

## **Innocenti Report Card No. 7**

### **Child Poverty in Perspective: an overview of child well-being in rich countries.**

#### CORRIGENDUM

This addendum/corrigendum has been issued to acknowledge updates in data presented in the Report Card no. 7, made available after the report was already in print. These updates do not substantially affect the overall picture neither the conclusions of the report which remain largely the same.

#### **Addendum**

France Following the completion of the research for Report Card 7, the French Ministry of Education informed IRC that the figure France had reported for the data source, 'OECD's Education at a Glance 2005' for percentage of 15-19 year-olds not in education, training or employment (Fig 3.3a) was erroneous. Removing the figure for France from the calculations places France 18<sup>th</sup> rather than 21<sup>st</sup> in the educational wellbeing dimension<sup>1</sup>

Belgium Following the completion of the research for Report Card 7, more recent data for Flanders, Belgium, suggests that the figures in the data source underestimate immunization rates used for the calculation of Fig 2.2: Percentage of children age 12-23 months immunized against the major vaccine-preventable diseases. Removing the figure for Belgium from the calculations, Belgium is placed 14<sup>th</sup> in the health and safety dimension<sup>1</sup>.

#### **Clarification**

P 5, box “the unit of measurement used on this scale is the standard deviation (a commonly used measure of dispersion)”.

To arrive at the z score, subtract the group (OECD countries) mean from the individual score (raw score), and divide the difference by the group (OECD countries) standard deviation. This process is also called normalisation.

#### **Corrigendum** (the correct wording is underlined)

P 3 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet ‘.. claiming the top third’

6<sup>th</sup> bullet ‘... including Austria, the United States and the United Kingdom’ – France would be deleted from the list following changes discussed in this note<sup>1</sup>.

P 4, box: indicator for households without jobs should read “- percentage of children in households without an employed adult”

---

<sup>1</sup> Following the issuing of the Innocenti Report Card and the changes acknowledged in this note for Belgium (Health and Safety), Denmark (Behaviours and Risks) and France (Educational Well-being), Denmark's rank becomes 6th instead of third, Belgium's 8th instead of 10th, and France shares a 14th position with Poland instead of 16th position. Because the changes to the individual dimensions also affect the ranking of other countries, the overall ranking is also somewhat affected, Canada has moved down one place and Austria and Portugal have changed places.

## **Innocenti Report Card No. 7**

### **Child Poverty in Perspective: an overview of child well-being in rich countries.**

P 6, Fig 1.2 heading should read “percentage of working-age households with children without an employed adult”

P 9, and in all further references to HBSC including box p 17, p 24, 46  
the correct reference should read “Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC), a WHO collaborative cross-national study”.

P 13, second column

“ .. the IMR is no longer a revealing indicator. But as Figure 2.1a shows, “

P 14, first column

“ ... earliest stage of life is the prevalence of low birth weight (Figure 2.1b)”

P 20 third column

“foot of the table – including Italy” as per discussion on data for France, see above

P 30, fig 5.2b “Percentage of students age 11. 13 and 15 who report having been drunk two or more times.” The correct figure for Denmark is 30.1 not 20.1 as shown. It would place Denmark between the UK (England) and Finland in the table 5.2b, and change the Danish position in the dimension from 6<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> (though the country remains above average).

P 30, fig 5.2c “Percentage of students age 15 who report having used cannabis in the last 12 months” – HBSC does not collect these data from 11 and 13 year olds.

P 40 “In the United States, for example, an annually-updated composite index of child well-being (based on 28 indicators) that has been in use for 30 years...which enables comparisons between states.“ The text refers to the Child Well-Being Index (CWI) hosted at Duke University under the auspices of the Foundation for Child Development (as discussed in Bradshaw et al (2006)) which releases an index based on 28 indicators, but has only done so since 2000 and does not do it at state level The KIDS COUNT Data Book has been ranking the states on the a set of child well-being indicators each year since 1990 (see [www.kidscount.org](http://www.kidscount.org))

P 42 ‘Reversed’: YES means that the indicator has been ‘reversed’ (-x) in the calculation of the dimension

## Innocenti Report Card No. 7

### Child Poverty in Perspective: an overview of child well-being in rich countries.

P 45

	Young people rating their health as fair or poor, aged 11, 13 and 15 yrs: 2001/02.	Young people with scores above the middle of the life satisfaction scale, aged 11, 13 and 15 yrs: 2001/02.	Students who strongly agree with the statement 'I feel like an outsider or left out of things' aged 15 yrs: 2003	Students who strongly agree with the statement 'I feel awkward and out of place' aged 15 yrs: 2003	Students who strongly agree with the statement 'I feel lonely' aged 15 yrs: 2003	Young people liking school a lot aged 11, 13, 15 years: 2001/02.
MEAN	14.1	<u>86.4</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>6.2</u>	23.3
STDDEV	3.5	<u>3.6</u>	1.7	<u>2.6</u>	<u>1.3</u>	8.1

These changes are only for descriptive purposes and do not affect the calculation of any tables or charts.

UNICEF IRC, 20 April 2007