

**PIRLS 2016 Field Test and Recruitment for Full Scale Response to Passback
(OMB# 1850-0645 v.8)**

OMB comment: NCES needs to beef up the incentive experiment discussion a lot. Right now, it doesn't explain the theory of action behind comparing \$200 and 2 ipad minis loaded with educational software – value? \$600-700? A much cleaner comparison would be two ways of delivering something of equal value, or offering two different values in the same way. Then, indicating that there is no power to detect differences means that this is just a qualitative test, with results gathered informally with no IC(?!). Basically, NCES is asking me to preapprove tripling the incentive based on anecdote. That's just not enough to justify tripling an incentive amount in my view.

NCES response: Since PIRLS is limited by the number of schools in this field test, and the desire was to test the typical monetary \$200 incentive against a popular/well recognize device with grade appropriate education software such as iPad mini (which does have a greater value than \$200), we do not have enough schools to do a three way experiment of comparing \$200 monetary incentive vs. a device with education software worth \$200 and vs. iPad mini with education software.

As a result, we took out the iPad school incentive experiment. The attached documents reflect the edits in tracked changes showing that all schools will receive \$200.