national education systems and doorstep interviews on education (DI_Q04) were included in the educational attainment variable. The distribution across skill domains is based on plausible values for literacy (PVLIT), numeracy (PVNUM) and adaptive problem-solving (PVAPS) scores, educational attainment (EDLEVEL) and demographic variables such as age (adults aged 25 to 64).

Sources

Data on educational attainment for most countries are taken from OECD databases, which are compiled from National Labour Force Surveys by the OECD Labour Market, Economic and Social Outcomes of Learning (LSO) Network. Data on educational attainment for Argentina, India and Indonesia are taken from the International Labour Organization (ILO) database.

Data on subnational regions for selected indicators are available in the OECD *Regional Statistics Database* (OECD, 2026[10]).

Data on proficiency levels are based on the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)(2023) (OECD, 2026[5]). PIAAC is the OECD Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies. See *About the Survey of Adult Skills* at the beginning of this publication for additional information.

References

OECD (2026), *Educational attainment - Regions*, OECD Data Explorer, https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=REGION_EDUCAT. [10]

OECD (2026), *PIAAC data and methodology*, https://www.oecd.org/en/about/programmes/piaac/piaac-data.html. [5]

OECD (2024), *Do Adults Have the Skills They Need to Thrive in a Changing World?: Survey of Adult Skills 2023*, OECD Skills Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b263dc5d-en. [7]

OECD (2024), *OECD Regions and Cities at a Glance 2024*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/f42db3bf-en. [6]

OECD (2024), "The state of academic careers in OECD countries: An evidence review", *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, No. 91, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/ea9d3108-en. [4]

OECD (2023), *Spotlight on Vocational Education and Training: Findings from Education at a Glance 2023*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/acff263d-en. [3]

OECD (2022), *Pathways to Professions: Understanding Higher Vocational and Professional Tertiary Education Systems*, OECD Reviews of Vocational Education and Training, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/a81152f4-en. [1]

OECD (2018), *Education Policy Outlook 2018: Putting Student Learning at the Centre*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264301528-en. [2]

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [9]

UNESCO-UIS (2012), *International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) 2011*, UNESCO-UIS, Montreal, https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000219109. [8]

Chapter A1 Tables

Tables and notes

Table A1.1	Educational attainment of adults (2025)
Table A1.2	Trends in the educational attainment of 25-34 year-olds, by gender (2015 and 2025)
Table A1.3	Educational attainment, by programme orientation and age group (2025)
WEB Table A1.4	*Distribution of adults by educational attainment, by literacy, numeracy and adaptive problem-solving levels (2023)*
WEB Table A1.5	*Subnational regions with the highest and lowest attainment rates, by educational attainment (2025)*

StatLink https://stat.link/tcxh4j

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via. https://stat.link/tcxh4.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; b – break in series; c – there are too few observations to provide reliable estimates; d – contains data from another column; m – missing data; r – values are below a certain reliability threshold and should be interpreted with caution x – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Table A1.1. Educational attainment of adults (2025)

Percentage of 25–64-year-olds with a given level of education as the highest level attained

	Below upper secondary				Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary			Tertiary				
	Less than primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Total	Upper secondary	Post-secondary non-tertiary	Total	Short-cycle tertiary	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or equivalent	Doctoral or equivalent	Total
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
OECD countries												
Australia	0	2	10	12	28	6	34	11	31	10	2	54
Austria	x(2)	1[d]	12	13	46	3	49	15	6	15	1	38
Belgium	2	3	10	15	36	2	37	1	25	20	1	47
Canada	x(2)	2[d]	5	7	20	10	29	25	25	14[d]	x(12)	64
Chile[1]	4	3	15	21	42	a	42	11	23	3	0	37
Colombia	x(6)	x(6)	m	35	m	x(9)	36	x(14)	m	x(14)	x(14)	29
Costa Rica	9	24	10	50	21	0	21	7	18	3	0	28
Czechia	0	0	5	6	66[d]	x(7)	66	0	8	20	1	29
Denmark	x(2)	1[d,b]	15[b]	16[b]	38[b]	0[b]	38[b]	6[b]	23[b]	15[b]	2[b]	46[b]
Estonia	0	1	10	10	37	10	47	5	16	21	1	42
Finland	x(2)	1[d]	10	11	45	2	46	6	18	17	1	43
France	1	2	11	15	40	0	40	14	12	17	1	45
Germany	x(2)	6[d]	8	14	36	14	50	1	20	13	2	35
Greece	1	8	9	18	38	9	47	0	24	10	1	35
Hungary	0	1	11	12	48	8	57	2	13	16	1	32
Iceland[1]	x(2)	0[d]	20	20	29	6	35	6	20	17	1	44
Ireland	0	2	7	9	19	13	32	2	37	18	2	59
Israel	3	3	7	13	36	a	36	11	25	14	1	51
Italy	1	3	29	33	44	1	45	0	6	15	1	22
Japan	x(7)	x(7)	x(7)	m	42[d]	x(10)	42[d]	21[d]	37[d]	x(11)	x(11)	58[d]
Korea	x(2)	2	4	6	36	a	36	15	38	5[d]	x(12)	58
Latvia	0	0	8	11	36	12	48	5	18	17	0	41
Lithuania	0	1	4	6	26	18	44	a	32	17	1	50
Luxembourg	2	5	11	18	25	3	28	6	15	30	3	55
Mexico	8	13	30	53	24	a	24	1	20	2	0	22
Netherlands	2	4	12	18	35	0	36	2	24	18	1	46
New Zealand	x(4)	x(4)	17[d]	17	25	14	39	4	32	7	1	44
Norway	0	1	15	16	31	2	34	12	22	16	1	50
Poland	0	1	4	5	52	3	55	0	9	29	1	40
Portugal	1	18	17	36	30	1	32	0	11	21	1	33
Slovak Republic	0	0	6	6	62	2	64	0	4	25	1	30
Slovenia	0	0	10	11	54	a	54	7	11	15	3	35
Spain	2	5	28	35	23	0	23	13	12	17	1	42
Sweden	x(2)	2[d]	12	14	27	8	35	10	21	18	2	51
Switzerland	0	1	12	14	40[d]	x(7)	40	m	25	18	3	46
Türkiye	4	29	15	48	24	a	24	8	17	2	1	28
United Kingdom	0	0	16	17	18	a	29	9	28	16	2	55
United States	1	2	5	8	40[d]	x(7)	40	11	26	13	2	52
OECD average	**1**	**4**	**12**	**18**	**35**	**4**	**39**	**7**	**20**	**14**	**1**	**43**

	Below upper secondary				Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary			Tertiary				
	Less than primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Total	Upper secondary	Post-secondary non-tertiary	Total	Short-cycle tertiary	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or equivalent	Doctoral or equivalent	Total
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	3	13	15	31	45	a	45	x	23[d]	x	m	23
Brazil[1]	11	15	13	38	x(9)	x(9)	40	x(11)	21[d]	1	0	22
Bulgaria	1	2	10	13	51	0	51	a	11	24	1	36
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	0	1	m	9	60	a	60	3	7	20	1	31
India	30	14	30	73	10	1	11	x(11)	16[d]	x	m	16
Indonesia[1]	12	27	19	58	30	a	30	2	9	1	0	13
Peru	3	18	m	32	33	m	33	5	m	m	m	m
Romania	1	3	16	25	53	3	56	m	19[d]	x(11)	x(11)	19
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	x(2)	4[d]	33	49	35	8	43	1	7	1[d]	x(12)	8
EU25 average	**1**	**3**	**12**	**15**	**41**	**5**	**46**	**4**	**16**	**19**	**1**	**39**
G20 average	**m**	**9**	**16**	**31**	**31**	**6**	**35**	**m**	**21**	**m**	**m**	**36**

Note: Data refer to ISCED 2011 for all countries, except Argentina and India, which use ISCED-97. Total might not add up to 100% for the averages because of missing data for some levels for some countries. Data for Argentina, India and Indonesia are from the International Labour Organization (ILO). Columns with data on the completion of intermediate lower secondary programmes, completion of intermediate upper secondary programmes, and all levels of education are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2025: 2024 for Brazil and Chile; 2023 for Iceland and IndonesiaThe data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/tcxh4.

Table A1.2. Trends in the educational attainment of 25-34 year-olds, by gender (2015 and 2025)

Percentage of 25–34-year-olds with a given level of education as the highest level attained

	Below upper secondary				Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary				Tertiary			
	2015		2025		2015		2025		2015		2025	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(19)	(20)	(22)	(23)
OECD countries												
Australia	12	11	8	6	45	34	42	28	42	54	50	66
Austria	9	11	13	8	55	48	49	42	36	41	38	50
Belgium	19	16	12	10	43	35	42	30	37	49	45	60
Canada	8	5	6	3	42	27	35	20	51	68	60	76
Chile[1]	17	16	12	8	55	52	49	43	28	31	39	48
Colombia	35	30	m	m	41	39	m	m	24	32	m	m
Costa Rica	54	49	39	31	20	20	30	32	26	31	31	37
Czechia	6	6	7	7	69	56	64	49	24	38	29	43
Denmark	21	15	19[b]	12[b]	44	33	38[b]	27[b]	35	52	44[b]	61[b]
Estonia	14	10	16	7	55	39	51	37	31	51	33	56
Finland	12[b]	8[b]	13	9	55[b]	43[b]	56	44	33[b]	49[b]	31	47
France	15	12	11	9	45	39	37	31	40	49	52	59
Germany	13	12	16	12	59	57	46	44	29	31	38	44
Greece	20	12	9	7	46	41	56	42	34	46	35	51
Hungary	15	13	12	12	59	48	60	50	26	38	28	38
Iceland[1]	32	21	22	15	38	33	47	27	30	46	31	58
Ireland	11	8	5	3	43	35	32	26	46	58	63	70
Israel	10	7	12	9	53	37	52	34	36	56	36	57
Italy	29	22	22	16	52	47	54	46	19	31	25	38
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	36[d]	29[d]	58[d]	61[d]	63[d]	70[d]
Korea	1	2	1	1	34	25	35	19	65	73	63	80
Latvia	20	10	14	7	54	36	50	38	26	54	35	55
Lithuania	14	6	6	3	41	29	41	27	45	65	53	70
Luxembourg	18	13	10	8	37	32	30	26	45	55	60	65
Mexico	56	55	40	39	24	24	32	31	20	21	28	30
Netherlands	16	12	12	8	43	37	37	31	41	51	52	61
New Zealand	20	18	12	10	45	37	46	37	35	44	42	53
Norway	20	17	16	13	40	26	36	21	40	57	48	66
Poland	8	4	6	4	58	43	58	42	34	53	36	55
Portugal	40	27	19	11	35	32	47	39	26	41	35	51
Slovak Republic	7	7	10	8	69	53	63	46	23	40	28	45
Slovenia	7	4	9	5	62	43	60	39	30	53	32	55
Spain	40	29	29	20	25	24	25	21	35	47	47	59
Sweden	20	15	18	12	41	31	36	27	39	54	46	61
Switzerland[3]	9	9	10	8	46	43	42	38	45	48	48	54
Türkiye	44	52	26	27	28	21	33	23	28	27	41	50
United Kingdom	14	13	12	10	38	35	30	26	48	52	58	65
United States	10	9	6	5	47	41	46	37	42	51	48	57
OECD average	**19**	**16**	**14**	**11**	**44**	**36**	**43**	**33**	**34**	**46**	**41**	**54**
OECD average for countries with available and comparable data for both years	**19**	**15**	**14**	**11**	**46**	**37**	**44**	**34**	**36**	**48**	**43**	**56**

	Below upper secondary				Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary				Tertiary			
	2015		2025		2015		2025		2015		2025	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(19)	(20)	(22)	(23)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	30	22	m	m	55	57	m	m	14	20
Brazil[1, 2]	39	31	30	21	45	47	49	51	16	22	20	28
Bulgaria	17	18	11	15	58	42	54	37	25	40	35	48
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	5	5	4	3	72	57	61	47	23	38	34	51
India	m	m	53	60	m	m	19	15	m	m	28	25
Indonesia[1]	51	56	42	43	36	29	43	36	13	15	15	21
Peru	m	m	16	21	m	m	36	30	m	m	m	m
Romania	26[b]	27[b]	23	27	51[b]	45[b]	56	48	23[b]	28[b]	21	25
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	54	49	46	39	37	40	47[d]	52[d]	9	11	7	10
EU25 average	**17**	**13**	**13**	**10**	**51**	**41**	**48**	**38**	**32**	**46**	**39**	**53**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**23**	**21**	**m**	**m**	**40**	**34**	**m**	**m**	**38**	**45**

Note: Data refer to ISCED 2011 for all countries, except Argentina and India, which use ISCED-97. Data for Argentina, India and Indonesia are from the International Labour Organization (ILO). Columns showing totals for men and women, and for vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2025: 2024 for Brazil and Chile; 2023 for Iceland and Indonesia.

2. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Brazil.

3. A break in 2020 affects the continuity of the data for Switzerland. See *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/tcxh4

Table A1.3. Educational attainment, by programme orientation and age group (2025)

Percentage of 25-34 year olds with a given level of education as the highest level attained

	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary							Tertiary						
		Upper secondary		Post-secondary non-tertiary		Total		Total	Short-cycle tertiary			Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or equivalent	Doctoral or equivalent	Total
		General	Vocational	General	Vocational	General	Vocational		General	Vocational	Total				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
OECD countries															
Australia	7	18	12	a	5	18	17	35	m	9	9	38	11	1	58
Austria	11	8	34	a	3	8	37	46	a	15	15	14	14	0	44
Belgium	11	12	22	a	2	12	24	36	x(11)	x(11)	1	27	24	1	53
Canada	5	19	a	a	9	19	9	28	3	20	22	30	15[d]	x(13)	68
Chile[1]	10	37	9	a	a	37	9	46	a	13	13	29	2	0	44
Colombia	20	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	45	x(15)	x(15)	x(15)	m	x(15)	x(15)	35
Costa Rica	35	28	2	a	0	28	3	31	a	4	12	20	2		34
Czechia	7	5[d]	52[d]	x(2)	x(3)	x(2)	x(3)	57	x(11)	x(11)	0	14	22	0	36
Denmark	15[b]	12[b]	20[b]	a	m	12[b]	20[b]	32[b]	m	6[b]	6[b]	26[b]	20[b]	1[b]	52[b]
Estonia	12	17	15	a	11	17	27	44	a	m	m	24	20	0	44
Finland	11	13	37	a	0	13	37	50	x(11)	x(11)	0	23	15	0	38
France	10	8	26	0	a	8	26	34	0	11	12	15	28	1	56
Germany	14	7	21	a	17	7	38	45	a	0	0	24	16	1	41
Greece	8	29	8	a	12	29	20	49	a			30	13	0	43
Hungary	12	13	27	a	15	13	42	55	a	2	2	9	21	1	33
Iceland[1]	19	22	12	0	4	23	15	38	x(11)	x(11)	5	22	17		44
Ireland	4	17	m	m	11	17	11	29	x(11)	x(11)	1	43	21	1	67
Israel	11	41	3	a	a	41	3	43	a	9	9	28	8	1	46
Italy	19	14	34	0	1	14	36	50	0	0	0	13	17	1	31
Japan	m	m	m	x(11)	x(11)	m	m	32[d]	m	m	17[d]	51[d]	x(12)	x(12)	68[d]
Korea	1	x(8)	x(8)	a	a	x(8)	x(8)	28	a	19	19	49	3	m	71
Latvia	11	23	15	a	6	23	21	45	a	8	8	25	11	0	45
Lithuania	5	17	7	a	11	17	18	34	a	a	a	43	17	0	61
Luxembourg	9	16	a	3	a	18	a	28	6		6	19	35		62
Mexico	40	30	1	a	a	30	1	31	a	0	0	27	2	0	29
Netherlands	10	7	27	a	0	7	27	34	a	1	1	30	24	1	56

	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary							Tertiary						
		Upper secondary		Post-secondary non-tertiary		Total		Total	Short-cycle tertiary			Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or equivalent	Doctoral or equivalent	Total
		General	Vocational	General	Vocational	General	Vocational		General	Vocational	Total				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
New Zealand	11	20	6	a	15	20	21	41	a	5	5	36	6	1	48
Norway	15	9	17	a	2	9	19	29	11	2	13	26	17	0	57
Poland	5	15	33	m	2	15	35	50	m			15	30	0	45
Portugal	15	21	19	a	2	21	21	43	a	1	1	25	16	0[r]	43
Slovak Republic	9	6	47	a	2	6	48	55	a			7	29	1	36
Slovenia	7	7	43	a	a	7	43	50	a	7	7	20	15	1	43
Spain	25	13	10	a	0	13	10	23	a	15	15	18	18	1	53
Sweden	15	8	15	6	3	14	18	31	a	5	10	25	17	1	54
Switzerland	9	10	29	x(8)	x(8)	10	29	40	a	m	m	29	20	2	51
Türkiye	26	16	12	a	a	16	12	28	15	a	15	28	3	0	46
United Kingdom	11	13	15	a	a	13	15	28	a	7	7	35	18	1	61
United States	5	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	42	6	4	10	30	11	2	53
OECD average	**13**	**16**	**19**	**0**	**4**	**16**	**21**	**38**	**1**	**6**	**7**	**25**	**16**	**1**	**47**
Partners and/or accession countries															
Argentina	26	m	a	m	m	m	m	56	m	a	x	17[d]	x(12)	m	17
Brazil[1]	26	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	50	a	x(12)	x(12)	23[d]	1	0	24
Bulgaria	13	25	21	a	0	25	21	46	a	a	a	20	21	0	41
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	4	5	50	a	a	5	50	54	a	c	c	14	27	c	42
India	56	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	17	x(12)	x(12)	x(12)	26[d]	x(12)	m	26
Indonesia[1]	42	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	40	x(11)	x(11)	3	14	1	c	18
Peru	19	33	m	m	m	33	m	33	m	7	7	m	m	m	m
Romania	25	3	45	a	3	3	49	52	a	x(12)	m	23[d]	x(12)	x(12)	23
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	42	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	x(8)	49[d]	x(11)	x(11)	1	7	1[d]	x(13)	9
EU25 average	**11**	**13**	**27**	**2**	**5**	**14**	**30**	**43**	**2**	**6**	**5**	**22**	**21**	**1**	**46**
G20 average	**22**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**37**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**27**	**m**	**m**	**42**

Note: Data refer to ISCED 2011 for all countries, except Argentina and India, which use ISCED-97. Data for Argentina, India and Indonesia are from the International Labour Organization (ILO). Columns showing data for 55-64 year-olds are available for consultation online. Percentage of each age group with a given level of education as the highest level attained. The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/tcxh4 1. Year of reference differs from 2025: 2024 for Brazil and Chile; 2023 for Iceland and Indonesia.

Chapter A2. Transition from education to work: Where are today's youth?

Highlights

- Most young adults are in education, with many also gaining work experience besides their studies. Across OECD countries, a significant proportion (53%) of 18-24 year-olds remain in education. On average, 18% of this age group are combining education with employment.
- For young people, being neither in employment nor in education or training (NEET) often stems from a combination of structural labour-market challenges, skills mismatches and personal or social factors, and the consequences of prolonged NEET status can be severe. In 2025, the OECD average share of youths who are NEET reached 14% among 18-24 year-olds and 16% among 25-29 year-olds.
- In the last decade, the share of 18-24 year-old NEETs has fallen on average by 2 percentage points to 14% in 2025, but cross-country comparisons reveal a wide range of trends, from large falls in Croatia, Iceland and Ireland to increases in Germany, Latvia and South Africa.

Context


The transition from education to employment is a complex process influenced by factors such as educational attainment, economic conditions and labour-market demand. Although education plays a fundamental role in improving young people's employment prospects, it is crucial that the skills they acquire through education are aligned with those needed in the labour market. Many young people stay on in education to enhance their employability but if their skills are not in demand, they may still face difficulties finding employment. Economic downturns and weak labour markets can further limit opportunities, leaving even highly qualified individuals struggling to find work and increasing the risk of prolonged unemployment.

Extended periods of unemployment can have serious consequences, particularly for young people whose working lives may later be impacted by the consequences of such early joblessness. Being out of the labour market for an extended period reduces their opportunities to gain work experience and develop essential soft skills, making it increasingly difficult to secure employment. Employers may also perceive employment gaps negatively, further compounding the challenge. This cycle of limited experience and prolonged unemployment can lead to persistent labour-market and social exclusion, especially for those with lower levels of educational attainment or work qualifications (Pohlan, 2024[1]).

In addition to the economic implications, long-term unemployment can have significant psychological effects, including increased discouragement and mental health challenges such as anxiety and depression, which may further reduce motivation to seek employment. Better co-ordination between education systems and labour markets is needed to address these challenges and ensure that young people develop skills aligned with workforce needs. Policy measures should also improve employment opportunities, provide career guidance and offer mental health support. Strengthening the link between education and employment can help mitigate the risks of long-term unemployment and social disengagement of young people.

Figure A2.1. Distribution of 18-24 year-olds by education participation and labour-force status (2025)

In per cent



1. Year of reference differs from 2025.
For data, see Table A2.1. *The data for this figure can be accessed via* https://stat.link/t764xw.

Other findings

- NEET rates differ by gender only slightly on average. A greater share of 18-24 year-old women are NEET than men in about half of OECD and partner countries.
- Most countries saw similar trends for young men and women, with the average NEET rate among 18-24 year-olds dropping between 2015 and 2025 by 2 percentage points to 13% for men and 4 percentage points to 15% for women. However, this is not the case in all countries: in a number of countries values increased for men and decreased for women (e.g. in Estonia where the value for men increased 2 percentage points and the one for women decreased by 8 percentage points), while the opposite was true in Finland (i.e. the value for men decreased by 3 percentage points and the one for women increased by 1 percentage point).
- Among 18-29 year-olds, the average NEET rate for individuals with low literacy proficiency levels (Level 2 or below) in the OECD Survey of Adult Skills stands at 17%. This risk significantly diminishes as skill levels rise; those with moderate to high literacy proficiency levels (Level 3 or above) have an average NEET rate of 9%.
- The most pronounced regional disparities in NEET rates emerge in Canada, Italy, Mexico and the Republic of Türkiye where the gaps between the regions with the highest and lowest NEET rates reach or exceed 20 percentage points.

Note

This chapter analyses the situation of young people in transition from education to work: those in education, those who are employed and those who are NEET. The NEET group includes not only those who have not managed to find a job (unemployed NEETs), but also those who are not actively seeking employment (NEETs outside the labour force, or inactive). The analysis distinguishes between 18-24 year-olds and 25-29 year-olds, as a significant proportion of those in the younger age group will be continuing their studies despite having completed compulsory, or in some countries even beyond compulsory, education.

Analysis

Educational and labour-market status

The transition from education to employment is a complex process influenced by factors such as educational attainment, economic conditions, and labour-market demand. Most 18-24 year-olds are in a period of transition coinciding with the final years of upper secondary education, enrolment in tertiary education or initial entry into the labour market, which is critical for shaping future career trajectories. Remaining in education enhances young people's employability, although the success of this transition depends heavily on whether the skills they acquire are aligned with those needed in the labour market (Geel and Backes-Gellner, 2012[2]). Combining work and study is increasingly common and offers valuable practical experience, helping students build professional networks and facilitating a smoother entry into full-time employment. Young people who are neither in employment nor in education or training (NEET) face significant risks, as prolonged periods of inactivity or unemployment can lead to persistent social exclusion and a loss of essential soft skills.

Across OECD countries, a significant proportion (53%) of 18-24 year-olds remain in education as they pursue various qualifications (Figure A2.1). On average, approximately one-third of these (18% of the entire age group) are combining education with employment, particularly those in tertiary education, where part-time work can help cover tuition fees, accommodation and living expenses, or contribute to career development. The distribution of these categories varies dramatically by country. In the Netherlands, almost half of 18-24 year-olds (49%) are both working and studying, whereas this figure is 5% or less in Hungary and Italy and, among OECD partner countries, Croatia, Romania and South Africa (Table A2.1).


Considering those no longer studying, 33% of 18-24 year-olds are employed and not in education, with the highest rates observed in Israel and New Zealand (over 45%). The rest are NEET: on average, 5% of people of this age across the OECD are not studying and unemployed (i.e. actively seeking work) while 9% are not studying and outside the labour force (inactive). South Africa has the highest overall share of unemployed (22%) and inactive (26%) NEET youths while at the other end of the spectrum, Iceland reports only 1% unemployed and 3% inactive NEET youths in this age group. In countries like Colombia, Israel, Mexico and Türkiye there are relatively high shares of inactive (17% and over) NEET youth compared to those who are unemployed, while in Portugal, Spain and Sweden there are slightly more unemployed NEET youth than inactive ones (Figure A2.1).

Among 25-29 year-olds, there is a clear shift toward the labour market as the majority of this age group will have completed their initial education in most OECD countries and many will have acquired substantial labour-market experience. Among those who are in education, some might be finishing their initial tertiary studies, while others might have re-entered education to obtain further qualifications (see Chapter B4). A substantial majority of 25-29 year-olds are employed and not in education (68%). The share in education falls to 15% on average across OECD countries, but a larger proportion of these (approximately two-thirds) are combining education and work than among the younger cohort. In Israel, Italy and Portugal, 25-29 year-olds are slightly more likely than their younger peers to be both working and learning, often due to part-time master's and up-skilling programmes (Table A2.1). In Finland, high rates of study and work among this older group are driven by the expansion of apprenticeship and training models (Eurydice, 2025[3]).

On average, in 2025 the overall NEET rate across OECD countries was 14% among 18-24 year-olds, ranging from 5% in Iceland to 31% in Türkiye, and reaching 48% in partner country South Africa. Among 25-29 year-olds, the NEET rate increases to 16% on average and ranges from 9% in the Netherlands and Norway to 33% in Türkiye and 55% in South Africa. The older age group (25-29 year-olds) has a higher NEET rate in the majority of OECD and partner countries: Czechia and Greece are the countries with the largest increase between the younger and older cohorts, while the opposite trend is observed in other countries like Colombia and Costa Rica (Figure A2.2).

Figure A2.2. Share of NEETs among 18-29 year-olds, by age group (2025)

In per cent



1. Year of reference differs from 2025.
For data, see Table A2.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/t764xw.

The share of both unemployed and inactive NEET 25-29 year-olds are only slightly higher than among the younger cohort on average. However, Greece and South Africa have a much higher share of unemployed NEETs among the older age group, while Czechia, Italy and Latvia have higher shares of inactive NEETs (Table A2.1).


NEET rates and trends

The status of being NEET often stems from a combination of structural labour-market challenges, skills mismatches and personal or social factors (Rahmani and Groot, 2023[4]). Structural barriers, such as dual labour markets that offer stable positions to some while relegating others to precarious, low-wage work, can exacerbate the risk of young people falling out of both work and education (Marques and Salavisa, 2017[5]). Personal challenges such as long-term health issues, addiction or weak support networks can also play a significant role. The consequences of prolonged NEET status are severe, leading to a loss of opportunities to gain work experience and develop essential soft skills, which may result in persistent labour-market and social exclusion. Furthermore, long-term unemployment can cause significant psychological effects, including increased anxiety, depression and discouragement, further reducing the motivation to seek employment.

Over the last decade, the share of young people who are NEET increased during the COVID-19 pandemic to reach levels slightly lower than those recorded in 2015 (OECD, 2025[6]). Although the OECD average share of 18-24 year-old NEETs fell in the last decade by 2 percentage points to 14% in 2025, cross-country comparisons reveal a range of trends. Almost all countries saw a decline in NEET rates with the sharpest drops observed in Croatia, Ireland and Italy (by 10 percentage points or more). Germany, Israel, Latvia and South Africa are the countries where the NEET rate increased the most between 2015 and 2025 (by 2 percentage points or more, see Table A2.2).

Figure A2.3. Trends in the share of NEETs among 18-24 year-olds (2015 and 2025)

In per cent



1. Year of reference differs from 2015.
2. Year of reference differs from 2025.
For data, see Table A2.2. *The data for this figure can be accessed via* https://stat.link/t764xw.

NEET rates diverge by gender, with the rates for young women only slightly higher on average. Across OECD and partner countries, a larger share of 18-24 year-old women are neither in employment nor in education or training than their male peers in about half the countries, with the differences reaching 17 percentage points in Colombia and 19 in Mexico. In the remaining countries, young men have higher NEET rates than women (Table A2.2), with the largest differences (4-5 percentage points) observed in Belgium, Estonia and France (Table A2.2).

In most countries, the trends were similar for young men and women between 2015 and 2025, with the average rate among 18-24 year-olds falling by 2 percentages point for men (13% in 2025) and 4 percentage points for women (15% in 2025). However, this is not the case for all the countries: in a number of countries the rate increased for men and decreased for women (e.g. in Estonia where the rate for men increased by 2 percentage points and the one for women decreased by 8 percentage points). The opposite trend was observed in Finland, with a 3 percentage-point fall for men and a 1 percentage-point rise for women. In Croatia, the rate fell for both genders but by 13 percentage points for men compared to 8 percentage points for women, closing the gender gap in NEET rates over this period (Table A2.2).

Despite these overall improvements, NEET rates remain persistently high, reinforcing the importance of comprehensive and well-coordinated support systems for young people. Although some countries have succeeded in reducing NEET levels, others continue to struggle, highlighting that policy effectiveness varies widely and that no single approach works universally. Box A2.1 lists some of the policies implemented by across OECD countries to support those at risk of becoming NEET.

Box A2.1. Supporting NEET youth: Integrated approaches to re-engagement

NEET" is a broad and heterogeneous category requiring context-specific responses. Effective NEET reduction requires integrated, multi-agency strategies that combine early intervention with personalised, holistic support. Successful systems do not rely on a single model but instead combine accessible services, tailored learning pathways, co-ordinated governance and targeted labour-market interventions to support successful transitions from school to work.

However, these policy interventions can only be effective when embedded in favourable macro-economic conditions. Strategies therefore need to reflect national circumstances, whether focusing on prevention among specific at-risk groups in countries with relatively low NEET rates or on large-scale re-engagement and activation efforts where structural challenges remain more pronounced.

Finland demonstrates the value of combining a youth guarantee with accessible one-stop guidance services, while Norway and Ireland highlight the role of personalised and second-chance learning pathways in re-engaging young people. The Netherlands shows how data-driven governance combined with a youth-centred strategy can support early identification and targeted interventions, whereas Italy combines labour-market activation with measures to prevent early school leaving. Slovenia's PUM-O Plus illustrates the effectiveness of flexible, non-formal learning environments that promote confidence-building and gradual re-engagement.

Many countries also operate systems to identify and monitor young people who are at risk of disengaging from education or training before they become NEET. These include municipal tracking and outreach mechanisms, such as Sweden's Municipal Activity Responsibility (KAA), which require local authorities to maintain contact with young people who are no longer enrolled in education and offer support to help them re-engage. While such preventative systems play an important role in reducing future NEET rates, they are not the primary focus of the country examples presented below.

Policy interventions targeting youth in selected OECD countries

Finland: Ohjaamo One-Stop Guidance Centres

Ohjaamo centres provide free, low threshold support for all young people under 30, helping them navigate the increasingly complex transition from school to work. Developed in the context of Finland's Youth Guarantee (*Nuorisotakuu*) and aligned with the objectives of the EU Youth Guarantee, they bring together employment, education, social and health services in a single, easily accessible entry point. The network has expanded (to around 70 centres nationwide by 2022), providing co-ordinated and personalised support to young people facing a wide range of educational, employment and social challenges.

Ohjaamo operates as a multi-agency service model that brings together employment services, social services, health professionals and local partners in one physical location, reducing administrative barriers and making it easier for young people to access support. Services vary by municipality, but typically include guidance on education and training, job-search support, income assistance, housing, and access to mental or physical healthcare. Young people can visit without an appointment, which is central to the "low threshold" approach aimed at reaching those who might otherwise avoid public services. The model emphasises face-to-face support, flexible service delivery, and adapting assistance to each young person's pace and preferences (Ohjaamo, n.d.[7]).

Ireland: Youthreach and Integrated Youth Activation Services

Ireland supports young people who are NEET through a combination of second chance education programmes and integrated employment services. A central element of this approach is Youthreach, Ireland's national programme for early school leavers aged 15-20 who have left mainstream education without qualifications. Youthreach aims to help young people develop the skills, confidence and qualifications needed to progress to further education, training, apprenticeships or employment.

Participation is voluntary and free of charge. The programme combines basic education, vocational training and personal development in a supportive learning environment designed for young people who may have struggled in traditional school settings. The flexible and learner-centred approach is intended to rebuild confidence, strengthen engagement and support successful transitions into education or work.

Youthreach operates alongside Ireland's broader youth activation framework, which includes the EU Youth Guarantee and the Intreo public employment service. Young people who are unemployed can access personalised guidance, career counselling, training opportunities, apprenticeships and job-search support through Intreo offices. This integrated approach seeks to ensure

that young people who disengage from education or employment can access appropriate support pathways and avoid long-term exclusion from the labour market (Government of Ireland, 2022[8]; Government of Ireland, 2025[9]).

Italy: Integrated pathways to support young people's transition into education and work

Italy supports young people who are NEET through a range of policy initiatives, including *Garanzia Giovani*, the national implementation of the EU Youth Guarantee, the *Programme Garanzia di Occupabilità dei Lavoratori* (GOL), and the 2021-27 *Programme Giovani, Donne e Lavoro* (ANPAL, n.d.[10]; Government of Italy, n.d.[11]; Government of Italy, n.d.[12]). Together, these initiatives aim to facilitate young people's transition into employment by providing personalised support, skills development opportunities and access to training, apprenticeships, internships and employment pathways.

A central feature of the Italian approach is its focus on reaching and engaging young people who are furthest from the labour market to prevent long-term disengagement. Young people entering these programmes typically follow an integrated pathway that begins with personalised guidance and skills assessment and leads to tailored combinations of training, mentoring, job-search assistance, work-based learning or employment opportunities. Regional authorities play a key role in delivering and adapting these services to the local labour market. The measures implemented include outreach activities targeting disadvantaged youth, specialised guidance and mentoring, training, apprenticeships, traineeships, opportunities for civic service, support for self-employment, and incentives for recruitment.

Italy also seeks to prevent young people becoming NEET through education policies aimed at reducing early school leaving. The *Agenda Sud* initiative, launched in 2023, supports primary and secondary schools in Southern Italy through targeted interventions designed to improve educational outcomes and address regional disparities (Government of Italy, n.d.[13]). By encouraging more young people to remain in education and attain upper secondary qualifications, the initiative contributes to improving employability and reducing the risk of becoming NEET.

Netherlands: From School to Sustainable Work Act

The Netherlands introduced the From School to Sustainable Work Act in January 2026, a national framework aimed at reducing the number of young people aged 16-27 who are NEET. The law strengthens the transition from school to work by improving early identification of young people at risk and by enhancing co-operation between education providers, municipalities, employers and youth services. Young people under the age of 16 remain covered by compulsory education legislation and are therefore expected to be in school, while the extension of support up to the age of 27 provides greater scope to assist young adults facing difficulties in their transition to employment or further education.

The Dutch approach is unique because it combines a youth-centred and data-driven strategy at regional level. Rather than applying a one-size-fits-all approach, interventions are tailored to the specific challenges, opportunities and labour market realities within each region, while always keeping the needs, talents and personal circumstances of young people at the centre. A key element of the Dutch approach is the national data infrastructure facilitated by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science and the Education Executive Agency (DUO), using data provided by Statistics Netherlands (CBS). Data on vulnerable groups and regional trends are collected and shared with municipalities and schools, enabling them to design targeted, evidence-based interventions that respond to the actual needs of young people in their region. Across all measures, the talents, ambitions and personal circumstances of young people remain central, ensuring that support is tailored to what each individual needs to successfully complete education and build a sustainable future in work or society. The impact of these new measures will be evaluated in 2028, when the law will be reviewed (Overheid.nl, 2025[14]; Landelijk Ondersteuningsteam, n.d.[15]).

Norway: UngInvest AIB (Arbeidsinstituttet Buskerud)

UngInvest AIB is a strengths-based, practice-oriented training programme for young people aged 16-24 who are in need of an alternative path through upper secondary education. Its purpose is to help young people rebuild motivation, strengthen core skills and transition into school, apprenticeships or work. Admission is continuous throughout the year, and participants can join within two days, ensuring rapid access to support.

UngInvest supports young people who are uncertain about their educational path or who need to reinforce basic subjects such as Norwegian, mathematics and English before moving forward. The programme focuses on building trusting relationships and tailoring learning to each young person's needs, while all teaching remains aligned with the national upper secondary curriculum. The programme aims to increase participants' engagement by helping them stay in education or enter employment through supported or sheltered employment, labour-training courses, childcare, military service or health-related treatment programmes. *UngInvest* collaborates closely with schools, vocational training boards, employers and key support services

such as the public employment service (the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration, NAV), psychological counselling and other follow-up services. This co-ordinated, multi-agency approach helps address both educational and personal barriers to progress (UngInvest, n.d.[16]).

Slovenia: Project Learning for Young Adults (PUM-O)

PUM-O Plus is Slovenia's easily accessible support programme for young people aged 15-29 who have left school early or are at risk of doing so. Participation is voluntary and free of charge, and young people can join either through their employment office counsellor or directly via a local PUM-O Plus provider. The model is designed to remove administrative barriers and provide a welcoming, youth-friendly environment where participants can stabilise their daily routine, explore interests and receive personalised support.

Services combine creative, social and educational activities with individual mentoring. Young people work in small groups and engage in project-based learning that helps them discover new skills, strengthen their confidence and reflect on their future plans. Activities range from practical workshops and community projects to discussions, sports, cooking and artistic expression. Mentors provide continuous one-to-one guidance, helping participants set goals, address personal or social challenges and prepare for a return to school or entry into employment.

PUM-O Plus places strong emphasis on personal development and empowerment. The programme supports young people in deciding on their educational or career pathways, developing key competencies and building the motivation needed to re-engage with formal systems. It also serves as a bridge to other employment or training programmes offered through the public employment service. Upon completion, participants receive a certificate documenting the skills, achievements and progress they made during their time in the programme (Government of Slovenia, n.d.[17]).


NEET rates by literacy skill levels

Cognitive skills are a defining factor in a young person's transition to adulthood, with literacy proficiency serving as a key predictor of their risk of becoming NEET. Individuals with lower skill levels often face significant hurdles, as their qualifications may not align with the specific demands of a modern workforce, leading to persistent difficulties in finding employment. Data from across the OECD confirm that the risk of becoming NEET are inversely related to literacy proficiency levels. Among 18-29 year-olds, the average NEET rate for individuals with literacy proficiency levels of Level 2 and below in the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) stands at 17%. This risk significantly diminishes as skill levels rise; those with literacy proficiency Level 3 and above have an average NEET rate of 9% (Figure A2.4).

NEET rates for the low performing cohort range from 10% to 28% across OECD countries and economies, while those for high performers range from 4% to 16%. The countries with the highest average literacy scores for adults (OECD, 2025[6]), are also those with the smallest gap in NEET rates between low and high performers as well as some of the lowest NEET rates overall (Table A2.3).

Figure A2.4. Share of NEETs by literacy proficiency level (2023)

In per cent; 18-29 year-olds; Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)



For data, see Table A2.3. *The data for this figure can be accessed via* https://stat.link/t764xw.

Subnational variation in NEET rates

National averages often mask significant subnational variations, as regional disparities in labour-market conditions and access to education can create very different outcomes for youth within the same country. Within OECD countries, the share of 18-24 year-olds who are neither in employment nor in education or training (NEET) can vary dramatically from one region to another. Subnational differences in NEET rates present critical challenges for policymakers seeking to promote inclusive labour markets and equitable access to opportunities. The following analysis is of regions at the TL2 level, which are large subnational regions as defined by the OECD's regional-classification grid (OECD, 2024[18]).

The most pronounced regional disparities in NEET rates are seen in Canada, Italy, Mexico, Romania and Türkiye, where the gaps between the regions with the highest and lowest NEET rates reach or exceed 20 percentage points. In Canada, the NEET rate in Quebec is 10%, while in Nunavut it is 38%, a 28 percentage-point difference, signalling the need for region-specific labour-market strategies and social support in remote communities. In Türkiye, regional NEET rates range from 19% in Istanbul to 48% percent in Central East Anatolia - East (Table A2.4, available online).

Conversely, Ireland, Japan, Norway and Slovenia exhibit limited regional variation, with gaps of less than 5 percentage points between the best- and worst-performing regions. Ireland's NEET rates range from 8% (Southern) to 9% (Eastern and Midland), suggesting broadly uniform labour-market outcomes. In Norway, the difference between Western Norway (9%) and Agder and Sør-Østlandet (11%) also indicates modest disparities, as also is the NEET rate gap in Slovenia between Western and Eastern Slovenia (8 and 10% respectively). In Japan, the NEET rate ranges from 2% (Hokuriku) to 5% (Chugoku and Kyushu-Okinawa) highlighting the country's generally low NEET incidence. Although countries with larger land areas or populations often exhibit wider subnational differences – as in Canada and Türkiye – size alone does not account for all the variation. Japan is large both geographically and demographically but has one of the smallest regional differences, whereas rates in Greece – considerably smaller by both measures – differ by 19 percentage points between the highest and lowest regions. This indicates that country size alone does not explain regional variation in NEET rates and that other contextual factors, such as economic structures, education systems and social policies, are also likely to contribute. Targeted policies for specific regions are therefore essential to narrowing these gaps and ensuring that all young people have access to education and employment opportunities (Table A2.4, available online).

Definitions

Educational attainment refers to the highest level of education successfully completed by an individual.

Employed, outside the labour force/inactive and unemployed individuals: See Definitions section in Chapter A3.

Individuals in education are those who are receiving formal education and/or training.

Levels of education: See the Reader's Guide at the beginning of this publication for a presentation of all ISCED 2011 levels.

NEET refers to young people neither employed nor in formal education or training.

Proficiency levels: See *Definitions* in Chapter A1.

Methodology

Data from the national labour force surveys usually refer to the second quarter of studies in a school year, as this is the most relevant period for knowing if a young person is really studying or has left education for the labour force. This second quarter corresponds in most countries to the first three months of the calendar year (i.e. January, February and March), but in some countries to the second three months (i.e. April, May and June).

Education or training corresponds to formal education or training; therefore, someone not working but following non-formal studies is considered NEET. However, the definition of NEET is different for subnational data collection for countries taking part in the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS), where young adults who are in non-formal education or training are not considered to be NEET. For OECD EU countries, NEET rates by subnational region are therefore not comparable to the rates at national level presented in this chapter.

For further details, refer to the *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics* (OECD, 2017[19])and the *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)

Sources

For information on the sources, see Chapter A1.

Data on subnational NEET rates stem from the OECD Regions and Cities databases http://oe.cd/geostats. Data on subnational NEET rates for Australia is from the Australian Bureau of statistics.

References

ANPAL (n.d.), *Garanzia Giovani*, Agenzia Nazionale Politiche Attive del Lavoro, https://storicoanpal.politicheattive.lavoro.gov.it/garanzia-giovani.html. [10]

Eurydice (2025), *Finland - National reforms in vocational education and training*, https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia/finland/national-reforms-vocational-education-and-training. [3]

Geel, R. and U. Backes-Gellner (2012), "Earning while learning: When and how student employment is beneficial", *LABOUR*, Vol. 26/3, pp. 313-340, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9914.2012.00548.x. [2]

Government of Ireland (2025), *Intreo - the Public Employment Services*, Department of Social Protection, https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-social-protection/organisation-information/intreo-the-public-employment-services/. [9]

Government of Ireland (2022), *Youthreach*, https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-further-and-higher-education-research-innovation-and-science/services/youthreach/. [8]

Government of Italy (n.d.), *Agenda Sud - Programma Nazionale 2021-2027*, Ministero dell'Istruzione e del Merito, https://pn20212027.istruzione.it/avvisi/agenda-sud/. [13]

Government of Italy (n.d.), *Programma GOL*, Ministerio del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali, https://www.lavoro.gov.it/temi-e-priorita/occupazione/focus/pagine/programma-gol. [11]

Government of Italy (n.d.), *Programma nazionale Giovani, donne e lavoro 2021-2027*, Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali, https://www.lavoro.gov.it/pn-giovani-donne-lavoro/programma. [12]

Government of Slovenia (n.d.), *PUM-O Plus: Projektno učenje mlajših odraslih*, https://www.ess.gov.si/iskalci-zaposlitve/programi-za-zaposlovanje/predstavitev-programov/pum-o-plus-projektno-ucenje-mlajsih-odraslih/. [17]

Landelijk Ondersteuningsteam (n.d.), *Wet Van school naar duurzaam werk*, https://www.samenvoordeklant.nl/dossier/wet-van-school-naar-duurzaam-werk. [15]

Marques, P. and I. Salavisa (2017), "Young people and dualization in Europe: A fuzzy set analysis", *Socio-Economic Review*, Vol. 15/1, pp. 135-160, https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mww038. [5]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en. [6]

OECD (2024), *OECD Territorial Grids: TL2024 Classification*, ECD Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs, Regions and Cities, https://webfs-cfe.oecd.org/files/.Stat/region/OECD_territorial-grid_TL2024.pdf. [18]

OECD (2017), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264279889-en. [19]

Ohjaamo (n.d.), *If you don't know where to start, start at Ohjaamo!*, https://ohjaamot.fi/en/etusivu. [7]

Overheid.nl (2025), *Wet van school naar duurzaam werk*, https://wetgevingskalender.overheid.nl/Regeling/WGK013026. [14]

Pohlan, L. (2024), "Unemployment's long shadow: The persistent impact on social exclusion", *Journal for Labour Market Research*, Vol. 58/1, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12651-024-00369-8. [1]

Rahmani, H. and W. Groot (2023), "Risk factors of being a youth not in education, employment or training (NEET): A scoping review", *International Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 120, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102198. [4]

UngInvest (n.d.), *UngInvest AIB er et fylkeskommunalt, praksisnært og styrke-basert læringstilbud for unge i alderen 16-24 år*, https://bfk.no/unginvest/. [16]

Chapter A2 Tables

Tables and notes

Table A2.1	Share of young adults in education/not in education, by age group and labour-force status (2025)
Table A2.2	Trends in the share of 18-24 year-olds in education/not in education, by work status and gender (2015 and 2025)
Table A2.3	Distribution of 18-29 year-olds by education and labour-force status, by literacy proficiency level (2023)
Table A2.4 (web only)	Share of young people neither employed nor in formal education or training (NEET), by subnational region (2025)

StatLink https://stat.link/t764xw

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/t764xw.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* ([https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en.

Table A2.1. Share of young adults in education/not in education, by age group and labour-force status (2025)

In per cent

	18-24 year-olds										
	In education						Not in education				
	Employed			Unemployed	Outside the labour force	Total	Employed	NEET			Total
	Students in work-study programmes	Other employed	Total					Unemployed	Outside the labour force	Total	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
OECD countries											
Australia	5	30	34	2	12	49	40	4	7	10	51
Austria	8	15	24	2	23	49	38	6	7	13	51
Belgium	1	11	12	1	50	64	25	5	6	11	36
Canada	x(3)	x(3)	23	3	24	50	37	6	7	13	50
Chile[1]	x(3)	x(3)	9	5	43	56	24	7	13	19	44
Colombia	a	8	8	2	23	33	41	9	17	26	67
Costa Rica	a	12	12	3	27	42	38	11	8	20	58
Czechia	1	6	7	0	55	63	29	3	4	7	37
Denmark	x(3)	x(3)	32[b]	5[b]	14[b]	52[b]	35[b]	5[b]	8[b]	13[b]	48[b]
Estonia	0	18	18	5	35	58	32	9	5	11	42
Finland	x(3)	x(3)	25	7	28	61	24	7	9	16	39
France	11	8	19	2	33	54	28	9	9	18	46
Germany	15	19	34	1	23	59	31	3	7	11	41
Greece	a	6	6	0	52	59	23	8	11	19	41
Hungary	a	5	5	0	49	54	32	5	8	14	46
Iceland[1]	a	36	36	4	14	53	42	1	3	5	47
Ireland	a	32	32	2	28	64	29	3	6	9	38
Israel	x(3)	x(3)	10	0	20	30	51	2	17	20	70
Italy	m	3	3	1	57	61	23	6	10	16	39
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	a	13	13	1	42	56	29	7	7	14	44
Lithuania	a	9	10	1	44	54	32	5	8	13	46
Luxembourg	a	c	c	c	46	59	30	c	c	c	41
Mexico	a	10	10	0	29	39	42	3	17	19	61
Netherlands	x(3)	x(3)	49	4	11	64	30	2	4	6	36
New Zealand	a	21	21	3	14	37	48	7	8	15	63
Norway	5	32	38	4	23	64	29	2	4	7	36
Poland	a	11	11	1	46	58	28	5	9	14	42
Portugal	a	6	6	2	46	53	32	9	6	15	47
Slovak Republic	c	6	6	c	57	64	25	5	6	11	36
Slovenia	4	11	15	2	49	65	25	3	7	10	35
Spain	x(3)	x(3)	10	3	47	61	22	9	8	17	39
Sweden	m	18	18	8	30	56	35	6	3	9	44
Switzerland	16	17	34	2	21	56	33	4	6	10	44
Türkiye	a	12	12	3	16	30	39	7	24	31	70
United Kingdom	6	14	19	2	22	44	41	6	10	16	56
United States	x(3)	20	20	1	25	46	39	4	10	14	54
OECD Average	**3**	**15**	**18**	**3**	**33**	**53**	**33**	**5**	**9**	**14**	**47**

	18-24 year-olds										
	In education						Not in education				
	Employed			Unemployed	Outside the labour force	Total	Employed	NEET			Total
	Students in work-study programmes	Other employed	Total					Unemployed	Outside the labour force	Total	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Partner and/or accession countries											
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[1]	a	19	19	3	15	38	40	6	16	22	62
Bulgaria	m	6	6	0	61	68	17	2	13	15	32
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	x(3)	x(3)	4	c	51	56	31	7	6	13	44
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	x(3)	x(3)	15	2	22	40	40	3	17	20	60
Romania	x(3)	x(3)	1	c	52	53	24	7	16	23	47
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	a	1	1	1	36	38	14	22	26	48	62
EU25 average	**6**	**11**	**15**	**2**	**41**	**56**	**28**	**6**	**8**	**13**	**41**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: NEET refers to young people neither employed nor in education or training. Data usually refer to the second quarter of studies, which corresponds in most countries to the first three months of the calendar year, but in some countries, to the second three months. Columns with data for 25-29 year-olds are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2025: 2024 for Brazil and Chile; 2023 for Iceland.

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/t764xw.

Table A2.2. Trends in the share of 18-24 year-olds in education/not in education, by work status and gender (2015 and 2025)

In per cent

	In education				Not in education							
					Employed				NEET			
	2015		2025		2015		2025		2015		2025	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(13)	(14)	(16)	(17)
OECD countries												
Australia[1]	49	53	50	49	41	35	40	41	10	12	10	10
Austria[1]	46	51	45	53	42	38	42	34	13	12	13	13
Belgium	52	59	58	70	34	27	29	21	14	14	13	9
Canada	c	c	44	56	c	c	42	32	c	c	14	12
Chile[2]	50	51	55	57	34	23	27	21	16	26	17	22
Colombia	32	34	31	34	54	30	52	32	14	35	17	34
Costa Rica	46	47	42	100	38	22	38	m	17	30	20	m
Czechia	m	m	59	67	m	m	35	24	m	m	6	9
Denmark	61	68	51[b]	53[b]	27	20	36[b]	35[b]	13	12	13[b]	13[b]
Estonia	47	61	53	63	42	23	34	29	11	16	13	8
Finland	51	59	58	64	29	27	26	21	19	14	16	15
France	51	58	48	61	29	24	32	23	20	18	20	16
Germany	62	62	57	61	30	28	32	29	8	9	10	11
Greece[1]	60	65	55	62	17	11	26	19	23	24	19	18
Hungary	51	55	52	56	34	28	36	28	15	17	12	16
Iceland[2]	53	64	48	60	38	30	46	37	8	6	6	3
Ireland	52	54	62	63	28	28	29	29	19	17	9	8
Israel[1]	26	36	27	33	58	45	55	46	16	19	18	21
Italy	48	57	55	67	22	14	29	17	30	30	16	16
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	48	59	52	61	41	28	33	26	10	13	15	13
Lithuania	55	65	54	54	30	21	31	34	15	14	14	13
Luxembourg	64	69	54	65	28	23	c	c	c	c	c	c
Mexico[1]	37	35	37	41	53	28	53	30	9	37	10	29
Netherlands	63	62	63	66	30	31	31	28	7	6	6	6
New Zealand	42	41	36	37	46	40	50	46	13	18	14	16
Norway[1]	44	55	59	70	46	35	34	24	10	9	7	6
Poland	50	64	53	65	34	20	35	20	16	16	13	15
Portugal	54	55	49	57	29	24	36	27	17	20	15	15
Slovak Republic	47	62	56	72	37	21	33	17	16	17	12	11
Slovenia	60	73	55	77	27	12	36	13	14	16	10	10
Spain[1]	55	62	57	65	21	16	26	19	24	23	18	16
Sweden	41	51	51	61	47	38	40	30	12	11	9	10
Switzerland	55[b]	55[b]	54	59	32[b]	36[b]	35	32	13[b]	9[b]	11	9
Türkiye[1]	44	35	30	31	36	19	50	26	20	46	20	43
United Kingdom	43	43	42	46	44	40	43	39	13	17	16	15
United States	46	49	44	49	39	33	42	37	15	17	15	14
OECD average	**50**	**55**	**50**	**58**	**36**	**27**	**37**	**28**	**15**	**18**	**13**	**15**
OECD average for countries with available and comparable data for both years	**51**	**57**	**51**	**61**	**35**	**27**	**36**	**28**	**15**	**17**	**13**	**13**

	In education				Not in education							
					Employed				NEET			
	2015		2025		2015		2025		2015		2025	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(13)	(14)	(16)	(17)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[1,2]	35	39	35	41	45	28	49	31	20	34	17	28
Bulgaria	m	m	63	72	m	m	23	11	m	m	14	16
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	46	62	49	64	27	17	37	24	27	21	14	12
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru[1]	34	37	37	43	50	36	46	34	16	27	16	24
Romania	42[b]	46[b]	52	55	35[b]	25[b]	30	17	23[b]	29[b]	18	28
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**52**	**60**	**54**	**63**	**31**	**24**	**32**	**24**	**17**	**17**	**13**	**13**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: NEET refers to young people who are neither employed nor in formal education or training. Data usually refer to the second quarter of studies, which corresponds in most countries to the first three months of the calendar year, but in some countries, to the second three months. Columns with totals for both men and women are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Australia, Austria, Brazil, Greece, Israel, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Spain and Türkiye.

2. Year of reference differs from 2025: 2024 for Brazil and Chile; 2023 for Iceland.

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/t764xw.

Table A2.3. Distribution of 18-29 year-olds by education and labour-force status, by literacy proficiency level (2023)

In per cent, Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)

	Level 2 and below						Level 3 and above					
	In education		Employed and not in education		NEET		In education		Employed and not in education		NEET	
	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.	%	S.E.
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
OECD countries												
Austria	28	(3.1)	57	(3.2)	15	(2.5)	51	(2.6)	42	(2.6)	7	(1.6)
Canada	42	(3.1)	41	(3.3)	17	(2.4)	44	(2.7)	47	(2.9)	9	(1.3)
Chile	32	(1.5)	49	(2.2)	19	(1.7)	53	(3.5)	36	(3.4)	11	(3.3)
Czechia	27	(2.9)	54	(3.1)	19	(2.4)	51	(2.5)	41	(2.6)	8	(1.5)
Denmark	39	(3.6)	49	(3.8)	12	(2.5)	51	(2.6)	41	(2.6)	8	(1.5)
Estonia	36	(2.9)	47	(3.0)	17	(2.3)	48	(1.6)	46	(1.8)	6	(0.9)
Finland	42	(6.1)	40	(5.1)	18	(4.1)	54	(2.3)	37	(2.2)	9	(1.3)
France	30	(2.0)	52	(2.2)	18	(1.8)	45	(1.7)	46	(1.8)	9	(1.1)
Germany	34	(2.7)	47	(2.9)	19	(2.6)	52	(2.3)	42	(2.1)	6	(1.1)
Hungary	24	(2.0)	57	(2.3)	19	(1.8)	51	(3.2)	43	(3.2)	7	(1.6)
Ireland	34	(3.9)	52	(4.1)	14	(2.7)	50	(3.5)	46	(3.6)	4	(1.5)
Israel	25	(1.7)	48	(1.6)	27	(1.5)	36	(2.3)	48	(2.4)	16	(1.8)
Italy	34	(2.4)	39	(2.3)	28	(2.2)	54	(3.0)	30	(2.7)	16	(2.4)
Japan	27	(3.5)	64	(4.3)	10	(2.6)	33	(1.5)	57	(1.9)	9	(1.4)
Korea	32	(2.8)	50	(3.1)	18	(2.3)	44	(2.6)	41	(2.7)	16	(2.1)
Latvia	32	(3.2)	49	(3.5)	19	(2.9)	44	(3.6)	44	(3.6)	12	(2.5)
Lithuania	31	(2.4)	45	(2.6)	24	(2.4)	41	(4.0)	45	(4.3)	15	(3.0)
Netherlands	46	(3.8)	43	(3.8)	10	(2.2)	52	(2.3)	43	(2.3)	5	(1.1)
New Zealand	28	(3.2)	53	(3.3)	19	(3.1)	36	(3.8)	55	(3.8)	9	(2.2)
Norway	41	(3.6)	48	(3.5)	11	(2.3)	47	(1.9)	47	(2.2)	6	(1.1)
Poland	30	(1.7)	53	(1.8)	17	(1.3)	44	(3.6)	47	(3.5)	9	(1.8)
Portugal	28	(3.0)	52	(3.4)	20	(2.3)	51	(3.6)	38	(3.3)	11	(1.8)
Slovak Republic	33	(2.2)	54	(2.5)	13	(1.3)	43	(3.7)	51	(3.8)	6	(1.5)
Spain	43	(2.6)	40	(2.5)	16	(1.8)	55	(3.0)	36	(3.0)	9	(2.1)
Sweden	47	(4.5)	41	(4.5)	12	(2.8)	47	(2.6)	42	(2.6)	11	(2.0)
Switzerland	33	(3.2)	55	(3.0)	12	(2.1)	56	(2.1)	40	(1.9)	4	(0.8)
United States	37	(3.3)	45	(3.9)	18	(2.5)	44	(2.9)	46	(2.9)	10	(2.3)
Other economies												
England (UK)	38	(3.7)	50	(4.1)	12	(2.2)	47	(2.6)	47	(2.7)	6	(1.1)
Flemish Region (Belgium)	26	(3.6)	55	(3.6)	19	(2.7)	37	(2.8)	56	(2.7)	7	(1.2)
OECD average	**34**		**49**		**17**		**47**		**44**		**9**	
Partner and/or accession countries												
Croatia	29	(2.2)	48	(2.3)	23	(2.1)	48	(2.6)	42	(2.8)	10	(1.8)

Note: Literacy proficiency refers to the PIAAC proficiency scale, which is measured on a continuous scale and grouped into levels to facilitate interpretation. Level 2 and below includes Level 1 and below as well as Level 2, while Level 3 and above includes Levels 3, 4 and 5.
The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/t764xw.

Chapter A3. How does educational attainment affect participation in the labour market?

Highlights

- On average across the OECD, the employment rate reaches 60% among 25-64 year-olds with below upper secondary educational attainment, compared to 78% among those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education and 87% among tertiary-educated adults.
- Technological change and artificial intelligence (AI) are reshaping labour markets. Historically, tertiary-educated young adults have shown the most labour-market resilience, with lower unemployment rates than their peers with lower educational attainment during economic booms and crises. This has not changed in 2025, even as concern grows about AI's effect on entry-level hiring for tertiary graduates.
- Tertiary-educated adults are more likely to work in skilled occupations, but high skills can compensate for lower attainment. Although only 34% of highly skilled adults with vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment work in skilled white-collar jobs (compared with 73% of similarly skilled tertiary-educated adults), this is nearly twice the share of low-skilled adults with the same attainment.


Context

Highly skilled workers remain vital for modern economies, and they in turn benefit from robust employment opportunities linked to their education. These advantages, coupled with expanded educational opportunities, are some of the motivations for individuals across the OECD to pursue higher levels of education and acquire more skills. As demand for skills has increased, labour markets have successfully absorbed the growing number of highly educated workers, providing them with better employment prospects. Conversely, adults with lower qualifications continue to face challenging labour-market prospects, lower earnings (see Chapter A4) and a greater risk of unemployment.

Concurrently, increasing longevity is reshaping labour markets and career trajectories. As people live longer and spend a larger share of their lives in retirement, many countries face growing pressure to support longer and healthier working lives while addressing skills shortages. Educational attainment and lifelong learning play an important role in helping adults remain employable throughout longer careers, particularly as low-educated older adults continue to face higher risks of early labour-market exit and economic insecurity. Education systems must therefore adapt proactively to these demographic and technological changes, preparing learners for an evolving labour-market landscape and supporting skills development throughout adulthood.

Figure A3.1. Trends in OECD average unemployment rates of young adults, by educational attainment level (2000 to 2025)

In per cent of 25-34 year-olds in the labour force



The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ka9j74.

Other findings

- Health and education are the fields of study with the highest occupational concentration. Over half of tertiary-educated workers who studied the field of education work in the teaching profession on average, while 36% of those who studied health and welfare have become health professionals. In contrast, only 22% of those with a business, administration and law qualification work in a related field.
- Young women are more likely than men to be outside the labour force. The OECD average gender gap ranges from 6 percentage points among tertiary-educated 25-34 year-olds to 26 percentage points among those with below upper secondary education.
- Although part-time employment offers workers greater flexibility to balance employment with education, caregiving responsibilities or other personal commitments, it is also associated with lower earnings and career opportunities. On average among 25-64 year-olds in employment, part-time working is more prevalent among those with low numeracy skills (18% compared to 10% of those with high skills), women (21% compared to 7% of men) and those with below upper secondary attainment (18% compared to 13% of those with tertiary attainment).

Note

People of working age can be classified into three groups based on their labour-force status: employed, unemployed and outside the labour force (also referred to as inactive). The employed and unemployed together make up the labour force, which represents the total supply of labour available to contribute to economic production. Individuals who are neither employed nor actively seeking work are considered outside the labour force and are not included in the labour supply.

Analysis

There continues to be a strong relationship between labour-market participation and educational attainment that holds whether participation is measured by employment, unemployment or inactivity rates. This relationship exists in nearly all OECD and partner countries with available data. It is very rare to find a country where a subpopulation with lower educational attainment has higher

labour-market participation rates than a subpopulation with higher educational attainment. This positive relationship between education and the labour market holds for both men and women and has been stable over the decades, against the backdrop of a strong increase in attainment levels across the OECD (Table A3.2).

When analysing employment rates by educational attainment, it is important to recognise that educational pathways are not always linear. Adults may acquire qualifications at different levels throughout their lives as they seek to update or broaden their skills in response to changing labour-market demands. The data presented in this chapter classify individuals according to their highest level of educational attainment, not their most recent qualification. As a result, adults who complete an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary programme after obtaining a tertiary qualification are recorded as tertiary-educated. The results should therefore be interpreted as reflecting the labour-market outcomes associated with individuals' highest attained qualification rather than their full educational trajectory.

Educational attainment and employment rates

Increased educational attainment improves the employment prospects of adults. On average across the OECD, 60% of 25-64 year-olds with below upper secondary educational attainment are employed, compared to 78% among those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education. Among those, the employment rate for those who completed a vocational programme (79%) is higher than for those with general qualifications (75%). Finally, the employment rate increases to 87% among tertiary-educated adults (Table A3.1).

There are significant variations in employment rates by attainment level across countries. The Slovak Republic has the highest employment premium for adults with an upper secondary or post-secondary educational attainment, regardless of the programme orientation, at 47 percentage points (the employment rate is 81% at this level, compared to 34% for those adults with below upper secondary education). The lowest premiums at this level are observed in Colombia, Costa Rica and Mexico, and, among OECD partner countries, India and Indonesia. The highest employment premiums for tertiary-educated adults compared to those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education are found in Lithuania and Poland, where the difference in employment rates reaches 16 percentage points, and, among OECD partner countries, in South Africa (22 percentage points). In contrast, countries such as Czechia and Iceland report a much smaller premium for tertiary attainment, at 4 percentage points or less (Table A3.1). These differences indicate that the labour-market value of a degree is shaped not only by the level of education but also by national economic conditions, specific skill demands and the structure of secondary and post-secondary education systems (OECD, 2025[1]).

These data must also be understood in the context of broader generational shifts. Although younger adults (25-34 year-olds) are more highly educated than the wider adult population, their employment patterns are remarkably consistent with OECD averages: overall, 87% of tertiary-educated younger adults are employed, the same share as for tertiary-educated adults as a whole. Similarly, 83% of younger adults with vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment are employed (compared to 79% among 25-64 year-olds), as are 73% of those with a general qualification at the same level (75% among 25-64 year-olds), and 59% of those with below upper secondary attainment (60% among 25-64 year-olds) (Table A3.2).

Adults with vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary educational attainment typically benefit from more direct pathways into the labour market, as these programmes are specifically designed to provide occupation-specific skills that meet immediate employer needs. The slightly lower initial employment rates among their peers from general tracks may reflect the fact that these programmes are primarily oriented towards preparing students for further studies at the tertiary level. This distinction is critical, as vocational qualifications often provide a significant "safety net" against early-career unemployment, whereas the value of a general secondary qualification is frequently realised only upon the completion of a subsequent tertiary degree.

The employment benefits of higher education are particularly striking for women. The employment rate among young women (aged 25-34) with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment from a general programme is 21 percentage points higher than for their peers with below upper secondary attainment, rising to 30 percentage points higher if they hold a vocational qualification. In contrast, the employment advantages among similarly educated young men is 10 percentage points for a general qualification and 20 percentage points for a vocational one. The advantage to women of attaining tertiary education is even more pronounced: their employment rate is 14 percentage points higher than among those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment, whereas for young men the difference is only 5 percentage points (Table A3.2).

However, young women still face persistent disadvantages in the labour market, with lower employment rates than their male peers at every level of attainment. Across the OECD, 25-34 year-old women with below upper secondary attainment have an average employment rate of 45%, compared to 69% for similarly educated men. The gender gap narrows with rising attainment:

it is 15 percentage points among young adults with an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment and 6 percentage points among those with tertiary attainment (Table A3.2). These continued disparities highlight the importance of addressing structural barriers to employment, even as educational levels continue to improve.

Employment rates measure whether individuals are working, but not intensity of their participation in the labour market. Understanding differences in work intensity provides a more complete picture of labour-market outcomes. Box A3.1 examines how part-time employment varies by educational attainment, skills and gender using data from the 2023 cycle of the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC).

Box A3.1. Employment and work intensity

Part-time employment plays an important role in labour markets, offering workers greater flexibility to balance employment with education, caregiving responsibilities or other personal commitments. Although part-time work can facilitate labour-market participation for groups such as students, parents and older adults, who might otherwise be excluded from employment, it can also be associated with lower earnings, fewer opportunities for career progression and reduced access to employment-related benefits. The prevalence of part-time work varies considerably across countries and demographic groups, with women, young adults, older workers and low-skilled adults generally more likely to work part time.

The Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) collects information on the number of hours usually worked per week. Because national definitions of part-time employment vary across countries, the analysis here uses a harmonised definition based on hours worked rather than self-reported employment status, classifying adults who usually work less than 30 hours per week as working part time.

On average across the OECD, the share of employed 25-64 year-olds working part time ranges from 10% among those with PIAAC numeracy proficiency at Level 4 or above (i.e. those who can successfully complete complex mathematical tasks) to 18% among those performing at Level 1 or below (who typically struggle with multi-step calculations or the interpretation of more complex quantitative information). The part-time working rate is 21% among women, compared to 7% among men. Across educational attainment levels, 18% of adults with below upper secondary education work part time, compared to 14% of those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment and 13% of tertiary-educated adults (Table A3.8, available online).

Employment rate trends


Between 2015 and 2025, the employment landscape for young adults (aged 25-34) has been characterised by an upward trend in employment rates, although the increase has not been linear and marked by the negative downturn due to the COVID-19 pandemic. On average across OECD countries, the employment rate for tertiary-educated young adults grew by 4 percentage points (87% in 2025). There were similar increases for young adults with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment: by 3 percentage points for those with a general qualification and by 4 percentage points for those with a vocational one (in 2025 at 73% and 83% respectively). In contrast, those with below upper secondary attainment remain the most vulnerable group in the labour market. Their average employment rate rose by only 1 percentage point (at 59% in 2025) in the same period (Table A3.2).

These average changes mask a wide variety of trends across different countries. Hungary, Italy and Spain have seen a sharp improvement in employment rates for young adults between 2015 and 2025, regardless of educational attainment, while in Greece, employment prospects improved at all levels except among those with below upper secondary attainment. Large increases were also recorded in other countries over this period. The employment rate rose by 12 percentage points in the Slovak Republic among tertiary-educated young adults; in Croatia, Ireland and Portugal among those with a vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment; in Germany and Slovenia among those with a general qualification at the same level; and in Czechia and Korea among those with below upper secondary education (Table A3.2).

The employment prospects of young adults sometimes diverged strongly in the same country depending on attainment and programme orientation. For example, in France and Sweden the employment rate fell for those with a general upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment, but not for those with vocational attainment, while in Croatia the increase among this latter cohort was much larger than for those with a general qualification at the same level (Figure A3.2).

Figure A3.2. Trends in employment rates of young adults with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary educational attainment, by programme orientation (2015 and 2025)

In per cent; 25-34 year-olds



1. Year of reference differs from 2025.
2. Data for upper secondary attainment include completion of intermediate upper secondary programmes.
For data, see Table A3.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ka9j74.

As well as attainment levels, different skill levels and fields of study can lead to very different career pathways and occupations. Box A3.2 analyses the distribution of the adult population across different occupations using data from the 2023 cycle of the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC).

Box A3.2. Occupational outcomes of education

Educational attainment is strongly associated with occupational outcomes. Adults with tertiary education are considerably more likely than those with lower levels of attainment to work in skilled white-collar occupations such as managers, professionals and technicians. However, skills also matter. Among adults with similar educational attainment, those with stronger numeracy skills are more likely to work in higher-skilled occupations, suggesting that strong skills can partly compensate for lower levels of formal educational attainment. These findings highlight the importance of both qualifications and skills in shaping labour-market opportunities.

Occupations in this analysis of data from the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) are classified according to the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-08), which groups jobs according to the tasks and duties performed by workers. Skilled occupations include managers, professionals, and technicians and associate professionals, while semi-skilled occupations include clerical support workers, service and sales workers, skilled agricultural workers, craft and related trades workers, and plant and machine operators and assemblers (OECD, 2024[2]).

Educational attainment is a strong predictor of occupational outcomes. Adults with tertiary education are substantially more likely to work in skilled occupations than those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment, regardless of their skill level. On average across the OECD, 73% of tertiary-educated adults with high numeracy skill levels work as managers, professionals or technicians, compared to 34% of similarly skilled adults with vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment (Figure A3.3).


Skills nevertheless play an important role within educational attainment levels. Adults with vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment tend to be concentrated in a range of semi-skilled occupations, and those with lower numeracy proficiency are considerably less likely to work in skilled occupations than those with higher proficiency. On average across the OECD, only 18% of adults with vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment and low numeracy skills work as managers, professionals or technicians, just over half the rate among their high-skilled peers. This suggests that strong skills can improve occupational prospects even in the absence of tertiary qualifications (Table A3.4, available online).

The relationship between fields of study and occupations varies considerably across disciplines. Some fields exhibit strong occupational concentration (i.e. graduates from these fields tend to work in a related occupation) because they prepare graduates for specific professions. Health professionals predominantly come from health and welfare programmes, reflecting the highly specialised nature of the profession: on average 36% of tertiary-educated adults who studied a health and welfare field work as a health professional (Table A3.6, available online). The education field of study has an even higher occupational concentration: on average across the OECD, 53% of those whose main field of study was education work as teaching professionals (Figure A3.4).

In comparison, tertiary graduates from science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields or business, administration and law are distributed across a much wider range of occupations. On average, 31% of adults with a STEM degree work as a science and engineering or information and communications technology professionals, while only 22% of those with business, administration and law qualifications work as either business and administration professionals or legal, social and cultural professionals (Table A3.6, available online). The relationship also differs when examined from the perspective of occupations: Table A3.7, available online, presents the distribution by field of study for each occupation.

Figure A3.3. Distribution of adults with high numeracy skills by occupation, by educational attainment (2023)

25-64 year-olds, numeracy proficiency of PIAAC Level 3 and above, Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)




Note: The percentages in parentheses represent the adults with PIAAC numeracy proficiency level 3 or above at each specific educational attainment level. Additional data breakdowns for the category of Professionals are available in Tables A3.4 and A3.5, available online. Other occupations include Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers, elementary occupations and armed forces occupations.
For data see, Tables A3.4 and A3.5, available online. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ka9j74.

These findings should be interpreted in light of the way information collected in PIAAC. The survey records respondents' principal field of study associated with their highest qualification rather than all qualifications obtained throughout their lifetime. As a result, some teachers may not be recorded as having studied education if they first completed a subject-specific degree and subsequently obtained a teaching qualification, entered teaching through an alternative certification pathway, or became a teacher after working in another profession. Such pathways are common in some countries and help explain why many teaching professionals report a field of study other than education.

Figure A3.4. Distribution of tertiary-educated adults whose field of study was education by occupation (2023)

25-64 year-olds, Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)



For data, see Table A3.6, available online. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ka9j74.

Note that the category "Teaching professionals" refers to adults whose current occupation involves teaching-related professional duties. It is therefore not directly comparable with teacher statistics reported elsewhere in *Education at a Glance*, which are derived from administrative data and classify teachers according to the level of education at which they are employed. Nevertheless, the analysis provides valuable insights into how educational attainment, skills and fields of study are associated with occupational outcomes across OECD countries.

Subnational variations in employment rates

Within OECD countries, employment rates among adults (25-64 year-olds) can vary dramatically from one region to another. These subnational variations present critical challenges for policymakers seeking to promote inclusive labour markets and equitable access to opportunities. The following analysis is of regions at the TL2 level, which are large subnational regions as defined by the OECD's official regional classification (OECD, 2026[3]).

On average across OECD countries, regional disparities in employment rates are markedly larger for adults with lower educational attainment. In Italy, for instance, only 3% of 25-64 year-olds with below upper secondary education were employed in Campania in 2025, compared to 77% in the Autonomous Province of Bolzano, a difference of 38 percentage points. In contrast, among tertiary-educated adults, employment rates range from 73% in Calabria to 91% in the Autonomous Province of Bolzano, a much narrower 18 percentage-point spread (Table A3.9, available online).

The most pronounced regional disparities in employment rates among tertiary-educated adults are in Canada, Greece and Italy where the gap between the best- and worst-performing regions reaches or exceeds 12 percentage points. In contrast, regional differences in employment rates for tertiary-educated adults do not exceed 1 percentage point in Ireland and Slovenia (Table A3.9, available online).

Among partner countries, Bulgaria has a significant range of employment outcomes by region and education levels. In 2025, only 38% of adults with below upper secondary education were employed in the North West region compared to 60% in the South West – Ilfov. Among tertiary-educated adults, the disparity narrows, with employment rates ranging from 90% to 94% across regions (Table A3.9, available online).

Educational attainment and unemployment rates

Higher educational attainment continues to serve as a significant buffer against the risk of unemployment. Across many OECD and partner countries, unemployment rates are notably higher among younger adults with lower levels of education. In 2025, the average unemployment rate across OECD countries for 25-34 year-olds with below upper secondary attainment stood at 14%, nearly twice that for those with an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary qualification (8% for those with a general qualification and 6% for those with vocational attainment). For tertiary-educated young adults, the unemployment rate is lower still, at just 5% (Table A3.3).

The OECD average unemployment rate for 25-34 year-olds has gone through significant fluctuations over the last two decades Figure A3.2. Notable peaks occurred between 2008 and 2013 following the global financial crisis, and again during the 2020-21 COVID-19 pandemic. Across all education levels, tertiary-educated young adults remained the most resilient during these shocks, experiencing lower overall unemployment rates and less extreme spikes. For example, during the aftermath of the 2008 crisis, the unemployment rate for those without an upper secondary education rose by 7 percentage points between 2008 and 2010, whereas the increase for tertiary-educated adults was a more moderate 3 percentage points, and it rose more gradually over a longer period (2008 to 2013) (Figure A3.2).

Recent labour-market developments do not yet suggest a widespread deterioration in employment prospects for tertiary-educated young adults. Despite growing discussion about the potential impact of artificial intelligence on highly skilled occupations (Lane, 2024[4]), the unemployment rate among tertiary-educated 25-34 year-olds remained comparatively low in 2025, at 5% on average across the OECD, and showed no marked divergence from longer-term trends. However, over the most recent two years with data available unemployment increased slightly more among tertiary-educated young adults (+0.4 percentage points on average across the OECD with available data) than among lower levels of educational attainment. The unemployment rate decreased slightly among those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment (-0.2 percentage points between 2023 and 2025) and increased only slightly among those with below upper secondary education (+0.1 percentage points over the same period) (Table A3.3 and Figure A3.1).

Overall, the average unemployment rate masks wide cross-country variations. In the Slovak Republic and South Africa, the risk of unemployment is particularly acute among young adults with below upper secondary educational attainment: 40% or more are unemployed. The risk is reduced among those who completed upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education: the highest rate for all programmes combined is found in South Africa (39%), while it is highest in Finland for those with general attainment at this level (14%) and in Greece for those with vocational attainment (13%). Finally, the risk is substantially lower among tertiary-educated young adults, reaching 11% in Greece, and, among partner countries, 16% in South Africa (Table A3.3).

Between 2015 and 2025, Greece and Spain experienced the largest reduction in unemployment rates for all levels of educational attainment (and Czechia for young adults with below upper secondary education). The rate increased the most among young adults without a tertiary education in South Africa (Table A3.3).

Educational attainment and adults outside the labour force

Although unemployment rates are a common indicator of a country's economic health, they can be deceptive when viewed in isolation. This measure only captures individuals who are jobless but actively seeking employment, excluding those who are outside the labour force altogether (inactive). This distinction is vital; in some nations, low unemployment rates can mask a high rate of inactivity caused by discouraged workers. These are individuals who may wish to work but have ceased their search due to structural barriers, such as a lack of childcare, health concerns, or repeated failure to find a position, potentially obscuring deeper labour-market dysfunction.


The reasons for inactivity vary across people’s lives. Among young adults, family formation and caregiving responsibilities are important drivers of labour-market withdrawal, particularly among women. As people get older, health-related limitations become increasingly important. As populations live longer and working lives extend, addressing health-related barriers to employment will become an increasingly important component of policies aimed at sustaining labour-market participation (Crawshaw et al., 2024[5]).

On average across the OECD, 32% of young adults without upper secondary are outside the labour force, falling to 21% among those with general upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment, 11% among those with a vocational qualification at the same level and 9% among those with tertiary attainment. Across OECD and partner countries, this share ranges from 15% in Iceland and Portugal to 54% in Ireland among young adults with below upper secondary education, and from 5% in Hungary, Lithuania and the Netherlands to 32% in India among tertiary-educated ones (Table A3.3).

Across OECD and partner countries, young women are more likely than men to be outside the labour force. This pattern coincides with the life stage during which family formation and child-rearing responsibilities are most common, highlighting the continued influence of caregiving obligations on labour-market participation. However, this gender gap narrows as educational attainment increases. On average across the OECD, the gender difference ranges from 6 percentage points among tertiary-educated 25-34 year-olds to 26 percentage points among those with below upper secondary education. Across countries, differences in the share of young women and young men who are outside the labour force range from as little as 3 percentage points in Korea to 61 percentage points in the Republic of Türkiye among those with below upper secondary attainment, and from no gap at all in Portugal to 55 percentage points in India for those with tertiary attainment (Figure A3.5).

Figure A3.5. Share of 25-34 year-olds who are not in the labour force, by gender and educational attainment level (2025)

In per cent



1. Year of reference differs from 2025.
2. Data for upper secondary attainment include completion of intermediate upper secondary programmes.
For data, see Table A3.3.
The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ka9j74.

Definitions

Age groups: Adults refer to 25-64 year-olds. **Younger adults** refer to 25-34 year-olds. **Older adults** refer to 55-64 year-olds.

Educational attainment refers to the highest level of education successfully completed by an individual. See the *Reader's Guide* at the beginning of this publication for a presentation of all ISCED 2011 levels.

Employed individuals are those who, during the survey reference week, were either working for pay or profit for at least one hour or had a job but were temporarily not at work. The employment rate refers to the number of persons in employment as a percentage of the population.

Inactive individuals/those outside the labour force are those who, during the survey reference week, were outside the labour force and classified neither as employed nor as unemployed. Individuals enrolled in education are also considered as inactive if they are not looking for a job. The inactivity rate refers to inactive persons as a percentage of the population (i.e. the number of inactive people is divided by the number of the population of the same age group).

Labour force (active population) is the total number of employed and unemployed persons, in accordance with the definition in the Labour Force Survey.

Proficiency levels: See definition in Chapter A1.

Professions: Elementary occupations are those defined in ISCO-08 as 9-Elementary Occupations. Semi-skilled blue-collar occupations include 6-Skilled Agricultural, Forestry and Fishery Workers; 7-Craft and Related Trades Workers; and 8-Plant and Machine Operators, and Assemblers. Semi-skilled white-collar occupations include 4-Clerical Support Workers and 5-Service and Sales Workers. Skilled occupations include 1-Managers, 2-Professionals, and 3-Technicians and Associate Professionals.

Unemployed individuals are those who, during the survey reference week, were without work, actively seeking employment and currently available to start work. The unemployment rate refers to unemployed persons as a percentage of the labour force (i.e. the number of unemployed people is divided by the sum of employed and unemployed people).

Definitions of **Skill domains** and **Proficiency levels** related to data from Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) are included in Chapter A1.

Methodology

For information about methodologies, see Chapter A1. Note that the employment rates do not take into account the number of hours worked.

For further details, refer to the *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics* ((OECD, 2017[6])) and the *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

In PIAAC data, occupations are coded using the International Standard Classification of Occupations 2008 (ISCO-08). Occupations are usually available at the 1-digit (major group), 2-digit (sub-major group), 3-digit (minor group) and sometimes 4-digit level. Only data on 1- and 2-digit categories have been analysed in this report. ISCO-08 major groups (1-digit): 1 Managers; 2 Professionals; 3 Technicians and associate professionals; 4 Clerical support workers; 5 Service and sales workers; 6 Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers; 7 Craft and related trades workers; 8 Plant and machine operators and assemblers; 9 Elementary occupations; 0 Armed forces occupations

PIAAC data use respondents' highest field of study based on ISCED Fields of Education and Training 2013 (ISCED-F 2013). The broad fields are collapsed into broader categories. The share of part-time workers in PIAAC is derived from respondents' reported weekly working hours (question D2_Q11). To ensure comparability across countries, this chapter applies a harmonised definition of part-time employment, classifying workers who report working fewer than 30 hours per week as part-time.

Sources

For information on sources, see Chapter A1.

Data on subnational regions for selected indicators are available in the *OECD Regional Statistics Database:* https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/regions-cities-and-local-statistics.html.

Data on proficiency levels are based on the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) (2023). PIAAC is the OECD Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies. See *About the Survey of Adult Skills* at the beginning of this publication for additional information.

References

Crawshaw, P. et al. (2024), “Health inequalities and health-related economic inactivity: Why good work needs good health”, *Public Health in Practice*, Vol. 8, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhip.2024.100555. [5]

Lane, M. (2024), “Who will be the workers most affected by AI?: A closer look at the impact of AI on women, low-skilled workers and other groups”, *OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers*, No. 26, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/14dc6f89-en. [4]

OECD (2026), *OECD Territorial Grids*, OECD, Paris, https://webfs-cfe.oecd.org/files/.Stat/region/OECD_territorial-grid_TL2024.pdf. [3]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en. [1]

OECD (2024), *Do Adults Have the Skills They Need to Thrive in a Changing World?: Survey of Adult Skills 2023*, OECD Skills Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b263dc5d-en. [2]

OECD (2017), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264279889-en. [6]

Chapter A3 Tables

Tables and notes

Table A3.1	Employment rates of adults, by educational attainment (2025)
Table A3.2	Trends in employment rates of 25-34 year-olds, by educational attainment and gender (2015 and 2025)
Table A3.3	Trends in unemployment rates and shares of 25-34 year-olds outside the labour force, by educational attainment and gender (2015 and 2025)
WEB Table A3.4	*Distribution of adults with vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary educational attainment by occupation, by numeracy proficiency level (2023)*
WEB Table A3.5	*Distribution of tertiary-educated adults by occupation, by numeracy proficiency level (2023)*
WEB Table A3.6	*Distribution of tertiary-educated adults by occupation, by field of study (2023)*
WEB Table A3.7	*Distribution of tertiary-educated adults by field of study, by occupation (2023)*
WEB Table A3.8	*Share of employed adults working part-time by numeracy proficiency level, gender and educational attainment level (2023)*
WEB Table A3.9	*Subnational regions with the highest and lowest adult employment rates, by educational attainment (2025)*

StatLink https://stat.link/ka9j74

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter, can be downloaded via https://stat.link/ka9j74.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Table A3.1. Employment rates of adults, by educational attainment and programme orientation (2025)

Percentage of employed 25-64 year-olds among all 25-64 year-olds

	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary					Tertiary					All levels of education
		By programme orientation		By educational attainment		Total	Short-cycle tertiary	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or equivalent	Doctoral or equivalent	Total	
		General programmes	Vocational programmes	Upper secondary	Post-secondary non-tertiary							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	62	77	85	80	89	81	86	88	91	m	88	83
Austria	58	76	78	77	84	78	86	82	90	90	87	79
Belgium	48	68	75	73	84	73	81	86	90	92	88	76
Canada	57	72	81	72	81	75	80	84	86[d]	x(9)	83	79
Chile[1]	61	71	75	72	a	72	80	87	94	91	86	75
Colombia	66	x(6)	x(6)	x(6)	x(6)	72	x(11)	x(11)	x(11)	x(11)	81	73
Costa Rica	63	69	66	68	c	68	76	84	86	c	82	69
Czechia	63	x(6)	x(6)	87	m	87	86	85	90	95	89	86
Denmark	60[b]	72[b]	84[b]	82[b]	88[b]	82[b]	86[b]	86[b]	90[b]	93[b]	87[b]	81[b]
Estonia	65	82	83	82	86	83	85	88	90	99	89	84
Finland	50	67	78	75	94	76	84	88	90	m	89	79
France	54	74	75	75	70	75	86	86	90	90	88	77
Germany	63	70	84	82	87	83	91	88	89	92	88	82
Greece	60	69	77	71	76	72	c	80	89	93	83	73
Hungary	62	83	85	84	92	85	90	90	93	100	92	84
Iceland[1]	77	83	89	86	91	86	87	88	94	97	91	86
Ireland	56	76	80	75	80	77	84	87	90	92	88	82
Israel	56	73	80	74	a	74	84	88	91	89	88	79
Italy	56	68	77	74	79	75	76	79	88	93	85	71
Japan	x(4)	x(4)	x(4)	83[d]	x(4)	83[d]	85[d]	90[d]	x(8)	x(8)	88[d]	86
Korea	61	x(6)	x(6)	73	a	73	78	80	88	m	80	77
Latvia	64	75	78	76	77	77	91	88	88	99	89	80
Lithuania	58	73	76	73	77	75	a	90	92	99	91	82
Luxembourg	57	75	a	72	c	72	c	83	89	c	87	77
Mexico	66	73	62	72	a	72	75	80	86	89	81	71
Netherlands	68	78	85	84	87	84	90	89	92	93	90	84
New Zealand	68	81	84	81	85	83	89	89	88	93	89	83

	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary					Tertiary					All levels of education
		By programme orientation		By educational attainment		Total	Short-cycle tertiary	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or equivalent	Doctoral or equivalent	Total	
		General programmes	Vocational programmes	Upper secondary	Post-secondary non-tertiary							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Norway	59	72	82	79	83	79	83	89	92	95	89	81
Poland	49	79	76	76	77	76	80	90	92	96	92	81
Portugal	72	85	89	86	88	86	90	89	92	92	91	83
Slovak Republic	34	81	81	81	83	81	c	84	92	94	91	81
Slovenia	57	80	79	79	a	79	85	89	94	96	91	81
Spain	64	74	76	75	71	75	83	83	88	92	85	75
Sweden	66	79	86	84	81	83	85	89	92	93	89	84
Switzerland	68	79	84	83	m	83	m	88	89	93	89	84
Türkiye	51	60	65	62	a	62	67	77	83	93	75	60
United Kingdom[2]	61	79	78	80	a	78	83	88	89	90	87	80
United States	59	x(6)	x(6)	x(6)	x(6)	71	78	83	86	91	83	76
OECD average	**60**	**75**	**79**	**77**	**83**	**78**	**83**	**86**	**90**	**94**	**87**	**79**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina[1]	69	x(6)	x(6)	77	a	77	x(11)	x(11)	x(11)	x(11)	88	77
Brazil[1]	61	x(6)	x(6)	x(6)	x(6)	75	x(8)	86[d]	86	95	86	72
Bulgaria	47	78	84	81	85	81	a	90	93	96	92	81
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	42	72	77	76	a	76	80	85	93	99	90	77
India	66	x(6)	x(6)	65	81	67	x(11)	x(11)	x(11)	x(11)	64	66
Indonesia[1]	75	x(6)	x(6)	75	a	75	78	83	88	96	82	76
Peru	78	81	m	81	m	81	m	81	m	m	m	m
Romania	46	78	77	77	86	77	x(11)	x(11)	x(11)	x(11)	92	72
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	39	x(6)	x(6)	53	69	56	64	78	84[d]	x(9)	78	50
EU25 average	**57**	**75**	**80**	**78**	**82**	**79**	**85**	**86**	**91**	**95**	**89**	**80**
G20 average	**60**	**m**	**m**	**73**	**80**	**74**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**83**	**74**

Note: Data refer to ISCED 2011 for all countries, except Argentina and India, which use ISCED-97. Data for Argentina, India and Indonesia are from the International Labour Organization (ILO). The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ka9j74.

1. Year of reference differs from 2025: 2024 for Brazil and Chile; 2023 for Iceland and Indonesia. 2. Data for upper secondary attainment include completion of a sufficient volume and standard of programmes that would be classified individually as completion of intermediate upper secondary programmes (10% of adults aged 25-64 are in this group).

Table A3.2. Trends in employment rates of 25-34 year-olds, by educational attainment and gender (2015 and 2025)

Percentage of employed 25-34 year-olds among all 25-34 year-olds

	Below upper secondary				Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary								Tertiary			
	Men		Women		General				Vocational				Men		Women	
	2015	2025	2015	2025	Men		Women		Men		Women		2015	2025	2015	2025
					2015	2025	2015	2025	2015	2025	2015	2025				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)
OECD countries																
Australia	74	78	43	50	80	81	69	72	92	96	66	73	92	95	80	89
Austria	65	69	51	47	74	77	69	73	89	87	82	83	87	90	84	85
Belgium	61	60	38	32	73	69	64	54	85	84	74	75	88	89	86	87
Canada	67	65	42	45	80	78	64	67	89	89	83	80	88	88	81	84
Chile[1]	79	72	43	46	77	77	56	55	92	86	63	64	89	89	83	82
Colombia	90	86	50	45	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	90	89	79	77
Costa Rica	87	85	46	45	88	85	59	62	84	c	68	c	84	85	78	80
Czechia	56	70	27	49	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	91	94	68	69
Denmark	62	69[b]	47	44[b]	72	70[b]	64	63[b]	90	90[b]	77	79[b]	85	89[b]	80	84[b]
Estonia	69	66	51	70	92	85	67	78	93	91	65	82	95	93	79	88
Finland	61	47	40	31	75	70	55	56	83	80	69	75	88	90	76	86
France	63	59	36	39	79	76	68	63	82	84	64	74	87	89	82	85
Germany	68	70	44	45	57	72	50	60	89	91	82	86	91	91	84	85
Greece	62	67	34	30	64	74	44	53	68	84	56	65	67	82	63	80
Hungary	65	73	36	48	80	79	64	78	89	92	66	82	94	92	74	93
Iceland[1]	85	86	62	68	77	85	70	74	95	90	82	88	91	91	83	88
Ireland	52	42	33	33	72	84	61	67	81	85	58	74	85	92	83	87
Israel	72	66	38	47	75	69	65	68	88	87	69	70	90	88	83	84
Italy	63	71	36	34	56	67	45	48	75	82	58	65	66	75	60	73
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	91[d]	94[d]	76[d]	89[d]
Korea	63	67	45	64	73[d]	72[d]	54[d]	62[d]	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	85	82	67	77
Latvia	70	66	52	52	84	85	69	73	86	89	79	68	94	93	80	86
Lithuania	66	68	43	12	81	85	68	72	86	89	63	72	95	93	89	91
Luxembourg	86	c	64	c	c	c	c	c	93	a	80	a	91	c	84	c
Mexico	91	90	42	47	88	89	53	59	93	91	61	63	87	89	74	76
Netherlands	79	76	55	54	78	82	72	73	90	93	78	84	93	94	89	91
New Zealand	78	72	49	53	87	86	63	71	91	92	64	71	91	92	82	86
Norway	67	69	53	53	82	77	59	71	90	92	84	84	87	90	86	89
Poland	55	60	31	33	83	90	61	71	87	93	60	70	92	96	84	90
Portugal	77	77	71	68	77	84	78	81	81	90	78	88	78	89	81	89
Slovak Republic	45	44	32	21	85	80	55	67	88	93	60	72	90	90	66	86
Slovenia	69	65	49	32	73	81	57	75	85	92	74	82	88	90	79	88
Spain	63	71	47	53	66	72	59	66	75	83	67	74	77	85	74	82
Sweden	75	73	53	54	79	74	72	63	91	92	85	82	88	89	86	85
Switzerland	76	77[r]	55	53[r]	81	80[r]	78	77[r]	92	90	84	85	92	91	86	89
Türkiye	84	80	26	24	84	82	33	36	91	87	38	38	86	87	65	62
United Kingdom[2]	77	67	43	46	89	86	71	78	91	88	73	73	92	93	84	89
United States	73	70	37	48	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	88	88	80	83
OECD average	**70**	**69**	**44**	**44**	**78**	**79**	**62**	**66**	**87**	**89**	**70**	**75**	**88**	**90**	**79**	**84**
OECD average for countries with available and comparable data for both years	**70**	**69**	**44**	**44**	**78**	**79**	**62**	**66**	**87**	**89**	**70**	**75**	**87**	**90**	**79**	**84**
Partner and/or accession countries																
Argentina	m	84	m	49	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	m	94	m	86

	Below upper secondary				Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary								Tertiary			
	Men		Women		General				Vocational				Men		Women	
	2015	2025	2015	2025	Men		Women		Men		Women		2015	2025	2015	2025
					2015	2025	2015	2025	2015	2025	2015	2025				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)
Brazil[1,3]	80	81	45	43	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	90	92	82	84
Bulgaria	46	56	27	26	74	80	63	69	82	89	71	77	89	92	81	88
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	c	54[r]	c	c	c	66[r]	c	c	77	87	64	77	78	86	78	87
India	m	94	m	37	m	x(20)	m	x(22)	m	x(20)	m	x(22)	m	82	m	31
Indonesia[1]	91	90	m	47	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	x(19)	x20	x(21)	x22	90	91	78	76
Peru[3]	92	82	65	65	94	92	67	62	m	m	m	m	86	m	74	m
Romania	74[b]	62	46[b]	25	80[b]	87	63[b]	70	85[b]	91	68[b]	68	90[b]	93	85[b]	88
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	56	42	38	26	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	x(19)	x(20)	x(21)	x(22)	82	83	79	72
EU25 average	**65**	**64**	**43**	**41**	**75**	**78**	**62**	**67**	**84**	**88**	**70**	**76**	**87**	**90**	**79**	**86**
G20 average	**m**	**74**	**m**	**43**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**88**	**m**	**78**

Note: Data refer to ISCED 2011 for all countries, except Argentina and India, which use ISCED-97. Totals might not add up to 100% for the averages because of missing data for some levels for some countries. Data for Argentina, India and Indonesia are from the International Labour Organization (ILO). Columns showing data for category totals are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2025: 2024 for Brazil and Chile; 2023 for Iceland and Indonesia.

2. Data for upper secondary attainment include completion of a sufficient volume and standard of programmes that would be classified individually as completion of intermediate upper secondary programmes (8% of adults aged 25-34 are in this group).

3. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Brazil and Peru.

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ka9j74

.

Table A3.3. Trends in unemployment rates and shares of 25-34 year-olds outside the labour force, by educational attainment and gender (2015 and 2025)

Unemployment rates as a percentage of 25-34 year-olds in the labour force; shares of those outside the labour force as a percentage of all 25-34 year-olds

	Men and women															
	Unemployment rate of young adults								Share of young adults outside the labour force							
	Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary				Tertiary		Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary				Tertiary	
	2015	2025	General		Vocational		2015	2025	2015	2025	General		Vocational		2015	2025
			2015	2025	2015	2025					2015	2025	2015	2025		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(19)	(20)
OECD countries																
Australia	15	6	6	5	4	2	3	2	31	30	20	19	14	11	12	7
Austria	19	17	8	9	6	6	4	5	29	27	23	18	9	9	11	9
Belgium	25	20	13	12	10	8	6	5	33	40	22	30	11	13	8	7
Canada	15	13	9	10	7	6	5	6	33	34	20	19	7	8	11	9
Chile[1]	12	13	10	12	7	10	7	8	32	29	26	24	17	16	9	8
Colombia	8	8	x(7)	x(8)	x(7)	x(8)	10	10	22	25	x(17)	x(18)	x(17)	x(18)	7	8
Costa Rica	11	8	11	8	8	c	10	8	24	26	16	20	19	c	10	11
Czechia	29	12	x(7)	x(8)	x(7)	x(8)	3	2	41	33	x(17)	x(18)	x(17)	x(18)	20	19
Denmark	14	13[b]	7	10[b]	5	5[b]	8	8[b]	35	31[b]	27	26[b]	11	9[b]	11	7[b]
Estonia	15	14	5	7	6	8	3	6	27	m	14	m	12	m	13	m
Finland	17	26	12	14	8	10	8	6	36	46	24	25	16	13	12	7
France	28	22	11	13	14	9	8	7	30	36	18	21	14	12	9	7
Germany	17	12	6	8	5	3	3	4	32	32	43	27	10	8	10	8
Greece	37	23	30	12	34	13	30	11	19	34	23	26	6	13	7	10
Hungary	21	15	8	4	7	5	3	3	35	28	23	19	14	8	15	5
Iceland[1]	6	6	7	5	3	3	4	2	18	15	21	15	7	8	10	8
Ireland	27	22	14	6	15	6	6	4	40	51	23	18	18	15	11	6
Israel	6	4	7	4	7	4	5	3	39	39	25	28	12	15	10	11
Italy	23	16	18	10	15	8	16	6	33	34	40	38	20	17	26	21
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	4[d]	2[d]	m	m	m	m	m	m	13[d]	7[d]
Korea	10	5	x(7)	x(8)	x(7)	x(8)	5	4	41	31	x(17)	x(18)	x(17)	x(18)	20	17
Latvia	19	12	10	9	9	9	6	4	21	30	13	13	9	11	10	7

	Men and women															
	Unemployment rate of young adults								Share of young adults outside the labour force							
	Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary				Tertiary		Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary				Tertiary	
	2015	2025	General		Vocational		2015	2025	2015	2025	General		Vocational		2015	2025
			2015	2025	2015	2025					2015	2025	2015	2025		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(19)	(20)
Lithuania	18	11	11	9	11	12	4	4	28	45	15	11	13	6	5	5
Luxembourg	11	c	13[r]	c	5	a	6	c	15	c	8[r]	c	9	a	8	c
Mexico	4	3	5	3	6	3	7	4	32	31	26	24	24	22	14	14
Netherlands	12	7	10	6	7	3	4	3	22	28	16	16	10	9	6	5
New Zealand	9	10	5	6	6	5	3	3	29	30	21	16	15	13	11	8
Norway	12	10	7	5	4	2	4	3	31	31	22	23	8	9	10	7
Poland	23	13	10	5	9	4	6	2	40	43	19	15	16	12	8	5
Portugal	14	13	12	9	14	6	13	6	13	15	13	9	8	4	8	5
Slovak Republic	38	40	8	5	12	6	8	3	38	43	24	23	14	10	19	9
Slovenia	18	18	13	5	13	5	11	4	23	35	25	18	7	7	8	8
Spain	35	20	24	13	23	12	18	8	14	21	18	20	8	10	9	9
Sweden	18	20	8	10	5	4	5	7	20	19	17	23	7	8	9	7
Switzerland	14	13[r]	4	8	4	5	4	4	23	23	17	14	8	7	7	6
Türkiye	11	11	12	11	8	10	12	10	40	42	30	30	23	25	14	19
United Kingdom[2]	11	9	6	4	5	5	3	4	32	37	15	14	13	15	9	6
United States	12	10	x(7)	x(8)	x(7)	x(8)	3	3	36	34	x(17)	x(18)	x(17)	x(18)	14	12
OECD average	**17**	**14**	**10**	**8**	**9**	**6**	**7**	**5**	**29**	**32**	**21**	**21**	**12**	**11**	**11**	**9**
OECD average for countries with available and comparable data for both years	**17**	**14**	**10**	**8**	**9**	**6**	**7**	**5**	**30**	**32**	**22**	**21**	**12**	**11**	**11**	**9**

	Men and women															
	Unemployment rate of young adults								Share of young adults outside the labour force							
	Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary				Tertiary		Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary				Tertiary	
	2015	2025	General		Vocational		2015	2025	2015	2025	General		Vocational		2015	2025
			2015	2025	2015	2025					2015	2025	2015	2025		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(19)	(20)
Partner and/or accession countries																
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	23	m	m	m	m	m	6
Brazil[1,3]	13	9	x(7)	x(8)	x(7)	x(8)	7	4	26	28	x(17)	x(18)	x(17)	x(18)	8[b]	8
Bulgaria	27	16	10	4	9	3	5	2	49	53	25	23	14	12	11	8
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	c	c	c	c	20	8	15	5	c	47[r]	39	41[r]	11	10	8	9
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	36	m	x(18)	m	x(18)	m	32
Indonesia[1]	3	m	x(7)	x(8)	x(7)	x(8)	6	m	30	29	x(17)	m	x(17)	m	10	14
Peru[3]	2	6	3	5	m	m	6	m	21	23	16	18	m	m	14	m
Romania	11[b]	20	9[b]	7	8[b]	5	6[b]	3	32[b]	46	22[b]	16	16[b]	15	7[b]	6
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	33	47	x(7)	x(8)	x(7)	x(8)	13	16	29	34	x(17)	x(18)	x(17)	x(18)	8	9
EU25 average	**21**	**17**	**12**	**9**	**11**	**7**	**8**	**5**	**29**	**35**	**22**	**22**	**12**	**10**	**11**	**8**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**33**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**12**

Note: Data refer to ISCED 2011 for all countries, except Argentina and India, which use ISCED-97. Totals might not add up to 100% for the averages because of missing data for some levels for some countries. Data for Argentina, India and Indonesia are from the International Labour Organization (ILO). Columns showing data for category totals and the breakdown for men and women are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2025: 2024 for Brazil and Chile; 2023 for Iceland and Indonesia.

2. Data for upper secondary attainment include completion of a sufficient volume and standard of programmes that would be classified individually as completion of intermediate upper secondary programmes (8% of adults aged 25-34 are in this group).

3. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Brazil and Peru.

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ka9j74.

Chapter A4. What are the earnings advantages to education?

Highlights

- On average across the OECD, full-time full-year workers without upper secondary attainment earn 31% less than the overall average for all full-time full-year workers. For those with vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment the figure is 17% less while those with general upper secondary attainment earn 13% less.
- Using the earnings of adults with upper secondary attainment as a benchmark, across OECD countries, adults with short-cycle tertiary attainment enjoy an earnings advantage of 18% more on average. This earnings advantage reaches 39% among those with a bachelor's degree and 80% among those with a master's, doctoral or equivalent qualification.
- Based on the OECD Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC), 41% of adults with medium literacy, numeracy and adaptive problem-solving proficiency levels are in the top 40% of earners across the OECD. The probability of being among the top earners rises to 65%, of adults with high skills in all domains, while it falls to 17% among those with low skills in all domains.

Context

Higher levels of educational attainment are closely linked to stronger employment prospects (see Chapter A3) and higher earnings (OECD, 2025[1]). The prospect of greater financial returns, together with wider social benefits, encourages individuals to invest in education and training throughout their lives.


However, the earnings premium associated with higher education is far from uniform. Within countries, it differs according to factors such as age, gender, programme orientation and field of study. Labour-market participation patterns also matter; individuals working part time generally earn less overall, and often less per hour worked, than those employed full time. Similarly, those who have gained more experience typically earn more. Despite rising levels of educational attainment, gender pay gaps continue to persist across all attainment levels and programme types.

More young adults than ever are attaining tertiary qualifications (see Chapter A1), and tertiary education systems continue to expand (OECD, 2024[2]). Labour markets in most countries have largely absorbed this increasing supply of highly educated workers, although substantial earnings differences remain, depending on the field of study. These differences may reflect differing demand for particular skills across sectors, as well as wider structural and cultural influences. As economies and labour markets evolve, education systems face growing pressure to ensure that they are equipping their graduates with the competencies needed not just by labour markets, but by society more widely.

Earning inequalities are also shaped by broader economic and institutional contexts. In countries where the share of tertiary-educated adults remains comparatively small, higher earnings may be more concentrated among this group, contributing to wider income disparities and raising concerns about social mobility. Wage outcomes are also shaped by the interaction between the supply and demand for skills, minimum wage legislation, labour-market regulations, and institutional features such as trade union coverage, collective bargaining systems and the overall quality of working conditions (ILO, 2024[3]).

Figure A4.1. Difference in earnings from the overall average, by level and programme orientation (2024)

25-64 year-olds; full-time, full-year workers; compared to average earnings of workers across all attainment levels



Note: Upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary combined are plotted when no breakdown into general and vocational programmes was available.
1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
2. Includes part-time and part-year workers.
For data, see Table A4.1 and Table A.A4.5. in Sources, Methodology and Technical Notes. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/kxu07h.

Other findings

- Young women (25-34 year-olds) earn on average 15-19% less than their male peers, depending on the level of educational attainment, while 45-54 year-old women earn between 20% and 23% less.
- On average across OECD countries, 29% of workers with below upper secondary attainment earn at or below half the median earnings, compared to 18% of those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment and just 10% of tertiary-educated workers.
- The impact of social and emotional skills on wage levels is more modest than traditional factors. Personality traits explain a smaller share of wage variation (1.5%) compared to educational attainment (8.8%) and literacy skills (4.3%).
- Assertiveness (a facet of extraversion) is the strongest economic predictor for wages among the social and emotional skills. The PIAAC survey reports a correlation of 3.2% after adjusting for years of education and literacy skills.

Note

The analysis uses three different baselines for comparing relative earnings: 1) all workers; 2) workers with upper secondary attainment; and 3) male workers. In all cases, given the focus on relative earnings, any increase or decrease in the results could reflect a change in the interest group (numerator) or in the baseline group (denominator). Readers are advised to consider actual earnings in Tables A.A4.4 and A.A4.5 from *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* when interpreting relative earnings ([link to be added]).

Due to the difference in survey methods used to gather data from countries, the analysis of relative earnings is based on full-time full-year workers to ensure better comparability across countries. Refer to *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* ([link to be added]) for more information on the survey methods. Data on relative earnings for all workers (full- and part-time) are available for consultation online (http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s).

Analysis

Earnings relative to all workers

Higher levels of educational attainment are generally associated with higher earnings. This section compares the earnings of workers who have not attained tertiary education, relative to the whole adult workforce, regardless of educational attainment. This means that the average is partly shaped by the comparatively high earnings of tertiary-educated workers, who represent a growing share of the workforce across OECD countries. As a result, workers with lower levels of educational attainment may appear further behind than when benchmarked against those with upper secondary attainment, or when considering median earnings (see below).

The analysis is restricted to full-time full-year workers aged 25-64 to improve comparability across countries and educational groups by limiting the influence of differences in working hours or labour-market attachment. Including part-time and part-year workers would lower average earnings in many countries with increased representation of groups that are more likely to work reduced hours or experience intermittent employment, such as younger adults, women or adults with lower levels of educational attainment.

The skills, knowledge and competencies acquired through upper secondary education provide an essential foundation for participation in the labour market and help ensure that individuals attain minimum levels of literacy and numeracy that are required in most occupations (OECD, 2024[2]). Without these core skills, individuals can struggle to find a job or be more likely to be confined to lower-paying jobs.

On average across the OECD, full-time full-year workers who have not completed upper secondary education earn 31% less than the average earnings across all levels of educational attainment. The earnings disadvantage ranges from 18% in Denmark, Finland and Romania to over 50% in Colombia and South Africa. On average, workers whose highest attainment is vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education earn 17% less than the average earnings, with the gap ranging from 1% more than the average earnings in Mexico to 34% less in Luxembourg. Workers who have a general upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary qualification as their highest educational level earn 13% less than the average earnings, ranging from 1% in Finland to 25% in Israel (Figure A4.1).

Earnings relative to workers with upper secondary attainment

Tertiary education plays an important role in promoting upward economic mobility, as a key enabling factor for strong labour-market outcomes. The advanced knowledge and specialised skills developed through tertiary programmes are in high demand by employers and lead to low rates of unemployment (see Chapter A3). Holding a tertiary qualification also opens up a wider range of occupations, including professional and managerial positions that are generally associated with higher levels of pay. In addition, tertiary institutions provide opportunities for students to build networks with peers, academic staff and industry professionals, which may contribute to stronger employment prospects and higher earnings over time.

The average earnings of tertiary-educated adults working full time and throughout the year are considerably higher than those of workers whose highest level of attainment is upper secondary education. On average across OECD countries, completing a tertiary qualification is associated with an earnings premium of 54%, although the magnitude of this advantage varies substantially across countries. The earnings premium linked to tertiary attainment is 25% or less in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, while it exceeds 100% in Chile and Colombia among OECD countries, as well as in Brazil and South Africa among OECD partner countries (Table A4.1).

The earnings advantage of tertiary education generally increases with higher attainment. In most OECD and partner countries, adults working full time and throughout the year who hold a master's, doctoral or equivalent qualification earn more on average than those with a bachelor's degree, who in turn earn more than individuals with a short-cycle tertiary qualification. Across OECD countries, adults with a master's, doctoral or equivalent qualification earn on average 80% more than those with upper secondary education as their highest qualification. This advantage drops to 39% among those with a bachelor's degree and to 18% among those with short-cycle tertiary attainment (Table A4.1).

Earnings advantages by educational attainment tend to increase among older workers. On average across OECD countries, tertiary-educated 25–34 year-olds earn 38% more than their peers with upper secondary attainment, while 45-54 year-olds earn 65% more. Within the levels of tertiary attainment, the earnings advantage of a short-cycle tertiary qualification is 11% among 25-34 year-olds and 18% among 45-54 year-olds on average across OECD countries. Among those with bachelor's attainment, 25-

34 year-olds earn 31% more and 45-54 year-olds earn 47% more than their peers with an upper secondary attainment. For master's or higher attainment, the advantage is 52% for the younger age group and 92% more for the older one (Table A4.1). Comparing countries, the earnings advantage for tertiary-educated 25-34 year-olds ranges from 20% or less in Italy, Korea and the Nordic countries to 100% or more in Brazil, Colombia and South Africa, while for 45-54 year-olds it ranges from 30% or less in Denmark, Norway and the United Kingdom to around 200% more in Colombia and South Africa (Table A4.1).

Investing in education has a significant impact on earning potential and employment outcomes (see Chapter A3), but it is not the only factor affecting success in the labour market; employers and the labour market can also reward specific or fundamental skills or other factors. Possessing certain personality traits (or social and emotional skills) is also positively associated with labour-market rewards (Box A4.3).

Box A4.3. Skills that matter for success and well-being in adulthood

The recent publication from the 2023 Survey of Adult Skills (Cycle 2) (OECD, 2025[4]) represents a paradigm shift in the OECD's approach to adult skills. For decades, the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC) focused primarily on the key information-processing skills (namely, literacy, numeracy and problem solving) deemed essential for workforce participation. However, as the global landscape is being radically reshaped by the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI), population ageing and international migration, the definition of a skilled adult has necessarily evolved. While cognitive skills such as literacy and numeracy remain essential, social and emotional skills — including the ability to collaborate, adapt, manage emotions and persevere — are increasingly recognised as important drivers of success and well-being throughout life. In an era where AI surpasses human performance in routine analytical tasks, social and emotional skills (SES) constitute a distinct human advantage in performing tasks that cannot be performed by machines. The survey findings underscore how social and emotional skills complement cognitive ones and independently contribute to adults' success at work and beyond.

Theoretical framework: the Big Five model and its measurement

The 2023 survey adopted the Big Five framework (or Five Factor model) (OECD, 2025[4]), the most robust taxonomy in psychological research. This model is descriptive rather than normative; it does not categorise traits as inherently good or bad but organises human behaviour into five higher-order domains (Figure A4.2).

Figure A4.2. The Big Five framework: Domains and facets

Domain	Facets	Behavioural facilitation
Openness to experience	Aesthetic sensitivity, intellectual curiosity, creative imagination	Facilitates being imaginative, enjoying the exploration of abstract ideas, and a tendency for aesthetic and self-exploration.
Conscientiousness	Organisation, productiveness, responsibility	Facilitates task- and goal-oriented behaviour, impulse control, planning and goal-directed persistence.
Extraversion	Assertiveness, energy level, sociability	Facilitates an energetic and action-oriented approach to life, social engagement, and enthusiasm.
Agreeableness	Compassion, respectfulness, trust	Facilitates a prosocial and communal orientation towards others through altruism, tender-mindedness and modesty.
Emotional stability	Anxiety, depression, emotional volatility	Facilitates even-temperedness, positive emotionality and the ability to handle stress effectively.

Source: OECD (2025[4]), *Skills that Matter for Success and Well-being in Adulthood*, https://doi.org/10.1787/6e318286-en, Chapter 1.

Social and emotional skills as drivers of educational attainment

The Survey of Adult Skills provides empirical evidence that social and emotional skills are powerful predictors of how long individuals stay in formal education (proxy for attainment). Openness to experience and emotional stability emerge as the most consistent predictors of educational attainment across nearly all participating OECD countries. On average, a one-standard-deviation increase in openness correlates to an additional 0.4 years of education, ranging from 0.2 years in Canada to 0.8 years in Italy. However, analysis of individual facets reveals important nuances. Intellectual curiosity and aesthetic

sensitivity are much stronger predictors of education length than creative imagination, which actually showed a negative association in Canada, Czechia and Norway. This suggests that the desire for abstract ideas and self-exploration is more important for navigating formal academic structures than pure divergent thinking.


The role of conscientiousness is markedly context dependent. It shows a positive link with attainment in 16 countries, but exhibits a negative correlation in Austria, suggesting that national education systems reward different behavioural profiles. Furthermore, the association between openness and education is significantly stronger for older adults and those from less-educated families, indicating that these traits may serve as critical tools for individuals navigating structural barriers and unequal educational opportunities.

Labour market outcomes: employment status and economic returns

Extraversion and emotional stability are the traits most significantly associated with the likelihood of being employed in modern labour markets. Individuals who are socially proactive and resilient to stress navigate recruitment and workplace challenges more effectively. However, although social and emotional skills are essential for securing work, their direct impact on wage levels is more modest than traditional factors. Personality traits explain only 1.5% of wage variation, compared to 8.8% for educational attainment and 4.3% for literacy proficiency. This reinforces the primary importance of formal qualifications in securing high earnings.

Figure A4.3. Adjusted change in hourly wages related to a one-standard-deviation increase in the Big Five facets (2023)

Employed adults aged 25-65, in per cent



Note: Aggregated results across the OECD countries that used the BFI-2-S measure [see OECD (2025[4]), Chapter 1]. Estimates are obtained by controlling for gender, age, parental education, immigrant background, whether one lives with a partner and whether one has children – and then, in a second step, for years of education attained and literacy proficiency. Wages are gross hourly earnings for employed and self-employed individuals, including bonuses, in PPP-adjusted 2022 USD. (r) denotes reverse-coded sub-domains, where a positive score corresponds to a low tendency for anxiety, depression or emotional volatility (and thus higher emotional stability). Darker colours denote differences that are statistically significant at the 5% level. Results for Korea are not presented.
Source: OECD (2025[4]), *Skills that Matter for Success and Well-being in Adulthood*, https://doi.org/10.1787/6e318286-en, Figure 3.6.

Disaggregating the domains reveals that, among the Big Five facets, assertiveness (a facet of extraversion) shows the largest positive association with wages (Figure A4.3). A one-standard-deviation increase in assertiveness is associated with 4.8% higher hourly wages before accounting for years of education and literacy proficiency, and with 3.2% higher hourly wages after additionally accounting for them. Accounting for these factors is crucial; it demonstrates that assertiveness is economically rewarded independently of someone's educational attainment or literacy proficiency. Factors related to emotional stability are

also significant: a lower tendency for depression is consistently linked to higher earnings, likely due to its impact on productivity and professional stamina.

A pivotal finding of the Skills that Matter report is the compensatory role of social and emotional skills, particularly for vulnerable populations. Emotional stability, extraversion and conscientiousness are markedly more important for employment among individuals with low literacy proficiency. This suggests that strong social and emotional competencies act as a vital buffer for adults who struggle with complex information processing. In service-oriented, care-based or manual work environments, the "human advantage", i.e. the ability to regulate one's emotions, communicate effectively with colleagues and persist with tasks, can mitigate the labour-market disadvantages typically associated with lower cognitive scores. For these individuals, social and emotional skills are not just soft skills but survival mechanisms that provide a pathway to employment stability that technical training alone might not achieve.

Source: OECD (2025[4]), *Skills that Matter for Success and Well-being in Adulthood*, https://doi.org/10.1787/6e318286-en,

Gender disparities in earnings


Although increasing educational attainment narrows gender differences in employment rates (see Chapter A3), the gender gap in earnings does not vary much across educational attainment levels. On average across OECD countries, tertiary-educated women and those with vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment working full time and for the full year earn 22% less than their male peers, while women with general attainment at the same level and those with below upper secondary attainment earn 20% less (Figure A4.4 and Table A4.3). As women are more likely to work part time or only for part of the year than men, the gender differences in earnings are even wider among all workers than among full-time full-year workers (OECD, 2025[1]).

For all education levels, the gender gap in earnings is wider among 45-54 year-olds than it is for younger age groups. Young women (25-34 year-olds) in full-time full-year employment earn between 15% and 19% less than their male peers, depending on their level of educational attainment, while 45-54 year-old women earn between 20% and 23% less. On average, the gender gap is between 2 and 8 percentage points wider for 45-54 year-old women than for 25-34 year-old ones. However, differences across educational attainment levels vary by country and are relatively small on average (Table A4.3).

There is no single explanation for the persistence of gender pay gaps, despite women now surpassing men in educational attainment levels in many countries (see Chapter A1). These disparities reflect a combination of interconnected factors, including occupational segregation, sectors, firms and job ladders, and differences within firms in tasks, responsibilities, promotion and wage setting (D., Blau and Kahn, 2017[5]; OECD, 2022[6]). Women are generally less likely than men to receive promotions or substantial wage increases when changing employers. Childbirth and caregiving responsibilities may reinforce this pattern by affecting labour-market attachment, hours worked, job mobility and wage growth (Rabaté et al., 2021[7]; Goldin et al., 2017[8]; Kleven, Landais and Søgaard, 2019[9]). Women are therefore more likely to seek careers offering greater flexibility and work-life balance in order to accommodate family responsibilities, which may reduce their earnings relative to men with similar levels of educational attainment. Cross-country differences in childcare policies, parental leave, working-time riles, second-earner incentives, collective bargaining, pay transparency and equal-pay enforcement can therefore affect how strongly family responsibilities and workplace inequalities translate into earning gaps (OECD, 2026[10]; OECD, 2022[6]). Consequently, although progress has been made towards greater gender pay equality, substantial disparities persist, with women in many countries continuing to earn less than men for comparable work due to enduring structural inequalities and discrimination (ILO, 2024[3])

Figure A4.4. Gender gap in earnings, by educational attainment and programme orientation (2024)

Percentage difference between women's and men's earnings among 25-64 year-old full-time full-year workers



1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
2. Low reliability of the value for workers with below upper secondary educational attainment.
For data, see Table A4.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/kxu07h.


Distribution of earnings among workers

Relative earnings by level of educational attainment not only indicate the extent to which labour markets reward additional education but also reflect broader patterns of income distribution and social inequality (OECD, 2025[1]). Higher relative earnings among tertiary-educated adults may provide strong incentives for individuals to pursue further education, but they can also point to wider wage dispersion and income inequality, particularly where earnings among less-educated workers remain comparatively low or stagnant. Although education has the potential to promote greater social mobility and reduce inequality, disparities in access to education and in educational outcomes may also contribute to the persistence of existing socio-economic inequalities (UNESCO, 2020[11]).

This trade-off is evident in countries where high earnings premiums coexist with greater income inequality. For example, Chile, Colombia and Costa Rica are among the OECD countries with the highest earnings premiums for tertiary-educated adults, as well as the highest levels of wage dispersion. Conversely, in countries with more compressed wage structures, such as the Nordic countries, the earnings advantage of tertiary education is smaller, but overall income inequality is also lower (Table A4.1).

Figure A4.5. Share of workers earning at or below half the median earnings, by educational attainment (2024)

25-64 year-old workers, in per cent



1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
For data, see Table A4.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/kxu07h. .

A key indicator of education-related labour-market inequality is the proportion of individuals at each attainment level who earn significantly more or less than the median earnings of all full- and part-time workers. On average across OECD countries, 29% of workers with below upper secondary attainment earn at or below half the median wage, compared to 18% of those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education and just 10% of tertiary-educated workers (Figure A4.5). Conversely, only 26% of workers with below upper secondary attainment earn more than the median, compared to 42% of those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment and 68% of tertiary-educated workers (Table A4.2). However, these statistics should be treated with some caution, as they include part-time and part-year workers, who are mostly concentrated in the low earners' categories.

These disparities are even more pronounced at the top of the earnings distribution. On average across OECD countries, just 3% of workers with below upper secondary attainment earn more than twice the median wage, compared to 6% of those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment and 22% of tertiary-educated workers. Among OECD and partner countries, more than 40% of tertiary-educated 25-64 year-olds earn more than twice the median in Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica and South Africa (Table A4.2).

Income distribution can also be analysed in relation to skill levels, to analyse the extent to which low skills are preventing adults from accessing high-paying jobs (Box A4.4).

Box A4.4. A multidimensional view of skills domains

Traditional single-domain assessments offer only a partial view of human capital because literacy, numeracy and problem-solving skills are deeply interconnected and tend to cluster as strengths or weaknesses. Data from the OECD Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) confirm that multidimensional skill profiles are a powerful predictor of economic success independent of formal education, acting as a sorting mechanism within labour markets. Analysing outcomes through income quintiles illustrates this compound effect: adults with consistently high proficiency across all three domains benefit from a substantial earnings premium and are heavily concentrated among higher earners, while those with multiple weaknesses face a severe earnings penalty and significant barriers to upward mobility.

Analysis of PIAAC data across OECD countries shows a systematic relationship between combined skill profiles and the probability of being a high earner, defined here as belonging to the top two earnings quintiles or top 40% of earners. Approximately 64% of high-skilled individuals (those with high skills in at least two skills domains) are considered high earners, compared to 42% of medium-skilled individuals (those with medium skills in at least two domains) and 20% of low-skilled ones (those with low skills in at least two domains) (Table A4.4, available online).

Breaking down these groups further concedes some precision, as the greater number of combinations produces many small sub-populations with smaller sample sizes for less robust cross-country comparisons. However, it does allow the effect of having low, medium or high skills in individual domains to be analysed. Taking those adults who have medium proficiency levels in all three domains as a useful benchmark, on average across the OECD, approximately 41% of these individuals are in the top 40% of earners. There is a substantial earnings premium associated with higher proficiency levels: adults with high skills in at least one domain and medium skills in the others have a 58% probability of being among the high earners. Adults with high proficiency levels across all three domains reach a probability of approximately 65% (Figure A4.6).


These findings demonstrate that multiple strengths across literacy, numeracy and adaptive problem solving provide a compound economic advantage. Labour markets reward not only isolated competencies but also the consistency of high-level performance across domains.

Conversely, low proficiency in even a single domain generates a substantial earnings penalty. Adults with low skills in one domain and medium skills in the other two see their probability of belonging to the top earnings groups fall to approximately 31%. This penalty intensifies as weaknesses accumulate: the share of top earners drops to 25% for those with low skills in two domains and medium skills in the third, and to 17% for those with low skills in all domains (Figure A4.6).

The disadvantage is even clearer at the top and bottom of the earnings distribution. On average across OECD countries, approximately 38% of adults with low skills across all domains are concentrated in the lowest earnings quintile, while only around 7% reach the highest quintile. In some countries, including Sweden and Norway, more than 55% of adults with low proficiency levels in all domains are found in the bottom 20% of earners. These patterns illustrate a clear “multiple weakness penalty”: labour-market disadvantage increases sharply when deficiencies accumulate across domains rather than in isolation (Table A4.4, available online).

Figure A4.6. Share of high earners, by skill levels (2023)

In per cent of 25-64 year-old earners in the top 4th and 5th quintiles; Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)



For data, see Table A4.4 (available online). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/kxu07h .

Skills versus educational credentials

Both educational attainment and measured skills are positively associated with labour-market success. However, the evidence suggests that combined skill profiles are often a more effective predictor of high earnings than educational credentials alone. Across the OECD, approximately 65% of adults with high skills across all domains and all levels of educational attainment belong to the top two earnings quintiles, compared to 54% of tertiary-educated adults (across all skill levels). Tertiary-educated adults have more heterogeneous outcomes when considering their skill levels. Among tertiary-educated adults, those with high skills in at least two domains have a probability of around 67% of being top earners, while those with low skills in at least two domains see this probability fall to approximately 32% (Table A4.4, available online).

Definitions

Adults refer to 25-64 year-olds; young adults refer to 25-34 year-olds.

Earnings include annual money earnings as direct payment for labour services provided, before taxes, plus work-related payments such as annual bonuses, result-related bonuses, extra pay for holidays and sick-leave pay from employer(s). Earnings do not include income from other sources, such as government social transfers, investment income, net increase in value of an owner operated business and any other income not directly related to work.

Educational attainment refers to the highest level of education successfully completed by an individual.

Individuals with zero earnings refer to individuals who have earnings, but the result of their business activities is exactly zero.

Individuals with negative earnings refer to individuals who reported deficits in their business activities.

Levels of education: See the Reader's Guide at the beginning of this publication for a presentation of all International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) 2011 levels.

Definitions of **Skill domains** and **Proficiency levels** and the distributions of the population related to data from Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) are included in Chapter A1.

Methodology

The analysis of relative earnings of the population with specific educational attainment and of the distribution of earnings does not control for hours worked, although the number of hours worked is likely to influence earnings in general and the distribution in particular. For the definition of full-time earnings, countries were asked whether they had applied a self-designated full-time status or a threshold value for the typical number of hours worked per week.

Earnings data are based on an annual, monthly or weekly reference period, depending on the country. This chapter presents annual data, and earnings data with a reference period shorter than a year are adjusted. Please refer to Table A.A4.1 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes*, for more information on the adjustment methods ([link to be added]). Data on earnings are before income tax for most countries. Earnings of self-employed people are excluded for many countries and, in general, there is no simple and comparable method to separate earnings from employment and returns to capital invested in a business.

This chapter does not take into consideration the impact of effective income from free government services. Therefore, although incomes could be lower in some countries than in others, the state could be providing both free health care and free schooling, for example. The total average for earnings (men plus women) is not the simple average of the earnings figures for men and women. Instead, it is the average based on earnings of the total population. This overall average weights the average earnings separately for men and women by the share of men and women with different levels of educational attainment.

In the earnings data, individuals with zero and/or negative earnings should be reported as earners. Individuals with negative earnings should also be considered in the calculation of the overall median earnings. However, data on individuals with zero and/or negative earnings are not available for all countries. Individuals with zero earnings are included for Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Germany, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the Republic of Türkiye and the United States. Individuals with negative earnings are included for Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden and the United States. Refer to the *Definitions* section for the definition of individuals with zero and negative earnings. Note that the share of both zero and negative earners are very low among full-time full-year workers in countries with available data, and this finding holds true when looking at the breakdown by educational attainment levels. The impact of the inclusion/exclusion of zero and/or negative earners is negligible on the relative earnings and the distribution of earnings.

For more information see the *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics* (OECD, 2018[12]) and *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* ([link to be added]).

Table A4.4 and Figure A4.6 include data on adults' earnings based on the quintile distribution of Monthly earnings including bonuses for wage and salary earners and self-employed (EARNMTHALLPPPC2, derived variable).

Distribution of social and emotional skills across adults and critical evaluation of the Big Five model

Distribution of skills

Policy design requires a granular understanding of how these skills are distributed. The Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) identifies several systemic demographic patterns:

- **Gender:** A near-universal trend shows women reporting higher average levels of agreeableness and conscientiousness, but lower levels of emotional stability than men.
- **Ageing:** Skills evolve over the lifespan. Younger adults exhibit higher extraversion and openness, whereas older adults exhibit higher conscientiousness and agreeableness, reflecting a gradual shift toward social conformity and task-oriented discipline.

- **Parental education:** Adults with tertiary-educated parents report higher openness (likely due to early exposure to diverse ideas) but lower conscientiousness compared to those from lower-educated backgrounds.
- **Migration:** First-generation immigrants typically report higher agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness than native-born populations. This likely reflects the self-selection effect, where individuals who choose to migrate are often those possessing greater resilience and openness to new environments.

Critical evaluation

- **Descriptive versus normative:** The model describes typical behaviour, not ideal behaviour. High scores are not always optimal; for example, extreme conscientiousness can manifest as rigid perfectionism that hinders adaptation.
- **Self-reporting and social desirability:** Responses are subject to the individual's self-perception and the "social desirability bias," where respondents provide answers which they believe the interviewer wants to hear.
- **Cross-cultural comparability:** Cultural norms dictate how assertive or respectful an individual claims to be. This is why comparisons of cross-country averages are statistically invalid.
- **Lack of causality:** The survey is cross-sectional, representing associations at a single point in time. It is impossible to definitively state whether high openness *causes* one to pursue more education, or if the experience of higher education *develops* one's openness. This bidirectional relationship must be considered when designing interventions.

Sources

This chapter is based on the data collection on education and earnings by the OECD Network for data development on labour market, economic and social outcomes of education (LSO Network). The data collection takes account of earnings for individuals working full time and for the full year, as well as part time or part of the year, during the reference period. This database contains data on dispersion of earnings from work and on student earnings versus non-student earnings. The source for most countries is national household surveys such as Labour Force Surveys, the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC), or other dedicated surveys collecting data on earnings. About one-quarter of countries use data from tax or other registers. See *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes*, for country-specific notes on national sources ([link to be added]).

Data on proficiency levels and social and emotional skills are based on the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) (2023). PIAAC is the OECD Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies.

References

D., F., L. Blau and Kahn (2017), "The Gender Wage Gap: Extent, Trends, and Explanations", *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 55/3, pp. 789-865, https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20160995. [5]

Goldin, C. et al. (2017), "The Expanding Gender Earnins Gap: Evidence from the LEHD-2000 Census", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 107/5, pp. 110-14, https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20171065. [8]

ILO (2024), *Global Wage Report 2024-25: Is Wage Inequality Decreasing Globally?*, International Labour Organization, Geneva, https://doi.org/10.54394/cjqu6666. [3]

Kleven, H., C. Landais and J. Søgaard (2019), "Children and Gender Inequality: Evidence from Denmark", *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, Vol. 11/4, pp. 181-209, https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20180010. [9]

OECD (2026), *Pay Transparency in Progress: Valuing Jobs, Closing Gender Pay Gaps, Gender Equality at Work*, OECD Publishing, https://doi.org/10.1787/121f268d-en. [10]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en. [1]

OECD (2025), *Skills that Matter for Success and Well-being in Adulthood: Evidence on Adults' Social and Emotional Skills from the 2023 Survey of Adult Skills*, OECD Skills Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/6e318286-en. [4]

OECD (2024), *Do Adults Have the Skills They Need to Thrive in a Changing World?: Survey of Adult Skills 2023*, OECD Skills Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b263dc5d-en. [2]

OECD (2022), *Same skills, different pay: Takling gender inequalities at firm level*, OECD Publishing, https://doi.org/10.1787/a4d18506-en. [6]

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics 2018: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [12]

Rabaté, S. et al. (2021), "The child penalty in the Netherlands and its determinants", *CPB Discussion Paper*, No. 424, CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis, https://doi.org/10.34932/trkz-qh66. [7]

UNESCO (2020), *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education: All Means All*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris, https://doi.org/10.54676/jjnk6989. [11]

Chapter A4 Tables

Tables and notes

Table A4.1	Relative earnings of workers compared to those with upper secondary attainment, by educational attainment and age group (2024)
Table A4.2	Distribution of workers by educational attainment and level of earnings relative to the median (2024)
Table A4.3	Women's earnings as a percentage of men's earnings, by educational attainment and age group (2024)
***WEB Table* A4.4**	*Distribution of adults into earning quintiles, by educational attainment and literacy, numeracy and adaptive problem-solving skill levels (2023)*

StatLink https://stat.link/kxu07h

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/kxu07h.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)

Table A4.1. Relative earnings of workers compared to those with upper secondary attainment, by educational attainment and age group (2024)

Adults with income from employment (full-time full-year workers); upper secondary attainment for each age group = 100

	Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary						Tertiary							
			Post-secondary non-tertiary		By programme orientation				Short-cycle tertiary		Bachelor's or equivalent		Master's, doctoral or equivalent		Total	
					General programmes		Vocational programmes									
	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	25-64 year-olds
	(1)	(3)	(7)	(9)	(10)	(12)	(13)	(15)	(19)	(21)	(22)	(24)	(25)	(27)	(28)	(30)
OECD countries																
Australia	105	95	111	109	m	m	m	m	103	109	125	131	131	150	124	131
Austria	84	79	117	112	93	105	106	108	116	126	113	108	145	170	126	143
Belgium[1]	c	84	c	120[r]	104[r]	103	100	100	c	c	112	122	132	151	123	137
Canada[1]	112	90	139	119	100	100	139	119	112	116	146	148	157	172	137	141
Chile	81	74	a	a	101	100	97	100	108	123	193	221	310	379	172	206
Colombia[1,2]	72	70	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	205	250
Costa Rica	84	80	c	c	m	m	m	m	117	120	183	199	c	305	166	193
Czechia	83	79	m	m	107	108	99	99	92	105	124	134	143	168	136	160
Denmark	94	91	c	123	m	m	m	m	101	108	109	112	127	142	115	123
Estonia	82	85	98	97	106	106	96	96	m	92	125	134	136	154	131	140
Finland[1]	100	99	114	117	106	121	100	99	101	122	114	122	140	161	124	139
France[1,2]	91	88	m	m	104	113	99	96	118	127	124	139	165	194	144	157
Germany	74	80	93	119	98	113	98	104	116	117	127	148	140	175	129	153
Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary	84	82	117	124	106	106	101	102	117	119	138	157	169	210	152	176
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland[1]	c	90	103	99	m	m	m	m	c	141	151	156	196	188	168	165
Israel[1]	72	71	a	a	101	101	86	95	110	116	142	152	130	211	131	162
Italy[1,2]	92	81	m	m	97	96	101	101	m	m	117	104	123	144	120	135
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	98	83	a	a	98	98	101	101	108	110	114	132	143	173	114	130
Latvia	c	89	81	92	100	103	95	95	114	122	136	144	164	173	139	153
Lithuania[1]	88	93	100	104	m	m	m	m	a	a	145	149	171	187	152	169
Luxembourg	c	76	c	c	114	115	83	85	c	128	127	142	131	156	128	150
Mexico[1]	86	80	a	a	100	100	112	103	114	125	142	148	172	210	143	154
Netherlands	91	86	114	110	103	112	100	98	109	129	119	129	142	168	129	145
New Zealand	101	94	106	100	101	101	104	99	118	114	126	136	130	146	126	136
Norway	84	86	106	99	90	102	103	99	104	118	99	106	113	131	105	118
Poland	91	88	95	101	m	m	m	m	m	m	130	140	137	156	135	152
Portugal	87	86	117	115	99	100	106	103	121	113	m	m	m	m	160	175
Slovak Republic[2]	86	83	m	m	99	104	100	100	105	122	117	129	129	158	127	154
Slovenia[3]	87	84	a	a	m	m	m	m	112	126	123	134	145	174	130	154
Spain	93	82	m	m	101	102	97	97	122	114	133	136	173	174	148	148
Sweden	91	86	97	112	100	108	99	99	104	108	107	115	123	144	112	125
Switzerland[2]	83	83	m	m	99	101	100	100	x(13,16)	x(15,18)	124[d]	134[d]	138[d]	163[d]	130	148
Türkiye[2,4]	79	76	a	A	m	m	m	m	x(18)	x(20)	x(18)	x(20)	x(18)	x(20)	134	153
United Kingdom[2]	66	72	a	A	101	107	99	93	113	111	142	133	149	149	141	135
United States	86	76	m	m	m	m	m	m	113	111	170	165	195	214	166	170
OECD average	**87**	**83**	**107**	**109**	**101**	**105**	**101**	**100**	**111**	**118**	**131**	**139**	**152**	**180**	**138**	**154**

	Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary						Tertiary							
			Post-secondary non-tertiary		By programme orientation				Short-cycle tertiary		Bachelor's or equivalent		Master's, doctoral or equivalent		Total	
					General programmes		Vocational programmes									
	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25–34 year-olds	25–64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	25-64 year-olds
	(1)	(3)	(7)	(9)	(10)	(12)	(13)	(15)	(19)	(21)	(22)	(24)	(25)	(27)	(28)	(30)
Partner and/or accession countries																
Argentina[1,4]	90	87	a	A	m	m	m	m	126	130	157	175	240	246	151	163
Brazil[2]	79	76	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	204	238
Bulgaria[1]	64	66	m	109[r]	100	97	100	103	a	a	148	145	182	188	162	174
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru[2]	79	76	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	154	175
Romania	94	91	123	124	100	99	102	102	m	m	m	m	m	m	136	138
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	59	53	197	193	m	m	m	m	167	157	321	303	325	391	310	306
EU25 average	**87**	**85**	**m**	**111**	**102**	**106**	**99**	**99**	**111**	**119**	**126**	**133**	**148**	**168**	**136**	**151**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: There are cross-country differences in the inclusion/exclusion of zero and negative earners. Columns showing data on relative earnings for workers with upper secondary attainment and for 45-54 year-olds are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2025 for Mexico; 2023 for Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Finland, Israel, Italy and the United States; 2022 for France, Ireland and Lithuania.
2. Index 100 refers to the combined levels of upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education (levels 3 and 4 in the ISCED 2011 classification).
3. Includes part-time and part-year workers.
4. Earnings net of income tax for Türkiye and a combination of gross (self-employed) and net (employees) earnings for Argentina.

