

RE:FINE Project '*Assessment for increasing quality,
equal opportunities and accountability in education*'

**Results of a survey of attitudes towards the reform
of examination systems in selected
post-socialist countries of Europe**

Prepared for

The Centre for Testing Technologies, Ukraine

by

George Bethell and Algirdas Zabulionis

Anglia Assessment, UK

January 2008

1. Contents

1. Contents	1
2. Introduction.....	2
What is RE:FINE?.....	2
RE:FINE and Educational Assessment	2
The Context	3
3. Survey Design	5
Purpose of the survey	5
Description of the survey	5
4. Overview of findings	9
5. Summary of responses by country	11
5.1 General attitudes to external examinations	11
Commentary	11
5.2 Understanding of the examination system.....	12
Commentary	12
5.3 Impact on teaching and learning	13
Commentary	14
5.4 Quality and fitness for purpose	15
Commentary	15
5.5 Equity, transparency and appeals	17
Commentary	17
5.6: Security and malpractice	18
Commentary	19
5.7 Organisation of exams and the use of technology.....	19
Commentary	19
Annex A: Descriptions of Examination Systems	21
Annex B: Model Questionnaire (English language version)	27
Annex C: Technical report of a survey of attitudes towards the reform of examination systems in selected post-socialist countries of Europe	33

2. Introduction

What is RE:FINE?

The acronym RE:FINE stands for Resourcing Education: Fund for Innovations and Networking. The Fund was provided by the Open Society Institute (OSI) and co-ordinated by OSI's Education Support Program (ESP). During the period 2004-2006, RE:FINE supported special education projects to further open society goals in four key areas: accountability, equity, anticorruption, and the improvement of learning outcomes. RE:FINE provided grants for networking projects in South Eastern Europe, Central and Eastern Europe, Russia, the Caucasus, Central Asia, and Mongolia. The fund also supported projects in countries where OSI is developing new partnerships. All projects initiated under the RE:FINE umbrella will be completed by the end of 2008.

RE:FINE and Educational Assessment

The study reported herein was carried out under the RE:FINE Project '*Assessment for increasing quality, equal opportunities and accountability in education*'. The Project, co-ordinated by the Centre for Testing Technologies, Ukraine, was designed to establish a civil platform for assessment in post-socialist countries with the aim of promoting transparency in access to education. In particular it encouraged the exploration of the impact of examinations and other forms of assessment on quality, equity and accountability in education systems.

The Project organised a network to facilitate the exchange of experience and best practices on assessment issues amongst education stakeholders, and raise capacity of agencies and experts working in the area of assessment. The partner countries included in the initial proposal were Ukraine, Poland, Kyrgyzstan, Slovenia and Lithuania. However, through the Project's activities and, in particular, its international conferences, representatives of 16 network members have been involved to date. (See Table 1.)

<i>RE:FINE Assessment Network Members</i>			
Armenia	Azerbaijan	Estonia	Georgia*
Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Latvia*	Lithuania*
Moldova	Mongolia	Montenegro	Poland
Russia	Slovenia*	Tajikistan	Ukraine*

Table 1: Partner countries and network members in the RE:FINE Assessment Project. Countries taking part in this survey are denoted by *.

The Context

The RE:FINE Assessment Project was important because, since the early 1990's, there has been an explosion of interest in educational assessment and examinations throughout the post-socialist countries of Europe. Many transitional countries have seen extensive and radical changes in the way in which students are assessed and how their achievements are reported. In particular, there has been a general move away from assessment instruments (i.e. question papers and tests) set and marked by schools towards more formal and rigorous examinations controlled by external authorities. In several countries, new assessment agencies have been developed and these have, in general, emerged as major players in their national education systems.

The development of new examination systems was invariably part of a more comprehensive program of reform. Typically, changes in assessment were intended to complement curriculum reform, new approaches to teacher training and the development of new textbooks and teaching materials. These far reaching changes were the direct result of the social, political and economic changes which swept through Europe at the end of the 20th century. Table 2 identifies four typical 'national imperatives' for countries in transition and gives examples as to the contributions which can be made by educational reforms in general and assessment reforms in particular.

Given the scope, scale and diversity of recent reforms in the field of examinations and testing, the RE:FINE Assessment Project provided the 'new' assessment community with a valuable forum in which experiences could be shared and new ideas presented in a collegiate atmosphere.

National imperative	Examples
Establishing/strengthening national beliefs and cultural values and redefining the rights and responsibilities of citizens in a civil society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Revising curricula, and national tests/exams, for key subjects, e.g. History, State Language, National Literature. ■ Introducing new subjects, e.g. Civics.
Developing a national workforce with the knowledge and skills appropriate for the economic growth of a country in a highly competitive, technologically advanced, global market place.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Shifting the emphasis from ‘factology’, i.e. the recall of discrete facts, to widely applicable ‘enabling skills’ and problem solving in both curricula and examinations. ■ Introducing new subjects and qualifications in, e.g., Information and Communications Technology (ICT). ■ Focussing on ensuring <i>all</i> students achieve satisfactory standards of, e.g., basic literacy and numeracy.
Developing an assessment system which will a) allow the school and higher education (HE) systems to operate more effectively; b) provide individuals with qualifications suitable for accessing learning and employment possibilities at home and abroad	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Moving from teacher-made tests to external examinations at key transition points. ■ Introducing ‘fairer’ university selection procedures either through centralized school examinations or through standardized tests. ■ Developing curricula and examinations which match standards typical for, e.g., European Union and OECD countries.
Developing an assessment system which will assist the government, and others, in monitoring educational quality, effectiveness and efficiency.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Introducing sample-based national assessment systems. ■ Participating in international competitive studies (e.g. PISA, PIRLS, etc.) ■ Incorporating examination data into school monitoring and evaluation systems.

Table 2: National objectives and the contributions to be made by educational reforms (Source: *Examination and Assessment Reform: An overview of experiences in Central and Eastern Europe*, G Bethell, available at www.osi.hu/esp.)

3. Survey Design

Purpose of the survey

The main purpose of this survey was to allow interested members of the RE:FINE Assessment Network to gather information about the understanding of, and attitudes towards, their centralized examination systems and/or current reforms in this area. This was deemed important because, all too often, educational reforms are implemented without sufficient efforts being made to gauge the reactions of those closest to the point of impact.

It should be noted that the survey does not attempt to measure the impact of examinations on levels of learner achievement - this being far beyond the time scale and resources available for data gathering. Nor was the survey designed to compare the quality of examinations in those countries taking part. Judgements of quality must always refer back to the purposes of the assessments in question. In this case, each participating country has its own unique context and objectives rendering any simplistic comparison of 'quality' meaningless. For this reason, we do not, as a rule, present international averages where these would be essentially meaningless and might cause inappropriate comparisons to be drawn.

The survey had two main research questions:

'What is the level of understanding of current examination procedures and of any recent, or ongoing, reforms?'

'What are the attitudes of stakeholders towards examinations – particularly where new examinations have been introduced or traditional assessment systems are undergoing reform?'

Description of the survey

The Target Group

The survey had to be conducted with few resources. Therefore, to maximise efficiency it was decided that it would target secondary school principals only. This group was chosen because it occupies a unique place at the interface between educational policy makers and the most important group of stakeholders – learners. School principals are an important conduit through which information from ministries of education passes to teachers and, hence, to students and their parents. In addition, school principals have to manage the implementation of reforms. In the case of examinations, principals often act as administrators and supervisors as their schools are turned into examination centres. As a result, school principals are well placed to comment on educational policies, the impact of reforms on pedagogical practice, and the administrative burden of organising examinations in schools.

Participation and Samples

Five countries volunteered to take part in the survey: Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia and Ukraine. Within this group we see significantly different contexts. Recent examination reforms in Europe have tended to follow four developmental phases:

- In the *reform phase*, traditional systems have been replaced by new examinations. (Typically school-based examinations have been replaced or supplemented by external, centralized examinations.)
- In the *consolidation phase*, the new system has been adopted and, in general, accepted by society. It is 'embedded' in the education system.
- In the *re-evaluation phase*, deficiencies in the 'new' system become more apparent and there is pressure to re-evaluate the quality of examinations.

- Depending on the results of the re-evaluation, the assessment system may be modified or radically reformed (again).

The table below indicates the status of participating countries.

Country	Context	Development Phase
Slovenia	The first transition country to implement radical reforms in school graduation and university entrance exams (1989-1995).	Re-evaluation (with changes to be implemented soon)
Latvia	The current system evolved over the period 1997-2005 during which time it grew from one to sixteen centrally marked subject examinations.	Re-evaluation
Lithuania	Reforms of 1997-1999 introduced external examinations for graduation/university admission. These are currently being reviewed.	Re-evaluation
Georgia	Recent reforms (2005) have introduced new, centralised exams for university selection.	Consolidation
Ukraine	Reform is on-going. New examinations have been trialled (2006-2007) but modifications are still taking place.	Reform

Table 3: Overview of the context/background for participating countries.

Each participating country was asked to select a random sample of approximately 200 school principals to take part in the survey. Three countries met or surpassed this criterion. The samples achieved in Georgia¹ and Slovenia² fell short of the criterion but their responses are significant and so are included here for the sake of completeness.

