



**The Economic Benefits of International Education to the United States for the 2004-2005 Academic Year:
A Statistical Analysis**

NAFSA estimates that foreign students and their dependents contributed approximately \$13.29 billion to the U.S. economy during the 2004-2005 academic year. This conservative figure is based on tuition figures from the College Board, enrollment figures from the Institute of International Education's *Open Doors 2005* report, living expenses calculated from College Board figures and analysis of the data by Lynn Schoch and Jason Baumgartner at Indiana University – Bloomington's Office of International Services.

NAFSA's annual *Economic Impact Statements* estimate the amount of money foreign students bring to the United States to support their education. This report does not rely on a "multiplier effect." Although this might provide a more accurate estimate of actual economic impact, there is no consensus on the appropriate size of such a multiplier. Along with our partners at the Institute of International Education, the College Board, and Indiana University, we are committed to continuing efforts to improve our data and methodology. By any measure, international education makes a significant contribution to the U.S. economy.

Arkansas

Total Number of Foreign Students: 2,784

Part 1: Net Contribution to State Economy by Foreign Students (2004-05)

Contribution from Tuition and Fees to State Economy:		\$29,203,000
Contribution from Living Expenses:		\$37,316,000
Total Contribution by Foreign Students:		\$66,519,000
Less U.S. Support of 28.7%	-	\$19,100,000
Plus Dependents' Living Expenses:	+	\$1,412,000

Net Contribution to State Economy by Foreign Students and their Families:

\$48,831,000

Part 2: Contribution to State Economy by Foreign Students' Dependents (2004-05)

Spouses' Contribution

Percent of Married Students:	9.7%
Percent of Spouses in the U.S.:	85.0%
Number of Spouses in the U.S.:	271
Additional Expenses for a Spouse: (% of student living expenses)	25.0%
Spouses' Contribution:	\$953,000

Children's Contribution

Number of Couples in the U.S.:	271
Number of Children per Couple:	0.6
Number of Children in the U.S.:	163
Additional Expenses for a Child: (% of student living expenses)	20.0%
Children's Contribution:	\$459,000

Net Contribution to State Economy by Foreign Students' Dependents:

\$1,412,000

Part 3: Foreign Student Contribution from Tuition/Fees and Living Expenses (2004-05)

Institution and City	# of Foreign Students	Tuition and Fees (thousands)	Living Expenses and Dependents (thousands)	Less U.S. Support (thousands)	Total Contribution (thousands)
Arkansas State University, Beebe	15	\$49.5	\$207.1	\$12.8	\$243.9
Arkansas State University, Jonesboro	235	\$2,438.7	\$2,844.3	\$683.8	\$4,599.1
Arkansas Tech University, Russellville	115	\$955.8	\$1,354.2	\$276.7	\$2,033.2
Harding University, Searcy	195	\$2,024.1	\$2,399.8	\$525.7	\$3,898.2
Henderson State University, Arkadelphia	80	\$582.4	\$1,047.0	\$194.9	\$1,434.6
Hendrix College, Conway	20	\$330.2	\$275.2	\$211.0	\$394.3
John Brown University, Siloam Springs	120	\$1,646.9	\$1,964.6	\$1,052.9	\$2,558.6
Lyon College, Batesville	21	\$266.9	\$280.9	\$190.8	\$357.0
North Arkansas College, Harrison	4	\$13.6	\$53.6	\$3.4	\$63.8
Northwest Arkansas Community College, Bentonville	158	\$583.0	\$2,167.9	\$137.5	\$2,613.4
Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia	61	\$905.2	\$673.9	\$457.0	\$1,122.1
Philander Smith College, Little Rock	14	\$176.3	\$185.5	\$108.9	\$252.9
Pulaski Technical College, North Little Rock	28	\$89.9	\$384.8	\$23.7	\$451.0

