

Home ► All Journals ► Education ► Oxford Review of Education ► List of Issues ► Volume 44, Issue 1 ► The relationship between A-level subject

Oxford Review of Education >

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

Open access

5,433
Views29
CrossRef citations to date11
Altmetric

Listen

🖹 Full A

🔒 Repri

Abstra

English

schools

been

in ac

English

score of

categori

as 'facili

'less sui

commor

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

G Cite this article **A** https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2018.1409976

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 907 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," whereas 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 ["privacy preferences"] link on the bottom of the webpage [or the floating icon on the bottom-left of the webpage, if applicable]. Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. <u>Here</u>

We and our partners process data to provide:



Q

. .

Check for updates

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:



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, <u>2012</u>; Chowdry, Crawford, Dearden, Goodman, & Vignoles, <u>2013</u>; Sullivan, Parsons, Wiggins, Heath, & Green, <u>2014</u>), as do students from state, rather than private, schools (Sullivan et al., <u>2014</u>; Sutton Trust, <u>2011</u>). This matters to social mobility because it is well-established

that high	ritton,
Dearden	× <u>2003;</u>
Hussain,	<u>6</u> ; Walker &
Zhu, <u>201</u>	e numbers of
relativel	Ashley,
Duberle	<u>012;</u>
Milburn,	r their social
homog	ties (Ashley
et al	Mobility
Commis	and 60-
70% of t	ies (Ashley
et al., <u>2(</u>	to careers
in areas	es from
which th	sing social
mobility.	

💼 Related research

Why are there these differences in high-status university attendance by social background and school type? The most significant reason seems to be prior attainment (Anders, 2012; Chowdry et al., 2013; Marcenaro-Gutierrez, Galindo-Rueda, & Vignoles, 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 Alevel 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



that some facilitating subjects are good general preparation for university because of the academic skills they foster. Whether these subjects are facilitating of entry to highly 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',² 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 <u>1</u>.

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 accountial for the corresponding degree in Informed

choices,	×	em not
good pre		ts is actually
unhelpfu		
A furthe		The very
large dif		ian non-
Russell (at for those
with the second se		subject
(Diln)		th holding
maths A		ranked
universit		associated
with hav		oy Dolton
and Vigr		
This pap		sh school
Article contents	📄 Related research	

university attended and subject choice at A-level using a newly devised taxonomy. Previous studies have not examined the detail of A-level choices and used facilitating subjects only as controls (Boliver, <u>2013</u>; Crawford, <u>2014</u>). 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, <u>2015</u>), but does allow the role of GCSE³ performance to be taken into account, which has been shown to be very important in university entry (Crawford, <u>2014</u>).

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, c	×	
Previo		у
admiss		
Subjec		
A-lev		rticipation
by SE		variables,
and ther		eople from
more pri		<u>016</u> ; Toth,
Sammor		nces (Gill &
Bell, <u>201</u>		tend to be
taken by		ound, but is
also a re		rs (Dilnot
Article contents	📄 📄 Related research	

facilitating subjects at higher grades than their peers at sixth form and FE colleges (Dilnot, 2016; Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2015; Sutton Trust, 2011). Conversely, students from lower SES backgrounds are more likely to take at least two 'less suitable' A-level subjects (Dilnot, 2016), and more of these subjects are offered by schools and colleges with lower mean attainment (Gill, 2015a).

Facilitating subjects—specific content versus general university preparation

Having A-level subjects from particular content-based groups is associated with taking university courses from related subject areas as one might expect, with particularly strong relationships for STEM subjects (Vidal Rodeiro, Sutch, & Zanini, 2013). Clearly for many students the content of their STEM A-level is necessary preparation for entry to a higher-status university.

Informed choices sets out 'essential' and 'useful' A-level subjects for some 60 popular Russell Group degree courses, where the 'essential' subjects are always content related. The majority of the courses listed do have 'essential' requirements, and those A-level subjects described as 'essential' for any of these degree courses effectively make up the 'facilitating' list (Russell Group, 2016). But some very popular courses (for example accounting, business/management, and law) do not have 'essential'

requirem		×	A-level
subjects		~	ieir
perceive			ause of their
content.			
On avera			A-level
subjects			ifficult A-
level sur			igh-status
univ			is controlled
for. This			that is
importar			aving maths
A-level is			oliver, <u>2013</u> ;
Chowdry			ng
advanta			c content
(because			d with other
=	Article contents	Belated research	

'Less suitable' subjects

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, <u>2016</u>) and at non-selective state schools and colleges rather than private or grammar schools (Dilnot, <u>2016</u>; Gill, <u>2015b</u>).

