

## The Onus of Student Debt: Who is Most Impacted by the Rising Cost of Higher Education?

Mary Beal

Mary O. Borg

Harriet A. Stranahan\*

### Abstract

With an average undergraduate student accumulating debt of over \$37,000, burdens like these have the potential to fray the social and economic fabric of the country. Using a sample of over 13,000 undergraduate students at a large comprehensive university, we estimate a selection bias corrected OLS regression to determine student characteristics and programs that best predict student loan debt. Our results suggest that the decision to take on student debt and the amount of debt accrued does differ based upon demographic characteristics and major of study. Not surprisingly, the results suggest that students with greater support from home have lower debt burdens. Finally the model shows a strong impact of Florida's Bright Futures Scholarships (FBF) on student debt burdens. Whereas previous research suggested that FBF benefit higher socioeconomic groups, our model suggests that lower income scholarship recipients benefit more in terms of reduced accumulated loan debt.

**Keywords:** Microeconomics, Public Finance, Student Loan Debt

### Introduction

Student loan debt in the US threatens the future of the current generation of American workers. Students leaving college today are burdened with the highest levels of student debt in recorded history. The statistics are frightening: 44.2 million people in the US have student loan debt, total student loan debt is over \$1.3 trillion, second only to housing debt in the US and over \$32 billion of the debt balance is currently in default. The average student who graduated in 2016 has a debt burden of over \$37,000, with some two million of those borrowers having debt levels exceeding \$100,000 (Friedman, 2017).

Debt burdens like these have the potential to fray the social and economic fabric of the entire country. According to a survey conducted by the American Society of Realtors and the non-profit American Student Assistance, millennials report that they have delayed purchasing homes, changing jobs, saving for retirement, and even getting married and starting families because of their high debt burdens (National Association of Realtors, 2017). Whether these survey results will cause long run changes in home ownership, job mobility, and marriage and fertility rates remain to be seen, but they certainly reflect the degree of societal angst that this generation feels. An angst that is made even greater by the fact that student loan debt is the only kind of debt that cannot be discharged in bankruptcy proceedings.

Given the societal problems that student debt can cause, we would like to know who is most likely to acquire the amount of student loans that lead to this heavy debt burden. The burden of student debt is not distributed randomly. It affects some socioeconomic and demographic groups more than others. Therefore, in this paper, we examine the individual factors that cause some students to take on more debt than others.

### **I. Literature Review**

Researchers have studied student debt for many years. Much of the research looks at how heavy debt burdens limit student opportunities after they graduate. For example, Baum and Sanders (1998) found that the students with the highest levels of debt were less likely to go to graduate or professional school after graduation. Millet (2003) found that highly indebted students were more likely to live with their parents after graduation and were not able to move to other cities to further their education or find better employment. Baum and O'Malley (2002) found that heavily indebted students were not as likely to buy homes and cars as their less-indebted counterparts. These studies used data from the 1990s before student debt burdens started to rise rapidly. After the recession of 2001-2002 and especially after the financial crisis of 2008, states and the federal government significantly reduced higher education funding and financial aid, making the debt burdens that students acquired in the 2000s exponentially bigger than the already troublesome debt loads of the 1990s. In fact, student loan debt was the only type of debt that continued to rise during the severe deleveraging that took place following the financial crisis of 2008.

Not surprisingly, more recent studies of the consequences of student debt find even more disturbing results. For example, Despard, Perantie, Taylor, Grinstein-Weiss, Friedline, and Raghavan (2016) found that debtors from low and moderate-income households had a 51% higher probability of experiencing material hardships, a 19% higher probability of experiencing medical hardships and a 27% higher probability of experiencing financial difficulty after graduation than their counterparts without student debt.

Who are the students most affected by these unprecedented debt levels and the serious consequences they often entail? Less research has examined this issue, but the research that has been done is consistent. The students most likely to suffer from crippling debt after college are those who are least able to afford college, but the ones who have the most to gain from it – students from lower socio-economic (SES) households and students of non-white races.

