

Please cite this paper as:

Damme, D. V. and K. Karkkainen (2011), "OECD Educationtoday Crisis Survey 2010: The Impact of the Economic Recession and Fiscal Crisis on Education in OECD Countries", *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 56, OECD Publishing.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5kgj1r9zk09x-en>



OECD Education Working Papers  
No. 56

## OECD Educationtoday Crisis Survey 2010

THE IMPACT OF THE ECONOMIC RECESSION  
AND FISCAL CRISIS ON EDUCATION IN OECD  
COUNTRIES

Dirk V. Damme, Kiira Karkkainen

**For Official Use**

**EDU/WKP(2011)2**

Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques  
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

**English - Or. English**

**DIRECTORATE FOR EDUCATION**

**OECD EDUCATION TODAY CRISIS SURVEY 2010 - THE IMPACT OF THE ECONOMIC  
RECESSION AND FISCAL CRISIS ON EDUCATION IN OECD COUNTRIES**

**OECD Directorate for Education Working Paper No. 56**

For further information contact: Dirk Van Damme, Head of CERI; Email [Dirk.Vandamme@oecd.org](mailto:Dirk.Vandamme@oecd.org)  
and Kiira Karkkainen, Analyst, CERI; Email: [Kiira.Karkkainen@oecd.org](mailto:Kiira.Karkkainen@oecd.org)

**English - Or. English**

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine  
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

**EDU/WKP(2011)2  
For Official Use**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY .....	4
RÉSUMÉ.....	5
1. Introduction.....	7
2. Diverse impact on demand for education .....	8
3. Influence on public investment across countries, concentrated impact within countries .....	9
4. Stimulus measures, increasing public financing and strengthened reform .....	10
5. Decreasing education financing and weakened reform in some countries .....	13
6. Diverse impact on public investment over time, across and within sectors of education.....	15
7. Final observations .....	16
ANNEX 1 – QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS .....	18
ANNEX 2 – THE CRISIS AND DEMAND FOR EDUCATION IN THE PAST .....	20
ANNEX 3 – THE CRISIS AND EXPECTED DEMAND FOR EDUCATION .....	21
ANNEX 4 – TARGETING OF STIMULUS SPENDING ON EDUCATION.....	22
ANNEX 5 – THE CRISIS AND PUBLIC FINANCING OF EDUCATION IN THE PAST .....	23
ANNEX 6 – THE CRISIS AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM .....	24
ANNEX 7 – THE CRISIS AND EXPECTED PUBLIC FINANCING OF EDUCATION .....	25

### Boxes

Box. 6.1. Education in the context of the economic crisis in Ireland.....	16
---	----

OECD DIRECTORATE FOR EDUCATION

OECD EDUCATION WORKING PAPERS SERIES

This series is designed to make available to a wider readership selected studies drawing on the work of the OECD Directorate for Education. Authorship is usually collective, but principal writers are named. The papers are generally available only in their original language (English or French) with a short summary available in the other.

Comment on the series is welcome, and should be sent to either [edu.contact@oecd.org](mailto:edu.contact@oecd.org) or the Directorate for Education, 2, rue André Pascal, 75775 Paris CEDEX 16, France.

The opinions expressed in these papers are the sole responsibility of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the OECD or of the governments of its member countries.

Applications for permission to reproduce or translate all, or part of, this material should be sent to OECD Publishing, [rights@oecd.org](mailto:rights@oecd.org) or by fax 33 1 45 24 99 30.

---

[www.oecd.org/edu/workingpapers](http://www.oecd.org/edu/workingpapers)

---

Applications for permission to reproduce or translate  
all or part of this material should be made to:

Head of Publications Service  
OECD  
2, rue André-Pascal  
75775 Paris, CEDEX 16  
France

Copyright OECD 2011

## SUMMARY

The OECD Directorate for Education surveyed the impact of the economic recession on education for the first time in June 2009. Responses were received from seventeen OECD member countries, the Flemish Community of Belgium and two Canadian provinces. The results of the survey reflect the observations of officials in education ministries and public agencies in member countries regarding various aspects of the impact of the economic recession and fiscal crisis on education.

The survey indicated that the main effects of the crisis on education were:

- a marked increase in demand for non-compulsory education in many countries as a result of rising unemployment;
- some budget cuts in education in some countries;
- attempts by governments in several countries to reduce the negative consequences on schools and universities by targeted explicit or implicit stimulus measures; vocational education and training, tertiary education and upper-secondary education benefit the most from stimulus measures;
- a rather severe impact on private investment.

A second OECD *educationtoday* Crisis Survey was carried out over the summer of 2010. Twenty-five OECD member countries completed the questionnaire. The main change between the two surveys is that the first was carried out at a time of economic recession, while the second was developed at a time of economic recovery and fiscal consolidation. Indeed, the education systems in OECD member countries are mainly confronted with the difficulties of governments to maintain the growth of public spending as in past pre-crisis years.

The main outcomes of the 2010 survey are the following:

- The survey data does not portray an education system dramatically affected by overall budget cuts. In countries where public investment in education has diminished, the effects are still very specific and concentrated, and vary across and within sectors of education.
- In general, governments seem to be rather successful in protecting education spending. Although in some cases the impact on teachers and schools is significant, governments are trying to contain the negative impact of fiscal consolidation. Some countries even have increased funding for specific parts of the education system in order to enhance output and efficiency. Only in the few countries which have been severely hit by the crisis a more general expenditure cut has occurred.
- The demand for non-compulsory education continues to augment, especially in vocational education and training, although the recession reduces the capacity of enterprises to uphold their training investments. As a result, higher demand is not systematically transformed in all cases into more training places.
- The recession has not slowed down reforms in education; on the contrary, some countries have accelerated reforms. Alleviating unemployment, meeting increased demands, preparing future growth and fostering innovation are the most frequently mentioned policy rationales for education policies which are trying to enhance the education system's capacity and efficiency.
- Some governments are also taking into consideration the difficult situation of private households by increasing social measures to contain education cost.

## RÉSUMÉ

La Direction de l'éducation de l'OCDE a réalisé une première enquête de l'incidence de la crise économique sur le secteur éducatif en juin 2009. Dix-sept pays de l'OCDE, la Communauté flamande de Belgique et deux provinces canadiennes y avaient répondu. Les résultats de l'enquête expriment les observations des fonctionnaires des ministères de l'éducation et des organismes publics dans les pays membres, sur divers aspects de l'impact de la récession économique et de la crise budgétaire sur le secteur de l'enseignement.

L'enquête mettait notamment en évidence les conséquences suivantes de la crise sur le secteur éducatif :

- Une hausse marquée de la demande d'enseignement non obligatoire dans de nombreux pays, en réaction à l'augmentation du chômage ;
- Certaines coupes budgétaires dans l'enseignement dans certains pays ;
- Des tentatives par les pouvoirs publics de plusieurs pays de réduire les conséquences néfastes sur les établissements scolaires et universitaires, grâce à des mesures de relance ciblées, explicites ou implicites. L'enseignement et la formation professionnels (EFP), l'enseignement supérieur et le deuxième cycle du secondaire bénéficient le plus de ces mesures de relance ;
- Une incidence profonde sur les investissements privés.