Country	Number of cases
Latvia	185
Lithuania	210
Ukraine	477
Georgia	153
Slovenia	39
All Participants	1064

Table 4: Participating countries and sample sizes

¹ Georgia submitted a further 23 records after the main analysis was completed. The data for their total sample of 176 records is included in the international database available to participating countries.

² Slovenia is a small country (20,000 sq. km.) and its sample of 39 records represents a significant proportion (~50%) of target schools.

Questionnaire Design

As previously mentioned, the survey had two main research questions:

'What is the level of understanding of current examination procedures and of any recent, or ongoing, reforms?'

'What are the attitudes of stakeholders towards examinations – particularly where new examinations have been introduced or traditional assessment systems are undergoing reform?'

These were broken down to identify discrete issues to be investigated via the questionnaire. These were:

- Do key stakeholders feel that they have enough information about the examinations and, in particular, any changes taking place?
- What effect does the examination system have on teaching and learning? Do they have a positive effect or do they, for example, encourage teaching to the test and the use of private tutoring?
- Are the examinations seen as being fair or are there concerns about social inequity? Can transparency and appeals systems protect the rights of students?
- Is the system trusted or is malpractice a serious concern? Is maintaining security and secrecy a priority?
- Are the examinations 'fit for purpose'? Are they of high quality? Are they appropriate for selecting students for places on university courses? Should they be used for monitoring educational standards?
- Are there problems associated with the organisation of examinations? Do they cause unacceptable levels of disruption in schools? Should new technologies be used to improve the examination process?

The survey questionnaire was drafted to address all these areas. (See Annex B.)

In order to increase the efficiency of data collection and entry, and to reduce the effort required by principals to complete the questionnaire, the majority of questions were of the selected-response type. These included standard Likert response scales ('strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' with a neutral mid-point) and modified scales ('essential' to 'not important' with a 'do not know' option).

At the end of the questionnaire, respondents were given the opportunity to add their own comments in open-response format.

The draft questionnaire was prepared in English. Participants checked the draft and submitted comments. The amended draft was approved and sent to participants for translation into the target language. A translation deviation form was completed in each country to ensure comparability across language versions.

In each block of items, participating countries were given the opportunity to add a small number of questions relating to their own contexts and priorities. Responses to country-specific items are not included in this report but data has been made available to the countries concerned. Similarly, comments made by respondents in the open format section of the questionnaire are to be considered at a local level and are not reported herein.

Analysis and presentation of results

The primary analysis reported here focussed on the common, objective items of the questionnaire. It did not include country-specific items added by participants nor did it attempt to summarise the free response comments offered by some principals. Each country will receive the international data set so that secondary analysis can be carried out as required.

Data was entered locally and then sent to the co-ordinator for analysis. Once the data had been cleaned, SPSS was used to tabulate results for each item and within domains.

For all Likert items, responses were transformed to a numerical scale. For positively worded statements: strongly agree = 2, agree = 1, neutral = 0, disagree = -1, strongly disagree = -2. Where a negative statement was used, the scale was reversed: strongly disagree = 2, disagree = 1, neutral = 0, agree = -1, strongly agree = -2. This means that in the tables of results, positive average scores always indicate a generally positive attitude whilst negative scores mean that principals, on average, expressed negative sentiments.

The questionnaire also included one block of 'modified' items where principals were asked to judge the importance of various aspects of the examinations. Here the transformation was: essential = 2, very important = 1, some importance = 0, not important = -1. This transformation has the advantage that an expression of strong agreement has the same maximum score (+2) as a similar judgement on the Likert scale. This makes the tables of results easy to interpret 'at a glance'. However, because the two scales are not truly equivalent, non-Likert items are clearly identified in the tables.

Following the coding of all items, they were regrouped according to content. For example, all items related to 'understanding of the system' were collated. Based on the pattern of results, commentaries were written. These form the main body of this report.

4. Overview of findings

Since the political upheavals of the late 1980's, the post-socialist transition countries of Europe have implemented significant educational reform programmes. In these, the introduction of new examination systems has been a common element. However, each country had its own context in which to work and a particular set of priorities to address. Therefore, it is little surprise that each country represented in this survey has developed its own, unique solution to assessing students at the school/university interface. There are common themes such as the promotion of fairness and the reduction of malpractice, but there are also significant differences in approach and practice. We can conclude that there is no single examination model that is equally applicable in all contexts. *Therefore, the quality of a particular examination must be judged according to its intended purposes, the environment in which it operates and the priorities of those responsible for setting educational policy.*

Examination systems are not static – they evolve over time. Some changes are planned. For example, the reform of curricula requires new examination syllabuses, and the increasing availability of new technologies makes more efficient and secure administrative procedures possible. However, changes in attitudes towards examinations over time are more difficult to describe and explain. The survey results show interesting differences between the young examination system of Georgia and the older systems of Slovenia and the Baltic States. In general, for example, school principals in Georgia are more enthusiastic about the benefits of their new, high-tech examination system than are their counterparts in Latvia and Lithuania.

In countries with more mature examination systems we find some evidence of disillusionment. Perhaps as schools and teachers become more familiar with an examination they become more aware of its inevitable shortcomings. Also, when a new examination is designed, all those involved are focussed on the key issues being addressed. However, as time goes by, the underlying principles are largely forgotten and, hence, the advantages gained are less obvious. The survey shows that all countries want to retain their external examination systems, but, with the notable exception of Georgia, they do not feel strongly that the new systems are far superior to those that went before.

Notwithstanding the above, *the school principals in this survey are generally positive towards the use of external examinations for the key purpose of selecting students for places in institutions of higher learning.* They do not, with the exception of Ukraine, want to see this function reverting to universities.

School principals also see the examinations as being a useful tool for motivating both teachers and learners. However, they are less convinced that examination results are good indicators of a school's performance.

To summarise, according to this survey:

- Principals understand their national examination systems well. They are generally positive about the use of examination results for selecting students for higher education. However, in the more mature systems there is little or no enthusiasm for expanding the number of external exams.
- Principals are generally satisfied with their national examinations and do not want to abandon recent reforms. However, they appear not to be convinced that the quality of the examinations is high enough. The agencies responsible should take this into account and continue to work towards raising the standards of their question papers and other aspects of the assessment process.
- Principals generally feel that high-stake examinations motivate teachers and learners. There is no consensus about the extent of the problem of 'teaching to the test'. There is some concern that such examinations promote the use of private tutors, but, in general,

Principals believe that additional tuition, i.e. above that received in school, is not necessary for students to be successful.

- Principals generally believe that external examination systems are fair and that the results can be trusted. They believe that, with careful control, standardised examinations can reduce the incidence of malpractice. However, they recognise the importance of maintaining high levels of security.
- Principals advocate transparency and accountability in examinations. In general they believe that a student should have a chance to see his/her script after marking. They feel strongly that maintaining a reliable scoring process is of the utmost importance.
- Principals recognise the need for efficient and effective administrative procedures – especially in the supervision of students in the examination hall. However, they are uncertain as to the likely benefits of using new technologies, e.g. computer-based testing, in place of more traditional techniques.

5. Summary of responses by country

5.1 General attitudes to external examinations

This cluster of items relates to the attitude of principals to the current examination system. The responses from each country are summarised in the table below.

Item code		Latvia	Lithuania	Ukraine	Georgia	Slovenia
14.3	The external examination system is OK but some aspects should be improved.	0.93	1.16	1.11	0.96	1.03
14.7	I think the external examination system should be abandoned. ***	0.70	0.64	1.06	1.17	1.11
11.10	The new examination system is an improvement on the former system.	0.12	0.79	0.08	1.39	0.51
14.1	I would like to see Matura/Baccalaureate examinations in more subjects.	-0.42	-0.08	0.97	-0.27	-1.10
14.4	Selection examinations should be set and controlled by the universities***.	0.2	0.52	-0.22	0.35	0.18
14.5	I would like to see more school-based assessment.	0.64	-0.57	1.27	0.97	0.08

Table 5: Mean responses on Likert scale: Strongly agree =2, Agree =1, Neutral=0, Disagree=-1, Strongly disagree=-2. (For negative statements, denoted by ***, Strongly disagree =2, Disagree =1, Neutral=0, Agree=-1, Strongly agree=-2.) Green cells indicate significant positive responses (>0.9). Orange cells indicate significant, negative responses (< -0.9). Discrepant responses are shown in red.

Commentary

Respondents in all participating countries are, in general, in favour of the centralized or external examinations used at the interface between secondary schooling and university education. There is little support for the outright abandonment of existing examinations and few wish to reverse the reforms of past years entirely. However, only in Georgia is there a strong belief that the new exam system is superior to that of the past.

Notwithstanding the above, there is little enthusiasm for the expansion of these systems. Indeed, in Slovenia, the strength of the response may suggest that the principals who responded would like to see a reduction in the number of subjects included, or at least a simplification of the system³. The only notable exception to this pattern is in Ukraine where the introduction of new examinations is at a very early stage and in 2007 included only three subjects (Mathematics, History and Ukrainian Language).

