Chapter 3

The Diversification of the Student Profile

Elizabeth Stallman
Gayle A. Woodruff
Jinous Kasravi
David Comp

Introduction

The story of U.S. undergraduate student participation in education abroad in the latter part of the 20th century centers on broadening access for students who previously did not have or did not take advantage of opportunities for education abroad, or higher education itself. In this chapter we explore the diversification of the profile of students participating in education abroad from 1960 to 2005. Indeed, diversification is equally the "democratization of access" as described in 1987 by Jack Egle, then President and Executive Director of the Council on International Educational Exchange (Bowman, p. 5). This democratization of education abroad is largely a result of eliminating barriers to access in higher education, from the 1950s onward. Reducing the barriers to and encouraging participation in education abroad has been a slower process.

Even today, the overwhelming majority of education abroad participants are White, female, young, single, financially comfortable, and without disability. A decades-old claim holds that since the study abroad structure was created by upper-middle-class White Americans of Western European ancestry; those who do not resemble these initiators are reluctant to seek out what may be perceived as an inhospitable or impractical experience (Adam, 2003; Goodwin & Nacht, 1988). In an effort to break this self-reinforcing cycle, more institutions are designing study abroad programs for underrepresented students, with several notable successes.

Our discussion begins with a chronological overview of key issues and trends as they relate to the undergraduate student profile of each decade, and an overview of the demographics of undergraduates embarking on study abroad. We then analyze the profile of U.S. students abroad by a closer examination of seven key demographics: race and ethnicity, socio-economic status, field of study, undergraduate standing, gender, age, and disability. To the extent possible each of these topics is addressed by decade.

In our treatment of the material that follows we have relied on a combination of statistical data, research reports, qualitative essays, and scholarly analyses. The information available on student trends in higher education and education abroad varies from the detailed and comprehensive to the sporadic or nonexistent.

We have noted eras and topics where data are missing and have, to the best that available information allows, filled these in with complementary information and analysis. We join the call for continued, thorough, and high quality research regarding students who study abroad in order to achieve the most accurate and inclusive profile possible.

Regarding terms and usage in this chapter, with respect to race and ethnicity, in our own discussion and analysis we use the terms African American, Asian American, Latino, Native American, and White. Other terms (such as Hispanic) are used when we quote or refer to another author's work which uses terms different from our own, or when a concept is already in use (such as the discipline Black studies). We use the term student (or person) of color when referring to students who do not identify as White.

For the purpose of this chapter it is also necessary to differentiate between the terms 'underrepresented students' and 'students of color.' Students identified as Asian American, African American, Hispanic American, and Native American are referred to as 'students of color.' 'Underrepresented students' are those who have historically faced barriers to studying abroad, and as a result have not had a significant number of students participate. Some examples of underrepresented students in education abroad are: students of color, males, students in the engineering, math, and science fields; students with disabilities; and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students.

The Landscape of U.S. Higher Education 1960–2005

In this section we provide the context of higher education trends and events as they relate to demographic student characteristics in order to understand the ccollege students of the day. A thorough discussion of the impact of geo-political events on education abroad is found in Chapter 1 of this book.

Since 1960 there has been steady growth in overall undergraduate enrollment as reported by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Educational Statistics (USDOE). In 1961 there were approximately 3 million[1] students enrolled as undergraduates in degree-granting institutions across the United States (USDOE, 2007a). In 1976, 9.1 million students enrolled as undergraduates in degree-granting institutions. The nation saw this number grow to nearly 12 million in 1990 and nearly 15 million in 2005 (see Table 1).

[1] Prior to 1976 only overall higher education enrollment figures are available which include graduate and professional students. This figure is an approximation based on the ratio of undergraduate to graduate students after 1976.

The 1960s

In the 1960s, the "baby boom" generation began to enter college, sending overall enrollments surging (Geiger, 2005). By 1970, as shown in Table 2, more than two times the number of freshmen enrolled in college as in 1960. While enrollments continued to rise each decade after, this swift increase in a short time span was never repeated. Further, the 1960s saw an increase in the percentage of recent high school graduates choosing to enroll in college (USDOE, 2007d). This percentage has also risen steadily over the years since.

Table 1. Total Fall Undergraduate Enrollment: Selected Years 1976-2005

	1976	1980	1990	2000	2005
Undergraduate enrollment*	9,149	10,469.1	11,959.1	13,155.4	14,964

*Numbers in thousands *Source*: USDOE, 2007f

Table 2. First-Time Freshman Fall Undergraduate Enrollment: Selected Years 1960-2005

	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
Freshman Enrollment*	923	2,063	2,588	2,257	2,428	2,657

*Numbers in thousands *Source*: USDOE, 2007d

Early in this decade President John F. Kennedy had established the Peace Corps, or aid to developing nations as delivered by college-educated volunteers. Kennedy's youth, enthusiasm, and optimism had a positive influence on many college students and recent graduates at the time. His example encouraged them to apply for these and other overseas opportunities. In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed two fundamental pieces of legislation that would influence the later student demographics of higher education. First, the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) abolished national-origin immigration quotas set in 1924. For the first time in many years an increasing number of immigrants, mostly from Asia, came to the U.S. to establish careers and raise families. The INA opened doors to new immigrants whose children would enter college in the coming decades, increasing the racial and ethnic diversity of institutions across the country. The Higher Education Act (HEA), established grants, loans, and the Federal Work-Study program to financially needy college students. The HEA continued what the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (popularly known as the GI Bill) had begun, democratizing access to college for more academically eligible students. The HEA has three major sections or titles: Title III,

which provides aid to historically Black colleges and universities and Hispanic institutions; Title IV, which awards aid to students in financial need (also known as Federal Pell Grants); and Title IX, antidiscriminatory legislation that banned gender discrimination in federally-funded institutions. In 1966, Congress passed the International Education Act, with support from President Johnson. Among its goals was to further student exchanges, but the act was never appropriated funds, remaining an unfunded promise for international exchange.

Enrollment of students of color in the 1960s is tied to one of the landmarks of that decade, the civil rights movement. The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka (1954) to desegregate American public education made it a legal right for students of color to matriculate at what had been predominantly White institutions. Gradually enrollments increased, particularly in the 1960s: African American undergraduate enrollment in northern states in 1954 was 45,000. This figure more than doubled by 1967, to 95,000 (Lucas, 1994, p. 242). In southern, predominantly White institutions the figures are even more remarkable: African American undergraduate enrollment in these colleges in 1960 was just 3,000. By 1970 these student ranks had exploded to 98,000 (Lucas, p. 242). Early data on enrollment in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) is limited, but there is some evidence that enrollments in HBCUs declined in the 1960s, from 82% of all college-attending African Americans in 1965 to just 60% in 1970 (Lucas, p. 242). The focus was clearly on obtaining rights within the predominantly White institutions.

During that period, the civil rights movement and Vietnam War were at the heart of the intense social, economic, and political causes that heated student debate and action across the nation. The Cold War epitomized the Soviet Union's power struggle with the United States. The Iron Curtain made Eastern Europe and the USSR off-limits to visitors from the West. Further, the 1957 launch of the Soviet satellite *Sputnik* sparked U.S. federal funding in the science study and research for graduate students, while the National Defense Education Act provided millions of dollars in support to higher education in general. Some viewed this as "bolstering the nation's defenses" while others, particularly undergraduates, perceived it as dependency on federal funding that threatened the autonomy of colleges and universities (Lucas, 1994). Enrollment in liberal arts majors peaked at 47% in this decade. The larger discussion about the undergraduate curriculum "oscillat(ed) back and forth between the two poles of commonality and diversification," or between a common, defining tradition and new demands for diversification and inclusion of ethnic, gay, and women's studies (Lucas, 1994, p.

247).[2] The liberal education debate became marginalized in light of governmental funding and student demands calling for technical expertise and career preparation. The top three fields of study in which Bachelor's degrees were awarded were social and behavioral sciences, education, and the humanities. Just ten years later only social and behavioral sciences made this list, falling to number three (USDOE, 2007h; 2007i).

The 1970s

In the 1970s, overall college enrollments seemed to be leveling off. In 1970, 52% of high school graduates enrolled in college, more than at any time before, yet by 1980 the percentage dipped to 49% (USDOE, 2007d). Still, in that time the number of freshmen enrolled rose 20% to 2.5 million (see Table 2). College students were also impacted directly by the oil crisis and the resulting recession, monumental federal policy changes for higher education, Watergate, the women's rights movement and the end of the Vietnam War.

Student selection of major changed to reflect the economic and social relevance found in vocational and professional majors, satisfying the desire of many undergraduates to "study and seek to ameliorate problems" of the day, such as poverty, the environment, and racial and gender inequality (Geiger, 2005, p. 65). Women's studies programs blossomed in this decade in response to the breaking down of traditional barriers to participation, the model offered by the demand for and creation of Black studies programs in the 1960s, and the momentum of the women's movement in the 1970s (Bastedo, 2005; Lucas, 1994). Between 1970 and 1980, 300 women's studies programs were established on campuses across the nation (Lucas, 1994). These new fields of study spurred the later creation of other heritage and identity movements in the curriculum, such as Chicano studies, Asian American studies, and queer studies (Bastedo, 2005). These programs took time to establish, but are surely somewhat responsible for the rebound in the number of humanities degrees by 1990 (USDOE, 2007h; 2007i). Employers also began to demand better job preparation for college graduates (Altbach, 2005). Concurrently, there was a marked increase in Business and Computer Science degrees conferred from 1970 to 1980 (USDOE, 2007h; 2007i).

The once-closed doors of the "ivory tower" were opening in other ways as well. While in 1960 White students dominated national enrollments, representing 97% of all students entering college for the first time, by 1976 students

[2] See Chapter 2 for a full discussion of the issues related to changes and developments in the undergraduate curriculum during this period.

of color were capitalizing on the civil rights victories and represented 16.2% of college enrollment by 1976 (Dey & Hurtado, 2005, p. 320; Lucas, 1994, p. 242; see Table 3).

Table 3 Total Fall Undergraduate Enrollment, by Race/Ethnicity: Selected Years 1976-2005

	1976	1980	1990	2000	2005
African American	10.0% (943.4)	9.7% (1,018.8)	9.6% (1,147.2)	11.8% (1,548.9)	13.1% (1,955.4)
Asian American	1.8% (169.3)	2.4% (248.7)	4.2% (500.5)	6.4% (845.5)	6.5% (971.4)
Hispanic	3.7% (352.9)	4.1% (433.1)	6.1% (724.6)	10.3% (1,351.0)	11.6% (1,733.6)
Native American	0.7% (69.7)	0.7% (77.9)	0.8% (95.5)	1.1% (138.5)	1.1% (160.4)
Nonresident Alien	1.5% (143.2)	2.0% (209.9)	1.8% (218.7)	2.2% (288.0)	2.1% (314.7)
Caucasian	82.2% (7,740.5)	81.0% (8,480.7)	77.5% (9,272.6)	68.3% (8,983.5)	65.7% (9,828.6)
Total	9,149	10,469.1	11,959.1	13,155.4	14,964.0

Source: USDOE, 2007f
Percentage by total undergraduate enrollment (Numbers in thousands)

Table 4. First-Time Freshman Fall Undergraduate Enrollment, by Gender: Selected Years 1960-2005

	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
Male	58.5% (540)	55.8% (1,152)	47.1% (1,219)	46.3% (1,045)	46.3% (1,124)	45.2% (1,200)
Female	41.6 (384)	44.2 (911)	52.8 (1,369)	53.6 (1,211)	53.7 (1,304)	54.8 (1,457)
Total	923	2,063	2,588	2,257	2,428	2,657

Source: USDOE, 2007d
Percentage by total undergraduate enrollment (Numbers in thousands)

The Higher Education Act of 1965 was amended in 1972, to provide even more support for academically qualified students who could not afford college. In academic year 1976–77, the average Pell Grant award was $759 and the maximum was $4,747 (in 2004 dollars; ACE, 2007). In that same year the average annual tuition for an in-state undergraduate at a four-year public institution was $1,218 and

the room and board cost was $1,351 for a total of $2,569 (in 2007 dollars; USDOE, 2007l), meaning it was possible for a student to satisfy 30% of his or her tuition and living expenses with an average Pell Grant and 100% of these expenses with a maximum award. Other factors that continued college affordability in the 1970s were that students could rely more on grants than loans and that tuition increases generally matched the Consumer Price Index (Gladieux, King, & Corrigan, 2005).

