

The Impact of State Financial Aid on College Participation: Meeting the Needs of the Under-Served

Houston D. Davis, Brian E. Noland, and Nicole McDonald

In 1999-2000, over 13,000 low-income high school graduates who were eligible for state based financial aid did not receive grant awards because the state of Tennessee had not appropriated sufficient funds for this need based financial aid. The primary purpose for this research was to identify and analyze the college participation decisions of those 13,000 non-recipients of state financial aid in the fall of 1999.

Human capital theorists (Schultz 1961; Becker 1964; Denison 1967) have demonstrated that social and economic mobility are critical to postsecondary education in today's society. When state appropriations to postsecondary education lag, the results often include short-sighted cuts to valuable programs, increases in tuition costs, and potential drops in participation rates. These reductions adversely impact the ability of higher education to provide the resources needed to improve the human capital stock of society (Curtin & Nelson, 1999). From a campus perspective, declining state appropriations lead to a destabilization of institutional budgets unless other revenue streams are found. Increasing the institutional reliance on grant and contract work to raise revenues is one possibility, but the biggest share of the revenue crunch is passed on to students via increases in tuition and fees (Leslie & Slaughter, 1997). Students and their families are forced to weigh the present costs of college, including tuition levels and deferred income, against the future economic benefits of the degree.

Researchers have pointed out that rising college costs and decreases in federal and state financial aid have especially stressed minority and low-income student participation in higher education (Justiz, 1994; Heller, 1999). An increased level of commitment to grants, rather than reliance upon loans, for low income students does much to combat the aversion to borrowing found among low-income, minority students. Studies have also demonstrated that there is a negative relationship between increases in tuition costs and enrollment rates in college (Heller, 1999). Financial aid becomes a part of the net price of attendance and thus becomes the balance to the scale of attendance and non-attendance among all students. Finally, the receipt of financial aid has been shown to be positively associated with retention and persistence rates in higher education (Justiz, 1994).

Recent statewide policy and budgetary developments in Tennessee focused the attention of elected officials and business leaders on mechanisms to increase participation in the public higher education system. A recent report issued by a special advisory board to the Governor cited financial aid disparities as one of the chief barriers

Houston D. Davis, PhD is Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs at Austin Peay State University. **Brian E. Noland** is Director of Academic Programs for the Tennessee Higher Education Commission and is a PhD Candidate in Political Science at the University of Tennessee. **Nicole McDonald** is a Doctoral Student in Higher Education Administration at Vanderbilt University.

to Tennessee remaining competitive with its peers (Governor's Council, 1999) in terms of economic development, educational attainment, and new job starts. That group was shocked to realize that in 1998-1999, over 10,000 low-income high school graduates who were eligible for state based financial aid did not receive grant awards because the state of Tennessee had not appropriated sufficient funds for this need based financial aid (Governor's Council, 1999). For the 1999-2000 fiscal year, this number had grown to over 13,000 (Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation, 2000).

The purpose for conducting this research was to identify and analyze the college participation decisions of those 13,000 non-recipients of state financial aid in the fall of 1999. These individuals are of increased importance to scholars and practitioners because they represent groups historically denied access to higher education. Specifically, 70% of the target population fall at or below the poverty level. These potential students represent the citizens who stand to benefit the most from an advanced degree.

Theoretical Framework/Literature Review

The decision to participate in higher education involves a multi-level process and is influenced by a number of factors. The decisions students make regarding college choice include whether to participate or not participate in higher education, which institution to attend, and how to finance their college education. According to research (Tierney, 1980; Hossler, Braxton, & Coopersmith, 1989; Anderson & Hearn 1992; Heller, 1996; Freeman, 1999), economic considerations are primary in students' college decision-making process. A 1997 study of college freshmen conducted at UCLA found that "more college freshmen than ever before reported that they selected their institutions for financial reasons" (Geraghty, 1997, p. A41). According to the UCLA survey, approximately one-third of the freshman surveyed rated financial aid as "very important" in their choice of a college, while 40% of those surveyed indicated they would have to work during college. The study also confirmed that economic expectations are important to students in making their college choice.

