UDE
Umfrage
*mit**Meinung**wirken*

Diversity Monitoring
Update 2020

Results of the survey of first-year students in the winter semester 2019/20 and the survey of 2018 graduates

BY ANNA EBERT UND KARL-HEINZ STAMMEN

ZHQE Zentrum für Hochschulqualitäts-entwicklung

UNIVERSITÄT DUISBURG ESSEN
Open-Minded

Table of contents

Preliminary remarks

Diversity monitoring refers to the recurring, systematic gathering and analysis of and reporting on predefined data and indicators relating to diversity. This type of established monitoring and analysis process, which is based on empirical data, serves three essential purposes for a higher education institution:

- the purpose of monitoring, analysing and illustrating essential aspects of a higher education institution,

- the purpose of system monitoring, especially with regard to benchmarks, and

- the purpose system diagnostics by identifying trends and issues.

To this effect, diversity monitoring at UDE serves to support stakeholders in making informed decisions. To do so, as many aspects of diversity as possible must be considered in addition to the core dimensions of personality (Gardenswartz & Rowe 2010). The HEAD Wheel (Higher Education Awareness for Diversity) by Gaisch and Aichinger (2016) reflects the various facets of diversity at higher education institutions. In order to present different features of diversity, five aspects of diversity that are relevant to higher education institutions are depicted in the form of a wheel and subdivided into multiple dimensions. This holistic approach attempts to reflect not only the demographic diversity of individuals and groups within a higher education institution but also the cognitive, disciplinary, functional and institutional diversity that exists at higher education institutions. On the one hand, this serves to create awareness of intersectionality, i.e. the fact that overlapping dimensions of diversity affect one another. On the other hand, disciplinary and cognitive diversity, for example, and the interactions between them are considered resources that can contribute to the development of competences in individuals and stakeholders at a university through diversity management measures (Stammen 2018).

Due to its geographical location and the diversity of students at UDE who come from various regions, nations, cultures and social classes, targeted promotion and support of this heterogeneity is of particular importance for UDE and also integral to its guidelines.[1] In this context, consideration of this diversity is regarded as a contributing factor to both equity in education and excellence. Empirically measurable heterogeneity can provide information on the extent to which equity in education has been achieved. In order to get insights into developments regarding (in)accessibility, e.g. with regard to university admission, or academic success, information is required at university level, which can be correlated with students' (socio)demographic (e.g. gender, educational background) and personal (e.g. motivation to study, perceived self-efficacy) features (see Becker 2011, Finger 2013, Middendorff et al. 2013). Individual performance issues due to high academic standards, but also students' doubts about their own capability, financial problems during their studies and a lack of motivation to study have been identified as examples of decisive motives to drop out of university (Heublein & Wolter 2011; Ebert & Hauser 2017). Therefore, this type of information is to be gathered as far as it is available, reported and updated on a yearly basis as part of the diversity monitoring process.

For the 2020 diversity monitoring report, various (socio) demographic context factors have also initially been correlated in a contingency table on the basis of the survey among first-year students in the winter semester 2019/20 (Table 4). Another contingency table displays university entrance criteria differentiated by the previously reported (socio)demographic variables (Table 5). Furthermore, studyrelated cognitive variables have been correlated with (socio)demographic factors and aspects of the students' educational background (Table 6).

On the basis of the survey of 2018 graduates, aspects of academic success and work-related aspects (e.g. final degree mark, student satisfaction, duration of the job search, income) have been correlated with (socio)demographic diversity variables (Tables 7, 8 and 9).[2]

In order to facilitate the identification of noteworthy items, significant diversity-related differences occurring

---

1   See *http://www.uni-due.de/de/universitaet/leitlinien.shtml* (accessed on 02 February 2020).

2   Please note that the student-related data cannot be directly compared to the graduate-related data since the subjects belong to different cohorts.

for individual variables are highlighted in colour in all analyses. For this purpose, an overall index[3] was initially calculated for the distribution among the entire sample ('Overall' row), correlating the number of existing values of the variable (i.e. their variability, e.g. female and male) with the corresponding proportions (i.e. the balance) for each variable (e.g. gender). Similarly, variable-specific indices have been calculated for the relevant values (e.g. humanities, social sciences, educational sciences, etc.) of a variable (e.g. faculty). If a variable-specific index is higher than the calculated overall index by 5 % or more, there is greater diversity for this variable, i.e. the relevant group (in this case: students or graduates) is more heterogeneous with regard to this variable (highlighted in dark blue). If a variable-specific index is lower than the calculated overall index by 5 % or more, there is less diversity for this variable, i.e. the group is less heterogeneous with regard to this variable (highlighted in light blue). The 'Age' variable, for example, is subdivided into the three values '<20 years' (57 %), '20–22 years' (33 %) and '>22 years' (10 %) in student-related monitoring (see Table 4). The overall index is initially calculated on this basis. If we then consider the relevant variable-specific values for the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration ('Econ.+BA'), for example, their distribution yields a variable-specific index that does not differ by more than 5 % upwards or downwards from the overall index. The Faculties of Educational Sciences ('Ed.') and Medicine ('Med.') are in contrast to that: the calculated variable-specific indices are higher than the overall index by more than 5 %. Thus, the students at the Faculties of Educational Sciences and Medicine are more heterogeneous than the entire sample. At the Faculties of Physics ('Phys.') and Chemistry ('Chem.'), it is the other way around: the students at these faculties are more homogeneous with regard to their age. So groups that are more homogeneous or more heterogeneous than the distribution in the overall sample can be easily identified by comparing the variable-specific indices for individual variables with the overall index. Whether this is to be interpreted as positive, neutral or negative, strongly depends on the variable in question but also on the research interest at hand.

---

3   The calculations are based on fractionalisation indices, which are a gauge that helps reflect the distribution in relation to the number and relative size of the existing categories in one index (see Schaeffer 2016). The fractionalisation index is calculated by adding up the squared proportions of all categories and deducting the sum from 1. The values can vary between 0 and 1. If the value was 0 (maximum homogeneity), all individuals would belong to one category or variable value; if the value was 1, there would be as many categories or variable values as there are individuals (maximum heterogeneity). Example: If a distribution (e.g. for the 'Gender' variable) resulted in two categories or variable value figures of equal size (e.g. 'Female' and 'Male' with 50 % each), the fractionalisation index would be: $1 - (0.5^2 + 0.5^2) = 0.5$. A higher degree of heterogeneity or a lower degree of homogeneity could not be reached in cases with two categories. In contrast, if the gender ratio was 80 % to 20 %, the fractionalisation index would be significantly lower at $1 - (0.8^2 + 0.2^2) = 0.32$, i.e. there would be a lower degree of heterogeneity or a higher degree of homogeneity. If, within the distribution, there were only women (or only men), the value would be $1 - (1.0^2 + 0.0^2) = 0$, which would mean maximum homogeneity.

