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- What were the questions and who wanted to know?
- How did we find the answers?
- What did we learn?
- Why does it matter for Mozambique?
Mozambique, 2006

- High growth after war, but still a very poor country
  - Very poorly educated labor force; weak capacity in Government but strong Education team
  - Massive increase in education infrastructure, especially in rural areas but still enrollment, dropout, completion problems

- What was the next step for the sector?
  - New curriculum with fewer tests to reduce dropouts
  - Reduce costs to households – no national fees, free textbooks; expand ‘direct support to schools’
  - Continue to expand infrastructure

- Question from the Government – did it work? And what about secondary?
**Research strategy**

- **Qualitative study first (2007)** – what is going on?
  - Teachers, community leaders: removal of fees removed “psychological barrier”
  - Significant unhappiness with new curriculum
  - High demand for secondary education not met with current facilities; parents reported high fees

- **Implement National Panel Survey, 2008**
  - Resurvey of ¼ of households in IAF 2002/3 with children in 2002/3
  - Standard household data
  - Education history module
  - Detailed employment module

- **What were the trends? Could any changes be attributed to the reforms?**
More kids entered school and at an earlier age.
Gains in enrollment were highest among poor households in EP1, but not EP2.
But was this the effect of the reform?

- How to identify reform effects?
  - Use information in Education History Module (cross-section)
- Methodology: Difference-in-differences using time (year) and child’s age to identify the treatment group.
- Analyzed effects for (i) the whole population, (ii) marginal age by age effects, and (iii) subgroups
- Cross check with the analysis of panel households
YES! There was a clear program-induced increase in enrollment.

![Graph showing enrollment probability by age with different program phases: Pre-program, Post-program, and Post-pre. The graph indicates a clear increase in enrollment probability after the program.]
Who benefited most?

- Controlling for all household and individual characteristics, the reforms successfully led to an average of 12% increase in the probability of enrollment for all individuals ages 6-18.
- The effect is particularly higher for girls and all children in rural areas.
- There were positive spillover effects on secondary school attendance rate.
- But demand side issues remain - females and orphans remain less likely to enroll.
School fees imposed locally; higher fees in urban areas, **EP2**

**Annual Per Student Expenditures on Obligatory Contributions (fees)**

**EP1**
- **EP1 2003**
- **EP1 2008**

**EP2**
- **EP2 2003**
- **EP2 2008**
Efficiency is low and many children who should be in school are not.
Why do children not go to school? Parents perceived that they are not ready.
Not enough secondary school places


Moving forward - what matters for Mozambique?

- Very unskilled labor force holding down growth; still widespread poverty
- **Tradeoffs: Where to put the marginal education money?**
  - “last mile” on EP1? Demand side or supply?
  - EP2 even though capacity constraints not major?
  - Secondary (where political pressure is?)
  - ECD (to get kids ready and start on time)
  - TVET (will this solve problems of youth bulge?)
Most of the labor force still works in household economic activities

Type of Employment, Ages 20 and above

- Wage-Public sector
- Wage-Private sector
- Non-farm HH enterprise
- Agriculture

1997: 100%
2003: 100%
2009: 100%
Inescapable math of the informal economy in SSA

Share of labor force in private wage jobs in 2020 vs. Annual growth rate in wage jobs

Legend:
- Red: Lower starting point
- Green: Mean starting point
- Blue: Higher starting point
Are Mozambicans now entering the labor force prepared to raise productivity in the informal economy?

**Education of Youth Ages 15-25**

- Secondary 2 complete or above **
- Secondary 1 complete
- Primary 2 complete
- Primary 1 complete
- Primary 1 incomplete *
- No education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrated analysis: Education + Employment + Inclusive Growth brings a new point of view

- To get inclusive growth: fix primary
  - Worry less about post secondary skills, more about basic skills
  - Quality!
  - Everyone on board w/new curriculum
  - Start kids on time, especially in rural areas – what is needed? What is the cheapest option?
  - Use private sector for secondary school expansion?
  - Centralized monitoring is not working; local demand side monitoring needed
THANK YOU!
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