JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS TEACHING

Dr. Sheldon Cooper and Production Functions: A Pedagogical Approach to the Theory of Production

This article presents a pedagogical approach to teaching microeconomic production theory using selected episodes from The Big Bang Theory. Centered on the fictional collaboration between Sheldon, Leonard, and Howard on a military innovation project, we formally model their cognitive contributions through production functions, including Cobb-Douglas, conditional, penalized, and Leontief forms. Each character is treated as a distinct intellectual input, illustrating key concepts such as input complementarity, diminishing marginal returns, structural bottlenecks, and imperfect substitution. Unlike prior uses of pop culture in economics education, which often focus on introductory content or informal analogies, this article integrates formal modeling, analytical rigor, and a structured instructional design. It includes a classroom-ready lesson plan, a curated video guide, and applied exercises, adaptable to intermediate microeconomics courses, especially in units on production theory or the theory of the firm. By embedding abstract concepts in a rich narrative context, the proposed approach enhances student engagement, deepens conceptual understanding, and demonstrates how fictional narratives can serve as powerful tools for rigorous economic instruction.

Otávio Detoni†

†Federal University of São João del-Rei (UFSJ)

1. Introduction

In production theory, output is the result of combining multiple inputs through a given technology. While textbooks often illustrate this with physical resources such as labor and capital, real-world innovation processes, especially in science and engineering, rely on the coordination of intellectual inputs: abstract reasoning, empirical translation, and technical implementation. The efficiency of such processes depends not only on the availability of these competencies, but also on how well they interact. Understanding the dynamics of complementarity, substitutability, and bottlenecks in cognitive production is therefore essential to modeling knowledge-intensive activities.

The television series *The Big Bang Theory,* although rooted in comedy, provides a satirical yet insightful portrayal of these dynamics. In one of its episodes, three scientists, Sheldon, Leonard, and Howard, are invited to collaborate with the United States Department of Defense on the development of a miniaturized missile guidance system. While fictional, the storyline offers a didactic representation of the challenges involved in translating abstract theory into practical applications and coordinating individuals with highly complementary but asymmetric skills.

This narrative invites a direct analogy with microeconomic production theory. Concepts such as factor complementarity, diminishing marginal returns, input substitutability, and structural bottlenecks become evident as the project unfolds or stalls. More importantly, the episode allows for the formal construction of production functions centered on cognitive capital, highlighting the limits of scalability and the importance of interdependence among different types of intellectual inputs.

This article proposes using this narrative framework as a pedagogical tool for teaching production theory. By modeling the interaction among the characters, we aim to explore, through analytical rigor and pedagogical clarity, the foundational microeconomic concepts that underlie scientific production processes. The goal is to demonstrate how structured use of popular culture, particularly when combined with formal modeling, can enhance student engagement, improve the visualization of abstract ideas, and foster critical thinking in economics education.

Although *The Big Bang Theory* concluded in 2019, it remains widely accessible on streaming platforms and continues to resonate with undergraduate students. The ongoing popularity of the spin-off series *Young Sheldon* (2017-2024) further reinforces the cultural visibility of its characters, particularly Sheldon Cooper, whose persona remains familiar to contemporary audiences. Previous pedagogical applications of the original series, such as *Bazinganomics: Economics of the Big Bang Theory* by Tierney et al. (2016), focus primarily on cataloging brief video clips to illustrate a wide array of economic concepts, often at an introductory level and without formal modeling. While such efforts are valuable for engagement, they do not provide structured analytical tools or integrate the series into a coherent instructional framework. In contrast, this article develops a conceptually rigorous and pedagogically integrated approach to teaching production theory, using fully specified production functions, narrative-based modeling, and a detailed lesson plan. The aim is not merely to entertain, but to foster deep economic reasoning through structured application.

Despite growing interest in using popular media for teaching economics, most applications remain confined to introductory topics or serve only as illustrative analogies. Rarely do they incorporate rigorous economic modeling, such as production functions, structural complementarities, or inter-agent productivity, into a formal instructional design. This article addresses that gap by treating characters as formal economic inputs and situating the activity within the context of intermediate microeconomics,[1] specifically in the topic of production theory. By offering a structured and conceptually robust framework, including formal modeling and a classroom-ready lesson plan, we demonstrate how pop culture can move beyond surface-level engagement and serve as a powerful tool for teaching complex economic theory.

2. Literature Review

Over the past two decades, the use of popular media as a pedagogical tool has gained traction in economics education. Becker (2000) argues that integrating real-world references enhances both student engagement and retention. Expanding on this insight, Mateer et al. (2016) demonstrate how short video clips from TV and film, including *The Big Bang Theory* and *Seinfeld*, can help make abstract economic concepts more accessible and relatable to students.

