

Working Paper 1

APPLICANTS AND ENTRANTS THROUGH UCAS TO THE UK'S DIFFERENTIATED FULL-TIME HE SYSTEM 1996-2010

Linda Croxford and David Raffe
Centre for Educational Sociology, University of Edinburgh

Acknowledgements

This working paper is a product of the research project on *Changing Transitions to a Differentiated Higher Education System*, funded by the Nuffield Foundation (EDU/38783). It uses data from the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS). UCAS cannot accept responsibility for any inferences or conclusions derived from the data by third parties. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not of the Nuffield Foundation or UCAS.

Overview

This is the first Working Paper of the research project on *Changing Transitions to a Differentiated Higher Education System*, funded by the Nuffield Foundation. The paper has two main aims. The first is to provide a descriptive overview of applications and entry through UCAS to full-time higher education (HE) in the UK. It examines the changing numbers of applicants and the types of institutions and programmes to which they applied, the outcomes of their applications and the consequent pattern of entry to an HE system differentiated by institution and programme. These patterns are described for selected years from 1996 to 2010, to indicate trends, and for applicants domiciled in the four home countries of the UK (with EU and overseas applicants also included for comparison). The second aim of the paper is to inform future work in the project, which will be based on analyses of the UCAS data. The paper outlines the main features of the data and discusses some of the issues that may be raised in using them to address the project's research questions (see Appendix 1). Together with Working Paper 2, which examines the changing social and demographic characteristics of applicants and entrants, and their educational backgrounds, this paper thus covers some of the initial exploratory analyses which are necessary in a secondary analysis of a large dataset.

Background

The main objectives of the project on *Changing Transitions to a Differentiated Higher Education System* are:

- to provide a comprehensive account of the changing social, demographic and educational characteristics of applicants and entrants to HE in the UK since 1996, and of the types of programmes and institutions which they apply to or enter;
- to analyse the changing nature of institutional differentiation in UK HE;
- to analyse differences across the four home countries of the UK, and changes in cross-border flows of applicants and entrants, in the first decade since devolution;
- to disseminate the knowledge acquired in order to inform policy and practice.

The project will analyse processes of application and entry to HE in the UK over a period when the system underwent significant quantitative and qualitative change. At the root of this change was continued expansion. The very rapid increase in participation which occurred in the late 1980s slowed down during the 1990s but expansion nevertheless continued at a pace which varied over time, across parts of the UK and across different sectors of HE. The project will monitor the progress of this expansion over the period 1996-2000, and analyse some of its consequences, with respect to full-time undergraduate programmes in HE institutions, that is to programmes covered by the UCAS data. However, it is important to remember that postgraduate education and HE provision in FE colleges also grew during this period, and that expansion had a more qualitative dimension associated with the widening range of functions attributed to HE.

The expansion of HE can be linked to three related policy and research debates which the project will seek to inform. The first is the debate about widening participation. In the UK as elsewhere there has long been a debate concerning the extent and manner in which expanding the number of HE places will reduce social inequalities in access, and increase participation among social, ethnic and demographic groups which have traditionally been under-represented in HE. Even if expansion results in more places being filled by under-represented groups, theories of 'maximally maintained inequality' predict that it will only improve the relative participation among these groups when participation among more traditional groups approaches saturation point (Raftery and Hout 1993). In practice, the effect of expansion may depend on national policy and the structure of the HE system. Of particular interest is the nature of institutional differentiation. Theories of 'effectively maintained inequality' predict that, as participation among advantaged groups approaches saturation, inequalities will become manifested in the different institutions or programmes in which people participate rather than in the difference between participation and non-participation (Lucas 2001). Researchers have used different methods and drawn on contrasting theoretical perspectives to explore the inequalities associated with different levels and types of HE (Forsyth and Furlong 2000, Reay, David and Ball 2006, Shavit, Arum and Gamoran 2007). As Reay et al. (2006, 162) argue, "there has been a shift in the focus of attention in contemporary debates, as the higher education system itself moves from an elite to a mass system, from a concentration upon who goes and who does not go to university to questions about 'who goes where?'" This shift in focus is mirrored in the question of whether expanding second-tier HE provides a means of inclusion or diversion: of

including less advantaged entrants or of diverting them from higher-status pathways (Iannelli, Gamoran and Paterson forthcoming). The project will examine the changing composition of applicants and entrants to HE and their distribution across the sectors of the HE system.

The debate about widening participation is thus closely connected with the second debate, about the relation of expansion to the institutional diversity of HE. The extent to which a mass HE system requires greater functional specialisation among HE institutions, or conversely requires large institutions each with a wide range of functions, has been a subject of debate for many decades (eg Williams and Fry 1994, Teichler 2007, Scott 2008). Whatever the desirable outcome, in practice expansion appears not to have encouraged greater specialisation, at least within the UK: institutions have been reluctant to put all their eggs into a single basket. Many institutions offering initial teaching education, and several other specialist institutions, have merged with universities or with other non-university institutions to form new universities with a wide range of functions. However, to the extent that horizontal differentiation is reduced the scope for vertical differentiation may increase. If all institutions have similar missions and functions they are easier to compare and order in a single hierarchy. Such stratification may be formal or informal. After 1992 the UK's binary system was replaced by a unified system, and former polytechnics became universities, but the distinction between 'pre-1992' and 'post-1992' universities continues to have informal currency and the project will investigate whether this is reflected in stable differences in the characteristics and origins of applicants. It will also look for correlations between the characteristics of institutions and the characteristics of the people who apply to them, and it will ask whether the nature of institutional stratification has changed since 1996.

Patterns and trends in institutional differentiation vary across different countries and in relation to different national policies (Huisman, Meek and Wood 2007, Teichler 2007); trends in widening participation similarly vary across national and policy contexts. These two debates are therefore related to the third debate which the project seeks to inform: that about the differences between the HE systems of the four home countries of the UK, and the connections between them, especially following parliamentary devolution. The Scottish Parliament and National Assembly for Wales were established in 1999, with powers over HE, although the Welsh Assembly's powers were limited to begin with: it did not have legislative powers and its responsibilities excluded such issues as student funding. The Northern Ireland Assembly was first elected in 1998 and agreement to form a power-sharing Executive was reached in 2000, although a period of suspension from 2002-07 reduced its impact during this period. However, policy divergence had already taken place under an earlier process of administrative devolution, in which the establishment of separate Scottish and Welsh HE Funding Councils in 1992 was an important landmark.

