

"The Foundation and Theoretical Advances of the Education Production Function from 1960s to the Present"

Dr. Subrata Ghosh^{1*}

^{1*}Assistant Professor in Economics, Raiganj Surendranath Mahavidyalaya, UD, West Bengal, India, Contact: +919832054174, Email: emailmeatsubrata@gmail.com

Citation: Dr. Subrata Ghosh, (2023). The Foundation And Theoretical Advances Of The Education Production Function From 1960s To The Present, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 29(3), 1378-1382
DOI: 10.53555/kuey.v29i3.9372

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Since its advent in the 1960s, the education production function (EPF) has been a fundamental concept in the economics of education, drawing from the broader framework of production functions in economics. EPF shows the relationship between educational inputs—such as teacher quality, school resources, and student characteristics—and outputs, often measured in terms of academic achievement including non-cognitive skills, and future labour market success. Early models of EPF highlighted primarily on tangible inputs like class size and teacher credentials, but later iterations covered a wider range of variables, such as family background, student motivation, and the institutional context of schooling. The concept has undergone significant theoretical developments, incorporating elements from microeconomic theory, human capital theory, more advanced econometric and statistical methods, including various socio-economic, institutional, and policy-driven factors. This paper provides an extensive review of theoretical development from the 1960s to the present, focusing on how different educational inputs are modeled, the evolution of empirical techniques, and the influence of policy and institutional factors in diverse educational settings. This review also aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of theoretical contributions and empirical findings over these decades, highlighting key theoretical developments and its implications for education policy and practice, and future directions for research.

Keywords: Education Production Function (EPF), Human Capital Theory, Educational Inputs, Academic Achievement, Non-cognitive Skills

JEL Classification Code: A12, A20, D24, J24, A1, D91

Introduction:

The education production function's roots can be traced back to early human capital theory, primarily developed by economists like Theodore Schultz (1961) and Gary Becker (1964), which laid the foundation for understanding education as an investment in human capital that enhances the skills and productivity of individuals, and ultimately contributing to economic growth (Becker, 1964). The first systematic attempt to apply this idea to education is attributed to James S. Coleman's 1966 study (Coleman Report, 1966), suggesting that resources have only little impact on educational attainment but family background plays critical role in shaping student achievements. However, the study of the education production function (EPF) is built on the analogy of a traditional economics production function, explaining the relationship between inputs in the education system (such as teacher quality, school resources, and student characteristics) and the outputs (student achievement and learning outcomes). Since its inception in the 1960s, the models focused on how investments in education translate into desired outcomes, such as higher test scores, improved graduation rates, and better labour market performance etc. Its development has been closely linked to advances in econometrics and policy analysis, evolving to reflect changes in educational systems, technological advancements, and shifts in labour market demands. Further, throughout the 1970s and 1980s, mainly researchers such as Eric Hanushek and Alan Krueger expanded on Coleman's initial work that led to the development of econometric models, quantifying the impact of various inputs on student achievement. However, during the 1990s and 2000s, several theoretical challenges emerged, and the EPF evolved further to

include a broader set of factors including family background, peer influences, role of institution, culture and psychological factors etc. Recently, many researchers and scholars began to advocate for a more nuanced approach that accounts for non-cognitive skills, such as motivation, perseverance, and social skills, which are increasingly recognized as important determinants of long-term educational outcomes. This review aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the theoretical and empirical evolution of EPF, decade by decade, from the early 1960s to recent years, by highlighting the major contributions, debates, and future directions in understanding how different educational inputs impact student outcomes, and its implications for education policy and practice.

Evolution and Theoretical Development of the Education Production Function

The 1960s: Foundation of the Education Production Function

The 1960s witnessed the emergence of the EPF, largely inspired by economic theories of production and the broader human capital theory, which emphasized the role of education in economic growth. The foundational work by Mincer (1958) on human capital and Solow (1957) on growth models laid the groundwork for understanding education's role in economic development. However, in education, "Equality of Educational Opportunity" (Popularly known as Coleman Report), marked a significant turning point in educational research. The report was among the first large-scale studies (over 600,000 students and 60,000 teachers in the United States) to investigate the relationship between school resources (inputs) and student performance (outputs). This report shifted the focus from school inputs to broader social and environmental factors in education (Coleman et al., 1966). The findings revealed that school resources, such as facilities and funding, had a relatively small effect on student achievement compared to family background and peer influence (i.e. socio-economic status). The findings set the stage for future EPF research into non-school factors that affect educational outcomes. On the other hand, Bowles (1969) offered a critical perspective on the simplistic input-output models of education prevalent in the 1960s, and emphasized the role of socioeconomic inequalities and the broader social context in shaping educational outcomes.