A growing number of studies have extended this approach to animated series. Luccasen and Thomas (2010), and later Luccasen, Hammock, and Thomas (2011), analyze the use of *The Simpsons*, *Futurama*, and other shows to illustrate concepts such as opportunity cost, incentives, elasticity, and structural unemployment. These contributions highlight how narrative and visual media can enrich learning, especially among students less responsive to traditional lecture-based instruction.

In a broader pedagogical framework, Hall (2005) and Wight (2002) explore the role of storytelling in communicating both foundational and advanced economic ideas. Moulder (2009) similarly argues for the integration of literature, podcasts, and film, suggesting that economics instruction should reflect not only technical rigor but also its human and social dimensions.

More recent contributions have begun to move beyond illustrative use toward structured conceptual modeling through pop culture. Deyo and Podemska-Mikluch (2014) show how the *Harry Potter* universe can be employed to teach scarcity, incentives, and marginal thinking. O'Roark (2017) draws from the superhero genre to explore public goods, utility, and moral hazard, revealing the pedagogical potential of fictional universes as analytical scaffolds. Tierney et al. (2016), in turn, compiled a collection of brief teaching clips from *The Big Bang Theory*, offering broad topical coverage but limited formal integration with economic models or structured classroom implementation.

Despite the increasing popularity of these approaches, the majority of existing work remains confined to introductory-level applications and informal analogies. Few studies attempt to link rigorous economic modeling, such as production functions, complementarity among agents, or structural bottlenecks, with narrative-based pedagogy in a formal, teachable format.

The point, therefore, is not merely to highlight the potential of popular culture in economics education, but, recognizing this potential, to provide a conceptually rigorous, pedagogically structured, and immediately applicable teaching resource. By combining formal

[1] This activity is not intended to replace core coverage of production theory in an intermediate microeconomics course, but to serve as an optional applied module within that unit. While concepts such as bottlenecks or penalized production functions are not standard topics, they are introduced here in a pedagogically simplified form, emerging naturally from the narrative structure of the case. Their inclusion is meant to stimulate critical thinking and to illustrate how core theoretical ideas can be extended to analyze complex real-world (or fictional) production problems. Instructors may adopt only the central modeling components if constrained by time, or incorporate the full activity in elective or advanced courses such as Industrial Organization or Topics in Microeconomics.

production theory with narrative engagement, this article offers instructors a coherent and innovative tool for deepening student understanding of firm-level production in intermediate microeconomics.

3. The Technology of Scientific Production

The Big Bang Theory episodes that motivate this analysis present a narrative structure that, while fictional and comedic, allows for a rigorous economic interpretation. Across a coherent narrative arc, including Season 10, Episodes 2 ("The Military Miniaturization") and 3 ("The Dependence Transcendence"), Episode 15 ("The Locomotion Reverberation"), and Season 11, Episode 8 ("The Tesla Recoil"), three scientists, Sheldon, Leonard, and Howard, are recruited to collaborate on a classified military project aimed at developing a miniaturized missile guidance system. The mission involves not only technical mastery but also the coordination of specialized skills across distinct domains of scientific knowledge, exposing bottlenecks, complementarity, and the challenges of imperfect substitution among cognitive inputs.

This configuration can be interpreted as a knowledge-intensive production process, in which the main inputs are not physical resources or materials, but rather cognitive, analytical, and operational competencies. In this context, the project can be modeled as a production function $Q = f(S, L, H)$, where $S, L$and H represent the contributions of Sheldon, Leonard, and Howard, respectively, understood as distinct vectors of intellectual capital.[2]

The project's production structure relies on three distinct cognitive inputs. Sheldon Cooper serves as the theoretical core, with advanced mathematical capabilities that render him a highly specific and low-substitutability factor. His absence halts production entirely, as seen in S10E15, while S10E03 further illustrates how fatigue alone significantly reduces his productivity. Leonard Hofstadter serves as a versatile operational bridge, translating theory into experiment and maintaining interpersonal cohesion; while replaceable in principle, his absence reduces overall efficiency and team integration. Howard Wolowitz, with his applied engineering expertise, enables implementation, transforming theoretical models into functional hardware. Though the show never depicts his full removal, S11E08 implies that without him, production loses viability. Each input is essential not only in its individual domain but also due to structural complementarities that sustain the project's overall functionality.

A. Modeling with a Production Function

To formally represent how the three scientists contribute to the technological advancement of the project, we adopt the language of production theory. The final output Q (the quality of the miniaturized guidance system) is modeled as a function of three inputs: S, L , and H, which correspond to the efforts and competencies of Sheldon, Leonard, and Howard, respectively:

$$Q = f(S, L, H)$$

A first attempt to model their productive interaction can be made using a standard Cobb-Douglas production function:

$$Q = AS^{\alpha} L^{\beta} H^{\gamma}$$

This structure allows for marginal substitutability: if Sheldon contributes slightly

[2] The term intellectual capital is used here to denote specialized stocks of analytical, theoretical, and problem-solving capacity that function as productive inputs in knowledge-intensive activities.

less, Leonard and Howard can, in principle, partially compensate with greater technical and experimental effort. Nevertheless, the function also features an important property — total output drops to zero if any input is zero: $Q = 0$ when $S = 0, L = 0$, or $H = 0$. In other words, while there is marginal substitutability when all inputs are positive, each input remains essential in the extreme.