Une seconde enquête d'*educationtoday*/OCDE a été menée pendant l'été 2010. Vingt-cinq pays membres ont rempli le questionnaire. Le principal changement entre les deux enquêtes tient au fait que la première a été réalisée pendant la crise, alors que la seconde s'est déroulée au cours d'une période de reprise et d'assainissement des dépenses publiques. De fait, les systèmes éducatifs dans les pays membres sont essentiellement touchés par les difficultés que les autorités éprouvent à maintenir la progression des dépenses publiques au niveau d'avant la crise.

Les principaux résultats de l'enquête 2010 sont les suivants :

- D'après les données de l'enquête, les systèmes éducatifs ne souffrent pas considérablement des coupes budgétaires globales. Dans les pays où les investissements publics dans l'éducation ont diminué, les effets sont très spécifiques et concentrés, et variables selon et au sein des différentes branches du secteur éducatif.
- En règle générale, les pouvoirs publics semblent parvenir assez bien à préserver les dépenses d'éducation. Même si dans certains cas, les conséquences sur les enseignants et les écoles sont notables, les autorités s'efforcent de contenir les retombées négatives de l'assainissement budgétaire. Certains pays ont même augmenté les fonds alloués à des parties spécifiques du système éducatif afin d'en améliorer les résultats et l'efficacité. Il n'y a que dans les quelques pays qui ont été durement touchés par la crise que des coupes budgétaires plus générales ont été appliquées.
- La demande d'enseignement non obligatoire continue d'augmenter, en particulier les programmes d'EFP, même si la récession amoindrit la capacité des entreprises de maintenir leurs investissements dans la formation. En conséquence, la progression de la demande ne se traduit pas systématiquement par des places de formation supplémentaires.

- La récession n'a pas ralenti les réformes dans le secteur éducatif, certains pays les ont au contraire accélérées. Lutter contre le chômage, répondre à des demandes accrues, préparer la croissance future et promouvoir l'innovation constituent les raisons les plus fréquemment invoquées pour des politiques de l'éducation dont l'objectif est de renforcer les capacités et l'efficacité du système éducatif.
- Certains États prennent également en compte la situation difficile des ménages en développant les mesures sociales en vue de maîtriser le coût des études.

## 1. Introduction

1.1 During the global economic crisis, the OECD Directorate for Education responded to a request from member countries to develop an international platform for information exchange on education and the crisis. How does the economic crisis impact education systems across the OECD area? How can education help in combating the crisis? What will be the role of education when looking beyond the crisis, to future growth? Aimed at providing an international forum for exploring these questions, the OECD *educationtoday* initiative<sup>1</sup> was launched in June 2009.

1.2 A first OECD *educationtoday* Crisis Survey was conducted in June 2009<sup>2</sup> to acquire initial intelligence on the impact of the economic crisis on education across OECD countries. At that moment, the education sector was experiencing the first effects of the economic recession, which was felt as a real shock, from which the full consequences could not yet be seen. The survey observed at that moment the crisis appeared to have the following main effects on education:

- growing demand for education, especially in vocational education and training and in tertiary education;
- increase in public involvement in education, for example through stimulus measures;
- strong policy focus to prepare for the recovery and the future economy;
- limited number of early budget cuts affecting various levels of education;
- not yet very visible, but hidden impact on service delivery;
- negative impact on private funding and private involvement in education.

1.3 This paper provides a comparative analysis of the results of the Second OECD *educationtoday* Crisis Survey. The objective of the Second Crisis Survey is to collect information and to provide a general overview about the impact of the economic and financial crisis on education in OECD countries, at a time where the economic recession transformed into a fiscal crisis severely affecting public spending capacity. It aims to portray only general trends – providing indications on *whether or not* the economic and financial crisis has impacted the education sector and, if yes, in *what way*. Overall, the survey addresses topics of education enrolment and applications on the demand side, as well as public education financing, educational reform and stimulus measures for economic recovery on the supply side. It covers all sectors of education from pre-primary to tertiary education, including vocational education and training as well as adult education. The survey focuses on public education concerns without explicitly addressing the consequence of the crisis on private education provision or financing.

1.4 Regarding the method of the survey, an e-mail questionnaire was sent to members of the OECD Education Policy Committee, on the 17 August 2010.<sup>3</sup> The survey comprised of multiple-choice questions which were of a general nature, taking into consideration the difficulty of distinguishing precise figures regarding the impact of the crisis on education. It was possible to provide written comments to clarify the replies or give further detail if required. In total, we received completed questionnaires from 25 OECD countries,<sup>4</sup> the respondents of which were mostly officials of national Ministries of Education (Annex 1). The OECD Secretariat received the responses in August, September and October 2010. The method chosen was to collect information within an as short a timeframe possible. The downside of this method is that the survey relies largely on the informed opinion of education officials, which in many cases are not necessarily supported by national data collection systems. Regular OECD data collection via the INES



networks will produce more robust data over a number of years; this will have to be compared with the more immediate results from this survey.

1.5 Overall, the economic crisis appears to be having widespread impact on education in OECD countries. While most OECD countries report some consequence of the crisis on education in terms of demand or public investment, often only a few sectors of education are concerned. Most countries explicitly acknowledge the importance of education and skills for economic recovery and public investment especially on vocational education and training is reported to have increased due to the crisis. At the same time, public investment in most sectors of education appears to have decreased in only a few countries. In general, the impact of the economic crisis on education appears to be highly context dependent and varying over time, across and within countries and sectors.

## **2. Diverse impact on demand for education**

2.1 According to the respondents, the economic crisis appears to be influencing demand for education both in quantitative and qualitative terms in several OECD countries. Roughly half of OECD countries with available data indicate some kind of crisis related changes in enrolment and/or applications regarding at least one sector of education – namely pre-primary, upper-secondary and tertiary education as well as vocational education and training and students above 25 years of age. Spain reports past or expected impact on the demand regarding all sectors of education, while in two other countries – Denmark and Iceland – four out of five sectors are regarded to be impacted by the crisis.

2.2 Where relevant, the impact of the economic crisis on the demand for education has been to a large extent positive (Annex 2). Seven countries indicate positive influence of the crisis on tertiary and adult education demand as well as on demand for vocational education and training, while six countries report increasing demand in upper secondary education. Most of the Nordic countries, Hungary, Ireland and Spain as well as Australia, New Zealand and the Canadian province of Alberta report crisis related increases in enrolments in and/or applications in at least two of these sectors of education between 2007 and 2010.

2.3 The economic crisis appears to have had the least impact on demand for pre-primary education. No OECD country reports changes in past pre-primary enrolment or applications to be attributable to the crisis. Despite the crisis, the demand for pre-primary education is generally indicated to be growing, both in terms of enrolment and applications.

2.4 Some countries expect the crisis to increase future demand for education, with focus on vocational education and training (Annex 3). Nine countries expect enrolments and/or applications to vocational education and training to rise due to the crisis in 2011, while increased demand for tertiary education is expected in four countries and for upper-secondary education in five countries. Growing demand for education by students above 25 years of age is expected also in five countries, whereas Spain is the only country expecting the crisis to increase applications to pre-primary education in 2011. In addition to Spain, Denmark, Iceland, Ireland, New Zealand and the Canadian Province of Alberta expect crisis related increases in enrolments and/or application regarding at least two sectors of education.

