

7

Does School Spending Matter?

The New Literature on an Old Question

C. Kirabo Jackson

There has been a long-standing debate regarding whether increasing the financial resources available to public schools can improve child outcomes in general and low-income children's outcomes in particular. Shedding light on this issue, in 1966, James Coleman and coauthors conducted the first large-scale U.S. study to link student achievement outcomes to family background and school characteristics. The report used data from a cross section of students in 1965 and examined the cross-sectional relationship (i.e., at a given point in time) between school spending, family background, and test scores. The report concluded that "it is known that socioeconomic factors bear a strong relation to academic achievement. When these factors are statistically controlled, however, it appears that differences between schools account for only a small fraction of differences in pupil achievement" (Coleman et al., 1966, pp. 21–22). Since Coleman et al. (1966), many social scientists have estimated the relationship between school spending and student outcomes in order to better ascertain whether increased financial resources for public schools improve child outcomes.

THE OLD LITERATURE

Prior to 1995, all U.S.-based studies relating student outcomes to measures of per-pupil spending were observational (i.e., correlational) in nature. These studies either (a) estimated the relationship between school spending and

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0000187-008>

Confronting Inequality: How Policies and Practices Shape Children's Opportunities, edited by L. Tach, R. Dunifon, and D. L. Miller

Copyright © 2020 by the American Psychological Association. All rights reserved.

student outcomes after accounting for family background, (b) estimated the relationship between changes in school spending over time within a particular geographical area (e.g., state, district) and changes in student outcomes after accounting for family background, or (c) some combination of the two.

Spending and Outcomes Tend to Move Together

Summarizing these older studies, in an influential literature review, Hanushek (2003) examined the findings of 163 studies relating school resources to student achievement that were published prior to 1995. When assessing the results of several studies, it is helpful to consider what one would observe if school spending were indeed unrelated to student outcomes. If school spending and student outcomes were unrelated (and each study were independent), then 2.5% of studies should be significant and positive and 2.5% should be significant and negative (with a two-sided p -value $< .05$).¹ However, Hanushek found that 27% of these early studies were statistically significant and positive, whereas 7% were significant and negative—there were more than 10 times as many positive and significant studies than would be expected by random chance alone if the true effect were zero.

It is important to point out that the 163 studies included both single-state studies and those that combined multiple states. This distinction is important. If school-spending effects are heterogeneous, they may be large in some states and nonexistent in others. Accordingly, if school spending matters on average, but the effects are heterogeneous, one should see larger impacts in multistate studies (which may reflect the average of positive effects and some null effects) than in individual state studies (some of which could have real null effects). This is exactly what Hanushek's (2003) data showed. Among the 74 studies that used multiple states, 35% were statistically significant and positive, whereas only 1% were statistically significant and negative. Although Hanushek looked at this and concluded that there was little association between resources and outcomes, the statistical reasoning dictates otherwise. Indeed, Hedges, Laine, and Greenwald (1994) conducted a formal meta-analysis of much of the data studied in Hanushek (2003) and concluded that the older studies on school spending and student outcomes suggested a strong association between school spending and student outcomes. To put it bluntly, any claim that there is little evidence of a statistical link between school spending and student outcomes is demonstrably false.

The Old Literature Should Not be Taken as Causal

Although the literature on school spending and student outcomes published prior to 1995 indicated a real and economically meaningful *association* between increased school spending and improved student outcomes, these studies did

¹Although all of the individual studies are likely not statistically independent, this is a useful benchmark. Importantly, a lack of statistical independence across studies does not lead one to expect a higher proportion of false positives.

not provide strong evidence of a *causal* relationship between increased school spending and improved student outcomes. This is for two key reasons.

The first reason is straightforward. The older studies compared students from different households across schools, so that the observed relationships were correlational. Simply comparing outcomes among families that attend schools with different levels of spending does not yield a causal relationship, because there may be many other differences between these families and schools. Although one can always include additional controls to help mitigate omitted variables bias, if there are any remaining unobserved student characteristics that predict achievement and are correlated with school spending (or family background, or any other covariate in the models) then the estimated relationship will be biased. As the common saying goes “correlation does not imply causation,” and similarly “lack of correlation does not imply lack of causation.” To complicate this approach further, adding additional controls can, in some cases, exacerbate any underlying biases and influence the result in unpredictable and counterintuitive ways (see Elwert & Winship, 2014; Lechner, 2008). The second reason is subtler. Even if there are no omitted variables nor confounding, because school spending is a function of family background (i.e., families select into neighborhoods based on schools, and school spending is based, in part, on property values that are a function of wealth), it can be difficult to disentangle the two. If one does not appropriately model the relationships between school spending, family background, and student outcomes, a regression model using observational variation is unlikely to correctly attribute “blame” to the correct variable.²

One can overcome these limitations of the older literature by relying on exogenous (i.e., external) shocks to school spending that are both (a) unrelated to other determinants of student outcomes, and (b) not driven by the decisions of the individual families under study. With such independent variation in school spending, one can then credibly disentangle school spending from family background and disentangle variation in school spending from other underlying differences. This is the approach taken in the new literature on school spending.