³ Matura in Slovenia requires students to take five subjects: three compulsory and two electives chosen from a comprehensive list of almost all other subjects offered in Gymnasia.

The seemingly aberrant response in Lithuania to item 14.5 is due to a deviation in the questionnaire. The Lithuanian version asked whether principals would like to see more 'school-based Matura examinations' (i.e. examinations set by the National Examination Centre but administered by schools and marked by teachers). In all other countries the wording implied internal forms of assessment, controlled by schools.

5.2 Understanding of the examination system

This cluster of items relates to the level of understanding of the current examination system as reported by school principals.

Item code		Latvia	Lithuania	Ukraine	Georgia	Slovenia
11.1	I have a good understanding of the national Matura examination system	1.38	1.46	1.00	1.47	1.74
11.4	I feel confident when explaining the Matura examination system to staff and parents.	1.17	1.46	1.07	1.35	1.62
11.3	Schools have enough information about the Matura examinations.	1.19	1.49	0.98	1.33	1.51
11.8	Teachers are <i>confused</i> about changes to the examination system. ***	0.73	-0.74	0.78	0.81	0.95
11.6	Students have complained that the examination system is <i>not</i> clear to them. ***	0.79	0.60	0.83	0.81	0.92
14.2	I would like to receive more detailed information about examination results.	1.12	0.79	1.05	1.10	0.13

Table 6: Mean responses on Likert scale: Strongly agree =2, Agree =1, Neutral=0, Disagree=-1, Strongly disagree=-2. (For negative statements, denoted by ***, Strongly disagree =2, Disagree =1, Neutral=0, Agree=-1, Strongly agree=-2.) Green cells indicate significant positive responses (>0.9). Orange cells indicate significant, negative responses (< -0.9). Discrepant responses are shown in red.

Commentary

School principals in all participating countries report that they have enough information about examinations, they understand the system and they are confident in explaining it to others. This appears to be particularly true in Slovenia where the examinations have been in place for more than 10 years.

Principals also appear to believe, rightly or wrongly, that their teachers and students, have less clarity. This may simply reflect the unreliability of self-reporting on matters of professional competence. However, it may also indicate that the ultimate end-users (teachers, students and parents) do not receive all the information that they need. Perhaps ministries and assessment agencies should be making more effort to ensure that their public relations campaigns are effective, and that all stakeholders receive information specifically adapted to their needs and levels?

Finally, whilst principals receive enough information about the nature of the examinations, most would like to have more data concerning the *results* of examinations – a topic touched upon elsewhere in the survey.

(The aberrant negative response to item 11.8 in Lithuania may relate to a specific issue rather than to the examination system as a whole. The Lithuanian Language (Mother Tongue) examination is currently being reformed. It has been announced that new format examinations will be administered in summer, 2008. At the time of the survey, there was little information available for Principals and so there was some uncertainty.).

5.3 Impact on teaching and learning

This cluster of items relates to the perceived impact of the examination system on teaching and learning behaviours. This is sometimes referred to as the 'backwash effect'. The backwash effect is positive if it promotes good practice in classrooms and results in higher levels of attainment. However, if it distorts teaching practice and encourages the use of private tutoring then the effect is negative.

Item code		Latvia	Lithuania	Ukraine	Georgia	Slovenia
11.9	Teachers are increasingly teaching to the exam syllabus and neglecting ... the curriculum.***	1.03	-0.09	0.51	0.76	-0.56
11.5	The examination reforms of recent years have made private tutoring more of a problem.***	-0.19	-0.79	-0.46	-0.75	0.08
11.15	For most students, the knowledge received in school is enough for them to succeed in Matura exams without any extra help from a private tutor.	0.81	0.53	0.31	-0.26	1.16
13.5	Matura exams are important in reducing the need for private tutoring.	-0.34	-0.59	0.13	1.09	-0.33
14.10	The student's final result on the exam should consist of two parts: external and internal (school-based).	0.16	-0.01	n/a	0.95	n/a
14.5	I would like to see more school-based assessment.	0.64	-0.57	1.27	0.97	0.08
13.8	Matura exams are important in identifying weak links in the school system.	0.07	0.05	0.74	1.22	0.13

Table 7: Mean responses on Likert scale: Strongly agree =2, Agree =1, Neutral=0, Disagree=-1, Strongly disagree=-2. (For negative statements, denoted by ***, Strongly disagree =2, Disagree =1, Neutral=0, Agree=-1, Strongly agree=-2.) Green cells indicate significant positive responses (>0.9). Orange cells indicate significant, negative responses (< -0.9). Discrepant responses are shown in red. 'n/a' means that this statement was not applicable in a particular country.

Commentary

This domain shows a wide range of responses reflecting the diversity in the nature of examination systems surveyed. It also indicates that different countries have different views on the key issues affecting the relationship between teaching and assessment.

One of the most common criticisms of high-stake examinations is that they encourage teachers to 'teach to the test' and, as a result, neglect those elements of the curriculum that are not included in the examination syllabus. Students may also spend a disproportionate amount of time on examination preparation. These changes of behaviour in teachers and learners are regarded as symptoms of a strong, negative backwash effect. In many countries, it is common practice for students to take additional lessons with private tutors. This too is regarded as an undesirable effect since it increases the cost of education to parents, discriminates against poorer families and, hence, exacerbates social inequity, and, in some cases, offers opportunity for unprofessional or corrupt practices.

The survey shows that only in Latvia do principals feel strongly that the examinations are distorting the delivery of the curriculum. In Lithuania, Ukraine and Slovenia there is no evidence that this is perceived to be a major problem.

Interpretation of the results concerning private tutoring should take into account the perceived extent of the problem in each country. For example, in Ukraine and Georgia nearly 80% of first year university undergraduates report having had private tuition in one or more subjects in the last year of schooling. The corresponding figure for Lithuania is just over 60%. (For further information see *Education in a Hidden Marketplace: Monitoring of Private Tuition*, OSI, 2006.)

Respondents in Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia are relatively confident that students do not actually need extra tuition to be successful in the examinations. This view is not reflected in Georgia where school principals appear unconvinced. However, they do agree that the new forms of examination currently being introduced should play an important part in reducing demand for tuition.

The survey included two items concerning the balance between external examinations and school-based assessment. On this issue there was no consensus. This may be an area where the views of school principals do not adequately reflect those of subject teachers who, in general, tend to favour internal assessment over external examinations.

5.4 Quality and fitness for purpose

This cluster of items relates to the perceived quality of the examinations and, in particular, their fitness for a range of purposes. The purpose targeted include: selection of applicants for institutions of higher learning (universities); motivation of teachers and learners; and, monitoring educational standards.

Item code		Latvia	Lithuania	Ukraine	Georgia	Slovenia
11.2	Matura examinations are a fair way of selecting students for university places.	0.58	1.08	1.03	1.12	0.62
13.6	Matura exams are important in identifying the best students for universities.	0.56	0.72	1.03	1.05	-0.1
14.4	Selection examinations should be set and controlled by the universities***.	0.2	0.52	-0.22	0.35	0.18
13.3	Matura exams are important in motivating students in their learning.	0.52	1.00	1.32	1.63	0.85
13.4	Matura exams are important in motivating teachers to raise their level of qualification.	0.57	1.10	1.32	1.68	0.85
13.2	Matura exams are important in making schools more accountable for standards of teaching.	0.79	0.92	1.31	1.6	1.23
13.7	Matura exams are important in giving valuable, objective data on educational standards.	0.41	0.35	1.06	1.33	0.56
11.16	The results of Matura exams are good indicators of a school's overall performance.	-0.04	-0.29	0.66	0.61	0.00
13.8	Matura exams are important in identifying weak links in the school system.	0.07	0.05	0.74	1.22	0.13
11.11	Generally, the exam papers for Matura examinations are of a high quality.	0.49	0.27	0.37	0.88	0.74

Table 8: Mean responses on Likert scale: Strongly agree =2, Agree =1, Neutral=0, Disagree=-1, Strongly disagree=-2. (For negative statements, denoted by ***, Strongly disagree =2, Disagree =1, Neutral=0, Agree=-1, Strongly agree=-2.) Green cells indicate significant positive responses (>0.9). Orange cells indicate significant, negative responses (< -0.9). Discrepant responses are shown in red.

Commentary

This domain shows a relatively high degree of agreement with all countries responding in the same direction with few, minor exceptions. However, principals in Ukraine and Georgia are significantly more positive in their attitudes as indicated by the preponderance of green cells in their columns in the table. These are the two countries where reforms are relatively recent. Ukraine is in the 'reform' phase and Georgia is at the beginning of the 'consolidation' phase.

In both cases, there is still a widely held belief that the reforms will result in significant, positive outcomes. The other countries in the survey have more mature examination systems where some of the initial enthusiasm has dissipated and where critical re-evaluation has begun.

All countries feel that Matura-type examinations offer a fair way of selecting students for university places. In addition, respondents do not seem to want universities to control admission systems, but their feelings on this point are not strong. Indeed, in Ukraine, where the new examinations are still at the experimental stage, there may be some support for retaining the more familiar university controlled selection procedure.

