IJIET, e-ISSN 2548-8430, p-ISSN 2548-8422, Vol. 10, No. 1, January 2026, pp. 73-86

International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/IJIET
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

THE REPRODUCTION OF EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY IN INDONESIA: AN EXAMINATION OF HINDERING FACTORS AND DIGITAL ACCESS IN RURAL AND URBAN SCHOOL SETTINGS

Faisal Rahman Dongoran[1] and Reza Aditia[2*]
[1,2] Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
faisalrahman@umsu.ac.id[1] and rezaaditia@umsu.ac.id[2]
*correspondence: rezaaditia@umsu.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v10i1.12907
received 28 June 2025; accepted 31 January 2026

Abstract
This study investigates factors contributing to educational disparities in Indonesia, particularly concerning school location and status. Employing a correlational research design, the study analyzed data from the 2022 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), focusing on the Indonesian school questionnaire dataset. The sample comprised 410 Indonesian schools, including 237 public and 173 private institutions. Pearson's chi-square test was utilized for statistical analysis to examine associations between categorical variables. Findings reveal significant relationships between school location and learning impediments related to teacher availability, physical infrastructure availability and quality, and digital resource availability. These issues are predominantly concentrated in public schools in rural areas, indicating a systematic disadvantage. While some challenges are also present in private schools, the impact is more pronounced in public institutions. The results suggest that educational inequality in Indonesia is structurally reproduced, perpetuating social and economic hierarchies. This necessitates comprehensive policy interventions that address both resource provision and underlying systemic issues.

Keywords: educational inequality, learning barriers, school infrastructure, social reproduction

Introduction

The stark disparities between urban and rural schools remain a formidable challenge. This significantly impacts teaching quality and the assimilation of digital device utilization (Afrianti & Aditia, 2020; Thamrin et al., 2023), which in turn affects the educational opportunities available to school-aged Indonesians. Ideally, all children of the nation should receive equal access, not merely the chance for access (Ainscow, 2020; Cole, 2007; OECD, 2018a; Selwyn, 2009). In the classroom, where the minds of the younger generation are shaped and futures are formed, the lack of quality education is an obstacle that must be overcome.

Adequate learning materials are fundamental for educational progress (Arends, 2012). However, their equitable availability continues to be a major

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

challenge. Many schools in rural areas lack sufficient reading materials in their libraries, a problem that can hinder learning development (Asrowi et al., 2019; Gordon & Cicchetti, 2023; Love & Ewoldt, 2021; Macasawang et al., 2019; Shieh et al., 2023). Moving to urban areas, where resources are generally more available, access disparities still persist. Schools located in economically disadvantaged environments continue to struggle in providing adequate learning materials, leading to an incomplete educational experience for students (Kharizmi, 2015). Even when available, the learning resources often have poor quality, regardless of the school's geographical location (rural or urban) (Pratiwi et al., 2022). Outdated book collections and obsolete teaching aids create stagnant rather than progressive learning. This causes them to fall further behind not only in economic capital, but also social capital and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 2018c). In an era of rapid technological advancement, relying solely on ancient learning tools will hinder students' exposure to contemporary knowledge and ideas. The impact is significant: the younger generation will find it difficult to meet the demands of a constantly changing world.

The availability of physical infrastructure also frequently reproduces the disparities between schools located in rural and urban areas (Apple, 2017). In rural areas, schools grapple with a lack of classrooms, inadequate sanitation facilities, and insufficient seating arrangements. These fundamental challenges create an environment where the effort to acquire knowledge becomes an extraordinarily difficult struggle. Urban schools, although sometimes in relatively better condition, are not free from infrastructure problems. Old buildings and poorly maintained facilities certainly detract from a conducive learning atmosphere, diverting attention from education to environmental discomfort.

The integration of digital devices in the educational process promises to bridge gaps by providing equal access regardless of their geographical location. However, the availability of internet-connected digital devices remains a major obstacle, especially in rural areas. The “digital divide,” a term that has become increasingly prominent in recent years, seems to signal a paradox where something initially intended to act as an equalizer instead becomes a divider (Kormos, 2018; Wang, 2013). Even when digital devices are available, the integration of appropriate software also poses challenges (Wang, 2013). Urban schools with relatively better financial resources have access to a variety of such software. Conversely, rural schools only use limited and common applications. The result is, of course, a digital experience full of inequality.

