

Social and Economic Conditions of Student Life in Europe

DZHW (Ed.)



EUROSTUDENT VI 2016–2018 | Synopsis of Indicators

DZHW
German Centre for Higher Education Research
and Science Studies

eurostudent.eu

Funded with the support of all participating countries.
Co-funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union and the following bodies.



Federal Ministry
of Education
and Research



Ministry of Education, Culture
and Science of the Netherlands

wbv

Social and Economic Conditions of Student Life in Europe

German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies
(DZHW) (Ed.)

Social and Economic Conditions of Student Life in Europe

EUROSTUDENT VI 2016–2018 | Synopsis of Indicators



eurostudent.eu

Funded with the support of all participating countries.
Co-funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union and the following bodies.



Federal Ministry
of Education
and Research



Ministry of Education, Culture
and Science of the Netherlands

wbv

This publication is available as a free download on wbv-open-access.de.

This publication has been published under the following Creative Commons Licence:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>



Names of goods, company names and brand names used in this publication may be protected by property rights even if these rights have not been explicitly specified. The fact that names of goods, company names and brand names are used in this publication does not entitle to assume that these names can be used freely.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in the maps in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the authors concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city, or area, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Editor

German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW)

Authors

Kristina Hauschildt
Eva Maria Vögtle
Christoph Gwośc

Email: eurostudent@dzhw.eu
Website: <http://www.eurostudent.eu>

Publishing House

W. Bertelsmann Verlag GmbH & Co. KG
P.O. Box 10 06 33, 33506 Bielefeld
Phone: (+49-5 21) 9 11 01-11
Fax: (+49-5 21) 9 11 01-19
E-mail: service@wbv.de
www.wbv.de

Design

Marion Schnepf, www.lokbase.com

© W. Bertelsmann Verlag
GmbH & Co. KG, Bielefeld 2018

Printed in Germany
Order no.: 6001920c
ISBN: 978-3-7639-5913-6 (Print)
DOI: 10.3278/6001920cw

The authors and the publisher have thoroughly checked the accuracy of the information presented in this publication. However, mistakes cannot be ruled out completely. Some information might have changed since print production. The aforementioned parties, therefore, do not assume liability for the accuracy and completeness of the information presented here.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek:
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie.
Detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Project sponsors



This project has been co-funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Federal Ministry
of Education
and Research

This project was commissioned and supported with funds by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, BMBF, grant agreement no. M521500).



Ministry of Education, Culture
and Science of the Netherlands

This project was supported with funds by the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (MinOCW).

Members of the project consortium



German Centre for Higher Education Research
and Science Studies

German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies
(DZHW), Germany

Kristina Hauschildt, Christoph Gwosć, Matthias Liedtke, Eva Maria Vögtle



Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS), Austria

*Martin Unger, Angelika Grabher-Wusche, Georg Fochler, Berta Terzieva,
Iris Schwarzenbacher, Daiga Kuzmane, Clemens Danler*



ResearchNed, The Netherlands
Bas Kurver, Froukje Wartenbergh-Cras



Praxis Centre for Policy Studies (Praxis), Estonia
Hanna-Stella Haaristo



National Commission for Further and Higher Education (NCFHE), Malta
Christine Scholz Fenech, Madonna Maroun



Research and Higher Education Monitoring and Analysis Centre – MOSTA,
Lithuania
Eglė Ozolinčiūtė, Kristina Masevičiūtė, Vaida Šaukeckienė



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Confederation

Federal Department of Home Affairs FDHA
Federal Statistical Office FSO

Federal Statistical Office (FSO), Switzerland

Yassin Boughaba, Sarah Gerhard Ortega, Philipp Fischer

Country abbreviations

In all figures and tables, the following abbreviations are used to refer to the participating countries.

AL	Albania	IT	Italy
AT	Austria	LT	Lithuania
CH	Switzerland	LV	Latvia
CZ	Czech Republic	MT	Malta
DE	Germany	NL	The Netherlands
DK	Denmark	NO	Norway
EE	Estonia	PL	Poland
FI	Finland	PT	Portugal
FR	France	RO	Romania
GE	Georgia	RS	Serbia
HR	Croatia	SE	Sweden
HU	Hungary	SI	Slovenia
IE	Ireland	SK	Slovakia
IS	Iceland	TR	Turkey

Contents

A	Background	9
A1	Foreword	10
A2	Introduction	12
A3	General methodological notes	20
B	Empirical findings and interpretation	25
B1	Characteristics of national student populations	26
B2	Socio-economic background of students	46
B3	Transition into and within higher education	66
B4	Types and modes of study	86
B5	Students' time budget	110
B6	Students' employment	128
B7	Students' resources	146
B8	Students' expenses	174
B9	Housing situation	198
B10	Cross-national student mobility	218
B11	Policy considerations	243
C	Appendix	247
C1	Glossary	248
C2	Methodological notes on figures and tables	255
C3	Metadata	262
C4	References	268
C5	National contributors	280

Background

A

Part A

Chapter A1

Foreword



Photo: M. Ambrasas

From Reykjavik to Tbilisi, from Oslo to Valletta, and all over Europe today we have an opportunity to be acquainted with the latest insights and analyses of study conditions as well as the role of social and economic characteristics of students in European higher education. Through almost two decades of EUROSTUDENT surveys, we have gained a better understanding of our students' social characteristics, economic, and study conditions indicating significant changes in students' composition. Understanding these changes is fundamental to having the ability to ensure accessibility to higher education.

Knowledge, science, and innovation are the engines of progress in a modern society. Socio-economic innovation and high-level research are essential factors in our effort to improve the social and economic situation and quality of life all over Europe. Today we see that the main perspective of Europe's growth and competitiveness in the international space is and should be knowledge, science, and innovation. Accessible education is the cornerstone if we want to continue this path.

EUROSTUDENT combines data on a wide range of topics relevant to students' lives from 28 countries of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). The particular value in EUROSTUDENT lies in its comparative view, which provides a starting point for national and European-level discussions, as well as peer learning. At the same time, the data also show that many, if not most, of the EUROSTUDENT countries face similar challenges: students' background is still often related to their choice of studies, higher education institution (HEI), financial situation, and decision to go abroad during their studies. While the EHEA has been successful in creating an area where students can move relatively freely while gaining qualifications that are recognised to be of the same worth, attention should continue to be paid to the question whether students within a country also have the same chances regarding access to and success in studies which are of the same value.

One year ago, the newly elected Government of the Republic of Lithuania highlighted five areas that require the greatest attention of policymakers. Back then, it was decided that education, health, an efficient public sector, a fast growing economy, and security are our highest priorities. It was highlighted that the state has to assure everyone's equal opportunities to receive quality in education (despite one's ethnical/social background, living area, or age). These priorities also contribute to Bologna Process goals in widening access to HEIs, spreading lifelong learning practices, and encouraging flexibility of study forms.

A similar status most probably is relevant and applicable in many other European countries.

I wish other readers of the report many interesting insights into the lives of students in their own and other countries, and I am confident that a lot can be learned which helps us make higher education across the EHEA more inclusive and accessible. I am looking forward to future rounds of EUROSTUDENT keeping track of new developments.

A blue ink signature of Jurgita Petrauskienė, Minister of Education and Science of Lithuania.

Jurgita Petrauskienė
Minister of Education and Science,
The Republic of Lithuania

Chapter A2

Introduction


Context of the Synopsis: Monitoring the social dimension of higher education and student mobility in Europe

This Synopsis of Indicators presents the findings of the 6th round of the EUROSTUDENT project, to which 28 countries of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) have contributed between 2016 and 2018. It is a compendium of key indicators on the social and economic conditions of students, as well as temporary student mobility, in Europe.

For more than 15 years now, since it was chosen as a central theme for the first time in the Prague Communiqué (2001), the social dimension of higher education (HE) has played an important role in the Bologna Process in the now 48 countries of the EHEA. Strengthening the social dimension of higher education is still a key political goal on the European level. In the Yerevan Communiqué, EHEA ministers reaffirmed their intention to “enhance the social dimension of higher education, improve gender balance and widen opportunities for access and completion, including international mobility, for students from disadvantaged backgrounds” (Yerevan Communiqué, 2015). “Building inclusive and connected higher education systems” is also a priority for action in the European Commission’s Modernisation Agenda for Higher Education (European Commission, 2017, p. 6)

Figure A2.1 ↴

EUROSTUDENT VI topics



By collecting data on the social and economic conditions of students in the EHEA, the EUROSTUDENT project ensures that important indicators on the state of the social dimension in the Bologna countries are available. The EUROSTUDENT topics cover all aspects of student life: access to higher education, studying, living, and working conditions during studies, mobility experiences, as well as students' own assessments of their situation (Figure A2.1). With regard to international student mobility, EUROSTUDENT not only offers insights into students' activities and their recognition by HEIs, but also into obstacles to mobility for students who have not been mobile themselves.

Furthermore, the distinction between different focus groups based on students' socio-economic background, past and current study conditions, and living situation makes it possible to gain a differentiated understanding of the student experience in all its diversity. An overview of the EUROSTUDENT focus groups is given in Box A2.2. As such data are rarely available through other sources, EUROSTUDENT indicators serve an important monitoring function to assess the state of the social dimension in the EHEA. EUROSTUDENT indicators have been used in past Bologna Process Implementation Reports (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012, European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015; Eurostat & HIS, 2009) and will also contribute to the upcoming 2018 report.

The following sections provide some notes on the Synopsis and the EUROSTUDENT data, as well as general information about the EUROSTUDENT project. Detailed methodological information on the EUROSTUDENT survey is provided in >[Chapter A3](#).

Notes on the Synopsis

Concept and structure

Scope

The Synopsis is a compendium of indicators on the social dimension of higher education in the EUROSTUDENT countries. It is designed to adopt a broad, comparative perspective. It mostly presents analyses on an aggregate level.

Reporting infrastructure

The Synopsis is embedded into a reporting infrastructure consisting of several different elements. In the text, references are made to other elements of the reporting infrastructure. This is indicated by an arrow (>[Database](#)).

Additional information

Each chapter concludes with a table appendix providing additional data on topics covered in the chapters. This report includes a glossary (>[Chapter C1](#)), methodological notes on figures (>[Chapter C2](#)), metadata on the national survey and key background data on the higher education systems covered (>[Chapter C3](#)), references (>[Chapter C4](#)) as well as a list of the national contributors to EUROSTUDENT VI (>[Chapter C5](#)).

Glossary

An overview of key terms is provided in >[Chapter C1](#). References to the glossary are made using the following symbol: ☰

Box A2.1**Things to keep in mind when interpreting the EUROSTUDENT data**

- **Watch out for deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** The basis for data comparisons across countries are the EUROSTUDENT conventions. *Inter alia*, they define the standard target group of the national surveys (Box A3.1). Not all countries manage to fully comply with the conventions (Box A3.2). This is indicated in the respective figures, with detailed explanations of the deviations found in chapter >C2. Cases which should only be directly compared to other countries with extreme caution are marked with an asterisk beneath or next to the country abbreviation in figures and tables.
- **Differences not tested for significance:** The analyses presented in the Synopsis are based on aggregate data collected from the national contributors. Micro data are not centrally collected. For this reason, differences between countries cannot be tested for statistical significance.
- **Focus groups not mutually exclusive:** Many indicators further differentiate the figures for all students by so-called focus groups. These are groups of students considered to be particularly relevant (Box A2.2). The focus groups may overlap, for instance, a student can be a Master student, a delayed transition student and 30 years or older at the same time.
- **EUROSTUDENT average refers to unweighted cross-country means:** Unweighted mean and median values of all EUROSTUDENT countries with available data on the respective indicator are used in the charts and text as a first orientation. They should be read with caution because they may conceal differences between countries in terms of the size of the national student and sample populations.
- **Comparisons over time possible only for selected indicators:** For selected indicators, the Synopsis of Indicators undertakes a comparison between EUROSTUDENT V and EUROSTUDENT VI data. However, such comparisons are not possible for all countries as changes in a target group or in a survey question may have taken place despite the EUROSTUDENT conventions having stayed the same. It should be noted that the indicators for a comparison over time have been carefully selected. Not all indicators can be directly compared due to changes in the core questionnaire.

EUROSTUDENT focus groups

The EUROSTUDENT focus groups allow the identification of certain groups of students, based on their socio-demographic characteristics, past and current educational situations, and current living situation, throughout the report (Box A2.2). These are groups of students considered to be particularly relevant.

Downloading EUROSTUDENT data and figures

The present Synopsis of Indicators presents only a selection of EUROSTUDENT data. All data are available online in the EUROSTUDENT database: www.eurostudent.eu/database

Any corrections made to the data after the publication of the Synopsis will be updated in the EUROSTUDENT database.

The data used for the figures in the Synopsis, as well as high-resolution pdf files of the figures, can be directly downloaded by clicking on the download symbol in the top left-hand corner of each figure: 

Box A2.2

Focus groups names and symbols

Name of variable	Values	Further explanation
Socio-demographic characteristics of students		
Age group	◆ < 22 years ◆ 22–24 years ◆ 25–29 years ◆ 30 years and older	–
Educational background	▲ with higher education background ▼ without higher education background	Students are grouped according to the highest educational attainment of at least one of their parents. In EUROSTUDENT, students with higher education background have parents of which at least one has attained a tertiary education degree. In terms of ISCED 2011, this means that at least one of these students' parents has successfully completed a short cycle tertiary degree (level 5), a Bachelor's (level 6) or Master's degree (level 7), or a doctorate (level 8) or their national equivalent. In some countries, these national equivalents may not be considered to be a part of higher education (Box B2.1). Students without higher education background have parents whose highest educational degree is no higher than ISCED 2011 level 4 (post-secondary non-tertiary education).
Impairments	● students with impairments ● students without impairments	This focus group distinguishes between students with and without impairments , regardless of whether the impairments are limiting the students in their studies or activities people usually do. Impairments include physical/chronical diseases, long-standing health problems, functional limitations, mental health problems, sensory, vision or hearing impairments, learning disabilities, and mobility impairments.
Migration background	students without migration background, domestically educated 2 nd generation migrants, domestically educated	EUROSTUDENT categorises students according to their migration background based on their own and their parents' place of birth. In addition, in order to be able to identify international students, EUROSTUDENT considers the place of attainment of the higher education entry qualification, or, in absence of this, the place of first leaving the regular school system (Box B1.1). The focus groups distinguishes the following two groups: Students without migration background, domestically educated are students who were born in the country of survey, as were their parents, and who attended/completed the national school system. 2nd generation migrants, domestically educated are students with at least one parent born abroad, who were born in the country of survey, and who attended/completed the national school system.
Sex	■ male ● female	–
Living conditions		
Dependency on income source	■ dependent on family support ■ dependent on self-earned income ■ dependent on national public student support	A student is considered dependent on an income source if one of the three sources "support from family/partner" (including transfers in kind), "self-earned income" or "public support" provides more than 50% of the student's total income (total income includes transfers in kind). Students with a mixed budget (i.e. no source providing more than 50% of total income) are not assigned to a group.
Financial difficulties	■ with financial difficulties ■ without financial difficulties	This focus group distinguishes between the two groups based on students' self-assessment.
Housing situation	■ living with parents ■ not living with parents	–
Students in paid employment	■ students working in paid job up to 20 hours per week ■ students without paid employment during the semester	The groups are differentiated based on the extent of their regular paid employment during term time, not taking into account employment from time to time during the semester or paid jobs during the holidays.
Study conditions		
Field of study	□ arts and humanities □ engineering, manufacturing & construction	This focus group categorises students based on their field of study (according to ISCED-F2013) as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • education (incl. teacher training) • arts and humanities • social sciences, journalism and information • business, administration and law • natural sciences, mathematics and statistics • information and communication technologies (ICTs) • agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary • health and welfare • services EUROSTUDENT data can be differentiated by all fields of study, but not all fields will be used as focus groups in this report.
Study intensity	● low intensity ● high intensity	This indicator groups students according to their weekly workload in a typical week for study-related activities (taught courses and personal study time). Low intensity students spend between 0 and 20 hours a week on study-related activities. High intensity students spend more than 40 hours a week on study-related activities.

Name of variable	Values	Further explanation
Study conditions		
Type of higher education institution (HEI)	■ university ■ non-university	Types of HEIs are characterised based on national legislation and understanding. If a distinction between types of HEIs exists within a country, institutions classified as universities are typically allowed to award doctoral degrees. Other types of HEIs may include, depending on national legislation, universities of applied sciences, polytechnics, professional HEIs, and similar institutions, which offer higher education programmes covered in the EUROSTUDENT standard target group. These are included in the EUROSTUDENT focus group non-university .
Type of study programme	● Bachelor ● Master	Within the EUROSTUDENT standard target group, which covers all types of higher education study programmes, students currently enrolled in a Bachelor degree programme and students currently enrolled in a Master degree programme are two special focus groups often used throughout the report. All data are also available for short-cycle programmes, short national degrees, long national degrees, and are presented on occasion and are available in the online database.
Study-related background		
Access route	○ standard access route ↑ alternative access route	This focus group categorises students based on their entry qualification into higher education. Students are classified as having used the standard access route if they possess an upper secondary qualification or equivalent obtained in direct relation to leaving school for the first time (e.g. Matura, Abitur, Baccalauréat), either in the country of survey or abroad. The alternative access route has been used by students who either do not possess such a qualification, or obtained it later in life, e.g. via evening classes or adult learning.
Educational origin	★ international students ∅ domestic students	Educational origin of the student is determined based on the origin of the higher education entrance qualification or – in the absence of such a qualification – the place of leaving the school system for the first time. International students are studying in the country of the survey and have left the school system for the first time outside of the country of the survey. That means the status as international student is not related to place of birth, nationality, or citizenship. Domestic students hold a higher education entry qualification from the country of survey or have left the school system for the first time there.
Transition route	■ direct transition ■ delayed transition	This focus group distinguishes between students according to the duration between leaving the school system for the first time and entering higher education. Direct transition students have a delay of no more than 24 months between leaving school and entering higher education. Delayed transition students have entered higher education for the first time more than 24 months after leaving the regular school system for the first time.

All EUROSTUDENT data, as well as this Synopsis of Indicators, including its figures and tables, are available under an Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International Licence ([CC BY-SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)).

About the EUROSTUDENT project

EUROSTUDENT goals


The work of EUROSTUDENT is based on the conviction that cross-country comparisons facilitate learning about strengths and weaknesses or simply idiosyncrasies of national higher education systems and – thereby – help countries to see their own higher education system in a new light. The project therefore strives to fulfil three main functions:

- To provide a broad, policy-relevant cross-country comparison of data on the social dimension of European higher education.
- To support countries in their efforts to use the insights from the international comparison to review and improve the social dimension of higher education in their country.
- To assist in capacity-building in order to establish policy-relevant and robust national monitoring structures for the social dimension of higher education.

With the EUROSTUDENT VI Synopsis of Indicators, the authors hope to contribute to the ongoing process of establishing a European-wide monitoring infrastructure on the social dimension of higher education and to support evidence-based policy on national and European levels.

Fig. A2.2 

The EUROSTUDENT VI network



Project organisation

EUROSTUDENT is a network of researchers as well as data collectors, representatives of national ministries and other stakeholders who have joined forces to examine the social and economic conditions of student life in higher education systems in Europe. The 6th round of the project took place from January 2016 to May 2018.

Responsibilities in EUROSTUDENT

EUROSTUDENT combines a central coordination approach with a strong network of national partners in each participant country. The EUROSTUDENT consortium provides a core questionnaire and extensive instructions for data cleaning and the calculation of indicators. The implementation and analysis of the national student surveys in line with the central conventions lies within the area of responsibility of the contributing countries. Throughout the project, the EUROSTUDENT consortium collaborates closely with the EUROSTUDENT countries to assure a common understanding of and compliance with data conventions. More information on the methodology behind EUROSTUDENT can be found in [Chapter A3](#).

Due to the network aspect of the project, the knowledge of experts from different countries is brought together. This ensures that the design of the project is suitable for international comparative analyses and that country-specific context information is taken into account.

EUROSTUDENT participant countries

EUROSTUDENT VI data cover a large part of the EHEA: The participants reach from Iceland in the north all the way to Turkey in the south and from Portugal in the west to Georgia in the east. EUROSTUDENT VI indicators are based on survey responses of more than 320,000 students.

Figure A2.2 gives an overview of the 28 participating countries in EUROSTUDENT VI. More information on the contributing network members can be found in [Appendix C5](#).

The 6th round of the project was funded with the support of all EUROSTUDENT countries and co-funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union, the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), and the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (MinOCW).

EUROSTUDENT consortium

The EUROSTUDENT network combines a central coordination approach with the principle of shared responsibility. The central coordination is directed by the German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW), which is based in Hanover, Germany. In its function as the central coordinator, DZHW heads the EUROSTUDENT consortium consisting of seven international partners:

- German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW, Germany)
- Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS, Austria)
- ResearchNed (the Netherlands)
- MOSTA Research and Higher Education Monitoring and Analysis Centre (Lithuania)
- Praxis Centre for Policy Studies (Praxis, Estonia)
- the Maltese National Commission for Further and Higher Education (NCFHE, Malta)
- the Swiss Federal Statistical Office (FSO, Switzerland).

EUROSTUDENT steering board

The steering board guides the EUROSTUDENT consortium in the development of a reliable, contextually sensitive and policy relevant comparative study of the social dimension in European higher education. On the basis of the assigned tasks, the steering board makes an active contribution to the middle- and long-term development of the project. The EUROSTUDENT VI steering board was composed of representatives from the European Commission (EC), European Students' Union (ESU), Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG), German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (MinOCW), as well as three country representatives of the fee-paying countries from France (L'Observatoire national de la vie étudiante, OVE), Slovenia (Ministry of Education, Science and Sport) and Sweden (Ministry of Education and Research).

Acknowledgements

Without its network, EUROSTUDENT would not be able to provide robust and comparative data on the social dimension of higher education in Europe. The Central Coordination Team at DZHW would like to thank the involved network partners at ministries and research institutions in the 28 contributing countries ([>Chapter C5](#)) for their invaluable role in conducting the national surveys and their efforts to deliver reliable and accurate data on the EUROSTUDENT indicators. The discussions and comments by the participants at the various EUROSTUDENT conferences and workshops have also been very helpful for gaining insight into the national and international contexts, and we sincerely thank everyone who participated and contributed, especially the participants at the Synopsis Working Group in Hanover. The valuable insights and advice provided by the former and current members of the Steering Board (Mette Moerk Andersen, Odile Ferry, Ksenja Hauptman, Hans Hermsen, Nadia Manzoni, Lea Meister, Frank Petrikowski, Linda Pustina, Åsa Rurling, Caroline Sundberg, and Carole Waldvogel) are deeply appreciated. We would also like to send a very special word of thanks to Jurgita Petrauskienė for framing the Synopsis with her insightful foreword. We would also like to express our gratitude to all our partners in the EUROSTUDENT VI consortium for a very successful collaboration. The ‘chapter buddies’ Angelika Grabher-Wusche, Hanna-Stella Haaristo, Bas Kurver, Kristina Masevičiūtė, Eglė Ozolinčiūtė, Vaida Šaukeckienė, Christine Scholz Fenech, Martin Unger, and Froukje Wartenbergh-Cras provided very helpful advice on the chapters. Last but not least, the authors’ thanks go to the team behind the scenes at DZHW: Matthias Liedtke, Hayastan Avetisyan, Amber Hoots, Jeanette Ihnen, Torben Rauhut, Hendrik Schirmer, and Franziska Sidortschuk, who in the course of the project supported it in a variety of ways.

Chapter A3

General methodological notes

EUROSTUDENT couples a central coordination approach with a strong network of national partners in each participant country ([>Chapter C5](#)). The EUROSTUDENT consortium ([>Chapter A2](#)) provides national contributors with the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire, as well as extensive instructions for conducting the field phase at the national level, data cleaning and weighting, calculation of indicators, and data delivery.

The national research teams are chosen and funded by the participating national ministries. The national research teams are responsible for implementing a national student survey, delivering the data to the EUROSTUDENT VI data team in accordance with EUROSTUDENT conventions, and providing national interpretations of the delivered data. The delivered data are checked in a series of feedback loops for accuracy and comparability and are validated for publication by the national research team.

In the 6th round of the EUROSTUDENT project, the process of data collection and delivery was headed by the consortium partner Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS) in Vienna, Austria.

EUROSTUDENT conventions are the instruments used to ensure the comparability and quality of the data collected. Since the 1st round of EUROSTUDENT, these conventions have been continuously developed further and are the result of productive discussions during several project meetings, intensive seminars, and workshops which were organised by the EUROSTUDENT consortium. They are documented in several handbooks which are provided to all EUROSTUDENT partners as well as the interested public.

EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire

The EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire details the items, responses, and instructions to be used in the national surveys. The questionnaire handbook provides in-depth explanations of the purpose of each question and instructions on adapting it, if necessary, to the national context. EUROSTUDENT employs so-called hashtags (#) to mark instances where the national teams need to go beyond simple translation of the question by making adaptations to the particular national context. For example, “#common language(s)” would, in Germany, mean German, in Switzerland it would be German, French, Italian and Rhaeto-Romanic. This method is used to ensure that the resulting national questionnaires will be understandable and applicable to the students being surveyed in each country. The EUROSTUDENT VI questionnaire handbook is available on the EUROSTUDENT website.

Survey execution

The questionnaire handbook also provides guidelines for the preparation and execution of the survey at the national level. It provides information on the EUROSTUDENT standard target group, sampling guidelines, as well as information on the survey organisation and method. Mandatory preparatory seminars for all national teams additionally provided the opportunity to present and discuss the plans for national implementation with other national teams and the EUROSTUDENT data team.

Box A3.1

The standard target group of EUROSTUDENT VI

The EUROSTUDENT target group includes all students who are – at the time of observation (usually: semester) – enrolled in any national study programme regarded to be higher education in a country. Usually that corresponds to ISCED levels 5, 6, and 7.

This means all students should be included regardless of:

- Nationality – National and foreign students should be included, as long as they are studying for a full degree in the country of observation (and are not only obtaining a limited number of credits, e.g. as an Erasmus student).
- Full-time/part-time status – Full-time, part-time, and/or correspondence students should be included as long as the study programmes the students are enrolled in offer a minimum of physical face-to-face interaction in lectures/classes (not only exams).
- Character of the higher education institution (HEI) or study programme – General as well as professional orientations of HEIs and study programmes should be included, as long as the programmes and institutions are considered to be higher education in the national context.
- Legal character of the HEI – Public and private institutions should be included, as long as private institutions are considered to be a regular part of the higher education system in the national context.

Excluded from the EUROSTUDENT target group are:

- Students on (temporary) leave, i.e. students who have officially or non-officially interrupted their studies at the time of observation for whatever reason.
- Students on credit mobility, short-term mobile students (e.g. Erasmus students), i.e. students who are currently studying in the country of observation (incoming) or who have currently left the country of observation (outgoing) for a short time period (e.g. one or two semesters) with the purpose of gaining only a relatively small number of credits.
- Students in ISCED 8 study programmes (PhD – and doctoral programmes).
- Students in distance learning study programmes which do not offer any physical face-to-face lecture period at all, but are solely based on written/online interaction (apart from exams).
- Students at very specialised HEIs, e.g. military or police academies, or HEIs directly affiliated with one company. This might also include programmes providing training only for public administration.
- Students in programmes classified as ISCED (2011) levels 5 or 6 which are not regarded to be higher education in the national context. This could encompass, for example, further vocational training programmes for Master crafts(wo)men, or upper secondary schools or post-secondary programmes not regarded as higher education.

Box A3.2

Notes on national samples and deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group

Albania: Only full-time students included in sample. This constitutes a deviation from the EUROSTUDENT target group.

Austria: Survey conducted in 2015. The focus group “students with higher education background” presented throughout the report does not include students with parents whose highest degree is at ISCED level 5 (in Austria: Master crafts(wo)men and post-secondary education, parts of vocational upper secondary school) as these degrees are not considered to be higher education in Austria. There are no short cycle programmes in the Austrian HE system.

Switzerland: Short-cycle programmes (post-secondary professional programmes, i.e. ‘höhere Berufsbildung’/‘formation professionnelle supérieure’) are not included in sample because they are not considered to be higher education.

Czech Republic: No short-cycle programmes included in sample as they do not exist or are not considered to be higher education. Part-time students are understood to be students studying during the weekend, etc. Full-time students go to school on a daily basis.

Germany: The German sample does not include students with non-German citizenship holding foreign higher education entry qualifications (“Bildungsausländer”). International students according to EUROSTUDENT conventions are therefore not part of the target group. This constitutes a deviation from the EUROSTUDENT target group. While the German data with regard to parents’ higher education background have been calculated according to EUROSTUDENT conventions, the classification of parents who are Master crafts(wo)men at ISCED level 6, and thus as “with higher education”, is not in line with the national understanding of these degrees as vocational. No short-cycle programmes included in sample as they do not exist or are not considered to be higher education.

Estonia: No short-cycle programmes included in sample as they are not considered to be higher education.

Finland: Short-cycle programmes not included in the sample as they do not exist or are not considered to be higher education. Private universities in Finland offer foreign degrees which can be obtained in Finland and were not included in the sample.

Georgia: No non-universities exist in Georgia. No short-cycle programmes included in sample as they do not exist or are not considered to be higher education.

Croatia: Short-cycle programmes not included in the sample due to the very small size and number of these programmes.

Ireland: No private institutions included in the sample. This constitutes a deviation from the EUROSTUDENT target group.

Iceland: No non-universities exist in Iceland.

Italy: Survey conducted in 2017. No international students are included in the sample. This constitutes a deviation from the EUROSTUDENT target group. Specialised higher education institutions (HEIs) (for arts and interpretation; AFAM – Alta formazione artistica e musicale; SSML – Scuole superiori per mediatori linguistici) are – in line with the EUROSTUDENT conven-

tions – not included in sample, due to the very small size of the sector and the very specialised character. No short-cycle programmes included in sample as they do not exist.

Lithuania: No short-cycle programmes included in sample as they do not exist or are not considered to be higher education.

Latvia: Survey conducted in 2017. Part-time students are not included in the sample. This constitutes a deviation from the EUROSTUDENT target group.

Norway: Short-cycle programmes not included in the sample as they are not considered to be higher education.

Poland: No short-cycle programmes included in sample as they are not considered to be higher education.

Portugal: Survey conducted in 2017.

Romania: Survey conducted in 2017. No non-universities exist in Romania. No short-cycle programmes included in sample as they do not exist or are not considered to be higher education.

Serbia: Survey conducted in 2017. Non-universities not included in sample. This constitutes a deviation from the EUROSTUDENT target group. No short-cycle programmes included in sample as they do not exist or are not considered to be higher education.

Sweden: No non-universities exist in Sweden.

Slovakia: No short-cycle programmes included in sample as they do not exist or are not considered to be higher education.

Turkey: Survey conducted in 2017. Online students are – in line with the EUROSTUDENT conventions – not included in the sample, although these make up a large part of the student population. No non-universities exist in Turkey.

The EUROSTUDENT target group includes all students who, at the time of observation (semester), are enrolled in any national study programme regarded to be higher education in a country. Usually that corresponds to programmes at ISCED levels 5, 6, and 7. Box A3.1 provides further details on the EUROSTUDENT standard target group. Not all countries fully complied with this – deviations from the EUROSTUDENT conventions as well as further notes on national samples are given in Box A3.2.

EUROSTUDENT encourages the use of online surveys. Most national contributors have followed this recommendation, while others have chosen other methods based on the national context (Table A3.1).

Table A3.1

Main survey instruments used by national contributors

	Online survey	Paper and pencil	Telephone interview
Countries	AT, CH, CZ, DE, DK, EE, FI, FR, GE, HR, HU, IE, IS, LT, MT, NL, NO, PL*, PT, RO, RS, SE, SI, SK, TR	AL*, LV*, RS	IT
Total number	25	3	1

* (partially) conducted in classrooms

Data cleaning and analysis

After the data collection, national contributors clean the data and prepare the calculation of national indicators. Detailed cleaning and coding instructions are given for each variable, so that a national dataset adhering to EUROSTUDENT standards is created. SPSS syntax supporting this process is also provided.

EUROSTUDENT recommends weighting the raw data using population data on sex, age, study programme (BA, MA, etc.), type of HEI and field of study. Additional weighting variables are encouraged. [>Chapter C3](#) provides an overview of the implemented weighting schemes at the national level.

The EUROSTUDENT data team supports the national research teams during the data cleaning and delivery process. Furthermore, each national team is required to attend a seminar at which the process is explained in detail and the steps are discussed between the national teams and the EUROSTUDENT data team.

The calculation of the indicators in EUROSTUDENT VI is done using a (semi-)automatic SPSS syntax. The results of these calculations are uploaded into the EUROSTUDENT database, where they are checked and commented on by the national teams. Delivered data were checked by the EUROSTUDENT data team before being validated for publication by the national researchers. Small deviations between the Synopsis of Indicators and the [>Database](#) may occur due to necessary rounding.

Any deviations from the EUROSTUDENT conventions in national questionnaires or calculations are noted beneath each figure/table and explained in more detail in [>Chapter C2](#).

In addition to delivering the necessary indicators, national researchers comment on the data they deliver from a national point of view. This, on the one hand, helps the EUROSTUDENT consortium in interpreting the data, and, on the other, provides orientation to interested researchers and other stakeholders wishing to work with the EUROSTUDENT data themselves. All data provided by the national contributors as well as any commentaries on the data are made available at the end of the project via the EUROSTUDENT database.

Chapter B1

Characteristics of national student populations

B
1

Students' age

At least half of all students are younger than 25 in the large majority of countries. The youngest student populations are found in Albania, France, Georgia, Serbia, and Slovakia. Finland, Iceland, and Sweden have the largest shares of students 30 years old and older, as well as the highest mean ages of all countries.

Gender balance

Female students are the majority almost everywhere, but fields of study show large gender imbalances: Almost everywhere, the lowest shares of female students are found in information and communication technologies (ICTs) subjects, while the most women can be found in the field of education and teacher training.

Students with children

In the large majority of EUROSTUDENT countries, at most 10 % of students have children up to the age of six. The highest shares of parents can be found among students in Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Norway, and Sweden, where between 15 % and 33 % of students have children of any age. Students who are parents tend to be found more often among females, Bachelor students, students having used alternative access routes, and at non-universities.

findings

B
1

Students with migration background

In around 40 % of EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 20 % of students possess a migration background or a foreign higher education qualification. In general, shares of 1st generation migrants tend to be low in comparison to 2nd generation migrants and international students.

Students with impairments

In roughly a third of all EUROSTUDENT countries, 15 % or more of students indicate at least some limitation to their studies by impairments. Physical chronical diseases are either the, or one of the, most often named limitations in most countries. Student satisfaction with the support they receive varies greatly by country; in most countries, students whose impairments are not noticeable are the least satisfied.

Main issues

The Strategy for the Development of the Social Dimension (European Higher Education Area, 2015) underlines the commitment of EHEA ministers to make European higher education reflect the diversity of Europe's populations. Indeed, past developments have shown Europe's student populations to have become increasingly diverse. Orr, Wartenbergh-Cras, & Scholz (2015) have aptly described this phenomenon, which has also been shown in past EUROSTUDENT reports (Hauschmidt, Gwosć, Netz, & Mishra, 2015; Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011), as "the decline of the 'normal' student".

Wolter (2015) notes that diversity in the higher education context has to be understood as a broad concept which can include a variety of characteristics and groups, e.g. gender, age, the educational attainment and socio-economic background of parents, the migration status or international mobility of students, educational biography, students with children, and studying with impairments. The different living situations associated with these socio-demographic variables may influence the way students identify and understand themselves (Brooks, 2017), and can have implications for organising studies, and in turn for dropping out (e.g., Polakow, Robinson, & Ziefert, 2014; Stoessel, Ihme, Barbarino, Fisseler, & Stürmer, 2015).

How are different demographic factors related to students' studies?

Student age

Students' age is often relevant to study-related laws, rules, and regulations. For example, it may affect eligibility for public student support, as well as more general benefits or health insurance. It also serves as an important proxy, as older students often have more responsibilities than younger students (e.g. with regard to family or work), have different backgrounds and experiences, and live in different circumstances. The age profile of the student population varies greatly by country and is therefore important to take into consideration when comparing different countries or regions.

Gender

Although women are the majority among students at higher education institutions (HEIs) in most EU countries, large differences in gender distribution can be found according to subject area (Eurostat Statistics Explained, 2017). Past EUROSTUDENT data also show that women differ from males with regard to their higher education background, with women making up a larger part of these students in three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries (Hauschmidt et al., 2015). Gender is therefore an important background variable.

Student parents

Students with children, in comparison to their childless peers, bear the additional responsibility of caring and possibly providing for their children. Several studies in the UK have identified diverse challenges faced by student parents: time constraints, setting up childcare, issues regarding the organisation of studies, e.g. with regard to timetables or work placements, and additional financial demands (Brooks, 2012, Lyonette, Atfield, Behle, & Gambin, 2015; Marandet & Wainwright, 2010; Moreau, 2016; Moreau & Kerner, 2012). For Austria, Dibiasi, Kulhanek, and Brenner (2015) find that slightly more than half of student parents see difficulties in providing childcare and pursuing their studies. It is plausible to assume that these challenges potentially hold true for students all over Europe, although the extent may vary according to the available support mechanisms.

Migration background

‘Migration background’ in EUROSTUDENT refers to students who, based on their own and their parents’ places of birth, have a history of migration either themselves or in their immediate family. The group of students with migration background may differ from their peers in regard to language, social background, educational aspirations, legal status, or gender composition (Griga, 2013). Study choice, entry, and progress of students with a migration background may be influenced by these factors, with additional individual factors such as ethnicity, as well as system characteristics, adding additional variation. For example, Jackson, Jonsson, and Rudolphi (2012), in an analysis of Swedish and English data, found that educational aspirations in the immigrant community are generally higher than among non-immigrant populations, but that the academic performance varies for the different ethnic groups. Griga and Hadjar (2014) show in their analysis of 10 European systems that a stratified secondary school system lowers migrants’ probability of graduating from higher education, whereas they particularly benefit from alternative access routes to higher education.

While language and legal status in all probability have more relevance to students who migrated themselves, i.e. were born in a country different from the one they are undertaking their studies in, social background, educational aspirations, and cultural gender roles may also influence students who did not migrate themselves but come from a family in which at least one parent was born in a different country. Therefore, the analyses in this chapter focus on these 2nd generation migrant students (Box B1.1).

In recent years, the growing number of migrants seeking refuge in Europe has been a topic of debate in higher education (Heldmark & Lubick, 2017), with the European Commission funding projects to support the integration of migrants and refugees in higher education and research (European Commission, n.d.). The current EUROSTUDENT report is however not able to identify any students based on their possible refugee status¹.

Students with impairments

Enabling access, participation, and completion for students with disabilities in higher education is an objective of European and EHEA policy (European Commission, 2010; European Higher Education Area, 2015). Students with impairments may face various difficulties in pursuing their studies, and these may vary depending on the type and extent of any disability, impairment, long-standing health problem, or functional limitation present. In the past, in-depth studies of impaired students’ experiences in Germany and Austria have found that many students with impairments may have difficulties fulfilling the time and attendance requirements, resulting in delays and interruptions in their studies due to their impairments. Many impaired students also experience financial difficulties (Deutsches Studentenwerk, 2011; Terzieva, Dibiasi, Kulhanek, Zaussinger, & Unger, 2016).

What is the composition of the student populations in EUROSTUDENT countries with regard to the categories above? The chapter presents the data on these demographic characteristics. Data on students’ socio-economic background are presented in [Chapter B2](#).

¹ Additionally, at the point of time of data collection in most EUROSTUDENT countries (spring 2016), only a minority of these students will have already entered higher education in Europe.

Data and interpretation

At least half of all students are younger than 25 in the large majority of countries

EUROSTUDENT countries vary largely concerning the age composition of their student populations. Overall, the majority of students are younger than 25 years in almost all EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure B1.1).


- Exceptions are Iceland, Finland, and Sweden, where more than half of all students are 25 years or older. Accordingly, the mean age in these countries lies over 28 years. Relatively large shares of older students – 30 % or more – can also be found in Norway, Austria, Estonia, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, Hungary, Latvia, Italy, and Turkey.
- Ireland, Malta, the Czech Republic, Portugal, and Croatia each have 28 % of students 25 years old or older.
- In all other countries, the share of students who are at least 25 years old does not exceed 26 %. The lowest shares, and correspondingly the youngest student populations on average, are found in Slovakia, Serbia, France, Albania, and Georgia. Here, at least 80 % of students are below the age of 25. The average age in these countries is between 22 and 23.5 years.

Across all EUROSTUDENT countries, older students, in particular, can be found among certain student groups (Table B1.1, Table B1.2). In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, the average age of students is higher among Master students, students at non-universities, low intensity students, students without higher education background, delayed transition students, and students having accessed higher education through alternative access routes. Students depending on their own self-earned income, pursuing a paid job for more than 20 hours a week, and living away from the parental home are also on average older than their counterparts. Differences in average age between male and female students of up to 3 years are also found

Figure B1.1 ↴

Age profile of students

Share of students in different age groups (in %) and mean age (in years)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, A.1.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 5.0 When were you born?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CH, DE, RO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

in some countries, but there is no clear pattern of one group being older than the other across countries (Table B1.1).

Female students are the majority almost everywhere, and fields of study show large gender imbalances

Female students are the majority in all EUROSTUDENT countries except Germany and Turkey (Table B1.3). Particularly high shares of female students are found in Estonia, Iceland, Lithuania, Norway, and Sweden, where at least 60 % of students are women.

Large differences in the share of women become apparent according to field of study. In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of female students is the lowest or second-to-lowest in ICTs-related study programmes (Table B1.3 and [Database](#)). Focusing only on two fields of study – ICTs and education – the share of female students in ICTs-related study fields is lower than the average share of female students in all fields of study in all EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure B1.2).

- Particularly low shares of females – compared with all fields of studies – are found in ICTs subjects in Italy, Hungary, Lithuania, Georgia, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Switzerland, and Slovenia – here, there are at least 75 % fewer women in ICTs studies than in all subjects.
- The extent of female underrepresentation in ICTs is relatively small in Romania, Denmark, and Serbia, where no more than 27 % fewer women are enrolled in ICTs subjects than in other fields of study.

In contrast, the highest shares of women can be found among students of education and teacher training (in around 60 % of countries) or health and welfare programmes (in a third of countries) (Table B1.3). Only in Germany, Sweden, and Serbia is an altogether different study field more popular among women (services, agriculture, and natural sciences, mathematics and statistics, respectively). In education science and teacher training, however, women make up higher shares of students than in all subjects in all countries except Serbia (Figure B1.2).

- In Italy, Georgia, Malta, Portugal, and Romania, the shares of females are 62 % to 80 % higher in education and teacher training than in all subjects.
- In Lithuania, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Norway, Iceland, Sweden, and Denmark, at most 30 % more females compared to all subjects study education and teacher training.


Of course, taking the reverse perspective and focusing on the male students, the reverse pattern becomes apparent: the highest shares of males are found in ICTs subjects, whereas the share of men in education subjects is low.

When looking at the shares of females in particular groups of students, some cross-country patterns, but also differences between countries become apparent (Table B1.3).

- In over 80 % of countries, at least slightly higher shares of women can be found among  students without higher education background than among  students with higher education background. Exceptions are Austria, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, and Turkey.
- Women tend to be less well represented among those students entering higher education via  alternative access routes (compared to standard access routes) in around three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries; exceptions are France, Latvia, Sweden, as well as Estonia and Switzerland. In the first three countries, more women (at least 4 percentage points) are found among students using alternative access routes than among those having entered higher education with standard access routes. In Estonia and Switzerland, the difference is negligible.

Figure B1.2**Female students in selected fields of study**

Over-/underrepresentation in comparison to average share of female students in respective country (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, A.3. **No data:** AL.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.1 What is your sex?**Note(s):** Values indicate the percentage deviation of the share of women in the respective field of study vs. the total share of female students in the respective country. Example: In Italy, the share of female students in information and communication technologies is 86% lower than the average share of female students in Italy.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** CH, RO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- Women tend to live outside the parental home – in over 80 % of EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of females in these housing forms is at least slightly higher compared to students living with their parents.
- In Austria, Georgia, Portugal, and Turkey, shares of female students are at least 10 percentage points higher among direct transition students than among their counterparts who started higher education within a delay of at least 2 years after leaving the school system for the first time. In contrast, in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Sweden, more females, at least 5 percentage points, can be found among delayed transition students.
- Higher shares of women among Bachelor vs. Master students (a difference of 5 or more percentage points) can be found in Norway, Sweden, and Turkey. The opposite pattern – shares of women in Master's programmes at least 5 percentage points higher than in Bachelor programmes – is evident in Georgia, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, and Slovenia.
- With regard to migration background, shares of females that are at least 5 percentage points higher among 2nd generation migrants (domestically educated) than among domestically educated students without migration background are found in Georgia, Slovakia, and Turkey. In Estonia, Lithuania, and Poland, on the other hand, higher shares of females (at least a difference of 5 percentage points) can be found among the domestically educated, native-born students.

Up to 20 % of students in EUROSTUDENT countries have children up to the age of six

The share of students with children is 10 % or lower in two thirds of EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure B1.3). In general, the older a student population is on average, the higher the share of students with children.

- The highest shares of parents can be found among students in Iceland, Norway, Estonia, Finland, Sweden, and Latvia, where between 15 % and 33 % of students have children. The same countries have the highest shares of parents of young children up to the age of six.
- Less than 5 % of students have children in Serbia, France, and Italy.


Students who are parents tend to be found more often among female students – only in Ireland, Malta, Portugal, Turkey, and Serbia, there are (at least slightly) more fathers than mothers among the students (Table B1.4). In the large majority of countries – and unsurprisingly, taking into account students' age – more student parents are found in Master programmes compared to Bachelor programmes. Students with children are more often found among alternative access students. Their share is 2 to 50 percentage points higher when compared to students who access higher education based on a standard entry qualification or equivalent in almost all countries. Perhaps relatedly, with the exception of Malta and France, at least 4 percentage points more of student parents attend types of HEIs other than universities.

It should be noted that not all students with children necessarily had them during their studies, but may have become parents before (re-)entering higher education (see Régnier-Loilier, 2017, for French analyses on this). In fact, EUROSTUDENT data indicate that studying with children may lead students to pursue their studies differently than their peers: In all countries but two, higher shares of student parents are found among low intensity students than among those

Figure B1.3 

Students with children by age of youngest child and mean age of students

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, A.1, A.12, & A.13.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 5.0 When were you born?, 5.6 Do you have children?, 5.7 How old is your youngest child?


Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Box B1.1**Migration background in EUROSTUDENT**

EUROSTUDENT categorises students according to their migration background based on their own and their parents' place of birth. In this, EUROSTUDENT follows the categorisation applied by Eurostat in the Labour Force Survey ad-hoc module "Migration and labour market". In addition, in order to be able to distinguish international students, EUROSTUDENT considers the place of attainment of the higher education entry qualification, or, in absence of this, the place of first leaving the regular school system. Application of this scheme results in the following categories:


- **Students without migration background, domestically educated:** Students who were born in the country of survey, as were their parents, and who attended/completed the national school system.
- **1st generation migrants, domestically educated:** Students born abroad, who attended/completed the national school system.
- **International students:** Students born abroad, who attended/completed a foreign school system.
- **2nd generation migrants, domestically educated:** Students with at least one parent born abroad, who were born in the country of survey, and who attended/completed the national school system.
- **Other students, domestically educated:** Students born abroad, with parents born in the country of survey, who attended/completed the national school system.



EUROSTUDENT does not collect information about students' reasons for migration, or any information about their official residency status. It is therefore not possible to identify, for example, students seeking or having been granted asylum. Any such students will be counted as international students (if they completed school abroad) or 1st generation migrants (if they completed school in the country of survey).

Figure B1.4 **Migration and education background of students**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, A.4. **No data:** IT, RO; **international students:** DE.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.3 In which country were you and your parents (or those who raised you) born?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** DE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.**In around 40% of EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 20% of students possess a migration background or a foreign higher education qualification**

- In Switzerland, Sweden, Ireland, France, Austria, and Finland, at least 12 % of students entered higher education using a foreign entry qualification, or have left the school system for the first time abroad, making them international students. Low shares of international students can be found in Croatia, Slovakia, Albania, and Poland (Figure B1.4).
- In Switzerland, Sweden, Ireland, Croatia, Denmark, and Germany, 5 % or more of all students were born abroad and possess a national higher education entry qualification, i.e. are 1st generation migrants. In general, these shares tend to be low in comparison to 2nd generation migrants and international students.
- The highest shares of domestically educated, 2nd generation migrants can be found in Switzerland, Sweden, France, Croatia, Serbia, and Latvia. Only few domestically educated, 2nd generation migrants are among the students in Finland, Iceland, Georgia, Turkey, Poland, and Albania.

For many countries, the national comments in the E:VI online >[Database](#) provide information on the main countries of origin of the students with migration background.


How well are migrants represented in the EUROSTUDENT student populations?

- Compared with the general population of approximately the same age (15–29)², the shares of 2nd generation migrant students correspond to the population in Switzerland, Sweden, and Germany (Figure B1.5).
- In France, Latvia, Estonia, Slovenia, Austria, and Finland, the shares of 2nd generation migrant students are lower than in the population. In the remaining countries, the shares of 2nd generation migrants are higher among students than in the general population ages 15–29.

² This comparison offers a first point of reference, as the age composition of the student populations in the EUROSTUDENT countries varies and may not correspond ideally to the LFS age group.

Figure B1.5**2nd generation migrants in EUROSTUDENT and the general population**

Share of persons born in country of survey with at least one parent born abroad (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, A.4, Labour Force Survey (LFS) 2014 [lfs0_14pciti]. **No data:** IT; no LFS data: AL, DK, GE, IE, IS, NL, RO, RS, TR.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.3 In which country were you and your parents (or those who raised you) born?**Note(s):** EUROSTUDENT data refer to higher education student population. LFS data refer to general population aged 15–29. 2nd generation migrants are persons (students) born in the country of survey with at least one parent born abroad.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** DE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.**The share of students with impairments ranges from 7 to 39%**


Across EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students indicating any type of disability, impairment, long-standing health problem, or functional limitation ranges from less than 10 % in France, Georgia, Romania, Albania, and Serbia to more than 25 % in Iceland, the Netherlands, and Sweden (Figure B1.6). However, not all students indicating impairments experience impairment-related limitations to their studies: in roughly a third of all EUROSTUDENT countries, 15 % or more of students indicate at least some limitation (values 1 to 4 on a 5-point scale), in roughly 40 % of countries, this is true for less than 10 % of students (Figure B1.6). Generally, a high correspondence exists with regard to limitations students experience in their studies and in activities people usually do ($r > 0.9$, not shown).

In roughly 40 % of countries, physical chronic diseases are either the, or one of the, most often named limitations (Table B1.5). In around a quarter of countries, other longstanding health problems, functional limitations, etc. constitute (one of the) most frequently named impairments. Mental health problems, as well as sensory impairments, are among the main impairments in a further seven countries. Learning disabilities are among the most frequent impairments in two countries. Mobility impairments are mentioned by up to 3 % of students in all countries, but do not represent the most frequent obstacle type anywhere.


These findings already point towards the fact that not all impairments are visible, and thus known to students' surroundings. In around two thirds of EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, 1 % of all students, at most, indicate an immediately noticeable impairment, and in only two countries – Iceland and Sweden – do more than 5 % of all students indicate that they have an impairment which becomes noticeable after some time ([>Database](#)).

Figure B1.6 **Students limited in their studies due to a health impairment by extent of limitation**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, A.9. **No data:** FI; extent of limitation: TR.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.8 Please indicate if you have a disability, impairment, long-standing health problem or functional limitation, 5.10 [only students who indicated an impairment] Due to your impairment, to what extent are you limited in your studies?**Note(s):** Students responded to question 5.10 on a scale from "1" = severely limited to "5" = not limited at all. Value for TR indicates share of students with limitations without differentiating by extent of limitation.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** AT, CH, DE, FR, NL, SI.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.**Figure B1.7** **Impaired students' assessment of the public and institutional support provided**

Share of students with impairments that are at least somewhat limiting (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, A.10. **No data:** CH, DE, PT, TR.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 5.11 Please think of the limitations you face in your studies due to your impairment: How would you rate the public and institutional support you receive to overcome these limitations?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** AT, IT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Students who indicated experiencing at least some limitation in their studies due to their impairment were asked to rate the public and institutional support they received (Figure B1.7). It should be noted that between 15 % and 59 % of students with impairments that are at least somewhat limiting indicate not needing or wanting any support in all countries but one.

- In Lithuania, the Czech Republic, Poland, Romania, and Serbia, more than 40 % of students with at least somewhat limiting impairments indicate that they do not want or need any institutional or public support.
- The largest shares of impaired students rating the support they receive to be (entirely) sufficient can be found in Albania, the Netherlands, Ireland, and Georgia. More than a quarter of students find the support in these countries to be (entirely) sufficient.
- In Denmark, Italy, Estonia, Malta, Iceland, Austria, Serbia, Slovenia, and Hungary, on the other hand, at least a third of at least somewhat limited students rates the support they receive from the public and institutions to be not sufficient (at all).

Further analyses show that the assessment of the support is related to the severity of limitations: in almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, students with an impairment that is severely limiting are the least satisfied with the support offered. In addition, the noticeability of impairments seems to play a role in the students' assessment of the support provided: in around two thirds of EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, students whose impairments are not noticeable are the least satisfied with the support received ([>Database](#)). In the remaining third of countries, however, this pattern is reversed, with students with immediately noticeable impairments more often rating the support received to be insufficient.

Students with impairments in E:V and E:VI


In the 18 EUROSTUDENT countries with available data for both rounds of EUROSTUDENT, no clear pattern emerges with regard to students with impairments (Figure B1.8).

- In around 45 % of EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students who indicated an impairment that is (severely) limiting [E:VI] or presents a (quite) big obstacle [E:V] to their studies has not changed. This is the case in Ireland, Austria, Slovenia, Norway, Latvia, Croatia, Poland, and Slovakia.
- In three EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with severe limitations has (slightly) decreased. In Lithuania, Estonia, and Serbia, 1 to 2 percentage points fewer students indicate a (severely) limiting impairment.
- Higher shares of students with impairments are registered in almost 40 % of EUROSTUDENT countries. A clear increase can be seen in the Netherlands, where 4 percentage points more students indicated that an impairment (severely) limits their studies. The national research team relates this to new regulations which offer better support for certain types of limitations, so that more students make an effort to receive official recognition for their impairments. In Denmark, Sweden, the Czech Republic, Malta, Hungary, and Romania, between 1 and 2 percentage points more students indicate such impairments in EUROSTUDENT VI compared to EUROSTUDENT V.

Figure B1.8 

Students with impairments in E:V and E:VI

Share of students with impairments that are limiting/an obstacle in their studies (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, A.10, A.13; EUROSTUDENT VI, A.9. **No data:** E:V: AL, CH, IS, IT, PT, TR. E:VI: FI; data not comparable over time: DE, FR, GE.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): E:V 5.7/E:VI 5.8 Please indicate if you have a disability, impairment, long-standing health problem or functional limitation, E:V 5.8 [only students who indicated an impairment] Overall, to what extent are your impairments an obstacle to your studies?, E:VI 5.10 [only students who indicated an impairment] Due to your impairment, to what extent are you limited in your studies?

Note(s): "impairment that is (quite) big obstacle" combines the first two answer categories of a 5-point scale of "big obstacle" to "no obstacle at all". "impairment that is (severely) limiting in studies" combines the first two answer categories of a 5-point scale from "severely limited" to "not limited at all".

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT, CH, NL, SI.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Discussion and policy considerations

As in previous rounds, the EUROSTUDENT data presented in this chapter highlight the diversity of student populations: a ‘typical’ student in country A may be very different from a ‘typical’ student in country B, and two students in the same country may be completely different when it comes to their age, gender, family situation, health, or migration background. Providing conditions in higher education that allow students from all these different groups to access higher education and to thrive there means taking into account the specific challenges students from these groups may face.

At the national level, studies focusing on particular groups of students may provide further insight into the particular needs of students from certain groups, as for example the studies performed on the situation of students with impairments in Austria and Germany (Deutsches Studentenwerk, 2011; Terzieva et al., 2016; Wroblewski, 2017). Understanding the needs of certain students is crucial in order to provide targeted support that is effective in furthering their success.

Although the presented data focus on the different characteristics of students separately, it should be kept in mind that the categories are not mutually exclusive, but intersect (Gross, Gottburgsen, & Phoenix, 2016) – for example, international students may also be parents (Brooks, 2013), and disabled students can come from a low educational background (Weedon, 2017). The challenges inherent in one background factor can thus be worsened, but also alleviated, by another.

Finally, it should not be forgotten that students from diverse backgrounds also contribute different perspectives and experiences to higher education, thus widening and enriching learning and research at HEIs (Smith, 2015). In this way, ensuring that the diversity of the populations is reflected in the student populations in higher education also ensures that the academic discourse reflects societal concerns and life experiences, thus contributing towards the goal of an inclusive system that is open to all backgrounds, and towards “higher education institutions [that] are not ivory towers, but civic-minded learning communities connected to their communities” (European Commission, 2017, p. 6).

Tables

Table B1.1

Age profile of students and mean age by sex, type of higher education institution, and study programme

Share of students (in %) and mean, S.D., and median of age (in years) at time of survey

	< 22 years	22 to 24 years	25 to 29 years	30 years and over	Mean	SD	Median	Mean age					
								Sex		Type of HEI		Study programme	
								Female	Male	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master
AL	65	22	8	5	22.0	4.3	20.7	21.7	22.4	21.9	23.2	21.3	24.2
AT	23	29	28	20	26.7	7.1	24.8	26.1	27.4	26.7	26.9	25.8	28.6
CH	17	38	32	13	25.5	5.7	24.0	25.5	25.5	24.8	26.5	24.5	27.9
CZ	31	41	17	12	25.0	5.9	23.2	25.0	24.9	24.9	26.1	24.4	26.6
DE	27	30	30	12	24.7	5.2	24.0	24.4	24.9	24.7	24.7	23.8	26.8
DK	18	45	25	12	25.4	5.2	24.1	25.5	25.3	25.1	25.9	24.8	27.1
EE	25	30	22	23	26.8	7.1	24.3	27.0	26.5	26.6	27.8	26.1	30.0
FI	18	28	26	28	28.2	8.0	25.5	28.6	27.7	28.3	28.0	26.8	31.1
FR	54	29	12	5	22.8	4.7	21.7	22.7	22.9	23.2	21.9	21.7	25.7
GE	52	36	10	2	22.0	2.8	21.8	21.9	22.1	22.0	n/a	21.5	25.7
HR	37	35	19	9	24.0	4.8	22.9	24.1	23.9	23.6	25.7	23.3	26.4
HU	31	34	17	19	26.1	7.5	23.3	26.3	26.0	25.5	28.6	25.6	29.5
IE	55	17	9	19	25.3	8.8	21.6	25.1	25.5	24.9	25.8	23.5	31.7
IS	12	29	23	35	29.7	8.8	26.3	30.2	28.7	29.7	n/a	27.2	35.5
IT	30	37	25	8	23.8	3.7	23.0	23.7	23.8	23.8	n/a	23.0	26.1
LT	46	31	13	11	24.0	5.6	22.3	24.0	24.0	23.9	24.4	23.6	27.0
LV	33	32	20	15	25.5	6.4	23.5	25.5	25.4	25.0	26.1	23.2	28.2
MT	46	25	14	14	25.0	8.1	22.3	24.6	25.5	25.1	24.7	22.9	28.9
NL	33	44	16	7	23.9	5.8	22.8	23.8	24.0	23.5	24.2	23.5	26.4
NO	22	30	23	25	28.0	9.0	25.0	29.0	27.0	27.0	29.0	25.0	30.0
PL	40	39	12	9	23.9	5.2	22.6	23.8	24.1	23.2	26.5	23.2	26.2
PT	49	23	12	16	24.8	7.7	22.1	24.1	25.7	24.3	25.7	24.1	28.5
RO	51	27	9	13	24.2	6.3	21.8	23.9	24.4	24.2	n/a	23.7	26.8
RS	48	34	14	4	23.0	3.9	22.2	22.9	23.1	23.0	n.d.	22.4	26.6
SE	17	31	26	26	28.6	9.6	25.2	29.1	27.9	28.6	n/a	26.6	29.3
SI	37	37	18	8	24.1	5.0	22.8	24.1	24.1	23.3	26.5	22.9	26.7
SK	53	29	8	10	23.4	5.5	21.8	23.5	23.1	22.4	29.1	22.5	25.3
TR	44	25	19	12	23.8	5.5	22.0	22.1	25.2	23.8	n/a	22.4	30.1
av.	36	32	18	14	25.0	6.2	23.1	24.9	25.0	24.8	26.1	23.9	28.0

n.d.: no data. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, A.1.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 5.0 When were you born?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, DE, RO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B1.2

Students' mean age by study intensity, educational background, transition route, dependency on income source, extent of paid employment, access route, and housing situation

Mean of age (in years)

	Study intensity		Educational background		Transition route		Dependency on income source			Extent of paid employment		Access route		Housing situation	
	Low intensity	High intensity	Without HE background	With HE background	Direct	Delayed	Dependent on family	Dependent on self-earned income	Dependent on public student support	No paid employment during lecture period	Employed during lecture period > 20h/week	Alternative access route	Standard access route	Living with parents	Not living with parents
AL	23.6	21.8	22.1	21.7	22.2	25.8	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	21.5	23.9	22.5	22.0	21.5	22.5
AT	29.3	25.0	27.4	25.5	25.3	32.0	23.6	29.4	27.3	25.2	31.7	32.6	26.1	23.6	27.5
CH	28.0	24.3	26.0	24.9	24.5	31.8	23.9	28.1	25.8	24.2	29.7	28.8	25.0	23.4	27.2
CZ	26.7	23.3	25.7	24.2	23.5	37.4	22.7	27.6	24.4	22.8	29.3	29.3	24.9	23.2	25.8
DE	25.9	24.0	25.5	24.3	23.8	28.1	23.4	26.7	24.4	23.8	28.7	31.4	24.3	22.7	25.2
DK	25.3	25.8	26.0	25.2	24.4	29.6	26.9	26.3	24.9	26.0	28.1	28.6	25.1	22.6	25.7
EE	27.3	26.4	28.5	26.0	25.5	34.8	23.9	29.3	25.2	24.0	29.8	30.3	26.5	24.3	27.6
FI	30.9	27.4	30.5	27.2	26.3	33.4	27.9	31.7	24.7	27.0	33.2	n.d.	n.d.	23.7	28.4
FR	23.1	22.4	23.1	22.6	22.4	27.6	21.9	25.3	22.2	21.9	25.3	32.9	22.7	21.2	23.6
GE	23.0	21.7	21.8	22.1	21.9	24.9	21.7	23.7	22.0	21.5	23.6	23.3	22.0	21.8	22.4
HR	26.2	22.7	24.4	23.5	23.4	32.2	22.6	26.6	22.5	22.6	28.3	29.3	22.8	23.2	24.9
HU	28.3	23.9	27.6	24.9	24.2	35.9	23.2	30.5	22.9	23.0	31.3	35.2	25.8	23.9	27.4
IE	30.0	24.7	27.1	23.9	23.5	38.0	22.1	28.1	24.4	24.5	32.2	31.5	24.7	21.9	27.5
IS	32.2	28.0	32.9	26.8	27.3	36.0	29.6	29.0	28.7	28.8	34.7	33.9	27.9	24.1	31.8
IT	25.9	23.1	24.0	23.3	23.4	28.5	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	23.2	27.3	n.d.	23.8	23.6	24.0
LT	25.0	24.0	24.5	23.6	23.1	33.9	23.1	25.8	23.0	22.4	26.7	33.4	23.8	22.8	24.6
LV	26.5	25.5	26.4	25.0	24.3	31.9	23.8	27.2	22.7	23.7	27.2	28.0	25.3	23.4	26.4
MT	31.5	23.0	26.5	23.4	n.d.	n.d.	22.6	26.5	21.9	23.2	31.5	28.9	22.9	22.5	32.8
NL	25.5	23.2	24.7	23.3	22.9	25.5	22.6	27.4	23.0	23.5	30.3	26.0	23.0	21.8	25.5
NO	32.0	26.0	31.0	27.0	26.0	33.0	28.0	34.0	24.0	26.0	37.0	32.0	27.0	24.0	28.0
PL	24.8	22.5	24.6	22.9	23.0	35.9	22.3	26.0	22.4	22.2	26.1	28.9	23.7	23.2	24.4
PT	29.4	23.3	25.5	23.5	23.4	31.5	23.4	33.0	22.8	22.3	33.1	28.1	23.8	22.7	26.8
RO	26.3	22.4	25.0	23.3	23.1	38.5	22.9	28.4	21.7	21.8	28.4	25.5	24.1	22.6	25.0
RS	23.7	22.6	22.8	23.1	22.6	25.3	22.5	24.3	23.1	22.3	26.7	23.9	23.0	22.8	23.2
SE	32.6	26.5	30.4	27.3	27.1	32.6	26.8	34.2	25.0	26.9	37.8	34.2	28.0	23.1	29.4
SI	26.2	22.9	24.9	23.3	23.4	34.1	22.7	26.3	22.2	22.7	27.2	32.0	23.6	23.0	25.0
SK	24.8	22.0	23.7	22.8	21.8	31.3	21.9	25.9	21.4	21.7	28.3	32.9	23.3	22.4	24.1
TR	24.9	23.6	23.7	24.0	23.0	28.5	22.5	28.5	21.7	22.3	28.6	n.d.	n.d.	23.1	24.1
av.	27.1	24.0	25.9	24.2	23.9	31.8	23.8	28.1	23.6	23.6	29.5	29.7	24.4	22.9	26.1

n.d.: no data.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, A.1. **No data:** Transition route: MT; dependency on income source: AL, IT; (alternative) access route(s): FI, IT, TR.

Eurostudent question(s): 5.0 When were you born?

Deviations from Eurostudent conventions: CH, DE, RO.

Deviations from Eurostudent standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B1.3

Share of female students by type of HEI, study programme, field of study, educational background, transition route, migration background, access route, and housing situation

Share of students (in %)

	Female students	Type of HEI		Study programme		Field of study			Educational background		Transition route		Migration background		Access route		Housing situation	
		University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master	Education	ICTs	Engineering, manufacturing and construction	Health and welfare	Without HE background	With HE background	Direct transition	Delayed transition	2 nd generation migrant, domestically educated	W/o migration background, domestically educated	Alternative access route	Standard access route	Living with parents
AL	59	60	41	56	65	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	64	54	59	t.f.c.	59	58	59	62	56
AT	55	55	56	55	54	72	17	29	65	55	56	56	45	54	54	41	55	57
CH	52	51	54	52	52	71	12	20	71	56	50	52	56	53	52	53	52	53
CZ	58	58	62	57	58	74	18	34	77	61	55	57	64	61	58	50	58	59
DE	48	52	42	47	47	67	17	24	68	49	49	48	50	50	48	41	49	43
DK	56	53	60	57	57	70	43	28	77	56	56	57	54	59	56	48	57	52
EE	60	60	61	60	60	92	31	33	87	64	59	60	61	55	63	61	60	58
FI	53	52	53	53	52	79	18	22	79	55	52	54	52	56	55	n.d.	n.d.	40
FR	53	58	43	59	55	73	26	28	64	55	52	53	57	55	53	60	53	54
GE	53	53	n/a	53	59	96	11	24	60	56	53	54	36	64	54	45	54	53
HR	57	58	55	54	56	85	27	30	78	61	57	59	59	58	59	52	60	64
HU	54	53	58	51	55	79	10	28	75	59	50	53	56	51	54	40	54	52
IE	51	53	48	50	55	74	19	17	67	51	51	52	44	51	50	43	52	48
IS	63	63	n/a	60	71	80	22	42	81	65	62	62	64	61	63	61	64	53
IT	56	56	n/a	54	55	93	8	30	58	58	52	56	52	n.d.	n.d.	56	56	57
LT	60	61	56	59	62	74	12	22	81	64	57	60	57	53	61	56	60	55
LV	58	62	53	55	63	85	24	27	79	62	57	59	55	61	59	67	58	53
MT	53	57	40	54	54	86	15	21	65	55	51	n.d.	n.d.	54	53	54	58	53
NL	52	52	52	51	56	72	11	19	74	52	53	53	46	51	51	48	53	47
NO	61	58	64	61	55	74	21	33	80	65	60	62	55	58	62	55	62	61
PL	59	59	61	56	64	86	13	37	76	61	58	60	54	36	60	57	59	60
PT	53	53	53	54	57	87	24	29	76	54	52	56	42	57	53	44	56	51
RO	54	54	n/a	52	57	97	40	29	64	55	51	55	48	n.d.	n.d.	43	55	56
RS	56	56	n.d.	56	52	51	47	57	64	56	55	56	56	57	55	41	56	53
SE	60	60	n/a	63	53	74	24	38	76	64	58	58	64	62	60	64	60	53
SI	58	61	50	59	64	89	14	25	77	60	57	59	53	62	58	57	58	60
SK	58	58	63	59	56	72	13	21	74	65	49	57	66	64	59	t.f.c.	59	57
TR	45	45	n/a	56	34	65	18	30	60	44	49	49	20	54	45	n.d.	n.d.	52
av.	56	56	54	55	56	78	21	29	72	58	54	56	53	56	56	52	57	53
																		57

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, A.3. **No data:** Field of study: AL; transition route: MT; migration background: IT, RO; (alternative) access route(s): FI, IT, TR. **Too few cases:** Transition route: AL; alternative access route: SK.