2.5 As to negative impact of the economic crisis on demand for education, the Flemish community of Belgium and the Canadian province of Alberta regard past decreases in enrolments and/or applications to vocational education and training to be crisis related. In Belgium, private companies have been seen to cut back on their investments also in education and training of employees, while in Alberta enrolments to apprenticeship training are inclined to decrease during the economic downturn. In addition, Norway and Alberta expect enrolments and/or applications to vocational education and training to decrease in 2011 due

to the crisis. In Greece, applications to education by students above 25 years of age are expected to decrease as a result of the crises.

2.6 Although private education was not specifically addressed in the survey, some OECD countries observe the negative impact of the crisis on participation in private education. Apprenticeships have decreased in Ireland, particularly in the construction sector, while Hungary notes an enrolment decrease regarding payable tertiary level training. Even though the overall participation in vocational education did not change in the Netherlands, there has been a clear shift from work-based to school-based programs due to the lack of available internships. This tendency has also been observed in Slovenia, where trends in enrolments and/or applications vary between programmes in relation to private or public funding. While demand for government financed and co-financed programmes – such as literacy programmes and those for unemployed – have increased, demand for self-payable programmes and programmes financed by employers have decreased.

2.7 Some countries note other qualitative changes in demand for education due to the crisis. For example, in Slovenia, while total number of higher education students is almost unchanged, the structure in the division between full-time and part-time students has changed significantly. Between 2006 and 2010, the number of full-time students has increased by 7% and the number of part-time students has decreased by 22%. The decrease in part-time studies is noted also by Hungary. In Slovenia, also applications for one year of undergraduate are decreasing, while there is an expected increase in number of students enrolling in Master programmes.

### 3. Influence on public investment across countries, concentrated impact within countries

3.1 Regarding the supply side, the results of the survey suggest that the economic crisis and related stimulus measures have had some influence on education across the OECD area. Public education financing and/or reforms of at least some sectors of education are reported to have been somehow affected by the crisis and/or related stimulus measures in the majority of OECD countries with available data. While most OECD countries have developed stimulus measures for economic recovery, education and/or skills enhancement were seen as an explicit priority area in a great majority of those countries (Table 3.1). Many of the countries not putting an explicit focus on education in their stimulus measures still reported stimulus related spending to some sectors of education (Annex 4). Only two countries – the Czech Republic and Hungary – report not having developed stimulus measures for economic recovery. Hungary noted, however, that, although budgetary pressures have made it difficult to develop stimulus measures, European Union financed development programmes have been serving a similar purpose.

**Table 3.1. Development of stimulus measures for economic recovery in OECD countries since 2007**

Stimulus measures		No stimulus measures
Education and/or skills enhancement as an explicit priority	No explicit focus on education and/or skills enhancement	
Australia, Canada (Federal Government, Saskatchewan), Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Korea, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, Turkey	Austria, Belgium (Flanders), Canada (Alberta, New Brunswick, Quebec), Japan, Mexico, Poland, Portugal, Spain	Czech Republic, Hungary

3.2 That outlined, the economic crisis does not appear to be having an overwhelming impact on public education financing or educational reforms in most OECD countries (Annex 5 and Annex 6). Regarding most sectors of education, several – if not most – countries report past and/or expected increases in public financing *not* attributable to the economic crisis. Six countries – Austria, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Mexico and Poland – do not report any explicit influence of the crisis on public education budgets or reform in any sector of education. Overall, the crisis is also reported of having no impact on most educational reforms. The unaffected reforms are reported to concern issues such as educational content, standards and new type of delivery models, but also expansion of educational participation and quality enhancement. For example Austria reports no impact of the crisis on educational reforms making pre-primary education compulsory and reducing class size. In Poland, in addition to new curriculum and delivery models, reforms aiming at increasing participation in pre-primary and primary education have not been affected by the crisis. Both Hungary and Slovenia note the importance of European Social Funds in enabling the implementation of educational reforms during the economic crisis.

3.3 The results of the survey suggest that the impact of the economic crisis on public education financing and educational reform concentrated within a few sectors of education. Only in four OECD countries, namely Greece, Hungary, Iceland and Ireland, are public financing and/or reforms of *all* sectors of education – from pre-primary to tertiary education, including vocational education and training as well as adult education – reported to be somewhat affected by the crisis. As to the extent of the stimulus spending regarding the education sector, only Greece and Poland report that this spending has somehow benefited all sectors of education. Five other countries – Denmark, Ireland, Japan, Korea and Turkey – indicate that stimulus spending has been targeted to nearly all sectors of education.

3.4 Overall, the crisis and/or related stimulus measures seem to mostly impact public financing and reform of vocational education and training, followed by tertiary and upper-secondary education. Crisis related past or expected changes in public financing and/or reform of vocational education and training as well as of tertiary education are reported in sixteen countries, regarding upper-secondary education in fourteen countries. In total, nineteen OECD countries report impact of the crisis on public financing and/or reform of vocational education and training and/or tertiary education. As for explicit stimulus measures, vocational education and training is benefiting from them in most OECD countries, followed by tertiary and upper-secondary education.

3.5 The impact of the crisis and/or related stimulus measures on public financing and reform of other sectors of education appears less common. Thirteen countries do not report any past or expected consequences on pre-primary, primary or lower-secondary education. Some crisis related changes in public financing and/or educational reform of pre-primary education are reported in only seven countries, regarding primary, lower-secondary and adult education in nine countries.

#### **4. Stimulus measures, increasing public financing and strengthened reform**

4.1 The survey suggests that the economic crisis can also have positive impact on the supply side of education, especially regarding certain sectors of education that attract increasing public investment to alleviate unemployment and meet the increasing education demand. This appears to be the case especially for vocational education and training as well as for tertiary education.

4.2 Overall, the economic crisis appears to have led to increasing public investment especially in vocational education and training as well as tertiary education, less so other sectors of education (Annex 5). While stimulus measures for economic recovery are reported to have benefited vocational education and training in nineteen OECD countries and tertiary education in eighteen countries, crisis related increases in central budgets for those sectors of are reported ten and seven OECD countries, respectively (Annex 4 and Table 4.1). Most OECD countries report also non-crisis related increases

especially in tertiary education budgets over the past three years. Although less widespread, few countries report also crisis related increases in public investment in other sectors of education between 2007 and 2010. While stimulus measures are indicated to have benefited primary education in eleven and lower-secondary education in ten countries, Australia, Finland, the Netherlands and New Zealand report past crisis related increases in central budgets for primary, lower-secondary and/or upper-secondary education. As to adult students, Denmark, Finland Hungary and Ireland consider the past increases in central budgets for students above 25 years of age between to be crisis related, while they are reported to have benefited from stimulus spending in eleven countries. Less than other sectors of education, pre-primary education was reported to benefit from stimulus spending in nine countries.

4.3 In relation to rationales of crisis related increases in public investment, alleviating unemployment has been the most popular motivation of stimulus spending on vocational education and training as well as on adult and upper-secondary education, followed by preparing for future growth and meeting the education demand (Annex 4). As to tertiary education, meeting the education demand has been most frequently mentioned rationale for stimulus spending, while preparing for future growth and fostering innovation have been the main reasons behind stimulus investment in more than half of the concerned countries. Regarding lower levels of education, stimulus spending has been motivated especially by meeting the education demand, but also by preparing for future growth and alleviating unemployment. In eight countries concerning at least one education sector, education related stimulus spending is also driven by both the aim to foster innovation and enhance green economy. Innovation has been part of the rationale in two other countries, enhancing green economy in one other country. Both fostering innovation and enhancing green economy have been regarded as explicit motivations for stimulus spending on several sectors of education especially in Canada and Denmark. In Greece, fostering innovation is considered to be as a rationale for stimulus spending on all sectors of education.