When assessing the impact of financial aid in broadening access to higher education, it is important to note that financial aid is not a monolithic entity. Rather, financial aid is a multifaceted, multidimensional program intended to help students and prospective students overcome obstacles to higher education access. Financial aid is multifaceted because it is designed to offer an array of financial assistance to students with need. Financial aid programs include various forms of grants, subsidized and unsubsidized student loans, parent loans, tuition assistance, and college work-study programs. Financial aid is multidimensional in terms of its programmatic administration. Specifically, financial aid is administered through federal, state, and college/university entities. In considering the state administration of financial aid, "state support for public higher education has a long and impressive tradition" (Hossler, et al, 1997, p. 188). Fife and Leslie (1976) credited state funded aid programs with encouraging nearly 50% of financial aid recipients to attend some type of higher education institution. Due to state budget constraints "states have had to hold steady or reduce the size of their student

financial aid awards” (Hossler, et al, 1997, p. 163).

The goal of federal and state financial aid programs has been to reduce the economic barriers that preclude lower-income students from participating in college. However, there is considerable debate over the effectiveness of such aid programs in broadening student access. When evaluating the success of financial aid in helping lower-income students overcome obstacles to higher education, it is important to consider the impact of the various types of aid available to these students, such as loan versus grant, and the impact of the administration of aid to students. Students are influenced by a number of factors in the course of their college-choice process. As a result, they are likely to respond differentially to the availability and/or award of various forms of financial aid. In studies on the relationship between financial aid and institutional enrollments using the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972, research showed a positive correlation between the receipt of financial aid regardless of amount and the probability of a given student’s enrollment (Jackson, 1978; Blakemore & Low, 1983). However, Blakemore and Low (1985) also found a positive relationship between a decrease in student financial aid and a decline in student enrollment.

In examining the effects of specific forms of financial aid on student enrollment, research (Schwartz, 1985; Moore, Studenmund, & Slobko, 1991) identified increases in grant awards increased the probability of student enrollment, whereas the increased availability of student loans had no significant effect on enrollment. Also, the Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP) found that more than 50% of the respondents in their study felt additional loan debt for education would be financially risky for their families. The IHEP (1995) study also identified lower income students who rely on student loans to finance their postsecondary education are concerned about their ability to repay the loans. Similar opinions are expressed by all students who rely heavily on student loans to finance their education; however, these fears are more acute among lower income students (IHEP 1995).

As noted, research regarding the relationship between financial aid and student enrollments implied that the receipt of financial aid awards factor into students’ decisions to enroll in college (Jackson, 1978; Blakemore & Lowe, 1983; Schwartz, 1985; Blakemore & Lowe 1985; Moore, Studenmund, & Slobko, 1991). While research validated the impact of the receipt of financial aid on the enrollment decision, it also suggested that the receipt of financial aid influences students’ choices about the type of institution in which to enroll. “Students from lower-income families do tend to be more sensitive to tuition and aid when making undergraduate enrollment decisions than do those from upper-income families” (Heller, 1996, p. 24).

According to Heller, because poor students have fewer financial resources to pay for college, they have a more elastic demand for higher education. That is, with all other things being equal, “family income serves, at least in part, as an effective bypass... with the end result that students from low-income families-- even when qualified-- are often unable to attend college” (Heller, 1996, p. 25). Further, if the student is able to attend, they are often forced to enroll at the community college level because of fiscal constraints and academic shortcomings. Thus, these students are often prevented from considering selective institutions because of fiscal difficulties. The channeling effect

created by fiscal shortcomings denies these students access to the positive impacts on student outcomes related to degree attainment, social status, and economic potential provided by participation at selective institutions (Hearn, 1991). Also, “it is well established that tuition is negatively related to student demand for public and private post-secondary education” (Tierney, 1980, p. 528). Economically disadvantaged students are less likely to attend selective institutions. Hearn (1984) found that lower-socio-economic status, African-American and female students are less likely to attend highly selective institutions. Hu and Hossler (1998) found a correlation between price sensitivity and college choice. Their study found that students who chose to attend private institutions were less concerned about cost than those who attended public institutions; and that high tuition, high aid strategies failed to consider not only the ability of students to pay, but also their willingness to pay.