Eurostudent question(s): 5.1 What is your sex?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, RO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B1.4

Students with children by sex, type of HEI, study programme, study intensity, extent of financial difficulties, and access route

Share of students (in %)

	Students without children	Students with children	Sex		Type of HEI		Study programme		Study intensity		Extent of financial difficulties		Access route	
			Female	Male	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master	Low intensity (<20h/week)	High intensity (>40h/week)	With financial difficulties	Without financial difficulties	Alternative access route	Standard access route
AL	92	8	9	7	8	13	7	13	15	5	11	8	13	8
AT	91	9	9	8	8	12	8	9	15	4	10	8	25	7
CH	95	5	5	4	3	7	4	7	11	2	6	5	11	4
CZ	91	9	10	7	8	16	9	10	15	3	9	9	28	9
DE	95	5	6	5	5	6	5	7	8	3	8	4	24	4
DK	90	10	11	8	7	14	10	11	10	11	13	8	23	9
EE	80	20	22	16	19	26	19	27	24	17	20	20	34	19
FI	83	17	20	14	13	21	16	21	27	13	21	17	n.d.	n.d.
FR	97	3	3	3	4	1	2	6	3	3	4	2	29	3
GE	93	7	9	5	7	n/a	6	16	12	5	8	6	9	7
HR	95	5	7	3	4	13	5	10	9	2	7	3	18	2
HU	88	12	14	9	10	21	11	18	19	4	14	10	41	11
IE	88	12	12	13	10	15	8	25	26	9	15	10	31	10
IS	67	33	38	26	33	n/a	24	56	35	27	38	28	57	24
IT	99	1	1	1	1	n/a	1	1	4	0.2	3	1	n.d.	1
LT	88	12	13	9	10	15	12	17	13	11	14	10	60	10
LV	85	15	16	13	12	18	7	22	20	14	15	15	26	14
MT	89	11	9	12	11	10	6	17	28	3	12	11	23	5
NL	95	5	5	5	2	6	4	6	9	2	4	5	9	3
NO	79	21	25	14	17	26	12	25	37	11	16	25	37	18
PL	93	7	8	6	4	18	7	11	8	2	9	5	25	7
PT	92	8	7	10	7	11	8	13	18	4	12	7	16	6
RO	91	9	10	7	9	n/a	9	11	12	4	7	9	8	9
RS	97	3	3	4	3	n.d.	2	10	4	1	4	3	7	3
SE	84	16	19	11	16	n/a	11	15	26	10	16	16	36	13
SI	94	6	7	5	3	15	4	9	11	3	8	4	34	4
SK	91	9	11	6	5	31	10	9	18	1	16	6	t.f.c.	9
TR	94	6	3	9	6	n/a	3	18	10	3	9	5	n.d.	n.d.
av.	90	10	11	9	9	15	8	15	16	6	12	9	26	8

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, A.12. **No data:** (Alternative) access route(s): FI, IT, TR. **Too few cases:** Access route: SK.

Eurostudent question(s): 5.6 Do you have children?

Deviations from Eurostudent conventions: AT.

Deviations from Eurostudent standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B1.5

Share of students indicating any type of impairment, disability or other long-standing health problem/functional limitation, and type of impairment

Share of students (in %)

Students indicating any type of impairment, disability, or other long-standing health problem/functional limitation	Physical chronic disease	Mental health problem	Mobility impairment	Sensory impairment (vision or hearing)	Learning disability (ADHD, Dyslexia)	Other long-standing health problem/functional limitation/impairment/etc.
AL 7	2	1	1	2	1	2
AT 14	9	5	1	2	1	8
CH 18	8	5	0.5	1	1	8
CZ 15	3	5	1	2	4	3
DE 23	6	7	2	8	1	4
DK 21	5	6	2	4	4	5
EE 16	6	3	0.5	2	1	6
FI 28	9	9	3	2	4	9
FR 10	2	1	0.4	2	2	3
GE 8	3	1	0.4	3	0.3	2
HR 16	4	2	0.4	5	1	6
HU 15	5	2	1	2	2	6
IE 20	3	8	1	3	5	4
IS 39	9	15	3	8	18	7
IT 14	4	5	1	4	2	3
LT 24	8	3	1	10	0.4	7
LV 15	7	2	1	4	1	4
MT 13	3	5	0.1	2	3	3
NL 36	15	7	3	2	15	13
NO 23	8	7	3	3	5	4
PL 20	7	1	1	7	2	6
PT 24	6	2	1	8	1	6
RO 7	1	0.4	1	2	0.3	3
RS 7	1	1	0.2	3	1	1
SE 27	6	11	1	6	6	5
SI 21	7	5	1	5	3	5
SK 13	3	0.1	1	2	2	7
TR 11	6	3	3	1	2	3
av. 18	6	4	1	4	3	5

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, A.5.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 5.8 Please indicate if you have a disability, impairment, long-standing health problem or functional limitation. [multiple responses possible]

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, FR, NL, SI.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Chapter B2

Socio-economic background of students

B
2

Parents' education

The parents of higher education (HE) students vary greatly with regard to their education across EUROSTUDENT countries. However, students whose fathers did not attain tertiary degrees are underrepresented in all countries.

Students without higher education background

The study and living conditions of students without higher education background differ from that of their peers in many countries. Students without higher education background tend to enter higher education later, study in short or first programmes at non-universities, and rely on paid employment to a greater extent than students with higher education background.

findings

B
2

Financial status of students' parents

Most students come from averagely well-off families. The countries with the highest shares of students with not very or not at all well-off parents are found in Croatia, Germany, Ireland, Romania, and Turkey. In Albania, Sweden and the Netherlands, the highest shares of students indicate their parents to be (very) well-off. Students' assessment of parental financial status is related to the parents' educational attainment.

Study intention and doubts about study choice

Students without higher education background tend to have less clear study intentions and more often doubt their choice to enter higher education. Bachelor students whose parents attained a higher education degree themselves report higher certainty with regard to their study intention than their peers without higher education background in all but one country.

Main issues

Students' parents can have substantial influence not only on their childhood, but also on later stages of education and even later life (Antonucci, 2016; Mazzonna, 2014). This chapter therefore presents data on the educational and economic background of students, with a particular focus on equity-related aspects.

Participative equity

Inclusive higher education, accessible to students of all backgrounds, is a key concern of higher education policy-makers (European Commission, 2017; Marconi, 2015). Past ministerial communiqués in the Bologna Process have stressed the intention for systems to be more inclusive, so that the student body in the countries of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) would reflect the diversity of the population, i.e. that a state of participative equity should be attained in European higher education (Bucharest Communiqué, 2012; Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué, 2009; London Communiqué, 2007; Yerevan Communiqué, 2015). Participative equity is attained when all possible social groups take part in higher education to the same degree (Mühleck & Griga, 2010). Ideal participative equity would have the make-up of the student population be exactly proportional to the make-up of the general population of the same age in all possible characteristics. However, certain groups have been traditionally underrepresented in higher education in many countries. One such group is that of students without higher education background.

Students without higher education background

Students **○** without higher education background, i.e. students whose parents' educational attainment does not exceed upper secondary education, have been the focus of extensive research. Parental education has long been shown to be related to educational attainment (Shavit & Blossfeld, 1993), and more recent studies continue to show that students without recent familial experience in higher education enter higher education to a lesser degree than their peers whose parents hold higher educational degrees in many countries (e.g. Haim & Shavit, 2013). Explanations for this phenomenon have posited that the unfamiliar "habitus" of actors in higher education (teachers, students) and the unknown culture and practices within higher education prevents students without higher education background from developing a feeling of belongingness and integration at their education institutions (Bourdieu, 1984; Holmegard, Madsen, Ulriksen, 2017). Other theories focus more on the background-specific norms, resources and constraints which influence educational and career choices in different ways, even when the academic performance is equal (Becker & Hecken, 2009; Boudon, 1974; Breen & Goldthorpe, 1997; Thompson, 2017).

Even when **○** students without higher education background have successfully entered higher education, other inequalities may persist, as access to higher education is not the only aspect of equity. Salmi & Bassett (2014) distinguish between equity of access, equity of results, and equity of outcomes. Studies in several higher education systems have shown that widened access to higher education often goes along with an increased degree of stratification. Vertical stratification refers to sequential degrees at different levels (e.g. short cycle – Bachelor – Master), while horizontal stratification refers to the differentiation within a higher educational system, e.g. with regard to the type of higher education institutions (HEIs), particular institutions, or field of study, which vary in their selectivity, academic and economic prestige, retention rates, and labour market value (Marconi, 2015; Marginson, 2016; Triventi, 2013). Participation in higher education

may therefore be of different value depending on the particular choices made, and studies have shown that the choices within stratified systems depend on students' socio-economic background (Brown, 2017; Marginson, 2016; Triventi, 2013).

Financial status of students' parents

While income and wealth are two distinct concepts (Skopek, Bucholz, & Blossfeld, 2014), both have been shown to influence the educational attainment across generations in families in different countries (European Commission, 2017; Pfeffer & Hälsten, 2012; Torche & Costa-Ribeiro, 2012; Wightman & Danziger, 2014). A family's income is not only related to prior educational attainment, but also to the possibilities for the acquisition of social and cultural capital and of course directly affects the amount of direct financial support a family is able to offer their children (Wightman & Danziger, 2014). In addition, family wealth may provide "insurance against negative mobility outcomes during the status attainment process" (Pfeffer & Hälsten, 2012, p. 1); i.e. wealth may give students with well-off parents the certainty that there is something to fall back on in case their educational endeavour fails, thus increasing their propensity to make the attempt to gain a higher educational degree.

The EUROSTUDENT data set provides information not only on the educational attainment and financial situation of students' parents, but also enables a look at the study choices and conditions of students without higher education background, as well as a self-assessment of their past and current situation.

The main questions this chapter strives to answer are therefore:

- What is the educational and socio-economic background of students' parents?
- How well represented are the students without higher education background in the EUROSTUDENT countries?
- Who are the students without higher education background, and in which ways do their study conditions differ from those of their peers?
- How do these students assess their past and current study situation?

Methodological and conceptual notes

Students without higher education background

EUROSTUDENT uses the highest educational degree attained by either of students' parents, as reported by the students, to classify students according to their educational background (Box 2.1).

Financial status of students' parents

In the EUROSTUDENT VI survey, an item adapted from the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), which was carried out by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), was used. Students were asked to rate the financial well-being of their parents in comparison to other families using the five categories: (1) not at all well-off, (2) not very well-off, (3) average, (4) somewhat well-off, and (5) very well-off (Caro & Cortes, 2014).

Calculating representation indices

As an indicator for the representation of students from different education backgrounds, the actual shares of students from a certain group are set against the share of students from this group in the general population. The index used in this chapter – as in previous rounds of EURO-

Box B2.1

Parental education background in EUROSTUDENT

ISCED 2011	Notes	Labour Force Survey	EUROSTUDENT focus groups
ISCED 01: Early childhood educational development ISCED 02: Pre-primary education ISCED level 1: Primary education ISCED level 2: Lower secondary education ISCED level 3: Upper secondary education ISCED level 4: Post-secondary non-tertiary education		non-tertiary education ISCED (0–4)	without higher education background
ISCED level 5: Short-cycle tertiary education	Not implemented in all countries. Not considered to be higher education in all countries. May include vocationally oriented programmes typically not considered to be higher education within a country.	tertiary education (ISCED 5–8)	with higher education background
ISCED level 6: Bachelor's or equivalent level	May include vocationally oriented programmes typically not considered to be higher education within a country.		
ISCED level 7: Master's or equivalent level ISCED level 8: Doctoral or equivalent level			

STUDENT (Hauschmidt, Gwosć, Netz, & Mishra, 2015) – is based on characteristics of students' fathers, as population statistics needed in the calculations regarding students' parents as a unit are not available. The index sets the share of students with fathers with a certain education background, e.g. without higher education, against the share of 40–59 year-old men with the same respective educational attainment in the population. This comparison group is chosen to represent the parent generation of students.

If the shares are equal, e.g., if the share of 40–59 year-olds that attended higher education equals that of the fathers of the students who attained a tertiary degree, the index takes on the value of 1. This value indicates perfect participative equity with regard to the group in question. Values above 1 indicate that students with the education background in question are more common than it would be expected based on the population (overrepresentation), values below 1 indicate underrepresentation.

This index makes cross-country comparisons possible, because it takes into account country-specific differences in overall educational attainment. However, it does not take into account the fact that the countries under investigation may be observed at different stages of educational expansion (Blossfeld, P. N., Blossfeld, G. J., & Blossfeld, H.-P., 2015) – the educational opportunities available to the parent generation may, therefore, be more or less similar to the current student generation in the different countries. A further limitation of the index is that it draws only on potential or hypothetical parents, as more fitting data – shares of young people from specific education backgrounds – are not available for most of the EUROSTUDENT countries. The choice of 40–59 year-olds as the parent generation, along with the assumption that adults from all education backgrounds have the same number of children at about the same time in their lives, may not be fully adequate in all countries (see Mühleck, 2013). A further issue not taken into account by the index is the share of international students in the national student populations. This may bias the index, depending on the size and composition of the groups of international students.

International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED)

The EUROSTUDENT project makes use of the 2011 revision of the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) in classifying the educational attainment of students' parents (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2012). ISCED is an instrument for compiling and presenting internationally comparable education statistics. The ISCED classifies educational programmes by assigning them to an ISCED level, which indicates the level of education conveyed by the respective programme. The EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire stipulates that parents' highest educational attainment be classified according to ISCED 2011.

Box B2.1 indicates how ISCED categories were aggregated in the EUROSTUDENT analyses. Detailed information on the exact national qualifications behind each ISCED level can be found in the ISCED mappings: <http://uis.unesco.org/en/ised-mappings>.

The aggregation applied in EUROSTUDENT into "without higher education background" and "with higher education background", based on only two categories, absorbs some of the problems that have been associated with the comparability of ISCED in the past (Schneider, 2009; Ortmanns & Schneider, 2016). Still, the fact that, in the different EUROSTUDENT countries, qualifications at the same ISCED level may be regarded to be higher education in one country and as vocational training in the other remains¹. Differences also exist relating the implementation and status of short-cycle qualifications² (European Commission/BACEA/Eurydice, 2015) and concerning the coding of parental degrees that are no longer awarded.

In order to enable comparisons with external data sources such as the Labour Force Survey, the ISCED classification has been applied despite these caveats. Some countries, however, may deviate from the focus group definition (Box B2.1).

Data and interpretation

Between a quarter and almost three quarters of students in EUROSTUDENT countries have parents without tertiary degrees

The parents of higher education students vary greatly with regard to their education across EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure B2.1). Between roughly a quarter and almost three quarters of students in EUROSTUDENT countries have parents who did not successfully take part in tertiary education themselves. In around 60 % of EUROSTUDENT countries, students with parents whose highest educational attainment does not exceed upper secondary education are the minority.

- Large shares of students with parents who did not attain tertiary degrees can be found in Turkey, Italy, Portugal, Malta, and Poland. In these countries, this applies to 60 % or more of all students.
- In Sweden, Latvia, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Denmark, and Norway, less than 40 % of students have parents who do not hold a tertiary degree.
- In the remaining countries, the share of students with parents whose education level does not exceed post-secondary, non-tertiary education lies between 40 % and 60 %.


¹ For example, German Master crafts(wo)men vocational qualifications are at ISCED level 6 (professional) in the qualification framework, i.e. equivalent to the level of higher education. However, these types of degrees are not typically regarded to be part of the higher education system in Germany. Austrian Master crafts(wo)men qualifications, in contrast, are at ISCED level 5 (and are not regarded to be higher education either).

² For example, in Austria, a qualification attained at a college for higher vocational education ("Berufsbildende Höhere Schulen") is at ISCED level 5, but is not typically regarded as higher education in Austria.

Figure B2.1 ↓

Educational attainment of students' parents

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, D.2. **No data:** FI.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 6.0 What is the highest level of education your mother/guardian and father/guardian have obtained? [indicated separately]**Note(s):** Per student, the highest educational attainment of either the father or the mother is counted. "Don't know" responses were excluded from calculations.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** CH.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

On average across all countries, students' mothers' educational level does not differ from that of students' fathers, but country specific differences become apparent (Table B2.1). In around half of EUROSTUDENT countries, students' mothers more often than fathers do not hold a tertiary degree, reflecting the tendency for educational attainment in a couple to be skewed towards the male (van Bavel, 2012). However, in slightly less than half of EUROSTUDENT countries – mainly in Eastern European and Nordic ones – the reverse is true, with higher shares of tertiary attainment found among students' mothers, rather than among fathers.

No clear cross-country trend over time is visible with regard to students' parents' education

In the 19 EUROSTUDENT countries with available data for both rounds of EUROSTUDENT, no clear pattern of increasing or decreasing shares of students without higher education background emerges.

- No or only small changes are found in around half of EUROSTUDENT countries. In the Czech Republic, Switzerland, and Latvia, no change in the shares of students without higher education background has taken place. In Italy, Slovakia, the Netherlands, France, Sweden, and Denmark, a slight decrease (of up to 3 percentage points less) can be found. In Hungary and Estonia, the share of students without higher education background has increased by up to 2 percentage points.
- Large decreases in the share of students without higher education background are seen in Malta, Romania, Ireland, and Serbia. Here, the share of these students has decreased by at least 7 percentage points.
- Relatively large increases can be found in Poland, Croatia, Slovenia, and Lithuania. At least 5 percentage points more students indicated that their parents do not hold tertiary education degrees in the EUROSTUDENT VI compared with EUROSTUDENT V.

Figure B2.2**Educational attainment of students' parents – E:V vs. E:VI**

Share of students with parents without tertiary degrees (highest degree at ISCED levels 0-4) (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT V/VI, D.2. Data not comparable over time: AT, DE, GE, NO. **No data:** E:V: AL, IS, PT, TR; E:VI: FI.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** E:V 6.1/E:VI 6.0 What is the highest level of education your mother [E:V: mother/guardian] and father [E:VI: father/guardian] have obtained? [indicated separately]**Note(s):** Per student, the highest educational attainment of either the father or the mother is counted.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** E:V: DE, GE, IT. E:VI: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Figure B2.3 ↴

Representation of students with parents not holding a tertiary degree
(based on fathers' educational attainment)



Data source: Educational attainment of students' fathers: E:VI, D.1. Share of men age 40–59 in population: EU-LFS 2016 [lfsa_pgaed].

No LFS data: AL, GE, RS.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 6.0 What is the highest level of education your mother/guardian and father/guardian have obtained? [indicated separately]; "don't know" responses excluded

Note(s): The graph compares the share of students' fathers who have not attained tertiary education (ISCED 5–8) with the corresponding share of 40–59 year-old men in the population. Shares of equal size result in a position on the diagonal (index value = 1). An index value of 1 indicates that there are exactly as many students from non higher education backgrounds as would be expected based on the distribution of educational attainment in the population. Values over 1 indicate overrepresentation of this group and lie above the diagonal, values below 1 and below the diagonal indicate underrepresentation. Comparisons to LFS data can be influenced by several factors, e.g. the age distribution of students' parents, reproductive patterns, and the share of international students in a country.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Students with fathers without tertiary degrees are underrepresented in almost all EUROSTUDENT countries

On EUROSTUDENT average, only around 80 % of the expected number of students whose fathers' degree does not exceed ISCED level 0–4 are currently enrolled in higher education (Figure B2.3).

- Students from non-higher education backgrounds (as measured by fathers' educational attainment) are relatively well-represented in Italy, Switzerland, Portugal, and Iceland. Here, the share of students in higher education amounts to at least 90 % of what would be expected based on the educational attainment of the fathers' generation.
- In Germany, Norway, Denmark, and Hungary, less than two thirds of the expected share of students with fathers who did not attend tertiary education are currently enrolled in higher education.

Students without higher education background tend to enter higher education later, study in short or first programmes at non-universities, and rely on paid employment to a greater extent than students with a higher education background

Students whose parents did not attain tertiary education themselves differ from their peers in several respects (Tables B2.2 and B2.3). The EUROSTUDENT focus group 'students without higher education background' allows investigating the background and study situation of this group.³

³ Note that, depending on the country, students with parents holding higher vocational degrees (at ISCED levels 5 or 6) may be part of this focus group (Box B2.1).

Looking at different demographic groups, students without higher education background are more often found among females in the large majority of countries. Exceptions are Austria, Germany, Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, Serbia, and Turkey, in which the difference is very small or non-existent, or, in the case of Turkey, tends towards the reverse. While in almost all countries, larger shares of students without higher education background can be found among domestic vs. international students, no clear pattern can be found with regard to the migration background of this student group. In slightly more than half of all EUROSTUDENT countries, higher shares of native-born students have parents without higher education degrees (Table B2.2). This pattern is reversed in eight countries, with more students without higher education background found among domestically educated 2nd generation migrants.

With regard to their entry into higher education, students without higher education background are more often found among students having entered higher education using alternative  entry qualifications than among students having used the standard access route in all countries with available data, except for Albania and Serbia (Table B2.2). Alternative  access routes seem to be particularly often used by students without higher education background in Austria, France, Hungary, Iceland, and the Netherlands, where at least 20 percentage points more students without higher education background are found in this group when compared to students with standard access routes. Relatedly, students without higher education background are more often found among  delayed transition students in all countries (Table B2.2).

As a result of these different transition patterns,  students without higher education background are on average 1.7 years older than their peers (Table B1.2). In all but three countries, students without higher education background are most often found among the age group of students who are at least 30 years old (Table B2.2). In Austria, Italy, Malta, Poland, and Portugal, at least three quarters of students older than 30 years have parents who did not attain high education degrees.

Once having entered higher education, the study conditions of students without higher education background often differ from those of their peers (Table B2.3).


Where different types of HEIs exist, students without higher education background are more likely to be studying at  non-universities than at  universities in all countries except Albania and France (in the latter case, non-universities refer to the prestigious Grandes Écoles). When comparing short-cycle programmes (where they exist), Bachelor and Master programmes, in all countries except Albania, Croatia, Poland, and Romania, the highest shares of students without higher education background can be found, where they exist, in short-cycle programmes, if these are not a part of the higher education landscape, in BA programmes. In contrast, students without higher education background are less often enrolled in long national degrees, which are often high-prestige fields of study such as medicine or law (Figure B4.3). With regard to their future plans, students without higher education background less often plan to continue with a Master programme after completion of their Bachelor degree (Figure B3.8). The fields of study with the highest share of students from non-tertiary educated families are typically found in education and teaching programmes, as well as in business programmes (Table B4.3).

The living conditions of students without higher education background are often also different. In around 80 % of all EUROSTUDENT countries, the largest share of students without higher education background can be found among those  students depending either on public support

Figure B2.4 ↴

Students' assessment of parental financial status

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, D.3. No data: AT, CH, FR, IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 6.1 How well-off financially do you think are your parents (or guardians) compared with other families?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

(in slightly more than half of all countries) or on their self-earned income. Accordingly, in all but four countries, their share is higher among ⚡ students with a paid job of at least 20 hours a week than among non-employed students. Often, this involvement appears to come at a cost with regard to time spent on studies: in more than three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students without higher education background is higher among ⚡ low intensity than among ⚡ high intensity students (Table B2.3).

Most students come from averagely well-off families

In two thirds of EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of students, when asked to indicate the ⚡ financial status of their parents, considers their family to fall into the “average” category (Figure B2.4).


- The countries with the highest shares of students with not very or not at all well-off parents are found in Turkey, Ireland, Croatia, Germany, and Romania. Here at least a quarter of students make such an assessment. In Sweden, Norway, and the Czech Republic, on the other hand less than 15 % think this is the case.
- The highest shares of students from – by their own assessment – averagely well-off families can be found in Romania, Slovakia, Lithuania, and Norway, where at least 55 % of students agree.
- Low shares of students from averagely wealthy families are apparent in the Netherlands, Albania, and Sweden, where less than 40 % give such an assessment. Accordingly, these three countries register the highest shares of students who indicate that their parents are very or somewhat well-off (at least 48 %).

Students' assessment of parental financial status is related to the parents' educational attainment (Figure B2.5). On average, across all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students who regard their parents to be somewhat or very well-off is 22 percentage points higher among students

Figure B2.5 ↓

Students' assessment of parental financial status by educational background

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, D.3. No data: AT, CH, FR, IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 6.1 How well-off financially do you think are your parents (or guardians) compared with other families?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

with higher education background than among those without. The share of students indicating that their parents are not at all or not very well-off, in contrast, is on average 15 percentage points lower.


Students without higher education background tend to have less clear study intentions and more often doubt their choice

The EUROSTUDENT questionnaire includes items related to students' assessment of the clearness of their study intentions, their sense of belongingness in higher education, and doubts they may have about studying (Figure B2.6). Bachelor students whose parents attained a higher education degree themselves report a higher certainty with regard to their study intention: at

Figure B2.6 ↴

BA students' study intentions, sense of lack of belongingness in higher education, and doubts about studying by higher education background

Share of Bachelor students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, J.23 (a), J.26 (b), J.28 (c). **No data:** a) AT, CH, DE, FR, IT, TR; b) and c) DE, FR, IT, TR.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.13 To what extent do you agree with the following statements? a) It was always clear I would study one day.

b) I often have the feeling that I don't really belong in higher education. c) I sometimes ask myself whether studying was the right choice for me.

Note(s): Values shown are aggregated shares of the categories 'strongly agree' and 'agree'.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** a) HU, b) AT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

least 2 percentage points more (strongly) agree that it was always clear that they would study one day than among their peers without higher education background in all but one country (Figure B2.6a). With one exception, at least two thirds of students with higher education background agree with this statement in all EUROSTUDENT countries. It should be noted that all respondents are already in higher education, which probably leads to an overestimation of the certainty for both groups. Nevertheless, the pattern points towards a general trend for students from higher education backgrounds to be more confident about their educational pathway.

The data show, that in some countries, after entering higher education, students without higher education background start to question their presence more than their peers (Figure B2.6b). Between 7 % and 28 % of all Bachelor students in the EUROSTUDENT countries indicate sometimes feeling as if they did not belong in higher education. The shares of students without higher education background agreeing with this statement are at least 3 percentage points higher in a third of EUROSTUDENT countries.

- This is the case in Norway, Estonia, Serbia, Portugal, Ireland, Slovakia, Iceland, and Switzerland. Between 1 and 2 % more students without higher education background agree with this sentiment in Albania, Georgia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Croatia, Denmark, Sweden, and the Czech Republic. In Latvia, the shares are the same in the two groups.
- In Malta, Poland, Hungary, the Netherlands, Finland, Romania, and Austria, the pattern is – if mostly very slightly – reversed.

Across EUROSTUDENT countries, on average almost every fifth student sometimes doubts whether studying was the right choice (Figure B2.6c). Such doubts are at least slightly more common among students without higher education background in 80 % of the countries with available data.

- In Albania, Norway, Estonia, Latvia, and Serbia, at least 4 percentage points more students without higher education background report sometimes doubting whether studying is right for them.
- In Lithuania, Poland, the Netherlands, Romania, and Austria, there is no difference between the two groups, or the pattern is even reversed.

Discussion and policy considerations

As in previous EUROSTUDENT rounds (Hauschmidt et al., 2015; Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011), the data presented provide evidence that students without higher education background are still clearly underrepresented in almost all countries of the EHEA. Furthermore, the data show that students whose parents did not attain a higher education degree themselves differ from their peers with regard to accessing higher education, their study conditions, and their living conditions.

With regard to their entry into higher education, students without higher education background are more often found among students having entered higher education using non-standard qualifications (e.g. recognition of prior learning, vocational qualifications – see >[Chapter B3](#)), and tend to enter higher education later than students with higher education background. Non-standard access routes therefore appear to be an effective instrument in increasing the participation of this student group, even if the share of students using these routes remains small in most countries. Nevertheless, an admissions system which provides alternatives to the ‘standard’

entry qualification can be a successful means of increasing participation of underrepresented groups. Even if governments are not the main actors in charge of admissions to higher education, they can create incentives to increase the share of underrepresented groups, through reporting requirements or even formula-based funding, and by rewarding inclusive institutions⁴. Mentoring and outreach initiatives can be ways to contact and motivate potential students even before entering higher education⁵.

B
2

It should be noted, however, that, in many countries, these findings represent the last stage of an educational career that – in the different countries – is characterised by varying degrees of differentiation. The more educational choices precede students' entry into higher education, the more likely it is that the mechanisms behind the inequality found in higher education come into effect already at earlier points in students' lives. A recent comparative study on admissions systems in Europe (Orr, Usher, Haj, Atherton, & Geanta, 2017) has found that systems with the least academic barriers to accessing higher education show the most equitable outcomes (based on graduates' parents educational attainment), while systems in which students' choice of secondary school predetermines their possibility to enter into higher education show the lowest relative participation rates by students from lower educational backgrounds. In some systems, the most effective interventions to increase the participation of students without higher education background therefore might take place even before secondary school.

Once having entered the higher education system, students without higher education background are more likely to be studying at non-universities than at universities in almost all countries. They are also disproportionately often found in short-cycle programmes, and less often in Master or long national degree programmes. Differences can also be found with regard to the subject choice, with students without higher education background more often opting towards educational and business programmes. Taken together, these findings can be regarded in two ways: as an indicator of successfully widened access and participation, as non-universities and short-cycle programmes – where they exist – appear to particularly attract students without academic familial background, thus promoting and enabling access to higher education for this group. The possible downside of this finding is encapsulated in the question of “access to what?” (Margison, 2016) – to what extent do the types of higher education more often frequented by students without higher education background provide them with the same results and outcomes (Salmi & Bassett, 2014)? If the findings reflect a highly stratified system of higher education in which subjects, course types, HEI types, and perhaps even individual HEIs are very diverse with regard to their prestige and quality, such conditions may reinforce existing educational and income inequalities. A more detailed national-level examination taking into account possible status differences within a system, as well as studies tracking the graduates on their career paths after leaving the higher education system, could be of help for the further understanding of this issue.

The results presented in this chapter also point towards the fact that effective policy measures to support students without higher education background need to target not only the access and transition phase into higher education. In all countries, students without higher education background rely on their family less than do their peers with highly educated parents, and they more often work. Although public support is often already successful in reaching these students, effec-

⁴ For example, the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) in the UK is a public body regulating fair access to higher education by ensuring HEIs have measures in place to promote access for disadvantaged student groups.

⁵ e.g. the German “Arbeiterkind” initiative, which provides information and support before and during higher education to students with working-class parents by higher education students with the same background.

tive policy should ensure that grants and scholarships reach the group in question and provide sufficient means. Furthermore, effective policies to increase participation include both financial aid as well as measures to overcome non-financial obstacles (Salmi & Bassett, 2014). An increased involvement in paid employment of students without higher education background, in many countries, is related to this group spending less time on their studies. Flexible study paths and modes of study ([>Chapter B4](#)) can make it easier to combine successfully studies with the need to earn a living, and benefit not only students without higher education background, but provide students from all walks of life with the chance to successfully take part in higher education in the course of their lives.

Tables

Table B2.1

Highest educational attainment of students' parents, mothers, and fathers

Share of students (in %)

	Both parents		Fathers' highest level of education		Mothers' highest level of education	
	No tertiary education (highest degree at ISCED level 0–4)	Tertiary education (highest degree at ISCED level 5–8)	No tertiary education (highest degree at ISCED level 0–4)	Tertiary education (highest degree at ISCED level 5–8)	No tertiary education (highest degree at ISCED level 0–4)	Tertiary education (highest degree at ISCED level 5–8)
AL	57	43	66	34	66	34
AT	50	50	59	41	67	33
CH	42	58	47	53	63	37
CZ	52	48	64	36	65	35
DE	27	73	31	69	50	50
DK	25	75	41	59	32	68
EE	33	67	52	48	41	59
FI	n.d.	n.d.	47	53	42	58
FR	40	60	53	47	50	50
GE	31	69	40	60	44	56
HR	58	42	70	30	70	30
HU	46	54	53	47	62	38
IE	45	55	55	45	60	40
IS	47	53	63	37	57	43
IT	69	31	77	23	79	21
LT	46	54	65	35	53	47
LV	36	64	58	42	43	57
MT	62	38	72	28	77	23
NL	46	54	54	46	62	38
NO	22	78	34	66	36	64
PL	60	40	74	26	65	35
PT	65	35	76	24	70	30
RO	58	42	63	37	65	35
RS	44	56	56	44	58	42
SE	36	64	53	47	46	54
SI	49	51	65	35	58	42
SK	59	42	71	29	69	31
TR	73	27	76	24	85	15
av.	47	53	58	42	58	42

n.d.: no data.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, D.2. **No data:** Both parents: FI.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 6.0 What is the highest level of education your mother/guardian and father/guardian have obtained? [indicated separately]

Note(s): "Don't know" responses were excluded from calculations.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B2.2

Students without higher education background by sex, age group, educational origin, migration background, access route, and transition route

Share of students (in %)

	All students	Sex		Age group		Educational origin		Migration background		Access route		Transition route	
		Female	Male	≤ 22 years	30 years or over	Domestic student	International student	2 nd generation migrant students with national ed. background	Students without migrant background, national ed. background	Alternative	Standard	Direct	Delayed
AL	57	61	51	56	66	57	39	t.f.c.	58	48	57	49	t.f.c.
AT*	64	64	64	57	75	70	40	56	73	88	68	66	85
CH	42	45	39	37	52	43	34	47	43	49	41	41	49
CZ	52	55	49	49	71	54	31	51	55	62	52	50	75
DE	27	27	27	22	35	n.d.	n.d.	35	26	43	26	25	34
DK	25	25	26	25	36	26	24	27	25	30	25	25	29
EE	33	34	30	27	45	33	25	33	33	46	32	29	52
FI	32	33	30	25	43	33	23	25	34	n.d.	n.d.	27	46
FR	40	41	38	40	52	41	34	45	39	60	40	39	50
GE	31	32	29	33	26	31	32	27	31	35	31	30	41
HR	58	60	56	55	72	59	t.f.c.	59	57	67	56	56	87
HU	46	50	41	40	62	45	49	32	46	68	45	41	68
IE	45	45	45	40	64	48	30	38	52	49	45	42	68
IS	47	48	44	24	68	48	26	41	49	61	41	40	64
IT	69	71	66	66	79	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	69	68	83
LT	46	49	42	44	56	47	24	47	47	64	45	45	58
LV	35	38	33	34	45	36	15	35	36	43	35	34	45
MT	62	64	60	54	84	63	56	39	65	70	59	n.d.	n.d.
NL	46	45	46	43	68	47	36	55	46	62	40	42	63
NO	22	24	20	16	35	22	25	22	22	33	20	19	34
PL	60	61	58	55	80	60	30	29	61	68	60	58	81
PT	65	66	63	60	77	65	52	51	67	80	61	62	79
RO	58	60	56	55	72	59	23	n.d.	n.d.	71	58	56	91
RS	44	45	44	46	39	45	35	43	45	39	44	44	47
SE	36	38	33	32	47	38	28	41	37	45	35	33	44
SI	49	50	47	44	74	49	50	58	47	67	48	47	76
SK	59	65	50	59	74	59	t.f.c.	52	59	t.f.c.	58	56	71
TR	73	71	74	74	72	73	51	69	74	n.d.	n.d.	71	80
E:Vi av.	47	49	45	43	60	48	34	42	47	56	46	44	62

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, D.2. **No data:** Educational origin: DE, IT; (alternative) access route: FI, IT, TR; delayed transition: MT.**Too few cases:** International students: HR, SK; alternative access route: SK; delayed transition: AL.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 6.0 What is the highest level of education your mother/guardian and father/guardian have obtained? [indicated separately]

Note(s): "Don't know" responses were excluded from calculations.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT, FR.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B2.3

Students without higher education background by type of HEI, study programme, study intensity, extent of paid work, and dependency on income source

Share of students (in %)

	All students	Type of HEI		Study programme		Study intensity		Extent of paid work		Dependency on income source			
		University	Other HEI	Short-cycle	Bachelor	Master	Low intensity	High intensity	0h paid work per week during lecture period	>20h paid work per week during lecture period	Dependent on family	Dependent on self-earned income	Dependent on public student support
AL	57	57	54	n/a	57	65	68	57	57	57	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT*	64	61	78	n/a	65	62	66	61	60	74	51	71	87
CH	42	36	51	n/a	44	38	48	39	39	52	35	50	58
CZ	52	51	66	n/a	56	50	55	47	49	62	47	59	57
DE	27	24	33	n/a	29	26	30	27	24	35	18	33	42
DK	25	22	30	34	26	20	27	26	29	26	26	26	26
EE	33	31	41	n/a	35	32	33	33	26	37	28	35	33
FI	32	26	38	n/a	34	27	35	32	29	38	29	36	30
FR	40	42	35	56	45	40	44	35	41	36	29	40	58
GE	31	31	n/a	n/a	33	18	23	33	34	22	31	29	23
HR	58	56	71	n/a	59	64	65	54	55	70	56	68	71
HU	46	44	54	61	47	41	49	39	40	56	37	56	56
IE	45	38	54	56	45	43	52	42	43	57	33	51	61
IS	47	47	n/a	71	42	57	48	40	46	62	50	42	46
IT	69	69	n/a	n/a	72	69	76	65	67	80	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	46	41	59	n/a	48	46	44	46	44	48	45	51	58
LV	35	35	36	43	35	38	32	36	36	37	35	36	42
MT	62	58	78	76	59	61	67	55	57	75	60	65	62
NL	46	32	54	t.f.c.	48	35	49	45	41	54	38	56	48
NO	22	19	26	n/a	23	21	27	19	20	32	22	30	17
PL	60	57	71	n/a	61	66	65	50	54	70	44	70	82
PT	65	58	76	81	68	67	69	63	61	77	60	78	88
RO	58	58	n/a	n/a	60	63	67	51	54	66	54	66	74
RS	44	44	n.d.	n/a	46	35	44	43	45	46	45	40	t.f.c.
SE	36	36	n/a	46	37	30	42	34	33	47	32	42	34
SI	49	45	63	66	47	47	55	45	46	58	37	55	67
SK	59	57	66	n/a	61	57	59	55	60	62	56	57	80
TR	73	73	n/a	87	70	61	75	69	73	70	67	74	87
E:VI av.	47	45	54	62	48	46	51	44	45	54	41	51	55

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, D.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 6.0 What is the highest level of education your mother/guardian and father/guardian have obtained? [indicated separately]

Note(s): "Don't know" responses were excluded from calculations.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT, FR.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Chapter B3

Transition into and within higher education

Direct and delayed transitions into higher education

B
3

Across all EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 72 % of students transition directly into higher education (HE), i.e. within 2 years. In more than a third of countries, more than 90 % of students transition directly, whereas in five countries, more than 20 % of students transfer with a delay of more than 24 months.

Delayed transition for particular student groups

First generation students transition into higher education more frequently with a delay, compared to their peers with higher education background. Likewise, ⚡ delayed transition into higher education is more common for ⚡ non-university students, students in the field of education (incl. teacher training), and those ⚡ dependent on own earnings.

Alternative access routes

Only a small share of students in some countries enters without standard higher education entry qualification or an equivalent. Most students entering via ⚡ alternative access routes possess a ⚡ standard higher education entry qualification, which they obtained after leaving the school system. These students are also more likely to have ⚡ regular work experience before higher education, and higher shares tend to be found at non-universities than at universities when comparing them to their peers who entered via the ⚡ standard access route.

findings

Transitions into Master programmes

B
3

The majority of Master students have transferred directly, i.e. within less than a year from their previous study programme to their current Master programme. Non-university students, those without higher education background, and those having used an alternative access route for entry into higher education, as well as students of health and welfare and those of education (incl. teacher training), more commonly report having taken a break of more than 24 months in their educational career between their previous study programmes and current Master programme.

Bachelor students' plans to continue their studies

Bachelor students' plans to continue their studies reflect patterns for the transitions between previous degree and current programme for Master students. Most Bachelor students plan to continue their studies within a year after obtaining a Bachelor's degree. Students with higher education background more frequently voice plans to directly continue studies compared to their peers without higher education background.

Main issues

In the course of the Bologna Process, member states have committed themselves to widen participation in higher education, to improve permeability between different education sectors, to widen opportunities for access and completion, to remove obstacles to the recognition of prior learning for the purposes of providing access to higher education programmes, and to facilitate the award of qualifications on the basis of prior learning (see Vögtle, 2014:9–19).

The previous chapters have shown that the student body, though very diverse in many countries, does not completely represent the population in most EUROSTUDENT countries, reflecting the fact that ensuring equal access to people from all backgrounds remains one of the main challenges in European higher education (European Higher Education Area, 2015). As participation in higher education has implications on an individual's opportunities for their future lives in the long term, ensuring access to students from all backgrounds has relevance with regard to concepts such as equity, social justice (Brennan & Naidoo, 2008), and opportunity (Clancy & Goastellec, 2007). Many countries have made efforts to widen participation of disadvantaged groups by introducing alternative pathways into higher education, i.e. enabling students to enter without the standard upper secondary qualification, or to obtain the secondary school qualification after leaving school. This chapter will look at students' transitions into and within higher education to shed light on the patterns of entering higher education and different study programmes of students from diverse backgrounds.

Transitions into and within higher education

Although delayed entry or the 'gap year' has been popularly described as a desirable choice for youth to travel, volunteer, or find themselves, this optional delay is largely a phenomenon of students from higher socio-economic backgrounds (Wells & Lynch, 2012). More commonly, transition into higher education has in many countries taken place directly after students have left secondary school, so much so that 'winding biographical paths to higher education' are still seen to confer a status of 'non-traditionality' upon students (Wolter, 2015:163). As delaying entry into higher education considerably decreases the likelihood of completing a Bachelor's degree, and completion rates continue to drop the longer the delay (see Wells & Lynch, 2012), delaying entry into higher education might contribute to reproducing social inequality as students with a delayed entry also tend to have higher dropout rates (see Atherton, Dumangane, & Whitty, 2016). At the same time, a delayed entry into higher education after gaining work experience, or even the necessary qualifications needed for entering higher education, can be an indication of lifelong learners taking the opportunity to further their educational career. Indeed, past EUROSTUDENT reports have shown that these  'delayed transition' students are most likely to be older and  students without higher education background (Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011; Hauschildt et al., 2015).

Once in higher education, the succession of study programmes (short-cycle, where applicable, Bachelor, Master, and doctoral courses) presents students with several 'decision points' at which they can choose to either continue their educational career or enter the labour market (temporarily or permanently). The tiered structure of study programmes thus enables students to create individual, intertwining career and study paths and creates opportunities for lifelong learning. However, studies in Germany have shown that the decision to pursue a Master's degree directly after a Bachelor programme may be influenced by students' socio-economic and educational

background due to financial constraints, differing costs perceptions, and differences in students' previous educational biographies (Lörz, Quast, & Roloff, 2015; Sarcletti, 2015).

Access routes into higher education

Across EUROSTUDENT countries, what is considered to be the  'standard' access route into higher education varies. In the majority of countries, an upper secondary qualification is the traditional direct entry route to most higher education institutions (HEIs). In some countries, all prospective higher education students have to pass a standard higher education entrance examination in order to gain access to higher education. Additionally, students' pathways may already be determined relatively early in the secondary school system (Orr et al., 2017).

One approach to widen participation is to offer so-called 'second chance', 'non-traditional' or  alternative access routes to enter higher education. This is mostly achieved by placing less emphasis on academic success at the secondary level as the determining factor for access to higher education (Orr & Hovdhaugen, 2014). Offering opportunities beyond the 'standard' track is seen as a means to increase the participation of students who might not consider higher education as a viable option during their early or first educational career, e.g. students from non-academic families or otherwise disadvantaged groups (Brooks, 2008; Clancy & Goastellec, 2007). Most countries offer other access routes to higher education for students who left school without an upper secondary qualification, although their share in relation to all admissions tends to remain small (Orr et al., 2017). Such alternative access routes include adult learning, special entry exams for certain student groups, special access courses, and  accreditation/recognition of prior learning and/or vocational experience (Hauschildt et al., 2015). Some of these alternative routes grant students the 'standard' qualification or an equivalent, e.g. upper secondary school certificate, while others grant direct access without obtaining the standard qualification.

In order to contribute to the ongoing discourse about transition and access, the analyses in this chapter focus on higher education  entry routes as well as transition pathways within higher education. In the course of these analyses, special attention will be given to students' educational background while aiming to provide answers to the following questions:

- To what extent do students in EUROSTUDENT countries enter higher education directly after secondary school? Which student groups in particular tend to experience a delay between leaving school and entering higher education?
- To what extent are alternative access routes to higher education used? Which students predominantly use alternative access routes into higher education and what are their study and living conditions?
- How have current Master students shaped their transition into their Master programme and what are Bachelor students' plans in this regard? To what extent does this vary by sex, type of HEI, and educational background?

Methodological and conceptual notes

In the context of EUROSTUDENT VI, pupils who obtained a higher education entry qualification in conjunction with or shortly after finishing upper secondary school are defined as  standard access route students. Students who have left the secondary school system without obtaining the standard  entry qualification (school leaving certificate and/or exam) granting access to higher education (in the respective country) in direct conjunction with leaving school, or who have

Box B3.1

EUROSTUDENT VI's distinction between standard and alternative access route students

	Standard access route	Alternative access route
Type of qualification	Students possess the standard national entry qualification (e.g. Matura, Abitur, Maturità, Baccalauréat) or a foreign equivalent	Students either possess the standard national entry qualification (e.g. Matura, Abitur, Maturità, Baccalauréat) or a foreign equivalent or DO NOT possess the standard national entry qualification (e.g. Matura, Abitur, Maturità, Baccalauréat) or a foreign equivalent
Point of acquisition	... obtained in direct relation to leaving the school system for the first time (< 6 months delay)	... obtained AFTER leaving the school system for the first time (> 6 months delay), e.g. through evening school

Source: EUROSTUDENT VI

B
3

attained this qualification more than 6 months after leaving the school system, e.g. via evening classes or adult learning, are defined as having used **alternative access routes**. The EUROSTUDENT definition thus includes not only the type of higher education entry qualification, but also a time dimension in relation to duration of transition between secondary and higher education (Box B3.1).

Data and interpretations

Delayed transition into higher education is more common among non-university students and students without higher education background

In all countries, the vast majority of students transition into higher education using a relatively direct route, i.e. within 2 years of leaving the school system for the first time (Figure B3.1). Even in the countries with the largest share of delayed transition students (Sweden, Finland, and Iceland) over 70 % of students transition directly. In all countries, students who **delay transition** into higher education are older than their peers who transitioned directly (Table B1.2). However, the share of delayed transition students varies greatly between countries (Figure B3.1).

- Less than 7 % of students experience a delay of more than 2 years after leaving school before they enter higher education for the first time in Italy, Slovenia, France, and Georgia.
- More than a quarter of all students are **delayed transition students** in Sweden, Finland, and Iceland.


In the following, the analyses focus on delayed transition students by type of HEI. It should be noted that, because the absolute sizes of the different higher education sectors vary greatly across EUROSTUDENT countries, the shares presented in the following do not inform about the overall distribution of students between the different types of HEIs (Figure B4.1), but only about the distributions within a certain **type of HEI**.

Across countries, the share of delayed transition students is much higher at non-universities (where these exist) than at universities in all countries except France, where the prestigious Grandes Écoles belong to the non-university sector (Table B3.1).


- Within this group of countries, Estonia, Ireland, Lithuania, Norway, and Portugal show the smallest differences between types of HEIs (between 7 and 9 percentage points).

Figure B3.1 **Duration of transition from secondary school to higher education**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, B.4. **No data:** MT.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.3 How long after leaving the #regular school system for the first time did you enter higher education for the first time?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** AT, CH, DE, FR, HU.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.**Figure B3.2** **Delayed transition students by educational background**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, B.4. **No data:** MT.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.3 How long after leaving the #regular school system for the first time did you enter higher education for the first time?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** AT, CH, DE, FR, HU.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- Austria, the Netherlands, and Slovakia show the largest differences by type of HEI, with shares of delayed transition students between 18 and 30 percentage points higher at non-universities than at universities.

In all but one country, the share of delayed transition students is larger among students without higher education background compared to their peers with higher education background (Figure B3.2).

- The smallest respective group differences can be found in Serbia, Switzerland, France, and Georgia, with the shares of delayed transition students among students with and without higher education background having differences of 3 percentage points or less.
- The largest differences between students with and without higher education backgrounds are found in Finland, Iceland and Austria: here, the share of delayed transition students is 16 to 19 percentage points higher among students without higher education background.

Additionally, compared across fields of study, in half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, larger shares of delayed transition students can be found among students of education (incl. teacher training) and among low intensity students. Moreover, across all countries, the share of delayed students is highest in the group of students who are dependent on own earnings to finance their living compared those dependent on family support or national public student support (Table B3.1).

The majority of alternative access route students possess standard entry qualification or an equivalent

Alternative access routes, per EUROSTUDENT definition, include qualifications gained after leaving the school system and may include adult learning, special entry exams for certain student groups, special access courses, and accreditation/recognition of prior learning and/or vocational experience. It, therefore, comes as no surprise that alternative access students tend to be older in all EUROSTUDENT countries than their peers who access via the country specific, standard route (Table B1.2).

In 90 % of EUROSTUDENT countries, we can find students who report having used alternative access routes into higher education¹. Nevertheless, across all countries, the vast majority of students enter HEIs via the country-specific, standard access route (Figure B3.3).

- EUROSTUDENT countries with a relatively large share of students – above 25 % – having accessed higher education using an alternative access route are the Netherlands, Malta, and Iceland.
- Relatively small shares of alternative access route students, 2 % or below, can be found in France, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Lithuania, and Serbia.

In line with the results for delayed transition students, the share of alternative access route students is larger in non-universities (where applicable) than in universities across all countries (Table B3.2).


- Large shares of alternative access route students enrolled in non-universities at or above 30 % can be found in Croatia, Malta, the Netherlands, and Portugal.
- The largest shares of alternative access route university students in countries with other types of HEIs can be found in Croatia, Malta, and Portugal. These shares lie between 15 and 26 %.

In almost all countries, higher shares of students without higher education background accessed higher education via an alternative route compared to students with higher education background (Table B3.2).

¹ There are no data for alternative access route students in Finland, Italy, and Turkey.

Figure B3.3 **Access routes into higher education**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, B.9. **No data:** FI, IT, TR.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.0 Do you have a #Matura or foreign equivalent?; [Only students with #Matura] 2.1 Did you obtain your #Matura or foreign equivalent in direct relation (within 6 months) of leaving the #regular school system for the first time?; [Only students without #Matura] 2.2 Where did you last attend the #regular school system?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** AT, CH, DE, EE, HU.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- The largest differences by educational background of between 14 to 16 percentage points can be found in Iceland, the Netherlands, and Portugal, where alternative access is much more common for students without higher education background. The Netherlands and Iceland are also among those countries with the overall largest share of alternative access route students (more than 25 %, Figure B3.3).

According to the EUROSTUDENT definition, students using the so-called alternative access route might still possess a standard entry qualification to higher education – the decisive factor is when they obtained it (Box B3.1). Figure B3.4 depicts the overall share of alternative access routes per country and which entry qualification alternative access route students used for transition into higher education.² Even in countries with relatively large shares of alternative access route students, the majority of alternative access students do possess the standard entry qualification or an equivalent (Figure B3.4), and in the vast majority, they obtained it domestically (Table B3.2).

- Exemptions are Denmark, Croatia, Ireland, and Serbia, where the majority of alternative access route students (50–76 %) accessed HEIs without a standard entry qualification or an equivalent (Table B3.2).


Alternative access routes in higher education sometimes specially aim at students who first take a vocational path and have entered the labour market before transitioning into higher education. In some countries, alternative access includes granting access to higher education through the recognition of prior learning or work experience. Thus, it is worthwhile to investigate the share of students with prior work experience in the overall student population (Figure B3.5a) as well as for alternative access route students (Figure B3.5b).

² The depicted shares were calculated on basis of the overall shares of alternative access route students and the shares of alternative access route students who used the respective entry qualification.

Figure B3.4 ↴

Type of qualification used for access to higher education

Share of all students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, B.5 & B.9. No data: FI, IT, TR. Too few cases: For educational origin: SK.

Note(s): Values for foreign upper secondary entry qualification are larger than zero, but too small to display for DE, FR, HR, SI.

Eurostudent question(s): 2.0 Do you have a #Matura or foreign equivalent?; [Only students with #Matura] 2.1 Did you obtain your #Matura or foreign equivalent in direct relation (within 6 months) of leaving the #regular school system for the first time?; [Only students without #Matura] 2.2 Where did you last attend the #regular school system?

Deviations from Eurostudent conventions: AT, CH, DE, EE, HU.

Deviations from Eurostudent standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

In most countries, 50 to 75 % of students have (any kind of) prior work experience, but the shares of students with and without work experience prior to entering higher education differ largely across countries (Figure B3.5a).

- In the Nordic countries (Iceland, Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden), more than a third of students have ⚡ regular work experience prior entering higher education.
- Largest shares of students with (any kind of) prior work experience (shares of above 85 %) can be found in Iceland and Norway.
- ⚡ Periodical prior work experience is most common in Estonia, Latvia, Poland, and Slovenia with 36–41 % of students working for less than a year before entering higher education.
- Smallest shares of students with (any kind of) prior work experience of 21 to 26 % can be found in Georgia, Italy, and Serbia.


Across all countries, the share of students with prior, ⚡ regular work experience is larger among alternative access students (Figure B3.5b).

- The largest differences between groups of 50 percentage points or more are evident in Austria, Lithuania, and Hungary.
- The smallest differences between standard access route students and alternative access route students can be observed in Albania, Georgia, and Serbia (Figure B3.5b). However, the latter countries are also the countries with comparatively small overall shares of students with regular prior work experience (Figure B3.5a).

Figure B3.5 ↓

Students with work experience prior to entering higher education

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, B.3. **No data:** Prior work experience: DE; alternative access route: FI, IT, TR. **Too few cases:** Alternative access route: SK.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 2.7 Did you have any paid job(s) prior to entering higher education for the first time?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT, FR, SK.


Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Delayed transition between graduating from a previous programme and Master is more common for non-university students and those dependent on own earnings

In this section, the duration of the transition between graduating from a previous programme to the current Master programme is observed. In doing that, we do not specify whether the transition took place within a country or across countries (which will be analysed in [Chapter 10, Figure B10.9](#)). With the introduction of a two-tiered structure in the course of the Bologna Process (Bachelor/Master), new pathways for the termination or continuation of higher education studies have emerged within as well as across countries ([Chapter B4](#), [Chapter B10](#)). The succession of study programmes presents students with several ‘decision points’ at which they can choose to

Figure B3.6**Duration of transition between graduating from previous programme to current Master programme**

Share of all students in a Master programme (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, B.10. **No data:** FR.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.8 How long after graduating from your previous study programme did you start your current Master programme?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** CH, DE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

either continue their educational career or enter the labour market. It is therefore worthwhile to examine whether there are country-specific differences throughout the transition between graduating from a previous programme and beginning a Master programme.

In all countries except Norway, Iceland, Ireland, and Turkey, the majority of Master students have transferred directly from their previous programme into their current Master programme within a year of graduating (Figure B3.6).

- In two countries, Slovakia and Italy, more than 90 % of Master students have entered their current programme within less than a year after their previous programme.
- The largest shares – between 18 and 20 % of Master students – with intermediate transition duration of between 1 year and 2 years can be found in Albania, Georgia and Estonia.
- In Malta, Norway, Iceland, Ireland, and Turkey, more than a third of Master students have postponed the transition into their Master programme for more than 2 years after graduating from their previous programme.


In all but one country, the share of Master students who have had a transition period of more than 2 years between their previous and current study programme is higher among non-university students (Figure B3.7).

- Finland, Hungary, and the Netherlands show particularly large differences among students with a longer transition period of 32 to 65 percentage points between university and non-university students.
- The smallest differences can be found in Germany, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia. These countries are also among those with the smallest overall share of students who have had longer breaks between Bachelor and Master (Figure B3.6).

Figure B3.7 

Delayed transition (> 24 months) between graduating from previous programme to current Master programme by type of HEI

Share of all students in a Master programme (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, B.10. **No data:** FR.

Note(s): No non-universities exist in GE, IS, IT, RO, SE, TR.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.8 How long after graduating from your previous study programme did you start your current master programme?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, DE.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

A similar pattern can be observed for alternative access route students: higher shares of students with a break of more than 2 years between a previous programme and a current Master's course are found in all countries where such routes exist. Across all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with a longer delay between Bachelor and Master programme is 10 percentage points higher among alternative access route students (Table B3.3), pointing towards the fact that these students are spreading out their educational career over a relatively long timespan.

- In Lithuania, the Netherlands, and Slovenia, the share of students with a transition period of more than 2 years between a previous programme and their current Master programme is at least 25 percentage points higher among students having used an alternative vs. standard access route.

In the large majority of countries, a delay of more than 2 years between Bachelor and Master programmes is more common among students without higher education background than among their peers with higher education background (Table B3.3).

- The largest differences are evident in Hungary, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Turkey. Here, at least 10 percentage points more students without higher education background (compared to students with higher education background) had a transition period of more than 1 year between their current Master programme and their previous programme.
- The smallest (or no) differences between students with and without higher education background of 1% or less can be found in Germany, Poland, and Slovakia.

On EUROSTUDENT average, large shares of students with a delay in the duration of transition between previous programme and their current Master programme (25 % and above) are found in the following fields of study: education (incl. teacher training), business, administration and law, health and welfare, and services (Table B3.3).

- Countries where more than 40 % of students have delayed the continuation of their studies – irrespective of the field of study – are Ireland, Iceland, and Turkey.
- The largest shares (between 62 and 72 %) of students in the field of health and welfare whose transition period between their previous programmes and their current Bachelor programme lasted longer than 24 months can be found in Ireland, Norway, and Serbia.
- The largest shares of students who delayed the continuation of studies in the field of education (incl. teacher training) across countries of around 50 and up to 57 % can be found in Hungary, Sweden, and Turkey.
- In the field of business, administration and law, the largest shares lie between 40 and 50 % and can be found in Estonia, Ireland, and Iceland.

B
3

No clear pattern across countries with regard to male and female Master students becomes evident regarding the duration of transition between a previous programme and their current Master programme (Table B3.3). However, relatively large differences between the sexes with regard to the shares of delayed transitions into a Master programme can be found in five countries.

- In Estonia, Lithuania, and Norway, the share of women who had delay in transition between their previous study programme and their current Master programme is 10 or more percentage points higher than for male students.
- In Serbia and Turkey, male Master students had such a period before entering their Master programme more frequently; these shares are 6 to 13 percentage points higher than for female students.

Bachelor students with higher education background and university students plan to continue further studies directly

While the previous analyses, focusing on students currently enrolled in Master's programmes, give insight into students' past behaviour, focusing on Bachelor students allows a glimpse of their plans for the future.

The majority of Bachelor students are planning to continue their studies, most within a year after graduating from their current programme. However, the shares of undecided students vary largely across countries (Figure B3.8a).

- The largest shares of students already decided to continue studying of around 80 % and above can be found in Slovakia, Romania, Croatia, and the Czech Republic.
- Between 15 and 20 % of Bachelor students do not plan to continue their studies at all after graduating from their current programmes in Denmark, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Lithuania.
- More than a third of all Bachelor students is undecided in Turkey, Estonia, Ireland, Latvia, and Lithuania whether to continue their studies after graduating from their current Bachelor programme.


But there is large cross-national variation within which period of time Bachelor students plan to transition into a Master programme (Figure B3.8a).

- The highest shares of students planning to continue their studies within a year of graduating from their current Bachelor programme can be found in Slovakia, Romania, Croatia, Poland, and the Czech Republic, where this is the case for 65–70 % of Bachelor students.
- Contrary to this, in Estonia, Ireland, Latvia, and Lithuania, less than a third of Bachelor students are planning to continue their studies directly.

Figure B3.8 ↴

Plans to continue studies and time period of transition into further programme after finishing current study programme(s)

Share of Bachelor students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, B.12. No data: DE, FI, FR.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.10 Are you planning to continue studying in higher education after finishing your current study programme(s)?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT, IT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- More than 20 % of Bachelor students plan to continue their studies at a later point in time in Albania, Iceland, Norway, Malta, and Ireland.

Across EUROSTUDENT countries, there is almost no difference in the expressed plans to delay continuation of studies between sexes (Table B3.4).

- Only in Georgia, Ireland, Norway, and Portugal, the share of female students stating that they are planning to delay their continuation of studies for a period of time longer than a year after graduating, is 4 to 5 percentage points higher than among male students.

Regarding differences according to the type of HEI, no clear cross-country pattern becomes apparent (Table B3.4).

- In the Czech Republic, Denmark, Norway, and Portugal, non-university Bachelor students more frequently state plans for a later transition into a further study programme than university students.
- Contrastingly, in Lithuania, Malta, and Slovakia, university students more frequently plan to postpone the continuation of their studies.
- Non-university students in Austria, Switzerland, and the Netherlands state more often than university students that they do not plan to continue studying after graduating from their current Bachelor programme (differences between 6 and 14 percentage points).
- The contrary holds for Albania, Poland, and Slovakia, where Bachelor students at universities state more often than their peers at non-universities that they do not plan to continue studies (between 1 and 6 percentage points difference).

Mirroring the findings about Master students' past transitions, Bachelor students' plans for further studies vary by educational background. With the exception of one country, a direct continuation is more often being planned by students with higher education background (Figure B3.8b).

- Large differences of more than 10 percentage points can be found in Croatia, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Hungary, Denmark, Portugal, Switzerland, Norway, the Netherlands, and Estonia. In these countries, students without higher education background plan to directly continue studies after graduating from the current programme to a lesser extent.
- The smallest differences between the groups of students with and without higher education background (between 1 and 3 percentage points) can be found in Romania, Sweden, and Ireland.

Discussion and policy considerations

The analyses in this chapter reveal both country-specific trends about the 'character' of the higher education system as well as cross-country patterns about specific student groups and their transition into and within higher education.

The durations of transitions within the systems – into higher education and from Bachelor to Master (or other further studies) – appear related: none of the countries with the highest shares of direct transitions into higher education register particularly high shares of long interruptions between Bachelor and Master students, and vice versa. Broadly speaking, countries with high shares of alternative access students tend to belong to the group with medium to longer transition periods, and students in these systems have often gained work experience before higher education. In countries with low shares of students reporting having used alternative access routes, transitions into and within the system tend to be shorter. Age and work experience, prior to transitions as well as during higher education, are closely correlated since delayed transition students are already older at the entry into higher education ([Chapter B1](#)) and thus older when graduating with a Bachelor degree and with increasing age, the probability of transitioning into a Master decreases. Our findings lend support to systemic influences on the process of transition into and within higher education: the passage of students through the higher education systems tends to follow a 'fast in – fast through' logic (or not). Moreover, there might be cultural influences that set the tone for "how things are done", into which students consciously or unconsciously give in (see also Charles, 2016).

Across all countries, the analyses in this chapter find that certain groups of students particularly often enter higher education with a delay, and these students share some common characteristics with alternative access route students. These students tend to be older ([>Chapter B1](#)), more often have prior work experience and pursue paid jobs to a greater extent while they are in higher education ([>Chapter B6](#)). Moreover higher shares of students who have entered higher education with a delay are found at non-universities, and they more often depend on their own earnings. This might also be due to the fact that other income sources (like contributions from family members, national public student support or stipends) might not be available to them.

Where they exist and are used,  alternative access routes therefore appear to fulfil their function of widening access for underrepresented groups; however, the actual shares of students having entered higher education through such a pathway, in most countries, are quite small. Close attention should be paid to the question of whether these students, once in higher education, are able to reconcile their living and working situation with the study requirements – ‘non-traditional’ students who accessed alternatively might require more flexible and adaptable study paths to suit their situation.

Finally, the role of earlier educational choices or situations (e.g. tracking in secondary schools) in determining the pool of possible entrants into higher education cannot be overemphasised. If the aim is to widen participation in higher education, the whole education system should be analysed in search for ‘leaks in the pipeline’, taking into account selection processes before higher education, which restrict the number of possible entrants to higher education by creating inequalities in the attainment of entry qualifications. The growing number of refugees around the world is also creating new groups that may not find it easy to access higher education in their respective host countries (Atherton et al., 2016).