The 1970s: The Evolution of Empirical Models in Education Production

The 1970s marked the beginning of rigorous empirical investigations into the EPF, aided by the development of more sophisticated econometric techniques. Pioneers like Hanushek, Bowles, Gintis, Walberg, Murnane, and Levin each contributed to expanding the EPF's theoretical and empirical framework, laying the groundwork for future research in educational policy and practice.

Hanushek (1971) contributed significantly during this period, and by employing econometric techniques, he introduced a production framework for analyzing the relationship between inputs (such as school funding, teacher qualifications, class size) and student achievement, and viewed that not all traditional educational inputs (such as class size and expenditure per student) have consistent impact on student outcomes or performance. Instead, he argued that inefficiencies in resource allocation often lead to low educational outputs. His research set the stage for the debates on how resources should be allocated to maximize student achievement. Further, Levin (1974) developed the concept of cost-effectiveness analysis within the framework of the EPF, and argued that it was not enough to measure the relationship between inputs and outputs without considering the costs involved in achieving those outputs. However, Murnane (1975) significantly advanced the study of teacher effects in the EPF by conducting empirical analyses on how teacher characteristics influence student achievement, and demonstrated that teacher effects varied significantly across different student populations, and his findings were foundational in shaping later research on teacher quality and its impact on educational production.

During the late 70s, Bowles and Gintis (1976) critically examined the relationship between education and economic structures through the lens of the EPF, and introduced a broader social critique, arguing that schools were instruments for reproducing societal divisions. They contended that education, rather than equalizing opportunities, reinforced existing hierarchies, thereby influencing the theoretical debates on the role of education in promoting or hindering social mobility.

The 1980s: Refinement and Policy Impact

The 1980s saw a further refinement of the EPF, as scholars like Hanushek, Levin, Ladd, Walberg, Card, Krueger, and Rivkin expanded the EPF by introducing new variables, such as accountability systems, teacher quality, and cost-effectiveness, and these developments laid the groundwork for future research in education policy and the economics of education. Cognitive skills and test scores became increasingly important in education production models during this time. But Ladd (1982) highlighted the potential of incentive-based policies (e.g., merit-based teacher pay or performance evaluations) to affect teacher behaviour and, ultimately, student achievement, and provided evidence that school accountability systems could serve as an input within the EPF framework. However, Levin (1983) expanded upon his earlier work on cost-effectiveness analysis in education, further solidifying its role as a critical tool in evaluating educational policies and interventions, and provided a framework influential in decisions around resource allocation, especially in low-income school districts.

During the same decade, Walberg (1984) continued to build on his earlier work throughout the 1980s, refining his model of educational productivity by incorporating more diverse variables such as psychological, social,

and environmental factors into the EPF framework. His educational productivity model emphasized the importance of non-school factors in determining student success, offering a more comprehensive view of how educational inputs combine to produce outcomes. Similarly, Hanushek (1986) also continued to refine his analyses of EPF by focusing on the relationship between school resources and student outcomes. His studies consistently found little or no correlation between increased spending on schools and improved student performance, and spurred debates about education reform, shifting attention to efficiency in the allocation of educational resources and the importance of measuring teacher performance.

During the late 1980s, Rivkin (1988) contributed to the development of the EPF by highlighting the geographic and economic disparities in teacher distribution, particularly in underserved areas where teacher turnover was high, and their effects on educational outcomes. His work also highlighted the broader understanding of the teacher-student relationship within the EPF, emphasizing that teacher stability and quality were critical inputs for producing favourable educational outcomes.

The 1990s: Expansion of Inputs and Introduction of Value-Added Models

In the 1990s, the theoretical developments by the contributions of scholars like Hanushek, Card, Krueger, Hedges, Laine, Figlio, Gamoran, and Baker in the EPF expanded the scope of research beyond simple input-output models, leading to a more comprehensive understanding of how various inputs contribute to educational success and economic mobility. During the period, researchers increasingly focused on value-added models (VAMs), measuring the impact of individual schools or teachers on student performance, independent of student background characteristics. The development of VAMs was driven by the work of scholars like Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain (1998) which highlighted the significant influence of teachers on student achievement, with teacher quality emerging as one of the most critical factors in the EPF.

