



2005/ED/EFA/MRT/PI/21

Background paper prepared for the  
Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2005  
*The Quality Imperative*

## **Economic analysis of school quality**

Eric A. Hanushek  
2004

This paper was commissioned by the *Education for All Global Monitoring Report* as background information to assist in drafting the 2005 report. It has not been edited by the team. The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to the *EFA Global Monitoring Report* or to UNESCO. The papers can be cited with the following reference: "Paper commissioned for the *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005, The Quality Imperative*". For further information, please contact [efareport@unesco.org](mailto:efareport@unesco.org)

# Economic Analysis of School Quality

Eric A. Hanushek\*

April 2004

Paper prepared for the  
*Education for All Global Monitoring Report*

## *abstract*

*Most empirical analyses of human capital have concentrated solely on the quantity of schooling attained by individuals, ignoring quality differences. This focus contrasts sharply with policy considerations that almost exclusively consider school quality issues. This paper presents basic evidence about the impact of school quality on individual earnings and on economic growth. In assessing these effects, special attention is given to variations across countries at different levels of development.*

---

\* Hoover Institution, Stanford University; University of Texas at Dallas; and National Bureau of Economic Research.

# Economic Analysis of School Quality

By Eric A. Hanushek

Economists have devoted considerable attention to understanding how human capital affects a variety of economic outcomes. The underlying notion is that individuals make investment decisions in themselves through schooling and other routes. The accumulated skills that are relevant for the labor market from these investments over time represent an important component of the human capital of an individual. The investments made to improve skills then return future economic benefits in much the same way that a firm's investment in a set of machines (physical capital) returns future production and income. In the case of public education, parents and public officials act as trustees for their children in setting many aspects of the investment paths.

In looking at human capital and its implications for future outcomes, economists are frequently agnostic about where these skills come from or how they are produced. Although we return to that below, it is commonly presumed that formal schooling is one of several important contributors to the skills of an individual and to human capital. It is not the only factor. Parents, individual abilities, and friends undoubtedly contribute. Schools nonetheless have a special place because they are most directly affected by public policies. For this reason, we frequently emphasize the role of schools.

The human capital perspective immediately makes it evident that the real issues are ones of long-run outcomes. Future incomes of individuals are related to their past investments. It is not their income while in school or their income in their first job. Instead, it is their income over the course of their working life.

The distribution of income in the economy similarly involves both the mixture of people in the economy and the pattern of their incomes over their lifetime. Specifically, most measures

of how income and well-being vary in the population do not take into account the fact that some of the low-income people have low incomes only because they are just beginning a career. Their lifetime income is likely to be much larger as they age, gain experience, and move up in their firms and career. What is important is that any noticeable effects of the current quality of schooling on the distribution of skills and income will only be realized years in the future, when those currently in school become a significant part of the labor force. In other words, most workers in the economy were educated years and even decades in the past—and they are the ones that have the most impact on current levels of productivity and growth, if for no reason other than that they represent the larger share of active workers.

Much of the early and continuing development of empirical work on human capital concentrates on the role of school attainment, that is, the quantity of schooling. The revolution in the United States during the twentieth century was universal schooling. This has spread around the world, encompassing both developed and developing countries. Quantity of schooling is easily measured, and data on years attained, both over time and across individuals, are readily available.

Today, however, policy concerns in most corners of the world revolve much more around issues of quality than issues of quantity.

## **Impacts of Quality on Individual Incomes—Developed Countries**

One of the challenges in understanding the impact of quality differences in human capital has been simply knowing how to measure quality. Much of the discussion of quality—in part related to new efforts to provide better accountability—has identified cognitive skills as the important dimension. And, while there is ongoing debate about the testing and measurement of these skills, most parents and policy makers alike accept the notion that cognitive skills are a key dimension of schooling outcomes. The question is whether this proxy for school quality—

students' performance on standardized tests—is correlated with individuals' performance in the labor market and the economy's ability to grow. Until recently, little comprehensive data have been available to show any relationship between differences in cognitive skills and any related economic outcomes. Such data are now becoming available.

Much of the work by economists on differences in worker skills has actually been directed at the issue of determining the average labor market returns to additional schooling and the possible influence of differences in ability. The argument has been that higher-ability students are more likely to continue in schooling. Therefore, part of the higher earnings observed for those with additional schooling really reflects pay for added ability and not for the additional schooling. Economists have pursued a variety of analytical approaches for dealing with this, including adjusting for measured cognitive test scores, but this work generally ignores issues of variation in school quality.\*

There is mounting evidence that quality measured by test scores is directly related to individual earnings, productivity, and economic growth. A variety of researchers documents that the earnings advantages to higher achievement on standardized tests are quite substantial.† While these analyses emphasize different aspects of individual earnings, they typically find that measured achievement has a clear impact on earnings after allowing for differences in the

---

\* The approaches have included looking for circumstances where the amount of schooling is affected by things other than the student's valuation of continuing and considering the income differences among twins (see Card (1999)). The various adjustments for ability differences typically make small differences on the estimates of the value of schooling, and Heckman and Vytlačil (2001) argue that it is not possible to separate the effects of ability and schooling. The only explicit consideration of school quality typically investigates expenditure and resource differences across schools, but these are known to be poor measures of school quality differences (Hanushek (2002)). Early discussion of ability bias can be found in Griliches (1974).

† These results are derived from different specific approaches, but the basic underlying analysis involves estimating a standard "Mincer" earnings function and adding a measure of individual cognitive skills. This approach relates the logarithm of earnings to years of schooling, experience, and other factors that might yield individual earnings differences. The clearest analyses are found in the following references (which are analyzed in Hanushek (2002)). See Bishop (1989, (1991); O'Neill (1990); Grogger and Eide (1993); Blackburn and Neumark (1993, (1995); Murnane, Willett, and Levy (1995); Neal and Johnson (1996); Mulligan (1999); Murnane et al. (2000); Altonji and Pierret (2001); Murnane et al. (2001); and Lazear (2003).

quantity of schooling, the experiences of workers, and other factors that might also influence earnings. In other words, higher quality as measured by tests similar to those currently being used in accountability systems around the country is closely related to individual productivity and earnings.