The effectiveness of digital integration also depends on teachers' proficiency in utilizing these devices. Urban teachers often receive more training opportunities and workshops, giving them higher digital literacy. On the other hand, in rural areas, where opportunities for teacher professional development are still limited, teachers struggle to maximize the potential of digital devices, especially older teachers. As a result, this digital divide is not unique to students but also occurs among educators. An investigation of this from the perspective of school status, whether the school is public or private, also needs to be carried out; in Indonesia, the quality of private schools is often worse than that of public schools (Stern & Smith, 2016).

Considering the complexity and multidimensionality that affect both students and teachers, as well as the potential differences between public and private schools, this research aims to further investigate the contributing factors. Therefore, the

Research Questions (RQ) of this study are: (1) What is the relationship between the availability of teachers and school location based on school status (public and private)?; (2) What is the relationship between teacher quality and school location based on school status (public and private)?; (3) What is the relationship between the availability of learning materials (such as textbooks, IT equipment, libraries, or laboratory equipment) and school location based on school status?; (4) What is the relationship between the quality of available learning materials (such as textbooks, IT equipment, libraries, or laboratory equipment) and school location based on school status?; (5) What is the relationship between the availability of physical infrastructure (such as buildings, grounds, air conditioning, lighting, and audio systems) and school location based on school status?; (6) What is the relationship between the quality of available physical infrastructure (such as buildings, grounds, air conditioning, lighting, and audio systems) and school location based on school status?; (7) What is the relationship between the availability of digital resources (such as desktops or laptops, internet access, learning management systems, or school learning platforms) and school location based on school status?; (8) What is the relationship between the quality of available digital resources (such as desktops or laptops, internet access, learning management systems, or school learning platforms) and school location based on school status?

Method

This research employed correlational research design. This design is chosen to describe and illustrate the degree of association (or relationship) between two or more variables (Creswell, 2012). The target population for this study is all schools in Indonesia. The data for this research will be obtained from the 2022 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) data, published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

Regarding sample design, PISA utilizes a stratified two-stage sampling method. The first stage involves selecting schools that cater to 15-year-old students (junior high schools). The second stage includes all students within the selected schools, with an equal probability of selection for every student in that school (OECD, 2016). It is important to note that the data collected in PISA extends beyond literacy, numeracy, and science skills. PISA provides several other datasets in addition to the student questionnaire, including the well-being questionnaire, educational career questionnaire, financial literacy questionnaire, ICT familiarity questionnaire, school questionnaire, teacher questionnaire, and parent questionnaire. This research will specifically use the dataset available in the school questionnaire. This dataset contains information on school background, school management, teaching staff, evaluation and assessment, targeted groups, and school climate. This information will help illustrate similarities and differences among school groups to better understand the context of student test results (OECD, 2018b). The utilization of this dataset is deemed capable of answering all the Research Questions (RQs) proposed in this study. Since all RQs in this study aim to examine the association between variables, and all variables consist of categorical data (nominal and ordinal), the statistical analysis employed will be Pearson's chi-square test (Field, 2009; Fisher, 1922; Siegel, 1956). To further clarify how data analysis will be conducted, readers can refer to the proposed contingency

table presented in Table 1. Furthermore, the research roadmap for this study can be viewed in Figure 1.

Findings and Discussion

Sample demographics

This study utilizes PISA 2022 data provided by the OECD, with a specific focus on Indonesian demographic data. Given the research's emphasis on disparities between public and private schools, it's essential to understand the distribution of these school types within the sample. Public schools constituted 237 schools, or 57.8% of the total sample, while private schools accounted for 173 schools, or 42.2%. In total, 410 Indonesian schools were included in the PISA 2022 sample.

Table 1. Research sample demographics

	Frequency	Percent
Public schools	237	57.8
Private schools	173	42.2
Total	410	100.0

Chi-square analysis

The statistical results from the Chi-Square test provide insights into the relationship between school location and various factors hindering instruction, differentiated by school status (public vs. private). Several interesting findings emerged from the chi-square analysis (Table 2). The chi-square test revealed a significant relationship between learning impediments caused by the availability of teachers and school location for public schools, with a coefficient of $\chi2(15)=32.136, p<0.05$. Conversely, no significant relationship was found for private school samples. As detailed in Appendix 1, rural schools exhibited the highest prevalence of this issue. Specifically, 21.3% of public schools located in "villages, hamlets, or rural areas (less than 3,000 inhabitants)" reported that "lack of teaching staff" (RQ 1) was a "very significant" impediment, and another 21.3% reported it "to some extent." However, this percentage sharply decreased and even disappeared entirely for schools located in "metropolitan cities" and "megacities."

