

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316669015>

Who Attends For-Profit Institutions? The Enrollment Landscape

Chapter · January 2017

DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-47187-7_7

CITATIONS

0

READS

32

3 authors, including:



[Rhonda V. Sharpe](#)

Women's Institute for Science, Equity and Race

18 PUBLICATIONS 48 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[William Darity](#)

Duke University

231 PUBLICATIONS 3,509 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Bold Policies for Social Change [View project](#)



Black Women in the U.S. Economy: The Hardest Working Woman [View project](#)

All content following this page was uploaded by [William Darity](#) on 04 May 2017.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

For-Profit Universities

Tressie McMillan Cottom • William A. Darity, Jr.
Editors

For-Profit Universities

The Shifting Landscape of Marketized Higher
Education

palgrave
macmillan

- Roh, D. (2006). *The Mechanics Institute*. <http://transliteracies.english.ucsb.edu/post/research-project/research-clearinghouse-individual/research-reports/the-mechanics-institute>. Downloaded 29 Sept 2012.
- Roper, J. (n.d.g). *The struggle for equality by Connecticut blacks in the 18th and 19th century*. Yale-New Haven Teachers' Institute. <http://www.yale.edu/ynhi/curriculum/units/1981/cthistory/81.ch.03.x.html>. Downloaded 5 Sept 2013.
- Shapin, S., & Barnes, B. (1977). Science, nature and control: Interpreting mechanics' institutes. *Social Studies of Science*, 7, 31-74.
- Tierney, W. G. (2010). The public good in a changing economy. In G. Hentschke, V. Lechuga, & W. Tierney (Eds.), *For profit colleges and universities: Their makers, regulation, performance and pace in higher education* (pp. 171-188). Sterling: Stylus Publications.
- Tierney, W. G., & Hentschke, G. C. (2007). *New players, different game: Understanding the rise of for-profit colleges and universities*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Trow, M. (1974). Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education. Reprinted in Michael Burrage, (Ed.) (2010). *Martin Trow: Twentieth century higher education: Elite to mass to universal*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tuskegee University. (n.d.g). http://www.tuskegee.edu/about_us/history_and_mission.aspx. Downloaded 10 Sept 2012.
- Walker, J. (1825). *An essay on the education of the people*. London.
- Washington, B. T. (2004). *Up from slavery: An autobiography*. LLC Sioux Falls: NuVision Publications.
- Young Mechanics Institute. (1832, September 4). *Connecticut Journal*. Pdf. Property of The Institute Library.

Who Attends For-Profit Institutions?: The Enrollment Landscape

Rhonda Vonshay Sharpe, Steve Stokes,
and William A. Darity, Jr.

OVERVIEW

For-profit educational institutions, particularly universities and other institutions of vocational and higher learning, have seen enormous, "almost exponential" growth in recent years (Coleman and Vedder 2008; see also Levine 1997; Breneman et al. 2006; Kamenetz 2005; Bennett et al. 2010; National Center for Education Statistics 2011). The National Center for Education Statistics estimates that from 1998-99 to 2008-09, the number of associate's and bachelor's degrees conferred by for-profit postsecondary institutions grew by 125 and 400 percent respectively (National Center for Education Statistics 2011). The corresponding growth in associate and

R.V. Sharpe (✉)
Women's Institute for Science, Equity and Race,
Mechanicsville, VA, USA
e-mail: rhondavsharpe@wisepolicy.org

S. Stokes
Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, USA
e-mail: steve.s.stokes@gmail.com

W.A. Darity, Jr.
Samuel DuBois Cook Center on Social Equity, Duke University,
Durham, NC, USA
e-mail: william.darity@duke.edu

© The Author(s) 2017
T. McMillan Cottam, W.A. Darity, Jr. (eds.), *For-Profit Universities*,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-47187-7_7

bachelor degree conferrals from public universities was 33 and 29 percent over the same time period (Ibid.). Other research has shown that since 1976, for-profit enrollment has grown at an annualized rate of about 11 percent, much faster than the sector as a whole (Coleman and Vedder 2008; Kamenetz 2005). While they are still a relatively small part of the overall higher education landscape, their size, scope and influence are rapidly expanding.

This rapid growth and rise in popularity has not gone unnoticed by lawmakers and regulators, nor has it been without controversy (Boardman 2012). While some believe that proprietary universities fill crucial gaps left by our traditional nonprofit and state-sponsored higher education system, others claim that these businesses are ineffective at best and unethical at worst, leaving poor, minority, and other nontraditional students with high levels of debt and low prospects of gainful employment (Kamenetz 2005; Carey 2010; Coleman and Vedder 2008; Bennett et al. 2010). Unfortunately the claims made by both camps largely are unsupported. Research on for-profit post-secondary school or the people who enroll in them is sparse (Kinser and Levy 2005; Cellini 2010). The most fully developed study thus far is Bennett et al. 2010 report for the Center for College Affordability and Productivity.

It is worth noting that for-profit education is by no means a new, novel or strictly American occurrence. As early as the Golden Age of Ancient Greece, competitive for-profit education was quite prominent and successful, particularly in Athens (Coulson 1999; Carey 2010; Bennett et al. 2010). Bennett et al. (2010) assert that in ancient Greece, "competition among the sophists was brisk and produced two beneficial outcomes for the consumers of education: affordability and quality" and, as a result, literacy rates were high among members of the citizen class, commerce flourished, and Athens ultimately became an intellectual and cultural powerhouse.

Over the preceding centuries, the influence and prevalence of for-profit institutions waxed and waned, but the approach never disappeared completely (Coleman and Vedder 2008). Even within the structure of a more traditional university system there was a period where students' fees went directly to the professor whose lectures they selected; for example, Adam Smith lectured under precisely those conditions at the University of Glasgow in the eighteenth century. Social, political and economic forces often affected the prevalence, distribution and demand for private for-profit education services. In the 1890s at the apex of the Industrial Revolution in America, skilled labor was high in demand but short in supply. A standard narrative has

it that bookkeeping, shorthand, teaching, medicine, law, the use of mechanical typewriters and stenographers, and other related skills were exceedingly valuable (Heckman 2000), particularly to women who often were excluded not only from traditional colleges but also from traditional labor-intensive employment opportunities (Kamenetz 2005; Breneman et al. 2006; Goldin and Katz 1999; Turner 2006). It is not surprising that this gap between the supply and demand for skilled labor spawned some of the nation's first for-profit "career colleges" (Kamenetz 2005).