The principals surveyed generally feel that these high-stake examinations achieve a range of secondary purposes: they motivate teachers and learners; they make schools more accountable; and, they provide objective data on standards. However, principals are far less convinced of the value of using examinations as indicators of school performance. This reflects the doubts and concerns expressed by pedagogues in countries such as England where examination and test results have been used increasingly to judge the performance of individual schools and, in some cases, teachers.

Finally, there is no strong support for the view that the quality of examination papers is high. This suggests that the agencies responsible for test production need to invest more in order to raise both the quality of their question papers - both as measurement instruments and as aids to teaching and learning.

5.5 Equity, transparency and appeals

This cluster of items relates to the fairness of examinations and to the rights of test-takers. It includes not only items about general concepts such as equity and trust, but also items about specific procedures such as the right of students to see their scripts after they have been marked.

Item code		Latvia	Lithuania	Ukraine	Georgia	Slovenia
11.12	I trust the results of the Matura examination process.	0.51	0.98	0.98	1.21	1.03
13.1	Matura exams are important in increasing fairness (equity) for students.	0.96	0.88	1.55	1.56	1.15
11.14	Matura exams increase social <i>inequality</i> . ***	0.75	0.53	0.34	1.04	-0.15
11.13	Matura exams are <i>unfair</i> for students from rural schools.***	0.53	0.24	0.30	1.05	1.15
14.6	There should be more use of computerized scoring to reduce subjectivity.	n/a	0.63	1.17	0.80	-0.42
14.8	After the exam, the school should get back the marked scripts of students.	1.08	1.00	n/a	0.53	n/a
14.9	An effective appeal system includes the student's right to discuss the marking of his/her script.	0.35	0.54	n/a	1.01	n/a
12.12	It is important that the student should have a right to see his/her script after examination.	0.58	1.06	n/a	1.45	n/a
12.10	It is important that Matura exams ensure the reliability of marking of students' scripts.	1.39	1.58	1.33	1.32	1.23
12.7	It is important that public trust in data processing of exam scores is ensured.	1.02	1.28	1.18	1.36	1.51
12.9	It is important that all institutions of higher education use Matura exam results and do not run their own entrance exams.	1.13	1.17	1.45	1.27	0.72

Table 9: Mean responses on Likert scale: Strongly agree =2, Agree =1, Neutral=0, Disagree=-1, Strongly disagree=-2. (For negative statements, denoted by ***, Strongly disagree =2, Disagree =1, Neutral=0, Agree=-1, Strongly agree=-2.) Green cells indicate significant positive responses (>0.9). Orange cells indicate significant, negative responses (< -0.9). Discrepant responses are shown in red.

Commentary

This domain shows a significant level of trust in centralised examinations and a belief that they are generally fair to students. There is, however, a wide range of views on specific issues. For example, there is strong support for computerised scoring in Ukraine whilst in

Slovenia there appears, albeit from a small sample, to be a resistance to move towards automatic scoring.

In Latvia and Lithuania, principals believe that students should have the right to get their answer scripts back. The lower score in Georgia is probably due to the fact that whilst students do not get their original scripts back, they can see a scanned image of them, on-line. Georgian responses to item 12.12 show that there is clearly strong support for this innovative practice.

In all countries surveyed, ensuring reliability of marking and winning public confidence in the results of the system are considered extremely important.

Finally, principals believe strongly that universities should use the results of state examinations in their selection procedures. Respondents recognise that if universities run their own entrance examinations, as was the case in the past, teaching and learning practices are likely to be distorted and old inequities may re-emerge.

5.6: Security and malpractice

This cluster of items relates to malpractice in the examination process. Malpractice is defined⁴ as ‘a deliberate act of wrong doing, contrary to official examination rules, ... designed to place a candidate or group of candidates at an unfair advantage or disadvantage.

Item code		Latvia	Lithuania	Ukraine	Georgia	Slovenia
11.7	Matura examinations encourage cheating and other forms of malpractice.***	0.66	0.89	1.05	1.18	1.41
11.17	Centralized Matura exams reduce the room for corruption in education.	0.27	0.62	n/a	1.24	n/a
12.1	It is important to prevent leakage of the exam papers before the exams.	1.32	1.50	1.34	1.39	1.87
12.5	It is important to prevent students from cheating during the examination.	1.12	1.72	1.14	1.38	1.56
12.11	It is important that only anonymous (coded) student's exam script be processed (marked).	1.19	1.60	n/a	1.26	n/a

Table 10: Mean responses on Likert scale: Strongly agree =2, Agree =1, Neutral=0, Disagree=-1, Strongly disagree=-2. (For negative statements, denoted by ***, Strongly disagree =2, Disagree =1, Neutral=0, Agree=-1, Strongly agree=-2.) Green cells indicate significant positive responses (>0.9).

⁴ See Greaney, V. and Kellaghan, T. *Integrity of Public Examinations in Assessment: Problems, Developments and Statistical Issues*, Goldstein, H. and Lewis, T. Wiley and Sons, 1996.

Commentary

This domain shows that principals believe that formal Matura examinations *discourage* cheating and reduce malpractice. This is not to say that there is no cheating – simply that external examinations conducted under controlled conditions reduce the opportunity to gain unfair advantage.

Item 11.17 specifically asked about corruption. In Latvia and Lithuania there was only moderate support for this statement. The interpretation of this is not straight forward. It may be because corruption in these countries is not seen as a major problem and therefore is not a priority of the examination system. However, in Georgia there is a much stronger positive response. Here, fighting corruption through centralised examinations was a fundamental issue in designing the new exams and the technologies through which they are delivered.

Finally, responses to statements about specific security measures were universally rated as being extremely important if not essential. This suggests that highly visible security and control measures are necessary to maintain public confidence in the system.

5.7 Organisation of exams and the use of technology

This cluster of items mainly relates to the organisation of examinations in schools examination centres. Principals are likely to have strong views on this since their schools are often used as examination centres and they may be required to act as supervisors.

(See Table 11.)

Commentary

This domain shows that there is no consensus about the increased use of computers in administering or scoring examinations. At present, the countries in our sample have very different examination formats. For example, in Georgia students write on separate answer sheets designed so that they can be scanned for both recognition of responses to objective (multiple-choice) items *and* for presentation on-line. In contrast, students in Lithuania write their answers to objective items and open tasks in the question booklet. This is more convenient for students, but it makes scanning and automatic scoring impossible.

There is clear evidence that the principals in our survey recognise the importance of making proper arrangements for the conduct of examinations. They consider the key administrative procedures as being extremely important in ensuring the quality of the examination. Controlling student behaviour in the examination room is considered as being of the utmost importance.

Finally, the prevention of 'leakage' of question papers is perceived as a major issue in all countries surveyed. In Latvia and Lithuania this has probably been exacerbated in recent years by well publicised lapses in security. In the future, new technologies may offer the possibility of secure distribution over the internet. However, there appears to be no complete solution to this problem as long as countries print and distribute question papers in advance of the examination.

Item code		Latvia	Lithuania	Ukraine	Georgia	Slovenia
14.6	There should be more use of computerized scoring to reduce subjectivity.	n/a	0.63	1.17	0.80	-0.42
14.11	In the near future, testing on computer will be the most objective way to assess student knowledge.	0.00	0.46	n/a	0.77	n/a
12.2	It is important to... arrange proper rooms and furniture for the exams.	0.41	1.43	0.64	1.24	0.56
12.3	It is important to... arrange for proper distribution of materials before the examination (logistics).	0.64	1.46	1.12	1.32	1.36
12.6	It is important to... collect materials efficiently at the end of the examination.	0.84	1.39	0.77	1.33	1.03
12.8	It is important to... reduce the impact of holding exams on ordinary school life (e.g. disruption caused by the exam session timetable)	1.13	1.56	0.78	1.35	1.05
12.4	It is important to... ensure that students are silent during examinations.	0.94	1.63	1.09	1.47	1.38
12.5	It is important to... prevent students from cheating during the examination.	1.12	1.72	1.14	1.38	1.56
12.1	It is important to... prevent leakage of the exam papers before the exams.	1.32	1.50	1.34	1.39	1.87

Table 11: Mean responses on Likert scale: Strongly agree =2, Agree =1, Neutral=0, Disagree=-1, Strongly disagree=-2. (For negative statements, denoted by ***, Strongly disagree =2, Disagree =1, Neutral=0, Agree=-1, Strongly agree=-2.) Green cells indicate significant positive responses (>0.9). Orange cells indicate significant, negative responses (< -0.9). Discrepant responses are shown in red.

