

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search http://ageconsearch.umn.edu aesearch@umn.edu

Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.

Graphically speaking

Public education



"Current expenditures include all per pupil costs except capital outlays and debt service.

n the information age, an educated workforce is a critical need of the U.S. economy. Despite this need, more than 10 percent of the U.S. population does not finish high school. Less than half of those who do, do not pursue post-secondary education. As studies report U.S. students' declining performance in international achievement competitions, public concern is voiced about continued and increasing expenditure on public schools.

Inputs

School spending (adjusted for inflation) has increased throughout the 20th century. Total public spending per pupil is up from \$725 in 1929 to \$5,257 in 1992, and has

doubled in the last 25 years (figure 1).
Teacher salaries have increased from \$11,466 in 1929 to \$35, 905 in 1991 (figure 2). Adjusted for inflation, teacher salaries increased by 20 percent during the 1980s, the decade of school reform (figure 2).

The pupil/teacher ratio has been reduced dramatically during the past 40 years, down to 17 students per teacher (figure 3).

■ Per pupil funding growth has been fueled by a shift from local to state funding for primary and secondary education (figure 4). This graph shows the national statistics: however, there is wide variation across states; Hawaii with 87 percent state funding, to New Hampshire with 89 percent local funding.

Output

Funding growth and decreases in the pupil/ teacher ratio are associated with little or no improvement in student outcome measures. Scores for scholastic aptitude tests for college-bound seniors (SAT) have had a downward trend over the past 25 years (figure 5). School dropout rates (figure 6) for the most part have shown only slight improvement over the last decade. The percentage of dropouts for all persons aged 16 through 24 fell only two percentage points, from 15 percent in 1972 to 13 percent in 1991. There was dramatic improvement in the rate for black, non-Hispanic students, which declined from 22 percent to 14 percent; the rate for white, non-Hispanic persons declined from 12 percent to 9 percent; but the drop-out rate for Hispanics has remained close to 35 percent over the past two decades.

The puzzle

Despite increases in school funding and lower pupil/teacher ratios, student performance a measured by achievement test scores and drop out rates has worsened or shown only sligh improvement. Research provides little insigh into the issue. Smaller class size, graduate training for teachers, teacher experience, and highe teacher salaries do not appear to be systematically associated with improved student performance on standardized achievement test (Hanushek).

What are explanations for poor studen performance, despite increased public invest nvestment

and performance

by Kevin T. McNamara and Bob F. Jones

Total public elementary and Percentage high school dropouts secondary school revenues by source among persons 16-24 yrs. old by race 40% 90% 80 35 Hispanic Loca Scholastic aptitude test score 70 30 averages for college bound seniors 60 25 500 s Math 20 450 40 Black State All 400 15 30 Verba 350 20 White Federal 300 10 250 0 1929 200 1949 1969 1989 1979 150 100 50 1969 1979 1989

ment in education? One might be that the performance measures are not appropriate measures of school outcomes. In 1990, 42 percent of all high school students took the SAT exam. Thus a measure of the cognitive skills of less than 50 percent of high school students in their final year of school may not provide a representative performance measure. Test bias, shifts in the population taking the SAT, and the interaction of school, home, and community support in the learning process raise concerns about comparisons of SAT scores across time, and as a criterion for school evaluations.

The dropout rate may not be an appropriate performance measure either. Household and community factors may impact dropout rates independent of school resources. Evaluation of schools' success independent of these non-school factors might lead to incorrect conclusions about schools' effectiveness.

Part of the problem may be that schools are not efficient. Use of average salary and

average pupil/teacher ratios as an input measure assumes school administrators can allocate salary money and teachers to encourage teacher and student productivity. Teacher contracts and state mandates, however, often influence or control these decisions.

Social changes over the last two decades also impact the education process. There have been dramatic increases in both dual income and single parent households. As a result, parents have less time and energy to work with and supervise their children. The result may be that more student time is allocated to television, recreation and work, rather than reading and studying. Schools also are influenced by these social changes. Teachers' expectations for pupil performance may change. School resources may be shifted to other services, such as security, after school day care, and meal programs.

For more information

- Dertouzos, M.L., R.K. Lester, and R. Solow. Made in America: Regaining the Productive Edge. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.
- Hanushek, Eric A. "The Economics of Schooling: Production and Efficiency in Public Schools." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 24(3):1141-1177, 1986.
- U.S. Department of Education. *Digest of Education Statistics*, 1992. Washington D.C., Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, 1992.

Kevin T. McNamara is assistant professor and Bob F. Jones is professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics at Purdue University.