

**PISA 2009 Results: Learning Trends: Changes in Student Performance Since 2000 (Volume V)**

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264091580-en>

ISBN 978-92-64-09149-8 (print)

ISBN 978-92-64-09158-0 (PDF)

© OECD 2010

## Corrigenda

In each volume's figure entitled "A map of PISA countries and economies", Moldova should be included in the list of "Partner countries and economies in PISA 2009", Mauritius should have an asterisk after it, and the Dominican Republic should be removed from the list of "Partner countries in previous surveys".

### Page 27

The second sentence should read:

The first column provides information on whether reading performance in PISA 2009 was above (**light blue**), at (**dark blue**) or below (**medium blue**) the average for OECD countries.

### Page 29

*Figure V.1.2.*

The correct values for the United Kingdom are presented below:

	Mean score in reading 2009	Number of years for which PISA results are available	Reading	Mathematics	Science
United Kingdom	494	3	-0.3	-1.0	-0.4

### Page 63

*Figure V.3.4*

Countries are ranked **in descending order** of the percentage of students at proficiency Level 5 or above in mathematics in 2009.

**Page 65**

*Figure V.3.6*

The note should read:

Score point changes in science performance **between 2006 and 2009** that are statistically significant are marked in darker tone.

**Page 94**

*Figure V.5.7*

The left side legend is missing and should read:

**Change in the percentage of students who read fiction between 2000 and 2009**

**Page 99**

*Figure V.5.11*

The subtitle should read:

Percentage of students **agreeing or strongly agreeing with the following statements**

**Page 106**

In the last but one paragraph, the 7<sup>th</sup> sentence should read:

In Albania, Indonesia and Peru the share of students performing at level 2 **and below** fell by 14 to 15 percentage points.

**Page 157**

*Table V.3.2*

The Proficiency levels in PISA 2009 are missing. These results are presented below.

	Proficiency levels in PISA 2009			
	Below Level 2 (less than 420 score points)		Level 5 or above (above 607 score points)	
	%	S.E.	%	S.E.
<b>OECD</b>				
Australia	15.9	(0.7)	16.4	(0.9)
Austria	m	m	m	m
Belgium	19.1	(0.8)	20.4	(0.7)
Canada	11.5	(0.5)	18.3	(0.6)
Czech Republic	22.3	(1.1)	11.6	(0.9)
Denmark	17.1	(0.9)	11.6	(0.8)
Finland	7.8	(0.5)	21.7	(0.9)
France	22.5	(1.3)	13.7	(1.0)

Germany	18.6	(1.1)	17.8	(0.9)
Greece	30.3	(1.8)	5.7	(0.6)
Hungary	22.3	(1.5)	10.1	(1.1)
Iceland	17.0	(0.6)	13.6	(0.6)
Ireland	20.8	(1.0)	6.7	(0.6)
Italy	24.9	(0.6)	9.0	(0.5)
Japan	12.5	(1.0)	20.9	(1.2)
Korea	8.1	(1.0)	25.6	(1.6)
Luxembourg	23.9	(0.6)	11.4	(0.6)
Mexico	50.8	(1.0)	0.7	(0.1)
Netherlands	13.4	(1.4)	19.9	(1.5)
New Zealand	15.4	(0.9)	18.9	(0.9)
Norway	18.2	(0.9)	10.2	(0.7)
Poland	20.5	(1.1)	10.4	(0.9)
Portugal	23.7	(1.1)	9.6	(0.8)
Slovak Republic	21.0	(1.2)	12.7	(1.0)
Spain	23.7	(0.8)	8.0	(0.5)
Sweden	21.1	(1.0)	11.4	(0.8)
Switzerland	13.5	(0.8)	24.1	(1.4)
Turkey	42.1	(1.8)	5.6	(1.2)
United Kingdom	20.2	(0.9)	9.8	(0.7)
United States	23.4	(1.3)	9.9	(1.0)
OECD average-28	20.8	(0.2)	13.4	(0.2)
<b>Partners</b>				
Brazil	69.1	(1.2)	0.8	(0.2)
Hong Kong-China	8.8	(0.7)	30.7	(1.2)
Indonesia	76.7	(1.9)	0.1	(0.0)
Latvia	22.6	(1.4)	5.7	(0.6)
Liechtenstein	9.5	(1.8)	18.1	(2.4)
Macao-China	11.0	(0.5)	17.1	(0.5)
Russian Federation	28.6	(1.5)	5.2	(0.8)
Serbia	40.6	(1.4)	3.5	(0.5)
Thailand	52.5	(1.6)	1.3	(0.4)
Tunisia	73.6	(1.5)	0.3	(0.2)
Uruguay	47.6	(1.3)	2.4	(0.4)

## Pages 193 and 194

### *Tables S.V.g and S.V.h*

In last three rows, the non-adjudicated subnational results from PISA 2003 for the United Kingdom (England, Northern Ireland and Wales) cannot be calculated and thus should be replaced with “**m**” to stand for missing. Similarly, the change between 2003 and 2009 cannot be calculated for these regions, and thus should be replaced with an “**m**” as well.

**Page 196**

*Table S.V.j*

The title should read:

**Percentage of students below Level 2 and at Level 5 and above on the science scale in PISA 2006 and 2009**

The heading for last two columns should read:

**Change between 2006 and 2009 (PISA 2009 – PISA 2006)**

**Page 199**

*Table S.V.n*

The PISA 2009 values and the change between 2000 and 2009 should read as follows (corrected values appear in red in the table below):

S.V.n

**Percentage of students and reading performance by immigrant status in PISA 2000 and 2009**

	PISA 2000				PISA 2009				Change between 2000 and 2009 (PISA 2009 - PISA 2000)											
	Percentage of students with an immigrant background		Performance of native students		Performance of students with an immigrant background		Difference in performance between native students and students with an immigrant background		Change in the percentage of student with an immigrant background	Change in the performance difference between native students and students with an immigrant background										
	%	S.E.	Mean score	S.E.	Mean score	S.E.	Score dif.	S.E.												
<b>Adjudicated</b>																				
Belgium (Flemish Community)	7.1	(1.3)	541	(3.3)	432	(14.4)	109	(13.6)	9.0	(1.0)	526	(2.7)	457	(6.1)	70	(6.8)	1.9	(1.6)	-40	(15.2)
United Kingdom (Scotland)	2.2	(0.6)	528	(3.6)	495	(18.0)	33	(17.1)	4.0	(0.5)	503	(3.0)	486	(13.2)	18	(12.8)	1.7	(0.7)	-16	(21.3)
<b>Non-adjudicated</b>																				
Belgium (French Community)	18.3	(1.8)	495	(8.0)	409	(9.6)	86	(11.2)	22.1	(2.2)	508	(3.8)	448	(9.7)	60	(9.9)	3.8	(2.8)	-26	(14.9)

Note: Values that are statistically significant are indicated in bold (see Annex A3).  
See Table V.4.4 for national data.

**Page 200**

*Table S.V.p*

The title should read:

**Percentage of students reading for enjoyment in PISA 2000 and PISA 2009, by gender**

The subtitle should read:

**Results based on students' self-reports**

**Page 202**

*Table S.V.s*

The title should read:

**Reading performance of students who read fiction in PISA 2000 and PISA 2009**

The subtitle should read:

**Results based on students' self-reports**