THE NEW LITERATURE ON SCHOOL SPENDING

The “credibility revolution” (Angrist & Pischke, 2010) in empirical economics started to take root in the mid-1990s. The vast majority of the studies examined in Hanushek (2003) were undertaken before this revolution and would

²The intuition is as follows. If one does not properly specify the relationship between school resources and family background (say one uses a contemporaneous measure of school spending as opposed to a cumulative measure of school spending or, alternatively, one includes spending in levels as opposed to logs), because school spending is often endogenous to family income in observational data, the specification errors in school spending are likely to be correlated with family income. In this scenario, the model may attribute the benefits of school spending to family income. I have verified this with simulated data.

not be deemed credible by existing standards of evidence. This is not to say that all studies on school spending written before 1995 are “wrong” or that the authors of these studies made mistakes. The point is that the older studies are not based on the most up-to-date or credible research designs and should, therefore, not be taken as causal. Accordingly, to determine whether there is a causal relationship between school spending and student outcomes, one should only examine studies that can be deemed credibly causal by current standards.

In the past 5 years, a new literature relating school spending to student outcomes has emerged. This new literature is heavily influenced by the credibility revolution, and the studies rely on empirical models that employ exogenous independent variation in school spending in order to disentangle the influence of school spending from that of family background and other influences. What distinguishes the new research from the old research is that it is design based. That is, the new studies lay out a clear comparison group to which some treated group will be compared. These studies do not simply use any variation in school spending, but rather rely on changes in school spending that are known and understood. The ability to identify exactly why one family is exposed to more school spending than another is critical to assessing the extent to which the results in each study can be interpreted causally. In each of these newer studies, the source of variation in school spending is transparent, and that source can credibly be argued to be unrelated to family background and other attributes. Although none of these studies is perfect, each study is clear about the possible sources of any bias, and each study conducts considerable sensitivity analysis on the main results. The results from this more credibly causal set of studies are summarized here and some conclusions are drawn.

School Finance Reforms (National Studies)


Ideally, one would want to run an experiment in which money was randomly dropped on some school districts but not on others. To ensure that one makes comparisons among similar populations, one could then compare the outcomes of cohorts that were in school during and after the money drop to the outcomes of cohorts from the same school district before the money drop. Note that the fact that the money is dropped from above ensures that it is not driven by the decisions of the individual school districts or parents. The fact that the timing and location of the money drop is random ensures that the places that received the money drop were not also areas in which families were becoming richer or poorer, etc. Although such a money drop does not exist in reality, school finance reforms (SFRs) provide a context that approximates this idealized experiment.

A key source of variation used in many studies is SFRs. In most states, before the 1970s, local property taxes accounted for most resources spent on K–12 schooling (Howell & Miller, 1997). Because the local property tax base is typically higher in areas with higher home values, and there are high levels of residential segregation by socioeconomic status, heavy reliance on local

financing contributed to affluent districts' ability to spend more per student. In response to large within-state differences in per-pupil spending across wealthy/high-income and poor districts, state supreme courts overturned school-finance systems in 28 states between 1971 and 2010. Because of these court decisions, many states implemented SFRs that led to important changes in public education funding. Most of these court-ordered SFRs changed the parameters of spending formulas to reduce inequality in public-school spending and weaken the relationship between per-pupil school spending and the wealth and income level of the district.

Jackson, Johnson, and Persico (2015) examined SFRs that occurred between 1971 and 1990. They compared the changes in spending in previously low-spending and high-spending districts in years before and after a court-mandated SFR. They classified districts as low- or high-spending based on whether their average per-pupil spending levels were in the bottom or top 25% of districts in their state as of 1972, before any reforms were implemented. Figure 7.1 shows that in states that passed SFRs, low-spending districts experienced greater increases in per-pupil spending than similar districts in nonreform states, while high-spending districts experienced decreases—reducing spending gaps between previously low- and high-spending districts in reform states.

FIGURE 7.1. School Finance Reform Event Study on Log Spending by Prereform Spending





The outcome variable is the natural log of per-pupil spending relative to the average spending levels in the 10 years prior to the court order. Negative values on the X-axis indicate years prior to the court order, whereas positive values indicate years after the court order. Low- and high-spending districts are those in the bottom and top 25% of the per-pupil spending distribution within the state in 1972, respectively. Data from Jackson, Johnson, and Persico (2015).

Having established that court-mandated SFRs affected school spending differently in different kinds of districts, Jackson, Johnson, and Persico (2016) used more detailed information about the specific reforms enacted in each state to predict how much of an increase each district would receive based on the behaviors of similar districts in other states passing similar kinds of reforms. The basic idea behind this approach is as follows: if certain kinds of reforms have systematic and predictable effects on certain kinds of school districts, then one can predict district-level changes in school spending after a court-ordered SFR based only on factors that are unrelated to potentially confounding changes in unobserved determinants of school spending and student outcomes (e.g., local commitment to education or the state of the local economy). With this clean, predicted variation in spending, one can then test whether in those districts that are predicted (based on prereform characteristics) to experience larger reform-induced spending increases, cohorts exposed to the reform have better outcomes than unexposed cohorts. The increased financial resources that suddenly become available to some cohorts, but not others, within some districts but not available to other districts due to the statewide passage of a SFR, approximates the money drop analogy laid out above. By relating outcomes with only the quasirandom reform-induced variation in school spending (rather than all variation in spending), one removes the confounding effect of unobserved factors that might influence both school spending and student outcomes (e.g., other local policies or changes in family background).

