

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

05 February 2019

Version of attached file:

Published Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Not peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Donnelly, Michael and Gamsu, Sol (2018) 'HOME AND AWAY : social, ethnic and spatial inequalities in student mobility.', Project Report. The Sutton Trust, London.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://www.suttontrust.com/research-paper/home-and-away-student-mobility/>

Publisher's copyright statement:**Additional information:**

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

HOME AND AWAY

Social, ethnic and spatial inequalities in student mobility

Michael Donnelly and Sol Gamsu
– February 2018



UNIVERSITY OF
BATH



Contents

Foreword	2
Recommendations.....	3
Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction.....	6
Background and context.....	6
2. Data and methods	10
Creating the typology	10
Methods.....	10
A typology of student mobility.....	11
3. Degrees of mobility: class, ethnicity, prior attainment and place	13
Social class	13
Ethnicity	14
Geography	15
Universities	15
4. Modelling student mobility before and after the fees increase	17
Short distance commuters.....	17
Short distance movers	18
Medium distance commuters.....	19
Medium distance movers	20
Long distance commuters	20
Long distance movers	21
5. Summary of findings.....	22
Ethnicity	22
Place	23
Social class and regional inequality.....	23
Student mobilities and geographical inequalities in outreach	23
6. Conclusion: resolving the policy tensions and contradictions of unequal educational mobilities	25
7. Appendices.....	27
Appendix 1 – Detailed descriptive tables	27
Appendix 2 – University tables	30
Appendix 3 – Regression models.....	40

Foreword

The concept of place has played an increasingly important role in political discussion in recent years. North or south, urban or rural, coastal or inland, there are growing geographical divides in UK education and society. As the Sutton Trust's Social Mobility Index has shown, vast areas of the country suffer from low levels of opportunity, while others enable their young people to thrive.

These divisions affect all aspects of a person's life: the type of school they go to, the friends they make, the experiences they gain, the workplace opportunities they have access to, even the opinions they hold. University is frequently the first important opportunity for geographical movement in the life of a young person. Access to university too is shaped by place, and it is timely that this report explores the patterns of student mobility at universities across the UK.

In the modern economy it is often those who are most mobile who are most likely to find success. Moving away to university can be an important first step. Moving to London, or other large cities in the UK, can be an 'escalator' for social mobility. But too often, the opportunity to move away to attend university is restricted to those from better off homes. The assumption persists that the UK university experience is characterised by young people moving away from home for the first time. However, our report shows that this is in fact far from the case for many people, and that moving long distances to attend university is largely the preserve of those from well-off backgrounds. A variety of factors, including financial and cultural barriers each play a part in decisions to stay at home or move away.

This poses complex questions about the relationships between geographical and social mobility. But at the root of the issue is the uneven spread of top class universities across the country. Depending on where you were born, your access to the best universities can be severely limited without travelling significant distances. Those from all backgrounds should be encouraged and helped to consider travelling to the best university for their needs. Through our Sutton Trust summer schools we play our part, giving 2,400 young people each year the chance to experience those universities before they apply. But it is also important for those who wish to - or indeed need to - stay at home that there are excellent local options for everyone. It is crucial that these local opportunities include high quality apprenticeship options too.

In the short term, universities need to do more, through outreach and opening up beyond open days to expand their horizons to attract young people from all backgrounds and geographical locations. The student finance system also urgently needs to be reformed, including restored maintenance grants and means-tested tuition fees, so a lack of money is no longer a barrier to accessing the best education. Universities with high numbers of 'commuter students' should also consider their needs more strongly when it comes to timetabling, travel and support for their university experience. Home or away, every student deserves access to the best higher educational opportunities. Getting this right has an important role in social mobility.

I am very grateful to Dr Michael Donnelly and Dr Sol Gamsu for this important new research.

Sir Peter Lampl

Founder and Chairman of the Sutton Trust and Chairman of the Education Endowment Foundation

Recommendations

1. **Young people from less affluent backgrounds should receive greater financial assistance to help meet the increased costs associated with moving out, including restoring maintenance grants and lowering fees for the less well-off.** To ensure equal access to a similar range of university choices and experiences, the government's Review of Post-18 Education should consider reforming student finance by reintroducing maintenance grants and means-tested fees.
2. **Financial support should also be provided that is specific to the financial realities of commuting significant distances to university, given the socio-economic profile of commuter students.** The young persons' railcard is not valid on peak fares, at the precise time when many will be travelling to attend lectures. In more rural areas, where train travel will not always be possible, petrol vouchers and subsidised bus services should also be considered.
3. **Universities should consider more flexible timetabling of lectures where they have seen large increases in students commuting from the family home to attend university.** Limiting classes that start early in the morning, requiring expensive peak-time commutes, would have clear benefits. A more flexible approach to office hours and some forms of e-learning may also be of benefit. Universities should also consider the reality of commuting and the social side of university life in their student support.
4. **Universities should work to reassure families who may discourage their children from studying away from home for cultural reasons.** Outreach activities, open days and summer schools such as the Sutton Trust UK Summer School programme can help to reassure such students – and their parents – about travelling by offering more opportunities for them to visit those universities.
5. **A specific spatial element should be included in future university access agreements, including a focus on peripheral geographical areas.** There is a notable lack of provision of university outreach in peripheral areas in stark contrast to working-class schools and colleges in London which often receive high levels of engagement. Addressing this imbalance will be key to changing patterns of mobility and broader inequalities in post-16 provision.
6. **Selective universities should consider reserving a proportion of places for local working-class students.** Some universities are very disconnected from their local communities, with limited local recruitment of students who stay living in the family home, often posing a problem of local legitimacy. Such changes must also be accompanied by the creation of an academic, cultural and social environment that is amenable to these students.
7. **Halal Student Loans are needed to enable Muslim students to borrow money in accordance with their religious beliefs** so that – if they wish to do so – they have the same opportunities for mobility as their non-Muslim peers.

Executive Summary

- Student mobility, whether or not a student leaves home to study and how far they are willing to travel if so, is a major dimension of inequality within higher education choice and experience. Staying at home and studying locally is strongly differentiated by ethnicity and social background with students from disadvantaged groups much more likely to be living at home.
- This study defines six types of student who entered university for the first time in 2009/10 and 2014/15 either staying in the family home whilst studying ('commuters') or living in other accommodation which involves living away from the family home ('movers'). In 2014/15, full-time undergraduate students aged 20 or under formed the following groups: 'short-distance commuters' (23.3%); 'short-distance movers' (32.5%); 'medium-distance commuters' (1.2%); 'medium-distance movers' (31.5%); 'long-distance commuters' (0.3%); 'long-distance movers' (10.9%)
- The majority of young people (55.8% in 2014/15) stay local for university, attending a university less than about 55 miles away from their home address. University is not a time when all young people leave home and move away: only one in ten students attend a university over 150 miles from home, and those that do are socially, ethnically and geographically distinct groups.
- In absolute terms, the number of commuter students over all distances has increased since 2009-10 (from 72,310 to 77,945). With rising young undergraduate student numbers, this actually equates to a small percentage drop, but many institutions have seen substantial increases in the proportion of commuter students they now recruit. London universities in particular have seen substantial percentage increases, suggesting that rising housing costs and debt are changing students' choices in the capital.
- Social class is a key factor which drives the mobility choices of young people, with disadvantaged students less likely to leave home and travel further. Over three times more students in the lowest social class group commute from home than do so from the highest group (44.9% compared with 13.1%). In contrast, leaving home and attending a distant university is too often the preserve of white, middle class, privately educated young people.
- Controlling for other factors including class, location and attainment, state school students are 2.6 times more likely to stay at home and study locally than their privately educated counterparts.
- British Pakistani and British Bangladeshi students are over six times more likely than White students to stay living at home and study locally – with the chances increasing substantially since the increase in fees to £9,000. Whilst cultural differences might explain some of this disparity, it also underscores the fact that many universities remain white-dominated spaces, limiting university choices for BAME students who may feel more comfortable in a more diverse university.
- The increase in tuition fees to £9,000 in 2012 has not substantially affected overall trends in student mobility. For the young, full-time students analysed here, there is no evidence of a substantial rise in students staying at home and attending their local university. However there have been small changes that have made some less advantaged groups more immobile. These patterns are only slight but the same may not be the case for part-time and mature students whose mobility patterns are worthy of further study.
- Commuting distances of about 55 miles and above have increased since 2009-10 in percentage terms (from 0.9% to 1.2% for the medium-distance commuters, from 0.1% to 0.3% for long-distance commuters). There has been a small increase of just under 3,000 students in the absolute numbers of students commuting less than around 55 miles, but this is not a proportional increase, with the percentage falling slightly between 2009-10 and 2014-15 from 24.1% to 23.3%.

