



EURO STUDENT REPORT

Social and Economic Conditions of Student Life

Synopsis of Indicators

Austria, France, Germany, Italy

In its capacity as the umbrella organisation of the 65 Studentenwerke (Organisations for Student Affairs) in Germany, the Deutsches Studentenwerk (DSW) takes this opportunity to present the first Euro-Student-Report.

This pilot project builds on experience gained by the DSW with its social surveys on the economic and social situation of students in Germany, which it has regularly carried out since 1951. These representative surveys are funded by the Federal Ministry for Education, Science, Research and Technology (BMBF) and managed by the HIS Hochschul-Informationssystem GmbH (Higher Education Information System).

The long-standing co-operation between the DSW and its French partner organisation, the Centre National des Œuvres Universitaires et Scolaires, led to an initiative to establish the European Council for Student Affairs (ECStA). Founded in 1993, the ECStA aims to create a formal international co-operation and information structure for the higher education social sector. One of the functions of the organisation is to collect comparative data from all the countries represented in the ECStA for publication in surveys similar to those already available on Germany, France, Italy and Austria. This European social survey aims to collect data on the living conditions of students in various European countries which will allow longer-term comparisons to be made. The data and comparisons will serve as the basis for relevant socio-political decision-making in the education sector, in particular, on the promotion of social and regional mobility.

All data used in the pilot project are based on original material collected in each case by the organisation responsible for the respective national survey and made available for the purposes of this project.

Hence, this data stock will serve to supplement previously available general statistics on the specific issues in question.

The DSW would like to thank all the partner organisations involved, the Austrian Federal Ministry for Science and Transport, the Observatoire de la Vie Etudiante in France, the Fondazione RUI in Italy, for their readiness to participate in this pilot project, as well as the relevant offices at the European Union for their financial support. The DSW sincerely hopes that further countries will take an active part in the next Euro-Student-Report. Special thanks go to Mr. Klaus Schnitzer of the HIS Higher Education Information System for compiling and evaluating the data.

Bonn, April 1997

Prof. Dr. Hans-Dieter Rinkens
President of the Deutsches Studentenwerk

EURO STUDENT REPORT
Social and Economic Conditions of Student Life
Synopsis of Indicators for
Austria, France, Germany, Italy

Pilot-Project of the Deutsches Studentenwerk (DSW)

Under the Auspices of the European Council for Student Affairs (ECSTA)
With Support of the EU-Commission

Compilation of National Survey Data (1994) of
Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung (BMWF) in Austria,
Observatoire de la Vie Etudiante (OVE) in France,
Deutsches Studentenwerk (DSW) in Germany,
Fondazione RUI in Italy.

Contributions for National Profiles
Austria: Eva Schmutzer-Hollensteiner, BMWF
France: Louis Gruel and Claude Grignon, OVE
Germany: Klaus Schnitzer, HIS
Italy: Giovanni Finochietti, RUI

Project Coordination:
HIS Hochschul-Informations-System, Hannover, Germany
Klaus Schnitzer

Euro - Student - Report

Table of Contents

| Part A | Progress Report on the Pilot Project | Pg. |
|---------------|---|------------|
| 1. | Promotion of Regional and Social Mobility in the European Educational Community | 2 |
| 1.1 | Obstacles to Mobility at European and National Levels | 2 |
| 1.2 | Analysis of Socio-Economic Obstacles at National and European Levels | 4 |
| 2. | From Autonomous National Surveys to European Comparisons: A Feasibility Test | 6 |
| 2.1 | Project Design | 6 |
| 3. | Project Implementation | 9 |
| 3.1 | Institutional Context | 9 |
| 3.2 | Project Partners | 9 |
| 3.3 | Project Financing | 10 |
| 3.4 | Timetable | 10 |
| 4. | Achievement of Project Aims | 11 |
| 4.1 | Achievement of Overall Project Aim | 11 |
| 4.2 | Appraisal of Survey Strategy | 14 |
| 4.3 | Effectiveness of Project Organization | 14 |
| 4.4 | Appraisal of Survey Procedures | 14 |
| 4.5 | Quality of the Surveys Findings | 15 |

Euro - Student - Report

Table of Contents

Part B

Synopsis of Indicators

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Fig. 1 | Social Background and Educational Background |
| Fig. 2 | Participation in Higher Education |
| Fig. 3 | Student Mobility |
| Fig. 4 | Study-Related Sojourn Abroad, by Parental Income |
| Fig. 5 | Choice of Country for Foreign Study |
| Fig. 6 | Effect of Foreign Language Proficiency on Student Mobility |
| Fig. 7 | Foreign Language Proficiency among Students |
| Fig. 8 | Degree of Foreign Language Proficiency |
| Fig. 9 | Income of Students' Parents |
| Fig. 10 | Student Age Profile and Gender Ratio |
| Fig. 11 | Student Age Profile by Gender |
| Fig. 12 | Family Status of Students |
| Fig. 13 | Students' Type of Residence |
| Fig. 14 | Type of Residence, by Size of Study Location |
| Fig. 15 | Average Cost of Accommodations |
| Fig. 16 | Higher Education Catchment Area |
| Fig. 17 | Sources of Student Financing |
| Fig. 18 | Income Distribution for Students Maintaining Own Households |
| Fig. 19 | Income Distribution and Sources of Income for Students Residing at Home |
| Fig. 20 | Income Profile for Students Maintaining Own Household (Importance of Parental Income Contribution) |
| Fig. 21 | Income Profile for Students Residing at Home (Importance of Parental Contribution) |

Euro - Student - Report

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------|--|
| Fig. 22 | Income Profile for Students Maintaining Own Households (Importance of State Aid) |
| Fig. 23 | Regional Differences in Income |
| Fig. 24 | Student Spending Profile |
| Fig. 25 | State Aid for Students |
| Fig. 26 | Aid and Social Mobilisation |
| Fig. 27 | Higher Education Expenses by Sources |
| Fig. 28 | Higher Education Expenses by Sources |
| Fig. 29 | Employment and Income |
| Fig. 30 | Student Earnings by Parental Income and Age |
| Fig. 31 | Weekly Time Budget Relative to Extent of Job Activity |
| Fig. 32 | Weekly Time Budget by Faculty |
| Fig. 33 | Percentage of Disabled or Chronically Ill Students |

Euro - Student - Report

Part A:

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 2

1. Promotion of Regional and Social Mobility in the European Educational Community

1.1 Obstacles to Mobility at European and National Levels

One of the principle aims of the European integration process is the creation of a common social community within Europe. Free movement of labour, both as a right and a reality, is the foundation for such a process of integration. Moreover, free movement is a prerequisite for economic growth and competitiveness, as well as for social development.