The 1980s

In the 1980s, college costs continued to rise, as did student dependence on loans. Use of federal financial aid for education abroad was little understood as an option for students. The large numbers of children of Asian immigrants from the 1960s contributed toward the diversification of college enrollments in this decade.

Table 5. First-Time Freshman Fall Enrollment in Undergraduate Institutions, by Institutional Type: Selected Years 1960-2005

	1960 [1,2]	1970[2]	1980	1990	2000	2005
4-year Public	42.9% (396)	36.5% (754)	29.6% (765)	32.2% (727)	34.7% (842)	35.9% (954)
4-year Private	33.9 (313)	19.2 (397)	16.2 (418)	17.7 (400)	20.6 (499)	22.8 (607)
2-year Public	19.7 (182)	41.4 (854)	50.8 (1,314)	46.1 (1,041)	39.2 (952)	36.8 (977)
2-year Private	3.5 (32)	2.8 (58)	3.5 (91)	3.9 (88)	5.6 (135)	4.5 (119)
Total	923	2,063	2,588	2,257	2,428	2,657

Source: USDOE, 2007d
Percentage by total undergraduate enrollment (Numbers in thousands)
Figures may not total due to rounding
[1] Excludes first-time freshmen in occupational programs not creditable towards a bachelor's degree.
[2] Data for 2-year branches of 4-year college systems are aggregated with the 4-year institutions.

By 1990 more than three out of every four freshmen were enrolled in a public college or university, a display not only of the expanding ranks of students but also of institutions (see Table 5). The development of two-year colleges in particular had become the single fastest growth sector for higher education (Bowman, 1987; Lucas, 1994). Between 1980 and 1990 undergraduate enrollment of students of color increased by 3.6% to an overall 20.7% representation of all undergraduates (see Table 3). Most of this increase is attributed to larger numbers of Asian and Latino students. In this decade the number of Asian students enrolled in college doubled, from 248,700 in 1980 to 500,500 in 1990, while undergraduate Latinos

increased more than 1.5 times (from 433,100 to 724,600; Table 3). At the same time the enrollment of African American students seemed to level off; while there was an increase in numbers, their representation among students on campus dropped slightly to 9.6% (see Table 3). African American students were choosing to attend predominantly White institutions in greater numbers: by 1987 a black student was less likely to matriculate at an HBCU for the first time in history (Lucas, 1994, p. 242). Still, HBCUs also continued to increase their enrollments, particularly the public institutions (Lucas, 1994). These differences can be attributed to several causes: fluctuations in the U.S. population, changes in criteria for college admission (race-conscious to race-neutral), and variable access to higher education for different groups (UCLA, 2007).

In 1980, the gender disparity moved in favor of female undergraduates. Women now represented 52.8% of registered freshmen; by the end of the decade that representation increased to 53.6%, and continued to increase into the new millennium (see Table 4). In the general U.S. population in 1980 women also outnumbered men, 51 to 49 %, a stable trend that had occurred since before 1960 and continues today (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). It is clear, therefore, that more women were choosing to enroll in college than men. In fact, in 1989 women received 53% of the Bachelor degrees and in the twenty years leading up to 1990, the sheer number of women attending college more than doubled (Lucas, 1994, p. 231).While the women's movement paved the way for women to take on the challenge of higher education, career preparation, the necessity of a college education for many entry-level positions, and the affordability due to increased federal funding generally led larger numbers of students to seek higher education.

Another fundamental story for higher education in this decade is funding. State funding for higher education in the 1980s was in decline, and colleges and universities looked to government and industry partnerships and increasing tuition rates to fill in funding gaps. While government and industry had been tapped by higher education institutions since World War II, by the 1980s these connections came to be called governmental "partnerships" and "corporatization." Contracts with corporations such as sports apparel, credit cards, and soft drinks were met initially with public outcry. Soon these labels and contracts became familiar sights in campus eateries, dormitories, and stadiums.

In order to meet steeply rising tuition costs and as Pell Grants remained stagnant, students began to rely much more heavily on federal student loans. From 1980 to 1989 the volume of student loan dollars increased more than 2½ times, rocketing from $4.8 billion to nearly $12.5 billion (ACE, 2003). In

this same time the average Pell Grant award per student increased from $882 to $1,438, however the purchasing power of these funds plummeted since the awards covered 23% less of the cost of a four-year degree in 1989 than they did at the start of the decade (ACE, 2007). Students and their families had to pay for more college expenses than at any time in history. As with corporate contracts, this increased financial burden on students has not been a temporary situation but a permanent one. It has served as a barrier to access for students in financial need to attend and complete an undergraduate degree.

Starting in the 1980s, the median income for parents of college students began to rise steeply. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program at UCLA (2007, pp. 1–2) reports that from the early 1970s to the 1980s, college student parental income rose at the same rate as the average national income. The difference between the two was 45 percent (in favor of undergraduate parents), but in 1971 dollars represented a gap of just over $4,000. This suggests that, for a time, paying for a college education was within financial reach of the average American family since access to higher education was increasing and tuition and fees were still low. From the mid-1980s, however, the income of the parents of college students began to outpace the national average. By 2005 the parents of new freshmen earned more than twice as much as the average American household, a difference of nearly $39,000. Regardless of how these students ultimately pay for their college education, it is clear that more students come from more affluent families, a trend that began in the 1980s.

With regard to field of study there appears to have been a disconnect between undergraduates and their professors in the 1980s. For students, the aim of a college education had changed from learning in order to develop and discover knowledge, to preparation for a profession and career. This was reflected in the feelings of the general population who were deemed to have "skepticism over the practicality of general education," (Lucas, 1994, p. 270). Findings from surveys on college freshman opinions from 1971 to 2006 show that increased earnings and job potential have consistently been the most-often selected reason for attending college (UCLA, 2007, p. 3).

More undergraduate students received degrees in the humanities, the social and behavioral sciences, and business in 1990–91 than ten years earlier, counting for over 50% of the Bachelor's degrees awarded that year (USDOE, 2007h). Degrees in business had the largest representation of all degrees (22.8%). The social discourse that favored practical degrees likely had an influence on these students, but also the fact that most business programs are found at public four-year institutions while humanities and social sciences dominate private four-

year schools. In 1986[3] nearly twice as many freshmen enrolled in public four-year institutions as private four-year colleges (USDOE, 2007d).

The 1990s

In the 1990s, college classrooms continued to be increasingly diverse as more students of color and students with disabilities enrolled. Undergraduates as a whole numbered nearly 12 million, with 60% of high school graduates enrolling in college in 1990 (USDOE, 2007e). By now, a college education had become a requirement for anyone who desired to fulfill the dream of middle-class work and society. Still, affordability continued to be a limitation to college access and retention.

During the recession of the early 1990s, in public higher education, state funding for all public institutions dropped 10% from 1981 to 2000 (Zusman, 2005, p. 119). For example, the Pennsylvania State University's state appropriation in 1990 was 21% and had fallen to 13% by 2002 (Zusman, 2005, p. 119). Higher education institutions may be victims of their own success: the growth in external grants, donations, and enterprises for public institutions has, in part, led to the decline in state funding. Still, "nationally two-thirds of the change [of funding sources] reflects the substitution of tuition and fee income for state support" (Zusman, 2005, p. 119). These cuts in funding are paralleled by tuition increases. The average in-state tuition and fees at a four-year public institution in 1990–91 were $1,888 and nearly doubled by 2000–01 to $3,501. Private four-year institutions instituted a rise of 70% over the same time period ($9,083 to $15,470; USDOE, 2007l).

Student loan volume increased nearly 60% in the preceding decade and increased again by 130% from 1990 to 2000 (ACE, 2003). The 1992 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act gave all students access to guaranteed student loans (Gladieux, King, & Corrigan, 2005). While this provides one explanation for the large increase in student loans disbursed, another may be the large increases in tuition during this time.

By now, the age and ethnic makeup of undergraduates had changed dramatically from 1960. In 1999 nearly 1/3 of enrolled undergraduates were 25 years or older (see Table 6). In 2000, nearly 30% of undergraduates were students of color and this trend has kept moving (see Table 3). Colleges were becoming more flexible to working parents and professionals and employers were offering

[3] Assuming a four-year completion rate, these freshmen would have graduated in 1990; the freshman enrollment difference between four-year public and private institutions is the same in 1990 (see Table 5).

tuition benefits. Certainly the dawn of online education inspired many students to pursue a degree for the first time in a virtual environment. Overall, the rising economic benefits of attaining a college degree were surely encouraging to more students despite the rising costs.

Table 6. Total Fall Undergraduate Enrollment, by Age: Selected Years 1993-2005

	1993	1999	2005
Under 18	2.0% (245.3)	3.0% (383.8)	3.8% (566.4)
18 to 24	60.3 (7,435.1)	63.1 (7,998.1)	64.4 (9,628.0)
25 to 34	19.9 (2,455.2)	17.2 (2,180.9)	17.1 (2,556.3)
35 to 49	13.5 (1,659.5)	12.2 (1,551.7)	11.0 (1,652.4)
50 and over	2.7 (333.3)	3.1 (393.4)	3.2 (485.2)
Age unknown	1.6 (195.4)	1.4 (173.1)	0.5 (75.4)
Total	12,323.9	12,681.2	14,963.9

Sources: USDOE, 1993; 1999; 2005
Percentage by total undergraduate enrollment. (Numbers in thousands).
Figures may not total due to rounding

The 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provided equal access for persons with disabilities[4] to postsecondary institutions that receive any governmental funding: federal, state, or local. This resulted in changes in campus demographics as significantly more students with disabilities enrolled and sought assistance, "between 1986 and 1994, the percentage of individuals with disabilities, age sixteen or older, who reported attending college or completing a degree rose from 29 to 45% (Hall & Belch, 2000, p. 6). In 1999 a learning disability was the most commonly reported disability by undergraduates, a notable change from 1990 where vision impairment was most common disability. Students with the highest rates of participation in college are those with sensory impairments, such as hearing or

[4] The National Center for Education Statistics classifies disabled students as those who reported that they had one or more of the following conditions: a specific learning disability, a visual handicap, hard of hearing, deafness, a speech disability, an orthopedic handicap, or a health impairment.

visual; those with multiple impairments were the smallest representation. A student with a disability is most likely to attend a public two-year institution (representing 8% of the overall enrollment), while those with a visual impairment in particular most often enroll in four-year institutions (Hall & Belch, 2000, p. 8).

