

Report on Findings from the 2001 Undergraduate Student Support Survey

Executive Summary

In a Spring 2001 survey of students admitted to UC as freshmen, 68% of respondents reported that they also were admitted to a non-UC postsecondary institution, while 32% were admitted only to UC campuses. Of the total, 2% reported they were planning to attend a California Community College (CCC) and less than 1% indicated they did not plan to attend college the following year. The 68% who were also admitted to a non-UC institution listed 358 non-UC institutions as their top-choice alternatives to enrolling at UC. These non-UC “competitor” institutions included all 23 California State University (CSU) campuses (43%), 55 California private schools (28%), 186 out-of-state private schools (20%), 78 out-of-state public schools (8%), and 16 other institutions (<1%).

Among all survey respondents, 71% reported they planned to enroll at a UC campus. The remaining 29% listed 269 non-UC institutions as their planned enrollment choices. Of this group, 28% planned to enroll at a California private school, 26% at an out-of-state private school, 26% at CSU, 8% at a CCC, 7% at an out-of-state public school, and less than 1% at an international school. The remaining 4% were unsure of their decision or had decided not to attend college.

CSU campuses dominated the top choice non-UC institutions to which respondents had been admitted (“competitor” schools). Of the 11 most frequently cited non-UC competitor schools, eight were CSU campuses. In contrast, seven of the 11 most frequently cited non-UC enrollment choices were California private schools. This pattern is consistent with UC frequently being a first-choice alternative to a CSU but a back-up school to a California private.

In head-to-head competition between UC and particular competitors, UC tended to lose students when the competitors were selective private schools like Harvard, Stanford, MIT, and Northwestern. For example, 96% of those who cited Harvard as their top non-UC planned to go there. Conversely, UC tended to attract students away from the CSU campuses, especially San Francisco State University, San Jose State University, and Cal Poly Pomona. Only 10% of those who cited San Francisco State as their top non-UC planned to enroll there.

The schools that students planned to attend differed among ethnic groups. Asian Americans chose UC at the highest rate (81%) and African Americans at the lowest (60%). Chicanos chose CSU more frequently than any other ethnic group (11%), while Asian Americans chose it the least often (4%). African Americans and Native Americans were the most likely to choose an out-of-state school (15%), while Chicanos were the least likely to do so (5%).

There were also modest differences across parent income category in the schools students planned to attend. Low-income (\leq \$30,000) students chose UC more frequently (79%) than did high-income ($>$ \$100,000) students (71%). Students with parent incomes from \$60,000 to \$100,000 chose CSU campuses at a higher rate (10%) than students in other income categories. Students in the highest income group chose out-of-state schools more often (12%) than did students in the lowest income group (4%).

Overall, UC's cost of attendance was lower than that of its non-UC competitors. Across all respondents who were admitted to a non-UC school as well as to a UC campus, the average cost of attendance at UC was \$15,806, which was \$6,462 below the non-UC average (\$22,268). UC maintained an overall cost advantage when scholarship and grant aid were taken into consideration. The average net cost (cost of attendance less gift aid) at UC was \$14,078, which was \$4,725 lower than the \$18,803 average net cost of attendance at the non-UC schools.

UC's overall cost advantage was dependent on the type of non-UC school respondents listed as their top-choice non-UC. The primary reason that UC had a cost advantage relative to its competitors as a whole was that 48% of UC's competitor institutions were high-cost private institutions. UC had an \$11,811 average net cost advantage against its private competitors but a \$3,041 net cost *disadvantage* against its CSU competitors.

Although financial aid reduced overall cost differentials, it did not eliminate them. For students whose top-choice non-UC competitor school was a private institution, UC had a \$14,610 net cost advantage among students with parental incomes over \$100,000. UC maintained a lower but still significant net cost advantage (\$7,597) among low-income (\leq \$30,000) students whose top-choice non-UC was a private school. Analogously, CSU had a cost advantage of \$3,962 over UC among the highest income students, and although this advantage was reduced to \$875 for the lowest income students, it was not entirely eliminated.

CSU's cost advantage was relatively large (\$1,182) for low-income Chicanos but non-existent for low-income whites (-\$6). This difference was primarily due to differences in the total CSU cost of attendance for each group rather than to differences in UC's gift aid. In addition to selecting a different mix of CSU campuses, 35% of Chicanos, but only 15% of whites, reduced the cost of attending CSU by opting to live at home with parents.

The size of UC's cost advantage for most underrepresented minorities (African Americans, Chicanos, and Latinos) was about \$4,000 less than it was for other students. This difference was tied to the amount of gift aid offered by the respondents' private school alternatives, which provided more scholarships and grants to underrepresented minorities than to Asian Americans and whites. For instance, the average cost of attendance at the private institutions listed as top-choice non-UC alternatives was nearly the same for low-income whites (\$30,253) and low-income African Americans (\$30,242). However, the privates offered significantly more gift aid to the African Americans (\$14,854) than to the whites (\$9,625). These findings are consistent with the hypothesis that private institutions, which are not governed by Proposition 209's restrictions on considering race and ethnicity in awarding financial aid, target scholarship funds to underrepresented minorities. In spite of this practice, UC maintained its cost advantage against the privates, on average, for every ethnic group at every income level.

Higher income students did not appear to be price sensitive when making their enrollment decisions. Lower income students exhibited some price sensitivity but only when UC's net cost was substantially more than the net cost at their non-UC alternative. For respondents with parent incomes below \$60,000, the percent choosing UC dropped dramatically when UC's net cost was at least \$5,000 more than the net cost of their non-UC top choice. In contrast, among students with parent incomes over \$60,000, the percent choosing UC stayed about the same regardless of the cost differential between UC and the non-UC alternative.

Although underrepresented minorities chose UC less frequently than other respondents overall, their price sensitivity patterns were similar to those of other admits. Among lower-income underrepresented minorities, the percentage choosing UC declined when UC's net cost was

substantially more than the respondent's non-UC alternative. There was no evidence of price sensitivity among those from higher income families.

Respondents were asked to indicate the factors that played a role in their choice of college. Overall, respondents were most likely to list academic quality (78%) and location (73%) as reasons for choosing the school they did. Fifty-seven percent of low-income students cited either cost or financial aid as an important factor compared to 43% of those with incomes over \$100,000.

Respondents also were asked to rate their top-choice UC and non-UC on various factors. On average, the respondents' top-choice UC scored higher than their top-choice non-UC on cost of attendance and location but lower on personal attention and availability of affordable housing. Respondents rated UC lower than their non-UC alternative on personal attention and availability of affordable housing even when they planned to enroll at UC. Moreover, students who indicated that personal attention was one of the most important factors in their decision were much less likely to select UC (only 39% compared to 65% choosing UC overall).

A logistic regression is planned to provide more detail about the relative importance of factors affecting students' enrollment decisions.

Background

The University has a long-standing interest in understanding why the students it admits choose to attend UC or to go elsewhere. Because cost and financial aid are more directly influenced by systemwide administrative policies and practices, the role played by these factors is of special interest. The University's degree of competitiveness on cost and aid issues, and the degree to which its competitive position in turn affects enrollment, have potentially important implications for policies on fees and financial aid.