In considering the administration of state financial aid, Blakemore and Lowe (1985) also studied the effects of cuts in state-funded financial aid on low-income students and found that enrollment declined most significantly among low-income students. McPherson and Schapiro (1994) found that lower-income students were disproportionately likely to attend community colleges, and suggested that limited financial aid “may be impairing the ability of low-income students to gain access to institutions other than community colleges” (p. 14). Currently, there are a number of forces that influence the ability of states to meet the demand for need-based financial aid. Among those forces are declining state economies, increased competition for state funds, and increased demand for higher education. In fact, Hossler et al (1997), estimated that students are now responsible for “142 percent more when compared to their level of effort from 1980” (p. 161).

While research provides clear information regarding the importance of financial aid, the value of specific types of financial aid programs, and the implications of these factors on the college-choice process for low-income students, few studies have focused on what becomes of those students whose financial needs for higher education go unfulfilled. The purpose for conducting the study was to explore the impact of the non-receipt of state-funded financial aid on the participation and college choice decisions of unserved students. Specifically, this study explored the following key questions:

1. Did unserved students with financial need have an “elastic demand” for higher education? (i.e., are they less likely to attend)
2. Did the shortfall in state financial aid funding actually deny unserved students access to higher education?
3. For those unserved students who did participate in higher education, were they more likely to be located/concentrated in a particular institution-type?
4. How did those students who were non-recipients of financial aid fund their college or university education?

Research Strategy/Methodology

This study examined the link between financial aid and college participation. The research represents a sub-set of a larger effort to examine and analyze college choice in

Tennessee. In order to determine the relative importance of a variety of factors that impact the participation and college choice decision, a survey was conducted to measure the impact of the non-receipt of state financial aid on the participation and college choice decision. The participants for the research were randomly selected from an overall population of approximately 13,000 students who were denied state financial aid in 1999. The target population represented those students who were qualified to receive Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation (TSAC) need-based grants but were not served because of a general lack of state funding during the fiscal year. Of the 13,292 students who were not served by TSAC, an estimated 70% had a combined family income below \$19,999. Over 7,600 of the 13,292 students denied aid had an Expected Family Contribution (EFC) of zero.

The target population for the research represented some of the neediest students in higher education. Those students who qualified for TSAC grants were some of the most economically disadvantaged residents of Tennessee. The non-receipt of financial aid has the deleterious effect of forcing potential students to maximize their Pell grants and borrow funds to cover the remainder of their costs of attending college. In effect, these students are being placed in an unmanageable financial situation. Therefore, the non-receipt of financial aid could have a devastating impact on the participation and college choice decision.

To assess the impact of non-receipt upon college choice, a survey was developed and administered to a randomly selected subgroup of the target population in January of 2000. In order to generalize to the target population, the authors utilized simple random sampling to generate the respondent pool. Simple random sampling is the optimal sampling technique because it presents each member of the target population an equal chance of being selected for inclusion in the study (Henry 1990; Dillman 1994). The sample population contained a pool of 419 respondents and is generalizable to the overall target population at a 95% confidence level, representing a sampling error of no more than $\pm 5\%$.

In order to obtain results in a timely and efficient manner, the survey was conducted using computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) technology. As Dillman (1994) noted, CATI enables researchers to complete complex surveys in a short time frame because data can be collected, analyzed, and interpreted almost instantly. CATI also increases the reliability and validity of the results which improves the generalizability of the results (Frey 1989; Lavrachas 1993).