- *Where* young people live in the UK is a further contributing factor in predicting the likelihood they will be mobile, above and beyond their social class and ethnicity. Those in northern regions of England, especially the North East, are much less likely to be mobile compared to those in the south.
- Scottish students appear to have become less likely to leave Scotland for university with long-distance moves to study at university declining relative to other UK regions. The Scottish tendency to stay north of the border for university may have been reinforced by the fee increase in England of 2012.
- We also provide a breakdown of patterns of student recruitment for each individual university. This allows us to highlight the enormous contrasts between universities: in some, well over 50% of students live locally and in the family home (Newman University in Birmingham, the University of Wolverhampton, Glasgow Caledonian University, Glyndwr University and City University in London); in other peripheral elite universities such as St Andrews or Durham where long-distance re-location for study is the norm, and universities' student populations are relatively detached from local communities.
- Some of the clearest evidence of changes in patterns of student mobility is evident at the institutional level. A number of London universities such as LSE, SOAS, St Mary's University College, and some outside London such as the University of Stirling and Staffordshire University, have seen a 10% or higher increase in the proportion of students commuting short distances to university. In most cases, this has corresponded with a concurrent fall of a similar percentage of students moving out of the family home but staying short-distance.
- There is a stark contrast between the widening participation and outreach activities (both university and third-sector provided) that exist in London and what is present in culturally and economically deprived communities in peripheral areas. London has an infrastructure for widening participation and outreach on a scale which simply does not exist in more peripheral parts of the country. Student mobility on entry to university occurs against a backdrop of highly unequal access to cultural enrichment and outreach for students post-16.

1. Introduction

The research reported here is part of a larger programme of work¹ addressing the spatial and social mobilities of higher education students in the UK, funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (award no. ES/N002121/1). This wider study includes further analyses of student records data to trace the different ways in which young people are spatially mobile for university, which is complemented by in-depth qualitative work in 20 purposefully selected fieldwork locations across the UK.

In this report, we present new findings on the extent and nature of student mobility in the UK, examining who leaves home and who doesn't, as well as how far different groups travel. Entering university has long been seen as a rite of passage, which in the UK is imagined as a time when many young people will gain independence by living a significance distance away from home for the first time. Using very detailed data containing information on all students entering university in 2009-10 and 2014-15, we test how true this idea is in contemporary British higher education. Importantly, we examine the extent to which rising tuition fees, especially the increase to over £9,000 seen in most parts of the UK, has affected trends in the movement of students.

Contrary to popular opinion, we find that most young people stay relatively local for university. Over 50% of students in both years entered university less than 91 km (57 miles) away from home. It is only a minority of students who move out of home and far away. However, there are important disparities between different groups in the chances they will leave home and the distance they travel. These social, ethnic and spatial inequalities in student mobility are examined in detail here, together with their wider significance and policy implications.

The dataset we draw on was obtained from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) and contains fine-grained information for every student registered at each university in the UK. The data is drawn from the HESA Student Record and includes data on student sex and ethnicity, household social class (measured by the National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification, NS-SEC), attainment (UCAS tariff points) as well as postcode data used to create a distance variable. Our typology of student mobility combines distance and whether or not students stay at home to divide students into 'commuters', those living in the parental/guardian home in their first year of university, and 'movers', those who move out into another accommodation type over three distances. We describe the data preparation in Section 2.

We begin by reviewing past research on student mobility in the UK, including both quantitative and qualitative studies into the extent, nature and explanations for different mobility patterns. After outlining the data-sets and methods of analyses used here, we present a typology of six different types of student mobility which is qualified further according to students' social class, ethnicity, and geographic location. To help understand the factors driving students to opt for a given type of mobility, a series of six models is presented. Key findings from this modelling, as well as their significance and wider implications for policy are explained in the final section.

Background and context

Policy expectations around the spatial mobility of students on entering university are still based around the assumption that most students will leave home for university. This harks back to the historic roots of university attendance as an extension of boarding school, in which white, predominantly male, middle-class students moved from one form of institutionally-provided catered accommodation to another.² However, in an era of increasing tuition fees and at a time when nearly half of young people go to university, there are now a variety of ways in which people are spatially mobile on entering university. Our analysis examines how true the common image of moving out of home and away for university is for different students from different backgrounds, choosing different universities and courses and growing up across different parts of the UK.

¹ Further findings from the wider study can be found here: <http://www.bath.ac.uk/education/research/projects/geographies-higher-education/>

² Holdsworth C. (2009) 'Going away to uni': mobility, modernity, and independence of English higher education students. *Environment and planning A* 41: 1849-1864.

In a context of regional inequality, being spatially mobile for university carries with it important implications for the potential social mobility of young people. The role of London as an 'escalator region' for young people with strong net inflows of 16-24 year olds and with upward mobility into professional and managerial occupations has been long established.³ Indeed, whilst London is particularly advantageous, there is a 'migration premium' for upward social mobility associated with moving to a large UK city compared to staying in the same region.⁴ However, London is not an escalator for everyone. Friedman and Macmillan have recently explored the complex role of London within patterns of regional and social mobility.⁵ They argue that for Londoners, especially those from international migrant backgrounds, the city is not actually a hotspot for social mobility. Instead it is middle-class regional migrants who benefit most from moving to the capital and are much more likely to move into top professional or managerial jobs. For higher education, this implies that middle-class graduates still reap the most benefits from regional mobility and that these migrants to London may in fact restrict mobility opportunities for young people from London.

The link between regional spatial mobility, higher education and social mobility is similarly complex. The majority of papers exploring this topic have principally focused on the regional loss or gain of undergraduate students and whether or not these students relocate for employment on graduation.⁶ Many of the papers highlight the clear London effect with the capital receiving a net-gain of graduates and a higher rate of pay once they arrive.⁷ In contrast, areas such as Northern Ireland, Wales and the East of England are all net losers of students, and especially higher-attaining students, on graduation.⁸ A particularly important contribution comes from Kidd et al. who explore the effect of different types of mobility pre- and post-university and the link with graduate earnings. Remaining in your home area to study and remaining there on graduation is associated with lower graduate earnings. However, those that are immobile in their choice of university but subsequently move for employment receive significant financial benefits in earnings. Staying at home for university is not intrinsically associated with lower earnings, as the authors emphasise, what matters is the geographical limits of students' job searches.⁸ This underlines the potential contradictions between a policy of encouraging more balanced regional growth, which would rely on the retention of graduates, and a policy with a narrow social mobility focus, which would in effect encourage the outward migration of academically-able youth. The issue of spatial mobility on entry to and graduation from university is situated at the crux of major policy decisions about young people, economic growth and regional inequality. In this report we will focus on spatial mobility into university and importantly provide an analysis of change over time, particularly since the 2012 change in tuition fees in England.

To date the literature that has looked at home to university transition and the reason behind students staying living in the family home has been largely qualitative.⁹ This research has highlighted the complex reasons behind these choices. Whilst students may be 'immobile' in terms of remaining in the family home, Finn warns us against seeing mobility as simply a question of the 'value' of being mobile to

³ Fielding AJ. (1992) Migration and social mobility: South East England as an escalator region. *Regional Studies* 26: 1-15.