Data basis

Table 1: Basic data relating to (socio)demographic diversity variables (sources: survey of first-year students in the winter semester 2019/20 and survey of 2018 graduates)

		Survey among new students		Survey among graduates	
		n	%	n	%
Overall		1285	100%	1457	100%
Faculty	Hum.	257	20%	269	19%
	Soc.	141	11%	106	7%
	Ed.	85	7%	117	8%
	Econ.+BA	165	13%	188	13%
	MSM	81	6%	114	8%
	Math.	48	4%	61	4%
	Phys.	24	2%	29	2%
	Chem.	97	8%	64	4%
	Bio.	57	5%	79	5%
	Engr.	236	19%	370	26%
	Med.	83	7%	53	4%
Type of Degree	BA	878	68%	574	39%
	BA (teaching)	324	25%	188	13%
	MA			431	30%
	MA (teaching)			101	7%
	St.ex.	83	7%	37	3%
	Doctor's			78	5%
	L/Dipl/Mag			47	3%
Gender	f	790	62%	713	55%
	m	481	38%	575	45%
Age in years	<20 y.	695	57%		
	20-22 y.	402	33%		
	>22 y.	125	10%		
	<24 y.			263	21%
	24-27 y.			603	47%
	>27 y.			419	33%
Educational background	low	284	24%	154	12%
	medium	379	32%	509	40%
	high	330	27%	350	27%
	very high	211	18%	269	21%
Immigration background	yes	542	43%	394	31%
	no	710	57%	888	69%
Chronic illness/disability	yes	86	7%		
	no	1199	93%		
Children in the household/ Childcare	yes	125	10%	111	9%
	no	1160	90%	1180	91%
Care for family members	yes	84	7%		
	no	1201	94%		

Table 2: Basic data relating to variables of diversity regarding university entrance criteria and cognitive diversity (source: survey of first-year students in the winter semester 2019/20)

		Survey of first-year students	
		n	%
Overall		1285	100%
Vocational qualification	yes	114	9%
	no	1166	91%
Mark in the university entrance qualification	1.0-1.5	192	16%
	1.6-2.5	586	48%
	2.6-4.0	450	37%
Place where the entrance qualification was obtained	Ruhr Area	770	65%
	NRW	301	25%
	Germany	61	5%
	Other country	62	5%
Preparedness for studies	-	221	17%
	0	587	46%
	+	470	37%
Main source of funding	own	232	18%
	third party	808	64%
	loan	233	18%
Reconciliation of work and studies	-	156	24%
	0	193	30%
	+	295	46%
Perceived self-efficacy	-	92	7%
	0	503	39%
	+	686	54%
Enjoyment of studies	-	167	13%
	0	340	27%
	+	771	60%
Investment in studies	-	164	13%
	0	396	31%
	+	719	56%
Information of studying	-	214	17%
	0	555	43%
	+	512	40%
Confident learning	-	127	10%
	0	554	43%
	+	597	47%
Anxiety when facing examinations	-	349	27%
	0	453	35%
	+	477	37%

Table 3: Basic data relating to aspects of academic and professional success (source: survey of 2018 graduates)

		Survey of graduates	
		n	%
Overall		1457	100%
Mark for the degree	1.0-1.5	393	27%
	1.6-2.5	777	53%
	2.6-4.0	287	20%
Degree completed within the standard period of study	yes	419	31%
	no	948	69%
Student satisfaction	-	123	9%
	0	347	25%
	+	919	66%
Master's course following the Bachelor's degree	yes	593	78%
	no	169	22%
Employment	yes	968	88%
	no	127	12%

Gainfully employed respondents only

		Survey of graduates	
		n	%
Form of employment contract	permanent	417	57%
	fixed-term	315	43%
Full-time employment	yes	512	68%
	no	240	32%
Gross monthly income	<2001€	214	30%
	2001-3000€	79	11%
	3001-4000€	200	28%
	>4000€	216	31%
Application of qualifications	-	170	21%
	0	267	33%
	+	362	45%

Results

Demographic diversity upon entering university

Table 4: (Socio)demographic diversity variables upon entering university (source: survey of first-year students in the winter semester 2019/20)

