

# Boys and Bilingualism

## Mapping the gender-gap at Wolfert TTO

Alderik Visser MA & Dico Krommenhoek BA

Nota Bene

This is a draft version of the article that will be published online in the (peer-reviewed) IB Journal of Teaching Practice 2 (2), december 2014.

### Authors

Alderik Visser primarily works as a teacher and teacher-researcher at Wolfert TTO, an urban bilingual secondary school in the inner-city of Rotterdam, The Netherlands. He teaches History, Philosophy and Theory of Knowledge in both English and Dutch. Apart from that, he teaches Adolescent Psychology to in-service teachers at the Leiden University Graduate School of Education, privately gives teacher-training courses on scientific- and higher order thinking skills and works as a freelance writer on educational topics. [alderik@xs4all.nl](mailto:alderik@xs4all.nl)

Dico Krommenhoek  
[needs added]

### Abstract

Members of the parent-committee of our bilingual school have asked the school's 'homegrown' research department to investigate the occurrence of any 'boy problem' at our institution. Having gone through great pains to construct a workable database with initial test-scores and grades, it proved relatively easy to retrieve informative data about both groups and individual students. As expected, we did find a measurable, small but significant vertical 'gender-gap', with girls in general outperforming boys slightly in almost all fields in the context of our Dutch secondary school. Contrary to our expectations, this gap seems largest in the academic, relatively 'white' and 'middle-class' bilingual academic track. Given the scale of our small research we cannot be sure about the general causes of this gender-gap. Potential explanations that may apply to our specific school-context may be found in either the 'culture of achievement' reigning among students and their parents, or in fact the bilingual nature of education in that particular department.

### Introduction

In the Anglo-Saxon world, rumours that girls have started to outperform boys in practically all fields in education have been circling for at least twenty years (Driesen 2007; Driesen & Van Langen 2010, 2013; Epstein 1998; Jha & Kelleher 2006). From 2000 onwards, this alleged 'boys problem' has become a topic in The Netherlands too, with a rather sudden outburst of public awareness around 2010 (Coenen & Meng 2011; Derks & Vermeersch 2003; Jolles 2010; Woltring 2003). Either stirred by this

debate circling around the possible effects of the so-called ‘feminization’ of schools, or simply alarmed by the lack of ambition of their adolescent sons, members of the parents-committee of our bilingual secondary school wanted to know: to what extent is this gender-gap indeed visible at our school for relatively high-achieving kids? And if girls indeed outperform boys significantly, what, if any, could our school effectively do to respond to or even counter any disbalance observed?

Speaking about gender is creating gender, which makes studying gender and education like entering a mine-field (Braidotti 1994, Fine 2011). Discussing a hypothetical ‘boys problem’ emerging in western societies, a variety of stances is taken, ranging from denail to relativism to sheer exaggeration (Baron-Cohen 2003; Biddulph 1999; Gurian 2001; Hartman e.a. 2006; Jones & Myhill 2004; Martino, Lingard & Mills 2004).

Fact is, however, that in some OECD-countries (and not in others...), girls seem indeed to have started slightly to perform better than boys in certain fields, for which a number of explanations – (neuro)biological, social and /or educational - is offered (Driessen & Van Langen 2011; 2013; OECD 2009). As compared to girls, boys generally lag somewhat behind in developing senso-motor, language and emotional skills, run a higher risk to be diagnosed with developmental disorders such as ASS, AD(H)D and the like, more often have to cope with learning disabilities and are significantly more liable to show deviant and/or externalizing problem-behavior and – thus – to leave the system prematurely (Woltrink 2004). Whether boys have always been ‘such boys’, or that their demeanor has become perceived as more problematic than ever before is fiercely debated (Crott 2013; Gorard e.a. 1999; Mirza e.a. 2000, Smith 2003). Fact is that growing participation of girls in higher levels of secondary education, starting in the early 1970’s has by now now led to a noticeable overrepresentation of women, not only in such ‘typical’ university studies as languages and humanities, but also in former ‘male’ domains like Medicine and Law (Evers, Livernois & Mancuso 2006; Europese Commissie 2009; Langen & Driessen 2008; Tavecchio & Doornenbal 2004). Some claim, therefore, that women have always been the more intelligent part of the world but were not acknowledged as such. Others perceive a threatening ‘feminization’ of education, detrimental to the intrinsic needs and urges of boys and/or their ‘brains’, not only because of a steady decline of men teaching at primary and secondary level, but also because of a stronger focus on language-, cooperative- and other skills, boy allegedly are less good at (Hartman 2006; James 2007; Woltring 2004).