Smith DP and Sage J. (2014) The regional migration of young adults in England and Wales (2002–2008): a 'conveyor-belt' of population redistribution? *Children's Geographies* 12: 102-117.

⁴ Champion T, Coombes M and Gordon I. (2014) How Far do England's Second-Order Cities Emulate London as Human-Capital 'Escalators'? *Population, Space and Place* 20: 421-433.

⁵ Friedman, S., & Macmillan, L. (2017). Is London really the engine-room? Migration, opportunity hoarding and regional social mobility in the UK. *National Institute Economic Review*, 240(1), R58-R72.

⁶ Hoare A. (1991) Bias in university enrolments: a regional analysis. *Regional Studies* 25: 459-470. Faggian A and McCann P. (2009) Universities, agglomerations and graduate human capital mobility. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 100: 210-223. Hoare A and Corver M. (2010) The regional geography of new young graduate labour in the UK. *Regional Studies* 44: 477-494.

⁷ O'Leary NC and Sloane PJ. (2008) Rates of return to degrees across British regions. *Regional Studies* 42: 199-213.

⁸ McQuaid R and Hollywood E. (2008) *Educational migration and non-return in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: Equality Commission for Northern Ireland. Pill MC, Bristow GI, Davies R, et al. (2011) Stay, leave or return? Patterns of Welsh graduate mobility.

People, Place and Policy Online 5: 135-148. Kidd MP, O'Leary N and Sloane P. (2017) The impact of mobility on early career earnings: A quantile regression approach for UK graduates. *Economic Modelling* 62: 90-102.

⁹ Holdsworth C. (2006) 'Don't you think you're missing out, living at home?' Student experiences and residential transitions. *The Sociological Review* 54: 495-519.

Patinotis J and Holdsworth C. (2005) 'Seize that chance!' Leaving home and transitions to higher education. *Journal of Youth Studies* 8: 81-95. Hinton D. (2011) 'Wales is my home': higher education aspirations and student mobilities in Wales.

Children's Geographies 9: 23-34. Donnelly M and Evans C. (2016) Framing the geographies of higher education participation: Schools, place and national identity. *British Educational Research Journal* 42: 74-92.

academic or employment success.¹⁰ She underlines how the question of where to study and the experience of staying at home or leaving are bound up in emotional decisions and experiences which are far more subtle and complex than a 'one-off' decision of whether to leave home or not. Similarly, the university experience of commuter students who stay 'local' are more complex than a simple linear transition from school to university. These 'immobile' students in fact engage with complex everyday mobilities through which they develop 'feelings of and strategies for resilience' and resistance to modes of university life which are often not oriented around their needs.¹¹ This builds on the earlier work of Clayton et al. who show how for working-class students staying local is a strategy for minimising the risk and retaining family support whilst at university.¹²

These qualitative findings complement the conclusions of Gibbons and Vignoles in their quantitative analysis of the effect of distance on university choice and participation in England.¹³ While distance had little effect on whether or not students participated in higher education or not, they found distance had the single largest effect on institution choice. Race, gender and class were also important to students' university choice, with students' sensitivity to distance increasing the more disadvantaged they are, and Pakistani and Bangladeshi girls particularly likely to stay at a local university. They conclude that 'costs of distance may therefore be predominantly psychic or information based'¹⁴ which chimes closely with the qualitative evidence reviewed above. In keeping with arguments about student migration on graduation, they argue that what matters most is the geography of local higher education and what universities are within commuting distance: it is the structural geography of institutions and economic opportunity that limit students' choices, not their personal, social or cultural proclivities to 'mobility'.

One area where Gibbons and Vignoles do not find clear evidence is on whether or not the additional cost of studying away from home affects students' decision-making about where to study. Other qualitative and survey-based analyses have suggested that staying in the parental home whilst at university is strongly influenced by financial concerns. Patiniotis and Holdsworth found that of those opting to stay at home, 78% of students on Merseyside cited financial reasons. Similar figures were reported by Davies et al. where 72% of students wishing to live at home described minimising debt as an important reason behind their choice.¹⁵ The role of finance in working class localism is also supported by a qualitative Scottish study which finds economic pragmatism or minimising debt to be the main factor in deciding to stay at home.¹⁶ Students with lower parental income were also more debt averse which made students more likely to apply to a local university to minimise costs.¹⁷ Those with savings and or non-repayable family contributions towards studying were also more likely to opt to move away.¹⁸ This research largely drew on data collected prior to or just after the 2006 fee increase of £3,000, not the increase to £9,000 that is explored here. Unlike these earlier small-scale surveys and qualitative studies, our analysis will seek to examine these questions using the data for the entire cohort of students attending university prior to and after the increase to £9,000.

In our analysis, we build on the analysis of Wakeling and Jefferies who explored the links between changing tuition fees and the cross-border movement of students in the UK.¹⁹ During the change to £3,000 tuition fees in 2006 in England, they found little evidence of English students becoming 'fee refugees' in Scotland or the Republic of Ireland where they could still have paid fees of less than £3,000;

¹⁰ Finn K. (2017) Multiple, relational and emotional mobilities: Understanding student mobilities in higher education as more than 'staying local' and 'going away'. *British Educational Research Journal* 43: 743-758.

¹¹ Holton M and Finn K. (2017) Being-in-motion: The everyday (gendered and classed) embodied mobilities for UK university students who commute. *Mobilities*: 1-15.

¹² Clayton J, Crozier G and Reay D. (2009) Home and away: risk, familiarity and the multiple geographies of the higher education experience. *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 19: 157-174.

¹³ Gibbons S and Vignoles A. (2012) Geography, choice and participation in higher education in England. *Regional science and urban economics* 42: 98-113.

¹⁴ Ibid: p111.

¹⁵ Davies P, Slack K, Hughes A, et al. (2008) *Knowing where to study? Fees, bursaries and fair access*. Stoke on Trent: University of Staffordshire.

¹⁶ Christie H. (2007) Higher education and spatial (im) mobility: nontraditional students and living at home. *Environment and Planning A* 39: 2445-2463.

¹⁷ Callender C and Jackson J. (2008) Does the fear of debt constrain choice of university and subject of study? *Studies in Higher Education* 33: 405-429.

¹⁸ Purcell K, Elias P, Ellison R, et al. (2008) *Applying for Higher Education—the diversity of career choices, plans and expectations*. University of Warwick: Institute for Employment Research.

¹⁹ Wakeling P and Jefferies K. (2013) The effect of tuition fees on student mobility: the UK and Ireland as a natural experiment. *British Educational Research Journal* 39: 491-513.

instead they became more likely to stay in England. Northern Irish and Welsh students also continued to attend English universities despite the advantages of studying in Scotland. Scottish students did match 'expected' behaviour, remaining in Scotland to study, but this, they argued was part of a longer-term trend. Their analysis emphasises the point that patterns of student mobility and cross-border flows are embedded in longer-term cultural and regional divisions. In our own work we explore how the historical cultural divides between the English regions are also at work in the transition to university.²⁰ We argue that strong patterns of students staying local in English regions such as the North East may be linked to the distinctive regional identity of the area. Our analysis here seeks to extend the work of Wakeling and Jefferies by exploring (English) regional as well as national differentiation in the effect of the tuition fee rise on students' likelihood to stay local or move further afield.

Building on past work, we develop a typology of student mobility that attempts to move beyond singular dimensions of mobility that depict it either in terms of distance travelled or leaving home. The experience of attending university entails a unique combination of the two, which shapes the educational social, educational and emotive experiences young people will have. In this sense, leaving the family home and moving far away is just one particular kind of rite of passage. The transition to university, and rite of passage, taken by young people, will inevitably take a variety of other forms and combinations. Through the typology offered here, we attempt to classify these journeys, examining which students are likely to take them, and how this has changed over time, especially in the context of increasing university tuition fees.

