



Kent Academic Repository

Dolton, Peter and de Vries, Robert (2020) *Reading Between the Lines: What the World Really Thinks of Teachers*. The Varkey Foundation

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/90993/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://www.varkeyfoundation.org/media/6525/reading-between-the-lines.pdf>

This document version

Publisher pdf

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).



READING BETWEEN THE LINES

WHAT THE WORLD REALLY THINKS
OF TEACHERS



**VARKEY
FOUNDATION**

A good teacher for every child

READING BETWEEN THE LINES

WHAT THE WORLD REALLY THINKS OF TEACHERS

AUTHORS

Professor Peter Dolton, University of Sussex

Doctor Robert De Vries, University of Kent



About the Varkey Foundation

The Varkey Foundation is a not-for-profit organisation established to improve the standards of education for underprivileged children throughout the world. Our mission is to ensure that every child has a good teacher.

The Varkey Foundation is a charity registered with the Charity Commission for England and Wales under charity number 1145119 and a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales under company number 07774287. Registered Office: 2nd Floor, St Albans, 57-59 Haymarket, London SW1Y 4QX

Copyright © The Varkey Foundation, 2020. www.varkeyfoundation.org. All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced in any form or by any means without written permission of Varkey Foundation, or of Varkey Foundation. We welcome its citation and use for non-commercial purposes, and ask that you credit the Varkey Foundation where you do use our data and/or our conclusions. If you have any questions about the report, any of its findings, please feel free to contact info@varkeyfoundation.org.

Cover: Peter Tabichi lifts the Global Teacher Prize Trophy at the 2019 award ceremony. © Varkey Foundation

CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	3
Data and Methodology.....	9
1. Teacher Status: Three Alternate Measures.....	13
2. Teacher Status and Student Outcomes	25
3. Teacher Status Across Countries	33
Summary and Conclusions	41
Technical Appendix	47
References.....	70

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



Photo: Global Teacher Prize Finalist Wu Rongjin (China) © Wu Rongjin

The high status of teachers is vital to the functioning of schools and to instilling parental confidence in all educational systems. The Varkey Foundation’s Global Teacher Status Index (GTSI) survey represents the most comprehensive research that has ever been conducted to robustly document teacher status around the world. The latest survey, which commissioned by the foundation in 2018, collected data on teacher status from a diverse sample of 35 countries, covering Africa, the Americas, Asia, Australasia and Europe. It followed on from a survey commissioned by the Varkey Foundation in 2013 that documented teacher status in 21 countries.

The Global Teacher Status Index is the most comprehensive research ever conducted on the status of the teaching profession around the world.

In our 2018 report that set out the results from the latest GTSI survey, we collated a variety of indicators to derive a single international index of teacher status.¹ We found dramatic variations in teacher status between countries, consistent with the findings from our 2013 survey. We also found that this variation appeared to be substantively related to children’s attainment as measured by scores on the 2018 OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA).

Our objectives in the present report are threefold. First, we explore the concept of teacher status more thoroughly than we were able to in the previous omnibus report. Second, we conduct a more robust investigation of the link between teacher status and student attainment (making use of updated PISA data). And third, we explore the factors which may explain why teachers enjoy higher status in some countries than others.

¹ Dolton, Marcenaro, de Vries and She, *Global Teacher Status Index 2018*, Varkey Foundation (2018)

THREE NEW MEASURES OF TEACHER STATUS

Our first task in this report is to more thoroughly explore the concept of ‘teacher status’. Our primary measure of teacher status is the Global Teacher Status Index (GTSI) itself. This measure uses a mathematical technique called Principal Component Analysis to take information from a variety of different survey questions about teachers and summarise it in a single score from 0-100. This score indicates the overall status of teachers in each country under consideration.

The GTSI is a framework that allows us to consider teacher status as a single, unitary concept. However, people’s views of teachers are likely to be more nuanced than a single measure allows. In this report, we explore three alternate ways of assessing people’s views of teacher status. We compare them against each other, and against the GTSI itself. These measures are described in detail in the section “Teacher status: Three alternate measures”. However, briefly, we contrast:

- **Ranked Teacher Status:** A measure based on how teachers are ranked relative to other comparable occupations;
- **Implicit Teacher Status:** A scale based on people’s implicit perceptions of teachers; and
- **Explicit Teacher Status:** A scale based on people’s explicit judgements of teachers’ characteristics and working conditions.

Exploring these varying focuses and measurement approaches allows us to come to a deeper understanding of people’s multifaceted views of teachers. In contrasting these measures, we find that, although they are all linked (again suggesting that we are tapping into a single underlying stance towards teachers), they are nevertheless distinct.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHER STATUS AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

The distinction between these three alternative measures is important to our second objective: an analysis of the relationship between teacher status and student learning outcomes. In this analysis we use the latest available PISA data, published in 2018. Our results re-affirm our previous finding that teacher status can be an important predictor of student attainment, as measured by PISA scores in Reading, Mathematics and Science.

In comparing the latest PISA results with the GTSI and our three alternate measures, we find:

- **2018 GTSI:** Teacher status, as measured by the GTSI, is moderately positively correlated with 2018 PISA results. In countries with higher GTSI scores, PISA scores tend to be higher. Around 8% of the variation in PISA scores between countries is explained by differences in teacher status as measured by the GTSI 2018.
- **Ranked Teacher Status:** Again, there is a moderate positive correlation between Ranked Teacher Status and the 2018 PISA results. In countries where teachers are ranked higher in terms of respect relative to other occupations, PISA scores tend to be higher. Around 13% of the variation in PISA scores between countries is explained by differences in teacher status rankings.
- **Implicit Teacher Status:** There is a remarkably strong positive correlation between Implicit Teacher Status and the 2018 PISA results. PISA scores are significantly higher in countries where people implicitly view teachers more positively. Around 31% of the variation in PISA scores between countries is explained by differences in Implicit Teacher Status.
- **Explicit Teacher Status:** In contrast to our findings on implicit status, the correlation between explicit views of teacher status and PISA scores is negligible. Only 3% of the variation in PISA scores between countries is explained by differences in explicitly expressed teacher status. This is a surprising result, given that one might expect explicit evaluations of teacher attributes and working conditions to be most relevant to attainment.

In addition to the above measures of teacher status, teacher wages are also strongly correlated with PISA scores. In further analyses, we determined that these effects are independent of each other. Regardless of how well teachers are paid, children perform better in countries where teacher status is higher (as measured by the ranking or implicit measures). Adjusting for teacher pay, in countries where teachers are ranked one place higher relative to other occupations, children perform 21.3 points better in PISA on average.

EXAMINING DIFFERENCES IN TEACHER STATUS ACROSS COUNTRIES

Our third objective for this report was to examine the factors that might explain cross-national differences in teacher status. This is important for two reasons.

First, as we note above, improving teacher status is, in our view, a necessary part of improving children's education worldwide.

Understanding what factors might underlie differences in teacher status is therefore an important step towards that goal. We find that teachers generally enjoy higher status in richer countries, and in countries which allot a greater fraction of public funds to education. We also find that teachers are generally lower status in countries where the profession is more feminised (i.e. where a greater fraction of the teaching workforce is female). We find that teacher status is unrelated to the extent to which schools are privately run, or to the extent to which the education system is focused on vocational training as opposed to academic education.

The second reason this analysis is important is that it also contributes to our understanding of the relationship between teacher status and student attainment. Crucially, we find that this relationship does not appear to be explained by background factors which may be related to both higher teacher status and better PISA scores (such as national wealth or government spending on education).

Finally, in addition to more concrete predictors of teacher status, we also examine potential cultural correlates. Here we find little evidence that teacher status is part of a cluster of other cultural values unrelated to education. However, we are unable to determine whether it is part of a broader sense in which education holds high intrinsic cultural value.

Adjusting for teacher pay, in countries where teachers are ranked one place higher relative to other occupations, children perform 21.3 points better in PISA on average.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY



Photo: Global Teacher Prize Finalist Anh Phuong Ha (Vietnam) © Anh Phuong Ha

DATA

This report is based principally on data from the 2018 GTSI survey. This survey, which was undertaken by the polling company Populus, included more than 41,000 people in 35 countries. The sample in each country comprised two components. First, quota sampling was used to obtain a balanced and demographically representative sample of 1,000 members of the general public in each country. Second, an additional over-sample of 200 teachers was surveyed in each country. Data were collected through a mix of online and face-to-face, computer-aided personal interviewing (CAPI). Full details of the survey methodology can be found in Dolton et al., (2018). A full copy of the questionnaire is included as an Appendix to this report. All results described in this report are based on the general population sample in each country. An additional over-sample of teachers was also surveyed, but the data from this additional sample is excluded from the following analyses.

METHODS

This report describes the results of three main sets of analyses:

MEASURING TEACHER STATUS

An examination of three alternative measures of teacher status:

- **Ranking status measure:** How teachers are ranked relative to other comparable occupations.
- **Implicit status measure:** Measuring respondents' implicit perceptions of teachers.
- **Explicit status measure:** Measuring respondents' explicit judgements about teachers.

The derivation of these measures is described in detail in the section "Teacher status: Three alternate measures".

COMPARING TEACHER STATUS AND STUDENT ATTAINMENT

An examination of the relationship between the three alternative measures of teacher status and student attainment, as measured by PISA scores.