Some HE policies have diverged following devolution, although the extent of such divergence has been questioned (Keating 2006, Universities UK 2008, Gallacher and Raffae forthcoming). The project will explore the extent to which policy divergence is reflected in diverging patterns of application and participation. All four home countries have pursued policies for widening participation. These policies differed in emphasis and in their detailed

provision but they reflected broadly similar strategies; the main differences were consequent on different policies for student finance, described below. The home countries followed somewhat different policies for the institutional differentiation of their systems. In England policies encouraged greater selectivity in research funding and, by implication, greater vertical (and perhaps horizontal) differentiation among HEIs. The government sought to focus expansion on the FE sector and Foundation Degrees (Parry 2009). In Wales successive administrations sought to encourage institutional 'reconfiguration' through mergers, although actual progress in this respect was slow. Scottish policies promoted institutional collaboration, but there was support for several mergers that took place. The most conspicuous policy differences concerned student fees. In 1998, following the Dearing Report of the previous year, an annual tuition fee of £1,000, with exemptions or reductions for poorer students, was introduced across the UK. In 2006 the up-front tuition fee was replaced in England and Northern Ireland by a 'variable fee' of up to £3,000 per annum, also collected from graduates after they had passed an earnings threshold. Wales followed suit one year later, but provided a learning grant for Welsh-domiciled students at Welsh institutions that effectively compensated for the increase permitted by the variable fees regime; this grant was withdrawn in 2010. The UK-wide tuition fee was replaced in Scotland in 2000 by a means-tested 'Graduate Endowment', effectively a deferred tuition fee of £2000 collected from graduates after they had passed an earnings threshold. This was abolished for graduates from 2007 onwards, since when full-time Scottish students have not had to pay any form of tuition fee. European Union rules require member states to treat EU nationals on the same basis as their own nationals, but this does not apply to relations between administrations within a member state. As a result, when variable fees were introduced in the rest of the UK Scotland introduced a (smaller) annual fee to students from the rest of the UK who studied in Scotland. There have, at the same time as changes in fees, been variations in the forms, levels and conditions of student support. The project is not designed specifically to examine the consequences of changing fee regimes (and it cannot of course anticipate the effects of further changes in 2012), but these form an important part of the context.

The project will also explore a different type of divergence, in the 'social relations' of HE, and ask whether the four systems have become more self-contained. This would be reflected in an increased tendency for students to apply to, and enter, institutions in their own home country (Rees and Taylor 2006).

Data

The project uses UCAS data on applications in 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008 and 2010. Established in 1993, UCAS provides a centralised system which manages nearly all applications to full-time undergraduate courses in the UK. The process operates according to an annual timetable. It varies slightly according to the types of courses and institutions applied to, and some details have changed over time, but the basic outlines are as follows. Each applicant may make up to five (formerly six) applications; each application receives a conditional or unconditional offer or is rejected; the applicant may accept up to two offers, either an unconditional offer or a conditional offer plus an 'insurance' choice. When the

applicant's qualifications are known, and the outcome of conditional acceptances is thus determined, applicants who have not met the conditions for either of the two provisionally accepted courses may enter a new clearing stage and compete for courses with unfilled places.

This process generates the following data, which we shall use in the project:

- *applicants*: age, sex, domicile (country/region), social class, disability, school/college, grade or tariff score, qualification type;
- *applications*: subject group, level of course (degree/foundation degree/HND), type of institution, country/region of institution, outcome (eg refused, conditional offer, confirmed offer), whether offer refused, accepted or deferred;
- *acceptances through clearing*: subject group, level of course (degree/foundation degree/HND), type of institution, country/region of institution.

The UCAS data provide rich population data on applicants, applications, and entrants to full-time undergraduate HE in the UK. Our analyses are based on clean and (in their own terms) remarkably complete data on 3.1 million applicants. Nevertheless, these are administrative data, collected for purposes other than research, and there are consequent issues in using the data for our research project. Some of these issues have been discussed by other researchers who have analysed UCAS data, notably Gorard et al. (2007) and Hoelscher and Hayward (2008). They include issues concerning the data described above, such as the measurement of applicants' social and demographic characteristics, the recording and scaling of prior qualifications, identifying entrants to HE and classifying institutions. These will be discussed in the context of the relevant tables presented below or (in the case of social and demographic characteristics and qualifications) in Working Paper 2.

A further issue concerns the population that is covered by the UCAS data. This is restricted in two important ways. First, it covers only applicants. We cannot, using UCAS data alone, make statements about over- or under-representation of different groups because we do not know the number of people in each group who did not apply to HE. We can make comparisons within the sample - for example, comparing applicants (or entrants) to different types of HE, or in different home countries - but we cannot answer questions that presuppose information on the whole cohort of potential applicants. However, to the extent that the composition of this cohort has changed only slowly over time, we hope to be able to draw conclusions from trends in our data.

Second, our data cover only applicants to institutions and programmes that recruit through UCAS. They do not cover part-time or postgraduate courses. They cover nearly all applications to full-time undergraduate courses in HE institutions (HEIs), but a few HEIs are not members of UCAS and some, such as music conservatoires, have separate admissions schemes. The main limitation is the incomplete coverage of colleges of Further Education. Colleges have for many years provided a significant proportion of full-time undergraduate HE in Scotland. Following the 1997 Dearing Report they were expected to expand their role as providers of sub-degree HE in England, in varying modes of collaboration with HEIs (Bathmaker et al. 2008). FE Colleges were given a leading role in the delivery of Foundation Degrees (FDs), which were introduced in 2001 (initially on a pilot basis) as short-cycle HE programmes typically with a vocational orientation and a work-based element. Colleges

have played a smaller role in HE in Wales and Northern Ireland, although they have been the main institutions delivering FDs in Northern Ireland, and their role is planned to expand in Wales.

Ideally, given our interest in institutional differentiation and widening participation, our data would have covered all applicants to full-time HE, whether offered in a university or a college. However, membership of UCAS is much lower among FE colleges than among HEIs, and even if colleges are members of UCAS, some of their HE courses may recruit directly and those that recruit through UCAS may accept internal applications from within the same college. Much college-based HE, especially at degree level, is delivered through various forms of collaboration with universities; these collaborative arrangements are not visible in the UCAS data, which record only the institution (in some cases the university, in other cases the college) which directly handled the admissions process.

In this paper we report on all applicants¹ and applications made through UCAS, but we will restrict most future analyses to applications and applicants to HEIs in order to have a more easily defined population. It is nevertheless of interest that some applicants made applications both to HE and FE institutions. As we see below (Tables 4 and 5), 7% of our sample applied to an FE college but only 2% applied only to an FE college and not to any HEI.

Numbers of applicants and entrants

Table 1 shows the number of applicants in each year covered by the study. By 2010 the number of applicants to full-time undergraduate HE through the UCAS system had climbed above two-thirds of a million (688,933). Of these, 84% were UK domiciled and 71% (nearly half a million) were English domiciled. Figure 1b presents each year's total as a percentage of the 1996 baseline. Applications grew modestly over the ten years to 2006 with a much faster growth (from 121% to 167% of the 1996 figure) between 2006 and 2010. The pattern of increase varied across the home countries: for example, Northern Ireland had the largest proportionate increase in applications between 1996 and 2004, and the smallest increase over the following six years. Between 2006 and 2010 applications grew more in England than in the other home countries. Applications from other EU countries declined in the early years of the study but then grew rapidly, especially between 2008 and 2010; the net growth over the whole period was similar to that of UK students. Applications from non-EU countries grew more dramatically and more than doubled over the period.

