eurostudent.eu

Report on quality assurance in EUROSTUDENT IV

Martin Unger
leader of the workpackage "Quality Assurance"
IHS, Vienna

HIS Hochschul Informations System GmbH

CHERI Centre for Higher Education Research and Information

eesti üliõpilaskondade liit

ЦКОКО

NIFU Nordisk institutt for studier av innovasjon, forskning og utdanning

Quality assurance in EUROSTUDENT IV

Ensuring quality of survey data and moreover, ensuring the comparability of international survey data is a very special challenge. In the case of EUROSTUDENT, the challenge is even bigger given the fact that not a single international survey is conducted (like e.g. the PISA-study), but 25 countries conducted individually their different national surveys. These surveys are based on the Eurostudent core set of questions, but are done accordingly to national circumstances regarding e.g. the way students can be approached (hence the survey method) or the content of the surveys according to national demands.

In such a case, quality assurance means first of all ensuring that all countries follow the same standards and conventions for sampling, questioning, data cleaning and data delivery and that adoptions to national requirements are agreed upon with the coordinating team. However, before countries can follow the international standards, they have to be developed and delivered in a user-friendly manner to the countries. Exactly these steps have been greatly improved in EUROSTUDENT IV compared to previous rounds when less countries were involved and hence issues of quality assurance could been dealt with more informally. More and more detailed manuals and handbooks were produced, more personal consulting to countries was provided and more checks of delivered data were run. All of this was even more important, because several countries participated for the first time in EUROSTUDENT or conducted a student survey for the first time ever.

In the proposal for EUROSTUDENT IV, the role of quality assurance was defined as follows: “Quality control and feedback of assessments into the project production processes must be assured continually throughout the project. Additionally, special assessments will be carried out around the time of the achievement of the project milestones.” Moreover, the tasks defined in the proposal comprised among others, the following:

- Assessment of adherence to definitions and conventions for country contributions in WP5 (data analysis and reporting).
- Quality check of central online-questionnaire (WP3), especially online plausibility checks, filters etc.
- Special focus on treatment of missing data, particularly in metric data (time budget, money)
- Quality checks off delivered data (WP4): Checks for plausibility by comparing data with previous EUROSTUDENT data, identifying outliers, review of implausible data with data providers
- Assessment of completion of WP2 (definitions and conventions)
- Advise editors of final report on how to interpret the data and which data should be excluded

Hence, quality assurance in EUROSTUDENT IV (WP 6) was established as a cross-sectional topic co-operating in WP2 (development of project conventions and definitions), WP3 (provision of infrastructure and methodological support for online surveys), WP4 (development of tools for data delivery) and WP5 (tools and execution of data analysis and reporting). Therefore, the quality assurance team…

- assisted the WP-leaders in fulfilling their tasks mainly by providing intensive feedback, e.g. on drafts of the manuals and handbooks, the data delivery tool, the reporting tool and how the data was used in the final report
- was present at all workshops and intensive seminars of the project, presenting on any occasion the common definitions, how they can technically be followed, what are "tricky issues" in data management, and how to overcome obstacles in software programmes for statistical analysis
- was heavily involved in developing plausibility checks of the data provided by the countries, in executing these checks and in advising countries on how to solve technical problems in their data treatment
- participated in all country visits of WP3, had close contacts to several other countries teams and consulted researchers from other countries by discussing their technical problems on informal occasions at the workshops.

This elaborates some examples of the cross-sectional involvement of quality assurance (WP6) within EUROSTUDENT IV. A complete list of all (formal) activities undertaken by the quality assurance team can be found in Annex 8. However, as already mentioned, many other activities had a more informal manner (face-to-face discussions, telephone calls, E-Mails) and hence are not documented.

1. Target group and common set of core questions

EUROSTUDENT IV started with a revision of the core target groups to be surveyed and the core set of questions. This work (WP2) was achieved through the Vienna Intensive Seminar, many bilateral contacts and between the partners involved in the WP and ended in a large manual for compiling questionnaires and surveys. However, before all this work was done, a short online survey was run within the EUROSTUDENT community (Ministries, researchers and data users) in order to determine what kind of students should be included or excluded from being surveyed (hence the target group of the survey) and what topics are of most interest for all participant.

While this survey was used in WP 2 exactly for fulfilling the tasks of the work package, from the point of view of quality assurance, the survey fulfilled another objective too: Already in the first month of the project, participating countries were alerted to issues of standards and conventions. First of all, it is not trivial to decide which students *should* be included in such a survey (desirably "all") and which students *can* be included taking national requirements into account (e.g. can a public Ministry get access to students at private institutions and how?). Secondly, which kind of students should be in-

cluded to ensure a meaningful international comparison? As a result e.g. ISCED 5B students and students in distance learning programs have been excluded from the target group, because their situation did not seem to be internationally comparable.

The full results of the survey can be found in Annex 1.

2. Sampling

A very crucial point for the comparison of student survey data is how students are invited to take part in the survey. Has every student the same chance of participating? The problem here is that national authorities in different countries have very different possibilities of contacting "their" students. In some countries, a national registry exists containing the postal and electronic contact information of all students in a country. In other countries, the registry contains e.g. only information from students at public institutions, or students who at some point applied for a public grant, or students from younger cohorts (because the registry was installed only recently), and in some countries no nationwide registry with student contact information exists at all. Therefore, different solutions had to be found, to ensure random selection among all students in a country. As a consequence, sampling and surveying methods differed from country to country. Hence, the role of the coordinators of EUROSTUDENT, and most of all the quality assurance team, was to ensure comparability of the survey data despite the different ways of sampling. In most cases, this task required very close contacts with the countries, e.g. during the country visits in WP3. These were mainly countries participating for the first time in EUROSTUDENT or Ministries conducting a student survey for the first time ever. With other countries, the issue of sampling was discussed on various occasions, be it country visits, meetings at the co-ordinators' institute or at EUROSTUDENT events.

The more students participate in the survey, the more valid the data becomes, as more subgroups of students can be analysed and overall more analysis can be done. However, depending on the sampling and survey methods chosen, more participants increase the cost of surveying, data cleaning and analysis. Hence, each country has to find a trade-off between available resources and desired depth of analysis. In EUROSTUDENT IV, a working paper written by the quality assurance team assisted the countries in defining the optimal sample size, which also depends on minimum requirements for comparability and the heterogeneity of the higher education system in a country (see Annex 2).[1] Secondly, an introduction on how to use online-surveys within the EUROSTUDENT framework was given at the Berlin Intensive Seminar on online surveys (see

[1] See also website:
http://www.eurostudent.eu/download_files/documents/Initial_Sample_Size_151009.pdf

Annex 3). Both this report and the outcomes of the Intensive Seminar were elaborated in a working handbook.[2]

3. Weighting and data cleaning

When the data has been collected, a common way of weighting, data processing and cleaning must be followed by all countries to ensure comparability. Again, preconditions in different countries vary in this step of the research process, e.g. because countries have a long tradition of national reporting on the situation of students and cannot easily switch their rules of data processing which would cause breaks in national time series or because weighting procedures must depend on the different ways of sampling. However, EUROSTUDENT identified several crucial variables in the data sets where different ways of data processing would indeed cause very different results and hence prevent comparability of the data. For example the treating of "0" in financial issues as a valid amount or as a missing data (because no answer was given) results in very different averages of students' income. First work on this was done by a working group in Hannover and Tallinn. These "tricky issues" were then discussed in several intensive seminars and workshops and common conventions elaborated and integrated in the handbook for data analysis (see Annex 4; FW: see also full handbook on the website).

A very special case is the calculation of a certain indicator, where SPSS, the most often used software for statistical analysis, produces wrong results. Again, trainings with the researchers from all EUROSTUDENT member countries here organised at the Prague workshop and a special section of the handbook is devoted on how to avoid these calculative errors (see Annex 5). The handbooks (on data collection and analysis) themselves have been checked in several rounds by the quality assurance team and improved continuously during the project.

4. Checking online questionnaire within the Common Survey Hosting Initiative (CSH)

A good example for more "informal" activities are the checks of the online-questionnaire provided within the common survey hosting (CSH) in WP3. It was far more effective that the person who programmed the questionnaire and the person testing it (both situated in different countries) sat at the same time in front of their computers and worked "together" on the questionnaire while being connected via Skype and discussed all issues of relevance, instead of producing long lists of deficiencies and maybe producing some misunderstandings because none of the involved persons are native speakers. The effectiveness of these kinds of online-collaborations has been proven ex-post during the checks of the data provided by the participants of the CSH as none of the

[2] http://www.eurostudent.eu/download_files/documents/Planning_and_executing_national_online_surveys_Draft.pdf

striking issues popping up during the checks has been caused by mistakes in the programming of the questionnaire.

5. Developing indicators for comparative analysis

During EUROSTUDENT IV, several new indicators and comparative concepts had been developed for a deeper understanding of the social situation of students in Europe. For any comparison, the indicators used are the crucial issue especially when the task is to compare very different systems of higher education. Do the indicators chosen fit all systems/countries? Do they fit them all in an equal manner? Hence, indicator development is obviously a core issue for quality assurance, albeit the lead responsibility for this task laid in other working packages.

An example of the work done is the development of the innovative concept of "students with delayed transition".[3] The development of this new comparative concept had been based on data analysis of several countries (early birds providing data or using data from the last EUROSTUDENT round). One question during development of the concept was "what is the added value?", hence, do students with direct and delayed transition really differ with regard to their social and economic situation and moreover, do they differ in several countries? The main question was, what is the best cut-off point, or the time-gap between direct and delayed transition which "fits" for most countries? Part of this analysis based on Austrian data is documented in Annex 6.

6. Data delivery and checks for plausibility of the data provided by the countries

The last step in ensuring comparability was the analysis of the data provided online in the data delivery module (DDM) by the participating countries. This data has been checked with plausibility checks already implemented in the DDM, compared with results from previous EUROSTUDENT rounds and other international data (e.g. from EUROSTAT) to ensure plausibility and validity. Another round of checks identified outliers among countries; hence cross-country checks were implemented by the quality assurance team. However, the whole task of data delivery and data checking was done in a very close co-operation between the overall project co-ordinators (responsible among others for programming the data delivery and reporting modules as well as the semi-automatic plausibility checks) and the quality assurance team manifested in many emails, telephone calls, video conferences, informal discussions at every EUROSTUDENT event and a special working group by the two teams convened in November 2010.

After all the checks, countries where asked to recalculate their data or provide an interpretation of the outliers (see Annex 7 for an example). A few countries had severe

[3] see Glossary in handbook:
http://www.eurostudent.eu/download_files/documents/EUROSTUDENT_IV_-_Data_Delivery_Handbook_-_2010_11_23.pdf

problems in analysing their data at all, hence members of the consortium assisted them intensively in these procedures – far beyond the role of the consortium to just collate national data.

Final remark

The consortium working on EUROSTUDENT IV made a great step forward in analysing the social situation of students in Europe between 2000 and 2011. First of all by redesigning the common set of questions (with involvement of many participating countries), providing far more elaborated handbooks, tools and instructions for the participating countries, but also by developing new indicators. These new indicators have been developed and tested (with data from a few countries) mainly by the coordinating and quality assurance teams. A review of these new concepts remains to be done at the beginning of the next round of EUROSTUDENT, but the questionnaire as such will only be consolidated a bit and kept widely unchanged.

The consortium has at all times made efforts to be inclusive and transparent about the way it works and makes decisions on conventions, standard procedures and key concepts. During development phases this was largely achieved through use of internal project wiki-pages,[4] working groups, Intensive Seminars and workshops. The final outcomes of these phases were then published on the public website as soon as possible and in line with any external restrictions (see http://www.eurostudent.eu/about/docs). Two more benefits are expected from the publication of such documents: (i) users of the data will have easy access to the information necessary to understand the conventions and standards used in the project and (ii) similar projects will be able to benefit from the development of conventions, procedures and key concepts of EUROSTUDENT in the sense of 'peer learning'.

