# The Unintended Effect of Decreasing State Support for Higher Education on Student Diversity

Dora Gicheva

Department of Economics, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

January 5, 2024

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲匡▶ ▲匡▶ 三臣 めんぐ

## State Appropriations for Public Four-Year Institutions



### Appropriations as Share of Revenues



### Appropriations as Share of Revenues



## Tuition as Share of Revenues



## Minority Student Representation at Public Four-Year Institutions



State Appropriations and Minority Student Representation

- Do changes in state funding for higher education impact the share of minority students enrolling at public four-year institutions?
- Do the impacts vary by institution selectivity level?
- What are the mechanisms driving the relationship?

- Do changes in state funding for higher education impact the share of minority students enrolling at public four-year institutions?
- Do the impacts vary by institution selectivity level?
- What are the mechanisms driving the relationship?
  - Price
  - Financial aid
  - Other institutional spending

Dora Gicheva (UNCG)

State Appropriations and Minority Student Representation

æ

<ロト < 四ト < 回ト < 回ト < 回ト</p>

Þ

< A

(4) E (4) E

Postsecondary budget cuts have impacts beyond quality of education

Links between cost of attendance and college decisions of marginal students

Postsecondary budget cuts have impacts beyond quality of education

Dora Gicheva (UNCG)

State Appropriations and Minority Student Representation

Links between cost of attendance and college decisions of marginal students

Postsecondary budget cuts have impacts beyond quality of education

Importance of financial aid for institutional diversity

- Cuts in state funding for higher education associated with:
  - **Higher tuition** (Webber, 2017)
  - More student debt (Chakrabarti, Gorton, and Lovenheim, 2020)
  - Shift of students into for-profit institutions (Goodman and Volz, 2020)
  - **Decrease in overall enrollment** (Deming and Walters, 2018; Monarrez, Hernandez, and Rainer, 2021)
  - **Relative increase in out-of-state** (Jaquette and Curs, 2015) **and international** (Bound, Braga, Khanna, and Turner, 2020) **student enrollment**

(人間) くちゃ くちゃ

- IPEDS data for 1998-99 to 2019-20
  - Data from every postsecondary institution in the U.S. eligible for federal financial aid
  - Fall enrollment of first-time undergraduate students by race and ethnicity
  - Institution-level appropriations
  - Posted tuition and fees; share of students receiving financial aid
  - Institutional spending

э

- IPEDS data for 1998-99 to 2019-20
  - Data from every postsecondary institution in the U.S. eligible for federal financial aid
  - Fall enrollment of first-time undergraduate students by race and ethnicity
  - Institution-level appropriations
  - Posted tuition and fees; share of students receiving financial aid
  - Institutional spending
- State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO): state-level funding
  - $\bullet$  Includes state ( ${\sim}90\%)$  but not local ( ${\sim}10\%)$  support
  - Includes federal stimulus funding
  - Excludes funding for research, hospitals, medical education

- IPEDS data for 1998-99 to 2019-20
  - Data from every postsecondary institution in the U.S. eligible for federal financial aid
  - Fall enrollment of first-time undergraduate students by race and ethnicity
  - Institution-level appropriations
  - Posted tuition and fees; share of students receiving financial aid
  - Institutional spending
- State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO): state-level funding
  - $\bullet$  Includes state ( ${\sim}90\%)$  but not local ( ${\sim}10\%)$  support
  - Includes federal stimulus funding
  - Excludes funding for research, hospitals, medical education
- State- and county-level demographics and unemployment

• Equation of interest for institution *i* in county *c* in state *s*:

ShareMinority<sub>icst</sub> =  $\beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln(Appropriations_{it}) + X_{cst}\gamma + \mu_i + \eta_t + \varepsilon_{icst}$ 

- Controls for state and county unemployment rate and state- and county-level shares of Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American residents among population age 18–25
- Errors clustered at the state level

• Equation of interest for institution *i* in county *c* in state *s*:

ShareMinority<sub>icst</sub> =  $\beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln(Appropriations_{it}) + X_{cst}\gamma + \mu_i + \eta_t + \varepsilon_{icst}$ 

