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Introduction to the Documentation of the International Workshop

Documentation of the 4th International Workshop by the Research Group on Higher Education and the Réseau Uni 21 of the FREREF

“Empirical Evidence for the Development of the Bologna Process - Contributions in Different European Countries”

Already for the forth time the Research Group on Higher Education at the University of Konstanz has organized a workshop on European researches about study situation and the development of higher education. This time the main point of interest has been to present and discuss international empirical results about the Bologna process. In the year 2010 the European Area of Higher Education should have been established almost completely, offering comparable credit points and final degrees. Lately several researches, delivering regional and national results, have been published focussing on the development of the new study structure. Additionally several European universities have examined the effects of these reforms on conditions of study and on the study situation of students. Within the framework of the workshop only a selection of research institutes and their results could be presented, showing, nevertheless, the whole range of topics.

For two days 29 representatives of science and administration from eight European countries presented their results in the large Senate hall at the University of Konstanz. The regions Rhône-Alpes (France) and Catalonia (Spain) were present. With both regions Baden-Württemberg has been cultivating close scientific contacts for over one decade. Furthermore Prof. John Brennan, since several years head of the Centre for Higher Education Research and Information in London, could be won to give the „Introductory Lesson“. In addition our long-standing colleges from Lithuania and Ukraine, from Carinthia and the French-speaking part of Switzerland again were giving talks.

It has been a special honour to us, as well as to the participants, to be able to welcome two high-ranking representatives of the FREREF to our workshop in Konstanz: Prof. Walo Hutmacher, having largely contributed as president of the FREREF in enlarging and strengthening the European cooperation, gave us an overview of the basic ideas underlying FREREF with regard to education. Joel Bonamy, head of FREREF administration, provided us with an insight into the present and future activities of FREREF, especially of the summer university on life-long-learning (LLL). Furthermore, he gained an impression about the development of the Réseau Uni 21, and about future cooperation within this network. The way our workshop is appreciated at the University of Konstanz was shown by Prof. Katharina Holzinger, vice rector of international affairs at the university, and her friendly welcome talk. She illustratively introduced us to the main topic of our workshop by describing how the Bologna process has been put into practice at the University of Konstanz.

The talks centred around judgements and experiences of students. In what way do they feel the new study structure effects their daily life at the university? What are the effects of the Bologna process on the mobility of students? What are their opinions on job prospects after the Bachelor or Master exam?

The present documentation of the workshop shows the contents of the talks in a printed edition, additionally to presenting them as PDF files on our homepage. The documentation provides an overview of recent empirical studies on study situation and changes belonging to the Bologna process. Some of these researches have been done using the German student survey and its question instrument QUISS, thus partly enabling direct international analyses.
This documentation only gives you the slides of the presentations, the important and interesting discussions had to be left out. All talks presented in this edition earn further discussions on the subject, and should encourage representatives of science, in practice, of administration and higher education policy to reinforce their exchanges and cooperation.

We want this documentation to strengthen the importance of the science network ISSUE (International Student Survey in Europe) and to further spread its results. These are not only important for students, but mainly relevant for higher education administration, regional and national ministries, or the European Commission. They could contribute to the further development of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) with regard to its international orientation.

We do not want to miss the opportunity here to thank the Ministry of Science and Art Baden-Württemberg for giving us financial help without which we could neither have organized these workshops nor welcomed all our international guests.

Monika Schmidt and Tino Bargel
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The influence of research on the development of higher education in Europe

John Brennan
Centre for Higher Education Research and Information (CHERI)
The Open University, UK
A complex terrain

- Who are we trying to influence?
- What do they want?
- How can we provide it?
- When will they want it and when can we provide it?
- And what will they do with it?

Many actors

- European Commission
- Other European organisations
- National ministries
- NGOs
- Companies
- University ‘managers’
- University ‘academics/researchers’
- Users/consumers – ‘stakeholders’
EIPEE: Evidence Informed Policy in Education in Europe

- Athens Institute for Education and Research
- Campbell Collaboration
- Danish Clearinghouse for Educational Research
- Department of Sciences of Education and Cultural and Formative Processes, University of Florence
- Directorate of Knowledge Management, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, Netherlands
- European Association for Practitioner Research on Improving Learning
- EPPI-Centre, Institute of Education, University of London
- German Commission of Education Organisation, Education Planning & Law
- German Institute for International Research
- Hungarian Institute for Educational Research and Development
- Institute for Effective Education, University of York
- Ministry of Education and Research, Norway
- National Union of Teachers, England
- Research Utilisation Research Unit, University of Edinburgh
- Swiss Coordination Centre for Research in Education
- Education Evidence Portal (EEP), UK

A question of ‘place’

- European Union
- European Higher Education Area
- Nation states
- Regions and other sub-national territories
- Cross-border groupings
- Localities (e.g. city regions)
- Europe ‘in the world’
A question of ‘authority and decision-making’

Sources and levels of authority
- Individual professors, departments, faculties and universities
- National Ministries
- Other national agencies (e.g. quality assurance bodies and research councils)
- European Commission
- Other European actors (ERC, ESF, ENQA, EUA, Council of Europe)
- Other ‘stakeholders’ – users, consumers, interest groups

The legitimisation of disorder

“we need....administrative doctrines and broader ideologies that tell officials they are doing alright when the system as a whole looks like a mess, nearly everyone in the system feels powerless, and no one can clearly identify who is doing what to whom.”

Burton Clark, 1983
What do ‘users’ want?

1. What is it that they need to know?
2. What is already known?
3. What is not known?
4. What are our research questions?

Types of higher education policy research

- Studies to support policy development
- Studies to support policy implementation
- Studies to support policy evaluation
- ‘Questions which are best left unasked’!
Policy agendas: Education and Training 2020

“A European strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.”

- Making lifelong learning and mobility a reality
- Improving the quality and efficiency of education and training
- Promoting equity, social cohesion and active citizenship
- Enhancing innovation and creativity, including entrepreneurship, at all levels of education and training.

Policy agendas: The Bologna process

Making European higher education ‘coherent, compatible and attractive’

- Mobility between and within higher education systems, and into the labour market.
- Lifelong learning and recognition of informal learning
- Increase mobility (one fifth of graduates to have studied abroad)
- An external dimension: increase attractiveness of Europe as an education destination
- An external dimension: support recognition of European degrees worldwide
- Importance of quality assurance systems.
The discourse

- Economy
- Skills
- Enterprise
- Innovation
- Technology
- Competences
- Globalisation
- Sustainability

- Demography
- Mobility
- Social cohesion
- Opportunity
- Equity
- Community
- Public good
- Lifelong learning

Knowledge society

“Knowledge can no longer be regarded as discrete and coherent, its production defined by clear rules and governed by settled routines. Instead, it has become a mixture of theory and practice, abstraction and aggregation, ideas and data. The boundaries between the intellectual world and its environment have become blurred as hybrid science combines cognitive and non-cognitive elements in novel and creative ways.”

(Gibbons et al, 1994)
‘Socially robust’ knowledge

- ‘relational’ (neither absolute nor relative)
- When research has been ‘infiltrated’ and ‘improved’ by social knowledge
- Has a strong empirical dimension – frequent testing, feedback & improvement
- A ‘strongly contextualised’ scientific field
- A ‘fine’ distinction between ‘robustness’ and ‘acceptability’
- From ‘scientific autonomy’ to ‘scientific accountability’

(Nowotny et al, 2004)

Making ‘socially robust’ knowledge: Implications for methods

1) Roles and relationships
   - Researchers
   - Practitioners
   - Policy makers
   - Interest groups
Making ‘socially robust’ knowledge: Implications for methods

2) Taking account of contexts
   • Geography and history
   • What is being compared?
   • Policies, practices and impacts
   • Differentiated higher education and differentiated societies
   • Within Europe and extra Europe comparison

Making ‘socially robust’ knowledge: Implications for researchers

• Drawing in ‘social knowledge’
• Juggling multiple roles
• Recognising ‘power’ and ‘interests’
• Valuing ‘distance’
• Challenging assumptions
• Multi-methods
• Multiple audiences
New evaluation criteria for higher education in France

L. Lima, C. d’Aubigny & G. d’Aubigny
Université de Grenoble - France

Empirical Evidence for the Development of the Bologna Process – Contributions in Different European Countries
IV International Workshop at the University of Konstanz
11-13/11/2010
• In a context of modification of the governance of universities granting them a bigger autonomy in terms of financial management, university funding is changing in France.
• This change can show us something about the political view of quality criteria for higher education and also something about the political use of evaluation of higher education and its consequences.

The political origin of change

• In 2008, a report from the Evaluation and Control Commission of the French National Parliament presented the assessment of university funding in France.
• One of the main conclusions was the lack of link between evaluation and decision.
The political origin of change

• The goal was to “set up a system of distribution of the means which provides the financing of the missions of public utility assumed by higher education while inciting universities to the performance”.
• The aim was to increase the equity, the transparency and the incentive nature of the financing.
• The proposition was “an allocation calculated predominantly to the activity of the establishment, and a minority part of the allocation determined according to the performance of the university”.

The political origin of change

• In this perspective, activity is link to the number of students, what corresponds more or less to the current system of financing.
• What is new, about which it is interesting to wonder, is the part connected to the performance.
• The question is how to define the performance of a university?
• How to asses this performance?
• Some proposals of this report are linked with the assessment of performance:

• First proposal: “for the teaching missions, the part of funding measured according to criteria of performance could reach 10%; it should however be lower for the Bachelor's degree, and higher for the Master's degree.”
  — Why is performance more important for Master’s degree than for bachelor’s degree?
  — This difference is justified in the report by the mission of “democratization of the higher education assumed by the universities by leading a large number of students to the success in bachelor’s degree”.

• Second proposal: “Performance indicators have to measure evolutions, not levels”.
  — It seems to mean that there is no interest in the performance in itself but in the evolution of performance.
  — Thus the funding must be able to increase or to decline as the performance increases or decreases.
• Third proposal: “The evaluation of the performance of the teaching system has to take into account the success to diplomas, professional integration, social situation of the students and socioeconomic characteristics of the region of the university.”
  
  – This proposition seems important because it tells us something about the indicators of performance and about the way to take into account some external parameters to maintain equity between universities by adopting an “other things being equal” approach.

• The indicators of performance are:
  
  – success to diplomas;
  
  – professional integration.

• The external parameters with some influence on success to diplomas and professional integration are:
  
  – The social situation of students;
  
  – The socioeconomic characteristics of the region.
• If evaluation is the assessment of the distance between reality and an ideal.
• then, in this report, the ideal university is:
  – a performing university,
  – where more students each year obtain their diplomas,
  – which increases each year their probability to find a job.

• However, other purposes could have been taken into account as:
  – the self-fulfillment of students;
  – the development of skills...
  – but also the reduction of the disparities of success linked with the social characteristics of students.
• By adopting the “other things being equal” approach (at the individual level), justifying it by equity between universities, the research for equity between students is, in some way, excluded of the performing ideal university.
The implementation of the project

• To implement the project to assess performance of universities in the process of funding, it is necessary to determine how to measure the level of success to diplomas and professional integration.

The implementation of the project: success to diplomas

• The problem of the “level of success to diplomas” seems quite easy, but it is not.
• In the formula (number of students obtaining their diplomas / number of students), there is two things to define:
  – What is a student? Is it a registered student or is it a student participating to the exams (all the exams, some exams, at least one exam)? What about professionals who are at the same time students?
  – When should we decide that a student should have obtained a diploma? Should it be 3 years for a bachelor’s degree? Or is 4 years acceptable?
The implementation of the project: success to diplomas

• The solution adopted by the higher education ministry for the implementation of the reform next year is:
  – The count is on registered students that participated in at least one exam.
  – The level of success to diplomas is calculated 3 years after the entry at university for bachelor’s degree.

The reaction in universities is to try to answer the question “what to do with unsuccessful students?”

• Two types of answers:
  – Try to promote success for all students;
  – Try to remove unsuccessful students.

• In some universities the answer is:
  – to remove unsuccessful students, as soon as possible, from their field of study;
  – to put them in a new structure of study, proposing an initiation to university studies, to promote their success without taking them into account in the statistics of specifics fields of studies.
The implementation of the project: professional integration

• The problem of professional integration is more complex.
• It is necessary to answer 4 questions:
  – Which students having left the university must be taken into account?
  – What is the appropriate indicator of professional integration?
  – Which are the elements of the context to be neutralized to identify the gain brought by a specific university?
  – Which method to use for this neutralization?