Tables

Table B3.1

Students with a time delay of more than 24 months between leaving secondary school for the first time and entering higher education by sex, type of HEI, field of study, study intensity, and dependency on income source

Share of students (in %)

	All students	Sex		Type of HEI	Field of study												Study intensity		Dependency on income source		
		Female	Male	University	Non-university	Education (incl. teacher training)	Arts and humanities	Social sciences, journalism and information	Business, administration and law	Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics	Information and communication technologies (ICTs)	Engineering, manufacturing and construction	Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary	Health and welfare	Services	Low intensity	Medium intensity	High intensity	Dependent on family support	Dependent on own earnings	Dependent on national public student support
AL	9	8	10	5	t.f.c.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	12	11	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	
AT	22	18	26	18	36	24	20	21	25	16	24	23	22	19	24	25	22	19	7	27	64
CH	13	14	12	7	20	19	18	8	13	5	11	9	8	15	22	18	12	10	8	21	19
CZ	10	11	9	10	20	26	8	10	10	3	1	4	8	10	10	16	10	16	4	2	21
DE	17	17	16	13	23	15	16	18	18	9	11	14	25	26	31	20	16	16	12	24	20
DK	19	18	20	13	27	31	18	13	21	11	23	20	0	21	0	19	19	19	20	21	18
EE	15	15	15	13	21	22	14	10	17	4	9	18	2	16	16	13	13	16	9	19	10
FI	27	27	28	20	35	29	27	28	24	14	22	25	30	37	38	29	26	27	27	33	22
FR	5	6	5	6	3	10	9	7	5	3	6	4	t.f.c.	4	3	5	5	5	4	7	6
GE	4	3	6	4	n/a	4	4	4	4	3	5	2	9	4	2	2	4	4	4	4	3
HR	7	7	7	4	16	4	8	4	7	1	7	4	3	14	9	9	6	4	2	12	4
HU	16	17	15	13	28	26	18	17	19	7	12	10	20	13	18	20	16	11	7	30	5
IE	12	11	14	9	16	9	14	21	14	8	13	12	7	10	15	18	10	11	4	15	14
IS	27	28	26	27	n/a	41	25	28	27	25	26	22	30	22	0	25	30	25	33	22	29
IT	6	6	7	6	n/a	17	7	10	4	3	6	3	10	7	0	12	6	4	0	0	0
LT	9	9	10	7	16	21	5	3	14	0	5	12	3	8	2	8	8	10	6	13	3
LV	15	14	16	10	23	10	14	11	16	7	13	18	9	17	17	14	14	18	12	16	9
MT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
NL	16	15	19	3	24	21	12	7	18	4	20	19	17	18	23	16	16	18	9	26	17
NO	22	20	25	18	27	24	20	16	21	15	17	23	26	27	t.f.c.	25	22	19	25	28	16
PL	7	6	8	4	18	8	5	5	11	0	7	4	7	7	10	7	10	3	2	13	1
PT	17	14	21	14	23	20	18	13	23	9	34	17	19	9	15	20	22	14	14	32	20
RO	7	6	8	7	n/a	26	5	6	7	5	3	7	3	2	t.f.c.	11	7	3	3	18	2
RS	16	16	16	16	n.d.	22	16	10	17	13	11	16	19	18	15	19	12	15	15	37	t.f.c.
SE	28	30	25	28	n/a	35	26	31	26	20	21	18	39	32	54	28	29	27	18	31	29
SI	6	6	7	3	17	1	4	4	9	0	1	6	6	7	18	12	6	3	3	11	1
SK	16	18	13	12	42	18	17	34	14	6	4	14	9	21	13	24	17	8	11	27	8
TR	15	7	22	15	n/a	11	15	12	19	12	25	12	23	9	21	14	13	16	11	27	13
av.	14	14	15	11	23	19	14	14	16	8	13	13	14	15	16	17	14	13	10	21	14

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, B.4.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 2.3 How long after leaving the #regular school system for the first time did you enter higher education for the first time?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT, CH, DE, FR, HU.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B3.2

Students entering higher education through alternative route by sex, type of HEI, field of study, and educational background/Share of alternative access students by educational origin

Share of students (in %)

Alternative access route	Share of alternative access students of respective whole population															Share of alternative access students					
	Sex		Type of HEI		Field of study										Educational background	Educational origin					
	Female	Male	University	Non-university	Education (incl. teacher training)	Arts and humanities	Social sciences, journalism and information	Business, administration and law	Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics	Information and communication technologies (ICTs)	Engineering, manufacturing and construction	Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary	Health and welfare	Services							
AL	9	9	9	9	21	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	7	10	86	14	n.d.		
AT	8	6	10	7	13	8	7	9	6	8	8	6	6	9	10	3	96	n.d.	4		
CH	13	13	13	5	23	14	12	6	10	8	14	15	23	34	15	11	59	n.d.	41		
CZ	2	1	2	2	5	3	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	81	9	9		
DE	5	4	5	4	6	5	5	5	4	3	4	4	4	6	8	7	3	62	0.1	38	
DK	8	7	9	5	11	10	7	6	12	7	12	11	n.d.	5	n.d.	9	7	43	4	52	
EE	7	7	7	6	11	9	8	9	6	5	4	7	2	10	4	10	6	92	8	n.d.	
FI	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	
FR	1	2	1	2	n.d.	4	3	2	1	1	4	0.4	t.f.c.	0.2	0.1	2	1	98	2	n.d.	
GE	3	2	3	3	n/a	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	4	2	3	2	85	15	n.d.		
HR	19	17	22	15	35	12	22	14	22	7	21	15	16	21	26	22	16	23	0.2	76	
HU	3	2	3	2	3	3	4	4	2	2	3	2	3	1	2	4	1	64	9	27	
IE	8	7	10	6	10	4	8	13	8	6	9	10	8	11	7	8	7	30	19	50	
IS	29	28	31	29	n/a	38	26	31	29	27	36	29	31	18	n.d.	38	21	76	2	22	
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	
LT	2	2	2	2	4	7	2	3	1	0	0	3	2	2	3	3	1	80	6	13	
LV	6	7	4	4	8	5	4	3	7	4	2	5	4	6	13	7	5	64	6	31	
MT	28	27	30	26	42	27	26	35	34	5	39	25	t.f.c.	21	t.f.c.	29	20	65	0	35	
NL	26	24	27	4	38	35	17	14	28	6	35	22	26	31	34	34	18	88	3	9	
NO	16	14	18	13	18	15	13	11	14	12	18	19	23	18	t.f.c.	22	13	73	5	22	
PL	4	4	4	3	9	4	4	4	4	0	0	3	6	4	8	4	3	98	2	n/a	
PT	22	18	26	17	30	33	32	17	26	12	38	20	22	12	29	27	13	87	n.d.	13	
RO	4	3	5	4	n/a	4	1	4	4	1	4	7	5	2	3	5	3	91	9	n/a	
RS	2	1	2	2	n.d.	0	6	1	1	1	0.2	1	4	1	1	2	2	n/a	29	71	
SE	10	10	9	10	n/a	13	10	10	7	7	10	5	5	10	19	12	8	81	19	n/a	
SI	6	5	6	4	11	5	4	7	9	1	5	4	4	4	10	8	4	54	0.1	46	
SK	1	1	2	1	2	3	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	
TR	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n/a	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	
av.	10	9	10	7	16	11	9	9	10	5	11	9	9	9	11	12	7	73	8	33	

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, B.5 & B.9.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 2.0 Do you have a #Matura or foreign equivalent?; [Only students with #Matura] 2.1 Did you obtain your #Matura or foreign equivalent in direct relation (within 6 months) of leaving the #regular school system for the first time?; [Only students without #Matura] 2.2 Where did you last attend the #regular school system?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT, CH, DE, EE, HU.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B3.3

Students with a time delay of more than 24 months between graduating from previous study programme and current Master programme by sex, educational background, access route, dependency on income source and field of study

Share of Master students (in %)

		Sex		Educational background		Access route		Dependency on income source		Field of study																						
		All students		Female	Male	With HE background	Without HE background	Standard access route	Alternative access route	Dependent on family support	Dependent on own earnings	Dependent on national public student support	Education		Arts and humanities		Social sciences, journalism and information		Business, administration and law		Natural sciences, Mathematics and statistics		Information and communication technologies (ICTs)		Engineering, manufacturing and construction		Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary		Health and welfare		Services	
		All	Students							n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.				
AL	10	10	11	9	12	11	5	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.				
AT	11	11	10	13	8	6	8	6	13	4	11	16	36	11	10	14	6	14	6	15	14	10	8	27	8	t.f.c.	10	t.f.c.				
CH	15	17	13	13	17	13	31	7	24	16	10	15	9	14	10	15	10	14	10	15	14	10	15	15	15	15	15	15	15			
CZ	4	4	5	3	5	4	14	1	6	3	7	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4			
DE	7	8	6	6	7	6	8	3	11	4	6	7	10	9	2	2	4	4	4	4	7	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15			
DK	9	9	8	8	11	8	16	17	16	4	t.f.c.	12	6	t.f.c.	6	t.f.c.	7	n.d.	10	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.				
EE	30	34	24	29	34	30	34	12	37	10	32	24	25	43	9	36	18	t.f.c.	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43				
FI	29	30	27	26	29	n.d.	n.d.	27	34	13	27	21	21	31	25	31	29	14	50	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40				
FR	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.				
GE	27	28	25	28	24	27	21	22	29	37	30	27	31	24	10	8	20	26	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.				
HR	8	9	7	4	10	3	17	0	11	0	15	3	2	14	3	5	2	0	24	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.				
HU	26	27	25	20	34	25	33	10	38	7	49	20	20	29	4	15	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14			
IE	45	44	46	40	49	46	39	22	56	24	45	34	42	48	34	56	37	t.f.c.	65	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40				
IS	42	43	39	34	47	46	34	43	44	28	46	39	37	45	40	40	40	t.f.c.	56	56	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.				
IT	5	5	4	5	4	4	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	12	8	5	n.d.	3	n.d.	2	n.d.	20	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.				
LT	23	27	17	22	24	22	59	31	20	t.f.c.	37	12	33	35	9	t.f.c.	5	t.f.c.	24	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.					
LV	27	27	27	25	31	28	21	25	28	t.f.c.	31	27	37	28	15	t.f.c.	18	t.f.c.	35	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.					
MT	35	35	35	29	33	25	46	t.f.c.	44	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	50	t.f.c.	33	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.				
NL	12	13	12	8	20	9	34	5	38	4	33	9	7	17	2	5	12	0	10	t.f.c.	72	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.			
NO	38	44	31	34	52	37	46	39	63	7	46	24	36	39	18	t.f.c.	20	t.f.c.	72	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.				
PL	6	6	6	6	6	6	19	3	11	0	1	t.f.c.	8	10	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	3	0	10	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8				
PT	30	32	27	31	30	28	28	20	56	3	42	28	22	40	10	t.f.c.	20	t.f.c.	40	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35				
RO	14	15	13	14	15	15	13	9	18	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	27	12	11	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	16	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.					
RS	16	13	19	18	12	17	t.f.c.	3	45	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	0	12	26	11	t.f.c.	11	t.f.c.	62	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16				
SE	28	31	25	24	36	26	48	21	48	15	56	27	25	23	17	30	18	t.f.c.	54	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.					
SI	7	8	6	6	9	5	39	2	13	0	12	2	12	12	1	t.f.c.	3	t.f.c.	15	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.					
SK	3	4	0,4	2	3	3	t.f.c.	3	2	t.f.c.	3	3	3	4	0	2	0	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.						
TR	49	40	53	42	52	n.d.	n.d.	32	63	34	57	47	43	57	43	t.f.c.	43	48	46	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61	61			
av.	21	21	19	18	23	18	28	15	31	11	29	19	19	25	12	17	13	12	33	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27				

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, B.10.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.8 How long after graduating from your previous study programme did you start your current master programme?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, DE.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B3.4**Bachelor students' plans for continuation of studies by sex and type of HEI**

Share of all Bachelor students (in %)

	Plans to continue within a year after finishing current study programme(s)				Plans to continue studies later after finishing current study programme(s)				No plans to continue studying				Undecided			
	Female	Male	University	Non-university	Female	Male	University	Non-university	Female	Male	University	Non-university	Female	Male	University	Non-university
AL	51	47	48	61	22	21	22	22	5	7	6	0	23	24	24	17
AT*	71	81	82	58	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	17	9	8	28	12	10	10	14
CH	42	45	69	18	15	18	16	17	18	15	4	30	24	22	12	35
CZ	61	68	67	45	9	5	7	12	9	7	7	15	21	19	19	28
DE	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
DK	44	51	77	16	17	12	8	22	17	18	6	29	22	19	9	32
EE	32	31	35	22	20	20	21	18	9	10	8	12	38	40	36	47
FI	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
FR	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
GE	52	46	49	n/a	19	15	17	n/a	1	3	2	n/a	28	36	32	n/a
HR	66	65	74	43	7	8	6	12	5	10	5	13	22	17	15	32
HU	47	50	52	35	16	13	13	20	12	11	12	12	25	26	23	33
IE	31	33	34	30	25	21	24	22	9	11	9	11	35	34	33	37
IS	46	43	45	n/a	25	27	26	n/a	2	4	3	n/a	27	26	27	n/a
IT*	63	60	62	n/a	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n/a	20	20	20	n/a	17	20	18	n/a
LT	33	26	33	25	12	13	14	10	16	21	15	22	39	41	38	43
LV	32	32	36	26	18	16	16	19	9	13	8	15	41	39	40	40
MT	36	38	42	18	29	25	28	22	4	6	4	11	31	31	26	49
NL	39	41	82	25	14	11	8	14	18	20	2	25	29	27	7	36
NO	38	46	47	36	25	18	19	25	14	15	12	16	23	21	22	23
PL	69	61	68	59	6	5	5	5	5	7	6	5	21	27	21	31
PT	44	44	54	34	22	16	17	22	6	8	5	10	28	31	24	35
RO	70	68	69	n/a	6	7	7	n/a	5	5	5	n/a	19	20	20	n/a
RS	62	63	63	n.d.	7	6	6	n/a	6	6	6	n/a	25	25	25	n/a
SE	34	39	36	n/a	20	17	19	n/a	18	21	19	n/a	28	24	27	n/a
SI	58	55	60	34	7	7	6	16	6	10	7	9	29	29	27	41
SK	68	73	69	74	5	2	4	3	5	7	6	3	23	19	21	20
TR	40	35	38	n/a	16	16	16	n/a	8	16	12	n/a	35	33	34	n/a
av.	49	50	56	37	16	14	14	17	10	11	8	15	27	26	24	33

n.d.: no data. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, B.12.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.10 Are you planning to continue studying in higher education after finishing your current study programme(s)?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** AT, IT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Chapter B4

Types and modes of study

Key

B
4

Types of higher education institutions

Across all countries, the majority of students are enrolled at universities; the EUROSTUDENT (unweighted) average for enrolment at non-universities is 30 %. Higher shares of students having used alternative access routes, as well as larger shares of students without higher education (HE) background, low intensity students, and students dependent on own earnings can be found at non-universities compared to their respective counterparts.

Enrolment in degree programmes

Across EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of students are enrolled in Bachelor programmes. With the exception of six countries, the second-largest share of students is enrolled in Master programmes. On average, 10 % of students are enrolled in long national programmes. Higher shares of students with higher education background are enrolled in these long national programmes, compared to students without higher education background. In contrast, higher shares of students without higher education background are found in short-cycle programmes, in which, on cross-country average, around 10 % of students are enrolled.

Interruption of studies

Across EUROSTUDENT countries, on average 7 % of students report having interrupted their current study programmes for at least 1 year. In some countries, the shares of students with previous study interruptions are as high as 15 %. The three main stated reasons for interruptions of studies are a lack of motivation, financial difficulties, and work-related reasons. For students without higher education background, financial difficulties are the most-often stated reason for the interruption of studies.

findings

Satisfaction with study programme

Across countries, the majority of students is satisfied with the organisation of studies and timetable (on average, 55 % of students are satisfied or very satisfied), with study facilities (64 %) and with the quality of teaching (65 %). Overall, larger shares of non-university and Master students tend to be satisfied with all three above-mentioned aspects, but this varies across countries.

Fields of study

Students' educational background differs across different fields of study. The largest differences between students by educational background are evident in education (incl. teacher training): higher shares of students without higher education background are enrolled in these subjects than students with higher education background.

B
4

Students with formal part-time status

Across countries, 17 % of students are formally enrolled as part-time students. The share of formal part-time students is highest in short-cycle study programmes (33 %) compared to Master (21 %) and Bachelor (14 %) programmes. Students without higher education background are more frequently enrolled as part-time students compared to their peers with higher education background. The share of part-time students increases with students' age but there are, on cross-country average, no differences in the shares of part-time students between sexes. The share of part-time students is twice as high among non-university students (30 %) compared to university students; likewise, shares for alternative access route students are more than twice as large as for students having accessed via a standard access route. Among delayed transition students, the shares of part-time students are around three times as large as among students who have transitioned directly into higher education.

Main issues

The Bologna Process has resulted in a considerable restructuring of study programmes in the majority of its signatory states, leading to convergence especially with regard to study programmes and the usage of [European Credit Transfer System \(ECTS\)](#) points (Vögtle, 2014). The analyses in this chapter are based on the expressed commitment by Bologna Process participants to make study structures flexible in order to enable students, especially those with a paid job or who have previously interrupted their educational career or entered higher education at a later point in life, to balance their personal, professional, and educational activities. Moreover, study interruptions, reasons for the interruption, and results on students' satisfaction with their study programme are presented in this chapter.

Degree structure reforms

The Bologna Declaration (1999) and the reforms introduced by its signatory states had the goal of making Europe's higher education systems more compatible across and between countries and to facilitate student mobility. The Bologna framework proposed the adoption of a system of higher education based on two main cycles: undergraduate and graduate. Later, with the Berlin Communiqué (2003), doctoral studies as well as [short-cycle higher education programmes](#) and qualifications were also included within the Bologna framework. In addition to making the study programmes comparable and compatible across member countries, the introduction of 'flexible learning pathways' and 'student-centered learning' forms part of the Bologna Agenda. These are seen as means to help diverse student groups balance their educational, professional, and personal demands. In view of the degree reforms, this chapter describes the enrolment of students in different types of study programmes and examines the flexibility of study structures in the EUROSTUDENT countries by looking at the share of students with full-time and part-time enrolment status.

Selective enrolment in higher education institutions

Formal barriers for participation in higher education regarding gender, as well as ethnic and social groups, have been eliminated across Europe. With the introduction of higher education institutions (HEIs) following a different model than 'traditional' [universities](#), access to higher education has been diversified. However, recent research has indicated that this institutional diversification is often accompanied by an increased degree of stratification with different types of institutions, or individual institutions, conveying different levels of prestige and, possibly, labour market returns (Arum, Gamoran, & Shavit, 2007; Reimer & Jacob, 2011; Triventi, 2013; Marconi, 2015; Marginson, 2016). Furthermore, existing research points towards the fact that students from disadvantaged backgrounds tend to concentrate in lower-prestige HEIs (UNESCO (IIEP), 2017; Kwiek, 2013; Triventi, 2013; Marginson, 2016; Brown, 2017; see also [Chapter B2](#)). Due to this stratification, 'different tracks fostering or blocking social mobility' (Smolentseva, 2012, p. 37) are formed which may not be equally accessible to all social groups (Brooks, 2008).

Selective enrolment in degree programmes

(Potential) students in higher education are confronted with a plethora of opportunities and choices, ranging from selecting study programmes, to types of institutions, and field of study. Different types of study programmes, however, may be more or less attractive to certain student groups. For instance, short-cycle higher education programmes, because of their applied focus, have been found to particularly attract students from disadvantaged backgrounds, such as 1st generation students, adult learners (Kirsch, Beernaert, & Nørgaard, 2003) and students with

migration background. At the same time, students from high social backgrounds have been found to be attracted to courses in medicine, law, and veterinary science (Reimer & Pollak, 2010), which are mostly offered as long national programmes, as well as natural and social sciences (for instance for Germany see Georg & Bargel, 2017; for the UK see Brooks, 2008). A similar finding has recently been reported by Garaz and Torotcoi (2017) with regard to Roma students' subject choice. Against this background, this chapter further examines the characteristics of students enrolled in various study programmes and fields of study.

Study interruptions and study conditions

A common misconception relevant to study conditions has been that students dropping out or interrupting higher education could not succeed academically, i.e. that the students failed, not the institutions. However, students leave or interrupt studies not solely for academic reasons, but also because of financial stress, mental health issues, and dissatisfaction with the institution (Cole, 2017). Bearing this in mind, this chapter analyses the extent to which students have temporarily interrupted their studies as well as their reasons for doing so.

With the Berlin Communiqué (2003), the quality of higher education provision has evolved into a central aspect of the Bologna Process, culminating in the adoption of standards and guidelines for quality assurance with the Bucharest Communiqué (2012). In the course of widened participation of diverse student groups, renewed focus has been placed on teaching styles (Wolter, 2015) as a means to improve the quality of education provided. The main focus in the debate on educational quality lies on teaching methods and curricula, however, in most (national and international) rankings of individual HEIs, quality of study facilities are no less important for overall assessments. Moreover, recent research (Roksa, Trolian, Blaich, & Wise, 2017) has highlighted clear and organised instruction as another aspect related to quality of education, related to a range of outcomes such as grades and persistence to learning and well-being. Therefore, EUROSTUDENT results on students' assessment of the quality of teaching, organisation of studies and the timetable, as well as study facilities, may provide insights into overall and country-specific patterns related to certain aspects of quality of higher education provision.

The chapter aims to provide answers to the following questions:

- To what extent are students enrolled in different types of HEIs, different degree programmes, fields of study, and study status in the EUROSTUDENT countries? Does the composition of the student body vary between types of HEIs, degree programmes, formal study status, and fields of study?
- How large is the share of students who have interrupted their studies within the EUROSTUDENT countries, and what are the reasons for interruption? Do these shares differ according to students' educational background?
- How satisfied are students with their study programme with regard to the quality of teaching, the organisation of studies and timetable, and study facilities? Does the satisfaction with the study programme vary by degree programme and type of HEI?

Methodological and conceptual notes

Classification of study programmes and definition of students' formal enrolment

As in previous EUROSTUDENT rounds, in examining students' enrolment patterns, three aspects are considered in this chapter. These include an examination of the share of students

across various study programmes, fields of study, and the formal status of students' enrolment. In understanding students' enrolment across study programmes, the following four types of programmes are considered: Bachelor programmes, Master programmes, short-cycle higher education programmes, and long national programmes (see Hauschmidt et al., 2015, pp. 75–87). In addition, other types of programmes (for instance single subjects) are briefly considered, keeping in mind that it is difficult to compare them cross-nationally.

The formal status of students is assessed on the basis of their formal registration status, i.e. whether they are enrolled in the higher education programme on a full-time or a part-time basis, which is independent of the number of hours actually spent on study-related activities and thus does not correlate perfectly with the actual intensity of the study programme ([> Chapter B5](#)).

Data and interpretations

B
4

Students without higher education background and low intensity students are more likely to be studying at non-universities

In all countries with different types of HEIs (where such different types exist) except one, the majority of students are enrolled in universities (Figure B4.1). The EUROSTUDENT (unweighted) average for enrolment in non-universities is 30 %.

- The largest shares of more than 45 % of non-university students can be found in Norway, Ireland, Finland, and the Netherlands. In Ireland and Finland, the distributions of students between universities and non-universities are the most balanced, with shares of around 50 % each.
- Relatively small shares of non-university students can be found in Albania and the Czech Republic, where less than 10 % of students are enrolled in non-universities.

What does EUROSTUDENT data tell us about students enrolled at non-universities? Across all countries, with one exception, higher shares of students having used alternative access routes are enrolled at non-universities than students having used the standard access route (Table B4.1).


- In Switzerland, Denmark, Ireland, and the Netherlands, between 60 % and 94 % of alternative access students are enrolled in non-universities. These shares are between 14 and 40 percentage points higher than the respective share of standard access route students. In Croatia, Poland, and Slovenia, the share of alternative access students enrolled at non-universities is also at least 20 percentage points higher than that of standard access route students.
- The qualification pathway plays a lesser role in Albania, Hungary, and Norway – here, the differences between the shares of students enrolled at non-universities differ by less than 10 percentage points between standard and alternative access students.

Regarding the enrolment at different types of HEIs, on cross-country average, there are only slight differences between students without migration background and domestically educated 2nd generation migrant students, with the shares being more or less the same in the two groups (31 % vs. 30 %, Table B4.1).

- In Austria, Switzerland, Finland, Ireland, and Poland, however, higher shares of students without migration background are found at non-universities than 2nd generation migrant students.

Figure B4.1 **Students' enrolment by type of HEI**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, C.1.**Note(s):** No non-universities exist in GE, IS, IT, RO, SE, TR.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.2. At what type of HEI are you studying in the current semester?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** CH.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- In Lithuania, Latvia, Malta, and Slovenia, the pattern is reversed, with shares of 2nd generation migrant students between 1 and 4 percentage points higher compared to domestic students.
- In the remaining countries, the shares among the two student groups are equal, or slightly higher shares (of up to 3 percentage points higher) of students enrolled at non-universities are found among students without migration background.

With respect to the educational background of students, across EUROSTUDENT countries, larger shares of students without higher education background than students with higher education background are enrolled at non-universities¹ (Table B4.1).

- The largest differences between students with and without higher education background with regard to their enrolment at non-universities can be found in Ireland, Lithuania, the Netherlands, and Portugal, where the shares of students without higher education background enrolled at non-universities are more than 15 percentage points higher than those of students with higher education background.
- Only small differences by educational background of less than 5 percentage points are apparent in Albania, the Czech Republic, Latvia, and Slovakia. With the exception of Latvia, these countries generally have small shares of non-university students.

Across countries, more than a quarter of high intensity students, compared to around a third of low intensity students, are studying at non-universities (Table B4.1). In around 60% of EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, the share of low intensity students at non-universities is at least 3 percentage points higher than that of high intensity students.

¹ With the exemption of France, where the prestigious Grandes Écoles form part of the non-university sector.

- In Austria, Germany, France, Ireland, and Lithuania, and, to a lesser extent, in Denmark and Estonia, this pattern is reversed, with higher shares of high intensity students studying at non-universities than low intensity students.

Out of the three income dependent groups, the highest share of non-university students can be found among students dependent on own earnings. Thirty-eight percent of these students are enrolled in non-universities, whereas 28% of students dependent on family support and 29% of students depending on national public student support are enrolled at this type of HEI (Table B4.1).

- In Switzerland, Finland, the Netherlands, and Norway, between half and three quarters of students who are dependent on own earnings are enrolled at non-universities.

Despite a large variation in enrolment in different degree programmes across EUROSTUDENT countries, most students are enrolled in Bachelor programmes


A large variation of degree programmes across EUROSTUDENT countries exists, and not all types of degree programmes, that are offered nationally, can be observed from a cross-national perspective. Thus, the following four types of programmes are considered in comparison: Bachelor programmes, Master programmes, short-cycle higher education programmes, and long national programmes.

In all EUROSTUDENT countries, Bachelor and Master programmes are offered. Across all countries, with the exception of Sweden and France, the majority of students are enrolled in Bachelor programmes with an (unweighted) cross-country average of 64% and the second-largest share of students is enrolled in Master programmes (22% on average), except for five countries, namely Italy, Portugal, Turkey, Sweden, and France (Figure B4.2).

Figure B4.2 ↓

Enrolment in different study programmes

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, C.4. **No data:** Short-cycle degree, short national degree and other degree: AL.

Note(s): No short-cycle programmes exist in AL, AT, CH, CZ, DE, EE, FI, GE, HR, IT, LT, NO, PL, RO, RS, SK.

Eurostudent question(s): 1.4 With which degree does your current (main) study programme conclude?

Deviations from Eurostudent conventions: CH.

Deviations from Eurostudent standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- In the Netherlands, Georgia, Serbia, Ireland, and Lithuania, at least three quarters of students are enrolled in Bachelor programmes.
- In a third of all countries, large shares of Master students of 25 % or more can be found. These countries are Switzerland, Finland, Poland, the Czech Republic, Malta, Slovakia, Norway, Latvia, and France.

For 23 out of the 28 EUROSTUDENT countries information on long national degree programmes is available. On EUROSTUDENT average, 10 % of students are enrolled in long national programmes (Figure B4.2).

- The largest shares of students enrolled in long national programmes of around 20 % can be found in Italy, Austria, and France.
- In Iceland, Malta, and Turkey, less than 5 % of all students are enrolled in long national programmes.

In the EUROSTUDENT countries with data on short-cycle programmes, on average, about 10 % of students are enrolled in these (Figure B4.2).

- The largest shares of students enrolled in short-cycle programmes are found in Ireland, Malta, Slovenia, Turkey, Latvia, and France, where between 10 % and slightly less than a third of students are enrolled in such a programme.
- Shares of students in short-cycle programmes are 3 % or lower in the Netherlands, Iceland, Portugal, and Sweden.
- Short national programmes, where existent, are taken up – on EUROSTUDENT average – by relatively low shares of students of about 3 %. Programmes other than the ones mentioned above, where they exist, also have very low shares of enrolled students (Figure B4.2).
- Exceptions are Norway, Sweden, and France, where between 4 and 8 % of students are enrolled in short national programmes. Also, 3 to 12 % of students are enrolled in programmes (for instance single subjects) other than the above-mentioned ones.

Enrolment in long national and short-cycle degree programmes tends to be socially selective


Students' choice of study programmes and formal study status is related to their personal characteristics and background ([> Chapter B1](#), [> Chapter B2](#)). To illustrate this, the following analyses take a closer look at the distribution of  students with and without higher education background in  long national degree programmes.

On average, the share of  students with higher education background in long national programmes is 5 percentage points higher compared to the shares for  students without higher education background (Figure B4.3).

- Exceptions are Georgia, Iceland, and Malta, where the shares of students with and without higher education background enrolled in long national programmes are equal.
- The largest differences between students with and without higher education background of 10 percentage points or more are evident in Italy, France, Portugal, Romania, and Poland.
- Differences in enrolment in long national programmes between students with and without higher education background of less than 5 percentage points exist in Austria, Sweden, Hungary, Slovenia, Slovakia, Norway, and Serbia.
- In contrast, larger shares of students without higher education background enrol in short-cycle degree programmes compared to their peers with higher education background ([> Chapter B2](#)).

Figure B4.3 ↗**Students' enrolment in long national degree programmes by higher education background**

Share of all students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, C.4. No data/not applicable: DK, FI, IE, NL.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.4 With which degree does your current (main) study programme conclude?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Part-time study status is more common for students without higher education background and students who used alternative access routes into higher education

Studying ↗ part-time can be defined in two different ways, formally and informally: a formal part-time status refers to enrolment in designated part-time study programmes, whereas an informal part-time status can be attained through adjustment of the own actual ↗ time budget by students themselves (↗ [Chapter B5](#)). Across all countries in which a formal part-time study status exists, on average 17 % of students are formally enrolled as part-time students (Figure B4.4).

- Overall, the largest shares of formal part-time students can be found in Poland, Sweden, Hungary, and Croatia, where over a quarter of students are formally enrolled as part-time students.
- The lowest shares of formal part-time students, on the other hand, with shares of less than 10 % can be found in the Netherlands, Romania, Estonia, Iceland, and Germany.


↗ Students without higher education background are more frequently enrolled as part-time students compared to ↗ students with higher education background. On EUROSTUDENT average, the difference in shares between students with and without higher education background is 8 percentage points, with larger shares of part-time students being found in the group of students without higher education background (Figure B4.4).

Regarding the age distribution of part-time students, across all EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of part-time students increases with students' age. On average, 55 % of part-time students are 30 years old or older; in the age group up to 21 years, the average share of part-time students amounts to only 5 % (Table B4.2).

- The highest shares of part-time students in the age category up to 21 years of between 10 and 19 % can be found in Croatia, Poland, Sweden, and Turkey.

Figure B4.4 **Students' formal part-time study status by higher education background**

Share of all students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, C.5. **No data:** IT.

Countries in which no formal part-time status exists: AT, DK, FR, GE, RS, TR.

Countries which did not include part-time students in sample: AL, LV.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.5 What is your current formal status as a student?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** CH, CZ, IT, RO.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- In the Czech Republic, Croatia, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia, at least 85 % of students aged 30 years or older are formally enrolled as part-time students.

No differences in the shares of part-time students among male and female students (both 17 %) are apparent on cross-national average, but at the country level, some differences do exist (Table B4.2).

In all countries (where applicable), the share of part-time students is higher among non-university students; across countries, the share of part-time students is twice as high among non-university students (30 %) compared to university students (Table B4.2).

- The largest differences between shares of part-time students at universities and non-universities can be found in Poland, Slovenia, and Slovakia, where shares of part-time students are between 35 and 51 percentage points higher at non-universities than at universities.

Across countries, the share of formal part-time students is highest in short-cycle study programmes (33 %) compared to Master (21 %) and Bachelor (14 %) programmes (Table B4.2).

- The highest shares of part-time students in Bachelor programmes are found in Croatia, Hungary, and Poland, where between a quarter and a third of Bachelor students are studying part-time.
- The largest shares of Master students studying part-time can be found in Ireland and Poland, where 40 to 50 % of Master students are formally enrolled as part-time students.
- The share of formal part-time students in short-cycle programmes is between 19 and 54 %, with the largest shares apparent in Ireland, Iceland, and Malta (between 40 and 54 %), and the smallest in Hungary, Portugal, and Sweden (between 19 and 26 %).

In all countries but one, the shares of part-time students among students having used an **○** alternative access route into higher education are larger than among **○** standard access route students. On EUROSTUDENT average, the shares of part-time students among **○** alternative access route students are more than twice as large as for students having accessed higher education via a **○** standard access route (34 % vs. 15 %, Table B4.2).

- The difference between students having used **○** standard and **○** alternative access routes, respectively, is the largest in the Czech Republic, Croatia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, and Slovakia. In these countries, the share of part-time students among students having used alternative access routes is between 25 and 53 percentage points higher than among students having used **○** standard access routes.

A similar pattern can be found with respect to the duration of the transition period into higher education. In all countries but one, the share of students with **○** formal part-time study status is higher among **○** delayed transition students than among **○** direct transition students. On cross-country average, shares of students with formal part-time status are almost three times higher among **○** delayed transition students, than the shares of those students who have transitioned **○** directly into higher education (Table B4.2).

- In the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, more than three quarters of delayed transition students are enrolled as part-time students.

Enrolment in certain fields of study tends to be socially selective

EUROSTUDENT data show differences in enrolment with regard to students' education background. In all fields of study except ICTs (information and communication technologies), at least a slight difference (on average) between the two groups can be found (Table B4.3). Figure B4.5 depicts enrolment in the fields of study "education (incl. teacher training)" (Figure B4.5a) and "natural sciences, mathematics and statistics" (Figure B4.5b) for students with and without higher education background.

Across countries, with the exception of Turkey, Serbia, and Finland, the shares of students without higher education background enrolled in education (incl. teacher training), are higher compared to students with higher education background (Figure B4.5a).


- The largest differences between the two groups can be found in Austria, Switzerland, the Czech Republic, Sweden, Iceland, Poland, and Romania, where the shares of students studying education-related subjects are at least five percentage points higher among students without higher education background than among students with higher education background.
- The smallest differences between students with and without higher education background regarding their enrolment in education-related fields of study of one percentage point or less are apparent in Germany, Turkey, Serbia, Finland, Lithuania, France, and Portugal.

In around 70 % of EUROSTUDENT countries, the shares of students with higher education background are at least slightly higher in the field of natural sciences, mathematics and statistics, compared to students without higher education background (Figure B4.5b, Table B4.3).

- The largest difference in enrolment in natural sciences, mathematics and statistics according to students' educational background can be found in Norway and Slovenia, where the shares of students with higher education background are 4 percentage points higher.
- In seven countries (Slovakia, Poland, Turkey, Italy, Latvia, Portugal, and Georgia) the shares of students with and without higher education background enrolled in natural sciences, math-

Figure B4.5 ↴**Students' enrolment in selected fields of study by educational background**

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, C.3. No data: AL.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.6 What is your current (main) study programme?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

ematics and statistics are equal and only in one country are the shares of students without higher education background higher (Figure B4.5b).

Lack of motivation, financial difficulties, and work-related reasons are main reasons for (temporary) interruptions of study programmes


The shares of students who have officially or unofficially interrupted their current study programme for at least two consecutive semesters vary greatly across countries (Figure B4.6).

- Relatively large shares of students who have interrupted their current study programme can be found in Croatia, Estonia, Turkey, and Albania, where this applies to between 10 % and 15 % of all students.
- In Germany, Georgia, and Slovakia, on the other hand, no more than 4 % of student report having interrupted their studies.

Figure B4.6 ↴

Students who interrupted their current (main) study programme for at least two consecutive semesters by study programme

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, C.7. **No data:** CH, FR, IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 2.8 Did you ever (officially or unofficially) interrupt your current (main) study programme for at least two consecutive semesters?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT, CZ.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Generally, the cross-national pattern reveals that higher shares of Master students report having interrupted their current study programme (Figure B4.6).

- The pattern is reversed in Hungary, Portugal, Malta, the Netherlands, and Romania where, compared to Master students, Bachelor students have more frequently interrupted their current studies.
- The largest differences between Master and Bachelor students can be found in Estonia and Turkey, where the share of Master students who have in the past interrupted their current studies is around 10 percentage points higher compared to Bachelor students. The smallest respective differences of 1 percentage point can be found in Latvia, Ireland, and Poland.
- No difference in shares between Bachelor and Master students, with regard to study interruptions, is visible in Sweden and Georgia.


Focusing on the stated reasons for the interruption of the current main study programme, on EUROSTUDENT (unweighted) average, the three main reasons stated are: a lack of motivation, financial difficulties, and work-related reasons. However, there are large cross-national variations with regard to the most-often stated reasons for interruption (Table B4.4).

- Across all EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, a 'lack of motivation' was stated by 31% of respondents as a reason for their interruption of studies. In the Czech Republic, Finland, Croatia, Iceland, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Sweden, and Slovenia, the share of students giving this reason for an interruption lies above the EUROSTUDENT average.
- Across countries, financial difficulties were stated by 27% of respondents as a reason for a study interruption. Countries in which shares of students above the EUROSTUDENT average state financial difficulties as a reason for study interruptions are Albania, Georgia, Croatia, Hungary, Ireland, Iceland, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Romania, and Serbia.

Figure B4.7 ↓

Students' (selected) reasons for interruption of current (main) study programme for at least two consecutive semesters

Share of students who interrupted studies (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, C.8. No data: CH, FR, IT. Too few cases: SK; for higher education background: MT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 2.9 What was/were the reason(s) for the interruption of at least two consecutive semesters during your current (main) study programme?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- On EUROSTUDENT average, a quarter of respondents who have interrupted their current (main) study programme state work-related reasons. In Germany, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Malta, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and Slovenia, the share of students giving work-related reasons for a study interruption lies above the EUROSTUDENT average of 25 %.

When analysing the reasons for interruptions for students with and without higher education background separately, similar reasons emerge, but in a different order. For students with higher education background, the three main reasons on cross-country average are lack of motivation (34 %), work-related reasons (24 %), and financial difficulties (23 %) whereas for students without higher education background, four main reasons are evident: financial difficulties (31 %),

lack of motivation (28 %), as well as work- (26 %) and family-related reasons (25 %) (Table B4.4). In over 85 % of countries with available data, ◊ students without higher education background more often state financial difficulties as a reason for study interruption than ◊ students with higher education background (Figure B4.7a).

- In Hungary, Sweden, and the Netherlands, this pattern is reversed, with students with higher education background stating financial reasons for study interruption to a (slightly) greater extent.
- The largest differences between ◊ students with and without higher education background can be found in Lithuania, Serbia, and Poland, where the share of students without higher education background who state that they interrupted because of financial difficulties is 18 to 22 percentage points higher than among students with higher education background.
- In Albania, Iceland, and Denmark, the difference in relevance of financial reasons for students with and without higher education background is relatively small, ranging between 1 and 2 percentage points.

B 4

With regard to work-related reasons for study interruption, a less clear pattern than for financial difficulties emerges. In around half of all EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, higher shares of ◊ students without higher education background state a work-related reason for study interruption, than ◊ students with higher education background (Figure B4.7b).

- The largest differences between the two groups, between 7 to 11 percentage points, can be found in Portugal, Latvia, and Estonia.
- In contrast, in Georgia, Turkey, Lithuania, Serbia, Poland, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, the share of students with higher education background who state work-related reasons for study interruptions is higher compared to those of their peers without higher education background.

Figure B4.8 ↴

Students' satisfaction with their current study programme
Share of all students indicating to be (very) satisfied with a certain aspect (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, J29, J30 & J31. **No data:** CH, DE, IT, TR; **quality of teaching:** AT; **study facilities:** FR.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.9 How satisfied are you regarding the following aspects of your current (main) study programme?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

A majority of students is satisfied with study facilities, quality of teaching, the organisation of studies, and the timetable

Across countries, a majority of students is satisfied with the organisation of studies and timetable (on average, 55 % of students are satisfied or very satisfied), with study facilities (64 %), and with the quality of teaching (65 %). With the exception of one country, the majority of students in each country is satisfied with the quality of teaching (Figure B4.8).

- Over two thirds of students in Georgia, Finland, and Iceland state that they are satisfied with the organisation of studies and the timetable. The lowest shares of satisfied students in this regard are found in France and Romania, where less than 40 % of students are satisfied with the organisation of studies and the timetable.
- In Finland, Estonia, and the Czech Republic, over three quarters of students are (very) satisfied with the study facilities. The lowest shares of students who report being (very) satisfied with their study facilities can be found in Albania, Serbia, and Romania, where the respective share lies between 40 % and 50 %.
- Students are particularly satisfied with the quality of teaching in Georgia, Finland, and the Czech Republic, where around three quarters of students report being (very) satisfied with this aspect.

With regard to the quality of teaching, as well as the organisation of studies and the timetable, slightly higher shares of (very) satisfied students are registered among  non-university students, rather than among  university students, even though there is no clear pattern across countries. There is no difference between types of higher education visible with regard to the satisfaction with study facilities (Table B4.5).

- With regard to the quality of teaching, larger shares of  university students (rather than  non-university students) are satisfied with this aspect in Albania, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, and Portugal.

Master students, on cross-country average, tend to be more satisfied with all three aspects; however, this varies across countries (Table B4.5).

Discussion and policy considerations

In addition to the analyses in the previous chapter ([Chapter B3](#)), this chapter reveals country-specific trends in the composition of the entire higher education system with regard to different types of HEIs (where applicable), degree programmes offered, formal study status, the interruption of studies and students' assessment of study conditions as well as cross-national patterns.

On average, 7 % of all students report having interrupted their current study programme for at least a year (officially or unofficially). However, the shares differ largely across countries. The three main stated reasons for interruptions of studies are the lack of motivation, financial difficulties, and work-related reasons. Financial reasons for study interruptions play an above-average role in Albania, Croatia, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, and Turkey. For students without higher education background, financial difficulties are, across all countries, the most commonly stated as reason for study interruptions.

Across countries, the majority of all students is satisfied with the organisation of studies and timetable (on average, 55 % of students are satisfied or very satisfied), with study facilities (64 %),

and with the quality of teaching (65 %). Only in five countries, Croatia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, and Serbia, students are satisfied below average in all three aspects. Overall, larger shares of non-university and Master students are satisfied with all three above-mentioned aspects, but this varies across countries.

On EUROSTUDENT average, where applicable, 30 % of students are enrolled in non-universities. Nine countries have shares above the average and thus, a relatively large non-university sector; these countries are Denmark, Germany, Finland, Ireland, Latvia, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and Switzerland. Since aggregate analysis of enrolment data may hide the social selectivity that exists between different forms of higher education (Clancy & Goastellec, 2007), this chapter also analysed enrolment data by students' educational background. With the exception of France, the shares of **○** students without higher education background enrolled at non-universities were much higher compared to those of students with higher education background (see also [>Chapter B2](#)), and students having used **○** alternative entry routes, as well as delayed transition students, particularly take advantage of alternatives to universities.

B 4

With regard to enrolment in different degree programmes, the data point towards a selective enrolment into long national and short-cycle degree programmes. Students with higher education background show higher enrolment rates into long national degree programmes, as they are often offered in the field of medicine, law, or other state-regulated professions which are generally regarded to carry a relatively high level of prestige. The contrary holds for short-cycle programmes: these seem to attract students without higher education background to a greater extent in all countries in which they are offered ([>Chapter B2](#)). A reason for the attractiveness of short-cycle programmes could be that they provide a clearer career path than more general programmes. Despite the commonalities for short-cycle programme students with regard to educational background, the composition of the student body enrolled in short-cycle programmes differs largely across countries ([>Database](#)). For instance, in some countries, younger students are more frequently enrolled in short-cycle programmes and in these countries, the shares of students employed alongside studies are also lower. Whereas in other countries, older students and students pursuing paid jobs are enrolled in short-cycle programmes to a greater extent, compared to their peers. Therefore, it seems greatly worthwhile to engage in further, in-depth, comparative analyses on demographics and socio-economic background of students enrolled in short-cycle programmes.

Flexible study structures are seen as a means to increase participation and to increase study success. The extent to which formal part-time status is common in a national higher education system varies largely across countries. On average, where applicable, 17 % of students are formally enrolled as part-time students. In four countries, Croatia, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, and Sweden, more than one fifth of students are formally enrolled as part-time students, and also the share of university students formally enrolled as part-time students is above average (14 %) in these countries. Thus, in these countries, the study structures seem to allow a higher degree of flexibility. Across countries, the share of part-time students is twice as high among non-university students (30 %) compared to university students. Similar patterns emerge with regard to **○** alternative access routes and **○** delayed transition students: the average share of part-time students, across countries, is more than twice as high among alternative access route students than among students having accessed via a **○** standard access route; among **○** delayed transition students, the average share of part-time students is three times larger compared to students who have transitioned directly into higher education. With the exception of Hungary, Portugal, and Sweden, the

largest shares of part-time students can be found in short-cycle degree programmes, followed by Master and Bachelor programmes. In Iceland, Ireland, and Malta, the share of formal part-time students enrolled in short-cycle study programmes is exceptionally large (above the EUROSUDENT average of 33 %). In all countries, students without higher education background are more frequently enrolled as part-time students than students with higher education background, and the share of part-time students' increases with students' age.

The patterns of enrolment and study paths described in this chapter can be regarded in two ways: one the one hand, a diversified higher education system can offer attractive opportunities for students who may not have otherwise entered higher education at all, therefore successfully serving the Bologna goal of widened participation and better access to higher education. Close attention should however be paid to the outcomes of different types of study programmes to ensure that, on the other hand, no new inequalities are created within the higher education system, if 'non-traditional' students' access to higher education is more or less restricted to certain types of institutions or degrees. If certain groups are shown to be concentrated in less prestigious HEIs, to interrupt or fail to complete their courses, then equal access to higher education is clearly only part of the picture. This emphasises the need for extensive data collection (and equally, analysis on the basis of microdata) in order to fully understand the inequalities in any given system (see Atherton et al., 2016), as well as across national higher education systems.

Tables

B
4

Table B4.1

Students enrolled in non-universities by access route into higher education, migration background, educational background, study intensity, and dependency on income source

Share of all students (in %)

	Access route		Migration background		Educational background		Study intensity		Dependency on income source		
	Alternative access route students	Standard access route students	Students without migrant background, national ed. background	2nd generation migrant students with national ed. Background	With HE background	Without HE background	High intensity	Low intensity	Dependent on family support	Dependent on own earnings	Dependent on national public student support
AL	11	4	5	t.f.c.	5	5	4	11	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT	33	20	22	16	11	22	9	14	18	29	
CH	78	38	47	41	36	51	40	48	33	59	38
CZ	20	7	8	6	5	9	3	10	6	10	5
DE	46	35	35	33	31	41	40	36	28	41	36
DK	60	41	43	40	39	50	41	40	45	46	42
EE	32	19	20	17	17	24	21	18	20	21	11
FI	n.d.	n.d.	49	38	43	58	46	47	51	52	47
FR	3	29	30	29	31	25	35	22	32	29	25
GE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
HR	36	15	18	18	13	22	10	26	14	26	12
HU	25	19	20	18	16	23	8	27	13	26	10
IE	60	46	47	42	39	55	49	43	37	49	51
IS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
IT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
LT	48	29	29	33	21	37	29	23	27	33	31
LV	54	40	39	40	40	41	41	43	39	39	44
MT	23	12	21	22	12	25	16	21	16	27	19
NL	94	54	65	63	54	75	63	67	60	77	60
NO	54	45	47	46	44	53	39	53	43	53	41
PL	49	21	22	17	16	26	11	33	12	38	13
PT	54	35	39	37	26	45	37	40	35	50	44
RO	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RS	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
SE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
SI	43	22	23	25	17	29	15	35	15	35	12
SK	24	14	14	14	12	16	8	20	10	22	2
TR	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
av.	42	27	31	30	25	35	28	32	28	38	29

n.d.: no data. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, C.1.

Note(s): No non-universities exist in GE, IS, IT, RO, SE, TR.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.2. At what type of HEI are you studying in the current semester?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B4.2

Part-time students by age group, sex, type of HEI, study programme, access route and transition route into higher education

Share of students (in %)

	< 22 years	22–24 years	25–29 years	30 years and older	Female	Male	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master	Short-cycle	Standard access route	Alternative access route	Direct transition	Delayed transition
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CH	2	6	15	32	11	13	n.d.	27	12	10	n/a	9	27	9	29
CZ	2	8	33	90	21	18	18	37	20	23	n/a	19	45	12	87
DE	2	2	4	11	3	4	2	6	4	4	n/a	3	8	3	7
DK	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
EE	1	4	13	9	6	7	6	8	6	7	n/a	6	4	7	3
FI	1	3	13	34	14	14	13	14	9	24	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	11	21
FR	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
HR	10	18	45	85	25	27	22	44	27	27	n.d.	18	61	23	73
HU	2	9	41	89	30	23	23	45	26	37	25	26	64	17	77
IE	1	6	27	58	15	15	14	16	6	41	54	15	20	12	39
IS	1	2	5	12	5	7	6	n/a	3	10	42	6	7	5	9
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	5	17	40	74	20	21	15	34	23	17	n/a	20	55	15	72
LV	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
MT	1	11	46	70	19	20	19	21	8	37	41	14	33	n.d.	n.d.
NL	0,5	3	11	71	8	7	3	11	7	10	28	5	15	5	11
NO	3	4	14	54	22	14	15	23	8	22	n.d.	18	24	16	28
PL	19	33	65	89	37	36	27	72	34	49	n/a	35	62	33	87
PT	3	14	32	55	15	20	16	20	15	35	19	14	29	14	33
RO	2	2	15	31	6	8	7	n/a	10	3	n/a	7	10	5	29
RS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
SE	13	14	25	56	28	27	28	n/a	19	28	26	27	32	27	28
SI	5	8	20	61	13	14	5	40	13	5	31	12	34	11	53
SK	5	18	62	94	25	19	15	66	22	28	n.d.	22	75	14	66
TR	17	23	22	21	15	24	20	n/a	17	12	31	n/a	n/a	19	27
av.	5	10	27	55	17	17	14	30	14	21	33	15	34	14	41

n.d.: no data. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, C.5.

Countries in which no formal part-time status exists: AT, DK, FR, GE, RS, TR.

Countries which did not include part-time students in sample: AL, LV.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.5 What is your current formal status as a student?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, CZ, IT, RO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B4.3

Enrolment into different fields of study by educational background

Share of students (in %)

	Education (incl. teacher training)		Arts and humanities		Social sciences, journalism and information		Business, administration and law		Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics		ICTs		Engineering, manufacturing and construction		Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary		Health and welfare		Services	
	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background	With HE background	Without HE background
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT	11	18	14	11	18	15	17	19	11	9	5	6	14	14	1	1	9	7	1	1
CH	11	16	12	11	10	9	24	25	10	7	3	3	15	12	1	1	13	14	1	1
CZ	8	13	12	9	12	12	16	17	10	8	8	6	17	15	4	6	10	10	2	3
DE	13	14	10	9	8	8	19	21	8	7	5	6	22	22	2	2	9	9	3	3
DK	10	13	18	16	22	18	6	9	8	6	3	2	15	19	0	0	19	17	0	0
EE	5	9	12	9	10	8	22	21	7	5	9	7	16	19	2	2	14	16	4	5
FI	5	5	12	12	7	6	19	17	6	5	11	8	19	17	2	3	15	23	4	4
FR	3	4	14	14	9	10	25	25	11	9	2	3	18	16	0	0	13	7	5	11
GE	1	3	13	16	37	37	15	13	4	4	4	3	7	7	4	6	11	10	4	4
HR	6	8	9	8	6	6	31	32	5	3	6	5	19	16	5	4	9	11	5	6
HU	9	12	10	8	6	5	26	26	4	3	6	5	19	19	4	6	12	11	4	5
IE	6	8	18	19	4	6	17	19	15	14	10	10	12	11	2	1	12	8	3	3
IS	6	11	14	10	19	24	16	21	9	6	9	7	14	8	2	2	10	11	0	0
IT	3	6	13	14	10	13	23	22	9	9	2	2	18	17	3	3	19	14	0	0
LT	5	6	10	7	11	9	28	32	4	3	4	2	17	21	3	2	16	15	3	3
LV	3	6	10	12	8	6	26	19	3	3	6	10	18	21	1	1	20	17	5	5
MT	3	6	15	16	15	9	16	25	8	5	10	11	11	10	0	0.3	20	14	3	3
NL	10	14	8	6	12	8	25	28	8	5	3	4	10	8	1	1	17	18	6	8
NO	16	19	9	8	9	9	21	22	8	4	4	4	13	11	1	1	19	22	t.f.c.	t.f.c.
PL	5	11	12	7	11	12	19	25	4	4	5	5	22	19	2	2	13	7	7	9
PT	3	4	9	9	10	9	19	24	5	5	3	2	29	23	2	2	14	14	6	8
RO	2	7	10	9	13	12	19	18	4	7	9	8	22	25	6	6	14	6	1	2
RS	7	7	12	13	11	11	22	17	7	6	8	6	16	20	3	7	10	8	4	5
SE	9	16	8	8	12	11	12	11	12	9	8	8	17	14	1	1	21	22	1	1
SI	5	7	11	8	11	9	15	17	11	5	5	4	20	22	3	4	14	14	6	9
SK	7	11	9	8	12	16	24	26	7	7	12	8	13	7	3	4	9	9	3	4
TR	8	8	11	11	8	8	21	25	4	4	3	4	26	22	3	3	13	8	3	6
av.	7	10	12	11	12	11	20	21	7	6	6	6	17	16	2	3	14	13	3	4

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, C.3.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.6 What is your current (main) study programme?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B4.4**Reasons for interruptions of current study programme by higher education background**

Share of all students who interrupted their study programme (in %)

	Financial difficulties			Lack of motivation			Family-related reasons (e.g. pregnancy, care of children, parents, etc.)			Work-related reasons (e.g. non-compulsory internship, job opportunity)			Health-related reasons			Other reasons		
	All students	With HE background	Without HE background	All students	With HE background	Without HE background	All students	With HE background	Without HE background	All students	With HE background	Without HE background	All students	With HE background	Without HE background	All students	With HE background	Without HE background
AL	37	36	37	13	23	6	15	14	17	11	9	14	6	7	5	27	23	28
AT*	26	24	27	27	28	27	21	18	22	62	58	65	20	20	20	31	36	28
CH	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
CZ	24	20	29	45	46	44	19	20	19	25	27	24	11	12	10	28	28	28
DE	18	16	24	25	26	23	28	26	31	30	30	31	23	24	21	47	49	42
DK	7	6	7	21	23	16	39	36	42	20	21	19	23	22	31	24	27	13
EE	15	11	23	25	28	21	22	20	30	30	27	34	14	15	12	43	49	28
FI	25	21	34	33	31	39	26	25	28	40	39	44	19	16	22	28	31	18
FR	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
GE	50	47	59	13	14	12	27	30	18	11	12	7	7	9	1	14	15	11
HR	30	23	35	48	50	44	20	20	22	17	16	19	21	22	20	11	15	11
HU	31	32	30	25	31	19	21	22	21	29	26	31	14	19	10	31	30	30
IE	31	24	36	22	24	20	18	14	20	19	19	19	23	27	20	24	26	25
IS	33	32	34	34	30	37	43	38	45	28	26	30	21	24	16	41	43	39
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	36	26	44	43	42	49	25	22	30	12	15	10	24	24	23	14	18	8
LV	20	17	23	31	40	16	19	18	24	27	26	34	22	13	36	16	20	11
MT	26	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	36	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	16	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	26	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	13	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	58	t.f.c.	t.f.c.
NL	13	13	12	41	47	37	14	11	16	14	12	16	30	32	28	40	38	39
NO	15	14	17	21	24	12	29	26	36	28	30	24	20	17	27	26	28	21
PL	31	18	40	35	38	32	15	15	15	9	11	8	20	27	16	28	23	32
PT	41	34	43	35	43	31	25	15	28	28	21	32	13	18	11	19	26	17
RO	30	23	34	33	31	35	16	15	17	21	17	23	10	11	9	27	38	20
RS	32	23	42	35	40	28	24	30	18	18	20	16	32	31	32	18	15	22
SE	15	17	12	36	35	36	20	17	24	32	35	31	20	22	17	27	29	25
SI	26	22	32	40	44	38	19	19	21	33	36	32	21	21	19	27	29	24
SK	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.
TR	40	29	42	22	22	23	17	16	15	20	26	17	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	34	41	32
av.	27	23	31	31	34	28	23	21	25	25	24	26	19	20	18	28	29	24

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, C.8.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 2.9 What was/were the reason(s) for the interruption of at least two consecutive semesters during your current (main) study programme?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** AT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B4.5**Students' satisfaction with their current study programme by type of HEI**

Share of all students indicating to be (very) satisfied (in %)

	Quality of teaching				Organisation of studies and timetable				Study facilities			
	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master
AL	69	68	67	71	53	50	53	51	46	53	44	47
AT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	50	59	53	57	59	72	64	63
CH	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
CZ	75	74	75	72	58	67	60	56	78	66	78	74
DE	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
DK	74	65	70	73	55	44	50	54	66	59	63	66
EE	68	74	69	70	61	64	63	59	83	84	83	83
FI	82	71	74	81	70	63	64	70	83	80	81	83
FR	67	70	66	65	36	46	38	36	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
GE	76	n/a	75	73	72	n/a	71	73	72	n/a	71	72
HR	49	61	54	50	38	51	42	43	49	64	54	52
HU	70	76	71	72	59	65	60	63	69	68	69	70
IE	72	69	70	76	64	54	58	65	77	58	67	73
IS	71	n/a	68	79	66	n/a	64	70	67	n/a	65	74
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	56	63	60	56	58	55	57	67	69	65	67	74
LV	63	73	66	68	54	58	51	62	72	71	69	73
MT	58	67	57	68	47	43	43	52	69	48	65	65
NL	68	57	59	68	72	56	60	75	72	61	64	69
NO	65	65	61	72	62	59	56	67	66	69	65	71
PL	55	54	55	53	46	53	48	47	54	54	54	51
PT	62	60	60	62	50	46	49	49	56	49	51	56
RO	39	n/a	39	43	37	n/a	35	45	40	n/a	39	45
RS	55	n.d.	57	47	43	n.d.	44	40	48	n.d.	49	46
SE	70	n/a	66	73	60	n/a	55	66	71	n/a	69	75
SI	63	73	66	59	53	66	54	57	65	71	68	61
SK	62	82	66	65	53	69	55	61	61	60	63	62
TR	34	n/a	32	42	31	n/a	28	40	32	n/a	30	40
av.	65	68	64	66	55	56	53	58	64	64	64	65

n.d.: no data. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, J29, J30 & J31.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.9 How satisfied are you regarding the following aspects of your current (main) study programme?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Chapter B5

Students' time budget



Students' time budget for studies and jobs

Students' total time budget varies across EUROSTUDENT countries, ranging from less than 40 hours per week to more than 50 hours per week spent studying and working. On EUROSTUDENT average, the time students spend on taught studies and personal study time is the same, with 17 hours per week each, but variations exist at the national level. Students in EUROSTUDENT countries averagely spend between 5 and 20 hours a week engaging in paid work alongside their studies. In relation to their  total time budget, this makes up between 11 % and 39 % of their time.

B
5

Students' satisfaction with time budget

At least a third of students in each country would like to dedicate more time to personal studies, particularly students dependent on own income. In almost all countries, in contrast, students depending on public support report the lowest degree of dissatisfaction with the time they spend on personal studies.

Relationship between time spent on studying and working

An increase in time spent on paid work is associated with a reduction in time spent on personal study time and/or taught studies. Among students who engage in paid employment alongside their studies, the time budget changes in two ways: time spent on study-related activities decreases, and the total time budget increases. On average, students working more tend to reduce the hours spent on personal studying to a greater extent than time spent on taught studies.

Time spent on paid work by access and transition route

Delayed transition students and alternative access students spend more time on paid jobs than the average student in almost all countries. In some countries, students having entered higher education with a delay of more than 2 years spend between 11 and 20 hours per week more on paid jobs than the average student.



findings

Time budget of students according to study-related characteristics

Students' time budget varies according to type of higher education institution (HEI), degree programme, and field of study. In all countries with available data, university students spend at least 2 hours per week more on personal study time than students at non-universities. In contrast, students at non-universities tend to spend more time following taught instruction than their peers at universities. In the large majority of countries, students at non-universities spend more time pursuing paid work. Master students tend to spend more time on personal studies and on paid work than in other programme types, while Bachelor students and students in long national degrees have the most taught lessons. In most countries, students in the field of health and welfare have the largest total time budgets.

B
5

Changes in students' time use

Compared to the previous EUROSTUDENT round, on cross-country average, no change in the time students spend on study-related activities is apparent. On the national level, however, the total time spent on study related activities has remained unchanged only in Estonia, the Netherlands, and Switzerland. In the Czech Republic, Denmark, Georgia, Italy, and Norway, an increase in both taught studies and personal study time is registered. In Croatia, Sweden, and Lithuania, the average time spent on both taught and personal studies has decreased when comparing E:VI and E:V.

Time budget according to student characteristics

Among students aged 30 years and over, paid work gains importance and makes up a larger part of students' time budget. Students not living with parents, on average, have a higher total time budget than students living with parents, and spend – on average across EUROSTUDENT countries – 2 hours more on paid jobs. The total time budget for  students with and without higher education background is, on unweighted average across countries, of the same size, but students without higher education background spend less time on study-related activities and more time on paid work.

Main issues

This chapter presents an analysis of students' time budget and their assessment of it. Effective and efficient use of the 'scarce resource' time (Williams, Masuda & Tallis, 2016) – in particular in the face of competing demands – is a challenge faced not only by higher education students, but by every human being. Time deficits arise "when completing one set of required or desired activities (e.g., income production) precludes engaging in another set of desired activities" (Williams et al., 2016, p. 269). A lack of time – or time poverty (Vickery, 1977) – can have detrimental effects on quality of life (OECD, 2013; Williams et al., 2016).

Students' time budget

Even though a common conception of the higher education student is that of "a learner, an individual who is, above all else, dedicated to his or her studies" (Brooks, 2017, p. 2), students are confronted with the challenge of dividing available time to very different sets of activities: besides the pursuit of their studies, they may be engaged in paid work ([>Chapter B6](#)), as well as fulfilling other familial or societal duties ([>Chapter B1](#)). Analyses of higher education students' time use have shown that the time students spend on study-related activities varies with students' age (Hauschildt et al., 2015), by type of HEI (Darmody, Smyth, & Unger, 2008), type of study programme (Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science, 2017), and field of study (Fernex et al., 2014; Darmody et al., 2008). These differences are the results of different demands facing students, but also reflect the different types of students found across different types and modes of studies ([>Chapter B1](#), [>Chapter B2](#), [>Chapter B4](#)). One important differentiating factor in this regard is students' employment alongside studies ([>Chapter B6](#), see also [Thematic Review](#)).

Competing demands on students' time

Students' engaging in paid work alongside their studies is a reality in many countries. Up to three quarters of students report regularly or periodically working in paid jobs during the lecture period ([>Chapter B6](#)). For students engaged in paid work, balancing the demands of their studies with their work commitments can be challenging: even if their work is related to studies, the mere time requirements can add up to a total time budget of more than that of a full-time employee (Hauschildt et al., 2015). Having a job alongside higher education may therefore reduce students' leisure time, rest time, or personal study time (see Body et al., 2014), each of which can have potentially negative consequences for the student. Existing studies have found that employment exceeding a certain threshold –which may vary by country, type of HEI, and other variables – is negatively related to the amount of time students spend on their studies (e.g., Darmody et al., 2008; Hauschildt et al., 2015; Keute, 2017; Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011). As a result, students working more intensively alongside their studies may be more likely to experience conflict between their work and their studies (Creed et al., 2015), make slower progress in their studies (Body et al., 2014; Darolia, 2014; Theune, 2015; Triventi, 2014), and be at higher risk of dropping out (Hovdhaugen, 2013).

Bearing these considerations in mind, not only the factual hours spent on certain activities are of importance, but also the students' perceptions of workload (see Creed et al., 2015; Darmody et al., 2008) and their satisfaction with the amount of time dedicated to certain activities.

With the following analyses, we aim to contribute to the above-mentioned discussion and provide answers to the following questions:

- What is the overall time budget of students and does this differ by past and current study-related characteristics of students, i.e.  access route into higher education, type of HEI, and field of study?
- How is time spent on study-related and work-related activities distributed?
- How satisfied are students with the time available for personal studies?

Methodological and conceptual notes

EUROSTUDENT data on students' time budget are based on self-reports of time spent on three basic components – taught studies, personal study time, and paid jobs – in a typical week in the lecture period (including weekends). Taught studies refer to the hours that students spend on study units organised by their HEI and mainly include activities such as lectures, seminars, tests, or unpaid jobs in laboratories. Students' personal study time comprises activities such as reading, revising, practicing, preparing for lectures, and tests as well as writing assignments. Taught studies and personal study time are collectively referred to as study-related activities. The category 'paid jobs' includes regular and gainful employment activities during the term-time, jobs performed only during semester breaks are excluded. Time spent on other activities, e.g. volunteering, household and caring duties, leisure activities, or self-care (exercising, sleeping) is not captured.

Data and interpretations

Students' time budget for studies and work ranges from less than 40 hours per week to more than 50 hours per week

Students' total time budget varies across EUROSTUDENT countries, ranging from less than 40 hours per week to more than 50 hours per week spent studying and working (Figure B5.1).

- Students in Iceland, Malta, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Slovenia report the largest total time budgets, with more than 50 hours a week spent engaged in study-related activities and paid work.
- In Sweden and Turkey, students spend up to 40 hours on study-related activities and paid work.

On EUROSTUDENT average, the time students spend on taught studies and personal study time is the same, with 17 hours per week each. In Estonia, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, and the Netherlands, this pattern is reflected – here students spend similar amounts of time on the two activities, with differences of at most 1 percentage point (Figure B5.1).


- In around half of EUROSTUDENT countries, students spend more time on taught studies than on personal study time. This is the case in Poland, Latvia, Slovenia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Lithuania, Portugal, Slovakia, Romania, Ireland, Switzerland, Albania, France, and Turkey.
- In slightly less than a third of countries, personal study takes up more time for students than taught studies. In Iceland, Malta, Italy, Finland, Norway, Austria, Serbia, and Sweden, students spend between 2 and 11 hours more studying on their own than instructed by a teacher at the HEI. With the exception of Malta and Serbia, students in these countries are characterised by relatively high average age ( Chapter B1).

Figure B5.1 

Time budget of students by type of activity

Mean hours/week

mean hours/week



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.4, H.7 & H.19.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.7 How many hours do you spend on your paid job(s) in a typical week in the current #lecture period?, 3.11 How many hours do you spend in taught courses and on personal study time in a typical week during the current #lecture period?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CH, IE.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

B
5

Students in EUROSTUDENT countries spend between 5 and 20 hours a week engaging in paid work alongside their studies. In relation to their time budget in a typical week, this makes up between 11 % and 39 % of their time (Figure B5.1).

- In slightly more than a third of countries, students spend on average less than 10 hours per week on paid jobs. This applies to students in Georgia, Portugal, Denmark, Italy, Switzerland, Albania, France, Serbia, Sweden, and Turkey. With the exception of Denmark and Switzerland, the share of students working during the entire lecture period is below the EUROSTUDENT average in these countries (>[Chapter B6](#)).
- In every fifth country, the average student spends at least 15 hours per week on paid jobs. This is the case in Iceland, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. In Estonia and Latvia, paid work is the activity on which students actually spend the most time (out of the three categories taught studies, personal study time, and paid work). The countries with the highest number of hours worked per week are characterised by a high share of students working during the entire lecture period (>[Chapter B6](#)).

Students' time budget varies according to student characteristics: older students, students not living with parents, and students without higher education background spend more time on paid jobs

Among students aged 30 years and over, paid work makes up a larger part of students' time budget (Table B5.1). In three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries, students aged 30 and over spend more time working for money than pursuing either taught or personal studies, in the rest of the countries, students spend the most time on personal studies. Taught studies remain the single most time-consuming activity in only one country among students 30 years or over.

Students not living with parents, on average, have a higher total time budget, and spend – on average across EUROSTUDENT countries, 2 hours more on paid jobs than their peers living with

parents (Table B5.1). In the Czech Republic, Estonia, and Latvia, paid jobs are the single largest component in the time budget of students not living with parents (compared to taught studies and personal study time).

The total time budget for **⌚** students with and without higher education background is, on unweighted average across countries, of the same size, at 46 hours. Students without higher education background, however, spend, on average across EUROSTUDENT countries, less time on study-related activities (1 hour less on taught studies and 2 hours less on personal study time) and engage in paid work 3 hours more than students with higher education background (Table B5.1). Students without higher education background differ from their counterparts in several respects, e.g. age and time of entry into higher education (**>Chapter B2**), factors also related to the extent of their paid employment.

- In the Czech Republic, Estonia, Croatia, Hungary, Iceland, Malta, and Poland, particularly large differences can be found between students with and without higher education background – in these countries, students without higher education background work at least 5 hours more per week (on average) than students with higher education background.
- In Albania, Latvia, and Serbia, in contrast, no difference between students with and without higher education background with regard to time spent on paid work can be found. Students with higher education background in Denmark, France, Georgia, and Turkey work between 1 and 4 hours per week more than their counterparts.

Changes over time with regard to the time budget of students are found at the national level, but on cross-country average, no trend is apparent

When comparing the total time spent on study-related activities over time no change in the average number of hours per week students spend is apparent on average: students in both the 5th and 6th round of EUROSTUDENT spend 17 hours each on personal study time and taught studies, resulting in an average of 34 hours per week spent on study-related activities. On the national level, however, the total time spent on study-related activities has remained unchanged only in Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Estonia.

In 10 countries, the total time budget for study-related activities has increased by 1 (Ireland, Slovakia, Malta) to 6 hours (Denmark, the Czech Republic).

- In Italy, Denmark, Norway, and the Czech Republic, an increase in both taught studies and personal study time is registered.
- In Poland, Ireland, Finland, and Slovakia, no change in taught studies is found; but students' personal study time has increased by 1 to 2 hours per week. In Romania and Malta, in contrast, time spent on personal study time has not changed, but students report more time spent on taught studies.
- In Serbia and Estonia, the time students spend on personal studies has also increased since the previous EUROSTUDENT round, but students report spending less time on taught studies.


In 9 countries, students report spending between 1 (Slovenia, France, Latvia, Austria), 2 (Croatia, Serbia, Lithuania, Hungary), or 4 (Sweden) hours per week less on study-related activities in the current EUROSTUDENT round than in E:V.

- In Croatia, Lithuania, and Sweden, the average time spent on both taught and personal studies has decreased when comparing E:VI and E:V.
- Slovenian, French, and Hungarian students also report spending less time on taught studies than in EUROSTUDENT V, but the time they spend on personal study time has not changed.

Figure B5.2 ↴

Students' time budget for study-related activities in E: V and E: VI

Study-related activities of students not living with parents (in mean hours/week)



EUROSTUDENT VI █ taught studies personal study time
 EUROSTUDENT V █ taught studies personal study time

Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, I.1 & EUROSTUDENT VI, H.4, H.7. **No data:** E:V: AL, IS, PT, TR. **Data not comparable over time:** DE, GE.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.14 How many hours do you spend in a typical week in taught courses and on personal study time?, 3.11 How many hours do you spend in taught courses and on personal study time in a typical week during the current #lecture period?


Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CH, IE.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Figure B5.3 

Time spent on paid jobs by transition and access route into higher education

Students' time budget (in mean hours/week)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.19. No data: Alternative access route: FI, IT, TR.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.7 How many hours do you spend on your paid job(s) in a typical week in the current #lecture period?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CH, IE.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- In Latvia and Austria, reversely, time spent on personal study time has decreased, whereas no change in the amount of time students report spending on taught studies per week is apparent.

Students having entered higher education through alternative routes and delayed transition students spend more time on paid jobs

Related to students' age is the point of entry into higher education. In three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries,  delayed transition students spend the most weekly hours on paid work, followed by  alternative access students¹, in comparison to all students. In all remaining countries except one,  alternative access route students spend the most time working, followed by delayed transition students (Figure B5.3).

- In Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia, Slovakia, Lithuania, Romania, and Croatia,  delayed transition students spend between 11 and 20 hours per week more on paid jobs than all students. In Hungary, Slovenia, and Croatia,  alternative access students also work at least 10 hours more per week in paid jobs than the average student.
- In Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, France, Denmark, and Albania, the amount of time spent on paid jobs does not differ greatly between  delayed transition and all students. The difference amounts to 2 hours at most; in Albania, delayed transition students even work 2 hours less than all students.
- In Latvia, Iceland, Romania, Norway, Ireland, Georgia, Sweden, and Denmark, the differences between  alternative access students and all students with regard to the time spent on paid jobs are relatively small: alternative access students work at most 1 hour more per week than all students in the respective country; in Ireland, they even work 2 hours less.

¹ Note that these two groups overlap, see >Chapter B3.

- Delayed transition students and alternative access students, in some countries, also differ with regard to the time spent on taught studies and personal study time, but no clear cross-country pattern becomes apparent (Table B5.2).

Time budget of students varies according to type of HEI, degree programme, and field of study

Different types of HEIs may require students to organise their studies differently. When comparing the time budget of students at universities and non-universities (Figure B5.4), the clearest difference becomes apparent looking at time spent on personal studies: in all countries with available data, university students spend at least 2 hours per week more studying individually.

- This difference between the types of HEIs is especially pronounced in Poland, Denmark, Croatia, Switzerland, Norway, and Finland. In these countries, students at universities spend at least 5 hours per week more on personal studies.

In contrast, in about three quarters of the countries with available data, students at non-universities spend more time following taught instruction than their peers at universities (Figure B5.4).

- Students at non-universities in Denmark, Lithuania, Finland, Austria, Germany, and France spend between 5 and 8 hours more per week in taught classes than students at universities. In Malta and Croatia, the difference is only an hour a week.
- In Poland, Slovenia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Albania, students at universities spend more time in taught instruction – between 1 and 5 hours a week more than their colleagues at non-universities.

In over 85 % of EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, students at non-universities spend more time pursuing paid work (Figure B5.4).

- In Poland, Croatia, and Slovakia, students at non-universities report spending at least 10 hours per week more on paid work.
- In Latvia, Denmark, and Albania, students at universities report working more than their peers at non-universities. In Ireland, no difference between the types of HEIs can be found.


Differences in students' time budget are also apparent for type of degree programme and field of study. In all countries, either Bachelor students or students pursuing a long national degree spend the most time on taught studies (Table B5.2). Exceptions are Denmark, France and Portugal – here, students in short-cycle programmes report the highest number of hours spent in taught classes. In all countries but Iceland and the Netherlands, Master students report the lowest number of hours spent in taught studies.

Personal study time, on the other hand, is highest in long national degree programmes and Master programmes, and tends to be relatively low in short-cycle programmes. In all countries but one, the highest number of hours spent in paid work is registered by Master students or students enrolled in short-cycle programmes (Table B5.2).

The programme type is related to both the type of HEI and the field of study. Across almost all countries, certain patterns can be found (Table B5.3): in almost all countries, it is either students in the field of health and welfare or students studying a natural science, mathematics or statistics who spend the most time on study-related activities. This pattern is generally reflected when looking at taught studies and personal study time separately, as well. In most countries, this results in the highest overall time budget for students in the health fields, i.e. when taking paid

Figure B5.4 **Students' time budget by type of HEI**

Students' time budget by type of activity (in mean hours/week)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, H.4, H.7 & H.19. No non-universities exist in GE, IS, IT, RO, SE, TR. **No data:** non-universities: RS.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.7 How many hours do you spend on your paid job(s) in a typical week in the current #lecture period?, 3.11 How many hours do you spend in taught courses and on personal study time in a typical week during the current #lecture period?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** CH, IE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

jobs into account as well. In contrast, students in the field of business, administration and law, as well as arts and humanities students, are among those with the lowest number of hours spent on study-related activities in almost all countries. Students of business, administration and law, however, report spending the most time on paid jobs in the large majority of countries.