- Controls for state and county unemployment rate and state- and county-level shares of Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American residents among population age 18–25
- Errors clustered at the state level
- Institutional appropriations likely correlated with the error term
  - Targeted support to institutions
  - Reverse causality

• Use shift-share instrument for institutional appropriations

$$Z_{it} = \left(\frac{Appropriations_{i,1997}}{Revenues_{i,1997}}\right) [In(StateAppropriations_{st})]$$

э

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

• Use shift-share instrument for institutional appropriations

$$Z_{it} = \left(\frac{Appropriations_{i,1997}}{Revenues_{i,1997}}\right) \left[\ln(StateAppropriations_{st})\right]$$

• Requires exogenous shift (Borusyak, Hull & Jaravel, 2018) or exogenous baseline share (Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin & Swift, 2020)

- Baseline reliance on appropriations is related to changes in student body composition
- Economic conditions driving changes in appropriations and changes in minority enrollment

## Share minority is positively correlated with reliance on appropriations...



### ...But the change in share minority is not



## Economic Conditions and Appropriations



## Economic Conditions and Minority Enrollment



Excluded institutions:		Flagships	Nonselective	HBCUs
Number of schools	523	513	431	484
Number of observations	8120	7960	6710	7503

Excluded institutions:		Flagships	Nonselective	HBCUs		
Number of schools	523	513	431	484		
Number of observations	8120	7960	6710	7503		
Share minority						
Ln(State appropriations)	0.065***	0.067***	0.065**	0.068***		
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.019)		
Mean of dependent variable	0.276	0.278	0.271	0.228		

Excluded institutions:		Flagships	Nonselective	HBCUs
Number of schools	523	513	431	484
Number of observations	8120	7960	6710	7503
	Share	minority		
Ln(State appropriations)	0.065***	0.067***	0.065**	0.068***
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.019)
Mean of dependent variable	0.276	0.278	0.271	0.228
	Shar	e Black		
Ln(State appropriations)	0.022	0.022	0.011	0.021
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.020)	(0.017)
Mean of dependent variable	0.157	0.158	0.151	0.101

Excluded institutions:		Flagships	Nonselective	HBCUs
Number of schools	523	513	431	484
Number of observations	8120	7960	6710	7503
	Share	minority		
Ln(State appropriations)	0.065***	0.067***	0.065**	0.068***
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.019)
Mean of dependent variable	0.276	0.278	0.271	0.228
	Share	e Black		
Ln(State appropriations)	0.022	0.022	0.011	0.021
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.020)	(0.017)
Mean of dependent variable	0.157	0.158	0.151	0.101
	Share	Hispanic		
Ln(State appropriations)	0.039***	0.040***	0.044***	0.041***
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.014)
Mean of dependent variable	0.110	0.110	0.112	0.117

Dora Gicheva (UNCG)

State Appropriations and Minority Student Representation

### Accounting for Differential Treatment Timing

Dora Gicheva (UNCG)

State Appropriations and Minority Student Representation

3

・ロッ ・雪 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ

• TWFE model with staggered continuous and possibly endogenous treatment

- TWFE model with staggered continuous and possibly endogenous treatment
- Consider model with binary treatment
  - $\bullet\,$  First year when state experienced large ( >15%) budget cut

### Distribution of First Year with Large Budget Cut



### Event Study Estimates: Share Minority



### Event Study Estimates: Share Black



æ

### Event Study Estimates: Share Hispanic



æ

- Posted tuition and fees
  - Large tuition increases shift low-SES and lower-achieving students from 4-year to 2-year colleges (Hemelt & Marcotte, 2016)
  - Tuition increases at non-selective 4-years negatively related to diversity of student body (Allen & Wolniak, 2019)
- Generosity of state and institutional aid
  - Large literature on effects of aid on college access
- Student debt
  - Evidence that Hispanic students are more averse to borrowing (Boatman, Evans & Soliz, 2017)