The average applicant made 4.1 applications in 2010 (Table 2). This figure declined over the period, especially between 2006 and 2008 when the maximum number of applications was reduced from six to five. However, in each year this average showed the same trend across the four home countries: applicants from Northern Ireland made the greatest average number of applications, followed by England and then Wales, with applicants from Scotland making fewest applications.

¹ Applicants are restricted to those who made at least one application through UCAS (this excludes around 1% of "applicants" in the original UCAS data for whom there are no application records).

Table 3 shows the outcomes of the process for each applicant. Overall success rates -as indicated by the proportion of applicants who were offered and accepted a place - rose between 1996 and 2000, were relatively stable from 2000 to 2008 and then fell again to 2010. They varied across the home countries, being highest in England and Wales and lowest in Northern Ireland and (especially in the later years) in Scotland. Success rates among applicants from outside the UK were consistently lower than among UK domiciled applicants. The proportion accepted through clearing declined over the period, although the main decline occurred in 2010 when success rates of main-scheme applications also fell.

In 2008 7% and in 2010 9% of applicants were repeat applicants, who had applied through UCAS in earlier years (table not shown). The data do not record repeat applicants in the earlier years of the study. The second-time applicants tended to be a year older than the first-time applicants, suggesting that they were applying in the year after an unsuccessful initial application (table not shown). In most other respects, such as their social and educational backgrounds, the repeat applicants were similar to first-time applicants. This suggests that they were not failures or less successful in any absolute sense, but rather felt that they had failed to do themselves justice, or to get the particular type of course they were seeking, the first time around.

In this paper we identify as 'entrants' all those who were formally accepted for a place through UCAS, including those accepted through clearing. The data do not tell us if all these acceptances were followed through to entry to, and continuation on, the course; nor do they cover people who made successful direct applications to institutions after the UCAS clearing process was completed. The data on entrants presented below may not, therefore, correspond precisely to data from other sources such as HESA.

Table 4a shows the number of entrants to full-time undergraduate HE, as defined above. By 2010 the number of UK-domiciled entrants had risen to 424,613; this figure can be compared with the mid-year 2010 UK population estimates for 18 year-olds (808,000) and 19 year-olds (836,000); even allowing for variations in the cohort size across age bands, and for second-time entrants to HE, this suggests that around half the UK population enters full-time HE at some time in their lives. Table 4b shows figures indexed on the 1996 total. Over the period from 1996 to 2010 the number of entrants increased by almost the same proportion (65%) as the number of applicants shown in Table 1b above (67%). However, the trend was smoother for entrants than for applicants; the number of entrants increased faster than the number of applicants over the first ten years and somewhat more slowly in the more recent period. As in the case of applicants, the number of entrants increased more in England than in the other home countries; the proportionate English increase since 1996 (62%) was nearly double that of Scotland (34%). Northern Ireland and Wales fell between these two, although Northern Ireland was distinctive for its trajectory of growth, which occurred mainly during the period to 2004. The number of entrants from other EU countries grew slightly more than the number of UK domiciled entrants; the fastest growth of all was in entries by non-EU applicants.

Institution types

Table 5 shows the percentage of applicants who had applied to different types of institutions: pre- and post-1992 universities (with the Russell Group of research-intensive universities separated out from other pre-1992 institutions), other HEIs, FE colleges and other institutions. Each institution is classified in terms of its status at the time of application. Given our interest in changing patterns of institutional differentiation, we treat mergers and changes of status as part of the phenomenon to be studied and we do not try to ‘control’ for them. However, in order to avoid possible circularity we identify Russell Group institutions in terms of current (2011) membership. The institutional categories shown in Table 5 are harder to apply to Welsh institutions, many of which belonged to the federal University of Wales for some or all of the period. In classifying these institutions we have treated them as universities from the date at which they acquired ‘full’ membership of the University of Wales (a pragmatic decision which has to be interpreted in the light of the frequent changes in the University’s categories of membership).

Each applicant could apply to more than one type of institution so the percentages in Table 5 sum to more than 100. Around half of all applicants in 1996 applied to a Russell Group university; this proportion declined slightly (to 44%) over the period. In each year a slightly larger proportion of applicants applied to another (non-Russell Group) pre-1992 university; this proportion also declined slightly (to 51%) over the period. The proportion applying to a post-1992 university was relatively stable over the period, at around two-thirds. Applications to other HEIs fell over the period, from 29% to 15% of applicants. This is likely to reflect the mergers and other institutional changes which brought many of these institutions into the university sector. The proportion applying to FE colleges rose from 4% in 1996 to 9% in 2010 but the trend was uneven, with peaks in 2000 as well as 2010. A small fraction, but always less than 1%, applied to other institutions.

In Table 5 the comparisons across the home countries are based on the domicile of each applicant but they inevitably reflect the different institutional structures within each country; they also reflect differences in the proportions of institutions, especially FE colleges, which participated in the UCAS scheme. England had the smallest proportions of applicants to Russell Group and other pre-1992 universities, and the largest proportions of applicants to post-1992 universities and to FE colleges. Northern Ireland showed the opposite pattern, with the largest proportions applying to Russell Group and other pre-1992 universities and relatively few to post-1992 universities or FE colleges. Welsh applicants made similar choices to their English peers, but the proportionate decline in applications to Russell Group or other pre-1992 universities was less evident among Welsh than English applicants. The Welsh data show a steep decline in the proportions applying to other HEIs; this is partly a consequence of the way we have categorised member institutions of the University of Wales, as described above, although it also reflects the very fragmented character of Welsh HE at the beginning of the period. After Northern Ireland, Scottish applicants were the most likely to apply to pre-1992 universities; like their Northern Irish peers, relatively few Scottish applicants applied through UCAS to other HEIs or to FE colleges. Compared with UK-domiciled applicants those from outside the UK were more

likely to apply to Russell Group or other pre-1992 universities, and less likely to apply to post-1992 universities or other HEIs.

Table 5 shows multiple applications; each applicant could apply different types of institutions, and the figures for each group of applicants add up to more than 100%. Table 6 summarises trends in applicants' portfolios of applications. It shows the respective proportions who applied only to pre-1992 universities, who applied only to post-1992 universities, or who made 'mixed' applications to both types. Russell Group universities are included with the pre-1992 category and the table does not include applications to non-university institutions. In the UK as a whole in 2010 slightly more than one third of applicants made mixed applications to both pre- and post-1992 institutions; about a third applied only to post-1992 universities and rather less than a third applied only to pre-1992 universities. Applicants in Northern Ireland were the most likely, and those in England the least likely, to restrict their applications to pre-1992 universities (59% compared with 21% in 2010). Conversely, applicants in England were the most likely, and those in Northern Ireland the least likely, to restrict their applications to post-1992 universities (36% and 6% respectively in 2010). In both respects Wales and Scotland were intermediate cases but rather closer to the English pattern.