However, the events depicted in the series indicate a form of even more rigid insubstitutability. In Season 10, Episode 15 ("The Locomotion Reverberation"), after the initial version of the project is completed, Sheldon revisits the equations and identifies a theoretical refinement that could further miniaturize the device. Leonard and Howard, satisfied with the current delivery, resist the proposal, insisting that the work is already finished and approved. To resolve the impasse, Leonard purchases a train-driving experience to distract Sheldon, exploiting his well-known obsession with locomotives. Enthusiastic about the opportunity, Sheldon temporarily withdraws from the project.

The problem escalates when Colonel Williams visits the lab, sees Sheldon's equations on the board, and demands the proposed improvement. At that point, Leonard and Howard are unable to complete the additional calculations. Sheldon is physically present, but cognitively disengaged, and production comes to a halt.

This scenario reveals that Sheldon's contribution is not only formally necessary (as in the Cobb-Douglas specification), but functionally irreplaceable: his productive absence halts progress, even when the other inputs are available. To capture this structural asymmetry, we propose a conditional production function, where Sheldon's active participation is a necessary condition for output:

$$Q = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} S = 0 \\ S^{\alpha}(L^{\beta} + H^{\beta})^{\gamma} & \text{if} S > 0 \end{cases}$$

B. Sheldon Present, but Tired

Not all project interruptions arise from philosophical disputes or interpersonal conflict. Sometimes, the most significant barriers to scientific progress are far more human: fatigue. During the development of the miniaturized military system—particularly in Season 10, Episode 3 ("The Dependence Transcendence") - Sheldon, the team's theoretical engine, begins to exhibit clear signs of cognitive exhaustion. He yawns, loses focus, and—most critically—refuses to continue calculating. Howard, ever the pragmatist, suggests an energy drink. No success. Sheldon is, effectively, out of commission.

The episode illustrates how even short-term depletion of a highly specialized input can stall the entire production process, independent of conflict or coordination failure. In the meantime, Leonard and Howard attempt to keep the project alive in Sheldon's mental absence. However, it quickly becomes evident that their efforts are fruitless: without the theoretical input, the calculations fail to converge. The productive engine stalls. The genius remains—just not functionally.

This scenario can be formally captured using a penalized production function:

$$Q = \phi(S)(L^{\beta} + H^{\beta})^{\gamma}$$

with the penalization term defined as:

$$\phi(S) = S - \delta(S - S^{*})^{2}$$

Here, S^* represents Sheldon's optimal level of productive focus, and δ reflects the sensitivity of output to deviations from this ideal. The farther Sheldon drifts from his optimal cognitive state—whether due to distraction, fatigue, or lack of motivation—the less effective his contributions become. The economic intuition is straightforward: capital that is misallocated, underutilized, or disengaged loses productive value, even if physically present.

Fortunately, the tide turns when Sheldon experiences an imaginative "encounter" with The Flash, his favorite superhero. Renewed by inspiration and finally accepting Howard's energy drink, he returns to the task with a burst of analytical clarity. In economic terms, his S approaches S^* once again, and the production function regains full efficiency.

Productivity is restored—resurrected by caffeine, comic book mythology, and just the right amount of nerdy euphoria.

C. What If Sheldon Worked Alone?

As revealed in Season 11, Episode 8 ("The Tesla Recoil"), the military project takes an unexpected twist: Leonard and Howard discover that Sheldon has continued working on the miniaturized guidance system in secret, collaborating directly with the Department of Defense, without their knowledge or involvement.

This surprising turn stems from a prior decision by the Air Force. After gathering what they deemed sufficient insight from the original research team, they chose to proceed without them. There is no formal dismissal, only the quiet institutional assumption that the scientists had fulfilled their role.

This marks a fundamental change in the production structure. The project enters a new phase, in which theory must be converted into implementation. Yet Sheldon, convinced of the project's untapped potential and of his own indispensability, unilaterally resumes his work, proposing optimizations to Colonel Williams and rejoining the effort alone.

This shift radically alters the underlying production function. The new structure can be represented as:

$$Q = S^{\alpha}(\varepsilon)^{\gamma} \text{ with } \varepsilon \approx 0$$

That is, Sheldon remains a productive input, but he lacks the complementary factors that once allowed his theories to be implemented. Leonard and Howard, though perhaps less dazzling, were crucial for translating abstract formulations into real-world systems. Without them, the gears spin in place. The project collapses functionally; ideas do not assemble machines.