Excluded institutions:		Flagships	Nonselective	HBCUs
Ln(pos	sted tuition a	and fees): 1998	3-2019	
Ln(State appropriations)	-0.15*	-0.16*	-0.15	-0.15*
	(0.089)	(0.087)	(0.10)	(0.091)
Mean of dependent variable	8.884	8.879	8.921	8.899

3

< □ > < 同 > < 三

Excluded institutions:		Flagships	Nonselective	HBCUs	
Ln(posted tuition and fees): 1998-2019					
Ln(State appropriations)	-0.15*	-0.16*	-0.15	-0.15*	
	(0.089)	(0.087)	(0.10)	(0.091)	
Mean of dependent variable	8.884	8.879	8.921	8.899	
Ln(posted tuition and fees): 2004-2019					
Ln(State appropriations)	-0.24***	-0.24***	-0.23**	-0.24***	
	(0.077)	(0.076)	(0.088)	(0.079)	
Mean of dependent variable	9.009	9.003	9.048	9.024	

3

< □ > < 同 > < 三

▶ ∢ ≣

Excluded institutions:		Flagships	Nonselective	HBCUs
Share	of students v	with loans: 199	8-2019	
Ln(State appropriations)	-0.051	-0.049	-0.027	-0.066
	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.045)	(0.042)
Mean of dependent variable	0.515	0.519	0.515	0.500

Excluded institutions:		Flagships	Nonselective	HBCUs
Share c	of students v	vith loans: 1998	8-2019	
Ln(State appropriations)	-0.051	-0.049	-0.027	-0.066
	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.045)	(0.042)
Mean of dependent variable	0.515	0.519	0.515	0.500
Share c	of students v	vith loans: 2004	4-2019	
Ln(State appropriations)	-0.080**	-0.079**	-0.069*	-0.084**
	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.039)	(0.035)
Mean of dependent variable	0.537	0.541	0.537	0.520

æ

< □ > < 同 > < 三

→ < Ξ

	Share with	Share with	Share with	Ln(scholarship
	state	institution	federal	spending
	grants	grants	grants	per FTE)
Ln(State appropriations)	0.18*	0.095	-0.017	0.75***
	(0.099)	(0.063)	(0.029)	(0.26)
Mean of dep. variable	0.391	0.447	0.403	2.27

3

< □ > < 同 > < 三

▶ ∢ ≣

- Are there spillovers to other types of institutions?
  - Evidence from prior studies (Goodman & Volz, 2020; Bound & Simon, 2021)
- Estimate state-level model of incoming student characteristics by institution type:

$$y_{jst} = eta_0 + \sum_j eta_j \ln(StateAppropriations_{s,t-1}) + X_{st}eta_1 + (\mu_j imes \eta_t) + (\mu_j imes \eta_s) + arepsilon_{jst}$$

where

 $j = \{$ public 4-year, public 2-year, private nonprofit 4-year, private for-profit $\}$ 

	Share	Share	Share
	minority	Black	Hispanic
Public 4-year	0.054**	0.017	0.033***
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.0096)
Public 2-year	0.025	-0.0022	0.030***
	(0.019)	(0.012)	(0.010)
Private 4-year nonprofit	-0.012	-0.011	-0.0019
	(0.013)	(0.010)	(0.012)
For-profit	-0.029	-0.0077	-0.021
	(0.029)	(0.023)	(0.015)

ъ.

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

	Share		Share		Share	
	minority		Black		Hispanic	
	$degrees_{t+3}$		$degrees_{t+3}$		$degrees_{t+3}$	
$Ln(State appropriations)_t$	0.028**	0.0089	0.00053	-0.0064	0.036***	0.023**
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.0060)	(0.0040)	(0.012)	(0.0095)
Share incoming students <sub>t</sub>		0.32***		0.28***		0.40***
		(0.029)		(0.038)		(0.063)

æ

イロト イヨト イヨト

- Decreases in postsecondary funding associated with fewer incoming underrepresented minority students
- Cost of attendance is likely an important factor
- Other mechanisms?
- Findings may be relevant for student body composition at other types of institutions
- Evidence of impact on degrees awarded