After a brief decline in the first half of the twentieth century, proprietary universities made a comeback in the 1970s, and continued to grow and expand over the next three decades. Frequently, this growth is attributed to the 1972 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, which, among other things, permitted certain tuition subsidies like Pell Grants to be used at for-profit colleges and universities Bennett et al. (2010; Kamenetz 2005; Turner 2006). For example, S. R. Cellini found that in California, increases in federal and state tuition support encouraged students to enroll in for-profit programs, particularly in counties with high levels of poverty, where more students were eligible for need-based aid (Cellini 2010). Allegations of fraud and financial mismanagement in the 1980s and 1990s led to a series of high-profile Congressional hearings resulting in somewhat tighter regulations (Carey 2010; Kamenetz 2005). Today the largest of these publicly traded giants each rake in more than \$4 billion annually (and more than \$32 billion collectively), mostly in the form of tuition subsidies and grants, subsidized student loans, and other forms of federal tuition support (Kamenetz 2005; Carey 2010; Boardman 2012). Thus, these private profit-seeking institutions rely heavily either directly or indirectly on government spending.

Anecdote has it that the growth of for-profits over the past two decades also is closely associated with the rise and proliferation of the internet. As intuitive as it may sound, Breneman et al. (2006) report that such a connection is, "largely coincidental." Indeed, they show that distance (online) learning is not unique to for-profit universities, in the same way that face-to-face instruction is not unique to traditional brick and mortar public and private institutions.

Throughout their recent history, the general custom of for-profit post-secondary schools has been to provide *highly career-oriented training* to underserved (non-traditional student) populations. For-profit institutions give considerably less attention—nor even lip service—to a research mission

or the principles of liberal arts education. Nevertheless, thus far their faculty have been drawn largely from traditional (nonprofit) institutions, although the expansion in for-profits has been sustained for a sufficient period of time that they now are able to "grow" some of their own faculty. Regardless, for-profit institutions generally seek to teach skills that are intended to make individuals work place ready for specific types of employment and deemphasize general intellectual knowledge and critical analysis of conventional perspectives within each field of specialization.

Indeed, critics lament the apparent lack of liberal arts training at for-profit institutions Bennett et al. (2010). For-profit curricula often push to the side courses in the humanities, fine arts, and social sciences in favor of business, engineering, and computer-related fields. Perhaps this is done to the greater likelihood that certification in many technical skills (e.g. computer programming, culinary arts, and accounting) provides a verifiable and transparent signal to potential employers, whereas expertise in the arts, humanities and "soft" sciences sends a less reliable signal (Turner 2006).

In addition, for-profits routinely are criticized for having relatively high drop-out rates (some as high as 66 percent), tuition rates that are higher than their public counterparts, relatively high student loans default rates, and relatively low post-graduation employment rates (Boardman 2012; Staff 2012). DeVry University and the University of Phoenix, in particular, have exceptionally low degree completion rates—as low as 4 percent in some cases, while those for-profits at the upper end of the degree completion rate scale only achieve rates of approximately 75 percent Bennett et al. (2010).

Still there also is a high degree of variation in the graduation rates at traditional colleges and universities. Two year non-profit institutions also generally have notoriously low completion rates as do a number of traditional four year colleges. Historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) often are singled out for their low graduation rates. At one point in the previous decade St. Augustine's University had a degree completion rate of a mere 8 percent Bennett et al. (2010).

While for-profit attendance does not assure students of successful degree completion, one can argue that there is an admirable egalitarianism associated with their virtually open enrollment policy. Moreover, a positive dimension of the low college completion rate means that for-profits do not function as "diploma mills"; high attrition could be seen as an indicator of quality control. Unfortunately, there is no agency

that conducts an independent assessment of the quality of for-profits. In principle, quality assurance would be dictated by the labor market success (or failures) of their graduates—among those who do graduate. But there also is little data on the comparative job outcomes for graduates of for-profits versus graduates of traditional colleges and universities.

Stephanie Cellini (2012) argues that the greater expense of a two year education at the average for-profit than the average community college sets a higher bar for the requisite employment outcome to make it worthwhile for students. She estimates that net benefits for students would have to amount to an 8.5 percent annual gain in earnings to yield a net financial benefit for students from a for-profit education in contrast with the 5.3 percent annual gain needed to yield a net financial benefit from a traditional community college education.

For-profits appear to operate on a business model that is predicated on high rates of attrition and high rates of flows of new students year in and year out. Is this a successful business model? Again the jury is out in the absence of more information about the profitability of these institutions. We do know that the 15 largest of the for-profits that enroll close to 60 percent of all students at those institutions Bennett et al. (2010) typically have sustained operations for at least 15 years.

Non-traditional students are disproportionately drawn to for-profit programs. (Coleman and Vedder 2008; Turner 2006). Breneman et al. (2006) suggest that, "extending the market is the most accurate way to view the impact of the for-profits thus far... [especially to] students who, in many cases, would otherwise not enroll at all." This is particularly true for older, non-traditional adult students and students from ethnic/racial groups subject to discrimination who often are passed over in the admissions offices of traditional universities, particularly those admissions offices that generate "selective" student bodies. In addition, it is widely held that proprietary institutions are likely to be more flexible and responsive to demographic and economic changes, largely because they are unencumbered by bureaucratic political constraints (Turner 2006; Heckman 2000).

In reality, "neither extreme view is likely to be completely accurate" Bennett et al. (2010). As major players on the field of education, much about the performance and fate of for-profits remains to be seen. As the industry and corresponding empirical research develop, we will begin to see how these players might fit into and alter the established system of higher education not only in the U.S., but also globally (Cellini 2010).

Indeed, despite the controversy and importance of the subject, Breneman et al. (2006) point out that researchers often lack reliable information about, "the basic demographics of the for-profit sector of the higher education market... [and that] little empirical research has been devoted to a documentation of the changes in the number, distribution, and characteristics of for-profit education providers over the past three decades." Factors that may have contributed to this oversight include definitional ambiguities, a lack of publicly available representative data sets, the absence of transparent information from the institutions themselves and the fact that the industries' rise to prominence is a relatively recent occurrence (Kinser and Levy 2005; Cellini 2010). While research in this area is increasing and evolving, this paper represents an attempt to augment what traditionally has been a deficiency in the literature. Specifically, we seek to identify the trends in enrollment at for-profit institutions by age, gender, and race using a particularly rich data set.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

This study examines the trends in enrollment at for-profit institutions by enrollment level—undergraduate and graduate, by enrollment status—full-time and part-time, and age. The analysis by age includes the years 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, and 2011. The analysis by gender and race is limited to the years 1995 thru 2011. The study addresses two broad research questions:

1. How have the demographics of students enrolled at for-profit institutions changed since 1995?
2. How has the market share of for-profits changed since 1995?

To address these research questions, we rely on data from Integrated Post-Secondary Educational Data System Enrollment Survey accessed via WebCASPAR. The sample is limited to undergraduate and graduate students who self-identified as black, white, Hispanic, Asian or Native American.