Three recent U.S. studies provide direct and quite consistent estimates of the impact of test performance on earnings (Mulligan (1999); Murnane et al. (2000); Lazear (2003)). These studies employ different nationally representative data sets that follow students after they leave schooling and enter the labor force. When scores are standardized, they suggest that one standard deviation increase in mathematics performance at the end of high schools translates into 12 percent higher annual earnings.

Murnane et al. (2000) provide evidence from the High School and Beyond and the National Longitudinal Survey of the High School Class of 1972. Their estimates suggest some variation with males obtaining a 15 percent increase and females a 10 percent increase per standard deviation of test performance. Lazear (2003), relying on a somewhat younger sample from NELS88, provides a single estimate of 12 percent. These estimates are also very close to those in Mulligan (1999), who finds 11 percent for the normalized AFQT score in the NLSY data. By way of comparison, estimates of the value of an additional year of school attainment are typically 7-10 percent.

There are reasons to believe that these estimates provide a lower bound on the impact of higher achievement. First, these estimates are obtained fairly early in the work career (mid20's to early 30s), and other analysis suggests that the impact of test performance becomes larger with experience.<sup>‡</sup> Second, the labor market experiences that are observed begin the mid1980's and extend into the mid1990s, but other evidence suggests that the value of skills and of schooling has

---

<sup>‡</sup> Altonji and Pierret (2001) find that the impact of achievement grows with experience, because the employer has a chance to observe the performance of workers.

grown throughout and past that period. Third, future general improvements in productivity are likely to lead to larger returns to skill.<sup>§</sup>

A limited number of additional studies are available for developed countries outside of the United States. McIntosh and Vignoles (2001) study wages in the United Kingdom and find strong returns to both numeracy and literacy.<sup>\*\*</sup> Finnie and Meng (2002) and Green and Riddell (2003) investigate returns to cognitive skills in Canada. Both suggest that literacy has a significant return, but Finnie and Meng (2002) find an insignificant return to numeracy. This latter finding stands at odds with most other analyses that have emphasized numeracy or math skills.

Another part of the return to school quality comes through continuation in school.<sup>††</sup> There is substantial U.S. evidence that students who do better in school, either through grades or scores on standardized achievement tests, tend to go farther in school.<sup>‡‡</sup> Murnane et al. (2000) separate

---

<sup>§</sup> These analyses typically compare workers of different ages at one point in time to obtain an estimate of how earnings will change for any individual. If, however, productivity improvements occur in the economy, these will tend to raise the earnings of individuals over time. Thus, the impact of improvements in student skills are likely to rise over the work life instead of being constant as portrayed here.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Because they look at discrete levels of skills, it is difficult to compare the quantitative magnitudes directly to the U.S. work.

<sup>††</sup> Much of the work by economists on differences in worker skills has actually been directed at the issue of determining the average labor market returns to additional schooling. The argument has been that higher-ability students are more likely to continue in schooling. Therefore, part of the higher earnings observed for those with additional schooling really reflects pay for added ability and not for the additional schooling. Economists have pursued a variety of analytical approaches for dealing with this, including adjusting for measured cognitive test scores, but this work generally ignores issues of variation in school quality. The approaches have included looking for circumstances where the amount of schooling is affected by things other than the student's valuation of continuing and considering the income differences among twins (see Card (1999)). The various adjustments for ability differences typically make small differences on the estimates of the value of schooling, and Heckman and Vytlačil (2001) argue that it is not possible to separate the effects of ability and schooling. The only explicit consideration of school quality typically investigates expenditure and resource differences across schools, but these are known to be poor measures of school quality differences (Hanushek (2002)).

<sup>‡‡</sup> See, for example, Dugan (1976); Manski and Wise (1983)). Rivkin (1995) finds that variations in test scores capture a considerable proportion of the systematic variation in high school completion and in college continuation, so that test score differences can fully explain black-white differences in schooling. Bishop (1991) and Hanushek, Rivkin, and Taylor (1996), in considering the factors that influence school attainment, find that individual achievement scores are highly correlated with continued school attendance. Neal and Johnson (1996) in part use the impact of achievement differences of blacks and whites on school

the direct returns to measured skill from the indirect returns of more schooling and suggest that perhaps one-third to one-half of the full return to higher achievement comes from further schooling. Note also that the effect of quality improvements on school attainment incorporates concerns about drop out rates. Specifically, higher student achievement keeps students in school longer, which will lead among other things to higher graduation rates at all levels of schooling.

This work has not, however, investigated how achievement affects the ultimate outcomes of additional schooling. For example, if over time lower-achieving students tend increasingly to attend further schooling, these schools may be forced to offer more remedial courses, and the variation of what students know and can do at the end of school may expand commensurately.

The impact of test performance on individual earnings provides a simple summary of the primary economic rewards to an individual. This estimate combines the impacts on hourly wages and on employment/hours worked. It does not include any differences in fringe benefits or nonmonetary aspects of jobs. Nor does it make any allowance for aggregate changes in the labor market that might occur over time.

## **Impacts of Quality on Individual Incomes—Developing Countries**

Questions remain about whether the clear impacts of quality in the U.S. generalize to other countries, particularly developing countries. The literature on returns to cognitive skills in developing countries is restricted to a relatively limited number of countries: Ghana, Kenya, Morocco, Pakistan, South Africa, and Tanzania. Moreover, a number of studies actually employ the same basic data, albeit with different analytical approaches, but come up with somewhat different results.