Annex A: Descriptions of Examination Systems

Latvia	
Name of exam	Centralized exam
Year of first exam	Year 1997
Purpose	dual-purpose (graduation + selection)
Number of subjects taken by student	compulsory 2 optional 3
Compulsory subjects	Latvian language, Foreign language Note: from 2009, Mathematics will be added
Reporting scale (please describe)	Levels A, B, C, D, E, F (A- the highest, F- the lowest)
Item types	objective and open format
Marking	dual (computer + human)
Students able to see marked scripts?	No
Examining Authority	Izglītības satura un eksaminācijas centrs (ISEC) (Centre for Curriculum Development and Examinations) Website : http://www.isec.gov.lv

Lithuania

Name of exam	Valstybinis Brandos egzaminas (State Matura examination) Mokyklinis Brandos egzaminas (School Matura examination)
Year of first exam	The year 1999 (starting from two exams in History and Math)
Purpose	dual-purpose (graduation + selection)
Number of subjects taken by student	compulsory1 Optional not less than 2
Compulsory subjects	Lithuanian Language examination (as the Mother Tongue or as the State language for the students of National minorities)
Reporting scale (please describe)	Criteria based scale for School Matura examination (Marks 1-10 with 4 for minimal pass) Norm-based scale for State Matura examination (Marks 1-100 based on percentiles of students raw results with cut-off score for passing)
Item types	objective and open format
Marking	dual (computer + human)
Students able to see marked scripts?	Normally - NO, with some exception after the appeals granted individually by the Minister. (In 2007 only 36 students exercised this right.)
Examining Authority	Nacionalinis egzaminų centras (NEC) (National Examination Centre) Website http://www.nec.lt

Ukraine

Name of exam	Державна підсумкова атестація (State Final Attestation) Зовнішнє незалежне оцінювання (External Independent Assessment)
Year of first exam	2006 (starting from 3 exams in Ukrainian language, History and Math)
Purpose	dual-purpose (graduation + selection)
Number of subjects taken by student	compulsory1 optional..... in the year 2008: not more than 2 from out of 10 (Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Geography, History of Ukraine, World History, World Literature, Mathematics, Law, Economics)
Compulsory subjects	Ukrainian Language examination
Reporting scale (please describe)	Criteria based scale for State Final Attestation (Marks 1-12) Norm-based scale for External Independent Assessment (Marks 100-200 based on percentiles of students raw results)
Item types	objective and open format
Marking	dual (computer + human)
Students able to see marked scripts?	No decisions yet. The appeal system will be introduced for the first time in 2008.
Examining Authority	Український центр оцінювання якості освіти (Ukrainian Centre for Evaluation of Quality in Education) Website http://www.testportal.com.ua

Georgia

Name of exam	Unified Admission Examinations
Year of first exam	2005
Purpose	university selection
Number of subjects taken by student	compulsory2 optional Math, Science, Foreign Languages, History
Compulsory subjects	Georgian Language General Ability Test (GAT)
Reporting scale (please describe)	Norm-based scale (Marks 100-200)
Item types	objective and open format
Marking	dual (computer + human)
Students able to see marked scripts?	yes – on-line: the copy of the student’s script with the detailed table of obtained raw scores for each item available through the internet till the beginning of appeals
Examining Authority	National Examinations Centre Website http://www.naec.ge

Slovenia

Name of exam	Matura																																										
Year of first exam	1995																																										
Purpose	dual-purpose (graduation + selection) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (In future, Matura will remain a condition to enter university-type institutions, but selection will be left to the institution.)																																										
Number of subjects taken by student	compulsory ...3..... elective ...2...																																										
Compulsory subjects	Mother Tongue, Mathematics, a Foreign Language																																										
Reporting scale (please describe)	<p>In common with school-based tests and the internal final examination, each Matura subject is graded on a five-point scale: 1 is considered a negative or failing grade with 2, 3, 4, and 5 as positive grades.</p> <p>In order to pass Matura, a student must achieve a positive grade in all five subjects.</p> <p>Successful students also receive a point score derived from the sum of their subject grades. If a subject has been passed at the higher level, then up to three points are added to the student's score. This gives a maximum possible Matura points score of 34.</p> <p>Examples of Matura point scores</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;"></th> <th style="width: 50%;"></th> <th style="width: 25%;">Total Points Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="6" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">Student A</td> <td>Maths 5 (Higher level)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5+3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Slovene 5+</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5+3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English 5 (Higher level)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5+3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>History 5</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chemistry 5</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Total = 34</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="6" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">Student B</td> <td>Maths 4 (Basic level)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Slovene 4–</td> <td style="text-align: right;">4+1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>French 2 (Higher level)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2+1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Geography 4</td> <td style="text-align: right;">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Philosophy 2</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Total = 18</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="6" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">Student C</td> <td>Maths 3 (Basic level)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Slovene 3–</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>German 3</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Biology 3</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chemistry 3</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Total = 15</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Total Points Score	Student A	Maths 5 (Higher level)	5+3	Slovene 5+	5+3	English 5 (Higher level)	5+3	History 5	5	Chemistry 5	5	Total = 34		Student B	Maths 4 (Basic level)	4	Slovene 4–	4+1	French 2 (Higher level)	2+1	Geography 4	4	Philosophy 2	2	Total = 18		Student C	Maths 3 (Basic level)	3	Slovene 3–	3	German 3	3	Biology 3	3	Chemistry 3	3	Total = 15	
		Total Points Score																																									
Student A	Maths 5 (Higher level)	5+3																																									
	Slovene 5+	5+3																																									
	English 5 (Higher level)	5+3																																									
	History 5	5																																									
	Chemistry 5	5																																									
	Total = 34																																										
Student B	Maths 4 (Basic level)	4																																									
	Slovene 4–	4+1																																									
	French 2 (Higher level)	2+1																																									
	Geography 4	4																																									
	Philosophy 2	2																																									
	Total = 18																																										
Student C	Maths 3 (Basic level)	3																																									
	Slovene 3–	3																																									
	German 3	3																																									
	Biology 3	3																																									
	Chemistry 3	3																																									
	Total = 15																																										

Slovenia (continued)	
Item types	objective (mcq) only <input type="checkbox"/> open format only <input type="checkbox"/> objective and open format <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Marking	automatic (computer) only <input type="checkbox"/> manual (human) only <input type="checkbox"/> dual (computer + human) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Students able to see marked scripts?	yes – returned to student <input type="checkbox"/> yes – on-line <input type="checkbox"/> yes – returned <i>on request</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/>
Examining Authority	Državni izpitni center, RIC (National Examination Centre) website: http://www.ric.si

Annex B: Model Questionnaire (English language version)

Dear School Principal,

This questionnaire is part of a study to evaluate the impact of reforms to examination systems at the end of upper secondary schooling in some post-socialist countries. It is initiated by Open Society Institute in Budapest and administrated in <country> by <name of institution>.

the purposes of research and evaluation and we will therefore not identify any individual or school in our reports. Please send this filled questionnaire to: < contact name + address of institution>.

SECTION 1: ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL

1. Where is your school located?

- A. in <the capital city>
- B. in a large city <with population more than 100.000? citizens>
- C. in another city <centre of administrative region>
- D. in other places (other towns and villages)

****Note for countries: Please use appropriate categories for your country*

2. What is the approximate number of students in your school? Please write in:

- the total number of students
- number of students in final grade only

3. Which of the following best describes your school's type?

- A. gymnasium/lyceum (
- B. general secondary school
- C. other school (adults' school, VET school, or etc.)

****Note for countries: Please use appropriate categories for your country corresponding to some type of "elite" upper secondary schools, "ordinary" schools, and others...-*

4. In your opinion, which of the following best describes your school's overall performance?

- A. well above the national average (in the top quarter of schools)
- B. just above the national average
- C. about average for the nation
- D. just below national average
- E. well below the national average (in the bottom quarter of schools)

5. After the last school year, approximately what proportion of your final year students applied for places in universities? (Please write the percentages – 0% means that nobody applied, 100% means that all students applied.)

***Note for countries: Universities stand here for university type higher education, use proper wording if needed.

.....%

6. Of the students who applied, approximately what proportion succeeded in gaining a place at a university? (Please write the percentages – 0% meaning that nobody was successful, 100% means that every student that applied was successful.)

.....%

SECTION 2: ABOUT YOU

7. Your gender:

- A. female
- B. male

8. How old are you?

- A. 20-30
- B. 31-40
- C. 41-50
- D. 51-60
- E. More than 60 years

9. How long have you been a school Headmaster? Please write in:

..... years

10. How have you been involved in the Matura examination system? (Please check all that apply)

- A. Teaching students in preparation for the examinations.
- B. Organizing/administering Matura examinations **in** my school.
- C. Organizing/administering Matura examinations **outside** my school.
- D. Working as a marker of students exams' scripts.

***Note for countries: "Matura" stands here as a general term for examinations at the end of higher secondary school (results might be used for certification of graduation from the secondary school AND/OR selection for universities). Please use appropriate wording here.

SECTION 3: ABOUT THE MATURA EXAMINATION SYSTEMS

11. Please read statements below carefully and try to estimate the extent to which you agree with each of them (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral (Not sure), Disagree or Strongly Disagree). Check one circle for each row.

