The growth in global climate protests by students challenge the status quo of policy makers and political leaders in mitigating the effects of climate change. These events suggest that young people are increasingly well-informed and aware of environmental issues and the impact of increases in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. To investigate how well-informed students are on the issue of climate change, we have used secondary data from the Programme of International Student Assessment (PISA) [1], a cross-national study involving 540,000 students in 72 OECD and partner countries to explore students’ responses. Our analysis of these data provides unparalleled insight into fifteen-year-old students’ self-reported awareness about greenhouse gases and how this varies by achievement, enjoyment of and interest in science, students’ socio-economic status and country of origin. We find there are substantial global variations in students’ awareness of greenhouse gases, which is independent of the international ranking of PISA scores. Measures of scientific literacy have the greatest association with students’ awareness about greenhouse gases, although enjoyment of science and interest in broad scientific topics suggests that school science courses that are rigorous in content and enjoyable for students prepare them to be well-informed citizens about climate change. Given the global interest in issues of equity, we argue that both schools and curriculum designers have the ability to cultivate enjoyment and interest to build positive attitudes, awareness and responsibility towards the environment alongside the development of scientific literacy.
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Abstract

The growth in global climate protests by students challenge the status quo of policy makers and political leaders in mitigating the effects of climate change. These events suggest that young people are increasingly well-informed and aware of environmental issues and the impact of increases in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. To investigate how well-informed students are on the issue of climate change, we have used secondary data from the Programme of International Student Assessment (PISA) [1], a cross-national study involving 540,000 students in 72 OECD and partner countries to explore students’ responses. Our analysis of these data provides unparalleled insight into fifteen-year-old students’ self-reported awareness about greenhouse gases and how this varies by achievement, enjoyment of and interest in science, students’ socio-economic status and country of origin. We find there are substantial global variations in students’ awareness of greenhouse gases, which is independent of the international ranking of PISA scores. Measures of scientific literacy have the greatest association with students’ awareness about greenhouse gases, although enjoyment of science and interest in broad scientific topics suggests that school science courses that are rigorous in content and enjoyable for students prepare them to be well-informed citizens about climate change. Given the global interest in issues of equity, we argue that both schools and curriculum designers have the ability to cultivate enjoyment and interest to build positive attitudes, awareness and responsibility towards the environment alongside the development of scientific literacy.

1. Introduction

1.1 Environmental awareness

Activism in response to climate change is global and has been led by young people, inspired by protests in Sweden by Greta Thunberg. As future leaders, informed and active citizens, it is important that they understand and respond to effects of a changing climate. Young people’s knowledge of science and perceptions about climate change are rarely examined in large-scale studies and even fewer use cross-cultural analyses. In a cross-country study of 13-16 year olds (n=760) in Austria and Germany [2], researchers found students’ knowledge, awareness and willingness to act vary considerably and even the group of ‘concerned activists’ were not very knowledgeable about climate change. A survey administered to young secondary students in New South Wales, Australia (n=500) and England (n=785) explored ‘degree of willingness to act’ and ‘believed usefulness of action’ in respect of ameliorating climate change [3], reporting a discrepancy in students’ self-reports about being well-informed and their ‘beliefs about the effectiveness of actions in reducing climate change’. Encouraging students to ‘take action’ [3] may thus not reflect the knowledge needed to explain climate change even if motivation and behavioural change suggests otherwise. It is long assumed that being armed with appropriate knowledge predicates behavioural change.

One longitudinal survey has reported that adults’ trust in climate scientists is associated with interest in science as measured in 12-14 year olds [4] supporting the notion that school science courses that foster interest and curiosity may have long-lasting consequences for confidence in climate scientists. Schools and universities have been urged to use education to promote the message of sustainability, action and collaboration [5], climate change [6, 7], help ‘adaptation literacy’ to be creative in responding to climate change [8], and address risks and stresses from climate change in schools[9].
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The relationship between climate change mechanistic knowledge and acceptance [10] suggest that education and interventions can bring about changes in the understanding of the causes of climate change, regardless of political orientation, religious and worldviews [11-13]. For example, first year university students (n=24) showed large gains (ES=.53) in being informed about the earth’s climate systems following a semester long introductory geology course [14]. Student activism is now global, beliefs and knowledge about climate change and behaviours to mitigate climate change have been explored, but how confident are students in their ability to explain? Is this likely to be associated with their school education, academic achievement in science or reflective of their wider socio-cultural environment? This paper addresses a gap in the literature about students’ environmental awareness in respect of greenhouse gases in exploring how informed they think they are.

1.2 Scientific literacy and PISA

One of the goals of science education in schools is to develop scientific literacy. For example, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) defined this as:

…the ability to engage with science-related issues, and with the ideas of science, as a reflective citizen. A scientifically literate person is willing to engage in reasoned discourse about science and technology, which requires the competencies to explain phenomena scientifically, evaluate and design scientific enquiry, and interpret data and evidence scientifically [15]

Measurement of scientific literacy (PISA scores) amongst 15-year olds provides a global snapshot and focus for educators, researchers and policy makers. School science is important in supporting the development of students’ attitudes, responsibility towards environmental awareness, their interest, motivation, and engagement in science. PISA uses a stratified two-stage sample design [16] in each country to identify and select schools and students to ensure valid representative sample, testing students’ ability to apply their knowledge to real world problems in mathematics, reading and science, along with trials in an innovative area which in 2015 was collaborative problem solving and financial literacy. The 2015 data from a 540,000 student sample represents the 29 million 15-year olds, and therefore comprises one of the largest cross-country study of education [17], providing a cross-sectional report every three years with a focus on literacies (reading, scientific and mathematical) independent from OECD countries’ curricula with a rotating focus on subjects. The official OECD and country reports on students’ achievement are used to inform policies [17-19], stimulate debate about approaches to teaching and learning [20-23], and create headlines in national media, where the ranking of countries can be prioritised over other aspects of education [19, 24]. Linking PISA scores with associated economic gains is contentious at best [25, 26] but the negative association between interest in and achievement in science is evident at the country level and student level of analysis [17], which is both counterintuitive and problematic. Much of the secondary analyses undertaken by researchers explores relationships using student and school level variables including achievement (or scientific literacy, the ‘score’), socioeconomic status, gender, and affective dispositions. These are disseminated through professional and subject-specific research avenues [21, 24]. This research provides a unique opportunity to undertake
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substantial ‘cross-cultural field work’ [25] from OECD and partner countries, of varying different geo-political persuasions with respect to climate change.

1.3 Objectives of the study

While PISA does not measure environmental literacy directly, questions focused on students’ reported self-awareness of environmental issues enable exploration of associations between measures of scientific literacy, affective dispositions of students and broader factors influencing environmental literacy [26]. In 2006 (the last time these items were used prior to 2015), for example, 58% of students reported an awareness of greenhouse gases compared with 73% of students who were aware of the consequences of forest clearing [27]. Importantly, the relationship between students’ awareness and scientific knowledge of environmental issues was reported to be linear in Australia [28], and also was robust using released 2006 test items about the greenhouse [29] and globally awareness of environmental issues was associated with socioeconomic background [30]. In another small study exploring Turkish students’ scientific literacy scores and environmental awareness [31], the relationship again was linear.

In view of the political discourse surrounding climate change, greenhouse gases and means to mitigate these, we have used the 2015 PISA data set to carry out an exploratory analysis of the relationship between achievement, affective measures and awareness (being informed) of the increase of greenhouse gases, as well as the relative influence of home background indices (wealth, cultural possessions, home educational and ICT resources [16]).

Our primary research question is therefore:

1. **What is the level of awareness of greenhouse gases in PISA 2015 students?**

In addition, we explore associations between scientific literacy, student level variables and affective measures, and consider the following secondary questions:

2. **How is awareness of greenhouse gases associated with scientific literacy?**
3. **How are student background variables and affective measures related to students’ reports of being informed about greenhouse gases?**
4. **How does awareness of greenhouse gases vary by OECD and partner countries?**
5. **Is there a gender gap in awareness of greenhouse gases and if so, how does this vary by OECD and partner countries?**

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 PISA data

PISA data are from a subset of the student questionnaire of the OECD’s 2015 Programme for International Student Assessment and combined with country-level environmental data. In 2015, science was the senior subject and the questionnaire was designed to explore student performance more widely, and importantly broad attitudes towards the study of science and scientific issues. The PISA dataset analysed during this study are available from the OECD [32].
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PISA is targeted at 15-year olds attending educational institutions in grades 7 or higher, with testing generally taking place between March 2015 and the end of August 2015, although some countries could agree with the OECD to test outside of that period. In all but the Russian Federation, the sampling process was of a two-stage stratified design. Firstly, a minimum of 150 schools were sampled from a national list on the basis of nationally determined school-level strata – explicit and implicit – with the implicit strata used for sorting the schools uniquely within each explicit stratum. For example, in the United States the explicit strata included region, funding, whether or not the school was a public school and no modal grade. The implicit strata included grade span, urbanisation, minority status, school gender composition and state. In the United Kingdom this included country, school type, region, modal grade (in England), school gender composition, and certainty selections, with the implicit strata being school performance (England and Wales only), and local authority. This was followed by a second stage where students were randomly sampled on the basis of equal probabilities within the sampled school with a general target of 42 using the computer-based test and 35 for the paper-based test [16]. Weights are included to allow inferences to be representative across participating countries.