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/kxu07h.

Table A4.2. Distribution of workers by educational attainment and level of earnings relative to the median (2024)

Median earnings from work for 25-64 year-olds with income from employment (full- and part-time workers)

	Below upper secondary					Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary					Tertiary				
	At or below half the median	More than half the median but at or below the median	More than the median but at or below 1.5 times the median	More than 1.5 times the median but at or below twice the median	More than twice the median	At or below half the median	More than half the median but at or below the median	More than the median but at or below 1.5 times the median	More than 1.5 times the median but at or below twice the median	More than twice the median	At or below half the median	More than half the median but at or below the median	More than the median but at or below 1.5 times the median	More than 1.5 times the median but at or below twice the median	More than twice the median
	(1)	(4)	(7)	(10)	(13)	(16)	(19)	(22)	(25)	(28)	(31)	(34)	(37)	(40)	(43)
OECD countries															
Australia	18	45	22	7	8	14	43	25	9	8	10	33	28	14	15
Austria	30	45	20	3	2	17	34	30	12	7	12	20	24	18	25
Belgium	27	53	17	3	c	16	49	27	6	2	7	26	38	17	12
Canada[1]	39	31	17	7	6	28	30	22	10	10	22	23	21	16	19
Chile	29	53	14	2	2	16	46	23	7	7	5	20	21	14	39
Colombia[1]	44	35	13	6	2	23	31	26	14	6	7	13	15	22	43
Costa Rica	27	42	25	3	2	17	36	30	9	7	6	13	22	13	47
Czechia	13	65	19	3	1	4	53	31	8	3	1	23	38	17	21
Denmark	35	37	22	4	2	18	38	33	8	4	14	25	38	13	10
Estonia	24	45	20	5	6	20	40	22	9	9	12	24	28	16	20
Finland[1]	31	39	21	5	3	20	42	28	7	3	11	23	34	17	14
France[1]	50	26	18	4	2	31	29	29	7	4	15	17	28	19	22
Germany	32	47	15	3	3	19	41	29	6	4	12	21	29	19	19
Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary	29	52	14	3	1	9	50	27	9	5	4	19	32	19	26
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland[1]	36	33	18	7	7	24	35	24	9	9	14	20	20	19	27
Israel[1]	30	39	20	8	4	20	32	23	12	13	11	20	19	15	35
Italy[1]	28	38	25	6	3	18	32	28	12	9	12	22	30	16	20
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	28	58	12	2	0	14	56	22	6	3	7	39	28	15	10
Latvia	27	46	16	7	4	16	49	23	7	6	6	26	34	16	19
Lithuania[1]	20	51	21	6	2	17	48	23	8	4	12	22	25	18	22
Luxembourg	36	49	c	c	c	18	46	24	9	c	4	20	30	23	22
Mexico[1]	29	36	24	5	5	17	33	31	9	11	8	18	30	13	32
Netherlands	32	37	23	6	2	21	37	27	11	5	12	21	29	19	19
New Zealand	25	38	25	7	5	22	35	27	10	7	16	24	28	15	17
Norway	53	26	15	4	2	24	30	31	10	5	17	18	38	15	12
Poland	c	76	19	4	1	c	64	26	7	3	c	29	37	17	16
Portugal	9	58	25	5	3	7	47	30	8	7	3	14	28	20	35
Slovak Republic	29	47	19	5	1	15	38	30	11	6	9	16	27	22	25
Slovenia	9	71	17	2	1	6	56	29	7	3	3	25	32	21	19
Spain	28	41	22	6	3	21	36	25	10	9	13	22	22	18	26
Sweden	25	46	23	4	1	16	37	34	9	4	14	25	37	15	10
Switzerland	28	53	17	2	1	20	42	30	5	2	9	23	34	19	14
Türkiye[2]	29	47	19	4	1	18	38	27	11	6	10	20	21	24	25

	Below upper secondary					Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary					Tertiary				
	At or below half the median	More than half the median but at or below the median	More than the median but at or below 1.5 times the median	More than 1.5 times the median but at or below twice the median	More than twice the median	At or below half the median	More than half the median but at or below the median	More than the median but at or below 1.5 times the median	More than 1.5 times the median but at or below twice the median	More than twice the median	At or below half the median	More than half the median but at or below the median	More than the median but at or below 1.5 times the median	More than 1.5 times the median but at or below twice the median	More than twice the median
	(1)	(4)	(7)	(10)	(13)	(16)	(19)	(22)	(25)	(28)	(31)	(34)	(37)	(40)	(43)
United Kingdom	18	57	19	4	2	13	51	26	6	5	6	35	32	13	14
United States	39	43	11	3	3	25	42	20	7	7	12	24	25	14	26
OECD average	**29**	**46**	**19**	**5**	**3**	**18**	**41**	**27**	**9**	**6**	**10**	**22**	**29**	**17**	**22**
Partner and/or accession countries															
Argentina[2]	35	34	18	7	5	24	34	25	8	8	12	20	22	18	28
Brazil	57	25	10	4	4	34	29	18	8	11	17	12	14	11	45
Bulgaria[1]	41	43	11	3	1	17	40	23	11	10	7	19	18	20	35
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru[1]	49	19	15	9	9	34	16	21	13	16	25	9	15	13	39
Romania	c	76	21	3	c	0	60	32	8	0	c	17	39	42	2
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa[1]	35 r	40 r	12 r	5 r	8 r	13 r	29 r	14 r	7 r	37 r	3 r	6 r	4 r	5 r	83 r
EU25 average	28	49	19	4	3	16	44	27	9	5	9	22	30	19	20
G20 average	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

Note: There are cross-country differences in the inclusion/exclusion of zero and negative earners. For a given level of educational attainment, the figures by level of earnings relative to median earnings may not add up to 100% because of missing data. Columns showing data broken down by gender are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2025 for Mexico; 2023 for Argentina, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Finland, Israel, Italy, South Africa and the United States; 2022 for France, Ireland and Lithuania.

2. Earnings net of income tax for Türkiye and a combination of gross (self-employed) and net (employees) earnings for Argentina.

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/kxu07h.

Table A4.3. Women's earnings as a percentage of men's earnings, by educational attainment and age group (2024)

Average earnings of adults with income from employment (full-time full-year workers)

	Below upper secondary			Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary									Tertiary		
				General programmes			Vocational programmes			Total					
	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	45-54 year-olds	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	45-54 year-olds	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	45-54 year-olds	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	45-54 year-olds	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	45-54 year-olds
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(6)	(7)	(9)	(11)	(12)	(14)	(16)	(17)	(19)	(21)	(22)	(24)
OECD countries															
Australia	88	85	84	m	m	m	m	m	m	88	92	84	85	96	81
Austria	83	86	81	84	96	68	81	83	80	84	84	82	75	85	77
Belgium[1]	85[r]	c	c	86	c	c	83	c	80[r]	84	79[r]	84[r]	87	93	94
Canada[1]	73	56	76	81	79	77	65	60	63	74	69	72	75	81	73
Chile	82	80	86	77	82	72	78	80	79	77	82	74	74	81	70
Colombia[1]	86	82	88	m	m	m	m	m	m	85	89	83	80	87	75
Costa Rica	84	87	79	m	m	m	m	m	m	83	86	78	89	92	100
Czechia	84	89	83	78	81	74	84	83	83	84	84	82	73	81	70
Denmark	81	79	80	m	m	m	m	m	m	81	80	79	78	87	74
Estonia	70	69	74	71	78	71	75	80	76	73	80	74	78	81	80
Finland[1]	81	88	77	82	89	80	80	84	77	80	84	76	77	86	74
France[1]	83	c	85	81	86	79	79	82	78	81	83	80	77	85	78
Germany	93	c	c	76	104	c	82	76	83	81	78	81	78	86	67
Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary	89	92	90	90	89	92	82	80	83	84	83	85	71	77	69
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland[1]	71	c	c	m	m	m	m	m	m	89	98[r]	91	68	78	75
Israel[1]	67	c	c	74	71	78	63	c	c	73	70	79	62	64	62
Italy[1]	79	92	76	81	83	85	77	88	71	78	86	75	73	88	64
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	80	c	72	74	82	68	72	83	66	73	82	68	75	91	70
Latvia	58	c	c	66	70	74	74	69	77	70	69	76	79	86	79
Lithuania[1]	84	81	79	m	m	m	m	m	m	83	80	81	80	82	79
Luxembourg	82	c	c	81	c	c	86	c	c	84	79	86	82	93	82
Mexico[1]	78	81	79	81	82	78	74	69	79	81	81	78	80	85	81
Netherlands	87	100	81	83	85	84	85	87	85	85	87	86	82	91	88
New Zealand	85	91	79	82	91	79	80	75	76	81	83	78	79	86	71
Norway	83	84	80	82	85	79	78	77	77	79	78	78	77	86	76
Poland	79	81	77	m	m	m	m	m	m	82	81	80	76	80	75
Portugal	82	90	78	81	87	76	78	83	75	80	86	76	74	81	73
Slovak Republic	79	85	80	78	78	77	79	77	78	79	77	78	76	83	71
Slovenia[2]	82	82	81	m	m	m	m	m	m	83	80	83	81	80	82
Spain	78	78	78	79	77	81	76	73	79	78	76	80	85	92	82
Sweden	85	85	83	85	87	82	81	82	80	83	84	82	80	86	76
Switzerland	82	82	81	90	99	89	84	90	83	85	92	85	85	93	86
Türkiye[3]	70	80	72	m	m	m	m	m	m	77	78	78	81	88	83
United Kingdom	74	95	70	77	84	76	67	71	68	73	77	73	82	82	81
United States	77	77	78	m	m	m	m	m	m	73	73	70	72	81	70
OECD average	**80**	**84**	**80**	**80**	**85**	**m**	**78**	**m**	**77**	**80**	**81**	**79**	**78**	**85**	**77**

	Below upper secondary			Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary									Tertiary		
				General programmes			Vocational programmes			Total					
	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	45-54 year-olds	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	45-54 year-olds	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	45-54 year-olds	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	45-54 year-olds	25-64 year-olds	25-34 year-olds	45-54 year-olds
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(6)	(7)	(9)	(11)	(12)	(14)	(16)	(17)	(19)	(21)	(22)	(24)
Partner and/or accession countries															
Argentina[3]	55	55	51	m	m	m	m	m	m	72	71	79	75	75	78
Brazil	74	84	74	m	m	m	m	m	m	71	80	69	68	73	64
Bulgaria[1]	88	79[r]	85	80	89	85	78	98[r]	74	78	92	77	80	68	83
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru[1]	65	59	64	m	m	m	m	m	m	73	74	72	82	88	83
Romania	84	88	83	85	80	85	89	90	88	89	89	88	94	94	96
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	69	75	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	75	78	m	m	74	m
EU25 average	**81**	**85**	**81**	**80**	**85**	**80**	**81**	**82**	**79**	**81**	**83**	**81**	**78**	**84**	**78**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: There are cross-country differences in the inclusion/exclusion of zero and negative earners. Columns showing data for other age groups are available for consultation online.

1. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2025 for Mexico; 2023 for Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Finland, Israel, Italy and the United States; 2022 for France, Ireland and Lithuania.

2. Includes part-time and part-year workers.

3. Earnings net of income tax for Türkiye and a combination of gross (self-employed) and net (employees) earnings for Argentina.

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/kxu07h,


Chapter A5. To what extent do adults participate in education and training?

Highlights

- Recent participation in formal education is an important factor influencing adults' participation in additional non-formal learning. Across OECD countries and economies, 61% of young adults who completed their highest qualification in the last five years have participated in non-formal learning, compared to only 46% of those whose highest qualification was earned more than five years ago.
- Employment also plays a role in engaging individuals and facilitating access to non-formal learning. Although on average 49% of employed adults participate in non-formal learning across the OECD, the rate drops to about 34% for adults who are unemployed and to 17% of adults who are outside the labour force.
- Adults with below upper secondary attainment are over three times more likely to report having never participated in non-formal learning compared to those with a tertiary qualification.

Figure A5.1. Share of young adults participating in non-formal education or training in the last 12 months, by recency of highest qualification (2023)

In per cent; 25-34 year-olds; Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)



For data, see Table A5.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.

Context

Adult learning has become a central pillar of education and skills policy across OECD countries, reflecting the recognition that learning can no longer be confined to initial schooling or early adulthood. The rapid adoption of artificial intelligence in the workplace, demographic ageing and labour-market transformation are reshaping the skills individuals need throughout their lives, increasing the need for adults to learn, let go of outdated practices and re-learn best practices. In this context, adult learning is increasingly understood as a critical component of lifelong learning strategies that support healthy economies and societies.

Despite this evolving understanding of the role and importance of adult learning systems, participation in adult education and training remains unequal across OECD countries and population groups. Adults with higher levels of education, stronger literacy skills and stable employment are significantly more likely to participate in further learning, while low-skilled adults, older workers and those in precarious employment participate less frequently (OECD, 2025[1]). Furthermore, even where the gaps between different populations have narrowed, this has mostly been due to declines in participation among advantaged groups rather than increases among historically disadvantaged ones (OECD, 2025[1]). Barriers related to time, cost, motivation, information and access continue to limit participation among those who could benefit most from upskilling and reskilling opportunities.

This chapter focuses on access to adult learning opportunities through examining differences in participation across population groups. Characteristics such as educational attainment, age, labour-force status, gender and how recently people had completed their highest qualification provide insight into how participation in adult learning differs and help identify the groups that remain least connected to lifelong learning opportunities. In addition to examining current participation patterns, the chapter also considers the share of adults who report having never participated in non-formal learning and explores differences in adults' interest in participation.

Other findings

- On average, there is little reported unmet interest in further learning among adults, with over 75% of the population overall reporting they have no interest in participating in non-formal learning beyond any they have already done.
- Across all countries with available data, adults whose health problems severely limit their everyday activities are less likely to participate in adult learning than their peers with no such limitations (16% compared to 41%).
- There is some overlap between the skills most commonly targeted by employer-provided courses and the skills adults most frequently report they need at work. Employers are most likely to report providing continuing vocational training (CVT) courses targeting technical or job-specific skills, followed by "other" skills, and management and organisational skills. Meanwhile, digital skills, management and organisational skills, interpersonal skills, and "other" skills are the areas where individuals feel they need upskilling.

Note

Different sources are used in this chapter. The Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) is used for those countries and economies which participate in it and national sources are used for the other countries. Boxes A5.1 and A5.2 feature data from additional sources. Refer to the *Sources* section for more detail.

Analysis

Although education policy has traditionally focused on early childhood to late adolescence, the importance of continued learning has become globally recognised in recent decades. Modern adult learning policies highlight the economic imperative of increasing and maintaining an employable workforce while recognising the impact of lifelong learning on individual learners (Elfert and Rubenson, 2022[2]). OECD and partner countries have implemented a wide array of policies aimed at strengthening the motivation of adult learners, supporting employability and the portability of skills, and expanding sustainable access to learning opportunities (OECD, 2025[3]). Although countries have made efforts to increase coherent and consistent learning opportunities for adults beyond initial education, engagement in such learning is not consistent across subpopulations.

Participation in non-formal learning by time since completing formal education

Access can be analysed through both system- and individual-level characteristics, as their interaction shapes participation in adult learning. Across OECD countries and economies, 61% of adults who completed their highest formal qualification within the last five years had participated in additional non-formal learning within the previous 12 months, compared to 43% of adults whose highest qualification was obtained more than five years ago (Table A5.1). A formal qualification refers to an educational qualification recognised by a national entity, while non-formal learning refers to organised education or training that does not lead to a formal qualification. For more information on the difference between formal and non-formal learning, please see the *Definitions* section.

Some of this difference in participation is likely to be associated with age, as older adults are both less likely to participate in adult learning (Figure A5.2) and more likely to have completed their highest qualification more than five years ago. However, Figure A5.1 shows that the pattern persists even among 25-34 year-olds, suggesting that the association between recent formal education and participation in adult learning is not explained by age alone.


This finding is strongly supported in the lifelong learning literature. Foundational OECD work on adult learning describes this dynamic as “learning begets learning” – prior educational participation strongly predicts continued engagement in adult education (OECD, 2014[4]). Research further suggests that participation in education builds confidence, motivation and social capital, while active learning networks and supportive social environments reinforce continued participation in lifelong learning (Cocquyt et al., 2019[5]).

Participation in non-formal learning by age and labour force status

Figure A5.2 shows that participation in non-formal learning among employed adults varies considerably across OECD member and accession countries and age groups. Among employed adults aged 25-44, participation rates range from 16% in Korea and 28% in Croatia and Poland to over 70% in Finland, Norway and the United States. Participation is also relatively high in Canada, Denmark, Estonia and Ireland, where more than 65% of employed younger adults report having participated in non-formal learning during the previous 12 months.

Figure A5.2. Share of employed adults participating in non-formal education or training, by age group (2023)

In per cent; 25-64 year-olds; participation in the last 12 months; Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) or national survey



1. Source for Australia is Australia's Work-Related Training and Adult Learning Survey. The reference year is the 2020/2021 financial year.
For data, see Table A5.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.

Participation rates tend to decline with age in OECD countries and economies, although the difference is relatively small compared to those associated with educational attainment (see Figure A5.5). On average across the OECD, 52% of employed 25-44 year-olds participated in non-formal learning in 2023, compared to 45% of employed 45-64 year-olds. The gaps are particularly wide in Canada, Chile, Estonia and Latvia, where participation rates among younger workers exceed those of older workers by at least 10 percentage points. In contrast, the differences are smaller in Italy, Korea and New Zealand (Figure A5.2). Differences between age groups may reflect differences in labour-market incentives and access to training. Younger employed adults are often more likely to participate in training because they are earlier in their careers, more exposed to technological change and more likely to anticipate greater financial returns from continued training (OECD, 2025[6]). Additionally, younger adults may need to participate in adult learning to acquire practical, company- or job-specific skills that were not covered in their initial education or training. Older workers, on the other hand, may face barriers due to time constraints or lower employer support, or simply perceive fewer benefits to participating in training (OECD, 2021[7]).

Overall, cross-country differences in participation in adult learning among employed adults are linked to a range of factors, including labour-market structures, employers' demand for skills, access to training opportunities and national lifelong learning policies. Countries with high participation rates often have strong labour-market demand for advanced skills with well-developed adult learning systems and broad employer support for training (OECD, 2023[8]). Box A5.1 examines the overlap between the skills targeted by employers in the training they provide, and the areas where adults feel they need skills most.

Aside from age and systemic factors, employers play a role in facilitating access to learning opportunities. Although on average 49% of employed adults participate in non-formal learning across the OECD, the rate drops to about 34% for adults who are unemployed and to 17% of adults who are outside the labour force (Table A5.2). This pattern highlights a potential policy challenge, as opportunities for learning are often less accessible to adults who have weaker connections to the labour market.


Box A5.1. Employer and employee perspectives on skills needs

Adult learning systems are shaped both by employers' decisions about what training to provide and workers' perceptions of the skills they need. Enterprise-based and household surveys offer complementary evidence from both these perspectives into how continuing vocational training (CVT) is addressing labour-market skill requirements and filling individual skill gaps. This box compares the type of skills targeted by employer-provided training courses with individuals' assessments of the skills they need, in order to understand the relationship between employer and employee perspectives. Data from the EU Continuing Vocational Training Survey (EU-CVTS) provide information about the types of skills targeted by employer-financed CVT courses. On average across the surveyed countries, the skills most frequently covered are technical or job-specific skills, "other" skills, and management and organisational skills (Figure A5.3).

Although this pattern is broadly consistent regardless of firm size, some differences do emerge. Smaller enterprises (10-49 employees) are more likely to provide CVT courses related to interpersonal skills, such as handling customers, while these are replaced by management skills among medium-sized (50-249 employees) and large firms (250 employees and over). The change in emphasis may reflect differences in job roles and organisational complexity. Smaller firms often rely on direct customer interaction, while larger firms require stronger management and co-ordination capacities, differences that may also shape how workers experience and address skill shortfalls (OECD, 2024[9]). Larger firms are more likely to report skills gaps overall, perhaps because their organisational complexity makes it harder for them to react quickly to close skill gaps (OECD, 2024[9]).

Figure A5.3. Share of firms providing continuing vocational training courses, by skill targeted (2020)

In per cent of firms surveyed; EU Continuing Vocational Training Survey (EU-CVTS)



Note: Skills domains are descriptive composite indicators constructed by grouping related skill categories across PIAAC and EU-CVTS. Please see the Methodologies section for more information. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.


The Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) household survey offers a complementary perspective by asking individuals to identify areas where their skills are not sufficient for their job. Across OECD countries and economies, adults cite digital skills, management and organisational skills, interpersonal skills, and "other" skills as areas where they feel the need for upskilling (Figure A5.4). These areas are a fairly good match for those targeted by employers in their CVT provision, except that employers place greater emphasis on technical or job-specific skills. The absence of these skills from individuals' reported skill shortfalls does not necessarily indicate a mismatch in employee and employer perspectives. Instead, it may reflect that training in these areas is effective, well-targeted or tightly matched to their job requirements.

In both surveys, "other" skills are cited frequently, and this prominence of the "other" category is notable, as it suggests that a substantial portion of skills relevant to employees and employers alike do not fall neatly into the predetermined survey categories. This highlights the diverse nature of skills in today's labour market, which often requires individuals to master interdisciplinary or context-specific competencies if they are to perform well in their jobs and be able to pivot at their roles change.

This combined analysis underlines the importance of aligning training programmes with actual skill needs, including emerging and cross-cutting competencies such as digital literacy, problem solving and interpersonal communication. Policies could focus on ensuring equitable access to relevant training across firms of all sizes, supporting initiatives that respond to evolving and interdisciplinary skill demands, and promoting lifelong learning strategies that help workers keep adapting to the labour market.

Figure A5.4. Share of adults reporting having less skills than what is required by their job, by skill (2023)

In per cent; 25-64 year-olds; Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)




Note: Skills domains are descriptive composite indicators constructed by grouping related skill categories across PIAAC and EU-CVTS. Please see the Methodologies section for more information. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.

Adults who have never participated in non-formal learning

A notable share of adults report never having participated in non-formal learning. Across all levels of educational attainment, around one in five adults report not having participated at all in such training during their lifetime. Non-participation is particularly prevalent among adults with lower levels of educational attainment, with twice as many adults with below upper secondary attainment reporting never participating in such learning than among the total adult population. In contrast, the share is substantially lower among tertiary-educated adults, often below 15% in many countries. On average there is a 30 percentage-point difference between adults with below upper secondary attainment and adults with tertiary attainment, highlighting the cumulative nature of inequalities in adult learning participation (Table A5.3).

Figure A5.5. Share of adults reporting having never participated in non-formal education or training, by educational attainment and gender (2023)

In per cent; 25-64 year-olds; Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)



For data, see Table A5.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.

There are also differences in participation by gender, although they are smaller than those related to educational attainment. Gender disparities in participation may relate to differences in labour-market participation, caring responsibilities and access to training opportunities (OECD, 2023[8]). Women with below upper secondary attainment are generally more likely than their male peers to report never having participated in non-formal learning. The gender differences among tertiary-educated adults are smaller and, in several countries and economies, women are only slightly less likely than men to report never having participated in non-formal learning activities (Figure A5.5).

Figure A5.5 shows that, on average across the OECD, 40% of men and 44% of women with below upper secondary attainment report never having participated in non-formal learning, compared to 13% of tertiary-educated men and 12% of tertiary-educated women. Across all countries and economies, a far larger share of men and women with lower educational attainment report never having participated in non-formal education or training than their tertiary-educated peers. In Korea, the share reaches 90% of men and 74% of women with below upper secondary attainment. This may partially be explained by the common practice of working long hours in Korea, which may inhibit individuals from participating in additional learning (Hijzen and Thewissen, 2020[10]), but long working hours are also seen in other OECD countries, suggesting that there are additional factors behind the high level of non-participants (OECD, 2023[11]).

These patterns suggest that participation in adult learning remains associated with prior educational attainment and that some groups remain persistently disconnected from adult learning systems over their life course. Adults with lower levels of education may face multiple barriers to participation, including limited access to training opportunities, financial constraints, weaker foundational skills and lower employer support for training. OECD analysis also shows that adults who are already highly skilled and highly educated are more likely to continue engaging in learning throughout adulthood, potentially reinforcing existing inequalities in skills development and labour-market outcomes (OECD, 2021[12]). Regardless of educational attainment, health problems can also be a barrier to adult learning (Box A5.2).


Interest in participating in non-formal learning

Figure A5.6 shows that a substantial share of adults neither participated in non-formal learning nor wanted to do so during the previous 12 months. This pattern is particularly common among adults with lower levels of educational attainment. On average

across OECD countries and economies, 69% of adults with below upper secondary attainment reported not participating and not wanting to participate in non-formal learning in 2023, compared to 53% of those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment and 33% of tertiary-educated adults.

Figure A5.6. Share of adults who did not participate in non-formal education or training and did not want to, by educational attainment (2023)

In per cent; 25-64 year-olds; participation in the last 12 months; Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) or national survey



1. Source for Australia is Australia's Work-Related Training and Adult Learning Survey. The reference year is the 2020/2021 financial year.
For data, see Table A5.4 (available online). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.

In most countries and economies, adults with below upper secondary attainment are considerably more likely to report having no interest in participating in non-formal learning than tertiary-educated adults. The shares are particularly high among this group in Croatia (93%), Poland (90%) and the Slovak Republic (86%), whereas the lowest shares are found in Estonia (46%), Norway (52%) and Sweden (51%). Among tertiary-educated adults, the share reporting that they have neither participated nor wanted to participate was relatively high in Croatia (48%), Korea (67%) and Poland (56%) (Figure A5.6).

Out of adults of all educational attainment levels who had participated in non-formal learning the past 12 months, 30% reported that they have no desire for any further training. This means that together with the population of adults who did not participate in non-formal learning in the past 12 months, over 75% of adults report no interest in a primary or additional non-formal learning activity, suggesting that there is very little latent interest among the population (Table A5.4, available online).

Such a lack of latent interest is concerning from a policy perspective, and understanding what underlies it is difficult as it can be multifaceted. Lack of interest could reflect weaker perceived benefits, negative prior educational experiences, limited information about available opportunities or low expected labour-market returns (Ampofo et al., 2026[13]). Hindrances to adult learning, however, may extend beyond such structural or experiential barriers to include motivational ones. Although it is difficult to disentangle structural and motivational factors, research shows that motivation is not only a predicator of participation in adult learning – albeit smaller in effect than educational attainment or employment status – but also something that is malleable (Gorges, 2025[14]). In addition to addressing structural or resource constraints, policymakers should begin to assess whether interventions targeting motivation could be effective in increasing and sustaining participation.


Box A5.2. Activity limitations due to health problems and participation in adult learning

Adults whose health severely limits their everyday activities are consistently less likely to participate in adult learning than those without such limitations across countries with available data. Data from the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS), collected through the Global Activity Limitation Indicator (GALI), show substantial participation gaps in education and training between those with severe activity limitations and those with none.

The GALI indicator measures self-reported long-standing limitations on activities one may "usually do" caused by physical, mental or emotional health problems lasting at least six months (Eurostat, 2026[15]). As of 2024, almost one-quarter of those aged 16 and older reported either some or severe activity limitations (Eurostat, 2025[16]), although the share is likely to be smaller among the 25-64 year-old population discussed here. While such measures cannot fully capture the role of individuals' environments or wider social barriers, they provide important insight into inequalities in participation associated with activity limitations (Geiger and Prinz, 2025[17]).

Figure A5.7. Share of adults participating in education or training in the last 12 months, by activity limitation and gender (2024)

In per cent; 25-64 year-olds; participation in formal or non-formal learning in the last 12 months; EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) or national survey



Note: The average includes only countries participating in the 2024 EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS), not all OECD countries.
1. Source for Mexico is the INEGI National Time Use Survey (ENUT) 2024.
For data, see Table A5.5 (available online). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.

In all countries with available data, 16% of adults with severe activity limitations participated in adult learning in the last 12 months, compared to 41% of adults with no limitations. Participation rates among adults with severe activity limitations vary substantially across countries. Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden report comparatively high participation rates among adults both with and without severe limitations (Table A5.5, available online). These countries are characterised by well-developed lifelong learning systems, including comparatively high public investment in adult education, flexible learning opportunities and established systems of guidance and support for adult learners (OECD, 2025[1]). Participation in formal education after the age of 25 is also more common in these countries, which may contribute to higher participation overall (see Part B).

However, high overall participation rates do not necessarily correspond to smaller participation gaps between adults with and without severe activity limitations. The participation gap between adults with severe limitations and those with no limitations reaches 30 percentage points in Denmark, 35 percentage points in the Netherlands, and 35 percentage points in Norway. This

suggests that broad investment in lifelong learning systems alone may not be sufficient to ensure equitable participation among adults with activity limitations.

Gender differences in participation among adults with severe activity limitations also differ from wider adult learning patterns. In most countries with available data, women with severe activity limitations participate in adult learning at slightly higher rates than men with severe limitations (18% compared to 14%) (Figure A5.7). This contrasts with overall adult learning participation patterns, where gender parity has been virtually reached across OECD countries (OECD, 2025[1]).

Definitions

Adults refer to 25-64 year-olds.

Adult learning means the participation of adults in lifelong learning. In this chapter, the term "learning" is used interchangeably with the term "education and training" and adult learning refers to both formal and/or non-formal education and training, usually taking place after the end of initial education. Formal and non-formal education and training are defined in the *Classification of Learning Activities* (Eurostat, 2016[18]) as follows:

- **Formal education or training** is defined as "education that is institutionalised, intentional and planned through public organisations and recognised private bodies, and - in their totality - constitute the formal education system of a country. Formal education programmes are thus recognised as such by the relevant national education or equivalent authorities, e.g. any other institution in cooperation with the national or sub-national education authorities. Formal education consists mostly of initial education [...]. Vocational education, special needs education and some parts of adult education are often recognised as being part of the formal education system. Qualifications from formal education are by definition recognised and, therefore, are within the scope of ISCED. Institutionalised education occurs when an organisation provides structured educational arrangements, such as student-teacher relationships and/or interactions, that are specially designed for education and learning".
- **Non-formal education or training** is defined as "education that is institutionalised, intentional and planned by an education provider. The defining characteristic of non-formal education is that it is an addition, alternative and/or complement to formal education within the process of lifelong learning of individuals. It is often provided in order to guarantee the right of access to education for all. It caters to people of all ages but does not necessarily apply a continuous pathway structure; it may be short in duration and/or low-intensity; and it is typically provided in the form of short courses, workshops or seminars. Non-formal education mostly leads to qualifications that are not recognised as formal or equivalent to formal qualifications by the relevant national or sub-national education authorities or to no qualifications at all. Nevertheless, formal, recognised qualifications may be obtained through exclusive participation in specific non-formal education programmes; this often happens when the non-formal programme completes the competencies obtained in another context". For example, an individual without an upper secondary degree may attend an evening course for adults run by a community organisation. After completing the programme, they may pass an officially recognised assessment that leads to a formal qualification, while the learning itself happened in a non-formal programme.

Methodology

For methodological information, please see the *Survey of Adult Skills 2023 – Reader's Companion* (OECD, 2024[19]).

The tables in this chapter present data derived from samples and are subject to statistical error. The corresponding standard errors are available in the online version of the tables, accessible via the StatLinks provided in the *Tables and Notes* section. Readers are encouraged to consult these online tables, as the precision of the estimates varies, and in some cases, the standard errors are relatively large.

To support meaningful cross-survey comparison, individual skill items from the Survey of Adult Skills (2023) and the EU Continuing Vocational Training Survey (EU-CVTS) have been grouped into broader analytical domains reflecting common areas of

competence, such as digital, technical, managerial and transversal skills. This approach does not imply direct equivalence between indicators but facilitates comparison by highlighting differences in emphasis between employer training priorities and workers' perceived skill development needs. Table A5.1.a. shows how the skill items used in these surveys have been grouped into broader domains for comparison purposes.

Table A5.1.a. Aligned skill domains

Aligned skill domain	Skill(s) in PIAAC household survey	Skill(s) in EU CVTS
Digital skills	Computer or software skills	General IT skills Professional IT skills
Technical / job specific skills	Skills in operating machinery/equipment	Technical, practical or job-specific skills
Management and organisational skills	Project management or organisational skills	Management skills
Interpersonal skills	Team-working or leadership skills Communication and presentation skills Skills in handling customers/clients, patients or students	Team-working skills Oral or written communication skills Customer handling skills
Foundational skills	Reading and writing skills Skills involving numbers, calculating skills	Problem-solving skills Numeracy and/or literacy skills
Other skills	Other skills	Other skills not listed above

Source: Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) Cycle 2 (2023) and EU Continuing Vocational Training Survey (2020).

For more information, please refer to *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Sources

Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) Cycle 2 (2023).

EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) (2024).

EU Continuing Vocational Training Survey (2020).

References

Ampofo, J. et al. (2026), "Inclusive lifelong learning for adults: Institutional obligations under UNESCO's education for sustainable development framework", *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 122, p. 103562, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2026.103562. [13]

Cocquyt, C. et al. (2019), "Examining the role of learning support in blended learning for adults' social inclusion and social capital", *Computers & Education*, Vol. 142, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103610. [5]

Elfert, M. and K. Rubenson (2022), "Lifelong learning: Researching a contested concept in the Twenty-First Century", in *Third International Handbook of Lifelong Learning*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67930-9_48-1. [2]

Eurostat (2026), *EU Labour Force Survey: Explanatory Notes*, European Commission, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/1978984/6037342/EU-LFS+Explanatory+notes+from+Q1+2021+onwards.pdf. [15]

Eurostat (2025), *Statistics explained: Population with disability*, European Union, https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Population_with_disability. [16]

Eurostat (2016), *Classification of Learning Activities (CLA): Manual: 2016 Edition*, Publications Office of the European Union, https://doi.org/10.2785/874604. [18]

Geiger, B. and C. Prinz (2025), "Measuring disability employment gaps: How to get robust comparisons across countries and over time", *OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers*, No. 314, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/2d0be829-en. [17]

Gorges, J. (2025), "Global motivation to learn and adult learning: A nomological network analysis and a four-year longitudinal study", *Learning and Individual Differences*, Vol. 123, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2025.102763. [14]

Hijzen, A. and S. Thewissen (2020), "The 2018-2021 working time reform in Korea: A preliminary assessment", *OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers*, No. 248, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/0e828066-en. [10]

OECD (2025), *Education Policy Outlook 2025: Nurturing Engaged and Resilient Lifelong Learners in a World of Digital Transformation*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/c3f402ba-en. [3]

OECD (2025), *OECD Employment Outlook 2025: Can We Get Through the Demographic Crunch?*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/194a947b-en. [6]

OECD (2025), *Trends in Adult Learning: New Data from the 2023 Survey of Adult Skills*, Getting Skills Right, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/ec0624a6-en. [1]

OECD (2024), *Survey of Adult Skills – Reader's Companion: 2023*, OECD Skills Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/3639d1e2-en. [19]

OECD (2024), *Understanding Skill Gaps in Firms: Results of the PIAAC Employer Module*, OECD Skills Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b388d1da-en. [9]

OECD (2023), *Hours worked*, https://www.oecd.org/en/data/indicators/hours-worked.html. [11]

OECD (2023), *OECD Skills Outlook 2023: Skills for a Resilient Green and Digital Transition*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/27452f29-en. [8]

OECD (2021), *Career Guidance for Adults in a Changing World of Work*, Getting Skills Right, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9a94bfad-en. [7]

OECD (2021), *OECD Skills Outlook 2021: Learning for Life*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/0ae365b4-en. [12]

OECD (2014), "Learning begets learning: Adult participation in lifelong education", *Education Indicators in Focus*, No. 26, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/5jxsvvmr9z8n-en. [4]

Chapter A5 Tables

Tables A and notes

Table A5.1	Share of adults participating in non-formal education or training, by reference period, educational attainment, recency of highest qualification and age group (2023)
Table A5.2	Share of adults participating in non-formal education or training, by labour force status and age group (2023)
Table A5.3	Share of adults reporting having never participated in non-formal education or training, by educational attainment and gender (2023)
WEB Table A5.4	*Distribution of adults by participation in non-formal education or training and interest in doing so, by educational attainment (2023)*
WEB Table A5.5	*Share of adults participating in education or training in the last 12 months, by activity limitation and gender (2024)*

StatLink https://stat.link/ds0m4z

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer, http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s , contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Table A5.1. Share of adults participating in non-formal education or training, by reference period, educational attainment, recency of highest qualification and age group (2023)

Survey of adult skills (PIAAC)

	25-64 year-olds						25-34 year-olds					
	Reference period: last 12 months						Reference period: last 12 months					
	Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary		Tertiary		Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary		Tertiary	
	Completion timeframe of highest qualification						Completion timeframe of highest qualification					
	Within last 5 years	More than 5 years ago	Within last 5 years	More than 5 years ago	Within last 5 years	More than 5 years ago	Within last 5 years	More than 5 years ago	Within last 5 years	More than 5 years ago	Within last 5 years	More than 5 years ago
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)
OECD countries												
Austria	c	16	46	29	58	50	c	30	c	32	59	52
Canada	c	26	56	46	79	65	c	32	53	50	79	69
Chile	c	17	47	34	66	60	c	28	42	41	64	67
Czechia	c	21	c	37	72	61	c	40	c	38	69	62
Denmark	c	31	54	52	75	68	c	49	48	60	75	66
Estonia	c	39	70	43	80	66	c	50	68	57	78	71
Finland	c	24	63	57	77	73	c	c	54	63	73	67
France	c	19	21	31	50	49	c	25	c	34	50	53
Germany	c	20	50	40	63	62	c	26	48	44	63	64
Hungary	c	11	40	20	58	48	c	11	42	28	59	48
Ireland	c	30	61	44	71	67	c	c	c	46	66	65
Israel	c	8	c	26	53	44	c	15	c	36	52	43
Italy	c	9	c	27	51	51	c	7	c	28	52	44
Japan	c	16	c	31	66	46	c	c	c	31	63	43
Korea	c	9	c	12	20	17	c	c	c	11	18	15
Latvia	c	20	43	29	73	64	c	36	49	40	71	62
Lithuania	c	15	39	19	61	48	c	28	25	28	57	49
Netherlands	c	31	53	49	75	64	c	30	51	53	76	70
New Zealand	c	34	67	52	69	70	c	39	60	44	66	64
Norway	c	44	c	52	83	69	c	c	c	58	81	77
Poland	c	10	c	14	43	40	c	8	c	20	43	38
Portugal	c	19	43	40	66	66	c	27	c	40	62	62
Slovak Republic	c	9	47	24	52	50	c	15	c	29	52	53
Spain	c	23	60	38	72	56	c	23	c	43	69	54
Sweden	c	32	62	50	64	61	c	36	54	50	64	62
Switzerland	c	21	35	40	61	60	c	55	29	45	59	63
United States	c	22	c	48	86	77	c	37	c	57	87	77
Other economies												
England (UK)	c	26	64	48	77	64	c	31	63	50	76	63
Flemish Region (Belgium)	c	28	c	41	65	63	c	27	c	48	65	69
OECD average	**m**	**22**	**51**	**37**	**65**	**58**	**m**	**29**	**49**	**42**	**64**	**58**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Croatia	c	4	c	11	45	43	c	3	c	14	42	41

Note: Columns showing data on all levels of education, and participation in the last five years are available for consultation online. The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.

Table A5.2. Share of adults participating in non-formal education or training, by labour force status and age group (2023)

Participation in the last 12 months

	Employed		Unemployed		Outside the labour force	
	25-44	45-64	25-44	45-64	25-44	45-64
	%	%	%	%	%	%
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)
Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)						
OECD countries						
Austria	42	39	49	30	27	8
Canada	69	56	51	34	31	17
Chile	52	35	42	12	31	12
Czechia	55	43	32	31	19	9
Denmark	67	60	49	50	36	23
Estonia	65	53	58	45	37	14
Finland	73	68	46	38	37	19
France	45	40	34	24	23	8
Germany	57	49	27	27	30	17
Hungary	38	28	29	16	15	3
Ireland	66	58	48	36	24	16
Israel	42	36	36	c	20	9
Italy	34	32	22	c	13	5
Japan	46	38	c	c	23	20
Korea	16	15	24	21	11	13
Latvia	57	45	48	28	22	12
Lithuania	42	32	23	22	18	7
Netherlands	64	55	c	c	27	16
New Zealand	64	64	33	52	29	21
Norway	74	65	48	c	39	17
Poland	28	24	9	c	7	3
Portugal	47	36	53	31	20	14
Slovak Republic	37	33	20	17	12	5
Spain	50	45	35	34	38	13
Sweden	60	56	35	25	29	14
Switzerland	54	47	46	39	30	14
United States	74	68	52	c	27	22
Other economies						
England (UK)	65	61	30	34	19	17
Flemish Region (Belgium)	62	52	c	c	16	18
OECD average	**52**	**45**	**37**	**30**	**24**	**13**
Partner and/or accession countries						
Croatia	28	22	12	11	8	3
Other surveys						
OECD countries						
Australia[1]	36	37	23	16	11	8

Note: Columns showing the combined data for 25-64 year-olds are available for consultation online.

1. Source for Australia is Australia's Work-Related Training and Adult Learning Survey. The reference year is the 2020/2021 financial year.

2. Source for Brazil is the Continuous National Household Sample Survey (PNAD). The source year is 2024. Results for Brazil are not directly comparable with results from PIAAC. See *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en). The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.

Table A5.3. Share of adults reporting having never participated in non-formal education or training, by educational attainment and gender (2023)

25–64-year-olds; Survey of adult skills (PIAAC)

	Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary		Tertiary		All levels of education	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	(1)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(10)	(11)
OECD countries								
Austria	38	46	24	24	10	12	20	23
Canada	30	35	13	14	8	7	12	12
Chile	55	53	21	30	9	10	25	28
Czechia	36	50	24	24	4	6	19	20
Denmark	14	12	6	5	5	2	7	4
Estonia	12	16	10	8	6	3	8	6
Finland	11	14	6	5	3	2	5	4
France	36	43	21	24	13	16	21	23
Germany	46	45	16	17	8	7	15	17
Hungary	56	61	37	37	17	14	33	31
Ireland	33	37	16	25	9	10	16	18
Israel	75	76	49	45	25	24	42	35
Italy	64	72	34	46	23	24	44	50
Japan	52	64	32	32	19	19	27	27
Korea	90	74	77	60	68	54	72	58
Latvia	39	38	22	19	5	5	18	13
Lithuania	51	55	37	35	14	10	31	24
Netherlands	20	20	15	11	8	9	13	12
New Zealand	31	32	13	13	10	6	15	12
Norway	18	17	6	5	3	3	6	5
Poland	48	50	23	34	11	10	22	27
Portugal	30	43	18	15	8	5	22	24
Slovak Republic	54	65	37	41	19	15	35	34
Spain	29	33	16	17	7	5	17	17
Sweden	22	29	12	12	8	8	12	12
Switzerland	45	46	25	26	14	12	21	23
United States	40	41	18	17	c	c	13	12
Other economies								
England (UK)	38	48	16	19	11	10	16	18
Flemish Region (Belgium)	35	44	22	28	9	10	18	19
OECD average	**40**	**44**	**24**	**25**	**13**	**12**	**22**	**22**
Partner and/or accession countries								
Croatia	61	72	46	50	19	18	42	42

Note: Columns showing the combined data for men and women are available for consultation online.
The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ds0m4z.

Chapter A6. How are social outcomes related to education?

Highlights

- This chapter uses data from the Survey of Adult Skills to explore the effects of educational background on flexibility in employment and work-life balance.
- Across OECD and partner countries, individuals with higher levels of education are significantly more likely to work remotely. On average, tertiary-educated adults report the highest prevalence of working from home (42%), while those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment are considerably less likely to do so (18%). Workers with below upper secondary attainment show the lowest incidence of remote work across OECD countries (10%).
- Adults with higher numeracy proficiency levels are more likely to report flexible working hours. On average across OECD countries, 44% of adults with high numeracy skills (at or above Level 4) report having high or very high flexibility in their working hours, compared to 28% of those with low numeracy skills (at or below Level 1).
- In all OECD and partner countries, tertiary-educated men enjoy more flexibility in their working hours than their female peers. On average, 47% of tertiary-educated men report having high or very high flexibility in their working hours in their main job, compared with 35% of tertiary-educated women.

Context


Work-life balance is an important aspect of high-quality employment and sustainable labour-market outcomes. It depends not only on the total number of hours worked but also on how work is organised and the extent to which individuals can manage their professional and personal responsibilities effectively. Ensuring adequate balance requires paying attention to the flexibility in working arrangements, the organisation of working time and the risks associated with excessive or irregular hours. Furthermore, as many OECD countries face the challenges of ageing populations, work-life balance policies will need to continue evolving, particularly through more flexible working arrangements, to better support increasing informal caregiving responsibilities (Bernini et al., 2026[1]). Flexibility in working hours such as being able to choose when to start and finish working, organise breaks or schedule holidays has been associated with greater levels of well-being and job satisfaction (OECD, 2022[2]). The increased prevalence of remote work or working from home has expanded opportunities for autonomy and reduced commuting time, but it has also blurred the boundaries between work and personal life and may lead to longer effective working hours (OECD, 2025[3]).

Overtime or work beyond contractual or typical hours remains a key factor affecting work-life balance. Prolonged or regular overtime can increase health risks and limit participation in non-work activities, thereby offsetting the potential advantages of flexible or remote working arrangements (OECD, 2019[4]).

This chapter will address work-life balance as not just a question of reducing hours but of ensuring that work is organised in ways that support workers' autonomy and well-being while preventing excessive or extended working hours.

Figure A6.1. Share of employed adults reporting high or very high flexibility of working hours in their main job, by numeracy proficiency level (2023)

In per cent; 25-64 year-olds; Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)



For data, see Table A6.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/otk7yv.

Other findings

- In most OECD and partner countries, the share of employees working additional hours in their main job tends to be highest among those with tertiary education, reflecting the greater prevalence of managerial and professional roles and the higher degree of job responsibility and autonomy often associated with such positions.
- In most OECD and partner countries, tertiary-educated workers are more likely than those with lower educational attainment to report worrying about work when not at work. On average across OECD countries, 47% of tertiary-educated workers report doing this sometimes or most of the time, compared to 35% of those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment and 31% of those with below upper secondary attainment.

Note

The analysis included in this chapter using EU Labour Force Survey (EU LFS) does not filter for individuals holding a single full-time job. As a result, information about multiple jobholders is excluded from this analysis. Note that the profiles of multiple jobholders are varied, ranging from highly educated professionals seeking job enrichment to those in elementary occupations driven by financial necessity, and may have an impact on work-life balance that is not explored in this chapter (Conen, 2020[5]).

Care should be taken when interpreting results from different sources, as differences in data collection methods and reference periods can affect comparability. This is especially important when examining data on individuals' frequency of working from home, autonomy over working hours and the incidence of overtime (Table A6.2 and Figure A6.2) where the timing and geographical coverage of data collection may influence the outcomes reported.

Analysis

Work-life balance is a critical determinant of overall well-being, influencing both physical and mental health, job satisfaction, and family stability. This chapter analyses three key dimensions of work-life balance: i) flexibility in working hours; ii) the ability to work from home; and iii) the incidence of overtime or extra hours. These dimensions shape how individuals experience and manage their professional and personal responsibilities.

Flexibility in working hours provides workers with greater autonomy to schedule tasks around personal and family needs. This flexibility can support mental wellbeing by reducing stress linked to time conflicts and by improving work satisfaction (OECD, 2022[2]).

The ability to work from home represents another critical dimension of work-life balance as it can enhance work-life integration by eliminating commuting time and allowing for more flexible scheduling. At the same time, it can also blur boundaries between work and personal life, particularly for women who often bear a disproportionate share of household and caregiving responsibilities (Craig and Churchill, 2020[6]). Remote work also results in less time spent collaborating with colleagues and less developed networks in the workplace which may have implications for productivity (Yang et al., 2021[7]).

The incidence of overtime or extra hours presents a more complex picture. Extended hours may reflect greater responsibility or commitment, but can also increase stress levels and the risk of burnout, counteracting the potential well-being gains from flexibility or remote work.

Overall, an individual's experience of these three dimensions of work-life balance may be influenced by their skill level and education. Highly educated individuals tend to enjoy greater autonomy and flexibility, though often at the cost of longer hours. Meanwhile, lower-educated and lower-skilled workers face more rigid work structures and fewer opportunities for remote work, amplifying challenges in balancing work and family demands. Addressing these disparities requires labour-market and organisational policies that promote flexibility across all occupations, support equitable access to remote work and regulate excessive working hours to protect both productivity and wellbeing (Eurofound, 2022[8]).

Flexibility in working hours


Flexibility in working hours provides an important indicator of how well individuals can balance professional and personal responsibilities, and it reflects the degree of autonomy and trust placed in workers to manage their schedules, as well as industry and occupational requirements. Higher-skilled and more highly educated workers are more likely to benefit from such arrangements, as they are disproportionately represented in managerial occupations or those related to information and communication technologies (ICT) that allow output-oriented work rather than requiring rigid schedules (OECD, 2022[2]; OECD, 2024[9]). In contrast, workers in lower-skilled or manual occupations often face limited control over their schedules, with shift work or fixed hours reducing opportunities for flexibility. Such constraints may contribute to higher rates of work-family conflict and worse health outcomes (Chung and van der Lippe, 2018[10]).

Figure A6.1 shows that on average across the OECD countries and economies participating in the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC), 44% of adults with high numeracy skills (proficiency levels at or above Level 4) report high or very high flexibility in their working hours in their main job. This share falls to 38% among adults with intermediate numeracy skills (Level 3), 32% among those with basic numeracy skills (Level 2) and only 28% of those with the lowest numeracy proficiency levels (at or below Level 1). Among adults with low numeracy skills, the greatest levels of flexibility at work are in Finland (49% of employees) and Japan (40%), while the lowest are in Croatia (18%) and Italy (15%). In Finland, the proportion of adults with low numeracy proficiency who report having high or very high flexibility in their working hours is greater than that of adults with intermediate numeracy skills in all other countries, and it is even greater than the share of adults with high numeracy skills in most countries. In Chile, Korea, Poland and Spain, the differences across numeracy proficiency levels are small, below 5 percentage points.

In addition to skill-related differences, there are also gender differences in access to flexible working arrangements among tertiary-educated employed adults. Figure A6.2 shows that on average across OECD countries and economies participating in the Survey of Adult Skills, 47% of tertiary-educated men report high or very high flexibility in their working hours, compared to 35% of similarly educated women, a gender gap of 12 percentage points. This gender gap exists in almost all OECD countries and economies, with the largest differences observed in the Flemish Region of Belgium, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland and Switzerland, where the gap exceeds 15 percentage points. Conversely, Croatia, Japan and Spain show smaller gender differences with gaps below 7 percentage points.

Figure A6.2. Share of tertiary-educated employed adults reporting high or very high flexibility in working hours in their main jobs, by gender (2023)

In percent; 25-64 year-olds; Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) or national survey



1. Source for Australia is the Australian Bureau of Statistics Characteristics of Employment Survey (2023)
For data, see Table A6.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/otk7yv.

Several factors may contribute to this gap. Women are often over-represented in service-sector occupations such as education and care work, fields that offer lower levels of autonomy over schedules, even among tertiary-educated workers (Jacobi, Hamjediers and Naujoks, 2025[11]). In addition, gender differences in job roles, working time preferences and family responsibilities can shape access to and perceptions of flexibility. Where flexibility is available for women, it may also differ in quality or form, such as flexibility from part-time working, which can have implications for income and career progression (Jost and Möser, 2023[12]).

Across OECD countries, the share of employed adults reporting high or very high flexibility in their working hours increases moderately with age. On average, 33% of 25-34 year-olds report high flexibility, compared to 36% among both 35-44 and 45-54 year-olds, and 37% among 55-64 year-olds. In most countries, older workers are slightly more likely to report flexible working hours, although the size of the differences across age groups remains small. Finland, Norway and Switzerland show consistently high levels of flexibility across all age groups, while Italy, Poland and Portugal report comparatively lower levels regardless of age (Table A6.1).


The ability to work from home

Working from home has become a key aspect of modern employment, but access to it is uneven because it depends on two distinct conditions. First, the tasks performed in a job must be suitable for remote work. Many jobs in manufacturing, construction, agriculture, care, retail and other in-person services require physical presence and therefore cannot be carried out from home, regardless of workers' preferences or the level of digitalisation. Second, where tasks are technically suitable for remote work, actual take-up depends on the broader conditions that enable such arrangements, including digital tools, broadband access, management practices, trust between employers and employees and the regulatory framework (Sostero et al., 2020-07-24[13]; Dingel and Neiman, 2020[14]). Access to remote work therefore varies significantly by education, largely because education is associated with occupation, sector and task content. Tertiary-educated workers are more often employed in knowledge-intensive, professional and managerial occupations whose task can be performed remotely, while workers with lower levels of educational attainment are more likely to hold jobs requiring physical presence. Greater access to remote work can contribute positively to an individual's job satisfaction and personal well-being (Barrero, Bloom and Davis, 2021[15]). Conversely, lower-educated workers are less likely to have jobs suitable for remote work, which limits their ability to adapt to changing family needs or health circumstances (Chung and van der Lippe, 2018[10]). This structural divide reinforces existing inequalities in well-being and job quality across educational groups.

Figure A6.3 shows that on average across OECD countries that participated in the EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS), 42% of tertiary-educated workers report working from home at least occasionally, compared to 18% of those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education and only 10% of those with below upper secondary education. This pattern is consistent across almost all countries. The largest share of tertiary-educated workers working from home is in the Netherlands, where the rate exceeds 80%. At the other end of the scale, Bulgaria, Romania and the Republic of Türkiye report considerably lower shares – at or below 10%, across all education levels. The relatively high rate among tertiary-educated workers in the Netherlands likely reflects the country's larger concentration of knowledge-based and digital service jobs. This is coupled by workplace cultures in the Netherlands that are accepting of hybrid work across all attainment levels, with both employees and employers generally viewing it as positively affecting productivity, motivation, and work-life balance (Conen and Neut, 2026[16]). In contrast, Bulgaria, Romania and Türkiye remain characterized by a high relative importance of manufacturing and other sectors requiring on-site presence that is not compatible with remote work. These structural features might be combined with lower levels of digital adoption among firms and varying teleworking practices that could contribute to less teleworking compared to more service-oriented economies (OECD, 2026[17]; OECD, 2026[18]).

Figure A6.3. Share of employed adults who sometimes or usually work from home, by educational attainment (2023)

In per cent; 25-64 year-olds; EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) or national survey



Note: The average includes only countries participating in the 2023 EU Labour Force Survey, not all OECD countries.
1. Source for Australia is the Australian Bureau of Statistics Characteristics of Employment survey (2024).
2. Source for Canada is the Canadian Labour Force Survey (2022).
3. Source for Israel is the Social Survey (2024).
For data, see Table A6.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/otk7yv.

In all countries with available data, the largest differences in remote working are observed between those with tertiary education and those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment, with two-thirds of countries showing gaps of more than 20 percentage points. In contrast, the differences between individuals with upper and below upper secondary attainment are small, remaining below 20 percentage points in all countries.

Incidence of overtime or extra hours

The incidence of overtime or extra hours worked provides insights into work intensity and labour-market conditions. Although working additional hours in the main job may offer some workers the opportunity to increase their earnings, high levels of overtime can also signal structural pressures.


Patterns of overtime vary across educational attainment levels, with workers who have lower attainment more likely to experience involuntary overtime, where overtime is imposed by their employer due to lack of staff or emergencies, rather than simply being on offer. Such overtime tends to increase stress and physical fatigue and limit opportunities for rest and family life. Among workers with a tertiary education, including managers and professionals, working longer hours may be more of a voluntary decision. This

kind of overtime often stems from job responsibilities, performance expectations or career ambitions. However, although these workers generally have greater autonomy over their hours, the fact that overtime is worked voluntarily does not preclude it contributing to work-life imbalance and stress (Kaduk et al., 2022[19]).

Figure A6.4 shows that on average across European countries participating in the EU-LFS, tertiary-educated workers show the highest rates of overtime work (16%), followed by those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment (12%) and finally those with below upper secondary attainment (10%). This pattern of higher overtime prevalence among individuals with higher educational attainment is consistent across most countries. The highest shares of tertiary-educated workers working overtime are observed in Switzerland, where the rate exceeds 40%. Conversely, Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia and Romania report considerably lower shares of overtime work across all education levels, generally below 2.5%. Switzerland may show particularly high rates because it has greater levels of high-skilled employment in financial and professional services. Workers in high-skilled sectors such as financial, scientific and professional services are frequently exempt from standard overtime regulations, leading to a higher prevalence of both regular and uncompensated extra hours (Eurofound, 2022[20]). Lower rates in Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia and Romania may reflect a greater concentration of jobs with fixed schedules, lower shares of high-autonomy professional work and weaker incentives or expectations for unpaid overtime (Eurofound, 2022[20]).

Figure A6.4. Share of employed adults working overtime in their main job, by educational attainment (2023)

In per cent; share of 25-64 year-olds who reported working overtime or extra hours during the reference week; EU Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) or national survey



Note: The average includes only countries participating in the 2023 EU Labour Force Survey, not all OECD countries.
1. Source for Australia is the Australian Bureau of Statistics Characteristics of Employment survey (2024).
2. Source for Canada is the Canadian Labour Force Survey (2022).
3. Source for Israel is the Labour Force Survey (2024).
For data, see Table A6.2. .The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/otk7yv.

Difficulties in maintaining work-life balance


Flexible working arrangements and the ability to work from home can support work-life balance, but they do not necessarily prevent tensions between professional and personal responsibilities. Difficulties in disconnecting from work, fatigue after working hours and conflicts between work and family responsibilities remain important dimensions of job quality and well-being (Sonnentag and Schiffner, 2019[21]). These challenges may vary with educational attainment levels, reflecting differences in working conditions, job demands and occupational responsibilities.

Figure A6.5 shows that tertiary-educated workers are more likely than those with lower levels of educational attainment to report worrying about work when not at work. On average across OECD countries, 47% of tertiary-educated employed adults report that

they sometimes or most of the time continue worrying about work outside working hours, compared to 35% of those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment and 31% of those with below upper secondary attainment. This positive gradient by educational attainment is observed in most countries and is particularly pronounced in Portugal, where around 63% of tertiary-educated workers report worrying about work outside working hours compared to 26% workers with below upper secondary education. There are high shares among tertiary-educated workers in Belgium, Luxembourg, Norway and Sweden. In contrast, Austria, Hungary and Lithuania report comparatively lower shares among tertiary-educated workers, although even in these countries they remain more likely than lower-educated adults to report difficulties disconnecting from work.

Figure A6.5. Share of adults who, some or most of the time, kept worrying about work when not at work, by educational attainment (2024)

In per cent of adults who responded some or most of the time; 25-64 year-olds; European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS)



Note: The average includes only countries participating in the 2024 European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS), not all OECD countries.
For data, see Table A6.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/otk7yv.

Higher levels of work-related worry among tertiary-educated workers likely reflect differences in job characteristics and work organisation. Adults with higher attainment are more likely to work in managerial, professional and knowledge-intensive occupations associated with stronger managerial expectations and higher levels of psychological or emotional demand (Eurofound and ILO, 2019[22]).

In contrast, the other indicators of difficulties maintaining work-life balance presented in Table A6.3 show weaker and less consistent relationships with attainment. Feelings of being too tired after work to carry out household chores are widespread across all educational groups, with relatively small differences by education level on average across OECD countries. Similarly, the shares of workers reporting that their job prevented them from giving sufficient time to family or that family responsibilities made it difficult to concentrate on work show more mixed patterns across countries and educational groups. In several countries, lower-educated workers report comparable or even greater levels of work-family conflict than tertiary-educated workers. These findings suggest that while higher educational attainment is strongly associated with difficulties disconnecting psychologically from work, this should not be interpreted as indicating that work-related stress is concentrated among tertiary-educated workers. Other dimensions of work-life balance difficulties are widely distributed across the workforce and may reflect different forms of work-related strain across occupations and working conditions, such as time pressure, physical or scheduling constraints and work-related risks.

Definitions

Age group: the term **adult** refers to 25-64 year-olds.

Educational attainment refers to the highest level of education successfully completed by an individual.

Flexibility in working hours is defined as the ability of employees to adjust start and end times, take breaks or modify schedules to better accommodate personal needs.

Levels of education: See the *Reader's Guide* at the beginning of this publication for a presentation of all ISCED 2011 levels.

Overtime or extra hours is defined as hours worked beyond the regular or contractual working hours established by a labour contract, collective agreement or national legislation.

Proficiency levels: See definitions in Chapter A1.

Working from home is defined as carrying out work responsibilities remotely, whether from one's home or another suitable location, rather than at the employer's physical workplace.

Methodology

Different questions were asked to survey respondents, depending on the data source:

Table A6.1.

1. **Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) (2023) question:** "To what extent could you choose or change your working hours? 1. Not at all 2. Very little 3. To some extent 4. To a high extent 5. To a very high extent".

Table A6.2.

1. **European Labour Force Survey (2023) question on work from home**: "During those four weeks (in your main job), how much of your working time did you spend working from home, including telework? 1.You worked exclusively from home during the period 2.Half of your working hours or more 3.Less than half of your working hours 4.You did not work from home during the period".
2. **European Labour Force Survey (2023) question on autonomy over working hours**: "Can you decide for yourself the start and end of your working day? 1.Yes, completely 2.Yes, to some extent 3.No, my working hours are determined by my employer 4.No, my working hours are set by my clients or a third party 5.No, my working hours are determined by other factors (regulatory constraints, weather, etc.)".
3. **European Labour Force Survey (2023) question on overtime/extra hours in the main job**: "For the week from Monday … to Sunday … (in your main job), on the days you worked or attended training, did you work more hours than usual / more than your contract stipulates / more than the statutory number of hours? 1. Yes 2. No".

Table A6.3.

1. **European Working Conditions Survey (2024) question**: "How often in the last 12 months have you:
    a. kept worrying about work when you were not working?
    b. felt too tired after work to do some of the household jobs which needed to be done?
    c. found that your job prevented you from giving the time you wanted to your family?
    d. found it difficult to concentrate on your job because of your family responsibilities?
        i. 1. Always; 2. Most of the time; 3. Sometimes; 4. Rarely; 5. Never.

International Social Survey Programme (2022) question: "How often has each of the following happened to you in the last 3 months?"

e. I have come home from work too tired to do the chores which need to be done.
f. I have found it difficult to concentrate at work because of my family responsibilities.
    i. 1. Several times a week; 2. Several times a month; 3. Once or twice; 4. Never

Source

- Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) Cycle 2 (2023)
- The European Labour Force Survey (2023)
- The European Working Conditions Survey (2024)
- International Social Survey Programme: Family and Changing Gender Roles V – ISSP (2022)
- National sources:
  - Australian Bureau of Statistics Characteristics of Employment Survey – Table A6.1. and Table A6.2.
  - Canadian Labour Force Survey – Table A6.2.
  - Israel's Social Survey and Israel's Labour Force Survey – Table A6.2.
  - Japanese Basic Survey on Wage Structure – Table A6.2.

For more information, please refer to *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

References

Barrero, J., N. Bloom and S. Davis (2021), "Why working from home will stick", *NBER Working Paper*, No. 28731, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA, https://doi.org/10.3386/w28731. [15]

Bernini, A. et al. (2026), "Informal long-term care in the contact of demographic change and intergenerationa fairness in the EU", *Publications Office of the European Union*, https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2760/9689703. [1]

Chung, H. and T. van der Lippe (2018), "Flexible working, work-life balance, and gender equality: Introduction", *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 151, pp. 365-381, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2025-x. [10]

Conen, W. (2020), "Multiple Jobholding in Europe", *Economic and Social Science Institute of the Hans-Böckler-Foundation* No. 20, https://www.wsi.de/de/15341.htm. [5]

Conen, W. and N. Neut (2026), *Juridische en organisatorische vraagstukken bij hybride werken: Eindrapportage*, AIAS-HSI (Amsterdams Instituut voor Arbeidsstudies – Hugo Sinzheimer Instituut, Universiteit van Amsterdam). [16]

Craig, L. and B. Churchill (2020), "Dual-earner parent couples' work and care during COVID-19", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 28/S1, pp. 66-79, https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12497. [6]

Dingel, J. and B. Neiman (2020), "How Many Jobs Can be Done at Home?", *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 189, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104235. [14]

Eurofound (2022), *Overtime in Europe: Regulation and Practice*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, https://doi.org/10.2806/095550. [20]

Eurofound (2022), *The Rise in Telework: Impact on Working Conditions and Regulations*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, https://doi.org/10.2806/069206. [8]

Eurofound and ILO (2019), *Working Conditions in a Global Perspective*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, https://doi.org/10.2806/870542. [22]

Jacobi, A., M. Hamjediers and T. Naujoks (2025), "Tailored to women, provided to men? Gendered occupational inequality in access to flexible working-time arrangements", *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 176, pp. 1179-1205, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-024-03483-9. [11]

Jost, M. and S. Möser (2023), "Salary, flexibility or career opportunity? A choice experiment on gender specific job preferences", *Frontiers in Sociology*, Vol. 8, https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2023.1154324. [12]

Kaduk, A. et al. (2022), "Involuntary vs. voluntary flexible work: Insights for scholars and stakeholders", *Community, Work and Family*, Vol. 22/4, pp. 412-442, https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2019.1616532. [19]

OECD (2026), *Foundations for Growth and Competitiveness 2026*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/40a7532f-en. [18]

OECD (2026), *OECD Economic Surveys: Romania 2026*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/4844067e-en. [17]

OECD (2025), *Workforce Insights from Central Governments: Findings of the 2024 OECD/EU Survey of Public Servants*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/2f9080b1-en. [3]

OECD (2024), *Do Adults Have the Skills They Need to Thrive in a Changing World?: Survey of Adult Skills 2023*, OECD Skills Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b263dc5d-en. [9]

OECD (2022), *OECD Employment Outlook 2022: Building Back More Inclusive Labour Markets*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1bb305a6-en. [2]

OECD (2019), *OECD Compendium of Productivity Indicators 2019*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b2774f97-en. [4]

Sonnentag, S. and C. Schiffner (2019), "Psychological detachment from work during nonwork time and employee well-being: The role of leader's detachment", *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 22, https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2019.2. [21]

Sostero, M. et al. (2020-07-24), *Teleworkability and the COVID-19 crisis: a new digital divide*, European Commission, https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC121193. [13]

Yang, L. et al. (2021), "The effects of remote work on collaboration among information workers", *Nature Human Behaviour*, Vol. 6/1, pp. 43-54, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01196-4. [7]

Chapter A6 Tables

Tables and notes

Table A6.1	Share of employed adults reporting high or very high flexibility of working hours in their main job, by numeracy proficiency level, educational attainment, gender and age group (2023)
Table A6.2	Indicators of work-life balance among employed adults, by educational attainment (2023)
Table A6.3	Prevalence of work-life balance difficulties, by educational attainment (2024)

StatLink https://stat.link/otk7yv

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/otk7yv.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer, http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Table A6.1. Share of employed adults reporting high or very high flexibility of working hours in their main job, by numeracy proficiency level, educational attainment, gender and age group (2023)

In per cent; 25-64 year-olds

	By numeracy proficiency level						
	Level 1 and below	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Below upper secondary,	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary
					Total	Total	Total
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(7)	(10)	(13)
Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC)							
OECD countries							
Austria	24	35	47	57	22	35	55
Canada	29	32	34	39	30	31	36
Chile	35	37	39	35	35	35	38
Czechia	30	35	43	50	21	36	51
Denmark	32	43	48	54	37	44	49
Estonia	28	34	42	50	31	37	44
Finland	49	49	57	65	58	50	65
France	21	27	33	39	21	24	35
Germany	22	34	43	56	17	34	52
Hungary	27	30	39	50	18	30	43
Ireland	21	28	28	29	25	25	28
Israel	33	36	42	54	34	38	40
Italy	15	16	19	23	13	16	23
Japan	40	43	41	47	40	40	46
Korea	31	32	33	32	30	31	33
Latvia	20	19	26	33	20	21	26
Lithuania	23	23	32	50	26	23	30
Netherlands	24	36	44	53	27	35	51
New Zealand	28	35	38	43	25	33	39
Norway	27	37	43	50	30	39	45
Poland	27	24	26	28	24	26	26
Portugal	23	26	34	39	23	27	36
Slovak Republic	24	26	29	35	16	25	34
Spain	25	28	27	27	24	25	29
Sweden	36	39	45	55	39	44	48
Switzerland	25	41	47	56	27	37	54
United States	32	34	39	45	32	34	39
Other economies							
England (UK)	28	31	35	41	23	31	38
Flemish Region (Belgium)	20	33	43	49	22	35	46
Average	**28**	**32**	**38**	**44**	**27**	**32**	**41**
Partner and/or accession countries							
Croatia	18	15	15	10	13	14	19
Other surveys							
OECD countries							
Australia[1]	a	a	a	a	27	30	37

Note: Columns showing the standard errors and data broken down by gender and by age group are available for consultation online. Data was sourced from the PIAAC Cycle 2 Database. 1. Reference year 2023. Source for Australia is the Australian Bureau of Statistics Characteristics of Employment survey. Results are not directly comparable to PIAAC as the source questionnaire collects data on "whether workers had/did not have an agreement to work flexible hours", rather than "high or very high flexibility of working hours" (PIAAC).

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/otk7yv.

Table A6.2. Indicators of work-life balance among employed adults, by educational attainment (2023)

In per cent; 25-64 year-olds

	Sometimes or usually working from home			Decision-making autonomy over their working hours						Working overtime or extra hours in their main job		
	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary		Tertiary		Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary
				Worker can fully decide	Worker can decide under flexible working time arrangements	Worker can fully decide	Worker can decide under flexible working time arrangements	Worker can fully decide	Worker can decide under flexible working time arrangements	Share working overtime		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(8)	(9)	(11)	(12)	(17)	(19)	(21)
Labour Force Survey (LFS)												
OECD countries												
Austria	8	19	48	14	11	18	23	29	40	5.6	8.9	12.2
Belgium	9	21	57	10	10	14	17	21	34	5.1	10.4	19.8
Czechia	5	10	31	8	1	12	5	13	20	7.1	8.2	9.1
Denmark	18	29	59	16	28	19	36	21	48	12.6	16.8	21.2
Estonia	6	17	45	15	21	18	20	20	32	6.5	5.8	8.2
Finland	26	28	63	22	35	19	39	28	53	16.5	19.3	28.0
France	11	19	56	15	11	18	17	29	32	8.3	12.0	16.9
Germany	6	16	45	17	11	18	24	32	38	8.0	11.7	19.9
Greece	2	3	14	49	1	28	2	20	3	4.2	4.3	4.2
Hungary	1	4	20	4	2	10	4	12	15	1.4	1.8	2.4
Iceland	24	35	66	27	20	31	27	38	38	34.4	33.4	30.9
Ireland	14	23	52	24	9	17	13	18	24	10.0	13.2	22.4
Italy	2	10	28	16	3	16	6	19	10	3.9	6.4	9.1
Latvia	c	5	17	c	c	11	6	13	14	c	1.6	1.3
Lithuania	3	5	20	7	6	9	7	9	12	3.2	2.6	2.4

	Sometimes or usually working from home			Decision-making autonomy over their working hours						Working overtime or extra hours in their main job		
	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary		Tertiary		Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary
				Worker can fully decide	Worker can decide under flexible working time arrangements	Worker can fully decide	Worker can decide under flexible working time arrangements	Worker can fully decide	Worker can decide under flexible working time arrangements	Share working overtime		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(8)	(9)	(11)	(12)	(17)	(19)	(21)
Luxembourg	11	23	59	14	19	14	34	19	54	15.6	21.2	31.7
Netherlands	27	46	81	19	24	21	33	31	48	18.2	22.1	26.2
Norway	24	32	63	18	24	20	31	18	48	15.0	17.8	20.2
Poland	10	8	23	20	3	16	4	14	11	2.7	2.6	3.4
Portugal	3	12	42	15	5	14	9	18	21	10.3	16.3	29.2
Slovak Republic	c	8	24	c	c	9	6	10	23	c	2.4	2.9
Slovenia	4	10	35	15	4	16	11	17	33	8.4	13.3	18.3
Spain	4	8	25	17	8	16	12	14	22	3.1	3.7	5.0
Sweden	19	37	64	12	29	15	45	14	63	13.9	21.1	24.5
Switzerland	10	28	62	12	10	18	25	27	42	21.4	34.6	44.2
Türkiye	5	4	9	m	m	m	m	m	m	3.2	5.8	5.4
Average	**10**	**18**	**42**	**17**	**13**	**17**	**18**	**20**	**31**	**9.9**	**12.2**	**16.1**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Bulgaria	c	1	6	5	2	5	2	5	4	1.2	1.0	0.4
Croatia	3	6	26	13	3	13	4	13	11	4.1	2.7	2.4
Romania	1	2	10	36	2	11	4	7	9	2.3	2.2	1.6

	Sometimes or usually working from home			Decision-making autonomy over their working hours						Working overtime or extra hours in their main job		
	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary		Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary		Tertiary		Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary
				Worker can fully decide	Worker can decide under flexible working time arrangements	Worker can fully decide	Worker can decide under flexible working time arrangements	Worker can fully decide	Worker can decide under flexible working time arrangements	Share working overtime		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(8)	(9)	(11)	(12)	(17)	(19)	(21)
Other surveys												
OECD countries												
Australia[1]	25	29	52	32	a	36	a	38	a	29	31	37
Canada[2]	31	30	41	m	9	m	14	m	35	16	18	19
Israel[3]	8[r]	19	38	m	m	m	m	m	m	0	1	2
Japan[4]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

Note: Columns showing data for all educational levels, the share of adults whose employer, organisation or client(s) decide their working hours, and the average overtime hours worked in the reference week by those working overtime (h) are available for consultation online. Data was sourced from the EU Labour Force Survey Database. The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/otk7yv.

1. Source for Australia is the Australian Bureau of Statistics Characteristics of Employment survey. The reference year for Australia is 2024. Results are not directly comparable to the EU-LFS as the source questionnaire collects data on whether employed individuals "usually worked/did not work from home" compared to "sometimes or usually working from home" (LFS), "able/not able to work extra hours to take time off" compared to "can fully decide him-/herself" (LFS) and "usually/did not usually work extra hours or overtime" compared to capturing the range of hours of overtime worked (LFS).

2. Source for Canada is the Canadian Labour Force Survey. The reference year for Canada is 2022.

3. Source for Israel for the frequency of working from home is the Social Survey. Results are not directly comparable to the EU-LFS. Please see the Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes for more information. Source for Israel for working overtime or extra hours is the Labour Force Survey. The reference year for Israel for both indicators is 2024.

4. Source for Japan is the Basic Survey on Wage Structure. For the following reasons, the results are not directly comparable with EU LFS: i) The underlying questionnaire covers the actual number of overtime hours worked during one month period for the population aged 15-70+ years old; ii) Overtime hours are reported by employers, not self-reported by individual employees; iii) Educational attainment categories differ from those used in the EU LFS; iv) The survey primarily aims to measure wage structures and therefore applies specific conditions when compiling data on working hours.

Table A6.3. Prevalence of work-life balance difficulties, by educational attainment (2024)

In per cent; share of employed 25-64 year-olds reporting experiencing difficulties sometimes or most of the time

	Kept worrying about work when not at work			Felt too tired after work to do some household chores			Felt job prevented them from giving time to family			Found it difficult to concentrate on job due to family responsibilities		
	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary	Tertiary
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(13)	(14)	(15)
European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS)												
OECD countries												
Austria	19	22	34	60	52	50	39	32	38	29	24	26
Belgium	37	45	59	56	55	63	30	35	46	23	20	29
Czechia	32	39	49	58	62	65	15	44	57	15	36	44
Denmark	35	42	47	55	54	53	25	25	34	14	16	19
Estonia	33	37	53	62	57	61	11	32	33	12	18	19
Finland	45	37	57	74	59	62	36	40	38	12	15	21
France	44	39	51	64	57	50	31	30	32	23	17	15
Germany	25	36	44	60	58	58	36	35	45	15	19	26
Greece	38	42	44	76	75	73	61	55	50	27	32	33
Hungary	17	24	30	49	54	55	29	39	37	15	15	14
Ireland	26	28	50	55	52	60	22	29	38	25	20	27
Italy	37	40	46	74	63	50	65	48	33	36	33	27
Latvia	38	37	57	62	61	70	36	39	49	17	22	30
Lithuania	20	18	33	57	50	45	21	22	25	21	10	8
Luxembourg	36	64	63	68	68	74	40	41	50	36	28	35
Netherlands	22	39	48	37	43	46	23	42	35	12	21	24
Norway	55	45	63	50	59	57	31	39	43	21	16	29
Poland	29	20	35	69	52	49	42	33	33	34	17	14

	Kept worrying about work when not at work			Felt too tired after work to do some household chores			Felt job prevented them from giving time to family			Found it difficult to concentrate on job due to family responsibilities		
	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary	Tertiary
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Portugal	26	40	63	62	66	69	45	49	54	31	32	27
Slovak Republic	29	33	36	72	69	55	32	39	33	21	26	31
Spain	22	41	55	55	60	57	45	44	49	26	32	37
Sweden	41	44	59	75	66	60	30	40	45	19	24	24
Switzerland	31	39	53	68	50	51	42	31	38	24	18	15
Average	**31**	**35**	**47**	**59**	**56**	**56**	**33**	**36**	**39**	**21**	**21**	**24**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Bulgaria	13	23	38	55	61	51	27	35	25	12	16	14
Croatia	43	35	44	75	70	62	44	51	47	25	30	25
Romania	48	38	53	70	73	69	56	42	51	35	30	38
Other surveys												
OECD countries												
Australia[1]	m	m	m	52	51	54	m	m	m	8	15	21
Israel[1,2]	m	m	m	71	75	77	46	52	58	29	37	35
Japan[1]	m	m	m	50	42	54	m	m	m	9	7	8
New Zealand[1]	m	m	m	40	44	56	m	m	m	5	13	20
United States[1]	m	m	m	48	64	58	m	m	m	6	17	15

	Kept worrying about work when not at work			Felt too tired after work to do some household chores			Felt job prevented them from giving time to family			Found it difficult to concentrate on job due to family responsibilities		
	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary	Tertiary	Below upper secondary	Upper secondary or post-secondary	Tertiary
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Partner and/or accession countries												
India[1]	m	m	m	53	50	46	m	m	m	25	37	30
South Africa[1]	m	m	m	46	54	62	m	m	m	23	40	31

Note: Data was sourced from the European Working Conditions 2024 Survey in May 2026.

1. Source and reference year differs from main table. Reference year is 2022 for Australia, India, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, South Africa and the United States. Survey source is the International Social Survey Programme: Family and Changing Gender Roles V - ISSP 2022. Data from ISSP are not directly comparable with data from EWCS. Due to differences in response scales between ISSP and EWCS, categories have been set to approximate moderate-to-high frequency exposure, grouping ISSP responses of 'several times a week' and 'several times a month' as comparable to EWCS responses of 'sometimes' or 'most of the time'. Following consultations with the country, data on educational attainment for Israel were recoded to improve comparability with the harmonized ISCED variable.

2. The data source for "Felt job prevented them from giving time to family" for Israel is the European Social Survey (ESS). The data refers to 2021. The following response categories were included: “sometimes” and “often”.

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/otk7yv.

Part B. Access to education, participation and progression


Chapter B1. How has participation in early childhood education and care evolved across age groups and countries?

Highlights

- Enrolment in early childhood education and care (ECEC) among children from the age of 3 to the start of primary education reached 90% on average across OECD countries in 2024, up from 86% in 2015, with much of that increase driven by rises in a relatively small number of countries.
- The childcare gap between the end of paid parental leave and guaranteed access to ECEC averages around 2 years across OECD countries, although there is no gap in 13 out of 44 countries. In these countries, parental leave and ECEC entitlement are aligned or overlap, providing greater flexibility for families. Conversely, in some other countries the gap can be more than 5 years.
- Participation in ECEC increases with age and tends to be higher in countries with stronger institutional support for participation, where there are shorter childcare gaps and earlier legal entitlement to ECEC. Across OECD countries, participation averaged 63% among 2-year-olds and 77% among 3-year-olds in 2024.

Figure B1.1. Trends in enrolment rates from the age of 3 to the start of compulsory primary education (2015 and 2024)

All ECE programmes, in per cent



Note: The numbers in parentheses refer to the age when compulsory primary education starts.
1. The legal age at which school becomes compulsory is 6, but children are allowed in legislation to attend primary education from age 4, and most attend from age 5.
2. The legal age at which school becomes compulsory is 6, but children are allowed in legislation to attend primary education from age 5, and most do.
3. Year of reference differs from 2015.
For data, see Table B1.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/1he0vc.

Context

Participation in early childhood education and care (ECEC) is a foundational element of social and economic policy, serving as a critical lever to enhance child development, foster school readiness and promote social equity. An expanding body of research is finding that high-quality early learning substantially improves cognitive and socio-emotional skills, particularly for children from disadvantaged backgrounds, while simultaneously facilitating labour-market participation among parents, especially women (Yoshikawa, Weiland and Brooks-Gunn, 2016[1]; Shuey and Kankaraš, 2018[2]; OECD, 2021[3]; Berger, Panico and Solaz, 2026[4]). Over the past decade, many OECD countries

have seen a significant expansion in ECEC access, driven by a growing policy consensus that the foundational years are vital for educational attainment in the long term, well-being and lifetime earnings.

Despite this general upward trend, the landscape of ECEC provision for children under the age of 3 remains highly diverse, reflecting differences in institutional arrangements, governance models and policy priorities. Participation for the youngest cohorts is shaped by a complex interplay between formal educational programmes (ISCED 0) and other registered ECEC services that may focus more on care than formal educational content. National approaches can be distinguished by their governance structures, with countries adopting either integrated systems that provide a continuous framework from birth to the start of school, or split systems that separate early childhood development from pre-primary education. Cross-country differences in enrolment for those under age 3 are often shaped by children and family policies, as well as by service availability, affordability, and the strategic allocation of public funding, which frequently prioritizes the years immediately preceding primary education.

The “childcare gap” between the end of paid parental leave and the start of a legal entitlement to a publicly supported ECEC place serves as one primary institutional determinant of participation patterns (Eurydice, 2025[5]). The structural design of parental leave systems, including the duration of leave reserved specifically for mothers and for fathers, directly influences the timing of a child’s first entry into institutionalised care and the equitable distribution of caregiving responsibilities. In countries where leave policies and ECEC entitlements are not well-synchronised, families often face significant financial and logistical barriers to participation, potentially leading to lower enrolment or a reliance on informal or private care. Policy efforts to eliminate this gap through extended leave or earlier legal guarantees are increasingly viewed as essential for supporting work-life balance and ensuring continuous support for the child's development.

As children approach the typical starting age for primary education, enrolment patterns become more uniform across the OECD, although the nature of participation is increasingly shaped by compulsory schooling requirements. There is a notable trend towards lowering the starting age of compulsory education to include one or more pre-primary years, a reform designed to guarantee universal access and strengthen foundational learning before the start of formal primary school. This reflects a strategic commitment to reducing socio-economic inequalities and ensuring a smooth transition into the school system. Ultimately, although participation is becoming nearly universal for older children, the diversity of policy designs continues to influence the timing, intensity and equity of access to early childhood services across the OECD.

Other findings

- Reforms lowering the compulsory starting age of pre-primary education, combined with other supporting policies, have contributed to efforts to expand ECEC participation starting from age 3 in countries such as Brazil, Costa Rica, Finland, Hungary, Lithuania and the Slovak Republic. However, OECD evidence suggests that these reforms alone did not necessarily lead to major increases in enrolment, as participation was already high in many countries before the reforms (OECD, 2025[6]).
- Participation in ECEC among children under age 2 varies widely across countries, from less than 3% in Mexico and the United Kingdom to above 50% in Israel, Korea, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. These differences may reflect a range of factors, including family policies, the affordability and availability of ECEC services, and cultural preferences regarding the care of young children.
- Waiting lists for ECEC remain common in several OECD countries even among children with legal entitlement. In 2024, 38% of ECEC leaders of pre-primary centres in Denmark reported that there were children waiting for a place in their centre, as did 22% of leaders in the Flemish Community of Belgium and 21% in Sweden. Shortages were particularly frequent for children under 3 in Germany and Israel, where 41% of leaders reported applicants remaining on waiting lists.

Note

This chapter only covers formal education and care. Informal care services (generally unregulated care arranged by the child’s parents either in the child’s home or elsewhere, provided by relatives, friends, neighbours, babysitters or nannies) are not covered (see Definitions section for more details). In some countries, children under the age of 3 are likely to be enrolled in other registered ECEC services which do not meet ISCED 2011 criteria. Although data

coverage for these services has improved in recent years, enrolment rates for children under 3 should still be interpreted with some caution due to remaining differences in data availability and reporting practices across countries. Enrolment information for children aged 3 and over is generally more robust and comparable across countries.

Analysis

Childcare gap and its institutional determinants

Access to affordable and high-quality childcare in the first years of a child's life is closely linked to the level of development and diversity of early childhood education and care (ECEC) systems, parents' labour-market participation and broader gender equality outcomes. Differences in how countries organise parental leave and ECEC systems can create a range of levels of support for families during this period.

The childcare gap indicator, developed by Eurydice, refers to the interval between the end of paid parental leave and the start of a guaranteed, publicly supported ECEC place (Eurydice, 2025[5]). The design of ECEC systems, parental leave provisions and labour-market conditions jointly determine the opportunities and constraints families face. Therefore, the size of childcare gap provides a useful indication of how institutional arrangements shape parental choices regarding both fertility and childcare arrangements in the earliest years (Hobson, 2011[7]; Daly and Uzunalioğlu, 2026[8]). Where gaps are large, parents – particularly those with fewer resources – have a limited choice of care options, often facing trade-offs between employment, income and childcare, which can reinforce existing inequalities.

On average across OECD countries, the childcare gap is around 2 years, but this conceals substantial variation. In some systems, it extends to 5 years or even more. Countries with long gaps, including Australia, Iceland and Ireland, typically combine short parental leave periods with a relatively late start of legal entitlement to ECEC or compulsory education. Another group of countries have moderate gaps of between 2 and 4 years. In these systems, legal entitlement to ECEC typically begins earlier, often around 3 or 4 years old, but coverage remains incomplete, leaving a period during which formal care is not guaranteed. There are also countries with shorter gaps (around one year or less) which combine relatively longer statutory parental leave with earlier access to ECEC (Figure B1.2).

There are 13 countries with no childcare gap, with ECEC entitlement starting at or before the end of paid parental leave. These systems ensure continuity of care through extended parental leave, early entitlement or both. ECEC entitlements in these countries are generally introduced from a very early age, often before children reach 18 months. In Finland, Hungary and Korea, entitlement begins before parental leave ends, providing additional flexibility and allowing parents more choice about when to return to work (Figure B1.2).


Having no childcare gap is often associated with higher enrolment rates among children under the age of 3. For example, ECEC participation among 2-year-olds exceeds 90% in Korea, Norway and Sweden. In Korea, where entitlement to ECEC starts at birth and parental leave can be up to three years, there is also relatively high enrolment among children under 2 (56%). However, the relationship between childcare gaps and participation is not deterministic, as enrolment patterns are also shaped by parental preferences, labour-market dynamics, affordability and the availability of services. For example, the Netherlands has a childcare gap of over three years, but enrolment among children under the age of 2 has reached 69%, suggesting that strong demand for childcare and broad service provision can support high participation even in the absence of an early statutory entitlement (Table B1.1. and Figure B1.3.).

The existence of a childcare gap does not necessarily mean there is no childcare provision during this period. Childcare services may still be publicly subsidised, widely available or accessible through targeted support schemes, even if there is no universal legal entitlement. For example, some countries, such as New Zealand, provide universal public funding to support children's participation in early childhood education despite not meeting the definition of a universal legal entitlement used in this report. As a result, children and parents may still receive substantial support to access ECEC, and participation rates can remain high. The constraints families face during the childcare gap therefore depend not just on entitlement rules, but also on factors such as affordability, service availability, opening hours and eligibility conditions. As a result, parents may rely to varying degrees on formal childcare, informal care arrangements or private provision, with potentially different implications for labour-market participation and family well-being across countries.

The implications of the childcare gap extend beyond ECEC participation to broader economic and social outcomes. According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), gaps in childcare policy constitute a significant structural barrier to employment, with disproportionate effects on mothers. Based on modelling assumptions about the effects of expanding childcare access and reducing barriers to participation, the ILO estimates that substantial employment gains could be generated, with around 84% of net new jobs accruing to women. Addressing gaps in childcare support is therefore an important lever for both increasing ECEC participation and advancing gender equality in the labour market (ILO, 2023[9]).

Figure B1.2. Childcare gap (2024)

In years



Note: The childcare gap is defined as the interval between the end of paid statutory parental leave after a child's birth and the point at which families qualify for a publicly supported place in early childhood education and care (ECEC). Legal entitlement to ECEC refers to a right established by law that obliges public authorities or institutions to provide a ECEC service to individuals who meet defined criteria. This right is enforceable, meaning eligible individuals can claim it and, if necessary, seek legal remedies if the obligation is not fulfilled.

1. The legal age at which school becomes compulsory is 6, but children are allowed in legislation to attend primary school from age 5, and most do.
2. The legal age at which school becomes compulsory is 6, but children are allowed in legislation to attend primary education from age 4, and most attend from age 5.
3. Age 5 refers to the age at which children have a legal entitlement to enrol in primary school, rather than a legal entitlement to ECEC.
4. Legal entitlement varies by state and local jurisdiction. Most states have a minimum entitlement age of 5, but it can range from 3 to 6 across all states and localities. The starting age for compulsory education also varies by subnational entity and ranges from 5 to 7. Primary education typically begins at 6.
5. Legal entitlement is provided only for pre-primary schools and special pre-primary schools.
6. Legal entitlement age ranges from 1 year to 1 year and 8 months depending on birth month.

For data, see Table B1.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/1he0vc.

Parental leave systems

Across OECD countries, the duration and structure of paid parental leave vary considerably, reflecting different policy priorities in supporting families during early childhood. This diversity underscores the need for caution in cross-country comparisons, as care and family policies evolve within distinct national contexts and differ in duration, design, levels of compensation and take-up.

On average, paid maternity leave amounts to 18 weeks, with most OECD and partner countries clustering around this level. This leave is generally an individual entitlement for mothers, linked directly to pregnancy and childbirth and typically taken immediately before or after the birth. A few countries provide substantially longer periods, exceeding 55 weeks in Bulgaria and Greece.

There is much greater variation in the additional paid parental and home care leave available to mothers after maternity leave. Unlike maternity leave, these entitlements are intended for the longer-term care of the child and may be reserved for mothers, transferable between parents or shared within the family; leave reserved exclusively for fathers is excluded from this measure. Although these periods are paid, benefit levels and eligibility conditions may differ from those applying to maternity leave. The duration of additional leave ranges from no additional leave in some countries to over two years in Czechia, Finland, Hungary and the Slovak Republic (Table B1.3.).

Parental leave frameworks exhibit a marked gender imbalance, with most countries providing far more leave that is either reserved for mothers or shared within the family but predominantly used by mothers than that reserved for fathers. Paid parental and home care leave specifically reserved for fathers, as distinct from paternity leave taken around childbirth, remains limited, averaging 11 weeks across OECD countries, and several countries have none at all. Nevertheless, some countries offer fathers more substantial entitlements, including Japan, Korea and a number of European countries (Table B1.3.). These arrangements reflect broader efforts to promote a more equal sharing of childcare responsibilities and to support women's labour-market participation. At the same time, countries increasingly differ not only in the amount of leave available to fathers, but also in how leave is structured, shared and sequenced between parents.

Across OECD countries, parental leave systems are increasingly being designed to balance gender equality objectives, parental choice and incentives for fathers' participation, while also supporting mothers' return to employment and reducing the risk of prolonged labour-market interruptions following childbirth. However, the organisation and practical use of leave vary considerably. In Finland, a large share of parental leave is not earmarked for either parent and can be flexibly shared between mothers and fathers, with each parent entitled to 160 parental allowance days, of which up to 63 days may be transferred to the other parent. The Finnish model also allows both parents to take some of the leave simultaneously and measures entitlements in benefit days rather than weeks, illustrating the complexity of capturing such systems in international indicators (Government of Finland, 2026[10]). In Germany, parents are jointly entitled to 14 months of parental allowance, with each parent required to take at least two months and generally able to claim up to 12 months. The remaining months can be allocated flexibly between parents, although the simultaneous receipt of basic parental allowance is generally limited, illustrating how leave systems may combine incentives for fathers' participation with restrictions on concurrent leave-taking. In Spain, maternity and paternity leave are designed to be fully equivalent, individual and non-transferable entitlements with identical duration and payment conditions. However, although fathers' take-up has become nearly universal following the 2021 reform equalising leave at 16 weeks, much of their leave continues to be taken simultaneously with mothers' leave, limiting the extent to which it extends the overall duration of parental care (Farré et al., 2024[11]; Recio Alcaide, Castellanos Serrano and Andrés Jiménes, 2024[12]). In contrast, in Chile, mothers may transfer part of their parental postnatal leave entitlement to fathers from the seventh week onward, thereby introducing a more selective mechanism for sharing leave within the household. These examples highlight the diversity of approaches used to encourage fathers' participation in caregiving and to facilitate mothers' re-entry into the labour market, while also underscoring the importance of considering the timing, transferability and sequencing of leave when interpreting cross-country indicators of parental leave duration and use.

The availability of leave entitlements does not necessarily translate into equal take-up across parents. The use of parental leave is strongly influenced by compensation levels and broader structural factors, including labour-market conditions, cultural norms and socio-economic background, which shape families' decisions. Evidence from European countries shows that women remain the main users of parental leave, while lower participation by men continues to reinforce gender inequalities in care, employment and earnings (Lammi-Taskula et al., 2026[13]). In practice, workplace culture and job insecurity can also discourage take-up among women. For example, in Korea, some women do not fully use their parental leave entitlements due to concerns about job security and low wage replacement rates (Kim, Hwang and Kim, 2021[14]; Lee, 2023[15]).

Disparities in access and use also affect immigrant and minority parents. Studies from Belgium and the Nordic countries show that immigrant parents often have lower uptake of parental leave and related family support policies than native-born parents. In Belgium, first-generation migrant mothers, particularly those of Moroccan and Turkish origin, are less likely to use parental leave, partly due to having more precarious employment and difficulties meeting employment-based eligibility criteria (Kil, Wood and Neels, 2017[16]). In Sweden, immigrant fathers' use of parental leave also tends to be lower among recently arrived migrants and those with weaker labour-market attachment (Tervola, Duvander and Mussino, 2017[17]). Language barriers, limited awareness of entitlements and administrative complexity may further hinder access and take-up among immigrant and minority families.

The availability and generosity of parental leave may also vary within countries, depending on subnational policies and employer practices. For instance, although the United States does not have nationally mandated paid parental leave, several states, including California, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Washington and the District of Columbia, have introduced state-level paid leave schemes. Nevertheless, access remains limited: in 2021, only 23% of US workers had access to paid family leave, primarily through employer-sponsored benefits, while 89% had access to unpaid leave (OECD, 2022[18]). In other contexts, employers may supplement statutory provisions. For example, in Brazilian law generally provides 120 days of maternity leave and 5 days of paternity leave. However, in the public sector and in some private companies that participate in specific programmes, the maternity leave may be extended to 180 days.

Starting age and coverage of legal entitlement to ECEC

Legal entitlement to an ECEC place has become increasingly common over the past decade. Such entitlement typically obliges public authorities to guarantee access to ECEC services for children within a defined age range, upon parental request (Eurydice, 2025[5]). The starting age of universal legal entitlement varies considerably across countries, ranging from at or near birth in countries including Brazil, Hungary, Korea and Mexico to the age of 5, as in Chile, Colombia and the Republic of Türkiye. In some countries, entitlement starts before a child's first birthday, including Denmark (6 months), Finland (9 months) and Slovenia (11 months), reflecting more integrated early childhood systems. In Latvia, all children from the age of 18 months until the start of primary education are legally entitled to a place in a preschool institution. Municipalities are responsible for ensuring access and, where a municipal place is unavailable, local governments must cover the costs of attendance in a private preschool provider for eligible children (Table B1.3.).

Between 2015 and 2024, there has been a clear trend towards earlier entitlement among several countries. Reforms have focused on lowering the starting age of entitlement or expanding access through targeted measures, including fee reductions or different eligibility criteria for specific groups. One notable example is Hungary, where the starting age of entitlement shifted from age 3 to birth. In addition, some countries introduced legal entitlement for the first time over this period, including Czechia and Poland for 3-year-olds, Lithuania for 4-year-olds, the Slovak Republic – initially for 4-year-olds from 2024-25, extending to 3-year-olds from 2025-26 (Eurydice Unit Slovakia, 2023[19]) – and Türkiye for 5-year-olds (Table B1.3.).

Universal or targeted legal entitlements may be supported by a variety of policy instruments, including measures to improve affordability, increase the intensity of provision, and expand service availability. Many systems combine legal entitlement with income-based fee structures, especially before the start of compulsory education. For instance, Denmark, Finland and Slovenia provide early access, starting before age 1, through full-time services with fees adjusted according to household income. Other countries combine free provision with fee-based extensions. Sweden offers all children aged 3 and over 15 hours of free ECEC per week, alongside additional fee-based services (Serapioni, 2025[20]). In Portugal, ECEC is free for 25 hours per week for 3-6 year-olds, with additional hours subject to income-based fees, while younger children face a combination of flat-rate and income-related charges. Poland provides a similar entitlement of 25 free hours per week from the age of 3, although implementation remains uneven, particularly for younger children (Serapioni, 2025[20]). In practice, the availability of places and the capacity of local services may influence access as much as formal entitlement provisions (Box B1.2).

Reductions in fees, expansion of available places, investment in childcare centres and the extension of opening hours can also play an important role in improving access and supporting enrolment, particularly for younger children. In Chile, access to public ECEC is mainly organised through targeted policies rather than a fully universal entitlement. Public ECEC provision through JUNJI (Junta Nacional de Jardines Infantiles) and Fundación Integra is available free of charge from 85 days of age, with access guaranteed for children belonging to the 60% most socioeconomically vulnerable population. In addition, Article 203 of the Chilean Labour Code establishes the right of working mothers employed in companies with 20 or more female workers to access childcare services for their children under two years of age. This constitutes a non-waivable and enforceable right supervised by the Dirección del Trabajo (Ministry of Education of Chile, 2026[21]; The Chilean Labour Directorate, 2026[22]). New Zealand operates a co-funded early childhood education (ECE) system in which costs are shared between the government and parents. The system is largely based on a demand-driven, supply-side funding model, with most public funding delivered directly to providers through enrolment-based subsidies and grants. This includes universal activity-based measures such as the ECE Subsidy and the 20 Hours ECE scheme, alongside needs-based support for disadvantaged or isolated communities through Equity funding, and individualised assistance for families through childcare subsidies and FamilyBoost rebates (Ministry of Education of New Zealand, 2026[23]). In Ireland, access to free and universal ECEC programmes begins at age 2 years and 8 months; however, participation is not supported by a legal entitlement (Department of Children, 2019[24]). Lithuania and Luxembourg both provide 20 hours of free ECEC per week. In Lithuania, the entitlement begins at age 3, while in Luxembourg it is available for children aged 1 to 4 (Serapioni, 2025[20]).

Starting age of compulsory education

Lowering the starting age of compulsory education to include some pre-primary education has become an increasingly common policy lever to boost enrolment in ECEC, particularly among targeted groups. Over the past decade, several countries have introduced or expanded compulsory pre-primary education as part of wider efforts to increase participation. However, evidence from recent reforms suggests that the effects of these policies cannot be assessed solely through short-term changes in enrolment or public expenditure. In many countries, participation rates in early childhood education were already high and the infrastructure largely in place prior to the reforms. Lowering the compulsory starting age has thus served to consolidate existing participation

patterns, strengthen legal guarantees and improve equity and inclusiveness, particularly for disadvantaged groups (OECD, 2025[6]).

Reforms introduced since 2015 illustrate this trend. Compulsory pre-primary education has been introduced or extended to 3-year-olds in France (2019) and Hungary (2015); 4-year-olds in Costa Rica (2018), Greece (2020) and Romania (2023) (with Bulgaria lowering the age from 5 to 4 in 2023); and 5-year-olds in Belgium (2020), Czechia (2017) and the Slovak Republic (2021). In other countries, such as Finland (2015), Lithuania (2016) and Sweden (2018), compulsory participation has been introduced for 6-year-olds. These changes reflect a gradual shift towards earlier universal participation in structured early education. As a result, pre-primary education is now compulsory for at least one year in 26 OECD and partner countries. In 13 countries, it begins one year before entry into primary education, while in others it starts earlier (Table B1.3.)

Box B1.1. Interactive visualisations of the structure of ECEC programmes

An interactive online platform is available to provide complementary contextual information on early childhood education and care (ECEC) programmes. It gives information on the different types of programmes, their duration and starting ages as well as information regarding their governance, curriculum frameworks and monitoring methods.

The platform can be accessed via the Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) Systems Dashboard.

Enrolment of children under 3

Participation in ECEC before the age of 3 is closely linked to wider social policies, including parental leave, income support, childcare subsidies and the timing of access to ECEC services, all of which vary considerably across OECD countries, as discussed above. Cross-country comparisons should be interpreted with caution, as higher enrolment is not always an explicit policy goal and may also reflect differences in family preferences, labour-market conditions and care arrangements (UNESCO, 2026[25]).


Provision of ECEC for the youngest children can be a complex mix of educational programmes classified as ISCED programmes and other registered services that remain outside ISCED classification. In several countries, the main form of provision for this age group are other registered ECEC services, which do not fully meet ISCED 2011 criteria (OECD/Eurostat/UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2015[26]) (Box B1.1). For example, in France and the Netherlands, children under 3 are primarily enrolled in such services, with participation rates for children under 2 reaching 47% in France and 69% in the Netherlands, and 66% and 88% for 2-year-olds (Table B1.1.). In contrast, countries such as Israel, Korea and Luxembourg achieve high participation mainly through early childhood educational development (ISCED 01) programmes. Enrolment rates in these services are 51% of those under 2 and 75% of 2-year-olds in Israel, 56% and 97% in Korea, and 61% and 81% in Luxembourg (Table B1.1.).

Average ECEC enrolment rates among 2-year-olds reached 63% across OECD countries in 2024, but variation remains wide. Participation is near universal in Iceland (94%), Korea (97%), Norway (95%) and Sweden (93%), supported by integrated systems and early entitlement to ECEC. In contrast, enrolment remains very low in Mexico at 9%, illustrating substantial cross-country differences in participation in formal early childhood education and care (Figure B1.3).

In many countries, participation is highly age sensitive, increasing sharply as children reach their second birthday. For instance, in Latvia, enrolment rises from 12% of children under 2 to 86% of 2-year-olds, with similar patterns also found in Iceland, Lithuania and Sweden (Figure B1.3).

Figure B1.3. Enrolment rates of children under 3 in early childhood education (ISCED 0) and other ECEC services (outside ISCED), by age group (2024)

In per cent



Note: Some countries have other registered ECEC services which form part of their overall provision but do not meet all the ISCED 2011 Level 0 criteria to be classified as educational programmes. Panel A shows the countries that either report enrolment data for these other services or where such services do not exist. Panel B shows countries where these services exist, but they only have enrolment data for ISCED 0 programmes.
1. There are no ECEC services that fall outside ISCED classification.
2. Non-ISCED programme(s) operate(s) in drop-in basis, so the registration and attendance are not regular.
3. Year of reference differs from 2024.
4. Year of reference differs from 2015.
5. Early childhood education excludes early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01) being offered in the Flemish Community.
For data, see Table B1.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/1he0vc.

Trends in enrolment of children under 3

Participation in ECEC for children under 2 has expanded in several countries over the past decade, although increases remain uneven. Israel recorded one of the most significant increases, with enrolment in early childhood educational development programmes more than doubling from 22% in 2015 to 51% in 2024 (Table B1.1.). This expansion has been supported by increased public investment and efforts to widen access to subsidised childcare services as part of broader labour-market and family policies (OECD, 2023[27]). Since 2015, Korea and the Netherlands have also experienced substantial increases in participation among children under age 2, rising by 23 percentage points to 56% in ISCED 01 services in Korea and by 25 percentage points to 69% in other registered ECEC services in the Netherlands (Table B1.1.). In Korea, this increase is closely linked to long-standing policies to expand ECEC provision, including the introduction of free childcare in 2012, tax incentives to reduce the financial burden of raising children and continued efforts to build a comprehensive and integrated ECEC system (Dougherty and C. Morabito, 2023[28]). Recent reforms have also focused on improving access through better co-ordination of supply and demand and system integration (OECD, 2025[29]). By contrast, among countries with complete enrolment data, Bulgaria, Germany and Mexico recorded only modest increases of a few percentage points over the past decade (Table B1.1.).

Participation levels among 2-year-olds are generally higher and have increased more consistently across most countries. Israel, Japan and Lithuania recorded the largest increases, each rising by at least 30 percentage points. In Finland, the rise in enrolment from 53% in 2015 to 77% in 2024 reflects sustained investment in ECEC and the provision of subsidised services, with public funding playing a central role in improving accessibility and supporting participation (Table B1.1.). In Ireland, the increase from 15% to 39% is closely linked to policy reforms aimed at improving affordability and access (Table B1.1.). The introduction and then expansion of the Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) programme, and the implementation of the National Childcare Scheme in 2019, which provides income-related and universal subsidies for children from 6 months old, have significantly reduced costs for families and encouraged participation (OECD, 2025[30]).

Lithuania also recorded substantial growth in enrolment among 2-year-olds, with participation rising from 57% to 87% over the period. This increase is associated with policies ensuring affordability and access, including the provision of free ECEC hours for

young children and strong public financing mechanisms designed to reduce barriers for families (Eurydice, 2024[31]). Such approaches, combining universal access with financial support, have been found to be effective at expanding participation (OECD, 2025[6]). In Poland, participation increased from 16% to 36%, driven in part by the expansion of services outside formal ISCED programmes (Table B1.1.). Recent years have seen a steady increase in the number of childcare institutions and municipalities offering services, supported by public funding from both national and European sources. Policies aimed at improving geographical coverage, particularly in rural areas, and expanding affordable childcare places have contributed to rising participation among young children (Eurydice, 2024[32]).

Box B1.2. Unmet demand in early childhood education and care centres

Waiting lists for early childhood education and care (ECEC) services remain common in many OECD countries, highlighting how statutory entitlements do not always translate into immediate access, as capacity constraints may lag behind the pace of policy expansion. Even in systems with high overall enrolment, bottlenecks due to local or system-wide shortages can delay children's entry into early learning.

In 2024, a notable share of ECEC leaders in pre-primary centres reported that there were children who were still awaiting a place in their centre, particularly in Denmark (38%), the Flemish Community of Belgium (22%) and Sweden (21%). Note that these percentages refer to the share of centres reporting waiting lists rather than the share of children waiting for a place. Furthermore, some children may already be enrolled in another ECEC setting. In Denmark, where all children are guaranteed access to an age-appropriate ECEC provision from 26 weeks of age until school entry, municipalities allocate places according to waiting-list rules (The Ministry of Education of Denmark, 2026[33]). Similarly, in Sweden, reports of waiting lists may partly reflect situations in which families do not obtain a place in their preferred centre, rather than an inability to access ECEC altogether. In both Denmark and Sweden, leaders frequently report that children are eventually enrolled after an initial wait, suggesting temporary capacity pressures or constraints in accessing preferred settings rather than persistent shortages of provision. Conversely, in countries such as Japan and Spain, a notable proportion of centre leaders report that demand is not formally registered at the centre level. This may reflect the organisation of admission systems, as placement allocation and demand management are often handled by municipalities or educational authorities rather than by individual centres. Consequently, centre leaders may have limited visibility of overall demand, even where formal application, allocation and monitoring procedures are in place. Meanwhile, fewer delays are reported in Colombia, Israel and Türkiye, where waiting list pressures appear more limited (Figure B1.4, Panel A).


Capacity constraints are more pronounced for children under the age of 3. In Germany and Israel, 41% of leaders in centres for these children reported that applicants remained on waiting lists at the time of the survey, underscoring persistent shortages for this age group (Figure B1.4, Panel B).

Potential reasons behind unmet demand in ECEC centres

Unmet demand reflects a combination of inter-related factors. First, rising maternal employment and improved affordability can drive demand faster than supply can adjust. Second, supply-side constraints, particularly workforce shortages linked to recruitment challenges and low wages, may limit expansion. Third, system design influences how effectively supply responds to demand: more market-oriented systems, such as Ireland, may face co-ordination challenges because provision is delivered by a large number of independent providers, making it harder to ensure that capacity expands where it is most needed. Finally, demographic pressures also play a role. In Israel, high fertility rates are sustaining a strong demand for childcare places, particularly for younger children, increasing pressure on available capacity (Blank and Silverman, 2023[34]; Tercatin, 2026[35]). Overall, unmet demand reflects not only insufficient provision but also the interaction between policy design, labour-market dynamics and demographic trends.

Figure B1.4. Unmet demand in early childhood education and care centres (2024)

Percentage of ECEC centres whose leaders report the following applied in the 12 months prior to the survey



1. Estimates should be interpreted with caution due to a higher risk of non-response bias.
2. Municipalities have a statutory obligation to provide an ECEC place within 4 months of application (or within 2 weeks in urgent cases, such as parental employment). Families anticipate this and apply in advance for a place. Families may also be queuing for a transfer to another ECEC setting. In neither case does this reflect unmet demand as such.
Source: (OECD, 2025[36]), *Results from TALIS Starting Strong 2024: Strengthening Early Childhood Education and Care*, TALIS, https://doi.org/10.1787/20af08c0-en.

Recent policy responses to unmet demand in ECEC centres

Countries have adopted a range of strategies to expand capacity and reduce waiting lists. In Germany, recent reforms have focused on expanding provision through sustained public investment and improved staffing conditions, with further measures reinforced in 2025 to support regional authorities (KMK, 2022[37]). In Ireland, the Core Funding model introduced in 2022 provides stable public funding to providers in exchange for commitments to expand capacity and improve accessibility, aiming to gradually increase provision while maintaining affordability (Government of Ireland, 2022[38]).

Addressing unmet demand is essential if ECEC systems are to provide universal and equitable access while supporting labour-market participation. Insufficient capacity may leave parents, particularly mothers, reliant on informal care, needing to reduce their working hours or stop working altogether, reinforcing gender inequalities. Persistent shortages can also affect quality if rapid expansion leads to higher child-to-staff ratios or increased reliance on less qualified personnel. Aligning supply with legal entitlements is therefore critical to ensuring that all children benefit from early education.

Enrolment of children from the age of 3 to the start of compulsory primary education

Participation in ECEC increases markedly as children approach primary school age, with near-universal enrolment typically reached by ages 4 or 5. On average, enrolment among 3-year-olds stands at 77% across OECD countries, although participation is already universal in France and Israel (100%) and nearly so in Belgium (98%), Hungary (99%) and the United Kingdom (98%) (Table B1.2.). Participation remains much lower at this age in countries such as Costa Rica (7%), Saudi Arabia (5%) and Türkiye (15%). However, enrolment rises sharply as children approach primary education, reaching 100% by age 4 in Costa Rica and 87% by age 5 in Türkiye, reflecting the expansion of provision focused on the years immediately preceding primary education (Table B1.2.). In some cases, participation may be underestimated due to missing data on other registered services, which may account for additional enrolment in countries such as Costa Rica, Greece, Saudi Arabia and Switzerland (Table B1.2.).

Once children reach the age of 5, the transition to primary education starts to become a key differentiating factor in enrolment rates. Although on average most children of this age in OECD countries are in pre-primary education (86%), a large share will

have already entered primary school in Australia (75%), Ireland (96%), New Zealand (87%) and the United Kingdom (97%). Differences in national education structures and the typical starting age of primary education thus influence the type of provision children attend before the age of 6, which is the average age when children start primary school across OECD countries (Table B1.2.).

By the age of 6, a strong divide emerges between the OECD countries where children remain in early childhood education and those where they have already transitioned to primary education. On average, 26% of this age group are still enrolled in ECE, while 71% are in primary education. In Finland (96%), Latvia (95%), Poland (99%) and Sweden (98%), the vast majority of 6-year-olds remain in ECE. In contrast, in countries like India, Ireland, Japan, Korea and Peru, all children have already transitioned to primary education by this age (Table B1.2.).

The starting age of compulsory education is another critical determinant of enrolment patterns. Among children aged between 3 and the starting age for compulsory primary education, enrolment rates reach 96% or higher in most countries that have introduced compulsory pre-primary education, including Belgium, France, Hungary, Israel, Latvia and Luxembourg. An earlier start for primary education is also associated with high ECEC participation: enrolment among 3-4 year-olds reaches 95% in Ireland and 99% in the United Kingdom. In contrast, where there is no compulsory participation in any educational level at age 5, enrolment tends to remain lower, suggesting that institutional frameworks, rather than parental preferences alone, play a central role in achieving near-universal participation (Figure B1.1 and Table B1.3).

Trends in enrolment of children from the age of 3 to the start of compulsory primary education

Between 2015 and 2024, a clear association emerged between the lowering of compulsory starting ages and substantial growth in enrolment rates across the OECD. On average, participation for children from age 3 to the start of primary education rose from 86% to 90% over this period (Table B1.2.). The most pronounced increases occurred in countries implementing major policy reforms. For instance, Costa Rica saw its enrolment rate for this group rise from 51% to 72% after lowering the compulsory starting age to 4. Similarly, Brazil, Lithuania and the Slovak Republic recorded increases of at least 10 percentage points as they progressively integrated pre-primary education into compulsory frameworks (Table B1.2. and Figure B1.1). The effects of these reforms extend beyond short-term enrolment increases and may also reflect wider efforts to strengthen inclusiveness and formalise participation in ECEC systems (OECD, 2025[6]). Overall, these developments point to a broader shift across the OECD towards earlier institutional engagement in education, with the aim of ensuring that more children benefit from structured learning environments during their formative years.

In addition to changes in compulsory frameworks, targeted policy interventions have also contributed to increased participation. In Croatia, enrolment among this age group rose from 70% to 88%, supported by efforts to expand kindergarten infrastructure, improve access in rural and under-served areas, and strengthen staffing capacity (Eurydice Unit Croatia, 2022[39]). In Türkiye, participation increased from 38% to 51%, reflecting sustained government investment in pre-primary education, including the construction of new kindergartens and measures to improve access in disadvantaged regions (OECD, 2020[40]). Luxembourg also recorded a 10 percentage-point increase, reaching 96%, driven in part by the expansion of the *Chèque-service accueil* system, which combines childcare subsidies with free ECEC hours to reduce financial barriers for families (OECD, 2019[41]).

The Sustainable Development Goal 4 Indicators (SDG 4) monitoring framework also places strong emphasis on children's participation in education before entry into primary school. SDG indicator 4.2.4 measures the net enrolment rate in early childhood education programmes, reflecting the extent to which children of the official age group have access to early learning opportunities that support their development and future educational success. Complementing this measure, SDG indicator 4.2.2 focuses specifically on participation in organised learning one year before the official primary entry age, providing a globally comparable measure of children's readiness for formal schooling. Readers interested in exploring these indicators further can consult the OECD SDG 4 Dashboard, which provides interactive access to SDG indicators and country results.

Definitions

Childcare gap: The period between the end of paid parental leave and the age at which children become legally entitled to access ECEC services.

Early childhood education and care (ECEC) refers to services and programmes supporting the education, development, well-being and care of young children before entry into primary education, including both educational programmes classified as ISCED level 0 and other regulated childcare arrangements outside the formal education system.

Early childhood education (ECE) refers specifically to the educational component of ECEC, corresponding to programmes classified as ISCED level 0. These programmes provide holistic learning opportunities to support children's cognitive, physical, social and emotional development through organised and intentional educational activities.

ECE services: Institutionalised ECEC arrangements, including centre-based, community-based and recognised home-based settings, operating within a national regulatory framework. For international reporting, these services must provide intentional educational activities for at least two hours per day and 100 days per year.

ISCED 01 refers to **early childhood educational development** services covering programmes designed primarily for children aged 0 to 2. These programmes provide intentional educational content aimed at supporting early developmental milestones through organised learning activities in institutional or recognised home-based settings. **ISCED 02** refers to **pre-primary education** programmes generally designed for children from age 3 until the start of primary education. These programmes focus on socialisation, early learning and school readiness through structured and guided educational activities.

Legal entitlement to ECEC: Legal entitlement to ECEC refers to a right established by law that obliges public authorities or institutions to provide a ECEC service to individuals who meet defined criteria. This right is enforceable, meaning eligible individuals can claim it and, if necessary, seek legal remedies if the obligation is not fulfilled.

Maternity leave (or pregnancy leave): Maternity leave refers to employment-protected leave for employed women around the time of childbirth (and, in some countries, adoption).

Paid parental and home care leave reserved for fathers refers to weeks of employment-protected leave that can be used only by the father or other parent.

Paid parental and home care leave available to mothers includes all weeks of employment-protected leave for parents, often supplementary to maternity and paternity leave and typically following maternity leave, as well as leave that allows a parent to remain at home to care for a child, provided these weeks are either reserved for the mother or can be shared within the family, and excluding any weeks reserved exclusively for the father.

Paternity leave refers to employment-protected leave available to fathers around the time of childbirth. It is generally shorter than maternity leave and often paid at or close to full wage replacement.

Unmet demand: A situation in which demand for ECEC services exceeds the available supply of places, limiting families' ability to access their preferred ECEC arrangements.

Methodology

Enrolment rates

Net enrolment rates are calculated by dividing the number of children of a particular age / age group enrolled in ECEC by the size of the population of that age / age group. While enrolment and population figures refer to the same period in most cases, mismatches may occur due to data availability and different sources used in some countries. Therefore, population data are adjusted when calculating enrolment rates by age so that if the cumulative enrolment data across all ISCED levels exceed the population data for a particular age, the population data for that age are adjusted to match the total enrolment for the corresponding age.

Enrolment rates from age 3 to the start of compulsory primary education are calculated based on the methodology described above. The indicator begins at age 3 for all countries, but the upper age limit varies depending on the starting age of compulsory primary education in each country. For example, as compulsory primary education starts at age 6 in Australia, the indicator measures the net enrolment rate of children aged 3 to 5 (inclusive).

Childcare gap

The childcare gap is calculated as the period between the end of paid parental leave and the start of a legal entitlement to ECEC or compulsory education. Parental leave is first converted from weeks into years by summing maternity leave, home care leave for mothers and leave for fathers, and dividing the total by 52. Where parental leave overlaps with the start of legal entitlement, this overlap is deducted to avoid double counting.

For countries with a universal legal entitlement to ECEC, the childcare gap is calculated as the difference between the starting age of that entitlement and the end of paid parental leave. If parental leave extends beyond the entitlement start age, the childcare gap is set to zero.

For countries without a universal entitlement, or where entitlement is not applicable or missing, the childcare gap is calculated as the time between the end of paid parental leave and the start of compulsory education, whether at pre-primary or primary level.

Sources

Data refer to the reference year 2024 (school year 2023/24) and are based on the UNESCO-UIS/OECD/Eurostat data collection on education statistics administered by the OECD in 2026. For more information, see Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

The UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) provided some data for Argentina, the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and Thailand.

Data on parental leave indicators are from the OECD Family database (OECD, 2025[42]).

Data on unmet demand in early childhood education and care centres are from TALIS 2024 (OECD, 2025[36]).

References

Berger, L., L. Panico and A. Solaz (2026), "Can early universal preschool reduce socioeconomic inequalities in child development? The role of duration and intensity of preschool attendance in the French birth cohort, Elfe", *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, Vol. 76, pp. 272-286, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2026.03.010. [4]

Blank, C. and S. Silverman (2023), "Free early childhood education: Challenges and policy alternatives", *Early Childhood Research Series*, No. 11, Taub Center, https://www.taubcenter.org.il/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/ECEC-Position-Paper-ENG-2023.pdf (accessed on 10 May 2026). [34]

Daly, M. and M. Uzunalioğlu (2026), "The childcare gap in Europe: Probing policy constructions of work-life balance and parental agency", *Journal of Family Studies*, pp. 1-21, https://doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2026.2626691. [8]

Department of Children, D. (2019), *Early Childhood Care and Education Programme (ECCE)*, https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-children-disability-and-equality/publications/early-childhood-care-and-education-programme-ecce/ (accessed on 29 May 2026). [24]

Dougherty, S. and C. Morabito (2023), *OECD Journal on Budgeting, Volume 2023 Issue 2*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/79ab69f5-en (accessed on 10 May 2026). [28]

Eurydice (2025), *Data and Visuals: Gap between childcare leave and place guarantee in ECEC*, European Commission, https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/data-and-visuals/early-childhood-education-and-care (accessed on 10 May 2026). [5]

Eurydice (2024), *Early childhood education and care in Lithuania: Access*, European Commission, https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia/lithuania/access (accessed on 10 May 2026). [31]

Eurydice (2024), *Early childhood education and care in Poland: Access*, European Commission, https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia/poland/access (accessed on 10 May 2026). [32]

Eurydice Unit Croatia (2022), *Croatia: Comprehensive steps to improve early childhood education and care (ECEC)*, European Commission, https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/news/croatia-comprehensive-steps-improve-early-childhood-education-and-care-ecec (accessed on 10 May 2026). [39]

Eurydice Unit Slovakia (2023), *Slovakia: Introduction of a legal entitlement to pre-primary education*, European Commission, https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/news/slovakia-introduction-legal-entitlement-pre-primary-education (accessed on 10 May 2026). [19]

Farré, L. et al. (2024), "¿Qué sabemos sobre el uso de los permisos de paternidad en España?", *EsadeEcPol Brief*, No. 46, Center for Economic Policy, https://www.esade.edu/ecpol/es/publicaciones/que-sabemos-sobre-el-uso-de-los-permisos-de-paternidad-en-espana/ (accessed on 19 May 2026). [11]

Government of Finland (2026), *Family benefits*, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, https://stm.fi/en/income-security/financial-assistance-families (accessed on 19 May 2026). [10]

Government of Ireland (2022), *Minister O'Gorman launches 'Together for Better' new funding model for Early Learning and Care and School Age Childcare as Core Funding contracts begin for 4,000 services*, Department of Children, Disability and Equality, https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-children-disability-and-equality/press-releases/minister-ogorman-launches-together-for-better-new-funding-model-for-early-learning-and-care-and-school-age-childcare-as-core-funding-contracts-begin-for-4000-services/ (accessed on 10 May 2026). [38]

Hobson, B. (2011), "The agency gap in work-life balance: Applying Sen's capabilities framework within European contexts", *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, Vol. 18/2, pp. 147-167, https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxr012. [7]

ILO (2023), "The benefits of investing in transformative childcare policy packages towards gender equality and social justice", *ILO Brief*, International Labour Organization, Geneva, https://doi.org/10.54394/LCOE5158. [9]

Kil, T., J. Wood and K. Neels (2017), "Parental leave uptake among migrant and native mothers in Belgium", *N-IUSSP*, https://www.niussp.org/fertility-and-reproduction/parental-leave-uptake-among-migrant-and-native-mothers-in-belgium/ (accessed on 13 May 2026). [16]

Kim, E., W. Hwang and M. Kim (2021), "Determinants of perceived accessibility of maternity leave and childcare leave in South Korea", *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, Vol. 18/19, p. 10286, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph181910286. [14]

KMK (2022), *Excerpt - Early Childhood Education and Care*, Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education, Science and Cultural Affairs, https://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/Dateien/pdf/Eurydice/EN/early_childhood_education_and_care.pdf. [37]

Lammi-Taskula, J. et al. (2026), *Mapping the Unknown: Research Gaps in Parenting Leave Inequality Research in Europe*, COST Action Parental Leave Policies and Social Sustainability (Sustainability@Leave), https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/8kbsz_v1 (accessed on 10 May 2026). [13]

Lee, Y. (2023), "Norms about childcare, working hours, and fathers' uptake of parental leave in South Korea", *Community, Work and Family*, Vol. 26/4, pp. 466-491, https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2022.2031889. [15]

Ministry of Education of Chile (2026), *Early Childhood Education Admission Regulations*. [21]

Ministry of Education of New Zealand (2026), *Early Childhood Education Funding Review Ministerial Advisory Group: Report on Discovery Phase engagement September 2025 – January 2026*, https://www.education.govt.nz/our-work/strategies-policies-and-programmes/early-learning/ministerial-advisory-group-early-childhood-education-funding-system-review/early-childhood-education-funding-system-review-engagement (accessed on 28 May 2026). [23]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en. [6]

OECD (2025), *Indicator PF2.1. Parental leave systems*, OECD Family Database, https://webfs.oecd.org/els-com/Family_Database/PF2_1_Parental_leave_systems.pdf (accessed on 16 July 2024). [42]

OECD (2025), *Results from TALIS Starting Strong 2024: Strengthening Early Childhood Education and Care*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/20af08c0-en. [36]

OECD (2025), *Starting Strong VIII Country Notes: Ireland*, OECD, Paris, https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/support-materials/2025/01/reducing-inequalities-by-investing-in-early-childhood-education-and-care_a0fd3f31/Ireland-country-note25Feb.pdf (accessed on 10 May 2026). [30]

OECD (2025), *Starting Strong VIII Country Notes: Korea*, OECD, Paris, https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/support-materials/2025/01/reducing-inequalities-by-investing-in-early-childhood-education-and-care_a0fd3f31/Korea-country-note-25Feb.pdf (accessed on 10 May 2026). [29]

OECD (2023), *OECD Economic Surveys: Israel 2023*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/901365a6-en. [27]

OECD (2022), *OECD Economic Surveys: United States 2022*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/eeb7cbe9-en (accessed on 8 May 2024). [18]

OECD (2021), *Starting Strong VI: Supporting Meaningful Interactions in Early Childhood Education and Care*, Starting Strong, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/f47a06ae-en. [3]

OECD (2020), "Education policy outlook in Turkey", *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, No. 23, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b7c69f4c-en. [40]

OECD (2019), *Luxembourg – Starting Strong VI Country Note*, OECD, Paris, https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/about/programmes/edu/ecec/migrate/starting-strong-vi/StartingStrongVI-CountryNote-Luxembourg.pdf (accessed on 10 May 2026). [41]

OECD/Eurostat/UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2015), *ISCED 2011 Operational Manual: Guidelines for Classifying National Education Programmes and Related Qualifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264228368-en. [26]

Recio Alcaide, A., C. Castellanos Serrano and J. Andrés Jiménes (2024), "¿Cómo incide el nuevo diseño de los permisos de nacimiento en la corresponsabilidad? Un análisis con registros administrativos de la Seguridad Social de 2016 a 2023", *Papeles de Trabajo*, No. 4/2024, Instituto de Estudios Fiscales, Madrid, https://cpage.mpr.gob.es/producto/como-incide-el-nuevo-diseno-de-los-permisos-de-nacimiento-en-la-corresponsabilidad/ (accessed on 19 May 2026). [12]

Serapioni, M. (2025), *Childcare Gap in the European Union: A 2025 Overview*, COFACE, https://coface-eu.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/Observatory_childcaregap_website.pdf (accessed on 10 May 2026). [20]

Shuey, E. and M. Kankaraš (2018), "The power and promise of early learning", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 186, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/f9b2e53f-en. [2]

Tercatin, R. (2026), *Jerusalem daycare deaths put spotlight on longstanding gaps in Haredi early childhood care*, The Times of Israel, https://www.timesofisrael.com/jerusalem-daycare-deaths-put-spotlight-on-longstanding-gaps-in-haredi-early-childhood-care/ (accessed on 10 May 2026). [35]

Tervola, J., A. Duvander and E. Mussino (2017), "Promoting parental leave for immigrant fathers—What role does policy play?", *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, Vol. 24/3, pp. 269-297, https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxx006. [17]

The Chilean Labour Directorate (2026), *Right to a Nursery*, https://www.dt.gob.cl/portal/1626/w3-article-59956.html (accessed on 28 May 2026). [22]

The Ministry of Education of Denmark (2026), *Admission to daycare*, https://uvm.dk/dagtilbud/plads-i-dagtilbud/optagelse-i-dagtilbud (accessed on 26 June 2026). [33]

UNESCO (2026), *Global Education Monitoring Report 2026: Access and Equity, Countdown to 2030*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, https://doi.org/10.54676/JLKL3223. [25]

Yoshikawa, H., C. Weiland and J. Brooks-Gunn (2016), "When does preschool matter?", *The Future of Children*, Vol. 26/2, pp. 21-35, https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1118535.pdf. [1]

Chapter B1 Tables

Tables and notes

Table B1.1	Trends in enrolment rates of children under 3, by type of provision (2015 and 2024)
Table B1.2	Enrolment rates of children over 2, by age and type of provision (2024)
Table B1.3	Duration of parental leave (2025) and trends in starting ages for legal ECEC entitlement and compulsory education (2015 and 2024)

StatLink https://stat.link/1he0vc

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/1he0vc.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Table B1.1. Trends in enrolment rates of children under 3, by type of provision (2015 and 2024)

Public and private institutions

	Under age 2				Age 2					
	Other registered ECEC services		Early childhood educational development (ISCED 01)		Other registered ECEC services		Early childhood educational development (ISCED 01)		Pre-primary (ISCED 02)	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
OECD countries										
Australia	1	4	29	36	1	2	56	65	0	0
Austria[1]	x(5)	x(6)	6	10	7[d]	6[d]	32	45	7	8
Belgium	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	52	52
Canada[2]	m	18	m	20	m	23	m	45	m	m
Chile	0	0	13	20	1	1	30	43	1	0
Colombia	m	27	m	6	m	21	m	27	1	0
Costa Rica	m	m	1	2	m	m	3	5	0	0
Czechia	m	m	a	a	m	m	a	a	13	10
Denmark	m	m	42	39	m	m	90	87	1	0
Estonia[3]	1	3	5	8	7	8	x(9)	x(10)	61[d]	66[d]
Finland	m	m	15	23	m	m	53	77	0	0
France	m	47	a	a	m	66	a	a	12	10
Germany	a	a	23	26	a	a	66	73	0	0
Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary	a	a	m	5	a	a	m	55	0	0
Iceland	m	m	21	22	m	m	95	94	0	0
Ireland[4]	m	m	4	12	m	m	15	39	0	0
Israel	a	a	22	51	a	a	40	75	0	0
Italy	m	m	a	m	m	m	a	m	16	14
Japan	a	a	17	33	a	a	36	63	4	10
Korea	a	a	33	56	a	a	89	97	0	0
Latvia[1]	m	x(6)	7	12	m	3[d]	67	83	0	0
Lithuania	a	a	6	14	a	a	57	87	0	0
Luxembourg	m	m	m	61	m	m	m	81	m	0
Mexico	a	a	1	3	a	a	5	4	0	5
Netherlands	44	69	a	a	78	88	a	a	0	0
New Zealand	5	4	30	31	8	5	65	68	0	0
Norway	m	m	36	43	m	m	91	95	0	0
Poland	4	12	a	a	9	28	a	a	7	7
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0	0
Slovak Republic	m	m	a	a	m	m	a	a	13	15
Slovenia	m	m	21	30	m	m	69	85	0	0
Spain	m	m	23	34	m	m	56	73	0	0
Sweden	1	0	24	27	3	1	87	92	0	0
Switzerland	m	m	a	a	m	m	a	a	0	0
Türkiye	a	a	m	m	a	a	m	m	0	0
United Kingdom[4]	m	m	1	1	m	m	55	53	0	0
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
OECD average	**m**	**m**	**13**	**19**	**m**	**m**	**40**	**50**	**6**	**6**

	Under age 2				Age 2					
	Other registered ECEC services		Early childhood educational development (ISCED 01)		Other registered ECEC services		Early childhood educational development (ISCED 01)		Pre-primary (ISCED 02)	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Partner and/or accession countries										
Argentina	m	m	2	3	m	m	10	15	0	0
Brazil	a	a	11	18	a	a	32	48	0	0
Bulgaria	4	5	a	a	39	44	a	a	11	16
China	m	m	a	a	m	m	a	a	m	m
Croatia	m	m	11	19	m	m	31	49	6	10
India	m	m	a	a	m	m	a	a	0	0
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0	0
Peru	m	m	0	4	m	m	0	13	0	0
Romania	m	m	1	2	m	m	6	12	12	14
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0	0
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0	0
Thailand[4]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	1	1
EU25 average	**m**	**m**	**14**	**21**	**m**	**m**	**52**	**67**	**9**	**9**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**2**	**3**

Note: Early childhood education (ECE) = ISCED 0, other registered ECEC services = ECEC services outside the scope of ISCED 0, because they are not in adherence with all ISCED criteria. To be classified in ISCED 0, ECEC services should: 1) have adequate intentional educational properties; 2) be institutionalised (usually school-based or otherwise institutionalised for a group of children); 3) have an intensity of at least 2 hours per day of educational activities and a duration of at least 100 days a year; 4) have a regulatory framework recognised by the relevant national authorities (e.g. curriculum); and 5) have trained or accredited staff (e.g. requirement of pedagogical qualifications for educators).

1. For other registered ECEC services, 2-year-olds includes children under the age of 2.
2. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2023 for Canada.
3. Early childhood educational development (ISCED 01) for children under 2 represents all enrolment in early childhood education (ISCED 0).
4. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2017 for Ireland; 2019 for Thailand; and 2020 for the United Kingdom.

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/1he0vc.