[4] http://eurostudent.his.de/wiki/index.php/Main_Page

Annexes

The Annex has been merged from various different documents. Hence the original lay-out of these papers has been partly lost.

Survey on target and comparative groups

1 Who answered ?

Persons		Percent
Government/ administration	11	45,8%
Researcher	10	41,7%
User of Eurostudent data	3	12,5%
Total	24	100%

2 Level of relevance of Eurostudent topics

	Gov./ Admin		Res.	User	Total
Demographic characteristic of the student body	Highly relevant	90,9%	90%	100%	90,9%
	Relevant	9,1%	10%	0% Low	9,1%
	relevance	0%	0%	0%	0%
Access to higher education	Highly relevant	81,8%	60%	100%	72,7%
	Relevant	9,1%	30%	0% Low	18,2%
	relevance	9,1%	10%	0%	9,1%
Social make-up of student body	Highly relevant	72,7%	100%	100%	86,4%
	Relevant	27,3%	0%	0% Low	13,6%
	relevance	0%	0%	0%	0%
Accommodation	Highly relevant	45,5%	60%	100%	54,5%
	Relevant	36,4%	30%	0% Low	31,8%
	relevance	18,2%	10%	0%	13,6%
Funding and state assistance	Highly relevant	100,0%	90%	100%	95,5%
	Relevant	0%	10%	0% Low	4,5%
	relevance	0%	0%	0%	0%
Living expenses and student spending	Highly relevant	63,6%	70%	100%	68,2%
	Relevant	36,4%	30%	0% Low	31,8%
	relevance	0%	0%	0%	0%
Student employment and time budget	Highly relevant	81,8%	90%	100%	86,4%
	Relevant	18,2%	10%	0% Low	13,6%
	relevance	0%	0%	0%	0%
Internationalization and mobility	Highly relevant	63,6%	60%	100%	63,6%
	Relevant	27,3%	40%	0% Low	31,8%
	relevance	9,1%	0%	0%	4,5%

Members of the government/administration:

Switzerland:
Access to higher education: as Eurostudent III showed, it's very complicated to compare the very dif- frent national ways of access to higher education
Living expenses and student spending, but by % and not by sum of money. Because if using â‚¬, the purchasing power (pouvoir d'achat) should be taken in account.
Mobility: the national surveys can't give precise informations on mobility because this is only possible by questioning graduates (at the end of their cursus) and not student which haven't finish their studies.

Finland:
If we want to follow the development, we can not drop any issues we have had.

Researchers of higher education: Slovenia:
the relevance depends on quality of answers received; questions with lower relevance should be mo- dified

Austria:
The topics are all highly relevant, because without them Eurostudent is not Eurostudent anymore. However, not all of the indicators within each topic are highly relevant.

3 Target groups

3.1 Nationality

Gov./ Admin		Res.	User	Total
National students (defined by citizenship)	18,2%	50,0%	0%	30,4%
Resident students (defined by location of prior education, i.e. including migrants)	9,1%	20,0%	0%	13,0%
Resident and foreign students aiming to complete a full study in your country ploma mobility")	36,4%	20,0%	0% ("di-	26,1%
Resident and all foreign students, including short term mobility ("credit point mobility")	36,4%	10,0%	100%	30,4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Multiple answers possible

Members of the government/administration:

Lithuania:
The aim is to learn about socio-economic conditions of the students in a particular country regardless of their nationality, however, the short term students should not be a target group as their answers may not reflect a situation in the host country.

Georgia:
Eurostudent is a very valuabe instrument for understanding student mobility. I do not quite understand according to which considerations we could limit the Eurostudent to national students and residents or limit international students to full study programs students only. Moreover, since mobility is not limited to full-time programs only, we need to include international students who are taking short-term programs as well. Hence I would gladly read comments of other colleagues in the list if they have counter arguments in this regard.

Switzerland:
Eurostudent should give an image on the study conditions in each country. This means with foreign students also, but only the ones who achieve all the study in a country.
Consequently, our "second choice" would be "resident students (defined by location of prior education).

Austria:
survey should be as complete as possible, but is this technically achievable?

Bulgaria:

This is the target group I am professionally interested in.

Finland:
It would be interesting to know more about foreign students since our aim is to promote mobility.

Researchers of higher education: Germany:
According to our experience it is very difficult to motivate non-resident foreign students to take part at surveys like this. It is not easy providing them an idea of who is asking, what purposes they were the asked for, what kind their personal benefit would be if they would take part, that a misuse of their (per- sonal) data is really guaranteed â€¦
A lot of questions essential for resident students are irrelevant for foreigners or difficult to answer. It is advisable to use an at least bilingual (national language & English) questionnaire in order to improve the response rate of foreigners due to their better understanding of what is questioned. These are two strong reasons which suggest developing a special instrument focused only on non-resident foreign students. For E IV-network it would be too much, too difficult & too time-consuming work to make an agreement of two different questionnaires.

Norway:
It is difficult to make a stratified random sample of the group of non-national (foreign) students.

France:
All the students (french and foreign) registered during academic years are questioned.

Slovenia:
The number of "diploma mobily" students is negligable, should be treated separately

Italy:
Groups are very different in terms of numbers and % in the total population. There are also too many differences among groups (i.e. in terms of social background, study behaviours, etc.). As a result, it is very difficult to give them all adequate representation in a same sample and in a same analysis.

Austria:
To facilitate work, I should have chosen resident students only. However, Eurostudent becomes more and more relevant for international organisations (OECD, EU, Bologna) and for them, mobility is a core

topic. Eurostudent will be the only source available to provide serious survey data on long term mobil- ity and Eurostudent can only profit from international attention paid for this data. Hence, if (and only if) we are able to solve the technical problems on how to separate short from long term mobility, our tar- get group should be resident and foreign students on long term mobility.

Users of Eurostudent data/Stakeholders: Malta:
Wider viewpoint and more comprehensive analysis

3.2 Mode of Study

Gov./ Admin				Res.	User	Total
Part-time students		82%	70%	100%	Full-time students	78%
100%	100%	100%	Distance students		73%	100%
40%	50%					57%
Other, please specify		18%	10%	50%		17%

Multiple answers possible

Others mentioned:

Gov/admin: E-Learning, in service

students attending classes while working in the fields

Researcher: In-service training

User: Exchange students

Comments:

Members of the government/administration: Lithuania:
The information, provided by full-time and part-time students is the most accurate

Georgia:
If the Eurostudent is about studying economic background and social differences among students, the mode of study would be important to consider. Undfortunatelly, I am not familiar with other countries' experience. But in Georgia the mode of study always correlated with students' social and economic background. For instance, female students from rural areas were more likely to take distance pro- grams. And male students from rural areas were more likely to take part-time programs. Also, Geor- gian students who go abroad (if they do not recieve a state or other scholarships and grants) tend to take part-time programs to earn for living. I think this could be true for other developing country nation- als studying abroad.

Switzerland:
For CH, all students who want to achieve a complete degree in a high school should be taken in ac- count. Students attending classes while working in the fields = so called (in german) berufsbegleitenden Stu- dierenden

Bulgaria:
It will be useful to have statistics about all students with reference to their status of the university.

Finland:
In Finland all student are full -time students if they are degree students, but in practice a significat a- mount of student study part -time.

Belgium:
part time does not exist in Flanders. We have full time and less (or more) then full time

Researchers of higher education: Germany:
If distance students are included a lot of additional differentiations must be considered, e.g. with re- gard to students' time-budget, employment, finance, accommodation, commuting etc. For sure this is of impacts on the complexity of data collection, data comparability and potential/restrictions concerning analysis.

Norway:
Full-time students should be top priority and most in focus. Part-time and distance students could be includ- ed, but may be more difficult to sample and include in the national data, and sample/data quality may vary between countries.

Slovak Republic:
The social and economic conditions of student life of full-time and part-time students are rather differ- ent in our country, therefore we suggest to include both groups (full-time and part-time students) in the survey. However it is important to respect the specific features both of them and to analyse some is- sues regarding to these groups separately.

France:
In France, there are no part-time students. Nevertheless, we distinguish the students in in-service trai- ning (workers who have the possibility of spending the diploma by having a calendar adapted over a longer period) and normal students.

Slovenia:
distance students are part of part time students, statistically insignificant (yet)

Italy:
Same problem as before. Groups are very different in terms of numbers and % in the total population. There are also too many differences among groups (i.e. in terms of social background, study behav- iours, etc.). As a result, it is very difficult to give them all adequate representation in a same sample

and in a same analysis.

Austria:
We should cover part and full-time students, but treat them separately for many indicators. Distance students are a relevant group only in some countries, but would increase problems of comparability a lot. Therefore, I would exclude them.

?

We recomend to includ both chosen groups (part-time and full-time students), but it is important to re- spect specific features of them in the analyse and some issues to describe separetly by these groups

Users of Eurostudent data/Stakeholders: Malta:
Once again, more comprehensive data

3.3 Level of Education

Gov./ Admin		Res.	User	Total
ISCED 5A	91%	100%	100%	95%
ISCED 5B	82%	40%	100%	67%
ISCED 6	55%	50%	100%	57%

Multiple answers possible

Comments:

Members of the government/administration: Lithuania:
The results of the survey might be highly influenced and distorted if the target group is also ISCED 6 level students

Ireland:
In Ireland 5B makes up about 40% of all enrolments to higher education. We include Ordinary De- grees which are Level 7 on our National Framework in 5B

Switzerland:
ISCED 5A is THE population of the survey :-)

Researchers of higher education: Germany:
The social and economic situation of students enrolled at ISCED 6-programmes is too heterogeneous to design a common questionnaire in order to cover all possibilities and to produce comparable data.

Norway:
ISCED 6 students does not really count as students but as employees in some countries (including Norway) and should not be included in Eurostudent.

France:
Our survey concerns all the levels. 85 % of the students of the higher education are concerned. The only ones of the particular or private training formations are not concerned.

Italy:
Same problem as before. Groups are very different in terms of numbers and % in the total population. There are also too many differences among groups (i.e. in terms of social background, study behaviours, etc.). As a result, it is very difficult to give them all adequate representation in a same sample and in a same analysis.

Austria:
Students at ISCED 6 could be covered as well, but should be excluded from the main analysis. There should be a special (and short) chapter dedicated to doctoral students or even a separate, special re- port on the situation of doctorates. PhD students will be a big topic of the future and we would be at the forefront :-).

3.4 Type of Programme

Gov./ Admin		Res.	User	Total
BA	100%	100%	100% MA	100%
	100%	100%	100% Doc-	100%
torate/ PhD	55%	40%	100% First	50%
degrees	55%	30%	0% Short	41%
courses	18%	30%	100% Di-	27%
ploma programmes	64%	50%	0% Other	55%
national degrees, please specify	9%	10%	0%	9%
Other, please specify	18%	0%	0%	9%

Multiple answers possible

Others mentioned:

Gov/admin: Ordinary Degrees adult eduction Higher Certificates

Researcher: see comments below

User:

Comments:

Members of the government/administration: Ireland:
What is the difference between a BA and a First Degree

Switzerland:
CH take in account BA/MA and the "old" Diplomen + Lizenziat, which where the degree before Bolo- gna and still exists for a few students who started there studies before the new system.

Bulgaria:
It is mainly the degree programmes that are statistically representative for the needs of the administra- tive work in the Ministry of education and Science.

Finland:
It would be important to get information about all students who are aiming to get a higher education de- gree. Student may change their study field or even change the degree they are aiming. So we can not focus to the first degrees.

Belgium:
I would like to tick more, but having a decent number of students filling the questionaire may be a prob- lem.

Researchers of higher education: Germany:
no further comment, see "level of education"

Norway:
All forms of tertiary education students should be included.