However, the most interesting finding of Table 6 is the absence of a trend towards 'mixed' applications. If the distinction between pre- and post-1992 universities were losing its significance we might expect greater 'randomness' in applications with respect to this distinction, and an increase in candidates applying to both types. In practice, there is no evidence of a trend for more applicants to mix pre- and post-1992 institutions in their application. The possible exception is Wales, where the increase in 'mixed' applications in 2010 may partly reflect the fact that according to our classification of Welsh HEIs the number of universities of either type, and therefore the scope for making mixed applications to Welsh institutions, increased significantly over the period. However, the trend in all countries has to be interpreted alongside the declining average number of applications shown in Table 2, which would have reduced the scope for applicants to mix institutional types.

Table 6 does not cover applications to non-university HEIs or FE colleges, but the small proportions making no university applications indicate that a majority of entrants to these institutions through UCAS also applied to a university. Further analyses, not shown here, reveal that in 2010 only 2% of applicants applied to another HEI and to no university, and another 2% applied only to an FE college. (The equivalent figures across all cohorts are 3% and 2%.) The main exception among the home countries was Scotland, where 5% in 2010 (6% across all cohorts) applied to other HEIs but not to a university.

Table 7 shows the distribution of entrants across types of institutions. It excludes those who failed to secure a place as identified by UCAS (see Table 3 above) and it includes those who did not secure one of their first-round preferences but found a place through clearing; it therefore cannot be compared directly with Tables 5 and 6 although it shows similar trends over time and across home countries. These include: the trend away from Russell Group universities, and towards post-1992 universities and colleges in England; the decline in entry

to 'other HE institutions' in England and, especially, in Wales; and the variation across home countries in the proportions entering a pre-1992 university (highest in Northern Ireland and lowest in England).

Table 8 shows the proportion of applications to each type of institution in each country which result in entry, as defined for this study. This was the outcome of decisions made both by applicants and institutions, so the figures cannot be read as a simple indicator of the success rates of applications. Nevertheless, there is a slight tendency for the proportions to be inversely related to institutional status, suggesting a tendency to pitch applications at a slightly higher level than eventual entry. (Comparing Table 5 and 7 tells a similar story.) Nevertheless, with the exception of FE colleges, the more important trend in Table 8 may be the relatively shallow gradient of entry rates across institutions, suggesting that applicants are realistic in the range of institutions to which they apply, and balance realism against the possibility of a high-status place.

Programmes and subjects

Tables 9 and 10 show the types of programmes applied to and entered respectively. First degrees remained the dominant programme type, accounting for a large majority of applications and entries in all four countries throughout the period. Foundation Degrees, first introduced in 2001, attracted a growing minority of applicants from England (11% in 2010), Wales (7%) and Northern Ireland (4%). (In Scotland 1% of applicants applied to a Foundation Degree elsewhere in the UK.) There was a corresponding decline in the proportions applying for HNC or HND programmes, suggesting a displacement of HNC/Ds by Foundation Degrees. Other tables, not shown here, show that nearly half of Foundation Degree and HNC/D applicants also applied to first degree programmes. It must be remembered that many HNC/Ds and Foundation Degrees were offered in colleges, which have been less likely to recruit through UCAS.

The other significant trend in Tables 9 and 10 is towards 'other' programmes, which lead to qualifications other than degrees, Foundation Degrees or HNC/Ds. It is not possible to identify the precise qualifications covered by the 'other' category, but the information on subject areas gives a strong indication. In 2006, when 1% of entries were to 'other' programmes (Table 10), a half of these were courses in social studies and law and the next largest category, with 15%, was subjects allied to medicine (Table 13 below). In 2008 and again in 2010 the proportion of entries to 'other' programmes was much higher, at 3%. Of these, 85% and 84% respectively were in subjects allied to medicine.

Tables 11 and 12 cast further light on institutions and programmes by showing the distribution of applications and entries respectively across the different types of programmes for each institution type within each home country. Countries are here identified by the location of the institutions rather than the domicile of the applicant. The vast majority of applications and entries to Russell Group and other pre-1992 universities have been to first degree programmes. A large proportion of applications and entries to post-1992 universities are for degree programmes; however a minority (small, but larger than for the pre-1992 universities) are to other programmes. The same is true for other

HEIs, although they vary more over time and across the home countries. FE colleges in England and Wales have attracted more applications and entries to Foundation Degrees or HNC/Ds than to degrees; in Scotland all applications to FE colleges through UCAS have been to HNC/Ds.

Finally, Table 13 shows the subjects taken by entrants to each type of programme, aggregated across all domiciles. The largest degree subject areas were social studies and law, business and administrative studies, creative arts and design, biological sciences and subjects allied to medicine; the last three of these were areas of relative growth since 1996. Education, languages and related and engineering and technology were areas of relative decline. Foundation Degrees were most commonly in creative arts and design or in business and administrative studies, with particular growth in social studies and law. HNC/Ds were also most likely to be in creative arts and design or in business and administrative studies, with significant numbers studying engineering and technology or mathematical and computing science, although the latter had declined relatively since 2000. As noted before, the 'other' programme category consists primarily of courses in subjects allied to medicine.

Discussion

At least four themes help to summarise these findings.

The first, which cross-cuts the other three, is that there were differences across the four home countries of the UK. They had different rates and trajectories of expansion, different institutional structures and programmes, and to some extent different patterns and trends in applications and entry. Convergence or divergence among the four systems have not been the main focus of this paper, but it shows that there is ample scope for further analyses.

The second theme is expansion. The number of UK-domiciled applicants to full-time undergraduate HE rose by 61% over the period, and entrants by 58%. Entries increased most in England (by nearly two-thirds) and least in Scotland (by about one-third). In Northern Ireland most of the increase occurred during the early part of the period, in England in the later part. The precondition is therefore satisfied for the project's aim of exploring the effects of expansion on such outcomes as widening participation and institutional differentiation. However, the uneven pace of expansion, especially in England, must be noted; across the UK as a whole entries rose by a relatively modest 29% over the first ten years of the study, but accelerated between 2006 and 2010.

The third, related finding is the responsiveness of demand to supply, and vice versa. A large majority of applicants found a place, and success rates were relatively stable over the period of study except for an increase between the first two cohorts and a decline between the last two cohorts. The pattern of success rates across institutional types suggests that applicants balanced their aspirations for a high-status place against a realistic understanding of the state of the market and their own relative position within it. The small number of repeat applicants, and their characteristics relative to first-time applicants, are also consistent with this realism. This means that we should be wary of interpreting UCAS data in terms of the

supply and demand for HE, or at least we should recognise that these are already subject to strong mutual influences.

The final theme is the combination of institutional stability and change. There was a slight trend in applications and entries away from Russell Group institutions towards post-1992 universities and FE colleges. Mergers and redesignation reduced the number of non-university HEIs. Institutional structures varied across the four home countries, as did changes over the period, although the categories used in this paper are probably more applicable to England and Scotland than to Northern Ireland or (especially) Wales. The vast majority of applications and entries were to first (bachelors) degrees. The newly-introduced Foundation Degrees appeared to displace HNCs and HNDs, but the UCAS data do not cover part-time programmes or a majority of FE college programmes so they are not well placed to study these trends in detail. On the other hand, the UCAS data can be used to show patterns of differentiation among universities: for example, they show that only a minority of applicants made mixed applications that covered both types. The apparent stability of the distinction between pre- and post-1992 universities, and other possible dimensions of differentiation, will be the subject of further analyses.