Table B1.2. Enrolment rates of children over 2, by age and type of provision (2024)

Public and private institutions

	Age 3		Age 4		Age 5		Age 6		Age 3 to the start of compulsory primary education	
	Other registered ECEC services	Early childhood education (ISCED 0)	Early childhood education (ISCED 0)	Primary education	Early childhood education (ISCED 0)	Primary education	Early childhood education (ISCED 0)	Primary education	All programmes	
	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
OECD countries										
Australia[1]	2	81	93	2	25	75	2	98	85	92
Austria[2]	2	81	93	0	97	0	42	57	88	91
Belgium[3]	m	98	98	0	97	1	4	94	98	98
Canada	m	m	m	0	93	0	0	96	m	m
Chile	0	61	83	0	91	0	24	69	79	79
Colombia	9	55	78	0	84	16	5	82	87	78
Costa Rica	m	7	100	0	100	0	2	97	51	72
Czechia	m	74	88	0	94	0	47	47	85	85
Denmark	m	95	97	0	96	1	6	93	98	96
Estonia	2	88	91	0	93	0	91	1	91	91
Finland	m	87	91	0	93	0	96	0	80	92
France	0	100	100	0	99	1	2	98	100	100
Germany	a	92	96	0	98	0	42	58	96	96
Greece[3]	m	0	97	0	100	0	5	95	63	66
Hungary	a	99	98	0	97	0	54	41	92	98
Iceland	m	96	96	0	96	0	0	99	97	96
Ireland[4]	m	91	79	18	2	96	0	100	m	95
Israel	a	100	97	0	96	1	11	85	98	98
Italy[3]	m	92	95	0	89	7	1	97	96	94
Japan	a	90	97	0	98	0	0	100	91	95
Korea	a	96	97	0	94	0	0	100	92	96
Latvia	1	93	95	0	97	0	95	3	93	96
Lithuania	a	96	98	0	98	0	91	9	87	98
Luxembourg	m	91	98	0	99	1	33	67	86	96
Mexico	a	43	81	0	75	25	1	98	79	75
Netherlands	2	88	94	0	98	0	0	99	93	94
New Zealand[1]	3	82	86	0	8	87	0	97	94	88
Norway	m	97	97	0	98	0	1	99	97	97
Poland	3	87	96	0	100	0	99	1	m	96
Portugal	m	84	96	0	100	0	17	83	89	94
Slovak Republic	m	71	81	0	93	0	44	54	72	82
Slovenia	m	91	94	0	96	0	10	88	88	94
Spain	m	97	98	0	98	0	1	98	97	98
Sweden	1	95	96	0	96	0	98	1	94	96
Switzerland	m	2	49	0	98	1	53	47	m	m
Türkiye[3]	a	15	43	0	87	2	11	89	38	51
United Kingdom	m	98	98	2	0	97	0	99	100	99
United States[3]	m	41	67	0	86	4	20	72	67	66
OECD average	**m**	**77**	**90**	**1**	**86**	**11**	**26**	**71**	**86**	**90**

	Age 3		Age 4		Age 5		Age 6		Age 3 to the start of compulsory primary education	
	Other registered ECEC services	Early childhood education (ISCED 0)	Early childhood education (ISCED 0)	Primary education	Early childhood education (ISCED 0)	Primary education	Early childhood education (ISCED 0)	Primary education	All programmes	
	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Partner and/or accession countries										
Argentina	m	57	88	0	94	0	0	96	74	81
Brazil	a	65	84	0	92	1	16	81	71	81
Bulgaria	0	80	89	0	93	0	89	5	85	89
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	80	84	0	86	0	82	18	70	88
India[3,5]	m	38	60	40	49	51	0	100	72	82
Indonesia[5]	m	11	41	0	69	0	52	36	76	53
Peru	m	79	92	0	99	0	0	100	m	90
Romania	m	70	79	0	81	0	15	73	85	76
Saudi Arabia[3]	m	5	14	0	59	5	1	99	1	2
South Africa[5,6]	m	m	m	0	m	0	m	31	m	m
Thailand	m	86	88	0	94	2	6	89	m	90
EU25 average	**m**	**85**	**93**	**1**	**92**	**4**	**43**	**55**	**88**	**92**
G20 average	**m**	**62**	**77**	**3**	**75**	**17**	**9**	**89**	**76**	**78**

Note: Early childhood education (ECE) = ISCED 0, other registered ECEC services = ECEC services outside the scope of ISCED 0, because they are not in adherence with all ISCED criteria. To be classified in ISCED 0, ECEC services should: 1) have adequate intentional educational properties; 2) be institutionalised (usually school-based or otherwise institutionalised for a group of children); 3) have an intensity of at least 2 hours per day of educational activities and a duration of at least 100 days a year; 4) have a regulatory framework recognised by the relevant national authorities (e.g. curriculum); and 5) have trained or accredited staff (e.g. requirement of pedagogical qualifications for educators).

1. The legal age at which school becomes compulsory is 6, but children are allowed in legislation to attend primary education from age 5, and most do.
2. In other registered ECEC services, 3-year-olds also includes 4- and 5-year-olds.
3. Early childhood education excludes early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01).
4. The legal age at which school becomes compulsory is 6, but children are allowed in legislation to attend primary education from age 4, and most attend from age 5.
5. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Indonesia; 2018 for South Africa; and 2020 for India.
6. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2023 for South Africa.

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/1he0vc.

Table B1.3. Duration of parental leave (2025) and trends in starting ages for legal ECEC entitlement and compulsory education (2015 and 2024)

	Duration of parental leave (in weeks)				Starting age of legal entitlement to ECEC		Starting age of compulsory pre-primary education		Typical starting age of primary education
	Paid maternity leave	Paid parental and home care leave available to mothers	Paid paternity leave	Paid parental and home care leave reserved for fathers					
	2025	2025	2025	2025	2015	2024	2015	2024	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
OECD countries									
Australia[1]	2	18	0	2	a	a	a	a	5
Austria	16	44	4	9	a	a	5	5	6
Belgium	15	17	4	17	3	2.5	a	5	6
Canada	16	35	0	5	a	a	a	a	6
Chile	18	12	1	0	5	5	a	a	6
Colombia	18	0	3	0	5	5	5	5	6
Costa Rica	17	0	2	0	5	4	a	4	6
Czechia	28	136	2	0	a	3	a	5	6
Denmark	22	19	2	9	1	0.5	a	a	6
Estonia	14	68	4	0	2	1.5	a	a	7
Finland	7	154	0	27	1	0.75	a	6	7
France	16	26	4	26	3	3	a	3	6
Germany	14	44	0	9	1	1	a	a	6
Greece	56	9	3	9	4	4	a	4	6
Hungary	24	136	2	9	3	0	3	3	6
Iceland	26	6	0	20	a	a	a	a	6
Ireland[2]	26	9	2	7	a	a	a	a	5
Israel	15	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	6
Italy	22	26	2	13	a	a	a	a	6
Japan	14	44	4	48	m	3	a	a	6
Korea	13	78	4	78	0	0	a	a	6
Latvia	16	78	2	9	2	1.5	5	5	7
Lithuania	18	62	4	9	a	4	a	6	7
Luxembourg	20	26	2	26	3	3	4	4	6
Mexico	12	0	1	0	m	0	3	3	6
Netherlands	16	9	6	9	4	4	5	5	6
New Zealand[1,3]	26	0	0	0	5	5	a	a	5
Norway[4]	18	68	0	15	1	1.6	a	a	6
Poland	20	32	2	9	a	3	6	6	7
Portugal	6	24	5	17	3	3	a	a	6
Slovak Republic	34	130	2	26	a	4	a	5	6
Slovenia	15	37	2	9	1	0.92	a	a	6
Spain	16	0	16	0	3	3	a	a	6
Sweden	13	43	1	13	1	1	a	6	7
Switzerland	14	0	2	0	4	4	4	4	6
Türkiye	16	0	1	0	m	5	a	a	6
United Kingdom[5]	39	0	2	0	3	3	a	a	5
United States[6]	0	0	0	0	m	3-6	5	5	6
OECD average	**18**	**37**	**2**	**11**	**3**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**

	Duration of parental leave (in weeks)				Starting age of legal entitlement to ECEC		Starting age of compulsory pre-primary education		Typical starting age of primary education
	Paid maternity leave	Paid parental and home care leave available to mothers	Paid paternity leave	Paid parental and home care leave reserved for fathers					
	2025	2025	2025	2025	2015	2024	2015	2024	2024
Partner and/or accession countries									
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	4	4	6
Brazil	17	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	6
Bulgaria	59	52	2	0	5	3	5	4	7
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	a	6
Croatia	30	26	4	9	a	a	6	6	7
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	a	6
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	a	7
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	5	5	6
Romania	18	86	2	9	a	4	a	4	6
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	a	6
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	a	7
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	a	6
EU25 average	**22**	**52**	**3**	**11**	**2**	**4**	**5**	**5**	**6**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**6**

Note: Maternity leave (or pregnancy leave) refers to employment-protected leave for employed women around the time of childbirth (and, in some countries, adoption). Parental and home care leave available to mothers includes all weeks of employment-protected leave for parents, often supplementary to maternity and paternity leave and typically following maternity leave, as well as leave that allows a parent to remain at home to care for a child, provided these weeks are either reserved for the mother or can be shared within the family, and excluding any weeks reserved exclusively for the father. Paid parental and home care leave reserved for fathers refers to weeks of employment-protected leave that can be used only by the father or other parent. Legal entitlement to ECEC refers to a right established by law that obliges public authorities or institutions to provide a ECEC service to individuals who meet defined criteria. This right is enforceable, meaning eligible individuals can claim it and, if necessary, seek legal remedies if the obligation is not fulfilled.

1. The legal age at which school becomes compulsory is 6, but children are allowed in legislation to attend primary school from age 5, and most do.
2. The legal age at which school becomes compulsory is 6, but children are allowed in legislation to attend primary education from age 4, and most attend from age 5.
3. Age 5 refers to the age at which children have a legal entitlement to enrol in primary school, rather than a legal entitlement to ECEC.
4. Legal entitlement age ranges from 1 year to 1 year and 8 months depending on birth month.
5. Legal entitlement is provided only for pre-primary schools and special pre-primary schools.
6. Legal entitlement varies by state and local jurisdiction. Most states have a minimum entitlement age of 5, but it can range from 3 to 6 across all states and localities. The starting age for compulsory education also varies by subnational entity and ranges from 5 to 7. Primary education typically begins at 6.

Source: Data for the duration of parental leave is derived from the OECD Family Database. (OECD, 2025[42]).

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/1he0vc.


Chapter B2. How is school provision organised across education levels?

Highlights

- On average across OECD countries, lower secondary school provision has undergone a process of consolidation despite an increase in the student population. The number of institutions declined slightly by 0.10% per year between 2015 and 2024, while the number of students enrolled at the typical age grew by 0.96% per year over that period.
- On average across OECD countries, there are 1.97 primary schools for every lower secondary school. The ratio is higher for public institutions, with 2.26 public primary schools per public lower secondary school.
- On average across OECD countries, lower secondary schools enrol nearly twice as many students per grade as primary schools (64 students per grade compared to 34).
- National averages often mask substantial internal variation in school sizes. Across the OECD, the median size of lower secondary institutions ranges from 16 to 166 students per grade. Although systems in Ireland and Italy display relatively homogeneous school sizes, in places like Korea and England (United Kingdom) provision is much more disparate with very large urban schools coexisting alongside smaller rural ones.

Figure B2.1. Average annual growth rates in the number of schools and the number of students enrolled at the typical age, at lower secondary level (2015 to 2024)

In per cent



Note: Information is derived from system-level (aggregate) data.
1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
2. Changes in the typical age of enrolment following education system reforms affect the comparability of trend estimates over time.
For data, see Table B2.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/n9wxcm.

Context

Educational institutions constitute one of the most visible and enduring components of education systems. As well as providing physical spaces for learning, they shape how students progress through education, how resources are allocated and how educational opportunities are distributed across populations and territories. Decisions regarding the organisation, the number

and size of institutions therefore influence not only the efficiency of education systems but also students' learning experiences and pathways (OECD, 2018[1]).

The organisation of school provision varies considerably across OECD countries. Some systems rely on highly integrated structures in which students remain within the same institution for their entire primary and secondary education, while others have distinct primary, lower secondary and upper secondary institutions. These institutional arrangements influence the timing of transitions between schools, the continuity of learning experiences and the extent to which students encounter specialised educational environments as they progress through the system (Perico E Santos, 2023[2]).

At the same time, education systems are operating in increasingly diverse demographic contexts. Changes in fertility patterns, internal mobility and migration have reshaped the demand for educational provision in many OECD countries, requiring policymakers to consider how educational resources and infrastructure can best respond to evolving population needs (OECD, 2018[1]; Di Cataldo and Romani, 2024[3]) (see Chapter 1, Teacher shortages and the attractiveness of the teaching profession). Beyond these demographic shifts, the resilience of educational infrastructure is increasingly being tested by environmental factors, including the rising exposure of students to extreme heat, which can disrupt learning and impact overall well-being (see Box B2.2).

Differences in the size and distribution of institutions further shape students' educational experiences. Larger institutions may support broader curricular offerings, greater teacher specialisation and a wider range of extracurricular opportunities, whereas smaller institutions may facilitate more personalised learning environments and stronger connections between students and staff. Understanding how countries organise educational institutions across levels, how school networks evolve over time and how school size varies within systems provides important insights into the ways education systems balance accessibility, quality, continuity and efficiency (Ares Abalde, 2014[4]).

Other findings

- Primary education (ISCED 1) starts at the age of 6 in most OECD and partner countries, although the typical entry age ranges from 5 in countries such as Australia, Ireland, New Zealand and the United Kingdom to 7 in Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Sweden. The total duration of the primary and secondary education cycle ranges from 11 years in Colombia, Costa Rica and Peru to 14 years in Iceland.
- Between 2015 and 2024, nearly 43% of OECD small regions experienced a decline in their population aged 10-14. In Japan, Korea, the Netherlands and Portugal, this decline affected more than 85% of small regions.
- The organisation of institutions shapes how students progress through compulsory education. In Poland and Slovenia, where integrated school structures cover both primary and lower secondary education, most students remain in the same institution throughout compulsory education, whereas students in France and the Netherlands typically transition to larger and more specialised schools.
- Climate change is expected to increase students' exposure to extreme heat in many countries. In Hungary, for example, the share of primary students exposed to more than 30 hot days in school per year is projected to rise from 19% to 96% by 2050 (relative to the 1983-2016 reference period), highlighting the need for investments in cooling and climate-resilient school infrastructure.

Analysis

Organisation of primary and secondary education systems


The organisation of primary and secondary education reflects fundamental policy choices regarding how students progress through the education system. Primary education (ISCED 1) is designed to provide foundational literacy, numeracy and learning skills, while lower secondary education (ISCED 2) introduces more subject-specific instruction and prepares students for the broader curricular choices available at upper secondary level (ISCED 3) (OECD/Eurostat/UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2015[5]). The duration and sequencing of these levels vary considerably across OECD countries, shaping both the timing of educational transitions and the structure of learner pathways.

Figure B2.2 illustrates the substantial differences in the age at which students start primary education and how long the different educational levels last. Although most OECD and partner countries begin primary education at the age of 6, students typically enter at age 5 in Australia, Ireland, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, and at age 7 in Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Sweden. The combined duration of primary and secondary education ranges from 11 years in Colombia, Costa Rica and Peru to 14 years in Iceland. It is important to note that the duration of primary and secondary education should not be equated with the duration of compulsory education, as some countries include some years of pre-primary education within compulsory schooling while others do not require attendance throughout the full upper secondary cycle (OECD, 2024[6]).

Education systems also vary in the number and timing of institutional transitions experienced by students. In integrated systems, students often progress through primary and lower secondary education within the same institution or school cluster, reducing the number of transitions between schools. In more segmented systems, students move between institutions at a younger age and may encounter several transitions during their compulsory schooling. Transitions represent important moments in students' educational trajectories because they often coincide with significant academic, social and developmental changes (Perico E Santos, 2023[2]). When poorly managed, transitions can increase the risk of disengagement, grade repetition or early leaving from education and training; when well supported, they can facilitate progression into programmes better aligned with students' interests and aspirations (Perico E Santos, 2023[2]).

The organisation of educational pathways therefore involves balancing continuity and differentiation. Integrated structures may strengthen students' sense of belonging and provide greater continuity in learning experiences by allowing them to remain within a familiar institutional environment for longer periods. Conversely, systems offering multiple pathways and earlier differentiation may facilitate specialisation and provide a wider range of educational opportunities, but they also require greater coordination to ensure permeability between programmes and equitable progression opportunities. Recent evidence suggests that successful education systems are characterised not by the absence of transitions, but by their ability to support students through them and maintain flexible pathways between programmes and levels of education (Varsik, 2025[7]).

Figure B2.2. Theoretical age range and duration of primary and secondary education programmes (2024)



For data, see Table B2.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/n9wxcm.

Demographic change and the evolution of school provision

Demographic change is reshaping school provision across many OECD countries. Declining fertility rates, together with migration flows, have altered the size and geographical distribution of school-age populations, pressuring education systems to adapt infrastructure to shifting demand. These trends can play out very differently both across and within countries, with most countries experiencing growth in some regions and a decline in others (see Box B2.1). An increase in the student-age population may generate demand for new schools in metropolitan areas, while declining populations in remote areas can pose challenges to service delivery. However, although aggregate changes in student numbers and institutions can mask the impact of local responses to changing demographic patterns, they can still provide an important indication of the overall responsiveness of school networks and how countries are balancing efficiency, accessibility and long-term planning in the provision of education services (OECD, 2018[1]). The need for network responsiveness is further amplified by environmental stressors; for example, rising temperatures are prompting countries to reconsider school infrastructure and operational schedules to mitigate negative impacts on student health and cognitive performance (see Box B2.2).

Between 2015 and 2024, school provision changed slowly overall across the OECD, although the pace differed by level of education. On average across OECD countries, the number of primary institutions declined by 0.57% per year, while the number of students increased by 0.17% per year. At lower secondary level, the number of institutions remained broadly stable, declining by only 0.10% annually, despite student numbers increasing by 0.96% per year. Upper secondary education showed similar stability, with the number of institutions increasing by just 0.08% annually despite a 0.68% annual increase in enrolment. These global trends suggest that systems have sought to accommodate demographic change through adjustments within existing provision rather than through large-scale expansion of educational infrastructure (Table B2.1).

Box B2.1. The decline in the number of 10-14 year-olds across OECD small regions


National aggregate changes in student numbers often mask diverse local responses and shifting demographic patterns within a country. A country may show overall stability or growth in student enrolment at the national level, while simultaneously experiencing a decline in its student-age populations in many of its regions (Figure B2.1 and Figure B2.3).

Between 2015 and 2024, almost 43% of small regions in the OECD saw a decrease in the number of 10-14 year-olds, with most countries experiencing growth in some regions and a decline in others. The decline was most widespread in Japan, Korea, the Netherlands and Portugal, where over 85% of small regions saw a decline in the number of 10-14 year-olds. In total, only seven countries did not experience an aggregate decline in any of their small regions (Czechia, Ireland, Luxembourg, New Zealand, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Sweden). Israel also recorded no aggregate decline, based on the latest available data for 2023.

In countries like Finland and Lithuania, sustained growth in student numbers at the national level has been accompanied with substantial institutional reorganisation to address declining student numbers in specific regions, with 21% of regions in Finland and 70% in Lithuania experiencing a fall in their student-age populations. These differences underscore how demographic pressure is rarely uniform, requiring policymakers to balance the need for new infrastructure in growing hubs with the challenges of consolidation in depopulating areas.

Figure B2.3. Share of small regions experiencing an increase or decrease in the number of 10-14 year-olds (2015 to 2024)

In per cent



Note: Small regions refer to Territorial Level 3 (TL3) regions, which are subnational administrative or statistical units below the national level. See *Definitions* section for details.
1. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2023 for Costa Rica and Israel; 2022 for Colombia, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Norway and the United Kingdom; and 2020 for Portugal.
Source: OECD (n.d.[8]), *OECD Regions, Cities and Local Areas database* http://oe.cd/geostats.
The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/n9wxcm.

OECD countries have followed markedly different pathways in their efforts to align school provision with local demographic realities and changing settlement patterns. In Lithuania, the number of institutions declined substantially across primary and lower secondary education, despite sustained growth in student numbers at the national level. The optimisation of the Lithuanian school network is part of broader reforms aimed at improving efficiency and educational quality in response to a projected sharp decline in the population (Shewbridge et al., 2016[9]). Finland provides an example of institutional adaptation driven by local demographic changes, even as aggregate student populations continue to grow. Faced with declining student populations, some Finnish municipalities have progressively consolidated school provision and reorganised educational provision to maintain services (Table B2.1) (OECD, 2025[10]). However, these developments have not been confined to areas experiencing demographic decline, as longer-term trends towards larger school units and broader structural changes have also shaped educational provision across the country.

The strongest evidence of institutional adaptation can be observed at lower secondary level, where several countries reduced the number of institutions despite stable or growing student populations (Figure B2.1). While Lithuania recorded the largest decline in lower secondary institutions (-2.94% annually), neighbouring Poland also experienced a substantial reduction (-2.38% annually), largely reflecting the 2017 education reform that phased out lower secondary schools (*gimnazjum*) and replaced the previous 6+3


structure with an eight-year primary cycle (OECD, 2025[11]). Elsewhere, countries have increasingly relied on administrative restructuring rather than simple school closures. Portugal's school clustering reform (*agrupamentos de escolas*), for example, consolidated governance and administration across multiple institutions while maintaining educational provision in different locations. Such approaches illustrate how school systems can adapt to demographic change through organisational innovation, allowing them to improve co-ordination and resource management without necessarily reducing access to educational services (World Bank, 2025[12]).

School closures can have important implications beyond the education sector. Evidence from Finland suggests rural communities have experienced stronger population decline following the loss of local schools (Lehtonen, 2021[13]). The adaptation of education systems must therefore balance efficiency and educational quality with wider territorial considerations about maintaining the accessibility of services, and the attractiveness and competitiveness of rural or remote regions.

The distribution of institutions across education levels

The number of primary schools per lower secondary school provides an indication of how education systems organise progression between these levels. In most OECD countries, lower secondary provision is delivered through a smaller number of institutions serving larger catchment areas than primary education. In some systems, both levels are provided within integrated institutions. These schools are counted once at each level, which contributes to similar numbers of primary and lower secondary institutions. These organisational choices influence the number of transitions students experience, the use of educational infrastructure and the allocation of teaching resources across levels (OECD, 2018[1]).

Figure B2.4. Number of primary schools per lower secondary school, by type of institution (2024)



Note: This figure combines system-level and institution-level data. When both sources were available, institution-level data were used. OECD and EU averages were recalculated accordingly and differ from those reported in Tables B2.2 and B2.3.
1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
For data, see Table B2.2. and Table B2.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/n9wxcm.

On average across OECD countries, there are 1.97 primary schools for every lower secondary school (Figure B2.4). This indicates that lower secondary education is generally organised through a smaller number of institutions serving larger catchment areas than primary education. Such structures reflect both the increasing complexity of educational provision as students progress through the system and the greater capacity of older students to travel longer distances to school using a wider range of transport options. Lower secondary education typically requires a broader curriculum, greater teacher specialisation and access to specialised facilities, such as science laboratories or technical equipment, which can be more efficiently provided through larger institutions serving multiple primary school catchment areas (OECD, 2018[1]).

Differences between the public and private sectors reveal greater variation in how educational provision is organised in some systems. In most OECD countries and economies, the number of primary schools per lower secondary school is broadly similar for both sectors, but the ratio of primary to lower secondary schools is slightly higher for public institutions than private ones in many countries. This pattern suggests that public school networks more frequently prioritise local access to primary education through a larger number of primary institutions, while private providers are more likely to concentrate provision across fewer institutions or operate schools spanning multiple education levels. The contrast is particularly pronounced in England (United Kingdom), where the ratio reaches 8.6:1 among public institutions but only 2.5:1 among private institutions. This difference partly reflects the prevalence of "all-through schools" and other vertically integrated models within the private sector (Chapman and Muijs, 2014[14]). Overall, these differences suggest that public and private sectors pursue distinct organisational approaches, balancing accessibility, institutional integration and the efficient use of educational resources in different ways.

Differences in the number of primary schools for every lower secondary school can highlight important differences in how education systems organise the transition between these levels of education. Countries such as Hungary (0.94), Lithuania (0.92), Poland (1.01) and Slovenia (1.00) have almost equal numbers of primary and lower secondary institutions, whereas the ratio exceeds four primary institutions per lower secondary institution in Costa Rica (4.62), France (5.03), Ireland (4.27) and the Netherlands (4.71) (Figure B2.4).

These contrasting patterns reflect different approaches to organising compulsory education. In some countries, including Poland and Slovenia, primary and lower secondary education are frequently provided within the same institution, allowing students to remain in the same school throughout compulsory education. In Slovenia, where the unified basic school (*osnovna šola*) spans both levels, students generally progress without changing schools and remain in the same institution until the end of basic education. However, similar ratios do not necessarily imply similar institutional arrangements. A low ratio may reflect integrated schools spanning multiple education levels, but it may also result from separate primary and lower secondary institutions operating at similar scales within the same school network. Conversely, high ratios generally indicate that lower secondary education is organised through a smaller number of institutions serving larger catchment areas than primary education.

Average school size across education levels

The average size of educational institutions varies substantially across OECD countries and education levels, reflecting different approaches to organising educational provision. Some systems operate relatively small institutions throughout compulsory education, while others concentrate students into larger schools, particularly at lower secondary level. These differences influence not only how resources are allocated, but also the range of educational opportunities available to students, including access to specialised subjects, extracurricular activities and support services (OECD, 2018[1]).

At primary level, institutions enrol an average of 34 students per grade across OECD countries (Figure B2.5) although average sizes range from fewer than 20 students per grade in Costa Rica and Switzerland to more than 50 in Colombia, Israel, Korea and Türkiye. Smaller primary institutions often reflect the geographical distribution of the population and the need to provide local access to education in sparsely populated areas, while in some systems they may also reflect a preference for smaller learning communities during the early years of schooling. Research suggests that smaller schools can facilitate closer relationships between students and teachers, greater parental engagement, and stronger connections to the local community, all of which may contribute to students' sense of belonging and well-being (OECD, 2024[15]).

Institutional size increases substantially at lower secondary level


On average across OECD countries and economies, lower secondary schools enrol 64 students per grade, nearly twice the OECD average of 34 students per grade at primary level. Particularly large institutions on average are found in Luxembourg (145), the Netherlands (162) and England (United Kingdom) (149). These larger institutions often expose students to a wider range of educational opportunities than would be feasible in smaller settings. As students progress through education, schools are

increasingly expected to offer optional subjects, extracurricular activities, academic support services and guidance programmes tailored to diverse interests and aspirations. Larger institutions may therefore provide students with greater flexibility in shaping their learning pathways and exploring future educational and career options (OECD, 2018[1]; Ares Abalde, 2014[4]).

The relationship between school size and educational quality is not straightforward. Although larger institutions may benefit from economies of scale and a broader educational offer, research suggests that the advantages of increasing size diminish beyond a certain point. Very large institutions may face greater organisational complexity and can make it more difficult to maintain personalised learning environments and strong student-teacher relationships (Ares Abalde, 2014[4]). This helps explain why some countries continue to operate relatively small lower secondary institutions despite the potential efficiency gains associated with larger schools.

Differences between primary and lower secondary school size also reveal distinct models of educational organisation. In the Netherlands, lower secondary institutions are several times larger than primary schools, indicating a system in which students move from local primary provision into larger specialised institutions serving wider catchment areas. Conversely, countries such as Poland and Slovenia display relatively similar average sizes across both levels of education. This pattern is consistent with more integrated institutional structures in which students remain within the same school or educational complex for a longer period, resulting in greater continuity in cohort size and educational provision across levels (OECD, 2018[1]).

Figure B2.5. Average number of students per grade, by level of education (2024)



Note: This figure combines system-level and institution-level data. When both sources were available, institution-level data were used. OECD and EU averages were recalculated accordingly and differ from those reported in Tables B2.1 and B2.3.
1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
For data, see Table B2.1 and Table B2.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/n9wxcm.

Rather than indicating that there is a single optimal model, these differences illustrate the trade-offs between larger institutions offering more educational opportunities and smaller institutions that can provide more personalised learning environments. Maintaining very small schools can also increase per-student costs, particularly where fixed infrastructure and staffing costs serve a limited number of students. The wide variation observed across OECD countries suggests that school size reflects broader


policy choices regarding educational priorities, institutional organisation and the balance between diversity of provision and proximity to learners.

Variation in school size within countries

National averages provide useful information about the overall size of institutions, but they often conceal substantial variation within education systems. Although the median lower secondary school size (based on institution-level data) is 72 students per grade (Table B2.3), the spread of school sizes reveals that many students are educated in much smaller settings. Across the OECD, the middle 50% of lower secondary institutions range from 46 students per grade at the 25th percentile to 111 students per grade at the 75th percentile. However, in many countries, the 25th percentile is significantly lower, highlighting that a large number of very small schools coexist with larger institutions (Figure B2.6. In some countries, such as Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Norway, Peru and Poland, lower secondary schools at the 25th percentile enrol only between 10 and 20 students per grade. Maintaining such small institutions is often a strategic necessity to ensure accessibility in low-density or remote areas, particularly where long travel distances could otherwise limit participation in education (OECD, 2024[16]). However, it also presents significant challenges for education systems. Operating a network of very small schools is generally more costly on a per-student basis due to the limited scope for economies of scale in infrastructure, administration and staffing (Andrews, Duncombe and Yinger, 2002[17]; Leithwood and Jantzi, 2009[18]). The small scale may also limit the educational opportunities available to students, as these institutions often lack the critical mass of staff and students required to offer a broad range of optional subjects, specialised facilities such as science laboratories or diverse extracurricular activities. As a result, students within the same education system may experience markedly different learning environments depending on the size of the institution they attend (OECD, 2024[16]).

Figure B2.6. Spread of school sizes at lower secondary level, by percentile (2024)

Number of students per grade at the 25th, 50th (median) and 75th percentiles



Note: Information is derived from institution-level (school register) data.
1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
2. Average number of students per grade is estimated from enrolment by education level divided by the typical number of grades in that level, as information on the grades offered by individual schools is not available.
For data, see Table B2.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/n9wxcm.

The degree of variation in school size differs considerably across education systems. Countries such as Poland and the Slovak Republic display relatively narrow distributions, indicating that students are likely to attend schools of broadly similar size regardless of where they live. Such homogeneity suggests that educational provision is organised in a relatively consistent manner across the country, with students experiencing comparable institutional environments. Conversely, other countries exhibit substantial disparities in school size. In England (United Kingdom), the 25th percentile corresponds to 49 students per grade while the 75th percentile reaches 215 students per grade. Korea shows a similarly wide distribution, ranging from 29 to 195 students per grade. These large spreads indicate that students within the same education system may experience very different schooling environments depending on the institution they attend. While some students are educated in relatively small schools characterised by closer-knit cohorts, others attend much larger institutions serving several times as many students per grade. Such differences in scale may reflect differences in settlement patterns, population density and school network organisation (Figure B2.6)

The coexistence of small and large institutions within the same education system does not necessarily indicate unequal provision but rather reflects the diversity of educational contexts in which students learn. The policy challenge is therefore not to eliminate variation in school size, but to ensure that students have access to high-quality learning environments and comparable educational opportunities regardless of the type of institution they attend (Ares Abalde, 2014[4])

Box B2.2. Student exposure to rising temperatures


Heat can affect students' health, well-being and educational outcomes. Several studies have linked high temperatures with lower performance on cognitive and curricular tests as well as lower school engagement. One study using Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) data across multiple countries found that higher temperatures reduce test performances among school-age children. Each additional day above 26.7°C during the three years preceding an exam lowered PISA test scores by 0.18% of a standard deviation (Park, Behrer and Goodman, 2021[19]). At the extremes, high temperatures can also lead to school closures, such as the 2025 heatwave that forced authorities to cancel classes in France (FRANCE 24, 2025[20]) and an extreme heat episode in Mexico in 2023 that led to the school closures and restrictions on outdoor exercise (Unicef, 2023[21]).

By 2050, primary school students will be exposed to more days with high temperatures at school (Figure B2.7). Even under a middle-of-the-road climate scenario, by 2050 Bulgaria and Chile are projected to join Colombia, Costa Rica and the United States on the list of countries where over one-quarter of primary school students attend schools experiencing more than 60 hot days a year. The effects will be different across OECD countries. In Hungary, the share of students exposed to more than 30 hot days per year will increase more than fourfold, from 19% during the 1983-2016 reference period to 96% in 2050, with the typical student facing 49 hot days in a year. The impact is less marked in countries like Denmark, Ireland, Latvia and Lithuania, where no primary school students will be exposed to more than 30 hot days per year. By 2050, even under the high-emissions scenario, more than a half of Danish primary school students will experience 1-5 hot days in school per year and those in Ireland will not experience any (OECD, 2026[22]).

Countries currently implement preventative measures to protect children from episodes of extremely high temperatures at school while ensuring the quality of their learning. In the Australian state of Queensland, the Department of Education recommends schools to modify or suspend outdoor activities, make cooler indoor spaces at school more accessible, ensure students stay hydrated and use simple cooling techniques to reduce heat stress (Queensland Government, 2024[23]). In Spain, Madrid's Action Plan for Heat Waves foresees adjusting timetables, for example by moving classes into the cooler early morning hours and scheduling physical education classes during cooler hours (Comunidad de Madrid, 2026[24]). Although school closures can help manage the effects of extreme heat on student well-being, they risk aggravating the learning loss from high temperatures. Therefore, such measures should remain a last resort unless accompanied by compensatory measures like pre-planned contingency days. This is currently a common practice in the US state of Rhode Island where the school calendar must include four contingency days in the events extreme heat, extreme cold/snow, and health and safety concerns like illness or building conditions. (Rhode Island Department of Education, 2025[25]).

Figure B2.7. Distribution of students by school exposure to hot days, by climate scenario (1983-2016 and 2050)

Share of primary students enrolled in schools exposed to days of 30°C or over



Note: Schools are grouped according to the number of hot days experienced in the calendar year. The share of students is determined using each school's enrolment numbers for 2024.
Source: (OECD, 2026[26])) Using climate projections to assess increasing student exposure to high temperatures, https://doi.org/10.1787/98a7f132-en.

Countries also adapt school infrastructure to cope with extreme temperatures. Investment in heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems is a common way for governments to provide thermal comfort for children in schools, although the cost can be a major challenge. For example, Japan successfully equipped almost all regular classrooms in public primary and lower secondary schools with air conditioning in 2022 (Government of Japan, 2024[27]; Akesaka and Shigeoka, 2025[28]). This investment was partly financed through public-private-partnerships in which local governments entered long-term contracts with private companies that installed and maintained school air conditioning systems in return for service fees (Sekartaji et al., 2023[29]). Efforts have also been made in European countries including France, where the government aims to upgrade the infrastructure of 40 000 primary schools during the next 10 years with an initial investment of EUR 2 billion. The plan involves energy upgrades, insulation and transitioning to geothermal systems, among other improvements (Cerema, 2024[30]).

Definitions

Educational institutions are entities that have the provision of instructional services to individuals, or related clinical, community, or research services, as their sole or main purpose.

Integrated structures (or basic education schools) are institutional frameworks where students typically progress through ISCED levels 1 and 2 within a single institutional cycle or on a shared school site. In contrast, **segmented systems** involve institutional transitions between education levels, sometimes as early as age 10.

OECD small regions refer to Territorial Level 3 (TL3) regions, which are subnational administrative or statistical units below the national level. The OECD Territorial Classification distinguishes between two regional levels: large regions (Territorial Level 2, TL2) and small regions (Territorial Level 3, TL3). These regions are used to support internationally comparable analyses of demographic, economic and social developments within countries. Further information on the OECD regional classification and regional statistics is available in the OECD Regions and Cities Database (OECD, n.d.[8]).

Methodology

Average school size is measured as the number of students per grade. This is calculated by dividing the total number of students enrolled at a given level of education by the number of grades included in that level within the institution.

Sources

The analysis in this chapter draws on two complementary data sources that provide information on the number and characteristics of educational institutions.

System-level (aggregate) data are based on the OECD-INES ad-hoc data collection on the number of educational institutions with ICT services, basic hygiene facilities and adapted infrastructure by level of education – all programmes (general and vocational), conducted in November 2025.

Institution-level (school register) data are based on the OECD-INES Data Collection on Schools 2026, conducted in January 2026. These data are derived from national school registers and provide information at the individual institution level.

The two sources complement one another. System-level data provide broad coverage and support trend analyses over time, while institution-level data offer a more granular picture of the organisation of school provision and the distribution of schools within countries. Where both sources are available, the results are presented separately to ensure transparency regarding differences in data collection methods and coverage.

References

Akesaka, M. and H. Shigeoka (2025), "Hotter days, wider gap: The distributional impact of heat on student achievement", *RIETI Discussion Paper Series*, No. 25-E-024, The Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry, https://www.rieti.go.jp/jp/publications/dp/25e024.pdf. [28]

Andrews, M., W. Duncombe and J. Yinger (2002), "Revisiting economies of size in American education: Are we any closer to a consensus?", *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 21/3, pp. 245-262, https://doi.org/10.1016/s0272-7757(01)00006-1. [17]

Ares Abalde, M. (2014), "School size policies: A literature review", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 106, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/5jxt472ddkjl-en. [4]

Cerema (2024), *Rénovation des écoles : un guide à destination des élus locaux*, https://www.cerema.fr/fr/actualites/renovation-ecoles-guide-elus-locaux (accessed on 18 November 2025). [30]

Chapman, C. and D. Muijs (2014), "Does school-to-school collaboration promote school improvement? A study of the impact of school federations on student outcomes", *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Vol. 25/3, pp. 351-393, https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2013.840319. [14]

Comunidad de Madrid (2026), *Plan de Actuación ante Episodios de Altas Temperaturas*, Comunidad de Madrid, https://www.comunidad.madrid/docs/2026-05/web-plan-contra-el-calor_cm_2026.vf_.pdf. [24]

Di Cataldo, M. and G. Romani (2024), "Rational cuts? The local impact of closing undersized schools", *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, Vol. 109, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2024.104057. [3]

FRANCE 24 (2025), *France shuts schools as temperatures peak amid Europe-wide heatwave*, https://www.france24.com/en/environment/20250701-france-braces-for-peak-temperatures-amid-europe-wide-heatwave. [20]

Government of Japan (2024), *Installation of air conditioning equipment in public school facilities*, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology, https://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/zyosei/mext_01278.html (accessed on 7 October 2024). [27]

Lehtonen, O. (2021), "Primary school closures and population development – is school vitality an investment in the attractiveness of the (rural) communities or not?", *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 82, pp. 138-147, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.01.011. [13]

Leithwood, K. and D. Jantzi (2009), "A review of empirical evidence about school size effects: A policy perspective", *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 79/1, pp. 464-490, https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308326158. [18]

OECD (2026), *Using climate projections to assess increasing student exposure to high temperatures*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/98a7f132-en. [26]

OECD (2026), "What are the likely impacts of rising temperatures on students and how are countries adapting?", *Education Indicators in Focus*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/960244d5-en. [22]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en. [11]

OECD (2025), "Shrinking smartly and sustainably in Finland: Multi-level governance, subnational finance and service delivery", *OECD Regional Development Papers*, No. 166, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/4fb53cc8-en. [10]

OECD (2024), *Education at a Glance 2024: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/c00cad36-en. [6]

OECD (2024), "How are demographic changes affecting education systems?", *Education Indicators in Focus*, No. 87, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/158d4c5c-en. [16]

OECD (2024), *PISA 2022 Results (Volume III): Creative Minds, Creative Schools*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/765ee8c2-en. [15]

OECD (2018), *Responsive School Systems: Connecting Facilities, Sectors and Programmes for Student Success*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264306707-en. [1]

OECD (n.d.), *OECD Regions and Cities Database*, http://oe.cd/geostats. [8]

OECD/Eurostat/UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2015), *ISCED 2011 Operational Manual: Guidelines for Classifying National Education Programmes and Related Qualifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264228368-en. [5]

Park, R., A. Behrer and J. Goodman (2021), "Learning is inhibited by heat exposure, both internationally and within the United States", *Nature Human Behaviour*, Vol. 5, pp. 19-27, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-00959-9. [19]

Perico E Santos, A. (2023), "Managing student transitions into upper secondary pathways", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 289, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/663d6f7b-en. [2]

Queensland Government (2024), *Managing excessive heat in schools*, https://education.qld.gov.au/students/student-health-safety-wellbeing/student-health/managing-excessive-heat-schools. [23]

Rhode Island Department of Education (2025), *Calendar Guidance: Guidance for Establishing School Calendars and Length of the School Day*, Rhode Island Department of Education, https://ride.ri.gov/sites/g/files/xkgbur806/files/2025-04/SchoolCalendarGuidance_v250411.pdf. [25]

Sekartaji, D. et al. (2023), "Energy-use and indoor thermal performance in junior high school building after air-conditioning installation with the private finance initiative", *Buildings*, Vol. 13/2, p. 455, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13020455. [29]

Shewbridge, C. et al. (2016), *OECD Reviews of School Resources: Lithuania 2016*, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264252547-en. [9]

Unicef (2023), *Las olas de calor, agravadas por el cambio climático, afectan la garantía del derecho a la educación de la niñez y adolescencia en México*, https://www.unicef.org/mexico/comunicados-prensa/las-olas-de-calor-agravadas-por-el-cambio-clim%C3%A1tico-afectan-la-garant%C3%ADa-del (accessed on 7 October 2025). [21]

Varsik, S. (2025), "Transitions through education and into the labour market: Exploring educational outcomes and equity gaps using international surveys", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 324, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/18be3c52-en. [7]

World Bank (2025), *Portugal's School Clustering Reform:Lessons for Georgia for Improving Efficiency, Equity, and Quality through School-Network Restructuring*, World Bank, Washington, DC, http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/099112525193042171. [12]

Chapter B2 Tables

Tables and notes

Table B2.1	Trends in the number of institutions and students, and average institution size (students per grade), by level of education (2015 and 2024)
Table B2.2	Trends in the ratio of primary schools to lower secondary schools, by type of institution (2015 and 2024)
Table B2.3	School sizes, by education level and percentile, and ratio of primary schools to lower secondary schools, by type of institution (2024)

StatLink https://stat.link/n9wxcm

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/n9wxcm.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)

Table B2.1. Trends in the number of institutions and students, and average institution size (students per grade), by level of education (2015 and 2024)

Based on system-level (aggregate) data

	Typical age of enrolment	Annual growth rate in the number of institutions	Annual growth rate in the number of students	Average number of students per grade per school	
		2015 to 2024	2015 to 2024	2015	2024
		%	%	Number	Number
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
			Primary		
OECD countries					
Australia	5-11	0	1	47	50
Austria	6-9	0	1	21	23
Belgium	6-11	0	0	29	29
Canada	6-11	m	m	m	m
Chile	6-11	- 1	0	26	29
Colombia[1]	6-10	0	- 1	15	14
Costa Rica[1,2]	6-11	0	0	17	17
Czechia	6-10	m	m	m	m
Denmark	6-12	0	- 1	m	m
Estonia	7-12	- 1	1	26	32
Finland	7-12	- 2	0	m	m
France	6-10	0	0	m	m
Germany	6-9	1	1	31	33
Greece	6-11	- 1	- 1	22	20
Hungary	6-9	1	- 1	38	32
Iceland	6-12	0	1	27	27
Ireland	5-12	m	m	m	m
Israel	6-11	2	2	55	55
Italy	6-10	-0.51	-1.57	32	29
Japan	6-11	m	m	m	m
Korea	6-11	0.40	-0.85	73	65
Latvia	7-12	m	m	m	34
Lithuania[1]	7-10	-2.89	0.72	30	39
Luxembourg	6-11	0.86	1.59	33	35
Mexico	6-11	-1.43	-0.70	22	24
Netherlands	6-11	-0.96	-0.54	m	m
New Zealand	5-10	-0.03	0.38	30	31
Norway	6-12	-0.98	0.09	26	29
Poland[3]	7-10	-6.51	-3.13	26	53
Portugal	6-11	-0.84	-0.60	21	21
Slovak Republic	6-9	-0.42	1.52	19	23
Slovenia	6-11	0.17	1.17	42	46
Spain	6-11	-0.01	-0.55	34	33
Sweden	7-12	-0.65	1.44	23	28
Switzerland	6-11	-0.21	1.61	15	18
Türkiye	6-9	-0.96	0.80	45	53
United Kingdom	5-10	m	m	m	m
United States	6-11	m	m	m	m

	Typical age of enrolment	Annual growth rate in the number of institutions	Annual growth rate in the number of students	Average number of students per grade per school	
		2015 to 2024	2015 to 2024	2015	2024
		%	%	Number	Number
OECD average		**-0.57**	**0.17**	**31**	**33**
Partner and/or accession countries					
Argentina	6-11	m	m	m	m
Brazil	6-10	-1.66	-0.10	23	26
Bulgaria[3]	7-10	-0.81	-1.09	32	32
China	6-11	m	m	m	m
Croatia	7-10	m	m	m	m
India	6-10	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	7-12	m	m	m	m
Peru	6-11	0.45	-1.27	m	15
Romania	6-10	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	6-11	m	m	m	m
South Africa	7-13	m	m	m	m
Thailand	6-11	m	m	m	m
EU25 average		**-0.82**	**-0.02**	**29**	**32**
G20 average		**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Lower secondary

	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
OECD countries					
Australia	12-15	m	m	m	m
Austria	10-13	0	0	40	41
Belgium	12-13	0	2	62	74
Canada	12-14	m	m	m	m
Chile	12-13	0	1	29	32
Colombia[1]	11-14	1	0	40	36
Costa Rica[1,2]	12-14	- 1	1	54	61
Czechia	11-14	m	m	m	m
Denmark	13-15	0	0	m	m
Estonia	13-15	- 1	3	25	37
Finland	13-15	- 2	1	m	m
France	11-14	0	1	m	m
Germany	10-15	0	0	33	36
Greece	12-14	1	0	52	48
Hungary	10-13	1	- 2	35	27
Iceland	13-15	0	2	29	35
Ireland	13-15	m	m	m	m
Israel	12-14	2	2	51	52
Italy	11-13	0.03	-0.32	67	64
Japan	12-14	m	m	m	m
Korea	12-14	0.35	-1.36	149	127
Latvia	13-15	m	m	m	33
Lithuania[1]	11-16	-2.94	1.50	26	36
Luxembourg	12-14	1.76	0.55	115	103
Mexico	12-14	-0.54	-0.68	52	51
Netherlands	12-14	-0.39	-0.30	m	m
New Zealand	11-14	-0.04	1.85	33	39

	Typical age of enrolment	Annual growth rate in the number of institutions	Annual growth rate in the number of students	Average number of students per grade per school	
		2015 to 2024	2015 to 2024	2015	2024
		%	%	Number	Number
Norway	13-15	-0.03	0.83	50	54
Poland[3]	11-14	-2.38	3.10	43	52
Portugal	12-14	-0.51	0.07	67	71
Slovak Republic	10-14	0.27	1.51	25	28
Slovenia	12-14	0.17	2.30	39	47
Spain	12-14	0.30	1.70	56	64
Sweden	13-15	-0.39	2.75	46	60
Switzerland	12-14	-0.52	1.55	36	44
Türkiye	10-13	1.17	0.58	68	65
United Kingdom	11-13	m	m	m	m
United States	12-14	m	m	m	m
OECD average		**-0.10**	**0.96**	**51**	**52**
Partner and/or accession countries					
Argentina	12-14	m	m	m	m
Brazil	11-14	-0.17	0.07	40	41
Bulgaria[3]	11-13	-0.82	-1.72	26	32
China	12-14	m	m	m	m
Croatia	11-14	m	m	m	m
India	11-13	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	13-15	m	m	m	m
Peru	12-14	1.71	1.26	m	32
Romania	11-14	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	12-14	m	m	m	m
South Africa	14-15	m	m	m	m
Thailand	12-14	m	m	m	m
EU25 average		**-0.35**	**0.88**	**47**	**50**
G20 average		**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Upper secondary

	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
OECD countries					
Australia	16-17	m	m	m	m
Austria	14-17	0	0	45	44
Belgium	14-17	0	2	63	73
Canada	15-17	m	m	m	m
Chile	14-17	0	1	59	61
Colombia[1]	15-16	1	1	31	30
Costa Rica[1,2]	15-16	0	3	34	42
Czechia	15-18	m	m	m	m
Denmark	16-18	m	m	m	m
Estonia	16-18	- 1	2	49	67
Finland	16-18	- 2	0	107	130
France	15-17	0	2	m	m
Germany	16-18	0	- 2	46	40
Greece	15-17	0	1	50	52
Hungary	14-17	0	- 1	72	61
Iceland	16-19	0	0	121	130

	Typical age of enrolment	Annual growth rate in the number of institutions	Annual growth rate in the number of students	Average number of students per grade per school	
		2015 to 2024	2015 to 2024	2015	2024
		%	%	Number	Number
Ireland	16-17	m	m	m	m
Israel	15-17	2	2	77	77
Italy	14-18	-0.17	0.35	73	76
Japan	15-17	m	m	m	m
Korea	15-17	0.39	-3.12	228	166
Latvia	16-18	m	m	m	47
Lithuania[1]	17-18	-1.32	-2.08	54	51
Luxembourg	15-18	1.04	0.48	87	82
Mexico	15-17	0.89	1.27	67	69
Netherlands	15-17	-0.39	0.25	m	m
New Zealand	15-17	0.60	1.08	99	104
Norway	16-18	-0.13	0.18	143	147
Poland[3]	15-18	-1.77	3.10	44	51
Portugal	15-17	0.12	1.30	93	103
Slovak Republic	15-18	-1.09	-0.81	49	50
Slovenia	15-18	0.00	0.92	152	165
Spain	15-17	0.72	3.17	43	53
Sweden	16-18	-0.30	1.84	65	79
Switzerland	15-18	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	14-17	3.65	0.98	116	92
United Kingdom	14-17	m	m	m	m
United States	15-17	m	m	m	m
OECD average		**0.08**	**0.68**	**79**	**79**
Partner and/or accession countries					
Argentina	15-17	m	m	m	m
Brazil	15-17	0.76	1.20	73	76
Bulgaria[3]	14-18	0.44	3.36	50	52
China	15-17	m	m	m	m
Croatia	15-18	m	m	m	m
India	14-17	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	16-18	m	m	m	m
Peru	15-16	1.71	5.66	m	27
Romania	15-18	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	15-17	m	m	m	m
South Africa	16-18	m	m	m	m
Thailand	15-17	m	m	m	m
EU25 average		**-0.32**	**0.76**	**67**	**71**
G20 average		**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Colombia and Costa Rica; and 2017 for Lithuania.
2. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2023 for Costa Rica.
3. Changes in the typical age of enrolment following education system reforms affect the comparability of trend estimates over time.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/n9wxcm.

Table B2.2. Trends in the ratio of primary schools to lower secondary schools, by type of institution (2015 and 2024)

Based on system-level (aggregate) data

	Total institutions		Public institutions		Private institutions	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
OECD countries						
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	1.93	1.88	2.08	2.05	0.96	0.97
Belgium	2.60	2.63	m	3.84	m	2.03
Canada	m	1.43	m	m	m	m
Chile	1.30	1.19	1.45	1.32	1.16	1.07
Colombia[1]	3.18	2.94	3.88	3.55	1.38	1.45
Costa Rica[1,2]	3.97	4.10	4.73	4.98	1.37	1.41
Czechia	m	m	m	m	m	m
Denmark	1.16	1.17	m	m	m	m
Estonia	1.13	1.10	1.12	1.10	1.26	1.10
Finland	m	m	m	m	m	m
France	5.28	5.03	6.04	5.74	2.87	2.76
Germany	1.04	1.13	1.16	1.26	0.55	0.59
Greece	2.46	2.12	2.40	2.16	3.70	1.44
Hungary	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.90	0.91
Iceland	1.12	1.14	1.11	1.14	1.43	1.11
Ireland	m	m	m	m	m	m
Israel	1.04	1.04	m	m	m	m
Italy	2.15	2.05	2.14	2.04	2.25	2.10
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	1.81	1.82	2.26	2.25	0.22	0.21
Latvia	m	1.03	m	1.01	m	1.22
Lithuania[1]	0.91	0.92	0.90	0.89	1.39	1.20
Luxembourg	3.72	3.44	4.56	4.14	1.00	0.92
Mexico	2.56	2.36	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	9.93	9.43	12.29	10.88	9.12	8.91
New Zealand	1.17	1.18	1.20	1.20	0.76	0.78
Norway	1.90	1.74	1.95	1.86	1.55	1.14
Poland	1.67	1.13	1.73	1.12	1.16	1.18
Portugal	3.39	3.29	3.88	3.68	1.76	1.85
Slovak Republic	1.38	1.30	1.41	1.33	1.17	1.13
Slovenia	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Spain	1.89	1.84	2.50	2.39	1.09	1.10
Sweden[1]	2.23	2.13	2.56	2.43	1.37	1.35
Switzerland	2.77	2.85	3.14	3.28	1.09	1.28
Türkiye	1.62	1.34	1.66	1.39	1.08	0.93
United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m
OECD average	**2.32**	**2.15**	**2.72**	**2.55**	**1.66**	**1.52**
Partner and/or accession countries						
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	1.91	1.67	1.96	1.68	1.73	1.64
Bulgaria	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.10	1.03
China[1]	3.64	2.74	3.89	2.95	1.20	0.89
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m
India[1]	1.96	1.70	m	m	m	m

	Total institutions		Public institutions		Private institutions	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Indonesia[1]	3.22	3.49	m	m	m	m
Peru[1]	2.42	2.26	3.02	2.74	1.44	1.38
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia[1]	1.67	1.58	1.74	1.64	1.37	1.39
South Africa[2]	3.42	5.67	3.34	5.61	4.86	6.26
Thailand[1]	2.75	3.08	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**2.41**	**2.23**	**2.81**	**2.58**	**1.92**	**1.73**
G20 average	**2.42**	**2.44**	**2.54**	**2.70**	**1.87**	**1.99**

1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for China, Colombia, Costa Rica, India, Indonesia, Peru and Saudi Arabia; and 2017 for Lithuania and Sweden.
2. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2023 for Costa Rica and South Africa.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/n9wxcm.

Table B2.3. School sizes, by education level and percentile, and ratio of primary schools to lower secondary schools, by type of institution (2024)

Based on institution-level (school register) data

	Spread of schools by size (students per grade)						Ratio of primary to lower secondary schools		
	Primary			Lower secondary			Total	Public institutions	Private institutions
	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
OECD countries									
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	12	22	43	30	50	74	1.96	2.17	0.96
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile[2]	6	22	43	18	32	57	1.19	1.32	1.07
Colombia[2]	15	30	68	22	44	91	1.33	1.09	1.83
Costa Rica[2]	3	8	21	21	52	133	4.62	5.88	1.43
Czechia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Denmark	18	30	51	22	44	66	1.02	1.25	0.74
Estonia[2]	10	21	53	12	24	64	1.06	1.06	1.12
Finland	10	25	48	17	64	116	2.08	2.17	0.89
France	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary[2]	19	33	54	17	29	49	0.94	0.95	0.91
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland	8	17	31	64	101	141	4.27	m	m
Israel[2]	32	52	77	26	53	113	1.51	1.82	1.12
Italy	15	22	40	25	56	99	2.07	2.07	2.09
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	9	48	99	29	115	195	1.85	2.29	0.21
Latvia[2]	11	23	59	12	23	56	1.03	1.00	1.35
Lithuania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Luxembourg	19	31	47	52	146	220	3.56	4.39	0.92
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	16	25	37	97	146	215	4.71	5.08	4.55
New Zealand	11	23	48	7	16	47	0.83	0.84	0.79
Norway[2]	9	23	43	11	34	89	1.76	1.88	1.15
Poland[2]	11	21	43	11	20	42	1.01	1.01	1.04
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovak Republic[2]	11	22	42	17	27	48	1.31	1.34	1.11
Slovenia[2]	25	43	60	25	45	62	1.00	1.00	1.14
Spain[2,3]	17	26	48	31	60	97	1.84	2.39	1.10
Sweden	18	33	51	34	64	102	2.31	m	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Other economies									
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	20	27	40	65	88	124	3.01	4.61	2.44
French Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
England (UK)	22	31	58	49	166	215	3.97	8.60	2.46
Scotland (UK)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
OECD average	**17**	**27**	**45**	**46**	**72**	**111**	**2.49**	**3.33**	**1.86**

	Spread of schools by size (students per grade)						Ratio of primary to lower secondary schools		
	Primary			Lower secondary			Total	Public institutions	Private institutions
	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Partner and/or accession countries									
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[2]	6	18	43	15	33	69	1.65	1.68	1.56
Bulgaria[2]	10	19	46	11	21	48	1.02	1.02	1.03
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru[2]	2	4	11	10	20	52	2.81	2.81	m
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**15**	**26**	**47**	**32**	**61**	**98**	**2.04**	**2.09**	**1.41**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Columns showing the average number of students per grade in primary and lower secondary schools are available for consultation online.
2. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2023 for Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Hungary and Spain; and 2025 for Estonia, Israel, Latvia, Norway, Peru, Poland, Slovenia and the Slovak Republic.
3. Average number of students per grade is estimated from enrolment by education level divided by the typical number of grades in that level, as information on the grades offered by individual schools is not available.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/n9wxcm.

Chapter B3. How do students transition into upper secondary education and what are their outcomes afterwards?

Highlights

- Upper secondary education is the dominant pathway after lower secondary education. On average across countries with available data, 92% of students are enrolled in further education one year after completing lower secondary education. Of these, 88% are enrolled in upper secondary education, while the remainder are in other forms of further education.
- Men are more likely than women to leave upper secondary education without a qualification, particularly those in vocational programmes. Two years after the expected graduation date, average dropout rates in vocational education reach 22% for men and 18% for women, compared with 9% for men and 7% for women in general education.
- Post-completion pathways are heavily shaped by institutional and cultural norms. 65% or more of upper secondary graduates in Austria, Finland and Sweden do not immediately enrol in further education, while the share is substantially higher in Denmark, at around 85%. Conversely, direct progression to a bachelor's or master's degree is relatively common in Estonia, the Flemish Community of Belgium, Italy and Lithuania, where around half to three-fifths of upper secondary graduates transition immediately into these programmes.

Context

The transition from lower to upper secondary education is a critical junction that sets the stage for future educational success. Smooth transitions are essential for ensuring that students remain engaged and progress linearly toward graduation. A smooth transition into upper secondary education is characterised by students progressing on time, making informed educational choices aligned with their interests and abilities, and receiving the support needed to remain engaged and successfully complete their studies. Such transitions foster both educational success and students' overall well-being (OECD, 2023[1]).

When students start their upper secondary education is often influenced by factors such as prior grade repetition, which directly contributes to delayed entry and a higher risk of non-completion later in the educational journey. Transition pathways are also shaped by system-level features. The distribution of students into general or vocational programmes reflects the degree of stratification within education systems and may influence access to subsequent educational opportunities. Similarly, some systems offer preparatory or bridging years to support academic readiness or transitions between programmes. Understanding how these structural features affect the timing and pathways of entry can help identify policies that promote on-time progression, persistence and successful completion.

Completing upper secondary education is an important milestone in students' educational pathways and a key objective of education systems. It provides young people with the knowledge, skills and qualifications needed to participate fully in society, access further learning opportunities and make successful transitions into employment. As a result, upper secondary completion is widely regarded as a minimum benchmark for educational attainment in modern economies. Monitoring completion rates therefore provides valuable insights into the extent to which education systems support students in progressing successfully through education and attaining this essential qualification. However, improvements in completion


rates do not necessarily translate into better learning outcomes. Recent results from the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) show that student performance has stagnated or declined in many OECD countries, highlighting the importance of considering both educational attainment and student achievement when assessing education system performance.

Behind overall completion rates, however, there can be substantial differences in outcomes across student groups. Factors such as delayed entry into upper secondary education, immigrant background, parental educational attainment and other socio-economic characteristics are associated with differences in students' likelihood of completing their studies. In particular, entering upper secondary education after the theoretical starting age is often linked to lower completion rates, reflecting the cumulative effects of earlier educational challenges. These differences in outcomes can reveal persistent inequalities in educational opportunities and attainment, highlighting the need for policies that support students with diverse backgrounds and needs. Understanding such patterns requires high-quality longitudinal data that track students over time and combine information on educational pathways with students' backgrounds and experiences. Such data can help identify critical transition points, support early intervention and inform more targeted and effective policy responses (Varsik, 2025[2]).

The transition from upper secondary education to further education, training or employment represents another key stage in young people's educational and professional trajectories. Those completing upper secondary education do not follow a uniform path thereafter. They may continue into tertiary education, pursue additional vocational qualifications, enter the labour market or combine work and further study. The timing and direction of these transitions are shaped by a range of factors, including the structure of education systems, labour-market opportunities, tertiary admission requirements and broader social and cultural norms. As a result, post-completion pathways vary considerably across countries, reflecting different approaches to supporting young people's progression into further learning and employment.

Figure B3.1. Status of students one year after the last grade of lower secondary education (2024)

In per cent



1. Individuals in the "not enrolled" category include those who are enrolled in programmes other than general or vocational upper secondary education.
2. Year of reference differs from 2024.
3. Data only cover public institutions.
For data, see Table B3.1.The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.

Other findings

- On average across participating countries, 85% of students who enter general upper secondary programmes are either at the theoretical age for entry or below it, compared to only 65% of those entering vocational programmes, reflecting structural factors such as prior grade repetition or the use of optional preparatory years before committing to a pathway.

- Women are more likely than men to complete upper secondary education on time in nearly all systems, with 78% graduating within the expected time, compared to 72% of men. This gender gap is particularly pronounced in Norway, where the difference between men and women amounts to 15 percentage points.
- Outcomes two years after the expected timeframe reveal notable differences in system efficiency, with total completion at 90% or more in Canada, Colombia, Ireland, Switzerland and Türkiye. By contrast, completion rates remain below 80% in Austria, Brazil and Denmark, suggesting over one-fifth of those starting upper secondary education will leave without the relevant qualification.
- Entering upper secondary education after the theoretical age is a powerful predictor of non-completion, with late entrants graduating at significantly lower rates than their on-time peers. In Brazil, Italy, Latvia, Norway and Spain, the completion gap between on-time and delayed entrants is around 30 percentage points or more, highlighting the long-term impact of early academic delays.

Note

This chapter presents the results of data collected through an ad-hoc survey on upper secondary completion rates, which is planned to be conducted biennially. The survey aims to explore students' transition pathways by following entrants from the same cohort through national administrative registries or longitudinal surveys. As not all countries are able to provide such data, country coverage is lower than the full set of OECD countries. Moreover, coverage varies across analyses depending on the availability of data for the different breakdowns collected. The survey also gathered extensive qualitative information on policies and institutional practices, including admission arrangements, student support measures, pathways between education levels and labour-market links. These contextual data were used to strengthen the analysis by helping to explain cross-country differences and interpret the quantitative results.

The students included in this survey are those who were new entrants to an upper secondary programme and who were full-time national students at the time they entered the programme. Restricting it to first-time entrants to upper secondary education excludes adult education programmes and students enrolling in upper secondary education for a second time after their initial schooling. The year of reference (2024) corresponds to a period two years after the theoretical end of the programmes these students entered (N+2), 2023 to one year after the theoretical end (N+1) and 2022 to the theoretical end (N). The year of entry varies among countries, as it depends on the duration of the programme.

Analysis

Entry into upper secondary education

Entry into upper secondary education is a critical stage in students' educational trajectories, shaping subsequent learning opportunities, educational attainment and career prospects. Students who are able to transition smoothly into programmes that align with their interests, aspirations and abilities are more likely to remain engaged, achieve positive learning outcomes and successfully progress through the education system. Conversely, delayed progression, grade repetition and barriers to access can disrupt educational pathways and increase the risk of disengagement and early school leaving (OECD, 2023[3]). Ensuring equitable access to upper secondary education and supporting successful transitions are therefore essential for promoting student well-being, improving educational outcomes and facilitating successful labour-market integration.

Reducing early leaving from education and training is also a key priority at the European level. Under the European Education Area framework (2021-30), EU Member States committed to reducing the share of early leavers to below 9% by 2030. To support this objective, the European Commission monitors and promotes policies across several key areas such as early warning systems, anti-bullying measures, teacher training, targeted support for at-risk learners, multidisciplinary support teams and strengthened career guidance. Together, these measures aim to improve student well-being, engagement and successful completion of upper secondary education (European Commission / EACEA / Eurydice, 2023[4]).

Box B3.1. Interactive visualisations on upper secondary education pathways: from entry to post-completion

An interactive online platform provides complementary contextual information on upper secondary education pathways. Through a series of interactive visualisations and country-level indicators, users can explore transitions into upper secondary education, the structure and characteristics of upper secondary programmes, completion requirements and outcomes, and students' destinations after graduation. The platform combines qualitative information on programme duration, starting age, selection mechanisms, graduation criteria and transition pathways with quantitative indicators on participation, progression, completion and post-completion outcomes.

The platform can be accessed at the Dashboard on Upper Secondary Education Systems.

Transition from lower to upper secondary education

Across OECD countries and economies with available data, transition rates from lower secondary education to further education programmes remain high. On average, 92% of students enrol directly in some form of further education, without a break in their studies, after completing lower secondary education. Of these, 88% transition to upper secondary education, while the remaining 5% enrol in other forms of further education. However, overall transition rates vary considerably, ranging from 71% in Luxembourg to 99% in Israel. Among the 22 countries and economies with available data, 16 report overall transition rates of at least 90%, including 10 where rates exceed 95%. Similarly, transition rates specifically into upper secondary education are high in most systems, confirming that upper secondary education is the normative continuation of students' educational pathways across OECD countries (Table B3.1).

In many countries, these high transition rates are supported by compulsory education policies extending into upper secondary education. Among the 22 countries and economies with available data, at least one year of upper secondary education falls within the scope of compulsory education in 14 systems. Although compulsory education ends before upper secondary education in Lithuania and Sweden, the full duration of upper secondary education is compulsory in Chile, Colombia, the Flemish and French communities of Belgium. Nevertheless, the relationship between compulsory education and transition rates is not always straightforward. For example, Sweden records a high transition rate of 97% despite upper secondary education not being compulsory, whereas the rate in Colombia is 84% even though all years of upper secondary education are compulsory. This suggests that factors beyond compulsory education policies, such as progression requirements, grade repetition and transition arrangements, also shape students' progression into upper secondary education (Table B3.1).

Some countries continue to face challenges in ensuring a smooth progression into upper secondary education. Lower transition rates in Colombia (84%), the French Community of Belgium (87%), Latvia (88%) and Luxembourg (71%), reflect larger shares of students completing lower secondary education in these countries either repeating the final grade of lower secondary education or not being enrolled in formal education. Relatively high rates of students repeating lower secondary grades in Colombia (9%), the French Community of Belgium (11%) and Luxembourg (20%) contribute to delayed transitions into upper secondary education. In Luxembourg, lower transition rates are also linked to the relatively high share of those completing lower secondary education not being enrolled in any further education (9%), partly reflecting cross-border mobility, as some families leave the country or students continue their studies abroad and therefore cannot be tracked in the national education system (Table B3.1). In Latvia, lower transition rates may partly reflect examination requirements at the end of lower secondary education. To support smoother transitions, Latvia recently introduced a reform allowing students who fail one centralised examination to enter vocational education and training programmes while retaking the failed subject during their first year, reducing the need to repeat an entire school year (OECD, 2025[5]).

Although approximately half of students transition into general upper secondary programmes (54% on average), significant cross-country differences exist in the distribution of students across educational pathways. In Austria, Bulgaria, the Flemish Community of Belgium, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia, at least half of students enter vocational programmes immediately after lower secondary education. In contrast, in countries such as Chile and New Zealand, over 90% of students transition into general education, reflecting differences in how upper secondary education is structured (Table B3.1). In Chile, all students initially enrol in a general programme during the first two years of upper secondary education before selecting a specific pathway for the remaining two years leading to an upper secondary qualification (OECD, 2023[6]). New Zealand offers a common upper secondary pathway at entry, with no differentiation by programme orientation or school. Students can then combine elements of both general

and vocational learning within their programmes of study, rather than following separate general and vocational pathways (OECD, 2023[7]).

In a few countries, a notable share of students completing lower secondary education enrol in programmes classified as "other programmes" rather than general or vocational upper secondary education. In Austria, where 14% of students enrol in other programmes, this mainly refers to *the Polytechnische Schule*, a one-year pre-vocational orientation programme that completes the ninth year of compulsory education and helps students prepare for further education or training pathways (OeAD, 2026[8]). Denmark also has a distinctive transition model, with 54% of students enrolling in other programmes, primarily the optional tenth grade. This additional year after compulsory lower secondary education allows students to strengthen their academic skills, explore career interests and gain greater maturity before choosing a formal upper secondary pathway. The programme is intended to support smoother transitions into both general and vocational upper secondary education through guidance and practical learning experiences (Field et al., 2012[9]). Similarly, in Sweden, 11% of students are enrolled in introductory programmes that support students who do not meet the eligibility requirements for national upper secondary programmes. While such programmes can help students strengthen foundational skills and prepare for further study, they may also create an additional transition step that can reduce the likelihood of progressing to and completing an upper secondary qualification (Eurydice, 2025[10]).

Mechanisms for assessing learning outcomes by the end of lower secondary education

Across surveyed education systems, student learning outcomes at the end of lower secondary education are widely assessed, although the methods and purposes of assessment vary considerably. Many countries combine external examinations with internal school-based assessments. For example, the Republic of Türkiye uses teacher assessments to identify students' learning needs, support teaching and learning, and determine school achievement scores, which are an important criterion for placement into upper secondary institutions that do not admit students through the central examination and a tie-break criterion for those that do. Latvia combines national examinations with passing grades to both certify completion of lower secondary education and determine eligibility for upper secondary entry. Countries such as Estonia, France and Poland rely more heavily on standardised examinations linked to certification or progression. In France, the *Diplôme national du brevet* combines written and oral examinations with continuous assessment, while Poland requires students to complete a written *eighth-grader exam* and Estonia uses national tests to determine graduation eligibility.

By contrast, Chile, Finland and Sweden place greater emphasis on teacher-led and school-based assessment practices. Finland does not have a national leaving examination at the end of lower secondary education, relying instead on teacher assessments guided by the national curriculum, while national evaluations are conducted only on a sample basis for system monitoring. Similarly, Chile tracks student achievement through school-based assessments and promotion records, and the national SIMCE (*Sistema de Medición de la Calidad de la Educació*n) assessments are not linked to certification or progression. In Sweden, national tests are marked internally by teachers to support consistent evaluation against national goals.

Education systems use assessments at the end of lower secondary education for multiple purposes. Many countries and economies use the results to determine eligibility for entry into upper secondary education or placement into specific academic and vocational pathways, as is the case in Bulgaria, England (United Kingdom), Estonia, Hungary, Norway and Türkiye. In others, assessments primarily certify completion of lower secondary education, including in the French Community of Belgium, Italy and Poland.

At the same time, countries increasingly use assessment data to support system monitoring and improve teaching and learning, and in several systems, assessment systems are designed primarily for monitoring educational performance at the system level rather than determining individual student progression. Colombia's *Saber 9°*, Germany's *IQB-Bildungstrend*, New Zealand's assessment arrangements and Spain's external evaluations in Grades 6 and 10 are mainly used for statistical monitoring and policy development, without direct consequences for students' certification or transition into upper secondary education. Korea, Spain (through its Grade 4 and 8 diagnostic evaluations) and Türkiye also use assessment results diagnostically to identify learning needs and adapt instruction. In addition, in Türkiye, findings obtained from national monitoring studies such as the Monitoring and Evaluation of Academic Skills Study (ABİDE) are used to monitor student achievement at the system level, identify areas for improvement in curricula and their implementation, and inform evidence-based education policies. By contrast, Brazil and Costa Rica report that they collect no systematic information on learning outcomes at this stage.

Academic requirements for entry to upper secondary education

The extent to which students are required to achieve a defined academic standard before entering upper secondary education can influence how smoothly they transition from lower secondary education. While achievement requirements may help ensure students are prepared for more advanced study, highly selective standards can create barriers to progression.

Across countries and economies, approaches in transition to upper secondary education vary considerably. Some systems require students to meet specific academic thresholds or obtain certification at the end of lower secondary education. For example, in Sweden, students must achieve passing grades in Swedish, English and mathematics, together with additional subjects (depending on whether they enter a vocational or general programme). Similarly, in Türkiye, students are required to successfully complete lower secondary education in order to progress to upper secondary education. In particular, students must achieve a minimum score of 70 out of 100 in Turkish and 50 out of 100 in other subjects. Students who do not meet these requirements are required to repeat the grade.

Other systems place greater emphasis on universal entitlement to continue education after compulsory schooling. In Norway, all students who complete lower secondary education are entitled to at least one upper secondary programme regardless of academic performance, while in Korea progression mainly depends on meeting attendance requirements in lower secondary education. France and the French Community of Belgium also follow a more automatic progression model linked to compulsory education structures.

Other countries adopt more a decentralised approach. In Canada, there are no national entrance examinations and admission criteria vary across provinces and school boards, while in Finland individual institutions may set their own grade thresholds or entrance examinations if demand exceeds available places.

Remedial pathways at entry to upper secondary education

Education systems use different mechanisms to support students who do not meet the entry requirements for upper secondary education. Nordic countries often rely on bridging programmes: in Finland, the one-year *TUVA programme* (*Tutkintokoulutukseen valmentava koulutus - Preparatory education for upper secondary qualifications*) supports students in improving grades and developing study skills needed for upper secondary education. Other systems focus on remedial support within compulsory education, such as Türkiye's *Support and Remedial Courses (Destekleme ve yetiştirme kursları-DYK)*.

Some systems also offer alternative or vocational pathways for students struggling in mainstream education. In Hungary, programmes such as *Dobbantó* (Springboard) and *Műhelyiskola* (workshop school) provide more flexible learning environments for students who have fallen behind or face difficulties in traditional school settings. Similarly, Germany and Switzerland commonly use pre-vocational or pre-apprenticeship programmes to support students who are not yet ready to enter full upper secondary education.

In some systems, students' academic performance determines the type of upper secondary programmes they can attend, rather than access to upper secondary education altogether. In countries like Israel, Luxembourg and Türkiye, for example, students who do not meet the highest academic thresholds may be excluded from selective academic pathways but are generally still guaranteed a place in non-selective general or vocational education programmes. Together, these approaches reflect efforts to maintain students' participation in education while providing multiple pathways to support progression into upper secondary education.

Guidance and counselling strategies during transition

Countries employ a wide range of guidance and counselling approaches to support students' transition into upper secondary education and manage the complexity of selecting the right educational pathway. In many systems, guidance is embedded into the curriculum and supported by national frameworks. Austria integrates career guidance into the lower secondary curriculum, while in Finland guidance counselling is a compulsory subject combining individual counselling, group activities and work-life orientation. Spain regulates guidance through national legislation, with school counselling departments providing personalised recommendations, and Korea designates dedicated career teachers who are responsible for students' careers. Türkiye also operates a structured guidance and psychological counselling system regulated by the Ministry of National Education. Poland requires students to take a minimum of 10 hours of mandatory career guidance classes in Grades 7 and 8.

Several countries complement counselling services with assessment tools and digital platforms (OECD, 2026[11]). In Spain, a formal competence assessment (*consejo orientador*) providing personalised recommendations about their future pathway is

issued to every student in the 8th and the 10th school year, prior to decision on general or vocational pathways. Hungary uses national career orientation tools and examinations to assess students' interests and skills, Türkiye offers digital career guidance inventories, and Finland provides online services to support education and career planning.

Parental and external involvement also play an important role. In Hungary, career guidance discussions are integrated into parent-teacher meetings, while Sweden frequently organises guidance meetings involving parents. Austria incorporates external actors such as the Public Employment Service, and parental engagement is also common in Denmark and France.

By contrast, some systems leave guidance largely to schools or do not provide measures specifically targeted at the transition from lower to upper secondary education. In the Flemish Community of Belgium, guidance is managed at school level, while in Canada approaches vary across provinces and territories. Ireland reports that, due to the absence of a formal distinction between lower and upper secondary education, specific transition measures are not applicable.

New entrants to upper secondary education by age

Delayed entry into upper secondary education serves as a critical indicator of how frequently students end up taking less linear paths through education. In most systems, the theoretical entry age is 15 or 16 years old but it ranges from 14 years in Chile, the Flemish Community of Belgium, Hungary and Italy to 17 years in Lithuania. On average across participating countries, 76% of students enter upper secondary programmes at or below the theoretical entry age. In some systems, many students start upper secondary education later than the theoretical age, often due to grade repetition during primary or lower secondary education. For instance, 60% of students in Colombia, 69% in the French Community of Belgium and 56% in Luxembourg enter upper secondary education at or below the theoretical entry age, and in these systems the share of students who end up repeating the last grade of lower secondary education ranges from 9% to 20%. In other systems, however, delayed entry is more of a structural feature designed to support student readiness and orientation than a consequence of academic difficulty. Denmark provides a notable example: only 39% of students enter upper secondary programmes at or below the theoretical entry age, largely because more than half of students (54%) enrol in another programme after lower secondary education, primarily the optional tenth grade (discussed above), which aims to strengthen academic foundations and clarify career choices before students commit to a formal upper secondary pathway (Table B3.1) and Table B3.5, available online).

Delayed entry rates are also related to the orientation of upper secondary programmes. On average across participating countries, 85% of students enter general upper secondary programmes at or below the theoretical age and in several countries, including Estonia, Italy, Lithuania, Norway, Slovenia and Sweden, the rate is over 95%. In contrast, the average is only 65% for vocational programmes. This disparity suggests that vocational pathways more often accommodate students with non-linear educational trajectories, whether due to prior grade repetition, delayed transitions or periods of disengagement from education (Table B3.5 and Figure B3.1a., available online).

The contrast between programme orientations is particularly pronounced in some systems. In Estonia, 98% of students enter general programmes on time compared to 69% of those starting vocational programmes. This reflects the fact that vocational pathways in Estonia tend to attract students with weaker prior academic achievement and a greater risk of delayed progression or non-completion (Musset et al., 2019[12]). Most of these delayed entrants are only one year over the theoretical age – just 6% of all Estonian entrants to upper secondary vocational programmes are two or more years older. There are also wide differences in Denmark, where 63% of students enter general programmes on time compared to only 10% in vocational programmes, partly reflecting the widespread use of preparatory or transitional routes before vocational entry. Vocational entrants in Denmark also tend to be substantially older than their peers in other countries, with 73% entering two or more years above the theoretical age (Table B3.5, available online).

Countries where on-time entry is both high and relatively consistent across programme orientations, such as Lithuania (99% in general and 88% in vocational education), Slovenia (96% and 89%) and Sweden (97% and 94%), may have more integrated transition mechanisms and lower levels of stratification between general and vocational pathways (Table B3.5, available online). These patterns are closely related to later completion outcomes.

Completion of upper secondary education

Requirements to complete upper secondary education

Completion requirements for upper secondary education vary significantly across countries, reflecting different priorities regarding academic achievement, accountability and access to higher education. In many systems, students gain their upper secondary

qualification based on a combination of internal school-based assessment, external examination and attendance, although the emphasis placed on each component differs. A recent study of 71 upper secondary certificates across 38 systems identified that assessment most commonly combines external exams with internal school-based assessment certificates. Some certificates are entirely internally-assessed (19 certificates) and others rely only on external examinations (OECD, 2026[13]). For example, Austria combines a final thesis, standardised external examinations and oral school-based examinations within its "three-pillar" model (Government of Austria, 2025[14]). France also emphasises external assessment through the *baccalauréat*, where final examinations account for 60 percent of the final grade and continuous internal assessment contributes 40 percent (Government of France, 2025[15]). Bulgaria requires students to pass two compulsory State Matriculation Examinations (Eurydice, 2026[16]).

Other systems place greater emphasis on credit and course completion rather than high-stakes examinations. In Canada, students graduate by completing a required number of credits, with requirements differing across provinces and sometimes including provincial examinations. Japan follows a similar approach, requiring students to complete more than 74 units in most of the programmes for graduation. Attendance also forms an important component in some countries. Chile requires an attendance rate of at least 85%, while Korea mandates attendance for two-thirds of total school days. However, the absence of standardised examinations for upper secondary completion does not necessarily imply the absence of high-stakes examinations. In several systems, students may sit separate examinations for entry into higher education. For example, in Korea, admission to many tertiary programmes is strongly influenced by performance on the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT), a national university entrance examination.

Some countries distinguish between completing upper secondary and qualifying for higher levels of education through dual certification systems. This reflects a broader pattern observed across education systems: external setting and marking are more common where certificates and grades play an important role in selection for post-secondary destinations, while school-based assessment and marking are more prevalent where upper secondary certificates have a limited role in higher education admissions (OECD, 2026[13]). In Finland, students in general programmes receive both a school leaving certificate based on teacher assessment and a matriculation examination certificate used for higher education admission. Poland follows a comparable model, where students receive a school leaving certificate upon completing upper secondary education, while access to higher education requires completion of the nationally set Matura examination.

Vocational upper secondary education shares several features with general education but places greater emphasis on practical training and professional qualification. Mandatory work-based learning is common across vocational systems. Norway requires apprenticeships in most vocational programmes, while Estonia requires practical training to account for at least 35% of total study time. Several countries also require external professional certification or practical aptitude assessments, such as Austria's externally administered apprenticeship examination and the Slovak Republic's occupational skills assessments.

Some countries integrate academic and vocational requirements within the same framework. In Hungary, vocational students in the *Technikum* pathway must complete both the general Matura examination and a vocational skills assessment, while Sweden combines vocational and academic learning through mandatory work-based learning. Overall, vocational pathways tend to place greater emphasis on practical competence and labour-market preparation, although many countries increasingly combine academic and vocational elements.

On-time completion

Timely completion of upper secondary education is an important indicator of education system efficiency, as it reflects whether students progress through the system without grade repetition, prolonged disengagement, delayed transitions to further education or the labour market, or dropping out. Delayed completion is often associated with weaker school engagement and a higher risk of non-completion (Lyche, 2010[17]; Rumberger, 2011[18]). This is particularly important because leaving school without an upper secondary qualification is associated with poorer labour-market outcomes and poses a major challenge for education systems. Across OECD countries, the employment rate among 25-34 year-olds is 59% for those without upper secondary attainment, compared with 79% for those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary attainment (see Chapter A3). In addition, workers aged 25-64 year-olds without upper secondary qualifications earn, on average, 17% less than those who have completed upper secondary education (see Chapter A4).

Across countries with available data, on average, 75% of students who were expected to graduate in 2024 completed upper secondary education on time. Rates vary considerably, surpassing 85% in Colombia, Ireland, Israel and Türkiye, but falling below 60% in Austria, Denmark, the French Community of Belgium and Luxembourg (Table B3.2).

As discussed above, countries differ considerably in the design of their upper secondary certification systems and graduation requirements, including the extent to which they rely on external examinations, internal assessment, credit accumulation and

work-based learning. These institutional arrangements can form part of the broader context in which students progress through upper secondary education. Students in systems where a larger share of students take external examinations tend to perform better in PISA mathematics, reading and science. However, these differences are no longer statistically significant after accounting for students' and schools' socio-economic background, suggesting that wider socio-economic and systemic factors play a more important role in shaping student outcomes than certification structures alone (OECD, 2026[13]). Systems with a stronger emphasis on external examinations also tend to report lower levels of growth mindsets (referring to students' belief that their abilities and intelligence can be developed through effort, learning, and persistence) among students, highlighting the importance of balancing standardised assessment with more diverse forms of evaluation that support broader learning behaviours and student development (OECD, 2026[13]).

A consistent cross-country pattern is the gender gap in on-time completion. In all countries with available data except Denmark, women are more likely than men to complete upper secondary education within the theoretical duration. On average across countries and economies, 78% of women complete on time compared with 72% of men. This gap is particularly pronounced in the French Community of Belgium, Italy and Norway, where women outperform men by more than 10 percentage points, while completion rates are nearly identical between genders in Finland, Ireland and Sweden (Table B3.2). Many factors can potentially contribute to these differences. Among others, boys tend to perform less strongly in reading, which can affect achievement across multiple subjects and could contribute to lower completion rates (OECD, 2023[19]).

However, not completing upper secondary education within the theoretical duration does not necessarily mean not completing at all, as many students complete their studies after an additional period of time. Consequently, gender gaps in completion rates tend to narrow when completion is measured several years after the expected completion date (see Chapter B3 in (OECD, 2023[20])).

Completion within and after the expected timeframe


The first year after the expected graduation date is the most important period for students who have not completed upper secondary education to catch up. On average across countries and economies with available data, completion rates increase by 6 percentage points between the end of the theoretical duration (N) and one year later (N+1), compared with only 3 percentage points between N+1 and N+2. In the French Community of Belgium, for example, completion rates increase by 17 percentage points between N and N+1, but by only 4 percentage points between N+1 and N+2. A similar pattern is observed in Denmark, where the corresponding increases are 15 and 3 percentage points. These suggests that, for most students who do not complete on time, one additional year is generally enough to meet the remaining graduation requirements (Table B3.3, and Figure B3.2).

However, cross-country differences in these patterns reflect variation in progression rules, opportunities for re-engagement and the flexibility of pathways. In several systems, completion rates do not change much in the year after the end of the theoretical duration, indicating relatively linear educational pathways in which student outcomes are largely determined once they have passed their expected graduation date. In Ireland and Lithuania, for instance, there is virtually no increase in completion rates between N and N+1(Table B3.3, and Figure B3.2).

In contrast, a second additional year remains important in some systems characterised by more flexible progression pathways or prolonged student participation. In Luxembourg, completion rates increase by a further 8 percentage points between N+1 and N+2, while Austria records an additional gain of 6 percentage points. These patterns may reflect systems where students remain enrolled for longer periods in order to meet graduation requirements. In Austria, for example, students must obtain a positive final report card before they are eligible to sit the Matura examination (Table B3.3, and Figure B3.2).

Figure B3.2. Cumulative upper secondary completion rates, by timeframe (2022-2024)

Cohort of students who were expected to complete upper secondary education in 2022 based on the theoretical duration of programmes, in per cent



1. Data are only available for 2022.
2. Data only include information related to new entrants to general upper secondary programmes.
3. Data for 2023 are missing.
4. Data only cover public institutions.
5. Year of reference differs from 2024.

For data, see Table B3.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.

Completion after the expected timeframe by age

As suggested by the entry patterns discussed above, the age at which students enter upper secondary education is a strong predictor of eventual completion. On average across countries with available data, 88% of students who enter at or below the theoretical entry age complete upper secondary education by the end of the theoretical programme duration plus two years. Completion rates among these students exceed 95% in countries such as Colombia, Israel and Türkiye. By contrast, completion rates are substantially lower among students who enter one or more years late, averaging 66% across countries and economies with available data (Table B3.6, available online). While these differences may partly reflect pre-existing differences between students who experience delayed progression and those who do not, the pattern is consistent with evidence showing that students who have repeated a grade tend to exhibit weaker academic outcomes than non-repeaters (Ikeda and García, 2014[21]).

The size of this gap varies considerably across education systems. In Brazil, Italy, Latvia, Norway and Spain, the difference in completion rates between students entering on time and those entering late around 30 percentage points or more. Estonia and Lithuania also show gaps of around 40 percentage points, although results for late entrants should be interpreted cautiously in these countries, as they account for less than 10% of the cohort. In contrast, Switzerland shows a much smaller gap (around 10 percentage points), suggesting more flexible progression arrangements and stronger second-chance pathways (Table B3.6 and Figure B3.2a, available online). Box B3.2 examines two other factors related to students' backgrounds that might lower their completion rates: parental educational attainment and immigration status.

Some systems have introduced targeted policies to support students with delayed educational trajectories. Brazil, for example, implemented *Correção de Fluxo Escolar* (school flow correction) programmes from the mid-1990s onwards to address widespread age-grade distortion (*distorção idade-série*) caused by grade repetition and interrupted schooling. These accelerated learning programmes enabled over-age students to complete multiple grades before re-entering age-appropriate cohorts. By the 2000s, nearly all Brazilian states had adopted some form of flow correction policy, with variants continuing in several state and municipal systems throughout the 2010s (Bruns, Evans and Luque, 2011[22]; Cenpec, 2026[23]).

Box B3.2. Inequalities in upper secondary completion


National completion rates can mask substantial disparities across student groups. Parents' educational attainment and immigrant status remain strongly associated with students' likelihood of completing upper secondary education, even in systems with relatively high overall completion rates. Differences in family educational background, access to academic support, language proficiency and familiarity with education systems can all shape students' progression and completion. Understanding these disparities is important for identifying groups at greater risk of non-completion and for designing targeted policy responses.

Completion rates by parents' educational attainment

Parents' educational attainment continues to be a strong determinant of success in upper secondary education. Across all countries with available data, students whose parents have completed tertiary education are significantly more likely to graduate within two years of the end of theoretical duration than those whose parents have below-tertiary attainment (Figure B3.3, Panel A).

Figure B3.3. Upper secondary completion rates two years after the end of the theoretical duration of the programme, by parents' educational attainment and immigrant background (2024)

Cohort of students who were expected to complete upper secondary education in 2022 based on the theoretical duration of programmes, in per cent



1. Only information on the attainment level of the mother is available in the Flemish Community of Belgium.
2. Completion rates for students with an immigrant background should be interpreted with caution, as they make up less than 10% of their cohort.
For data, see Table B3.6 (available online). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.

The differences in completion rates between students whose parents lack tertiary attainment and those from tertiary-educated backgrounds are wider in Denmark and Norway (14 percentage points lower), and Finland (17 percentage points lower). In contrast, the gap is only 3 percentage points in Israel and 4 percentage points in Switzerland (Figure B3.3, Panel A). This suggests that these systems are more effective at decoupling student outcomes from family educational history. In Switzerland, the strong integration of vocational education and training with the labour market, including well-established apprenticeship pathways and close employer involvement, may support smoother transitions and completion among students from diverse socio-economic backgrounds (OECD, 2025[24]).

Completion rates by students' immigrant background

Immigrant background represents another significant axis of inequity, with immigrant students facing substantial hurdles in graduating from upper secondary education in most countries with data available. In Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, completion rates for immigrant students are at least 11 percentage points lower than for their non-immigrant peers. These disparities highlight the challenges of integrating students who may face language barriers or have entered the host country's school system late in their educational trajectory. Israel stands as a notable exception to this trend, achieving parity with a 95% completion rate for both immigrant and non-immigrant students (Figure B3.3, Panel B).

Upper secondary systems in Nordic countries such as Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden are characterised by relatively differentiated pathways and substantial student choice about programme orientation and progression. The systems with greater flexibility and autonomy may place greater demands on students' capacity to navigate educational transitions and make informed educational choices. In such contexts, family educational support and familiarity with the education system may play a particularly important role in shaping students' educational trajectories (Perico E Santos, 2023[25]).

To address these inequities, countries have implemented various targeted measures. For instance, Finland uses preparatory programmes like TUVA to help students, including those with immigrant backgrounds, develop the language proficiency and study skills required for a full upper secondary qualification. Other systems focus on reducing the financial "pull-out" factors that disproportionately affect disadvantaged cohorts, such as Brazil's use of conditional cash transfers and graduation bonuses specifically targeted at low-income students in public schools (see Box B3.3). The expansion of community-based support and educational mediators, as seen in Bulgaria and Latvia, also aims to bridge the gap between schools and marginalised families to ensure that students' backgrounds do not predetermine educational completion. The Netherlands monitors early school leavers through Regional Contact and Coordination Offices (RMCs), and uses targeted language support to help immigrant students remain engaged in education. Alternative pathways also allow students who do not initially meet graduation requirements to complete their qualifications later.

Status of students at the end of theoretical duration plus two years

Considering where students are two years after the theoretical end of their upper secondary programme (N+2) provides a broader picture of how education systems balance completion, continued enrolment and dropping out. Total completion rates at N+2 reach or exceed 90% in Canada, Colombia, Ireland, Slovenia, Switzerland and Türkiye (Figure B3.4). However, these rates refer only to students who entered upper secondary education and should therefore be interpreted alongside participation rates. In some countries, high completion rates may partly reflect more selective entry into upper secondary education. For example, while Colombia records high completion rates among upper secondary entrants, the transition rate from lower secondary education to further education is 84%, indicating that not all young people continue into upper secondary education (Table B3.1.). By contrast, other systems face greater challenges in supporting students to complete once they have entered upper secondary education. Completion rates are below 80% in Austria, Brazil and Denmark, where larger shares of students are either still enrolled in education without graduating or have left education without completing (Figure B3.4).


The share of students who remain enrolled two years after they would be expected to graduate highlights systems where students continue their studies for longer periods before meeting graduation requirements. For instance, in Austria, Finland and Luxembourg, between 6% and 7% of the cohort remain in education at this point (Figure B3.4). In some systems, this may reflect demanding certification structures, while in others it may indicate more flexible progression pathways that allow students additional time to complete outstanding requirements, repeat academic years or change programmes during upper secondary education.

High dropout rates are particularly notable in Brazil (20%) and Denmark (21%) (Figure B3.4). These patterns may partly reflect the complexity of graduation requirements and the challenges students face in navigating multiple academic or vocational pathways. In Brazil, students must complete both the nationally defined core curriculum and a specialised itinerary, while also meeting attendance and performance requirements. Another factor to consider is that the group classified as neither graduated nor enrolled have not necessarily all dropped out. In some cases, students may have left the education system covered by the data but remain enrolled elsewhere. For example, in the Flemish Community of Belgium, students recorded as no longer enrolled in Flemish education may have subsequently enrolled in education programmes in the French Community. This group may also include students who completed upper secondary education but did not obtain a full qualification. This is the case in Sweden, where an upper secondary diploma is awarded only to students who pass certain compulsory subjects. Graduation is conditional on achieving passing grades in core subjects as well as meeting programme-specific requirements. Students who do not meet

these requirements receive a study certificate, which corresponds to ISCED attainment levels 342 or 352, rather than an upper secondary qualification (OECD/Eurostat/UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2015[26]).

Figure B3.4. Status of upper secondary students two years after the end of the theoretical duration of their programme (2024)

Cohort of students who were expected to complete upper secondary education in 2022 based on the theoretical duration of programmes, in per cent



1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
2. Data only include information related to new entrants to general upper secondary programmes.
3. Data only cover public institutions.
4. Not graduated and not enrolled category includes students who are still in education.

For data, see Table B3.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.

Dropout rates by gender and programme orientation

Gender differences remain a persistent feature of educational disengagement, with men more likely than women to leave upper secondary education without a qualification. On average across countries with available data, 14% of men have left upper secondary education without a qualification by the end of the theoretical duration plus two years (N+2), compared with 10% of women. The gender gap is particularly pronounced in Estonia (9 percentage points), Latvia (8 percentage points) and Italy (7 percentage points) (Table B3.7, available online).

More men than women drop out of upper secondary education regardless of programme orientation, but the gap is wider in vocational pathways, suggesting that gendered patterns of disengagement are amplified within vocational education. At N+2, the average drop out rate in vocational education is 22% for men and 18% for women, compared with 9% and 7% in general education. In the French Community of Belgium and Latvia, dropout rates for men in vocational programmes are at least 9 percentage points higher than for their female peers. There are also wide gaps in vocational pathways in Estonia, Luxembourg, Norway and Spain (Figure B3.5).


A few countries display more limited gender differences within vocational education, or even a reversal of the gender gap. In Denmark, Hungary and Lithuania, drop out rates among women in vocational programmes exceed those among men. In Lithuania, almost half of women enrolled in vocational upper secondary programmes leave education without completing, compared with 42% of men (Figure B3.5). However, these figures should be interpreted with caution due to the relatively small number of women enrolled in vocational programmes. Lithuania has recently introduced reforms aimed at strengthening the attractiveness of vocational education through improved career guidance, clearer progression pathways and stronger links to employment and

tertiary education. Reforms to the Matura examination also seek to introduce more flexible and competency-based assessment approaches that better reflect vocational learners' skills and learning pathways (OECD, 2023[27]).

The considerably higher dropout rates – for both genders – in vocational education compared to general programmes partly reflect differences in student composition, as such programmes often enrol a higher share of students with weaker prior academic performance, previous grade repetition, lower socio-economic backgrounds or weaker attachment to school, all of which are associated with a greater risk of dropping out (OECD, 2023[20]). In contrast, systems with strong and well-integrated vocational education and training structures, such as Switzerland, maintain comparatively low dropout rates across both programme orientations (Figure B3.5). Vocational education and training can play an important role in supporting overall completion by providing a broader range of learning pathways that accommodate diverse students' interests, needs and aspirations.

Figure B3.5. Upper secondary drop out rates two years after the end of the theoretical duration of the programme, by gender and programme orientation (2024)

Cohort of students who were expected to complete upper secondary education in 2022 based on the theoretical duration of programmes, in per cent



1. Data only cover public institutions.
2. Data only include information related to new entrants to general upper secondary programmes.
3. Dropouts include students who are still in education.
4. Year of reference differs from 2024.

For data, see Table B3.7 (available online). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.

Gender differences in dropout rates for general education are also apparent in several countries. Brazil records the highest dropout rate among men in general upper secondary education, at 23%, and, alongside Israel, has the largest gender gaps within this orientation, at 8 percentage points. In several systems, including Austria and Norway, gender gaps are evident across both general and vocational pathways, suggesting that differences in persistence and engagement are not confined to a single programme orientation but reflect broader structural or behavioural patterns across upper secondary education (Figure B3.5).

Dropping out is rarely the result of a single event, but rather the outcome of a cumulative process of disengagement (Rumberger, 2011[18]; Varsik, 2025[2]). Students leave education for a combination of personal, school-related and system-level reasons that often reinforce one another. Poor academic performance, absenteeism and low motivation are common risk factors, frequently linked to socio-economic background and earlier educational experiences. School environments and practices can also contribute

to disengagement, particularly when students feel unsupported. At the system level, policies such as grade repetition or limited vocational opportunities may further increase students' risks of dropping out (Lyche, 2010[17]; Varsik, 2025[2]). As a result, effective prevention strategies need to address both immediate warning signs and the broader conditions that gradually push students out of education.

Mechanisms to reduce dropout rates and improve retention

Countries are adopting comprehensive strategies to reduce dropout rates in upper secondary education, combining legal obligations, targeted funding, early identification of at-risk students, financial support and flexible learning pathways. One common policy approach is the extension of compulsory participation in education or training. In France, training became mandatory for 16–18-year-olds in 2020 and can be fulfilled through schooling, apprenticeships, civic service or employment-oriented training pathways. Austria and Italy similarly require participation in education or training until the age of 18, while Finland extended compulsory education to age 18 in 2021 with the aim of strengthening equity and improving attainment levels. England also requires young people to remain in education, training or work-based learning until their 18th birthday (OECD, 2024[28]).

A second group of measures focuses on personalised and targeted support for students and schools at greater risk of disengagement. France's REP (*Réseau d'Éducation Prioritaire* ("Priority Education Network")) and REP+ (*Réseau d'Éducation Prioritaire Renforcé* ("Enhanced/Reinforced Priority Education Network")) networks, Spain's PROA+ (*Programa para la Orientación, Avance y Enriquecimiento Educativo* ("Programme for Educational Guidance, Progress and Enrichment")) programme and Ireland's DEIS (Delivering Equality of Opportunity in Schools) initiative provide additional resources to schools serving disadvantaged communities, with a focus on mentoring, pedagogical support and family engagement. Several countries have also introduced individualised guidance systems. Sweden assigns a mentor to each student to monitor attendance and academic progress, Austria operates a dedicated youth coaching programme for students at risk of dropping out, and Bulgaria employs educational mediators to strengthen links between schools and families.

Early warning systems have also become a central element of retention strategies. These systems use attendance, behavioural and academic indicators and artificial intelligence (AI) tools to identify students at risk of dropping out and enable earlier intervention. Chile's SAT (*Sistema de Alerta Temprana* ("Early Warning System")) combines attendance, socio-economic and performance data. In the United States, most districts use early warning systems of some kind, some of which are AI-based (OECD, 2023[29]). Hungary operates a mandatory early school-leaving warning system. In Türkiye, students' attendance, academic performance and dropout risk are regularly monitored, while school-based Prevention, Intervention and Guidance Commissions identify at-risk students and provide targeted support. Following a 2016 reform, vocational training centres were incorporated into compulsory education, enabling students who leave upper secondary education to continue their studies through these centres or open education high schools and complete an upper secondary diploma. The Flemish Community of Belgium requires schools to intervene after repeated unjustified absences. Several systems increasingly incorporate digital monitoring tools and predictive models, including Finland's AI-HOKS (Artificial Intelligence–supported Personal Competence Development Plan) pilot for vocational education and training (VET) students and New Zealand's predictive models for identifying youth at risk of becoming neither employed nor in education or training (NEET).

Financial support mechanisms are also widely used to reduce the economic pressures associated with school participation and completion. Spain offers scholarships and grants to support retention, while Bulgaria, Hungary and Türkiye provide transport support, free textbooks or scholarships. Korea combines free upper secondary education with additional benefits for students from financially vulnerable backgrounds.


Several countries have also introduced more flexible and modular pathways to address high dropout rates in vocational education. Spain's 2022 VET reform expanded modular learning and strengthened "Basic VET" as an alternative pathway for students at risk of dropping out, allowing easier re-entry and movement across programmes. Estonia introduced preparatory studies for students who do not meet lower secondary thresholds and extended the obligation to learn until age 18. Italy developed regional vocational training pathways offering more practice-oriented alternatives to traditional academic pathways. These approaches seek to prevent temporary disengagement from becoming permanent non-completion by providing students with more flexible routes to qualification. Box B3.3 looks at improvements in completion rates among some countries and economies over the past 15 years.

Box B3.3. Trends in upper secondary completion rates

Upper secondary completion rates two years after the end of the theoretical duration (N+2) have improved across many countries with available data over time, reflecting efforts to strengthen retention, reduce dropout rates and support progression through upper secondary education (Figure B3.6).

Figure B3.6. Trends in upper secondary completion rates two years after the end of the theoretical duration of the programme (2010 and 2024)

Cohorts of students who were expected to complete upper secondary education in 2008 and 2022 based on the theoretical duration of programmes, in per cent



1. Year of reference differs from 2010.
2. Year of reference differs from 2024.
3. Data only include information related to new entrants to general upper secondary programmes.

For data, see Table B3.3 and Table B3.8 (available online).. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.

Several countries have recorded particularly large increases in completion rates over the past 15 years, although the reference year for the earlier observation differs across countries. Lithuania recorded the largest improvement, with completion rates at the end of theoretical duration rising from 64% to 87%. Substantial gains were also observed in Brazil, where completion rates increased from 65% to 79%, and in Chile, where they rose from 74% to 88%. Latvia and Norway also recorded increases of around 9 percentage points over the period (Figure B3.6).

Countries and economies with already comparatively high completion rates in earlier years generally experienced smaller changes over time. In Slovenia, completion rates remained consistently high, suggesting that stable upper secondary structures and a well-integrated vocational education and training system already supported strong retention outcomes. Similarly, completion rates remained high and relatively stable in Colombia, the Flemish Community of Belgium and Sweden (Figure B3.6).

Denmark often appears as an outlier in comparative analyses of upper secondary completion, particularly with regard to vocational education (Figure B3.6). Interpreting these results requires an understanding of the structure and recent reforms of the Danish VET system. A major reform introduced in 2014 aimed to make vocational education more attractive and better adapted to younger students by simplifying programme structures, strengthening academic requirements and creating a

clearer and more coherent youth education environment. However, the reform also introduced higher entry requirements and more demanding progression expectations, which may have contributed to lower completion rates among some student groups in the years immediately following implementation. In addition, transitional effects associated with programme restructuring and changes in student composition may have influenced completion patterns. As a result, declining completion rates observed in the figure should not necessarily be interpreted as evidence of declining system performance, but rather in the context of substantial changes to the design and expectations of the VET system.

Differences between programme orientations remain a persistent feature across countries over time. In most systems, general education recorded larger improvements in completion rates than vocational education. Lithuania experienced one of the largest increases in general education, rising from around 48% to over 77% over a period of nearly 15 years. Brazil, Chile and Sweden also recorded increases of at least 11 percentage points in general programmes. By contrast, only Brazil, Latvia and Norway recorded increases of more than 1 percentage point in vocational completion rates, while several other countries experienced declines. In Sweden, for example, vocational completion rates fell by 11 percentage points over the period (Table B3.3 and Table B3.8, available online). These findings underline the importance of sustained policy efforts aimed not only at increasing access to upper secondary education, but also at strengthening progression, retention and successful completion, particularly within vocational pathways.

Some of these developments may reflect broader structural reforms in upper secondary education, and interpreting these trends therefore requires consideration of wider policy and system-level developments. In Latvia and Lithuania, reforms aimed at modernising vocational education and strengthening links between vocational and general pathways may have contributed to improved completion outcomes. In Brazil, improvements in completion coincide with policies combining financial incentives with curricular reform. *Bolsa Família* links financial support to school attendance, while the *Pé-de-Meia* programme provides payments and graduation bonuses for low-income upper secondary students. In parallel, the New Upper Secondary Education framework introduced more flexible learning pathways and elective components aimed at increasing student engagement and retention. Chile strengthened retention through attendance monitoring, early warning initiatives and targeted support for vulnerable students, alongside reforms designed to improve progression within upper secondary education. Together, these examples illustrate how countries have combined financial support, curricular flexibility and targeted interventions to address long-standing patterns of educational disengagement and improve upper secondary completion rates over time. These improvements likely reflect a combination of policy efforts, broader economic growth and changes in labour market demand that have increased the value of upper secondary qualifications and strengthened incentives for young people to remain in education.

However, higher completion rates do not necessarily reflect improvements in student learning. Although rising completion rates may reflect stronger student support, engagement and progression through the education system, they may also be influenced by changes in assessment, certification or progression requirements. This distinction is important, as recent PISA results show that learning outcomes have stagnated or declined in many OECD countries, highlighting that gains in educational attainment are not always accompanied by improvements in students' learning outcomes (OECD, 2023[19]).

Post-completion pathways

The transition from upper secondary education to further education, training or employment is influenced by a combination of education system structures, national requirements, labour-market demands and cultural norms. Students' post-secondary trajectories are shaped not only by their qualifications but also by wider social and institutional arrangements, including compulsory military or civic service, gap-year practices, labour-market dynamics and formal transition mechanisms. These factors may either accelerate or delay progression into higher education and employment, contributing to cross-national variation in transition pathways.

Transition patterns across levels of education


Patterns in where students go after graduating from upper secondary education vary considerably across countries and reflect differences in education system design and progression opportunities. One year after graduation, around 9% of upper secondary graduates across participating countries have re-entered either general or vocational upper secondary education. In the Flemish Community of Belgium and Slovenia, close to 20% of upper secondary graduates enrol in vocational upper secondary programmes. This reflects systems in which vocational pathways are organised as multi-stage routes, allowing students to acquire additional qualifications or strengthen their prospects for tertiary education (OECD, 2023[30]; OECD, 2023[31]). Conversely, in

New Zealand, around 85% of upper secondary graduates who remain in education enrol in a general upper secondary programme (Table B3.4). This pattern reflects the structure of the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA), where Level 2 is generally considered sufficient for upper secondary completion, but Level 3 is frequently pursued to meet university entrance requirements and expand tertiary education opportunities (OECD, 2023[7]).

Another transition pathway is enrolment in post-secondary non-tertiary and short-cycle tertiary programmes. On average, 13% of upper secondary graduates are in one of these programmes one year after graduation. The role of post-secondary non-tertiary and short-cycle tertiary education in graduate transitions varies considerably across countries; they are well established in some systems but play only a limited role in others. This transition is particularly common in Austria, France, Hungary and Spain, where at least one-quarter of upper secondary graduates follow these pathways (Table B3.4). In Austria and Hungary, post-secondary vocational programmes provide specialised professional qualifications closely aligned with labour-market needs. In France, programmes such as the *Brevet de technicien supérieur* (BTS) and the *Bachelor universitaire de technologie* (BUT) attract many upper secondary graduates from technological and vocational pathways by combining vocational preparation with opportunities for further tertiary progression. Similarly, Spain's higher VET programmes (*Formación Profesional de Grado Superior*) offer a strong labour-market orientation while also facilitating access to tertiary education. These examples illustrate how countries with strong VET traditions use post-secondary non-tertiary and short-cycle tertiary education as flexible pathways linking upper secondary education, employment and further study.

Figure B3.7. Status of graduates from upper secondary education in the year after their graduation, by gender (2023)

In per cent



1. Not enrolled category includes students enrolled in general or vocational upper secondary programmes.
2. Students enrolled in post-secondary non-tertiary or short-cycle tertiary education exclude those enrolled in bachelor's or master's degree programmes.
3. Data only include the graduates from general upper secondary programmes.
For data, see Table B3.4. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.

Direct progression to bachelor's and master's programmes is the most common transition pathway. Across participating countries, 35% of upper secondary graduates enrol in these programmes in the year after completion. This pattern is particularly prominent in Estonia, the Flemish Community of Belgium, Italy and Lithuania, where more than half of upper secondary graduates continue directly into these programmes. In these systems, tertiary education is closely integrated with upper secondary completion, making direct progression the dominant route for many students (Table B3.4).

Gender differences are evident across transition pathways. On average across participating countries, 39% of women who completed upper secondary education enrol in bachelor's or master's programmes within one year of graduation, compared with 31% of men. This pattern is observed in all participating countries and is particularly pronounced in Austria, Canada, France and Lithuania, where the gender gap in tertiary enrolment exceeds 12 percentage points. Gender differences are less marked in other educational pathways. Men are slightly more likely to enrol in vocational upper secondary programmes and in post-secondary non-tertiary or short-cycle tertiary education. These patterns are especially pronounced in countries with strong vocational progression routes, such as Slovenia for vocational upper secondary education and France for post-secondary non-tertiary and short-cycle tertiary programmes, where the gender gap is around 10 percentage points (Figure B3.7).

Non-enrolment and delayed transitions and their institutional drivers

A substantial share of students leave formal education shortly after graduating from upper secondary education. On average across participating countries, 42% of upper secondary graduates are not enrolled in any formal education one year later. This pattern is particularly common in Austria, Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, where the share is more than 60%. Men are more likely than women to follow this pathway (45% compared to 39% on average), with the largest gender gaps observed in Austria, Norway and Switzerland (Table B3.4).

However, non-enrolment should not be interpreted as disengagement from education, training or work. Several institutional and cultural factors explain why some upper secondary graduates have not taken up further formal education or have postponed enrolment. Direct entry into the labour market remains a central transition pathway. Data from Norway and Sweden show most graduates who are no longer enrolled are employed: 90% in Norway and 79% in Sweden, with only a small share outside the labour force (Table B3.4, relevant data available online). A direct transition to employment is especially common among graduates from vocational programmes and reflects the labour-market orientation of many VET systems. In Hungary, for example, direct employment is the expected outcome for graduates of vocational schools (s*zakképző iskola*), whereas graduates of technical schools (t*echnikum*) are more likely to use their qualifications as a pathway to tertiary education. These examples illustrate that, in many systems, leaving formal education after upper secondary completion is part of a planned transition into work rather than an indication of inactivity.

To support transitions and widen educational opportunities, several countries have developed bridging mechanisms that facilitate progression into tertiary education. In Chile, for instance, private preparatory institutions (*preuniversitarios*) play a significant role in helping students prepare for the national higher education admission examination (PAES). These institutions operate outside the formal education system but are widely used by students seeking entry into competitive tertiary programmes.

Mandatory military or civic service is another factor that can delay progression to further education. In Austria, military service is compulsory for male citizens and typically takes place around the age of 18 or 19, often postponing entry into tertiary education. Similar patterns are observed in Switzerland, where military service must be completed between the ages of 19 and 25 and many students choose to fulfil this obligation before beginning tertiary studies. Military or civic service also remains a common transitional experience in Finland and Denmark. Since these obligations primarily apply to men, they may contribute to the higher shares of men who are not enrolled in education immediately after completing upper secondary education. In Korea and Türkiye, in contrast, while military service is compulsory for male citizens, there is no requirement to enlist immediately after completing upper secondary education; the majority of male students fulfil their military obligation before or after graduating from tertiary education. As a result, military service should not be regarded as a factor delaying initial entry into tertiary education, although it can affect the timing of graduation and subsequent entry into the labour market.

The impact of military service on educational transitions varies across countries, however. In Chile, military service is compulsory through a lottery-based mechanism when voluntary recruitment targets are not met, but students enrolled in tertiary education may defer or be exempted from service. Sweden follows a different approach, operating a selective model of conscription in which only around 10% of young people are called to serve. As a result, military service has a more limited influence on overall transition patterns.

Gap-year practices and tertiary admission systems also influence transition timelines. Taking a gap year is common in Denmark, Estonia, Germany and Sweden, where young people often use this period for employment, travel, voluntary activities or career exploration before committing to further study. In Denmark, taking one or more gap years after upper secondary general education is common practice. These practices can contribute to higher levels of non-enrolment immediately after upper secondary education, even among students who intend to pursue tertiary education at a later stage.

In Finland, delayed entry into tertiary education is closely linked to the competitive nature of higher education admissions. Enrolment caps (*numerus clausus*) apply across all higher education fields, and many students do not gain admission on their

first attempt. As a result, students frequently postpone entry, attend preparatory courses or apply repeatedly before securing a place. Gap years are also observed in Switzerland, particularly among graduates from general education pathways, although they are not actively encouraged. In England (United Kingdom) and New Zealand, by contrast, gap years remain less common than direct progression into education or employment.

Definitions

Dropout rates refer to the share of students who leave the specified level of education without graduating from a first qualification at the level.

External examinations: External examination refers to the exams that are set, marked, or regulated by an external authority such as a ministry of education, a national examination board, or a regional education authority, outside the student's own school staff/management.

Programme orientation can refer either to the programme in which the student originally entered upper secondary education or to the programme from which the student graduated. Both types of analysis are included in the chapter. Data include only programmes sufficient for level completion. Two programme orientations are considered in the analysis:

- general programmes (ISCED-P 343 and 344)
- vocational programmes (ISCED-P 353 and 354).

The **reference year** for the survey is 2024 and it refers to two years after the end of the theoretical duration of the programmes analysed. For example, if a programme has a duration of two years, the cohort reported must have entered upper secondary education in the academic year 2020/21. Their status is then recorded by the end of the theoretical duration of the programme (academic year 2021/22) and two years later (academic year 2023/24).

The share of students who are **still in education** corresponds to those still pursuing the original qualification or that have transferred to another programme but have not yet completed it.

School-based assessments are designed and implemented by teachers to monitor, support, and evaluate student learning within the classroom.

The **theoretical duration of studies** is the regulatory or common-practice time it takes a full-time student to complete a level of education. Completion is measured within three timeframes: by the end of the theoretical duration (N = 2022), by the end of the theoretical duration plus one year (N+1 = 2023) and by the end of the theoretical duration plus two years (N+2 = 2024). The theoretical duration always refers to the programme in which the student originally entered upper secondary education. This means that even if a student transfers to a different programme with a different duration they will still be registered according to the programme in which they originally entered the level. Please see, Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en), for information on each country's theoretical duration for general and vocational upper secondary programmes.

Methodology

The transition rate from lower to upper secondary education is calculated as the number of students enrolled in upper secondary or other educational programmes one year after enrolling in the final grade of lower secondary education, divided by the total number of students enrolled in the final grade of lower secondary education.

The completion rate is calculated as the number of graduates divided by the number of entrants, measured at the end of the programme's theoretical duration (N), one year later (N+1) and two years later (N+2). In this analysis, N refers to 2022.

For countries that submit longitudinal data it is also possible to calculate the share of students still in education and the share of students who have neither graduated nor are still enrolled – both of which are calculated for the timeframes of N and N+2. Both shares are calculated by dividing the number of students in the given situation or timeframe (N, N+1 or N+2) by the number of new entrants at the start of the programme.

For countries and economies that submitted transition data one year after graduation, the share of enrolled students for each ISCED level and the share of graduates who are not enrolled were calculated by dividing the number of individuals in the given category by total number of graduates one year before.

For more information see the OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics (OECD, 2018[32]) and Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)

Sources

Data on completion rates refer to the academic year 2023/24 and were collected through a special survey undertaken in 2025. Data for some countries may have a different reference year. For more information see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)..

References

Bruns, B., D. Evans and J. Luque (2011), *Achieving World-Class Education in Brazil: The Next Agenda*, Directions in Development, World Bank, Washington, DC, https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8854-9. [22]

Cenpec (2026), *Correção de Fluxo Escolar (School Flow Correction)*, https://www.cenpec.org.br/projeto/correcao-de-fluxo-escolar/ (accessed on 1 June 2026). [23]

European Commission / EACEA / Eurydice (2023), *Structural Indicators for Monitoring Education and Training Systems in Europe – 2023: Early Leaving from Education and Training. Eurydice report.*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, https://doi.org/10.2797/06916 (accessed on 1 June 2026). [4]

Eurydice (2026), *Assessment in general upper secondary education: Bulgaria*, https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia/bulgaria/assessment-general-upper-secondary-education. [16]

Eurydice (2025), *Education and Training in Sweden*, https://national-policies.eacea.ec.europa.eu/youthwiki/chapters/sweden/61-general-context (accessed on 9 June 2026). [10]

Field, S. et al. (2012), *A Skills beyond School Review of Denmark*, OECD Reviews of Vocational Education and Training, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264173668-en. [9]

Government of Austria (2025), *Die Zentralmatura (Centralised Matura)*, Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research, https://www.bmb.gv.at/Themen/schule/schulpraxis/zentralmatura.html. [14]

Government of France (2025), *Le baccalauréat général*, Ministry of National Education, Higher Education and Research, https://www.education.gouv.fr/reussir-au-lycee/le-baccalaureat-general-10457. [15]

Ikeda, M. and E. García (2014), "Grade repetition: A comparative study of academic and non-academic consequences", *OECD Economic Studies*, Vol. 2013/1, pp. 269-315, https://doi.org/10.1787/eco_studies-2013-5k3w65mx3hnx. [21]

Lyche, C. (2010), "Taking on the completion challenge: A literature review on policies to prevent dropout and early school leaving", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 53, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/5km4m2t59cmr-en. [17]

Musset, P. et al. (2019), *Vocational Education and Training in Estonia*, OECD Reviews of Vocational Education and Training, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/g2g9fac9-en. [12]

OeAD (2026), *School Upper Secondary, Pre-Vocational School, PVS(Politechnische Schule)*, Austria's Agency for Education and Internationalisation, https://bildungssystem.oead.at/en/school-upper-secondary/translate-to-english-polytechnische-schule (accessed on 1 June 2026). [8]

OECD (2026), *Observatory on Digital technologies in Career guidance for Youth (ODiCY)*, https://www.oecd.org/en/toolkits/odicy.html?orderBy=mostRelevant&page=0 (accessed on 9 June 2026). [11]

OECD (2026), *The Theory and Practice of Upper Secondary Certification*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b3fea5ba-en. [13]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: Latvia*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/education-at-a-glance-2025_1a3543e2-en/latvia_cf017b16-en.html (accessed on 1 June 2026). [5]

OECD (2025), *Vocational Education and Training Systems in Nine Countries*, OECD Reviews of Vocational Education and Training, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1a86eb6c-en. [24]

OECD (2024), *Education at a Glance 2024: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/c00cad36-en. [28]

OECD (2023), *Chile*, OECD Education GPS, https://gpseducation.oecd.org/Content/MapOfEducationSystem/CHL/CHL_2011_EN.pdf (accessed on 1 June 2026). [6]

OECD (2023), *Education at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en. [20]

OECD (2023), *Flemish Region (Belgium)*, OECD Education GPS, https://gpseducation.oecd.org/Content/MapOfEducationSystem/BFL/BFL_2011_EN.pdf (accessed on 1 June 2026). [30]

OECD (2023), *New Zealand*, OECD Education GPS, https://gpseducation.oecd.org/Content/MapOfEducationSystem/NZL/NZL_2011_EN.pdf (accessed on 1 June 2026). [7]

OECD (2023), *OECD Digital Education Outlook 2023: Towards an Effective Digital Education Ecosystem*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/c74f03de-en. [29]

OECD (2023), *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The State of Learning and Equity in Education*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en. [19]

OECD (2023), *Policy pointers for equitable, effective and personalised upper secondary transitions*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/ac6c2095-en (accessed on 1 June 2026). [3]

OECD (2023), "Policy pointers for equitable, effective and personalised upper secondary transitions", *OECD Education Spotlights*, No. 7, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/ac6c2095-en. [1]

OECD (2023), *Slovenia*, OECD Education GPS, https://gpseducation.oecd.org/Content/MapOfEducationSystem/SVN/SVN_2011_EN.pdf (accessed on 1 June 2026). [31]

OECD (2023), *Strengthening Upper Secondary Education in Lithuania*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/a69409d7-en. [27]

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [32]

OECD/Eurostat/UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2015), *ISCED 2011 Operational Manual: Guidelines for Classifying National Education Programmes and Related Qualifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264228368-en. [26]

Perico E Santos, A. (2023), "Managing student transitions into upper secondary pathways", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 289, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/663d6f7b-en. [25]

Rumberger, R. (2011), *Dropping Out: Why Students Drop Out of High School and What Can Be Done About it*, Harvard University Press. [18]

Varsik, S. (2025), "Transitions through education and into the labour market: Exploring educational outcomes and equity gaps using international surveys", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 324, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/18be3c52-en. [2]

Chapter B3 Tables

Tables and notes

Table B3.1	Distribution of students in the year after the last grade of lower secondary education (2024)
Table B3.2	Share of upper secondary students completing their studies within the theoretical duration, by gender and programme orientation at graduation (2024)
Table B3.3	Distribution of upper secondary students by outcome and timeframe (2022-2024)
Table B3.4	Distribution of upper secondary graduates in the year after their graduation, by gender (2023)
Table B3.5 (WEB)	Distribution of upper secondary entrants by student profile (relative age, parents' educational attainment, immigrant background), by programme orientation (2018 to 2021)
Table B3.6 (WEB)	Upper secondary completion rates two years after the end of the theoretical duration of the programme by student profile (relative age, parents' educational attainment, immigrant background) (2024)
Table B3.7 (WEB)	Upper secondary drop out rates two years after the end of the theoretical duration of the programme by gender and programme orientation (2024)
Table B3.8 (WEB)	Distribution of upper secondary students by outcome two years after the theoretical end of their programme (2010)

StatLink https://stat.link/tva6w2

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/tva6w2

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Table B3.1. Distribution of students in the year after the last grade of lower secondary education (2024)

	Theoretical starting age of upper secondary	Ending age of compulsory education	Status of students in the year after the last grade of lower secondary education					
			Repeating the last grade of lower secondary education	Enrolled in:				Not enrolled
				A general upper secondary programme	A vocational upper secondary programme	Another educational programme	Total (transition rate)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)=(4)+(5)+(6)	(8)
OECD Countries								
Australia	16	17	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	14	15	3	26	50	14	90	7
Canada[1]	15	16	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile	14	18	1	92	0	2	95	4
Colombia	15	16	9	56	28	a	84	6
Costa Rica	15	17	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	15	15	m	m	m	m	m	m
Denmark	16	16	1	30	7	54	91	8
Estonia	16	16	3	65	22	3	90	7
Finland	16	18	0	51	38	8	98	2
France	15	16	m	m	m	m	m	m
Germany	16	18	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	15	15	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary	14	16	1	42	55	0	97	2
Iceland	16	16	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland	16	16	m	m	m	m	m	m
Israel	15	17	a	58	41	a	99	1
Italy	14	16	1	51	41	x(8)	92	7[d]
Japan	15	15	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	15	14	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	16	16	7	54	35	a	88	5
Lithuania	17	16	1	78	14	0	92	7
Luxembourg[2]	15	16	20	31	39	2	71	9
Mexico	15	17	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	15	17	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Zealand	15	16	1	96	0[d]	x(5)	96	3
Norway	16	16	0	51	44	0	95	5
Poland	15	15	2	45	50	a	96	2
Portugal	15	18	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovak Republic	15	16	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	15	15	1	36	62	0	97	2
Spain	15	16	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden	16	15	0	59	27	11	97	2
Switzerland	15	15	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	14	18	3	47	46	0	93	4
United Kingdom	14	18	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	15	16	m	m	m	m	m	m
Other economies								
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	14	18	2	47	50	0	97	1
French Comm. (Belgium)	14	18	11	60	25	1	87	2

	Theoretical starting age of upper secondary	Ending age of compulsory education	Status of students in the year after the last grade of lower secondary education					
			Repeating the last grade of lower secondary education	Enrolled in:				Not enrolled
				A general upper secondary programme	A vocational upper secondary programme	Another educational programme	Total (transition rate)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)=(4)+(5)+(6)	(8)
Partner and/or accession countries								
Argentina	15	17	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[3]	15	17	4	77	10	a	87	8
Bulgaria	14	16	3	40	53	0	93	5
China	15	14	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	15	16	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	14	13	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	16	15	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	15	17	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	15	19	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	15	14	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	16	15	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	15	15	m	m	m	m	m	m
Average	**15**	**16**	**3**	**54**	**35**	**5**	**92**	**5**

1. Ending age of compulsory education varies between 16 and 18 across provinces.
2. Data only cover public institutions.
3. Year of reference differ from 2024: 2023 for Brazil.

The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.

Table B3.2. Share of upper secondary students completing their studies within the theoretical duration, by gender and programme orientation at graduation (2024)

Cohort of students who were expected to complete upper secondary education in 2024 based on the theoretical duration of programmes

	Share of upper secondary students								
	Women			Men			Total		
	Total	Of which: Completed a general programme on time	Of which: Completed a vocational programme on time	Total	Of which: Completed a general programme on time	Of which: Completed a vocational programme on time	Total	Of which: Completed a general programme on time	Of which: Completed a vocational programme on time
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
OECD Countries									
Australia[1]	m	m	47	m	m	36	m	m	42
Austria	64	23	40	55	14	41	59	19	41
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile	86	60	26	80	52	28	83	56	27
Colombia	88	58	30	84	55	28	86	57	29
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Denmark	54	39	14	64	52	12	57	44	13
Estonia	81	71	10	74	52	22	77	61	16
Finland	74	48	26	74	35	40	74	41	33
France	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland[2]	93	64	29	93	65	27	93	65	28
Israel	97	58	39	91	56	35	94	57	37
Italy	79	56	24	68	32	36	73	43	30
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	74	56	17	66	43	22	69	50	20
Lithuania	87	82	5	82	70	12	85	76	9
Luxembourg[3]	55	29	27	47	19	28	51	24	27
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Zealand[2]	74	73	1	69	68	1	71	70	1
Norway	75	65	10	60	44	16	67	54	13
Poland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Portugal	72	63	10	66	46	19	69	55	15
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	83	40	44	76	22	54	80	31	49
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden	80	62	18	78	52	26	79	57	22
Switzerland	76	32	44	70	19	51	73	25	48
Türkiye	94	62	32	90	51	39	92	57	35
United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

	Share of upper secondary students								
	Women			Men			Total		
	Total	Of which: Completed a general programme on time	Of which: Completed a vocational programme on time	Total	Of which: Completed a general programme on time	Of which: Completed a vocational programme on time	Total	Of which: Completed a general programme on time	Of which: Completed a vocational programme on time
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Other economies									
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	79	44	35	69	29	40	74	36	38
French Comm. (Belgium)	64	45	19	51	34	17	58	40	18
Partner and/or accession countries									
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[4]	73	67	6	67	62	5	70	65	5
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Average	**78**	**55**	**24**	**72**	**45**	**28**	**75**	**50**	**26**

1. Data only include information related to new entrants to vocational upper secondary programmes.
2. Data only include information related to new entrants to general upper secondary programmes.
3. Data only cover public institutions.
4. Year of reference differ from 2024: 2023 for Brazil.

The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.

Table B3.3. Distribution of upper secondary students by outcome and timeframe (2022-2024)

Cohort of students who were expected to complete upper secondary education in 2022 based on the theoretical duration of programmes

	Status by the end of theoretical duration of the programme (2022)					Status one year after the end of theoretical duration of the programme (2023)					Status two years after the end of theoretical duration of the programme (2024)				
	Graduated			Not graduated and still in education	Not graduated and not enrolled	Graduated			Not graduated but still in education	Not graduated and not enrolled	Graduated			Not graduated but still in education	Not graduated and not enrolled
	From a general programme	From a vocational programme	Total			From a general programme	From a vocational programme	Total			From a general programme	From a vocational programme	Total		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
OECD Countries															
Australia[1]	m	35	m	7	57	m	40	m	2	58	m	44	m	m	m
Austria	19	40	59	32	8	22	50	72	14	14	23	55	78	7	16
Canada[2]	83[d]	x(1)	83	17[d]	x(4)	m	m	m	m	m	90[d]	x(11)	90	x(15)	10[d]
Chile	56	27	83	12	5	58	30	88	3	9	58	30	88	1	10
Colombia	55	27	82	12	6	61	29	90	2	8	62	29	91	1	8
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Denmark	46	10	57	25	18	49	23	72	8	20	50	25	75	4	21
Estonia	62	15	77	10	13	63	18	81	5	14	64	18	82	3	14
Finland	40	30	70	23	7	45	35	80	10	10	45	37	83	6	11
France	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary	40	40	79	14	7	42	43	85	5	10	42	43	86	3	12
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland[2]	71	22	93	0	6	71	22	93	0	7	71	22	93	0	7
Israel	56	38	94	0	6	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Italy	44	29	73	14	13	47	35	82	4	14	47	36	84	1	15
Japan[3]	71	22	94	m	6	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	59	21	79	12	9	60	22	82	5	14	60	23	83	2	15

	Status by the end of theoretical duration of the programme (2022)					Status one year after the end of theoretical duration of the programme (2023)					Status two years after the end of theoretical duration of the programme (2024)				
	Graduated			Not graduated and still in education	Not graduated and not enrolled	Graduated			Not graduated but still in education	Not graduated and not enrolled	Graduated			Not graduated but still in education	Not graduated and not enrolled
	From a general programme	From a vocational programme	Total			From a general programme	From a vocational programme	Total			From a general programme	From a vocational programme	Total		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Lithuania	76	10	86	4	10	77	10	87	2	12	77	10	87	1	13
Luxembourg[4]	25	29	54	36	10	29	44	72	16	12	30	50	80	7	12
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Zealand[2]	71	1	72	23	5	77	2	79	9	12	77	3	80	5	15
Norway	56	13	69	23	8	58	20	78	10	12	59	22	81	5	14
Poland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Portugal	56	17	74	20	6	61	22	83	6	11	61	23	84	2	14
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	31	51	82	13	5	32	56	88	0	12	33	57	90	0	10
Spain	50	17	67	25	8	54	23	78	11	12	55	26	81	5	13
Sweden	57	23	80	6	15	59	24	83	0	16	59	24	83	0	17
Switzerland	24	50	74	21	5	28	58	86	8	5	29	61	90	5	5
Türkiye	55	34	89	11	1	58	39	98	2	1	59	40	99	1	1
United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Other economies															
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	37	37	75	17	8	40	45	85	3	12	40	46	86	1	13
French Comm. (Belgium)	44	18	62	31	7	52	27	79	10	11	53	30	83	3	14

	Status by the end of theoretical duration of the programme (2022)					Status one year after the end of theoretical duration of the programme (2023)					Status two years after the end of theoretical duration of the programme (2024)				
	Graduated			Not graduated and still in education	Not graduated and not enrolled	Graduated			Not graduated but still in education	Not graduated and not enrolled	Graduated			Not graduated but still in education	Not graduated and not enrolled
	From a general programme	From a vocational programme	Total			From a general programme	From a vocational programme	Total			From a general programme	From a vocational programme	Total		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Partner and/or accession countries															
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[5]	70	4	75	16	10	74	5	79	4	17	75	5	79	1	20
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Average	**52**	**25**	**76**	**16**	**10**	**53**	**30**	**82**	**6**	**13**	**55**	**30**	**85**	**3**	**12**

Note: The students included in this survey are those who were new entrants to an upper secondary programme and who were full-time national students at the time they entered the programme. The year of reference (2024) corresponds to a period two years after the theoretical end of the programmes these students entered, 2023 to one year after the theoretical end and 2022 to the theoretical end. The year of entry varies among countries, as it depends on the duration of the programme. Data on drop-out rates by gender and programme orientation are available for consultation online.

1. Data only include information related to new entrants to vocational upper secondary programmes.
2. Data only include information related to new entrants to general upper secondary programmes.
3. Year of reference differ from 2022: 2020 for Japan.
4. Data only cover public institutions.
5. Year of reference differ from 2024: 2023 for Brazil.

The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.

Table B3.4. Distribution of upper secondary graduates in the year after their graduation, by gender (2023)

Any ISCED or non-ISCED programme

	Enrolled in an upper secondary general programme		Enrolled in an upper secondary vocational programme		Enrolled in a post-secondary non-tertiary or short-cycle tertiary programme		Enrolled in a bachelor's or master's degree programme		Enrolled in another type of programme		Not enrolled	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD Countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	0	0	0	0	28	22	16	3	0	0	55	75
Canada	x(11)	x(12)	x(11)	x(12)	23	23	52	39	a	a	25[d]	38[d]
Chile	a	a	a	a	11	13	44	46	a	a	44	41
Colombia	0	0	0	0	42[d]	45[d]	x(5)	x(6)	0	0	58	55
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Denmark[1]	0	0	2	3	1	2	11	10	0	0	85	85
Estonia	0	0	0	0	3	1	56	48	4	5	37	45
Finland	0	0	5	3	0	0	30	26	a	a	64	70
France	0	0	0	0	27	37	53	39	0	0	20	24
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary	2	3	6	9	24	28	42	34	0	0	26	26
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Israel	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	2	66	55	0	0	34	43
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	0	0	0	0	12	8	48	44	2	3	38	44
Lithuania	0	0	1	3	9	11	63	48	0	0	28	39
Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Zealand	88	82	2	3	3	6	1	1	0	0	6	9
Norway	4	2	9	8	2	3	31	19	0	0	54	68
Poland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	2	1	15	24	20	18	46	37	a	a	16	21
Spain	0	0	3	6	25	31	46	38	0	0	26	26
Sweden	5	3	0	0	2	4	26	20	0	0	67	73
Switzerland	8	6	4	6	4	2	36	24	0	0	49	62
Türkiye	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

	Enrolled in an upper secondary general programme		Enrolled in an upper secondary vocational programme		Enrolled in a post-secondary non-tertiary or short-cycle tertiary programme		Enrolled in a bachelor's or master's degree programme		Enrolled in another type of programme		Not enrolled	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	0	0	16	21	4	6	70	58	0	0	10	15
French Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Average	**6**	**5**	**3**	**5**	**13**	**14**	**39**	**31**	**0**	**0**	**39**	**45**

Note: Columns giving the totals for men and women and the labour-force status of individuals who are not enrolled in education are available for consultation online.
1. Data only include the graduates from general upper secondary programmes.
The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/tva6w2.


Chapter B4. What is the profile of international students and how is mobility evolving?

Highlights

- The share of international students increases markedly with the level of tertiary education: accounting for 11% of new entrants at bachelor's level, 24% at master's level and 34% at doctoral level on average across OECD countries in 2024, and reaching as high as 87% of doctoral entrants in Luxembourg.
- International students are more likely than national students to graduate in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields: on average across the OECD, 30% of international graduates obtained a STEM degree compared to 23% of national graduates, with particularly high shares observed in countries such as in the United States.
- Most OECD countries receive a much higher number of international students than the number of national students they send abroad. Australia hosts 45 times more international students than the number of students it sends overseas, while the United Kingdom hosts 18 times more.

Figure B4.1. Share of inbound and outbound international students (2024)

Inbound international students as a percentage of all students enrolled domestically and outbound international students as a percentage of all national students (whether enrolled domestically or abroad); ISCED levels 5-8



1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
For data, see Table B4.3.The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/5nvwya.

Context

Participation in tertiary education develops advanced skills and provides access to highly qualified professions. Over the past decade, international student mobility has expanded considerably, with growing numbers of students crossing borders to pursue tertiary studies. This trend increasingly reflects the attractiveness and international reach of education systems, as well as their capacity to respond to rising global demand for advanced skills and specialised expertise (OECD, 2026[1]).

Studying abroad has become a key differentiating experience for young adults, offering access to high-quality education, internationally recognised institutions and specialised learning opportunities that may not be available in their home countries (OECD, 2026[1]). Students' decisions are shaped by a combination of personal aspirations and structural factors. Improving employability in increasingly globalised labour markets remains a major motivation, while tuition fee policies, financial support mechanisms and the perceived reputation of host institutions also influence destination choices (Beine, Noël and Ragot, 2014[2]; OECD, 2026[1]). The expansion of programmes taught in English in non-English-speaking countries has further facilitated international mobility by reducing linguistic barriers and easing academic and social integration (Ovchinnikova, Jones and Van Mol, 2023[3]; OECD, 2026[1]). Regional frameworks such as the European Higher Education Area have also strengthened mobility within Europe with harmonised degree structures and credit transfer systems.

For host countries, international students represent both an economic contribution and a strategic source of talent. In addition to supporting local economies through their living expenses, these students frequently pay higher tuition fees than domestic students, providing an important source of funding for tertiary institutions (OECD, 2026[1]). Retaining highly skilled graduates may also help countries address labour shortages, strengthen innovation systems and mitigate demographic pressures linked to ageing populations (OECD, 2026[1]; OECD, 2024[4]).

For origin countries, student mobility presents both opportunities and challenges. Although outward mobility may raise concerns about "brain drain", internationally mobile graduates can also contribute to knowledge transfer, research collaboration and capacity building if they return or maintain professional ties with their home country (Tran and Bui, 2019[5]). International students are particularly concentrated at advanced levels of tertiary education and in STEM fields at doctoral level, reflecting the growing internationalisation of research and doctoral education systems (Marti and Peneoasu, 2025[6]; OECD, 2025[7]).

