

Who Chooses to Teach (and Why)?

Hanushek, Eric A. and Richard R. Pace

Working Paper No. 354  
August 1993

University of  
Rochester

**Who Chooses to Teach (and Why)?**

Eric A. Hanushek and Richard R. Pace

Rochester Center for Economic Research  
Working Paper No. 354



## **Who Chooses To Teach (and Why)?\***

by Eric A. Hanushek and Richard R. Pace  
University of Rochester

August 1993

\*We would like to thank Stanley Engerman, Richard Murnane, Orley Ashenfelter, and Robert Strauss for helpful comments. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Cornell-Princeton Policy Conference, Ithaca, NY, May 1993.



## Who Chooses To Teach (and Why)?

by Eric A. Hanushek and Richard R. Pace

An important line of educational policy discussion focuses on changing the composition of the teaching force, yet remarkably little is known about who goes into teaching and why. This dearth of knowledge is also particularly puzzling, given the diverse interest in the subject for the past two decades. In recent experience, people have been concerned about the overall supply of qualified teachers, about the supply in various specialties such as math and science education, and about the quality of teachers attracted into the elementary and secondary schools. As a result of these concerns, many people seem willing to change radically the rules governing teaching jobs and the compensation for them on the belief (or hope) that a different group can be induced to enter teaching and that school performance will ultimately improve.

There are perennial projections of supply shortage. These projections reflect recent declines in the production of new teachers (NCES, 1991), the clear upturn in the student population occurring now, and anticipation of high retirement rates of teachers over the next decade. Many have questioned whether aggregate shortages will materialize, in part because of the large "reserve army" of potential teachers who could return to teaching. This questioning has led to a different set of issues—whether or not there will be a shortage of high-quality teachers and whether or not there will be sufficient numbers of teachers such as math and science teachers. Without getting into questions about whether or not some sort of shortage may materialize, it is clear that there are large remaining questions about who is being prepared for teaching and what people respond to in making such decisions.

The paucity of existing analysis allows numerous statements simply to be repeated and used in the development of policies, whether or not they are accurate or relevant. For example, much of the information we have about characteristics and quality of teachers does not come from information

about teachers *per se*, but instead comes from employing such information as the SAT performance and other characteristics of high school seniors who indicate they plan on becoming a teacher.<sup>1</sup> The group of teacher aspirants is not, however, the group that eventually enters the teaching profession. Considerable shuffling takes place with many who originally expressed interest leaving the study of teaching, only to be replaced by a new group that had not previously thought of teaching.

This paper provides a simple analysis of the choice of preparing for a teaching career in college. It begins with a description of flows into and out of teacher training during various points of the college career. This analysis of flows highlights two features: choices by gender and racial background and the achievement levels of prospective teachers. The subsequent analysis turns to models of career choice that involve the direct estimation of how earnings opportunities and teacher certification requirements influence choices.

## **1. Background and Data**

Analysis of the supply of teachers is quite complicated because individuals enter into teaching jobs from various places (Murnane *et al.*, 1991; Boe and Guilford, 1992). At any point in time, the newly hired teachers include a mixture of new college graduates, of returning teachers who had been out of teaching for some time, and of past college graduates who have either retrained or are currently entering teaching for the first time.

---

<sup>1</sup>See, for example, the discussion in the Carnegie Forum(1986) report calling for significant increases in teacher salaries, justified in part by the comparison of SAT scores of college bound students. Similar analyses of prospective teachers employing the ACT test are found in Weaver[1983], although that study acknowledges possible supply changes during undergraduate schooling.

The focus of this paper is the decision to prepare for elementary and secondary teaching. We presume that this is the key step in setting potential teacher supply, because late entrants and re-entrants still went through a prior phase of teacher preparation. We also consider whether early jobs involve teaching or not, but the limited time span of the panel inhibits very broad generalizations from this.

Most information about decisions that determine the occupational choices of teachers involve either analyzing aspirations data—collected long before preparation for teaching or job choices are completed—or data on the current stock of teachers. These data, which provide insights into some issues, do not permit attention to the key decision points in the process and to how fundamental factors such as certification requirements and the like influence teacher preparation and supply.

We view the process of entry into the teaching profession as a series of sequential decisions. The process begins with the development of career goals and the initial aspirations of students in high school. We trace how the group that starts out with aspirations for teaching wends its way through the educational system and, specifically, which of these students ends up fully prepared to teach. The process also involves the infusion of new people who turn to teaching even though they did not have early aspirations to do so. We consider how these people compare with those who "always" wanted to teach.

This analysis employs the longitudinal data from the High School and Beyond (HSB) survey to follow students from high school through college. The first wave of the HSB data was collected from a group of high school seniors in 1980, and students were subsequently followed through 1986.<sup>2</sup>

The HSB data have a number of strengths for this work. First, its longitudinal design permits direct investigation of the choices students are making at each stage. Thus, it is possible to follow

---

<sup>2</sup>A separate part of the HSB data collection obtained information on students who were sophomores in 1980, but this panel is not used here.



individual students from high school through college, observing at each stage whether or not a student is preparing for a teaching career. Second, its large national sample provides information on how varying certification requirements and rewards for teachers affect students' choices. Third, since all students were given standardized achievement tests, there is a rough measure of "quality" that can be introduced.

The HSB data are not, however, without their weaknesses. The HSB survey tracks a single cohort through school and thus introduces some uncertainty about what generalizations can be made to other times and cohorts. Additionally, the data provide just initial choices and actions. The seniors in 1980 would at best graduate from college in 1984, but common patterns of delayed completion of college imply that many of the sampled students would not graduate by then. The early observations in the HSB surveys make it particularly difficult to observe a full set of employment decisions of potential teachers before the end of the panel. Because of movement into and out of teaching over extended periods of time for many in the teaching profession (Murnane *et al.*, 1991), this severely limits larger generalizations past those that derive from training decisions.