²⁰ Donnelly M and Gamsu S. (2018) Regional structures of feeling? A spatially and socially differentiated analysis of UK student im/mobility. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, DOI: 10.1080/01425692.2018.1426442

2. Data and methods

The data drawn on here comes from two data releases from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) which provided data on all students attending university in 2009-10 and 2014-15. We selected these years to avoid the years just prior to the tuition fee change and significantly after the tuition fee increase. This is to avoid any effects associated with a ‘bulge’ of applicants hoping to avoid the £9,000 fee and any associated decline in tuition thereafter.

Cleaning of the data included the removal of international students, students from the EU, students living in the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man (for whom geographical coordinate data are problematic). Part-time and mature students (using the HESA definition of students aged 21 or over) were excluded from the analysis as we anticipated that these students would likely have different mobility decisions. Once these students were removed this leaves us with a sample of $n=286,170$ for the 2009-10 cohort and $n=312,280$ for the 2014-15 cohort. It is worth noting that we did run the analyses which follow including part-time and mature students which leads to some small but significant changes in the results. These are not reported in detail here but they suggest that the mobility practices of part-time and mature students are worthy of their own separate study.²¹

Creating the typology

The typology of long, medium and short distance commuters was created by combining two variables, firstly the term-time accommodation variable produced by HESA. Students who were recorded as living in the family home were coded as ‘commuters’, those who were living in another form of accommodation (provider-maintained property, other rented accommodation, private-sector halls, private rented housing) were coded as ‘movers’.

Distance travelled is calculated using home postcode and the central postcode of the university. These postcodes were matched to geographical coordinates (longitude and latitude) which were then used to calculate the straight-line distance between home and university using the haversine conversion available in the R package ‘geosphere’.²² This produced a distance in metres which was then converted into kilometres. To set the breaks for distance travelled, a k-means clustering approach was used to select two breakpoints. Similar to the Jenks natural breaks method but using a different algorithm, k-means attempts to minimise the variance within a group of numbers and maximize the variance between groups.²³ Using a k-means approach means the breakpoints are slightly less arbitrary than simply using 0-50km for example. Instead they represent groups of distances which are clustered within the breakpoints suggested, the differences between the clusters themselves are maximised. This means that we are looking at sets of distances which are a better proxy for divisions amongst students in how far they are willing to travel for university, whether they leave home to study or commute. The analysis was run on the combined data for 2009-10 and 2014-15 so the breaks would be common to both years (running the k-means measure on each cohort separately produced similar breakpoints), resulting in the following thresholds 0-91km (0-57 miles), 91-244km (57-152 miles), 244km (152 miles) and above. This results in the typology shown below in table 1 which begins the analysis that follows. Note where produced all raw numbers are rounded to a multiple of five in line with HESA’s data suppression rules.

Methods

Our typology forms the basis for a set of descriptive analyses of who the ‘commuter’ and ‘mover’ students are in terms of their personal characteristics. We then ran a logistic binary regression on dummy variables for each classification in the typology for both years in the data-set. This gave us six models and allows to control for how students’ characteristics affected the likelihood of being in each group across the two

²¹ Most notably, when part-time and mature students were included, students from families that were long-term unemployed (NS-SEC 8) became slightly more likely to remain at home and commute to university. This effect accounted for attainment, ethnicity and other variables which are also held constant in the modelling below.

²² Hijmans R, Williams E and Vennes C. (2017) Geosphere: Spherical Trigonometry.

²³ These break values were calculated using the ‘classInt’ package in R, written by Roger Bivand et al. (see: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=classInt>). K-means was preferred over Jenks natural breaks because of the size of the data set and the length of time taken to compute the breakpoints.

years. We used variables contained in the HESA student record to control for ethnicity, gender, household social class (NS-SEC), parental higher education, attainment (UCAS tariff points, divided into decile), subject choice (using the broader subject areas rather than individual subjects), university types (dummy variables for universities that are or are not a Sutton Trust 30²⁴ university or, separately, Oxbridge), school-type (private or state) and the region of students' home domicile. The analysis begins below with descriptive cross-tabs for the typology before moving on to summarise the findings of the modelling.

A typology of student mobility

The typology created here attempts to capture the diverse ways in which those going to university are being 'mobile'. The typology is sensitive to the fact that young people are being 'mobile' in terms of staying or leaving their family home *and* the sense of moving (or not moving) in proximal distance terms. The ways in which these two kinds of 'mobility' intersect is significant because it shapes the kinds of social and educational experiences young people have at university as well as more pragmatic concerns, including the cost of attending university.

Table 1 on the following page displays the typology, which consists of six possible combinations of immobility or mobility types, from those living at home and commuting a relatively short distance ('short distance commuter) right through to those leaving home and moving a significant geographic distance ('long distance mover'). Attending university is often thought of as a rite of passage that involves leaving home and moving far away, but the reality in contemporary UK higher education is quite different. About a third of students left home and moved over 91km away (groups 4 and 6 combined, table 1) before the 2010 fee increase (33.8%), and slightly more than a third after the increase in fees (36.2%). In fact, the majority of students tend to attend a university under 91km away from home (65% in 2009-10 and 62% in 2014-15 – groups 1 and 2 combined, table 1). The rite of passage of entering university is very much a local phenomenon for the vast majority of young people in the UK. It is also noticeable that these distinct rites of passage, or types of student mobility, have altered very little following the increase in tuition fees – with no drastic increase in young people staying local or in their parental home. However, whilst overall patterns have remained fairly constant, for different groups of students there have been significant shifts in their likelihood of choosing a mobility type.

The vast majority of young people move out of - or do not live in - the family home to attend university (groups 2, 4 and 6 combined: 74.8% in 2009-10 and 74.9% in 2014-15), but most do not travel a significant distance in doing so. Indeed, the most common trajectory young people take to attend university is to stay at home or move out of home and travel a relatively short distance (less than 91km) – in 2009-10, 58% of students did this, with a slight decline after the increase in fees to 55.8% (group 2). For full-time, young undergraduates, the tuition fee increase has overall not led to a substantial rise in the proportion of students staying at home and attending their local university. There are small percentage increases in the number of students remaining in the family home whilst commuting longer distances (groups 3 and 5), but these increases are very small. There are also slightly larger percentages of students moving away and travelling longer distances to attend university (groups 4 and 6). For these students then, the effect of the fee increase seems to have done little to overall patterns of mobility in terms of leaving home and distance travelled.

²⁴ The Sutton Trust 30 are the most-selective universities in the UK, as defined by earlier Sutton Trust (2011) research. They include the following institutions: University of Bath, University of Birmingham, University of Bristol, University of Cambridge, Cardiff University, Durham University, University of Edinburgh, University of Exeter, University of Glasgow, Imperial College, King's College London, University of Lancaster, University of Leeds, University of Leicester, University of Liverpool, London School of Economics, University of Manchester, University of Newcastle, University of Nottingham, University of Oxford, University of Reading, Royal Holloway, University of London, University of Sheffield, University of Southampton, University of St Andrews, University of Strathclyde, University of Surrey, University College London, University of Warwick and University of York.

Table 1: A Typology of Student Mobility

Migration type	2009-10		2014-15		Typology description		
	n	Percentage	n	Percentage	Stay living in family home	Move out of family home	Distance travelled (home to university)
1. Short distance commuter	68990	24.1 %	72850	23.3 %	Y	N	0-91km (57 miles)
2. Short distance mover	96785	33.9 %	101860	32.5 %	N	Y	
3. Medium distance commuter	2710	0.9 %	4165	1.2 %	Y	N	91km- 244km (57-152 miles)
4. Medium distance mover	87645	30.6 %	98790	31.5 %	N	Y	
5. Long distance commuter	610	0.1 %	930	0.3 %	Y	N	244km- (152 miles-)
6. Long distance mover	29530	10.3 %	33690	10.9 %	N	Y	
Total	286270	100 %	312280	100 %			

It might be surprising that, in the context of increasing tuition fees, rising costs of student accommodation²⁵ and generally higher living and travel costs, more students should be taking the costlier option of attending university further away. However, it should be emphasised that these figures relate to overall patterns, with variations apparent for different social and ethnic groups. We shall see later that once these attributes are held constant, there are a number of more subtle trends which have changed since the introduction of the £9,000 tuition fee. These national figures also hide considerable institutional variation with some universities seeing large increases in the proportion of student commuters.