• A simulation made in 2009 for the ministry of higher education by the CEREQ (CEnter for REsearch on Qualifications) on the data of the “Generation 98” and “Generation 2004” surveys brings answers to some of these questions.
• In this large survey, the students are questioned three years after the end of their studies, then every two years.
The simulation

• Three methods are used for the neutralization of the context:
  – Shift and share (structural-residual analysis);
  – Linear regression and logistic regression;
  – Multilevel analysis.

The simulation : indicators of professional integration

• The equivalence of various indicators of professional integration has been tested by structural analysis.
• The rate of employment and the salary are weakly related ($R^2=0.13$).
• The association between the rate of employment and the percentage of executives and professionals is stronger, but still weak ($R^2=0.40$).
• This results shows that a ranking of universities, in terms of professional integration, is going to depend on chosen indicators.
Simulation with shift and share

• Different variables are used to explain the gain in professional integration (rate of employment after 3 years (RE) or proportion of professionals and executives (PPE)).
• The first variable is the level at which the students left the university: the consideration of this variable reduces the observed differences of PPE between the universities of about 58% and modify their relative positions.
• When also taken into account, the specific field of study has low impact on the PPE but it has a more important effect on the explanation of the RE.

Simulation with logistic regression

• This technique allows one to take into account individual variables, here:
  – the type of secondary education,
  – the sex,
  – the social status of the parents,
  – the place of birth of the father.
**Simulation : multilevel analysis**

- This technique allows one to take into account some characteristics at the aggregate level of the university (as economic environment).
- Significant effects of the rates of regional unemployment, proportion of executives and professionals in the region on the level of salary.
- The consideration of the regional economic characteristics leads to the disappearance of most of the university effects.
- In other words, when regional economic characteristics are controlled, there is almost no differences of professional integration linked with universities.

**Conclusions of the simulation**

- Evaluating universities according to the professional integration of their students implies a choice among multiple options (indicators, methods) which would not end in the same ranking.
- Multilevel analysis made on the data of the Generation surveys, shows that the comparison of the “professional integration performance” between universities constitutes a real challenge.
Conclusion

• In reference to the objectives of equity and transparency of the new process of university funding, it is very difficult to understand why the ministry of higher education chose to measure the performance of universities in terms of rate of employment after thirty months, only for the students leaving the university after a Master's degree, by analyzing and by publishing until now, only data with uncontrolled individual and aggregate characteristics.

Conclusion

• It is all the more not understandable, as the choices of the ministry are not clearly argued, while decreasing the funding of universities which are in regions in economic decline, or excluding unsuccessful students by new processes, takes the risk to influence strongly the future functioning of the institutions of higher education.
Bologna-Process and the effects on the integration of University students

IV International Workshop at the University of Konstanz

Josep Maria Masjuan & Marina Elias
Theoretical background

- Relations developed inside university are fundamental elements to understand university student learning process.

- Classical research:
  - Pascarella & Terenzini - Astin
  - Tinto - Weidman

- Recent researches:

- Students’ relationship with institution leads to benefits for both.

- Social Network = social capital.

Signs of desengagement

- McInnis (2002)
  - University of the Masses => new profile of student: feel less integrated in the institution in terms of expressive belonging and show an apparent lack of commitment.

- Lately Contributions:
  1. HEIs are not at one => have specific characteristics, and these are changing depending on relations between their members.
  2. Different student profile
  3. To feel integrated, students must see that goals, views and norms are consistent with academic culture.
Research

- The research we are carrying out (r+d+i of the Ministry of Education) titled *Los estudiantes ante la nueva reforma universitaria* (Students coping new university reform), 2008-2011 period.
- We are analysing 10 Bachelors at 4 Spanish public universities in the metropolitan region of Barcelona.
- Analysis of the context: documental revision, interviews to staff (dens, degree coordinators...)
- We just have done 8 student interviews on each of the Bachelors (80 interviews in total).
- We are doing a questionnaire to hand out to students on November 2010.

Proposal of new model
Is a new model necessary?

- The theoretical framework is broad and some times confusing.
- Based on Tinto and Weidman’s models, we maintain the separation between academic and social aspects.
- Our contribution involves taking into account the identification process and focusing the interest on the individual’s reference group.
- It is necessary to separate cultural dimension from behavioural dimension.
- We maintain that identification is a suitable concept for the whole model.

**Is a new model necessary?**

- The theoretical framework is broad and some times confusing.
- Based on Tinto and Weidman’s models, we maintain the separation between academic and social aspects.
- Our contribution involves taking into account the identification process and focusing the interest on the individual’s reference group.
- It is necessary to separate cultural dimension from behavioural dimension.
- We maintain that identification is a suitable concept for the whole model.
Time 1: preuniversity

- Personal project

  motivation for choosing the course, evaluation of the costs/benefits of studying, moral norm (duty to make an effort, constancy in studies),

Perception of control opportunities

- Bologna Process changes in pedagogical methodology
  - Increase in students’ attendance to lectures and on the time they devote to study. Students spend more hours on campus => they have more contact with their classmates.
  - Increase in workload.
  - To reduce it:
    - student chooses among all the assignment activities proposed by lecturers; those to be submitted are more important to pass the subject matters.
    - students make use of their contacts with classmates to pass on their class notes, to divide their reading of books.

OPORTUNITIES
Institutional norms (types of diploma, course organization, students per class)
Institutional culture of bachelor
Quality of teaching (Motivation, definition of objectives, pedagogy, coherent evaluation, empowerment of autonomy)
Qualitat de les instal·lacions (aules, biblioteques, TIC)
Student’s competences (social origin, gender, previous experience)
Job opportunities
Time available for university (combining with employment)
Time 2: University experience

- Cultural dimension
  - Academic identification
  - Social identification
    - Group with academic identification.
    - Group without academic identification.
    - External group.

- Behaviour
  - Academic participation
  - Social participation
Time 3: Result

- The direct relation between changes in pedagogical methods and learning achievement is not clear. But positive changes have been observed in identification of students in institution.
- The contacts help students to maintain their efforts in study => is good for their learning process (the attainment appears indirectly).
- There is need for a certain academic identification with the institution in order to achieve good academic results.
- The social identification is a step more than academic identification.

Conclusions

- Bologna Process => students spend more time at university.
- The increase in physical presence:
  - tends to increase the interactions between colleagues and lecturers.
  - seems to lead to more academic identification with the university.
- The increase in interactions => increase in social identification with the university (creation of reference peer group).
- The increase in social identification with a university reference peer group => positive effect on the students’ academic identification.
- There is need for a certain academic identification with the institution in order to achieve good academic results.
- Social identification is a value added to academic id.
- Certain signs of the reengagement of students.
The free riders as an element of distortion of students’ working groups

Josep Masjuan & Marina Elias

GRET, Department of Sociology, University Autonomous of Barcelona
Parts of the presentation

• Introduction
• Methodology
• Types of free riders
• Consequences of this behaviour on the team mates.
• Students' reactions to the free riders.
• Discussion of the results
• Political consequences

INTRODUCTION

• The aim of this presentation is to show you that free-riders are an important element of distortion of student activity.
• The focus of the topic is based on guidelines derived from the seminal article by R. Axelrod and W. D. Hamilton, "The Evolution of cooperation" published in Science in 1981
METHODOLOGY

The data and methodology used for the analysis come from the same research explained before.

Our research question was: **Which are the different speeches of students about their experiences with free riders.**

Our purposes were:

- a) Trying to understand the experiences of students on the topic
- b) Decide the items of a questionnaire which give us the possibility to know the extension of every answer in a sample of 1,000 students.

Types of free riders

- **Lazy (Coach Potatoes)**
  
  He/She is always tired and bored and really more interested in watching TV than working in on his/her homework.

- **Cheaters (Hitchhikers)**
  
  He/She never answer phone messages, Is too busy to answer.

  He/She misses every meeting - he always promises he’ll be here, but never shows up.

  He/She speaks loudly and self confidently when somebody try to discuss his problems - He/She thinks the problems are everyone else’s fault
Cheaters (Hichhikers)

"Ok, so I decided to leave the team and so don’t worry you more. So I fuck you , but do not worry. Because if you have been worried if I do something, and you think that is bad ...or I don’t know what....! (Architecture P54)

Consequences of the free riders behaviour in the participants

• The team mates have to assume by force the contribution expected from free rider.

• Some times the team mates are damaged by evaluation marks.
Students' reactions to the free riders I

a) *Exclusion of the group as mechanisms of punishment.*

- Speak directly with teachers reporting the case.
- Do not put his/her name on the report.
- Take appropriate measures to not join the same group in the future.

Students' reactions to the free riders II

b) *Resignation and absorption of the problem*

- Considering that to punish free rider have higher costs than benefits.
- Assuming that the result will be worse
- Forgiving him because he/she is a friend
- Giving him/her light work.
- Considering that he/she is too busy in personal life.
- Considering there are students with different abilities
- Considering is not right to notify the teacher.
Some ideas about university policy that can be suggested by these results

• *Utility of the teams work can not be taken for granted, so students and faculty have to learn how to do it accurately.*

• *Students should learn how have not been confuse the nature of friendly relations (familiar altruism) with the nature of team work relations (reciprocal altruism).*

• *The faculty and the students have to mark the limits of what can be absorbed and what not, because this confusion has negative consequences.*
Empirical Results of the new Students Evaluation in Lithuania

Assoc. Prof. Ruta Braziene and Prof. Gediminas Merkys, KTU, Lithuania

IV. International Workshop at the University of Konstanz, Germany
November 11th – 13th, 2010
Survey instrument

- Adapted QUISS II, (Qualitätsverbesserung in Schulen und Schulsyssthemen) created by Tino Bargel and team, in Konztanz University, Germany;

- Created and empirically proved questionnaire extended by the additional modules thematically important for Lithuanian higher education context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUISS II modules</th>
<th>Extension modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation of Students University studies.</td>
<td>- Students national identity and emigrational notions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students social integration.</td>
<td>- Subjective Quality of Life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Informational technology usage modality.</td>
<td>- Students attitudes towards study fees and loan system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation of Social Inequality.</td>
<td>- Political notions, democratic worldviews and civil participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation of gender discrimination effects.</td>
<td>- Students social network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation of study motivation and career formation social factors.</td>
<td>- Evaluation of Students material conditions: financial recourses, leisure, social environment, transport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample

- **937** Bachelor students (I-IV year) representing all study fields (Humanities, Arts, Physical, Biomedical Social and Technological science);
- Representing Lithuanian Universities of Kaunas, Klaipėda, Šiauliai ir Vilnius and several colleges.

Distribution of the respondents according to the study course, N=964, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study year</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Distribution of respondents according to the study fields, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>478 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>74 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology sciences</td>
<td>74 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical sciences</td>
<td>78 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical sciences</td>
<td>142 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>118 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>964 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>739 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>225 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>964 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaunas</td>
<td>299 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaipėda</td>
<td>100 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiauliai</td>
<td>308 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilnius</td>
<td>257 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presently not working</td>
<td>743 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presently working</td>
<td>180 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>41 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>964 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have study place financed by the State</td>
<td>519 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have study place financed by the State</td>
<td>304 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have paid for one/several study modules</td>
<td>131 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>10 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>964 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondents by gender, N=964, %**
# Results