---

attainment to explain racial differences in incomes. Their point estimates of the impact of cognitive skills (AFQT) on earnings and school attendance appear to be roughly comparable to that found in Murnane et al. (2000). Behrman et al. (1998) find strong achievement effects on both continuation into college and quality of college; moreover, the effects are larger when proper account is taken of the various determinants of achievement. Hanushek and Pace (1995) find that college completion is significantly related to higher test scores at the end of high school.

Table 1 provides a simple summary to the quantitative estimates available for developing countries.

The summary of the evidence permits a tentative conclusion that the returns to quality may be even larger in developing countries than in developed countries. This of course would be consistent with the range of estimates for returns to quantity of schooling (e.g., Psacharopoulos (1994)), which are frequently interpreted as indicating diminishing marginal returns to schooling.

There are some reasons for caution in interpreting the precise magnitude of estimates. First, the estimates appear to be quite sensitive to the estimation methodology itself. Both within individual studies and across studies using the same basic data, the results are quite sensitive to the techniques employed in uncovering the fundamental parameter for cognitive skills.<sup>§§</sup> Second, the evidence on variations within developing countries is not entirely clear. For example, Jolliffe (1998) finds little impact of skills on farm income, while Behrman, Ross, and Sabot (forthcoming 2004) suggest an equivalence across sectors at least on theoretical grounds.

Nonetheless, the overall summary is that the available estimates of the impact of cognitive skills on outcomes suggest strong economic returns within developing countries. The substantial magnitude of the typical estimates indicates that quality concerns are very real for developing countries and that this aspect of schools simply cannot be ignored – a topic that comes up below.

## **Impacts of Quality on Economic Growth**

The relationship between measured labor force quality and economic growth is perhaps even more important than the impact of human capital and school quality on individual productivity and incomes. Economic growth determines how much improvement will occur in the overall standard of living of society. Moreover, the education of each individual has the

---

<sup>§§</sup> The sensitivity to estimation approach is not always the case; see, for example, Jolliffe (1998). A critique and interpretation of the alternative approaches within a number of these studies can be found in Glewwe (2002).

possibility of making others better off (in addition to the individual benefits just discussed). Specifically, a more educated society may lead to higher rates of invention; may make everybody more productive through the ability of firms to introduce new and better production methods; and may lead to more rapid introduction of new technologies. These externalities provide extra reason for being concerned about the quality of schooling.

The potential effect of differences in growth rates on economic well-being is easy to see. Figure 1 begins with the value of gross domestic product (GDP) per capita for a medium income country in the year 2000 and shows its value in 2050 under different growth rates. If it grows at one percent each year, this measure (in U.S. dollars) would increase from \$5,500 to \$9,000 – or increasing by almost two-thirds over the period. If it were to grow at two percent per year, it would reach \$15,000 in 2050! Small differences in growth rates have huge implications for the income and wealth of society.

The current economic position of the United States, for example, is largely the result of its strong and steady growth over the twentieth century. Economists have developed a variety of models and ideas to explain differences in growth rates across countries – invariably featuring the importance of human capital.\*\*\*

The empirical work supporting growth analyses has emphasized school attainment differences across countries. Again, this is natural because, while compiling comparable data on many things for different countries is difficult, assessing quantity of schooling is more straightforward. The typical study finds that quantity of schooling is highly related to economic growth rates. But, quantity of schooling is a very crude measure of the knowledge and cognitive skills of people – particularly in an international context.

---

\*\*\* Barro and Sala-I-Martin (1995) review recent analyses and the range of factors that are included.

Hanushek and Kimko (2000) go beyond simple quantity of schooling and delve into quality of schooling.<sup>†††</sup> We incorporate the information about international differences in mathematics and science knowledge that has been developed through testing over the past four decades. And we find a remarkable impact of differences in school quality on economic growth.

The international comparisons of quality come from piecing together results of a series of tests administered over the past four decades. In 1963 and 1964, the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) administered the first of a series of mathematics tests to a voluntary group of countries. These initial tests suffered from a number of problems, but they did prove the feasibility of such testing and set in motion a process to expand and improve on the undertaking.<sup>‡‡‡</sup>

Subsequent testing, sponsored by the IEA and others, has included both math and science and has expanded on the group of countries that have been tested. In each, the general model has been to develop a common assessment instrument for different age groups of students and to work at obtaining a representative group of students taking the tests. An easy summary of the participating countries and their test performance is found in figure 2. This figure tracks performance aggregated across the age groups and subject area of the various tests and scaled to a common test mean of 50.<sup>§§§</sup> The United States and the United Kingdom are the only countries to participate in all of the testing.

---

<sup>†††</sup> Barro and Lee (2001) provide an analysis of qualitative differences that also includes literacy.

<sup>‡‡‡</sup> The problems included issues of developing an equivalent test across countries with different school structure, curricula, and language; issues of selectivity of the tested populations; and issues of selectivity of the nations that participated. The first tests did not document or even address these issues in any depth.

<sup>§§§</sup> The details of the tests and aggregation can be found in Hanushek and Kimko (2000) and Hanushek and Kim (1995). This figure excludes the earliest administration and runs through the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) (1995). Other international tests have been given and are not included in the figure. First, reading and literacy tests have been given in 1991 and very recently. The difficulty of unbiased testing of reading across languages plus the much greater attention attached to math and science both in the literature on individual earnings and in the theoretical growth literature led to the decision not to include these test results in the empirical analysis. Second, the more recent follow-up to the 1995 TIMSS in math and science (given in 1999) is excluded from the figure simply for presentational reasons.

There is some movement across time of country performance on the tests, but for the one country that can be checked—the United States—the pattern is consistent with other data. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in the United States is designed to follow performance of U.S. students for different subjects and ages. NAEP performance over this period, shown in Appendix Figure A1, also exhibits a sizable dip in the seventies, a period of growth in the eighties, and a leveling off in the nineties.

Kimko’s and my analysis of economic growth is very straightforward. We combine all of the available earlier test scores into a single composite measure of quality and consider statistical models that explain differences in growth rates across nations during the period 1960 to 1990.<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> The basic statistical models, which include the initial level of income, the quantity of schooling, and population growth rates, explain a substantial portion of the variation in economic growth across countries.

