# Monetizing the Value of Official Statistics: A Case Study

Thilo Klein

PARIS21 Secretariat

October 20, 2016

Partnership in Statistics for Development (PARIS21) Monetizing the Value of Official Statistics

### Motivation

[The researchers] are sceptical about the UN's push for "data for development" [...], gathering data is hugely expensive, at around \$1.5 billion per SDG target. – The Economist (2015)

Social and economic benefit per USD spent Sources: Copenhagen Concensus Centre (2015); Jerven (201

### Motivation

[The researchers] are sceptical about the UN's push for "data for development" [...], gathering data is hugely expensive, at around \$1.5 billion per SDG target. – The Economist (2015)

#### Social and economic benefit per USD spent



Sources: Copenhagen Concensus Centre (2015); Jerven (2014)

# Motivation (cont'd)

### Costing

- Extrapolation from the costs of 18 MDG targets to 169 SDG targets is very naive
- Espey et al. (2016) estimate required investment in data production for SDGs at \$1 billion annually

#### Return on investment

- Jerven (2014) concludes that "the benefit-cost ratio is *likely to be* below one."
- ightarrow How can we measure the return on investment in data?

# Motivation (cont'd)

### Costing

- Extrapolation from the costs of 18 MDG targets to 169 SDG targets is very naive
- Espey et al. (2016) estimate required investment in data production for SDGs at \$1 billion annually

#### Return on investment

- Jerven (2014) concludes that "the benefit-cost ratio is *likely* to be below one."
- $\rightarrow\,$  How can we measure the return on investment in data?

## Challenges

#### Methodological challenges

- not clear where to expect impacts: users and uses often unknown
- RCTs are difficult: information spillovers; withholding information is clearly unethical
- no market prices: statistics are a public (or club) good

## Methodologies

#### Review of methodologies

- Cost or investment approach
- Market (equivalent) pricing
- Stated preferences
- Revealed preferences
- Impact assessment

 $\rightarrow$  Forthcoming report by UNECE Task Force on the Value of Official Statistics

## Methodologies

#### Review of methodologies

- Cost or investment approach
- Market (equivalent) pricing
- Stated preferences
- Revealed preferences
- Impact assessment

 $\rightarrow$  Forthcoming report by UNECE Task Force on the Value of Official Statistics

### Impact assessment: Literature

#### Targeting

- Effective targeting of anti-poverty programmes in Indonesia (Alatas et al., 2012, AER)
- SA Old Age Pension scheme (Edmonds, 2006, JDE)

### Health

- Changes in sexual behavior of teenage girls after learning HIV risk statistics from the Kenyan DHS (Dupas, 2011, AEJ)
- Reduced infant mortality after informing citizens of clinics quality in Uganda (Björkman and Svensson, 2007, QJE)

#### Education

• School accountability through dissemination of performance information in Portugal (Nunes et al., 2015, EER)

### Impact assessment: Literature

#### Targeting

- Effective targeting of anti-poverty programmes in Indonesia (Alatas et al., 2012, AER)
- SA Old Age Pension scheme (Edmonds, 2006, JDE)

### Health

- Changes in sexual behavior of teenage girls after learning HIV risk statistics from the Kenyan DHS (Dupas, 2011, AEJ)
- Reduced infant mortality after informing citizens of clinics quality in Uganda (Björkman and Svensson, 2007, QJE)

#### Education

• School accountability through dissemination of performance information in Portugal (Nunes et al., 2015, EER)

### Impact assessment: Literature

### Targeting

- Effective targeting of anti-poverty programmes in Indonesia (Alatas et al., 2012, AER)
- SA Old Age Pension scheme (Edmonds, 2006, JDE)

### Health

- Changes in sexual behavior of teenage girls after learning HIV risk statistics from the Kenyan DHS (Dupas, 2011, AEJ)
- Reduced infant mortality after informing citizens of clinics quality in Uganda (Björkman and Svensson, 2007, QJE)

#### Education

• School accountability through dissemination of performance information in Portugal (Nunes et al., 2015, EER)

7/16

### Impact assessment: School choice

### School choice

- well-established instrument to allow parents to choose the right school for their child
- potential to hold schools to account, reward them for good performance and thus improve educational outcomes