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



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' Alevels 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.

hose pro-		acconic
variable	×	s between
high-sta		use an
interval-		al analysis
methods		versities of
different		er-simplified
(Boliver,		published
rankings		nents within
univ		de students
in ma		ne Guardian
Universi		ion
produce		ngs differ
from the		ude a
measure		ilable, but
only ran		e University
Guide us		ber of
Article contents	Related research	

Most previous work on high-status university entry has used dichotomous outcome

The Times scores were chosen for use in analysis rather than the Guardian rankings 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, <u>2014</u>), 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.⁵ 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 whother they had attempted A loyals in mathe-	accounting bysiness, or
law, was	× able'
subjects	
Prima fa	t categories
and scor	ole were split
into quir	umber of A-
levels fro	
Figu	of university
attende	
	elated research



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 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 o	~	scored
institutio	~	
Table		
Downlo		
Subject		d private
scho		age, as
those at		n-selective
state scl		ome of this
difference		ess than a
third of s		ege
students		ss suitable'
subjects		rammar

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-



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 β_{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 (β_{nb} - β_{nw}) of the school mean of each variable is the difference between the within and the between effects, and is known as 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 Alevels, 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.



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	
low of university	
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 s	×	
All three		ided
between		accounting
and 13 f		udying
business		ound 10
points.		
Mode		A-level and
score		degrees.
Model 4		ful subjects,
and 'less		e related A-
level thu		counting)
with a fa		in the
model. I		ing the
effect of		al number
Article contents	ch	

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 Alevel 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 othe	acilitating
subject a	× ionships (6
and 10 p	
Models 4	at lower
scoring	ilitating
subject (itating
subject (s suitable'
subjeavail	ls are
Discus	
Across a	associated
with being	ts higher
Article contents	📄 Related research

type is controlled for. For two students with otherwise similar characteristics, one with three facilitating subjects and one with none, this difference equates to being at Bristol rather than Leicester, or Oxford Brookes rather than Gloucestershire in 2013 rankings. This is consistent with previous literature and given that university subject group is controlled for seems not just to be an artefact of the way degree courses with facilitating pre-requisites are distributed through the rankings.

Using a random effects model allows for the investigation of the role of school-level variables in the models. School type was seen to be significant for all three models across all university subjects, with FE and sixth form college students being at lower scoring universities compared with comprehensive schools overall, and private and grammar school students at higher scoring ones, even after controlling for prior attainment and subject choice groups. This could, of course, be a result of selection (where those students have chosen to apply) but whether the reason is a lack of aspirational applications or acceptance rates varying systematically by school type, there is still a gap.

The answer to the question of whether there is something especially facilitating about maths A-level appears to be 'yes'. On average, having maths rather than any other facilitating subject is associated with a seven-point premium across all subjects. There is likely to be wide variation in this promium by degree course⁸ but the overall relations

The num negative are cont Russell (that mor

For a subject

subjects Whether levels, o is beyon

somewh

ree course ber of suggests t be useful. facilitating litating ntent. ilitating Aerable skills and ese course

ntly

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



should be taken in choosing 'less suitable' A-levels, even if they seem to relate to the degree course eventually followed. Using university application data to link to NPD and HESA data at the individual applicant level will help further understand these relationships.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

This wok was supported by the Economics and Social Research Council [grant number ES/J500021/1].

Notes on contributor

Catherine Dilnot is a Senior Lecturer at Ox	xford Brookes University. Her research interest
is in fair	× counting
professio	nartered
accounta	
Acknov	
I am	for their
advi	nal Pupil
Databas	l by the
Departm	tation of
results.	
Notes	
Article contents	Related research

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 low	vess curves for a random sar	nple of the data	suggests that th	e
relations			×	with a flat
line betv				ve 500 QCA
points (t				fter.
7. Repea				ased on a
principa				action and
proportie				
8. Ru				, and
philos				be a pre-
requisite				le lower
than for				
	Article contents		Related research	

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/43479 1/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.