Several recent studies show that African American students take on heavier student debt burdens than their counterparts from other races (Price, 2004; Jackson and Reynolds, 2013; Goldrick-Rab, Kelchen, and Houle, 2014; Houle, 2014; Grinstein-Weiss, Perantie, Taylor, Guo, and Raghavan, 2016). In fact, Jackson and Reynolds (2013) have ambivalent feelings about student debt for black students. Although, they believe it is essential to level the playing field for disadvantaged students who otherwise could not attend college, they are distressed by the fact that black students disproportionately have higher student debt loads, are more likely to acquire debt and not finish college, and are more likely to default on their loans. This suggests that student loans are not reducing racial inequality in college attendance as much as other forms of income-based financial aid such as grants-in-aid could.

Kim, Chatterjee, Young, and Moon (2016) find that student loan debt is substantially higher for black young adults even though they are less likely to attend college. They attribute this to the large wealth gap between the percentage of white households in the 4th quartile of family wealth (39%) and the percentage of black families (8%) in that quartile. Houle (2014) concludes that the higher debt burden born by black students is a premium they must pay in addition to the cost of college attendance because of the significantly smaller family contributions they receive for

their college expenses. Grinstein-Weiss et al. (2016) use a unique dataset that includes only low and moderate-income households, and even within this uniform sample, blacks are twice as likely as their white counterparts to have student debt. Among the students in the sample who have debt, the average amount of debt held by black students is \$7721 more than the debt of the non-black students.

Some studies indicate that Hispanic students are more likely to be loan averse (Callender and Jackson, 2005) than white or Asian students. Yet despite this, a study by Elliot and Lewis (2015) found that 77% of Hispanic college graduates had student debt compared to 64% of white graduates and 59% of Asian graduates. Only black students surpassed them with 82% having student debt upon graduation (Elliot and Lewis, 2015). A study by Gross, Torres, and Zerquera (2013) examined the effect of various forms of financial aid on the graduation rates of students in Indiana. They put particular emphasis on the effect that student aid had on Hispanic students because many of them were new arrivals in Indiana. Like the study by Elliot and Lewis (2015), they found the percentage of Hispanic students receiving loans (41%) was second only to that of black students (52.8%). However, they also found that increases in the amount of student loans acquired by Black and Hispanic students actually increased the stop-rate<sup>1</sup> of these students; whereas; grants in aid increased their graduation rates. Other studies have also found that high levels of student debt reduce graduation rates for low-income students (Kim (2007); Dwyer et al. (2012)). Thus, the form of financial aid may be critically important in helping under-represented populations achieve a college degree.

The socio-economic status of the student's household, which includes both income and parents' education, affects a student's probability of attending college and the probability of acquiring student debt during that process. As expected, there is an inverse relationship between parents' income and the amount of student debt that their children acquire (Houle (2014)). This is because higher income households have been shown to provide more money for their children's education (Choy and Berker, 2003), to save more for their children's college education (Steelman and Powell (1991)), and to spend more for the room and board and social activities of their college-age children (Schoeni and Ross, 2005).

Similarly, higher parental education levels are also associated with lower levels of student debt (Houle (2014)). One reason may be because more highly educated parents are better equipped to navigate the labyrinth of financial aid forms and scholarship applications that accompany college attendance (Hossler and Vesper (1993)), and they are also more aware of true college costs and tuition discounting schemes (Grodsky and Jones (2007)). More educated parents are also more likely to financially plan, save, and go into debt for their children's college educations (Charles, Roscigno, and Torres (2007); Steelman and Powell (1991); Cha, Weagley, and Reynolds (2005)). In addition, students with highly educated parents are more likely to qualify for merit-based scholarships which have proliferated at the same time that financially-based grants-in-aid have declined (Borg and Stranahan (2004), Heller (2006), Borg and Borg (2007)). Chen and Wiederspan (2014) find that the amount of merit-based aid given by the state does reduce student debt burdens but only in Georgia, where the HOPE scholarship amount of merit aid is so large that it is three standard deviations above the US average. When they removed Georgia from their analysis, the effect disappeared. Thus, there are many reasons that students from high SES

---

1 A "Stop-out" is a period of non-enrollment or temporary withdraws will re-enrollment at a later date.

households acquire less student debt over their educational careers than their less-advantaged counterparts.