After Proposition 209 went into effect, there was an increased interest in the role of financial aid in the enrollment decisions of underrepresented minorities in particular. There has been considerable speculation, but little hard evidence, that better financial aid awards from schools not bound by Proposition 209 are at least partially responsible for enticing these students away from UC.

To investigate these issues, the Student Financial Support group at the University of California Office of the President conducted the first Undergraduate Student Support Survey in the spring of 2001. In contrast to a traditional "no-show" survey focused exclusively on those not enrolling at UC, the present survey was designed to include students who chose UC as well as those who did not. The three main objectives of this survey were: 1) to determine who the current college competitors for UC are, 2) to explore whether the financial aid packages offered to undergraduate students admitted to the University of California are competitive with those offered by non-UC institutions, and 3) to explore the effect these financial aid offers have on enrollment decisions. Of particular interest was how these patterns differed across ethnicity and parent income.

Survey Methodology

A sample of 19,915 students was drawn from the population (50,096) of first-time freshmen California residents who had been admitted to the University of California in the Spring 2001. In order to compare aid packages among different ethnic groups, underrepresented minority groups were over-sampled to ensure sufficient numbers for comparison of these groups. Students involved in several UC outreach programs were also over-sampled.

Timing was crucial. Students had to be contacted after they submitted a Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) so that the survey did not influence their decision about where to attend college but before they finished their school year and were no longer easy to contact.

The web-based survey, which included the sample of students with e-mail addresses (17,581), began on April 30, 2001 and concluded on June 22, 2001. Underrepresented minority students without e-mail addresses (2,334) were contacted by telephone, using a system that paralleled the web system. The telephone survey began on May 11, 2001 and was concluded on June 18, 2001.

The structure of the survey instrument was loosely modeled after the Graduate Support Survey pilot conducted in Spring 2000. The students were asked to provide detailed information about their financial aid offers from the school they planned to attend. If they planned to attend a UC campus, they were also asked to provide aid information from their top choice among the non-UC institutions that admitted them. If they planned to attend a non-UC school, they were also asked to provide aid information from their top choice among the UC campuses that admitted them.

Because their two actual top choice schools could both have been UC campuses or both non-UC schools, the comparison school was not necessarily the student's second choice. Students were also asked to rate each school on a number of dimensions and to indicate which of these dimensions was important in their college choice.

Survey data was linked with admissions data in order to include student-level demographic information such as parent income, ethnicity, and GPA in the analyses.

Response Rates

**Table 1
Response Bias**

	Population*	Sample **	Respondents***	Non-respondents
Total Students	50,096	19,915	11,104	8,811
Gender				
Female	56.9%	58.9%	61.3%	55.9%
Male	43.1%	41.1%	38.7%	44.1%
Ethnicity				
African American	3.3%	8.2%	7.3%	9.3%
Asian American	26.8%	11.0%	13.1%	8.4%
Chicano	11.1%	27.9%	27.7%	28.2%
Latino	3.5%	8.8%	8.5%	9.2%
Native American	0.6%	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%
White	38.7%	22.6%	22.1%	23.2%
Other	16.1%	19.9%	19.8%	20.0%
Outreach Group				
ELC	20.1%	22.5%	27.1%	16.7%
EAOP	5.0%	11.6%	13.3%	9.4%
MESA	0.9%	2.1%	2.3%	1.8%
PUENTE	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Non-Outreach	76.1%	68.7%	63.5%	75.4%
NOTE: Some students are part of more than one outreach group				
Parent Income				
Mean	\$89,121	\$79,002	\$75,266	\$83,706
Age				
Mean	17.76	17.75	17.74	17.75
Grade point average				
Mean	3.74	3.73	3.78	3.66
UC Yield				
(Admits Enrolling at UC)	56.3%	54.0%	64.5%	40.6%

* Population includes all California residents admitted as freshmen to UC for Fall 2001.

** Sample includes all students selected to participate in the survey.

*** Respondents includes all who answered at least the first question in the survey.

The overall response rate for the survey was 56% (11,104 of 19,915) with the response rates from the telephone interviews (61%) slightly higher than the web interviews (55%). The response

rate among males was slightly lower than that among females (Table 1). Response rates by ethnicity were proportional to their percentage in the sample with two exceptions: African Americans had a lower response rate and Asian Americans had a higher response rate. The Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) and Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) groups also responded at higher rates than the sample as a whole. Additionally, respondents had a lower average parent income and a higher average GPA than non-respondents.

A comparison of admissions data and survey responses showed that the unweighted percentage of respondents who stated that they planned to enroll at one of UC campuses (69%) was slightly higher than the actual percentage of respondents who enrolled at UC for Fall 2001 (65%). This difference is similar to the typical drop from student Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) data to actual Fall enrollment. The percentage of respondents enrolling at UC (65%) was also higher than the percentage of UC admits enrolling at UC (56%). Response bias favoring those students who have chosen to enroll at the surveying institution is common in surveys of admitted students.

Of the 11,104 total respondents, 88% completed the entire survey, 10% completed only part of the survey, and 1% terminated the survey because they were undecided about which college they planned to attend or had decided not to go to college in 2001-02. The telephone survey proved critical to ensuring adequate responses from underrepresented minorities. The response rates by ethnic group ranged from 50% for African Americans to 66% for Asian Americans. Of the 1,633 African Americans sampled, 37% responded on the web and 13% responded via the telephone interview. Of the 5,563 Chicanos and 1,755 Latinos sampled, 38% and 41% respectively responded via the web while 17% and 12% respectively responded via the telephone survey.

As shown in Table 1A, there was an unequal distribution of parent income levels among the respondents in different ethnic groups. Chicanos had the lowest average income of any ethnic group. Over 70% of Chicanos had incomes of \$60,000 or less, while 60% of both African Americans and Latinos had incomes in that range. In contrast, 26% of white respondents fell into this category. This pattern is consistent with other data that UC has collected.

Table 1A
Ethnicity of Respondents by Parent Income Level*

	0-\$30,000	\$30,001-\$60,000	\$60,001-\$100,000	>\$100,000
African American	34.8%	25.7%	22.1%	17.4%
Native American	18.1%	31.2%	26.9%	23.8%
Asian	30.6%	23.8%	23.7%	21.9%
Chicano	41.1%	31.7%	17.2%	10.0%
Latino	35.7%	26.7%	20.2%	17.4%
White	8.2%	18.2%	30.6%	43.0%
Other	13.5%	24.0%	32.1%	30.4%
All Ethnicities	21.4%	23.0%	26.4%	29.2%

*Percentages are weighted to account for the over-sampling of underrepresented minorities and outreach groups.

Results

School Choice

Responses were weighted to correct for the over-sampling of underrepresented minorities and outreach groups. The weighting procedure raised the estimated percentage of students reporting that they planned to attend UC from 69% to 71%. Of the program participants who did not plan to enroll at UC, 28% planned to enroll at a California private school, 26% at an out-of-state

private school, 26% at a California State University (CSU) campus, 8% at a California Community College (CCC), 7% at an out-of-state public school, and less than 1% at an international school. Among the less than 1% that decided not to attend college, the reasons given were: 34% planned to travel, 20% cited cost or financial reasons, 12% planned to explore job opportunities, 11% wanted more time to assess their plans, and 9% planned to join the Armed Services. The remaining 4% were either undecided or chose to attend a non-UC school but did not give information about which school.

