

University of Huddersfield Repository

Johnes, Jill and Johnes, Geraint

Costs and efficiency in English higher education: An analysis using latent class stochastic frontier models

Original Citation

Johnes, Jill and Johnes, Geraint (2015) Costs and efficiency in English higher education: An analysis using latent class stochastic frontier models. In: Efficiency in Education, 19-20 November 2015, KU Leuven. (Unpublished)

This version is available at https://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/27823/

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/

COSTS AND EFFICIENCY IN ENGLISH HIGHER EDUCATION



AN ANALYSIS USING LATENT CLASS STOCHASTIC FRONTIER MODELS

Efficiency in Education, KU Leuven 19th – 20th November 2015



Jill Johnes, University of Huddersfield UK **Geraint Johnes**, Lancaster University UK



Inspiring tomorrow's professionals







Outline of talk



- 1. Introduction
- 2. Literature review
- 3. Conceptual issues
- 4. Model specification
 - Defining the variables
 - Estimation method
- 5. **Results**
 - Estimated average costs
 - Economies of scale
 - Economies of scope
 - Efficiencies

6. Conclusions and further work

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data /file/237411/bis-13-918-efficiency-in-higher-education-sector.pdf

1. Introduction



- HEIs receive public money

 funding body grants
 - non-payment of tuition fees
- Reduced incentive to be efficient
- Need to assess efficiency of higher education institutions (HEIs)



1. Introduction



- HEIs receive public money
 - funding body grants
 - non-payment of tuition fees
- Reduced incentive to be efficient
- Need to assess efficiency of higher education institutions (HEIs)



 Cost functions provide information on efficiency, economies of scale and economies of scope



The English higher education sector comprises very diverse groups of HEIs:

- ✓ Pre-1992 universities: degree programmes in all academic subjects; research mission
- ✓ Post-1992 universities: degree programmes in academic and vocational subjects; many have a research mission
- Former colleges of HE: often (but not exclusively) small, specialist HEIs; most do not have a research mission

1. Introduction



Questions

- What are average and marginal costs of outputs of English HEIs?
- Are there economies of scale and scope in English HE?
- How efficient are English HEIs?
- How does 'mission group' affect costs?
- Are there other factors which might affect HEIs' costs?

2. Literature Review



- USA: Cohn *et al* (1989)
- UK: Glass *et al* (1995a; 1995b); Johnes (1996; 1997; 1998); Izadi *et al* (2002); Stevens (2005); Johnes *et al* (2005; 2008); Thanassoulis *et al* (2011)
 - ✓ Relatively low efficiency in panel data studies
 - ✓ Efficiency varies by type of university
 - ✓ Ray economies of scale; diseconomies of scope
 - Student quality, location of HEI are not important determinants of costs

2. Literature Review



Most recent developments (RPM and LCM)

- USA: Agasisti & Johnes (2009) use latent class model (LCM) with SFA
 - Allows objectives to vary by group suggested by the data
- UK: Johnes & Johnes (2009) use a random parameter model (RPM) with SFA
 - ✓ Allows *each HEI* to have different objectives
- Findings:
 - ✓ HEIs are heterogeneous in terms of both cost structure and efficiency

3. Conceptual Issues



Functional form of cost function

a) Linear: $C = \alpha_0 + \sum_i \beta_i y_i$

b) Quadratic: $C = \alpha_0 + \sum_i \alpha_i F_i + \sum_i \beta_i y_i + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \sum_i \sum_j \gamma_{ij} y_i y_j + v$

3. Conceptual Issues



Denote by C(y) the total cost of producing all N outputs $C_i(y)$ the marginal cost of output i $AIC(y_i)$ the average incremental cost of output iwhere $AIC(y_i) = [C(y) - C(y_{N-i})]/y_i$

Ray economies of scale $S_R = \frac{C(y)}{\sum_i y_i C_i(y)}$

✓ If $S_R > 1$ (< 1) then there are economies (diseconomies) of scale

3. Conceptual Issues



Product-specific economies of scale $S_i(y) = AIC(y_i)/C_i(y)$

✓ If S_i > 1 (< 1) then there are economies (diseconomies) of scale for product *i*