An increase in time spent on paid work is associated with a reduction in time spent on personal study time and taught studies

The findings reported above already point towards the fact that the time spent on different activities is related: often, an increase in one activity goes along with less time spent on another. Figure B5.5. depicts – on a cross-country average perspective – the relationship between taught

Figure B5.5**Students' time budget by type of activity as (unweighted) cross-country average**

Time budget of students in paid jobs (mean hours/week)

mean hours/week

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, H.4, H7, H.19.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.7 How many hours do you spend on your paid job(s) in a typical week in the current #lecture period?, 3.11 How many hours do you spend in taught courses and on personal study time in a typical week during the current #lecture period?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** CH, IE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.**B
5**

studies, personal study time, and paid jobs. The time spent on the two study-related activities is differentiated for students who do not work at all (0 hours per week), students working 1 to 5 hours a week, 6 to 10 hours a week, 11 to 15 hours a week, 16 to 20 hours a week, or more than 20 hours per week.


Across all EUROSTUDENT countries, students who do not have a paid job spend on average 19 hours a week each on taught studies and personal studies, resulting in a total time budget of 38 hours (Figure B5.5., Table B5.4). Among students who engage in paid employment alongside their studies, the time budget changes in two ways: time spent on study-related activities decreases, and the total time budget increases. Students working more tend to reduce the hours spent on personal study time to a greater extent than time spent on taught studies – presumably, the latter is not as easy, given set course requirements that need to be fulfilled. This basic pattern can be found in almost all countries (Table B5.4). On average across countries, study-related activities start to suffer even with small numbers of hours worked. In individual countries, however, the point at which paid jobs lead to a reduction in study time, the extent of the reduction, as well the type of activity which is reduced may vary. The [Thematic Review](#) presents patterns that can be found in a differentiated analyses of national data.

At least a third of students in each country would like to dedicate more time to personal studies, particularly students depending on own income

How satisfied are students with their time budget? The following presents the analyses of students' satisfaction with their personal study time. More differentiated analyses on students' satisfaction with the extent of paid employment and taught studies are presented in the [Thematic Review](#).

Figure B5.6 **Students' satisfaction with time spent on personal studies by dependency on income source**

Share of students who would like to dedicate more time to personal studies (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.28. **No data:** AT, DE, IT; for dependency on income source: AL. **Too few cases:** Dependent on family support: RS; dependent on national public student support: RS.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.12 Looking at the time you spend on study-related activities and paid job(s) during the current #lecture period, please indicate if you would like to spend less or more time on the following activities.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

When asked to rate their satisfaction with the time spent on personal studies, between a third and 60 % of students indicate wanting to spend more time preparing and revising (Figure B5.6).

- In Hungary, Malta, and Romania, at least half of all students indicate that they would like to spend more time on personal studies. Indeed, students in Hungary and Romania currently appear to be spending relatively little time on personal studies, although this is not the case for Maltese students (Figure B5.1).
- In Estonia, Georgia, Latvia, Sweden, Turkey, Denmark, Switzerland, Iceland, and the Netherlands, up to 40 % of students indicate that they are not satisfied with the time they spend on personal studies, wishing for more.

Differences in the satisfaction of students with their personal study time are apparent according to their main income source: the highest shares of students wishing for more time spent on personal studies are found among students dependent on their own income in almost all countries² (Figure B5.6).

- Exceptions are France and Lithuania, where students dependent on national public student support most often indicate wanting to spend more time on personal studies, as well as Turkey, where there is no difference between these two groups of students.

In almost all countries, in contrast, students depending on public support report the lowest, below-average extent of dissatisfaction with the time they spend on personal studies.

² Analyses of students' satisfaction with the different components of their time budget by extent of paid jobs can be found in the [Thematic Review](#).

Discussion and policy considerations

This chapter highlights both common patterns as well as country-specific differences in students' time budget. In all countries, the time students spend studying and engaging in paid work equals or exceeds that of a typical full-time position: in most countries, students spend at least 40 hours a week studying and in paid jobs; in some countries, the total time budget for these activities exceeds the 50-hour mark. Whether students spend more time in direct interaction with teaching staff, or studying on their own, depends on the country – in about half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, personal studies are the dominant way of studying, while in others, students spend more time in class.

This presumably reflects, to some extent, the requirements set by different types of HEIs, fields of study, and study programmes. The data in this chapter show that students at non-universities tend to spend less time on personal studies, and more time in taught classes, than students at universities. Different degree programmes and field of study also show relatively 'typical' patterns across countries.

Besides study-related activities, many students engage in paid employment alongside their studies. Large variation exists with regard to the average amount of time students spend working: in relation to the average students' total time budget, the share of paid work ranges from roughly 10% to 40% in the different EUROSTUDENT countries. The time spent on work is naturally related to the employment rate among students ([Chapter 6](#)).

Differences in the extent of employment among different student groups highlight that paid work may play a role in creating and perpetuating inequalities between students: In all countries, paid work gains importance and makes up a larger part of students' time budget among older students, as well as among students without higher education background, students  dependent on their own income, and  alternative access and  delayed transition students. As the results in this chapter show that increased time spent working is related to a decrease in study time, as well as an increase in total time budget, these student groups may be particularly challenged in finding enough time to fully pursue their studies. Such 'time poverty' has been related to unequal educational outcomes (Burston, 2016). Paid work alongside studies, in particular a large number of hours, has been found to be related to dropout (Hovdhaugen, 2013), time to degree (Aina, Baici, & Casalone, 2011; Theune, 2015), and academic achievement (Body et al., 2014). While EUROSTUDENT data collects information on the distribution of time between study-related activities and paid jobs, it does not include information on students' grades and graduation rates, so that these potentially negative effects cannot be captured with available data.

However, the results do point towards the fact that engaging in paid work – especially if paid work makes up a large part of students' time budget – may be a risk factor for students with regard to their study success. As working is in many cases a necessity for students in order to be able to fund their living ([Chapter B6](#), see also [Thematic Review](#)), such students may be at a disadvantage compared to students who are able to devote themselves to their studies (almost) full-time. In fact, at least a third of all students, and even higher shares among those  dependent on their own income, wish for more time to spend on personal studies.

The presented data do not give insights into the reasons behind the patterns found in students' time allocation, e.g. individual motivations and strategies regarding the expected benefits, past

experience, or cultural and social background (see Fernex et al., 2014, for an overview of different models). EUROSTUDENT data do show, however, that delayed transition and, to a lesser extent, also alternative access route students more often characterise themselves as workers rather than students ([>Chapter B6](#)). The same holds for non-university students and students without higher education background. Older students also more often characterise themselves as primarily workers ([>Chapter B6](#)). For HEIs, this, together with the findings on students' time budget and their desire for more personal study time in this chapter, is an important point: not all students understand themselves to be primarily students, and not all students will be able to pursue their studies in a typical full-time manner. Flexible study options, e.g.  part-time courses, modular courses rather than entire degree programmes, or evening courses, can support students in creating a higher education pathway that is adaptable to and suited to their personal situation. Online courses and materials could be a way to make higher education more accessible and compatible with the situation of students who have very large time budgets. It should also be considered whether flexibility can also be created with regard to the need for personal study time at certain points in time, e.g. by offering multiple points in time at which exams can be taken or papers written. Creating sufficient and accessible funding options of course might also alleviate some of the need for paid work, although particular student groups might have higher financial needs due to their living situation and the need to support others financially ([>Chapter 6](#), [>Chapter 8](#)) that might not be fully met through public funding.

Up until now, the discussion in this chapter has focused on the possible detrimental effects of paid work during studies. It should also be noted, however, that working alongside studies also has possible benefits, for example allowing students to gain experience, network, and gain insights into practical applications of their study programme, thus strengthening the link between higher education and the labour market and potentially increasing employability and employment prospects (Creed, French, & Hood, 2015; Sanchez-Gelabert, Figueroa, & Elias, 2017; Tuononen, Parpala, Mattsson, & Lindblom-Ylänne, 2015). These aspects are beyond the scope of this chapter and are explored in more detail in the EUROSTUDENT [>Thematic Review](#) on students' employment.

Tables

B
5

Table B5.1

Average time spent on taught studies, personal studies, and paid jobs by age categories, form of housing, and educational background

Students' time budget (in mean hours/week)

	All students			< 22 years			30 years and older			Living with parents			Not living with parents			With HE background			Without HE background		
	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs
AL	21	16	6	22	17	4	21	16	12	20	16	7	21	17	6	21	17	6	20	16	6
AT	12	18	12	15	18	4	9	14	23	13	19	8	12	18	13	12	19	10	12	18	13
CH	20	15	9	24	15	4	14	13	18	22	14	7	19	15	11	21	15	8	20	14	11
CZ	17	14	16	21	14	8	11	12	38	18	14	13	17	14	17	18	14	13	17	14	18
DE	16	17	11	21	15	6	13	18	18	18	16	9	16	18	11	16	18	10	16	17	12
DK	19	19	7	21	16	6	19	21	7	20	17	7	19	19	7	19	19	8	20	18	7
EE	16	15	20	19	14	9	14	16	32	16	15	15	15	16	21	15	16	18	16	15	23
FI	16	18	10	21	14	4	12	19	16	17	15	6	16	18	10	15	18	10	16	17	12
FR	19	14	8	20	14	4	15	16	14	19	13	6	19	15	9	19	15	9	19	13	8
GE	20	18	9	21	18	5	19	20	25	19	17	9	20	18	9	19	17	10	21	19	6
HR	17	18	11	21	18	4	12	15	32	17	17	10	18	18	11	17	19	8	17	17	13
HU	19	14	15	23	15	6	14	12	34	19	14	13	19	14	17	20	15	13	18	13	18
IE	19	16	10	21	14	6	14	16	20	20	16	8	18	17	11	19	17	9	18	16	12
IS	16	23	15	20	23	9	12	24	20	19	23	10	15	23	16	17	24	12	15	23	18
IT	17	23	5	21	21	2	7	21	15	16	22	4	18	24	5	18	24	3	17	22	5
LT	18	16	13	19	15	7	17	15	26	18	15	10	17	16	14	17	16	13	18	16	14
LV	18	14	19	19	14	10	17	14	27	18	15	15	18	14	20	17	14	19	18	14	19
MT	16	24	13	19	25	6	9	18	30	17	26	10	14	19	19	17	25	10	16	23	15
NL	15	16	10	18	16	7	8	16	24	16	16	9	14	17	11	15	17	9	15	16	11
NO	13	19	12	15	18	6	11	15	22	14	18	9	13	20	12	13	20	11	13	17	15
PL	21	14	18	23	15	11	18	11	34	21	13	20	21	15	17	22	16	14	21	13	21
PT	21	17	9	24	18	2	16	15	28	22	17	6	21	17	11	22	18	6	21	17	10
RO	20	13	13	23	14	5	14	11	32	20	12	11	20	13	14	21	14	11	19	12	15
RS	16	19	6	18	19	3	10	21	24	16	19	6	16	19	6	16	20	6	16	18	6
SE	10	21	9	13	19	3	7	19	18	11	20	5	10	21	9	11	21	8	9	21	11
SI	20	17	14	23	17	7	12	15	34	20	16	13	19	17	15	20	18	12	19	16	16
SK	18	15	14	20	14	8	11	14	35	18	14	13	18	15	15	18	15	13	18	14	14
TR	18	11	8	19	10	2	13	12	27	17	11	9	18	11	8	18	12	9	18	11	8
av.	17	17	12	20	16	6	13	16	24	18	16	10	17	17	12	18	18	10	17	16	13

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.4, H.7 & H.19.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.7 How many hours do you spend on your paid job(s) in a typical week in the current #lecture period?, 3.11 How many hours do you spend in taught courses and on personal study time in a typical week during the current #lecture period?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CH, IE.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B5.2

Average time spent on taught studies, personal studies, and paid jobs by transition route into higher education and degree programme

Students' time budget (in mean hours/week)

	Transition route into HE						Degree programme studied											
	Delayed transition			Alternative access			All Bachelor students			All Master students			Long national degree			Short-cycle		
	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs
AL	21	18	4	19	15	8	21	16	5	17	13	12	24	28	2	n/a	n/a	n/a
AT	12	16	18	12	17	17	13	17	10	10	18	16	11	20	12	n/a	n/a	n/a
CH	18	15	14	21	13	13	22	14	8	16	17	11	n.d.	n.d.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CZ	12	12	36	16	14	24	18	13	15	15	14	20	21	19	9	n/a	n/a	n/a
DE	16	17	13	16	17	16	18	16	10	11	20	13	17	21	8	n/a	n/a	n/a
DK	20	18	7	20	19	7	21	17	7	14	25	9	n/a	n/a	23	14	7	
EE	16	16	29	15	15	24	16	14	19	12	18	26	19	21	12	n/a	n/a	n/a
FI	15	18	13	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	18	16	9	11	21	13	n.d.	n.d.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
FR	18	15	9	16	15	10	17	12	5	17	16	12	18	20	13	25	7	4
GE	21	19	12	18	16	9	20	18	7	13	14	24	23	22	6	n/a	n/a	n/a
HR	16	16	26	14	15	21	18	16	10	14	15	17	18	26	5	n/a	n/a	n/a
HU	16	13	30	19	16	26	19	14	15	16	13	22	25	20	8	20	11	16
IE	17	17	14	19	18	8	20	16	8	13	21	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	14	13	18
IS	14	24	18	16	24	16	18	23	12	11	24	20	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	7	23	25
IT	13	20	11	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	17	21	4	15	23	7	16	29	3	n/a	n/a	n/a
LT	20	15	24	19	15	19	19	15	12	12	17	24	19	19	7	n/a	n/a	n/a
LV	19	14	22	18	13	20	19	14	14	13	13	29	22	26	9	21	12	20
MT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	15	20	18	17	24	9	14	26	18	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	16	19	20
NL	16	16	12	16	16	13	15	16	10	14	19	10	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	12	14	18
NO	14	18	15	14	19	13	15	18	9	10	25	13	16	26	7	n/a	n/a	n/a
PL	18	12	35	20	11	26	22	13	18	19	12	24	23	24	8	n/a	n/a	n/a
PT	20	15	17	20	15	15	22	16	8	15	18	16	23	21	4	25	15	9
RO	14	11	32	20	11	13	21	12	10	12	9	27	28	22	2	n/a	n/a	n/a
RS	15	18	9	12	13	11	17	18	5	11	18	12	19	34	2	n/a	n/a	n/a
SE	9	22	11	9	21	10	10	21	7	10	24	9	15	21	6	11	22	10
SI	14	15	28	15	15	24	21	17	12	16	17	18	23	25	9	19	12	19
SK	13	14	26	12	15	22	18	14	13	16	14	18	23	26	3	n/a	n/a	n/a
TR	17	12	13	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	19	11	4	11	13	25	28	17	1	18	9	8
av.	16	16	18	16	16	16	18	16	10	14	18	17	21	23	6	18	14	15

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.4, H.7 & H.19. **No data:** Delayed transition: MT; alternative access: FI, IT, TR; long national degree: CH, FI. No short-cycle programmes exist in AL, AT, CH, CZ, DE, EE, FI, GE, HR, IT, LT, NO, PL, RO, RS, SK.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.7 How many hours do you spend on your paid job(s) in a typical week in the current #lecture period?, 3.11 How many hours do you spend in taught courses and on personal study time in a typical week during the current #lecture period?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CH, IE; transition route: HU.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B5.3**Average time spent on taught studies, personal studies, and paid jobs by selected fields of study**

Students' time budget (in mean hours/week)

	Arts and humanities			Business, administration and law			Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics			Health and welfare		
	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs	Taught studies	Personal study time	Paid jobs
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT	10	17	11	11	18	17	12	19	8	20	21	7
CH	15	17	10	17	14	12	24	16	6	25	13	9
CZ	17	15	14	15	12	19	19	15	9	23	17	10
DE	13	17	10	17	17	13	18	21	8	19	17	10
DK	13	22	7	22	11	9	22	22	5	24	19	6
EE	16	18	15	14	13	26	16	18	9	20	17	19
FI	12	20	8	14	17	11	14	21	5	21	16	11
FR	15	15	6	19	13	9	23	14	6	14	29	12
GE	21	20	7	20	18	9	20	19	9	21	21	8
HR	17	20	8	13	18	13	19	19	6	22	20	10
HU	17	16	12	16	12	20	22	15	8	26	17	8
IE	16	18	7	15	14	13	22	16	7	22	20	10
IS	13	22	15	14	21	19	19	22	10	22	21	13
IT	15	21	5	14	25	5	19	23	3	21	24	3
LT	17	21	9	17	14	16	17	19	10	21	16	8
LV	17	17	16	15	10	24	17	16	18	22	18	17
MT	12	26	13	13	21	19	19	28	5	24	25	10
NL	14	21	8	13	15	12	19	17	5	18	16	9
NO	10	21	11	11	20	14	14	24	7	18	16	12
PL	22	18	13	18	11	26	25	17	10	27	24	7
PT	20	19	6	18	15	14	25	19	3	28	20	5
RO	22	14	13	16	12	16	21	11	5	27	22	3
RS	16	16	6	10	22	9	18	20	5	19	32	4
SE	7	24	7	8	24	6	15	22	5	17	20	6
SI	18	18	10	16	16	19	23	19	8	23	20	13
SK	17	15	11	15	12	17	23	17	8	23	23	11
TR	18	15	6	17	9	9	16	11	11	23	13	5
av.	16	19	10	15	16	15	19	19	7	22	20	9

n.d.: no data.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.4, H.7 & H.19. **No data:** AL.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.7 How many hours do you spend on your paid job(s) in a typical week in the current #lecture period?, 3.11 How many hours do you spend in taught courses and on personal study time in a typical week during the current #lecture period?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** CH, IE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B5.4**Average time spent on taught studies, personal studies, and paid jobs by average time spent on paid jobs**

Students' time budget (in mean hours/week)

	Mean total time spent on study-related activities in a typical week by average time spent on paid jobs during a typical week																		
	Taught studies						Personal study time						Hours per week spent on paid job(s) (including non-working students as 0 h)						
	Average time spent on paid jobs during week in lecture period																		
	0 h	1 to 5 h	6 to 10 h	11 to 15 h	16 to 20 h	21 h or more	0 h	1 to 5 h	6 to 10 h	11 to 15 h	16 to 20 h	21 h or more	0 h	1 to 5 h	6 to 10 h	11 to 15 h	16 to 20 h	21 h or more	
AL	21	t.f.c.	15	22	20	18	17	15	15	18	13	12	0	2	8	t.f.c.	19	39	
AT	14	14	13	11	10	8	21	21	20	19	17	11	0	4	9	14	19	36	
CH	24	23	21	18	16	12	18	15	15	15	13	9	0	3	8	13	18	31	
CZ	21	20	19	18	16	12	17	15	14	13	13	11	0	3	9	14	19	39	
DE	17	17	15	15	13	11	18	18	17	16	16	14	0	3	8	13	18	34	
DK	20	20	20	18	16	14	20	20	18	18	18	15	0	4	9	14	19	32	
EE	18	16	17	15	17	13	18	20	19	18	13	13	0	4	9	14	19	38	
FI	18	17	17	15	15	9	19	18	19	16	17	14	0	4	9	14	19	35	
FR	20	19	17	16	15	18	15	14	14	12	14	12	0	3	8	13	19	36	
GE	21	22	20	17	19	16	19	19	18	18	18	14	0	4	8	14	19	43	
HR	19	18	16	18	15	13	20	17	16	15	18	12	0	4	9	14	19	38	
HU	23	22	20	22	18	13	17	16	14	13	12	11	0	3	9	14	19	39	
IE	20	18	20	20	19	12	18	18	16	14	14	12	0	4	8	13	18	36	
IS	18	18	18	18	15	10	28	26	24	23	21	17	0	4	8	13	19	37	
IT	19	17	17	14	12	5	24	23	21	21	18	16	0	4	8	13	19	34	
LT	19	17	19	19	17	14	17	19	14	16	14	14	0	3	9	13	20	39	
LV	20	18	17	20	19	15	17	13	15	16	15	11	0	4	9	14	19	38	
MT	19	t.f.c.	17	20	17	9	29	t.f.c.	25	17	23	15	0	t.f.c.	9	14	19	39	
NL	17	16	16	16	14	8	19	16	16	16	16	13	0	3	8	13	18	33	
NO	15	14	14	14	13	9	22	22	22	19	19	12	0	4	8	14	18	34	
PL	24	23	21	21	21	18	18	16	13	13	15	10	0	4	9	14	19	39	
PT	23	22	21	20	21	15	19	17	17	19	16	13	0	3	9	13	19	39	
RO	23	t.f.c.	19	23	17	13	15	t.f.c.	12	12	10	9	0	3	9	13	20	39	
RS	17	17	15	12	15	10	20	19	21	16	16	14	0	4	9	14	19	38	
SE	12	11	11	10	8	3	23	22	22	20	20	14	0	3	8	14	19	37	
SI	23	20	21	20	20	13	19	18	18	16	15	13	0	4	9	14	19	36	
SK	20	21	21	19	19	13	16	16	15	14	13	13	0	4	9	14	19	38	
TR	19	16	17	19	17	14	11	11	11	10	12	9	0	4	8	14	19	42	
av.	19	18	18	18	16	12	19	18	17	16	16	13	0	4	9	14	19	37	

t.f.c.: too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.4, H7, H.19.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.7 How many hours do you spend on your paid job(s) in a typical week in the current #lecture period?, 3.11 How many hours do you spend in taught courses and on personal study time in a typical week during the current #lecture period?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CH, IE.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Chapter B6

Students' employment

Key

Students with paid jobs

On EUROSTUDENT average, slightly more than half of all students pursue  paid jobs during the lecture period, a third does so  regularly. When taking the  lecture-free period into account, around 70 % of students pursue paid work, with particularly large shares of working students found in Estonia, the Czech Republic, Iceland, Norway, and Slovakia. The majority of employed students works during both the  lecture and the  lecture-free period. With students' age, the share of students  with paid jobs during the lecture period tends to increase. The highest shares of 60–70 % of students who do not pursue paid jobs at all can be found in Georgia, Albania, and Serbia.

B
6

Working to gain experience

Working in order to gain experience on the labour market is a reason for working alongside studies for an average 60 % of students with  paid jobs during the lecture period in EUROSTUDENT countries. Gaining experience on the labour market is particularly important for these students in France, Finland, and Estonia.

Working in order to afford studies

On average, half of the students who engage in  paid jobs during the lecture period agree (totally) that they are in need of self-earned income in order to be able to study. More than 60 % of these students state that they could not afford to be a student without a paid job in Norway, Iceland, Finland, Ireland, Portugal, and Malta. Students whose parents are not (at all) well-off more often state having to pursue paid jobs to be able to study compared to their peers with better-off parents.

findings

Self-perception: worker vs. students

Around a third of students with  paid jobs during the lecture period in EUROSTUDENT countries perceive themselves as workers who are studying alongside their job, rather than as students working alongside their studies. In Denmark, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Ireland, and Iceland, at least three quarters of students with  paid jobs during the lecture period identify themselves as primarily students, whereas more than half of the working students in Hungary, Romania, Estonia, and Portugal identify themselves as primarily workers. Higher shares of students with paid jobs who identify as workers tend to be found among students having used  alternative access routes,  delayed transition students,  students without higher education background, as well as older students.

Income of working students

On average, the earnings of students with  regular paid jobs during the lecture period account for more than a third of their total monthly income. In Estonia, Poland, Romania, and Austria, self-earned income provides more than half of these students' total monthly income. Students in the field of education, in business, administration and law, and in information and communication technologies (ICTs) have rather high earnings; median earnings for students in the field of natural sciences, mathematics and statistics, as well as in agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary subjects are relatively low.  Students without higher education background have higher earnings than their counterparts with higher education background, reflecting the fact that they tend to work more hours. In a similar vein, students at non-universities often have markedly higher earnings than their peers who are enrolled at universities. A similar pattern can be observed for Master and Bachelor students: the first group has considerably higher earnings.

Main issues

A large body of literature has demonstrated that employment while being a higher education student has become increasingly common across Europe¹.

Extent of paid work alongside studies

Students in EUROSTUDENT countries vary greatly in the number of hours they work, and differences between different student groups in the extent of their employment become apparent ([>Chapter 5](#)). The impact of paid work on studies and students' overall time budget is also dependent on when and how much students work ([>Chapter B5](#), [>Thematic Review](#)). Employment during the lecture period has, for example, been shown to be taken up to a larger extent by older students, as well as  students without higher education background (Hauschildt et al., 2015) and more likely affects time budget for study-related activities negatively (compared to employment during the  lecture-free period). This chapter will analyse how students' employment is distributed over the lecture period, and whether there are differences between different groups of students.

Reasons for working

The extent of students' employment is related to aspects of financial need, the structure of the economy and higher education system, as well as student profiles (Beerkens et al., 2011). The opening of higher education to 'non-traditional' students has seen more older students and students from lower socio-economic groups taking up studies – these groups often tend to be employed during their studies (see e.g., Middendorff et al., 2017; Staneva, 2017, for Germany; Savic & Kresoja, 2016; for Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro; also Brooks, 2017; Hauschildt et al., 2015; for an overview). In fact, many older students take up studying with a delay, after having gained experience on the labour market (Mishra, 2016), and may consider their studies to complement their paid work, rather than vice versa. Changes in the expected lifestyle and consumption preferences of students may also constitute a need for additional resources (Beerkens et al., 2011). Self-reported reasons for taking up  paid jobs during the lecture period, students self-identification as 'workers' vs. 'students', as well as an analysis of the actual amount of income generated will be presented in this chapter.

B
6

Challenges and benefits of paid work alongside studies

A crucial question about student employment is its effect on academic success; there is accumulating evidence that working alongside studies is negatively related to students' grades, academic progress, retention and time to degree (Theune, 2015; Beerkens et al., 2011). The effect of student employment is, however, more nuanced than this broad generalisation. Besides the hours worked, the characteristics of the type of employment seem relevant when it comes to answer the question whether pursuing employment alongside studies is detrimental to academic progress and performance (e.g., Tuonenen et al., 2015).

Paid jobs with a (strong) relation to the students' studies are perceived as less detrimental to study success, or even beneficial. However, these jobs might not be equally accessible to all students. Several studies have indicated that  students without higher education background might be disadvantaged when it comes to student jobs that are more closely related to study content (e.g. Hauschildt et al., 2015; Middendorff et al., 2017). A recent study conducted in Germany, however,

¹ For an overview of this literature, please refer to Brooks (2017) or Beerkens et al. (2011).

found differences between students with and without higher education background in this regard to decrease over the course of the studies (Staneva, 2017).

Paid employment during studies may also have a positive impact on students' employability, especially if the work is related to students' field of study (Beerkens, 2011; Sanchez-Gelabert et al., 2017). Work experience gained during studies can help students develop workplace-relevant skills; furthermore, insights into possible employment opportunities may be gained, as well as contacts with possible employers made (Sanchez-Gelabert et al., 2017). The latter aspects might be even more relevant for students in the field of arts and humanities or social sciences, as these fields do not target certain professions. Transition into the labour market is typically longer for these students, and having pursued a job alongside studies might provide a good opportunity to signal workplace-relevant skills, thus 'compensating' for the lack of concrete relation of the field of study to a certain profession (Body et al., 2014; Staneva, 2017). Moreover, a French student survey found out that students pursuing public sector jobs alongside studies appear to be less prone to fail in their studies (Body et al., 2014). More analyses of challenges and benefits related to students' paid work are undertaken in the >[Thematic Review](#)² on students' paid work alongside studies and will only be briefly touched upon in this chapter.

In sum, this chapter will focus on the following main questions:

- What is the extent of paid work among students in EUROSTUDENT countries? Do different groups of students engage in paid jobs to varying extent?
- What are the reasons for students taking on paid jobs? Do students with  paid jobs during the lecture period identify as students or workers?
- How much income do students with  regular paid jobs during the lecture period generate through paid work?

Data and interpretations

On EUROSTUDENT average, slightly more than half of all students pursue paid jobs during the lecture period, a third does so regularly

The timing of students' employment can vary, across countries as well as within countries, as some students work during the entire lecture period, others only in the lecture-free period, and others during both. With regard to students' employment during the lecture period, on EUROSTUDENT average, slightly more than half of students (51%) pursue  paid jobs during the lecture period (Figure B6.1a). Around a third of students (35%) have  regular paid jobs during the whole lecture period. On cross-country average, 16% of students pursue  occasional paid jobs during term and almost half of students are not employed during the lecture period.

However, variations across countries become apparent with regard to the share of students with  paid jobs during the lecture period (Figure B6.1a).


- In Germany, the Czech Republic, and the Netherlands, more than 70% of students work during the lecture period, either pursuing  regular paid jobs or  occasionally. In Albania, Italy, and Serbia, less than a quarter of students work in paid jobs during the lecture period.
- The largest shares of students with  regular paid jobs during the entire lecture period can be found in Germany, Estonia, the Czech Republic, Iceland, and Latvia.

² The [Thematic Review](#) on students' paid work is a EUROSTUDENT publication focusing on this specific topic. It is available on the EUROSTUDENT website www.eurostudent.eu

Figure B6.1 ↴

Students' employment during the lecture and lecture-free period

Share of all students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.31. No data: Figure B6.1b: AT, DE, IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.6 Do you have (a) paid job(s) during the current #lecture period?, 3.13 Did you have (a) paid job(s) during the #lecture-free period/holidays during the last 12 months?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CH


Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- Pursuing occasional paid jobs during term time is particularly common among students in the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, and Slovenia; here, at least a quarter of students engage in these periodical jobs during the lecture period.

With the exception of Denmark and Albania, a clear cross-national pattern is detectable: the shares of students with paid jobs during the lecture period increase with students' age. The average share of students with paid jobs during the lecture period is more than three times as large for students who are older than 30 years compared to students who are younger than 21 years (65 % vs. 20 %) (Figure B6.2). The same pattern of increasing employment rates throughout the age groups is reflected in almost all countries.

Figure B6.2 **Students' employment during the lecture period by age groups**

Share of all students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.31.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.6 Do you have (a) paid job(s) during the current #lecture period?

Note(s): Values indicate shares of all students working from time to time or during the entire lecture period.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CH.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AI, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Besides working during the lecture period, students may also take up paid jobs in the lecture-free period. Although no taught courses are held during this period, students might still be required to write papers, undertake required internships, or study for upcoming exams. It is therefore interesting to also investigate the extent of students' employment during the lecture-free period.

Taking also paid work during the lecture-free period into account shows that, on EUROSTUDENT average, around 70 % of students pursue paid work while enrolled in higher education. Around 20 % of students take up paid jobs only during the lecture-free period (Figure B6.1b). Working only during the lecture period is relatively uncommon; students with paid jobs during the lecture period tend to be employed in the lecture-free period as well: on average 4 % of students work only during the (entire) lecture period, and 3 % only work from time to time during the lecture period. Around a third of students, on average, engage in paid work during the lecture-free period as well as during the entire lecture period, and 13 % of students have occasional paid jobs during the lecture period and during the lecture-free period. Across countries, large variations can be found (Figure B6.1b).

- The highest shares of students who work only during the lecture-free period can be found in Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, Croatia, and France. In these countries, around a quarter of students engage in paid work only during the lecture-free period.
- More than 80 % of students pursue paid work while enrolled in higher education in Estonia, the Czech Republic, Iceland, Norway, and Slovakia. In Estonia, the Czech Republic, Iceland, and Latvia, 40 to 50 % of students are employed during the entire lecture period and during the lecture-free period.
- The highest shares of students (60 to 70 %) who never take up paid jobs, neither during the lecture period nor during the lecture-free period, are found in Georgia, Albania, and Serbia.

In the Thematic Review, the analyses on students' employment are taken a step further by grouping countries according to the share of the student population with paid jobs during the lecture period and hours worked by these students.

Older working students, students having used alternative access routes, as well as delayed transition students more often perceive themselves to be primarily workers (vs. students)

Among students with paid jobs during the lecture period, around a third perceive themselves to be primarily workers (rather than students) on EUROSTUDENT average (Figure B6.3a). The majority (65 %) of students with paid jobs during the lecture period perceive themselves primarily as students who are working alongside studies.

- Particularly high shares of self-identified workers can be found among students with paid jobs in Hungary, Romania, Estonia, and Portugal – here, more than half of working students identify themselves as primarily workers who are studying (Figure B6.3b).
- In Denmark, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Ireland, and Iceland, at least three quarters of students with paid jobs identify themselves as primarily students who work.

Students with paid jobs during the lecture period having entered through alternative access routes (51 %) and delayed transition students (59 %) to a greater extent perceive themselves as workers studying alongside their job compared to all students with paid jobs during the lecture period (Figure B6.3b). This pattern is reflected across almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, however, there is cross-national variation in whether the shares of self-identified workers are higher among alternative access route or delayed transition students³ (Figure B6.3b).

- The differences between alternative access route students, delayed transitions students and all students with paid jobs during the lecture period are particularly pronounced in Slovenia, Italy, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Poland, and Hungary.
- Among students with paid jobs during the lecture period, in Albania and Romania, alternative access route students identify themselves to a greater extent primarily as students (compared to all students), and in Georgia, delayed transition students identify themselves to a greater extent as students working alongside studies in comparison to all students.

On cross-country average, the shares of students with paid jobs during the lecture period who identify themselves primarily as students working alongside studies are higher among students with than without higher education background (70 % vs. 60 %). Similarly, the shares of students who identify themselves primarily as workers tend to be higher among students without higher education background (Table B6.1).

- Exceptions are Denmark, Georgia, Serbia, and Turkey, where the shares of students without higher education background who identify themselves as students are larger (by 1 to 7 percentage points) than among students with higher education background.


In all EUROSTUDENT countries, the vast majority of (very) young students (up to 21 years) with paid jobs during the lecture period perceive themselves as primarily students who are working alongside studies. In contrast, with the exception of one country, more than three quarters of working students ages 30 years or older identify themselves as primarily workers who study in addition to their paid job across all countries (Table B6.1).

³ It should be noted that there is large overlap between the two student groups.

Figure B6.3 ↴

Self-identification as primarily student or worker by access route into higher education

Share of students with paid jobs during lecture period (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.37. **No data:** DE, FR; for delayed students: MT; for alternative access students: IT, TR. **Too few cases:** For delayed students: AL; for alternative access students: RS, SK.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.10 Which of the following describes your current situation best? Primarily I am a student, and I am working alongside my studies, or: Primarily I work, and I am studying alongside my paid job(s).

Note(s): Values indicate shares of students with occasional or regular paid jobs during the lecture period identifying as either student or worker. Values indicate shares of all students working from time to time or during the entire lecture period.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CZ.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- In the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Slovakia, over 90% of students with paid jobs during the lecture period over the age of 30 identify themselves as primarily workers studying alongside their paid job.

Besides financial reasons, non-monetary considerations (remain) important for the pursuit of employment alongside studies

Students with a paid job during the lecture period were asked to rate to which extent they work in order to cover their living costs, to gain experience on the labour market, and whether they need the job to be able to study, or because they have to support others financially. As students'

motivation to work is covered in the [> Thematic Review](#) and a discussion of financial vs. non-monetary reasons (e.g. preparedness for the labour market) for students to take up employment while enrolled in higher education is provided there, this chapter focuses just on two main reasons: working in **●** paid jobs during the lecture period because studies could not be afforded without paid jobs and working to gain experience on the labour market (for an overview of all motives analysed by students dependency on income source, see Table B6.2).

Across EUROSTUDENT countries, a majority of students with **●** paid jobs during the lecture period agrees (totally) that they work in order to gain experience on the labour market. In both the current and the past round of EUROSTUDENT, about 60 % of students with a paid job during the lecture period indicate that this is a motive for them to pursue a paid job. At the national level, the relevance of this motive has changed in many cases (Figure B6.4).

- In 11 countries, the shares of students who engage in paid jobs in order to gain experience on the labour market have decreased since the last round of EUROSTUDENT (by 1 to 12 percentage points). This is the case in Latvia, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Romania, Italy, Sweden, Norway, Hungary, Austria, Serbia, and Ireland.
- In 1 country, there has been no change in shares, and in 11 countries, the shares of students who agree (totally) that they work to gain experience on the labour market have risen by 1 to 9 percentage points in France, Finland, Estonia, Croatia, Poland, Slovakia, the Netherlands, Denmark, Malta, Germany, and Switzerland.

Focusing on this round of EUROSTUDENT (E:VI), there is quite some variation across countries: between 40 % and three quarters of students who pursue **●** paid jobs during the lecture period do so in order to gain experience on the labour market.

- The largest shares of students of more than 70 % who (totally) agree that this is a motive for employment can be found in France, Finland, and Estonia.
- In Norway, Hungary, Austria, Serbia, and Ireland, at most 50 % of working students indicate that they work in order to gain experience on the labour market.

On average, half of the students who engage in **●** paid jobs during the lecture period agree (totally) that they are in need of a **●** self-earned income in order to be able to study (Figure B6.5a and Figure B6.5b). With regard to this reason, the cross-country differences are even larger than for the motive of gaining experience on the labour market; about a third of students and up to three quarters of students state that they could not afford to be a student without their jobs.


- More than 60 % and up to three quarters of students who work during the lecture period state that they could not afford to be a student without a paid job in Norway, Iceland, Finland, Ireland, Portugal, and Malta.
- Less than 40 % of students who pursue a paid job in Serbia, Lithuania, Latvia, the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Italy do so because they could not afford to be a student otherwise.

How do the reasons for paid employment differ among students dependent on different income sources (Table B6.2)? Among students depending on either their own income, their family/partner, or national public student support, students **●** dependent on self-earned income state, on average, to the largest extent that they could not afford to be a student without paid work (61 %). For those students **●** dependent on national public student support (50 %) and **●** dependent on family support (35 %), this reason tends to be less relevant. With some exceptions, this pattern is reflected across countries (Figure B6.5a).

Figure B6.4 

Students who work in order to gain experience on the labour market in E:V and E:VI

Share of students with paid jobs during the lecture period (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V & EUROSTUDENT VI, H.9 & H.34. No data: AL, IS, PT, TR. Data not comparable over time: GE.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.10. To what extent do the following statements apply to your situation?, 3.8 To what extent do the following statements apply to your situation?

Note(s): Values indicate the shares of students with paid jobs during the lecture period who agree (totally) that they work alongside studies in order to gain experience on the labour market. Values indicate the shares of students agreeing (totally) that they have a paid job alongside studies in order to gain experience on the labour market.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- In Norway, Iceland, Finland, and Ireland, at least half the students in all groups, regardless of their main income source, state that they need paid jobs during the lecture period in order to afford their studies.
- Large differences between students dependent on family support and those dependent on self-earned income of above 30 and up to 42 percentage points can be found in Portugal, Malta, Germany, Poland, Hungary, Estonia, Slovenia, Croatia, the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, and Sweden. In these countries, the shares are much larger for students dependent on self-earned income.
- In Romania and Sweden, students dependent on national public student support report to a lesser extent that they could not afford to be a student without paid jobs during the lecture period compared to students dependent on family support.

The need to have  paid jobs during the lecture period in order to finance the studies also varies by the  financial status of students' parents (Figure B6.5b). Students who rate their parents to be less well-off most often indicate having to work in order to be able to afford their studies. On EUROSTUDENT average, around two thirds (65 %) of students who state that their parents are not (at all) well-off report a need for gainful employment in order to finance their life while being enrolled in higher education. Across EUROSTUDENT countries, this applies to around half of students with averagely well-off parents (52 %), and more than a third of students who report that their parents are (very) well-off (37 %). This pattern is reflected in almost all EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure B6.5b).

- Exceptions are Malta and Albania, where students whose parents are averagely well-off state to a higher degree than students from not (at all) well-off families that they need to pursue paid jobs in order to be able to study.

B
6

Regularly working students' earnings account for more than a third of their total monthly income

Self-earned income is, from a  macro perspective, on cross-country average students' second most important source of income ( Chapter B7). Across the EUROSTUDENT countries, the  median of students' self-earned income for students with  regular paid jobs during the entire lecture period amounts to 326 Purchasing Power Standard (PPS)⁴ per month; and this source of income accounts for students with  regular paid jobs during the entire lecture period for more than a third of employed students' total monthly income (including transfers in kind) (Figure B6.6). The  median amount of these students' monthly earnings of course varies between countries, and so does the share of earnings in students' total monthly income.

In more than two fifths of the countries with available data, earnings of students with  regular paid jobs during the entire lecture period make up more than 40 % of their total monthly income (Figure B6.6).


- This holds true for Estonia, Poland, Romania, Austria, Hungary, Latvia, Switzerland, Malta, Lithuania, and Norway. In the four countries mentioned first, self-earned income provides even more than half of students' total monthly income (Figure B6.6).
- In the Netherlands and Serbia, own earnings are of relatively less importance to students. In these countries, the share of self-earned income in relation to the total income of students with paid jobs does not exceed 20 %.

⁴ For an explanation of Purchasing Power Standard (PPS), see  Chapter B7.

Figure B6.5 ↓

Students who could not afford to study without paid jobs

Share of students with paid jobs during the lecture period (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.34. **No data:** AT, CH, FR, TR; for dependency on income source: AL, IT; parental wealth: IT. **Too few cases:** For dependency on national public student support: GE, LT, LV, MT, RS, SK.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.8 To what extent do the following statements apply to your situation?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT.


Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- Students with regular paid jobs in Estonia, Poland, Romania, Latvia, Switzerland, and Portugal, generate the highest incomes, earning at least 500 PPS per month.
- The median amount of income earned by students with regular paid jobs is comparatively low in France, Croatia, and Serbia, ranging from 89 to 182 PPS per month.

The amounts of self-earned income differ not only between countries, but also between various student groups (Table B6.3). Monthly earnings of students with regular paid jobs during the lecture period differ greatly by field of study. Students in the field of education, in business, administration and law, and in ICTs have rather high earnings, with a cross-country median of more than 360 PPS per month. The median earnings are rather low at 240 PPS per month

Figure B6.6**Students' income from current paid job**

Median monthly self-earned income of students with regular paid jobs (in PPS) and as share of total monthly income incl. transfers in kind (in %,  micro perspective)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, G.68. **No data:** IT, FI, IS; self-earned income as share of total monthly income: AL.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?, 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

**B
6**

for students in the field of natural sciences, mathematics and statistics, as well as in agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary subjects. Students without higher education background have higher earnings than their counterparts with higher education background (cross-country median: 376 vs. 338 PPS). This is because the first group usually relies to a relatively high extent on gainful employment, while the second group receives a larger share of their income from their family ([Chapter B7](#)). In a similar vein, students with  regular paid jobs at non-universities (who are more often students without higher education background than students at universities) often have markedly higher earnings than their peers who are enrolled at universities (cross-country median: 455 vs. 326 PPS), which is in line with the finding that in the large majority of countries, students at non-universities spend more hours per week on paid work ([Chapter B5](#)). A similar pattern can be observed for Master and Bachelor students: the first group has considerably higher earnings (cross-country  median: 510 PPS vs. 271 PPS). Master students are clearly older than their fellow students in Bachelor programmes in all countries and – associated with this – they more often live outside the parental home ([Chapter B9](#)) and have children ([Chapter B1](#)). Master students also spend more hours working in paid jobs than Bachelor students in almost all countries ([Chapter B5](#)).

Benefits and challenges of pursuing paid employment alongside studies

Analyses in the previous chapter ([Chapter B5](#)) have shown that employment alongside studies potentially enhances existing inequalities between different groups of students. The employment rate during the lecture period is higher for older students (Figure B6.2), as well as among  delayed transition and  alternative access route students, who perceive themselves more frequently as workers pursuing studies (vs. as primarily students with a paid job, Table B6.1). Results in the previous chapter ([Chapter B5](#)) have shown that increased time spent working is related to a decrease in study time, thus, engaging in paid work may, beyond a certain threshold, become detrimental to study success. Since paid employment is, on EUROSTUDENT average, a

necessity for half of the students with  paid jobs during the lecture period in order to be able to fund their living (Figure B6.5a and Figure B6.5b), these students are at risk of being disadvantaged compared to students who do not pursue paid work and are thus able to devote more time to study-related activities. As will be shown in [>Chapter B10](#), the fear of losing a paid job also presents an obstacle to cross-national mobility. This issue is explored more in-depth in the [>Thematic Review](#).

However, as has already been laid out in the [>Main Issues](#) section of this chapter, working alongside studies can also be beneficial to study success or labour market integration, due to the possibility of gaining experience (Figure B6.4) and insights into practical applications of study programmes. In fact, in two thirds of EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 45 % of students with  paid jobs during the lecture period have a job related to their field of study; especially high shares in this matter are evident for students in the field of ICTs, as well as in the field of health and welfare. Further information on these issues is covered by the [>Thematic Review](#) on students' paid work.

Discussion and policy considerations

As the analyses in the present and previous chapter ([>Chapter B5](#)) have demonstrated, paid work alongside studies is nowadays very common across EUROSTUDENT countries. Across countries, the majority of students with  paid jobs during the lecture period perceive themselves primarily as students working alongside studies (vs. workers studying in addition to their paid job). However, in some countries, and in particular among delayed transition or alternative access students, the majority of students with  paid jobs during the lecture period identify themselves as primarily workers rather than students.

Students indicate working for both monetary as well as non-monetary reasons. On EUROSTUDENT average, around 60 % of students state that they pursue  paid jobs during the lecture period in order to gain experience on the labour market. This reason is particularly relevant for students in Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, and Georgia. Indeed, studies have indicated that working alongside studies might be beneficial to students' future labour market insertion and employability (Beerkens, 2011; Sanchez-Gelabert et al., 2017), as it provides students with the opportunity to signal workplace-relevant skills (Body et al., 2014). Around half of the students with  paid jobs during the lecture period across EUROSTUDENT countries indicate that self-earned income is a necessity in order to be able to study. Particularly large shares of students state this in Albania, Germany, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Iceland, Malta, Norway, Poland, and Portugal. Indeed, the self-earned income in Hungary, Malta, and Poland, as well as in Austria, Estonia, Latvia, Romania, and Switzerland, makes up almost half of working students' available total income or more. Across all EUROSTUDENT countries, students from less privileged backgrounds state, compared to their peers from more well-off families, to a greater extent that they could not afford to study without  paid jobs during the lecture period.

Close attention to group differences in the need for students to work alongside their studies is warranted. With increased time spent on employment, time dedicated to study-related activities tends to decrease ([>Chapter B5](#)) which in turn can result in a prolonged study time and may increase the risk of study interruptions ([>Chapter B4](#)) or dropping out from higher education. Such scenarios are "wasteful from the perspective of social costs and the costs of individual

students" (Beerkens et al., 2011, p. 680). Moreover, financial difficulties and the need to reconcile competing demands can also negatively affect students' mental health (Antonucci, 2016). If the need for paid work is hindering particular groups of students from successfully engaging in their studies, support measures should be targeted at these groups.

Higher education institutions, by expanding distance and online education, can create flexible study opportunities which make a combination of paid employment and studies more feasible. This requires the provision of clear and complete syllabi and study materials, such as appropriate textbooks or articles which can be studied independently (Triventi, 2014). Offering more flexible and individually adjustable timetables which support students in a paid job to reconcile competing time demands is of no less importance. This is of particular relevance for older students engaging in lifelong learning, who see studies to be accompanying their (main) job. At the policy level, an improvement or adjustment of financial aid schemes, making them accessible to older students and based on socio-economic selection criteria for recipients, rather than on purely merit-based criteria, might help to limit hours worked, thereby shortening study duration (Theune, 2015). Additionally, such support schemes might also help to broaden access to higher education (Beerkens et al., 2011).

Tables

Table B6.1**Students' self-identification as primarily student or worker by (selected) age groups, educational background and type of HEI**

Share of students with paid jobs during the lecture period (in %)

	Primarily student							Primarily worker										
	All students	< 22 years	22–24 years	25–29 years	30 years and older	Without HE background	With HE background	University	Non-university	All students	< 22 years	22–24 years	25–29 years	30 years and older	Without HE background	With HE background	University	Non-university
AL	71	70	74	75	t.f.c.	70	74	72	t.f.c.	29	30	26	25	t.f.c.	30	26	28	t.f.c.
AT	65	94	85	63	28	61	74	68	54	35	6	15	37	72	39	26	32	46
CH	79	96	92	77	42	74	82	89	67	21	4	8	23	58	26	18	11	33
CZ	65	91	76	45	4	59	70	66	47	35	9	24	55	96	41	30	34	53
DE	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
DK	91	96	92	88	83	92	91	90	92	9	4	8	12	17	8	9	10	8
EE	46	90	62	39	14	42	49	47	46	54	10	38	61	86	58	51	53	54
FI	70	98	90	75	39	65	72	72	68	30	2	10	25	61	35	28	28	32
FR	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
GE	70	84	72	45	40	76	69	70	n/a	30	16	28	55	60	24	31	30	n/a
HR	66	92	85	53	11	62	75	73	46	34	8	15	47	89	38	25	27	54
HU	48	93	73	33	7	38	58	51	37	52	7	27	67	93	62	42	49	63
IE	75	96	89	58	25	67	82	77	73	25	4	11	42	75	33	18	23	27
IS	75	96	95	85	45	63	85	75	n/a	25	4	5	15	55	37	15	25	n/a
IT	67	90	83	58	27	64	74	67	n/a	33	10	17	42	73	36	26	33	n/a
LT	52	86	57	26	11	47	57	55	45	48	14	43	74	89	53	43	45	55
LV	55	87	58	42	25	47	58	52	59	45	13	42	58	75	53	42	48	41
MT	60	95	75	37	12	54	72	57	70	40	5	25	63	88	46	28	43	30
NL	85	97	92	72	20	81	89	92	82	15	3	8	28	80	19	11	8	18
NO	71	95	95	80	28	58	74	76	66	29	5	5	20	72	42	26	24	34
PL	52	71	56	40	12	47	60	61	28	48	29	44	60	88	53	40	39	72
PT	46	91	68	44	15	43	56	51	39	54	9	32	56	85	57	44	49	61
RO	48	85	56	32	17	45	51	48	n/a	52	15	44	68	83	55	49	52	n/a
RS	72	93	85	54	22	75	69	72	n.d.	28	7	15	46	78	25	31	28	n.d.
SE	68	91	92	76	34	63	72	68	n/a	32	9	8	24	66	37	28	32	n/a
SI	68	89	76	55	14	62	75	76	47	32	11	24	45	86	38	25	24	53
SK	67	89	77	26	4	64	71	75	34	33	11	23	74	96	36	29	25	66
TR	52	90	85	46	16	53	51	52	n/a	48	10	15	54	84	47	49	48	n/a
av.	65	90	78	55	24	60	70	67	56	35	10	22	45	76	40	30	33	44

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.37. **No data:** DE, FR. No non-universities exist in GE, IS, IT, RO, SE, TR. **Too few cases:** 30 years and older: AL; non-universities: AL.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.10 Which of the following describes your current situation best? Primarily I am a student, and I am working alongside my studies, or: Primarily I work, and I am studying alongside my paid job(s).

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: CZ.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B6.2**Motivation for employment alongside studies by dependency on income source**

Share of students with paid jobs during the lecture period (in %)

	Dependent on family support				Dependent on self-earned income				Dependent on national public student support			
	To cover living costs	To gain experience on the labour market	Without paid job(s), to be a student is not affordable	To support others financially	To cover living costs	To gain experience on the labour market	Without paid job(s), to be a student is not affordable	To support others financially	To cover living costs	To gain experience on the labour market	Without paid job(s), to be a student is not affordable	To support others financially
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT	53	44	n.d.	n.d.	87	51	n.d.	n.d.	77	35	n.d.	n.d.
CH	31	46	n.d.	4	69	61	n.d.	10	64	39	n.d.	9
CZ	57	60	20	10	84	75	53	24	63	54	24	23
DE	n.d.	54	43	5	n.d.	56	77	8	n.d.	45	65	5
DK	65	53	39	20	80	64	58	10	78	53	48	4
EE	54	66	25	21	86	72	59	34	77	58	40	19
FI	82	70	55	31	97	76	76	35	90	74	60	8
FR	28	68	n.d.	n.d.	77	85	n.d.	n.d.	45	69	n.d.	n.d.
GE	38	73	32	21	45	74	49	24	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.
HR	62	58	20	12	86	73	62	29	67	65	48	16
HU	46	52	28	10	70	50	62	22	77	46	53	15
IE	70	39	53	7	88	42	82	24	80	36	68	10
IS	79	41	65	27	90	41	72	21	86	24	74	25
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	65	62	24	18	83	65	46	24	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.
LV	73	60	27	27	87	69	42	26	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.
MT	58	40	41	5	71	61	74	20	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.
NL	45	60	18	4	79	68	57	15	64	53	36	5
NO	67	53	57	24	88	52	79	33	76	46	70	4
PL	57	56	33	20	76	72	73	36	69	37	54	24
PT	71	56	48	26	87	51	84	29	82	55	70	16
RO	64	61	36	32	72	65	49	31	73	59	30	8
RS	63	41	26	19	58	71	31	12	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.
SE	45	55	19	15	88	51	52	24	36	55	14	5
SI	48	61	24	6	79	68	60	18	64	65	44	11
SK	57	58	27	15	88	69	55	23	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.
TR	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
av.	57	55	35	16	80	63	61	23	70	51	50	12

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, H.34. **No data:** AL, IT, TR; to cover living costs: DE; could not afford to be a student: AT, FR; to support others financially: AT, FR.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.8 To what extent do the following statements apply to your situation?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: AT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B6.3

Self-earned income from current paid jobs of students with regular paid jobs during the entire lecture period by field of study, educational background, type of HEI, and study programme

Monthly amount (median) (in PPS)

	Field of study								Educational background		Type of HEI		Study programme			
	Education (incl. teacher training)	Arts and humanities	Social sciences, journalism and information	Business, administration and law	Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics	ICTs	Engineering, manufacturing and construction	Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary	Health and welfare	Services	With HE background	Without HE background	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	338	338	338	t.f.c.	253	371	
AT	375	469	469	731	375	937	469	375	351	375	375	562	469	762	380	
CH	592	533	474	906	355	829	415	296	563	355	515	592	474	889	530	
CZ	398	199	341	284	114	341	171	171	132	227	227	284	227	455	199	
DE	282	329	329	322	244	376	294	188	282	376	282	376	310	301	282	
DK	202	253	303	303	202	294	232	n.d.	202	n.d.	253	253	253	218	202	
EE	676	406	723	1,082	406	1,335	811	t.f.c.	541	541	744	676	744	676	622	
FI	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	
FR	543	182	155	228	164	396	228	t.f.c.	182	n.d.	182	182	182	91	364	
GE	t.f.c.	200	312	260	240	240	240	240	240	320	280	240	240	n/a	223	
HR	167	124	209	209	137	209	104	63	104	209	146	188	167	293	167	
HU	542	274	465	542	219	547	331	427	328	361	345	542	411	547	438	
IE	271	271	362	362	271	362	271	181	271	271	271	362	271	326	271	
IS	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n/a	n.d.	
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n/a	n.d.	
LT	503	288	487	568	487	409	646	t.f.c.	325	325	487	487	487	487	455	
LV	507	446	669	784	565	595	663	t.f.c.	520	537	595	595	624	595	446	
MT	t.f.c.	328	361	610	t.f.c.	907	366	t.f.c.	381	t.f.c.	379	488	427	366	305	
NL	273	182	182	273	136	227	182	91	200	273	182	273	182	255	227	
NO	510	438	408	438	292	292	292	292	401	t.f.c.	365	554	452	365	510	
PL	459	167	417	626	215	768	375	t.f.c.	250	626	417	563	417	626	500	
PT	625	250	549	750	t.f.c.	828	657	t.f.c.	489	438	473	681	515	725	625	
RO	642	457	668	713	233	1,069	655	624	535	t.f.c.	579	668	646	n/a	579	
RS	89	213	89	89	n.d.	t.f.c.	18	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	89	89	89	n.d.	89	
SE	285	285	285	244	244	263	163	t.f.c.	244	t.f.c.	305	407	326	n/a	244	
SI	187	187	250	375	125	250	187	187	250	362	187	250	187	500	187	
SK	246	150	300	300	204	225	270	t.f.c.	169	t.f.c.	270	300	225	300	225	
TR	191	218	272	218	762	272	327	544	272	180	435	258	272	n/a	109	
E:VI med.	387	262	351	369	240	376	293	240	272	358	338	376	326	455	271	510

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, G.68.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?

Note(s): The unit in the table is Purchasing Power Standard (PPS). See >Chapter B7.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Chapter B7

Students' resources

Key

Distribution of student income

When comparing the lowest with the highest 20 % of income receivers, student income is rather unevenly distributed within the national student population in France, Lithuania, Malta, Portugal, and Turkey. In contrast, the differences between high and low incomes are comparatively small within Austria, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Sweden.

B
7

Extent of students' financial difficulties

In Albania, Georgia, Iceland, Ireland, Poland, and Slovenia, more than a third of students report to have either serious or very serious financial difficulties. In another nine countries, at least a quarter of students is affected by (very) serious financial difficulties. However, the majority of students in the EUROSTUDENT countries are not facing such serious problems: In all countries, more than 60 % of students experience at the most moderate financial difficulties.

Level of student income

The magnitude of students' total monthly income, including transfers in kind, varies between countries. In Iceland, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, students' monthly median income is comparatively high with values above 1,100 Purchasing Power Standard (PPS). In Croatia, France, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Turkey, students' median income is less than 700 PPS per month. Across countries,  students with financial difficulties have a monthly median income, including transfers in kind, of 819 PPS while that of their peers without financial difficulties amounts to 914 PPS.



findings

Student groups especially affected by financial difficulties

When looking at the financial situation of different student groups it turns out that students (1) whose parents are considered to be financially not well-off, (2) who have impairments, and (3) who depend on national public student support are especially affected by (very) serious financial difficulties. While on average across countries, 26 % of all students report (very) serious financial difficulties, the respective share amounts to 48 % among students whose parents seem to be financially not well-off, 34 % among ⚡ students with impairments and 32 % among those depending on national public student support.

Composition of student funding

From a macro perspective, students' total monthly income including transfers in kind is on cross-country average composed in the following way: contributions from family/partner 47 %, students' self-earned income 34 %, national public student support 14 %, and other income sources 5 %.

B
7

Recipients of family/partner contributions

In a large majority of countries, more than 80 % of all students receive the largest part of their total income including transfers in kind from family/partner. For students not living with parents, the share of those who receive contributions from family/partner has increased across the EUROSTUDENT countries from 68 % [E:V] to 78 % [E:VI].

Main issues

Taking part in higher education (HE) can be a financial burden on students in several ways: directly, through the (additional) expenses incurred for example by moving into a separate household and the need to cover ongoing living and study-related costs, and indirectly, through the income ‘not earned’, as students often cannot participate in gainful employment full-time. Sufficient funds available to students can, therefore, be regarded as a necessary financial condition for entry into and successful completion of higher education. The ministers responsible for higher education in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) have repeatedly referred to this point and its significance for developing the social dimension of higher education (London Communiqué, 2007; Bucharest Communiqué, 2012; Yerevan Communiqué, 2015). This chapter investigates different aspects of the income situation of students that are also relevant for assessing the status quo of the social dimension in the EHEA.

Financial difficulties of students

Being confronted with financial difficulties implies a higher risk of needing to prolong the studies, e.g. due to taking up gainful employment, or even dropping out of higher education (Quinn, 2013; Heublein et al., 2017). The analysis focuses on the question which student groups are especially confronted with financial difficulties and thus exposed to such a higher risk.

Magnitude of student income

Related to financial difficulties is often the issue of students’ available income. Previous EUROSTUDENT reports (Hauschildt et al., 2015; Orr et al., 2011) have shown that a large degree of heterogeneity exists in students’ income across the EHEA, even when controlling for purchasing power (Gwosć & Hauschildt, 2016). As insufficient income can be one reason for students’ financial difficulties (Forsyth & Furlong, 2003; Beloc, Maruotti, & Petrella, 2010), the relation between students’ income situation and their assessment of financial difficulties is also investigated.

B
7

Distribution and concentration of student income

While a comparison of the amount of student income provides, *inter alia*, an indication of financial heterogeneity across countries, a financial diversity within countries can be observed as well. An analysis of the distribution and concentration of student income is, therefore, used to investigate the extent of income differences within a country’s student population. This may provide a starting point for discussions on distributional justice, which is an important value in most societies (Dabla-Norris et al., 2015).

Composition of student funding

Study funding depends on the availability and fruitfulness of different sources of income. The extent to which different sources contribute to the funding of students is explored from the macro perspective. In addition, a special emphasis is placed on the importance of contributions from family/partner and support from the public sector (micro perspective), two main sources of student funding (Hauschildt et al., 2015). The role of self-earned income for study funding, another important source of funding, is examined in [Chapter B6](#).

Methodological and conceptual notes

Income data are based on students' self-reported income from several different sources. Based on the EUROSTUDENT conventions, total student income is grouped into four categories; a) family/partner contributions, b) self-earned income, c) national public student support, and d) other income. These categories and further concepts that are important for the understanding of the data are shortly explained.

Transfers in kind

Transfers in kind are students' living and study-related costs that are not paid by the students themselves, but by other persons such as the students' parents, partners, or other relatives. The key criterion for transfers in kind is that the payments go directly to the students' creditors, i.e. the respective money is intangible for the students. A vivid example would be the rent paid by parents directly to the landlord of their collegiate child. While one student may receive parental support completely in cash, another may receive the same magnitude of support as transfers in kind. The concept of transfers in kind is then used in order to consider the different forms of support students receive from their social environment and to capture by this means the overall picture of the students' financial situation. In this way, family support for students becomes indeed comparable.

Family/partner contributions

Family/partner contributions refer to another type of support that students receive from their parents, partner, or others. It comprises disposable income such as cash/money transfers which students can freely use for monthly spending (= transfers in cash). In the figures and tables in this chapter, amounts for transfers in kind have been added to family/partner contributions.

Self-earned income

The category “self-earned income” covers students' income which is generated through gainful employment. Income from both current employment as well as from previous employment (= savings) is taken into account. With respect to income from previous employment, only the average amount students use per month to cover their costs of living and studying is considered.

B
7

National public student support

National public student support comprises payments which students receive, usually because of their student status, directly from the state in which they study. It includes on the one hand grants and scholarships (= non-repayable support), and on the other hand loans which may be subject to interest or not (= repayable support). Support from all possible institutional levels (i.e. federal level, province, and municipality) as well as from the higher education institutions (HEIs) is taken into account. However, as the EUROSTUDENT data are based on students' self-reported data, some public support items are not covered. This refers e.g. to tax relief for students and students' parents or cost takeover of the state to the benefit of students (e.g. payments of the state to HEIs which are meant to cover students' tuition fees as is the case in Georgia).¹

¹ In Georgia, about 31% of students do not have to pay fees as these costs are defrayed by the state. The payments of the state go directly to the universities. In accordance with the EUROSTUDENT conventions, this financial contribution of the state to the institutional costs of HE are not included in public support to students.

Other income

‘Other income’ is a residual category which encompasses a plethora of income items from either private or public sources that are not assigned to one of the other categories mentioned above. Student income from other private sources could be, for instance, grants and loans from private companies. Income from other public sources is e.g. housing benefits or child benefit for students, i.e. public support items that are not exclusively geared towards students. Furthermore, ‘other income’ may include support from non-country sources, i.e. from foreign countries or international entities such as the EU.

Purchasing Power Standard

This chapter contains figures in which the magnitude of student income is displayed. As half of the EUROSTUDENT countries are not (yet) part of the Euro area,² PPS have been used as a common currency to ensure data comparability. PPS is an artificial currency used to eliminate the influence of exchange rates and differing price levels between countries, which can distort the international comparison of monetary values. For this purpose, the monetary values which were reported by the EUROSTUDENT countries in national currency were converted into PPS values using the Euro as reference. The respective currency conversion factors that have been applied are Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) for 2016 as reported by Eurostat (2017c) and – in the case of Georgia – the Worldbank (Worldbank, 2017b).

One PPS can be depicted as a tiny goods basket which costs exactly the same amount of money (= 1 PPS) in all EU-28 countries. Differences in the magnitude of income measured in PPS – e.g., country A: 800 PPS, country B: 500 PPS – then explain that income receivers in country A can buy 800 units of this goods basket, while income receivers in country B can purchase only 500, though the price is the same in both countries.

The interested reader can view all financial data in the EUROSTUDENT database also in Euro and national currency units ([Database](#)).

B
7

Data and interpretation

Across the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students with (very) serious financial difficulties varies from more than 10 % to 40 %

As part of the EUROSTUDENT survey, students were asked to what extent they currently experience financial difficulties. The respective answer scale contained five response options, ranging from “very seriously” to “not at all” (Figure B7.1).


On cross-country average, 9 % of students report to currently have very serious financial difficulties and another 17 % state serious difficulties. In contrast, 22 % of students report only slight financial difficulties and another 23 % no difficulties at all.

- In six countries, more than a third of students reports to have either serious or very serious financial difficulties. This applies to Georgia, Albania, Slovenia, Poland, Iceland, and Ireland.
- In another nine countries, at least a quarter of students report being affected by (very) serious financial difficulties, namely in Norway, Denmark, Latvia, Austria, Croatia, Serbia, Malta, Romania, and Lithuania.

² This holds for Albania, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Norway, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey.

Figure B7.1 ↓**Students' assessment of their financial situation**

Extent of current financial difficulties of all students. Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, F.168. **No data:** IT.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.5 To what extent are you currently experiencing financial difficulties?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

The majority of students in the EUROSTUDENT countries does not face such serious problems: In all countries, more than 60 % of students experience moderate financial difficulties at the most.

- The Czech Republic, Switzerland, and the Netherlands are the countries with the least shares of students in financial distress. There, around 16 % of students report (very) serious difficulties.
- There are seven countries in which more than half of students have only slight or no difficulties at all; this includes Germany, Finland, Sweden, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Switzerland, and the Netherlands.

Various causes for financial difficulties are discussed below with reference to specific student focus groups.

Students with financially not well-off parents, with impairments, and dependent on national public student support experience above-average financial difficulties


Financial difficulties are not evenly distributed across the student population; some student groups are more affected than others. Three of these groups are looked at in more detail (Figure B7.2). In all countries with available data, students who assess their parents as being either financially not very well-off or not at all well-off³ report exceptionally frequently (very) serious financial difficulties compared to all students (Figure B7.2a). On cross-country average, around a quarter of all students report (very) serious financial difficulties; among students whose parents are considered to be financially not well-off, this applies to almost every second student.

- In Georgia, Poland, Slovenia, Albania, Serbia, and Portugal, more than 60 % of students whose parents seem to be financially not well-off report (very) serious financial difficulties; in Ireland, Iceland, and Croatia, it is still more than half.
- In Germany, Finland, Sweden, and the Netherlands, such problems are somewhat less common. There, less than a third of students whose parents seem to be not well-off have (very)

³ The description of students' parents' financial well-being is based on students' subjective assessment. The students were asked: "How well-off do you think your parents are compared with other families?" The five-staged response scale ranged from "very well-off" to "not at all well-off".

Figure B7.2 ↴

Students' assessment of their financial situation by parental wealth, impairments, and dependency on income source



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.168. **No data:** IT; parents financially well-off (very + somewhat) & parents financially not well-off (very + at all): AT, CH, FR; dependent on income source: AL. **Too few cases:** Dependent on national public student support: RS.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.5 To what extent are you currently experiencing financial difficulties?

Note(s): Values above the country abbreviations present the share of all students with (very) serious financial difficulties. For chart a), the student groups "parents financially very well-off" and "parents financially somewhat well-off" have been summed up. The same holds for the student groups "parents financially not very well-off" and "parents financially not at all well-off".

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

serious financial difficulties. Nevertheless, these shares are still more than 10 percentage points higher compared to the country average.

The share of students whose parents are considered to be financially either very well-off or somewhat well-off and who have (very) serious financial problems is below average in all countries with available data. On cross-country average, this share amounts to 16 %, while the respective share among all students is 26 %.

- However, in Georgia, Poland, Iceland, Albania, Malta, Denmark, and Norway, financial difficulties are comparatively widespread even among students who assess their parents as financially well-off: more than 20 % of those students state to have (very) serious financial difficulties.
- In contrast, in Serbia, Croatia, Portugal, Slovakia, and Germany, less than a tenth of those students are confronted with (very) serious financial difficulties.

For the group of countries, where students whose parents seem to be financially not well-off report the largest shares for (very) serious difficulties, the extent of difficulties seems to be associated with the countries' wealth and the size of family/partner contributions in study financing. In Georgia, Poland, Slovenia, Serbia, Portugal, and Croatia, the GDP per capita is below the EU-28 average⁴ and at the same time more than 80 % of the student population in these countries receive family/partner contributions which make up between 53 % and 88 % of the recipients' total monthly income (Figure B7.6). Not surprisingly, the combination of the high importance of family support for study financing and a country's rather low wealth may lead to some problems especially for students from families that are financially not well-off.

Students with impairments

Another student group that is affected by financial difficulties to an above-average extent are ◉ students with impairments. In all countries, students with impairments struggle more often with (very) serious financial difficulties than all students.

- The highest differences between the two groups can be found in Georgia, Albania, Serbia, Croatia, Austria, Estonia, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic. In those countries, the share of students with (very) serious financial difficulties is among those with impairments at least 10 percentage points above the country average.
- In Portugal, Turkey, and Switzerland, the respective share is at the most 4 percentage points higher than the value for all students.

Among students without impairments, lower shares of students report values for (very) serious financial difficulties than the country average in all countries but Malta, although the differences tend to be rather small – 1 or 2 percentage points – in most countries.

The extensive financial difficulties of ◉ students with impairments may be due to different reasons. On the one hand, these students may have lower incomes, e.g. in case their impairments limit their abilities or chances for gainful employment. On the other hand, ◉ students with impairments may have higher expenses than other students, especially but not solely health-related expenses. A further analysis of EUROSTUDENT data shows that in fact both problems exist in principle. Across countries, the monthly median income, including transfers in kind, of ◉ students with impairments amounts to 815 PPS, while that of all students is 865 PPS. In more

⁴ A comparison of the countries' GDP per capita in PPS with the average value of the EU-28 countries for the year 2016 shows the following results: EU-28 = 100, Georgia = 27 (own estimate), Poland = 69, Slovenia = 83, Serbia = 36, Portugal = 77, Croatia = 59 (Eurostat 2017a; Eurostat, 2017b; Worldbank, 2017a).

than 60 % of the countries, the median income of $\textcolor{blue}{\circlearrowleft}$ students with impairments is below that of the reference group of all students; in Georgia, Romania, and Estonia, the income difference is higher than 60 PPS per month ($\textcolor{blue}{>Database}$). In most EUROSTUDENT countries, students with impairments have also lower earnings than e.g. their counterparts without impairments (cross-country median: 285 vs. 326 PPS per month) and there is some indication that the first group more often works in low-paid jobs (BMFWF, 2016). Furthermore, in the majority of countries, students with impairments tend to be older than their peers without impairments ($\textcolor{blue}{>Database}$); this could cause the first group to lose age-restricted public support items faster, which may aggravate their income situation.