However, there is a caveat to the relationship between SES and student debt levels. Many scholars speculate that the relationship is non-linear and leads to what they call a “middle-class squeeze” (Choy and Berker (2003); Chen and Zerquera (2011); Clawson and Leiblum, (2008); Houle (2014)). Pell grants and most other forms of need-based financial aid go to the poorest low-income families. In fact, 75% of Pell grants go to households with annual incomes of \$30,000 or less (Protopsaltis and Parrott (2017)). This does not include most households considered middle-class since the median income in the US was over \$57,000 in 2017 (US Census (2017)). Another reason that middle class students may acquire greater student debt burdens than their poorer counterparts is because they are more likely to attend higher cost elite colleges (Baum and Saunders (1998); Choy and Carroll (2000); Gladieux and Perna (2005)) and they are more likely to go on to graduate and professional schools after college (Alexander, Holupka, and Pallas (1987); Grodsky and Jackson (2009)). If these speculations are correct, then the relationship between household SES and student debt burden may be an upside-down U. Students in the middle range of income may have greater debt burdens than their counterparts at the lower-end of the income distribution who receive more income-based financial aid as well as more debt than students at the upper-end of the income distribution whose families have more income and assets to pay for college and post-graduate education. This is an interesting question which we hope our study can answer.

Another interesting relationship that our data allow us to explore is how student debt levels are related to merit-based forms of financial aid. As mentioned above, students from higher SES households are more likely to receive merit-based aid like the Florida Bright Futures scholarship and Georgia’s HOPE scholarship, which should keep their student debt levels lower than non-scholarship recipients. However, Goetz, Mimura, Desai, and Cude (2008) provide evidence that students who begin college with HOPE scholarships but then lose them have higher student loan debt and higher credit card debt than students who retain their HOPE scholarships. Therefore, the effects of these scholarships may be more nuanced than originally thought. For marginal students who are not able to keep the scholarship, the scholarship may be a mixed blessing. If they lose the scholarships but want to continue their educations, they have no choice but to take out student loans.

Our study will explore how student debt levels are related to pre-paid college plans. We could find no research that specifically examined the relationship between having a pre-paid college plan and a student’s level of education debt. Nam and Ansong (2015) did find evidence that dedicated education savings accounts, which are not pre-paid plans but are designed to be used for education expenses, increase the likelihood of acquiring a degree. However, Pressman and Scott (2017) find that most dedicated education savings accounts are held by wealthier households because the tax advantages are more lucrative to high income earners. For this reason, they are less likely to affect the college outcomes of low and middle-income college students. However, our results should be of interest to researchers because pre-paid college plans are acquired less for their tax advantages and more for their ability to freeze the price increases associated with a college education. Thus, they are likely to be a more attractive college savings

vehicle for low and middle-income households. If this is true, they may affect the college debt levels of the students in our study.

## **II. Data**

The analysis uses a sample of 13,643 students from a comprehensive 4-year state university in Florida to predict the total amount of (education) loan debt that students have at time of graduation (between 2008-2014). All students in the sample completed the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) making them all credit market participants. However, only 66% of them (9,070 students) ended up taking out student loans and accumulating debt at the time of graduation. The mean debt accumulation for the sub-sample of debtors was just over \$18,000. The data set includes detailed financial and demographic information from the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), application information from the institution, as well as information on Florida Bright Futures Scholarship awards (FBF) and Pre Paid College Fund (FLPrepay).

Table I shows the descriptive statistics for both the entire sample of (education) credit market participants as well as for the sub-sample of students who took out loans and accumulated student loan debt. The categorical variables have been converted into dummy variables so the mean represents the proportion of the sample that possesses each characteristic. For example, 62% of the sample is female for both all students and among those who take on debt. Age, loan debt and income are continuous variables. The average age of 23-24 at graduation indicates the student population is a bit older than expected but this is usual for a regional university where many students are married and work full time while attending college. Average family income is \$68,000 for the sample as whole and averages \$58,000 for those 66% of students who take out student loan debt. Fully, 42% of all students are not dependent upon their parents for financial support, and 60% of them have transferred from another community college or institution. This institution attracts students who maybe the first in their families to go to college and many put themselves through school working full time and, in some cases, taking on debt to complete their degrees. These students are the types of students who could be adversely affected by increases in the cost of tuition and by reductions in federal, state and institutional forms of financial aid.