A focus of this analysis is the quality of individuals choosing teaching. This investigation cannot, however, observe actual teaching performance of any individuals, so the measurement of quality must rely on surrogates of future performance. The primary measure of quality of potential teachers employs the composite test score from the HSB battery of achievement tests taken in 1980. This composite score combines reading, vocabulary, and mathematics.

The primary motivation is studying the supply of high quality teachers, but we do not have an opportunity to observe directly the quality of classroom instruction by any of the sampled individuals. Indeed, nobody has ever been able to do that in a systematic way. It is plausible, however, to believe that "smarter" teachers with higher achievement of their own could perform better in the classroom. This logic motivates one of the few studies of teacher supply that considers quality differences

(Manski 1987). Tracing people by their observed achievement is further motivated by studies which suggest that teachers who score higher on basic achievement tests tend also to be better teachers. Separate studies of educational production functions have tended to find some positive relationship of teacher and student measured achievement, although it is far from universal.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, achievement is fixed at high school, so that differential gains in achievement (whether directly related to college program or not) are not incorporated in the observed outcomes. Unfortunately, these data, in common with other available data, do not have any direct achievement measures after completion of postsecondary education.

The analysis here first provides a descriptive overview of the path to teaching careers. It then turns to an investigation of whether or not the differences in requirements and rewards across states influences these observed patterns.

## **2. Overall Transition Patterns**

This section identifies the movement of students into and out of training programs for elementary and secondary teaching. Special attention is given to students who aspire to elementary and secondary teaching during their senior year in high school, and they are followed through college. This group has continually stronger attachment to the possibility of teaching than high school students or college entrants as a whole.

Special attention is given to the top of the achievement distribution. The comparison employed traces students who scored in the top quarter of the test distribution of those who ever

---

<sup>3</sup>See the overall description of such studies and summary of results in Hanushek(1986, 1989). The studies finding a positive and significant relationship between teacher test score and student performance number 8 out of 31 separate estimates; another 10 studies find positive but insignificant effects of teacher test scores. More recent work not surveyed also shows mixed results; cf. Ferguson(1991) and Hanushek(1992).

attend a regular, academic post-secondary program during the first two years after high school graduation time. We prefer to use this fixed measure of the achievement distribution, but it is important to note that the empirical achievement distribution is anything but fixed. At each step of the educational process, there is a sorting and narrowing of performance differences. Table 1 describes the changes in the achievement distribution for the entire college population, regardless of career choices. The table vividly depicts the sorting process. While the achievement distribution is defined in terms of students who ever attended college—such that 50 percent would be in the top half and 25 percent in the top quartile—those still in school at each point are an ever more select group. We follow the high school class of 1980 over three two-year intervals. Two-thirds of those who have graduated from college by spring 1986 come from the top half of the distribution of initial attenders, and fully 42 percent come from the top quartile. Moreover, the selection process is even more sharp for males, where over 46 percent of the graduates come from the top quartile of the initial distribution. These summary statistics of the achievement distribution provide a benchmark for consideration of the distribution of students opting for teaching careers.

This analysis is a snapshot, looking at the progression of one cohort through their post-secondary studies. As such, it cannot distinguish between time-specific factors and the normal transition and aging process. The subsequent investigation of variations in transition probabilities across different states, however, provides some indication of more fundamental driving forces.

We begin with the entire sample of students in their senior year of high school in 1980 and trace their path through college and through teaching preparation. Table 2 is divided into two parallel views of teachers engaged in preparation for teaching and ultimately in a teaching occupation by Spring 1986. The left half of the table ("original aspirants") takes a fixed group of students—those high school students who aspired to a teaching job in elementary and secondary schools in their senior year of high school—and follows their actual choices. The right half of the table ("late aspirants")

Table 1. Achievement Distribution of College Attenders by Gender<sup>a</sup>

College status (survey year)	Total		Males		Females	
	% top half	% top quartile	% top half	% top quartile	% top half	% top quartile
Attending college "sophomore year" (1982)	52.8	30.3	57.0	34.1	49.1	27.1
Attending college "senior year" (1984)	62.3	37.4	65.0	40.8	59.6	34.1
Graduated college (1986)	66.6	42.3	68.2	46.4	65.1	38.4

a. Ability distribution is based on reading, vocabulary, and mathematics test scores in 1980 of the sample of students who have ever been enrolled in an academic postsecondary program by the time of the first HSB follow-up (1982).

Table 2. Teacher Preparation Transitions by Ability<sup>a</sup> and Aspirations: Entire Sample

Status (year)	Original Aspirants			Late Aspirants		
	% top half	% top quartile	n	% top half	% top quartile	n
Aspire to Teach senior year HS (1980)	40.2	17.4	352	0.0	0.0	0
In Teacher Training (1982)	45.5	21.6	130	36.2	11.2	232
In Teacher Training (1984)	45.1	16.8	93	55.5	24.3	203
Graduated College, teacher prepared (1986)	50.0	21.5	56	47.3	20.9	98
Actively Teaching (1986)	51.5	33.1	64	63.3	25.9	159

a. Ability distribution is based on reading, vocabulary, and mathematics test scores in 1980 of the sample of students who have ever been enrolled in an academic postsecondary program by the time of the first HSB follow-up (1982).

provides a similar set of snapshots of all engaged in the specified teacher preparation who were *not* original teaching aspirants before entering college. The sum of the two halves provides the total stock of students preparing for (engaging in) teaching at each point in time.

As Table 2 indicates, only a small proportion of high school students who aspire to teaching ever complete a bachelor's degree with a specialty in teaching and education. If we follow the group of 352 original aspirants, we find that only 56, or 15.9 percent, graduate by 1986 having completed a teacher preparation program.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, of the total 154 students who graduate from teacher training, only slightly over one third (36.4 percent) thought they would be teachers when they were in high school.<sup>5</sup> This is very important, because it suggests that simply looking at statistics of aspirants does not characterize very well who actually prepares for teaching. A higher number of people than those completing teacher preparation are actually teaching in elementary and secondary schools in 1986,<sup>6</sup> and the representation of original aspirants in the actual teachers is even lower.