We resort to a direct descriptive analysis is used to answer the research questions. This study has several limitations. First, we do not examine the trends at any particular type of for-profit institution, e.g. vocational vs. academic; therefore, we do not isolate whether changes are broad or being driven by a smaller segment of for-profit institutions. Second, we do not

have data on the educational history of students in the sample so we do not know if they transferred to a for-profit or completed all of their education at a for-profit institutions.

FINDINGS: WHO THE STUDENTS ARE AT FOR-PROFITS

Our central finding is for-profit institutions have become a vital source of educational enrollment for black and Hispanic students at all ages. Therefore, these groups particularly affected by the advantages and disadvantages associated with for-profit education.

We begin with a discussion about enrollment trends at for-profit institutions by age. Of the 18–24 year old (traditional college age) students enrolled in college as full-time undergraduates, 6 percent were enrolled at for-profits in 2011 up from 1 percent in 1995 (See Table 1). Traditional college age students at for-profits were 1 percent of the full-time undergraduate enrollment in 1995 and 6 percent of the full-time undergraduate enrollment in 2011.

In 1995, 4 percent of all nontraditional students enrolled as full-time undergraduate students were at for-profit institutions. By 2011, the percentage of all nontraditional students enrolled as full-time undergraduates at for-profit institutions was 34 percent, an increase of 30 percentage points. For-profit institutions enrolled 13 percent of all full-time undergraduates in 2011, a significant increase from 2 percent in 1995.

Of the 18–24 year old (traditional college age) students enrolled in college as part-time undergraduates, 4 percent were enrolled at for-profits in 2011. This represents an increase from less than 1 percent in 1995. In 1995, 1 percent of all nontraditional students enrolled as part-time undergraduate students were enrolled at for-profit institutions. By 2011, the percentage of all nontraditional students enrolled as full-time undergraduates at for-profit institutions had grown to 10 percent. For-profit institutions enrolled 8 percent of all part-time undergraduates in 2011 up from 1 percent in 1995.

At the graduate level, full-time enrollment for students in the 18–21 age range actually declined at for-profit institutions, but increased at public and private nonprofit institutions. But for all other ages, full-time graduate enrollment rose at for-profits. Between 1995 and 2011, for-profit experienced increases in full-time enrollment at the graduate level that ranged from 9 times as many students among 22–24 year olds to nearly

Full-time		Age group		Institutional control		25-29		30-34		35-39		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions		Public		For-Profit		Private:		Nonprofit		Institutions	
-----------	--	-----------	--	-----------------------	--	-------	--	-------	--	-------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--	--------	--	------------	--	----------	--	-----------	--	--------------	--

(continued)

Part-time	Age group	Institutional control												
			1995	1997	1999	2001	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011			
18-19	Public		206,363	215,865	240,516	253,314	264,001	276,894	293,956	330,839	363,067			
	Institutions		8,833	9,214	8,648	9,382	11,236	10,008	9,936	11,568	14,000			
	Private: Nonprofit		2,167	2,188	2,351	2,775	3,441	4,461	6,015	8,898	8,499			
20-21	Public		264,846	272,328	287,809	316,161	333,196	340,775	350,445	383,076	433,795			
	Institutions		17,423	16,421	15,826	15,925	16,347	16,498	16,928	17,086	19,407			
	Private: Nonprofit		3,968	2,983	3,912	4,584	6,185	8,925	11,050	17,682	19,139			
22-24	Public		374,012	358,493	365,976	401,011	443,976	453,542	463,220	498,692	526,139			
	Institutions		37,555	34,351	32,250	32,227	34,517	35,596	36,341	36,980	39,447			
	Private: Nonprofit		5,921	4,547	5,881	6,608	10,062	13,996	18,038	30,752	34,730			

Table 1 (continued)

Full-time	Age group	Institutional control												
			1995	1997	1999	2001	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011			
40-49	Public		96,220	93,148	89,586	94,131	111,256	103,947	96,010	119,891	132,079			
	Institutions		25,496	26,499	27,434	29,276	32,573	34,397	34,478	37,856	40,775			
	Private: Nonprofit		4,159	9,377	13,683	19,626	29,090	50,723	58,404	98,006	106,698			
50-64	Public		17,841	19,865	21,854	23,993	31,358	32,040	32,681	45,039	52,538			
	Institutions		4,716	6,545	6,806	7,616	9,145	10,419	11,466	13,588	15,747			
	Private: Nonprofit		944	2,139	2,997	4,976	8,073	15,930	19,944	37,920	43,834			
Percent of 25-64 year olds	Public		78%	74%	72%	70%	68%	60%	57%	52%	53%			
	Institutions		18%	18%	18%	18%	17%	16%	16%	13%	13%			
	Private: Nonprofit		4%	8%	10%	12%	15%	24%	27%	35%	34%			

Part-time		Age		Group		Percent		of		year		olds	
Institutional	Control	1995	1997	1999	2001	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011	Public	Private	Nonprofit
40-49	Institutions	408,258	407,942	395,935	417,850	426,068	401,131	378,518	384,412	369,137	62,834	63,591	55,462
		Private:	62,834	63,591	55,462	51,679	52,879	48,994	52,144	53,301	47,958	205,211	27,985
		Nonprofit	6,138	4,060	4,959	5,419	8,834	13,444	19,486	38,931	47,958	205,211	27,985
50-64	Public	133,846	151,122	161,811	188,136	190,739	194,744	203,434	213,781	205,211	16,812	16,812	23,521
		Private:	133,846	151,122	161,811	188,136	190,739	203,434	213,781	205,211	16,812	16,812	23,521
		Nonprofit	16,822	19,276	18,196	17,799	19,557	22,284	26,564	27,985	16,812	16,812	23,521
25-64	Institutions	1,451	1,032	1,256	1,393	2,422	4,298	7,075	16,812	23,521	41%	41%	42%
		Private:	1,451	1,032	1,256	1,393	2,422	4,298	16,812	23,521	41%	41%	42%
		Nonprofit	16,822	19,276	18,196	17,799	19,557	22,284	26,564	27,985	16,812	16,812	23,521
18-24	Public	1%	3%	5%	2%	9%	17%	18%	18%	17%	1%	3%	5%
		Private:	1%	3%	5%	2%	9%	17%	18%	17%	1%	3%	5%
		Nonprofit	38%	39%	39%	41%	40%	37%	39%	42%	38%	39%	39%