Most important, the quality of the labor force as measured by math and science scores is extremely important. One standard deviation difference on test performance is related to 1 percent difference in annual growth rates of gross domestic product (GDP) per capita.<sup>††††</sup>

This quality effect, while possibly sounding small, is actually very large and significant. Because the added growth compounds, it leads to powerful effects on national income and on societal well-being. One needs only to return to the calculations presented in Figure 1 to understand the impact of such skill based improvements in economic growth.

---

<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> We exclude the two TIMSS tests from 1995 and 1999 because they were taken outside of the analytical period on economic growth. We combine the test measures over the 1965–1991 period into a single measure for each country. The underlying objective is to obtain a measure of quality for the labor force in the period during which growth is measured.

<sup>††††</sup> The details of this work can be found in Hanushek and Kimko (2000) and Hanushek (2003b). Importantly, adding other factors potentially related to growth, including aspects of international trade, private and public investment, and political instability, leaves the effects of labor force quality unchanged.

## Importance of quality

The frequent focus of governmental programs has been increasing school attainment and expanding on the years of schooling of the population. The previous discussion, however, highlights the central importance of quality. While years of schooling attainment are important, that holds only if quality is maintained.

The impact of improved quality can be calculated from the considerations of how quality affects growth rates for economies. Consider the effects of beginning a successful school improvement program in 2005. Of course school reform takes time. And, even if successful, it takes some time before the school graduates work their way into the labor force and thus some time before the impact will be felt.

Figure 3 illustrates the impact that reform could be expected to have over time if it is successful at achieving moderately strong knowledge improvement (corresponding to a 0.5 standard deviation increase in test score achievement).<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> The curves sketch out the path of GDP improvement that would occur with a reform plan that reaches its improvement goal within 10, 20, or 30 years.

Consider just the slow improvement of schools over a 30-year period. In 2040, the GDP would be almost four percent higher than projected without the schooling reforms. Of course, faster reforms would yield even greater gains in GDP. This magnitude would cover total school spending in most countries of the world.

## Causality

One common concern in analysis such as this is that schooling might not be the actual cause of growth but, in fact, may just reflect other attributes of the economy that are beneficial to

---

<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> These calculations are calibrated to scores on international mathematics and science exams. The “moderately strong” improvement implies an increase in scores by 0.5 standard deviations across the international comparisons. This is equivalent of bringing a country at the 31<sup>st</sup> percentile of performance up to the median for the world.

growth. For example, as seen in figure 2, the East Asian countries consistently score very highly on the international tests, and they also had extraordinarily high growth over the 1960–1990 period. It may be that other aspects of these East Asian economies have driven their growth and that the statistical analysis of labor force quality simply is picking out these countries. But in fact, even if the East Asian countries are excluded from the analysis, a strong—albeit slightly smaller—relationship is still observed with test performance. This test of sensitivity of the results seems to reflect a basic importance of school quality, a factor that contributes also to the observed growth of East Asian countries.

Another concern might be that other factors that affect growth, such as efficient market organizations, are also associated with efficient and productive schools—so that, again, the test measures are really a proxy for other attributes of the country. In order to investigate this, we concentrate on immigrants to the United States who received their education in their home countries. We find that immigrants who were schooled in countries that have higher scores on the international math and science examinations earn more in the United States. This analysis makes allowance for any differences in school attainment, labor market experience, or being native English-language speakers. In other words, skill differences as measured by the international tests are clearly rewarded in the United States labor market, reinforcing the validity of the tests as a measure of individual skills and productivity.

Finally, the observed relationships could simply reflect reverse causality, that is, that countries that are growing rapidly have the resources necessary to improve their schools and that better student performance is the result of growth, not the cause of growth. As a simple test of this, we investigated whether the international math and science test scores were systematically related to the resources devoted to the schools in the years prior to the tests. They were not. If anything, we found relatively better performance in those countries spending less on their schools.

In sum, the relationship between math and science skills on the one hand and productivity and growth on the other comes through clearly when investigated in a systematic manner across countries. This finding underscores the importance of high-quality schooling.

## **Why Has U.S. Growth Been So Strong?**

Figure 2 on international test score differences does introduce an important issue of interpretation. Namely, the U.S. has not been competitive on an international level in terms of tests. It has scored below the median of countries taking the various tests. Moreover, this figure – which combines scores across different age groups – disguises the fact that performance on tests of U.S. students is much stronger at young ages but falls off dramatically at the end of high school (Hanushek (2003b)).

Earlier, we introduced the discussion of the importance of growth by recounting America's successful economic growth during the twentieth century. Yet, looking at figure 2, we see that the United States has been at best mediocre in mathematics and science ability. Regardless of the set of countries taking the test, the United States has performed in the middle of the pack or below. Some people find this anomalous. How could math and science ability be important in light of the strong U.S. growth over a long period of time?

The answer is that quality of the labor force is just one aspect of the economy that enters into the determination of growth. A variety of factors clearly contribute, and these factors work to overcome any deficits in quality. These other factors may also be necessary for growth. In other words, simply providing more or higher-quality schooling may yield little in the way of economic growth in the absence of other elements, such as the appropriate market, legal, and governmental institutions to support a functioning modern economy. Past experiences investing in less developed countries that lack these institutional features demonstrates that schooling is not itself a sufficient engine of growth.

Indeed, some have questioned the precise role of schooling in growth. Easterly (2002),

for example, notes that education without other facilitating factors such as functioning institutions for markets and legal systems may not have much impact. He argues that World Bank investments in schooling for less developed countries that do not ensure that the other attributes of modern economies are in place have been quite unproductive. As discussed below, schooling clearly interacts with other factors, and these other factors have been important in supporting U.S. growth. They are also surely relevant for other countries.