All of the respondents completed a battery of questions that assessed the relative importance of several factors on the college participation decision. Respondents were not asked to provide demographic information because this data was available from secondary data files of the 1999 Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) and TSAC. As Dillman (1994) noted, respondents are more likely to reply honestly if they do not perceive the survey instrument to be overly intrusive. Furthermore, he noted that those surveys that omit demographic information are less intrusive and generally produce more reliable and valid results than instruments that contain such questions. The survey instrument was pre-tested on a randomly selected group of students who did not receive state based financial aid in 1998 in order to assure that the instrument

accurately measured research constructs such as factors that impact participation and college choice.

Results

Several studies noted that economic considerations are often the determinant element in the participation decision (Tierney, 1980; Hossler, Braxton, & Coopersmith, 1989; Anderson & Hearn 1992; Heller, 1996; Freeman, 1999). The results of this study support the findings noted in the literature, but offer several startling insights into the participation/college choice decision. The majority of the respondents in the study population reported that although they were denied TSAC assistance, they still elected to participate in higher education. Specifically, 81% of the respondents noted that they were enrolled during the fall 1999 semester. These results are somewhat surprising given the base assumption of policy makers in Tennessee that the non-receipt of aid would prevent such students from attending college (Governor's Council Report, 1999). However, the negative effects of non-receipt of state financial aid and preexisting economic conditions were found in patterns of institution selection and increased the reliance upon employment to meet the cost of postsecondary education participation.

Several core questions were posed to both enrollees and non-enrollees in order to assess the relative impact of key theoretical constructs on the participation decision. Research has demonstrated that the receipt of financial aid plays a major role in the college participation decision of first generation college students (Astin 1975; Hossler Braxton and Coopersmith 1989). Such individuals are placed in the tenuous situation of lacking familial support for participation because of their first generation status. Almost 55% of the respondents reported that they were first generation college students. However, chi square analysis did not reveal a significant difference between groups with respect to the decision to attend college ($\chi^2 = 1.358$, Pearson's $r = -.22$).

Studies have also demonstrated that student's perceptions of their academic preparation for college impacts the participation decision (Astin, 1975). Those students who believed that their high schools adequately prepared them for college were more likely to attend than those who felt unprepared for college. Of the 419 study participants, 65% reported that they believed their high school adequately prepared them for college. However, the two groups of students (prepared v. non-prepared) differed significantly with respect to participation (Table 1).

Students Enrollment in Fall 1999

Of those students in the state who were denied TSAC grants, 81.4% (341 of the 419 surveyed) reported that they attended a postsecondary school in the fall of 1999. Over 90% of these students were attending Tennessee's public institutions (including universities, community colleges, and technology centers) and just over 80% of them reported attending the institution as a full-time student (Table 2). Of note is the pattern of institutional selection when this pool of needy students is compared to the overall population. From 1995-1999 Tennessee averaged just under 27,000 first time freshmen

in the public 2-year and 4-year public institutions. For each of these five enrollment periods, students chose to begin their studies at four-year institutions 57% of the time and 2-year institutions 43% of the time (THEC, 2000). The students in our research pool did not reflect this same ratio of 4-year to 2-year attendance.

Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) described a “cooling-out function” performed by 2-year institutions that leads many lower income students away from the bachelor’s degree path. Within the study of unserved TSAC award applicants, 33.1% of students chose to attend 4-year public and 53.1% chose 2-year public with the balance reporting attendance at private institutions or technical schools. When considering only those students represented in the public institution categories (86% of the overall population), 38.4% of public attendees took the 4-year path and 61.6% took the 2-year path.

Although denied aid through the TSAC grant program, these students still elected to attend college, and reported that this participation was supported by a variety of auxiliary student financial aid sources. Primarily, the federal Pell Grant program served 87.7% of the students who were attending a postsecondary institution. The following table shows the type of grants and/or loans that the attendees received for the 1999-2000 school year (Table 3).

Although the majority of the students received a Pell Grant, the maximum award in that program for the 1999-2000 academic year was \$3,000. Even if the student decided to save money by avoiding the costs associated with on-campus residency, this award represented approximately 47% of the average costs of attendance (COA) at Tennessee’s public four-year institutions. The possibility of qualifying for the full Pell Grant amount is minimal because the award amount is not only linked to student need but also to allowable costs to attend the respective institution (including private school costs as well). Tennessee’s traditionally low tuition rates thus have the unintended consequence of reducing the amount of federal financial aid available to its residents.