2.2 Missing data

Of the 519334 original observations from 69 countries, the final analysis contained 336396 students from 54 countries, losing participants from Argentina, Albania, Algeria, Georgia, Indonesia, Jordan, Kosovo, Lebanon, Macedonia, Malta, Moldova, Romania, Vietnam, Thailand, and Trinidad and Tobago. A missing data pattern analysis highlighted several covariates that reduced the sample size considerably. In particular, interest in broad science reduced the available sample by approximately 52000, and highest occupational status of parents reduced the sample further by approximately 22000. In addition, the interaction of missing data across four covariates – enjoyment of science, climate-ordered, instrumental motivation to science, and interest in broad science – reduced the sample by almost 19000 students.

The analysis reported is the complete case analysis only. A three-level multiple imputation procedure using Stat-JR’s n-level multiple imputation template was attempted [33, 34]. Unfortunately, the imputation did not converge. However, the sample size remains very large across the majority of participating schools countries.

2.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Policies

For the country-level environmental data, the 2017 total Greenhouse gas emissions excluding land use change and forestry, measured in millions of tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (MtCO2e) were downloaded from the World Resources Institute - CAIT climate data explorer historical emissions database [35] and divided by the population of each territory to produce a per capita measure. The Climate Change Performance Index reports on climate policies and this enables a comparative analysis of the most recent national policies and enacted efforts to protect the climate. These data [36] help us understand the wider context of the students’ responses in different countries.

2.4 Outcome
“Hot-headed” students? Scientific literacy, perceptions and awareness of climate change in 15-year olds across 54 countries

Our outcome variable formed part of a suite of questions to capture students’ awareness about selected environmental issues, some of which were used in earlier rounds of PISA. In PISA 2015, students were asked, ‘How informed are you about the increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere?’ (ST09201TA), each with four options: I have never heard of this; I have heard about this but I would not be able to explain what it is really about; I know something about this and could explain the general issue; and I am familiar with this and I would be able to explain this well.

2.5 Model building

Multilevel ordered logistic “proportional odds” regression was used to estimate the individual, school and country-level probability of being informed about the issue surrounding the increase in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Multiple models of increasing complexity were fitted, with the final model being adjusted on the basis of vectors of individual-level demographic and background variables (including the gender of respondent, immigration status, parental education, the highest occupational status of parents and economic and social resources); science affective measures – such as enjoyment, broad interest and motivation to study science; student performance on the science PISA test; and carbon dioxide equivalent per capita (see methods for further details). Taking full advantage of the multilevel nature of the data, we allowed the intercepts to vary by school and country, along with three coefficients which varied by country – female, student performance on Science PISA test, and a female*PISA score interaction. Several of the predictors are composite scores from multiple items (parental education, highest occupational status of parents) and some of these are further derived from IRT scaling using the generalised partial credit model (cultural possessions, home educational resources, wealth, ICT resources, enjoyment of science, interest in broad science topics, instrumental motivation to science). The scaling methodology is discussed in the technical report [16].

For the PISA science score this was designed to examine student competencies (explaining scientific phenomena, designing scientific enquiry as well as interpreting data), knowledge (which includes content knowledge of the natural world and technology, how such knowledge is produced and the rationale behind scientific procedures) and finally contexts (including personal contexts, and scientific issues at the local, national and global level)[16]. As the PISA questionnaire is so broad, each student is only ever asked a smaller subset of all available questions and so PISA have a procedure to impute the values producing 10 plausible values for each of the three main subject domains – Reading, Mathematics and Science (see [16] for a discussion on how these plausible values are generated).

For the purpose of modelling each plausible value added to the final model separately, the model was fit and the parameter simulations saved. Once all 10 plausible values had been fit, the parameter simulations were merged and quantities of interest were calculated [37].

Further details are available in the appendix.

3. Findings

1 All codes used to create models are available at https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/JDCZA
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We present the findings organised by research questions (RQ) below:

3.1 **RQ1: What is the level of awareness of greenhouse gases in PISA 2015 students??**

With the broad attitudes towards contemporary scientific issues, a subset of 4-item Likert questions asked student respondents on how informed they were about environmental issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How informed are you about the increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere?</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have never heard of this</td>
<td>51090 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have heard about this but I would not be able to explain what it is really about</td>
<td>127728 (24.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know something about this and could explain the general issue</td>
<td>182110 (35.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with this and I would be able to explain this well</td>
<td>107172 (20.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>51234 (9.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>519334 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Distribution of the outcome variable*

The distribution of unweighted responses in table 1 shows that a baseline of 55.7% of students know ‘something about this’ or are ‘familiar with this and could explain it well’. It is concerning that such a large number of students do not feel well informed enough to explain this issue (24.6%) or have never heard of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere (9.8%). We now explore whether this patterning of responses is related to individual PISA scores or if these are associated with countries.

3.2 **RQ2: How is awareness of greenhouse gases associated with scientific literacy?**

The individual level weighted multilevel regressions results are presented in table 2. These show the average individual in the average school and in the average country (which have means of 0). All school and country-level effects are centred on zero. We can then easily see which positively or negatively deviate from the average probability. The coefficients are on the logit scale, but have also been converted to odds-ratios and probability for easier interpretation. Our comparison group is a student who is male, “native” to that country, whose parental education and highest occupational status are at the OECD average (mean centred at 0); home resources, such as cultural possessions, home educational resources, wealth and ICT resources are at the OECD average; enjoyment of science, interest in broad science and instrumental motivation towards science are at the OECD average; PISA score was again at the OECD average, and the student went to the average school in the average country with the average CO₂ emissions per capita.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Posterior Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Posterior 95%</th>
<th>Odds-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability Scale 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credible Intervals</th>
<th>95% Credible Intervals</th>
<th>Credible Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of respondent</td>
<td>-0.14 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.20, -0.08</td>
<td>0.82, 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant (First generation)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.07, 0.15</td>
<td>1.07, 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant (Second generation)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.02, 0.05</td>
<td>0.98, 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Education</td>
<td>0.01 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.01, 0.01</td>
<td>1.01, 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Occupational Status of Parents</td>
<td>0.04 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.03, 0.05</td>
<td>1.03, 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Possessions</td>
<td>0.14 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.13, 0.15</td>
<td>1.14, 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Education Resources</td>
<td>0.08 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.07, 0.09</td>
<td>1.07, 1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>0.03 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.01, 0.05</td>
<td>1.01, 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Resources</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.01)</td>
<td>-0.04, -0.00</td>
<td>0.96, 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of Science</td>
<td>0.32 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.31, 0.33</td>
<td>1.37, 1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Broad Science</td>
<td>0.32 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.31, 0.33</td>
<td>1.36, 1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Motivation to Science</td>
<td>0.03 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.02, 0.04</td>
<td>1.02, 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PISA Score</td>
<td>1.69 (0.05)</td>
<td>1.59, 1.76</td>
<td>4.91, 5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ emissions per capita</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.01)</td>
<td>-0.03, 0.01</td>
<td>0.98, 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex*PISA Score</td>
<td>-0.16 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.20, -0.11</td>
<td>0.81, 0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cutpoints:**

(I have never heard of this) (I have heard about this, but I would not be able to explain what it is really about)  
-2.73 (0.06)  
-2.86, -2.62

(I have heard about this, but I would not be able to explain what it is really about) (I know something about this and could explain the general issue)  
-0.57 (0.06)  
-0.70, -0.46

(I know something about this and could explain the general issue) (I)  
1.88 (0.06)  
1.75, 2.00
am familiar with this and I would be able to explain this well)

Table 2: Model of students’ perceptions of being informed of the increase in greenhouse gas emissions

The largest coefficient is seen from the association between being well-informed and the PISA score, the measure of scientific literacy. In the PISA sample, males who scored one standard deviation higher were on average 34.5% more likely to perceive being more informed, whereas females were 6% lower than their male counterparts. This pattern is also illustrated in the Australian report, which showed a “positive relationship between environmental awareness and scientific literacy” [28].

3.3 RQ3: are student background variables and affective measures related to students’ reports of being informed about greenhouse gases?