Empirical research may help to weed out the more speculative approaches. Female teachers in primary education seem not to respond very differently to disruptive behavior by either boys or girls, for reasons of which the ‘feminization – theory’ might be in need of some adjustments (Rietveld, Van Beijsterveld & Boomsma 2011 see also Marsh e.a. 2008). As much as a slight overall difference between boys and girls can indeed be measured in some contexts, the largest discrepancies in learning-potential and achievement are still to be found at the individual, not the aggregated level (Hyde 2005; Driessen & Van Langen 2007, 2013). And even though vertical inequality may indeed exist – girls being slightly better within the confinements of a certain educational track – horizontal inequality – uneven spread of boys and girls over different tracks allowing for different opportunities, still works out negatively for Dutch female students. That may all seem a reassurance for parents of potentially high-achieving sons,

but that, too may prove premature; Even in a small country like The Netherlands, vertical inequality between boys and girls has the effect that, every year, thousands of boys have to resit a class, are demoted to a lower level of education and/or drop out of the system altogether (Driessen en Van Langen 2006; 2010).

Asked by worried parents to research a possible 'boy problem' occurring at our school, we soon decided not to go too deep into the matter and leave possible explanations of and reactions to any real or perceived problem to professionals. As our fellow teachers did indeed expect a small performance gap at our school, but weren't sure on estimate size or locus, we decided to start off with a small exploratory research: *to what extent do male and female students at our schools show significant differences in terms of initial test-scores, school-based assessments and other performance indicators?* Informed by comparable research done in The Netherlands, our hypothesis was that girls at our school would indeed outperform boys slightly, but significantly (Langen & Driessen 2010; 2013). Led by our own intuitions as teachers as well as by theory, we didn't expect the variable of *gender*, but instead *SES* and the strongly related *ethnicity* to account for most of the measured variety. Therefore, our expectation was that this hypothesized gender-effect would be somewhat bigger in HAVO-groups, with more children with a relatively lower SES working at a somewhat lower academic level. At the same time, we expected the difference to be largest among the inner-city migrant population frequenting our non-bilingual, regular department.

## **Method**

As most of the data under consideration were stored in the schools computer-system, we expected to finish our inventory within a maximum of three months. It turned out, however, that different sets of data could not be retrieved and/or combined very easily, and that quite some information about individual children still needed to be entered. Hence, we were forced to construct a database of our own, combining personal data of all children enrolled at school ( $n = 1729$ ) with their initial test scores (*Advanced Raven Non-Verbal Intelligence Test (AR)*; *National Intelligence Test Education (NIO)* and a *National School-Aptitude Test (CITO eindtoets basisonderwijs)*). As far as the system allowed for that, both these sets of data were combined with aggregated average test scores on groups of subjects, e.g. sciences, languages and humanities. In order to more or less take into account that our school is bilingual, about 80% of the subjects being taught in English instead of in Dutch, Biology as a subject was 'traditionally' counted as one of the humanities (in Dutch: *zaakvakken* or 'matter-subjects'). Again, as far as the system allowed us to, frequency of students failing a year, going up or dropping down a level, or leaving the school were administered, too. Other possibly relevant data, like instances of disturbing behavior, absenteeism, homework-practice, etc. were theoretically available, but were considered too unreliable to be taken into account.