Sixty-eight percent of respondents reported that they had also been admitted to a non-UC school. In all, 358 different non-UC colleges and universities were named as “competitor” schools (Appendix A). Of these schools, 43% of the competition was from the 23 CSU campuses, 28% was from 55 California private schools, 20% was from 186 out-of-state private schools, 8% was from 78 out-of-state public schools (including military schools), and less than 1% was from 16 international schools. This total did not include California Community Colleges because students planning to attend a California Community College were not asked to specify which school they would attend. Among the top 20 competitor schools, there were nine CSU campuses, seven California private schools, two out-of-state private schools, and two out-of-state public schools (Table 2). Among the competitor schools, 269 different non-UC colleges and universities were named as schools where students planned to enroll (Appendix B). Among these, 20 schools (eight California private schools, six CSU campuses, five non-California private schools, and one out-of-state public school) accounted for over 50% of the responses (Table 2A). The greater prevalence of CSU campuses among the schools considered by UC admits than among the schools they actually chose suggests that CSU may serve as a backup to UC for many students. UC, in turn, may frequently serve as a backup to private schools.

Table 2
Top Twenty Competitor Schools Considered by Respondents
(Non-UC Schools Where Respondents Planned to Enroll or
for Those Planning to Enroll at UC, the Non-UC Alternate Choice School)

Competitor Schools	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted Percentage
1 CA Polytechnic State University (SLO)	757	11.3%
2 University of Southern California	635	8.7%
3 San Diego State University	619	7.5%
4 CSU, Long Beach	421	4.6%
5 CA State Polytechnic University (Pomona)	285	3.8%
6 San Jose State University	187	2.8%
7 Santa Clara University	172	2.5%
8 Loyola Marymount University	228	2.3%
9 CSU, Fullerton	231	2.3%
10 San Francisco State University	144	1.9%
11 CSU, Northridge	209	1.9%
12 Stanford University	177	1.7%
13 University of San Diego	142	1.7%
14 New York University	97	1.5%
15 University of the Pacific	98	1.4%
16 Boston University	79	1.3%
17 CSU, Sacramento	110	1.3%
18 University of Arizona	68	1.2%
19 Occidental College	94	1.2%
20 University of Washington	62	1.1%

The non-UC schools listed most frequently as schools students planned to attend differed among ethnic groups (Appendix C). For example, two Ivy League schools appeared in the top 10 non-UC schools chosen by African Americans, Native Americans, and Asian Americans. No Ivy League schools appeared in the top 10 for Chicanos, Latinos, or whites.

Table 2A
Top Twenty Competitor Schools Actually Selected by Respondents
(Schools Where Those Choosing a Non-UC Most Frequently Planned to Enroll)

Non-UC Schools	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted Percentage
1 CA Polytechnic State University (SLO)	276	11.6%
2 University of Southern California	225	7.4%
3 San Diego State University	153	5.1%
4 Stanford University	157	4.1%
5 CSU, Long Beach	96	2.8%
6 Santa Clara University	56	2.5%
7 Loyola Marymount University	79	2.2%
8 University of San Diego	69	2.2%
9 New York University	45	1.8%
10 CA State Polytechnic University (Pomona)	58	1.7%
11 University of the Pacific	41	1.5%
12 University of Arizona	29	1.5%
13 Northwestern University	25	1.5%
14 Chapman University, CA	30	1.4%
15 CSU, Northridge	56	1.3%
16 Harvard University	40	1.2%
17 Massachusetts Institute of Technology	28	1.2%
18 Occidental College	39	1.2%
19 Boston University	26	1.2%
20 CSU, Fullerton	53	1.1%

All UC campuses were represented both among the schools respondents planned to attend and among those considered by those enrolling at a non-UC. Among those admitted to at least one non-UC, the campuses most commonly cited as enrollment choices were Berkeley and Davis. Among those choosing not to attend UC, Riverside and Santa Cruz were the most frequently named alternate choice UC campuses (Table 2B).

Table 2B
Distribution of UC Campuses Cited as Enrollment Choice or Alternate Choice
(Respondents Accepted to at Least One Non-UC)

	Respondents Enrolling at UC (UC Campus Cited as Top Choice)		Respondents Enrolling at Non-UC (UC Campus Cited as Alternate Choice)	
	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted Percentage	Unweighted Frequency	Weighted Percentage
Berkeley	813	14.8%	454	13.6%
Davis	742	14.4%	386	12.5%
Irvine	641	12.3%	262	7.8%
Los Angeles	769	12.7%	308	9.6%
Riverside	701	11.0%	517	14.8%
San Diego	575	12.1%	327	11.9%
San Francisco	1	0.0%	1	0.0%
Santa Barbara	705	12.3%	352	10.1%
Santa Cruz	544	10.5%	560	19.7%

As shown in Table 2C, the percentage of students choosing different types of schools varied by ethnic group. Asian Americans chose UC at the highest rate (81%) while African Americans chose UC at the lowest rate (60%). Chicanos chose CSU campuses the most frequently (11%) while Asian Americans chose CSU campuses only 4% of the time. Asian Americans chose California private schools much less often (5%) than African Americans, Chicanos, and Latinos (15%, 12%, and 11%, respectively).

Table 2C
Percentage of Each Ethnic Group Choosing Particular School Type

	Overall	African American	American Indian	Asian	Chicano	Latino	White	Other
UC	71% ¹	60%	67%	81%	66%	66%	66%	72%
CSU	7%	7%	8%	4%	11%	9%	9%	7%
CCC	2%	1%	2%	3%	4%	4%	2%	2%
CA Private	8%	15%	6%	5%	12%	11%	8%	7%
Out-of-State Public	2%	3%	5%	1%	2%	2%	4%	3%
Out-of-State Private	7%	13%	10%	5%	4%	7%	10%	7%
Other / Unknown ²	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%

1. The overall percentage reported here is slightly than the weighted percentage among all respondents (69%) because it is restricted to those valid ethnicity and income data.

2. Other/Unknown includes military colleges, international colleges, unspecified colleges, and those not going to college.

As shown in Table 2D, the tendency to stay in California for college varied by ethnicity. African American and white students chose out-of-state schools 13% and 10% of the time, respectively, compared to Asian Americans and Chicanos, who chose out-of-state schools only 5% and 4% of the time, respectively.

Table 2D
Percentage of Students Planning to Enroll at a School in California

Ethnicity	Enroll at CA School
Chicano	95%
Asian	94%
Latino	91%
Other	91%
White	87%
African American	85%
American Indian	85%
OVERALL	89%

School choice patterns also differed by parent income level (Table 2E). Students with incomes of \$30,000 or less chose UC more frequently (79%) than did those with incomes over \$100,000 (71%). Those with incomes between \$60,000 and \$99,999 chose CSU campuses at a higher rate (10%) than students in other income groups. Very few students in the highest income group enrolled at a California Community College (1%). Income appeared to have bigger effect on the likelihood of attending college outside of California than it did on the likelihood of attending a private school. Higher income students were more likely to enroll at out-of-state privates than were lower income students, but the percentage choosing California privates varied little by income. Moreover, students in the highest income group chose out-of-state schools, both public and private, more often (12%) than did students in the lowest income group (4%).