France:
Three quarters of students are studying a Bachelor or a Master diploma. Bachelor students do repre- sent a little bit less than a half (45,8%) of the whole student population.
Our survey also includes training courses with specific diplomas (nurses' schools, business schools).
It also includes Classes of preparation for competitive examinations of admission to business schools and schools of engineers.

Slovenia:
which one comply with ISCED 5A, 6 criteria

Italy:
Same problem as before. Groups are very different in terms of numbers and % in the total population. There are also too many differences among groups (i.e. in terms of social background, study behaviours, etc.). As a result, it is very difficult to give them all adequate representation in a same sample and in a same analysis.

Austria:
To assure international comparability, I strongly advocate to exclude short courses, because similar programmes are in some countries placed inside and in other countries outside of the tertiary education system (e.g. nursery). For the last time we should include old diploma programmes, for Eurostudent V we might limit those to the exceptions of the Bologna process (mainly Medicine). Other national degrees should only be included, if they are comparable to BA, MA, PhD or diploma programmes.

Users of Eurostudent data/Stakeholders: Belgium:
The others would be interesting as well, but having information on ba, ma, phd and short cycle is a priority.

3.5 Type of Institution

Gov./ Admin		Res.	User	Total
Public higher education institutions	46%	67%	100% All	57%
universities, colleges of technology and other institutes of post-secondary education, whatever their source of finance or legal status	73%	67%	100%	71%

Multiple answers possible

Comments:

Members of the government/administration: Ireland:
we do not include post secondary education that is not third level

Switzerland:
Eurostudent should first of all give information on the public higher education institutions. Comparison on public insitution has to be possible. But this is not a reason to exclude private institutions.

Researchers of higher education: Germany:
Why is this question of a multiple choice format?

Norway:
All forms of tertiary education institutions should be included.

Slovenia:
all HE institutions that offer ISCED 5A, 6 courses

Italy:
I can only refer to the Italian situation. Public HEIs include State and non-State institutions. Post- secondary education is not Higher Education in Italy. Including all HEIs in national surveys need pay- ing great care to the representation of each sub-group in the sample. I am not sure that this kind of care is taken adequately into account in each of the contributing countries.

Austria:
Private Universities should only be included if it is possible to cover the whole sector in a country (ran- dom sample among all institutes) and if they play a relevant role in that country (like >20% of all students). We should avoid to have some private universities in and others not.

4 Comparative groups

	Gov./ Admin		Res.	User	Total
BA students	Necessary for all topics	70,0%	50,0%	100,0%	61,9%
	Necessary for selected topics	30,0%	40,0%	,0% Not	33,3%
	necessary	,0%	10,0%	,0%	4,8%
MA students	Necessary for all topics	60,0%	50,0%	100,0%	57,1%
	Necessary for selected topics	40,0%	40,0%	,0% Not	38,1%
	necessary	,0%	10,0%	,0%	4,8%
21-old students	Necessary for all topics	11,1%	22,2%	,0%	15,8%
	Necessary for selected topics	55,6%	55,6%	,0% Not	52,6%
	necessary	33,3%	22,2%	100,0%	31,6%
"Young students" (e.g. 18-22 years old)	Necessary for all topics	36,4%	40,0%	100,0%	40,9%
	Necessary for selected topics	45,5%	40,0%	,0% Not	40,9%
	necessary	18,2%	20,0%	,0%	18,2%
Female students	Necessary for all topics	40,0%	60,0%	100,0%	52,4%
	Necessary for selected topics	50,0%	40,0%	,0% Not	42,9%
	necessary	10,0%	,0%	,0%	4,8%
Full time students	Necessary for all topics	72,7%	77,8%	100,0%	76,2%
	Necessary for selected topics	27,3%	22,2%	,0% Not	23,8%
	necessary	,0%	,0%	,0%	,0%
Part time students by for-mal status	Necessary for all topics	44,4%	22,2%	,0%	31,6%
	Necessary for selected topics	44,4%	55,6%	100,0%	52,6%
	Not necessary	11,1%	22,2%	,0%	15,8%
Part time students by study intensity	Necessary for all topics	22,2%	10,0%	100,0%	20,0%
	Necessary for selected topics	55,6%	40,0%	,0% Not	45,0%
	necessary	22,2%	50,0%	,0%	35,0%
ISCED 5A	Necessary for all topics	66,7%	70,0%	100,0%	70,0%
	Necessary for selected topics	33,3%	20,0%	,0% Not	25,0%
	necessary	,0%	10,0%	,0%	5,0%
ISCED 5B	Necessary for all topics	60,0%	11,1%	100,0%	40,0%
	Necessary for selected topics	30,0%	44,4%	,0% Not	35,0%
	necessary	10,0%	44,4%	,0%	25,0%
ISCED 6	Necessary for all topics	45,5%	44,4%	100,0%	47,6%
	Necessary for selected topics	27,3%	11,1%	,0% Not	19,0%
	necessary	27,3%	44,4%	,0%	33,3%
National students	Necessary for all topics	50,0%	60,0%	,0%	52,4%
	Necessary for selected topics	40,0%	20,0%	,0% Not	28,6%
	necessary	10,0%	20,0%	100,0%	19,0%
Resident students	Necessary for all topics	25,0%	44,4%	100,0%	38,9%
	Necessary for selected topics	62,5%	11,1%	,0% Not	33,3%
	necessary	12,5%	44,4%	,0%	27,8%
Foreign students (diploma mobility)	Necessary for all topics	22,2%	22,2%	,0%	21,1%
	Necessary for selected topics	77,8%	22,2%	100,0%	52,6%
	Not necessary	,0%	55,6%	,0%	26,3%
Foreign students (credit mobility)	Necessary for all topics	12,5%	11,1%	,0%	11,1%
	Necessary for selected topics	50,0%	11,1%	100,0%	33,3%
	Not necessary	37,5%	77,8%	,0%	55,6%

	Gov./ Admin		Res.	User	Total
Students by parents educational attainment	Necessary for all topics	45,5%	40,0%	100,0%	45,5%
	Necessary for selected topics	45,5%	60,0%	,0% Not	50,0%
	necessary	9,1%	,0%	,0%	4,5%
Students by form of accommodation (living with vs. away from parents)	Necessary for all topics	40,0%	20,0%	100,0%	33,3%
	Necessary for selected topics	40,0%	70,0%	,0% Not	52,4%
	necessary	20,0%	10,0%	,0%	14,3%
Disabled students	Necessary for all topics	30,0%	11,1%	100,0%	25,0%
	Necessary for selected topics	60,0%	44,4%	,0% Not	50,0%
	necessary	10,0%	44,4%	,0%	25,0%
Students minorities, like e.g.	Necessary for all topics	50,0%	,0%	100,0%	33,3%
	Necessary for selected topics	50,0%	50,0%	,0% Not	44,4%
	necessary	,0%	50,0%	,0%	22,2%
Others, namely	Necessary for all topics	100,0%	,0%	,0% Necessary	42,9%
	for selected topics	,0%	25,0%	,0% Not necessary	14,3%
	,0%	75,0%	,0%		42,9%

Student minorities, like e.g.

Gov/admin: Roma (2) Turkish

students with child(ren)

Traveller Community and Ethnic monirities

Researcher: students with child(ren) User:

Others, namely

Gov/admin: former education

students by type of residence (rural or urban areas) students who recieve state grants and scholarships target group

Researcher: fields of study

User:

Comments:

Members of the government/administration: Georgia:
One important question that the Eurostudent could answer is who recieves state grants and scholar- ships. In the case of Georgia for instance, students with higher SES are more likely to recieve scholar- ships that students with lower SES. This is the case with Erasmus as well for instance. Would be interesting cross national differences in this regard.

Switzerland:
"young students" (18-22): as Eurostudent III showed, students of 22 years are not "young" in all coun- tries. So this group doesn't make sens in our opinion for a good comparison.
21-old students: in a way same problem, because 21-old student are in some countries at the begin- ning of there studies and in others countries at the end. The comparison is therefore not very relevant.
We propose (see "other, namely") to select a target group, which only exclude some students with specifics characteristics. In our point of view should be excluded from the "target group": a) students with children - because there way of life, finances, accomodation are completely different than the other students; b) students aged more than 30 - because they have also a other way of life and fi- nances and so on; c) students having paid activities more than 30 hours/week - because those stu- dents are mainly workers

studying beside and not "typical" students. The "target group" as proposed should not exclude the other students from the survey but should be the selected group for better comparisons.

Belgium:
i ma not shure i understood the question correctly

Researchers of higher education: Austria:
ISCED 6 should be treated completely separately, but for all topics.
Instead of differing between 5A and 5B (which are very different from country to country) we should break by field of studies in some topics.

?

21-old students and "young students"
By our opinion, it would be better to include group "young students" (not 21-old students - it is very narrow age category), but the international statistics use the age category of 21-old in the mathings, hence in the regard of that, it would be useful to give some compromise solution (to monitor both ?)

ANNEX 2

eurostudent.eu

How to define the size of the initial sample ?

A relatively small sample is needed for the participation in EUROSTUDENT IV. The reason therefore is, that we only need data on the national level of each country and we only compare large subgroups of students (e.g. male – female). This paper provides you with hints on how to calculate the **minimum sample size** (not on the actual sampling as this depends too much from the specific higher education systems) needed from each country. However, it may make sense to increase the sample size, on the one hand because a larger sample usually provides better data quality and is therefore more reliable, on the other hand, because this would enable you to make additional analysis of the situation in your country, for example deeper analysis of smaller subgroups not of relevance in the EUROSTUDENT context.

For planning your sample, you should focus on the target group of EUROSTUDENT, which was defined as follows:

- Resident students. Resident students are students who have finished their prior education (school) in the respective country regardless of their nationality. (Not citizenship, which may be different.)
- Full-time and part-time students by status. (Not by study intensity, which may be different and will be included in the analysis of the data.)
- Students in ISCED 5A-programmes
- All higher education institutions offering programmes at ISCED 5A and considered “normal”. In many cases this means only public, non-specialist institutions of higher education.
- BA, MA and all national degrees corresponding to ISCED 5A (E.g. traditional diploma, Lizentiat, national degrees in medicine. Short courses only if they are based on ISCED 5A)
- Distance students that study at a “normal” higher education institution, i.e. excluding institutions solely for long distance students like open universities and similar.

For drawing a sample of your students, you have to ensure that you have enough questionnaires returned from each subgroup of interest for EUROSTUDENT. Since not all indicators needed in EUROSTUDENT IV are defined yet, we provide you a list of subgroups used in EUROSTUDENT III:

<u>Very important</u> subgroups of students. You should ensure to have a minimum number of questionnaires (at least 50) returned from each of these groups:

- Male students
- Female students
- Male first year students
- Female first year students
- Groups of students by type of institution (e.g. University vs. University of Applied Science vs. Teacher Training College)
- Groups of students by “ownership” (public HE-Institution vs. other Types of HE-Institutions)
- Students from low educational background (Father ISCED 0, 1, 2)
- Students from high educational background (Fathers ISCED 5, 6)
- Full-Time students (by formal status)
- Part-Time students (by formal status)

- Bachelor students
- Master students
- Other Types of degree programmes on ISCED 5A
- Students younger than 21 years
- Students aged 21-24 years
- Students aged 25-28 years
- Students older than 28 years
- Students living with parents
- Students maintaining own households
- Working students

<u>Less important</u> subgroups of students. To be able to provide all indicators used in EUROSTUDENT, you should also ensure a minimum number of returned questionnaires from these groups:

- Students with children
- Students from study locations with less than 100.000 inhabitants
- Students from study locations with more than 500.000 inhabitants
- Students living in own lodging/sublet/private flat
- Students living in student halls
- Students aged 20 years
- Students aged 21 years
- Students aged 22 years
- Students aged 23 years
- Students aged 24 years
- Students aged 25 years
- Students aged 26 years
- Students aged 27 years
- Bachelor students maintaining own households
- Students from high education background maintaining own households
- Students from low education background maintaining own households
- Receivers of state support for students maintaining own households
- Non-working students
- Students working 1-5hrs/wk
- Students working 6-10hrs/wk
- Students working 11-15hrs/wk
- Students working more than 15hrs/wk
- Students in engineering studies
- Students in humanities/arts
- Students by year of study ($1^{st,}$ $2^{nd,}$ $3^{rd,}$ $4^{th,}$ 5^{th} year)
- Students with study experience abroad (“mobile” students)
- Students with low education background, who have not been abroad
- Students studying engineering, who have not been abroad

For the calculation of the sample size, you may assume the following:

- Return rate: 20% (conservative)
- A minimum of 50 questionnaires per subgroup is needed for analysis.