There is a significant influx of people at each stage, but, not surprisingly, the biggest transition comes between senior year of high school and sophomore year of college. As soon as two years later ("the sophomore year"), significantly less than half of those enrolled in actual teacher preparation programs at the college level aspired to teaching originally. This seems straightforward:

---

<sup>4</sup>In all cases, the descriptive statistics are weighted according to the sample weights provided in the HSB data. This weighting is important because the HSB data were not derived from a representative national sample but instead oversampled certain types of schools and student types.

<sup>5</sup>Note, however, that those aspiring to a teaching career in high school are still much more likely than the remaining population to prepare for teaching. Specifically, the portion of the HSB sample that we employ includes 4,050 students who attended some academic postsecondary schooling by the first follow-up in spring 1982.

<sup>6</sup>This larger number of people teaching presumably reflects both varying certification requirements and waivers of preparation requirements, either temporary waivers or those included in alternative certification arrangements.

Most people do not get their college academic program settled until after having attended college for some time.

Individuals who aspire to be teachers in high school are below average for all college entrants in terms of high school achievement. Only 40 percent of aspirants are found in the top half of the achievement distribution defined by all students who ever attended college by 1982 (two years after graduation from high school). There are, more importantly, noticeably fewer in the very top of the distribution, although there is significant representation of the best. About seventeen percent of the aspirants are found in the top quartile of the achievement distribution.

From the original pool of people aspiring to teaching, a disproportionate number of those eventually exiting come from the bottom portion of the distribution.<sup>7</sup> Thus, those who are left are more heavily weighted in the right half of the distribution. The pattern over time is very interesting, nevertheless. Those studying education in the 1982 survey at roughly the spring of the sophomore year look similar in the aggregate to the whole pool of original aspirants in terms of being from the lower half of the distribution. By graduation, however, half of students who maintain teaching goals and graduate from a teacher preparation program come from the top half of the achievement distribution of all entering college students, and over twenty percent are from the top quartile of entering students. Moreover, of those actually teaching in elementary and secondary schools in the final survey (1986), a full third of the teachers come from the top quartile of the initial distribution. Thus, while some relatively weak people study education, graduation and actual employment apparently represent larger hurdles for the weak students, and the remaining group does not appear to be the "dregs" as some have suggested.

---

<sup>7</sup>Note, again, that the left half of Table 1 includes an almost fixed population—those originally aspiring to a teaching career. (A few people exit from school or from teacher training in 1982 and re-enter later). Therefore, ignoring re-entrants, as this group is traced over time, a rising mean (or portion in the top of the distribution) comes from people lower in the distribution exiting.

A similar pattern holds for the late aspirants. The injections into the system begin with low ability students in the sophomore year, but by graduation the people who switched into teaching during their college years look quite similar in distribution to those remaining students who always were pointed toward a teaching career.

The final shape of the distribution when one considers the award of a degree deserves special consideration. Many who are seeking teaching degrees have not received a B.A. degree by Spring of the sixth year after high school graduation. Of the original aspirants into teaching, only 56 out of 93 studying education in 1984 have graduated by 1986; similarly, about half of the late entrants studying education in 1984 have completed their degree requirements by spring 1986. Those failing to receive a degree, not surprisingly, tend to come from the lower half of the overall distribution. Thus, in terms of the shape of the distribution of graduates with teaching degrees, it is stronger than the original aspirants and, indeed, very close to a representative draw from the overall distribution of college attenders. (On the other hand, it may be that the HSB follow-up is too early to capture the full distribution of graduates. Indeed, the low achievers may eventually complete training, implying that the distribution of those prepared to teach is lower than that of the graduates found in spring 1986). Against this, the data in Table 1 for all college graduates (by 1986 in the HSB data set) indicated that two-thirds fall in the top half of the achievement distribution of college entrants, and 42 percent come from the top quartile. The graduates with teaching credentials come close to replicating the initial distribution of college students but fall noticeably down in the distribution of all college graduates.

The picture of teacher preparation varies sharply by gender. Table 3 displays the breakdown of transitions for males (part A) and females (part B). A number of generalizations are apparent. First, and quite obviously, males represent only a small part of the sample—about twenty percent of potential and actual teachers. Second, males that are committed to teaching in high school (the



Table 3A Teacher Preparation Transitions by Ability<sup>a</sup> and Aspirations: Males

Status (year)	Original Aspirants			Late Aspirants		
	% top half	% top quartile	n	% top half	% top quartile	n
Aspire to Teach senior year HS (1980)	53.3	22.3	64	0.0	0.0	0
In Teacher Training (1982)	61.7	33.7	12	41.9	11.1	59
In Teacher Training (1984)	69.8	34.0	13	46.5	19.9	62
Graduated College, teacher prepared (1986)	60.2	40.0	8	37.7	16.9	20
Actively Teaching (1986)	60.2	45.5	8	63.2	26.8	35

a. Ability distribution is based on reading, vocabulary, and mathematics test scores in 1980 of the sample of students who have ever been enrolled in an academic postsecondary program by the time of the first HSB follow-up (1982).

Table 3B. Teacher Preparation Transitions by Ability<sup>a</sup> and Aspirations: Females

Status (year)	Original Aspirants			Late Aspirants		
	% top half	% top quartile	n	% top half	% top quartile	n
Aspire to Teach senior year HS (1980)	37.7	16.4	288	0.0	0.0	0
In Teacher Training (1982)	44.0	20.5	118	34.8	11.2	173
In Teacher Training (1984)	41.7	14.4	80	59.7	26.4	141
Graduated College, teacher prepared (1986)	48.3	18.5	48	50.1	22.0	78
Actively Teaching (1986)	50.2	31.3	56	63.3	25.7	124

a. Ability distribution is based on reading, vocabulary, and mathematics test scores in 1980 of the sample of students who have ever been enrolled in an academic postsecondary program by the time of the first HSB follow-up (1982).

original aspirants) are higher in the achievement distribution at every observation point, although the new injections into teaching tend to both be lower in achievement than male original aspirants and than women who enter teaching preparation later. On net, at graduation time there are proportionately fewer males in the top half of the distribution but more in the top quarter. Third, women are much more likely than men to stay in teaching once they express an interest in this in high school (even though the absolute continuation rates are low even for women with less than twenty percent entering teaching by 1986). The picture that emerges is that teaching remains a "standard" occupation for women in ways that it is not for men, and men who graduate and enter teaching are somewhat more likely to come from the very top of the achievement distribution.