Other findings

- Women represent around half of international new entrants at bachelor's (51%) and master's levels (52%) across OECD countries, but remain slightly under-represented at doctoral level, accounting for 45% of international entrants on average.
- International student mobility remains highly concentrated, with Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States hosting around half of all international students across the OECD in 2024.
- International graduates are also over-represented in business, administration and law (26% compared to 23% among national graduates), but are less likely to graduate from fields closely linked to national labour markets, such as education (4% compared to 11%) and health and welfare (13% compared to 18%).

Note

This chapter focuses on international students, defined as those who have left their country of origin and moved to another country for the purpose of study. However, not all countries are able to report data using this definition and instead provide data on foreign students (as Canada, Colombia, Hungary, Korea, New Zealand, Slovak Republic, Türkiye and the United States), defined as those who are not citizens of the country in which they are enrolled. As a result, this chapter combines both types of data; for consistency, the term international students is used throughout.

Analysis

Profile of international new entrants


Share of international new entrants by education level

The representation of international students among new entrants increases significantly with the level of tertiary education, a trend reinforced by a growing institutionalisation of doctoral schools that facilitate international talent recruitment (Marti and Peneoasu, 2025[6]). On average across OECD countries in 2024, international students made up 7% of new entrants to short-cycle tertiary programmes, 11% at the bachelor's level, 24% at the master's level and 34% at the doctoral level. Although this upward pattern is nearly universal, the degree of internationalisation varies widely. In Luxembourg, international students represent the majority of new entrants at the highest levels, reaching 68% for master's programmes and 87% for doctoral programmes. Similarly, in New Zealand, 56% of master's and 63% of doctoral new entrants are internationally mobile. Conversely, in OECD and partner countries such as Colombia, Greece and Peru, international students represent 5% or less of new entrants across all tertiary levels (Figure B4.2).

This concentration of international students at more advanced levels is driven by the perceived quality and international recognition of host institutions, as well as the availability of specialised research opportunities. Structural factors such as tuition fee policies and the language of instruction also play a pivotal role; English-speaking countries like Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand and the United Kingdom remain highly attractive destinations, with international students making up at least 45% of doctoral new entrants in these countries (Figure B4.2). Institutional enrolment patterns also vary across institutions within countries, reflecting linguistic and migration-related drivers. In the Netherlands, most international students are enrolled in research universities, attracted by the broad range of English-taught programmes that reduce adaptation costs, whereas more than half of domestic students are enrolled in universities of applied sciences, which are professionally oriented and typically offer instruction in Dutch. In Canada, international students are nearly twice as likely as their domestic peers to attend colleges than universities, which offer shorter, career-oriented programmes to facilitate access to post-graduation work permits and permanent residency (OECD, 2026[1]).

Global student mobility has intensified significantly over the past decade, particularly at the more advanced levels of tertiary education. Between 2015 and 2024, the OECD average share of international students rose by 6 or 7 percentage points at both the master's level (from 18% to 24%) and the doctoral level (from 27% to 34%). The increases have been particularly striking in Australia, where the share of international entrants to master's programmes surged from 50% to 64% over this period, and from 39% to 50% at the doctoral level. Other major host countries also saw substantial growth: in the United Kingdom, international students now represent 58% of master's new entrants, up from 45% in 2015, while in Estonia the share of international new entrants at the doctoral level more than doubled from 20% to 41%. At lower tertiary levels, the increase in the share of international new entrants was more moderate in percentage-point terms, although proportionally similar to the growth observed at master's and doctoral levels. Between 2015 and 2024, the share of international new entrants at bachelor's level rose from 8% to 11% on average across OECD countries, and from 5% to 7% for short-cycle tertiary programmes (Table B4.1).

Figure B4.2. Share of international new entrants, by education level (2024)



1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
For data, see Table B4.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/5nvwya.

The sustained expansion of international mobility at advanced tertiary levels coincided with a broader post-pandemic rebound across the OECD. In 2023, international student flows increased by 6.7%, with a record number of over 2.1 million newly granted study visas and residence permits (OECD, 2026[1]). This increase reflects the lifting of pandemic-era travel restrictions and the continued role of international education as a strategic pathway for skilled migration in major host systems (OECD, 2026[1]; OECD, 2024[4]). While the subject of this chapter remains formal degree-seeking international mobility, student mobility increasingly also includes shorter experiential components, such as international internships, which fall outside the scope of the data presented here. These experiences can serve as a practical bridge between higher education and the global labour market (Predovic, Dennis and Jones, 2023[8]; Tran and Bui, 2019[5]).

Share of international new entrants by gender

Gender patterns among international new entrants show that women have achieved parity at initial tertiary levels but remain under-represented at doctoral levels. On average across the OECD, women make up 51% of international new entrants at bachelor's level and 52% at master's level but only 45% at the doctoral level, suggesting that gender parity remains slightly less balanced in international research-oriented programmes. There are substantial differences across countries: in Iceland, women represent 68% of international bachelor's entrants, compared to only 19% in Latvia. At the doctoral level, women form the smallest share of international entrants in Colombia (35%), Latvia (34%) and the Republic of Türkiye (33%), while in New Zealand they account for the majority of international doctoral entrants (55%) (Table B4.1).

Over time, there has been a gradual convergence toward gender parity in international doctoral studies, though progress remains uneven. Since 2015, the share of female international doctoral entrants has risen by 2 percentage points, from 43% to 45% on average across OECD countries (Table B4.1). For some countries the change has been more rapid; for instance, the share of female international doctoral entrants in Estonia rose from 27% to 49% over this period. In contrast, other countries have

experienced a widening of the gender gap at this level, such as Colombia, where the share of women among international doctoral entrants fell from 56% in 2015 to 35% in 2024.

Profile of international graduates by field of study

International students are a vital component of STEM education, as they are often significantly more likely than national students to choose these disciplines. On average across the OECD, 30% of international tertiary graduates earned a STEM degree in 2024, compared to 23% of national graduates. In the United States, 53% of international graduates studied a STEM field, compared to 20% of national graduates. Significant over-representation of STEM studies among international graduates is also observed in Denmark (46% of international graduates compared to 23% of national ones) and Iceland (37% compared to 15%). Korea remains a notable exception to this trend, with its national students (32%) twice as likely to graduate from a STEM programme as its international students (16%) (Figure B4.3).


The high concentration of international students in STEM reflects an intense global competition for talent as countries seek to bolster their national innovation ecosystems. STEM curricula also benefit from international standardisation and a common technical language, which facilitates cross-border mobility and results in higher stay-on rates for these graduates compared to other fields (OECD, 2026[1]). Many OECD countries have introduced targeted migration and retention strategies specifically for this group. Since January 2026, Korea has expanded the K-STAR Visa Track for international graduates in STEM fields, widening access to fast-track residence pathways for master's and doctoral graduates from a broader range of universities in order to facilitate the long-term settlement of highly qualified foreign talent in the country (Kyungpook National University, 2025[9]). Similarly, the United States allows students in STEM fields to extend their Optional Practical Training (OPT) periods beyond the standard duration, granting them additional time to acquire professional experience and seek employment opportunities within the domestic startup ecosystem (U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 2022[10]). As doctoral-level research is heavily concentrated in STEM disciplines, these students play a critical role in supporting long-term research and development capacity and mitigating the impact of ageing populations on the future supply of high-level skills (OECD, 2024[4]).

The broader distribution of international graduates also highlights a preference for disciplines with high global transferability. On average, international students were also over-represented in the broad field of business, administration and law, studied by 26% of international graduates in 2024 compared to 23% of national graduates. This concentration is most pronounced in highly internationalised systems such as Australia (where 47% of international graduates studied that field), Canada (44%) and the United Kingdom (43%), roughly double the share among national graduates. Luxembourg exhibits the highest concentration, with 53% of international graduates qualifying in business-related fields (Table B4.2).

In contrast, international students are significantly less likely than their national peers to graduate from the fields of education (4% compared to 11%) and health and welfare (13% compared to 18%). These fields are often more closely tied to domestic labour markets and specific national regulatory frameworks. These distribution patterns are further shaped by institutional barriers, including localised language requirements and the complexity of professional recognition. In the Netherlands, for instance, international graduates are significantly less likely than domestic graduates to work in the government, education and healthcare sectors (OECD, 2026[1]). However, some countries have successfully positioned themselves as regional medical education hubs. In Bulgaria, 47% of international graduates qualified in a health and welfare field, compared to just 10% of national graduates, with significant over-representation also observed in Romania (33% compared to 11% of national graduates) and the Slovak Republic (35% compared to 17% of national graduates). These patterns partly reflect the strong recruitment of international students into medical degree programmes, often through English-language provision targeting students from abroad.

For many host countries, attracting international students into transferable disciplines – such as STEM and business – serves as a strategic tool for addressing local skill shortages. Several OECD countries have expanded post-study work opportunities and retention measures to integrate international talent into the domestic workforce and address local skill shortages (OECD, 2026[1]; OECD, 2024[4]). Although international graduates may initially face a "labour-market penalty" in terms of employment and salaries, longitudinal data from Australia and the Netherlands confirm that this gap narrows significantly within three to five years as graduates gain local experience (OECD, 2026[1]).

Figure B4.3. Share of STEM graduates at tertiary level, by mobility status (2024)



For data, see Table B4.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/5nvwya.

Patterns of inbound and outbound mobility

International student mobility remains a central feature of the global tertiary landscape. On average across OECD countries in 2024, outbound international mobile students account for 6% of all national students (whether enrolled domestically or abroad) while inbound students account for 12% of all students enrolled domestically (Figure B4.1).

The distribution of these students remains highly uneven, with major English-speaking systems acting as primary "net receivers": Australia (32%), Canada (25%), Luxembourg (51%) and the United Kingdom (23%) host the largest shares of international students. Among these, Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom also maintain very low outbound shares of 4% or less, whereas Luxembourg does not (Figure B4.1). Although this concentration has been historically driven by the global status of English and institutional prestige, a strategic "policy recalibration" is currently underway in hubs such as Canada and the United Kingdom. In response to acute housing pressures and institutional capacity constraints, authorities are shifting from recruitment-led growth toward a focus on sustainability and system balance (Box B4.1).

In contrast to the major hubs, outbound mobility is particularly high in smaller or regionally integrated systems, where students often seek qualifications abroad to access specialised programmes not available locally. Bulgaria (12%) and the Slovak Republic (21%) remain significant "net senders" of talent, where the share of students going abroad exceeds the share of international students hosted domestically. Changes between 2015 and 2024 show varied patterns: while the Slovak Republic saw a 6 percentage point increase in its outbound share over that period, other countries experienced slight declines, with Norway falling from 7% to 5% and Sweden from 4% to 3% (Figure B4.1).

Luxembourg presents the most striking pattern in the OECD, with an outbound mobility rate of 77% of Luxembourgish tertiary students enrolled abroad. This exceptionally high rate is rooted in two structural factors: the country's small geographic size and its relatively recently established national university system. These factors require the vast majority of Luxembourgish students to seek degrees in larger, established systems in neighbouring countries. Simultaneously, Luxembourg functions as a highly

specialised research magnet, hosting an inbound share of 51% of total enrolment, the highest among OECD countries (Figure B4.1).

Top five origin countries for inbound international students

The geographical origin of international students remains highly concentrated, with the People's Republic of China and India serving as the primary sources of inbound students for the majority of OECD countries. China is one of the top five origin countries for nearly 20 nations, including Germany, Japan and the United States. Concurrently, India has solidified its role as a leading exporter of students, ranking as the top origin country for major host systems such as Canada, Germany and the United Kingdom. This dominance is particularly evident in English-speaking destinations, where Indian students account for 40% of international inflows to Canada and over 20% of inflows to both the United Kingdom and the United States. Apart from these two global leaders, mobility tends to be defined by regional clusters where geographic and linguistic proximity reduce the "psychological distance" for students (Ovchinnikova, Jones and Van Mol, 2023[3]). For instance, students from Colombia, Ecuador and Peru dominate inflows to Chile and Spain, while historical ties, linguistic and migration also remain influential in France, where four out of the top five origin countries for inbound international students are African countries (Table B4.4) By contrast, Czechia and Poland primarily host students from neighbouring Belarus, the Slovak Republic and Ukraine.

Changes in the past decade underscore the dynamic nature of these flows, most notably the rapid ascent of India as a student origin country. In Germany, India rose from the third most important origin country in 2015 to the first in 2024, while in Ireland, it emerged as the leading origin country over the same period. Geopolitical shifts and regional crises have also abruptly altered student flows; Ukraine has emerged as a top origin country for Lithuania and the Slovak Republic, reflecting displacement triggered by war, while the rise of Venezuela as a top origin country in Chile and Colombia underscores the impact of large-scale regional migration (Table B4.4)

Top five destination countries for outbound international students

The global landscape of destination countries in 2024 remains dominated by a few high-profile host systems, with the top five destination countries (Australia, Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States) together welcoming almost 60% of all international students moving to OECD countries. The United Kingdom and the United States continue to attract students from diverse regions due to the global status of English and the prestige of their institutions. Within Europe, Germany serves as the primary regional hub, appearing among the top five destinations for nearly every reporting country on the continent, as well as for students from Australia, Japan and Korea (Table B4.4). This concentration highlights the enduring pull of systems offering high-quality research environments and strong labour-market prospects, often reinforced by a "network effect" where existing skilled diasporas act as a magnet for new arrivals (Beine, Noël and Ragot, 2014[2]).

Trends in destination choices indicate a gradual diversification of the mobility market as regional hubs have gained prominence between 2015 and 2024. For instance, the Netherlands has emerged as a dominant regional hub, ascending to the top destination for outbound students from Belgium, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania by 2024, while also ranking as the second most preferred choice for those from Finland, Germany, Ireland and Portugal. This shift reflects the expansion of English-taught programmes and competitive tuition structures in Continental Europe, although recent Dutch policy discussions have begun to focus on rebalancing this internationalisation to manage system capacity (OECD, 2026[1]). Regional mobility patterns have also evolved in recent years. Australia remains one of the main destinations for students from New Zealand, reflecting longstanding geographic and cultural ties, while Japan has emerged among the top five destinations for Australian students studying abroad. These evolving patterns suggest that while traditional hubs maintain their dominance, students are increasingly seeking destinations that offer a balance between institutional quality and favourable post-study opportunities (Table B4.3).

Box B4.1. International student mobility: From expansion strategies to regulated growth

International student mobility has become an increasingly important component of tertiary education policies across OECD and partner countries. As well as their contribution to campus internationalisation, international students are often viewed as a source of skilled labour, research capacity, innovation and long-term demographic renewal. As a result, many governments have developed dedicated policy frameworks to increase their attractiveness to international students, combining immigration reforms, financial incentives, labour-market opportunities and internationalisation strategies. More recently, however, several major host countries have introduced measures aimed at regulating or slowing inflows in response to pressures related to housing, infrastructure and migration management (OECD, 2026[1]).

National strategies to strengthen international attractiveness

Many countries have adopted explicit internationalisation strategies combining recruitment targets, national branding and improved student services. Finland's Talent Boost programme aims to triple the number of foreign students by 2030 (Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment of Finland, 2023[11]), while Japan has set a target of hosting 400 000 international students by 2033, building on earlier internationalisation plans (Prime Minister's Office of Japan, 2023[12]). Korea launched the Study Korea 300K Project in 2024, aiming to attract 300 000 international students by 2027 through simplified visa procedures, stronger institutional support and the expansion of English-taught programmes (Government of Korea, 2023[13]).

Bilateral and regional partnerships also play an important role in internationalisation strategies. Rather than focusing solely on recruitment targets, some countries seek to strengthen academic and research ties with specific partner countries. For example, Norway has recently strengthened its co-operation with France and Germany through dedicated strategic agreements, which include higher education and research among their areas of collaboration. Such partnerships can support student mobility and foster long-term academic links between countries (Government of Norway, 2025[14]; Government of Norway, 2023[15]).

Policies facilitating access and reducing administrative barriers have also contributed to mobility growth. Canada progressively expanded its Student Direct Stream between 2018 and 2021 to accelerate visa processing for students from selected countries meeting language and financial requirements (Government of Canada, 2024[16]). In Europe, the Bologna Process and the European Higher Education Area have continued to support regional mobility through the harmonisation of degree structures and recognition systems, helping reduce administrative and academic barriers across participating countries (EHEA, 2026[17]). Bilateral agreements have also played an increasing role. Australia and India introduced a mutual recognition mechanism for academic qualifications in 2023 (Australian Government, 2023[18]), while Canada and Finland signed a Youth Mobility Agreement in 2024 to facilitate educational and professional exchanges (Government of Canada, 2024[19]).

Linking international education with skills and migration strategies

An increasing number of policies now link international education with skilled migration and labour-market integration. Australia and Canada expanded post-study work opportunities during the late 2010s and early 2020s, allowing graduates to remain in the country for several years after graduation to gain professional experience (Australian Government, 2023[20]; Government of Canada, 2024[21]). Canada's Post-Graduation Work Permit aimed to improve the retention of highly skilled graduates, including in sectors facing labour shortages (Government of Canada, 2024[21]), while the United Kingdom's Graduate Route aims more broadly to retain skilled graduates after the completion of their studies. Germany reinforced this approach in 2024 through the DAAD Campus-Initiative for International Talents, designed to facilitate the transition from higher education to employment (DAAD, 2025[22]; DAAD, 2024[23]).

Financial support measures remain another important policy instrument, although approaches vary considerably across countries. France expanded scholarship opportunities for international students through programmes such as the Eiffel Scholarship (Campus France, 2024[24]). Germany remains distinctive among major host countries in maintaining very low tuition fees in most public institutions, which contributes to its attractiveness among international students (DAAD, 2024[23]). In contrast, Australia and the United Kingdom rely more heavily on international tuition fees, which have become an important

source of funding for tertiary institutions and, in some cases, research activities (Australian Government, 2024[25]; Cuibus, Walsh and Němeček, 2025[26]).

Managing capacity pressures and regulating student inflows

Since 2023, several major destination countries have introduced measures aimed at regulating or slowing the growth of international student inflows. These reforms are generally presented as responses to pressure on housing markets, infrastructure capacity, migration systems or quality assurance. Australia replaced the Genuine Temporary Entrant requirement with a stricter Genuine Student test in 2024 and strengthened English-language and financial capacity requirements (Australian Government, 2023[20]) and introduced a prioritisation system for offshore student visa processing (Australian Government, 2026[27]). Canada introduced a temporary cap on new study permits in 2024 and significantly increased proof-of-financial-support thresholds for applicants (Government of Canada, 2024[28]). The United Kingdom restricted the ability of most international students to bring dependants from January 2024 (UK Government, 2023[29]).

Although these restrictive measures remain recent, available data already suggest an impact on new inflows. The number of newly issued residence permits for tertiary-level students declined by 13% across the OECD between 2023 and 2024, particularly in Canada (-39%), Australia (-22%), the United Kingdom (-14%) and the United States (-12%) (OECD, 2025[30]). These developments suggest that international student policies are entering a new phase in which some countries continue to compete for global talent while increasingly seeking to balance the attraction of students with domestic economic, social and infrastructure constraints.

Definitions

Foreign students are defined solely by their citizenship. This group includes not only internationally mobile students but also "non-mobile" foreign citizens who may have been born in the host country or have lived there as permanent residents for many years prior to enrolling in tertiary education. Because naturalisation policies vary significantly between nations, data based on citizenship should be interpreted with caution; for example, a country with restrictive citizenship laws may report a higher share of "foreign students" than a country that grants residence or citizenship more easily, even if the actual number of new arrivals is lower. In this chapter, the term "international students" is used as the default analytical category, but it incorporates "foreign students" for countries unable to provide mobility-based data.

Inbound mobility refers to international students hosted by a reporting country, while **outbound mobility** refers to students from a reporting country who are enrolled in tertiary programmes abroad. The host country is the nation where the student is currently enrolled and the “country of destination" is the term used from the perspective of an outbound student.

International students are those who left their country of origin and moved to another country specifically to pursue a degree. The country of origin is ideally defined as the "country of prior education" (the country where the student obtained the qualification required to enter their current level of study) or the "country of upper secondary education". Where these criteria cannot be met, the "country of usual residence" is used. International students are the most accurate measure of student mobility as they exclude long-term residents with foreign citizenship.

National students (or domestic students) are those who are not internationally mobile. This group consists of students whose citizenship or prior education matches the reporting country. It should be noted that some "local" students may still have immigrant backgrounds or have lived abroad previously, but for the purpose of mobility statistics, they are classified as non-mobile.

New entrants are students enrolling for the first time in a specific tertiary level of education (ISCED 5, 6, 7 or 8).

Stay-on rates: the proportion of students who remain in their host country after graduation.

STEM fields include the broad disciplines of science, technology, engineering and mathematics. These fields are characterised by high global demand and transferable curricula, often leading to higher stay-on rates for international graduates compared to other fields.

Methodology

Defining and identifying mobile students, as well as their types of learning mobility, are a key challenge for developing international education statistics, since current international and national statistical systems only report domestic educational activities undertaken within national boundaries (OECD, 2018[31]).

Data on international and foreign students are therefore obtained from enrolments in their countries of destination. This is the same method used for collecting data on total enrolments, i.e. records of regularly enrolled students in an education programme.

The share of inbound international students refers to the proportion of all tertiary students enrolled in the reporting country who are internationally mobile.

For OECD countries, the share of outbound international students refers to the proportion of students from the reporting country studying abroad relative to the total tertiary student population originating from that country (students enrolled domestically plus students enrolled abroad).

Sources

Data refer to the 2023/24 academic year and are based on the UNESCO-Institute of Statistics (UIS)/OECD/Eurostat data collection on education statistics administered by the OECD in 2025. Data for some countries may have a different reference year. For more information see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

The UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) provided some data for Argentina, the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and Thailand.

References

Australian Government (2026), *Australian Government confirms 2027 National Planning Level*, https://www.studyaustralia.gov.au/en/Agent-Hub/agent-news-index/australian-government-confirms-2027-national-planning-level (accessed on 17 July 2026). [27]

Australian Government (2024), *Australian Universities Accord: Final Report*, Department of Education, Australian Government, https://www.education.gov.au/australian-universities-accord/resources/final-report. [25]

Australian Government (2023), *Mechanism for the Mutual Recognition of Qualifications between Australia and India*, Department of Education, Australian Government, https://www.education.gov.au/international-education-engagement/resources/recognition-qualifications-australia-india. [18]

Australian Government (2023), *Migration Strategy: Getting Migration Working for the Nation.*, Australian Government, https://immi.homeaffairs.gov.au/programs-subsite/migration-strategy/Documents/migration-strategy.pdf. [20]

Beine, M., R. Noël and L. Ragot (2014), "Determinants of the international mobility of students", *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 41, pp. 40-54, https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ECONEDUREV.2014.03.003. [2]

Campus France (2024), *France Excellence Eiffel Scholarship Program*, https://www.campusfrance.org/en/france-excellence-eiffel-scholarship-program. [24]

Cuibus, M., P. Walsh and F. Němeček (2025), "Student migration to the UK", *Briefing*, Migration Observatory, University of Oxford, https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/briefings/student-migration-to-the-uk/. [26]

DAAD (2025), *Campus-Initiative for International Talents*, Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, https://www.daad.de/en/information-services-for-higher-education-institutions/expertise-on-subjects-countries-regions/campus-initiative-international-academic-experts/. [22]

DAAD (2024), *The Right University*, Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, https://www.daad.de/en/studying-in-germany/universities/universities/. [23]

EHEA (2026), *The European Higher Education Area (EHEA)*, https://ehea.info/about-ehea/. [17]

Government of Canada (2024), *About the post-graduation work permit*, https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/study-canada/work/after-graduation/about.html. [21]

Government of Canada (2024), *Canada announces the launch of the Canada–Finland Youth Mobility Agreement*, https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/news/2024/02/canada-announces-the-launch-of-the-canadafinland-youth-mobility-agreement.html. [19]

Government of Canada (2024), *Canada to stabilize growth and decrease number of new international student permits issued to approximately 360,000 for 2024*, https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/news/2024/01/canada-to-stabilize-growth-and-decrease-number-of-new-international-student-permits-issued-to-approximately-360000-for-2024.html. [28]

Government of Canada (2024), *Student Direct Stream: How to apply*, https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/study-canada/study-permit/student-direct-stream/apply.html/1000. [16]

Government of Korea (2023), *MOE to announce Study Korea 300K Project: Korea aims to be the top 10 world-leading countries for study abroad by 2027*, https://english.moe.go.kr/boardCnts/viewRenewal.do?boardID=265&boardSeq=96185&lev=0&searchType=null&statusYN=W&page=1&s=english&m=0201&opType=N. [13]

Government of Norway (2025), *Strategic Partnership between the Kingdom of Norway and the French Republic*, https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/783f693cabd542abb79fbd744fda4905/250619_franco-norwegian-strategic-partnership_alternat_no.pdf. [14]

Government of Norway (2023), *The Norwegian Government's Strategy for Cooperation with Germany*, https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/28109f74d956419488003f648beca8ac/e-1023-b-tysklandstrategi.pdf. [15]

Kyungpook National University (2025), *K-STAR Visa Track expands pathways for international STEM graduates to settle in Korea, Seoul,*, https://en.knu.ac.kr/board/news01.htm?mode=view&mv_data=aWR4PTM4MzAmc3RhcnRQYWdlPSZsaXN0Tm89JnRhYmxlPWNzX2Jic19kYXRhJmNvZGU9ZU5ld3Mmc2VhcmNoX2l0ZW09JnNlYXJjaF9vcmRlcj0%3D (accessed on May 2026). [9]

Marti, S. and A. Peneoasu (2025), "Doctoral education in Europe today: Enhanced structures and practices for the European knowledge society", *2025 EUA-CDE Survey Report*, No. I, European University Association, https://eua.eu/publications/reports/doctoral-education-in-europe-today-enhanced-structures-and-practices-for-the-european-knowledge-society.html. [6]

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment of Finland (2023), *Ministerial working group approves revised Talent Boost programme on work-based and education-based immigration for 2023-2027*, https://tem.fi/en/-/ministerial-working-group-approves-revised-talent-boost-programme-on-work-based-and-education-based-immigration-for-2023-2027. [11]

OECD (2026), *International Students in Higher Education: A comparative analysis of trends, challenges and policy responses in Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom*, Higher Education, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/005ff28d-en. [1]

OECD (2025), *International Migration Outlook 2025*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/ae26c893-en. [30]

OECD (2025), "What are the key trends in international student mobility?", *Education Indicators in Focus*, No. 88, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/2a423a76-en. [7]

OECD (2024), *International Migration Outlook 2024*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/50b0353e-en. [4]

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [31]

Ovchinnikova, E., E. Jones and C. Van Mol (2023), *The role of language in student mobility*, EDUCatt, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389314343_The_role_of_language_in_student_mobility. [3]

Predovic, D., J. Dennis and E. Jones (2023), *Do international and domestic internships differ? How do they compare with other international experiences?*, EDUCatt, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389314536_Do_international_and_domestic_internships_differ_How_do_they_compare_with_other_international_experiences. [8]

Prime Minister's Office of Japan (2023), *Council for the Creation of Future Education*, https://japan.kantei.go.jp/101_kishida/actions/202303/_00024.html. [12]

Tran, L. and H. Bui (2019), "International graduates: Navigating the host and home labour markets", *Research Digest*, International Education Association of Australia, https://www.ieaa.org.au/common/Uploaded%20files/Research%20Publications/2019/PUB-IEAA-International-Graduates-Navigating-the-Home-and-Host-Labour-Markets-Research-Digest-16.pdf. [5]

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (2022), *Practical Training*, https://www.ice.gov/sevis/practical-training. [10]

UK Government (2023), *Changes to student visa route will reduce net migration, London*, https://www.gov.uk/government/news/changes-to-student-visa-route-will-reduce-net-migration. [29]

Chapter B4 Tables

Tables and notes

Table B4.1	Trends in the profile of international new entrants, by tertiary education level (2015 and 2024)
Table B4.2	Distribution of national and international tertiary graduates, by field of education (2024)
Table B4.3	Trends in inbound and outbound internationally mobile tertiary students (2015 and 2024)
Table B4.4	Top five origins and destinations for inbound and outbound international students (2015 and 2024)

StatLink https://stat.link/5nvwya

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/5nvwya.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s/.

Data cut-off for the print publication 13 June 2025. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)

Table B4.1. Trends in the profile of international new entrants, by tertiary education level (2015 and 2024)

	Share of international new entrants								Share of female international new entrants					
	Short-cycle tertiary		Bachelor's or equivalent		Master's or equivalent		Doctoral or equivalent		Bachelor's or equivalent		Master's or equivalent		Doctoral or equivalent	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
OECD countries														
Australia	m	44	17	26	50	64	39	50	48	50	48	51	42	47
Austria	2	3	20	25	28	37	36	52	54	57	55	53	49	50
Belgium[1]	5	3	8	9	16	12	52	46	63	57	55	58	43	47
Canada[1,2]	16	44	14	17	25	36	38	45	51	48	45	43	39	44
Chile	0	4	0	2	3	6	11	29	49	53	52	50	47	49
Colombia	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	51	58	51	51	56	35
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	5	2	11	15	13	19	18	28	52	49	53	53	46	46
Denmark	12	3	8	7	21	24	40	40	57	55	54	54	40	49
Estonia	a	a	6	5	12	17	20	41	43	50	36	53	27	49
Finland	a	a	7	13	27	30	30	39	46	46	41	45	42	49
France	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Germany	0	0	6	7	26	35	14	29	48	44	52	48	48	48
Greece	a	a	3	3	1	1	3	2	43	58	45	60	54	42
Hungary	1	1	6	9	16	24	11	30	49	48	52	57	50	49
Iceland	37	38	15	11	13	21	47	47	60	68	58	62	51	42
Ireland	1	5	4	8	16	38	30	47	54	60	53	51	47	49
Israel	m	2	4	4	5	9	7	41	59	53	57	55	44	41
Italy	8	0	6	5	6	11	15	17	59	54	56	55	37	43
Japan[1]	m	m	2	2	11	10	18	21	42	41	53	47	46	44
Korea[1]	0	4	2	3	11	17	12	23	57	58	61	60	43	52
Latvia[1]	2	1	10	12	16	31	15	9	34	19	39	40	42	34
Lithuania	a	a	3	12	8	17	4	13	37	36	41	47	32	45
Luxembourg	6	11	29	25	80	68	86	87	57	55	53	52	36	48
Mexico	0	1	0	1	1	8	3	12	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	2	2	11	23	24	36	39	m	55	55	54	59	43	m
New Zealand	32	13	28	22	29	56	55	63	52	55	52	53	47	55
Norway	1	2	5	4	9	9	30	31	60	64	48	50	38	50
Poland[1]	13	0	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Portugal	3	19	3	9	9	23	30	32	56	53	51	51	43	47
Slovak Republic	0	1	5	21	6	12	9	14	64	41	55	54	29	37
Slovenia	1	9	3	14	4	15	8	28	53	56	57	53	45	48
Spain[1]	1	3	2	4	20	17	20	22	52	53	52	56	48	46
Sweden	0	0	4	7	18	23	39	44	55	60	46	54	39	46
Switzerland	0	0	10	12	30	35	57	61	50	49	51	50	46	46
Türkiye	0	3	2	7	5	9	10	14	29	43	33	46	29	33
United Kingdom	5	4	15	15	45	58	45	44	52	47	56	52	46	51
United States	2	2	m	m	15	15	48	40	m	m	48	44	39	39
OECD average	**5**	**7**	**8**	**11**	**18**	**24**	**27**	**34**	**51**	**51**	**50**	**52**	**43**	**45**
Partners and/or accession countries														
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria[1]	a	a	2	3	7	12	8	12	38	31	45	56	37	50
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

	Share of international new entrants								Share of female international new entrants					
	Short-cycle tertiary		Bachelor's or equivalent		Master's or equivalent		Doctoral or equivalent		Bachelor's or equivalent		Master's or equivalent		Doctoral or equivalent	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Peru	m	m	m	1	m	2	m	4	m	50	m	52	m	52
Romania	a	a	3	5	5	9	4	5	47	49	45	56	36	48
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**4**	**4**	**7**	**11**	**17**	**23**	**24**	**30**	**51**	**49**	**50**	**53**	**42**	**46**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Bulgaria and Latvia; 2017 for Belgium, Canada, Korea and Spain; and 2021 for Japan and Poland.
2. Year of reference for Canada is 2023 instead of 2024

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/5nvwya..

Table B4.2. Distribution of national and international tertiary graduates, by field of education (2024)

	Education		Arts and humanities		Social sciences, journalism and information		Business, administration and law		Science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM)		Health and welfare	
	International	National	International	National	International	National	International	National	International	National	International	National
	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	7	10	7	10	3	8	47	23	25	17	10	29
Austria	4	13	10	6	20	5	23	24	29	31	11	11
Belgium	3	9	13	9	14	11	13	23	23	19	29	26
Canada	1	7	4	8	5	12	44	20	32	23	5	20
Chile	6	11	3	3	5	5	34	27	22	23	25	23
Colombia	10	9	8	5	12	9	34	41	19	23	14	6
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	2	18	11	9	13	8	21	18	34	22	13	14
Denmark	1	6	9	9	10	10	22	25	46	23	8	23
Estonia	4	11	18	13	11	8	29	18	32	26	3	16
Finland	3	7	8	9	4	7	22	19	48	29	11	23
France	1	4	8	9	9	7	32	37	32	24	16	14
Germany	2	12	10	9	7	7	22	24	51	34	6	9
Greece	5	8	11	10	12	15	14	20	29	26	19	13
Hungary	3	14	9	9	16	12	16	27	27	21	21	7
Iceland	7	19	21	6	15	16	7	20	37	15	5	20
Ireland	2	12	12	9	9	6	29	26	31	25	15	16
Israel	19	22	10	6	14	13	19	18	25	29	12	11
Italy	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Japan	1	7	32	13	30[d]	6[d]	x(5)	x(6)	22	20	2	15
Korea	4	7	21	15	12	5	33	12	16	32	4	18
Latvia	0	11	3	8	6	8	34	25	26	19	27	19
Lithuania	2	8	10	9	12	11	29	25	20	23	22	21
Luxembourg	4	23	4	4	9	11	53	30	24	21	4	11
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Zealand	9	9	6	13	6	12	31	17	34	21	11	21
Norway	4	15	14	8	14	12	12	17	41	23	11	19
Poland	1	9	10	8	15	10	28	26	17	19	18	17
Portugal	2	5	8	10	12	12	32	20	22	29	17	17
Slovak Republic	8	15	8	7	9	10	14	20	18	21	35	17
Slovenia	4	10	7	7	19	10	27	18	29	28	8	14
Spain	4	17	10	8	13	7	34	19	17	22	16	19
Sweden	2	14	7	6	16	12	16	15	46	27	10	21
Switzerland	5	10	12	6	10	6	18	27	40	23	9	20
Türkiye	4	7	12	11	12	9	18	21	31	18	18	24
United Kingdom	3	7	8	13	11	14	43	22	27	21	8	22
United States	2	7	8	17	10	13	20	18	53	20	5	21
OECD average	**4**	**11**	**10**	**9**	**12**	**10**	**26**	**23**	**30**	**23**	**13**	**18**

	Education		Arts and humanities		Social sciences, journalism and information		Business, administration and law		Science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM)		Health and welfare	
	International	National	International	National	International	National	International	National	International	National	International	National
	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partners and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	9	15	10	4	8	6	17	30	28	17	17	20
Bulgaria	9	17	8	7	8	9	13	26	9	20	47	10
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	2	8	8	9	7	8	15	21	34	28	22	15
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	12	3	2	4	15	7	23	28	19	21	14	22
Romania	2	6	7	9	10	10	24	26	18	30	33	11
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**3**	**11**	**9**	**8**	**11**	**9**	**25**	**23**	**29**	**25**	**18**	**16**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/5nvwya.

Table B4.3. Trends in inbound and outbound internationally mobile tertiary students (2015 and 2024)

Inbound (students hosted) and outbound (students abroad) - ISCED levels 5-8

	Number of international students (in thousands)				Share of international students			
	Inbound		Outbound		Inbound		Outbound	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
OECD countries								
Australia	293	580	12	13	15	32	1	1
Austria	68	92	17	28	16	21	5	7
Belgium	56	49	13	20	11	9	3	4
Canada[1]	279	481	47	53	16	25	3	4
Chile	4	22	7	23	0	2	1	2
Colombia[1]	4	9	36	70	0	0	1	3
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	42	57	7	12	11	17	2	4
Denmark	32	29	5	6	10	10	2	2
Estonia	3	4	4	3	5	10	7	8
Finland	23	36	9	8	8	11	3	3
France	238	285	81	113	10	10	4	4
Germany	219	438	113	134	7	13	4	5
Greece[2]	21	23	36	39	3	3	5	4
Hungary	22	43	10	16	7	14	3	6
Iceland	2	2	3	2	8	11	13	12
Ireland	18	35	15	18	9	12	7	7
Israel	9	13	13	19	2	3	3	4
Italy	90	123	53	89	5	5	3	4
Japan	132	184	30	34	3	5	1	1
Korea	55	144	107	88	2	5	3	3
Latvia	5	10	5	5	6	14	6	8
Lithuania	5	11	11	7	4	11	7	7
Luxembourg	3	4	10	14	46	51	73	77
Mexico	10	110	27	42	0	2	1	1
Netherlands	81	176	15	19	10	18	2	2
New Zealand	57	44	5	5	21	18	2	2
Norway	10	13	18	14	4	4	7	5
Poland	44	95	23	26	3	7	1	2
Portugal	17	55	10	17	5	13	3	4
Slovak Republic	m	22	31	31	m	16	15	21
Slovenia	2	9	3	3	3	12	3	4
Spain	m	114	34	53	m	5	2	2
Sweden	27	36	17	14	6	7	4	3
Switzerland	51	68	12	21	17	20	5	7
Türkiye	71	336	44	77	1	5	1	1
United Kingdom	431	721	30	40	18	23	2	2
United States	907	1 006	63	117	5	5	0	1
OECD average					**8**	**12**	**6**	**6**
Partners and/or accession countries								
Argentina[2]	m	127	6	16	m	3	0	0
Brazil	20	28	39	89	0	0	0	1
Bulgaria	12	15	24	24	4	8	8	12
China[2]	m	m	804	1 126	m	m	2	2
Croatia	1	5	8	8	0	3	5	5

	Number of international students (in thousands)				Share of international students			
	Inbound		Outbound		Inbound		Outbound	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
India[2]	42	46	240	943	0	0	1	2
Indonesia[1,2]	m	m	48	79	m	m	1	1
Peru	m	13	11	45	m	1	m	2
Romania	23	38	31	32	4	7	6	6
Saudi Arabia	73	69	83	42	5	3	5	2
South Africa[2]	41	34	9	14	4	3	1	1
Thailand	14	41	27	34	1	2	1	2
EU25 average					**8**	**12**	**7**	**8**
G20 average					**6**	**9**	**2**	**2**

Note:
- Inbound students refer to internationally mobile tertiary students enrolled in the reporting country. Outbound students refer to tertiary students from the reporting country studying abroad.
-Outbound student data are based on information reported by host countries. Students studying in non-reporting countries or economies may not be covered.
- The share of inbound international students is expressed as a percentage of total tertiary enrolment in the reporting country.
- For OECD countries, the share of outbound international students refers to the proportion of students from the reporting country studying abroad relative to the total tertiary student population originating from that country (students enrolled domestically plus students enrolled abroad). For Argentina, China, India, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and Thailand, total tertiary enrolment is used instead as denominator.
- OECD, EU and G20 values correspond to averages in this table, except for Columns 1 to 4, which present totals.
1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Colombia and Indonesia; and 2019 for Canada.
2. Year of reference for Canada is 2023 instead of 2024.
The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/5nvwya.

Table B4.4. Top five origins and destinations for inbound and outbound international students (2015 and 2024)

	Top five origin countries and/or territories for inbound international students in descending order of importance		Top five destination countries and/or territories for outbound international students in descending order of importance	
	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
OECD countries				
Australia	China (People's Republic of) (34), India (13), Malaysia (5), Viet Nam (5), Nepal (4)	China (People's Republic of) (23), India (20), Nepal (10), Viet Nam (4), Philippines (4)	United States (32), New Zealand (21), United Kingdom (16), Germany (5), Canada (4)	United States (32), New Zealand (17), United Kingdom (17), Germany (10), Japan (3)
Austria	Germany (41), Italy (12), Türkiye (4), Bosnia and Herzegovina (4)	Germany (46), Italy (10)	Germany (57), United Kingdom (11), Switzerland (8), United States (5)	Germany (66), Switzerland (6), United Kingdom (4), Netherlands (4)
Belgium	France (47), Netherlands (9), Luxembourg (5), Cameroon (4)	France (35), Netherlands (10), Luxembourg (4), Cameroon (3), Morocco (3)	United Kingdom (23), Netherlands (19), France (18), Germany (9), United States (7)	Netherlands (25), Germany (16), France (13), United Kingdom (9), United States (5)
Canada[1]	m	India (40), China (People's Republic of) (13), Nigeria (4), France (4), Philippines (3)	United States (56), United Kingdom (14), Australia (6), Ireland (3)	United States (55), United Kingdom (14), Australia (6), Ireland (3)
Chile	Peru (30), Colombia (18), Ecuador (10), Bolivia (6), Argentina (5)	Venezuela (27), Peru (23), Colombia (17), Bolivia (10), Ecuador (7)	United States (33), United Kingdom (11), France (11), Germany (10), Australia (8)	Argentina (30), Spain (18), United States (12), Germany (7), Australia (6)
Colombia[1]	Venezuela (37), Ecuador (11), Mexico (10), Peru (7), France (4)	Venezuela (66), Ecuador (6), Mexico (4), Peru (4)	United States (21), Argentina (20), Spain (12), France (8), Germany (6)	Argentina (20), Spain (17), United States (13), Australia (13), Canada (6)
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m
Czechia	Slovak Republic (55), Russia (13), Ukraine (6), Kazakhstan (3)	Slovak Republic (39), Ukraine (12), Russia (11), Kazakhstan (5), India (3)	Germany (20), United Kingdom (19), Poland (10), United States (10), France (9)	Slovak Republic (27), Germany (13), United Kingdom (10), Netherlands (8), Poland (8)
Denmark	Norway (11), Germany (11), Romania (8), Sweden (7), Lithuania (5)	Germany (11), Norway (10), China (People's Republic of) (6), Sweden (5), Spain (5)	United Kingdom (26), United States (19), Germany (10), Sweden (6), Norway (6)	United States (14), Germany (14), United Kingdom (12), Norway (12), Netherlands (11)
Estonia	Finland (46), Russia (8), Türkiye (4), Georgia (4), Latvia (4)	Finland (17), Ukraine (11), Russia (7), India (4), Nigeria (4)	United Kingdom (28), Finland (15), Denmark (13), Germany (12), Netherlands (7)	Netherlands (20), Finland (14), Germany (11), Russia (11), United Kingdom (8)
Finland	Russia (15), China (People's Republic of) (10), Viet Nam (8), Nepal (6), India (4)	China (People's Republic of) (9), Bangladesh (8), Russia (6), India (6), Viet Nam (6)	Sweden (21), United Kingdom (21), Estonia (14), Germany (9), United States (7)	Sweden (18), Netherlands (15), Germany (9), Estonia (9), United Kingdom (7)
France	Morocco (12), China (People's Republic of) (11), Algeria (7), Tunisia (4), Italy (4)	Morocco (12), Algeria (10), China (People's Republic of) (8), Senegal (5), Tunisia (4)	Belgium (22), Canada (17), United Kingdom (14), Switzerland (11), Germany (9)	Canada (17), Belgium (12), Spain (11), Switzerland (11), Germany (9)
Germany	China (People's Republic of) (12), Russia (5), India (5), Austria (5), France (4)	India (12), China (People's Republic of) (9), Türkiye (5), Austria (5), Iran (4)	Austria (24), Netherlands (20), United Kingdom (12), Switzerland (10), United States (6)	Austria (31), Netherlands (16), Switzerland (9), United States (5), United Kingdom (5)
Greece[2]	Cyprus (60), Albania (9), Germany (6)	Cyprus (68), Albania (6), Germany (5), Russia (3)	United Kingdom (28), Cyprus (8), Italy (8), Bulgaria (8), Germany (8)	Netherlands (11), Cyprus (11), Germany (11), United Kingdom (11), Italy (10)
Hungary	Germany (13), Slovak Republic (9), Romania (7), Serbia (6), Brazil (6)	Germany (8), Romania (7), China (People's Republic of) (6), Iran (5), Serbia (5)	Austria (19), Germany (17), United Kingdom (16), Denmark (10), United States (7)	Netherlands (18), Germany (15), Austria (15), Poland (7), United Kingdom (7)
Iceland	Germany (11), United States (10), Denmark (7), Sweden (5), France (5)	United States (11), Poland (7), Philippines (7), Germany (7), Nigeria (4)	Denmark (38), United States (15), United Kingdom (9), Sweden (8), Norway (5)	Denmark (33), United States (13), Sweden (9), Slovak Republic (9), United Kingdom (7)
Ireland	China (People's Republic of) (11), United Kingdom (11), Malaysia (10), United States (8), Saudi Arabia (7)	India (20), China (People's Republic of) (12), United States (9), Canada (5), United Kingdom (4)	United Kingdom (73), United States (7), France (3)	United Kingdom (53), Netherlands (11), United States (7), Germany (5), Poland (4)

	Top five origin countries and/or territories for inbound international students in descending order of importance		Top five destination countries and/or territories for outbound international students in descending order of importance	
	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Israel	United States (27), France (11), Russia (9), Ukraine (7), United Kingdom (4)	United States (19), Russia (14), France (9), West Bank and Gaza Strip (8), Ukraine (6)	United States (17), Romania (16), Moldova (14), Germany (12), Italy (10)	Jordan (11), United States (11), Germany (10), Italy (9), Romania (9)
Italy	China (People's Republic of) (14), Albania (13), Romania (8), Iran (4), Greece (3)	Iran (12), Türkiye (6), China (People's Republic of) (6), India (5), Greece (3)	United Kingdom (20), Austria (15), France (15), Germany (11), Switzerland (9)	Germany (13), France (12), Austria (10), Netherlands (9), Switzerland (8)
Japan	China (People's Republic of) (60), Korea (10), Viet Nam (8), Nepal (4)	China (People's Republic of) (50), Viet Nam (12), Korea (8), Nepal (8)	United States (50), United Kingdom (10), Germany (6), Australia (6), France (5)	United States (34), Australia (9), United Kingdom (9), Korea (7), Germany (7)
Korea	China (People's Republic of) (64), Viet Nam (5), Mongolia (4)	China (People's Republic of) (43), Viet Nam (21), Uzbekistan (7), Mongolia (6), Nepal (4)	United States (60), Japan (13), Australia (6), United Kingdom (4), Canada (4)	United States (45), Japan (16), Australia (8), Germany (7), Canada (6)
Latvia	Germany (16), Uzbekistan (12), Russia (10), Sweden (5), Kazakhstan (5)	India (25), Uzbekistan (12), Sweden (9), Germany (7), Ukraine (7)	United Kingdom (30), Denmark (17), Germany (12), Netherlands (11), United States (5)	Netherlands (26), Germany (12), Russia (11), United Kingdom (10), United States (5)
Lithuania	Belarus (35), Nigeria (5), Russia (5), India (5), Spain (4)	Ukraine (17), Belarus (14), India (9), Germany (5), Sweden (4)	United Kingdom (40), Denmark (15), Poland (8), Germany (8), Netherlands (8)	Netherlands (27), United Kingdom (13), Germany (10), Poland (7), Denmark (5)
Luxembourg	France (31), Germany (15), Belgium (14), Italy (3)	France (21), Germany (11), Belgium (8), Italy (6), India (3)	Germany (36), Belgium (19), France (14), United Kingdom (11), Austria (9)	Germany (42), Belgium (11), Austria (11), France (11), Netherlands (7)
Mexico	m	United States (98)	United States (56), France (9), Germany (8), United Kingdom (7), Canada (5)	United States (37), Spain (12), Canada (11), Germany (10), France (6)
Netherlands	Germany (39), China (People's Republic of) (7), Belgium (4), Greece (4), Italy (3)	Germany (17), Italy (6), Romania (6), China (People's Republic of) (5), Spain (5)	Belgium (24), United Kingdom (23), United States (12), Germany (8), France (4)	Belgium (21), United States (11), United Kingdom (11), Germany (11), Türkiye (5)
New Zealand	India (30), China (People's Republic of) (29), Australia (5), United States (5)	China (People's Republic of) (33), India (22), United States (5), Sri Lanka (5), Australia (5)	Australia (46), United States (28), United Kingdom (10)	United States (33), Australia (29), United Kingdom (12), Germany (8)
Norway	Sweden (8), China (People's Republic of) (7), Russia (6), Germany (5), Nepal (5)	Germany (7), Iran (6), Pakistan (5), China (People's Republic of) (5), Denmark (5)	United Kingdom (30), Denmark (19), United States (13), Poland (9), Hungary (5)	Denmark (20), United Kingdom (19), United States (10), Poland (7), Hungary (5)
Poland	Ukraine (52), Belarus (9), Norway (4)	Ukraine (43), Belarus (13), Zimbabwe (4), Türkiye (4)	Germany (24), United Kingdom (23), France (8), Italy (6), United States (6)	Netherlands (22), Germany (20), United Kingdom (14), United States (6), Denmark (5)
Portugal	Brazil (32), Angola (14), Cabo Verde (11), Spain (5), Mozambique (4)	Brazil (28), Guinea-Bissau (11), Angola (11), Cabo Verde (9), France (7)	United Kingdom (26), France (18), United States (9), Brazil (8), Germany (6)	United Kingdom (17), Netherlands (15), Spain (15), France (10), Germany (8)
Slovak Republic	m	Ukraine (48), Czechia (15), Russia (6), Germany (3)	Czechia (73), Hungary (6), United Kingdom (5), Austria (4)	Czechia (72), Hungary (6), Netherlands (5), Austria (3)
Slovenia	m	m	Austria (21), Germany (15), United Kingdom (14), United States (8), Italy (8)	Austria (19), Germany (15), Netherlands (15), United States (6), United Kingdom (6)
Spain	m	France (11), Colombia (10), Ecuador (6), Italy (6), Peru (6)	United Kingdom (21), Germany (15), France (15), United States (14), Netherlands (4)	Germany (15), United States (14), United Kingdom (13), Netherlands (12), France (10)
Sweden	China (People's Republic of) (11), Finland (9), Germany (9), India (6), Iran (6)	China (People's Republic of) (12), India (10), Germany (9), Finland (5), Iran (4)	United States (25), United Kingdom (18), Denmark (13), Poland (8), Norway (5)	United States (18), Denmark (11), United Kingdom (10), Latvia (7), Netherlands (6)
Switzerland	Germany (24), France (19), Italy (10)	Germany (19), France (19), Italy (11), China (People's Republic of) (6)	United Kingdom (26), Germany (20), United States (10), France (10), Austria (7)	Germany (34), United Kingdom (17), Italy (7), Austria (7), France (6)
Türkiye	Azerbaijan (15), Turkmenistan (13), Syrian Arab Republic (8), Iran (8), Afghanistan (5)	Syrian Arab Republic (18), Azerbaijan (12), Turkmenistan (9), Iran (9), Iraq (4)	United States (23), Germany (12), Bulgaria (8), United Kingdom (7), Austria (6)	Germany (26), United States (11), Italy (9), United Kingdom (8), Poland (5)

	Top five origin countries and/or territories for inbound international students in descending order of importance		Top five destination countries and/or territories for outbound international students in descending order of importance	
	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
United Kingdom	China (People's Republic of) (21), India (4), Nigeria (4), Malaysia (4), Hong Kong (China) (4)	India (23), China (People's Republic of) (21), Nigeria (8), Pakistan (6)	United States (33), France (7), Netherlands (7), Germany (6), Australia (5)	United States (24), Germany (16), Bulgaria (6), Australia (4), Ireland (4)
United States	China (People's Republic of) (33), India (13), Korea (7), Saudi Arabia (6), Canada (3)	India (27), China (People's Republic of) (25), Korea (4)	United Kingdom (24), Canada (13), Grenada (7), Germany (7), France (5)	Mexico (26), United Kingdom (18), Canada (8), Germany (7), France (4)
Partners and/or accession countries				
Argentina[2]	m	Brazil (20), Peru (13), Ecuador (13), Colombia (11), Bolivia (10)	United States (31), Brazil (17), France (12), Germany (7), Italy (6)	United States (19), Spain (17), Peru (16), Brazil (8), Germany (7)
Brazil	Angola (12), Colombia (8), Peru (7), Paraguay (5), Argentina (5)	Venezuela (8), Angola (8), Colombia (6), Peru (6), Japan (6)	United States (34), Portugal (14), France (11), Germany (10), United Kingdom (7)	Argentina (28), United States (18), Portugal (17), Australia (8), Germany (5)
Bulgaria	Türkiye (28), Greece (25), North Macedonia (5), Ukraine (4), Germany (4)	Greece (20), United Kingdom (16), Ukraine (10), Germany (10), Italy (6)	Germany (27), United Kingdom (26), Netherlands (8), Austria (6), France (6)	Türkiye (24), Netherlands (23), Germany (21), United Kingdom (6), Austria (6)
China[2]	m	m	United States (36), Australia (12), United Kingdom (11), Japan (10), Canada (7)	United States (22), United Kingdom (14), Australia (11), Japan (8), Hong Kong (China)
Croatia	Bosnia and Herzegovina (19), Slovenia (16), Germany (11), Sweden (7), United States (5)	Bosnia and Herzegovina (39), France (8), Germany (8), Spain (4)	Bosnia and Herzegovina (40), Italy (12), Austria (11), United States (7), Serbia (6)	Bosnia and Herzegovina (26), Netherlands (15), Austria (11), Germany (11), Italy (7)
India[2]	Nepal (21), Afghanistan (9), Bhutan (6), Sudan (5), Nigeria (5)	Nepal (29), Afghanistan (7), United States (6), Bangladesh (6), United Arab Emirates (5)	United States (47), Australia (15), United Kingdom (8), Canada (7), New Zealand (6)	United States (28), Canada (20), United Kingdom (17), Australia (12), Germany (5)
Indonesia[1,2]	m	m	Australia (22), United States (20), Malaysia (17), United Kingdom (7), Japan (6)	Australia (23), Malaysia (14), Egypt (12), United States (10), Türkiye (7)
Peru	m	Venezuela (22), Argentina (19), Ecuador (15), Chile (10), Japan (6)	m	Argentina (37), Spain (14), United States (12), Chile (11), Canada (4)
Romania	Moldova (30), Israel (9), France (7), Tunisia (5), Italy (5)	Moldova (33), France (11), Italy (7), Israel (5), Germany (4)	Italy (25), United Kingdom (21), France (11), Germany (8), Denmark (8)	Netherlands (23), United Kingdom (13), Moldova (10), Hungary (9), Germany (9)
Saudi Arabia	Yemen (12), Syrian Arab Republic (12), Egypt (6), West Bank and Gaza Strip (6), Pakistan (6)	Yemen (24), Syrian Arab Republic (12), West Bank and Gaza Strip (6), Egypt (5), Jordan (4)	United States (64), United Kingdom (10), Canada (7), Australia (6)	United States (36), United Kingdom (23), Australia (7), Jordan (6), Malaysia (5)
South Africa[2]	Zimbabwe (27), Nigeria (7), Democratic Republic of the Congo (7), Namibia (7), Lesotho (6)	Zimbabwe (32), Namibia (7), Democratic Republic of the Congo (7), Lesotho (7), Nigeria (6)	Cuba (25), United States (20), United Kingdom (13), Australia (7), Germany (3)	United States (21), United Kingdom (17), Australia (11), Germany (9), Rwanda (6)
Thailand	China (People's Republic of) (33), Myanmar (12), Cambodia (9), Lao People's Democratic Republic (6), Viet Nam (5)	China (People's Republic of) (60), Myanmar (18), Cambodia (4)	United States (26), United Kingdom (22), Australia (17), Japan (9), Malaysia (5)	Australia (33), United Kingdom (18), United States (15), Japan (8), Egypt (6)

Note: Inbound students refer to internationally mobile tertiary students enrolled in the reporting country. Outbound students refer to tertiary students from the reporting country studying abroad. Outbound student data are based on information reported by host countries. Students studying in non-reporting countries or economies may not be covered. The figures in parentheses in columns 1 and 2 indicate the share of all international mobile students in the destination country who come from the respective origin country. The figures in parentheses in columns 3 and 4 indicate the share of all international mobile students from the origin country who study in the respective destination country. Country names are not included in the top 5 if the share is below 3%.

1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Colombia and Indonesia; and 2019 for Canada.
2. Year of reference for Canada is 2023 instead of 2024.The data for this Table can be accessed via https://stat.link/5nvwya

Part C. Financial resources invested in education

Chapter C1. Key system-level indicators of education finance

Highlights

- OECD countries allocated an average of 9.8% of total government expenditure to education in 2023, equivalent to 4.2% of GDP (Figure C1.1), but how these two measures correlate can differ substantially. For example, Chile allocated the largest share of government expenditure to education, at 15.6%, which amounted to 4.4% of GDP, while the 8.1% of government expenditure France allocated to education, translated into a higher share of its GDP spent on education (4.6%), due to its large public sector.
- Governments spent on average USD 13 859 per student in public institutions and USD 8 711 in private institutions at primary to post-secondary non-tertiary levels in 2023. The difference is even greater for tertiary education where public expenditure per student in public institutions is USD 18 928 compared with USD 6 202 in private institutions.
- In 2023, on average across OECD countries, 66% of expenditure in educational institutions went to staff compensation at primary to tertiary level, compared to 24% for other current expenditure and 9% for capital expenditure. Belgium devotes the largest share of expenditure to staff compensation (79%) and also has among the highest expenditure on all staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (USD 13 909).

Context

Governments invest in education to support a range of economic and social objectives, including promoting equal opportunities, strengthening skills and productivity, supporting social cohesion and fostering long-term economic growth. At the same time, education systems operate in environments characterised by changing demographics, labour-market demands, fiscal constraints and evolving expectations regarding educational quality and access. Financing education therefore requires policy choices not only about the overall level of investment, but also about how resources are distributed across levels of education, types of institutions and student populations.

Education systems are financed through different combinations of public and private resources. Although governments remain the principal source of funding for education, private contributions from households and companies often play a greater role in tertiary education and in some privately managed institutions. The balance between public and private financing reflects broader policy choices regarding cost-sharing and the organisation of educational provision. Understanding how funding is allocated across sectors and institutions can therefore provide insight into countries' education priorities and financing models.


Understanding how much countries invest in education is only one dimension of education finance. It is equally important to examine how resources are allocated and spent within educational institutions, including the balance between expenditure on staff and infrastructure. In particular, staff compensation may affect the attractiveness of the teaching profession and play an important role in countries' ability to address teacher shortages.

This chapter provides a broad picture of key education finance indicators, setting out how OECD countries are responding to the challenge of financing education systems. It distinguishes between the levels that mostly cover schooling (i.e. primary to post-secondary non-tertiary education) and tertiary education. It also considers how

resources are distributed across institutions, funding sources and geographical areas. Subsequent chapters offer more detailed insights into expenditure patterns and financing arrangements in specific levels of education.

Figure C1.1. Government expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP and as a percentage of government expenditure on all services (2023)

Total expenditure on education (inside and outside of educational institutions), primary to tertiary education, in per cent



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
For data, see Table C1.7 (available online). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ax7gjn.

Other findings

- Governments financed 70% of expenditure in tertiary institutions on average. Government sources accounted for more than 85% of expenditure in Austria, Finland, Iceland, Luxembourg and Norway, with Norway recording the highest public share at 94%.
- Between 2015 and 2023, public spending on education as a share of GDP remained broadly stable across OECD countries, declining only slightly from 4.4% to 4.2% of GDP on average, despite major fiscal disruptions, including the COVID-19 pandemic, inflationary pressures and rising energy costs.
- Regional differences in expenditure per student remain substantial in some large and decentralised education systems, particularly in Canada and the United States, while variation was comparatively moderate in smaller countries such as Belgium and Lithuania.

Analysis

Government expenditure on education as a share of GDP and as a share of government expenditure on all services

Assessing investment in education requires more than a single measure because each indicator answers a different policy question. Government expenditure on education as a share of GDP shows how much of a country's overall economic resources the government devotes to education. This is useful for assessing whether education investment is keeping pace with national income. Expenditure on education as a share of government expenditure on all services answers a different question: how much priority education receives compared with other public services. This is important for budget decisions because governments also face competing demands from areas such as health and defence. These indicators should also be read alongside other indicators such as expenditure per student, private spending and how resources are distributed across levels of education. For example, countries with similar income levels and similar education spending as a share of GDP may still differ in their spending per student because of differences in the size of their student populations.

In 2023, OECD countries allocated an average of 9.8% of total government expenditure to education from primary to tertiary levels, equivalent to 4.2% of GDP. However, substantial differences across countries illustrate that public investment in education depends both on the priority assigned to education within government budgets and on the overall level of public expenditure relative to economic output. Taken together, these two indicators point to four broad groups of countries with differing approaches to financing education (Figure C1.1).

The first group of countries combines high budgetary prioritisation with high levels of spending relative to economic output, allocating around 10% or more of total government expenditure to education and over 5% of GDP to education. These include Belgium, Denmark, Iceland, Israel, Norway and Sweden. In these countries, education forms a significant component of public spending and benefits from relatively high levels of public investment overall. Several Nordic countries stand out in this category, with expenditure on education among the highest shares of GDP across OECD countries (Figure C1.1).

The second group allocates a large share of public budgets to education, while spending a more moderate share of GDP. Chile provides a clear example: it allocates the largest share of total government expenditure to education (15.6%), yet this amounts to 4.4% of GDP, only slightly above the OECD average. This pattern suggests that education occupies a particularly prominent place in public budgets, even if overall spending relative to economic output is less exceptional. Ireland and Saudi Arabia show similar patterns, with Ireland combining high budgetary priority with one of the lowest shares of GDP devoted to education (Figure C1.1). Note however that GDP-based indicators in Ireland should be interpreted with caution as its GDP is highly volatile, driven by multinational-dominated sectors (OECD, 2025[1]).

The third group of countries gives education more moderate priority in their budgets but this translates into comparatively high expenditure relative to GDP, reflecting their larger public sectors. Countries allocating less than 9% of total government expenditure to education while devoting around 4.0% or more of GDP include Austria, France and Germany. France, for example, allocates 8.1% of government expenditure to education, below the OECD average (9.9%), while spending 4.6% of GDP, above the OECD average. Austria and Germany show similar patterns, with education representing a comparatively small share of public expenditure, while expenditure relative to economic output remains close to or above the OECD average. These patterns are consistent with countries where relatively high levels of overall public expenditure help sustain education spending relative to economic output (Figure C1.1).

Finally, some countries record lower levels for both indicators, suggesting more limited public spending on education relative to both fiscal priorities and economic output. Greece, Hungary and Romania allocate comparatively smaller shares of both government expenditure and GDP to education. In these systems, education represents a less prominent component of public budgets and overall spending relative to the size of the economy is also comparatively low (Figure C1.1).

Changes in government expenditure on education as a share of GDP


Between 2015 and 2023, government expenditure on education as a share of GDP declined slightly across OECD countries, from 4.4% to 4.2% on average (Figure C1.2). In many countries, expenditure relative to GDP also remained broadly stable, with only modest changes between 2015 and 2023, although others saw very strong declines in expenditure. These limited changes represent a notable degree of stability in public investment in education during a period marked by major economic and fiscal disruptions. Many countries experienced sustained economic growth in the years preceding the COVID-19 pandemic, followed by

sharp increases in public expenditure during the pandemic to support health systems, households and economic activity. More recently, governments have faced additional fiscal pressures linked to high inflation and rising energy costs.

Expenditure patterns nevertheless evolved differently in some countries. Chile and Czechia, for example, recorded increases of around 0.5 percentage points of GDP between 2015 and 2023. In Chile, the increase raised its public education expenditure above the OECD average, while in Czechia it represented a gradual strengthening from comparatively lower levels. These changes may reflect efforts to expand participation or improve educational provision, although broader economic conditions may also have affected the GDP denominator. By contrast, Brazil, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Ireland, Latvia and Mexico recorded notable decreases. Bulgaria experienced the largest decline, from 5.7% of GDP in 2015 to 3.3% in 2023, while Costa Rica also saw a marked reduction over the period (Figure C1.2).

Figure C1.2. Trends in government expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP (2015 and 2023)

Total government expenditure on education (inside and outside of educational institutions); primary to tertiary education



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
For data, see Table C1.7 (available online). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ax7gjn.

Cross-country differences in the overall level of investment in education remained substantial in 2023. At one end of the distribution, expenditure remained below 3.0% of GDP in Ireland, Japan, Mexico and Romania, indicating comparatively lower levels of public investment in education relative to GDP. At the other end, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Israel, Norway and Sweden continued to devote more than 5.0% of GDP to education (Figure C1.2). The concentration of Nordic countries in this group reflects models of public investment characterised by relatively large public sectors and strong commitments to universal public services. In these countries, education forms part of a broader social model in which governments play a comparatively large role in financing social and human capital investments.


Expenditure in public and private educational institutions

Government expenditure per student in public and private institutions provides insight into how countries allocate public resources across different types of education providers. Even though they are privately managed, at least half of the expenditure on government-dependent private institutions comes from the government and in many countries, government remains an important – sometimes the main – source of funding for students enrolled in these institutions (Table C1.1). Comparing expenditure levels across sectors therefore helps illustrate the extent of public support to privately managed institutions and the degree to which governments seek to provide comparable levels of resources across institutional types.

Differences in government expenditure between public and private institutions may reflect a range of factors, including the scope of public funding, regulatory frameworks, student composition and the organisation of education systems. In some countries, public expenditure levels are relatively similar across sectors, reflecting funding arrangements aimed at supporting broadly comparable educational provision. In others, public expenditure is concentrated more heavily in public institutions, with private institutions playing a more complementary role (Figure C1.3).

Figure C1.3. Government expenditure on educational institutions per full-time equivalent student, by type of institution (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP; primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
2. Year of reference 2022.
For data, see Table C1.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ax7gjn

On average, governments in OECD countries spent USD 13 859 per full-time equivalent student in public institutions at primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary levels, compared to USD 8 711 in private institutions in 2023. However, expenditure levels varied substantially across countries and types of institutions, reflecting broader differences in public spending capacity. In public institutions, public expenditure per student exceeded USD 20 000 in Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway and Switzerland, while remaining below USD 5 000 in China, Colombia, Mexico, South Africa and the Republic of Türkiye. Luxembourg recorded the highest level of expenditure per student (USD 34 515), substantially above the OECD average. These differences illustrate the diversity in the level of resources available to educational institutions across countries, even after accounting for differences in purchasing power (Figure C1.3).

In most countries, government expenditure per student remained higher in public institutions than in private institutions, although the size of the difference varied considerably. Particularly large gaps were observed in China, Costa Rica, Greece, Saudi Arabia and the United States, where government expenditure per student in private institutions represented only a small fraction of that in public institutions (Figure C1.3).

In contrast, expenditure levels in public and private institutions are more comparable in Hungary, Israel, Korea and the Slovak Republic, suggesting funding arrangements that provide relatively similar levels of public resources per student across institutional types. Denmark, Hungary, Israel and Switzerland stand out as exceptions, with government expenditure per student in private institutions exceeding expenditure in public institutions, highlighting the diversity of financing arrangements across education systems. In Denmark, government-dependent private institutions account for only a very limited number of students at this level (Figure C1.3).

Adequate and equitable investment per student is also a key indicator in the SDG 4 monitoring framework, reflecting countries' commitment to ensuring inclusive and quality education for all, particularly under Target 4.5 on reducing disparities in education. Comparing expenditure per student across levels of education and funding sources provides an important measure of the

resources available to support learning and of countries' capacity to ensure equitable educational opportunities. Readers interested in exploring this indicator across countries and years can consult the SDG 4 Dashboard.

Distribution of expenditure by source of funds

The distribution of expenditure on educational institutions by source of funds provides insight into how countries share the cost of education between governments, households and other private actors, as well as the contribution of non-domestic sources, such as international organisations. Differences in funding structures reflect broader policy choices and the balance between public and private responsibility for financing education.


This section presents expenditure by source of funds before government transfers to the private sector. This means that funding is attributed to the source that initially provides it, rather than to the sector that makes the final payment to educational institutions. For example, if a household pays tuition fees using a government scholarship or a student loan intended for tuition, this amount is counted as government funding before transfers, rather than as private funding. Similarly, transfers from non-domestic sources to government are treated as non-domestic funding, not government funding. This approach therefore shows who initially finances expenditure on educational institutions.

In 2023, on average across OECD countries, across primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education, government sources accounted for 90% of initial expenditure before transfers, compared to 8% from private sources and 2% from non-domestic sources. In Finland, Norway and Sweden, initial funding is entirely public and it accounted for over 95% of expenditure in Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria and Iceland. Private sources accounted for a larger share of initial funding in a smaller group of countries, representing over 15% of expenditure before transfers in Australia, Chile and Ireland. Finally, only Estonia, Greece and the Slovak Republic recorded over 5% of expenditure from non-domestic sources, signalling that in most countries non-domestic sources account for a small share of initial funding (Table C1.6, available online).

At tertiary level, on average, governments financed 70% of expenditure on educational institutions in 2023, while private sources contributed 24% and non-domestic sources accounted for 6%. Financing arrangements varied considerably at this level across countries, reflecting different approaches to the funding of tertiary education systems. Government sources accounted for more than 85% of expenditure in Austria, Finland, Iceland, Luxembourg and Norway. Norway, for example, recorded the highest public share (94%), reflecting a model in which tertiary education is largely publicly funded and tuition fees are limited (Figure C1.4).

Figure C1.4. Distribution of expenditure on educational institutions, by source of funds before transfers (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions before transfers to the private sector; tertiary education (including R&D)



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
2. Year of reference 2022.
For data, see Table C1.6 (available online). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ax7gjn.

By contrast, private sources accounted for at least half of expenditure at tertiary level in Australia, Israel and the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom recorded the highest private share (55%), followed by Israel where 54% of funding came from private sources. In these systems, private contributions such as tuition fees paid by households and international students play a comparatively larger role in financing tertiary education (Figure C1.4).

Non-domestic funding accounted for a relatively small share of expenditure in most countries, but played a more important role in some systems. Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania and Portugal recorded the largest shares of non-domestic funding (Figure C1.4). This may reflect the role of international funding programmes from the European Union. For example, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) invested EUR 147 million for research infrastructure in Portugal and EUR 339 million for research and innovation to strengthen science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) career pathways. This comes alongside other initiatives in Portugal to increase the number of tertiary STEM graduates in first-cycle programmes and short-term courses (European Commission, 2025[2]).

Expenditure per student for reference year 2024

Some countries were able to provide an early indication of how expenditure per student evolved between 2023 and 2024. Expressed in constant 2020 prices, the available data suggest generally stable or moderately increasing levels of expenditure per student across most levels of education. Among most of the countries with available data for both 2023 and 2024, expenditure on primary to tertiary education per student increased moderately. Lithuania recorded the largest increase (10.2%), followed by New Zealand (4.6%), Germany (2.8%) and Denmark (2.7%), while expenditure remained broadly stable in Spain (1.2%), Sweden (1.2%), Slovenia (1.0%), Israel (-0.2%) and the Netherlands (-1.1%). These early trends suggest that, despite continued fiscal pressures in many countries, education expenditure per student generally kept pace with or exceeded inflation (Table C1.9, available online).

Distribution of expenditure within educational institutions

Expenditure within educational institutions can broadly be divided into three categories: current expenditure on staff compensation, other current expenditure (such as teaching materials, support services, school operations, maintenance, student meals and rents) and capital expenditure on infrastructure and equipment. The distribution of funding is particularly relevant in the current context of teacher shortages. Staff compensation represents the largest component of education expenditure in most countries and can influence the attractiveness of education careers, including the recruitment and retention of teachers. However, any measure increasing compensation of staff has large budget implications due to the size of the teaching staff population.

In 2023, across primary to tertiary education, OECD countries allocated an average of 66% of expenditure to staff compensation, compared to 24% for other current expenditure and 9% for capital expenditure. Belgium recorded the highest share among OECD countries with available data, at 79%, followed by Bulgaria at 76%. These high shares indicate that a particularly large proportion of institutional expenditure is directed towards personnel costs, although they do not necessarily imply higher salaries for individual teachers, as they also depend on the number and composition of staff employed (Table C1.2),

Other current expenditure covers goods and services used in education, including contracted and purchased services such as building maintenance, ancillary services such as student meals, and rents paid for school buildings or other facilities. In some countries, this category represented a larger share of expenditure. Chile, Czechia and Finland, for example, allocated more than one-third of expenditure to other current costs, suggesting a greater role for operating costs, support services or purchased services in the organisation of educational provision (Table C1.2).

Capital expenditure represented a comparatively small share of total expenditure in most OECD countries. However, it was higher in Australia, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Korea, New Zealand and Türkiye, where it accounted for more than 12% of total expenditure. Peru stood out among partner countries, with 21% of expenditure devoted to capital investment. Higher capital expenditure may reflect infrastructure investment cycles, expansion of capacity or efforts to modernise educational facilities (Table C1.2).

Regional disparities


Regional differences in expenditure per student provide insight into the extent to which resources available to educational institutions differ within countries. In Lithuania, expenditure per student varied by less than USD 300 between regions, indicating

similar levels of resources across the country. Similarly, in Belgium, expenditure per student differed by less than USD 2 000 between the Flemish and French Communities (Figure C1.5).

Larger countries with more regions tend to have more pronounced variation across regions. This is the case in the United States, for example, where in 2021, expenditure per student ranged from less than USD 10 000 in Idaho to more than USD 31 000 in the District of Columbia. The situation in 2023 is similar in Canada where expenditure ranged from around USD 12 800 per student in Newfoundland and Labrador to about USD 29 800 in the Northwest Territories, with northern and remote regions recording substantially higher expenditure levels. These differences may reflect the higher costs of providing education in sparsely populated and geographically remote areas (Figure C1.5).

Figure C1.5. Regional variation in expenditure on educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023)

In equivalent USD converted using PPPs; primary and secondary education



1. Includes post-secondary non-tertiary education.
2. Education finance data for Canada are calendarised, but not for subnational data.
3. Data refer to public expenditure on non-university education per student in public institutions. Only public expenditure is reported, implying that private expenditure on public institutions is not included.
4. Reference year 2021. Data refer to public institutions only. ISCED 02 is included in the ISCED 1-3 total for both spending and enrolment counts. Total expenditure includes current expenditure and capital outlays.
The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ax7gjn.

However, regional variation remained comparatively moderate in Germany, despite education being organised across 16 Länder with substantial responsibility for education funding (OECD, 2020[3]). Expenditure per student ranged from USD 15 100 in Saxony and North Rhine-Westphalia to nearly USD 20 000 in Berlin, a narrower range than observed in other similarly decentralised systems (Figure C1.5).

Differences in regional expenditure per student should be interpreted cautiously. Differences across regions may reflect differences in local costs, student populations and governance arrangements. Higher expenditure levels may therefore reflect higher costs associated with service delivery, demographic factors or targeted funding for specific student populations, rather than differences in the quality or effectiveness of education provision.

Definitions

Educational institutions can be divided into two categories: **public** and **private**. An institution is classified as private if its overall control and management rest with a non-governmental organisation (e.g. a church, trade union, business enterprise or foreign or international agency) and if most of the members of its governing board are not selected by a public agency. Private institutions

can be further divided into government-dependent and independent private institutions. A **government-dependent private institution** is a private institution that receives 50% or more of its core funding from government agencies, or one whose teaching personnel are paid by a government agency or by the government directly. An **independent private institution** is a private institution that receives less than 50% of its core funding from government agencies and whose teaching personnel are not paid by a government agency.

Expenditure on educational institutions refers to expenditure on educational goods and services within both teaching (e.g. schools, universities and colleges) and non-teaching institutions (ministries and local authorities). It excludes expenditure outside educational institutions, even if publicly subsidised (e.g. private tutoring outside educational institutions, the purchase of textbooks and other materials, and students' living expenses).

Final spending reflects actual disbursements to educational institutions after public-private transfers. **Final government spending** includes direct government purchases of educational resources and payments to educational institutions. **Final private spending** includes direct expenditure on educational institutions (e.g. tuition fees), whether partially covered by government subsidies or not. It also includes expenditure by private companies on the work-based element of combined school- and work-based programmes. **Final non-domestic spending** includes direct non-domestic payments to educational institutions such as research grants or other funds from non-domestic sources paid directly to educational institutions.

Government expenditure on educational institutions can take the form of purchases by a government agency of educational resources to be used by educational institutions, or funding provided by a government agency to educational institutions to make such purchases.

Government transfers to the private sector include two categories. Government transfers to households include transfers that translate into payments to educational institutions for educational services (e.g. scholarships or student loans for tuition). Government transfers to other private entities include, for example, subsidies to firms that host apprentices and interest subsidies to private financial institutions that provide student loans.

Initial government spending includes direct government expenditure on educational institutions and transfers to the private sector. It excludes transfers from non-domestic sources. **Initial private spending** includes tuition fees and other household payments to educational institutions, minus the portion of such payments offset by government subsidies. **Initial non-domestic spending** includes direct non-domestic expenditure on educational institutions (e.g. a research grant from a foreign corporation to a public university) and transfers from non-domestic sources to governments.

Private expenditure on educational institutions includes tuition fees and other private payments to educational institutions, whether or not supported by government subsidies. Private sources of expenditure include **households** (students and their families) and **other private entities**, such as businesses and non-profit organisations.

Research and development includes research performed at tertiary educational institutions, regardless of whether it is financed from general institutional funds or through separate grants or contracts from public or private sponsors.

Methodology

The **framework that underpins the education finance indicators** contained in Part C is built around three dimensions (for details see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes*, (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en):

- **The location of service providers**. This dimension distinguishes between the spending that occurs in educational institutions and spending that takes place outside them. In this context, educational institutions include both teaching institutions (e.g. schools and universities) and non-teaching institutions (e.g. education ministries). Examples of spending outside educational institutions include books purchased outside institutions, fees for private tutoring and student living costs.
- **The type of goods and services**. This dimension allows spending on core educational purposes (e.g. expenditure on teachers, school buildings, books, administration of schools) to be differentiated from other education-related expenditures (e.g. research and development, ancillary services such as meals and housing).
- **The source of funds.** The framework distinguishes between three sources of funds. Government expenditure refers to spending by public authorities. Private expenditure refers to spending by households and other private entities (e.g. companies). International funds consist of funds from public multilateral organisations for development aid to education.

Expenditure and GDP values in national currencies are converted to equivalent USD by dividing the national currency figure by the purchasing power parity (PPP) index for GDP. The PPP conversion factor is used instead of the market exchange rate, because exchange rates are affected by various factors (e.g. interest rates, trade policies or expectations of economic growth) that do not necessarily reflect relative domestic purchasing power across countries. The use of purchasing power parity-adjusted US dollars (USD PPP) accounts for differences in price levels between countries. Subnational expenditure data are adjusted using national PPPs. If the reference periods for education expenditure and GDP differ, the expenditure data are adjusted to match the GDP reference period using relevant national inflation rates (see Annex 2 for further details). Trend data are expressed in constant 2020 US dollars to account for inflation and ensure comparability over time.

Expenditure per full-time equivalent (FTE) student is calculated for primary to tertiary education, and only for programmes and educational institutions with both enrolment and expenditure data. This measure is affected by how countries report the number of FTE students, especially at tertiary level, where part-time study is more common. Some countries count all students as full time, while others calculate the number of FTE students based on students' intensity of participation – for example by using credits earned during a specific period towards the targeted qualification. All else being equal, countries that calculate FTE students based on part-time enrolment will report higher expenditure per FTE student than those that report all students as full time.

In keeping with the system used by many countries to record government expenditures and revenues, educational expenditure data are compiled on a cash accounting rather than an accrual accounting basis. Therefore expenditure (both capital and current) is recorded in the year in which the payments occurred. In particular:

- Capital acquisitions are counted fully in the year in which the expenditure occurs.
- Depreciation of capital assets is not recorded as expenditure, although expenditure on repairs and maintenance is recorded in the year it occurs. This can result in sharp fluctuations in expenditure from year to year owing to the start or completion of school building projects which, by their nature, are sporadic.
- Expenditure on student loans is recorded as the gross loan outlay in the year in which the loans are made, without subtracting repayments or interest payments from existing borrowers.

A notable exception to the cash accounting rules is the treatment of the retirement costs of educational personnel in situations where there are no (or only partial) ongoing employer contributions towards the future retirement benefits of the personnel. In these cases, countries are asked to impute these expenditures to arrive at a more internationally comparable cost of employing the personnel.

At tertiary level, many countries operate a loan payment/repayment system. While public loan payments are included in expenditure figures, loan repayments from private individuals are not. As a result, private contributions to education costs may be underestimated.

For more detailed information, please refer to the *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics* (OECD, 2018[4]). For country-specific notes, see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Sources

Data refer to the financial year 2023 (unless otherwise specified) and are based on the UNESCO, OECD and Eurostat (UOE) data collection on education statistics administered by the OECD in 2025 (for details see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes*,(https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Data for China, India, Indonesia and Saudi Arabia are from the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS), while data for Argentina and South Africa are partly sourced from UIS.

References

European Commission (2025), *Education and Training Monitor 2025: Portugal*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/portugal.html. [2]

OECD (2025), *OECD Economic Surveys: Ireland 2025*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9a368560-en. [1]

OECD (2020), “Education Policy Outlook in Germany”, *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, No. 16, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/47b795b1-en. [3]

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics 2018: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [4]

Chapter C1 Tables

Tables and notes

Table C1.1.	Expenditure on educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023)
Table C1.2.	Distribution of expenditure within educational institutions (2023)
Table C1.3.	Trends in expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (2015 and 2023)
Table C1.4.	Expenditure on educational institutions as a percentage of GDP (2023)
WEB Table C1.5.	Expenditure on educational institutions per full-time equivalent student as a percentage of GDP per capita (2023)
WEB Table C1.6.	Distribution of expenditure on educational institutions, by source of funds, before and after transfers (2023)
WEB Table C1.7.	Trends in total government expenditure on education as a percentage of government expenditure on all services and as a share of GDP (2015 and 2023)
WEB Table C1.8.	Expenditure on educational institutions as a percentage of GDP, by level of education and source of funds (2023)
WEB Table C1.9.	Expenditure on educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2024)

StatLink https://stat.link/ax7gjn

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/ax7gjn..

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **u** – partial data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Table C1.1. Expenditure on educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions; in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP; by level of education

	Public and private educational institutions											
	Total expenditure (government, private and non-domestic)						Government expenditure					
	Primary to post-secondary non-tertiary	Lower and upper secondary	Tertiary		Primary to tertiary		Primary to post-secondary non-tertiary	Lower and upper secondary	Tertiary		Primary to tertiary	
			Including R&D	Excluding R&D	Including R&D	Excluding R&D			Including R&D	Excluding R&D	Including R&D	Excluding R&D
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia[1]	16 697[d]	19 373[d]	29 004	19 916	19 179[d]	17 346[d]	13 875	15 288	9 846	m	13 063	m
Austria[2]	19 508[u]	20 930	27 994	17 268	22 073[u]	18 831[u]	18 580[u]	19 935	24 551	14 792	20 385[u]	17 435[u]
Belgium[3]	19 027	20 739[d]	26 885	16 776	20 642	18 564	18 168	19 665[d]	22 099	14 644	18 976	17 444
Canada[1,4]	16 003[d,u]	16 128[d]	29 822	21 299	19 744[d,u]	17 437[d,u]	14 523[d,u]	14 636[d]	13 852	8 193	14 341[d,u]	12 809[d,u]
Chile	7 809	7 887	11 511	10 961	8 908	8 745	6 227	6 386	4 770	4 335	5 794	5 665
Colombia[5]	3 506[u]	3 479[u]	3 042[u]	m	3 405[u]	m	3 498[u]	3 471[u]	3 042[u]	m	3 398[u]	m
Costa Rica	m	m	19 872	m	m	m	5 845	5 798	17 459	17 457	7 028	7 027
Czechia	13 061	15 318	16 609	10 369	13 706	12 572	11 843	13 736	11 945	6 757	11 861	10 919
Denmark	17 055	16 947	32 299	14 643	20 508	16 508	15 934	15 496	26 320	14 314	18 287	15 567
Estonia[6]	11 418	10 793	22 077	12 849	13 369	11 680	10 983	10 391	17 660	11 444	12 205	11 067
Finland[7]	14 717	15 293[d]	21 179	11 065	16 141	13 913	14 677	15 229[d]	18 566	10 734	15 533	13 808
France	14 932	16 745	23 285	16 970	16 800	15 388	13 400	14 674	15 130	10 318	13 787	12 711
Germany	17 123	18 924	24 738	13 950	18 785	16 430	14 918	16 589	20 459	11 686	16 127	14 212
Greece	8 790	8 305	5 890	3 672	7 647	6 774	6 975	6 725	4 499	3 106	6 000	5 451
Hungary[8]	8 660	8 558	21 004	17 172[u]	10 847	10 168[u]	7 762	7 678	14 483	10 948	8 953	8 326
Iceland[1,9]	19 876[d]	18 611[d]	24 010[d]	m	20 719[d]	m	19 308[d]	17 720[d]	21 107	m	19 675[d]	m
Ireland	15 496[u]	14 722[u]	25 576	20 165	17 277[u]	16 301[u]	12 751[u]	12 731[u]	14 799	10 365	13 113[u]	12 330[u]
Israel	13 333	12 798	14 966	10 990	13 653	12 873	12 064	10 831	6 202	2 225	10 913	10 132
Italy[3]	14 848	14 541[d]	15 385	10 534	14 981	13 780	13 970	13 767[d]	9 628	5 423	12 895	11 854
Japan[1,10]	12 013[d]	12 969[d]	21 662[d]	m	14 212[d]	m	11 085[d]	11 312[d]	7 743[d]	m	10 323[d]	m
Korea	19 179	21 980	16 479	12 611	18 256	16 933	18 017	20 627	7 792	4 935	14 521	13 544
Latvia	9 519	10 091	16 880	12 825	11 022	10 194	8 909	9 295	8 125	5 566	8 749	8 226
Lithuania	10 802	10 891	18 175	12 508	12 374	11 166	10 164	10 262	13 073	8 405	10 785	9 789
Luxembourg[11]	32 766	34 385	64 008[u]	37 519[u]	34 958[u]	33 100[u]	31 046	32 553	56 513[u]	35 231[u]	32 832[u]	31 339[u]
Mexico[12]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	18 363	20 142	26 538	17 223	20 416	18 077	16 248	16 657	19 036	11 487	16 949	15 052
New Zealand	11 852	12 914	20 548	15 463	13 284	12 447	10 220	10 766	11 352	8 113	10 407	9 873
Norway[13]	20 528[u]	21 218[u]	30 939	20 223	22 866[u]	20 459[u]	19 932	20 159	28 207	18 855	21 791	19 690
Poland[14]	11 056	10 538	16 958	10 633	12 195	10 975	9 725	9 198	13 133	8 337	10 383	9 457
Portugal[3]	13 893	15 303[d]	16 637	12 038	14 546	13 452	12 352	13 519[d]	9 213	5 544	11 605	10 733
Slovak Republic	11 270[u]	11 172[u]	21 225[u]	15 631[u]	12 810[u]	11 945[u]	10 439	10 332	17 471	m	11 527	m
Slovenia	13 655	13 069	24 063	19 029	15 466	14 590	12 192	11 513	19 765	15 879	13 510	12 834
Spain	14 009	15 051	19 732	14 723	15 374	14 179	11 963	13 163	12 621	8 284	12 120	11 085
Sweden	16 353	16 247	29 485	14 027	18 669	15 943	16 323	16 201	24 094	12 466	17 694	15 643
Switzerland[3]	m	m	m	m	m	m	21 918	21 299[d]	34 241	15 840	24 347	20 720
Türkiye	5 118	5 226	11 311	8 428	6 348	5 775	4 377	4 430	9 093	6 247	5 314	4 748
United Kingdom	15 879	16 109	34 269	28 081	19 318	18 161	13 491	13 156	7 457	3 265	12 363	11 579
United States[15]	17 164	17 711	39 551	34 303	22 144	20 977	15 847	16 350	15 181	12 018	15 699	14 995
OECD average	**14 436**	**15 003**	**22 878**	**16 058**	**16 075**	**14 865**	**13 231**	**13 555**	**15 960**	**10 538**	**13 601**	**12 690**

Partner and/or accession countries	Public and private educational institutions											
	Total expenditure (government, private and non-domestic)						Government expenditure					
	Primary to post-secondary non-tertiary	Lower and upper secondary	Tertiary		Primary to tertiary		Primary to post-secondary non-tertiary	Lower and upper secondary	Tertiary		Primary to tertiary	
			Including R&D	Excluding R&D	Including R&D	Excluding R&D			Including R&D	Excluding R&D	Including R&D	Excluding R&D
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[16]	m	m	m	m	m	m	4 294	4 448	3 539	m	4 133	m
Bulgaria	8 471	8 547	14 332	13 617	9 676	9 530	8 212	8 214	9 054	8 714	8 385	8 315
China	5 019	5 901	7 710	m	5 626	m	4 386	4 981	4 480	m	4 407	m
Croatia[15]	7 949	7 962[u]	10 982	10 982	8 680	8 680[u]	7 477	7 358[u]	8 224	8 224	7 657	7 657
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru[15]	2 308	2 722	3 649	3 623	2 618	2 612	1 989	2 324	1 424	1 399	1 858	1 853
Romania	7 365	9 732	13 332	13 304	8 432	8 427	6 477	8 387	11 042	11 015	7 293	7 288
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	10 380	10 003	9 348	m	10 036	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**14 004**	**14 598**	**22 211**	**14 780**	**15 496**	**14 047**	**12 860**	**13 331**	**16 860**	**10 987**	**13 504**	**12 439**
G20 average	**m**	**15 055**	**23 020**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**11 736**	**12 328**	**10 273**	**m**	**11 308**	**m**

Note: Columns showing data by type of institution (public and private) are available for consultation online.
1. Includes some expenditure outside educational institutions, such as scholarships or student loans.
2. Excludes local government expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary private institutions.
3. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions in lower and upper secondary education.
4. Excludes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions.
5. Excludes payments from private sources to educational institutions and expenditure on private institutions by local governments and international sources.
6. Government expenditure on independent private institutions is included in government-dependent private institutions (web columns).
7. Lower and upper secondary education includes post-secondary non-tertiary education.
8. Excludes expenditure from international sources. Includes private expenditure for goods and services required directly or indirectly by educational institutions.
9. Expenditure on public educational institutions includes transfers from international sources to the government and private educational institutions.
10. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions in upper secondary and tertiary education.
11. Total expenditure on short-cycle tertiary education excludes the payments to private institutions from non-educational private entities.
12. Excludes some local government expenditure (web columns).
13. Excludes some expenditure from private sources.
14. Excludes government and private expenditure on independent private institutions (web columns).
15. Year of reference 2022.
16. Excludes international and household expenditure on primary education. Lower and upper secondary categories include only lower secondary expenditure.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ax7gjn.

Table C1.2. Distribution of expenditure within educational institutions (2023)

In per cent; expenditure from all sources within educational institutions; by level of education

	Primary to post-secondary non-tertiary			Lower and upper secondary			Tertiary (including R&D)			Primary to tertiary (including R&D)		
	Capital	Current expenditure on staff compensation	Other current expenditure	Capital	Current expenditure on staff compensation	Other current expenditure	Capital	Current expenditure on staff compensation	Other current expenditure	Capital	Current expenditure on staff compensation	Other current expenditure
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	13	67	20	13	66	21	13	52	36	13	62	25
Austria	6	68	26	4	70	26	7	59	34	6	65	29
Belgium[1]	4	85	11	3[d]	86[d]	11[d]	5	65	30	4	79	16
Canada[2]	10[u]	73[u]	17[u]	10	73	17	8	60	32	9[u]	68[u]	23[u]
Chile	5	69	26	6	65	30	3	46	52	4	60	36
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	5	71	23	m	m	m
Czechia	7	59	35	7	57	36	8	59	33	7	59	34
Denmark	7	75	18	6	75	19	5	61	34	6	70	24
Estonia	12	66	22	11	67	22	6	64	30	10	65	24
Finland[3]	11	54	35	9[d]	55[d]	35[d]	4	60	37	9	56	35
France	9	71	20	9	71	21	9	67	24	9	70	21
Germany	10	71	19	10	72	18	9	60	30	10	68	22
Greece	2	87	11	3	89	8	44	44	12	15	74	11
Hungary	4	69	28	4	69	27	29	44	27	12	60	27
Iceland[4]	7[u]	69	24	5[u]	70	25	2[d,u]	66	32	6[d,u]	68	26
Ireland[5]	m	m	m	m	m	m	10[u]	77[u]	13[u]	m	m	m
Israel[6]	9	74	16	8	78	15	9	62	29	9	72	19
Italy[7]	5	75	20	6[d]	76[d]	18[d]	10	45	45	6	67	26
Japan	13	68	19	12[d]	69	20[d]	12	46	42	13	60	27
Korea	19	59	22	18	60	22	11	51	38	17	57	26
Latvia	11	69	21	11	68	21	10	58	32	10	65	24
Lithuania	7	73	20	7	73	20	19	57	24	10	68	21
Luxembourg[8]	10	73[d]	17	7	77[d]	16	1[u]	70[u]	28[u]	9[u]	72[u]	19[u]
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	11	70	19	10	70	19	11	64	25	11	68	21
New Zealand[6]	15[u]	66[u]	19[u]	14[u]	67[u]	19[u]	12[u]	55[u]	33[u]	14[u]	63[u]	22[u]
Norway[6]	11[u]	70	19	11[u]	68	21	10	59	31	11[u]	67	22
Poland	9	69	21	9	69	22	14	64	22	11	68	21
Portugal	6	72	21	7[d]	70[d]	23[d]	8	65	27	7	70	23
Slovak Republic	8	69	23	9	65	26	16[u]	47	37	10[u]	63	27
Slovenia	7	72	20	7	71	22	12	62	26	9	70	22
Spain	5	72	22	5	75	20	13	61	26	8	69	24
Sweden	8	65	27	8	63	29	4	64	33	7	65	29
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye[9]	13	69	18[d]	12	70	19[d]	16	60	24[d]	14	65	21[d]
United Kingdom	6	75	19	6	74	19	11	43	46	7	66	27
United States[10]	10	71	19	10	71	19	8	58	33	9	66	25
OECD average	**9**	**70**	**21**	**8**	**70**	**21**	**11**	**59**	**31**	**9**	**66**	**24**

	Primary to post-secondary non-tertiary			Lower and upper secondary			Tertiary (including R&D)			Primary to tertiary (including R&D)		
	Capital	Current expenditure on staff compensation	Other current expenditure	Capital	Current expenditure on staff compensation	Other current expenditure	Capital	Current expenditure on staff compensation	Other current expenditure	Capital	Current expenditure on staff compensation	Other current expenditure
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[6]	5[u]	72[u]	23[u]	4[u]	74[u]	22[u]	4[u]	79[u]	17[u]	5[u]	74[u]	22[u]
Bulgaria	7	78	15	8	77	15	10	74	16	8	76	15
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia[10]	2[u]	79	19	6[u]	74[u]	20[u]	9	64	27	5[u]	74	22
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru[10]	22	66	12	24	62	14	19	36	45	21	58	20
Romania[11]	3	69	28	3	65	31	7	58	36	4	66	30
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**7**	**71**	**22**	**7**	**71**	**22**	**11**	**61**	**28**	**8**	**68**	**24**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

1. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions in lower and upper secondary education.
2. Excludes current expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions.
3. Lower and upper secondary education includes post-secondary non-tertiary education
4. Includes current expenditure on ancillary services and R&D activities.
5. Excludes some current and capital expenditure on independent private institutions.
6. Excludes some current and capital expenditure on private institutions.
7. Current expenditure in lower and upper secondary education includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions.
8. Current expenditure in lower and upper secondary education includes expenditure on short-cycle tertiary institutions.
9. Includes expenditure on ancillary services.
10. Year of reference 2022.
11. Excludes current expenditure on non-teaching staff.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ax7gjn.

Table C1.3. Trends in expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (2015 and 2023)

Expenditure from all sources within educational institutions; constant prices (2020 = 100); by level of education

	Expenditure on all staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)						Expenditure on teaching staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)					
	Primary to post-secondary non-tertiary		Lower and upper secondary		Tertiary (including R&D)		Primary to post-secondary non-tertiary		Lower and upper secondary		Tertiary (including R&D)	
	2015	2023	2015	2023	2015	2023	2015	2023	2015	2023	2015	2023
	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(8)	(9)	(14)	(15)	(17)	(18)	(20)	(21)
OECD countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria[1]	11 906	11 208	13 396	12 404	12 817	13 905	10 605	9 860[u]	12 272	11 260	11 762	12 229
Belgium[2]	12 530	13 668	14 028[d]	15 154[d]	16 099	14 839	x(2)	10 799	11 132	12 467[d]	10 199	9 707
Canada[3]	m	9 297[u]	m	9 369	15 831	14 515	m	7 527[u]	m	7 586	8 877	7 832
Chile	m	4 614	m	4 400	m	4 525	m	2 936	m	2 795	m	2 130
Colombia[4]	m	2 808[u]	m	2 787[u]	m	m	m	2 674[u]	m	2 654[u]	m	m
Costa Rica	m	4 222	m	4 192	m	11 902	m	x(3)	m	x(6)	m	x(9)
Czechia	m	6 457	5 363	7 394	m	8 195	m	4 434	4 041	5 278	m	5 840
Denmark	m	10 103	m	10 029	m	16 702	m	x(3)	m	x(6)	m	x(9)
Estonia	5 239	6 322	5 171	6 040	8 785	11 922	3 491	4 280	3 504	4 233	3 770	3 941
Finland[5]	6 890	6 800	7 270[d]	7 199[d]	12 968	10 764	5 575	5 483	5 767[d]	5 719[d]	6 986	5 843
France	9 166	9 495	10 783	10 509	14 973	13 974	6 672	6 881	7 875	7 605	7 844	7 493
Germany	9 910	10 414	10 806	11 628	12 379	12 680	x(2)	x(3)	x(5)	x(6)	x(8)	x(9)
Greece	m	6 360	6 773	6 160	1 884	2 147	m	6 034	6 583	5 860	1 414	1 638
Hungary	5 148	5 084	5 176	5 053	5 611	7 893	x(2)	x(3)	x(5)	x(6)	x(8)	x(9)
Iceland	m	10 774	m	10 265	m	12 478	m	7 800	m	7 589	m	7 538
Ireland[6]	6 200	7 642[u]	6 765	7 247[u]	8 169	8 547[u]	5 335	6 439[u]	5 857	6 305[u]	7 984	8 411[u]
Israel[7]	5 871	7 532	6 000	7 293	8 835	7 352	x(2)	x(3)	x(5)	x(6)	x(8)	x(9)
Italy[7]	9 001	9 515	9 289	9 507[d]	7 304	5 955	7 083	7 554	7 384	7 426[d]	4 556	4 176
Japan[8]	7 578	7 129	8 251[d]	7 716[d]	9 459[d]	9 036	x(2)	x(3)	x(5)	x(6)	x(8)	x(9)
Korea	7 936	10 530	8 445	12 418	5 824	7 457	6 152	7 802	6 673	9 353	3 641	3 946
Latvia[9]	4 979	5 472	5 031	5 830	5 719	8 109	x(2)	x(3)	x(5)	x(6)	x(8)	4 538
Lithuania	4 769	6 828	4 691	6 868	5 708	8 618	3 650	4 562	3 621	4 587	2 858	3 916
Luxembourg[10]	18 817	19 102[d]	18 914	21 370[d]	29 181	32 999[u]	17 694	16 630[d]	17 385	18 984[d]	7 537	3 614[u]
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	9 297	10 845	10 855	11 856	14 410	14 575	x(2)	x(3)	x(5)	x(6)	x(8)	x(9)
New Zealand[4]	m	6 535[u]	m	7 120[u]	m	9 624[u]	m	4 638[u]	m	5 144[u]	m	m
Norway[6]	10 954	9 793	11 877	9 798	13 700	12 128	x(2)	x(3)	x(5)	x(6)	x(8)	x(9)
Poland	5 531	6 549	5 574	6 141	7 632	9 855	x(2)	x(3)	x(5)	x(6)	x(8)	x(9)
Portugal[2]	7 289	7 319	7 965[d]	8 037[d]	9 312[d]	7 459	6 354	6 647	7 017[d]	7 297[d]	x(8)	7 459
Slovak Republic	4 795	6 492	4 735	6 117	m	8 351	3 815	5 075	3 762	4 726	m	4 858
Slovenia	7 458	8 318	7 241	7 733	9 006	12 049	x(2)	x(3)	x(5)	x(6)	x(8)	x(9)
Spain	7 462	8 162	8 453[d]	9 031	9 531	9 618	6 556	7 232	7 535[d]	8 134	6 852	6 845
Sweden[4]	8 572	9 297	8 617	8 993	18 025	16 562	x(2)	7 326[u]	6 849	7 200	x(8)	x(9)
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	2 648	3 010	2 703	3 207	5 742	6 636	2 461	2 667	2 518	2 821	5 742	x(9)
United Kingdom	9 810	10 660	9 346	10 701	18 953	11 110	8 382	9 512	7 855	9 556	10 654	6 147
United States	10 103	m	10 819	m	18 834	m	6 773	m	7 262	m	8 685	m
OECD average	**7 990**	**8 688**	**8 278**	**8 941**	**11 071**	**11 181**	**m**	**7 187**	**m**	**7 712**	**m**	**m**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	3 954	m	4 551	m	3 686	m	2 974	m	3 342	m	2 457	m
Brazil[4]	m	2 605[u]	m	2 743[d,u]	m	2 130[u]	m	2 605[d,u]	m	2 743[d,u]	m	2 130[d,u]
Bulgaria	5 558	5 071	5 897	5 105	12 271	8 153	4 549	4 127	4 800	4 134	8 738	5 757

	Expenditure on all staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)						Expenditure on teaching staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)					
	Primary to post-secondary non-tertiary		Lower and upper secondary		Tertiary (including R&D)		Primary to post-secondary non-tertiary		Lower and upper secondary		Tertiary (including R&D)	
	2015	2023	2015	2023	2015	2023	2015	2023	2015	2023	2015	2023
	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(8)	(9)	(14)	(15)	(17)	(18)	(20)	(21)
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	4 452	m	m	m	5 487	m	4 452	m	m	m	5 487	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	850	m	710	m	582	m	813	m	641	m	489	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania[11]	2 681	3 757	3 312	4 619	4 162	5 661	2 676	x(3)	3 308	x(6)	4 084	x(9)
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**7 771**	**8 446**	**8 091**	**8 695**	**10 759**	**11 252**	**m**	**7 064**	**7 212**	**7 576**	**m**	**6 131**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Columns showing data for primary to tertiary education and the percentage change between 2015 and 2023 are available for consultation online.
1. Current expenditure on total teacher staff excludes public expenditure.
2. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions in lower and upper secondary education.
3. Excludes current expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions.
4. Excludes some current expenditure on private institutions.
5. Lower and upper secondary education includes post-secondary non-tertiary education
6. Excludes some current expenditure on independent private institutions.
7. Excludes some current expenditure on lower secondary institutions.
8. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions in upper secondary and tertiary education.
9. Excludes current government expenditure on primary and secondary public institutions.
10. Current expenditure in lower and upper secondary education includes expenditure on short-cycle tertiary institutions.
11. Excludes current expenditure on non-teaching staff.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ax7gjn.

Table C1.4. Expenditure on educational institutions as a percentage of GDP (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions; by level of education

	Public and private educational institutions											
	Total expenditure (government, private and non-domestic)						Government expenditure					
	Primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary	Lower and upper secondary	Tertiary		Primary to tertiary		Primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary	Lower and upper secondary	Tertiary		Primary to tertiary	
			Including R&D	Excluding R&D	Including R&D	Excluding R&D			Including R&D	Excluding R&D	Including R&D	Excluding R&D
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia[1]	3.9[d]	2.1[d]	1.7	1.2	5.6[d]	5.0[d]	3.2	1.7	0.6	m	3.8	m
Austria[2]	2.9[u]	1.9	1.8	1.1	4.7[u]	4.0[u]	2.8[u]	1.8	1.6	1.0	4.4[u]	3.7[u]
Belgium[3]	4.1	2.5[d]	1.5	0.9	5.6	5.1	3.9	2.4[d]	1.2	0.8	5.2	4.8
Canada[1,4]	3.1[d,u]	1.6[d]	2.2	1.5	5.3[d,u]	4.7[d,u]	2.8[d,u]	1.5[d]	1.0	0.6	3.8[d,u]	3.4[d,u]
Chile	3.8	2.0	2.3	2.2	6.1	6.0	3.0	1.6	1.0	0.9	4.0	3.9
Colombia[5,6,7]	2.8[u]	1.5[u]	0.7[u]	m	3.5[u]	m	2.8[u]	1.5[u]	0.7[u]	m	3.5[u]	m
Costa Rica	m	m	1.4	m	m	m	3.5	1.8	1.2	1.2	4.7	4.7
Czechia	3.2	2.3	0.9	0.6	4.2	3.8	2.9	2.1	0.7	0.4	3.6	3.3
Denmark	3.5	1.9	2.0	0.9	5.5	4.4	3.3	1.7	1.6	0.9	4.9	4.2
Estonia	3.3	1.6	1.4	0.8	4.7	4.1	3.2	1.5	1.1	0.7	4.3	3.9
Finland[8]	3.9	2.4[d]	1.6	0.8	5.4	4.7	3.8	2.4[d]	1.4	0.8	5.2	4.6
France	3.7	2.4	1.7	1.2	5.4	4.9	3.3	2.1	1.1	0.7	4.4	4.0
Germany	3.1	2.2	1.3	0.7	4.4	3.8	2.7	1.9	1.0	0.6	3.7	3.3
Greece	2.7	1.3	1.2	0.7	3.8	3.4	2.1	1.0	0.9	0.6	3.0	2.7
Hungary[6,9]	2.3	1.5	1.2	1.0[u]	3.5	3.3[u]	2.1	1.3	0.8	0.6	2.9	2.7
Iceland[1,5]	4.2[d]	1.9[d]	1.3[d]	m	5.4[d]	m	4.0[d]	1.9[d]	1.1	m	5.2[d]	m
Ireland[10]	2.3[u]	1.0[u]	0.8	0.7	3.2[u]	3.0[u]	1.9[u]	0.9[u]	0.5	0.3	2.4[u]	2.3[u]
Israel	4.9	2.2	1.3	1.0	6.2	5.9	4.4	1.9	0.6	0.2	5.0	4.6
Italy[3]	2.9	1.8[d]	1.0	0.7	3.8	3.5	2.7	1.7[d]	0.6	0.3	3.3	3.0
Japan[1,11]	2.3[d]	1.3[d]	1.2[d]	m	3.5[d]	m	2.1[d]	1.1[d]	0.4[d]	m	2.6[d]	m
Korea	3.4	1.9	1.5	1.2	4.9	4.5	3.2	1.8	0.7	0.5	3.9	3.6
Latvia	2.9	1.5	1.3	1.0	4.2	3.9	2.7	1.4	0.6	0.4	3.4	3.2
Lithuania	2.6	1.7	1.2	0.8	3.8	3.5	2.5	1.6	0.9	0.6	3.3	3.0
Luxembourg[12]	3.1	1.8	0.5[u]	0.3[u]	3.5[u]	3.4[u]	2.9	1.7	0.4[u]	0.3[u]	3.3[u]	3.2[u]
Mexico[5]	m	m	m	m	m	m	2.0[u]	1.0[u]	0.6	0.4[u]	2.6[u]	2.4[u]
Netherlands	3.4	2.2	1.7	1.1	5.1	4.5	3.0	1.8	1.2	0.7	4.2	3.8
New Zealand	4.0	2.3	1.4	1.0	5.3	5.0	3.4	1.9	0.7	0.5	4.2	3.9
Norway[10]	3.2[u]	1.7[u]	1.4	0.9	4.6[u]	4.1[u]	3.1	1.6	1.3	0.9	4.4	4.0
Poland	3.1	1.9	1.1	0.7	4.2	3.8	2.7	1.7	0.9	0.6	3.6	3.3
Portugal[3]	3.5	2.1[d]	1.3	0.9	4.8	4.5	3.1	1.9[d]	0.7	0.4	3.8	3.6
Slovak Republic	3.2[u]	2.1[u]	1.1[u]	0.8[u]	4.3[u]	4.1[u]	3.0	1.9	0.9	m	3.9	m
Slovenia	3.3	1.7	1.2	1.0	4.5	4.2	2.9	1.5	1.0	0.8	3.9	3.7
Spain	3.3	1.9	1.4	1.1	4.7	4.3	2.8	1.7	0.9	0.6	3.7	3.4
Sweden	3.9	2.0	1.5	0.7	5.3	4.6	3.8	2.0	1.2	0.6	5.1	4.5
Switzerland[3]	m	m	m	m	m	m	3.1	1.6[d]	1.2	0.6	4.3	3.7
Türkiye	2.3	1.6	1.3	1.0	3.6	3.3	2.0	1.4	1.0	0.7	3.0	2.7
United Kingdom	4.0	2.2	2.0	1.6	6.0	5.6	3.4	1.8	0.4	0.2	3.8	3.6
United States[13]	3.4	1.8	2.2	1.9	5.6	5.3	3.1	1.7	0.9	0.7	4.0	3.8
OECD average	**3.3**	**1.9**	**1.4**	**1.0**	**4.7**	**4.3**	**3.0**	**1.7**	**0.9**	**0.6**	**3.9**	**3.6**

	Public and private educational institutions											
	Total expenditure (government, private and non-domestic)						Government expenditure					
	Primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary	Lower and upper secondary	Tertiary		Primary to tertiary		Primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary	Lower and upper secondary	Tertiary		Primary to tertiary	
			Including R&D	Excluding R&D	Including R&D	Excluding R&D			Including R&D	Excluding R&D	Including R&D	Excluding R&D
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[14]	m	m	m	m	m	m	3.6	2.3	0.8	m	4.4	m
Bulgaria	2.4	1.6	1.0	1.0	3.4	3.3	2.3	1.5	0.7	0.6	2.9	2.9
China	2.9	1.6	1.3	m	4.2	m	2.5	1.4	0.7	m	3.3	m
Croatia[13]	2.4	0.8[u]	1.0	1.0	3.4	3.4[u]	2.2	0.7[u]	0.8	0.8	3.0	3.0
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru[13]	2.9	1.5	1.4	1.4	4.2	4.2	2.5	1.3	0.5	0.5	3.0	3.0
Romania	2.0	1.6	0.8	0.8	2.8	2.8	1.8	1.4	0.7	0.6	2.4	2.4
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	3.0	1.4	1.3	m	4.3	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	1.8[d]	0.6[d]	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**3.1**	**1.8**	**1.3**	**0.9**	**4.3**	**3.9**	**2.8**	**1.7**	**0.9**	**0.6**	**3.8**	**3.4**
G20 average	**m**	**1.9**	**1.6**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**2.8**	**1.6**	**0.8**	**m**	**3.6**	**m**

Note: Columns showing data by type of institution (public and private) are available for consultation online.
1. Includes some expenditure outside educational institutions, such as scholarships or student loans.
2. Excludes local government expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary private institutions.
3. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions in lower and upper secondary education.
4. Excludes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions.
5. Excludes some local government expenditure.
6. Excludes expenditure from international sources
7. Excludes some expenditure from private sources.
8. Lower and upper secondary education includes post-secondary non-tertiary education
9. Includes private expenditure for goods and services required directly or indirectly by educational institutions.
10. Excludes some expenditure from private sources on private institutions.
11. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions in upper secondary and tertiary education.
12. Excludes payments to private institutions from non-educational private entities in short-cycle tertiary education.
13. Year of reference 2022.
14. Excludes international sources and household expenditure on primary education. Lower and upper secondary categories include only lower secondary expenditure.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ax7gjn.


Chapter C2. How is early childhood education financed?

Highlights

- Total expenditure per child in pre-primary education increased from USD 9 555 in 2015 to USD 11 329 in 2023 on average across OECD countries (accounting for inflation).
- Government expenditure per child has grown even faster on average, with an increase of around 32% across OECD countries over the same period, pointing to a strengthening role for public financing.
- Government expenditure on 3-5 year-olds enrolled in education accounts for 0.52% of GDP across OECD countries, while considering expenditure from all sources (including private and non-domestic funding) increases this to 0.6% of GDP.

Figure C2.1. Expenditure on pre-primary educational institutions per child, by source (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
2. Year of reference 2022.
For data, see Table C2.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/4y0jap.

Context

Investment in early childhood education (ECE) can ensure better access and higher-quality care for young children. Furthermore, expenditure dedicated to ECE can be a policy lever to increase women's labour-market participation rates and promote equity by ensuring strong foundations for further learning for disadvantaged children. Widely available and affordable early childhood education is also used a means to increase birth rates and limit demographic decline.

Interpreting ECE funding requires different consideration than at other levels of education. Young children require close and frequent adult supervision, raising the cost of provision. The ages covered by ECE contain a mix of compulsory and non-compulsory (but sometimes free) years of education, the structure of which varies across countries. In addition, ECE programmes vary widely in how long children attend each day. Yet data on hours of participation in ECE are limited, making it impossible to calculate the full-time-equivalent (FTE) enrolment counts that are the basis for the per-student expenditure data used in other chapters. As a result, expenditure per child at the early childhood educational development and pre-primary levels is based on total spending divided by the number of children enrolled, rather than on an FTE basis. This may distort comparisons, as countries with shorter attendance hours can appear to invest less per child. In addition, not all countries report finance data for early childhood educational development, limiting most analysis to pre-primary education. The data also only cover programmes meeting ISCED classification criteria, such as requiring at least 2 hours of educational activities per day and 100 days a year (see the *Definitions* section in Chapter B1). The figures in this chapter do not capture funding of provision without such explicit educational requirements, or home-based or informally organised care, underestimating the scale of early childhood education in countries where such arrangements are common.

Other findings

- Expenditure per child aged 3 to 5 typically amounts to around 18-34% of GDP per capita across OECD countries, showing a relatively narrow range of investment intensity by this measure.
- On average across OECD countries, 78% of current expenditure in pre-primary education is allocated to staff compensation (representing salaries, retirement pensions and other non-salary staff compensation).
- Expenditure on staff compensation in pre-primary education is USD 10 702 per child on average across OECD countries, ranging from between USD 8 000 and USD 14 000 in 17 out of 31 countries with available data.

Analysis

Expenditure per child in early childhood education

Early childhood educational development and pre-primary education

The data on early childhood educational development (ISCED 01) show wide differences in expenditure per child across OECD countries, alongside many missing observations. Of the 38 OECD countries, 21 do not report expenditure at this level, either because data are not available or because no provision is classified as ISCED 01. One reason is that provision for young children sometimes falls under the responsibility of a different ministry from the one responsible for primary and secondary education, and is considered care rather than education. Among the countries with available data, total expenditure on early childhood educational development (from government, private and non-domestic sources) is highest in Nordic countries (over USD 35 000 per child in Finland, Iceland and Norway). The lowest levels of expenditure are in Hungary, Israel and Lithuania (below USD 9 000 per child) (Table C2.1).

Where comparable figures exist, the gap between total and government expenditure on early childhood educational development tends to be relatively large. The gap reflects not only private spending, but also the use of public to private transfers (such as childcare subsidies), which are included in total expenditure but not recorded under government expenditure in Table C2.1. As a result, the difference between total and government expenditure captures both indirect public funding and private contributions (as well as non-domestic sources, which tend to account for a very small share). These patterns are consistent with the structural features of provision for the youngest children: more limited coverage, fragmented service delivery and financing models that rely less on direct public provision and more on mixed or subsidy-based systems than those typically found at higher levels of education.

In contrast, at pre-primary level, total expenditure per child tends to fall within a narrower range than for early childhood educational development. Out of the 32 OECD countries with data at this level, 20 spend in the range USD 10 000 to USD 18 000 per child, with an OECD average of USD 13 904. This reflects the near-universal nature of pre-primary education, with enrolment rates among 5-year-olds of over 95% in 28 OECD countries and over 89% in all OECD countries (see Table B1.2). In addition, government expenditure (USD 11 928 on average across OECD countries) is closer to total expenditure (OECD average USD 13 574) at this level, indicating a larger role in direct government expenditure and a smaller share of private contributions

(whether subsidised or not) at this level (Figure C2.1). Expenditure on staff compensation in pre-primary education is USD 10 702 per child on average across OECD countries, ranging from between USD 8 000 and USD 14 000 in 17 out of 31 countries with available data.

Trends in expenditure per child on pre-primary education

Total expenditure per child in pre-primary institutions grew in most countries between 2015 and 2023, with the OECD average increasing from USD 9 555 to USD 11 329 (measured in constant 2020 US dollars, adjusted for purchasing power parity), an increase of 27% on average. Government expenditure grew even more strongly on average (32%). There is much variation in the magnitude of changes across countries. Some systems experienced strong increases, such as Lithuania, where government and total expenditure increased by over 130%, and Korea, where both measures increased by over 70%. Others saw more moderate increases or even declines. Norway and Sweden, for example, experienced moderate decreases, but their levels of expenditure per child remain among the highest across OECD countries (Table C2.3).

In most countries, both total and government expenditure per child moved in the same direction, but government expenditure tended to grow faster, narrowing the gap between the two, as was the case in Finland, Germany and Korea. This suggests a strengthening of direct public financing relative to other sources. The difference in pace was very marked in Japan, where government spending increased by 92%, much more rapidly than expenditure, which grew by 24%. The United Kingdom is the only country where the direction of change was different in these two measures: total expenditure per child in pre-primary education fell, even as government expenditure increased over this period (Table C2.3).


Expenditure per child aged 3 to 5

Measuring spending on 3-5 year-olds enrolled in education allows comparisons to be made between countries regardless of where they draw the line between early childhood education and primary education. In addition, unlike measures that focus on a particular level of education, it is not affected by differences in the age composition of the target population. Age greatly influences the amount of expenditure per child – younger children require higher adult-child ratios, leading to higher personnel costs per child. But children start and stop the different stages of early childhood education at different ages across countries, meaning they will have different age profiles in different countries (see Chapter B1 and Chapter B2). All other things being equal, spending per child in pre-primary education will be higher in countries where primary education starts relatively early and the average age of children in pre-primary education is relatively young. Comparing expenditure for a defined age group such as 3-5 year-olds addresses this by limiting the effects of national enrolment age policies and hence offers a clearer basis for cross-country comparison.

Government expenditure per child aged 3 to 5 enrolled in education increased in most countries between 2015 and 2023, often at a rapid pace. Across OECD countries, the average growth was 34%, indicating an expanding public role in financing early childhood education. Several countries recorded substantial increases, with expenditure increasing by 92% in Japan, 85% in Korea and more than doubling in Lithuania. A further 20 OECD countries recorded more moderate increases. At the same time, this pattern is not universal. A few countries show very limited change, notably the United Kingdom which showed no change. In some countries, government expenditure per child fell. This was the case in Norway and Sweden, although both remain among the OECD countries with the highest the highest expenditure per child. (Figure C2.2).

Figure C2.2. Trends in government expenditure per child aged 3 to 5 (2015 and 2023)

In equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP, constant 2020 prices



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
For data, see Table C2.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/4y0jap.

Table C2.3 shows that total expenditure from all sources also increased between 2015 and 2023 across most OECD countries. Some countries saw moderate increases, e.g. Austria (23%), Finland (25%), Israel (28%), Japan (24%), Latvia (25%) and Spain (29%), where total expenditure grew by between 20% and 30%, while Lithuania (138%) and Korea (70%) saw much more rapid growth. As with government expenditure, the trends are not uniform across countries. A small number show stagnation or falls in spending per child, notably Sweden (- 9%) and the United Kingdom (- 13%), indicating either spending restraint or rising enrolment outpacing funding increases. Norway also shows a slight decrease in total spending (- 4%). In most countries, however, expenditure has increased over time, although at varying rates. Overall, the data point to a general upward trend in investment in early childhood education, alongside considerable cross-country variation in the pace of change.

Expenditure on children aged 3 to 5 relative to GDP

Most OECD countries dedicate the equivalent to 0.4-0.7% of GDP to education for children aged 3 to 5. One group of countries stands out for their relatively high investment by this measure, notably Iceland (1.08% of GDP), Israel (0.86%) and Estonia and Sweden (0.82%). These values are driven by policy priorities, as well as demographic factors (for example, in Israel the share of children aged 0-4 is nearly twice the average for high-income countries (United Nations, 2024[1])). At the lower end, Japan allocates a smaller share of national income (0.14%) to education for children aged 3 to 5 (Table C2.4, available online).

The data on total expenditure on early childhood education per child relative to GDP per capita show that in 2023, most OECD countries invested within a relatively narrow range, typically between about 16% and 29% of GDP per capita per 3-5 year-old. A smaller group of countries stands out with higher relative spending levels, with Finland, Iceland and Lithuania spending the equivalent of around 30% or more of GDP per capita on every 3-5 year-old in education. At the lower end, Colombia, Israel and the Netherlands spend between 7% and 15% of GDP per capita per 3-5 year-old (Table C2.5, available online).

Distribution of expenditure within public institutions

Table C2.2 provides data on the distribution of expenditure in public pre-primary institutions (the focus on public institutions allows for greater country coverage, as these data are not collected for independent private institutions). Current expenditure accounts for 93% of reported total expenditure on public pre-primary institutions on average across OECD countries. Expenditure on staff compensation is the largest component of current expenditure (78% on average across OECD countries). Within this, 20 countries were able to provide a breakdown between teaching and non-teaching staff at this level of education. Compensation for teaching staff accounts for the largest share of current expenditure in most countries, often representing between 50% and 70% of total current expenditure. In some systems, such as Colombia and Greece, this share is even higher at near 80% or more. Expenditure

on non-teaching staff is generally much lower, typically ranging between around 10% and 30%, but with some exceptions. For example, Austria and Lithuania devote over 30% of current expenditure to the compensation of non-teaching staff.

Within staff costs, salaries represent the largest component, often making up the majority of spending – for example, Austria (75%), Italy (81%) and Luxembourg (69%). However, there is significant variation in the proportions of the different components of staff compensation (i.e. salaries, retirement pensions and other non-salary staff compensation), driven by differences in employment conditions, pension systems and accounting practices (Table C2.2).

Definitions

For the definition of expenditure on educational institutions, government expenditure on educational institutions and private expenditure on educational institutions, refer to Chapter C1.

Methodology

For an overview of the methodology based on the joint data collection by UNESCO, the OECD and Eurostat (UOE), see Chapter C1. For more detailed information, please refer to the OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics (OECD, 2018[2]). For country-specific notes, see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes,* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Sources

Data refer to the financial year 2023 (unless otherwise specified) and are based on the UNESCO, OECD and Eurostat (UOE) data collection on education statistics administered by the OECD in 2025 (for details see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes,* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Data for China, India, Indonesia and Saudi Arabia are from the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS), while data for Argentina and South Africa are partly sourced from UIS.

References

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics 2018: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [2]

United Nations (2024), *World Population Prospects 2024, Online Edition*, https://population.un.org/wpp/. [1]

Chapter C2 Tables

Tables and notes

Table C2.1.	Expenditure on early childhood education per child (2023)
Table C2.2.	Distribution of expenditure within public early childhood educational institutions (2023)
Table C2.3.	Trends in expenditure on early childhood education per child (2015 and 2023)
WEB Table C2.4.	Expenditure on early childhood educational institutions as a percentage of GDP (2023)
WEB Table C2.5.	Expenditure on early childhood educational institutions per child as a percentage of GDP per capita (2023)

StatLink https://stat.link/4y0jap

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chaptercan be downloaded via https://stat.link/4y0jap.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s. .

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **u** – partial data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets)**.** For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes,* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Table C2.1. Expenditure on early childhood education per child (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP; by level of education

	Public and private educational institutions							
	Total expenditure (government, private and non-domestic)				Government expenditure			
	Early childhood education			Age 3 to 5	Early childhood education			Age 3 to 5
	Early childhood educational development (ISCED 01)	Pre-primary (ISCED 02)	All ECE (ISCED 0)		Early childhood educational development (ISCED 01)	Pre-primary (ISCED 02)	All ECE (ISCED 0)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
OECD countries								
Australia	13 420	14 632	14 122	14 635	9 359	10 752	10 165	11 374
Austria	20 751	16 403	17 267	16 659	16 089	13 875	14 315	14 006
Belgium[1]	m	13 902	13 902[u]	m	m	13 554	13 554[u]	m
Canada[2]	m	15 816[d]	m	m	m	14 353[d]	m	m
Chile	9 621	8 390	8 655	8 426	8 236	6 720	7 047	6 764
Colombia[1,3]	m	1 575[u]	1 575[u]	1 715[u]	m	1 571[u]	1 571[u]	1 711[u]
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	5 781	5 914	5 911	5 910
Czechia	a	10 014	10 014	10 014	a	9 060	9 060	9 060
Denmark	29 807	14 394	19 970	14 514	22 561	10 895	15 116	10 997
Estonia	x(3)	x(3)	13 632	13 632	x(7)	x(7)	12 211	12 211
Finland	35 919	18 893	22 666	18 893	34 763	18 024	21 734	18 024
France	a	12 519	12 519	12 519	a	11 768	11 768	11 768
Germany	25 970	16 392	18 958	16 389	21 787	14 952	16 783	14 950
Greece[1]	m	10 148	10 148[u]	m	m	8 148	8 148[u]	m
Hungary	8 893	9 531	9 501	9 503	8 128	8 720	8 692	8 694
Iceland	35 373	26 391	29 510	26 381	32 762	23 631	26 802	23 626
Ireland	m	m	m	m	x(7)	x(7)	8 295	10 217
Israel	4 709	8 438	7 104	8 448	1 482	7 810	5 546	7 820
Italy[1]	m	13 904	13 904[u]	13 930	m	11 992	11 992[u]	12 039
Japan[4]	m	10 991[d]	10 991[d,u]	10 991[d]	m	8 124[d]	8 124[d,u]	8 124[d]
Korea[1]	m	15 438	15 438[u]	15 439	m	13 966	13 966[u]	13 967
Latvia	9 732	9 732	9 732	9 732	9 097	9 097	9 097	9 097
Lithuania	7 142	18 160	13 917	18 160	6 018	16 135	12 238	16 134
Luxembourg	a	30 871	30 871	30 872	a	29 921	29 921	29 920
Mexico[5]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	a	12 224	12 224	12 224	a	10 560	10 560	10 560
New Zealand[6]	10 024[u]	9 277[u]	9 594[u]	9 786	10 024	9 277	9 594	9 505
Norway	39 665	22 036	28 672	22 036	35 234	19 574	25 469	19 574
Poland	a	10 759	10 759	10 759	a	9 298	9 298	9 298
Portugal[1]	m	10 598	10 598[u]	m	m	7 342	7 342[u]	m
Slovak Republic	a	10 548[u]	10 548[u]	10 549	a	9 456	9 456	9 457
Slovenia	17 068	13 115	14 366	13 116	13 523	10 409	11 395	10 411
Spain	13 213	12 309	12 575	12 309	9 745	10 129	10 016	10 128
Sweden	25 012	17 380	19 370	17 380	23 528	16 286	18 174	16 286
Switzerland[7]	a	m	m	m	a	18 979	18 979	18 992
Türkiye	x(3)	x(3)	5 269	m	x(7)	x(7)	4 395	m
United Kingdom	11 201	6 798	7 644	9 660	3 093	5 436	4 986	8 185
United States[1,8]	m	12 803	12 803[u]	m	m	9 828	9 828[u]	m
OECD average	**m**	**13 574**	**13 904**	**13 881**	**m**	**11 928**	**11 988**	**12 220**

	Public and private educational institutions							
	Total expenditure (government, private and non-domestic)				Government expenditure			
	Early childhood education			Age 3 to 5	Early childhood education			Age 3 to 5
	Early childhood educational development (ISCED 01)	Pre-primary (ISCED 02)	All ECE (ISCED 0)		Early childhood educational development (ISCED 01)	Pre-primary (ISCED 02)	All ECE (ISCED 0)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Partner and/or accession countries								
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	x(7)	x(7)	4 491	4 489
Bulgaria	a	10 918	10 918	10 918	a	10 781	10 781	10 781
China	a	3 161	3 161	m	a	1 835	1 835	m
Croatia [8]	x(3)	x(3)	8 373[d]	m	x(7)	x(7)	6 003	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru [8]	306	2 017	1 921	m	292	1 835	1 749	m
Romania	13 759	6 220	6 613	6 269	12 258	5 932	6 262	5 973
Saudi Arabia	a	m	m	m	a	7 962	7 962	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**m**	**13 588**	**13 889**	**13 917**	**m**	**12 106**	**12 089**	**12 490**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**13 366**	**m**	**10 088**	**8 858**	**10 612**

1. All ECEC (ISCED 0) excludes early childhood educational development (ISCED 01).
2. Includes some transfers and payments for education to non-educational private entities.
3. Excludes payments from private sources to educational institutions. Excludes expenditure from local governments and international sources on private institutions.
4. Includes some transfers and payments for education to non-educational private entities. All ECEC (ISCED 0) excludes early childhood educational development (ISCED 01). Data do not cover day care centres and integrated centres for early childhood education.
5. Government expenditure excludes expenditure on independent private institutions and local government expenditure on public institutions (web columns).
6. Total expenditure excludes some private sources expenditure for government-dependent private institutions.
7. Total expenditure excludes some private sources expenditure for private institutions.
8. Year of reference 2022.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/4y0jap.

Table C2.2. Distribution of expenditure within public early childhood educational institutions (2023)

In per cent; expenditure from all sources; by level of education

	Pre-primary (ISCED 02)											
	Distribution of current and capital expenditure		Distribution of current expenditure by staff category				Distribution of current expenditure by type of compensation					Expenditure on staff compensation per child (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)
	Capital	Current	Teaching staff	Non-teaching staff	All staff	Other current expenditure	Salaries	Retirement pensions	Other non-salary staff compensation	All staff	Other current expenditure	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	13	87	41	34	75	25	75	0	0	75	25	10 442
Belgium[1]	7	93	68	18	86	14	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	86	14	13 020
Canada	10	90	66	15	82	18	66	5	11	82	18	11 660
Chile	3	97	55	23	79	21	68	6	4	79	21	8 131
Colombia[1,2]	m	m	90	4	94	6	34	32	29	94	6	1 824
Costa Rica	1	99	70	11	81	19	33	6	42	81	19	4 816
Czechia	8	92	56	24	80	20	59	13	8	80	20	7 400
Denmark	6	94	x(5)	x(5)	87	13	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	87	13	11 898
Estonia	x(25)	x(26)	x(27)	x(28)	x(29)	x(30)	x(31)	x(32)	x(33)	x(29)	x(30)	x(36)
Finland	8	92	45	15	60	40	48	10	2	60	40	10 463
France	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Germany	15	85	x(5)	x(5)	77	23	m	m	m	77	23	13 185
Greece[1]	1	99	78	2	80	20	55	22	2	80	20	8 227
Hungary	5	95	x(5)	x(5)	73	27	63	8	2	73	27	6 488
Iceland	9	91	57	14	71	29	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	71	29	17 495
Ireland	x(25)	x(26)	x(27)	x(28)	x(29)	x(30)	x(29)	x(29)	x(29)	x(29)	x(30)	x(36)
Israel	5	95	x(5)	x(5)	78	22	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	78	22	7 712
Italy[1]	8	92	71	11	82	18	81	0	0	82	18	13 002
Japan[3]	7	93	x(5)	x(5)	80	20	66	14	x(10)	80	20	11 549
Korea[1]	5	95	50	16	66	34	51	10	5	66	34	20 142
Latvia	5	95	x(5)	x(5)	75	25	58	14	2	75	25	6 816
Lithuania	3	97	49	31	81	19	78[d]	x(7)	2	81	19	13 739
Luxembourg	16	84	66	11	77	23	69	6	3	77	23	21 019
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	11	89	x(5)	x(5)	79	21	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	79	21	12 885
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Norway	6	94	x(5)	x(5)	84	16	64	20	0	84	16	19 019
Poland	6	94	x(5)	x(5)	70	30	59	10	2	70	30	6 986
Portugal[4]	m	m	69	8	77	23	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	77	23	6 538
Slovak Republic	13	87	53	21	74	26	55	8	11	74	26	6 961
Slovenia	7	93	x(5)	x(5)	78	22	67	6	4	78	22	9 632
Spain	6	94	67	9	76	24	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	76	24	9 817
Sweden	6	94	x(5)	x(5)	73	27	49	13	10	73	27	11 852
Switzerland	15	85	60	23	82	18	68	13	1	82	18	12 583
Türkiye[5]	x(25)	x(26)	x(27)	x(28)	x(29)	x(30)	x(31)	x(32)	x(33)	x(29)	x(30)	x(36)
United Kingdom	2	98	66	14	79	21	35	43	2	79	21	5 849
United States[1,6]	10	90	52	27	79	21	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	79	21	10 601
OECD average	**7**	**93**	**m**	**m**	**78**	**22**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**78**	**22**	**10 702**

	Pre-primary (ISCED 02)											
	Distribution of current and capital expenditure		Distribution of current expenditure by staff category				Distribution of current expenditure by type of compensation					Expenditure on staff compensation per child (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)
	Capital	Current	Teaching staff	Non-teaching staff	All staff	Other current expenditure	Salaries	Retirement pensions	Other non-salary staff compensation	All staff	Other current expenditure	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	m	m	4 356d
Brazil	x(25)	x(26)	x(29)	x(29)	x(29)	x(30)	x(31)	x(32)	x(33)	x(34)	x(30)	x(36)
Bulgaria	7	93	48	28	76	24	63	9	4	76	24	7 793
China	16	84	x(5)	x(5)	73	27	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	73	27	2 533
Croatia[6]	x(25)	x(26)	x(29)	x(29)	x(29)	x(30)	x(31)	x(32)	x(33)	x(34)	x(30)	x(36)
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania[7]	4	96d	x(5)	x(5)	74d	26	72	0	3	74d	26	4 469d
Saudi Arabia	2	98	75	13	88	12	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	88	12	9 355
South Africa	2	98	63	10	74	26	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	74	26	861
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**7**	**93**	**m**	**m**	**77**	**23**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**77**	**23**	**10 125**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**9 372**

Note: Columns showing the distribution of expenditure in early childhood educational development and all early childhood education are available for consultation online.