For learning impediments caused by the availability of physical infrastructure (RQ 5), the analysis indicated a significant relationship with school location for both public and private schools. However, this relationship appeared stronger for public schools, with $\chi2(15)=34.718, p<0.05$, compared to private schools with a coefficient of $\chi2(15)=27.061, p<0.05$. Referring to the descriptive statistics (Appendix 1), this issue was most severe in rural areas. The more rurally located a school, the greater the problem regarding the availability of physical infrastructure, applicable to both public and private institutions.

Regarding problems caused by the poor quality of available physical infrastructure (RQ 6), a significant relationship with school location was exclusively found in public schools, with $\chi2(15)=37.618, p<0.05$. Again, based on the descriptive statistics in Appendix 1, high levels of problems related to physical infrastructure quality were observed in rural schools, with 34.4% of samples in "villages, hamlets, or rural areas (less than 3,000 inhabitants)" reporting "very significant" issues, and 11.5% reporting them "to some extent." Samples located in "small towns (3,000 to approximately 15,000 inhabitants)" also reported this issue

as quite prevalent, with 11% of samples in this geographical category responding "very significant" and 15.9% responding "to some extent.".

Another interesting finding pertains to issues related to the availability of digital resources such as desktops or laptops, internet access, learning management systems, and school learning platforms. The chi-square analysis showed a significant relationship between this variable and school location, but this significant relationship was only present in public schools, with $\chi 2(15)=27.894, p<0.05$. According to the descriptive statistics in Appendix 1, this problem was most severe in rural schools. Interestingly, however, public schools located in "metropolitan cities (1,000,000 to approximately 10,000,000 inhabitants)" also showed a relatively high percentage.

For other school-related problems investigated in this study, no significant relationship was found between each variable and school location, for either public or private schools. However, these findings require further critical examination and do not necessarily imply that the overall condition of education in Indonesia is good. A more detailed look at the descriptive statistics (Appendix 1) indicates that the lack of a significant relationship is often due to all geographical groups reporting "very significant" or "to some extent" rather than "not at all" or "very little," suggesting that these problems are pervasive across all geographical groups, not exclusive to specific ones.

Table 1. Analisis statistik chi-square

		Coefficient	df	Sig.
RQ 1	Public schools	32.136	15	0.006
	Private schools	16.036	15	0.380
RQ 2	Public schools	18.383	15	0.243
	Private schools	16.672	15	0.339
RQ 3	Public schools	20.696	15	0.147
	Private schools	20.147	15	0.166
RQ 4	Public schools	19.209	15	0.204
	Private schools	22.745	15	0.090
RQ 5	Public schools	34.718	15	0.003
	Private schools	27.061	15	0.028
RQ 6	Public schools	37.618	15	0.001
	Private schools	18.594	15	0.233
RQ 7	Public schools	27.894	15	0.022
	Private schools	11.301	15	0.731
RQ 8	Public schools	19.208	15	0.204
	Private schools	11.791	15	0.695

Structurally reproduced inequality

Bourdieu argued that schools, rather than being agents of meritocracy, actually function as arenas of social reproduction, where children from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds acquire unequal cultural capital. The findings of this research clearly echo Bourdieu's perspective. The availability of teachers (RQ 1), the availability and quality of physical infrastructure (RQ 5 & RQ 6), and the availability of digital resources (RQ 7) reveal significant patterns of inequality based on school location, especially in public schools. Public schools in rural areas