It is useful to describe some of the other contributing factors to U.S. growth. This is done in part to understand more fully the character of economic growth, but more importantly to highlight some important related issues that are central to thinking about human capital policies.

### **A. Economic Structure**

Almost certainly the most important factor sustaining the growth of the U.S. economy is the openness and fluidity of its markets. The United States maintains generally freer labor and product markets than most countries in the world. The government generally has less regulation on firms (both in terms of labor regulations and in terms of overall production), and trade unions are less extensive than those in many other countries. Even broader, the United States has less intrusion of government in the operation of the economy—not only less regulation but also lower tax rates and minimal government production through nationalized industries. These factors encourage investment, permit the rapid development of new products and activities by firms, and allow U.S. workers to adjust to new opportunities. While identifying the precise importance of these factors is difficult, a variety of analyses suggest that such market differences could be very important explanations for differences in growth rates. <sup>§§§§</sup>

Because of the generally favorable institutional conditions, U.S. growth has been strong, even if some of the underlying factors are not as competitive. In other words, the economic

---

<sup>§§§§</sup> See, for example, Krueger (1974); World Bank (1993); Parente and Prescott (1994, (1999).

structure can mask problems within the economy. But this does not negate the fact that improving our schools and the quality of our labor force would enhance growth and incomes.

### ***B. Substitution of Quantity for Quality***

Over the twentieth century, the expansion of the education system in the United States outpaced that around the world. The United States pushed to open secondary schools to all citizens. With this came also a move to expand higher education with the development of land grant universities, the G.I. bill, and direct grants and loans to students. In comparison with other nations of the world, the U.S. labor force has been better educated, even after allowing for the lesser achievement of its graduates. In other words, more schooling with less learning each year has yielded more human capital than found in other nations that have less schooling but learn more in each of those years.

This historical approach, however, appears on the verge of reaching its limits for the United States. Other nations of the world, both developed and developing, have rapidly expanded their schooling systems, and many now surpass the United States. Figure 4 shows secondary school completion rates for both Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries and a selection of others in 1999.<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup> Remarkably, the United States trailed a large number of other countries in 1999 and falls just slightly below the OECD average completion rate. The United States gains some by having rates of college attendance above the typical OECD country. Nonetheless, as summarized in figure 5, U.S. students are not likely to complete more schooling

The past advantage of the United States in amount of school completed has gone away as other nations have discovered the importance of schooling. Thus, going into the future, the United

---

<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup> Data come from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2001) which has made an effort to use standardized definitions. The non-OECD countries are included in the World Education Indicators project.

States appears unlikely to continue dominating others in human capital unless it can improve on the quality dimension.

Note, however, that this story about U.S. school quality does not generalize well to developing countries – countries that are often not close in any quality dimension. Thus, the U.S. success that expanding mediocre schools does not imply that the practice seen in many developing countries of expanding totally dysfunctional schools is the right path.<sup>††††</sup> Indeed, as discussed below and as argued in Hanushek (1995), it appears to be a considerable mistake for developing countries to expand quantity or access to schools while ignoring quality. Indeed there is an argument that improving quality would actually make it easier to expand access by reducing repetition and other counterproductive aspects of schools Hanushek (1995).

### ***C. Quality of U.S. Colleges***

The analysis of growth rates across countries emphasizes quality of the elementary and secondary schools of the United States. It did not include any measures of the quality of U.S. colleges. By most evaluations, U.S. colleges and universities rank at the very top in the world. No direct measurements of quality of colleges across countries exist. However, there is indirect evidence. Foreign students by all accounts are not tempted to emigrate to the United States to attend elementary and secondary schools—except perhaps if they see this as a way of gaining entry into the country. They do emigrate in large numbers to attend U.S. colleges and universities. They even tend to pay full, unsubsidized tuitions at U.S. colleges, something that many fewer American citizens do.

A number of the economic models of economic growth in fact emphasize the importance of scientists and engineers as a key ingredient to growth. By these views, the technically trained college students who contribute to invention and to development of new products provide a special element to the growth equation. Here, again, the United States appears to have the best

---

<sup>††††</sup> A direct discussion and analysis of poor schools in rural Brazil is found in Harbison and Hanushek (1992).

programs. If this view is correct, U.S. higher education may continue to provide a noticeable advantage over other countries.

But the raw material for U.S. colleges is the graduates of our elementary and secondary schools. As has been frequently noted, the lack of preparation of our students leads to extensive remedial education at the postsecondary level, detracting from the ability of colleges and universities to be most effective. And, pre-college preparation is likely an important factor driving the increased proportions of foreign born graduates from the science and engineering programs of U.S. colleges and universities.

## **Generalizing to Developing Countries**

The previous discussions have concentrated considerable attention on the United States and on other developed countries. Most developing countries look very dissimilar to these. Do these results generalize?

The modeling of economic growth in Hanushek and Kimko (2000) relied upon the direct measures of math and science achievement that were portrayed in Figure 2. Unfortunately, relatively few developing countries participated in that testing. The analysis did, however, work to extend the modeling to a large number of countries not included in the direct testing. This was done by modeling test scores and then projecting the results to other countries. The analysis did not, however, consider all countries. It excluded countries whose predicted scores fell outside the range of observed tests. This exclusion applied to a number of developing countries.

Within the set of countries with observed or projected test data, the growth models appear rather robust. A variety of tests indicates that the modeling applies to the range of countries.

Questions remain, however, about the wider range of countries. Clearly, many of the arguments made by Easterly (2002) obviously apply to the most destitute countries – those which also tend to lack a good structure of laws, which tend to have a variety of restrictions on labor and

product markets, and so forth. These countries may not be able to fruitfully use schooling investments if the labor markets will not accommodate skilled workers.

The tentative conclusion would be that the previous results generalize if the other conditions for growth also exist. If they do not, it is much more uncertain. But it is also true in the latter cases, that investment in quantity of schooling is unlikely to be productive either.