		Overall	Gender		Age in years			Educational background				Immigration backg-round		Chronic illness / disability		Childcare		Care for familiy members	
		n	f	m	<20 y.	20-22 y.	>22 y.	low	medium	high	very high	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
Overall		1285	790	481	695	402	125	284	379	330	221	542	710	86	1199	125	1160	84	1201
		100%	62%	38%	57%	33%	10%	24%	32%	27%	18%	43%	57%	7%	93%	10%	90%	7%	94%
Faculty	Hum.	257	85%	15%	54%	38%	8%	24%	35%	27%	14%	43%	57%	7%	93%	10%	90%	5%	95%
	Soc.	141	61%	39%	56%	36%	8%	20%	36%	29%	15%	33%	67%	7%	93%	6%	94%	8%	92%
	Ed.	85	85%	16%	48%	36%	16%	28%	44%	21%	6%	38%	62%	5%	95%	11%	89%	2%	98%
	Econ.+BA	165	49%	51%	63%	30%	7%	37%	25%	23%	15%	58%	42%	9%	92%	12%	88%	9%	92%
	MSM	81	50%	50%	54%	43%	3%	26%	30%	34%	10%	51%	49%	4%	96%	9%	91%	6%	94%
	Math.	48	58%	42%	61%	30%	9%	36%	27%	25%	11%	32%	68%	8%	92%	10%	90%	6%	94%
	Phys.	24	29%	71%	77%	14%	9%	9%	36%	46%	9%	21%	79%	8%	92%	17%	83%	8%	92%
	Chem.	97	65%	35%	68%	18%	14%	20%	35%	28%	17%	32%	68%	3%	97%	14%	86%	9%	91%
	Bio.	57	79%	21%	63%	21%	16%	7%	40%	33%	20%	21%	79%	11%	90%	4%	97%	7%	93%
	Engr.	236	38%	62%	56%	36%	9%	24%	27%	24%	26%	58%	42%	5%	95%	11%	89%	5%	95%
	Med.	83	76%	24%	44%	30%	26%	9%	17%	36%	38%	30%	70%	8%	92%	4%	96%	10%	90%
Type of degree	BA-L-G	72	90%	10%	63%	21%	16%	11%	42%	35%	12%	17%	83%	7%	93%	15%	85%	3%	97%
	BA-L-HRSGe	76	82%	18%	47%	43%	11%	38%	35%	20%	7%	50%	50%	9%	91%	16%	84%	4%	96%
	BA-L-GyGe	140	67%	33%	62%	30%	8%	22%	32%	30%	16%	43%	57%	7%	93%	10%	90%	8%	92%
	BA-L-BK	36	57%	43%	12%	67%	21%	14%	43%	34%	9%	44%	56%	6%	94%	6%	94%	0%	100%
	B.A.	270	73%	27%	53%	36%	11%	25%	39%	24%	12%	38%	63%	6%	94%	9%	92%	7%	93%
	B.Sc.	608	49%	51%	62%	31%	7%	26%	27%	27%	20%	50%	50%	6%	94%	10%	90%	7%	93%
	St.Ex.	83	76%	24%	44%	30%	26%	9%	17%	36%	38%	30%	70%	8%	92%	4%	96%	10%	90%
Gender	f	790			57%	33%	10%	23%	34%	28%	16%	43%	57%	7%	93%	10%	90%	6%	94%
	m	481			57%	33%	10%	25%	28%	26%	20%	44%	56%	7%	93%	9%	91%	8%	92%
Age in years	<20 y.	695	63%	37%				21%	29%	29%	21%	40%	60%	5%	95%	10%	90%	8%	92%
	20-22 y.	402	63%	37%				28%	32%	28%	13%	49%	52%	8%	92%	7%	94%	4%	96%
	>22 y.	125	63%	37%				25%	47%	22%	7%	41%	59%	14%	86%	17%	83%	10%	90%
Educational background	low	284	59%	41%	51%	38%	11%					74%	26%	5%	95%	12%	88%	6%	94%
	medium	379	67%	33%	52%	32%	16%					30%	70%	7%	93%	10%	90%	6%	94%
	high	330	63%	37%	59%	33%	9%					38%	62%	9%	91%	10%	90%	7%	93%
	very high	211	56%	44%	71%	25%	4%					30%	70%	4%	96%	7%	93%	8%	92%
Immigration background	yes	542	62%	38%	53%	37%	10%	41%	23%	24%	13%			6%	94%	12%	88%	6%	94%
	no	710	63%	37%	60%	30%	11%	11%	39%	30%	21%			8%	93%	8%	92%	7%	93%
Chronic illness / disability	yes	86	62%	38%	40%	39%	21%	19%	33%	37%	11%	37%	63%			12%	88%	7%	93%
	no	1199	62%	38%	58%	33%	10%	24%	31%	27%	18%	44%	56%			10%	90%	7%	94%
Childcare	yes	125	65%	36%	59%	23%	18%	28%	31%	29%	12%	52%	48%	8%	92%			13%	87%
	no	1160	62%	38%	57%	34%	9%	23%	32%	27%	18%	42%	58%	7%	93%			6%	94%
Care of family members	yes	84	54%	46%	65%	20%	15%	22%	30%	27%	21%	39%	61%	7%	93%	19%	81%		
	no	1201	63%	37%	56%	34%	10%	24%	32%	27%	17%	44%	56%	7%	93%	9%	91%		

■ Group is more heterogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least +5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.)   ■ Group is more homogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least -5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.)

Diversity regarding university entrance criteria

Table 5: Variables of (socio)demographic diversity and diversity regarding university entrance criteria (source: survey of first-year students in the winter semester 2019/20)

		Overall	Vocational qualification		Mark in the university entrance qualification			Place where the entrance qualification was obtained				Preparedness for studies			Main source of funding			Reconciliation of work and studies		
		n	yes	no	1.0-1.5	1.6-2.5	2.6-4.0	Ruhr Area	NRW	Germany	other country	-	0	+	own	third party	loan	-	0	+