4.4 More specifically, budgetary increases have covered a variety of functions depending on the country and the sector of education (Table 4.1). Crisis related increases in expenditure for tertiary education and vocational education and training have benefited both operational and capital funding. Increases in vocational education and training spending appear to have given benefit to additional study places, while those for tertiary education were used especially for infrastructure – among other things. For example, since growing enrolments have been the main driver of the increase in tertiary education financing in New Zealand, tuition subsidy rates, student allowance rates and increased eligibility for student allowances have also increased. In primary, lower-secondary and upper-secondary education the budgetary increases attributable to the crisis have been directed mainly to capital funding, benefiting especially infrastructure. For example, in Finland the past budgetary increases concentrated on investments in infrastructure. In the Netherlands, investments in primary and secondary education were restricted to school buildings. On the other hand, in Australia teachers, *inter alia*, benefited from crisis related budgetary increases. As for adult education, crisis related budgetary increases have benefited for example student and family support.

4.5 Furthermore, educational reforms increasingly moved into the focus of budget decisions (Annex 6). In Greece, the implementation of educational reforms regarding most sectors of education has been accelerated due to the crisis. Crisis related expansion of the vocational education and training reform scope since 2007 or acceleration of the reform implementation is reported by ten OECD countries. For example in Belgium, the flexibility of the training provision for employees have increased, while in Hungary reform concerned on qualification, modularisation and examinations. As for tertiary education, the crisis influenced the expansion of the reform scope and acceleration of the reform implementation in seven countries. For example, Icelandic tertiary education institutions have been merged into larger units, while investment in strategic reform and research and development are showing increased importance in higher education in Ireland. Reform implementation regarding adult students has been accelerated, and the scope of the reform expands five countries. In Slovenia, the reforms included for example programmes for

**Table 4.1. Type of increases in central education budget between 2007 and 2010 in OECD countries, where the increases are regarded to be attributable to the economic crisis and/or related stimulus measures \***

OECD country	Pre-primary education		Primary education		Lower-secondary education		Upper-secondary education		Tertiary education		Vocational education and training		Students above 25 years of age	
	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target
Australia	n/a	n/a	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, I, T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, I, T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, I, T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>I, S</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Belgium - Flanders	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, P, I, S</b>	n/a	n/a
Canada - Newfoundland	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>O, C</b>	<b>I, H</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>I, H</b>	n/a	n/a
Canada - Saskatchewan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	<b>C</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>I</b>	m	m
Denmark	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>O</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>m</b>
Finland	n/a	n/a	<b>C</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>I</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>O</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>S</b>
Hungary	<b>O, C</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>P, I</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>P, I</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>P, I, S</b>
Ireland	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>O</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>S</b>
Netherlands	n/a	n/a	<b>C</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>I</b>	n/a	n/a	<b>O</b>	<b>S</b>	n/a	n/a
New Zealand	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>O, C</b>	<b>I, S, T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>S, F, H</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>S, F</b>	n/a	n/a
Norway	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>O, C</b>	<b>I, S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>A, P, S</b>	m	m
Sweden	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>m</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>S, F</b>	n/a	n/a

**O = Operational funding; C = Capital funding; A = Administration; P = Procurement; I = Infrastructure; S = Additional study places; T = Teachers' salaries; F = Student/family support; H = Other; n/a = Not applicable; m = Missing; Bolding = Influence of the crisis and/or stimulus measures**

\* Central = national and/or state level

Note: Belgium (fl.): Primary education corresponds both primary and pre-primary education, upper-secondary education corresponds both lower-secondary and upper-secondary education and vocational education and training correspond training centres.

unemployed and vulnerable groups. In addition, scope of the lower and upper-secondary reform has been expanded due to the crisis in Ireland, with added impetus to reforms regarding skills promotion and investment in information and communication technology. The implementation of upper-secondary reform has been accelerated or its scope has been expanded also in three other countries, while the crisis has had similar influence on pre-primary education reform in Greece, Korea and Ireland.

4.6 As to the future, the economic crisis does not appear to be leading to widespread cuts in public education financing in the OECD area in 2011, although the situation seems to be marked by uncertainty in

many countries (Annex 7). Most countries with available data expect public education financing for most sectors of education to increase in 2011 independently of the crisis or stay at the current level. New Zealand considers expected increases in 2011 in central education budget and Turkey in regional/local funds for upper-secondary and tertiary education to be attributable to the economic crisis. Denmark and Sweden expect crisis related increases in central education budget for vocational education and training in 2011, while Denmark and Turkey expect regional/local funds to increase for the same reason. Crisis related increases in both central education budget and local/regional funds for students above 25 years of age are also expected in Denmark.

## **5. Decreasing education financing and weakened reform in some countries**

5.1 According to the survey the negative impact of the economic crisis on public investment in education appears to be limited to only a few countries (Annex 5). The most widespread negative effects of the crisis on the public financing of education appears to have occurred in Hungary, Iceland and Ireland as well as in the Canadian province of Alberta (Table 5.1 and Annex 5). Together with Denmark, these countries report crisis related decreases in central budgets for primary, lower-secondary and upper-secondary education as well as for students above 25 years of age between 2007 and 2010. The four mentioned countries also report crisis-related decreases in central budget for tertiary education as well as for vocational education and training. Hungary and Alberta regard also the decreases in central budgets for pre-primary education as attributable to the crisis. In addition, crisis related budgetary decreases for upper-secondary and tertiary education as well as for vocational education and training are indicated to have taken place in Slovenia between 2007 and 2010. The Flemish Community of Belgium reports decreases in the central budget for vocational education and training during the past three years, which are seen as attributable to the crisis.

5.2 The past decreases in central budgets for pre-primary, primary and lower-secondary education have affected mainly operational funding, while those regarding upper-secondary, tertiary and adult education as well as vocational education and training have impacted both operational and capital funding (Table 5.1). The specific targeting of the crisis related budgetary decreases over variety of functions differs across countries. In Hungary and Ireland, the past decreases in central education budgets have affected teachers' salaries in most sectors of education, in Iceland, regarding upper-secondary and tertiary education as well as vocational education and training. For example in Hungary, the crisis has had general negative impact on salaries through wage-freeze and withdrawal of the 13th month salary. Support for students and/or families has been affected in Alberta from pre-primary to upper-secondary education. In Iceland, cuts in central budget for vocational education and training have touched upon student support.

5.3 Regarding the future, few countries expect crisis-related cuts in public financing of education in 2011 (Annex 7). Greece expects all central education budgets to decrease in 2011 due to the crisis; Iceland and Ireland foresee decreases regarding most sectors of education, while demand for education is expected to increase in both countries. For example, Iceland indicates uncertainty as to financing of additional study places, despite the expected increase in demand for upper-secondary, tertiary and vocational education. Iceland also foresees decreases in regional/local funds for pre-primary, primary and lower-secondary education. In addition to Iceland and Ireland, central budgets for primary, lower-secondary and upper-secondary education are expected to decrease in 2011 due to the economic crisis also in Australia and the Canadian province of New Brunswick.