Researchers and practitioners alike have assumed that more students are feeling pressure to work while in school to “make ends meet.” This trend was validated by the respondents in the study. Of those students who were enrolled in 1999, almost 69% reported that they held a job while enrolled in school (Table 3). This data paralleled a trend over the last decade in which the majority of students were forced to hold jobs while attending school. An analysis of a secondary data source, the Tennessee Enrolled Student Survey (19__), revealed that between 1993-1999, 69.2% of students were employed full/part-time while enrolled in the Tennessee higher education system. This survey also demonstrated that when asked to report the number of hours worked per week, 21.5% of the respondents stated that they worked 10-19 hours, 29.5% worked 20-35 hours, and 15.1% worked 35 hours and above. Thus, nearly one-half of all students enrolled in the Tennessee postsecondary system work 20 hours or more per week and approximately two-thirds work 10 hours or more per week. As Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) noted, these employment patterns not only have a negative impact on the college experience, they also negatively impact student retention and persistence.

Students Not Enrolled in Fall 1999

Of the 419 non-recipients of financial aid surveyed in this study, 18.6% reported that they did not attend school in the fall of 1999. These individuals were asked to state the primary factor that determined their non-participation decision. Predictably, financial barriers emerged as the number one reason for non-attendance as 35.9% of the respondents mentioned this as their chief impediment to college participation. (Table 4). The second most common response was that their "employment" prevented college participation. Table 4 also shows the percentage of these individuals who were currently employed at the time of the survey administration. With such a high percentage working, it can be argued that the desire, or need to work was a prevalent factor in most of the non-participation decisions even if it was not the primary barrier.

Future Plans of All Participants

All the participants in the survey were asked about their future postsecondary education plans. When the 419 survey participants were asked about plans to attend college in the fall of 2000, 83.1% stated that they did plan to enroll (Table 5). This statistic was only slightly higher than the 81.4% who reported attendance in fall 1999. Those who expressed that they did not plan to attend in fall 2000 were asked if they had any plans for continuing their education in the future. Table 5 shows that approximately one-third of this group hoped to continue their education at some point. These students were then asked what the higher education system could do to most help them if they wanted to attend college in the future. Financial assistance was mentioned by 51.6%, with 17.7% requesting increased program offerings and 11.3% mentioning that they needed to become better prepared academically before they enrolled in college (see Table 5).

The Future: Financial Aid Trends in Tennessee

The National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs (NASSGAP) annually provides benchmarks by which researchers and practitioners can evaluate state commitments to financial aid programs. In a recent NASSGAP's report it was noted that during 1997-1998 Tennessee awarded a little more than \$20 million in need and merit based aid, compared to the national average per state of over \$67 million. Table 6 demonstrates the mix of total grant aid for Tennessee and national entities.

One of the dangers of making national comparisons is that such comparisons often do not account for population variations from state to state. After adjusting the data to account for population, Tennessee distributes approximately \$4 per resident in financial aid compared to the national per resident average of \$13 (Table 7). Tennessee also falls behind national averages in aid per resident aged 18-24 and per undergraduate FTE.

Tennessee also lags behind regional peers with respect to the average student financial aid award. In an attempt to gauge regional comparisons, data for the 16 member states of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) were extracted from

the NASSGAP report. SREB comparisons have been commonly used by policymakers in Tennessee because of the similarity of member states. Table 8 shows the 1997-1998 total need and merit-based aid in Tennessee compared to the SREB states including and excluding Georgia. Georgia's much publicized HOPE Scholarship program skews averages among the states, but even with the removal of Georgia, Tennessee awards approximately one-half of the aid of other SREB states (see Table 9).