However, in continuing his influential work on EPF, Hanushek (1992) emphasized the policies aimed at improving educational outcomes in improving teacher quality over increasing school resources, and his extensive use of econometric models to assess educational inputs and outputs significantly advanced empirical methodologies in this field.

During this decade, Card and Krueger (1996) also made significant contributions to the EPF, using innovative data analysis techniques, and they demonstrated that improvements in school quality—particularly class size and teacher-student ratios—were strongly correlated with higher wages later in life. This research contributed to a re-evaluation of resource allocation in education policy, and provided a direct link between school quality and economic mobility. Further, applying meta-analysis, Hedges and Laine (1996) revealed that increased school resources such as smaller class sizes, better facilities, and higher teacher salaries, were positively correlated with higher student achievement, particularly in disadvantaged communities, and this marked a pivotal moment in the theoretical development of the EPF. However, Gamoran (1996) was another key figure in this field who examined how the organization of schools (including tracking and ability grouping), influenced student achievement within EPF framework, and led to a widening achievement gap between students from different socioeconomic backgrounds.

During this decade, Baker's work was also instrumental in advancing the argument that early childhood education is a critical input in the EPF, with long-lasting benefits for individuals and society, particularly for children from disadvantaged backgrounds, and this findings demonstrated that early educational interventions had substantial positive effects on later academic success, high school graduation rates, and future income in low income countries (Baker, 1997).

Figlio (1999) further forwarded the development of the EPF by exploring how high-stakes testing and performance-based incentives for teachers and schools could drive improvements in teacher performance and increase educational productivity, especially in underperforming schools, and the research became instrumental in shaping discussions around the effectiveness of test-based accountability systems and merit pay for teachers aligned with student outcomes. But Card (1999) connected the EPF to labour market outcomes, focusing on how education affects earnings and employment prospects, and this research underscored the long-term economic benefits of education by emphasizing the human capital model.

The 2000s: Increasing Complexity and the Role of Technology

The 2000s saw increasing complexity in the EPF as researchers began to account for the growing role of technology in education, particularly artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning, in optimizing educational inputs and personalizing learning pathways. This period also saw an increasing emphasis on data-driven analyses, providing deeper insights into how educational systems can be optimized for both short-term and long-term success.

During the beginning of this decade, Hoxby's research introduced the idea of school competition into the EPF, and her work suggested that competition among public schools could lead to improvements in educational outcomes, offering a new angle by considering market dynamics in education (Hoxby, 2000). But Bishop and Wößmann (2004) investigated how educational systems, particularly the use of standardized testing and curriculum reforms, influenced student outcomes across countries. The rapid expansion of technology in schools, particularly the use of computers and digital learning tools, led researchers to explore how these new inputs affected the EPF.

In another study by pioneer researchers during the period on teacher stability within the EPF framework highlighted that teacher turnover, particularly in high-poverty schools, is negatively impacted student performance, as teacher experience and quality played critical roles in educational outcomes, and their study demonstrated that high rates of teacher turnover reduced student achievement, especially for disadvantaged students (Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain 2005). In the same year, Fryer and Levitt (2004) extended the contribution to the EPF literature by focusing on factors such as school resources, parental involvement and neighbourhood effects influencing 'black-white achievement gap', and its persistence in U.S. schools, and their findings emphasized on policy reforms aimed at equalizing educational opportunities by improving school conditions in minority-dominated areas .

During the same period, Baker and Le Tendre(2005) provided a broader global context for the EPF in shaping the distribution of educational opportunities to studying educational inequality, particularly in terms of school financing and resource distribution, and argued that international comparisons could inform national policies to reduce inequality and improve overall educational performance. But studies by Heckman, Stixrud, and Urzua (2006) emphasized the role of non-cognitive skills, such as motivation and perseverance, as critical factors in educational achievement, highlighting the importance of a holistic view of the EPF. However, Heckman's Early Childhood Education Research work emphasized the importance of early childhood education as an input in the EPF, and his research demonstrated that investments in early education yield significant long-term benefits in terms of both educational and economic outcomes (Heckman, 2006).

Using longitudinal data, Chetty, Friedman and Rockoff (2014) conducted a landmark study on long-term impacts of effective teachers on student earnings, college attendance, and social mobility to measure the value-added of teachers in the EPF, and found that students assigned to high-value-added teachers experienced significant improvements in long-term economic outcomes, not just test scores at a single point. Thus, personalization and adaptive learning technologies also became important inputs in the EPF during this decade. However, Hanushek and Woessmann (2015) expanded the earlier education production function theories by linking educational outcomes to national economic performance, and argued that cognitive skills, not just years of schooling, were crucial in determining productivity and growth.