**Table 5.1. Type of decreases in central education budget between 2007 and 2010 in OECD countries, where the cuts are regarded to be attributable to the economic crisis \***

OECD country	Pre-primary education		Primary education		Lower-secondary education		Upper-secondary education		Tertiary education		Vocational education and training		Students above 25 years of age	
	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target	Type of financing	Specific target
Belgium - Flanders	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, I</b>	n/a	n/a
Canada - Alberta	<b>O</b>	<b>A, P, S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>A, P, S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>A, P, S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>A, P, S</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>A</b>
Denmark	n/a	n/a	<b>m</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>m</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>O</b>	<b>m</b>
Hungary	<b>O</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>T, P</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>F</b>
Iceland	n/a	n/a	<b>O</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, P, I, T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, P, I, T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, P, I, S, T</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>H</b>
Ireland	n/a	n/a	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, I, T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, I, T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, I, T</b>	<b>O, C</b>	<b>A, I, T</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>A, T</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>A, T</b>
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>C</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>I</b>	n/a	n/a

**O = Operational funding; C = Capital funding; A = Administration; P = Procurement; I = infrastructure; S = Additional study places; T = Teachers' salaries; F = Student/family support; H = Other; n/a = Not applicable; m = Missing; Bolding = Influence of the crisis**

\* Central = national and/or state level

Note: Belgium (fl.): Primary education corresponds both primary and pre-primary education, upper-secondary education corresponds both lower-secondary and upper-secondary education and vocational education and training correspond training centres.

5.4 Further to direct budget cuts, the negative impact of the economic crisis on education affects educational reforms in some OECD countries (Annex 6). The scope of primary and/or lower-secondary education reforms has been reduced due to the economic crisis in Finland, Hungary and Iceland and Ireland. In Finland, a statutory duty for education and training providers to ensure continuing professional training for their personnel was postponed, although public investment in further training of teachers was increased as part of the planned reform. In Ireland, investment in professional development and other supports was scaled back after implementation of a revised primary curriculum. In Australia, Hungary, and Iceland the crisis has led to reducing the scope of the pre-primary education reform, in New Zealand to delaying of the reform. For example in Australia, the economic crisis has led to cancelling plans to further expand number of Early Learning Centres. Upper secondary education reforms in Finland and Hungary have also been reduced since 2007, whereas in Iceland the reform of upper-secondary education has been delayed due to the crisis. Although tertiary education reform has been delayed due to the crisis in Hungary, the crisis has led to reducing the scope of the reform of vocational education and training in Finland and Korea. For example, in Hungary, the full implementation of the new multi-cycle training system and the modernisation of the financing system have been delayed. The reform scope regarding students above 25 years of age have been reduced in Greece.

## 6. Diverse impact on public investment over time, across and within sectors of education

6.1 While appearing highly dependent on the country context, it is important to note that the impact of the economic crisis can also vary greatly over time as well as across and within sectors of education in a particular country.

6.2 On the one hand, the education sector as a whole does not appear to be *only* hit by the crisis for example in Denmark, Hungary, Iceland and Ireland, despite potentially very difficult economic contexts (Box 6.1). For example, in parallel to decreases regarding lower levels of education, Denmark reports crisis related past *and* expected public investment in vocational education and training as well as for students above 25 years old. Past stimulus spending has been targeted to the education sector in Denmark, Iceland and Ireland, while Hungary has benefited from European Union financing. For most sectors of education, in addition to crisis related cuts, Denmark, Hungary and Ireland report simultaneous non-crisis related increases in central education budgets over the past three years. For example Ireland notes that even though the current public expenditure allocation for education expenditure in 2010 was 5% less than the allocation for 2009, the overall education funding for first-level and second-level education increased by 10% and 7% between 2007 and 2010 and decreased by 3% at third level. In addition, the impact of the crisis on educational reforms has varied across sectors of education in all four countries.

6.3 On the other hand, countries that have indicated increases in public education financing in the past the overall impact of the crisis on education may be less bright. While Greece reports no impact of the crisis on the public financing of education in the past, widespread decreases in education budgets are expected in 2011 due to the crisis. Even though past budgetary increases for primary, lower-secondary and upper-secondary education were considered as attributable to the crisis and related stimulus measures in Australia, those same budgets are expected to decrease in 2011 because of the crisis. Crisis related increases in public financing for primary and lower-secondary between 2007 and 2010 were reported to take place in Finland, but the reform scope regarding those same sectors of education was simultaneously reduced due to the crisis. The Netherlands indicates that even though the central budget of tertiary education has increased between 2007 and 2010, the budget per student has in fact decreased. This may also be the case in several other countries expecting increasing demand for education, as the survey does not provide information on how much the economic crisis has affected education demand or budgets.

6.4 While the impact of the crisis can differ over a few-year-period as well as both across and within sectors of education in a given country, it can also vary across regions particularly in federal countries. The crisis has impacted the education sector differently across Canadian provinces. In addition, for example Switzerland notes that, that so far no major impact of the crisis on education budgets is identified, even though some cases of some budget cuts appear to have taken place or are announced to take place in some parts of the country.

6.5 Furthermore, it may be that the public investment in education is increasing in some countries to ensure educational participation in the event of decreasing possibilities for private educational investment. For example in Japan, where the private cost of education is above the OECD average, measures have been taken to ease the negative impact of the economic crisis on students and their families. Bearing the cost of education is expected to become more difficult for families due to rising unemployment and decreasing household disposal income caused by the economic crisis. In order to reduce the economic burden of the households, Japan has established in 2010 a system that makes the tuition of public upper secondary schools free and provides the assistance grant for entering private upper secondary schools. In addition, economic support in higher education has been improved such as support for tuition reduction. In Portugal, crisis related measures regarding tertiary education included freezing prices for student residences and canteens, fare reduction of public transportation for students, increased study grants for scholarship students and access to social welfare for foreign students.



### Box. 6.1. Education in the context of the economic crisis in Ireland

In Ireland, the overall outlook presents a difficult financial environment. This has had an effect on the operations of the educational sector. A prudent approach to Government expenditure is necessary, while the expectations are for a return to more modest growth rates in the near future. The Government's objective is to reduce the cost of public service delivery and achieve a general government deficit (GGD) below 3% by 2014. Along with all other public bodies, the education sector needs to reduce overall public expenditure levels in order to contribute towards this objective. Examining all aspects of expenditure is required to secure maximum efficiency, effectiveness and value for money in the delivery of all education and training programmes.

A further challenge for the education sector is meeting the growing education and training demand associated with the changing demographics in Ireland. Enrolment at all levels will continue to increase over the next number of years and will increase the demand for school accommodation, higher education provision, special educational needs supports and teacher supply. In addition to increased enrolments migrant learners are now an established feature of Irish society. Diversity of the student body – at all levels of education and training – is now the norm and requires appropriate and timely policy responses to cater for the needs of all learners.

Although overall public expenditure levels are to be reduced, the Irish Government has sought to protect key frontline services including education. Frontline teachers in schools have been exempted from a general Government moratorium on filling vacant public sector posts. The level of capitation payments made to schools in the current deflationary environment has been maintained. Although class size in schools has increased and pay levels have been reduced, front line services such as teaching posts in schools and colleges have been protected. The current public expenditure allocation for education expenditure in 2010 was 5% less than the allocation for 2009 with almost 80% of the reduction taking the form of a general pay cut in line with the decision to reduce public service pay rates. As a result, significant funding was still available for investment in education services.