After a full year of monks-work, this database allowed us to perform relatively simple statistics, turning mere guesses about the alleged gender-gap and, in fact, many other things in school, into accessible ciphers. In order to test for boys versus girls, initial test-scores and school-grades of students at four different departments (bilingual HAVO, bilingual VWO, regular HAVO and regular VWO),

were compared both per year and per department, from grade 1 to their pre-graduation year (form 4 or 5). Due to technicalities, the important last year of graduation could not be taken into account. Comparisons were made using two-sided sample t-tests ( $\alpha = 0,05$ ) of the averages of the aggregated scores, as well as by plainly subtracting averages, means and standard-deviations of students grouped by gender and department.

## Results

Using relatively simple statistics to interpret a relatively large database, we have found evidence to support our first and main hypothesis. Two subsidiary hypotheses were, however, falsified. Additionally, our confined, rather simple and straightforward but not necessarily easy preliminary research has given some unsuspected results.

The vast majority of the population of interest is enrolled at a bilingual school, at which ca. 80 percent of all lessons are taught in English (as a second language). Apart from Dutch, a considerable amount of other languages – French, German, Spanish and Mandarin – are mandatory too, at least in the junior years. As language-skills are not merely connotated ‘feminine’, but seem to be causally related to sex, we expected – and many colleagues in fact ‘saw’ - more girls in our classrooms. Simply listing all students proved the opposite: 55,2% of the school-population as of 2011 was male, 44,8% female. More recent enrollment-figures show this trend to be enduring: at the start of form one (comp. MYP 2), some 60% of the students are enrolled in 2013 are boys, 40% girls (Visser, 2013b). One of the possible explanations for this relative overrepresentation of male adolescents could be their performance as measured at the end of primary school. Before entering secondary school, practically all children in The Netherlands (ca. 95%) are held to participate in a national school-aptitude test (CITO-eindtoets Basisonderwijs) consisting of four rather large sub-tests. In every one of the four departments at our school, children seem to have performed on these test congruently with both the national image and our – stereotypical - expectations. As can be seen in fig. 1, girls show consistently better in language than boys, whereas boys are on the whole markedly better in calculus. Boys do score slightly better on tests measuring information processing skills and are able to reproduce substantially –but not always significantly- more factual knowledge in the field of social studies (*‘wereldoriëntatie’*). These measured differences are particularly large in the (tiny) non-bilingual academic stream (-11,3% language, +20,3% calculus) and smallest in the (relatively large) bilingual academic stream (-1,4 % language, 10,4 % calculus). Standard deviations being rather large, these average differences may not seem very conclusive. Still, boys’ relative strength in calculus and humanities (or their relative lack of test anxiety) seems to work out in such a way, that their aggregated results set out on a scale, oddly ranging from 500 – 550 are slightly, but consistently higher. These differences are somewhat larger among the predominantly migrant non-bilingual groups, and is smallest among the predominantly ‘white’ and middle-class children at the bilingual academic stream.

These findings seem to be corroborated by other test scores. In order to be placed at the selective and more expensive bilingual department, all children applying have to perform the *National Intelligence Test for Education* (NIO). Although the conditions under which this standardized IQ-test consisting of 8 sub-tests is taken are rather suboptimal, the prognostic value for children aged 11 limited to only half a year, the school considers such an extra test as . As can be seen in Table 2, boys at both bilingual departments significantly do better at this test, too. Interestingly, not only their symbolic intelligence, but also their verbal intelligence, as measured by this test, seems to be slightly (thavo) or indeed significantly (tvwo) higher, which results in a considerable 'gender-gap' in measured intelligence. That does not necessarily mean, however, that boys at our bilingual school would be more intelligent than girls: among those who, in earlier years, have done not the NIO, but the Advanced Raven non-verbal intelligence test instead, and whose test-scores could be retrieved (n = 243), no such gender-gap could be established.

Comparing these test-scores with the actual performance of boys and girls at our schools, the results are counter-intuitive, if not paradoxical. On all levels, girls seem to outperform boys when it comes to test-grades and/or assessments in the context of different subjects. Quite expectedly, this effect is most persistent and significant in languages. In some departments, however, girls do better in science and humanities as well.

