

Oxford Review of Education >

Volume 44, 2018 - Issue 1: Special Issue: Inequalities and the Curriculum by Guest Editors: Alice Sullivan, Morag Henderson, Jake Anders, Vanessa Moulton

Open access

5,230 29

Views | CrossRef citations to date | Altmetric

12

Listen

Special Issue: Inequalities and the Curriculum

# The relationship between A-level subject choice and league table score of university attended: the 'facilitating', the 'less suitable', and the counter-intuitive

Catherine Dilnot

Pages 118-137 | Published online: 12 Feb 2018

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2018.1409976>

Check for updates

Full Article

Reprint

Abstract

English s

schools

been

in ad

English e

score of

category

as 'facili

'less sui

common

## We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 878 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting I Accept enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under we and our partners process data to provide. Selecting Reject All or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the Show Purposes link on the bottom of the webpage. Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. [Here](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device

I Accept

Reject All

Show Purpose

university overall, even controlling for degree subject, and the converse is true for 'less suitable' subjects. The heterogeneous relationships of professionally-related A-level subjects with university ranking make decision-making for aspirational 16-year-olds problematic: an apparently sensible subject choice for students wishing to prepare for a professional career may, in fact, put them at a disadvantage.

Keywords: [A-level subject choice](#) [facilitating subjects](#) [fair access](#) [university league tables](#)

## Introduction

University participation for English school students has increased over recent decades, but among university entrants young people from less privileged backgrounds continue to be particularly under-represented at high-status universities (Anders, [2012](#); Chowdry, Crawford, Dearden, Goodman, & Vignoles, [2013](#); Sullivan, Parsons, Wiggins, Heath, & Green, [2014](#)), as do students from state, rather than private, schools (Sullivan et al., [2014](#); Sutton Trust, [2011](#)). This matters to social mobility because it is well-established that higher returns are associated with attending high-status universities (Britton, Dearden, Shephard, & Vignoles, [2016](#); Chevalier, [2014](#); Chevalier & Conlon, [2003](#); Hussain, McNally, & Telhaj, [2009](#)) and particular degrees (Britton et al., [2016](#); Walker &

Zhu, [2012](#)). The numbers of relatively low-achieving students at high-status universities (Ashley, [2012](#); Duberley, [2012](#)) and their social mobility (Ashley, [2012](#)) are lower than for their social mobility (Ashley, [2012](#)) and 60-70% of students from low-achieving backgrounds (Ashley, [2012](#)) go on to careers in areas with low social mobility. Why are students from low-achieving backgrounds not attaining



[2007](#)), but there is evidence that apparently equally well qualified applicants receive differential offer rates from universities according to their social background (UCAS, [2016b](#)) and schooling (Boliver, [2013](#)) conditional on having applied in the first place. The Russell Group has suggested that part of the reason for this is that students from less privileged backgrounds apply to university with the 'wrong' subjects and qualifications for the courses for which they apply (Russell Group, [2015](#)). This begs the question of which are the 'right' subjects and qualifications.

A-levels are much the most widely held qualifications amongst English-domiciled university applicants; in 2015, 73% of English 18-year-olds applying to UK university did so with just A-levels and 9% had mixed A-level and BTEC qualifications. Fifteen percent applied with only BTECs (UCAS, [2016a](#)). At age 16+, students following the academic A-level path typically choose four subjects to study at AS-level during Year 12, continuing with three of them to A2-level in Year 13. Until 2015, some 96 A-levels (including double awards) were available for teaching in England, although 27 will no longer be delivered under present reforms. But that still gives a wide variety of subjects from which students may choose, and these choices may make a difference to their chances of acceptance at university in general, and high-status university in particular. As discussed elsewhere in this issue, schools may constrain choices at age 14 (Anders, Henderson, Moulton, & Sullivan, [2018](#)) which has a knock-on effect on A-level choices (Dilnot, [2016](#)). Most students applying to university do so during Year 13 with grades predicted

predicted university required

Many un of the im 2011, pu

Inform histor more of

will be a keep op to the be that som

the ac



selective university because of their subject content or because of skills they demonstrate (or perhaps signal), is a question that has not yet been explored.