Overall		1285	114	1166	192	586	450	770	301	61	62	221	587	470	232	808	233	156	193	295
		100%	9%	91%	16%	48%	37%	65%	25%	5%	5%	17%	46%	37%	18%	64%	18%	24%	30%	46%
Faculty	Hum.	257	6%	94%	9%	58%	33%	74%	22%	3%	2%	17%	48%	35%	20%	64%	16%	23%	36%	40%
	Soc.	141	5%	95%	7%	46%	46%	56%	32%	11%	2%	19%	34%	47%	22%	63%	15%	23%	24%	53%
	Ed.	85	11%	89%	18%	61%	21%	70%	24%	5%	1%	9%	45%	46%	12%	64%	24%	21%	34%	45%
	Econ.+BA	165	6%	94%	4%	42%	54%	70%	24%	2%	4%	16%	56%	28%	21%	56%	23%	24%	26%	50%
	MSM	81	11%	89%	1%	30%	68%	63%	32%	5%	0%	18%	43%	39%	23%	63%	15%	15%	20%	65%
	Math.	48	6%	94%	18%	57%	25%	64%	22%	7%	7%	19%	44%	38%	17%	57%	26%	15%	30%	56%
	Phys.	24	5%	96%	21%	67%	13%	65%	35%	0%	0%	13%	46%	42%	8%	79%	13%	29%	57%	14%
	Chem.	97	10%	90%	16%	47%	37%	74%	19%	2%	5%	19%	42%	39%	15%	70%	16%	35%	28%	37%
	Bio.	57	16%	84%	25%	60%	16%	67%	24%	9%	0%	16%	39%	46%	11%	79%	11%	18%	33%	49%
	Engr.	236	8%	92%	15%	45%	40%	56%	22%	6%	16%	21%	48%	31%	17%	59%	25%	19%	34%	47%
	Med.	83	24%	76%	76%	20%	4%	55%	34%	7%	5%	12%	51%	37%	20%	74%	6%	63%	17%	20%
Type of degree	BA-L-G	72	18%	82%	14%	76%	10%	70%	27%	2%	2%	19%	47%	33%	10%	79%	11%	20%	43%	38%
	BA-L-HRSGe	76	1%	99%	0%	44%	56%	79%	18%	3%	0%	25%	51%	24%	18%	60%	23%	16%	32%	51%
	BA-L-GyGe	140	7%	93%	19%	63%	18%	72%	24%	2%	1%	18%	42%	40%	22%	58%	20%	27%	33%	39%
	BA-L-BK	36	29%	71%	0%	63%	37%	55%	45%	0%	0%	8%	69%	22%	36%	56%	8%	12%	20%	68%
	B.A.	270	7%	93%	6%	51%	43%	61%	28%	9%	2%	13%	39%	47%	21%	61%	19%	23%	29%	49%
	B.Sc.	608	7%	93%	14%	42%	44%	64%	23%	5%	9%	19%	47%	34%	16%	64%	20%	22%	30%	48%
	Vo	83	24%	76%	76%	20%	4%	55%	34%	7%	5%	12%	51%	37%	20%	74%	6%	63%	17%	20%
Gender	f	790	9%	91%	18%	50%	32%	65%	26%	6%	4%	18%	48%	34%	17%	65%	18%	25%	31%	43%
	m	481	8%	92%	12%	44%	44%	64%	24%	5%	8%	17%	42%	41%	19%	62%	19%	23%	28%	50%
Age in years	<20 y.	695	0%	100%	18%	54%	29%	69%	25%	4%	2%	17%	43%	41%	12%	74%	14%	21%	27%	52%
	20-22 y.	402	10%	90%	12%	39%	49%	59%	29%	7%	6%	19%	48%	34%	21%	57%	22%	24%	32%	44%
	>22 y.	125	54%	46%	11%	47%	43%	56%	21%	6%	17%	19%	49%	32%	43%	26%	30%	42%	29%	29%
Educational background	low	284	5%	95%	6%	43%	50%	66%	20%	10%	4%	25%	50%	26%	16%	45%	39%	28%	31%	41%
	medium	379	16%	84%	11%	52%	37%	65%	22%	12%	1%	17%	45%	38%	30%	58%	12%	26%	30%	43%
	high	330	8%	92%	19%	50%	31%	59%	25%	11%	5%	14%	43%	43%	15%	72%	14%	18%	31%	52%
	very high	211	5%	95%	30%	45%	25%	49%	27%	12%	12%	12%	43%	46%	10%	85%	6%	23%	30%	47%
Immigration background	yes	542	5%	95%	13%	44%	43%	63%	23%	5%	9%	19%	53%	28%	19%	52%	28%	23%	32%	45%
	no	710	12%	88%	18%	50%	32%	66%	27%	6%	1%	16%	40%	44%	18%	72%	10%	25%	29%	47%
Chronic illness / disability	yes	86	14%	86%	13%	46%	40%	62%	22%	9%	7%	19%	42%	39%	22%	57%	21%	26%	33%	41%
	no	1199	9%	92%	16%	48%	36%	65%	25%	5%	5%	17%	46%	37%	18%	64%	18%	24%	30%	46%
Care for children and/or family members	yes	193	9%	91%	17%	42%	42%	74%	19%	2%	5%	19%	46%	35%	22%	57%	21%	32%	29%	39%
	no	1092	9%	91%	16%	49%	36%	63%	26%	6%	5%	17%	46%	37%	18%	65%	18%	23%	30%	47%
Vocational qualification	yes	114			7%	44%	49%	61%	30%	7%	3%	18%	48%	35%	49%	38%	13%	36%	35%	29%
	no	1166			17%	48%	35%	65%	25%	5%	6%	17%	46%	37%	15%	66%	19%	23%	29%	48%
Mark in the university entrance qualification	1.0-1.5	192	4%	96%				60%	25%	4%	11%	10%	45%	45%	11%	78%	11%	33%	28%	40%
	1.6-2.5	586	8%	92%				64%	26%	5%	5%	16%	43%	42%	17%	65%	18%	25%	31%	44%
	2.6-4.0	450	12%	88%				67%	25%	6%	2%	22%	50%	28%	23%	56%	22%	20%	31%	49%
Place where the entrance qualification was obtained	Ruhr Area	770	9%	91%	15%	48%	38%					18%	46%	36%	19%	64%	17%	24%	32%	43%
	NRW	301	11%	89%	15%	49%	36%					17%	42%	41%	15%	65%	20%	24%	23%	53%
	Germany	61	12%	89%	12%	48%	40%					15%	43%	43%	16%	56%	28%	29%	35%	35%
	other country	62	5%	95%	36%	47%	17%					12%	59%	30%	25%	54%	21%	39%	22%	39%
Main source of funding	own	232	24%	76%	9%	45%	46%	67%	21%	5%	7%	20%	48%	33%				30%	33%	37%
	third party	808	5%	95%	19%	49%	32%	65%	26%	5%	4%	17%	43%	41%				21%	29%	51%
	loan	233	7%	94%	10%	47%	43%	58%	28%	8%	6%	18%	55%	28%				24%	32%	45%