## Quality of Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Items</th>
<th>It /it Litauen</th>
<th>It /it Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fachübergreifendes Wissen wurde gefördert</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprachliche Fähigkeiten wurden gefördert</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellektuelle Fähigkeiten wurden gefördert</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamfähigkeit wurde gefördet</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbeitstechnische Fähigkeiten wurden gefördert</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planungsfähigkeit wurde gefördet</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allgemeinbildung wurde gefördet</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomie und Selbstständigkeit wurde gefördet</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problemlösefähigkeit</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kritikfähigkeit wurde gefördet</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soziales verantwortungsbewusstsein wurde gefördert</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of It/ tot</td>
<td>It/rot=0.70</td>
<td>It/rot=0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach α coefficient</td>
<td>α = 0.93</td>
<td>α = 0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor Validation, Principal Component and Alpha Factoring Methods, KMO=0.945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Scores</th>
<th>Principal Component Analysis (58%)</th>
<th>Alpha Factoring (54%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intellektuelle Fähigkeiten wurden gefördert</td>
<td>0,82</td>
<td>0,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Arbeitstechnische Fähigkeiten wurden gefördert</td>
<td>0,80</td>
<td>0,77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Planungsfähigkeit wurde gefördert</td>
<td>0,79</td>
<td>0,77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sprachliche Fähigkeiten wurden gefördert</td>
<td>0,78</td>
<td>0,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teamfähigkeit wurde gefördet</td>
<td>0,78</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Soziales verantwortungsbewusstsein wurde gefördert</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>0,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kritikfähigkeit wurde gefördert</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>0,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Problemlösefähigkeit</td>
<td>0,76</td>
<td>0,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Allgemeinbildung wurde gefördet</td>
<td>0,74</td>
<td>0,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Autonomie und Selbstständigkeit wurde gefördet</td>
<td>0,70</td>
<td>0,66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fachübergreifendes Wissen wurde gefördet</td>
<td>0,66</td>
<td>0,62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Psycho-emotional conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary indicators</th>
<th>lt/tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am satisfied with my life</td>
<td>,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My life seems to me meaningful</td>
<td>,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For me is simple to concentrate and undertake everyday activities</td>
<td>,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel safe in everyday life</td>
<td>,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am enough bouncy, vibrant</td>
<td>,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am satisfied with my physical appearance</td>
<td>,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I sleep well</td>
<td>,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am able to perform your everyday activities, goals</td>
<td>,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am satisfied with me</td>
<td>,664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach $\alpha = 0.817$
### Common Quality of life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary indicators</th>
<th>It/tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Your Quality of Life</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your Health</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your Professional abilities</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your Personal Relationship with other People</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Your Sexual Life</td>
<td>0.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Your Friends support, help and assistance</td>
<td>0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Your place of residence and dwelling</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Your possibilities to get health care services</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Your transport possibilities</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Cronbach } \alpha = 0.717\]

### Material conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary indicators</th>
<th>It/tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Your place of residence and accommodation</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your possibilities to get health care services</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your transport possibilities</td>
<td>0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your environment is safe</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You have enough money to satisfy your everyday needs</td>
<td>0.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You have an access to information that is necessary to you in your everyday activities</td>
<td>0.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You have possibilities for different leisure activities</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Your mobility possibilities are good, you could go whenever you want</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Cronbach } \alpha = 0.757\]
Teaching and learning quality and psycho-emotional condition, N=924, ANOVA, df=2, F=40.99, p=0.000.

Quality of life (situational), N=924, ANOVA, df=2, F=38, p=0.000.
Attitudes towards study fees and loans/credits system and social status, N=924

Negative attitudes towards study fees and loans/credits system

Z score

Social status

Males
Females

Vilnius
Vidurys
Apačia
Motivation for higher education: results of the empirical study at Kyiv University

Andrii Gorbachyk
Dean of Sociology Faculty,
National Taras Shevchenko
University of Kyiv, Ukraine
UniDos-VI
Kyiv University monitoring survey of student’s and university’s life

- Population: students of Kyiv University, 17 of faculties and institutes – bachelor’s, specialist’s and master’s programs
- Random sample, 1225 respondents
- Self-completion of the questionnaires
- September-October 2010

Research questions:
- What is the structure of the concept “motivation for high education”?  
- Are there some changes of motivation during the time of education?  
- Does motivation depend of what faculty student study at?  
- Are there some gender differences in motivation?  
- Does motivation depend of social-economic status of student's parents?  
- Does motivation depend of student's own life experience?
What is your purpose of getting higher education?

Higher education is useful for...
Please use the scale from 1 to 7, where 1 – not useful, 7 – very useful

- to get an interesting job
- to have a reliable income
- to get a high social status
- to develop own ideas and thoughts
- to learn more about the chosen specialty
- to get a good academic (classical) education
- to be an educated person in general
- to delay the beginning of adult
- to help another people
- contribute to the development of society
- to get an academic degree
- to leave home town/village
- to keep up with the friends

Components of motivation for getting high education. Result of factor analysis (PC, varimax rotation, 53% of variance).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. 10. contribute to the development of society</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 5. to learn more about the chosen specialty</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 6. to get a good academic (classical) education</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 9. to help another people</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 4. to develop own ideas and thoughts</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 7. to be an educated person in general</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 12. to get an academic degree</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2. to have a reliable income</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1. to get an interesting job</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3. to get a high social status</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 15. to keep up with the friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 14. to leave home town/village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 8. to delay the beginning of adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three components of motivation:

SELF - orientation to self-development and society
CAREER - orientation to wellbeing, income, status
DELAY - orientation to prolongation of youth and delay of contacts with labor market

Mean values of motivation components for two groups of students
- who have plans to specialty in the future (postgraduate education, job related with specialty)
- no such plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SELF</th>
<th>DELAY</th>
<th>CAREER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have plans to use specialty</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No such plans</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Motivation and year of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+4</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+6</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Motivation and faculty types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Types</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic-Humanitarian</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Motivation and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factors, which influenced components of motivation (OLS regression, beta-coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SELF</th>
<th>CAREER</th>
<th>DELAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (woman)</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.079*</td>
<td>-0.094*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents have high education</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty type (soc-econ-human)</td>
<td>0.097*</td>
<td>0.113*</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for education</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live separately from parents</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.230*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of study (3 or 4)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.069*</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of study (5 or 6)</td>
<td>-0.100*</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of work</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.087*</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some conclusions

- Faculty type and year of study are both the most influenced factors for the explanation of the motivation. Students from socio-economic faculties are more motivated for career and at the same time increasing the duration of studying at the University negatively influencing on career orientation (in comparison with newcomer students).
- Gender also positively (woman in comparison with man) influenced career orientation and delay of own labor adult life orientation
- Experience of living separately from parent’s family positively influence on the orientation on the delay of adult life
- It is surprised, that own experience of own work (labor market experience) negatively (!) influence on career orientation

Thank you for attention!
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Basic conceptual argumentation for the defense and development of an elite institutional system of higher education

A) Conservative Approach

1. The support of mechanisms for the reproduction of the top positions in the system of social stratification.
2. Need to ensure quality training for effective further use material and financial capital.
3. Using higher education as a significant mechanism of social selection.
4. Elite professional higher education - the basis of cultural capital, the main factor of life success and career chances.
5. Number of elite universities should not be large, (but their budget would be great to recruit eminent scholars to provide the scientific schools and develop university infrastructure).

B) Liberal-Democratic Approach

1. Elite institutional system of higher education is not completely “closed” system, it is really “open” to all people who want to obtain high-quality knowledge.
2. Elite universities provide opportunities to continue studies at graduate and postgraduate talented bachelors from other non-elite universities.
3. Elite universities - an important factor in changing status position and social mobility.
4. Diploma of elite universities - a guarantee of successful employment at the labor market.
5. An elite university is a real and referential institutional model of higher education; each non-elite university should strive to become an elite, so the number of elite universities should increase.
Higher Education System of Ukraine: main developments 2005-2010

1. Ukraine joined the Bologna Process in 2005. Key developments since then include:
   - approval of an action plan on Quality Assurance in higher education;
   - amendments to the law on HE has been prepared according to Bologna provisions and recommendations;
   - Ukraine has become a governmental member of the European Quality Assurance Register.

2. Current challenges include:
   - introduction of the innovative institutional structure, three-cycle system and joint degrees;
   - establishing programmes for foreign students;
   - aligning university programmes with Bologna structure;
   - development of the national qualifications framework for lifelong learning;
   - creating mechanisms for recognition of prior learning;
   - implementation of the Diploma Supplement in the EU/CoE/UNESCO format;
   - creation of the national QA agency;
   - increasing outward and inward mobility;
   - assuring portability of student grants and loans;
   - provision of equal access to higher education;
   - curriculum reform with a view to the needs of employers;
   - promotion of cultural values and democratic ideals.
3. Ukrainian government’s efforts to establish and develop an **Elite System of Higher Education** through the creation of new institutional networks:
   - the network of “National Universities”;
   - the network of “Research Universities”

*For Ukraine the term since 1991 –to 1999 was the period of intensive and dynamic development of the institutes of higher education. Such intensive development Ukrainian government regarded as an important factor of social control over the youth groups because the mass youth unemployment (till 60%) could become a serious condition of social disorganization. But since 1999 the process of institutional development has been stopped. Moreover, since 2006 the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine had withdrew the state’s license for educational activity from 90 institutes of higher education.*
1. In 2010, the Ukrainian system of higher education organizations involves 862 (906 in 2009) - higher education institutions of I-IV accreditation levels. The total number of students is near 2.7 mln. The network of state’s institutions of Higher Education in Ukraine (479) includes professional colleges (237), academies and universities (242). The sector of municipal or private institutions of HE was also considerably enlarged – to 383 (268 professional colleges; 115 - academies and universities).

2. Professorial-teaching staff (now 12252 professors, 45 300 docents) constantly renews by skilled personnel. But the process of this renovation really determines by another processes of the degradation
   a) of the system of Scientific-Research Institutes (more than 300) and
   b) of the institutional system of National Academy of Science of Ukraine.
The current trends of development of the elite institutional system of Higher Education in Ukraine

The process of commercialization of Higher Education institutional system in Ukraine is the indispensable result of its progressive integration into institutional mechanisms of market economy. But this process produced some contradictions between the sector of state’s institutions of HE and the sector of private institutions of HE. In order to develop the resource basis of the state’s system of HE Ukrainian government decided to select a group of advanced universities by increasing their budget by 15% and create a network of “National universities”. In 2009, the number of such universities reached 120.

First attempt to create an elite system of higher education in Ukraine can not be considered us successful, because not all “National Universities” were able to confirm their elite status. In the 2009 National Ranking of UNESCO “Top Ukraine 200” more than 50% of “National Universities” occupied ranking positions from 100 to 200.
The National Ranking of UNESCO “Top Ukraine 200” - 2009
Evaluation of the integral index of the university*

Source: http://www.zn.ua/3000/3300/66306/

The current trends of development of the elite institutional system of Higher Education in Ukraine

In February 2010, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine adopted a special Decree N163 on the establishment in 2011 of a new elite network - 14 "Research Universities". This Decree provides the following measures:

- increasing the budget of the new Research University by 30%;
- enlargement staff scholars which enable to provide innovating scientific investigations minimum to 300 researchers;
- setting minimum amounts of research funding - 20 million UAH. (2 million Euro);
- the formation of innovative technical parks.

Unfortunately, current economic and financial crisis is a serious obstacle for successful implementation of the Governmental Decree on Research Universities in the next year.
Conclusions

- Organization and development of the HE Elite institutional system in Western Europe is based on the principles of liberal-democratic approach which maintain and protect the values of: “institutional autonomy”, “academic freedom”; “maximization of the talents and capacities of all citizens”.

- Elite system of HE in Ukraine is based on the principles of conservative approach which protect the value of institutional selection. So now in Ukraine really exist two institutional networks of elite HE – 1) the network of the “National Universities”; 2) the network of the “Research Universities”.

- Today the network of the “National Universities” is in crisis state. So current affords of Ukrainian government to develop the new elite network of the “Research Universities” are closely connected with the question – what we have to do with the network of the “National Universities”?
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Beyond Mobility and Transition: Professional Success. Some Glances at the Situation of Austrian Graduates

Helmut Guggenberger
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Content of presentation

- Some information on Austrian graduates
- The Austrian graduate survey ARUFA
  - contribution → empirical evidence / Bologna process etc.
- Some findings from ARUFA
  - mobility
  - transition
  - professional success
- Some conclusions

Austria: completions of studies .1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>2.255</td>
<td>3.069</td>
<td>4.168</td>
<td>5.152</td>
<td>6.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>2.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2.079</td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td>2.219</td>
<td>2.465</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>2.087</td>
<td>2.196</td>
<td>2.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universities of Applied Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>4.419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Universities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: uni: data 2010
Austria: completions of studies .2

**Dia. 1: all degrees**

- Doctorate
- Master
- Bachelor
- Diploma

Austria: completions of studies .3

**Dia. 2: first degree / gender**

- **male**
- **female**

Source: uni: data 2010

Konstanz, 12.11.2010
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Transition rates from Bachelor to Master programmes

Indicators on transition .1

Ministry's statistics

Transfer rates of Bachelor graduates into master programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Guggenberger et al 2010

Indicators on transition .2

Austrian Survey on social conditions of student life (Studierendensozialerhebung 2009; Unger et al 2010)

Spring 2009, 42,000 respondents; special questions for Master students about their self-awareness as Bachelor graduates (n = 2,700):

- from universities 83 %
- from Fachhochschulen 62 %

continue with a Master programme;

Majority of Bachelor graduates are still students.