The 2000s

The current decade is still in progress and thus difficult to analyze. The American economy has struggled after the "dot-com bust" and the recession of 2008. Tuition increases have far outstripped increases in median family income, by six to one from 1980 to 2003 (Gladieux, King, & Corrigan, 2005, p. 177). Since 1971 the income of parents of college students has increased overall and also to a greater degree than the average national income, "suggesting…that students are from more economically advantaged homes than their predecessors" (UCLA, 2007, p. 1). A comparison of these income statistics to the drop in Pell Grant awards as a percentage of the cost of attending college[5] strengthens this suggestion even more.

Since 1980, business has been the most popular major, selected by between 1/4 and 1/5 of undergraduates. Those graduating with degrees in education have dropped precipitously, from a high of 20.9% in 1970–71 to the newest low of 5.6% in 2004–05. Holding steady for a number of decades are degrees in the natural sciences and computer sciences and engineering; even social and behavioral sciences seems to have leveled off at approximately 12%. Of interest are two categories; first is "other fields of study," which includes a miscellaneous assortment of majors from architecture to transportation. Degrees in this category accounted for nearly one out of every four conferred in 2004–05. Despite the fear of the demise of the liberal arts curriculum, the percentage of Bachelor degrees in the humanities has remained steady since 1970–71, while enjoying greater numbers of students every year (USDOE, 2007i).

Looking at statistics regarding race and ethnicity, in 1976 African American students represented 10% of all undergraduates. Their representation fluctuated, with a low of 9.7% in 1980 and a new high of 13.1% in 2005 (see Table 3). As noted previously, factors such as changes in population and access to higher education have affected African American undergraduate enrollment.Over this time, two groups enjoyed consistent and strong success in college enrollments. Hispanic students have seen the greatest increase, leaping from 3.7% of overall enrollment in 1976 to 11.6% in 2005 (see Table 3). Asian American students have also had significant gains, moving from 1.8% representation in 1976 to 6.5% in 2005.

[5] In academic year 2004–05, the maximum award of $4,050 was just 37% of the cost of attendance at a four-year public institution.

Asians have experienced a flattening out since 2000, with only a 0.1% gain in this time period. One possible explanation is that Asian Americans have leveled off or reached a saturation point in the maximum representation of those choosing to enroll in college. Overall, both Latinos and Asian Americans effectively multiplied by five in their 1976 numbers to reach their current representation. These figures are also somewhat representative of the larger U.S. population (US Census Bureau, 2007). As shown in see Table 4, gender gap in undergraduate enrollment continues to widen even as enrollment rates increase (Table 4).

In the 2003 two landmark Supreme Court cases revisited higher education admission decisions based on race and affirmative action. The University of Michigan case decisions considered admission to the undergraduate program (Gratz vs. Bollinger) and to the law school (Grutter vs. Bollinger). The Gratz decision rejected the admission policy of granting more points to students of color. The Grutter decision allowed the University of Michigan law school admission committees to take race into account with the aim of diversifying the student body (Wright, 2006). We note that these cases, have overruled each other and the recent decisions were very close (Gratz 6–3, Grutter 5–4).

In the next section we turn our focus to an overview of education abroad from the 1960s to 2005. Many, if not all, of the topics in this higher education landscape section have had an effect on students in education abroad as well as the field itself.

The Landscape of Study Abroad: 1965–present

While U.S. student mobility in the 1960s was ushered in by the cumulative effects of world history that in the mid-20th century included the formation of the People's Republic of China, the launch of the *Sputnik* satellite by the Soviet Union, and a shift in U.S. foreign policy to include more intentional international education efforts, U.S. domestic affairs also were affecting study abroad. Hope amidst chaos was the theme of the timeframe from the 1960s through the 1970s for U.S. study abroad activities.

In the 1960s a student embarking on an education abroad experience was largely considered to be participating in an extra-curricular activity, one that was a fun diversion. Thus, data collection regarding study abroad demographics, while conducted, was not a serious undertaking. Table 7 represents data as best as could be collected by IIE and the United Nations Education, Science, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) regarding U.S. students abroad during the 1960s. IIE collected data that represented U.S. students enrolled in academic-year abroad programs. In the *Open Doors* report for 1965–66, for the first time

Table 7. U.S. Students Enrolled in Institutions Abroad: Selected Years 1965-2005

	1965-66	1970-71	1980-81	1989-90	2000-01	2005-06
Open Doors	24,900[1] 8,152[2]	32,209	30,613	70,727	154,168	223,534
UNESCO	15,881	20,710	19,692	--	--	--

[1]Full year [2]Special sessions
Sources: IIE, 2005; 2007b; *UNESCO Yearbook*, 1968; 1972; 1984
Note: *UNESCO Yearbook* data end in 1984

IIE collected data on U.S. students in summer and special sessions abroad in addition to academic-year programs. For that reporting year there were 24,900 U.S. students enrolled in academic-year abroad programs plus another 8,152 students in summer and special programs (IIE, 2005).

Into the 1960s, formal academic programs abroad were conducted mainly by four-year, private liberal arts institutions. Later in the 1960s into the 1970s state universities and two-year colleges began to offer study abroad options (Brown, 1983). In reference to a CIEE report from 1976, Brown (1983) indicates that 631 two-year institutions were offering programs with a combined enrollment of over 3,500 students. Other efforts that began in the late 1970s include ISEP, the International Student Exchange Program. ISEP developed agreements with institutions around the world to allow U.S. students to study abroad without requiring their home institutions to have a direct, reciprocal agreement with those foreign universities.

In 1973, IIE discontinued surveying foreign institutions regarding the numbers of U.S. studying abroad. As a result no data were collected between 1973 and 1977. In the late 1970s, IIE recommenced collecting data, this time directly from U.S. institutions regarding students on U.S. college-sponsored study abroad programs. Data continued to be collected on students studying abroad through U.S. institutions between 1978 and 1983. In *Open Doors 1979*, it was suggested that the reporting on U.S. students studying abroad during the 1970s might have been badly underestimated, a concern that has continued since definitions of study abroad and who participates have shifted over time (IIE, 2005).

During the 1970s UNESCO continued to report on U.S. students studying abroad in foreign institutions, as reported by those institutions. In *Open Doors 1978*, a chart is provided showing UNESCO data by country of origin of students abroad. This practice continued in the next reports however IIE noted that the "UNESCO data cannot be compared directly with IIE college-sponsored study abroad data since the two surveys measure different (though possibly overlapping) populations" (IIE, 2005).

Further in these late 1970s *Open Doors* reports, charts were included for the first time listing the U.S. college-sponsored study abroad programs. The top sending institution at the time was Central Washington University, with over 2,000 students going abroad to Mexico (IIE, 2005).

Several sources provide insight into the growing numbers of U.S. students abroad during the early to mid-1980s. First, *Open Doors*, reported on U.S. college-sponsored study abroad programs for 1980–81, and again in 1985–86. Second, UNESCO detailed U.S. students enrolled in foreign institutions, as reported by those institutions. For the first time, we find that *Open Doors* data refers to study abroad at community colleges. *Open Doors 1982* reports that 300 students studied abroad in 1980–81 through the Los Angeles Community Colleges.

In the 1980s two large-scale surveys of study abroad participants provide further detail on the demographics of U.S. students abroad. Jolene Koester's 1985 profile of U.S. students abroad in which she analyzed data collected by CIEE as part of the sales of the International Student Identity Card (ISIC), and the University of California's Education Abroad Program's participant questionnaire responses between 1986 and 1988. (See Table 8.)

The ISIC survey results of 1982–83 are noteworthy in that over 8,000 students completed the survey and those students originated from a wide variety of U.S. institutions across the nation. Table 8 summarizes the survey data regarding students who studied abroad across three program types: U.S. college-sponsored program, direct enrollment in foreign universities, or independent study abroad. Similar data exist for students who traveled or worked abroad but are not included here.

Students on U.S. sponsored programs were more likely to be abroad for one to three months, or approximately one semester or quarter; yet those who enrolled directly had a longer time abroad of six to twelve months. This is likely due to the structure of U.S. programs, designed to parallel the home institution calendar. Conversely, a student who enrolled in a foreign university follows that institution's calendar. Regarding financial support, family and friends and personal savings are the dominant sources for students in all program types. This is evidence that study abroad was still the domain of wealthier students and that few students were likely aware of the possibility of using federal funds for study abroad. Field of study is once again confirmed as students in the liberal arts numbered two for every five students who completed this survey.

The University of California (UC) system's Education Abroad Program (EAP) polled returned study abroad participants about their experiences. The results of the 1986 and 1988 questionnaires provide another snapshot of the student demographic. Jerry Carlson, long-time leader in UC's EAP, published

widely regarding this and other data collected by EAP during the 1980s. The response size of the EAP surveys totaled 861 students, thus making it (after the Koester ISIC surveys) one of the largest data sets of study abroad student demographics and experiences during the 1980s.

In keeping with the trend that the majority of students who studied abroad in the 1980s were White, the EAP report reveals that 82% of survey respondents were White and 18% were non-White (UC EAP, 1989, p. 5). Similarly as with other national trends, the bulk of California study abroad students who responded to the surveys were majoring in the social sciences (43%) and humanities and languages (31%). Thirteen percent of the respondents were in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines (UC EAP, pp. 6–7). While over half of the respondents stated that they could use credits from abroad toward their majors, the science majors reported a greater degree of challenges such as not being able to get into courses abroad that would count toward their science majors (UC EAP, p. 49). This is a curricular barrier for students that has only recently begun to lower.

During the first decade of the 21st century, one of the surveys administered by the American Council on Education (ACE) helps to define the profile of college students in the new millennium. In 2008, ACE partnered with the Art & Science Group and The College Board to produce a report, *College-Bound Students' Interests in Study Abroad and Other International Learning Activities*, based upon responses of 1,509 college-bound high school seniors. This survey is of most interest regarding the diversification of the study abroad profile.

ACE discovered that female students were more likely than their male counterparts to indicate that they planned to study abroad, 58% compared with 40% (2008). The respondent demographics may also be indicative of the type of student who will be studying abroad in the first decade of the 21st century:

- 55% female, 45% male
- 61% White, 13% Hispanic, 12% African American, 10% Asian, 4% other ethnicities
- 28% family income less than $50,000, 26% family income between $50,000–$100,000, 12% family income between $100,000 and $150,000 (ACE, 2008).