■ Group is more heterogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least +5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.) ■ Group is more homogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least -5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.)

Cognitive diversity upon entering university

Table 6: Variables of (socio)demographic diversity, diversity regarding university entrance criteria and cognitive diversity (source: survey of first-year students in the winter semester 2019/20)

		Overall	Perceived self-efficacy			Enjoyment of studies			Investment in studies			Information about studying			Confident learning			Anxiety when facing examinations		
		n	-	0	+	-	0	+	-	0	+	-	0	+	-	0	+	-	0	+
Overall		1285	92	503	686	167	340	771	164	396	719	214	555	512	127	554	597	349	453	477
		100%	7%	39%	54%	13%	27%	60%	13%	31%	56%	17%	43%	40%	10%	43%	47%	27%	35%	37%
Faculty	Hum.	257	6%	39%	55%	16%	29%	55%	16%	32%	53%	23%	49%	27%	10%	42%	48%	24%	35%	41%
	Soc.	141	5%	41%	54%	15%	24%	61%	14%	36%	50%	16%	35%	49%	16%	40%	44%	34%	31%	36%
	Ed.	85	6%	39%	55%	4%	23%	74%	15%	28%	57%	22%	44%	34%	5%	47%	48%	32%	38%	31%
	Econ.+BA	165	6%	43%	51%	15%	36%	49%	15%	31%	55%	12%	43%	45%	11%	41%	49%	27%	34%	39%
	MSM	81	6%	37%	57%	12%	27%	61%	7%	36%	57%	23%	34%	44%	5%	49%	46%	31%	40%	30%
	Math.	48	8%	40%	52%	15%	21%	65%	15%	21%	64%	10%	40%	50%	8%	48%	44%	25%	29%	46%
	Phys.	24	4%	33%	63%	17%	13%	71%	8%	33%	58%	17%	46%	38%	8%	50%	42%	33%	38%	29%
	Chem.	97	14%	35%	51%	20%	31%	50%	14%	28%	58%	11%	43%	45%	12%	33%	55%	21%	38%	41%
	Bio.	57	4%	35%	61%	7%	21%	71%	12%	30%	58%	9%	46%	46%	11%	33%	56%	39%	32%	30%
	Engr.	236	10%	47%	43%	12%	24%	64%	11%	39%	50%	14%	44%	42%	12%	48%	40%	24%	40%	36%
	Med.	83	2%	24%	74%	5%	20%	76%	2%	9%	89%	15%	47%	39%	3%	48%	50%	27%	34%	40%
Type of degree	BA-L-G	72	6%	47%	47%	14%	31%	56%	11%	19%	69%	13%	51%	36%	8%	24%	68%	24%	38%	39%
	BA-L-HRSGe	76	4%	46%	50%	11%	30%	59%	18%	33%	49%	20%	50%	30%	15%	41%	45%	17%	33%	49%
	BA-L-GyGe	140	6%	32%	62%	10%	28%	62%	11%	28%	61%	25%	48%	27%	7%	44%	49%	31%	38%	31%
	BA-L-BK	36	14%	26%	60%	8%	28%	64%	14%	22%	64%	22%	36%	42%	11%	43%	46%	26%	34%	40%
	B.A.	270	7%	39%	54%	15%	25%	60%	18%	32%	50%	20%	40%	40%	12%	44%	44%	29%	33%	39%
	B.Sc.	608	8%	42%	50%	15%	27%	58%	12%	36%	52%	14%	42%	45%	10%	45%	45%	28%	36%	36%
	St.Ex.	83	2%	24%	74%	5%	20%	76%	2%	9%	89%	15%	47%	39%	3%	48%	50%	27%	34%	40%
Gender	f	790	7%	41%	52%	13%	27%	60%	10%	27%	63%	17%	45%	38%	10%	40%	49%	21%	35%	44%
	m	481	7%	37%	56%	13%	27%	61%	17%	38%	45%	15%	41%	44%	10%	48%	43%	38%	35%	27%
Age in years	<20 y.	695	7%	37%	56%	13%	26%	61%	12%	33%	55%	17%	42%	41%	9%	41%	50%	30%	34%	36%
	20-22 y.	402	8%	44%	48%	15%	27%	58%	16%	29%	56%	17%	45%	38%	12%	47%	41%	24%	34%	42%
	>22 y.	125	5%	36%	60%	8%	23%	69%	9%	23%	69%	20%	39%	41%	11%	44%	45%	21%	42%	37%
Educational background	low	284	10%	50%	40%	19%	32%	48%	13%	33%	54%	22%	42%	36%	14%	53%	34%	17%	38%	46%
	medium	379	6%	39%	55%	10%	25%	65%	14%	29%	57%	16%	42%	42%	9%	41%	50%	31%	32%	37%
	high	330	7%	32%	61%	10%	24%	65%	13%	29%	59%	13%	46%	41%	7%	39%	54%	30%	35%	36%
	very high	211	3%	36%	61%	11%	26%	64%	11%	34%	55%	16%	42%	42%	9%	41%	50%	32%	39%	29%
Immigration background	yes	542	9%	44%	47%	13%	31%	57%	9%	34%	57%	18%	46%	36%	11%	48%	41%	23%	35%	42%
	no	710	6%	35%	59%	13%	23%	64%	16%	28%	56%	16%	42%	42%	9%	39%	52%	31%	35%	34%
Chronic illness/disability	yes	86	9%	41%	49%	16%	21%	63%	8%	27%	64%	14%	43%	43%	5%	52%	43%	17%	29%	54%
	no	1199	7%	39%	54%	13%	27%	60%	13%	31%	56%	17%	43%	40%	10%	43%	47%	28%	36%	36%
Care for children and/or family members	yes	193	7%	34%	59%	11%	26%	63%	13%	27%	60%	21%	43%	37%	9%	40%	51%	26%	38%	36%
	no	1092	7%	40%	53%	13%	27%	60%	13%	32%	56%	16%	44%	41%	10%	44%	46%	28%	35%	38%
Vocational education	yes	114	3%	43%	54%	5%	19%	77%	12%	21%	67%	15%	43%	42%	8%	46%	46%	26%	38%	36%
	no	1166	8%	39%	53%	14%	27%	59%	13%	32%	55%	17%	44%	40%	10%	43%	47%	28%	35%	38%
Mark in the university entrance qualification	1.0-1.5	192	6%	20%	75%	8%	22%	70%	5%	20%	75%	14%	47%	39%	5%	34%	62%	33%	41%	26%
	1.6-2.5	586	6%	40%	54%	11%	25%	64%	11%	30%	59%	18%	39%	43%	8%	43%	50%	31%	33%	36%
	2.6-4.0	450	8%	48%	45%	17%	29%	54%	19%	37%	45%	17%	47%	37%	15%	47%	38%	22%	34%	44%
Place where the entrance qualification was obtained	Ruhr Area	770	8%	41%	51%	14%	26%	60%	15%	31%	54%	17%	44%	39%	11%	43%	46%	26%	35%	39%
	NRW	301	4%	36%	60%	11%	23%	66%	10%	30%	60%	18%	43%	39%	6%	43%	51%	33%	33%	34%
	Germany	61	5%	36%	59%	10%	31%	59%	16%	34%	49%	15%	43%	43%	8%	48%	43%	25%	43%	33%
	other country	62	12%	38%	51%	8%	38%	54%	7%	25%	69%	12%	39%	49%	16%	44%	40%	19%	36%	45%
Main source of funding	own	232	7%	39%	55%	15%	29%	57%	17%	30%	53%	21%	41%	37%	11%	49%	40%	25%	35%	40%
	third party	808	7%	39%	55%	13%	25%	63%	12%	30%	57%	16%	45%	39%	10%	41%	50%	31%	34%	35%
	loan	233	11%	41%	48%	12%	31%	57%	10%	35%	55%	15%	40%	46%	10%	48%	42%	17%	39%	44%

■ Group is more heterogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least +5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.)   ■ Group is more homogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least -5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.)

Demographic diversity of graduates

Table 7: (Socio)demographic diversity variables of graduates (source: survey of 2018 graduates)