consistently face issues of teacher shortages, poor availability and quality of physical infrastructure, and limited digital resources. These conditions directly limit the accumulation of equitable cultural capital for students in those areas. Fewer teachers, inadequate facilities, and limited access to modern technology mean that rural students have less exposure to the knowledge, skills, and pedagogical practices needed to succeed in the broader education system. As Bourdieu (2018c, 2018a, 2018b) explained, cultural capital inherited from family and environment plays a crucial role in shaping an individual's educational opportunities. Children from rural backgrounds who lack "legitimate" cultural capital (in the form of valued knowledge, ways of speaking, and behaviors aligned with school demands) will experience greater difficulty navigating an education system designed to benefit those who already possess such capital. This is consistent with empirical evidence from Indonesia, where studies highlight persistent gaps in educational quality between urban and rural areas due to uneven resource distribution and inadequate teacher training (Kawuryan et al., 2021; Sidauruk et al., 2025). Research also directly links family-based social and cultural capital to students' cognitive ability and educational outcomes within the Indonesian context, reinforcing Bourdieu's framework (Maunah, 2020).

In addition, the significant differences found between public and private schools in several aspects (e.g., the availability and quality of physical infrastructure) can also be analyzed through the lens of social capital. Although some findings indicate that problems in public schools are more prominent, it should be noted that in some areas, these problems also occur in private schools, albeit with lower intensity. This suggests that while private schools may have more flexibility in acquiring resources from specific social networks or connections (social capital), they are not entirely immune to broader structural challenges related to geographical location. Empirical studies in Indonesia have shown a complex picture regarding public versus private school effectiveness; for instance, some research indicates that public school graduates tend to achieve higher scores on national exit exams compared to private school graduates, even after controlling for student and family characteristics (Newhouse & Beegle, 2006). These findings reinforce that public schools in rural areas, which are often the primary choice for less affluent communities, become a focal point for the reproduction of inequality, where students are faced with resource limitations that systematically hinder their educational progress.

Althusser (2009), in his essay on Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs), argued that schools are one of the most important ISAs, functioning to reproduce capitalist relations of production by instilling dominant ideology and training individuals for their roles in society. In this context, the findings of this study show how schools, especially public schools in rural areas, can become an effective mechanism for reproducing inequality through their ideological function. Teacher shortages, poor facilities, and limited access to digital resources in rural schools can be seen as a manifestation of the state's failure to provide equitable infrastructure for all its citizens. This failure is not just an administrative problem, but also has ideological implications. Children who grow up in these limited educational environments may internalize ideas about their "proper" place in the social hierarchy. They may believe that their limitations are the result of "fate" or "lack of effort," when in fact they are the product of structural injustice disguised by the

ideology of meritocracy. Furthermore, the lack of access to digital technology, which is increasingly essential in the modern era, means that rural students fall behind in developing the skills needed to compete in a technology-dominated job market. This effectively prepares them for lower positions in the economic structure, thus reproducing class hierarchy. Empirical research in Indonesia indicates that digital transformation disproportionately benefits high-skilled workers, contributing to wage inequality and job polarization, where those with limited digital access are left behind (Wihardja et al., 2024). Althusser would argue that this condition serves to normalize inequality, making it seem natural and inevitable, thereby maintaining the stability of the capitalist system.

In addition to Bourdieu and Althusser, other left-leaning educational thinkers have also put forward similar criticisms of the education system. Bowles et al. (1976) argued that schools function to adapt students to their roles in the capitalist workplace hierarchy, teaching them obedience, discipline, and acceptance of authority. The findings of this study, especially regarding resource limitations in rural schools, can be interpreted as part of this "matching" process. A lack of resources may encourage students to accept existing conditions, limit their aspirations, and prepare them for jobs that do not require high skills, which in turn perpetuates economic inequality. This "correspondence principle" posits that the social relations of education mirror those of production, thereby instilling traits like subordination and motivation by external rewards necessary for the capitalist labor force (Bowles, 1971). Freire (2020), with his concept of "problem-posing education" and his critique of the "banking concept of education," would highlight how the conditions found in this study hinder students' potential for liberation. Education limited by a lack of resources and quality teachers tends to be "banking-style," where teachers fill students' minds with information without encouraging critical thinking or awareness of their social conditions. This reinforces helplessness and prevents students from becoming agents of change in their own lives and society.

