The Impact of Road Infrastructure Investments on Educational Choices and Outcomes: A Theoretical Framework

Jaime Polanco-Jimenez

1 Introduction

This paper develops a theoretical framework to analyze the impact of road infrastructure investments on educational choices and outcomes. Building upon Becker's human capital theory, I integrate the role of infrastructure in the cost-benefit analysis that households undertake when deciding on educational investments. Importantly, this model recognizes that the benefits of education extend beyond future wages to encompass non-monetary returns like personal satisfaction, social status, and other factors.

2 Model Setup

2.1 Agents and Time Horizon

I consider a continuum of heterogeneous households indexed by i, each maximizing their expected utility. The time horizon consists of two periods, with potential extensions to a multi-period framework:

- **Period 1:** Households decide on the level of education (e_i) to invest in their child, taking into account both monetary and non-monetary returns. This decision is influenced by household-specific factors, such as socioeconomic status, location (urban vs. rural), and the existing level of infrastructure.

- **Period 2:** : Children enter the labor market, where they earn wages (w_i) determined by their human capital (h_i). They also experience non-monetary benefits, which may vary by individual preferences, social norms, and the child's traits.

In a multi-period framework, the model could be extended to consider how households adjust educational investments over time as road infrastructure improves and as children progress through different stages of education (e.g., primary, secondary, higher education).

2.2 Human Capital Production Function

A child's human capital is determined by:

$$h_i = f(e_i, a_i, q(I, X_i), r(I, X_i), \epsilon_i), \tag{1}$$

where:

- e_i is the level of education chosen by household i.
- a_i represents the child's innate ability, distributed according to a function $G(a_i)$.
- $q(I, X_i)$ represents the quality of schooling, which depends on road infrastructure investments (I) and household/location-specific factors (X_i), such as urban/rural location, access to other public goods, and baseline education quality. Assume $\frac{\partial q}{\partial I} > 0$ and $\frac{\partial q}{\partial X_i}$ varies across households.
- $r(I, X_i)$ denotes access to educational resources, similarly influenced by I and X_i. Assume $\frac{\partial r}{\partial I} > 0$ and $\frac{\partial r}{\partial X_i}$ varies across households.
- ϵ_i captures idiosyncratic shocks to the human capital production process, which could include unobserved factors such as health or social networks.

2.3 Wages

The child's potential wage in period 2 is determined by a Mincerian wage equation:

$$w_i = w_0 \cdot \exp(\beta h_i) = w_0 \cdot \exp(\beta \cdot f(e_i, a_i, q(I, X_i), r(I, X_i), \epsilon_i)). \tag{2}$$

Here, w_0 represents the base wage, and β_i represents the individual-specific return to human capital, which may vary across different segments of the population (e.g., urban vs. rural, gender, socioeconomic status). This heterogeneity captures the varying impact of education on wages in different labor markets.

2.4 Road Infrastructure

Road infrastructure (I) is modeled as a public good, but its determination may not be exogenous. Considerations include:

Endogeneity of I: Road infrastructure investments might be influenced by political economy factors, geographic considerations, or economic needs, potentially correlated with educational outcomes. Discussing how I is determined and addressing potential endogeneity concerns (e.g., through instrumental variables or fixed effects) can strengthen the model.

Spillover Effects: Infrastructure improvements might have spillover effects on non-educational outcomes (e.g., health, labor mobility), which could indirectly influence education. These effects could be integrated into the model by expanding $q(I, X_i)$ and $r(I, X_i)$ to account for broader societal impacts.

2.5 Household Utility and Costs

The household's utility function now incorporates both monetary (wage) and non-monetary benefits:

$$U_i = w_i + b(e_i, I, S_i) - c(e_i, I) \tag{3}$$

where:

- w_i is the child's wage in period 2 (if they enter the labor market).
- $b(e_i, I, S_i)$ represents the total non-monetary benefit from education.
- S_i is a vector of factors influencing non-monetary benefits (e.g., household characteristics, social norms, individual child traits).

- $c(e_i, I)$ represents the total cost of education:

$$c(e_i, I) = c_d \cdot e_i + c_t(I) \cdot e_i \tag{4}$$

  with c_d being the direct cost per unit of education and $c_t(I)$ the transportation cost, decreasing in I.

3 Household Decision-Making

Households face a decision-making process where they must weigh the potential benefits of investing in education against the associated costs. This decision now accounts for both monetary and non-monetary returns and considers the influence of road infrastructure (I) and household-specific characteristics (X_i).