A related question is whether the remaining 63 subjects (pre-reform) are all equally unhelpful in contrast with facilitating subjects. A study of Informed choices and the general admissions guidance of Russell Group universities suggests that some subjects are considered less suitable preparation by some universities. This has led to the production of a taxonomy of A-levels, dividing them into 'facilitating', 'useful', 'less suitable',<sup>2</sup> and 'non-counting' in the context of highly selective university entry (Dilnot, [2015](#)). There is little evidence to date on how the number of these subjects offered at A-level is related to the status of university attended. The taxonomy is reproduced in Appendix [1](#).

Many of the 'less suitable' A-level subjects have a vocational bent; they include law, accounting, and business. A student making A-level choices at age 16 who aspires to a career in a professional services firm might think that taking an A-level in law, accounting, or business would be helpful in achieving that goal through facilitating admission to a high-status university to read the corresponding subject. But none of these A-levels is described as essential for the corresponding degree in Informed choices, and given that some Russell Group universities at least consider them not good preparation for university study, it may be that choosing these subjects is actually unhelpful.

A further  
large dif  
Russell G  
with thre  
(Dilnot, 2  
maths A  
univ  
with hav  
and Vign  
  
This pap  
students  
universit

The very  
an non-  
at for those  
subject  
th holding  
ranked  
associated  
by Dolton  
  
sh school  
us of  
onomy.



subjects only as controls (Boliver, [2013](#); Crawford, [2014](#)). The relationship of 'less suitable' A-levels and university attended has not previously been examined. Using these linked data does not allow comparative offer rates to be computed in the absence of further linkage to UCAS applications data, which are unavailable at the time of this analysis (Machin, [2015](#)), but does allow the role of GCSE<sup>3</sup> performance to be taken into account, which has been shown to be very important in university entry (Crawford, [2014](#)).

I further shed light on the previously unexamined association with university status of vocational A-level subjects related to professional careers in law, accounting, and business. Two of these related A-levels (law and accounting) are taken disproportionately by students from lower SES backgrounds and are rarely offered at private schools. While no causal claims as to their efficacy (or not) in helping students to gain places on accounting, business, and law degrees at highly ranked universities can be made in the absence of linked applications data, this work will provide information about associations to students making A-level choices at age 16 and those who guide them. I proceed by discussing the literature on A-level subject choice and university admission, then set out methods and data. In the last section I discuss results, conclusions, and directions for further research.

Previous  
admiss

Subject

A-level s

by SES a

and th

more

Sammon

Bell, [201](#)

taken by

also a re

[2016](#)). S

facilitati

×





The 41 subjects categorised as 'less suitable' in the taxonomy are ones where at least one Russell Group university has expressed reservations about the subject as university preparation and the subject is never required for even related university courses. The 20 'useful' subjects are those which appear on at least one Russell Group university approved list of A-levels and are absent from all non-preferred lists. 'Less suitable' subjects are more likely to be taken by students from lower SES backgrounds (Dilnot, [2016](#)) and at non-selective state schools and colleges rather than private or grammar schools (Dilnot, [2016](#); Gill, [2015b](#)).

Work by Vidal Rodeiro et al. ([2013](#)) suggests that doing at least two 'applied' or 'expressive' A-level subjects (most of which are in the 'less suitable' category of the taxonomy) is associated with reduced odds of being at a Russell Group university. Their analysis is based on HESA data for those at university in 2011/12, but not linked to attainment other than A-level results.