It seems that the White, middle-class female continues to be the U.S. student who prefers to study abroad. Yet these statistics are tantalizing as we see greater numbers of students of color, male students, and lower income students

Table 8. Percentage Comparison of Students in Three Program Types: 1982-83

	Programs Sponsored by U.S. Educational Institutions	Direct Enrollment in Foreign Universities	Independent Study
Year in School	3rd year postsecondary: 37	3rd year postsecondary: 28	5th year postsecondary/ graduate: 27
Length of Trip	1-3 months:41 3-6 months: 25 6-12 months : 24 > 1 year : 4 < 1 month: 3	6-12 months: 35 1-3 months: 31 3-6 months:17 > 1 year: 13 < 1 month: 3	1-3 months: 35 6-12 months: 28 3-6 months: 21 > 1 year: 11 < 1 month: 6
Financial Support[1]	Family/friends: 47 Personal savings: 27 Scholarship/grant : 14 Loan: 11	Family/friends: 50 Personal savings: 28 Loan: 12 Scholarship/grant : 8	Personal savings: 46 Family/friends: 31 Scholarship/grant : 12 Loan: 8
Major Influence[1]	Family/friends: 22 Career goals: 18 Language course : 18 Interest in int'l events:15 Other academic course: 10	Family/friends: 23 Language course: 18 Career goals: 17 Interest in int'l events: 16 Other academic course: 11	Career goals: 25 Interest in int'l events: 22 Family/friends: 16 Language course: 13 Other academic course: 8
Field of Study	Other Liberal Arts: 24 Foreign Language: 17 Social Sciences:12 Business: 11 Other: 11 Professional: 7 Engineering/ Physical Sciences: 6 Pre-professional: 5 Education: 4 Graduate: 3	Other Liberal Arts:24 Foreign Language:17 Professional:12 Social Sciences:11 Other:10 Engineering/Physical Sciences 8 Business: 7 Pre-professional: 5 Graduate: 5 Education: 2	Other Liberal Arts: 25 Foreign Language:16 Other: 12 Social Sciences: 10 Business: 9 Engineering/Physical Sciences: 6 Pre-professional: 6 Professional: 5 Education: 4 Graduate: 6 Vocational: 1

Source: (Koester, 1985) [1]Top sources

indicating interest in studying abroad. We will revisit each of these topics in the following sections.

As we move out of the first decade of the new millennium, the hope of federal funding lies in the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Act. The Simon Act, the most exciting federal legislation for international education in decades, aims to level the disparity between college enrollment and study abroad participation. The goal is for one million American students to study abroad by 2017 (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005). At its core the Simon Act holds the promise of increasing dramatically the

quantity and diversity of students studying abroad. In the November 2005 report that serves as the basis for the Simon Act, the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (Lincoln Commission) recommends "diversity of students, institutions, and destinations" (p. xiii) with special foci on increasing the number of students of color abroad as well as expanding the number of students studying in nontraditional global destinations.

From Landscape to Portrait: Students Abroad 1965–Present

The sections that follow examine in greater detail the profile of the American student abroad though seven key demographics: race and ethnicity, socio-economic status, field of study, undergraduate standing, gender, age, and disability.

Race and Ethnicity

While very little data and few sources exist that address the race and ethnicity of students studying abroad during the 1960s and 1970s, we can draw some conclusions on the student profile based on historical events of the time. First, the civil rights movement made it possible for larger numbers of students of color to enroll in higher education. While the profile of the undergraduate student in the U.S. was becoming more diversified, we can conclude that the profile of those going abroad was not as diverse.

Two perennial obstacles to study abroad for students of color are cost and fear (CIEE, 1991). As previously discussed, African American students were focused on gaining access to the predominantly White institutions; therefore studying abroad was not an aim yet. Enrollment in U.S. higher education often proved a difficult enough obstacle and adjustment for this population of students; therefore the thought of studying, living, and adjusting to another culture, possibly language, and environment was rarely, if ever, a prospect for their higher education.

The civil rights movement is an example of a domestic issue that affected study abroad during the 1970s. In one of the earliest efforts to target underrepresented students for study abroad, the University of California's EAP sought to diversify the students who studied abroad through a grant it obtained from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State. EAP sought to stimulate study abroad enrollment and provide orientation to that end for minority and disadvantaged students. EAP defined "ethnic minority students" as: American Indian/Native American; Asian (Chinese/Chinese-American, Japanese/Japanese-American, Other Oriental, or Southeast Asian);

Black/Afro-American; Hispanic (Latin-American, Latin, Mexican/Mexican-American, Chicano, or Other Spanish/Spanish-American) and "non-ethnic minority disadvantaged students"[6] (Shorrock, 1979, p. 1).

The EAP project was focused on access to study abroad for two groups during the 1970s: students of color and students in financial need. This project awarded study abroad scholarships based upon financial need. During its history, 187 awards were made and, of those awards, 100 grantees were students of color (Shorrock, 1979, p. 4). Additionally, the project focused heavily on engaging as role models the students of color who successfully studied abroad in order to recruit other students to study abroad. These students also presented valuable insights such as the need for more representation of students of color in EAP communication materials (Shorrock, 1979, p. 6).

Included in Shorrock's project report is a snapshot of study abroad participation from 1977–79 by ethnic minority students within the UC system. Of the students of color who studied abroad during that timeframe, Hispanic students represented 51%, Asian students 32%, and Black students 10% (1979, p. 10). While the top two destinations of these students were Spain and France, there appears to be some heritage seeking study abroad that occurred, as 22 students studied in Mexico, 21 in Japan, 13 in Kenya, and 8 in Hong Kong, however it is not clear which students of color were studying in which countries (Shorrock, 1979, p. 10).

Shorrock (1979) concludes the project report on an optimistic note referencing the national state of affairs regarding international education:

> The potential availability of these returned alumni as authentic role-models in reaching out to their fellow minorities together with a renewed national interest and concern for ethnic, foreign language and international studies, as symbolized by the President's Commission, means that this Project is fast reaching a new point of "take-off." (p. 27)

This reference to the 1979 Presidential Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (during the administration of President Jimmy Carter) seems optimistic given that during the earlier part of the 1970s, the Nixon administration attempted to cut this Title VI program (Dessoff, 2008a).

More efforts in the field of international education to increase the diversity of U.S. students studying abroad began in the early 1980s. IIE data did not yet reflect race or ethnicity in their annual report, and very few universities documented the numbers of students studying abroad based on this demographic. The *Open Doors* reports do, however, reveal that the total number of students studying

[6] Those with a documented need for financial assistance.

abroad during this time period increased significantly (see Table 7). Although the breakdown by ethnicity was not reported, the increase in enrollment of Asian American students in U.S. higher education during this time period may have impacted the study abroad student profile as well (see Table 3).

In 1986, the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) was established to promote development of and improve access to postsecondary institutions for Hispanic students (HACU, 2008). Beginning with 18 member institutions in the U.S., it has grown to over 450 and now includes colleges and universities in Puerto Rico, Latin America, Spain, and Portugal. HACU's Office of International Affairs has focused on providing services to members and their students on various international initiatives such as study abroad. As a result, the value of study abroad and international education exchange were areas of focus by HACU for Hispanic students not only in the U.S., but also their member institutions overseas.

It was not until the early 1990s that we began to see a comprehensive emphasis on students of color participating in study abroad programs, as well as a more coordinated and sustained effort within the field of education abroad to show the world the racial and ethnic diversity of the United States. CIEE reinvigorated the goal of increasing opportunities for students of color to participate on study abroad programs when they chose *International Education: Broadening the Base of Participation* as the theme of their annual conference in 1990. As the theme suggests, the conference primarily focused on strategies for increasing the study abroad participant profile including economic level, race and ethnic origin, and academic discipline (CIEE, 1990, p. 4). During the conference's opening plenary Johnnetta B. Cole, President of Spelman College, emphasized the importance of increasing student diversity on study abroad programs as well as increasing program options in Africa and the Caribbean which might be more attractive to students of color. Additionally, Cole advocated for the collection of data on these students. She demonstrated the importance of good statistics by saying:

> What is the number of black students studying abroad today? How has that number changed over time? And other "minority" students? Frankly, we don't know because we don't keep such statistics. I understand why: During earlier periods keeping such statistics was not the correct thing to do. But this is a different time, and we need those statistics in order to characterize the current situation and to monitor progress in broadening the involvement of students of color in overseas educational exchange. Without hard figures, nevertheless, we know the situation is not good. (1991, pp. 1–2)

In 1993 IIE began to collect study abroad data on student ethnicity. The numbers confirmed what was known anecdotally: there existed very little racial and ethnic diversity among students studying abroad. According to IIE reports for that year, students that studied abroad during the 1993-94 academic year were comprised of 83.8% White, 5% Asian American, 5% Hispanic American, 2.8% African American, 3.1% multiracial, and 0.3% Native American (2005).

During the early 1990s, more efforts were directed toward increasing the numbers of students of color in study abroad and overall diversification of the study abroad student profile. One of the first steps was to investigate the reasons why these populations of students were not going overseas. Several barriers were identified which began to shape our understanding of the participation of students of color in study abroad during this period, primarily finances and lack of knowledge about study abroad opportunities. The majority of students, regardless of race or ethnicity, cited finances as being the primary barrier inhibiting their participation. Subsequently, students of color cited finances as a larger barrier in comparison to White students (Hembroff & Rusz, 1993). Additional barriers that explain the low numbers of students of color going overseas were: student concern about study abroad fitting into their academic program; fear; perceived racism overseas; lack of knowledge of another language; lack of family support; and lack of institutional support and outreach (CIEE, 1991; Fels, 1993; Hembroff & Rusz, 1993; Van Der Meid, 2003).

Generational status of U.S. students who enroll in college affected study abroad participation rates as well. Students from ethnic groups who had recently immigrated to the U.S. tended to study abroad in lower rates. For example, fewer Vietnamese and Filipino students studied abroad in comparison to Japanese or Chinese students (Doan, 2002; Van Der Meid, 2003). A student's generational status is discussed further in the next section of this chapter.

Furthermore, while exploring the social and economic background of students enrolled in higher education institutions during the 1990s, additional disparities based on race were evident. A report by USDOE (2003) that gathered information on undergraduate students and financial aid in the year 2000 identified students falling within the categories of Black, Hispanic, Asian Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native as low-income. According to the data in Table 9, the percentage of undergraduate students enrolled in higher education receiving financial aid varied by race. Except for Asian Pacific Islander students, more students of color received financial aid to pay for their education in comparison to White students.

Table 9. U.S. Undergraduate Students Receiving Financial Aid: 1999-00

Race/ethnicity	Enrollment of undergraduates (in thousands)	Total aid received (%)
White, non-Hispanic	11,074	53.3
Black, non-Hispanic	2,051	69.5
Hispanic	1,984	58.3
Asian Pacific Islander	1,050	44.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	170	56.5

Source: USDOE, 2003

We draw a parallel between fewer students of color who study abroad and more who identified finances as a large barrier. In view of this, a large portion of those enrolled in higher education likely did not have the economic means to pay for study abroad in addition to their education.

Despite the barriers, an encouraging phenomenon during this period was the increase in students embarking on heritage seeking in study abroad. Heritage seekers are individuals who choose their study abroad location based on their own cultural heritage with the goal of enhancing knowledge of their cultural background (Szekeley, 1998). Growth of these programs slightly altered the demographics of the study abroad student profile, because more underrepresented students chose to participate in a study abroad program based on their ethnic and cultural background.