1. All ECEC (ISCED 0) excludes early childhood educational development (ISCED 01) (web columns).
2. Total expenditure excludes private, international and local government expenditure.
3. All ECEC (ISCED 0) excludes early childhood educational development (ISCED 01) (web columns). Data do not cover day care centres and integrated centres for early childhood education.
4. All ECEC (ISCED 0) excludes early childhood educational development (ISCED 01).
5. Total current expenditure also includes expenditure for ancillary services.
6. Year of reference 2022.
7. Total expenditure excludes current expenditure on non-teaching staff.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/4y0jap

Table C2.3. Trends in expenditure on early childhood education per child (2015 and 2023)

Expenditure on public and private educational institutions

	Total expenditure per child (constant prices, 2020=100)						Government expenditure per child (constant prices, 2020=100)					
	Age 3 to 5			Pre-primary (ISCED 02)			Age 3 to 5			Pre-primary (ISCED 02)		
	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	23	11 396	14 057	23	11 277	13 840	20	9 869	11 817	19	9 838	11 707
Belgium	m	m	m	23	9 593	11 811	m	m	m	23	9 346	11 516
Canada[1]	m	m	m	m	m	12 704[d]	m	m	m	m	m	11 529[d]
Chile	15	6 290	7 260	18	6 146	7 230	12	5 210	5 828	14	5 080	5 790
Colombia[2]	m	m	1 452[u]	m	m	1 334[u]	m	m	1 448[u]	m	m	1 330[u]
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	32	3 992	5 285	42	3 723	5 288
Czechia	38	6 112	8 442	38	6 112	8 442	35	5 643	7 638	35	5 643	7 638
Denmark	m	m	12 400	m	m	12 298	m	m	9 395	m	m	9 308
Estonia	44	7 946	11 452	m	m	m	50	6 843	10 259	m	m	m
Finland	25	12 817	16 045	25	12 817	16 045	35	11 372	15 307	35	11 372	15 307
France	15	9 774	11 195	15	9 776	11 195	15	9 130	10 523	15	9 131	10 524
Germany	19	11 683	13 941	19	11 684	13 944	35	9 397	12 718	35	9 397	12 719
Greece	m	m	m	41	6 003	8 467	m	m	m	25	5 454	6 797
Hungary	3	7 920	8 142	3	7 920	8 166	1	7 379	7 449	1	7 380	7 471
Iceland	45	14 394	20 831	45	14 394	20 839	53	12 215	18 656	53	12 214	18 660
Ireland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	8 644	m	m	m
Israel	28	5 432	6 950	28	5 428	6 942	30	4 933	6 434	30	4 929	6 425
Italy	52	7 843	11 910	53	7 765	11 889	53	6 745	10 294	54	6 654	10 254
Japan[3]	24[d]	7 842[d]	9 733[d]	24[d]	7 842	9 733[d]	92[d]	3 754[d]	7 194[d]	92[d]	3 754[d]	7 194[d]
Korea	70	8 268	14 085	70	8 264	14 085	85	6 888	12 743	85	6 883	12 742
Latvia	25	6 500	8 112	25	6 500	8 112	20	6 322	7 583	20	6 322	7 583
Lithuania	138	6 411	15 277	138	6 411	15 277	153	5 362	13 573	153	5 362	13 573
Luxembourg[4]	5	23 535	24 730	5	23 526	24 730	6	22 638	23 968	6	22 637	23 968
Mexico	m	3 056	m	m	m	m	m	2 566	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	35	7 606	10 301	35	7 606	10 301	32	6 767	8 899	32	6 767	8 899
New Zealand[5]	m	m	8 748	m	m	8 292[u]	16	7 348	8 497	9	7 617	8 292
Norway	- 4	15 520	14 931	- 4	15 520	14 931	- 1	13 352	13 263	- 1	13 352	13 263
Poland	31	7 225	9 498	31	7 225	9 498	38	5 939	8 208	38	5 939	8 208
Portugal	m	m	m	3	8 419	8 675	m	m	m	11	5 425	6 010
Slovak Republic	40	6 318	8 866	40[u]	6 318	8 866[u]	49	5 342	7 948	49	5 341	7 948
Slovenia	16	9 530	11 023	16	9 530	11 022	22	7 198	8 750	22	7 198	8 748
Spain	29	7 666	9 905	29	7 665	9 905	29	6 301	8 150	29	6 301	8 150
Sweden	- 9	16 764	15 225	- 9	16 764	15 225	- 10	15 877	14 266	- 10	15 877	14 266
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	19	13 633	16 198	19	13 616	16 187
Türkiye	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United Kingdom	- 13	9 878	8 629	- 23	7 868	6 073	0	7 278	7 312	5	4 642	4 856
United States	m	m	m	m	9 602	m	m	m	m	m	7 063	m
OECD average	**29**	**9 525**	**11 598**	**27**	**9 555**	**11 329**	**34**	**8 201**	**10 331**	**32**	**8 142**	**10 067**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	3 335	m

	Total expenditure per child (constant prices, 2020=100)						Government expenditure per child (constant prices, 2020=100)					
	Age 3 to 5			Pre-primary (ISCED 02)			Age 3 to 5			Pre-primary (ISCED 02)		
	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	3 758	m	m	m
Bulgaria	- 20	10 520	8 418	- 20	10 521	8 418	- 13	9 578	8 312	- 13	9 578	8 312
China	m	m	m	m	m	2 705	m	m	m	m	m	1 570
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	242	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	1 530	m
Romania	50	3 333	5 003	50	3 315	4 964	45	3 295	4 766	44	3 277	4 734
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	5 937
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**29**	**9 542**	**11 697**	**28**	**9 369**	**11 413**	**32**	**8 077**	**10 491**	**30**	**8 297**	**10 166**
G20 average	**28**	**8 335**	**11 582**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**47**	**6 537**	**9 220**	**m**	**m**	**m**

1. Includes some transfers and payments for education to non-educational private entities.
2. Total expenditure excludes private, international and local government expenditure.
3. Includes some transfers and payments for education to non-educational private entities. Data do not cover day care centres and integrated centres for early childhood education.
4. Data do not cover all ECEC programmes at ISCED 01 and 02, such as crèches and parental assistants.
5. Total expenditure excludes some private sources expenditure for government-dependent private institutions.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/4y0jap

Chapter C3. How are primary and lower secondary education financed?

Highlights


- Total expenditure per student in primary education averages USD 13 639 across OECD countries, with most countries in the USD 10 000 to USD 17 000 range (expressed in purchasing power parity (PPP) terms, which adjust for cross-country price differences). There are large differences between the highest-spending countries (over USD 19 000 per student in Iceland, Luxembourg and Norway) and the lowest-spending ones (below USD 5 000 in Colombia and the Republic of Türkiye).
- Expenditure is higher at lower secondary level than at primary level, with an OECD average of USD 15 305 per student. This difference is seen in most countries and reflects higher costs linked to subject-specialist teaching, broader curricula and more advanced infrastructure.
- Expressing expenditure per student as a share of GDP per capita provides a measure of the economic effort associated with education spending relative to a country's average income. This measure shows much less cross-country variation than expenditure expressed in USD PPP: most OECD countries cluster between 20% and 25% of GDP per capita at primary level and 21% to 27% at lower secondary level.

Context

In all OECD and partner countries, education at the primary and lower secondary levels is compulsory (see Chapter B1). As a result, countries frequently apply similar policies, funding mechanisms and institutional arrangements to both levels, treating them as a unified stage of education. In many OECD countries, primary and lower secondary education are provided within the same structure, often referred to as basic education, reinforcing this integrated approach. Lower secondary education (ISCED 2) is provided as a general programme for all students in most countries, without a division between general and vocational tracks. Since programme orientation becomes more relevant and widespread at the upper secondary level (ISCED 3), issues related to this differentiation are addressed separately in Chapter C4. This chapter examines how funding patterns are changing over time and how resources are allocated within institutions and between different types of institutions.

Figure C3.1. Expenditure on primary and lower secondary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023)

Direct expenditure on educational institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
2. Year of reference 2022.
For data, see Table C3.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/e0c4fw.

Other findings

- In most OECD countries, private institutions receive much lower levels of government funding than public institutions, although in a few countries either the difference is more moderate (e.g. Belgium and Slovenia, where government expenditure is 10-30% lower per student in private institutions than in public ones) or there is near parity (e.g. Finland).
- Education expenditure is strongly driven by staff costs: across OECD countries 91% of total expenditure is dedicated to current expenditure and about 80% of current expenditure is devoted to staff compensation at both primary and lower secondary levels.
- Staff compensation per student in primary education increased by around 15% on average in recent years, from USD 7 210 in 2015 to USD 8 035 in 2023, but growth was stronger in countries such as Czechia (USD 3 550 to USD 5 064), the Netherlands (USD 7 250 to USD 9 471) and the Slovak Republic (USD 4 896 to USD 7 204).

Analysis

Expenditure per student in primary and lower secondary education

Total expenditure per student

Across OECD countries, total expenditure per student in primary education averages USD 13 639 (Figure C3.1). Most countries fall within a range of approximately USD 10 000 to USD 17 000, suggesting broadly comparable spending patterns despite different economic contexts. However, there are pronounced outliers at either end of the scale. High-spending countries such as Luxembourg (USD 31 112), Iceland (USD 21 074) and Norway (USD 19 711) invest much more per student than the OECD average. In contrast, lower expenditure levels are seen in Colombia (USD 3 535) and Türkiye (USD 4 900), as well as in partner and accession countries China, Romania and Peru (below USD 4 500).

At lower secondary level, total expenditure per student tends to be higher than at primary level, with an OECD average of USD 15 305. This is the case in most countries and reflects various factors. At lower secondary level, students are taught by subject specialists (rather than one teacher who covers multiple subjects, as at primary level), which increases staffing needs (more teachers are required per group of students) and involves teachers with higher qualifications and salaries (see Chapter D3). In addition, the curriculum becomes more complex and schools often need to provide facilities such as science labs or IT equipment, which are less common in primary education. Cross-country differences continue to be wide at this level, with Luxembourg (USD 35 223 per student) again at the top end, while Chile (USD 7 725), Colombia (USD 3 603) and Türkiye (USD 5 038) are among the lowest (Figure C3.1)

Differences between public and private institutions

Across OECD countries, reported total expenditure per student (which includes government, private and non-domestic expenditure) is generally higher in public institutions than in private ones. At primary level, the OECD average for total expenditure is USD 14 032 per student in public institutions compared to USD 12 530 in private institutions. At lower secondary level, the difference remains similar, at USD 15 573 in public institutions and USD 14 275 in private institutions (Table C3.1). There are various potential explanations for this pattern, which may seem surprising. One is that institutions are considered private due to the way they are managed, not how they are funded: an institution is classified as private if its overall control and management rest with a non-governmental organisation (OECD, 2018[1]). Within private institutions, further distinction can be made between government-dependent institutions (which rely mostly on government funding) and independent private institutions. The landscape of private institutions and the concentration of different types, as well as their associated funding arrangements vary widely across OECD countries. Another potential reason for lower reported expenditure in private institutions is the difficulty of measuring private expenditure on educational institutions, which may be substantial in some education systems but not fully recorded in official statistics. Household surveys are a common source of data on private expenditure, but depending on the features of the survey, the resulting data may not fully capture the expected categories of household expenditure on education.

There is also considerable variation across countries in the extent of government expenditure on private institutions compared to public ones. In some countries private and public institutions both receive similar amounts of funding per student from government, or the difference is relatively small (up to 15%). For example, in Finland, government spending is almost identical at around USD 13 800 per student in both public and private institutions at primary level. In Sweden private institutions receive slightly lower amounts of government funding per student than public ones, while in Hungary the opposite is the case. In a second set of countries, government expenditure per student is 15-40% lower in private institutions than in public ones. For example, in Slovenia and the United Kingdom, the gap is between 10% and 20% at both primary and lower secondary levels. The gap is slightly larger in Belgium and the Netherlands, where government expenditure per student in private institutions is 20-30% lower than in public ones at both primary and lower secondary levels. Other countries that fall into this group include Australia and Lithuania. Finally, government expenditure per student in private institutions is much lower than in public institutions in about a dozen countries. The gap is near 90% or more in Costa Rica, Greece and Italy, suggesting that in these countries private institutions rely predominantly on private sources of funding. The gap is also relatively wide (over 70%) in Canada, Czechia, New Zealand and Portugal (Table C3.1). In Luxembourg, the results are strongly influenced by the inclusion of the two European schools LUX1 and LUX2. These private schools are mainly financed by the European Union institutions, while government funding accounts for a higher share of funding in other types of private institutions.


Expenditure per student as a share of GDP per capita

Figure C3.2 shows total expenditure per student relative to GDP per capita at primary and lower secondary levels. This indicates the level of resources devoted to each student relative to the average income in a country, providing a measure of the economic effort associated with education spending. This differs from expenditure expressed in USD PPP, which reflects the expenditure per student after adjusting for price differences, but does not indicate how that spending relates to a country's income level.

Measures of expenditure per student as a share of GDP per capita show a much narrower range than those expressed as USD PPP. At primary level, most OECD countries fall roughly between 16% and 27% of GDP per capita, with a few lower values such as Ireland (10%) and Türkiye (12%), and some higher values such as Korea (28%). At lower secondary level, most countries are between 21% and 30%. Even a country such as Luxembourg, with very high spending expressed in USD PPP terms, appears much closer to the OECD average once expenditure is expressed relative to GDP per capita (20% at primary level and 23% at lower secondary).

Figure C3.2. Expenditure on primary and lower secondary educational institutions per student as a percentage of GDP per capita (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions, in per cent



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
2. Year of reference 2022.
For data, see Table C3.5 (web only). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/e0c4fw.

Distribution of current expenditure in public institutions


Figure C3.3 shows the share of different types of current expenditure in public institutions (data are not available for all institutions, as the underlying data are not collected for independent private institutions). Across OECD countries, current expenditure in primary education institutions is largely driven by staff compensation. On average, 80% of total current expenditure is devoted to staff compensation, while the remaining 20% is allocated to other current expenditure. Within staff compensation, salaries account for the largest share at 62%, followed by retirement pensions at 11% and other non-salary compensation at 7%. Box C3.1 details how pension contributions are measured or estimated for different types of teachers' pension schemes.

There is considerable variation across countries in how staff compensation is structured. In some systems, salaries account for a particularly large share of current expenditure. For example, salaries represent 81% of total current expenditure in Chile. Salaries also take up a relatively large share of current expenditure in Austria (72%) and Italy (76%), while pensions and other compensation account for relatively little. In contrast, other countries allocate a larger share to pensions or other types of compensation. In Japan, retirement pensions account for 15% of expenditure, while in Greece they reach 26%. Some systems report relatively high shares of other non-salary staff compensation, which reaches 42% in Costa Rica.

The share of current expenditure allocated to non-staff costs varies significantly as well, with some countries devoting a much larger share to other current expenditure than the OECD average. Finland allocates 40% of its current expenditure to non-staff costs, and Czechia 35%, suggesting relatively higher spending on infrastructure, materials and services. By contrast, Chile (5%), Colombia (6%) and Greece (7%) and dedicate only a small share to these categories.

Figure C3.3. Distribution of current expenditure by type of compensation, primary public educational institutions (2023)

Direct expenditure within public educational institutions, in per cent



1. Year of reference 2022.
2. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
For data, see Table C3.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/e0c4fw.

At lower secondary level, the overall structure of current expenditure is very similar to that observed in primary education. On average across OECD countries, 80% of current expenditure is devoted to staff compensation. Within that share, salaries account for 62% of current expenditure, retirement pensions for 11% and other non-salary compensation for 7%. As at primary level, there is a great deal of cross-country variation in the composition of staff compensation. In some systems, salaries account for a particularly large share of expenditure. For example, in Italy salaries represent 87% of current expenditure at lower secondary level, while total staff compensation represents 88%; in Austria, 74% of current expenditure goes on salaries and 75% on staff compensation overall. In contrast, some other countries allocate a larger share of current expenditure to pensions or other compensation. In Colombia, retirement pensions account for 32% of expenditure, and in the United Kingdom they reach 28%. As at primary level, Costa Rica devotes the largest share to other non-salary staff compensation, at 42% of current expenditure, reflecting different compensation structures. The share of expenditure devoted to non-staff costs also varies significantly. Although the OECD average remains 20% of current expenditure, as at primary level, some systems allocate a much larger share to non-staff costs, reaching 40% in Finland and 37% in Czechia. In contrast, Colombia and Ireland report comparatively low shares, at 6 and 7% respectively (Table C3.2, online columns).

Box C3.1. Pension schemes and implications for data on staff compensation

Reported expenditure on staff compensation includes not only salaries, but also non-salary staff compensation, and the employer's cost of pension entitlements accrued by current educational personnel. The features of the pension schemes that apply to teachers affect the way pension contributions are measured and reported in expenditure data.

In **fully funded systems**, employers make regular contributions to pension funds for current employees, and expenditure corresponds directly to these observed payments. As a result, pension costs are based on actual financial transactions, providing a clear and directly observable measurement of pension contributions linked to current employment.

This applies, for example, in Australia, where teacher pensions are based specific superannuation funds designed for educators. It also partly applies in Canada or the Netherlands, where funded occupational schemes play an important role.

In **unfunded** or **pay-as-you-go** (PAYG) systems, employers do not make pension contributions for current employees. Instead, pensions are paid directly from public budgets when retirees claim them. As no current contributions are observed, the cost of pensions must be estimated (imputed) and reported as part of current staff compensation.

In most OECD countries primary and lower secondary teachers' pensions are largely financed on a PAYG basis. In some countries there is an element of fully funded pension (this is often a smaller component), so that both observed and imputed contributions are needed to measure the full cost of accrued pension rights. For example, in Germany the system is predominantly pay-as-you-go through a statutory pension scheme. A small fully funded component exists in the supplementary pension scheme for public-sector employees in the former East German states. Similarly, in France mixed systems exist but the main system operates on a PAYG basis. In Czechia and Hungary, Italy, Portugal and Spain teachers' pensions are largely financed on a PAYG basis. A mixed approach exists in Finland, Korea and Sweden, where pension systems combine PAYG components with funded elements and so both observed and imputed contributions are needed to measure the full cost of staff pension entitlements.


Note: This textbox refers to primary and lower secondary education, pension schemes may differ at other education levels.
Source: (OECD, 2025[2]) (International Organisation of Pension Supervisors, 2026[3]) (European Commission, Eurydice Network, 2026[4]) .

Trends in expenditure on staff compensation per student

Figure C3.4 shows how expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student has changed in recent years at primary level. Between 2015 and 2023, staff compensation per student (in constant PPP-adjusted USD) increased on average across OECD countries, from USD 7 210 in 2015 to USD 8 035 in 2023. Several countries recorded particularly strong growth. For example, expenditure on staff compensation per student increased from USD 7 250 to USD 9 471 in the Netherlands, from USD 7 781 to USD 9 220 in Canada and from USD 6 141 to USD 8 054 in Ireland. Significant increases also occurred in Central and Eastern European countries such as Czechia (from USD 3 550 to USD 5 064) and Poland (from USD 5 674 to USD 7 863).

Figure C3.4. Trends in expenditure on staff compensation in primary educational institutions per student (2015 and 2023)

Expenditure in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP, constant prices (2020=100)



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
For data, see Table C3.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/e0c4fw.

Other countries experienced either more moderate changes or little change over the period. Staff compensation per student in the United Kingdom increased slightly at this level from USD 10 419 in 2015 to USD 10 612 in 2023, while there were slight declines in Austria (from USD 9 815 to USD 9 660) and Norway (from USD 10 037 to USD 9 804). Germany also recorded a slight decrease from USD 7 956 to USD 7 888. Declines were more noticeable in a few cases: in Luxembourg expenditure on staff compensation per student fell from USD 19 043 to USD 16 480, although it remains by far the country with the highest expenditure at this level. Japan also recorded a moderate decline, from USD 6 848 to USD 6 503 (Figure C3.4).

These changes have done little to reduce differences in spending on staff compensation per student across OECD and partner countries. High-spending countries such as Luxembourg (USD 16 480), Belgium (USD 11 750), Iceland (USD 11 211) and the United Kingdom (USD 10 612) remain well above the OECD average for primary education in 2023. At the other end of the distribution, countries such as Türkiye (USD 2 613), and accession and partner countries Romania (USD 2 573) and Brazil (USD 2 398) report much lower levels. Although some countries with lower initial levels have increased their expenditure, including Estonia, Hungary and Lithuania, they still remain below the OECD average for this measure (Figure C3.4).

Definitions

For the definition of expenditure on educational institutions, government expenditure on educational institutions, private expenditure on educational institutions, and public and private educational institutions, refer to Chapter C1.

Methodology

For an overview of the methodology based on the joint data collection by UNESCO, the OECD and Eurostat (UOE), see Chapter C1. For more detailed information, please refer to the OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics (OECD, 2018[1]). For country-specific notes, see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Sources

Data refer to the financial year 2023 (unless otherwise specified) and are based on the UNESCO, OECD and Eurostat (UOE) data collection on education statistics administered by the OECD in 2025 (for details see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes*, (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Data for China, India, Indonesia and Saudi Arabia are from the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS), while data for Argentina and South Africa are partly sourced from UIS.

References

European Commission, Eurydice Network (2026), *Eurypedia: Description of national education systems*, https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia (accessed on 7 May 2026). [4]

International Organisation of Pension Supervisors (2026), *Resources: Pension system profiles of IOPS member jurisdictions/territories*, https://www.iopsweb.org/en/resources.html#jurisdiction_profiles (accessed on 7 May 2026). [3]

OECD (2025), *Pensions at a Glance 2025: OECD and G20 Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/e40274c1-en. [2]

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics 2018: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [1]

Chapter C3 Tables

Tables and notes

Table C3.1	Expenditure on primary and lower secondary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023)
Table C3.2	Distribution of expenditure within public primary and lower secondary educational institutions (2023)
Table C3.3	Trends in expenditure in primary and lower secondary educational institutions on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (2015 and 2023)
WEB Table C3.4	Expenditure on primary and lower secondary educational institutions as a percentage of GDP (2023)
WEB Table C3.5	Expenditure on primary and lower secondary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student as a percentage of GDP per capita (2023)

StatLink https://stat.link/e0c4fw

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/e0c4fw.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **u** – partial data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes,* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en.

Table C3.1. Expenditure on primary and lower secondary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions; in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP; by level of education

	Primary educational institutions						Lower secondary educational institutions					
	Total expenditure (government, private and non-domestic)			Government expenditure			Total expenditure (government, private and non-domestic)			Government expenditure		
	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia[1]	14 686[d]	14 271	15 597[d]	12 968	13 884	10 954	20 108[d]	17 733	23 384[d]	15 844	17 047	14 184
Austria	17 801	17 940	15 638	17 013	17 586	8 068	20 654	21 135	16 507	19 801	20 801	11 173
Belgium	16 818	19 903	14 160	16 236	19 393	13 517	21 886	24 786	20 074	21 007	24 117	19 064
Canada[2]	15 870[d]	15 950[d]	14 765	14 402[d]	15 144[d]	4 080	16 151[d]	16 779[d]	10 337	14 657[d]	15 931[d]	2 857
Chile	7 725	7 895	7 626	6 059	7 895	4 986	8 367	8 823	8 068	6 869	8 823	5 592
Colombia[3,4]	3 535[u]	4 289[u]	525[u]	3 526[u]	4 279	525[u]	3 603[u]	4 289[u]	609[u]	3 594[u]	4 279	609[u]
Costa Rica	m	m	m	5 894	5 967	97	m	m	m	5 794	5 963	167
Czechia	9 679	9 781	7 272	9 033	9 310	2 518	16 201	16 460	10 580	15 133	15 653	3 853
Denmark	17 184	17 203	17 096	16 458	17 073	13 703	21 008	17 026	29 946	18 359	16 897	21 643
Estonia	12 116	12 193	11 149	11 654	12 031	6 961	13 312	13 445	11 329	12 894	13 272	7 273
Finland	13 823	13 823	13 797	13 818	13 818	13 780	21 706	22 115	14 983	21 697	22 107	14 965
France	12 310	m	m	11 565	m	m	14 699	m	m	13 471	m	m
Germany[5]	13 163	13 016	15 742	12 825	12 694	15 121	16 451[u]	16 532[u]	15 795[u]	16 040[u]	16 169[u]	14 988[u]
Greece	9 121	9 206	8 064	7 647	8 255	82	8 600	8 235	14 127	6 924	7 374	87
Hungary[6]	8 821	8 379	10 473[d]	7 892	7 863	7 999	8 239	7 595	10 473	7 409	7 239	7 999
Iceland	21 074	21 406	11 385	20 889	21 220	11 211	21 157	21 384	12 814	20 973	21 201	12 597
Ireland[7]	13 217	13 297	5 403	12 943	13 074	a	16 145	16 145	a	12 699	12 699	a
Israel	13 945	16 594	5 814	13 331	16 257	4 349	m	m	m	m	m	m
Italy	15 367	15 995	5 967	14 313	15 161	1 610	15 707	16 074	8 730	15 034	15 745	1 517
Japan[8]	10 996[d]	x(1)	x(1)	10 843[d]	x(4)	x(4)	12 406[d]	x(7)	x(7)	11 623[d]	x(10)	x(10)
Korea	16 365	16 395	14 620	15 396	15 603	3 229	17 637	17 795	16 829	16 944	17 138	15 956
Latvia	8 788	8 732	10 128	8 389	8 570	4 019	8 833	8 701	11 826	8 477	8 644	4 699
Lithuania	10 231	10 018	13 082	9 620	9 826	6 879	10 607	10 447	12 802	9 987	10 223	6 732
Luxembourg	31 112	32 289	21 128	29 507	32 289	5 908	35 223	38 227	22 234	33 385	38 227	12 449
Mexico[7,9]	m	2 703[u]	m	m	2 703[u]	m	m	1 975[u]	m	m	1 975[u]	m
Netherlands	15 942	18 911	14 923	15 708	18 763	14 659	20 493	23 876	19 411	19 427	23 130	18 243
New Zealand	10 762	10 687	14 070	9 942	10 139	1 180	12 129	11 836	17 565	10 314	10 806	1 179
Norway[10]	19 711[u]	19 424	27 115[u]	19 711	19 424	27 115	19 711[u]	19 895	16 843[u]	19 711	19 895	16 843
Poland	12 727	12 228	18 552	11 446	11 572	9 971	11 648	11 204	17 220	10 461	10 542	9 448
Portugal	12 181	12 749	8 445	10 936	12 408	1 255	15 599	16 479	9 362	14 387	16 138	1 973
Slovak Republic[11]	11 395[u]	11 314	12 184[u]	10 591	10 512	11 367	9 737[u]	9 790	9 223[u]	9 014	9 075	8 424
Slovenia	14 335	14 328	15 004	12 981	13 010	10 467	14 205	14 189	15 844	12 859	12 875	11 212
Spain	12 767	13 952	10 208	10 534	12 762	5 723	14 270	15 890	10 803	12 599	15 414	6 576
Sweden	16 692	16 978	14 811	16 679	16 978	14 711	16 446	16 857	14 785	16 426	16 857	14 685
Switzerland[4]	m	21 890[u]	m	22 642	21 890	35 503	m	26 790[u]	m	27 226	26 790	31 879
Türkiye	4 900	4 484	11 142	4 271	4 350	3 080	5 038	4 713	9 449	4 430	4 588	2 285
United Kingdom	15 602	15 893	15 152	13 893	14 989	12 193	15 077	14 751	15 204	12 977	14 083	12 546
United States[12]	16 605	17 019	12 456	15 468	16 867	1 450	17 323	17 504	15 369	16 030	17 348	1 789
OECD average	**13 639**	**14 032**	**12 530**	**12 893**	**13 432**	**8 479**	**15 305**	**15 573**	**14 275**	**14 291**	**14 830**	**9 560**

	Primary educational institutions						Lower secondary educational institutions					
	Total expenditure (government, private and non-domestic)			Government expenditure			Total expenditure (government, private and non-domestic)			Government expenditure		
	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	5 313	m	m	m	m	m	5 690	m
Brazil[13]	m	4 999[u]	m	4 064	4 999	a	m	5 191	m	4 390	5 191	a
Bulgaria	8 290	8 373	4 649	8 213	8 370	1 246	8 371	8 368	8 467	8 196	8 363	1 282
China	4 229	4 246	4 003	3 853	4 112	518	5 771	5 886	4 865	5 126	5 709	566
Croatia[12]	8 055[d]	7 967[d,u]	6 421[d,u]	7 532[d]	7 611[d]	2 767[d]	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru[12]	1 985	x(1)	x(1)	1 728	x(4)	x(4)	2 782	x(7)	x(7)	2 306	x(10)	x(10)
Romania	4 021	3 918	8 588	3 783	3 709	7 056	10 228	10 206	11 751	8 658	8 631	10 536
Saudi Arabia	m	12 035	m	10 329	12 035	36	m	12 619	m	11 122	12 619	46
South Africa	m	m	m	m	3 141	m	m	m	m	m	3 229	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**13 038**	**13 437**	**11 787**	**12 293**	**13 027**	**7 799**	**15 428**	**15 817**	**14 376**	**14 348**	**15 226**	**9 492**
G20 average	**12 736**	**11 417**	**m**	**11 092**	**10 071**	**m**	**14 215**	**12 296**	**m**	**12 130**	**10 890**	**m**

1. Includes scholarships and other grants from private sources to households and students.
2. Includes central government expenditure outside educational institutions.
3. Excludes expenditure on private institutions by local governments and international sources.
4. Excludes payments from private sources to educational institutions.
5. Excludes expenditure on vocational lower-secondary institutions.
6. Includes expenditure by non-educational private entities on primary education and payments by households for goods and services required directly or indirectly by educational institutions.
7. Excludes central government expenditure on independent private institutions.
8. Includes government transfers and payments to the non-educational private sector.
9. Excludes expenditure by local and regional governments.
10. Excludes payments by households to private educational institutions and payments by non-educational private entities to independent private institutions.
11. Excludes international expenditure on government-dependent private institutions.
12. Year of reference 2022.
13. Excludes household expenditure and non-domestic expenditure on primary education.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/e0c4fw.

Table C3.2. Distribution of expenditure within public primary and lower secondary educational institutions (2023)

In per cent; expenditure from all sources; by level of education

	Primary											
	Distribution of current and capital expenditure		Distribution of current expenditure by staff category				Distribution of current expenditure by type of compensation					Expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)
	Capital	Current	Teaching staff	Non-teaching staff	All staff	Other current expenditure	Salaries	Retirement pensions	Other non-salary staff compensation	All staff compensation	Other current expenditure	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	12	88	63	18	81	19	69	8	4	81	19	10 337
Austria	12	88	60	13	73	27	72	2	0	73	27	11 587
Belgium	6	94	62	23	85	15	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	85	15	16 001
Canada	10	90	66	15	82	18	66	5	11	82	18	11 594
Chile	1	99	57	37	95	5	81	8	6	95	5	7 377
Colombia	m	m	90	4	94	6	34	32	29	94	6	4 050
Costa Rica	1	99	70	11	81	19	33	6	42	81	19	4 816
Czechia	7	93	41	25	65	35	48	10	7	65	35	5 955
Denmark	9	91	x(5)	x(5)	82	18	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	82	18	12 746
Estonia	15	85	49	27	77	23	57	11	8	77	23	7 952
Finland	13	87	50	10	60	40	49	9	2	60	40	7 242
France	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Germany[1]	11	89	x(5)	x(5)	79	21	m	m	m	79	21	9 147
Greece	1.6	98.4	90	3	93	7	64	26	3	93	7	8 377
Hungary	2	98	x(5)	x(5)	72	28	63	7	2	72	28	5 891
Iceland	9	91	52	22	74	26	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	74	26	14 395
Ireland	13	87	81	19	100	0	m	m	m	100	0	9 616
Israel	11	89	x(5)	x(5)	81	19	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	81	19	11 952
Italy	5	95	62	14	77	23	76	1	0	77	23	11 668
Japan	14	86	x(5)	x(5)	78	22	63	15	x(10)	78	22	7 335
Korea	21	79	52	20	72	28	60	8	4	72	28	9 500
Latvia	10	90	x(5)	x(5)	76	24	60	14	2	76	24	5 973
Lithuania	6	94	56	23	80	20	77[d]	x(7)	3	80	20	7 546
Luxembourg	16	84	66	11	77	23	68	6	3	77	23	21 019
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	11	89	x(5)	x(5)	79	21	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	79	21	13 283
New Zealand	17	83	61	18	79	21	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	79	21	7 059
Norway	11	89	x(5)	x(5)	81	19	65	16	0	81	19	13 978
Poland	9	91	x(5)	x(5)	78	22	65	11	3	78	22	8 823
Portugal	2	98	79	7	86	14	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	86	14	8 139
Slovak Republic	8	92	63	16	79	21	59	8	12	79	21	8 302
Slovenia	8	92	x(5)	x(5)	81	19	70	6	4	81	19	10 718
Spain	5	95	66	10	76	24	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	76	24	10 043
Sweden	9	91	57	16	73	27	50	13	10	73	27	11 326
Switzerland	12	88	65	18	84	16	69	14	1	84	16	16 039
Türkiye[2]	15	85[d]	75	6	81	19[d]	70	6	4	81	19[d]	3 192
United Kingdom	8	92	68	11	79	21	54	24	2	79	21	11 624
United States[3]	10	90	52	27	79	21	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	79	21	12 093
OECD average	**9**	**91**	**64**	**16**	**80**	**20**	**62**	**11**	**7**	**80**	**20**	**9 908**

	Primary											
	Distribution of current and capital expenditure		Distribution of current expenditure by staff category				Distribution of current expenditure by type of compensation					Expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)
	Capital	Current	Teaching staff	Non-teaching staff	All staff	Other current expenditure	Salaries	Retirement pensions	Other non-salary staff compensation	All staff compensation	Other current expenditure	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	4 586
Brazil	5	95	m	m	75	25	53	11	11	75	25	3 523
Bulgaria	7	93	69	15	84	16	69	10	5	84	16	6 560
China	12	88	x(5)	x(5)	82	18	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	82	18	3 181
Croatia[3]	m	100[d]	x(5)	x(5)	81[d]	19[d]	78[d]	0[d]	3[d]	81[d]	19[d]	6 319[d]
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	3	97	x(5)	x(5)	86	14	83	0	3	86	14	3 190
Saudi Arabia	2	98	75	13	88	12	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	88	12	10 425
South Africa	4	96	68	11	79	21	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	79	21	2 386
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**8**	**92**	**64**	**15**	**79**	**21**	**65**	**8**	**4**	**79**	**21**	**9 476**
G20 average	**10**	**90**	**m**	**m**	**79**	**21**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**79**	**21**	**7 899**

Note: Columns showing data for lower secondary education are available for consultation online.

1. Excludes expenditure on vocational lower-secondary institutions (web columns 13-24).

2. Current expenditure includes expenditure for ancillary services.

3. Year of reference 2022.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/e0c4fw.

Table C3.3. Trends in expenditure in primary and lower secondary educational institutions on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (2015 and 2023)

Expenditure from all sources within public and private educational institutions; constant prices (2020 = 100); by level of education

	Expenditure on all staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)						Expenditure on teaching staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)					
	Primary			Lower secondary			Primary			Lower secondary		
	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	-1.6	9 815	9 660	-10.2	13 692	12 299	-2.1	8 149	7 981	-11.0	12 408	11 038
Belgium	11.7	10 523	11 750	14.6	14 172	16 247	9.7	7 882	8 645	15.0	11 565	13 301
Canada	18.5	7 781[d]	9 220	m	x(2)	9 383	16.8	6 393[d]	7 465	m	x(8)	7 597
Chile	m	m	4 841	m	m	4 652	m	m	3 086	m	m	2 981
Colombia[1]	m	m	2 831[u]	m	m	2 886[u]	m	m	2 696[u]	m	m	2 748[u]
Costa Rica	m	m	4 253	m	m	4 185	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	42.7	3 550	5 064	43.0	5 738	8 206	31.1	2 410	3 159	31.7	4 045	5 327
Denmark	m	m	10 192	m	m	11 662	m	m	x(3)	m	m	x(6)
Estonia	24.7	5 335	6 652	29.1	5 528	7 139	27.4	3 432	4 374	33.9	3 532	4 731
Finland	-1.8	6 290	6 179	-1.9	9 944	9 755	-3.0	5 271	5 116	-3.4	8 425	8 135
France	15.1	6 975	8 030	-0.8	9 472	9 398	15.6	5 050	5 839	-0.8	6 762	6 711
Germany[2]	-0.9	7 956	7 888	1.8[u]	10 189[u]	10 372[u]	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(5)	x(6)
Greece	15.6	5 867	6 783	-11.7	7 264	6 412	15.0	5 654	6 501	-13.8	7 077	6 102
Hungary	23.1	4 163	5 124	30.3	3 743	4 875	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(5)	x(6)
Iceland	m	m	11 211	m	m	10 508	m	m	7 939	m	m	7 442
Ireland[1]	31.1[u]	6 141	8 054[u]	6.2	6 805	7 230	25.6[u]	5 217	6 554[u]	6.7	5 893	6 287
Israel	34.2	5 827	7 821	m	m	m	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	m	m
Italy	13.4	8 403	9 529	18.1	9 504	11 222	17.8	6 593	7 769	35.5	7 496	10 158
Japan	-5.0	6 848	6 503	-6.4	7 845	7 345	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(5)	x(6)
Korea	18.2	7 302	8 634	25.5	7 722	9 694	13.5	5 502	6 243	19.6	6 068	7 257
Latvia	2.4	4 909	5 025	26.1	4 972	6 269	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(5)	x(6)
Lithuania	32.4	5 057	6 694	46.5	4 703	6 892	15.6	3 934	4 549	26.4	3 694	4 668
Luxembourg	-13.5	19 043	16 480	10.9	19 683	21 831	-24.7	18 427	13 872	7.3	18 079	19 408
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	30.6	7 250	9 471	13.1	10 644	12 040	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(5)	x(6)
New Zealand[1]	m	m	6 172[u]	m	m	6 759[u]	m	m	4 743[u]	m	m	5 194[u]
Norway	-2.3	10 037	9 804	-10.5	10 953	9 804	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(5)	x(6)
Poland	38.6	5 674	7 863	18.1	5 966	7 044	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(5)	x(6)
Portugal	-0.8	6 498	6 448	-5.1	8 338	7 914	5.0	5 577	5 857	-0.8	7 312	7 256
Slovak Republic	47.2	4 896	7 204	26.7	4 677	5 928	47.0	3 908	5 743	22.9	3 757	4 619
Slovenia	16.7	7 711	8 998	-0.6	8 960	8 909	m	m	m	m	m	m
Spain	10.9	6 426	7 126	4.4	8 309	8 671	11.3	5 531	6 155	5.6	7 394	7 811
Sweden	12.7	8 655	9 756	7.4	8 992	9 656	14.7	6 697	7 679	9.3	6 952	7 596
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye[3]	3.1	2 536	2 613	17.0	2 376	2 780	0.5	2 344	2 355	14.4	2 197	2 514
United Kingdom	1.8	10 419	10 612	9.7	9 173	10 067	4.3	9 073	9 460	17.6	7 825	9 206
United States	m	9 435	m	m	10 212	m	m	6 332	m	m	6 854	m
OECD average	**15.0**	**7 210**	**8 035**	**11.6**	**8 437**	**9 154**	**m**	**m**	**6 596**	**m**	**m**	**7 896**

	Expenditure on all staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)						Expenditure on teaching staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)					
	Primary			Lower secondary			Primary			Lower secondary		
	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	3 393	m	m	4 507	m	m	2 627	m	m	3 326	m
Brazil[1]	m	m	2 398[u]	m	m	2 745[u]	m	m	2 398[d,u]	m	m	2 745[d,u]
Bulgaria	2.3	4 876	4 987	-17.6	6 061	4 996	1.3	4 046	4 100	-18.6	5 039	4 104
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	4 452[d]	m	m	m	m	m	4 452[d]	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	961	m	m	770	m	m	950	m	m	701	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania[4]	41.1	1 824	2 573	45.3	3 292	4 783	m	1 821	x(3)	m	3 290	x(6)
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**17.1**	**6 863**	**7 710**	**12.8**	**8 289**	**9 047**	**13.0**	**6 111**	**6 493**	**9.1**	**7 464**	**7 953**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

1. Excludes expenditure on independent private institutions.
2. Excludes expenditure on vocational lower-secondary institutions.
3. Excludes current expenditure on teaching staff in public institutions.
4. Includes expenditure on non-teaching staff in independent private institutions (web columns).

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/e0c4fw.


Chapter C4. How is upper secondary education financed?

Highlights

- Governments spend USD 13 174 per student on upper secondary education on average across OECD countries (USD 12 421 in general programmes and USD 13 901 in vocational programmes). This is equivalent, on average, to 19% of GDP per capita for general programmes and 22% of GDP per capita for vocational programmes.
- Staff compensation, comprising not only salaries for teaching and non-teaching staff, but other types of compensation including pension schemes and health insurance, is the largest component of expenditure on educational institutions. OECD countries spend, on average, USD 10 212 per student in public upper secondary institutions on staff compensation, representing over half of total expenditure from all sources per student at this level (USD 14 847).
- Expenditure per student on staff compensation at upper secondary level increased on average across OECD countries from USD 8 432 in 2015 to USD 9 105 in 2023 (accounting for inflation and cross-country differences in purchasing power). This represented an increase in two-thirds of OECD countries and a decrease the remaining one-third, with changes driven by changing enrolment patterns in many cases – declining enrolment tends to lead to higher expenditure per student on staff compensation, as staffing arrangements take time to adjust to changing student numbers.

Figure C4.1. Government expenditure per full-time equivalent student on upper secondary educational institutions, by programme orientation (2023)

Direct expenditure on educational institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
2. Year of reference 2022.
For data, see Table C1.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/83o9jl.

Context

Upper secondary education is the stage where many countries start diversifying provision, allowing students to choose between different programmes or be guided to specific options. The diversity of provision means that the associated costs and funding arrangements will also vary not only between countries but also within countries depending on the type of programme.

General upper secondary programmes play a key role in preparing young people for further studies, often at tertiary level, and to a lesser extent for entry into the labour market. Within general programmes, students often have the option to study specific areas in more depth. In addition, most OECD countries have one or more vocational tracks at this level. The costs of delivering these programmes will vary, depending on their duration and forms of delivery (e.g. ranging from fully school-based programmes with practical training in school workshops to apprenticeships where young people spend most of their time in a workplace). In a few OECD countries there is no distinct vocational track in initial upper secondary education or it is very small (e.g. in Canada except for the province of Québec, New Zealand and the United States). In these countries post-secondary non-tertiary and short-cycle tertiary programmes play a key role in preparing young people for the labour market.

This chapter looks at funding arrangements that underpin upper secondary education, focusing mostly on differences between general and vocational programmes. Tables in this chapter also cover post-secondary programmes, but in less detail, given the relatively small size of this level of education on average across OECD countries.

Other findings

- In most countries, government expenditure per student in vocational upper secondary education (USD 13 901 on average across OECD countries) exceeds that in general programmes (USD 12 421).
- Some countries have seen differences between general and vocational programmes in the way expenditure per student on staff compensation has evolved: in 4 out of 20 OECD countries with data available, expenditure increased for one type of programme but decreased for the other. This appears to be largely driven by differences in enrolment patterns, where declining vocational enrolment is combined with rising general.
- Despite increases on average overall, one-third of OECD countries saw expenditure on staff compensation per student decline between 2015 and 2023.

Analysis

Government expenditure on upper secondary education

Expenditure per student

Figure C4.1 shows government expenditure per student in upper secondary education for general and vocational programmes. On average, OECD governments spend USD 12 421 per student in upper secondary general programmes and USD 13 901 per student in vocational ones. This figure refers to expenditure after public-private transfers, meaning that government subsidies to the private sector (for example to companies that provide apprenticeships) are not reported under government expenditure here, as they are considered direct expenditure from private sources.

In most countries, government spending per student in vocational programmes exceeds that in general programmes even without taking into account public-private transfers, which are common in vocational programmes in some countries. Higher costs in vocational programmes might be driven by a number of factors. Some vocational programmes require schools to purchase technical equipment and keep it up to date, which can be costly, particularly in fields that make extensive use of advanced technologies. This creates extra costs, especially in programmes where most of the practical training is delivered in school workshops.

Another factor behind higher costs in vocational programmes is that some courses require smaller class sizes – practical training in a school workshop for would-be electricians requires smaller groups than a theory-focused biology lesson. The distribution of

enrolment in different fields of study also influences average costs in different countries. In countries where vocational provision includes a larger share of enrolment in fields like construction and manufacturing, the costs of providing it will be higher than in countries where vocational programmes are more heavily oriented towards service sectors.

When companies bear a considerable share of the cost of training, government expenditure per student may be lower in vocational than in general programmes. This can be observed in several countries where apprenticeships are common. For example, upper secondary vocational programmes in Switzerland are mainly delivered through apprenticeships, with apprentices spending three or four days in a company and one or two days at school. The cost of delivering training is largely borne by the private sector, so government expenditure on vocational upper secondary education (USD 15 390) is lower than on general programmes (USD 20 169). Similarly, expenditure per student is lower in vocational programmes in Germany (USD 16 605 compared to USD 18 717 in general ones) and in the Netherlands (USD 12 572 vs USD 17 102).


Expenditure per student as a share of GDP per capita

Expenditure per student as a share of GDP per capita measures how much a country invests in each upper secondary student relative to its average economic output per person. This provides insight into the priority given to education within national resources and allows comparisons across countries with different income levels. It also adjusts for cross-country differences in the relative size of the student population in particular types of programmes across countries (in contrast to expenditure on education as a share of GDP, which will be higher for programmes enrolling larger shares of the population).

Figure C4.2 shows these data for different programme orientations. Government expenditure on upper secondary education and per student is, on average, 19% of GDP per capita for general programmes and 22% of GDP per capita for vocational programmes across OECD countries. This measure shows relatively little variation across countries: 18 countries spend between 20% and 25% of GDP per capita per student in general upper secondary education, with only Germany and France spending more than 25%. There is more variation across countries for spending on vocational programmes. Nine countries spend more than 25% of GDP per capita per student in vocational upper secondary education, with Austria, the Slovak Republic and Spain spending at least 30% of GDP per capita per student in these programmes.

Figure C4.2. Government expenditure per full-time equivalent student on upper secondary educational institutions as a percentage of GDP per capita, by programme orientation (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
2. Year of reference 2022.
For data, see Table C4.5 (web only). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/83o9jl.


Expenditure on staff compensation and other types of current expenditure

Staff compensation per student provides insights into the level of investment in human resources within education systems and reflects differences across countries in salary levels, staffing and enrolment patterns, as well as the scope of employee benefits available to education personnel. It is important to note that staff compensation is different from salaries: it also includes other types of compensation, such as expenditure on retirement (e.g. pension schemes to finance the retirement benefits for current educational personnel), as well as non-salary compensation (e.g. health insurance, childcare benefits and housing or childcare subsidies). Data on teachers' salaries are provided in Chapter D3.

Staff compensation is the largest component of expenditure on educational institutions. The following paragraphs focus on public institutions to allow for greater country coverage (the underlying data are not collected for independent private institutions and some countries cannot disaggregate between different types of private institutions). OECD countries spend, on average, USD 10 212 per student in upper secondary education on staff compensation, representing over half of total expenditure per student from all sources at this level (USD 14 847). As shown in Figure C4.3, expenditure on teaching staff compensation accounts for nearly two-thirds of current expenditure on upper secondary education on average across OECD countries. Reported data on expenditure on teaching staff and non-teaching staff vary considerably across OECD countries. In Colombia and Greece over 80% of current expenditure is dedicated to teaching staff compensation, while this category accounts for less than half of current expenditure in Czechia, Finland and Lithuania.

Figure C4.3. Distribution of current expenditure in public upper secondary educational institutions (2023)

In per cent



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
2. Year of reference 2022.
For data, see Table C4.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/83o9jl.

Expenditure on non-teaching staff accounts for 15% of current expenditure on average across OECD countries. This category includes, for example, head teachers and other school administrators, counsellors, school psychologists, and health personnel. It also includes personnel outside schools, such as inspectors and educational administrators at different levels of government. The exact list of occupations under this category varies across countries, as does the share of expenditure dedicated to non-teaching staff: it accounts for over one-quarter of reported current expenditure in Chile and Lithuania, but 10% or less of current expenditure in seven countries (Figure C4.3).

Similarly, there is wide variation in reported current expenditure that is not dedicated to staff compensation (Other current expenditure), which averages 22% of current expenditure across OECD countries. This category includes expenditure on services from outside providers (e.g. maintenance of school buildings, school meal preparation and rent for school buildings), as well as expenditure on other resources (e.g. teaching and learning materials, electricity, telecommunications and insurance). This

category represents less than 10% of current expenditure in Colombia, Greece and Israel, while accounting for close to 40% of current expenditure in Finland and Czechia (Figure C4.3).

Trends in expenditure on staff compensation

Trends in expenditure on teaching and non-teaching staff combined

Between 2015 and 2023, expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student in upper secondary education increased from USD 8 432 to USD 9 105 on average across the OECD countries for which trend data are available. Most countries recorded higher spending levels in 2023, with six countries reporting an increase of at least 20% over this period. Korea and Latvia experienced the largest relative increases, with expenditure on staff compensation per student increasing by 68% in Korea and by 74% in Latvia (Figure C4.4).

Demographic changes are an important driver of expenditure per student trends in some countries, particularly if student numbers decline but staffing arrangements and the associated expenditure change little. This is a common pattern, as education systems often adjust slowly to demographic shifts and some staff-related costs are fixed, at least in the short term. A classroom with fewer students still requires a teacher for each lesson, while a school with fewer classes still needs a school head, a librarian and a school nurse. In Korea, for example the large increase in staff compensation per student was to a large extent driven by a decline of nearly 30% in the number of students in upper secondary education between 2015 and 2023 (OECD, 2026[1]).

Not all these increases were driven entirely by demographic change. In Latvia, for example, the number of students remained relatively stable, so the rising expenditure per student was driven by changes in the vocational sector, where expenditure on staff compensation per student increased from USD 4 889 in 2015 to USD 7 027 in 2023. Lithuania also saw a much larger increase in staff compensation per student in vocational upper secondary programmes (77%, from USD 4 210 to USD 7 433) than in general programmes, even as the number of students decreased in both tracks. In Türkiye, expenditure per student on staff compensation increased slightly (by 2.8%) in general programmes, while it increased strongly (by 57%) in vocational programmes.


A minority of OECD countries saw a considerable fall in expenditure on staff compensation per student – by 18% or more in Canada, Hungary and Norway, with smaller decreases in seven other countries. Here again some differences emerge between general and vocational programmes. For example, in Hungary staff compensation per student fell by over 40% in vocational programmes, but only by 14% in general programmes between 2015 and 2023. Over the same period, enrolment in vocational programmes more than doubled, while falling in general programmes, explaining much of the change in expenditure per student on staff compensation (OECD, 2026[1]). In Norway, the drop in expenditure per student in vocational programmes was slightly higher (24%) than in general programmes (20%), coinciding with a moderate increase in enrolment in vocational upper secondary programmes and a slight decrease in enrolment in general programmes at this level (Table C4.3). In a few countries there was an increase in expenditure per student on staff compensation in one type of programme, but a decrease in the other. For example, in Belgium spending per student on staff compensation rose by 11.3% in vocational programmes, while it fell by 4.2% in general programmes (Table C4.3).

Enrolment patterns seem to be an important driver here as well. For example, between 2015 and 2023, vocational upper secondary enrolment declined and general enrolment increased in Belgium, Finland and Türkiye (OECD, 2026[1]). Over the same period, expenditure per student on staff compensation increased in vocational programmes but decreased in general programmes in Belgium. In Türkiye it increased more rapidly in vocational than in general programmes, whereas in Finland it decreased less in vocational than in general programmes (Table C4.3).

Among OECD countries that are able to report expenditure on teaching staff compensation (as opposed to all staff compensation), average expenditure is USD 7 706. As with teaching staff compensation, Korea experienced by far the largest increase in expenditure per student between 2015 and 2023, rising by 60%. In Czechia, Lithuania the Slovak Republic and the United Kingdom the increase was between 20% and 30%. Five countries report a decrease in expenditure per student on teaching staff, with the largest falls observed in Canada (20%) and Italy (16.5%) (Table C4.3, online columns).

Figure C4.4. Trends in expenditure on staff compensation in upper secondary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2015 and 2023)

Expenditure in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP, constant prices (2020=100)



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
For data, see Table C4.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/83o9jl.

Trends in teaching staff compensation

Among OECD countries that are able to report expenditure on teaching staff compensation (as opposed to all staff compensation), average expenditure is USD 7 706. As with teaching staff compensation, Korea experienced by far the largest increase in expenditure per student between 2015 and 2023, rising by 60%. In Czechia, Lithuania the Slovak Republic and the United Kingdom the increase was between 20% and 30%. Five countries report a decrease in expenditure per student on teaching staff, with the largest falls observed in Canada (20%) and Italy (16.5%) (Table C4.3, online columns).

Definitions

For the definitions of expenditure on educational institutions, government expenditure on educational institutions and private expenditure on educational institutions, refer to Chapter C1.

Methodology

For an overview of the methodology based on the joint data collection by UNESCO, the OECD and Eurostat (UOE), see Chapter C1. For more detailed information, please refer to the OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics (OECD, 2018[2]). For country-specific notes, see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Sources

For an overview of the data sources used based on the joint data collection by UNESCO, the OECD and Eurostat (UOE), refer to Chapter C1. For additional details, see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

References

OECD (2026), *Enrolment data adjusted to the financial year*, Data Explorer. [1]

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics 2018: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [2]

Chapter C4 Tables

Tables and notes

Table C4.1.	Expenditure on upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023)
Table C4.2.	Distribution of expenditure within public upper secondary educational institutions (2023)
Table C4.3.	Trends in expenditure in upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary educational institutions on staff compensation (2015 and 2023)
WEB Table C4.4.	Expenditure on upper secondary educational institutions as a percentage of GDP (2023)
WEB Table C4.5.	Expenditure on upper secondary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student as a percentage of GDP per capita (2023)

StatLink https://stat.link/83o9jl

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter, can be downloaded via https://stat.link/83o9jl.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **u** – partial data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets)**.** For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en*)*.

Table C4.1 Expenditure on upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP, by type of institution

	All upper secondary educational institutions (general and vocational)						General upper secondary educational institutions			Vocational upper secondary educational institutions		
	Total (government, private and non-domestic expenditure)			Government expenditure			Total (government, private and non-domestic expenditure)			Total (government, private and non-domestic expenditure)		
	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(13)	(14)	(15)
OECD countries												
Australia[1]	18 112	22 605	13 819	14 335	20 603	8 347	20 227	17 097	24 362	13 822	42 172	m
Austria[2]	21 292	22 030	17 122	20 112	21 600	11 697	18 189	18 260	17 821	23 418	24 548	16 572
Belgium[3]	20 117[d]	23 851[d]	17 858[d]	18 936[d]	22 826[d]	16 584[d]	18 441[d]	22 309[d]	16 516[d]	21 481[d]	24 861[d]	19 101[d]
Canada[4]	16 105[d]	16 558[d]	11 409	14 615[d]	15 722[d]	3 153	16 087[d]	16 581[d]	11 109	16 407[d]	16 189[d]	20 579
Chile	7 635	7 783	7 553	6 132	7 783	5 210	7 212	7 222	7 206	9 878	9 884	9 872
Colombia[5]	3 199[u]	4 289[u]	356[u]	3 191[u]	4 279	356[u]	2 874[u]	4 289[u]	284[u]	4 046[u]	4 289[u]	1 207[u]
Costa Rica	m	m	m	5 802	5 951	586	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	14 337	15 505	8 760	12 183	14 448	1 376	14 345	15 330	9 030	14 333	15 570	8 676
Denmark	13 358	13 071	26 356	12 966	12 949	13 738	9 794	9 251	26 526	18 690	18 645	25 172
Estonia	8 264	8 049	12 992	7 877	7 857	8 316	6 713	6 219	13 320	10 579	10 603	5 196
Finland[3]	11 902[d]	11 849[d]	12 067[d]	11 810[d]	11 784[d]	11 891[d]	11 908	12 051	10 582	11 900[d]	11 738[d]	12 267[d]
France	19 527	x(1)	x(1)	16 311	x(4)	x(4)	18 175	x(7)	x(7)	22 033	x(13)	x(13)
Germany[6]	23 653[d]	19 351[d]	33 124[d]	17 638[d]	18 957[d]	14 733[d]	19 238	19 710	15 936	27 880[d]	18 760[d]	37 315[d]
Greece	8 012	7 645	14 531	6 528	6 890	93	7 235	6 853	11 781	9 635	9 176	188 489
Hungary[4]	8 849	8 213	10 415[d]	7 923	7 910	7 955	8 098	6 416	10 415[d]	9 561	9 394	10 415[d]
Iceland[4]	16 502[d]	16 897[d]	15 102[u]	15 024[d]	15 403[d]	13 681[u]	14 276[d]	13 749[d]	16 839[u]	22 129[d]	26 970[d]	12 928[u]
Ireland[7]	13 297[u]	13 326	6 754[u]	12 763[u]	12 820	m	38[u]	x(2)	6 754[u]	x(2)	x(2)	a
Israel	12 798[d]	8 044[d]	39 660[d]	10 831[d]	7 953[d]	27 099[d]	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)
Italy[3]	13 978[d]	14 945[d]	5 436[d]	13 155[d]	14 437[d]	1 823[d]	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)
Japan[8]	13 523[d]	x(1)	x(1)	11 005[d]	x(4)	x(4)	x(1)	x(1)	x(1)	x(1)	x(1)	x(1)
Korea	26 498	29 247	22 486	24 457	27 724	19 688	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)
Latvia	11 441	11 234	13 509	10 173	10 628	5 610	10 735	10 390	12 846	12 386	12 230	18 691
Lithuania	11 712	11 675	12 749	11 058	11 214	6 645	10 134	9 999	12 989	15 855	15 900	7 301
Luxembourg	33 648	35 671	25 053	31 821	35 671	15 463	32 726	38 401	19 136	34 319	34 089	36 086
Mexico[9]	m	3 672[u]	m	m	3 672[u]	m	m	3 814[u]	m	m	3 446[u]	m
Netherlands	19 806	20 411	19 752	13 995	19 715	13 488	18 303	20 411	17 566	20 494	a	20 494
New Zealand	13 939	14 193	11 944	11 355	12 335	3 640	15 040	14 772	18 980	10 326	11 742	6 570
Norway	22 438	20 744	39 242	20 521	20 744	18 309	20 911	22 170	11 026	23 786	19 539	78 045
Poland	9 577	9 284	11 742	8 103	8 340	6 359	8 801	8 367	11 052	10 213	9 972	12 822
Portugal[3]	15 034[d]	16 598	10 182[d]	12 730[d]	16 251[d]	1 807	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)
Slovak Republic	13 397[u]	14 107	10 131[u]	12 375	13 112	8 986	10 686[u]	11 303	8 781[u]	14 707[u]	15 307	11 218[u]
Slovenia	12 190	12 235	11 204	10 472	10 703	5 419	13 164	12 946	16 317	11 721	11 904	6 477
Spain	15 817	17 433	11 691	13 716	16 945	5 472	14 159	15 013	12 220	19 220	21 920	10 255
Sweden	16 078	16 272	15 536	16 010	16 245	15 353	14 108	14 243	13 778	19 225	19 222	19 234
Switzerland[10]	23 824[d,u]	x(1)	x(1)	17 098[d]	17 127[d]	16 934[d]	x(1)	x(1)	x(1)	x(1)	x(1)	x(1)
Türkiye	5 399	5 034	8 820	4 429	4 843	540	4 163	3 470	9 945	7 819	7 993	5 685
United Kingdom	17 008	14 766	17 622	13 311	14 099	13 095	17 753	14 766	19 015	15 047	a	15 047
United States[11]	18 117	18 202	17 202	16 686	18 039	2 002	18 117	18 202	17 202	a	a	a
OECD average	**15 288**	**14 847**	**15 521**	**13 174**	**14 099**	**8 984**	**13 388**	**13 573**	**13 770**	**16 104**	**16 387**	**23 681**

	All upper secondary educational institutions (general and vocational)						General upper secondary educational institutions			Vocational upper secondary educational institutions		
	Total (government, private and non-domestic expenditure)			Government expenditure			Total (government, private and non-domestic expenditure)			Total (government, private and non-domestic expenditure)		
	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private	Public and private	Public	Private
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	5 486	6 629	2 527	5 478	6 618	2 527	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)
Brazil[12]	m	5 711[d,u]	m	4 519[d]	5 711[d]	a	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	8 665	8 383	20 431	8 227	8 358	2 792	8 532	8 255	15 537	8 775	8 485	33 711
China	6 050	6 297	4 862	4 815	5 742	363	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)
Croatia[11]	8 837[d]	7 886[u]	9 688[u]	7 358	7 503	4 044	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)	x(1)	x(2)	x(3)
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru[11]	2 625	x(1)	x(1)	2 351	x(4)	x(4)	2 625	x(7)	x(7)	a	a	a
Romania	9 203	9 272	6 517	8 098	8 150	6 066	11 346	11 506	7 062	7 603	7 636	5 631
Saudi Arabia	m	10 587	m	8 959	10 587	29	m	x(2)	m	m	x(2)	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	3 486	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**14 480**	**14 512**	**14 317**	**12 894**	**13 971**	**8 074**	**12 949**	**13 862**	**13 617**	**16 382**	**15 787**	**25 256**
G20 average	**15 288**	**13 354**	**m**	**12 122**	**12 160**	**6 027**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Columns showing government expenditure on general and vocational upper secondary institutions and all expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions are available for consultation online.

1. Includes scholarships and other grants to households and students.
2. Post-secondary expenditure excludes local government expenditure on private institutions (web columns).
3. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions.
4. Includes some expenditure outside educational institutions.
5. Excludes private, non-domestic and some local government expenditure.
6. Includes expenditure on lower secondary vocational institutions.
7. Excludes expenditure on independent private institutions.
8. Includes transfers and payments from government to the non-educational private sector and expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions.
9. Excludes local government expenditure.
10. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions. Excludes expenditure from private sources.
11. Year of reference 2022.
12. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions. Excludes expenditure from private and non-domestic sources.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/83o9jl.

Table C4.2. Distribution of expenditure within public upper secondary educational institutions (2023)

Expenditure from all sources

	All upper secondary educational institutions (general and vocational)											
	Distribution of current and capital expenditure		Distribution of current expenditure by staff category				Distribution of current expenditure by type of compensation					Expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)
	Capital	Current	Teaching staff	Non-teaching staff	All staff	Other current expenditure	Salaries	Retirement pensions	Other non-salary staff compensation	All staff compensation	Other current expenditure	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	11	89	48	22	70	30	60	7	3	70	30	m
Austria	2	98	65	6	71	29	70	1	0	71	29	15 389
Belgium[1]	4[d]	96[d]	67[d]	22[d]	90[d]	10[d]	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	90[d]	10[d]	20 486[d]
Canada	10	90	66	15	82	18	66	5	11	82	18	12 036
Chile	3	97	51	34	85	15	73	7	5	85	15	6 438
Colombia	m	100.0	90	4	94	6	34	32	29	94	6	4,050.4
Costa Rica	3	97	70	11	81	19	33	6	42	81	19	4 816
Czechia	8	92	45	11	56	44	41	9	6	56	44	7 981
Denmark	6	94	x(5)	x(5)	82	18	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	82	18	9 992
Estonia	3	97	56	18	74	26	55	11	8	74	26	5 772
Finland[1]	7[d]	93[d]	48[d]	14[d]	62[d]	38[d]	51[d]	9[d]	2[d]	62[d]	38[d]	6 837[d]
France	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Germany[2]	9[d]	91[d]	x(5)	x(5)	83[d]	17[d]	m	m	m	83[d]	17[d]	14 557[d]
Greece	3	97	89	3	92	8	64	25	3	92	8	6,783
Hungary	5	95	x(5)	x(5)	77	23	66	8	3	77	23	6 010
Iceland	1	99	60	18	78	22	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	78	22	13 009
Ireland	15	85	70	10	80	20	m	m	m	80	20	8 624
Israel[3]	9[d]	91[d]	x(5)	x(5)	91[d]	9[d]	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	91[d]	9[d]	6 631[d]
Italy[1]	7[d]	93[d]	56[d]	24[d]	80[d]	20[d]	79[d]	1[d]	0[d]	80[d]	20[d]	11 121[d]
Japan[1]	10[d]	90[d]	x(5)	x(5)	81[d]	19[d]	66[d]	15[d]	x(10)	81[d]	19[d]	10 723[d]
Korea	16	84	56	19	75	25	59	11	5	75	25	19 503
Latvia	11	89	x(5)	x(5)	76	24	60	14	2	76	24	7 669
Lithuania[4]	11	89	49	27	76	24	74[d]	x(7)	2	76	24	7 906
Luxembourg[5]	7	93[d]	75[d]	8	83[d]	17	73	6	3	83[d]	17	27 460[d]
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	12	88	x(5)	x(5)	79	21	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	79	21	14 102
New Zealand	12	88	m	m	77	23	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	77	23	9 571
Norway	14	86	x(5)	x(5)	79	21	63	16	0	79	21	14 066
Poland	7	93	x(5)	x(5)	74	26	62	10	2	74	26	6 453
Portugal[1]	5[d]	95[d]	74[d]	6[d]	80[d]	20[d]	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	80[d]	20[d]	10 350[d]
Slovak Republic	18	82	51	17	68	32	50	7	11	68	32	7 865
Slovenia	7	93	x(5)	x(5)	73	27	63	6	4	73	27	8 210
Spain	6	94	72	7	80	20	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	80	20	13 052
Sweden	6	94	52	12	64	36	43	12	9	64	36	9 757
Switzerland[1]	10[d]	90[d]	73[d]	13[d]	86[d]	14[d]	71[d]	14[d]	1[d]	86[d]	14[d]	13 381[d]
Türkiye[6]	9	91[d]	77	6	83	17[d]	72	7	4	83	17[d]	3 967
United Kingdom	10	90	68	11	79	21	50	28	1	79	21	10 513
United States[7]	10	90	52	27	79	21	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	79	21	12 933
OECD average	**8**	**92**	**63**	**15**	**78**	**22**	**60**	**11**	**7**	**78**	**22**	**10 515**

	All upper secondary educational institutions (general and vocational)											
	Distribution of current and capital expenditure		Distribution of current expenditure by staff category				Distribution of current expenditure by type of compensation					Expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)
	Capital	Current	Teaching staff	Non-teaching staff	All staff	Other current expenditure	Salaries	Retirement pensions	Other non-salary staff compensation	All staff compensation	Other current expenditure	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	4	96	61	39	100	m	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	100	m	5 904
Brazil[1]	5[d]	95[d]	m	m	76[d]	24[d]	56[d]	11[d]	9[d]	76[d]	24[d]	4 136[d]
Bulgaria	6	94	67	16	84	16	69	10	5	84	16	6 619
China	20	80	x(5)	x(5)	77	23	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	77	23	3 980
Croatia[7]	6	94	x(5)	x(5)	79	21	76	0	3	79	21	6 492
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania[8]	3	97	x(5)	x(5)	68	32	65	0	3	68	32	5 596
Saudi Arabia	2	98	75	13	88	12	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	88	12	9 167
South Africa[9]	4[d]	96	67[d]	13[d]	80[d]	20[d]	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	80[d]	20[d]	2 698[d]
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**7**	**93**	**62**	**13**	**76**	**24**	**63**	**8**	**4**	**76**	**24**	**10 212**
G20 average	**9**	**91**	**m**	**m**	**81**	**21**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**81**	**21**	**9 326**

Note: Columns showing the distribution of expenditure within general and vocational upper secondary institutions are available for consultation online.
1. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions.
2. Includes expenditure on lower secondary vocational institutions.
3. Includes expenditure on lower secondary institutions.
4. Expenditure on salaries includes expenditure for retirement (pensions).
5. Includes expenditure on short-cycle tertiary institutions.
6. Includes expenditure for ancillary services.
7. Year of reference 2022.
8. Excludes expenditure on non-teaching staff.
9. Includes expenditure on tertiary institutions.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/83o9jl.

Table C4.3. Trends in expenditure in upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary educational institutions on staff compensation (2015 and 2023)

Expenditure per full-time equivalent student in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP, from all sources, by level of education, constant prices (2020=100)

	Expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student											
	All upper secondary educational institutions (general and vocational)			General upper secondary educational institutions			Vocational upper secondary educational institutions			Post-secondary non-tertiary educational institutions		
	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria[1]	-3.8	13 035	12 541	-5.8	11 422	10 765	-2.4	14 098	13 757	-8.3	2 059	1 889
Belgium[2]	4.3[d]	13 954[d]	14 560[d]	-4.2[d]	13 863[d]	13 277[d]	11.3[d]	14 015[d]	15 604[d]	m	x(2)	x(3)
Canada	-18.8	11 522	9 356	m	m	9 346	m	m	9 532	m	m	m
Chile	m	m	4 267	m	m	4 147	m	m	4 904	m	a	a
Colombia[3]	m	m	2 562[u]	m	m	2 302[u]	m	m	3 239[u]	m	m	3 425[u]
Costa Rica	m	m	4 201	m	m	4 207	m	m	4 189	m	a	a
Czechia	29.6	5 010	6 491	31.6	5 113	6 731	28.8	4 973	6 405	m	m	1 307
Denmark	m	m	8 585	m	m	6 456	m	m	11 770	m	m	a
Estonia	2.0	4 840	4 935	-1.2	4 746	4 687	6.2	4 997	5 306	19.5	4 968	5 935
Finland[2]	-3.1[d]	6 036[d]	5 847[d]	-9.3	6 567	5 953	-0.6[d]	5 839[d]	5 802[d]	m	x(8)	x(9)
France	-4.6	12 603	12 019	-2.9	12 087	11 733	-7.0	13 502	12 551	7.5	8 921	9 587
Germany[4]	18.5[d]	11 841	14 029[d]	14.9	10 951	12 581	20.8[d]	12 756	15 415[d]	12.6	8 955	10 087
Greece	-6.3	6 309	5 910	-4.2	5 586	5 352	-12.7	8 108	7 075	m	m	5 146
Hungary	-20.1	6 532	5 216	-13.8	5 434	4 683	-43.7	10 157	5 721	-58.0	12 643	5 313
Iceland	m	m	10 063	m	m	8 705	m	m	13 494	m	m	14 061
Ireland[5]	8.1[u]	6 717	7 264[u]	m	6 717	m	m	a	x(3)	69.1	3 999	6 762
Israel	21.6	6 000	7 293	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	0	1 566
Italy[2]	-5.2[d]	9 155	8 679[d]	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(2)	x(3)
Japan[2]	-6.5	8 644[d]	8 083	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(2)	x(3)
Korea	67.8	9 087	15 251	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(2)	x(3)	a	a	a
Latvia	73.8	5 085	8 835	18.6	5 217	6 189	43.7	4 889	7 027	148.8	5 552	13 812
Lithuania	45.8	4 662	6 799	35.7	4 833	6 558	76.6	4 210	7 433	79.8	4 214	7 576
Luxembourg[6]	14.8[d]	18 260	20 965[d]	18.3	17 229	20 380	13.1[d]	18 913	21 390[d]	142.7	1 822	4 423
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	a
Netherlands	5.4	11 085	11 678	21.8	8 724	10 626	-0.9	12 266	12 160	5.0	10 532	11 057
New Zealand[7]	m	m	7 591[u]	m	m	8 619[u]	m	m	4 216[u]	m	m	4 086[u]
Norway	-22.1	12 578	9 794	-19.9	12 200	9 767	-24.2	12 947	9 818	-13.4	10 377	8 989
Poland	2.2	5 242	5 358	10.1	4 435	4 882	-2.2	5 876	5 749	4.5	1 742	1 821
Portugal[2]	7.4[d]	7 591[d]	8 149[d]	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(2)	x(3)	m	x(2)	x(3)
Slovak Republic	33.5	4 800	6 410	36.4	3 912	5 336	30.9	5 291	6 928	27.4	5 292	6 741
Slovenia	11.4	6 128	6 823	7.8	6 936	7 477	14.0	5 709	6 509	m	a	a
Spain[8]	9.2	8 593[d]	9 385	6.2	8 370	8 885	15.0	9 053[d]	10 410	m	x(2)	a
Sweden	1.4	8 317	8 432	m	m	7 355	m	m	10 152	28.8	3 764	4 847
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	20.0	2 999	3 599	2.8	2 675	2 749	57.2	3 349	5 263	m	a	a

	Expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student											
	All upper secondary educational institutions (general and vocational)			General upper secondary educational institutions			Vocational upper secondary educational institutions			Post-secondary non-tertiary educational institutions		
	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023	Change between 2015 and 2023 (%)	2015	2023
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
United Kingdom	18.8	9 469	11 252	11.1	10 617	11 798	28.2	7 656	9 816	m	a	a
United States	m	11 461	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	7 752	m
OECD average	**10.9**	**8 432**	**9 105**	**m**	**m**	**8 520**	**m**	**m**	**9 507**	**m**	**m**	**m**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	4 618	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	a
Brazil[9]	m	m	2 740[d,u]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	-10.1	5 760	5 179	-4.1	5 315	5 099	-15.3	6 195	5 244	-24.6	26 638	20 095
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	a
Croatia	m	4 059	m	m	x(2)	m	m	x(2)	m	m	a	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	632	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	m
Romania[10]	33.3	3 333	4 444	-26.9	7 501	5 484	1758.7	197	3 667	34.3	1 247	1 675
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**10.8**	**8 039**	**8 693**	**6.8**	**7 802**	**8 246**	**101.8**	**8 476**	**9 166**	**32.6**	**6 823**	**7 441**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Columns showing expenditure on teaching staff are available for consultation online.
1. Excludes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary vocational institutions.
2. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions.
3. Excludes expenditure in independent private institutions.
4. Includes expenditure on lower secondary vocational institutions.
5. Excludes expenditure on independent private institutions.
6. Includes expenditure on short-cycle tertiary institutions.
7. Excludes expenditure in private institutions.
8. Data for 2015 include expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions.
9. Includes expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary institutions. Excludes expenditure in independent private institutions.
10. Excludes expenditure on non-teaching staff.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/83o9jl.


Chapter C5. How is tertiary education financed?

Highlights

- Expenditure per student in bachelor's, master's and doctoral educational institutions continues to differ widely across OECD countries, ranging from below USD 6 000 in Greece to more than USD 70 000 in Luxembourg.
- Public funding remains the main source of financing across the OECD for bachelor's, master's and doctoral educational institutions, accounting for 68% of total expenditure on average, although the share coming from government sources ranges from over 90% in Norway to 21% in the United Kingdom, reflecting differences in tuition fee policies and funding models.
- Research and development (R&D) represents around one-third of total expenditure across the OECD on bachelor's, master's and doctoral educational institutions, underlining the dual role of tertiary educational institutions in both teaching and research.

Figure C5.1. Expenditure on bachelor's, master's and doctoral educational institutions per full-time equivalent student, by source of expenditure (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP, including R&D



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
For data, see Table C5.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/h7ub2s.

Context

The expansion of tertiary education across OECD countries has widened access and increased attainment, while also increasing the resources needed to support quality, equity and financial sustainability. As student populations increase and public budgets come under strain from competing priorities such as health care, pensions and defence, countries are adopting increasingly diverse approaches to financing tertiary education. These differences reflect not only varying levels of public investment capacity, but also broader policy choices regarding tuition fees, cost-sharing arrangements and the respective roles of governments, households and other private actors in funding higher education.

At the same time, tertiary institutions fulfil multiple functions that extend beyond teaching. In many countries, tertiary educational institutions play a central role in research and innovation systems, meaning that a substantial share of expenditure is devoted to R&D activities. As a result, differences in expenditure per student across countries reflect not only differences in teaching costs, but also differences in institutional structures, research intensity and staffing profiles.

This chapter examines how tertiary education is financed across OECD and partner countries by analysing expenditure per student, the balance between public and private funding sources, differences across types of institutions, the role of R&D expenditure, and the distribution of spending within institutions. It also explores how expenditure patterns have evolved over time, highlighting the impact of demographic change, staffing developments and national policy priorities on tertiary education financing.

The analysis focuses mainly on bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent programmes, which enrol most tertiary students across OECD countries and provide a more comparable basis for analysis. However, as short-cycle tertiary programmes play an important role in some systems and may follow different funding arrangements, the data tables at the end of the chapter also include information on this level of education.

Other findings

- The distribution of expenditure within all tertiary institutions differs markedly across countries, with Ireland and Portugal concentrating over 70% of resources on teaching staff while at the other end of the scale, Luxembourg allocates 92% of its current expenditure to non-teaching staff and other current expenditure such as research and operational costs.
- Denmark and Sweden have above-average expenditure per student at bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent levels, and devote over 50% of this expenditure to R&D activities, the highest shares across OECD countries.
- Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom have well-developed government-backed student loan systems to support access to tertiary education and rely far more heavily on household expenditure than other OECD countries. This partly explains why they have higher than average expenditure per student at bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent levels.

Analysis

Expenditure by source of funding

Across OECD and partner countries, spending per student in tertiary education varies widely, both in terms of overall investment levels and the balance between public and private sources of funding, reflecting differences in funding models and tuition fee policies (Johnstone, 2004[1]; Židonė-Bylė and Krušinskas, 2025[2]). On average across the OECD, expenditure per full-time equivalent student in bachelor's, master's and doctoral programmes amounts to USD 16 405 from government sources and USD 7 780 from private and non-domestic sources (Figure C5.1). This latter category covers a range of funding sources, with households accounting for the largest share of private expenditure in most countries. Across OECD countries, household expenditure represents 19% of total tertiary expenditure on average, compared to 9% from other private entities and 5% from non-domestic sources (Table C1.6, available online).

Overall, the data reveal no strong correlation between the funding model and the level of expenditure per student across countries. Countries such as Greece, Romania and the Republic of Türkiye report relatively low levels of overall expenditure per student, combined with limited private and non-domestic contributions. In Greece, for example, total expenditure per student remains

below USD 6 000, with public funding accounting for about three-quarters of the total, indicating constrained overall investment in bachelor's, master's and doctoral programmes (Figure C5.1).

In contrast, Luxembourg and the Nordic countries have some of the highest overall expenditure per student and tend to rely heavily on public funding. Luxembourg records by far the highest total expenditure, at over USD 70 000 per student, with nearly 90% financed publicly. Similarly, Denmark, Norway and Sweden each spend over USD 31 000 per student, while private funding represents less than one-fifth of total expenditure. Finland and Iceland also show strongly public-oriented funding models, with private and non-domestic expenditure accounting for only around 12% of total spending (Figure C5.1). These patterns reflect the long-standing practices among Nordic countries of providing tertiary education with low or no tuition fees for domestic students, alongside well-developed public support mechanisms for students (see Figure C5.6 in (OECD, 2025[3])).

Other countries take a different approach and rely strongly on private and non-domestic funding to support high levels of expenditure. In the United Kingdom, total expenditure exceeds USD 34 000 per full-time equivalent student, close to 80% of which comes from private and non-domestic sources, the largest share among OECD countries with available data. This is largely driven by uncapped tuition fees for international students, while the figure for domestic students is likely to be lower given that their tuition fees are capped. Australia also combines high total expenditure in bachelor's, master's and doctoral programmes (over USD 32 000) with high private and non-domestic contributions, accounting for around 70% of the total. In Canada, where expenditure per student is similarly high, private and non-domestic funding slightly exceeds public funding, representing 54% of total expenditure (Figure C5.1).

In other countries where private and non-domestic sources play a dominant role, overall spending levels are more moderate. In Israel and Japan, such sources account for around 60% of total expenditure per full-time equivalent student. Chile, Korea and Latvia also rely comparatively heavily on private and non-domestic funding, which makes up more than half of total expenditure (Figure C5.1). In Chile, the state-guaranteed student loan ("Crédito con Aval del Estado", a low-interest financing scheme for higher education) is classified as private expenditure. In practice, however, the government typically pays in advance for the loan portfolios of higher-risk students, and also pays when students default. As a result, a significant share of what is recorded as private funding is ultimately borne by the government.

These differences in funding structures are closely linked to countries' tuition fee and student-support policies. Nordic countries combine low or no tuition fees with extensive public financial support for students, reflecting a model in which tertiary education is financed predominantly through progressive taxation. In contrast, Australia, Canada, England (United Kingdom), New Zealand and the United States rely more heavily on tuition fees and private contributions, often combined with well-developed student loan systems to support access. Other countries, including France, Germany and Switzerland, tend to combine moderate tuition fees with more targeted forms of public support. These different approaches illustrate the variety of policy choices countries make to balance financial sustainability, access and equity in tertiary education systems (OECD, 2025[3]).

Expenditure by type of institution

Expenditure per student also differs considerably according to the type of tertiary institution attended, reflecting the diversity of institutional profiles and funding arrangements within tertiary education systems (Figure C1.2). Today, on average across OECD countries, about half of 25-34 year-olds hold a tertiary qualification, compared with less than one-third of 55-64 year-olds, signalling a significant expansion of tertiary education (see Chapter A1 and the OECD Data Explorer – Education and Skills (OECD, 2026[4])). As access has expanded, some tertiary systems have also diversified their modes of provision (OECD, 2025[5]; Teixeira et al., 2022[6]), relying not just on public institutions, but also on government-dependent private and independent private institutions (see Box C5.1).

Box C5.1. Types of educational institutions

Educational institutions can be divided into two categories: **public** and **private**. An institution is classified as private if its overall control and management rest with a non-governmental organisation (e.g. a church, trade union, business enterprise or foreign or international agency) and if most of the members of its governing board are not selected by a public agency. Private institutions can be further divided into government-dependent and independent private institutions.


A **government-dependent private institution** is a private institution that receives 50% or more of its core funding from government agencies, or one whose teaching personnel are paid by a government agency or by the government directly.

An **independent private institution** is a private institution that receives less than 50% of its core funding from government agencies and whose teaching personnel are not paid by a government agency.

In most OECD countries with available data, expenditure per full-time equivalent student is higher in public institutions than in private institutions, reflecting their central role in delivering both teaching and research, as well as their access to core public funding streams. Where they exist, government-dependent private institutions often show lower levels of expenditure per student compared with public institutions. This is partly because they operate on a mix of public transfers and private resources and receive lower levels of direct public funding per student than public institutions. As a result, expenditure levels in these institutions are often lower than in the public sector (Figure C5.2).

Figure C5.2. Expenditure on bachelor's, master's and doctoral educational institutions per full-time equivalent student, by type of institution (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP, including R&D



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
For data, see Table C5.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/h7ub2s.

Expenditure per student in independent private institutions varies widely across countries. In some systems, they operate with relatively low expenditure per student but in contexts where these institutions are small, specialised or highly selective, expenditure per student can be comparatively high. This is the case for Belgium, where less than 1% of students are enrolled in independent private institutions and the exceptionally high expenditure per student (USD 68 644) corresponds almost exclusively to those enrolled in the College of Europe, which receives significant funding from the European Union. In contrast, in New Zealand, where independent private institutions enrol a similarly low share of students, expenditure is much more modest, at only USD 5 274 per student (Figure C5.2).

In Korea, a large share of students are educated in private institutions (OECD, 2025[5]). This is a well-established feature of this system: private institutions have historically played a central role in absorbing increasing demand for higher education. As a result,

private institutions are not marginal providers but a core component of the tertiary landscape. Despite its large enrolment share, expenditure per full-time equivalent student in independent private institutions is less than half that in public institutions (Figure C5.2. Figure C1.2). This reflects potential structural system characteristics: limited R&D activity may reduce per-student costs in private institutions, while public institutions may be more selective and offer a greater concentration of higher-cost programmes, which raises average expenditure levels.

Expenditure on research and development

R&D is a central component of tertiary education spending because it reflects the broader role of tertiary educational institutions as key producers of knowledge and innovation, not just as providers of teaching. Universities are among the main centres of public research in many OECD countries, contributing directly to scientific progress, technological development and innovation capacity. This dual function means that a significant share of expenditure per student is linked to activities that extend beyond instruction. In countries with strong research systems, such as the Nordic countries, tertiary institutions are closely integrated into national innovation ecosystems, supporting productivity growth and long-term economic development. For example, in Finland, three universities leading in the areas of science and technology, art and design, and business and economics were merged into Aalto University in 2010, which ranks high internationally in research and innovation collaboration (OECD, 2022[7]).


The extent of this dual teaching and research role varies significantly across countries, leading to differences in the share of expenditure devoted to R&D activities. On average across OECD countries, around one-third of total expenditure per student is related to R&D, amounting to USD 8 433, while USD 15 753 is devoted to teaching and other core educational activities. Countries with the highest overall spending per student also tend to allocate substantial resources to R&D. In Luxembourg, R&D expenditure reaches nearly USD 30 000 per student, reflecting the strong integration of research into its tertiary system. Denmark and Sweden show a similar pattern, with R&D expenditure representing a very large share of total spending (Figure C5.3).

In contrast, Bulgaria, Chile and Romania stand out for combining comparatively low overall levels of expenditure per student with very limited investment in R&D activities within tertiary institutions. In Bulgaria and Chile, R&D expenditure amounts to less than USD 1 000 per student, while in Romania it is almost negligible (USD 28 per student). It is important to note that these figures exclude R&D taking place outside of tertiary education institutions. In countries with dedicated public research institutes, these data do not capture the share of their public R&D undertaken in those institutes. For example, research activities in Bulgaria have historically been concentrated in public research institutes rather than universities (OECD, 2025[8]). This highlights how cross-country comparisons of R&D expenditure within tertiary educational institutions should be interpreted in light of the broader organisation of national research systems and the different roles assigned to universities and non-university research institutions (Figure C5.3).

Romania's R&D figures reflect its lower overall investment capacity, with very little and decreasing R&D expenditure in the public sector, leaving the country ranked 27th among the 27 EU Member States (European Commission, 2025[9]). Like Bulgaria, Romania inherited the Soviet model of organisation of the science system where universities were primarily teaching institutions and scientific research was undertaken in separate research institutes. After 1990, the number of R&D personnel in higher education increased slightly due to the new research mission of universities. As a member of the European Union (EU) since 2007, Romania participated in the EU-wide target to increase R&D to 3% of GDP but has not managed to attain its national objective. Recent trends show a decline with Romania having the lowest R&D intensity across the EU (European Commission, 2021[10]). In Chile, R&D expenditure is among the lowest in the OECD and fewer than 10% of large firms collaborate with universities, well below the OECD average of 29% (OECD, 2025[11]).

Figure C5.3. Expenditure on bachelor's, master's and doctoral educational institutions per full-time equivalent student, by expenditure component (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
For data, see Table C5.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/h7ub2s.

Distribution of current expenditure


Expenditure within tertiary educational institutions is distributed differently across countries, reflecting variations in institutional organisation, staffing structures and the balance between teaching, administration and other operational activities (Figure C1.4). On average across the EU25 countries, teaching staff account for 44% of current expenditure, non-teaching staff for 25% and other current expenditure for 31% (Figure C5.4).

In Ireland expenditure is strongly concentrated on teaching staff, with 85% of current expenditure devoted to teaching personnel, followed by Portugal (74%). In contrast, Luxembourg devotes a relatively large share of expenditure to non-teaching staff, with 63% of expenditure allocated to non-teaching personnel and only 8% to teaching staff. This reflects both the strong research orientation of the University of Luxembourg and the functional allocation rules used in reporting expenditure. In particular, the non-teaching category includes a large number of postdoctoral researchers, doctoral researchers, technical staff and administrative personnel, whose activities are classified under research or administration rather than teaching. There are also comparatively high shares of spending on non-teaching staff in Estonia (46%) and in Latvia (43%) (Figure C5.4).

In a number of countries, a substantial share of spending comes under the category of other current expenditure. This includes expenditure on materials, operational costs and contracted services obtained from external providers, such as building maintenance, ancillary services and facility rents. Italy, Korea and Saudi Arabia devote close to half of current expenditure to this category (Figure C5.4).

Figure C5.4. Distribution of current expenditure within public tertiary educational institutions (2023)

In per cent



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
2. Year of reference 2022.
For data, see Table C5.2 The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/h7ub2s.

Trends in expenditure per full-time equivalent student

Changes in expenditure per student are shaped not only by overall funding levels, but also by demographic changes and the distribution of resources across levels of education as well as policy priorities, labour-market conditions and institutional reforms. On average across the OECD, total expenditure per student in tertiary education increased by 10% between 2015 and 2023. Changes in staff compensation were generally more moderate, with expenditure on all staff compensation rising by 7% on average over that period (Figure C5.5).


Expenditure per student has evolved differently across OECD and partner countries between 2015 and 2023, reflecting differences in demographic trends, institutional funding, salary developments and investment priorities. Several Central and Eastern European countries recorded particularly strong growth in expenditure per student over the period. The largest increases were in Hungary, at 73%, and Slovenia, at 59%, followed by Lithuania, Poland and Korea where expenditure per full-time equivalent student rose by more than 30%. In Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Romania, the growth in staff compensation per student outpaced overall expenditure per student due to the declining student numbers in these countries, which may have led to smaller class sizes and higher unit costs, even as total staffing levels remained relatively stable (Figure C5.5).

In contrast, expenditure per student declined in several countries between 2015 and 2023. The largest falls were observed in Bulgaria (-29%) and Finland (-15%). In Luxembourg, all staff compensation per student increased over the period, while expenditure on teaching staff per student decreased. This reflects a shift in the staffing structure, with strong growth in postdoctoral and doctoral research staff, as well as other non-teaching staff, contributing to faster growth in expenditure on research and administrative functions than on teaching staff. Similarly, in Estonia, Korea and Lithuania, expenditure on teaching staff compensation grew much more slowly than overall staff expenditure, suggesting stronger growth in non-teaching or research-related personnel costs (Figure C5.5).

In Bulgaria, Finland and the United Kingdom, declining total expenditure per student was accompanied by substantial reductions in expenditure on staff compensation between 2015 and 2023. The largest fall for both categories of staff expenditure was in the United Kingdom where expenditure per student on teaching staff compensation fell by 46% and expenditure on all staff compensation fell by 45%. This fall is surprising given that expenditure per student only decreased by 9% in the United Kingdom over the same period (Figure C5.5).

Figure C5.5. Changes in expenditure per full-time equivalent student, by type of expenditure (2015 and 2023)

In per cent, expenditure on bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent educational institutions (including R&D)



1. Data include or exclude some categories, please refer to the source table for more information.
For data, see Table C5.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/h7ub2s.

Definitions

For the definition of expenditure on educational institutions, government expenditure on educational institutions, private expenditure on educational institutions and research and development, refer to Chapter C1.

Methodology

For an overview of the methodology based on the joint data collection by UNESCO, the OECD and Eurostat (UOE), see Chapter C1. For more detailed information, please refer to the OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics (OECD, 2018[12]). For country-specific notes, see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en.

Sources

For an overview of the data sources used based on the joint data collection by UNESCO, the OECD and Eurostat (UOE), refer to Chapter C1. For additional details, see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

References

European Commission (2025), *European Innovation Scoreboard 2025: Country Profile Romania*, European Commission, Brussels, https://ec.europa.eu/assets/rtd/eis/2025/ec_rtd_eis-country-profile-ro.pdf. [9]

European Commission (2021), "PSF review of the Romanian R&I System", *Background Report*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, https://doi.org/10.2777/38334. [10]

Johnstone, D. (2004), "The economics and politics of cost sharing in higher education: Comparative perspectives", *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 23/4, pp. 403-410, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2003.09.004. [1]

OECD (2026), *Data Explorer - Education and Skills*, http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/5q. [4]

OECD (2025), *Education and Skills in Bulgaria*, Reviews of National Policies for Education, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/ac0229da-en. [8]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en. [3]

OECD (2025), *OECD Economic Surveys: Chile 2025*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/efad96ce-en. [11]

OECD (2025), *The Financial Sustainability of Higher Education: Insights from Policy in OECD Countries*, Higher Education, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/f544ccfe-en. [5]

OECD (2022), *OECD Economic Surveys: Finland 2022*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/516252a7-en. [7]

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics 2018: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [12]

Teixeira, P. et al. (2022), "Competition and diversification in higher education: Analysing impacts on access and equity in the case of Portugal", *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 57/2, pp. 235-254, https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12501. [6]

Židonė-Bylė, G. and R. Krušinskas (2025), "Who pays, who graduates? Funding mechanisms and other drivers of graduation in the European Union", *Economies*, Vol. 13/12, p. 364, https://doi.org/10.3390/economies13120364. [2]

Chapter C5 Tables

Tables and notes

Table C5.1.	Expenditure on tertiary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023)
Table C5.2.	Distribution of expenditure within public tertiary educational institutions (2023)
Table C5.3.	Trends in expenditure in tertiary educational institutions on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (2015 and 2023)
WEB Table C5.4.	Expenditure on tertiary educational institutions as a percentage of GDP (2023)
WEB Table C5.5.	Expenditure on tertiary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student as a percentage of GDP per capita (2023)

StatLink https://stat.link/h7ub2s

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/h7ub2s.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **u** – partial data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)

Table C5.1. Expenditure on tertiary educational institutions per full-time equivalent student (2023)

Expenditure on educational institutions, including and excluding R&D, by level of education, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP

	Total (government, private and non-domestic expenditure)											
	Short-cycle tertiary (including R&D)					Bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent (including R&D)					Short-cycle tertiary (excluding R&D)	Bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent (excluding R&D)
	Public and private	Public	Private	Government dependent private	Independent private	Public and private	Public	Private	Government dependent private	Independent private	Public and private	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	13 850	39 397	2 133	x(3)	x(3)	32 368	34 032	13 893	x(8)	x(8)	12 086	21 654
Austria	23 492	24 907	17 187	x(3)	x(3)	28 745	31 935	19 464	x(8)	x(8)	23 492	16 231
Belgium	19 060	20 796	17 663	17 663	a	27 272	31 179	24 596	24 508	68 644	19 060	16 663
Canada	22 464	22 464	a	a	a	34 468	34 468	a	a	a	22 464	20 563
Chile	4 252	10 688	3 835	21 392	3 379	13 843	19 263	12 526	28 608	8 139	4 252	13 116
Colombia	m	m	m	a	m	m	m	m	a	m	m	m
Costa Rica	m	m	a	a	a	m	m	a	a	a	m	m
Czechia	37 633	43 438	13 096	13 096	a	16 542	17 754	6 413	6 550	6 371	37 633	10 283
Denmark	15 666	14 778	51 764	51 764	a	34 216	34 189	51 926	51 926	a	15 214	14 577
Estonia	a	a	a	a	a	22 077	22 890	7 967	a	7 967	a	12 849
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	21 179	31 836	11 180	11 180	a	a	11 065
France	23 668	m	m	m	m	23 172	m	m	m	m	23 668	14 995
Germany	9 641	16 029	9 139	x(3)	x(3)	24 773	27 383	10 735	x(8)	x(8)	9 641	13 960
Greece	a	a	a	a	a	5 890	5 890	a	a	a	a	3 672
Hungary[1]	23 109	7 560	23 580[d]	x(3)	x(3)	20 923	12 644	23 581[d]	x(8)	x(8)	23 109[u]	16 945[u]
Iceland[2]	24 010[d]	24 179[d]	22 991[u]	22 991[u]	a	24 010[d]	27 798[d]	12 869[u]	12 869[u]	a	m	m
Ireland[3,4]	x(6)	x(7)	a	a	a	25 576[d,u]	25 993[d]	6 152	a	6 152	x(6)	20 165[d,u]
Israel	5 662	6 278	5 555	5 256	6 001	20 797	646	24 000	24 383	22 135	5 662	14 329
Italy	4 551	a	4 551	a	4 551	15 553	16 882	10 711	a	10 711	4 551	10 627
Japan[5]	14 885[d]	x(1)	x(1)	m	x(1)	23 242[d]	x(6)	x(6)	m	x(6)	m	m
Korea	9 337	26 365	8 981	a	8 981	18 001	30 231	14 028	a	14 028	9 147	13 349
Latvia	18 365	19 526	17 034	20 712	12 198	16 667	a	16 667	18 368	8 337	18 177	12 056
Lithuania	a	a	a	a	a	18 175	19 652	7 889	a	7 889	a	12 508
Luxembourg[6]	9 406	9 406	a	a	a	70 510[u]	70 510	m	a	m	9 406	40 866[u]
Mexico	m	m	m	a	m	m	m	m	a	m	m	m
Netherlands	13 071	a	13 071	16 333	8 195	27 001	35 584	22 623	20 925	34 713	12 473	17 386
New Zealand	12 532	13 178	11 348	12 031	5 274	21 750	22 129	13 924	13 929	5 274	12 532	15 902
Norway	23 076	31 518	11 236	11 236	a	31 233	34 324	16 688	20 180	15 002	23 076	20 116
Poland	8 136	14 695	2 997	a	2 997	16 961	21 830	6 529	a	6 529	8 136	10 634
Portugal	11 317	13 590	4 531	a	4 531	16 914	17 883	13 017	a	13 017	11 317	12 075
Slovak Republic	13 419[u]	15 274	10 861[u]	10 861[u]	a	21 346[u]	22 602	8 863[u]	a	8 863[u]	13 419[u]	15 665[u]
Slovenia	10 951	10 183	13 941	14 360	13 790	25 589	26 391	19 372	18 547	20 546	10 951	19 969
Spain	14 440	16 457	10 131	x(3)	m	21 301	22 776	17 364	a	m	14 440	14 806
Sweden	8 099	7 737	8 215	8 341	6 292	32 299	32 288	32 446	32 446	a	8 099	14 807
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye[3]	x(6)	x(7)	x(10)	a	x(10)	11 311[d]	12 314[d]	6 890[d]	a	6 890[d]	x(6)	8 428[d,u]
United Kingdom	31 748	a	31 748	31 748	a	34 420	a	34 420	34 420	a	28 154	28 077
United States	m	m	m	a	m	m	m	m	a	m	m	m
OECD average	**15 772**	**m**	**13 721**	**m**	**m**	**24 186**	**25 631**	**16 669**	**m**	**m**	**15 206**	**15 753**

	Total (government, private and non-domestic expenditure)											
	Short-cycle tertiary (including R&D)					Bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent (including R&D)					Short-cycle tertiary (excluding R&D)	Bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent (excluding R&D)
	Public and private	Public	Private	Government dependent private	Independent private	Public and private	Public	Private	Government dependent private	Independent private	Public and private	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[3,4]	m	m	a	a	a	m	m	m	a	m	m	m
Bulgaria	a	a	a	a	a	14 332	13 045	25 271	a	25 271	a	13 617
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	a	m	m	m	m	a	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	a	a	a	a	a	13 332	14 427	4 549	a	4 549	a	13 304
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**15 531**	**m**	**14 517**	**m**	**m**	**23 348**	**25 253**	**16 539**	**m**	**m**	**15 458**	**14 989**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: columns showing government expenditure are available for consultation online

1. Expenditure for all institutions excludes expenditure by international sources. Expenditure for private institutions includes some expenditure outside educational institutions.
2. Expenditure on public educational institutions includes transfers from international sources to the government and to private educational institutions.
3. Expenditure on bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent includes non-R&D expenditure on short-cycle tertiary education.
4. Excludes central government expenditure on independent private institutions.
5. Expenditure on tertiary education includes some expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary education and some expenditure on upper secondary vocational education (KOSEN grades 1 to 3).
6. Expenditure on short-cycle tertiary education excludes payments from non-educational private entities to private institutions.
7. Excludes some local government expenditure.
8. Year of reference 2022.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/h7ub2s.

Table C5.2. Distribution of expenditure within public tertiary educational institutions (2023)

Expenditure from all sources within educational institutions, including R&D

	Distribution of current and capital expenditure (%)		Distribution of current expenditure by staff category (%)				Distribution of current expenditure by type of compensation (%)					Expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)
	Capital	Current	Teaching staff	Non-teaching staff	All staff	Other current expenditure	Salaries	Retirement pensions	Other non-salary staff compensation	All staff	Other current expenditure	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	9	91	30	29	59	41	47	7	5	59	41	17 139
Austria	7	93	57	9	66	34	65	0	0	66	34	18 678
Belgium	5	95	49	24	73	27	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	73	27	21 347
Canada[1]	8	92	35	30	65	35	54	x(9)	11[d]	65	35	18 071
Chile	8	92	27	35	62	38	62	0	0	62	38	10 487
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	5	95	x(5)	x(5)	75	25	26	8	42	75	25	13 311
Czechia	9	91	46	19	65	35	48	10	7	65	35	10 600
Denmark	5	95	x(5)	x(5)	64	36	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	64	36	19 567
Estonia	6	94	22	46	68	32	50	10	8	68	32	14 728
Finland	4	96	30	29	60	40	50	8	2	60	40	18 267
France	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Germany	10	90	x(5)	x(5)	67	33	m	m	m	67	33	16 628
Greece	44	56	60	19	78	22	50	9	19	78	22	2,573.8
Hungary	5	95	x(5)	x(5)	61	39	43	6	13	61	39	6 769
Iceland[2]	2[d]	98	41	27	67	33	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	67	33	18 141
Ireland	10	90	85	1	86	14	m	m	m	86	14	10 319
Israel	20	80	x(5)	x(5)	25	75	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	25	75	578
Italy	10	90	36	15	52	48	36	14	3	52	48	7 888
Japan	13	87	x(5)	x(5)	50	50	41	8	x(10)	50	50	16 329
Korea	16	84	24	28	52	48	48	1	3	52	48	12 752
Latvia	10	90	26	43	68	32	53	13	2	68	32	12 291
Lithuania[1]	19	81	33	39	71	29	68[d]	x(7)	3	71	29	11 136
Luxembourg[3]	1	99[u]	8[u]	63	71[u]	29	60	5	6	71[u]	29	41 195[u]
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	12	88	x(5)	x(5)	71	29	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	71	29	23 373
New Zealand	12	88	x(5)	x(5)	63	37	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	63	37	11 781
Norway	11	89	x(5)	x(5)	66	34	54	13	0	66	34	20 326
Poland	15	85	x(5)	x(5)	76	24	55	9	12	76	24	14 887
Portugal	8	92	74	0	74	26	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	74	26	10 018
Slovak Republic	16	84	30	24	54	46	40	6	8	54	46	10 215
Slovenia	13	87	x(5)	x(5)	74	26	64	6	4	74	26	15 370
Spain	15	85	55	20	75	25	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	75	25	13 665
Sweden	3	97	x(5)	x(5)	66	34	44	13	9	66	34	20 233
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye[4]	13	87[d]	x(5)	x(5)	76	24[d]	65	6	5	76	24[d]	8 665
United Kingdom	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
United States[5]	8	92	29	36	65	35	m	m	m	65	35	21 204
OECD average	**11**	**89**	**m**	**m**	**66**	**34**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**66**	**34**	**14 804**

	Distribution of current and capital expenditure (%)		Distribution of current expenditure by staff category (%)				Distribution of current expenditure by type of compensation (%)					Expenditure on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)
	Capital	Current	Teaching staff	Non-teaching staff	All staff	Other current expenditure	Salaries	Retirement pensions	Other non-salary staff compensation	All staff	Other current expenditure	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	4 101
Brazil	4	96	m	m	82	18	57	11	14	82	18	11 182
Bulgaria	9	91	56	25	81	19	70	7	4	81	19	9 595
China	20	80	x(5)	x(5)	55	45	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	55	45	3 713
Croatia[5]	10	90	x(5)	x(5)	71	29	68	0	3	71	29	8 561
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	7	93	x(5)	x(5)	61	39	58	0	3	61	39	7 538
Saudi Arabia	5	95	37	14	51	49	x(10)	x(10)	x(10)	51	49	8 282
South Africa	0	100	26	28	54	46	m	m	m	54	46	6 050
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**11**	**89**	**44**	**25**	**69**	**31**	**55**	**7**	**6**	**69**	**31**	**14 393**
G20 average	**10**	**90**	**m**	**m**	**61**	**39**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**61**	**39**	**11 693**

1. Current expenditure includes expenditure for retirement.
2. Capital expenditure includes expenditure on government-dependent private institutions.
3. Expenditure in short-cycle tertiary education lacks payments from non-educational private entities to private institutions.
4. Current expenditure includes expenditure for ancillary services.
5. Year of reference 2022.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/h7ub2s.

Table C5.3. Trends in expenditure in tertiary educational institutions on staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (2015 to 2023)

Expenditure from all sources within educational institutions including R&D, by level of education, constant prices (2020=100)

	Expenditure on all staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)								
	All tertiary			Short-cycle tertiary			Bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent		
	Percentage change between 2015 and 2023	2015	2023	Percentage change between 2015 and 2023	2015	2023	Percentage change between 2015 and 2023	2015	2023
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
OECD countries									
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	8.5	12 817	13 905	-1.7	14 967	14 714	11.0	12 408	13 770
Belgium	-7.8	16 099	14 839	0.1	12 817	12 826	-7.9	16 223	14 939
Canada	-8.3	15 831	14 515	-19.4	12 177	9 811	-0.8	17 617	17 485
Chile	m	m	4 525	m	m	1 803	m	m	5 399
Colombia[1]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	m	m	11 902	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	m	m	8 195	54.5	12 682	19 590	m	m	8 159
Denmark	m	m	16 702	m	m	8 984	m	m	17 592
Estonia	35.7	8 785	11 922	a	a	a	35.7	8 785	11 922
Finland	-17.0	12 968	10 764	a	a	a	-17.0	12 968	10 764
France	-6.7	14 973	13 974	-11.4	12 843	11 384	-5.9	15 658	14 738
Germany	2.4	12 379	12 680	m	m	5 117	2.6	12 380	12 698
Greece	14.0	1 884	2 147	a	a	a	14.0	1 884	2 147
Hungary	40.7	5 611	7 893	197.5	2 823	8 397	37.5	5 725	7 874
Iceland[2]	m	m	12 478	m	m	12 479	m	m	12 478
Ireland[3,4]	4.6[u]	8 169	8 547[u]	m	x(8)	x(9)	m	m	8 547[d,u]
Israel	-16.8	8 835	7 352	-22.6	2 312	1 789	-10.3	12 089	10 839
Italy	-18.5	7 304	5 955	-5.0	1 242	1 180	-17.7	7 328	6 029
Japan[5]	-4.5	9 459[d]	9 036	-7.9	6 412[d]	5 903	-4.9	10 275[d]	9 767
Korea	28.0	5 824	7 457	29.2	3 260	4 214	24.5	6 542	8 148
Latvia	41.8	5 719	8 109	79.6	5 895	10 586	36.2	5 690	7 753
Lithuania	51.0	5 708	8 618	a	a	a	51.0	5 708	8 618
Luxembourg[6]	13.1[u]	29 181	32 999[u]	-95.4[u]	21 290	975[u]	22.4[u]	30 070	36 813[u]
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	1.1	14 410	14 575	-19.3	8 158	6 582	2.9	14 436	14 851
New Zealand[7]	m	m	9 624[u]	m	m	4 216[u]	m	m	10 434[u]
Norway	-11.5	13 700	12 128	-14.3	10 488	8 989	-11.3	13 810	12 245
Poland	29.1	7 632	9 855	-69.9	16 378	4 931	29.4	7 620	9 857
Portugal	-19.9	9 312[d]	7 459	m	x(8)	5 558	-18.8	9 312[d]	7 558
Slovak Republic	m	m	8 351	82.9	5 361	9 805	m	m	8 328
Slovenia	33.8	9 006	12 049	103.3	2 635	5 359	29.2	9 930	12 828
Spain	0.9	9 531	9 618	3.1	8 364	8 620	0.9	9 824	9 913
Sweden	-8.1	18 025	16 562	-10.4	4 992	4 472	-5.0	19 112	18 153
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye[4]	15.6	5 742	6 636	m	x(8)	x(9)	15.6[d]	5 742[d]	6 636[d]
United Kingdom	-41.4	18 953	11 110	105.4	6 830	14 030	-45.4	20 044	10 934
United States	m	18 834	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
OECD average	**6.1**	**11 071**	**11 181**	**m**	**m**	**8 208**	**6.7**	**11 647**	**11 891**

	Expenditure on all staff compensation per full-time equivalent student (in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for GDP)								
	All tertiary			Short-cycle tertiary			Bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent		
	Percentage change between 2015 and 2023	2015	2023	Percentage change between 2015 and 2023	2015	2023	Percentage change between 2015 and 2023	2015	2023
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Partner and/or accession countries									
Argentina	m	3 686	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[3,4]	m	m	2 130[u]	m	m	m	m	m	2 130[d,u]
Bulgaria	-33.6	12 271	8 153	a	a	a	-33.6	12 271	8 153
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	5 487	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	582	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania[8]	36.0	4 162	5 661	m	a	a	36.0	4 162	5 661
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**9.6**	**10 759**	**11 252**	**m**	**9 318**	**8 530**	**10.1**	**11 075**	**11 752**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: averages only include countries with available data for both 2015 and 2023. Columns showing expenditure on teaching staff and total expenditure per student are available for consultation online.

1. Excludes some expenditure from private and international sources (web columns).
2. Excludes current expenditure from international sources (web columns).
3. Excludes current expenditure on independent private institutions.
4. Expenditure on bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent includes non-R&D expenditure on short-cycle tertiary education.
5. Expenditure on tertiary education includes some expenditure on post-secondary non-tertiary education and some expenditure on upper secondary vocational education (KOSEN grades 1 to 3).
6. Expenditure on short-cycle tertiary education excludes payments from non-educational private entities to private institutions.
7. Data refer to public institutions only.
8. Teaching staff expenditure includes expenditure on non-teaching staff in public institutions (web columns).

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/h7ub2s.

Part D. Teachers, the learning environment and organisation of schools

Chapter D1

This chapter is not included in this edition of Education of a Glance


Chapter D2. How do student-teacher ratios and class sizes vary across education levels?

Highlights

- Between 2015 and 2024, the ratio of children to teachers in pre-primary education fell by an average of 14% across OECD countries. This improvement resulted from a 14% increase in the number of teachers combined with a 2% decline in student enrolment.
- In primary education, the average student-teacher ratio across OECD countries fell slightly from 15:1 in 2015 to 14:1 in 2024. There is substantial cross-country variation in primary staffing in 2024, with ratios ranging from as low as 7:1 in Greece and 8:1 in Luxembourg to as high as 22:1 in Colombia and 23:1 Mexico.
- In lower secondary education, class size and student-teacher ratios are moderately positively correlated, although they reflect different dimensions of teaching resources. For example, Japan and the United States have similar student-teacher ratios (12:1 and 14:1), but average class sizes differ markedly, at 32 and 21 students respectively.

Figure D2.1. Changes in the ratio of children to teachers, number of children and number of teachers in pre-primary education (2015 to 2024)

In per cent



1. Year of reference differs from 2015.
2. Public institutions only.
3. Pre-primary includes early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01).

For data, see Data Explorer. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/po9vrb.

Context

Class sizes and student-teacher ratios are two key indicators closely monitored by policymakers, as both have a significant impact on educational expenditure, particularly through the cost of teacher salaries. These metrics provide important insights into the allocation of resources within education systems and their potential influence on the quality of the learning environment.

This chapter examines these indicators across multiple educational levels, from early childhood education (ECE) to tertiary education. At each stage, the nature of teacher-student interactions changes to reflect differences in pedagogical approaches and developmental needs. In ECE settings, for instance, the presence of auxiliary staff such as teachers' aides is common, supporting both instructional and caregiving roles and significantly influencing the child-to-staff ratio.

In light of current challenges – including demographic shifts, teacher shortages and budget constraints – it is essential to monitor these indicators and their evolution over time. These factors influence both the quality of education and the ability of systems to meet the diverse needs of students, requiring ongoing attention to ensure sustainable human resource planning.

Other findings

- Across OECD countries, student-to-teacher ratios remained relatively consistent across education levels, from an average of 14:1 in primary, 13:1 in lower and upper secondary and 15:1 in tertiary education. While these averages suggest overall consistency, national ratios vary significantly between educational stages, reflecting diverse institutional structures and policy priorities in the allocation of teaching staff.
- Average class sizes in primary education remained stable at 21 students across all institutions between 2015 and 2024, although diverging trends emerged in specific national contexts. In Israel and the United Kingdom, for instance, class sizes in the private sector rose while those in the public sector remained relatively stable.
- Class sizes increase on average to 23 students in lower secondary education, reflecting the transition from a generalist primary model to the subject-specialised instruction of secondary school. This upward trend is observed in the majority of countries, most notably in Costa Rica and Thailand, although some systems such as Australia and the United Kingdom show a decrease between these levels.

Note

Student-teacher ratios and class sizes measure very different characteristics of the educational system. Student-teacher ratios compare the number of students to the number of teachers at a given level of education and in similar types of institutions. This indicator provides information on the level of teaching resources available in a country relative to its student population, reflecting the human resources allocated, whether directly or indirectly, to children's education. This ratio is of importance from both administrative and economic standpoints as it is closely related to the amount of money spent per student.

In contrast, class sizes measure the average number of students that are grouped together in a classroom, which has greater significance from a psychological standpoint and is a more direct measure of the teaching resources brought to bear on a student's development. At higher levels of education, an individual student will often attend several different classes, depending on the subject area. This makes class sizes difficult to define and compare at these levels. Therefore, this indicator is limited to primary and lower secondary education.

Analysis

Student-teacher ratios and class sizes are essential indicators of the human resource investment in education. They provide a proxy for the intensity of the instructional relationship and the capacity of teachers to offer individualised support to their students (OECD, 2024[1]). For policymakers, these metrics are central to balancing educational quality with fiscal sustainability, as teachers' salaries represent the largest share of educational spending (see Chapter D3). Furthermore, staffing levels influence teachers' working conditions and student engagement, directly impacting the overall effectiveness and equity of school systems. As demographic shifts and teacher shortages continue to affect the organisation and allocation of teaching resources, monitoring how these ratios evolve is vital for sustainable human resource planning.

Staffing of early childhood education

Early childhood education and care (ECEC) profoundly influences children's educational, cognitive, behavioural and social development, both in the short and long term. As a foundational stage for lifelong learning and well-being, high-quality ECEC contributes to reducing inequalities and promoting inclusion from an early age. The quality of ECEC systems is influenced by a complex interplay of factors, including curriculum and pedagogy, staff education and training, workforce composition, staff-to-child ratios, and monitoring mechanisms at the system and setting level. These elements serve as key policy levers to enhance service quality and foster more equitable and inclusive environments (OECD, 2025[2]). Although no single indicator can fully capture the complexity of ECEC quality and the interactions between children and staff, workforce composition and staff-child ratios provide valuable insights into two essential dimensions of quality. The analysis that follows focuses on early childhood education (ECE), i.e. ECEC services that meet the criteria for ISCED level 0 (see Definitions section).

Child-to-staff and child-to-teacher ratios

The ratios of children to teachers and children to contact staff both provide insight into staff intensity but capture different aspects of provision. The child-to-teacher ratio refers to the number of children per qualified teacher, while the child-to-contact-staff ratio covers all staff members who work directly with children, including both teachers and teachers' aides. It is important to distinguish between the two, as they can lead to very different interpretations of staff availability in ECEC settings.

The intensity of staffing in early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01) is primarily driven by the developmental needs of children under the age of 3, who require more sensitive and individualised interaction (COFACE Families Europe, 2023[3]). On average across OECD countries, there are 10 children for every teacher at this level, but when all contact staff are taken into consideration, the ratio drops to an average of 5 children per staff member. These averages conceal significant variation across countries: the child-to-teacher ratio ranges from 3:1 in Iceland to as high as 47:1 in OECD partner country Peru. These differences often reflect different organisational models. Some systems rely on a small number of teachers leading teams of auxiliary staff. In the United Kingdom, for example, teachers' aides account for 91% of contact staff, resulting in a child-to-staff ratio of 3:1 despite a much higher child-to-teacher ratio of 32:1. Conversely, in countries like Lithuania, where the child-to-teacher ratio is a relatively low 8:1, teachers' aides make up a smaller share of the workforce, at only 39% (Table D2.1).

Child-to-teacher ratios in early childhood educational development programmes are slightly higher in private institutions than in public ones overall across OECD countries, although the differences between the two sectors remain relatively small. On average across OECD countries, public institutions report a ratio of 9 children per teacher, compared to 11 children per teacher for private institutions. However, differences between public and private institutions vary widely at the national level. For instance, in the United Kingdom, the ratio in public settings is 25:1 compared to 33:1 in private ones, while in Chile, public institutions maintain a very low ratio of 2:1 against 8:1 in the private sector. Conversely, in Peru the trend is sharply reversed, with public institutions reporting 72 children per teacher compared to 13 in private settings. These variations often reflect distinct national approaches to ECE organisation. For instance, public provision may be subject to stricter minimum staffing regulations, while the private sector often operates under different funding models or workforce requirements (Table D2.1).

In pre-primary education (ISCED 02), which typically serves children from age 3 until they start primary school, staffing ratios are generally higher than in early childhood educational development, reflecting the transition toward more formalised pedagogical approaches. On average across OECD countries, the child-to-teacher ratio in pre-primary education is 13:1, while the ratio of children to all contact staff is 9:1. Cross-country differences remain substantial, with child-to-teacher ratios ranging from 5:1 in Iceland to 22:1 in France and 33:1 in the United Kingdom. Teachers' aides in pre-primary education make up an average of 37% of contact staff, which is lower than the 49% in ISCED 01 programmes on average across OECD countries. This reduced reliance on auxiliary staff at the pre-primary level may reflect the fact that older children generally require less intensive care and supervision than younger children (Table D2.1).

Differences in staffing patterns between public and private institutions tend to be smaller at pre-primary level than in early childhood educational development provision. On average across OECD countries, the child-to-teacher ratio is the same for both public and private institutions, at 13:1. This may reflect the more formalised nature of pre-primary education, where regulatory frameworks and staffing requirements tend to be more comparable across sectors. Nevertheless, significant disparities persist at the national level. In Colombia, public institutions report 29 children per teacher compared to just 11 in the private sector, whereas in France, the trend is reversed with public settings maintaining a lower ratio (21:1) than private ones (27:1) (Table D2.1). These differences may reflect different national policy priorities and the degree to which private institutions receive public funding or are integrated into the formal school system. Unlike early childhood educational development, pre-primary systems are often more

closely aligned with primary school structures, which can lead to more standardised staffing formulas in the public sector, while some private providers may use lower ratios as a specific pedagogical or market-based choice.

Trends in child-to-teacher ratios

The allocation of human resources to pre-primary education has seen notable changes over the past decade, with the child-to-teacher ratio falling by 14% across the OECD between 2015 and 2024 (Figure D2.1). This downward trend reflects the fact that the teaching workforce has grown while student enrolment has fallen slightly. Specifically, the number of teachers increased by 14% on average, while the number of children enrolled fell by 2%. In several OECD countries, declining birth rates and broader demographic changes have contributed to lower enrolment pressures, creating opportunities to reduce child-to-teacher ratios despite ongoing challenges related to teacher shortages and workforce ageing (OECD, 2024[4]). In some countries, the number of teachers in pre-primary education has grown substantially faster than the number of children enrolled, contributing to marked declines in child-to-teacher ratios. In Croatia, national reforms aimed at expanding access to early childhood education and facilitating the recruitment of additional kindergarten staff (Euridyce, 2026[5]) meant the number of teachers increased by around 31% while enrolment only increased by 8%. Similarly, in Greece, the teaching workforce expanded by 52% as enrolment grew by 9% following the progressive extension of compulsory pre-primary education (EASNIE, 2026[6]).


However, the downward trend was not universal, as several countries experienced increasing child-to-teacher ratios during the same period. These increases occur when the number of students grows faster than the number of teachers, or when teacher numbers contract while enrolment remains stable or grows. In the United States, the ratio rose by 7% as the number of teachers fell by 11%, a decline that exceeded the 5% drop in student numbers (Figure D2.1).

Primary school teachers play a pivotal role in children's cognitive, emotional and social development (Jowett et al., 2023[7]; Rucinski, Brown and Downer, 2018[8]). In most OECD countries, primary schools typically follow a generalist model, where a single teacher covers several subjects with the same group of students, allowing for sustained interactions and stronger relational continuity. This daily proximity enables teachers to respond more effectively to individual learning needs and foster a supportive classroom climate. Lower student-to-teacher ratios in primary education can enhance these interactions by giving teachers more time and flexibility to engage with each student (Werler and Tahirsylaj, 2020[9]).

On average across OECD countries, the ratio of students to teaching staff in primary education was 14:1 in 2024, a slight decrease from the 15:1 recorded in 2015. Despite this relative stability, there is considerable variation between countries, reflecting diverse national policy priorities and demographic contexts (OECD, 2024[4]). In 2024, student-teacher ratios ranged from fewer than 10 students per teacher in Greece (7:1), and Luxembourg (8:1) to as many as 22 in Colombia and Peru or 23 in Mexico. Most countries cluster between 11:1 and 16:1, suggesting a widespread policy aim to maintain staffing levels that support relational continuity and sensitive interactions during children's foundational years of cognitive and emotional development (Figure D2.2).

Over the past decade, trends highlight significant shifts in human resource allocation across several systems. The most pronounced declines in student-teacher ratios occurred in Bulgaria, where the ratio fell from 18:1 to 10:1, and in Mexico from 27:1 to 23:1. These reductions typically reflect faster growth in the teaching workforce than in student enrolment. In contrast, a small number of countries experienced increasing ratios during this period. For example, in Lithuania, Peru and the United Kingdom, the ratio rose by 3 or more students per teacher. Such increases may reflect challenges in teacher recruitment or shifts in demographic trends that outpace growth in the teaching workforce (Figure D2.2).

Figure D2.2. Trend in the ratio of students to teaching staff in primary education (2015 and 2024)



1. Year of reference differs from 2024.
2. Year of reference differs from 2015.
3. The reform of the modular structure in adult education (Flemish Community), introduced in 2023-2024, changed the reporting methodology for student enrolments in adult education programmes, resulting in a break in the time series.
For data, see Table D2.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/po9vrb.

The student-to-teacher ratio in primary education is particularly significant due to the generalist nature of the teaching model. Lower ratios allow more time and flexibility to respond to individual learning needs and foster a supportive classroom climate. Conversely, higher ratios – such as those observed in Brazil (22:1), India (27:1), Mexico (23:1) and South Africa (26:1) – may limit the opportunities for such individualised attention (Figure D2.2). Student-to-teacher ratios are therefore closely monitored as an indicator of the human resources allocated to education systems. However, reducing these ratios often requires substantial investment through increased teacher recruitment and salary expenditures, making it one of the costliest education policy options and raising broader questions about how resources can be allocated most effectively across competing educational priorities.

Staffing of lower and upper secondary education

Teachers in lower secondary education often act as a bridge between the generalist approach of primary education and the subject specialisation of upper secondary levels. They support students during early adolescence, a critical period for social and emotional development, while introducing more structured academic expectations. In some educational systems, lower secondary teachers are trained to teach multiple subjects and maintain continuous interactions with a consistent group of students, which can help strengthen teacher-student relationships and provide stability as students adapt to more complex school environments. Recent research has shown that such sustained interactions contribute positively to students' social participation and sense of belonging (Schürer, van Ophuysen and Marticke, 2025[10]).

Upper secondary teachers, in contrast, are typically subject specialists who work with older students preparing for higher education or the labour market. Their instructional role is more academic or vocational, depending on the educational track, and their relationships with students tend to be more formal and content focused. Given the segmented nature of upper secondary education – where teachers often see many different student groups each day – opportunities for individualised support are more

limited. In this context, student-teacher ratios can influence the capacity of teachers to provide personalised guidance and monitor learning effectively.

On average across OECD countries, the student-to-teacher ratio at lower secondary level is 13:1, a figure which has remained stable since 2015. However, there is significant cross-country variation in OECD and partner countries, ranging from 28:1 in South Africa and 31:1 in Mexico to 8:1 in Croatia, Greece and Norway. Notable changes in staffing intensity have occurred over the last decade, like in Bulgaria, where the ratio fell from 13:1 in 2015 to 9:1 in 2024. Some countries like the Slovak Republic experienced the opposite trend, with the ratio rising from 12:1 to 16:1 over the same period. Changes such as these typically reflect differences in the pace of growth of the teaching workforce relative to student enrolment (Table D2.2).

At upper secondary level, the student-to-teacher ratio is also 13:1 on average across OECD countries, but this masks different arrangements of teaching resources within national systems. Several OECD countries report a lower ratio at upper secondary level than at lower secondary; most strikingly in Mexico, where it falls significantly, from 31:1 in lower secondary to 22:1 in upper secondary. Conversely, in Finland, the ratio nearly doubles, from 9:1 in lower secondary to 17:1 in upper secondary (Table D2.2). This reflects Finland's inclusion-oriented education model, where extensive support services, special-needs provision and individualised learning require higher staffing levels at lower secondary level. The Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2024 found that over half of Finnish teachers work in schools with substantial special-needs populations, and collaborative support structures are widespread (OECD, 2025[11]).

Although average ratios at this level have also been almost stable between 2015 and 2024, individual OECD countries have faced different pressures. In Latvia, the student-to-teacher ratio in upper secondary education increased from 10:1 to 14:1, and in Lithuania and Poland, it rose by 2 students per teacher. In contrast, Chile saw a reduction in the ratio from 23:1 to 18:1 at upper secondary level, while in Türkiye the ratio fell by 3 students per teacher (Table D2.2).

Staffing of post-secondary education

Post-secondary non-tertiary

Post-secondary non-tertiary education often serves as a bridge between upper secondary and tertiary education or the labour market, resulting in a diversity of programme structures and staffing arrangements across countries. These programmes frequently combine theoretical instruction with vocational or work-based learning components, which can influence student-to-teacher ratios depending on the level of practical training and individual supervision required. The analysis of student-to-teacher ratios and their trends at post-secondary non-tertiary level should be interpreted with caution, as programmes at this level remain highly heterogeneous across countries and, in some cases, enrol only very small numbers of students. In countries such as Bulgaria, Colombia, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, post-secondary non-tertiary programmes are relatively limited in scope, which can lead to particularly volatile or atypical ratios. In contrast, this level of education is more developed in countries such as Germany, Greece, Hungary, New Zealand and Poland, where student-to-teacher ratios may provide a more stable picture of programme organisation (OECD, 2026[12]).

On average across OECD countries, the student-to-teacher ratio at this level was 18:1 in 2024, an increase from 17:1 in 2015. Poland reports one of the highest student-to-teacher ratios among OECD countries at 60:1 (Table D2.2). This comparatively high ratio may partly reflect the organisation of *szkoła policealna* programmes, which are largely vocationally oriented, frequently attended by adult learners and often delivered through flexible or part-time forms of provision (Eurydice, 2025[13]; Cedefop and Educational Research Institute, 2023[14]).

Tertiary

In tertiary education, the student-to-teacher ratio provides a measure of the academic resources available to students in increasingly diverse and complex learning environments. The ratios are shaped by a broad spectrum of tertiary teaching models, with research-intensive and laboratory-based instruction typically requiring lower ratios than large-scale undergraduate lectures (OECD, 2025[15]). On average across OECD countries, the ratio stands at 15:1, a similar level as in 2015 at 16:1. This average, however, masks considerable variation across systems; Luxembourg reports the lowest ratio at 4:1, while Greece is an outlier with a ratio of 54:1. High staffing ratios are also prominent in partner countries such as Brazil (29:1) and Peru (28:1). Between 2015 and 2024 there have been some notable shifts: Brazil experienced an increase in its ratio from 23:1 to 29:1, whereas Lithuania saw its ratio fall from 16:1 to 11:1, reflecting more effective expansion of the teaching workforce relative to student enrolment (Table D2.2).

Class sizes

While student-to-teacher ratios provide a system-level measure the overall teaching resources available, class sizes are a more direct measure of students' day-to-day learning environment and their interactions within the classroom. Class sizes continue to be a key concern for schools, education authorities and policymakers and can influence school choice among parents. Smaller classes are generally perceived as enabling teachers to provide more individualised attention, reduce the time they spend on classroom management and align their instruction better to students' learning needs. Although the overall evidence on the direct impact of class size on student performance remains mixed (OECD, 2016[16]), many systems continue to prioritise it as a policy lever to support teaching and learning, particularly for disadvantaged students, with evidence suggesting that smaller classes may provide more targeted support for students in disadvantaged contexts (Charpentier, 2026[17]).

In response to these concerns, countries have implemented a range of policies aimed at addressing class sizes, especially in contexts of educational disadvantage. In France, class sizes have been reduced in early primary education in schools located in priority education areas, as part of a broader effort to address educational inequality (Blouet, Charpentier and Odin-Steiner, 2020[18]). Ireland has adopted similar measures through its Delivering Equality of Opportunity in Schools (DEIS) programme, which includes lower staffing ratios in schools serving disadvantaged communities (Government of Ireland, 2020[19]). These strategies reflect a shared policy rationale that smaller classes may help improve learning conditions and support equity.

Over the past decade, many education systems have been influenced by two concurrent trends: a decline in the school-age population and increasing concerns about teacher shortages (see Chapter 1, Teacher shortages and the attractiveness of the teaching profession). Although these dynamics may seem to offset each other – fewer students could imply reduced pressure on staffing needs – the relationship is more complex. In many countries, declining student numbers have coincided with the ageing of the teaching workforce, creating significant replacement needs despite lower enrolment. Combined with difficulties in recruiting and retaining qualified teachers, particularly in rural areas and in specific subject areas, and in some cases a tight labour market that increases competition for qualified workers, this has limited the extent to which demographic change has translated into lower staffing requirements (see Box 2 and Table 7 of Chapter 1). As a result, average class sizes have generally remained stable and, in some contexts, have even increased despite declining enrolment.

On average across OECD countries, the average class size at the primary level remained remarkably stable between 2015 and 2024, at 21 students per class for all institutions. This overall stability extends to both public and private sectors, with public institutions averaging 21 students per class and private institutions averaging 20 students over the period. However, this aggregate stability masks significant cross-country differences and contrasting national trends. While many education systems maintained relatively stable average class sizes, notable reductions were observed in Brazil, France and Denmark. Across public and private institutions combined, average class sizes decreased from 23 to 20 students in Brazil, from 24 to 21 students in France, and from 22 to 19 students in Denmark. Conversely, Lithuania and Mexico experienced increases, with Lithuania's average rising from 16 to 19 students per class and Mexico's from 22 to 23 (Table D2.3).

The trends for both public and private institutions combined largely reflect changes in the public sector, which accounts for the vast majority of primary enrolment in most OECD countries. In Brazil, for instance, the overall decline in class size was primarily driven by the public sector, where the average fell from 24 to 21 students. In Lithuania, the increase in the national average was almost entirely a result of public sector trends, where class sizes rose from 16 to 19, while the private sector remained relatively stable (Table D2.3).

In some countries, private sector trends diverged significantly from the public sector. In Latvia, the overall average class size rose, from 16 to 18 students per class, while private institutions experienced a substantial increase from 9 to 12. A similar divergence was observed in the United Kingdom, where the average class size in private primary schools rose from 23 to 25, even as those for public institutions remained stable at 27 (Table D2.3).

Across OECD countries, average class sizes increase as students progress from primary to lower secondary education, from 21 to 23 students per class. This upward trend is observed in the majority of countries, with the most pronounced increase in Costa Rica and Thailand, where the average class size grows respectively by 16 and 13 students between the two levels. However, this pattern is not universal; in Australia, Hungary and the United Kingdom, the average number of students per class actually falls as students move into lower secondary education (Table D2.3).

There is significant variation across countries, particularly at the lower secondary level where average class sizes range from 18 students in Croatia, Latvia and Poland to 31 in Chile, 32 in Japan and 36 in Thailand. On average across OECD countries, the average class size in lower secondary education remained stable at 23 students per class between 2015 and 2024. This aggregate stability masks significant cross-country differences, with Korea experiencing a reduction from 30 to 26 students, as well as the

United States with a decrease from 27 to 21 students, while the United Kingdom saw a striking increase from 19 to 24 students per class (Table D2.3).

As is the case at primary level, national trends in class sizes are predominantly shaped by the public sector, which accounts for the largest share of lower secondary enrolment. In Korea and Mexico, the overall reduction in class size was mirrored in both public and private institutions, suggesting system-wide impacts of policy reforms or demographic shifts. Similarly, in the United Kingdom, national increases were driven by both sectors, with classes in public institutions increasing from 20 to 25 students and those in private institutions from 18 to 23. However, in some contexts, the private sector exhibited divergent patterns. In Latvia, while public class sizes rose moderately from 15 to 17, the private sector saw a sharp increase from 12 to 20 students per class. Such variations suggest that while public policy often sets the broad trend, private institutions may respond independently to different funding models or pedagogical priorities (Table D2.3).

Class sizes and student-teacher ratios


In lower secondary education, student-teacher ratios and average class sizes provide complementary insights into the allocation of teaching resources. While student-teacher ratios measure the total number of teachers relative to the student population, class sizes capture how students are actually grouped for instruction. Figure D2.3 illustrates a moderate positive correlation between these two indicators, suggesting that systems with more students per teacher often also employ larger class groupings. However, the relationship is not uniform because class size also depends on how teaching time and instruction time are organised. For example, a system may combine relatively high student-to-teacher ratios with smaller classes if teachers spend more time teaching or if students receive fewer instruction hours. Conversely, lower ratios do not necessarily translate into small classes when teachers have reduced teaching loads, when instruction time is extensive, or when additional staff are used for specialised support rather than regular classroom teaching. National policy choices regarding teacher working time, student instruction hours, and the use of teaching assistants or specialist teachers therefore shape the extent to which student-to-teacher ratios translate into actual class sizes.

The variation across countries is substantial, reflecting different ways of organising teaching resources and classroom instruction. Japan and the United States report broadly similar student-teacher ratios in lower secondary education with 12:1 and 14:1 respectively (Table D2.2), but average class sizes differ markedly, reaching 32 students per class in Japan compared to 21 in the United States (Table D2.3). Data show that these differences may be linked to how teachers' working time is organised (see Chapter D4, Table D4.1). Across OECD countries, teachers spend around half of their working time on non-teaching activities, including lesson preparation, marking, administrative work and collaboration with colleagues. Japan is characterised by particularly long overall working hours and a high workload outside classroom teaching, with teachers spending considerable time on planning, school activities and administrative responsibilities (OECD, 2025[20]). At the same time, Japan has been promoting smaller class sizes and implementing reforms to reduce teachers' non-teaching duties, highlighting that the allocation of staff resources depends not only on class size but also on policy choices regarding teachers' responsibilities.

A contrasting pattern emerges in Korea and Mexico, where average class sizes are relatively similar (26 and 25 students respectively), but student-teacher ratios differ sharply. Mexico reports the highest student-teacher ratio in the OECD at 31:1, compared to 14:1 in Korea (Figure D2.3). Evidence indicates that Korean teachers spend comparatively fewer hours on direct classroom teaching but more time on administrative tasks, lesson preparation and student support activities (see Chapter D4, Table D4.1). This suggests that Korea employs more teachers relative to the student population not necessarily to reduce class sizes, but to support a broader range of instructional and non-instructional responsibilities. These contrasts underline how class size and student-teacher ratios capture different dimensions of educational resources and should therefore be interpreted jointly.

At the opposite end of the scale, several European countries prioritise high staffing intensity through both small classes and low student-teacher ratios. Croatia, Latvia and Poland combine some of the smallest average class sizes in the OECD (18 students per class) with low student-to-teacher ratios ranging from 8:1 to 10:1. In contrast, France and the United Kingdom maintain larger classes (26 and 24 students respectively) alongside above-average student-to-teacher ratios (15:1 and 17:1) (Figure D2.3).

Figure D2.3. Student-teacher ratio and average class size in lower secondary education (2024)



1. Year of reference for student-teacher ratio differs from 2024.
2. Year of reference for class size differs from 2024.
3. Data come from the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS).
4. Public institutions only.

For data, see Table D2.2 and Table D2.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/po9vrb..

Definitions

Class size is defined as the number of students who are following a common course of study, based on the highest number of common courses (usually compulsory studies), and excluding teaching in subgroups.

Early childhood education (ECE): ECEC services in adherence with the criteria defined in the ISCED 2011 classification (see ISCED 01 and 02 definitions) are considered early childhood education programmes and are therefore referred to as ECE in this chapter. Therefore, the term ECE excludes programmes that do not meet the ISCED 2011 criteria.

Teachers' aides and teaching research assistants include personnel or students who support teachers in providing instruction to students.

Teaching staff refers to personnel directly involved in teaching to students. The classification includes classroom teachers, special-education teachers and other teachers who work with a whole class of students in a classroom, in small groups in a resource room, or in one-to-one teaching situations inside or outside a regular class.

Methodology

The ratio of students to teaching staff is obtained by dividing the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students at a given level of education by the number of FTE teachers at that level and in similar types of institutions. Exceptionally, for early childhood educational development (ISCED 01) and pre-primary education (ISCED 02), this ratio is based on headcounts of children and

FTE teachers due to the complexities arising from the lack of standardised study load criteria, variability in full-time enrolment hours, and the absence of a universally accepted FTE calculation methodology for students at this level.

For the ratio of students to teachers to be meaningful, consistent coverage of personnel and enrolment data are needed. For instance, if teachers in religious schools are not reported in the personnel data, then students in those schools must also be excluded.

Class size is calculated by dividing the number of students enrolled by the number of classes. In order to ensure comparability among countries, special needs programmes are excluded. Data include only regular programmes at primary and lower secondary levels of education and exclude teaching in subgroups outside the regular classroom setting.

Sources

Data refer to the reference year 2024 (school year 2023/24) and are based on the UNESCO-UIS/OECD/Eurostat data collection on education statistics administered by the OECD in 2025/26. For more information see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes,* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

The UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) provided some data for Argentina, the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and Thailand.