Accounting, business, and law A-levels, all of which might be expected to be helpful preparation for university courses in their disciplines, are categorised as 'less suitable' in the taxonomy of A-levels because of published reservations by the relatively small number of Russell Group universities publishing general approved lists, and other highly selective universities either remaining silent or stating neutrality about their usefulness. Evidence as to their effectiveness as preparation is largely anecdotal,

although  
universit  
the time  
selective  
practice  
hundred  
Group un  
tutor  
view  
saying la  
complac  
the effi  
of Inform  
(along w

up  
without, by  
y highly  
it, in  
several  
most Russell  
missions  
hold this  
ors as  
y and  
ature about  
rliest version  
subjects'



# Data

Three cohorts of all English students taking GCSEs (KS4) from National Pupil Database (NPD) data in 2008–2010 were matched to those taking at least three ‘counting’ A-levels from 2010 to 2012 (KS5 data), and then linked to Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data for starters in 2010–2012. Students were matched not just for ‘normal’ progression, but where possible when taking an extra year in the sixth form, and for taking one or two gap years before university. Students found only in the HESA and KS5 data (i.e. not at school in England at KS4 or otherwise unmatched) were retained in the dataset. Where students had more than one university instance in the dataset (because they left a university course and subsequently started again), their first instance only was included, as it was to this course that their A-levels would first have admitted them. Some 474,526 observations of students entering UK university with at least three ‘counting’ A-levels were matched to their school records at KS5, and of these, 451,491 were at universities included in the Times rankings. Of these, 6.5% had some missing demographic or GCSE data, leaving 421,836 complete cases for analysis.

Most previous work on high-status university entry has used dichotomous outcome variables (such as Russell Group attendance or not) to examine relationships between high-status participation and variables of interest. It is desirable, though, to use an interval-  
methods  
different  
(Boliver,  
rankings  
universit  
in makin  
Univ  
produc  
from the  
measure  
only ran  
Guide us  
universit

al analysis  
versities of  
er-simplified  
published  
ments within  
de students  
the Guardian  
ion  
ngs differ  
ude a  
ilable, but  
e University  
nber of  
mes guide.





because scores (rather than just ranks) are available for universities overall and including research is likely to be important to status. The Times guide is also the longest running provider (Chevalier, [2014](#)), and arguably the most widely respected.


Scores were used rather than ranks in the analysis because they better capture the distance between universities. The analysis was repeated using ranks and the results footnoted.<sup>5</sup> Overall university scores from the Times are given in Appendix [2](#). Scores are those published in 2012 for students making applications for 2013, and are based on data from 2008 to 2011, coterminous with the cohorts examined. This approach is preferred to that adopted by Chevalier ([2014](#)) of deriving a quality measure from the individual indicators in the Times Good University Guide for ease of interpretation of results. Robustness checks were performed using a derived quality measure and results footnoted. Overall scores for the institution rather than those relating to departments were used as future employers are likely to have knowledge of overall university prestige but not of individual departments (Chevalier, [2014](#)). For the period relevant to these entrants, the Times guide covered 116 UK universities, and excluded very small and specialist institutions.

The number of facilitating, useful, and 'less suitable' A-levels attempted by each student, and whether they had attempted A-levels in maths, accounting, business, or law, was calculated from KS5 data. Lists of facilitating, useful, and 'less suitable' subjects

Prima facie, the number of A-levels attempted by students in each of these categories and scores achieved in each of these subjects were split into quintiles based on the number of A-levels attempted.

Figure 1 shows the relationship between the number of A-levels attempted and the number of university





Display full size

Figure 1 shows that for the quintile of students at lowest scoring universities, on average students had around one from each category of A-levels. As the scores of university attended increase, the mean number of facilitating subjects per student increases, whilst the number of 'less suitable' A-levels per student decreases, and the number of 'useful' A-levels stays relatively stable.

The total number of 'counting' A-levels (i.e. excluding general studies and critical thinking) was calculated for each student at KS5, enabling the association with subjects from part... subjects... The result... with an... and so o... points.