Figure 7.2 shows that exposed cohorts in reform districts predicted to experience larger per-pupil school spending increases during their school-age years did experience larger spending increases, whereas exposed cohorts in reform districts predicted to experience smaller spending increases saw little change in school spending. Importantly, the figure also shows that predicted increases in per-pupil spending induced by SFRs are also correlated with increased years of educational attainment among exposed cohorts (relative to the unexposed cohorts). Using this variation in an instrumental variables framework, Jackson et al. (2016) found that a 10% increase in per pupil spending each year for all 12 years of public school led to 0.31 more completed years of education, about 7% higher wages, and a 3.2 percentage-point reduction in the annual incidence of adult poverty. They also found that the effects were more pronounced for children from low-income families.

Unlike an observational study, this was a design-based study in which the source of the variation in school spending was well-defined and understood. Because the school-spending changes used in this study were driven by state-level legislative action, they did not reflect individual family's decisions. Also, because the changes induced by the SFRs were outside of the control of local policymakers (because it was a statewide policy change), they were unrelated to other policies that may have been implemented by local authorities. Although this empirical approach lends itself to credible causal inference, this was but a single study. To better understand if school spending matters, it is

FIGURE 7.2. School Finance Reform Event Study by Predicted Dose



Areas with no predicted spending increase and those with large predicted spending increase dose are those in the bottom and top 25% of the distribution of predicted school finance reform impacts (i.e., dose), respectively. Adapted from “The Effects of School Spending on Educational and Economic Outcomes: Evidence From School Finance Reforms,” by C. K. Jackson, R. C. Johnson, and C. Persico, 2016, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131, pp. 181–182, 188–189. Copyright 2015 by C. K. Jackson, R. C. Johnson, and C. Persico.

important to look at a range of different studies, each of which is similarly credible, but that used different data, different methods, and different samples.

Recent SFRs (National Studies)

Jackson et al. (2016) examined school-spending impacts using variation due to court-ordered SFRs that occurred between 1972 and 1990. Because current school-spending levels are more than twice as high than during the 1970s, and school spending may exhibit diminishing marginal returns, it is reasonable to wonder if one would observe positive school-spending impacts at current school-spending levels. Speaking to this question, there are a number of studies that analyze the impacts of recent school finance reforms that occurred between 1990 and the present day. For example, Lafortune, Rothstein, and Schanzenbach (2018) studied the impact of post-1990 SFRs on absolute and relative spending and achievement in low-income school districts. Using an event-study design that exploited the quasirandomness of reform timing, they showed that reforms led to sharp, immediate, and sustained increases in school spending in low-income school districts. Using test score data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, they found that SFRs increased student achievement in these low-income districts. They concluded that a one-time \$1,000 increase in per-pupil annual spending sustained for 10 years increased test scores by between 0.12 and 0.24 standard deviations (*SDs*).

In another recent study, Brunner, Hyman, and Ju (in press) examined recent SFRs and explored their impacts by union strength. They examined whether or not teacher unions affected the fraction of reform-induced state aid that passed through to local spending and the allocation of these funds. They found that districts with strong teacher unions increased spending nearly dollar-for-dollar with state aid, spending the funds primarily on teacher compensation. In contrast, districts with weak unions used aid primarily for property tax relief and spent remaining funds on hiring new teachers. Importantly, the greater expenditure increases in strong union districts led to larger increases in student achievement.

In another study, Candelaria and Shores (2019) provided evidence on the effect of 1989–2010 court-ordered SFRs on per-pupil revenues and high school graduation rates. They used event-study models that were similar to those employed in the other above studies. They found that 7 years after reform, the highest poverty districts in a reform state experienced an 11.5% to 12.1% increase in per-pupil spending and a 6.8 to 11.5 percentage-point increase in graduation rates. Consistent with diminishing marginal returns to school spending, these impacts were smaller than those documented in Jackson et al. (2016). However, these estimated impacts are large, economically important, and statistically significant. The estimated impacts indicate that increased school spending may have economically important effects even at current school-spending levels.

In one of the few studies to examine the long-run impacts of recent SFRs, Biasi (2015) showed that equalizing school expenditure between high- and

low-income districts increased income mobility for low-income students, with small negative effects on high-income pupils. These results are in line with Jackson et al. (2016), who showed that increasing school spending improves long-run outcomes of disadvantaged students.


Changes in Underlying Revenue Sources (National Studies)

Given that SFRs are the result of some legislative action, it is helpful to have studies that rely on variation that is not a direct consequence of legislative action (which could potentially be endogenous to other policies). To address this critique, researchers have approximated the ideal experiment by taking the school-funding formulas as given and then examining what happens when the underlying variables of the formulas change. One such study was undertaken by Jackson, Wigger, and Xiong (2018). In their study, the authors relied on the fact that during the Great Recession state tax receipts (state income taxes and sales taxes) fell very suddenly relative to receipts for local or federal taxes. As a result, states in which funding formulas relied much more heavily on state taxes to fund education were also those that experienced the largest drops in their per-pupil revenues. Importantly, these changes were beyond the control of parents and policymakers. Also, because the reliance of states on state revenues was unrelated to recession intensity (i.e., states that were more reliant on state taxes to fund public schools were no more or less likely to experience large economic downturns during the recession), these changes were unrelated to changes in underlying family characteristics.

To show the patterns visually, Jackson et al. (2018) plotted the trajectory over time in both per-pupil spending and standardized test scores before and after the Great Recession for states that were more heavily reliant on state revenues for public education (relative to those that were less reliant). See the left panel of Figure 7.3. Those states that were most heavily reliant on state taxes were those for which the declines in per-pupil spending were most severe after the recession. The figure also shows that these states had larger declines in standardized scores than other states. A similar result is presented in the right panel of Figure 7.3, which shows that affected cohorts in these states also experienced lower high school completion rates. Using this recession-induced variation in an instrumental variables framework, Jackson et al. found that exposure to 10% lower per-pupil spending over the previous four years led to an approximately 5.0% *SD* lower test scores and 1.4 percentage-point lower graduation rates. The test score effects were similar in magnitude to those in studies based on spending increases.