Part-time		Age		Group		Percent		of		year		olds	
Institutional	Control	1995	1997	1999	2001	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011	Public	Private	Nonprofit
35-39	Institutions	44,053	41,774	35,026	31,861	31,637	254,660	252,325	260,348	247,570	32,736	34,075	34,075
		Private:	44,053	41,774	35,026	31,861	254,660	252,325	260,348	247,570	32,736	34,075	34,075
		Nonprofit	6,386	4,649	5,298	9,576	14,529	20,121	38,725	46,082	32,736	34,075	34,075
30-34	Public	351,108	315,449	290,146	313,934	327,055	309,737	304,077	337,483	350,591	41,268	41,268	41,268
		Private:	351,108	315,449	290,146	313,934	327,055	309,737	337,483	350,591	41,268	41,268	41,268
		Nonprofit	8,184	6,453	7,856	8,208	13,659	20,146	50,802	56,205	41,268	41,268	41,268
25-29	Institutions	434,119	426,562	401,244	413,693	446,982	460,845	481,148	531,245	533,625	51,376	51,376	51,376
		Private:	434,119	426,562	401,244	413,693	446,982	481,148	531,245	533,625	51,376	51,376	51,376
		Nonprofit	52,215	49,183	43,345	41,072	43,944	45,942	49,252	51,376	51,376	51,376	51,376
18-24	Public	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	4%	4%	1%	1%	1%
		Private:	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	4%	4%	1%	1%	1%
		Nonprofit	7%	7%	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	91%	91%	91%

Table 1 (continued)

Table 2 Graduate enrollment at for-profits by age

Age group	Institutional	control	Public	Institutions	Private:	Nonprofit	For-Profit	Percent of 18-24 year olds
18-19	132	46	104	43	60	73	135	537
	254	710	70	9,313	7,886	407	153,073	123,968
20-21	248	1	3,614	3,829	4,616	4,825	5,639	9,167
	45	26	93	122	101	221	592	15
22-24	62,576	65,146	68,628	74,827	91,746	94,958	102,033	147,395
	33,654	36,530	39,236	41,776	53,833	60,116	67,880	116,213
	873	1,209	1,336	644	2,117	4,967	5,363	8,508
	64%	63%	64%	64%	62%	59%	58%	54%
	35%	36%	36%	36%	37%	38%	39%	43%
	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	3%	3%

Age group	Institutional	control	Public	Institutions	Private:	Nonprofit	For-Profit	Percent of 18-24 year olds
25-29	72,683	80,492	81,759	81,155	97,646	101,736	106,761	144,154
	45,289	52,369	55,143	56,050	71,709	78,585	86,867	132,956
	1,042	2,359	4,227	1,955	4,461	18,819	20,217	26,406
	31,295	31,912	33,559	35,371	40,855	40,785	41,893	49,373
	18,190	20,168	22,112	23,959	30,238	31,772	33,993	44,890
	791	1,875	3,030	1,493	8,527	15,716	16,159	21,587
	19,286	18,828	18,278	17,062	19,062	19,731	20,725	22,702
	11,260	12,289	12,512	12,623	16,001	17,497	19,595	23,616
	670	2,479	2,657	1,045	6,129	12,650	14,148	19,232
	26,891	25,651	24,334	22,545	24,540	22,902	21,968	23,307
	16,671	18,114	18,227	18,120	22,296	22,964	24,537	28,167
	748	1,729	3,730	1,667	10,441	18,746	19,389	26,250
	40-49							27,364

(continued)

(различно)

[illegible]

50 times among students at ages 50–64. (See Table 2 for comprehensive data on graduate enrollment at for-profits and non-profits by age groups.)

Enrollment at for-profit institutions by race and gender is presented in Table 3. With the exception of black and Hispanic women, in general fewer undergraduate women were enrolled full-time at for-profit institutions in 1995 than men. However by 2011, the number of undergraduate women enrolled full-time at for-profit institutions exceeded the number of undergraduate men enrolled full-time at for-profit institutions for all groups. Twice as many black women and nearly twice as many Native American women were enrolled as full-time undergraduate students at for-profit institutions as their male counterparts. This trend holds true for part-time undergraduate enrollment at for-profit institutions. Of course, it must be noted that the enrollment of women at *all* colleges and universities now exceeds that of men.

Since 1995, blacks and Hispanics have exceeded 15 percent of the full-time undergraduate student population at for-profit institutions. In 1995, blacks were 17 percent, Hispanics were 16 percent, and whites were 63 percent of the full-time undergraduate student population at for-profit institutions. By 2011 blacks were 27 percent, Hispanics were 22 percent and whites were 47 percent of the full-time undergraduate population at for-profit institutions.

Asians comprise a smaller percentage of the full-time undergraduate student population at for-profit institutions in 2011 than they did in 1995, 3.5 percent in 2011 compared to 4.1 percent in 1995. Among non-whites and Hispanics enrolled as full-time undergraduate students, the percentage enrolled full-time at for-profit institutions doubled between 1995 and 2011. For blacks and Native Americans, this percentage increased six fold between 1995 and 2011.

The trends in part-time undergraduate enrollment at for-profit institutions are similar to the full-time enrollment trends at for-profit institutions. In 1995, blacks and whites comprised nearly 90 percent of part-time undergraduate population at for-profit institutions, 17 percent and 73 percent respectively. By 2011, blacks were 31 percent, Hispanics were 14 percent and whites were 50 percent of the part-time undergraduate population at for-profit institutions. Asians comprised a larger percentage of the part-time undergraduate population at for-profit institutions in 2011, 5 percent, than they did in 1995, 3.1 percent. Of the part-time undergraduate students, the percentage enrolled part-time at for-profit institutions for all groups at least doubled between 1995 and 2011.

Table 2 (continued)

Part	Time	Age group	Institutional control	Public	Private	Nonprofit	For-Profit	Ages 30-34	Private	Nonprofit	For-Profit	Ages 35-39	Private	Nonprofit	For-Profit	Ages 40-49	Private	Nonprofit	For-Profit	Public	Institutions	Private	Nonprofit	For-Profit	Public	Institutions	Private	Nonprofit	For-Profit	Ages 50-64	Private	Nonprofit	For-Profit						
				62,360	35,114	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,534	972	766	171	90	
				61,277	34,540	36,404	37,853	42,432	45,343	47,381	52,388	55,130	12,105	16,994	49,314	53,978	38,199	37,532	14,403	77,078	77,756	55,932	58,441	15,010	22,428	44,399	49,054	37,389	38,188	13,789	8,562	5,711	3,287	1,53					