In the non-bilingual - 'black'- departments, this effect seems smallest. At the regular havo, girls seem to get a head-start in year one. During the whole of their career, however, possible gender-effects are minimized, except for in languages. In the small regular academic department, quite the same seems to happen. Both in the first year and in all the others, average scores in sciences and humanities differ only slightly and insignificantly.

In the 'mixed' bilingual havo-department, boys seem to live up somewhat more to the (gendered) expectations. In year one, they score slightly, but significantly lower on languages, somewhat higher on sciences, but significantly lower on humanities, a pattern that is repeated all through their pre-graduation career. If there is indeed a 'boys problem,' it is firmly located at the academic, bilingual, predominantly 'white' tvwo: from year one to five, boys persistently and significantly get lower grades than girls, not only in languages (-0,4 on a scale from 1 - 10), but also in sciences (-0,2) and humanities (-0,3). Especially in years three and 4 (see figure 4), the measured average aggregated distance is relatively high. Bearing in mind that the 'gender-gap in initial test-scores was lowest in this department, this surely is an astonishing find.

For sure, the differences found are anything but dramatic: the aggregated average differences between boys and girls are rather small. Given that the standard-deviations are relatively high, it seems safe to say that individual differences indeed account more for academic success than mere gender. At the same time, these small-size differences seem to have measurable individual and institutional effects. As far as we were able to retrieve from the data, twice as many boys in the bilingual departments seem to have to resit classes than girls (62 against 29). Conversely, two times as many girls are promoted from bilingual havo to bilingual vwo after year one or two (41 against 18). Even though a lot of data seem to be missing here, there are indications that about the same figures hold from children leaving school for various reasons, including demotion.

All in all, it seems safe to say that in our school, girls do slightly but significantly outperform boys, not only in languages, but also in other academic subjects such as humanities and, to a lesser extent, sciences. Contrary to our expectations, this effect is demonstrably larger in the 'highest' – bilingual, academic – stream than in the 'lower,' more mixed and /or 'black' department, for reasons of which both subsidiary hypotheses are in fact falsified.

## **Discussion**

Comparing averages of groups, we have found evidence to support our first and main hypothesis and refute two others. With the use of more complex statistical features like ANOVA or indeed multilevel analyses of students in different streams, specific subjects and / or teachers, more could have perhaps been said about the relative prognostic value of 'gender' and success at our secondary school. With hindsight, it might not have been the wisest of decisions to count the English-taught biology as one of the humanities, few remaining 'sciences' (i.e. Mathematics and Technology) giving too few data to assess achievement in year one. Still, with all its possible flaws and limitations, our data do strongly suggest that a measurable, significant 'gender-effect' at the expense of the boys does appear in the largest of our school's departments. Further research into the prognostic value of the tests used for student placement has revealed that, from all variables given, neither IQ, nor other test scores, but 'gender' correlates most strongly with achievement in both our bilingual streams (Visser 2013). About the real causes of this 'gender-gap' we can, in the end, only speculate. Given, however, that this effect seems largest in our academic bilingual department, and effectively seems larger there, than in the general population of Dutch secondary schools at a comparable level, we believe that the (bi)lingual nature of our school might play a significant role here. In the non-bilingual streams, boys do live up more to the gendered expectations, in the sense that they do get (somewhat) higher grades in those subjects they are expected to excel at, i.e. in sciences and humanities. At the bilingual department, where both sciences and humanities, including Mathematics are taught through English, boys (in general) consistently lag behind the girls. Further research, comparing our and other bilingual schools with non-bilingual schools with a comparable population might be needed to corroborate such a conjecture. Another possible line of explanation, favoured by many of our colleagues at our school, could be found in terms of cultures of education and upbringing. Many of the children in our relatively 'white' academic department are raised more or less humanistically, in an authoritative 'culture of negotiation'. At both the bilingual departments they will meet an equally benevolent child-centered approach. As compared to their 'migrant' colleagues, especially 'white' boys have less to strive for in terms of social climbing, typically show less perseverance and cooperative skills in school-related and other tasks and a stronger inclination to negotiate about deadlines, grades, etc. Conversely, those migrant boys and girls who aspire to go to the 'elitist' bilingual stream have to cope with the gap between school culture and home-culture which is often referred to as a (relatively) authoritarian 'culture of command'. Even though such generalizations rarely hold any individual test, it seems plausible that both the alignment of and a supposed 'clash' between home-culture and school-culture can