References

Blouet, L., A. Charpentier and D. Odin-Steiner (2020), "Dédoublement des classes de CP en éducation prioritaire : exploitation des enquêtes auprès des enseignants après deux années de déploiement"*, Note D'Information*, No. 20.15, DEPP, https://archives-statistiques-depp.education.gouv.fr/Default/doc/SYRACUSE/45798/dedoublement-des-classes-de-cp-en-education-prioritaire-exploitation-des-enquetes-aupres-des-enseign. [18]

Cedefop and Educational Research Institute (2023), *VET in Europe database – Poland: system description*, https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/en/tools/vet-in-europe/systems/poland-u3. [14]

Charpentier, A. (2026), "Réduction de la taille de classe en éducation prioritaire: Que nous apprennent les données de la DEPP?"*, Synthèse de la DEPP*, No. 8, DEPP, https://www.education.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/document/r-duction-de-la-taille-de-classe-en-ducation-prioritaire-que-nous-apprennent-les-donn-es-de-la-depp--478949.pdf. [17]

COFACE Families Europe (2023), "High-quality early childhood education and care: Low children-to-staff ratio as a primary driver for children's well-being and families' engagement"*, COFACE Thematic Note*, COFACE Families Europe, https://coface-eu.org/thematic-note-on-high-quality-early-childhood-education-and-care/. [3]

EASNIE (2026), *Country information for Greece - Legislation and policy*, European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, https://www.european-agency.org/country-information/greece/legislation-and-policy. [6]

Euridyce (2026), *Croatia - National reforms in early childhood education and care*, European Commission, https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia/croatia/national-reforms-early-childhood-education-and-care. [5]

Eurydice (2025), *Poland - Organisation of post-secondary non-tertiary education*, European Commission, https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia/poland/organisation-post-secondary-non-tertiary-education. [13]

Government of Ireland (2020), *DEIS Delivering Equality of Opportunity in Schools*, Department of Education and Youth, https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-education/policy-information/deis-delivering-equality-of-opportunity-in-schools/. [19]

Jowett, S. et al. (2023), "Teacher–student relationship quality as a barometer of teaching and learning effectiveness: Conceptualization and measurement", *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 93/3, pp. 842-861, https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12600. [7]

OECD (2026), *OECD Data Explorer - Ratio of students to teaching staff by type of institution*, OECD. [12]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en. [15]

OECD (2025), *Reducing Inequalities by Investing in Early Childhood Education and Care*, Starting Strong, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b78f8b25-en. [2]

OECD (2025), "Results from TALIS 2024: Finland", *Country Note*, OECD, https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/results-from-talis-2024-country-notes_e127f9e2-en/finland_ab17fae3-en.html (accessed on 15 May 2026). [11]

OECD (2025), "Results from TALIS 2024: Japan", *Country Note*, OECD, https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/results-from-talis-2024-country-notes_e127f9e2-en/japan_b48b1dd7-en.html. [20]

OECD (2024), *Education at a Glance 2024: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/c00cad36-en. [1]

OECD (2024), "How are demographic changes affecting education systems?", *Education Indicators in Focus*, No. 87, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/158d4c5c-en. [4]

OECD (2016), *PISA 2015 Results (Volume II): Policies and Practices for Successful Schools*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264267510-en. [16]

Rucinski, C., J. Brown and J. Downer (2018), "Teacher–child relationships, classroom climate, and children's social-emotional and academic development.", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 110/7, pp. 992-1004, https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000240. [8]

Schürer, S., S. van Ophuysen and S. Marticke (2025), "Social participation in secondary school: The relation to teacher-student interaction, student characteristics and class-related variables", *Social Psychology of Education*, Vol. 28/1, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-024-09992-2. [10]

Werler, T. and A. Tahirsylaj (2020), "Differences in teacher education programmes and their outcomes across Didaktik and curriculum traditions", *European Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 45/2, pp. 154-172, https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1827388. [9]

Chapter D2 Tables

Tables and notes

Table D2.1	Ratio of children to staff in early childhood education (ECE), by level of education and type of institution (2024)
Table D2.2	Trends in the ratio of students to teaching staff, by level of education (2015 and 2024)
Table D2.3	Trends in average class size at primary and lower secondary education by type of institution (2015 and 2024)

StatLink https://stat.link/po9vrb

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/po9vrb.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2026: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes,* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Table D2.1. Ratio of children to staff in early childhood education (ECE), by level of education and type of institution (2024)

	Share of teachers' aides among contact staff (%)	Children to contact staff (teachers and teachers' aides)	Children to teaching staff				Share of teachers' aides among contact staff (%)	Children to contact staff (teachers and teachers' aides)	Children to teaching staff			
			All institutions		Public institutions	Private institutions			All institutions		Public institutions	Private institutions
	2024	2024	2015	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2015	2024	2024	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	46	5	9	9	9	10	41	8	13	13	13	13
Belgium	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	15	13	13	13
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile	28	5	12	7	2	8	61	7	25	18	14	21
Colombia[1]	62	11	m	28	28	m	39	14	33	23	29	11
Costa Rica	m	m	9	5	3	7	m	m	13	10	11	7
Czechia	a	a	a	a	a	a	10	11	13	12	12	11
Denmark[1]	43	3	5	5	5	12	43	6	11	10	9	m
Estonia	m	m	x(9)	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	m	m	9[d]	8[d]	8[d]	10[d]
Finland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	10	8	8	11
France[1]	a	a	a	a	a	a	36	14	24	22	21	27
Germany	13	4	5	5	4	5	15	7	10	9	9	9
Greece[1]	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	8	11	8	7	13
Hungary	31	5	10	7	7	11	48	7	12	13	13	12
Iceland	a	3	3	3	3	3	a	5	5	5	4	6
Ireland[1]	a	x(8)	x(9)	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	a	7[d]	8[d]	7[d]	10[d]	7[d]
Israel	m	m	m	m	a	m	m	m	m	m	17	m
Italy	m	m	a	m	m	m	a	11	13	11	10	15
Japan	a	a	a	a	a	a	10	10	15	11	8	11
Korea	m	m	5	5	5	5	m	m	15	12	10	13
Latvia[1]	m	m	8	5	5	5	m	m	10	11	10	16
Lithuania	39	5	10	8	8	8	33	6	11	9	9	5
Luxembourg	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	9	11	9	9	8
Mexico	76	5	44	22	18	28	a	18	25	18	19	14
Netherlands	a	a	a	a	a	a	22	16	21	21	16	23
New Zealand	m	m	6	5	4	5	m	m	10	9	10	9
Norway	59	3	9	6	6	7	59	5	16	11	11	12
Poland	a	a	a	a	a	a	m	m	15	13	13	13
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	17	16	15	18
Slovak Republic	a	a	a	a	a	a	5	11	12	12	12	10
Slovenia	40	5	13	8	8	8	40	9	19	14	15	13
Spain	m	m	9	9	8	10	m	m	15	11	11	14
Sweden	59	5	m	12	12	16	55	6	m	13	13	16
Switzerland	a	a	a	a	a	a	m	m	m	m	18	m
Türkiye	a	a	m	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	a	18	17	18[d]	19[d]	13[d]
United Kingdom[1]	91	3	34	32	25	33	87	4	39	33	25	35
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	26	12	15	16	20	12
OECD average	**49**	**5**	**12**	**10**	**9**	**11**	**37**	**9**	**15**	**13**	**13**	**13**

	Share of teachers' aides among contact staff (%)	Children to contact staff (teachers and teachers' aides)	Children to teaching staff				Share of teachers' aides among contact staff (%)	Children to contact staff (teachers and teachers' aides)	Children to teaching staff			
			All institutions		Public institutions	Private institutions			All institutions		Public institutions	Private institutions
	2024	2024	2015	2024	2024	2024	2024	2024	2015	2024	2024	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	37	8	14	13	13	13	17	15	20	18	19	17
Bulgaria[1]	a	a	a	a	a	a	m	m	12	11	11	8
China	a	a	a	a	a	a	m	m	20	13	13	13
Croatia	m	m	9	7	7	8	m	m	13	11	11	13
India	a	a	a	a	a	a	m	m	m	12	m	m
Indonesia[1]	m	m	21	m	m	m	m	m	13	15	m	m
Peru	37	30	9	47	72	13	20	15	18	19	23	13
Romania	5	12	37	13	13	10	5	13	16	14	14	10
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	10	16	18	13
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	29	16	m	23	24	10	5	23	m	24	27	19
EU25 average	**34**	**6**	**12**	**8**	**8**	**9**	**29**	**9**	**14**	**12**	**12**	**13**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**18**	**16**	**16**	**16**

1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Bulgaria, Colombia, France and Greece; 2017 for Indonesia, Latvia and the United Kingdom; and 2018 for Denmark and Ireland.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/po9vrb.

Table D2.2. Trends in the ratio of students to teaching staff, by level of education (2015 and 2024)

	Primary		Lower secondary		Upper secondary		Post-secondary non-tertiary		Tertiary	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
OECD countries										
Australia	15	14	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	12	12	9	9	10	10	12	13	14	15
Belgium[1]	13	12	9	9	10	9	16	7	22	23
Canada	17[d]	16[d]	x(1)	x(2)	13	13	m	m	m	m
Chile	21	17	22	19	23	18	a	a	m	m
Colombia[2]	24	22	26	23	26	23	31	30	31	26
Costa Rica	13	11	14	12	14	13	a	a	m	m
Czechia	19	18	12	12	11	11	21	16	23	17
Denmark	12	12	11	11	12	13	a	a	18	14
Estonia	13	12	10	10	15[d]	16[d]	x(5)	x(6)	14	10
Finland	14	12	9	9	16	17	18	19	15	16
France[2]	20	18	14	15	11	11	18	15	16	14
Germany	15	15	13	13	13	12	13	13	12	11
Greece	m	7	m	8	m	10	15	18	m	54
Hungary	11	11	11	11	11	11	14	11	15	11
Iceland	11	10	10	11	m	13[d]	m	x(6)	m	8
Ireland[3]	16	13	x(5)	x(6)	14[d]	14[d]	m	6	20	19
Israel	15	15	12	12	11	11	m	m	m	14
Italy	12	11	12	10	12	11[d]	m	x(6)	20	19
Japan	17	15	14	12	12[d]	11[d]	x(5)	x(6)	m	m
Korea	19	16	17	14	15	12	a	a	m	m
Latvia	11	13	8	10	10	14	23	36	19	16
Lithuania	10	14	7	10	8	10	16	7	16	11
Luxembourg	11	8	11	9	11	9	m	7	8	4
Mexico[2]	27	23	34	31	23	22	a	a	17	17
Netherlands	17	16	16	16	18	16	a	17	15	13
New Zealand	16	16	16	17	13	13	20	24	17	17
Norway	10	10	10	8	10	10	13	17	10	9
Poland	11	13	10	10	10	12	14	60	15	13
Portugal	14	13	10	10	10[d]	9[d]	x(5)	x(6)	14	13
Slovak Republic	17	14	12	16	14	14	14	11	13	12
Slovenia	16	11[d]	8	x(2)	13	14	a	a	17	12
Spain	14	12	12	11	11	10	a	a	13	12
Sweden	13	12	12	11	14	13	10	10	10	10
Switzerland[3]	16	15	12	12	12[d]	12[d]	x(5)	x(6)	15	14
Türkiye	18	18	17	14	14	11	a	a	22	22
United Kingdom[2]	17	20	15	17	17	m	a	a	16	14
United States	15	14	15	14	15	15	x(9)	x(10)	14[d]	13[d]
OECD average	**15**	**14**	**13**	**13**	**14**	**13**	**17**	**18**	**16**	**15**
Partner and/or accession countries										
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	25	22	25	21	24	22	25	33	23	29
Bulgaria[2]	18	10	13	9	12	12	4	2	12	10
China	16	16	12	13	16	14	m	m	m	m
Croatia	14	11	9	8	10	8	a	a	13	11
India[4]	31	27	30	19	33	21	m	m	24	26
Indonesia[2,4]	14	20	14	21	14	20	m	m	30	33
Peru	18	22	9[d]	20	x(3)	20	a	a	m	28
Romania	19	18	12	11	14	13	70	51	19	19

	Primary		Lower secondary		Upper secondary		Post-secondary non-tertiary		Tertiary	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Saudi Arabia	9	14	8	14	8	14	m	m	20	31
South Africa[4]	30	26	m	28	m	32	m	m	m	m
Thailand[2]	17	15	25	21	28	20	m	m	25	20
EU25 average	**14**	**13**	**11**	**11**	**12**	**12**	**19**	**18**	**16**	**15**
G20 average	**19**	**18**	**18**	**17**	**16**	**16**	**m**	**m**	**20**	**21**

1. The reform of the modular structure in adult education (Flemish Community), introduced in 2023-2024, changed the reporting methodology for student enrolments in adult education programmes, resulting in a break in the time series.
2. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Bulgaria, Colombia, France, Indonesia and Thailand; and 2017 for Mexico and the United Kingdom.
3. Includes only public institutions.
4. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2023 for India, Indonesia and South Africa.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/po9vrb.

Table D2.3. Trends in average class size in primary and lower secondary education, by type of institution (2015 and 2024)

Calculations based on number of students and number of classes

	Primary						Lower secondary					
	Public institutions		Private institutions		All institutions		Public institutions		Private institutions		All institutions	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	23	23	25	23	24	23	22	22	24	19	23	20
Austria	18	19	19	19	18	19	21	21	21	21	21	21
Belgium[1,2]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	19	19
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile	28	27	31	32	30	30	29	29	31	33	31	31
Colombia	24	24	18	17	23	22	31	29	24	22	29	27
Costa Rica	15	14	17	16	15	15	28	30	21	20	27	28
Czechia	21	20	15	15	21	20	22	22	19	15	22	22
Denmark	22	20	22	17	22	19	21	20	20	18	21	19
Estonia	19	19	15	15	19	18	18	20	15	16	18	20
Finland	19	19	17	18	19	19	20	19	20	21	20	19
France	23	21	25	24	24	21	25	25	26	27	25	26
Germany	21	21	21	20	21	21	24	24	24	22	24	23
Greece	17	16	20	22	17	17	21	21	23	24	21	22
Hungary	21	23	21	21	21	22	21	20	21	20	21	20
Iceland	19	19	15	14	19	19	21	21	13	16	20	21
Ireland	25	22	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Israel	28	28	24	26	27	27	29	31	24	26	28	30
Italy	19	18	19	18	19	18	21	20	21	21	21	20
Japan	27	26	29	28	27	26	32	32	33	33	32	32
Korea	23	21	28	27	23	21	30	26	29	25	30	26
Latvia	16	18	9	12	16	17	15	17	12	20	15	18
Lithuania	16	19	14	15	16	19	19	22	19	19	19	22
Luxembourg	15	15	20	21	16	16	19	18	19	21	19	19
Mexico	22	23	20	20	22	23	28	26	24	22	28	25
Netherlands	m	23	m	23	m	23	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	19	19	12	13	19	18	23	18	17	13	22	18
Portugal	21	20	21	19	21	20	22	21	24	23	23	22
Slovak Republic	18	19	17	18	18	19	19	21	18	18	19	21
Slovenia	19	18	20	17	19	18	20	21	21	19	20	21
Spain	21	20	25	23	22	21	25	24	26	26	26	25
Sweden	19	21	17	19	19	20	21	22	22	21	21	22
Switzerland[3]	19	19	m	m	m	m	19	19	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	22	23	18	19	22	23	25	23	19	18	25	23
United Kingdom	27	27	23	25	26	26	20	25	18	23	19	24
United States	22	21	18	16	21	20	28	22	20	15	27	21
OECD average	**21**	**21**	**20**	**20**	**21**	**21**	**23**	**23**	**22**	**21**	**23**	**23**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	24	21	18	16	23	20	28	25	24	23	27	25
Bulgaria[1]	21	20	13	14	21	20	22	21	11	13	22	20
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia[1]	17	16	8	15	17	16	19	18	6	14	19	18

	Primary						Lower secondary					
	Public institutions		Private institutions		All institutions		Public institutions		Private institutions		All institutions	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	13	m	17	m	14	m	22	m	23	m	23
Romania	m	20	m	16	m	19	m	20	m	16	m	20
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	19	m	21	m	20	m	37	m	31	m	36
EU25 average	**19**	**19**	**18**	**18**	**19**	**19**	**21**	**21**	**19**	**20**	**21**	**21**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Bulgaria and Croatia; and 2018 for Belgium.
2. Data come from the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS). In TALIS, class size refers to the number of students enrolled in a specific "target class" reported by teachers.
3. Only public institutions included.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/po9vrb.

Chapter D3. How much are teachers and school heads paid?

Highlights

- In most OECD countries, the statutory salaries of teachers increase with the level of education they teach. On average across OECD countries and economies, the salaries of teachers with the most prevalent qualifications with 15 years of experience range from USD 60 437 at pre-primary level to USD 68 928 at upper secondary level.
- Between 2015 and 2025, statutory salaries for both starting teachers and for teachers with 15 years of experience increased in most countries, and usually at a faster rate for starting salaries. On average across OECD countries and economies with comparable data from 2015 to 2025 for primary and secondary teachers with the most prevalent qualification, salaries for those with 15 years of experience increased by 6-7% while starting salaries increased by 18-20% over the same period.
- On average, teachers' actual salaries at primary and general secondary levels of education are 87-95% of the average earnings of tertiary-educated workers across OECD countries. School heads' actual salaries are usually higher than those of tertiary-educated workers.


Context

Pay and working conditions are important factors for attracting, developing and retaining skilled and high-quality teachers (see Chapter 1, *Teacher shortages and the attractiveness of the teaching profession*). Teachers' salaries, in absolute terms and relative to those of other professions, can have a direct impact on the attractiveness of teaching as a career, although other aspects can also be influential, such as opportunities for professional development, administrative workloads and how teachers are perceived (OECD, 2023[1]). They can influence individuals' decisions on whether to enrol in teacher education, to become a teacher (Nagler, Piopiunik and West, 2020[2]) and to remain in teaching (Qin, 2020[3]). In general, the higher teachers' relative salaries are, the more attractive the profession, and they are a key indicator in the Sustainable Development Goal 4 Indicators (SDG4) monitoring framework (Indicator 4.c.5) (see SDG 4 Dashboard,https://www.oecd.org/en/data/dashboards/monitoring-sdg-4.html). Salaries and career prospects can also have an impact on the decision to become and remain a school head (see Box D3.2 in *Education at a Glance 2025* (OECD, 2025[4])). Relatively low salaries for school heads may discourage teachers from taking on the role (Pont, Nusche and Moorman, 2008[5]).

The salaries of school staff, particularly teachers and school heads, represent the largest single cost in formal education (Part C). Although competitive salaries are a factor in improved learning outcomes of students (OECD, 2020[6]), they are not the only factor. As such, it is important for policy makers to carefully consider the salaries and career prospects of teachers and school heads to ensure both high-quality education systems and sustainable education budgets.

Figure D3.1. Actual salaries of lower secondary teachers and school heads relative to earnings of tertiary-educated workers (2025)

Ratio of salaries to the earnings of full-time, full-year workers aged 25-64



Note: Data refer to the ratio of annual average salaries (including bonuses and allowances) of teachers and school heads in public institutions relative to the earnings of workers with similar educational attainment (weighted average) and to the earnings of full-time, full-year workers with tertiary education. Earnings of workers with similar educational attainment to teachers are weighted by the distribution of teachers (or school heads) by qualification level (see Tables X2.10 and X2.11). As values close to one may be difficult to identify in the figure, please refer to the source table.
1. Data on earnings for full-time, full-year workers with tertiary education refer to the whole country.
2. Year of reference for salaries of teachers differs from 2025.
For data, see Table D3.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/z15uv3.

Other findings

- Teachers' salaries can range quite widely within countries, as different qualification levels can be associated with different salary scales. For lower secondary teachers, the average salary for teachers at the top of the scale and with the maximum qualifications is 75% higher than the average starting salary for those with the minimum qualifications.
- School heads' statutory salaries vary to a similar extent to teachers' salaries: at the primary and secondary levels maximum salaries are 70-75% higher than minimum salaries. However, school heads' actual salaries are more than 50% higher on average than those of teachers across these levels in OECD countries.
- Actual salaries for teachers increased by 17% in real value between 2015 and 2025 for primary and secondary levels. In countries where salaries fell in real terms, this was mainly due to inflation as nominal salaries still increased.
- Teachers' relative salaries (actual salaries as a percentage of the earnings of tertiary-educated workers) fell very slightly (by 1 percentage point) between 2015 and 2023 at primary and secondary levels, but this masks significant variation across countries resulting from differences in the growth rates of teachers' salaries and tertiary-educated workers' earnings.
- Financial compensation for participating in mentoring programmes or supporting new teachers is paid in around half of all countries, but the decision to take up a mentoring role can rely on more than financial considerations. Intrinsic motivations might also play role, such as the value of collaboration or taking more of a leadership role.

Note

Statutory salaries are just one component of teachers' and school heads' total compensation. Other benefits, such as regional allowances for teaching in remote areas, family allowances, reduced rates on public transport and tax allowances on the

purchase of instructional materials may also form part of their total remuneration. In addition, there are large differences in taxation and social benefits systems across OECD countries. There can also be substantial variation in the salary scales of teachers and school heads at subnational level in some countries, based on local factors such as the cost of living (Box D3.1). This should be kept in mind when analysing teachers' salaries and making cross-country comparisons, along with potential comparability issues related to the data collected – see Box D3.1 of Education at a Glance 2019 (OECD, 2019[7]), Box D3.2 of Education at a Glance 2023 (OECD, 2023[8]) and *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en) – and the fact that the data collected only cover public educational institutions.

All figures expressed in USD are converted from national currencies based on exchange rates that are adjusted for differences in purchasing power across countries (see *Methodology* section).

Analysis

Teachers' salaries

Teachers' salaries can vary according to a number of factors, including their qualification levels, the level of education taught, and how much experience they have and what stage of their career they are in. They can also vary within countries if statutory salaries and compensation structures are defined at the subnational level (Box D3.1).

Statutory salaries

Teachers may enter the teaching profession with the minimum qualification or a higher qualification which may be associated with a higher salary. In about two-fifths of OECD countries and economies, teachers with the most prevalent qualification (to enter the teaching profession) have the same salary range as those with the minimum qualification required to become a teacher. In countries with different salary ranges for different qualification levels, very few teachers may hold the minimum or maximum qualifications (Annex 2, Table X2.9). For this reason, the comparative analysis on statutory salaries focuses on teachers who hold the most prevalent qualifications. However, data on teachers' statutory salaries are collected for three qualification levels (minimum, most prevalent and maximum), available in the OECD Data Explorer. Data on teachers' salaries at secondary level are collected only for teachers in general programmes although, exceptionally, the data for upper secondary teachers in vocational programmes were analysed in Box D3.3 in *Education at a Glance 2023* (OECD, 2023[8]).

For a given level of qualification, teachers' salaries vary according to years of experience. The OECD data collection on teachers' salaries gathers information on statutory salaries at four points on the salary scale: starting salaries, salaries after 10 years of experience, salaries after 15 years of experience and salaries at the top of the scale. The analysis usually concentrates on the salaries of teachers with 15 years of experience as a proxy for mid-career teachers.

Teachers' statutory salaries vary widely across countries. The salaries of lower secondary teachers with the most prevalent qualifications after 15 years of experience range from less than USD 30 000 in Argentina and the Slovak Republic to more than USD 100 000 in Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands (Table D3.1).

Typically, teachers' salaries increase with the level of education they teach. On average across OECD countries and economies, the salaries of teachers (with the most prevalent qualifications after 15 years of experience) range from USD 60 437 at pre-primary level to USD 64 349 at primary level, USD 66 583 at lower secondary level and USD 68 928 at upper secondary level (Table D3.1).


Salary differences between levels of education vary across countries. Notably, upper secondary teachers in Finland (with the most prevalent qualifications after 15 years of experience) earn 42% more than pre-primary teachers, and in Mexico, they earn 68% more. In Finland, these higher salaries at upper secondary level can be explained by the fact that upper secondary teachers need higher qualifications than pre-primary teachers (for information on the most prevalent qualification see Table D.D3.3 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en). In Mexico, the difference is mainly driven by the fact that teachers at upper secondary level have a different salary structure to those at other levels. In

contrast, teachers in about one-quarter of OECD countries and economies with available data earn the same salary irrespective of the level of education taught (Table D3.1).

Teachers' salaries usually increase with each year of experience. On average, it takes about 21 years for lower secondary teachers (with the most prevalent qualification to enter the profession in 2025) to progress from the starting level to the top of the salary scale. In Canada, Colombia, New Zealand and Scotland (United Kingdom), salary scales are compressed to at most 10 years from starting to top of scale salaries (that is, faster salary progression over a few years), while others have more extended salary scales which give teachers more incentive to serve for longer. These different approaches mean teachers' salaries increase at different rates in different countries. For example, for lower secondary teachers in both Ireland and the Netherlands, statutory salaries at the top of the salary scale are about double the starting salaries (for those with the most prevalent qualification to enter the profession in 2025) but it will take a teacher in Ireland on average 35 years to reach the top of the scale, compared to only 12 years for their counterpart in the Netherlands (OECD Data Explorer (OECD, 2026[9]) and Figure D3.6).

Figure D3.2. Lower secondary teachers' average actual salaries compared to the statutory minimum and maximum salaries (2025)

Annual salaries of teachers in public institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for private consumption



Note: Actual salaries include bonuses and allowances.
1. Minimum and maximum salaries refer to actual salaries instead of statutory salaries.
2. Year of reference for actual salaries differs from 2025.
For data, see Table D3.3 and OECD Data Explorer. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/z15uv3.

Looking at the full range of statutory salaries (where the minimum is the starting salary for teachers with the minimum qualifications and the maximum is the salary at the top of the scale for teachers with the maximum qualifications), on average the maximum teacher's salary in lower secondary education is 75% higher than the minimum across countries and economies. However, the difference varies greatly across countries, from about 4% more in Hungary to nearly four-fold in Colombia (Figure D3.2). Maximum

salaries are at least double minimum salaries in 13 other countries and economies. These differences may signal differences in salary structures. For instance, Hungary has only one salary range irrespective of teachers' qualifications (but with some differentiation between teachers with a bachelor or a master qualification), while Colombia has different salary ranges for teachers with different qualification levels.

In most countries and economies where minimum salaries are below the OECD average, the maximum salaries are also below the OECD average. At lower secondary level, a notable exception is Colombia, where minimum salaries are 27% lower than the OECD average, but maximum salaries are 61% higher. These differences may reflect the different career paths available to teachers with different qualifications (Figure D3.2).

The difference between maximum salaries (which may only apply to a very small proportion of teachers) and the salaries of teachers with the most prevalent qualifications and 15 years of experience, also varies across countries. At lower secondary level, the gap between these two groups is less than 10% in nine countries and economies (Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, New Zealand, Poland, Romania and Scotland [United Kingdom]) while it exceeds 60% in five others (Chile, Colombia, France, Mexico and Portugal) (Figure D3.2 and Table D3.1).

Box D3.1. Subnational variations in teachers' and school heads' salaries at pre-primary, primary and secondary levels

Teachers' statutory salaries can vary significantly within countries, especially in federal countries where salaries may be defined at the subnational level. Differences in statutory or actual salaries can result, at least partly, from differences in the cost of living between subnational entities. Data provided by four OECD countries (Belgium, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States) illustrate these variations at the subnational level.

The size of subnational differences in statutory salaries varies across these four countries (depending on the level of education and the stage teachers have reached in their careers) which may be related to the large difference in the size of these countries. In 2025, the starting salaries for primary teachers differed by about 6% (USD 2 949) in Belgium, from USD 52 227 per year in the French Community to USD 55 176 in the Flemish Community. The largest differences were in Canada and the United States: starting salaries for primary school teachers varied in Canada by 51% (USD 25 031) across subnational entities (from USD 48 762 in Quebec to USD 73 793 in the Northwest Territories) and in the United States by 52% (USD 22 575), ranging from USD 43 669 in North Carolina to USD 66 244 in California. Starting salaries in secondary education also varied the least in Belgium (by 6%, from USD 52 227 in the French Community to USD 55 176 in the Flemish Community at lower secondary level) and the most in the United States (by 67% at lower secondary level, from USD 43 562 in North Carolina to USD 72 664 in New York) (OECD, 2026[9]).

Subnational differences in statutory salaries remain consistent across levels of education in Belgium, Canada (apart from at pre-primary level) and the United Kingdom, but differ for different stages of teachers' careers in Canada and the United Kingdom. In Belgium, the variation in statutory salaries between subnational entities ranges from 6% to 9%. In the United Kingdom, the variations are similar at different levels of education, but greater across subnational entities in starting salaries than in salaries at the top of the scale. For example, at lower secondary level, starting salaries in the United Kingdom vary by 27% (USD 12 677) between subnational entities (from USD 46 357 to USD 59 034), but the difference narrows to 16% (USD 11 849, from USD 71 887 to USD 83 736) at the top of the scale. In Canada, the variations are similar at primary and secondary levels but also differ between career stages. The difference between subnational entities reaches 51% (USD 25 031) for starting salaries and 54% (USD 36 944) for salaries after 10 years of experience, but then narrows to 40% (USD 29 989) for salaries after 15 years of experience and at the top of the salary scale. In the United States, there is no clear pattern in the size of the variation of statutory salaries across subnational entities at different stages of teachers' careers and levels of education. At lower secondary level, the difference is the smallest for starting salaries and the widest for salaries after 15 years of experience, which range from USD 56 568 to USD 108 821 (a difference of 92%, or USD 52 253) rather than for salaries at the top of the scale. The differences in salaries after 15 years of experience across subnational entities are largest at primary level (a difference of 99%) and smallest at upper secondary level (a difference of 83%).

There are also large subnational variations in the actual salaries of teachers and school heads across the three countries with available data in 2025. In Belgium, subnational variation in actual salaries is less than 16% for all levels of education for both teachers and school heads, and greater for school heads than for teachers. For example, at upper secondary level, teachers' salaries in Belgium range from USD 90 115 in the French Community to USD 95 233 in the Flemish Community, a difference of 6%, or USD 5 118. In comparison, school heads' salaries range from USD 125 594 in the French Community to USD 144 487 in the Flemish Community, a difference of 15%, or USD 18 893. Subnational variations in actual salaries were slightly bigger for teachers at lower and upper secondary levels in the United Kingdom and at upper secondary for teachers and at primary level for school heads in the United States, where the average salaries of primary school heads ranged from USD 87 502 in West Virginia to USD 180 545 in New York, a difference of 106%, or USD 93 043.

The extent of the subnational differences in teachers' and school heads' actual salaries also varies according to level of education. In the United Kingdom, the subnational variation in school heads' salaries is largest at pre-primary level, while for teachers the variation is greater at the secondary level. In the United States, subnational variation in the average actual salaries of school heads was greater at primary level than at lower and upper secondary levels.

Source: Education at a Glance Database, http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s

Actual salaries

Teachers' actual salaries include all work-related payments, such as the base salary (as defined in the statutory salary scale), results-related bonuses, extra pay for teaching overtime, holidays, allowance for performing certain tasks and other additional payments (see *Definitions* section). For example, Czechia has implemented a range of allowances, including additional payments for student counselling and payments for performing additional tasks upon completion of the relevant professional development activities, and these payments are at the discretion of the school head. In Switzerland, such allowances are less frequent or replaced by alternative benefits – training student teachers leads to a reduction in teaching time, for example. In 2025, the average actual salaries of teachers aged 25-64 were USD 56 334 at pre-primary level, USD 62 942 at primary level, USD 65 499 in general programmes at lower secondary level and USD 69 255 in general programmes at upper secondary level (Table D3.3).

Bonuses and allowances can be a significant addition to statutory salaries. At lower secondary level, 31 countries and economies have data available on both the statutory salaries of teachers with the most prevalent qualifications after 15 years of experience (a proxy for mid-career salaries) and the actual average salaries of 25-64 year-old teachers. In more than two-fifths of these countries, actual average salaries are at least 10% higher than statutory salaries, which may reflect the importance of bonuses and allowances in the compensation system for teachers in these countries. Actual salaries are over 25% higher than statutory salaries (after 15 years of experience) in Costa Rica (62%), Czechia (33%), Lithuania (26%), Poland (34%) and the Slovak Republic (43%) (Table D3.1 and Table D3.3).

Comparing teachers' actual salaries to minimum and maximum statutory salaries also gives an indication of the distribution of teachers between the minimum and maximum salary levels. For example, at lower secondary level in Norway, the actual salaries of 25-64 year-old teachers are 13% higher than the minimum statutory salaries, which is the smallest difference among countries with available data on both measures for the same reference year (Figure D3.2). This may be due to the relatively small range of statutory salaries in the country (Table D3.1), combined with smaller additional allowances than in other countries. Meanwhile, actual salaries are higher than the statutory salary at the top of the scale in nine countries. The largest differences between these actual and statutory salaries among countries with comparable data are in Costa Rica and Poland, where actual salaries are at least 28% higher than the maximum statutory salaries, suggesting that allowances have a substantial effect on teachers' take-home pay (Figure D3.2 and Table D3.8, available online).

Trends in statutory salaries

Nearly two-thirds of OECD countries have comparable data on the statutory salaries of teachers for both 2015 and 2025 for at least one level of education, based on teachers with the most prevalent qualifications after 15 years of experience. During this period, teachers' statutory salaries increased in real terms (that is, in constant 2015 prices) in one-half to three-fifths of these

countries depending on the level of education. On average across OECD countries and economies with comparable data, statutory salaries increased by about 7% at primary level, 6% at lower secondary level (general programmes) and 7% at upper secondary level (general programmes), rewarding those who had stayed in the teaching profession (Table D3.7, available online).


However, some countries saw much larger changes in statutory salaries over this period. At lower secondary level, they grew by more than 30% in real terms in Colombia, Lithuania and Poland. The nominal increases were even larger, but inflation has cancelled out some of the nominal wage gains over the period (OECD, 2022[10]). In contrast, in 12 countries and economies, real statutory salaries of lower secondary teachers have declined since 2015. The largest decrease was in Ireland where salaries fell by almost 13% in real terms although in nominal terms (that is, in current values and not considering inflation), salaries still increased between 2015 and 2025 (Annex 2 Table X2.6 and Table D3.7, available online).

Starting salaries also increased during the period 2015-25. On average across OECD countries and economies with comparable data over the period, starting statutory salaries rose in real terms by 20% at primary level and lower secondary level and by 18% at upper secondary (general programmes) level, making it more attractive to enter the profession (Table D3.6, available online). Again, these changes vary widely between countries. In three-quarters of OECD countries and economies, starting statutory salaries at the lower secondary level increased in real terms. However, in a few countries, they decreased significantly, including by 10% or more in Costa Rica, Italy and Portugal (Table D3.6, available online).

In most of the 29 countries with available data for the period 2015 to 2025 for both starting salaries and salaries after 15 years of experience of lower secondary teachers, salaries at both stages either increased or decreased. However, in England (United Kingdom), France, Germany, Ireland, Japan and the United States, starting salaries rose while those for teachers with 15 years of experiences decreased in real values. In these countries, none of the increases or decreases exceeded 13 percentage points, except in Japan, where starting salaries increased by 17 percentage points (Figure D3.3). These changes resulted from a combination of changes in nominal salaries and changes in the cost of living – in these countries, nominal salaries in current national currencies increased for teachers at both stages of their careers (Annex 2 Tables X2.5 and X2.6).

Figure D3.3. Change in lower secondary teachers' statutory and actual salaries between 2015 and 2025

Change in teachers' real statutory salaries (2015 = 100), in percentage points



Note: Change in teachers' statutory salaries is based on the most prevalent qualifications after 15 years of experience. Salaries are converted to constant prices using deflators for private consumption.
1. Actual salaries for minimum and maximum statutory salaries.
For data, see Tables D3.6, D3.7 and D3.8 (available online). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/z15uv3.

Even where salaries at both stages of teachers' careers increased or decreased together over this period, the size of the change differed. In most of the 18 countries where salaries increased in real terms for both stages, the increase was larger for starting salaries, except in Czechia, New Zealand, Slovenia and the Republic of Türkiye, where teachers saw larger increases for salaries after 15 years of experience. In the five countries where salaries decreased in real terms for both stages, there is no clear trend as to which saw the greatest drop. In Finland and Italy, the change was the same for both stages (Figure D3.3). These differences may reflect changes in the compensation systems for teachers to attract or retain teachers in the profession (see Chapter 1).

Trends in actual salaries

Over the period 2015 to 2025, nearly half of OECD countries and economies have comparable time series data for actual salaries at primary and secondary levels of education (for pre-primary level only about one-third do). On average across OECD countries and economies with comparable data for all the reference years between 2015 and 2025, actual salaries increased in real terms by about 17% at primary and secondary levels. About two-thirds of these countries showed an increase over the period 2015 to 2025 (in real terms) for all levels of education. The increase exceeded 20% in Estonia, Iceland (at pre-primary, primary and lower secondary level), Israel (at upper secondary level), Latvia and the Slovak Republic, and actual salaries doubled in Lithuania. These differences may result from the combination of changes in the amounts of statutory salary or allowances that teachers received as well as changes in teachers' characteristics (for example, more experienced teachers may earn higher salaries) (Table D3.8, available online).

In three OECD countries and economies (the French Community of Belgium, Germany and Italy) with comparable time series data, teachers' actual salaries fell in real terms at all levels of education covered by the available data. There was a fall of at least 3% in Austria (at secondary levels), the Flemish and French Communities of Belgium (both at upper secondary level) and Italy (at all levels). As all of these countries showed increases in nominal terms, these falls were driven by the rate of inflation outstripping increases in actual salaries (Table D3.8, available online).

School heads' salaries

Statutory salaries

School heads' responsibilities may include educational activities (including teaching) as well as other administrative, staff management and financial responsibilities (see Chapter D4 in *Education at a Glance 2022* (OECD, 2022[11]) for more details, including differences in the nature of the work carried out and the hours worked by school heads compared to teachers). Some countries have specific salary scales for heads, who may or may not receive a school-head allowance on top of their statutory salaries. In other countries, heads may be paid according to teachers' salary scales, with an additional school-head allowance. The use of teachers' salary scales may reflect the fact that school heads may be teachers who have taken on management responsibilities of a school, possibly accompanied by a reduction in their teaching responsibilities (see Box D3.2 in *Education at a Glance 2025* (OECD, 2025[4])). In 14 out of the 37 countries and economies with data available, lower secondary school heads are paid according to teachers' salary scales with a school-head allowance, while they have a specific salary range in the other 23. Of these, 16 countries and economies have no specific school-head allowance while 7 include a school-head allowance in the salary (Table D3.14, available online).

The amounts payable to school heads (through statutory salaries and/or school-head allowances) may vary according to the characteristics of the school or schools they lead, such as the size of the school (based on the number of students or teachers). They could also vary according to the individual characteristics of the school heads themselves, such as the duties they have to perform or their years of experience (for the determinants of statutory salary and school-head allowance, see Table D.D3.5 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)).

Considering the large number of criteria involved in the calculation of their salaries, statutory salary data for school heads focus on those related to the minimum qualification requirements to become a school head, and Table D3.4 (available online) shows only the minimum and maximum salaries (the minimum qualification requirements can be found in Table D.D3.6 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)). Caution is therefore

necessary when interpreting these values because minimum and maximum statutory salaries may refer to school heads in different types of schools and few school heads may earn these amounts in practice.

As with teachers, school heads' salaries also vary widely across countries and levels of education. More than half of OECD countries and economies have similar pay ranges for primary and lower secondary school heads, while upper secondary school heads benefit from higher statutory salaries on average. The similar salaries at primary and lower secondary levels may result from the fact that school heads in many of these countries are in charge of schools providing both primary and lower secondary education (Table D3.4, available online).

At lower secondary level, the average minimum salary for school heads is USD 72 467 across OECD countries and economies, ranging from USD 25 774 in Costa Rica to USD 151 218 in Luxembourg. The maximum salary is USD 115 064 on average, ranging from USD 55 233 in Poland to USD 209 131 in Luxembourg (Figure D3.4).

On average across OECD countries and economies, the maximum statutory salary of a school head with the minimum qualifications is 70-75% higher than the minimum statutory salary at primary and secondary levels. In ten countries and economies school heads at the top of the scale can expect to earn at least twice the statutory minimum salary in at least one of these levels of education; in Colombia, Costa Rica and Thailand, they can expect to earn more than three times the minimum salary at all levels of education (Figure D3.4 and Table D3.4, available online).

Actual salaries


Across OECD countries and economies, average actual salaries for school heads (aged 25-64) ranged from USD 93 468 at primary level to USD 100 867 at lower secondary level and USD 107 309 at upper secondary level. School heads' actual salaries are higher than those of teachers, and the premium (the difference in actual salaries between school heads and teachers in favour of school heads) increases with levels of education. On average across OECD countries and economies with data for both teachers and school heads, school heads' actual salaries in 2025 were 51% higher than teachers' at primary level, 55% higher at lower secondary level and 56% at upper secondary level (Table D3.3).

The premiums paid to school heads vary widely across countries and levels of education, however. At pre-primary level, the largest difference was in Slovenia, where school heads' actual salaries are 80% higher than those of teachers. At the primary level, school heads' actual salaries are three times teachers' actual salaries in Italy. At lower and upper secondary levels, school heads' actual salaries are about twice or more those of teachers in England (United Kingdom), Italy and Scotland (United Kingdom). The lowest premiums, of less than 30%, are in Estonia (primary and secondary), France (pre-primary and primary), Norway (pre-primary), Poland (lower secondary) and Türkiye (all levels) (Table D3.3). The reasons for these different salary structures are manifold. In France, the low premiums can be explained by the fact that pre-primary and primary school heads are teachers relieved from part of their teaching duties. Similarly, school heads in Poland are teachers with significantly reduced teaching loads. In both these countries, they are paid according to the teachers' salary scale at this level of education, with the addition of a specific school-head allowance, accounting for additional managerial functions. In Norway, teachers' actual salaries are similar across education levels with a difference of 21% between the lowest average actual salary (pre-primary level) and the largest (secondary levels). Meanwhile school heads' salaries are lowest for the pre-primary level as well but gradually increase until they are 42% higher at the upper secondary level, leading to progressively increasing differences between school heads' and teachers' salaries.

As expected, school heads' actual salaries are higher than minimum statutory salaries. This may partly result from the fact that actual salaries include additional payments to the statutory salaries, depending on their tasks and responsibilities. They are also usually lower than maximum statutory salaries. However, actual salaries are higher than maximum statutory salaries in a few countries, which might result from the existence of differences in salaries by qualification level of school heads. In the figure actual salaries refer to all school heads whereas minimum and maximum statutory salaries refer to school heads with the minimum qualification level (Figure D3.4).

Figure D3.4. Lower secondary school heads' average actual salaries compared to the statutory minimum and maximum salaries (2025)

Annual salaries of school heads in general programmes in public institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for private consumption



Note: Actual salaries include bonuses and allowances. Actual salaries of all school heads are compared to statutory salaries of school heads with minimum qualification.
1. Actual base salaries for statutory minimum and maximum salaries.
2. Data on statutory salaries exclude management allowances for school heads.
3. Year of reference for actual salaries differs from 2025.
For data, see Table D3.3
and Table D3.4, available online. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/z15uv3.

Base salaries and additional payments: Incentives and allowances

Statutory salaries, based on pay scales, are only one component of the total compensation of teachers and school heads. School systems may also offer them additional payments, such as allowances, bonuses or other rewards. These may take the form of financial remuneration or reductions in the number of teaching hours. Decisions on the criteria used for the formation of the base salary and additional payments are taken at different levels of authority.

Criteria for additional payments vary across countries. In the large majority of countries and economies, teachers' core tasks (teaching, planning or preparing lessons; marking students' work; general administrative work; communicating with parents; supervising students; and working with colleagues) are rarely compensated through specific bonuses or additional payments. Teachers may also be required to take on other responsibilities or perform some tasks without additional compensation although doing so often entails some sort of financial incentive (see Chapter D4 for teachers' tasks and responsibilities and associated financial or other incentives).

At lower secondary level, teachers who participate in school or other management activities in addition to their teaching duties receive extra financial compensation in nearly 60% of the countries and economies with available information. For example, in Korea, teachers serving as head teacher of a certain grade or dean of academic affairs receive regular additional payments. In contrast, in Switzerland teachers taking on school or other management duties are compensated with reduced teaching hours. It is also common for teachers to be awarded additional payments, either annual or occasional, for teaching more classes or hours

than required by their full-time contract or performing special tasks such as training student teachers. Additional payments for participation in mentoring programmes and/or supporting new teachers in induction programmes is rewarded with a financial compensation in half of the countries with comparable data (see Box D3.2 and Table D3.10, available online).

Further allowances on outstanding performance or teaching in disadvantaged, remote or high-cost areas can also lead to additional compensation, either in the form of occasional additional or annual payments, or through increases in base salary. For example, in Chile teachers are placed in a higher salary scale if they teach in a school with a high proportion of vulnerable students. Outstanding performance can also lead to additional payments, for example in Poland where teachers can receive occasional payments based on in-class observations by a school head and student results (see Box D3.2 in *Education at a Glance 2024* (OECD, 2024[12]) for more information on such allowances).

There are also criteria for additional payments for school heads, but fewer tasks or responsibilities lead to additional payments compared to teachers. Central or state governments or top-level authorities and local authorities are the two main authorities who decide the entitlement criteria and amounts of allowances for school heads across countries (Tables D3.11 and D3.13, available online).


Box D3.2. Financial compensation for mentoring and participation rates

Mentoring is an effective tool to increase teaching quality, reduce teacher attrition and help the transfer of knowledge from skilled teachers to novices. Several reasons may explain the benefits of developing mentoring schemes. Mentoring can convey practical teaching skills like classroom management better than initial teacher training, as experienced teachers are in a good position to support new teachers. Mentoring and induction programmes are also helpful to second-career teachers who tend to have shorter initial teacher training (OECD, 2025[13]).

Teachers might be either intrinsically or extrinsically motivated to play mentoring or induction roles. Teachers could be intrinsically motivated by the possibilities of supporting others, taking on more responsibilities and fostering the kind of collaborative work environment created by mentoring. Both are linked to increased job satisfaction and well-being (e.g. through better professional relationships and collaborative work environments) and contribute to a greater sense of self-efficacy (OECD, 2025[13]). Extrinsic motivation could come from financial compensation or reduced teaching hours for taking on mentoring responsibilities.

Figure D3.5 combines the shares of teachers currently assigned as mentors, collected by the TALIS survey (OECD, 2025[13]), with data on the existence and type of financial compensation for taking up mentorship (Table D3.10, available online). Teachers in nearly three-fifths of the countries and economies with available data benefit from some form of financial compensation for mentoring responsibilities (left hand side of Figure D3.5). The most common forms are regular additional payments or payments based on a percentage of the salary, while occasional payments or salary step increases are used by some countries. For example, in Bulgaria teachers receive a fixed amount every month on top of their salary for mentoring, while in Lithuania, they advance one step in the pay scale, and in Chile they are paid a lump sum at the beginning of the mentorship period. In some other countries, teachers can benefit from non-financial compensation through a reduction in teaching time. This is the case the Flemish Community of Belgium and in Portugal, where teaching hours are reduced according to the mentoring needs.

Figure D3.5. Share of teachers assigned to be mentors, with or without financial compensation, by teaching experience



Note: The code in square brackets refers to the type of financial compensation received by mentors. This compensation is defined either as a percentage of statutory base salaries paid to teachers (%), regular additional payments (RP), incidental/occasional additional payments (OP), or salary progression (a step increment or other progression within the salary range) (SP). The share of teachers who are mentors is estimated based on principals' responses and using final teacher weights. Mentoring can be available either to all teachers in the school, only to teachers who are new to the school, or only to teachers who are new to teaching (i.e. have less than one year paid employment as a teacher). Information on teaching time compensation for mentoring activities is available in Table D4.4, available online.

1. Estimates should be interpreted with caution due to higher risk of non-response bias.

For data, see Table D3.10 (available online) and (OECD, 2025[13])*Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching,* https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en), Table 4.10. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/z15uv3.

In most countries, teachers with more than 10 years of experience are more likely to take on mentoring roles than their colleagues with 6-10 years of experience. This pattern may reflect the role of mentoring as one channel through which experience and professional knowledge are shared between experienced and novice teachers, although the relationship between teaching experience and mentoring responsibilities varies across education systems (Figure D3.5).

Figure D3.5 also shows that participation rates in mentoring activities are similar for both sets of countries. Regardless of whether teachers will benefit from financial compensation for mentoring activities, the level of participation in mentoring is below 15% in most countries. This highlights the importance of intrinsic motivation in encouraging teachers to mentor others. It should be noted that the amount of the financial compensation related to mentoring activities is not collected but could also play a role in teachers' decisions on whether to take them on.

Source: Data collection on salaries of teachers, and OECD (2025[13]), *Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching*, https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en.

Salaries relative to other tertiary-educated workers

Relative salaries of teachers and school heads

Education systems compete with other sectors of the economy to attract high-quality graduates as teachers and to retain them in the profession. Teachers' salaries relative to other occupations with similar education requirements, and their likely future

earnings, may have an influence on whether individuals choose a teaching career (Nagler, Piopiunik and West, 2020[2]) or to stay in the profession (Qin, 2020[3]).

In most OECD countries, a tertiary degree is required to become a teacher at all levels of education (see Table D.D3.3 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)) meaning that the likely alternative to initial teacher education would be a similar tertiary programme. Thus, teachers' relative salary levels and labour-market conditions in different countries can be understood by comparing teachers' actual salaries with the average earnings of other tertiary-educated professionals.

Two types of comparisons can be made. The first compares teachers broadly with full-time, full-year workers aged 25–64 who have completed tertiary education (ISCED levels 5-8). The second compares teachers with similarly educated workers, weighted by the proportion of teachers at each level of tertiary attainment. This second method ensures that comparisons between countries take into account differences in the distribution of bachelor's, master's and doctoral or equivalent attainment among teachers compared to tertiary-educated workers more generally (see Annex Table X2.10 for the proportions of teachers by attainment level, the *Methodology* section for more details and Box D3.3 for comparability issues related to measuring teachers' relative salaries).

Young graduates may consider teachers' statutory salaries relative to earnings of similarly educated workers over the course of their careers when considering teaching as a lifelong career (for earnings by field of study in tertiary education see Chapter A4 in *Education at a Glance 2025* (OECD, 2025[4])). Data for lower secondary teachers with the most prevalent qualification to enter the profession in 2025 are available for 29 OECD countries and economies. On average, teachers' starting salaries in these countries and economies are 61% of the average earnings of similarly educated workers aged 25-64, while salaries at the top of the scale reach 96% of the average earnings of similarly educated workers (Figure D3.6).

In a few countries and economies, teachers' statutory salaries do reach or exceed the earnings of similarly educated workers. In Korea and Luxembourg, statutory salaries after 15 years of experience are at least 23% higher than the average earnings of similarly educated workers – and double for teachers at the top of the salary scale in Korea (Figure D3.6).

In the countries where teachers' salaries do not exceed the average earnings of similarly educated workers at any stage in their career, the most prevalent qualifications are usually a master's degree (Table D.D3.3 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)).

Where teachers' salary scales are compressed, their relative pay may increase faster. For example, the starting salaries of lower secondary teachers in the Netherlands with the most prevalent qualification are just 61% of the average earnings of similarly educated workers, but will reach 1.25% after 12 years at the top of the scale. In contrast, relative salaries at the start of the career in Ireland are similar (56%), but due to more expanded salary scales (it takes 35 years to reach the top of the scale) they reach 89% after 15 years on average, and 109% of the average earnings of similarly educated workers at the top of the scale (Figure D3.6).

Figure D3.6. Lower secondary teachers' statutory salaries at different stages of their career relative to earnings of similarly educated workers (2025)

Ratio of salaries of teachers in general programmes in public institutions with the most prevalent qualification at the time of entry relative to the earnings of full-time, full-year workers aged 25-64 with similar educational attainment



Note: The number in square brackets refers to the average number of years needed to progress from the starting salary to the top of the salary scale. Countries are ranked in descending order of the number of years needed. Reference years for earnings of workers and salaries of teachers may differ from 2025 (see Table D3.2).
1. Weighted average of the statutory salaries across different subnational entities.
2. In practice, many teachers obtain higher tertiary degrees during their service and are placed in a higher salary range.
3. Starting salary is relative to the earnings of workers who have attained a bachelor's degree or equivalent (ISCED 6). Salaries after 15 years of experience and at the top of the salary scale are relative to the earnings of workers with a master's degree or equivalent (ISCED 7) or higher attainment.
4. Combination of different salary scales for the same ISCED qualification requirement. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/z15uv3.

Similarly to statutory salaries, teachers' average actual salaries, which reflect their total earnings, can also be compared against either the earnings of similarly educated workers or all tertiary-educated workers. However, the data available only allow for the computation of averages of relative salaries when comparing actual salaries to earnings of tertiary-educated workers. Box D3.3 considers the comparability issues involved in calculating relative salary measures.

Box D3.3. Comparability issues with relative salaries of teachers

Meaningful international comparisons rely on the provision and implementation of rigorous definitions and a related statistical methodology. In view of the diversity of countries' education and teacher compensation systems, adhering to these guidelines and methodology is not always straightforward. Some caution is therefore required when interpreting these data.

The relative salaries measure divides the salaries of teachers or school heads (the numerator) by the earnings of comparable workers (the denominator) using two different methods (see Table D3.2 and *Methodology* section). These measures of relative salaries are subject to biases due to differences in the characteristics, working patterns and remuneration systems of teachers and other workers or differences in the data used for salaries and earnings. Box D3.1 in *Education at a Glance 2021* (OECD, 2021[14]) addressed comparability issues, including the potential bias related to the inclusion of teachers in data on workers'

earnings while Box D3.2 in *Education at a Glance 2023* (OECD, 2023[8]) addressed the bias related to differences in working days between teachers and tertiary-educated workers.

On the bias related to the mean or median

Another source of potential biases in the measure of relative salaries relates to differences arising based on whether the arithmetic mean or the median was used as the central tendency measure, addressed in Box D3.2 in *Education at a Glance 2025* (OECD, 2025[4]). The measure of relative salaries is more stable over the years when using the median (as the median is less sensitive to change in extreme values). There are also substantial differences (though only inconsistent patterns) when comparing mean to median ratios of the same year, which is consistent with the median being generally more robust with regard to outlier values and skewed distributions.

Thus, it might be useful to examine further how actual salaries are distributed to analyse the variation of relative salaries. Possible yardsticks are maximum and minimum relative statutory salaries (defined as relative starting salary for teachers with the minimum qualification and relative salary at the top of the scale for those with the maximum qualification) and relative actual salary deciles, defined as the salary value for teachers at the threshold of the top or bottom 10% of the salary distribution. Comparing the relative average actual salaries with minimum and maximum salaries can indicate whether salary distributions are roughly symmetric or skewed, for example if a comparatively small number of high salary values are skewing it to the right.

Statutory salaries are readily available for most countries but come with some methodological issues: allowances and other benefits received on top of statutory amounts are not included even though they can form a substantial part of teachers' salaries. There are also conceptual differences to both actual salary data and earnings data. Actual salary deciles do not suffer from the same issues since they do include allowances and other benefits. However, they might not be as easily available.

A preliminary analysis of the patterns of relative salaries against actual salary deciles and minimum or maximum statutory salaries based on the examples of three countries and economies (Finland, the Flemish Community of Belgium and Latvia) suggests there would be very different results for the identified salary distributions depending on the type of salaries measured. The importance of allowances for actual salaries and the small shares of teachers receiving the maximum or minimum salaries may explain these differences and make the case for an analysis covering a larger number of countries to help conclude the best way to handle the differences in the distribution of salaries across countries.

On the bias related to part-time work

Part-time work might introduce a bias to the relative salaries measure (if included in data on salaries without a weighting system to compute average salaries for full-time equivalent teachers), since part-time teachers would then affect the average actual salaries of teachers. The current analysis of relative salaries used in this chapter excludes part-time teachers from actual salaries (and part-time workers from earnings), but some countries include part-time teachers (reporting salaries of full-time equivalent teachers), for example due to technical limitations.

However, biases could nevertheless arise if certain groups of teachers are more likely to be part time than others (similar issue may also bias earnings of other tertiary educated workers). For example, younger teachers, who tend to be less experienced, are also likely to receive lower salaries. If this cohort of teachers are more likely to work part-time, and thus more likely to be excluded from the data collection on salaries of teachers, then higher salaries from more experienced teachers would receive more weight than salaries of younger full-time teachers (see Box D4.4 in Chapter D4). This might introduce an upward bias in relative actual salaries. On top of that, the existence of a wage penalty related to part-time work (meaning teachers working part-time earn lower hourly wages) may increase the bias.

On the bias related to special pension schemes

Special pension schemes for teachers can increase lifetime earnings, e.g. through higher pension payouts, and thus can have an impact on the attractiveness of the teaching profession even if it is not directly visible in the relative salary measure. There are no recent data covering special pension schemes for teachers in particular, but civil servants in two-fifths of countries with available data are subject to a special pension scheme. Since teachers in many countries are also civil servants, these data can be used as a proxy (OECD, 2016[15]).

Differences in pension schemes can show in some key measures. In Belgium, for example, the gross replacement rate, which expresses how much of the pre-retirement earnings the pension replaces before tax, is up to 75% for the civil service scheme, compared to up to 48% for the general scheme. In Germany, this rate is up to 72% for the special scheme and up to 48% for the general one and in Korea civil servants can expect up to 61%, while workers in the general scheme can expect up to 39%. Contribution rates to pension schemes can also differ. In Germany, civil servants pay no contribution, while in Belgium the rate is the same as for the general scheme and in Korea civil servants pay double the rate of the general scheme (OECD, 2016[15]).

There remain some caveats to this brief comparison. It covers only mandatory public schemes, not voluntary occupational schemes (i.e. where the employer bears part of the contribution) or personal pension schemes, and these might substantially increase effective pensions. In many countries, occupational schemes are a substantial pillar of the general scheme (e.g. 401(k) or 403(b) plans in the United States or the *betriebliche Altersvorsorge* in Germany). Finally, teachers are not necessarily covered by special pension schemes in all countries, as for example they may not have the status of a civil servant. For example, in Germany, 75% of the teaching workforce are civil servants.

In most countries and economies with available information and at almost all levels of education, teachers' actual salaries are lower than those of tertiary-educated workers. On average, pre-primary teachers' actual salaries are 83% of the full-time, full-year earnings of tertiary-educated 25-64 year-olds, rising to 87% for primary teachers, 91% for lower secondary teachers and 95% for upper secondary teachers. The lowest relative salaries are at pre-primary level in Czechia with 55% of average earnings of tertiary-educated workers (although no tertiary education is required to become a teacher at pre-primary level) (Table D3.2).

Teachers' actual salaries reach or exceed those of tertiary-educated or similarly educated workers on average in a few countries. Teachers earn more than tertiary-educated workers at all levels of education in Costa Rica, Lithuania, Peru, Portugal, Romania, and Türkiye. Teachers' actual salaries exceed the earnings of tertiary educated workers by more than 50% in Costa Rica (at secondary level), Peru and Türkiye (Table D3.2).

School heads' career prospects and their relative salaries are also a signal to teachers of their potential career progression pathway and the associated compensation in the longer term (see Box D3.2 in *Education at a Glance 2025* (OECD, 2025[4])). Not only do school heads earn more than teachers, they also, unlike teachers, typically earn more than tertiary-educated workers. However, there are some exceptions, most notably at the pre-primary level where the average actual salaries of school heads are at least 5% lower than the earnings of tertiary-educated workers in Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Hungary and Norway (Table D3.2). A possible explanation might be that in Czechia and Finland the minimum qualifications for school heads at the pre-primary level are lower than for other levels.

Trends in teachers' relative actual salaries

Salaries are one of several factors that can influence the attractiveness of the teaching profession, but pose challenges when interpreted in isolation. Prospective teachers are likely to weigh options in sectors other than education before entering the teaching profession. Trend data on relative actual salaries can make it possible to see how changes in salaries compare against broader economic developments.

Trend data on relative actual salaries of teachers compare salaries of teachers to earnings of tertiary-educated workers for the same reference year (see *Definitions*), allowing changes in these relative salaries to be analysed. The resulting ratio can be interpreted as expressing the average actual salary of teachers as a percentage of the earnings of tertiary educated workers.

The most recent data available are for the reference year 2024, but only 7-12 countries (depending on the education level) have data for the change between 2015 to 2024, whereas a larger number of countries have data covering 2015 to 2023 (14 countries at the pre-primary level, 18 at the primary level and 19 at the secondary levels). Therefore, to allow for better generalisation, this analysis focuses on the period 2015 to 2023 (Table D3.9, available online).

The changes between 2015 and 2023 are on average small and relative salaries remained virtually stable over the period. Across all the 18 or 19 countries with comparable data for both years at primary and secondary levels of education, teachers' relative salaries fell very slightly at all levels of education. At lower secondary level, they fell from 0.59 to 0.58, i.e. teachers' salaries were 59% of the earnings of tertiary educated workers in 2015, but 58% in 2023. There is a similar decrease, amounting to about

1 percentage point, for all levels of education over this period. However, this masks large differences across countries and economies. At the lower secondary level, teachers' relative actual salaries fell in more than two-thirds of countries with data, in five of them (Estonia, Finland, Israel, New Zealand and Portugal) by more than 5 percentage points. Meanwhile relative salaries increased in six countries and economies, in five of which (Australia, Chile, Czechia, Scotland [United Kingdom] and the Slovak Republic) they rose by at least 8 percentage points (Table D3.9 available online).

However, these changes in relative salaries need to be interpreted with caution. Falling relative salaries do not necessarily imply teachers' real salaries fell. For example, the largest fall at the lower secondary level occurred in Israel where relative salaries fell by 19 percentage points between 2015 and 2023. This was due to a combination of changes in both teachers' actual salaries and the earnings of tertiary-educated workers: while teachers' salaries increased by 8% in real terms over this period, the earnings of tertiary-educated workers rose more, resulting in the relative fall (Tables D3.8 and D3.9, available online).

In contrast, increasing relative actual salaries can indicate both rising real salaries for teachers and improvements in the attractiveness of the salaries in the teaching profession. In Scotland (United Kingdom) relative actual salaries for lower secondary teachers increased by almost 15 percentage points over the period 2015 to 2023 while in Czechia they increased by over 13 percentage points. These are the largest increases across countries with available data. In both countries, this appears to be driven by stronger growth in actual teachers' salaries than for earnings of tertiary-educated workers. In Scotland, the real value of actual teacher salaries increased by 13%, while for Czechia the increase was 29% over the time period (Tables D3.8 and D3.9, available online).

Definitions

Teachers refer to professional personnel directly involved in teaching students. The classification includes classroom teachers and other teachers who work with a whole class of students in a classroom, in small groups in a resource room, or in one-to-one teaching situations inside or outside a regular class.

School head refers to any person whose primary or major function is heading a school or a group of schools, alone or within an administrative body such as a board or council. The school head is the primary leader responsible for the leadership, management and administration of a school.

Actual salaries refer to the annual average earnings received by full-time teachers/school heads aged 25-64 before taxes. It is the gross salary from the employee's point of view: it includes the part of social security contributions and pension-scheme contributions that are paid by the employees (even if deducted automatically from the employees' gross salary by the employer). However, the employers' premium for social security and pension is excluded. Actual salaries also include work-related payments, such as school-head allowance, annual bonuses, results-related bonuses, extra pay for holidays and sick-leave pay. Income from other sources, such as government social transfers, investment income and any other income that is not directly related to their profession is not included.

Earnings for workers with tertiary education are average earnings for full-time, full-year workers aged 25-64 with an education at ISCED level 5, 6, 7 or 8.

Salary at the top of the scale refers to the maximum scheduled annual salary (top of the salary range) for a full-time teacher (for a given level of qualification of teachers recognised by the compensation system).

Salary after 15 years of experience refers to the scheduled annual salary of a full-time teacher. Statutory salaries may refer to the salaries of teachers with a given level of qualification recognised by the compensation system (the minimum training necessary to be fully qualified, the most prevalent qualifications or the maximum qualification), plus 15 years of experience.

Starting salary refers to the average scheduled gross salary per year for a full-time teacher with a given level of qualification recognised by the compensation system (the minimum training necessary to be fully qualified or the most prevalent qualifications) at the beginning of the teaching career.

Statutory salaries refer to scheduled salaries according to official pay scales. The salaries reported are gross (total sum paid by the employer) less the employer's contribution to social security and pension, according to existing salary scales. Salaries are

"before tax" (i.e. before deductions for income tax). Statutory salaries also include additional payments that all teachers or school heads receive and that constitutes a regular part of the annual salary, such as 13th month pay. In the case of school heads, statutory salaries include the management allowance that all school heads receive for managing the school where applicable.

Methodology

Data on teachers' salaries at lower and upper secondary level refer only to general programmes.

In most countries, the criteria to determine the most prevalent qualifications of teachers are based on a principle of relative majority (i.e. the level of qualifications of the largest proportion of teachers).

The period of reference for teachers' salaries is the school year 2024/25 where the school year begins on the second half of the calendar year 2024 and ends in the first half of the calendar year 2025, or otherwise, the school year 2025 where the school year starts in the first half of the calendar year 2025. For ease of reference in the publication, the reference school year is given as 2025.

Salaries were converted into equivalent USD using purchasing power parities (PPPs) for private consumption from the OECD Data Explorer on national accounts. These PPPs refer to the calendar year and have been adjusted to refer to January 2025 for the conversion of salaries. Tables with salaries in national currency are included in Annex 2 (see Tables X2.3, X2.4, X2.5, X2.6 and X2.7). To calculate the index of change in teachers' salaries compared to 2015, the deflator for private consumption is used to convert salaries to 2015 prices. Reference statistics used in the calculation (PPPs and deflators for private consumption) are available in Table X2.8 in Annex 2. For more information, please see the methodology section of *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

In Table D3.2, the ratios of teacher salaries to earnings for similarly educated full-time, full-year workers aged 25-64 are calculated based on weighted averages of earnings of tertiary-educated workers (Columns 2 to 5 for teachers and Columns 10 to 13 for school heads). The weights, collected for every country individually, are based on the percentage of teachers or school heads at each ISCED level of tertiary attainment (see Tables X2.9 and X2.10 in Annex 2). The ratios have been calculated for countries for which these data are available. When data on earnings of workers referred to a different reference year than the 2025 reference year used for salaries of teachers or school heads, a deflator has been used to adjust earnings data to 2025. For all other ratios in Table D3.2 and those in Table D3.5 (available online), information on all tertiary-educated workers was used instead of weighted averages. Data on the earnings of workers take account of earnings from work for all individuals during the reference period, including the salaries of teachers. In most countries, the population of teachers is large and may influence the average earnings of workers.

For the trend data on relative salaries in Table D3.9 (available online) the methodology is slightly different. The relative actual salary ratios are calculated only using teachers' salaries and workers' earnings from the same reference year, meaning that there is no need to use deflators to adjust data to a similar reference year. Data points for years in which one of the components is not available are marked as missing.

For more information, please see the OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics (OECD, 2018[16]) and *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Sources

Data on salaries for teachers and school heads are collected from the 2025 joint OECD/Eurydice data collection on salaries of teachers and school heads. Data refer to the school year 2024/25 (or the school year 2025) and are reported in accordance with formal policies for public institutions. Data on workers' earnings are based on the regular data collection by the OECD Labour Market and Social Outcomes of Learning Network.

References

Nagler, M., M. Piopiunik and M. West (2020), "Weak markets, strong teachers: Recession at career start and teacher effectiveness", *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 38/2, pp. 453-500, https://doi.org/10.1086/705883. [2]

OECD (2026), *Education and Skills, OECD Data Explorer*, http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/5q. [9]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en. [4]

OECD (2025), *Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en. [13]

OECD (2024), *Education at a Glance 2024: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/c00cad36-en. [12]

OECD (2023), *Education at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en. [8]

OECD (2023), "What do OECD data on teachers' salaries tell us?", *Policy Brief*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/de0196b5-en. [1]

OECD (2022), *Education at a Glance 2022: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/3197152b-en. [11]

OECD (2022), *OECD Economic Outlook, Volume 2022 Issue 2: Confronting the Crisis*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/f6da2159-en. [10]

OECD (2021), *Education at a Glance 2021: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b35a14e5-en. [14]

OECD (2020), *PISA 2018 Results (Volume V): Effective Policies, Successful Schools*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/ca768d40-en. [6]

OECD (2019), *Education at a Glance 2019: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/f8d7880d-en. [7]

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics 2018: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [16]

OECD (2016), *OECD Pensions Outlook 2016*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/pens_outlook-2016-en. [15]

Pont, B., D. Nusche and H. Moorman (2008), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 1: Policy and Practice*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264044715-en. [5]

Qin, L. (2020), "Country effects on teacher turnover intention: a multilevel, cross-national analysis", *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, Vol. 20/1, pp. 79-105, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-020-09269-3. [3]

Chapter D3 Tables

Tables and notes

Table D3.1.	Teachers' statutory salaries, based on the most prevalent qualifications at different points in teachers' careers (2025)
Table D3.2.	Teachers' and school heads' actual salaries relative to earnings of tertiary-educated workers (2025)
Table D3.3.	Teachers' and school heads' average actual salaries (2025)
WEB Table D3.4.	School heads' minimum and maximum statutory salaries, based on minimum qualifications (2025)
WEB Table D3.5.	Teachers' actual salaries relative to earnings of tertiary-educated workers, by age group and gender (2025)
WEB Table D3.6.	Trends in teachers' statutory starting salaries, based on the most prevalent qualifications (2000 and 2005 to 2025)
WEB Table D3.7.	Trends in teachers' statutory salaries, based on the most prevalent qualifications after 15 years of experience (2000 and 2005 to 2025)
WEB Table D3.8.	Trends in teachers' average actual salaries (2000, 2005 and 2010 to 2025)
WEB Table D3.9.	Trends in teachers' actual salaries relative to earnings of tertiary-educated workers (2000, 2005 and 2010 to 2024)
WEB Table D3.10.	Criteria used for base salaries and additional payments awarded to teachers (2025)
WEB Table D3.11.	Criteria used for base salaries and additional payments awarded to school heads (2025)
WEB Table D3.12.	Decision-making level for criteria used for determining teachers' base salaries and additional payments (2025)
WEB Table D3.13.	Decision-making level for criteria used for determining school heads' base salaries and additional payments (2025)
WEB Table D3.14.	Characteristics of the compensation system for school heads (2025)

StatLink https://stat.link/z15uv3

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/z15uv3.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Table D3.1. Teachers' statutory salaries, based on the most prevalent qualifications at different points in teachers' careers (2025)

Annual salaries of full-time teachers in public institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for private consumption, by level of education

	Pre-primary				Primary			
	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
OECD countries								
Australia	62 034	88 721	88 721	97 314	59 686	85 248	85 248	96 103
Austria	m	m	m	m	67 576	71 641	80 252	118 140
Canada	m	m	m	m	47 909	84 159	84 165	84 165
Chile	33 442	41 055	50 205	61 903	33 442	41 275	50 205	61 903
Colombia	36 196	66 011	66 011	66 011	36 196	66 011	66 011	66 011
Costa Rica	28 480	33 454	35 941	43 402	28 762	33 786	36 298	43 835
Czechia	27 055	27 893	28 563	31 746	28 646	30 489	31 829	37 609
Denmark	60 749	68 655	68 655	68 655	69 578	79 329	79 882	79 882
Estonia	m	a	a	a	33 804	a	a	a
Finland[1]	42 432	46 267	46 708	46 708	47 087	53 719	57 485	60 934
France[2]	45 002	49 416	51 038	72 407	45 002	49 416	51 038	72 407
Germany	m	m	m	m	85 496	97 723	102 407	110 375
Greece	25 267	30 344	32 883	48 114	25 267	30 344	32 883	48 114
Hungary	38 256	38 966	39 634	39 634	38 256	38 966	39 634	39 634
Iceland	57 449	57 991	60 496	61 780	57 449	57 991	60 496	61 780
Ireland	a	a	a	a	46 922	64 880	74 863	92 896
Israel	41 398	48 724	52 994	83 349	35 937	41 641	47 004	72 998
Italy	40 302	44 171	48 422	58 758	40 302	44 171	48 422	58 758
Japan	m	m	m	m	43 085	55 089	61 679	74 196
Korea	43 139	61 754	72 226	115 171	43 139	61 754	72 226	115 171
Latvia	32 803	m	m	52 484	30 342	m	m	48 544
Lithuania	44 680	46 122	51 380	58 465	44 680	46 122	51 380	58 465
Luxembourg	96 522	124 836	140 924	170 523	96 522	124 836	140 924	170 523
Mexico	30 939	37 899	47 362	59 028	30 939	37 899	46 447	57 464
Netherlands	65 843	94 445	107 269	134 772	65 843	94 445	107 269	134 772
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	40 888	65 283	65 283	65 283
Norway	53 186	60 649	60 649	62 515	64 371	66 918	66 918	71 844
Poland	32 493	38 533	46 818	48 794	32 493	38 533	46 818	48 794
Portugal	44 924	53 926	57 045	94 262	44 924	53 926	57 045	94 262
Slovak Republic	20 641	23 546	24 118	26 968	25 560	28 740	29 433	32 921
Slovenia	41 137	59 542	67 143	78 340	41 137	57 501	69 569	84 193
Spain	59 526	64 744	69 047	85 216	59 526	64 744	69 047	85 216
Sweden[3, 4, 5]	51 266	54 237	55 260	59 037	51 842	57 359	59 877	68 830
Switzerland	72 615	91 582	m	109 916	75 054	95 194	m	114 251
Türkiye	49 916	53 565	56 015	64 135	49 916	53 565	56 015	64 135
United States	51 746	57 404	77 629	86 732	50 688	68 784	74 639	88 089
Other economies								
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	55 176	69 029	77 634	97 714	55 176	69 029	77 634	97 714
French Comm. (Belgium)	52 227	65 223	73 390	89 725	52 227	65 223	73 390	89 725
England (UK)	47 897	a	73 914	73 914	47 897	a	73 914	73 914
Scotland (UK)	59 034	74 097	74 097	74 097	59 034	74 097	74 097	74 097
OECD average	**46 342**	**56 856**	**60 437**	**72 705**	**48 038**	**60 631**	**64 349**	**77 033**

	Pre-primary				Primary			
	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Partner and/or accession countries								
Argentina	27 334	30 837	32 735	39 038	27 117	30 559	32 397	38 918
Brazil	25 710	m	m	m	25 710	m	m	m
Bulgaria	33 526	34 580	35 917	m	33 526	34 580	35 917	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	47 287	49 404	50 581	56 462
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	22 065	m	m	45 772	22 065	m	m	45 772
Romania	37 612	47 100	48 885	53 569	37 612	47 100	48 885	53 569
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	20 838	36 026	41 745	47 120	20 838	32 522	41 745	47 120
EU25 average	**44 687**	**53 392**	**57 643**	**69 588**	**47 717**	**57 613**	**62 650**	**76 044**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

	Lower secondary, general programmes				Upper secondary, general programmes			
	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale
	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
OECD countries								
Australia	59 603	85 002	85 002	96 205	59 603	85 002	85 002	96 205
Austria	67 576	74 939	83 922	125 164	67 576	81 164	90 913	138 423
Canada	47 909	84 159	84 165	84 165	47 909	84 159	84 165	84 165
Chile	33 442	41 275	50 205	61 903	34 581	42 795	51 952	63 384
Colombia	36 196	66 011	66 011	66 011	36 196	66 011	66 011	66 011
Costa Rica	29 640	34 822	37 412	45 184	29 640	34 822	37 412	45 184
Czechia	28 646	30 489	31 829	37 776	28 646	30 489	31 829	37 693
Denmark	69 831	80 544	80 544	80 544	64 564	83 905	83 905	83 905
Estonia	33 804	a	a	a	33 804	a	a	a
Finland[1]	50 227	57 580	61 616	65 313	52 738	63 325	66 486	70 475
France[2]	48 743	53 157	54 778	76 521	48 743	53 157	54 778	76 521
Germany	94 735	106 766	111 804	122 852	98 772	110 354	115 632	132 306
Greece	25 267	30 344	32 883	48 114	25 267	30 344	32 883	48 114
Hungary	39 021	39 745	40 426	39 634	39 021	39 745	40 426	40 426
Iceland	57 449	57 991	60 496	61 780	51 536	62 393	65 459	65 459
Ireland	48 589	66 771	77 036	94 607	48 589	66 771	77 036	94 607
Israel	36 115	44 234	48 271	72 998	40 217	49 346	54 177	74 567
Italy	43 315	47 820	52 613	64 478	43 488	48 953	54 077	67 368
Japan	43 085	55 089	61 679	74 196	43 085	55 089	61 730	76 159
Korea	43 482	63 636	74 310	116 446	43 139	61 754	72 226	115 171
Latvia	30 342	m	m	48 544	30 342	m	m	48 544
Lithuania	44 680	46 122	51 380	58 465	44 680	46 122	51 380	58 465
Luxembourg	109 393	136 741	150 897	190 149	109 392	136 741	150 897	190 149
Mexico	38 669	48 115	59 984	74 402	64 959	74 531	79 550	79 550
Netherlands	66 008	100 709	115 235	134 772	66 008	100 709	115 235	134 772
New Zealand	40 888	65 283	65 283	65 283	42 724	68 727	68 727	68 727
Norway	64 371	66 918	66 918	71 844	64 371	72 851	72 851	81 551

	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale
	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Poland	32 493	38 533	46 818	48 794	32 493	38 533	46 818	48 794
Portugal	44 924	53 926	57 045	94 262	44 924	53 926	57 045	94 262
Slovak Republic	25 560	28 740	29 433	32 921	25 560	28 740	29 433	32 921
Slovenia	41 137	57 501	69 569	84 193	41 137	57 501	69 569	84 193
Spain	66 772	72 675	77 440	95 292	66 772	72 675	77 440	95 292
Sweden[3, 4, 5]	53 581	58 758	61 633	70 369	54 561	59 387	62 115	71 209
Switzerland	84 627	109 555	m	128 521	94 381	121 206	m	143 695
Türkiye	49 916	53 565	56 015	64 135	49 916	53 565	56 015	64 135
United States	51 844	72 324	78 231	89 037	54 288	71 005	78 458	85 609
Other economies								
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	55 176	69 029	77 634	97 714	68 679	87 360	99 533	123 881
French Comm. (Belgium)	52 227	65 223	73 390	89 725	64 890	82 620	94 175	113 432
England (UK)	47 897	a	73 914	73 914	47 897	a	73 914	73 914
Scotland (UK)	59 034	74 097	74 097	74 097	59 034	74 097	74 097	74 097
OECD average	**49 712**	**63 085**	**66 583**	**79 800**	**51 155**	**65 691**	**68 928**	**82 451**
Partner and/or accession countries								
Argentina	20 160	23 169	24 713	29 541	20 160	23 169	24 713	29 541
Brazil	25 710	m	m	m	25 710	m	m	m
Bulgaria	33 526	34 580	35 917	m	33 526	34 580	35 917	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	47 287	49 404	50 581	56 462	47 287	49 404	50 581	56 462
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	22 065	m	m	45 772	22 065	m	m	45 772
Romania	37 612	47 100	48 885	53 569	37 612	47 100	48 885	53 569
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	20 838	32 522	41 745	47 120	20 838	32 522	41 745	47 120
EU25 average	**49 471**	**60 003**	**65 122**	**78 979**	**50 091**	**61 679**	**66 962**	**81 614**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: The definition of teachers' most prevalent qualifications is based on a broad concept, including the typical ISCED level of attainment and other criteria. The most prevalent qualification is defined for each of the four career stages included in this table. In many cases, the minimum qualification is the same as the most prevalent qualification. The minimum and the most prevalent qualifications are described in Table X3.D3.3 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes*.

1. Data on pre-primary education include salaries of kindergarten teachers (the majority).
2. Data include the average of fixed bonuses for overtime hours for lower and upper secondary teachers.
3. Year of reference: 2024 (calendar year for Sweden).
4. Data exclude the social security contributions and pension scheme contributions paid by employees.
5. Actual salaries (including teachers of general subjects within vocational programmes in Sweden, and excluding bonuses and allowances in the United States).

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z15uv3.

Table D3.2. Teachers' and school heads' actual salaries relative to earnings of tertiary-educated workers (2025)

Ratio of salary, using annual average salaries (including bonuses and allowances) of full-time teachers and school heads in public institutions relative to the earnings of workers with similar educational attainment (weighted average) and to the earnings of full-time, full-year workers with tertiary education, by level of education

	Year of reference of latest available data on earnings of tertiary-educated workers	All teachers							
		Actual salaries, relative to earnings for full-time, full-year similarly educated workers (weighted averages, 25-64 year-olds)				Actual salaries, relative to earnings for full-time, full-year workers with tertiary education (ISCED 5 to 8, 25-64 year-olds)			
		Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
OECD countries									
Australia	2024	m	m	m	m	1.00	0.92	0.92	0.92
Austria	2024	m	m	m	m	m	0.76	0.83	0.90
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile[1]	2024	0.66	0.67	0.68	0.70	0.77	0.78	0.79	0.81
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	2024	m	m	m	m	1.25	1.28	1.69	1.69
Czechia[1]	2024	0.74	0.69	0.68	0.71	0.55	0.69	0.69	0.74
Denmark	2024	m	m	m	0.82	0.69	0.81	0.82	0.94
Estonia	2024	0.72	0.86	0.84	0.83	0.66	0.87	0.87	0.87
Finland[2]	2023	0.75	0.74	0.81	0.91	0.68	0.86	0.94	1.06
France	2022	0.83	0.81	0.85	0.92	0.82	0.81	0.90	0.98
Germany	2024	m	m	m	m	m	0.87	0.96	1.01
Greece	2018	0.69	0.69	0.73	0.73	0.70	0.70	0.76	0.76
Hungary	2024	0.79	0.75	0.75	0.65	0.70	0.73	0.73	0.76
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland	2022	a	m	m	m	a	0.87	0.91	0.91
Israel	2023	0.68	0.65	0.65	0.72	0.73	0.73	0.76	0.81
Italy	2023	m	m	m	m	0.64	0.64	0.67	0.71
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	2024	0.69	0.71	0.71	0.70	0.65	0.74	0.74	0.74
Lithuania	2022	m	m	m	m	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01
Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	2024	0.86	0.86	0.90	0.90	0.81	0.81	0.88	0.88
New Zealand	2024	m	0.87	0.86	0.90	m	0.87	0.87	0.91
Norway	2024	0.75	0.79	0.86	0.81	0.68	0.75	0.75	0.82
Poland	2024	0.70	0.82	0.85	0.85	0.72	0.84	0.87	0.87
Portugal	2024	m	m	m	m	1.35	1.26	1.25	1.34

	Year of reference of latest available data on earnings of tertiary-educated workers	All teachers							
		Actual salaries, relative to earnings for full-time, full-year similarly educated workers (weighted averages, 25-64 year-olds)				Actual salaries, relative to earnings for full-time, full-year workers with tertiary education (ISCED 5 to 8, 25-64 year-olds)			
		Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Slovak Republic	2024	m	m	m	m	0.60	0.74	0.74	0.79
Slovenia[1, 2]	2022	0.74	0.79	0.79	0.80	0.68	0.84	0.85	0.89
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden[1]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	2024	m	m	m	m	1.79	1.79	1.68	1.68
United States	2024	0.53	0.54	0.55	0.57	0.60	0.61	0.63	0.66
Other economies									
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)[3]	2023	0.98	0.95	0.94	0.98	0.87	0.85	0.86	1.03
French Comm. (Belgium)[3]	2023	0.92	0.89	0.83	0.91	0.82	0.80	0.79	0.98
England (UK)[3]	2024	0.82	0.82	0.96	0.96	0.87	0.87	1.03	1.03
Scotland (UK)[3]	2024	m	m	m	m	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
OECD average		**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**0.83**	**0.87**	**0.91**	**0.95**
Partner and/or accession countries									
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	2022	m	m	m	m	1.65	1.63	1.58	1.58
Romania	2024	m	m	m	m	1.01	1.04	1.05	1.07
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average		**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**0.77**	**0.84**	**0.87**	**0.91**
G20 average		**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

	All school heads							
	Actual salaries, relative to earnings for full-time, full-year similarly educated workers (weighted averages, 25-64 year-olds)				Actual salaries, relative to earnings for full-time, full-year workers with tertiary education (ISCED 5 to 8, 25-64 year-olds)			
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes
	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
OECD countries								
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	1.51	1.75	1.75
Austria	m	m	m	m	m	1.11	1.16	1.38
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile[1]	0.94	0.93	0.94	1.04	1.10	1.08	1.10	1.22
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	1.99	1.83	2.20	2.20
Czechia[1]	1.01	1.05	1.05	1.16	0.80	1.09	1.09	1.21
Denmark	m	m	m	1.31	0.90	1.20	1.20	1.51
Estonia	0.87	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.93	1.09	1.09	1.09
Finland[2]	0.95	1.02	1.20	1.24	0.91	1.19	1.40	1.44
France	m	m	m	m	0.96	0.96	1.31	1.31
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	0.92	0.92	0.98	0.98	1.00	1.00	1.14	1.14
Hungary	1.05	1.02	1.02	0.99	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.05
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ireland	a	m	m	m	a	1.23	1.58	1.58
Israel	a	0.99	0.96	1.12	a	1.27	1.25	1.36
Italy	a	m	m	m	a	1.94	1.94	1.94
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
Lithuania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Luxembourg	a	a	m	m	a	a	m	m
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	1.14	1.14	1.24	1.24	1.13	1.13	1.27	1.27
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	1.37	1.57	1.78
Norway	0.94	1.08	1.08	1.20	0.86	1.01	1.01	1.22
Poland	1.02	1.09	1.09	1.19	1.05	1.12	1.12	1.22
Portugal	m	m	m	m	1.84	1.84	1.84	1.84
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia[1, 2]	1.23	1.06	1.06	1.10	1.23	1.19	1.19	1.23
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden[1]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	m	m	m	m	2.02	2.09	2.09	2.09
United States	0.83	0.84	0.87	0.89	1.05	1.06	1.09	1.12

	All school heads							
	Actual salaries, relative to earnings for full-time, full-year similarly educated workers (weighted averages, 25-64 year-olds)				Actual salaries, relative to earnings for full-time, full-year workers with tertiary education (ISCED 5 to 8, 25-64 year-olds)			
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes
	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
Other economies								
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)[3]	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.45	1.26	1.26	1.36	1.57
French Comm. (Belgium)[3]	1.25	1.27	1.25	1.30	1.13	1.16	1.21	1.36
England (UK)[3]	1.47	1.47	2.00	2.00	1.54	1.54	2.17	2.17
Scotland (UK)[3]	a	m	m	m	a	1.51	1.95	1.95
OECD average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**1.28**	**1.39**	**1.46**
Partner and/or accession countries								
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	2.80	2.69	2.64	2.64
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**1.21**	**1.29**	**1.35**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Where the year of reference for the earnings of tertiary-educated workers and the salaries of teachers differ, the earnings of tertiary-educated workers have been adjusted to the reference year used for salaries of teachers using deflators for private final consumption expenditure.
1. Reference year differs from 2025 for salaries of teachers and school heads: 2024 for Czechia, Slovenia and Sweden (calendar year), 2023 for Chile.
2. Data on teachers in pre-primary education include the data for teachers in early childhood education and care.
3. Data on earnings for full-time, full-year workers with tertiary education refer to the whole country: Belgium for the Flemish and the French Communities of Belgium, and the United Kingdom for England and Scotland.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z15uv3.

Table D3.3. Teachers' and school heads' average actual salaries (2025)

Annual average salaries (including bonuses and allowances) of teachers and school heads in public institutions, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs for private consumption, by level of education

	25-64 year-old teachers				25-64 year-old school heads			
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
OECD countries								
Australia	83 751	77 473	77 583	77 607	m	126 760	146 501	146 526
Austria	m	91 397	99 455	107 487	m	132 729	139 443	165 831
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile[1]	38 443	39 089	39 441	40 482	60 024	59 306	60 206	66 775
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	44 666	45 889	60 543	60 543	71 101	65 504	78 711	78 711
Czechia[1]	33 731	42 352	42 436	45 172	48 903	66 754	66 754	73 902
Denmark	68 888	81 741	82 233	94 886	90 159	120 867	120 867	152 235
Estonia	33 458	44 158	44 158	44 158	46 897	55 073	55 073	55 073
Finland[2]	52 786	66 315	72 742	82 300	70 446	92 136	108 159	111 632
France[1]	58 309	57 343	63 915	69 433	68 050	68 050	92 987	92 987
Germany	m	99 000	109 039	114 266	m	m	m	m
Greece	33 607	33 607	36 478	36 478	47 620	47 620	54 242	54 242
Hungary	46 676	48 705	48 705	50 698	63 140	66 793	66 793	69 937
Iceland[2]	65 816	68 380	68 380	87 094	87 754	96 759	96 759	115 102
Ireland	a	79 083	82 831	82 831	a	112 274	143 755	143 755
Israel	57 962	57 400	59 811	64 282	a	100 682	98 377	107 654
Italy	51 346	51 346	53 992	57 427	a	156 372	156 372	156 372
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	33 996	38 482	38 482	38 557	51 370	51 370	51 370	51 370
Lithuania	64 864	64 864	64 864	64 864	m	m	m	m
Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	a	a	m	m
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	98 899	98 899	107 310	107 310	138 070	138 070	155 222	155 222
New Zealand	m	67 384	67 518	70 754	m	106 333	121 996	138 780
Norway	65 595	73 021	73 021	79 200	83 204	97 498	97 498	117 777
Poland[1]	51 362	59 900	62 503	62 322	75 205	80 367	80 367	87 274
Portugal	68 677	64 449	63 986	68 362	93 666	93 666	93 666	93 666
Slovak Republic	33 863	42 060	42 060	44 864	m	m	m	m
Slovenia[1, 2]	46 182	56 624	57 424	59 876	83 244	80 119	80 119	82 983
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden[1, 2]	51 150	58 391	60 737	61 894	77 966	86 557	86 557	87 330
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	66 657	66 657	62 895	62 895	75 245	77 933	77 933	77 933
United States	68 074	69 950	72 439	74 850	119 526	120 659	124 232	127 940
Other economies								
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	80 060	78 580	79 241	95 233	116 242	116 242	125 146	144 487
French Comm. (Belgium)	75 841	74 038	72 603	90 115	104 147	106 409	111 169	125 594
England (UK)	63 658	63 658	75 839	75 839	113 360	113 360	159 295	159 295
Scotland (UK)	72 307	72 307	72 307	72 307	a	110 754	143 296	143 296
OECD average	**56 334**	**62 942**	**65 499**	**69 255**	**m**	**93 468**	**100 867**	**107 309**

	25-64 year-old teachers				25-64 year-old school heads			
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary, general programmes	Upper secondary, general programmes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Partner and/or accession countries								
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	29 007	28 767	27 830	27 830	49 321	47 451	46 486	46 486
Romania	49 282	51 011	51 460	52 396	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
EU25 average	**53 057**	**62 192**	**64 797**	**68 488**	**m**	**91 773**	**98 230**	**104 050**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Where the year of reference for the earnings of tertiary-educated workers and the salaries of teacher differ, the earnings of tertiary-educated workers have been adjusted using deflators for private final consumption expenditure.

1. Reference year differs from 2025: 2024 for Chile (school heads), Czechia, Slovenia and Sweden (calendar year); 2023 for Chile (teachers) and France (calendar year).

2. Data on teachers in pre-primary education include the data for teachers in early childhood education and care.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z15uv3.

Chapter D4. How much time do teachers spend teaching and working?

Highlights

- Based on official regulations or agreements, teachers in public educational institutions in OECD countries and economies are required to teach on average 965 hours per year at pre-primary level, 770 hours at primary level, 710 hours at lower secondary level (general programmes) and 678 hours at upper secondary level (general programmes).
- The way teachers' total working time is divided between teaching and non-teaching activities, and the distribution of working hours taking place within the school or elsewhere, varies widely across countries.
- Non-teaching tasks are part of teachers' workloads and there is wide variation across countries as to which tasks are mandatory or voluntary for teachers. Tasks and activities that are considered voluntary in a larger proportion of countries are also those for which teachers are provided an allowance or additional payment in a larger proportion of countries. For example, few countries require teachers to mentor new teachers; and an allowance or additional payment is generally offered to teachers for volunteering to do so.

Context


Although statutory working and teaching hours only partly determine teachers' actual workloads, they do offer valuable insights into the demands placed on teachers in different countries. Teaching hours and the extent of non-teaching duties may also affect the attractiveness of the teaching profession (see Chapter 1, *Teacher shortages and the attractiveness of the teaching profession*). Together with salaries (see Chapter D3) and average class sizes (see Chapter D2), this chapter presents some key measures of the working lives of teachers.

The proportion of teachers' statutory working time spent teaching indicates how much time they have available for non-teaching activities, such as lesson preparation, correction, in-service training and staff meetings. A greater share of statutory working time spent teaching may indicate that a smaller share of working time is devoted to tasks such as assessing students and preparing lessons, as stated in regulations. It could also indicate that teachers perform these tasks in their own time and hence work longer hours than their statutory working hours.

In addition to class sizes and the ratio of students to teaching staff (see Chapter D2), students' hours of instruction (see Chapter D1 of *Education at a Glance 2025* (OECD, 2025[1])) and teachers' salaries (see Chapter D3), the amount of time teachers spend teaching also has implications for the financial resources that countries need to allocate to education (see Chapter C7 of *Education at a Glance 2023* (OECD, 2023[2])).

Figure D4.1. Teaching time of teachers, by level of education (2025)

Net statutory teaching time in hours per year, in public institutions



Note: Please refer to the source table for information on whether the data refer to typical, minimum or maximum hours.
1. Actual teaching time (in Latvia except for pre-primary level).
2. Reference year differs from 2023. Refer to the source table for details.
3. Average planned teaching time in each school at the beginning of the school year.
For data, see Table D4.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ud51n.

Other findings

- Across countries and economies, required teaching time in public institutions varies more widely at the pre-primary level than at any other level, ranging from 505 hours in Mexico to 1 445 hours in Iceland.
- Lower secondary teachers spend 42% of their working time on teaching on average, ranging from less than 32% in Bulgaria and the Republic of Türkiye, to 58% or more in Israël, Lithuania, Luxembourg and Scotland (United Kingdom). Teachers in most countries are required to perform various non-teaching tasks during their working time, such as lesson planning/preparation, marking students' work and communicating or co-operating with parents or guardians.
- In 21 OECD countries and economies, teachers' statutory working time includes working during students' school holidays in at least one level of education. In most of these countries, working time during school holidays is required to be spent on specific activities, such as preparation for the next school term, or individual and/or collective professional development activities.

Analysis

Teaching time of teachers

Across pre-primary, primary and secondary levels, countries vary considerably in their annual statutory teaching time – the number of hours per year a full-time teacher in a public school is required to teach. Differences in how teaching time is regulated and/or reported across countries may explain some of the differences in statutory teaching time between countries (for more information see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes,* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Statutory teaching time in public institutions varies more at the pre-primary level than at any other level among OECD countries and economies with data available. On average, pre-primary teachers are required to teach 965 hours per year, spread over 40 weeks or 193 days. The number of teaching days ranges from 162 days per year in France to 225 days in Germany. Annual teaching hours range from 505 hours or less per year in Mexico to 1 445 hours in Iceland. These wide variations result from the combination of differences in the number of days of teaching and in the number of teaching hours per day. For example, pre-primary teachers teach an average of 2.7 hours per day over 190 days in Mexico, but 6.6 hours per day over 219 days in Iceland (Table D4.1 and Figure D4.1).

Primary school teachers are required to teach an average of 770 hours per year in public institutions. In most countries and economies with available data, teaching time ranges from about 2.4 to 6.2 hours a day, with an OECD average of more than 4 hours per day. There is no set pattern to how teaching time is distributed throughout the year. For example, primary school teachers in the Netherlands teach 940 hours per year, 112 hours more than in Spain (828 hours). However, as teachers teach on more days per year in the Netherlands than in Spain (200 days compared to 176 days), teachers in both countries teach nearly 5 hours a day on average (Figure D4.1).

Lower secondary school teachers in general programmes in public institutions are required to teach an average of 710 hours per year. Teaching time ranges from under 500 hours in Bulgaria, Poland and Thailand, to over 1 000 hours in Chile and Costa Rica (Table D4.1 and Figure D4.1). However, while reported hours refer to the minimum time teachers are required to teach in Thailand, they refer to the maximum teaching time in Chile (see Box D4.2 and Table D.D4.3 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en). Where official documents in some countries define a minimum or maximum number of teaching hours, teaching hours can be adjusted to meet the specific needs of individual schools.

A teacher in general upper secondary education in public institutions has an average teaching workload of 678 hours per year. Teaching time ranges from fewer than 500 hours per year in Bulgaria, Iceland, Japan, Poland and Thailand to more than 1 000 hours in Chile and Costa Rica (Figure D4.1). Teachers in Bulgaria, Japan, Korea, Norway, Poland, Thailand and Türkiye teach for less than 3 hours per day, on average, compared to 6 hours or more in Costa Rica (Table D4.1).

In some countries teaching time requirements may differ at the subnational level (Box D4.1), or throughout a teacher's career, or according to their qualification level (Box D4.2). Several countries reduce some new teachers' teaching workload during their induction programmes. Some countries also encourage older teachers to stay in the profession by reducing their teaching hours. For example, in Chile, Portugal and Spain, teachers may have a reduced teaching workload based on their number of years in the profession and/or age.

Box D4.1. Teaching hours at the subnational level (2025)

There are regional differences in teachers' statutory teaching and working time in the four countries reporting subnational data (Belgium, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States). The number of weeks of teaching (at pre-primary, primary and lower and upper secondary levels) is the same across subnational entities with available data in Belgium and the United Kingdom but varies across provinces in Canada (ranging from 36 to 40 weeks in 2025) and states in the United States (from 34 to 37 weeks in 2021). However, equal number of weeks of teaching at the subnational level can mask differences in teaching time in terms of days or hours of teaching at the subnational level.

The four countries show different patterns of variation at the subnational level. In Belgium, neither the number of days of teaching nor the number of hours vary much (in relative terms) between the Flemish and French Communities, except for teaching time at the pre-primary level (a difference of 9%, from 704 hours in the Flemish Community to 766 hours in the French Community). In the United Kingdom, the number of days of teaching varies by less than 3% between subnational entities with available data (by 5 days), but teaching hours vary much more widely. Teaching time is 48% longer in Wales (1 265 hours) than in Scotland (855 hours). There is greater variation in Canada in both dimensions: the number of teaching days varies by 6% at primary and lower secondary levels, and 9% at the upper secondary level, while teaching time varies by 45% at the primary level (from 700 hours in New Brunswick to 1 018 hours in Manitoba) rising to 65% for lower and upper secondary general programmes (from 615 hours in Québec to 1 018 hours in Manitoba). In contrast, in the United States, the number of days of teaching varies by 6-8% (from 169 days at the primary level to 183 days in general programmes at the upper secondary level) but teaching hours vary much more. At the primary level, teaching time in Michigan (993 hours), the state with the longest teaching hours, is 29% higher than teaching time in Maine (770 hours). For lower and upper secondary general programmes, the difference is 37-38% (from less than 760 hours in New Hampshire at lower secondary level and in Oregon at upper secondary level, to 1 038 hours in Mississippi at lower secondary level and Alabama at upper secondary level) and exceeds 50% at the pre-primary level (from 665 hours in Oregon to 1 018 hours in Alabama).

However, caution is necessary when comparing information at the subnational level: there can be differences in the regulations between countries and between subnational regions within countries, and also differences in how data are reported and varying data availability for subnational regions within countries. For example, these figures refer to typical teaching time for the subnational regions of Belgium, but to estimated teaching time (based on self-reported information from teachers) for the different states in the United States.

Source: (OECD, 2026[3]) Education at a Glance Database, http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4sg.

Differences in teaching time by level of education

Teaching time tends to decrease as the level of education increases, which may be due to teaching at higher levels requiring more subject specialisation and preparation from teachers as well as a larger non-teaching workload (for example, due to examinations). In most countries and economies, the number of statutory teaching hours (in public institutions) at the pre-primary level is greater than at the upper secondary level (general programmes). The exceptions are Brazil, Chile and Scotland (United Kingdom), where teachers are required to teach the same number of hours at all levels of education, and Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and Thailand, where upper secondary school teachers are required to teach more hours than pre-primary school teachers (Table D4.1).

The largest difference in teaching time requirements is between the pre-primary and primary levels of education. On average across the countries and economies with data for both levels, pre-primary teachers are required to spend about 36% more time in the classroom than primary teachers. In Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Iceland, Latvia and Slovenia, pre-primary school teachers are required to teach more than twice the number of hours per year as primary school teachers (Table D4.1).

Primary school teachers teach 9% more hours per year on average than lower secondary school teachers. The difference reaches or exceeds 30% in the Netherlands, Romania and Türkiye whereas there is no difference in Brazil, Chile, Czechia, Hungary, Iceland, Scotland (United Kingdom), Slovenia and Thailand. In contrast, the teaching workload for primary school teachers is lighter than for lower secondary teachers – by 3-7% in Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Estonia and Lithuania; 14% in Latvia; 17% in Croatia; and 23% in Mexico (Table D4.1).

In most countries and economies, the teaching hours in lower and upper secondary levels are similar (5% different or less). However, lower secondary teachers teach at least 25% more hours per year than their upper secondary counterparts in Iceland and in Norway (Table D4.1).

Box D4.2 Teaching hours: Interpretation and comparability issues

In this chapter, data on the working conditions of teachers refer to full-time fully qualified teachers in the reference year, as defined for each country. Although there are minimum qualification requirements (usually a tertiary qualification) to enter the teaching profession and become fully qualified teachers (see Chapter D6 in *Education at a Glance 2023* (OECD, 2023[2])), some countries set other (higher or lower) qualification levels associated with different levels of compensation (see Chapter D3). In some countries, teachers' qualifications may influence their teaching hours. In these cases, the data on teaching time refer to typical qualification levels, that is to say the most prevalent qualification teachers hold. For example, in France, general secondary teachers can have two different tertiary qualifications (*certification* or *agrégation*) which have different teaching requirements, and the teaching time cited for secondary teachers refers to those with certification, the most prevalent qualification at this level.

Data on teaching time refer to net contact time as stated in the regulations of each country. The international data collection exercise ensures that similar definitions and methodologies are used when compiling data from all countries. For example, teaching time is converted into hours (of 60 minutes) to avoid differences resulting from the varying length of teaching periods between countries.

Official documents might regulate teaching time as a minimum, typical or maximum time, and these differences may explain some of the differences reported between countries. Although most data refer to typical teaching time, about one-third of countries and economies report either maximum or minimum values for teaching time. Some other countries report an average. For example, teaching time for Latvia is reported as typical value, but this is statutory data for pre-primary level and actual data for primary and secondary levels (see Table D.D4.3 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Note*s (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)).

Statutory teaching time in this international comparison excludes preparation time and periods of time formally allowed for breaks between lessons or groups of lessons. However, at pre-primary and primary levels, short breaks (of ten minutes or less) are included in the teaching time when the classroom teacher is responsible for the class during these breaks (for example, at the primary level in Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, Korea, the Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Spain and Switzerland).

To enhance data comparability, professional development days (including attending conferences) and student examination days are excluded from teaching hours. At each level of general education, about two-thirds of the countries and economies with available information were able to exclude the number of days spent on these activities when reporting statutory teaching time (see Table D.D4.4 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)). However, in the rest of the countries, regulations do not always specify the number of days devoted to some of these activities and/or whether teachers are required to conduct these activities outside of scheduled teaching times, making it difficult to estimate and exclude them from teaching time.

Less than one-third of countries and economies cannot exclude professional development days from reported teaching time: the regulations specify some days of professional development activities for all teachers, but the impact on reported teaching time is difficult to estimate as the number of days and how they are organised during the school year may vary across schools or subnational entities. Similarly, more than one-quarter of countries and economies with available information cannot exclude student examination days from teaching time at each level of general education. Although the regulations may include some guidelines about the number of student examination days, they are not clear about whether scheduled teaching time is reduced by the time devoted to examinations, and if so, by how much. Overall, not excluding the time devoted to professional development and student examination may result in annual teaching time being overestimated by a few days in these countries.

In some cases, some professional development activities and student examinations may result in the overestimation of teaching time, even if countries are not asked to exclude them from teaching hours. Examples include professional development activities required for specific groups of teachers only (when regulations do not explicitly forbid them from

participating during their scheduled teaching time) and compulsory standardised student assessments which are conducted for only a few hours of the school day. The complexity of estimation and the fact that only some teachers participate in these activities make it difficult to standardise reporting practices across all countries in order to exclude these activities from teaching time.

More detailed information on the reporting practices on teaching time and working time is available in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Actual teaching time

Statutory teaching time, as reported by most of the countries in this chapter, refers to teaching time as defined in regulations. However, individual teachers may spend more or less time teaching than the statutory hours, for example, because of overtime, leave (in addition to statutory leave) or because statutory teaching time is defined in terms of minimum or maximum hours. Actual teaching time is the annual average number of hours that full-time teachers spend teaching a group or a class of students, including overtime and other activities ranging from keeping order to administrative tasks, and therefore provides a clearer picture of teachers' actual teaching workload.

While only a few countries were able to report both statutory and actual teaching time, these data suggest that actual teaching time can differ from the statutory requirements. For example, lower secondary teachers in Lithuania actually taught 2% less hours in 2024 than their 2025 statutory teaching time, while those in Poland taught 22% more hours (see Table D.D4.6 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en), and the OECD Data Explorer (http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s)).

Differences between statutory and actual teaching time may result from overtime due to teacher absences or shortages. The nature of the data can also contribute to differences, as figures on statutory teaching time refer to official requirements and agreements, whereas actual teaching time is based on administrative registers, statistical databases, representative sample surveys or other representative sources (for more details, see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)).


Working time of teachers

In the majority of countries and economies, full-time teachers' working time is partly determined by the statutory teaching time specified in working regulations. In addition, teachers in most countries are also formally required to work a specific number of hours per year, as stipulated in collective agreements or other contractual arrangements. This may be specified either as the number of hours teachers must be available at school for teaching and non-teaching activities (working time required at school), or as the total number of working hours. Both correspond to official working hours as specified in contractual agreements, and countries differ in how they allocate time for each activity. These teaching and working time requirements are adjusted for part-time teachers (Box D4.3).

Nearly half of countries and economies specify teachers' working time required at school for at least one level of education. In more than one-third of the 18 countries with available data for both pre-primary and upper secondary levels, the number of hours teachers are required to be available at school differs by less than 5% between these levels. Among the remaining countries and economies, pre-primary teachers' working time required at school is at least 20% more than their upper secondary counterparts in the Flemish Community of Belgium, Hungary, Luxembourg, Portugal, Sweden and Türkiye, and the difference exceeds 38% in Latvia and Romania. Greece and Israel are the only countries where upper secondary teachers are required to be working at school for at least 3% more hours than their pre-primary counterparts. Despite these large differences in working time required at schools between pre-primary and upper secondary levels, total statutory working time is the same for both levels in Hungary, Romania and Türkiye (Table D4.2).

Figure D4.2. Working time of teachers in lower secondary education (2025)

Statutory working time in hours per year, in general programmes in public institutions



1. Teachers' working time requirements refer to those of civil servants.
2. Reference year differs from 2023. Refer to the source table for details.
For data, see Table D4.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ud51n.

In some countries, the regulations only specify teachers' total annual statutory working time (at school and elsewhere), but not the working time required at school. This is the case for all levels of education in about one-quarter of OECD countries and economies (Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, England [United Kingdom], Japan, Korea, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Switzerland) and for some levels of education in Estonia (primary and secondary), France (secondary), the French Community of Belgium (pre-primary and primary) and Germany (at primary and secondary level) (Table D4.2 and Figure D4.2).The variations across countries in teachers' annual working hours can be partly due to whether their total working time covers the periods when students are on school vacations. For example, at general upper secondary level, total working time for teachers in Israel, who are not required to work during school vacations, is 1 217 hours, compared to 1 807 hours in Switzerland, where teachers work up to 4 weeks (174 hours) during school vacations (Figure D4.3). In 21 countries and economies, teachers' statutory working time includes working during students' school holidays in at least one level of education. In most of these, teachers are required to spend the working time during school holidays on specific activities, such as preparation for the next term, or individual and/or collective professional development activities (see Table D.D4.5 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes,* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)).

Non-teaching time

Although teaching time is a substantial component of teachers' workloads, other activities such as assessing students, preparing lessons, correcting students' work, in-service training and staff meetings should also be taken into account when analysing the demands placed on teachers in different countries. The amount of time available for these non-teaching activities varies across countries; a larger share of statutory working time spent teaching may indicate that a smaller share of time is devoted to these activities or that they are done outside the statutory working time.

Even though teaching is their core activity, teachers spend most of their working time on non-teaching activities in many countries. In the 27 countries and economies with data for both teaching and total working time for lower secondary teachers, 42% of


teachers' working time is spent on teaching on average, with the proportion ranging from less than 32% in Bulgaria and Türkiye, to 58% or more in Israel, Lithuania, Luxembourg and Scotland (United Kingdom) (Figure D4.3).

Although the proportion of working time spent teaching tends to increase with the number of teaching hours per year, there are some differences among countries. For example, Luxembourg and the Netherlands have a similar number of teaching hours at lower secondary level (739 hours per year in Luxembourg and 720 hours in the Netherlands), but 60% of teachers' working time is spent on teaching in Luxembourg, compared to 43% in the Netherlands. In some other countries, teachers devote similar proportions of their working time to teaching, despite having considerably different teaching hours. For example, in both Croatia and Poland, lower secondary teachers spend about 34% of their working time teaching, but have 604 teaching hours per year in Croatia, compared to 486 hours in Poland (Figure D4.3).

A few countries and economies have no formal requirements about the amount of time teachers spend on non-teaching activities, at least at some levels of education. This is the case in countries that only define the number of teaching hours per year, and not their annual working hours (at school or elsewhere), such as Austria (primary and secondary levels), Brazil, Costa Rica, the French Community of Belgium (lower and upper secondary levels), Italy and Mexico (Table D4.2). However, this does not mean that teachers are given total freedom over how they carry out other tasks. In Italy, teachers are required to perform up to 80 hours of scheduled non-teaching collegial work at school per year. Of these 80 hours, up to 40 hours are dedicated to meetings of the teachers' assembly, staff planning meetings and meetings with parents, with the remaining 40 hours dedicated to class councils (Table D.D4.5 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes,* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)).

Figure D4.3. Number of hours of teaching and percentage of working time spent teaching for lower secondary teachers (2025)

Annual net teaching and total statutory working hours, in general programmes in public institutions



Note: Please refer to source tables for information on whether the data refer to typical, minimum or maximum hours.
1. Actual teaching time.
2. Average planned teaching time in each school at the beginning of the school year.
Countries and other economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of total statutory working time spent teaching.
For data, see Figure D4.2 and Table D4.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ud51n.

Non-teaching tasks and responsibilities

Non-teaching tasks are a part of teachers' workloads and working conditions. The non-teaching activities required by legislation, regulations or agreements between stakeholders (e.g. teachers' unions, local authorities and school boards) do not necessarily reflect teachers' actual participation in non-teaching activities, but they provide an insight into the breadth and complexity of teachers' roles, and may explain part of the stress related to the teachers' workloads (Box D4.3).

Box D4.3. Teachers' workload and stress: Insights from TALIS 2024

Teachers do not necessarily spend their working time in the way statutory arrangements suggest. Data from the Teaching and Learning International Survey 2024 (TALIS 2024) allows the actual time lower secondary teachers spend on different tasks to be identified and the prevalence of stress associated with those tasks assessed.

Workload, stress and salaries are key determinants of teachers' job satisfaction and ultimately of the attractiveness of the teaching profession. High levels of stress and disproportionate workloads compared to other workers can discourage potential candidates from entering the profession and encourage current teachers to leave (see Chapter 1), while competitive salaries (see Chapter D3) and manageable working conditions help retain experienced teachers and attract new candidates.

Allocation of actual working time

Across all OECD countries, lower secondary teachers report teaching as their main activity, although it accounts for less than half of their workload. On average, they reported spending 43% of their total actual working time[1] teaching (OECD, 2025[4]). The share is similar to that derived from statutory data. Teaching only exceeds half the self-reported working time of teachers in Finland and the French Community of Belgium. Lesson planning (14% of working time on average) and marking students' work (9%) are the next most time-consuming activities. Teachers also report spending about 6% of their working time on administrative tasks on average, ranging from about 4% or less in France and Romania, to over 9% in Japan and about 14% in Korea.

Across most OECD countries and economies, average teaching time does not differ significantly by teachers' years of experience (Table 3.12 in (OECD, 2025[4])). Where differences do exist, novice teachers (those with up to five years of teaching experience) are more likely to report spending a larger share of working time teaching than experienced teachers (with more than ten years of experience). This is the case in 11 OECD countries and economies, while the opposite pattern is observed in only 6. Novice and experienced teachers do appear to organise their non-teaching time differently. On average across OECD countries, novice teachers spend over half an hour more per week on lesson planning than their experienced peers and in 12 OECD countries and economies, this gap widens to between one and two additional hours per week. Although there is no significant difference in the time novice and experienced teachers spend on marking and correcting on average across OECD countries, in the 15 OECD countries and economies where differences do emerge, experienced teachers report spending more time on this task than novice ones, with the difference exceeding one hour in Israel, Lithuania, Portugal and Romania.

Workload and source of stress

The relationship between teaching workload and stress is complex. The volume and distribution of working time provide only a partial picture of teachers' workload. Some activities tend to weigh more heavily than others on teachers' self-reported stress, and the tasks perceived as most stressful are not always the most time-consuming. These pressures can have broader consequences for how teachers organise their professional lives, potentially leading to them adjusting their working arrangements, including opting to teach part time (see Chapter D5).

On average across OECD countries, the share of teachers who reported experiencing "a lot" of stress in their work increased slightly from 17.4% in 2018 to 18.8% in 2024 (Table 2.4 in (OECD, 2025[4])). However, in some countries and economies there are much larger increases, of 7-11 percentage points in Australia (+9.8 points), Estonia (+10.7 points), Japan (+7.2 points) and Norway (+8.1 points) and exceeding 15 percentage points in Alberta (Canada) (+15.4 percentage points). In 2024, particularly high shares were reported in Australia (34.0% of teachers), Estonia (28.5%), Hungary (28.5%), New Zealand (32.9%) and the United States (29.6%). Administrative workload also appears to be a major source of pressure. Across the OECD, more than half of teachers (51.7%) report that having too much administrative work is a source of stress "quite a bit"

or “a lot”, with particularly high shares in Australia (69.0% of teachers), the Flemish Community of Belgium (75.5%), Portugal (79.3%), Spain (64.3%) and South Africa (66.1%) (Table 3.16 in (OECD, 2025[4])).

On average across OECD countries, 31% of lower secondary teachers identify the number of teaching hours as a source of stress. The share exceeds 50% in Brazil, Portugal, Saudi Arabia and South Africa. Teaching hours generally weighs equally on teachers regardless of their experience level, but where differences do emerge, experienced teachers tend to be more likely than novice teachers to report higher levels of stress, with an average gap of around 4 percentage points across OECD countries (Table 3.16 in (OECD, 2025[4])).

Marking students’ work is a source of stress for 40% of teachers across OECD countries, ranging from around 25% in Finland and Iceland to over 70% in Portugal. Experienced teachers were more likely to report stress from this than novice teachers across most OECD countries, a difference that exceeded 14 percentage points in Costa Rica and Denmark. The reverse pattern emerges only in Alberta (Canada), Colombia, Japan and the United States, where a greater share of novices report stress from this aspect of their work than their more experienced colleagues (Table 3.16 in (OECD, 2025[4])).

Other responsibilities, including being held accountable for student achievement, maintaining classroom discipline and addressing parents’ or guardians’ concerns, are equally likely to be identified as sources of stress by teachers, even though they are less time consuming than the activities identified above.

Source: OECD (2025[4]), *Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching*, https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en

As with other employees, individual teachers often have no choice about whether or not to perform certain tasks. According to national regulations for general lower secondary teachers, individual planning or preparing lessons and marking and correcting student work are two non-teaching tasks that are mandatory for teachers during their statutory working time in at least 40 out of the 46 countries and economies with available data. Communicating and co-operating with parents is also mandatory in 36 countries and economies. General administrative work and teamwork and dialogue with colleagues are also required in at least 29 countries and economies, and can be decided at the school level in at least 5 other countries with available data (Table D4.3, available online).

Responsibilities such as serving as a class or form teacher, participating in mentoring programmes or supporting new teachers in induction programmes, and participating in school or other management in addition to teaching duties are common among lower secondary teachers. These responsibilities are either mandatory for teachers or mandatory at the discretion of schools in more than half of countries. Full-time classroom teachers in general lower secondary education are either required or asked to perform student counselling in more than two-thirds of countries and economies with available information. However, not all teachers are eligible to carry out student counselling in some countries. For example, in Israel, only teachers with a master’s degree or higher can perform this duty (Table D4.4, available online).

Teachers can also take on responsibilities voluntarily. In at least 20 countries and economies, individual lower secondary teachers in general programmes may choose to engage in extracurricular activities or undertake special tasks. Teaching more classes or hours than their full-time contract requires is also a voluntary decision by teachers in more than one-third of countries and economies (Table D4.4, available online).

Participation in professional development activities is considered an important responsibility of teachers at all levels of education, as it is mandatory for all teachers at all levels in at least 27 countries and economies and is required at the discretion of individual schools in at least 8. Only three countries (Israel, Norway and Portugal) allow teachers to participate in professional development activities at their own discretion at all levels (Table D4.4, available online). Regardless of these requirements, a large majority of teachers in OECD countries participate in professional development activities (OECD, 2025[4]).

In general, requirements to perform certain tasks and responsibilities do not vary much between levels of education. However, there can be some differences, reflecting the changing needs of students at different levels of education. For example, supervising students during breaks is mandatory for teachers more widely at pre-primary level (25 countries and economies), than at primary (23), lower secondary (17) and upper secondary (16) (Table D4.3, available online).


Differences in task requirements between countries could help explain differences in the proportion of statutory working time teachers spend on non-teaching tasks and responsibilities. For example, Japan is one of the 11 countries where engaging in extracurricular activities is mandatory at the discretion of schools at lower secondary level (Table D4.4, available online), and

lower secondary teachers in Japan reported spending the highest proportion of their actual working time on this responsibility (10%) among OECD countries (OECD, 2025[4]).

Regardless of whether they are mandatory or not, teachers may receive some compensation for performing additional tasks and responsibilities, either in the form of reduced teaching time or through allowances or remuneration on top of their base salaries according to different criteria (see Chapter D3 for the criteria for additional payments). At lower secondary level, as at other levels of education, the number of countries awarding teachers an allowance or additional payment varies depending on the tasks and responsibilities concerned. Tasks and activities that are considered voluntary in a larger proportion of countries are also those for which teachers are provided an allowance or additional payment in a larger proportion of countries. For example, few countries require teachers to mentor new teachers, and an allowance or additional payment is generally offered to teachers for volunteering to do so (Figure D4.4).

Figure D4.4. Requirements and incentives for tasks and responsibilities of lower secondary teachers (2025)

Number of countries and other economies, in general programmes in public institutions



Note: "Mandatory for some" indicates that the specified task or responsibility is mandatory at the discretion of individual schools or in some subnational entities. "Financial incentive" indicates the task results in an allowance or additional payments for teachers.
Tasks and responsibilities are listed in decreasing order of the number of countries and other economies where the specified item is mandatory to some extent.
For data, see Tables D4.3 and D4.4 (available online). The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/ud51n.

Tasks related to teaching such as individual planning or preparing lessons, marking and correcting student work, and communicating and co-operating with parents are rarely compensated. At lower secondary level, performing these tasks results in an additional payment or allowance in at most three countries (less than 10% of those where these tasks are either mandatory or voluntary). However, more than three-quarters of countries and other economies (where tasks are mandatory or voluntary) offer financial compensation to teachers at lower secondary level for teaching more classes or hours than their full-time contract requires (Figure D4.4 and Table D4.4, available online). This may be explained by the fact that this task is directly related to teachers' main role; their statutory conditions clearly define the number of hours they are expected to teach, so they need to be compensated for any additional hours of teaching.


Participation in school or other management activities can result in additional compensation for teachers in more than half of the countries and economies with available data. In some, their teaching time might be reduced to balance the workload between teaching and other responsibilities, in addition to financial compensation (Figure D4.4 and Table D4.4, available online).

Box D4.4. Part-time teachers: Insights from TALIS 2024

This chapter analyses teaching and working time of teachers in public institutions, focusing on full-time teachers to ensure the comparability of information across countries. However, a significant proportion of teachers work on a part-time basis, and the share of part-time teachers varies significantly across countries (see Chapter D5).

Furthermore, teachers can vary in their degree of part-time work. In 17 out of 35 countries, the largest proportion of part-time teachers work 70-90% of the statutory working time of a full-time teacher. However, working less than half of the full-time statutory hours is also common, and this is even the most common form of part-time work in eight countries (Table 7.43 in (OECD, 2025[4])). This means that teachers' working time can still vary significantly even between two countries with a similar share of part-time teachers.

Figure D4.5. Share of part-time teachers in lower secondary education, by age group (2024)



Note: Results are based on teachers' responses and refer to teachers' employment status in the school where they completed the survey.
1. Estimates should be interpreted with caution due to higher risk of non-response bias.
Source: (OECD, 2025[4]),Table 7.47 in *Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching* (https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en).

Part-time work can be voluntary, if teachers choose to work fewer hours, or it can be involuntary, if teachers would like to work longer hours but are offered only a part-time contract. According to TALIS 2024 (Tables 7.47 and 7.50 in (OECD, 2025[4])), over one-third of all teachers working part time across OECD countries are doing so involuntarily[2] (see Chapter 1).

Differences in part-time working by age

The attractiveness of the teaching profession can also differ by age, which may also explain differences in the share of part-time teachers by age groups. Figure D4.5 compares shares of the part-time teachers at lower secondary level for older (50 or older) and younger teachers (under 30) with the overall share for teachers of all ages (note that in the TALIS data used for this figure, part-time teachers refer to those working part-time at the school where the teacher responded to the TALIS survey).

The share of part-time teachers among those under 30 is 5 percentage points higher than among all teachers in 17 out of 35 countries. This difference exceeds 15 percentage points in Israel, Italy and Portugal. In contrast, the proportion of part-time teachers is at least 5 percentage points lower for younger teachers than for all teachers in Australia, the Flemish Community of Belgium and Sweden.

Among teachers aged 50 or older, the rate of part-time working tends to be similar to the general teacher population. The share of older teachers working on a part-time basis is at least 5 percentage points higher than for all teachers in four countries, and at least 5 percentage points lower in seven countries. In the rest of the countries, the share of part time employment among these two age groups differs by less than 5 percentage points.

Part-time work can also take the form of part-year employment, which refers to a full-time working arrangement for only part of the year, and not working for the remainder. The TALIS survey does not collect data on part-year employment of teachers but collects information on teachers with fixed-term contracts that could be a proxy for estimating the number of part-year teachers. Since fixed-term contracts might be used as a trial evaluation period, younger teachers would be expected to have higher rates of fixed-term contracts. Fixed-term contracts can also be chained seamlessly or directly transformed into permanent contracts, leading to full-time employment.

According to TALIS 2024, 19% of teachers in the schools surveyed are on fixed-term contracts (Table 7.37 in (OECD, 2025[4])). Working only part of the year might reflect difficulties in securing full-time employment. Nearly half of all teachers on a fixed-term contract could be considered to be so involuntarily (defined as having a fixed-term contract but valuing job security highly). In almost all countries except Latvia, Lithuania and Korea, the share of young teachers on fixed-term contract is at least 5 percentage points higher than all teachers. Japan is the only country where the share of older teachers on fixed term contracts is significantly higher than all teachers. In all other countries the difference is either close to zero or negative, indicating that younger teachers are more likely in almost all countries to work on a fixed term contract.

As teachers' salaries usually increase with the number of years of experience, and so indirectly with their age, part-time work arrangements can affect the measure of teachers' relative salaries (defined as the ratio between their salaries and those of tertiary-educated workers) if the extent of part-time work is distributed unevenly across age groups (see Chapter D3).

Definitions

Actual teaching time is the annual average number of hours that full-time teachers teach a group or class of students. It includes all extra hours, such as overtime. Data on these hours can be sourced from administrative registers, statistical databases, representative sample surveys or other representative sources.

The **number of teaching days** is the number of teaching weeks multiplied by the number of days per week a teacher teaches, minus the number of days on which the school is closed for holidays.

The **number of teaching weeks** refers to the number of weeks of instruction excluding holiday weeks.

Statutory teaching time is defined as the scheduled number of 60-minute hours per year that a full-time teacher teaches a group or class of students, as set by policy, their employment contracts or other official documents. Teaching time can be defined on a weekly or annual basis. Annual teaching time is normally calculated as the number of teaching days per year multiplied by the number of hours a teacher teaches per day (excluding preparation time). It is a net contact time for instruction, as it excludes periods of time formally allowed for breaks between lessons or groups of lessons and the days that the school is closed for holidays. At pre-primary and primary levels, short breaks between lessons are included if the classroom teacher is responsible for the class during these breaks.

Total statutory working time refers to the number of hours that a full-time teacher is expected to work as set by policy. It can be defined on a weekly or annual basis. It does not include paid overtime. According to a country's formal policy, working time can refer to:

- the time directly associated with teaching and other curricular activities for students, such as assignments and tests
- the time directly associated with teaching and other activities related to teaching, such as preparing lessons, counselling students, correcting assignments and tests, professional development, meetings with parents, staff meetings, and general school tasks.

Working time required at school (of teachers) refers to the time teachers are required to spend working at school, including teaching and non-teaching time.

Methodology

When interpreting differences in teaching hours among countries, net contact time, as used here, does not necessarily correspond to the teaching load. Although contact time is a substantial component of teachers' workloads, preparing for classes and the necessary follow-up, including correcting students' work, also need to be included when making comparisons. Other relevant elements, such as the number of subjects taught, the number of students taught and the number of years a teacher teaches the same students, should also be taken into account.

For more information please see the *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics 2018* (OECD, 2018[5]) and *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes,* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en) for country-specific notes.

Sources

Data are from the 2025 OECD-INES-NESLI Survey on Working Time of Teachers and refer to the school year 2024/25 (statutory information) or school year 2023/24 (actual data), unless otherwise indicated.

References

OECD (2026), *Education and Skills, OECD Data Explorer*, http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/5q (accessed on 2 July 2026). [3]

OECD (2025), *Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en. [1]

OECD (2025), *Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en. [4]

OECD (2023), *Education at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en. [2]

OECD (2018), *OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics 2018: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en. [5]

Chapter D4 Tables

Tables and notes

Table D4.1.	Organisation of teachers' teaching time (2025)
Table D4.2.	Organisation of teachers' working time (2025)
WEB Table D4.3.	Teachers' tasks, by level of education (2025)
WEB Table D4.4.	Teachers' other responsibilities, by level of education (2025)

StatLink https://stat.link/ud51nx

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/ud51nx.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Table D4.1. Organisation of teachers' teaching time (2025)

Number of statutory teaching weeks, teaching days and net teaching hours in public institutions over the school year

	Number of weeks of teaching					Number of days of teaching					Net teaching time, in hours				
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary
			General programmes		Vocational programmes			General programmes		Vocational programmes			General programmes		Vocational programmes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(17)	(18)
OECD countries															
Australia[1]	39	40	40	40	m	189	192	193	192	m	868	857	841	839	m
Austria[1]	m	37	37	37	37	m	178	178	178	178	m	783	625	584	587
Canada	m	37	37	37	m	m	184	184	184	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile[2]	38	38	38	38	38	179	179	179	179	179	1 003	1 003	1 003	1 003	1 003
Colombia[1]	40	40	40	40	40	191	191	191	191	191	764	955	840	840	840
Costa Rica[1]	42	42	42	42	42	199	199	199	199	199	816	1 234	1 274	1 274	1 274
Czechia[1]	44	39	39	39	39	211	191	191	191	191	1 308	630	630	573	573
Denmark	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Estonia[1]	46	35	35	35	40	220	174	174	174	199	1 320	592	626	679	a
Finland[3]	m	38	38	38	a	m	187	187	187	a	m	673	595	561	a
France[1]	36	36	36	36	36	162	162	a	a	a	900	900	720	720	720
Germany[1]	46	40	40	40	40	225	193	193	193	193	m	691	642	620	617
Greece[2]	35	35	36	36	36	172	172	174	174	174	645	645	600	600	600
Hungary[2]	42	38	38	38	37	197	183	183	180	176	1 261	659	659	648	634
Iceland[1]	46	36	36	30	30	219	180	180	150	150	1 445	624	624	480	480
Ireland	a	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Israel[1]	38	38	37	36	36	182	182	177	174	174	1 029	844	707	595	595
Italy[3]	41	38	38	38	38	186	171	171	171	171	930	752	616	616	616
Japan[4]	m	40	40	39	39	m	202	202	196	196	m	715	594	499	499
Korea[3]	36	38	38	38	38	180	190	190	190	190	757	662	521	532	526
Latvia[5]	39	33	35	35	44	190	160	170	170	215	1 292	480	558	588	1 013

	Number of weeks of teaching					Number of days of teaching					Net teaching time, in hours				
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary
			General programmes		Vocational programmes			General programmes		Vocational programmes			General programmes		Vocational programmes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(17)	(18)
Lithuania[2]	a	36	38	36	a	a	175	185	175	a	a	840	888	840	a
Luxembourg[1]	36	36	36	36	36	176	176	176	176	176	880	810	739	739	739
Mexico[1]	42	42	42	36	36	190	190	190	171	171	505	760	988	838	684
Netherlands[2]	40	40	40	40	40	200	200	200	200	200	940	940	720	720	m
New Zealand[1]	m	38	38	38	m	m	191	190	188	m	m	855	813	752	m
Norway[2]	a	38	38	38	38	a	190	190	190	190	a	741	663	523	595
Poland[2]	43	38	38	37	37	207	180	180	178	178	1 035	608	486	481	481
Portugal[2]	38	38	36	36	36	174	174	165	165	165	870	783	605	605	605
Slovak Republic[1]	44	38	38	38	38	210	186	186	186	186	1 176	707	651	614	614
Slovenia[1]	46	38	38	38	38	219	190	190	190	190	1 314	627	627	570	570
Spain[1]	37	37	37	37	37	176	176	176	176	176	828	828	642	642	642
Sweden	47	a	a	a	a	224	a	a	a	a	m	a	a	a	a
Switzerland[5]	39	39	39	39	39	188	188	188	188	188	788	788	750	638	713
Türkiye[1]	36	36	36	36	36	180	180	180	180	180	900	720	504	504	954
United States[5, 6]	36	36	36	36	a	178	178	179	178	a	900	908	893	888	a
Other economies															
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)[3]	37	37	37	37	37	176	176	178	178	178	704	704	646	604	630
French Comm. (Belgium)[1]	37	37	37	37	37	177	177	177	177	177	766	708	646	612	646
England (UK)	38	38	38	38	a	190	190	190	190	a	a	a	a	a	a
Scotland (UK)[2]	38	38	38	38	a	190	190	190	190	a	855	855	855	855	a
OECD average	**40**	**38**	**38**	**37**	**38**	**193**	**183**	**184**	**182**	**183**	**965**	**770**	**710**	**678**	**685**
Partner and/or accession countries															
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil[3]	42	42	42	42	42	200	200	200	200	200	800	800	800	800	800

	Number of weeks of teaching					Number of days of teaching					Net teaching time, in hours				
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary
			General programmes		Vocational programmes			General programmes		Vocational programmes			General programmes		Vocational programmes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(17)	(18)
Bulgaria[1]	36	33	34	35	35	180	160	165	170	170	1 080	414	444	490	489
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia[1]	47	36	36	36	36	221	175	175	175	175	1 216	499	604	551	630
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania[1]	36	36	36	36	37	173	173	173	173	178	865	692	519	519	712
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand[3]	40	40	40	40	m	187	187	187	187	m	224	449	449	449	m
EU25 average	**41**	**37**	**37**	**37**	**38**	**195**	**178**	**179**	**179**	**183**	**1 033**	**694**	**629**	**617**	**638**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Data on vocational programmes at lower secondary level (Columns 4, 10 and 16) are available for consultation online.
1. Typical teaching time (teaching time required from most teachers when no specific circumstances apply to teachers).
2. Maximum teaching time.
3. Minimum teaching time.
4. Average planned teaching time in each school at the beginning of the school year.
5. Actual teaching time (in Latvia, except for pre-primary level).
6. Year of reference 2021.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ud51n.

Table D4.2. Organisation of teachers' working time (2025)

Teachers' statutory working time at school and total working time in public institutions over the reference year

	Working time required at school, in hours					Total statutory working time, in hours				
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary
			General programmes		Vocational programmes			General programmes		Vocational programmes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries										
Australia	1 217	1 119	1 078	1 078	m	a	a	a	a	m
Austria	m	a	a	a	a	m	a	a	a	a
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	a	a	a
Chile	1 839	1 839	1 839	1 839	1 839	1 971	1 971	1 971	1 971	1 971
Colombia	1 152	1 152	1 152	1 152	1 152	1 720	1 720	1 720	1 720	1 720
Costa Rica	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Czechia	a	a	a	a	a	1 688	1 688	1 688	1 688	1 688
Denmark	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Estonia	1 610	a	a	a	a	1 610	1 540	1 540	1 540	1 540
Finland	m	811	733	680	1 125	a	a	a	a	1 500
France[1]	954	954	a	a	a	1 607	1 607	1 607	1 607	1 607
Germany	1 755	a	a	a	a	1 755	1 764	1 764	1 764	1 764
Greece	1 104	1 104	1 146	1 146	1 146	a	a	a	a	a
Hungary	1 418	1 171	1 171	1 152	1 126	1 600	1 600	1 600	1 600	1 680
Iceland	1 704	1 650	1 650	1 672	1 672	1 704	1 704	1 704	1 752	1 752
Ireland	a	m	m	m	m	a	a	a	a	a
Israel	1 069	1 242	1 208	1 217	1 217	1 069	1 242	1 208	1 217	1 217
Italy	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Japan[1]	a	a	a	a	a	1 736	1 736	1 736	1 736	1 736
Korea	a	a	a	a	a	1 440	1 520	1 520	1 520	1 520
Latvia	1 496	1 030	1 030	1 030	1 320	1 760	1 584	1 584	1 584	1 320
Lithuania	a	a	a	a	a	a	1 512	1 512	1 512	1 512
Luxembourg	1 068	998	864	864	864	1 508	1 402	1 234	1 234	1 234
Mexico	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Netherlands	a	a	a	a	a	1 659	1 659	1 659	1 659	1 659
New Zealand	m	1 544	1 532	1 520	m	a	a	a	a	a
Norway	a	1 300	1 225	1 150	1 150	a	1 688	1 688	1 688	1 688
Poland	a	a	a	a	a	1 728	1 440	1 440	1 424	1 424
Portugal	1 034	947	812	812	812	1 324	1 324	1 279	1 279	1 279
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	1 583	1 583	1 583	1 583	1 583
Slovenia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Spain	1 111	1 111	1 077	1 077	1 077	1 385	1 385	1 385	1 385	1 385
Sweden	1 792	1 360	1 360	1 360	1 360	a	1 767	1 767	1 767	1 767
Switzerland[1]	a	a	a	a	a	1 807	1 807	1 807	1 807	1 807
Türkiye[1]	980	800	734	734	1 034	1 584	1 584	1 584	1 584	1 584
United States[2]	1 448	1 443	1 453	1 459	a	m	m	m	m	a
Other economies										
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	915	950	811	760	791	a	a	a	a	a
French Comm. (Belgium)	a	a	a	a	a	962	962	a	a	a
England (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	1 265	1 265	1 265	1 265	a
Scotland (UK)	1 080	1 080	1 080	1 080	a	1 365	1 365	1 365	1 365	a
OECD average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**1 564**	**1 579**	**1 581**	**1 581**

	Working time required at school, in hours					Total statutory working time, in hours				
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Upper secondary
			General programmes		Vocational programmes			General programmes		Vocational programmes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries										
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	a	a	a	a	a
Bulgaria	a	a	a	a	a	1 520	1 520	1 520	1 520	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	a	a	a	a	m	1 768	1 768	1 768	1 768	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	a
Romania	865	692	623	623	854	1 488	1 488	1 488	1 488	1 488
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	800	800	800	800	m	1 130	1 130	1 130	1 130	m
EU25 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**1 559**	**1 533**	**1 554**	**1 553**	**1 527**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: Data on vocational programmes at lower secondary level (Columns 4 and 10) are available for consultation online.
1. Total working time requirements refer to those of civil servants.
2. Year of reference 2021.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/ud51n.

Notes

[1] TALIS collects data on both total weekly workload, reported as a single figure, and disaggregated estimates of hours spent on specific tasks. The survey does not constrain teachers' responses, so the sum of disaggregated time spent on individual tasks (e.g. teaching, planning, marking and correcting, communicating with parents, etc.) can exceed the reported total workload. To analyse the distribution of working time across different activities, this chapter looks at the task-based data as a share of the sum of time devoted to all tasks among teachers working full-time (pages 108-109 (OECD, 2025[4])).

[2] In TALIS involuntary part-time work refers to teachers working part-time even though not considering job flexibility as highly important. On average, involuntary part-time work is 7% among all teachers (full-time and part-time), and 19% of teachers work part-time. Then more than one-third (7/19) of teachers working part-time are doing so involuntarily.


Chapter D5. What are the main characteristics of the teaching workforce across levels of education?

Highlights

- Women dominate the teaching profession, especially in early childhood and primary education, but less so at higher levels. In OECD countries, women account for 96% of teachers at pre-primary level but only 46% at tertiary level on average.
- Female representation in school management remains lower than in teaching positions. Although women make up 83% of primary teachers, they hold only 67% of management roles.
- The intensity of teachers' working time reflects the prevalence of part-time work among the teaching workforce, with secondary teachers averaging 89% of a full-time workload. Working-time intensity is notably low in Mexico and Switzerland, reflecting larger shares of teachers who work part time.
- Most teachers meet their countries' minimum educational attainment requirements for the profession, yet significant gaps exist. On average, 89% of lower secondary teachers meet current requirements, but shares are much lower in countries like Iceland and Sweden.

Figure D5.1. Average working-time intensity of teachers in secondary education, by gender (2024)

Based on the ratio of full-time equivalent teachers to total teacher headcount, indicating the average proportion of a full-time workload per teacher.