There are five key factors that have practical significance— i.e. whether the effect is of a sufficient magnitude given the context to be considered important (see the discussion in the supplementary materials) - on individual students being informed about greenhouse gases. These are sex of respondent (being female), cultural possessions, enjoyment of science, interest in broad science topics and the previously discussed PISA score. On average female students have an odds ratio interval of 0.82 to 0.92. When converted to the probability scale females were on average 4.7% less likely to perceive being informed than their male counterparts, although this varies considerably by country and this variation is addressed further below. For those students that on average were one standard deviation higher in terms of home cultural possessions (e.g. classical literature; books of poetry; works of art, books on art, music or design; and musical instruments), they had an odds ratio interval of 1.14 to 1.17. In probability terms, this means between three and four percentage greater likelihood of being more informed on the issue of the increase in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

Critically, positive coefficients on the affective measures show that they contribute considerably to the probability of being informed. For students that were one standard deviation higher in their enjoyment of science, they were approximately 8% more likely to perceive being more informed. This is a major shift for a social science based question and is something that teachers, schools and curriculum designers can influence and prioritise. This pattern is repeated for those who were one standard deviation higher than the OECD average regarding a broad interest in science topics, again being 8% more likely to be perceive being more informed (odds ratio of 1.37, 1.40).

3.4 RQ4: How does awareness of greenhouse gases vary by OECD and partner countries?

At the group-levels, knowledge about greenhouse gases in fifteen-year olds varies considerably by both school attended and country lived in. In a variance components analysis, 9% of the variance could be attributed to the school-level and 7% by country. In the final model the remaining unexplained variance was 4% at the school-level and 6% at the country-level. The school-level residuals (figure 3) mostly fell between ±0.5 on the logit scale (0.61 and 1.65 on
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The odds-ratio scale, and ±12% on the percentage probability scale. The most extreme cases were -1.30 (UK) and 1.43 (Uruguay) logits from the baseline. On the odds ratio scale this is 0.27, and 4.18 respectively, and on the percentage probability scale this is -29% and +31% from the baseline. Once the country-level adjustments are taken account of the average student within these two schools sit -9% and +21% around the baseline. While these cases represent the extremes, and are subject to considerable uncertainty, the school-level is important: accounting for all other factors we have explored, schools’ contributions to student knowing about greenhouse gases cannot be overstated. In the case of the UK and Uruguayan education systems, both are both highly centralised, yet these two schools sit significantly away from the national averages. While we do have a lot of unmeasured variables here that can explain some of the variation, some of this will no doubt be down to school and subject leadership.

Figure 1: School-level residuals presenting the average deviation for each school from the intercept on the logit scale (Mean centred on 0)

With a focus on the country-level, while we did not see much of a relationship between country-level CO₂ emissions per capita, there is marked variation in intercept, showing students in some countries are much more knowledgeable than others (see figure 2). In particular, the average student in the average school in Sweden, Portugal, UK, and Ireland were 28%, 23%, 22%, and 21% more likely to report being more informed above the baseline respectively. Sweden has ambitious targets to be ‘carbon neutral’, leads the Climate Change Performance Index (CCPI). Portugal leads for both national and international policy performance, with renewable energy sources and commitment to be carbon neutral by 2050 and an aim to end coal use by 2030 [36]. It seems plausible to suggest that students in these countries are aware of climate change as a matter of global significance whether through education policy and school curricula or through wider societal and media discourse. For example, the UK Parliament (May 2019), Ireland’s
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Dáil (June 2019) Canada’s House of Commons and French government (July 2019) have declared a ‘climate emergency’.

Although the individual student PISA score is a predictor of environmental awareness, and in contrast to our earlier prediction, the relationship of PISA scientific literacy score to environmental awareness at the country level is less tenuous. East Asian countries (China, Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Macao, Singapore and Viet Nam) along with Canada, Estonia and Finland atop the international league table in achievement in science[1]. However, many students in these countries do not feel knowledgeable about greenhouse gases. China’s national policy and commitments to renewable energy, meet emissions targets and is considered to be an ‘improving’ country in respect of CCPI although a per capita high ‘net contributor’. At the lower end of the scale, probabilities of students feeling well-informed about greenhouse gases which are decreasing order from the baseline which include Latvia (19%), Israel (16%), Tunisia (15%), Estonia (15%), Uruguay (13%), Czech Republic (12%), Dominican Republic (11%), Columbia (11%), Luxembourg (10%), the USA (9%), New Zealand (8%), Russia (7%), Iceland (7%), and Croatia (6%). New Zealand is a medium-ranked CCPI country with respect to overall climate policy, a ‘top ranking’ country in PISA science, yet students there are not likely to feel well informed about the role of greenhouse gases. Indeed, the school curriculum lacks mandate to teach about climate change [38] except during the final years of high school. Being a geologically active country, with curriculum resources directed to address local and immediate environmental concerns may well explain the finding that New Zealand students do not feel well-informed about greenhouse gases. Contrary to the
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findings drawn from adult populations, we do not find that levels of environmental awareness were high in the US student population: quite the reverse. Even amongst 15-year olds, US students were significantly less likely to feel well informed about greenhouse gases than those in European countries (fig 4). This is a stark finding. Compared with other countries, the US was identified in 2019 as ‘one of the worst-performing countries’ [36] and worsening in 2020 in regard to both national and international policy. The policies and practices of different states and cities are thus not currently well aligned with the administration, which appears to promote scepticism towards anthropogenic causes of climate change and the withdrawal from the Paris agreement.

3.5 RQ5: Is there a gender gap in awareness of greenhouse gases and if so, how does this vary by OECD and partner countries?

In the final model, the average gender difference highlighted that females were 4.7% less likely to perceive being more informed about greenhouse gases than males, in contrast to the finding reported in adults [39], where females show greater concern about environmental issues than males. The sex and PISA score interaction demonstrated that those female students that scored 1 standard deviation higher on the PISA score were approximately 6% less (an odds-ratio interval of 0.81,0.90 and probability interval of -0.07, -0.05) likely to informed on the issue of greenhouse gases.

Furthermore, we can explore the gender variation further by country as the slope has been allowed to vary. As seen in Figure 3, there is considerable country-level variation in probabilities. Female students on average in the following countries sit further below the -4.7% probability: Iceland (-13.7%), the US (-12.7%), Chile (-11.7%), Latvia (-11.7%), Czech Republic (-10.7%), Switzerland (-10.7%), New Zealand (-10.7%), and Poland (-9.7%). On the other hand, in Turkey (4.5%), Macao (3.3%) South Korea (3.1%), Hong Kong (3.1%), Chinese Taipei (2.47%), Montenegro (1.6%), Greece (0.60%) and mainland China (0.43%), females were more likely than male peers to know about greenhouse gases. It is difficult to determine whether this reflects differential emphasis in different schools, curriculum, or varying levels of environmental awareness. While we are unable to identify causes for the gender gap, the school science curricula, teachers and teaching are likely mediators to mitigate this.
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Figure 3: The varying country-level effect of being female on perceiving being more informed about greenhouse gases in the atmosphere

Positive effects are evident, especially between the variables of the PISA score and interest of, and enjoyment of science. These are large effects, likely to be reflective of the school environment, the curriculum content, teaching and learning.

Limitations

The OECD recognises that not all 15-year olds are enrolled in formal education across the world, so the data and analysis of these data need to be understood with this caveat in mind. Likewise, whether students’ responses across the world reflect the same understanding of attitudinal questions. We cannot know this but acknowledge this uncertainty in discussing the findings presented here. The use of student self-reported data such as PISA is subject to question and critique. We acknowledge this position and point to the use of the same questions across different rounds of the PISA cycle, refinements of constructs, questions and attention to survey design. Additionally, the self-reported nature has highlighted a gender gap that interestingly is not uniform across the all participating countries. It may be that ‘gaps’ are likely to be culturally dependent [40] and this is deserving of greater exploration.

5. Discussion

This analysis shows that students’ awareness of climate change is individually associated with their PISA score (achievement) and at the country level also likely to be shaped by local (national) policies and practices. Given the apparent mismatch in students’ environmental awareness of greenhouse gases and their achievement scores on PISA, we cannot assume all young people have equal access to scientifically informed materials about climate change and greenhouse gases at school [41]. High quality instruction in science can foster interest in
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Science and lead to improvement in knowledge and scientific literacy [12]. At the same time, where schools promote science-related self-efficacy, or ‘build confidence in their students’ abilities’ [42] students are likely to also have higher levels of achievement. Schools, the curriculum, teaching and learning do not operate in a social vacuum. In part, this may well reflect the emphasis on curriculum content, teachers’ confidence about teaching climate change in school or wider societal attitudes. Education may help mitigate the consequences of political inaction and address gaps in scientific and societal understanding of climate change [43, 44] and greater priority needs to be given to environmental issues in schools. Students’ beliefs and concerns about climate change may well be linked to local political and policy positions [45] reflecting the public discourse or polarisation in adults’ views [46] and the global student-led climate strikes.