During the new millennium period there has been little change in the ethnic diversity of the study abroad students. In Table 10 we see that numbers are increasing for students of all races and ethnicities, but the percentages remain relatively stagnant. Minor increases are evident in the numbers of Asian American, Native American, and multiracial students going overseas. Barriers that were

Table 10. Percentage of Students in Study Abroad, by Race: Selected Years 1993-2006

	1993/94	2000/01	2005/06
Caucasian	83	84.3	83.0
African-American	2.8	3.5	3.5
Hispanic-American	5	5.4	5.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	5	5.4	6.3
Native American/Alaska Native	0.3	0.5	0.6
Multiracial	3.1	0.9	1.2

Source: IIE, 2007b

previously identified continue to prohibit many students from studying abroad, particularly students of color. Table 11 displays the disparity in the profile of the study abroad student in comparison to the total U.S. population based on the 2000 census, enrollment in higher education institutions, students going abroad, and Gilman scholarship recipients.[7]

Table 11. Percentage of U.S. Population and Enrollment, Comparative Data

Race/Ethnicity	U.S. Population 2000	Higher Education Enrollment 2004*	Students Abroad 2004-05	Community College Students Abroad 2003-04	Gilman Scholarship Recipients 2004-05
Caucasian	75.1 (*n*=211,460,626)	66.1 (*n*=11,422,770)	83.0 (*n*=170,966)	81.4 (*n*=4,702)	44 (*n*=154)
Black/African American	12.3 (*n*=34,658,818)	12.5 (*n*=2,164,683)	3.5 (*n*=7,209)	3.7 (*n*=214)	16 (*n*=55)
Hispanic/Latino American	12.5 ** (*n*=35,305,818)	10.5 (*n*=1,809,593)	5.6 (*n*=11,535)	10.2 (*n*=589)	9 (*n*=32)
Asian American	3.7 *** (*n*=10,242,998)	6.4 *** (*n*=1,108,693)	6.3 (*n*=12,977)	4.1 (*n*=237)	9 (*n*=32)
Native American	0.9 (*n*=2,475,956)	1.0 **** (*n*=176,138)	0.4 (*n*=824)	0.2 (*n*=11)	1 (*n*=3)
Multiracial	2.4 (*n*=6,826,228)	n/a	1.2 (*n*=2,472)	0.4 (*n*=23)	7 ***** (*n*=25)
No Response	---	---	---	---	14

Source: Comp, 2005
* Excludes Nonresident alien data
** U.S. Census data provides separate data on Hispanic/Latino populations
*** Includes Hawaiian/Pacific Islander populations
**** Includes American Indian/Alaska Native populations
***** Other

While there were higher numbers of students of color enrolled in higher education institutions during this time period, the numbers of those students participating in study abroad are disparate. In looking at the total U.S. population and the total number of students enrolled in higher education, we can see that for some of the racial categories, the numbers are rather similar. Looking further at the total number of students going abroad during this time period, it is evident that the numbers decline. Only Asian American students reflect equal representation in those that are enrolling in higher education (6.4%), and those that are going abroad (6.3%); although this number is still minimal compared to the total number enrolled in higher education (1,108,693).

[7] The federally-funded Gilman Scholarship is for financially-needy students who receive Pell Grants. This program is discussed in greater detail in the section on socio-economic status.

Having grown up as ethnic minorities in the U.S., students of color who study abroad find the experience perplexing and exhilarating for reasons different from their White classmates. Fuyuki Hiroshima was a Japanese American student at Dartmouth at the dawn of the new millennium. As an undergraduate she joined a short-term research project in India. In the following reflection she seems relieved when her White friends, and not herself, stand out because of their skin color:

> What I will never forget about the trip were the staring eyes, the quiet gazes that watched us as we ate, relentless in their pursuit. But most of the time those stares were not directed at me. They were focused on my white companions. The people in India have seen East Asians before, so I was nothing new. The white skin of my colleagues, however, was an anomaly. Crowds of people would stop, point, and watch as we crossed the street. Strangers followed us around for hours. I know this sounds mean, but I couldn't help but think, Ha! Now they know what it's like to look 'different' from everyone else — to be judged because of the color of their skin (in Garrod & Kilkenny, 2007, pp. 91–92).

During this period, there has been an increased push by the federal government and higher education institutions to augment the numbers and the representation of students of color. Several programs, initiatives, and funding sources have been added at institutional and national levels to expand opportunities for students of color to participate in overseas study (AED, 2006; IIE, 2006).

In partnership with multicultural affairs professionals, the efforts of study abroad professionals to diversify the ethnicity of students who study abroad is demonstrated in the University of Minnesota's Multicultural Study Abroad Group (MSAG). This organization began in 2001 as a grassroots activity of 25 professionals from both the study abroad and multicultural affairs offices with the focus to identify barriers for students of color to study abroad and seek programmatic initiatives to overcome those barriers. MSAG has collected data on over 700 students of color regarding attitudes and behaviors toward study abroad in order to make programmatic decisions. These initiatives have resulted in the number of students of color who study abroad on University of Minnesota programs increasing 200% from 2001 to 2007.

Through a grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) Comprehensive program, Loyola Marymount's Center for Global Education created the Project for Learning Abroad Training and Outreach (PLATO) in 2004. PLATO provides resources, training, and outreach for all college students in the U. S., but with

a focus on underrepresented students. PLATO's program components and resources consist of marketing materials for outreach to underrepresented students; a pre-study abroad online learning course; retention resources and mentor message boards for students while abroad; a re-entry online course; an international honors certificate; faculty/staff development modules; and K–12, community college, and home campus outreach.

While PLATO concentrated on all underrepresented students during this time period, additional efforts and resources by HACU encouraged initiatives solely regarding Hispanic students and study abroad. In 2005, HACU member institutions signed an agreement to create the Laureate International Scholarship Program (HACU, 2008). The goal of this program was to increase the numbers of Hispanic students studying abroad from their U.S. member institutions. Funding in the amount of $8 million was earmarked for study abroad scholarships. In 2006, the American Institute for Foreign Study (AIFS) and Global Learning Semesters committed additional scholarships for students in HACU member institutions.

Government efforts in the promotion and support of study abroad for American undergraduates increased during this decade. As noted previously, the Simon Act proposes to increase the diversity of students who study abroad (Lincoln Commission, 2005). In 2006, the Academy for Educational Development organized the *Colloquium on diversity in education abroad: How to change the future* (AED, 2006). During the proceedings several key speakers and professionals in the field of international education discussed not only the barriers, but outlined best practices and presented next steps to increase the numbers. Additionally, several new initiatives have been implemented through institutions as well as private and national organizations to attract more students of color to study abroad. Recently, the Phelps Stokes Fund, the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Educationand Bardoli Global Inc. joined to increase the number of students of color in international exchange programs through collaborations amongst public and private organizations, leaders in higher education institutions, study abroad program providers, and increased resources and funding for students of color to study abroad (Collaborative for Diversity in Education Abroad, 2007).

While the benefits of study abroad have been noted by the U.S. government, higher education institutions, and the American society as a whole, in recent years a shift has taken place in gearing efforts toward increasing the ethnic diversity of the study abroad student. We have seen a slight increase within certain ethnic groups studying abroad since 1965; current programs and institutions continue to work towards augmenting the numbers even more.

Socio-economic Status

Unlike race or gender, socio-economic status is not as clearly defined or determined a category. Most researchers use a combination of categories, often pulling from income, education level, and occupation and assigning a number based on an algorithm. We define socio-economic status (SES) as a combination of parental educational level, career, and income. We rely on secondary data since SES data are not compiled in collections such as *Open Doors*.

At least to the mid-1980s most study abroad participants likely came from wealthy, educated families. In her 1984 analysis of a survey given to over 8,000 CIEE and International Student Identity Card (ISIC) applicants, Koester (1985) reports that 55% of respondents had traveled abroad previously (p. 18). For undergraduate students, prior trips abroad were likely with family members, making study abroad socially acceptable and financially possible. Moreover, 28% of these early 1980s study abroad participants had at least one parent who had lived abroad (Koester, 1985, p. 23), a factor that may have compounded the students' desire and acceptability to go abroad. The final factor that underscores the SES status of study abroad students in the 1980s are the students' sources of funding. More than two-thirds (approximately 70%) relied largely on personal savings and family funds to pay for their program abroad; for one out of five students, loans and scholarships were the major source (Koester, 1985, p. 16).

Steve Johnson, Assistant Director of the International Student Travel Center at the University of Minnesota from 1972 to 1995, states that while it was a student's right to use federal financial aid for approved study abroad, it was not yet the practice of campus financial aid officers to allow financial aid to "travel" with studying abroad (personal communication, 6/26/08). Johnson reports having to advocate against what could be perceived as discriminatory practices in order to allow students more options — options they had the right to use — to fund study abroad. Arguments such as this were successful on selected campuses until 1992, when that year's reauthorization of federal student aid in the Higher Education Act made explicit the ability of students to use federal funds for study abroad (Bolen, 2001). In recent years some campuses (notably private ones) have begun to allow students to use institutional scholarships for study abroad in order to increase access and affordability. The aim is to make up the resulting financial setback by either full-paying students or the institution's endowment (Rubin, 2008).

Recent scholarship programs such as Gilman (IIE, 2007a) and the proposed Simon Act are largely aimed at making study abroad possible for a broader spectrum of students across socio-economic classes. The Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, introduced in 2001, has provided funds to

more than 3,100 students in financial need (IIE, 2008a). This scholarship, named for retired Congressman Benjamin A. Gilman and funded through the federal International Academic Opportunity Act of 2000 (IIE, 2008a), is exclusively for undergraduate, degree-seeking students enrolled at two-year and four-year colleges who receive federal Pell Grant funding. Currently, scholarship winners can receive up to $5,000 to offset expenses of one to nine months of study abroad. Two students describe their background and how much this scholarship meant to them. Erica Reid, an undergraduate at Boston College in 2004–05, needed a scholarship to convince her family that she could go to China. She states several barriers many students like her have against studying abroad:

> Being a first generation American as well as first generation college student I did not have anyone's footsteps to follow or advice to heed. My parents were very nervous about my decision to study abroad. What eventually helped to ease their minds was the fact that I would have...financial support (IIE, 2008c).

Another Gilman scholarship recipient, Dat Ha at UCLA, tells of similar barriers that may have prevented his study abroad experience in Hong Kong. He is an immigrant "whose parents did not have access to higher education, let alone [have] the opportunity to study abroad," (IIE, 2008c). Ha and Reid are among the 351 Gilman scholarship recipients in academic year 2004–05. By evidence of the 16.4% acceptance rate in that year, it is clear that there is even more desire — and hope — to study abroad among lower income students (IIE, 2008b).

The latest hope for funding comes from another federal source, the Simon Act. It proposes a significant amount funds to send 1 million U.S. undergraduates abroad by 2017. Two key features of this legislaton are diversification of the student population, to proportionately match the undergraduate enrollment population, and diversification of U.S. institutions that send students abroad, to reach students in two-year colleges, minority-serving institutions, and other institutions whose enrollment is largely comprised of low-income and first-generation students (Lincoln Commission, 2005). The provisions of the Simon Act would allow more students with limited means, like Reid and Ha, to explore education abroad without concern for finances.

A study by a team at the University of Iowa has examined the choice process regarding a student's intent to participate in study abroad as an undergraduate (Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2008). In this study the researchers investigated the dynamic interaction between SES and social and cultural capital in college freshmen to determine predictors of study abroad. They determine

SES by level of parents' education and whether the student receives federal aid (Salisbury et al.); their definition of social and cultural capital regarding study abroad is stated as "the availability of information about study abroad, its perceived educational importance, social or family constraints, comfort in negotiating multicultural environments, awareness of and interest in international events and issues, previous travel abroad, and second language proficiency" (Salisbury et al., pp. 10–11). It appears that low SES in itself is not a strong enough predictor, but when combined with low cultural and social capital, such a student is least likely to investigate study abroad (31% predicted probability; Salisbury et al., p. 23). At the opposite end of the spectrum the predicted probability to study abroad rockets to 85% among students with high SES and high social and cultural capital (Salisbury et al., p. 23). In between these, evidence shows that collegiate experiences, beyond financial aid advising for low SES students, can positively influence a student's decision to study abroad. While pre-college social and cultural capital cannot be influenced by college faculty or administration, such in-college capital can be and should be promoted in order to increase the interest of lower SES students in the desirability and possibility of studying abroad.