Cap... 16. The... with each... The HES... Socio-Ec... missing... ent at age... s 58 points, ... nal Statistics... amounts of... al. (2013)

the attributes of local and very local areas and free school meal (FSM) eligibility. Quintiles were constructed for the whole cohort at KS4. FSM and local area data are not observable for students in private schools. These students, again following Chowdry et al. (2013), are assumed to be from families of higher SES than most maintained school and college students, and were therefore included in the top SES quintile. Dealing with the private school students in this way left only 4.1% missing data. Robustness checks on a common dataset for observations with non-missing data for all three measures show negligible differences in the coefficients of subject choice variables.

Descriptive statistics are given in Table 1, for all students in the sample split by school type, and for the three degree course subjects of accounting, business, and law. The mean score of university attended of students from private school is 690 (so Birmingham or Reading would be 'mean universities' for these students) and grammar schools 659 (Manchester or Kent). The mean score of university attended for students from non-selective state schools and colleges is much lower (581 for non-selective state schools, 574 for sixth form colleges, and 544 for FE). These scores follow the pattern of average SES quintile by school type, as well as points held in the best three A-levels by school type, with the highest being those from private schools (767 points) and the lowest from FE colleges (676 points). Accounting and business students are, on average, at lower scoring universities than all students taken together, with mean scores of 554 and 531 respectively. Law students are, on average, at higher scored institutions.

Table

Download



proportions for law at FE and sixth form colleges of 13.9% and 12.6% of students. The proportions of those doing business are much more similar across school type.

Subject choices also vary considerably by the three degree courses examined, despite none generally having A-level pre-requisites. Maths is held by 67% of accounting degree students, whilst for business and law students the proportions are 17.5% and 16.8% respectively. Business A-level is held by almost half of students studying for business degrees, and almost a third of those reading accounting. Law A-level is also extremely popular among those doing law degrees (held by 42.4%). Accounting is held by 21.7% of accounting degree students, a rather less popular choice than either business or maths.

## Methods

Previous work (Boliver, [2013](#); Chowdry et al., [2013](#); Noden et al., [2014](#); Shiner & Noden, [2015](#); Vidal Rodeiro et al., [2013](#)) suggests that prior academic attainment, social background, gender, school type, prior application attempts, and university course group are all important in university participation, and for the rank of university attended. These factors are therefore all controlled for in investigating the role of A-level subjects.

The mean university attended by students with A-level subjects was significantly higher than those without. The mean university attended by students with A-level subjects was significantly higher than those without. The mean university attended by students with A-level subjects was significantly higher than those without.

Observations such as these are likely to be influenced by factors such as school type, because of the way in which they are collected, and are therefore likely to be biased. The 'effects' of these factors are likely to be confounded with other factors, and using the



between and within effects differ: for example, the relationship between university score and number of facilitating subjects found by comparing two students in the same school (the within effect) is different from that between two otherwise similar students who are at schools with different mean numbers of facilitating subjects taken (the between effect). Including the school mean of each level 1 (individual) variable in the model allows the within and between effects to differ, and effectively relaxes the assumption that there is no correlation between the level 2 error and the level 1 variables.

The models to be estimated are of the form:

$$(1)$$

where  $Y_{ij}$  is the score of university attended by individual  $i$  from school  $j$ .

Using the random coefficients estimator means that the  $\beta_{nw}$  are the within (fixed effect) coefficients for the individual level variables. A positive coefficient on the 'within' subject choice variable is interpreted as an increase in mean score of university attended by students with a particular subject, or one from a particular group, rather than any other subject, or one from any other group, compared with other students at the same school. The coefficient term  $(\beta_{nb}-\beta_{nw})$  of the school mean of each variable is the difference between the within and the between effects, and is known as the contextual effect.