The importance of **mobility** is emphasized by the European Commission's various initiatives such as described in the recently published White Paper on general and vocational education (*Teaching and Learning: towards the learning society*, 1995), in the *White Paper on European social policy* (1994), the *White Paper on growth, competitiveness and employment: The challenges and ways forward into the 21st century* (1993), and the *Green Paper on Innovation* (1995).

The Strategic Role of Education

In all of these initiatives mobility is perceived as being strategically important for **education, vocational training and research**. Even as early as the first Programme for Action in 1976, education was stressed as being of major significance within the context of European unification efforts. Consequently, one of the main goals of the European Community's Programmes for Action has always been to overcome existing obstacles to transnational education.

General Obstacles to Mobility

Despite the great success of the **EU Programmes for Action** in promoting cross-border mobility in vocational training, not all obstacles to and difficulties involved with mobility could be overcome. Many obstacles at a national level cannot be easily removed by means of promotional efforts; they continue to exert a socially selective influence, or prevent the seeds of educational mobility from coming to fruition in vocational life.

Many obstacles block mobility directly (formal recognition of educational experience/credits), and many are of general nature (language barriers). Yet others are rooted in the social and legislative structures which have evolved in specific nations. The latter are largely beyond the reach of joint Programmes for Action, and thus fundamentally lend themselves to harmonisation only from within, in the **national context**.

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 3

A special virtue of the current draft of the *Green Paper: Education-Training-Research: The obstacles to transnational mobility* (XXII/289/96-DE) is that it analyzes these obstacles in their entire scope of meaning and establishes numerous lines of action (1 to 10).

National Obstacles

The **Green Paper** expresses goals which go beyond those of the direct measures taken so far: It grasps cross-border mobility as both programme-dependent and spontaneous, it encompasses obstacles to mobility at all levels and within all contexts (multilateral/national, interregional/local), and it makes proposals which in many cases lie within the scope of national jurisdiction.

In this sense, the Green Paper and the current EURO-STUDENT-REPORT share a common intent.

The EURO-STUDENT-REPORT deals with obstacles to free movement in European education right down to the micro-structures of national government. The EURO-STUDENT-REPORT cannot do this for all of the areas of hindrance outlined in the Green context. Of the 10 areas listed in the Green Book,

- difficulties related to rights of residence
- international differences in the status of academics in training
- taxes and levies
- social security
- recognition, certification, validation
- territorial principle for national scholarships
- socio-economic obstacles
- administrative obstacles
- linguistic and cultural obstacles
- practical obstacles

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 4

only **one** actually emerges at the forefront of the EURO-STUDENT-REPORT: **socio-economic obstacles**.

Social Mobility as a Prerequisite for Regional Mobility

The focus of observation of the current EURO-STUDENT-REPORT is thus on the **social dimension** of mobility, this being based on the assumption that cross-border (physical) mobility can only be achieved to the extent that national social mobility increases. Regional and social mobility are analyzed in terms of their reciprocal aspects.

The findings of the EURO-STUDENT-REPORTS testify to the existence of many different varieties of such interdependencies in the member states, as well as to the fact that obstacles to mobility are often very subtly hidden in the guise of indirect, often unintentional forms of **mobility discouragement** (e.g. indirect tax transfers to parents to support the education of their offspring, student financing in the form of goods and services of local nature).

1.2 Analysis of Socio-Economic Obstacles at National and European Levels

Investigative Task: Socially Dependent Participation in Education

The impetus for focusing attention on the social dimensions of educational mobility in the higher education sector originated from the European Community's **Memorandum on Higher Education** and corresponding recommendations issued by the **European Parliament**. Both recommended investigating the interplay of regional and social mobility by means of in-depth analysis, both within the member states and from a transnational vantage point.

In the European Memorandum on Higher Education, under the objective of widening participation in higher education, special mention was made of the need to examine national "discrepancies in equal opportunity" (§§ 28, 29) and "specific costs of higher education for the individual" (§ 62).

This path of inquiry is also set forth in the European Parliament's recommendation. The Parliament's Commission for Culture, Youth, Education and Communication invited the EC Commission on Higher Education in the European Community to "collaborate with national educational authorities to investigate the extent to which, in all member states, young persons from unqualified or little qualified working-class families, disabled persons or those with special educational needs, or persons belonging to particular ethnic minorities constitute a significantly smaller

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 5

proportion of those attending higher education facilities than persons from the population at large (...) and to explicitly strive to ensure that the findings of this investigation are utilized for the conception of measures conducive to attaining this goal." (from: *Draft Report of the European Parliament*, dated 4th February, 1993, DUC-DE/PR/219041).

Responsibility of the European Council for Student Affairs (ECSTA)

Based on the knowledge of the central importance of procuring data on the various member states relative to the material foundations of, and national differences in, educational mobility in higher education – and realizing that this field of analysis constitutes a core mission of national student organisations for student affairs – representatives of said organisations recommended (on the occasion of their European conference on economic and social student support held in Bonn in September of 1992) that a comprehensive European survey be designed.

The project bearing the name EURO-STUDENT-REPORT was launched as the first initiative on the part of the European Council for Student Affairs (ECSTA), an association of student services organisations from European Community countries. On the occasion of the ECSTA's inaugural meeting on 3rd May, 1993 – which was jointly convened by Germany's DSW, France's CNOUS and the Commission of the European Community – it was unanimously agreed to conduct a **social survey as a basis for joint action towards creating equal opportunity and increasing European mobility**. Representatives of the member states were charged with making immediate preparations for a **pilot survey**.

Creation of a European Pool of Information

The express aim of the pilot survey was to create a fundamental pool of information which could be useful, especially in EU-wide efforts at increasing mobility. The **pragmatic intent** behind this concept for European activity not only dictated which fields of data were to be examined, but also how the data was to be presented. The investigation was not to be limited to specific socio-economic differences at the national level (**National Profiles**), but rather to also allow for **analytical comparison** of member states. Differences in mobility-related profiles were to be portrayed in the form of comparable indicators to be made as highly aggregated as possible. Thus the concept of comparison with the aid of socio-economic indicators was born (**Synopsis of Indicators**).

From the very start, this Synopsis of Indicators, inspired as it was by *Education at a Glance*, was intended to generate findings to support the European Commission in its coordination tasks. Moreover, the procurement of data was envisioned as a way of contributing to the creation of a **problem-orientated data pool for Europe**. just

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 6

as sought after by EUROSTAT.