Conclusion

The research findings comprehensively illustrate how educational inequality in Indonesia, particularly concerning geographical location and school status, aligns with theories of social reproduction. Disparities in teacher availability, physical infrastructure, and digital resources systematically disadvantage students in rural areas, especially within public schools. This is not merely an issue of efficiency or resource allocation; rather, it's a manifestation of deeper mechanisms that perpetuate social and economic hierarchies. Addressing this inequality necessitates comprehensive policy interventions that not only focus on providing resources but also critically examine the underlying structures and ideologies of the education system, consistent with the analyses of left-leaning thinkers who seek to understand and challenge the reproduction of injustice in society.

References

Afrianti, N., & Aditia, R. (2020). Online learning readiness in facing the Covid-19 pandemic at MTS Manunggal Sagara Ilmi, Deli Serdang, Indonesia. *Journal of International Conference Proceedings*, *3*(2), 59–66. https://doi.org/10.32535/jicp.v0i0.905

Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, *6*(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587

Apple, M. W. (2017). *Cultural and economic reproduction in education: Essays on class, ideology and the state* (Vol. 53). London: Routledge.

Arends, R. I. (2012). *Learning to teach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Asrowi, A., Hadaya, A., & Hanif, M. (2019). The impact of using the interactive e-book on students' learning outcomes. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(2), 709–722. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12245a

Bourdieu, P. (2018a). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In R. Brown (Ed.), *Knowledge, education, and cultural change* (pp. 71–112). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351018142

Bourdieu, P. (2018b). Distinction a social critique of the judgement of taste. In D. Grusky (Ed.), *Inequality: Classic readings in race, class, and gender* (pp. 287–318). Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (2018c). The forms of capital. In *The sociology of economic life* (pp. 78–92). New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429499838

Bowles, S. (1971). Class power and mass education: A study of social structure and resource allocation in schooling. *Harvard Educational Reviews, 41*(4), 472-501.

Bowles, S., Gintis, H., & others. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America* (Vol. 57). New York: Basic Books.

Cole, M. (2007). *Marxism and educational theory: Origins and issues*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203397329

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational reserach: Planning, conducting and evaluating* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London: Sage publications.

Fisher, R. A. (1922). On the interpretation of χ 2 from contingency tables, and the calculation of P. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, *85*(1), 87–94. https://doi.org/10.2307/2340521

Freire, P. (2020). Pedagogy of the oppressed. In J. Beck, C. Jenks, N. Keddie, & M. F. D. Young (Eds.), *Toward a sociology of education* (pp. 374–386). New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429339530

Gordon, C. A., & Cicchetti, R. (2023). New perspectives of equity, access, and meaningful use of school library resources and services. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *98*(1), 100–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2023.2160117

Kawuryan, S. P., Sayuti, S. A., Aman, A., & Dwiningrum, S. I. A. (2021). Teachers quality and educational equality achievements in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction*, *14*(2), 811–830. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14245a

Kharizmi, M. (2015). Kesulitan siswa sekolah dasar dalam meningkatkan kemampuan literasi. *JUPENDAS (Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar)*, *2*(2), 11-21.

Kormos, E. M. (2018). The unseen digital divide: Urban, suburban, and rural teacher use and perceptions of web-based classroom technologies. *Computers in the Schools*, *35*(1), 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2018.1429168

Love, M. L., & Ewoldt, K. B. (2021). Implementing asynchronous instructional materials for students with learning disabilities. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *57*(2), 132–137. https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512211001847

Macasawang, E. M. A., Guimba, W. D., & Alico, J. C. (2019). Analysis on an English textbook for grade 7: Focus on compliance to the K-12 grade level standards and competencies. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, *2*(1), 41–51. https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1993.02.01.37

Maunah, B. (2020). Social and cultural capital and learners' cognitive ability: issues and prospects for educational relevance, access and equity towards digital communication in Indonesia. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, *11*(1), 163–191.

Newhouse, D., & Beegle, K. (2006). The effect of school type on academic achievement: Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Human Resources*, *41*(3), 529–557. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.753544

OECD. (2016). *Sampling in PISA*. Prague: OECD.

OECD. (2018a). Equity in education. In *Pisa*. OECD. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264073234-en

OECD. (2018b). *School questionnaire for PISA 2018 main survey version*.

Pratiwi, M. A., Suhartika, I. P., & Ginting, R. T. (2022). Identifikasi faktor-faktor penyebab kerusakan koleksi di perpustakaan dan strategi pencegahannya. *Jurnal Ilmiah Perpustakaan dan Informasi (JIPUS)*, *2*(1).