The coefficient  
only term  
school-le

Effective  
accounti  
course



Result

Table 2  
shows the  
school is



ol type, the  
ij are the

nts reading  
ely for each

Model 1  
prehensive  
cores (the

having extra A-levels for a given number of facilitating subjects and best three A-level points compared with a student's school mean is positively associated with score, there is a significant negative relationship of university score with school mean number of A-levels, once the school mean number of facilitating A-levels, school mean marks from best three A-levels, and all else in the model are controlled for. This 'between' effect suggests that each increase of one in school mean number of non-facilitating A-levels not adding to its mean A-level score from best three subjects is associated with being at a university scoring seven points lower. Doing A-level maths (model 2) compared with someone in the same school with the same number of facilitating subjects but not doing maths is associated with a seven-point premium. The 'between' effect of schools is also important. Students at hypothetical schools where everyone does maths are on average at universities scoring 16 points higher than those at schools where no-one does maths, at 5% confidence. Being at a grammar school or private school rather than a comprehensive is associated with a premium of around four or five points on average. A negative relationship of slightly larger magnitude is observed for those at FE and sixth form colleges.

Table 2. Association of Times league table score with A-level subject choice across all university subjects.

Download CSV

Display Table



The relationship between facilitating subjects and university scores for students studying accounting, business, and law is shown in models 1 and 2 of Table 3. Despite none of these courses having pre-requisite A-level subjects, each facilitating subject is associated with attending universities with a score of between around 6 and 11 points higher, with maths conveying a further premium, particularly for business (14 points). Even for law students, having maths is associated with a premium over other facilitating subjects (six points). For neither of these models is there a significant contextual (between minus within) effect of mean number of facilitating subjects for the school.

Table 3. Association of Times league table score with A-level subject choice for students studying accounting, business, and law at university.



[Download CSV](#)

[Display Table](#)

Model 3 shows the negative association of university score with 'less suitable' subjects; it is slightly smaller for these three degree courses than for all students together, although still negative and significant, and largest for law students (-13 points). For all three subjects FE college students are at lower scoring universities than comprehensive school students (at 5% confidence).

All three  
between  
and 13 f  
business  
points.



ded  
accounting  
studying  
round 10

Models  
score  
Model 4  
and 'less  
level thu  
with a fa  
model. I  
effect of

d A-level and  
degrees.  
ful subjects,  
e related A-  
counting)  
in the  
ing the  
al number



represents a comparison of the related A-level with any non-facilitating A-level, and finally model 7 controls for the total number of 'less suitable' A-levels, so showing the relationship with ranking if the related A-level is swapped with any other 'less suitable' subject.

Table 4. Association of Times league table score with choosing the course-related A-level rather than an A-level from another category for students studying accounting, business, and law at university.



Download CSV

Display Table

The results show considerable differences for the three subjects examined. For accounting students, having accounting A-level is associated with no significant difference in score compared with a facilitating subject, any other subject, and any other non-facilitating subject. It is associated with an increase in score of eight points compared with holding other 'less suitable' subjects. On the other hand, business A-level seems more helpful for admission to higher ranked university to read business than accounting is for accounting degrees. Although swapping business for a facilitating subject is associated with being at a university with six fewer points and swapping it for any other subject shows a very small relationship, swapping it for any non-facilitating subject is associated with being at a university with six fewer points and 10 points fewer for accounting students. Relationships (6



Discus

Across a  
with bei

s associated  
ts higher





these subjects. The role of specific subject A-levels varies considerably between these three degree courses. Accounting A-level is done by relatively few students. It is not associated with a significantly lower ranking than facilitating subjects, on average, but neither is it helpful, except compared with other 'less suitable' subjects. Business, on the other hand, seems a relatively helpful choice compared with all but facilitating subjects. It is noteworthy that it is done by a much larger proportion of private school students than accounting or law.

The results for law students are consistent with the anecdotal evidence that higher ranking universities 'don't like' law A-level. Having law A-level is associated with a score discount of 19 points compared with swapping it for a facilitating A-level and 10 points compared with any non-facilitating one. Students taking it, of whom much the highest proportions are at sixth form and FE colleges, are apparently not putting themselves at the advantage that they might reasonably have expected.