National and European Usability

It was the prospect of usability going beyond that of national social surveys – stemming as it does from the comparative nature of the data collected and its relevance for European coordination efforts – which prompted the EU-commission to lend its support to ECSTA's pilot project. Thus the pilot project served to create the channels of **communication and coordination** necessary for the collection of comparative data.

The current report on the pilot project presents initial findings from its synoptic section on a trial basis (Part B: Synopsis of Indicators) in order to illustrate other possible ways of using national data in European coordination efforts.

2. From Autonomous National Surveys to European Comparisons: A Feasibility Test

The pilot project of the EURO-STUDENT-REPORT is designed as a test of a decentral/central method of data procurement for the purpose of generating comparative European indicators.

The following methodological comments on the EURO-STUDENT-REPORT are meant to point out the problems involved in generating comparative socio-economic indicators and ways of solving them.

2.1 Project Design

Objective

The project objective was the decentralized acquisition of comparable key data on the following aspects of student life:

- personal student financing
- social background
- state support

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 7

- international mobility
- housing

The targeted information appeared indispensable, and could not be culled from any existing federal statistics or EUROSTAT. Thus it could only be gathered by means of independent national surveys.

Project Organisation

The organisation of this joint European project called for a **coordinated, decentralized work effort**. The participating organisations from the member states agreed on mutual conventions to apply to the type of survey, the target data, and the form of presentation, these being regarded as the minimum standards bearing on the national surveys.

The respective national umbrella organisations for student affairs and ministries of education were to bear responsibility for the decentralized national surveys and data evaluation. The task of empirical data collection was to be given to professional survey institutes. Agreement on the minimum conventions was reached as proposed by HIS Hochschul-Informationssystem in the ECSTA Project Advisory Committee.

Project Conventions

Each national umbrella organisation for student affairs participating in the survey pledged to uphold the minimum standards agreed upon. These minimum standards were meant to ensure the validity, representativeness and comparability of the results. The conventions concerned the following:

- **Definitions:** Definition of the higher education system; definition of social indicators
- **Survey organisation:** Written surveying, postal sending, representative random sampling, representative selection among institutions of higher education, representativeness checking
- **Data provision:** Standard tables and indicators arrived at by prescribed methods of calculation

Survey Strategy

The survey conventions only applied to the minimum data set. It remained up to the discretion of each participating country as to whether to acquire only these data, or to glean the required data from a larger national survey as a subset – with the proviso, however, that the data had to meet the minimum requirements (**minimal strategy**).

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 8

The EURO-STUDENT-REPORT was conceived as a pilot project, and did not make any claims of completeness or area-wide coverage relative to the national data provided.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed with sets of questions to cover the following main topics:

- educational participation and social stratification
- student financing (income and spending)
- job activity
- housing
- international mobility
- personal data
- foreign languages

Proposals were taken on which questions to include, but these were able to be altered to accommodate the various countries as long as the desired categories of responses could still be generated with the answers.

Case Counts

Each national survey was supposed to ensure that at least 2,000 completed questionnaires would be available for evaluation (minimum response).

This net sample was then to be taken as representing the student body of the given member nation. The sample was supposed to be a random one if at all possible, although quota sampling was also permitted.

Report Formats

The EURO-STUDENT-REPORT was supposed to be divided into two parts: a monographic part containing systematic country overviews, and a comparison part based on the individual indicators:

- **National statistical profiles** (presentations of individual countries)

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 9

Systematic, country-by-country presentation of all topic areas following a standard report format. The national profiles consist of statistical overviews in the form of standard tables with annotations.

- **Indicator comparison** (transnational synopsis)

The most important social indicators, presented in transnational, synoptical graphs.

The national statistical profiles were to be prepared in such a way as to minimize the subsequent work involved in producing the indicators for comparison. The task of merging the indicators from the various countries was performed centrally by HIS.

3. Project Implementation

3.1 Institutional Context

This joint project aimed at acquiring key social data on students of selected member states of the European Union was conducted by the Deutsches Studentenwerk (DSW) under the auspices of the European Council for Student Affairs (ECSTA). The ECSTA supervised it by means of Dott. Ing. A. Razzano, Director of Fondazione RUI, Rome, and D. Schäferbarthold, Deputy Secretary General of the Deutsches Studentenwerk (DSW), Bonn.

HIS Hochschul-Informationen-System Hannover was charged with the procedural coordination of the surveys and the generation of the report.

3.2 Project Partners

The basis of the project was formed by nationally conducted surveys on students' social circumstances. A subset of this data was gathered in accordance with standard conventions and made available for the EURO-STUDENT-REPORT.

The participants were:

Austria – Project sponsor: Ministry of Science and Research
Implementation: Fessel+GfK Opinion Research Institute

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 10

France – Project sponsor: Observatoire de la Vie d'Etudiants (OVE)
Implementation: Ditto

Germany – Project sponsor: Deutsches Studentenwerk (DSW)
Implementation: HIS Hochschul-Informationen-System

Italy – Project sponsor: Fondazione RUI
Implementation: Universita degli Studii di Camerino

3.3 Project Financing

The national surveys were financed by the individual member states. Depending on the scope of the individual surveys, costs ranging from 200,000 to 500,000 ECU were incurred for the project. The European Community contributed funds towards the coordination of the national surveys and creating a joint EURO-STUDENT-REPORT. These funds were administered by the Deutsches Studentenwerk.

3.4 Timetable

The national surveys were conducted in 1994. In 1995, at the same time as the findings were undergoing analysis, the member states generated tables of results as agreed upon for the National Reports.

The National Reports were submitted as follows:

- Austria: July, 1995
- Germany: October, 1995
- Italy: November, 1995
- France: December, 1995 (partial), 1996

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 11

4. Achievement of Project Aims

4.1 Achievement of Overall Project Aim

Strengths

The overall project goal of generating comparable key data and indicators by coordinated, decentralized efforts has proved **effective**. The surveys were able to be conducted such that they describe nearly identical time frames. Time lags occurred only during subsequent analysis, thus hindering efforts to merge all the data concurrently.

In the case of Germany, the entire set of data was provided. In the case of the other countries, data on certain issues was omitted (Austria: mobility; Italy: financing of studies; France: job activity only presented in part).