Table 2E
Percentage of Students in Each Parent Income Group
Choosing to Enroll at a Particular School Type

	Total	\$0-\$30,000	\$30,001-\$60,000	\$60,001-\$100,000	>\$100,000
UC	71%¹	79%	74%	69%	71%
CSU	7%	6%	8%	10%	7%
CCC	2%	3%	3%	3%	1%
CA Private	8%	7%	7%	8%	8%
Out-of-State Public	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%
Out-of-State Private	7%	3%	5%	7%	10%
Other / Unknown ²	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%

1. The overall percentage reported here is slightly higher than the weighted percentage among all respondents (69%) because it is restricted to those valid ethnicity and income data.

2. Other/Unknown includes military colleges, international colleges, unspecified colleges, and those not going to college.

Another way to consider the relative competitiveness of the non-UC schools is to compare the number of students who choose UC over a particular institution to the number who choose that same institution over UC. Table 2F shows the top 20 non-UC schools where students chose to enroll and the top 20 non-UC alternate choice schools that lost students to UC. Fifteen of the schools appeared on both top 20 lists. The schools to which UC generally loses students include elite private schools like Harvard, Stanford, and MIT. Conversely, UC generally attracts students away from the CSU campuses, particularly San Francisco State University, San Jose State University, and California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

Table 2F
Choice Patterns Among Respondents Considering 25 Frequently Cited Competitor Schools
(The Non-UC Schools Most Frequently Cited as an Enrollment Choice and the Non-UC
Schools Most Frequently Cited as an Alternate Choice)

Top Choice Non-UC School	Percent Planning to Attend Non-UC	Percent Planning to Attend UC	Overall Percent Planning to Attend UC**	Difference between Percent Planning to Attend UC & Overall Percent Planning to Attend UC
Harvard University	95.9	4.1	63.4	-59.3
Stanford University	88.3	11.7	63.4	-51.7
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	85.9	14.1	63.4	-49.3
Northwestern University	71.5	28.5	63.4	-34.9
Chapman University, CA	66.0	34.0	63.4	-29.4
University of San Diego	47.8	52.2	63.4	-11.3
University of Arizona	44.4	55.6	63.4	-7.8
New York University	43.1	56.9	63.4	-6.5
University of the Pacific	38.1	61.9	63.4	-1.5
CA Polytechnic State University (SLO)	37.6	62.4	63.4	-1.1
Santa Clara University	36.9	63.1	63.4	-0.3
Occidental College	36.9	63.1	63.4	-0.3
Loyola Marymount University	35.4	64.6	63.4	1.1
Boston University	32.1	67.9	63.4	4.5
University of Southern California	31.3	68.7	63.4	5.3
CSU Sacramento	25.8	74.2	63.4	10.8
University of Washington	25.0	75.0	63.4	11.6
San Diego State University	24.8	75.2	63.4	11.8
CSU, Northridge	24.6	75.4	63.4	11.9
CSU Fresno	23.1	76.9	63.4	13.5
CSU, Long Beach	22.1	77.9	63.4	14.5
CSU, Fullerton	17.9	82.1	63.4	18.7
CA State Polytechnic University (Pomona)	16.1	83.9	63.4	20.5
San Jose State University	12.0	88.0	63.4	24.5
San Francisco State University	10.3	89.7	63.4	26.3

* All percentages are weighted to account for the over-sampling of underrepresented minorities and outreach groups.

**Percentage of students planning to attend UC excludes those choosing between two UC campuses.

Financial Aid

Among all the respondents accepted to at least one non-UC school, 68% applied for financial aid at one of the schools. Forty-nine percent applied for financial aid at both the school where they planned to enroll and their alternate choice school (either their top choice UC or their top choice non-UC). Some students may have applied for financial aid only at the most expensive schools

because they believed they could afford the less expensive schools without aid or because they did not believe they would be eligible for aid at lower cost schools. Additionally, some of these students may have been considering many other schools ahead of the alternate choice school listed. They may have only completed the financial aid application process at their true top choice schools.

Overall, only 23% of respondents actually reported being offered financial aid at both UC and non-UC schools, but 55% were offered financial aid at one of the schools. It is likely that some students completed the aid application process only at the school they planned to attend. In such cases, students may have wanted to know if they would receive enough aid at their first choice institution in order to afford to go there rather than wanting to comparison shop among institutions. The data from the survey about the financial aid offers reflect the information that the student had at the time of deciding which school to attend; it does not necessarily reflect the amount of financial aid the student was actually eligible to receive. Since there is no standard format for financial aid award letters, the amount and type of information provided on them varies from school to school.

Several different methods for examining the financial aid offers were explored: comparing students who received aid offers at both schools, comparing students who received aid offers at one school, comparing all students who applied for aid, and comparing all students. After examining the results of analyses run in a variety of ways, the decision was made to use all students to maximize the sample size and to include representative higher income students in the analyses. While the figures were different depending on the subgroups examined, the general patterns seen were similar.

Net Cost Comparison

The net cost to attend a particular school was calculated by taking the cost of attendance and subtracting all gift aid. Gift aid includes scholarships, grants, and any other money that does not have to be repaid. As shown in Tables 3, 3A, and 3B, the mean net cost at UC was \$15,806 while the mean cost to attend the top choice non-UC schools was \$22,268 (\$11,199 for CSU and \$32,545 for privates). However, the average gift aid at UC was only \$1,727 compared to \$3,465 for the top choice non-UC schools (\$678 for CSU and \$6,324 for privates). This resulted in a mean net cost (cost of attendance less gift aid) for UC that was \$4,725 less than for the top choice non-UC schools. This overall lower mean net cost for UC occurs because so much of the competition is with private institutions. Although these institutions on average provide large amounts of gift aid, their cost of attendance is so much higher than UC's that the net cost for UC remains significantly lower for students of all income levels.

Table 3
Differences in Mean Cost of Attendance, Mean Gift Aid, & Mean Net Cost
 (Respondents Accepted to at Least One Non-UC)

	Mean Cost of Attendance	Mean Gift Aid	Mean Net Cost
UC	\$15,806	\$1,727	\$14,079
Non-UC	\$22,268	\$3,465	\$18,803
UC – Non-UC Difference	- \$ 6,463	- \$1,738	- \$ 4,725

Table 3A
Differences in Mean Cost of Attendance, Mean Gift Aid, & Mean Net Cost
(Among Students Whose Top Choice Non-UC Was a CSU campus)

	Mean Cost of Attendance	Mean Gift Aid	Mean Net Cost
UC	\$15,599	\$2,036	\$13,563
CSU	\$11,199	\$ 678	\$10,522
UC – Non-UC Difference	\$ 4,400	\$1,358	\$ 3,041

Table 3B
Differences in Mean Cost of Attendance, Mean Gift Aid, & Mean Net Cost
(Among Students Whose Top Choice Non-UC Was a Private School)

	Mean Cost of Attendance	Mean Gift Aid	Mean Net Cost
UC	\$15,984	\$1,574	\$14,410
Private	\$32,545	\$6,324	\$26,221
UC – Non-UC Difference	- \$16,561	- \$4,750	- \$11,811

Another way to look at the difference between costs for UC and non-UC schools is to look at the total out-of-pocket costs instead of the net cost. That is, we can discount cost of attendance by loans and work-study in addition to gift aid. Students may not always differentiate between gift aid and self-help awards, and to the extent that they do not, the critical comparison would be between out-of-pocket costs rather than true net costs.