Sweden, for example, is identified by the CCPI as a ‘high-performing’ as a country, with falling levels of greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy as 40% of its total supply. Policies in place to mitigate climate change are comprehensive, including energy, industry, agriculture, etc. National legislation for climate and energy, policies aligned with international protocols and the European Council mirror a country-wide approach to the environment. ‘Respect for the environment’ is embedded from early years’ education [47] as a fundamental value throughout schooling. Commitment to the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goals is coordinated across all government departments through the Minister for Public Administration within Sweden and through the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Specifically, the targets articulated to ensure climate change measures through policy, planning including education.

Girls’ education needs to be examined to ensure that they have equal access to the curriculum and that they feel more informed about environmental issues. This is challenging for educators, policy makers and political, business and industrial leaders. International cooperation and commitment to align polices with a ‘green’ low-emission future will be essential to mitigate the environmental emergency, reduce social inequalities and protect human societies [44]. With the declaration of environmental emergencies, it appears that political leadership is not coming fast enough, and from the analysis of these data that even young people do not feel well-informed [45]. With inter-generational learning being one approach to rouse consciousness of climate change [48], the siren voices to maintain the status quo are in sharp contrast to young activist Greta Thunberg ‘I want you to panic’.
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Appendix

Weights

In the second stage of sampling all students within the school had an equal probability of selection. However, sampling probabilities at the first stage differed significantly across the participant countries. Some countries over or under-sampled specific sectors, explicit and implicit strata varied, school and student non-response differed across countries, and without available information to adjust for sample design and non-response for all countries, weighting becomes a necessity for appropriately modelling the outcome. Finally, schools are selected with a probability proportional to size. There are two methods to appropriately weight PISA data – via the final student weights or via the senate weights. Student weights scale up to the size of the population so larger countries carry more weight. Senate weights on the other hand allow each country to contribute equally to the analysis [52]. As the cross-country component of the research question was important, senate weights were used to adjust for the varying sample design and non-response.

Analysis strategy

As the outcome variable was a four ordered category variable where respondents expressed their level of awareness and ability to explain the environmental phenomenon, an ordered logistic “proportional odds” multilevel approach was used to model the data. This model assumes an underlying latent (and linear) variable that the ordered categorical variable maps on to via a series of (K-1) thresholds/cutpoints. The proportional odds assumption works on the basis of the linear predictor is assumed to explain the relationship in the same manner between all pairs of response categories, hence there are a single set of coefficients. When extending the model to adjust for group membership – in this case, the school attended by the student and the country in which the student and school are based. The varying intercept model allows for the thresholds/cut points to vary by school and country but maintaining the assumption of the same slope across all predictors, with the varying slope model further relaxing the assumption, by allowing some coefficients to vary by group membership.

A Calibrated Bayesian [53] approach was used, where frequentist methods were used for model development and model checking, but given the model complexity of the three-level model, logistic link function and multiple varying slopes, the analysis was conducted using Stan, a Bayesian Hamiltonian Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampler accessed through the R package brms [54]. The sampler was run on 10 chains for 5000 iterations to allow for the 10 plausible values to be modelled appropriately (1 per chain), and weakly informative priors – normal priors on the betas with 0 mean and standard deviations of 5, and half-cauchy priors on the variance parameters with means of 0 and standard deviations of 5. All parameters demonstrated convergence with rhat potential scale reduction factor values of ≤ 1.01. Samples were then extracted to allow for post-processing and summary statistic calculations.

Model specification.

The final model reported here was as follows. The probability of the students perceiving themselves as being informed on the issue of the increase in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere was adjusted on the basis of a vector of individual-level demographic and background variables (sex of respondent, immigration status – “native”, “1st generation” and “second-generation”, parental education, and highest occupational status of parents); a vector
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of economic and social resources (Cultural possessions at home, Home educational resources, Family wealth, and ICT Resources); a vector of science affective measures (enjoyment of science, interest in broad science issues, instrumental motivation towards science; 10 plausible values of PISA overall science score; a group-level mean-centred indicator for the tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per capita; and a sex of respondent and PISA score interaction. The intercept was adjusted for school attended and country that the student resided in, and three of the covariates – sex of respondent, PISA score and the sex*PISA score interaction, were allowed to vary by country. This resulted in 5 additional parameters ((U0jk, V0k, V0k, V0k, V0k, V0k), which provide the group membership adjustments.

The higher-level residuals were distributed as follows U0, the school-level residual is assumed to be normally distributed and centred on a mean of 0 with the variance parameter σ2u. The country-level residuals form a quadvariate normal distribution, with means of 0 and a variance-covariance matrix in which the diagonals are the four variance parameters for the intercept adjustment and 3 slope variances (and the off-diagonals are used to provide the intercept-slope correlations). The model is presented below:

\[ y_{ijk} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y^*_{ijk} \leq \theta_1 \\ 2 & \text{if } y^*_{ijk} \leq \theta_2 \\ 3 & \text{if } \theta_{K-1} < y^*_{ijk} \end{cases} \]

\[ y^*_{ijk} = \text{logistic}(\beta_1 \text{Sex}_{ij} + \beta_2 \text{Immig}_{2ijk} + \beta_3 \text{Immig3}_{ijk} + \beta_4 \text{Pared}_{ijk} + \beta_5 \text{Hisei}_{ijk} + \beta_6 \text{Culpposs}_{ijk} + \beta_7 \text{Hedres}_{ijk} + \beta_8 \text{Wealth}_{ijk} + \beta_9 \text{Ictres}_{ijk} + \beta_{10} \text{Joyscie}_{ijk} + \beta_{11} \text{Intbsci}_{ijk} + \beta_{12} \text{Instscie}_{ijk} + \beta_{13k} \text{Pisa.Score}_{ij} + \beta_{14} \text{co2e}_{k} + \beta_{15k} \text{Sex}\times \text{Pisa.Score}_{ij} + u_{0jk} + v_{0k} + v_{1k} + v_{2k} + v_{3k}) \]

\[ u_{0j} \sim N(0, \sigma^2_u) \text{ for } j = 1 \ldots J \]

\[ \begin{pmatrix} v_{0k} \\ v_{1k} \\ v_{2k} \\ v_{3k} \end{pmatrix} \sim N\left(0, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2_{v0} & \rho_{v0v1} & \rho_{v0v2} & \rho_{v0v3} \\ \rho_{v1v0} & \sigma^2_{v1} & \rho_{v1v2} & \rho_{v1v3} \\ \rho_{v2v0} & \rho_{v2v1} & \sigma^2_{v2} & \rho_{v2v3} \\ \rho_{v3v0} & \rho_{v3v1} & \rho_{v3v2} & \sigma^2_{v3} \end{pmatrix} \right) \text{ for } k = 1 \ldots K \]

**Odds-Ratios**

Ordinal Logistic regression returns coefficients which are the log of odds. These can be exponentiated to form odds ratios. Odds ratios are bounded at 0 at one end of the scale to positive infinity at the other. An odds ratio of 1 indicates a probability of .5, with anything
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under 1 indicating that the group has a lower probability than the comparison group and anything above 1 indicating that the group has a higher probability than the comparison group. To convert odds ratios to the probability scale, the following formula should be used:

\[
\frac{\text{odds}}{1 + \text{odds}}
\]

We have generally presented the results on the odds-ratio scale and probability scale to aid interpretation. Where we refer to probability we have re-centred a probability of 0.5 at 0 so that it provides a clear direction for the effect.

Practical and statistical significance

The analysis uses Bayesian inference to fit the ordinal logistic proportional odds multilevel model. Bayesian approaches do not rely on traditional null hypothesis significance testing, with the assumption of hypothetical repeated sampling and p-values. Parameters are represented as a probability distribution, with those that are more consistent with the data having higher probability and a narrower set of values, while those which are less consistent having lower probabilities and values that are more spread out [57]. 95% credible intervals are still judged in the same manner as 95% confidence intervals - as to whether they cross 0, however, the probability of a positive or negative effect can be directly calculated and where the distribution of an effect partially crosses 0, the weight of evidence for the direction and size of the effect can be judged.