Due to certain response items of highly national character (e.g. involving social stratification, degrees), not all of the information could be collected in directly comparable form. However, it was possible to gather comparable data on those sub-categories necessary for creating indicators (e.g. percentage of children with blue-collar parents). The graphics in Fig. A give an example of generating the "blue collar parents" -indicator from individual national categories in France and Germany.

Even though the systematical approach of portraying the social circumstances of student life could not generate fully congruent results, the indicators provided do allow a **reliable comparison** of systems with regard to **core issues** such as:

- participation in higher education
- the degree of student mobility in Europe
- the financing of studies
- student housing

Drawbacks

Nevertheless a satisfactory way of assessing **forms of student financing** has yet to be found. There are two problems which need to be solved:

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project: Fig. A


Pg. 12

France:

Social Background of the Students

Germany:


Fathers Vocation



Indicator:

Students from working-class families: 18%

Fathers Vocation



Indicator:

Students from working-class families: 16%

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 13

1. When student funding is differentiated in terms of state sources (direct transfers) and private sources, two avenues of funding are left out of the picture:
 - indirect transfers (i.e. tax breaks, child allowances given to the parents)
 - “real transfers”, i.e. material subsidies (free dormitory occupancy, free canteen meals, book donations, etc.)
2. For purposes of comparison, a distinction must be made between two types of households: students living with their parents, and students living on their own. These two types of households are present to varying degrees in the different countries. The dominant type of household in Germany and Austria – students living on their own – is not typically found in the Mediterranean countries of Europe. The financial circumstances of the majority of students in these countries – i.e. those living with their parents – can only be described with a great degree of “fuzziness”. Monetary expression of the non-cash benefits received (free food and housing) can only be expressed monetarily in the form of estimates.

These procedural issues were addressed in the following manner for the present study:

1. Outside of the survey an overall calculation of private and state spending for student financing was carried out. This included the following amounts:
 - direct contributions
 - real transfers (material subsidies) by the state
 - indirect family burden equalization by the state

This approach made it possible to globally specify the actual amount of state and private contributions. The percentage of state contributions (state contribution rate) was adopted as an additional indicator.

2. Maintenance provided by parents to students residing with them was taken into account by means of an alternate method of calculation:
 - cash contributed, excluding non-cash benefits
 - calculation of what housing would cost outside of the parental home, as an expression of monetary savings due to living at home

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 14

4.2 Appraisal of Survey Strategy

The decentralized approach to conducting such a survey has proven fundamentally **effective**. In any event, this approach is superior to a centralized effort to collect data from various member states. Differences in the way of collecting the data did, however, create problems. Austria, for example, opted for **quota sampling**, and conducted oral interviews. The other countries chose the path of true **random sampling**, accomplished by mail. In spite of the fact that quota sampling is advantageous in terms of swiftness and formal representativeness, it has drawbacks with regard to the representation of critical groups (e.g. older students, working students). Moreover, the low number of cases taken seldom lends itself to disaggregation by particular groups.

4.3 Effectiveness of Project Organization

Even with only four countries involved, noncentral organization engenders a **great deal of coordination work**. To facilitate the merging of data, the conventions for data collection and provision need to be even more tightly circumscribed and adhered to. It is only possible to achieve such binding conventions with the help of greater EU financing.

A considerable amount of procedural work is involved in merging, jointly interpreting and synoptically presenting the data, and this task cannot be accomplished "on the side". In the event that this pilot study is extended, provisions will have to be made for central, full-time management.

4.4 Appraisal of Survey Procedures

The polling instruments used have proven effective with regard to **survey content**. Only in the case of inquiry into the sensitive matter of "financial situation" in Italy was there concern of possible rejection on the part of those tested, as implied by pre-tests. However, the results of the Italian surveys show that it is indeed possible to inquire into the issue of student financing, there.

With regard to the **processing** of responses, different standards of quality prevail at present. Only in the case of the Austrian and German surveys were extensive plausibility tests carried out. Greater attention must be paid to the weighting of data in the event of deviation from the representative sample. This cannot be done centrally.

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 15

Two problems occurred relative to the **comparability** of results:

1. To enable comparison of educational participation rates according to family income, income-based frequency divisions were created from the given distributions. The use of rigidly defined, universal income brackets would have led to distortions due to national variation in income levels. Therefore, each country's income distribution was divided up into quartiles. The **lower quartile** was defined as the "**poverty quartile**", regardless of the respective ECU poverty line. Such functional divisions allow adequate comparison of countries' educational participation rates as a function of income-distribution characteristics.
2. The educational systems in the various countries differ widely. Different age profiles, for example, are found to give rise to different patterns of economic behavior among students. As a model for eliminating such system-related effects, some items (e.g. amount of student income, extent of student job activity) were based on subpopulations of homogeneous age make-up. In Fig. B examples are shown to produce job-rates for **homogeneous student-cohorts** (see Fig. B for Austria and Germany). In this case the indicator for "Job Activity Rate" was taken as the rate of the youngest and oldest students (see also Part B: Synopsis of Indicators, Fig. 24).

4.5 Quality of the Surveys Findings

Completeness

The **main topics** addressed by the survey (educational participation and social stratification, income, spending, job activity, housing, mobility, time budgets, personal data) are covered by the various national surveys to an extent of about **90%**. The national reports and consequently the European Synopsis contain **certain "white patches"** which differ from country to country. For example, foreign mobility was not assessed in Austria because too few cases were produced by the small quota sample. The reduced treatment given to the issues of income (Italy) and spending budgets (e.g. only rent spending in France) is not the result of any intrinsic obstructions. With further use of the current method of survey, area-wide coverage can be ensured.

Validity

The populations surveyed vary in size. The smallest (approx. 1,500 cases) was in Austria, due to the quota sampling method used. The largest were in France and Germany (over 20,000 evaluated cases). The size of the ran-

Euro - Student - Report



Progress Report of the Pilot Project: Fig. B

Pg. 16

Austria:

Student Earnings by Age

Germany:



Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 17

dom samples is by all means **sufficient** for the purpose of overall cross-national comparison. The Austrian quota sample is limited in its potential for further differentiation.

The differences in response behavior are more disturbing. The **response rates** were:

- 100% in Austria (inevitably, due to quota sample)
- 51% in Germany
- 35% in France
- 28% in Italy

The formal representativeness of the responses differs correspondingly. In all of the surveys, the upper age brackets are underrepresented. The social sciences are found to be underrepresented in all the surveys except Austria's.

The resulting system-related distortions of the findings are of varying magnitude. They can, however, be eliminated by appropriate **weighting schemes**. Further efforts are necessary in this regard.