These analyses examine the relationship between:

- Average teacher status scores; and
- Average scores in PISA Reading, Mathematics and Science at the country level from the 2018 PISA assessments.

It should be noted that five of the 35 countries participating in the GTSI 2018 survey did not take part in the PISA assessments (Egypt, Ghana, India, Taiwan and Uganda²). Our analyses are therefore based on the remaining 30 countries. Full details of this analysis are given in the section “Teacher status and student outcomes”.

EXAMINING THE FACTORS THAT DRIVE TEACHER STATUS

An examination of country-level predictors of teacher status. These analyses examine the relationship between:

- Various country-level predictors (including national wealth, education spending, the gender composition of the teaching workforce, and measures of cultural values); and
- Average teacher status.

Data sources and details of each indicator are given in the section “Teacher status across countries”.

² Due to differences in education systems, education outcomes, and teacher status, we consider Taiwan separately from the People’s Republic of China for the purposes of our analyses.

What explains why teachers are accorded so much more respect in some countries than others? And what are the implications of teacher status for students? Do students in countries where teachers are highly respected perform better?

1. TEACHER STATUS: THREE ALTERNATE MEASURES

By the end of the lesson, students should be able to:



Photo: Global Teacher Prize Finalist Samuel Isaiah (Malaysia) © Samuel Isaiah

In this investigation we explore three different methods for measuring the status of teachers: Ranked, Implicit and Explicit. In this section we explain the rationale for these three different measures and how they were computed.

RANKED TEACHER STATUS

Our first measure of teacher status is based on a ranking of occupations in relation to each other. GTSI 2018 respondents were asked to rank the following 14 professions in the order of how well they thought were respected (with 14 being the highest and 1 being the lowest):³

- Primary school teacher
- Secondary school teacher
- Head teacher
- Doctor
- Nurse
- Librarian
- Local government manager
- Social worker
- Website designer
- Police officer
- Engineer
- Lawyer
- Accountant
- Management consultant

³ The order of this list was randomised to ensure that responses were not biased by the order in which occupations were listed.

Table 1: Average status rank across all countries

(Highest=14; Lowest=1)

Occupation	Average Rank
Doctor	11.6
Lawyer	9.5
Engineer	9.1
Head teacher	8.1
Police officer	7.8
Nurse	7.4
Accountant	7.3
Local government manger	7.3
Management consultant	7.1
Secondary school teacher	7.0
Primary school teacher	6.4
Web designer	5.9
Social worker	5.8
Librarian	4.6

These occupations were deliberately chosen to require at least secondary education along with further training (which for the majority will be a degree, but for others will be professional training). The occupations were also carefully selected to cover a variety of different types of work in both the private and public sectors.

The rationale for this measure is that respondents are not required to make an explicit quantitative judgement about any specific occupation on any set dimension. Rather, the ranking measure taps into a more instinctive sense of which occupations are more or less prestigious. This is similar to the rationale for widely used CAMSIS measure of occupational status (Prandy and Jones, 2001).

The average rank for each occupation across all countries is given in Table 1.

This table shows that headteachers are, on average, ranked among the top four occupations, but that secondary and primary teachers are near the bottom, above only librarians, social workers and web designers. However, these averages disguise a high degree of heterogeneity between countries, as can be seen in Figure 1, below, which shows the average ranking accorded to each type of teacher in each of the countries participating in GTSI 2018.

Figure 1: Headteacher, secondary teacher and primary teacher occupational respect rankings by the general public across countries




Figure 1 shows some consistent patterns: headteachers were perceived as more highly respected than secondary teachers in every country except Taiwan and Hungary. Secondary teachers were perceived as more highly respected than primary teachers in every country except Turkey, the USA, and France. However, there are pronounced differences between countries in the status rank of teachers. Focusing on secondary teachers specifically, at the bottom of the scale in Brazil and Israel, they are on average ranked only fifth out of the 14 occupations. Whereas in China and Malaysia, at the other end of the scale, secondary teachers are ranked eighth or ninth.

It is these variations in teacher status (as measured by ranking measurement as well as by our implicit and explicit measurements) that we explore in this report. What explains why teachers are accorded so much more respect in some countries than others? And what are the implications of teacher status for students? Do students in countries where teachers are highly respected perform better?

IMPLICIT TEACHER STATUS


Our second measure of occupational status is an attempt to tap into respondents' implicit (unconsidered, automatic) impressions of teachers. This is measured using a sequence of word associations. Respondents were asked to, as quickly as possible, indicate which one of the following pairs of opposite words they most associated with teachers:

- **Trusted/Untrusted**
- **Well paid/Poorly paid**
- **Influential/Not influential**
- **Inspiring/Uninspiring**
- **Respected/Not respected**
- **High status/Low status**
- **Hard working/Lazy**
- **Caring/Uncaring**
- **High flyer/Mediocre**
- **Intelligent/Unintelligent**

To create our measure of Implicit Teacher Status we combined information on whether the respondent gave a positive or negative response with information on how long they took to respond. Positive responses were given a positive score, and negative responses a negative score. The value of the score depended on the time taken to respond: responses given in under two seconds were given a score of +5 or -5 (depending on whether the response was positive or negative), responses given in two to four seconds were given a score of +4/-4, responses in four to six seconds a score of +3/-3, responses in six to eight seconds a score of +2/-2, and responses between eight to 10 seconds a score of +1/-1. Responses after 10 seconds were given a score of zero. These scores were summed and then rescaled to give a score from 0-100. In this way, quicker responses were assumed to be indicative of a more decisive view.

The rationale for this measure is based on a large volume of psychological research demonstrating that people's spontaneous, unreflective feelings can be quite different to their deliberate, considered attitudes (Mayerl, 2013). In an often-studied example, spontaneous measures find evidence of negative attitudes towards ethnic minorities which are not picked up by conventional survey questions (Banaji, 2013).

Figure 2: Mean Implicit Teacher Status scores across countries



This may be a consequence of social desirability bias: when asked a conventional survey question, respondents give the answer they think will reflect best on them, rather than their true feelings (Dovidio et al., 1997). Or it may be because the negative attitudes in question are largely implicit. Implicit attitudes are unconscious, automatically activated feelings and associations we hold in relation to certain subjects or groups (Greenwald et al., 1998). For example, consciously we may genuinely believe that women are no less technically competent than men. However, due to persistent exposure to sexist stereotypes, unconsciously we may associate greater technical competence with men (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012).

The majority of the previous literature on the difference between spontaneous and deliberate attitudes has focused on negative feelings about traditionally stigmatised groups (Banaji, 2013). Teachers clearly do not fit this description. However, precisely the same processes may apply to teachers as to other groups. When asked conventional survey questions, respondents may feel a social pressure to give a positive view of teachers, even if their true feelings or beliefs are quite different. Respondents may also hold positive or negative unconscious perceptions of teachers - feelings and associations of which they themselves are not fully aware. Measures which encourage spontaneous, reflexive responses

may therefore offer an additional insight into the popular perception of teachers in the survey countries.

Figure 2 shows the average of this score across the countries in our sample.

EXPLICIT TEACHER STATUS

Our third measure of teacher status is based on participants' explicit responses to questions about the characteristics of teachers and teaching. Respondents were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the following nine propositions concerning the working conditions, abilities, and professionalism of teachers:


- Being an effective teacher requires rigorous training.
- **It is too easy to become a teacher.**
- **The quality of teachers is too variable.**
- Pupils respect teachers in my country.
- The teachers in my children's school are respected by their pupils.
- Teachers work hard.
- Teachers enjoy a positive media image.
- **Teachers have long holidays.**
- Teachers have the autonomy to exercise their professional judgement.

Response options were: Strongly Agree, Tend To Agree, Neither Agree Nor Disagree, Tend To Disagree, Strongly Disagree. We scored these responses as follows:

- Strongly Agree (5)
- Tend To Agree (3)
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree (0)
- Tend To Disagree (-3)
- Strongly Disagree (-5)

The statements given in red text in the list above were considered to indicate a negative view of teachers (where the rest of the statements indicated a positive view). Responses to these statements were therefore scored in the reverse direction.

Figure 3: Mean Explicit Teacher Status scores across countries



To these nine items we added a tenth (scoring indicated in parentheses):

“Imagine you had children. To what extent do you think you would encourage or not encourage them to become a teacher?”

- **Definitely Encourage (5)**
- **Probably Encourage (3)**
- **Maybe Encourage (0)**
- **Probably Not Encourage (-3)**
- **Definitely Not Encourage (-5)**

The scores on these 10 items were summed, then rescaled to give a score from 0 to 100.

Figure 3 shows the average of this score across the countries in our sample.

Table 2: Correlations between the different measures of teacher status (Pearson's R) in the full non-teacher sample

(N=35,566)

	Rank (Primary)	Rank (Secondary)	Rank (Head)	Implicit status	Explicit status
Rank (Primary)	-	-	-	-	-
Rank (Secondary)	0.55	-	-	-	-
Rank (Head)	0.18	0.23	-	-	-
Implicit status	0.20	0.23	0.13	-	-
Explicit status	0.17	0.18	0.10	0.52	-

COMPARING THE THREE MEASURES OF TEACHER STATUS

Table 2 shows the extent of the correlation between our three measures of teacher status. Focusing first on the Ranking Measure, this table shows that the rank accorded to primary and secondary teachers is strongly correlated (0.55). People who rank secondary school teachers highly also tend to rank primary school teachers highly. However, ranking of primary and secondary school teachers is much more weakly correlated with the ranking of headteachers, suggesting that the extent to which headteachers are respected is to some extent separable from the respect accorded to the main body of the teaching profession.