Heterogeneity in Decision-Making:

Different households may perceive and evaluate the trade-off differently based on their specific circumstances. For instance, rural households might place more emphasis on transportation costs and school quality improvements due to infrastructure investments, while urban households might focus more on access to resources and the direct costs of education.

3.1 The Trade-off

Households weigh the benefits of education (now including both monetary and non-monetary components) against the costs. Investing in education is an investment in the child's future well-being, but it requires upfront expenditures.

3.2 Present Value of Benefits

The present value of benefits (PV(Benefits)) represents the expected returns from education, incorporating both monetary gains and non-monetary benefits. The equation can be modified to reflect household heterogeneity:

$$\text{PV(Benefits)} = \frac{w_i(e_i, I, X_i) + b(e_i, I, S_i) - [w_i(0, I, X_i) + b(0, I, S_i)]}{1 + r} \tag{5}$$

This equation captures the difference in both wage and non-monetary benefits between having education (e_i) and having no education (0), discounted by the rate r.

If the model is extended to a multi-period framework, the PV(Benefits) would include future periods, with the household potentially updating its decisions as new information about the child's ability, infrastructure improvements, or labor market conditions becomes available.

3.3 Present Value of Costs

The present value of costs (PV(Costs)) remains the same as before:

$$\text{PV(Costs)} = c(e_i, I, X_i) = e_i \cdot (c_d + c_t(I) + \omega(X_i)) \tag{6}$$

Where $\omega(X_i)$ represents household-specific costs, such as opportunity costs or additional expenses, which vary depending on X_i (e.g., rural vs. urban, income level). c_d is the direct cost per unit of education. $c_t(I)$ captures transportation costs, which decrease with better infrastructure (I).

Endogeneity Consideration:

To address potential endogeneity in road infrastructure investments, you might consider how households perceive the likelihood of future infrastructure improvements when making their decisions. This could involve incorporating expectations about I into the cost function, leading to a modified decision rule.

3.4 Investment Decision Rule

Households will choose to invest in education ($e_i > 0$) if and only if:

$$\text{Invest if: PV(Benefits)} > \text{PV(Costs)} \tag{7}$$

Or, substituting the expressions the households invest in if:

$$\frac{w_i(e_i, I, X_i) + b(e_i, I, S_i) - [w_i(0, I, X_i) + b(0, I, S_i)]}{1 + r} > e_i \cdot (c_d + c_t(I) + \omega(X_i)) \tag{8}$$

This rule captures the heterogeneity in household decision-making. It shows that investment in education depends on the household's specific context, including how they perceive the benefits of education relative to its costs, given their location, socioeconomic status, and the prevailing infrastructure.

4 Optimal Level of Education (Conditional on Investment)

If the household decides to invest in education, they will choose the level of education (e_i) that maximizes their expected utility. The optimization problem becomes:

$$\max_{e_i} E[U_i] = w_0 \cdot \exp(\beta a_i e_i (q(I) + r(I))) + \gamma e_i - c_d \cdot e_i - \frac{c_0}{I} \cdot e_i \tag{9}$$

First-Order Condition and Explicit Solution: To find the utility-maximizing level of e_i, we take the derivative of the expected utility function with respect to e_i and set it equal to zero:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial E[U_i]}{\partial e_i} &= \beta_i w_0 a_i (q(I, X_i) + r(I, X_i)) \exp(\beta_i a_i e_i (q(I, X_i) + r(I, X_i))) \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial b(e_i, I, S_i, Z_i)}{\partial e_i} - (c_d + c_t(I) + \omega(X_i)) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Solving for e_i, the explicit solution for the optimal level of education is:

$$e_i^* = \frac{1}{\beta_i a_i (q(I, X_i) + r(I, X_i))} \ln \left(\frac{c_d + c_t(I) + \omega(X_i) - \frac{\partial b(e_i, I, S_i, Z_i)}{\partial e_i}}{\beta_i w_0 a_i (q(I, X_i) + r(I, X_i))} \right) \tag{11}$$

Interpretation and Policy Implications:

This equation reveals the nuanced relationship between the optimal level of education (e_i^*) and various factors influencing household decisions, with a specific focus on heterogeneity across households and the impact of road infrastructure:

1. **Transportation Costs:** Higher I reduces $c_t(I)$, lowering the total costs of education and encouraging higher e_i^*.

2. **School Quality and Resources:** Improvements in $q(I, X_i)$ and $r(I, X_i)$, driven by infrastructure investments, can increase the returns to education, though the optimal level may adjust based on how productive each additional unit of education becomes.

3. **Household-Specific Factors:** Differences in $\omega(X_i)$, S_i, and Z_i mean that the same level of infrastructure improvement may have varying effects on different households.