## **Improving quality**

Much of school policy is traditionally thought of as an exercise in selecting and ensuring that the optimal set of resources, somehow defined, is available. Matched with this policy perspective has been a line of research considering the relationship between resource usage and student performance. If the effectiveness of different resources or combinations of resources were known, it would be straightforward to define an optimal set of resources. Moreover, we could often decide about policies that would move us toward such an optimal set of resources. Unfortunately, this alludes us.

Schools in the United States have been the focus of extensive research. Both aggregate data about performance of schools over time and more detailed school and classroom data point to a simple conclusion: There is a lack of any consistent or systematic effect of resources on student achievement. While controversial, partly because of the conflict with existing school policies, the evidence is very extensive (Hanushek (2003a)).

Most other countries of the world have not tracked student performance over any length of time, making analyses comparable to the United States discussion impossible. Nonetheless, international testing over the past four decades permits an overview of spending across countries. Seven different mathematics and science tests (the data for the growth analysis) were given between the early 1960s and 1995 to students at different grade levels in a varying set of voluntarily participating nations. Performance bears little relationship to the patterns of expenditure across the countries. Hanushek and Kimko (2000) estimate models that relate

spending, family backgrounds, and other characteristics of countries to student performance for the tests prior to 1995. This estimation consistently indicates a statistically significant negative effect of added resources on performance after controlling for other influences. Similar findings hold for the OECD countries.

Existing statistical analyses in less developed countries have shown a similar inconsistency of estimated resource effects as that found in the United States (Hanushek (1995)). In general, a minority of the available studies suggests much confidence that commonly identified resources – class size, teacher experience, and teacher salaries – positively influence student performance. There is generally somewhat stronger support for these resource policies than that existing in United States analyses, hinting that the importance of resources may vary with the level of resources. Nonetheless, the evidence does not indicate that pure resource policies can be expected to have a significant effect on student outcomes.

In sum, a wide range of analyses indicate that overall resource policies have not led to discernible improvements in student performance. It is important to understand what is and is not implied by this conclusion. First, it does not mean that money and resources *never* matter. There clearly are situations where small classes or added resources have an impact. It is just that no good description of when and where these situations occur is available, so that broad resource policies such as those legislated from central governments may hit some good uses but also hit bad uses that generally lead to offsetting outcomes. Second, this statement does not mean that money and resources *cannot* matter. Instead, as described below, altered sets of incentives could dramatically improve the use of resources.

The evidence on resources is remarkably consistent across countries, both developed and developing. Had there been distinctly different results for some subsets of countries, issues of what kinds of generalizations were possible would naturally arise. Such conflicts do not appear particularly important.

Many countries have of course attempted to improve their schools. While some have succeeded, many have not. One explanation for past failure is simply that insufficient attention has been at to teacher quality. By many accounts, the quality of teachers is the key element to improving student performance. But the research evidence also suggests that many of the policies that have been pursued around the world have not been very productive. Specifically, the chosen policies of individual countries may have led to changes in measured aspects of teachers such as degrees or teacher qualifications, but they have not tended to improve the quality of teachers – at least when quality is identified by student performance.<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>

Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain (2001) describe estimates of differences in teacher quality on an output basis. Specifically, the concern is identifying good and bad teachers on the basis of their performance in obtaining gains in student achievement. An important element of that work is distinguishing the effects of teachers from the selection of schools by teachers and students and the matching of teachers and students in the classroom. In particular, highly motivated parents search out schools that they think are good, and they attempt to place their children in classrooms where they think the teacher is particularly able. Teachers follow a similar selection process (Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin (2004, (forthcoming, Spring 2004)). Thus, from an analytical viewpoint, it is difficult to sort out the quality of the teacher from the quality of the students that she has in her classroom. The analysis of teacher performance in Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain (2001) goes to great lengths to avoid contamination from any such selection and matching of kids and teachers.

Estimates that the differences in annual achievement growth between an average and a good teacher are large. Within one academic year, a good teacher can move a typical student up at least four percentiles in the overall distribution (equal to a change of 0.12 standard deviations

---

<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> For a review of existing U.S. literature, see Hanushek and Rivkin (2004). This paper describes various attempts to estimate the impact of teacher quality on student achievement. Similar studies are currently much less available in other countries.

of student achievement). From this, it is clear that having a series of good teachers can dramatically affect the achievement of any student. In fact, a series of good teachers can erase the deficits associated with poor preparation for school.

The difficulty, as pointed out in the preceding discussion, is that hiring good teachers is not easily done. Teaching ability is not closely related to training or experience. Moreover, common salary systems do not target particularly high quality teachers.

From a policy viewpoint the primary objective should be improving the overall quality of the teaching force. If one were simply to redistribute existing teachers, the overall policy goals would not be achieved.

## **Conclusions**

In making decisions about schools, countries always face limited budgets. If there are the commonly accepted two objectives of expanding access and of improving quality, these objectives will conflict because they must compete for the same budget. Thus, by this standard formulation policy makers are faced with a particularly unpleasant dilemma: choose between broad availability of schools and good schools.

An alternative view, while apparently different, is actually quite closely related. Analyses of labor market implications and the rate of return to schooling in developing countries suggest strongly that schooling is a very good investment. A year of schooling typically shows a 25-30 percent real rate of return. Such a return often looks noticeably better than other investment alternatives. At the same time, school completion rates in low-income countries are very low. These two facts do not go together. If it is such a high rate of return activity, why aren't people taking advantage of those high returns?

Work on school quality has something to say about both elements of education policy. First, the simple trade-off story about access and quality is very misleading, if not wrong in important ways. In fact, in many circumstances there may not really be the trade-off suggested.

Second, the unifying idea is that school quality may be an important explanation for the "strange" investment behavior that does not take advantage of the available high returns.