The Air Force's confidence in continuing without the full team reflects a common overestimation of theory's sufficiency. In practice, it is plausible that Sheldon was eventually paired with military engineers and experimental physicists to fill the operational gap left by his former teammates. From a production function perspective, inputs were substituted, but likely with losses in synergy, speed, and tacit coordination. After all, not everyone can interpret Sheldon, and fewer still can tolerate him as Leonard did.

D. Replacing Sheldon with Barry?

At a later stage, Leonard and Howard attempt to move forward with the project without Sheldon. They develop an idea, identify a promising direction, and appear ready to act, until they encounter a critical limitation: they are unable to perform the necessary theoretical calculations. They lack mastery over the deeper physical formulation of the problem, expertise that was once Sheldon's domain.

In this context, they turn to Barry Kripke. Despite his ethical shortcomings and abrasive personality, Barry is a capable theoretical physicist, and for the project's continuity, that is enough. With his entry, the project resumes.

This scenario can be formally modeled by replacing the theoretical input *S* with *B*, where Barry's contribution is characterized by a lower marginal productivity:

$$Q = B^{\theta}(L^{\beta} + H^{\beta})^{\gamma} \text{ with } \theta < \alpha$$

In this structure, production still occurs, but with reduced quality and efficiency. The substitution of Sheldon by Barry keeps the project viable, yet at a theoretical cost. However, the most critical insight here is not how much is lost, but that without any theoretical physicist, production would be zero.

This reinforces a central point: the "theoretical physics" input is qualitatively irreplaceable, even if quantitatively substitutable. The project requires someone to formalize the problem, structure the mathematical modeling, and ensure the technical coherence of the solution. No matter how inventive Leonard and Howard are, they cannot proceed without this essential link.

From an economic standpoint, this reflects a production factor marked by structural complementarity and imperfect substitution. The role must be filled, but the resulting productivity depends on who fills it. Barry is functional, but far from ideal.

4. Hypothetical Extensions: Two Sheldons, No Howard, and the Limits of Scaling

What happens to the production process when the structure of inputs changes dramatically? What if the lab gains a second Sheldon? Or loses its only engineer? These contrafactual exercises offer a pedagogical entry point to explore returns to scale, complementarity, and the fragility of knowledge-based production systems.

A. Two Sheldons: Increasing One Input

Imagine a scenario in which the team doubles its theoretical input by adding a second Sheldon, while keeping Leonard and Howard constant. Within the Cobb-Douglas framework:

$$Q = AS^{\alpha}L^{\beta}H^{\gamma}$$

Increasing Sheldon's input from *S* to *2S* results in:

$$Q' = A(2S)^{\alpha}L^{\beta}H^{\gamma}$$
$$Q' = 2^{\alpha}Q$$

This result illustrates a foundational principle of microeconomic theory: diminishing marginal returns. If $\alpha < 1$, which is standard in most empirical and pedagogical applications, the output increases less than proportionally. For instance, with $\alpha = 0{,}4$, production rises by only about 32%, not 100%, despite the theoretical effort being doubled.

From a narrative perspective, the implications are even more severe. Adding a second Sheldon would likely introduce interpersonal conflict, duplication of efforts, and coordination failures. Social frictions, divergent modeling approaches, and inflated egos could outweigh the mathematical benefits of scale.

This divergence between formal output gain and organizational dysfunction highlights a deeper didactic insight: returns to a single input are not just about quantity, but about contextual effectiveness. In theory, two Sheldons increase production via 2^α; in practice, they may reduce it due to internal inefficiencies and the non-scalability of cognitive idiosyncrasies.

From a teaching standpoint, this scenario offers an opportunity to demonstrate how diminishing marginal returns emerge even in intellectually driven production, and how they are often exacerbated by fixed complementary factors and human limitations. In short, more Sheldon does not necessarily mean more output, especially if one of them refuses to work with the other.

B. No Howard: Limits of Implementation

Although the series never explicitly depicts a scenario in which Howard is removed from the project, we can infer the likely consequences through economic reasoning. Without Howard, the team loses its sole engineer, the only member capable of translating theoretical and experimental insights into functional aerospace hardware.

Even with Sheldon's theoretical breakthroughs and Leonard's experimental guidance, the project would likely come to a standstill due to the lack of engineering expertise. This situation is best captured by a Leontief production function, where output is determined by the least available input:

$$Q = \min(S, L, H)$$

In this structure, increasing any one factor does not lead to more output unless all required components are present in fixed proportions. It emphasizes complementarity in its strongest form.

While the narrative does showcase what happens without Sheldon (production halts) and explores reduced efficiency without Leonard, it never removes Howard from the equation—perhaps because his absence would be less dramatic narratively, but equally catastrophic functionally.

From a pedagogical standpoint, this reinforces a crucial point: some forms of capital are visible and charismatic, like Sheldon; others are quiet and technical, like Howard. But both are necessary for production.