Selwyn, N. (2009). The 'new'connectivities of digital education. In M. W. Apple, S. J. Ball, & L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education* (pp. 90–98). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203863701

Shieh, J.-J., Reynolds, B. L., & Ha, X. V. (2023). Using a design-based approach to develop a checklist for evaluating preservice teacher learning materials. *TESOL Journal*, e717. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.717

Sidauruk, J. M., Susilowati, M., & Akbar, K. K. (2025). Indonesia's struggle with education inequality: Is reform the answer? *Indonesia Discourse*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.15294/indi.v2i1.23035

Siegel, S. (1956). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Stern, J. M. B., & Smith, T. M. (2016). Private secondary schools in Indonesia: What is driving the demand? *International Journal of Educational Development*, *46*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2015.11.002

Thamrin, T., Aditia, R., & Hutasuhut, S. (2023). Key factors to foster academic performance in online learning environment: Evidence from Indonesia during COVID-19 pandemic. *Cogent Education*, *10*(1), 0–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2174726

Wang, P.-Y. (2013). Examining the digital divide between rural and urban schools: Technology availability, teachers' integration level and students' perception. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, *2*(2), 127–139. https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v2n2p127

Wihardja, M. M., Pradana, A. T., Wibisana, P. S., & Swarnata, A. (2024). *The heterogeneous impacts of digital transformation and investment on Indonesia's labour market*. Jakarta: Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (ERIA).

Appendix A

			Lokasi sekolah												Total	
			A village, hamlet or rural area (fewer than 3 000 people)		A small town (3 000 to about 15 000 people)		A town (15 000 to about 100 000 people)		A city (100 000 to about 1 000 000 people)		A large city (1 000 000 to about 10 000 000 people)		A megacity (with over 10 000 000 people)			
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Instruction hindered by: A lack of teaching staf (RQ 1)	Public schools	Not at all	20	32.8%	38	46.3%	30	68.2%	17	47.2%	5	83.3%	4	57.1%	114	48.3%
		Very little	19	31.1%	29	35.4%	11	25.0%	17	47.2%	1	16.7%	3	42.9%	80	33.9%
		To some extent	9	14.8%	7	8.5%	1	2.3%	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	7.6%
		A lot	13	21.3%	8	9.8%	2	4.5%	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	24	10.2%
		Total	61	100.0%	82	100.0%	44	100.0%	36	100.0%	6	100.0%	7	100.0%	236	100.0%
	Private schools	Not at all	14	36.8%	28	56.0%	19	65.5%	15	60.0%	9	64.3%	12	85.7%	97	57.1%
		Very little	16	42.1%	15	30.0%	8	27.6%	7	28.0%	3	21.4%	1	7.1%	50	29.4%
		To some extent	3	7.9%	4	8.0%	2	6.9%	1	4.0%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	12	7.1%
		A lot	5	13.2%	3	6.0%	0	0.0%	2	8.0%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	11	6.5%
		Total	38	100.0%	50	100.0%	29	100.0%	25	100.0%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%	170	100.0%
Instruction hindered by: Inadequate or poorly qualified teaching staff (RQ 2)	Public schools	Not at all	30	49.2%	35	42.7%	26	59.1%	16	44.4%	3	50.0%	5	71.4%	115	48.7%
		Very little	20	32.8%	39	47.6%	15	34.1%	18	50.0%	3	50.0%	2	28.6%	97	41.1%
		To some extent	8	13.1%	2	2.4%	1	2.3%	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	5.1%