School quality is directly related to decisions about attending schools and to promotion through schools. High quality schools raise student achievement and speed students through primary (and perhaps secondary) schools, thus conserving on costs. Additionally, students respond to school quality in deciding whether or not to drop out of school. They tend to stay in high quality schools and drop out of low quality schools.

Both of these mechanisms indicate a direct relationship between the quantity of schooling attained and the quality of that schooling. Thus, studies of the rate of return to schooling which only consider quantity of schooling produce a misleading estimate of the potential gains. Estimation of the rate of return to schooling that does not account for quality differences will systematically overstate the productivity gains that are associated with additional years of schooling, because the estimates will include quality differences that are correlated with quantity. If policy simply pushes people to stay in school longer, without changing the fundamental quality of the schools, the newly-induced school completers will only get the returns associated with years of schooling and not with quality. Thus, they will not be able to gain as much as the rate of return estimates suggest.


**Table 1. Summary of Estimated Returns to a Standard Deviation Increase in Cognitive Skills**

Country	Study	Estimated effect <sup>a</sup>	Notes
Ghana	Glewwe (1996)	0.21**-0.3** (government) 0.14-0.17 (private)	Alternative estimation approaches yield some differences; math effects shown generally more important than reading effects, and all hold even with Raven's test for ability.
Ghana	Jolliffe (1998)	0.05-0.07*	Household income related to average math score with relatively small variation by estimation approach; effect from off-farm income with on-farm income unrelated to skills.
Ghana	Vijverberg (1999)	?	Income estimates for math and reading with nonfarm self-employment; highly variable estimates (including both positive and negative effects) but effects not generally statistically significant.
Kenya	Boissiere, Knight, and Sabot (1985); Knight and Sabot (1990)	0.19**-0.22**	Total sample estimates: small variation by primary and secondary school leavers.
Morocco	Angrist and Lavy (1997)	?	Cannot convert to standardized scores because use indexes of performance; French writing skills appear most important for earnings, but results depend on estimation approach.
Pakistan	Alderman et al. (1996)	0.12-0.28*	Variation by alternative approaches and by controls for ability and health; larger and more significant without ability and health controls.
Pakistan	Behrman, Ross, and Sabot (forthcoming 2004)	?	Estimates of structural model with combined scores for cognitive skill; index significant at .01 level but cannot translate directly into estimated effect size)
South Africa	Moll (1998)	0.34**-0.48**	Depending on estimation method, varying impact of computation; comprehension (not shown)generally insignificant.
Tanzania	Boissiere, Knight, and Sabot (1985); Knight and Sabot (1990)	0.07-0.13*	Total sample estimates: smaller for primary than secondary school leavers.


\*significant at .05 level; \*\*significant at .01 level.

a. Estimates indicate proportional increase in wages from a one standard deviation increase in measured test scores.


**Figure 1: Effect of Economic Growth on GDP per Capita  
(medium income country)**




**Fig. 2. Normalized test scores on mathematics and science examinations, 1970–1995**




**Figure 3. Improved GDP with Moderately Strong Knowledge Improvement**



**Fig. 4: Secondary school completion rates, 1999**



**Fig. 5: Expected years of schooling, 1999**



## References

- Alderman, Harold, Jere R. Behrman, David R. Ross, and Richard Sabot. 1996. "The returns to endogenous human capital in Pakistan's rural wage labor market." *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 58:29-55.
- Altonji, Joseph G., and Charles R. Pierret. 2001. "Employer learning and statistical discrimination." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116,no.1 (February):313-350.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Victor Lavy. 1997. "The effect of a change in language of instruction on the returns to schooling in Morocco." *Journal of Labor Economics* 15:S48-S76.
- Barro, Robert J., and Jong-wha Lee. 2001. "International data on educational attainment: Updates and implications." *Oxford Economic Papers* 53,no.3 (July):541-563.
- Barro, Robert J., and Xavier Sala-I-Martin. 1995. *Economic Growth*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Behrman, Jere R., Lori G. Kletzer, Michael S. McPherson, and Morton Owen Schapiro. 1998. "The microeconomics of college choice, careers, and wages: Measuring the impact of higher education." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 559(September):12-23.
- Behrman, Jere R., David Ross, and Richard Sabot. forthcoming 2004. "Improving the Quality Versus Increasing the Quantity of Schooling: Evidence for Rural Pakistan." *Topics in the Economics and Growth of Developing Areas of The B.E. Journals of the Economics and Growth of Developing Areas*.
- Bishop, John. 1989. "Is the test score decline responsible for the productivity growth decline?" *American Economic Review* 79,no.1:178-197.
- . 1991. "Achievement, test scores, and relative wages." In *Workers and their wages*, edited by Marvin H. Koster. Washington, DC: The AEI Press:146-186.
- Blackburn, McKinley L., and David Neumark. 1993. "Omitted-ability bias and the increase in the return to schooling." *Journal of Labor Economics* 11,no.3 (July):521-544.
- . 1995. "Are OLS estimates of the return to schooling biased downward? Another look." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 77,no.2 (May):217-230.
- Boissiere, Maurice X., John B. Knight, and Richard H. Sabot. 1985. "Earnings, schooling, ability, and cognitive skills." *American Economic Review* 75,no.5:1016-1030.
- Card, David. 1999. "Causal effect of education on earnings." In *Handbook of labor economics*, edited by Orley Ashenfelter and David Card. Amsterdam: North-Holland:1801-1863.