5. Lesson Plan: Implementing Production Theory with Dr. Sheldon Cooper

This section presents a classroom-ready lesson plan designed to operationalize the pedagogical framework proposed in this article. It is intended for use in an intermediate microeconomics course, specifically within the unit on production theory, traditionally framed as a foundational component of the theory of the firm.

The lesson begins by revisiting standard production functions - typically modeled using physical inputs such as capital and labor - to reinforce prior knowledge and contextualize the analytical tools students have encountered. Building on this foundation, the activity transitions to a narrative-based modeling approach, treating cognitive contributions from fictional characters as production inputs. This structure allows students to apply familiar theoretical concepts to unconventional, intellectually engaging scenarios, deepening their understanding of complementarity, substitution, and scalability within production processes.

A. Learning Objectives

By the end of this class, students should be able to:

- Interpret and compare production functions (Cobb-Douglas, conditional, Leontief, penalized);
- Identify input complementarity, imperfect substitution, and structural bottlenecks;
- Analyze counterfactual changes in input structure and their effects on output;
- Apply economic reasoning to non-traditional production contexts using fictional narratives.

B. Target Audience and Pedagogical Context

- **Level**: Undergraduate – Intermediate Microeconomics
- **Topic**: Production Theory / Theory of the Firm
- **Length**: flexible; can be adapted to a single class or extended across multiple sessions depending on instructional goals
- **Pre-requisites**: Basic knowledge of production functions and returns to scale

C. Materials and Resources

- Selected video clips from *The Big Bang Theory* (see Appendix A)
- Handouts with guided questions and production functions (see Appendix C)
- Mathematical reference summary (see Appendix B)
- Whiteboard and projector for modeling, clip viewing, and group discussion

D. Lesson Flow – Sheldon and Production Theory

i. Review of standard production theory

Begin with a brief review of traditional production theory within the theory of the firm, including classical examples such as capital and labor, diminishing marginal returns, and returns to scale.

Pedagogical purpose: connect to prior knowledge and introduce the formal structure that will be applied through the narrative exercise.

ii. Transition to cognitive production and narrative motivation

Show the initial clip from *The Big Bang Theory* (S10E02, 9:26–12:09), where a team of scientists is recruited for a military innovation project. (see Appendix A)

Pedagogical purpose: to justify modeling intellectual labor as productive inputs and motivate the use of fictional narrative.

iii. Mapping cognitive inputs to characters

In small groups, students identify key types of cognitive capital (theoretical, empirical, technical) and map them to the characters—Sheldon, Leonard, and Howard. (see Appendix A).

Pedagogical purpose: encourage economic abstraction and active model-building.

iv. Formal modeling with production functions

Introduce the various production functions discussed in the article: Cobb-Douglas, conditional with bottlenecks, penalized (fatigued Sheldon), imperfect substitution (Barry), and Leontief (see Appendix B).

Pedagogical purpose: formalize concepts of complementarity, substitutability, and structural bottlenecks.

v. Scenario-based application with episode clips

Present and discuss selected clips illustrating changes in productivity, input removal, and imperfect substitution. Examples: S10E03 (Sheldon exhausted and hyperactive), S10E15 (Sheldon leaves and rejoins the project), S11E08 (Barry replaces Sheldon) (see Appendix A).

Pedagogical purpose: apply production models to narrative-based scenarios to reinforce theoretical understanding.

vi. Guided analytical exercise in class

Select one exercise from Appendix C (e.g., Exercise 1 – Cobb-Douglas and returns to scale) to solve during class, with guided support from the instructor. (see Appendix C).

Pedagogical purpose: consolidate mathematical modeling and promote critical interpretation of results.

vii. Reflective plenary discussion

Facilitate a class-wide discussion synthesizing group responses, emphasizing key insights about scalability, non-substitutability, and cognitive complementarity.

Pedagogical purpose: generalize theoretical concepts and connect them to real-world analogies.

viii. In-class problem-solving using Appendix C exercises

Students solve selected analytical exercises from Appendix C in small groups or individually, with instructor facilitation. Exercises may include formal derivations, productivity comparisons, and interpretation of counterfactual scenarios (e.g., Exercises 1 to 5) (see Appendix C).

Pedagogical purpose: promote hands-on application of production theory, reinforce mathematical reasoning, and connect formal analysis to the narrative context.

ix. Homework – Open Analytical Essay

Assign the optional essay from Appendix C as homework. Students model a real or fictional production process involving two core inputs, applying concepts such as substitutability, returns to scale, and bottlenecks (see Appendix C – Optional Open Essay).

Pedagogical purpose: assess independent mastery of production theory through creative and analytical transfer of knowledge.

E. Instructor Notes

This lesson was piloted in an Intermediate Microeconomics course, with highly positive informal feedback. Students consistently reported that the narrative context improved their understanding, enhanced their attention during class, and helped them better retain abstract concepts such as input complementarity and diminishing returns.