The results of another similar study were reported by Miller (2018), where the funding formulas as given were scrutinized. Miller then asked what happens when state property values rise and fall. The investigator found that, because state funding formulas treat districts differently (by income levels, housing values, etc.), the same state-level change in house prices translated into different changes in per-pupil spending across individual districts within a state. Also, because different states used different funding formulas, the same

FIGURE 7.3. Event Study by Reliance on State Revenues



States with a high reliance on state revenues are those with had more than one-third of the public school revenue from state sources. The solid lines represent the linear fit during the prerecession period/cohorts (negative values of exposure) and postrecession periods/cohorts (non-negative values of exposure). NAEP = National Assessment of Educational Progress. Adapted from "Do School Spending Cuts Matter? Evidence From the Great Recession," by C. K. Jackson, C. Wigger, and H. Xiong, 2018 (<https://www.nber.org/papers/w24203.pdf>). Copyright 2018 by C. K. Jackson, C. Wigger, and H. Xiong.

increase or decrease in home values translated into different changes in the level of per-pupil spending across states. Miller then estimated the effect of education spending on district-level student outcomes in 24 states by leveraging changes in revenue driven by property value variation. To do this, he fed state-level changes in property values into the fixed school-finance formulas that determined how state aid and local revenue responded to those changes to create a simulated instrument for school spending. Importantly, because the changes driven by the formulas were beyond districts and parents' control, the simulated school-spending changes were highly predictive of real changes in revenue and spending but were unrelated to other district policies and underlying changes within districts. Using these simulated changes as instruments, a 10% increase in spending increased graduation rates by 3 to 5 percentage points and student test scores by 0.07 to 0.09 *SDs*. These estimated impacts were similar to those found in Jackson et al. (2018).

Overview of Multistate Studies

The studies discussed thus far all rely on data from multiple states. As such, these studies do not answer the question of whether school spending matters in all states, or in all contexts, but rather provide estimates of whether school spending improves student outcomes on average. To gain a sense of all such recent U.S. studies, I compiled a list of all studies on the impact of school spending on student outcomes that use some sort of quasi-experimental design (i.e., any nonobservational study). I compiled this list employing a Google search, citation searches, and through consultation with active researchers in the field. To examine whether school spending matters on average, I first examined the estimated impacts for multistate studies. See Table 7.1.

In the top half of Table 7.1, I summarize all of the national-level studies or multistate studies. Of the 13 multistate studies, 12 (92%) find a positive and statistically significant relationship between school spending and student outcomes.³ If each study was independent (which is perhaps an implausible scenario), one would not even expect a single study to be statistically significant and positive by random chance. If one were to be conservative, one could treat each source of variation independently. There are school-finance studies, tax-limit studies, recession-based studies, house-price-based studies, and studies that use the rollout of Title I. The single study that was not significant was an SFR study, but there were several positive estimated impacts. As such, using all five sources of variation, on average, the evidence points to a causal positive impact of increased school spending on outcomes.⁴

³Card and Payne (2002), Figlio (1997), Hoxby (2001), and Husted and Kenny (2000) are listed in the summary table but are not referenced in the main text.

⁴As in all overviews, there is the concern that the set of published studies may reflect some publication bias where only the positive impacts are accepted for publication. I will explore this possibility using formal statistical techniques in future work.

TABLE 7.1. List of Studies

Study	Positive and Significant	Negative and Significant	Not Significant	Outcomes	Variation	State	Type of Spending
Multi-State Studies							
Jackson, Johnson, & Persico (2015)	Y			Education, Wages	CO-SFR	ALL	Any
Johnson & Jackson (2018)	Y			Education, Wages, other	CO-SFR	ALL	Any
Lafortune, Rothstein, & Schanzenbach (2018)	Y			Test Scores	SFR	ALL	Any
Candelaria & Shores (2019)	Y			Graduation Rates	CO-SFR	ALL	Any
Brunner, Hyman, & Ju (in press)	Y			Test Scores	SFR	ALL	Any
Biasi (2015)	Y			Income mobility	SFR	ALL	Any
Card & Payne (2002)	Y			SAT score inequality	CO-SFR	ALL	Any
Hoxby (2001)			Y	Dropout rates	SFR	ALL	Any
Figlio (1997)	Y			Test Scores	DiD-Tax Limit	ALL	Any
Johnson (2015)	Y			Graduation Rates	DiD	ALL	Title I
Jackson, Wigger, & Xiong (2018)	Y			Test Scores	IV-Recession	ALL	Any
Miller (2018)	Y			Test Scores	IV-House Values	ALL	Any
Cascio, Gordon, & Reber (2013)	Y			Dropout	Event Study	SOUTH	Title I