The descriptive statistics show that two-thirds of the students have loan debt at graduation but in many ways, students who take on loan debt are not much different than the sample as a whole in terms of ethnicity, age, gender and major choice. There is evidence that students with loan debt are less likely to be dependent of a family and more likely to be married and have children at home than the sample overall. Not surprisingly, they also have lower average family incomes and are less likely to have a Florida Bright Futures Scholarship or a Florida Prepaid College fund. The descriptive statistics show that compared to the overall sample, students who take out loans seem to have more responsibilities and fewer resources to draw on while completing their degrees.

This study provides new information about how the burden of college debt differs across students' income, ethnicity and socioeconomic circumstances. In addition, the results shed new light on whether state sponsored programs such as Florida Prepaid Fund or Florida Bright Futures help mitigate (in-state) student debt burdens.

### III. Methodology

In estimating the determinants of accumulated student loan debt we are faced with the problem that we only observed total debt for students who are willing and able to take out loans. One concern when modeling student loan debt accumulation is sample selection bias, since selection into having student loans is nonrandom, and failing to account for this may result in biased estimates if underlying, unmeasured characteristics determine both who takes out loans and the amount they take out. In order to address this issue, we adopt the standard (two-step) approach of a sample selection correction model which was first proposed by Heckman (1976, 1979).

The first step of this model isolates the factors associated with holding debt (the decision to take out a loan) whereas the second step investigates the different characteristics of only the debt holders (positive total loan debt). In stage 1 (selection stage), borrowing is a binary dependent variable that is equal to 1 if the student took out any student loans and 0 otherwise. A probit regression model is used in the selection stage to identify the likelihood of taking out a loan as follows:

$$Prob(Loan\ Yes_i = 1 | X_i) = \Phi(X_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i)$$

where  $Loan\ Yes_i$  is a binary variable equal to 1 if student  $i$  took out any student loan and 0 otherwise,  $X_i'$  is a vector of individual and household characteristics of student  $i$  and  $\varepsilon_i$  is the error term.  $\phi$  is the standard normal probability density function and  $\Phi$  is the standard normal cumulative distribution function. Following Greene (2003), the inverse mills ratio is then calculated for each observation as follows:

$$\lambda_i = \frac{\phi(X_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i)}{\Phi(X_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i)}$$

In stage 2 (outcome stage), the amount of student loan debt at the time of graduation is estimated (for only students who took out loans) using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis as follow:

$$Y_i = \beta_o + x_1\beta_1 + x_2\beta_2 + \dots + x_k\beta_k + \varepsilon_i = X_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i$$

where  $Y_i$  is the total amount of accumulated student loan debt at graduation for student  $i$ ;  $X_i'$  is a vector of individual and household level characteristics for student  $i$  including the inverse mills ratio;  $\beta$  is a vector of coefficients to be estimated; and  $\varepsilon_i$  is an error term. When using the Heckman selection method it is desirable to exclude at least one variable that is included in the selection equation from the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage regression or the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage model is likely to suffer from collinearity problems (although it is technically identified). The criteria for a variable being excluded is that it is correlated with the decision of whether or not the student takes out a loan but has no direct impact on the level of accumulated debt that a student takes on. The EFC vs. COA variable is used as the exclusion restriction in our models. It is a binary variable equal to 1 if the effective family contribution towards education expenses (EFC) is greater than the estimated cost of attendance (COA) and 0 otherwise. These values are estimates based on information put on the FSFA. Those with an EFC that is greater than the COA will be less likely to take out loans (due to lack of need and increased chance of federal loan denial). However, it is unlikely that whether or not the EFC is greater than the COA impacts debt accumulation. In addition to this argument, we find that when EFC vs. COA is included in the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage regression they are insignificant (there inclusion affects other estimates indicating likely collinearity problems).

#### IV. Empirical Results

The results of the 1<sup>st</sup> stage probit model and 2<sup>nd</sup> stage OLS models are shown in Table II. The probit model estimates the likelihood of a student taking out a loan, while the 2<sup>nd</sup> Stage OLS regression predicts total amount of loans that a student accumulates by the end of his or her college career, given that the student takes out student loans.