Contrary to what might be expected, what is striking from this analysis of student mobility is that there has been very little change in the kinds of choices young people are making since the increase in tuition fees. Using binary logistic regression on each of the six groups from the classification, in what follows we explore how individual differences in gender, social class, ethnicity and geographic location, course choice and university type affected the type of mobility decisions students made before and after the tuition fee increase.

²⁵ National Union of Students and Unipol. (2016) *NUS/Unipol Accommodation Costs Survey 2014-16*. London and Leeds: NUS and Unipol.

3. Degrees of mobility: class, ethnicity, prior attainment and place

In line with previous research, we find here that the kind of mobility choices young people make are highly gradated according to their individual, social and geographic characteristics. Young people's university experiences, in terms of their decisions about whether or not to leave home and the distance they travel, are highly variable according to who they are and where they are from.

Social class

Table 2 displays the proportion of students engaging in different kinds of mobility broken down by their social class origin in 2009-10 and 2014-15. Social class origin is measured here according to the National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification (NS-SEC) which classifies individuals according to their parental occupations on a scale which runs from 1 (higher managerial and professional occupations) to 8 (never worked or long-term unemployed).²⁶ The likelihood of moving out of the family home and far away for university study is clearly demarcated by social class origin. For example, in 2014-15 whilst just over a fifth of all students are short distance commuters, the chances of being so increases significantly the more disadvantaged the social groups become, with 13.1% of the top social class group doing so and 44.9% of the bottom group. Interestingly there is relatively little difference in the proportion of each social class in the short distance mover category. It is only for students who leave home and move longer distances to study (groups four and five) that we see a clear social gradient with the proportion of students declining the more disadvantaged the student's background.

Table 2: Social Class and Student Mobility 2014-15²⁷

NS-SEC	Migration type 2014-15						Total
	1. Short distance commuter	2. Short distance mover	3. Medium distance commuter	4. Medium distance mover	5. Long distance commuter	6. Long distance mover	
1 Highest	13.1 %	31.6 %	1.2 %	39.2 %	0.3 %	14.5 %	100 %
2	18.3 %	33.1 %	1.3 %	34.9 %	0.3 %	12.1 %	100 %
3	22 %	33.7 %	1.3 %	32 %	0.3 %	10.8 %	100 %
4	31.8 %	30.4 %	1.4 %	27.2 %	0.3 %	8.9 %	100 %
5	27.2 %	34.9 %	1.5 %	28.3 %	0.2 %	7.9 %	100 %
6	32.3 %	33.5 %	1.3 %	25.5 %	0.3 %	7.2 %	100 %
7	35.3 %	34 %	1.2 %	22.9 %	0.2 %	6.4 %	100 %
8 Lowest	44.9 %	34.2 %	1.8 %	12.7 %	0.5 %	5.9 %	100 %
Unclassified	28.3 %	31.7 %	1.3 %	28.4 %	0.3 %	9.9 %	100 %
Unknown	39.1 %	31.9 %	3.5 %	17.1 %	0.7 %	7.6 %	100 %
Total	23.3 %	32.5 %	1.2 %	31.5 %	0.3 %	10.9 %	100 %

Looking across all mobility types, it is clearly more common for the higher social class groups to be moving further away for their university studies, whilst the opposite is true for lower social class groups. It is only amongst students from the most affluent class backgrounds, NS-SEC 1, that the majority of

²⁶ A full description of the NS-SEC can be found on the Office for National statistics website here: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/thenationalstatisticsocioeconomicclassificationnssecbasedonsoc2010>

²⁷ See appendix 1 for tables which include rounded numbers and column percentages.

students attend a university that is over 91km away. For students from all other social class backgrounds, the majority will stay within 91km of their home address, whether this involves leaving home or not. This underlines the largely local pattern of recruitment for most universities – most students stay relatively local no matter what their class background. When it comes to commuting shorter distances, less than 91km, to attend university there is a clear class gradient, with larger proportions of each social class group in this short distance commuter category as we go down the social class spectrum. Conversely, the proportion from each social class in the medium distance and long distance mover categories declines as we go down the social class hierarchy. Our results here replicate the well-established findings regarding working-class students being less mobile than their middle-class peers.

Ethnicity

The different types of mobility described here are not experienced evenly by all ethnic groups. British Pakistani and British Bangladeshi students have markedly different mobility choices to all other ethnic groups. In 2014/15, the vast majority (around 90% in each case) of young people from these two ethnic groups attended a university less than 91km away from home, and in doing so, most stayed living in their parental home (group 1: 65.9% and 71.1% respectively). Similarly, British Indian students are more concentrated in the mobility types that involve attending a university closer to home, and just over a third are living at home and commuting to a local university (short distance commuter). As a proportional group, White and Chinese students are more likely to attend a university further away from home and are especially concentrated in the long distance mover category compared to other groups. For Black Caribbean students, there is a noticeable tendency to leave home but attend a local university ('short distance mover'), with 37.1% of Black Caribbean students taking this route, the largest percentage of any ethnic group.

Table 3: Ethnicity and Student Mobility 2014-15²⁸

Ethnicity	Migration type 2014-15						Total
	1. Short distance commuter	2. Short distance mover	3. Medium distance commuter	4. Medium distance mover	5. Long distance commuter	6. Long distance mover	
White	18.8 %	33.5 %	1.4 %	34 %	0.3 %	11.9 %	100 %
Black Caribbean	28.4 %	37.1 %	1.1 %	28.3 %	0.1 %	5 %	100 %
Black African	27.7 %	32.8 %	1.3 %	29.9 %	0.3 %	8 %	100 %
Other Black	35.8 %	29.9 %	1.5 %	24.8 %	0 %	8 %	100 %
Indian	34.1 %	31.5 %	1 %	27.5 %	0.2 %	5.7 %	100 %
Pakistani	65.9 %	19.8 %	0.9 %	10 %	0.3 %	3.2 %	100 %
Bangladeshi	71.1 %	18.3 %	0.8 %	7.5 %	0.6 %	1.8 %	100 %
Chinese	18.7 %	34.9 %	1.1 %	32 %	0.3 %	13 %	100 %
Other Asian	36.6 %	32.2 %	1.3 %	23.1 %	0.4 %	6.5 %	100 %
Other (incl. mixed)	26.9 %	32.4 %	1.2 %	28.2 %	0.4 %	10.9 %	100 %
Unknown/NA	29.7 %	29.3 %	1.6 %	27.9 %	0.7 %	10.8 %	100 %
Total	23.4 %	32.7 %	1.3 %	31.8 %	0.2 %	10.7 %	100 %

²⁸ See appendix 1 for tables which include rounded numbers and column percentages.

Geography

In terms of geography, it is clear that the mobility paths followed vary enormously across different regions of England and countries of the UK (table 4). *Where* young people live seems to affect whether they will opt for one of the routes in the mobility typology. Particular regions and countries have an especially large proportion of students opting to remain local for their university choices, whether they choose to live at home or not. In most regions and nations, the majority of students travel less than 91km to attend university with Scotland, the North West and London having the highest total percentage of students in the short distance commuter and short distance mover categories. Only in the South East, the East of England and the South West was there a majority of students travelling medium or long distance to attend university. For the East of England and the South West, lack of provision is likely to be a factor. Long distance movers also form a larger percentage of students from the South East, the East of England and the South West, with Northern Ireland having the highest proportion of students (over 20%) attending university over 244km (152 miles) away. In contrast to Northern Ireland, 5% or fewer students in both midland regions made long distance moves of this length. Geography thus has a substantial effect on mobility patterns, with the constraints of provision and transport having a big effect on how far students travel and whether or not they leave home to study.