Out-of-pocket costs were calculated by subtracting all gift aid, work-study, and loan amounts from the cost of attendance. As can be seen in Table 3C, the mean out-of-pocket cost for UC was less than for non-UC schools. In fact, the difference is somewhat greater than the difference seen when net costs were compared. This may be related to the practice at some campuses of including parent loan amounts on the original financial aid award letters. Competitor schools may include these loans in the initial award letters less frequently than UC, even though they are available at both schools. The remainder of the report discusses net cost rather than out-of-pocket cost, but the patterns observed were similar.

Table 3C
Differences in Mean Out-of-Pocket Cost
(Respondents Accepted to at Least One Non-UC)

	Mean Cost of Attendance	Mean Financial Aid (Gift Aid, Work-study, & Loans)	Mean Out-of-Pocket Cost
UC	\$15,806	\$3,744	\$12,061
Non-UC	\$22,268	\$5,086	\$17,182
UC – Non-UC Difference	- \$ 6,462	- \$1,342	- \$ 5,121

The mean net cost varied by income group. UC's net cost was competitive at all income levels but most competitive for higher income students, who are generally ineligible for need-based financial aid. As seen in Table 3D, for students of all parent income levels except those over \$100,000, the difference between UC and non-UC mean net cost was very similar (\$2,492-\$2,602). In the highest income group, however, the difference in net cost between UC and non-

UC was over \$7,000. It appears that both UC and the non-UC schools were working to make the net cost manageable for those in the lowest income brackets.

Table 3D
Mean Net Cost Differences by Parent Income Level
 (Respondents Accepted to at Least One Non-UC)

Parent Income Level	Mean UC Net Cost	Mean Non-UC Net Cost	UC – Non-UC Mean Difference
0- \$30,000	\$10,258	\$12,797	- \$2,539
\$30,001-\$60,000	\$13,082	\$15,574	- \$2,492
\$60,001-\$100,000	\$14,935	\$17,537	- \$2,602
> \$100,000	\$15,622	\$22,742	- \$7,120
Missing	\$15,048	\$22,357	- \$7,309

As shown in Table 3E there were also differences in net cost among ethnic groups. Some of the difference can be explained by the difference in parent income level (Table 1A) and family size (Table 3F). Parent income and family size are important because they are factored into the formula for determining eligibility for need-based financial aid. Those with large families qualify for financial aid at a higher income level than those with smaller families. Chicanos, for example were more likely to have low incomes (Table 1A) and large families (six or more people). Not surprisingly, they also had the lowest mean net cost for both UC and the non-UC.

Table 3E
Mean Net Cost Differences by Ethnicity
 (Respondents Accepted to at Least One Non-UC)

Ethnicity	Mean UC Net Cost	Mean Non-UC Net Cost	UC – Non-UC Mean Difference
African American	\$13,217	\$17,542	- \$4,325
American Indian	\$14,005	\$17,345	- \$3,340
Asian	\$13,336	\$19,111	- \$5,575
Chicano	\$12,306	\$14,447	- \$2,140
Latino	\$12,982	\$15,761	- \$2,778
White	\$14,856	\$20,058	- \$5,202
Other	\$14,526	\$19,298	- \$4,772

Table 3F
Percentage of Each Ethnic Group with Various Family Sizes
 (includes student, parent(s), and siblings)

Family Size	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six or More
African American	15.2%	24.9%	28.9%	19.8%	11.3%
American Indian	5.0%	22.6%	47.0%	17.5%	7.9%
Asian	4.7%	19.1%	44.9%	21.8%	9.5%
Chicano	5.7%	16.1%	27.9%	27.7%	22.6%
Latino	7.0%	21.9%	35.9%	22.6%	12.6%
White	6.3%	20.9%	44.6%	21.1%	7.2%
Other	5.0%	15.8%	44.3%	24.1%	10.8%

Some of the difference in net cost seen in Table 3E can be attributed to the proportion of students in various ethnic groups who were comparing UC to a private school rather than to a CSU campus (Table 3G). For instance, Chicanos were more likely to be choosing between a UC campus and a CSU campus than other ethnic groups. Consequently, UC's overall cost advantage (\$2,140) was somewhat lower for them. In contrast, African Americans more frequently considered a private school as an alternative to UC. As a result, UC tended to have a higher cost advantage (\$4,325) for African Americans.

Table 3G
Percentage of Each Ethnic Group Whose Enrollment Choice or Alternate Choice School was a CSU vs. a Private School
 (Respondents Accepted to at Least One Non-UC)

	CSU	Private	Other Schools*
African American	34.9%	58.2%	6.9%
American Indian	45.8%	41.3%	12.9%
Asian	43.7%	51.8%	4.5%
Chicano	55.9%	40.0%	4.1%
Latino	49.3%	45.3%	5.4%
White	39.3%	48.2%	12.5%
Other	43.3%	48.2%	8.5%
ALL	43.1%	48.3%	8.6%

*Other schools include international, military, and non-California public schools

As mentioned above, UC is doing well overall in competing with non-UC schools on net cost. The costs to attend UC are, on average, lower than those to attend non-UC schools across all parent income groups and ethnicities. When both ethnicity and income are considered simultaneously, the differences between ethnic groups are more striking (Table 3H). Since the mean net cost of attendance for UC varies very little between ethnic groups (\$15,599-\$15,932), differences in the non-UC net cost is the driving force in determining the size of UC's cost advantage for each ethnicity. One factor contributing to this difference is the initial cost of attendance for the non-UC schools selected by different ethnic groups (Appendix D). The mean cost of attendance for non-UC schools cited by African Americans was \$23,831; whereas, the mean cost of attendance for non-UC schools cited by Chicanos was only \$19,385. This was due to Chicanos' greater tendency to consider CSU campuses.

Table 3H
Size of UC Cost Advantage by Parent Income & Ethnicity
 (Respondents Accepted to at Least One Non-UC)

	<=\$30,000	\$30,001-\$60,000	\$60,001-\$100,000	>\$100,000	All Parent Income Levels
African American	\$1,665	\$3,275	\$4,024	\$ 8,650	\$4,324
Asian	\$3,207	\$3,617	\$3,444	\$10,339	\$5,575
Chicano	\$1,548	\$1,437	\$1,513	\$ 5,444	\$2,141
Latino	\$ 760	\$ 665	\$4,002	\$ 5,149	\$2,778
White	\$4,353	\$3,017	\$2,090	\$ 6,330	\$5,203
Other*	\$2,039	\$1,237	\$2,873	\$6,705	\$4,716
OVERALL	\$2,539	\$2,492	\$2,602	\$7,120	\$4,725

* Other includes Native Americans.