References

- Bathmaker, A-M., Brooks, G., Parry, G. and Smith, D. (2008) Dual-sector further and higher education: policies, organisations and students in transition. *Research Papers in Education*, 23(2), pp.125-138.
- Forsyth, A. and Furlong, A. (2000) *Socioeconomic disadvantage and access to higher education* (Bristol: Policy Press).
- Gallacher, J. and Raffe, D. (2008) Difference and divergence within the UK. Paper to seminar on *Higher Education in the UK across National Boundaries: the impact of Europe and devolution*.
- Gorard, S. with Adnett, N., May, H., Slack, K., Smith, E. and Thomas, L. (2007) *Overcoming the barriers to higher education* (Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books).
- Hoelscher, M. and Hayward, G. (2008) Analysing access to HE for students with different educational backgrounds: preliminary descriptive results, *Degrees of Success Working Paper 3* (University of Oxford).
- Huisman, J., Meek, L. and Wood, F. (2007) Institutional diversity in higher education: a cross-national and longitudinal analysis, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 61(4), pp.563-577.
- Iannelli, C., Gamoran, A. and Paterson, L. (forthcoming) Expansion through diversion in Scottish higher education 1987-2001, *Oxford Review of Education*.
- Jones, G. (2007) The Welsh universities and devolution, *Welsh Journal of Education*, 14(1), pp.21-42.
- Keating, M. (2005) Higher education in Scotland and England after devolution, *Regional and Federal Studies*, 15(4), pp.423-435.

- Lucas, S. (2001) Effectively maintained inequality: educational transitions, track mobility and social background effects, *American Journal of Sociology*, 106, pp.1642-1690.
- Parry, G. (2009) Student demand and institutional diversification: the case of England, *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 15(2), pp.170-186.
- Raftery, A. and Hout, M. (1993) Maximally maintained inequality: expansion, reform and opportunity in Irish education 1921-75, *Sociology of Education*, 66, pp.41-62.
- Reay, D., David, M.E. and Ball, S. (2005) *Degrees of Choice: social class, race and gender in higher education* (Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books).
- Rees, G. and Taylor, C. (2006) Devolution and the restructuring of participation in higher education in Wales, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 60(4), pp.370-391.
- Scott, P. (2008) *Beyond the market: higher education in 2020*, AUA lecture, October.
- Shavit, Y., Arum, R. and Gamoran, A. (2007) *Stratification in Higher Education: A Comparative Study* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Teichler, U. (2007) The changing patterns of the higher education systems in Europe and the future tasks of higher education research, in ESF (ed) *Higher Education Looking Forward: relations between higher education and society* (Strasbourg: ESF).
- Universities UK (2008) *Devolution and Higher Education: impact and future trends* (London: Universities UK).
- Williams, G. and Fry, H. (1994) *Longer Term Prospects for British Higher Education* (London, CVCP).

Appendix 1: Research Questions

1. In what ways have the social, demographic and educational characteristics of applicants and entrants to full-time HE changed over the period 1996-2010? Are there different trends across the four home countries?
2. How successful are different types of applicants in gaining entry to at least one of their chosen higher education institutions? How have their success rates varied over the period 1996-2010 and across the four home countries?
3. To what extent do different types of institutions attract applicants and entrants with different characteristics, and how has this pattern of differentiation varied over time?
4. What pattern of institutional differentiation is reflected in the characteristics of applicants or entrants to each institution, and how has this pattern of differentiation varied over time?
5. What proportions of students from each home country have (a) applied to and (b) accepted places in institutions in another home country? (Likewise, for each English region.) How have these proportions varied across different types of applicants and of institutions, and how have they changed over time?

Appendix 2: Tables

Table 1: Number of applicants, by cohort and domicile

1a: Number

Domicile	cohort					
	1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All applicants	413035	435904	480119	500966	581043	688933
England	297165	317287	336301	354018	419075	489739
Wales	17320	18164	19216	21231	22505	24718
Northern Ireland	14492	15138	16967	17215	17034	19550
Scotland	31979	33748	36554	35177	37668	46037
All UK	360956	384337	409038	427641	496282	580044
EU	28254	24371	24712	29570	33754	46456
Other country	23688	26773	45940	42911	50389	60813
All non-UK	51942	51144	70652	72481	84143	107269

1b: Index of trends (1996=100)

Domicile	cohort					
	1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All applicants	100	106	116	121	141	167
England	100	107	113	119	141	165
Wales	100	105	111	123	130	143
Northern Ireland	100	104	117	119	118	135
Scotland	100	106	114	110	118	144
All UK-domiciled	100	106	113	118	137	161
EU	100	86	87	105	119	164
Other country	100	113	194	181	213	257
All non-UK	100	98	136	140	162	207

Table 2: Average number of applications, by cohort and domicile

Domicile	cohort					
	1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All applicants	5.0	4.6	4.5	4.6	3.9	4.1
England	5.1	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.1
Wales	4.9	4.5	4.2	4.2	3.7	3.8
Northern Ireland	5.6	5.3	5.1	5.2	4.4	4.4
Scotland	4.2	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.6	3.7
All UK-domiciled	5.0	4.7	4.5	4.6	3.9	4.1
EU	4.9	4.3	4.2	4.4	3.9	4.1
Other country	4.8	4.4	4.5	4.5	3.9	3.8
All-non-UK	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.5	3.9	3.9

Note: maximum number of mainscheme applications reduced from 6 to 5 between 2006 and 2008.

Table 3: Outcome of applications, by cohort and domicile (% of all applicants)

Domicile		cohort					
		1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All applicants	Accepted through main scheme	57	63	66	65	65	60
	Clearing etc	15	15	12	13	14	11
	Not accepted or offer refused	28	22	21	22	21	29
England	Accepted through main scheme	59	65	69	68	68	63
	Accepted through clearing etc	16	16	13	13	14	10
	Not accepted or offer refused	25	19	18	18	18	26
Wales	Accepted through main scheme	61	68	71	67	68	64
	Accepted through clearing etc	16	15	13	14	14	11
	Not accepted or offer refused	23	18	16	19	17	24
Northern Ireland	Accepted through main scheme	52	62	69	64	71	63
	Accepted through clearing etc	10	9	6	8	8	6
	Not accepted or offer refused	38	28	24	28	21	31
Scotland	Accepted through main scheme	62	66	66	66	63	59
	Accepted through clearing etc	14	15	11	10	15	11
	Not accepted or offer refused	25	19	23	24	22	30
Non-UK	Accepted through main scheme	42	47	49	49	47	43
	Accepted through clearing etc	11	14	12	13	14	14
	Not accepted or offer refused	47	39	39	38	39	43

Table 4: Number of entrants, by cohort and domicile**4a. Number**

Domicile	cohort					
	1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All entrants	295807	339747	377544	390890	456627	487329
England	221718	255457	276759	288647	343260	360187
Wales	13322	14909	16113	17148	18595	18671
Northern Ireland	9044	10846	12878	12385	13430	13507
Scotland	24114	27229	28225	26802	29391	32248
All UK-domiciled	268198	308441	333975	344982	404676	424613
EU	14764	14834	15401	18284	21170	25362
Other country	12741	16167	27789	26818	30307	35832
All non-UK	27505	31001	43190	45102	51477	61194