The last several years have produced sizeable increases across the country in the availability of state level student aid. From 1992-1993 to 1997-1998, Tennessee experienced a 41% increase in total aid from state allocations (Table 9). Nationally, states have appropriated 51% more aid dollars over that same period of time. Removing Georgia from the analysis, the SREB states have well outpaced Tennessee by increasing aid to need and merit programs by 89%. Not only is Tennessee's current commitment to financial aid less than that of neighboring states and the country at large, but the rate of increase in those same states will make it almost impossible to "catch-up" at the current level of commitment in Tennessee.

The students surveyed in this study are of increased importance because they represent groups historically denied access to higher education and those citizens who stand to benefit the most from an advanced degree. College expenses, most notably maintenance fees and tuition, continue to outpace increases in median family income and average cost of living. Due to these steep increases in fees, participation rates are sure to be influenced as students and their families weigh the present costs of college against the future benefits of a degree. As noted earlier in the study, there appear to be college choice restrictions for those low-income students who opt to pursue higher education. Though many of the students surveyed did report attending a college even though denied a state grant, the students in this study were disproportionately entering the 2-year sector instead of seeking education in the 4-year institutions. This evidence of college choice restrictions is troubling because many of the low-income, high-risk students entering the 2-year sector do not have the student service and support mechanisms that their 4-year counterparts enjoy. Commitments to more grants, as opposed to loans, for low-income students will do much to combat their aversion to borrowing money and will not only enhance entry into the system but will also stand to influence retention and persistence rates.

Conclusion

Scholars have increasingly called for a greater nexus between academic research and public policy development, formation, and implementation (Wiess, 1972; Meltsner, 1976; Gordon, 1992; Birnbaum, 2000). Although this idea is widely accepted, there are very few examples of scholarly research moving into the higher levels of the decision-making process. Birnbaum (2000) and Weiss (1982, as cited in Birnbaum, 2000) each posit that research modifies the definition and perceptions of problems and places boundaries upon available solutions. In line with the research of Kingdon (1995), policy scholars or researchers may see themselves as policy entrepreneurs who help inform and shape the public policy agenda. In much the same way this study has

impacted several initiatives on the postsecondary policy front as well as the higher education funding debate and eventual appropriation.

In cooperation with the Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, this study provided much needed data to the debate over the fate of the unserved students in the Tennessee Student Assistance Award program. Combined with growing concerns for lagging participation rates in higher education and this new knowledge of ever increasing pressures to borrow money or increase workload to pay for education, the improvement requests of the higher education community for financial grant and aid programs were met with less criticism. During the 2000 legislative session the Tennessee Student Assistance Award program was appropriated \$9 million in improvement funds, almost a 50% increase over its base budget of approximately \$20 million. With this additional money nearly 7,500 of the 13,000 unserved students were provided with grants through the state financial aid program.

Even with this substantial increase, Tennessee still lags well behind regional and national financial aid benchmarks and about 5,500 of the states poorest students are still denied aid because of lack of funds. As noted earlier, in 1997-1998 the state awarded a little more than \$20 million in need and merit based aid compared to the national average of \$67 million per state. Accounting for population disparity, Tennessee distributes \$4 per resident in aid compared to the national per resident average of \$13. Tennessee also falls far behind national averages in aid per resident age 18-24 and per undergraduate. Not only is the state's current commitment to financial aid less than peer comparisons, but the rate of increase in those same states will make nearly impossible any attempts to catch-up at the current level of commitment in Tennessee (NASSGAP, 1999).

If the state of Tennessee is to realize the full potential of its human capital, segments of the population like the one in this study must not be ignored. Participation and retention barriers litter the landscape of these students' futures in higher education and compromise their entry into the workforce. Whether seen in increases in work activity while enrolled, disproportional student loan burdens, or extended time to degree, the lack of commitment to student grant programs have far-reaching consequences. Higher education continues to be one of the central keys to opening the door to prosperity and individual self-actualization. Seen as an investment rather than a cost, postsecondary budgeting and increased allocations to financial aid represent some of the safest bets to improve the human capital stock of Tennessee's citizenry.