Source: Unger et al 2010

Recent Austrian graduate survey

- Arbeitssituation von Universitäts- und FachhochschulabsolventInnen
  - acronym: ARUFA
  - coordination: INCHER-Kassel
  - subcontractor: Institut für Soziologie
  - http://www.arufa.at

- The Working Situation of Graduates from Universities and Universities of Applied Sciences
### ARUFA .1

#### Details for the study

"The Working Situation of Graduates from Universities and Universities of Applied Sciences"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracting entity</th>
<th>Federal Ministry of Science and Research (bmwi_f), Vienna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/coordination</td>
<td>INCHER-Kassel (project leader, Harald Schomburg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Department of Sociology at the University of Klagenfurt (Helmut Guggenberger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>01.11.2009 to 31.08.2010 (draft of final report 11/2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Full population survey, internet-based polling, online questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field phase</td>
<td>12/2009 – 02/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>Years of graduation 2003/04 – 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universities of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Konstanz, 12.11.2010
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### ARUFA .2

#### Content of questionnaire

| A | Prior to study - entrance qualification; vocational training; work experience |
| B | Course of studies and degree(s) obtained - start, institution, field, degree of first ... study |
| C | Study decision and study experience - situation in the last year/s of study, choice of university/ Fachhochschule: choice of field/course of study, (mandatory, voluntary) internships, work experience, stays abroad; competences at time of graduation |
| D | Evaluation of study offers and study conditions - descriptions of study, aspects of teaching and learning, offers and conditions, advice and guidance, resources, practice and occupation related elements; contact with institution of degree |
| E | Course of employment - phases of search, phases of occupation etc., working situation, stays abroad, employers; aspects of search for employment; status and conditions of occupation |
| F | Employment at time of survey - characteristics, status and conditions, place and branch, characteristics of enterprise/organisation, innovations in enterprise/organisation, influence of crisis |
| G | Work and competencies required - occupation, professional activity, time required to become an expert; skills and competences required; job satisfaction, professional orientation |
| H | Coherence between study and employment - use of qualifications, fit, level of degree |
| I | Socio-biographical data - gender, age, parents' status, citizenship, marital status, children |
| J | Comments and recommendations - study, changes (institution, study); questionnaire |

Konstanz, 12.11.2010

HG, IFS
ARUFA .3

Definition of target population

- all addresses relevant for target population;
- i.e. all graduates
  - from universities and Fachhochschulen
  - having completed a degree programme / course of study between October 2003 and September 2008

Challenge: gaining valid addresses

- centralized
  - universities’ data network / Datenverbund der Universitäten
- decentralized
  - providers offering FH programmes / Erhalter von Fachhochschulen

ARUFA .4

Selected degrees in the "ARUFA" sample (first degree; details in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bachelor Degree</th>
<th>Diploma Degree Mag./Mag.°</th>
<th>Diploma Degree Dipl.-Ing./Dipl.-Ing.°</th>
<th>Medical doctorate</th>
<th>Teacher education</th>
<th>Study programme to be combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"new" and "traditional"
Stage model of transition (ARUFA et al)

Mobility .1

- **Bologna keyword # 1**
- **Dimensions**
  - domestic mobility / international mobility
  - in cycle (horizontal) / between cycles, after graduation (vertical) mobility
  - mobility regarding subjects; (type of) institution: university – FH – etc.
- **increasing student mobility ?**
  - at present: 1.5 per cent in augmented programmes (bm.w_f^a 2008a)
  - overall downward trend
  - goal AT: 50 per cent of students with experience abroad up to 2020 (bm.w_f^b 2008b; cf. Leuven communiqué 2009)
- **ARUFA data**
  - experience abroad in connection with the degree programme
  - mobility for professional or income purposes after gaining first degree
  - value of experience abroad, of competences connected
  - „working internationally“
## Mobility .2

### Experience abroad during studying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA-FH</th>
<th>BA-Uni</th>
<th>Mag-FH</th>
<th>Mag-Uni</th>
<th>DI-FH</th>
<th>DI-Uni</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay abroad connected to</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 or more (%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term (month, mean)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim (multiple choice; %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- study</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- internship</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- languagecourse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- thesis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

q. C8: Did you absolve a stay abroad connected to your degree programme completed?

## Mobility .3

### Experience abroad after gaining first degree (multiple answers; details in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA-FH</th>
<th>BA-Uni</th>
<th>Mag-FH</th>
<th>Mag-Uni</th>
<th>DI-FH</th>
<th>DI-Uni</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>study outside of Austria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete an internship outside of</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look for work outside of Austria</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have regular employment outside</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spend time working outside of</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria at the employer’s request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

q. E3: Did you ever since your graduation ...
Transition and professional success .1

- professional success – indicators
  - transition types: gainful occupation – vocational training – further study – unemployment / seeking employment – children, family etc.
  - success of the search: length of time spent seeking employment
  - income
  - conditions of employment
    - temporary/permanent
    - part time/full time
  - matching
    - vertical adequacy / fit
    - horizontal adequacy / fit
  - job satisfaction
- cf. Schomburg et al 2010: 139

Transition and professional success .2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First degree</th>
<th>BA-FH</th>
<th>BA-U</th>
<th>Mag-FH</th>
<th>Mag-Uni</th>
<th>DI-FH</th>
<th>DI-Uni</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of job search (month; mean)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time employment – first employment (%)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed for an unlimited period – f.e. (%)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross income per month – f.e. (€, all; mean)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>1,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed for an unlimited period – at time of survey (%)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross income per month – a.t.o.s. (€, all; mean)</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>2,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of qualifications – a.t.o.s. (1+2, %)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical fit (%)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy (1+2, %)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalency (1+2, %)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (1+2, %)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional success .1

- “Employability”: Bologna keyword # 2
- meanings and definitions
  - “fit for labour market”
  - fit to meet challenges of profession
  - “a vague term which might be better named ‘professional relevance’” (Teichler 2010)
- improving employability as a goal
  - how to measure?
  - traditional versus new degree programmes?
- ARUFA data
  - contributions
    - choice of study programme, course of study; choice of institution; attitude to studying
    - retrospective evaluation of degree course: study satisfaction, studying again
  - indicators for „professional success“
    - horizontal and vertical fit
    - job satisfaction, situation meeting expectations
    - etc.

Konstanz, 12.11.2010

Professional success .2

- Universitätsgesetz 2002 (§ 3) - duties of Austrian universities:
  - “3. academic, artistic, pedagogical and critical training for occupations requiring the application of academic knowledge and methods, as well as training in artistic and academic abilities to the highest levels;”
  - 4. the training and career advancement of junior academics and young artists;
  - 5. continuing education, particularly postgraduate training”
  - cf. bm.w_步伐 2009
- Fachhochschul-Studiengesetz (§ 3) - self-concept and goals of FH:
  - 1) Degree courses offered at universities of applied sciences are degree courses at university level, that serve to provide scientifically-based vocational training. The primary goals are:
    - 1. To ensure practical training at university level;
    - 2. to impart the ability to solve the tasks faced by the respective professional field in accordance with current scientific knowledge and with practical requirements;
    - 3. to promote the permeability of the educational system and the professional flexibility of graduates.
  - cf. FHStG 2010

Konstanz, 12.11.2010
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Further analyses

ARUFA data
- differentiations: institution and field of study ...
- offers of degree programmes / courses of study; study conditions
- choice behaviour
  - institution
  - degree programme / course of study
- domestic / international mobility before, during, after studying
- internships, work experience
- competences available / used
- occupations: status, activity ...; innovation ...; self employment
- etc.

choice of comparisons
- former studies
  - CHEERS
  - REFLEX
- recent studies
  - KOAB
    (Kooperationsprojekt Absolventenstudien)
    http://www.uni-kassel.de/incher/absolventen/
  - etc.

Further challenges

Design
- periodical graduate surveys
  - to be established in Austria ?
- improving return rate (weakness of graduate surveys)
  - incentives ?
  - getting valid adresses !
- decentralisation
- more theoretical considerations !
- etc.

Comparison
- comparability
  - core of questionnaire
- „Asking the same question?“
  - indicators
  - wording
  - etc.
Summary .1

- **What about student mobility?**
  - periods abroad for study or training purposes; special university units providing relevant support to students
  - mutual recognition of academic performance (comparability of workload or grades)
  - Practical experience shows there is still room for improvement and – as our data illustrates – study-related periods abroad are still more of an exception than the rule.

- **What about ‘employability’, after the first cycle (Bachelor level)?**
  - On the whole, the Austrian university graduates involved in the ARUFA study appear satisfied with their degree programmes; a few aspects (such as under-developed job-related elements in the degree, or a lack of awareness about course content) appear to justify criticism.
  - Job satisfaction also appears to be very high – however, we are not yet in a position to establish a truly “objective” picture based on a survey of students or graduates.
  - As far as horizontal (use of qualifications) and vertical (adequacy of degree) fit are concerned, no dramatic problems were revealed. To a limited extent bachelor graduates are worse off here, as with regard to other criteria relating to (emerging) professional success.

Summary .2

- **Summary**
  - relatively few differences between “traditional” and “new” degrees; no really big disadvantages for the latter
  - however, clear differences between the types of university
    - may be due to the divergent tasks (greater scientific or basic research orientation at the universities versus a more pronounced practice and application orientation at FH)
    - may also be ascribed to varying conditions (“open admission to higher education”, in part “mass studies” versus “admission”, “university place management”)

- **Conclusions**
  - need for factual and data-based discussion about vocational practicability of academic degrees in general
  - increasing importance of new degrees – no way back
  - continuing heterogeneity: combinations of studying and working, types of degrees completed back-to-back ...
  - ongoing challenges: job-accompanying courses of study, innovative forms of teaching ...
References

Completion Rates as a Performance Indicator: Influencing Factors

Presentation for the FREREF-Workshop 11.-13.11.2010 in Konstanz

Dr. René Kremplkow
iFQ: Institute for Research Information
and Quality Assurance
Germany 53175 Bonn
kremplkow@forschungsinfo.de
www.forschungsinfo.de
Overview

1. Three examples of completion rates as a performance indicator in Performance Based Funding (PBF) systems
2. Initial conditions for high completion rates: “Elite” vs. “Normal” Universities / “Metropolitan” vs. “Regional” Universities
3. Multivariate analyses of input-output relationships for universities in Saxony: “Metropolitan” vs. “Regional” Universities
4. Preliminary Conclusions

1. Completion rates as a performance indicator in Performance Based Funding (PBF)
   - In many state-wide models of PBF, the number of graduates or completion rates are used.
   - With increasing performance budgets stronger effects are expected - intended and unintended (approx. ½ billion € / 20-33% in the budgets)
   - Expected effects are related to the adequacy of indicators (are they valid? reliable?), and also to the perception of the PBF as fair* and just (see Wottawa 2001, Streicher 2005, Krempkow 2007, Liebig 2009)

*For this topic (perception of fairness & justice of performance measurement and Performance Based Funding systems on Higher Education Institutions) a separate article is in print: See the next volume of “QiW”, no. 3/2010 (in German): [http://www.universitaetsverlagweber.de/QiW.html](http://www.universitaetsverlagweber.de/QiW.html)
### Three examples of PBF in the Federated States of Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Baden-Württemberg</th>
<th>North Rhine-Westphalia</th>
<th>Berlin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Other subjects** (state without medicine) | - Research: Uni 35%; FH 20% (Uni of applied science)  
- young academics: 10%; teaching: Uni 55%, FH 50%; number of graduates: 30%; FH 40%;  
- equation: “up to 31%” (shifts in proportion of female alumni, professors, academic staff, graduates). | - Research: Uni 50%; FH 15%;  
- young academics: “success of equation” considered; teaching: Uni 50%; FH 85%; number of graduates;  
- equation: additional 5% by number of alumni (bonus-penalty [malus] system). | - Research: Uni 45%; FH 15%;  
- young academics: see below (equation) (no proportion defined). teaching: Uni 50%, FH 80%; completion rate  
- equation: 5% (proportion of female alumni, professors, …, values >50% capped). |

### Three Examples of Inner-Department PBF in Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freiburg Example</th>
<th>Münster Example</th>
<th>Göttingen Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of PBF of federal state subvention</td>
<td>approx. 12 %</td>
<td>approx. 25 %</td>
<td>approx. 10 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Balance of functions (weight of the functions/ allocated resources out of PBF) according to criteria/indicators | **Research (weight within PBF: 60%); third-party funds and publications**  
Teaching (weight within PBF: 40%); IMPP factor (final grades), load of teaching, evaluation of teaching | **Research (66%): third-party funds and publications**  
Teaching (33%): IMPP factor (final grades), load of teaching, satisfaction of students | **Only Research (100%): third-party funds and publications**  
Teaching (0%): (but planned) |
| Assessment period | Past 3 years | Past 5 years | Past 3 years |

Data: Krempkow (2010); Brähler (2009); Table: Krempkow.
Different opinions: comparable Initial Conditions?