Google Scholar

 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

.0. 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

.1. Co	ok,	×	Recruitment
th	roug		professional
se	rvic		
.2. Cr	awf		nd
ur	iver		n. Retrieved
fro			
.3. Di	not		sed
pr	efer		ing Papers).
Re	trie		
	Article contents	Related research	

4. Dilnot, C. (2016). How does the choice of A-level subjects vary with students' socioeconomic status in English state schools? British Educational Research Journal, 42, 1081–1106.

Web of Science ® Google Scholar

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-

http://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/222146-provision-of-gce-a-levelsubjects-2014.pdf



20. Gorard, S., & See, B. H. (2009). The impact of socio-economic status on participation and attainment in science. Studies in Science Education, 45, 93–129.

Web of Science ® Google Scholar

P.1. Higton, J., Noble, J., Pope, S., Boal, N., Ginnis, S., Donaldson, R., & Greevy, H. (2012). Fit for purpose?: The view of the higher education sector, teachers and employers on the suitability of A levels. Coventry: Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/37793 0/2012-04-03-fit-for-purpose-a-levels.pdf

Google Scholar

2. 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 a/file/41464 https: X 5/Data port.pdf Googl 4. Marce tually goes to uni 25. Milbur **Fair Access** to the http:// party/Unle ashind Googl

26. Milburn, A. (2012). Fair access to professional careers: A progress report by the independent reviewer on social mobility and child poverty. London: Cabinet Office . Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/61090/

IR FairAccess acc2.pdf

Google Scholar

7. Noden, P., Shiner, M., & Modood, T. (2014). University offer rates for candidates from different ethnic categories. Oxford Review of Education, 40, 349–369.



8. O'Leary, J. (2012). Good university guide 2013. London: Times Books.

Google Scholar

9. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. (2015). Social mobility indicators. Retrieved from www.gov.uk/government/publications/social-mobility-indicators



3. Russell Group. (2016). Informed choices. London: The Russell Group. Retrieved from http://russellgroup.ac.uk/media/5457/informed-choices-2016.pdf.

Google Scholar

34. Shiner, M., & Noden, P. (2015). 'Why are you applying there?': 'Race', class and the construction of higher education 'choice' in the United Kingdom. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 36, 1170–1191.



 Sullivan, A., Parsons, S., Wiggins, R., Heath, A., & Green, F. (2014). Social origins, school type and higher education destinations. Oxford Review of Education, 40, 739– 763.

Web of Science ® Google Scholar

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.



39. UCAS. (2016a). Applicants and acceptances by groups of applicants 2015. Cheltenham: UCAS. Retrieved from https://www.ucas.com/corporate/data-and-analysis/ucas-undergraduatereleases/ucas-undergraduate-end-cycle-data-resource-4

Google Scholar

10. UCAS. (2016b). UCAS undergraduate reports by sex, area background, and ethnic group. Cheltenham: UCAS. Retrieved from www.ucas.com/corporate/data-and-analysis/ucas-undergraduate-releases/ucasundergraduate-reports-sex-area

Google Scholar

 Vidal Rodeiro, C. (2007). A level subject choice in England: Patterns of uptake and factors affecting subject preferences. Cambridge: Cambridge Assessment. Retrieved from

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



Appendix 1

Table A1. Taxonomy of A-levels available for teaching 2014/15.¹

Table	
Download CSV Display Table	

Notes: ¹Subjects with no entries in England/combined with other subject in National Pupil Database are marked 'n'; those to be discontinued are marked 'd'; applied Alevels are marked '*'.

²Includes six additional endorsements/pathways

³Information and communication technology.

Appendix 2

Table A2. The Times Good University Guide scores 2013.



Information for	Open access
Authors	Overview
R&D professionals	Open journals
Editors	Open Select
Librarians	Dove Medical Press
Societies	F1000Research
Opportunities	Help and information
Reprints and e-prints	Help and contact
Advertising solutions	Newsroom
Accelerated publication	All journals
Corporate access solutions	Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

🔛 Sign me u