Instructors are encouraged to tailor the depth of formal modeling to the class profile. The modular structure of Appendices A, B, and C allows for flexible adaptation: from a one-day in-class activity to an extended project or capstone modeling exercise.

6. Conclusion: From Pop Culture to Structured Economic Insight

The use of cultural narratives in economics education has proven effective in making abstract concepts more accessible and engaging. The episodes of The Big Bang Theory analyzed here provide a particularly fertile ground for this approach, blending humor with a rich representation of key microeconomic principles such as input complementarity, production bottlenecks, non-substitutability, and diminishing returns.

By modeling the cognitive contributions of Sheldon, Leonard, and Howard as formal inputs in production functions, this paper demonstrates how fictional narratives can be translated into analytically rigorous structures. Sheldon's withdrawal reveals an absolute bottleneck; his fatigue, a loss in productive efficiency; and his substitution by Barry Kripke, a case of imperfect yet necessary input replacement. These scenarios map directly onto standard production theory, but do so through a medium that is familiar, vivid, and intuitively compelling.

From a pedagogical standpoint, this approach offers three major contributions:

- Cognitive engagement – By leveraging familiar characters and compelling situations, the material connects with students' prior experiences, enhancing interest and retention.
- Visualization of abstract structures – Production functions and input complementarities, often introduced in a mechanical way, gain concreteness when applied to human interactions—even fictional ones.
- Development of critical thinking – Through contrafactual simulations—such as removing Howard, duplicating Sheldon, or replacing him with Barry—students are invited to reflect on the boundaries and assumptions of economic models in non-trivial contexts.

Rather than presenting an isolated case study, this article proposes a broader teaching methodology: the use of analytically structured cultural narratives to teach economic theory without compromising formal rigor. For instructors, this framework offers ready-to-use exercises, modeling opportunities, and intuitive entry points into complex ideas. When purposefully employed, pop culture becomes more than a pedagogical hook and instead serves as a powerful tool for fostering deep economic reasoning and model-based thinking.

References

Becker, W.E. (2000). Teaching economics in the 21st century. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(1), pp.109–119. DOI: 10.1257/jep.14.1.109

Deyo, D., & Podemska-Mikluch, M. (2014). It's just like magic: The economics of Harry Potter. *Journal of Economics and Finance Education*, 13(2), 90-98. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.2272692

Hall, J.C. and Gillis, M.T. (2007). Homer Economicus: Using The Simpsons to teach economics. *The American Economist*, 51(2),44–50.

Luccasen, A., & Thomas, M. K. (2010). Simpsonomics: Teaching economics using episodes of The Simpsons. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 41(2), 136-149. DOI: 10.1080/00220481003613847

Luccasen, A., Hammock, M., & Thomas, M. K. (2011). Teaching macroeconomic principles using animated cartoons. *The American Economist*, 56(1), 38-47. DOI: 10.1177/056943451105600106

Mateer, G. D., O'Roark, B., & Holder, K. (2016). The 10 greatest films for teaching economics. *The American Economist*, 61(2), 204-216. DOI: 10.1177/0569434516653749

Moulder, J. (2009). Commentary on teaching economics with podcasts, literature, and movies. *Journal of Philosophical Economics*, 2(2), pp.134–136. DOI: 10.46298/jpe.10582

O'Roark, B. (2017). Super-economics man! Using superheroes to teach economics. *Journal of Economics Teaching*, 2(1), 51-67. DOI: 10.58311/jeconteach/59c103378fbce8cf7065a7cca4bab7ed5fc49b21

Tierney, J.,Mateer, G. D., Smith, B., Wooten, J., & Geerling, W. (2016). Bazinganomics: Economics of the Big Bang Theory. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 47(2), 192. DOI: 10.1080/00220485.2016.1146099

Wight, J.B. (2002). The teaching economist: Using literature to teach economics. *Journal of Economic Education*, 33(4), pp.377–384.

Appendix A.

Table A.1 – Summary of Episodes from The Big Bang Theory and Their Pedagogical Use in Teaching Production Functions

Episode	Title	Time Range	Scene Description	Economic Concepts
S10E02	The Military Miniaturization	9:26 – 12:09	First meeting with Colonel Williams	Team formation, complementarity
S10E03	The Dependence Transcendence	0:00 – 1:15	Sheldon is exhausted and unproductive	Cognitive fatigue, productivity decay
S10E03	The Dependence Transcendence	3:51 – 5:09	Flash convinces Sheldon to drink energy beverage	Motivational dynamics, effort recovery
S10E03	The Dependence Transcendence	6:56 – 7:35	Sheldon returns hyperactive to the project	Short-term productivity spike
S10E03	The Dependence Transcendence	14:23 – 16:19	Sheldon crashes from overstimulation	Return to fatigue and drop in output
S10E15	The Locomotion Reverberation	0:00 – 3:05	Sheldon proposes simplifying the project and gets train gift	Scope reduction, incentive realignment
S10E15	The Locomotion Reverberation	6:40 – 8:02	Sheldon disengages; colonel prefers simplified model	Project disengagement, external feedback
S10E15	The Locomotion Reverberation	9:01 – 11:11	Team tries to convince Sheldon to return	Team coordination under input loss
S10E15	The Locomotion Reverberation	16:37 – 18:29	Sheldon agrees to rejoin the project	Reintegration of core input
S11E08	The Tesla Recoil	2:29 – 3:44	Sheldon confesses to working solo on the military project	Individual incentive misalignment, team rupture
S11E08	The Tesla Recoil	12:17 – 13:12	Leonard and Howard try to improve the project without Sheldon	Attempted substitution, limitations without key input
S11E08	The Tesla Recoil	14:15 – 15:12	Barry Kripke replaces Sheldon in the project	Imperfect Substitution input