accounts for the failure of many an individual boy or girl at our school. More research, especially focussing the amount of 'migrant' boys and girls failing the academic bilingual streams, seems to be needed here.

Constructing a database with all relevant figures about all individual students and their test-scores proved to be a time-consuming, sometimes even frustrating, but very rewarding activity. More relevant information could and still can be retrieved from it. Quite unexpectedly, we noticed that significantly more boys frequent our school than girls do. Subsequent research on the prognostic value of the different placement-tests used at our school, using the very same database, suggests, amongst others, that this value is lower for boys than for girls, and that verbal intelligence and language skills do correlate strongly with success in *all* subject-areas. Hence, placement-policies at our school have changed, demanding a higher score for language-skills for all children, and allowing for girls to have a lower average IQ as measured by the NIO-test. Secondly, figures listed in our database fuelled existing doubts about the levels of assessment and practices of determination used in the first years of our non-bilingual departments. Here, too, girls measurably, albeit not always significantly perform better than boys do. Effectively, however, quite a few migrant girls (and some boys) with relatively low initial test-scores (CITO under 540) show able to get such grades, that they are promoted to 'higher', more academic levels. Starting in year four of both the havo and the vwo-department, these girls visibly start to fail to live up to these academic expectations. Even though the figures are too small in this stream to be statistically significant, this pattern is so strong among the non-bilingual VWO-students, that the school needs to worry about the discriminating value of of this type of education in the lower years. Not coincidentally, a task-force to reinvigorate academic learning in this department has by now been formed.

Thirdly, our database reveals that, in every department, students show willing and able to get relatively good grades in year one, but fail to do so in the subsequent years two to four. Again, this holds true only collectively, not individually, and again, this effect is largest among boys in the academic bilingual department (see fig. 4). Assuming that students in general enter secondary school highly motivated, but soon adjust themselves to the low general expectancy of 'the system', our school now participates in a pilot-project run by Leyden University to keep motivation and achievement up by setting higher general standards and supporting intrinsic motivation by more differentiated, talent-oriented learning.

Given all these 'coidental' fruits, we strongly recommend every school to store data about all their students in such a way, that they can be easily combined and retrieved. Relatively easy statistics are sufficient for any manager or team of teachers to get access to a goldmine of 'hard' information about their student population. Moving beyond mere conjectures about boys, girls, tests and aptitudes, such real figures make research-based teaching and management close at hand.