Comparability

Although a relatively large amount of freedom was given for characteristic national categories, a high degree of comparability was still ensured by focusing on comparable subsets of data (e.g. "children of blue-collar parents") and by forming structural equivalencies (sub-categories of identical age).

Yet to be settled is the definition of the "normal student". The **principle forms of student household** vary from country to country. Attempts at specifying one "standard" student by forming virtual household equivalences for those groups who did not fulfil the criteries of "standard" students were not successful as f.e. in Italy the majority of students does not live in an independent household, but live at home with the parents (see Fig. 13 of Synopsis of Indicators).

For this reason it was decided in the pilot project to introduce **two standard households** for students:

- students maintaining own households
- students residing at home.

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 18

Relevance of Findings

How relevant the findings are depends on how well they may be exploited for the implementation of policies seeking to create equal educational opportunity in Europe.

Of major importance are the social and income-related discrepancies in **educational participation** within and among the member states. The magnitude of these discrepancies clearly indicates a great need for action. The picture presented by the survey's data and indicators is of greater integrity than ever before.

The models of **student financing** encountered superbly reflect structural differences among the countries. Even when comparing only the four countries, considerable qualitative differences emerge: At the one end of the spectrum we find subsistence-like financing (students living with parents), and at the other end nearly complete self-financing (over 60% of students in Germany and Austria having jobs). These differences elucidate the difficulties involved in developing guidelines for a system of student financial aid in Europe as a way overcoming educational barriers.

In deliberating these issues, **indirect transfers** (tax subsidies) need to be given even more consideration than before. However, such transfers cannot be brought to light within the scope of empirical polling of students. This would call for collateral analysis of state budgets. Since the effects of indirect transfers are highly income-dependent, this dependency will have to be given closer attention when developing measures for promoting educational mobility.

Alongside findings on social mobility, insight into **international regional mobility** is of major significance to the European objective of creating a European Union. The current findings succeed in giving an overall picture of international student mobility in terms of groups, programmes and free movers. When it comes to efforts to promote educational mobility in Europe, **foreign language proficiency** is of major importance, as well as the effects of social standing on mobility. Here, too, the findings demonstrate the need for explicit action on a Europe-wide level.

The overview of **forms of student housing** provides more than a descriptive outline. For the purpose of comparative analysis, the forms of student housing can be drawn upon to arrive at characteristic types of households which are suitable for comparison. In the context of international mobility, this analysis reveals housing-related barriers which deserve closer attention. Extremely high percentages of students live with their parents. This **subsistence form of student living keeps student immobile** and by this represents serious obstacles to study abroad.

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 19

Besides accomodation characteristics other special characteristics such as

- state-subsidies (i.e. tax subsidies only for national education)
- self-financing (dependency on job opportunities at home)
- educational participation (stratified participation rates)

have a great bearing on student mobility. These **indirect** obstacles to regional mobility are often more **persistent** than direct obstacles.

Condensing of Information and Reference System

By means of creating indicators, the size of the data pool was condensed by approximately 10 : 1. Only by means of condensation does the data become manageable and lend itself to comparison. The specific indicators make system-related differences apparent at a glance. Still, the indicators cannot satisfactorily explain the differences by themselves. However, the comprehensible way in which the indicators in the national profiles have been derived enables one to retrace references in order to clarify systematic differences.

The educational **indicators must be interpreted with caution**, bearing in mind the national deviations from means. The indicators can only be understood from the national breakdowns in detail. The pilot project offered two **references** for the indicators:

1. The so-called "National Profiles" show corresponding tables where national singularities, groupings or typical distributions can be found according to the conventions of the EURO-STUDENT-REPORT. The National Profiles are part of the full version of the EURO-STUDENT-REPORT.
2. All contributors of the EURO-STUDENT-REPORT have produced national reports basing on the full set of survey datas:
 - Austria: Materialien zur sozialen Lage der Studierenden, by: Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kunst, 1995.
 - France: Les conditions de vie des étudiants, by: OVE, 1996.
 - Germany: Das soziale Bild der Studentenschaft, by: DSW, 1995.
 - Italy: Euro Student '95, Della parte degli studenti, by: RUI, 1995.

These national reports provide an even deeper analysis of findings.

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 20

Weaknesses and Strengths of the Survey

Weaknesses arose from the following:

- Due to limited sanctioning ability (financing), it was not possible to ensure a sufficient degree of uniformity with regard to both survey strategies and the presentation of results.
- The different rates at which the surveys were conducted gave rise to considerable delays in merging the data, thus rendering the data considerably less up-to-date.
- The validity of the data leaves room for improvement. Particularly when it comes to the monitoring of the returns (plausibility testing, weighting), the standards of quality for empirical sociological research will have to be adhered to more closely.

The coverage of direct sources of funding in the national reports was highly inconsistent. With regard to this topic, the thrust of the survey has not yet been fully realized. Especially in the case of countries having mainly real transfers or extensive indirect transfers, further instruments (state budget analysis, different standard households) are necessary in order to improve the informative value of the findings.

The study is characterized by the following strengths:

- The survey's root concept has proved transferable. Incremental broadening to include other states of the European Community is feasible. In view of the impact of the pilot project, other countries have already declared a **strong interest** in participating in a second stage: **Portugal, the Netherlands, Great Britain and Sweden.**
- Findings can be used to create a problem-oriented database. The data on students' material conditions are outside of the scope of official statistics, and as such can only be obtained in the way described here.
- The findings on socially dependent educational participation, the housing situation, job activity, international mobility and foreign language proficiency are solid, and are of great significance in their bearing on European measures to promote equal opportunity of education and living in Europe.

Euro - Student - Report

Progress Report on the Pilot Project

Pg. 21

4. Recommendations for a Second Phase

Taking the weaknesses and strengths of the pilot study into account, one arrives at the following recommendations:

1. A subsequent trial phase should follow the pilot stage. The inclusion of another three to four countries is organizationally feasible. Candidates are Portugal, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Sweden.
2. The topical content should be reduced for a second trial. The surveys should concentrate on the issues of social mobility (educational participation and financing) and international mobility.
3. The matter of student financing including indirect and real transfers (material subsidies) should also be addressed more closely in a preliminary study. Special attention should then be paid to the particular structural traits of the southern European countries. The issue of student financing should refer to two different household types (independent and living with parents).
4. For the purpose of conducting the social surveys in the selected countries of the European Community, the funding provided for coordination of national surveys by the European Community should be increased to a point where the conventions prescribed for collecting and processing a minimum set of data can be made binding for the national surveys.
5. The second round of European social surveys should be scheduled for 1997/98.
6. The national profiles including statistics and graphics should be published in a separate Annex to the Synopsis of Indicators.