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	I have a good understanding of the national Matura examination system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	Matura examinations are a fair way of selecting students for university places.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	Schools have enough information about the Matura examinations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	I feel confident when explaining the Matura examination system to staff and parents.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	The examination reforms of recent years have made private tutoring more of a problem.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	Students have complained that the examination system is <u>not clear</u> to them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	Matura examinations encourage cheating and other forms of malpractice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	Teachers are confused about changes to the examination system.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	Teachers are increasingly teaching to the examination syllabus and neglecting other parts of the curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10	The new <current – use appropriate wording> examination system is an improvement on the former system.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11	Generally, the exam papers for Matura examinations are of a high quality.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12	I trust the results of the Matura examination process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13	Matura exams are unfair for students from rural schools.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14	Matura exams increase social inequality.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15	For most students, the knowledge received in school is enough for them to succeed in Matura exams without any extra help from a private tutor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16	The results of Matura exams are good indicators of a school's overall performance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17	The centralized Matura exams reduce the room for corruption in education.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. *Think about the administration of Matura examinations. Try to estimate the extent to which these issues might be important for the examination system. Check one circle for each row.*

		Essential	Very important	Some importance	Not important	I do not know
1	Preventing leakage of the exam papers before the exams.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	Arranging proper rooms and furniture for the exams.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	Proper distribution of exam materials before the examination (logistics).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	Ensuring that students are silent during examinations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	Preventing students from cheating during the examination.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	Collecting materials efficiently at the end of the examination.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	Ensuring public trust in the exam data processing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	Reducing the impact of holding examinations on ordinary school's life (e.g. problems caused by the exam session timetable)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	Making sure that all institutions of higher education (e.g. universities) use Matura	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

exams' results and do not run their own entrance exams.

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 10 | Ensuring the reliability of marking of students exams' scripts. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 11 | Only anonymous (coded) student's exam script might be processed (marked). | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 12 | Student should have a right to see his/her script after examination. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13 | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

13. In which areas do you think Matura examinations could add value to education? *Please check one circle for each row which the best corresponds to your opinion.*

- | | | Strongly
agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly
disagree |
|---|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Increasing fairness (equity) for students. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2 | Making schools more accountable for standards of teaching. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3 | Motivating students in their learning. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4 | Motivating teachers to rise up their qualification. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5 | Reducing the need for private tutoring. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6 | Identifying the best students for universities. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7 | Giving valuable, objective data on educational standards. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8 | Identifying weak links in the school system. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9 | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

14. Please, think about the way you would like the school examination and university selection systems to develop in the future. *Check one circle for each row which the best corresponds to your opinion.*

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	I would like to see Matura examinations in more subjects.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	I would like to receive more detailed information about examination results.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	The external examination system is OK but some aspects should be improved.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	Selection examinations should be set and controlled by the universities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	I would like to see more school-based assessment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	There should be more use of computerized scoring to reduce subjectivity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	I think the external examination system should be abandoned.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	The school should get back marked students' scripts after the exam.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	The effective appeal system should include the student's right to discuss his/her script's marking process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10	The final student's result on Matura exam should consist from two parts: external and internal (done by school).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11	In the nearest future the testing on computer will be the most objective way to assess students' knowledge.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Thank you for your help.

Annex C: Technical report of a survey of attitudes towards the reform of examination systems in selected post-socialist countries of Europe.

Sample sizes in participating countries

<i>Country</i>	<i>Number of records in international database at time of analysis</i>	<i>%</i>
Latvia	185	17,4%
Lithuania	210	19,7%
Ukraine	477	44,8%
Georgia	153	14,4%
Slovenia	39	3,7%
TOTAL	1064	100,0%

FREQUENCY STATISTICS OF THE SURVEYS' QUESTIONNAIRE BY COUNTRY

SECTION 1: ABOUT THE SCHOOL

Q1	Where is your school located?			
	in the capital city	in a large city	in a centre of administrative region	in another city
Latvia	24,6%	14,8%	22,4%	38,3%
Lithuania	9,1%	20,7%	26,4%	43,8%
Ukraine	9,4%	27,9%	26,8%	35,8%
Georgia	17,0%	39,0%	14,9%	29,1%
Slovenia	23,1%	15,4%	35,9%	25,6%

Q2	What is the approximate number of students in your school?			
	the total number of students		number of students in final grade only	
	maximum	mean	maximum	mean
Latvia	2072	505,49	494	63,69
Lithuania	1400	575,40	200	62,96
Ukraine	1884	499,89	252	46,72
Georgia	1872	610,19	190	51,15
Slovenia	1150	702,38	316	173,79

Q3	Which of the following best describes your school's type?		
	gymnasium/lyceum	general secondary school	other school
Latvia	3,3%	85,6%	11,0%
Lithuania	26,2%	68,6%	5,2%
Ukraine	16,1%	77,8%	6,1%
Georgia	0,0%	98,0%	2,0%
Slovenia	79,5%	12,8%	7,7%

Q4	In your opinion, which of the following best describes your school's overall performance?				
	well above the national average	just above the national average	about the national average	just below the national average	well below the national average
Latvia	6,6%	21,5%	59,1%	12,2%	0,6%
Lithuania	11,4%	37,1%	47,5%	3,5%	0,5%
Ukraine	1,3%	18,5%	75,1%	5,1%	0,0%
Georgia	10,1%	38,9%	49,7%	1,3%	0,0%
Slovenia	34,2%	36,8%	23,7%	5,3%	0,0%

Q5, Q6	After the last school year, approximately what proportion of your final year students <u>applied</u> for places in universities?	Of the students who applied, approximately what proportion <u>succeeded</u> in gaining a place at a university?
	<i>(mean of % per country)</i>	<i>(mean of % per country)</i>
Latvia	70,46	73,32
Lithuania	69,48	67,81
Ukraine	71,07	66,24
Georgia	58,69	45,93
Slovenia	89,55	85,76

SECTION 2: ABOUT SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Q7	Principal's gender	
	Female	male
Latvia	26,2%	73,8%
Lithuania	48,8%	51,2%
Ukraine	44,6%	55,4%
Georgia	63,8%	36,2%
Slovenia	48,7%	51,3%

Q8	Principal's age				
	20-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	more than 60
Latvia	0,0%	9,3%	33,9%	44,3%	12,6%
Lithuania	1,0%	7,2%	46,4%	38,8%	6,7%
Ukraine	0,8%	14,7%	43,1%	34,7%	6,7%
Georgia	0,7%	26,1%	38,6%	31,4%	3,3%
Slovenia	0,0%	5,4%	29,7%	54,1%	10,8%

Q9	How long have you been a school Principal?		
	maximum	mean	std. deviation
Latvia	40	13,03	8,354
Lithuania	35	12,00	7,767
Ukraine	40	10,95	8,147
Georgia	29	6,32	7,148
Slovenia	25	10,82	6,518

Q10	Have you been involved in the Matura examination system? <i>Please check all that apply.</i>			
	Teaching students in preparation for the exams	Organizing/administering Matura examinations in my school	Organizing/administering Matura examinations outside my school	Working as a marker of students' exams' scripts
Latvia	28,6%	93,0%	3,2%	10,3%
Lithuania	40,0%	93,3%	11,9%	36,2%
Ukraine	37,7%	63,1%	n/a	1,9%
Georgia	23,5%	43,8%	6,5%	2,6%
Slovenia	35,9%	87,2%	28,2%	n/a

SECTION 3: ABOUT THE MATURA EXAMINATION SYSTEMS

Please read statements below carefully and try to estimate the extent to which you agree with each of them (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral (Not sure), Disagree or Strongly Disagree).

Q11_1	I have a good understanding of the national Matura examination system				
	strongly agree	Agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	48,6%	43,1%	6,1%	2,2%	0,0%
Lithuania	52,7%	42,0%	3,9%	1,5%	0,0%
Ukraine	18,0%	66,5%	12,4%	3,0%	0,0%
Georgia	49,3%	49,3%	0,7%	0,7%	0,0%
Slovenia	74,4%	25,6%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%

Q11_2	Matura examinations are a fair way of selecting students for university places.				
	strongly agree	Agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	16,5%	40,7%	28,6%	13,2%	1,1%
Lithuania	36,1%	41,8%	16,3%	5,8%	0,0%
Ukraine	30,3%	51,7%	9,7%	7,4%	1,1%
Georgia	32,9%	55,3%	7,2%	4,6%	0,0%
Slovenia	12,8%	53,8%	15,4%	17,9%	0,0%

Q11_3	Schools have enough information about the Matura examinations.				
	strongly agree	Agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	34,6%	54,4%	6,6%	4,4%	0,0%
Lithuania	54,5%	42,1%	1,4%	1,9%	0,0%
Ukraine	23,6%	60,1%	6,5%	9,7%	0,0%
Georgia	42,4%	51,0%	4,0%	2,6%	0,0%
Slovenia	51,3%	48,7%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%

Q11_4	I feel confident when explaining the Matura examination system to staff and parents.				
	strongly agree	Agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	33,5%	52,7%	11,5%	1,6%	0,5%
Lithuania	51,2%	45,0%	2,9%	1,0%	0,0%
Ukraine	25,5%	60,8%	8,8%	4,8%	0,0%
Georgia	41,2%	53,6%	4,6%	0,7%	0,0%
Slovenia	61,5%	38,5%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%

