



**The Economic Benefits of International Education to the United States for the 2005-2006 Academic Year:  
A Statistical Analysis**

NAFSA estimates that foreign students and their dependents contributed approximately \$13.49 billion to the U.S. economy during the 2005-2006 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 2006* 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.

# West Virginia

Total Number of Foreign Students: 2,523

## Part 1: Net Contribution to State Economy by Foreign Students (2005-06)

Contribution from Tuition and Fees to State Economy:		\$29,799,000
Contribution from Living Expenses:		\$34,285,000
Total Contribution by Foreign Students:		\$64,085,000
Less U.S. Support of 29.4%	-	\$18,819,000
Plus Dependents' Living Expenses:	+	\$1,559,000

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

**\$46,825,000**

## Part 2: Contribution to State Economy by Foreign Students' Dependents (2005-06)

### *Spouses' Contribution*

Percent of Married Students:	12.2%
Percent of Spouses in the U.S.:	85.0%
Number of Spouses in the U.S.:	307
Additional Expenses for a Spouse: (% of student living expenses)	25.0%
Spouses' Contribution:	\$1,057,000

### *Children's Contribution*

Number of Couples in the U.S.:	307
Number of Children per Couple:	0.6
Number of Children in the U.S.:	182
Additional Expenses for a Child: (% of student living expenses)	20.0%
Children's Contribution:	\$502,000

### *Net Contribution to State Economy by Foreign Students' Dependents:*

**\$1,559,000**

## Part 3: Foreign Student Contribution from Tuition/Fees and Living Expenses (2005-06)

Institution and City	# of Foreign Students	Tuition and Fees (thousands)	Living Expenses and Dependents (thousands)	Less U.S. Support (thousands)	Total Contribution (thousands)
Alderson Broaddus College, Philippi	10	\$179.7	\$135.4	\$77.4	\$237.7
Appalachian Bible College, Bradley	4	\$28.6	\$39.6	\$15.0	\$53.1
Bethany College, Bethany	35	\$503.0	\$564.3	\$428.1	\$639.1
Bluefield State College, Bluefield	22	\$154.3	\$305.1	\$66.4	\$392.9
Concord University, Athens	83	\$720.9	\$1,106.5	\$447.8	\$1,379.6
Davis & Elkins College, Elkins	25	\$407.8	\$349.5	\$186.5	\$570.8
Fairmont State College, Fairmont	69	\$594.8	\$990.3	\$388.7	\$1,196.4
Glenville State College, Glenville	22	\$190.1	\$267.7	\$112.4	\$345.4
Marshall University, Huntington	363	\$3,983.1	\$5,349.1	\$1,282.2	\$8,050.0
Mountain State University, Beckley	93	\$530.1	\$1,182.4	\$105.4	\$1,607.1
Ohio Valley College, Vienna	33	\$386.1	\$429.2	\$200.2	\$615.0
Salem International University, Salem	301	\$3,040.1	\$3,363.7	\$2,163.0	\$4,240.8
Shepherd College, Shepherdstown	32	\$339.8	\$442.9	\$192.0	\$590.7

University of Charleston, Charleston	35	\$707.0	\$594.4	\$320.3	\$981.1
West Liberty State College, West Liberty	10	\$90.5	\$125.8	\$53.0	\$163.4
West Virginia Northern Community College, Wheeling	2	\$11.2	\$29.7	\$2.6	\$38.4
West Virginia State College, Institute	7	\$56.9	\$76.4	\$54.0	\$79.2
West Virginia University - Institute of Technology, Montgomery	42	\$485.3	\$469.7	\$324.4	\$630.6
West Virginia University at Parkersburg, Parkersburg	6	\$35.4	\$81.5	\$17.1	\$99.8
West Virginia University, Morgantown	1,244	\$15,610.0	\$18,780.8	\$11,466.2	\$22,924.6
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon	54	\$1,093.5	\$688.7	\$716.6	\$1,065.6
Wheeling Jesuit University, Wheeling	31	\$651.0	\$471.5	\$199.3	\$923.2

## **Methodology: How We Compute Economic Impact 2006**

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 formula 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 2006* report, funded by the Department of State, provides numbers of foreign students at universities and colleges throughout the United States during the 2005-06 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 2005-06 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 or current employment.