The movements in and out of teacher training by gender tend to follow quite different patterns. For males, injections into training are generally lower in ability than original aspirants. For females, the opposite is true. The new female entrants into teaching training tend to be higher ability than those who originally planned on a teaching career and who stay with it through graduation. Thus, looking at only people who aspire to teaching in high school leads to downward biases in quality when based on females and upward biases when looking at males.

The patterns also differ sharply by race. The HSB data set permits separate analyses of the training of whites, Hispanics, and Blacks. To put these data into perspective, however, we begin with the racial picture of overall college completion. Table 4 reproduces the data on the changing achievement distribution but provides the racial detail. Hispanics and Blacks have a much smaller proportion in the top half and top quartile of the achievement distribution than do whites, but the interesting story is in the selection process over time. Hispanic students go through a selection process similar to whites such that at graduation there is over twice the percentage of students in the right tail of the distribution as was there initial (19.3 to 38.7 percent in the top half and 10.8 to 24.8

Table 4. Achievement Distribution of College Attenders by Race and Ethnicity<sup>a</sup>

College status (survey year)	Hispanic		Black		White	
	% top half	% top quartile	% top half	% top quartile	% top half	% top quartile
Attending college "sophomore year" (1982)	19.3	10.8	19.7	6.5	59.9	35.2
Attending college "senior year" (1984)	30.8	15.9	23.8	7.3	68.2	41.9
Graduated college (1986)	38.7	24.8	19.2	6.7	71.0	45.7

a. Ability distribution is based on reading, vocabulary, and mathematics test scores in 1980 of the sample of students who have ever been enrolled in an academic postsecondary program by the time of the first HSB follow-up (1982).

percent in the top quartile).<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, the achievement distribution of Blacks is virtually unchanged between entry and graduation from college—there is no selection!

Table 5 presents the teacher training patterns for Blacks (Part A), Hispanics (Part B), and Whites (Part C). While the samples for minority groups are small, high quality (top half or top quartile) Blacks exit from teaching throughout the process, and they are not replaced with high quality injections. What is more, a much smaller proportion of eligible Blacks will stay with teaching careers than is found for whites. Again, while the samples get quite small, Hispanics are more likely than Blacks to enter and to stay in teaching training programs. And, those who do enter teaching tend to be noticeably higher in the achievement distribution. These differences across racial and ethnic groups are consistent with the overall patterns of progress through college that were shown in Table 4.

Finally, in each of the descriptions of student flows there was an apparent anomaly in that there were more actively teaching in 1986 than had graduated with teacher preparation. While this will be discussed more below, this reflects preparation for teaching through taking courses of study other than teaching. In fact, a number of those who graduate with teacher preparation are not included in the category of active teachers, since obtaining a teaching degree is neither necessary nor sufficient for obtaining a teaching job.

### **3. Factors Influencing Teacher Preparation and Entry**

The previous descriptions of the flows into and out of a teacher preparation program and the completions of training give a coarse overview of entry into teaching. Nevertheless, they obscure

---

<sup>8</sup>The cut-off points on achievement distribution are defined in terms of the entire population, not separated by gender or race.

Table 5A. Teacher Preparation Transitions by Ability<sup>a</sup> and Aspirations: Blacks

Status (year)	Original Aspirants			Late Aspirants		
	% top half	% top quartile	n	% top half	% top quartile	n
Aspire to Teach senior year HS (1980)	17.3	7.5	66	0.0	0.0	0
In Teacher Training (1982)	24.1	0.0	13	0.44	0.0	43
In Teacher Training (1984)	0.0	0.0	7	10.6	0.3	37
Graduated College, teacher prepared (1986)	0.0	0.0	5	0.0	0.0	13
Actively Teaching (1986)	0.0	0.0	5	3.5	0.3	25

a. Ability distribution is based on reading, vocabulary, and mathematics test scores in 1980 of the sample of students who have ever been enrolled in an academic postsecondary program by the time of the first HSB follow-up (1982).

Table 5B. Teacher Preparation Transitions by Ability<sup>a</sup> and Aspirations: Hispanics

Status (year)	Original Aspirants			Late Aspirants		
	% top half	% top quartile	n	% top half	% top quartile	n
Aspire to Teach senior year HS (1980)	6.5	4.6	83	0.0	0.0	0
In Teacher Training (1982)	10.2	9.8	30	12.4	1.0	57
In Teacher Training (1984)	13.5	12.3	17	16.3	4.6	40
Graduated College, teacher prepared (1986)	2.1	2.1	7	15.2	0.0	22
Actively Teaching (1986)	33.4	30.5	9	21.5	9.3	35

a. Ability distribution is based on reading, vocabulary, and mathematics test scores in 1980 of the sample of students who have ever been enrolled in an academic postsecondary program by the time of the first HSB follow-up (1982).

Table 5C. Teacher Preparation Transitions by Ability<sup>a</sup> and Aspirations: Whites

Status (year)	Original Aspirants			Late Aspirants		
	% top half	% top quartile	n	% top half	% top quartile	n
Aspire to Teach senior year HS (1980)	46.2	20.0	190	0.0	0.0	0
In Teacher Training (1982)	50.4	24.7	85	42.2	13.3	122
In Teacher Training (1984)	48.0	17.6	68	62.7	28.2	123
Graduated College, teacher prepared (1986)	53.2	22.7	43	52.0	24.0	62
Actively Teaching (1986)	54.3	34.6	48	71.9	30.7	89

a. Ability distribution is based on reading, vocabulary, and mathematics test scores in 1980 of the sample of students who have ever been enrolled in an academic postsecondary program by the time of the first HSB follow-up (1982).



what could be important differences based upon the detailed circumstances facing individual students. While these data do not permit looking at individual-specific demand considerations, they do permit looking at variations across states, and this provides an opportunity to look at some of the most debated issues of educational policy.