Q11_5	The examination reforms of recent years have made private tutoring more of a problem.				
	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	8,8%	27,6%	39,8%	21,5%	2,2%
Lithuania	26,8%	36,8%	26,8%	7,7%	1,9%
Ukraine	13,1%	42,5%	23,6%	19,2%	1,7%
Georgia	23,8%	42,2%	18,4%	15,6%	0,0%
Slovenia	5,1%	20,5%	35,9%	38,5%	0,0%

Q11_6	Students have complained that the examination system is not clear to them.				
	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	0,0%	6,6%	19,2%	63,2%	11,0%
Lithuania	1,4%	13,8%	18,1%	56,2%	10,5%
Ukraine	1,3%	6,1%	12,7%	68,2%	11,7%
Georgia	1,3%	4,0%	15,2%	71,5%	7,9%
Slovenia	5,1%	2,6%	5,1%	69,2%	17,9%

Q11_7	Matura examinations encourage cheating and other forms of malpractice.				
	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	1,7%	14,4%	18,2%	48,1%	17,7%
Lithuania	2,9%	5,2%	16,7%	50,5%	24,8%
Ukraine	0,9%	5,8%	6,6%	60,8%	26,0%
Georgia	2,0%	3,9%	3,3%	55,3%	35,5%
Slovenia	2,6%	0,0%	10,3%	28,2%	59,0%

Q11_8	Teachers are confused about changes to the examination system.				
	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	0,0%	9,3%	18,7%	61,5%	10,4%
Lithuania	17,7%	54,5%	14,4%	11,0%	2,4%
Ukraine	1,1%	8,2%	14,9%	63,2%	12,6%
Georgia	0,7%	9,2%	6,5%	75,8%	7,8%
Slovenia	7,7%	0,0%	10,3%	53,8%	28,2%

Q11_9	Teachers are increasingly teaching to the examination syllabus and neglecting other parts of the curriculum.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	0,0%	5,5%	8,3%	64,1%	22,1%
Lithuania	8,6%	34,8%	17,1%	35,7%	3,8%
Ukraine	3,6%	16,2%	14,7%	56,8%	8,6%
Georgia	2,0%	9,2%	9,8%	69,3%	9,8%
Slovenia	10,3%	56,4%	17,9%	10,3%	5,1%

Q11_10	The new/current examination system is an improvement on the former system.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	4,0%	32,8%	39,0%	20,3%	4,0%
Lithuania	19,0%	50,0%	23,3%	5,7%	1,9%
Ukraine	3,2%	43,3%	16,3%	33,0%	4,2%
Georgia	52,9%	37,9%	5,2%	2,6%	1,3%
Slovenia	12,8%	35,9%	43,6%	5,1%	2,6%

Q11_11	Generally, the exam papers for Matura examinations are of a high quality.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	3,9%	57,5%	22,7%	16,0%	0,0%
Lithuania	2,9%	40,6%	38,6%	16,4%	1,4%
Ukraine	5,9%	45,2%	30,8%	15,9%	2,1%
Georgia	19,2%	57,6%	17,2%	6,0%	0,0%
Slovenia	5,3%	68,4%	21,1%	5,3%	0,0%

Q11_12	I trust the results of the Matura examination process.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	5,5%	54,7%	26,0%	13,3%	0,6%
Lithuania	18,7%	63,6%	14,8%	2,4%	0,5%
Ukraine	19,2%	64,3%	12,0%	4,0%	0,4%
Georgia	36,4%	51,0%	9,3%	3,3%	0,0%
Slovenia	23,1%	61,5%	10,3%	5,1%	0,0%

Q11_13	Matura exams are unfair for students from rural schools.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	0,6%	11,8%	33,7%	41,6%	12,4%
Lithuania	7,2%	20,1%	23,0%	41,1%	8,6%
Ukraine	5,4%	18,7%	24,3%	43,9%	7,7%
Georgia	1,3%	2,0%	7,2%	69,9%	19,6%
Slovenia	0,0%	5,1%	10,3%	48,7%	35,9%

Q11_14	Matura exams increase social inequality.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	0,6%	7,8%	24,0%	50,8%	16,8%
Lithuania	3,3%	13,9%	20,6%	50,7%	11,5%
Ukraine	4,7%	23,5%	13,0%	51,2%	7,7%
Georgia	1,3%	4,6%	7,3%	62,3%	24,5%
Slovenia	12,8%	28,2%	28,2%	23,1%	7,7%

Q11_15	For most students, the knowledge received in school is enough for them to succeed in Matura exams without any extra help from a private tutor.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	7,2%	75,7%	8,3%	8,3%	0,6%
Lithuania	8,1%	58,1%	16,2%	14,3%	3,3%
Ukraine	6,1%	50,9%	13,9%	26,3%	2,7%
Georgia	2,0%	25,2%	20,5%	49,7%	2,6%
Slovenia	23,7%	68,4%	7,9%	0,0%	0,0%

Q11_16	The results of Matura exams are good indicators of a school's overall performance.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	2,7%	36,3%	20,3%	35,2%	5,5%
Lithuania	5,3%	22,2%	21,7%	40,1%	10,6%
Ukraine	14,7%	54,5%	14,5%	14,3%	1,9%
Georgia	12,4%	56,2%	13,1%	17,6%	0,7%
Slovenia	7,7%	28,2%	25,6%	33,3%	5,1%

Q11_17	The centralized Matura exams reduce the room for corruption in education.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	3,9%	44,8%	27,6%	21,5%	2,2%
Lithuania	12,9%	50,5%	24,3%	11,0%	1,4%
Ukraine	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Georgia	32,7%	60,8%	4,6%	2,0%	0,0%
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Think about the administration of Matura examinations. Try to estimate the extent to which these issues might be important for the examination system.

Q12_1	Preventing leakage of the exam papers before the exams.				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	52,5%	29,3%	16,0%	2,2%	0,0%
Lithuania	59,5%	27,1%	5,2%	3,3%	4,8%
Ukraine	54,9%	25,5%	16,0%	2,7%	0,8%
Georgia	42,3%	37,3%	2,1%	3,5%	14,8%
Slovenia	89,7%	7,7%	2,6%	0,0%	0,0%

Q12_2	Arranging proper rooms and furniture for the exams.				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	4,4%	34,1%	59,9%	1,6%	0,0%
Lithuania	47,8%	47,4%	4,3%	0,5%	0,0%
Ukraine	15,2%	36,5%	44,9%	3,4%	0,0%
Georgia	53,3%	19,3%	22,7%	3,3%	1,3%
Slovenia	15,4%	38,5%	33,3%	12,8%	0,0%

Q12_3	Proper distribution of exam materials before the examination (logistics).				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	11,5%	42,9%	40,7%	3,3%	1,6%
Lithuania	52,6%	41,6%	4,8%	1,0%	0,0%
Ukraine	35,9%	40,3%	23,8%	0,0%	0,0%
Georgia	38,7%	54,0%	4,7%	1,3%	1,3%
Slovenia	48,7%	38,5%	12,8%	0,0%	0,0%

Q12_4	Ensuring that students are silent during examinations.				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	19,9%	54,7%	25,4%	0,0%	0,0%
Lithuania	63,5%	35,6%	1,0%	0,0%	0,0%
Ukraine	33,7%	41,5%	23,5%	0,4%	0,8%
Georgia	47,3%	52,0%	0,7%	0,0%	0,0%
Slovenia	43,6%	51,3%	5,1%	0,0%	0,0%

Q12_5	Preventing students from cheating during the examination.				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	30,9%	49,7%	19,3%	0,0%	0,0%
Lithuania	72,4%	26,2%	1,0%	0,0%	0,5%
Ukraine	36,8%	40,4%	21,6%	0,4%	0,8%
Georgia	42,6%	51,4%	2,7%	1,4%	2,0%
Slovenia	59,0%	38,5%	2,6%	0,0%	0,0%

Q12_6	Collecting materials efficiently at the end of the examination.				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	18,8%	49,2%	28,7%	2,8%	0,6%
Lithuania	47,1%	43,8%	6,7%	1,0%	1,4%
Ukraine	22,0%	36,2%	38,8%	3,0%	0,0%
Georgia	53,7%	28,9%	12,8%	4,0%	0,7%
Slovenia	23,1%	59,0%	15,4%	2,6%	0,0%

Q12_7	Ensuring public trust in the exam data processing.				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	28,6%	46,2%	23,1%	1,6%	0,5%
Lithuania	37,5%	52,9%	7,2%	1,4%	1,0%
Ukraine	40,0%	38,7%	20,1%	0,8%	0,4%
Georgia	43,6%	48,3%	5,4%	1,3%	1,3%
Slovenia	61,5%	28,2%	10,3%	0,0%	0,0%

Q12_8	Reducing the impact of holding examinations on ordinary school's life (e.g. problems caused by the exam session timetable)				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	31,5%	50,8%	16,6%	1,1%	0,0%
Lithuania	60,8%	33,5%	5,3%	0,0%	0,5%
Ukraine	22,6%	35,2%	38,0%	3,2%	1,1%
Georgia	43,7%	42,3%	9,2%	0,7%	4,2%
Slovenia	25,6%	53,8%	20,5%	0,0%	0,0%