- “It is only fair to compare universities that are truly similar from the view of their goals, their profiles, and their structures.”
  (Gero Federkeil, Centre for University Development (CHE), for the advancement of the EU concept of a global university ranking)

- “It is normal in life that there are not the same initial conditions.”
  (Peter Frankenberg, Minister of Education and Science of Baden-Württemberg)

=> Question: (How) is it possible to compare initial conditions in order to measure competition between universities?

2. Initial Conditions for Completion Rates: Model

[Diagram showing the relationship between Strategic Goals, Input, Research, Results, and Effects, with support processes indicated]

Study Quality
Completion Rates
Follow-up/ Governance

管理 Wolff 2010, according to Nickel 2007, Teichler 2003
Overview

Initial Conditions in the field of study and teaching
- Frequently cited:
  - "Study Skills", mostly measured by university entrance scores (Abitur-Noten)
  - Parallel discussions about diversity / social dimension of study:
    - Background aspects: educational background, gender, migratory background
    - Special life circumstances: e.g. parenthood, pregnancy, long-term care of family members, frequency of gainful employment

⇒ Diversity along with "study skills" will also be classified at the level of study as a partial aspect of various initial conditions (German Council of Science and Humanities [WR] 2008:78; Krempkow 2009:51, 2010)

State of Information
- Often implicit expectation of similar initial conditions within the same kind of higher education institutions; or expectation of the insignificance of differences.

Question: To what extent are these expectations true?

⇒ 1st Goal: Analyze the similarities of initial conditions according to the results of the INCHER-KOAB study and the Saxon University Report

Data Bases

(1) INCHER- Cooperation Project in Graduate Surveys ("Kooperationsprojekt Absolventenstudien - KOAB")
- Survey year 2008, n=34,000 graduates, response rate ~50%
- For design see Schomburg (2008); for methods: Heidemann et al. (2009)
- Data from table section A: "Fundamental Analysis for Advancement through the Excellence Initiative" (Grundauswertung nach Förderung durch Exzellenzinitiative) see Heidemann (2010); also for a university see Krempkow 2010)

(2) Saxon University Report
- Survey year 2006, n=10,000 students; response rate 54%
- This is according to the level of study and covers different initial conditions for a similar cohort of graduation. See for details: Lenz et al. (2006), Krempkow et al. (2008, 2010),
- Detailed methodology: Krempkow (2008)
(1) **Nationwide Initial Conditions**

**Example: “Elite” vs. “Normal” Universities**

**Problems:** So far, there is barely any nationwide data that allows an analysis of the level of different universities / departments (accordingly, recent data from CHE, HIS[1], INCHER (expected) is not available as SUF.)

- Currently only aggregated data from the INCHER-KOAB table section is usable. So only differences between the groups of “elite” and “normal” universities are testable (as per the 3rd line of the federal Excellence Initiative, funded vs. fully not funded)

- **Differences within the groups of “elite” vs. “normal” universities are currently not testable. Only an exemplary “elite” university is analysable. However, this is also one of the six winners of the funding foundation’s competition “Excellence in Teaching” and is thus a fitting case to consider not only its basic conditions, but also its teaching.**

**Conclusion:** Nationwide only a descriptive overview of differences is available

A causal interpretation of interdependencies based on this data is not possible!

**Desired:** multivariate analysis of nationwide graduate surveys in the future

---

[1] Names of the participating universities in the HIS-SUF were withheld in order to preserve their anonymity.

Institut für Forschungsinformation und Qualitätssicherung, www.forschungsinfo.de

René Krempkow
11/2010

---

(1) **Excellence Initiative:**

“Elite” Unis (with promoted future strategy): in KOAB included
(1) Initial Conditions: Examples of “Elite” vs. “Normal” Unis.

Question: Are initial conditions for German universities similar? (here: for teaching performance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background (external conditions/input):</th>
<th>“Elite” Unis (n~7,000)</th>
<th>“Normal” Unis (n~8,000)</th>
<th>Difference „Elite“ to “Normal“</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational background (non-academic fathers, in %)</td>
<td>41 (+/-6)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender affiliation (female, in %)</td>
<td>57 (+/-5)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration background (students who finished their school education in other countries, in %)</td>
<td>4 (+/-2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special life circumstances (external conditions/input):

| Parenthood (children in household, in %) | 9 (+/-3) | 3 | 12 | 4 |
| Gainful employment as reason to extend study time (scale 1=highly important; 5=no value; 1+2 in %; [stat. mean]) | 30 [4.4 (+/-2)] | 30 | 38 | 8 |
| Familial reasons for extending study time (pregnancy, children, care of family member: scale 1=highly important; 5=no value 1+2 in %; [stat. mean]) | [4.5] | 38 | 38 | 8 |

“Study skills” (external conditions/input):

| University entrance scores (Abiturnote) (mean) | 1.9 (+/-0.6) | 2.1 | 2.4 | 0.3 |

(2) “Output” of “Elite” vs. “Normal” Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study prospective / Study results (output):</th>
<th>“Elite”-Unis (n~7,000)</th>
<th>“Normal” Unis (n~8,000)</th>
<th>Difference “Elite” to “Normal”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time frame: duration of study (average semester)</td>
<td>11 (+/-3)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed degree in study period (in %)</td>
<td>39 (+/-5)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance perspective: entrance scores (stat. mean)</td>
<td>1.85 (+/-0.06)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion rate (in %; data: University of Freiburg/official statistic)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

=> “Elite” University of Freiburg has a significantly higher completion rate than “normal” universities.
### (2) Initial Conditions in the Federated States of Germany: Saxony Example

**Question:** Are Initial Conditions for Saxon Universities similar? (here: teaching performance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=3,000)</td>
<td>(n=2,000)</td>
<td>(CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender affiliation (female, in %)</td>
<td>47 (+/-2)</td>
<td>56 (+/-2)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Background (students who finished their school education in other countries, in %)</td>
<td>51 (+/-2)</td>
<td>42 (+/-3)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Circumstances: Parenthood (% with children)</td>
<td>3 (+/-1)</td>
<td>2 (+/-1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of financial conditions in the study period (higher need for frequent gainful employment (scale: from 0=not at all to 6=strong; value 5+6, in % [mean])</td>
<td>30; [3.0] (+/-1)</td>
<td>32; [3.2] (+/-1)</td>
<td>2; [0.2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of gainfully employed (average &gt;10h per week, in %) and duration per week [in h, mean]</td>
<td>10; [3.1] (+/-2)</td>
<td>14; [3.9] (+/-2)</td>
<td>4; [0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of part-time students (self-assessed, in %); duration of student activities per week [in h, mean]</td>
<td>32; [3.2] (+/-2)</td>
<td>33; [3.5] (+/-2)</td>
<td>1; [0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Study Skills”: university entrance scores (Abiturnote) (mean)</td>
<td>2.1 (+/-0.5)</td>
<td>2.4 (+/-0.5)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: Dr. René Krempkow 11/2010**

- Averages weighted by number of on campus students in 2005. Confidence interval in parenthesis. The CI is at 95% for the alpha (type I) level of error.
- Can also be classified as “international” (cf. Lenz et al 2006). Therefore, no clear positive or negative assessment is possible.
(2) Output in the Federated States of Germany: Saxony Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study results (Output, data: official statistic):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time frame</strong>: duration of study (average semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of students in prescribed period of study (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance perspective</strong>: uni. entrance scores (stat. mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate (analogous to the OECD calculation method, in %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ “Metropolitan” universities have a somewhat higher completion rate than “regional” universities.

⇒ But a correlation with initial conditions cannot be simply supposed. Rather, empirical documentation through multivariate analysis must be provided.

The assessment of student’s final grades is difficult, because the method of awarding grades can also vary greatly depending on location (WR 2003, 2007).

3. Multivariate Analysis of Input-Output Contexts for Universities in Saxony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple linear regression with data from Krempkow (2008) and online survey Saxson University Report (only Universities, standardised Beta coefficients)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of included courses of study: n=92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan- vs. Regional universities (1/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture of Disciplines</strong>: Engineering+Science vs. Humanities+Social Sciences (1/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year students (1. semester, 6. Previous year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational background (% of fathers with uni. degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni entrance score (stat. mean of online survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of women (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students finished their school in other countries (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study conditions (scale:100=positive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries (scale: 100=positive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement of competence (scale: 100=positive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction (scale:100=positive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institut für Forschungsinformation und Qualitätssicherung

Data: Krempkow 2008, Lenz et al 2006
Tabelle: René Krempkow 11/2010
4. Preliminary Conclusions

For the results of INCHER-KOAB and Saxon University Report

- For current PBF systems initial conditions appear more favourable for *metropolitan* universities than for "regional" universities.
- Similar for "elite" universities it is a probably relation: initial conditions and output more favourable than for "normal" universities.
- You should pay attention to a possible false conclusion: This was not an effect of the Excellence Initiative! (See the data base! Maybe differences are more observable through the Excellence Initiative.)

Implications:

- If similar results arise: "Elite" universities and their teaching capacities are better positioned to compete for resources by state PBF (not only in Research, also in Teaching*). And: For "regional" universities and universities with other bases of students it is hardly possible to achieve above-average completion rates

=> Further development of PBF: Initial conditions are to be systematically taken into account (see also references in WR 2008)

Ausführlichere Informationen/ Links:

Education and Work:
Employability?

„If you think wrong, you can act right only accidentally“
According to the critical theory of action, we act on the basis of our orientations, given the case that we have available the required competences, skills, knowledge and own the power to overcome possible social or natural obstacles.

Orientations are values, beliefs, prejudices or opinions on the one hand.

Those orientations are learned from the beginning of our existence without a chance to critically reflect them.

Primary socialisation is more or less nothing other than adaptation to all circumstances that are already established prior to our birth.
Most significant in this process of adapting orientations is the **mother tongue**. When learning a language, we unconsciously incorporate into our thinking all the special meanings and feelings that underlie every word.

On the other hand, orientations are based on our **own experiences**, considerations, investigations or enquiries. Pre-condition to owning these kinds of orientations is to become *self-conscious* during the development of one’s own personality.
Some of the most important words with regard to the most important areas of current societal life are in general: work, economy and money

With regard to studies: education, university and employability.

“Work” has many meanings: e.g. work as product, as a programme, as a process.

It is more adequate to understand work as the most important activity in order to secure and to improve the societal conditions of life.

But:

Currently, the meaning of work is reduced to paid work.
The word “economy” is of classical Greek origin. It is a combination of “οἶκος” (oikos) – household – and “νόμος” (nomos) – law.

Thus, economy is the necessity to act adequately with limited resources.

But:

Today the predominant understanding of economy is to think in terms of business and money.

“Moneyism” as a religious belief system became more and more the basic orientation of activities.

The function of money is, with no doubt, to enhance the exchange of products and services as commodities of markets.

Money in this understanding is nothing other than an abstract medium – a symbol for a promise of the issuer of money to deliver commodities and, correspondingly, a symbol for the owner of money to have the claim to receive the commodities.

But:

Many people see money as an end in itself – or even more unenlightened – as an actor:

“Money rules the world.”

“Money never sleeps.”

“The power of money.”
In a social-scientific understanding with regard to human beings, education is an interconnected process of stimulus and response.

Stimulus from the outside of the individual, from society and nature.

Response of the individual with the effects of learning and becoming a personality.

This process is ongoing from birth (or even prior to birth) until dementia or death, intended or unintended.

In a broad understanding, education also means the personal given state of the educational process regarding knowledge, skills and feelings of the individual.

The entirety of all kinds of educational stimuli and respective responses can be called the education system of which the school system is an important part.
But:

The most predominant understanding of education is currently “schooling”, neglecting the fact that schooling is only a transitive or active stimulus of education. Schooling as education can only be successful if there is a response from the individual. Response is understood as at least a minimum of awareness.

But:

Public understanding of education is normative, generally based on values like becoming

a responsible citizen,

a useful worker,

an employable graduate.
**University** derives from the Latin word “universitas”; i.e. the community or entirety:

- *universitas magistrorum et scholarium*, the community of teachers and students
- *universitas litterarum*, the entirety of sciences.

**But:**

In the present understanding, the university is an institution of higher schooling with professors as employees and students as clients.