Table 4: Mobility type and students' home region²⁹

Home region/nation	Migration type 2014-15						Total
	1. Short distance commuter	2. Short distance mover	3. Medium distance commuter	4. Medium distance mover	5. Long distance commuter	6. Long distance mover	
North East	33.2 %	28.2 %	0.7 %	27 %	0.5 %	10.4 %	100 %
North West	30.7 %	37.5 %	0.7 %	22.3 %	0.3 %	8.5 %	100 %
Yorkshire & the Humber	21.3 %	40.1 %	0.8 %	28.3 %	0.3 %	9.2 %	100 %
East Midlands	16.9 %	40.3 %	1.2 %	36.3 %	0.1 %	5.2 %	100 %
West Midlands	30.9 %	30.5 %	1.1 %	33.6 %	0.1 %	3.8 %	100 %
East of England	12.6 %	22.9 %	2 %	47.8 %	0.4 %	14.3 %	100 %
London	31.8 %	30.6 %	1 %	24.4 %	0.4 %	11.8 %	100 %
South East	11.4 %	32.6 %	1.9 %	39.1 %	0.3 %	14.6 %	100 %
South West	11.2 %	24.9 %	2 %	44.4 %	0.4 %	16.9 %	100 %
Wales	22.4 %	36.8 %	1.4 %	32.3 %	0.2 %	6.9 %	100 %
Scotland	34.6 %	37.8 %	1.3 %	20.8 %	0.2 %	5.3 %	100 %
Northern Ireland	26.8 %	31.5 %	1.8 %	15.5 %	0.2 %	24.1 %	100 %
Total	23.4 %	32.5 %	1.5 %	31.4 %	0.1 %	10.7 %	100 %

Universities

There is enormous variation across different universities in the mobility choices of their students as defined by the typology. Appendix 2 shows the top and bottom 20 universities in terms of the percentage of students in all six mobility categories. For example, it is possible to see clearly here the 'top 20' universities for students living at home and less than 91km away. The full break-down for each university

²⁹ See appendix 1 for tables which include rounded numbers and column percentages.

in the country is also provided in the data-set accompany this report, published on the Sutton Trust website.³⁰

Many older, research-intensive institutions are dominated by students who move away and travel a significant distance from home, whilst many post-1992 universities have very localised student bodies who do not move out of home and live very close to their university. In 2014-15, over three quarters of the student body at the University of the West of Scotland (77.5%), and Newman University (76.2%) in Birmingham come from less than 91km away and also live in their parental home. At these institutions and many others (City University – 71.3%, University of Sunderland – 63.2%), short distance commuting from the family home is the norm. This compares to less than 2% of students at the Universities of Bath, Bristol, Durham, York and Exeter, with the University of Oxford and University of Cambridge having no students of this sort.

Research-intensive institutions are dominated by students who take what is seen as the traditional ‘rite of passage’ of going to university; that is moving out of home and moving far away. Nearly three-quarters of students attending the University of Bristol (74.8%), the University of Warwick (76%) and Loughborough University (69.5%) move out of their family home and travel between 91km and 244km (152 miles) to attend university (‘medium distance movers’). A substantial proportion of students at the University of Durham (61%), St Andrews (45.3%) and Glasgow School of Art (42.5%) leave home and travel even further, over 244km (152 miles). Looking at the full data-set for each individual university, we can see that University of Durham recruited just 12.6% of its student body from less than 91km away. You might expect some of these universities to have students travelling further given their peripheral geographic location. Yet, it is also the case that there is a significant local population in the areas many of these universities are located who are seemingly not attending them but instead attending their post-1992 university neighbours. For example, over two thirds of students at the post-1992 university Sheffield Hallam (69%) come from less than 91km away (including both those who stay at home and those who move out), yet this figure is just 40% at its Russell Group neighbour, the University of Sheffield.

It is worth noting significant changes over time in the different types of mobility at certain universities. Certain London universities have seen substantial changes in the proportion of students living at home and attending a nearby university (<91km away). St Mary’s University College Twickenham, London School of Economics and the School of Oriental and African Studies have all seen a rise of at least 10% in the proportion of their undergraduate intake living in the family home, as have Staffordshire and Stirling Universities outside the capital. Medium distance commuting to university from the family home has also increased by 26.7% at the University of East Anglia (UEA), by 12% at Staffordshire and by 9.8% at the University of Cumbria. These localised effects suggest that if the tuition fee rise has affected the mobility patterns of undergraduate students, changes may have been highly localised. In London, rising housing costs may be compounded by the change in tuition fees encouraging greater numbers of students to remain at home. The fact that only some London institutions show evidence of this change suggests this could also relate to specific patterns of recruitment, the opening of new types of courses and the profile of their student body. These localised trends are complex to explain but they do suggest a need to consider how university life (societies and other social events), term-time teaching and staff availability are organised for students who are both living at home and commuting considerable distances each day.

³⁰ <https://www.suttontrust.com/research-paper/home-and-away-student-mobility/>

4. Modelling student mobility before and after the fees increase

It is clear from the above analysis that the idea of university being a time when young people leave home and move far away is not equally experienced by young people from different social and ethnic groups and living in different parts of the UK. Yet, many of the differences identified above are likely to be correlated, making it difficult to say whether possessing certain individual, social and geographic characteristics make you more likely to follow a certain mobility trajectory. For example, whether it is living in a particular geographic locality that is driving these patterns or being from a particular social or ethnic background, or even choosing specific kinds of universities. It is difficult to ascertain the individual importance of different factors without holding other variables constant.

To reveal what really influences and shapes the likelihood of a young person taking a particular mobility trajectory, multivariate analysis is used here. Multivariate analysis involves using regression modelling, in this case binary logistic regression, to predict how following a particular mobility trajectory (in this case the six varieties of mobility identified in the typology) is influenced by different sets of factors (such as social background, location, prior attainment or educational choices). Individual models for each of the six mobility trajectories found in the typology are specified here, with each model predicting the likelihood of choosing the particular mobility choice. Using each of the control variables examined above, we produce individual models for the two cohorts who entered HE before and after the tuition fee increase for each kind of mobility path (Appendix 3). The results are shown here in the form of odds ratios, with a greater likelihood that a student will choose a particular mobility path if the value is above 1.00 and a reduced likelihood that they will follow the mobility trajectory if the value is below 1.00. For each variable included in the models, 'dummy' variables are created with comparisons made against a base category. For example, when looking at ethnicity, White groups are the base with other ethnic groups compared against this in terms of their strength in predicting mobility.

Short distance commuters

Short distance commuters are those students staying in their parental home and attending a university less than 91km - or 57 miles - from their home address, making up 24.1% of those entering university before the increase in fees and 23.3% after the fees increase. Holding constant various factors, the findings here suggest a range of possible explanations, with ethnicity, social class, and place all having increased effects on the likelihood of commuting to university since the fee increase. British Pakistani and British Bangladeshi groups, those from lower social class backgrounds, as well as young people living in the North East and North West appear especially likely to remain at home and stay local for university (See Appendix 3 Table 5).

Ethnicity

After holding social class, locality and all other factors constant, ethnic identity is by far the most important factor which affects the likelihood that a young person will decide to stay living at home and attend a local university, with particular ethnic groups being much more likely to choose this. Accounting for social class, prior attainment, subject choices, locality, and the status of the university chosen, these ethnic differences remain, and seem to have been reinforced by the introduction of £9,000 tuition fees. Before the fees increase, British Pakistani and British Bangladeshi young people were 5.3 and 6.1 times more likely than their White counterparts to follow this route. Since the fees increase this pattern has become even more entrenched, with British-Pakistani students now 6.3 times and British-Bangladeshi students now 6.6 times more likely than their White peers to stay at home and study within 91km. British Indian young people are also twice as likely as their White counterparts to live at home and stay local for university, though their likelihood of doing so has increased only slightly since the increase in fees.