		Overall	Gender		Age in years			Educational background				Immigration background		Children in the household	
		n	f	m	<24 y.	24-27 y.	>27 y.	low	medium	high	very high	yes	no	yes	no
Overall		1457	713	575	263	603	419	154	509	350	269	394	888	111	1180
		100%	55%	45%	21%	47%	33%	12%	40%	27%	21%	31%	69%	9%	91%
Faculty	Hum.	269	79%	21%	23%	43%	34%	13%	44%	25%	18%	28%	72%	8%	92%
	Soc.	106	65%	35%	12%	52%	36%	14%	42%	26%	18%	32%	68%	8%	92%
	Ed.	117	78%	22%	30%	43%	28%	12%	39%	33%	17%	20%	80%	11%	89%
	Econ.+BA	188	47%	53%	17%	44%	39%	11%	35%	29%	25%	34%	67%	10%	90%
	MSM	114	57%	43%	31%	50%	19%	18%	42%	23%	18%	26%	74%	5%	95%
	Math.	61	65%	35%	29%	49%	22%	15%	42%	17%	26%	28%	72%	8%	93%
	Phys.	29	35%	65%	31%	35%	35%	8%	36%	24%	32%	23%	77%	12%	89%
	Chem.	64	50%	50%	28%	40%	33%	18%	42%	28%	12%	30%	70%	7%	93%
	Bio.	79	68%	32%	29%	40%	31%	11%	45%	25%	18%	27%	73%	6%	94%
	Engr.	370	30%	70%	14%	54%	32%	9%	39%	29%	23%	41%	59%	6%	94%
	Med.	53	63%	37%	0%	44%	56%	7%	21%	37%	35%	14%	86%	35%	65%
Type of degree	BA	574	56%	44%	37%	47%	17%	15%	37%	26%	22%	34%	67%	4%	96%
	MA	431	41%	59%	2%	53%	46%	9%	37%	30%	24%	33%	67%	8%	92%
	BA-L	188	78%	22%	36%	51%	13%	12%	46%	26%	17%	28%	72%	4%	96%
	MA-L	101	78%	22%	9%	62%	29%	11%	59%	23%	7%	23%	77%	7%	93%
	St.Ex.	37	59%	41%	0%	56%	44%	7%	22%	44%	26%	15%	85%	33%	67%
	Prom	78	49%	51%	0%	6%	94%	6%	33%	30%	30%	24%	77%	35%	65%
	L/Dipl/Mag	47	55%	45%	0%	6%	94%	20%	51%	17%	11%	25%	75%	26%	74%
Gender	f	713			25%	48%	28%	12%	40%	28%	20%	32%	68%	8%	92%
	f	575			15%	46%	39%	12%	40%	27%	22%	30%	71%	9%	91%
Age in years	<24 y.	263	66%	34%				11%	36%	29%	24%	24%	76%	1%	99%
	24-27 y.	603	56%	44%				13%	41%	26%	20%	31%	69%	3%	97%
	>27 y.	419	47%	53%				12%	41%	27%	21%	35%	65%	21%	79%
Educational background	low	154	57%	43%	18%	51%	31%					77%	23%	11%	90%
	medium	509	55%	45%	18%	48%	33%					22%	78%	8%	92%
	high	350	57%	44%	22%	45%	33%					25%	75%	8%	92%
	very high	269	53%	47%	24%	44%	32%					29%	71%	9%	91%
Immigration background	yes	394	57%	43%	16%	47%	37%	30%	28%	22%	19%			10%	90%
	no	888	55%	45%	22%	47%	31%	4%	45%	30%	22%			8%	92%
Children in the household	yes	111	51%	50%	2%	18%	80%	15%	38%	26%	21%	36%	65%		
	no	1180	56%	44%	22%	50%	28%	12%	40%	27%	21%	30%	70%		

■ Group is more heterogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least +5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.) ■ Group is more homogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least -5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.)

Diversity of graduates with regard to aspects of academic success

Table 8: (Socio)demographic diversity variables and aspects of academic success (source: survey of 2018 graduates)

		Overall	Mark for the degree			Degree completed within standard period of study		Student satisfaction			Master's course following the Bachelor's degree	
		n	1.0-1.5	1.6-2.5	2.6-4.0	yes	no	-	0	+	yes	no
Overall		1457	393	777	287	419	948	123	347	919	593	169
		100%	27%	53%	20%	31%	69%	9%	25%	66%	78%	22%
Faculty	Hum.	269	23%	58%	18%	23%	78%	10%	33%	56%	91%	9%
	Soc.	106	26%	60%	13%	18%	82%	13%	22%	66%	73%	27%
	Ed.	117	33%	60%	8%	46%	55%	7%	24%	69%	41%	59%
	Econ.+BA	188	19%	50%	31%	21%	79%	8%	33%	59%	71%	29%
	MSM	114	18%	58%	25%	35%	66%	7%	27%	67%	73%	27%
	Math.	61	31%	48%	21%	38%	62%	7%	29%	64%	92%	8%
	Phys.	29	52%	35%	14%	42%	58%	0%	21%	79%	100%	0%
	Chem.	64	31%	42%	27%	43%	57%	11%	26%	63%	100%	0%
	Bio.	79	35%	54%	10%	53%	47%	5%	22%	72%	95%	5%
	Engr.	370	27%	54%	20%	27%	73%	10%	17%	74%	79%	21%
	Med.	53	49%	30%	21%	64%	36%	7%	20%	74%		
Type of degree	BA	574	16%	55%	29%	26%	74%	9%	25%	65%	71%	29%
	MA	431	36%	57%	7%	29%	72%	7%	21%	72%		
	BA-L	188	13%	59%	29%	35%	65%	11%	28%	61%	98%	2%
	MA-L	101	31%	62%	7%	59%	41%	5%	32%	63%	0%	0%
	St.Ex.	37	27%	43%	30%	64%	36%	3%	17%	80%	0%	0%
	Prom	78	99%	0%	1%	0%	0%	5%	20%	74%	0%	0%
	L/Dip/Mag	47	13%	60%	28%	0%	100%	25%	43%	32%	0%	0%
Gender	f	713	26%	55%	19%	34%	66%	10%	27%	64%	76%	24%
	m	575	29%	53%	19%	28%	72%	8%	22%	70%	81%	19%
Age in years	<24 y.	263	22%	64%	14%	53%	47%	3%	20%	76%	88%	12%
	24-27 y.	603	24%	55%	21%	28%	72%	10%	24%	66%	77%	23%
	>27 y.	419	34%	47%	19%	21%	79%	11%	28%	62%	57%	43%
Educational background	low	154	21%	47%	32%	27%	73%	8%	29%	63%	73%	27%
	medium	509	26%	55%	19%	34%	66%	9%	23%	68%	76%	24%
	high	350	26%	57%	17%	32%	68%	10%	23%	67%	76%	24%
	very high	269	35%	52%	13%	30%	70%	8%	26%	67%	86%	15%
Immigration background	yes	394	21%	51%	29%	25%	75%	9%	28%	64%	72%	28%
	no	888	30%	55%	14%	34%	66%	9%	23%	68%	80%	20%
Mark for the degree	1.0-1.5	393				44%	56%	4%	17%	79%	82%	18%
	1.6-2.5	777				32%	68%	9%	26%	66%	82%	18%
	2.6-4.0	287				14%	86%	15%	34%	51%	68%	32%
Degree completed w/in standard period of study	yes	419	33%	58%	9%			5%	20%	76%	85%	15%
	no	948	19%	56%	26%			11%	28%	61%	75%	25%
Student satisfaction	-	123	13%	54%	33%	16%	84%				69%	31%
	0	347	19%	54%	27%	24%	76%				69%	31%
	+	919	32%	53%	15%	36%	64%				82%	18%
Master's course following Bachelor's degree	yes	593	16%	59%	26%	31%	69%	9%	23%	68%		
	no	169	12%	46%	43%	19%	81%	14%	36%	51%		

■ Group is more heterogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least +5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.) ■ Group is more homogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least -5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.)