Table 2 also shows that there is a strong correlation (0.52) between our implicit and explicit measures of teacher status. This suggests that, despite the differences in the way they are measured, these two measures may be capturing a common underlying concept. The correlation between these measures and the ranking measure is, however, much lower. This suggests that these two sets of measures may be capturing different elements of teacher status. It is plausible that our explicit and implicit measures are capturing respondents' evaluations (explicit and implicit, respectively) of teacher attributes and characteristics. Whereas our ranking measure focuses more strongly on prestige and respect. The distinction between these concepts is clear if we recognise that a respondent may easily consider teachers to be good at their jobs (competent, trustworthy, inspiring, well-trained, etc.) while still feeling that they are not highly respected relative to other professionals.

Table 3: Correlations between perceived teacher pay and perceived teacher status (Pearson's R) in the full non-teacher sample

(N=35,566)

	Respect (Primary)	Pay (Primary)	Respect (Secondary)	Pay (Secondary)	Respect (Head)	Pay (Head)
Respect (Primary)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pay (Primary)	0.29	-	-	-	-	-
Respect (Secondary)	0.55	0.21	-	-	-	-
Pay (Secondary)	0.20	0.51	0.27	-	-	-
Respect (Head)	0.18	0.04	0.23	0.09	-	-
Pay (Head)	0.09	0.13	0.13	0.19	0.30	-

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED STATUS AND PERCEIVED PAY

In addition to being asked to rank teachers in terms of their perceived status, GTSI 2018 respondents were also asked to rank them against the same professions in terms of their perceived pay. It is possible that people's answers to these questions may influence each other. For example, respondents who rank teachers highly in terms of perceived respect may feel obligated, through a sense of consistency, to rank them highly in terms of perceived pay as well. To account for this possibility, a random half of the sample was asked the pay question before the respect question, and vice-versa.

Table 3 shows the correlations between the pay and respect questions for the full sample. This table re-affirms the disconnection between primary and secondary teachers on the one hand and headteachers on the other. The perceived pay of primary teachers is highly correlated with the perceived pay of secondary teachers, but the pay perceptions of both of these groups are only weakly correlated with the perceived pay of headteachers.

Table 3 also shows that there is only a moderate correlation between perceived pay and perceived respect for the three groups of teachers. This suggests perceptions of pay and respect are not strongly connected.

Respondents recognise that while teachers may be highly respected, they may not be highly paid (or vice-versa).

We proceeded to repeat the same analysis separately for those respondents who answered the pay question first and for those who answered the respect question first. Our results show that the correlations are consistently higher among respondents who were asked the respect question first. This suggests that first asking respondents to consider the extent that teachers are respected encourages them to bring their responses on pay more closely in line with their respect ranking.

People who rank secondary school teachers highly also tend to rank primary school teachers highly. However, ranking of primary and secondary school teachers is much more weakly correlated with the ranking of headteachers.

2. TEACHER STATUS AND STUDENT OUTCOMES



Photo: Global Teacher Prize Finalist Antonio Pérez Moreno (Spain)

© Antonio Pérez Moreno

In the GTSI 2018 report, we examined the relationship between our combined GTSI measure and the most recent PISA scores that were available at the time of writing (PISA 2015). Since that report was published, PISA scores from the tests pupils sat in 2018 have become available. These are much more directly relevant to measures in the GTSI 2018 survey, which was conducted in the same year. In this report we therefore update our previous analysis of the relationship between teacher status and student outcomes as measured by PISA scores. Here we also expand on our previous analysis by comparing the predictive power of our three alternative measures of teacher status. Based on our previous results, we expect that countries where teachers enjoy higher status will also have better student attainment.

CREATING THE GTSI SCORE


The GTSI score was created using Principal Component Analysis (PCA). Through PCA, we examine the correlation between people's responses to a variety of different survey questions, and accordingly determine whether these can be explained by a smaller number of underlying factors.

We applied a PCA model to the following four questions that were asked in the GTSI survey:

1. Ranking primary school teachers against other professions.
2. Ranking secondary school teachers against other professions.
3. Ranking of teachers according to their relative status based on the most similar comparative profession.
4. Perceived pupil respect for teachers.

The PCA reduced these four factors to a single fundamental measure of teacher status, which we re-scaled to produce a 0-100 score representing the status of teachers in each country. Full details of the statistical methodology and construction of the index may be found in the technical appendices of the GTSI 2018 report.

Figure 4: Scatterplot of country mean GTSI 2018 score against PISA 2018 scores



TEACHER STATUS AND PISA SCORES: THE RELATIONSHIP

Figure 4 replicates our primary analysis from the GTSI 2018 report by plotting each country's average GTSI 2018 score against its PISA 2018 score. The overall PISA score given in these figures is the mean average of each country's absolute scores in Reading, Science, and Mathematics. The GTSI 2018 score represents our attempt to compile a single, global measure of teacher status for each country. It is not one of the three alternative measures of status we focus on in this report, but is included as an update of our findings as reported in the main GTSI 2018 report.

Figure 4 shows that there is a positive relationship between the 2018 GTSI and PISA scores. Countries in which our global measure indicates that teachers enjoy high status also tend to do better in the PISA assessments. However, this relationship is not particularly strong: The correlation coefficient is 0.28, indicating a moderate correlation. The R squared statistic reported on the chart is 0.08, indicating that around 8% of the variation in PISA scores between countries is explained by differences in teacher status as measured by GTSI 2018.

Figures 5-7 show the same relationship between teacher status and PISA scores, but for each of our three measures of teacher status separately. For the ranking measure, we focus on secondary teachers specifically as PISA tests are administered to secondary school age students (aged 15).

Figure 5: Scatterplot of mean secondary teacher respect rank against PISA 2018




Figure 6: Scatterplot of mean Implicit Teacher Status score against PISA 2018




Figure 7: Scatterplot of mean Explicit Teacher Status score against PISA 2018





Figure 8: Scatterplot of mean annual secondary school teacher wage against PISA 2018



Figures 5-7 show that, of the three teacher status measures, Implicit Teacher Status scores are the strongest predictor of PISA outcomes. The correlation between Implicit Teacher Status scores and PISA outcomes is remarkably strong (a correlation coefficient of 0.55), with the R-squared value showing that almost a third (0.31) of the variation in PISA scores can be explained by this measurement of teacher status. There is also a moderately strong correlation (a correlation coefficient of 0.36, an R-squared of 0.13) between Ranked Teacher Status and PISA scores. The relationship between our Explicit Teacher Status measure and PISA scores is considerably weaker (a correlation coefficient of 0.17, an R-squared of 0.03). From these results, it appears that the extent to which teachers are implicitly respected and admired is considerably more important for student outcomes than explicit evaluations of teacher quality and working conditions. This is a surprising finding, given that one might expect evaluations of teacher quality and working conditions to have a closer relationship with PISA scores, which are often considered to be an indicator of the quality of teaching and support students receive.

For the purposes of comparison, Figure 8 shows the relationship between PISA scores and the amount that secondary school teachers are paid in equivalent USD.⁴ This figure shows that teacher wages are a strong predictor of PISA scores. However, notably, they are not as strongly related to PISA scores as our measure of Implicit Teacher Status.

The analyses reported above examine only the straightforward, bivariate relationship between teacher status and pay and PISA scores. By contrast, Table 4 shows the results of a series of linear regression models predicting PISA 2018 scores from each of our measures of teacher status (and from perceived teacher pay rank) while holding constant average teacher wages. This table shows a clear relationship between the respect ranking of teachers and PISA scores: Countries in which secondary school teachers are ranked one place higher score 21.3 points better in PISA on average. By contrast, the perceived pay of teachers does not strongly predict PISA scores.

⁴ See the technical appendices to the GTSI 2018 report for a full explanation of how teacher pay was derived.

Table 4. Regression analysis of PISA 2018 scores on status score alternatives

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Respect rank	Pay rank	Implicit score	Explicit score	GTSI2018
Teacher wage	0.00152*** (3.24)	0.00170*** (3.11)	0.00106** (2.15)	0.00156*** (3.12)	0.00164*** (3.46)
Respect rank	21.28** (2.24)	26.12** (2.16)			
Pay rank		-9.483 (-0.66)			
Implicit score			2.082** (2.66)		
Explicit score				2.178 (1.04)	
GTSI2018					0.779** (2.12)
Constant	279.7*** (4.13)	295.3*** (4.08)	327.0*** (8.04)	310.7** (2.76)	392.4*** (17.11)
Observations	30	30	30	30	30
R2	0.374	0.384	0.411	0.286	0.364

t statistics in parentheses

* p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Matching the results reported in Figure 6, above, our Implicit Teacher Status measure also strongly predicts PISA scores, even after accounting for teacher wages: Countries where the Implicit Teacher Status score is 10 points higher (on our scale of 0-100) would be predicted to score 20.8 points higher on the PISA assessments. Also reflecting the above results, our Explicit Teacher Status score is not strongly predictive of PISA scores.