That means, the *initial* sample size for each subgroup should be 250 questionnaires.

Calculation of the minimum sample size needed

The calculation of the sample size has to consider several characteristics of the national higher education system. For example the different types of institutions, different degree types, different shares of full- and part time students, gender segregation by field of study and so on. Hence, it is not possible here to provide a formula that fits all countries.

Instead, we will provide you with a very simple formula that allows you to calculate an **approximated value** of the **minimum sample size** needed. In any case, you have to do a proper random sampling based on the real data of your student population considering the subgroups listed above. However, for a **first and rough calculation** of the sample size, the following will do:

Take the number of different degree programmes (e.g. Bachelor, Master, Lizentiat) per type of higher education institution (private universities, public universities...) in your country and multiply it with 2.000. That will provide you with enough questionnaires to be able to provide data on most of the very important subgroups listed above – unless a certain subgroup is very small in your country. In such a case, you should add questionnaires for oversampling that group. However, this formula gives you only an approximated value of the sample **size**. It is not a substitute for a proper random sampling as such!

Table 1: Rough formula to calculate a minimum sample size

Type of Institution	Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D	Sum
Type of Degrees	#	#	#	#	#

➔ x different types of programmes * 2.000 = # minimum initial sample size

➔ expected return rate 20% = # realised sample

Example 1: Country with a differentiated HE system

Type of Institution	Public Universities	Public Univ. of Applied Sciences	Private Universities	Teacher Training Colleges	Sum
Type of Degrees	BA, MA, Dipl.	BA, MA	BA, MA	BA, Dipl.	9

➔ 9 different types of programmes * 2.000 = 18.000 minimum initial sample size

➔ expected return rate 20% = 3.600 realised sample

Example 2: Country with a homogeneous HE system

Type of Institution	Public Universities	---	---	---	Sum
Type of Degrees	BA, MA	---	---	---	2

➔ 2 different types of programmes * 2.000 = 4.000 minimum initial sample size

➔ expected return rate 20% = 800 realised sample

Why do we focus here on the type of institution and the type of degrees? We assume that students attending a private or public university or an UAS are different, e.g. by their social background. Moreover, we assume that the Bologna-Structure of degrees (BA, MA) is of special interest for international comparisons. That's why we regard these two characteristics as the "basis" for any sampling.

As mentioned above, you have to consider real data about your student population or – in absent of data – use assumptions, for a proper random sampling. If you want to provide all indicators needed for your country, you have to ensure that you have at least 50 questionnaires for analysis from each of the groups listed above. E.g.: If we assume that 5% of the students have been enrolled in a foreign country ("mobile students")[5] we need to have an initial sample of 5.000, of which 1.000 will participate (20% return rate) so we will end up with 50 mobile students in the realized sample. In such a case, an initial sample of 5.000 is the minimum – regardless of the shape of your higher education system (if 10% of your students were mobile, a sample size of 2.500 would do it). Hence, when you do your real sampling, you have to consider such assumptions for all the subgroups listed above. Thus, the general formula above cannot be used to decide, how many questionnaires should really be sent to each type of degree programme per institutional type. Instead, you have to carefully sample your students to ensure that each of the subgroups listed above receives at least 250 questionnaires.

However, questionnaires will usually *not* be sent equably to all groups, but some groups have to be oversampled according to the real number of enrolled students ("quota sample"). This oversampling has to be corrected in the final data set by weighting the data.[6] Hence, if your budget is limited, you should invest in a very detailed planning of your sample to use your resources as efficient as possible while still gaining enough questionnaires for each group of analysis. Or in other words, as more limited your budget is, as more you should pay attention on the sampling of your student population. **Please do not hesitate to contact us if you need further assistance with that!**

[5] Be aware that we are surveying students not graduates. Hence the rate of mobile students is relatively low, because it includes beginners as well who did not yet have the chance to be mobile.

[6] Further weighting (post stratification) is usually needed, because we have a different share of non-responses in different groups.

An Alternative

You may also use the considerations above to calculate your sample the other way around: Fix your sample size according to your resources and then check with the here presented rough formula on what level you can do analysis and what kind of indicators you can calculate. For example, if your budget allows you to send out 20.000 questionnaires, you can estimate how many questionnaires you can expect from each subgroup according to the specifications of your HE-System.

Invitations sent via email

If you have chosen to do an online survey and if you have the possibility to send the invitations for the survey by email, you should consider to increase the sample size, because this may be done with nearly no extra costs.

eurostudent.eu

ANNEX 3

EQUIHS
employment • qualification • innovation

Institut für Höhere Studien
Institute for Advanced Studies
Vienna

Introduction to online surveys

Martin Unger
(unger@ihs.ac.at)

Eurostudent IV
Intensive Seminar 16-18.9.09
Berlin

Pros and Cons of Online Surveys

+ Cheap
+ Individualized, dynamic questionnaires (better data quality)
+ Immediate availability of data
+ Can be quite a long questionnaire
- Answers more superficial/ ad hoc (less data quality)
- Selection bias ?

YES, but…

„open questionnaire“ - public website

+ Anonymous
- No control who participates
- No control how often a person participates
- Not possible to interrupt answering

➔ “Dirty sample”

➔ Not an option for E IV

Survey protected by individual Password

+ Possible to interrupt answering
+ Control "who" participates (random sample)
+ Everybody participates only once
+ Different versions of questionnaire by password
? Anonymity ? Technically vs trustfully ?
? How to deliver passwords ?

➔ Desirable option for E IV

Password delivered by snail mail

- Expensive
- "Individualization" by target group even more $
- Change of media needed (lower return rate)
- If anonymous, reminder difficult
+ Anonymity can be ensured trustfully
+ Further info can be provided (folder)
+ Postal address not case sensitive

possible

Password delivered by E-Mail

- Addresses may change often, case sensitive
- Only very, very short E-Mails are read
? Maybe technically anonymous, but trustfully ?
? E-Mails, esp. Private E-Mails available ?
? Inflation of online surveys advertised by E-Mail
+ Cheap
+ Targeted reminders possible
+ Immediate control of access by groups
+ Easy "individualization"

possible

eurostudent.eu

The questionnaire

Its not a translation of a paper questionnaire !
People hardly read on screen!

- Design and Layout are very important
- Interactive, dynamic, “personalized”:
  As more suited to individual situations, as less drop-outs
- Make it as easy as possible for respondents
  (use checks carefully, error messages, complicated questions, allow back moving and interruption)

equIHS
employment • qualification • innovation

Institut für Höhere Studien
Institute for Advanced Studies
Vienna

Tricky issues

Martin Unger
(unger@ihs.ac.at)

Eurostudent IV
Workshop on Data Conventions and Quality Control
Prague, 23/24.3.2010

Agenda

- overall missings, what are valid cases ?
- Transfers in kind
- Missing or Zero ?
- Comments
- Differences national report – Eurostudent report

Overall missings, defining valid cases

- What is it about?
  - Should drop-outs be included?
  - Should a minimum of questions be answered?
- Why is it a problem ?
  - Large differences in valid cases per variable leeds to differences in totals. E.g.
    Total is 5.000, but 1.000 miss in gender
    ➔ total by gender is 4.000

eurostudent.eu

Overall missings, defining valid cases

- Solution
  - A case is only valid if answers are given for age, gender and qualification being studied for plus at least 2 other focus groups

Transfers in kind

- What is it about?
  - Transfers in kind are very difficult to survey. Especially with students living with parents or living in partnership.
- Why is it a problem ?
  - Students cash situation may differ a lot, but due to transfers in kind their living situation might be equal. Hence, we have to treat them equally.

Transfers in kind

- Solution part 1:
  - Transfers in kind **must** be added to income **and** expenditures
- Solution part 2:
  - Students living with parents:
    - Transfers in kind **never** added (“ignored”)
  - Students maintaining own households:
    - Transfers in kind **always** added

eurostudent.eu

Transfers in kind

- Conclusion:
  - No total or average income/expenditure for all students (i.e. summed up for both forms of housing) can be reported

Missing or Zero

- What is it about ?
  - In open questions, where we expect numbers (e.g. time budget, money), a missing value might be a “real” missing or actually a zero.
- Why is it a problem ?
  - If we aggregate the data e.g. for sums or means, missings are excluded, zeros are valid numbers (lowering the mean e.g.)

Missing or Zero ?

3.11 How many hours do you spend in a typical week in taught courses, personal study and on paid jobs?
(Try to remember day by day and fill in the sum of hours over the whole week including the weekend. Add a '0' or strike-out box if no hours were spent on an activity on the respective day.)

	MO	TU	WE	TH	FR	SA	SU
Taught studies (lessons, seminars, labs, tests, etc.)	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Personal study time (like preparation, learning, reading, writing homework)	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Paid jobs	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

eurostudent.eu

Missing or Zero

- No-Solution:
  - Adding a “don’t know”, “doesn’t refer to me” or similar button in the questionnaire.
  - Because this invites respondents to give no answer in the most sensitive and very important questions.
  - We might end up with a high number of missings then.
    ➔ Are data still reliable ?

Missing or Zero

- Solution for Eurostudent IV:
  - We need a common rule for data cleaning. See proposal.
- Possible Solution for Eurostudent V:
  - Allow only online-questionnaires in E:V
  - First ask if you have income from a certain source, only if yes ask for the amount
    A missing is a missing then!
  - However, problematic with expenditures...

Missing or Zero: time budget (p. 143)

- If all fields are empty or filled with 0, then exclude the case completely from analysis of this subtopic.
- If total hours per day (i.e. the sum of all fields in column) is more than 24 and total hours per week is more than 120, then exclude the case completely from analysis of this subtopic.
- If a student has responded that he/she works “regularly during term-time” (question 3.8) and the field for “paid jobs” in question 3.11 is empty or 0, then exclude the case completely from analysis of this subtopic.
- If a student has responded that he/she does not work (question 3.8), and the value for "paid jobs" in question 3.11 is not 0, set it to 0.
- For all other cases, where fields are left empty, replace empty field with 0.

Version adopted in Prague

eurostudent.eu

Missing or Zero: Living costs (p. 103)

- If all fields in the first column – "I pay out of my own pocket" – are empty or filled with 0, then exclude the case completely from analysis of this subtopic.
- Separately for living with parents – not living with parents:
  cut off the lowest and the highest X% of the total amount
  X can vary between 0.25% and 2% by decision of countries .
  Cut-off cases should be missing for this subtopic!
- For all other cases, where fields are left empty, replace empty field with 0.

Version adopted in Prague

Missing or Zero: Funding (p. 122)

- If all fields are empty or filled with 0, then exclude the case completely from analysis of this subtopic.
- If total income (i.e. the sum of all income categories except Total income) is less than € 5 or more than € 5,000, then exclude the case completely from analysis of this subtopic.
- If some fields are empty, compare total income with total expenditure (question 3.6) before data cleaning. If total income is half or double total expenditure, exclude the case completely from analysis of this subtopic.
- If a student has responded that he/she works (question 3.8 and/or 3.9), and no income is given for field "self-earned income through paid job" or field is empty, then exclude the case completely from analysis of this subtopic.
- For all other cases, where fields are left empty, replace empty field with 0.