Individual states operate quite distinct policies with respect to certification requirements, work conditions and rules, and compensation. And, indeed, many reform proposals begin with the notion of working through state-level policies. One set of policies would improve the compensation and conditions of employment for teachers and would work to expand the pool of potential teachers. A further set of policies involves tightening the requirements for teaching, through such things as extended training requirements, testing programs, and the like.

The analytical approach here is to combine the High School and Beyond data with information about the structure of teaching requirements and pay for teachers.<sup>9</sup> We then attempt to explain variations in the probability of preparing for teaching careers by variations in state requirements and state economic conditions in addition to the background factors considered previously.

We concentrate on the probability that an individual will graduate with an education degree, given that they graduated from college by 1986. As noted above, obtaining a teaching degree is not the only route into teaching, but it is by far the most common. Of the elementary school teachers observed in 1986, only 3.4 percent had bachelor's degrees outside of education, although one quarter had yet to obtain a degree even though they were actively teaching. On the other hand, at the secondary level, 27.6 percent had degrees outside of education (and 19 percent had yet to graduate). Because of the observations here that are very early in any possible careers, it is not possible to

---

<sup>9</sup>To do this analysis, we combine High School and Beyond data with information on state certification requirements found in Woellner[1982] and Goertz, Ekstrom, and Coley[1984]. Because the HSB does not provide direct information on state of residence for students, we employ the Hanushek and Taylor[1990] algorithm to determine state of residence.

identify with any precision who may and may not enter ultimately teaching. Therefore, it is not possible to trace through the college preparation of those who do and do not eventually enter teaching.

Our modeling work concentrates on three factors that have been featured in current discussions of teacher supply policies: the amount of teacher-specific coursework that is required for certification; the use of teacher tests for certification; and, the relative earnings of teachers. These matters, which are some of the most important policies controlled at the state level, have been highlighted for change—even though the recommended changes have not always pointed in the same direction.

Policy recommendations about coursework requirements have actually gone in all directions. Considerable tension exists. States periodically review their requirements and frequently call for introducing new and additional course requirements for teacher preparation. On the other hand, another set of arguments suggests that these undergraduate coursework requirements should be lowered significantly if not dropped. The lowering of undergraduate requirements has been argued as appropriate because such requirements for education courses crowd out other undergraduate courses that are hypothesized to be more important. Some suggest that it is better to develop the thorough subject matter knowledge and analytical ability that is central to liberal arts preparation; others concentrate on the potentially adverse supply effects that come from a person having to commit to a full teaching career while cutting off other career possibilities. Those advocating loosening the requirements for undergraduate preparation split, however, on where to take these recommendations. Some feel that relaxing or eliminating the undergraduate requirements should go hand in hand with a new requirement of master's level training in education (cf. Carnegie Forum[1986], Holmes Group[1986]). Others believe that other strategies such as New Jersey's Provisional Teacher Program offer much more hope (Murnane *et al.*[1991]). Again, while this work cannot assess the outcomes of

teacher training requirements in terms of student learning,<sup>10</sup> it can look at the effects of different requirements on the supply of trained teachers.

The testing of teachers is another controversial area. Since 1980, a majority of states have enacted legislation requiring teachers to take and pass a test before initial certification. The most common test is the National Teacher Examination (NTE), but a number of states have developed alternatives. A variety of questions have been raised about this. Are teacher test performance and teaching performance highly correlated? Are the tests discriminatory? Do the tests erect an artificial barrier to entry into teaching? While we cannot look at the larger issues, we can look at whether the use of such tests influences student decisions on teacher preparation.

Finally, the most frequently suggested policy for improving the quality of the teaching force is to increase the compensation of teachers. The relative salaries of teachers, displayed in Table 6, fell noticeably since World War II. The pattern is, however, a bit different than conventional wisdom typically suggests since most of the fall came before 1960 for men and before 1970 for women. In more recent times, relative salaries have remained virtually constant.<sup>11</sup> The policy argument remains, nonetheless, straightforward: Higher salaries will attract a larger and more qualified pool of applicants. It is possible to look at this hypothesis by observing variations in the relative earnings of teachers compared to other occupations.

The statistical analysis considers how these various factors affect the probability of completing a teacher training program. The variable definitions along with descriptive statistics are found in Table 7 and probit estimates of student decisions for teacher training appear in Table 8. Overall by

---

<sup>10</sup>Hanushek[1989] provides evidence that currently offered graduate training for teachers is quite ineffective. There is little or no evidence suggesting that teachers with advanced training do better in the classroom than those with just a bachelor's degree.

<sup>11</sup>Real teacher salaries have increased since the mid-1970s. These increases have been sufficient to keep pace with the salaries for nonteachers but insufficient to increase relative earnings (see Hanushek, Rivkin, and Jamison 1993).

Table 6. Average yearly earnings of teachers as a proportion of earnings of nonteaching college graduates: 1940-1988<sup>a</sup>

Year	Men	Women	Total
1940	0.92	1.16	1.05
1950	0.86	1.03	0.94
1960	0.80	0.99	0.88
1970	0.78	0.92	0.85
1980	0.77	0.91	0.84
1988	0.78	0.88	0.84

Note: a. Average earnings of nonteachers is a weighted average of earnings based on the sex and age composition of teachers.

Source: Hanushek, Rivkin, and Jamison[1992], pp. 222.

1986 12.5 percent of the college graduates were prepared for teaching careers. The probit estimates in Table 8 indicate the marginal effects of each factor. The separate columns vary in the characterization of state factors. The first column considers just the effects of the number of professional credits in undergraduate training required and of the use of either the NTE test or a state test for certification; the second column adds the relative earnings of teachers in each state; and the third and fourth allow for interactions between student race and test requirements. In general, the estimates are very stable across specifications, so we will simply report the results from column 2 unless otherwise indicated.