In addition to these findings, we also found that our existing GTSI 2018 score was a significant determinant of PISA attainment. This is an important result as it mirrors our findings from the 2013 and 2018 GTSI reports. This is notable because it shows that the relationship between teacher status and PISA scores remains robust over two different surveys of teacher status (GTSI 2013 and GTSI 2015) and three different PISA rounds.

Figure 9: Scatterplot of mean Implicit Teacher Status score against GDP per capita





Figure 10: Scatterplot of mean Implicit Teacher Status score against the proportion of total government spending allocated to education



3. TEACHER STATUS ACROSS COUNTRIES




Photo: The class of Global Teacher Prize Finalist Leah Juelke (USA) © Leah Juelke

Why do teachers enjoy considerably higher or lower status in some countries than others? This is an important question in terms of determining what might be done to improve teacher status in countries where it is currently low. It is also important in terms of our efforts to understand how teacher status might affect student outcomes (particularly PISA scores). If some other factor (for example, education spending), strongly predicts teacher status and PISA scores, then perhaps it is this fact that explains why status scores and PISA attainment are linked, rather than a causal effect of teacher status.

There is a moderate correlation between what a country spends on education and the status of teachers in that country

TEACHER STATUS AND EDUCATIONAL INDICATORS

In this section, we examine the relationship between teacher status and a variety of important education indicators. Because our previous analyses showed that our measure of implicit status was most closely associated with PISA, we focus on this measure for these analyses.

Unless otherwise stated, all educational indicators are taken from the World Bank Education Statistics database (EdStats) for the year 2018 or the most recent available previous year.

We begin by examining the relationship between teacher status and indicators of national wealth and education spending. It is plausible that teachers would enjoy higher status in richer countries that spend more on education. Figures 9 and 10 show that this is indeed the case, though the correlation in both cases is only moderate.

Figure 11. Scatterplot of mean Implicit Teacher Status against the proportion of secondary school pupils who are enrolled in privately run schools




Figure 12. Scatterplot of mean implicit teacher status against the proportion of secondary school pupils enrolled in vocational programmes





Figure 13. Scatterplot of mean Implicit Teacher Status against the proportion of secondary school teachers who are female



In addition to national wealth and spending, the composition of the education system itself may affect the status of teachers. For example, teachers may be evaluated differently in education systems that are strongly dominated by the private rather than the public sector. Figure 11 plots the relationship between teacher status and the proportion of secondary school pupils who are enrolled in privately run institutions.⁵ This shows that there is in fact no relationship between teacher status and the extent to which secondary schools are privately versus publicly run.

In terms of pupil characteristics, we also hypothesised that teachers may enjoy lower status in countries where the secondary education system is more strongly focused on vocational education. However, Figure 12 also shows that teacher status is not related to the fraction of secondary school students enrolled in vocational (as opposed to academic) programmes.

Finally, we hypothesised that, due to sexist attitudes, teachers may enjoy lower status in countries where the profession is more strongly dominated by women. Figure 13 shows that there is indeed a moderate negative

⁵ Note that schools which depend on government funding but are otherwise managed by private institutions (such as academy schools in England) are considered “privately run institutions” for the purposes of calculating this figure.

correlation between teacher status and the proportion of secondary school teachers who are female.⁶

These results show that there are a number of factors which may be important predictors of Implicit Teacher Status, including national wealth, spending on education, and the gender composition of the teaching workforce. If these factors are also predictors of PISA attainment, they may therefore at least partly explain the link between the social status of teachers and performance in international standardised testing.

Implicitly held beliefs about teachers are affected by national wealth, spending on education and the gender composition of the teaching workforce.

To account for this possibility, we first examined the relationship between each indicator and PISA scores. This showed that only GDP had a positive relationship with both teacher status and PISA scores. A subsequent linear regression model demonstrated that the relationship between Implicit Teacher Status and PISA scores was robust to adjustment for GDP per capita. As we show in the previous section, the association between Implicit Teacher Status and PISA scores is also not explained by teachers being paid more in countries where they are accorded higher status.

⁶ In this figure, data for Japan, Canada, and Israel are taken from the OECD Education at a Glance database. For Canada, the figure for 'Upper Secondary' is taken to represent secondary education as a whole.

Table 5. Ranking countries by our three measures of teacher status

■ Asian countries ■ South American countries

	Rank (Primary)	Rank (Secondary)	Rank (Head)	Implicit status	Explicit status
1	China	China	Malaysia	China	Indonesia
2	Turkey	Malaysia	Indonesia	Ghana	China
3	Malaysia	Taiwan	China	Singapore	India
4	Korea	Indonesia	India	Canada	Uganda
5	Indonesia	Korea	Finland	Malaysia	Ghana
6	Taiwan	Turkey	Russia	India	Singapore
7	UK	India	Czech Republic	USA	Malaysia
8	Russia	Greece	Korea	Taiwan	Taiwan
9	India	Singapore	UK	Indonesia	USA
10	Greece	Russia	Greece	Switzerland	Canada
11	Canada	Switzerland	Singapore	Uganda	New Zealand
12	New Zealand	Germany	Uganda	UK	Colombia
13	France	UK	Italy	Finland	Turkey
14	Panama	Canada	France	Netherlands	Netherlands
15	USA	Egypt	Japan	New Zealand	Finland
16	Singapore	Finland	Germany	France	Russia
17	Finland	New Zealand	Switzerland	Korea	Chile
18	Switzerland	Panama	Turkey	Turkey	Switzerland
19	Japan	Hungary	Portugal	Germany	Korea
20	Spain	France	New Zealand	Portugal	Spain
21	Egypt	Czech Republic	Egypt	Japan	UK
22	Chile	Japan	Israel	Czech Republic	France
23	Colombia	Netherlands	Colombia	Russia	Brazil
24	Peru	USA	Canada	Italy	Peru
25	Portugal	Spain	Netherlands	Brazil	Japan
26	Germany	Chile	Panama	Colombia	Panama
27	Netherlands	Peru	Chile	Chile	Portugal
28	Argentina	Colombia	Spain	Spain	Argentina
29	Hungary	Portugal	Argentina	Panama	Hungary
30	Czech Republic	Uganda	USA	Argentina	Italy
31	Italy	Italy	Peru	Hungary	Egypt
32	Israel	Argentina	Taiwan	Greece	Germany
33	Brazil	Ghana	Ghana	Egypt	Czech Republic
34	Uganda	Israel	Hungary	Peru	Greece
35	Ghana	Brazil	Brazil	Israel	Israel

TEACHER STATUS AND CULTURAL VALUES

In this section we take a different approach to examining cross-national variation in teacher status. Table 5 ranks all of the countries in the dataset by their scores on our three alternate measures of teacher status. A simple way to read this table is to pick a specific country and examine its rank in each ordering. For example, consider China. Reading across the columns we see that China is ranked in the top three for all of our status measures. By contrast, Israel is in the bottom four for all three measures.

Doing this repeatedly for each country we can see that there is a high degree of concordance between the rankings (as would be suggested by the high degree of correlation we observed in a previous section).

Teacher status tends to be similar between countries on the same continent, and is generally highest in Asian countries and lowest in South American countries.

A notable facet of this table is that countries on the same continent tend to be grouped together. This is particularly clear for the Asian countries (marked in red), which consistently appear near the top of the table. It is also apparent that the South American countries (marked in green) often (though slightly less consistently) appear in the bottom half of the table. This geographical clustering suggests that there may be common cultural factors which explain differences in teacher status. This is of course not to suggest that all Asian or South American countries share a common culture, but merely that countries which are closer together geographically also tend to be more similar in terms of cultural exchanges, languages and a shared history.

We explored this possibility by examining the association between teacher status and a variety of cultural values captured by the 2010-2014 World Values Survey (the most recently collected data).⁷ We found that, in general, Implicit Teacher Status was not closely correlated with indicators of individualism (the extent to which people in the country valued personal wealth and achievement versus helping others) or with the proportion of a

⁷ Full details of the variables used in this analysis are given in the Technical Appendix.

country's population who felt that obedience versus self-expression was a quality that should be encouraged in children. However, we found that Implicit Teacher Status was moderately negatively correlated (a correlation coefficient of -0.34) with an indicator of the extent of respect for authority (the proportion of the population who believed that "greater respect for authority" would be a positive development). This suggests that in countries where respect for authority is more highly valued, teacher status is lower.⁸ Although there is the odd exception these results were broadly consistent for our other two measures of teacher status (explicit and ranking).

Teacher status may be strongly determined by culture – it may be part of a broader cluster of beliefs and attitudes concerning the value of education.

Based on the geographical clustering of teacher status, our analysis suggests that teacher status may be strongly culturally determined. However, it does not appear to be strongly predicted by other plausibly related cultural values such as individualism. Instead, it is possible that teacher status is part of a broader cluster of attitudes and beliefs concerning the value of education.

⁸ This correlation is only moderate so there are a number of exceptions, for example China.



SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Photo: Global Teacher Prize Finalist Lilia Melo (Brazil) © Lilia Melo

In this report we introduced and examined three different definitions and measures of teacher status. These measures were based on:

- **Ranked Teacher Status:** How people ranked teachers relative to other occupations in terms of respect;
- **Implicit Teacher Status:** How people responded to quick-fire word association tests assessing implicit perceptions of teachers; and
- **Explicit Teacher Status:** How people responded to a series of explicit questions concerning teachers' attributes and working conditions (including their level of training, overall quality and professional judgement).

We found that, although these measures were related, and all in some sense captured “teacher status”, they were nevertheless quite distinct. Implicit and explicit perceptions of teachers were highly correlated, but both were less strongly correlated with the ranking measure. Given the content of the implicit word associations and explicit questions, it seems likely that these two measures offer an insight into respondents' evaluations of teacher attributes – particularly teacher quality.

There is a clear relationship between teacher status and student outcomes as measured by PISA scores.

By contrast, the ranking measure more directly assesses respondents' instinctive sense for how much respect or prestige is accorded to teachers in their country. It is apparent from these results that respondents are fully able to separate their perceptions of how much teachers are respected by society in general from their own attitudes towards teachers (and particularly their sense of teacher quality). We should note here that, although our Implicit and Explicit Teacher Status Measures were highly correlated, they were far from perfectly so. This suggests that, despite their overlap in content, these measures are offering two different windows into people's perceptions of teachers. This distinction is important for our analysis of the relationship between teacher status and student attainment, as we describe below.

In our previous reports (in 2013 and 2018), we observed a clear relationship between teacher status (as measured by our principal measure of teacher status, the GTSI 2018) and student outcomes as measured by PISA scores. In this report, we are able to re-affirm this

finding with the newly released 2018 PISA data. This is a particularly important result as it demonstrates that the relationship between teacher status and student attainment is robust across entirely separate datasets collected from a different cohort in each country five years apart and surveyed over many more countries. This substantially increases the likelihood that this result reflects a genuine relationship between teacher status and student attainment at the national level.

In this report, we explored the relationship between teacher status and student attainment by examining it using our three alternative measures of teacher status separately. We found a substantial link between the ranking measure and PISA scores, echoing our finding with the overall GTSI 2018 measure. However, we found an even more striking correlation between our implicit measure of teacher status and PISA scores. This analysis showed that almost a third (31%) of the variation in PISA scores between countries could be explained by this measure alone. This association (and the association between the ranking measure and PISA scores) was robust to controlling for actual teacher wages in each country (at purchasing power parity). This suggests that, alongside teacher pay, teacher status is a crucial determinant of student attainment.

Almost a third of the variation in PISA scores between countries could be explained by Implicit Teacher Status – by people’s implicitly held views about teachers.

In contrast with the implicit and ranking measures, our explicit measure of teacher status was not a substantive predictor of PISA scores. This difference between the measures suggests that people’s explicit evaluations of (for example) teacher quality are less relevant for student outcomes than their implicit perceptions of teachers and of the prestige that teaching attracts. This is surprising as one might expect explicit, considered evaluations to play a stronger role than “gut instinct” unconsidered perceptions. However, considered opinions are more strongly vulnerable to reporting bias than unconsidered, automatic responses. Our unconsidered measures may therefore offer a truer picture of people’s instinctive perception of teachers and teaching, and it is

this perception that is more strongly representative of how teachers are actually treated in the societies we analyse.

Given the apparent importance of teacher status for student attainment, we also focused in this report on predictors of teacher status. What factors explain why teachers enjoy substantially higher status in some countries than others? We found, perhaps unsurprisingly, that teachers enjoyed higher status in richer countries (as measured by GDP per capita) and in countries in which the government spent a higher fraction of its budget on education. However, we also found that teachers were held in lower esteem in countries where the teaching workforce was more strongly dominated by women. This is a dispiriting finding that suggests a level of possible gender stereotyping or societal sexism that may damage teacher status in countries where the profession is more female dominated. This is in line with previous research suggesting that the status and pay of occupations tends to drop as they become more female dominated (Levanon, England and Allison, 2009). In terms of educational policy indicators which have been suggested to increase or decrease teacher status, we found that teacher status was related neither to the extent to which schools are run by the private sector, nor to the extent to which the education system is geared towards vocational training as opposed to academics.

Geographically and culturally proximate countries tend to score similarly on teacher status in a way that does not appear to be explained by other background factors.

It should be noted that the fact that teachers enjoy higher status in richer countries which spend more on education offers a potential alternative explanation for the link we observe between teacher status and PISA scores. For example, it is possible that countries in which teachers are accorded high status do well on PISA scores not because the status of teachers is higher but because they are richer and therefore can invest more personal and public resources in increasing attainment. However, our analysis shows that the relationship between government education spending (as a proportion of total spending) and PISA scores is in fact negative, and that the relationship between teacher status and PISA scores is robust to accounting for GDP.

Although national wealth, education spending, and the gender composition of the teaching profession may be important in explaining national differences in teacher status, our analysis also suggests that cultural differences may also play a crucial role. Geographically and culturally proximate countries tend to score similarly on teacher status in a way that does not appear to be explained by other background factors. Our analysis of cultural correlates of teacher status provides little evidence that high teacher status is part of a cluster of other non-education related values (such as individualism). However, we were unable to examine the relationship between teacher status and other attitudes relating to education.

Previous research (for example, Merriman and Nicoletti, 2007; Pelham, Crabtree and Nyiri, 2009) has argued for cultural differences in the intrinsic value placed on education. For example, this may include the extent to which “doing well in school” – i.e. high educational attainment – is considered an important goal for children and young people. It seems highly likely that this – the cultural value placed on education – may be an important predictor of the status of teachers. However, to our knowledge, there are no international survey data that provide information on the value of education across different cultures. Future survey research on this topic would be highly valuable.

In summary, this report has shown that:

- There are large differences in the status of teachers between countries.
- The global concept of “teacher status” can be decomposed and measured in different ways.
- The distinction between these ways of capturing teacher status has important implications for the relationship between teacher status and student attainment.
- Measures which tap into people’s unconsidered, automatic perceptions of teachers may be more genuinely reflective of the way in which teachers are treated in society - with this treatment being the most crucial for student outcomes.
- A country’s student attainment (as measured by PISA scores) is strongly related to the status of teachers (in particular when measured implicitly), and that this relationship is not explained by differences in national wealth or actual teacher pay. A clear corollary here is that a greater focus should be placed on raising the status of teachers across the world.
- That teacher status is related to national wealth, education spending, and the gender composition of the teaching workforce, but is not directly related to clear policy differences such as the role of the private sector in providing education or the extent to which the education system is geared towards vocational programmes.
- That teacher status is likely to be partly culturally determined, although it remains an open question as to whether high teacher status is part of a broader set of attitudes relating to the intrinsic value of education.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

WORLD VALUES SURVEY ANALYSIS

For our analysis of cultural correlates of teacher status we used data on cultural values from the most recent World Values Survey (WVS), for which data was collected over the period 2010-2014. Of the countries participating in the 2010-2014 WVS, 20 also participated in the GTSI 2018 survey: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Egypt, Germany, Ghana, India, Japan, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Russia, Singapore, Spain, Taiwan, Turkey, and the United States of America. Our analyses therefore apply only to these countries.

We examined the relationship between teacher status and the following four indicators derived from the 2010-2014 World Values Survey:

INDIVIDUALISM

We derived a scale for individualism by combining data from three items in the Schwartz Human Values inventory. In completing this inventory, respondents are given a list of attributes for a hypothetical person. They are asked to indicate whether this attribute is like them, using a scale from one (“very much like me”) to six (“not like me at all”). To compute an individualism scale we calculated the mean average score across the following three items (asterisks indicate items where the coding was reversed). Higher numbers indicate greater individualism:

It is important to this person to be rich; to have a lot of money and expensive things;*

It is important to this person to have a “good time” and to “spoil” oneself;*

It is important for this person to do something for the good of society.

VALUE OF OBEDIENCE VS. SELF-EXPRESSION IN CHILDREN

WVS respondents were shown a list of 11 “qualities that children can be encouraged to learn at home”. They were asked to choose up to five that they considered to be especially important.

We measured the value of obedience and self-expression at the country level by calculating the proportion of respondents in each country who chose these as important qualities from the list.

RESPECT FOR AUTHORITY

WVS respondents were asked about changes that might take place in the near future and whether they would think these changes would be a good thing, a bad thing, or that they wouldn’t mind. We measured respect for authority by the proportion of respondents who responded that “Greater respect for authority” would be a good thing.

GTSI 2018 QUESTIONNAIRE

GLOBAL TEACHER STATUS INDEX GENERAL PUBLIC QUESTIONNAIRE
2018

Client	Varkey Foundation
Project	Teacher Index Survey
Sample	1000 adults 16-64
Public Market Countries (35)	<p>Online: Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Israel, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, UK, USA</p> <p>Taiwan, Hungary, Ghana, Uganda, Argentina, Peru, Columbia, Chile, Panama, India, Russia, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Canada.</p> <p>CAPI: Uganda, Ghana</p>
Teacher Countries (29)	<p>Online: Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Netherlands, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, UK, USA, Taiwan, Argentina, Peru, Columbia, Chile, India, Russia, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Canada.</p> <p>CAPI: Uganda, Ghana</p>
Quotas	<p>Age, Gender, Region</p> <p>Quotas of 100 aged 16-21 within overall sample</p> <p>Note: some flexibility needed on older age groups; CAPI will focus on population dense areas.</p>
Sub-Sample	200 serving teachers in each country.
Methodology	Online

PERSONAL & BACKGROUND

ASK ALL

S1 Are you...