Before dismissing law (or indeed any other A-level) as potentially unhelpful for university entry, it is important to consider both the aspirations of students taking it, and the context of their other subjects. Students may be unconcerned about the ranking of university they attend. But given that 42% of those reading law with at least three A-levels have law A-level, it is likely some students will have taken it to aid them to get into a high-ranking university, and the results described here are likely to be counter-

between choosing  
between sensible to  
choose I the choice is  
between ity  
applicati relatively rare,  
to be ad or those  
using th introduced  
legal the picture  
is un



This wor, and the  
league t ned because  
of unobs applied for  
and likel s,  
particula high-



1. A group of 24 high-status research-intensive UK universities.
2. 'Less suitable' subjects are those where reservations are expressed by at least one Russell Group university as to appropriateness for university study. The original taxonomy further split this category according to whether or not subjects are ever described as useful for the related degree course at a Russell Group university. Most of the subjects never so described have been discontinued in current reforms. The aggregated version of the taxonomy is therefore used in this analysis.
3. High stakes examinations taken at age 16.
4. The Times overall university rankings are a weighted linear function of eight standardised indicators: student satisfaction, research quality, services and facilities spend, completion rates, entry standards, student-staff ratio, good honours, and graduate prospects. The first two have a weighting of 1.5 each, and the remainder 1 each. The last four indicators are adjusted for subject mix at the university. The top university is then given 1000 points and the others scaled accordingly (O'Leary, 2012).
5. All analyses are also performed with ranks, rather than scores. The relationships observed are substantively unchanged.
6. Plotting lowess curves for a random sample of the data suggests that the relationship of A-level scores with university attendance is roughly linear with a flat line between 500 and 600 points (the range of scores for the top 500 QCA schools) and a steeper slope after.
7. Repeated measures ANOVA based on a 2x2x2 factorial design and interaction and proportion of students.
8. Running a regression on the data, and the results suggest that there may be a pre-university requirement that is lower than for other subjects.



1. Anders, J. (2012). The link between household income, university applications and university attendance. *Fiscal Studies*, 33, 185-210.

 | [Web of Science](#)® | [Google Scholar](#)

2. Anders, J., Henderson, M., Moulton, V., & Sullivan, A. (2018). The role of schools in explaining individuals' subject choices at age 14. *Oxford Review of Education*, 44(1).

 | [Web of Science](#)® | [Google Scholar](#)

3. Ashley, L., Duberley, J., Sommerlad, H., & Scholarios, D. (2015). A qualitative evaluation of non-educational barriers to the elite professions. London: Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission. Retrieved from [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/434791/A\\_qualitative\\_evaluation\\_of\\_non-educational\\_barriers\\_to\\_the\\_elite\\_professions.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/434791/A_qualitative_evaluation_of_non-educational_barriers_to_the_elite_professions.pdf)

[Google Scholar](#)

4. Boliver, V. (2013). How fair is access to more prestigious UK universities? *The British Journal of Sociology*, 64, 344-364.

 | [PubMed](#) | [Web of Science](#)® | [Google Scholar](#)

5. Bolive  
univer



6. Britton  
gradu  
backg  
http



7. Cheva  
Labor

8. Chevalier, A., & Conlon, G. (2003). Does it pay to attend a prestigious university?. London: Centre for the Economics of Education, London School of Economics. Retrieved from <http://cee.lse.ac.uk/ceedps/ceedp33.pdf>.

 | [Google Scholar](#)

9. Chowdry, H., Crawford, C., Dearden, L., Goodman, A., & Vignoles, A. (2013). Widening participation in higher education: Analysis using linked administrative data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 176, 431–457.

 | [Web of Science ®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

10. Coe, R., Searle, J., Barmby, P., Jones, K., & Higgins, S. (2008). Relative difficulty of examinations in different subjects. Durham: Centre for Evaluation and Monitoring, Durham University. Retrieved from <http://www.cem.org/attachments/SCORE2008report.pdf>.