References

- Anderson, M., & Hearn, J. (1992). Equity issues in higher education outcomes. In W. E. Becker and D. R. Lewis (Eds), *The Economics of American Higher Education* (pp. 301-334). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- Astin, A. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out*. Washington, DC: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Becker, G. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. NY: Columbia University.

- Birnbaum, R. (2000). Policy scholars are from Venus; Policy makers are from Mars. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(2), 119-132.
- Blakemore, A., & Low, S. (1983). Scholarship policy and race-sex differences in the demand for higher education. *Economic Inquiry*, 21, 504-519.
- Blakemore, A., & Low, S. (1985). Public expenditures on higher education and their impact on enrollment patterns. *Applied Economics*, 17, 331-340.
- Curtin, T., & Nelson, E. (1999). Economic and health efficiency of education based funding. *Social Science and Medicine*, 48, 1599-1611.
- Denison, E. (1967). *Why growth rates differ*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.
- Dillman, D.A. (1979). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Freeman, K. (1999). Will higher education make a difference? African Americans' economic expectations and college choice. *College & University Journal*, Fall, 7-12.
- Geraghty, M. (1997). Finances are becoming more crucial in students' college choice, survey finds. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 43(19), A41-A42.
- Gordon, G. (1992). *Public administration in America (4th ed.)*. New York, NY: St. Martins Press.
- Governor's Council. (1999). *Investing in people: Tennessee's commitment to 21st century higher education excellence*. Nashville, TN: Governor's Council on Excellence in Higher Education.
- Hearn, J. (1984). The relative roles of academic, ascribed, and socioeconomic characteristics in college destinations. *Sociology of Education*, 57(1), 22-30.
- Hearn, J. (1991). Academic and nonacademic influences on the college destinations of 1980 high school graduates. *Sociology of Education*, 64(3), 158-171.
- Heller, D. (1996). *Tuition Prices, Financial Aid, and Access to Public Higher Education: A State-Level Analysis*. Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse Document Reproduction, Number ED 394 469.
- Heller, D. (1999). The effects of tuition and state financial aid on public college enrollment. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(1), 65-89.
- Hossler, D., Braxton, J., & Coopersmith, G. (1989). Understanding student college choice. In J. C. Smart (Ed), *Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research, Volume 5 (pp. 231-288)*. New York: Agathon Press.
- Hossler, D., Lund, J., Ramin, J., Westfall, S., & Irish, S. (1997). State funding for higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68(2), 160-190.
- Hu, S., & Hossler, D. (1998). *The linkage of student price sensitivity with preferences to post secondary institutions*. Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse Document Reproduction Service Number ED 427 593.
- Institute for Higher Education Policy. (1995). *College debt and the American family*. Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse Document Reproduction Service Number ED 420 228.
- Jackson, G. (1978). Financial aid and student enrollment. *Journal of Higher Education*, 49, 549-574.

- Justiz, M. J., Wilson, R., & Bjork, L. G. (1994). *Minorities in higher education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Kingdon, J. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. New York: Longman Press.
- Leslie, L. L., & Slaughter, S. A. (1997). The development and current status market mechanisms in U.S. postsecondary education. *Higher Education Policy*, 10(3-4), 239-252.
- McPherson, M., & Schapiro, M. (1994). *College choice and family income: Changes over time in the higher education destinations of students from different Income backgrounds*. Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse Document Reproduction Service Number ED 380 024.
- Meltsner, A. (1976). *Policy analysts in the bureaucracy*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- National Association of State Grant and Aid Programs. (1999). *29th annual NASSGAP survey report*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schultz, T. (1961). Investment in human capital. *American Economic Review*, 51, 1-17.
- Schwartz, J. (1985). Student financial aid and the college enrollment decision: The effects of public and private grants and interest subsidies. *Economics of Education Review*, 9(2), 123-134.
- Tennessee Higher Education Commission. (1999). *Enrolled student survey*. Nashville, TN: Author.
- Tennessee Higher Education Commission. (2000). *Enrolled student database*. Nashville, TN: Author.
- Tierney, M. (1980). The impact of financial aid on student demand for public/private higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 51(5), 527-545.
- Weiss, C. H. (1972). *Evaluation research: Methods of assessing program effectiveness*. Princeton, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Weiss, C. H. (1982). Policy research in the context of diffuse decision making. *Journal of Higher Education*, 53 (6), 619-639.