CODE ONE

Male

Female

S2 Please enter your date of birth. Please enter this in the format of dd- mmm-yyyy, so 4th January 1975 would be entered as 04-Jan-1975.

ENTER TEXT

S3 Which of the following best describes the area where you live...

CODE ONE

Inner city

Suburban area

Town

Predominantly rural

S4 - REGION (Refer to region document for each country)

CODE ONE

S5 Which of the following best describes you...

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

I am not a parent [MULTI EXCLUSIVE]

I am a parent of children aged 18 or under

I am a parent of children over 18

S6 Which of the following best describes your current marital status?

CODE ONE

Single

In a relationship but not living together

Married

Civil Partnership

Cohabiting

Widowed

Separated

Divorced

Prefer not to answer

S7 What is the level of education that most closely represents the highest level of education that you have achieved to date?

CODE ONE

Primary School

Secondary school, high school

University degree

Higher academic degree - e.g. masters, doctorate, MBA.

Formal Professional qualification (e.g. Law, Accountancy, Surveying, Architecture, Banking)

Still in full time education

Not applicable - I have no formal education

S8 What type of school did you last attend as a pupil or student up to the age of 18?

SINGLE CODE

State school (funded by the government, state or federal authorities)

Independent OR private school (paid for privately)

Special school (e.g. specialising in educating those with special abilities or disabilities),

Other type of school

Not applicable - I have no formal education

S9 Apart from school, did you, receive any additional teaching, tuition or coaching at any stage during your school years up until the age of 18?

MULTICODE

Private (one to one or small groups) tuition or coaching

Supplementary or additional teaching (at the weekend or evening) inside your own school.

Supplementary or additional teaching (at the weekend or evening) outside school.

Other

None

S10 Which of the following best describes your current working status?

CODE ONE

Working full time in the private sector <go to S11>

Working part time in the private sector <go to S11>

Working full time in the public sector (Government controlled organisations) <go to S11>

Working part time in the public sector (Government controlled organisations) <go to S11>

Not working - seeking work <go to S10A>

Not working - not seeking work as unavailable / looking after family / home <go to S10A >

Not working - not seeking work as unavailable due to illness or other reasons <go to S10A >

Student <go to S10A >

Retired <go to S11>

S10A You said you are not currently working; have you ever been employed full or part time?

Yes <go to S11>

No <go to S10>

S11 What is your current occupation?

[IF YES AT S10A OR CODE 8 AT S10] Which of the following was your previous main occupation?

What is your occupation?

- Teacher
- Manager, Director, Senior Official
- Professional
- Technical
- Administrative, Secretarial
- Skilled trade
- Unskilled trade, Craft
- Carer
- Sales, Customer services
- Machine operator
- Other

In which sector do you work?

- Agriculture, forestry, fishing
- Mining, quarrying
- Manufacturing
- Energy
- Water
- Wholesale and retail trade, repair
- Accommodation, restaurant, catering
- Transport, storage
- Financial and insurance services
- Information and communication technology
- Real estate
- Professional, scientific and technical services
- Administrative and support services
- Public administration and defence
- Education
- Health and social work
- Arts, entertainment, recreation
- Other

[IF TEACHER]

S11T What sort of Teacher are you? Your current job description (Please tick as many as apply)

[IF YES AT S10A OR CODE 8 AT S10] What sort of Teacher were you in your last teaching role?]

Early Years, Preschool or Nursery teacher

Primary School teacher

Lower Secondary School teacher (ages 11-14)

Upper Secondary School teacher (ages 15-18)

Temporary or Supply teacher

Assistant / Deputy head teacher

Head teacher / Principal

Adult Education or Further Education teacher

Other

S12 Please enter your personal income BEFORE ANY TAX DEDUCTIONS have been made.

[IF YES AT S10A OR CODE 8 AT S10]

Please enter your personal income from your last occupation BEFORE ANY TAX DEDUCTIONS have been made.

Please write in as either an hourly daily, weekly, monthly or annual amount. If you have variable working patterns you can write your hourly wage.

Please round to the nearest unit in your currency and remember to include the full number

SINGLE CODE ONLY ALLOW ANSWER FOR ONE TIME SCALE

Hourly [INSERT NUMERIC - AUTO INSERT CURRENCY SYMBOL FOR MARKET]

Daily [INSERT NUMERIC - AUTO INSERT CURRENCY SYMBOL FOR MARKET]

Weekly [INSERT NUMERIC - AUTO INSERT CURRENCY SYMBOL FOR MARKET]

Monthly [INSERT NUMERIC - AUTO INSERT CURRENCY SYMBOL FOR MARKET]

Annual [INSERT NUMERIC - AUTO INSERT CURRENCY SYMBOL FOR MARKET]

Refused

S13 Can we just check is your <weekly/monthly/annual> personal income of <INSERT ANSWER FROM S10> ...

[IF YES AT S8A OR CODE 8 AT S8]

Can we just check was your <weekly/monthly/annual> personal income of <INSERT ANSWER FROM S10> ...

CODE ONE

Gross salary before any tax deductions

Net salary after any tax deductions

S14 How many hours do you work in an average week?

[IF YES AT S10A OR CODE 8 AT S10] How many hours did you work in an average week?

[INSERT NUMERIC - MAX 100, MIN 1]

[IF TEACHER]

S14T How many hours do you work in an average week, including work outside school such as marking and planning lessons?

[IF YES AT S10A OR CODE 8 AT S10]

How many hours did you work in an average week, including work outside school such as marking and planning lessons?

[INSERT NUMERIC – MAX 100, MIN 1]

S15 How many years have you worked in your current occupation

[IF YES AT S10A OR CODE 8 AT S10]

How many years did you spend working in your previous main occupation?

S16 Do you consider yourself to be an ethnic minority in <INSERT COUNTRY>?

CODE ONE

Yes

No

Prefer not to say.

S17 What religion are you?

We would like to remind you that this is an anonymous survey and your answers to this question will not be linked back to you by name.

- Christianity – Protestant
- Christianity – Catholic
- Christianity – Other
- Islam – Shia
- Islam – Sunni
- Hinduism
- Sikhism
- Buddhism
- Judaism
- Shinto
- Chinese folk religion /Taoism
- Christianity –Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland
- Christianity –Pentecostal/Charismatic
- Christianity –Eastern Orthodoxy
- Christianity –Calvinism
- Christianity –Anglican
- Christianity –Presbyterian
- Christianity –Russian Orthodox

- Christianity -Swiss Reformed Church
- Other
- Agnostic / Atheist
- None
- Prefer not to answer

IMPLICIT EXERCISE

Pre-test warm up

Actual test:

Teaching profession in your country

Trusted/ Untrusted

Well paid/ Poorly paid

Influential/ Not influential

Inspiring/ Uninspiring

Respected/ Not respected

High status/ Low status

Hard working/ Lazy

Caring/ Uncaring

High flyer/ Mediocre

Intelligent/ Unintelligent

TEACHER ONLY QUESTIONS

T1. Have you had a previous occupation(s) before becoming a teacher?

Yes <go to T1A>

No <go to T2>

T1A. How many years did you work in that previous occupation(s) before becoming a teacher?

If less than 1 year, please round to the nearest year

OPEN ENDED NUMERIC - MAX 70 YRS, MIN 0

T2. What are your main career aspirations for the next five years? (please tick one)

Continue to Teach full time as a classroom teacher

Continue to Teach part time as a classroom teacher

Progress to a higher level within the teaching profession

Have a career break for family or other reasons

Pursue a career outside school teaching

Retire from Teaching

Something else [ANCHOR]

I don't know [ANCHOR]

T3. Which of the below best describes the type of school you currently teach at?

State school (funded by the government, state or federal authorities)

Independent OR private school (paid for privately)

Special school (e.g. specialising in educating those with special abilities or disabilities),

Other type of school

Not in one school (other type of teacher)

T4. Approximately how many pupils are there in your current school, in total?

SINGLE CODE

Fewer than 50

50 - 99

100 - 199

200 - 399

400 - 599

600 - 999

1,000 -1499

1500 or more

I don't know

T5. Which of the below best describes the location of the school you currently teach at?

SINGLE CODE

Inner city

Suburban area

Town

Predominantly rural

T6. When was the last time you engaged in formal training, or professional development (PD), related to your teaching job?

SINGLE CODE

A day or less within the last week

More than a day within the last month

A day or less within the last school term or semester

More than a day within the last school term or semester

A day or less within the last year

More than a day within the last year

More than a year ago

I have never had formal training or professional development related to my teaching job

MAIN QUESTIONNAIRE

ASK ALL

50/50 split rotate order of Q1 and Q2

Q1 Please rank the following 14 professions in order of how well you think they are RESPECTED. With 1 being the most respected and 14 being the least respected.

Please drag the items into the target boxes on the right of the screen.