An important distinction needs to be made between where an effect is bounded away from zero (statistical significance in the frequentist literature) and “practical significance” in which we consider the magnitude of the effect given the applied context. Often with a large enough sample size extremely small differences are “significant”, but if the effect size is small the impact of the covariate is much less relevant for understanding how our outcome variable varies.
Figure 2
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Color scale indicating odds ratio values across different regions of the world.
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Abstract

The growth in global climate protests by students challenge the status quo of policy makers and political leaders in mitigating the effects of climate change. These events suggest that young people are increasingly well-informed and aware of environmental issues and the impact of increases in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. To investigate how well-informed students are on the issue of climate change, we have used secondary data from the Programme of International Student Assessment (PISA) [1], a cross-national study involving 540,000 students in 72 OECD and partner countries to explore students' responses. Our analysis of these data provides unparalleled insight into fifteen-year-old students' self-reported awareness about greenhouse gases and how this varies by achievement, enjoyment of and interest in science, students' socio-economic status and country of origin. We find there are substantial global variations in students' awareness of greenhouse gases, which is independent of the international ranking of PISA scores. Measures of scientific literacy have the greatest association with students' awareness about greenhouse gases, although enjoyment of science and interest in broad scientific topics suggests that school science courses that are rigorous in content and enjoyable for students prepare them to be well-informed citizens about climate change. Given the global interest in issues of equity, we argue that both schools and curriculum designers have the ability to cultivate enjoyment and interest to build positive attitudes, awareness and responsibility towards the environment alongside the development of scientific literacy.

I. Introduction

1. Environmental awareness

Activism in response to climate change is global and has been led by young people, inspired by protests in Sweden by Greta Thunberg. As future leaders, informed and active citizens, it is important that they understand and respond to effects of a changing climate. Young people’s knowledge of science and perceptions about climate change are rarely examined in large-scale studies and even fewer use cross-cultural analyses. In a cross-country study of 13-16 year olds (n=760) in Austria and Germany [2], researchers found students’ knowledge, awareness and willingness to act varies considerably and even the group of ‘concerned activists’ were not very knowledgeable about climate change. A survey administered to young secondary students in New South Wales, Australia (n=500) and England (n=785) explored ‘degree of willingness to act’ and ‘believed usefulness of action’ in respect of ameliorating climate change [3], reporting a discrepancy in students’ self-reports about being well-informed and their ‘beliefs about the effectiveness of actions in reducing climate change’ [4]. Encouraging students to ‘take action’ [5] may thus not reflect the knowledge needed to explain climate change even if motivation and behavioural change suggests otherwise. It is long assumed that being armed with appropriate knowledge predicates behavioural change.

One longitudinal survey has reported that adults’ trust in climate scientists is associated with interest in science as measured in 12-14 year olds [4] supporting the notion that school science courses that foster interest and curiosity may have long-lasting consequences for confidence in climate scientists. Schools and universities have been urged to use education to promote the message of sustainability, action and collaboration [5], climate change [6, 7], help ‘adaptation...
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lack of scientific literacy’ to be creative in responding to climate change [8], and address risks and stresses from climate change in schools [9].

The relationship between climate change mechanistic knowledge and acceptance [10] suggest that education and interventions can bring about changes in the understanding of the causes of climate change, regardless of political orientation, religious and worldviews [11-13]. For example, first year university students (n=24) showed large gains (ES=.53) in being informed about the earth’s climate systems following a semester long introductory geology course [14]. Student activism is now global, beliefs and knowledge about climate change and behaviours to mitigate climate change have been explored, but how confident are students in their ability to explain? Is this likely to be associated with their school education, academic achievement in science or reflective of their wider socio-cultural environment? This paper addresses a gap in the literature about students’ environmental awareness in respect of greenhouse gases in exploring how informed they think they are.

1.2 Scientific literacy and PISA

One of the goals of science education in schools is to develop scientific literacy. For example, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) defined this as:

…the ability to engage with science-related issues, and with the ideas of science, as a reflective citizen. A scientifically literate person is willing to engage in reasoned discourse about science and technology, which requires the competencies to explain phenomena scientifically, evaluate and design scientific enquiry, and interpret data and evidence scientifically [15]

Measurement of scientific literacy (PISA scores) amongst 15-year olds provides a global snapshot and focus for educators, researchers and policy makers. School science is important in supporting the development of students’ attitudes, responsibility towards environmental awareness, their interest, motivation, and engagement in science. PISA uses a stratified two-stage sample design [16] in each country to identify and select schools and students to ensure a valid representative sample, testing students’ ability to apply their knowledge to real world problems in mathematics, reading and science, along with trials in an innovative area which in 2015 was collaborative problem solving and financial literacy. The 2015 data from a 540,000 student sample represents the 29 million 15-year olds, and therefore comprises one of the largest cross-country study of education [17], providing a cross-sectional report every three years with a focus on literacies (reading, scientific and mathematical) independent from OECD countries’ curricula with a rotating focus on subjects. The official OECD and country reports on students’ achievement are used to inform policies [17-19], stimulate debate about approaches to teaching and learning [20-23], and create headlines in national media, where the ranking of countries can be prioritised over other aspects of education [24]. Linking PISA scores with associated economic gains is contentious at best [25-26], but the negative association between interest in and achievement in science is evident at the country level and student level of analysis [17], which is both counterintuitive and problematic.
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1.3 Objectives of the study

While PISA does not measure environmental literacy directly, questions focused on students’ reported self-awareness of environmental issues enable exploration of associations between measures of scientific literacy, affective dispositions of students and broader factors influencing environmental literacy [26]. In 2006 (the last time these items were used prior to 2015), for example, 58% of students reported an awareness of greenhouse gases compared with 73% of students who were aware of the consequences of forest clearing [27]. Importantly, the relationship between students’ awareness and scientific knowledge of environmental issues was reported to be linear in Australia [28], and also was robust using released 2006 test items about the greenhouse [29] and globally awareness of environmental issues was associated with socioeconomic background [30]. In another small study exploring Turkish students’ scientific literacy scores and environmental awareness [31], the relationship again was linear.

In view of the political discourse surrounding climate change, greenhouse gases and means to mitigate these, we have used the 2015 PISA data set to carry out an exploratory analysis of the relationship between achievement, affective measures and awareness (being informed) of the increase of greenhouse gases, as well as the relative influence of home background indices (wealth, cultural possessions, home educational and ICT resources [16]).

Our primary research question is therefore:

1. What is the level of awareness of greenhouse gases in PISA 2015 students?

In addition, we explore associations between scientific literacy, student level variables and affective measures, and consider the following secondary questions:

2. How is awareness of greenhouse gases associated with scientific literacy?
3. How are student background variables and affective measures related to students’ reports of being informed about greenhouse gases?
4. How does awareness of greenhouse gases vary by OECD and partner countries?
5. Is there a gender gap in awareness of greenhouse gases and if so, how does this vary by OECD and partner countries?

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 PISA data

PISA data are from a subset of the student questionnaire of the OECD’s 2015 Programme for International Student Assessment and combined with country-level environmental data. In
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2015, science was the senior subject and the questionnaire was designed to explore student performance more widely, and importantly broad attitudes towards the study of science and scientific issues. The PISA dataset analysed during this study are available from the OECD [32].

PISA is targeted at 15-year olds attending educational institutions in grades 7 or higher, with testing generally taking place between March 2015 and the end of August 2015, although some countries could agree with the OECD to test outside of that period. In all but the Russian Federation, the sampling process was of a two-stage stratified design. Firstly, a minimum of 150 schools were sampled from a national list on the basis of nationally determined school-level strata – explicit and implicit – with the implicit strata used for sorting the schools uniquely within each explicit stratum. For example, in the United States the explicit strata included region, funding, whether or not the school was a public school and no modal grade. The implicit strata included grade span, urbanisation, minority status, school gender composition and state. In the United Kingdom this included country, school type, region, modal grade (in England), school gender composition, and certainty selections, with the implicit strata being school performance (England and Wales only), and local authority. This was followed by a second stage where students were randomly sampled on the basis of equal probabilities within the sampled school with a general target of 42 using the computer-based test and 35 for the paper-based test [34,16]. Weights are included to allow inferences to be representative across participating countries.

2.2 Missing data

Of the 519334 original observations from 69 countries, the final analysis contained 336396 students from 54 countries, losing participants from Argentina, Albania, Algeria, Georgia, Indonesia, Jordan, Kosovo, Lebanon, Macedonia, Malta, Moldova, Romania, Vietnam, Thailand, and Trinidad and Tobago. A missing data pattern analysis highlighted several covariates that reduced the sample size considerably. In particular, interest in broad science reduced the available sample by approximately 52000, and highest occupational status of parents reduced the sample further by approximately 22000. In addition, the interaction of missing data across four covariates – enjoyment of science, climate-ordered, instrumental motivation to science, and interest in broad science – reduced the sample by almost 19000 students.

The analysis reported is the complete case analysis only. A three-level multiple imputation procedure using Stat-JR’s n-level multiple imputation template was attempted [33, 34]. Unfortunately, the imputation did not converge. However, the sample size remains very large across the majority of participating schools countries.