Diversity of graduates with regard to professional aspects

Table 9: (Socio)demographic diversity variables and professional aspects (source: survey of 2018 graduates)

		Overall	Employment		Form of employment contract		Full-time employment		Gross monthly income				Application of qualifications		
									Gainfully employed respondents only						
		n	yes	no	permanent	fixed-term	yes	no	<2001€	2001-3000€	3001-4000€	>4000€	-	0	+
Overall		1457	968	127	417	315	512	240	214	79	200	216	170	267	362
		100%	88%	12%	57%	43%	68%	32%	30%	11%	28%	31%	21%	33%	45%
Faculty	Hum.	269	89%	11%	40%	60%	30%	70%	61%	16%	14%	10%	25%	34%	41%
	Soc.	106	80%	20%	27%	73%	63%	37%	33%	18%	35%	13%	24%	35%	41%
	Ed.	117	92%	8%	53%	47%	66%	34%	31%	20%	43%	7%	15%	32%	54%
	Econ.+BA	188	93%	7%	71%	29%	78%	22%	25%	7%	35%	33%	18%	33%	49%
	MSM	114	92%	8%	74%	26%	72%	28%	25%	19%	31%	25%	41%	31%	28%
	Math.	61	88%	12%	40%	60%	38%	63%	67%	0%	13%	20%	19%	50%	31%
	Phys.	29	75%	25%	50%	50%	69%	31%	36%	0%	27%	36%	8%	23%	69%
	Chem.	64	90%	11%	44%	57%	50%	50%	33%	5%	29%	33%	25%	13%	63%
	Bio.	79	81%	19%	46%	55%	48%	52%	67%	5%	14%	14%	32%	36%	32%
	Engr.	370	88%	12%	73%	27%	82%	18%	17%	7%	28%	48%	19%	35%	46%
	Med.	53	91%	9%	16%	84%	92%	8%	0%	7%	10%	83%	3%	36%	62%
Type of degree	BA	574	83%	17%	47%	53%	50%	50%	51%	15%	26%	9%	29%	33%	38%
	MA	431	92%	8%	77%	23%	94%	6%	4%	10%	40%	46%	17%	38%	45%
	BA-L	188	85%	15%	36%	64%	6%	95%	93%	6%	2%	0%	23%	24%	53%
	MA-L	101	96%	4%	42%	58%	33%	67%	27%	18%	27%	27%	33%	28%	39%
	St.Ex.	37	93%	7%	15%	85%	92%	8%	0%	0%	15%	85%	0%	48%	52%
	Prom	78	94%	6%	48%	52%	89%	11%	2%	4%	14%	80%	8%	14%	79%
	L/Dip/Mag	47	91%	9%	50%	50%	17%	83%	36%	18%	18%	27%	31%	54%	15%
Gender	f	713	87%	14%	53%	47%	63%	37%	37%	13%	29%	21%	23%	36%	42%
	m	575	90%	10%	60%	40%	73%	28%	24%	9%	26%	42%	20%	31%	49%
Age in years	<24 y.	263	82%	18%	33%	67%	24%	76%	74%	10%	13%	3%	24%	32%	44%
	24-27 y.	603	88%	12%	59%	41%	72%	28%	30%	11%	29%	29%	25%	34%	41%
	>27 y.	419	92%	8%	64%	36%	82%	19%	13%	12%	32%	43%	16%	34%	50%
Educational background	low	154	85%	15%	62%	38%	77%	23%	27%	10%	32%	31%	27%	30%	43%
	medium	509	88%	12%	55%	45%	67%	33%	32%	12%	27%	29%	22%	35%	43%
	high	350	91%	9%	62%	38%	67%	33%	28%	13%	27%	33%	20%	37%	43%
	very high	269	85%	15%	51%	49%	68%	33%	33%	9%	27%	31%	19%	28%	53%
Immigration background	yes	394	86%	14%	63%	37%	74%	26%	22%	13%	34%	31%	20%	35%	46%
	no	888	89%	11%	55%	45%	65%	35%	34%	11%	25%	31%	22%	34%	45%
Children in the household	yes	111	85%	15%	66%	34%	82%	18%	13%	8%	22%	57%	14%	35%	51%
	no	1180	88%	12%	56%	44%	66%	34%	32%	11%	28%	28%	22%	34%	44%

■ Group is more heterogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least +5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.)　　■ Group is more homogeneous than the overall sample. (Deviation of at least -5 % compared to the 'Overall' row; calculated on the basis of fractionalisation indices.)

Legend/list of abbrevations and scales

Age in years

< 20 y.	19 years and younger
20-22 y.	20, 21 or 22 years
> 22 y.	23 years and older
< 24 y.	23 years and younger
24-27 y.	24, 25, 26 or 27 years
> 27 y.	28 years and older

Anxiety when facing examinations

Factor (α=.69) as a result of an exploratory factor analysis of the following three items (incl. factor loadings): 'I am worried about whether I will even be able to finish my studies' (.69,); 'I get so nervous in examinations that I completely forget things that I usually know' (.83); 'I am usually scared before an examination' (.84).

-	disagree (strongly)
0	partly/partly
+	agree (strongly)

Application of qualifications

The results are based on the question 'Considering your current professional tasks all in all, to what extent do you apply the qualifications you acquired during your studies?'

-	to a low extent/not at all
0	partly/partly
+	to a rather/very high extent

Confident learning

Factor (α=.62) as a result of an exploratory factor analysis of the following three items (incl. factor loadings): 'I can concentrate on studying for long periods of time and complete a task' (.79); 'It is easy for me to learn new subject-specific content and facts and remember them' (.68); 'I am good at organising study material and workload' (.79).

-	disagree (strongly)
0	partly/partly
+	agree (strongly)

Degree completed within the standard period of study

The results are based on the question 'Did you compete your studies in the standard period of time?'.

Educational Background

Low	One or both parents do not have any vocational qualification or the respondent does not know the vocational qualification of one or both parents.
Medium	Both parents have a vocational qualification.
High	One parent has a higher education degree.
Very high	Both parents have a higher education degree.

Employment

Yes   Graduates who are in gainful employment at the time of the survey.

No   Graduates who are not in gainful employment at the time of the survey (e.g. further studies, extensive travels, etc.).

Enjoyment of studies

Factor (α=.85) as a result of an exploratory factor analysis of the following three items (incl. factor loadings): 'I enjoy my studies a lot' (.90); 'To be honest, I do not enjoy my studies very much' (-.88, recoded); 'I can fully identify with my studies' (.85).

-   disagree (strongly)

0   partly/partly

+   agree (strongly)

Faculty

Hum.   Faculty of Humanities

Soc.   Faculty of Social Sciences

Ed.   Faculty of Educational Sciences

Econ.+BA   Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

MSM   Mercator School of Management

Math.   Faculty of Mathematics

Phys.   Faculty of Physics

Chem.   Faculty of Chemistry

Bio.   Faculty of Biology

Engr.   Faculty of Engineering

Med.   Faculty of Medicine

Gender

f   female

m   male

Immigration background

Survey of first-year students

Yes   One or both parents and/or the respondent hold a foreign nationality, have acquired German nationality through naturalisation or are members of the group of ethnic German repatriates.