[Google Scholar](#)

11. Cook, A. C., Faulconbridge, J. R., & Muzio, D. (2012). London's legal elite: Recruitment through cultural capital and the reproduction of social exclusivity in City professional service fields. *Environment and Planning A*, 44, 1744–1762.

 | [Web of Science ®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

12. Crawford, C., Dearden, L., Goodman, A., & Vignoles, A. (2013). Widening participation in higher education: Analysis using linked administrative data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 176, 431–457. Retrieved from <http://www.rssociety.org/journals/series-a>.

[Google Scholar](#)

13. Dilnot, T. (2012). The London legal elite: Recruitment through cultural capital and the reproduction of social exclusivity in City professional service fields. *Environment and Planning A*, 44, 1744–1762. Retrieved from <http://www.eandp.com/doi/10.1080/09500804.2012.700000>.

[Google Scholar](#)

14. Dilnot, T. (2012). The London legal elite: Recruitment through cultural capital and the reproduction of social exclusivity in City professional service fields. *Environment and Planning A*, 44, 1744–1762. Retrieved from <http://www.eandp.com/doi/10.1080/09500804.2012.700000>.



5. Dolton, P. J., & Vignoles, A. (2002). The return on post-compulsory school mathematics study. *Economica*, 69(273), 113-142.

 | [Web of Science](#)® | [Google Scholar](#)

6. Fazackerley, A., & Chant, J. (2008). The hard truth about 'soft' subjects. London: Policy Exchange . Retrieved from

<https://policyexchange.org.uk/publication/the-hard-truth-about-soft-subjects/>.

[Google Scholar](#)

7. Gill, T. (2015a). Provision of GCE A level subjects 2014. Cambridge: Cambridge Assessment. Retrieved from

<http://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/222146-provision-of-gce-a-level-subjects-2014.pdf>

[Google Scholar](#)

8. Gill, T. (2015b). Uptake of GCE A level subjects 2014. Cambridge: Cambridge Assessment. Retrieved from

<http://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/222143-uptake-of-gcse-subjects-2014.pdf>

[Goog](#)



9. Gill, T.  
Intern

physics?

10. Goran  
an

participation

21. Higton  
Fit for  
the su  
Regul

, H. (2012).  
employers on  
ions



[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/377930/2012-04-03-fit-for-purpose-a-levels.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/377930/2012-04-03-fit-for-purpose-a-levels.pdf)

Google Scholar

22. Hussain, I., McNally, S., & Telhaj, S. (2009). University quality and graduate wages in the UK ( CEE Discussion Papers). Retrieved from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/25486/>

Google Scholar

23. Machin, S. (2015). Data and public policy: Trying to make social progress blindfolded. London: Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission. Retrieved from [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/414645/Data\\_and\\_public\\_policy\\_trying\\_to\\_make\\_social\\_progress\\_blindfolded\\_report.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/414645/Data_and_public_policy_trying_to_make_social_progress_blindfolded_report.pdf)

Google Scholar

24. Marcenaro-Gutierrez, O., Galindo-Rueda, F., & Vignoles, A. (2007). Who actually goes to university? *Empirical Economics*, 32, 333–357.

Web of Science ® | Google Scholar

25. Milburn, A. (2009). Unleashing aspiration: The final report of the Panel on Fair Access to the Higher Education System. Retrieved from [http://www.parliament.uk/document\\_content.asp?docId=31477&docType=Report](http://www.parliament.uk/document_content.asp?docId=31477&docType=Report)

Google Scholar

26. Milburn, A. (2009). Unleashing aspiration: The final report of the Panel on Fair Access to the Higher Education System. Retrieved from [http://www.parliament.uk/document\\_content.asp?docId=31477&docType=Report](http://www.parliament.uk/document_content.asp?docId=31477&docType=Report)

Google Scholar

27. Noden, P. (2009). Unleashing aspiration: The final report of the Panel on Fair Access to the Higher Education System. Retrieved from [http://www.parliament.uk/document\\_content.asp?docId=31477&docType=Report](http://www.parliament.uk/document_content.asp?docId=31477&docType=Report)