The results suggest that the decision to take out a loan and the amount of accumulated student debt are influenced by age and race variables, but the effects differ depending upon the decision being made. For example, age affects the decision to take out a loan, but not the amount of debt accumulated. Older students are indeed more likely to take out student loans, but total student loan burdens at graduation are similar across age groups. As reflected in other studies, loan debt differs significantly across ethnicity. African American students in our sample are more likely to take out student loans, but total debt is less than Whites. Hispanic and Other Ethnicity students are equally likely to take out loans overall but tend to accumulate less debt overall as compared to Whites. Asian students in our sample are significantly less likely to take on student loans during college. Among Asian students who do take out loans, total loan debt owed is not different than Whites. These results suggest there may be diversity of social capital available across different ethnic and racial groups. Researchers have noted a strong network of support in the extended families of Asian American households (Kim and McHenry (1998)), and other research suggests a lack of financial support available in low income African American and Hispanic households (Lee and Aytac (1998)).

There seems to be significant variation in the level of family support across students in our study and this may affect student's ability to support themselves while in school and even repay the loans later. Our results show that family income is an important determinant of student loan amounts: students from higher income households are less likely to take out loans, but if they do take out loans, students from higher income households end up with slightly higher loan debt. The importance of family income may come down to whether the student is classified as a dependent (receiving family support) or independent (not receiving support). We find that students who are independent are significantly more likely to have student loan debt and have much higher debt levels overall at graduation. Our results suggest that independent students shoulder 28%<sup>2</sup> more student loan debt than other students with family support, all else equal. In our sample about 15% of the students are married and about 15% have children. The results show the presence of children does not impact the likelihood or amount of loan debt, nor does whether a student is married. In this study the support network provided within marriage has no significant effect on student debt.

The Florida Prepaid College fund is a strong indicator of family support. Our results suggest that students with more Florida Prepaid College funds are less likely to take out student loans however, if they do, surprisingly loan debt is higher at graduation. Although highly significant, these effects seem to be small in magnitude.

---

<sup>2</sup> The average student with loans has a balance of \$12,000 at graduation. The coefficient on Dependent implies a higher loan balance of \$3400 at graduation for Independent students, or a 28% higher debt burden on average, all else equal.

Students who are transfers from another college are more likely to take out student loans, but the amount of student debt at graduation is significantly less, about 50% less<sup>3</sup>, than students who entered the university as first-time freshman. These results suggest that if students need loans as first-time freshmen, starting out at a local community and transferring to a university later may be an effective path that significantly reduces student loan burdens over the long term. Perhaps in anticipation of future income gains, our results suggest that loan debt differs across major. Engineering students accrue higher amounts of loan debt than Business students, whereas Health and Education majors accrue significantly less than Business students. Overall, these results suggest that student debt varies significantly by major colleges, all else equal.

The Florida Bright Futures Scholarship (FBF) is a popular merit based scholarship program that pays more than 500 million dollars annually to nearly 100,000 FBF scholarship recipients. FBF pays up to 100 percent of tuition at 28 state colleges and universities with the amount varying based upon academic achievement in high school and academic progress in college. Our results suggest that students who receive higher amounts in merit based scholarships are less likely to take out loans and take out significantly less student debt overall. At the means of the data, every dollar increase in Florida Bright Futures Scholarship is associated with a reduction of student loan debt of \$0.16<sup>4</sup>. Moreover, the results suggest that FBF has the greatest impact on lower income households loan burden. Students from lower income households that receive FBF have lower loan debt at graduation than FBF recipients from higher income households.

## V. Conclusion

The results suggest that the decision to take on student debt and the amount of debt accrued does differ based upon demographic characteristics and major. Interestingly, all students require the same amount of credit hours to graduate in all colleges, yet debt levels differ significantly by major. Our study suggests that Engineering students and Business majors are willing to take on higher debt levels than students in the college of Education. This may be readily explained by higher anticipated income after graduation for engineering than for Education graduates. Ethnicity, age and other factors are also associated with student's willingness to take on loan debt. For example, similar to other studies on student debt, we find that Blacks are more likely to take on loans to help pay for college, but interestingly they tend to accrue lower total amounts of debt than their counterparts in our study. Hispanics on the other hand are not less likely to take out loans, but when they do, they take out significantly less debt. Model results for some of the other variables suggest that students with greater support from home have lower debt burdens. For example, students who are dependent on parental help, have a Florida Prepaid Fund or are married are either less likely to take out loans or if they do, the amount of debt accrued is significantly less. Following this ample family support argument, one might expect students from higher income households would not have to borrow as much to attend college. Interestingly, students from higher income households are both more likely to incur debt and accrue slightly greater amounts.