Table 3 Undergraduate enrollment at for-profit institutions: 1995-2011

Full-time students	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Native American	1,116	2,071	2,365	2,817	3,286	3,259	4,021	3,335	4,411
Female	552	1,165	1,241	1,544	1,831	1,593	2,026	1,785	2,532
Male	564	906	1,124	1,273	1,455	1,666	1,995	1,550	1,879
Race share of enrollment for-profit	0.7%	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.0%	1.0%
Share of race enrollment total	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%
Asian	6,441	11,256	13,758	15,929	18,692	20,171	21,207	19,826	21,526
Female	2,668	5,145	6,117	6,927	8,036	8,214	9,141	8,434	10,245
Male	3,773	6,111	7,641	9,002	10,656	11,957	12,066	11,392	11,281
Race share of enrollment for-profit	4.1%	4.7%	5.2%	5.9%	6.0%	6.7%	6.2%	5.9%	5.1%
Share of race enrollment total	2%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Black	25,824	38,134	42,946	44,576	51,000	53,191	64,823	69,624	90,630
Female	14,351	22,000	24,711	25,093	29,148	29,987	37,282	41,101	56,049
Male	11,473	16,134	18,235	19,483	21,852	23,204	27,541	28,523	34,581
Race share of enrollment for-profit	16.6%	15.9%	16.3%	16.4%	16.4%	17.7%	18.8%	20.7%	21.3%
Hispanic	24,471	38,675	41,453	45,509	52,701	52,139	58,742	60,631	79,221
Female	12,684	20,867	21,942	23,881	27,291	26,557	30,002	31,525	42,285
Male	11,787	17,808	19,511	21,628	25,410	25,582	28,740	29,106	36,936
Ethnicity share of enrollment for-profit	15.7%	16.1%	15.8%	16.7%	17.0%	17.4%	17.1%	18.0%	18.7%
Share of ethnicity total enrollment for-profit	4%	6%	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	9%
White	97,523	149,904	162,503	163,109	184,531	171,387	195,681	183,647	228,841
Female	47,217	79,672	82,269	79,666	87,704	77,999	91,117	88,301	117,147
Male	50,306	70,232	80,234	83,443	96,827	93,388	104,564	95,346	111,694
Race share of enrollment for-profit	62.8%	62.4%	61.8%	60.0%	59.5%	57.1%	56.8%	54.5%	53.9%
Share of race enrollment total	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Full-time students	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Full-time for-profit enrollment	155,375	240,040	263,025	271,940	310,210	300,147	344,474	337,063	424,629
Share of subtotal for-profit enrollment	2%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%
Full-time total enrollment									
Native American	5,540	6,922	6,750	7,411	9,054	11,225	11,156	11,418	96,157
Female	3,316	4,262	4,040	4,744	5,819	7,030	7,110	7,477	58,067
Male	2,224	2,660	2,710	2,667	3,235	4,195	4,046	3,941	38,090
Race share of for-profit enrollment	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Share of race enrollment	6%	8%	7%	8%	9%	10%	11%	12%	7%
Asian	21,722	24,781	23,645	25,207	30,336	32,770	33,236	35,637	376,140
Female	10,461	12,761	12,374	13,452	17,128	18,806	18,727	20,256	188,892
Male	11,261	12,020	11,271	11,755	13,208	13,964	14,509	15,381	187,248

Full-time students	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Grand total
Race share of for-profit enrollment	4.5%	4.3%	4.3%	4.0%	4.0%	3.5%	3.3%	3.5%	4.4%
Share of race enrollment	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%
Black	105,127	129,975	129,688	153,122	196,336	259,980	273,553	277,007	2,005,536
Female	67,298	87,139	87,560	104,556	136,148	178,009	184,534	189,058	1,314,024
Male	37,829	42,836	42,128	48,566	60,188	81,971	89,019	87,949	691,512
Race share of for-profit enrollment	21.9%	22.7%	23.7%	24.6%	25.7%	27.4%	27.0%	27.1%	23.3%
Share of race enrollment	10%	11%	11%	13%	15%	18%	18%	18%	11%
Hispanic	88,090	99,784	99,329	108,707	130,064	169,027	203,955	223,130	1,575,628
Female	48,137	56,896	57,142	63,599	78,233	102,093	123,138	136,578	902,850
Male	39,953	42,888	42,187	45,108	51,831	66,934	80,817	86,552	672,778
Ethnicity share of for-profit enrollment	18.3%	17.4%	18.1%	17.4%	17.0%	17.8%	20.1%	21.8%	18.3%
Share of ethnicity total enrollment	9%	10%	10%	10%	11%	13%	14%	14%	10%

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Full-time students	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Grand total
White	260,326	310,582	288,873	328,777	397,777	476,188	491,849	476,629	4,568,127
Female	136,127	172,212	161,851	192,076	240,767	292,623	302,345	297,583	2,546,676
Male	124,199	138,370	127,022	136,701	157,010	183,565	189,504	179,046	2,021,451
Race share of	54.1%	54.3%	52.7%	52.8%	52.1%	50.2%	48.5%	46.6%	53.0%
for-profit									
enrollment	4%	5%	5%	5%	6%	7%	7%	7%	5%
Share of race									
total									
enrollment	480,805	572,044	548,285	623,224	763,567	949,190	1,013,749	1,023,821	8,621,588
for-profit									
subtotal									
for-profit									
share of	6%	6%	6%	7%	8%	9%	10%	10%	6%
Full-time									
Enrollment									
Part-time students	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Native American	351	405	296	344	408	687	505	684	700
Female	115	148	138	175	208	297	275	354	387
Male	236	257	158	169	200	390	230	330	313

Part-time students	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Race share of	0.4%	0.7%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	1.0%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%
for-profit									
enrollment	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Share of race									
total									
enrollment	13,251	9,084	10,519	11,721	13,696	15,307	17,555	20,087	24,545
Black									
Female	7,799	5,409	6,415	7,217	8,226	9,175	10,560	12,204	15,355
Male	5,452	3,675	4,104	4,504	5,470	6,132	7,095	7,883	9,190
Race share of	16.5%	16.1%	18.7%	20.1%	20.6%	21.6%	24.7%	24.6%	27.2%
for-profit									
enrollment	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Share of race									
total									
enrollment	2,484	2,135	2,472	2,932	3,486	4,304	4,056	4,528	4,439
Asian									
Female	1,122	906	1,199	1,290	1,579	1,892	1,742	1,992	1,915
Male	1,362	1,229	1,273	1,642	1,907	2,412	2,314	2,536	2,524
Race share of	3.1%	3.8%	4.4%	5.0%	5.2%	6.1%	5.7%	5.5%	4.9%
for-profit									
enrollment	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Share of race									
total									
enrollment	5,661	5,732	5,748	7,201	8,780	10,803	10,116	11,738	13,963
Hispanic									
total									
enrollment	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Share of race									
total									
enrollment	5,661	5,732	5,748	7,201	8,780	10,803	10,116	11,738	13,963

(continued)