## References

- Baron-Cohen, S. (2003). *The essential difference. Men, women and the extreme male brain*. London: Allen Lane, Penguin Books.
- Biddulph, S. (1999) *Jongens hoe voed je ze op? Waarom ze zo anders zijn en hoe ze opgroeien tot gelukkige en evenwichtige mannen*. Rijswijk, Elmar
- Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic Subjects. Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. Columbia: Columbia UP
- Carrington, B. & A. MacPhee (2008). Boys' 'underachievement' and the feminization of teaching. *Journal of Education for Teaching* 34 (2) 109–120
- Coenen, J., C. Meng, R. van der Velden (2011). *Schoolsucces van jongens en meisjes in het HAVO en VWO: waarom meisjes het beter doen*. Maastricht: ROA
- Crott, A. (2013). *Jongens zij het. Van Pietje Bell tot Probleemgeval*. Amsterdam: Atlas/Contact
- Derks, A. & H. Vermeersch (2003). *Gender en schools presteren. Een multilevel analyse naar de oorzaken van de grotere schoolachterstand van jongens in het Vlaams secundair onderwijs*. Brussel: VUB
- Driessen, G., A. van Langen (2006). *Sekseverschillen in onderwijsloopbanen*, Nijmegen: ITS
- Driessen, G., A. van Langen (2008). *Sekseverschillen in het onderwijs. 'The boys' problem' in internationaal perspectief*. *Mensch en maatschappij* 82 (2) 109 - 132
- Driessen, G., A. van Langen (2010). *De onderwijsachterstand van jongens*. Nijmegen: ITS.
- Driessen, G., A. Langen (2013) *Gender differences in primary and secondary education: Are girls really outperforming boys?* *International Review of Education* 59 (1) 67-86
- European Commission (2009). *Gender and education (and employment). Gendered imperatives and their implications for women and men. Lessons from research for policy makers*. Retrieved May 25, 2011, from [www.nesse.fr/nesse/activities/reports](http://www.nesse.fr/nesse/activities/reports).
- Evers, F., J. Livernois & M. Mancuso (2006). 'Where are the Boys? Gender Imbalance in Higher Education', *Higher Education Management and Policy* 18 (2), 1 - 25.
- Fine, C. (2011). *Waarom we allemaal van Mars komen. Hoe neuroseksisme aan de basis ligt van de verschillen tussen man en vrouw*. Tiel: Lannoo
- Gillborn, D., & Mirza, H. (2000). *Educational inequality. Mapping race, class and gender. A synthesis of research evidence*. London: Ofsted.
- Gorard, S., Rees, G., & Salisbury, J. (1999). Reappraising the apparent underachievement of boys at School. *Gender and Education*, 11(4), 441–454.
- Gurian, M. (2001). *Boys and Girls Learn Differently! A guide for Teachers and Parents* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Hartman, D. (ed.) (2006). *Educating Boys. The Good News, Insight from a selection of papers presented at the 4th Biennial 'Working with Boys, Building fine Men' Conference, Melbourne 2005*. Newcastle: Family Action Centre / University of Newcastle
- Hyde, J. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60(6), 581–592.



- James, A. (2007). *Teaching the male brain. How boys think, feel, and learn in school*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Jha and Kelleher (2006). *Boys' Underachievement in Education An Exploration in Selected Commonwealth Countries*. London/ Vancouver: Commonwealth of Learning
- Jolles, J. (2010). *Ellis en het verbreinen. Over hersenen, gedrag en educatie*. Amsterdam: Neuropsych Publishers
- Jones, S. & D. Myhill (2004). 'Troublesome boys' and 'compliant girls': gender identity and perceptions of achievement and underachievement. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 45 (4), 547 – 561
- Martino, W., Lingard, B. & Mills, M. (2004). Issues in boys' education: a question of teacher threshold knowledges? *Gender and Education*, 16 (3), 435 – 454
- Marsh, D. (e.a.) (2008). A Multilevel Perspective on Gender in Classroom Motivation and Climate: Potential Benefits of Male Teachers for Boys? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100 ( 1), 78–95
- OECD (2009). *Equally prepared for life? How 15-year-old boys and girls perform in school*. Paris: OECD.
- Rietveld, M.J.H., C.E.M. van Beijsterveld & D.I. Boomsma (2011). Sekse van de leerkracht en probleemgedrag bij leerlingen. *Pedagogische Studien*, 88 (2), 59 – 72
- Smith, E. (2003). Failing boys and moral panics: Perspectives on the underachievement battle. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 51 (3), 282–295.
- Tavecchio, L., J. Doornenbal (2004). Jongens als probleem. Inleiding bij het themadeel van het tijdschrift *Pedagogiek*. *Pedagogiek* 23 (3) 112-18
- Sorgen, M. Van, A. Visser. (2013) Tussenrapportage HV-project Wolfert College. Voortgang na een jaar. Rotterdam: Wolfert TTO (intern document)
- Visser, A. (2013) Over de voorspellende waarde van CITO- en NIO-tests op Wolfert TTO. Rotterdam: Wolfert TTO (interne notitie)
- Woltring, L.(2003). Jongenspedagogiek. Opvoeden met gevoel voor sekseverschillen. *Pedagogiek* 23 (3) 175-181