2.2.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Policies

For the country-level environmental data, the 2017 total Greenhouse gas emissions excluding land use change and forestry, measured in millions of tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (MtCO2e) were downloaded from the World Resources Institute - CAIT climate data explorer historical emissions database [35] and divided by the population of each territory to produce a per capita measure. The Climate Change Performance Index (2019).
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reports on climate policies and this enables a comparative analysis of the most recent national policies and efforts to protect the climate. These data [36] are available at https://www.climate-change-performance-index.org and together help us understand the wider context of the students’ responses in different countries.

2.3.4 Outcome

Our outcome variable formed part of a suite of questions to capture students’ awareness about selected environmental issues, some of which were used in earlier rounds of PISA. In PISA 2015, students were asked, ‘How informed are you about the increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere?’ (ST09201TA), each with four options: I have never heard of this; I have heard about this but I would not be able to explain what it is really about; I know something about this and could explain the general issue; and I am familiar with this and I would be able to explain this well.

2.4.5 Model building

Multilevel ordered logistic “proportional odds” regression was used to estimate the individual, school and country-level probability of being informed about the issue surrounding the increase in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Multiple models of increasing complexity were fitted, with the final model being adjusted on the basis of vectors of individual-level demographic and background variables (including the gender of respondent, immigration status, parental education, the highest occupational status of parents and economic and social resources); science affective measures – such as enjoyment, broad interest and motivation to study science; student performance on the science PISA test; and carbon dioxide equivalent per capita (see methods for further details). Taking full advantage of the multilevel nature of the data, we allowed the intercepts to vary by school and country, along with three coefficients which varied by country – female, student performance on Science PISA test, and a female*PISA score interaction. Several of the predictors are composite scores from multiple items (parental education, highest occupational status of parents) and some of these are further derived from IRT scaling using the generalised partial credit model (cultural possessions, home educational resources, wealth, ICT resources, enjoyment of science, interest in broad science topics, instrumental motivation to science). The scaling methodology is discussed in the technical report [16].

For the PISA science score this was designed to examine student competencies (explaining scientific phenomena, designing scientific enquiry as well as interpreting data), knowledge (which includes content knowledge of the natural world and technology, how such knowledge is produced and the rationale behind scientific procedures) and finally contexts (including personal contexts, and scientific issues at the local, national and global level) [16]. As the PISA questionnaire is so broad, each student is only ever asked a smaller subset of all available questions and so PISA have a procedure to impute the values producing 10 plausible values for each of the three main subject domains – Reading, Mathematics and Science [see [16], OECD-2015-p184 for a discussion on how these plausible values are generated).

1 All codes used to create models are available at https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/JDCZA
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For the purpose of modelling each plausible value added to the final model separately, the model was fit and the parameter simulations saved. Once all 10 plausible values had been fit, the parameter simulations were merged and quantities of interest were calculated [37].

Further details are available in the appendix.

3. Findings

We present the findings organised by research questions (RQ) below:

3.1 RQ1: What is the level of awareness of greenhouse gases in PISA 2015 students?

With the broad attitudes towards contemporary scientific issues, a subset of 4-item Likert questions asked student respondents on how informed they were about environmental issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How informed are you about the increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere?</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have never heard of this</td>
<td>51090 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have heard about this but I would not be able to explain what it is really about</td>
<td>127728 (24.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know something about this and could explain the general issue</td>
<td>182110 (35.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with this and I would be able to explain this well</td>
<td>107172 (20.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>51234 (9.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>519334 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of unweighted responses in table 1 shows that a baseline of 55.7% of students know ‘something about this’ or are ‘familiar with this and could explain it well’. It is concerning that such a large number of students do not feel well informed enough to explain this issue (24.6%) or have never heard of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere (9.8%). We now explore whether this patterning of responses is related to individual PISA scores or if these are associated with countries.

3.2 RQ2: How is awareness of greenhouse gases associated with scientific literacy?

The individual level weighted multilevel regressions results are presented in table 2. These show the average individual in the average school and in the average country (which have means of 0). All school and country-level effects are centred on zero. We can then easily see which positively or negatively deviate from the average probability. The coefficients are on the logit scale, but have also been converted to odds-ratios and probability for easier interpretation. Our comparison group is a student who is male, “native” to that country, whose parental education and highest occupational status are at the OECD average (mean centred at 0); home resources, such as cultural possessions, home educational resources, wealth and ICT resources...
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are at the OECD average; enjoyment of science, interest in broad science and instrumental motivation towards science are at the OECD average; PISA score was again at the OECD average, and the student went to the average school in the average country with the average CO₂ emissions per capita.

Table 2: Model of students' perceptions of being informed of the increase in greenhouse gas emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Posterior Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Posterior 95% Credible Intervals</th>
<th>Odds-Ratio 95% Credible Intervals</th>
<th>Probability Scale 95% Credible Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of respondent</td>
<td>-0.14 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.20, -0.08</td>
<td>0.82, 0.92</td>
<td>-0.05, -0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant (First generation)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.07, 0.15</td>
<td>1.07, 1.16</td>
<td>0.02, 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant (Second generation)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.02, 0.05</td>
<td>0.98, 1.05</td>
<td>-0.01, 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Education</td>
<td>0.01 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.01, 0.01</td>
<td>1.01, 1.01</td>
<td>0.02, 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Occupational Status of Parents</td>
<td>0.04 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.03, 0.05</td>
<td>1.03, 1.05</td>
<td>0.01, 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Possessions</td>
<td>0.14 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.13, 0.15</td>
<td>1.14, 1.17</td>
<td>0.03, 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Education Resources</td>
<td>0.08 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.07, 0.09</td>
<td>1.07, 1.09</td>
<td>0.02, 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>0.03 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.01, 0.05</td>
<td>1.01, 1.05</td>
<td>0.00, 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Resources</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.01)</td>
<td>-0.04, -0.00</td>
<td>0.96, 1.00</td>
<td>-0.01, 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of Science</td>
<td>0.32 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.31, 0.33</td>
<td>1.37, 1.40</td>
<td>0.08, 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Broad Science</td>
<td>0.32 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.31, 0.33</td>
<td>1.36, 1.39</td>
<td>0.08, 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Motivation to Science</td>
<td>0.03 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.02, 0.04</td>
<td>1.02, 1.04</td>
<td>0.00, 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PISA Score</td>
<td>1.69 (0.05)</td>
<td>1.59, 1.76</td>
<td>4.91, 5.96</td>
<td>0.33, 0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ emissions per capita</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.01)</td>
<td>-0.03, 0.01</td>
<td>0.98, 1.01</td>
<td>-0.01, 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex*PISA Score</td>
<td>-0.16 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.20, -0.11</td>
<td>0.81, 0.90</td>
<td>-0.07, -0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cutpoints:

(I have never heard of this) (I have heard about this, but I would not be able to explain what it is really about)

-2.73 (0.06)    -2.86, -2.62
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(I have heard about this, but I would not be able to explain what it is really about) (I know something about this and could explain the general issue)

-0.57 (0.06) -0.70, -0.46

(I know something about this and could explain the general issue) (I am familiar with this and I would be able to explain this well)

1.88 (0.06) 1.75, 2.00

Table 2: Model of students’ perceptions of being informed of the increase in greenhouse gas emissions

The largest coefficient is seen from the association between being well-informed and the PISA score, the measure of scientific literacy. In the PISA sample, males who scored one standard deviation higher were on average 34.5% more likely to perceive being more informed, whereas females were 6% lower than their male counterparts. This pattern is also illustrated in the Australian report, which showed a “positive relationship between environmental awareness and scientific literacy” [28, p. 235].

3.3 RQ3: are student background variables and affective measures related to students’ reports of being informed about greenhouse gases?

There are five key factors that have practical significance – i.e. whether the effect is of a sufficient magnitude given the context to be considered important (see the discussion in the supplementary materials) - on individual students being informed about greenhouse gases. These are sex of respondent (being female), cultural possessions, enjoyment of science, interest in broad science topics and the previously discussed PISA score. On average female students have an odds ratio interval of 0.82 to 0.92. When converted to the probability scale females were on average 4.7% less likely to perceive being informed than their male counterparts, although this varies considerably by country and this variation is addressed further below. For those students that on average were one standard deviation higher in terms of home cultural possessions (e.g. classical literature; books of poetry; works of art, books on art, music or design; and musical instruments), they had an odds ratio interval of 1.14 to 1.17. In probability terms, this means between three and four percentage greater likelihood of being more informed on the issue of the increase in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

Critically, positive coefficients on the affective measures show that they contribute considerably to the probability of being informed. For students that were one standard deviation higher in their enjoyment of science, they were approximately 8% more likely to perceive being more informed. This is a major shift for a social science based question and is something that
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teachers, schools and curriculum designers can influence and prioritise. This pattern is repeated for those who were one standard deviation higher than the OECD average regarding a broad interest in science topics, again being 8% more likely to perceive being more informed (odds ratio of 1.37, 1.40).