Part-time students		For-profit grand total		Part-time students		For-profit grand total		
1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
235,643	296,496	319,202	330,386	376,649	371,100	415,952	418,738	514,985
80,268	56,456	56,177	58,446	66,439	70,953	71,478	81,675	90,356
1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
72.9%	69.3%	66.1%	62.0%	60.3%	56.2%	54.8%	54.7%	51.7%
28,309	18,859	16,303	16,327	18,894	19,799	18,220	21,235	20,998
30,212	20,241	19,921	21,175	20,063	20,926	23,403	25,711	26,709
58,521	39,100	37,142	36,248	40,069	39,852	39,146	44,638	46,709
1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Share of ethnicity	Share of ethnicity	Share of ethnicity	Share of ethnicity	Share of ethnicity	Share of ethnicity	Share of ethnicity	Share of ethnicity	Share of ethnicity
7.1%	10.2%	10.2%	12.3%	13.2%	15.2%	14.2%	14.4%	15.5%
2,818	2,960	3,104	3,970	4,174	5,195	4,974	5,845	6,782
1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
4,616	4,567	4,632	5,391	7,259	8,410	9,209	17,077	91,997
2,134	2,261	2,384	2,772	3,828	4,511	5,029	10,118	46,674
2,482	2,306	2,619	3,431	3,899	4,180	4,959	6,959	45,323
4.3%	4.1%	3.6%	3.7%	3.5%	2.9%	2.9%	4.9%	4.1%
Share of race	Share of race	Share of race	Share of race	Share of race	Share of race	Share of race	Share of race	Share of race
1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%
of for-profit enrollment	of for-profit enrollment	of for-profit enrollment	of for-profit enrollment	of for-profit enrollment	of for-profit enrollment	of for-profit enrollment	of for-profit enrollment	of for-profit enrollment
428	397	449	466	723	1,189	996	1,283	7,772
Male	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male
478	546	703	748	1,146	1,875	1,875	2,266	11,048
Female	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female
906	943	1,152	1,214	1,869	1,936	2,871	3,549	18,820
Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American
478	546	703	748	1,146	1,875	1,875	2,266	11,048
Male	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male	Male
428	397	449	466	723	1,189	996	1,283	7,772
Female	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female	Female
906	943	1,152	1,214	1,869	1,936	2,871	3,549	18,820
Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American	Native American

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Part-time students	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Grand total
Share of race	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	16%
total enrollment	107,523	111,975	127,027	145,344	201,412	238,642	322,512	347,380	2,234,063
Part-time enrollment									
subtotal									
Percent of for-profit	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%
enrollment	588,328	684,019	675,312	768,568	964,979	1,187,832	1,336,261	1,371,201	10,855,651
For-profit enrollment									
Grand total									

Part-time students	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Grand total
Race share	27.8%	27.4%	29.0%	29.3%	30.3%	31.8%	33.0%	30.9%	28.1%
of for-profit enrollment									
Share of race	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%
total enrollment	16,512	16,695	17,810	19,868	25,853	31,398	43,120	47,164	298,162
Hispanic	8,369	9,042	9,880	10,905	14,373	17,324	23,892	27,174	162,266
Female	8,143	7,653	7,930	8,963	11,480	14,074	19,228	19,990	135,896
Male	15.4%	14.9%	14.0%	13.7%	12.8%	13.2%	13.4%	13.6%	13.3%
share of ethnicity									
for-profit enrollment									
Share of ethnicity	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%
total enrollment	55,574	59,050	66,656	76,218	105,427	120,988	160,767	172,293	1,198,398
White	31,000	35,045	40,493	44,214	61,365	70,832	97,352	104,969	687,751
Female	24,574	24,005	26,163	32,004	44,062	50,156	63,415	67,324	510,647
Male	51.7%	52.7%	52.5%	52.4%	52.3%	50.7%	49.8%	49.6%	53.6%
Race share									
of for-profit enrollment									
Grand total									

Table 3 (continued)

Between 1995 and 2001, the growth in full-time undergraduate enrollment at for-profit institutions was 559 percent or 6.5 times the 1995 enrollment level. For the same time period, the growth in the 1995 undergraduate enrollment at for-profit institutions was 333 percent or 4 times the 1995 enrollment level. The percentage of full-time undergraduate students enrolled at for-profit institutions increased from 2 percent in 1995 to 10 percent in 2011. The part-time undergraduate enrollment at for-profit institutions increased by only 1 percent from 2 percent in 1995 to 3 percent in 2011. The percentage point going from 2 percent in 1995 to 3 percent in 2011. The for-profit share of all undergraduate enrollments increased from 2 percent in 1995 to 8 percent in 2011.

Next, consider graduate enrollment at for-profit institutions by race and gender. With the exception of Hispanics women, fewer graduate women were enrolled full-time at for-profit institutions in 1995 than men (See Table 4). However by 1996, all female groups analyzed exceeded the number of males enrolled, full-time at for-profit institutions at the graduate level. By 2007, with the exception of Asian women, the number of women pursuing and enrolled full-time at for-profit institutions was at least twice that of the men in their racial groups. The number of Asian women at for-profit institutions exceeded the number of Asian men, but the gender gap is much smaller, 1 male for every 1.4 females.

In 1995, blacks were 10 percent, Hispanics were 11 percent, and whites were 72 percent of the full-time graduate population at for-profit institutions. By 2011, blacks were 35 percent, Hispanics were 9 percent and whites were 50 percent of the full-time graduate population at for-profit institutions. The percentage of Asians enrolled as full-time graduate students at for-profit institutions was less in 2011, 5 percent, than the percentage in 1995, 6 percent.

In 1995, less than 5 percent of any race/ethnic group enrolled as a graduate student attended a for-profit institution. By 2011, 38 percent of blacks enrolled as full-time graduate students attended a for-profit institution compared to 15 percent of Native Americans, 6 percent of Asian, 10 percent of Hispanics, and 7 percent of whites. Between 1995 and 2001, the growth in full-time graduate enrollment at for-profit institutions was 955 percent or 10.5 times the 1995 enrollment level.