OLD PROPOSAL

Missing or Zero: Funding (p. 122)

- If all fields are empty or filled with 0, then exclude the case completely from analysis of this subtopic.
- Separately for living with parents – not living with parents:
  cut off the lowest and the highest X% of the total amount
  X can vary between 0.25% and 2% by decision of countries .
  Cut-off cases should be missing for this subtopic!
- If a student has responded that he/she works (question 3.8), and no income is given for field "self-earned income through paid job" or field is empty, then exclude the case completely from analysis of this subtopic.
- For all other cases, where fields are left empty, replace empty field with 0.

Version adopted in Prague

ANNEX 5

eurostudent.eu

Examples of problems faced by data providers.

Calculating income deciles in SPSS

Ankara, 30st November 2010
Jakob Hartl, Petra Wejwar

eurostudent.eu

Contents

- Calculation of income deciles in SPSS
- Other technical notes on subtopics
  - living expences
  - funding and state assistance
- Discussion: other problems that may have occurred.

How to calculate income deciles in SPSS

- The command „percentiles 10 20…" will not provide deciles with equal headcounts.
- As the values cummulate around certain amounts SPSS does not provide distinct cut-off points.

eurostudent.eu

How to calculate income deciles in SPSS II

```
compute random_total=1.
EXECUTE.

SORT CASES BY random_total(A) "YOUR INCOME
VARIABLE" (A).
MATCH FILES
  /FILE=*
  /BY random_total
  /FIRST=PrimaryFirst
  /LAST=PrimaryLast.
DO IF (PrimaryFirst).
COMPUTE  MatchSequence=1-PrimaryLast.
ELSE.
COMPUTE  MatchSequence=MatchSequence+1.
END IF.
LEAVE  MatchSequence.
FORMATS  MatchSequence (f7).
COMPUTE  InDupGrp=MatchSequence>0.
SORT CASES InDupGrp(D).
MATCH FILES
  /FILE=*
  /DROP=PrimaryFirst PrimaryLast InDupGrp.
VARIABLE LABELS  MatchSequence 'Sequential
count of matching cases'.
VARIABLE LEVEL  MatchSequence (SCALE).
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=MatchSequence.
EXECUTE.
```

Variable to produce unique cases to define cut-off points for every decile.

In this step every case is ascribed a unique value, so that distinct cut-off points can be calculated.

NMatchSe is produced. This variable name changes when running the command more than once. It will then be NTI001 etc.

How to calculate income deciles in SPSS III

```
TEMPORARY.
SELECT IF
   „Valid cases_finances“ = valid
                  AND
   „form of housing“ = (not) living with parents .
RANK MatchSequence /ntiles(10).
```

Select cases BEFORE ranking! Otherwise the cutt-off points will be wrong for your sample!

With this command the cases are ranked by income in ascending order and by MatchSequence wich guarantees definite cut-off points for every decile.

Table of income deciles
(cross NMatchSe with your income variable)

```
TEMP.
SELECT IF „Valid cases_finances“ = valid AND
   „form of housing“ = (not) living with parents .
CTABLES
  /VLABELS VARIABLES=NMatchSe „Your income variable“
    DISPLAY=DEFAULT
  /TABLE NMatchSe [C] BY „Your income variable“
    [MEAN, MAXIMUM, COUNT F40.0]
  /CATEGORIES VARIABLES=NMatchSe ORDER=A KEY=VALUE
    EMPTY=EXCLUDE.
```

eurostudent.eu

Output

arith. Mean of decile | Income decile | headcount

		Your income Variable		
		Mean	Maximum	Count
NMatchSe Percentile Group of MatchSequence	1	127,06	182,00	467
	2	213,88	250,00	467
	3	277,76	300,00	467
	4	330,28	360,00	467
	5	398,71	435,00	465
	6	472,27	500,00	468
	7	548,33	600,00	467
	8	653,12	710,00	466
	9	823,04	980,00	467
	10	1355,57	3300,00	466

Differences in headcount (+/- 1) due to weighting.

Notes on financial data: TiK

- For all calculations in every subtopic on finances you should define ONE group of valid cases.
- Transfers in Kind cannot have missing values.
  - Implausible values → case not valid
  - „missing" value = 0

Students **not** living with parents → include TiK
Students living with parents → exklude TiK

Diskussion: What Problems did you face?

- Problems Austria faced
  - Calculation of income deciles
  - Recode national survey data for Eurostudent
  - Multiple vs. Single choice answers

For questions please contact
hartl@ihs.ac.at or wejwar@ihs.ac.at.

eurostudent.eu

ANNEX 6

Pre-Work for developing a new indicator on "students with delayed transition".

Early data from several countries has been analysed for this purpose. Here provided is the example of the Austrian analysis:

1: Students by age groups

	below 21y	21-25y	26-30y	over 30y	Ø age
Total	12,8 %	50,5 %	22,8 %	13,8 %	26,2
Version I: Delayed by 1,4 years					
Delay < 1,4 years	16,7 %	56,7 %	17,5 %	9,1 %	24,9
Delay >= 1,4 years	0,8 %	28,7 %	39,6 %	30,8 %	30,4
Version II: Delayed by 2 years					
Delay < 2 years	16,5 %	56,6 %	17,8 %	9,1 %	24,9
Delay >= 2 years	0,6 %	26,7 %	40,0 %	32,7 %	30,8
Version III: Delayed by 2 years OR beginning to study older than 23 years					
Not delayed	38,0 %	62,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	21,3
delayed	0,1 %	45,1 %	33,9 %	20,9 %	28,6

2: Students by sex

	Female	Male
Total	54,3 %	45,7 %
Version I: Delayed by 1,4 years		
Delay < 1,4 years	56,5 %	43,5 %
Delay >= 1,4 years	44,5 %	55,5 %
Version II: Delayed by 2 years		
Delay < 2 years	56,0 %	44,0 %
Delay >= 2 years	45,7 %	54,3 %
Version III: Delayed by 2 years OR beginning to study older than 23 years		
Not delayed	63,1 %	36,9 %
delayed	49,2 %	50,8 %

3: Students by sector of Higher Education

	Universities	Universities of the Arts	Univ. of Applied Sciences *)	Teacher training colleges
Total	81,3 %	2,9 %	12,6 %	3,3 %
Version I: Delayed by 1,4 years				
Delay < 1,4 years	83,9 %	2,2 %	10,9 %	3,0 %
Delay >= 1,4 years	70,8 %	3,2 %	21,3 %	4,8 %
Version II: Delayed by 2 years				
Delay < 2 years	84,0 %	2,2 %	10,8 %	3,0 %
Delay >= 2 years	69,5 %	3,2 %	22,3 %	5,0 %
Version III: Delayed by 2 years OR beginning to study older than 23 years				
Not delayed	81,1 %	1,8 %	13,2 %	3,9 %
delayed	81,4 %	2,7 %	12,8 %	3,1 %

*) Univ. of Applied Sciences offer special programmes for working students.

4: Students by Social class

	Low Class	Middle Class	Higher Class	Upper Class
Total	18,9 %	30,9 %	33,2 %	17 %
Version I: Delayed by 1,4 years				
Delay < 1,4 years	15,6 %	29,9 %	35,1 %	19,4 %
Delay >= 1,4 years	32,2 %	35,2 %	25,3 %	7,3 %
Version II: Delayed by 2 years				
Delay < 2 years	15,6 %	30,0 %	35,1 %	19,3 %
Delay >= 2 years	33,3 %	35,2 %	24,6 %	6,9 %
Version III: Delayed by 2 years OR beginning to study older than 23 years				
Not delayed	13,1 %	29,5 %	36,6 %	20,8 %
delayed	22,0 %	31,7 %	31,2 %	15,0 %

5: Students by location of prior education (instead of nationality)

	Domestic education	Foreign education
Total	84,4 %	15,6 %
Version I: Delayed by 1,4 years		
Delay < 1,4 years	89,1 %	10,9 %
Delay >= 1,4 years	88,7 %	11,3 %
Version II: Delayed by 2 years		
Delay < 2 years	88,9 %	11,1 %
Delay >= 2 years	89,8 %	10,2 %
Version III: Delayed by 2 years OR beginning to study older than 23 years		
Not delayed	88,6 %	11,4 %
delayed	89,3 %	10,7 %

6: Version I: Delayed by 1,4 years

	Delay < 1,4 years	Delay >= 1,4 years
Gesamt	80,1 %	19,9 %
Geschlecht		
Weiblich	83,6 %	16,4 %
Männlich	75,9 %	24,1 %
Alter		
Unter 21 J.	98,8 %	1,2 %
21-25 J.	88,8 %	11,2 %
26-30 J.	63,9 %	36,1 %
Über 30 J.	54,3 %	45,7 %
Soziale Herkunft (nur inländ. Eltern)		
Niedrige Schicht	66,1 %	33,9 %
Mittlere Schicht	77,4 %	22,6 %
Gehobene Schicht	84,8 %	15,2 %
Hohe Schicht	91,5 %	8,5 %
Soziale Herkunft (Selbsteinschätzung)		
Niedrige soziale Stellung	68,7 %	31,2 %
	72,2 %	27,8 %
	77,0 %	23,0 %
	83,3 %	16,7 %
Hohe soziale Stellung	83,8 %	16,2 %
Bildungsherkunft		
Bildungsinländer/in	80,2 %	19,8 %
Bildungsausländer/in	79,4 %	20,6 %
Erstsprache		
Deutsch	81,4 %	18,6 %
Andere Sprache	73,5 %	26,5 %
Kinder		
Kinder	53,4 %	46,6 %
Keine Kinder	82,5 %	17,4 %
Alter jüngstes Kind im HH		
Unter 3 J. im HH	62,6 %	37,4 %
3-6 J. im HH	57,7 %	42,3 %
7-14 J. im HH	44,7 %	55,3 %
Über 14 J. im HH	42,5 %	57,5 %
Alleinerziehend (Kind/er < 27J.)		
Ja	55,6 %	44,4 %
Nein	54,0 %	46,0 %
Unterstufe (nur Bildungsinländer/innen)		
Hauptschule	68,1 %	31,9 %
AHS-Unterstufe	87,4 %	12,6 %
Sonstige Schule	75,3 %	24,7 %

	Delay < 1,4 years	Delay >= 1,4 years
Gesamt	80,1 %	19,9 %
Studienberechtigung		
AHS-Matura	92,0 %	8,0 %
HAK-Matura	79,3 %	20,7 %
HTL-Matura	75,1 %	24,8 %
Sonstige BHS-Matura	80,2 %	19,9 %
Studienberechtigungsprüfung	0,0 %	100 %
Berufsreifeprüfung	0,0 %	100 %
Sonstige österr. Studienberechtigung	66,5 %	33,5 %
Schule/Berufsausbildung im Ausland	79,4 %	20,6 %
Studienjahr der Erstzulassung		
Vor 2000	86,5 %	13,5 %
2000/01	86,1 %	13,9 %
2001/02	84,7 %	15,3 %
2002/03	80,8 %	19,2 %
2003/04	81,8 %	18,1 %
2004/05	80,6 %	19,4 %
2005/06	78,0 %	22,0 %
2006/07	79,9 %	20,1 %
2007/08	78,4 %	21,6 %
2008/09	74,6 %	25,4 %
Version II: Delayed by 2 years		
Delay < 2 years	98,1 %	1,9 %
Delay >= 2 years	0,0 %	100 %
Version III: Delayed by 2 years OR beginning to study older than 23 years		
Not delayed	98,3 %	1,7 %
delayed	70,1 %	29,9 %
Hochschulsektor		
Wiss. Univ.	82,7 %	17,3 %
Kunstuniv.	73,7 %	26,3 %
Fachhochschule	67,3 %	32,8 %
Pädag. Hochschule	71,7 %	28,3 %
Type of Programme at Univ. of Applied Sciences		
Fulltime	78,3 %	21,8 %
extra-occupational	46,3 %	53,7 %
Targeted groups (work experience)	32,1 %	67,9 %
Studientyp		
Bachelor	78,8 %	21,2 %
Master	77,5 %	22,5 %
LA	87,6 %	12,4 %
Dipl	81,0 %	19,0 %