3.4 RQ4: How does awareness of greenhouse gases vary by OECD and partner countries?

At the group-levels, knowledge about greenhouse gases in fifteen-year olds varies considerably by both school attended and country lived in. In a variance components analysis, 9% of the variance could be attributed to the school-level and 7% by country. In the final model the remaining unexplained variance was 4% at the school-level and 6% at the country-level. The school-level residuals (figure 3) mostly fell between ±0.5 on the logit scale (0.61 and 1.65 on the odds-ratio scale, and ±12% on the percentage probability scale). The most extreme cases were -1.30 (UK) and 1.43 (Uruguay) logits from the baseline. On the odds ratio scale this is 0.27, and 4.18 respectively, and on the percentage probability scale this is -29% and +31% from the baseline. Once the country-level adjustments are taken account of the average student within these two schools sit -9% and +21% around the baseline. While these cases represent the extremes, and are subject to considerable uncertainty, the school-level is important: accounting for all other factors we have explored, schools’ contributions to student knowing about greenhouse gases cannot be overstated. In the case of the UK and Uruguayan education systems, both are both highly centralised, yet these two schools sit significantly away from the national averages. While we do have a lot of unmeasured variables here that can explain some of the variation, some of this will no doubt be down to school and subject leadership.

Figure 1: School-level residuals presenting the average deviation for each school from the intercept on the logit scale (Mean centred on 0)
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Figure 1: School-level residuals presenting the average deviation for each school from the intercept on the logit scale (Mean centred on 0)

With a focus on the country-level, while we did not see much of a relationship between country-level CO₂ emissions per capita, there is marked variation in intercept, showing students in some countries are much more knowledgeable than others (see figure 2). In particular, the average student in the average school in Sweden, Portugal, UK, and Ireland were 28%, 23%, 22%, and 21% more likely to report being more informed above the baseline respectively. Sweden has ambitious targets to be ‘carbon neutral’, leads the Climate Change Performance Index (CCPI). Portugal leads for both national and international policy performance, with renewable energy sources and commitment to be carbon neutral by 2050 and an aim to end coal use by 2030 [36]. It seems plausible to suggest that students in these countries are aware of climate change as a matter of global significance whether through education policy and school curricula or through wider societal and media discourse. For example, the UK Parliament (May 2019), Ireland’s Dáil (June 2019) Canada’s House of Commons and French government (July 2019) have declared a ‘climate emergency’.

Figure 2: Country-level intercept variation on the probability of perceiving being informed about the increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere
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Although the individual student PISA score is a predictor of environmental awareness, and in contrast to our earlier prediction, the relationship of PISA scientific literacy score to environmental awareness at the country level is less tenuous. East Asian countries (China, Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Macao, Singapore and Viet Nam) along with Canada, Estonia and Finland atop the international league table in achievement in science [1]. However, many students in these countries do not feel knowledgeable about greenhouse gases. China's national policy and commitments to renewable energy, meet emissions targets and is considered to be an 'improving' country in respect of CCPI although a per capita high 'net contributor'. At the lower end of the scale, probabilities of students feeling well-informed about greenhouse gases which are decreasing order from the baseline which include Latvia (19%), Israel (16%), Tunisia (15%), Estonia (15%), Uruguay (13%), Czech Republic (12%), Dominican Republic (11%), Columbia (11%), Luxembourg (10%), the USA (9%), New Zealand (8%), Russia (7%), Iceland (7%), and Croatia (6%). New Zealand is a medium-ranked CCPI country with respect to overall climate policy, a 'top ranking' country in PISA science, yet students there are not likely to feel well informed about the role of greenhouse gases. Indeed, the school curriculum lacks mandate to teach about climate change [38] except during the final years of high school. Being a geologically active country, with curriculum resources directed to address local and immediate environmental concerns may well explain the finding that New Zealand students do not feel well-informed about greenhouse gases. Contrary to the findings drawn from adult populations, we do not find that levels of environmental awareness were high in the US student population: quite the reverse. Even amongst 15-year-olds, US students were significantly less likely to feel well informed about greenhouse gases than those in European countries (fig 4). This is a stark finding. Compared with other countries, the US was identified in 2019 as 'one of the worst-performing countries' [38] and worsening in 2020 [39] in regard to both national and international policy. The policies and practices of different states and cities are thus not currently well aligned with the administration, which appears to promote scepticism towards anthropogenic causes of climate change and the withdrawal from the Paris agreement.

3.5 RQ5: Is there a gender gap in awareness of greenhouse gases, and if so, how does this vary by OECD and partner countries?

In the final model, the average gender difference highlighted that females were 4.7% less likely to perceive being more informed about greenhouse gases than males, in contrast to the finding reported in adults [39], where females show greater concern about environmental issues than males. The sex and PISA score interaction demonstrated that those female students that scored 1 standard deviation higher on the PISA score were approximately 6% less (an odds-ratio interval of 0.81, 0.90 and probability interval of -0.07, -0.05) likely to informed on the issue of greenhouse gases.

Furthermore, we can explore the gender variation further by country as the slope has been allowed to vary. As seen in Figure 3, there is considerable country-level variation in probabilities. Female students on average in the following countries sit further below the -4.7% probability: Iceland (-13.7%), the US (-12.7%), Latvia (-11.7%), Czech Republic (-10.7%), Switzerland (-10.7%), New Zealand (-10.7%), and Poland (-9.7%).
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On the other hand, in Turkey (4.5%), Macao (3.3%) South Korea (3.1%), Hong Kong (3.1%), Chinese Taipei (2.47%), Montenegro (1.6%), Greece (0.60%) and mainland China (0.43%), females were more likely than male peers to know about greenhouse gases. It is difficult to determine whether this reflects differential emphasis in different schools, curriculum, or varying levels of environmental awareness. While we are unable to identify causes for the gender gap, the school science curricula, teachers and teaching are likely mediators to mitigate this.

Figure 3: The varying country-level effect of being female on perceiving being more informed about greenhouse gases in the atmosphere

Positive effects are evident, especially between the variables of the PISA score and interest of, and enjoyment of science. These are large effects, likely to be reflective of the school environment, the curriculum content, teaching and learning.

Limitations

The OECD recognises that not all 15-year olds are enrolled in formal education across the world, so the data and analysis of these data need to be understood with this caveat in mind. Likewise, whether students’ responses across the world reflect the same understanding of attitudinal questions. We cannot know this but acknowledge this uncertainty in discussing the findings presented here. The use of student self-reported data such as PISA is subject to question and critique. We acknowledge this position and point to the use of the same questions across different rounds of the PISA cycle, refinements of constructs, questions and attention to
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5. Discussion

This analysis shows that students’ awareness of climate change is individually associated with their PISA score (achievement) and at the country level also likely to be shaped by local (national) policies and practices. Given the apparent mismatch in students’ environmental awareness of greenhouse gases and their achievement scores on PISA, we cannot assume all young people have equal access to scientifically informed materials about climate change and greenhouse gases at school [41]. High quality instruction in science can foster interest in science and lead to improvement in knowledge and scientific literacy [12]. At the same time, where schools promote science-related self-efficacy, or ‘build confidence in their students’ abilities’ [42], students are likely to also have higher levels of achievement. Schools, the curriculum, teaching and learning do not operate in a social vacuum. In part, this may well reflect the emphasis on curriculum content, teachers’ confidence about teaching climate change in school or wider societal attitudes. Education may help mitigate the consequences of political inaction and address gaps in scientific and societal understanding of climate change [43, 44] and greater priority needs to be given to environmental issues in schools. Students’ beliefs and concerns about climate change may well be linked to local political and policy positions [45] reflecting the public discourse or polarisations in adults’ views [46] and the global student-led climate strikes.

Sweden, for example, is identified by the CCPI as a ‘high-performing’ as a country, with falling levels of greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy as 40% of its total supply. Policies in place to mitigate climate change are comprehensive, including energy, industry, agriculture, etc. National legislation for climate and energy, policies aligned with international protocols and the European Council mirror a country-wide approach to the environment. ‘Respect for the environment’ is embedded from early years’ education [47] as a fundamental value throughout schooling. Commitment to the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goals is coordinated across all government departments through the Minister for Public Administration within Sweden and through the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Specifically, the targets articulated to ensure climate change measures through policy, planning including education.