Field of Study

While the vast majority of U.S. students who studied abroad from 1965 to 2005 were majoring in the humanities or social sciences, there are have been changes over this time period with regard to other disciplines. Table 12 shows two salient changes. The first is the significant increase in business majors studying abroad and the marked decrease in humanities students abroad since 1965. The numbers of education as well as engineering, mathematics, and computer science majors studying abroad in this time period have slightly increased.

When viewing the study abroad enrollment figures against data representing undergraduate degrees granted by U.S. institutions during the same time period, there are two noteworthy observations to make (see Table 13). First, the numbers of undergraduate degrees granted in business, engineering, mathematics, and computer science increased. Secondly, the number of undergraduate degrees in education markedly decreased.

Since 1965, the numbers of students from the humanities and social sciences combined have represented the highest percentage of students studying abroad, no matter how the figures have been calculated. With curricular emphases on international, intercultural, and foreign language themes, it has been easy to encourage students in these disciplines to augment their education with time spent abroad. Likely due to stable enrollments in these disciplines and

Table 12. U.S. Study Abroad Enrollments by Discipline as Percentage of Total Enrollments in Study Abroad, Selected Years 1965-2005

	1965	1970	1992	2002-03	2005-06
US Students Abroad (N)	18,092	32,148	71,154	174,629	223,534
Agriculture	0.6% (*n*=110)	0.2% (*n*=72)	0.7%	1.5%	1.3%
Business	1.7 (*n*=315)	4.2 (*n*=650)	12	17.7	17.7
Education	1.8 (*n*=327)	1.7 (*n*=546)	5.7	4.1	4.1
Engineering	1.5 (*n*=286)	1.4 (*n*=434)	1.6[1] 1.1[2]	2.9[1] 2.4[2]	2.9[1] 1.5[2]
Humanities	51 (*n*=9,234)	39.3 (*n*=12,629)	44.9	13.3	14.2
Medical Sciences	13 (*n*=2,368)	12.1 (*n*=3,885)	1.1	3.1	3.8
Physical & Natural Sciences	8.5 (*n*=1,532)	4.2 (*n*=1,363)	3.8	7.1	6.9
Social Sciences	15.3 (*n*=2,782)	11.9 (*n*=3,826)	17.3	21.3	21.7
Other	n/a	27.2 (*n*=8,743)	7.6	n/a	1.3

Sources: IIE, 2005; 2007b [1]Engineering; [2]Math and Computer Science
Notes: Figures for 1965 and 1970 reflect the number of U.S. students studying abroad as reported by foreign institutions. Figures for 1992 through 2006 reflect the number of U.S. students on U.S. college-sponsored study abroad programs, as reported by U.S. institutions. Between 1985 and 1992, humanities and social sciences were reported as one figure in *Open Doors*. Beginning in 1998, these disciplines were again reported separately.

study abroad initiatives targeted at other disciplines, humanities and social science study abroad percentages have become nearly equal with the percentage of degrees granted (see Table 13).

The single discipline that has seen the biggest increase since the 1960s in both students studying abroad and degrees granted is business (see Table 13). In the 1980s references began to emerge about the changing global economy and the need for more business and economics students to have a great understanding of the world so that by the early 1990s business schools seeking accreditation by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) were required to include global issues in their curriculum (Praetzel, Curcio, & Dilorenzo, 1996). Examples of innovations in internationalizing the business curriculum with study abroad are Niagara University's partnership with Schiller International University (Praetzel et al., 1996), the Huntsman Program at the University of Pennsylvania which brings together International Studies and Business in a dual-degree program requiring a study abroad experience, and the

Table 13. Percentage Representation of Undergraduate Majors in Study Abroad Compared to Percentage of Degrees Granted, Selected Years 1970-2006

	1970	1992-94*	2004-06
Humanities	study abroad: 39 degrees granted: 16	study abroad: 45 degrees granted: 14	study abroad: 14 degrees granted: 15
Social Sciences	study abroad: 12 degrees granted: 19	study abroad: 17 degrees granted: 22	study abroad: 22 degrees granted: 22
STEM	study abroad: 10 degrees granted: 12	study abroad: 6 degrees granted: 15	study abroad: 11 degrees granted: 15
Medical Sciences & Health Professions	study abroad: 13 degrees granted: 3	study abroad: 1 degrees granted: 7	study abroad: 4 degrees granted: 6
Education	study abroad: 2 degrees granted: 21	study abroad: 6 degrees granted: 9	study abroad: 4 degrees granted: 7
Business	study abroad: 4 degrees granted: 14	study abroad: 12 degrees granted: 21	study abroad: 18 degrees granted: 22
Agriculture	study abroad: .2 degrees granted: 1.5	study abroad: .7 degrees granted: 1.5	study abroad: 1.3 degrees granted:1.6

Sources: IIE, 2005; 2007; USDOE, 2007f
Note: 2004-06 data cover 2-year span
*1992-93 for STEM, medical sciences & health professions, education, business, and agriculture

2007 announcement by the Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota to require an international experience for all undergraduate students which began with the fall 2008 Freshman class.

The percentage of undergraduate degrees granted by U.S. institutions to students majoring in the STEM fields has remained relatively steady since the 1960s. Since the 1980s, when *Open Doors* standardized its data collection on U.S. students studying abroad to reflect data reported by U.S. institutions instead of foreign institutions, there has been an increase in the percentage of STEM majors who have studied abroad (see Table 12). Yet the percentage is still relatively low compared to the humanities and social science majors. (For a full discussion of developments in the internationalization of the curriculum and its relation to education abroad see Chapter 2.)

Undergraduate Standing

In looking at the diversification of the student profile as it pertains to undergraduate standing, it is interesting to note that more students continue to study abroad during their junior year in comparison to other years of their undergraduate studies. According to IIE, 36.5% of students studying abroad in 1989–90 decided

to go overseas during their junior year (see Table 14). Recent IIE data displays that this number has fluctuated in the intervening years and that more seniors are going abroad, yet the junior year still remains the most popular year in college to participate in study abroad. Currently, there is an increase in freshmen and seniors studying abroad, likely due to growth in program types, eligibility, curriculum, and duration.

Table 14. *Undergraduate Standing and Study Abroad*

	1989/90	1995/96	2000/01	2006/07
Associate's	4.1	2	0.9	2.7
Bachelor's				
Freshman	2.2	2	3.1	3.3
Sophomore	9.9	12.1	14	12.9
Junior	36.5	41.6	38.9	36.6
Senior	12.7	16.2	20	21.3
Unspecified/Other	26	15.5	14.6	12.5

Source: IIE, 2005; 2008

While the data on community college students and study abroad is scarce in *Open Doors* data, other sources show increasing numbers of community college students participate in study abroad programs. Rosalind Latiner Raby, Director of California Colleges for International Education, has been a longtime advocate for international education opportunities for community college students. She states that community colleges have been offering study abroad programs since 1967, although the numbers and profile of the participants were not collected until decades later (Raby, 2007). A large number of community college students participate in programs through third party providers and faculty led seminars (R. Raby, personal communication, June 20, 2008). In addition, the majority of community college students seek to transfer to a four-year institution, and are technically considered 'non-degree seeking' while abroad. *Open Doors* reports only students seeking an Associate's degree. Consequently, in comparison to four-year colleges, students who study abroad from two-year colleges are likely undercounted. Raby argues that this is generally true in the general population of students enrolled in community colleges in California (R. Raby, personal communication, June 20, 2008).

Two main barriers have existed in the participation of community colleges students in study abroad: cost and institutional limitations (Raby & Rhodes, 2004). While cost and the use of financial aid was a major barrier in the 1970s, today more colleges offer affordable short-term programs. Moreover, not all community colleges offer study abroad programs or have an advising office on

campus focused solely on study abroad, thereby setting institutional limitations that are difficult for students to overcome.

Gender

Women's enrollment in higher education increased significantly in the 1960s and 1970s (see Table 4), but few data sources were collected regarding gender and study abroad. *Open Doors* data for the first time reported on gender and the disparity in study abroad in the late 1970s. In 1978–79, American students abroad on U.S. college-sponsored programs were 58% female compared to 42% male. In 1979–80 the difference achieved a full 2-1 ratio: 61% of students abroad in that year were female. Also for the first time with the 1978 to 1980 data *Open Doors* gives the breakdown of regional distribution by gender. Few studies during this time discussed the reason for this gap, although Rubin's (1966) findings may help to provide an example that more females had the opportunity to study abroad, while more males were going overseas for military reasons.

As the numbers of females studying abroad continued to increase in comparison to males, it is interesting to note some differences in destination by gender. In 1979–80, more males than females studied abroad in Canada and countries in Asia and Oceania while more females selected Europe, Latin America, and Africa to study abroad.

Field of study is another area in which there is a noted difference between males and females. In 1985–1986, the percentage of males majoring in the physical and life sciences was 75.8%, while females tended to study in other fields (Shirley, 2006). Moreover, according to *Open Doors* and Table 12, it is evident that more students in the humanities and social sciences were studying abroad during this time period. Therefore, field of study may have had an impact in fewer males studying abroad.

Thomas and McMahon (1998) conducted a study on the relationship between student characteristics and admission criteria of a study abroad program, and the resulting academic performance of students on the program. A large sample of students participating in the University of California's EAP was surveyed. Authors noted that while enrollment in the University of California (UC) system was almost balanced between males and females, participation in EAP was not. Females comprised 2/3 of EAP participants. Several hypotheses were provided by the authors for the gender gap in the UC EAP programs. Major field of study, language courses, study abroad delaying graduation, and concern about study abroad being relevant to future career goals were some of the hypotheses provided as to why the gender gap continues to prevail.

During the first years of the 2000s, the percentage of females studying abroad has continued to increase. In 2006–07, the ratio rose to 65.1% females and 34.9% males (Table 15). The lower percentage of males studying abroad may be connected to family and other external obligations in the U.S., the lack of flexibility within academic field of study, and the perception of study abroad as a female domain.

Table 15. Gender and Study Abroad (percentages)

	1980/81	1989/90	1995/96	2000/01	2006/07
Male	38.7	35	34.7	35	34.9
Female	61.3	65	65.3	65	65.1

Sources: IIE, 2005; 2008

One of the first large scale studies focused on the gender gap in study abroad was published in 2006. Shirley (2006) conducted a study of males and females from 14 institutions throughout the U.S. to explore motivations, obligations, perceived benefits, and external influences on students who studied abroad in 2003. He compared the differences between males and females and their perceptions of their study abroad experience. Results indicated that females had more positive external influences on their decision to study abroad than males, and they cited internship and work obligations in larger numbers than males; while males were more likely to identify delay to graduation as an obligation to deter them from studying abroad. Shirley points out the large gender gap, and argues that if the proportion of males to females studying abroad were equal, then the total numbers of students going overseas would increase dramatically. Shirley concludes that very few differences were observed between males and females in relation to their study abroad experience, and recommends improved marketing strategies to narrow the gender gap. Later, in 2008, Elizabeth Redden found that at some of the higher education institutions in the U.S. that send the largest numbers of students abroad the gender imbalance remains the same; student expectations and personal experience and anticipated outcomes were some of the attributing factors.