Economies of scope $S_G = [\sum_i C(y_i) - C(y)]/C(y)$

✓ If $S_G > 0$ (< 0) then global economies (diseconomies) of scope exist for producing the outputs jointly rather than in separate institutions



a) Outputs TEACHING

- **UGMED** FTE undergraduates in medicine and dentistry (000s)
- UGSCI FTE undergraduates in sciences other than medicine and dentistry (000s)
- UGARTS FTE undergraduates in non-science subjects (000s)
- **PG** FTE postgraduates in all subjects (000s)



a) Outputs RESEARCH

 RESEARCH Quality related funding and research grants

THIRD MISSION

IPINCOME Income from third mission activity

Note that all squares and interactions of UGMED, UGSCI, UGARTS, PG and RESEARCH are included; the square of IPINCOME and interaction of IPINCOME only with RESEARCH are included.



b) Additional factors QUALITY OF STUDENTS

 MEANSAL Mean salary of graduates 6 months after graduation

QUALITY OF TEACHING

 NSS Percentage saying yes to the question: 'Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the course' from the National Student Survey

WIDENING PARTICIPATION

LOWPNO Number of FT UG entrants from 'low participation' neighbourhoods



b) Additional factors ESTATES COSTS

 LISTED The total area of the HEI identified as a listed building

DUMMY VARIABLES

- OXBRIDGE Dummy variable: 1 if HEI is Oxford or Cambridge
- YEAR Dummy for each year in the study (apart from the last)



• SFA

For HEI *i* at time *t*: $C_{it} = f(y_{1it}, \dots, y_{kit}) + v_{it} + u_{it}$

• SFA with latent class model (LCM) For HEI *i* at time *t*, *m* classes: $C_{it} = f_m(y_{1it}, ..., y_{kit}) + v_{it,m} + u_{it,m}$





- Panel data from 2008/09 to 2010/11 covering around 120 HEIs
- Efficiency is allowed to vary over time within any given model
- Data are largely from the Higher Education Statistics Agency
- All money units are in 2011 values

5. Results AIC from SFA linear model (2011 £)

| AICs | 2008/09 to 2010/11 | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|
| | | Class 1 | Class 2 |
| UGMED | 13484 | 10865 | 7774 |
| UGSCI | 7775 | 1931 | 8472 |
| UGARTS | 4574 | 9353 | 2757 |
| PG | 13953 | 246 | 18694 |
| No. in each class | | 121 | 234 |

Other outputs included: RESEARCH, IPINCOME Controls for: LISTED, LOWPNO, YEAR dummies, OXBRIDGE

5. Results Histogram of efficiency scores







5. Results Histogram of efficiency scores



2010/11 linear model

Latent class 1



Latent class 2

5. Results Akaike Information Criterion (AkIC)

AkIC = -2.logLF(m) + 2.k

where k is the number of estimated parameters

| No. of | 2008/09 to | |
|---------|------------|--|
| classes | 2010/11 | |
| 1 | 8393.3 | |
| 2 | 7711.9 | |
| 3 | 7637.9 | |
| 4 | 7561.9 | |

5. Results AIC from SFA quadratic model (2011 £)

| AICs | 2008/09 to 2010/11 | | |
|------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|
| | | Class 1 | Class 2 |
| UGMED | 16034 | 8720 | 19595 |
| UGSCI | 7858 | 5260 | 7185 |
| UGARTS | 5459 | 5883 | 2176 |
| PG | 5275 | 7839 | 1242 |
| No in each class | | 236 | 119 |

Other outputs included: RESEARCH, IPINCOME Controls for: LISTED, LOWPNO, YEAR dummies, OXBRIDGE