When looking at the combined regular expenses per month of students and those who support them financially, again in more than 60 % of the countries, $\textcolor{blue}{\circlearrowleft}$ students with impairments have expenses above the country average for all students. In Switzerland, Denmark, and Turkey, the difference amounts to more than 50 PPS per month. The expenses for health are at least one of the cost drivers. In almost 90 % of the countries, $\textcolor{blue}{\circlearrowleft}$ students with impairments have on average higher monthly expenses for health than all students, although on a moderate level (the absolute differences between the two groups vary between 1 and 29 PPS monthly) ($\textcolor{blue}{>Database}$).

Students depending on an income source

Figure B7.2c displays data for students depending on a particular income source. On average across countries, 26 % of $\textcolor{blue}{\circlearrowleft}$ students dependent on family support report to have (very) serious financial difficulties. The respective share among $\textcolor{blue}{\circlearrowleft}$ students dependent on own earnings is slightly lower at 24 % and it is highest among those who depend on national public student support with 32 %. Out of 25 countries that provided data on all three student groups, there are 17 countries in which students depending on national public student support report the largest shares of those with (very) serious financial difficulties.

- The shares are especially high (more than 40 % of students) in Georgia, Poland, Slovenia, Ireland, Iceland, and Portugal. In Ireland, more than half of the $\textcolor{blue}{\circlearrowleft}$ students dependent on national public student support are concerned and in Iceland it is almost two thirds.
- In seven countries, namely Latvia, Serbia, Denmark, Romania, Turkey, Finland, and Sweden, it is $\textcolor{blue}{\circlearrowleft}$ students dependent on family support with the largest shares reporting financial distress. In all these countries, the share of students affected is higher than 20 %.
- There are two countries, Malta and Croatia, where $\textcolor{blue}{\circlearrowleft}$ students dependent on own earnings report the greatest extent of (very) serious financial difficulties. In both countries, about one third of those students are affected.

There are other student groups that are in financial distress (Table B7.1). Financial difficulties appear to increase with students' age. Across the different age groups, in many countries students between 25 and 29 years and those who are 30 years and older are especially affected by (very) serious financial difficulties. This may be due to older students having higher financial needs than younger ones, e.g. due to the presence of dependent children.

In almost all countries, larger shares of $\textcolor{blue}{\circlearrowleft}$ students without higher education background indicate (very) serious financial difficulties than their counterparts with higher education background. On cross-country average, 29 % of students without higher education background report such problems, while only 23 % of students with higher education background do so. This is not surprising as students' parents with higher education may often have better financial opportunities to support their academic children.

With respect to students' study intensity, it turns out that in 19 out of 27 countries with available data, students with **high intensity** report the largest shares of those with (very) serious financial problems. This could be related to the fact that those students (have to) spend large parts of their time budget on studies, whereby they have fewer opportunities to earn money through gainful employment. In addition, they are often funded by state support (Figure B7.9) and this income source seems to provide generally lower amounts compared to gainful employment and family/partner contributions (Hauschmidt, Gwosć, Netz, & Mishra, 2015).

- International students are more often in financial distress than **domestic students**. In almost three quarters of the countries, larger shares of international students report (very) serious difficulties than domestic students.
- Delayed transition students are also more often struggling with financial difficulties than **direct transition students** (cross-country averages: 31 % vs. 25 %). This could be because of the fact that students from the first group are more often without higher education background (>[Chapter B2](#)) which lowers their chances for adequate family support. In addition, they are evidently older (>[Chapter B1](#)) which may lead to higher financial needs.

Students who are not living with parents more often have financial problems than their peers who are (still) living at the parental home (cross-country averages: 27 % vs. 24 %). This is, inter alia, related to the fact that the first group usually pays markedly larger shares of their budget on living costs (including accommodation) (>[Chapter 9](#)).

Finally, students who are paying fees to HEIs are in more than 80 % of the countries more often confronted with (very) serious financial difficulties than their counterparts who are not paying fees.

In more than 80 % of the countries, students with financial difficulties have lower incomes compared to their peers without financial difficulties

Across all displayed countries, students' monthly median income, including transfers in kind, amounts to 861 PPS (Figure B7.3).


- Students' income is above the international median in Iceland, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Ireland, Latvia, Portugal, Estonia, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Finland, Romania, and Serbia. In the remaining 13 countries, the income values are below the EUROSTUDENT median.
- In Iceland, Switzerland, and the Netherlands, students' monthly median income is comparatively high with values above 1,100 PPS.
- In Turkey, Slovakia, France, Slovenia, and Croatia, students' median income is less than 700 PPS per month.

By the use of PPS for international comparison, the impact of exchange rates for the Euro (for non-Euro countries) and price level differences between countries have been eliminated. For this reason, income differences between countries are not as pronounced as they would be when using Euro values. Nevertheless, there are still noticeable differences in the magnitude of students' median income between the countries, e.g. in Iceland the median income is more than twice as high as in Croatia. These differences may be influenced by several factors, such as the age structure of the student population and associated with this the different utilisation of income sources (>[Table B7.2](#); [Database](#)), the availability and magnitude of public and private funding sources, the cost structures in higher education, or the way cost-sharing in higher education between the private and the public sector is organised (Orr, Wespel, & Usher, 2014).

Figure B7.3 ↓

Students' income and assessment of their financial situation

Total monthly income including transfers in kind. Median income (in PPS)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, G.3. **No data:** AL, IT.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?, 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?**Note(s):** Values above the country abbreviations present the median income of all students. Transfers in kind are expenses of parents/partner/or others in favour of the students.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Students' financial difficulties seem generally related to the magnitude of student income. When comparing the monthly median income of students across different student groups it becomes apparent that in more than 80 % of the countries, ⚡ students with financial difficulties have lower incomes compared to all students and to their peers without financial difficulties. Across countries, ⚡ students with financial difficulties have a monthly median income, including transfers in kind, of 819 PPS which is below the value for all students (861 PPS) and especially below that of ⚡ students without financial difficulties (914 PPS).


- The income differences between students with and without financial difficulties are very pronounced in Ireland, Estonia, Norway, and France. There, ⚡ students with financial difficulties have a monthly median income which is more than 200 PPS lower than that of ⚡ students without financial difficulties.
- In Iceland, Latvia, Austria, Finland, Romania, and Hungary, the differences are still quite large: ⚡ students with financial difficulties have a median income which is more than 100 PPS per month lower than that of ⚡ students without financial difficulties.
- The differences between the two groups are rather low in Switzerland, Portugal, Lithuania, and Slovenia. In those countries, the median income of ⚡ students with financial difficulties is less than 50 PPS lower.
- There are three countries in which the pattern described above is reversed: in the Netherlands, Malta, and Turkey, it is ⚡ students with financial difficulties who have a higher median income than their counterparts who report no financial difficulties.

In Portugal, Malta, Lithuania, Turkey, and France, the income distribution among students is rather unbalanced

A student body may be more or less financially homogenous. In order to view the distribution of income levels between students within a country, every student's income can be ranked between the lowest and the highest levels and then assigned to a decile. In the following, the difference

Figure B7.4 

Distribution of students' income by income decile



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, G.10. **No data:** AL, FI, IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?, 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): Values below the country abbreviations in chart a) present the median income of all students. The zero line in chart b) presents the median income level. Transfers in kind are expenses of parents/partner/or others in favour of the students.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

in income levels between three income level groups is highlighted for each country (Figure B7.4). These income groups are the first 20 % of income receivers (2nd decile), the median income receivers, and the last 20 % of the income receivers (8th decile).

The 2nd decile, for instance, states that the “poorest” 20 % of the student body receive an income which does not exceed a certain amount of PPS; the same holds – with the necessary changes – for the other cut-off points (median and 8th decile). Large differences between the 2nd and 8th decile indicate a quite unbalanced income distribution. In turn, if this difference is rather small, income is more evenly distributed among students. The data are presented using PPS (chart a) and as a percentage of deviation from the median income (chart b) in order to facilitate a cross-country comparison.

- In Portugal, Malta, Lithuania, Turkey, and France, the relative difference between the 2nd and 8th decile is rather high. In Turkey, for instance, those 20 % of students who belong to the top income group (i.e. those who are beyond the 8th decile) have at least 95 % more income than students with the median income. Those 20 % of students who are in the lowest income groups shown here (up to 2nd decile) have at least 45 % less than the median income. In the other countries mentioned above, these differences are very pronounced as well: Portugal (+87 % vs. -45 %), Malta (+85 % vs. -52 %), Lithuania (+93 % vs. -46 %), and France (+85 % vs. -49 %). This indicates a rather unbalanced income distribution among students in those countries.
- In the Netherlands, Sweden, Austria, and Denmark, the relative difference between the 2nd and 8th decile is quite low. In Denmark, the 20 % top income receivers of students have at least 45 % more income compared to the median; the “poorest” 20 % of students have at least 29 % less than the median income. That means in those countries, total monthly income is comparatively evenly distributed among students.

Influential factors for inequality of student income could be, for instance, the extent of employment, the mode of study (full-time vs. part-time studies), the composition of income, students' socio-economic background, and the existence of dependents. Some degree of financial diversity within the student body is certainly unavoidable as there are groups of students with diverse needs which cause different financial requirements (e.g. students with children or with impairments). A high degree of financial dissimilarity could also imply, however, that students have access to different income sources which affect their studies in different ways.⁵ In this case, students have diverse study framework conditions which could affect the duration and success of their studies. A high degree of financial heterogeneity might point towards significantly different study conditions among students.

From a macro perspective, on average more than 80 % of students' income comes from private sources

Where do students' means actually come from? Across all countries, students' families/partners provide almost half of students' funding (Figure B7.5). Students', on cross-country average, earn a further third of their income through gainful employment, and the public sector provides 14 % of student income by providing grants/scholarships and loans. Other income sources make up 5 % of students' total monthly income. On this aggregate measure, the private sector (i.e. the students themselves and their families/partners) provides more than 80 % of student income, while the public sector accounts for more than a tenth.⁶

Looking at the data on a less aggregated level, the following characteristics can be observed for the countries:


- In roughly 60 % of the EUROSTUDENT countries, provisions from family/partner are the main source of student income (i.e. the income source with the highest share in total income). This group of countries encompasses Serbia, Georgia, Portugal, Croatia, Romania, Ireland, Turkey, Slovakia, Lithuania, Germany, the Czech Republic, France, Hungary, Latvia, and Poland. In

⁵ In a simplified example: “Wealthy” students may receive a large share of their income from their parents, whereas “poorer” students may have to generate their income mainly by gainful employment (for empirical relevance see Avdic & Gartell, 2015; Mertens, 2013; Callender, 2008). This would have different implications for the students' time budgets (>Chapter B5).

⁶ It must be stated, however, that the category “national public student support” may not cover all contributions of the state to student funding. On the one hand, some items of national public support such as housing benefits for students are reported in the category “other”. On the other hand, the provisions from family/partner for the students may contain means which the family or partner has received from the state beforehand (e.g. in Austria and Germany, the students' parents may receive child benefit for their collegiate children, and the parents in turn may pass on this support to their children). In such cases, the share of public support would be underestimated.

Figure B7.5 ↓

Composition of students' funding

Based on total monthly income including transfers in kind. Source of funding (in %, \blacktriangleright macro perspective)Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, G.20b. **No data:** AL, IT.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?, 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?**Note(s):** The category "other" includes in this case also income from sources from outside the respective survey country. Transfers in kind are expenses of parents/partner/others in favour of the students.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** CH, CZ.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.


most of these countries, the share of family/partner contributions accounts for more than 50 % of total income.

- There are eight countries in which students' self-earned income provides the highest share in total income. This is true for Switzerland, Slovenia, Estonia, Malta, Iceland, Austria, Finland, and Norway. In none of these countries is the respective share above 50 %.
- Only for students in the Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden, is national public student support the main source of income. In Denmark the state, on average, provides more than half of students' total income.

The composition of income changes with students' age (Table B7.2). With increasing age, the share of family/partner contributions in total income decreases in the majority of countries; the same goes for the share of national public student support. At the same time, the share of self-earned income and other income increases. Although the data presented here are not longitudinal data, in many cases the described pattern can be observed over the life course of the students. Differences are also apparent when looking at students' educational background; \blacktriangleright students with higher education background receive higher shares of family/partner contributions than their peers without higher education background (cross-country averages: 51 % vs. 43 %). Furthermore, \blacktriangleright students with higher education background receive on aggregate a little less national public student support (cross-country averages: 13 % vs. 15 %) and they have lower shares of earnings (31 % vs. 37 %) than their counterparts. The same pattern can be found for the comparison of students who are living with parents with those who are not living with parents (Table B7.3). When the extent of financial difficulties is analysed in the light of the composition of income, it shows that in most countries \blacktriangleright students with financial difficulties receive larger parts of their funding from the state and smaller parts from gainful employment compared to \blacktriangleright students without financial difficulties.

Figure B7.6 

Recipients of family/partner contributions and importance of income source

Based on total monthly income including transfers in kind,  micro perspectiveData source: EUROSTUDENT VI, G.32 & G.33. **No data:** IT; family/partner contributions as share of total income: AL, FI.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?, 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): Transfers in kind are expenses of parents/partner or others in favour of the students.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

In a large majority of countries, more than 80 % of students receive the largest part of their total income from family/partner

The importance of provisions from family/partner for the students' funding has already been examined in Figure B7.5. But while the respective data have been calculated across valid cases of recipients and non-recipients of family/partner contributions, the following analysis takes only the recipients of this source into account (Figure B7.6). This allows a better insight into the income situation of the students concerned. The chart combines the share of recipients of family/partner contributions (on the x-axis) with the relative importance of this source in the recipients' total monthly income (on the y-axis).


On average across all countries, 82 % of students receive support from their parents, partner, or others in cash or in kind. This type of support, on average, accounts for 58 % of the recipients' total monthly income including transfers in kind. Most countries fall into two of four quadrants:

- In the countries in the lower left quadrant, the share of recipients and the income share of family/partner contributions are both below the sample average. The lowest shares of recipients are reported by Denmark and Sweden (both 53 %) and the highest in this quadrant by Estonia (80 %). The share of family/partner contributions in total income ranges from 22 % in Norway to 57 % in Austria. It is striking that all Nordic countries with available data are found in this quadrant.
- In the group of countries in the upper right quadrant, both the share of recipients as well as the income share of family/partner contributions is above the sample average.⁷ The majority of countries (15 out of 25) can be found in this group. The share of recipients ranges from 82 % in Poland to a full coverage of 100 % in Serbia. The share of family/partner contributions in total income varies between 58 % in Latvia and Turkey and 88 % in Serbia. It seems that – not

⁷ Poland, Latvia, and Turkey have been counted for this group as well although for those countries only one variable is above average while the other coincides with the average.

Figure B7.7 ↓

Comparison over time: Recipients of family/partner contributions in E:V and E:VI – students not living with parents

Based on total monthly income including transfers in kind. Share of recipients (in %, )

Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, G.6 & EUROSTUDENT VI, G.40. **No data:** E:V: AL, CZ, IS, PT, TR; E:VI: IT. **Data not comparable over time:** FR, GE. **EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.6/3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current semester (E:VI: lecture period)?, 3.7/3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester (E:VI: lecture period)?

Note(s): Transfers in kind are expenses of parents/partner/or others in favour of the students.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: DK, SK.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

solely, but mainly – countries with a comparatively low GDP per capita use a student funding system that relies very much on the financial strength of the students' parents.⁸ In the countries in this quadrant, students are – at least de facto, but perhaps also legally – regarded to be financially dependent on their parents.

Students receiving family/partner contributions in E:V and E:VI

How has family support to student income developed over time? For students not living with parents, the share of those who receive contributions from family/partner has increased across the EUROSTUDENT countries from 68 % [E:V] to 78 % [E:VI]. The increase can be found in 65 % of the EUROSTUDENT countries (13 out of 20 countries with available data for E:V and E:VI).

- The increase ranges from a marginal 1 percentage point in Norway to 38 percentage points in Romania. Apart from Romania, the increase is also rather high in Denmark, Malta, Estonia, and Ireland, with more than 20 percentage points. In another five countries (Finland, the Netherlands, Poland, Lithuania, and Serbia) the share of recipients has increased by at least 10 percentage points.

In the remaining 35 % of the countries, the pattern described above is reversed.

- In Sweden, Austria, Switzerland, Latvia, Hungary, Germany, and Slovakia, the share of students receiving family/partner contributions among those who are not living with parents has decreased. The decrease, however, is rather small; it ranges between 1 percentage point in Sweden, Switzerland, and Latvia, and 4 percentage points in Austria and Slovakia.

In Turkey, France, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, and Denmark, at least 60% of students receive large parts of their total income from the state

The importance of national public student support can be investigated in the same manner as family support above (Figure B7.8).

B
7

Across the EUROSTUDENT countries, 41 % of all students receive national public student support and this type of support accounts for 39 % of the recipients' total monthly income including transfers in kind.

- It becomes apparent that national public student support in Turkey, France, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, and Denmark, reaches a share of the student population that is clearly above the international average of 41 %. In the upper right quadrant the lowest share of recipients can be found in Turkey at 60 % and the highest in Denmark at 91 %. The state is also an important contributor to the recipients' income. The share of national public student support in students' total income ranges from 43 % in the Netherlands to 67 % in Sweden.
- In the lower left quadrant, there are eight countries – Georgia, Serbia, Latvia, Slovakia, Lithuania, Austria,⁹ Croatia, and Portugal – providing national public student support which has a recipient quota below the international average, varying between 12 % in Georgia and 30 % in Portugal. The share of public support in students' total income ranges from 21 % in Georgia to 36 % in Austria, Croatia, and Portugal.
- In Estonia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Malta, the share of recipients of national public student support is above average (ranging between 45 % and 73 %), while the relative importance of national public student support in the recipients' total income is below average,

⁸ A comparison of the countries' GDP per capita in PPS with the average value of the EU-28 countries (EU-28 = 100) for the year 2016 shows that only Ireland (177), Switzerland (159), and Germany (123) have values above average. All other countries in the quadrant are clearly below average, ranging from values of 27 in Georgia (own estimate) to 88 in the Czech Republic (Eurostat, 2017a; Eurostat, 2017b; Worldbank, 2017a).

⁹ In 2017 Austria has reformed its public student support system which led to a substantial increase in the number of recipients and funding rate. However, as the survey data for Austria are from the year 2015, these effects are not reflected in the data above.

Figure B7.8 **Recipients of national public student support and importance of income source**

Based on total monthly income including transfers in kind, micro perspective

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, G.44 & G.47. **No data:** FI; national public student support as share of total income: AL.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?, 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?**Note(s):** Transfers in kind are expenses of parents/partner/or others in favour of the students.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** CH, CZ, IT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

ranging from 11% to 31% (lower right quadrant). This suggests that national public student support is expected to be only one of multiple income streams for students in these systems.

- Finally, in the upper left quadrant eight countries can be found. In Switzerland, Italy, Germany, Slovenia, Ireland, Romania, Poland, and Iceland, the share of national public student support in the recipients' total income is above average (between 40% and 50%) but the recipient quota is below average (between 11% and 39%).

The data in Figure B7.6 and Figure B7.8 present at least partially two sides of the same coin: In Georgia, Serbia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Croatia, and Portugal, both the values for the share of recipients of family/partner contributions and the income share of this source in students' total income are rather high. At the same time, the two respective values for national public student support are comparatively low in these countries. For the Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark rather the opposite is true: While the two values for family/partner contributions are rather "low" – at least when compared to the international average –, the values for national public student support are comparatively high. This suggests that the groups of countries make use of two different systems of student funding: One system in which students are considered as being financially dependent on their parents and where the parents consequently have to bear substantial parts of student support. In the other system, students are regarded as being financially more or even fully independent from their parents. There, the public sector absorbs rather high shares of student funding.

On cross-country average, especially students with high study intensity, lower ages, and who do not pay fees benefit from national public student support

Based on the data in Figure B7.8 it has already been pointed out that the shares of recipients of national public student support differ considerably between countries. This section explores

Figure B7.9**Recipients of national public student support**

Students receiving national public student support by study-related and socio-demographic characteristics.
Share of students on cross-country average (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, G.44. **No data:** FI; **domestic:** DE, IT; **international:** DE, IT. **Too few cases:** 30 years and older: AL; international: AL, HR, SK. Not applicable: Non-university: GE, IS, IT, RO, RS, SE, TR.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?

Note(s): The dotted line presents the cross-country average for all students receiving national public student support.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, CZ.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

whether there are differences between several student groups with regard to the receipt of national public student support (Figure B7.9).

For interpretation of the data it should be noted that public support systems often include multiple streams of funding in different forms (e.g. grants and loans) and with different target groups (underrepresented groups and high-performing students) which exist concurrently, but cannot be differentiated in this analysis. Furthermore, there are overlaps between certain groups, e.g. a student receiving public support may strive for a Bachelor's degree at a university and be studying with high intensity. Therefore, the focus of comparison should be on contrastive pairs (e.g. low intensity vs. high intensity).

Across countries, on average 40 % of all students benefit from national public student support.¹⁰ There are some groups of students who benefit especially from this income source, while others benefit clearly less than average. On the one hand, the recipient quota for national public student support is clearly above average, with shares ranging between 44 % and 46 %, among e.g. high-intensity students, not fee-paying students, and young students (younger than 22 years). On the other hand, for low-intensity students, fee-paying students, older students (at least 30 years old) and international students, the share of recipients is markedly below average, with values between 22 % and 31 %. Some arguments that are related to student age could shed some light on these findings: In many countries, student age is a personal characteristic which is subject to the eligibility criteria for public support. Students who exceed a certain age limit are not eligible for

¹⁰ A disaggregated comparison of the student groups on country-level is provided at the end of this chapter (Table B7.4).

public support. Furthermore, the granting of public support is often means-tested, i.e. the eligibility is dependent on the income of students and perhaps also on that of their parents/partner. With rising age, students tend to receive larger shares of their total income from gainful employment (Table B7.2). This may be caused, *inter alia*, by the necessity to care for their dependents. By doing so, older students might exceed the upper limit for additional earnings as defined by the eligibility criteria. As a result, there may be cutbacks in public support, perhaps to the extent that students lose it completely.¹¹ In order to earn more money, older students – especially those who are at least 30 years old – spend larger parts of their time budget on gainful employment, which is at the expense of study time (taught studies and personal study time, [>Chapter B5](#)); as a consequence they study with  low intensity. Older students are also more likely to be found among those students who have to pay long-term study fees, which may be a consequence of (the requirement to) spending more time on gainful employment.

 High intensity students – who have the highest recipient quota – are mainly found in the younger age groups (younger than 25 years). Across the EUROSTUDENT countries,  high intensity students have the lowest median age (22 years), while their peers who study with medium intensity are 1 year older (cross-country median: 23 years) and their fellow students with  low intensity show the highest median age with 25 years ([>Database](#)). The relation between study intensity and public support is presumably reflexive. On the one hand, the receipt of public support may induce high study intensity. This is because the period of eligibility is limited (e.g. to the standard period of study) and the recipients are usually required to regularly provide proofs of academic achievement in order to continue to receive public support. Thus, students are under pressure to perform. On the other hand, there are students who are particularly talented and complete their entire school education with high productivity and good grades. These students are more likely to be eligible for public support, especially in support systems with merit-based components.

Students who do not pay fees are another student group which benefits from national public student support above average. This could be explained by the fact that a targeted tuition waiver for certain groups of students is a measure that complements other social policy instruments of the state. A similar argument may explain why  students without higher education background have a higher recipient quota (42 %) than their counterparts with higher education background (37 %).¹² This result would be in line with a country's public support system which aims at reducing income disparities that are caused by different educational backgrounds of students. If this is true, the differing recipient quotas would be coherent with the policies pursued, but based on such highly aggregated data it cannot be judged whether the difference is appropriate. The relatively high recipient quota among students with higher education background may be explained, *inter alia*, by the fact that these students often benefit from merit-based public support and that in some higher education systems (e.g. in the Nordic countries) large parts of the student population are being supported, independently from their educational background.


¹¹ This problem could arise in particular if the amount of working hours is not divisible at the student's discretion (e.g. in order not to exceed the threshold for additional earnings, a student may like to be employed for 8 hours per week, but due to requirements of the company the employer accepts only 16 hours per week).

¹² On country-level, the difference between the two groups is in some cases much more pronounced. In Austria, Germany, France, Ireland, Poland, Portugal, and Slovenia, is the recipient quota among students without higher education background at least 14 percentage points higher than among those with higher education background (Table B7.4).

Figure B7.10 ↴

Composition of national public support

Support items as share of all national public support – based on students' average monthly disposable income

Shares (in %,  macro perspective)

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, G.23. No data: GE, IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?

Note(s): Interpretation aid: On average, national public support paid to students in Hungary consists of 64 % non-repayable support, 26 % repayable support, and 10 % other national public support. In the Czech Republic, non-repayable national public student support includes housing allowance and child benefit exclusively geared towards students.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, FR.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

In more than 60 % of the countries, more than half of national public support does not need to be repaid

Figure B7.10 displays the structure of national public support, based on students' average monthly disposable income (i.e. income without transfers in kind). Public support is divided into three categories. National public support, which is targeted especially at students in higher education, consists of 1) non-repayable components (such as grants and scholarships) and 2) repayable components (e.g. loans). Furthermore, there may be more general national support which is available for students as well, although it is not especially designed for them; examples are child benefit and housing allowance. This type of support is captured in the category 3) “ other national public support”. This category can principally contain both repayable and non-repayable support items.

Based on this categorisation three country groups can be differentiated:

- The largest group with 17 countries relies either exclusively or mainly on the provision of non-repayable national public support. In the Czech Republic, Romania, Slovenia, and Austria, this is the only type of support available to students.¹³ In the other countries, the share of non-repayable support ranges from 52 % in Slovakia to 94 % in France.
- In five countries the national public support system is based mainly on repayable funds. This holds for Sweden, Turkey, Albania, Iceland, and Norway. The share of repayable support ranges from 54 % in Albania to up to 90 % in Norway.
- In another four countries, the composition of national public support is rather mixed in the sense that none of the three support items mentioned before makes up more than 50 % of all

¹³ In these countries, the category “other national public support” contains only non-repayable support items.

national public support. However, in Germany, the Netherlands, and Lithuania, repayable national public student support provides the highest single share in total national public support, ranging from 41 % in Germany to 47 % in Lithuania. In Latvia, it is non-repayable national public student support which has the highest share (37 %).

The decision for supplying students either mainly (or exclusively) with non-repayable or repayable support can be seen as a basic policy measure. Non-repayable grants and scholarships save the students from any present or future financial burden (disregarding possible future burdens that may be generally allocated via the country's tax system). The respective costs must then be borne by the state, respectively the tax payers. Repayable loans reduce the state's costs for student funding in the long-run as the students have to bear these costs in the end (assumed that there is no loan default on the students' side). So from the students' point of view, the public support schemes in the Czech Republic, France, Malta, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, and Austria seem quite attractive as more than 90 % of the entire national public support is non-repayable. However, many of these countries differ markedly from each other with respect to the share of recipients of national public student support and the importance of this source for the recipients' total monthly income (Figure B7.8).

Discussion and policy considerations

EUROSTUDENT data reveal that more than a third of students in some countries are affected by (very) serious financial difficulties. This issue is not restricted to low-GDP countries. In all or most countries, student groups that are particularly affected by such difficulties are those whose parents are considered to be financially not well-off,  students with impairments, and students  dependent on national public student support. On the one hand, financial difficulties seem to be related to a lack of income, as  students with financial difficulties have across the countries a lower monthly median income than all students and especially than  students without financial difficulties. On the other hand, there is indication that some student groups have to shoulder higher expenses (e.g.  students with impairments who often have expenses for health higher than average). By their nature, the EUROSTUDENT data cannot provide information on students who abandon their studies or potential students who abstain from taking up studies due to (the prospect of) insufficient financial means. However, research in this area has shown that in EU-countries students from a low socio-economic background are the most likely to drop out of higher education (Thomas & Quinn, 2007). Students may also be affected by cumulative disadvantages which may result from different characteristics. An example of this is students with impairments: apart from facing physical problems of access and other barriers in terms of attitude of staff and fellow students, coming from a low socio-economic background increases their risk of dropping out considerably (Quinn, 2013).

The system of student funding in most EUROSTUDENT countries is broadly based on the private sector. On aggregate across countries, students themselves and their families/partners provide more than 80 % of students' total funding, while the state accounts for more than a tenth of students' means. More disaggregated data confirm that contributions from students' families play a major role in student financing. In 60 % of the countries, a large majority of students receives financial support from their family or partner, and this support accounts for more than half of the recipients' total monthly income. In those countries, the financial status of students' families seems to play a significant role in ensuring students can afford to participate in higher

education. Further analysis of EUROSTUDENT data indicates that the importance of familial support has increased over time. In 13 out of 20 countries with available data for E:V and E:VI, the share of this income source has increased for students not living with parents. According to Antonucci (2016), a process of ‘southern Europeanisation’ of policies across Europe can be witnessed. By this, she means that the reliance on the family to support young people’s engagement in higher education, which has historically characterised countries in southern Europe, has now become much more widespread as governments adopt funding policies that assume a significant contribution from families (or indeed complete reliance on family sources) (Brooks, 2017). In accordance with previous EUROSTUDENT research, there is some indication that national public student support is used in the majority of countries to counteract social disparities between students in higher education. On cross-country average, 42 % of \blacktriangleright students without higher education background receive national public student support, whereas the recipient quota among \blacktriangleright students with higher education background lies at 37 % on average. Students who are not paying fees also register above-average shares of recipients of national public student support. This could be due to the fact that the state uses the exemption from fees as a social policy instrument that complements direct public student support (i.e. the payment of grants and loans). In the majority of countries, national public support makes mainly or – in the case of the Czech Republic, Romania, Slovenia, and Austria – solely use of non-repayable support as opposed to repayable support. This can be considered as a “student-friendly” type of support as the recipients do not have to repay the funds. This type of support should also be conducive to disadvantaged students; especially to those from low educational backgrounds, as there is evidence that these students are more risk-averse to taking out loans for study financing than their peers from higher educational backgrounds (Callender & Jackson, 2005; Brown, Ortiz-Núñez, & Taylor, 2011; Calender & Mason, 2017). It must be doubted, however, whether national public student support always provides sufficient funds for the recipients. \blacktriangleright Students with financial difficulties have in the majority of countries higher shares of recipients of national public student support than \blacktriangleright students without financial difficulties. Although the difference in cross-country averages are small for the two groups (41 % vs. 39 %), they are often more pronounced within countries; e.g. in Ireland, Iceland, Norway, and Portugal, the share of recipients of national public student support is at least 15 percentage points higher among \blacktriangleright students with financial difficulties than among their counterparts without such difficulties (Table B7.4). It has also been mentioned before that students with a dependency on national public student support belong to those student groups that are confronted with (very) serious financial difficulties to a greater extent than their peers with a dependency on family support or own earnings in more than two thirds of the EUROSTUDENT countries. Against this background, policy-makers may want to critically review whether the allocation of funds to student support is deemed appropriate to meet the goals as defined by the EHEA process.

Tables

Table B7.1

Students' assessment of their financial situation by age, educational background, study intensity, educational origin, transition into higher education, form of living, and student fee

Students with (very) serious financial difficulties (in %)

	Age groups			Without HE background	With HE background	Study intensity			Educational origin		Transition into HE		Form of living	Student fee			
	<22 years	22–24 years	25–29 years			Low intensity	Medium intensity	High intensity	Domestic students	International students	Direct transition	Delayed transition	Living with parents	Not living with parents	Fee-paying	Not fee-paying	
AL	31	38	43	32	39	27	34	32	35	33	45	43	t.f.c.	33	34	35	29
AT	18	24	32	31	27	25	24	25	30	24	35	22	30	20	28	34	24
CH	10	14	20	24	20	14	15	16	19	15	21	15	24	14	18	17	22
CZ	14	16	22	18	19	15	15	16	19	16	20	n.d.	n.d.	14	18	24	15
DE	10	15	23	31	23	15	19	16	19	n.d.	n.d.	16	23	14	19	20	18
DK	24	27	30	36	31	27	23	25	33	28	30	26	35	26	28	35	28
EE	18	25	20	22	26	20	17	20	28	21	33	21	24	25	20	26	21
FI	14	16	21	21	19	17	14	16	24	17	26	16	23	16	18	18	18
FR	19	24	33	36	29	18	25	22	21	21	35	22	32	20	24	22	24
GE	38	42	37	32	47	36	33	38	42	40	27	39	45	37	44	41	37
HR	22	24	39	42	31	22	30	27	26	27	t.f.c.	26	43	24	31	29	25
HU	18	23	27	27	28	18	19	22	27	22	31	21	28	21	23	26	19
IE	32	36	44	41	41	32	27	34	43	36	34	34	50	33	37	35	47
IS	21	31	40	39	38	32	22	33	41	35	32	32	42	26	38	36	27
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	25	23	28	34	28	25	21	25	32	26	36	25	31	25	26	35	22
LV	27	25	35	29	33	26	23	28	36	28	33	27	38	30	28	32	27
MT	27	35	29	33	32	28	21	27	36	30	29	n.d.	n.d.	29	32	33	31
NL	8	16	23	14	17	12	14	13	18	14	26	14	19	10	18	15	0
NO	27	29	32	21	29	26	21	27	33	27	30	26	31	16	28	28	25
PL	33	40	46	43	45	28	42	36	41	38	39	38	39	37	39	43	33
PT	18	25	35	33	29	15	20	24	29	23	40	22	36	20	27	26	22
RO	26	23	23	25	26	23	24	26	25	25	24	25	29	28	24	29	24
RS	24	27	39	34	32	24	32	26	28	28	24	27	34	28	27	31	25
SE	12	17	22	20	18	18	14	17	22	17	24	17	22	18	18	26	18
SI	32	38	45	53	45	31	33	37	42	38	38	37	48	36	40	39	33
SK	17	18	22	26	20	16	16	20	19	18	t.f.c.	17	28	17	20	22	12
TR	22	19	15	28	17	31	25	20	16	20	27	22	12	24	19	16	20
av.	22	26	31	31	29	23	23	25	29	26	31	25	31	24	27	29	24

n.d. = no data t.f.c. = too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F168.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.5 To what extent are you currently experiencing financial difficulties?

Note(s): There are no students in NL who are not subject to fees.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B7.2

Composition of students' funding by age and educational background – based on total monthly income including transfers in kind

Source of funding (in %,  macro perspective)

	Age groups						Educational background									
	<22 years			30 years and older			With HE background			Without HE background						
	Family/partner	National public student support	Self-earned income	Other	Family/partner	National public student support	Self-earned income	Other	Family/partner	National public student support	Self-earned income	Other	Family/partner	National public student support	Self-earned income	Other
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT	63	7	19	11	12	7	63	19	47	4	37	12	28	10	48	14
CH*	75	3	18	5	24	3	67	6	51	3	42	4	39	5	51	5
CZ	69	6	24	1	17	3	79	1	56	5	38	2	45	5	48	1
DE	62	12	20	5	34	11	52	3	56	9	32	3	40	17	38	5
DK	23	54	21	3	32	40	19	9	22	52	22	4	24	52	20	4
EE	60	11	25	4	24	5	65	7	39	8	48	4	35	8	51	5
FI	31	48	18	3	24	9	53	14	25	26	38	11	23	23	44	11
FR	57	31	9	3	27	20	43	11	52	22	22	4	36	36	23	4
GE	81	2	11	5	55	1	37	6	75	2	18	5	76	2	15	6
HR	80	7	10	2	29	1	66	4	73	6	18	3	65	7	25	3
HU	70	15	13	2	22	2	71	5	53	9	35	3	38	10	49	3
IE	68	11	19	2	28	9	53	11	64	7	24	4	46	15	34	5
IS	36	10	51	2	38	13	43	6	33	17	45	5	36	15	44	5
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	65	8	23	4	47	4	43	5	53	7	34	5	51	6	38	5
LV	63	5	28	4	33	3	58	7	47	4	45	5	46	4	46	5
MT	46	17	36	2	22	4	67	7	39	11	47	2	35	11	51	3
NL	40	34	16	10	27	6	58	10	35	32	21	12	29	32	28	11
NO	15	60	23	2	16	10	66	8	15	38	43	5	14	26	53	6
PL	62	11	25	3	16	8	74	3	57	7	32	4	37	14	46	3
PT	85	8	5	1	45	2	50	4	81	2	15	3	66	8	24	2
RO	77	12	8	2	47	2	48	2	68	8	22	2	58	10	29	3
RS	89	3	6	2	80	0	14	7	88	3	7	2	87	3	8	2
SE	22	58	15	6	18	18	59	6	20	43	31	6	19	38	38	5
SI	53	13	29	5	26	0.1	71	3	49	7	39	5	35	10	49	5
SK	65	5	26	4	23	1	73	3	54	4	39	3	51	5	40	4
TR	64	23	7	5	30	4	63	3	61	11	25	4	49	19	27	5
av.	58	18	20	4	30	7	56	7	51	13	31	5	43	15	37	5

n.d. = no data

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, G.20b.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?, 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): The category "other" includes in this case also income from sources from outside the respective survey country. Transfers in kind are expenses of parents/partner/or others in favour of the students.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, CZ.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B7.3

Composition of students' funding by form of housing and extent of financial difficulties – based on total monthly income including transfers in kind

Source of funding (in %,  macro perspective)

	Form of housing							Financial difficulties								
	Living with parents			Not living with parents			With financial difficulties			Without financial difficulties						
	Family/partner	National public student support	Self-earned income	Other	Family/partner	National public student support	Self-earned income	Other	Family/partner	National public student support	Self-earned income	Other	Family/partner	National public student support	Self-earned income	Other
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT	43	8	38	10	33	8	45	14	33	10	42	16	35	7	46	12
CH*	54	3	38	5	41	4	50	5	43	6	44	6	46	3	47	5
CZ	52	5	42	2	50	5	44	2	50	5	42	2	49	5	45	2
DE	35	10	51	4	52	12	32	4	44	16	35	4	52	10	34	4
DK	39	30	29	1	21	54	21	4	24	57	15	5	21	49	27	3
EE	48	10	39	2	35	8	53	5	44	12	37	7	33	7	57	3
FI	48	18	28	7	23	25	41	11	31	29	22	17	21	23	49	7
FR	42	29	24	4	47	26	22	4	43	35	18	4	48	22	26	4
GE	76	2	17	5	76	2	16	6	77	2	14	7	74	2	19	5
HR	66	6	26	2	71	7	19	3	66	6	25	3	70	7	20	3
HU	49	10	40	2	45	9	42	3	45	11	41	3	47	9	41	3
IE	60	10	28	2	56	10	28	6	56	14	23	6	59	7	30	4
IS	34	8	56	2	35	17	42	6	34	24	34	8	34	9	55	2
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	56	8	31	5	51	6	38	5	52	8	33	7	50	5	41	4
LV	53	3	38	5	43	4	48	5	50	4	41	5	45	4	47	4
MT	38	12	49	1	34	10	49	7	40	11	46	3	37	11	50	1
NL	39	27	23	10	28	35	24	12	25	45	18	12	34	28	26	11
NO	21	34	43	3	14	35	45	5	16	47	31	6	13	28	54	5
PL	47	9	41	3	45	12	40	4	42	12	42	3	51	10	35	3
PT	80	5	13	2	63	7	27	3	67	9	21	3	74	3	21	2
RO	66	10	21	3	61	8	28	3	67	7	22	3	61	10	27	2
RS	85	3	9	3	89	3	6	2	87	2	8	2	89	4	5	2
SE	30	42	26	2	19	41	34	6	25	45	23	7	17	39	39	5
SI	44	8	44	4	40	10	45	6	42	9	44	5	43	9	42	6
SK	54	4	38	4	51	5	41	3	53	7	36	4	49	4	44	3
TR	62	14	20	4	48	18	29	5	58	11	27	4	50	20	24	6
av.	51	13	33	4	45	15	35	5	47	17	30	6	46	13	37	4

n.d. = no data

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, G.20b.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?, 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): The category "other" includes in this case also income from sources from outside the respective survey country. Transfers in kind are expenses of parents/partner/or others in favour of the students.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, CZ.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B7.4

Recipients of repayable and non-repayable national public student support by form of housing, age, educational background, student fee, and extent of financial difficulties

Share of recipients (in %)

	Form of housing		Age groups				Educational background		Student fee		Financial difficulties	
	Living with parents	Not living with parents	<22 years	22–24 years	25–29 years	30 years and older	With HE background	Without HE background	Fee-paying	Not fee-paying	With financial difficulties	Without financial difficulties
AL	4	6	5	7	2	t.f.c.	5	5	5	7	4	6
AT	24	24	25	26	24	20	15	29	21	25	25	23
CH*	10	12	9	12	11	9	8	15	11	33	17	8
CZ	43	57	65	58	37	11	54	51	34	58	49	54
DE	17	28	25	26	28	25	22	36	23	28	33	24
DK	92	90	92	94	89	79	90	91	79	91	89	91
EE	49	44	49	45	49	36	44	46	28	49	50	43
FI	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
FR	48	77	69	72	65	46	63	77	58	86	73	64
GE	12	13	12	14	5	14	12	12	10	16	11	14
HR	19	28	26	29	13	2	21	26	23	26	21	26
HU	45	49	62	59	32	11	49	46	37	59	46	50
IE	34	35	39	30	28	27	26	46	28	72	42	25
IS	18	46	20	33	51	41	38	40	39	37	56	24
IT	9	17	14	13	9	2	8	13	7	65	15	11
LT	27	22	21	24	30	24	24	23	21	25	26	23
LV	22	23	21	24	22	20	24	21	15	28	21	24
MT	81	46	92	75	40	22	74	72	16	86	70	75
NL	80	79	86	85	68	13	79	79	79	0	83	77
NO	63	79	92	93	81	39	80	69	78	73	85	70
PL	31	38	31	42	25	39	23	44	32	40	38	34
PT	29	31	38	34	20	12	12	39	30	32	41	16
RO	39	33	37	38	31	17	32	37	17	45	29	41
RS	15	18	18	20	6	0	18	16	14	28	12	21
SE	86	71	89	83	71	45	73	72	15	74	68	74
SI	32	34	42	34	24	1	26	41	33	32	34	33
SK	23	28	27	27	26	9	25	26	25	27	29	27
TR	56	62	73	68	44	17	53	62	54	65	47	65
av.	37	40	44	43	34	22	37	42	31	45	41	39

n.d. = no data t.f.c. = too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, G.44.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.3 What is the average monthly amount at your disposal from the following sources during the current lecture period?

Note(s): There are no students in NL who are not subject to fees.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, CZ.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Chapter B8

Students' expenses

Key

The composition of students' expenses

Students total monthly expenses are allocated predominantly to living costs and to a much lesser degree to study-related costs. On average across the EUROSTUDENT countries, students' total monthly expenses are composed in the following way: 60 % living costs paid by students, 29 % living costs paid by students' families/partners, 6 % study-related costs paid by students, 5 % study-related costs paid by students' families/partners.

Selected expenditure items

Students not living with parents allocate – on average across countries – more than a third of their total monthly expenses to accommodation, 22 % on food, and 4 % on communication.

B
8

Living expenses by size of study location

In a large majority of countries, students who are not living with parents in capital cities spend higher amounts on accommodation and food than their peers who live outside the parental home in cities with less than 100,000 inhabitants. The differences in students' accommodation costs are quite pronounced in France, Ireland, Italy, Poland, and Portugal, with higher amounts in the capital cities of at least 125 Purchasing Power Standard (PPS) per month. The differences in the costs for food are comparatively high in Estonia, Germany, Portugal, and Turkey, with higher expenses of at least 52 PPS monthly in the capital cities.



findings

Accommodation cost overburden

On cross-country average, around a quarter of students living with partner/children and in student accommodation, and around a third of students living in shared accommodations with other person(s) and alone spend at least 40 % of their income on accommodation, indicating a possible overburden. In more than 70 % of the countries, students living alone are affected by accommodation cost overburden to a greater extent than the total population.

Fees to HEIs

Fees make up a comparatively high share of students' total monthly expenses in Ireland, Georgia, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, and Turkey. In these countries, students dedicate at least 10 % of their total monthly expenses to fees.

Fee-payers

In Albania, Iceland, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, more than 90 % of all students pay fees to higher education institutions (HEIs). The share of fee-paying students is relatively small in the Nordic countries Denmark, Finland, and Sweden, ranging from 2 % to 13 %. In more than 80 % of the EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 60 % of fee-paying students do not receive national public student support.

Main issues

In this chapter, the previous analyses of student income ([Chapter B7](#)) are complemented by analyses of student expenses.¹ Students face a plethora of expenditure items. Some of them are directly caused by the students' participation in higher education (HE), such as fees to HEIs or learning materials. Other costs may be partially or fully independent of taking part in higher education, for instance, expenses for food and clothes. As some of students' expenses are being absorbed by the students' social environment, EUROSTUDENT attempts to take those payments into account as well in order to get a comprehensive overview of the students' expenditure situation. This knowledge is important, for instance, for policy-makers to be able to appropriately reflect on the calibration of any minimum public support for students.

Composition of students' expenses

In a first and simple analysis, the multitude of students' expenses will be summarised into two categories, 'living costs' and 'study-related costs'. In this way, a first impression of how the participation in higher education influences the students' cost structure can be gained. EUROSTUDENT data further allow to differentiate costs by payer. As many students are financially supported by their parents, other relatives, and their partners, 'costs paid by students' and 'costs paid by others' (so-called  transfers in kind) are differentiated. This gives a first although very rough impression of the different models of cost-sharing between students and their families that exist in the countries. The make-up of students' living and study-related costs will be examined as well to see which expenditure items have a special importance to the students' budget.

Students' expenses for accommodation

Accommodation costs continue to be one of the most important, if not the most important expenditure item for students, especially for those who live away from their parents. For students not living with parents, the share of accommodation costs in students' total expenses will be determined and compared to other selected items of living costs. As the magnitude of accommodation costs may vary by the size of the place of residence, this criterion is used for differentiation as well. Furthermore, by comparing data from E:V and E:VI it is examined how the share of accommodation costs has developed over time for students not living with parents. Finally, the analyses make use of a new indicator pointing towards accommodation cost overburden. As the levels of accommodation costs usually vary with the form of housing, this special type of financial difficulty is investigated for students living in four different forms of housing outside the parental home. In addition, for the housing form "living alone" a comparison is drawn on this indicator between the student population and the total population.

Students' expenses for fees

Another type of typical student expenses is the contributions to HEIs in the form of fees. The EUROSTUDENT countries pursue different policies on fees. In some countries, the higher education system is rather market-oriented with a university funding that rests to a large extent on student fees. Other countries rely more on public funding and refrain from charging high fees or do almost completely without them. The result of transmission of such policies into students' expenses is investigated by analysing the shares of students' expenses that are dedicated to fees. Although fees seem to be the most prominent item of students' study-related costs, the participation in higher education imposes other study-related costs on them as well. Thus, the relative

¹ In this chapter the terms 'expenses', 'expenditures', and 'costs' are used synonymously.

significance of fees is also compared to that of other study costs. Not only the amount of fees varies across the EUROSTUDENT countries, so does the share of fee-payers among students. In some countries, all students pay fees and in others it is only a very small minority. Our analysis displays the share of fee-payers among all students and compares this to the share of fee-payers in other student focus groups.

Methodological and conceptual notes

Based on the EUROSTUDENT conventions, students' expenses will be viewed in different ways. These perspectives and further concepts that are important for the understanding of the data are shortly explained in the following.

Living costs

The category living costs contains nine sub-categories: a) Accommodation costs (rent or mortgage as well as utilities), b) food, c) transportation, d) communication (telephone, internet, etc.), e) health (e.g. medical insurance), f) childcare, g) debt payment (except mortgage), h) social and leisure activities, i) other regular living costs (which include clothing, toiletries, tobacco, pets, insurance [except medical insurance]). The focus of this category is on the students' regular monthly costs. For this reason, students' extraordinary expenses (e.g., for buying a washing machine, holiday travel) were excluded.²

Study-related costs

Study-related costs are divided into four sub-categories: a) Fees (covering tuition fees, registration fees, examination fees, and administrative fees), b) social welfare contributions to the HEI and student associations, c) learning materials (e.g. books, photocopying, field trips, etc.), and d) other regular study-related costs (e.g. for private tutoring or additional courses). In the EUROSTUDENT questionnaire, study-related costs were asked per semester, however, for data delivery the values were re-calculated as monthly expenses to assure comparability with the data on living costs.

Total costs

Students' total costs are the sum of their monthly living and study-related costs. In addition, the category also contains any expenses of students' parents/partners/others that are directly geared towards the students' creditors (transfers in kind, see also costs by payer). It should be noted again that the focus is always on the *regular* monthly expenses; the expression "total costs" should, therefore, not be misinterpreted in the way that extraordinary expenses would be considered as well.

Costs by payer

Another crucial differentiation emphasises the importance of the payer. In all countries, the burden of financing individual participation in higher education is not only borne by the students themselves, but also by their parents, their partner, or other persons. The contributions of others may take on different forms: in some cases, students are provided with money directly (transfers in cash); in other cases the students' parents, partners, or others pay the students' debts directly to the students' creditors, i.e. those payments are intangible for the students (transfers in kind). Also combinations of the two types of transfers may occur. Although it is not easy to

² Of course students are also confronted with unavoidable extraordinary expenses during the course of their studies. Taking those into account, however, would overstate the ordinary running costs that typically occur per month and which are the focus of current interest.

capture especially the second kind of support, EUROSTUDENT makes the attempt to quantify transfers in kind as well, as it is of utmost importance to fully grasp the entire economic situation of students. Thus, expenditures are distinguished into payments of students (out-of-own pocket) and payments of parents/partner/others.³ In the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire, payments by the second group were captured for both living costs and study-related costs. In the following figures, these transfers in kind are either explicitly displayed or included in the students' expenses.

Purchasing Power Standard

This chapter contains several figures in which the magnitude of student expenses is displayed. To ensure a high level of data comparability, the absolute values are displayed in PPS. An explanation of the concept of PPS and its interpretation can be found in the previous chapter ([> Chapter B7](#)).

Data and interpretation

Across EUROSTUDENT countries, students' living costs account for 89% and study-related costs for 11% of total monthly expenses

In all countries with available data, living costs account for the lion's share of total monthly expenses paid by students themselves and their families/partners in support of the students (Figure B8.1). On cross-country average, living costs paid by students and others account for 89 % of the total monthly expenses, while study-related costs make up 11 %.

- The share of living costs paid by students and others is – even compared to the high cross-country average – particularly large in Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Estonia, and Germany, with values of at least 95 %. The share of study-related costs is rather low, i.e. not exceeding 5 % of total monthly expenses.
- It is relatively low in the Netherlands and Ireland. In the two countries, the share of living costs in relation to students' total expenses does not exceed 79 %. Accordingly, students and their families/partners together dedicate at least 21 % of students' expenses to study-related costs.

With respect to the cost-sharing between students and their families/partners in general the cross-country average reveals that students pay two thirds of their monthly expenses out of their own pocket, while their families/partners absorb the remaining third of expenses.

- In Croatia, Portugal, Georgia, Ireland, and Serbia, however, students' parents and partners pay more than half of students' total monthly expenses directly to the students' creditors.
- In contrast, students' families/partners absorb rather small shares of students' expenses in most of the Nordic countries (Norway, Finland, Sweden, and Denmark) and in Austria. In these countries, the respective share is below 20 %.


By looking at the cost-sharing for the category "living costs" it becomes apparent that in 85 % of the countries, students absorb higher shares of living costs than their families/partners.

- The share of living costs paid only by students is particularly high in Norway, Finland, Austria, Sweden, and Denmark, with these costs making up at least 78 % of total monthly expenses.

³ It should be noted that the concept of payer does not reveal the origin of the sources of funding in every case. The payments of students (out-of-own pocket) may be financed e.g. by students' self-earned income, cash/money transfers from their family/partner (transfers in cash), or public support. Similarly, the direct payments of parents/partner/others to the students' creditors (transfers in kind) may be based on income streams that parents/partner/others themselves have received from different private and public sources of income. The crucial point of the concept of payer is simply that the support for students by others (e.g. parents/partner/others) which takes on the form of transfers in kind and which is a money-worth advantage for the students is taken into account to describe the students' economic situation as accurately as possible.

Figure B8.1 **Composition of students' expenses by payer**

Living costs and study-related costs as share of students' total monthly expenses (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, F.41 & F.120. **No data:** IT; living and study-related costs paid by others: AL.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?**Note(s):** Interpretation aid: In Turkey, students' total monthly expenses consist of the following: 64 % living costs paid by students, 23 % living costs paid by students' parents/partner/others, 5 % study-related costs paid by students, and 8 % study-related costs paid by students' parents/partner/others.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** AL, DE, FR.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- In four countries, namely Croatia, Portugal, Georgia, and Serbia, students' families/partners finance larger shares of the students' living costs than the students themselves. The share of living costs in total monthly expenses paid only by others ranges from 45 % in Croatia to 55 % in Serbia.

The picture for the sharing of study-related costs is more mixed. In 54 % of the countries, students take over higher shares of study-related costs than their families/partners. In another 35 % of the countries this pattern is reversed and in the remaining 11 % of countries the burden of study-related costs is evenly shared between students and their families/partners.

By differentiating between two basic forms of housing, some clear differences come to light (Table B8.1). The total monthly expenses of students who are living with parents consist of 46 % living costs paid by students and 42 % living costs paid by their families/partners. In contrast, the total monthly expenses of students who are not living with parents consist of 66 % living costs paid by students and 26 % living costs paid by the students' families/partners. The differences for study-related expenses are less pronounced: students living with parents devote 7 % of their total monthly expenses to study-related costs and the share of their families/partners amounts to 7 % as well; the respective shares for students who are not living with parents are 6 % (students' own payments) and 4 % (payments by others).⁴ Students not living with parents usually face higher expenses for accommodation than their peers in the parental home, thus the markedly higher share they devote to accommodation costs is not surprising. Parents seem to cut back at least parts of their support, namely transfers in kind, once the children have left the parental home. The breach in student financing may be filled, for instance, by an increase in transfers in cash from students' parents or students' self-earned income.

⁴ Due to no data in some categories, the values for cross-country averages do not sum up to 100 %.

Students not living with parents spend on average more than a third of their total expenses on accommodation, 22% on food, and 4% on communication

In the following, students' expenses for living costs are examined in more detail (Figure B8.2). The analysis is restricted to students not living with parents. On average across the countries, students not living with parents dedicate more than 60 % of their total monthly expenses, which include transfers in kind, to accommodation, food and communication. More than a third is spent on accommodation, 22 % on food, and 4 % on communication.

- This descending order in the relative significance of the three expenditure items is reflected in almost all countries with the exceptions of Latvia and Lithuania, where the share of expenses on food is marginally higher than that on accommodation.
- In France, Finland, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, students not living with parents spend rather high shares on accommodation with at least 40 % of their total expenses. In contrast, accommodation appears to be relatively cheap in Latvia, Lithuania, and Georgia, where students allocate no more than 26 % of their expenses on this item.

In most countries, expenditures for food make up the second-largest share of living costs.

- In six countries, Germany, Hungary, Estonia, Slovakia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the share of expenses on food varies between 25 % and 27 %, thereby exceeding the cross-country average (22 %) only moderately. The relative expenses on food are rather low in Turkey, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Ireland, with no more than 18 %.


In all countries, the share of communication costs is the least one out of the three expenditure items compared.

- The variation across the countries is only small, ranging from 2 % in the Netherlands and Ireland to up to 5 % in Croatia, Serbia, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Georgia.

Figure B8.2 

Costs for accommodation, food, and communication – students not living with parents

Expenses paid by students and others (monthly expenses as share of total expenses in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.10, F.76, F.79 & F.85. **No data:** AL.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): Included are expenses of parents/partner/or others in favour of the students (= transfers in kind).


Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: DE, IT, RO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Figure B8.3 

Costs for accommodation and food by size of study location – students not living with parents

Monthly expenses paid by students and others (mean, in PPS)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.76 & F.79. **No data:** CH; **chart a):** AL; capital city: MT; **chart b):** capital city: MT. **Too few cases:** < 100,000 inhabitants: RS.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): Values above the country abbreviations indicate the expenses of students and others in study locations with less than 100,000 inhabitants.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AL, IT, RO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

In a large majority of countries, students in capital cities spend higher amounts on accommodation and food than their peers in smaller cities

Students' expenses on accommodation and food vary with the size of the study location (Figure B8.3). The absolute amounts for monthly expenses of students, financially supported by their families/partners, on accommodation and food are compared for students living in smaller cities with less than 100,000 inhabitants and students in the capital city. Across countries, students in smaller cities who are not living with parents spend 276 PPS per month on accommodation (Figure B8.3a).

- The amounts are comparatively high in some of the Nordic countries, namely Iceland, Norway, and Denmark. There, students in smaller cities pay more than 400 PPS monthly for accommodation. Rather low expenses are reported by students in Slovakia, Georgia, and Lithuania, with no more than 177 PPS per month.

Students not living with parents and residing in the capital city spend on cross-country average 338 PPS per month on accommodation.

- In all countries with available data, students not living with parents in the capital city pay larger amounts on accommodation than their peers in smaller cities; the only exceptions being Iceland and Slovenia where the general pattern is reversed.
- In Norway, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands, France, and Portugal, the amounts paid by students not living with parents in the capital city are relatively high, with more than 410 PPS per month.
- The difference in students' accommodation costs between smaller cities and the capital city are quite pronounced in Ireland, France, Portugal, Italy, and Poland. In these countries, students not living with parents in the capital city have accommodation expenses which are at least 125 PPS per month higher compared to their peers in smaller cities.

The basic pattern described above holds for the costs for food as well (Figure B8.3b). In more than 80 % of the countries, students in the capital city pay higher amounts for food than students in smaller cities. On average across the countries, students in smaller cities spend 176 PPS per month while their fellow students in the capital city spend 200 PPS in the same time span.

- The pattern is reversed in three countries, namely Iceland, Norway, and Slovenia. In Austria, there is no difference in the amounts spent on food between the two student groups.
- The differences in the amounts of costs for food are comparatively high in Germany, Estonia, Turkey, and Portugal. In these countries, students in the capital city spend at least 52 PPS per month more on food compared to their peers in smaller cities.

The data basically support the assumption that the local price level in capital cities is higher compared to other cities. Especially with respect to accommodation this could, *inter alia*, be due to overcrowding effects to which the market mechanism responds with an increase in prices. Furthermore, it may well be that suppliers of accommodation and food try to skim off the consumers' higher ability to pay which may exist in capital cities because of higher wage levels compared to smaller cities.

Comparison over time: Accommodation costs of students not living with parents in E:V and E:VI

Have accommodation costs of students who are not living with parents changed over time? Across the EUROSTUDENT countries on average, accommodation costs measured as percentage of students' total expenses, including transfers in kind, of students who are living outside the parental home have slightly increased from 32 % (E:V) to 35 % (E:VI). In more than three quarters of the countries, an increase of the share of accommodation costs is visible although there is quite some variation in the extent.

- In Denmark, Germany, and Norway, the increase in the share of accommodation costs is more marked with at least 8 percentage points difference. In contrast, the difference in the shares is only small at no more than 2 percentage points in Finland and Latvia.


In about one quarter of the countries, the above pattern is reversed.

- In Sweden, the Netherlands, Poland, Ireland, Hungary, and Lithuania, the share of accommodation costs in relation to students' total costs has decreased. In most of these countries, the decrease is small at no more than 3 percentage points.
- In Switzerland, the share of accommodation costs has not changed over time.

Figure B8.4 ↓

Time comparison of accommodation costs – students not living with parents

Monthly accommodation costs as share of total expenses including transfers in kind (in %, ● micro perspective)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, F.2 & EUROSTUDENT VI, F.10 & F.76. **No data:** AL; E:V: IS, PT, TR. **Data not comparable over time:** FR, GE.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.7/3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current semester (E:VI: lecture period)?

Note(s): Transfers in kind are expenses of parents/partner/or others in favour of the students.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: DE, IT, RO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

An increase in the share of accommodation costs may have different reasons. One obvious reason may be that in larger cities, especially in capital cities, the price level for renting or buying housing space has increased e.g. due to a growing number of students and other demanders who are confronted with a given supply of housing space. This is presumably true for many countries. Another reason may be student income and public support in particular, rising at a lower rate than the common price level, which would result in a relatively smaller student budget in real terms that can be used to cover expenses. A more in-depth analysis would be needed here to investigate the various triggers of the increasing share of accommodation costs.

On average, almost a quarter of students in EUROSTUDENT countries experience accommodation cost overburden

As indicated above, accommodation, including utilities, is often the single expenditure item with the largest significance for students who are not living with parents. The burden of financing accommodation can put a lot of pressure on the students' budget and may easily turn into an overburden. In order to identify the share of students who are suffering from accommodation cost overburden, EUROSTUDENT uses a new indicator which broadly follows a concept used by Eurostat. In our analysis, accommodation cost overburden is defined as given if a student spends at least 40 % of his total monthly income, which includes transfers in kind, on accommodation. It becomes apparent that in all EUROSTUDENT countries with available data, there are indeed parts of the student population who are confronted with accommodation cost overburden. On average across the countries, 23 % of all students, irrespective of their housing form, spend at least 40 % of their total income on accommodation, meaning that they are considered to be overburdened by accommodation costs.

- The share of students struggling with accommodation cost overburden is clearly above the EUROSTUDENT average in Denmark, Norway, Finland, Turkey, and Germany. In these countries, more than a third of all students are overburdened by accommodation costs.
- In Latvia, Lithuania, and Malta, the housing situation of students seems to be less problematic in financial respect. There, not more than 10 % of all students deal with the problem of overburden.


Figure B8.5 presents data on accommodation cost overburden of students who are living in different forms of housing outside the parental home; i.e., student accommodation, living with partner/children, living with other person(s), and living alone ([> Chapter B9](#)). All of these housing forms exclude each other mutually, e.g. the category 'students who are living alone' refers to students who live on their own outside student accommodations.

On cross-country average, the share of students with accommodation cost overburden amounts to 25 % among students living with partner/children, 26 % among students residing in student accommodation, 31 % among students living in shared accommodations with other person(s), and 36 % among students living alone. In almost 60 % of the countries, the largest share of accommodation cost overburden can be found among students living alone.

- In around a quarter of countries, it is students who live with other person(s) who are confronted the most with this problem. This group of countries encompasses Norway, Turkey, Poland, Slovenia, Estonia, Georgia, and Slovakia.
- There are three countries, Austria, Sweden, and Switzerland, where the share of students experiencing accommodation cost overburden is highest among students residing in student accommodation. However, the percentage point difference to the housing form with the second highest share is in all three countries very small.

Figure B8.5 **Accommodation cost overburden by form of housing**

Share of students living outside the parental home spending 40 % or more of their total income (including transfers in kind) on accommodation (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.178. **No data:** AL, IT. **Too few cases:** Student accommodation: MT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): Values above the country abbreviations indicate the share of students with accommodation cost overburden among students living in student accommodation.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: DE, RO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- Latvia is the only country in which the highest share of students reporting accommodation cost overburden can be found among students living with partner/children.

The comparatively low extent of overburden among students living in student accommodation could be explained, among other things, by the fact that this form of housing is supported by the state in many countries, which reduces housing prices below market level. In fact, further analyses have brought to light that student accommodation is the least costly housing option outside the parental home in over 80 % of all countries ([>Chapter B9](#)). Students living with partner/children are troubled with overburden problems to a lesser extent as well. Students using this form of housing are usually older, and associated with this they spend a lot of time on gainful employment ([>Chapter B5](#), [>Chapter B6](#)), which provides them with relatively high incomes. Another reason could be that there are also measures of social policy in place which support young families. Students who are living alone suffer the most from accommodation cost overburden. As they live outside student accommodations they cannot profit from publicly subsidised rents. Furthermore, they have no fellow occupant they could share accommodations costs with.


In Figure B8.6 a comparison of accommodation cost overburden is drawn between students living alone and single person households of the total population. The data for the latter group stem from the Eurostat database. Although the indicators of Eurostat and EUROSTUDENT differ in methodological respect to some extent from each other, the data are still comparable and a comparison seems insightful⁵. On average across the countries, the problem of accommodation

⁵ The Eurostat indicator is defined as the percentage of the population living in single person households where the total housing costs (net of housing allowances) represent more than 40 % of the total disposable household income (net of housing allowances). Non-monetary income components are not included in the Eurostat calculations of household income. With respect to Figure B8.6 the EUROSTUDENT indicator is defined as the percentage of students living alone (outside student accommodation) where the total housing costs represent at least 40 % of the total income (including transfers in kind).

Figure B8.6 ↴

Accommodation cost overburden – students living alone (outside student accommodation) compared to single person households of the population

Share of persons spending 40% or more of their total income (for students: including transfers in kind) on accommodation (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.178 & Eurostat database in the respective EUROSTUDENT survey year; exceptions: IE, IS, SK, TR: 2015; IT, LV, PT, RO, RS, TR: 2016. **No data:** AL; Eurostat data: GE; EUROSTUDENT data: IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): The Eurostat indicator is defined as the percentage of the population living in single person households where the total housing costs (net of housing allowances) represent more than 40% of the total disposable household income (net of housing allowances). Non-monetary income components are not included in the Eurostat calculations of household income. Values above the country abbreviations present the share of single person households with housing cost overburden.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: DE, RO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

cost overburden applies to around a quarter (23 %) of all single person households of the total populations, while slightly more than a third of all students who are living alone are concerned (36 %). In more than 70 % of countries, students are affected by overburden to a greater extent than the total population.

- In Iceland, Turkey, France, Finland, Ireland, and Malta, the share of students with accommodation cost overburden is more than 30 percentage points above the share for the total population.
- This difference is rather small in Sweden and Hungary, with no more than 7 percentage points difference between students and the population.


In more than 30 % of the countries, the above described pattern is reversed, i.e. the problem of overburden is more widespread among single person households.

- This is true for Serbia, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Romania, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Slovakia, and Latvia. In Serbia and Latvia, the differences between the groups are relatively large. The share of single person households with overburden problems is at least 11 percentage points above the share of students.
- In the other countries in this group the differences vary between 1 percentage point in Slovakia and 9 percentage points in Switzerland, Romania, and Lithuania.

There may be different reasons why accommodation cost overburden affects students in the majority of countries to a greater extent than the total population. On the one hand, many students may simply have lower incomes than other groups of the total population, especially when compared to full-time workers. On the other hand, there may not be enough housing space which is especially designated for students (i.e. subsidised student accommodations), so that

Figure B8.7 **Composition of study-related expenses**

Share of total monthly expenses paid by students and others (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.4, F.108, F.111, F.114, & F.117. **No data:** AL, IT; social welfare contributions: CH, DE, FR; learning materials: FR; other: CH, DE, FR.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): Values above the country abbreviations present the share of monthly expenses dedicated to fees. The subcategory "fees" includes not only tuition fees but also registration fees, examination fees, and administrative fees.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: CH, DE, FR.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

students have to compete with other groups of the total population for scarce housing space. It may also be that social policy measures geared towards parts of the total population take more account of the problem of housing cost than the system of public support geared towards students in higher education.

There are further student groups who are affected by accommodation cost overburden (Table B8.2). With respect to students' educational background, in 58 % of the countries students with higher education background are more often confronted with overburden than their peers without higher education background. International students are more often affected by this problem than domestic students (cross-country averages: 31 % vs. 21 %). Among students depending on a particular income source, students dependent on national public student support most often indicate spending potentially overburdening shares of their income on accommodation, while their fellow students dependent on own earnings are least affected (cross-country averages: 29 % vs. 16 %). Similarly, students who are not employed during the lecture period face most often this problem, while their peers who spend more than 20 hours weekly on paid jobs have the least difficulties (cross-country averages: 27 % vs. 17 %). As expected, students with financial difficulties are clearly more often affected than students without financial difficulties.

Fees tend to be the largest study-related expense for students in EUROSTUDENT countries, followed by learning materials

Apart from living costs, students have to cover study-related costs as well. The following analysis investigates the composition of study-related costs (Figure B8.7). It is differentiated between fees to HEIs, social welfare contributions to HEIs and student associations, expenses on learning materials, and other study-related costs.

On average across the countries, students allocate 8 % of their total monthly expenses (which include  transfers in kind) on fees, less than 1 % on social welfare contributions, about 2 % on learning materials, and less than 1 % on other study-related items.

- The share of study-related costs is extraordinarily large in Ireland at 35 % of students' total monthly expenses, and in the Netherlands it is more than 20 %.
- In the group of countries encompassing Germany, Sweden, Estonia, Denmark, and Finland, the share of study-related costs is rather low with no more than 5 %.

In more than 80 % of all countries with available data on at least two categories of study-related costs, it becomes apparent that fees are the expenditure item with the single highest share.

- The share of fees is comparatively high in Ireland, the Netherlands, Georgia, Poland, Turkey, Portugal, Serbia, and Hungary. In these countries, students dedicate at least 10 % of their total monthly expenses to fees.
- In contrast, the share of fees is rather low in the Czech Republic, Austria, Norway, Germany, Sweden, Estonia, Denmark, and Finland, with fees making up no more than 5 % of students' total monthly expenses.
- There is a group of four countries, namely Austria, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland, where fees do not require the single highest share in students' study-related costs. In these countries, the largest share of study-related costs is either on learning materials or social welfare contributions.

Learning material appears to be the second most important item of study-related costs.

- Comparatively high income shares devoted to learning materials are paid by students in the Netherlands, Turkey, Switzerland, Slovakia, Malta, Austria, Germany, Sweden, and Denmark. However, in none of the countries does the share exceed 4 %.

In no country do the shares dedicated to social welfare contributions and other study-related costs exceed 1 %.

As fees to HEIs have proven to be the most important expense item in the category study-related costs in most of the countries, it might be interesting to see which parts of the student population actually do pay fees. Across the EUROSTUDENT countries, on average more than half of all students (55 %) pay fees (Figure B8.8). However, there are great differences between the countries.