Finally, the model shows a strong impact of Florida's Bright Futures Scholarships (FBF) on student debt burdens. Whereas previous research suggested that FBF benefit higher socioeconomic groups, our model suggests that lower income groups benefit more in terms of

---

<sup>3</sup> The coefficient on Transfer is -6,000 which represents a 50% reduction from the average of \$12,000.

<sup>4</sup> Partial derivative at means of the data  $\text{Income}1000=58$ .

reduced loan debt. Our results suggest FBF recipients are less likely to take out loans and take out significantly less student debt overall. The impact of FBF is significant; we find that every dollar increase in Florida Bright Futures Scholarship is associated with a reduction of student loan debt of \$0.16. This is a significant benefit for students who receive these scholarships and the model suggests the benefits are even greater for lower income households who avoid even more debt per scholarship dollar earned.

**Table I. Variable Explanations and Descriptive Statistics**

Variable	MEAN for the entire sample of student graduates that completed the FAFSA (n=13,643)	MEAN for the sub-sample of student graduates who took out a loan & accumulated debt (n=9,070)
TOTAL LOAN DEBT at the time of graduation	12019	18079
LOAN_YES=1 if student has loans and 0 otherwise	0.66	1
INC1000 is household income in 1000's	68.09	58.30
AGE is student age at graduation	23.76	24.25
FEMALE= 1 if student is female and 0 otherwise	0.62	0.63
ASIAN = 1 if student is Asian and 0 otherwise	0.05	0.04
BLK =1 if student is Black and 0 otherwise	0.12	0.15
HISP=1 if student is Hispanic and 0 otherwise	0.08	0.08
OTHER = if student is any other Ethnicity and 0 otherwise	0.03	0.03
WHITE =1 if student is white and 0 otherwise	0.72	0.70
DEPENDENT =1 if student is a dependent of family and 0 otherwise	0.58	0.50
MARRIED=1 if student is married and 0 otherwise	0.13	0.15
CHILDREN=1 if student has children at home and 0 otherwise	0.12	0.15
TRANSFER = 1 if student did not start as a first time freshman but transferred in from another institution and 0 otherwise	0.61	0.68
HEALTH =1 if student graduated in college of health and 0 otherwise	0.15	0.15
BUSINESS = 1 if student earned a business degree and 0 otherwise	0.17	0.16
ENGINEER =1 if student earned an engineering degree and 0 otherwise	0.07	0.07
ARTSCI = 1 if student earned an arts & sciences degree and 0 otherwise	0.48	0.48
EDUC = 1 if student earned an education degree and 0 otherwise	0.12	0.13
FBF = amount of award for Florida Bright Futures scholarships in dollars (there are different levels of awards)	2956	2478
FBFyes = 1 if student had any level of Florida Bright Futures Scholarship and 0 otherwise	0.50	0.39

FLPREPAY = amount of Florida prepaid credit in dollars	796	556
FLPREPAYyes = 1 if student has any level of Florida prepaid credits and 0 otherwise	0.12	0.09
EFC>COA=1 if the effective family contribution (EFC) is greater than the cost of attendance (COA) and 0 otherwise	0.23	n/a

**Table II. Model Results**

Stage 1: PROBIT RESULTS (Probability of Taking Out a Loan)		Stage 2: OLS RESULTS of Total Debt at Graduation for students that took out loans	
	Marginal Effects		Coefficients
INC1000	-0.000154** (0.0000781)	INC1000	18.41*** (4.202)
-----	-----	INC_FBF	0.00541*** (0.000704)
AGE	0.0155*** (0.00188)	AGE	20.81 (46.97)
MALE	-0.00951 (0.00932)	MALE	118.3 (267.9)
ASIAN	-0.133*** (0.0204)	ASIAN	54.30 (745.1)
BLK	0.135*** (0.0120)	BLK	-1,035** (505.7)
HISP	0.00510 (0.0152)	HISP	-835.0* (434.0)
OTHER	-0.00719 (0.0238)	OTHER	408.4 (671.0)
DEPENDENT	-0.0740*** (0.0130)	DEPENDENT	-3,447*** (434.7)
MARRIED	0.00155 (0.0160)	MARRIED	-579.1 (396.2)
CHILDREN	0.00263 (0.0166)	CHILDREN	17.29 (393.9)
TRANSFER	0.0545*** (0.0109)	TRANSFER	-6,037*** (379.4)
HEALTH	0.0346** (0.0143)	HEALTH	-858.0** (436.3)
ENGINEER	0.00223 (0.0184)	ENGINEER	1,197** (544.6)
ARTSCI	0.0411*** (0.0116)	ARTSCI	-292.6 (359.9)
EDUC	0.0775***	EDUC	-1,029**