The top portion of Table 8 provides a multivariate extension of the previous descriptive analyses of student choices. Quite clearly, those preparing for teaching are heavily concentrated among white females. At the sample means, the white male preparation rate is 10 percentage points lower. Similarly, Asians (18.2 percentage points) and Blacks (9.2 percentage points) are more likely to train in other fields than teaching.

Holding constant race and gender, people scoring higher on the base year test score are less likely to enter teaching. A move from the mean to one standard deviation above the mean on the base year test score implies a 5.5 percentage point decline in the probability of training for teaching. Again, this negative influence of ability is consistent with the observation that graduates are an ever more select group of the population. Even though graduates with teaching degree are higher ability than those who ever dabble with teacher training in college or ever aspire to teach, they are below the average graduate.

The bottom portion of the table is concerned with the direct state policy instruments discussed. The requirements for professional credits (PROFCRDT) varies quite widely across states with the average being 19 credits and a standard deviation of over 11 credits. An increased requirement lowers the probability of completing a teacher's preparation curriculum, with an added

Table 7. Variable Definitions, Means, and Standard Deviations for Teacher Preparation Models  
(n= 1,325)

Variable	Mean (stnd.dev.)	Definition
Male	.438 (.496)	=1 if male; =0 if female
Hispanic	.155 (.362)	=1 if Hispanic or Spanish; =0 otherwise
Indian	.005 (.073)	=1 if American Indian or Alaskan Native; =0 otherwise
Asian	.048 (.214)	=1 if Asian or Pacific Islander; =0 otherwise
Black	.152 (.359)	=1 if African-American; =0 otherwise
Base Test Score	55.96 (7.44)	Student combined mathematics, reading, and vocabulary test score, base year (1980)
TEST	.435 (.496)	=1 if state requires testing for initial certification; =0 otherwise (Source: Goertz, Ekstrom and Coley[1984])
PROFCRDT	18.91 (11.47)	Number of professional education credits required by state for certification (Source: Woellner 1982)
RELEARN	1.011 (.095)	Mean starting teacher salary from 1980 HSB survey relative to mean 1980 Census annual earnings of all females age 25-34 with 4 years college by state

Table 8. Probit Estimates of the Probability of Earning a Bachelor's Degree in Education Conditional Upon Receiving a Bachelor's Degree (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Male	-0.645 (0.11)	-0.646* (0.11)	-0.646# (0.10)	-0.647# (0.11)
Hispanic	-0.242+ (0.15)	-0.222 (0.15)	-0.260+ (0.15)	-0.238 (0.15)
Indian	-0.105 (0.58)	-0.111 (0.58)	-0.133 (0.58)	-0.143 (0.58)
Asian	-1.176* (0.44)	-1.169* (0.44)	-1.19# (0.44)	-1.18* (0.44)
Black	-0.596# (0.16)	-0.587# (0.16)	-0.404* (0.20)	-0.376+ (0.21)
Base Test Score	-0.048# (0.01)	-0.048# (0.01)	-0.049# (0.01)	-0.049# (0.01)
TEST	-0.258+ (0.11)	-0.245* (0.11)	-0.195+ (0.11)	-0.173 (0.12)
PROFCRDT	-0.008+ (0.004)	-0.008+ (0.004)	-0.008+ (0.004)	-0.008+ (0.004)
RELEARN		0.377 (0.52)		0.487 (0.52)
Black x TEST			-0.435 (0.30)	-0.472 (0.30)
Intercept	2.040# (0.44)	1.625* (0.72)	2.062# (0.44)	1.528* (0.72)

Statistical significance:

- + p < .10
- \* p < .05
- # p < .01

10 credits reducing teaching preparation by 1.2 percentage points. These estimated effects are significantly different from zero at the 10 percent level.

The use of tests for certification also reduce teacher training. Other things being equal, teacher preparation will be 4 percentage points lower in a state requiring either the National Teachers Examination (NTE) or another state-wide test. This measure is clearly quite crude, because it does not provide indication of differential difficulty in passing tests.<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, these requirements have strong effects on teacher preparation, reducing teacher training on average by a third. Murnane *et al.*[1991] suggest that the use of certification tests may have differential effects on minorities, particularly Blacks. To analyze this, the last two columns of Table 8 include an interaction between whether or not the student is Black and the use of a certification test. While these estimates indicate a negative interaction—i.e., that Black students react more strongly to the use of tests than do other students, the estimated effects are statistically insignificant. (The statistical insignificance may simply reflect the relatively small samples and limited variation).

Finally, the models also consider the effect of relative teacher earnings. This measure compares HSB data on entry salaries for teachers with average earnings of female college graduates age 25-34 in each state. While the point estimates indicate that higher relative earnings elicit a positive supply response, the magnitude is extraordinarily small, and the effects are insignificantly different from zero. These negligible earnings effects could be explained by measurement difficulties. The earnings measures differ only by state and refer to 1980. Thus, if individuals have different expectations based either on more local information or on their forecasts of the future, these estimates could be biased downward. Nevertheless, they suggest that overall salary actions will not have a large short run effect on training and supply.

---

<sup>12</sup>Murnane *et al.*[1991] provides evidence that the stringency of the cut-off score employed has important effects on supply. Thus, the measurement of just the use of such a test is a very crude indication of the importance of this factor across states and over time.



Because of the special concern about high ability students and their choices, the preceding analysis was duplicated for students in the top quartile of those attending college. Of the 499 students in the top quartile who graduate from college by 1986, 6.2 percent complete teachers training (as compared to 12.5 percent for the entire population of graduates). Interestingly, however, the estimated probit models of choice for the top quartile are not significantly different from those for the rest of the population.