In an attempt to minimize the variance in the cost of attendance of the non-UC schools, the schools were separated into two groups: CSU campuses and private institutions. This separation by school type alleviates much of the difference in the average cost of the non-UC schools cited by each ethnic group. However, some variation persists due to ethnic differences in the particular set of CSU campuses (and planned living arrangements at those campuses) and private schools chosen by each ethnic group.

As seen in Table 3I, across all income levels, CSU's cost advantage is reduced as the parent income levels fall. That is, for those in the lowest income group, the cost advantage averages \$875. For the \$30,001-\$60,000 group, the advantage increases to \$2,589. For the higher income groups (\$60,001-\$100,000 and >\$100,000), the cost advantage is \$4,152 and \$3,962 respectively. The reduction in CSU's cost advantage at the lower income levels is due to the UC campuses' success in buying UC's costs with need-based financial aid.

Table 3I
Size of CSU Cost Advantage by Parent Income & Ethnicity
Among Students Whose Top Choice Non-UC Was a CSU Campus

	<=\$30,000	\$30,001-\$60,000	\$60,001-\$100,000	>\$100,000	All Parent Income Levels
African American	\$ 879	\$2,086	\$4,323	\$4,021	\$2,419
Asian	\$ 762	\$2,354	\$4,315	\$4,406	\$2,748
Chicano	\$1,182	\$2,318	\$3,906	\$4,618	\$2,221
Latino	\$ 701	\$3,064	\$3,826	\$4,620	\$2,469
White	-\$ 6	\$2,601	\$3,988	\$3,708	\$3,343
Other*	\$1,640	\$3,151	\$4,508	\$4,220	\$3,730
OVERALL	\$ 875	\$2,589	\$4,152	\$3,962	\$3,041

*Other includes Native American

The size of CSU's cost advantage among the lowest parent income group (<=\$30,000) is much larger for Chicanos than for whites. In fact, the net cost to attend CSU rather than UC is on average \$1,182 less for Chicanos; however, for whites CSU cost an average of \$6 more. Closer examination reveals that most of the difference seen is not due to differences in gift aid between Chicanos and whites, but is due to the differences in the initial cost of the CSU campuses. For Chicanos, the average cost of attendance for low-income students at a CSU was \$10,612 but for whites in this same group, the average cost of attendance was \$11,481 (Appendix E).

This CSU cost of attendance differential is due to several factors. The cost of attendance for CSU students commuting to a campus while living at home with parents (\$7,282-\$8,174) is much less than the cost for those living either in on-campus or off-campus housing (\$10,054-\$14,972). Chicanos and Latinos whose top choice non-UC was a CSU stated they planned to live with parents or relatives much more frequently (35% and 38% respectively) than did whites (15%). This is likely to be one of the reasons that the cost of attendance was higher for whites than for Chicanos.

Additionally, there is a fairly large difference between particular CSU campuses with regard to cost of attendance, with CSU Bakersfield at the low end and San Francisco State at the high end. Students from different ethnic groups prefer different CSU campuses, and this preference affects the average CSU cost of attendance for each ethnic group.

When UC’s competitors are private schools, the picture is reversed, and UC enjoys the cost advantage. As seen in Table 3J, the size of UC’s cost advantage varies by parent income level. The largest cost advantage (\$14,610) for UC is seen in the highest income group (>\$100,000). For the other income groups, UC’s cost advantage ranges from \$7,597 to \$9,717. This is due to the private schools’ use of need-based aid to buy down the costs for lower income students. However, the aid awarded was not sufficient to eliminate UC’s cost advantage—or to narrow the gap to the degree UC was able to its gap with CSU.

Table 3J
Size of UC Cost Advantage by Parent Income & Ethnicity
Among Students Whose Top Choice Non-UC Was a Private School

	<=\$30,000	\$30,001- \$60,000	\$60,001- \$100,000	>\$100,000	All Parent Income Levels
African American	\$3,973	\$6,608	\$9,758	\$12,758	\$8,522
Asian	\$9,137	\$11,227	\$10,480	\$16,248	\$12,897
Chicano	\$6,759	\$6,961	\$7,936	\$12,909	\$8,268
Latino	\$3,244	\$6,272	\$9,448	\$12,757	\$8,716
White	\$9,022	\$8,465	\$8,787	\$14,222	\$12,329
Other*	\$7,392	\$8,371	\$12,040	\$14,600	\$12,616
OVERALL	\$7,597	\$8,608	\$9,717	\$14,610	\$11,811

* Other includes Native American

There also appears to be a difference by ethnicity. Specifically, African American, Chicano, and Latino students tended to have a smaller UC cost advantage than Asian Americans, whites, and others. Across all income levels, UC’s cost advantage for African American, Chicano, and Latino students was between \$8,268-\$8,716; however, for Asian Americans, whites and others, the cost advantage was between \$12,329-\$12,897. This is a \$4,000 differential between the two groups. That is, the net savings of choosing UC instead of a private school is on average \$4,000 more for Asian Americans, whites, and others than it is for African Americans, Chicanos, and Latinos.

Closer examination of the lowest parent income group (<=\$30,000) reveals that the size of UC’s cost advantage was much greater for Asian Americans and whites than for African Americans, Chicanos, and Latinos. This is primarily due to differences in the gift aid offered by private institutions (Appendix F). The average cost of attendance at the private schools for whites and African Americans was almost identical (\$30,253 and \$30,242, respectively); however, the average amount of gift aid the private schools offered to whites and African Americans differed by more than \$5,000 (\$9,625 and \$14,854, respectively). Chicanos in this lowest parent income group had a cost of attendance at the private schools (\$30,788) similar to whites and African Americans; however, their average gift aid (\$13,070) was \$1,784 less than African Americans and \$3,445 more than whites. The mean cost of attendance at private schools for Asian Americans (\$32,359) and Latinos (\$31,668) was within \$1,000 of each other; however, the gift aid given to Asian Americans and Latinos differed by almost \$5,000 (\$13,167 and \$18,085 respectively). It appears that many private institutions, not bound by Proposition 209, continue to award more gift aid to underrepresented minorities than to other students, controlling for income. Despite this practice, UC maintained its cost advantage against the privates, on average, for every ethnic group at every income level.

School Choice by Net Cost Differences

In an effort to determine whether net cost made a difference in enrollment decisions, the mean net cost for those who chose to enroll at UC and those who chose to enroll at a non-UC school were compared. There was no overall relation between cost and enrollment choice. The mean net cost to attend UC was less regardless of the student's choice. The mean net cost for UC was \$4,598 less than the top choice non-UC for those that chose to enroll at UC and \$4,948 less for those who chose to enroll at the non-UC school.