Single-State Studies						
Hyman (2017)	Y		College-going	Rules-Based IV	MI	Any
Gigliotti & Sorensen (2018)	Y		Test Scores	Rules-Based IV	NY	Any
Papke (2008)	Y		Test Scores (pass rates)	IV-SFR	MI	Any
Roy (2011)	Y		Test Scores	Policy (SFR)	MI	Any
Guryan (2001)	Y		Test Scores	Rules-Based IV	MA	Any
Clark (2003)		Y	Test Scores	Rules-Based IV	KY	Any
Lee & Polachek (2018)	Y		Graduation Rates	RD-Referenda	NY	Any
Holden (2016)	Y		Test scores	RD	CA	Textbooks
Husted & Kenny (2000)	Y	Y	SAT Scores	DiD	CA	Any
Cellini, Ferreira, & Rothstein (2010)		Y	Test Scores	RD-Bonds	CA	Capital
Lafortune & Schönholzer (2018)	Y		Test Scores	Event-Study	CA	Capital
Martorell, Stange, & McFarlin (2016)		Y	Test Scores	RD-Bonds	TX	Capital
Conlin & Thompson (2017)	Y		Test Scores	IV	OH	Construction
Goncalves (2015)		Y	Test Scores	Event-Study	OH	Construction
Hong & Zimmer (2016)	Y		Test Scores	RD-Bonds	MI	Capital
Kogan, Lavertu, & Peskowitz (2017)	Y		Test Scores	RD-Referenda	OH	Any
Neilson & Zimmerman (2014)	Y		Test Scores	Event-study	New Haven, CT	Construction
van der Klaauw (2008)		Y	Test Scores	RD-Title I	NY City (NYC)	Title-I
Matsudaira, Hosek, & Walsh (2012)		Y	Test Scores	RD-Title I	NYC*	Title-I
Weinstein, Stiefel, et al. (2009)		Y	Test Scores	RD-Title I	NYC*	Title-I

Note. DiD = Difference in Difference; IV = Instrumental Variables; RD = Regression Discontinuity; SFR = School Finance Reform; CO-SFR = Court-Ordered School Finance Reform.

*These studies are not reported as being based in New York City. However, this location can be inferred.

The fact that the early (and less credibly causal) multistate studies indicate a positive relationship between school spending and student outcomes suggests that the on-average positive association is real. The fact that this is also true using only the more recent credible design-based studies that rely on different samples, sources of variation, and time periods is compelling evidence that there is a positive causal relationship and that, on average, money does matter.

MONEY DOES NOT ALWAYS MATTER: WITHIN-STATE STUDIES

Although individual state-level and district-level studies cannot answer the question of whether, on average, money matters, they *can* answer the question of whether money matters in particular contexts and not in others. Most of the state-level studies not only examine a particular location but are also based on a particular kind of spending (as opposed to overall budget increases as in the national studies). Given that spending effects will likely depend on how the money is spent, one might expect studies based on different geographic locations and based on different kinds of spending to be less consistent with each other, even if spending matters on average. To gain a handle on the heterogeneity by spending type and location, it is helpful to consider the state-level or city-level studies by the type of spending examined.

Unrestricted Spending

Although many single-state studies examine specific forms of spending, not all of them do. Three studies explored different sources of variation to examine the impact of increased school spending in Michigan. Papke (2008) used a difference-in-difference (before vs. after) analysis of outcomes in Michigan after the passage of a 1994 SFR. She found that increases in spending have nontrivial, statistically significant effects on math test pass rates. The effects were larger for districts with initially poor performance. Roy (2011) examined this same reform somewhat more extensively and came to largely the same conclusions. Hyman (2017) used a different approach, exploring the fact that the school funding formulas set into motion a predictable time path of additional allowances that was equalizing over time—thus providing plausibly exogenous variation in spending. The basic idea was that, for reasons outside the control of districts and parents, initially low-spending districts received large initial allowances from the state that fell over time as school-spending levels became more equal. Using the time path of the size of the state allowance to individual districts, he found that students exposed to 10% more spending were 3 percentage points (7%) more likely to enroll in college and 2.3 percentage points (11%) more likely to earn a postsecondary degree. In contrast to some other studies finding that school spending has larger impacts for disadvantaged children, these effects were concentrated among districts that were lower poverty, higher achieving at baseline.

Using data from New York State, Gigliotti and Sorensen (2018) leveraged variation in per-pupil expenditures from a specific provision of the state-aid formula in New York State that allowed districts to maintain prior levels of total state aid even as their student enrollment declined. Because of this provision, districts with declining enrollments tended to have systematically higher per-pupil expenditures over time. To isolate the influence of declining enrollment itself, Gigliotti and Sorensen controlled directly for demographic changes associated with these enrollment losses. Using this variation, they found that \$1,000 in additional per-pupil spending led to achievement gains of approximately 0.047 *SDs* in math and 0.042 *SDs* in English.

Relying on discontinuities inherent in the funding formulas in Massachusetts, Guryan (2001) found that increased school spending improved test scores. Similarly, using a regression-discontinuity design, Lee and Polachek (2018) found that increased school spending led to increased high school graduation rates. The only single-state study of unrestricted funds not to find positive and statistically significant effects was reported in Clark (2003). She examined the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) and found that the increased spending induced by KERA did not improve test scores. Finally, Kogan, Lavertu, and Peskowitz (2017) used a regression-discontinuity design to examine the impact of passing a referendum to increase school spending in Ohio. They found that referendum failure (as opposed to passage) led to lower instructional spending and lower student achievement growth.

Overall, of the nine single-state studies that examined the impacts of unrestricted spending, seven (77%) found a positive and statistically significant relationship between school spending and student achievement.⁵ This suggests that budget increases (that are unrestricted in the use of funds) will tend to improve student outcomes in most contexts.