No   The respondent and his/her parents hold the German nationality, which they have not acquired through naturalisation, and are not members of the group of ethnic German repatriates.

Graduate survey

Yes   One or both parents and/or the respondent were born in a foreign country and/or the respondent holds a foreign nationality.

No   The respondent and his/her parents were born in Germany and the respondent exclusively holds the German nationality.

Information about studying

The results are based on the question: 'How well informed do you feel you are about the opportunities, limitations and the overall regulations for studying?'

-   rather/very bad

0   partly/partly

+   rather/very good

Investment in studies

Factor (α=.73) as a result of an exploratory factor analysis of the following three items (incl. factor loadings): 'I do not work more for my studies than is absolutely necessary' (-.81, recoded); 'I set very high demands on myself when it comes to my study performance' (.77); 'I invest a lot of energy in order to be successful in my studies' (.85).

-	disagree (strongly)
0	partly/partly
+	agree (strongly)

Main source of funding

Own	respondents' own wages/salary or other personal funds (savings, assets)
Third Party	means provided by parents/relatives or the spouse, orphan's pension or grants
Loan	funding based on BAföG or student loan

n

n is the number of respondents who answered the relevant question. Thus, n may vary and differ from the overall n.

Place where the entrance qualification was obtained

Ruhr Area	
NRW	North Rhine-Westphalia
Germany	
Other Country	

Preparedness for studies

Factor (α=.79) as a result of an exploratory factor analysis of the following five items (incl. factor loadings): 'I am sufficiently familiar with the methods required for my studies' (.73); 'My knowledge and skills are sufficient to keep up with the content taught in the first semesters without many problems' (.75); 'I am familiar with the basic academic techniques that I need for my studies' (.69); 'I lack the knowledge and skills that are required for my studies' (-.69, recoded); 'Overall, I am well prepared for my studies' (.79).

-	disagree (strongly)
0	partly/partly
+	agree (strongly)

Reconciliation of work and studies

The results are based on the question: 'To what extent do you agree with the following statement? I can reconcile my work with my current studies at UDE …'.

-	rather/very bad
0	partly/partly
+	rather/very well

Self-efficacy

In order to measure perceived self-efficacy, we resorted to the scale of subjective convictions about oneself developed by Beierlein et al. (2012). Factor (α=.76) resulting from the following three items: 'I can rely on my abilities in difficult situations'; 'I can resolve most issues well by myself'; 'I can usually solve demanding and complicated tasks well'.

-	disagree (strongly)
0	partly/partly
+	agree (strongly)

Student satisfaction

The results are based on the question: 'Overall, how satisfied are you with your studies at UDE from today's perspective?'

-	(very) dissatisfied
0	partly/partly
+	(very) satisfied

Type of degree

BA	Bachelor's degree
MA	Master's degree
B.A.	Bachelor of Arts
MA-L	Master with a teaching option
BA-L-G	Bachelor with a teaching option for primary schools
BA-L-HRSGe	Bachelor with a teaching option for secondary schools
BA-L-GyGe	Bachelor with a teaching option for secondary schools offering university entrance qualification
BA-LA-BK	Bachelor with a teaching option for vocational schools
St.Ex.	State Examination
Prom	Doctorate
L/Dipl/Mag	Degrees from the former German academic system; L – Lehramt (5-year qualification for teaching specific subjects at schools, equivalent to a Master's degree); Dipl – Diplom (5-year undergraduate course, degree awarded in sciences and engineering, equivalent to a Master's degree); Mag – Magister (5-year undergraduate course, degree awarded in humanities, equivalent to a Master's degree)

Literature

Becker, Rolf (2011): Warum bildungsferne Gruppen von der Universität fernbleiben und wie man sie für das Studium an der Universität gewinnen könnte. In: Heinz-Hermann Krüger, Ursula Rabe-Kleberg, Rolf-Torsten Kramer und Jürgen Budde (Hrsg.): Bildungsungleichheit revisited. Springer, Wiesbaden, S. 223-234.

Beierlein, Constanze, Anastassyia Kovaleva, Christoph J.Kemper und Beatrice Rammstedt (2012): Ein Messinstrumentzur Erfassung subjektiver Kompetenzerwartungen. Allgemeine Selbstwirksamkeit Kurzskala (ASKU). Online: https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-292351 (accessed on 02 February 2021).

Ebert, Anna und Alisa Hauser (2017): Studienabbruchmotive an der UDE. Kurzbericht: Ergebnisse der Exmatrikuliertenbefragung 2015.

Finger, Claudia (2013): Diversität im Ausland? Die soziale Selektivität studentischer Mobilität im Rahmen des Bologna Prozesses. In: Qualität in der Wissenschaft -Zeitschrift für Qualitätsentwicklung in Forschung, Studium und Administration 7 (2), pp. 37-45.

Gaisch, Martina und Regina Aichinger (2016): Das Diversity Wheel der FH OÖ. Wie die Umsetzung einerganzheitlichen Diversitätskultur an der Fachhochschulegelingen kann. Online: http://ffhoarep.fh-ooe.at/handle/123456789/637 (accessed on 02 February 2021)

Gold, Andreas und Elmar Souvignier (2005): Prognoseder Studierfähigkeit. Ergebnisse aus Längsschnittanalysen. In: Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspsychologie und Pädagogische Psychologie 37 (4), pp. 214-222.

Heublein, Ulrich und Andrä Wolter (2011): Studienabbruch in Deutschland. Definition, Häufigkeit, Ursachen, Maßnahmen. In: Zeitschrift für Pädagogik 57 (2), pp. 214-236.

Middendorff, Elke, Beate Apolinarski, Jonas Poskowsky, Maren Kandulla und Nicolai Netz (2013): Die wirtschaftliche und soziale Lage der Studierenden in Deutschland 2012. 20. Sozialerhebung des Deutschen Studentenwerks durchgeführt durch das HIS-Institut für Hochschulforschung. BMBF, Bonn und Berlin.

Schaeffer, Merlin (2016): Diversity erfassen: Statistische-Diversitätsindizes. In: Petia Genkova und Tobias Ringeisen (Hrsg.): Handbuch Diversity Kompetenz. Band 1: Perspektiven und Anwendungsfelder. Springer, Wiesbaden, pp. 47–60.

Stammen, Karl-Heinz (2018): Qualitätsentwicklungmit Diversity Monitoring. In: Nicole Auferkorte-Michaelis und Frank Linde (Hrsg.): Diversität lernen und lehren – ein Hochschulbuch. Verlag Barbara Budrich, Leverkusen, pp. 261-276.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Centre for Quality Enhancement and Teaching Development at the University of Duisburg-Essen

Anna Ebert, M.A.
anna.ebert@uni-due.de

Dipl.- Soz.-Wiss. Karl-Heinz Stammen
karl-heinz.stammen@uni-due.de