

## Corrigenda

### Chapter 14,

#### **Figure 14.1 Attained school response rates, P.281**

The data point labelled as United Kingdom corresponds to the union of England, Wales and the Northern Ireland ('QUK') and not the United Kingdom as a whole. The label "United Kingdom" and the corresponding diamond should not appear in the figure.

#### **P.282**

*For the following sections, unweighted response rates were used instead of weighted response rates that should be used according to the Technical Standards.*

The first paragraph should read:

"Two countries – the Netherlands and the United States – failed to meet the school response rate requirements. Four other countries, Belgium, Hong Kong-China, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, had a response rate below the 85% level before the replacement but cleared the acceptable level after the replacement schools were included."

The second paragraph should read:

"After reviewing the sampling outcomes, the international contractor asked the Netherlands and the United States to provide additional data that would assist it in making a balanced judgement about the threat of non-response to the accuracy of inferences that could be made from their PISA data."

#### **P.283**

The section on Belgium should read:

"Belgium had a school response rate before replacements of 84.43%. After replacement the response rate was 96.64% which was above the PISA standard."

The section on the *Flemish Community* should read:

"The Flemish Community had a school response rate before replacements of 79.86%. After replacement the response rate was 96.23% which was above the PISA standard."

The section on Canada should read.

"There was a total of 6.38% exclusions in Canada, mainly special needs students. Canada's data were, therefore, included in the final database."

**P.284**

Sections about Denmark, Iceland and Poland should be removed.

The section on Estonia should read:

“There was a total of 5.80% exclusions in Estonia, mainly special needs students. Estonia’s data were, therefore, included in the final database.”

The section on Hong Kong-China should read:

“Hong Kong had a school response rate before replacements of 78.70%. After replacement the response rate was 94.12% which was above the PISA standard. Fewer than 150 schools participated (147), but this was deemed to be acceptable and Hong Kong’s data were included in the international database.”

The section on Luxembourg should read:

“There was a total of 8.40% exclusions in Luxembourg. After discounting for students who had spoken the language of instruction for less than one year, the rate was 6.91%. Therefore the level of exclusion did not threaten the validity of the data that were included in the international database.”

The section on the Netherlands should read:

“The Netherlands had a school response rate before replacements of 75.33%. After replacement the response rate was 89.38% which did not meet the PISA standard. There were also fewer than 4500 students assessed (4434). Additional analysis supported the case that no notable bias would result from non-response. The data from the Netherlands, therefore, were included in the international database.”

The section on New Zealand should read:

“New Zealand had a school response rate before replacements of 80.85%. After replacement the response rate was 89.33% which was above the PISA standard. Data were included in the international database.”

The section on Norway should read:

“There was a total of 6.11% exclusions in Norway. After discounting for students who had been speaking Norwegian for less than one year, the rate was 4.79%. Data were included in the final database.”

**P.285**

The section on Sweden should read:

“There was a total of 5.44% exclusions in Sweden. After discounting for students who had been instructed in Swedish for less than one year, the rate was 3.88%. Data were included in the final database.”

The section on the United Kingdom should read:

“There was a total of 5.43% exclusions in the United Kingdom. After discounting students who had been instructed in English for less than one year, the rate was 4.99%. Data were included in the final database.

The United Kingdom had a school response rate before replacements of 80.06%. After replacement the response rate was 89.23% which was above the PISA standard.”

The section on the United States should read:

“There was a total of 5.35% exclusions in the United States. After discounting students who had been instructed in English for less than one year, the rate was 4.55%.

The United States had a school response rate of 67.09% before replacements and 77.21% after replacements. Thus the school response rate standard was not met. The data from the United States, therefore, were included in the international database.”