Euro - Student - Report

Part B:

Synopsis of Indicators

Euro - Student - Report

Table of Contents

Part B

Synopsis of Indicators

- Fig. 1 Social Background and Educational Background
- Fig. 2 Participation in Higher Education
- Fig. 3 Student Mobility
- Fig. 4 Study-Related Sojourn Abroad, by Parental Income
- Fig. 5 Choice of Country for Foreign Study
- Fig. 6 Effect of Foreign Language Proficiency on Student Mobility
- Fig. 7 Foreign Language Proficiency among Students
- Fig. 8 Degree of Foreign Language Proficiency
- Fig. 9 Income of Students' Parents
- Fig. 10 Student Age Profile and Gender Ratio
- Fig. 11 Student Age Profile by Gender
- Fig. 12 Family Status of Students
- Fig. 13 Students' Type of Residence
- Fig. 14 Type of Residence, by Size of Study Location
- Fig. 15 Average Cost of Accommodations
- Fig. 16 Higher Education Catchment Area
- Fig. 17 Sources of Student Financing
- Fig. 18 Income Distribution for Students Maintaining Own Households
- Fig. 19 Income Distribution and Sources of Income for Students Residing at Home
- Fig. 20 Income Profile for Students Maintaining Own Household (Importance of Parental Income Contribution)
- Fig. 21 Income Profile for Students Residing at Home (Importance of Parental Contribution)
- Fig. 22 Income Profile for Students Maintaining Own Households (Importance of

Euro - Student - Report


Table of Contents

| | |
|---------|---|
| | State Aid) |
| Fig. 23 | Regional Differences in Income |
| Fig. 24 | Student Spending Profile |
| Fig. 25 | State Aid for Students |
| Fig. 26 | Aid and Social Mobilisation |
| Fig. 27 | Higher Education Expenses by Sources |
| Fig. 28 | Higher Education Expenses by Sources |
| Fig. 29 | Employment and Income |
| Fig. 30 | Student Earnings by Parental Income and Age |
| Fig. 31 | Weekly Time Budget Relative to Extent of Job Activity |
| Fig. 32 | Weekly Time Budget by Faculty |
| Fig. 33 | Percentage of Disabled or Chronically Ill Students |


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 1 Social Background and Educational Background

Indicator: Students from working-class families
in %



Indicator: Students from higher-education families
in %



Comments:


The comparison of professional and educational background of student families with the socio-economic background of the entire "paternal generation" (i. e. 40 - to - 60 - year - old - men) demonstrates that a disproportionately large number of students still comes from socio-economically more privileged backgrounds. They participate in higher education more than three times as compared with their share in the population (right). The percentage of students having working-class fathers comprises only a quarter of the working-class population in the given paternal generation (left). These social discrepancy in participation can still be noticed in all four memberstates A, F, D, I.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 2 Participation in Higher Education


Indicator: New-entry rate

in %



Indicator: Difference between male and female new-entry rate (f - m)

in %-points



Comments:


Alongside demographic trends, increased enrollment was a decisive factor in higher education expansion. The higher-education enrollment rate (expressed as the percentage of the average population in the given age bracket of commencing studies) is now in A, F, D and I beyond 20%. D and I are far ahead in the steady increase in enrollment rates.

The percentage of female entrants - which at the beginning of the Seventies was only half as great as that of male entrants - went on to surpass the rate of male entry, and it currently exceeds that rate by 2 to 6 percentage points with the exception of D which lays behind with 8 percentage points.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 3 Student Mobility

Indicator: Foreign study rate (all study-related activities abroad)
in %



Indicator: Foreign enrolment rate
in %




Comments:

An astonishing high percentage of students of higher education have spent some time abroad for study-related purposes. But the rate of students that was enrolled at a foreign institution of higher education is low among students from F and I, and rather high in D. Similar percentages claim to have taken part in a traineeship or language course. The lead in student mobility takes F. But also in D and I nearly one quarter of all students reports of study-related experiences in a foreign country.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 4 Study - Related Sojourn Abroad by Parental Income

Indicator: Foreign study rate of students from low income families
in %



Indicator: Foreign study rate of students from high income families
in %




Comments:

As is to be expected, more students of "well off" parents engage in foreign study than do students from the lowest of the three income brackets. This disparity is found both among those students who were enrolled at a foreign institution of higher education and those who went abroad for a limited time in conjunction with a traineeship or language course. The results are proof of still existing social barriers to international student mobility.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 5 Choice of Country for Foreign Study


Indicator: Most popular destination country
in % of studies abroad



Indicator: Second popular destination country
in % of studies abroad



Indicator: Third popular destination country
in % of studies abroad




Comments:

The foreign country where the largest percentage of students have spent study-related time is Great Britain. Second place is taken by France for D and I and Germany for F. A further breakdown of the students' other responses reveals a wide spread among other countries. Among the third popular destination countries the USA take a prominent role.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 6 Effect of Foreign Language Proficiency on Student Mobility

Indicator: Mobility rate among students with very good command in one foreign language
in %



Indicator: Mobility rate among students with very bad command in foreign languages
in %




Comments:

The decision to plan a study-related period abroad is dependent upon the degree of foreign language proficiency, among other things. The more highly students rate their active, written foreign language proficiency, the more inclined they are to plan to engage in foreign study. The current study does not allow any differentiation as to when foreign language skills were acquired. Thus one possible scenario is that students who feel foreign study to be important for their education strive to acquire the necessary language skills, and another is that the existence of good foreign language skills promotes an interest in international study and research.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 7 Foreign Language Proficiency among Students




Comments:

Nearly all students claim the ability to read and write English. About 40% to 50% of all students claim to have some command of a second foreign language. Nearly one in five of them can write in a third language in A and D; in F even 41% report having writing ability in a third language.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 8 Degree of Foreign Language Proficiency

Indicator: Percentage of students with (very) good writing ability in English
in %



Indicator: Percentage of students who stated good ability in 2 foreign languages
in %



Comments:

Although English as a foreign language is wide by spread among students, it is not guaranteed that the quality of the command is assured. In I only a quarter of the students state a good writing ability, in F one third and in D half of the students which claim to be in command of English writing abilities, state a good writing ability.