5. Results Histogram of efficiency scores

University of HUDDERSFIELD Inspiring tomorrow's professionals

2010/11 quadratic model



5. Results Histogram of efficiency scores



2010/11 quadratic latent class model

Latent class 1









Comparison of Models with Akaike Information Criterion (AkIC)

AkIC = -2.logLF(m) + 2.k

where k is the number of estimated parameters

| No. of | 2008/09 to |
|---------|------------|
| classes | 2010/11 |
| 1 | -661.0 |
| 2 | -848.9 |
| 3 | -915.9 |

5. Results Economies of scale and scope



Quadratic model: HEI with mean levels of output)

| | SFA | SFA class 1 | SFA class2 |
|---------------|------|-------------|------------|
| Scale | | | |
| Ray economies | 1.01 | 0.95 | 0.97 |
| UGMED | 1.25 | 1.11 | 1.23 |
| UGSCI | 1.00 | 1.26 | 0.75 |
| UGARTS | 1.23 | 0.84 | 0.46 |
| PG | 0.78 | 0.60 | 0.25 |
| RESEARCH | 1.13 | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| IPINCOME | 1.09 | 1.12 | 1.00 |

5. Results Economies of scale and scope



Quadratic model: HEI with mean levels of output)

| | SFA | SFA class 1 | SFA class2 |
|------------------|-------|-------------|------------|
| Scale | | | |
| Ray economies | 1.01 | 0.95 | 0.97 |
| UGMED | 1.25 | 1.11 | 1.23 |
| UGSCI | 1.00 | 1.26 | 0.75 |
| UGARTS | 1.23 | 0.84 | 0.46 |
| PG | 0.78 | 0.60 | 0.25 |
| RESEARCH | 1.13 | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| IPINCOME | 1.09 | 1.12 | 1.00 |
| Scope | | | |
| Global economies | -0.01 | -0.13 | -0.01 |

6. Conclusions



- Estimates of AICs from SFA models seem plausible
- Estimates of AICs from SFA LCM seem less precise
- Ray economies of scale are exhausted; there are product specific economies in UG teaching and in research
- There are diseconomies of scope is this a feature of the functional form?
- Efficiency differences are much lower once other (observed and unobserved) characteristics are taken into account
- A low efficiency score is usually explained by HEI being small and/or specialist
- What allowances should be made in determining efficiency?



AICs

| | Linear Group 1 | Linear Group 2 |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|
| UGARTS | 10204 | 2504 |
| UGSCI | 8624 | 7044 |
| PG | 3246 | 29614 |



AICs – Quadratic evaluated at group means

| | Linear Group 1 | Linear Group 2 | Quadratic Group 1 | Quadratic Group 2 |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| UGARTS | 10204 | 2504 | 1382 | 5743 |
| UGSCI | 8624 | 7044 | 2923 | 6889 |
| PG | 3246 | 29614 | 21841 | 7078 |



AICs – Quadratic evaluated at sector means

| | Linear Group 1 | Linear Group 2 | Quadratic Group 1 | Quadratic Group 2 |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| UGARTS | 10204 | 2504 | 1382 | 5743 |
| UGSCI | 8624 | 7044 | 2923 | 6889 |
| PG | 3246 | 29614 | 21841 | 7078 |



Quadratic model: HEI with mean levels of output)

| | Quadratic Group 1 | Quadratic Group 2 |
|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Scale | | |
| UGARTS | 0.14 | 0.71 |
| UGSCI | 0.41 | 0.62 |
| PG | 1.53 | 0.76 |
| RESEARCH | 0.90 | 1.17 |
| IPINCOME | 1.76 | 1.40 |
| Ray economies | 0.90 | 0.84 |



Quadratic model: HEI with mean levels of output)

| | Quadratic Group 1 | Quadratic Group 2 |
|----------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Scope | | |
| UGARTS | 0.03 | -0.04 |
| UGSCI | 0.18 | -0.03 |
| PG | 0.24 | -0.39 |
| RESEARCH | -0.02 | -0.24 |
| IPINCOME | 0.01 | -0.12 |
| Global | 0.24 | -0.51 |