In the course of the investigation, several other characteristics of state programs were examined. The TEST variable was disaggregated into the NTE and other state-specified tests; variables for the use of forgivable loans for students in education programs and for a certification requirement of obtaining a master's degree were introduced; and, the measure of course requirements was expanded to include requirements past professional education credits. None of these proved significant in the analyses. This, however, may simply reflect the crudeness of the measures and the limited variation in requirements across the states.

The choice models were also disaggregated into earlier choices made by these students. Table 9 presents estimates of three separate submodels: the probability of initially entering a teacher training program in 1982; the probability of remaining in a teacher training program through 1984; and the probability of entering a teacher training program in 1984 after not being in one in 1982.

These models give similar results to the graduation models with a few notable exceptions. The relative earnings of teachers in the state has a statistically significant impact on the initial choice of teacher preparation in 1982 (column 1), although the magnitude of the effect is small. A change of relative teacher earnings of 10 percent (the cross-sectional standard deviation) would imply a .7 percentage point increase in 1982 teacher preparation. When traced through until completion of training, the implied effect on eventual supply is thus quite small. Certification requirements (TEST

Table 9. Probit Estimates of Transition Probabilities (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Variable	Teacher Training 1982 <sup>a</sup>	Teacher Training 1982 and 1984 <sup>b</sup>	Teacher Training 1984 only <sup>c</sup>
Male	-0.638 <sup>#</sup> (0.07)	-0.460* (0.19)	-0.258* (0.10)
Hispanic	-0.173* (0.08)	0.129 (0.20)	-0.228 (0.15)
Indian	-0.238 (0.26)	0.116 (0.59)	-0.190 (0.49)
Asian	-0.564 <sup>#</sup> (0.18)	-0.782 (0.54)	-0.890* (0.38)
Black	-0.584 <sup>#</sup> (0.09)	0.107 (0.25)	-0.343* (0.15)
Base Test Score	-0.029 <sup>#</sup> (0.004)	0.024* (0.01)	-0.027 <sup>#</sup> (0.01)
TEST	-0.009 (0.06)	-0.266 <sup>+</sup> (0.16)	0.212* (0.11)
PROFCRDT	-0.001 (0.003)	-0.004 (0.01)	-0.006 (0.005)
RELEARN	0.557 <sup>+</sup> (0.29)	1.373 <sup>+</sup> (0.72)	0.288 (0.52)
Intercept	-0.026 (0.39)	-1.952* (0.97)	-0.281 (0.71)
Sample Size	4050	311	2142
Mean Probability	0.084	0.653	0.041

Notes: a. Probability of being in teacher training program in 1982 given that the student entered some academic postsecondary program.

b. Probability of being in a teacher training program in 1984 given that the student was enrolled in a teacher training program in 1982.

c. Probability of being in a teacher training program in 1984 given that the student was not enrolled in a teacher training program in 1982.

Statistical significance: + =  $p < .10$ ; \* =  $p < .05$ ; # =  $p < .01$

and PROFCDRT) both depress the probability of teacher training, but they are statistically insignificant in these estimates.

Continuation in teacher training (column 2) is also affected significantly by relative earnings. A 10 percent increase in relative earnings would imply a 5 percentage point increase in continuation rates (with a mean continuation rate of 65 percent). The continuation models also indicate that the use of certification tests depresses the rate by 9.7 percentage points. Finally, within the relatively small sample used to estimate the continuation models (311 students in teacher training in 1982), higher ability students in terms of base test scores tend to continue more frequently in the teaching programs they began than do lower ability students. This anomalous result may simply reflect the fact that lower ability students are more likely to drop out of school.

The state certification requirements and economic conditions have one irregularity in the model of late entrants into teaching (column 3). Students who were not enrolled in teaching preparation programs in 1982 are more likely to enter by 1984 if the state uses testing for certification (TEST). There is no obvious explanation for this, since, among other things, those with higher base tests still tend to enter teacher preparation less frequently.

The final investigation considers the probability of teaching in an elementary or secondary school sometime by 1986.<sup>13</sup> These models, comparing those in the teaching profession with all college graduates, are presented in Table 10. The results are very similar to those explaining the completion of teaching training (Table 8), which is not surprising since teacher training is chosen by some 69 percent of those who enter teaching. The very partial nature of these findings must, however, be emphasized. The HSB data permit only a preliminary look at career choices and patterns because of the survey timing. The students sampled frequently have not finished school within four

---

<sup>13</sup>Similar models were also estimated to examine those teaching in Spring 1986 (as opposed to ever having taught). These models were very similar in statistical terms and quantitative estimates to those presented and thus are not reproduced here.

Table 10. Probit Estimates of the Probability of Teaching in an Elementary or Secondary School by Spring 1986 Conditional Upon Receiving a Bachelor's Degree (Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Male	-.476# (.098)	-.476# (.098)	-.475# (.098)	-.475# (.098)
Hispanic	-.147 (.141)	-.143 (.143)	-.157 (.141)	-.151 (.143)
Indian	-.027 (.589)	-.028 (.585)	-.042 (.585)	-.044 (.585)
Asian	-.075 (.224)	-.072 (.225)	-.086 (.224)	-.082 (.225)
Black	-.203 (.146)	-.202 (.146)	-.107 (.188)	-.100 (.190)
Test Score	-.018# (.007)	-.018* (.007)	-.018# (.007)	-.018# (.007)
ANYTEST	-.250# (.098)	-.247* (.100)	-.216* (.107)	-.209+ (.110)
PROFCRDT	-.001 (.004)	-.001 (.004)	-.001 (.004)	-.001 (.004)
RELEARN		.071 (.503)		.127 (.507)
Black x TEST			-.209 (.266)	-.219 (.269)
Intercept	.169 (.409)	.090 (.692)	.181 (.410)	.040 (.694)

Statistical significance:

- + p < .10
- \* p < .05
- # p < .01

years of high school graduation, and those who have finished frequently have not settled into a career. Moreover, 1985 and 1986 were years of weak demand for new teachers. Thus, these estimates should not be interpreted as indicating the full pattern of teacher supply.