Source: Compiled by the author from selected episodes of *The Big Bang Theory* (CBS, Seasons 10–11).

Supplementary Materials

The video clips referenced in this article, selected from The Big Bang Theory, are available for instructional use at the following Critical Commons collection: https://criticalcommons.org/user/otaviodetoni/media

The clips are clearly labeled and organized according to the lesson plan described in the manuscript, and they correspond to the theoretical points discussed in each section.

Appendix B. Mathematical Formalization of Production Functions and Economic Properties

This appendix summarizes the mathematical structure of the production functions used throughout the article and discusses their key properties, particularly regarding returns to scale and input substitutability.

A.1 Cobb-Douglas Production Function (Baseline Model)

$$Q = AS^{\alpha}L^{\beta}H^{\gamma}$$

- Interpretation: Standard representation of marginal substitutability and diminishing marginal returns.
- Returns to Scale: Let us scale all inputs by a positive factor $\lambda > 0$:

$$Q' = A(\lambda S)^{\alpha}(\lambda L)^{\beta}(\lambda H)^{\gamma}$$
$$Q' = A\lambda^{\alpha+\beta+\gamma}S^{\alpha}L^{\beta}H^{\gamma}$$
$$Q' = \lambda^{\alpha+\beta+\gamma}Q$$

  Constant if $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1$

  Increasing if $\alpha + \beta + \gamma > 1$

  Decreasing if $\alpha + \beta + \gamma < 1$

- Substitutability:

  The elasticity of substitution between any pair of inputs is 1.

  All inputs are essential: $Q = 0$ if any input is zero.

  Substitution is marginal: small changes in one input can be offset by changes in another.

A.2 Conditional Function with Structural Bottleneck

$$Q = \begin{Bmatrix} 0 & \text{if} S = 0 \\ S^{\alpha}(L + H)^{\beta}1^{\gamma} & \text{if} S > 0 \end{Bmatrix}$$

- Key Feature: Production only occurs when $S > 0$. This introduces a hard threshold.
- Returns to Scale (for $S > 0$):

  Let $Q = S^{\alpha}\left(L^{\beta} + H^{\beta}\right)^{\gamma}$. Scale all imputs:

$$(\lambda S)^{\alpha}\left(\lambda^{\beta}L^{\beta} + \lambda^{\beta}H^{\beta}\right)^{\gamma}$$
$$\lambda^{\alpha}S^{\alpha}\lambda^{\beta\gamma}\left(L^{\beta} + H^{\beta}\right)^{\gamma}$$
$$\lambda^{\alpha+\beta\gamma}Q$$

Returns to scale depend on: $\alpha + \beta\gamma$

A.3 Penalized Production Function (Sheldon Tired)

$Q = \phi(S)\left(L^{\beta} + H^{\beta}\right)^{\gamma}$ with $\phi\left(S\right) = S - \delta\left(S - S^{*}\right)^{2}$

- Interpretation:

$\phi(S)$ is maximized when *S*=*S** (optimal productivity).

Deviations from *S**reduce output quadratically.

This is not homogeneous, so returns to scale analysis must fix $\phi(S)$ or treat it parametrically.

- At Optimum: *S*=*S**

$$\phi(S) = S^{*} \rightarrow Q = S^{*}(L^{\beta} + H^{\beta})^{\gamma}$$

- Returns to scale then behave like:

$$Q' = \lambda S^{*}\lambda^{\beta}L + \lambda^{\beta^{H^{\gamma}}}$$
$$Q' = \lambda^{\beta\gamma}Q$$

So: returns depend only on L and H if S is fixed.

A.4 Solo Sheldon with Absent Team

$$Q = S^{\alpha}\varepsilon^{\gamma} \text{ with } \varepsilon \approx 0$$

- Clearly $Q \approx 0$ for all *S*

- Interpretation: Theoretical work without implementation is unproductive in this case.