		A lot	3	4.9%	6	7.3%	2	4.5%	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	5.1%
		Total	61	100.0%	82	100.0%	44	100.0%	36	100.0%	6	100.0%	7	100.0%	236	100.0%
	Private schools	Not at all	14	36.8%	25	50.0%	15	51.7%	13	52.0%	5	35.7%	11	78.6%	83	48.8%
		Very little	18	47.4%	19	38.0%	11	37.9%	11	44.0%	7	50.0%	3	21.4%	69	40.6%
		To some extent	3	7.9%	2	4.0%	3	10.3%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	0	0.0%	10	5.9%
		A lot	3	7.9%	4	8.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	4.7%
		Total	38	100.0%	50	100.0%	29	100.0%	25	100.0%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%	170	100.0%
Instruction hindered by: A lack of educational material (e.g. textbooks, IT equipment, library or laboratory material) (RQ 3	Public schools	Not at all	18	29.5%	28	34.1%	19	43.2%	19	52.8%	1	16.7%	3	42.9%	88	37.3%
		Very little	19	31.1%	27	32.9%	17	38.6%	12	33.3%	2	33.3%	3	42.9%	80	33.9%
		To some extent	5	8.2%	12	14.6%	3	6.8%	4	11.1%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	25	10.6%
		A lot	19	31.1%	15	18.3%	5	11.4%	1	2.8%	2	33.3%	1	14.3%	43	18.2%
		Total	61	100.0%	82	100.0%	44	100.0%	36	100.0%	6	100.0%	7	100.0%	236	100.0%
	Private schools	Not at all	7	18.4%	14	28.0%	9	31.0%	6	24.0%	5	35.7%	9	64.3%	50	29.4%
		Very little	14	36.8%	13	26.0%	13	44.8%	12	48.0%	6	42.9%	3	21.4%	61	35.9%
		To some extent	8	21.1%	9	18.0%	4	13.8%	2	8.0%	2	14.3%	1	7.1%	26	15.3%
		A lot	9	23.7%	14	28.0%	3	10.3%	5	20.0%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	33	19.4%
		Total	38	100.0%	50	100.0%	29	100.0%	25	100.0%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%	170	100.0%
Instruction hindered by:	Public schools	Not at all	19	31.1%	25	30.5%	20	45.5%	18	50.0%	1	16.7%	3	42.9%	86	36.4%

Inadequate or poor quality educational material (e.g. textbooks, IT equipment, library or laboratory material) (RQ 4)		Very little	18	29.5%	33	40.2%	15	34.1%	14	38.9%	2	33.3%	3	42.9%	85	36.0%
		To some extent	7	11.5%	9	11.0%	3	6.8%	4	11.1%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	24	10.2%
		A lot	17	27.9%	15	18.3%	6	13.6%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	1	14.3%	41	17.4%
		Total	61	100.0%	82	100.0%	44	100.0%	36	100.0%	6	100.0%	7	100.0%	236	100.0%
	Private schools	Not at all	9	23.7%	12	24.0%	9	31.0%	7	28.0%	4	28.6%	10	71.4%	51	30.0%
		Very little	15	39.5%	17	34.0%	11	37.9%	10	40.0%	8	57.1%	2	14.3%	63	37.1%
		To some extent	7	18.4%	6	12.0%	6	20.7%	2	8.0%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	23	13.5%
		A lot	7	18.4%	15	30.0%	3	10.3%	6	24.0%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	33	19.4%
		Total	38	100.0%	50	100.0%	29	100.0%	25	100.0%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%	170	100.0%
Instruction hindered by: A lack of physical infrastructure (e.g. building, grounds, heating/cooling, lighting and acoustic systems) (RQ 5)	Public schools	Not at all	12	19.7%	25	30.5%	17	38.6%	19	52.8%	1	16.7%	4	57.1%	78	33.1%
		Very little	16	26.2%	32	39.0%	18	40.9%	14	38.9%	3	50.0%	2	28.6%	85	36.0%
		To some extent	12	19.7%	10	12.2%	6	13.6%	2	5.6%	1	16.7%	1	14.3%	32	13.6%
		A lot	21	34.4%	15	18.3%	3	6.8%	1	2.8%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	41	17.4%
		Total	61	100.0%	82	100.0%	44	100.0%	36	100.0%	6	100.0%	7	100.0%	236	100.0%
	Private schools	Not at all	8	21.1%	14	28.0%	10	34.5%	7	28.0%	6	42.9%	10	71.4%	55	32.4%
		Very little	14	36.8%	18	36.0%	11	37.9%	12	48.0%	5	35.7%	0	0.0%	60	35.3%
		To some extent	2	5.3%	6	12.0%	4	13.8%	3	12.0%	2	14.3%	3	21.4%	20	11.8%