Table 4
Mean Net Cost Differences for Those Choosing UC vs. Non-UC
 (Respondents Accepted to at Least One Non-UC)

	Mean Net Cost for UC	Mean Net Cost for Non-UC	UC – Non-UC Mean Difference
Chose UC	\$13,664	\$18,262	- \$4,598
Chose Non-UC	\$14,808	\$19,757	- \$4,949
Difference UC & Non-UC Choosers	-\$ 1,144	-\$ 1,495	\$ 351

Lower income students do appear to exhibit some price sensitivity in their college choices. As shown in Figure 1, low-income students chose UC at a lower rate when UC's costs were significantly more than the non-UC's costs. In the less than \$30,000 parent income group, 46% chose UC when the costs of UC were over \$5,000 more than non-UC costs. When UC cost more by \$1-\$4,999, however, 77% chose UC. Similarly, when UC had any cost advantage at all, 80% to 84% chose UC. The same pattern was observed among students with parent incomes from \$30,001 to \$60,000 (Figure 2).

In contrast, the choices of the higher income students did not appear to be price sensitive in this way. For those in the two higher income groups, there was no decrease in the rate of choosing UC even when the cost of UC was substantially higher (Figures 3 and 4). In fact, student with incomes over \$100,000 were *more* likely to choose UC when it cost over \$5,000 more than their non-UC alternative.

A likely explanation for the minimal amount of price sensitivity is that students care more about quality, broadly construed, than cost when they choose a college. When UC costs over \$5,000 more than the alternative, the alternative is likely to be a CSU. UC is generally more selective than CSU, and many students may perceive UC to be of higher quality than CSU. It appears that higher income students are willing and able to pay substantially more to go to UC rather than CSU. Similarly, many are willing to pay an even larger premium to go to a private school rather than to UC, presumably because they perceive the private school to be of higher quality than UC. While lower income students also seem to be willing to pay a premium for higher perceived quality, the *amount* of the premium they are able to pay is more limited than it is for their higher income peers.

Figure 1
Percent Choosing UC over a Non-UC among Students
with Parent Income Level <=\$30,000




Figure 2
Percent Choosing UC over a Non-UC among Students
with Parent Income Levels \$30,001-\$60,000




Figure 3
Percent Choosing UC over a Non-UC among Students
with Parent Income Levels \$60,000-\$100,000





Figure 4
Percent Choosing UC over a Non-UC by Net Cost among Students
with Parent Income Levels > \$100,000



The relationship between cost differences and choice patterns was also examined by ethnicity, controlling for income. The pattern of price sensitivity occurring only among lower income students faced with a price differential of \$5,000 or more held true for both underrepresented minorities (African Americans, Native Americans, Chicanos, & Latinos) and for non-underrepresented students (whites, Asian Americans, and others). Although underrepresented minorities chose UC less frequently than non-underrepresented students overall, they showed the same sensitivity to large price differences among lower income students and the same lack of price sensitivity among higher income students (Figures 5 and 6).

Figure 5
Percent Choosing UC over a Non-UC among Students
with Parent Income Levels <=\$60,000





Figure 6
Percent Choosing UC over a Non-UC among Students
with Parent Income Levels >\$60,000



Ratings of UC and the Non-UC Schools

In addition to providing information about financial aid offers from their top choice UC campus and their top choice non-UC school, students were asked to rate both schools on a number of other factors. There was relatively little difference in the average ratings of the UC and non-UC schools on many of the factors, including academic quality, prestige, and courses of study (Table 5). On average, students rated UC high on cost of attendance and low on personal attention relative to other institutions. UC also received higher average ratings on location and lower ratings on availability of affordable housing and financial aid. The low rating for financial aid likely reflects the lower amount of aid offered by UC relative to its higher cost competitors, rather than differences in the perception of net, or even out-of-pocket, costs.

Students generally rated the schools they chose more highly than their alternate choice. However, even UC-choosers rated UC more poorly on personal attention and availability of affordable housing. Among non-UC choosers, the non-UCs received a relatively high rating on financial aid, which offset a lower relative rating on cost of attendance. This pattern is consistent with the earlier finding that, for many students, private institutions tend to buy down a good portion of the higher cost with financial aid. The dimension on which UC choosers gave UC the greatest advantage was location. Among non-UC choosers, the chosen institutions received the widest margins on personal attention and social atmosphere.

Table 5
Average Ratings (1-7) Given to Top Choice UC and Non-UC
by Enrollment Choice, Ordered by Size of Difference in Overall Ratings
(Respondents Who Were Accepted to at Least One UC)

Rating Factor	All			Enrolling at UC			Enrolling at Non-UC		
	Top UC	Top Non-UC	Difference	Top UC	Top Non-UC	Difference	Top UC	Top Non-UC	Difference
Personal Attention	4.13	5.24	-1.11	4.48	4.94	-0.46	3.49	5.69	-2.20
Cost of Attendance	4.57	3.87	0.70	4.56	3.77	0.79	4.57	4.03	0.54
Location	5.17	4.73	0.44	5.52	4.40	1.12	4.53	5.25	-0.72
Financial Aid	3.23	3.66	-0.43	3.37	3.31	0.06	2.90	4.19	-1.29
Affordable Housing	3.89	4.32	-0.43	4.01	4.10	-0.09	3.62	4.67	-1.05
Academic Quality	5.43	5.16	0.27	5.68	4.85	0.83	4.98	5.65	-0.67
Prestige	5.19	4.96	0.23	5.41	4.66	0.75	4.77	5.44	-0.67
Ethnic composition	4.60	4.41	0.19	4.68	4.29	0.39	4.46	4.61	-0.15
Courses of Study	5.24	5.14	0.10	5.51	4.83	0.68	4.74	5.64	-0.90
Social Atmosphere	5.03	5.00	0.03	5.41	4.66	0.75	4.31	5.52	-1.21

Different ethnic groups tended to give different ratings to UC and non-UC on a number of factors (Appendix G). While most ethnic groups tended to rate the school they chose higher on the

academic factors (academic quality, courses of study, and prestige) as well as on location and overall social atmosphere, they tended to rate UC lower on personal attention to student and on the availability of affordable housing regardless of where they planned to enroll.

Factors Students Cited as Important in Choosing Schools

As noted in the previous section, students often chose to enroll at UC even when they rated UC lower on certain factors. In a separate section of the survey, students were asked to select all the factors that were important in their decision. These were not comparisons between the top UC and the top non-UC choice, but a reflection of how the students made their decision overall. As seen in Table 6, students most often cited academic quality (78%) and location (73%) when asked what was important in their decision to attend a particular college. In the previous section, it was reported that the average ratings of UC and non-UC on academic quality differed only modestly. However, this average reflects a relatively equal mix of high UC and high non-UC ratings rather than a lack of differentiation between the schools. Individual students clearly differentiated their options with regard to quality, and according to their own report, relied heavily on these perceived differences in their decisions. Cost of attendance and financial aid were cited less frequently (37% and 22%, respectively).