1. Includes only public and government dependent private institutions.
2. Secondary education includes post-secondary non-tertiary education.
3. Includes only general programmes at secondary level.
4. Data for secondary relate only to upper secondary education.

For data, see Table D5.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/4t97hi.

Context

Teachers are the most significant in-school determinant of student achievement and well-being, making the recruitment and retention of a high-quality workforce a top priority for education systems. However, many OECD countries are currently grappling with significant teacher shortages, driven by the declining attractiveness of the profession and an impending wave of retirements (see Chapter 1, Teacher shortages and the attractiveness of the teaching profession). These staffing challenges are often compounded by issues such as relatively low salaries, high workloads and limited opportunities for career advancement, which require a deeper understanding of the workforce's structural characteristics to inform effective policy responses.

The composition of the teaching workforce, particularly regarding gender, remains a central theme in educational policy, as it affects the diversity of role models available to students and reflects broader equity issues in the workplace (Kammermeier et al., 2025[1]). Although women make up the vast majority of teachers at the pre-primary and primary levels, their representation typically decreases as the level of education increases. Furthermore, women's representation in school management and leadership roles is lower than in the classroom in many education systems. Addressing these disparities is crucial not only for ensuring workplace equity but also for providing viable career progression pathways that can enhance the long-term attractiveness of the profession.

Teachers' working patterns and educational attainment requirements are also critical factors in determining the actual teaching capacity and preparedness of the workforce (UNESCO, 2024[2]). The intensity of teachers' working time, reflected in the balance between full-time and part-time employment, varies considerably across countries and levels of education, influencing both the flexibility of the profession and the total number of staff required to meet student needs. Simultaneously, there is a global trend of rising educational attainment requirements for would-be teachers, aimed at ensuring they possess advanced pedagogical and subject-matter expertise. In an era of persistent staffing challenges, understanding how these attainment requirements intersect with the actual attainment levels of the current workforce is essential for maintaining educational quality while managing the practical constraints of teacher supply.

Other findings

- Working-time intensity is almost identical for men and women on average among secondary school teachers. However, women are more likely to work part time than men in countries such as the Netherlands and Switzerland, while it is the other way round in Lithuania and the Slovak Republic, reflecting different patterns of part-time work by gender.
- Educational attainment requirements for the teaching profession have been increasing in many countries, with nearly half of OECD countries requiring a master's degree for lower secondary teaching. Requirements are often more flexible for vocational subjects to attract industry professionals.
- These changing requirements mean some experienced teachers do not hold current minimum attainment. These "legacy teachers" continue to be considered qualified to teach, a nuance essential for interpreting data in countries with ageing workforces.

Analysis

Gender composition of the teaching workforce

Women make up the large majority of the teaching workforce across most OECD countries, although their representation tends to decrease as the level of education increases. On average across OECD countries in 2024, 96% of teachers in pre-primary (ISCED 01) education were women, compared to 83% in primary education (ISCED 1). This dominance remains significant at the secondary level, with women making up 68% of teachers in lower secondary (ISCED 2) programmes and 60% in upper secondary ones (ISCED 3). However, the gender profile reverses at the tertiary level, where women are in the minority, making up 46% of the teaching staff on average (Table D5.1).

Pre-primary to post-secondary non-tertiary education

The teaching profession remains highly feminised, particularly at lower levels of education. In pre-primary education, the share of female teachers ranges from nearly 100% in the Slovak Republic, and 99% in Portugal to 88% in the Netherlands. However, the degree of feminisation varies substantially across countries at other levels of education, reflecting different cultural contexts and labour-market dynamics. In primary education, the share of female teachers ranges from 96% in Lithuania and 95% in Hungary to 63% in Japan and 59% in Saudi Arabia. The differences are even more pronounced at the upper secondary level, where Japan stands out with women making up only 32% of the workforce, against shares as high as 77% in Latvia and 78% in Lithuania (Table D5.1).

Between 2015 and 2024, the gender composition of the teaching workforce remained largely stable across education levels. The share of women teachers in pre-primary education declined slightly, from 97% to 96%, while it remained unchanged at 83% in primary education. At lower secondary level, the share decreased marginally from 69% to 68%, whereas at upper secondary level it increased slightly from 59% to 60%. At post-secondary non-tertiary level (ISCED 4), it remained stable at 56% (Table D5.1).

The high concentration of women in teaching, especially in pre-primary and primary education, reflects a combination of cultural norms, labour-market dynamics and working conditions. Teaching at lower levels is often associated with caregiving and child development, roles that continue to be socially linked to women in many societies (Gibbons, 2020[3]). In early childhood education (ECE), relatively low salaries, limited career progression and gender stereotypes surrounding care work discourage many men from entering or remaining in the profession (Wu, 2023[4]; Quinones, Barnes and Berger, 2021[5]). Male educators may also face greater scrutiny or suspicion, contributing to higher attrition rates (Brody and Ziv, 2020[6]). Research further shows that female student teachers are more strongly motivated by pedagogical and student-support goals, while male student teachers more often emphasise subject-related interests (Kammermeier et al., 2025[1]). These patterns are consistent with social role theories, which argue that gender norms shape occupational preferences and perceptions of career suitability.

Working conditions also help explain women's representation in teaching. Although salaries are often lower than those in other graduate professions, the profession typically offers more predictable working hours, greater job security and better compatibility with family responsibilities than other jobs, factors that tend to weigh more strongly in women's career decisions (OECD, 2023[7]; OECD, 2025[8]). At the same time, the feminisation of teaching is associated with lower relative salaries and occupational status. Evidence suggests that occupations with a high share of women tend to receive lower pay and social recognition, a pattern often explained by the "devaluation thesis", according to which work predominantly carried out by women is undervalued compared to male-dominated occupations (Leuze and Strauß, 2016[9]; Verzola Vaz and Camargo Botassio, 2022[10]). The resulting under-representation of men not only narrows the recruitment pool and may contribute to teacher shortages but also limits the diversity of role models available to children.

Recent trends suggest that targeted policies can contribute to modest changes. In a number of countries, the share of female teachers in pre-primary education fell between 2015 and 2024, including Norway (from 93% to 90%), Germany (from 96% to 93%) and the United Kingdom (from 98% to 93%) (Table D5.1). In Norway, this development aligns with sustained policy efforts aimed at increasing the share of men in the ECE workforce (OECD, 2020[11]). Norway has implemented national targets and initiatives such as the "Play Resources" project, which introduces boys and young men to the profession at an early stage (OECD, 2020[11]). In Germany, broader workforce strategies, such as expanding paid training pathways and improving career incentives, have also aimed to diversify recruitment into the sector (OECD, 2020[11]).

Tertiary education

Although men continue to form the majority of tertiary teaching staff in most countries, women have reached or exceeded parity in a number of countries, such as in Finland (53%), Latvia (55%) and Lithuania (56%). Between 2015 and 2024, there has been a notable shift toward greater gender parity in tertiary education. On average, the share of female teachers in tertiary education rose from 43% to 46% over this period. Some countries experienced significant progress: for example, the share of women in the Netherlands increased from 44% of teachers at tertiary level in 2015 to 50% in 2024 (Table D5.1).

Figure D5.2. Share of women among classroom teachers, by level of education (2024)

	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Tertiary
Lithuania	97	96	82	78	56
Hungary	99	95	75	63	43
Bulgaria	99	94	79	75	52
Czechia	99	94	77	59	38
Italy[1]	98	94	76	65	40
Romania	100	93	74	73	54
Croatia	99	93	74	68	52
Latvia	99	92	83	77	55
Austria	97	91	70	55	46
Estonia[1 2]	99	90	82	69	50
Slovak Republic	100	89	79	71	48
Brazil	96	89	66	55	47
Slovenia[3]	98	88		67	49
Poland	98	88	76	66	49
United States[4]	93	87	67	58	52
Germany	93	87	66	57	42
Netherlands	88	87	56	58	50
EU25 average	97	87	72	64	47
United Kingdom[5]	93	87	65		48
Israel	99	86	79	71	49
France[6]	92	85	65	55	44
New Zealand	97	85	68	61	54
Ireland[2 7]	97	84		68	46
Switzerland[1]	97	83	57	47	40
Belgium	95	83	67	62	51
OECD average	**96**	**83**	**68**	**60**	**46**
Portugal[1]	99	82	72	68	48
Sweden	96	82	65	55	48
Chile	98	81	70	58	
Iceland[1]	92	81	81	57	54
Finland	97	80	74	61	53
Costa Rica	94	80	58	58	46
South Africa[8]		79	61	60	
Spain	93	78	63	57	47
Colombia	96	77	51	49	41
Greece	98	77	70	60	37
Korea	99	77	72	59	38
Luxembourg	94	76	60	52	37
Canada[9]		75		75	50
China	97	75	62	58	
Norway	90	74	74	56	51
Indonesia	96	72	65	58	

	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Tertiary
Peru	98	71	47	46	37
Mexico	96	71	56	51	45
Thailand	71	68	65	67	56
Denmark	93	67	61	51	47
Türkiye[2]	95	66	61	54	47
Japan[1]	97	63	44	32	30
Saudi Arabia	100	59	48	51	48
India[8]	93	57	51	45	44

Note: Countries are ranked in descending order according to the share of women among teachers at primary level. The colour scale ranges from dark blue to light green, where darker shades indicate higher shares (approaching 100%) and lighter shades indicate lower shares. Grey indicates that data are not available.
1. Upper secondary includes post-secondary non-tertiary.
2. Pre-primary includes early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01).
3. Primary includes lower secondary.
4. Tertiary includes post-secondary non-tertiary.
5. Lower secondary includes upper secondary.
6. Data on teachers refer to full-time equivalents (FTE) rather than headcounts.
7. Upper secondary includes lower secondary.
8. Year of reference differs from 2024.
9. Primary includes pre-primary and lower secondary.
For data, see Table D5.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/4t97hi.

The increasing share of women in tertiary teaching across several OECD countries reflects both broader societal change and the impact of targeted policy interventions aimed at addressing structural barriers within academia such as persistent gender biases in recruitment, promotion and recognition, as well as unequal access to professional networks and research funding. Several countries have implemented measures to improve gender balance. In Switzerland, the Federal Programme “Equal Opportunity at Swiss Universities” established targets for female representation of 25% among full and associate professors and 40% among assistant professors (University of Bern, 2024[12]), and contributed to an increase in the share of women in tertiary teaching from 44% in 2015 to 50% in 2024 (Table D5.1). In the Netherlands, initiatives such as the Aspasia programme, administered by the Dutch Research Council, provided financial incentives to support the promotion of female researchers (NWO, 2021[13]). Combined with broader national strategies on diversity and inclusion, these measures have supported progress towards gender parity in tertiary education. While these developments suggest that targeted policies can accelerate progress, their impact remains uneven.


Gender disparities in school management

Despite the high degree of feminisation in the teaching profession, women remain consistently under-represented in management roles relative to their share of the teaching workforce across almost all OECD countries. Research suggests women are less likely to pursue leadership positions because of concerns about workload, work-life balance and self-confidence in leadership readiness (OECD, 2019[14]). This "leaky pipeline" is particularly apparent at higher levels of education.

Women are more strongly represented in management roles at lower levels of education, partly because access to leadership positions is often linked to prior teaching experience, and women constitute the vast majority of teachers in pre-primary and primary education. In 2024, women accounted for 90% of school management personnel in pre-primary education across OECD countries, compared to 67% in primary education, 61% in lower secondary education and 53% in upper secondary education. The share has also increased steadily over the past decade. In upper secondary education, for example, the average share of women in management positions rose from 46% in 2015 to 53% in 2024, reflecting the way wider efforts to improve gender balance in teaching roles have also increased women representation in management positions (Table D5.2).

The representation of women in school management varies widely across countries, reflecting broader labour-market patterns and cultural norms around leadership. In primary education, women account for nearly all management staff in Lithuania (95%) and the Slovak Republic (90%), but only 29% in Japan. At upper secondary level, the disparities are even greater, ranging from 79% in Lithuania to just 15% in Japan, 22% in Korea and 35% in Switzerland (Table D5.2).

Figure D5.3. Gender balance among teachers and school management staff in primary education (2024)



Note: Countries above the diagonal line have a higher proportion of women teachers than women in school management.
1. Data on teachers and school management refer to full-time equivalents (FTE) rather than headcounts.
For data, see Table D5.1 and Table D5.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/4t97hi.

Figure D5.3 shows how the gap between teaching and management roles differs across countries at primary level. On average across OECD countries, women make up 83% of primary teachers but hold 67% of school management positions. In Japan, women represent 63% of primary teachers but only 29% of school management staff. Large gaps are also observed in Hungary (where women are 95% of the teachers but only 79% of leaders) and Korea (77% versus 52%), albeit with women forming the majority in both roles. In contrast, Denmark stands out as one of the few countries where women are more strongly represented among school management personnel than among teachers themselves, accounting for 73% of school management personnel compared to 67% of teachers in primary education (Table D5.1; Table D5.2).

Making teaching more attractive through visible career progression

In most OECD countries, school management is not a separate profession but a career progression from teaching that requires substantial classroom experience. On average, school heads in public primary and secondary schools must be fully qualified teachers in nearly two-thirds of OECD systems (OECD, 2022[15]). In France, becoming a *chef d'établissement* at the secondary level requires passing a national competitive examination after several years of teaching and completing leadership training (Ministry of National Education, 2018[16]). In England (United Kingdom), aspiring school heads generally complete the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH), following teaching experience (UK Government, 2023[17]). However, pathways into school leadership vary across systems, with some countries offering more flexible routes and less formalised leadership structures.

The structure of management personnel has direct implications for teacher supply, particularly recruitment. Systems where management roles (principal, assistant principal, head teacher) are clearly defined, attainable and visible as career progression tend to make teaching more attractive, especially for candidates who value advancement, status and decision-making authority. Evidence from the OECD's Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) shows that teachers' perceptions of career opportunities are positively associated with job satisfaction and retention (OECD, 2025[8]).

The workload and design of leadership roles are important factors shaping the attractiveness of management positions within the teaching profession. If leadership roles are too burdensome, fewer teachers will aspire to them; if they are too diffuse, they may

not function as strong incentives. Among OECD countries principals tend to report very high workloads and administrative burdens, which can discourage teachers from moving into leadership and create bottlenecks in the career pipeline (OECD, 2025[8]). Nordic countries such as Norway and Sweden distribute leadership tasks across teams, which can make progression more accessible but may dilute incentives if roles are less distinct or well rewarded (Sundberg and Hovdhaugen, 2026[18]).

Working patterns and working-time intensity of the teaching workforce

The average working-time intensity of teachers is calculated as the ratio of full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers to total headcount. It reflects the prevalence of part-time employment and thus the effective amount of teaching that the teaching workforce can deliver. A ratio of 1.00 indicates that all teachers are employed full-time, while lower values reflect a greater reliance on part-time arrangements. Across OECD countries, working-time intensity remains relatively high but varies slightly by level of education, averaging 0.91 in pre-primary, 0.92 in primary and 0.89 in secondary education in 2024. These figures suggest that although most teachers work full-time, part-time employment remains a significant feature of the profession, particularly at the secondary level (Table D5.3).

There are substantial cross-country differences in working-time intensity, reflecting national approaches to labour-market flexibility and work-life balance – greater flexibility in working hours is not necessarily confined to teaching but reflects broader labour-market trends (see Chapter A6). In countries such as Colombia, Costa Rica and the Republic of Türkiye, the ratio is 1.00 across all education levels, indicating almost all teachers work full time. In contrast, the ratio is considerably lower in Switzerland (0.62 at primary level and 0.64 at secondary level) and the Netherlands (0.73 at primary level and 0.80 at secondary level), suggesting that part-time work is institutionalised within the teaching profession in these countries. Germany also reports comparatively low working-time intensity, with the ratio of full-time equivalent teachers to total teacher headcount reaching 0.77 at primary level and 0.81 at secondary level reflecting broader work-life balance preferences within a female-dominated workforce and the wider prevalence of part-time work arrangements in the labour market (Table D5.3).

Although working-time intensity is almost identical for men and women on average across OECD countries, respectively at 0.88 and 0.89 among teachers in secondary education, gender differences emerge at national level. Women have lower working-time intensity than men in the Netherlands, with ratios of 0.75 for women compared to 0.86 for men, and in Switzerland, where it is 0.61 compared to 0.68. A similar gap exists in the United Kingdom, where the ratio for women is 0.91 compared to 0.97 for men. Balancing this out are countries which display the opposite trend. In the Slovak Republic, the ratio is 0.74 for men compared to 0.86 for women, while in Lithuania the figures are 0.78 for men and 0.89 for women (Table D5.3). Working-time intensity also differs by age group, as discussed in Chapter D4.

The prevalence of part-time work is partially shaped by teachers' personal preferences and pursuit of work-life balance. Gender differences often reflect broader societal patterns in which women are more likely to choose part-time employment to balance professional and domestic responsibilities. Across OECD countries, around half of teachers report that one reason for entering the profession was the desire for working hours which were compatible with family responsibilities (OECD, 2025[8]). Such motivations are reflected in working-time intensity patterns. For example, Latvia, where flexible working hours are frequently cited as an important reason for choosing teaching, records lower FTE-to-headcount ratios than countries such as Bulgaria, where such motivations are less common and working-time intensity is higher (Table D5.3). Part-time working can also support teacher well-being and retention by offering greater flexibility and reducing burnout risks. Evidence from Germany, for example, associates reduced working hours with improved mental health outcomes among teachers, although sometimes at the cost of slower career progression (Seibt and Kreuzfeld, 2023[19]).

At the same time, labour-market structures and institutional conditions also play a key role. Part-time employment may be voluntary or involuntary, depending on the availability of full-time positions and broader labour-market conditions. In some education systems, part-time contracts serve as entry pathways for younger teachers or facilitate the recruitment of professionals with specialised expertise, particularly in secondary education (see Chapter D4). However, these arrangements may also be associated with reduced job security, fragmented workloads and weaker professional integration. In some contexts, part-time arrangements can increase teacher supply by enabling professionals to combine teaching with employment in other sectors, as observed in Mexico and the Slovak Republic. In Lithuania, the relatively high share of part-time male secondary teachers is largely linked to their concentration in subjects such as physical education, arts and non-formal education, where teaching loads are typically limited to only a small number of weekly hours.

Part-time employment therefore represents both a challenge and an opportunity for education systems. Part-time work can be used to enhance the attractiveness of teaching through greater flexibility but in turn means that larger numbers of teachers are required to meet staffing needs. It may also contribute to inequalities through lower lifetime earnings, fewer leadership

opportunities and reduced pension entitlements (OECD, 2019[14]). From a policy perspective, part-time employment can also be viewed as a form of latent workforce capacity. Increasing the working hours of part-time teachers, where feasible, may help alleviate shortages more rapidly than recruiting new entrants, although such measures must be carefully balanced against some teachers' strong preferences for flexible working arrangements.

Educational attainment requirements and teacher preparedness

Minimum attainment required to teach

Minimum educational attainment requirements for teachers vary considerably across OECD countries, although there is a clear trend toward higher levels of attainment as students progress through the education system. Although a bachelor's degree (ISCED 6) remains the most common requirement for entering the profession, increasingly many countries now require a master's degree (ISCED 7), particularly at secondary level, to ensure teachers possess both strong subject knowledge and advanced pedagogical skills. In most OECD countries pre-primary teachers are required to hold at least a bachelor's degree, although countries such as France, Italy and Portugal require them to have a master's degree. In contrast, some countries still permit teachers at this level to start with lower levels of attainment, including upper secondary education in Czechia and the Slovak Republic, and post-secondary non-tertiary education in Colombia and Ireland, illustrating the diversity of national pathways into teaching (see Box D5.1). Additionally, in many countries, simply meeting the national minimum educational requirements is not enough to be considered as qualified, as it does not ensure that individuals have the specific pedagogical knowledge or training required for teaching. For instance, in Chile, the minimum educational attainment requirement across all levels of education is a bachelor's degree but this must specifically correspond to a teaching degree (*pedagogía*) to satisfy national minimum requirements; other bachelor's degrees are not considered sufficient. This ensures that minimum attainment requirements are explicitly linked to teacher preparation and subject-specific pedagogy (Table D5.4).

Box D5.1. Minimum attainment requirements in pre-primary education

Attainment requirements in pre-primary education vary more widely than in primary or secondary education, reflecting historically fragmented governance structures and multiple routes into the profession. In many countries, pre-primary education staff may enter the workforce through vocational, post-secondary non-tertiary or tertiary pathways, creating greater variations in attainment profiles than at other levels of education. This may reflect the fact that in many countries, pre-primary education has traditionally been seen as offering care rather than a purely pedagogical service, resulting in attainment thresholds that are set below those required for school-level teaching (OECD, 2019[20]).

Countries have had to balance workforce expansion and quality standards in pre-primary. In Germany, for example, states have in recent years made progress in the recognition of foreign credentials but have also relaxed pedagogical licensing regulations, in response to mounting pre-primary staff shortages that risks undermining quality if not accompanied by clear compositional standards within settings (Grgic and Friederich, 2023[21]). While these developments have increased workforce supply, available evidence suggests that the overall qualification structure of the workforce has remained robust despite substantial employment growth, indicating that workforce expansion has not necessarily been accompanied by a decline in qualification levels (Autor:innengruppe Fachkräftebarometer, 2025[22]). This illustrates how attainment gaps in the pre-primary teaching workforce do not just reflect legacy regulatory designs but increasingly also the impact of active policy accommodations to chronic staffing pressures, a pattern with significant implications for the quality and equity of foundational learning for young children (Urban et al., 2012[23]).

At primary and lower secondary level, attainment requirements tend to become both more demanding and more standardised across countries. In primary education, most OECD countries require teachers to hold at least a bachelor's degree, although countries such as Finland, and Germany require a master's degree at this level. This trend becomes more pronounced in secondary education. Although a bachelor's degree remains sufficient in countries such as Australia, Canada and Greece, nearly half of the countries with available data require lower secondary teachers to hold a master's degree. In some systems, attainment requirements are tiered according to the level taught. For example, Denmark and the Netherlands require a bachelor's degree for lower secondary teachers but a master's degree for upper secondary teaching (Table D5.4).

At upper secondary level, attainment requirements display greater diversity, particularly according to programme orientation and subject area. Teachers of general subjects are almost universally required to hold bachelor's or master's degrees, whether they teach in general or vocational programmes. However, attainment requirements for technical, practical and vocational subjects are often more flexible. In countries such as Luxembourg, Poland and Sweden, vocational or technical instructors may enter the profession with post-secondary non-tertiary attainment, allowing schools to recruit individuals with substantial industry expertise who may not hold a tertiary degree. This flexibility reflects the importance of occupational experience in vocational education, where practical knowledge is essential for preparing students for the labour market (Figure D5.4).

Figure D5.4. Minimum educational attainment required for teachers at upper secondary, by programme orientation and subjects taught (2024)

	General programmes (general subjects)	General programmes (technical/practical/vocational subjects)	Vocational programmes (general subjects)	Vocational programmes (technical/practical/vocational subjects)
Australia	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Brazil	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Bulgaria	ISCED 6	Various	ISCED 6	Various
Chile	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Colombia	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Czechia	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 3
Denmark	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	Various
Estonia	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 6
Finland	ISCED 7		ISCED 7	Various
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 6	Various
France	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	Various
French Comm. (Belgium)	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	Various
Germany	ISCED 7	Various	ISCED 7	Various
Hungary	ISCED 7	Various	Various	Various
Iceland	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 4	ISCED 4
Israel	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Italy	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7
Japan	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Korea	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Latvia	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Lithuania	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Luxembourg	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 4
Mexico	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
New Zealand	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Norway	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
Poland	ISCED 7		ISCED 7	ISCED 4
Portugal	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7
Slovak Republic	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7
Slovenia	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	Various
Spain	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7
Sweden	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 4

	General programmes (general subjects)	General programmes (technical/practical/vocational subjects)	Vocational programmes (general subjects)	Vocational programmes (technical/practical/vocational subjects)
Switzerland	ISCED 7		Various	Various
Türkiye	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6
United Kingdom	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6

Note: Different colours are used to reflect the ISCED level of minimum educational attainment required. Data are based on an ad-hoc survey administered in March 2026 to delegates of the INES Working Party.
See Annex 3 for further details on programmes classified as having "various" levels of minimum educational attainment required.

Overall, these varied frameworks illustrate how upper secondary systems balance two competing priorities: the academic professionalisation of teaching and the need to maintain the labour-market relevance of vocational education. Persistent teacher shortages, particularly in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) and vocational subjects where competition with higher-paying private-sector employment is strong, have further encouraged countries to diversify attainment pathways and introduce second-career routes into teaching (see Chapter 1). Many systems therefore combine academic attainment requirements with practical experience to facilitate the recruitment of industry professionals while preserving educational standards.


Percentage of teachers meeting national educational attainment requirements

Although the vast majority of teachers across OECD countries meet the national minimum educational attainment requirements, there are significant variations across countries and education levels. On average across OECD countries in 2024, 87% of teachers meet current attainment requirements at pre-primary level, 88% at primary level and 89% at lower secondary level. Several countries, including Korea and Poland, report that nearly 100% of teachers at the pre-primary and primary levels meet the required attainment levels. However, these high averages mask substantial disparities elsewhere; for instance, only 35% of teachers in primary education meet the requirements in Sweden and 73% in Germany, while in lower secondary education, it is as low as 41% in Iceland, 74% in Luxembourg, and 63% in Sweden (Table D5.4). These disparities reflect the interaction between rising educational attainment requirements and the need to address teacher shortages through alternative career pathways. This percentage of teachers meeting national education attainment requirements differs from the share of 'fully qualified teachers' (see Chapter 1), as meeting these requirements alone is often insufficient to qualify as a teacher and does not necessarily ensure the required pedagogical training or knowledge.

Interpreting these figures requires a clear distinction between teachers who were recruited under current minimum educational attainment requirements and those who started teaching when earlier standards applied. Minimum attainment levels are not static; many OECD countries have progressively raised requirements, for example from a bachelor's degree to a master's degree for lower secondary teachers, as Iceland and Sweden have done. In Sweden, a large proportion of more experienced primary and lower secondary teachers hold a degree at ISCED level 6, which was the previous national requirement. It is also possible to qualify as a teacher by complementing subject studies with pedagogical training (KPU, *kompletterande pedagogisk utbildning).* Some teachers following this pathway have 180 credits and are therefore classified at ISCED level 6 rather than ISCED level 7. A similar situation can be observed in Iceland, where a 2008 reform raised the standard teacher attainment requirement from a bachelor's degree to a master's degree. The transition period ended in July 2011, after which only master's-level graduates could obtain teacher certification. Given the ageing teacher workforce, many current teachers qualified under the previous requirements. These teachers are generally considered qualified and possess a valid teaching certificate. As a result, a substantial share of current teachers hold educational attainments that were fully compliant under previous regulations but fall below new entry standards. These "legacy teachers" remain formally recognised as qualified within national systems, even if they do not meet updated academic thresholds (Table D5.4, Notes; Figure D5.4, Notes). This distinction is particularly important in countries with ageing teaching populations, where a seemingly low share of teachers meeting current attainment requirements may simply reflect past regulatory regimes.

Figure D5.5. Share of teachers meeting national minimum educational attainment requirements, by level of education taught (2024)

Based on national minimum educational attainment requirements applicable in 2024



Note: Minimum educational attainment requirements may have changed over time. In some countries, teachers who met previous requirements may no longer meet current minimum educational attainment levels, while still being considered fully qualified due to their experience or according to national regulations.
1. Data are based on TALIS and refer to teachers' self-reported highest level of formal education.
2. Year of reference differs from 2024.
3. Lower secondary includes pre-primary and primary.
4. Pre-primary includes early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01).
5. The minimum attainment requirements for teachers have increased from ISCED level 6 to ISCED level 7 at lower secondary level leading to lower reported shares.
6. Excludes teachers who qualify by complementing subject studies with pedagogical training and hold an ISCED level 6 qualification.
For data, see Table D5.4. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/4t97hi.

In systems facing acute recruitment pressures, schools may employ individuals who have not yet completed the required degree or pedagogical training. There is a policy trade-off between maintaining high entry standards and ensuring adequate staffing, with potential implications for long-term workforce quality and preparedness. However, although higher attainment requirements can constrain teacher supply during periods of labour-market pressure, cross-country evidence suggests they are not the primary driver of teacher shortages. Recruitment challenges are observed across systems with both high and moderate minimum attainment requirements thresholds. Countries such as Germany, Finland and Sweden, which require teachers to hold at least a master's degree, continue to face shortages in specific subjects and regions. However, so too do systems with lower formal thresholds such as Hungary, underscoring the importance of other factors such as training capacity, working conditions, ageing workforces and wider labour-market competition (see Chapter 1).

Most education systems already incorporate significant flexibility into teacher recruitment, even where formal minimum attainment requirements are stringent. Across OECD countries, common mechanisms include temporary appointments, substitute teaching roles, emergency hiring provisions, the recruitment of individuals still completing formal training and the recognition of legacy credentials acquired under previous regulatory frameworks (Eurydice, 2023[24]). Alternative and employment-based pathways have also expanded in response to shortages, particularly for second-career entrants and in high-need areas such as STEM and vocational education (see Chapter 1). Collectively, these practices indicate that the implementation of minimum educational attainment policies is often more flexible in practice than formal regulatory frameworks suggest.

Definitions

Classroom teachers: Professional personnel primarily responsible for guiding and directing students' learning experiences through the planning, organisation and conduct of group activities. The category includes special education teachers and practitioners in ISCED 0, but excludes teachers' aides and personnel whose main function is management or administration rather than instruction.

Full-time equivalent teachers (FTE): A standardised unit expressing workloads relative to full-time employment. FTEs are calculated by dividing contractual working hours by the normal annual statutory hours for the reference period. This conversion allows for the expression of diverse working patterns in a single unit for international comparison and ratio calculations.

Minimum educational attainment required to teach refers to the minimum ISCED level of educational attainment officially required by national authorities for entering the teaching profession at a given level of education in 2024.

Part-time teachers: Educational personnel whose contractual working hours are less than 90% of the normal or statutory hours required for a full-time employee in the same role and education level. This classification is regarded as an attribute of the individual employment contract rather than a characteristic of the education programme. A teacher who holds multiple part-time positions in different schools is classified as a full-time teacher if their combined workload exceeds 90% of the statutory working hours

School management personnel: Professional staff responsible for the management and administration of educational institutions. This category includes principals, head teachers and assistant principals at ISCED levels 0-3, as well as deans and department heads at tertiary levels whose principal activity is administrative. It excludes administrative support staff such as secretaries or clerks.

Teachers meeting national educational attainment requirements refers to teachers whose educational attainment meets or exceeds the minimum national educational attainment requirements applicable in 2024 for the level of education they teach.

Working-time intensity: refers to the average proportion of a full-time workload carried by teachers. In this chapter, it is measured through the ratio of FTE teachers to total teacher headcount. Values below 1 indicate the presence of part-time employment within the teaching workforce.

Methodology

The share of women among teachers is calculated by dividing the headcount of female teachers by the headcount of all teachers. This indicator is computed separately for each level of education, from pre-primary (ISCED 0) to tertiary education (ISCED 5-8).

The share of women in management is calculated by dividing the headcount of female management staff by the headcount of all management staff.

The share of teachers meeting national minimum educational attainment requirements is calculated by first excluding teachers whose educational attainment is unknown from the total headcount, and then dividing the number of teachers meeting the national minimum educational attainment requirement at a given level of education by the resulting total. This approach is adapted from the methodology used to compute SDG Indicator 4.c.1 in order to control for unknown values and to best reflect each country's regulatory context.

Sources

Data refer to the 2023/24 academic year and are based on the UNESCO-Institute of Statistics (UIS)/OECD/Eurostat data collection on education statistics administered by the OECD in 2025. Data for some countries may have a different reference year. For more information see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)

The UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) provided some data for Argentina, the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and Thailand.

References

Autor:innengruppe Fachkräftebarometer (2025), *Fachkräftebarometer Frühe Bildung 2025. Weiterbildungs-initiative Frühpädagogische Fachkräfte. Bielefeld*, https://doi.org/10.3278/9783763979578. [22]

Brody, D. and H. Ziv (2020), "Hybridized agency among male early childhood workers as a factor in their career decisions", *Early Years*, Vol. 40/1, pp. 20-36, https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2019.1605335. [6]

Eurydice (2023), *Structural Indicators for Monitoring Education and Training Systems in Europe: The Teaching Profession*, Publications Office of the European Union, https://doi.org/10.2797/849109. [24]

Gibbons, A. (2020), "The negation of babysitting: Deconstruction and care in early childhood", *Global Studies of Childhood*, Vol. 10/4, pp. 358–367, https://doi.org/10.1177/2043610620978507. [3]

Grgic, M. and T. Friederich (2023), "Innovative ways of handling staff shortages in ECEC? Increasing flexibility in the regulatory frameworks for non-traditional and non-German professional staff qualifications", *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy*, Vol. 17/22, https://doi.org/10.1186/s40723-023-00126-3. [21]

Kammermeier, M. et al. (2025), "Feminization of teaching: Gender and motivational factors of choosing teaching as a career", *Frontiers in Education*, Vol. 10, https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1471015. [1]

Leuze, K. and S. Strauß (2016), "Why do occupations dominated by women pay less? How 'female-typical' work tasks and working-time arrangements affect the gender wage gap among higher education graduates", *Work, Employment and Society*, Vol. 30/5, pp. 802-820, https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017015624402. [9]

Ministry of National Education (2018), "To be part of the management team", https://www.education.gouv.fr/etre-personnel-de-direction-6830. [16]

NWO (2021), *Aspasia*, Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek, https://www.nwo.nl/sites/nwo/files/media-files/Program%20Brochure%20Aspasia%202020_ENG.pdf. [13]

OECD (2025), *Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en. [8]

OECD (2023), *Joining Forces for Gender Equality: What is Holding us Back?*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/67d48024-en. [7]

OECD (2022), *Education at a Glance 2022: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/3197152b-en. [15]

OECD (2020), *Building a High-Quality Early Childhood Education and Care Workforce: Further Results from the Starting Strong Survey 2018*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b90bba3d-en. [11]

OECD (2019), *Good Practice for Good Jobs in Early Childhood Education and Care*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/64562be6-en. [20]

OECD (2019), *TALIS 2018 Results (Volume I): Teachers and School Leaders as Lifelong Learners*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en. [14]

Quinones, G., M. Barnes and E. Berger (2021), "Early childhood educators' solidarity and struggles for recognition", *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, Vol. 46/4, pp. 183-193, https://doi.org/10.1177/18369391211050165. [5]

Seibt, R. and S. Kreuzfeld (2023), “Working time reduction, mental health, and early retirement among part-time teachers at German upper secondary schools - a cross-sectional study”, *Frontiers in Public Health*, Vol. 11, https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1293239. [19]

Sundberg, R. and E. Hovdhaugen (2026), “Shared Leadership and Governance in Swedish and Norwegian Schools: Implications for Leadership Autonomy in Quality Work”, *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (NJCIE)*, Vol. 10/2, https://doi.org/10.7577/njcie.6467. [18]

UK Government (2023), *Headship national professional qualification*, Department for Education, https://www.gov.uk/guidance/headship-national-professional-qualification. [17]

UNESCO (2024), *Global Report on Teachers: Addressing Teacher Shortages and Transforming the Profession*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris, https://doi.org/10.54675/FIGU8035. [2]

University of Bern (2024), *Federal Programme Equal Opportunities: P-7 Diversity, inclusion and equity in higher education development (2021-2024)*, https://www.swissuniversities.ch/fileadmin/swissuniversities/Dokumente/Forschung/Chancengleichheit/web_DCC_Broschu%CC%88re_e.pdf. [12]

Urban, M. et al. (2012), “Towards competent systems in early childhood education and care. Implications for policy and practice”, *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 47/4, pp. 508-526, https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12010. [23]

Verzola Vaz, D. and D. Camargo Botassio (2022), “Occupational feminization and pay: the case of Brazil”, *Brazilian Review of Econometrics*, Vol. 42/1, https://doi.org/10.12660/bre.v42n12022.85018. [10]

Wu, S. (2023), “Critically consider the role of gender in early childhood education.”, *Research and Advances in Education*, Vol. 2/1, pp. 41-49, https://doi.org/10.56397/RAE.2023.01.07. [4]

Chapter D5 Tables

Tables and notes

Table D5.1	Trends in the share of women among classroom teachers, by level of education (2015 and 2024)
Table D5.2	Trends in the share of women among school management personnel, by level of education (2015 and 2024)
Table D5.3	Trends in the working-time intensity of the teaching workforce, by level of education and gender (2015 and 2024)
Table D5.4	Minimum educational attainment required for teachers and share of teachers who meet the national educational attainment requirements, by level of education taught (2024)

StatLink https://stat.link/4t97hi

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter, can be downloaded via https://stat.link/4t97hi.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Control codes

a – category not applicable; **b** – break in series; **d** – contains data from another column; **m** – missing data; **x** – contained in another column (indicated in brackets). For further control codes, see the Reader's Guide.

For further methodological information, see *Education at a Glance 2025: Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Table D5.1. Trends in the share of women among classroom teachers, by level of education (2015 and 2024)

	Pre-primary		Primary		Lower secondary		Upper secondary		Post-secondary non-tertiary		Tertiary	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	99	97	92	91	72	70	55	55	69	73	43	46
Belgium	97	95	82	83	63	67	63	62	46	49	49	51
Canada	x(3)	x(4)	74[d]	75[d]	x(3)	x(4)	74	75	m	m	49	50
Chile	99	98	81	81	68	70	56	58	a	a	m	m
Colombia[1]	97	96	77	77	53	51	46	49	66	65	37	41
Costa Rica	94	94	79	80	57	58	57	58	a	a	m	46
Czechia	100	99	94	94	78	77	59	59	42	40	40	38
Denmark	m	93	69	67	63	61	50	51	a	a	43	47
Estonia[2]	99	99	91	90	82	82	70[d]	69[d]	x(7)	x(8)	49	50
Finland	97	97	80	80	73	74	60	61	54	57	51	53
France[1,3]	91	92	82	85	60	65	59	55	39	43	43	44
Germany	96	93	87	87	66	66	53	57	59	61	38	42
Greece	98	98	70	77	66	70	53	60	55	55	33	37
Hungary	100	99	97	95	77	75	64	63	53	59	42	43
Iceland	94	92	82	81	82	81	m	57[d]	m	x(8)	m	54
Ireland[2]	99	97	87	84	x(7)	x(8)	71[d]	68[d]	m	65	44	46
Israel	99	99	85	86	79	79	70	71	m	m	m	49
Italy	99	98	96	94	78	76	66[d]	65[d]	x(7)	x(8)	37	40
Japan	97	97	65	63	42	44	30[d]	32[d]	x(7,11)	x(8,12)	27[d]	30[d]
Korea	99	99	78	77	70	72	51	59	a	a	35	38
Latvia	100	99	93	92	84	83	80	77	65	63	56	55
Lithuania	99	97	97	96	82	82	79	78	67	62	56	56
Luxembourg	96	94	76	76	58	60	50	52	m	31	38	37
Mexico	94	96	68	71	53	56	47	51	a	a	m	45
Netherlands	87	88	86	87	52	56	52	58	a	59	44	50
New Zealand	98	97	84	85	66	68	60	61	55	54	49	54
Norway	93	90	75	74	75	74	53	56	53	42	46	51
Poland	98	98	85	88	74	76	65	66	68	76	44	49
Portugal	99	99	80	82	75	72	65[d]	68[d]	x(7)	x(8)	44	48
Slovak Republic	100	100	90	89	76	79	72	71	68	66	45	48
Slovenia[1]	97	98	88	88[d]	88	x(4)	67	67	a	a	43	49
Spain	93	93	76	78	60	63	55	57	a	a	42	47
Sweden	96	96	77	82	77	65	53	55	44	47	44	48
Switzerland	97	97	82	83	54	57	43[d]	47[d]	x(7)	x(8)	34	40
Türkiye[2]	m	95	m	66	m	61	m	54	a	a	43	47
United Kingdom[1]	98	93	85	87	64	65[d]	61	x(6)	a	a	45	48
United States	94	93	87	87	67	67	57	58	x(11)	x(12)	49[d]	52[d]
OECD average	**97**	**96**	**83**	**83**	**69**	**68**	**59**	**60**	**56**	**56**	**43**	**46**
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	a	a	m	m
Brazil	97	96	91	89	71	66	58	55	47	50	46	47
Bulgaria	100	99	95	94	81	79	78	75	55	37	48	52
China	97	97	63	75	53	62	51	58	m	m	m	m
Croatia	99	99	94	93	74	74	67	68	a	a	48	52
India[4]	m	93	49	57	44	51	42	45	59	m	39	44
Indonesia[1]	96	96	66	72	55	65	54	58	a	a	43	m
Peru	96	98	68	71	45[d]	47	x(5)	46	a	a	33	37
Romania	100	100	89	93	71	74	70	73	78	79	49	54

	Pre-primary		Primary		Lower secondary		Upper secondary		Post-secondary non-tertiary		Tertiary	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Saudi Arabia	100	100	53	59	52	48	53	51	14	29	40	48
South Africa[4]	m	m	79	79	m	61	m	60	53	56	m	m
Thailand	m	71	73	68	72	65	63	67	m	m	62	56
EU25 average	**97**	**97**	**86**	**87**	**72**	**72**	**63**	**64**	**57**	**57**	**45**	**47**
G20 average	**96**	**95**	**76**	**76**	**60**	**62**	**54**	**55**	**45**	**m**	**41**	**44**

1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Colombia, France and the United Kingdom; and 2017 for Indonesia and Slovenia.
2. Pre-primary includes early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01).
3. The data on teachers are expressed in full-time equivalents (FTE) rather than headcounts and cover public and government-dependent private institutions at the pre-primary, primary, lower secondary and upper secondary levels, while only public institutions are included at all other education levels.
4. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2023 for India and South Africa.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/4t97hi.

Table D5.2. Trends in the share of women among school management personnel, by level of education (2015 and 2024)

	Pre-primary		Primary		Lower secondary		Upper secondary	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
OECD countries								
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	98	97	84	83	45	55	36	41
Belgium[1]	94	92	62	67	52	57	43	49
Canada[1]	x(3)	x(4)	63[d]	64[d]	x(3)	x(4)	63	64
Chile	81	83	56	62	56	62	46	54
Colombia[1]	x(3)	88	55[d]	43[d]	x(3)	x(4)	x(3)	x(4)
Costa Rica[1]	x(3)	m	69[d]	74	60	64	59	64
Czechia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Denmark[1]	86	86	75	73	68	68	68	67
Estonia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Finland	94	95	52	58	49	59	47	52
France[1,2]	86	87	61	69	50	57	42	49
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	98	98	43	55	43	55	32	44
Hungary	98	99	78	79	78	78	54	58
Iceland	97	97	76	85	76	85	m	73
Ireland[1,3]	99	98	62	62	x(7)	x(8)	50[d]	47[d]
Israel	m	m	69	73	60	67	49	54
Italy	a	a	x(5)	x(6)	84[d]	86[d]	53	62
Japan	62	64	21	29	8	16	9	15
Korea	94	96	42	52	26	41	10	22
Latvia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Lithuania	98	81	96	95	80	85	74	79
Luxembourg	a	x(4)	48	45[d]	x(7)	x(8)	30[d]	43[d]
Mexico	93	93	46	51	41	46	43	47
Netherlands	48	68	48	68	29	43	34	50
New Zealand	m	m	66	67	54	56	46	49
Norway	92	91	61	67	62	68	51	57
Poland	99	99	78	82	69	75	59	63
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovak Republic	100	99	87	90	87	72	61	68
Slovenia[3]	97	96	74	76[d]	73	x(4)	59	64
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden	91	94	68	75	69	75	53	62
Switzerland[4]	67	67	61	64	35	40	27	35
Türkiye	m	a	m	a	m	a	m	a
United Kingdom[1]	m	m	78	79	49	55	55	56
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
OECD average	**89**	**90**	**64**	**67**	**56**	**61**	**46**	**53**
Partner and/or accession countries								
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	88	m	82	m	72	m	62
Bulgaria	96	m	81	87	75	x(8)	74	80[d]
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	79	m	47	m	42	m	42

	Pre-primary		Primary		Lower secondary		Upper secondary	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Romania	98	97	75	82	66	69	60	67
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	79	m	46	m	46	m	39
EU25 average	**93**	**93**	**69**	**73**	**64**	**m**	**52**	**58**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

1. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Colombia, Costa Rica, France and the United Kingdom; 2017 for Canada; 2018 for Denmark and Ireland; and 2019 for Belgium.
2. Data on school management refer to full-time equivalents (FTE) rather than headcounts.
3. Pre-primary includes early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01).
4. Upper secondary education includes post-secondary non-tertiary education.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/4t97hi.

Table D5.3. Trends in the average working-time intensity of teachers, by level of education and gender (2015 and 2024)

Based on the ratio of full-time equivalent teachers to total teacher headcount, indicating the average proportion of a full-time workload per teacher.

	Pre-primary		Primary		Secondary					
					Total		Men		Women	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
OECD countries										
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	0.85	0.80	0.89	0.86	0.90	0.88	0.91	0.90	0.89	0.87
Belgium	0.86	0.85	0.87	0.85	0.81	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.80	0.82
Canada[1]	x(3)	x(4)	0.79[d]	0.90[d]	0.79	0.90	0.77	0.88	0.80	0.90
Chile	0.89	0.92	0.88	0.93	0.86	0.91	0.86	0.91	0.86	0.92
Colombia[2]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Costa Rica	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Czechia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Denmark[2]	0.91	0.89	0.84	0.84	0.86	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.87	0.85
Estonia[3,4]	0.94	0.97	0.84	0.87	0.74	0.80	0.66	0.76	0.77	0.81
Finland	m	0.95	m	0.97	m	0.96	m	0.97	m	0.96
France[5]	0.91	0.93	0.92	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.94	0.95
Germany	0.81	0.81	0.79	0.77	0.84	0.81	0.84	0.81	0.84	0.81
Greece[2]	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.97	0.98	0.97	0.98	0.97
Hungary	0.99	0.97	0.98	0.94	0.90	0.86	0.88	0.83	0.92	0.87
Iceland[4]	0.88	0.89	0.94	0.91	m	0.83	m	0.77	m	0.85
Ireland[3]	m	0.82	m	1.00	m	1.00	m	1.00	m	1.00
Israel	m	m	0.81	1.26	m	m	m	m	m	m
Italy[4]	0.94	0.93	0.97	0.95	0.91	0.91	0.90	0.91	0.91	0.92
Japan[4]	0.92	0.89	0.96	0.94	0.90	0.89	m	m	m	m
Korea	0.99	0.94	0.88	0.90	0.91	0.91	0.97	0.94	0.87	0.89
Latvia	1.00	0.97	1.00	0.95	0.91	0.87	0.89	0.83	0.91	0.88
Lithuania	0.90	0.93	1.25	0.99	1.04	0.87	0.92	0.78	1.07	0.89
Luxembourg	0.84	0.86	0.79	0.90	0.93	0.91	0.97	0.95	0.90	0.87
Mexico[2]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.60	0.59	0.62	0.60	0.60	0.59
Netherlands	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.73	0.81	0.80	0.89	0.86	0.74	0.75
New Zealand	0.78	0.78	0.88	0.88	0.89	0.90	0.91	0.91	0.88	0.89
Norway	0.90	0.95	0.86	0.85	0.87	0.86	0.88	0.86	0.86	0.87
Poland	0.90	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.88	0.92	0.83	0.89	0.90	0.94
Portugal[4]	0.99	0.98	0.96	0.93	0.91	0.87	0.89	0.86	0.92	0.87
Slovak Republic	1.00	1.00	0.89	0.92	0.86	0.83	0.79	0.74	0.88	0.86
Slovenia[2]	0.98	0.99	0.97	0.98	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.95	0.98	0.96
Spain	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.94	0.93
Sweden	m	0.91	0.89	0.90	0.87	0.91	0.84	0.92	0.88	0.91
Switzerland[4]	0.69	0.65	0.65	0.62	0.67	0.64	0.72	0.68	0.62	0.61
Türkiye	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
United Kingdom[2,6]	0.60	0.72	0.89	0.88	0.92	0.93	0.96	0.97	0.90	0.91
United States	0.92	0.96	0.94	0.97	0.96	0.97	0.96	0.98	0.95	0.97
OECD average	**0.91**	**0.91**	**0.91**	**0.92**	**0.89**	**0.89**	**0.88**	**0.88**	**0.88**	**0.89**
Partner and/or accession countries										
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.97	0.97	0.96	0.96	0.98	0.97
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	0.98	0.98	0.96	0.94	0.73	0.75	0.71	0.72	0.74	0.76

	Pre-primary		Primary		Secondary					
					Total		Men		Women	
	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024	2015	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	0.85	m	0.83	m	0.77	m	0.78	m	0.76
Romania	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.92	0.91	0.92	0.90	0.92	0.92
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	1.00	m	1.00	m	1.00	m	1.00	m	1.00
EU25 average	**0.93**	**0.92**	**0.93**	**0.92**	**0.89**	**0.89**	**0.88**	**0.88**	**0.89**	**0.89**
G20 average	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**	**m**

Note: The FTE-to-headcount ratio for teachers indicates the extent to which teaching capacity is delivered through full-time or part-time employment.
1. Data for primary include lower secondary education; data for secondary relate only to upper secondary education.
2. Year of reference differs from 2015: 2016 for Colombia, Mexico and the United Kingdom; 2017 for Slovenia; and 2018 for Denmark and Greece.
3. Pre-primary includes early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01).
4. Secondary education includes post-secondary non-tertiary education.
5. Includes only public and government dependent private institutions.
6. Secondary education includes only general programmes.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/4t97hi.

Table D5.4. Minimum educational attainment required for teachers and share of teachers who meet the minimum national attainment requirements, by level of education taught (2024)

Based on national minimum educational attainment requirements applicable in 2024

	Minimum ISCED level required to teach			Percentage of teachers who meet the minimum national attainment requirements		
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
OECD countries						
Australia[1]	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	97	98
Austria	ISCED 5	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	m	m	m
Canada[2]	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	x(6)	x(6)	94[d]
Chile	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	98	98	98
Colombia[2]	ISCED 4	ISCED 4	ISCED 6	99	96	99[d]
Costa Rica[1]	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	m	96
Czechia	ISCED 3	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	100	86	86
Denmark	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	82	85	82
Estonia[3, 4]	ISCED 5	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	90	76	82
Finland[3]	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	75	84	85
France	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	m	m	m
Germany[4]	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	64	73	80
Greece	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	m	m
Hungary	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	98	99	99
Iceland[1,5]	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	m	m	41
Ireland	ISCED 4	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	m	m	m
Israel	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	87	80	98
Italy[1]	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	m	m	90
Japan	ISCED 5	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	m	m
Korea	ISCED 5	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	100	100	100
Latvia	ISCED 5	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	95	96	96
Lithuania	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	75	95	96[d]
Luxembourg	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	70	88	74
Mexico	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	82	92	87
Netherlands[1]	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	94	96
New Zealand	m	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	90	93
Norway	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	91	84	85
Poland	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	100	100	95
Portugal[1]	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	m	m	94
Slovak Republic[1]	ISCED 3	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	m	m	99
Slovenia	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	85	x(6)	79[d]
Spain[1]	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	m	100	89
Sweden[2,5,6]	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	69	35	63
Switzerland	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	m	m	m
Türkiye	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	97	100
United States[1]	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	m	99
Other participants						
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	99	99	96
French Comm. (Belgium)	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	99	98	88
England (UK)	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	99	99	99[d]
Scotland (UK)	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	ISCED 7	m	m	m
OECD average				**87**	**88**	**89**

	Minimum ISCED level required to teach			Percentage of teachers who meet the minimum national attainment requirements		
	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary	Pre-primary	Primary	Lower secondary
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Partner and/or accession countries						
Argentina	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	m	m
Brazil	ISCED 3	ISCED 3	ISCED 6	100	100	91
Bulgaria[2]	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	97	99	99
China	ISCED 3	ISCED 3	ISCED 5	m	m	m
Croatia[1]	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 7	m	m	95
India	ISCED 3	ISCED 3	ISCED 3	m	m	m
Indonesia	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	m	m
Peru	ISCED 5	ISCED 5	ISCED 5	100	100	99
Romania[1]	ISCED 3	ISCED 3	ISCED 6	m	m	99
Saudi Arabia	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	m	m
South Africa	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	m	m
Thailand	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	ISCED 6	m	m	m
EU25 average				**m**	**m**	**86**
G20 average				**m**	**m**	**m**

Note:
- Data on the minimum educational attainment required for teachers and the share of teachers meeting national qualification standards are primarily based on the UIS TEACH questionnaire, which collects administrative data reported by countries on teachers' highest level of education and national qualification requirements. For a limited number of countries where TEACH data are not available, information is derived from the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS), based on teachers' self-reported highest level of formal education. As a result, data for these countries are not strictly comparable with those based on administrative sources and should be interpreted with caution.
- The minimum educational attainment required to teach at upper secondary level primarily refers to general programmes. Qualification requirements may vary depending on programme orientation and subject taught. See Figure D5.4 for further details.
Minimum educational attainment requirements may have changed over time. In some countries, teachers who met previous requirements may no longer meet current minimum educational attainment levels, while still being considered fully qualified due to their experience or according to national regulations.
- The column on the share of teachers meeting minimum national educational attainment requirements at the upper secondary level is web-only. This reflects the need for cautious interpretation, given cross-country differences in such requirements, particularly between general and vocational programmes.
- ISCED 7 refers to a master's degree or equivalent, ISCED 6 to a bachelor's degree or equivalent, ISCED 5 to short-cycle tertiary education, ISCED 4 to post-secondary non-tertiary education, and ISCED 3 to upper secondary education.
1. Data are based on TALIS and refer to teachers' self-reported highest level of formal education
2. Year of reference differs from 2024: 2025 for Bulgaria and Sweden; 2023 for Colombia; and 2021 for Canada.
3. Upper secondary education includes post-secondary non-tertiary education.
4. Pre-primary includes early childhood educational development programmes (ISCED 01).
5. The minimum attainment requirements for teachers have increased from ISCED level 6 to ISCED level 7 at lower secondary level leading to lower reported shares.
6. Excludes teachers who qualify by complementing subject studies with pedagogical training and hold an ISCED level 6 qualification.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/4t97hi.


Chapter D6. What school evaluation mechanisms are in place?

Highlights

- School inspections, school self-evaluations and school compliance reporting are mandatory in most countries and economies where they are regulated. Whereas the periodicity of school inspections ranges from once a year to once every six years, self-evaluations typically take place annually, although their periodicity can extend to every five years. Compliance reporting is most often conducted annually or more often.
- School inspections and school self-evaluation shape a range of decisions concerning schools' and teachers' performance, the assistance to improve skills of teachers, the school budget and teachers' remuneration, with school inspections having the widest influence over a range of decisions. Both inspections and self-evaluations are used to evaluate school performance and school administration, although more so for inspections, and both have a limited impact on teachers' conditions.
- School inspections are frequently used for both improving schools (formative purposes) and determining whether they are performing as required (summative purposes) while school self-evaluations are more commonly used for formative than summative purposes.

Figure D6.1. Requirement for and frequency of school inspections and self-evaluations (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels



1. Primary and lower secondary levels only.
2. Secondary level only.

For data, see Table D6.1. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/hwzdp9.

Context

Evaluation in education can encompass a large number of issues and a range of methods are available to assess the quality and effectiveness of education systems. Countries can use a combination of student examinations and assessments, school

inspections, school self-evaluations, and reports on schools' compliance with regional or national rules and regulations. This chapter analyses school inspections, school self-evaluations and school compliance reports at the primary and secondary level, focusing on public institutions. It complements Chapter D7, which covers the appraisal of teachers and school heads, as well as Chapter D6 in *Education at a Glance 2023* (OECD, 2023[1]), which covers student assessments and examinations.

The effective monitoring and evaluation of schools is central to the continuous improvement of student learning. It can provide individual schools, which have been recognised as key to improving learning outcomes, with essential feedback on how to improve their practices. School evaluation is also considered to be a potential lever of change that can assist with decision making and resource allocation. This role of school evaluation has become particularly important as individual schools are given greater autonomy, and as market forms of accountability gain in importance (OECD, 2013[2]). With devolved responsibilities, there is also more call for schools to be held accountable for their quality. School evaluation processes, which can be conducted internally (school self-evaluation) or by agents external to school (school inspection) can help meet such accountability needs. The results of school evaluations can have an impact on various aspects of education systems, including the allocation of funds to educational institutions (Part C and Chapter D6 in *Education at a Glance 2021* (OECD, 2021[3]), the compensation of teachers and schools heads (Chapter D3), and the professional development of staff (OECD, 2025[4]) and Chapter D7 of *Education at a Glance 2022* (OECD, 2022[5])).

Other findings

- School inspections tend to be the most standardised process, while school self-evaluations are less consistently structured. Both are mostly designed and organised at the central or state level, either exclusively or in combination with other levels of government.
- Failure to submit compliance reports carries enforceable consequences, ranging from reminders to financial sanctions.
- School inspections most frequently address compliance with rules and the quality of leadership and management, whereas school self-evaluations most commonly cover the quality of student learning and provisions for student well-being. Compliance reports typically include data on student populations, teacher qualifications, curriculum, safety, facilities and the closing budget or financial audit from the previous year.
- School inspection results are primarily shared with school administrators and higher-level education authorities, but also frequently with classroom teachers and parents. In a smaller number of countries they are also shared with the media, the general public and students. School self-evaluation results are often shared with all types of audiences. Compliance reports are most frequently shared with the central education authority or government, although there are wide variations across countries.
- The results of school inspections and self-evaluations are mostly shared in a paper format (a letter or report) with higher-level education authorities and school administrators. Websites are more frequently used to share inspection results with other audiences, while the results of school self-evaluations are more often shared with these groups on request.
- A school which is found to be underperforming by a school inspection will usually face further evaluation, and frequently compulsory training for school personnel, whereas in most countries there is no consequence to school underperformance revealed by self-evaluations.

Analysis

This chapter analyses the evaluation of primary and secondary schools through school inspections, self-evaluations and compliance reporting across 30 countries and economies that participated in a survey on the evaluation of teachers, school heads and schools. The results of the survey covering the evaluation of teachers and school heads are included in Chapter D7, and an overview of the different forms of evaluation of schools, teachers and school heads used by countries is available in Box D6.1.

The analysis here relates to primary and secondary education as a whole and in most countries, schools are evaluated in the same way across primary, lower secondary and upper secondary levels. However, in a few countries (Denmark, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway and Slovenia), there are some differences between levels of education. In these cases the analysis specifies the level of education where they differ, but focuses on lower secondary level in general.

Box D6.1. Overview of the existence and uses of evaluations of schools, teachers and school heads

Existence of evaluations

The existence of government policies or regulations for the evaluation of teachers and school heads (through appraisals) and schools (through inspections, self-evaluation or school reporting) varies widely across countries and economies. Broadly, two groups emerge among countries and economies with available data.

In about three-quarters of these countries and economies, a policy framework covers the appraisal of teachers and school heads. In half of these, a policy framework also covers school inspections, self-evaluations and compliance reporting (Chile, Czechia, France, the French Community of Belgium, Germany, Hungary, Korea, Lithuania, Romania, Slovenia and Spain). In the other half (Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, England [United Kingdom], the Flemish Community of Belgium, Japan, Luxembourg, Poland, the Slovak Republic, Sweden and the Republic of Türkiye), the regulations cover either only some forms of school evaluation or some forms of teacher and school head appraisals (Table D6.1 and Table D6.4, and Table D7.1 in Chapter D7).

In one-quarter of the countries and economies, the framework only covers school evaluations. In Denmark, the Netherlands and Portugal, all three types of school evaluation are formally regulated, whereas in Finland, Norway and Scotland (United Kingdom), the regulation covers only some types of evaluation. This does not mean that teachers and schools heads are not appraised in these countries, as some similar practices may exist (for example in the Netherlands) (Table D6.1and Table D6.4, and Table D7.1 in Chapter D7).

Use of evaluations for formative and summative purposes

In general, the wider the policy coverage of the regulations on evaluation arrangements, the more intensively evaluations are used for both formative and summative purposes (Box D6.3 and Box D7.4 in Chapter D7). The countries and economies where the regulations cover the full range of evaluations (teacher and school head appraisals, school inspections, self-evaluation, and compliance reporting) tend to report more intensive use of these evaluation activities for both formative and summative purposes than those countries where only some of these evaluation activities are covered. For example, France reports a high or moderate level of use of all evaluation activities for both purposes, with the exception of school head appraisal, which is used only to a limited extent for summative purposes. The French Community of Belgium and Spain also report a relatively high level of use of the different types of evaluation for both purposes.

Countries and economies where the regulations cover either some types of school evaluation, or some forms of teacher and school head appraisals, also use these evaluations for both formative and summative purposes, although to a lesser extent. Most of these countries and economies report making little or no use at all of some evaluation activities for summative or formative purposes. Nevertheless, the balance between formative and summative purposes tends to be relatively even across the evaluation activities used within this group. For example, the Slovak Republic reports a high level of use of each type of evaluation activity for both formative and summative purposes. Similarly, Bulgaria reports a moderate level of use of school head appraisals and a high level of use of school inspections for both formative and summative purposes.

Countries where the framework covers all types of school evaluation, but not teacher and school head appraisals (Denmark, the Netherlands and Portugal) tend to report a high or moderate level of use of school inspection and school self-evaluation for formative purposes, and to a lesser extent for summative purposes. Countries and economies where the regulations cover only some types of school evaluation (Finland, Norway and Scotland [United Kingdom]) tend to report a more limited use of evaluation activities for both formative and summative purposes.

Source: Table D6.1 and Table D6.4; Tables D6.5 and D6.6, available online; and Tables D7.1 and D7.4 in Chapter D7.

School inspections

A school inspection is a mandated, formal process of external evaluation that aims to hold schools accountable. School inspections at primary and secondary level are covered by government policies or regulations in 24 of the 30 countries and economies with available information. The existence and process for school inspection varies widely between countries (Table D6.1) and may depend on the purposes of these exercises, such as whether they are used for summative and formative purposes (Box D6.3).

Requirements and periodicity

School inspections are mandatory exercises in all of the 24 countries and economies with an official framework for them except Chile. In Brazil and the Flemish and French Communities of Belgium, school inspection is part of the accreditation process for schools, to grant recognition or credentials that a school meets or exceeds established minimum standards, which may explain why it is a mandatory process. In 10 countries and economies, inspections specifically target low-performing schools (based on previous evaluation for example). School inspections are both part of an accreditation process and also target low-performing schools only in the Flemish and French Communities of Belgium (Table D6.1).

The periodicity of school inspections varies largely across countries – from once a year in Denmark (at primary and lower secondary level) and Luxembourg (at secondary level), to once every six years in the Flemish Community of Belgium. The most common frequencies are every three years (in Austria, the French Community of Belgium, Korea and Türkiye), or every five years (in Bulgaria, France, Hungary, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia). However, in eight other countries, different types of periodicity are used, which may not mean the same frequency of inspections for all schools. For example, in Sweden, the frequency of school inspection is based on a risk assessment, with higher-risk schools inspected more often. In Czechia, the cycle for school inspections can vary from three years to five, seven or nine years, depending on the results of the latest inspection, among other criteria (including suggestions, complaints, or requests) and the assignment of a school to a particular cycle is not fixed. In Scotland (United Kingdom), schools are selected for an inspection based on a sampling approach (Figure D6.1 and Table D6.1).

Organisation

In all countries with available information, school inspections are standardised in their organisation. They are designed and organised at the central or state level exclusively in two-thirds of the countries and economies. In the remaining countries, they are devised and organised at the central or state level in combination with educational authorities at the provincial/regional level (in Austria, France and Türkiye) or at the local level (in Brazil) or both these levels (in Korea). In Chile, France, Luxembourg (at the secondary level) and Portugal, school boards or committees are also involved in the organisation of inspections (Table D6.1).

School inspections are highly structured in most countries and economies where they take place (20 out of 24 countries and economies), with similar activities completed at each school based on a specific set of data collection tools. In Bulgaria, France and Sweden, inspections are only partially structured, implying some differences in activities completed at each school. As inspections in these countries target low-performing schools, their activities can be adjusted according to the individual school's performance (Table D6.1).

School inspections are conducted by teams of inspectors in most systems (in 15 countries and economies). Slovenia is the only country where school inspections are conducted exclusively by a single inspector. In six other countries, inspections are conducted by either a single person or a team. Despite this variation in the way inspection is conducted, inspections are highly structured in four of these countries and partially structured in the other two (Table D6.1).

Subjects covered and sharing of results

School inspections can investigate a large number of aspects of a school's activities. The most common areas systematically covered by inspections are compliance with rules and regulations (always covered in 20 countries and economies) and quality of leadership and management (always covered in 19). These are followed by the quality of instruction, the quality of students' learning, the quality of provisions for students' well-being, the quality of curriculum and instructional materials, and alignment with school development plans or school projects, systematically covered in 16 or 17 countries and economies each. Schools' financial management is a less common area, which is always covered by inspections in only nine countries and economies. Some countries always cover some other topics in school inspections. For example, school inspections can also cover best practices to enhance public officials' morale and to foster a proactive culture in public service in Korea, human resources policy and professional development in the Flemish Community of Belgium, and institutional capacity in Romania (Figure D6.2 and Table D6.2).


The reports prepared after school inspections cover the subjects always included in those inspections, but they can also include topics that are not systematically addressed in all inspections. For example, in Luxembourg, secondary school inspections sometimes cover the quality of the curriculum and instructional materials, the quality of leadership and management, and alignment with school development plan or school projects, in which case they will then be included in the report (Table D6.2 and *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)).

As expected, the results of school inspections are mainly directly shared with school administrators (in 21 countries and economies) and also higher-level education authorities (in 18). However, in most countries they are also shared with classroom teachers (in 17) and parents (in 16). Results are less frequently made available to the media and the general public (in 13 countries and economies), and to students (in 10). The way results are most commonly shared varies depending on the audience. Whereas results are mostly shared with higher-level education authorities and school administrators in paper form (such as a letter or report), a government or education authority website is more often used to share results with other audiences. Less frequently, classroom teachers, parents, students and the media or the general public only receive results on request, which is the case in between two and six countries, depending on the audience considered (Table D6.5, available online).

Some countries use different approaches for sharing results with different audiences. For example, in Bulgaria higher-level education authorities and school administrators receive school inspection results in a report, while parents, students and the media and the general public can access them through a website. The results are also shared with teachers, but only on request. However, in other countries, the results are always shared using the same method to all stakeholders. For example, in the Netherlands the results are directly shared to all audiences though a website. In Czechia, the results are also available through a website to all audiences, even though they are also directly shared with higher-level education authorities and school administrators in paper form (Table D6.5, available online).

Figure D6.2. Areas addressed during school inspections and self-evaluations (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels



For data, see Table D6.2. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/hwzdp9.

Level of influence


The results of school inspections are most commonly used to evaluate schools' performance and their administration. In nearly all countries with available information, school inspection results can have a moderate to high level of influence on the overall evaluation of both school performance and school administration. They have a low level of influence on these two areas only in Luxembourg (at secondary level), while Slovenia is the only country which does not use the results of school inspections in evaluations of school performance at all (Figure D6.3 and Table D6.3).

The results of school inspections can also have an influence on other decisions. Their impact on teachers is usually limited. They are used to a moderate or high level in the evaluation of individual teachers in one-third of the countries and economies, and to help teachers to improve their teaching skills in half. However, they rarely affect decisions about teachers' remuneration or

bonuses, with only Korea using them to influence decisions about one-off performance-based bonuses (Figure D6.3 and Table D6.3).

Figure D6.3. Influence of school inspections and self-evaluations on school management (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels



Note: The level of influence on school and teacher evaluations reflects the extent to which school inspections and self-evaluations affect overall evaluations. For data, see Table D6.3. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/hwzdp9.

School inspection results also generally have only a limited influence on the size of the school budget. However, they have a high level of influence over decisions to reduce schools' funding as a penalty in the Netherlands, after successive school inspections have not led to the necessary improvements and when other instruments to increase performance (like extending the recovery period) have proved unsuccessful. Results also have a moderate level of influence on decisions to increase funding to support underperforming schools in Austria (Table D6.3).

In a few countries, the results of inspections are used to a limited extent (in the Flemish Community of Belgium and the Netherlands) or a moderate extent (in Czechia and Sweden) in decisions about school closures. For example, in the Flemish Community of Belgium, closure decisions can result from the systematic underperformance of a school, implying that a single inspection is not enough for this decision (Table D6.3). More details about the wider consequences for schools of underperformance demonstrated by an inspection or self-evaluation are discussed in Box D6.2.

Box D6.2. Consequences of underperformance for schools

When the results of a school inspection or self-evaluation demonstrate a school is underperforming, there can be a number of consequences for the school.

Underperformance in school inspection

Underperformance in an inspection usually leads to further evaluation for the school. This is the case in 19 of the 24 countries and economies with a legal framework for school inspection. Compulsory training for the personnel of an underperforming school is also used in over one-third of countries and economies (Table D6.5, available online).

Underperformance has financial consequences for the school in a few cases, whether this means increased funding as a support measure or a decreased funding as a punitive one. Chile is the only country where underperformance can lead to either an increase or a decrease in funding. Otherwise, underperformance can result in increased funding in Austria, England (United Kingdom) and the French Community of Belgium, and in decreased funding in the Flemish Community of Belgium and the Netherlands. For example, in the Flemish Community of Belgium, two negative evaluations of a school's use of resources intended to support equal educational opportunities result in a reduction of the corresponding resources (i.e. part of the additional staffing allocated on the basis of the number of disadvantaged pupils at a school).

School underperformance also has other consequences in one-third of the countries and economies. Some include measures to improve results of the school, either through proposals for training (France), the identification of development goals (Germany and Scotland [United Kingdom]), or recommendations and guidelines for improving performance (Lithuania). It can mean exemption from or mitigation of responsibility for public officials who acted without intentional misconduct or gross negligence (Korea), or a proposal to dismiss the school head (Czechia). Consequences also include fines for the school (Sweden), or even school closure, when underperformance is systematic (the Flemish Community of Belgium) (Table D6.5, available online).

Underperformance in self-evaluation

Unlike with school inspections, in most countries there are no consequences for school underperformance demonstrated by self-evaluations. In these cases, underperformance leads to further evaluation in seven countries and economies and to compulsory training for school personnel in four. Only Portugal reports any form of financial consequences.

Nevertheless, seven countries and economies report other types of responses to underperformance. For example, in Germany, the results of school self-evaluation are used to help schools to identify development goals that should be incorporated into their ongoing quality development. In Korea, evaluation results are used to develop the following year's educational plans or the mid- to long-term development strategies, and this may require follow-up consultation from the provincial office of education. In Slovenia an action plan for improvement needs to be developed by the school, as schools ensure the quality by setting goals (Table D6.5, available online).

In some countries, schools may also have some influence or control over some aspects of school inspections. France, Portugal, Romania and Scotland (United Kingdom) reported a moderate level (Table D6.3). For example, in Portugal, schools may highlight aspects that they consider relevant and which have not been assessed, for analysis at a higher level. In Scotland (United Kingdom), feedback from schools is gathered on the inspection process and its impact on supporting improvement at the school level. In Romania, schools can refuse specific evaluation teams and choose the period of evaluation (Table D6.3).

School self-evaluations

School self-evaluation refers to a systematic review by a school of the quality of the instruction and education services it provides and of the school's outcomes. A framework for school self-evaluation is included in government policies or official documents in 19 of the 30 countries and economies with available information (Table D6.1).

School self-evaluations and school inspections both assess educational quality and support school improvement by examining teaching practices, learning outcomes and organisational effectiveness. However, they differ in their purpose and in their

implementation. Where school inspection is a mandated, external form of evaluation conducted by inspectors, school self-evaluation is an internally led, formative process through which schools systematically review their own performance to identify strengths, areas for development, and priorities for improvement (see Box D6.3 for further details of the use of self-evaluations for summative and formative purposes).

Requirements and periodicity

As with school inspections, regulated school self-evaluation is a mandatory exercise for schools in almost all the countries and economies that use them, with the exception of Chile and Sweden. Chile is the only country where neither school self-evaluations nor inspections are mandatory (both also target low-performing schools). Self-evaluation is part of the school accreditation process in the French Community of Belgium and Romania. In the case of the French Community of Belgium, they also target low-performing schools (Table D6.1).

In nearly half of the countries and economies with regulations on school self-evaluation (9 out of 19), self-evaluations are conducted once a year. However, there are large differences across countries in the periodicity of these self-evaluations. In Japan, they are organised more than once a year, while they are conducted every five years in France, Hungary and Romania (Figure D6.1 and Table D6.1).

Organisation

School self-evaluations are less structured and standardised than school inspections. In more than half of the 19 countries and economies, school self-evaluations are devised and standardised at the central level or by school boards or committees. As with school inspections, school self-evaluations can be either organised exclusively by these bodies, or in combination with other levels of government. They are devised and standardised by both central authorities and school boards or committees in eight countries (Table D6.1).

Only six countries reported that their school self-evaluations are highly structured, with similar activities included in all self-evaluations across the board. However, they are partially structured in half of the countries and economies (9 out 19) implying they can be adjusted to meet the needs of individual schools. The Netherlands and Slovenia are the only countries where self-evaluations are not structured. In the Netherlands, although it is mandatory for schools to perform self-evaluations, it is the responsibility of the school boards to decide how to implement them, implying potential differences across schools. In Slovenia, there are recommendations, but they are not binding regulations on the way schools should implement self-evaluations. Nevertheless, a self-evaluation framework with standards and indicators is being prepared (Table D6.1).

School self-evaluations can be conducted by a range of different groups of participants. In about two-thirds of the countries and economies they involve school administrators and/or parents (13-14 out of 19). Classroom teachers are also involved in about one-third of the countries and economies and students in more than one-quarter. In France, for example, school principals organise the self-evaluation process, while classroom teachers and all school stakeholders take part either by answering targeted surveys, analysing survey results or taking part in working groups. In less than one-quarter of countries and economies, other groups may also participate in the self-evaluation. For example, in Korea the school may establish a self-evaluation committee that includes external experts and community representatives, in Lithuania social partners (state and non-governmental institutions, organisations, supporting organisations such as municipal psychological-pedagogical services, educational centres, and local enterprises with which the school has co-operation agreements) can also participate. In Sweden, representatives from local education authorities or governments are also involved in self-evaluations (Table D6.1).

Subjects covered and sharing of results

Most of the eight domains considered in Table D6.5 (available online) are systematically addressed during self-evaluations in the majority of the 19 countries and economies. The most common areas are the quality of students' learning (always covered in 13 countries and economies) and the quality of provisions for students' well-being (always covered in 12). Compliance with rules and regulations, quality of instruction, quality of curriculum and instructional materials, quality of leadership and management, and alignment with school development plan or school projects are also widely systematically covered, in 10 or 11 countries and economies each. Financial management is always covered in self-evaluations in less than one-third of countries and economies, and in a few countries, self-evaluations systematically address other topics. For example, in Czechia, they also consider the prevention of socially pathological phenomena; risky behaviour; and the provision of support for children, pupils and students with special educational needs; gifted students and those entitled to language training; continuous professional development of

teaching and non-teaching staff; and the school's activities and public presentation. In Korea, self-evaluations can also cover school-community partnerships, school self-governance culture and other related practices (Figure D6.2 and Table D6.5, available online).

The reports prepared following a self-evaluation cover the subjects always considered during the process, but can also cover other subjects. In general, there is a consistency between the subjects addressed during the school self-evaluation and the content of the report (Table D6.5, available online).

The results of school self-evaluations are shared in some form with higher-level education authorities, school administrators, classroom teachers, parents, students, and the media and general public in most countries and economies (in 10-14 out of 19). They are most frequently directly shared with higher-level education authorities, school administrators and classroom teachers (in 12 to 14 countries and economies). Higher education authorities and school administrators mostly receive the results in paper form, such as a letter or report, although in a few countries it is through a website or on request (for both groups in the Slovak Republic and for higher education authorities in Austria). Results are most often directly shared with teachers in paper form, but also on request in some countries. In Czechia, Korea and Romania, teachers receive the results directly through a government or education authority website (Table D6.5, available online).

Results are also shared directly with students and the media or general public in few countries, either in paper form (in three or four countries and economies) or a government or education authority website (in three countries and economies). However they are most commonly shared with these groups on requests (in four countries for each group). The way results are shared can differ depending on the audience. For example, in France results are shared on request with parents and students and are not shared with the media. In Hungary, they are shared on request with parents and the media but not shared with students. In Luxembourg, they are shared directly with parents and students in paper form and with the media on request (Table D6.5, available online).

Most countries and economies share the results in different forms to different audiences. However, some countries always share the results in the same way to all stakeholders. For example, the results are always directly shared in a paper report in Portugal and through a website in Romania, while in the Slovak Republic, they are only shared on request (Table D6.5, available online).

Level of influence

School self-evaluations appear to have more limited influence than school inspections. Only 13 out of 19 countries and economies report a moderate or high level of use of school self-evaluations in the overall evaluation of schools' performance and administration, with similar levels of use across countries for both purposes (Figure D6.3 and Table D6.3). There are also fewer consequences for schools found to be underperforming by self-evaluations than by inspections (Box D6.2).

The evaluation of individual teachers and the provision of assistance to teachers to improve their teaching skills are the two other areas that may be more influenced by school self-evaluations. Six to ten countries report a moderate or high level of use of school self-evaluations in these areas (Figure D6.3 and Table D6.3).

School self-evaluation processes are largely controlled by individual schools. Of the 19 countries and economies where schools are required to make self-evaluations, 9 reported that schools had a high level of influence on the process, 4 that they had a moderate influence and 3 that they had a low level of influence (Table D6.3).

Box D6.3. Summative and formative purposes of school evaluations

Figure D6.4 contrasts the extent to which countries use evaluation activities for either formative or summative purposes. The purpose of formative evaluation is to "improve", while the purpose of summative evaluation is to "prove". In other words, formative evaluations examine implementation and aim to obtain information that can be used to help improve the effectiveness of teachers, school managements or the school more generally. They are more relevant for internal audiences. Summative evaluations are often conducted at the end of a programme or at least at a point when long-term outcomes are available. Summative evaluations are closely linked to accountability to higher-level education authorities and audiences outside the school.

School inspections


School inspections are frequently used for both formative and summative purposes (Figure D6.4). Lithuania and Portugal are the only countries where school inspections are used (to a high extent) for formative purposes only. In the 19 countries and economies where inspections are used for both purposes, they can be used to different extent for each purpose. In most cases, they are used to similar extent for these two purposes: from a low level in Hungary and a moderate level in Scotland (United Kingdom) to a high level of use in 11 countries and economies. There are only six countries where school inspections are used to different extents for formative and summative purposes. School inspections have a mix of moderate and high levels of use for formative and summative purposes in Austria, Czechia, France, the Netherlands and Spain whereas in Germany they have a high level of use for summative purpose, but a low level of use for formative purpose (Table D6.5, available online).

School self-evaluation

In contrast, school self-evaluations are more commonly used for formative than summative purposes. Of the 19 countries and economies employing such evaluations, 16 report a moderate or high level of use of them for formative purposes, while only 9 report a similar level of use for summative purposes. Conversely, all countries making moderate or high level of use of these self-evaluations for summative purposes also use them to a moderate or high level for formative purposes (Figure D6.4 and Table D6.5, available online).

Figure D6.4. Summative and formative purposes of school evaluations

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels



Note: "Formative" refers to the use of evaluations for improvement. "Summative" refers to the use of evaluations to determine whether the object of the evaluation is doing what it is supposed to do.
For data, see Table D6.5, available online. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/hwzdp9.

School compliance reporting

A key element of accountability involves schools submitting data and information to higher levels of authority. To a lesser extent, parents and students, as well as the general public, also need to know whether their schools comply with established laws and regulations. Compliance reporting aims to confirm that schools are adhering to these laws and regulations.

Compliance reporting differs from self-evaluation and inspection in its purpose and scope. Compliance reporting is primarily concerned with compliance with established standards and consists in documenting whether schools meet prescribed legal, regulatory or administrative requirements. Whereas inspections and self-evaluations assess broader aspects of teaching, learning and school effectiveness, compliance reporting has a narrower focus, centered on verifying conformity with the applicable policy framework.

Requirements and periodicity


Most countries and economies (25 out of 30) have policy frameworks covering school compliance reporting, either at the national or central level (in 23 countries and economies), or only in some schools (in Denmark at primary and lower secondary levels and in France at all levels). School compliance reporting is compulsory in all of these countries and economies except France (Table D6.4).

The frequency of reporting varies widely, but most commonly once a year (in nine countries and economies) or more than once a year (in seven). Of the rest, school compliance reports are prepared every two years in Türkiye and every three years in Austria. In Hungary, school compliance is an ongoing process rather than a periodic exercise (Table D6.4).

In most of the countries and economies with mandatory compliance reporting (19 out of 25), there are consequences for schools that fail to report compliance-oriented data by the deadline (Table D6.4). There is wide variation in the type of consequences for schools. Schools may simply be reminded to provide the compliance report and offered an extension (for example in Austria and the French Community of Belgium), or they may face financial consequences, which is the case in several countries and economies including Chile, the Flemish Community of Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland and Sweden. For example, compliance can be enforced through a fine or funding sanction (in the Netherlands and Sweden), or funds can be withheld until the required information is submitted (in Norway). Other types of consequences include administrative offence procedures (in Hungary); sanctions for the school head, who can be suspended or dismissed (in Czechia); or reducing student enrollment, cutting or closing classes, or suspending student admissions if the school fails to comply with a corrective active plan within the designated period (in Korea).

Figure D6.5. Domains addressed in school compliance reports (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels in public institutions



For data, see Table D6.4. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/hwzdp9.

Subjects covered

Compliance reports can address a large number of subjects and about three-fifths of the countries and economies report data on all eight of the specific domains considered in the data collection. In 24 out of the 25 countries and economies, public schools report data on their student populations. Schools also report on teachers' qualifications/ credentials, the curriculum, safety issues, facilities and grounds, and the closing budget or financial audit from the previous year in 18-21 countries and economies each. The least commonly reported domains are proposed budgets for the subsequent year and issues related to governance. Nevertheless, one-third of the countries and economies also report information on other subjects. For example, in Czechia schools also report information on admission procedures or enrolment in compulsory schooling, students' results, and information on the prevention of socially pathological phenomena, risky behaviour and the provision of support for children. In Norway, schools need to report information on measures to protect students' privacy (Figure D6.5 and Table D6.4).

Means of reporting and authorities

The recipients of school compliance reports vary widely across countries and across the areas covered. The central education authority or government is the most frequently designated recipient. This is the case in almost all countries and for all types of information reported, notably student data (in 23 out of 25 countries and economies). Reports on the curriculum, safety issues and closing budget or financial audit from previous year are also shared with state education authorities in at least half of the countries and economies (Table D6.6, available online).

Local educational authorities and schools are also common recipients, receiving information on each of the areas covered in one-third to one-half of countries and economies. Parents and students and the general public are least likely to receive this information. This is not surprising, given that compliance reporting is all about demonstrating accountability to higher-level authorities (Table D6.6, available online).

Several data collection methods are used for compliance reports. Although some countries and economies use a single method for all domains, others use multiple methods across domains. For example, in Austria, Chile, Denmark, Hungary, Lithuania and Romania, all the information is exclusively collected through online data management platforms, whereas in Spain the information is collected via a combination of electronic forms, paper forms and online data management platforms in the different domains. Online data management platforms are the most frequently used tools across all of the domains (Table D6.6, available online).

Definitions

Formative evaluation has a purpose to improve. An example of formative evaluation could be reviews of teachers in the classroom with feedback provided so the teacher can become more effective. Any evaluation-related activity that is primarily intended to provide feedback for improvement can be considered formative evaluation.

School compliance reporting refers to reports and forms for higher levels of authority as part of regulatory accountability measures. Schools verify that they are compliant with relevant laws and regulations. In addition, schools may report basic information about their schools (number of students, curriculum etc.).

School inspections are defined as a mandated, formal process of external evaluation with the aim of holding schools accountable. Formal school inspections are not conducted by internal staff, parents, the community or the media.

School self-evaluations refer to activities in which schools systematically review the quality of the instruction and education services provided, as well as school outcomes. This activity involves internal evaluation that is formative in nature.

Summative evaluation has the purpose to prove, i.e. to determine whether the object of the evaluation is doing what it is supposed to do. It is primarily used for accountability. National examinations are an example of summative evaluation because they are primarily used to judge the amount of learning students have retained.

Methodology

This chapter is based on a survey on evaluation and assessment of teachers, school heads and schools that captured qualitative information on school inspections and self-evaluations and on school compliance reporting. Thirty OECD and partner countries

and economies contributed to this survey (Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechia, Denmark, England [United Kingdom], Finland, the Flemish and French Communities of Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Korea, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Scotland [United Kingdom], the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Türkiye).

For more information please see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Sources

Data presented in this chapter are from the OECD-INES 2025 survey on evaluation and assessment of teachers, school heads and schools and refer to the school year 2024/25 (or the school year 2025).

References

OECD (2025), *Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en. [4]

OECD (2023), *Education at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en. [1]

OECD (2022), *Education at a Glance 2022: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/3197152b-en. [5]

OECD (2021), *Education at a Glance 2021: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/b35a14e5-en. [3]

OECD (2013), *Synergies for Better Learning: An International Perspective on Evaluation and Assessment*, OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264190658-en. [2]

Chapter D6 Tables

Tables and notes

Table D6.1.	Organisation of school inspections and school self-evaluations (2025)
Table D6.2.	Areas addressed in school inspections and self-evaluations (2025)
Table D6.3.	Influence of school inspections and self-evaluations on school management (2025)
Table D6.4.	Domains addressed in school compliance reports, by type of institution (2025)
WEB Table D6.5.	Use and dissemination of school inspection and self-evaluation results (2025)
WEB Table D6.6.	Recipients of and data collection methods for school compliance report, by domain (2025)

StatLink https://stat.link/hwzdp9

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter can be downloaded via https://stat.link/hwzdp9.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Table D6.1. Organisation of school inspections and school self-evaluations (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels

	School inspections						School self-evaluations					
	Covered by policy/ regulations	Mandatory	Frequency	Component of school accreditation process?	Target low-performing schools?	Extent to which they are structured	Covered by policy/ regulations	Mandatory	Frequency	Component of school accreditation process?	Target low-performing schools?	Extent to which they are structured
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
OECD countries												
Austria	Yes	Yes	Every three years	No	No	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Once a year	No	No	Partially structured
Chile	Yes	No	a	No	Yes	Highly structured	Yes	No	a	No	Yes	Highly structured
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	Yes	Yes	Other	No	a	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Once a year	No	a	Partially structured
Denmark[1]	Yes	Yes	Once a year	No	Yes	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Other	No	No	Partially structured
Finland	No	a	a	a	a	a	No	a	a	a	a	a
France	Yes	Yes	Every five years	No	No	Partially structured	Yes	Yes	Every five years	No	No	Partially structured
Germany	Yes	Yes	Every two years	No	No	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Other	No	No	m
Hungary	Yes	Yes	Every five years	No	No	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Every five years	No	No	Partially structured
Japan	No	a	a	a	a	a	Yes	Yes	More than once a year	No	No	m
Korea	Yes	Yes	Every three years	No	No	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Once a year	No	No	Partially structured
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Other	No	Yes	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Once a year	No	No	Highly structured
Luxembourg[2]	Yes	Yes	Once a year	a	a	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Once a year	a	a	Highly structured
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Other	No	Yes	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Other	No	No	Unstructured
Norway	No	a	a	a	a	a	No	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	No	a	a	a	a	a	No	a	a	a	a	a
Portugal	Yes	Yes	Other	No	No	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Other	No	No	Highly structured
Slovak Republic	Yes	Yes	Every five years	No	No	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Once a year	No	No	Partially structured
Slovenia[1]	Yes	Yes	Every five years	No	a	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Once a year	No	a	Unstructured
Spain	Yes	Yes	Other	No	No	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Once a year	No	No	Highly structured
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Other	No	Yes	Partially structured	Yes	No	m	No	No	Partially structured
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

	School inspections						School self-evaluations					
	Covered by policy/ regulations	Mandatory	Frequency	Component of school accreditation process?	Target low-performing schools?	Extent to which they are structured	Covered by policy/ regulations	Mandatory	Frequency	Component of school accreditation process?	Target low-performing schools?	Extent to which they are structured
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
Türkiye	Yes	Yes	Every three years	No	No	Highly structured	No	a	a	a	a	a
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	Yes	Every six years	Yes	Yes	Highly structured	No	a	a	a	a	a
French Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	Yes	Every three years	Yes	Yes	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Once a year	Yes	Yes	Partially structured
England (UK)	Yes	Yes	Every four years	a	Yes	Highly structured	No	a	a	a	a	a
Scotland (UK)	Yes	Yes	Other	No	Yes	Highly structured	No	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries												
Brazil	Yes	Yes	Other	Yes	No	m	No	a	a	a	a	a
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Every five years	No	Yes	Partially structured	No	a	a	a	a	a
Romania	Yes	Yes	Other	No	No	Highly structured	Yes	Yes	Every five years	Yes	No	Highly structured

Extent to which school inspections and self-evaluations are structured

Highly structured: Similar activities completed at each school based on specific set of data collection tools

Partially structured: Only few similar activities completed at each school based on specific set of data collection tools

Unstructured: Activities at each school vary and depend on the strengths and weaknesses of the school

Note: Data on the existence of school compliance reports (Column 1) and the characteristics of school compliance reports in government-dependent private institutions (Columns 15 to 27) are available for consultation online.

1. Primary and lower secondary levels only. Data on upper secondary level is available for consultation online.

2. Secondary level only. Data on primary level is available for consultation online. The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/hwzdp9.

Table D6.2. Areas addressed in school inspections and self-evaluations (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels

	School inspections								
	Areas addressed during school inspections								
	Compliance with rules and regulations	Financial management	Quality of instruction	Quality of students' learning	Quality of provisions for students' well-being	Quality of curriculum and instructional materials	Quality of leadership and management	Alignment with school development plan or school projects	Other areas
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
OECD countries									
Austria	Always	Sometimes	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always
Chile	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Never
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always
Denmark[1]	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	m
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France	Never	Sometimes	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	m
Germany	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	m
Hungary	Always	Never	Never	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always
Lithuania	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	m
Luxembourg[2]	Always	Always	Never	Never	Always	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Never
Netherlands	Always	Sometimes	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Sometimes	Never
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Portugal	Always	Never	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	m
Slovak Republic	Always	Never	Never	Never	Never	Always	Always	Never	Never
Slovenia	Always	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	m
Spain	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Always	Sometimes
Sweden	Always	Sometimes	Always	Always	Always	Sometimes	Always	Always	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Never
Other economies									
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	Always	Sometimes	Always	Always	Sometimes	Always	Always	Always	Always
French Comm. (Belgium)	Always	Sometimes	Always	Always	Never	Always	Always	Never	m
England (UK)	Always	Never	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Never	Always
Scotland (UK)	Always	Sometimes	Never	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always
Partner and/or accession countries									
Brazil	Always	Sometimes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	Always	Always	Always	Never	Sometimes	Never	Always	Always	m
Romania	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always

	School self-evaluations								
	Areas addressed during school inspections								
	Compliance with rules and regulations	Financial management	Quality of instruction	Quality of students' learning	Quality of provisions for students' well-being	Quality of curriculum and instructional materials	Quality of leadership and management	Alignment with school development plan or school projects	Other areas
	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)
OECD countries									
Austria	Always	Sometimes	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always
Chile	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Never
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	Always	Always	Sometimes	Always	Always	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Always
Denmark[1]	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Always	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	m
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France	Never	Sometimes	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	m
Germany	Always	Never	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	m
Hungary	Always	Never	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Never
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always
Lithuania	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	m
Luxembourg[2]	Never	Never	Always	Always	Always	Never	Sometimes	Always	Never
Netherlands	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Portugal	Always	Never	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Sometimes
Slovak Republic	Always	Never	Never	Never	Sometimes	Always	Sometimes	Sometimes	Never
Slovenia	m	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	m	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes
Spain	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Sometimes
Sweden	Never	Never	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Other economies									
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
French Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
England (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Scotland (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries									
Brazil	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Bulgaria	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Romania	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always	Always

Note: Data on the existence of school inspections and self-evaluations (Columns 1 and 20), and on the areas covered in the resulting reports (Columns 11 to 19 and 30 to 38) are available for consultation online.

1. Primary and lower secondary levels only. Data on upper secondary level is available for consultation online.

2. Secondary level only. Data on primary level is available for consultation online. The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/hwzdp9.

Table D6.3. Influence of school inspections and self-evaluations on school management (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels

	School inspections								
	Overall evaluation of:		Evaluation of individual teachers	Provision of assistance to teachers to improve their teaching skills	Size of the school budget				Extent of school influence or control over school evaluation
	School performance	School administration			Increased funding to support underperforming schools	Increased funding as a reward	Decreased funding as a penalty	Provision of another financial reward or sanction	
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(14)
OECD countries									
Austria	High	High	Not used	Not used	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Low
Chile	Moderate	Moderate	Not used	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Moderate	Not used
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	Moderate	High	Low	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Moderate	Low
Denmark[1]	High	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	Not used
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France	Moderate	Moderate	Not used	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Moderate
Germany	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Not used	Not used
Hungary	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	High	High	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	High	Low
Lithuania	High	High	High	High	Low	Low	Not used	High	Low
Luxembourg[2]	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used
Netherlands	High	High	a	Moderate	Not used	Not used	High	Not used	Not used
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Portugal	High	High	High	Low	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Moderate
Slovak Republic	High	High	Moderate	Low	Not used	Not used	Not used	Moderate	Not used
Slovenia	Not used	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Low
Spain	Moderate	Moderate	m	m	m	Not used	Not used	m	Low
Sweden	High	Moderate	m	m	m	m	m	High	Not used
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

	School inspections								
	Overall evaluation of:		Evaluation of individual teachers	Provision of assistance to teachers to improve their teaching skills	Size of the school budget				Extent of school influence or control over school evaluation
	School performance	School administration			Increased funding to support underperforming schools	Increased funding as a reward	Decreased funding as a penalty	Provision of another financial reward or sanction	
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(14)
Türkiye	High	High	High	High	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used
Other economies									
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	High	Moderate	Not used	Low	Not used	Not used	Low	Not used	Low
French Comm. (Belgium)	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Moderate	Low
England (UK)	High	High	Not used	Not used	Low	Not used	Not used	Not used	Low
Scotland (UK)	High	Moderate	Not used	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Moderate
Partner and/or accession countries									
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	High	m	Not used	Moderate	m	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used
Romania	High	High	High	High	a	a	a	a	Moderate

	School self-evaluations								
	Overall evaluation of:				Size of the school budget				Extent of school influence or control over school evaluation
	School performance	School administration	Evaluation of individual teachers	Provision of assistance to teachers to improve their teaching skills	Increased funding to support underperforming schools	Increased funding as a reward	Decreased funding as a penalty	Provision of another financial reward or sanction	
	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(28)
OECD countries									
Austria	High	High	High	High	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	High
Chile	Moderate	Moderate	Not used	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Moderate	Not used
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	High	High	Moderate	High	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	High
Denmark[1]	High	High	m	m	m	m	m	m	Moderate
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France	Low	High	Not used	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	-
Germany	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Not used	Low
Hungary	Not used	Low	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	High
Korea	High	High	Not used	High	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Low
Lithuania	High	High	High	High	Low	Low	Not used	High	Low
Luxembourg[2]	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	High
Netherlands	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	High
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Portugal	High	High	High	Low	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	High
Slovak Republic	Moderate	Moderate	High	Moderate	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Moderate
Slovenia	Moderate	m	a	Moderate	a	a	a	a	High
Spain	Moderate	Moderate	Not used	m	m	Not used	Not used	Not used	Moderate
Sweden	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	High
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Other economies									
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
French Comm. (Belgium)	High	High	Not used	High	Not used	Not used	Not used	Not used	High

	School self-evaluations								
	Overall evaluation of:		Evaluation of individual teachers	Provision of assistance to teachers to improve their teaching skills	Size of the school budget				Extent of school influence or control over school evaluation
	School performance	School administration			Increased funding to support underperforming schools	Increased funding as a reward	Decreased funding as a penalty	Provision of another financial reward or sanction	
	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(28)
England (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Scotland (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries									
Brazil	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	m
Bulgaria	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Romania	High	High	a	a	a	a	a	a	Moderate

Note: Data on the existence of school inspections and self-evaluations (Columns 1 and 15) and their level of influence on remuneration and bonuses received by teachers (Columns 10 to 12 and 24 to 26) and on the likelihood of school closures (Columns 13 and 27) are available for consultation online.

1. Primary and lower secondary levels only. Data on upper secondary level is available for consultation online.

2. Secondary level only. Data on primary level is available for consultation online.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/hwzdp9.

Table D6.4. Domains addressed in school compliance reports, by type of institution (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels

	Public institutions												
					Domains for which schools are expected to submit compliance-oriented data								
	Covered by policy /regulations	Level of authority at which it is covered	Mandatory	Frequency	Student data	Teachers' qualifications/ credentials	Curriculum	Safety issues	Facilities and grounds	Proposed budget for subsequent year	Closing budget or financial audit from previous year	Issues related to governance	Other
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
OECD countries													
Austria	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Every three years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Chile	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	More than once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Denmark[1]	Yes	(some schools)	Yes	More than once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m
Finland	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Other	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
France	Yes	(some schools)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Germany	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	m
Hungary	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Other	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Japan	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Other	Yes	a	Yes	a	a	a	a	Yes	Yes
Korea	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	More than once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lithuania	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Luxembourg[2]	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Netherlands	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Once a year	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Norway[2]	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Poland	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	More than once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	a
Portugal	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	More than once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Slovak Republic	m	m	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Slovenia	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Spain	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m
Sweden	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Other	Yes	No	m	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

	Public institutions												
					Domains for which schools are expected to submit compliance-oriented data								
	Covered by policy /regulations	Level of authority at which it is covered	Mandatory	Frequency	Student data	Teachers' qualifications/ credentials	Curriculum	Safety issues	Facilities and grounds	Proposed budget for subsequent year	Closing budget or financial audit from previous year	Issues related to governance	Other
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Türkiye	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Every two years	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Other economies													
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	More than once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	m
French Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Once a year	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
England (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Scotland (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries													
Brazil	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m
Bulgaria	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	More than once a year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Romania	Yes	(national/central level)	Yes	Other	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Level of authority
(national/central level): At the national/central level (for all types of schools)
(state level): In some states (for all types of schools)
(some schools): In some types of schools
Note: Data on the existence of school compliance reports (Column 1) and the characteristics of school compliance reports in government-dependent private institutions (Columns 15 to 27) are available for consultation online.
1. Primary and lower secondary levels only. Data on upper secondary level is available for consultation online.
2. Secondary level only. Data on primary level is available for consultation online.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/hwzdp9.

Chapter D7. What teacher and school head appraisal systems are in place?

Highlights

- Teacher appraisals are covered by a policy framework in 24 of the 30 countries and economies with available data. Except appraisal for reward schemes, the different types of teacher appraisals are mandatory in the majority of countries where they are covered by a policy framework.
- School head appraisals are covered by a policy framework in 21 of 30 countries and economies with available data. Both types of school head appraisals are mandatory in nearly all countries where they are regulated. The exceptions are Chile and the Flemish Community of Belgium, for regular appraisals, and Brazil for initial certification.
- Teacher appraisals are used for both formative and summative purpose in half the 30 countries and economies where they are used, whereas school head appraisals are used for both purposes in more than one-third of these countries.


Context

The monitoring and appraisal of teachers is central to improving schools and learning environments. Well-designed teacher appraisal and feedback systems can be used as tools to increase teacher effectiveness and achieve better learning outcomes. Appraisal can sharpen the focus on instruction and teachers' professional learning, while also contributing to school organisation by allowing teachers to progress in their careers and take on new roles and responsibilities based on a solid evaluation of their performance. Appraisal systems can also provide an opportunity to recognise and reward effective teaching (OECD, 2013[1]).

Policymakers have become increasingly aware of the significance of school leadership for effective teaching and learning. Research confirms that school leadership matters for teaching quality and student outcomes, with effective school heads contributing to gains in student achievement, attendance, and teacher retention (Grissom, Egalite and Lindsay, 2021[2]). In recent years, several OECD countries and other economies have introduced or consolidated standards-based frameworks that integrate developmental and accountability functions within a single appraisal structure. Comparative data on school head appraisal, however, remain limited.

Figure D7.1. Requirements for and periodicity of teacher and school head appraisals, by type of appraisal (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels



1. Secondary education (for school heads' appraisals in France, for teachers' completion of probation in Luxembourg).
For data, see Table D7.2 and Table D7.5. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

Other findings

- Among teachers, regular appraisal, appraisal for the completion of probation, appraisal for registration and appraisal for promotion are mandatory in the majority of countries for which data are available.
- Most countries have at least two different types of teacher appraisal covered by regulations but Costa Rica, the Flemish and French Communities of Belgium, and Japan only regulate regular appraisals; Lithuania only regulates appraisal for promotion; and Luxembourg only regulates appraisal for the completion of probation.
- Teachers are usually appraised in relation to decisions about their employment status, such as promotion, contract renewal, or the conversion or awarding of a permanent contract. Regular appraisals are conducted as frequently in relation to decisions on employment as in response to performance concerns. They are also frequently used at the discretion of the school head. School heads are most often subject to regular appraisals in relation to decisions on employment status (in nine countries and economies), followed by in response to a complaint (in six countries) and at the discretion of the school board (in four countries).
- The procedures for teacher and school head appraisals are most commonly determined by the central or state education authorities. They are involved in at least two-thirds of countries and economies for the various types of teacher appraisals, and in about two-thirds or more countries for school head appraisals.
- Appraisals in most countries cover teachers' planning and preparation, instruction, classroom environment, professional development and contribution to school development, all of which are covered across the different types of teacher appraisal in most countries.
- In at least half of the relevant countries and economies, classroom observation and interviews with teachers are the most frequently used methods in regular appraisals and those on completion of probation and teacher registration.
- Results from regular teacher appraisals and those on completion of probation have the most impact on decisions about teachers' professional development activities and career advancement. The results of appraisals for promotion affect teacher's professional development activities in half the countries and economies which use them but affect teachers' career advancement in almost all countries and economies.

Note

This chapter analyses appraisals of teachers and school heads at the primary and secondary levels of education based on the results of a data collection on evaluation of teachers, school heads and schools. It complements Chapter D6, on the evaluation of schools. An overview of the different forms of evaluation of school, teachers and school heads used by countries is available in Box D6.1 of Chapter D6.

Analysis

The analysis relates to primary and secondary education as a whole and in most countries, appraisals of teachers and school heads are similar across primary, lower secondary and upper secondary levels. However, in a few countries (France and Luxembourg), there are some differences between primary and secondary levels of education. When there are differences, the analysis focusses on secondary level (information on primary level is available in tables).

Teacher appraisal

Teacher appraisal refers to the formal evaluation of individual teachers' performance, serving both a developmental (formative) function, identifying strengths and supporting improvement in teaching practice, and an accountability (summative) function to analyse how effective teachers are and holding them accountable. Appraisal systems have developed considerably, and formal appraisal is now near universal: on average across 27 OECD countries, in 2024 most teachers (94.5%) worked in schools where they have been formally appraised (Table 3.47 in (OECD, 2025[3])). The following discussion focuses on teachers' appraisals in public and government-dependent private institutions at the primary and secondary level. It reviews the requirements for teacher appraisals and their characteristics as defined in official frameworks (for information on actual appraisal of teachers see Box D7.1).

Requirements and periodicity

In systems where appraisal is covered by a policy requirement, they are more likely to operate consistently across schools, providing more harmonised feedback and more equal development opportunities to teachers. Among the 30 countries and economies taking part in the data collection, 24 reported having policy frameworks (national or state laws or regulations) in place to regulate one or more types of teacher appraisal. This includes three – Brazil, Bulgaria and England (United Kingdom) – where teachers are only appraised in some schools. In England (United Kingdom) appraisal arrangements differ between public and government-dependent private institutions, whereas in Bulgaria they are the same across both types of institution (Table D7.1). Among the six remaining countries, there is no policy framework in Finland, Norway, Portugal and Scotland (United Kingdom). Although Denmark and the Netherlands have no government policy for teacher appraisal, similar practices are observed across schools in both countries (Box D7.2).

According to the results of the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2024 (see Box D7.1 for more details), at least three-quarters of teachers are formally appraised in most of these 30 countries and economies: all teachers in Colombia, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia, over 90% in most other countries and economies, but less than 85% of teachers in Denmark and Spain and less than 76% of teachers in Finland, Italy and Norway (see Table 3.47 in (OECD, 2025[3])).

Countries and economies use a range of different approaches for appraisal, depending on its purpose. The survey for this chapter (see *Sources*) gathered information on five different types of teacher appraisal:

- Completion of probation involves a teacher's entry into the profession and is designed to evaluate the competence and progress of a newly hired teacher.
- Regular appraisal typically involves an internal school process regulated by general labour law provisions requiring teachers' employers to regularly appraise the performance and results of their employees.
- Teacher registration is designed to determine and officially confirm a teacher as competent for teaching and then to award or renew teachers' registered teaching status after the probationary period has been completed.

- Appraisal for promotion is often voluntary and takes place in relation to decisions on employment status (most countries integrate this activity with regular appraisals).
- Appraisal for rewards involves teacher appraisals explicitly designed to identify a select number of high-performing teachers to reward and acknowledge.

Policy frameworks often cover one or several types of teachers' appraisals to support continuous learning for individual teachers throughout their career and for the profession as a whole (Darling-Hammond, 2012[4]). In most countries the policy framework covers at least two types of teacher appraisal. However, a few only cover a single type: regular appraisal in the French Community of Belgium and Japan (in Costa Rica too, but information is missing for few other types of appraisal); appraisal for promotion in Lithuania; and appraisal for the completion of probation in Luxembourg (Figure D7.1).

Box D7.1. Appraisal and autonomy of teachers: Insights from TALIS 2024

The 2024 OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) provides some insights into actual appraisals of teachers through information reported by teachers or school heads.

The overwhelming majority of lower secondary teachers work in schools where formal appraisals are conducted at least sometimes. Based on the responses from principals (school heads), no teachers work in schools where they are never formally appraised in countries including Colombia, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia. This is consistent with the existence of a legal framework for teacher appraisals in Lithuania, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia (no information is available for Colombia, Israel and Latvia, as these countries did not participate in the survey used as the source for this chapter). In contrast, at least one in six teachers work in a school where teachers are never formally appraised in Denmark and Finland, where no regulatory framework for teacher appraisal exist at system level, and in Italy where information on the existence of a policy framework is not available (Table 3.47 in (OECD, 2025[3])). These proportions could be explained by the fact that there can be some practice of teachers' appraisal even if there is no formal framework for it (Table D7.1).

Lower secondary teachers tend to be appraised by multiple actors, with principals or other members of a school management team usually involved. However, teachers in Finland are mostly appraised by only one actor, usually the principal. Teachers are most commonly appraised through classroom observations or student results (Table 3.48 in (OECD, 2025[3])).

TALIS 2024 also investigates the link between the share of teachers who are appraised (distinguishing those never appraised, those appraised less than once per year and those appraised at least once per year) among those who report substantial or full autonomy in different dimensions of their teaching activity (implementing the curriculum in a flexible way, selecting teaching methods and strategies, choosing assessment activities, selecting learning objectives, and designing and preparing lessons) (Tables 5.40 to 5.44 in (OECD, 2025[3]). This could help understanding the formative role of appraisals in systems where a large proportion of teachers with high levels of autonomy are appraised.

The appraisal rates of teachers with high levels of autonomy vary widely across countries, implying a loose relationship between teachers' appraisals and instructional autonomy. Across all autonomy dimensions, teachers who report substantial or full autonomy in the dimension are appraised at a comparable rate to the full teacher population. For example, in Lithuania, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia, all teachers with substantial or full autonomy across dimensions work in schools where appraisals are at least sometimes conducted, while in Finland and Italy, at least 25% of teachers who report having substantial or full autonomy across dimensions are in schools with no school appraisal. High levels of autonomy without appraisal may leave teachers with little support, while frequent appraisal might restrict their autonomy. On the flipside, infrequent appraisal might indicate high institutional trust, and frequent appraisal might hint at autonomy operating within a more structured accountability framework (Tables 5.40 to 5.44 in (OECD, 2025[3])).

Note that teacher autonomy should be interpreted with caution as TALIS captures instructional autonomy as reported by teachers themselves, which may reflect how teachers interpret the latitude available to them rather than the formal authority they hold. Any differences shown may therefore reflect perceived rather than actual autonomy of teachers.

Source: OECD (OECD, 2025[3]), Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching, https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en.

Box D7.2. Non-regulated appraisal practices for teachers and school heads

Appraisal practices are widely used in Denmark and the Netherlands, even though the appraisal of teachers and school heads is not covered by a policy or regulatory framework (Table D7.1). In both countries, such practices are governed by collective agreements and institutional autonomy.

Appraisal practices in Denmark

Teacher appraisals in Denmark are not governed by regulations at any of the primary, lower and upper secondary levels of education. Nevertheless, under collective agreements concluded between the trade unions and either the Ministry of Finance or the Local Government organisation (KL), All public and government-dependent private institutions are required to hold annual professional development interviews. These interviews are compulsory for all teachers and conducted by school heads or closest member of the school's leadership team.

School head appraisals are also unregulated at all these levels of education, but the arrangements in place differ between primary and lower secondary education on the one hand, and upper secondary education on the other. At the primary and lower secondary level, municipal councils conduct an annual development interview with school heads. One of the objectives of this interview is to evaluate progress against annual attainment targets. This interview is also used in decisions about the level of performance salary. At the upper secondary level, school head appraisals are carried out by the school board's chairman as part of their annual development interview.

Appraisal practices in the Netherlands

In the Netherlands, the constitution guarantees the freedom to establish, organise and structure education, granting school boards broad autonomy to make independent decisions. As a result, no regulatory or policy framework covers teacher and school head appraisals at the primary and secondary levels, and appraisal practices vary between school boards. Guidance is nonetheless provided at the sectoral level through collective agreements negotiated between the representative organisations of school boards and the trade unions. The Collective Labour Agreement for Primary Education and the Collective Labour Agreement for Secondary Education include binding arrangements on job classification, appraisal and career development for both teacher and school head appraisals. Most school boards participate in representative organisations, although some independent schools prefer to apply their own employment terms and conditions.

In practice, teacher appraisals depend on human resource policies of individual school boards. Although no statute requires appraisal interviews, collective agreements provide guidance on periodic interviews on teacher performance, conducted by the school head (on behalf of the board) and covering professional development and sustainable employability. Such interviews are widely regarded as good practice and are commonly implemented. Appraisal outcomes may carry legal consequences, including eligibility for a bonus or allowance.

Collective agreements also require school boards to periodically review school heads' performance, covering professional development and sustainable employability, with appraisal outcomes carrying potential legal consequences, including eligibility for a bonus or allowance. In addition, a voluntary Professional Standard for Secondary School Heads has been developed by the professional community, outlining the expectations most schools hold for those in leadership positions.

Regular appraisals are the most common type of teachers appraisal regulated by policy frameworks, with 20 of the 30 countries and economies reporting their use (Figure D7.1 and Table D7.1). In all of these countries and economies except the Flemish and French Communities of Belgium, Poland and the Republic of Türkiye, regular appraisal is mandatory for teachers. These are conducted at regular intervals in 13 countries, most commonly on an annual basis (in 6 countries), but ranging from annually to every four years. In France, the frequency of regular appraisals is different for different types of teachers (tenured teachers and contract teachers on permanent or fixed-term contracts), while in Czechia it is up to the evaluator to decide the frequency, but the common practice is once a year. The periodicity varies by political entities and then geographical area in Germany (by *Länder*) and Switzerland (by *Canton*), and the Flemish Community of Belgium and Sweden do not define it at all (Table D7.2).

Appraisal upon completion of a probationary period is also common. It is covered by the regulations in 13 out of 30 countries and economies, where it is mandatory in all of them except in Romania and Slovenia. Although this form of appraisal might be expected to only take place once (to complete the probation period), it is carried out annually in England (United Kingdom). In Poland,

teachers are subject to two mandatory appraisals during the probation period of three years and nine months (and Tables D7.1 and D7.2).

Appraisals for teacher registration and promotion, both used for performance management, are less frequently used. Appraisal for registration is used in eight countries and economies and is mandatory in six of them, whereas appraisal for promotion is used by ten countries and economies but only mandatory in five. Only seven countries with available data had appraisal frameworks for teacher reward schemes (Figure D7.2).

The following analysis focuses on countries and economies with a regulatory framework for appraisal of teachers: 20 countries and economies for regular appraisal, 13 for the appraisal upon completion of a probationary period, 10 for appraisal for promotion, 8 for appraisal for registration and 7 for appraisal for reward schemes.

Organisation

Which teachers are covered by appraisal policies depends on the type of appraisal. Regular appraisal, the most widespread form, most commonly applies to teachers with permanent or fixed-term contracts (in 18 of 20 countries and economies), and in at least one-third of countries to registered teachers and teachers on probation (7-8 countries and economies). By definition, appraisal for the completion of probation should target teachers on probation, and this is the case in 12 of 13 countries and economies using this form of appraisal. Appraisals for teacher registration, used by eight countries and economies, focus on teachers on fixed-term contracts and provisionally registered teachers (in five to six countries), but also covers teachers on probation (in four) and permanent teachers (in three). Appraisals for promotion primarily target permanent teachers (in nine out of ten countries) (Table D7.2).

The circumstances under which teachers are appraised vary considerably across countries and economies, even for regular appraisals that do not exclusively take place in response to a specific situation. Although some countries use appraisals in multiple circumstances, in others, specific types of appraisal only take place in one specific situation. For example, regular appraisals take place in response to five different circumstances in Sweden, but only as the result of performance problems in Costa Rica and Japan, and only in relation to a decision on employment status in Brazil, Bulgaria and Hungary. In Korea and the Slovak Republic, none of these specific circumstances result in regular teacher appraisals. Teacher appraisals (either regular or for completion of probation or registration) are most commonly linked to decisions on employment status. Performance issues and complaints typically trigger teacher appraisals. Regular appraisal is also common as a result of performance problems (in most countries with this type of appraisal) and at the discretion of the school head (in more than one-third of countries). In one-quarter of countries and economies, regular appraisals also arise from a complaint or at the request of the teacher. Appraisals for completion of probation or registration are the result of complaints, performance problems, teachers' requests or decisions by the school head in two or three countries in each case. Appraisals for promotion are the type most commonly triggered by teachers' requests (Table D7.2).

For most types of appraisals (excluding appraisals for reward schemes, for which information is not available), central educational authorities most often determine the procedures for teacher appraisal. They are involved in at least three-quarters of the countries and economies for each type of appraisal considered. The involvement of central education authorities ensures more consistent procedures across schools and may help ensure the appraisal process is equitable for all teachers. Nevertheless, authorities at other levels of government, school boards or committees, school organising bodies, school heads and teachers' professional organisations also contribute to the procedures. In half of the countries using teacher appraisals, a single authority level determines the procedure for most appraisal types, while in other countries, multiple authorities have a say. For example, the procedures for regular appraisals are decided by a combination of two authorities in Bulgaria, the Flemish Community of Belgium and Korea, and up to five different authorities in the Slovak Republic (Table D7.7, available online).

Teachers are usually evaluated by a combination of actors in the various types of appraisals (again excluding those for reward schemes, for which information is not available). School heads are the most common evaluators. They are at least one of the evaluators in 15 out of the 20 countries and economies that use regular appraisals, in 10 out of the 13 that appraise teachers for the completion of probation, in 5 out of the 8 that use appraisals for teacher registration and in 5 out of the 10 that use them for promotion. In some countries (Costa Rica, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Switzerland and Türkiye) school heads are the only evaluators in regular teacher appraisals whereas they share the role with up to three other types of evaluators in others. For example, they evaluate teachers alongside the local education authorities in France, and with the teacher's supervisor, a peer evaluator at the same school and the teachers' professional organisation in the Slovak Republic. For appraisals for the completion of probation, teacher registration and promotion, teachers' supervisors are the second most common evaluators, used in three to four countries depending on the type of evaluation (Table D7.7, available online).

Subjects covered and methods

In most countries and economies, the main standards against which teachers are appraised are either national or state teaching standards or descriptions of the general and professional duties of teachers. National or state teaching standards are used by most countries for teacher registration, whereas descriptions of the general and professional duties of teachers are used by most countries for appraisal on completion of probation. Most countries use both types of documents for regular appraisals and appraisals for promotion. Other references or standards used by a few countries include the teachers' code of conduct, school development plan or school project, and the school's internal regulations. In general, at least three-fifths of the countries use multiple reference documents for regular appraisals, appraisals for completing probation and appraisals for promotion. For teacher registration appraisals, only one-third of countries use more than one document (Table D7.8, available online).

Appraisals can be used to analyse various aspects of a teacher's performance, including planning and preparation, instruction, classroom environment, professional development, contribution to school development and links to the community. Apart from links to the community, all these aspects are covered in the different types of appraisals (excluding appraisals for reward schemes due to lack of information). Some dimensions of teacher performance are better suited to some types of appraisals. Appraisals upon completion of probation focus on verifying basic competence as a condition for confirming teachers' employment, covering areas such as planning and preparation, instruction, and classroom environment (in 11 of 13 countries and economies), while appraisals for promotion mainly concern professional development (in 9 of 10 countries and economies) (Table D7.3).

Whatever the type of appraisal, they usually cover several or all these subjects. However, in Hungary, regular teacher appraisals review a different set of aspects (the quality and effectiveness of support for pedagogical work, quantitative indicators of task performance, reliability of work and adherence to deadlines, communication and collaboration, professional responsibility and commitment, supportive and ethical conduct related to the job role, institution-specific evaluation criterion, and three personalised performance objectives). In Japan, the aspects of teacher performance that are evaluated are not standardised and vary with the evaluator. In Sweden, teacher registration appraisals take place after a report has been made by the Schools Inspectorate on misconduct or underperformance (Table D7.3).

A mix of methods, instruments and information sources are used to appraise different aspects of a teacher's performance. The most frequently used methods in regular appraisals, appraisals for completion of probation and appraisals for registration are classroom observation and interviews (reported by at least half of countries and economies with available data). Teachers' self-appraisals and professional development certificates/ credentials are also used in regular appraisals in nearly one-third of countries. Student outcomes, parent surveys and student surveys are the least commonly used. Where they are used, it is primarily in regular appraisals (in no more than one-quarter of the countries with available data). The most frequently used sources of information in appraisals for promotion are teacher portfolios, classroom observation and professional development certificates, followed by teacher interviews and self-appraisals (Table D7.8, available online).

Regular appraisals result in teachers being given a rating, i.e. a score on a teaching performance scale, in half of the countries and economies using such appraisals (10 out of 20). Ratings are also the outcome of appraisals for teacher registration in 4 out of 8 countries, for completion of probation in 9 out of 13 countries and for promotion in 7 out of 10 countries (Table D7.3). Most countries have mechanisms to appeal appraisal results. The prevalence of appeal mechanisms increases from about two-thirds of countries for regular appraisals, to three-quarters for appraisals for teacher registration, four-fifths for appraisals for promotion, and over 90% for appraisals on completion of probation (Table D7.3).

Impact of appraisals on teachers

The results of appraisals can have an impact on various aspects of a teacher's career, including professional development activities, career progression and salaries, but underperformance may result in more specific consequences (Box D7.3). The way results are used also depends on the extent to which different types of appraisals are used for formative and summative purposes (Box D7.3).

Results from regular teacher appraisals have the most impact on decisions about teachers' professional development activities. They inform these decisions in three-quarters of countries and economies (15 out of 20). In most of them, they either always result in a professional development plan or they are expected to influence one. In Costa Rica, the Flemish Community of Belgium and Switzerland, the results only lead to a professional development plan for some teachers. In Romania they determine extra opportunities for in-service professional development. The results also affect career advancement in more than half of countries and economies (11 out of 20). They usually have an influence on either promotion decisions, the speed at which a teacher progresses in the career structure or salary scale, or decisions about their contracts (access to contracts or renewal of fixed-term


contracts or access to a permanent position). Regular appraisals only have an impact on all three of these aspects in Chile, and on both teachers' progression and contracts in Romania. The least widespread impact of regular teacher appraisals is on teachers' pay (in 7 out of 20 of countries and economies). Where they do impact pay levels, it is most frequently through career progression. In Chile, the results affect progression, but also teachers' base salaries, as well as a pay allowance for good performance (Figure D7.2 and Table D7.3).

The results of regular appraisals have an impact on these three areas of teachers' professional lives (professional development, career advancement and pay) in other countries, but they are not included in the frameworks related to teachers' appraisal. This is the case in Czechia and in Japan where the impact varies depending on the decisions of the evaluators. Korea is the only country where the results only have an impact on teachers' professional development activities (Figure D7.2 and Table D7.3).

Appraisals for completing probation have a similarly widespread impact on decisions about teachers' professional development activities and career advancement, but less impact on their pay. They affect decisions about teachers' professional development activities in 8 of the 13 countries and economies using such appraisals and decisions about career advancement in 7. In all of these countries the impact relates to decisions about access to contracts, as would be expected with an appraisal following a probationary period. The impact on professional development activities varies, ranging from always informing their professional development plan in the Slovak Republic and Türkiye to a professional development plan for some teachers only in the Flemish Community and Switzerland. These types of appraisal impact teachers' pay in four countries and economies. They affect teachers' base salaries in England (United Kingdom) and Romania, and salary scale progression in Poland and the Slovak Republic (Table D7.3).

Figure D7.2. Impact of regular appraisals on teachers and school heads (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels



For data, see Table D7.3 and Table D7.6. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

As might be expected, the results of appraisals for promotion affect teachers' career advancement in almost all the countries and economies using them (nine out of ten), and their pay levels in eight, but they also have an impact on teacher's professional development activities in five countries. Except in Korea, where the results of these appraisals only affect teachers' career advancement, the results affect either all three areas of teachers' professional lives, or both career advancement and pay levels (Table D7.3).

Appraisals for teacher registration have the least impact on teachers compared to other types of appraisals. They affect decisions on teacher's professional development activities in three out of the eight countries and economies that use them, and career

advancement in four, but do not have an impact on teachers' pay levels of teachers in any of them. In Austria, Bulgaria and Sweden, the results have no impact on any of the three aspects considered here. In all of the four countries where results have an impact on career advancement, they influence decisions on contracts. For example, in Slovenia, teachers who pass the professional examination can be employed for an indefinite period (Table D7.3).

Box D7.3. Consequences of underperformance for teachers and school heads

Teachers

As the main consequences of underperformance in appraisals for promotion or for registration are failing to get promotion or registration, this analysis focuses on the consequences of underperformance during regular appraisals or appraisals on completing probation.

The most frequent consequences of underperformance in regular appraisals are further appraisals and the submission or revision of professional development plans. Both of these are used in 10 out of the 20 countries and economies using regular appraisals. Compulsory training, deferred promotion or career advancement, withheld pay rises and dismissal are available in more than one-quarter of countries and economies (between six and eight, depending on the type of consequence). Only France uses transfers to another school or suspension (Table D7.3).

Three-quarters of countries and economies use several of these tools, which can be used in sequence. For example, in Chile, underperforming teachers in the *Inicial* and *Temprano tramos* must undergo a new appraisal and follow a compulsory professional improvement plan. Teachers who fail to progress after a second evaluation must be dismissed and cannot be rehired by the same institution or any other similar institution. If they fail to progress in a second evaluation after re-entry into the system, they cannot be hired in any institution governed by the Teacher Career System. Other countries use only one tool, for instance the submission or revision of professional development plans in Germany and Korea and withholding salary increments in the Slovak Republic (Table D7.3).

In all countries and economies using appraisals for completion of probation, teachers who underperform fail to pass probation. In Türkiye, unsuccessful candidates may receive additional training and a further assessment opportunity before a final decision is made, but candidates who remain unsuccessful do not complete the probation process. In half of the countries the consequences might also be dismissal or failing to gain a permanent contact. One-third of countries or fewer might respond by requiring teachers to take further training, defer their promotion or career advancement, or withhold salary increments in these cases (Table D7.3).

School heads

Among the 19 countries and economies with a legal framework for the regular appraisal of school heads, the most common response to underperformance in regular appraisals is the submission or revision of professional development plans (in 11 out of 19). Dismissal is a possibility in nearly half of these (9 out of 19), but may only apply when there are serious reasons to do so (Table D7.6).

For example in Czechia, school heads must be dismissed when they no longer meet some of the requirements to carry out their work (for example integrity or failing to complete the required training programme for school heads), or when organisational changes result in the ending of their post (for example, if their school merges with another). They can also be dismissed for serious violations or failure to comply with the legal obligations arising from their activities, tasks and competences, or following a proposal by the Czech School Inspectorate, or as a result of a final decision of the court in a dispute about the termination of employment or the dismissal of a school head.

In one-third to less than half of countries and economies, underperformance can result in further appraisal (in eight countries or economies) or compulsory training (in seven) aiming at improving their skills and competencies. Other negative consequences can be the deferral of promotion or career advancement or withheld salary increments (in eight countries each). In Czechia and Slovenia underperformance may result in the withdrawal or reduction of a school head's individual allowance (Table D7.6). Some other consequences are only used in a few countries. Underperformance may result in a transfer to another school in England (United Kingdom) and the Flemish Community of Belgium; failure to receive a permanent contract in England (United Kingdom) and the Flemish Community of Belgium; and suspension in England (United Kingdom) and the Slovak Republic (Table D7.6).

School head appraisal

School head appraisals have historically been less developed and less systematically monitored than teacher appraisals across OECD countries (OECD, 2015[5]). The importance of effective school leadership for teaching quality and student learning is well established (Grissom, Egalite and Lindsay, 2021[2]), yet comparative data on appraisals remain limited. In recent years, a number of countries have nonetheless introduced or consolidated standards-based frameworks that integrate developmental and accountability functions within a single appraisal structure. For example, Portugal has introduced mandatory specialised continuing professional development for school heads (OECD, 2020[6]), while in most states in the United States, both principals' practice measures and student outcomes are taken into account to produce summative principal ratings (Donaldson et al., 2021[7]). In Portugal, a proposal to connect performance, promotion and pay of school heads through appraisal arrangements have been included in the law in 2023 (OECD, 2020[6]).

School heads are primarily responsible for school management and administration. They typically hold the highest leadership position within a school, such as the headmaster, head teacher or principal, or a middle-level position in a leadership capacity, such as deputy school directors or department heads. Generally, there is no more than one school head per school. Austria, Denmark and Luxembourg are the only countries where there are neither legal frameworks for appraising school heads, nor similar practices (Figure D7.1 and Table D7.1).

Requirements and periodicity

School head appraisals are required by government policy or regulations in 21 of the 30 countries and economies taking part in the survey. Frameworks are usually implemented at the national or central level and hence cover all types of schools, except in Brazil where the regulations only cover appraisals for initial certification as a school head in some schools (there may be other school head appraisals, but these are not regulated). In England (United Kingdom) and Japan, the appraisal regulations are not specific to school heads and are similar for both teachers and school heads. In the Netherlands, there is no regulation on school head appraisals but similar practices exist (Box D7.2). Austria, Denmark and Luxembourg are the only countries where there are neither legal frameworks for appraising school heads, nor similar practices (Figure D7.1. and Table D7.1).

Regular appraisals of school heads are covered by the regulations in 19 countries and economies, while 11 have regulations on appraisals for their initial certification (the appraisal needed to acquire initial certification to be eligible for a school head position). In nearly half the countries and economies (10 out of 21) the frameworks cover both types of appraisal, while in 9 they only cover regular appraisals and they only cover initial certification in two countries (Figure D7.1. and Table D7.1).

Both types of appraisal are mandatory for school heads in nearly all countries and economies, with the exception of Brazil for initial certification and Chile and the Flemish Community of Belgium for regular appraisals. Regular appraisals of school heads take place annually in just over half the countries and economies (10 out of 19), but every four years in Bulgaria and Spain, and every five years in the French Community of Belgium. Periodicity can also vary within countries, especially federal ones such as Germany and Switzerland or according to school head characteristics. In France, school heads should be appraised once in the first three years of their appointment, and then every year (Figure D7.1. and Table D7.5).

The next sections focus on countries and economies with a legal framework for regular appraisal of school heads (19 countries and economies) or for initial certification of school heads (11 countries and economies).

Organisation

In more than half of countries and economies (12 out of 19) with a legal framework for the regular appraisal of school heads, all school heads are appraised, regardless of whether they have a permanent or a fixed-term contract. In other countries and economies, such as France, only school heads with a permanent contract are appraised regularly (the same applies in Bulgaria, Germany and Spain where there are no school heads with fixed-term contracts). Conversely, only school heads with a fixed-term contracts are appraised in Korea, Lithuania and Romania, all countries where school heads do not have permanent contracts (Table D7.5).

The circumstances of regular school head appraisals vary widely across countries. The most widespread approach is for such appraisals to take place in relation to decisions on employment status (in nine countries and economies) while in five they take place at the discretion of the education authority or as a result of a complaint. Appraisal at the discretion of the school board or committee or at the request of the school heads themselves are both considered in four countries and economies (Table D7.5).

The procedures for school head appraisal can be determined by education authorities at various levels of government or by another education body, whether alone or in combination with another body. For both forms of appraisal, this is most commonly the responsibility of the central educational authorities, which determine the procedures for initial certification appraisals in three-quarters of relevant countries and economies (8 out of 11), and for regular appraisals in nearly two-thirds (12 out of 19). However, educational authorities at other levels, school boards or committees, and school organising bodies are also involved in defining procedures in at least one country each. Multiple bodies contribute to determining procedures for appraisals in some countries. Although one level of authority has sole responsibility for determining the procedures for regular school head appraisals in 11 out of 19 countries and economies, two bodies have joint responsibility in Czechia, the Flemish and French Communities of Belgium, the Slovak Republic and Türkiye, and up to six bodies contribute in England (United Kingdom) (Table D7.9, available online).

Appraisals can be led by different types of evaluators, with a combination of actors used in nearly half the countries and economies. Local education authorities are most widely involved in regular school head appraisals. They participate in the regular appraisal of school heads in 9 out of 19 countries and economies. All the other types of evaluators considered, except intermediate agencies, participate in at least one country or economy. Just over half of the countries and economies (10 out of 19) use only one type of evaluator in this form of appraisal, while 6 use two types. For appraisals for initial certification, the responsibility is more evenly spread across the different categories of potential evaluators, and local education authorities are more prevalent across the 11 countries and economies using this type of appraisal (Table D7.9, available online).

Subjects covered and methods

Most countries appraise school heads against one or more reference standards that state clearly what school leaders are expected to know and do. Most commonly, this is a description of the general and professional duties of school heads, used in about two-thirds of countries and economies for regular appraisal (in 13 out of 19) or initial certification of school heads (in 6 out of 11). National or state and/or regional standards for school leadership are the second most commonly used reference document (in 11 countries and economies for regular appraisal and in 7 for initial certification). Although less common, school development plans or school projects, school internal regulations and codes of conduct are also used, most often for regular appraisal of school heads (Table D7.10, available online).

School head appraisals focus on a variety of areas, competencies and responsibilities. The eight different areas of appraisal considered for regular appraisals of school heads are general leadership, pedagogical/instructional leadership, organisation development, school climate, community relations, evaluation and accountability, resource management, and interpersonal skills. These are used in most countries and economies that have regulations on regular appraisal of school heads (in at least 15 out of 19). Six also consider other subjects in their regular appraisals. These include support for students with special educational needs and gifted students (Czechia), and records of in-service training (Korea). The eight areas are also covered for initial certification as school heads in most of the 11 countries with relevant frameworks but evaluation and accountability, resource management, and interpersonal skills are less widely covered in these appraisals (Table D7.6).

Countries and economies use a range of instruments and sources of information to assess school leaders' performance, singly and in combination. In France, regular appraisals of school heads (at the secondary level) are conducted solely using interviews or dialogue with the evaluator. In contrast, a large variety of instruments are used in England (United Kingdom), including interviews but also school visits, surveys (of teachers, students and/or parents), students' outcomes, professional development certificates and credentials, portfolios, and self-evaluation. The most common instruments or information sources used for regular appraisals of schools heads are interviews (17 out of 19 countries and economies) and portfolios (10 countries), although either school visits or self-appraisals are also used in more than half of countries and economies (11 out of 19). Interviews are also the most widely used instrument for initial certification appraisals (in 9 out of 11 countries and economies). Countries use up to four different instruments to perform these appraisals, combining school visits, interviews, self-evaluations, portfolios and professional development certificates or credentials. Few countries use other instruments. One example is Korea, where appraisers consult personnel files to verify the appraisee's years of service (Table D7.10, available online).

In three-quarters of countries and economies (15 out of 19) regular appraisals result in a rating, defined as a score on a school head performance scale. Appraisals for initial certification result in ratings in two-thirds of countries (8 out of 11). Most countries and economies have appeal mechanisms for both regular appraisal results (17 out 19) and appraisals for initial certification (8 out of 11) (Table D7.6).

Impact of appraisals on school heads

The results of regular appraisals have an impact on school heads' professional development activities, salaries and career progression in most countries and economies with available information (see Figure D7.2, for the consequences of underperformance, see Box D7.3). As with teachers, the impact of appraisals on school heads may vary depending on the extent to which appraisals are used for formative and summative purposes (Box D7.4).

Regular appraisals are used for decisions about school heads' professional development in more than three fifths of the countries and economies (12 out of 19), with the results either always informing professional development plans (in four cases), or expected to do so (in three cases). In five countries and economies they are only reflected in professional development plans for some school heads. For instance, in the Flemish Community of Belgium and Switzerland, this applies to school heads who demonstrated some shortcomings during their appraisal (Figure D7.4 and Table D7.6, available online).

Regular appraisals are used for decisions about career advancement in a similar number of countries and economies (12 out of 19). In five of them, appraisal results influence decisions about contracts (access or renewal of fixed-term contracts or access to permanent position), while in three they affect the speed at which a school head progresses in the career structure or salary scale, and in another three, appraisal results influence decisions about promotion. Regular appraisal results also affect school heads' pay levels in nearly three fifths of the countries and economies (11 out of 19). Good performance is rewarded with a specific allowance (in five of them) or with a change in the base salary (in three). In Bulgaria and the Slovak Republic, appraisals affect progress through the career structure and/or salary scales and in France, they affect both base salaries and progression Figure D7.3 and Table D7.6, available online).

The results of appraisals for initial certification impact on school heads' professional development and career advancement in less than half of the relevant countries and economies (4 out of 11). Initial certification as a school head always informs their professional development plans only in Türkiye, whereas they are expected to influence them in Germany and Lithuania, and affect only some school heads' plans in the French Community of Belgium. Regarding the impact on career advancement, the results of initial certification appraisals affect decisions on promotion in French Community of Belgium, Korea and Spain; and the speed of progression in the career structure in Germany. The results only influence pay levels in Korea, where successful initial certification entitles school heads to a specific allowance, and in Spain, where they affect the base salary. In Spain teachers who attain a school head position receive a fixed additional payment whose amount depends on the size of the school (Table D7.6).

Influence of teacher and school head appraisals on wider decisions


The results of appraisals may impact other activities and decisions about schools beyond those directly related to the teachers and school heads concerned. Information on the impact of the results of appraisals is available for all types of teacher appraisals combined and for all types of school head appraisals combined (Table D7.4).

In most countries and economies with available information (10 to 16 out of 15 to 18, depending on the type of decisions considered) teachers' appraisals do not have an impact on most of the types of decision considered in Table D7.4 and shown in Figure D7.3. These encompass evaluations of the performance and administration of educational institutions, their likelihood of closure, and the remuneration and bonuses received by teachers. Teacher appraisals have no impact on the size of school budgets in any country except the Slovak Republic, where they have a low level of influence on the provision of financial rewards or sanctions to the educational institution.

However, teacher appraisals have a moderate or high level of influence on some domains of decisions in a few countries. As might be expected, teachers' appraisals have moderate to high level of influence on the provision of assistance to improve teaching skills in 11 countries and economies. They also have a moderate or high level influence on teachers' salaries increase or bonuses in five to six countries, and on the evaluation of school administration and school performance in five countries. Teachers' appraisals have a high level of influence on evaluations of both school administration and school performance in the Slovak Republic and Türkiye and a moderate level on influence on both these areas in Hungary (Figure D7.3 and Table D7.4).

Figure D7.3. Influence of teacher and school head appraisals on educational authority decisions (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels



For data, see Table D7.4. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

The influence of school head appraisals is similar to those of teachers. They have no influence on school funding in any of the countries, and no influence on the likelihood of school closure or on school heads' remuneration and bonuses in most countries. Nevertheless, school head appraisals have a high to moderate influence on the evaluation of school administrations in eight countries and on the evaluation of school performance in five. Four countries report that school head appraisals have an influence on increases in salaries as a reward (Figure D7.4 and Table D7.4).