	Delay < 1,4 years	Delay >= 1,4 years
Gesamt	80,1 %	19,9 %
Studienrichtungsgruppen		
Geistes- u. kulturwiss.Studien	79,7 %	20,4 %
Ingenieurwiss. Studien	85,1 %	14,9 %
Künstlerische Studien	71,0 %	29,0 %
Lehramtsstudien	87,6 %	12,4 %
Medizinische Studien	87,2 %	12,8 %
Naturwiss. Studien	83,3 %	16,7 %
Rechtswiss. Studien	81,4 %	18,6 %
Sozial- u. wirtwiss. Studien	82,3 %	17,7 %
Theologische Studien	75,5 %	24,5 %
Veterinärmed. Studien	79,5 %	19,9 %
Individuelle Studien	76,4 %	23,8 %
FH-Fachbereich		
Gestaltung, Kunst	67,8 %	32,2 %
Technik, Ingenieurwissenschaften	63,2 %	36,8 %
Sozialwissenschaften	69,2 %	31,0 %
Wirtschaftswissenschaften	68,8 %	31,2 %
Naturwissenschaften	84,6 %	15,4 %
Gesundheitswissenschaften	74,9 %	25,1 %
PH-Lehramt		
LA Volksschulen	83,3 %	16,7 %
LA Hauptschulen	77,0 %	23,0 %
LA Sonderschulen	82,6 %	18,0 %
LA Sonstiges	42,0 %	58,0 %
Doppelstudium		
Ja	86,7 %	13,3 %
Nein	78,2 %	21,8 %
Beihilfen/Stipendienbezug		
Keine Beihilfe	83,8 %	16,2 %
Studienbeihilfe	88,6 %	11,4 %
Selbsterhalterstipendium	15,9 %	84,1 %
Studienabschlussstipendium	69,1 %	30,9 %
Erwerbstätigkeit SS 2009		
Während des ganzen Semesters	75,5 %	24,5 %
Gelegentlich während des Semesters	84,3 %	15,7 %
Keine	83,6 %	16,4 %
Erwerbstätigkeit in Stunden/Woche		
Unter 11h	85,6 %	14,4 %
11-35h	78,7 %	21,3 %
Über 35h	61,2 %	38,8 %
Aufgewachsen in städt. oder ländl. Umgebung		
(Vor)städtische Umgebung	83,1 %	16,9 %
Ländliche Umgebung	77,6 %	22,4 %

	Delay < 1,4 years	Delay >= 1,4 years
Gesamt	80,1 %	19,9 %
Aufgewachsen in Ö-Bundesland		
Burgenland	79,4 %	20,6 %
Kärnten	79,8 %	20,2 %
Niederösterreich	79,0 %	21,0 %
Oberösterreich	77,7 %	22,3 %
Salzburg	75,6 %	24,5 %
Steiermark	82,2 %	17,8 %
Tirol	77,2 %	22,9 %
Vorarlberg	74,9 %	25,1 %
Wien	85,3 %	14,7 %
Ausland	76,8 %	23,2 %
Wohnsituation		
Elternhaushalt	89,8 %	10,2 %
Andere Verwandte	84,5 %	15,8 %
Wohngem.	84,6 %	15,4 %
Studierendenwohnheim	89,5 %	10,5 %
Anderes Wohnheim	84,5 %	15,5 %
Einzelhaushalt inkl. Untermiete	72,2 %	27,8 %
Wohnsituation in drei Kategorien		
Eltern	90,2 %	9,8 %
Einzelhaushalt	81,8 %	18,2 %
PartnerHH	71,0 %	29,0 %
Auskommen mit finanziellen Mitteln		
Gut	82,4 %	17,6 %
Weder noch	79,6 %	20,4 %
Schlecht	76,2 %	23,8 %
Entfernung zur Hochschule		
Unter 30 min	82,8 %	17,3 %
30 bis 60 min	78,9 %	21,1 %
Über 60 min	76,3 %	23,7 %

Die Tabelle erfasst alle Studierenden.
Quelle: Studierenden-Sozialerhebung 2009.

7: Version II: Delayed by 2 years

	Delay < 2 years	Delay >= 2 years
Gesamt	35,4 %	64,6 %
Geschlecht		
Weiblich	41,3 %	58,7 %
Männlich	28,4 %	71,6 %
Alter		
Unter 21 J.	99,5 %	0,5 %
21-25 J.	42,9 %	57,1 %
26-30 J.	0,0 %	100 %
Über 30 J.	0,0 %	100 %

	Delay < 2 years	Delay >= 2 years
Gesamt	35,4 %	64,6 %
Soziale Herkunft (nur inländ. Eltern)		
Niedrige Schicht	24,2 %	75,8 %
Mittlere Schicht	33,3 %	66,7 %
Gehobene Schicht	38,7 %	61,3 %
Hohe Schicht	42,6 %	57,4 %
Soziale Herkunft (Selbsteinschätzung)		
Niedrige soziale Stellung	21,5 %	78,5 %
	27,7 %	72,3 %
	31,7 %	68,3 %
	38,4 %	61,6 %
Hohe soziale Stellung	39,5 %	60,5 %
Bildungsherkunft		
Bildungsinländer/in	35,2 %	64,8 %
Bildungsausländer/in	36,7 %	63,3 %
Erstsprache		
Deutsch	36,2 %	63,8 %
Andere Sprache	31,4 %	68,5 %
Kinder		
Kinder	1,9 %	98,1 %
Keine Kinder	38,5 %	61,5 %
Alter jüngstes Kind im HH		
Unter 3 J. im HH	4,0 %	96,0 %
3-6 J. im HH	1,5 %	98,5 %
7-14 J. im HH	0,5 %	99,5 %
Über 14 J. im HH	0,0 %	100 %
Alleinerziehend (Kind/er < 27J.)		
Ja	2,8 %	97,4 %
Nein	1,9 %	98,1 %
Unterstufe (nur Bildungsinländer/innen)		
Hauptschule	27,9 %	72,1 %
AHS-Unterstufe	39,6 %	60,4 %
Sonstige Schule	31,6 %	68,4 %
Studienberechtigung		
AHS-Matura	42,6 %	57,4 %
HAK-Matura	32,8 %	67,2 %
HTL-Matura	27,2 %	72,8 %
Sonstige BHS-Matura	35,5 %	64,5 %
Studienberechtigungsprüfung	2,0 %	98,1 %
Berufsreifeprüfung	5,7 %	94,3 %
Sonstige österr. Studienberechtigung	13,4 %	86,6 %
Schule/Berufsausbildung im Ausland	36,7 %	63,3 %

	Delay < 2 years	Delay >= 2 years
Gesamt	35,4 %	64,6 %
Studienjahr der Erstzulassung		
Vor 2000	0,0 %	100 %
2000/01	0,0 %	100 %
2001/02	0,0 %	100 %
2002/03	0,1 %	99,9 %
2003/04	0,4 %	99,6 %
2004/05	7,5 %	92,5 %
2005/06	32,5 %	67,5 %
2006/07	60,3 %	39,8 %
2007/08	73,1 %	26,9 %
2008/09	73,0 %	27,0 %
Version I: Delayed by 1,4 years		
Delay < 1,4 years	43,5 %	56,5 %
Delay >= 1,4 years	3,1 %	96,9 %
Version III: Delayed by 2 years OR beginning to study older than 23 years		
Not delayed	43,2 %	56,9 %
delayed	1,4 %	98,6 %
Hochschulsektor		
Wiss. Univ.	35,3 %	64,7 %
Kunstuniv.	26,6 %	73,4 %
Fachhochschule	36,1 %	63,9 %
Pädag. Hochschule	41,2 %	58,8 %
Type of Programme at Univ. of Applied Sciences		
Fulltime	50,6 %	49,4 %
extra-occupational	8,2 %	91,9 %
Targeted groups (work experience)	0,0 %	100 %
Studientyp		
Bachelor	51,8 %	48,2 %
Master	6,6 %	93,4 %
LA	39,6 %	60,4 %
Dipl	25,9 %	74,1 %
Studienrichtungsgruppen		
Geistes- u. kulturwiss.Studien	33,6 %	66,4 %
Ingenieurwiss. Studien	34,0 %	66,0 %
Künstlerische Studien	28,1 %	71,9 %
Lehramtsstudien	39,7 %	60,4 %
Medizinische Studien	29,8 %	70,2 %
Naturwiss. Studien	38,7 %	61,3 %
Rechtswiss. Studien	41,3 %	58,7 %
Sozial- u. wirtwiss. Studien	33,5 %	66,5 %
Theologische Studien	20,9 %	78,5 %
Veterinärmed. Studien	30,7 %	69,3 %
Individuelle Studien	32,7 %	67,3 %

	Delay < 2 years	Delay >= 2 years
Gesamt	35,4 %	64,6 %
FH-Fachbereich		
Gestaltung, Kunst	38,9 %	61,1 %
Technik, Ingenieurwissenschaften	32,8 %	67,2 %
Sozialwissenschaften	30,6 %	69,4 %
Wirtschaftswissenschaften	36,4 %	63,7 %
Naturwissenschaften	73,1 %	26,9 %
Gesundheitswissenschaften	53,4 %	46,3 %
PH-Lehramt		
LA Volksschulen	60,4 %	39,6 %
LA Hauptschulen	42,2 %	57,8 %
LA Sonderschulen	32,9 %	67,1 %
LA Sonstiges	13,9 %	86,5 %
Doppelstudium		
Ja	35,6 %	64,4 %
Nein	35,4 %	64,6 %
Beihilfen/Stipendienbezug		
Keine Beihilfe	34,0 %	66,0 %
Studienbeihilfe	53,4 %	46,6 %
Selbsterhalterstipendium	0,7 %	99,2 %
Studienabschlussstipendium	1,5 %	97,1 %
Erwerbstätigkeit SS 2009		
Während des ganzen Semesters	20,4 %	79,6 %
Gelegentlich während des Semesters	42,1 %	57,9 %
Keine	49,8 %	50,2 %
Erwerbstätigkeit in Stunden/Woche		
Unter 11h	43,5 %	56,5 %
11-35h	20,7 %	79,3 %
Über 35h	4,2 %	95,8 %
Aufgewachsen in städt. oder ländl. Umgebung		
(Vor)städtische Umgebung	34,9 %	65,1 %
Ländliche Umgebung	36,0 %	64,0 %
Aufgewachsen in Ö-Bundesland		
Burgenland	32,8 %	67,2 %
Kärnten	31,9 %	68,1 %
Niederösterreich	37,6 %	62,4 %
Oberösterreich	36,0 %	64,0 %
Salzburg	34,1 %	65,9 %
Steiermark	35,7 %	64,2 %
Tirol	31,1 %	68,9 %
Vorarlberg	31,0 %	69,0 %
Wien	34,9 %	65,1 %
Ausland	42,4 %	57,6 %
Wohnsituation		
Elternhaushalt	55,5 %	44,5 %
Andere Verwandte	40,5 %	59,5 %
Wohngem.	42,0 %	58,0 %
Studierendenwohnheim	58,3 %	41,7 %
Anderes Wohnheim	45,0 %	55,0 %
Einzelhaushalt inkl. Untermiete	19,5 %	80,5 %

	Delay < 2 years	Delay >= 2 years
Gesamt	35,4 %	64,6 %
Wohnsituation in drei Kategorien		
Eltern	55,8 %	44,2 %
Einzelhaushalt	38,5 %	61,5 %
PartnerHH	17,5 %	82,5 %
Auskommen mit finanziellen Mitteln		
Gut	40,4 %	59,6 %
Weder noch	33,6 %	66,4 %
Schlecht	27,4 %	72,6 %
Entfernung zur Hochschule		
Unter 30 min	37,7 %	62,3 %
30 bis 60 min	33,9 %	66,1 %
Über 60 min	35,7 %	64,3 %

Die Tabelle erfasst alle Studierenden.
Quelle: Studierenden-Sozialerhebung 2009.