Q12_9	Making sure that all institutions of higher education (e.g. universities) use Matura exams' results and do not run their own entrance exams.				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	37,4%	40,1%	19,2%	2,7%	0,5%
Lithuania	45,2%	29,0%	12,4%	8,6%	4,8%
Ukraine	58,1%	24,6%	12,1%	1,5%	3,8%
Georgia	40,7%	35,7%	9,3%	3,6%	10,7%
Slovenia	23,1%	33,3%	23,1%	12,8%	7,7%

Q12_10	Ensuring the reliability of marking of students exams' scripts.				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	51,1%	36,8%	12,1%	0,0%	0,0%
Lithuania	59,0%	39,5%	1,0%	0,0%	0,5%
Ukraine	47,3%	37,6%	13,8%	0,4%	0,8%
Georgia	34,5%	62,2%	1,4%	0,7%	1,4%
Slovenia	38,5%	46,2%	15,4%	0,0%	0,0%

Q12_11	Only anonymous (coded) student's exam script might be processed (marked).				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	3,9%	44,8%	27,6%	21,5%	2,2%
Lithuania	12,9%	50,5%	24,3%	11,0%	1,4%
Ukraine	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Georgia	32,7%	60,8%	4,6%	2,0%	0,0%
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Q12_12	Student should have a right to see his/her script after examination.				
	essential	very important	some importance	not important	I do not know
Latvia	3,9%	44,8%	27,6%	21,5%	2,2%
Lithuania	12,9%	50,5%	24,3%	11,0%	1,4%
Ukraine	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Georgia	32,7%	60,8%	4,6%	2,0%	0,0%
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

In which areas do you think Matura examinations could add value to education? *Please check one circle for each row which the best corresponds to your opinion.*

Q13_1	Increasing fairness (equity) for students.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	26,9%	51,1%	13,7%	7,7%	0,5%
Lithuania	25,0%	51,0%	11,5%	12,0%	0,5%
Ukraine	60,5%	35,5%	2,5%	1,3%	0,2%
Georgia	63,5%	31,8%	2,7%	1,4%	0,7%
Slovenia	35,9%	51,3%	7,7%	2,6%	2,6%

Q13_2	Making schools more accountable for standards of teaching.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	19,2%	50,5%	20,3%	9,3%	0,5%
Lithuania	21,9%	61,0%	5,2%	11,4%	0,5%
Ukraine	38,9%	55,0%	4,2%	1,7%	0,2%
Georgia	64,2%	33,8%	1,4%	0,7%	0,0%
Slovenia	33,3%	56,4%	10,3%	0,0%	0,0%

Q13_3	Motivating students in their learning.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	9,3%	50,0%	24,7%	15,4%	0,5%
Lithuania	21,0%	65,7%	6,2%	7,1%	0,0%
Ukraine	41,5%	51,3%	5,1%	1,9%	0,2%
Georgia	68,2%	31,8%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%
Slovenia	7,7%	74,4%	12,8%	5,1%	0,0%

Q13_4	Motivating teachers to rise up their qualification.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	12,1%	49,5%	22,0%	15,9%	0,5%
Lithuania	25,0%	65,9%	3,4%	5,8%	0,0%
Ukraine	41,5%	50,9%	6,4%	0,9%	0,4%
Georgia	73,3%	26,0%	0,7%	0,0%	0,0%
Slovenia	10,3%	71,8%	12,8%	2,6%	2,6%

Q13_5	Reducing the need for private tutoring.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	1,1%	11,0%	45,9%	36,5%	5,5%
Lithuania	2,4%	15,3%	23,0%	39,2%	20,1%
Ukraine	9,1%	31,7%	24,7%	31,5%	3,0%
Georgia	31,3%	50,7%	14,0%	4,0%	0,0%
Slovenia	0,0%	15,4%	43,6%	33,3%	7,7%

Q13_6	Identifying the best students for universities.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	11,0%	51,4%	21,5%	14,9%	1,1%
Lithuania	17,2%	56,0%	11,5%	12,4%	2,9%
Ukraine	29,9%	51,6%	10,8%	6,6%	1,1%
Georgia	42,9%	35,4%	10,2%	9,5%	2,0%
Slovenia	0,0%	28,2%	35,9%	33,3%	2,6%

Q13_7	Giving valuable, objective data on educational standards.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	4,4%	51,1%	26,9%	16,5%	1,1%
Lithuania	6,3%	46,2%	26,0%	19,7%	1,9%
Ukraine	19,8%	68,0%	10,7%	1,5%	0,0%
Georgia	50,3%	46,3%	2,7%	0,7%	0,0%
Slovenia	10,3%	53,8%	20,5%	12,8%	2,6%

Q13_8	Identifying weak links in the school system.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	3,8%	31,9%	33,5%	29,1%	1,6%
Lithuania	4,8%	34,6%	24,0%	33,7%	2,9%
Ukraine	13,5%	58,1%	17,3%	10,8%	0,2%
Georgia	36,4%	55,9%	2,8%	3,5%	1,4%
Slovenia	5,1%	30,8%	43,6%	12,8%	7,7%

Q14_1	I would like to see Matura examinations in more subjects.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	3,9%	14,4%	26,1%	46,7%	8,9%
Lithuania	7,7%	27,9%	16,3%	44,7%	3,4%
Ukraine	28,8%	51,6%	8,2%	10,8%	0,6%
Georgia	6,0%	18,8%	20,8%	51,0%	3,4%
Slovenia	2,6%	0,0%	7,7%	64,1%	25,6%

Q14_2	I would like to receive more detailed information about examination results.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	29,1%	57,1%	9,9%	3,8%	0,0%
Lithuania	19,5%	59,0%	5,2%	12,9%	3,3%
Ukraine	27,1%	57,0%	9,5%	6,1%	0,2%
Georgia	21,5%	69,8%	6,7%	1,3%	0,7%
Slovenia	10,3%	28,2%	28,2%	30,8%	2,6%

Q14_3	The external examination system is OK but some aspects should be improved.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	14,9%	68,5%	11,6%	5,0%	0,0%
Lithuania	23,6%	71,2%	3,4%	1,9%	0,0%
Ukraine	19,7%	73,4%	5,1%	1,7%	0,2%
Georgia	14,3%	72,1%	8,8%	4,8%	0,0%
Slovenia	20,5%	64,1%	12,8%	2,6%	0,0%

Q14_4	Selection examinations should be set and controlled by the universities.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	9,9%	19,2%	21,4%	40,1%	9,3%
Lithuania	10,5%	16,3%	7,7%	42,1%	23,4%
Ukraine	10,4%	37,2%	20,9%	27,0%	4,5%
Georgia	3,4%	14,9%	23,0%	50,7%	8,1%
Slovenia	7,9%	23,7%	23,7%	31,6%	13,2%

Q14_5	I would like to see more school-based assessment.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	15,4%	44,5%	29,7%	9,3%	1,1%
Lithuania	3,9%	13,0%	16,9%	54,1%	12,1%
Ukraine	38,6%	53,1%	5,5%	2,5%	0,2%
Georgia	30,7%	48,7%	8,0%	12,0%	0,7%
Slovenia	5,1%	38,5%	17,9%	35,9%	2,6%

Q14_6	There should be more use of computerized scoring to reduce subjectivity.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Lithuania	18,7%	45,5%	16,7%	18,2%	1,0%
Ukraine	33,4%	54,0%	8,9%	3,4%	0,2%
Georgia	20,1%	50,3%	19,5%	9,4%	0,7%
Slovenia	7,9%	13,2%	18,4%	50,0%	10,5%

Q14_7	I think the external examination system should be abandoned.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	3,9%	4,4%	28,2%	45,3%	18,2%
Lithuania	5,3%	11,5%	12,5%	55,3%	15,4%
Ukraine	1,7%	2,5%	11,2%	57,5%	27,1%
Georgia	0,0%	0,7%	12,8%	55,7%	30,9%
Slovenia	2,6%	7,9%	7,9%	39,5%	42,1%

Q14_8	The school should get back marked students' scripts after the exam.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	34,3%	48,1%	9,9%	7,2%	0,6%
Lithuania	34,8%	44,3%	8,1%	11,4%	1,4%
Ukraine	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Georgia	8,7%	53,7%	22,1%	12,8%	2,7%
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Q14_9	The effective appeal system should include the student's right to discuss his/her script's marking process.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	11,0%	35,4%	34,3%	16,6%	2,8%
Lithuania	14,8%	48,1%	15,2%	20,0%	1,9%
Ukraine	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Georgia	22,1%	62,4%	10,1%	5,4%	0,0%
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Q14_10	The final student's result on Matura exam should consist from two parts: external and internal (done by school).				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	11,5%	31,9%	25,3%	23,6%	7,7%
Lithuania	6,7%	24,3%	35,2%	29,0%	4,8%
Ukraine	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Georgia	24,8%	55,0%	10,1%	10,1%	0,0%
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Q14_11	In the nearest future the testing on computer will be the most objective way to assess students' knowledge.				
	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
Latvia	5,6%	27,8%	33,9%	26,7%	6,1%
Lithuania	17,6%	40,0%	17,6%	20,5%	4,3%
Ukraine	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Georgia	22,3%	47,3%	16,2%	13,5%	0,7%
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a