TABLE 1

College Participation and Perceived Preparation

N=415

College Attendance	Felt Prepared for College	
	Yes N=273	No n=142
Yes	82%	77%
No	18	23

Note: $\chi^2 = 8.483$, $df = 2$; $p < .05$; $c_v = .14$; $p < .05$; $r = -.034$; n.s.

TABLE 2

Student Enrollment by Type of Institution and Percentage of Time

Variable	Percentage
Type of Institution	
4-year public	33.1%
2-year public	53.1
Public Tech Center	6.2
4-year private	5.6
2-year private	0.6
Other	1.5
Enrollment Status	
Full-time	80.4
Part-time	19.4

TABLE 3

Respondents Financial Aid Receipt and Work Pattern

Type of Aid Received	Percentage
Pell Grant	87.7%
Stafford Loan (subsidized)	20.5
Stafford Loan (unsubsidized)	12.3
Scholarship	7.6
Job Training Partnership Act	6.2
Federal Workstudy	5.0
Federal Direct Loan (subsidized)	3.5
Supplemental Ed Opportunity Grants	2.6
Federal Direct Loan (unsubsidized)	2.3
Perkins Loan	1.5
Parent Loan for Undergrad Students	0.6
Work Study	
Full-time	22.0
Part-time	46.9

TABLE 4

Students Not Enrolled in Fall 1999

Variable	Percentage
Reason Not Attending	
Financial	35.9%
Other	34.6
Employment	9.0
Sickness	6.4
Moved	5.1
Not Feeling Prepared	5.1
Distance	1.3
Marriage	1.3
No Response	1.3

TABLE 4 (CONT.)

Variable	Percentage
Current Employment Status	
Full-Time	44.9
Part-Time	23.1
No	29.5
No Response	2.6

TABLE 5

Planning to Attend College Now and Later

Plans	Percentage
Plan to attend in the fall of 2000	
Yes	83.1%
No	14.8
No Response	2.1
Plan to attend in the future	
Yes	33.9
No	53.2
No Response	12.9
What could be done to help you attend?	
Financial assistance	51.6
Increase program offerings	17.7
Academic preparation work	11.3

TABLE 6

Total State Level Grant Aid

	Undgd Need	Grad Need	Undg Merit	Grad Merit	Total
Tenn Total	\$20,438,000	-	\$779,000	\$132,000	\$21,349,000
Natl Total	\$2,761,154,000	\$24,972,000	\$551,832,000	\$51,276,000	\$3,389,234,000
Natl Avge	\$55,223,080	\$499,440	\$11,036,640	\$1,025,520	\$ 67,784,680

TABLE 7

1997-1998 Aid Dollars per Various Demographic Variables

	Amount	Rank
Tenn per resident	\$4	35
National per resident	13	
Tenn per resident (18-24)	42	35
National per resident	136	
Tenn per undergraduate FTE	150	33
National per undergraduate FTE	464	

TABLE 8

1992-1993 and 1997-1998 Totals Relative to Peer States

	1992-1993	
Tennessee	\$15,099,000	\$21,349,000
SREB average w/Georgia	22, 190,933	52,797,067
SREB average w/o Georgia	22,023,857	41,625,429
National average	45,018,220	67,784,680

TABLE 9

1992-1993 and 1997-1998 Change in Aid Levels

	1992-1993	1997-1998	Change
Tennessee	\$15,099,000	\$21,349,000	41%
SREB totals w/Georgia	332,864,000	791,956,000	138
SREB totals w/o Georgia	308,334,000	582,756,000	89
National totals	2,250,911,000	3,389,234,000	51