## Appendices

Fig. 1: average scores on national school-aptitude tests (CITO): subtests and general score

Dept.	Language			Calculus			Information skills			Social studies (**)			General		
	m.	f.	Dif.	m.	F	Dif	m.	f.	Dif.	M	F	Dif	m	F	Dif.
havo	49,6 (20,3)	52,2 (17,3)	-2,6 n = 130	64,8 (20,4)	50,7 (23,2)	14,14 n = 130	52,1 (20,9)	50,3 (22,9)	1,8 n = 130	47,6 (25,0)	34,9 (21,2)	12,7*) n = 88	537,3 (4,9)	535,9 (4,5)	1,6 n = 130
vwo	61,3 (21,0)	72,7 (18,3)	-11,4 n = 49	83,5 (15,7)	63,2 (20,0)	20,3 n = 49	69,5 (21,3)	70,8 (21,7)	-1,24 *)	61,8 (22,6)	53,5 (19,2)	8,23 *) n = 31	541,7 (5,1)	539,4 (5,3)	2,2 n = 99
thavo	60,8 (17,2)	69,8 (15,5)	-9,0 n = 210	67,8 (20,3)	52,1 (17,5)	15,7 n = 210	67,9 (17,6)	66,3 (18,9)	1,53 *) n = 210	67,73] (20,3)	58,0 (20,3)	9,70 n = 164	540,8 (3,1)	539,8 (2,9)	1,0 n = 239
twwo	82,2 (14,9)	83,6 (13,4)	-1,4 n = 439	84,5 (13,7)	74,1 (17,7)	10,4 n = 439	83,3 (14,4)	82,4 (16,0)	0,8 *) n = 439	82,1 (16,5)	72,0 (20,2)	9,9 n = 307	545,8 (3,1)	545,0 (3,3)	0,81, n = 506

\*) non-significant

\*\*) in Dutch: wereldoriëntatie = a combination of geography, history and biology. Since this part of the test is not mandatory, quite some schools do not test or, in the case of some 'weak' schools, do not even teach this in primary school

Fig. 2: average scores on National Intelligence test Education (NIO) and Advanced Raven non-verbal intelligence test

Dept.	NIO Verbal			NIO symbolic			NIO Total			Advanced Raven		
	m.	f.	Dif.	m.	F	Dif	m.	f.	Dif.	m.	f.	Diff.
thavo	106,3 (9,1)	105,7 (8,5)	0,6 *) n = 177	108,44 (9,2)	101,0 (8,5)	7,4 n = 177	107,8 (7,4)	103,8 (7,7)	4,0 n = 177	18,7 (4,7)	18,6 (5,2)	0,1*) n = 86
twwo	115,5 (11,9)	112,3 (10,9)	3,2 n = 439	118,2 (10,5)	113,2 (10,7)	5,0 n = 373	119,9 (10,0)	114,3 (9,3)	4,7 n = 373	20,7 (5,44)	20,8 (4,9)	- 0,1*) n = 157

\*) non-significant

Fig. 3. Aggregated average scores per group of subjects: boys and girls per department

Dept.	Languages			Sciences			Humanities			Overall		
	m.	f.	Dif.	m.	f	Dif	m.	f.	Dif.	M	F	Dif
Havo year 1	6,5 (0,7)	7,1 (0,6)	-0,6 n = 93	6,4 (0,9)	6,7 (0,8)	-0,3 n = 93	6,7 (0,6)	6,9 (0,7)	-0,2 n = 93	6,5 (0,6)	6,9 (0,6)	-0,4 n = 93
Havo overall (1-4)	5,9 (0,7)	6,2 (0,6)	-0,3 n = 204	6,0 *) (0,9)	6,1*) (0,9)	-0,1 *) n = 204	6,1 *) (0,7)	6,0 *) (0,9)	-0,1*) n = 204	6,0 *) (0,7)	6,1*) (0,7)	-0,1*) n = 204
Thavo 1	6,7 (0,6)	7,0 (0,6)	-0,3 n = 211	6,2 (0,7)	6,1 (0,6)	0,1 *) n = 211	6,4 (0,7)	6,6 (0,6)	-0,2 n = 211	6,4 (0,5)	6,6 (0,5)	-0,1 n = 211