- In 15 % of the countries, namely the Netherlands, Switzerland, Iceland, and Albania, more than 90 % of all students pay fees.
- In a quarter of the countries, more than two thirds of the student populations pay fees. This is the case in Portugal, Norway, Ireland, Slovenia, Georgia, Serbia, and Slovakia.
- The share of fee-paying students is relatively small in the Nordic countries Finland, Denmark, and Sweden, with the share of fee-payers ranging between 2 % in Sweden and 13 % in Finland.


When comparing different student groups, it becomes apparent that international students more often pay fees than domestic students (Figure B8.8a). On cross-country average, 59 % of international students pay fees, while the share among their domestic fellow students amounts to 55 %. This pattern is reflected in more than half of all countries with available data.

- The differences between the two groups are quite pronounced in France, Turkey, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Malta, and Sweden. In these countries, the share of fee-payers is more than 10 percentage points higher among international students.

Figure B8.8 ↴

Students paying fees to HEIs

Share of fee-paying students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.171. **No data:** IT; domestic students: DE; international students: DE; business, administration and law: AL; natural sciences, mathematics and statistics: AL; ICTs: AL. **Too few cases:** International students: AL, HR, SK.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): Values above the country abbreviations present the share of fee-payers among all students. The category "fees" includes not only tuition fees but also registration fees, examination fees, and administrative fees.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

In almost 40 % of the countries, this pattern is reversed.

- In Switzerland, Iceland, Portugal, Norway, Ireland, Hungary, Romania, the Czech Republic, and Finland, domestic students more often pay fees than international students, although the difference between the two groups is only small in some countries.

When the relation between the payment of fees and students' gainful employment is explored, an interesting pattern becomes apparent (Figure B8.8b). Among students with increasing amounts of hours in paid employment during the lecture period, the share of fee-payers increases. On cross-country average, the share of fee-payers among students who are not employed amounts to 51 %. The share of fee-payers is 54 % among students spending up to 20 hours per week on gainful employment. Students who spend more than 20 hours weekly on paid jobs have a fee-payer quota of 62 %. This pattern could be explained, for instance, by long-term students (e.g. in some of the *Länder* in Germany or in Slovakia) who have to pay fees due to exceeding the standard period of study. As a consequence they dedicate more time to gainful employment to be able to pay fees. In some countries (e.g. Slovenia), part-time students, who usually spend quite some time on paid jobs, are subject to fees, while full-time students are not.⁶ In some Middle and Eastern European countries (e.g. Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary), students with state-funded places pay no or lower fees, while students with self-financed places pay the full amount. The students with self-financed places are more often employed.

The share of fee-payers differs also by field of study (Figure B8.8c). In more than 60 % of the countries, the fee-payer quota is highest among students in business, administration and law (cross-country average: 60 %). Around half of all students enrolled in the natural sciences, mathematics and statistics (48 %) and information and communication technologies (ICTs) (53 %) pay fees.

- In three countries, namely, Iceland, Slovenia, and Finland, the highest share of fee-payers can be found among students in natural sciences, mathematics and statistics.
- Students enrolled in ICTs are most often paying fees in slightly less than a quarter of countries: Switzerland, Portugal, Norway, Ireland, Serbia, and Turkey; however, in most of these countries the differences between the fields of study considered are rather small.


It is not clear whether these results are due to an underlying policy in the EUROSTUDENT countries that is trying to steer the flow of students into different fields of study. Imposing the requirement to pay fees only on a smaller share of students in natural sciences, mathematics and statistics compared to other fields of study, for instance, may be conducive to increase the number of enrolments in the field mentioned first. In contrast, charging large parts of the students with high amounts of fees in other fields of study could reduce the number of enrolments and thus counteract problems of overcrowding. The results described above may be caused, however, by varying policies on different types of HEIs. In Austria, for instance, universities of applied sciences have by law more extensive opportunities to charge fees than universities. If, in addition, the offer of certain study subjects differs across the types of HEIs, this may result in fee-payer quotas that vary across fields of studies although this may not be intended.

The share of fee-payers within a student population seems to increase with students' age (Table B8.3). This could be, *inter alia*, due to long-term students required to pay fees upon exceeding the standard period of studies. In a majority of countries,  students without higher education background pay fees more often than students with higher education background,

⁶ In Slovenia, full-time students do not pay tuition fees; instead they pay small amounts for registration fees. In contrast, part-time students are required to pay tuition fees (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2016).

Figure B8.9 **Payment of fees and the recipience of public support**

Share of fee-paying students who (do not) receive national public student support (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, G.44. **No data:** FI.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

and these students are typically older ([>Chapter B2](#)). Students at non-universities more often pay fees than their fellow students at universities (cross-country averages: 62 % vs. 54 %). The fee-payer quota among Master students is higher compared to students in Bachelor programmes (cross-country averages: 57 % vs. 55 %). With respect to a dependency on an income source, it becomes apparent that students dependent on own earnings more often pay fees than their fellows dependent on family contributions or national public student support (cross-country averages: 59 % vs. 53 % vs. 43 %).

In addition, Table B8.4 provides an overview of the monthly amounts of fees paid to HEIs differentiated by various study-related and socio-demographic characteristics of students.

In the large majority of EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 60% of fee-paying students do not receive national public student support

The students' burden of paying fees may be alleviated by financial support from the public sector. Figure B8.9 explores the relation between fee-payers and receivers of state support.

In more than 80 % of the EUROSTUDENT countries, more than 60 % of fee-paying students do not receive national public student support.

- The share of fee-payers who are publicly supported is rather small in Georgia⁷, Italy, and Albania. In these countries not more than 10 % of fee-paying students receive national public student support.
- In about one third of the countries, between 20 % and one third of fee-payers receive national public student support. This refers to Slovenia, Poland, Portugal, Estonia, Ireland, Slovakia, Germany, Croatia, Austria, and Lithuania.

⁷ In Georgia, about 31 % of students do not have to pay fees as these costs are defrayed by the state. The payments of the state go directly to the universities. In accordance with the EUROSTUDENT conventions, this financial contribution of the state to the institutional costs of HE are not included in public support to students.

- Large parts of fee-payers who get support from the public sector can be found in Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, France, and Turkey. There, more than half of all fee-paying students are being supported (although the share of fee-paying students varies across these countries from 5 % to 100%, Figure B8.8).

Discussion and policy considerations

The costs of participation in higher education are not only borne by students themselves; they receive financial support from their families and partners as well. On average across the countries, students pay two thirds of their living and study-related costs, while their parents/partners bear the remaining one third in the form of transfers in kind. In Austria and the Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden, students themselves cover more than 80 % of their expenses. In contrast, in Croatia, Georgia, Ireland, Portugal, and Serbia, the students' families take over more than half of students expenses. In all countries with available data, students' parents and partners contribute to the financing of students' living and study-related costs – one could say that study financing is a “family matter”, and its significance seems to be on the increase (Antonucci, 2016; Brooks, 2017). It has already been noted ([Chapter B7](#)) that there is indication of a spreading reliance on family support for study funding in Europe as governments adopt funding policies that assume a significant contribution from or even a complete reliance on the family (Antonucci, 2016; Brooks, 2017). In the Yerevan Communiqué, the countries forming part of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) declare a public responsibility for higher education and the reliance of the EHEA process on strong public funding (Yerevan Communiqué, 2015). The data presented in this chapter, however, point towards the fact that students' families, rather than the public, often bear significant parts of students' expenses.

Accommodation cost including utilities is the single expenditure item which has usually the greatest importance for students' total expenses, at least for those students who have left the parental home. In the EUROSTUDENT countries, accommodation costs make up between a quarter and around half of students' total expenses for those students who are not living with parents. The costs of accommodation depend, among other things, on the size of the city, town, or village the student lives in. In almost all countries, students who have moved away from their parents and live in the capital city are confronted with higher accommodation costs than their peers living outside the parental home in smaller cities (< 100,000 inhabitants). In France, Georgia, Ireland, Italy, Poland, and Portugal, the difference between the two groups is very pronounced with more than 100 PPS per month. With respect to the Social Dimension of the EHEA, higher costs in the capitals might imply that students from low socio-economic backgrounds living outside the capital cities are more likely to be excluded from comprehensive offers in higher education, as it is often the capitals that not only host a comparatively large number of HEIs but also those which are most reputable. Over time, the share of accommodation costs in students' total expenses has increased for student not living with parents. While this increase is rather small on cross-country average (3 percentage points), it is more pronounced with at least 6 percentage points in Denmark, Germany, Norway, Croatia, Serbia, Malta, and Romania. An increase in the share of accommodation costs may have different reasons. Apart from increasing housing prices, it could also be that student income has risen more slowly than the common price level. It is also not clear how the relative significance of other expense items has developed over time.

Using a variant of the Eurostat indicator on housing cost overburden, it becomes apparent that in all countries with available data, there is a certain share of students affected by this problem. In Denmark, Finland, Norway, Turkey, and Germany, more than a third of all students (living with and living away from parents) are struggling with housing cost overburden, meaning that they spend at least 40 % of their total income (including transfers in kind) on accommodation. The extent of this problem varies with the form of housing. Students who are living alone (outside student accommodation) are most often affected by housing cost overburden in contrast to their peers who are either living with partner/children or in student accommodation. There is also indication that at least parts of the student population are more affected by housing cost overburden than the total population. In more than two thirds of the countries, students living alone show larger shares of housing cost overburden compared to single person households of the total population; on cross-country average, the share of persons concerned is 13 percentage points higher among students. An increase in the offer of publicly supported student accommodation could be at least one suitable measure to reduce the financial pressure of accommodation costs on students and their families as student accommodation turns out to be the least costly form of housing outside the parental home in over 80 % of all countries ([>Chapter B9](#)). In addition, this form of housing is considered to be conducive for students e.g. in terms of social cohesion and inclusion (Astin, 1999; Gwosć & Engel, 2015). In this context it could also be debated whether the amount of national public student support takes the students' living costs sufficiently into account. In case that not all students who desire a place in a student accommodation can be served, it would be desirable for social policy to take the actual costs of living into account when deciding on the minimum amounts for public student support.

Study-related expenses are, in relative terms, less significant for students compared to living costs. The share of study-related costs in students' total expenses varies from 2 % in Finland to more than a third in Ireland. In most of the countries, fees to HEIs make up the largest share in study-related expenses. Students in Ireland dedicate about one third of their total expenses to fees; in all other countries, this share does not exceed 16 %. Across the countries, more than half of all students are paying some kind of fees. International students are more often subject to fees than domestic students, reflecting policies in many countries which charge fees from international students, in particular from those from non-EU countries.

Students who pay fees tend to allocate more time on gainful employment. In more than three quarters of the countries, the share of fee-payers is above average among students with a rather high workload of gainful employment (working > 20 hours weekly). The time which this student group dedicates to employment is not only at the expense of study time, but also at the expense of free time ([>Chapter B5](#); Hauschildt et al., 2015). This may put these students at a disadvantage in several ways compared to their peers who do not (have to) work that much or not at all: On the one hand, they can spend less time on studies, especially on personal study time, which may reduce their advancement in studies. On the other hand, the reduction of free time diminishes their opportunity to revitalise from studies and employment and to care for their social environment (Astin, 1999; Roberts et al., 2000; Miller et al., 2008; Lederer et al., 2015; Mercer et al., 2016; Lowe & Gayle, 2016). The relation between paying fees and students spending more time on employment may also be explained by further factors such as long-term students who need to dedicate more time to gainful employment to be able to pay fees; part-time students being generally subject to fees or students with self-financed study places who are not exempt from fees and finance their studies mainly through gainful employment.

Tables

Table B8.1**Composition of students' expenses by payer and form of housing**

Living costs and study-related costs as share of total monthly expenses (in %)

	Living with parents				Not living with parents			
	Living costs		Study-related costs		Living costs		Study-related costs	
	Paid by students	Paid by others	Paid by students	Paid by others	Paid by students	Paid by others	Paid by students	Paid by others
AL*	85	n.d.	15	n.d.	87	n.d.	13	n.d.
AT	65	25	7	3	82	12	5	1
CH	43	44	5	8	58	32	5	4
CZ	44	48	4	4	64	30	4	2
DE*	67	19	7	7	68	28	3	1
DK	47	46	6	1	80	17	3	1
EE	52	43	3	2	72	24	3	1
FI	46	52	2	1	81	17	2	0,1
FR*	60	26	4	9	68	23	3	5
GE	35	51	3	12	44	42	3	10
HR	35	52	5	9	52	39	5	4
HU	47	38	7	9	61	30	5	5
IE	30	31	10	29	42	25	10	23
IS	49	34	14	3	69	22	8	1
IT*	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	80	n.d.	20	n.d.
LT	41	47	4	8	64	25	5	5
LV	42	48	4	5	61	32	4	4
MT	44	48	6	2	68	22	9	2
NL	38	35	16	10	66	16	12	6
NO	66	22	11	1	86	9	5	1
PL	46	39	11	4	70	18	9	2
PT	21	65	5	9	54	34	6	5
RO	38	54	4	4	58	35	4	3
RS	24	62	3	11	40	49	3	8
SE	55	39	6	1	81	14	4	1
SI	47	43	6	4	62	31	5	2
SK	43	47	6	4	60	31	7	3
TR	47	34	5	14	71	19	5	5
av.	46	42	7	7	66	26	6	4

n.d. = no data

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.73, F.103, F.136 & F.152.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Note(s): Due to no data in some categories, the values for cross-country averages (last row) do not sum up to 100%.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AL, DE, FR, IT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B8.2

Accommodation cost overburden by educational background, educational origin, dependency on income source, number of weekly employment hours during the lecture period, and extent of financial difficulties
 Share of students spending 40% or more of their total income (including transfers in kind) on accommodation (in %)

	Educational background		Educational origin		Dependency on income source			Working hours during the lecture period			Financial difficulties	
	Without HE background	With HE background	Domestic	International	Dependent on family support	Dependent on own earnings	Dependent on national public student support	Working 0 h during the lecture period	Working 1–20 h during the lecture period	Working > 20 h during the lecture period	With financial difficulties	Without financial difficulties
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT	28	33	26	45	36	24	34	40	27	18	43	22
CH	11	13	9	30	16	7	20	18	11	6	18	11
CZ	14	15	14	19	17	10	19	19	14	10	24	11
DE*	34	34	n.d.	n.d.	40	26	37	41	30	23	44	31
DK	52	53	52	51	55	28	55	59	48	40	62	45
EE	17	20	18	28	25	12	30	28	15	14	28	13
FI	43	44	45	40	44	18	62	56	42	17	54	38
FR	30	29	28	41	29	28	34	29	30	29	42	22
GE	14	12	12	28	15	6	13	15	8	6	16	8
HR	23	22	23	t.f.c.	26	16	23	24	20	21	29	18
HU	15	12	13	22	13	13	17	11	10	16	19	9
IE	26	21	22	32	19	23	42	26	17	23	29	18
IS	31	30	29	49	33	26	51	33	32	25	41	19
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	8	9	9	20	10	7	9	10	9	6	13	6
LV	9	10	10	19	13	6	13	12	8	9	16	7
MT	7	9	6	29	10	7	3	8	6	8	14	4
NL	15	14	14	19	17	16	12	20	11	19	22	12
NO	39	46	45	39	37	23	61	62	42	23	62	33
PL	23	26	24	46	32	14	36	34	19	15	31	20
PT	16	17	16	25	17	15	20	17	14	15	22	15
RO	14	13	14	10	14	13	12	13	16	14	18	12
RS	10	11	11	8	13	1	t.f.c.	11	7	11	14	9
SE	25	28	25	37	36	22	25	34	23	10	42	20
SI	16	18	17	33	23	10	22	21	16	12	22	12
SK	16	16	16	t.f.c.	18	13	33	19	12	17	26	12
TR	40	29	37	40	37	26	54	41	29	27	26	44
av.	22	22	21	31	25	16	29	27	20	17	30	18

n.d. = no data t.f.c. = too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.178.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: DE, RO.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B8.3

Fee-paying students by age, educational background, type of HEI, study programme, and dependency on income source

Share of fee-paying students (in %)

	Age groups				Educational background		Type of HEI		Study programme		Dependency on income source		
	< 22 years	22–24 years	25–29 years	30 years and older	Without HE background	With HE background	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master	Dependent on family contributions	Dependent on own earnings	Dependent on national public student support
AL	92	94	93	t.f.c.	93	93	92	99	92	95	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT	14	21	31	30	24	24	18	53	26	25	21	32	15
CH	99	99	99	98	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	95
CZ	14	19	36	47	25	20	19	75	26	20	17	31	16
DE	35	30	30	38	32	30	27	41	36	27	28	36	28
DK	6	5	5	8	6	5	3	8	5	4	10	7	4
EE	10	18	31	24	18	21	18	28	21	20	17	26	6
FI	12	12	14	15	13	14	24	2	10	21	11	15	13
FR	62	62	69	81	52	71	65	59	66	64	78	56	40
GE	64	76	73	54	69	69	69	n/a	67	73	70	60	37
HR	58	68	68	67	66	63	67	48	62	65	63	67	53
HU	47	49	60	62	54	52	49	68	57	39	52	59	36
IE	88	89	86	77	81	91	90	81	86	93	93	88	60
IS	97	98	97	97	98	97	98	n/a	97	99	98	97	97
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n/a	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	28	31	49	60	35	34	38	29	35	37	33	35	34
LV	42	38	46	45	39	45	35	53	43	40	42	44	27
MT	4	18	39	58	23	12	19	22	10	40	7	37	4
NL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
NO	87	90	91	82	85	89	89	85	88	88	92	88	89
PL	51	56	82	90	66	52	53	86	61	67	46	84	39
PT	88	89	92	93	90	88	88	92	89	94	89	93	91
RO	31	34	53	68	40	35	38	n/a	39	38	36	48	21
RS	65	67	77	66	68	67	67	n.d.	68	67	83	96	t.f.c.
SE	1	2	3	1	1	3	2	n/a	1	7	9	1	0,1
SI	78	89	88	89	86	83	84	89	84	88	83	87	82
SK	61	67	79	100	70	63	64	93	68	68	63	78	60
TR	32	44	60	58	45	40	43	n/a	40	60	43	58	32
av.	51	54	61	62	55	54	54	62	55	57	53	59	43

n/a = not applicable n.d. = no data t.f.c. = too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.171.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: DE.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B8.4

Fees paid to HEIs by type of HEI, study programme, field of study, age, educational background, and the recipience of public support

Monthly amount of fees paid by students and others (median, in PPS)

	Type of HEI		Study programme		Field of study				Age groups				Educational background		Recipience of national public student support	
	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master	Social sciences, journalism and information	Business, administration and law	Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics	ICTs	< 22 years	22–24 years	25–29 years	30 years and older	Without HE background	With HE background	Recipients of public support	Non-recipients of public support
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
AT	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	59	57
CH	71	79	76	74	77	80	68	69	67	74	79	78	76	74	71	76
CZ	47	204	133	142	213	161	12	24	21	82	142	170	142	85	22	142
DE	41	41	41	42	44	42	42	41	39	41	42	44	42	41	41	41
DK	25	8	10	55	25	17	t.f.c.	15	8	12	17	17	12	12	10	336
EE	113	113	113	166	t.f.c.	225	t.f.c.	62	293	102	113	107	76	158	113	113
FI	13	7	13	13	13	12	13	9	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
FR	30	61	27	34	30	32	23	30	23	34	35	20	23	30	30	30
GE	150	n/a	150	150	150	150	93	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	133	150
HR	16	35	17	14	10	70	16	17	14	14	56	139	17	14	10	17
HU	16	164	33	14	162	190	11	22	11	14	149	152	33	22	9	148
IE	302	302	302	578	302	302	302	302	302	302	378	302	302	302	302	302
IS	65	n/a	65	65	65	72	65	181	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
IT	n.d.	n/a	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	189	123	153	227	202	153	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	189	162	135	163	162	184	180	164
LV	149	193	238	149	208	238	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	223	228	98	129	98	223	188	175
MT	122	141	91	146	t.f.c.	163	t.f.c.	330	t.f.c.	81	151	143	142	122	t.f.c.	132
NL	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148
NO	7	10	9	7	8	10	7	7	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	9
PL	63	158	63	158	158	172	t.f.c.	167	38	64	167	167	138	42	45	133
PT	104	73	79	104	83	83	84	63	83	99	81	83	79	104	63	90
RO	111	n/a	111	93	87	119	t.f.c.	130	111	82	111	111	100	119	15	111
RS	30	n.d.	30	44	36	118	24	19	24	36	59	118	30	30	15	59
SE	780	n/a	t.f.c.	814	t.f.c.	733	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	768	814	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	814	t.f.c.	733	
SI	4	21	5	5	4	5	4	3	4	5	5	156	5	5	4	5
SK	9	128	12	11	87	12	6	9	9	9	130	128	11	11	9	12
TR	54	n/a	79	44	70	61	37	27	65	61	46	54	52	79	52	54
E:VI med.	60	96	65	70	77	101	31	41	48	65	90	118	65	70	43	101

n/a = not applicable n.d. = no data t.f.c. = too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, F.174.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.4 What are your average expenses for the following items during the current lecture period?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: DE.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Chapter B9

Housing situation

Key

Housing situation

Living with parents is the most common housing form in around two thirds of countries. In another third of EUROSTUDENT countries, the largest share of students lives with their partner and/or children. Across countries, fifteen percent of students live together with others (outside of student accommodation). Living alone (outside of student accommodation) is the least common housing situation in the EUROSTUDENT countries: on cross-country average, only every tenth student does not share their living space.

Students' age and living situation

Students' living situation changes with age. In the older student age groups, increasing shares of students live with their partners, and smaller shares live with their parents or in student accommodation.

B
9

Student accommodation

On cross-country average, 18 % of students live in student accommodation. Student accommodation is used particularly often by international students, students at universities (vs. non-universities), and students who depend on national public student support. In 64 % of countries, a higher percentage of male than female students live in student accommodation. Delayed transition students less often use student housing.



findings

Sense of lack of belonging and housing form

Students' sense of belonging in higher education (HE) appears to be related to their living situation. In slightly over 80 % of EUROSTUDENT countries, students who live outside of their parents' home less often feel that they do not really belong in higher education – whether this is due to their living situation, or whether the living situation is a result of this feeling in the first place, cannot be deduced from the data.

Satisfaction with student accommodation

Students living in student accommodation are generally quite satisfied with its location and their commuting time, but less happy about costs and condition. In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, over 70 % of students living in student accommodation are (very) satisfied with its location. In a quarter of countries, less than half of all residents of student accommodation are satisfied with its condition.

Changes over time: BA students in student accommodation

On cross-country average, no change over time in the share of students living in student accommodation is apparent. However, depending on the country, the share of students living in student accommodation has sometimes clearly changed. A clear increase in Bachelor students living in student accommodation is found in roughly a quarter of countries, while lower shares are found in slightly less than a third of countries.

Main issues

Students' housing situation results from the interplay of personal preferences, financial restrictions, cultural and societal norms, and the availability of options.

Students living with parents

To some extent, students' choice of housing is a straightforward reflection of their personal situation. Most students who have a long-term partner, and especially children, will want to live together with them, if possible. Even for students without their own family, establishing an independent household outside of the parental home is also often seen as a reflection of adulthood (Orr, Gwosć, & Netz, 2011). There are, however, certain regional patterns related to the 'typical' age of leaving home (e.g., Aassve, Arpino, & Billari, 2013; Buchmann & Kriesi, 2011; Kuhar & Reiter, 2014). Proposed reasons for these large differences between countries have referred to cultural and institutional factors as well as differences in income, employment, support by parents, and family formation (Aassve et al., 2013). Past EUROSTUDENT reports (Hauschmidt, Gwosć, Netz, & Mishra, 2015; Orr et al., 2011) have shown that the share of higher education students living with parents in a country is in line with the results of other European studies on the living situation of young people, with young people in Southern European countries tending to stay at their parents' home much longer than in Northern Europe.

For students wishing to attend higher education, however, leaving the parental home may be necessity – a third of Europe's population lives in areas more than 50 km away from the nearest higher education institution (HEI) (Bonaccorsi, 2017). Commuting to an HEI may be impracticable for students in such areas. In fact, research has shown that the accessibility of the nearest HEI impacts not only on students' decision to pursue higher education at all (e.g. in Canada: Zarifa, Hango, & Pizarro Milian, 2017), but also on the choice of HEI type, or even subject (e.g. in Ireland: Flannery & Cullinan, 2014).

Living in the vicinity of the HEI may also have an influence on students' integration into higher education – long commutes can have a negative impact on the possibilities a student has to socialise with their fellow students, and can even present an obstacle for fully taking advantage of an HEI's facilities such as the library.

Student accommodation

Student accommodation – compared to other forms of housing – is often characterised by a closer relationship to higher education or even a specific institution through its homogenous population of students, often close proximity to an HEI, and student-focused or student-organised leisure and study-related activities. Student accommodation is often publicly subsidised, making it one of the least expensive options of housing outside of the parental home (Hauschmidt et al., 2015). It is therefore often regarded as a key instrument in ensuring access to higher education for students from disadvantaged social backgrounds (Gwosć & Engel, 2015).

Satisfaction with housing situation

Students' satisfaction with their housing situation may depend on different factors. Research on students' housing preferences in the Netherlands and Belgium, for example, has shown different features of housing to be of varying attractiveness to students, depending also on their demographic and study-related characteristics, as well as their values (Nijensteijn, Haans, Kemperman, & Borgers, 2015; Verhetsel, Kessels, Zijlstra, & van Bavel, 2017).

This chapter provides data on the following main questions:

- What is the living situation of students in the EUROSTUDENT countries? How is it related to students' parents' financial status, the geographic location within a country, and students' sense of belongingness in higher education?
- To what extent is student accommodation used in the different EUROSTUDENT countries, and which student groups in particular make use of this form of housing?
- How satisfied are students with their housing situation, in particular with different aspects of student accommodation? For student accommodation, the variables cost, condition, location, and time to commute will be considered.

Methodological and conceptual notes

EUROSTUDENT data refer to students' living situation during the week in the study term/ semester (Monday to Friday). A main distinction between students "living with parents" and students "not living with parents" is used with regard to students' housing (Figure B9.1). For students who are not living with parents, there is a further differentiation between the housing forms "alone", "with partner/child(ren)", "with other person(s)", and "living in student accommodation". Depending on the offered facilities, students living in student accommodation can also either live alone, with their partner/children, or with others in a shared flat or room, but these forms are not further distinguished. The terms "alone", with "partner/children", and with "other persons" in this chapter therefore always refer to housing forms outside of student accommodation.

The category "student accommodation" includes all sorts of accommodation in dormitories, halls of residence, or flats that are especially – though maybe not exclusively – designated for the use of students in higher education. No distinction is made between public or private providers.


Data and interpretation

In the majority of countries, most students live away from the parental home, but individual countries show idiosyncratic patterns

In over 80% of EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of all students do not live with their parents (anymore). Nevertheless, in around two thirds of all countries, living with parents is the

Figure B9.1 

Types of student housing



single most common housing form (compared to other forms of housing), with roughly a third to three quarters of students reporting this to be the case (Figure B9.2).

- Particularly high shares of students – between half and three quarters of all students – live in the parental home in Malta, Italy, Georgia, Albania, and Croatia.

In Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland, less than every fifth student still resides in the parental home. In these countries, as well as in Latvia, Iceland, Estonia, and Austria, the largest share of students lives with their partner and/or children, making this the most common form of housing for roughly a third of countries.

Across EUROSTUDENT countries, around 15 % of students live together with others (outside of student accommodation).

- It is the most popular form of housing in Germany, applying to 29 % of students. Shared housing is also relatively popular in Italy, Portugal, Switzerland, Poland, Ireland, Austria, Norway, and Denmark, where between 20 % and 25 % of students do this.

On cross-country average, 18 % of students live in student accommodation.

- In Slovakia, the Netherlands, Romania, Lithuania, Turkey, Sweden, and Finland, between 25 % and 41 % of students reside in student housing.
- In Malta, Italy, and Georgia, where the vast majority of students live with their parents, the shares of students living in student accommodation are below 5 %.

Living alone (outside of student accommodation) is the least common housing situation in the EUROSTUDENT countries: on cross-country average, only every tenth student does not share their living space.

- The highest shares of students living alone are found in France (every fourth student) and Finland (every fifth student).
- Five percent of students or less live alone in Italy, Albania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Poland, and Ireland.

Students' living situation changes with their age (Table B9.1). Across countries, the share of students living with their parents or in student accommodation decreases as the age of students increases. At the same time, more students live alone or with their partner and family. Among students ages 30 and older, this is the single most common form of housing for students in almost all countries. The age composition of the student populations in the EUROSTUDENT countries ([Chapter B1](#)) is therefore also to some extent reflected in the pattern of different housing forms found.


In most countries, students from less well-off families more often live outside the parental home

Students from well-off families live with their parents while studying more frequently in all but two countries (Figure B9.3).

- The difference between the two groups is particularly pronounced in Malta, Albania, Hungary, Turkey, and Iceland. In these countries, the shares of students from (very/somewhat) well-off families living with their parents is at least 10 percentage points higher than among students from not (at all/very) well-off families.
- In the Netherlands and Denmark, this pattern cannot be found. In Ireland, Germany, Norway, and Finland, the difference between students from well-off and not well-off families is 2 percentage points or less.

Figure B9.2 **Students' housing situation**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, E.1.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.0 Who do you live with during the current lecture period (Monday to Friday)?, 3.1 Do you live in a student accommodation?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** FR, IT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.**Figure B9.3** **Students living with parents by parents' financial status**

Share of students (in %)



**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, D.3 & E.1. **No data:** Parents' financial status: AT, CH, FR, IT.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.0 Who do you live with during the current lecture period (Monday to Friday)?, 6.1 How well-off financially do you think your parents are compared with other families?**Note(s):** Interpretation aid: In Malta, 73% of all students live with parents. Within the group of students whose parents are financially not well-off 63% live with parents and among students whose parents are financially well-off 77% live with parents. Values above the country abbreviations present the share of all students living with parents.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** FR, IT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Figure B9.4 ↴

Students' housing situation by study location

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, E.1. No data: CH; capital city: MT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.0 Who do you live with during the current lecture period (Monday to Friday)?

Note(s): Values above the country abbreviations present the share of students in the capital city living with parents (chart a)/living in student accommodation (chart b).

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

B
9


Students' form of housing is related to the size of the study location, but not consistently across countries

In order for parents to be able to continue offering a home to their children during studies, they need to have sufficient resources and spare space. However, the parental home must also be in some proximity to an HEI. Families living in a country's capital city are likely to be close to one or several HEIs. Indeed, in half of EUROSTUDENT countries, students more often live in the parental home in the capital city (Figure B9.4).

- In Italy, Croatia, Portugal, Albania, Turkey, Ireland, Hungary, Latvia, Iceland, Estonia, Sweden, Norway, and Finland, the share of students living with their parents is higher among residents of the country's respective capital city. The differences are particularly large in Portugal, Turkey,

Figure B9.5 **Students' sense of lack of belonging by form of housing**

Students who (strongly) agree that they often have the feeling of not really belonging in higher education. Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, J.19. **No data:** DE, FR, IT, TR.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 1.13 To what extent do you agree with the following statements? – I often have the feeling that I don't really belong in higher education.**Note(s):** Values above the country abbreviations present the share of all students who (strongly) agree with the statement above.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions:** AT.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

and Iceland – here, the share of students living with their parents is at least 20 percentage points higher in the capital city than in locations with less than 100,000 inhabitants. It can be assumed that this is also related to the housing prices, which generally tend to be high in capital cities ([>Chapter B8](#)). However, in the other half of EUROSTUDENT countries, this pattern is not found.

- In Georgia, Serbia, Slovenia, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Romania, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Austria, Germany, and Denmark, the share of students living with their parents is at least slightly higher among residents of smaller cities, towns, and villages of less than 100,000 inhabitants, compared to the capital city. In Serbia, Slovenia, Poland, and Slovakia, especially, clearly higher shares of students from smaller places live with their parents – the difference is at least 10 percentage points compared to the capital city.
- The pattern is reversed when looking at student accommodation (Figure B9.4b): in two thirds of the countries, the dominant form of housing – student accommodation or parental home – switches between the capital city and smaller places. That is, if higher shares of students live with their parents in the capital than in smaller places, higher shares of students live in student accommodation in smaller places (and vice versa).
- In Croatia, Albania, Finland, Georgia, Austria, Germany, and Denmark, this pattern does not become apparent.


Students' sense of lack of belonging in higher education appears to be related to their living situation

In slightly over 80 % of EUROSTUDENT countries, students who live outside of their parents' home less often feel that they do not really belong in higher education (Figure B9.5).¹

¹ The direction of this relationship cannot be deduced from the available data. However, most theoretical considerations assume a positive influence of on- or near campus living on students' integration (see Gormley, 2016).

Figure B9.6 ↴**Students' housing situation by educational origin**

Students living in student accommodation. Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, E.1. **No data:** DE, IT. **Too few cases:** International: SK.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 3.1 Do you live in a student accommodation?**Note(s):** Values above the country abbreviations present the share of domestic students living in student accommodation.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- In Hungary, Norway, Slovakia, Latvia, Sweden, Estonia, and Albania, the share of students doubting their belonging in higher education is at least 3 percentage points higher among students living with their parents than among students living on their own.
- In Romania and Georgia, the reverse pattern is found. Students living away from their parents ask themselves more often whether they belong in higher education.
- No difference between the two student groups is found in Portugal and Slovenia. In the rest of the EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students doubting whether they belong in higher education is between 1 and 2 percentage points higher among students living with their parents.

International students live in student accommodation more often than domestic students

In all but two countries, international students live in student accommodation more often than domestic students (Figure B9.6).

- In Romania, Sweden, Finland, Lithuania, the Czech Republic, Estonia, and Norway, the share of students living in student accommodation is more than 20 percentage points higher among international students (compared to domestic students).
- In Turkey, Serbia, Georgia, and Malta, the difference between the groups is not larger than 5 percentage points.

Somewhat logically, international students also tend to live with others and alone more often than with their parents (Database). Whether international students live more often with partner/family depends on the specific country (Database).

Students living in student accommodation tend to be younger, more often study at universities than at non-universities, and more often depend on national public student support

Students living in student accommodation also differ from their peers in other respects in many countries (Figure B9.7, Table B9.2).

The share of students living in student accommodation tends to decrease with rising age of the students. In the large majority of EUROSTUDENT countries, the highest shares of students living in student accommodation are found among students in the younger age groups (< 22 years, 22–24 years), whereas the lowest shares are found among students aged 30 and older (Figure B9.7a).

Students studying at different types of HEIs also (are able to) make use of student accommodation to differing extents. In all but three countries, students at universities more often live in student accommodation than students at non-universities (Figure B9.7b).

- In Finland, the Netherlands, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia, the difference is especially pronounced, with between 14 and 31 percentage points higher shares of students living in student accommodation among university students.
- Smaller differences (of 5 percentage points or less) between university and non-university students with regard to living in student accommodation, or none at all, are found in Lithuania, Albania, Ireland, Latvia, Estonia, Germany, Austria, and Portugal.
- In France, where non-universities refer to the ‘Grandes Écoles’, the pattern is reversed.

In almost all countries, students dependent on national public student support more often live in student accommodation than their peers dependent on their own income or their family (Figure B9.7c).

- Particularly large shares of students dependent on national public student support living in student accommodation—compared to all students—can be found in Turkey, Slovakia, Romania, Latvia, Hungary, and Portugal, where their share is at least 25 percentage points higher.
- In Finland, the Czech Republic, Ireland, and Austria, students dependent on their families most often live in student accommodation.

Furthermore, in 64 % of countries, a higher percentage of male than female students live in student accommodation (Table B9.2). With regard to students’ educational background, no overall pattern becomes apparent.


- In slightly more than half of the countries, higher shares of students without higher education background live in student accommodation. In almost all remaining countries, higher shares of students with higher education background live in student accommodation. This is mainly the case in countries characterised by a higher average age, or large shares of delayed transition students. These students have likely already settled into living arrangements before entering higher education that they keep during their studies.

Overall, the shares of delayed transition students using student accommodation are lower in all countries except Georgia, Italy, and Switzerland (Table B9.2). In roughly two thirds of EUROSTUDENT countries, at least slightly higher shares of students with financial difficulties live in student accommodation, compared to those without financial difficulties (Table B9.2). The shares of students living in student accommodation are also higher in all countries among high or medium intensity students, compared to low intensity students.

Figure B9.7 ↴

Students living in student accommodation by age, type of HEI, and dependency on income source

Share of students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, E.1. **No data:** non-university: RS; dependent on family support: AL, IT; dependent on own earnings: AL, IT; dependent on national public student support: AL, IT. **Too few cases:** dependent on national public student support: RS.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.1 Do you live in a student accommodation?


Note(s): Values above the country abbreviations present the share of all students living in student accommodation. No non-universities exist in GE, IS, IT, RO, SE, TR.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Figure B9.8 

Comparison over time: Bachelor students living in student accommodation

Share of students (in %)




Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, E.1 & EUROSTUDENT VI, E.1. No data: E:V: AL, GE, IS, PT, TR.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.2/3.1 Do you live in a student accommodation?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: E:V: DE, GE, IT. E:VI: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Figure B9.9 ↴**Students' satisfaction with the cost of accommodation by form of housing outside the parental home**

Share of students who are not satisfied (at all) (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, E.2. No data: CH, DE, IT, TR.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.2 How satisfied are you with your accommodation concerning the following aspects?

Note(s): Values above the country abbreviations present the share of students not satisfied (at all) among students living with partner/children.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: FR, IT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

A clear increase in BA students living in student accommodation is found in roughly a quarter of EUROSTUDENT countries

On cross-country average, no change in the share of students living in student accommodation is apparent (Figure B9.8). However, depending on the country, the number of students living in student accommodation has sometimes clearly changed.

- A clear increase in BA students living in student accommodation is found in roughly a quarter of countries. In Sweden, Romania, Denmark, Ireland, Norway, and Serbia, the share of students living in student accommodation has increased by 3 to 11 percentage points. Lithuania, France, Germany, and Italy also register a slight increase of between 1 and 2 percentage points.
- Lower shares of BA students living in student accommodation in the current EUROSTUDENT round compared to the previous one are registered in slightly less than a third of countries. In Slovakia, Finland, Latvia, Slovenia, Hungary, Estonia, and Malta, the 6th round of EUROSTUDENT sees less students living in student accommodation than in the previous edition. The shares are between 2 and 8 percentage points lower in these countries.
- No change is seen in every fifth EUROSTUDENT country. The shares of students living in student accommodation have stayed the same in the two EUROSTUDENT rounds in the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Poland, Austria, and Croatia.


For students living outside of the parents' home, satisfaction with housing costs is highest among those living with partner/children

Housing costs are one of students' main expenses (>Chapter B8). In almost all EUROSTUDENT countries, students' satisfaction with housing costs is highest among those living with their parents or in student accommodation (Table B9.3, Figure B9.10).

Figure B9.10 ↴

Satisfaction with different aspects of student accommodation

Students living in student accommodation who are (very) satisfied. Share of students (in percentage range)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, E.2. No data: CH, DE, TR; cost: IT; location: IT; condition: CZ; time to commute: AT, IT. Too few cases: MT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.2 How satisfied are you with your accommodation concerning the following aspects?

Note(s): Interpretation aid: In Albania, for example, between 30 and 40% of all students who are residing in student accommodation are (very) satisfied with the cost of student accommodation.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Among those living outside the parental home, and not in student accommodation, dissatisfaction with housing costs tends to be lowest among those living with their partner and/or children (Figure B9.9). In all but two countries, the lowest shares of students who are (very) dissatisfied with housing costs are found in this group. In around 70% of countries, students who live with others, i.e. friends or flatmates, are the most dissatisfied with their housing costs among those living without their parents and not in student accommodation.

- When student accommodation is taken into account, students in the Czech Republic, Sweden, Austria, and Ireland turn out to be the most dissatisfied with the costs of student accommodation in comparison to all other forms outside the parental home ([>Database](#)).

Students living in student accommodation are generally quite satisfied with location and time to commute, but are less happy about costs and condition

When asked to rate their satisfaction with different aspects of student accommodation, residents of student accommodation in almost all EUROSTUDENT countries express the highest satisfaction with the location of the student accommodation, whereas the most critically rated aspects almost everywhere concern the cost or condition (Figure B9.10).

- Except for Albania, France, and Romania, over 70 % of students living in student accommodation are (very) satisfied with its location. In Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, the Netherlands, Norway, Serbia, Slovakia, and Slovenia, between 80 % and 90 % of students indicate that this is the case.
- Students are particularly satisfied with the commuting time from their student accommodation to the HEI in Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden, with at least 80 % indicating that they are (very) satisfied.

The costs and condition of student housing are seen more critically by students.

- While at least 70 % of students are (very) satisfied with the cost of student accommodation in Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Hungary, Portugal, Serbia, and Slovakia, less than half of all students are satisfied with this aspect in Albania, Austria, France, Ireland, and Sweden.
- More than 70 % of students in Estonia, Finland, and Iceland indicate satisfaction with the condition of student accommodation. In Albania, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Serbia, and Slovakia, this is true for less than half of all residents of student accommodation.

Discussion and policy considerations

The living situation of students in higher education follows roughly the same patterns reported in previous EUROSTUDENT reports and other studies on housing: students in Northern European countries tend to leave the parental home earlier than their counterparts in the South (e.g., Buchmann & Kriesi, 2011; Kuhar & Reiter, 2014). Additionally, students' housing situation changes as they age, with older students more often opting to live with their partners and family rather than with their parents, friends, alone, or in student accommodation.

Living with parents represents a relatively low-cost form of housing – as students in most cases just continue to live at home, as they did during their school years, no additional costs in the sense of 'costs that were not there before' are incurred. The space and utilities used by the students of course still need to be paid, but nevertheless, living with parents is the cheapest or second-cheapest form of housing for students in all countries ([> Database](#)). Despite this fact, in almost all countries, it is students who rate their family to be (very/somewhat) well-off who are more often living with their parents. This somewhat counter-intuitive finding is in line with recent in-depth analyses of students' living arrangements in Ireland (Gormley, 2016), which find the same relationship even when taking actual annual family income into account. This relationship could be associated with the location of the parents' home: living with parents is only a viable option if the family lives in the vicinity of an HEI, which might be more likely for well-off families. EUROSTUDENT data can only distinguish cities, towns and villages by their size and capital status – this analysis did not yield a clear picture, with markedly higher shares of students in capital cities of EUROSTUDENT countries living with their parents than in communities with less than 100,000 inhabitants in one half of the countries, and a reversed pattern in the other half. More detailed micro data analyses at the national level could help to shed further light on this

finding and investigate whether the availability of affordable housing options is given for students from all social backgrounds. Finally, although the effect is small, the findings in this chapter also point towards a social and integrative function housing may offer: students who live with their parents tend to feel to a slightly lesser extent that they belong in higher education than their peers living outside the parental home in many countries.

The presented analyses in this chapter point towards the fact that student accommodation appears to serve an important function in providing affordable accommodation to students for whom living with parents might not be an option. Student accommodation is – except for living with parents – the least costly housing option in over 80 % of all countries ([Database](#)), and the analyses presented in this chapter show that student accommodation is used particularly often by e.g.  international students and  students dependent on national public student support. Student accommodation in most countries therefore seems to be effective in reaching these students and providing affordable housing to them. The findings however also point towards the fact that, in many countries, the ‘typical’ resident of student housing tends to be male, studying at a university (rather than at a  non-university), and studying with  high intensity. Students not fitting this description, for example students with children, or students who intensively work alongside their studies, may – perhaps rightly – feel that student accommodation is less well suited to their specific housing needs. Public student housing providers should consider to what extent a need of certain student groups for certain types of accommodation (e.g. family-friendly) may exist that is not yet being served.

Those students that do live in student accommodation particularly appreciate its location and the time to commute, reflecting the fact that student housing is often in direct proximity to HEIs. A lesser degree of satisfaction is reported with regard to its cost and condition – still, the dissatisfaction with the costs of this form of housing is in around 80 % of countries still lower than students’ dissatisfaction with the costs of other forms of housing outside the parental home, underlining the importance of student accommodation as an affordable housing form.

Tables

Table B9.1

Students' housing situation by age

Share of students (in %)

	Age groups																			
	< 22 years				22–24 years				25–29 years				30 years and older							
	With parents	Student accommodation	With partner/children	With other person(s)	Alone	With parents	Student accommodation	With partner/children	With other person(s)	Alone	With parents	Student accommodation	With partner/children	With other person(s)	Alone	With parents	Student accommodation	With partner/children	With other person(s)	Alone
AL	55	22	2	17	4	46	24	9	12	9	48	15	22	8	6	32	26	31	4	7
AT	36	18	9	28	10	23	10	20	32	14	12	7	35	26	20	6	2	60	7	25
CH	63	11	2	18	6	55	9	8	21	7	33	8	23	24	11	8	3	60	10	19
CZ	36	30	10	20	3	34	18	21	23	4	28	9	37	17	8	5	2	75	3	16
DE	32	18	6	29	15	23	13	16	34	15	14	10	28	30	18	7	5	51	15	23
DK	22	27	17	23	11	7	25	29	25	14	3	17	44	21	15	1	7	71	6	14
EE	31	29	18	12	10	29	21	26	14	10	26	12	38	8	16	8	6	72	3	11
FI	10	43	13	9	25	5	40	22	11	22	2	39	33	7	19	1	15	63	2	19
FR	44	15	5	13	23	25	14	15	17	29	14	15	27	17	26	5	6	55	13	21
GE	70	2	3	13	12	63	2	9	12	14	59	1	20	10	10	46	0.5	33	1	19
HR	53	12	3	21	10	56	10	7	19	9	54	3	22	11	10	23	1	61	4	12
HU	46	26	5	18	6	42	23	13	17	6	38	12	27	13	9	16	2	67	3	13
IE	49	27	1	22	1	42	19	3	33	3	32	8	22	31	7	8	2	66	11	13
IS	64	13	10	8	5	45	23	19	8	5	24	25	38	9	5	5	11	71	3	10
IT	69	5	0.4	23	3	70	3	1	22	4	71	2	3	18	6	61	1	19	8	12
LT	34	37	12	12	5	33	22	23	15	7	23	12	35	15	15	10	3	77	1	8
LV	44	28	15	7	6	35	20	27	9	9	24	10	48	5	12	10	6	73	0.4	11
MT	88	1	3	6	3	84	1	3	8	4	67	0.1	23	4	7	17	1	66	2	15
NL	63	28	3	4	2	40	35	13	5	6	22	26	32	6	14	3	5	72	1	20
NO	19	26	13	33	9	10	21	24	35	10	6	17	40	24	13	3	7	69	5	16
PL	43	16	11	26	4	43	12	18	23	5	37	4	40	16	3	24	1	66	2	8
PT	57	8	2	30	4	52	7	5	29	6	52	4	15	16	12	18	2	60	4	16
RO	38	36	6	13	8	32	33	17	10	8	30	15	34	6	16	14	1	71	3	12
RS	48	13	2	23	14	49	13	3	19	16	53	5	11	17	13	29	0.3	57	4	10
SE	36	37	11	7	9	15	43	20	8	14	6	34	36	8	16	3	7	68	3	20
SI	56	19	5	16	4	48	27	11	11	3	48	10	22	13	7	15	4	67	3	11
SK	45	40	5	8	2	54	26	8	8	3	36	5	41	5	13	20	0	65	5	10
TR	32	54	1	10	3	26	44	2	21	7	31	23	13	21	12	21	9	48	8	15
av.	46	23	7	17	8	39	20	14	18	9	32	12	29	15	12	15	5	61	5	15

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, E.1.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.0 Who do you live with during the current lecture period (Monday to Friday)?, 3.1 Do you live in a student accommodation?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: FR, IT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B9.2

Students living in student accommodation by sex, educational background, transition into higher education, study intensity, and extent of financial difficulties

Share of students (in %)

	Sex		Educational background		Transition into HE		Study intensity			Financial difficulties	
	Female	Male	With HE background	Without HE background	Direct transition	Delayed transition	Low intensity	Medium intensity	High intensity	With financial difficulties	Without financial difficulties
AL	23	20	19	23	25	t.f.c.	18	21	24	20	19
AT	9	10	11	8	8	4	5	10	13	10	9
CH	8	9	10	6	8	9	5	7	12	9	8
CZ	16	22	20	17	20	2	10	19	29	19	18
DE	11	13	13	11	13	9	8	12	15	12	13
DK	18	25	21	22	24	11	14	21	24	20	23
EE	17	19	17	18	20	4	14	19	23	15	17
FI	27	40	37	26	37	18	23	34	41	34	32
FR	13	16	14	15	14	12	12	14	17	15	14
GE	1	3	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	2	1
HR	9	8	7	10	9	1	4	8	14	9	9
HU	17	19	17	20	21	5	9	19	27	22	16
IE	21	17	21	17	21	4	12	22	19	18	19
IS	18	18	20	16	18	17	13	20	18	23	12
IT	3	3	2	4	3	3	1	3	4	4	3
LT	25	27	24	27	27	10	18	29	25	25	24
LV	15	23	17	22	20	10	13	19	25	18	18
MT	1	1	1	1	n.d.	n.d.	0	0	2	1	2
NL	30	28	38	20	33	16	25	30	34	33	29
NO	16	21	18	15	19	11	10	18	23	21	15
PL	10	13	11	11	12	1	7	9	18	11	12
PT	6	6	4	7	7	4	2	5	8	9	4
RO	24	34	28	29	31	3	21	29	39	29	26
RS	11	12	8	15	12	10	9	10	16	12	10
SE	26	37	34	25	35	20	18	35	37	30	29
SI	20	18	17	22	20	5	11	22	22	20	17
SK	25	35	30	29	33	7	17	31	40	28	29
TR	48	34	30	43	42	27	34	44	45	32	42
av.	17	19	18	17	20	9	12	18	22	18	17

n.d. = no data t.f.c. = too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, E.1.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.1 Do you live in a student accommodation?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B9.3

Satisfaction with cost of accommodation for students living with parents, with partner/children, with other person(s), alone

Share of students (in %)

	With parents			With partner/children			With other person(s)			Alone		
	(Very) satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied	Not satisfied (at all)	(Very) satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied	Not satisfied (at all)	(Very) satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied	Not satisfied (at all)	(Very) satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied	Not satisfied (at all)
AL	36	29	35	38	32	30	30	21	49	23	25	52
AT	85	8	6	59	22	20	52	21	27	57	19	24
CH	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
CZ	88	8	4	67	20	13	69	19	13	64	19	17
DE	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
DK	79	12	9	63	20	17	56	19	25	60	21	19
EE	74	17	9	66	21	13	60	22	18	60	22	19
FI	76	17	7	74	13	14	70	13	17	64	15	21
FR	64	26	10	52	27	21	57	23	20	45	28	27
GE	77	11	13	74	11	15	47	16	38	55	13	31
HR	61	21	18	37	26	37	34	25	41	39	22	39
HU	73	19	8	65	24	11	59	20	21	61	23	16
IE	72	14	14	56	22	22	43	22	35	46	24	30
IS	88	8	4	57	22	21	48	19	33	53	24	24
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	77	13	10	61	20	19	59	20	21	61	17	21
LV	61	27	12	57	28	15	58	28	14	58	23	19
MT	86	10	4	70	21	9	62	19	19	44	39	17
NL	89	8	3	58	23	18	58	19	23	51	23	26
NO	85	11	4	71	21	8	51	26	23	66	21	13
PL	73	13	14	60	17	23	55	17	29	55	21	24
PT	75	16	9	53	31	16	51	26	24	45	30	25
RO	56	21	23	49	26	25	31	30	39	46	21	33
RS	72	18	10	59	24	17	60	23	18	57	26	17
SE	79	14	7	67	20	13	58	23	19	65	20	15
SI	83	11	6	57	26	17	51	28	21	56	24	20
SK	82	12	7	63	26	12	61	17	22	44	36	20
TR	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
av.	75	15	10	60	23	18	53	22	25	53	23	24

n.d. = no data

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, E.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.0 Who do you live with during the current lecture period (Monday to Friday)?, 3.2 How satisfied are you with your accommodation concerning the following aspects?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: FR, IT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B9.4

Satisfaction with student accommodation concerning cost, location, condition, and time to commute (between accommodation and HEI)

Share of students (in %)

	Cost			Location			Overall condition			Commuting time		
	(Very) satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied	Not satisfied (at all)	(Very) satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied	Not satisfied (at all)	(Very) satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied	Not satisfied (at all)	(Very) satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor dissatisfied	Not satisfied (at all)
AL	38	34	28	64	23	13	48	32	20	53	22	25
AT	45	23	31	78	12	10	63	21	16	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
CH	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
CZ	55	23	21	82	11	7	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	62	22	16
DE	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
DK	67	16	18	76	14	10	68	20	11	75	14	11
EE	70	14	15	90	7	3	71	19	10	87	8	6
FI	74	13	13	84	9	6	75	15	10	80	11	9
FR	48	25	27	53	24	22	59	28	13	77	10	12
GE	71	9	20	73	10	16	64	16	20	72	13	15
HR	65	14	20	81	13	6	64	17	19	67	11	22
HU	80	11	9	83	12	5	51	25	24	83	8	9
IE	30	30	40	79	12	9	59	23	18	78	12	10
IS	61	19	21	90	5	5	73	19	8	89	5	6
IT	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	68	18	14	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	67	16	17	79	11	10	46	33	21	75	10	14
LV	61	23	16	81	10	9	45	32	24	80	11	9
MT	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	t.f.c.
NL	58	20	22	83	10	6	61	20	19	81	12	7
NO	58	23	20	85	10	5	63	26	11	82	13	5
PL	60	13	27	79	13	8	47	26	27	78	9	13
PT	72	16	12	77	13	10	52	32	16	74	18	9
RO	53	17	30	62	12	26	34	30	36	57	16	27
RS	86	7	7	88	8	4	48	35	17	77	13	10
SE	48	27	25	79	14	7	61	27	12	81	13	6
SI	69	19	12	87	9	4	67	21	12	74	16	10
SK	73	16	11	81	9	10	44	27	30	68	15	17
TR	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
av.	61	19	20	79	12	9	58	24	18	75	13	12

n.d. = no data t.f.c. = too few cases

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, E.2.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 3.1 Do you live in a student accommodation?, 3.2 How satisfied are you with your accommodation concerning the following aspects?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Chapter B10

Cross-national student mobility

Key

Enrolment

The largest shares of students who have been enrolled abroad can be found in Denmark, Germany, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, where 10 % or more of students have been enrolled abroad. On average, female students, university students, and  standard access route students are more often enrolled abroad compared to their respective counterparts, but this pattern is not reflected in all countries. Fields of study with temporary  enrolment abroad shares above the EUROSTUDENT average of 7 % are arts and humanities, social sciences, journalism and information, and business, administration and law. The lowest shares of enrolment abroad are found, on average, in the field of information and communication technologies (ICTs).

Internships

The largest shares of 9 to 12 % of students who have been abroad for an internship or work placement can be found in Austria, France, and Lithuania. On average across countries, there is no difference between the sexes with regard to realised internships abroad; but the average shares for students who realised an internship or work placement abroad are higher for non-university and  standard access route students. Fields of study with shares of students who have undertaken an internship or work placement abroad above the EUROSTUDENT average of 5 % are engineering, manufacturing and construction, agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary, health and welfare, and services.

B
10

Social selectivity of mobility

Across EUROSTUDENT countries, the shares of students who have been enrolled abroad are larger among  students with higher education background than among  students without higher education background. On cross-country average, this difference amounts to 3 percentage points. Overall, larger shares of students with higher education (HE) background have also realised an internship or work placement abroad, compared to students without higher education background. However, on EUROSTUDENT average, the difference between students with and without higher education background is less than in regard to enrolment abroad, and the pattern is not found in each country.

findings

Organisational framework and funding used for enrolment abroad

On average, 63 % of students used the organisational framework of EU programmes for their enrolment abroad. Other, e.g. national, programmes were used (on cross-country average) by 19 % of students, and 18 % organised their temporary enrolment abroad independently. Across all EUROSTUDENT countries, the largest share of students state that they have used three different sources to fund their temporary enrolment abroad. On average 51 % of students primarily used public funds to finance their enrolment period abroad and 49 % primarily used private funds. Out of the public funds, the largest share of students, on average, primarily used EU study grants (30 %); contributions from parents, family, or partner (30 %) constitute the largest part of private funding primarily used for enrolment abroad. However, the extent to which these different sources were used to fund the enrolment period abroad differs largely across countries.

Obstacles to enrolment abroad

An additional financial burden remains the main obstacle to mobility: On average across countries, 62 % of all students who do not plan to enrol abroad state this as a (big) obstacle for enrolment abroad. The second-largest share (47%) state the separation from partner, children, and friends as an obstacle, followed by the loss of a paid job (35 %), lack of motivation (30 %), difficult integration of enrolment abroad into the structure (28 %), and low benefits (27 %) for the studies at the domestic higher education institution (HEI) as well as insufficient foreign language skills (25 %). Students without higher education background tend to perceive the obstacles to be bigger than their counterparts with higher education background.

Bachelor students' plans to continue studies abroad

On EUROSTUDENT average, of all Bachelor students who plan to continue their studies, 12 % of them plan to do so abroad. In all countries, the shares of students with higher education background are higher (15 %) in this respect than for all students and for students without higher education background (9 %).

Main issues

Cross-national student mobility was stated as the main goal of the Bologna Process, and every successive declaration or communiqué reiterated the commitment of the Ministers of Education to foster student mobility (see London Communiqué, 2007, Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué, 2009; Bucharest Communiqué 2012). The latest Communiqué (Yerevan Communiqué, 2015) mentions automatic recognition of qualifications to foster mobility of students and graduates, the promotion of international mobility as a means to expand the range of competences and work options for students, and widening access to mobility for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Moreover, education and teacher training students were defined as a relevant group of students with regard to cross-national student mobility, in view of the important role they will play in educating future generations of Europeans.

With respect to cross-national student mobility, there have been attempts to strengthen synergies between the European Union and the Bologna Process, with a view to contribute to the Bologna and European Union 20 % mobility target. In 2011, the Council of the European Union agreed that at least 20 % of higher education graduates should have spent 3 months studying or training abroad by 2020. This refers to periods of higher-education-related study or training (including work placements) abroad, representing a minimum of 15 European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) credits or lasting a minimum of 3 months (Council of the European Union, 2011).

Numerous benefits have been associated with study-related experiences abroad: mobility experiences are commonly assumed to boost graduates' employability; even if only a minority of European employers explicitly value international student mobility (ISM) as such (van Mol & Timmerman, 2014). Cross-national student mobility is associated with a wage premium (see Di Pietro, 2015, for Italy; Kratz & Netz, 2016, for Germany); supposedly even more so for internships abroad (van Mol & Timmerman, 2014, for Austria, Belgium, Italy, Norway, Poland, and the United Kingdom; Kratz & Netz, 2016, for Germany). Additionally, ISM can support graduates in pursuing an international career (see e.g. Parey & Waldinger, 2011, for findings on German graduates, and Oosterbeek & Webbink, 2011, for Dutch graduates). Besides job-related and monetary benefits, study-related activities abroad are believed to benefit personality development (Zimmermann & Neyer, 2013), which might enable graduates to work in intercultural teams, and increase problem solving skills, flexibility, self-confidence, and creativity (Di Pietro, 2015).

Participative equity in international mobility

Since having been internationally mobile touches upon matters such as employability, wage gains, and soft skills, the topic of ISM is closely connected to issues of equity and access to higher education ([>Chapter B3](#)) and beyond. However beneficial study-related activities abroad might be for those participating, existing research on the topic tends to neglect the fact that the majority of students does not study abroad (for some exceptions, see Beerkens et al., 2016; van Mol, 2014). Several studies have investigated the social selectivity of ISM. For example, using data from the Erasmus Impact Study (European Commission, 2014), Key, Milatova, and Horstmann (2017) come to conclude that access to mobility schemes and the motivation to engage in study-related activities abroad are dependent on parental higher education background (see also Bargel, 2006; Beerkens et al., 2015; Finger, 2013; Lörz & Krawietz, 2011; Middendorff et al., 2013; Netz & Finger, 2016; Neumeyer & Pietrzky, 2016; Lörz et al., 2016). Therefore, in this chapter, special emphasis is placed on differences in study-related activities abroad by students' educational

background, as it is known to influence not only the transition into higher education but also decision-making within higher education ([>Chapter B3](#)). Moreover, differences in mobility rates by sex, field of study, and type of HEI are considered.

Organisation, funding, and recognition of credits gained for enrolment abroad

The organisational framework for students' mobility may vary from country to country, in particular with regard to funding opportunities. This chapter therefore analyses the organisation and funding of temporary  enrolment periods abroad as well as the extent to which  credits gained abroad were recognised upon return.

Obstacles to cross-national mobility

A majority of students abstains from studying abroad. Previous studies have stated financial constraints to be the predominant obstacle to mobility, especially for students without parental higher education background (see Middendorff et al., 2013; Hauschildt et al., 2015; Lörz, Netz & Quast, 2016). However, early life events (Carlson, 2013) as well as opportunity structures related to the HEI (Key et al., 2017; Petzold & Moog, 2017) are also assumed to influence whether students consider a study stay abroad. EUROSTUDENT data allow the analysis of obstacles to short-term or credit-seeking enrolment from three perspectives: for students who have been mobile, for students planning to go abroad ([>Database](#)), and for students who do not plan to become cross-nationally mobile. This chapter concentrates on factors that deter students from studying abroad, the presented analyses are therefore focused on the (perceived) obstacles to cross-national mobility for those who do not plan to enrol abroad.

Plans for degree mobility

At the end of this chapter, Bachelor students' plans for international  degree mobility are discussed, as educational aspirations not only concern decisions regarding whether and what, but also where to continue studying (Hauschildt et al., 2015). More precisely, the plans for further studies abroad of Bachelor students are presented. As with plans for further studies in general ([>Chapter B4](#)), differences by students' educational background and sex are considered.

Overall, this chapter aims to answer the following questions:


- How mobile are students in the different EUROSTUDENT countries, and which types of mobility are chosen? Can differences between different student groups be found?
- How do students organise and finance their enrolment abroad and what means are primarily used?
- To what extent are credit points earned abroad recognised?
- What are the obstacles to enrolment abroad, as perceived by students?
- To what extent do Bachelor students plan to continue with further studies abroad? What characterises students planning to continue to study abroad?

Methodological and conceptual notes

As Box B10.1 illustrates, EUROSTUDENT data take into account different types of study-related experiences abroad:  enrolment abroad/foreign enrolment, internships/work placements, language courses, research stays, summer schools, and other study-related experiences abroad. For these study-related activities, EUROSTUDENT data about the duration of the activities ([>Database](#)), whether credits were gained with it, where it took place, and some context

Box B10.1 ↴

Types of temporary ISM



on the location chosen for this cross-national study-related activity ([>Database](#)), are available. The analyses in this chapter, due to their importance with regard to the issues discussed in the previous section, will focus mainly on enrolment and internships/work placements abroad.

With the exemption of Bachelor students' plans for continuation of studies abroad, the analyses presented in this chapter focus on phases of temporary international mobility of returning students, i.e. students who continue their studies at their home institution after a stay abroad. So-called diploma or [○](#) degree mobility (Kelo et al., 2006; Teichler et al., 2011), which describes international mobility with the aim of completing an entire course of studies in a country other than the one where the higher education entrance qualification was obtained, is thus not subsumed under the term study-related experience abroad and is in this chapter only dealt with in connection to plans for further studies.

Data and interpretations


On average, 20 % of students have had some type of cross-national mobility experience

Figure B10.1 gives an overview of students' [○](#) study-related activities abroad, distinguishing between students who have been enrolled abroad, students who have completed an internship/work placement abroad, students who have done both, and students who temporarily went abroad for another purpose (e.g. summer school, language course; Box B10.1) but have not done an enrolment or internship abroad. Taking into account all types of study-related activities abroad, on unweighted average across countries, 20 % of students have been cross-nationally mobile (Figure B10.1). However, there are large differences in the shares of mobile students across countries.

- In more than half of the EUROSTUDENT countries, at least 20 % of students currently enrolled in higher education have some study-related experience (including enrolment and internships) abroad. These countries are Norway, Denmark, Slovenia, France, Finland, the Netherlands, Malta, Austria, Sweden, Estonia, Iceland, Lithuania, Serbia, Latvia, and Germany. With a view to the mobility target of 20 % of mobile graduates, these countries appear to be well on track to reaching it ([>Main Issues](#)).

Figure B10.1**Students' mobility experience by type of study-related stay abroad**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, I.2. **No data:** Internship and other types: CH.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.0 Have you ever been enrolled abroad since you first entered higher education in #country?, 4.8 Have you ever been abroad for other study-related activities as a student in higher education in #country?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- The largest shares of non-mobile students of above 85 % can be found in Slovakia, Croatia, Hungary, Poland, Georgia, Portugal, and Albania.

Among the different activities abroad, the combined category of 'any other type of study-related activity abroad' is the most common category in all countries. This category contains language courses, research stays, summer schools, and other (undefined) study-related experiences abroad. Details on these types of stays abroad can be found in the [Database](#).

Apart from this category, the highest shares of students report (only) an enrolment abroad to be the most frequent type of experience abroad in around 80 % of EUROSTUDENT countries (Figure B10.1).

- Exceptions are Austria, Lithuania, Serbia, Romania, and Poland, where larger shares of students report having been abroad for internships rather than enrolment, and France, where no difference between these two categories is found.

In all countries, there are students who have been abroad for both a temporary enrolment period and an internship or work placement. On average, 1 % of students have undertaken both of these types of study-related activities (Figure B10.1).

- Countries with shares of at least 2 % of students who have participated in a temporary enrolment and an internship abroad are Norway, France, Finland, Austria, Lithuania, and Latvia.

Students at non-universities and alternative access students tend to be less mobile

On average, there is no difference in the shares of students who have not (yet) been abroad for study-related activities by sex or type of HEI. However, some variation across countries can be noted (Table B10.1).

- In 9 countries (Albania, Denmark, Georgia, Croatia, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, and Turkey) female students are less cross-nationally mobile, whereas in 12 countries (Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia and Slovakia), male students are less mobile. In 6 countries (France, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Serbia, and Sweden), there are no differences with regard to non-mobility by students' sex.
- In six countries (Albania, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Latvia, and Malta), the shares of non-mobile students are higher at universities compared to non-universities. In all other countries with available data, the shares of non-mobile students are larger for students enrolled in non-universities compared to those enrolled at universities. The largest differences of 7 to 19 percentage points' difference exist in Albania and France (university students are less mobile) and in Finland, Lithuania, and Slovenia (non-university students are less mobile than university students).

With regard to the access route used for entry into higher education, on average, **●** alternative access route students are less mobile than students having accessed the standard route (Table B10.1).

- Exceptions are Albania, Georgia, Croatia, Ireland, Latvia, and Serbia, where the shares of non-mobile students are higher among **●** standard access route students.

Enrolment abroad more common for university students and students enrolled in arts and humanities

Focusing only on enrolment, across EUROSTUDENT countries, 2 to 13 % of all students have been enrolled abroad (Figure B10.2, Table B10.1) and on average, 6 % have been only enrolled abroad (and have not taken part in any other study-related activities abroad; Figure B10.1).

- The largest shares of students who have been enrolled abroad can be found in Germany, as well as in the Nordic countries Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, where 10 % or more of students have been enrolled abroad (Figure B10.2).
- Relatively low shares of enrolment abroad among current students are reported in Portugal, Albania, Romania, Slovakia, Georgia, Croatia, Poland, and Serbia. Five percent of students or less report having been enrolled abroad in these countries.

The differences in mobility shares between types of HEIs, different access routes, and, to some extent, the two sexes with regard to overall mobility (regardless of type of activity, Figure B10.1) are reflected when looking at enrolment. On cross-country average, female students, university students, and **●** standard access route students have slightly more often been enrolled abroad than their respective counterparts. However, this pattern is not apparent in all countries (Table B10.1)

- In Albania, Malta, Poland, Serbia, and Turkey, the share of male students who have been enrolled abroad is up to 3 percentage points larger compared to the one of female students.
- Compared to university students, non-university students have been enrolled abroad to a greater extent only in Albania, Austria, France, and Malta.
- **●** Alternative access route students show larger shares of students who report having been enrolled abroad compared to **●** standard access route students in Albania, Georgia, Croatia, Ireland, Latvia, and Serbia.

As demonstrated in the last round of EUROSTUDENT (Hauschildt et al., 2015), the shares of students who have been enrolled abroad vary greatly across fields¹. Fields of study with mobility shares of above the EUROSTUDENT average of 7 % are arts and humanities, social sciences, journalism and information, and business, administration and law ([> Database](#)). Nine to eleven percent of students enrolled in these fields of study have already been enrolled abroad at the time they were surveyed. In the field of education, on average, 6 % of students have already been enrolled abroad. Less than 5 % of students with past enrolment experience abroad, on average, are found in the field of ICTs.

Internships abroad are more common for non-university students and students having used alternative access routes

Focusing on internships and work placements abroad, on cross-country average, 5 % of students have been abroad for an internship or work placement (Table B10.1) and 4 % of all students have been abroad just for an internship or work placement (and no other activity; Figure B10.1).

- The largest shares of 9 to 12 % of students who have been abroad for an internship or work placement, can be found in Austria, France, and Lithuania (Table B10.1).

Across countries, there is no difference between the sexes with regard to internships or work placements abroad. The average shares of students who carried out an internship or work placement abroad are higher among non-university and  standard access route students. However, there are some exceptions from these patterns (Table B10.1).

- In Austria, Germany, Croatia, Hungary and Ireland, the shares of university students who have been abroad for an internship or work placement, are larger than those of students at non-universities. No differences between types of HEIs are visible in the Netherlands and Portugal.
- Larger shares of students having entered through an  alternative access route compared to  standard access route students have realised an internship or work placement abroad in Albania, Denmark, Georgia, Ireland, Malta, Portugal, and Slovenia.

Regarding internships and work placements abroad, the fields of study with mobility shares of above the EUROSTUDENT average of 5 % (Figure B10.4) are engineering, manufacturing and construction, agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary, health and welfare, as well as the field of services. In the field of education, on average, 4 % of students have been abroad for an internship or work placement. Other fields of studies with low shares of students going abroad for an internship are natural sciences, mathematics and statistics, and ICTs ([> Database](#)).