Girls’ education needs to be examined to ensure that they have equal access to the curriculum and that they feel more informed about environmental issues. This is challenging for educators, policy makers and political, business and industrial leaders. International cooperation and commitment to align policies with a ‘green’ low-emission future will be essential to mitigate the environmental emergency, reduce social inequalities and protect human societies [44]. With the declaration of environmental emergencies, it appears that political leadership is not coming fast enough, and from the analysis of these data that even young people do not feel well-informed [45]. With inter-generational learning being one approach to rouse consciousness of climate change [48], the siren voices to maintain the status quo are in sharp contrast to young activist Greta Thunberg ‘I want you to panic’.
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Appendix

Weights

In the second stage of sampling all students within the school had an equal probability of selection. However, sampling probabilities at the first stage differed significantly across the participant countries. Some countries over or under-sampled specific sectors, explicit and implicit strata varied, school and student non-response differed across countries, and without available information to adjust for sample design and non-response for all countries, weighting becomes a necessity for appropriately modelling the outcome. Finally, schools are selected with a probability proportional to size. There are two methods to appropriately weight PISA data – via the final student weights or via the senate weights. Student weights scale up to the size of the population so larger countries carry more weight. Senate weights on the other hand allow each country to contribute equally to the analysis [52]. As the cross-country component of the research question was important, senate weights were used to adjust for the varying sample design and non-response.

Analysis strategy

As the outcome variable was a four ordered category variable where respondents expressed their level of awareness and ability to explain the environmental phenomenon, an ordered logistic “proportional odds” multilevel approach was used to model the data. This model assumes an underlying latent (and linear) variable that the ordered categorical variable maps on to via a series of \((K-1)\) thresholds/cutpoints. The proportional odds assumption works on the basis of the linear predictor is assumed to explain the relationship in the same manner between all pairs of response categories, hence there are a single set of coefficients. When extending the model to adjust for group membership – in this case, the school attended by the student and the country in which the student and school are based. The varying intercept model allows for the thresholds/cut points to vary by school and country but maintaining the assumption of the same slope across all predictors, with the varying slope model further relaxing the assumption, by allowing some coefficients to vary by group membership.

A Calibrated Bayesian [53] approach was used, where frequentist methods were used for model development and model checking, but given the model complexity of the three-level model, logistic link function and multiple varying slopes, the analysis was conducted using Stan, a Bayesian Hamiltonian Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampler accessed through the R package brms [54]. The sampler was run on 10 chains for 5000 iterations to allow for the 10 plausible values to be modelled appropriately (1 per chain), and weakly informative priors – normal priors on the betas with 0 mean and standard deviations of 5, and half-cauchy priors on the variance parameters with means of 0 and standard deviations of 5. All parameters demonstrated convergence with rhat potential scale reduction factor values of \(\leq 1.01\). Samples were then extracted to allow for post-processing and summary statistic calculations.

Model specification.

The final model reported here was as follows. The probability of the students perceiving themselves as being informed on the issue of the increase in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere was adjusted on the basis of a vector of individual-level demographic and background variables (sex of respondent, immigration status – “native”, “1st generation” and
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“second-generation”, parental education, and highest occupational status of parents); a vector of economic and social resources (Cultural possessions at home, Home educational resources, Family wealth, and ICT Resources); a vector of science affective measures (enjoyment of science, interest in broad science issues, instrumental motivation towards science; 10 plausible values of PISA overall science score; a group-level mean-centred indicator for the tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per capita; and a sex of respondent and PISA score interaction. The intercept was adjusted for school attended and country that the student resided in, and three of the covariates – sex of respondent, PISA score and the sex*PISA score interaction, were allowed to vary by country. This resulted in 5 additional parameters ((U_{0jk}, V_{0k}, V_{0k}, V_{0k}, V_{0k}), which provide the group membership adjustments.

The higher-level residuals were distributed as follows U_{0k}, the school-level residual is assumed to be normally distributed and centred on a mean of 0 with the variance parameter \sigma^2_u. The country-level residuals form a quadivariate normal distribution, with means of 0 and a variance-covariance matrix in which the diagonals are the four variance parameters for the intercept adjustment and 3 slope variances (and the oft-diagonals are used to provide the intercept-slope correlations). The model is presented below:

\[ y_{ijk} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y_{ijk} \leq \theta_1 \\ 2 & \text{if } \theta_1 < y_{ijk} \leq \theta_2 \\ 3 & \text{if } \theta_2 < y_{ijk} \end{cases} \]

\[ y_{ijk} = \text{logistic}(\beta_1 \text{Sex}_{ij} + \beta_2 \text{Immi}2_{ijk} + \beta_3 \text{Immi}3_{ijk} + \beta_4 \text{Pared}_{ijk} + \beta_5 \text{Hisel}_{ijk} + \beta_6 \text{Cultpos}_{ijk} + \beta_7 \text{Hedres}_{ijk} + \beta_8 \text{Wealth}_{ijk} + \beta_9 \text{Ictres}_{ijk} + \beta_{10} \text{Joysci}_{ijk} + \beta_{11} \text{Intbrsci}_{ijk} + \beta_{12} \text{Instsci}_{ijk} + \beta_{13} \text{Pisa.Score}_{ij} + \beta_{14} \text{co2e}_{k} + \beta_{15} \text{Sex} \times \text{Pisa.Score}_{ij} + u_{0jk} + v_{0k} + v_{1k} + v_{2k} + v_{3k}) \]

\[ u_{0j} \sim N(0, \sigma^2_u) \text{ for } j = 1 \ldots J \]

\[ \left( \begin{array}{c} v_{0k} \\ v_{1k} \\ v_{2k} \\ v_{3k} \end{array} \right) \sim N \left( \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} , \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2_v & \rho \sigma_v \sigma_{v1} & \rho \sigma_v \sigma_{v2} & \rho \sigma_v \sigma_{v3} \\ \rho \sigma_{v1} \sigma_v & \sigma^2_{v1} & \rho \sigma_{v1} \sigma_{v2} & \rho \sigma_{v1} \sigma_{v3} \\ \rho \sigma_{v2} \sigma_v & \rho \sigma_{v2} \sigma_{v1} & \sigma^2_{v2} & \rho \sigma_{v2} \sigma_{v3} \\ \rho \sigma_{v3} \sigma_v & \rho \sigma_{v3} \sigma_{v1} & \rho \sigma_{v3} \sigma_{v2} & \sigma^2_{v3} \end{pmatrix} \right) \text{ for } k = 1 \ldots K \]

Missing data

Of the 519 334 original observations from 69 countries, the final analysis contained 336 396 students from 54 countries, losing participants from Argentina, Albania, Algeria, Georgia, Indonesia, Jordan, Kosovo, Lebanon, Malta, Moldova, Romania, Vietnam, Thailand, Trinidad and
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Hot-headed students? A multi-level cross-country comparison of students’ awareness of greenhouse gases and Tobago and Macedonia. A missing data pattern analysis highlighted several covariates that reduced the sample size considerably. In particular, interest in broad science reduced the available sample by approximately 52000, and highest occupational status of parents reduced the sample further by approximately 22000. In addition, the interaction of missing data across four covariates—enjoyment of science, climate ordered, instrumental motivation to science, and interest in broad science—reduced the sample by almost 19000 students.

The analysis reported is the complete case analysis only. A three-level multiple imputation procedure using Stat-JR’s n-level multiple imputation template was attempted [55, 56]. Unfortunately, the imputation did not converge. However, the sample size remains very large across the majority of participating schools countries.

Odds-Ratios

Ordinal Logistic regression returns coefficients which are the log of odds. These can be exponentiated to form odds ratios. Odds ratios are bounded at 0 at one end of the scale to positive infinity at the other. An odds ratio of 1 indicates a probability of .5, with anything under 1 indicating that the group has a lower probability than the comparison group and anything above 1 indicating that the group has a higher probability than the comparison group.

To convert odds ratios to the probability scale, the following formula should be used:

\[
\frac{\text{odds}}{1 + \text{odds}}
\]

We have generally presented the results on the odds-ratio scale and probability scale to aid interpretation. Where we refer to probability we have re-centred a probability of 0.5 at 0 so that it provides a clear direction for the effect.

Practical and statistical significance

The analysis uses Bayesian inference to fit the ordinal logistic proportional odds multilevel model. Bayesian approaches do not rely on traditional null hypothesis significance testing, with the assumption of hypothetical repeated sampling and p-values. Parameters are represented as a probability distribution, with those that are more consistent with the data having higher probability and a narrower set of values, while those which are less consistent having lower probabilities and values that are more spread out [57]. 95% credible intervals are still judged in the same manner as 95% confidence intervals - as to whether they cross 0, however, the probability of a positive or negative effect can be directly calculated and where the distribution of an effect partially crosses 0, the weight of evidence for the direction and size of the effect can be judged.

An important distinction needs to be made between where an effect is bounded away from zero (statistical significance in the frequentist literature) and “practical significance” in which we consider the magnitude of the effect given the applied context. Often with a large enough sample size extremely small differences are “significant”, but if the effect size is small the
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impact of the covariate is much less relevant for understanding how our outcome variable varies.

References for methods