Thavo general (1 – 4)	6,4 (0,7)	6,7 (0,6)	-0,4 n = 254	6,0 (0,8)	6,0 (0,7)	0,05 *) n = 254	6,1 (0,7)	6,2 (0,6)	- 0,2 n = 254	6,2 (0,6)	6,4 (0,5)	- 0,2 n = 254
Vwo Year 1	7,1 (0,7)	7,6 (0,7)	-0,5 n = 61	7,1 (0,8)	6,9 (1,2)	- 0,2 *) n = 61	7,3 (0,7)	7,4 (0,7)	- 0,1 *) n = 61	7,2 (0,7)	7,3 (0,7)	- 0,1 *) n = 61
Vwo general (1 – 5)	6,3 (0,7)	6,7 (0,7)	-0,4 n = 163	6,4 (0,7)	6,4 (0,9)	-0,02*) n = 163	6,5 (0,7)	6,7 (0,6)	- 0,2 *) n = 163	6,4	6,6	- 0,2
Tvwo year 1	7,2 (0,7)	7,6 (0,7)	- 0,4 n = 471	7,0 (0,8)	7,2 (0,7)	-0,2 n = 471	7,2 (0,8)	7,5 (0,8)	-0,35 n = 671	7,2 (0,6)	7,4 (0,6)	-0,3 n = 471
Tvwo general (1 – 5)	6,7 (0,7)	7,2 (0,8)	-0,4 n = 683	6,6 (0,9)	6,9 (0,9)	-0,24 n = 683	6,8 (0,8)	7,1 (0,8)	-0,3 n = 683	6,7 (0,7)	7,1 (0,7)	-0,34 n = 683

\*) non-significant

*Fig. 4. Aggregated average scores per group of subjects: boys and girls in the academic bilingual department, Form 1 - 5*

Form	Languages			Sciences			Humanities			Overall		
	m.	f.	Dif.	m.	f.	Dif.	m.	f.	Dif.	m.	f.	Dif.
TVWO 1	7,2 (0,7)	7,6 (0,7)	-0,4	7,0 (0,8)	7,2 (0,7)	-0,2	7,2 (0,8)	7,5 (0,8)	-0,35	7,1 (0,6)	7,4 (0,6)	-0,3
TVWO 2	6,7 (0,8)	7,2 (0,8)	- 0,5	6,6 (0,9)	6,8 (0,9)	- 0,2	6,7 (0,8)	7,1 (0,8)	- 0,4	6,8	7,1*	- 0,3
TVWO 3	6,5 (0,8)	7,1 (0,8)	-0,6	6,6 (0,9)	6,7 (1,0)	- 0,1	6,6 (0,8)	6,7 (0,6)	-0,2	6,8 (0,8)	7,1 (0,9)	-0,3
TVWO 4	6,4 (0,9)	7,0 (0,9)	-0,6 n = 228	6,2 (1,1)	6,3 (1,1)	- 0,1	6,7 (0,8)	6,8 (0,9)	- 0,1	6,4 (0,8)	6,7 (0,8)	- 0,3
TVWO 5	6,6 (0,7)	6,8 (0,8)	-0,2 n = 180	6,4 (0,8)	6,5 (0,8)	- 0,1	6,5 (0,7)	6,4 (0,8)	0,1	6,45 (0,6)	6,54 (0,7)	- 0,09
TVWO general	6,7 (0,7)	7,2 (0,8)	-0,5	6,6 (0,9)	6,9 (0,9)	-0,24	6,8 (0,8)	7,1 (0,8)	- 0,3	6,7 (0,7)	7,1 (0,7)	- 0,34