The race-gender composition for part-time graduate students enrolled at for-profit institutions shows fewer women enrolled in 1995, but women exceeded the male enrollment by 2011. The gender gap is largest for blacks, Hispanics and whites, with black women having enrollments that

Table 4 Graduate enrollment at for-profit institutions: 1995–2011

Full-time students	1995	1996	1997	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003
Native American	83	110	193	246	215	310	225	488
Female	35	49	108	127	122	181	149	302
Male	48	61	85	119	93	129	76	186
Race share of for-profit enrollment	0.7%	0.6%	1.0%	1.1%	0.9%	1.0%	0.8%	0.9%
Share of race full-time enrollment	2%	3%	4%	6%	5%	7%	5%	9%
Asian	700	1,177	1,293	1,766	2,293	2,309	1,849	3,021
Female	288	563	593	906	1,088	1,229	1,013	1,663
Male	412	614	568	860	1,205	1,080	836	1,358
Race share of for-profit enrollment	6%	6%	8%	10%	5%	5%	4%	6%
Share of race full-time enrollment	2%	3%	3%	4%	5%	5%	4%	6%
Black	1,163	1,877	2,307	2,953	3,816	5,397	5,830	11,278
Female	558	1,044	1,424	1,636	2,387	3,627	4,006	8,036
Male	605	833	883	1,317	1,429	1,770	1,824	3,242
Race share of for-profit enrollment	10%	10%	12%	13%	16%	18%	21%	22%
Share of race full-time enrollment	3%	4%	4%	6%	7%	9%	9%	15%
Hispanic	1,319	2,198	2,797	3,153	2,154	2,877	2,302	4,335
Female	736	1,197	1,608	1,793	1,115	1,541	1,311	2,596
Male	583	1,001	1,189	1,360	1,039	1,336	991	1,739
Race share of for-profit enrollment	11%	12%	14%	13%	9%	10%	8%	8%
Share of ethnicity full-time enrollment	4%	6%	7%	8%	5%	6%	8%	8%
White	8,881	12,747	12,999	15,296	15,255	18,710	16,987	32,268
Female	4,083	6,455	6,588	7,732	7,668	10,317	10,078	19,948
Male	4,798	6,292	6,411	7,564	7,587	8,393	6,909	12,320
Race share of for-profit enrollment	73%	70%	67%	65%	64%	63%	62%	63%
Share of race full-time enrollment	2%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	6%
Full-time for-profit enrollment subtotal	12,146	18,109	19,457	23,414	23,733	29,603	27,193	51,390
For-profit share of full-time enrollment	2%	3%	3%	4%	5%	5%	4%	7%

(continued)

(continued)

Full-time students	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Grand Total
Hispanic	6,013	7,794	7,696	7,802	9,651	10,642	10,896	11,696	93,283
Female	3,696	4,929	4,954	5,074	6,335	7,023	7,155	7,602	58,643
Male	2,317	2,865	2,742	2,728	3,316	3,619	3,740	4,094	34,640
Ethnicity share of enrollment	8.4%	9.0%	8.5%	8.5%	8.3%	8.3%	8.5%	9.1%	8.9%
Share of	10%	12%	12%	12%	12%	10%	10%	10%	9%
clintivity									
full-time									
enrollment									
White	44,103	50,584	52,189	50,264	61,051	67,951	65,977	64,149	589,146
Female	27,797	32,824	34,891	34,038	41,033	45,274	43,878	42,521	375,000
Male	16,306	17,760	17,298	16,226	20,018	22,677	22,099	21,628	214,146
Race share of	61.5%	58.7%	57.4%	54.7%	52.7%	52.8%	51.6%	50.1%	56.3%
for-profit									
enrollment									
Share of race	8%	9%	9%	9%	9%	8%	8%	7%	7%
full-time									
enrollment									
for-profit									
subtotal	71,736	86,178	90,937	91,850	115,817	128,780	127,823	128,168	1,045,972
For-profit share of full-time	10%	11%	12%	12%	13%	11%	10%	10%	8%

Table 4 (continued)

Full-time students	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Grand Total
Native American	671	808	810	863	1,154	1,218	1,145	1,183	9,720
Female	424	557	538	614	812	854	798	839	6,508
Male	247	251	272	249	342	364	347	344	3,212
Race share of	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
for-profit									
enrollment									
Share of race	12%	14%	13%	14%	16%	13%	14%	15%	11%
full-time									
enrollment									
Asian	4,040	4,810	4,822	5,140	6,817	7,355	6,699	6,806	60,693
Female	2,263	2,772	2,868	2,936	3,874	4,311	4,068	4,045	34,460
Male	1,777	2,038	1,954	2,204	2,943	3,044	2,601	2,761	26,233
Race share of	5.6%	5.6%	5.3%	5.6%	5.9%	5.7%	5.2%	5.3%	5.8%
for-profit									
enrollment									
Share of race	8%	9%	9%	9%	9%	7%	6%	6%	6%
full-time									
enrollment									
Black	16,909	22,182	25,420	27,781	37,144	41,614	43,137	44,334	293,130
Female	12,401	16,403	19,079	20,963	27,948	31,506	32,236	33,238	216,485
Male	4,508	5,779	6,341	6,818	9,196	10,108	10,901	11,096	76,645
Race share of	23.6%	25.7%	28.0%	30.2%	32.1%	32.3%	33.7%	34.6%	28.0%
for-profit									
enrollment									
Share of race	32%	41%	45%	48%	51%	38%	38%	38%	31%
full-time									

Table 4 (continued)

(continued)

Part-time students		For-profit share of total enrollment		Grand total	
2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002
Native American	12	35	17	3,957	2,532
Female	7	5	18	1,425	851
Male	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	297	554
Race share of for-profit enrollment					
Asian	91	116	151	4,816	3,555
Female	254	320	240	3,509	2,627
Male	6.4%	8.4%	6.9%	1,627	1,472
Race share of for-profit enrollment					
Black	445	599	812	26,594	19,973
Share of race part-time enrollment					
Female	193	241	286	35,514	26,859
Male	8.2%	10.6%	13.2%	39,884	30,148
Race share of for-profit enrollment					
Hispanic	62	92	115	4,602	3,355
Female	103	95	115	4,602	3,355
Male	3.0%	6.4%	4.7%	1,867	1,306
Ethnicity share of for-profit enrollment					
White	4,452	4,746	4,591	19,568	14,841
Share of ethnicity part-time enrollment					
Female	1,588	2,273	2,281	19,568	14,841
Male	82.2%	80.5%	74.5%	19,568	14,841
Share of race part-time enrollment					
Part-time for-profit enrollment subtotal	5,419	5,899	6,161	32,935	24,144
For-profit share of total enrollment	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
For-profit grand total	17,565	24,008	25,096	29,575	21,444

Table 4 (continued)