28. O'Leary, J. (2012). Good university guide 2013. London: Times Books.  
Google Scholar
29. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. (2015). Social mobility indicators. Retrieved from [www.gov.uk/government/publications/social-mobility-indicators](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/social-mobility-indicators)  
Google Scholar
30. Rowbottom, N. (2013). A-level subject choice, systematic bias and university performance in the UK: The case of accounting. *Accounting Education*, 22, 248–267.  
Google Scholar
31. Russell Group. (2011). Informed choices. London: The Russell Group.  
Google Scholar
32. Russell Group. (2015). Opening doors: Understanding and overcoming the barriers to university access. London: Russell Group. Retrieved from <https://www.russellgroup.ac.uk/media/5034/opening-doors-understanding-and-overcoming-the-barriers-to-university-access.pdf>  
Google Scholar
33. Russe...  
<http://...>  
Goog...
34. Shiner...  
constr...  
Soc...
35. Sulliva...  
schoo...  
763.



36. Sutton Trust. (2009). The educational background of leading lawyers, journalists, vice chancellors, politicians, medics and chief executives: Submission to the Milburn Commission on access to the professions. London: Sutton Trust. Retrieved from [http://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/ST\\_MilburnSubmission.pdf](http://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/ST_MilburnSubmission.pdf).  
Google Scholar


37. Sutton Trust. (2011). Degrees of success: University chances by individual school. London: Sutton Trust. Retrieved from <http://www.suttontrust.com/public/documents/sutton-trust-he-destination-report-final.pdf>.  
Google Scholar

38. Toth, K., Sammons, P., & Sylva, K. (2015). Subject to background. London: Sutton Trust. Retrieved from <http://www.suttontrust.com/researcharchive/subject-to-background/>.  
Google Scholar

39. UCAS. (2016a). Applicants and acceptances by groups of applicants 2015. Cheltenham: UCAS. Retrieved from <https://wwwucas.com/corporate/data-and-analysis/ucas-undergraduate-releases>.  
Google Scholar

40. UCAS. (2016b). Applicants and acceptances by ethnic group 2015. Cheltenham: UCAS. Retrieved from <https://wwwucas.com/corporate/data-and-analysis/ucas-undergraduate-releases>.  
Google Scholar

41. Vidal Rodeja, M. (2015). The impact of social capital on the take and factor... Retrieved from...  
from



<http://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/images/111069-a-level-subject-choice-in-england-patterns-of-uptake-and-factors-affecting-subject-preferences.pdf>

[Google Scholar](#)

12. Vidal Rodeiro, C., Sutch, T., & Zanini, N. (2013). Prior learning of undergraduates in UK higher education institutions. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate . Retrieved from <http://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/230030-prior-learning-of-undergraduates-in-uk-higher-education-institutions.pdf>

[Google Scholar](#)

13. Walker, I., & Zhu, Y. (2011). Differences by degree: Evidence of the net financial rates of return to undergraduate study for England and Wales. *Economics of Education Review*, 30, 1177-1186.

[Web of Science](#) <sup>®</sup> | [Google Scholar](#)

## Appendix 1

Table A1

Table

Download



Note

Pupil Data

levels are

<sup>2</sup>Include

<sup>3</sup>Informa

Append

Table



Download CSV

Display Table

Download PDF

## Related research

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by  
29



Information for

- Authors
- R&D professionals
- Editors
- Librarians
- Societies

Opportunities

- Reprints and e-prints
- Advertising solutions
- Accelerated publication
- Corporate access solutions

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 Sign me up

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

Open access

- Overview
- Open journals
- Open Select
- Dove Medical Press
- F1000Research

Help and information

- Help and contact
- Newsroom
- All journals
- Books



Copyright

Accessib

Registered  
5 Howick Pl

or & Francis Group  
orma business