4b. Index of trends (1996=100)

Domicile	cohort					
	1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All entrants	100	115	128	132	154	165
England	100	115	125	130	155	162
Wales	100	112	121	129	140	140
Northern Ireland	100	120	142	137	148	149
Scotland	100	113	117	111	122	134
All UK-domiciled	100	115	125	129	151	158
EU	100	100	104	124	143	172
Other country	100	127	218	210	238	281
All non-UK	100	113	157	164	187	222

Table 5: Type of institution applied to, by cohort and domicile (% of applicants)

Domicile		cohort					
		1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All	Russell Group	51	45	49	48	45	44
	Other pre-1992 University	57	53	55	55	51	51
	Post-1992 University	69	69	64	67	66	68
	Other HEI	29	22	25	18	14	15
	FE College	4	7	6	6	5	9
	Other institution	0.5	0.9	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5
England	Russell Group	48	42	46	44	41	39
	Other pre-1992 University	53	50	52	51	47	47
	Post-1992 University	73	73	68	71	71	74
	Other HEI	32	24	27	20	15	17
	FE College	5	8	8	7	6	12
	Other institution	0.5	0.9	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4
Wales	Russell Group	47	43	44	47	43	43
	Other pre-1992 University	53	54	59	54	52	56
	Post-1992 University	67	70	60	67	70	73
	Other HEI	44	23	33	21	11	8
	FE College	3	6	5	5	4	7
	Other institution	0.4	1.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
NI	Russell Group	66	65	65	65	63	62
	Other pre-1992 University	87	85	83	84	80	81
	Post-1992 University	43	41	36	39	39	39
	Other HEI	15	16	23	16	12	14
	FE College	3	3	2	1	1	2
	Other institution	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Scotland	Russell Group	46	48	48	51	48	44
	Other pre-1992 University	65	60	64	68	65	63
	Post-1992 University	65	59	57	60	58	64
	Other HEI	16	16	17	13	13	12
	FE College	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Other institution	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Non-UK	Russell Group	64	54	58	60	60	59
	Other pre-1992 University	65	55	59	61	59	60
	Post-1992 University	58	60	55	53	48	49
	Other HEI	20	17	17	12	9	10
	FE College	2	3	4	3	2	4
	Other institution	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.3	1.4

Table 6: Combinations of applications, by cohort and domicile (% of applicants)

Domicile		cohort					
		1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All	Pre-92 only	27	26	29	29	30	28
	Pre and post 92 universities	43	39	39	38	35	37
	Post-92 only	27	30	25	28	31	32
	no university applications	3	5	7	4	4	4
England	Pre-92 only	23	22	25	24	24	21
	Pre and post 92 universities	43	39	40	39	36	38
	Post-92 only	30	34	29	32	36	36
	no university applications	4	5	7	5	4	4
Wales	Pre-92 only	25	26	31	28	27	25
	Pre and post 92 universities	40	39	37	40	38	44
	Post-92 only	27	31	23	26	32	29
	no university applications	7	4	9	6	3	2
NI	Pre-92 only	56	58	63	60	60	59
	Pre and post 92 universities	39	36	31	34	33	34
	Post-92 only	4	6	4	5	5	6
	no university applications	0	1	2	1	1	1
Scotland	Pre-92 only	32	33	35	36	35	31
	Pre and post 92 universities	39	36	37	40	37	39
	Post-92 only	25	23	20	20	21	24
	no university applications	3	8	8	4	6	6
Non-UK	Pre-92 only	40	35	39	44	50	49
	Pre and post 92 universities	43	38	37	34	29	29
	Post-92 only	15	22	18	19	19	20
	no university applications	2	5	6	2	2	2

Table 7: Type of institution entered, by cohort and domicile (% of entrants)

Domicile		cohort					
		1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All	Russell Group	22	21	22	21	20	19
	Other pre-1992 University	22	21	23	23	23	22
	Post-1992 University	43	45	41	46	48	49
	Other HEI	11	9	11	6	5	6
	FE College	2	3	3	3	3	5
	Other institution	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
England	Russell Group	21	20	20	20	19	17
	Other pre-1992 University	19	19	20	20	19	18
	Post-1992 University	45	48	45	50	53	53
	Other HEI	12	10	11	7	6	6
	FE College	2	4	4	4	4	6
	Other institution	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2
Wales	Russell Group	20	20	19	20	18	17
	Other pre-1992 University	23	24	29	27	27	27
	Post-1992 University	35	45	33	42	48	52
	Other HEI	21	8	16	9	4	2
	FE College	1	3	3	3	3	3
	Other institution	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NI	Russell Group	38	35	35	35	33	33
	Other pre-1992 University	36	44	44	41	46	44
	Post-1992 University	20	16	15	19	17	18
	Other HEI	5	4	7	5	3	4
	FE College	1	1	0	0	0	1
	Other institution	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Scotland	Russell Group	20	22	21	22	21	17
	Other pre-1992 University	32	31	33	35	33	30
	Post-1992 University	42	36	35	37	38	44
	Other HEI	6	10	10	6	8	8
	FE College	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.5
	Other institution	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-UK	Russell Group	27	25	27	29	30	29
	Other pre-1992 University	29	24	27	30	32	31
	Post-1992 University	37	41	35	36	34	35
	Other HEI	6	9	8	4	3	3
	FE College	1	1	2	1	1	1
	Other institution	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.4

Table 8: Percentage of applications which resulted in entry, by location and type of institution

Location of institution		cohort					
		1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All UK	Russell Group	12	14	13	13	15	13
	Other pre-1992 University	14	16	16	16	19	16
	Post-1992 University	16	18	20	19	23	19
	Other HEI	16	22	22	19	23	20
	FE College	23	28	34	36	39	28
	Other institution	17	16	19	8	10	21
	Total	14	17	17	17	20	17
England	Russell Group	12	13	13	13	15	13
	Other pre-1992 University	14	15	16	16	19	16
	Post-1992 University	15	17	19	19	22	19
	Other HEI	15	21	21	19	22	19
	FE College	23	28	34	35	39	28
	Other institution	17	16	19	8	10	21
	Total	14	16	17	17	20	17
Wales	Russell Group	18	17	17	13	16	15
	other pre-92	20	21	22	22	27	24
	post-92	18	22	23	23	27	26
	other HEI	21	19	26	22	18	
	FE College		43	47	43	52	41
	Total	19	20	22	20	24	22
NI	Russell Group	12	16	17	17	20	17
	Other pre-1992 University	7	14	16	12	20	17
	Post-1992 University		13	11	15	18	17
	Total	9	15	16	14	20	17
Scotland	Russell Group	13	15	14	11	13	11
	Other pre-1992 University	15	18	17	16	19	15
	Post-1992 University	19	21	21	22	26	22
	Other HEI	17	47	34	20	35	29
	Total	16	19	18	16	20	16

