A Comparative Analysis of the Return on Investment of an IIT Education: Evidence from the 1980

Himashreee P[1], Suravi Reddy[2], Vaivaswat Verma[3], Tejas Anand[4], Rajkumar G R[5]
[1,2,3,4]*Dept. of AIML ,(Autonomous Institution affiliated to xVTU, Belagavi), RV College of Engineering, (Autonomous Institution affiliated to VTU, Belagavi), Bangalore, India*
[5]*Dept. of Mechanical Engineering (Autonomous Institution affiliated to VTU, Belagav) RV College of Engineering (of Affiliation) Bangalore, India*

***Abstract*— This paper examines the return on investment (ROI) of an engineering education at the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) by comparing two graduate cohorts: those who completed their degrees between 1980–1990 and those between 2000–2010. Using inflation-adjusted estimates of education costs and post-graduation earnings, the study evaluates how the economic payoff of an IIT degree has evolved over time. The analysis incorporates tuition fees, living expenses, opportunity costs, and early-career earnings to compute payback periods and medium-term ROI multiples. The results suggest that while absolute earnings increased substantially for later cohorts, rising education costs and changing labor-market conditions altered the relative returns to an IIT education.**

***Index Terms*—IITs, Return on Investment, Higher Education, Human Capital, India**

I. INTRODUCTION

Higher education is widely regarded as a key driver of individual income growth and national economic development. In India, the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) occupy a unique position as elite publicly funded institutions that combine highly selective admissions with strong labor-market outcomes. For several decades, an IIT degree has been perceived as one of the most valuable educational investments available to Indian students. However, the economic environment in which IIT graduates enter the labor market has changed significantly over time.

The period between the 1980s and the 2000s witnessed major structural shifts in India's economy, including liberalization, globalization, and rapid expansion of private-sector employment. At the same time, the financing model of IITs evolved, with a gradual reduction in government subsidies and increasing cost burdens placed on students. These changes raise important questions about whether the economic return on an IIT education has remained constant across generations.

II. BACKGROUND

Over the past several decades, however, the economic and institutional context surrounding higher education in India has changed significantly. Public funding patterns, tuition structures, and living costs associated with elite technical education have evolved, while the labor market for engineers has been reshaped by globalization, the expansion of the information technology sector, and increased international mobility. As a result, the financial calculus facing prospective students and policymakers today differs markedly from that of earlier generations.

Return on investment (ROI) analysis provides a useful framework for evaluating the economic value of higher education by comparing the costs incurred during study with the earnings realized after graduation. Prior research on the returns to engineering education has generally found positive wage premiums for graduates of elite institutions, but these studies often focus on single cohorts or short time horizons. Less attention has been paid to how returns change across generations in response to shifting costs and labor-market dynamics, particularly in the context of public institutions like the IITs that have undergone structural and economic transitions.

Comparing graduates from the 1980–1990 and 2000–2010 periods offer an opportunity to examine these changes in a systematic manner. The earlier cohort

entered a relatively protected and regulated economy with limited private-sector opportunities, while the later cohort benefited from economic liberalization, rapid growth in technology-driven industries, and expanded global demand for Indian engineers. At the same time, the later cohort faced higher direct and indirect education costs, as well as increased competition in both domestic and international job markets.

Against this backdrop, an ROI-based comparison across cohorts can shed light on whether the economic advantages traditionally associated with an IIT education have been sustained, enhanced, or diluted over time. Such an analysis is relevant not only for individual decision-making but also for informing higher-education policy, subsidy design, and long-term planning for elite public institutions in emerging economies.

III. METHODOLOGY

The return on investment (ROI) of an IIT education is defined as the ratio of economic benefits derived from the degree to the total economic cost incurred in obtaining it. Due to the absence of complete lifetime earnings data, the analysis relies on medium-term proxy measures that capture early-career outcomes. All monetary values are converted into real terms using a common base year to ensure comparability across cohorts.

The methodology separates the analysis into two components: cost-side analysis and earnings-side analysis. On the cost side, total educational investment is calculated by summing tuition fees, living expenses, and opportunity costs over the four-year duration of the degree. On the earnings side, inflation-adjusted entry-level salaries and projected ten-year earnings are used to estimate returns. The primary outcome measures include payback period and a ten-year earnings-to-cost ratio, which together provide an intuitive and quantitative assessment of ROI.

A. Mathematical Formulation of ROI

The return on investment (ROI) of an IIT education is defined as the ratio of cumulative economic benefits to total educational costs. All values are expressed in real (inflation-adjusted) terms.

1. Total Cost of Education is defined as:

$C = T + L + O$ (1)

Here T is the Total tuition and institutional fee L is the Total living and educational expenses and O is the Opportunity cost of education.