A.5 Substitution: Barry Replaces Sheldon

$$Q = B^{\theta}L^{\beta} + H^{\beta\gamma} \text{ with } \theta < \alpha$$

- Returns to Scale:

$$Q' = \lambda B^{\theta}\lambda^{\beta}L^{\beta} + \lambda^{\beta^{H^{\beta\gamma}}}$$
$$Q' = \lambda^{\theta+\beta\gamma}$$

Again, *returns depend on* $\theta + \beta\gamma$, but since the productivity is strictly lower than under Sheldon.

A.6 Leontief Production Function

$$Q = min(S, L, H)$$

- Returns to Scale:

$$Q' = \min(\lambda S, \lambda L, \lambda H)$$
$$Q' = \lambda Q$$

Always constant returns to scale

- Substitutability:

None: inputs are perfect complements.

Increasing any single input has no effect if it's not the minimum.

Appendix C. Suggested Exercises Teaching Production Theory with The Big Bang Theory

Exercise 1 – Cobb-Douglas and Returns to Scale

Using the production function:

$$Q = AS^{\alpha}L^{\beta}H^{\gamma}$$

a. Suppose $\alpha = 0.4, \beta = 0.3, \gamma = 0.3$. Does this function exhibit constant, increasing, or decreasing returns to scale? Justify mathematically.

b. If Sheldon's input doubles from *S* to *2S*, with *L* and *H* constant, what is the percentage change in output? Interpret the result in narrative terms (e.g., interpersonal costs of "two Sheldons").

Exercise 2 – Conditional Production Function

Consider the conditional function:

$$Q = \begin{cases} 0, \text{ if } S = 0 \\ S^{\alpha}\left(L^{\beta} + H^{\beta}\right)^{\gamma}, \text{ if } S > 0 \end{cases}$$

a. Suppose $\alpha = 0.5, \beta = 1, \gamma = 0.5$. Compute the returns to scale of this function (scale all inputs by *λ*).

b. Discuss how this function differs from a standard Cobb-Douglas in terms of substitutability and bottlenecks.

Exercise 3 – Penalization and Efficiency Loss

Given the penalized function:

$Q = \phi\left(S\right)\left(L^{\beta} + H^{\beta}\right)^{\gamma}$ with $\phi\left(S\right) = S - \delta\left(S - S^{*}\right)^{2}$

a. Assume $S^{*} = 5, \delta = 0.1$. Plot $\phi(S)$ for $S \in [0, 10]$. Where is Sheldon most productive? What happens if he is under- or over-stimulated?

b. Why does this function reflect the episode where Sheldon is tired and unproductive?

Exercise 4 – Imperfect Substitution

Suppose Barry Kripke replaces Sheldon in the production function:

$Q = B^{\theta}L^{\beta} + H^{\beta\gamma}$ with $\theta < \alpha$

a. Assume $\theta = 0.3, \alpha = 0.6$. What percentage loss in productivity occurs when replacing Sheldon with Barry, holding *L* and *H* constant?

b. Discuss in groups: Can lower-skilled workers be good substitutes in real-world R&D settings? Under what conditions?

Exercise 5 – Leontief Function and Engineering Bottlenecks

Consider the Leontief-type structure:

$$Q = \min(S, L, H)$$

For inputs *S=5, L=4, H=6* what is the output? What happens if Howard (*H*) is removed?

Why is this function especially useful to model the "No Howard" scenario? What pedagogical insights can be drawn from its rigid complementarity?

Optional Open Essay

Analytical Essay (Real-World Application)

"Modeling Real-World Production with Two Inputs: Substitution, Bottlenecks, and Returns to Scale"

Objective:

Apply the concepts of production theory to a real or realistically imagined production process involving two key inputs. This exercise encourages students to use formal tools (production functions) and economic reasoning to describe how a good or service is produced, highlighting the relationships between inputs.

Instructions:

Choose a real or realistic firm that produces a product or service. Then:

1. **Describe the Production Process**: Clearly state **what** is being produced and **identify two core inputs** (e.g., capital and labor; design and assembly; strategy and execution).

2. **Specify a Production Function**: Choose a functional form with **two variables**. Justify the choice of function based on how the inputs interact.

3. **Analyze Substitutability and Complementarity**: Are the two inputs **perfect complements, imperfect substitute**s, or partially replaceable? Could one input compensate for the reduction of the other?

4. **Evaluate Returns to Scale**: Discuss how output responds to proportional increases in both inputs. Use algebra (if applicable) to assess whether the function exhibits **increasing, constant,** or **decreasing returns to scale**.

5. **Identify a Potential Bottleneck**: Describe a situation where the absence or weakening of one input would **halt or severely limit production**, and explain how that reflects the structure of your chosen function.

6. **Optional – Graphical Representation**: Draw isoquants or input-output diagrams showing how combinations of the two inputs generate output.

Suggested Length: 1,000–1,500 words.

Examples of Simplified Production Contexts:

- A **bakery** using flour (*X*) and labor (*Y*) to produce bread.
- A **coffee shop** using espresso machines (*X*) and trained baristas (*Y*).