Textbook Spending

Some of the credible studies have been based on quirks in the school finance formulas that generate discontinuities in policies that can be exploited. One of the clearest examples of these studies was described by Holden (2016). That study explored the effects of a one-time payment of \$96.90 per student for textbooks, which was available if the students' school fell below a predetermined threshold of academic performance. The threshold for this payment allowed for variation in textbook spending that was unrelated to family background and not under the control of policymakers. Specifically, among schools with very similar achievement levels around the thresholds, whether a school had performance just above the threshold or just below

⁵Note that Husted and Kenny (2000) find a positive statistically significant impact of spending in some specifications. Because they do not have statistical significance in all models, I take the conservative approach and do not include this study as a positive impact.

was essentially random. Accordingly, any systematic difference in outcomes among those just above and below the cutoff could reasonably be attributed to the effect of the additional textbook spending. Exploiting this variation, Holden found that textbook funding had significant positive effects on school-level achievement in elementary schools. In her preferred estimates, a one-time increase in funding of \$96.90 per student improved school-average test scores by about 0.07 student-level *SDs*.

This estimated impact is larger than most in the literature. However, this could potentially be rationalized by a model in which spending on textbooks was inefficiently low. One implication of this is that the result of this study is unlikely to generalize to all other forms of spending. However, this study is a valuable contribution and a useful data point that helps us understand the relationship between school spending and student achievement.

Capital and Construction Spending

Looking at another particular type of spending, Martorell, Stange, and McFarlin (2016) used a regression-discontinuity design to examine the impacts of having additional capital spending in Texas. They studied the achievement effects of nearly 1,400 capital campaigns initiated and financed by local school districts, comparing districts where school capital bonds were either narrowly approved or defeated by district voters. Overall, they found little evidence that school capital campaigns improved student achievement. Similar null impacts were found for capital spending (using a very similar design) in California (Cellini, Ferreira, & Rothstein, 2010) and Ohio (Goncalves, 2015). However, Conlin and Thompson (2017) found positive impacts of capital spending toward new school construction in Ohio, and Hong and Zimmer (2016) found positive impacts of capital spending (again using an regression-discontinuity design) in Michigan. Looking at an even smaller unit of analysis, Neilson and Zimmerman (2014) used an event-study framework to study a new school construction policy in New Haven, CT, and found positive impacts on student achievement. Using an event-study design, Lafortune and Schönholzer (2018) found similar benefits of new school construction in Los Angeles, California.

As a whole, studies on the impact of capital spending in different states are mixed. Of the seven studies that were identified, four were positive and three were null impacts. The fact that none were negative suggests that the average impact of capital spending is positive, but that there may be considerable heterogeneity in that impact (and it may be zero in many cases).⁶

⁶It is worth noting that, even in those studies that find no effect in the short run, some of them point to potential long-run benefits (i.e., Cellini et al., 2010; Martorell et al., 2016).

Title I Spending

Many of the school spending papers that have relied on within-state variation examine Title I spending. Coincidentally, these studies all use data from New York City (NYC), all use the same regression-discontinuity design, and all come to the same conclusion. Title I provides financial assistance to schools and districts with high numbers or high percentages of children from low-income families. Often, there is some cutoff percentage of low-income children above which additional funds are provided and below which they are not. Researchers have used this discontinuous jump in school funding through the cutoff to identify the causal impact of additional school funding on student outcomes. Importantly, Title I funds are not unrestricted because schools must focus “Title I services to children who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet challenging State academic standards” (U.S. Department of Education, 2018). Also, by definition, schools receiving Title I funds are among the lowest income schools in the state.

In an influential study, van der Klaauw (2008) examined the impact of Title I funding on school finances and student performance in NYC public schools. Using a regression-discontinuity approach, he found that Title I eligibility did not improve student outcomes in high-poverty schools. However, he also found that gaining Title I eligibility does not lead to a statistically significant increase in average per-pupil expenditures. As such, while van der Klaauw’s study is a good test of the Title I program, it is not a good test of whether money matters. Weinstein, Stiefel, Schwartz, and Chalico (2009) also examined the Title I program in NYC and found that, although Title I changed the mix of spending for high schools, it had very little impact on spending in elementary and middle schools. Not surprisingly, they found that Title I spending did not improve the achievement of students and may even reduce schoolwide average test scores in elementary and middle schools. Matsudaira, Hosek, and Walsh (2012) found the same result using a similar approach in NYC. They found that Title I eligibility raised total revenues by between 3% and 4% relative to those that were not eligible. However, they found no statistically significant increase in average test scores.

Although the results from NYC might lead one to conclude that Title I spending does not improve child outcomes, note that not all Title I studies find null impacts. Cascio, Gordon, and Reber (2013) examined the rollout of Title I using an event-study framework in multiple Southern states. They documented considerable supplanting of Title I funds, such that receiving Title I money did not necessarily lead to increases in overall spending. However, they did find that White cohorts exposed to higher levels of Title I spending while in school had decreased dropout rates. Similarly, using nationally representative data, Johnson (2015) found that county-level Title I spending was associated with increased educational attainment. One potential explanation for this difference is that Title I was unsuccessful in New York City but generally improved outcomes elsewhere. Also, it is possible that Title I improved longer-run outcomes that were not well detected by test scores (see Jackson, 2018;

see also Beuermann & Jackson, 2019, for discussions of this). Yet another plausible explanation is that Title I funds are often offset by reductions in taxes, such that overall spending levels are often largely unchanged (Gordon, 2004). In such cases, a lack of a Title I effect does not speak to the broader impacts of school spending per se. Whatever the reasons, it is clear that increased Title I spending may not always improve student outcomes in all settings.