At the same time, *the Renewed Programme for Government, the National Development Plan 2007-2013 and the Capital Investment Plan* can be seen as further indicators of Ireland's commitment to invest in education and training. *Building Ireland's Smart Economy* – the Government's framework for sustainable economic renewal – and *the Report of the Task Force on Innovation* reaffirmed the central role that the skills and creativity of the labour force will play in the recovery and development of the Irish economy. *The National Skills Strategy* sets out the objectives for training and up-skilling the labour force in Ireland. The degree of progress in delivering on the strategies outlined will depend on the level of resources available to the sector over the period.

Source: Responses of Ireland to the Second OECD Crisis Survey, adaptation by the OECD Secretariat.

6.6 The investment from the part of the central governments can also be increased to cover the decreasing income for education providers from other sources of financing. In the decentralised education system of Sweden, for example, the Government has provided stimulus funds for local governments in order to avoid cuts in school budgets caused by decrease in local tax revenues. In Poland, the stimulus measures for economic recovery have included co-financing of post graduate programs and training courses for employees who work in companies facing difficult financial situation. In Canada, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has provided an incremental increase in the public post-secondary institution's operational budget since 2005-06 to fund a tuition freeze.

## 7. Final observations

7.1 Based on the Second OECD Crisis Survey, some general observations on the impact of the economic crisis on education in OECD countries can be suggested:

- *Growing and changing demand for education.* Demand for education was indicated to be growing in several countries due to the economic crisis. The increasing demand concerned especially vocational education and training, followed by tertiary, adult and upper-secondary

education. Some countries noted qualitative changes in the demand for education owing to the crisis.

- *Education as a political priority for economic recovery.* Stimulus measures for economic recovery seem to have benefited the education sector in majority of OECD countries. Meeting the education demand and alleviating unemployment, followed by preparation for the future growth, emerge as the main motivations for education related stimulus spending
- *Some impact in public involvement across countries, targeted impact within countries.* While public education financing and educational reforms are indicated to have been somewhat affected by the economic crisis in most countries, this impact seems to be targeted to few sectors of education.
- *Increasing public investment on vocational education and training and tertiary education.* The increasing public financing as well as acceleration and expansion of reforms appear to have benefited particularly vocational education and training as well as on tertiary education in several countries in the past. The increasing public investment in other sectors of education seems to be limited to fewer countries.
- *Widespread negative impact on education only in few countries.* While the negative impact of the economic crisis on public education financing and educational reforms appears to be limited to only few countries, several sectors of education are concerned in those countries. This includes negative impact on teachers and, to lesser extent, on students and families.
- *Diverse impact over time, across and within countries and sectors.* While appearing highly dependent on the country context, the impact of the economic crisis can vary over time as well as across and within sectors of education in a particular country. The impact can differ also across regions within a country.
- *Increasing governmental investment potentially covering up for other financing sources.* Few countries indicate increasing public support for students, families and education providers to cope with the impact of the economic crisis, at a time of decreasing household income and/or tax revenue.

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://community.oecd.org/community/educationtoday>

<sup>2</sup> The first Crisis Survey resulted to an analytical report (EDU/WKP(2010)6) and country wiki crisis pages on *educationtoday*.

<sup>3</sup> [www.oecd.org/dataoecd/58/57/46210548.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/58/57/46210548.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> In addition, Switzerland provided an e-mail comment.

## ANNEX 1 – QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS

### Australia

- Australian Government Department of Education, Employment

### Austria

- *Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Kunst und Kultur*
- Ministry of Science and Research

### Belgium

- Flemish Community – Flemish Ministry of education and Training

### Canada

- Human Resources and Skills Development Canada
- Alberta – Responding institution not specified
- British Columbia – Ministry of Education of
- New Brunswick - Department of Education
- Newfoundland – Responding institution not specified
- Ontario – Responding institution not specified
- Quebec – *Ministère de l'éducation, du loisir et du sport*
- Saskatchewan – Responding institution not specified

### Chile

- Ministry of Education

### Czech Republic

- Ministry of Education
- Institute for Information on Education

### Denmark

- Ministry of Education

### Finland

- Ministry of Education and Culture

### France

- Responding institution not specified

### Greece

- Ministry of Education, Lifelong Learning and Religious Affairs

### Hungary

- Ministry of National Resources

Iceland

- Ministry of Education, Science and Culture Ireland
- Department of Education and Science

Japan

- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology

Korea

- Korean Educational Development Institute

Mexico

- Secretariat of Public Education

Netherlands

- Ministry of Education, Culture and Science

New Zealand

- Ministry of Education

Norway

- Ministry of Education and Research

Poland

- Ministry of National Education

Portugal

- Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education

Slovenia

- Ministry of Education and Sport
- Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology

Spain

- *Instituto de Evaluación*

Sweden

- Ministry of Education and Research

Turkey

- Ministry of National Education

**ANNEX 2 – THE CRISIS AND DEMAND FOR EDUCATION IN THE PAST**

**Impact of the economic crisis on education enrolment and applications in OECD countries between 2007 and 2010 \***

OECD country	Pre-primary education				Upper secondary education				Tertiary education				Vocational education and training				Students above 25 years of age			
	Enrolment 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Applications 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Enrolment 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Applications 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Enrolment 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Applications 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Enrolment 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Applications 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Enrolment 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Applications 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis
Australia	↑	N	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	—	N	—	N	↑	Y	↑	Y
Austria	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Belgium (fl.)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	↑	N	n/a	n/a	↓	Y	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Canada (fed.)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Alberta	—	n/a	n/a	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	N	↑	N	↓	Y	↓	Y	↑	N	↑	N
British Columbia	—	n/a	n/a	n/a	—	n/a	n/a	n/a	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Brunswick	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Newfoundland	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Ontario	—	n/a	m	m	—	n/a	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Quebec	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Saskatchewan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	m	m	m	m
Chile	↑	N	m	m	↓	N	m	m	↑	N	↑	Y	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czech Republic	↑	N	↑	N	↓	N	↓	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	n/a
Denmark	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	m	↑	Y	—	n/a	↑	Y	—	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y
Finland	—	m	—	m	—	m	—	m	—	m	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y
France	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	n/a	↑	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	n/a	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Hungary	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↓	N	—	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y
Iceland	—	N	—	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y
Ireland	m	m	m	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y
Israel	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Italy	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Japan	↓	n/a	↓	n/a	↓	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↓	N	↓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Korea	↑	N	n/a	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	↓	N	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Netherlands	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	n/a	—	n/a	↑	n/a	—	n/a	↑	n/a	—	n/a
New Zealand	↑	N	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↓	N
Norway	↑	N	↑	N	—	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	—	n/a	↓	N	↓	n/a	m	m
Poland	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	↓	N	—	n/a	—	N	—	n/a	—	N	—	n/a	—	N
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m	↑	N	↑	N
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↓	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Spain	↑	N	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	Y	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y
Sweden	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	n/a	m	—	n/a
Switzerland **	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Turkey	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m
United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

↑ = Clearly increased; ↓ = Clearly decreased; — = Remained constant; Y = Yes; N = No; n/a = Not applicable; m = Missing; **Bolding** = Influence of the crisis

\* Beyond demographic forecasts and in comparison with the trend observable before 2007

\*\* Switzerland indicates that so far no major impact of the crisis on education enrolments are identified.