Schools' influence over appraisals

Individual educational institutions have an influence on teacher and school head appraisals even when there are legal frameworks covering them. The extent of this influence varies considerably across countries and economies. Schools have a moderate to high level of influence or control over teacher appraisals in nearly two-thirds of countries and economies with available information (13 out of 20). Only in the French Community of Belgium, Hungary and Türkiye do schools have no influence on procedures for appraisal.

Similarly, schools have a moderate to high level of influence or control over school head appraisals in nearly two-thirds of countries and economies with available information (10 out of 16). They have no influence on the appraisals of school heads in France, the French Community of Belgium and the Slovak Republic (Table D7.4).


Box D7.4. Summative and formative purposes of appraisals of teachers and school heads

Teacher and school head appraisals (all types of appraisal combined) can have a formative purpose, where the objective of helping them improve and progress in their skills and competencies. For instance, feedback on their performance helps teachers identify how to improve their teaching practice and, with the support of effective school leadership, can create professional learning communities within schools. Appraisals can also have summative purposes, aiming to analyse their performance and their effectiveness in order to inform a variety of employment decisions on areas such as career advancement, salary progression and the allocation of financial rewards or sanctions.

Some 14 countries and economies reported using teacher appraisals for both formative and summative purposes (among the 24 countries with a policy framework coverage for at least one type of appraisal). They might rely solely on appraisal results for these purposes (this is considered as a high level of use), or use them as one of many factors, but with a substantial level of use compared with the others (a moderate level of use) or with limited use compared with the other factors (a low level of use). Overall, teacher appraisals are used at a moderate or high level for formative purposes in 12 countries and for summative purposes in 15 countries (Figure D7.4 and Table D7.4).

Figure D7.4. Use of teacher and school head appraisals for formative and summative purposes (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels



Note: "Formative" refers to the use of appraisals for improvement. "Summative" refers to the use of appraisals to determine whether those being appraised are doing what they are supposed to do.
For data, see Table D7.4. The data for this figure can be accessed via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

Five countries reported a high level of use of teacher appraisals for both formative and summative purposes and three a moderate level for both. In other countries and economies, appraisals are used for summative and formative purposes at different levels. For example, in Korea they have a high level of use for formative purposes but a low level for summative purposes. By contrast, in the Flemish Community of Belgium and Luxembourg, they have a high level of use for summative purposes and a low level for formative purposes. In Luxembourg, the use for summative purposes includes a direct impact on completion of probation. In the Flemish Community of Belgium, the low level of use of teacher appraisals for formative purposes

reflects the fact that formal evaluations now only take place in cases of poor performance. In Costa Rica and the French Community of Belgium, teacher appraisals are only used for summative purposes (Figure D7.4 and Table D7.4).

A similar picture emerges for school head appraisals. These are used for both formative and summative purposes in 13 countries and economies (among the 21 countries with a policy framework covering at least one type of appraisal of school heads). In most of them, the levels of use for formative and summative purposes differ. Only Bulgaria, France (at the secondary level), the French Community of Belgium and the Slovak Republic reported a consistently moderate or high level of use for both formative and summative purposes. In Czechia and Türkiye school heads' appraisals have a high level of use for formative purposes, but a low level for summative purposes. Conversely, in the Flemish Community of Belgium and Spain these appraisals are used to a low level for formative purposes, but a high level for summative purposes. Appraisals are solely used for summative purposes in Korea, Lithuania and Slovenia. More generally school heads appraisals are used at a moderate or high level for formative purposes in 9 countries and for summative purposes in 14 (Figure D7.4 and Table D7.4).

Definitions

Professional development refers to in-service training that aims to update, develop and broaden the knowledge of teachers and school leaders. This includes any activity that develops an individual's skills, knowledge, expertise and other characteristics, through personal study and reflection as well as through formal courses.

References/standards refers to documents that provide the basis for appraisal criteria by defining what teachers and school leaders should know and be able to do, the tasks they should perform, and the regulations with which they should comply.

School head appraisals (i.e. evaluations) refer to the external evaluation of individual school leaders to make a judgement about their work and performance using objective criteria. Results of school head evaluations may be used to inform professional development activities, career advancement, and rewards.

Teacher appraisals, also referred to as teacher evaluations, refer to the evaluation of individual teachers to make a judgement about their work and performance using objective criteria. Results of teacher appraisals may be used to inform professional development activities, certification, career advancement and rewards. The term "teachers" covers all professional personnel directly involved in teaching students, including classroom teachers and other teachers who work with students as a whole class in a classroom, in small groups in a resource room, or in one-to-one teaching inside or outside a regular classroom.

Methodology

This chapter is based on a survey on evaluation and assessment of teachers, school heads and schools that captured qualitative information on school inspections and self-evaluations and on school compliance reporting. Thirty OECD and partner countries and economies contributed to this survey (Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechia, Denmark, England [United Kingdom], Finland, the Flemish and French Communities of Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Korea, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Scotland [United Kingdom], the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Türkiye).

For more information please see *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

Sources

Data presented in this chapter are from the OECD-INES 2025 survey on evaluation and assessment of teachers, school heads and schools and refer to the school year 2024/25 (or the school year 2025).

References

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012), "The right start: Creating a Strong Foundation for the Teaching Career", *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 94/3, https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171209400303. [4]

Donaldson, M. et al. (2021), "Principal evaluation under the Elementary and Secondary Every Student Act: A comprehensive policy review", *Education Finance and Policy*, Vol. 16/2, pp. 347-361, https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00332. [7]

Grissom, J., A. Egalite and C. Lindsay (2021), *How Principals Affect Students and Schools: A Systematic Synthesis of Two Decades of Research*, The Wallace Foundation, https://doi.org/10.59656/el-sb1065.001. [2]

OECD (2025), *Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/90df6235-en. [3]

OECD (2020), "Education Policy Outlook in Portugal", *OECD Education Policy Perspectives*, No. 21, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/0e254ee5-en. [6]

OECD (2015), *Education at a Glance 2015: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2015-en. [5]

OECD (2013), *Synergies for Better Learning: An International Perspective on Evaluation and Assessment*, OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264190658-en. [1]

Chapter D7 Tables

Tables and notes

Table D7.1.	Types of teacher and school head appraisals (2025)
Table D7.2.	Eligibility for and circumstances of teacher appraisals (2025)
Table D7.3.	Aspects appraised and use of results from teacher appraisals (2025)
Table D7.4.	Use of teacher and school head appraisals and their influence on various decisions (2025)
Table D7.5.	Eligibility for and circumstances of school head appraisals (2025)
Table D7.6	Aspects appraised and use of results from school head appraisals (2025)
WEB Table D7.7.	Governance and responsibilities for teacher appraisals (2025)
WEB Table D7.8.	Tools and references used for teacher appraisals (2025)
WEB Table D7.9.	Governance and responsibilities for school head appraisals (2025)
WEB Table D7.10.	Tools and references used for school head appraisals (2025)

StatLink https://stat.link/58zx6m

Data Download

The data for the figures and tables in this chapter, can be downloaded via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data.

Table D7.1. Types of teacher and school head appraisals (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels

	Teacher appraisals						School head appraisals		
		Types of appraisal covered by policy framework						Types of appraisal covered by policy framework	
	Covered by policy/regulations	Completion of probation	Teacher registration	Regular appraisal	Appraisal for promotion	Reward schemes	Covered by policy/regulations	Initial certification as school head	Regular appraisal
	(1)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(10)	(11)
OECD countries									
Austria	Yes (national/central level)	a	Yes	Yes	a	a	No	a	a
Chile	Yes (national/central level)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (national/central level)	No	Yes
Costa Rica	Yes (national/central level)	m	m	Yes	a	a	Yes (national/central level)	m	Yes
Czechia	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	a	Yes	No	No	Yes (national/central level)	a	Yes
Denmark[1]	No (similar practice)	a	a	a	a	a	No	a	a
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France[2]	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes (national/central level)	a	Yes
France[3]	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes
Germany	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	a	Yes	Yes	No	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes
Hungary	Yes (national/central level)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes
Japan	Yes (national/central level)	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes (Same as teacher)	m	m
Korea	Yes (national/central level)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes
Lithuania	Yes (national/central level)	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes
Luxembourg	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	a	No	No	No	No	a	a
Netherlands	No (similar practice)	a	a	a	a	a	No (similar practice)	a	a
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes (national/central level)	a	Yes
Portugal	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Slovak Republic	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes (national/central level)	No	Yes
Slovenia	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes
Spain	Yes (national/central level)	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Yes (national/central level)	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	a	a	a
Switzerland	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	a	Yes	a	No	Yes (national/central level)	No	Yes

	Teacher appraisals						School head appraisals		
		Types of appraisal covered by policy framework						Types of appraisal covered by policy framework	
	Covered by policy/regulations	Completion of probation	Teacher registration	Regular appraisal	Appraisal for promotion	Reward schemes	Covered by policy/regulations	Initial certification as school head	Regular appraisal
	(1)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(10)	(11)
Türkiye	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes
Other economies									
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes (national/central level)	a	Yes
French Comm. (Belgium)	Yes (national/central level)	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes
England (UK)	Yes (some schools)	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes (Same as teacher)	a	Yes
Scotland (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries									
Brazil	Yes (some schools)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	m	Yes (some schools)	Yes	No
Bulgaria	Yes (some schools)	m	Yes	Yes	m	a	Yes (national/central level)	a	Yes
Romania	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (national/central level)	Yes	Yes

Note: Data on the difference in teacher and school head appraisal policy (or regulation) between public and government-dependent private schools are available for consultation online (columns 2 and 9)

1. School head appraisal at upper secondary level is not legislated but widely practised

2. Primary level.

3. Secondary level.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

Table D7.2. Eligibility for and circumstances of teacher appraisals (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels

	Regular appraisal															
		Teachers eligible and included in the policy framework								Circumstances of the appraisal						
	Covered by policy/ regulations	All registered teachers	All provisionally registered teachers	Teachers on permanent contracts	Teachers on fixed-term contracts	Teachers on probation	Other	Obligation to undertake appraisal	Frequency of appraisal	In relation to a decision on employment status	As the result of a complaint	As the result of performance problems	At the discretion of the school board or committee	At the discretion of the school head	At the request of teachers themselves	Other
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
OECD countries																
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	a	No	Yes	Every three years	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Chile	Yes	a	a	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Every four years	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Costa Rica	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Every year	No	No	Yes	a	No	No	m
Czechia	Yes	a	a	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Other	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Denmark	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Yes	a	No	Yes	Different by type of teachers	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Germany	Yes	a	a	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Other	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Hungary	Yes	No	a	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Every year	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Japan	Yes	m	m	m	m	m	m	Yes	m	a	a	Yes	a	a	a	a
Korea	Yes	a	a	Yes	Yes	a	No	Yes	Every year	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Lithuania	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Luxembourg	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Netherlands	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	Yes	a	a	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	a	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

	Regular appraisal															
		Teachers eligible and included in the policy framework								Circumstances of the appraisal						
	Covered by policy/ regulations	All registered teachers	All provisionally registered teachers	Teachers on permanent contracts	Teachers on fixed-term contracts	Teachers on probation	Other	Obligation to undertake appraisal	Frequency of appraisal	In relation to a decision on employment status	As the result of a complaint	As the result of performance problems	At the discretion of the school board or committee	At the discretion of the school head	At the request of teachers themselves	Other
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Portugal	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Slovak Republic	Yes	a	a	Yes	Yes	No	a	Yes	Every year	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Slovenia	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Spain	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Sweden	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Yes	a	No	Yes	No periodicity	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	m
Switzerland	Yes	a	a	Yes	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Other	Yes	m	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	a
Türkiye	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	a	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Other economies																
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	No	a	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	No	a	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
French Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	a	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
England (UK)	Yes	m	m	m	m	m	a	Yes	Every year	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Scotland (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries																
Brazil	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	m	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	a
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Every four years	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Every year	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	a	m

Note: Data refer to regular appraisals of teachers. Data on other types of appraisals (for completion of probation, teacher registration, promotion and reward schemes) are available in separate rows for consultation online.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

Table D7.3. Aspects appraised and use of results from teacher appraisals (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels

	Regular appraisal												
		Aspects appraised											
	Covered by policy/ regulations	Planning and preparation	Instruction	Classroom environment	Professional development	Contribution to school development	Links to the community	Other	Appraisal results in a rating	Mechanisms exist to appeal appraisal results	Appraisal informs professional development activities	Appraisal affects career advancement	Appraisal affects pay levels
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
OECD countries													
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes (always)	Yes (progression)	No
Chile	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (always)	Yes (promotion, progression, contract)	Yes (base salary, allowance, progression)
Costa Rica	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	Yes (for some teachers)	No	Other
Czechia	Yes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	No	Yes	Other	Other	Other
Denmark	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (expected)	Yes (progression)	Yes (progression)
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (expected)	Yes (contracts)	Yes (progression)
Hungary	Yes	a	a	a	a	a	a	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes (progression)	Yes (base salary)
Japan	Yes	m	m	m	m	m	m	Yes	m	m	Other	Other	Other
Korea	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes (always)	No	No
Lithuania	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Luxembourg	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Netherlands	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	No	No
Portugal	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Slovak Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (always)	Other	Yes (progression)
Slovenia	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Spain	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Sweden	Yes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	Yes (expected)	m	m
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	m	Yes	Yes	Yes (for some teachers)	Yes (contracts)	m
Türkiye	Yes	m	m	m	m	m	m	No	m	m	Other	Other	Other

	Regular appraisal												
		Aspects appraised											
	Covered by policy/ regulations	Planning and preparation	Instruction	Classroom environment	Professional development	Contribution to school development	Links to the community	Other	Appraisal results in a rating	Mechanisms exist to appeal appraisal results	Appraisal informs professional development activities	Appraisal affects career advancement	Appraisal affects pay levels
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Other economies													
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes (for some teachers)	Yes (contracts)	No
French Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes (always)	Yes (contracts)	No
England (UK)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	m	No	Yes	Yes (expected)	m	m
Scotland (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries													
Brazil	Yes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	Yes (always)	Yes (promotion)	Yes (progression)
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (always)	Yes (promotion)	Yes (progression)
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	Yes (for in-service PD)	Yes (promotion, contracts)	No

Appraisal informs professional development activities

Yes (always): Yes, appraisal results systematically result in a professional development plan; *Yes (expected)*: Yes, appraisal results are expected to influence professional development plans; *Yes (for some teachers)*: Yes, appraisal results are reflected in a professional development plan for some teachers; *Yes (for in-service PD)*: Yes, appraisal results determine extra opportunities for in-service professional development; *No*: No, appraisal results do not inform teachers' professional development activities; *Other*: Other.

Appraisal affects career advancement

Yes (promotion): Yes, appraisal results influence decisions about promotion; *Yes (progression*): Yes, appraisal results influence the speed at which a teacher progresses along the career structure or salary scale; *Yes (contracts)*: Yes, appraisal results influence decisions on access to contracts or renewal of fixed-term contracts or access to a permanent position; *No*: No, appraisal results do not affect career advancement; *Other*: Other.

Appraisal affects pay levels

Yes (base salary): Yes, appraisal results affect the base salary; *Yes (allowance)*: Yes, a pay allowance is provided for good performance; *Yes (progression)*: Yes, to the extent that it allows the teacher to progress on the career structure and/or salary scale; *No*: No, appraisal results do not affect pay levels. *Other*: Other.

Note: Data refer to regular appraisals of teachers. Data on other types of appraisal (completion of probation, teacher registration, promotion and reward schemes) are available in separate rows for consultation online alongside data on responses to underperformance (Columns 14 to 26).

1. Primary level.
2. Secondary level.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

Table D7.4. Use of teacher appraisals and their influence on various decisions (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels

	Teacher appraisals									
			Influence on other activities and decision making by education authority							
	Formative purposes	Summative purposes	Evaluation of school performance	Evaluation of school administration	Likelihood of school closure	Remuneration/salary and bonuses received by teachers			Provision of assistance to improve teaching skills	Extent of school influence over teacher appraisal
						Increased salary as a reward	One-time bonus as a reward	Decreased salary as a penalty		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
OECD countries										
Austria	Moderate	High	Low	Moderate	None	None	High	None	High	Low
Chile	Moderate	High	Low	Low	None	High	None	None	High	Low
Costa Rica	m	High	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	Moderate
Czechia	m	m	a	a	None	None	High	None	Moderate	High
Denmark	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France[1]	High	High	Low	Low	None	None	None	None	High	Moderate
France[2]	High	High	Low	Low	None	None	None	None	High	Moderate
Germany	Moderate	Moderate	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Hungary	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	None	High	None	None	None	None
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	High	Low	None	None	None	None	High	None	High	Moderate
Lithuania	a	a	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	Low
Luxembourg[1]	Low	High	None	None	None	None	None	None	Low	a
Luxembourg[2]	Low	High	None	None	None	None	None	None	Low	High
Netherlands	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	m	m	None	None	None	High	Moderate	None	None	High
Portugal	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Slovak Republic	High	High	High	High	None	Low	Low	None	Moderate	Moderate
Slovenia	High	High	None	None	None	High	High	a	Moderate	High

	Teacher appraisals									
			Influence on other activities and decision making by education authority							
	Formative purposes	Summative purposes	Evaluation of school performance	Evaluation of school administration	Likelihood of school closure	Remuneration/salary and bonuses received by teachers			Provision of assistance to improve teaching skills	Extent of school influence over teacher appraisal
						Increased salary as a reward	One-time bonus as a reward	Decreased salary as a penalty		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Spain	High	High	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	High
Sweden	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Switzerland	High	Moderate	None	None	a	m	m	m	High	Moderate
Türkiye	Not used	Not used	High	High	None	None	None	None	None	None
Other economies										
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	Low	High	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	High
French Comm. (Belgium)	Not used	High	None	None	None	None	None	None	Moderate	None
England (UK)	Moderate	Moderate	None	None	None	High	None	None	High	High
Scotland (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries										
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	Not used	Not used	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	m	m	m	High
Romania	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	a	a	a	a	Moderate	Low

	School heads appraisals								
	Formative purposes	Summative purposes	Influence on other activities and decision making by education authority						Extent of school influence over school head appraisal
			Evaluation of school performance	Evaluation of school administration	Likelihood of school closure	Remuneration/salary and bonuses received by teachers			
						Increased salary as a reward	One-time bonus as a reward	Decreased salary as a penalty	
	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)
OECD countries									
Austria	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Chile	Moderate	High	Low	Low	None	High	None	None	Low
Costa Rica	m	High	High	High	a	Moderate	a	a	a
Czechia	High	Low	High	High	Low	None	High	None	Moderate
Denmark	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France[1]	High	Not used	Low	Low	None	Low	Low	None	None
France[2]	High	High	None	None	None	Low	Low	None	None
Germany	Moderate	Moderate	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Hungary	Low	Low	None	None	None	None	None	None	Low
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	Not used	Moderate	Low	High	None	None	High	None	Moderate
Lithuania	Not used	High	Moderate	Moderate	None	High	a	High	Moderate
Luxembourg[1]	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Luxembourg[2]	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Netherlands	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	m	m	None	None	None	None	None	None	Moderate
Portugal	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Slovak Republic	High	High	Moderate	High	Moderate	None	None	None	None
Slovenia	Not used	High	None	None	None	High	None	None	High
Spain	Low	High	None	None	None	None	None	None	Moderate
Sweden	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Switzerland	High	Moderate	None	None	m	m	m	m	Moderate

	School heads appraisals								
	Formative purposes	Summative purposes	Influence on other activities and decision making by education authority						Extent of school influence over school head appraisal
			Evaluation of school performance	Evaluation of school administration	Likelihood of school closure	Remuneration/salary and bonuses received by teachers			
						Increased salary as a reward	One-time bonus as a reward	Decreased salary as a penalty	
	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)
Türkiye	High	Low	None	High	None	None	None	None	High
Other economies									
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	Low	High	None	None	None	None	None	None	High
French Comm. (Belgium)	High	High	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
England (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Scotland (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries									
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	a	a	a	High
Romania	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate	a	a	a	a	Low

Note: "Formative" refers to the use of evaluations for improvement. "Summative" refers to the use of evaluations to determine whether the object of the evaluation is doing what it is supposed to do. Data on the influence of teacher and school head appraisals on the size of school budget (Columns 5 to 8 and 19 to 22) are available for consultation online.

1. Primary level.

2. Secondary level.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

Table D7.5 Eligibility for and circumstances of school head appraisals (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels

	Regular appraisal										
	School heads eligible and included in the policy framework			Obligation to undertake appraisal	Frequency of appraisal	Circumstances of the appraisal					
	School head on permanent contracts	School head on fixed term contracts	Other			In relation to a decision on employment status	As the result of a complaint	At the discretion of the education authority	At the discretion of the school board or committee	At the request of school heads themselves	Other
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
OECD countries											
Austria	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Chile	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	m	No	No	No	No	No	No
Costa Rica	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Every year	No	No	No	No	No	No
Czechia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Other	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Denmark	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France[1]	Yes	No	No	Yes	Other	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
France[2]	Yes	No	No	Yes	Every year	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Germany	Yes	a	No	Yes	Other	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Hungary	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Every year	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	a	Yes	a	Yes	Every year	No	No	No	No	No	No
Lithuania	a	Yes	a	Yes	Every year	No	No	No	No	No	No
Luxembourg	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Netherlands	a	a	a	a	m	a	a	a	a	a	a
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No periodicity	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

	Regular appraisal										
	School heads eligible and included in the policy framework			Obligation to undertake appraisal	Frequency of appraisal	Circumstances of the appraisal					
	School head on permanent contracts	School head on fixed term contracts	Other			In relation to a decision on employment status	As the result of a complaint	At the discretion of the education authority	At the discretion of the school board or committee	At the request of school heads themselves	Other
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Portugal	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Slovak Republic	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Every year	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Every year	Yes	No	No	No	No	a
Spain	Yes	a	a	Yes	Every four years	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Sweden	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Other	Yes	m	m	Yes	Yes	a
Türkiye	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Every year	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Other economies											
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	Yes	No	No	a	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
French Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Every five years	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	a
England (UK)	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Every year	No	No	No	No	No	No
Scotland (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries											
Brazil	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Bulgaria	Yes	a	a	Yes	Every four years	a	a	a	a	a	m
Romania	a	Yes	a	Yes	Every year	a	Yes	a	a	a	Yes

Note: Data refer to regular appraisals of school heads. Data on appraisals for initial certification as a school head are available in separate rows for consultation online.
1. Primary level.
2. Secondary level.
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

Table D7.6. Aspects appraised and use of results from school head appraisals (2025)

In general programmes, at primary and secondary levels

	Regular appraisal													
	Aspects appraised									Appraisal results in a rating	Mechanisms exist to appeal appraisal results	Appraisal informs professional development	Appraisal affects career advancement	Appraisal affects pay levels
	General leadership	Pedagogical/ instructional leadership	Organisation development	School climate	Community relations	Evaluation & accountability	Resource management	Interpersonal skills	Other					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
OECD countries														
Austria	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Chile	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (always)	Yes (promotion)	Base salary
Costa Rica	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Yes	No	No	Allowance
Czechia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Other	a	Other
Denmark	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France[2]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes (expected)	Yes (speed)	base salary, progression
France[3]	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (expected)	Yes (promotion, speed)	base salary, progression
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (expected)	Yes (speed)	No
Hungary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (expected)	No	Allowance
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Allowance
Lithuania	a	a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (PD plan)	Yes (contract)	Allowance
Luxembourg	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Netherlands	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Norway	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	m	Yes (contract)	m
Portugal	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Slovak Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (always)	Yes (speed)	Progression
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes (promotion)	Allowance
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes (promotion)	Base salary
Sweden	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a

	Regular appraisal													
	Aspects appraised									Appraisal results in a rating	Mechanisms exist to appeal appraisal results	Appraisal informs professional development	Appraisal affects career advancement	Appraisal affects pay levels
	General leadership	Pedagogical/ instructional leadership	Organisation development	School climate	Community relations	Evaluation & accountability	Resource management	Interpersonal skills	Other					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	Yes (PD plan)	Yes (contract)	m
Türkiye	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (always)	No	No
Other economies														
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	No	Yes	Yes (PD plan)	Yes (contract)	No
French Comm. (Belgium)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	a	Yes (PD plan)	No	No
England (UK)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes (PD plan)	Yes (speed)	Base salary
Scotland (UK)	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Partner and/or accession countries														
Brazil	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	m	m	Progression
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (always)	Yes (contract)	No

Appraisal informs professional development

Yes (always): Yes, appraisal results systematically result in a professional development plan, *Yes (expected):* Yes, appraisal results are expected to influence professional development plans; *Yes (PD plan*): Yes, appraisal results are reflected in a professional development plan for some school heads;

Yes (opportunities): Yes, appraisal results determine extra opportunities for in-service professional development; *No:* No, appraisal results do not inform school heads' professional development plan and activities; *Other*: Other.

Appraisal affects career advancement

Yes (promotion)**:** Yes, appraisal results influence decisions about promotion; *Yes (speed):* Yes, appraisal results influence the speed at which a school head progresses along the career structure or salary scale; *Yes (contract)*: Yes, appraisal results influence decisions on access to contracts or renewal of fixed-term contracts or access to a permanent position; *No:* No, appraisal results do not affect career advancement; *Other*: Other.

Appraisal affects pay levels

Base salary: Yes, appraisal results affect the base salary; *Allowance*: Yes, a pay allowance is provided for good performance; *Progression*: Yes, to the extent that it allows the school head to progress along the career structure or salary scale; *No*: No, appraisal results do not affect pay levels; *Other*: Other.

Note: Data refer to regular appraisals of school heads. Data on appraisals for initial certification as school head are available in separate rows for consultation online alongside data on responses to underperformance (Columns 15 to 25). The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/58zx6m.

1. School head appraisal at upper secondary level is not legislated but widely practised.
2. Primary level.
3. Secondary level.

Annex 1. Characteristics of education systems

Tables for Annex 1 - Characteristics of education systems

Table X1.1.	School year and financial year used for the calculation of indicators, OECD countries
Table X1.2.	School year and financial year used for the calculation of indicators, partner and accession countries

StatLink https://stat.link/erbqic


Data Download

The data for the tables in this chapter, can be downloaded via https://stat.link/erbqic.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.


Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data

Table X1.1. School year and financial year used for the calculation of indicators, OECD countries



The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/erbqic.

Table X1.2. School year and financial year used for the calculation of indicators, partner and accession countries



The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/erbqic.

Annex 2: Reference statistics

Tables for Annex 2 – Reference Statistics

Table X2.1	Basic reference statistics in current prices (reference period: calendar year, 2015, 2020, 2022, 2023, 2024)
Table X2.2	Basic reference statistics (reference period: calendar year, 2015, 2020, 2022, 2023, 2024)
Table X2.3	Pre-primary and primary teachers' statutory salaries, in national currencies, based on the most prevalent qualifications at different points in teachers' careers (2025
Table X2.4	Secondary teachers' statutory salaries, in national currencies, based on the most prevalent qualifications at different points in teachers' careers (2025)
Table X2.5	Trends in teachers' statutory starting salaries, in national currencies (2000 and 2005 to 2025)
Table X2.6	Trends in teachers' statutory salaries after 15 years of experience, in national currencies (2000 and 2005 to 2025)
Table X2.7	Trends in teachers' average actual salaries, in national currencies (2000, 2005 and 2010 to 2025)
Table X2.8	Reference statistics used in calculating salaries of teachers and school heads (2000 and 2005 to 2025)
Table X2.9	Distribution of teachers, by minimum or most prevalent qualifications and level of education (2025)
Table X2.10	Distribution of teachers aged 25-64, by educational attainment and level of education (2025)
Table X2.11	Distribution of school heads aged 25-64, by educational attainment and level of education (2025)

StatLink https://stat.link/z2esdn

Data download

The data for the tables in this chapter, can be downloaded via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

To access further data and/or other education indicators, please visit the OECD Data Explorer: http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s.

Data cut-off for the print publication 17 June 2026. Please note that the Data Explorer contains the most recent data

Table X2.1. Basic reference statistics in current prices (reference period: calendar year, 2015, 2020, 2022, 2023, 2024)

	Gross domestic product (GDP) (in millions of local currency, current prices)					Total government expenditure (in millions of local currency, current prices)				
	2015	2020	2022	2023	2024	2015	2020	2022	2023	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
OECD countries										
Australia	1 647 614	2 040 015	2 456 958	2 628 519	2 729 461	620 247	918 351	957 294	1 031 662	1 101 443
Austria	342 084	380 318	449 382	477 837	494 088	175 201	217 971	238 015	249 471	272 668
Belgium	415 538	463 751	561 309	602 376	620 272	223 896	271 076	294 711	318 078	335 288
Canada	1 999 215	2 299 350	2 889 420	3 001 039	3 142 280	812 749	1 182 045	1 179 589	1 262 510	1 402 308
Chile	158 622 903	201 306 507	262 954 242	282 096 646	310 681 170	40 935 942	61 261 849	73 231 558	79 504 743	m
Colombia	804 692 000	998 471 000	1 471 079 000	1 584 562 000	1 706 447 200	363 654 000	520 102 000	680 668 000	777 942 000	847 076 000
Costa Rica	30 171 919	36 495 246	44 810 031	47 059 272	49 115 935	9 099 110	12 475 503	13 051 117	18 824 168	18 780 060
Czechia	4 651 813	5 828 318	7 049 872	7 659 655	8 058 158	1 939 667	2 695 753	3 030 666	3 346 445	3 453 578
Denmark	2 030 206	2 326 592	2 831 270	2 787 930	2 926 878	1 104 800	1 240 994	1 276 593	1 321 428	1 385 275
Estonia	21 011	27 859	36 301	38 353	39 848	8 248	12 464	14 534	16 524	17 517
Finland	210 192	236 387	266 135	273 005	275 993	117 168	133 447	140 085	152 619	159 373
France	2 201 402	2 318 276	2 653 997	2 826 542	2 919 900	1 268 008	1 430 357	1 550 331	1 607 392	1 671 794
Germany	3 087 030	3 450 720	3 989 390	4 219 310	4 328 970	1 373 293	1 763 784	1 939 208	2 031 433	2 139 717
Greece	175 363	167 540	207 009	224 686	236 736	96 036	99 338	109 903	111 476	114 222
Hungary	34 984 755	48 807 766	65 950 424	75 218 235	81 493 548	17 616 154	24 907 128	32 333 477	37 248 383	38 398 095
Iceland	2 335 025	2 983 972	3 946 957	4 373 067	4 578 361	1 005 011	1 504 531	1 821 712	1 976 187	2 158 440
Ireland	272 283	381 729	520 718	524 729	562 794	76 430	101 932	107 603	116 622	125 998
Israel	1 177 086	1 414 517	1 764 332	1 882 809	2 006 304	450 849	643 126	662 175	757 466	888 709
Italy	1 663 278	1 670 012	1 998 073	2 142 744	2 202 031	835 694	948 296	1 097 627	1 149 206	1 109 154
Japan	550 642 675	558 948 000	592 683 700	620 581 250	m	208 755 400	249 073 500	243 092 800	240 871 000	245 630 000
Korea	1 740 776 000	2 058 466 500	2 323 781 500	2 408 687 400	2 556 857 400	504 008 400	738 883 100	860 322 100	857 483 200	896 273 400
Latvia	23 744	29 224	36 089	39 564	40 652	9 494	12 934	15 965	17 190	18 419
Lithuania	37 441	50 265	67 081	74 317	78 996	13 179	21 285	24 517	27 641	31 137
Luxembourg	54 142	64 499	76 731	82 115	86 180	21 861	30 341	33 991	38 061	40 369
Mexico	19 228 615	24 086 758	29 525 509	31 866 426	33 506 847	5 307 315	7 059 081	7 834 616	8 724 641	9 780 195
Netherlands	699 175	816 463	993 820	1 050 133	1 121 543	316 389	390 377	429 984	462 064	498 516
New Zealand	252 406	327 207	384 911	410 057	426 306	99 595	152 260	168 259	183 036	m

	Gross domestic product (GDP) (in millions of local currency, current prices)					Total government expenditure (in millions of local currency, current prices)				
	2015	2020	2022	2023	2024	2015	2020	2022	2023	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Norway	3 130 183	3 461 575	5 732 905	5 101 559	5 196 606	1 533 194	1 994 429	2 186 991	2 384 960	2 563 785
Poland	1 809 564	2 362 909	3 100 850	3 415 274	3 653 432	750 899	1 127 935	1 341 054	1 600 363	1 806 320
Portugal	179 393	201 033	243 957	270 353	289 784	86 677	98 754	107 034	113 272	123 174
Slovak Republic	80 376	94 321	109 960	123 539	130 208	35 467	41 972	47 373	59 596	61 806
Slovenia	38 494	46 739	56 882	64 050	67 418	19 052	24 209	27 116	29 814	31 334
Spain	1 087 112	1 129 214	1 375 863	1 497 761	1 594 330	474 893	580 164	637 117	680 225	725 001
Sweden	4 230 936	5 012 855	5 816 415	6 143 187	6 391 596	2 130 800	2 662 499	2 871 330	3 072 290	3 237 865
Switzerland	679 633	709 855	819 704	834 190	853 957	223 963	265 763	258 366	268 555	277 258
Türkiye	2 354 059	5 141 711	15 325 857	27 091 469	44 587 225	763 240	1 750 531	4 103 040	8 857 133	14 656 111
United Kingdom	1 947 201	2 174 203	2 623 753	2 786 984	2 928 548	812 551	1 099 820	1 175 557	1 280 729	1 337 139
United States	17 951 579	21 457 632	24 890 130	26 933 066	28 554 765	6 910 981	10 100 928	10 009 775	10 905 858	11 592 173
Partner and/or accession countries										
Argentina	5 954 511	27 209 814	82 810 045	192 408 000	583 910 000	2 463 163	11 558 522	31 172 287	72 417 362	181 123 984
Brazil	5 995 787	7 609 597	10 079 677	10 943 344	11 779 251	3 921 250	5 354 228	4 379 149	4 958 352	5 364 453
Bulgaria	45 797	61 856	86 078	94 525	104 767	18 495	25 595	35 542	36 724	41 060
China	70 251 150	103 486 760	123 402 940	129 427 170	134 908 350	21 837 060	36 310 049	40 260 431	42 366 255	44 440 402
Croatia	45 966	50 744	67 613	79 186	85 905	21 884	27 278	30 435	36 649	41 238
India	137 718 739	198 540 960	268 904 726	301 229 559	330 681 454	37 265 268	61 585 922	78 255 535	86 087 648	93 125 601
Indonesia	11 526 332 800	15 443 353 200	19 588 459 900	20 892 312 300	22 138 990 800	2 635 705 194	3 816 647 028	4 446 448 737	4 480 372 649	3 734 009 329
Peru	604 416	703 915	943 706	999 447	1 085 708	136 195	188 422	219 985	224 668	246 353
Romania	712 549	1 063 651	1 384 598	1 590 749	1 759 183	255 676	443 597	566 399	653 234	766 175
Saudi Arabia	2 600 305	2 879 817	4 646 532	4 569 693	4 703 029	1 001 292	1 075 734	1 174 310	1 293 235	1 374 718
South Africa	4 420 792	5 562 760	6 666 581	7 037 674	7 352 449	1 333 492	1 925 591	2 125 904	2 288 017	2 424 245
Thailand	13 743 480	15 661 291	17 377 997	17 954 668	18 582 671	3 027 323	3 950 751	4 224 508	4 065 261	4 178 141

Note: For countries where GDP is not reported for the same reference period as data on educational finance, GDP is estimated as: wt-1 (GDPt - 1) + wt (GDPt), where wt and wt-1 are the weights for the respective portions of the two reference periods for GDP which fall within the educational financial year. Adjustments were made in Part C for Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States. Columns showing the source of each data point are available for consultation on line.

Source: OECD Data Explorer, "Annual GDP and components - expenditure approach" and "Annual government non-financial accounts and key indicators (Expenditure)" (https://data-explorer.oecd.org). World Economic Outlook data were sourced using: https://api.imf.org/external/sdmx/3.0/data/dataflow/IMF.RES/WEO/9.0.0/. World Bank data were sourced using the WDI package in R. Data updated on 16 April 2026. The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Table X2.2. Basic reference statistics (reference period: calendar year, 2015, 2020, 2022, 2023, 2024)

	Purchasing power parity for GDP (PPP) (USD = 1)					Gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (local currency, current prices)					GDP deflator (2020 = 100)				
	2015	2020	2022	2023	2024	2015	2020	2022	2023	2024	2015	2020	2022	2023	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
OECD countries															
Australia	1.474	1.431	1.359	1.337	1.367	69 181	79 535	94 446	98 621	100 368	87.2	100.0	114.1	117.1	119.8
Austria	0.799	0.729	0.688	0.705	0.710	39 641	42 651	49 640	52 333	53 834	91.8	100.0	106.9	114.6	119.3
Belgium	0.800	0.716	0.698	0.703	0.704	36 857	40 191	48 056	51 136	52 342	91.4	100.0	109.6	115.6	117.8
Canada	1.248	1.202	1.145	1.140	1.150	55 993	60 464	74 183	74 934	76 154	92.8	100.0	116.3	118.1	121.3
Chile	391.179	409.842	434.952	432.562	435.779	8 826 396	10 345 529	13 261 387	14 132 469	15 467 258	79.8	100.0	115.0	122.5	131.2
Colombia	1 289.324	1 270.744	1 363.444	1 425.434	1 443.719	17 744 641	20 269 008	29 133 058	31 052 870	33 102 114	81.9	100.0	123.9	132.5	140.5
Costa Rica	353.964	328.024	336.220	318.842	307.792	6 247 222	7 143 969	8 598 560	8 946 497	9 253 539	90.3	100.0	108.8	108.7	108.8
Czechia	12.938	12.150	12.476	12.576	12.823	442 711	554 964	655 221	704 139	739 598	86.8	100.0	113.1	122.8	127.6
Denmark	7.305	6.365	6.106	6.055	6.050	357 277	399 093	479 357	468 718	489 706	94.3	100.0	113.8	111.3	113.0
Estonia	0.538	0.515	0.560	0.573	0.576	15 999	20 964	27 257	28 080	28 987	85.8	100.0	121.9	132.4	137.7
Finland	0.908	0.802	0.771	0.770	0.754	38 353	42 741	47 893	48 948	49 101	94.2	100.0	108.8	113.1	113.9
France	0.809	0.693	0.683	0.679	0.681	33 197	34 280	38 917	41 341	42 594	93.9	100.0	104.3	109.5	111.8
Germany	0.778	0.707	0.688	0.701	0.701	37 949	42 017	48 339	50 660	51 833	92.0	100.0	109.3	116.6	120.2
Greece	0.609	0.530	0.503	0.507	0.515	16 206	15 660	19 568	21 301	22 479	100.6	100.0	107.8	114.5	118.2
Hungary	132.554	141.838	155.230	169.087	175.578	3 570 691	5 047 120	6 866 207	7 841 616	8 522 589	81.2	100.0	121.0	139.1	149.7
Iceland	141.975	143.253	134.899	137.850	141.758	7 195 764	8 377 238	10 664 570	11 523 233	11 842 630	85.0	100.0	115.5	121.9	129.2
Ireland	0.810	0.775	0.721	0.740	0.741	57 985	75 824	100 143	99 083	104 512	96.3	100.0	109.1	112.8	118.0
Israel	3.924	3.747	3.443	3.457	3.502	137 948	151 689	182 743	191 241	201 200	96.1	100.0	107.3	112.1	118.4
Italy	0.739	0.632	0.591	0.602	0.600	27 616	28 096	33 858	36 327	37 350	94.5	100.0	104.8	111.3	113.5
Japan	103.469	100.742	94.922	93.832	94.463	4 332 528	4 430 961	4 743 481	4 990 521	m	97.5	100.0	100.6	105.2	108.6
Korea	857.483	829.359	810.157	811.048	809.267	34 122 827	39 711 137	44 970 904	46 577 986	49 406 918	94.6	100.0	105.0	107.2	111.5
Latvia	0.533	0.470	0.474	0.491	0.497	12 008	15 374	19 133	21 028	21 799	87.3	100.0	113.3	125.4	128.9
Lithuania	0.477	0.433	0.468	0.491	0.491	12 861	17 885	23 690	25 880	27 351	87.9	100.0	122.4	134.6	138.9
Luxembourg	0.881	0.838	0.800	0.807	0.816	95 087	102 194	117 097	122 972	127 027	92.7	100.0	112.5	120.3	125.8
Mexico	8.328	9.815	9.923	9.751	9.917	161 516	190 585	229 624	246 420	257 694	77.0	100.0	111.5	116.7	121.0
Netherlands	0.810	0.748	0.714	0.731	0.731	41 274	46 810	56 145	58 742	62 329	90.7	100.0	109.1	115.9	122.5
New Zealand	1.478	1.423	1.433	1.461	1.464	54 419	64 449	75 399	78 390	80 627	89.8	100.0	110.2	114.9	119.7
Norway	9.933	9.588	8.371	8.918	9.142	603 118	643 535	1 050 560	924 195	932 628	94.4	100.0	154.4	137.3	137.0

	Purchasing power parity for GDP (PPP) (USD = 1)					Gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (local currency, current prices)					GDP deflator (2020 = 100)				
	2015	2020	2022	2023	2024	2015	2020	2022	2023	2024	2015	2020	2022	2023	2024
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Poland	1.765	1.698	1.800	1.920	1.949	47 643	63 577	82 078	90 758	97 358	90.3	100.0	116.6	128.1	133.0
Portugal	0.585	0.543	0.517	0.513	0.516	17 279	19 358	23 303	25 558	27 096	91.3	100.0	107.5	115.5	121.1
Slovak Republic	0.492	0.489	0.487	0.496	0.502	14 823	17 273	20 150	22 637	23 852	92.7	100.0	109.7	120.7	124.8
Slovenia	0.595	0.532	0.515	0.538	0.550	18 656	22 227	26 966	30 205	31 698	92.5	100.0	109.3	120.3	124.4
Spain	0.665	0.606	0.559	0.557	0.562	23 437	23 851	28 792	30 976	32 633	94.8	100.0	107.4	114.1	117.4
Sweden	8.854	8.436	8.338	8.517	8.490	431 764	484 173	552 514	579 578	601 224	89.9	100.0	108.9	115.3	118.7
Switzerland	1.235	1.105	0.987	0.999	0.973	81 985	82 118	93 336	93 568	94 718	101.1	100.0	105.0	106.0	107.1
Türkiye	1.162	2.111	4.518	7.350	11.555	29 341	59 116	172 922	305 570	503 076	54.4	100.0	252.8	425.5	677.7
United Kingdom	0.693	0.653	0.633	0.661	0.664	29 917	32 577	38 792	40 670	42 304	88.4	100.0	106.4	113.2	117.6
United States	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	55 731	64 663	74 443	79 899	83 961	92.3	100.0	112.0	116.1	119.0
Partner and/or accession countries															
Argentina	6.883	26.887	61.180	139.807	419.901	138 053	599 642	1 791 075	4 124 095	12 405 774	18.9	100.0	261.9	615.3	1 892.8
Brazil	2.006	2.265	2.411	2.448	2.487	29 467	35 936	47 802	51 694	55 410	77.0	100.0	122.7	129.1	134.3
Bulgaria	0.371	0.366	0.383	0.378	0.388	6 557	9 443	13 314	14 663	16 265	80.6	100.0	124.0	133.9	143.6
China	3.782	4.015	3.794	3.644	3.533	50 787	73 285	87 411	91 814	95 797	89.7	100.0	106.6	106.1	105.2
Croatia	0.499	0.436	0.435	0.430	0.449	11 077	12 984	17 538	20 526	22 201	94.2	100.0	110.3	124.4	130.0
India	19.115	20.319	20.489	20.290	20.422	107 341	146 480	194 451	215 935	227 909	83.6	100.0	114.7	117.7	121.3
Indonesia	4 390.646	4 791.007	4 917.925	4 819.742	4 747.909	45 097 404	57 154 442	71 030 895	74 964 468	78 617 514	89.1	100.0	116.1	117.9	119.0
Peru	1.711	1.706	1.691	1.736	1.782	20 171	21 575	28 257	29 630	31 869	86.6	100.0	115.0	122.3	128.6
Romania	1.780	1.714	1.809	1.818	1.883	35 947	55 123	72 670	83 437	92 299	78.7	100.0	118.3	132.9	145.7
Saudi Arabia	1.617	1.921	2.007	1.895	1.845	87 211	91 271	144 413	135 588	133 229	93.8	100.0	135.2	132.3	132.6
South Africa	5.817	7.249	7.246	7.325	7.432	81 216	95 803	112 011	116 845	120 684	77.3	100.0	112.0	117.3	121.9
Thailand	12.338	11.407	10.891	10.647	10.492	194 830	218 606	242 252	250 405	259 288	94.5	100.0	106.5	107.9	108.9

Note: Columns showing the source of each data point are available for consultation on line.

Source: OECD (2026), OECD Data Explorer, "Annual Purchasing Power Parities and exchange rates", "Annual population and employment, national concept", and "Annual GDP and components - expenditure approach" (http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/4s). World Economic Outlook data were sourced using: https://api.imf.org/external/sdmx/3.0/data/dataflow/IMF.RES/WEO/9.0.0/. World Bank data were sourced using the WDI package in R. Data updated on 16 April 2026

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Table X2.3 Pre-primary and primary teachers' statutory salaries, in national currencies, based on the most prevalent qualifications at different points in teachers' careers (2025)

Annual salaries of full-time teachers in public institutions, by level of education

	Pre-primary				Primary			
	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
OECD Countries								
Australia	88 547	126 640	126 640	138 905	85 196	121 683	121 683	137 178
Austria	m	m	m	m	48 688	51 617	57 821	85 118
Canada	m	m	m	m	59 451	104 433	104 441	104 441
Chile	15 546 464	19 085 463	23 339 054	28 777 336	15 546 464	19 187 852	23 339 054	28 777 336
Colombia	55 821 669	101 802 483	101 802 483	101 802 483	55 821 669	101 802 483	101 802 483	101 802 483
Costa Rica	9 342 667	10 974 367	11 790 217	14 237 767	9 435 183	11 083 403	11 907 513	14 379 843
Czechia	387 600	399 600	409 200	454 800	410 400	436 800	456 000	538 800
Denmark	410 929	464 413	464 413	464 413	470 655	536 615	540 356	540 356
Estonia	m	a	a	a	21 840	a	a	a
Finland[1]	33 447	36 470	36 817	36 817	37 116	42 343	45 311	48 030
France[2]	32 264	35 428	36 591	51 911	32 264	35 428	36 591	51 911
Germany	m	m	m	m	59 979	68 557	71 844	77 433
Greece	14 094	16 926	18 342	26 838	14 094	16 926	18 342	26 838
Hungary	7 242 400	7 376 800	7 503 200	7 503 200	7 242 400	7 376 800	7 503 200	7 503 200
Iceland	8 963 578	9 048 086	9 438 904	9 639 298	8 963 578	9 048 086	9 438 904	9 639 298
Ireland	a	a	a	a	41 383	57 221	66 025	81 930
Israel	149 362	175 795	191 203	300 721	129 659	150 239	169 591	263 374
Italy	25 195	27 614	30 271	36 733	25 195	27 614	30 271	36 733
Japan	m	m	m	m	4 282 000	5 475 000	6 130 000	7 374 000
Korea	37 637 700	53 878 860	63 015 160	100 483 380	37 637 700	53 878 860	63 015 160	100 483 380
Latvia	17 488	m	m	27 981	16 176	m	m	25 880
Lithuania	23 522	24 281	27 049	30 779	23 522	24 281	27 049	30 779
Luxembourg	81 565	105 491	119 086	144 098	81 565	105 491	119 086	144 098
Mexico	334 182	409 361	511 572	637 584	334 182	409 361	501 685	620 686
Netherlands	48 852	70 073	79 588	99 994	48 852	70 073	79 588	99 994
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	61 329	97 920	97 920	97 920
Norway	507 400	578 600	578 600	596 400	614 100	638 400	638 400	685 400
Poland	65 248	77 376	94 012	97 981	65 248	77 376	94 012	97 981
Portugal	25 101	30 131	31 874	52 669	25 101	30 131	31 874	52 669
Slovak Republic	11 256	12 840	13 152	14 706	13 938	15 672	16 050	17 952
Slovenia	23 739	34 360	38 746	45 208	23 739	33 182	40 146	48 585
Spain	35 030	38 101	40 633	50 148	35 030	38 101	40 633	50 148
Sweden[3, 4, 5]	439 740	465 228	474 000	506 400	444 678	492 000	513 600	590 400
Switzerland	80 400	101 400	m	121 700	83 100	105 400	m	126 500
Türkiye	626 524	672 331	703 084	805 001	626 524	672 331	703 084	805 001
United States[5]	51 746	57 404	77 629	86 732	50 688	68 784	74 639	88 089
Other economies								
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	41 501	51 921	58 394	73 497	41 501	51 921	58 394	73 497
French Comm. (Belgium)	39 283	49 058	55 201	67 488	39 283	49 058	55 201	67 488
England (UK)	32 701	a	50 464	50 464	32 701	a	50 464	50 464
Scotland (UK)	40 305	50 589	50 589	50 589	40 305	50 589	50 589	50 589

	Pre-primary				Primary			
	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Partner and/or accession countries								
Argentina	11 477 743	12 948 511	13 745 340	16 391 906	11 386 289	12 831 858	13 603 338	16 341 527
Brazil	64 904	m	m	m	64 904	m	m	m
Bulgaria	13 075	13 486	14 007	m	13 075	13 486	14 007	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	23 362	24 408	24 989	27 895
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	43 008	m	m	89 218	43 008	m	m	89 218
Romania	77 352	96 864	100 536	110 170	77 352	96 864	100 536	110 170
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	218 640	378 000	438 000	494 400	218 640	341 232	438 000	494 400

Note: The definition of teachers' most prevalent qualifications is based on a broad concept, including the typical ISCED level of attainment and other criteria. The most prevalent qualification is defined for each of the four career stages included in this table. In many cases, the minimum qualification is the same as the most prevalent qualification. The minimum and the most prevalent qualifications are described in Table D.D3.3 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

1. Data on pre-primary education include salaries of kindergarten teachers (the majority).
2. Data include the average of fixed bonuses for overtime hours for lower and upper secondary teachers.
3. Year of reference: 2024 (calendar year).
4. Data exclude the social security contributions and pension scheme contributions paid by employees.
5. Actual salaries (including teachers of general subjects within vocational programmes in Sweden, and excluding bonuses and allowances in the United States).

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Table X2.4. Secondary teachers' statutory salaries, in national currencies, based on the most prevalent qualifications at different points in teachers' careers (2025)

Annual salaries of full-time teachers in public institutions, by level of education

	Lower secondary, general programmes				Upper secondary, general programmes			
	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
OECD Countries								
Australia	85 077	121 331	121 331	137 323	85 077	121 331	121 331	137 323
Austria	48 688	53 993	60 465	90 179	48 688	58 478	65 501	99 732
Canada	59 451	104 433	104 441	104 441	59 451	104 433	104 441	104 441
Chile	15 546 464	19 187 852	23 339 054	28 777 336	16 076 048	19 894 317	24 151 330	29 465 513
Colombia	55 821 669	101 802 483	101 802 483	101 802 483	55 821 669	101 802 483	101 802 483	101 802 483
Costa Rica	9 723 350	11 423 090	12 272 960	14 822 570	9 723 350	11 423 090	12 272 960	14 822 570
Czechia	410 400	436 800	456 000	541 200	410 400	436 800	456 000	540 000
Denmark	472 368	544 831	544 831	544 831	436 735	567 565	567 565	567 565
Estonia	21 840	a	a	a	21 840	a	a	a
Finland[1]	39 591	45 387	48 568	51 482	41 570	49 915	52 406	55 551
France[2]	34 945	38 110	39 273	54 861	34 945	38 110	39 273	54 861
Germany	66 461	74 902	78 436	86 186	69 293	77 419	81 121	92 819
Greece	14 094	16 926	18 342	26 838	14 094	16 926	18 342	26 838
Hungary	7 387 248	7 524 336	7 653 264	7 503 200	7 387 248	7 524 336	7 653 264	7 653 264
Iceland	8 963 578	9 048 086	9 438 904	9 639 298	8 041 044	9 734 924	10 213 362	10 213 362
Ireland	42 853	58 889	67 942	83 439	42 853	58 889	67 942	83 439
Israel	130 303	159 594	174 162	263 374	145 102	178 041	195 468	269 037
Italy	27 079	29 895	32 892	40 309	27 187	30 603	33 806	42 116
Japan	4 282 000	5 475 000	6 130 000	7 374 000	4 282 000	5 475 000	6 135 000	7 569 000
Korea	37 936 520	55 520 380	64 832 760	101 595 240	37 637 700	53 878 860	63 015 160	100 483 380
Latvia	16 176	m	m	25 880	16 176	m	m	25 880
Lithuania	23 522	24 281	27 049	30 779	23 522	24 281	27 049	30 779
Luxembourg	92 441	115 551	127 514	160 683	92 440	115 551	127 514	160 683
Mexico	417 678	519 702	647 900	803 637	701 637	805 031	859 244	859 244
Netherlands	48 975	74 721	85 499	99 994	48 975	74 721	85 499	99 994
New Zealand	61 329	97 920	97 920	97 920	64 083	103 086	103 086	103 086
Norway	614 100	638 400	638 400	685 400	614 100	695 000	695 000	778 000
Poland	65 248	77 376	94 012	97 981	65 248	77 376	94 012	97 981
Portugal	25 101	30 131	31 874	52 669	25 101	30 131	31 874	52 669
Slovak Republic	13 938	15 672	16 050	17 952	13 938	15 672	16 050	17 952
Slovenia	23 739	33 182	40 146	48 585	23 739	33 182	40 146	48 585
Spain	39 294	42 768	45 572	56 077	39 294	42 768	45 572	56 077
Sweden[3, 4, 5]	459 600	504 000	528 660	603 600	468 000	509 400	532 800	610 800
Switzerland	93 700	121 300	m	142 300	104 500	134 200	m	159 100
Türkiye	626 524	672 331	703 084	805 001	626 524	672 331	703 084	805 001
United States[5]	51 844	72 324	78 231	89 037	54 288	71 005	78 458	85 609
Other economies								
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	41 501	51 921	58 394	73 497	51 658	65 709	74 865	93 179
French Comm. (Belgium)	39 283	49 058	55 201	67 488	48 808	62 144	70 835	85 319
England (UK)	32 701	a	50 464	50 464	32 701	a	50 464	50 464
Scotland (UK)	40 305	50 589	50 589	50 589	40 305	50 589	50 589	50 589

Partner and/or accession countries	Lower secondary, general programmes				Upper secondary, general programmes			
	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale	Starting salary	Salary after 10 years of experience	Salary after 15 years of experience	Salary at top of scale
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Argentina	8 465 405	9 728 776	10 376 803	12 404 126	8 465 405	9 728 776	10 376 803	12 404 126
Brazil	64 904	m	m	m	64 904	m	m	m
Bulgaria	13 075	13 486	14 007	m	13 075	13 486	14 007	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	23 362	24 408	24 989	27 895	23 362	24 408	24 989	27 895
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	43 008	m	m	89 218	43 008	m	m	89 218
Romania	77 352	96 864	100 536	110 170	77 352	96 864	100 536	110 170
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	218 640	341 232	438 000	494 400	218 640	341 232	438 000	494 400

Note: The definition of teachers' most prevalent qualifications is based on a broad concept, including the typical ISCED level of attainment and other criteria. The most prevalent qualification is defined for each of the four career stages included in this table. In many cases, the minimum qualification is the same as the most prevalent qualification. The minimum and the most prevalent qualifications are described in Table D.D3.3 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

1. Data on pre-primary education include salaries of kindergarten teachers (the majority).
2. Data include the average of fixed bonuses for overtime hours for lower and upper secondary teachers.
3. Year of reference: 2024 (calendar year).
4. Data exclude the social security contributions and pension scheme contributions paid by employees.
5. Actual salaries (including teachers of general subjects within vocational programmes in Sweden, and excluding bonuses and allowances in the United States).

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Table X2.5. Trends in teachers' statutory starting salaries, in national currencies (2000 and 2005 to 2025)

Annual statutory starting teachers' salaries in public institutions for teachers with the most prevalent qualifications, by level of education

	Pre-primary						Primary					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(1)	(2)	(7)	(12)	(17)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(29)	(34)	(39)	(44)
OECD Countries												
Australia	m	m	m	63 821	70 819	88 547	m	m	m	63 257	71 233	85 196
Austria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	29 022	38 414	48 688
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	52 064	52 665	m
Chile	m	m	m	7 569 485	11 654 016	15 546 464	m	m	m	7 569 485	11 654 016	15 546 464
Colombia	m	m	m	22 612 928	34 696 391	55 821 669	m	m	m	22 612 928	34 696 391	55 821 669
Costa Rica	m	m	m	9 122 311	9 342 667	9 342 667	m	m	m	9 122 311	9 435 183	9 435 183
Czechia	m	m	m	242 000	338 400	387 600	m	m	m	251 200	360 000	410 400
Denmark	m	m	m	m	350 646	410 929	m	m	m	m	404 229	470 655
Estonia	m	m	m	a	a	m	m	m	m	10 400	15 520	21 840
Finland	m	m	m	28 611	29 201	33 447	m	m	m	32 412	33 140	37 116
France	20 181	21 031	22 026	24 595	26 197	32 264	20 181	21 031	22 026	24 595	26 197	32 264
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	44 860	51 695	59 979
Greece	m	m	m	13 104	13 104	14 094	m	m	m	13 104	13 104	14 094
Hungary	m	m	m	1 922 004	2 527 200	7 242 400	m	m	m	1 922 004	2 527 200	7 242 400
Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	8 963 578	m	m	m	m	m	8 963 578
Ireland	a	a	a	a	a	a	m	m	m	30 702	36 953	41 383
Israel	m	m	m	98 968	108 318	149 362	m	m	m	85 936	95 287	129 659
Italy	m	m	m	23 051	24 297	25 195	m	m	m	23 051	24 297	25 195
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	3 266 000	3 529 000	4 282 000
Korea	m	m	m	28 824 720	32 614 440	37 637 700	m	m	m	28 824 720	32 614 440	37 637 700
Latvia	m	m	m	4 860	9 000	17 488	m	m	m	4 860	9 000	16 176
Lithuania	m	m	m	m	10 476	23 522	m	m	m	m	14 573	23 522
Luxembourg	m	m	m	67 129	67 391	81 565	m	m	m	67 129	67 391	81 565
Mexico	m	m	m	164 657	230 295	334 182	m	m	m	164 657	230 295	334 182
Netherlands	m	m	m	32 562	39 504	48 852	m	m	m	32 562	39 504	48 852
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	46 117	54 318	61 329

	Pre-primary						Primary					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(1)	(2)	(7)	(12)	(17)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(29)	(34)	(39)	(44)
Norway	m	m	m	364 500	410 000	507 400	m	m	m	425 650	489 700	614 100
Poland	m	m	m	29 044	35 880	65 248	m	m	m	29 044	35 880	65 248
Portugal	m	m	m	21 960	22 351	25 101	m	m	m	21 960	22 351	25 101
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	6 222	8 592	11 256	m	m	m	6 960	10 646	13 938
Slovenia	m	m	m	16 864	19 529	23 739	m	m	m	16 864	19 529	23 739
Spain	m	m	m	28 129	30 550	35 030	m	m	m	28 129	30 550	35 030
Sweden[1]	m	m	m	330 000	397 200	m	m	m	m	330 000	402 000	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	72 200	74 900	80 400	m	m	m	79 053	80 300	83 100
Türkiye	m	m	m	39 802	72 036	626 524	m	m	m	39 802	72 036	626 524
United States[1, 2]	m	m	m	43 570	41 427	51 746	m	m	m	42 563	49 494	59 005
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	m	m	33 061	41 501	m	m	m	m	33 061	41 501
French Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	m	m	32 010	39 283	m	m	m	m	32 010	39 283
England (UK)	m	m	m	22 023	25 305	32 701	m	m	m	22 023	25 305	32 701
Scotland (UK)	m	m	m	21 867	32 034	40 305	m	m	m	21 867	32 034	40 305
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	11 477 743	m	m	m	m	m	11 386 289
Brazil	m	m	13 662	25 570	38 483	64 904	m	m	13 662	25 570	38 483	64 904
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	13 075	m	m	m	m	m	13 075
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	23 362
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	43 008	m	m	m	m	m	43 008
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	77 352	m	m	m	m	m	77 352
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	256 920	m	m	m	m	m	256 920

	Lower secondary, general programmes						Upper secondary, general programmes					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(45)	(46)	(51)	(56)	(61)	(66)	(67)	(68)	(73)	(78)	(83)	(88)
OECD Countries												
Australia	m	m	m	63 213	71 230	85 077	m	m	m	63 213	71 230	85 077
Austria	m	m	m	30 340	38 224	48 688	m	m	m	31 775	38 325	48 688
Canada	m	m	m	52 064	52 665	m	m	m	m	52 064	52 665	m
Chile	m	m	m	7 569 485	11 654 016	15 546 464	m	m	m	7 756 420	12 051 072	16 076 048
Colombia	m	m	m	22 612 928	34 696 391	55 821 669	m	m	m	22 612 928	34 696 391	55 821 669
Costa Rica	m	m	m	12 657 737	9 723 350	9 723 350	m	m	m	12 657 737	9 723 350	9 723 350
Czechia	m	m	m	251 200	360 000	410 400	m	m	m	251 200	360 000	410 400
Denmark	m	m	m	m	406 280	472 368	m	m	m	m	382 229	436 735
Estonia	m	m	m	10 400	15 520	21 840	m	m	m	10 400	15 520	21 840
Finland	m	m	m	35 005	35 792	39 591	m	m	m	37 120	37 954	41 570
France	21 278	22 173	23 220	26 686	28 735	34 945	21 278	22 173	23 220	26 686	28 735	34 945
Germany	m	m	m	50 448	57 311	66 461	m	m	m	50 764	59 935	69 293
Greece	m	m	m	13 104	13 104	14 094	m	m	m	13 104	13 104	14 094
Hungary	m	m	m	1 922 004	2 527 200	7 387 248	m	m	m	2 105 922	2 527 200	7 387 248
Iceland	m	m	m	m	6 854 066	8 963 578	m	m	m	m	m	8 041 044
Ireland	m	m	m	30 702	36 953	42 853	m	m	m	30 702	36 953	42 853
Israel	m	m	m	86 414	95 764	130 303	m	m	m	89 187	115 820	145 102
Italy	m	m	m	24 849	26 114	27 079	m	m	m	24 849	26 114	27 187
Japan	m	m	m	3 266 000	3 529 000	4 282 000	m	m	m	3 266 000	3 529 000	4 282 000
Korea	m	m	m	28 884 720	32 674 440	37 936 520	m	m	m	28 164 720	31 954 440	37 637 700
Latvia	m	m	m	4 860	9 000	16 176	m	m	m	4 860	9 000	16 176
Lithuania	m	m	m	m	14 573	23 522	m	m	m	m	14 573	23 522
Luxembourg	m	m	m	77 897	76 376b	92 441	m	m	m	77 897	76 376	92 440
Mexico	m	m	m	211 345	292 733	417 678	m	m	m	409 330	563 277	701 637
Netherlands	m	m	m	34 840	39 806	48 975	m	m	m	34 840	39 806	48 975
New Zealand	m	m	m	47 700	54 318	61 329	m	m	m	49 282	54 318	64 083
Norway	m	m	m	425 650	489 700	614 100	m	m	m	477 700	531 700	633 600
Poland	m	m	m	29 044	35 880	65 248	m	m	m	29 044	35 880	65 248
Portugal	m	m	m	21 960	22 351	25 101	m	m	m	21 960	22 351	25 101

	Lower secondary, general programmes						Upper secondary, general programmes					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(45)	(46)	(51)	(56)	(61)	(66)	(67)	(68)	(73)	(78)	(83)	(88)
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	6 960	10 646	13 938	m	m	m	6 960	10 646	13 938
Slovenia	m	m	m	16 864	19 529	23 739	m	m	m	16 864	19 529	23 739
Spain	m	m	m	31 415	34 121	39 294	m	m	m	31 415	34 121	39 294
Sweden[1]	m	m	m	330 000	414 000	m	m	m	m	342 000	416 400	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	89 509	89 500	93 700	m	m	m	100 477	100 800	104 500
Türkiye	m	m	m	41 197	74 547	626 524	m	m	m	41 197	74 547	626 524
United States[1, 2]	m	m	m	44 322	49 211	60 835	m	m	m	43 678	49 710	58 027
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	m	m	33 061	41 501	m	m	m	m	41 246	51 658
French Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	m	m	32 010	39 283	m	m	m	m	39 817	48 808
England (UK)	m	m	m	22 023	25 305	32 701	m	m	m	22 023	25 305	32 701
Scotland (UK)	m	m	m	21 867	32 034	40 305	m	m	m	21 867	32 034	40 305
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	8 465 405	m	m	m	m	m	8 465 405
Brazil	m	m	13 662	25 570	38 483	64 904	m	m	13 662	25 570	38 483	64 904
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	13 075	m	m	m	m	m	13 075
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	23 362	m	m	m	m	m	23 362
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	43 008	m	m	m	m	m	43 008
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	77 352	m	m	m	m	m	77 352
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	256 920	m	m	m	m	m	256 920

Note: Data on salaries for countries now in the euro area are shown in euros. Years 2006 to 2009, 2011 to 2014, 2016 to 2019 and 2021 to 2024 (i.e. Columns 3 to 6, 8 to 11, 13 to 16, 18 to 21, 25 to 28, 30 to 33, 35 to 38, 40 to 43, 47 to 50, 52 to 55, 57 to 60, 62 to 65, 69 to 72, 74 to 77, 79 to 82 and 84 to 87) are available for consultation online. The definition of teachers' most prevalent qualifications is based on a broad concept, including the typical ISCED level of attainment and other criteria. The most prevalent qualification is defined for the career stage included in this table. In many cases, the minimum qualification is the same as the most prevalent qualification. The minimum and the most prevalent qualifications are described in Table D.D3.3 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

1. Actual salaries (including teachers of general subjects within vocational programmes in Sweden, and excluding bonuses and allowances in the United States).

2. The most prevalent qualification for pre-primary and primary teachers in 2000 was a bachelor's degree or equivalent (ISCED 6), and a master's degree or equivalent (ISCED 7) in subsequent years

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Table X2.6. Trends in teachers' statutory salaries after 15 years of experience, in national currencies (2000 and 2005 to 2025)

Annual statutory teachers' salaries in public institutions for teachers with 15 years of experience and the most prevalent qualifications, by level of education

	Pre-primary						Primary					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(1)	(2)	(7)	(12)	(17)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(29)	(34)	(39)	(44)
OECD Countries												
Australia	m	62 240	74 125	91 291	106 583	126 640	m	62 240	75 382	91 805	102 380	121 683
Austria[1]	m	31 050	35 526	m	m	m	25 826	31 050	35 526	38 225	46 156	57 821
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	87 202	93 640	104 441
Chile	m	m	9 154 829	11 449 961	17 528 510	23 339 054	m	m	9 154 829	11 449 961	17 528 510	23 339 054
Colombia	m	m	m	41 239 431	63 276 168	101 802 483	m	m	m	41 239 431	63 276 168	101 802 483
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	11 790 217	11 790 217	m	m	m	m	11 907 513	11 907 513
Czechia	m	m	m	251 160	358 800	409 200	m	m	m	272 200	399 600	456 000
Denmark	m	m	m	m	397 756	464 413	m	m	m	m	465 241	540 356
Estonia	m	m	m	a	a	a	3 068	4 379	7 728	m	a	a
Finland	19 956	23 333	28 331	30 900	31 966	36 817	24 961	30 791	37 769	39 769	40 824	45 311
France	27 151	28 290	29 610	30 140	32 583	36 591	27 151	28 290	29 610	30 140	32 583	36 591
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	43 320	47 647	56 267	63 484	71 844
Greece	16 292	21 237	25 001	17 592	17 352	18 342	16 292	21 237	25 001	17 592	17 352	18 342
Hungary	751 668	1 739 076	1 780 884	2 884 041	3 178 980	7 503 200	897 168	1 944 576	1 916 568	2 884 041	3 178 980	7 503 200
Iceland	m	2 821 586	3 901 395	m	6 676 644	9 438 904	m	3 100 440	4 264 973	m	6 630 444	9 438 904
Ireland	a	a	a	a	a	a	33 370	48 206	57 390	57 390	62 072	66 025
Israel	72 174	82 076	99 707	145 012	158 912	191 203	75 912	82 179	115 299	130 922	138 394	169 591
Italy	m	25 234	27 645	27 845	29 162	30 271	20 849	25 234	27 645	27 845	29 162	30 271
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	5 774 000	5 699 000	5 841 000	6 130 000
Korea	m	38 608 000	42 003 257	50 422 920	57 579 740	63 015 160	m	39 712 000	42 003 257	50 422 920	57 579 740	63 015 160
Latvia	1 321	2 321	4 069	5 040	a	m	1 321	2 321	4 069	5 040	a	m
Lithuania	m	m	m	6 220	13 158	27 049	m	m	m	9 031	16 727	27 049
Luxembourg	m	62 139	93 182	106 536	98 391	119 086	m	62 139	93 182	106 536	98 391	119 086
Mexico	110 833	159 128	208 871	272 901	364 137	511 572	110 833	159 128	208 871	272 901	364 137	501 685
Netherlands	m	m	m	49 002	60 939	79 588	m	m	m	49 002	60 939	79 588
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	69 099	83 000	97 920
Norway	m	287 000	353 700	419 500	500 000	578 600	m	327 500	386 000	460 850	536 800	638 400

	Pre-primary						Primary					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(1)	(2)	(7)	(12)	(17)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(29)	(34)	(39)	(44)
Poland	m	31 216	40 120	47 645	58 441	94 012	m	31 216	40 120	47 645	58 441	94 012
Portugal	m	24 759	27 038	26 321	28 857	31 874	m	24 759	27 038	26 321	28 857	31 874
Slovak Republic	m	m	6 136	7 160	10 036	13 152	m	m	7 492	9 794	12 258	16 050
Slovenia	m	m	26 635	24 607	28 275	38 746	14 123	21 465	27 164	25 550	29 333	40 146
Spain	m	28 122	33 889	32 389	35 339	40 633	m	28 122	33 889	32 389	35 339	40 633
Sweden[2]	m	261 000	m	354 600	420 144	m	m	283 200	m	379 200	463 200	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	4 560	16 464	27 701	42 367	77 517	703 084	4 560	16 464	27 701	42 367	77 517	703 084
United States[2, 3]	36 758	41 500	m	m	62 193	77 629	38 046	51 413	52 742	60 705	62 102	74 639
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	29 586	35 417	40 042	43 842	46 673	58 394	29 586	35 417	40 042	43 842	46 673	58 394
French Comm. (Belgium)	28 485	33 428	38 610	42 425	45 056	55 201	28 485	33 428	38 610	42 425	45 056	55 201
England (UK)	30 018	33 978	35 929	38 584	41 687	50 464	30 018	33 978	35 929	38 584	41 687	50 464
Scotland (UK)	14 022	29 827	33 666	34 887	40 206	50 589	22 743	29 827	33 666	34 887	40 206	50 589
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	13 745 340	m	m	m	m	m	13 603 338
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	14 007	m	m	m	m	m	14 007
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	24 989
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	100 536	m	m	m	m	m	100 536
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	438 000	m	m	m	m	m	438 000

	Lower secondary, general programmes						Upper secondary, general programmes					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(45)	(46)	(51)	(56)	(61)	(66)	(67)	(68)	(73)	(78)	(83)	(88)
OECD Countries												
Australia	m	62 384	75 382	91 903	96 709	121 331	m	62 384	75 382	91 903	102 467	121 331
Austria[1]	26 916	33 635	38 451	41 334	48 325	60 465	29 728	34 265	41 382	44 500	52 635	65 501
Canada	m	m	m	87 202	93 640	104 441	m	m	m	87 202	93 640	104 441
Chile	m	m	9 154 829	11 449 961	17 528 510	23 339 054	m	m	9 700 782	11 694 832	18 137 514	24 151 330
Colombia	m	m	m	41 239 431	63 276 168	101 802 483	m	m	m	41 239 431	63 276 168	101 802 483
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	12 272 960	12 272 960	m	m	m	m	12 272 960	12 272 960
Czechia	m	m	m	272 200	400 800	456 000	m	m	m	272 200	400 800	456 000
Denmark	m	m	m	m	469 723	544 831	m	m	m	m	496 731	567 565
Estonia	3 068	4 379	7 728	m	a	a	3 068	4 379	7 728	m	a	a
Finland	28 293	34 677	40 791	42 951	44 090	48 568	31 115	36 550	43 168	46 363	47 584	52 406
France	28 249	29 433	30 803	32 231	35 121	39 273	28 249	29 433	30 803	32 231	35 121	39 273
Germany	m	46 842	52 784	61 058	69 508	78 436	m	53 096	57 150	64 767	71 880	81 121
Greece	16 292	21 237	25 001	17 592	17 352	18 342	16 292	21 237	25 001	17 592	17 352	18 342
Hungary	897 168	1 944 576	1 916 568	2 884 041	3 178 980	7 653 264	1 128 996	2 432 388	2 262 636	3 171 916	3 532 200	7 653 264
Iceland	m	3 100 440	4 264 973	m	6 630 444	9 438 904	m	3 198 000	4 104 000	m	7 187 328	10 213 362
Ireland	33 729	48 725	57 981	57 981	62 663	67 942	33 729	48 725	57 981	57 981	62 663	67 942
Israel	76 995	83 744	104 947	143 219	153 229	174 162	75 873	81 353	95 187	119 107	149 269	195 468
Italy	22 836	27 487	30 121	30 340	31 707	32 892	23 518	28 259	30 966	31 189	32 588	33 806
Japan	m	m	5 774 000	5 699 000	5 841 000	6 130 000	m	m	5 774 000	5 699 000	5 841 000	6 135 000
Korea	m	39 616 000	41 907 257	50 482 920	57 639 740	64 832 760	m	39 616 000	41 907 257	49 762 920	56 919 740	63 015 160
Latvia	1 321	2 321	4 069	5 040	a	m	1 321	2 321	4 069	5 040	a	m
Lithuania	m	m	m	9 031	16 727	27 049	m	m	m	9 031	16 727	27 049
Luxembourg	m	81 258	99 782	111 118	106 005	127 514	m	81 258	99 782	111 118	106 005	127 514
Mexico	141 093	203 399	268 456	350 283	465 340	647 900	m	m	m	514 509	692 596	859 244
Netherlands	m	m	m	61 556	69 554	85 499	m	m	m	61 556	69 554	85 499
New Zealand	m	m	m	71 780	83 000	97 920	m	m	m	74 460	83 000	103 086
Norway	m	327 500	386 000	460 850	536 800	638 400	m	364 000	434 700	524 400	588 100	695 000
Poland	m	31 216	40 120	47 645	58 441	94 012	m	31 216	40 120	47 645	58 441	94 012
Portugal	m	24 759	27 038	26 321	28 857	31 874	m	24 759	27 038	26 321	28 857	31 874
Slovak Republic	m	m	7 492	9 794	12 258	16 050	m	m	7 492	9 794	12 258	16 050

	Lower secondary, general programmes						Upper secondary, general programmes					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(45)	(46)	(51)	(56)	(61)	(66)	(67)	(68)	(73)	(78)	(83)	(88)
Slovenia	14 123	21 465	27 164	25 550	29 333	40 146	14 123	21 465	27 164	25 550	29 333	40 146
Spain	m	32 293	38 613	36 153	39 440	45 572	m	32 293	38 613	36 153	39 440	45 572
Sweden[2]	m	290 400	m	387 018	476 886	m	m	313 600	m	401 400	478 800	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	4 813	17 402	28 883	43 762	80 027	703 084	4 813	17 402	28 883	43 762	80 027	703 084
United States[2, 3]	43 834	47 215	55 919	62 369	66 105	78 231	43 918	49 467	55 724	61 327	65 248	78 458
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	31 191	35 417	40 042	43 842	46 673	58 394	39 886	45 301	51 454	56 311	59 946	74 865
French Comm. (Belgium)	30 327	33 802	38 610	42 425	45 056	55 201	39 040	43 519	49 764	54 499	57 869	70 835
England (UK)	30 018	33 978	35 929	38 584	41 687	50 464	30 018	33 978	35 929	38 584	41 687	50 464
Scotland (UK)	22 743	29 827	33 666	34 887	40 206	50 589	22 743	29 827	33 666	34 887	40 206	50 589
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	10 376 803	m	m	m	m	m	10 376 803
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	14 007	m	m	m	m	m	14 007
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	24 989	m	m	m	m	m	24 989
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	100 536	m	m	m	m	m	100 536
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	438 000	m	m	m	m	m	438 000

Note: Data on salaries for countries now in the euro area are shown in euros. Years 2006 to 2009, 2011 to 2014, 2016 to 2019 and 2021 to 2024 (i.e. Columns 3 to 6, 8 to 11, 13 to 16, 18 to 21, 25 to 28, 30 to 33, 35 to 38, 40 to 43, 47 to 50, 52 to 55, 57 to 60, 62 to 65, 69 to 72, 74 to 77, 79 to 82 and 84 to 87) are available for consultation online. The definition of teachers' most prevalent qualifications is based on a broad concept, including the typical ISCED level of attainment and other criteria. The most prevalent qualification is defined for the career stage included in this table. In many cases, the minimum qualification is the same as the most prevalent qualification. The minimum and the most prevalent qualifications are described in Table D.D3.3 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en).

1. Figures for the pre-primary level refer to primary teachers (in primary schools only) teaching pre-primary classes.

2. Actual salaries (including teachers of general subjects within vocational programmes in Sweden, and excluding bonuses and allowances in the United States).

3. The most prevalent qualification for pre-primary and primary teachers in 2000 was a bachelor's degree or equivalent (ISCED 6), and a master's degree or equivalent (ISCED 7) in subsequent years

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Table X2.7. Trends in teachers' average actual salaries, in national currencies (2000, 2005 and 2010 to 2025

Annual average salaries (including bonuses and allowances) of teachers aged 25-64, by level of education

	Pre-primary						Primary					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(8)	(13)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(26)	(31)	(36)
OECD Countries												
Australia	m	m	77 641	m	101 104	119 546	m	m	78 352	81 730	93 686	110 585
Austria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	47 416b	51 860	65 851
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile	m	m	m	11 494 412	m	m	m	m	m	11 258 028	m	m
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	14 012 470	14652 558	m	m	m	m	14 691 156	15 053 641
Czechia	m	m	228 603	277 809	415 700	m	m	m	290 682	325 614	515 600	m
Denmark	m	m	m	m	393 200	465 990	m	m	m	m	477 308	552 932
Estonia	m	m	m	8 807	14 814	21 616	m	m	m	13 254	19 387	28 529
Finland[2]	m	m	29 759	32 637	34 406	41 608	28 723	35 654	40 458	44 085	45 301	52 272
France	m	m	31 467	33 835	38 202	m	m	m	30 881	32 978	37 111	m
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	53 610	60 792	69 453
Greece	m	m	m	16 085	17 328	18 746	m	m	m	16 085	17 328	18 746
Hungary	m	m	2 217 300	3 238 584	3 939 026	8836 398	m	m	2 473 800	3 373 500	4 111 792	9 220 606
Iceland[2]	m	m	m	5 261 000	6 772 000	10269 000	m	m	m	5 966 000	7 450 000	10 669 000
Ireland	a	a	a	a	a	a	m	m	m	m	58 975	69 747
Israel	m	m	110 959	161 247	169 452	209 127	m	m	123 151	162 049	175 071	207 097
Italy	m	m	25 774	28 672	29 157	32 100	m	m	25 774	28 672	29 157	32 100
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	m	m	m	7 435	11 913	18 124	m	m	m	9 981	15 278	20 516
Lithuania	m	m	m	9 732	18 576	34 148	m	m	m	9 732	18 576	34 148
Luxembourg	m	m	88 315	93 705	m	m	m	m	88 315	93 705	m	m
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	m	m	43 374	45 126	56 127	73 378	m	m	43 374	45 126	56 127	73 378
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	68 833	82 876	101 071
Norway	m	289 548	368 580	448 797	518 890	625 785	m	348 877	422 930	505 878	572 804	696 623

	Pre-primary						Primary					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(8)	(13)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(26)	(31)	(36)
Poland	m	m	40 626	49 856	m	103 137	m	m	46 862	57 738	m	120 281
Portugal	m	m	m	31 234	33 805	38 373	m	m	m	28 561	30 502	36 011
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	8 986	13 144	18 466	m	m	m	12 185	17 089	22 936
Slovenia[2]	m	m	m	17 349	22 298	m	m	m	m	24 069	27 426	m
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden	204 516	252 268	296 997	343 285	403 158	m	239 887	288 154	323 621	378 684	457 892	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	m	m	m	m	m	836 661	m	m	m	m	m	836 661
United States	38 028	40 268	48 103	50 946	54 934	68 074	38 746	41 059	49 133	52 516	55 980	69 950
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	41 046	44 357	47 024	60 218	m	m	41 543	44 848	46 582	59 105
French Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	m	42 741	45 634	57 045	m	m	m	42 468	44 623	55 689
England (UK)	22 968	29 418	33 680	33 011	35 748	43 462	22 968	29 418	33 680	33 011	35 748	43 462
Scotland (UK)	m	m	31 884	33 166	37 492	49 367	m	m	31 884	33 166	37 492	49 367
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	56 540	m	m	m	m	m	56 073
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	101 352	m	m	m	m	m	104 909
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

	Lower secondary, general programmes						Upper secondary, general programmes					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(37)	(38)	(39)	(44)	(49)	(54)	(55)	(56)	(57)	(62)	(67)	(72)
OECD Countries												
Australia	m	m	78 221	82 516	95 270	110 742	m	m	78 225	82 542	93 298	110 776
Austria	m	m	m	55 799b	58 483	71 656	m	m	m	60 152b	66 081	77 443
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile	m	m	m	11 325 494	m	m	m	m	m	12 365 587	m	m
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	17 669 394	19 860 790	m	m	m	m	17 669 394	19 860 790
Czechia	m	m	289 771	325 034	512 000	m	m	m	313 534	338 662	537 100	m
Denmark	m	m	m	m	480 476	556 260	m	m	m	m	566 438	641 847
Estonia	m	m	m	13 254	19 387	28 529	m	m	m	13 254	19 387	28 529
Finland[2]	32 919	39 519	44 421	48 497	50 398	57 338	37 728	44 051	49 808	54 378	56 929	64 872
France	m	m	37 232	38 508	41 442	m	m	m	41 794	43 338	45 887	m
Germany	m	m	m	59 153	67 007	76 496	m	m	m	62 760	70 913	80 163
Greece	m	m	m	17 103	18 522	20 347	m	m	m	17 103	18 522	20 347
Hungary	m	m	2 473 800	3 373 500	4 111 792	9 220 606	m	m	2 814 100	3 588 180	4 471 546	9 597 830
Iceland[2]	m	m	m	5 966 000	7 450 000	10 669 000	m	m	5 172 300	7 931 000	9 988 000	13 589 000
Ireland	m	m	m	m	61 414	73 053	m	m	m	m	61 414	73 053
Israel	m	m	126 309	176 907	186 766	215 797	m	m	133 790	160 763	199 084	231 929
Italy	m	m	27 170	28 581	31 269	33 753	m	m	28 986	30 991	33 261	35 901
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Latvia	m	m	m	9 320	15 069	20 516	m	m	m	10 430	16 499	20 556
Lithuania	m	m	m	9 732	18 576	34 148	m	m	m	9 732	18 576	34 148
Luxembourg	m	m	101 471	106 650	m	m	m	m	101 471	106 650	m	m
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	m	m	52 831	56 796	65 212	79 618	m	m	52 831	56 796	65 212	79 618
New Zealand	m	m	m	70 223	82 965	101 273	m	m	m	74 624	89 382	106 127
Norway	m	348 877	422 930	505 878	572 804	696 623	m	372 694	449 704	555 315	621 412	755 575
Poland	m	m	47 410	58 907	m	125 508	m	m	46 147	57 837	m	125 145
Portugal	m	m	m	27 903	29 686	35 752	m	m	m	30 431	32 093	38 197
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	12 185	17 089	22 936	m	m	m	12 176	17 737	24 465

	Lower secondary, general programmes						Upper secondary, general programmes					
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
	(37)	(38)	(39)	(44)	(49)	(54)	(55)	(56)	(57)	(62)	(67)	(72)
Slovenia[2]	m	m	m	24 504	27 918	m	m	m	m	25 989	29 409	m
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden	247 793	290 058	324 639	389 624	476 260	m	265 488	315 592	347 967	405 662	484 829	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	m	m	m	m	m	789 437	m	m	m	m	m	789 437
United States	39 500	41 873	50 158	53 548	58 625	72 439	41 124	43 588	52 188	55 328	61 162	74 850
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	41 277	43 718	46 590	59 602	m	m	54 381	56 594	55 965	71 631
French Comm. (Belgium)	m	m	m	41 586	43 463	54 609	m	m	m	53 006	55 100	67 781
England (UK)	25 347	32 355	36 173	36 650	39 860	51 778	25 347	32 355	36 173	36 650	39 860	51 778
Scotland (UK)	m	m	31 884	33 166	37 492	49 367	m	m	31 884	33 166	37 492	49 367
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	54 245	m	m	m	m	m	54 245
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	105 831	m	m	m	m	m	107 757
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

Note: Years 2011 to 2014, 2016 to 2019 and 2021 to 2024 (i.e. Columns 4 to 7, 9 to 12, 14 to 17, 22 to 25, 27 to 30, 32 to 35, 40 to 43, 45 to 48, 50 to 53, 58 to 61, 63 to 66 and 68 to 71) are available for consultation online. See explanations on the break in the time series in Table D.D3.12 in *Education at a Glance 2026 Sources, Methodologies and Technical Notes* (https://doi.org/10.1787/dcf64a14-en)

1. Data on salaries for countries now in the euro area are shown in euros.

2. Data on teachers in pre-primary education include the data for teachers in early childhood education and care.

The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Table X2.8. Distribution of school heads aged 25-64, by educational attainment and level of education (2025)

	Purchasing power parity (PPP) for private consumption[1]					Deflators for private consumption (2015 = 100)								Reference year for statutory salary data	Reference year for actual salary data
	2023	2024	2025	Jan 2024	Jan 2025	Jan 2000	Jan 2005	Jan 2010	Jan 2015	Jan 2020	Jan 2023	Jan 2024	Jan 2025		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)= ((1)+(2))/2	(5)= ((2)+(3))/2	(6)	(7)	(12)	(17)	(22)	(25)	(26)	(26)	(26)	(0)
OECD Countries															
Australia	1.40	1.43	1.43	1.41	1.43	68	78	91	100	107	119	125	129	2025	2025
Austria	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	75	82	90	100	109	124	131	135	2024/2025	2024/2025
Canada	1.23	1.24	1.24	1.23	1.24	80	87	93	100	106	118	122	125	2024/2025	m
Chile	472.40	464.88	464.88	468.64	464.88	58	68	83	100	116	143	152	159	2025	2023
Colombia	1 520.22	1 542.19	1 542.19	1 531.21	1 542.19	48	66	83	100	123	156	166	174	2025	m
Costa Rica	339.93	328.05	328.05	333.99	328.05	28	52	83	100	110	126	126	125	2025	2025
Czechia	14.19	14.33	14.33	14.26	14.33	75	83	94	100	112	141	149	154	2024/2025	2023/2024
Denmark	6.80	6.76	6.76	6.78	6.76	77	84	93	100	103	114	117	120	2024/2025	2024/2025
Estonia	0.64	0.65	0.65	0.64	0.65	57	68	86	100	113	143	152	157	2024/2025	2024/2025
Finland	0.80	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	76	82	90	100	104	116	119	120	2024/2025	2024/2025
France	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	82	89	96	100	104	115	120	122	2024/2025	2023
Germany	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	81	87	93	100	106	121	127	130	2024/2025	2024/2025
Greece	0.55	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.56	78	86	99	100	98	107	110	113	2024/2025	2024/2025
Hungary	182.53	189.31	189.31	185.92	189.31	51	70	88	100	115	151	167	178	2024/2025	2024/2025
Iceland	151.20	156.03	156.03	153.61	156.03	44	55	83	100	115	134	142	149	2024/2025	2024/2025
Ireland	0.89	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	83	97	95	100	106	122	130	134	2024/2025	2024/2025
Israel	3.56	3.61	3.61	3.58	3.61	76	82	92	100	100	109	114	116	2024/2025	2024/2025
Italy	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.63	74	84	93	100	104	116	120	122	2024/2025	2024/2025
Japan	99.19	99.38	99.38	99.29	99.38	107	103	100	100	102	107	110	112	2024/2025	m
Korea	883.11	872.47	872.47	877.79	872.47	67	79	90	100	107	117	120	122	2025	m
Latvia	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	53	66	94	100	110	134	141	146	2024/2025	2024/2025
Lithuania	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	70	70	92	100	110	143	150	153	2024/2025	2024/2025
Luxembourg	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	75	84	92	100	107	118	123	126	2024/2025	m
Mexico	10.50	10.80	10.80	10.65	10.80	47	62	83	100	123	146	151	158	2024/2025	m
Netherlands	0.74	0.74	0.74	0.74	0.74	75	86	93	100	108	127	133	136	2024/2025	2024/2025
New Zealand	1.48	1.50	1.50	1.49	1.50	77	83	94	100	106	120	125	128	2025	2025
Norway	9.38	9.54	9.54	9.46	9.54	76	83	92	100	112	127	134	137	2024/2025	2024/2025
Poland	1.99	2.01	2.01	2.00	2.01	67	81	92	100	107	137	145	151	2024/2025	2024/2025

	Purchasing power parity (PPP) for private consumption[1]					Deflators for private consumption (2015 = 100)								Reference year for statutory salary data	Reference year for actual salary data
	2023	2024	2025	Jan 2024	Jan 2025	Jan 2000	Jan 2005	Jan 2010	Jan 2015	Jan 2020	Jan 2023	Jan 2024	Jan 2025		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)= ((1)+(2))/2	(5)= ((2)+(3))/2	(6)	(7)	(12)	(17)	(22)	(25)	(26)	(26)	(26)	(0)
Portugal	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.56	72	85	94	100	106	119	123	127	2024/2025	2024/2025
Slovak Republic	0.54	0.55	0.55	0.54	0.55	61	80	92	100	106	130	138	143	2024/2025	2024/2025
Slovenia	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58	63	82	94	100	104	122	128	131	2024/2025	2023/2024
Spain	0.58	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	71	83	94	100	104	117	121	125	2024/2025	m
Sweden	8.52	8.58	8.58	8.55	8.58	82	88	96	100	108	123	128	132	2024/2025	2024/2025
Switzerland	1.16	1.11	1.11	1.13	1.11	95	98	103	100	100	104	105	106	2024/2025	m
Türkiye	7.70	12.55	12.55	10.12	12.55	13	48	70	100	171	522	835	1 228	2024/2025	2024/2025
United States	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	75	83	92	100	107	122	126	129	2024/2025	2024/2025
Other economies															
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)[1]	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	75	83	92	100	108	127	132	135	2024/2025	2024/2025
French Comm. (Belgium)[1]	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	75	83	92	100	108	127	132	135	2024/2025	2024/2025
England (UK)[1]	0.67	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.68	77	82	91	100	107	123	129	134	2024/2025	2024/2025
Scotland (UK)[1]	0.67	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.68	77	82	91	100	107	123	129	134	2024/2025	2024/2025
Partner and/or accession countries															
Argentina	139.81	419.90	419.90	279.85	419.90	10	16	31	100	519	2 561	7 446	13 548	2025	m
Brazil	2.49	2.52	2.52	2.51	2.52	33	51	68	100	130	168	175	184	2025	m
Bulgaria	0.38	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.39	62	74	92	100	112	143	152	157	2024/2025	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	0.48	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.49	67	78	93	100	102	122	129	134	2024/2025	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	1.97	1.95	1.95	1.96	1.95	m	m	87	100	112	133	138	141	2025	2025
Romania	1.97	2.06	2.06	2.01	2.06	24	61	86	100	115	145	156	166	2024/2025	2024/2025
Saudi Arabia	1.91	1.88	1.88	1.89	1.88	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	7.60	7.70	7.70	7.65	7.70	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand[2]	10.65	10.49	10.49	10.57	10.49	66	74	89	100	103	110	112	112	2024/2025	m

Note: Values for PPPs and deflators were extracted from the OECD Data Explorer on national accounts on 02 April 2026. As 2025 PPPs were not available on this date, values for 2024 have been used for 2025. Deflators for the years 2006 to 2009, 2011 to 2014, 2016 to 2019 and 2021 to 2022 (i.e. Columns 8 to 11, 13 to 16, 18 to 21 and 23 to 24) are available for consultation online.

1. Data on PPPs and deflators refer to the whole country: Belgium for the Flemish and the French Community of Belgium, and the United Kingdom for England and Scotland.

2. Data on PPPs refer to the corresponding indicator recorded in the World Development Indicator database by the World Bank Group. The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Table X2.9. Distribution of teachers, by minimum or most prevalent qualifications and level of education (2025)

Teachers who have either the minimum or a higher than minimum (and most prevalent) qualification, in public institutions

	Pre-primary			Primary		
	Is there a difference between "minimum" and "most prevalent" qualifications?	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on the minimum qualification for teachers to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on a higher than minimum (and most prevalent) qualification to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Is there a difference between "minimum" and "most prevalent" qualifications?	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on the minimum qualification for teachers to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on a higher than minimum (and most prevalent) qualification to enter the teaching profession in 2025
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
OECD Countries						
Australia	No	100	a	No	100	a
Austria	m	m	m	Yes	40	m
Canada	a	a	a	No	m	a
Chile	No	m	a	No	m	a
Colombia	Yes	10	59	Yes	14	50
Costa Rica	Yes	6	94	Yes	12	79
Czechia	No	100	a	No	100	a
Denmark	No	100	a	No	100	a
Estonia	m	a	a	No	m	a
Finland	No	100	a	No	57	a
France	No	98	a	No	98	a
Germany	m	a	a	No	100	a
Greece	No	100	a	No	100	a
Hungary	No	93	a	No	87	a
Iceland	No	m	a	No	m	a
Ireland	a	a	a	No	34	a
Israel	No	57	a	No	47	a
Italy	No	100	a	No	100	a
Japan	m	a	a	No	m	a
Korea	Yes	m	m	No	m	a
Latvia	No	100	a	No	100	a
Lithuania	No	m	a	No	m	a
Luxembourg	No	70	a	No	84	a
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	No	100	a	No	100	a
New Zealand	a	a	a	No	m	a
Norway	No	100	a	No	11	a
Poland	No	93	a	No	97	a
Portugal	No	100	a	No	100	a
Slovak Republic	No	m	a	No	m	a
Slovenia	No	100	a	No	100	a
Spain	No	100	a	No	100	a
Sweden[1]	No	100	a	No	100	a
Switzerland	No	100	a	No	100	a
Türkiye	No	m	a	No	m	a
United States	No	46	a	Yes	41	50

	Pre-primary			Primary		
	Is there a difference between "minimum" and "most prevalent" qualifications?	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on the minimum qualification for teachers to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on a higher than minimum (and most prevalent) qualification to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Is there a difference between "minimum" and "most prevalent" qualifications?	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on the minimum qualification for teachers to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on a higher than minimum (and most prevalent) qualification to enter the teaching profession in 2025
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Other economies						
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)[2]	No	100	a	No	100	a
French Comm. (Belgium)	No	98	a	No	81	a
England (UK)	No	100	a	No	100	a
Scotland (UK)	No	100	a	No	100	a
Partner and/or accession countries						
Argentina	No	m	a	No	m	a
Brazil	No	m	a	No	m	a
Bulgaria	No	m	a	No	m	a
China	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	a	a	a	No	100	a
India	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	No	m	a	No	m	a
Romania	Yes	2	98	Yes	2	98
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	Yes	100	100	Yes	100	100

	Lower secondary, general programmes			Upper secondary, general programmes		
	Is there a difference between "minimum" and "most prevalent" qualifications?	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on the minimum qualification for teachers to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on a higher than minimum (and most prevalent) qualification to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Is there a difference between "minimum" and "most prevalent" qualifications?	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on the minimum qualification for teachers to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on a higher than minimum (and most prevalent) qualification to enter the teaching profession in 2025
	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD Countries						
Australia	No	100	a	No	100	a
Austria	Yes	38	m	Yes	24	m
Canada	No	m	a	No	m	a
Chile	No	m	a	No	m	a
Colombia	No	53	a	No	x(8)	a
Costa Rica	Yes	9	69	Yes	9	69
Czechia	No	100	a	No	100	a
Denmark	No	100	a	No	100	a
Estonia	No	m	a	No	m	a
Finland	No	90	a	No	97	a
France	No	81	a	No	63	a
Germany	No	100	a	No	100	a
Greece	No	100	a	No	100	a
Hungary	No	50	a	No	93	a
Iceland	No	m	a	No	m	a
Ireland	No	33	a	No	33	a
Israel	Yes	37	m	Yes	40	m
Italy	No	100	a	No	100	a
Japan	No	m	a	No	m	a
Korea	Yes	m	m	Yes	m	m
Latvia	No	100	a	No	100	a
Lithuania	No	m	a	No	m	a
Luxembourg	No	64	a	No	75	a
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	No	100	a	No	100	a
New Zealand	No	m	a	m	m	m
Norway	No	x(5)	a	Yes	6	56
Poland	No	97	a	No	99	a
Portugal	No	100	a	No	100	a
Slovak Republic	No	m	a	No	m	a
Slovenia	No	100	a	No	100	a
Spain	No	100	a	No	100	a
Sweden[1]	No	100	a	No	100	a
Switzerland	No	100	a	No	100	a
Türkiye	No	m	a	No	m	a
United States	Yes	38	51	Yes	32	55
Other economies						
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)[2]	No	94	a	Yes	23	77
French Comm. (Belgium)	No	79	a	Yes	5	79
England (UK)	No	98	a	No	98	a
Scotland (UK)	No	100	a	No	100	a

	Lower secondary, general programmes			Upper secondary, general programmes		
	Is there a difference between "minimum" and "most prevalent" qualifications?	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on the minimum qualification for teachers to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on a higher than minimum (and most prevalent) qualification to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Is there a difference between "minimum" and "most prevalent" qualifications?	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on the minimum qualification for teachers to enter the teaching profession in 2025	Percentage of teachers in a salary range based on a higher than minimum (and most prevalent) qualification to enter the teaching profession in 2025
	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Partner and/or accession countries						
Argentina	No	m	a	No	m	a
Brazil	No	m	a	No	m	a
Bulgaria	No	m	a	No	m	a
China	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	No	100	a	No	100	a
India	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	No	m	a	No	m	a
Romania	No	100	a	No	100	a
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	Yes	100	100	Yes	100	100

Note: See *Definitions* and *Methodology* sections of Chapter D3 for more information.
1. Year of reference: 2024 (calendar year for Sweden).
2. Government-dependent private institutions included. The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Table X2.10. Distribution of teachers aged 25-64, by educational attainment and level of education (2025)

Percentage of teachers

	Pre-primary			Primary			Lower secondary, general programmes			Upper secondary, general programmes		
	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD Countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile[1]	1	99[d]	x(2)	1	99[d]	x(5)	1	99[d]	x(8)	3	97[d]	x(11)
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia[1]	65	24	11	8	6	87	6	7	87	2	4	94
Denmark	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0	0	100
Estonia	22	52	26	10	28	62	7	22	71	4	16	80
Finland	10	81	9	2	1	97	2	1	97	0	0	100
France[1]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	9[d]	58[d]	33[d]	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	6[d]	55[d]	42[d]
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	100	m	m	100	m	m	100
Greece	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	0[d]	75[d]	25[d]	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	0[d]	64[d]	36[d]
Hungary	5	91	4	1[d]	71[d]	28[d]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	0	8	92
Iceland	21	52	28	10[d]	53[d]	36[d]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	16	31	53
Ireland	a	a	a	a	m	m	a	m	m	m	m	m
Israel	1	57	42	2	47	51	1	37	62	4	40	56
Italy	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	16	61	24	0	71	29	0	69	31	0	65	35
Latvia	27	50	24	x(7)	x(8)	x(9)	4[d]	42[d]	54[d]	5	31	65
Lithuania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

	Pre-primary			Primary			Lower secondary, general programmes			Upper secondary, general programmes		
	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	20	68	13	10	75	15	13	69	18	m	m	m
Netherlands	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	0[d]	81[d]	19[d]	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	0[d]	64[d]	36[d]
New Zealand	m	m	m	5	89	6	4	87	9	1	82	17
Norway	5	94	1	5[d]	74[d]	21[d]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	2	45	53
Poland	0	7	93	0	3	97	0	3	97	0	1	99
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia[1]	7	73	21	11	9	81	13	5	82	2	5	94
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden[1]	21	74	5	3	57	40	2	25	73	1	12	87
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	0	45	55	0	40	60	1	37	62	2	31	67
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	1	99	1	1	96	3	4	86	10	1	24	75
French Comm. (Belgium)	1	97	2	2	90	8	2	71	27	1	14	85
England (UK)	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	0[d]	42[d]	58[d]	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	0[d]	21[d]	78[d]
Scotland (UK)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	3	39	58	1	32	67	1	35	64	1	24	74
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

	Pre-primary			Primary			Lower secondary, general programmes			Upper secondary, general programmes		
	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

1. Reference year differs from 2025: 2024 for Czechia, Slovenia and Sweden (calendar year); and 2023 for Chile and France (calendar year).
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Table X2.11. Distribution of school heads aged 25-64, by educational attainment and level of education (2025)

Percentage of school heads

	Pre-primary			Primary			Lower secondary, general programmes			Upper secondary, general programmes		
	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD Countries												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile[1]	0	100[d]	x(2)	0	100[d]	x(5)	0	100[d]	x(8)	0	100[d]	x(11)
Colombia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Costa Rica	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czechia[1]	51	28	21	2	2	96	2	2	96	2	2	96
Denmark	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0	0	100
Estonia	0	21	79	1	7	92	1	6	93	1	1	98
Finland	13	60	27	0	0	100	0	1	99	0	0	100
France[1]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	d	d	d	m	m	m	m	m	m
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	0[d]	55[d]	46[d]	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	0[d]	23[d]	77[d]
Hungary	2	92	6	0[d]	67[d]	33[d]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	0	43	57
Iceland	19	47	34	3	46	51	3	46	51	9	30	61
Ireland	a	a	a	a	m	m	a	m	m	m	m	m
Israel	a	a	a	0	4	96	0	1	99	1	19	80
Italy	a	a	a	a	a	100[d]	a	a	x(6)	a	a	x(6)
Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Korea	1	6	93	0	10	90	0	9	91	0	8	92
Latvia	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	0[d]	19[d]	81[d]

	Pre-primary			Primary			Lower secondary, general programmes			Upper secondary, general programmes		
	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Lithuania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Luxembourg	a	a	a	a	a	a	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Netherlands	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	0[d]	62[d]	38[d]	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	0[d]	48[d]	52[d]
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Norway	5	94	2	2[d]	84[d]	13[d]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	2	48	51
Poland[1]	0	1	99	0[d]	0[d]	100[d]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	0	0	100
Portugal	a	6	94	d	d	d	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	a	xc:1	xc:1
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia[1]	0	47	53	0[d]	1[d]	99[d]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	0	3	97
Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden[1]	32	58	10	8[d]	46[d]	46[d]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	9	22	69
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Türkiye	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	0	2	98	0	2	98	0	2	98	0	2	98
Other economies												
Flemish Comm. (Belgium)	1	94	6	1	94	6	0	61	39	0	11	89
French Comm. (Belgium)	0	94	6	0	92	8	0	66	34	0	27	73
England (UK)	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	0[d]	47[d]	53[d]	x(10)	x(11)	x(12)	0[d]	15[d]	85[d]
Scotland (UK)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Partner and/or accession countries												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Bulgaria	0	12	88	0[d]	5[d]	95[d]	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)	x(4)	x(5)	x(6)
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

	Pre-primary			Primary			Lower secondary, general programmes			Upper secondary, general programmes		
	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent	Short-cycle tertiary or below	Bachelor's or equivalent	Master's or doctoral or equivalent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Croatia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Peru	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	78	18	4
Romania	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Thailand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

1. Reference year differs from 2025: 2024 for Chile, Czechia, Poland, Slovenia and Sweden (calendar year); and 2023 for France (calendar year).
The data for this table can be accessed via https://stat.link/z2esdn.

Contributors to this publication

INES Working Party

Ms. Marisol Acosta (Argentina)	Ms. Camila Neves SOUTO (Brazil)
Ms. María Florencia Álvarez (Argentina)	Mr. Dilyan Atanasov (Bulgaria)
Mr. Nilo Coras Ávila (Argentina)	Ms. Elena Tsankova (Bulgaria)
Mr. Julián Falcone (Argentina)	Ms. Tsveta Kostova-Sevastiyanova (Bulgaria)
Mr. Emiliano Iadevito (Argentina)	Ms. Evelin Jordanova (Bulgaria)
Ms. Agustina Lejarraga (Argentina)	Ms. Ivanka Karamieva – Todorova (Bulgaria)
Ms. Cecilia S. Remorini (Argentina)	Mrs. Aneliya Andreeva (Bulgaria)
Ms. Florencia Sourrouille (Argentina)	Ms. Krassimira Todorova (Bulgaria)
Ms. Mercedes Tarzibachi (Argentina)	Mr. Colin BAILEY (Canada)
Dr. Sarabjot BASRAI (Australia)	Ms. Aissata Foune CISSE (Canada)
Mr. Stuart FAUNT (Australia)	Ms. Yani MO (Canada)
Ms. Manon GAHAN (Australia)	Mr. Marouane MOHAMED (Canada)
Ms. Alex GORDON (Australia)	Ms. Andrija POPOVIC (Canada)
Dr. Caterina HO (Australia)	Dr. Linda WANG (Canada)
Mr. Abel MILES (Australia)	Mr. Graham ZIEGLER (Canada)
Dr. Steve NERLICH (Australia)	Ms. Paola LEIVA (Chile)
Ms. Siobhán PIELOW (Australia)	Ms. Javiera CUEVAS (Chile)
Ms. Ronida GÜLÜM (Austria)	Ms. Claudia NOVOA (Chile)
Mr. Martin MAYERL (Austria)	Ms. Vaness HUENUPI (Chile)
Mr. Mark NÉMET (Austria)	Mr. Juan SALAMANCA (Chile)
Ms. Helga POSSET (Austria)	Ms. Jeimy ARISTIZABAL (Colombia)
Ms. Natascha RIHA (Austria)	Mr. Joan BOFILL (Colombia)
Mr. Anton DERKS (Belgium)	Ms. Johana MARIN (Colombia)
Mr. Philippe DIEU (Belgium)	Mr. Rubén Moreno (Colombia)
Ms. Ruth JANSSENS (Belgium)	Ms. Elsa NELLY VELASCO (Colombia)
Ms. Nathalie JAUNIAUX (Belgium)	Mr. Jonathan David Saavedra RAMIREZ (Colombia)
Mr. Teun PAUWELS (Belgium)	Ms. Carolina CHAVES (Costa Rica)
Mr. Guy STOFFELEN (Belgium)	Ms. Dixie BRENES (Costa Rica)
Mr. Robert THOLEN (Belgium)	Mr. Olman MADRIGAL (Costa Rica)
Ms Melissa Riani Costa MACHADO (Brazil)	Ms. Cinthya PICADO (Costa Rica)
Ms. Rosária Duarte MELO (Brazil)	Ms. Marija GOJEVIĆ (Croatia)
Ms. Juliana MARQUES DA SILVA (Brazil)	Ms. Ana ŠOJAT (Croatia)
Ms. Christyne CARVALHO DA SILVA (Brazil)	Ms. Ivana Pilko Čunčić (Croatia)

Ms. Mia Trcol (Croatia)	Ms. Maria FASSARI (Greece)
Ms. Gordana Bralić (Croatia)	Ms. Lida GEORGIOPOULOU (Greece)
Ms. Josipa Jurić (Croatia)	Ms. Eirini GYFTAKI (Greece)
Mr. Vladimír HULÍK (Czech Republic)	Ms. Vassiliki MAKRI (Greece)
Mr. Václav JELEN (Czech Republic)	Mrs. Theano TYFOXYLOU (Greece)
Ms. Simona PIKÁLKOVÁ (Czech Republic)	Mr. Ábel Ferenc Urbán (Hungary)
Ms. Petra PRCHLÍKOVÁ (Czech Republic)	Ms. Zsófia Ashabere (Hungary)
Mr. Anand ENGBÆK (Denmark)	Mr. Zsombor Kanyári (Hungary)
Ms. Sofie JARLSTRØM CLAUSEN (Denmark)	Ms. Hildur Kristjánsdóttir (Iceland)
Ms. Trine PIEPGRAS CARSTENS (Denmark)	Mr. Anton Örn Karlsson (Iceland)
Mr. Klaus RASMUSSEN (Denmark)	Ms. Emilía Ósk Svavarsdóttir (Iceland)
Mr. Thomas SKJØDT (Denmark)	Ms. Hulda B. Herjolfsdóttir Skogland (Iceland)
Mr. Ken THOMASSEN (Denmark)	Mr. Jason KELLY (Ireland)
Ms. Clara Westphal Jensen (Denmark)	Mr. Paul ALEXANDER (Ireland)
Ms. Marianne Ahle Møller (Denmark)	Mr. Patrick O'Rourke (Ireland)
Mr. Mattias Nørgaard Matsushita (Denmark)	Mr. John Mullane (Ireland)
Ms. Kristel BANKIER (Estonia)	Ms. Sophie ARTSEV (Israel)
Ms. Marianne LEPPIK (Estonia)	Mr. Yoav AZULAY (Israel)
Ms. Käthrin RANDOJA (Estonia)	Ms. Orit BARANY (Israel)
Ms. Kertu VAHER (Estonia)	Ms. Hana COHEN (Israel)
Mr. Jukka HAAPAMÄKI (Finland)	Mr. Yoel FINKEL (Israel)
Ms. Petra PACKALEN (Finland)	Ms. Tsofiya FISHMAN (Israel)
Mr. Mika TUONONEN (Finland)	Ms. Dganit GAILIS (Israel)
Mr. Robert RAKOCEVIC (France)	Mr. Pinhas KLEIN (Israel)
Mr. Emeric CHOBERT--PASSOT (France)	Mr. Aviel KRENTZLER (Israel)
Ms. Mélanie DREGOIR (France)	Mr. Daniel LEVI-MAZLOUM (Israel)
Ms. Valérie LIOGIER (France)	Mr. David MAAGAN (Israel)
Mr. Louis BODELIN (France)	Ms. Iris Avigail MATATYAHU (Israel)
Mr. Louis MEURIC (France)	Mr. Amos MESSIKA (Israel)
Ms. Guillemette BUISSON (France)	Mr. Dov NATAN (Israel)
Ms. Sylvie ROUSSEAU (France)	Mr. Haim PORTNOY (Israel)
Mr. Mathieu ORZONI (France)	Ms. Hagit SARID (Israel)
Mr. Franck SALLES (France)	Ms. Daniela DI ASCENZO (Italy)
Ms. Saskia BADERSCHNEIDER (Germany)	Ms. Claudia PIZZELLA (Italy)
Ms Pia. BRUGGER (Germany)	Mr. Paolo TURCHETTI (Italy)
Ms. Mareen HALLIER (Germany)	Ms. Lucia DE FABRIZIO (Italy)
Ms. Marie LEISTE (Germany)	Ms. Francesca SALVINI (Italy)
Mr. Martin SCHULZE (Germany)	Ms. Maria Teresa MORANA (Italy)
Mr. Hans-Werner FREITAG (Germany)	Ms. Hiroe NODA (Japan)
Ms. Saskia SANDFORTH (Germany)	Mr. Yuki SATO (Japan)
Ms. Anna ANTONIOU (Greece)	Ms. Ayuko TAKATANI (Japan)

Ms. Hitomi MURAI-SUZUKI (Japan)	Mr. Mark ZUIDERWIJK (Netherlands)
Ms. Aya NAGANUMA (Japan)	Mr. Minghong DENG (New Zealand)
Mr. Youngki HUR (Korea)	Ms. Sophie KOSTER (New Zealand)
Ms. Jiyoon JUNG (Korea)	Ms. Marian LOADER (New Zealand)
Ms. Jeeeun MOON (Korea)	Mr. Paul MAHONEY (New Zealand)
Ms. Yelim Yu (Korea)	Mr. Rory SUDFELT (New Zealand)
Mr. Keun-Young PARK (Korea)	Ms. Kristin GÅSEMYR (Norway)
Mr. Changmo YEON (Korea)	Ms. Ane LANDØY (Norway)
Ms. Youngho SON (Korea)	Ms. Hild Marte BJØRNSEN (Norway)
Ms. Hyojin HAN (Korea)	Ms. Sophie SÆTERNES (Norway)
Ms. Eunji LEE (Korea)	Ms. Andrine STENGRUNDET (Norway)
Ms. Jiyoung KIM (Korea)	Mr. José Manuel ARENCIBIA ALEMÁN (Norway)
Mr. Donghyun KIM (Korea)	Ms. Saraí Sirley Valdivia ZAPANA (Perú)
Ms. Jeehye SON (Korea)	Mr. Luis Fernando Manuel Tarazona RAMOS (Perú)
Ms. Haein LEE (Korea)	Mr. Piotr JAWORSKI (Poland)
Ms. Eva BĒRZE (Latvia)	Ms. Renata KARNAS (Poland)
Ms. Iveta BIRZIŅA (Latvia)	Ms. Barbara DŁUŻEWSKA (Poland)
Ms. Ieva ERVALDE (Latvia)	Mr. Andrzej STOLARCZYK (Poland)
Ms. Annika GĒGERMANE (Latvia)	Ms. Joanna WYZINA (Poland)
Ms. Kristīne KNIPELE (Latvia)	Ms. Agnieszka ZALIWSKA-SZYMAŃSKA (Poland)
Mr. Viktors KRAVČENKO (Latvia)	Mr. Nuno Miguel RODRIGUES (Portugal)
Ms. Žanete LARIONOVA (Latvia)	Mr. Joaquim SANTOS (Portugal)
Mr. Andrejs PUDĀNS (Latvia)	Mr. Carlos MALACA (Portugal)
Ms. Evija ZAČA (Latvia)	Ms. Rute NUNES (Portugal)
Mr. Ričardas ALIŠAUSKAS (Lithuania)	Ms. Helena SALEIRO (Portugal)
Ms. Rita DUKYNAITĖ (Lithuania)	Mr. Adrian Barbulescu (Romania)
Ms. Ilona GRIGARAVIČIENĖ (Lithuania)	Ms. Veronica Chirea (Romania)
Ms. Jolita LIEPYTĖ (Lithuania)	Ms. Roxana Mazilescu (Romania)
Ms. Vilma MALINAUSKIENĖ (Lithuania)	Ms. Camelia Mircea-Sturza (Romania)
Ms. Aušra Urbonaitė (Lithuania)	Ms. Dumitra Moldovean (Romania)
Mr. Romain MARTIN (Luxembourg)	Ms. Ana-Maria Vasilescu (Romania)
Ms. Elisa MAZZUCATO (Luxembourg)	Ms. Andoria Ioniță (Romania)
Mr. Bruno RODRIGUES (Luxembourg)	Ms. Gabriela Deacu (Romania)
Ms. Nevena ZHELYAZKOVA (Luxembourg)	Ms. Sultana Stan (Romania)
Mr. Marco CALDERÓN ARGOMEDO (Mexico)	Ms. Liliana Pintilia (Romania)
Ms. Alicia del Rosario NAVA CARDONA (Mexico)	Mr. Adi Trifu (Romania)
Mr. René GÓMORA CASTILLO (Mexico)	Ms. Oana Năstăsescu (Romania)
Mr. Lorenzo VERGARA LÓPEZ (Mexico)	Mrs. Camelia Mircea-Sturza (Romania)
Mr. César MORÓN ROJAS (Mexico)	Mrs. Veronica Chirea (Romania)
Mr. Sake Boerefijn (Netherlands)	Mrs. Roxana Mihail (Romania)
Mr. Dennis VAN GESSEL (Netherlands)	Mrs. Laura Capita (Romania)

Mr. Adrian Barbulescu (Romania)	Ms. Pilar MARTIN JIMENEZ (Spain)
Mrs. Cristina Mangiurea (Romania)	Mr. José María GALLEGO ALONSO-COLMENARES (Spain)
Mr. Florin Popa (Romania)	Mr. Ricardo MARTÍNEZ ZAMORANO (Spain)
Mrs. Marioara Dobrescu (Romania)	Ms. Cristina MONEO OCAÑA (Spain)
Mr. Victor Iliescu (Romania)	Ms. Carmen TOVAR SÁNCHEZ (Spain)
Mrs. Antonela Toma (Romania)	Mr. Jaime VAQUERO JIMÉNEZ (Spain)
Mrs. Dumitra Moldovean (Romania)	MS. Isabel YUN MORENO (Spain)
Mrs. Ana-Maria Radulescu (Romania)	Mr. David VARAS DEL PESO (Spain)
Mr. Virgil Ion (Romania)	Ms. Anna BENGTSSON (Sweden)
Mrs. Gabriela Jitaru (Romania)	Ms. Veronica NELSTRAND BORG (Sweden)
Ms. Eva HLADIKOVA (Slovak Republic)	Mr. Mattias FRITZ (Sweden)
Ms. Miriama CISAROVA (Slovak Republic)	Mr. Alexander GERLINGS (Switzerland)
Mr. Ondrej FERENCI (Slovak Republic)	Ms. Katrin MÜHLEMANN (Switzerland)
Ms. Gabriela SLODICKOVA (Slovak Republic)	Mr. Weerapong UJAREAN (Thailand)
Ms. Ana NOVAK (Slovenia)	Dr. Yusuf CANBOLAT (Türkiye)
Ms. Martina KONTELJ (Slovenia)	Dr. Muzaffer Can DİLEK (Türkiye)
Ms. Petra PEČAN (Slovenia)	Dr. Merve BÜDÜN (Türkiye)
Ms. Andreja KOZMELJ (Slovenia)	Ms. Esra KIRKIL (Türkiye)
Ms. Mojca IFKO PINOSA (Slovenia)	Mr. Murat KAPIKIRAN (Türkiye)
Mr. Nejc JENSTERLE (Slovenia)	Ms. Yasemin YAZICIOĞLU (Türkiye)
Ms. Melita SELJAK (Slovenia)	Mr. Yanhong Zhang (UNESCO)
Ms. Tatjana ŠKRBEC (Slovenia)	Mr. Oscar Milafu Onam (UNESCO)
Ms. Mamphokhu KHULUVHE (South Africa)	Mr. Olivier Labé (UNESCO)
Mr. Bheki MPANZA (South Africa)	Mr. Adolfo Gustavo Imhof (UNESCO)
Ms. Nthabiseng TEMA (South Africa)	Mr. Alasdair Mc William (UNESCO)
Ms. Edzani NETSHIFHEFHE (South Africa)	Ms. Silvia Montoya (UNESCO)
Ms. Rirhandzu BALOYI (South Africa)	Mr. Patrick Searle (United Kingdom)
Dr. Junitha SURJU (South Africa)	Ms. Krystin Allard (United States)
Ms. Ayesha SULEMAN (South Africa)	Mr. Enis Dogan (United States)
Mr. Pablo ESTEBAN MARTÍNEZ (Spain)	Ms. RaeAnne Friesenhahn (United States)
Ms. Raquel HIDALGO GARCÍA (Spain)	Ms. Ashley Roberts (United States)
Mr. Jesús IBAÑEZ MILLA (Spain)	

LSO Network

Ms. Elena Tsankova (Bulgaria)	Mr. Emeric CHOBERT--PASSOT (France)
Ms. Tsveta Kostova-Sevastiyanova (Bulgaria)	Ms. Serena ROSA (France)
Ms. Evelin Jordanova (Bulgaria)	Ms. Laura CASTELL (France)
Ms. Ivanka Karamieva – Todorova (Bulgaria)	Mr. Cyrille GODONOU (France)
Mrs. Aneliya Andreeva (Bulgaria)	Mr. Fabrice MURAT (France)
Ms. Krassimira Todorova (Bulgaria)	Mr Hans-Werner FREITAG (Germany)
Mr. Colin BAILEY (Canada)	Mr. Martin SCHULZE (Germany)
Ms. Aissata Foune CISSE (Canada)	Ms. Anna ANTONIOU (Greece)
Ms. Yani MO (Canada)	Ms. Dimitra Aggelopoulou (Greece)
Mr. Marouane MOHAMED (Canada)	Ms. Maria Fassari (Greece)
Ms. Andrija POPOVIC (Canada)	Ms. Lida GEORGIOPOULOU (Greece)
Dr. Linda WANG (Canada)	Ms. Vassiliki Makri (Greece)
Mr. Graham ZIEGLER (Canada)	Mr. Panagiotis Passas (Greece)
Mr. Vladimir Kvetan (CEDEFOP)	Ms. Eirini Gyftaki (Greece)
Mr. Daniel SCHEUREGGER (CEDEFOP)	Mr. Anton Örn Karlsson (Iceland)
Mr. Marco SERAFINI (CEDEFOP)	Ms. Emilía Ósk Svavarsdóttir (Iceland)
Ms. Paola LEIVA (Chile)	Mr. Jason Kelly (Ireland)
Ms. Javiera CUEVAS (Chile)	Mr. Paul Alexander (Ireland)
Ms. Claudia NOVOA (Chile)	Mr. Patrick O'Rourke (Ireland)
Ms. Vanessa HUENUPI	Ms. Sophie ARTSEV (Israel)
Mr. Carlos GIMENEZ (Colombia)	Ms. Hana COHEN (Israel)
Mr. Camilo MENDEZ (Colombia)	Ms. Tanya BEN-GIGI (Israel)
Ms. Liliana MORALES (Colombia)	Ms. Merav PASTERNAC (Israel)
Mr. Camilo RAMIREZ (Colombia)	Ms. Raffaella CASCIOLI (Italy)
Ms. Mauren GARCÍA (Costa Rica)	Ms. Valentina GUALTIERI (Italy)
Ms. Dianny HERNÁNDEZ (Costa Rica)	Ms. Simona MINEO (Italy)
Ms. Anita PAVLOVIĆ (Croatia)	Mr. Gaetano PROTO (Italy)
Mr. Vladimír HULÍK (Czech Republic)	Mr. Youngki HUR (Korea)
Mr. Václav JELEN (Czech Republic)	Ms. Jiyoon JUNG (Korea)
Ms. Simona PIKÁLKOVÁ (Czech Republic)	Ms. Jeeeun MOON (Korea)
Ms. Petra PRCHLÍKOVÁ (Czech Republic)	Mr. Myunghwan YOO (Korea)
Ms. Trine Piepgras CARSTENS (Denmark)	Ms. Inyoung HWANG (Korea)
Mr. Thomas SKJØDT(Denmark)	Ms. Yelim Yu (Korea)
Ms. Marianne LEPPIK (Estonia)	Mr. Keun-Young PARK (Korea)
Ms. Elodie CAYOTTE (Eurostat, European Commission)	Mr. Donghyun KIM (Korea)
Ms. Sabine GAGEL (Eurostat, European Commission)	Ms. Sandra CERIŅA (Latvia)
Mr. Mika WITTING (Finland)	Ms. Gunita VIRSNĪTE (Latvia)
Mr. Allan Seuri (Finland)	Ms. Ugnė CIBULSKAITĖ (Lithuania)
Mr. Robert RAKOCEVIC (France)	Ms. Jolita GALECKIENĖ (Lithuania)

Ms. Liucija JASIUKEVIČIENĖ (Lithuania)
Ms. Evelina RAUDYTĖ-LIPEIKIENĖ (Lithuania)
Ms. Lolita ŠIAUČIULYTĖ (Lithuania)
Ms. Elisa MAZZUCATO (Luxembourg)
Ms. Nevena ZHELYAZKOVA (Luxembourg)
Mr. Gerardo H. TERRAZAS GONZÁLEZ (Mexico)
Mr. Andre DE MOOR (Netherlands)
Ms. Teja OUWEHAND (Netherlands)
Ms. Francis van der Mooren (Netherlands)
Mr. Asaad Ali (New Zealand)
Mr. Paul Mahoney (New Zealand)
Ms. Kristin GÅSEMYR (Norway)
Ms. Ane LANDØY (Norway)
Ms. Hild Marte BJØRNSEN (Norway)
Ms. Sophie SÆTERNES (Norway)
Ms. Andrine STENGRUNDET (Norway)
Ms. Saraí Sirley Valdivia ZAPANA (Perú)
Mr. Luis Fernando Manuel Tarazona RAMOS (Perú)
Ms. Barbara DŁUŻEWSKA (Poland)
Ms. Renata KARNAS (Poland)
Mr. Jacek MAŚLANKOWSKI (Poland)
Mr. Carlos Alberto MALACA (Portugal)
Mr. Nuno Miguel RODRIGUES (Portugal)
Ms. Rute NUNES (Portugal)
Mr. Joaquim SANTOS (Portugal)
Mr. Adrian Barbulescu (Romania)
Ms. Veronica Chirea (Romania)
Ms. Roxana Mazilescu (Romania)
Ms. Camelia Mircea-Sturza (Romania)
Ms. Dumitra Moldovean (Romania)
Ms. Ana-Maria Vasilescu (Romania)
Ms. Steluța Rădoi (Romania)
Ms. Mirela Ioniță (Romania)
Mr. Frantisek BLANAR (Slovak Republic)
Ms. Alja WEINDORFER (Slovenia)
Mr. Miran ŽAVBI (Slovenia)
Mr. Jesús IBAÑEZ MILLA (Spain)
Ms. Beatriz Teresa DACOSTA ALBASANZ (Spain)
Ms. Isabel YUN MORENO (Spain)
Mr. Mattias FRITZ (Sweden)
Ms. Lotta LARSSON (Sweden)
Ms. Louisa VOGIAZIDES (Sweden)
Ms. Wayra CABALLERO LIARDET (Switzerland)
Mr. Emanuel VON ERLACH (Switzerland)
Dr. Yusuf CANBOLAT (Türkiye)
Dr. Muzaffer Can DİLEK (Türkiye)
Dr. Merve BÜDÜN (Türkiye)
Ms. Esra KIRKIL (Türkiye)
Mr. Murat KAPIKIRAN (Türkiye)
Ms. Yasemin YAZICIOĞLU (Türkiye)
Ms. Amal Abdullahi (United Kingdom)
Mr. Enis Dogan (United States)
Ms. RaeAnne Friesenhahn (United States)
Mr. William Lowthert (United States)
Ms. Ashley Roberts (United States)

NESLI Network

Ms. Lynette BELLWOOD (Australia)
Mr. Oliver BERRY (Australia)
Ms. Katie DZIUBINSKI (Australia)
Mr. Matthew MCGAUGHEY (Australia)
Ms. Kyli SADADCHARAN (Australia)
Ms. Emma WIRTH (Australia)
Mr. Stefan POLZER (Austria)
Mr. Philippe DIEU (Belgium)
Mr. Teun PAUWELS (Belgium)
Ms. Bernadette SCHREUER (Belgium)
Mr. Robert THOLEN (Belgium)
Ms. Nathalie JAUNIAUX (Belgium)
Ms. Christyne Carvalho DA SILVA (Brazil)
Ms. Juliana MARQUES DA SILVA (Brazil)
Ms. Rosária Duarte MELO (Brazil)
Ms. Melissa Riani Costa MACHADO (Brazil)
Ms. Camila Neves SOUTO (Brazil)
Mr. Dilyan Atanasov (Bulgaria)
Ms. Elena Tsankova (Bulgaria)
Ms. Tsveta Kostova-Sevastiyanova (Bulgaria)
Ms. Evelin Jordanova (Bulgaria)
Ms. Ivanka Karamieva – Todorova (Bulgaria)
Mrs. Aneliya Andreeva (Bulgaria)
Ms. Krassimira Todorova (Bulgaria)
Mr. Colin BAILEY (Canada)
Ms. Aissata Foune CISSE (Canada)
Ms. Yani MO (Canada)
Mr. Marouane MOHAMED (Canada)
Mr. Graham ZIEGLER (Canada)
Ms. Paola LEIVA (Chile)
Ms. Javiera CUEVAS (Chile)
Ms. Claudia NOVOA (Chile)
Ms. Vanessa HUENUPI (Chile)
Ms. Jeimy ARISTIZABAL (Colombia)
Mr. Joan BOFILL (Colombia)
Ms. Johana MARIN (Colombia)
Mr. Rubén Moreno (Colombia)
Ms. Elsa Nelly VELASCO (Colombia)
Mr. Jonathan David Saavedra RAMIREZ (Colombia)
Ms. Carolina CHAVES (Costa Rica)
Mr. Olman MADRIGAL (Costa Rica)
Ms. Cinthya PICADO (Costa Rica)
Ms. Marija GOJEVIĆ (Croatia)
Ms. Ana ŠOJAT (Croatia)
Mr. Vladimír HULÍK (Czech Republic)
Mr. Václav JELEN (Czech Republic)
Ms. Simona PIKÁLKOVÁ (Czech Republic)
Ms. Petra PRCHLÍKOVÁ (Czech Republic)
Ms. Trine Piepgras CARSTENS (Denmark)
Mr. Thomas SKJØDT (Denmark)
Ms. Hanna KANEP (Estonia)
Ms. Marianne LEPPIK (Estonia)
Ms. Käthrin RANDOJA (Estonia)
Ms. Kristel VAHER (Estonia)
Ms. Hille VARES (Estonia)
Ms. Eve TÕNISSON (Estonia).
Ms. Nathalie BAIDAK (Eurydice)
Ms. Anita KREMO (Eurydice)
Ms. Teodora PARVEVA (Eurydice)
Mr. Jari-Matti RIIHELAINEN (Eurydice)
Mr. Teijo KOLJONEN (Finland)
Ms. Hanna LAAKSO (Finland)
Ms. Irma GARAM (Finland)
Mr. Emeric CHOBERT--PASSOT (France)
Ms. Anne GAUDRY-LACHET (France)
Ms. Mélanie DREGOIR (France)
Mr. Franck EVAIN (France)
Mr. Louis MEURIC (France)
Mr. Thomas ECKHARDT (Germany)
Ms. Marie LEISTE (Germany)
Mr. Marco MUNDELIUS (Germany)
Ms. Vassiliki Makri (Greece)
Mr. Panagiotis Passas (Greece)
Ms. Maria Fassari (Greece)
Ms. Eirini Gyftaki (Greece)
Mr. Ábel Ferenc Urbán (Hungary)

Ms. Zsófia Ashabere (Hungary)
Mr. Zsombor Kanyári (Hungary)
Mr. Anton Örn Karlsson (Iceland)
Ms. Emilía Ósk Svavarsdóttir (Iceland)
Ms. Hulda B. Herjolfsdóttir Skogland (Iceland)
Mr. Paul Alexander (Ireland)
Mr. Patrick O'Rourke (Ireland)
Mr. Jason Kelly (Ireland)
Mr. Yoav AZULAY (Israel)
Ms. Hana COHEN (Israel)
Mr. Pinhas KLEIN (Israel)
Mr. Aviel KRENTZLER (Israel)
Mr. Amos MESSIKA (Israel)
Mr. Daniel LEVI-MAZLOUM (Israel)
Mr. David MAAGAN (Israel)
Mr. Dov NATAN (Israel)
Ms. Gianna BARBIERI (Italy)
Ms. Lucia DE FABRIZIO (Italy)
Ms. Annarita Lina MARZULLO (Italy)
Ms. Maria Teresa Morana (Italy)
Ms. Daniela Di Ascenzo (Italy)
Ms. Hiroe NODA (Japan)
Mr. Yuki SATO (Japan)
Ms. Ayuko TAKATANI (Japan)
Ms. Hitomi MURAI-SUZUKI (Japan)
Ms. Aya NAGANUMA (Japan)
Mr. Youngki HUR (Korea)
Ms. Jiyoon JUNG (Korea)
Ms. Jeeeun MOON (Korea)
Ms. Yelim Yu (Korea)
Mr. Keun-Young PARK (Korea)
Ms. Youngho SON (Korea)
Mr. Kārlis BERNĀNS (Latvia)
Mr. Andrejs PUDĀNS (Latvia)
Ms. Kristina CIBULSKYTĖ (Lithuania)
Ms. Rita GAGIŠKIENĖ (Lithuania)
Ms. Vaida KOSTYGOVA (Lithuania)
Mr. Kęstutis KURTINYS (Lithuania)
Ms. Svajonė MIKĖNĖ (Lithuania)
Ms. Rima ZABLACKĖ (Lithuania)
Mr. Xavier Kamphaus (Luxembourg)
Ms. Charlotte MAHON (Luxembourg)
Ms. Elisa MAZZUCATO (Luxembourg)
Mr. Lorenzo VERGARA LÓPEZ (Mexico)
Mr. Marco CALDERÓN ARGOMEDO (Mexico)
Mr. César MORÓN ROJAS (Mexico)
Mr. René GÓMORA CASTILLO (Mexico)
Mr. Casper Lemmens (Netherlands)
Mr. Alex MULDER (Netherlands)
Mr. Minghong Deng (New Zealand)
Mr. Rory SUDFELT (New Zealand)
Ms. Kristin GÅSEMYR (Norway)
Ms. Ane LANDØY (Norway)
Ms. Hilde HULTIN (Norway)
Ms. Birthe SØNNESYN (Norway)
Ms. Katrina Bjerke THRONDSEN (Norway)
Ms. Saraí Sirley Valdivia ZAPANA (Perú)
Mr. Luis Fernando Manuel Tarazona RAMOS (Perú)
Ms. Barbara DLUZEWSKA (Poland)
Ms. Magdalena FELLS (Poland)
Ms. Renata KARNAS (Poland)
Ms. Aleksandra SARNOWSKA (Poland)
Mr. Andrzej STOLARCZYK (Poland)
Mr. Joaquim SANTOS (Portugal)
Mr. Nuno Miguel RODRIGUES (Portugal)
Mr. Marco PIMENTA (Portugal)
Mr. Adrian Barbulescu (Romania)
Ms. Veronica Chirea (Romania)
Ms. Roxana Mazilescu (Romania)
Ms. Camelia Mircea-Sturza (Romania)
Ms. Dumitra Moldovean (Romania)
Ms. Ana-Maria Vasilescu (Romania)
Mrs. Camelia Mircea-Sturza (Romania)
Mrs. Veronica Chirea (Romania)
Mrs. Roxana Mihail (Romania)
Mrs. Laura Capita (Romania)
Mr. Adrian Barbulescu (Romania)
Mrs. Cristina Mangiurea (Romania)
Mr. Florin Popa (Romania)
Mrs. Marioara Dobrescu (Romania)

Mr. Victor Iliescu (Romania)

Mrs. Antonela Toma (Romania)

Mrs. Dumitra Moldovean (Romania)

Mrs. Ana-Maria Radulescu (Romania)

Mr. Virgil Ion (Romania)

Mrs. Gabriela Jitaru (Romania)

Ms. Eva HLADIKOVA (Slovak Republic)

Ms. Zuzana ORLOVSKA (Slovak Republic)

Mr. Juraj ZDINAK (Slovak Republic)

Mr. Nejc JENSTERLE (Slovenia)

Ms. Karmen SVETLIK (Slovenia)

Ms. Tanja TAŠTANOSKA (Slovenia)

Mr. Jaime VAQUERO JIMÉNEZ (Spain)

Mr. Juan Carlos GIRÓN ORTEGA (Spain)

Mr. David VARAS DEL PESO (Spain)

Ms. Anna ENEROTH (Sweden)

Ms. Elina STENGÅRD (Sweden)

Ms. Melanie STUTZ (Switzerland)

Dr. Yusuf CANBOLAT (Türkiye)

Dr. Muzaffer Can DİLEK (Türkiye)

Dr. Merve BÜDÜN (Türkiye)

Ms. Esra KIRKIL (Türkiye)

Mr. Olivier Labé (UNESCO)

Mr. Robert Patman (United Kingdom)

Ms. Brenda Castaneda (United States)

Mr. Enis Dogan (United States)

Ms. RaeAnne Friesenhahn (United States)

Other Contributors

Ms. Sally Hinchcliffe (Editing)
Ms. Sophie Alibert (Concordance)
Ms. Jennifer Allain (Concordance)
Dr. Wieteke Conen (University of Amsterdam)

Education at a Glance 2026

OECD Indicators

Education at a Glance is the authoritative source of information on the state of education worldwide. It offers comprehensive data on the structure, financing, and performance of education systems across OECD countries and partner economies. The report presents key insights into the output of educational institutions, the impact of learning across countries, access and participation in education, financial investment in education and school organisation. The 2026 edition has a special focus on teacher shortages, examining their impact across countries and how education systems can respond.

PRINT ISBN 978-92-64-79294-4
PDF ISBN 978-92-64-71037-5