Age

In contrast to other demographics, the age of students participating in education abroad is hardly documented at all. Some documentation exists of adults (e.g., Orndorff, 1998), but these are not enrolled undergraduates.[8] In the years 1960 to 1990 it appears likely that nearly all students participating in study abroad were traditional-age college students (18–22 years old). We make this

[8] Students older than age 22, the upper boundary for a traditional-age undergraduate student, are often termed "non-traditional students."

assumption based on the typical length of time for which students went abroad at that time, from one semester to an academic year, which was likely a barrier to non-traditional-age students whose work and family responsibilities make it difficult for them to leave home for such an extended period. In his assessment of a study abroad tour for non-traditional business students, Peppas (2005, pp. 143–144) underscores this assumption: "study abroad has often been associated primarily with semester- or year-long stays in foreign countries. ... Unfortunately, this type of program is often not a viable option for non-traditional business students." There is also evidence in the education abroad research studies that have been conducted over time that refer to respondent ages as falling within the traditional range (e.g., Orahood, Kruze, & Easley Pearson, 2004; Savicki, Downing-Burnette, Heller, Binder, & Suntinger, 2004) but more often than not the respondents' year in college — Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior — is reported with no reference to age (e.g., Koester, 1985; Goldstein & Kim, 2006). In some quantitative studies age as a predictor variable has shown to be either not statistically significant (Cohen, Paige, Shively, Emert, & Hoff, 2005) or inconclusive (Huebner, 1998).

In the years since 1990, as short-term study abroad has increased, study abroad may have become more accessible for undergraduate students above age 22. One example, described in NAFSA's 2003 edition of *Internationalizing the Campus*, is of an adult student from the Community College of Philadelphia who studied abroad three times on short-term programs (Connell, 2003). Further, the State University of New York's Rockland Community College has been a long-time promoter of study abroad for its students. Most the SUNY-Rockland programs are ten days in length and allow students to complete three credits, a format that is likely very attractive to adult students with work and/or family responsibilities (2008).

Disability

Students with disabilities are perhaps the most underrepresented population in education abroad. Over the decades the field of international education has paid relatively little attention to students with disabilities, their needs, and their interest in studying abroad. While support and services for students with disabilities who want to participate in educational activities abroad continue to make gains on campuses across the United States, no public data is available on the numbers of students with disabilities who studied abroad from the 1960s to 1990s. This is not to say that these students did not pursue educational activities abroad.

The organizations that assist higher education students with disabilities to study abroad also help us understand the profile of these students. Susan Sygall

and Barbara Williams co-founded Mobility International USA (MIUSA) in Eugene, Oregon in 1981. In the early years of its existence MIUSA's attention focused on producing resources and opportunities for the individual traveler with disabilities. During its first year of operation, MIUSA conducted a survey in the United States and found that less than one percent of the responding exchange programs reported that they had participants with disabilities (MIUSA, 2007a, p. 26). By 1983, MIUSA began their International Community Service and German Professional Exchange programs. Throughout the 1980s, this organization steadily increased its inbound and outbound program offerings with England, Costa Rica, China, Italy, and Germany.

Into the 1990s MIUSA positioned itself as the leading authority on issues related to international travel and education for individuals with disabilities. During the early 1990s MIUSA inbound and outbound programs continued to blossom and added countries such as Mexico, Bulgaria, Japan, and Azerbaijan. In 1995 MIUSA was awarded funds by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the United States Department of State and began serving as the National Clearinghouse on Disability and Exchange (NCDE). The creation of the NCDE helped bring greater attention to the essential work of MIUSA in the field and, more importantly, to making international educational and travel opportunities a reality for those with disabilities.

Access Abroad (2008) at the University of Minnesota is a collaborative initiative between the Learning Abroad Center and Disabilities Services at that institution that provides accessibility information about programs abroad. Access Abroad's materials are geared toward a national audience, providing online resources including video clips to assist students with disabilities in making informed choices on studying abroad. The Access Abroad also provides best practice information and valuable tools to help education abroad professionals to support and increase study abroad participation by students with disabilities.

A regional effort focusing on issues and concerns related to students with disabilities studying abroad is No Barriers to Study (NBTS). Founded in 1988, NBTS focuses its attention solely on assisting college and university students with disabilities to study abroad. This organization is a consortium comprising professionals in the areas of study abroad, international programs, disability services, diversity and others from 18 colleges, universities and a third-party provider in Pennsylvania and one college in Maryland.

MIUSA has been advocating for many years for better data collection efforts both at the institutional level and at the national level. In 1998, the National Clearinghouse on Disability and Exchange partnered with IIE to

survey institutions of higher education in the United States on their practices in serving students with disabilities who wanted to study abroad and to gather preliminary data on the numbers of students studying abroad. In 2004, these two organizations conducted a telephone survey of the 40 top sending university and college study abroad offices to learn about institutional practice in tracking students studying abroad who have disabilities, and ran an online data collection survey to which 69 institutions responded. 41 institutions (representing approximately 10% of all reported study abroad participants) provided data on their study abroad participants and students with disabilities. The findings show that 505 study abroad students from these institutions had a disability which means that 3% of students who studied abroad during the 2003–2004 academic year had some type of disability (Scheib, 2005, p. 52). During that same academic year, of the 19,054,000 million students enrolled in U.S postsecondary institutions, 2,156,000 (11%) identified themselves as having a disability (MIUSA, 2007b. USDOE, 2006) For comparative purposes, of the 14,486,315 million students enrolled in U.S. postsecondary institutions during the 1992–1993 academic year, 6% or 912,637 students had a disability (USDOE, 1996).

Conclusion

Without reservation it can be said that the profile of the American student abroad has diversified over the latter half of the 20th century. The demographic that has experienced the greatest documented change is field of study, in which thousands of business students have embarked on study abroad to complete their undergraduate education. The profile of students engaging in study abroad has changed in part due to societal influences such as increased access, financial disparities, and globalization, but also due to purposeful initiatives to recruit underrepresented students, such as scholarships, curricular interventions, and peer mentoring.

The major trend shows that increasing access to and opportunity for study abroad takes time. Except for gender, an underrepresented group seems to establish itself first within U.S. higher education and then goes about pursuing study abroad. This is noted by Bolen, who estimates a 20-year time lapse for trends in higher education to become trends in study abroad (2001).Changes in society at large toward an interrelated, international existence are a great boost for the reputation of study abroad. Yet, as we see from the discussion presented here, fundamental changes to broaden the U. S. student profile requires balanced coordination: the systematic and on-going efforts by individual institutions matched by significant investment, legislation, or both, from institutions and government.

References

Academy for Educational Development. (2006). Colloquium on diversity education abroad: How to change the picture, Washington, DC.

Access Abroad. (2008). Resources for international education & disability professionals. Retrieved January 4, 2008, from http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/access/.

Adam, M. (2003). World climate demands Global Learning for All. *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*, 13, 10–13.

Altbach, P. G. (2005). Patterns in higher education development. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (2nd ed., pp. 15–37). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2007). CC STATS home page. Retrieved January 5, 2008, from http://www2.aacc.nche.edu/research/

American Council on Education. (2003). ACE fact sheet on higher education: Historical trends in the Federal Guaranteed and Direct Student Loan programs. Retrieved April 1, 2008, from http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Search&section=fact_sheets&template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentFileID=1097

American Council on Education. (2007). ACE fact sheet on higher education: Pell Grant funding history. Retrieved April 1, 2008, from http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Search&section=fact_sheets&template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentFileID=1099

American Council on Education, Art & Science Group LLC, & The College Board. (2008). *College-bound students' interest in study abroad and other international learning activities*. Retrieved April 1, 2008, from http://www.artsci.com/data/files/news/StudentPOLLNews/studentPOLL_International_Issue.pdf

Anderson, L. C. (Ed.). (2005). *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum*. Minneapolis, MN: Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota.

Bastedo, M. N. (2005). Curriculum in higher education: The historical roots of contemporary issues. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (2nd ed., pp. 462–485). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Bolen, M. (2001). Consumerism and U.S. study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*(3), 182–200.

Bowman, J. E. (1987). Educating American undergraduates abroad: The development of study abroad programs by American colleges and universities. (CIEE Occasional Paper #24). Retrieved January 15, 2008, from http://www.ciee.org/images/uploaded/pdf/occasional24.pdf

Brokaw, S. C. (1996). Planning, organizing, and executing short term international exposures for U.S. students of marketing and business: An alternative method. *Marketing Education Review, 6*(3), 87–93.

Brown, M. A. (1983). U.S. students abroad. In H. Jenkins (Ed.), *Educating students from other nations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Button, H. W., & Provenzo Jr., E. F. (1989). *History of education and culture in America* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Center for Global Education. (2008). Current projects. Retrieved January 4, 2008, from http://globaled.us/projects.asp

Cohen, A. D., Paige, R. M., Shively, R., Emert, H., & Hoff, J. (2005). *Maximizing study abroad through language and culture strategies: Research on students, study abroad program professionals, and language instructors. Final Report to the International Research and Studies Program, Office of International Education, U.S. Department of Education.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

Cole, J. B. (1991). Opening Address of the 43rd International Conference on Educational Exchange. *Black students and overseas programs: Broadening the base of participation* (pp. 1–5). New York, NY: CIEE.

Collaborative for Diversity in Education Abroad. (2007, May). *The collaborative for diversity in education abroad: Working together to transform the face of international exchange*, Washington DC.: author.

Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. (November 2005). *Global competence & national needs: One million Americans studying abroad*. Washington, DC: Author.

Comp, D. (2005). Comparative data on race and ethnicity in education abroad [Table]. Chicago, IL: Author.

Connell, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus 2003: Profiles of success at colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Council for International Educational Exchange. (1988, August*). Educating for global competence: The report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange*. New York, NY: CIEE.

Council for International Educational Exchange. (1990). 43rd International Conference on Educational Exchange, Charleston, South Carolina, November 1990. New York, NY: CIEE.

Council on International Educational Exchange. (1991). *Increasing participation of ethnic minorities in study abroad.* Retrieved February 15, 2006, from http://www.secussa.nafsa.org/forum/CIEEBooklet.pdf

Dessoff, A. (2008a). From Cambodia to Iran/1970–1979. *International Educator, 17*(3), 26–28.

-----. (2008b). 1960–1969: From Kennedy's inspirations to fiscal realities. *International Educator, 17*(2), 24–27.

-----. (2008c). NAFSA: The first 10 years. *International Educator, 17*(1), 20–22.

Dey, E. L., & Hurtado, S. (2005). College students in changing contexts. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (2nd ed., pp. 315–339). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Doan, T. M. (2002). *Asian American students: Study abroad participation, perspectives, and experiences.* Masters thesis: University of Minnesota.

Dwyer, M. (2004). More is better: The impact of study abroad program duration. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, X, 151–163.

Fels, M. D. (1993). *Assumptions of African-American students about international education exchange*: Government Printing Office (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED368315).

Gardner, D. P. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*: Government Printing Office (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED226006).

Geiger, R. L. (2005). The ten generations of American higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (2nd ed., pp. 38–70). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gladieux, L. E., King, J. E., & Corrigan, M. E. (2005). The federal government and higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (2nd ed., pp. 163–197). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gliozzo, C. (1980). The international education of minority students. *Minority Education, 2*(5), 6–7.

Goldstein, S. B., & Kim, R. I. (2006). Predictors of US college students' participation in study abroad programs: A longitudinal study [Electronic version]. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 507–521.