DRAG ITEMS - RANDOMISE ORDER

[INCLUDE TIME STAMP]

Doctor

Policeman

Primary School Teacher

Secondary School Teacher

Head Teacher

Lawyer

Engineer

Local Government Manager

Accountant

Librarian

Management Consultant

Nurse

Social Worker

Web Designer

DROP BOXES

1 - Most Respected

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 - Least Respected

Q2 Please rank the following 14 professions in order of how well you think they are PAID.

With 1 being the most respected and 14 being the least respected.

Please drag the items into the target boxes on the right of the screen.

RANDOMISE ORDER

[INCLUDE TIME STAMP]

Doctor

Policeman

Primary School Teacher

Secondary School Teacher

Head Teacher

Lawyer

Engineer

Local Government Manager

Accountant

Librarian

Management Consultant

Nurse

Social Worker

Web Designer

DROP BOXES

1 - Highest Paid

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 - Lowest Paid

ASK ALL

Q3 Thinking now about the list of occupations below, which do you think is most similar to a teacher in terms of STATUS?

ROTATE ORDER - CODE ONE

[INCLUDE TIME STAMP]

Doctor

Policeman

Lawyer

Engineer

Local Government Manager

Accountant

Librarian

Management Consultant

Nurse

Social Worker

Web Designer

None of these

ASK ALL

Q4A We would now like you to think about both primary and secondary school teachers in your country. Approximately how much do you think is the starting salary for a full time primary school and secondary school teacher in <INSERT COUNTRY>?

Please enter the total amount before any tax deductions have been made.

Please round to the nearest unit in your currency and remember to include the full number

GRID

COLUMNS:

Primary school teacher

Secondary school teacher

ROWS

SINGLE CODE- MAX 3x starting salary

Annual [INSERT NUMERIC - AUTO INSERT CURRENCY SYMBOL FOR MARKET]

Q4B Can we just check is this annual starting salary estimate of a full time primary school and secondary school teacher in <INSERT COUNTRY> ...

CODE ONE

Gross salary before any tax deductions

Net salary after any tax deductions

ASK ALL

Q5A Again thinking about both primary and secondary school teachers in your country, what do you personally think would be a fair starting salary for a full time primary school or secondary school teacher in <INSERT COUNTRY>? Please enter the total amount before any tax deductions have been made. Please round to the nearest unit in your currency and remember to include the full number.

GRID

COLUMNS:

Primary school teacher

Secondary school teacher

ROWS

SINGLE CODE - MAX 3x starting salary

Annual [INSERT NUMERIC - AUTO INSERT CURRENCY SYMBOL FOR MARKET]

Q5B Can we just check is your < annual> salary estimate of <INSERT ANSWER FROM Q4A> ...

CODE ONE

Gross salary before any tax deductions

Net salary after any tax deductions

Q6 If we told you that the starting salary for full time primary school teachers in <INSERT COUNTRY> is an average of <INSERT AMOUNT FROM SPREADSHEET> per annum before tax, would you say this was:

CODE ONE

Too much

About right

Too little

Q7 If we told you that the starting salary for full time secondary school teachers in <INSERT COUNTRY> is an average of <INSERT AMOUNT FROM SPREADSHEET> per annum before tax, would you say this was:

CODE ONE

Too much

About right

Too little

Q8

[GEN POP] What is the minimum annual salary you personally would need to be paid to become a full time teacher? Please enter the total amount before any tax deductions have been made. Please round to the nearest unit in your currency and remember to include the full number.

OPEN NUMERIC - AUTO INSERT CURRENCY SYMBOL FOR MARKET

I would never become a teacher regardless of salary

[TEACHERS] What is the minimum annual salary you would you personally need to be paid for you to leave teaching? Please enter the total amount before any tax deductions have been made.

Please round to the nearest unit in your currency and remember to include the full number.

OPEN NUMERIC - AUTO INSERT CURRENCY SYMBOL FOR MARKET

I would never leave teaching regardless of salary

[ASK ALL](#)

Q9 [ASK THIS TEXT IF CODE 2-3 AT S5] To what extent would you encourage or not encourage your child to become a teacher?

Q10 [ASK THIS TEXT IF CODE 1 AT S5] Imagine you had children. To what extent do you think you would encourage or not encourage them to become a teacher?

CODE ONE - FLIP ORDER

Definitely encourage

Probably encourage

Maybe encourage

Probably not encourage

Definitely not encourage

Q11a [ASK THIS TEXT IF CODE 2-3 AT S5] To what extent do you think that the education system in <INSERT COUNTRY> provides your children with a good or poor education?

Q11b [ASK THIS TEXT IF CODE 1 AT S5] Again, thinking about if you had children, to what extent do you think that the education system in <INSERT COUNTRY> would provide your children with a good or poor education? Please give your answer on a scale where 10 means 'provides an excellent education' and 0 means it 'provides a very poor education'.

CODE ONE - FLIP ORDER

10 - Provides excellent education

9

8

7

6

5

4

3

2

1

0 - Provides very poor education

Q12. [GEN POP + TEACHERS (PAST AND CURRENT)] On average, how many hours do you think full time primary and secondary school teachers work a week in term time (including work outside school such as marking and planning lessons)?

ROWS

Primary School teachers

Secondary School teachers

COLUMNS

OPEN NUMERIC [MAX 100, MIN 1]

Q13. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements in your country?

RANDOMISE ORDER

Being an effective teacher requires rigorous training

It is too easy to become a teacher

The quality of teachers is too variable

Pupils respect teachers in my country

The teachers in my children's school are respected by their pupils

Teachers work hard

Teachers should be rewarded in pay according to their pupils' results

Teachers should be rewarded in pay for the effort they put into their job

Teachers enjoy a positive media image.

Teachers have long holidays

Teachers have the autonomy to exercise their professional judgement

CODE ONE PER ITEM

Strongly agree

Tend to agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Tend to disagree

Strongly disagree

RANDOMISE WHICH IMAGE THEY GET:

[TEST CELL 1]

No image

[TEST CELL 2]



[TEST CELL 3]



ASK ALL

Q14. In your country, how much is currently spent, per pupil per year, on primary education? Don't worry if you're not sure of the answer, we're just looking for your best estimate.

0 _____ [] _____
10000

ASK ALL

Q15. In your country, how much is currently spent, per pupil per year, on secondary education? Don't worry if you're not sure of the answer, we're just looking for your best estimate.

0 _____ [] _____
10000

RANDOMISE HALF SAMPLE INTO Q16a & Q17b and HALF into Q16b & Q17b

Q16a. Actually, in primary education, the government spends around £4500 per pupil per year. How much do you think the government should spend?

0 _____ [] _____
10000

I agree with the current government spend

Q16b. How much do you think the government should spend, in primary education, per pupil per year.

0 _____ [] _____
10000

Q17a. Actually, in secondary education, the governments spends around £6000 per pupil per year. How much do you think the government should spend?

0 _____ [] _____
10000

I agree with the current government spend

Q17b. How much do you think the government should spend, in secondary education, per pupil per year.

0 _____ [] _____
10000

ASK ALL

MAX DIFF

Q18. Imagine the government of your country proposed extra taxes on the citizens of your country in order to spend 10% more of the state's money on something. Which of the below would your HIGHEST PRIORITY and LOWEST PRIORITY your government to spend the money on?

[10 OPTIONS DISPLAYED ACROSS SEVERAL SCREENS, WITH RESPONDENTS CHOOSING HIGHEST AND LOWEST PRIORITY OPTIONS. AFTER EACH SCREEN AN ANCHOR QUESTION (Q18A) WILL BE ASKED TO PROVIDE ABSOLUTE APPEAL ON THE MEASURES]

[BATTERY OPTIONS]

Reducing class size in Primary schools (pupils aged 8-11 years)

Reducing class size in Secondary schools (pupils aged 12-18 years)

Employing more teachers

Higher salaries for existing teachers

Better training and professional development for teachers

Improving school buildings and computers

Employing more non-teaching staff in schools (e.g. counsellor, pastoral staff etc.)

Do not spend it on education but instead spend it on something else (e.g. healthcare)

Do not spend any extra money and keep taxes the same

ASK ALL

Q18a. Considering all the options listed above, do you think:

[SINGLE CHOICE]

All of them are high priority

Some of them are high priority

None of them are high priority

ASK ALL

Q19 Government should redistribute income from the better off to those who are less well off.

strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

ASK ALL

Q20 Ordinary working people do not get their fair share of the nation's wealth.

strongly disagree disagree neutral agree strongly agree

ASK ALL

Q21 How important is hard work for getting ahead in life?

essential very important fairly important not very important not important at all

ASK ALL

Q22. Next we will ask you a few quiz questions. Please answer them as quickly and as accurately as you can.

A bat and ball cost £5.50. The bat cost £5.00 more than the ball. How much does the ball cost?

[SINGLE CHOICE]

£0.25

£0.50

£5.25

Other

ASK ALL

Q23. If it takes 5 machines 5 minutes to make 5 widgets, how long would it take 100 machines to make 100 widgets?

[SINGLE CHOICE]

1 minute

5 minutes

20 minutes

100 minutes

500 minutes

Other

ASK ALL

Q24. In a lake, there is a patch of lily pads. Every day, the patch doubles in size. If it takes 48 days for the patch to cover the entire lake, how long would it take for the patch to cover half the lake?