Note: Belgium (fl.): Vocational education and training correspond training centres; Norway: Vocational education and training forms part of upper-secondary education.

## ANNEX 3 – THE CRISIS AND EXPECTED DEMAND FOR EDUCATION

Expectations regarding the impact of the economic crisis on education enrolment and applications in OECD countries in 2011

OECD country	Pre-primary education				Upper secondary education				Tertiary education				Vocational education and training				Students above 25 years of age			
	Enrolment 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Applications 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Enrolment 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Applications 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Enrolment 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Applications 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Enrolment 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Applications 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Enrolment 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Applications 2011	Attributable to the crisis
Australia	↑	N	↑	N	↑	<b>Y / N</b>	↑	<b>Y / N</b>	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	n/a	n/a	↑	N
Austria	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Belgium (fl.)	↑	N	↑	N	↓	N	n/a	n/a	—	n/a	n/a	n/a	↑	<b>Y</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Canada (fed.)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Alberta	↑	N	n/a	n/a	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	N	↑	N	↓	<b>Y</b>	↓	<b>Y</b>	↑	N	↑	N
British Columbia	↑	N	n/a	n/a	↓	N	n/a	n/a	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Brunswick	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Newfoundland	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Ontario	—	n/a	m	m	—	n/a	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Quebec	↑	N	↑	N	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	—	n/a	↓	N	—	n/a	↓	N	—	n/a
Saskatchewan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	m	m	m	m
Chile	↑	N	m	m	—	n/a	m	m	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Czech Republic	↑	N	↑	N	↓	N	↓	N	↑	N	—	n/a	↑	N	↓	N	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Denmark	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>
Finland	↑ / —	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
France	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	↑	N	↑	N	n/a	—	n/a	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	m	m	—	n/a	↓	<b>Y</b>
Hungary	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	<b>Y / N</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	—	n/a	—	n/a
Iceland	—	n/a	m	m	↑	<b>Y</b>	m	m	↑	<b>Y</b>	m	m	↑	<b>Y</b>	m	m	↑	<b>Y</b>	m	m
Ireland	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>
Israel	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Italy	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Japan	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↓	N	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Korea	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Netherlands	—	n/a	↓	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N
New Zealand	↑	N	↑	N	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	—	n/a	—	n/a
Norway	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	↓	<b>Y</b>	m	m	—	n/a
Poland	↑	N	↑	N	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	↓	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m	↑	N	↑	N
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>
Spain	↑	N	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>
Sweden	↑	N	↑	N	↓	N	↓	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	<b>Y</b>	↑	<b>Y</b>	—	n/a	↓	N
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Turkey	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m
United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

↑ = Increase; ↓ = Decrease; — = Stay at the current level; Y = Yes; N = No; n/a = Not applicable; m = Missing; **Bolding** = Influence of the crisis

Note: Belgium (fl.): Vocational education and training correspond training centres; Norway: Vocational education and training forms part of upper-secondary education.

## ANNEX 4 – TARGETING OF STIMULUS SPENDING ON EDUCATION

Motivations for stimulus spending on different sectors of education in OECD countries since 2007

OECD country	Pre-primary education	Primary education	Lower-secondary education	Upper secondary education	Tertiary education	Vocational education and training	Students above 25 years of age
Australia	n/a	<b>U, F</b>	<b>U, F</b>	<b>U, F</b>	<b>D, F</b>	<b>D, F, G</b>	n/a
Austria	m	m	m	m	<b>U, O</b>	m	m
Belgium (fl.)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>U, F, I, G</b>	n/a
Canada (fed.)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>
Alberta	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>
British Columbia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Brunswick	m	n/a	n/a	n/a	m	m	m
Newfoundland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Ontario	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Quebec	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Saskatchewan	m	m	m	m	<b>U</b>	<b>U</b>	m
Chile	m	m	m	m	m	<b>U</b>	m
Czech Republic	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Denmark	n/a	<b>F, I, G</b>	<b>F, I, G</b>	<b>F, I, G</b>	<b>D, F, I, G</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>
Finland	m	<b>U</b>	<b>U</b>	m	m	<b>U, D, F</b>	<b>U, D, F</b>
France	m	m	m	m	<b>F, I, G, O</b>	m	m
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	<b>D, I</b>	<b>D, I</b>	<b>U, D, F, I</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>	<b>U, F, I, G</b>
Hungary	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Iceland	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>U, D</b>	<b>U, D</b>	<b>U, D</b>	<b>U, D</b>
Ireland	<b>F, I</b>	m	<b>D, F</b>	<b>D, F, I</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>
Israel	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Italy	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Japan	<b>D, F</b>	<b>D, F</b>	<b>D, F</b>	<b>U, D, F</b>	<b>U, D, F, I</b>	<b>U, D, F</b>	n/a
Korea	<b>D</b>	<b>U, D</b>	<b>U, D</b>	<b>U, D</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>	<b>U, D, F, I, G</b>	n/a
Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Netherlands	n/a	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	n/a	<b>U, F</b>	n/a
New Zealand	n/a	<b>U, D</b>	n/a	<b>U, D</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a
Norway	<b>D</b>	m	m	m	<b>D, F, I</b>	<b>U, F</b>	m
Poland	<b>U, F</b>	<b>U, F</b>	<b>U, F</b>	<b>U, D, F</b>	<b>U, D, I</b>	<b>U, D, F</b>	<b>U, D, F, I</b>
Portugal	m	m	m	m	<b>D, F, I, G</b>	m	<b>D, F, I, G</b>
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>U, F</b>
Spain	<b>D</b>	n/a	n/a	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	n/a
Sweden	m	m	m	m	<b>U, D, F</b>	<b>U, D, F</b>	m
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Turkey	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	n/a	<b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>U</b>
United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

**U = Alleviate unemployment; D = Meet the education demand; F = Prepare for the future growth; I = Foster Innovation; G = Enhance green economy; O = Other; n/a = Not applicable; m = Missing; Bolded = Stimulus spending on education**

Note: Belgium (fl.): Vocational education and training correspond training centres; Norway: Vocational education and training forms part of upper-secondary education.