Goodwin, C. D., & Nacht, M. (1988). *Abroad and beyond: Patterns in American overseas education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, L. M., & Belch, H. A. (2000). Setting the context: Reconsidering the principles of full participation and meaningful access for students with disabilities. *New Directions for Student Services*(91), 5–18.

Hembroff, L. A., & Rusz, D. L. (1993). *Minorities and overseas studies programs: Correlates of differential participation*: Paper presented at the Council of International Educational Exchange (CIEE), New York, NY.

Hiroshima, F. (2007). Balancing on the hyphen. In A. Garrod & R. Kilkenny (Eds.), *Balancing two worlds: Asian American college students tell their life stories*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities. (2008). Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities. Retrieved June 21, 2008, from http://www.hacu.net/hacu/HACU_101_EN.asp?SnID=702052811

Hoffa, W. W. (2007). *A history of US study abroad: Beginnings to 1965*. Carlisle, PA: Frontiers Journal and The Forum on Education Abroad.

Huebner, T. (1998). Methodological considerations in data collection for language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, IV*, 1–30.

Hull, W. F., IV, Lemke, W. H., Jr., & Houang, R. T.-k. (1977). *The American undergraduate, off-campus and overseas: A study of the educational validity of such programs.* . Santa Barbara, CA: University of California/CIEE.

Institute of International Education. (1981). *Open Doors: Profile of U.S. study abroad students*. New York, NY: Author.

-----. (1989). *Open Doors reports: Profile of U.S. study abroad students*. New York, NY: Author.

-----. (2005). *Open Doors 1948–2004: CD-ROM*. New York, NY: Author.

-----. (2006). *Open Doors reports: Profile of U.S. study abroad students*. New York, NY: Author.

-----. (2007a). Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program. Retrieved January 10, 2008, from http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=25122

-----. (2007b). *Open Doors reports: Profile of U.S. study abroad students.* Retrieved November 21, 2007, from http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=113282

-----. (2008a). *Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program: Study abroad scholarships for undergraduates*. [Brochure]. New York, NY: Institute of International Education.

-----. (2008b). Gilman International Scholarship Program annual application and award statistics. Retrieved January 10, 2008, from http://www.iie.org/programs/gilman/stats/General%20Gilman%20Comparison%20to%20National%2006-07.pdf

-----. (2008c). Gilman scholar profiles. Retrieved January 10, 2008, from http://www.iie.org/programs/gilman/profiles.html

Kauffmann, N. L., Martin, J. N., & Weaver, H. D. (1992). *Students abroad, strangers at home: Education for a global society*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Koester, J. (1985). *A profile of the U.S. student abroad*. New York, NY: Council on International Educational Exchange. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED265737).

Lucas, C. J. (1994). *American higher education: A history*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Mobility International USA. (2007a). Mobility International USA 25th anniversary. Retrieved January 3, 2008, from http://www.miusa.org/publications/books/miusa-25th-anniversary-book-pdf

-----. (2007b). *Will institutions gather study abroad disability data?* Handout distributed at the NAFSA Education Abroad Data Collection Subcommittee meeting at the NAFSA: Association of International Educators 2007 annual conference: Minneapolis, MN.

-----. (2008). About Mobility International USA. Retrieved January 3, 2008, from http://www.miusa.org/about

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2007). *Experiences that matter: Enhancing student learning and success*. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN: Author.

National Task Force on Undergraduate Education Abroad. (1990). Getting on with the task: A national mandate for education abroad, Report of the National Task Force on Undergraduate Education Abroad. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Orahood, T., Kruze, L., & Easley Pearson, D. (2004). The impact of study abroad on business students' career goals. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, X*, 117–130.

Orndorff, E. B. (1998). The short-term study travel experience for adult professionals: A phenomenological study. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Peppas, S. C. (2005). Business study abroad tours for non-traditional students: An outcomes assessment. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, XI*, 143–163.

PLATO — Project for Learning Training and Outreach. (2008). Project for Learning Training and Outreach. Retrieved June 29, 2008, from http://www.globaled.us/plato/about.html

Praetzel, G., Curcio, J., & Dilorenzo, J. (1996). Making study abroad a reality for all students. *International Advances in Economic Research, 2*(2), 174–182.

Raby, R. (1998). California Colleges for International Education Annual Report. Chatsworth, CA: CCIE.

Raby, R. (2007). International reform efforts and challenges in community colleges. In E. Valeau & R. L. Raby (Eds.), *New Directions in Community College Series*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Raby, R., & Rhodes, G. (2004). Barriers to student participation in California community colleges. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from http://coastline.cccd.edu/page.asp?LinkID=635#section3

Redden, E. (2008). Women abroad and men at home. *insidehighered.com*. Retrieved December 29, 2008 from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/12/04/genderabroad.

Rubin, E. (1966). A statistical overview of Americans abroad. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*(368), 1–10.

Rubin, K. (2008). Growing rapidly at small, medium, and large institutions. *International Educator, 17*(5), 42–45.

Salisbury, M. H., Umbach, P. D., Paulsen, M. B., & Pascarella, E. T. (2008, May). *Going global: Understanding the choice process of the intent to study abroad*: Paper presented at the 48th AIR Forum, Seattle, WA.

Savicki, V., Downing-Burnette, R., Heller, L., Binder, F., & Suntinger, W. (2004). Contrasts, changes, and correlates in actual and potential intercultural adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 28*, 311–329.

Scheib, M. (2005). How are we doing? A survey on students with disabilities in study abroad. *IIENetworker,* 52–54.

Shirley, S. (2006). The gender gap in post-secondary study abroad: Understanding and marketing to male students (Doctoral dissertation). University of North Dakota.

Shorrock, H. (1979). Report on the University of California Education Abroad Program's Project: To stimulate enrollment and provide orientation for minority and disadvantaged students. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California Education Abroad Program.

SUNY-Rockland Community College. (2008). Study abroad programs: Rockland Community College. Retrieved July 6, 2008, from http://www.sunyrockland.edu/academics/study-abroad/saprograms

Sygall, S. (2005). Introduction. In S. Sygall & M. Scheib (Eds.), Rights and responsibilities: A guide to national and international disability related laws for international exchange organizations and participants (pp. ii–iii). Eugene, OR: Mobility International USA/National Clearinghouse on Disability and Exchange.

Szekeley, B. (1998). Seeking heritage in study abroad. Retrieved April 21, 2008, from http://www.opendoorsweb.org/Lib%20Pages/STAB/seeking_heritage.htm

Thomas, S., & McMahon, M. (1998). Americans abroad: Student characteristics, pre-departure qualifications, and performance abroad. *International Journal of Educational Management, 12*(2), 57–64.

Thomas, W. G., III. (2004). Television news and the civil rights struggle: The views in Virginia and Mississippi. *Southern spaces: An interdisciplinary journal about the regions, places, and cultures of the American south* Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://www.southernspaces.org/contents/2004/thomas/4f.htm

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1968). *UNESCO Yearbook 1968*. Paris: Author.

-----. (1972). *UNESCO Yearbook 1972*. Paris: Author.

-----. (1984). *UNESCO Yearbook 1984*. Paris: Author.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2007). Annual estimates of the population by sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino origin for the United States: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2006. Retrieved December 16, 2007, from http://www.census.gov/popest/national/asrh/NC-EST2006/NC-EST2006-03.xls

-----. (2008). National population estimates — characteristics: 2000, 1990, 1980, 1970, 1960. Retrieved June 22, 2008, from http://www.census.gov/popest/archives/

U.S. Department of Education Institute of Educational Sciences. (1993). Digest of Education Statistics: 1993 Table 170. Total fall enrollment in institutions of higher education, by level, sex, age, and attendance status of student: Fall 1993. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d95/dtab170.asp

-----. (1996). Digest of Education Statistics: 1996, Table 206. Percent of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions, by disability status and student characteristics: 1992–93. Retrieved January 4, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d96/D96T206.asp

-----. (1999). Digest of Education Statistics: 1999 Table 175. Total fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by level, sex, age, and attendance status of student: 1999. Retrieved January 4, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d01/dt175.asp

-----. (2003). Digest of Education Statistics: 2003, Table 319. Percent of undergraduates receiving aid, by type and source of aid and selected student characteristics: 1999–2000. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d03/tables/dt319.asp

-----. (2005). Digest of Education Statistics: 2005 Table 182. Total fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by level, sex, age, and attendance status of student: 2005. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_182.asp

-----. (2006a). Digest of Education Statistics: 2006, Table 210. Total fall enrollment in degree granting institutions by race/ethnicity, sex, attendance status, and level of student. Retrieved November 5, 2007, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d06/tables/dt06_210.asp

-----. (2006b). Digest of Education Statistics: 2006, Table 215. Number and percentage of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions, by level, disability status, and selected student characteristics: 2003–04. Retrieved January 4, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d06/tables/dt06_215.asp?referrer=list

-----. (2007a). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 179. Total fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by attendance status, sex of student, and control of institution: Selected years, 1947 through 2005. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_179.asp

-----. (2007b). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 181. Total fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by sex, age, and attendance status: Selected years, 1970 through 2016. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_181.asp

-----. (2007c). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 182. Total fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by level, sex, age, and attendance status of student: 2005. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_182.asp

------. (2007d). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 189. Total first-time freshmen fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by attendance 1955 through 2005. Retrieved July 13, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_189.asp

-----. (2007e). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 192. College enrollment and enrollment rates of recent high school completers, by race/ethnicity: 1960 through 2006. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_192.asp

-----. (2007f). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 216. Total fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, attendance status, and level of student: Selected years, 1976 through 2005. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_216.asp

-----. (2007g). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 254. Bachelor's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by discipline division: Selected years, 1970–71 through 2004–05. Retrieved December 16, 2007, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d06/tables/dt06_254.asp

-----. (2007h). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 259. Associate's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by field of study: 1994–95 through 2005–06. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_259.asp

-----. (2007i). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 264. Bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by field of study and year: Selected years, 1970–71 through 2005–06. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_264.asp

-----. (2007j). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 271. Associate's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by race/ethnicity and sex of student: Selected years, 1976–77 through 2005–06. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_274.asp

-----. (2007k). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 274. Associate's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by race/ethnicity and sex of student: Selected years, 1976–77 through 2005–06. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_274.asp

-----. (2007l). Digest of Education Statistics: 2007, Table 320. Average undergraduate tuition and fees and room and board rates charged for full-time students in degree-granting institutions, by type and control. Retrieved June 7, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_320.asp

University of California Education Abroad Program. (1989). *1986–87 and 1987–88 EAP participant questionnaire: Analysis of responses*. Santa Barbara, CA: Author.

University of California Los Angeles: Cooperative Institutional Research Program. (2007). The American freshman: Forty-year trends: 1966–2006. Retrieved October 15, 2007, from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/publications.html

Van Der Meid, J. S. (2003). Asian Americans: Factors influencing the decision to study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 9*(Fall).

Vande Berg, M. (2007). Intervening in the learning of U.S. students abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*, 392–399.

Woodruff, G., Doan, T., Hoff, J., Hall, R., Troup, P., & Hernandez, R. (2005). Students of color and study abroad. In L. Anderson (ed.) *Internationalizing undergraduate education: Integrating study abroad into the curriculum*. Minneapolis MN: University of Minnesota.

Wright, R. O. (2006). *Chronology of education in the United States*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc.

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (2nd ed., pp. 115–164). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.