Part-time students		For-profit share of total enrollment		Grand total	
2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002
Native American	12	35	17	3,957	2,532
Female	7	5	18	1,425	851
Male	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	297	554
Race share of for-profit enrollment					
Asian	91	116	151	4,816	3,555
Female	254	320	240	3,509	2,627
Male	6.4%	8.4%	6.9%	1,627	1,472
Race share of for-profit enrollment					
Black	445	599	812	26,594	19,973
Share of race part-time enrollment					
Female	193	241	286	35,514	26,859
Male	8.2%	10.6%	13.2%	39,884	30,148
Race share of for-profit enrollment					
Hispanic	62	92	115	4,602	3,355
Female	103	95	115	4,602	3,355
Male	3.0%	6.4%	4.7%	1,867	1,306
Ethnicity share of for-profit enrollment					
White	4,452	4,746	4,591	19,568	14,841
Share of ethnicity part-time enrollment					
Female	1,588	2,273	2,281	19,568	14,841
Male	82.2%	80.5%	74.5%	19,568	14,841
Share of race part-time enrollment					
Part-time for-profit enrollment subtotal	5,419	5,899	6,161	32,935	24,144
For-profit share of total enrollment	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
For-profit grand total	17,565	24,008	25,096	29,575	21,444

are 3 times greater than black men and white and Hispanic women having enrollments that are just over 1.5 times that of their male counterparts. By 2011, blacks and whites were 87 percent of the part-time enrollment at for-profit institutions. Of the blacks and Native Americans enrolled part-time as graduate students in 2011, 12 percent of the Native Americans and 23 percent of the blacks were enrolled at for-profit institutions. The corresponding percentage for Asians, Hispanics and whites is less than 10 percent. Between 1995 and 2001, the growth in part-time graduate enrollment at for-profit institutions was 1755 percent or 17.5 times the 1995 enrollment level. However, the for-profit share of graduate enrollment was 10 percent in 2011 up from 1 percent in 1995.

CONCLUSION

Our findings show that enrollment at for-profit institutions has grown significantly. However, the majority of traditional college age students are not enrolled at for-profit institutions. By 2011, for-profits enrolled less than 10 percent of the full-time undergraduate or graduate students, 3 percent of the part-time undergraduate students, and 9 percent of part-time graduate students.

Women across race, ethnicity, enrollment levels and status seem to have a greater preference, relative to men, for enrolling at for-profit institutions. More women may enroll at for-profit institutions because of the availability of on-line courses, which offer greater flexibility to manage work—the first shift, household responsibilities—the second shift, and education—the third shift (Kramarae 2001). This may also explain why older adults comprise a larger percentage of students enrolled at for-profit institutions. The higher percentage of black, native American and Hispanic students enrolled at for-profit institutions also may be explained by comparatively low graduation rates from not-for-profit institutions.

Studies suggest that low income students and students from groups subject to discrimination students drop out/stop of school primarily for financial reasons. Therefore, the flexibility of for-profit institutions make them a feasible alternative for degree completion since for-profits require little if any time away from work. However, those without employment or who hold low wage jobs while enrolled still may have to depend heavily on government loans and can experience growing debt burdens. The capacity to meet those burdens, in turn, depends upon degree completion and the type of employment obtained post-degree.

Table 4 (continued)

Part-time students	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Grand total
Share of ethnicity	2%	2%	3%	3%	4%	5%	7%	8%	3%
White	12,582	15,309	17,669	22,837	26,231	33,337	41,727	47,595	270,380
Female	6,566	8,898	10,940	13,822	15,805	19,939	25,218	29,410	157,793
Male	6,016	6,411	6,729	9,015	10,426	13,398	16,509	18,185	112,587
Race share of	57.8%	56.0%	54.3%	52.3%	50.2%	48.9%	47.6%	47.4%	52.9%
Share of race part-time enrollment	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	4%	6%	6%	2%
Part-time for-profit enrollment	21,783	27,336	32,562	43,651	52,270	68,216	87,722	100,488	511,185
Enrollment subtotal	2%	3%	3%	4%	5%	6%	8%	9%	3%
For-profit share of total enrollment	93,519	113,514	123,499	135,501	168,087	196,996	215,545	228,656	1,557,157

Also like the "pragmatic" women in Kramarae's 2001 study, blacks, native Americans, and Hispanics may utilize for-profits to complete degrees for career advancement. Finally, we must note that attending college—whether for-profit or non-profit—is not the same thing as finishing college. This is especially true for black, native American, and Hispanic students.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, D. L., Lucchesi, A. R., & Vedder, R. K. (2010). *For-profit higher education: Growth, innovation and regulation*. Center for College Affordability and Productivity (CCAP). Washington, DC: CCAP.
- Boardman, W. (2012 *xxxx* 14-Aug). *For-profit colleges: Socrates could have died rich*. Retrieved 2012 *xxxx* 26-Nov from Independent Voter Network: <http://ivn.us/2012/08/14/for-profit-colleges-socrates-could-have-died-rich/>
- Breneman, D. W., Pusser, B., & Turner, S. E. (2006). *Earnings from learning: The rise of for-profit universities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Carey, K. (2010 *xxxx* 25-Jul). *Why do you think they're called for-profit colleges?* Retrieved 2012 *xxxx* 27-Nov from The Chronicle of Higher Education: <http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Do-You-Think-Theyre/123660/>
- Cellini, S. R. (2010). Financial aid and for-profit colleges: Does aid encourage entry? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 29(3), 526–552.
- Cellini, S. R. (2012). For-profit higher education: An assessment of the costs and benefits. *National Tax Journal*, 65(1), 153–180.
- Coleman, J., & Vedder, C. (2008). *For-profit education in the United States: A primer*. Washington, DC: Center for College Affordability and Productivity (CCAP).
- Coulson, A. J. (1999). *Market education*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Goldin, C., & Katz, L. F. (1999 *xxxx* Winter). The shaping of higher education: The formative years in the United States, 1890 to 1940. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), 37–62.
- Heckman, J. J. (2000 *xxxx* Mar). Policies to foster human capital. *Research in Economics*, 54(1), 3–56.
- Kamenetz, A. (2005 *xxxx* 16-Nov). *The profit chase: For-profit college have lots of champions – And lots of problems*. Retrieved 2012 *xxxx* 27-Nov from Slate: http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/college_week/2005/11/the_profit_chase.single.html
- Kinser, K., & Levy, D. C. (2005 *xxxx* Feb). The for-profit sector: U.S. patterns and international echoes in higher education. *PROFHE working paper series*, WP No. 5.
- Kramarae, C. (2001). *The third shift: Women learning online*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation.

Levine, A. (1997 *xxxx* Fall). How the academic profession is changing. *Daedalus*, 126(4), 1–20.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). *Students attending for-profit post-secondary institutions: Demographics, enrollment characteristics, and 6-year outcomes*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Staff, N. N. (2012 *xxxx* 25-Jul). *For-profit college still seeing declines in enrollment*. Retrieved 2012 *xxxx* 30-Nov from NBCnews.com: http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/07/25/12949437-for-profit-colleges-still-seeing-declines-in-enrollment

Turner, S. E. (2006). For-profit colleges in the context of the market for higher education. In D. W. Breneman, B. Pusser, & S. E. Turner (Eds.), *Earnings from learning: The rise of for-profit universities* (pp. 51–68). Albany: State University of New York Press.