Conclusion:

Over the last five decades, the education production function framework has undergone significant theoretical developments, incorporating elements from microeconomic theory, human capital theory and more sophisticated statistical methods. As methodological techniques and education systems have improved, it remains a vital framework for policymakers seeking to improve educational outcomes. But the inclusion of technology and global perspectives in the 2000s further broadened the scope of it. Future research will need to balance the focus on academic achievement with a broader set of outcomes, reflecting the complexities of human development and lifelong learning. These contributions may be the foundation for further empirical research and policy debates in the 21st century.

References:

1. Baker, D. P. (1997). The social consequences of illiteracy in a global context. *Review of Educational Research*, 67(1), 35-54.
2. Baker, D. P., & LeTendre, G. K. (2005). *National differences, global similarities: World culture and the future of schooling*. Stanford University Press.
3. Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. University of Chicago Press.
4. Bishop, J., & Wößmann, L. (2004). *Cross-country comparisons of educational systems and standardized testing*.
5. Bowles, S. (1969). Planning educational systems for economic growth. *Harvard Educational Review*, 39(2), 148-179.
6. Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. Basic Books.
7. Card, D. (1999). The causal effect of education on earnings. In O. Ashenfelter & D. Card (Eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics* (Vol. 3A, pp. 1801-1863). Elsevier.
8. Card, D., & Krueger, A. B. (1996). School resources and student outcomes: An overview of the literature and new evidence from North and South Carolina. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 10(4), 31-50.
9. Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., & Rockoff, J. E. (2014). Measuring the Impacts of Teachers II: Teacher Value-Added and Student Outcomes in Adulthood. *American Economic Review*, 104(9), 2633-2679.
10. Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity, the foundation for studying educational inputs and outcomes*.
11. Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
12. Figlio, D. N. (1999). Functional form and the estimated effects of school resources. *Economics of Education Review*, 18(2), 241-252.

13. Fryer, R. G., & Levitt, S. D. (2004). Understanding the black-white test score gap in the first two years of school. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(2), 447-464.
14. Gamoran, A. (1996). Student achievement in public magnet, public comprehensive, and private city high schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(1), 1-18.
15. Hanushek, E. A. (1971). Teacher characteristics and gains in student achievement: Estimation using micro data. *American Economic Review*, 61(2), 280-288.
16. Hanushek, E. A. (1986). The economics of schooling: Production and efficiency in public schools. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 24(3), 1141-1177.
17. Hanushek, E. A. (1992). The trade-off between child quantity and quality. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(1), 84-117.
18. Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2015). *The knowledge capital of nations: Education and the economics of growth*. MIT Press.
19. Heckman, J. J. (2006). Skill formation and the economics of investing in disadvantaged children. *Science*, 312(5782), 1900-1902.
20. Heckman, J. J., Stixrud, J., & Urzua, S. (2006). The effects of cognitive and non cognitive abilities on labor market outcomes and social behaviour. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 24(3), 411-482.
21. Hedges, L. V., & Laine, R. D. (1996). Does money matter? A meta-analysis of studies of the effects of differential school inputs on student outcomes. *Educational Researcher*, 23(3), 5-14.
22. Hoxby, C. M. (2000). Does competition among public schools benefit students and taxpayers? *The American Economic Review*, 90(5), 1209-1238.
23. Ladd, H. F. (1982). Performance standards and educational achievement. *Journal of Human Resources*, 17(3), 413-436.
24. Levin, H. M. (1974). Cost-effectiveness analysis in evaluation research. In C. Bennett (Ed.), *Educational evaluation and accountability* (pp. 34-59). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
25. Levin, H. M. (1983). *Cost-effectiveness: A primer*. Sage Publications.
26. Mincer, J. (1958). Investment in human capital and personal income distribution. *Journal of Political Economy*, 66(4), 281-302. <https://doi.org/10.1086/258055>
27. Murnane, R. J. (1975). The impact of school resources on the learning of inner-city children. The RAND Corporation.
28. Rivkin, S. G. (1988). Teacher labour markets and educational production. *RAND Journal of Economics*, 19(4), 456-473.
29. Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (1998). Value-added models and teacher quality.
30. Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417-458.
31. Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review*, 51(1), 1-17.
32. Solow, R. M. (1957). Technical change and the aggregate production function. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 39(3), 312-320. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1926047>
33. Walberg, H. J. (1984). Improving the productivity of America's schools. *Educational Leadership*, 41(8), 19-27.