Southeast Arkansas College, Pine Bluff	2	\$7.2	\$26.8	\$1.7	\$32.3
Southern Arkansas University Tech, Camden	13	\$46.7	\$177.6	\$11.2	\$213.1
Southern Arkansas University, Magnolia	138	\$738.0	\$1,522.4	\$271.1	\$1,989.3
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock	55	\$531.1	\$787.0	\$802.5	\$515.6
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville	905	\$11,728.2	\$15,255.6	\$12,019.1	\$14,964.6
University of Arkansas, Fort Smith	12	\$43.1	\$164.2	\$10.4	\$196.9
University of Arkansas, Little Rock	240	\$2,520.0	\$3,288.7	\$571.3	\$5,237.4
University of Arkansas, Monticello	20	\$129.0	\$214.1	\$103.5	\$239.6
University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff	33	\$231.4	\$437.4	\$179.3	\$489.5
University of Central Arkansas, Conway	190	\$1,746.7	\$1,779.9	\$447.7	\$3,078.9
University of the Ozarks, Clarksville	110	\$1,419.2	\$1,235.8	\$803.5	\$1,851.5

Methodology: How We Compute Economic Impact 2005

We define economic impact as the amount of money that foreign students collectively bring into the United States to pay for their education and to support themselves while they (and in some cases, their families) are here. The goal of our economic impact formulas is to use data already collected for other purposes to provide a reasonable estimate of the economic resources that foreign students import to the United States to support their education here each year.

The data sets used for these reports come from two sources:

1. The Institute of International Education's *Open Doors 2005* report, funded by the Department of State, provides numbers of foreign students at universities and colleges throughout the United States during the 2004-05 academic year. In many cases, this data provide separate totals for undergraduate, graduate, and non degree students.
2. The College Board provides cost figures for tuition, living, and miscellaneous expenses at U.S. institutions for the 2004-05 academic year.

The extensive data provided by these two sources (which collect it directly from surveys of the institutions involved) allow us to make our estimates sensitive to differences between institutions. However, there are still areas where our estimates and formulas could be improved. For example, we compute economic impact only for students reported in *Open Doors*. Universities that do not provide information to the Institute of International Education are not represented. Also, enrollment reports represent peak enrollment, and not necessarily enrollment levels throughout the year.

Tuition, fees, living expenses, and dollar estimates are derived from College Board data collected on surveys completed by institutions every year. We try to make our calculations sensitive not only to differing costs at institutions, but differing costs for ESL students, undergraduates, graduate students, and students on practical training.

Students on Practical Training: We assume these students earn enough in their U.S. jobs to pay living and educational expenses for the year, and so import no funds for their support. Therefore, net economic impact of students in practical training is zero.

Undergraduates and English Language Programs: The number of undergraduate students at an institution is specified by *Open Doors* data. College Board data provide undergraduate tuition and fee amounts, on-campus room and board amounts, and miscellaneous expenses. These categories are sometimes broken down into averages for international, out-of-state, flat rate, and in-state, students. When multiple averages are available, we choose averages in the order given above.

Economic impact of an undergraduate equals tuition and fees, plus room and board, plus miscellaneous figured at 50 percent of room and board, less U.S. support. We assume: (1) that spring enrollment figures are the same as the fall figures reported, (2) that all students are enrolled full time for two semesters or three quarters a year, and (3) that students live on campus for the full year. Miscellaneous expenses, enumerated in College Board data, average about 40 percent of room and board expenses. We use a 50 percent figure as an approximation that includes *all* extra expenses except for travel. The percentage of U.S. support for an undergraduate is based upon the institution type. For example, research institutions (based on Carnegie code) provide on average 10.7 percent support for undergraduates; community colleges provide 7.8 percent for undergraduates.

Estimating Support. The *Open Doors survey* asks schools to report the percentage of their students who are self-funded, the percentage who have U.S. source income, etc. We use these percentages, adjusted for different types of institutions, as though they represented percentages of funding, not percentages of individuals. This aspect of our analysis could benefit from further study. We have done local comparisons to data reported to SEVIS and the percentages align closely, but wider research into funding percentages could be valuable.

NOTE: “U.S. support” includes funding from a U.S. college or university, the U.S. Government, a U.S. private sponsor and current employment.