It could be that differences in familial relationships, ties and commitments could account for some of these disparities across ethnic groups, as has been identified by other qualitative work.³¹ The impact that

³¹ Bhopal K. (2011) 'We tend to stick together and mostly we stick to our own kind': British Indian women and support networks at university. *Gender and Education* 23: 519-534.

the increase in tuition fees has had might be explained by particular ethnic groups being more averse to taking on larger amounts of debt for religious reasons. The current student loans system is structured in a way that requires students to take out interest-bearing loans, which can create difficulties for some Muslim students who are unable to take out these loans for faith based reasons. For this reason, it might be that for the two cohorts of students included in this analysis, some are opting to reduce the costs of their study by staying home and staying local – especially after the trebling of tuition fees in 2012.

Social class

A further contributing factor driving choices to stay at home and stay local for university appears to be social class. The importance of social class can be seen in three ways; in terms of parental occupation (measured by NS-SEC group), levels of parental education, and attending a private/state school. After holding all other factors constant, state school students are 2.4 times as likely than their private schooled counterparts to stay at home and stay local, increasing to 2.6 times more likely since the increase in fees. Furthermore, when looking at the parental occupation of students, again controlling for everything else, it is clear that as groups become more disadvantaged, the likelihood of staying at home and staying local for university increases. This means that even accounting for differences in achievement, university choices, and locality, poorer students will still be more likely to stay at home and stay local than their more privileged peers. It could be that moving out of home and far away is something that young people from more advantaged backgrounds have been socialised into from an earlier age, perhaps encouraged by parents who have themselves been to university and see this mobility choice as the expected route to take. Since the fee increase there have been only small changes in these relationships, making it hard to say that there has been a substantial change in mobility for university by social class, though there is some evidence for slight changes. This is true for young, full-time undergraduates but larger negative changes for students from the most deprived backgrounds (NS-SEC 8, long-term unemployed) were evident when we ran the model with part-time and mature students included. This suggests that social class may combine more powerfully with age when affecting mobility decisions for university pre- and post-increase.

Place

A final factor that the modelling suggests seems to be especially important in driving students to stay living at home and attending a local university is the *place* they are located. Those living in the North East and North West are especially likely to stay living at home and attend a local university, whilst those in the South East, South West and East of England are much less likely to do so. It might be that differences in the number of university places across the regions help to explain these patterns. At the same time, it could be that they are explained by regionally specific identities, and attachments to certain places, which make it more difficult for young people to move away, regardless of their social class background.

Short distance movers

Short distance movers represent the largest single group of students (32.5% in 2014-15, a slight decrease on the 2009-10) and are those who choose to move out of their parental home but attend a university less than 91km away. Unlike the short distance commuters, there are no clear differences between social class groups in the chances they leave home and attend a local university, nor does the model suggest any disparities between those with differing levels of attainment or who choose different subjects. This equal likelihood of being short distance movers does not appear to have been affected by the increase in tuition fees. However, the model suggests that the likelihood of being a short distance mover decreases for British Pakistani and Bangladeshi young people (See Appendix 3 Table 5).

Ethnicity

There are no major changes in how ethnicity affects students' likelihood to be in the short distance mover category since the tuition fee increase. This group of students does not have as marked variation by ethnicity compared to the short distance commuters living at home. However, both British Pakistani and British Bangladeshi students are substantially less likely than their White peers to make short distance

moves to university which involve leaving the family home. These two ethnic groups are much less likely to move out of home and attend a local university, again, perhaps reflecting cultural orientations and differences in familial relationships, or perhaps an inability to take out commercial student loans for faith-based reasons.

Oxbridge

Attending Oxford or Cambridge universities (Oxbridge) appears to increase the likelihood that a student will opt for this mobility trajectory – moving out of their parental home and attending a university a relatively short distance. This is likely to represent the south-eastern skew of the recruitment of Oxbridge students, which has been identified elsewhere.³² It is likely that the particular concentration of private schools in the South East (which make-up a large proportion of Oxbridge's intake) and more advantaged young people generally could be attributed to this pattern. It might also be accounted for by geographic differences in levels of achievement, as identified elsewhere,³³ with a concentration of high-achievers in the south of England.

Place

Irrespective of all the factors controlled for here, the geographic place where young people live also appears important in predicting the likelihood that a young person will be a short distance mover. Those in the East of England, South West and Northern Ireland are less likely to move out of home and attend a university a relatively short distance away than young people located in other regions. Logically, given their rural and dispersed geographies, students in the South West and the East of England are the least likely to be in this category. It could also be that the particular geographic distribution of higher education opportunities in the UK, and the relatively fewer university places available in these localities could account for these disparities.³⁴

Medium distance commuters

Relatively few students live in the parental home and commute a distance of between 91km and 244km (152 miles) to university. Such medium distance commuters represent just 0.9% of students before the increase in fees, and 1.2% after. Given the small size of these two migration types, interpreting the composition of these groups obviously requires some caution. For social class, ethnicity, gender, school, subject and attainment the odds ratios are either mostly non-significant or only have an odds ratio which is significant for one of the two cohorts. For this reason, we only focus on university type and region here (See Appendix Table 6).

Sutton Trust 30 and Oxbridge

The model suggests that entrants to Oxbridge and Sutton Trust 30 universities are much less likely to be medium distance commuters than all other universities. It could be that entering a high-status university may make students more likely to want to re-locate and not stay living at home, perhaps because there is a stronger desire to become more involved in student life at these institutions. Given how competitive it is to enter one of these universities, students may feel much more invested in their university choice and student experience. It could also be the case that these universities are the least likely to attract younger students who might travel longer distances to study without moving.

³² Gamsu S. (2017) A historical geography of educational power: comparing circuits and fields of education in Sheffield and London. Geography. London: King's College London.

³³ Commission on Inequality in Education. (2016). Educational inequalities in England and Wales. London: Social Market Foundation.

³⁴ Wright, R. (2015). Post-16 and higher education: a multilevel analysis of educational participation in England. Ph. D. University of Bristol.

Place

Across both cohorts, there is a clear geography to this migration type, with students concentrated in rural or peripheral regions or nations where commuting due to a lack of provision is likely (South West, East of England, Northern Ireland). Students located in the South East are also more likely to be in this mobility category than their peers in Scotland (the reference category), which could be accounted for by the good transport links and its proximity to London.

Medium distance movers

Those falling in the medium distance mover category leave the family home and move a distance of between 91km (57 miles) and 244km (152 miles) to attend university. This is the second largest group of students (accounting for 30.6% of students before the increase in fees, and 31.5% after). The chance of falling into this group of students is closely linked to social class, ethnicity, choice of university and geographic origin (See Appendix 3, Table 6).

Social class and ethnicity

The higher the social class group, the more likely that students will fall into this category, holding all other factors constant. These social class differences remain very strong after the increase in fees, with odds ratios that decline more steeply in 2014-15 than in 2009-10 as we move down the spectrum from the highest social class group NS-SEC 1 to the lowest social class grouping (NS-SEC 8). The latter group, students whose parents are long-term unemployed, are now 0.4 times as likely as students in the highest social class group to move out of home and travel. As raised earlier, it may be that cost of moving out of home and travelling a longer distance is prohibitive for lower social class groups.

In line with findings on those in the short distance commuter category, it is British Pakistani and British Bangladeshi students who are much less likely than any other ethnic group to leave home and move away. Whilst most ethnic-minority background students have become slightly more similar to White British students across the two cohorts, White British students are still the most likely to make these longer moves out of home and away.

Place

The chances of being a medium distance mover also appears to differ according to where young people live, with particular regions having more students in this category (East and West Midlands, East of England, South East, South West, and Wales) compared to relatively fewer in others (North East, North West, and Northern Ireland). Given the range of factors already accounted for in the model, it could be that people living in different localities are differentially predisposed to moving away from their home region. Provision is again likely to be an important factor here.