Overview of Single-State Studies

Although the national studies almost uniformly point to an on average positive causal relationship between school spending and student achievement, it is helpful to examine all of the single-state studies to gain a sense of whether this is true in all states or cities. There have been 20 studies that examine relationships within an individual state (or city within a state). Of these, 13 (65%) found positive and significant relationships between spending and outcomes, and none found negative and significant impacts. If, in fact, there was no relationship, assuming that each study was independent, one would expect one study to be positive and significant. Given that there are more than 12 times that number, this pattern is consistent with positive overall impacts, in an average sense. However, the fact that, in about one third of the cases, there is no significant relationship suggests that a strong positive relationship may not exist in all settings or for all spending types.

To better understand why some studies find positive impacts but others do not, an examination of the few studies that are not positive is instructive. Three out of the seven papers that are not significant involve Title I spending and three out of the seven involve capital spending. Given that six out of seven (86%) of the studies that find no significant impact involve particular spending types, it may suggest that, although overall budget increases may improve outcomes, increased funding tied to particular uses may not improve such outcomes. In particular, the evidence is consistent with capital spending and Title I spending being less predictably effective than spending in general. Consistent with this interpretation, almost all of the national studies examine general increases in spending.

CONCLUSION

Social scientists have long sought to examine the causal impact of school spending on child outcomes. The literature on this topic can be put into two clear categories: (a) an older literature that relies on observation variation to correlate school spending and student outcomes, and (b) a newer literature that relies on quasi-experimental methods to uncover relationships that are plausibly causal.

The older literature provides strong support for there being a positive economically important association between increased school spending and

improved student outcomes. That is, despite claims to the contrary, the application of reasonable statistical reasoning to the patterns across studies would lead one to conclude that there is a strong statistical link between spending and outcomes. However, because this older literature is entirely observational in nature, these studies do not speak to the causal question of whether increased school spending improves student outcomes. To do this, one must examine the more recent quasi-experimental literature.

The recent quasi-experimental literature overwhelmingly supports a causal relationship between increased school spending and student outcomes. All but one of the several multistate studies find a strong link between spending and outcomes—indicating that money matters on average. Importantly, this is true across studies that use different datasets, examine different time periods, rely on different sources of variation, and employ different statistical techniques. Although one can poke holes in each individual study, the robustness of the patterns across a variety of settings is compelling evidence of a real positive causal relationship, on average, between increased school spending and student outcomes. However, an examination of single-state studies suggests that, on average, money matters, but that this is not always so in all settings or in all contexts. In particular, studies of Title I spending and capital spending in individual states uncover null impacts in some cases.

Exactly in what contexts increased school spending are most likely to improve student outcomes remains an open question. However, recent evidence suggests that school spending is more effective in areas with well-established Head Start programs (Johnson & Jackson, 2018). Also, Brunner et al. (in press) provided some evidence that the marginal impact of school spending may vary by teacher union strength. More generally, one might expect school spending increases to improve outcomes in settings with stronger incentives to promote student outcomes. However, this is an active area of research. By and large, the question of whether money matters is essentially settled. Researchers should now focus on understanding what kinds of spending increases matter the most, and in what contexts school spending increases are most likely to improve student outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Angrist, J. D., & Pischke, J. S. (2010). The credibility revolution in empirical economics: How better research design is taking the con out of econometrics. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24, 3–30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.2.3>
- Beuermann, D. W., & Jackson, C. K. (2019, May). *The short and long-run effects of attending the schools that parents prefer* (NBER Working Paper No. 24920). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Biasi, B. (2015). *School finance equalization and intergenerational income mobility: Does equal spending lead to equal opportunities?* Retrieved from https://www.russellsage.org/sites/all/files/conferences/Biasi_Draft.pdf
- Brunner, E., Hyman, J., & Ju, A. (in press). School finance reforms, teachers' unions, and the allocation of school resources. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_00828

- Candelaria, C. A., & Shores, K. A. (2019). Court-ordered finance reforms in the adequacy era: Heterogeneous causal effects and sensitivity. *Education Finance and Policy*, 14, 31–60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00236
- Card, D., & Payne, A. A. (2002). School finance reform, the distribution of school spending, and the distribution of student test scores. *Journal of Public Economics*, 83, 49–82. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727\(00\)00177-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(00)00177-8)
- Cascio, E. U., Gordon, N., & Reber, S. (2013). Local responses to federal grants: Evidence from the introduction of Title I in the South. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 5, 126–159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/pol.5.3.126>
- Cellini, S. R., Ferreira, F., & Rothstein, J. (2010). The value of school facility investments: Evidence from a dynamic regression discontinuity design. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125, 215–261. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2010.125.1.215>
- Clark, M. A. (2003). *Education reform, redistribution, and student achievement: Evidence from the Kentucky Education Reform Act* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.
- Conlin, M., & Thompson, P. N. (2017). Impacts of new school facility construction: An analysis of a state-financed capital subsidy program in Ohio. *Economics of Education Review*, 59, 13–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2017.05.002>
- Elwert, F., & Winship, C. (2014). Endogenous selection bias: The problem of conditioning on a collider variable. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40, 31–53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043455>
- Figlio, D. N. (1997). Did the “tax revolt” reduce school performance? *Journal of Public Economics*, 65, 245–269. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727\(97\)00015-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(97)00015-7)
- Gigliotti, P., & Sorensen, L. C. (2018). Educational resources and student achievement: Evidence from the Save Harmless provision in New York State. *Economics of Education Review*, 66, 167–182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2018.08.004>
- Goncalves, F. (2015). *The effects of school construction on student and district outcomes: Evidence from a state-funded program in Ohio* (Working Paper No. 593). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Gordon, N. (2004). Do federal grants boost school spending? Evidence from Title I. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88, 1771–1792. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2003.09.002>
- Guryan, J. (2001, May). *Does money matter? Regression-discontinuity estimates from education finance reform in Massachusetts* (NBER Working Paper No. w8269). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3386/w8269>
- Hanushek, E. A. (2003). The failure of input-based schooling policies. *Economic Journal*, 113, F64–F98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00099>
- Hedges, L. V., Laine, R. D., & Greenwald, R. (1994). An exchange: Part 1: Does money matter? A meta-analysis of studies of the effects of differential school inputs on student outcomes. *Educational Researcher*, 23, 5–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X023003005>
- Holden, K. L. (2016). Buy the book? Evidence on the effect of textbook funding on school-level achievement. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 8, 100–127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/app.20150112>
- Hong, K., & Zimmer, R. (2016). Does investing in school capital infrastructure improve student achievement? *Economics of Education Review*, 53, 143–158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.05.007>
- Howell, P. L., & Miller, B. B. (1997). Sources of funding for schools. *The Future of Children*, 7, 39–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1602444>
- Hoxby, C. M. (2001). All school finance equalizations are not created equal. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 1189–1231. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/003355301753265552>