The term “university” is used for all kinds of even very specialised institutions of higher education or even for non-academic organisations.
Community and cooperation at universities were successively replaced by hierarchy and competition.

Knowledge as the object of teaching and learning has become a commodity on the university market.

Money, not science, is the latent but more and more manifest orientation of action inside the university as well as from the outside.

The word “employability” belongs to employ, employment, employer, employee.

- Employability means suitable to be employed.
Employability is one of the essential normative purposes of the so-called Bologna Declaration of the year 1999.

Its underlying “Gesellschaftsbild” (concept or image of society) is that of the disappearing industrial society with many factories, hired labour and thousands of employees.

But:

As a result of increasing productivity, employees are no longer needed in such great numbers. The consequences are growing problems of unemployed people, time-limited employment, precarious jobs, mandatory flexibility and – in general – an uncertain financial future also of graduates.
To one-sided aim solely at employability as the purpose of studies is thoughtless and disregards the fact that self-employed people gained and have gained their professional bases at universities. Besides this tradition, many universities have established chairs for teaching entrepreneurship: Graduates should become ready to create their own business.

Conclusions

To reduce the full meaning of socially most important concepts like
- work, economy, money and
- education, university, employability
to only single aspects can hardly contribute to securing and improvement of societal conditions essential for life. If activities are guided by insufficient orientations, the outcomes must be inconsistent or even contradicted.
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The study area

A broader survey on higher education
France
April-June 2009
Rhône-Alpes Region
About 10 500 questionnaires to students of the third year of higher education (last year of Bachelors’)
1464 answers

Main groups of formations and abbreviations:

Universities (U) (1368 students)
Selective colleges “grandes écoles” (S) (96 students)

Literature and language (Lit.-Lang)
Mathematics and sciences
Human and social sciences (HSS)
Engineering
Law
Economics
Mathematics and sciences (Math.-Sc.)
The question of justice

- Inequalities are not always unfair when they are to the benefit of the most disadvantaged people (Rawls)
- People are more prone to judge impartially when they have not yet an established position in life (the veil of ignorance)
- In the process of educating the equality of opportunity is at stake
- Students are those people who soon will have in charge the reshaping of the society

⇒ Is higher education just through the eyes of the interested people?
⇒ What are student’s conceptions of social justice?

Main points of the presentation

1. Is higher education as students live it seems just?
   - Studying conditions
   - Do students master their life or studies?
2. What could be a fairer society, a fairer education system according to the students?
3. Do some of them suffer or benefit from inequalities and does it interfere with their success in studies?
   ⇒ For each point: some answer by students categories when relevant

4. Track to go further

   ! Analyse is not achieved. Here is only a stage
1. Is higher education as students live it seems just?
   – Is the way teaching is offered in higher education could be interpreted as a lack of equality? When we ask students on the teaching qualities we notice differences according to disciplines or institutions and also gender oriented answers (Table 1)
   – When we ask students about teachers’ behaviours, we must unfortunately conclude that part of them are not seen as just. Students in Law and Economics are more sensitive or more exposed to the inequalities of treatment (Table 2)
   – Do students feel responsible for their achievement? If they do, do society have to compensate for inequalities? Aren’t they then the reflect of liberty of choice and action? (Table 3)

Table 1 - Differences in the evaluation of teaching quality
Answers to the question: « In your formation you are offered … »
(Choose a proposal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of answers (even missing ones, for the first two columns)</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Selective colleges</th>
<th>Populations with specific positions (with significant difference)</th>
<th>% of effective answers</th>
<th>Comparisons Men/ Women (with significant difference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The same teaching quality for every student</td>
<td>76,4</td>
<td>63,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M: 71 &lt; W: 79 (sign. &lt; 0,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U &gt; E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sign. = 0,002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fulfilling teaching for every student</td>
<td>14,8</td>
<td>18,8</td>
<td>Eng-U : 24,1 (sign. = 0,03) HSS : 18,9 (sign. = 0,007)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M: 19 &gt; W: 15 (sign. = 0,008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U &lt; E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sign. = 0,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A better quality teaching for best students</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td>Law : 11,9 (sign. = 0,018)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M: 10 &gt; W: 6 (sign. = 0,004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U &lt; E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sign. = 0,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A better quality teaching for weakest students</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Compeyron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2 - Equality of treatment. How students comment teachers’ behaviour?
Answer to the question : « In my formation … »

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of answers (even missing answers : from 1,4 to 2,8%)</th>
<th>« Agree »</th>
<th>Desagree »</th>
<th>Specific positions (with significant difference)</th>
<th>Comparisons men / women (with significant difference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Selective colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers behave with me in justice</td>
<td>88,2</td>
<td>10,3</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers respect every students</td>
<td>77,2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks received by students are right</td>
<td>70,7</td>
<td>26,6</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers better treat :

- *best students* 41,1 36,5 Law : 56,3% (=0,001) Reste universités : 39,8% =
- *French students than foreigner ones* 7,3 6,2 Ingeneering : 17% (=0,004) Economy : 11,8% (=0,048) Law : 10,3% (=0,023) Rest of universities : 6,2% =
- *women than men* 6,3 19,8 Ingeneering : 24,1% (=0,001) Rest of universities : 5,7% U : M>W (=0,001) S : M>W (=0,005)

Table 3 - Responsible for their results

Answers to the question « In which proportion do you believe be personally responsible for your results ?» (% from 0 to 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your studies</th>
<th>Means Universities</th>
<th>Means Selective colleges</th>
<th>Significant comparisons</th>
<th>Comparisons men / women (with significant difference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80,3</td>
<td>80,8</td>
<td>S : Eng.: 84 &gt; Math-Sc.:76 (sign. = 0,007)</td>
<td>U : M &gt; W : 79 (sign. = 0,015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your personal life</td>
<td>79,3</td>
<td>79,6</td>
<td>U : Math-Sc. &gt; Lit.-Lg. : (sign. = 0,048)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What could be a fairer society, a fairer education system according to the students?

- Students were offered political choices concerning educational purposes. The idea was to compare their choice with types of justice theories: the first proposal is near to the pragmatic position holds by Ministers of education in democratic countries, the second can reflect a position according to the Rawls theory, the third insist on social cohesion, the last one can be compare with the utilitarian approach (Table 4).

- The question of justice is always torn between the wish to an equal treatment and the desire to adapt specific individual difficulties. There is here a consensus to consider that a fair education system leaves nobody aside and ensures success to everyone thanks to particular treatments (Table 5).

- How characterize a society of justice thanks to the students point of view? Mastering knowledge and work to everyone constitute its hard core. Students in Social sciences and Literature and languages more favour the equal distribution of resources while students in law and Economics favour it less (Table 6).

---

**Tables 4 - If I was Ministry of education …**

Answers to the question « *If you were Ministry of education, your goal would be:* » (Only one choice is possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of answers (even missing)</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Selective colleges</th>
<th>Populations with specific positions (with significant difference)</th>
<th>% of effective answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Raise to a maximum the mean level of education and making sure that the basic level of knowledge and ability is acquired.</em></td>
<td>48,1</td>
<td>57,3</td>
<td>Health : 65,2 (sign. =0,002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>U&lt;S sign. = 0,041</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Make certain that pupils, when going out school, have reached the most high minimum level.</em></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Raise to a maximum the mean level of education and shrinking differences.</em></td>
<td>17,7</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td>HSS: 23 (sign. =0,002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>U&gt;S sign. = 0,034</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Raise to a maximum the mean level of education</em></td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5 - Describing a fair education system

Answers to the question « *What is for you a fair education system? It is a system that:* 
From 0 : not at all, to 6 : very strongly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Coefficient of variation</th>
<th>Means University</th>
<th>Means Selective colleges</th>
<th>Populations with specific positions (with significant difference) % of effective answers</th>
<th>Comparisons Men/ Women (with significant difference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mind everyone’s success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t enclose in scolastic norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Take into account every differences (personal, ethnical, cultural …)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardize curricula, courses and methods of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6 - Defining a society of justice

Answers to the question « *According to you, are the following points able to improve justice in society?* ”

From 0 : not at all, to 6 : very strongly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From 0 : not at all, to 6 : very strongly</th>
<th>Means University</th>
<th>Means Selective colleges</th>
<th>Comparisons Men/ Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure the master of basic knowledge to the greater number</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>U : M=W (~0,041)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure a work to everyone</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>U : M=W (~0,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E : M=W (~0,005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure to everyone the same financial resources to study</strong></td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>U : M=W (~0,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedicate more educational resources to students in trouble with their study (pedagogical support, tutorial)</strong></td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>U : M=W (~0,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward those who devote most energy, effort</strong></td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enable to everyone a same success in study</strong></td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>U : M=W (~0,034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give to everyone the same capabilities to manage with life.</strong></td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>U : M=W (~0,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:S (~0,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give to everyone the same resources (rights, liberties, financial resources…) to manage with life.</strong></td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>3,3 (~3)</td>
<td>U : M=W (~0,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:S (~0,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure to all a same work income</strong></td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>U : M=W (~0,014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:S (~0,005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guide best students towards the picked formation</strong></td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>2,7 (~3)</td>
<td>U : M=W (~0,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:S (~0,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To set up a selection to put by the entry to higher education to the « most talented » (competitive examinations or files…)</strong></td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>U : M=W (~0,010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:S (~0,010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Do some of students suffer or benefit from inequalities and does it interfere with their success in studies?

- Some inequalities may have more determinant effects on failure or success in studies. We collected students’ perceptions (Table 7).
- If we look at the answers’ distribution, it is clear that the point on financial resources is seen as fundamental (Table 8).
- Through the same points we asked students if they have suffered from some inequalities that could have influenced their studies’ success. On each point, at least 10% of students answered positively (Table 9). Two groups seems to live more disadvantages: students in Economics and in Social Sciences (Graph 1).
- Distribution of answers about advantages of inequalities shows that nearly every source of inequalities benefits to at least a quarter of students (Table 10). Students in Health seems to be more advantaged (Graph 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7 - Inequalities that entail success or failure in studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answers to the question « According to you which importance have those inequalities between students on success or failure in their studies? »</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inequalities of financial resources</th>
<th>Means University (coefficient of variation)</th>
<th>Means Selective colleges</th>
<th>Populations with specific positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U &gt; S (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>4.6 31%</td>
<td>3.9 42%</td>
<td>U : HSS : 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Math.-Sc. : 4.4 (=0.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inequalities in work abilities acquired at school (method, tools work habits)</th>
<th>Means University (coefficient of variation)</th>
<th>Means Selective colleges</th>
<th>Populations with specific positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U &gt; S (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>4.3 29%</td>
<td>4.4 32%</td>
<td>U : HSS : 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Math.-Sc. : 3.9 (=0.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inequalities linked to cultural family background</th>
<th>Means University (coefficient of variation)</th>
<th>Means Selective colleges</th>
<th>Populations with specific positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U = S (0.01)</td>
<td>4.2 37%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U : HSS : 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Math.-Sc. : 3.9 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Health : 4.2 (=0.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inequalities of talent (natural quality or disability)</th>
<th>Means University (coefficient of variation)</th>
<th>Means Selective colleges</th>
<th>Populations with specific positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U = S (0.01)</td>
<td>3.7 43%</td>
<td>4.1 38%</td>
<td>U : HSS : 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Math.-Sc. : 3.9 (=0.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inequalities linked to familial networks of relationship</th>
<th>Means University (coefficient of variation)</th>
<th>Means Selective colleges</th>
<th>Populations with specific positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U &gt; S (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>3.7 46%</td>
<td>3.1 56%</td>
<td>U : Math.-Sc. : 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Eco. : 3.3 (=0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Law. : 4.2 (=0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; HSS : 3.9 (=0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Lit.-Lg. : 3.7 (=0.032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U : Health : 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Eco. : 3.4 (=0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Law. : 4.2 (=0.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inequalities linked to relatives’ professional activities</th>
<th>Means University (coefficient of variation)</th>
<th>Means Selective colleges</th>
<th>Populations with specific positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U = S (0.041)</td>
<td>3.4 52%</td>
<td>3.1 64%</td>
<td>U : Math.-Sc. : 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; SHS : 3.4 (=0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Law. : 3.6 (=0.008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inequalities linked to the parents’ academic tracks</th>
<th>Means University (coefficient of variation)</th>
<th>Means Selective colleges</th>
<th>Populations with specific positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U = S (0.041)</td>
<td>3.2 A. Compeyron</td>
<td>3.2 57%</td>
<td>U : Math.-Sc. : 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; SHS-SH : 3.4 (=0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Law. : 3.4 (=0.028)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 - Inequalities weight on studies 'success Answers' distribution (all the students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>D9</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>D9</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>D9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial resources</th>
<th>Acquired abilities</th>
<th>Family culture</th>
<th>Talent</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Parents' professions</th>
<th>Parents' studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 0% to 4,9% of the students</td>
<td>Di : i(^{th}) decile (10-quantile)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 0% to 9,9% of the students</td>
<td>Qi : i(^{th}) quartile (4-quantile)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 10% to 19,9% of the students</td>
<td>ME : Median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 20% to 29,9% of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 30% to 39,9% of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 9 - Weight of inequalities' disadvantages experienced by students on their studies 'success Answers' distribution (all the students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>D9</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>D9</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>D9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D9</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>D9</td>
<td>D9</td>
<td>D9</td>
<td>D9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>D9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial resources</th>
<th>Acquired abilities</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Family culture</th>
<th>Parents' professions</th>
<th>Talent</th>
<th>Parents' studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 0% to 4,9% of the students</td>
<td>Di : i(^{th}) decile (10-quantile)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 0% to 9,9% of the students</td>
<td>Qi : i(^{th}) quartile (4-quantile)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 10% to 19,9% of the students</td>
<td>ME : Median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 20% to 29,9% of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 30% to 39,9% of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 40% to 49,9% of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer given by 50% to 55% of the students</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 1 - To which extend do you think to have been victim in your studies to some of those inequalities? From 0: not victim at all, to 6 : very strongly victim.