Students were also given the opportunity to write in other reasons that were important in their decision. Common write-in reasons included the following:

1. Specialized academic programs (e.g., co-op & early admission)
2. Sports programs (to participate and to watch)
3. Size of classes
4. Future employment opportunities
5. Family and/or friends in attendance
6. Religious affiliation

Table 6
Percent of Students Citing Various Factors as Reasons for Choosing School to Attend

	Overall	Rank
Academic quality	77.9%	1
Location of campus	72.5%	2
Courses of study offered	64.4%	3
Overall social atmosphere	64.2%	4
Prestige of school	56.4%	5
Cost of attending	36.7%	6
Personal attention	32.3%	7
Not accepted to 1st choice	30.3%	8
Ethnic composition	23.2%	9
Financial aid	21.5%	10
Affordable Housing	11.9%	11
Other	10.5%	12


The top factors cited by students of all income levels were academic quality and location; all income groups cited financial factors much less often (Table 6A). When examining cost and financial aid together, it appears that those in the lowest parent income group care more about these factors than those in the highest parent income group (Figure 7). Fifty-seven percent of

those in the lowest parent income group cited either cost or financial aid, compared to 43% of those with incomes over \$100,000. This is consistent with the earlier findings indicating greater price sensitivity among low-income students. Affordable housing was also cited more often by those in the lowest parent income group compared with those in the highest parent income group (15% & 10%, respectively); however, the difference was not as dramatic as it was for financial aid.

Table 6A
Percentage of Students Citing Various Factors as Important in Choosing School
by Parent Income Categories

	Overall	\$30K or less	\$30K-\$60K	\$60K-\$100K	\$100K or more
Academic quality	77.9%	72.8%	74.0%	76.6%	81.9%
Location of campus	72.5%	68.2%	69.8%	73.8%	75.5%
Courses of study offered	64.4%	60.3%	62.2%	63.6%	67.7%
Overall social atmosphere	64.2%	56.7%	59.0%	61.8%	70.6%
Prestige of school	56.4%	52.9%	54.3%	55.0%	59.7%
Cost of attending	36.7%	33.8%	37.0%	38.7%	36.9%
Personal attention	32.3%	30.2%	29.0%	31.1%	34.1%
Not accepted to 1st choice	30.3%	26.1%	29.8%	31.6%	31.8%
Ethnic composition	23.2%	27.0%	22.7%	23.9%	23.7%
Financial aid	21.5%	46.6%	31.4%	16.8%	8.0%
Affordable Housing	11.9%	15.2%	13.3%	10.2%	9.6%
Other	10.5%	8.5%	9.5%	11.1%	12.0%

Figure 7
Percent Citing Either Cost of Attendance or Amount of Financial Aid as an
Important Factor in Choosing College to Attend



There were also ethnic differences in the factors cited (Table 6B). Whites reported having considered cost of attendance (38%) more frequently than African Americans or Chicanos (31% and 32%, respectively) but cited financial aid much less frequently (16.0%) than African

Americans, Chicanos, or Latinos (36%, 35%, and 32%, respectively). This is likely due to the different income profiles of the various ethnic groups. Whites also cited affordable housing less often (12%) than African Americans, Chicano, or Latinos (16%, 15%, and 14%, respectively). Fewer whites reported that ethnic composition mattered (16%) than African Americans, Asian Americans, Chicanos, and Latinos (32%, 30%, 25%, and 24%, respectively). Conversely, whites cited academic quality (82%), location (78%), and social atmosphere (71%) more often than any other ethnic group. Asian Americans cited personal attention less (23%) than any other group, but cited not being accepted to first choice school at the highest rate (37%). African Americans, on the other hand, emphasized personal attention more often (40%) than any other group.

Table 6B
Percentage of Students Citing Various Factors as Important in Choosing School
by Ethnicity

	Overall	African American	American Indian	Asian	Chicano	Latino	White	Other
Academic quality	77.9%	75.5%	77.8%	75.9%	70.4%	74.0%	81.7%	78.9%
Location	72.5%	64.3%	69.4%	69.3%	69.1%	66.8%	77.5%	71.2%
Course of study offered	64.4%	62.4%	67.9%	62.1%	59.1%	62.4%	67.6%	65.0%
Overall social atmosphere	64.2%	57.9%	61.5%	58.7%	58.0%	61.7%	70.9%	63.0%
Prestige of school	56.4%	53.8%	55.0%	58.1%	50.4%	54.0%	56.2%	59.8%
Cost of attending	36.7%	30.5%	37.3%	35.8%	32.1%	36.8%	38.4%	38.5%
Personal attention	32.3%	40.2%	36.5%	22.6%	36.7%	39.7%	36.5%	31.3%
Not accepted to 1st choice	30.3%	24.8%	25.7%	36.9%	23.3%	24.9%	27.3%	34.8%
Ethnic composition	23.2%	31.5%	19.8%	30.1%	25.3%	23.8%	15.8%	27.0%
Financial aid	21.5%	35.8%	24.3%	23.0%	35.1%	31.9%	16.0%	17.6%
Affordable Housing	11.9%	16.2%	10.2%	10.9%	15.1%	14.0%	11.7%	10.2%
Other	10.5%	10.4%	12.9%	9.3%	8.9%	11.6%	11.5%	10.7%

Another way to look at these data is to consider what percentage of students chose UC when they thought a particular factor was important. Here, personal attention stands out (Figure 8). When respondents rated personal attention as one of the most important reasons for choosing a school, they were much less likely to attend UC (only 39% compared to 65% overall attending UC).

Among the financial factors, UC came out ahead when the cost of attendance was important (71% choosing UC vs. 65% overall) but UC was slightly less likely to be chosen when affordable housing or financial aid were considered important (60 % and 57%, respectively, vs. 65% overall). When the contrast was between UC and a private school, this pattern was even more marked (Figure 9). When students were comparing UC and CSU, however, the reverse was true (Figure 10). They were more likely to choose UC if they had cited aid as a factor but more likely to choose CSU if they had cited cost.

Figure 8

**If Factor Cited as Important, Percent Choosing UC Over Non-UC
(among Respondents Admitted to at Least One Non-UC School)**




Figure 9

**If Factor Cited as Important, Percent Choosing UC Over Private
(among Respondents Whose Top Choice Non-UC Was a Private School)**





Figure 10

**If Factor Cited as Important, Percent Choosing UC Over CSU
(among Respondents Whose Top Choice Non-UC Was a CSU)**



Conclusions

The reasons that students choose to attend one college versus another are numerous. Financial aid packages do play a role in some but not all of these decisions. Overall, it appears that UC's undergraduate financial aid packages are competitive with those offered by non-UC institutions. After all gift aid is considered, UC has a substantial cost advantage over private schools while CSU has only a modest cost advantage over UC. Both CSU and private schools appear to be targeting lower income students with financial aid dollars in a similar fashion to UC. Lower income students appear to weigh cost and aid issues more heavily in their decisions than higher income students, a finding which reinforces the necessity of continuing current policies that focus on need-based aid.

For different ethnic groups, there are also different reasons for attending one college or another. Asian Americans cited personal attention less frequently than other groups and chose UC more often than any other group. Chicanos, on the other hand, placed more emphasis on financial issues and chose CSU more often than other ethnic groups. African Americans cited personal attention more often than other groups and chose out-of state privates more often than any other group. This suggests that attracting a diverse student body requires addressing different issues for different ethnic groups.

Further analysis of the survey data is planned. In particular, a logistic regression analysis that includes ratings of UC and non-schools on the various factors that affect enrollment choice should help quantify how many additional students UC might expect to enroll if additional financial aid dollars were available. Additionally, the regression analysis should allow an evaluation of how increases in expected enrollment might be maximized by targeting additional support dollars in various ways (e.g., on students with parent income less than \$30,000).