	(0.0145)		(500.0)
FBF	-0.00000401*** (0.00000139)	FBF	-0.453*** (0.0665)
FLPREPAY	-0.0000108*** (0.00000157)	FLPREPAY	0.133** (0.0667)
EFC>COA	-0.123*** (0.0130)	invmill	-16,139*** (2,061)
		Constant	30,945*** (1,992)
Observations	13,643	Observations	9,070
		Adj. R-squared	0.0777

Standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

### References

- Alexander, K., Holupka, S., & Pallas, A., 1987, Social background and academic determinants of two-year versus four-year college attendance: Evidence from two cohorts a decade apart, *American Journal of Education*, 96, 56-80.
- Baum, S., & O'Malley, M., 2003, College on credit: How borrowers perceive their education debt, *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 33(3), 7-19.
- Baum, S., and Saunders, D., 1998, *Life after debt: Results of the national student loan survey* (Braintree, MA: Nellie Mae Foundation).
- Borg, R., & Borg, M., 2007, The reverse Robin Hood effect: The distribution of net benefits from the Florida Bright Futures Scholarship, *Florida Political Chronicle*, 18, 1-8.
- Callender, C., & Jackson, J., 2005, Does the fear of debt deter students from higher education, *Journal of Social Policy*, 34(4), 509–540.
- Cha, K., Weagley, R. & Reynolds, L., 2005, Parental borrowing for dependent children's higher education, *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 26, 299-321.
- Charles, C., Roscigno, V. & Torres, K., 2007, Racial inequality and college attendance: The mediating role of parental investments. *Social Science Research*, 36, 329-52.
- Chen, J., & Zerquera, D., 2011. Unmet financial need and college persistence of middle-income students, in *Annual Meetings of the Association for Education Finance and Policy*, (Association for Education Finance and Policy, Seattle, WA).
- Chen, R., & Wiederspan, M., 2016, Understanding the determinants of debt burden among college graduates, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(4), 565-598.
- Choy, S., & Berker, A., 2003. How families of low- and middle-income undergraduates pay for college: Full-time dependent students in 1999-2000 (National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, DC).
- Choy, S., & Carroll, C., 2000. Debt burden four years after college. (National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, DC).
- Clawson, D., & Leiblum, M., 2008, Class struggle in higher education, *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 41, 12-30.
- Despard, M., Perantie, D., Taylor, S., Grinstein-Weiss, M., Friedline, T. & Raghavan, R., 2016,