- Dugan, Dennis J. 1976. "Scholastic achievement: its determinants and effects in the education industry." In *Education as an industry*, edited by Joseph T. Froomkin, Dean T. Jamison and Roy Radner. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger:53-83.
- Easterly, William. 2002. *The elusive quest for growth: An economists' adventures and misadventures in the tropics*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Finnie, Ross, and Ronald Meng. 2002. "Minorities, cognitive skills, and incomes of Canadians." *Canadian Public Policy* 28:257-273.
- Glewwe, Paul. 1996. "The relevance of standard estimates of rates of return to schooling for educational policy: A critical assessment." *Journal of Development Economics* 51:267-290.
- . 2002. "Schools and skills in developing countries: Education policies and socioeconomic outcomes." *Journal of Economic Literature* 40,no.2 (June):436-482.
- Green, David A., and W. Craig Riddell. 2003. "Literacy and earnings: An investigation of the interaction of cognitive and unobserved skills in earnings generation." *Labour Economics* 10:165-184.
- Griliches, Zvi. 1974. "Errors in variables and other unobservables." *Econometrica* 42,no.6 (November):971-998.
- Grogger, Jeffrey T., and Eric Eide. 1993. "Changes in college skills and the rise in the college wage premium." *Journal of Human Resources* 30,no.2 (Spring):280-310.
- Hanushek, Eric A. 1995. "Interpreting recent research on schooling in developing countries." *World Bank Research Observer* 10,no.2 (August):227-246.
- . 2002. "Publicly provided education." In *Handbook of Public Economics*, edited by Alan J. Auerbach and Martin Feldstein. Amsterdam: Elsevier:2045-2141.
- . 2003a. "The failure of input-based schooling policies." *Economic Journal* 113,no.485 (February):F64-F98.
- . 2003b. "The Importance of School Quality." In *Our Schools and Our Future: Are We Still at Risk?*, edited by Paul E. Peterson. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press:141-173.
- Hanushek, Eric A., John F. Kain, and Steve G. Rivkin. 2004. "The revolving door." *Education Next* 4,no.1 (Winter):77-82.
- . forthcoming, Spring 2004. "Why public schools lose teachers." *Journal of Human Resources* 39,no.2.
- Hanushek, Eric A., and Dongwook Kim. 1995. "Schooling, labor force quality, and economic growth." Working Paper 5399, National Bureau of Economic Research (December).
- Hanushek, Eric A., and Dennis D. Kimko. 2000. "Schooling, labor force quality, and the growth of nations." *American Economic Review* 90,no.5 (December):1184-1208.

- Hanushek, Eric A., and Richard R. Pace. 1995. "Who chooses to teach (and why)?" *Economics of Education Review* 14,no.2 (June):101-117.
- Hanushek, Eric A., and Steven G. Rivkin. 2004. "How to improve the supply of high quality teachers." In *Brookings Papers on Education Policy 2004*, edited by Diane Ravitch. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press:7-44.
- Hanushek, Eric A., Steven G. Rivkin, and Lori L. Taylor. 1996. "Aggregation and the estimated effects of school resources." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 78,no.4 (November):611-627.
- Harbison, Ralph W., and Eric A. Hanushek. 1992. *Educational performance of the poor: lessons from rural northeast Brazil*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heckman, James J., and Edward Vytlačil. 2001. "Identifying the role of cognitive ability in explaining the level of and change in the return to schooling." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 83,no.1 (February):1-12.
- Jolliffe, Dean. 1998. "Skills, schooling, and household income in Ghana." *World Bank Economic Review* 12:81-104.
- Knight, John B., and Richard H. Sabot. 1990. *Education, productivity, and inequality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krueger, Anne O. 1974. "The political economy of the rent seeking society." *American Economic Review* 64,no.3 (June):291-303.
- Lazear, Edward P. 2003. "Teacher incentives." *Swedish Economic Policy Review*.
- Manski, Charles F., and David A. Wise. 1983. *College choice in America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McIntosh, Steven, and Anna Vignoles. 2001. "Measuring and assessing the impact of basic skills on labor market outcomes." *Oxford Economic Papers* 53:453-481.
- Moll, Peter G. 1998. "Primary schooling, cognitive skills, and wage in South Africa." *Economica* 65:263-284.
- Mulligan, Casey B. 1999. "Galton versus the human capital approach to inheritance." *Journal of Political Economy* 107,no.6, pt. 2 (December):S184-S224.
- Murnane, Richard J., John B. Willett, M. Jay Braatz, and Yves Duhaldeborde. 2001. "Do different dimensions of male high school students' skills predict labor market success a decade later? Evidence from the NLSY." *Economics of Education Review* 20,no.4 (August):311-320.
- Murnane, Richard J., John B. Willett, Yves Duhaldeborde, and John H. Tyler. 2000. "How important are the cognitive skills of teenagers in predicting subsequent earnings?" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 19,no.4 (Fall):547-568.

- Murnane, Richard J., John B. Willett, and Frank Levy. 1995. "The growing importance of cognitive skills in wage determination." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 77,no.2 (May):251-266.
- Neal, Derek A., and William R. Johnson. 1996. "The role of pre-market factors in black-white differences." *Journal of Political Economy* 104,no.5 (October):869-895.
- O'Neill, June. 1990. "The role of human capital in earnings differences between black and white men." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 4,no.4 (Fall):25-46.
- Parente, Stephen L., and Edward C. Prescott. 1994. "Barriers to technology adoption and development." *Journal of Political Economy* 102,no.2 (April):298-321.
- . 1999. "Monopoly rights: A barrier to riches." *American Economic Review* 89,no.5 (December):1216-1233.
- Psacharopoulos, George. 1994. "Returns to investment in education: A global update." *World Development* 22:1325-1344.
- Rivkin, Steven G. 1995. "Black/white differences in schooling and employment." *Journal of Human Resources* 30,no.4 (Fall):826-852.
- Rivkin, Steven G., Eric A. Hanushek, and John F. Kain. 2001. "Teachers, schools, and academic achievement." Working Paper No. 6691, National Bureau of Economic Research (revised)
- Vijverberg, Wim P.M. 1999. "The impact of schooling and cognitive skills on income from non-farm self-employment." In *The economics of school quality investments in developing countries: An empirical study of Ghana*, edited by Paul Glewwe. New York: St. Martin's Press (with University of Oxford).
- World Bank. 1993. *The East Asian miracle: Economic growth and public policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

**Figure A1. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), age 17**