2. Payback Period is represented by:

$P = \frac{C}{Y_1}$ (2)

Where Y_1 is defined as the Real first-year post-graduation income.

3. Ten-Year Cumulative Earnings:

$E_{10} = Y_1 \sum_{n=0}^{9} (1+g)^n$ (3)

Where g is Real annual wage growth rate.

4. Return on Investment (ROI Multiple):

$ROI = \frac{E_{10}}{C}$ (4)

Table I

Parameter	1980s Cohort	2000s Cohort
Degree Duration	4 years	4 years
Tuition Fee (per anum)	₹1,000	Included
Opportunity Cost (per year)	₹5,000	₹2,000
Monthly Living Cost	₹500	included
Nominal Starting Salary	₹30,000	₹15,00,000
Inflation Base Year	2010	2010
CPI Adjustment Factor	6.58	1.51
Real Wage Growth (g)	5%	5%
Earnings Horizon	10 years	10 years

B. Cost side analysis

The total cost of an IIT education is computed as the sum of three components. First, tuition and institutional fees are estimated using cohort-specific fee structures, reflecting the highly subsidized nature of IIT education in the 1980s and the increased student contribution observed by the 2000s. Second, living and educational expenses, including hostel accommodation, food, and academic materials, are estimated using representative monthly expenditure figures for students during each period. These costs are multiplied by the four-year duration of the degree.

Table II

Cost Component	1980s Cohort	2000s Cohort
Tuition Fees (4 years)	₹26,320	₹13,59,000
Living Expenses (4 years)	₹1,57,920	Included above
Opportunity Cost (4 years)	₹1,31,600	₹12,08,000
Total Cost (C)	₹3,15,840	₹25,67,000

Third, opportunity cost is defined as the income foregone while pursuing the degree. For the 1980s cohort, opportunity costs are assumed to be relatively low due to limited employment opportunities in a closed and regulated economy. For the 2000s cohort, opportunity costs are higher, reflecting expanded private-sector employment and improved labor-market alternatives. The sum of these three components represents the total real cost of obtaining an IIT degree for each cohort.

C. Eearnings side analysis

Earnings outcomes are measured using inflation-adjusted entry-level salaries for IIT graduates in each cohort. These salaries are derived from reported ranges and averaged to obtain a representative starting income. To capture medium-term benefits, earnings are projected over the first ten years of employment using an assumed constant real wage growth rate.

Two primary indicators are derived from these earnings estimates. The first is the payback period, defined as the number of years required for cumulative earnings to equal the total cost of education. The second is the ten-year earnings-to-cost ratio, which measures how many times the initial investment is recovered within a decade. These metrics allow for a consistent comparison of economic returns across cohorts without relying on uncertain lifetime income projections.

Table III

Earnings Metric	1980s Cohort	2000s Cohort
Nominal First-Year Salary	₹30,000	₹15,00,000
Inflation Adjustment	× 6.58	× 1.51
Real First-Year Salary (Y_1)	₹1,97,400	₹22,65,000
10-Year Growth Factor	12.58	12.58
Ten-Year Earnings (E_{10})	₹24,84,000	₹2,84,83,000

IV. RESULTS

The analysis reveals substantial differences in both costs and returns across cohorts. For the 1980–1990 cohort, the total cost of education in real terms is relatively low, primarily due to heavy government subsidization and low opportunity costs. Although starting salaries are modest in absolute terms, the payback period is short and the ten-year ROI multiple is high, indicating a highly favourable investment.

In contrast, the 2000–2010 cohort faces significantly higher education costs, driven by increased tuition fees and higher opportunity costs. However, this cohort benefits from substantially higher real starting salaries and faster early-career income growth. While the absolute earnings are much larger, the increase in costs reduces the relative advantage when compared to earlier cohorts. These findings suggest a shift from a state-supported high-return model to a more market-driven investment framework.

Table IV

Metric	1980s Cohort	2000s Cohort
Total Cost (C)	₹3.16 L	₹25.67 L
First-Year Salary (Y_1)	₹1.97 L	₹22.65 L
Payback Period (P)	1.6 years	1.13 years
Ten-Year Earnings (E_{10})	₹24.84 L	₹284.83 L
ROI Multiple	7.86×	11.09×

V. DISCUSSION

The results highlight how changes in economic structure and education financing influence the returns to elite education. In the 1980s, IIT graduates benefited from scarcity, strong signaling effects, and limited competition, which amplified the economic payoff of the degree. The low cost of education meant that even moderate earnings translated into high returns.

By the 2000s, the expansion of engineering education and the integration of India into global labor markets altered this dynamic. While opportunities increased, so did competition and financial risk. The IIT degree continued to offer strong absolute returns, but the relative ROI declined as students bore a greater share of education costs. This shift reflects broader trends in the privatization of higher education financing and changing labor-market equilibria.