- Student debt and hardship: Evidence from a large sample of low- and moderate-income households, *Children and Youth Services Review*, 70, 8-18.
- Dwyer, R., McCloud, L., R Hodson, R., 2012, Debt and graduation from American universities, *Social Forces*, 90(4), 1133–1155.
- Elliott, W., & Lewis, M. K., 2015. *The real college debt crisis: How student borrowing threatens financial well-being and erodes the American dream* (Praeger Publishers, Santa Barbara, California).
- Friedman, Z., 2017, Student loan debt in 2017: A \$1.3 trillion crisis. *Forbes*. Retrieved March 19, 2018 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/zackfriedman/2017/02/21/student-loan-debt-statistics-2017/#c4bfa365daba>
- Gladieux, L., & Perna, L., 2005, Borrowers who drop out: A neglected aspect of the college student loan trend (The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, Washington, DC).
- Goetz, J., Mimura, Y., Desai, M., & Cude, B., 2008, HOPE or no-HOPE: Merit-based college scholarship status and financial behaviors among college students, *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 19 (1), 12-19.
- Goldrick-Rab, S., Kelchen, R., & Houle, J., 2014, The color of education debt: Implications of federal loan program reforms for Black students and Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Retrieved March 7, 2018 from University of Wisconsin-Madison, Wisconsin HOPE Lab website <http://wihopelab.com/publications/Goldrick-Rab%20Kelchen%20Houle%202014.pdf>
- Grinstein-Weiss. M., Perantie, D., Taylor, S., Guo, S., T. & Raghavan, R., 2016, Racial disparities in education debt burden among low- and moderate-income households, *Children and Youth Services Review*, 65, 166-174.
- Grodsky, E., & Jackson, E., 2009, Social stratification in higher education, *Teachers College Record*, 111, 2347-84.
- Grodsky, E., and Jones, M., 2007, Real and imagined barriers to college entry: Perceptions of cost. *Social Science Research*, 36 (2), 745-766.
- Gross, J., Torres, V., & Zerquera, D., 2013, Financial aid and attainment among students in a state with changing demographics, *Research in Higher Education*, 54(4), 383–406.
- Heller, D., 2006, Merit aid and college access, In *Symposium on the Consequences of Merit-Based Student Aid*, (University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education). Retrieved February, 19, 2018 from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.544.2863&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Hossler, D., & Vesper, N., 2016, An exploratory study of the factors associated with parental saving for postsecondary education, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(2), 140-165.
- Houle, J., 2014, Disparities in debt: Parent’s socioeconomic resources and young adult student loan debt, *Sociology of Education*, 87(1), 53-69.
- Jackson, B. & Reynolds, J., 2013, The price of opportunity: Race, student loan debt, and college achievement. *Sociological Inquiry*, 83, 335-68.
- Kim, D., 2007, The effect of loans on students' degree attainment: Differences by student and institutional characteristics, *Harvard Educational Review*, 77(1), 64-100.
- Kim, J., Chatterjee, S., Young J., & Moon, U., 2016, The cost of access: Racial disparities in student loan burdens of young adults, *College Student Journal*, 51(1), 99-116.

- Millett, C., 1993, How undergraduate loan debt affects application and enrollment in graduate or first professional school, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(4), 386-427.
- Nam, J., & Ansong, D., 2015, The effects of a dedicated education savings account on children's college graduation. *Economics of Education Review*, 48, 198-207.
- National Association of Realtors, 2017, Student loan debt and housing report 2017: When debt holds you back. Retrieved from <https://www.nar.realtor/research-and-statistics/research-reports/student-loan-debt-and-housing-report>.
- Price, D., 2004, Educational debt burden among student borrowers: An examination of the Baccalaureate and Beyond Panel, 1997 follow-up. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(7), 701-737.
- Schoeni, R., & Ross, K., 2005, Material assistance from families during the transition to adulthood, in R. Settersten, Furstenberg, F. & Rumbaut, R., eds.: *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy*. (University of Chicago Press).
- Protopsaltis, S. & Parrott, S., 2017, July 27, Pell grants - a key tool for expanding college access and economic opportunity - need strengthening, not cuts. The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities. Retrieved from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-budget/pell-grants-a-key-tool-for-expanding-college-access-and-economic-opportunity>.
- Steelman, L. & Powell, B., 1991, Sponsoring the next generation: Parental willingness to pay for higher education, *American Journal of Sociology*, 96,1505-29.
- Stranahan, H. & Borg, M., 2004, Some futures are brighter than others: The net benefits received by Florida Bright Futures recipients, *Public Finance Review*, 32(1), 105-126.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2017, Median household income in the United States. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2017/comm/income-map.html>.

## **Authors**

### **Mary Beal**

Instructor, University of North Florida, University of North Florida, University of North Florida,  
[M.Beal@unf.edu](mailto:M.Beal@unf.edu)

### **Mary O. Borg**

Professor, University of North Florida, University of North Florida, University of North Florida,  
[Mary.Borg@unf.edu](mailto:Mary.Borg@unf.edu)

### **Harriet A. Stranahan\***

Professor, University of North Florida, University of North Florida, University of North Florida,  
[Harriet.Stranahan@unf.edu](mailto:Harriet.Stranahan@unf.edu)

\*corresponding author