## ANNEX 5 – THE CRISIS AND PUBLIC FINANCING OF EDUCATION IN THE PAST

Impact of the economic crisis on central education budgets in OECD countries between 2007 and 2010 \*

OECD country	Pre-primary education		Primary education		Lower-secondary education		Upper-secondary education		Tertiary education		Vocational education and training		Students above 25 years of age	
	Budget 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2007-2010	Attributable to the crisis
Australia	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	N	n/a	n/a
Austria	n/a	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Belgium (fl.)	m	m	↑ / ↓	m	m	m	↑ / ↓	m	↑	m	↑ / ↓	Y	n/a	n/a
Canada (fed.)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Alberta	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓
British Columbia	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m
New Brunswick	m	m	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m	m	m
Newfoundland	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	Y	n/a	n/a
Ontario	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m	m	m
Quebec	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Saskatchewan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	↑	Y	↑	Y	m	m
Chile	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	m	m	m
Czech Republic	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Denmark	—	n/a	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑ / ↓	Y
Finland	—	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	Y
France	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↓	N	↑	N
Hungary	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y
Iceland	n/a	n/a	↓	Y	↓	Y↓	↓	Y↓	↓	Y	↓	Y	↑ / ↓	Y↓
Ireland	—	n/a	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↑ / ↓	Y	↑ / ↓	Y
Israel	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Italy	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Japan	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	n/a	—	n/a	↑ / ↓	n/a	n/a	n/a
Korea	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	n/a	n/a
Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a
Netherlands	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	N
New Zealand	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	↑	Y	↓	N
Norway	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	m	m
Poland	n/a	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	↑	N	m	m	↑	N
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↓	Y	↑ / ↓	Y↓	↓	Y	↑	N
Spain	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N
Sweden	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	n/a	n/a
Switzerland **	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Turkey	↑ / ↓	N	↑	N	n/a	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	n/a	n/a
United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

↑ = Clearly increased; ↓ = Clearly decreased; ↑ / ↓ = Both increased and decreased; — = Remained constant; Y = Yes; Y↓ = Yes, but only the decrease; N = No; n/a = Not applicable; m = Missing; Bolding = Influence of the crisis

\* In comparison with the trend observable before 2007; Central = national and/or state level

\*\* Switzerland indicates that so far no major impact of the crisis on education budgets are identified, although some single cases exist especially regarding tertiary education;

Note: Belgium (fl.): Primary education corresponds both primary and pre-primary education, upper-secondary education corresponds both lower-secondary and upper-secondary education and vocational education and training correspond training centres; Norway: Vocational education and training forms part of upper-secondary education.



## ANNEX 6 – THE CRISIS AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Impact of economic crisis on already planned educational reforms in OECD countries since 2007

OECD country	Pre-primary education	Primary education	Lower-secondary education	Upper secondary education	Tertiary education	Vocational education and training	Students above 25 years of age
Australia	<b>Reduction</b>	None	None	None	None	None	n/a
Austria	None	None	None	m	None	None	n/a
Belgium (fl.)	None	None	None	None	None	<b>Acceleration</b>	None
Canada (fed.)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Alberta	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
British Columbia	None	None	None	None	m	m	m
New Brunswick	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Newfoundland	None	None	None	None	None	None	n/a
Ontario	None	None	None	None	m	m	m
Quebec	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Saskatchewan	m	m	m	m	n/a	n/a	m
Chile	None	None	None	None	None	m	m
Czech Republic	None	None	None	None	None	n/a	n/a
Denmark	None	None	None	None	None	<b>Accel. / Exp.</b>	<b>Acceleration</b>
Finland	None	<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Reduction</b>	None	<b>Reduction</b>	None
France	m	m	m	m	None	m	m
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>Reduction</b>
Hungary	<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Delay</b>	<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>Acceleration</b>
Iceland	<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Delay</b>	<b>Expansion</b>	<b>Expansion</b>	None
Ireland	<b>Expansion</b>	<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Expansion</b>	<b>Expansion</b>	<b>Expansion</b>	<b>Expansion</b>	<b>Expansion</b>
Israel	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Italy	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Japan	None	None	None	<b>Expansion</b>	<b>Expansion</b>	<b>Expansion</b>	n/a
Korea	<b>Expansion</b>	None	None	None	<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>Reduction</b>	None
Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	None	None	None	None	n/a	n/a	n/a
Netherlands	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
New Zealand	<b>Delay</b>	None	None	<b>Acceleration</b>	None	None	None
Norway	None	None	None	None	n/a	None	m
Poland	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
Portugal	m	m	m	m	<b>Expansion</b>	m	<b>Expansion</b>
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	None	None	None	None	None	None	<b>Acceleration</b>
Spain	None	None	None	<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>Acceleration</b>	<b>Acceleration</b>	None
Sweden	None	None	None	None	None	<b>Expansion</b>	n/a
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Turkey	None	None	n/a	None	None	None	m
United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

n/a = Not applicable; m = Missing; **Bolding** = Influence of the crisis

Note: Belgium (fl.): Vocational education and training correspond training centres; Norway: Vocational education and training forms part of upper-secondary education.

## ANNEX 7 – THE CRISIS AND EXPECTED PUBLIC FINANCING OF EDUCATION

Expectations regarding the impact of the economic crisis on central education budgets in OECD countries in 2011 \*

OECD country	Pre-primary education		Primary education		Lower-secondary education		Upper secondary education		Tertiary education		Vocational education and training		Students above 25 years of age	
	Budget 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2011	Attributable to the crisis	Budget 2011	Attributable to the crisis
Australia	↑	N	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↑	N	—	n/a	n/a	n/a
Austria	n/a	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Belgium (fl.)	m	m	—	n/a	m	m	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	n/a	n/a
Canada (fed.)	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Alberta	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
British Columbia	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m	m	m
New Brunswick	m	m	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	m	m	m	m	m	m
Newfoundland	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	n/a	n/a
Ontario	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m	m	m
Quebec	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑ / —	N	↑	N	↑	N
Saskatchewan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	—	n/a	—	n/a	m	m
Chile	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m	m	m
Czech Republic	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Denmark	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	Y	↑	Y
Finland	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
France	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	m	m	m	m
Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Greece	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y
Hungary	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
Iceland	n/a	n/a	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y
Ireland	↑	N	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y	↓	Y
Israel	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Italy	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Japan	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Korea	↑	N	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a
Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Mexico	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	—	n/a
Netherlands	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a	—	n/a
New Zealand	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a	↑	Y	↑	Y	—	n/a	↓	N
Norway	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m
Poland	n/a	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	—	n/a
Portugal	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	n/a	n/a	m	m	n/a	n/a
Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	↑	N	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Spain	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N
Sweden	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	—	n/a	↑	Y	n/a	n/a
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Turkey	↑	N	↑	N	n/a	n/a	↑	N	↑	N	↑	N	m	m
United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
United States	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

↑ = Increase; ↓ = Decrease; — = Stay at the current level; Y = Yes; N = No; n/a = Not applicable; m = Missing; **Bolding** = Influence of the crisis

\* Central = national and/or state level

Note: Belgium (fl.): Primary education corresponds both primary and pre-primary education, upper-secondary education corresponds both lower-secondary and upper-secondary education and vocational education and training correspond training centres; Norway: Vocational education and training forms part of upper-secondary education.

## THE OECD EDUCATION WORKING PAPERS SERIES ON LINE

The OECD Education Working Papers Series may be found at:

- The OECD Directorate for Education website: [www.oecd.org/edu/workingpapers](http://www.oecd.org/edu/workingpapers)
- The OECD's online library, [www.oecd-ilibrary.org/papers](http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/papers)
- The Research Papers in Economics (RePEc) website: [www.repec.org](http://www.repec.org)

If you wish to be informed about the release of new OECD Education working papers, please:

- Go to [www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org)
- Click on “My OECD”
- Sign up and create an account with “My OECD”
- Select “Education” as one of your favourite themes
- Choose “OECD Education Working Papers” as one of the newsletters you would like to receive

For further information on the OECD Education Working Papers Series, please write to: [edu.contact@oecd.org](mailto:edu.contact@oecd.org).

- Choose “OECD Education Working Papers” as one of the newsletters you would like to receive

For further information on the OECD Education Working Papers Series, please write to: [edu.contact@oecd.org](mailto:edu.contact@oecd.org).