Graph 2 - To which extend do you think you have been favoured in your studies by some of those inequalities? From 0 : not at all favoured to 6 : very strongly favoured.
4. A link between inequalities’ benefits or disadvantages and the socio-economic background

- Less High level managerial workers amongst fathers of students in Economics and Social Sciences than in other disciplines. Students in Health appears more socially favoured (Graph 3).

- We can compare it to what should be ‘normal’ according to the fathers’ occupation of young people in the 1999 census (Graph 4). The most disadvantaged are not in higher education.

- We tried to build an aggregate indicator of advantages and disadvantages as felt by students by summing up the difference between the two scores for each type of inequalities (Graph 5 & 6). It gives a global index that holds significant relation with the variable ‘percentage of fathers high level managerial workers’ (Graph 7).

### Main socio-occupational categories and subcategories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers (self employed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, retailers and entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Craft workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retailers and related professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head of a company with 10 or more employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level managerial workers</td>
<td>Self employed professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial occupations in Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary- and higher-education teachers, scientists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professions of information, arts and entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative and sales / marketing managers in the business sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineers and technical managers in the business sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate level professions</td>
<td>Primary-school teachers and related professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate professions in the healthcare and social work sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clergy and religious professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate administrative professions in government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate administrative and sales/ marketing professions in the business sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foremen / women and supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower service professions</td>
<td>Civilian employees and service workers in Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police and armed forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative employees in the business sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales / marketing employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workers providing direct domestic services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>Skilled industrial workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled craft workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled workers in the handling, warehouse and transportation sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unskilled industrial workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unskilled farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm labourers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Portions of advantaged or desadvantaged socio professional categories of fathers with regard to studies

Portions of advantaged or disadvantaged socio professional categories of mothers with regard to studies
Graph 5 - Inequalities to the benefit or to the disadvantage of students in Economics

Graph 6 - Inequalities to the advantage or to the disadvantage of students in Health

Graph 7 - Net advantages global indicator linked to the percentage of fathers high level managerial workers

\[ Y = 0.0448 \times X - 0.9585 \]
\[ (t=7.0) \quad (t=-3.49) \]
\[ R^2 = 0.8756 \]
\[ F = 49 \]
To conclude (for the moment)

• Felt advantages and disadvantages linked to effective difficulties
• Part of inequalities in studies strongly linked to socio-economic inequalities
• What means to avoid inequalities that entail difficulties in studies?
• To which extend educational answer can be sufficient?
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The survey …

• … was financed by CRUS (federation of Swiss universities), was conducted by OVE (Observatory of the student life, University of Geneva) with support of CRUS and UNES (national federation of students associations)
• … aimed to know students concerns and difficulties in the Bologna system (survey conducted in 2008, after all Swiss universities had already entered in Bologna process)
• … was the first global check in order to see what is possible and/or necessary to adjust
• … investigated the assessments by students about their own studies conditions -> subjective assessment

Design: Some hopes and some fears

• Universities (CRUS) expressed some hopes about the Bologna reform…
• Students (UNES, OVE surveys) expressed some worries about Bologna reform…

Both gave us material for conceiving our questionnaire.
Some hopes (from CRUS)…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hopes</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scaling of degree courses</td>
<td>ECTS: learning outcomes, courses catalogue, workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- studies focused on students, they know what is expected of themselves, assure that studies are feasible in predicted time, adequacy of workload, opportunities of reorientation…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and transparency</td>
<td>ECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- studies focused on students, provide better information about the expectations, make link between evaluation and learning outcomes…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- publish all important types of information (about degree course, mobility opportunities, progress in the studies)</td>
<td>Courses catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- information about followed degree course</td>
<td>Transcript of records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>ECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- make easier horizontal and vertical mobility, make possible to change of university during studies (without too much obstacles), acknowledgement of acquired skills in other institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social dimension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- make studies more flexible (part-time studies, large range of courses to be chosen, flexible rules for individualized degree courses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outside strictly Bologna reform
- equality of opportunity, students participation, quality insurance, attractiveness of European space of higher studies

Some fears (from Students 2006 – OVE)…

- **Bologna means**
  - More constraints… (more selective, more work, more requirements, more stress, less freedom, and –above all- longer duration of studies)
  - … but less quality (decreasing of teaching quality, threats on teaching independence, less creativity…)
  - « Bologna offers nothing more but requires something more… »
  - A different philosophy (standardization, conformism, studies become a merchandise, fear for the privatization of the university, Bologna=tool of neoliberal capitalism…)
  - Reform conducted without collaboration of the students (students interests are pushed out by political and economical interests…)
  - A “sacrificed generation” : students having begun in old system and having to continue in the new system (uncertainty, organization problems, administrative struggle…)
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Data of our survey:

- Representative sample: 11268 students following their studies in the new system (bachelor or master) in each Swiss university
- 5350 accesses to online questionnaire, 4690 completed
- Responses rates: according to the universities, between 39% and 49%
- Respondents population is also representative (according to structural variables: sex, nationality, university, field of studies...
Some selected results:

- Globally, students are satisfied

Table 1: Responses to the question « What do you think globally about your studies? »

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather satisfied</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather dissatisfied</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(4865)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Percentages of students considering that their studies transmits the following skills
### Table 2: Opinion about ECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ECTS allows to…</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…meet the programs requirements in the “right” time</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…follow easily part of the studies in foreign university</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…evaluate students according to the skills they acquired</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…have freedom and flexibility in the studies</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Opinion about organization problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Don’t agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree course is not diverse enough</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coherence in courses</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses overlapping</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some compulsory courses are useless</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too rigid. Not freedom enough</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of some essential courses</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of exams coordination</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Globally, students are satisfied

This satisfaction is
• about all dimensions and their indicators
• clear (more than the majority)

• The first main conclusion: “The students are satisfied about their studies in the current system.”

But…

• A global satisfaction hides often some specific dissatisfactions
• -> some students categories may have less good assessments
• -> it’s important to know these categories (and to understand how these factors affect the study conditions) if we want to make something against these harmful processes
Variables indicating some variations (factors of students disappointment)

• Three variables selected
  – Field of studies
  – Standards of life
  – Study level (bachelor or master)

The field of studies affects…

• …the global satisfaction concerning the studies
• …the skills considered as transmitted by the studies
• …the perception of how the university takes into account the job expectations
• …the assessment of one ECTS workload
• …the project to continue studies after bachelor
• …the assessment of courses organization
Figure 6: Global assessment of the studies according to fields of studies

Table 4: Percentages of students considering these skills as transmitted by the studies according to field of studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social and human sciences</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Medicine and pharmacology</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Interdisciplinarity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of computer tools</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing abilities</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific method</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working by group</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abilities</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyvalent approach</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual skills</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Expertise</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7: Assessment of one ECTS workload according to field of studies

Table 6: Project to continue studies after bachelor according to field of studies
Variation of social features according to field of studies

- level of parents education
- having a job
- financial dependence towards parents

- Some students are cumulating low social-cultural background, job highly necessary, financial independence
- Some other students are cumulating high social-cultural background, job not necessary, financial dependence (in fact financial protection)

Figure 8: Level of father education according to field of studies

Figure 9: Level of mother education according to field of studies
Assessment of standards of life

Cumulating disabilities:

• Students having more difficult live conditions...
• ...experience also bigger cultural distance to University,
• ...may also less often rely on the financial support of their parents
• ...and are much to be required to have a job
– and furthermore are also more probably to
  • have a less good assessment of their studies
  • want to have more time available for their studies
  • are reluctant to continue their studies after bachelor
  • renounce for economic reasons to a foreign stay (horizontal mobility)
  • regret the studies rigidity or inflexibility
  • think that they will be unable to complete their studies in the right time

Table 8: Standards of life appraisal

Answers to the question: « How do you assess your standards of life? »

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very difficult</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather difficult</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather good</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very good</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 18: Project to continue the studies after bachelor according to standards of life appraisal

Figure 19: Percentages of students explaining their renouncement to a foreign stay for economic reasons according to standards of life appraisal
Study level (Bachelor / Master)

• Two hypothesis:
  – Hyp.1 : the master students are more satisfied (they know better university and are more familiar to it, are better institutionnaly integrated…)
  – Hyp. 2 : the master students are less satisfied (their experience and the problems they met made them more critical)

Table 9: Percentage of students satisfied about their studies according to area and level study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Master</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine et pharmacie</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td><strong>83.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and human sciences</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinarity</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Organization problems according to study level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses catalogue not diversified enough</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree course not cohesive</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules overlapped</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some compulsory courses not useful</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree course too rigid. Not freedom enough</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of important courses</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams coordination problems</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: answer to the question „Is there a difference between workload corresponding to diverse courses you followed?“ according to study level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very big difference</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big difference</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a little difference</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transition between old and new system

• 3 types of students:
  – **Type 1**: they have only known Bologna system
  – **Type 2**: the „shifters“ (they began in the old system and they was integrated to Bologna in course of studies)
  – **Type 3**: they knew only the old system in their entire previous studies and they know only the Bologna system in their current studies

Figure 22: Global evaluation of their studies according to the experience they have of the old and the new system
Transition from the old to the Bologna system

- The type 2 students (shifters) have a less good evaluation than the other ones
- The students of types 1 and 3 have the same evaluation
  - The bad evaluation of the shifters is due to their “shifting” rather than to the specific features of the Bologna system.
  - It’s reassuring while the shifters are appealed to quickly disappear
  - Just a few concern about the accountability towards this “sacrificed generation”

Transition from the old to the Bologna system

- But we have to speak cautiously about this satisfaction…
- If we examine the diverse features of studies organization, we observe the following points:
  - The same evaluation for types 1 and 3: organizational items (assessed positively) and lack of diversity (assessed negatively)
  - The same evaluation for all the students: uselessness of some courses and studies rigidity
  - The same evaluation for types 2 and 3: lack of coherence and lack of important courses
- It seems thus that the current Bologna system is…
  - less diversified
  - less coherent, less consistent
  - more incomplete, containing more gaps
Social Background of Students and international Activities -
some Results of the Student Survey in Germany:

Tino Bargel, AG Hochschulforschung, University of Konstanz

1 Introduction
I must confess, that I have presented my contribution about “Social Background of Students and international Activities” already two times this autumn, even the results are rather new (from our last enquete in winter 2009/10). It was at two conferences of our DAAD (that is the German Institution for international exchange of students, graduates and scientists), at Berlin and Constance that I presented results to discuss social inequality hidden in the exchange programs. This, it seems to me, is an example of our intention, to offer empirical evidence for practical and political discussions - in this case for the central topics of international exchange and of social inequality.

It is interesting, that questions of social inequality in access and in performance of studying did not find any interest at universities or in official politics for a long time. It is one result of the european development in higher education, that this topic become more and more crucial, especially concerning the international exchange and the creation of the European Area of Higher Education than ever before.