There are two important differences in these results compared to the earlier ones. First, actual teaching, which involves both the supply and demand sides of the market, is less biased toward low ability students. Specifically, even though student performance on the cognitive tests is still negatively related with entry into teaching, the quantitative effect is less for entry as opposed to teacher preparation. Second, the number of professional credits no longer exerts a statistically significant effect on teacher supply—presumably related to the fact that these requirements have less effect on the twenty percent of the sample who do not enter teaching through teacher training programs.

The existence of teacher certification tests still has a depressing effect on teacher supply. Indeed, testing has an even stronger depressing effect on actual entry into teaching in the schools as compared to completion of teacher training.

These latter models of course become more complicated because they combine both student choices and school system choices. The demand for teachers is directly related to changes in student populations, teacher retirements, subject area demands, and quality judgments of school officials. The models here do not separate demand and supply sides of the market and are thus best interpreted as reduced form relationships.<sup>14</sup> Nonetheless, they provide consistent patterns to those found for student choices of training programs.

---

<sup>14</sup>The only attempt to model both supply and demand of teachers that we know of is Strauss(1993). This analysis which concentrates on just a single state, cannot, however, investigate state policies such as credit requirements or use of teacher tests.

#### 4. Interpretation and Conclusions

This study stops considerably short of uncovering what we would like to know about teacher supply. It finds a number of factors that affect teacher preparation and thus teacher supply. It cannot, however, easily carry this through to statements about ultimate impacts on student learning.

The descriptive analysis and the subsequent models of student choice underscore what has been conventional wisdom. White females are much more likely to complete teacher preparation than males or members of racial and ethnic minority groups. Moreover, lower ability students as measured by cognitive achievement tests are more likely than higher ability students to enter teaching.

The most significant findings, however, relate to state requirements. The barriers that states set up for certification indeed inhibit supply. The prospect of taking an examination for certification lowers the rate of teacher preparation, everything else equal. Likewise, increased course requirements for professional education depress supply. Nothing of course is said here about whether or not these are appropriate (although others have argued that these requirements are not). These results merely indicate that such requirements are costly in terms of a smaller pool of trained teachers.

The results for the effects of teacher salaries do not indicate that this is a particularly powerful influence on student choices. Even though relative earnings of teachers compared to all college graduates vary considerably across the Nation, they do not have a large or statistically significant impact on student preparation for teaching.

The preliminary glimpse at actual entry into the teaching profession shows similar patterns across states. The use of teacher examinations for certification purposes has the clearest impact on lessening supply. Nonetheless, the data on actual teaching come too earlier in potential careers to

give a very complete picture of what supply ultimately will look like, and thus these results should not be given heavy weight.

We ultimately need to merge information about actual teaching ability with information about factors affecting supply. Such a statement is obviously much more easily stated than accomplished. All of the analytical work on schools and educational performance suggests that the simple, commonly measured attributes of teachers such as degree level or amount of teaching experience is not closely related to the classroom performance of the teacher (Hanushek 1986, 1989). Given this, direct estimation of supply functions for teachers is very difficult.

The quality measure of this study—cognitive test performance of students prior to college entry—has two problems. While teacher ability is somewhat related to student performance, it is far from perfect. Additionally, these are tests prior to attending college, thus ignoring any differential value-added by college experiences.

All of these arguments suggest that the study of teacher supply must be more directly related to actual classroom performance. The research design that accomplishes this is quite complicated. Moreover, the only direct method may involve some degree of experimentation. But even that has difficulties if one wishes to trace through the full response of student decisions and the like.

## REFERENCES

- Boe, Erling E. and Dorothy M. Gilford (ed.), *Teacher Supply, Demand, and Quality: Policy Issues, Models, and Data Bases* (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1992)
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986)
- Ferguson, Ronald, "Paying for Public Education: New Evidence on How and Why Money Matters," *Harvard Journal on Legislation*, 28(2), Summer 1991, pp. 465-498.
- Goertz, Margaret E., Ruth B. Ekstrom, and Richard J. Coley, "The Impact of State Policy on Entrance Into the Teaching Profession: Final Report", Educational Testing Service, October 1984 (mimeo).
- Guilford, Dorothy and Ellen Tenenbaum(ed.), *Precollege Science and Mathematics Teachers: Monitoring Supply, Demand, and Quality* (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1990).
- Hanushek, Eric A. "The Economics of Schooling: Production and Efficiency in Public Schools," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 24(3), September 1986, p. 1141-1177.
- Hanushek, E.A., "The Impact of Differential Expenditures on School Performance," *Educational Researcher*, 18(4), May 1989, p. 45-51.
- Hanushek, Eric A. "The Trade-off Between Children Quantity and Quality," *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(1), February 1992, pp: 84-117.
- Hanushek, Eric A., Steven G. Rivkin and Dean T. Jamison, "Improving Educational Outcomes While Controlling Costs," *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, 37 (December 1992), pp. 205-238.
- Hanushek, Eric A. and Lori Taylor, "Alternative Assessments of the Performance of Schools: Measurement of State Variations in Achievement", *Journal of Human Resources*, 25(2), Spring 1990, pp. 179-201.
- Holmes Group, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, 1986)
- Manski, Charles F., "Academic Ability, Earnings, and the Decision to Become a Teacher: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972," in David A. Wise (ed.), *Public Sector Payrolls* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), pp. 291-312.
- Murnane, Richard, Judith D. Singer, John B. Willett, James J. Kemple, and Randall J. Olsen, *Who Will Teach? Policies That Matter*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991)



National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *Digest of Education Statistics, 1992* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1992)

Strauss, Robert P., *Public School Teachers in Pennsylvania: Demand and Supply Through School Year 2000*, Carnegie-Mellon University (mimeo), 1993.

Weaver, W. Timothy, *America's Teacher Quality Problem: Alternatives for Reform* (New York: Praeger, 1983).

Woellner, Elizabeth H., *Requirements for Certification, 1982-83*, 47th Edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

Zarkin, Gary A., "Occupational Choice: An Application to the Market for Public School Teachers," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May 1985, pp. 409-446.