8: Version III: Delayed by 2 years OR beginning to study older than 23 years

	Not delayed	Delayed
Gesamt	81,6 %	18,4 %
Geschlecht		
Weiblich	84,5 %	15,5 %
Männlich	78,3 %	21,8 %
Alter		
Unter 21 J.	99,2 %	0,8 %
21-25 J.	90,4 %	9,6 %
26-30 J.	66,4 %	33,6 %
Über 30 J.	55,2 %	44,8 %
Soziale Herkunft (nur inländ. Eltern)		
Niedrige Schicht	67,3 %	32,7 %
Mittlere Schicht	78,9 %	21,1 %
Gehobene Schicht	86,2 %	13,8 %
Hohe Schicht	92,5 %	7,5 %
Soziale Herkunft (Selbsteinschätzung)		
Niedrige soziale Stellung	70,2 %	29,8 %
	73,9 %	26,1 %
	78,6 %	21,4 %
	84,8 %	15,2 %
Hohe soziale Stellung	85,1 %	14,9 %
Bildungsherkunft		
Bildungsinländer/in	81,5 %	18,5 %
Bildungsausländer/in	82,9 %	17,1 %
Erstsprache		
Deutsch	82,8 %	17,2 %
Andere Sprache	75,7 %	24,3 %
Kinder		
Kinder	55,0 %	45,0 %
Keine Kinder	84,1 %	15,9 %

	Not delayed	Delayed
Gesamt	81,6 %	18,4 %
Alter jüngstes Kind im HH		
Unter 3 J. im HH	65,2 %	34,8 %
3-6 J. im HH	59,4 %	40,6 %
7-14 J. im HH	45,1 %	55,0 %
Über 14 J. im HH	43,2 %	56,8 %
Alleinerziehend (Kind/er < 27J.)		
Ja	56,1 %	44,1 %
Nein	55,7 %	44,3 %
Unterstufe (nur Bildungsinländer/innen)		
Hauptschule	69,3 %	30,7 %
AHS-Unterstufe	88,6 %	11,4 %
Sonstige Schule	78,1 %	22,1 %
Studienberechtigung		
AHS-Matura	93,3 %	6,7 %
HAK-Matura	80,8 %	19,2 %
HTL-Matura	77,0 %	23,0 %
Sonstige BHS-Matura	81,4 %	18,6 %
Studienberechtigungsprüfung	0,0 %	100 %
Berufsreifeprüfung	0,0 %	100 %
Sonstige österr. Studienberechtigung	68,5 %	31,5 %
Schule/Berufsausbildung im Ausland	82,9 %	17,1 %
Studienjahr der Erstzulassung		
Vor 2000	87,8 %	12,2 %
2000/01	86,9 %	13,1 %
2001/02	87,2 %	12,8 %
2002/03	83,8 %	16,2 %
2003/04	83,6 %	16,4 %
2004/05	82,2 %	17,8 %
2005/06	79,7 %	20,3 %
2006/07	81,0 %	19,0 %
2007/08	79,8 %	20,2 %
2008/09	75,9 %	24,1 %
Version I: Delayed by 1,4 years		
Delay < 1,4 years	100 %	0,0 %
Delay >= 1,4 years	7,7 %	92,3 %
Version II: Delayed by 2 years		
Delay < 2 years	99,3 %	0,7 %
Delay >= 2 years	71,9 %	28,1 %
Hochschulsektor		
Wiss. Univ.	84,3 %	15,7 %
Kunstuniv.	75,1 %	24,9 %
Fachhochschule	68,3 %	31,7 %
Pädag. Hochschule	73,0 %	27,0 %
Type of Programme at Univ. of Applied Sciences		
Fulltime	79,2 %	20,8 %
extra-occupational	47,4 %	52,6 %
Targeted groups (work experience)	33,9 %	66,1 %

	Not delayed	Delayed
Gesamt	81,6 %	18,4 %
Studientyp		
Bachelor	80,3 %	19,7 %
Master	79,2 %	20,8 %
LA	89,3 %	10,7 %
Dipl	82,6 %	17,4 %
Studienrichtungsgruppen		
Geistes- u. kulturwiss.Studien	81,2 %	18,8 %
Ingenieurwiss. Studien	86,9 %	13,1 %
Künstlerische Studien	72,8 %	27,2 %
Lehramtsstudien	89,3 %	10,7 %
Medizinische Studien	88,1 %	11,9 %
Naturwiss. Studien	85,0 %	15,0 %
Rechtswiss. Studien	82,7 %	17,3 %
Sozial- u. wirtwiss. Studien	84,1 %	15,9 %
Theologische Studien	78,5 %	20,9 %
Veterinärmed. Studien	80,1 %	19,3 %
Individuelle Studien	78,8 %	21,4 %
FH-Fachbereich		
Gestaltung, Kunst	71,1 %	28,9 %
Technik, Ingenieurwissenschaften	64,6 %	35,4 %
Sozialwissenschaften	70,1 %	29,9 %
Wirtschaftswissenschaften	69,4 %	30,7 %
Naturwissenschaften	84,6 %	15,4 %
Gesundheitswissenschaften	76,5 %	23,5 %
PH-Lehramt		
LA Volksschulen	85,4 %	14,6 %
LA Hauptschulen	78,7 %	21,6 %
LA Sonderschulen	82,6 %	18,0 %
LA Sonstiges	42,7 %	57,3 %
Doppelstudium		
Ja	88,4 %	11,6 %
Nein	79,7 %	20,3 %
Beihilfen/Stipendienbezug		
Keine Beihilfe	85,2 %	14,8 %
Studienbeihilfe	89,9 %	10,0 %
Selbsterhalterstipendium	16,3 %	83,6 %
Studienabschlussstipendium	69,1 %	30,9 %
Erwerbstätigkeit SS 2009		
Während des ganzen Semesters	77,0 %	23,0 %
Gelegentlich während des Semesters	85,8 %	14,2 %
Keine	85,2 %	14,8 %
Erwerbstätigkeit in Stunden/Woche		
Unter 11h	86,9 %	13,1 %
11-35h	80,3 %	19,7 %
Über 35h	62,5 %	37,4 %
Aufgewachsen in städt. oder ländl. Umgebung		
(Vor)städtische Umgebung	84,7 %	15,3 %
Ländliche Umgebung	79,1 %	20,9 %

	Not delayed	Delayed
Gesamt	81,6 %	18,4 %
Aufgewachsen in Ö-Bundesland		
Burgenland	80,9 %	19,1 %
Kärnten	80,8 %	19,2 %
Niederösterreich	80,7 %	19,3 %
Oberösterreich	79,1 %	20,9 %
Salzburg	76,9 %	23,1 %
Steiermark	83,2 %	16,8 %
Tirol	78,1 %	21,9 %
Vorarlberg	77,2 %	22,8 %
Wien	86,4 %	13,6 %
Ausland	80,0 %	19,9 %
Wohnsituation		
Elternhaushalt	91,2 %	8,8 %
Andere Verwandte	86,4 %	13,6 %
Wohngem.	86,4 %	13,6 %
Studierendenwohnheim	90,8 %	9,2 %
Anderes Wohnheim	84,5 %	15,5 %
Einzelhaushalt inkl. Untermiete	73,8 %	26,2 %
Wohnsituation in drei Kategorien		
Eltern	91,5 %	8,5 %
Einzelhaushalt	83,3 %	16,7 %
PartnerHH	72,7 %	27,3 %
Auskommen mit finanziellen Mitteln		
Gut	83,8 %	16,2 %
Weder noch	81,2 %	18,8 %
Schlecht	78,0 %	22,0 %
Entfernung zur Hochschule		
Unter 30 min	84,1 %	15,9 %
30 bis 60 min	80,6 %	19,4 %
Über 60 min	77,3 %	22,7 %

Die Tabelle erfasst alle Studierenden.
Quelle: Studierenden-Sozialerhebung 2009.

eurostudent.eu

ANNEX 7

Feedback provided on the data delivered per country.

Example of Austria

Code	Country	Topic name	Notes
AT_A01	Austria	Age profile by characteristics of students	A comparison with Eurostat figures for 2008 (LYA) shows: age group up to 24 underrepresented, age group 25-29 overrepresented. Pls check and comment
AT_A02	Austria	Age profile by social background	ok
AT_A03	Austria	Gender profile by characteristics of students	Share of female students in the groups MA students and 30 years and over much lower than in the other groups and atypical in country comparison. Pls review and comment in DDM
AT_A04	Austria	Dependents by characteristics of students	ok
AT_A05	Austria	Students' assessment of study impairment and of how it is taken account of	In country comparison, high level of dissatisfaction, low level of satisfaction. Pls review and comment in DDM
AT_A06	Austria	Migrant students	Value for 1st generation appears very high (see general note) and is very high in country comparison. Pls review and comment in DDM
AT_B01	Austria	Qualification routes into higher education	Values similar betw CH and AT, but lower for DE. We should check cross-country congruence.
AT_B02	Austria	Prior experience on the labour market before entering higher education	ok, very large difference between groups delayed transition and direct transition. Pls comment in commentary box.
AT_B03	Austria	Prior experience on the labour market before entering higher education by social background	ok
AT_B04	Austria	Interruption of education career after graduating from secondary school by characteristics of students	ok
AT_B05	Austria	Time between obtaining HE entry qualification and entering HE	What accounts for the high median value for delay in males (higher than for low educ)? Similar pattern in AT, DE and CH
AT_B06	Austria	Location of graduation from secondary education	none
AT_B07	Austria	Student enrolment by programme	ok
AT_B08	Austria	Enrolment in programmes by social background	Ok. In general, the share of students from high education backgrounds is higher than for all students in MA programmes. Here not the case. Comments pls in commentary box.
AT_B09	Austria	Field of study by characteristics of BA students	ok
AT_B10	Austria	Formal status of enrolment	ok
AT_B11	Austria	Formal status of enrolment by size of academic workload	ok
AT_C01	Austria	Labour force activity of students' parents	Value for fathers 10 percentage points lower than EIII. Change or new definition?
AT_C02	Austria	Occupational status of students' parents	Values marginally higher than for EIII. Are you still using the same definition. For population data, the LFS might be better than the census from 2000
AT_C03	Austria	Highest educational attainment of students' parents	ok
AT_C04	Austria	Highest educational attainment of students' parents by characteristics of students	none
AT_C05	Austria	Occupational status by highest educational attainment	Pls check share of MA students with low education parents - at present higher than for BA students. (Although this does seem to agree with StB8)
AT_C06	Austria	Assessment of social standing of parents	Ok. In cross-country comparison: High share of students placing parents in 1-3, but comparative share in groups 1-5 and 6-10 (overall similar to DE)
AT_C07	Austria	Assessments of social standing of parents by highest educational attainment of parents	Pls see general note in guidelines
AT_C08	Austria	Assessments of social standing of parents by characteristics of students	none
AT_D01	Austria	Form of housing by age	Compared to E:III the share of all students living with parents has decreased markedly (and the opposite holds true for all students not living with parents). Also in current country comparison the share of all students living with parents is low, while t