Table 9: Type(s) of programme applied to, by cohort and domicile (% of applicants)

Domicile		2004	2006	2008	2010
All	Degree	96	95	93	92
	Foundation degree	4	7	8	9
	HNC/HND	7	5	3	3
	Other		3	6	7
England	Degree	96	95	91	91
	Foundation degree	5	8	10	11
	HNC/HND	8	5	4	3
	Other		2	7	9
Wales	Degree	96	95	94	95
	Foundation degree	2	4	6	7
	HNC/HND	9	8	7	6
	Other		3	3	4
NI	Degree	99	99	99	99
	Foundation degree	2	3	3	4
	HNC/HND	5	3	1	1
	Other		4	1	2
Scotland	Degree	95	97	94	93
	Foundation degree	0	1	1	1
	HNC/HND	6	2	5	5
	Other		4	3	10
Non-UK	Degree	98	98	98	99
	Foundation degree	3	4	3	4
	HNC/HND	4	3	2	1
	Other		2	1	1

Note: UCAS data for applicants in 1996 and 2000 include information on programmes for which applicants were accepted, but not on other programmes to which they applied.

Table 10: Type of programme entered, by cohort and domicile (% of entrants)

Domicile		cohort					
		1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
All	Degree	92	92	94	93	90	89
	F-degree			2	4	5	5
	HND	8	8	4	2	2	2
	other				1	4	4
England	Degree	92	91	93	92	88	88
	F-degree			3	5	6	7
	HND	8	9	4	3	2	1
	other				1	5	4
Wales	Degree	90	89	94	92	91	92
	F-degree			1	2	3	3
	HND	10	11	5	4	4	4
	other				1	1	1
NI	Degree	94	96	98	97	98	97
	F-degree			1	1	1	2
	HND	6	4	1	1	0	1
	other				1	0	1
Scotland	Degree	95	91	94	96	92	89
	F-degree			0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3
	HND	5	9	6	2	5	6
	other				2	2	5
Non-UK	Degree	96	96	97	97	97	97
	F-degree			1	1	1	2
	HND	4	4	2	1	1	1
	other				0.5	0.4	0.4

Table 11: Type of programme applied to, by cohort and domicile (% of applicants)

Location		2004				2006					2008					2010			
		Degree	F Degree	HND		Degree	F Degree	HNC/HND	Other		Degree	F Degree	HNC/HND	Other		Degree	F Degree	HNC/HND	Other
All UK	Russell Group	100	0	0		99	0	0	1		98	0	0	2		98	0	0	2
	other pre-92	99	0	1		98	0	0	1		97	1	0	2		96	1	0	3
	post-92	95	1	3		94	3	2	1		90	4	2	5		89	4	1	5
	other HEI	93	3	4		92	4	3	1		90	6	3	1		89	7	2	2
	FE College	42	19	39		39	35	25	1		40	45	15	0		57	31	7	4
	other institution	99	1	1		99	0	1	0		96	1	2	0		82	1	15	2
	All	96	1	2		96	2	1	1		93	3	1	3		92	3	1	4
England	Russell Group	100	0	0		99	0	0	1		98	0	0	2		97	0	0	3
	other pre-92	99	0	1		98	1	0	1		96	1	0	3		95	1	0	4
	post-92	95	1	4		94	3	2	1		90	4	2	5		89	4	1	5
	other HEI	94	4	2		94	4	1	1		91	8	0	1		90	8	0	2
	FE College	42	19	39		39	36	24	1		40	45	14	0		58	31	7	4
	other institution	99	1	1		99	0	1	0		96	1	2	0		82	1	15	2
	All	96	1	3		95	2	2	1		92	3	1	3		91	4	1	4
Wales	Russell Group	100				98			2		98			2		97			3
	other pre-92	99	0	1		98	0	1	0		99	0	1	0		99	0	1	0
	post-92	92	1	7		91	2	5	2		92	2	6	0		91	2	6	0
	other HEI	92	1	8		89	0	11			99	0	1			100			
	FE College	44	5	51		43	11	43	3		42	28	29	0		40	30	21	8
	All	96	0	3		95	1	3	1		96	1	2	1		95	1	3	1
Northern Ireland	Russell Group	100	0	0		97	1	0	2		99	1	0			99	1	0	0
	other pre-92	98	1	1		98	0	1	1		100	0	0			100	0	0	0
	other HEI	98	0	2		93	5	3	0		90	7	3			85	11	4	0
		98	1	1		97	1	1	1		99	1	0			99	1	0	0
Scotland	Russell Group	100		0		100		0	0		100		0	0		100		0	0
	other pre-92	100		0		99		0	1		99		0	1		99		0	1
	post-92	100		0		98		0	2		97		0	2		92		0	8
	other HEI	72		28		82		12	7		76		24	0		80		20	0
	FE College	2		98		0		100	0		0		100	0		0		100	0
	All	99		1		98		1	1		98		1	1		96		1	3

Table 12: Type of programme entered, by type of institution, location of institution and cohort (% of entrants)

Location		1996		2000		2004			2006				2008				2010			
		Degree	HND	Degree	HND	Degree	F-degree	HND	Degree	F-degree	HND	other	Degree	F-degree	HND	other	Degree	F-degree	HND	other
England	Russell Group	100	0	100	0	100	0	0	99	0	0	0	97	0	0	3	97	0	0	3
	other pre-92 university	99	1	98	2	99	0	1	97	1	1	1	95	1	1	4	95	1	0	3
	post-92 university	88	12	91	9	94	2	4	92	4	3	1	87	5	2	6	88	6	1	5
	other HEI	90	10	88	12	92	6	2	89	8	2	1	84	14	1	2	83	14	0	2
	FE College	42	58	32	68	38	26	36	33	42	23	1	35	50	14	1	47	41	9	3
	other institution	90	10	92	8	100	0	0	99	0	0	0	96	0	4	0	73	0	25	2
	All	92	8	92	8	93	3	4	92	4	2	1	89	5	2	4	89	6	1	4
Wales	Russell Group	100	0	100	0	100	0	0	99	0	0	1	98	0	0	2	98	0	0	2
	other pre-92 university	98	2	98	2	99	0	1	98	0	1	0	98	1	1	0	99	1	1	0
	post-92 university	77	23	83	17	91	1	8	91	2	6	1	89	3	8	1	88	4	8	1
	other HEI	84	16	89	11	89	1	10	84	0	15	0	98	1	1	0	100	0	0	0
	FE College			5	95	40	5	55	36	16	43	5	34	32	33	0	37	31	29	2
	other institution			100	0															
	All	91	9	91	9	94	0	5	94	1	4	1	93	2	4	1	93	2	4	1
Northern Ireland	Russell Group	100	0	100	0	100	0	0	97	1	0	1	99	1	0	0	98	2	0	0
	other pre-92 university	89	11	91	9	98	0	1	98	0	1	1	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
	other HEI			100	0	88	0	12	75	16	8	0	80	13	8	0	73	17	10	0
	other institution			41	59															
	All	95	5	95	5	98	0	1	97	1	1	1	99	1	0	0	98	1	0	0
Scotland	Russell Group	100	0	100	0	100		0	100		0	0	100		0	0	99		0	1
	other pre-92 university	100	0	100	0	100		0	99		0	1	99		0	1	98		0	2
	post-92 university	92	8	96	4	100		0	97		0	3	96		0	3	91		0	8
	other HEI	78	22	31	69	50		50	65		24	11	42		57	1	41		58	1
	FE College	96	4	93	7	0		100	0		100	0	0		100	0	0		100	0
	All					96		4	97		1	2	94		4	1	91		5	4
Total	Russell Group	100	0	100	0	100	0	0	99	0	0	1	97	0	0	3	97	0	0	2
	other pre-92 university	99	1	98	2	99	0	1	98	1	1	1	96	1	0	3	96	1	0	3
	post-92 university	88	12	91	9	94	2	4	93	4	2	1	88	5	2	5	89	5	2	5
	other HEI	89	11	83	17	88	5	7	87	7	4	1	79	12	7	2	78	12	7	2
	FE College	42	58	31	69	38	25	37	33	41	24	2	35	49	15	0	47	41	9	3
	other institution	90	10	89	11	100	0	0	99	0	0	0	96	0	4	0	73	0	25	2
	All	92	8	92	8	94	2	4	93	4	2	1	90	5	2	4	89	5	2	4