Temporary enrolment abroad is less common among students without higher education background


With regard to the educational background of students who have taken part in a temporary enrolment period abroad, there is a clear pattern across countries (Figure B10.2). Across EUROSTUDENT countries, the shares of students who have been enrolled abroad are larger for students with higher education background than for students without higher education background in all but one country. On cross-country average, this difference amounts to 3 percentage points (Figure B10.2).

- Particularly large differences of between 5 and 7 percentage points in the shares of the two groups are found in Iceland, France, Italy, Lithuania, Latvia, the Czech Republic, and Portugal.

¹ An upcoming EUROSTUDENT Intelligence Brief will focus on the mobility experiences in different fields of study.

Figure B10.2 ↴**Temporary enrolment abroad by educational background**

Share of students (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, I.3.**Note(s):** Parents educational background consists of three categories, third category (do not know) not shown here but contained in values for all students.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.0 Have you ever been enrolled abroad since you first entered higher education in #country?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- The smallest differences (less than 2 percentage points) in enrolment abroad between the two groups of students with and without higher education background can be found in Malta, Albania, Poland, and Serbia.

No clear trend over time in enrolment abroad of students without higher education background

When comparing the results from the current and previous EUROSTUDENT round, on EUROSTUDENT average, no change in the share of students without higher education background who have been enrolled abroad is apparent (Figure B10.3). However, this general pattern cannot be found in each country.

- In eight countries, namely, Malta, Latvia, Lithuania, the Czech Republic, Switzerland, Hungary, Slovakia, and Croatia, the shares of students without higher education background who have been enrolled abroad have increased in the current round of EUROSTUDENT compared to the last round by 1 to 4 percentage points.
- In the Netherlands and France, the shares of students without higher education who have been enrolled abroad have not changed.
- In the remaining countries, the shares of students without higher education background who have been enrolled abroad have decreased compared to the last round of EUROSTUDENT by 1 to 4 percentage points.


Internships abroad tend to be less socially selective than enrolment abroad

As with enrolment abroad, on average, larger shares of students with higher education background have undertaken an internship or work placement abroad, compared to students without higher education background. In three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students having been abroad for an internship or work placement is lower among students without higher education background (Figure B10.4).

Figure B10.3 ↓

Temporary enrolment abroad of students without higher education background in E:V and E:VI

Share of students without higher education background (in %)




Data source: EUROSTUDENT V, K.2 & VI, I.3. No data: E:V: AL, IS, PT, TR; not comparable over time: DE, GE, NO.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 4.1 Have you ever been enrolled abroad as student in higher education?, 4.0 Have you ever been enrolled abroad since you first entered higher education in #country?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Figure B10.4 ↴**Internships or work placements abroad by educational background**

Share of all students (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, I.28. No data: CH.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 4.8 Have you ever been abroad for other study-related activities as a student in higher education in #country?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions: FR.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- Large differences of 4 to 8 percentage points in the shares of students with and without higher education background having completed an internship abroad are found in Austria, France, and Albania. In Austria and France, the shares of students going abroad for this purpose are generally quite high.
- In Latvia, Malta, Slovenia, Romania, Norway, Slovakia, and Italy, no difference between the two groups is found.
- In all remaining countries, the shares of students without higher education background who have realised internships are between 1 and 3 percentage points lower than those of students with higher education background.


Despite the fact that, overall, larger shares of students with higher education background have carried out an internship or work placement abroad, than students without higher education background, the average difference between the two groups (2 percentage points) is smaller than the average difference between the two groups in regard to enrolment abroad. Therefore, internships appear to be less socially selective than enrolment abroad. A possible reason for this finding could be that internships or work placements might be remunerated, therefore offering a chance to financially support oneself while abroad.

The majority of enrolments abroad is organised in the context of EU programmes in almost all countries

How did students organise and fund their enrolment abroad? Across countries, 63 % organised their enrolment in the context of European Union (EU) programmes. Other (national, regional, etc.) programmes were used (on cross-country average) by 19 % of all students, and 18 % of students organised their temporary enrolment abroad independently (Figure B10.5).

Figure B10.5 **Organisational framework for enrolment abroad**

Share of students who have been enrolled abroad (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, I.8.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.5 Within which of the following organisational frameworks was your enrolment abroad organised?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** CH.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Although EU programmes are the most frequently used framework for enrolments abroad in all but three countries, there is a large variation across countries with regard to the organisational framework used for enrolments abroad.

- In around a third of all EUROSTUDENT countries, more than three quarters of students who have been enrolled abroad organised this in the context of an EU programme. These countries are Lithuania, Turkey, the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia, Romania, Slovenia, Latvia, Estonia, and Croatia.
- In Georgia and Norway, most students who have been enrolled abroad organised their stay independently. Relatively high shares of more than a quarter of students who organised their enrolment abroad independently are also found in Italy, the Netherlands, Serbia, Sweden, and Denmark. In Lithuania, Turkey, Romania, Slovenia, and Croatia, independently organised enrolment periods abroad are rather uncommon; this was done by less than 10% of students who have been enrolled abroad.
- Non-European programmes, e.g. at the national level, play a strong role in around a third of countries, namely, Switzerland, Albania, Finland, Germany, France, Iceland, Sweden, Georgia, Denmark, and Norway. In these countries, more than a quarter of students who have been enrolled abroad organised their stay abroad in the framework of other, non-EU programmes.

On average, two thirds of students receive contributions from parents, family or partner to fund their enrolment abroad

For funding their enrolment abroad, students draw on several different sources: across all EUROSTUDENT countries, the majority of students who have been enrolled abroad used between two and three different sources to finance their enrolment abroad, with the largest share of students stating that they have used three different sources ([>Database](#)).

When asked for the sources of funding in detail, on cross-country average, 68 % of students who have been enrolled abroad state that they used contributions from parents, family or partner to fund the enrolment abroad (Table B10.3). Own income from previous jobs or own savings were used by 54 %, and 52 % named European Union study grants as a source of funding for their temporary enrolment abroad. Almost a third of students (32 %) used regular study grants/loans from their home country; a further 17 % indicated that they used special study grants or loans from their home country for going abroad. Nine percent state that they funded their enrolment abroad with income from paid jobs while they were abroad, likewise 9 % that they received study grants or loans from the host country. Only a minority of students state that they financed their enrolment abroad with funding from private businesses (3 %) or received funding from non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

However, the extent to which these different sources were used to fund the enrolment period abroad varies greatly across countries (Table B10.3).

- More than three quarters of students used contributions from parents, family or partner to (partially) fund the enrolment abroad in Austria, Switzerland, the Czech Republic, Germany, France, Italy, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, and Turkey. Only in Norway and Sweden are the shares of students who have used this source below 40 %.
- In Denmark, Finland, Iceland, the Netherlands, and Slovenia, more than three quarters of students who have been enrolled abroad used own income from previous jobs or own savings to (partially) fund their enrolment period abroad. Less than a quarter of students used this source in Albania, Georgia, and Serbia.
- European Union study grants are of particularly high importance for students in the Czech Republic, Slovenia, and Slovakia, where more than three quarters of students who have been enrolled abroad state that they have used these grants to fund their stay abroad. In Albania, Denmark, Georgia, and Norway, this applies to less than a quarter of students.
- The shares of students who have used regular study grants or loans from their home country to fund their enrolment abroad are larger than 50 % in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden. The lowest shares of students who have used this source of less than 10 % can be found in Albania, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, and Turkey.
- Special study grants or loans for going abroad from their home countries were used by at least 40 % of students in Finland, France, Italy, Norway, and Sweden. Small shares of below 5 % for this source of funding were reported by students in Albania, Iceland, Romania, and Slovakia.

EU study grants are the largest public primary source of funding


Figure B10.6 depicts the primary source of funding used for the enrolment period abroad, differentiated by public (indicated in shades of blue in Figure B10.6) and private sources of funding (indicated in grey in Figure B10.6). The category public funds includes: EU study grants; regular study grants/loans from home country; special study grants/loans from home country for going abroad, as well as study grants/loans from the host country. The category private funds encompasses the categories contribution from parents, family or partner; own income from previous job or own savings; income from paid jobs during the stay abroad; funding from private businesses, and funding from NGOs. Since it is not possible to know if sources named as 'other' can be categorised as either public or private funds, it remains as its own category.

On cross-country average, about half of students (51 %) indicate having used primarily public funds to finance their enrolment period abroad, while the other half (49 %) primarily used private

Figure B10.6 ↴

Primary source of funding used for enrolment abroad

Share of students who have been enrolled abroad (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, I.12. **No data:** DE; for item "regular study grants/loans from home country": AL, FR, HR, IT, RS; for item "special study grant/loan from home country for going abroad": AT, CH, CZ, MT, RO, TR; for item "study grants/loans from host country": IE; for item "funding from private businesses": AL, AT, CH, CZ, MT, RO, TR; for item "funding from NGOs": AT, CH, CZ, FR, GE, IT, IS, LV, PT, NO, RO, RS, SE, SI; for item "other": IT, MT, SK.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 4.6 Which of the following sources did you use to fund your enrolment period abroad, and which one of them was your primary source of funding?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.


funds. Out of the public funds, the biggest primary source of funding are EU study grants, which were used primarily by 30 % of students who were enrolled abroad, followed by regular study grants or loans from their home country (12 %), special study grants or loans from their home country for going abroad (5 %), and study grants or loans from the host country (4 %). Contributions from parents, family or partner (30 %) constitute the largest part of primary private funding for enrolment abroad, followed by students' own income from previous job or their own savings (13 %) and income from paid jobs during their enrolment period abroad (3 %). Less than 1 % of students state that funding from private businesses or funding from NGOs has constituted the primary source of funding for their enrolment abroad. Other, not further specified primary sources of funding were used by 2 % of students who have been enrolled abroad.

- In Lithuania, the Czech Republic, Romania, Latvia, Hungary, Slovenia, Estonia, Sweden, and Norway, two thirds of students or more who were enrolled abroad report drawing primarily on public sources to fund their studies abroad.
- On the other hand, at least two thirds of students indicate having used primarily private funds to finance their enrolment abroad in Portugal, Austria, Ireland, Italy, France, Albania, and Switzerland.

With regard to individual sources of funding, the following country-specific usage patterns are found:

Figure B10.7**(Partial) Recognition of credits gained with study-related activity abroad**

Share of students who have been abroad for the respective activity (in %)

**Data source:** EUROSTUDENT VI, I.48, I.50 & I.7. **No data:** Any other type: AT, CH, FI; internship: AT, CH, FI, IT.**Note(s):** Values shown indicate share of students stating that credits gained abroad with respective activity were recognised partially or fully upon return.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.4 Were the credits (ECTS, certificates) you gained for your enrolment abroad recognised by your home institution?, 4.9 Please fill in, per activity, the following details for your most recent study-related stay abroad.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

- The largest shares of students who have primarily used EU study grants to finance their enrolment abroad of about twice the average (60 %) are Lithuania, the Czech Republic, Romania, Latvia, and Slovakia.
- In five countries, Portugal, Italy, France, Albania, and Switzerland, more than 50 % of students name contributions from parents, family or partners as their primary source of funding for an enrolment period abroad.
- More than a quarter of students used their own income from previous jobs or their own savings as primary source of funding for their enrolment period abroad in Iceland, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Switzerland.
- Regular study grants/loans from home country constitute the primary source of funding for enrolment abroad in Sweden, Finland, Denmark, and Norway; between 45 and 53 % of students state this as the primary source of funding.

Credits gained for enrolment abroad were (at least partially) recognised for three quarters of students

One crucial issue with regard to cross-national student mobility is whether and to what extent credits gained with study-related activities abroad are recognised upon the students' return to the home institution. The study-related activity abroad for which, on EUROSTUDENT average, the largest share of students states that credits gained abroad were (at least partially) recognised, is enrolment. On average, 60 % of students who have been enrolled abroad had the credits gained abroad fully and 16 % partially recognised (Table B10.4). For internships or work placements, 40 % of students had their credits (at least partially) recognised, and for types of study-related activities abroad other than internship/work placements or enrolment abroad, the share is 29 % of students (Figure B10.7).

However, across EUROSTUDENT countries, the variation is huge with shares of students' credit recognition between 6 and 91 % for the different activities (Figure B10.7).

- The largest shares of around 80 % or more of students whose credits gained through enrolment abroad were (at least partially) recognised can be found in Switzerland, Finland, the Netherlands, Iceland, Germany, Norway, Estonia, Austria, Denmark, Lithuania, and Poland. The smallest shares of students in this respect with shares between 50 and 60 % can be found in Albania, Georgia, Italy, and Serbia.
- Concerning the (at least) partial recognition of credits gained with internship or work placement abroad, a share of 60 % and above of students who had credits earned recognised is evident in Finland, the Netherlands, Sweden, Germany, Norway, and Estonia. The smallest shares of 15 % and below in this matter can be found in Lithuania, Poland, and Malta.
- For all other study related activities abroad, other than internship/work placements or enrolment combined, the largest shares (50 % to 62 %) of students who had their credits gained recognised can be found in the Netherlands, Sweden, Iceland, and Germany. Pertaining to this, the smallest shares of 10 % can be found for students enrolled in higher education in Malta and Serbia.

Students living with parents and students with paid employment for more than 20 hours per week less frequently plan to enrol abroad

Besides information on past mobility experiences, EUROSTUDENT also provides data on students' plans for enrolment abroad. In describing students' plans for enrolment abroad, this part of the chapter concentrates on cross-national patterns and overall differences between groups; a detailed overview for each country is provided in Table B10.2.

On average across EUROSTUDENT countries, lower shares of students with concrete plans to enrol abroad are found among ◉ students without higher education background, ◉ students with financial difficulties (3 percentage points difference each) and those living with their parents or guardians (2 percentage points difference) in comparison to their respective counterparts. The same holds true for students who pursue a paid employment for more than 20 hours per week (2 percentage points difference compared to students without paid jobs) and students ◉ dependent on family support, as well as ◉ students dependent on own earnings (on average, 2 percentage points difference compared to students dependent on national public student support). Although these averages are reflected in the majority of countries, individual countries may be exceptions to this pattern (Table B10.2).


The additional financial burden associated with ISM remains the biggest obstacle to enrolment abroad

The perceived or factual additional financial burden connected with ◉ study-related activities abroad – as in previous rounds of EUROSTUDENT (Hauschildt et al., 2015) – remains the main obstacle: almost two thirds (62 %) of all students who do not plan to enrol abroad perceive financial restrictions to be a (big) obstacle to a possible enrolment abroad. The second-largest share, almost half of students (47 %), state that a separation from partner, children, and friends presents an obstacle; followed by the loss of a paid job (35 %), a lack of motivation (30 %). Slightly less students fear organisational difficulties: a difficult integration of enrolment abroad into the structure of the study programme (28 %) and low benefits for the studies at the domestic HEI (27 %). A quarter of students are concerned about their own insufficient foreign language skills (25 %). The remaining obstacles were, on average, rated to be (big) obstacles by less than a quarter of students. This cross-national pattern is, with some exceptions, reflected in the ones for each EUROSTUDENT country, although country-specific idiosyncrasies exist (Table B10.5).

Figure B10.8 ↴

Obstacles to temporary enrolment abroad by education background

Cross-country average share of students who do not plan to enrol abroad (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, I.20. **No data:** FR; problems with access regulations to the preferred country (visa, residence permit): AT, DE; limited admittance to mobility programmes: AT, CH, IE; health/disability: AT, CH, DE; loss of paid job, lack of motivation, difficult integration of enrolment abroad into the structure of my home study programme: IE.

Note(s): Students assessed possible obstacles to studying abroad on a 5-point scale ranging from "no obstacle" to "big obstacle". The figure shows how large a share of students considered certain aspects to be either (4) "quite a big" or (5) "big obstacle".

Eurostudent question(s): 4.7 To what extent are or were the following aspects an obstacle for enrolment abroad to you?

Deviations from Eurostudent conventions: AT, CH, IT.

Deviations from Eurostudent standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

In the matter of (big) obstacles to enrolment abroad, certain (selected) obstacles are especially hindering for students in some countries (Table B10.5).

- The additional financial burden connected with enrolment abroad is particularly relevant for students in Estonia, Croatia, Iceland, Poland, and Portugal, where more than 70 % of students who have not yet been enrolled abroad and do not plan to rate this to be a (big) obstacle to enrolment abroad.
- Fear of losing a paid job presents a (big) obstacle to enrolment abroad for 40 to 51 % of students not planning to enrol abroad in Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Lithuania, Latvia, Malta, Norway, and Poland.
- A possibly difficult integration of an enrolment period abroad into the structure of the home study programme is perceived to be a (big) obstacle for more than a quarter and up to 53 % of students without enrolment experience abroad in Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, and Slovakia.
- Limited admittance to mobility programmes is named by more than a quarter and up to around half of non-mobile students in Albania, Germany, Georgia, Poland, and Portugal as a (big) obstacle to enrolment abroad.
- In Albania, Georgia, Poland, Portugal, and Serbia, state access regulations to the preferred country (visa, residence permit) are reported to be a (big) obstacle to enrolment abroad by more than a quarter and up to 43 % of students who have not been enrolled abroad and do not plan to do so.

Besides these variations across countries, a common pattern concerning students' educational background and obstacles to enrolment abroad is apparent across EUROSTUDENT countries. The responses of students without higher education background generally reflect the same order of obstacles, with financial issues, as well as concerns about a separation from family and friends, at the top of the list. Most obstacles, however, are rated to be more deterring by students without higher education background than by the average student (Figure B10.8). Exceptions in this regard are 'problems with recognition of results achieved abroad', 'difficult integration of enrolment abroad into the structure of the domestic study programme', and 'lack of motivation'; here the shares of students without higher education background perceiving these aspects to be (big) obstacles are slightly (1 percentage point) lower than for all students. No difference can be found in the matter of 'low benefit for studies at home', 'lack of information provided by domestic higher education institution', 'limited admittance to mobility programmes' and 'health/disability' (Figure B10.8).

Students with higher education background plan to continue their studies abroad to a larger extent compared to their peers without higher education background


In contrast to the previous parts of this chapter, the following analyses will focus on **degree** mobility, giving insight into Bachelor students' plans to complete a whole degree (most likely a Master's degree) abroad after finishing their current study programme. In order to capture students' plans for international degree mobility, Bachelor students who had indicated planning further studies after completing the current study programme, were asked about the planned location, domestically or abroad. They could also indicate that they were still undecided, whether to continue their studies abroad or domestically.

On average across EUROSTUDENT countries, 12 % of all Bachelor students, with plans to continue studying, plan to do so abroad. As has been the case for Bachelor plans to continue

Figure B10.9 

Bachelor students' plans for continuation of studies abroad by parental higher education background

Share of students with plans to continue studying after their current study programme (in %)



Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, J.5. **No data:** DE, FR, IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 1.11 Where are you planning to continue studying after finishing your current study programme(s)?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

studies (independent of location, [>Chapter B4](#)), this applies to larger shares of students with higher education background (15 %), than students without higher education background (9 %) (Figure B10.9).

- Around a quarter of Bachelor students with plans for further studies plan to continue their studies abroad in Albania, Iceland, and Turkey.
- The smallest shares of Bachelor students planning to continue their studies abroad are found in Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Netherlands, Poland, and Slovakia, where this applies to 5 % or less of students.
- The largest differences in Bachelor students' plans to continue their studies abroad by educational background can be found in Albania, Iceland, Turkey, Lithuania, Ireland, and Hungary. In these countries, the difference between the two groups of students is 10 percentage points or more.
- Countries with the smallest differences between students with and without higher education background relevant to Bachelor students' plans to continue studies abroad are Switzerland, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Slovakia.

Discussion and policy considerations

The mobility patterns of students in EUROSTUDENT countries, despite some cross-country commonalities, are quite varied with regard to the extent and types of mobility undertaken by students. On EUROSTUDENT average, 20 % of students report having been abroad for study-related purposes, but this varies from 10 to over 30 % between countries. In most countries, temporary enrolment abroad is the most frequent type of mobility experience: On EUROSTUDENT average, 7 % of students have been abroad for temporary enrolment at least once (and might in addition have been abroad for other study-related activities). Particularly high shares of students with experience of temporary enrolment abroad can be found in Denmark, Germany, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, where 10 % or more of students have been enrolled abroad. Most of these countries are also characterised by above-average shares of recognition of credit points gained abroad. In Austria, France, and Lithuania, internships or work placements abroad are used by relatively large shares of students as a form of mobility experience. What becomes apparent from the data is also that other types of mobility besides these two main types, in some countries, are of relatively high importance: up to 19 % of students in some countries, and 9 % on average, report some sort of temporary study-related mobility, other than enrolment and internships, e.g. language courses, research stays, summer/winter schools, as well as other forms. These forms of mobility constitute the main form of mobility in many countries (vs. enrolments and internships/work placements), thus perhaps pointing towards a 'mobility reserve' of students who find it easier to flexibly integrate these typically shorter stays into their studies and lives, but shy away from the larger commitment of a stay abroad of several months, typically associated with studies or internships abroad. However, these other types of stays are not as often recognised towards fulfilment of students' study requirements. With a view to the Bologna and European Union mobility target of 20 % graduates with mobility experience, it might be advisable to take a closer look at existing mobility patterns and activities and to investigate how mobility experiences other than enrolment or internship/ work placement abroad might be fruitfully integrated into study programmes.

With regard to both enrolments and internships abroad, the data show that these remain socially selective in many countries. Across EUROSTUDENT countries, the shares of students who have

been enrolled abroad are larger among students with higher education background than among those without higher education background. The pattern is less pronounced when looking at internship or work placement, but even here, in three quarters of EUROSTUDENT countries, the share of students having been abroad for an internship or work placement is lower among students without higher education background. This is despite the fact that internships are, on average, more common among students at [non-universities](#), which typically register higher shares of students without higher education background than universities ([Chapter B4](#)). Students with higher education background are also found to more often plan entire degree programmes abroad after completion of their current Bachelor programme. These results could point towards a process in which [degree mobility](#) comes to serve as a new process of distinction, in which students with higher education background replace practices which have become more common (e.g. temporary enrolment abroad) by more exclusive practices (e.g. degree mobility) (Netz & Finger, 2016).

Related to the observed social selectivity is the question of possible deterrents to student mobility. In fact, the additional financial burden associated with a stay abroad is the most often named obstacle to enrolment abroad, particularly by students without higher education background. These students also more often fear a loss of their paid job should they go abroad. Ensuring that sufficient financial support is available to all types of students can be key in widening access to student mobility. Currently, on EUROSTUDENT average, almost half of the students draw on private funds as the main source of funding for enrolments abroad. EU study grants are the most important source of funding in around half of EUROSTUDENT countries, and also, in most countries, EU programmes are the main organisational framework for mobility. While this demonstrates the success of these programmes, with a view to the future, the question of the sustainability of this pattern can be posed: should this support, for whatever reason, cease to be available or reduced in its scope, negative effects on mobility rates are to be expected, if no adequate replacements are created at the national level.

Regular national study support already provides the largest single primary source of funding for enrolment abroad – through regular study support from the home country – in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden. The national public student support in these countries is (fully) portable (European Commission, 2017c), i.e., can be taken up by students regardless of where they live or what they are studying, and is received by above-average shares of students and/or makes up above-average shares of their income ([Chapter B7](#)). Restrictions with regard to the portability of public student support to foreign countries (e.g. due to being tied to certain institutions at home) might pose a serious obstacle to student mobility. If funding for mobility periods is not widely available, considering socio-economic criteria in the granting of mobility, funds and places might also provide a measure to enhance student mobility, especially for those groups of students, that benefit from it to a lesser extent.

Tables

Table B10.1**(Selected) study-related activities abroad by sex, type of HEI access route**

Share of students (in %)

	No study-related experience abroad								Enrolment abroad								Internship/work placement abroad								
	All students	Sex		Type of HEI		Access route		All students	Sex		Type of HEI		Access route		All students	Sex		Type of HEI		Access route					
		Female	Male	University	Non-university	Standard access	Alternative access		Female	Male	University	Non-university	Standard access	Alternative access		Female	Male	University	Non-university	Standard access	Alternative access				
AL	90	93	87	91	82	91	82	4	3	6	4	7	3	10	3	2	5	3	8	3	6				
AT	76	74	78	75	77	77	86	9	10	8	9	10	10	4	12	13	10	12	10	9	5				
CH	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	7	7	7	8	6	7	6	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.			
CZ	84	83	85	84	83	84	91	8	9	7	8	7	8	4	4	4	3	3	7	4	4	4			
DE	80	77	83	78	83	80	89	10	11	9	11	8	10	6	5	7	4	6	4	6	2				
DK	68	68	67	68	67	67	72	11	12	10	14	7	11	8	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	8			
EE	77	77	79	77	80	77	78	7	8	7	8	5	7	7	6	5	7	5	8	6	4	4			
FI	74	72	77	71	78	n.d.	n.d.	13	15	10	15	10	n.d.	n.d.	8	10	7	8	9	9	n.d.	n.d.			
FR	71	71	71	77	58	71	89	9	9	8	7	13	9	1	9	9	9	9	6	17	9	1			
GE	90	90	89	90	n/a	90	82	3	4	3	3	n/a	3	6	2	2	2	2	n/a	2	8				
HR	87	88	85	86	89	88	84	3	3	3	3	2	2	5	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2			
HU	87	86	88	87	88	87	92	6	6	5	6	4	6	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	0				
IE	81	79	83	78	84	81	77	6	7	5	8	4	6	8	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	6			
IS	78	80	76	78	n/a	77	82	10	10	9	10	n/a	10	7	2	3	2	2	n/a	3	2				
IT	83	84	83	83	n/a	83	n.d.	9	9	8	9	n/a	9	n.d.	3	3	3	3	3	n/a	3	n.d.			
LT	78	79	78	76	83	78	89	9	10	8	11	5	10	0.4	11	11	11	11	11	12	11	8			
LV	79	78	79	81	75	79	78	9	11	6	9	8	9	12	8	7	9	5	12	8	7				
MT	75	78	72	76	72	75	82	8	8	9	7	14	9	3	6	4	9	5	12	5	6				
NL	74	74	74	70	76	73	78	8	9	7	13	6	9	4	7	8	6	7	7	7	6				
NO	65	63	69	65	66	64	72	13	14	11	14	12	14	8	5	6	4	4	6	5	4				
PL	87	87	87	87	88	87	92	3	2	3	3	3	3	0.1	4	3	6	4	5	4	4				
PT	90	89	90	88	92	90	92	5	6	5	7	3	6	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2			
RO	84	84	84	84	n/a	83	87	4	5	3	4	n/a	4	3	5	4	6	5	n/a	5	5				
RS	79	79	79	79	n.d.	79	73	2	1	2	2	n.d.	2	3	3	4	3	3	n.d.	3	1				
SE	77	77	77	77	n/a	76	84	11	11	10	11	n/a	12	6	4	4	4	4	n/a	4	3				
SI	70	70	72	69	76	70	73	8	9	7	9	4	8	6	6	6	6	6	5	9	6	8			
SK	86	85	86	86	87	85	100	4	6	3	4	4	4	t.f.c.	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	t.f.c.			
TR	85	87	83	85	n/a	n.d.	n.d.	6	5	6	6	n/a	n.d.	n.d.	2	2	3	2	n/a	n.d.	n.d.				
av.	80	80	80	79	79	80	84	7	8	7	8	7	7	5	5	5	5	5	7	5	4				

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, I.1, I.3, I.28. **No data:** No study related experience abroad, internships: CH; (alternative) access route: FI, IT, TR.**Too few cases:** Alternative access route: SK.**Eurostudent question(s):** 4.8 Have you ever been abroad for other study-related activities as a student in higher education in #country?**Deviations from Eurostudent survey conventions:** AT, DE, FR, RO.**Deviations from Eurostudent standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B10.2

Students' plans to temporarily enrol abroad by educational background, dependency on income source, financial difficulties, form of housing, and employment status

Share of students (in %)

	All students	Educational background		Dependency on income source				Financial difficulties		Form of housing		Employment status	
		With HE background	Without HE background	Dependent on family support	Dependent on own earnings	Dependent on national public student support	Other	Students with financial difficulties	Students without financial difficulties	Students living with parents	Students not living with parents	In a paid job for more than 20 hours per week	Students without paid jobs
AL	13	15	12	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	0	12	12	15	14	14	
AT	33	35	32	36	26	28	35	30	36	35	22	35	
CH	21	22	21	20	27	22	25	19	21	19	23	28	18
CZ	34	35	33	33	35	32	44	35	34	33	34	31	31
DE	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
DK	21	21	21	18	20	20	27	20	21	11	22	21	17
EE	20	20	15	19	15	25	20	19	22	20	20	19	23
FI	27	27	25	29	25	28	18	24	27	19	27	27	27
FR	15	17	12	17	17	12	12	12	16	12	17	19	13
GE	22	23	20	21	24	t.f.c.	26	19	28	21	24	22	22
HR	10	9	10	7	11	20	13	9	11	10	9	10	9
HU	12	15	7	12	10	16	20	7	15	12	13	9	11
IE	14	16	12	16	11	13	14	13	16	12	16	12	13
IS	24	25	24	24	24	21	36	23	30	27	23	17	27
IT	19	23	18	24	20	16	39	18	20	18	22	15	19
LT	13	14	11	12	12	10	21	9	15	13	13	7	13
LV	26	24	29	21	34	t.f.c.	24	31	29	23	28	30	22
MT	15	13	16	16	11	t.f.c.	21	10	16	15	15	6	17
NL	16	18	14	13	16	16	22	14	17	14	18	19	13
NO	22	23	17	16	15	23	25	20	23	19	23	25	21
PL	13	18	7	13	17	15	7	10	13	15	12	14	11
PT	10	12	8	11	5	7	7	8	12	11	9	7	10
RO	21	19	23	21	19	31	20	21	23	18	22	23	21
RS	7	8	6	5	t.f.c.	t.f.c.	18	6	7	9	6	6	6
SE	21	21	19	21	12	23	26	18	23	16	22	11	22
SI	16	17	15	15	13	23	18	16	15	16	16	13	17
SK	11	15	8	10	9	t.f.c.	34	8	10	10	13	6	12
TR	12	16	10	13	13	12	10	14	11	12	12	11	12
av.	18	19	16	18	18	20	22	16	19	17	19	16	18

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, I.4. **No data:** DE; dependency on income source: AL.

Too few cases: Dependent on own earnings, dependent on national public student support: RS.

Eurostudent question(s): 4.1 Which of the following statements describes your current stage of planning best?

Deviations from Eurostudent survey conventions: AT.

Deviations from Eurostudent standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B10.3

Sources of funding for enrolment abroad

Share of students who have been enrolled abroad (in %)

	Contribution from parents/ family/ partner	Own income from previous job or own savings	Income from paid job during my studies abroad	Study grants/loans from host country	Regular study grants/loans from home country	Special study grant/ loan from home country for going abroad	EU study grants	Funding from private businesses	Funding from NGOs	Other
AL	48	23	15	3	7	4	4	0	7	11
AT	78	65	8	4	22	n.d.	67	n.d.	n.d.	9
CH	80	67	7	1	19	n.d.	41	n.d.	n.d.	11
CZ	83	62	10	7	27	n.d.	79	n.d.	n.d.	6
DE	78	51	11	n.d.	41	n.d.	53	n.d.	n.d.	11
DK	43	81	10	8	69	20	18	26	3	7
EE	62	60	11	17	24	13	66	2	4	6
FI	53	77	10	6	72	41	38	6	3	7
FR	78	49	13	10	n.d.	48	29	2	0	6
GE	61	14	4	16	n.d.	7	12	2	0,5	16
HR	74	56	5	9	12	19	52	3	4	3
HU	73	48	13	9	10	5	73	1	3	7
IE	59	50	14	2	15	10	46	3	2	4
IS	48	81	14	13	55	2	57	2	2	6
IT	88	51	12	8	n.d.	45	41	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
LT	75	54	4	12	15	13	72	1	1	2
LV	75	55	13	6	20	15	67	4	1	6
MT	89	73	9	22	73	n.d.	74	3	0,4	1
NL	70	79	8	9	82	12	48	1	1	12
NO	29	66	5	6	80	44	13	1	1	7
PL	79	35	17	7	3	21	66	0	1	6
PT	86	39	8	4	15	7	67	1	0	2
RO	69	28	3	22	6	3	64	0,4	0,5	8
RS	71	23	7	5	2	7	38	3	0	15
SE	38	71	9	10	74	40	34	2	1	6
SI	71	77	13	9	38	5	82	3	n.d.	3
SK	78	48	9	9	8	3	78	1	1	3
TR	76	37	3	12	4	n.d.	67	1	1	0
av.	68	54	9	9	32	17	52	3	2	7

n.d.: no data.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, I.10. **No data:** Study grants/loans from host country: DE; special study grant/loan from home country: AT, CH, CZ, DE, MT, TR; funding from private businesses: AT, CH, CZ, DE, IT; funding from NGOs: AT, CH, CZ, DE, IT, SI; other: IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 4.6 Which of the following sources did you use to fund your enrolment period abroad, and which one of them was your primary source of funding?

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B10.4**Recognition of credits for enrolment abroad**

Share of students with enrolment abroad (in %)

	Fully recognised	Partially recognised	No recognition	No credits gained	Don't know (yet)	No intention of having credits recognised
AL	34	24	8	8	12	13
AT	47	34	1	2	15	n.d.
CH	65	26	2	3	4	n.d.
CZ	58	19	5	5	6	6
DE	79	n.d.	13	n.d.	8	n.d.
DK	75	8	2	6	5	4
EE	72	19	3	2	0,3	5
FI	77	11	2	4	5	2
FR	70	6	5	9	10	n.d.
GE	39	15	5	21	11	8
HR	54	17	5	7	4	12
HU	31	31	10	4	5	18
IE	69	8	7	10	7	n.d.
IS	66	16	5	3	2	7
IT	46	10	2	3	6	33
LT	71	18	1	3	4	3
LV	60	14	8	6	7	5
MT	58	4	5	22	3	8
NL	74	10	4	3	5	5
NO	76	8	3	7	3	3
PL	66	18	1	6	6	3
PT	63	13	3	5	11	5
RO	55	13	6	7	11	7
RS	37	18	18	6	12	9
SE	56	14	7	3	8	11
SI	56	23	4	4	6	8
SK	52	28	5	4	5	6
TR	62	14	4	8	10	2
av.	60	16	5	6	7	8

n.d.: no data.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, I.7.**EUROSTUDENT question(s):** 4.4 Were the credits (ECTS, certificates) you gained for your enrolment abroad recognised by your home institution?**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT survey conventions:** DE.**Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group:** AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Table B10.5

Obstacles for enrolment abroad

Share of students who have not been enrolled and do not plan to (in %)

	Additional financial burden	Separation from partner, child(ren), friends	Loss of paid job	Lack of motivation	Difficult integration of enrolment abroad into the structure of home study programme	Low benefit for studies at home	Insufficient skills in foreign language	Problems with recognition of results achieved abroad	Lack of information provided by HEI	Limited admittance to mobility programmes	Problems with access regulations to the preferred country (visa, residence permit)	Health/disability
AL	47	17	16	13	n.d.	30	18	25	30	26	34	4
AT	65	49	49	34	37	32	14	30	17	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
CH	46	27	31	36	16	23	9	12	7	8	3	n.d.
CZ	64	62	44	39	45	36	41	41	24	20	14	9
DE	70	49	51	31	38	60	22	32	12	31	n.d.	n.d.
DK	54	49	24	27	24	19	10	12	15	16	6	6
EE	72	58	45	29	24	30	20	21	12	9	10	6
FI	63	54	35	28	22	28	25	17	14	9	11	9
FR	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
GE	68	41	34	32	35	26	48	28	33	32	43	17
HR	77	52	29	26	10	30	21	41	36	19	14	4
HU	68	57	43	32	29	23	39	29	31	21	20	16
IE	67	41	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	26	42	16	32	n.d.	12	8
IS	72	55	40	19	17	19	12	14	13	7	8	6
IT*	22	11	n.d.	n.d.	23	n.d.	13	7	8	n.d.	n.d.	t.f.c.
LT	68	44	42	39	21	28	37	27	21	20	16	6
LV	54	49	42	37	27	25	31	18	10	11	16	6
MT	69	48	41	22	32	27	13	19	27	20	10	4
NL	58	50	26	25	28	26	24	9	25	12	5	5
NO	56	55	45	25	19	18	13	15	15	15	3	7
PL	75	62	43	47	53	35	50	42	41	47	38	13
PT	82	53	36	25	34	29	35	31	25	26	31	9
RO	62	40	26	23	26	18	22	23	25	20	19	n.d.
RS	65	40	14	23	28	17	24	23	35	16	28	2
SE	44	49	23	35	19	18	8	10	8	6	4	7
SI	68	41	35	28	29	28	24	26	27	12	12	5
SK	67	58	33	34	40	32	40	36	30	22	18	9
TR	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
av.	62	47	35	30	28	27	25	23	22	18	16	8

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases.

Data source: EUROSTUDENT VI, I.20. **No data:** FR, TR; problems with access regulations to the preferred country (visa, residence permit): AT, DE, IT; limited admittance to mobility programmes: AT, IE; my health/disability: AT, CH, DE; loss of paid job, lack of motivation, difficult integration of enrolment abroad into the structure of my home study programme: IE. **Too few cases:** Health/disability: IT.

EUROSTUDENT question(s): 4.7 To what extent are or were the following aspects an obstacle for enrolment abroad to you?

Note(s): Students assessed possible obstacles to studying abroad on a 5-point scale ranging from "no obstacle" to "big obstacle". The table shows how large a share of students considered certain aspects to be either (4) "quite a big" or (5) "big obstacle".

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT conventions: AT, CH, IT.

Deviations from EUROSTUDENT standard target group: AL, DE, IE, IT, LV, RS.

Chapter B11

Policy considerations

The data presented in the preceding chapters present a broad, comparative perspective on the situation of higher education students in 28 countries of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). Many findings throughout the report show differences between groups of students concerning their access and participation in higher education. Findings are, therefore, relevant with regard to the social dimension of higher education. They can be used at the national level to gain an understanding of the current state, as well as possible starting points for improvement of the social dimension in the higher education system, in order to move towards increased inclusivity and widened participation, as outlined in the latest ministerial communiqué as well as in the Social Dimension Strategy of the EHEA (European Higher Education Area, 2015; Yerevan Communiqué, 2015).

How can EUROSTUDENT data be used as a starting point in policy discussions and evaluations at the national and European level?

Identify underrepresented groups and groups of students who need additional support

The EUROSTUDENT focus groups ([>Chapter A2](#)) make it possible to follow different groups of students throughout all topics. Students can be differentiated based on socio-demographic characteristics, but also with regard to study-related background characteristics, e.g. their  entry qualification into higher education, as well as current study-related and living conditions. [>Chapters B1 and B2](#) show that there is a wide variety across EUROSTUDENT countries. The difference in average age between the ‘youngest’ and ‘oldest’ country amounts to almost 8 years. The share of students with children ranges from 1 % to a third of all students. In many countries, at least a quarter of students up to almost half of students either has a  migration background or has completed secondary school abroad, whereas, in other countries, this does not hold true for even 5 % of students. Large variation also exists with regard to the share of students with impairments, parents’ education and financial status. Nevertheless, some patterns exist that hold in almost all countries: fields of study (still) tend to be highly segregated by gender, and  students without higher education, though varying in their shares, are underrepresented in all countries.

In some cases – as it was possible to do in [>Chapter B2](#) pertaining to students without higher education background – other data may be available which allow a direct comparison between the expected and actual representation of different student groups; e.g. in national registries, statistics on school leaving certificates, or statistical data at the national or European level. Even in the absence of such data, comparing the EUROSTUDENT data on students’ demographic and socio-economic characteristics in comparison to other relevant countries – countries with an (otherwise) similar (student) population, with a similar school and/or higher education system, and with a similar history – can bring into focus specific student groups which are relatively common in otherwise similar countries. This can point towards opportunities for widening access and increasing the participation of these groups in higher education.

Take into account the interplay of different areas of students' lives and studies

EUROSTUDENT data provide insights into different areas of students' lives and studies, ranging from entry into higher education ([>Chapter B3](#)), their study situation ([>Chapter B4](#)), a detailed analyses of their time budget and employment ([>Chapters B5 and B6](#)), their finances ([>Chapters B7 and B8](#)), housing ([>Chapter B9](#)), to mobility experiences ([>Chapter B10](#)). Although presented separately, these aspects are interrelated, so that policy measures aimed at changing one aspect should show an awareness of and, if necessary, take into account the implication for other areas of students' lives.

To present an example: **•** Students without higher education background, for instance, are shown to differ from their peers **•** with higher education background in many respects throughout the report¹:

- Students without higher education background are on average older and tend to enter higher education later than their peers with higher education background. They also more often use **•** alternative access routes. Furthermore, students without higher education background tend to report having had a less clear study intention before entering higher education.
- Once in higher education, students without higher education background tend to be more often found at non-universities than their counterparts and they more often study part-time. Higher shares of students without higher education background tend to be found in short-cycle and Bachelor programmes, and lower shares in long national degrees (often, e.g., medicine, law). They less often plan to continue their studies after a Bachelor's programme and they experience longer breaks between Bachelor and Master's programmes.
- Although their total time budget is, on average, the same as that of students with higher education background, students without higher education background spend more time on paid work. They more often rely on paid employment in order to finance their studies and have higher earnings than their peers with higher education background. Their parents are less well-off than those of students with higher education background. Students without higher education background in paid jobs more often identify as workers studying alongside their job, rather than as students, compared to students with higher education background.
- Students without higher education background more often report financial difficulties. Financial difficulties are more often stated as a reason for past study interruptions by students without higher education background. Moreover, they present a greater obstacle to enrolment abroad for this group.
- Students without higher education background less frequently go abroad during their studies for both enrolment and internships than students with higher education background, although the difference between the two groups is smaller with regard to internships.

Reports in different countries have taken such an approach of looking at the entire living situation and have published reports on specific student groups, e.g. students with impairments (Deutsches Studentenwerk, 2011; Terzieva, Dibiasi, Kulhanek, Zaussinger, & Unger, 2016), students with children (Dibiasi et al., 2015; Régnier-Loilier, & Arnaud, 2017), international students (Apolinarski & Poskowsky, 2013; Swiss Federal Statistical Office, 2015; Zaussinger et al., 2017/2016), or non-traditional students (Haltia, Jauhainen, & Isopahkala-Bouret, 2017).

¹ The presented results for students without higher education background are generalised and based on average values. For the most part, all findings are reflected in each of the EUROSTUDENT countries. Nevertheless, individual countries may differ in the extent to which they apply and in selected aspects.

By following specific student groups ‘throughout the data’, a comprehensive picture can be gained of their situation. This is helpful in several ways: Firstly, it becomes more apparent how measures may be interrelated. For example, an age limit on the eligibility for public student support may affect older students not only through the loss of funds, but also increase the need for paid jobs among these students. If the offered study programmes are not flexible enough to accommodate this, students’ progress may be impeded or even prevented. Secondly, at the same time, it can become clear how a single measure can be beneficial in several respects. For example, providing affordable student housing may not only reduce the burden of accommodation costs, but also lessen the need for paid work, free up more study time, and increase students’ sense of belongingness in higher education.

Draw on further analyses using micro data to better understand the interrelatedness of student characteristics

The different EUROSTUDENT focus groups ([>Chapter A2](#)) overlap: a single student can, at the same time, have children, possess a migration background, be studying at a non-university, and have entered higher education using an  alternative access route. Although the presented analyses in this report tend to focus on the different characteristics of students separately, it should be kept in mind that the categories are not mutually exclusive, but intersect (Gross, Gottburgsen, & Phoenix, 2016).

Additional analyses using micro data can help to better understand the interrelatedness of student characteristics. Taking multiple student characteristics into account simultaneously can help to identify certain ‘types’ of students based on a number of shared characteristics, e.g., among non-traditional students (Haltia, Jauhainen, & Isopahkala-Bouret, 2017). The simultaneous analyses of several factors can also serve to identify those aspects of students’ backgrounds or current study situations which are decisive in shaping a particular result, holding other aspects constant. In this way, it can be better understood how the challenges and benefits inherent in different student characteristics combine to exacerbate or alleviate each other.

Grasping the interrelatedness of different student characteristics also highlights the fact that certain measures implemented to help a particular group of students enter or progress through higher education may serve to improve the conditions of several groups at the same time. For example, flexible study options, e.g.  part-time courses, modular courses, and distance and online courses are ways of creating higher education pathways that can be adapted by different student groups to their personal situations and purposes.

Take existing measures and the context of the higher education system into account

EUROSTUDENT provides a snapshot of the current study and living conditions of higher education students. Different measures with different objectives, targeted towards different student groups, have been in place for varying lengths of time in the 28 countries participating in the current round of the project. While the present report cannot attempt to analyse or even report all of them, further national level analyses can use the presented data (as well as additional data collected at the national level) to take a closer look at how existing measures may be shaping the

patterns found. For example, a clear relation to existing national support schemes for student mobility can be found in the analyses of how students fund their enrolment abroad ([>Chapter B10](#)) – more in-depth analyses could evaluate whether certain measures are effective in reaching their target group as intended.

Finally, previous and later phases of students' educational and/or professional career – i.e., the (secondary) school system and the labour market – are not directly covered by EUROSTUDENT data, but can significantly shape the patterns found. For example, the selectivity of the school system, as well as the availability and attractiveness of alternatives to higher education, i.e. in a vocational system, has a large influence on the composition of possible entrants to higher education. Similarly, for instance, actual and planned transitions into further studies after a completed Bachelor programme ([>Chapter B4](#)) might be reflective of the estimated worth of Bachelor degrees in the national labour market, or the assessment of employment prospects in general.

In summary, although the present report provides a comprehensive, comparative overview of social and economic conditions of students in the EHEA, the full wealth of EUROSTUDENT data has not yet been fully exploited. Additional data and analyses are available in the EUROSTUDENT [>Database](#), as well as the [Thematic Review](#)² on students' paid work. Policy-makers and researchers alike are invited and encouraged to draw on the available data to better understand the social dimension of higher education in their country, with a view to, in the spirit of the EHEA social dimension strategy, "widening participation for equity and growth" (European Higher Education Area, 2015).

² The [Thematic Review](#) is a EUROSTUDENT publication taking a close look at students engaging in paid work alongside their studies. It is available for download on the EUROSTUDENT website www.eurostudent.eu

Part C

Appendix C1

Glossary

Note: Hashtags (#) are used in the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire to indicate that the national questionnaire should be adapted to the national context (if necessary). Therefore, the exact wording in these instances may differ across countries.

A

Age: Age groups are based on students' age at the time of survey.

Alternative access route: See [Entry routes to higher education](#), [\(Higher education\) entry qualification](#).

C

Children, students with: Based on students' self-report on whether they have any children. The question text did not include any specification on parental relation, genetic relation, guardianship, etc.

Concentration of student income: See [Gini coefficient](#).

Contribution from family/partner: Money which students receive from their parents, other relatives, employers, or the person they are sharing their life with. It comprises on the one hand disposable income such as cash/money transfers, which students can freely use for monthly spending (= transfers in cash). On the other hand, it contains so-called transfers in kind. See [Transfers in cash](#), [Transfers in kind](#).

Credit mobility: Short-term mobility with the aim of completing a part of a study programme outside of the country of observation. See [Temporary study period abroad](#), [Degree](#)

[mobility](#), [Enrolment abroad](#), [Study-related activities abroad](#).

Credit points: A unit of formal recognition of students' academic achievements. Within the EHEA credits are generally gained in form of ECTS credit points. See [ECTS](#).

Current (main) study programme: The specific (main) study programme students are enrolled in at the indicated HEI leading to the indicated degree in #country.

D

De facto part-time/full-time students spend up to 20 hours/21 hours or more per week on study-related activities (= taught studies + personal study time) irrespective of the formal status. See [Study intensity](#), [Low intensity students](#), [High intensity students](#), [Part-time status](#)/[Full-time status](#).

Degree mobility: Long-term mobility with the aim of completing an entire degree in the country of observation. See [Credit mobility](#), [Temporary study period abroad](#).

Delayed transition: A delay of more than 24 months after leaving school for the first time and entering higher education. See [Transition route](#), [Direct transition](#).

Dependency on income source: A student is "dependent on an income source", if one of the three sources "support from family/partner" (including transfers in kind), "self-earned income" or "national public student support" provides more than 50% of the student's total income (total income includes transfers in kind). Students with a mixed budget (i.e. no source providing more than 50% of

total income) are not assigned to a group. See [Dependent on family/national public student support/self-earned income](#).

Dependent on family/national public student support/self-earned income: Students are dependent on one of the three sources, if the income source provides more than 50 % of their total income (including transfers in kind). See [Dependency on income source](#).

Direct transition: Students, who entered higher education for the first time with a delay of less than 2 years after leaving the regular school system. See [Transition route](#), [Delayed transition](#).

Domestic student: Domestic students hold a higher education entry qualification from the country of survey or have left the school system for the first time there. See [Educational origin](#), [International students](#).

E

ECTS: The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System. See [Credit points](#).

Educational background: Educational background of students can be categorised into two types: with higher education background and without higher education background. See [Students with/without higher education background](#).

Educational origin: Educational origin of the student is determined based on the origin of the higher education entrance qualification or – in the absence of such a qualification – the place of leaving the school system for the first time. See [International students](#), [Domestic students](#).

Enrolment abroad: Formal status of enrolment outside of the country of observation at a legally recognised HEI and participating in an officially recognised degree programme. See [Temporary study period abroad](#), [Credit mobility](#), [Study-related activities abroad](#).

Entry routes to higher education: Entering higher education using the standard higher education entry qualification or an equivalent is considered to be the standard entry route. Students entering higher education without the standard higher education entry qualification (or an equivalent), or who did not obtain the qualification in direct conjunction (within six months) with leaving the school system for the first time, are defined as having used alternative access routes. See [\(Higher education\) entry qualification](#), [Alternative access route](#).

EUROSTUDENT target group: See Box A3.1.

F

Fees: Fees paid to the HEI, including tuition fees, registration fees, examination fees, and administrative fees.

Field of study: Students can be distinguished based on their field of study (according to ISCED-F2013), e.g. information and communication technologies (ICTs).

Financial difficulties: Two groups can be distinguished based on students' self-assessment. See [Students with/without financial difficulties](#).

Financial status of students' parents: Students were asked to assess the parents' affluence on a five-staged scale from "very well-off" to "not at all well-off". This question is taken from the PIRLS 2006 survey.

G

Gini coefficient: A measure that highlights the concentration of income using a single value for the whole income distribution. The Gini coefficient can take on values between 0 and 1. If there was no concentration of income at all (i.e. each income receiver had the same amount of income), the value of the Gini coefficient would be 0. In case of maximum concentration (i.e. only one person receiving all income) the Gini coefficient would be equal to 1. That means the higher the concentration of income (i.e. the

higher the differences between low and high incomes), the higher the value of the Gini coefficient. See **Concentration of student income**.

Grant: Non-repayable monetary form of student support.

H

(Higher education) entry qualification, standard: Proof of qualification that grants access to higher education, usually an upper secondary qualification at ISCED level 3. In most countries, a common entry qualification exists. This qualification is generally obtained in school or in a nation-wide test usually taking place around the point in time of finishing upper secondary school. Many national names for this type qualification are related to the terms "Matura/maturità" or "Baccalauréat". In EUROSTUDENT terms, this qualification represents the standard entry qualification. This qualification (or an equivalent) can in most countries also be obtained outside of the regular school system, e.g. via bridging courses, second chance/adult education, etc. In some countries it is also possible to enter higher education entirely without this standard entrance requirement, but based on the students' abilities (e.g. in arts), or the students' vocational experience (recognition of prior learning). See **Entry routes to higher education**, **Alternative access route**.

High intensity students spend more than 40 hours a week on study-related activities. See **Study intensity**, **Low intensity students**, **De facto part-time/full-time students**.

I

Impairments, students with: All students with a disability or impairment, long-standing health problems, and functional limitations. To be more precise, physical chronic disease, mental health problems, mobility impairments, sensory impairments (vision and hearing), and learning disabilities (ADHD, dyslexia).

Income, total: Total income includes provisions from family/partner (in cash and in kind), monetary support from national public sources (grants, loans, and scholarships geared towards students), self-earned income, means from other national public and private sources (e.g. child benefits, income from capital), and support from non-country sources, i.e. public or private support items from abroad or international entities (e.g. the EU).

International students: International students are studying in the country of the survey and have left the school system for the first time outside of the country of the survey. That means the status as international student is not related to place of birth, nationality or citizenship. See **Educational origin**, **Domestic students**.

Interruption of current study programme: Official and unofficial breaks within the current study programme of at least two consecutive semesters (≥ 1 year).

ISCED: The International Standard Classification of Education is an instrument to categorise educational programmes by assigning them to levels of education (ISCED 2011), based on the highest attainable degree. The ISCED-F 2013 additionally offers a classification for fields of education and training, at and above the secondary educational level. See **Box B2.1**.

L

Lecture period: Usually 3–4 months, during the course of the semester, when lectures are held and contribute to the students' taught studies is the lecture period.

Lecture-free period: All periods without lecturing, regardless of any possible legal distinction between lecture-free periods and holidays.

Living costs/costs of living: Students' monthly living costs include accommodation, food, social and leisure activities, transportation, health costs, communication, childcare, debt

payment (except mortgage), and other regular costs (e.g. clothing, toiletries).

Low intensity students spend between 0 and 20 hours a week on study-related activities. See [● Study intensity](#), [● High intensity students](#), [● De facto part-time/full-time students](#).

M

Macro perspective: Macro perspective refers to calculation of percentages based on country-level averages. See [● Micro perspective](#).

#Matura: Term used in the EUROSTUDENT core questionnaire to refer to standard [● \(higher education\) entry qualification](#).

Median: The median is a parameter that divides an ordered statistical observation series into two equal parts.

Micro perspective: Micro perspective refers to calculations (of means, medians, percentages) based on individual students' responses. See [● Macro perspective](#).

Migration background: EUROSTUDENT categorises students according to their migration background based on their own and their parents' place of birth. In addition, in order to be able to distinguish international students, EUROSTUDENT considers the place of attainments of the higher education entry qualification, or, in absence of this, the place of first leaving the regular school system (Box B1.1.). The following groups can be distinguished: domestically educated students without migration background, and domestically educated 2nd generation migrants. See [● Students without migration background](#), [● domestically educated](#), [● 2nd generation migrants](#), [● domestically educated](#).

N

National public student support: Monetary support from the state, especially designed for students in higher education. This includes

grants, loans, and scholarships. See [● Public support](#), [● Other national public support](#).

Non-university: Type of HEI other than universities, depending on national legislations, may include universities of applied sciences, polytechnics, professional HEIs and similar institutions, which offer higher education programmes covered in the EUROSTUDENT standard target group. See [● Type of HEI](#), [● University](#).

O

Occasional paid job during term: See [● Paid job during lecture period](#).

Other national public support: General monetary support from the state which is under certain conditions also available for students in higher education. It includes, for instance, child benefits and housing allowance. See [● Public support](#), [● National public student support](#).

P

Paid job during lecture period: Paid work alongside studies during the lecture period. Two kinds of jobs fall under this category: jobs during the entire semester (regular paid job) and jobs from time to time during the lecture period (occasional paid job).

Paid jobs before entering HEI: Labour market experience prior to entering HEI for the first time is separated into two categories: casual minor jobs and regular paid jobs. A casual minor job is labour that lasted less than 1 year or was less than 20 hours per week for which a salary was received. A regular paid job is labour that lasted for at least 1 year and consisted of 20 hours or more per week for which a salary was received.

Parents/Guardian: These terms include all types of legal guardianship, such as own parents, step-parents, foster parents, and guardians.

Part-time status/Full-time status: Formal status of enrolment. See [De facto part-time/full-time students](#).

Personal study time: Time students spend on self-preparation separate from taught studies. This includes: studying, homework, reading, and learning the material. See [Studies, taught](#), [Study-related activities](#).

Programme, Long national degree: National degree programmes in higher education at level ISCED 7. This type of degree might be a traditional degree, e.g. a diploma or a Lizentiat. The traditional long courses, awarding equivalents to Master degrees in certain subject areas, are still common in e.g. law, medicine, architecture and sometimes teacher training. See [Programme, Short national degree](#).

Programme, Short-cycle: Short-cycle higher education programmes (ISCED level 5) are usually practice based, occupation-specific and prepare for direct labour market entry. These programmes have a minimum duration of 2 years, which is also the typical length but can also last for 3 years and may provide a pathway to other higher education programmes. The EUROSTUDENT standard target group covers short cycle programmes if they are regarded to be higher education in a country. In determining students' [educational background](#), no differentiation between short-cycle tertiary and short-cycle higher education is made.

Programme, Short national degree: In contrast to short-cycle programmes (ISCED 5), some countries also offer short national degrees at level ISCED 6. This type of degree is traditional for the country, but does not comply with the Bologna-agreement. Therefore, the programme is not a Bachelor programme, but equivalent to a Bachelor. More information can be found in the ISCED 2011 Operational Manual.

Public support: Public support refers to financial contributions from the state. This includes student-specific support such as grants, loans,

and scholarships but also more general support available also for students, such as child benefits or housing allowance. Public support may be national, i.e. from the country in which the student is studying, or from non-country sources, which means it is paid by a foreign state or international entity such as the EU. See [National public student support](#), [Other national public support](#), [Support from non-country sources](#).

R

Recognition of prior learning (RPL): The process of granting official status to experiences and competences gained outside of the formal education system (e.g. work experience, non-formal courses, self-study, and volunteer work).

Regular paid job during lecture period: Regular refers to jobs carried out continuously throughout the term time without specification of number of hours worked.

Regular work experience: Worked for more than 1 year without interruption and at least 20 hours per week.

S

Second generation migrants, domestically educated: Students with at least one parent born abroad, who were born in the country of survey, and who attended/completed the national school system. See [Migration background](#), [Students without migration background, domestically educated](#).

Self-earned income/own earnings: All self-earned income from paid jobs. Includes savings from self-earned income.

Sex/Gender: EUROSTUDENT data are based on officially registered sex at entry to higher education.

Standard access route: See [\(Higher education\) entry qualification](#), [Entry routes to higher education](#).

Standard deviation (SD): A measure that is used to quantify the amount of variation or dispersion of a set of data values.

Student accommodation: Accommodation provided explicitly for students, often subsidised (by government, HEI, or another organisation).

Students in paid work: Two groups are distinguished based on the extent of their regular paid work during term time, not taking into account working from time to time during the semester or paid jobs during the holidays. See [Students working in paid job up to 20 hours per week](#), [Students without paid work during the semester](#).

Students with/without financial difficulties: See [Financial difficulties](#).

Students with/without higher education background: Students with higher education background, who have parents of which at least one has attained a tertiary education degree. In terms of ISCED 2011, this means that at least one of these students' parents has successfully completed a short-cycle tertiary degree (level 5), a Bachelor's (level 6) or Master's degree (level 7), or a doctorate (level 8) or their national equivalent. In some countries, these national equivalents may not be considered to be a part of higher education (Box B2.1). Students without higher education background have parents whose highest educational degree is no higher than ISCED 2011 level 4 (post-secondary non-tertiary education). See [Educational background](#).

Students without migration background, domestically educated: Students, who were born in the country of survey, as were their parents, and who attended/completed the national school system. See [Migration background](#), [2nd generation migrants, domestically educated](#).

Students without paid work during the semester: See [Students in paid work](#) [Students working in paid job up to 20 hours per week](#).

Students working in paid job up to 20 hours per week: See [Students in paid work](#), [Students without paid work during the semester](#).

Studies, taught: Students' contact hours. Including lectures, tutorials, seminars, lessons, etc. and is reported in clock hours (60 min./hour) regardless of course hours, which may differ from this format.

Study intensity: This indicator groups students into three categories according to their weekly workload in a typical week for study-related activities (taught courses and personal study time). See [High intensity students](#), [Low intensity students](#), [De facto part-time/full-time students](#).

Study-related activities: See [Studies, taught](#), [Personal study time](#).

Study-related activities abroad: All kinds of study-related activities abroad during course of study. The category comprises temporary enrolment, internship/work placement, language course, research stay/fieldtrip, summer/winter school, and other study-related activities abroad. See [Temporary study period abroad](#), [Credit mobility](#), [Enrolment abroad](#).

Study-related costs: Costs that are directly related to studies. Four categories are distinguished: [Fees](#), [social welfare contributions](#), [learning materials](#), and [other regular costs](#).

Support from non-country sources: These are private or public support items which a student receives either from abroad or from an international entity such as the EU. See [Public support](#).

T

Temporary study period abroad: See [Credit mobility](#), [Enrolment abroad](#), [Study-related activities abroad](#).

Thematic Review: The Thematic Review on students' paid work is a EUROSTUDENT publication focusing on this specific topic. It is available on the EUROSTUDENT website: www.eurostudent.eu

Time budget in a typical week: Reports of the time spent on study-related and employment-related activities throughout the course of a typical week (including weekend), reflecting the student's routine during the study term/semester as closely as possible.

Transfers in cash: Money which students received from their parents, other relatives, or partner without specification of what to spend it on. See [Contribution from family/partner](#), [Transfers in kind](#), [Income, total](#).

Transfers in kind: Transfers in kind are living and study-related costs that are not paid by students themselves, but by other persons such as the students' parents, partners, or relatives. The key criterion for transfers in kind is that the payments go directly to the students' creditors, i.e. the respective money is intangible for the students. See [Contribution from family/partner](#), [Transfer in cash](#), [Income, total](#).

Transition route: Duration of transition between leaving school for the first time and entering higher education. See [Delayed transition](#), [Direct transition](#).

Type of HEI: Types of HEIs are distinguished based on national legislation and understanding. Types of HEIs include universities and non-universities. See [University](#), [Non-university](#).

Types of student housing: with parents, alone, with partner/child(ren), with other person(s), and student accommodation.

Type of study programme: Study programmes are classified according to their highest attainable degree in line with ISCED 2011. ISCED 2011 differentiates between short-cycle tertiary education programmes (ISCED 5), Bachelor's or equivalent (ISCED 6), and Master's or equivalent (ISCED 7) programmes. PhD students, doctoral or equivalent level (ISCED 8) are not part of the EUROSTUDENT target group. See [ISCED](#).

U

University: If a distinction between types of HEIs exists within a country, institutions classified as universities are typically allowed to award doctoral degrees. See [Type of HEI](#), [Non-university](#).

Appendix C2

Methodological notes on figures and tables

Chapter B1: Characteristics of national student populations

Figure B1.1, Table B1.1, Table B1.2

CH: Data based on official registry data. **DE:** Only year of birth surveyed, therefore June set as month of birth for all students according to EUROSTUDENT data cleaning instructions. **RO:** Data cleaned and completed with administrative data.

Figure B1.2, Table B1.3

CH: Data based on official registry data. **RO:** Data cleaned and completed with administrative data.

Figure B1.3, Table B1.4

AT: Children of partner who live in the same household are included; children older than 24 are excluded.

Figure B1.4, Figure B1.5

DE: The data for Germany do not include foreign students ('Bildungsausländer'), i.e. students with a foreign higher education entry qualification and a foreign nationality.

Figure B1.6, Figure B1.8

E:VI: AT: Degree of limitation asked for every specific impairment that respondents indicated. Any limitation was counted as limiting for the entire case. **CH:** The national questionnaire used a scale with only three response options. These were assigned to EUROSTUDENT categories 1, 3 and 5. Item 'mobility impairment' in E:VI was changed to 'hard to walk' in the national questionnaire. **DE:** The extent of limitations through any impairments were assessed on a 5-point scale only by students who had previously indicated their impairments to be limiting. Figure B1.6 shows values for students indicating no limitations and very small limitations in the category 'not limited at all'. **FR:** French questionnaire refers to 'chronical disease' instead of 'physical chronical disease'. **NL:** The number of impairments/diseases asked in the Dutch questionnaire is higher than the EUROSTUDENT convention. **SI:** Due to Slovene language specifics and the lack of proper translations of certain words/phrases, 'disability, impairment, long-standing health problem or functional limitation' were replaced with 'the following health problems', which were later listed as separate multiple-choice answer options.

Figure B1.7

AT: Three items were asked: 1. Support by counselling centers; 2. Support by university administration; 3. Support by teachers; and coded together. Response option 'I don't need/want any support' was not offered, instead the category 'don't know' was offered (not shown). **IT:** Response option 'I don't need/want any support' was not offered.

Table B1.5

CH: Item ‘mobility impairment’ in E:VI; item ‘hard to walk’ in the national questionnaire. **FR:** French questionnaire refers to ‘chronical disease’ instead of ‘physical chronical disease’. **NL:** The number of impairments/diseases asked in the Dutch questionnaire is higher than the EUROSTUDENT convention. **SI:** Due to Slovene language specifics and the lack of proper translations of certain words/phrases, ‘disability, impairment, long-standing health problem or functional limitation’ were replaced with ‘the following health problems’, which were later listed as separate multiple-choice answer options.

Chapter B2: Socio-economic background of students**Figure B2.1**

CH: ISCED 5 degrees could not be distinguished.

Table B2.2, Table B2.3

AT: The focus groups ‘students without higher education background’ presented in this figure/table and throughout the report includes students with parents whose highest degree is at ISCED level 5 (short-cycle programmes) as these degrees are not considered to be higher education in Austria. **FR:** Response option ‘do not know’ not offered.

Figure B2.6

AT: Slightly different wording: ‘I often have the feeling that I don’t really belong to my higher education institution’ instead of ‘belonging in higher education’. **HU:** “I always wanted to get a degree” instead of “It was always clear I would study one day” (original phrasing used for international students).

Chapter B3: Transition into and within higher education**Figure B3.1, Figure B3.2, Table B3.1**

AT: Only national students. **CH:** Information from national register of students (Swiss University Information System); duration of transition into higher education is approximated. **DE:** Delay calculated based on month and year of obtaining #Matura or foreign equivalent. **FR:** Delay calculated using the moment of graduation from high school and the first entering into a higher education institution (HEI). **HU:** For domestic students, additional questions were used in order to identify **●** delayed transition and **●** alternative access route students as the questions on higher education entry qualification deviated slightly in order to fit the national context.

Figure B3.3

AT: Only national students. **CH:** Information from national register of students (Swiss University Information System); duration of transition into higher education is approximated. **DE:** The coding of ‘non-traditional’ students was adopted from the German Social Survey (21. Sozialerhebung). Students who were admitted to higher education via the second or third educational pathway were coded as non-traditional students. **EE:** Entry into HE without #Matura not possible in Estonia, so response option ‘no, I do not have a #Matura’ was not offered. **HU:** see notes Figure B3.1.

Figure B3.4, Table B3.2

AT: All international students coded to have standard entry qualification, as the information was not asked. **CH:** Information from national register of students (Swiss University Information System). **DE:** The coding of ‘non-traditional’ students was adopted from the German Social Survey (21. Sozialerhebung). Students who were admitted to higher education via the second or third educational pathway were coded as non-traditional students. **EE:** Entry into higher education without #Matura not possible in Estonia, so response option ‘no, I do not have a #Matura’ was not offered. **HU:** see notes Figure B3.1.

Figure B3.5

AT: The category ‘casual prior work experience’ contains all who worked ‘less than 1 year OR less than 20 h’. No information for ‘periodical work experience’. **FR:** The category ‘casual prior work experience’ contains paid and unpaid employment of less than 1 year or less than 20 h a week. **SK:** Category ‘casual prior work experience’ not offered.

Figure B3.6, Figure B3.7, Table B3.3

CH: Item ‘less than 1 one year after graduating’ is a joint category (1 month to 12 months). **DE:** Time period when previous degree was attained and when enrolment in Master took place asked as drop-down in semesters.

Figure B3.8a–b, Table B3.4

AT, IT: Category ‘within a year after finishing current programme’ contains all students who plan to continue studying at all, regardless of when.

Chapter B4: Types and modes of study**Figure B4.1, Table B4.1**

CH: Information from national register of students (Swiss University Information System).

Figure B4.2, Figure B4.3

CH: Besides Bachelor and Master, all other degrees were defined as ‘other’.

Figure B4.4, Table B4.2

CH: Only two categories in the national questionnaire (no ‘other’); Information from national register of students (Swiss University Information System). **CZ:** Part-time students are those who are studying during the weekend etc. Full-time students go to school on daily basis. **IT:** Question not asked, all cases classified as full-time. **RO:** The question has been asked with an extra response option, ‘distance learning student’.

Figure B4.5a–b, Table B4.3

CH: Information from national register of students (Swiss University Information System).

Figure B4.6

AT: Interruptions refer to two semesters in total, regardless of whether they were consecutive or not. **CZ:** Answer YES split into three additional answers: 1) Yes, I interrupted my studies for at least 1 year (e.g. during my bachelor studies). 2) Yes, I interrupted between graduating from higher

education and re-entering higher education (e.g., between my bachelor and master studies), 3) Yes, I interrupted my studies at least for 1 year between unsuccessful and current studies).

Figure B4.7, Table B4.4

AT: Reasons for the interruption surveyed slightly differently. Labour-market-related reasons included the taking on/intensification of employment as well as internships. Pregnancy and the care of family members were also asked separately. The category 'other reasons' includes 'difficulties with visa' which was asked separately as well.

Chapter B5: Students' time budget

Figure B5.1, Figure B5.2, Figure B5.3, Figure B5.4, Figure 5.5, Table B5.1, Table B5.2, Table B5.3, Table B5.4

CH: Number of response options differs: two additional questions are asked about 1) volunteering activities and 2) about domestic work (care and cleaning activities). **IE:** In a divergence from EUROSTUDENT convention, not all students who worked during terms were asked how many hours they worked. Instead, only students who worked during the 'whole semester' were asked how many hours they worked.

Chapter B6: Students' employment

Figure B6.1, Figure B6.2

CH: Phrasing of question altered; two national questions: "During the last 12 months did you have (a) paid job(s)?" / "Do you have a paid job during the lecture period?". Due to alteration, it is not possible to know if respondents had a paid job at time of survey or previously.

Figure B6.3, Table B6.1

CZ: Additional response option offered: 'Primarily, I am occupied with other duties/activities (e.g. care responsibilities) besides my studies.'

Figure B6.4, Figure B6.5, Table B6.2

AT: Number of response options differs: Regarding the reasons to have a paid job, there are 14 items in the national questionnaire.

Figure B6.6, Table B6.3

CH: Grants and loans from non-country sources (i.e. foreign institutions) cannot be identified as such and thus cannot be differentiated from national public student support. **CZ:** The category 'national public student support' includes data on child benefit. According to the EUROSTUDENT conventions, however, this support item belongs to the category 'other income'. **HU:** see notes Figure B3.1. **IT:** Data on expenses paid by others (e.g. parents, partner, others) in favour of the students (transfers in kind) could not be provided. Data do not include students who are living with parents.