The situation is much worse in the second foreign language.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 9 **Income of Students' Parents**


Indicator: Income cut-off between upper and lower half of parental income distribution (median)

in ECU



Indicator: "Poverty rate" (percentage of students' parents having income below income cut-off for lowest-income quarter of all private households)

in%



Comments:


When scrutinizing income figures for parents with student offspring, one must bear in mind that the figures represent estimates provided by the students, themselves. On average, students' parents have a monthly income of more than 2000 ECU (median) at their disposal, with the exception of I. The lower median of family income in I does not reflect a lower national level of income but a higher grade of educational participation in education in low income classes.

While in I the percentage among students' parents belonging to the lowest income quartile of the population is nearly as high (22%) as the corresponding lowest 25% in the population, the corresponding percentage in A, F and D is far lower (10-13%).


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 10 Student Age Profile and Gender Ratio

Indicator: Total average age (first course)
in years



Indicator: Proportion of female students (first course)
in %



* premier cycle (two first years) including preparatory classes

Comments:

The average age of students is mainly dependent upon the given system of higher education. Student bodies are appreciably older in systems where no intermediate stages are passed through on the way to degrees bestowing vocational qualification (A, D) than in tiered systems (F) which lead to an initial qualifying degree within a short time.


In all cases, high percentages of women are present in the first course of study for vocational qualification. In F and I, female students even make up the majority.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 11 Student Age Profile by Gender


Indicator: Average age of male students (first course)

in years



Indicator: Average age of female students (first course)

in years



* premier cycle (two first years) including preparatory classes


Comments:

The average ages of male and female students hardly differ in the various systems of higher education. There is a tendency for male students to be somewhat older due to military service, but this effect is being compensated for to an increasing degree by the fact that especially women take up studies following a phase of family establishment.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 12 Family Status of Students

Indicator: Proportion of married students
in %



Indicator: Proportion of students with children
in %




Comments:

It is no longer unusual for students to begin establishing their own families while still studying. As a rule of thumb, every fifteenth student is either married or bears responsibility for his/her own children. The departure from this trend in the case of A may be artificially caused by older students being underrepresented in the sample.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 13 Students' Type of Residence

Indicator: Proportion of dormitory residents
in %



Indicator: Proportion of students living at home
in %




Comments:

There is a general tendency to provide for 10 - 15% of the student body dormitories as a subsidized form of housing. Only in I the universities cannot cope with this standard due to high expansion rates in the student population. In I "living with the parents" is the most common substitute for missing dormitories (69%). But also in A and F the average percentage of students living with their parents is high (37%/38%). In D both living forms are less frequent. There, the trend establishing one's own household in (shared) flats is prevailing.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 14 Type of Residence by Size of Study Location




Comments:

There seems to be no clear connection between size of student town and type of residence. In A and I there is a tendency to stay with the family in order to substitute high rents in metropolitan towns. In F and especially in D flat sharing situations are typically for urban type of study location.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 15 Average Cost of Accommodations

Indicator: Average dormitory cost
in ECU



Indicator: Average cost of student accommodations
in ECU




Comments:

Dormitories represent the least expensive form of residence for students in all concerned member - states. Dormitory residents spend about 25% less in A and D and nearly 50% less in F on accommodations. Highest average cost of student accommodations is found in F, due to the high grade of concentration of students in the metropolitan area of Paris.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 16 Higher Education Catchment Area

Indicator: Regionalisation quota (catchment area up to 100 km by all students)
in %



Comments:


There is a general tendency to attend the institution near of parents residence. In many cases this means daily commuting. Two third of the student population in A, F and D lives in a catchment area of up to 100 km; in I three quarters.

The high grade of regionalisation signals the unwillingness of leaving the familiar circumstances. This constitutes an obstacle for regional and international mobility.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 17 Sources of Student Financing

Indicator: Parental monetary contributions
frequency in % and cash value in ECU



Indicator: Parental contributions including tangibles
frequency in % and value in ECU




Comments:

Parents are the most widely specified financial source; about three quarters of all students in A and D receive parental contributions amounting to an average of 250 resp. 273 ECU a month. If tangibles provided by parents are also included - these being of above-average relevance for those living with their parents - then one finds family support to be of prime significance: more than 85% of students receive some kind of support from their parents, whether monetary and/or tangible.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 18 Income Distribution for Students Maintaining Own Households

Indicator: Average monetary income per month of students
arithmetic mean, in ECU



Indicator: Income cut-off between lower and upper half of distribution of student income
median, in ECU



Comments:


Students residing outside their parental homes need compared with students residing with their parents a higher financial support. The average monthly budget amounts 706 ECU in D and 565 ECU in A. The difference in student income in A and D seems to be due to different standard of living costs.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 19 Income Distribution and Sources of Income for Students Residing at Home


Indicator: Average monetary income per month

arithmetic mean, in ECU



Indicator: Income cut-off between lower and upper half of distribution of student income

median, in ECU




Comments:

Students residing with their parents generally need only additional "pocket - money" as main items of living costs, food and accommodation, are covered directly by the parents. The difference of cash income between A and D is also due to different levels of living costs.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 20 Income Profile for Students Maintaining Own Household
(Importance of Parental Income Contribution)


Indicator: Parental financing quota (percentage of students receiving parental contributions)
in %



Indicator: Parental financing amount (absolute)
in ECU



Indicator: Portion of total income made up by average parental contribution
in %




Comments:

The importance of parental income contribution to students maintaining their own households is demonstrated by 3 indicators: frequency, amount in absolute figures and portion of total income. With regard to frequency parents' contribution is the most important source in A and D. Students in A and D receive a considerable sum of around 300 ECU. Parental contributions make up the largest portion of the overall income, namely around 47% in D and 40% in A.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 21 Income Profile for Students Residing at Home (Importance of Parental Contribution)


Indicator: Parental financing quota
(percentage of students
receiving parental con-
tributions)
in %



Indicator: Parental financing
amount (absolute)
in ECU



Indicator: Portion of total income
made up by average pa-
rental contribution
in %



Comments:


As shown in Fig. 15 students residing at home have less money at their disposal. Nevertheless, the parents' contribution is important.

In A the monetary contribution of the parents covers 47% of the budget, in D the parents' share is only 32%. The monetary contributions do not cover any tangibles.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 22 Income Profile for Students Maintaining Own Households - Importance of State Aid


Indicator: Difference between Income of working-class offspring and all students
in % - points



Indicator: Ratio of state aid to parental contribution, for "working-class" offspring
in % - points



Indicator: Ratio of state aid to parental contribution, for "higher education" offspring
in % - points



Comments:


The income patterns of students maintaining their own households emerge as being closely dependent upon social background, even though the differences in income amounts tend to be small.