		A lot	14	36.8%	12	24.0%	4	13.8%	3	12.0%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	35	20.6%
		Total	38	100.0%	50	100.0%	29	100.0%	25	100.0%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%	170	100.0%
Instruction hindered by: Inadequate or poor quality physical infrastructure (e.g. building, grounds, heating/cooling, lighting and acoustic systems) (RQ 6)	Public schools	Not at all	15	24.6%	25	30.5%	17	38.6%	16	44.4%	1	16.7%	5	71.4%	79	33.5%
		Very little	18	29.5%	35	42.7%	20	45.5%	15	41.7%	1	16.7%	2	28.6%	91	38.6%
		To some extent	7	11.5%	13	15.9%	2	4.5%	4	11.1%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	27	11.4%
		A lot	21	34.4%	9	11.0%	5	11.4%	1	2.8%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	39	16.5%
		Total	61	100.0%	82	100.0%	44	100.0%	36	100.0%	6	100.0%	7	100.0%	236	100.0%
	Private schools	Not at all	9	23.7%	14	28.0%	10	34.5%	8	32.0%	6	42.9%	9	64.3%	56	32.9%
		Very little	14	36.8%	22	44.0%	9	31.0%	12	48.0%	5	35.7%	0	0.0%	62	36.5%
		To some extent	6	15.8%	6	12.0%	6	20.7%	1	4.0%	2	14.3%	3	21.4%	24	14.1%
		A lot	9	23.7%	8	16.0%	4	13.8%	4	16.0%	1	7.1%	2	14.3%	28	16.5%
		Total	38	100.0%	50	100.0%	29	100.0%	25	100.0%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%	170	100.0%
Instruction hindered by: A lack of [digital resources] (e.g. desktop or laptop computers, internet access, learning management systems or school learning platforms) (RQ 7)	Public schools	Not at all	12	19.7%	22	26.8%	19	43.2%	15	41.7%	1	16.7%	3	42.9%	72	30.5%
		Very little	18	29.5%	31	37.8%	12	27.3%	10	27.8%	4	66.7%	3	42.9%	78	33.1%
		To some extent	7	11.5%	11	13.4%	9	20.5%	6	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	34	14.4%
		A lot	24	39.3%	18	22.0%	4	9.1%	5	13.9%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	52	22.0%
		Total	61	100.0%	82	100.0%	44	100.0%	36	100.0%	6	100.0%	7	100.0%	236	100.0%
	Private schools	Not at all	8	21.1%	17	34.0%	8	27.6%	8	32.0%	5	35.7%	7	50.0%	53	31.2%

		Very little	12	31.6%	19	38.0%	13	44.8%	11	44.0%	6	42.9%	4	28.6%	65	38.2%
		To some extent	6	15.8%	4	8.0%	4	13.8%	2	8.0%	1	7.1%	2	14.3%	19	11.2%
		A lot	12	31.6%	10	20.0%	4	13.8%	4	16.0%	2	14.3%	1	7.1%	33	19.4%
		Total	38	100.0%	50	100.0%	29	100.0%	25	100.0%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%	170	100.0%
Instruction hindered by: Inadequate or poor quality [digital resources] (e.g. desktop or laptop computers, internet access, learning management systems or school learning platforms) (RQ 8)	Public schools	Not at all	13	21.3%	25	30.5%	17	38.6%	12	33.3%	1	16.7%	3	42.9%	71	30.1%
		Very little	18	29.5%	22	26.8%	14	31.8%	15	41.7%	4	66.7%	3	42.9%	76	32.2%
		To some extent	7	11.5%	15	18.3%	5	11.4%	4	11.1%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	32	13.6%
		A lot	23	37.7%	20	24.4%	8	18.2%	5	13.9%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	57	24.2%
		Total	61	100.0%	82	100.0%	44	100.0%	36	100.0%	6	100.0%	7	100.0%	236	100.0%
	Private schools	Not at all	9	23.7%	16	32.0%	9	31.0%	6	24.0%	5	35.7%	8	57.1%	53	31.2%
		Very little	12	31.6%	21	42.0%	11	37.9%	12	48.0%	6	42.9%	3	21.4%	65	38.2%
		To some extent	6	15.8%	5	10.0%	5	17.2%	2	8.0%	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	20	11.8%
		A lot	11	28.9%	8	16.0%	4	13.8%	5	20.0%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%	32	18.8%
		Total	38	100.0%	50	100.0%	29	100.0%	25	100.0%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%	170	100.0%