[SINGLE CHOICE]

24 days

47 days

Other

REFERENCES

- Akerlof, G. and Shiller, R. (2009), 'Chapter 2: Fairness', *Animal Spirits*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey
- Banaji, M. R. (2013), 'The Implicit Association Test at age 7: A methodological and conceptual review', *Social psychology and the unconscious: The automaticity of higher mental processes*, Psychology Press, London
- Barmby, P. W. (2006), 'Improving teacher recruitment and retention: the importance of workload and pupil behaviour', *Educational research*, 48 (3), pp. 247-265
- Barton, N. and Bold, T. and Sandefur, J. (2017), 'Measuring Rents from Public Employment: Regression Discontinuity Evidence from Kenya', *Working Paper 457*, Center for Global Development
- Becker, G., Murphy, K. and Werning, I. (2000), 'Chapter 8: Status and Inequality', *Social Economics: Market Behaviour in a Social Environment*, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass
- Chan, T.W. and Goldthorpe, J. (2007), 'Class and status: The conceptual distinction and its empirical relevance', *American Sociological Review*, 72(4), 512-32
- Clark, G. (2014), *The Son Also Rises*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey
- Coelli, T. (1996), 'A guide to DEAP version 2.1: A data envelopment analysis (Computer) program', *Working Paper Center for Efficiency and Productivity Analysis*, Department of Economics University of New England
- Dolton, P. (1990), 'The Economics of Teacher Supply', *Economic Journal*, Vol.100, pp. 91-104
- Dolton, P. (2006), 'Teacher Supply', *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, Elsevier
- Dolton, P. (2017), 'Public Opinion on Teacher Pay and Status: Cross Country Evidence', forthcoming MIT Press
- Dolton, P., G Makepeace and W Van der Klaauw (1989), 'Occupational Choice and Earnings Determination: The Role of Sample Selection and Non-Pecuniary Factors', *Oxford Economics Papers*, Vol.41, pp. 573-594
- Dolton, P. and Marcenaro-Gutierrez, O. D. (2011), 'If You Pay Peanuts Do You Get Monkeys? A Cross-Country Analysis of Teacher Pay and Pupil Performance', *Economic Policy*, Vol. 26, No. 65, 5-55
- Dolton, P. and Marcenaro-Gutierrez, O. D. (2013), *An International Index of Teacher Status, October 2013*, published by the Varkey Foundation
- Dolton, P. and Marcenaro-Gutierrez, O. D. (2014), *The Efficiency Index: Which Education Systems deliver the Best Value for Money?*, published by GEMS Education Solutions
- Dolton, P. and Marcenaro-Gutierrez, O. D. (2016), *How to Get the Best Bang for Your Buck: The Relative Efficiency of Educational Systems: A Cross Country Prescriptive Analysis*, Mimeo, University of Sussex
- Dolton, P. and K Mavromaras (1994), 'Intergenerational Occupational Choice Comparisons: The Case of Teachers in the UK', *Economic Journal*, Vol.104, pp. 841-863

- Dolton, P. and M Kidd (1994), 'Occupational Access and Wage Discrimination', *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, Vol.56, No.4, pp.457-474
- Dolton, P. and R, Tol (2016), 'A survey of the UK population on public policy', *Working Paper Series 08416*, Department of Economics, University of Sussex, February 2016: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/sus/susewp/08416.html>
- Dolton, P. and W. Van der Klaauw (1999), 'The Turnover of UK Teachers: A Competing Risks Explanation', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol.81(3), August 1999, pp.543-552
- Dolton, P., McIntosh, S. and Chevalier, A. (2007), 'Recruiting and Retaining Teachers in the UK: An Analysis of Graduate Occupation Choice from the 1960s to the 1990s', *Economica*, vol.74, pp.69-96
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., and Howard, A. (1997), 'On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33(5), 510-540
- Dunteman G. (1989), *Principal Component Analysis*, Sage University, US, Paper 69
- Economist, *The Big Mac index*
- Everton T, Turner P, Hargreaves L, and Pell T (2007), 'Public perceptions of the teaching profession', *Research Papers in Education*, 22:3, 247-265.
- Farrell, M. J. (1957), 'The measurement of productive efficiency', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A*, 120, 253-281
- Feenstra, R. C., Inklaar, R. and Timmer, M. P. (2015), 'The Next Generation of the Penn World Table', *American Economic Review*, 105(10), 3150-3182
- Frank, R. (1985), *Choosing the Right Pond: Human Behaviour and the Quest for Status*, Oxford University Press, London
- Frederick, S. (2005), 'Cognitive reflection and decision making', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19, 25-42
- Freeman, R. and Ostendorp, R. (2002), 'Wages around the World: Pay and Occupations and Countries', *Inequality Around the World* (ed. by Freeman, R.) Palgrave, International Economic Association
- Fryer, R. and Dobbie W. (2013), 'Getting Beneath the Veil of Effective Schools: Evidence from New York City', *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 5 (4), 28-60
- Guarino, C. M., Santibanez, L., and Daley, G. (2006), 'Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature', *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 173-208
- Goldhaber, D. (2002), 'The Mystery of Good Teaching', *Education Next*, 2(1), Hoover Institute
- Goldthorpe and Hope (1974), *The Social Grading of Occupations: A New Approach and Scale*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., and Schwartz, J. L. (1998), 'Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: the implicit association test', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1464
- Hofstede, G. (2001), *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organisation Across Nations*, 2nd Edition, Sage Publications, California
- Jackson J E, (1991), *A Users Guide to Principal Components*, John Wiley and Sons, New York
- Judge H (1988), 'Cross-National Perceptions of Teachers', *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (May, 1988), 143-158
- Kahneman, D. (2011), *Thinking Fast, Thinking Slow*, Penguin, London
- Lambert, P.S. and Griffiths, D. (2018), *Social Inequalities and Occupational Stratification: Methods and Concepts in the Analysis of Social Distance*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan
- Lavy, V. (2002), 'Evaluating the effect of teachers group performance incentives on pupil achievement', *Journal of Political Economy*, 110, 1286-317
- Levanon, A., England, P., and Allison, P. (2009), 'Occupational feminization and pay: Assessing causal dynamics using 1950-2000 US census data', *Social Forces*, 88(2), 865-891
- Louviere, J., Flynn, T. and Marley, A. (2015), *Best Worst Scaling: Theory, Methods and Applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Marley, A., and Louviere, J. (2005), 'Some probabilistic models of best, worst and best-worse choices', *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 49, 464-480
- Mayerl, J. (2013), 'Response latency measurement in surveys. Detecting strong attitudes and response effects', *Survey Methods: Insights from the Field*: <https://surveyinsights.org/?p=1063>
- McKinsey and Company (2007), *How the World's Best-Performing School Systems come out on Top*, McKinsey, London
- Merriman, W., and Nicoletti, A. (2007), *Globalization and American Education*, The Educational Forum, 72. 8-22
- Meyer, E. (2014), *The Culture Map*, Public Affairs, New York
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., and Handelsman, J. (2012), 'Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(41), 16474-16479
- OECD (2013), *PISA 2012 results: What makes schools successful? Resources, policies and practices* (Vol. IV), Paris: PISA, OECD Publishing
- OECD (2006), *Eurostat-OECD Methodological Manual on Purchasing Power Parities*, Paris: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264011335-en>
- OECD (2008), *Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide*, Paris

- Pelham, B., Crabtree, S., and Nyiri, Z. (2009), 'Gallup presents... Technology and Education: The Power of the Personal Computer', *Harvard International Review*, 31(2), 74-76
- Prandy, K., and Jones, F. L. (2001), 'An international comparative analysis of marriage patterns and social stratification', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 21(4/5/6), 165-183
- Peston, M. (1972), *Public Goods and the Public Sector*, Macmillan, London
- Ravillion, M. (2016), *The Economics of Poverty: History, Measurement and Policy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Reise, S. Ventura, J. Nuechterlein, K., and Kim, K. (2005), 'An illustration of multilevel factor analysis', *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 84(2), 126-136
- Rivkin, S., Hanushek, E. and Kain, J. F. (2005), 'Teachers, schools and academic achievement', *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417-458
- Romer, T. and Rosenthal, H. (1979), 'Bureaucrats versus Voters: On the Political Economy of Resource Allocation by Direct Democracy', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 93(4), 563-587.
- Sandefur, J. (2018), 'Teacher Pay around the World: Beyond "Disruption" and "Deskilling"', *Center For Global Development Blogspot*: <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/chart-week-teacher-pay-around-world-beyond-disruption-and-deskilling>
- Sparrow N (2009). 'Developing Reliable Online Polls.' *International Journal of Market Research*, vol.48(6)
- Thaler, R. H. and Sunstein, C.R. (2008), *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth and Happiness*, Yale University Press, New Haven
- Turner, B. S. (1988), *Status*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes
- Vegas, E., Murnane, R. J. and Willett, J. B. (2001), 'From high school to teaching: Many steps, who makes it?'. *Teachers College Record*, 103(3), 427-449
- Verhoeven J, Aelterman, A, Rots, I and Buvens, I (2006), 'Public perceptions of teachers' status in Flanders', *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 12, No. 4, August 2006, 479-500



2nd Floor, St Albans House
57-59 Haymarket
London, SW1Y 4QX, UK
+44(0)20 7593 4040
www.varkeyfoundation.org