In A working class-offspring dispose a slightly more than average students, in D slightly less. Deficits in parental contributions are compensated by state aid. The smaller share of the overall financial burden shouldered by "working-class" parents is compensated for by state aid. State support to students from working-class families constitutes factor 1.1 of the parental contribution, in A and D.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 23 Regional Differences in Income

Indicator: Regions with the greatest upward and downward deviation relative to national mean
in % - points



Comments:

The most prominent differences in student income are those between regions:


F shows the highest regional variations, A the lowest. In the eastern Länder of D overall student income is consistently 20% below western levels.

The regional differences in income may be accounted for by differences of costs of living.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 24 Student Spending Profile

Indicator: Proportion of rent relative to all expenditures for students living away from home
in %



Indicator: Proportion of tuition relative to all expenditures
n %




Comments:

In general there is no difference between the amount of the income-budget and the spending-budget. Students maintaining their own households spend the biggest part of the budget for accommodation. In A not much less than a third of the budget goes for rent and related expenses, in D more than a third.

As far as A and D are concerned there are no expenses for tuition fees.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 25 State Aid for Students



* research grants excluded

Comments:


The provision of direct state aid to students is governed by different national schemes. For a student to receive aid social need is prerequisite. The criterias for social aid seem to be quite different. In I only 6% of the students receive financial aid, in D less than 29%. F (24%) and A (16%) take up middle positions. The mean aid amounts are quite substancial for the budget. They are lowest in A.

With regard to direct state aid it must be stated that there exists a complementary system of indirect state aid to students or their parents (s. Fig. 3).


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 26 Aid and Social Mobilisation

Indicator: State aid quota for students from lowest income quartile
in %



Indicator: Mean aid amount for students from lowest income quartile
in ECU per month



Comments:

The aid quota as broken down by parental income shows that state support schemes are clearly meeting their objective of attributing aid in accordance with social need.


The aid quota for students belonging to the lowest quartile (in terms of parental income) is two to three times higher than average.

A comparison of the average aid amounts reveals the lowest quartile as receiving the greatest amounts of aid, with average aid amounts declining as parental income increases.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 27 Higher Education Expenses by Sources

Indicator: Student aid amount (direct and indirect) for a family with low income per capita in ECU



Indicator: Student aid amount (direct and indirect) for a family with high income per capita in ECU



Comments:


In most countries, the state's compensation of burden payments for families are socially stratified. In D, such payments cover a major share of the living expenses of students from low-income families (left) (see also Fig. 14). For students of well-to-do parents (right), the amount of family burden compensation being provided by the state in D is by no means negligible. The quoted figure of 241 ECU is in this case comprised wholly of indirect transfers.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 28 Higher Education Expenses by Sources


Indicator: Students living expenses by sources (private and state)

in %



Indicator: Higher education expenses (instruction costs + student living costs) borne by state and private sources

in %



Comments:

The funds to cover students' living expenses (left) come mainly from private sources, and this more so in the case of A than D. The state's compensation of burden payments for families cover a quarter of these living expenses in A, and a third in D.


In the case of overall income (right), the state's share rises to two thirds (A = 69%, D = 66%). This is due to the fact that the private sector in A and D is not called upon to contribute to the cost of instruction via tuition fees.

Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 29 Employment and Income


Indicator: Job activity rate

in %




Indicator: Proportion of total income contributed by job activity

in %



Indicator: Proportion of those with only low job income (up to 100 ECU)

in %




Comments:

Job patterns of students are quite different. In A and D two third of the student population are gainfully employed in some way while studying. In I and F the job activity is lower (46% resp. 40%). But in all four states the job income represents about one third of the total income. In F dominates the jobbing student with low job income, in D and I jobbing students try to make their job income as a basic income source.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 30 Student Earnings by Parental Income and Age

Indicator: Job activity rate of students whose parents' income falls in lowest quartile
in %



Indicator: Job activity rate of youngest and oldest students
in %




Comments:

Students with parents who are more "well-to-do" naturally have a larger budget at their disposal than do their counterparts from lower income quartiles. This is due to differences in the groups' base income, which is made up in part by parental contributions. The proportion of those working and the average income from job activity are, however, of similar magnitude throughout the different income quartiles. This means students from lower income quartiles are not significantly compensating for their lower base income by increasing the share of the burden covered by job activity. A breakdown by age reveals some more distinct trends, though: The younger the students, the less they tend to work while studying or during semester breaks.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 31 Weekly Time Budget Relative to Extent of Job Activity

Indicator: Time budget for study-related activities
in hours/week



Indicator: Time budgets for job-related activities
in hours/week




Comments:

The study - related time budgets vary from country to country. The busiest students are found in F. The less time students are occupied in instruction activities, the more time they spend on job activities. By this complementary time - structure students spend more than 40 hours per week in productive activities in all four countries.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 32 Weekly Time Budget by Faculty

Indicator: Average time budget for study-related activities in humanities
in hours/week



Indicator: Average time budget for study-related activities in technical faculties
in hours/week



Comments:


Some interesting differences emerge when one regards time budgets by faculty. For instance, the study time spent by students in technical faculties are at high level in all countries.

Contrastingly, students in humanities invest less hours a week in their studies. At the same time, the latter group shows the highest weekly time budget for job activity.


Euro - Student - Report: Synopsis of Indicators

Fig. 33 Percentage of Disabled

Indicator: Percentage of disabled students
in %




Indicator: Percentage of chronically ill students
in %



Comments:

2,3% of the students in D claim to have a handicap. 10,4% of the students claim to be suffering from a chronic illness. Relative to the total student population of approx. 1.7 million for D, this means one can assume there to be approx. 200,000 affected individuals at German institutions of higher education, of whom approx. 39.000 are handicapped and approx. 177,000 are chronically ill. The degree to which these students regard their impairments as detrimental or limiting in the pursuit of their studies varies quite widely. 23% of handicapped and 25% of chronically ill students experience their impairment as having a moderately or highly limiting effect on their studies.



Addresses of the participating organisations:

Deutsches Studentenwerk
Weberstr. 55
D-53113 Bonn

Observatoire de la Vie Etudiante
8, rue Calvin
F-75005 Paris

Fondazione RUI
Viale XXI Aprile 36
I-00162 Roma

Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Verkehr
Minoritenplatz 5
A-1014 Wien

HIS Hochschul-Informationen-System GmbH
Goseriede 9
D-30159 Hannover