- Husted, T. A., & Kenny, L. W. (2000). Evidence on the impact of state government on primary and secondary education and the equity–efficiency trade-off. *The Journal of Law & Economics*, 43, 285–308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/467456>
- Hyman, J. (2017). Does money matter in the long run? Effects of school spending on educational attainment. *American Economic Journal. Economic Policy*, 9, 256–280. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/pol.20150249>
- Jackson, C. K. (2018). What do test scores miss? The importance of teacher effects on non-test score outcomes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 126, 2072–2107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/699018>
- Jackson, C. K., Johnson, R. C., & Persico, C. (2015). Boosting educational attainment and adult earnings: Does school spending matter after all? *Education Next*, 15(4), 69–76.
- Jackson, C. K., Johnson, R. C., & Persico, C. (2016). The effects of school spending on educational and economic outcomes: Evidence from school finance reforms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131, 157–218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjv036>
- Jackson, C. K., Wigger, C., & Xiong, H. (2018, August). *Do school spending cuts matter? Evidence from the great recession* (NBER Working Paper No. w24203). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3386/w24203>
- Johnson, R. C. (2015). Follow the money: School spending from Title I to adult earnings. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 1, 50–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2015.1.3.03>
- Johnson, R. C., & Jackson, C. K. (2018, February). *Reducing inequality through dynamic complementarity: Evidence from Head Start and public school spending* (NBER Working Paper No. w23489). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3386/w23489>
- Kogan, V., Lavertu, S., & Peskowitz, Z. (2017). Direct democracy and administrative disruption. *Journal of Public Administration: Research and Theory*, 27, 381–399. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mux001>
- Lafortune, J., Rothstein, J., & Schanzenbach, D. W. (2018). School finance reform and the distribution of student achievement. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 10, 1–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/app.20160567>
- Lafortune, J., & Schönholzer, D. (2018, December). *Do school facilities matter? Measuring the effects of capital expenditures on student and neighborhood outcomes*. Paper presented at the 2019 American Economic Association, Allied Social Science Associations Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA. Retrieved from <https://www.aeaweb.org/conference/2019/preliminary/paper/2iN6Hbs4>
- Lechner, M. (2008). A note on endogenous control variables in causal studies. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 78, 190–195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.spl.2007.05.019>
- Lee, K. G., & Polachek, S. W. (2018). Do school budgets matter? The effect of budget referenda on student dropout rates. *Education Economics*, 26, 129–144. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2017.1404966>
- Martorell, P., Stange, K., & McFarlin, I., Jr. (2016). Investing in schools: Capital spending, facility conditions, and student achievement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 140, 13–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2016.05.002>
- Matsudaira, J. D., Hosek, A., & Walsh, E. (2012). An integrated assessment of the effects of Title I on school behavior, resources, and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 31, 1–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2012.01.002>
- Miller, C. L. (2018, July). *The effect of education spending on student achievement: Evidence from property wealth and school finance rules* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
- Neilson, C. A., & Zimmerman, S. D. (2014). The effect of school construction on test scores, school enrollment, and home prices. *Journal of Public Economics*, 120, 18–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.08.002>

- Papke, L. E. (2008). The effects of changes in Michigan's school finance system. *Public Finance Review*, 36, 456–474. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1091142107306287>
- Roy, J. (2011). Impact of school finance reform on resource equalization and academic performance: Evidence from Michigan. *Education Finance and Policy*, 6, 137–167. http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00030
- U.S. Department of Education. (2018). *Improving basic programs operated by local educational agencies (Title I, Part A)*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/index.html>
- van der Klaauw, W. (2008). Breaking the link between poverty and low student achievement: An evaluation of Title I. *Journal of Econometrics*, 142, 731–756. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2007.05.007>
- Weinstein, M. G., Stiefel, L., Schwartz, A. E., & Chalico, L. (2009). *Does Title I increase spending and improve performance? Evidence from New York City* (Working Paper No. 09-09). New York, NY: Institute for Education and Social Policy.