The Importance of the social dimension - which is now the official term - has been shown, not least of all, through international mobility and studying abroad. The “social dimension” has been established during the Bologna process. It has been talked about for the first time in the communiqué of Prague in 2001, strengthened by the communiqué of Berlin in 2003, confirmed officially as “essential” in the communiqué of Bergen (2005), further explained, enlarged and described more concretely in the communiqués of London (2007) and Leuven (2009).

Thus the battle against social inequality in study, deriving from the social origin of students, is declared to be an important job when realizing the European Area of Higher Education. I want to present some results, deriving mainly from our student survey, hoping to give some ideas and hints to you as well how to cope practically with social inequality, using the example of going abroad.

2 Definitions of social background
This is indeed not the place here to give a methodical lecture on how to define and measure the social background or origin of students. But it seems to be appropriate to shortly clarify the necessary terms.
The term “social background” of a student tells us something about the social status and the cultural environment of his or her parents. When contrasting working-class children to children with an academic background, a frequent and popular comparison, two different criteria are being used, that of profession (worker) and that of qualification (graduate of higher education). Status of profession and of education are indeed two different criteria. Both are used to classify people with regard to social standing, influence and payment.

Because education, job position and financial income are closely connected, it is obvious to define social classes using an index which integrates all these factors. These index uses points for each factor, and finally leads to the definition of social classes. Mostly three to six classes are build up: mostly from the lower to the middle and upper or higher social class.

We are using the term “educational climbers” (members of a lower class who use education in order to rise to a higher social layer) at the student survey for several reasons, also political ones. For us these students have non-academic parents, a simple but a definition of many consequences.

3 Students with different social origin
3.1 Choice of university and subject
Social origin in itself is already effective when choosing the kind of university - university or university of applied sciences - as well as the subject. When looking at the kind of university the facts are clear: universities stay to be a place where the majority of students (58%) reproduce the status of their parents, who also graduated there.

Universities of applied sciences, however, noticeably are institutions chosen by educational climbers and lateral entrants. --- If you care for some figures deriving from the student survey: At universities there are 42 per cent educational climbers; among the universities of applied sciences things are different: here are 69 per cent of the students educational climbers (according to the definition above.)

With regard to the subjects taken by students we get the following picture: At universities the reproduction rate of university graduates are similar in all subjects mostly ranging from 54 per cent in social science and 63 per cent in engineering; the quota is highest in medicine: 71 per cent. In former years jurisprudence had a reproduction rate above proportion, whereas educational climbers more often chose engineering even at universities.

Among the prospective young engineers an interesting splitting has taken place: children of graduates now keep to themselves at universities more and more, and children of educational climbers are mainly to be found at universities of applied sciences. However we are going to interpret these differences, the fact remains that when choosing universities and subjects students show social differences which are noticeable and persistent with even new ones appearing (as in engineering).

3.2 Indicators, features and conditions
It is possible to go through every single condition for students with regard to subjects or to universities, and to find out about their relation to social background. However, though it is not possible to do so here in detail, but I want to point out some important open or covered conditions, using three examples in doing so.
When beginning their study students' assurances vary whether or not they will be able to cope with it. This is an elementary element of social capital (first example). It differs very much with regard to their social background, its rate has been between 19 and 21 per cent of late years - a remarkable margin. This amount of social security, regarding the entrance to university and the milieu at universities, by the way is very far fetching: it helps to cope with demands and difficulties of a study; it is helpful, and a protection against external disturbances (like fluctuation of the labour market).

The economic situation covers an important area (the second example): the nucleus here is financing of study and social scholarships (BaföG). The social background is very important - as expected - when looking at the way students finance their study: only one out of five students coming from lower classes can fully count on their parents. Contrary to that two out of three students with parents having a university degree can be sure of being financed by them. This is a far better precondition in order to do a study consistently.

It is true that working-class children receive BaföG above proportion: about half of them compared to 15 per cent of higher social classes. But on the other hand this rate had been much higher with about 63 per cent in 1993, it receded to only 41 per cent in 1998, and has gone up again lately without having touched the mark of former times.

Far too many educational climbers therefore have to cope with a large amount of uncertainties and financial straits during their study, just for securing their bare living. Furthermore they more often have the burden, for example, to do a job outside university for their living, parallel to their study and during term. The payment by BaföG partly compensates disadvantages of the lower social classes, but it is not enough by far.

With regard to coping with study educational climbers more often have problems in connection to cultural, academic styles at universities (third example). Life and dealings with each other are more often strange and unusual to them. Subsequently orientation in study and planing of study is more troublesome for them. The unfavourable social climate - for instance the prevailing anonymity - poses more difficulties, especially at universities.

To summarize the findings about the situation of students from lower social classes: they more frequently are troubled whether or not they will be able to do the study successfully, and in the allotted time. This pressure has augmented since the introduction of the Bachelor study. Furthermore educational climbers, especially students of working-class origin, have some more difficulties in communicating with teachers, and in participating in discussions during class. Thus they are less able to show their capacities, and are more reserved to present themselves. This could be a reason why they get less frequently a job as a tutor or as a student assistant at universities.

3.3 Disadvantages - one main factor or a set of factors?
In the face of these different factors, ranging from economic, to social and to cultural dimensions and possibly having all a connection to social class, it is important to put a basic question: Can they be regarded as a fixed set of factors, or are there some main ones, or does every factor occur only singularly?
Our results show us that there is an obvious **axis of social inequality** during study, leading from students' social origin. They are especially determined by economic resources, especially in Baden-Württemberg, compared to Rhone-Alpes (France) or to Catalunya (Spain). But furthermore having social capital is important, and finally elements of cultural capital have some relations to the social background which is noticeable.

All the different factors are closely intermingled with economic, social and cultural elements. This result is very marked. How difficult it is to dissolve social inequality is verified by this result. It shows how important the role of money is in order to take part in social and cultural life, how important financial support and social scholarships (Bafög) are, being certainly a crucial point of discussion.

4 **Study abroad and social background**

It has been the question how to promote and multiply a study abroad. This accounts for the fact that the social dimension in building the European Area of Higher Education has lately got more into focus for a lot of researchers.

4.1 **Strategic value of a study abroad**

More and more, experiences abroad are being valued by students. A study phase abroad is not only deemed important for personal development but for employability as well. This positive view of a study abroad has increased of late years. It has been supported by economy and guidelines of politics.

If this is indeed the case, then the study aboard will be a special example for a lasting social inequality in study. Because how to plan and to carry out a time spent abroad - be it as a study phase, an internship or a language course - vary, depending very much on the social background of students.

4.2 **Amount of information on possibilities to study abroad**

Let's start with the amount of information for students existing about possibilities to do a study abroad. This has considerably and continuously increased since the eighties. Until the beginning of the nineties less than one out of four (22 to 24 per cent) students felt to be sufficiently or well informed. In the meantime this figure has more than doubled: nearly half of them (46 per cent) ascribe this factor to themselves now (2009/10).

Students coming from parents of “low social class” describe themselves to be less well informed, but the gap has lessened since the nineties and can be regarded as to be small now (1 to 6 per cent). But the amount of students who are disinterested from the first, is larger among students coming from a lower social class, and has kept persistently at the same level over the years.

4.3 **Activities and study phase abroad**

Regarding a study phase abroad already accomplished, the student survey offers three quota with reference to social classes: 4 per cent of students coming from the near-illiterate social class, 7 per cent of middle class students, but 11 per cent of students with a parental social background of higher civil servants and freelancers have already been abroad for study.
These differences continue to be quantitative impressive even in the **planning of a study phase abroad**: 15 per cent of students from lower educated social class, but 27 per cent of students coming from the middle group of educational climbers, and even 33 per cent of students with an academic parental background are planning such a study phase in earnest.

Looking at **other activities abroad**, for example internships/work placements or language courses, similar differences with regard to the social background of students occur. They are noticeable throughout, and the according figures have been stable in the last years. In social classes having a higher education activities abroad, including a study phase, are tripled in relation to those of the low educated social class. This is a considerable lead, which has been often proved, especially when measured in absolute figures.

### 4.4 Reasons against a study phase abroad

When examining questions regarding international mobility, it is useful to get to know students’ reasons against a study phase abroad. Are these reasons weighted differently and in accordance with the social background, as it is the case concerning the necessity to work and earn money beside studying?

The biggest difference, to be expected in relation to social background, exists on account of financing the time abroad. It is a noticeable one indeed: 45 per cent of students with parents of lower qualification in contrast to 27 per cent of students with parents coming from an academic world (so not without troubles as well) state that problems of financing weight heavily with them, and prevent them to go abroad. - The parental purse is even more important for the decision to do a study phase abroad than to start a study at all; we may say: economic inequality has an even greater effect here.

Some kind of social difference exists with reference to the knowledge of a foreign language (as a cultural factor) as well: 22 per cent of students coming from a class with a low educational level, in relation to 15 per cent with a high educational level, state that insufficient knowledge of a foreign language is an important reason for them not to go abroad for study. - That is true: Let us take a look at the knowledge of the English language: 34 per cent of German students whose parents have an academic profession think their English is very good, but only 21 per cent of educational risers think so; at universities of applied sciences this figure is even less.

All other criteria amount to a similar level. The difference regarding their fear to loose time when studying abroad, remains rather small (plus 2 to 4 per cent) between students of different social backgrounds. Similarly the factors getting credit points excepted at home and receiving information are not more important to students with a lower educational background than to others - these factors are even rarely mentioned.

### 4.5 “International Offices” as Student’s Service’

I should like to add a positive result here immediately to prevent the impression that social scientists only know how to criticise the efforts of others. It regards the “**Auslandsämter**” more frequently known now as **International Offices**.
First of all it is noticeable that the rush of students calling at the office keeps within clear bounds. Though the frequent feeling at the office itself of having too much work is justified, only one out of ten students calls at the office in order to get information or council. This is not a high rate, it has been even a bit higher in the late nineties. There is a noticeable social difference: a higher social background leads to nearly twice as many calls at that office (lately: 9 per cent coming from a low to 17 per cent coming from a high social layer). Before, that is in 1998, there were clearly more calls, but the difference was the same: 14 to 23 per cent.

Students, regardless of their social background, give a feedback about the work of the International Office which is far, far more positive than negative: 75 per cent, to only 16 per cent of students who are not satisfied. - It is highly possible that as a result of this counselling, as well as of other activities, students are nowadays far better informed about a study abroad than before.

The social background has no influence on how students judge the quality of the received counsel at the International Office: students of the low, middle and high social classes, with regard to the educational level of the parents, they all give positive feedbacks with above 70 per cent. The positive vote is equally high regardless to the social class. One should recommend to students, and especially to those with a lower educational background, to use the offers of the International Office.

5 Conclusions and recommendations
A lot has happened in the past years with regard to the question of students' social background together with a fair and equal treatment at universities. I do not only want to direct the focus on the established “Eurostudent”, project for a permanent surveillance of students' social-economic situation in Europe. But I want to stress the fact as well that the problem itself is more in focus now. It will be important to pick up such new attention and targets in earnest, if the European Area of Higher Education is to fulfil the social and democratic concept of higher education.

Activities and measures with regard to a social balance, with equity and fairness being more in the centre of activities and studies abroad, could be taken on three levels:

First: the importance of internationality and international mobility should not only be stressed verbally on the side of the state, foundations and enterprises, but the financing of it should be more open and transparent: Therefore, one of the main demands of students here are more scholarships for a study abroad.

Secondly two demands are to be made on institutes prior to universities:
1. Social equality in education with regard to the access to universities, including the learning of foreign languages.
2. Far more information about a study abroad should be given to young people before they start to study (for example during the last years at school).
3. The universities themselves, their faculties and service offices should fulfil the following tasks developing the study programs for the Bachelor:
- organisational rulings for study, for example “windows” or “phases” for studying abroad, and giving faculties pattern how to cope with them;
- establish internationality and relation to research as principles of study from the very beginning, not imploring that during the introduction only, but to take it always to heart during class;
- better adaptation of ECTS points to the work and expenses in connection with a study abroad;
- underline the importance of language courses and conversation lectures as additional learning possibilities.

To notice: Social diversification is lowest at universities where a time abroad is part of the course of study, and thus integrated organisationally. The international exchange here is part of the study and is supported.

Finally this should be the basis for a “social main-streaming and monitoring” on the condition that a reduction of social inequality is an important part for the quality of study. In accreditation as well as in evaluation far more weight should be put on this fact. Faculties and universities should have an transparency policy here, giving information about development and success in this field, and accounting for it. - We all should really understand that equity and fairness are important factors for the quality of study.
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