AT_D02	Austria	Form of housing by gender and qualification being studied for	Compared to E:III the share of all BA students living in student halls has decreased quite a bit. Can you comment on this?
AT_D03	Austria	Form of housing for all students by size of study location	ok
AT_D04	Austria	Form of housing by social background	Shares of students living with parents (low and high edc background) are quite low in country comparison. Pls comment on this.
AT_D05	Austria	Assessment of accommodation by form of housing	In country comparison the share of students living with parents who are (very) dissatisfied is quite high. Can you comment on this?
AT_D06	Austria	Cost of accommodation for students not living with parents	ok
AT_D07	Austria	Form of housing and daily time for travelling from home to higher education institution	ok
AT_E01	Austria	Profile of students' expenditure by form of housing	none
AT_E02	Austria	Profile of students' key expenditure by characteristics of students who are not living with parents	none
AT_E03	Austria	Profile of students' key expenditure by social background of students not living with parents	none
AT_E04	Austria	Profile of students' key expenditure by size of study location of students not living with parents	none
AT_E05	Austria	Students' assessment of their financial situation by form of housing	none
AT_E06	Austria	Students' assessment of their financial situation and average income by form of housing	none
AT_E07	Austria	Students' assessment of their financial situation by characteristics of students who are not living with parents	none
AT_E08	Austria	Students' assessment of their financial situation by finance-related characteristics of students not living with parents	none
AT_F01	Austria	Total monthly income by characteristics of students for students not living with parents	none
AT_F02	Austria	Total monthly income by characteristics of students of students living with parents	none
AT_F03	Austria	Composition of monthly income by type of housing and characteristics of students	none
AT_F04	Austria	Distribution and concentration of total monthly income of students living with parents	none
AT_F05	Austria	Distribution and concentration of total monthly income for students not living with parents	none
AT_F06	Austria	Recipients of family/partner contribution and importance of income source by type of housing	none
AT_F07	Austria	Recipients of public support and importance of income source by form of housing	none
AT_F08	Austria	Make-up of public support	none
AT_F09	Austria	Public support by payment of fees to institutions of higher education for Bachelor students	none
AT_G01	Austria	Employment rate during term-time and in the term break by type of housing	none
AT_G02	Austria	Employment rate during term-time by hours of work and characteristics of students who are not living with parents	none
AT_G03	Austria	Employment during term-time by parents' highest educational attainment	none
AT_G04	Austria	Employment during term-time by field of study	none
AT_G05	Austria	Reliance on paid employment by characteristics of students who are not living with parents	none
AT_G06	Austria	Distribution and concentration of student income from paid employment, students not living with parents	none
AT_G07	Austria	Time budget for study-related activities by characteristics of students	none
AT_G08	Austria	Time budget for study-related activities by parents' highest educational attainment	none
AT_G09	Austria	Time budget for study-related activities by extent of paid employment	none
AT_G10	Austria	Time budget for study-related activities by qualification being studied for and field of study	none
AT_G11	Austria	Students' assessment of their workload by charac-	none

		teristics of students	
AT_G12	Austria	Students' assessment of their workload by composition of time budget	none
AT_H01	Austria	All students' assessment of general aspects of studies	none
AT_H02	Austria	Bachelor students' assessment of general aspects of studies	none
AT_H03	Austria	Students' assessment of general aspects of studies by social background	none
AT_H04	Austria	Students' assessment of general aspects of studies by field of study	none
AT_H05	Austria	Students' assessment of importance of studies	none
AT_H06	Austria	Students' assessment of importance of studies by field of study	none
AT_H07	Austria	Plans for future studies	none
AT_I01	Austria	Enrolment abroad by characteristics of students	In country comparison, the enrolment rate of all students and of female students are rather high. How can this be explained? How can the increase in the enrolment rates of all students and female students since EUROSTUDENT III be explained? To what extent
AT_I02	Austria	Enrolment abroad by field of study	In country comparison, the enrolment rate of students in humanities and arts is very high. How can this be explained? To what extent could it have to do with the structures/specific measures to support mobility in this field? To what extent could it have
AT_I03	Austria	Enrolment abroad by social background and form of housing	In international comparison, the enrolment rate of students with high education background is rather high. In EUROSTUDENT III, the enrolment rate of students with low education background was higher than the enrolment rate of students with high education
AT_I04	Austria	Study-related activities abroad by characteristics of students	Please check the percentage value for all students with no activities abroad!
AT_I05	Austria	Organisation of enrolment abroad	ok
AT_I06	Austria	Sources of funding for enrolment abroad	In country comparison, the share of students with high educ. background giving parents/family as primary source is very high. Please comment on this in the DDM.
AT_I07	Austria	Important aspects and fulfilled expectations concerning the enrolment abroad	In country comparison, the share of students whose expectations regarding their personal development are met at (very) high level is rather high. Please comment on this in the DDM.
AT_I08	Austria	Issues that influence plans for an enrolment abroad	In country comparison, the shares of students for whom (lacking) home support and (lacking) finances are big obstacles to enrolment abroad are rather high. Please comment on this in the DDM.
AT_I09	Austria	Issues that influence plans for an enrolment abroad by field of study	ok
AT_I10	Austria	Issues that obstruct plans for an enrolment abroad by social background	In country comparison, the share of students with high education background for whom (lacking) home support and (lacking) finances are big obstacles to enrolment abroad are very high. Please comment on this in the DDM.
AT_I11	Austria	Choice of country for foreign study-related activities	ok
AT_I12	Austria	Foreign language proficiency according to self-assessment	Please check whether you selected labels (English, French, Russian, etc.) in the drop down menu whilst entering the absolute numbers of students speaking a respective language.
AT_I13	Austria	Language of domestic study programme	Are you sure that it is not possible to provide data on the languages of students' domestic study programmes? Please comment on this in the DDM.

eurostudent.eu

ANNEX 8

List of activities undertaken by Partner 2 (IHS, AT) in the frame of WP 6 – quality assurance and cross-sectional involvements in WP 2 and 3

Date	Activity	WP
2008		
Oct 2008	Kick-Off Meeting of the consortium in Hannover	2, 3, 6
Oct-Nov 2008	Online-Survey among Eurostudent stakeholders (governments, researchers, users of the data): 1. What groups of students should Eurostudent target? 2. What groups of students should Eurostudent treat as main comparative groups for analysis? 3. Main topics covered by Eurostudent and level of relevance of these topics	2
Dec 2008	Hosting Workshop in Vienna (16 participants): Definitions and conventions, re-designing the questionnaire	2
	Working on the questionnaire and the accompanying manual together with HIS and CKOKO	2, 6
2009		
Jan 2009	Workshop in Sofia, Meeting of partners from WP 2: Redesigning the questionnaire, production of manual [7]	2
Feb 2009	Ensuring comparability of already designed national questionnaires DE, CH	6
	Kick-Off-Workshop The Hague: Communicating definitions, conventions (target group, comparative groups, questionnaire, manual), presenting concept for quality assurance, presenting Eurostudent exchange network of researchers	2, 6
March/April 2009	Reworking questionnaire and manual	6
April 2009	Budapest: Discussing possibility for Hungary to join Eurostudent network. Communicating definitions and conventions to be followed. Commenting on pretest already been done in Hungary	6
Sep 2009	Writing call for tender for CSH, selection of best offer (together with HIS)	6
	Intensive Workshop on Online Surveys (Berlin). 2 presentations (introduction, tricky issues)	6
	Meeting of the consortium: Discussing quality concept Meeting of the Steering Board: Presenting quality concept	2, 3, 6
Oct 2009	Paper for national partners on how to draw a sample of students for Eurostudent surveys	6
	Presenting Eurostudent at the ESU convention in Stockholm	2, 3, 6
Nov 2009	Reviewing the handbook on executing online surveys	6
	Workshop on Indicators in Hannover. Designing the DDM in coherence with the questionnaire and the technical manual	6
Dec 2010	Commenting on the DDM-Handbook	6

[7] See for details http://www.ckoko.bg/content/category/11/60/186/lang,en.

Date	Activity	WP
	Hosting the Kick-Off meeting of CSH-countries in Vienna (15 participants). Discussing of tasks to be done by Eurostudent and tasks to be done by countries. Planning of the surveys in the CSH countries, obstacles and proposals to overcome the obstacles. How to translate the common questionnaire? How to run a pretest? Discussing state of the art and progress of CSH with CSH-contractor.	3
2010		
Dec 2009 – Feb 2010	Working on new indicators, empirically testing new indicator on delayed transition students with examples from several countries	6
Jan 2010	CSH-Country visit Malta: How to draw a sample, including country specifics in the common questionnaire, how to prepare the data for analysis (weighting etc.), how to analyse the data Discussing state of the art and progress of CSH with CSH-contractor.	3
Feb 2010	Workshop on indicators in Tallinn. Commenting on new indicators, design of the handbook and the DDM.	6
	CSH-Country visit Slovenia: How to draw a sample, including country specifics in the common questionnaire, how to prepare the data for analysis (weighting etc.), how to analyse the data Discussing state of the art and progress of CSH with CSH-contractor.	3
	"Country visit" Spain, meeting in Hannover: Discussion on how a Spain can still join Eurostudent IV, definitions and conventions to follow, access to students, drawing a sample, weighting and analysis of the data	6
	CSH-Country visit Denmark: How to draw a sample, including country specifics in the common questionnaire, how to prepare the data for analysis (weighting etc.), how to analyse the data Discussing state of the art and progress of CSH with CSH-contractor.	3
	Quality check of central online-questionnaire: Malta	6
March 2010	Several pages of feedback on Eurostudent IV handbook	6
	Intensive seminar in Prague on data conventions and quality. Presentation on tricky issues in data treatment. Discussing and defining standards for dealing with these issues. Presenting CSH (together with Researchned). Discussing next steps on data analysis, delivery and state of the relevant "helping-tools".	6
	Meeting of CSH-countries in Prague: Common problems, state of the art, assistance needed Discussing state of the art and progress of CSH with CSH-contractor.	3
	Quality check of central online-questionnaire: Denmark	6
April 2010	CSH-Country visit Croatia: How to draw a sample, including country specifics in the common questionnaire, how to prepare the data for analysis (weighting etc.), how to analyse the data Discussing state of the art and progress of CSH with CSH-contractor.	3
	Quality check of central online-questionnaire: Slovenia	6
May 2010	CSH-Country visit Poland: How to draw a sample, including country specifics in the common questionnaire, how to prepare the data for analysis (weighting etc.), how to analyse the data Discussing state of the art and progress of CSH with CSH-contractor.	3

Date	Activity	WP
	Country visit Portugal: How to draw a sample, including country specifics in the common questionnaire, how to prepare the data for analysis (weighting etc.), how to analyse the data	6
	Quality check of central online-questionnaire: Croatia	6
Jun 2011	Quality check of central online-questionnaire: Poland	
Jun/Jul 2010	Discussing state of the art and progress of CSH with CSH-contractor via phone and/or mail.	3
Jul/Aug 2010	Providing feedback on draft versions of the DDM	6
Sept 2010	Intensive Seminar on data analysis and interpretation in Malta: Discussions on how comparability of data can be ensured. What are the duties of participating countries in data delivery? How can delivered data be interpreted and what are the limitations of the collected data?	6
	Meeting of the steering board in Berlin	2, 3, 6
Oct 2010	Meeting with representatives of DG Education in Brussels. Discussing dissemination strategies and future of Eurostudent.	6
Nov 2010	Meeting on WP 6 in Hannover. Discussing central data and plausibility checks in the DDM. Discussing further data checks to be done by IHS. Several pages of feedback about DDM. Discussing improvements of DDM, the technical manual and DRM	6
	Video conference on WP 6: Discussing next steps in data checking and cleaning	6
Dec 2010	Workshop on Data Interpretation and Context Information in Ankara. Presentation on problems faced by data providers. Discussion of common problems in indicator construction and calculation. Presenting a programme syntax to overcome obstacles in SPSS for calculation of certain indicators. Presentation of exemplified indicators.	6
	2nd Country visit Portugal: Assisting Portugal with data treatment: weighting, plausibility checks, following the Eurostudent conventions for calculating the indicators. Discussing problems of data delivery.	6
2011		
Jan/Feb 2011	Data checks, feedback on data quality, need of improvements	6
April 2011	10 pages of Feedback on draft synopsis of indicators	6
May 2011	Meeting of the steering board in Berlin	2, 3, 6
	Feedback on draft synopsis of indicators	6
Jun 2011	Final conference Copenhagen (attendance and travel not funded by Eurostudent IV)	2, 3, 6
Sept/Oct 2011	Assisting Slovenia in data treatment (weighting etc.) for DRM	6