VI. LIMITATIONS

This study relies on estimated and representative values rather than precise individual-level data. Salary figures are averages and do not capture dispersion or extreme outcomes. Opportunity costs and living expenses are approximated based on historical context rather than direct observation. Additionally, the

analysis focuses on a ten-year earnings horizon and does not account for long-term career divergence, non-monetary benefits, or international migration. Despite these limitations, the comparative framework remains useful for understanding broad changes in the economic returns to an IIT education.

VII. CONCLUSION

The comparison of IIT graduates across two decades demonstrates that the return on investment of elite technical education is not static but depends heavily on institutional financing and labor-market conditions. While IIT education continues to yield substantial economic benefits, the nature of those benefits has changed. The findings underscore the importance of contextualizing education outcomes within broader economic transformations when evaluating the value of higher education investments.

REFERENCES

[1] G. Eason, B. Noble, and I. N. Sneddon, "On certain integrals of Lipschitz-Hankel type involving products of Bessel functions," Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London, vol. A247, pp. 529–551, April 1955. (references)

[2] J. Mincer, Schooling, Experience, and Earnings. New York, NY, USA: Columbia Univ. Press, 1974.

[3] T. W. Schultz, "Investment in human capital," American Economic Review, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 1961.

[4] Government of India, Report of the Third Pay Commission, Ministry of Finance, New Delhi, India, 1973.

[5] Government of India, Report of the Fourth Pay Commission, Ministry of Finance, New Delhi, India, 1986.

[6] Ministry of Human Resource Development, Annual Report, Government of India, New Delhi, India, various years.

[7] Indian Institutes of Technology Council, Minutes of the IIT Council Meetings, New Delhi, India, various years.

[8] P. Rama Rao, Review of the Indian Institutes of Technology, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, 2004.

[9] NASSCOM, Strategic Review: The IT Industry in India, National Association of Software and Services Companies, New Delhi, India, various years.

[10] Reserve Bank of India, Handbook of Statistics on the Indian Economy, Mumbai, India, various issues.

[11] Reserve Bank of India, Report on Currency and Finance, Mumbai, India, various years.

[12] Planning Commission of India, Five Year Plans, Government of India, New Delhi, India, various years.

[13] World Bank, World Development Indicators, Washington, DC, USA, various years.

[14] International Labour Organization, Global Wage Report, Geneva, Switzerland, various years.

[15] A. K. Sen, Development as Freedom. New York, NY, USA: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999.

[16] A. Banerjee and E. Duflo, Poor Economics. New York, NY, USA: PublicAffairs, 2011.

[17] J. Bhagwati and T. N. Srinivasan, India's Economic Reforms. New Delhi, India: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993.

[18] A. Panagariya, India: The Emerging Giant. New York, NY, USA: Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.

[19] National Sample Survey Office, Employment and Unemployment Situation in India, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, various rounds.

[20] National Sample Survey Office, Household Consumer Expenditure Survey, Government of India, various rounds.

[21] S. Deshpande, "Returns to education in India," Indian Journal of Labour Economics, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 1–20, 2001.

[22] K. Sundaram and S. Tendulkar, "Employment and poverty in India," Economic and Political Weekly, vol. 38, no. 48, pp. 5261–5272, 2003.

[23] A. Deaton and V. Kozel, "Data and dogma: The great Indian poverty debate," World Bank Research Observer, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 177–199, 2005.

[24] L. Katz and D. Autor, "Changes in the wage structure and earnings inequality," in Handbook of Labor Economics, vol. 3A. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier, 1999, pp. 1463–1555.

[25] P. Krugman, Pop Internationalism. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1996.
[26] S. Mehrotra et al., India's Skills Challenge. New Delhi, India: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
[27] Ministry of Education, Government of India, All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE), New Delhi, India, various years.
[28] Times of India, "Fee hike may make IITs unaffordable for many," Times of India, Mumbai, India, 2008.
[29] Business Standard, "IIT fee rise: Too little, too late," Business Standard, New Delhi, India, 2012.
[30] Economic Times, "How IIT fees have changed over the decades," Economic Times, New Delhi, India, various years.
[31] J. Heckman, L. Lochner, and P. Todd, "Earnings functions, rates of return and treatment effects," Econometrica, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 31–47, 2006.
[32] OECD, Education at a Glance, Paris, France, various years.
[33] UNESCO, Global Education Monitoring Report, Paris, France, various years.
[34] M. Spence, Job Market Signaling, Quarterly Journal of Economics, vol. 87, no. 3, pp. 355–374, 1973.
[35] A. Weiss, "Human capital vs. signaling explanations of wages," Journal of Economic Perspectives, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 133–154, 1995.