#### Suitability for analysis

- important decision, sets the course of a child's development
- well-defined (and restricted) use of school statistics
- availability of microdata on school choices and outcomes

### Impact assessment: School choice

### School choice

- well-established instrument to allow parents to choose the right school for their child
- potential to hold schools to account, reward them for good performance and thus improve educational outcomes

#### Suitability for analysis

- important decision, sets the course of a child's development
- well-defined (and restricted) use of school statistics
- availability of microdata on school choices and outcomes

8/16

### Impact assessment: School choice (cont'd)

#### Costs of examination system

- In the UK, GCSE exams are organised by competing providers that charge about £250 per candidate (Source: OfQual)
- $\bullet~\mbox{Cost}$  of 500k x  $\pounds300=\pounds150m$  per cohort

#### $\rightarrow$ Benefits?

#### Counterfactual experiment

- Wales and England have very similar education systems
- In 2001, Wales abolishes school league tables while tables for English schools continue to be published

#### ightarrow Diff-in-diff analysis of GCSE results and PISA scores

8/16

### Impact assessment: School choice (cont'd)

#### Costs of examination system

- In the UK, GCSE exams are organised by competing providers that charge about £250 per candidate (Source: OfQual)
- Cost of 500k x  $\pounds 300=\pounds 150m$  per cohort

#### $\rightarrow$ Benefits?

#### Counterfactual experiment

- Wales and England have very similar education systems
- In 2001, Wales abolishes school league tables while tables for English schools continue to be published

#### $\rightarrow$ Diff-in-diff analysis of GCSE results and PISA scores

### Impact assessment: School choice (cont'd)

#### Costs of examination system

- In the UK, GCSE exams are organised by competing providers that charge about £250 per candidate (Source: OfQual)
- Cost of 500k x  $\pounds300=\pounds150m$  per cohort

#### $\rightarrow$ Benefits?

#### Counterfactual experiment

- Wales and England have very similar education systems
- In 2001, Wales abolishes school league tables while tables for English schools continue to be published
- $\rightarrow$  Diff-in-diff analysis of GCSE results and PISA scores

### National exam performance in England and Wales



Source: Burgess et al. (2013, JPubEcon)

#### Benefits I: Cost-savings potential

- Burgess et al. (2013): Effect size of publishing school league tables equivalent to class-size reduction of 30%
- This would require hiring additional teachers at £2.9 billion per cohort (compared to just £150m for examination system)
- $\rightarrow$  Any  $\pounds 1$  invested saves  $\pounds 18$  compared to cutting class size.

#### Benefits I: Cost-savings potential

- Burgess et al. (2013): Effect size of publishing school league tables equivalent to class-size reduction of 30%
- This would require hiring additional teachers at £2.9 billion per cohort (compared to just £150m for examination system)
- $\rightarrow$  Any  $\pounds 1$  invested saves  $\pounds 18$  compared to cutting class size.



#### Benefits II: Impact on economic growth

- Hanushek/Woessmann (2009): 1 standard deviation increase in PISA scores improves GDP by 1.74 percentage points
- Publishing league tables improves PISA scores for England by 0.1 standard deviations compared to Wales (2003-2009)
- $\rightarrow$  Any £1 invested yields an £16 increase in GDP.

#### Benefits II: Impact on economic growth

- Hanushek/Woessmann (2009): 1 standard deviation increase in PISA scores improves GDP by 1.74 percentage points
- Publishing league tables improves PISA scores for England by 0.1 standard deviations compared to Wales (2003-2009)
- $\rightarrow$  Any £1 invested yields an £16 increase in GDP.



### Impact assessment: Conclusion

### Strengths

- provides measure of societal impact, not only a price tag
- can rule out competing accountability mechanisms: choice-based; high-stakes; low-stakes

### Limitations

- partial analysis: benefit of dissemination vs. cost of production
- steady-state assumption: effect of improved education persists
- reverse causation: effects of PISA scores on GDP estimates
- parallel trend assumption: diff-in-diff method is problematic
- difficult to replicate: method relies on rare policy changes
- redistributional effects of statistics are not captured

### Impact assessment: Conclusion

### Strengths

- provides measure of societal impact, not only a price tag
- can rule out competing accountability mechanisms: choice-based; high-stakes; low-stakes