Table 13: Subject studied, by type of programme and cohort (% of all entrants)

Domicile		cohort					
		1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
Degree	A Medicine & Dentistry	2	2	3	3	2	2
	B Subjects allied to Medicine	5	7	7	7	7	8
	C Biological Sciences	6	5	8	8	8	9
	D Vet Sci,Ag & related	1	1	1	1	1	1
	F Physical Sciences	5	4	4	4	4	4
	G Mathematical & Comp Sci	6	9	6	6	6	6
	H/J Engineering & Technology	8	6	6	6	6	6
	K Architecture,Build & Plan	2	2	2	2	2	2
	L/M Social Studies & Law	15	14	14	14	14	14
	N Business & Admin studies	11	11	11	12	12	12
	P Mass Comms and Documentation	2	3	2	2	2	2
	Q/R/T Languages & related	7	5	5	5	5	4
	V Hist & Philosophical studies	4	3	4	4	4	3
	W Creative Arts & Design	4	9	10	10	10	10
	X Education	7	4	3	3	3	3
	Y Combined arts	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Y Combined sciences	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Y Sciences combined with social sciences or arts	3	4	4	4	4	4
	Y Social sciences combined with arts	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Z General, other combined & unknown	4	2	2	1	1	1
F Degree	B Subjects allied to Medicine			3	4	5	4
	C Biological Sciences			7	7	5	5
	D Vet Sci,Ag & related			8	7	7	7
	F Physical Sciences			1	1	1	1
	G Mathematical & Comp Sci			8	10	7	7
	H/J Engineering & Technology			6	5	5	5
	K Architecture,Build & Plan			1	2	2	2
	L/M Social Studies & Law			4	6	8	10
	N Business & Admin studies			17	13	12	13
	P Mass Comms and Documentation			3	2	3	2
	Q/R/T Languages & related			0	0	0	0
	V Hist & Philosophical studies			0	0	0	0
	W Creative Arts & Design			24	25	23	22
	X Education			7	7	7	6
	Y Combined arts			0	1	1	1
	Y Combined sciences			1	2	2	2
	Y Sciences combined with social sciences or arts			9	8	8	9
	Y Social sciences combined with arts			2	2	3	3
	Z General, other combined & unknown			0	0	0	0

Table 13 (contd): Subject studied, by type of programme and cohort (% of all entrants)

Domicile		cohort					
		1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
HND	B Subjects allied to Medicine	1	3	2	2	2	2
	C Biological Sciences	2	1	4	4	5	5
	D Vet Sci,Ag & related	6	5	5	5	5	5
	F Physical Sciences	2	1	1	1	1	2
	G Mathematical & Comp Sci	19	20	16	12	12	11
	H/J Engineering & Technology	10	6	7	9	9	11
	K Architecture,Build & Plan	3	2	3	6	7	5
	L/M Social Studies & Law	2	4	4	3	5	6
	N Business & Admin studies	37	25	26	28	30	29
	P Mass Comms and Documentation	4	5	2	1	1	1
	Q/R/T Languages & related	0	0	0	0	0	0
	V Hist & Philosophical studies	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W Creative Arts & Design	3	18	20	21	16	16
	X Education	8	2	2	1	2	2
	Y Combined arts	0	1	1	1	0	0
	Y Combined sciences	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Y Sciences combined with social sciences or arts	2	5	4	4	3	3
	Y Social sciences combined with arts	1	3	1	1	2	1
	Z General, other combined & unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	A Medicine & Dentistry				1	0	0
	B Subjects allied to Medicine				15	85	84
	C Biological Sciences				1	0	0
	D Vet Sci,Ag & related				1	0	0
	F Physical Sciences				1	0	0
	G Mathematical & Comp Sci				1	0	0
	H/J Engineering & Technology				1	0	0
	K Architecture,Build & Plan				0	0	0
	L/M Social Studies & Law				49	10	11
	N Business & Admin studies				7	1	1
	P Mass Comms and Documentation				2	0	0
	Q/R/T Languages & related				1	0	0
	V Hist & Philosophical studies				2	0	0
	W Creative Arts & Design				4	1	1
	X Education				5	0	1
	Y Combined arts				1	0	0
	Y Combined sciences				2	0	0
	Y Sciences combined with social sciences or arts				2	0	1
	Y Social sciences combined with arts				1	0	0
	Z General, other combined & unknown				4	0	0

Table 13 (contd): Subject studied, by type of programme and cohort (% of all entrants)

Domicile		cohort					
		1996	2000	2004	2006	2008	2010
Total	A Medicine & Dentistry	2	2	2	2	2	2
	B Subjects allied to Medicine	5	7	6	7	9	10
	C Biological Sciences	6	5	8	8	8	8
	D Vet Sci,Ag & related	1	1	1	1	1	1
	F Physical Sciences	5	4	4	4	4	4
	G Mathematical & Comp Sci	7	9	7	6	6	6
	H/J Engineering & Technology	8	6	6	6	6	6
	K Architecture,Build & Plan	2	2	2	2	2	2
	L/M Social Studies & Law	14	13	13	14	14	14
	N Business & Admin studies	13	12	12	12	12	12
	P Mass Comms and Documentation	2	3	2	2	2	2
	Q/R/T Languages & related	6	5	5	4	4	4
	V Hist & Philosophical studies	4	3	3	3	3	3
	W Creative Arts & Design	3	10	11	11	11	11
	X Education	7	4	3	3	3	3
	Y Combined arts	3	2	3	3	3	3
	Y Combined sciences	2	2	1	2	2	2
	Y Sciences combined with social sciences or arts	3	4	5	5	4	4
	Y Social sciences combined with arts	3	3	3	3	3	2
	Z General, other combined & unknown	3	2	1	1	1	1