Chapter B7: Students' resources

Figure B7.5, Figure B7.9, Table B7.2, Table B7.3, Table B7.4

CH: Grants and loans from non-country sources (i.e. foreign institutions) cannot be identified as such and thus cannot be differentiated from national public student support. **CZ:** The category 'national public student support' includes data on child benefit. According to the EUROSTUDENT conventions, however, this support item belongs to the category 'other income'.

Figure B7.7

DK: The results for E:V do not contain data on international students. **SK:** For E:V, students from non-universities have not been included in the survey.

Figure B7.8

CH: Grants and loans from non-country sources (i.e. foreign institutions) cannot be identified as such and thus cannot be differentiated from national public student support. **CZ:** The category 'national public student support' includes data on child benefit. According to the EUROSTUDENT conventions, however, this support item belongs to the category 'other income'. **IT:** Data on expenses paid by others (e.g. parents, partner, others) in favour of the students (● transfers in kind) could not be provided. Data do not include students who are living with parents.

Figure B7.10

CH: Grants and loans from non-country sources (i.e. foreign institutions) cannot be identified as such and thus cannot be differentiated from national public student support. **FR:** For the category "repayable national public student support" loans from the public and the private sector could not be distinguished from each other; thus the share of "repayable national public student support" may be exaggerated. Data on "other national public support" could not be provided.

Chapter B8: Students' expenses

Figure B8.1

AL: The survey in Albania did not cover data on students' costs that were not paid by the students themselves, but by others (e.g. paid by parents, other relatives, the partner, or employer; so-called ● transfers in kind). In this case the costs paid only by students (living costs and study-related costs) already sum up to 100 %. Thus, the comparability of the composition of students' expenses is limited. **DE:** The survey in Germany did not cover payments of students and others for the following categories: debt payment (except mortgage), social welfare contributions, and other regular study-related costs. **FR:** For the category "study-related costs" only fees have been taken into account.

Figure B8.2

DE: The survey in Germany did not cover payments of students and others for the following categories: debt payment (except mortgage), social welfare contributions, and other regular study-related costs. **IT:** Data on expenses paid by others (e.g. parents, partner, others) in favour of the students (● transfers in kind) could not be provided. **RO:** The question on total accommodation costs has been split in two questions and the data have been summed up into one variable.

Figure B8.3

AL, IT: Data on expenses paid by others (e.g. parents, partner, others) in favour of the students (⌚ transfers in kind) could not be provided. **RO:** The question on total accommodation costs has been split in two questions and the data have been summed up into one variable.

Figure B8.4

DE: The survey in Germany did not cover all expenditure items as defined by the EUROSTUDENT conventions. **IT:** Data on expenses paid by others (e.g. parents, partner, others) in favour of the students (⌚ transfers in kind) could not be provided. **RO:** The question on total accommodation costs has been split in two questions and the data have been summed up into one variable.

Figure B8.5, Figure B8.6

DE: The survey in Germany did not cover payments of others in favour of the students for the following categories: debt payment (except mortgage), social welfare contributions, and other regular study-related costs. Thus, transfers in kind are not captured completely. **RO:** The question on total accommodation costs has been split in two questions and the data have been summed up into one variable.

Figure B8.7

CH: The survey in Switzerland did not cover payments of students and others for social welfare contributions and other regular study-related costs. Thus, not all data on regular expenses have been captured. **DE:** The survey in Germany did not cover payments of students and others for the following categories: debt payment (except mortgage), social welfare contributions, and other regular study-related costs. Thus, not all data on regular expenses have been captured. **FR:** Data on social welfare contributions, learning materials, and other regular study-related costs could not be delivered.

Figure B8.9

CH: Grants and loans from non-country sources (i.e. foreign institutions) cannot be identified as such and thus cannot be differentiated from national public student support. **FR:** For the category “repayable national public student support” loans from the public and the private sector could not be distinguished from each other.

Table B8.1

FR: For the category “study-related costs” only fees have been taken into account.

Table B8.2

RO: The question on total accommodation costs has been split in two questions and the data have been summed up into one variable.

Chapter B9: Students' housing**Figure B9.2, Figure B9.3, Figure B9.9, Table B9.1, Table B9.3**

FR: Category ‘with partner/children’ only contains own children (not partners). **IT:** Response option ‘living with children’ not provided.

Figure B9.5

AT: Slightly different wording: 'I often have the feeling that I don't really belong to my higher education institution' instead of 'belonging in higher education'.

Chapter B10: Cross-national student mobility**Figure B10.4**

FR: 'Ever been abroad – internship/work placement' in the French questionnaire mentioned only 'internship'.

Table B10.1

AT: Different entry question: 'During your studies in Austria, since the #Semester of first admittance, have you ever been abroad for one of the following study purposes?'. The AT questionnaire did not ask for 'other study-related stays abroad'. **DE:** Response options differ (multiple stays abroad asked, latest recoded manually). **FR:** "Ever been abroad – Internship/work placement" in the French questionnaire mentionned only 'internship'. **RO:** The question on other study related activities abroad has been asked as a multiple choice question. **HU:** see notes Figure B3.1.

Figure B10.5

CH: There are two additional items in the national questionnaire: 1) joint programme, included in 'other programme'; 2) bilateral agreement between two HEIs, included in 'other programme'.

Table B10.2

AT: Different entry question: 'During your studies in Austria, since the #Semester of first admittance, have you ever been abroad for one of the following study purposes?' For those who haven't been enrolled abroad (yet): 'Are you planning to enrol abroad (or to do an internship abroad)?' – 'Yes, I plan an enrolment abroad', 'Yes, I plan an internship abroad', 'Yes, I maybe will enrol abroad or do an internship abroad', 'No, I do not plan an enrolment or internship abroad'. In the EUROSTUDENT variable, answer option 2 (planners) also includes those who said, maybe they will do an enrolment or internship abroad.

Figure B10.8, Table B10.5

AT: In the national questionnaire, students who have not been abroad have been asked if they are planning an enrolment abroad or an internship abroad. In case they were planning to do an internship (first) they were asked about their obstacles in their planning stages. Only students who are planning neither form of stay abroad are included in the following indicators. **CH:** Three items are phrased differently in the national questionnaire: Item 'lack of information provided by my HEI' phrased as 'difficulties to obtain information about studying abroad'; item 'separation from partner, child(ren), friends' phrased as 'separation from my partner, my children'; item 'lack of motivation' phrased as 'no interest'. **IT:** Three-point scale used instead of 5-point scale.

Table B10.4

DE: Response options differ, recognition only in yes/no manner, no differentiation between full and partial recognition.

Appendix C3

Metadata

Table C3.1

Information on survey execution and weighting

	Return rate	Sampling method	Field phase	Survey method	Weighting variables
AL	n/a	stratified probability sample based on HEI (private, public), program level	2016	paper and pencil in classrooms	sex, program level
AT	15 %	full population survey	May–July 2015	online	Depending on the type of HEI and ISCED level we used HEI, age, sex, study field, national/international students (international students furthermore according to their citizenship).
CH	66.4 %	stratified probability sample based on field of study and HEI	24 March–31 May 2016	online	field of study, HEI, sex, age, place of residence before the beginning of the study program
CZ	7.3 %	full population survey	April 2016	online	sex, age, HEI, current study programme
DE	19.6 %	stratified random sampling	May–June 2016	online	sex, age, type of HEI, federal state of the HEI, field of study
DK	31 %	stratified probability sample based on HEI and nationality for universities, university colleges and business academies; full population survey for artistic and cultural educational institutions and maritime educational institutions	27 May–3 July 2016	online	HEI, degree, age, sex, national/international
EE	12 %	stratified random sampling based on HEI, level of studies, sex, entry before or after higher education reform in Estonia; sample based on official registry data	10 May–17 June 2016	online	HEI, level of studies, sex, entry before or after higher education reform
FI	31 %	proportionate stratified random sampling by age, sex, HEI, field of education	Spring semester 2016	online	age, sex, HEI, field of education (CALMAR)
FR	21 %	stratified random sampling	March–May 2016	online	type of HEI, the field of studies, sex, citizenship, age, level of the studies, type of baccalaureat (for universities)
GE	n/a	stratified random sampling	May–June 2016	online, tablet based	HEI, age, sex, programme of study
HR	20.9 %	stratified probability sample, strata represent six types of HEIs (Zagreb Uni, Rijeka Uni, Split Uni, Osijek Uni, Small Universities, HEIs of professional studies) sampled from database of all students in higher education (ISAK)	June 2016	online	raking method by: strata, sex, age, private – public HEIs, part-time – full-time study, FOET and level of study
HU	4 %	stratified non-probability sample based on typology and size of HEI, full population survey within selected HEIs	31 May–3 July 2016	online	sex, age, qualification studied for, HEI type, field of study
IE	10 %	full population survey from participating HEIs	April–May 2016	online	HEI type, sex, age, type of qualification, status
IS	12.1 %	full population survey	3 May–1 July 2016	online	HEI, sex, age, study programme
IT	35 %	quota sample by: sex, age (class of), field of study, programme type, study location	May–June 2017	CATI – computer-assisted telephone interviewing	sex, age (class of), field of study, programme type, study location
LT	2.8 %	full population survey	April–June 2016	online	type of HEI, study intensity (full-time, part-time), sex, age, field of study
LV	n.d.	stratified probability sample based on field of study, study level and urbanisation level	March–May 2017	paper and pencil	age, sex, field of study, study level
MT	11 %	full population survey	May 2016	online	type of institution, age, sex, level of programme
NL	11,6 %	student panel and stratified postal sample stratified on year in study, Masters, international students	June–August 2016	online	HEI type, degree, field of study, age, sex, international students
NO	36.7 %	simple random sampling	May 2016	online	age, sex, HEI type
PL	n.d.	multistage cluster with the randomisation on at least first stage, allocation proportional to number of students	June 2016	online	RIM weighting: region (six categories), type of HEI, sex, size of the HEI, type of programme (Master/other), field of study, study mode, age

Table C3.1 (continued)**Information on survey execution and weighting**

	Return rate	Sampling method	Field phase	Survey method	Weighting variables
PT	1.5 %	full population survey	21 March–11 May 2017	online	combined weight; first level region, HEI type, second level age, sex; finally, area of study, degree
RO	n.d.	stratified probability sample based on qualification studied for (bachelor/master), HEI form of property (public/private), PPS selection of sampling units defined by university-faculty-study domain	May–July 2017	online	
RS	3.3 % (online only)	The online survey (n = 4,941, N = 151,589) was conducted without any sampling: all students from HEIs that have an option of contacting students via email were invited to complete the questionnaire. At other HEIs (n = 1,141, N = 42,867) the stratified probability sample of students based on region, university and the field of study was applied.	19 April–20 June 2017	online, paper and pencil	level of studies, HEI, field of study, HEI type, sex, age
SE	2.3 %	full population survey	April–May 2016	online	sex, age, full-time/part-time/more than part-time, distance studies
SI	6.4 %	total coverage	22 April–30 June 2016	online	age, sex, qualification, type of HEI, form of housing/subsidised accommodation
SK	7.4 %	stratified probability sample based on HEI, formal status as a student and sex	May 2016	online	sex, age, qualification studied for, type of HEI, and formal status
TR	5.9 %	simple random sampling (10 % from each university)	May–July 2017	online	age groups, ISCED-level, sex, region, and field of study

Table C3.2

Key data on national student populations

Share of valid responses, weighted (in %)

	Students in sample (n)	Socio-demographic characteristics of students												Living conditions						
		Sex		Age groups			Educational background		Impairments		Migration background		Dependency on income source			Financial difficulties		Housing		
		Female students	Male students	Up to 21 years	22–24 years	25–29 years	30 years or over	With HE background	Without HE background	Students with impairments	Students without impairments	Students without migration background, domestically educated	2 nd generation migrants, domestically educated	Dependent on family support	Dependent on self-earned income support	Dependent on national public student support	With financial difficulties	Without financial difficulties	Living with parents	Not living with parents
AL	2414	59	41	65	22	8	5	43	57	7	93	96	0.2	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	34	27	52	48
AT	43632	55	45	23	29	28	20	36	64	14	86	68	8	41	35	7	26	49	20	80
CH	15825	52	48	17	38	32	13	58	42	18	82	53	24	54	35	4	17	57	43	57
CZ	16652	58	42	31	41	17	12	48	52	15	85	85	5	60	32	2	17	57	30	70
DE	53161	48	52	27	30	30	12	73	27	23	77	81	13	52	25	12	18	68	21	79
DK	11826	56	44	18	45	25	12	75	25	21	79	74	8	12	8	67	28	48	8	92
EE	2037	60	40	25	30	22	23	67	33	16	84	81	12	40	43	8	22	48	24	76
FI	7381	53	47	18	28	26	28	68	32	28	72	73	2	20	27	39	18	53	4	96
FR	41896	53	47	54	29	12	5	60	40	10	90	67	17	48	16	28	23	45	33	67
GE	7558	53	47	52	36	10	2	69	31	8	92	92	2	85	9	1	39	30	66	34
HR	4978	57	43	37	35	19	9	42	58	16	84	74	18	73	16	6	27	44	51	49
HU	7202	54	46	31	34	17	19	54	46	15	85	89	4	52	32	9	23	47	37	63
IE	20274	51	49	55	17	9	19	55	45	20	80	63	9	61	21	10	36	33	38	62
IS	1978	63	37	12	29	23	35	53	47	39	61	86	3	26	47	15	35	39	28	72
IT	5000	56	44	30	37	25	8	31	69	14	86	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	69	31	
LT	3363	60	40	46	31	13	11	54	46	24	76	89	6	59	29	4	26	41	30	70
LV	2340	58	42	33	32	20	15	65	35	15	85	81	15	49	40	2	29	39	32	68
MT	1423	53	47	46	25	14	14	38	62	13	87	80	9	37	40	10	30	36	73	27
NL	12092	52	48	33	44	16	7	54	46	36	64	82	10	26	14	30	14	65	42	58
NO	8235	61	39	22	30	23	25	78	22	23	77	79	9	7	28	52	27	47	9	91
PL	3098	59	41	40	39	12	9	40	60	20	80	97	1	46	33	11	38	36	40	60
PT	5056	53	47	49	23	12	16	35	65	24	76	78	13	72	17	8	24	41	49	51
RO	4164	54	46	51	27	9	13	42	58	7	93	n.d.	n.d.	63	21	10	25	38	32	68
RS	6514	56	44	48	34	14	4	56	44	7	93	77	15	96	2	1	28	37	48	52
SE	8585	60	40	17	31	26	26	64	36	27	73	60	15	14	22	52	18	60	13	87
SI	4968	58	42	37	37	18	8	51	49	21	79	85	11	44	32	11	38	29	48	52
SK	1457	58	42	53	29	8	10	41	59	13	87	94	5	61	29	4	19	50	44	56
TR	25644	45	55	44	25	19	12	27	73	11	89	93	2	49	16	22	21	48	29	71

n.d.: no data.

Note(s): Rounded values are shown. Decimal points are only shown for values below 0.5.

Table C3.2 (continued)

Key data on national student populations

Share of valid responses, weighted (in %)

	Study conditions															Study-related background							
	Field of study							Study intensity			Type of HEI		Type of study programme		Access route		Educational origin		Transition route				
	Arts and humanities	Engineering, manufacturing and construction	Education (incl. teacher training)	Social sciences, journalism and information	Business, administration and law	Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics	ICTs	Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary	Health and welfare	Services	Low intensity	Medium intensity	High intensity	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master	Standard access route	International students	Domestic students	Delayed transition	Direct transition	
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	12	53	35	95	5	68	24	9	91	2	98	9	91
AT	12	14	16	16	19	10	6	1	7	1	29	46	25	82	18	54	24	8	92	21	79	22	78
CH	12	13	13	10	24	9	3	1	13	1	19	49	32	57	43	73	26	13	87	16	84	13	87
CZ	11	16	11	12	16	9	7	5	10	2	27	48	25	93	7	63	28	2	98	9	91	10	90
DE	10	22	13	8	20	7	6	2	9	3	19	52	29	65	35	62	23	5	95	n.d.	n.d.	17	83
DK	17	16	11	21	7	7	3	n.d.	18	n.d.	11	51	38	58	42	49	18	8	92	9	91	19	81
EE	11	17	6	9	21	7	8	2	14	4	28	48	25	80	20	69	23	7	93	6	94	15	85
FI	12	19	5	7	19	6	10	2	17	4	21	48	31	51	49	68	32	n.d.	19	81	27	73	
FR	14	17	3	9	25	10	3	t.f.c.	10	8	26	43	31	71	29	35	27	1	99	13	87	5	95
GE	14	7	2	37	14	4	4	5	11	4	14	51	35	100	n/a	82	11	3	97	3	97	4	96
HR	8	18	6	6	31	4	6	4	10	6	20	47	33	81	19	63	20	19	81	1	99	7	93
HU	9	19	11	6	26	4	5	5	11	4	27	44	29	81	19	67	17	3	97	5	95	16	84
IE	19	11	7	5	18	15	10	2	10	3	17	51	32	52	48	78	12	8	92	14	86	12	88
IS	13	12	9	21	18	7	8	2	11	n.d.	15	42	43	100	n/a	71	24	29	71	6	94	27	73
IT	14	17	5	12	22	9	2	3	16	n.d.	17	38	45	100	n/a	63	17	n.d.	100	n.d.	n.d.	6	94
LT	9	19	5	10	30	4	3	2	15	3	21	51	28	71	29	76	14	2	98	3	97	9	91
LV	10	19	4	7	23	3	8	1	19	5	22	56	22	59	41	51	30	6	94	3	97	15	85
MT	15	9	4	11	22	7	10	t.f.c.	17	3	17	36	47	79	21	60	26	28	72	6	94	n.d.	n.d.
NL	7	9	12	10	26	6	3	1	17	7	25	52	22	36	64	85	15	26	74	6	94	16	84
NO	8	12	17	9	21	7	4	1	20	t.f.c.	23	49	28	54	46	53	25	16	84	6	94	22	78
PL	9	20	8	12	23	4	5	2	9	9	14	56	29	78	22	64	26	4	96	1	99	7	93
PT	9	25	3	9	22	5	3	2	14	7	11	47	42	61	39	63	17	22	78	3	97	17	83
RO	10	23	4	12	18	6	8	6	13	t.f.c.	23	49	28	100	n/a	66	21	4	96	3	97	7	93
RS	13	18	7	11	20	7	7	5	9	4	22	43	35	100	n.d.	80	13	2	98	5	95	16	84
SE	8	16	11	12	12	11	8	1	21	1	27	48	25	100	n/a	40	23	10	90	17	83	28	72
SI	10	21	6	10	16	8	5	4	14	8	20	43	37	77	23	58	21	6	94	3	97	6	94
SK	8	9	9	14	26	7	10	4	9	3	23	51	26	86	14	60	33	1	99	0.4	100	16	84
TR	11	23	8	8	24	4	4	3	10	5	33	48	19	100	n/a	53	14	n.d.	n.d.	3	97	15	85

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Note(s): Rounded values are shown. Decimal points are only shown for values below 0.5.

Table C3.3

Key data on national student populations

Share of valid responses, unweighted (in %)

	Students in sample (n)	Socio-demographic characteristics of students												Living conditions							
		Sex		Age groups			Educational background		Impairments		Migration background		Dependency on income source			Financial difficulties		Housing			
		Female students	Male students	Up to 21 years	22–24 years	25–29 years	30 years or over	With HE background	Without HE background	Students with impairments	Students without impairments	Students without migration background, domestically educated	2 nd generation migrants, domestically educated	Dependent on family support	Dependent on self-earned income	Dependent on national public student support	With financial difficulties	Without financial difficulties	Living with parents	Not living with parents	
AL	2414	66	34	87	9	3	1	44	56	6	94	96	0	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	31	31	55	45	
AT	44619	63	37	23	33	28	17	34	66	14	86	74	9	41	35	7	25	51	21	79	
CH ¹	15825	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	
CZ	16653	60	40	35	43	14	8	55	45	15	85	84	5	64	28	2	16	59	28	72	
DE	53161	55	45	28	35	30	8	74	26	23	77	82	12	55	23	12	17	69	20	80	
DK	11827	53	47	17	38	30	16	73	27	22	78	68	7	14	10	62	31	43	7	93	
EE	2077	62	38	26	29	21	24	68	32	15	85	82	11	40	42	8	21	49	23	77	
FI	7381	61	39	18	30	26	25	69	31	28	72	73	2	20	26	41	18	52	4	96	
FR	41896	63	37	62	27	8	3	62	38	9	91	75	16	51	15	27	19	49	32	68	
GE	7579	62	38	61	29	8	2	70	30	8	92	92	2	84	10	1	38	32	67	33	
HR	5074	68	32	47	38	11	4	43	57	16	84	74	18	76	12	6	25	46	51	49	
HU	7202	67	33	38	31	14	17	57	43	15	85	88	5	54	28	10	22	48	37	63	
IE	20274	60	40	52	21	10	18	55	45	20	80	62	9	61	19	11	37	31	38	62	
IS	1978	73	27	11	29	25	35	53	47	39	61	85	3	27	46	15	35	39	27	73	
IT	5000	56	44	33	40	22	5	31	69	14	86	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	69	31		
LT	3363	75	25	53	32	9	7	54	46	25	75	94	6	64	24	4	25	41	29	71	
LV	2363	66	34	48	27	13	12	64	36	15	85	82	14	55	34	3	27	39	33	67	
MT	1423	58	42	42	23	14	21	34	66	13	87	79	8	36	42	9	30	35	68	32	
NL	12092	67	33	53	32	11	4	59	41	35	65	87	9	30	9	28	12	67	42	58	
NO	8237	62	38	21	31	24	24	78	22	23	77	79	9	7	27	53	27	47	9	91	
PL	3098	69	31	42	43	10	5	41	59	19	81	97	1	56	21	13	38	37	36	64	
PT	4884	71	29	52	24	10	13	35	65	25	75	77	13	74	14	9	24	40	44	56	
RO	4172	72	28	47	35	8	9	49	51	8	92	n.d.	n.d.	73	15	7	24	39	30	70	
RS	6082	59	41	48	36	12	4	58	42	6	94	76	16	96	2	1	26	39	49	51	
SE	8585	66	34	18	31	27	23	64	36	27	73	60	15	14	16	58	19	59	12	88	
SI	4968	71	29	43	37	15	5	51	49	22	78	87	9	47	27	13	38	28	40	60	
SK	1482	62	38	55	35	5	5	42	58	13	87	94	5	65	24	4	18	51	46	54	
TR	22359	57	43	57	32	8	3	23	77	9	91	95	2	50	7	30	20	45	22	78	

¹ no unweighted data published

n.d.: no data.

Note(s): Rounded values are shown. Decimal points are only shown for values below 0.5.

Table C3.3 (continued)

Key data on national student populations

Share of valid responses, unweighted (in %)

	Study conditions																		Study-related background					
	Field of study									Study intensity			Type of HEI		Type of study programme		Access route		Educational origin		Transition route			
	Arts and humanities	Engineering, manufacturing and construction	Education (incl. teacher training)	Social sciences, journalism and information	Business, administration and law	Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics	ICTs	Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary	Health and welfare	Services	Low intensity	Medium intensity	High intensity	University	Non-university	Bachelor	Master	Standard access route	International students	Domestic students	Delayed transition	Direct transition		
AL	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	8	52	40	96	4	75	15	8	92	2	98	6	94	
AT	11	14	17	15	17	10	5	2	10	1	27	47	26	77	23	55	24	7	93	13	87	20	80	
CH ¹	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	
CZ	10	24	8	9	14	10	9	2	13	2	22	47	31	96	4	59	29	1	99	10	90	7	93	
DE	10	22	14	8	17	9	6	2	9	3	18	52	30	69	31	61	23	3	97	n.d.	n.d.	15	85	
DK	17	28	9	12	13	4	5	n.d.	12	n.d.	10	48	42	33	67	43	12	12	88	19	81	24	76	
EE	13	14	7	9	21	6	9	1	15	5	26	47	27	77	23	64	27	7	93	6	94	14	86	
FI	12	18	5	6	18	6	9	2	19	4	20	49	31	51	49	69	31	n.d.	n.d.	18	82	26	74	
FR	14	25	4	8	20	10	2	t.f.c.	10	7	23	44	33	66	34	34	21	0.3	100	7	93	2	98	
GE	15	5	3	39	16	3	2	4	10	3	15	51	35	100	n/a	76	19	2	98	3	97	3	97	
HR	8	19	7	9	26	6	6	4	13	2	17	46	38	88	12	66	19	10	90	1	99	3	97	
HU	15	11	16	9	24	7	5	2	8	4	26	45	29	80	20	63	20	2	98	5	95	14	86	
IE	20	10	7	5	18	15	9	2	11	3	14	51	36	52	48	81	11	9	91	15	85	13	87	
IS	13	11	9	21	19	7	7	2	11	n.d.	14	42	44	100	n/a	68	27	29	71	7	93	27	73	
IT	13	17	6	12	21	10	2	5	15	n.d.	15	39	46	100	n/a	63	18	n.d.	100	n.d.	n.d.	5	95	
LT	11	16	5	11	20	6	4	3	22	2	17	53	30	71	29	76	12	2	98	3	97	6	94	
LV	9	16	7	6	22	4	7	4	19	5	20	59	22	61	39	63	22	5	95	3	97	11	89	
MT	16	7	5	11	25	6	12	t.f.c.	16	3	21	37	43	76	24	62	22	32	68	7	93	n.d.	n.d.	
NL	9	10	12	11	17	11	3	2	21	4	20	54	25	52	48	79	20	17	83	2	98	9	91	
NO	9	12	16	9	20	8	4	1	20	t.f.c.	22	49	29	59	41	52	26	15	85	6	94	22	78	
PL	3	21	4	12	24	2	5	4	18	8	12	51	37	84	16	57	24	3	97	1	99	5	95	
PT	11	15	3	16	18	7	1	2	21	6	11	44	46	67	33	60	20	19	81	3	97	14	86	
RO	8	16	3	7	10	4	4	6	42	t.f.c.	16	41	43	100	n/a	48	10	4	96	3	97	5	95	
RS	8	12	2	9	22	6	8	4	18	11	19	40	41	100	n.d.	72	12	1	99	5	95	15	85	
SE	8	15	12	13	12	10	7	1	23	1	19	51	29	100	n/a	43	23	10	90	17	83	30	70	
SI	11	17	8	11	14	9	3	4	16	7	17	42	40	81	19	58	21	4	96	2	98	4	96	
SK	9	10	10	13	25	9	10	4	9	3	20	52	28	92	8	60	33	1	99	0.4	100	11	89	
TR	11	15	16	14	19	3	2	2	11	5	32	49	19	100	n/a	68	6	n.d.	n.d.	2	98	8	92	

¹ no unweighted data published

n.d.: no data. t.f.c.: too few cases. n/a: not applicable.

Note(s): Rounded values are shown. Decimal points are only shown for values below 0.5.

Appendix C4

References

Aassve, A., Arpino, B., & Billari, F. C. (2013). Age norms on leaving home: Multilevel evidence from the European social survey. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(2), 383–401. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a4563>

Ahlstrand, A. (2017). Introduction to the conference theme [lecture slides]. In *Conference report. Refugees' impact on Bologna reform. Recognition of prior learning and inclusion in the light of increased migration*. Malmö, Sweden: Swedish Council for Higher Education (UHR).

Aina, C., Baici, E., & Casalone, G. (2011). Time to degree: Students' abilities, university characteristics or something else? Evidence from Italy. *Education Economics*, 19(3), 311–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2011.585016>

Antonucci, L. (2016). *Student lives in crisis: Deepening inequality in times of austerity*. Bristol, United Kingdom: Policy Press.

Apolinarski, B., & Poskowsky, J. (2013). Ausländische Studierende in Deutschland 2012: Ergebnisse der 20. Sozialerhebung des Deutschen Studentenwerks durchgeführt vom Deutschen Zentrum für Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsforschung (DZHW) [International students in Germany 2012]. Retrieved from BMBF website: www.bmbf.de

Arum, R., Shavit, Y., & Gamoran, A. (2007). More inclusion than diversion. Expansion, differentiation, and market structure in higher education. In Y. Shavit, R. Arum, & A. Gamoran (Eds.), *Studies in Social Inequality. Stratification in higher education. A comparative study* (pp. 1–35). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Astin, A. W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 518–529.

Atherton, G., Dumangane, C., & Whitty, G. (2016). *Charting equity in higher education: Drawing the global access map*. London, United Kingdom: Pearson.

Avdic, D., & Gartell, M. (2015). Working while studying? Student aid design and socioeconomic achievement disparities in higher education. *Labour Economics*, 33, 26–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2015.01.002>

Bargel, T. (2006). Soziale Ungleichheit im Hochschulzugang und Studienverlauf [Social inequality in higher education access and course of study]. Konstanz, Germany. Retrieved from http://www.ssoarinfo/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/23663/ssoar-2006-bargel-soziale_ungleichheit_im_hochschulzugang_und.pdf?sequence=1

Bar Haim, E., & Shavit, Y. (2013). Expansion and inequality of educational opportunity: A comparative study. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 31, 22–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2012.10.001>

Becker, R., & Hecken, A. E. (2009). Why are working-class children diverted from universities? An empirical assessment of the diversion thesis. *European Sociological Review*, 25(2), 233–250. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcn039>

Beerkens, M., Mägi, E., & Lill, L. (2011). University studies as a side job: Causes and consequences of massive student employment in Estonia. *Higher Education*, 61(6), 679–692. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9356-0>

Beerkens, M., Souto-Otero, M., Wit, H. de, & Huisman, J. (2016). Similar students and different countries? An analysis of the barriers and drivers for Erasmus participation in seven countries. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20(2), 184–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315315595703>

Belloc, F., Maruotti, A., & Petrella, L. (2010). University drop-out: An Italian experience. *Higher Education*, 60(2), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9290-1>

Berlin Communiqué (2003). Realising the European Higher Education Area: Communiqué of the Conference of Ministers responsible for higher education. Retrieved from European Higher Education Area website: www.ehea.info

Blossfeld, P.N., Blossfeld, G.J., & Blossfeld, H.-P. (2015). Educational expansion and inequalities in educational opportunity: Long-term changes for East and West Germany. *European Sociological Review*, 31(2), 144–160. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcv017>

BMWFW (2016). Materialien zur sozialen Lage der Studierenden 2016 [Materials on the social situation of students 2016]. Vienna, Austria: BMWFW.

Body, K. M.-D., Bonnal, L., & Giret, J.-F. (2014). Does student employment really impact academic achievement? The case of France. *Applied Economics*, 46(25), 3061–3073. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2014.920483>

Bologna Declaration (1999). The Bologna Declaration of June 1999: Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education. Retrieved from https://www.eurashe.eu/library/modernising-phe/Bologna_1999_Bologna-Declaration.pdf

Bonaccorsi, A. (2017). What ETER tells us about the regional dimension of European higher education (ETER brief No. 4). Retrieved from [https://eter-project.com/assets/pdf/ETER_RegionalDimension.pdf](https://eter-project.com/assets/pdf/ETERRegionalDimension.pdf)

Boudon, R. (1974). Education, opportunity and social inequality: *Changing prospects in western society*. New York, NY: Halsted Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Breen, R., & Goldthorpe, J. H. (1997). Explaining educational differentials: Towards a formal rational action theory. *Rationality and Society*, 9(3), 275–305.

Brennan, J., & Naidoo, R. (2008). Higher education and the achievement (and/or prevention) of equity and social justice. *Higher Education*, 56(3), 287–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-008-9127-3>

Brooks, R. (2008). Accessing higher education: the influence of cultural and social capital on university choice. *Sociology Compass*, 2(4). Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00134.x/epdf>

Brooks, R. (2012). Student-parents and higher education: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Education Policy*, 27(3), 423–439. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2011.613598>

Brooks, R. (2013). International students with dependent children: The reproduction of gender norms. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36(2), 195–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2013.820128>

Brooks, R. (2017). Understanding the higher education student in Europe: A comparative analysis. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 18(4), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2017.1318047>

Brown, R. (2017). Higher education and inequality. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 2016(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2017.1375442>

Brown, S., Ortiz-Núñez, A., & Taylor, K. (2011). Educational loans and attitudes towards risk. Working Paper (Sheffield Economic Research Paper Series No. 2011010). Retrieved from The University of Sheffield website: www.shef.ac.uk/economics

Bucharest Communiqué (2012). Making the most of our potential: Consolidating the European Higher Education Area. Final version. Retrieved from European Higher Education Area website: www.ehea.info

Buchmann, M. C., & Kriesi, I. (2011). Transition to adulthood in Europe. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37(1), 481–503. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150212>

Burston, M.A. (2016). I work and don't have time for that theory stuff: time poverty and higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2015.1135885>

Callender, C. (2008). The impact of term-time employment on higher education students' academic attainment and achievement. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(4), 359–377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930801924490>

Callender, C., & Jackson, J. (2005). Does the fear of debt deter students from higher education? *Journal of Social Policy*, 34(4), 509–540. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004727940500913X>

Callender, C., & Mason, G. (2017). Does student loan debt deter higher education participation? New evidence from England. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 671(1), 20–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716217696041>

Carlson, S. (2013). Becoming a mobile student – a processual perspective on German degree student mobility. *Population, Space and Place*, 19(2), 168–180.

Caro, D. H., & Cortés, D. (2012). Measuring family socioeconomic status: An illustration using data from PIRLS 2006 (IERI Monograph Series: Issues and Methodologies in Large-Scale Assessments Volume 5).

Charles, N. (2016). Les étudiants français à la vitesse TGV: L'individualisation des parcours d'études à l'aune des cas anglais et suédois [French students at TGV speed: The individualisation of study paths in the light of English and Swedish cases]. *OVE Infos*. (31). Retrieved from http://www.ove-national.education.fr/medias/OVE_Infos_n31_Nicolas_Charles.pdf

Clancy, P., & Goastellec, G. (2007). Exploring access and equity in higher education: Policy and performance in a comparative perspective. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 61(2), 136–154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2007.00343.x>

Cole, J.S. (2017). Concluding comments about student transition to higher education. *Higher Education*, 73(3), 539–551. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0091-z>

Council of the European Union (2011). Council conclusions on a benchmark for learning mobility. Retrieved from EUR-Lex website: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html>

Creed, P.A., French, J., & Hood, M. (2015). Working while studying at university: The relationship between work benefits and demands and engagement and well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 86, 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.11.002>

Dabla-Norris, E., Kochhar, K., Suphaphiphat, N., Ricka, F., & Tsounta, E. (2015). Causes and consequences of income inequality: A global perspective. IMF staff discussion note: 15/13. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.

Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science (2017). Opgørelse af undervisningstid mv. med data fra Eurostudent [Assignment of teach-

ing hours, etc. With data from Eurostudent]. Retrieved from Ministry of Higher Education and Science website: www.ufm.dk

Darmody, M., Smyth, E., & Unger, M. (2008). Field of study and students' workload in higher education: Ireland and Austria in comparative perspective. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 49(4–5), 329–346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715208093080>

Darolia, R. (2014). Working (and studying) day and night: Heterogeneous effects of working on the academic performance of full-time and part-time students. *Economics of Education Review*, 38, 38–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2013.10.004>

Deutsches Studentenwerk (2011). Beeinträchtigt studieren: Datenerhebung zur Situation Studierender mit Behinderung und chronischer Krankheit 2011 [Studying while impaired: Data collection on the situation of students with disability and chronic illness 2011]. Vienna, Austria.

Dibiasi, A., Kulhanek, A., & Brenner, J. (2015). Studierende mit Kindern: Zusatzbericht der Studierenden-Sozialerhebung 2015 [Students with children]. Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from Institut für Höhere Studien (IHS) website: www.sozialerhebung.at

Di Pietro, G. (2015). Do study abroad programs enhance the employability of graduates? *Education Finance and Policy*, 10(2), 223–243. https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00159

European Commission (n.d.). Education and training: education and migrants: Higher education for migrants and refugees. Retrieved Jan 15, 2018, from http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/migration/higher-education-refugees_en

European Commission (2010). European disability strategy 2010–2020: A renewed commitment to a barrier-free Europe. Brussels, Belgium. Retrieved from European Disability Forum web-

site: <http://edf-eph.org/disability-strategy-europe-2020>

European Commission (2014). Erasmus impact study. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission (2017a). Communication from the European Commission to the European Parliament, the council, the European Economic and Social Committee of the regions: On a renewed EU agenda for higher education (No. 247). Brussels, Belgium. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/he-com-2017-247_en.pdf

European Commission (2017b). Education and training: Monitor 2017. Education and Training. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission (2017c). [Interactive map] Higher education indicators: Scoreboard indicator 3: Portability of domestic public grants and publicly-subsidized loans. Retrieved from <https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/en/mobility-scoreboard/higher-education-indicators/scoreboard-indicator-3-portability-domestic-public>

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2012). The European higher education area in 2012: Bologna process implementation report. Brussels, Belgium: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA Pg Eurydice).

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2015). The European higher education area in 2015: Bologna process implementation report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2016). National student fee and support systems in higher education 2016/2017: Eurydice Facts and Figures. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Higher Education Area (2015). Widening participation for equity and growth: A strategy for the development of the social dimension and lifelong learning in the European Higher Education Area to 2020. Retrieved from EUROPEAN Higher Education Area website: www.ehea.info

Eurostat (2017a). GDP per capita in PPS. [Table]. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=teco0114&plugin=1>

Eurostat (2017b). Main GDP aggregates per capita. [Table]. Retrieved from http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=nama_10_pc&lang=en

Eurostat (2017c). Purchasing power parities (PPPs), price level indices and real expenditures for ESA 2010 aggregates. [Table]. Retrieved from <http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/submitViewTableAction.do>

Eurostat & HIS. (2009). The Bologna Process in higher education in Europe: Key indicators on the social dimension and mobility. Eurostat: Statistical books. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publication of the European Communities.

Eurostat Statistics Explained (2017). Tertiary education statistics. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Tertiary_education_statistics#Gender_distribution_of_participation

Fernex, A., Lima, L., & Vries, E. de (2014). Exploring time allocation for academic activities by university students in France. *Higher Education*, 69(3), 399–420. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9782-5>

Fields, T.J., Earhart, C., Liu, T., & Campbell, H. (2015). A hedonic model for off-campus student housing: the value of proximity to campus. *Housing and Society*, 40(1), 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08882746.2013.11430608>

Finger, C. (2013). Diversität im Ausland? Die soziale Selektivität studentischer Mobilität im Rahmen des Bologna Prozesses [Diversity abroad? The social selectivity of student mobility within the framework of the Bologna Process]. *Qualität in der Wissenschaft*, (2), 37–45.

Fischer, P., & Gerhard Ortega, S. (2015). Internationale Studierende an den Schweizer Hochschulen: Themenbericht der Erhebung 2013 zur sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Lage der Studierenden [International students at Swiss universities] (Statistik der Schweiz). Neuchâtel, Switzerland. Retrieved from Federal Statistical Office website: <https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/en/home.html>

Flannery, D., & Cullinan, J. (2014). Where they go, what they do and why it matters: the importance of geographic accessibility and social class for decisions relating to higher education institution type, degree level and field of study. *Applied Economics*, 46(24), 2952–2965. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2014.916392>

Forsyth, A., & Furlong, A. (2003). Access to higher education and disadvantaged young people. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(2), 205–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192032000060948>

Garaz, S., & Torotcoi, S. (2017). Increasing Access to Higher Education and the Reproduction of Social Inequalities: The Case of Roma University Students in Eastern and Southeastern Europe. *European Education*, 49(1), 10–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10564934.2017.1280334>

Georg, W., & Bargel, E. (2017). Parental qualifications as determinants of university entrance and choice of a field of study in Germany. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 7(1), 78–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2017.1265777>

Griga, D. (2013). Factors influencing the chances of immigrant and non-immigrant groups to access higher education in the EU

countries. In A. F. Camilleri & K. Mühleck (Eds.), *Evolving diversity II. Participation of students with an immigrant background in European higher education* (pp. 7–15). Brussels, Belgium: MENON Network.

Griga, D., & Hadjar, A. (2014). Migrant background and higher education participation in Europe: the effect of the educational systems. *European Sociological Review*, 30(3), 275–286. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jct031>

Gross, C., Gottburgsen, A., & Phoenix, A. (2016). Education systems and intersectionality. In A. Hadjar & C. Gross (Eds.), *Education systems and inequalities. International comparisons* (pp. 51–72). Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.1332/policypress/9781447326106.003.0004>

Gwosć, C., & Engel, S. (2015). Intelligence Brief: The importance of student accommodation in European higher education. Retrieved from http://www.eurostudent.eu/download_files/documents/Gwosc_2015_Student_Accommodation.pdf

Gwosć, C., & Hauschmidt, K. (2016). Income and Purchasing Power of students in Europe. EUROSTUDENT Intelligence Brief 1/2016. Retrieved from www.eurostudent.eu/download_files/documents/IB_income_purchasing_power.pdf

Haltia, N., Jauhainen, A., & Isopahkala-Bouret, U. (2017). Non-upper secondary school graduates in higher education: Eurostudent VI article series. (Publications of the Ministry of Education and Culture, Finland 2017:28). Retrieved from http://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/80047/OKM_28_2017.pdf

Hauschmidt, K., Gwosć, C., Netz, N., & Mishra, S. (2015). *Social and Economic Conditions of Student Life in Europe: Synopsis of Indicators*. EUROSTUDENT V 2012–2015. Bielefeld, Germany: W. Bertelsmann Verlag.

Heldmark, T., & Lubick, N. (2017). Conference report: Refugees' impact on Bologna reform. *Recognition of prior learning and inclusion in the light of increased migration*. Malmö, Sweden. Retrieved from Swedish Council for Higher Education (UHR) website: Swedish Council for Higher Education

Heublein, U., Ebert, J., Hutzsch, C., Isleib, S., König, R., Richter, J., & Wöisch, A. (2017). *Zwischen Studienerwartungen und Studienwirklichkeit: Ursachen des Studienabbruchs, beruflicher Verbleib der Studienabbrecherinnen und Studienabbrecher und Entwicklung der Studienabbruchquote an deutschen Hochschulen* [Between study expectations and study reality]. Forum Hochschule. Hannover, Germany: Deutsches Zentrum für Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsforschung.

Holmegaard, H. T., Madsen, L. M., & Ulrikssen, L. (2017). Why should European higher education care about the retention of non-traditional students? *European Educational Research Journal*, 16(1), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904116683688>

Hovdhaugen, E. (2013). Working while studying: The impact of term-time employment on dropout rates. *Journal of Education and Work*, 631–651. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2013.869311>

Jackson, M., Jonsson, J. O., & Rudolphi, F. (2012). Ethnic inequality in choice-driven education systems: A longitudinal study of performance and choice in England and Sweden. *Sociology of Education*, 85(2), 158–178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040711427311>

Kelo, M., Teichler, U., & Wächter, B. (2006). Toward improved data on student mobility in Europe: Findings and concepts of the Eurodata study. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 194–223.

Keute, A.-L. (2017). *For mye betalt arbeid går på bekostning av studietiden* [Too much paid work is at the expense of study time]. Retrieved from Statistics Norway website: <http://www.ssb.no/>

Key, O., Milatova, P., & Horstmann, N. (2017). Herkunft macht mobil: Soziale Selektivität bei Auslandsstudium und Auslandspraktikum [Origin makes you mobile: Social selectivity regarding study abroad and internship abroad] (Arbeitspapier No. 196). Retrieved from Centrum für Hochschulentwicklung (CHE) website: www.che.de

Kirsch, M., Beernaert, Y., & Nørgaard, S. (2003). *Tertiary short cycle education in Europe: A comparative study*. Brussels, Belgium: EURASHE.

Kratz, F., & Netz, N. (2016). Which mechanisms explain monetary returns to international student mobility? *Studies in Higher Education*, 70(3), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1172307>

Kuhar, M., & Reiter, H. (2014). Leaving home in Slovenia: A quantitative exploration of residential independence among young adults. *Journal of adolescence*, 37(8), 1409–1419. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.05.011>

Kwiek, M. (2013). From system expansion to system contraction: Access to higher education in Poland. *Comparative Education Review*, 57(3).

Lederer, A. M., Autry, D. M., Day, C. R. T., & Oswalt, S. B. (2015). The impact of work and volunteer hours on the health of undergraduate students. *Journal of American College Health*, 63(6), 403–408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2015.1015028>

Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué (2009). *The Bologna Process 2020 – The European Higher Education Area in the new decade: Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers responsible for higher education*, Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve, 28–29 April 2009. Retrieved from European Higher Education Area website: www.ehea.info

London Communiqué (2007). *Towards the European Higher Education Area: responding to challenges in a globalised world*. Retrieved from European Higher Education Area website: www.ehea.info

Lörz, M., & Krawietz, M. (2011). Internationale Mobilität und soziale Selektivität: Ausmaß, Mechanismen und Entwicklung herkunftsspezifischer Unterschiede zwischen 1990 und 2005 [International mobility and social selectivity]. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 63(2), 185–205.

Lörz, M., Netz, N., & Quast, H. (2016). Why do students from underprivileged families less often intend to study abroad? *Higher Education*, 72(2), 153–174. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9943-1>

Lörz, M., Quast, H., & Roloff, J. (2015). Konsequenzen der Bologna-Reform: Warum bestehen auch am Übergang vom Bachelor ins Masterstudium soziale Ungleichheiten? [Consequences of the Bologna-Reform: Why do social differences exist at the transition from bachelor to master degree programs?]. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 44(2), 137–155. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zfsoz-2015-0206>

Lowe, J., & Gayle, V. (2014). From lifelong learning to youth employment: Back to the future for higher education in Scotland's colleges. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 40(3), 351–371. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2014.971104>

Marconi, G. (2015). Equity in tertiary education: Relevance and data availability across OECD countries. *The GAPS Think Piece*, (24), 1–10.

Marginson, S. (2016). The worldwide trend to high participation higher education: dynamics of social stratification in inclusive systems. *Higher Education*, 72(4), 413–434. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0016-x>

Mazzonna, F. (2014). The long-lasting effects of family background: A European cross-country comparison. *Economics of Education Review*, 40, 25–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2013.11.010>

Mercer, J., Clay, J., & Etheridge, L. (2016). Experiencing term-time employment as a non-traditional aged university student: A Welsh study. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 21(3), 181–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2016.1195168>

Mertens, A. (2013). Studium und Erwerbstätigkeit [Study and work]. *Beiträge zur Hochschulforschung*, 35(4), 34–53. Retrieved from Beiträge zur Hochschulforschung website: <http://www.bzh.bayern.de/>

Middendorff, E., Apolinarski, B., Becker, K., Bornkessel, P., Brandt, T., Heißenberg, S., & Poskowsky, J. (2017). The economic and social situation of students in Germany 2016: Summary of the 21st social survey of Deutsches Studentenwerk, conducted by the German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW). Berlin, Germany: Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF).

Middendorff, E., Apolinarski, B., Poskowsky, J., Kandulla, M., & Netz, N. (2013). Die wirtschaftliche und soziale Lage der Studierenden in Deutschland 2012: 20. Sozialerhebung des Deutschen Studentenwerks durchgeführt durch das HIS-Institut für Hochschulforschung [The economic and social situation of students in Germany 2012]. Berlin, Germany: BMBF.

Miller, K., Danner, F., & Staten, R. (2008). Relationship of work hours with selected health behaviors and academic progress among a college student cohort. *Journal of American College Health*, 56(6), 675–679. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JACH.56.6.675-679>

Mishra, S. (2016). Intelligence Brief: Delayed entry into higher education (No. 5). Hannover, Germany. Retrieved from http://www.eurostudent.eu/download_files/documents/IB_delayed_transition.pdf

Mühleck, K. (2013). Data, methods, and terms. In A. F. Camilleri & K. Mühleck (Eds.), *Evolving diversity II. Participation of students with an immigrant background in European higher education* (pp. 17–22). Brussels, Belgium: MENON Network.

Mühleck, K., & Griga, D. (2010). Data & methods. In A. F. Camilleri & K. Mühleck (Eds.), *Evolving diversity. An overview of equitable access to HE in Europe* (pp. 17–28). Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.

Netz, N., & Finger, C. (2016). New horizontal inequalities in German higher education? Social selectivity of studying abroad between 1991 and 2012. *Sociology of Education*, 89(2), 79–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040715627196>

Neumeyer, S., & Pietrzyk, I. (2016). Auslandsmobilität im Masterstudium: Hat die Bildungsherkunft einen Einfluss auf die Dauer und die Art der Auslandsmobilität und falls ja, warum? [International mobility in master studies]. *Beiträge zur Hochschulforschung*, 38(4), 108–127.

Nijenstein, S., Haans, A., Kemperman, A. D. A. M., & Borgers, A. W. J. (2015). Beyond demographics: human value orientation as a predictor of heterogeneity in student housing preferences. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 30(2), 199–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-014-9402-9>

OECD (2013). *How's life? 2013: Measuring well-being*. OECD Better Life Initiative. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

OECD (2015). *In it together: Why less inequality benefits all*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

Oosterbeek, H., & Webbink, D. (2011). Does studying abroad induce a brain drain? *Economica*, 78(310), 347–366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0335.2009.00818.x>

Orr, D., Gwosć, C., & Netz, N. (2011). *Social and economic conditions of student life in Europe: Synopsis of indicators final report Eurostudent IV 2008–2011*. Bielefeld, Germany: W. Bertelsmann Verlag.

Orr, D., & Hovdhaugen, E. (2014). 'Second chance' routes into higher education: Sweden, Norway and Germany compared. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33(1), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2013.873212>

Orr, D., Usher, A., Haj, C., Atherton, G., & Geanta, I. (2017). *Study on the impact of admission systems on higher education outcomes: Volume I: Comparative report. Education and Training*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Orr, D., Wartenbergh-Cras, F., & Scholz, C. (2015). A challenge for student engagement: The decline of the "normal" student. In Council of Europe (Ed.), *Higher Education Series: Vol. 20. Student engagement in Europe: society, higher education and student governance* (Vol. 20, pp. 147–160). Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.

Orr, D., Wespel, J., & Usher, A. (2014). Do changes in cost-sharing have an impact on the behaviour of students in higher education institutions? Evidence from nine case studies. *Volume I: Comparative Report*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.

Ortmanns, V., & Schneider, S.L. (2016). Harmonization still failing? Inconsistency of education variables in cross-national public opinion surveys. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 28(4), 562–582. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edv025>

Parey, M., & Waldinger, F. (2011). Studying abroad and the effect on international labour market mobility: Evidence from the introduction of ERASMUS. *The Economic Journal*, 121(551), 194–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2010.02369.x>

Petzold, K., & Moog, P. (2017). What shapes the intention to study abroad? An experimental approach. *Higher Education*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0119-z>

Pfeffer, F.T., & Hällsten, M. (2012). Mobility regimes and parental wealth: The United States, Germany, and Sweden in comparison. *SOEPpapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2166784>

Polakow, V., Robinson, K., & Ziefert, M. (2014). *Student parents in the shadows: The academic and personal costs of unmet child care needs. A report on the child care needs study*. Retrieved from Eastern Michigan University website: https://www.emich.edu/wcen/documents/child_care_needs_study_report.pdf

Prague Communiqué (2001). *Towards the European higher education area: Communiqué of the meeting of European ministers in charge of higher education in Prague on May 19th 2001*. Retrieved from European Higher Education Area website: www.ehea.info

Quinn, J. (2013). *Drop-out and completion in higher education in Europe among students from under-represented groups*. An independent report authored for the European Commission. Retrieved from NESET II website: <http://nesetweb.eu/en/>

Régnier-Loilier, A. (2017). *Étudier et avoir des enfants: Contexte de survenue des grossesses et conséquences sur les études* [Studying with children: Context of pregnancy occurrence and consequences for studies]. OVE Infos. (36). Retrieved from www.ove-national.education.fr

Reimer, D., & Jacob, M. (2011). Differentiation in higher education and its consequences for social inequality: Introduction to a special issue. *Higher Education*, 61(3), 223–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9373-z>

Reimer, D., & Pollak, R. (2010). Educational expansion and its consequences for vertical and horizontal inequalities in access to higher education in West Germany. *European Sociological Review*, 26(4), 415–430. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcp029>

Roberts, R., Golding, J., Towell, T., Reid, S., Woodford, S., Vetere, A., & Weinreb, I. (2000). Mental and physical health in students: The role of economic circumstances. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 5(3), 289–297. <https://doi.org/10.1348/135910700168928>

Roksa, J., Trolian, T. L., Blaich, C., & Wise, K. (2017). Facilitating academic performance in college: Understanding the role of clear and organized instruction. *Higher Education*, 74(2), 283–300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0048-2>

Salmi, J., & Bassett, R. M. (2014). The equity imperative in tertiary education: Promoting fairness and efficiency. *International Review of Education*, 60(3), 361–377. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-013-9391-z>

Sanchez-Gelabert, A., Figueiroa, M., & Elias, M. (2017). Working whilst studying in higher education: The impact of the economic crisis on academic and labour market success. *European Journal of Education*, 52(2), 232–245. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12212>

Sarcletti, A. (2015). Bachelor students' transition to post-graduate studies. Do students with and without migration background have different plans? *Beiträge zur Hochschulforschung*, 36(2), 116–139.

Savić, M., & Kresoja, M. (2016). Modelling factors of students' work in Western Balkan countries. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1190960>

Schneider, S. L. (2009). Confusing credentials: the cross-nationally comparable measurement of educational attainment (Ph.D thesis). University of Oxford, United Kingdom.

Skopek, N., Buchholz, S., & Blossfeld, H.-P. (2014). National patterns of income and wealth inequality. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 55(6), 463–488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715214565674>

Smith, D. G. (2015). *Diversity's promise for higher education: Making it work* (2nd revised edition). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smolentseva, A. (2012). Access to higher education in the post-soviet states: Between soviet legacy and global challenges. Salzburg, Austria. Retrieved from Salzburg Global Seminars website: Salzburg Global Seminar website: <http://www.salzburgglobal.org/home.html>

Staneva, M. (2017). Studentische Erwerbstätigkeit: Elternhaus spielt bei Wahl des Studenten-jobs eine Rolle [Students' gainful employment: Parents' educational background plays a role in the choice of a student job]. *DIW Wochenbericht* (41), 914–924. Retrieved from DIW Berlin website: <http://www.diw.de/en>

Stiglitz, J. E. (2013). *The price of inequality: how today's divided society endangers our future*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Stoessel, K., Ihme, T. A., Barbarino, M.-L., Fis-seler, B., & Stürmer, S. (2015). Sociodemographic diversity and distance education: Who drops out from academic programs and why? *Research in Higher Education*, 56(3), 228–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-014-9343-x>

Teichler, U., Ferencz, I., & Bürger, S. (2011). *Mapping Mobility in European Higher Education: Volume I: Overview and Trends. Mapping Mobility in European Higher Education: Vol. 1*. Bonn, Germany: DAAD German Academic Exchange Service.

Terzieva, B., Dibiasi, A., Kulhanek, A., Zaus-singer, S., & Unger, M. (2016). Zur Situation behinderter, chronisch kranker und gesundheitlich beeinträchtigter Studierender: Quantitativer Teil der Zusatzstudie zur Studierenden-Sozialerhebung 2015 [The situation of disabled, chronically ill and impaired students]. Retrieved from http://irihs.ihs.ac.at/4269/1/100329_Solar15_Zusatzbericht_Internationale_Studierende.pdf

The World Bank (2017a). GDP per capita (current US\$). Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD?view=chart>

The World Bank (2017b). PPP conversion factor, GDP (LCU per international \$). Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/PA.NUS.PPP?locations=GE&view=chart>

Theune, K. (2015). The working status of students and time to degree at German universities. *Higher Education*, 70(4), 725–752. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9864-z>

Thomas, E., & Quinn, J. (2007). First generation entry into higher education: An international study. Society for research into higher education. Maidenhead, New York: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=234255>

Thompson, R. (2017). Explaining inequality? Rational action theories of educational decision making. In A. Mountford-Zimdars & N. E. Harrison (Eds.), *Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE). Access to higher education. Theoretical perspectives and contemporary challenges* (pp. 67–84). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Torche, F., & Costa-Ribeiro, C. (2012). Parental wealth and children's outcomes over the life-course in Brazil: A propensity score matching analysis. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 30(1), 79–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2011.07.002>

Triventi, M. (2013). Stratification in higher education and its relationship with social inequality: A comparative study of 11 European countries. *European Sociological Review*, 29(3), 489–502. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Moris_Triventi/publication/275143780_Sтратification_in_Higher_Education_and_Its_Relationship_with_Social_Inequality_A_Comparative_Study_of_

https://www.eurostudent.eu/11_European_Countries/links/572b2df108aef7c7e2c6ab29.pdf

Triventi, M. (2014). Does working during higher education affect students' academic progression? *Economics of Education Review*, 41, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2014.03.006>

Tuononen, T., Parpala, A., Mattsson, M., & Lindblom-Yläne, S. (2015). Work experience in relation to study pace and thesis grade: Investigating the mediating role of student learning. *Higher Education*, 72(1), 41–58. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9937-z>

UNESCO & IIEP (2017). Six ways to ensure higher education leaves no one behind. *Global education monitoring report: policy paper*. (30). Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002478/247862E.pdf>

UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2012). International standard classification of education: ISCED 2011. Montreal, Canada: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

van Bavel, J. (2012). The reversal of gender inequality in education, union formation and fertility in Europe. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, 10, 127–154. <https://doi.org/10.1553/populationyearbook2012s127>

van Mol, C. (2014). Intra-European student mobility in international higher education circuits: Europe on the move. *Palgrave Studies in Global Higher Education*. London/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

van Mol, C., & Timmerman, C. (2014). Should I stay or should I go? An analysis of the determinants of Intra-European student mobility. *Population, Space and Place*, 20(5), 465–479. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.1833>

Verhetsel, A., Kessels, R., Zijlstra, T., & van Bavel, M. (2017). Housing preferences among students: collective housing versus individual accommodations? A stated preference study in

Antwerp (Belgium). *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 32(3), 449–470. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10901-016-9522-5>

Vickery, C. (1977). The time-poor: A new look at poverty. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 12(1), 27–48.

Vögtle, E. M. (2014). Higher education policy convergence and the Bologna process: A cross-national study. *Transformations of the State*. Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weedon, E. (2017). The construction of under-representation in UK and Swedish higher education: Implications for disabled students. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 12(1), 75–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197916683470>

Wells, R. S., & Lynch, C. M. (2012). Delayed college entry and the socioeconomic gap: Examining the roles of student plans, family income, parental education, and parental occupation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(5), 671–697. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2012.0028>

Wightman, P., & Danziger, S. (2014). Multi-generational income disadvantage and the educational attainment of young adults. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 35, 53–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2013.09.004>

Williams, J. R., Masuda, Y. J., & Tallis, H. (2016). A measure whose time has come: Formalizing time poverty. *Social Indicators Research*, 128(1), 265–283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-1029-z>

Wolter, A. (2015). Massification and diversity: Has the expansion of higher education led to a changing composition of the student body? European and German experiences. In P. Zgaga, U. Teichler, & H. G. Schuetze (Eds.), *Higher education research and policy. Higher education reform. Looking back – looking forward* (pp. 149–171). Frankfurt a.M., Germany: Peter Lang GmbH

Wroblewski, A. (2016). Unterstützungsangebote für Studierende mit Behinderung oder chronischer Erkrankung: Quantitativer Teil der Zusatzstudie zur Studierenden-Sozialerhebung 2015 [Support for students with disabilities or chronic disease]. Retrieved from www.sozialerhebung.at

Yerevan Communiqué (2015). EHEA Ministerial Conference Yerevan 2015. Retrieved from European Higher Education Area website: www.ehea.info

Zarifa, D., Hango, D., & Pizarro Milian, R. (2017). Proximity, prosperity, and participation: Examining access to postsecondary education among youth in Canada's provincial north. *Rural Sociology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ruso.12183>

Zaussinger, S., Binder, D., Dibiasi, A., Litofcenko, J., & Thaler, B. (2016). Internationale Studierende: Zusatzbericht der Studierenden-Sozialerhebung 2015. Retrieved from http://irihs.ihs.ac.at/4269/1/100329_Sola15_Zusatzbericht_Internationale_Studierende.pdf

Zimmermann, J., & Neyer, F. J. (2013). Do we become a different person when hitting the road? Personality development of sojourners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105(3), 515–530. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033019>

Appendix C5

National contributors

	Country name	Project sponsor	Implementation	Contact person	Research team	National report
AL	Albania	Ministry of Education and Sport	University of Tirana	Prof. Asoc. Linda Pustina, Ms. Mirela Bimo (Ministry of Education, Sport and Youth, Albania)	Prof. Dr. Kozeta Sevrani, Msc. Ogerta Elezaj, Prof. Asoc. Edira Kalemci, Prof. Dr. Fatmir Memi (University of Tirana), Msc. Ledia Thomo (National Institute of Statistics, Albania), Prof. Asoc. Linda Pustina, Ms. Mirela Bimo (Ministry of Education, Sport and Youth, Albania)	–
AT	Austria	Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF)	Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS)	Martin Unger (IHS)	Martin Unger, Angelika Grabher-Wusche, Iris Schwarzenbacher, Berta Terzieva, Anna Dibiasi, Sarah Zaussinger, Daiga Kuzmane, Clemens Danler	www.sozialerhebung.at
CH	Switzerland	The State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI)	Swiss Federal Statistical Office (FSO)	Yassin Boughaba	Yassin Boughaba, Sarah Gerhard Ortega, Philipp Fischer	www.students-stat.admin.ch
CZ	Czech Republic	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS)	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS)	Jakub Fischer (MEYS)	Jakub Fischer, Kristýna Vítavská, Michaela Jirková, Hana Lipovská, Petr Mazouch, Veronika Ptáčková, Martina Šimková	http://www.msmt.cz/uploads/odbor_30/TF/Analytische_materialy/Eurostudent/E_VI_zaverenecna_zprava.pdf
DE	Germany	Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF)	Deutsches Zentrum für Hochschul- und Wissenschaftsforschung (German Centre for Research on Higher Education and Science Studies, DZHW)	Elke Middendorff (DZHW)	Elke Middendorff (DZHW), Beate Apolinarski (DZHW), Karsten Becker (DZHW), Philipp Bornkessel (DZHW), Tasso Brandt (DZHW), Sonja Heißenberg (DZHW), Jonas Poskowsky (DZHW)	www.sozialerhebung.de
DK	Denmark	Ministry of Higher Education and Science	Epinion in cooperation with the ministry	Louise Bank (Ministry of Higher Education and Science)	Louise Bank, Ministry of Higher Education and Science, Ditte Beyer, Ministry of Higher Education and Science, Ken Thomassen, Former employee of Ministry of Higher Education and Science	–
EE	Estonia	Ministry of Education and Research	Praxis Centre for Policy Studies	Hanna-Stella Haaristo (Praxis Centre for Policy Studies)	Hanna-Stella Haaristo, Eve Mägi, Laura Kirss, Cenely Lepik, Sandra Haugas, Kersti Kõiv	http://www.praxis.ee/tood/eurostudent
FI	Finland	Ministry of Education and Culture	Statistics Finland	Vesa Virtanen	Anna-Kaarina Potila, Vesa Virtanen	http://minedu.fi/julkaisu?pubid=URN:ISBN:978-952-263-500-6
FR	France	Centre National des Œuvres universitaires et scolaires (CNOUS)	Observatoire national de la vie étudiante (OVE)	Odile Ferry (OVE)	Odile Ferry (OVE)	http://www.ove-national.education.fr/
GE	Georgia	Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia	IPM Research; Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia	Mzia Tsereteli, Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia	Marina (Mako) Mchedlishvili, Alexandre Siprashvili	–
HR	Croatia	Ministry of Science and Education	Ministry of Science and Education	Marina Crnčić Sokol, Ministry of Science and Education	Ivan Rimac, Jelena Oresta	–
HU	Hungary	Ministry of Human Capacities	Educational Authority (EA)	Edit Veres (Educational Authority, Department of Higher Education Research)	Krisztina Gaskó, Ádám Hámori, Ágoston Horváth, László Kiss, Zoltán Nagy, Anna Sebők, Ildikó Székács-Román, Zsuzsanna Veroszta	https://www.felvi.hu/felsooktatasismuely/EUROSTUDENT
IE	Ireland	Higher Education Authority	Insight Statistical Consulting	David Harmon, Insight Statistical Consulting	David Harmon, Dr. Stephen Erskine, Olivier Foubert (Insight Statistical Consulting), Victor Pigott and Denise Frawley (Higher Education Authority)	–

	Country name	Project sponsor	Implementation	Contact person	Research team	National report
IS	Iceland	Ministry of Education, Science and Culture	Maskina Research	Thora Asgeirsdottir (Maskina Research)	Thora Asgeirsdottir, Thorlakur Karlsson, Hrafn Ingason	–
IT	Italy	MIUR – Ministry of Education, Universities and Research	Associazione Cimea (CIMEA)	Giovanni Finocchietti	Giovanni Finocchietti, Maria A. Pannone, Alessandro Melchionna, Luisa Laricini	www.eurostudent.it
LT	Lithuania	Ministry of Higher Education and Science	Research and Higher Education Monitoring and Analysis Centre – MOSTA	Vaida Šaukeckienė	Vaida Šaukeckienė, Eglė Ozoliņčiūtė, Kristina Masevičiūtė, Rolandas Jakštys	not online yet
LV	Latvia	Ministry of Education and Science (IZM)	Institute of Philosophy and Sociology University of Latvia (LU FSI)	Diana Laipniece (IZM), Marika Laudere (IZM)	Ilze Koroleva (LU FSI), Aleksandrs Aleksandrovs (LU FSI), Ilze Trapenciere (LU FSI), Rita Kaša (LU FSI)	http://izm.gov.lv/lv/publikacijas-un-statistika/petijumi
MT	Malta	National Commission for Further and Higher Education (NCFHE)	National Commission for Further and Higher Education (NCFHE)	Christine Scholz Fenech (NCFHE)	Christine Scholz Fenech (NCFHE), Madonna Maroun (NCFHE), Dr. Milosh Raykov (University of Malta)	https://ncfhe.gov.mt/en/research/Pages/Eurostudent.aspx
NL	The Netherlands	Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW)	ResearchNed	Froukje Wartenbergh-Cras (ResearchNed), Bas Kurver (ResearchNed)	Froukje Wartenbergh-Cras (ResearchNed), Bas Kurver (ResearchNed), Danny Brukkx (ResearchNed)	www.studentenmonitor.nl
NO	Norway	Ministry of Education and Research	Statistics Norway (SSB)	Anna-Lena Keute (SSB), Kjartan Steffensen (SSB)	Anna-Lena Keute (SSB), Kjartan Steffensen (SSB)	National results will be published in a collection of articles in the period February 2018 – September 2018
PL	Poland	Ministry of Science and Higher Education	PBS Ltd.	Ewa Piotrowicz (PBS Ltd.)	Ewa Piotrowicz, Marta Jankowska, Natalia Hipsz, Julita Pieńkosz, Małgorzata Drozd-Garbacewicz, Waclaw Galewski, Jarosław Szczepański	–
PT	Portugal	Directorate-General for Higher Education/ Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education (DGES/MCTES)	CIES-IUL – Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology at ISCTE-IUL	Susana da Cruz Martins (CIES-IUL)	Susana da Cruz Martins, Rosário Mauritti, Bernardo Machado, António Firmino da Costa	–
RO	Romania	Ministry of National Education	Executive Agency for Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation Funding (UEFISCDI) and Institute for Education Sciences (ISE)	Gabriela Jitaru (UEFISCDI)	Sorin Mitulescu and Irina Boeru (ISE), Gabriela Jitaru and Andreea Gheba (UEFISCDI)	www.eurostudent.uefiscdi.ro/ and www.ise.ro
RS	Serbia	University of Belgrade (UB)	University of Belgrade (UB)	Dr. Ana Jakovljević (UB)	Ana Jakovljević, Bojana Obradović Kuzminović, Branko Marović, Dragan Stanojević, Dušan Bugarski, Ljerka Gordić, Marija Milisavljević, Milena Stanojević, Stefan Janković	–
SI	Slovenia	Ministry of Education, Science and Sport	Ministry of Education, Science and Sport, Slovenian Student Union, The Centre of the Republic of Slovenia for Mobility and European Educational and Training Programmes (CMEPIUS)	Ksenja Hauptman and Saša Zubukovec, Alenka Flander, Katarina Aškerč Veniger, Sebastian Kočar, Jelena Strbac Nemec, Marko Ruperčič	Ksenja Hauptman, Saša Zubukovec, Alenka Flander, Katarina Aškerč Veniger, Sebastian Kočar, Jelena Strbac Nemec, Marko Ruperčič	http://www.mizs.gov.si/si/delovna_podrojca/direktorat_za_visoko_solidstvo/sektor_za_visoko_solidstvo/evrostudent/
SK	Slovakia	Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport (MŠVVaŠ)	Slovak Centre of Scientific and Technical Information (CVTI SR)	Roman Kollár (CVTI SR)	Roman Kollár (CVTI SR), František Blanár (CVTI SR)	http://www.cvtisr.sk/
SE	Sweden	Swedish Ministry of Education and Research	Swedish Council for Higher Education	Erica Finneman, Swedish Council for Higher Education	Erica Finneman, Fredrik Lindström, Jari Rusanen, Sukaina Nasser	https://www.uhr.se/publikationer/Rapporter/
TR	Turkey	Council of Higher Education (YÖK) and Anadolu University	Anadolu University	Bilge Kağan Özdemir	Duygu Tunali, Mehmet Fırat	–

Social and Economic Conditions of Student Life in Europe

EUROSTUDENT VI 2016–2018 | Synopsis of Indicators

The EUROSTUDENT VI – Synopsis of Indicators is the central publication of the EUROSTUDENT project and the result of the collaboration of a European-wide network including researchers, data collectors, representatives of national ministries, and other stakeholders. It comprises data from student surveys conducted in 28 countries in the European Higher Education Area during the sixth round of the EUROSTUDENT project.

Adopting a broad, comparative perspective, the EUROSTUDENT VI – Synopsis of Indicators provides information on topic areas such as access to higher education, study conditions, as well as international student mobility, assessment of studies, and future plans with the aim of inspiring policy debates and laying the ground for further research.



ISBN 978- 7639-5913-6