### Limitations

- partial analysis: benefit of dissemination vs. cost of production
- steady-state assumption: effect of improved education persists
- reverse causation: effects of PISA scores on GDP estimates
- parallel trend assumption: diff-in-diff method is problematic
- difficult to replicate: method relies on rare policy changes
- redistributional effects of statistics are not captured

### Revealed preferences I: School choice

Hungarian Education Office website

### Revealed preferences I: School choice

#### Hungarian Education Office website

			A HIVATAL	ÜGYINTÉZ	ÉS PÁLYÁZ	ATOK   SAJTÓS	ZOBA KAPCS	DLAT BEJELEN	TKEZÉS		
OKTATÁSI HIVATAL											
KÖ	ZNEVELÉS	FELSŐOKTATÁS SZAKKÉPZÉS TOVÁBBKÉP	ZÉS LLL NYE	LVVIZSGA	KÉPESÍTÉ	ÉSEK ELISMER	RTETÉSE KI	R HIVATALI ÜGʻ	YEK		
Kö	Köznevelés 🤇 Intézménykereső 🔇 Intézmények a számok tükrében 🤇 Hazal mérések statisztikál										
	OM azon.	A feladatellátási hely neve	Képzési forma	Évfolyam	Összesen	A jelentésben szereplők	Matematika	Szövegértés			
	033556	KOSZISZ Királyfalvi Miklós Katolikus Általános Iskola és Óvoda (4327 Pöcspetri, Iskola út 4.)	általános iskola	6	20	18	1574 🗁	1532 💬	٩		
	037728	"Agy Tanoda" Magyar- Angol Két Tanitási Nyelvű Általános Iskola (2000 Szentendre, Jókai utca 3.)	általános iskola	6	11	10	1627 🕲	1607 🕲	٩		
	031960	"B" ÉPÜLET (2500 Esztergom, Pázmány Péter utca 16.)	általános iskola	6	31	31	1520 😄	1510 💬	٩		
	027264	003 Szent Mór Katolíkus Általános Iskola, Alaptokú Můvěszeti Iskola és Gimnázium Papnövelde utcai telephely (7621 Pécs, Papnövelde utca 1-3)	általános iskola	6	57	54	1581 🕲	1610 🕲	٩		
	029374	2. sz. épület (3800 Szikszó, Malom út 2-6.)	általános iskola	6	65	63	1413 🛞	1373 🛞	٩		

### Revealed preferences I: School choice (cont'd)

Parents face trade-off between (i) schools in geographical proximity vs. (ii) high academic performance record

 $\rightarrow$  Use the statistic or minimise commuting cost?

### Revealed preferences I: School choice (cont'd)

Parents face trade-off between (i) schools in geographical proximity vs. (ii) high academic performance record

 $\rightarrow$  Use the statistic or minimise commuting cost?



### Revealed preferences II: National newspapers

Publishers face trade-off between revenue from (i) placing ads vs. (ii) sales (through more/better content)

 $\rightarrow$  Stats content is placed if demand exceeds revenue from ads

### Revealed preferences II: National newspapers

Publishers face trade-off between revenue from (i) placing ads vs. (ii) sales (through more/better content)

 $\rightarrow$  Stats content is placed if demand exceeds revenue from ads

#### Method



Example (Mexico)

Media	Notes	Impact	Market Value
Television	425	71M	\$41M
Printed Media	2,976	50M	\$31M
Radio	786	23M	\$72M
Internet	5,324	91M	\$6M
Total	9,511	236M	\$151M

# Revealed preferences: Conclusion

### Strengths

- measures subjective value to users
- applicable in developing countries and at reasonable cost

### Limitations

- partial effect: value to the public (not policy makers, administrators, etc)
- school choice: confounding problem: stats explain choice if parents (i) use them or (ii) would have found them useful
- **newspaper analysis:** unclear which keywords to use and which part of the article to count

# Revealed preferences: Conclusion

### Strengths

- measures subjective value to users
- applicable in developing countries and at reasonable cost

### Limitations

- partial effect: value to the public (not policy makers, administrators, etc)
- school choice: confounding problem: stats explain choice if parents (i) use them or (ii) would have found them useful
- **newspaper analysis:** unclear which keywords to use and which part of the article to count