Long distance commuters

This is the smallest group of students categorised by the typology, constituting just 0.3% of students progressing to university in 2014 (See Appendix 3, Table 7). The small number of students here means that any interpretation of the model predicting who is in this group difficult, with most of the variables accounted for here being non-significant. There are two important exceptions to this. Firstly, students at Sutton Trust universities were half as likely as those at other institutions to be commuting very long distances to study in 2009-10, with this figure falling to 0.3 times as likely in 2014-15. The regional coefficients are also interesting here, with students from all the northern English regions as well as the South West and the South East of England much more likely than their Scottish peers to make this type of commitment. Commuting long distances from Scotland is highly unlikely, particularly given the financial advantages of staying in their home country for Scottish students. These regional patterns in England are perplexing and perhaps suggest highly idiosyncratic course choices, or course structures which allow flexibility for students (distance-learners were removed during data-cleaning). Errors of measurement during university's data recording of student responses is another possibility.

Long distance movers

Leaving home and moving a significant distance (over 244km – 152 miles) is often imagined to be what going to university entails (See Appendix 3, Table 7). However, given the long distances involved here, this is only the fourth most popular trajectory, comprising just 10.3% of students before the increase in fees and a slightly higher proportion after the increase (10.9%). This is also the most socially, ethnically and geographically differentiated groups of students. The model suggests that this type of mobility is clearly the preserve of white, advantaged, often privately educated young people living in regions of the south of England. Those in the north, and young people who are non-white and disadvantaged appear much less inclined to opt for this mobility path.

Ethnicity, social class and school and university type

White students are much more likely to fall into this category of mobile student, with all other ethnic groups much less likely, but especially so for Black Caribbean, British Pakistani and British Bangladeshi. This corresponds with findings from previous mobility types, with British Pakistani and British Bangladeshi students being more likely to be in the staying at home and commuting over shorter distance categories. The findings, when seen in the context of differences in ethnic diversity across universities, suggest White British students may generally have greater flexibility and agency in their choice-making processes with less restrictions on which universities feel ‘comfortable’ and non-exclusionary.³⁵ It also likely reflects the fact that more White students live in peripheral rural and island areas where long distance moves to attend university are more likely.

The likelihood of being a long distance mover is slightly gradated by social class, with the chances of taking this path declining slightly as the social class groups become more disadvantaged. However, school type seems to have a larger effect here, with state school students 0.6 times as likely as their privately educated peers to make these long distance moves. Students attending a Sutton Trust 30 university are also 2.5 times as likely to make these long distance moves, reflecting their national recruitment patterns. Interestingly being at Oxbridge makes you much less likely to have made a long distance move to attend university. This is likely to be due to the south-eastern bias to Oxbridge recruitment and the relatively lower rates of applications from more peripheral regions of the UK.

Place

As suggested for long distance commuters above, those in Scotland are much less likely to also be in the category of long distance movers, again most probably reflecting the fact that free tuition fees in Scotland have a significant impact here. The increase in all the odds ratios for other regions and nations suggests that this tendency of Scottish students to study locally in their home nation may have been reinforced by the fee rise. Significant variance exists between other parts of the UK in the chances that a student will leave home and move a substantial distance. Those in the Southern regions (London, South East, South West and East of England) are all much more likely to be in this category of mobile students, compared to their peers in the Northern regions (North West, North East, Yorkshire and the Humberside). The fact that Northern Irish students were 7.6 times as likely as Scottish students to re-locate long distances, rising to 9.5 times as likely in 2014-15 once again suggests the importance of provision and choice in determining the proclivity of students to re-locate and move out of the family home.

³⁵ Gamsu S and Donnelly M. (2017) *Diverse Places of Learning? Home neighbourhood ethnic diversity and the ethnic composition of universities*. Bath: Institute for Policy Research, University of Bath.

5. Summary of findings

The idea of university being a rite of passage that involves leaving home and moving far away does not ring true for most young people in the UK. It is certainly not something that is equally experienced by all social and ethnic groups living in different parts of the UK.

The traditional view of what it means to go away to university, moving out and far away, is very much the preserve of white, middle class and privately educated young people from the south of England. These differences represent a consistent (and somewhat growing) divide in higher education experiences. We also find here a growing phenomenon of 'commuter students' – those living in their parental home and commuting a significant distance to university (over 91km) at particular institutions. Since the increase in fees, these students have increased but in a highly localised manner which is specific to particular universities and regions. The localised nature of these changes has important policy implications. Student financial support should be re-orientated to suit the particular financial needs of working-class commuter students, and universities need to gear themselves up to recognising their particular needs in terms of support provided.

More broadly, policy attention needs to focus on recognising the significant and growing social class, ethnic and spatial inequalities between young people in their student mobility choices, which are summarised here.

Ethnicity

There are clear differences between ethnic groups in the chances that they will be mobile for university, even after holding constant other important factors. Regardless of their social class, prior attainment, and geographic location, British Bangladeshi, British Pakistani and Indian students are more likely to stay living at home and attend a local university (less than 91km away from their home address). The increase in tuition fees has entrenched the trend for British Pakistani and British Bangladeshi students to stay at home and stay local for university. These two ethnic groups are also much less likely to move out of home and attend a university a significant distance away. It is White, Black African and Chinese students who are the most mobile ethnic groups over the medium and longer distances defined here, with these ethnic groups more likely to leave home and travel the furthest geographic distance.

In the UK, a significant number of British Pakistani and British Bangladeshi people are Muslim. The increasing trend for these groups to stay living at home and attend a local university could, for at least some young people, be driven by a reluctance to take out the standard interest-bearing student loans, which conflict with Islamic beliefs. For some, staying at home and attending a local university could be a further strategy to mitigate the increasing costs of study. This adds further weight to the case for introducing Halal student loans in the UK, to ensure that student financial support does not discriminate on grounds of religious belief.

In the qualitative fieldwork as part of the wider research, we have also found that some ethnic minority students perceive areas outside of their immediate community to be unaccepting and racist towards people of colour. Indeed, this was the case for British Bangladeshi students interviewed at two inner-city schools located in areas of London and Birmingham with a large ethnic minority population. At the vulnerable age of 17, when most entrants to university are making their choices, it could be that choosing a place that is perceived as safer (in terms of fears around racism and exclusion) could be a key driver. If this is the case, intolerance in wider society could be acting to narrow and limit the higher education decision-making of some young people from ethnic minority backgrounds. More work needs to be done to address intolerance in wider society, and make places accepting and welcoming for all groups. Universities themselves could act and play a part in showing ethnic minority young people the tolerance and respect for difference that is evident on campus and in the wider locality.

These disparities between ethnic groups could also be suggestive of cultural differences in orientations and dispositions when it comes to life transitions and emerging adulthood. It may be more of a cultural norm for British Bangladeshi and British Pakistani young people to stay at home or close to home, perhaps for reasons to do with family relationships and ties or faith. The opposite might be true for White

and Chinese young people, whose families and social networks could emphasise the importance of moving away and gaining independence from home and family.

Place

Above and beyond ethnicity and social class, a further contributing factor that appears to be predicting the likelihood that students will choose particular mobility paths is the geographic places they are from. It therefore may be too simplistic to suggest that social class and ethnicity operates the same across different parts of the country, and that place-based factors such as regionally specific identities and culture, as well as the provision of university courses, can become important determinants independent of class and ethnicity per se.

Those in many northern regions of England are much more likely to stay living at home and attend a local university than those in the south, whilst those in southern England are at the same time more likely to leave home and commute long distances. It could be that place-based identities are much stronger in the north of England than they are in the south, which might explain why those in the north are likely to stay at home and stay local. Whilst social class is already controlled for in the modelling in terms of occupation, it might be that there are further disparities in income across the country that might be making some young people from the north stay immobile – especially in peripheral regions like the North East, where mobility to the south is costly. In the qualitative work carried out as part of the wider project, students in the North East of England were much more likely to cite financial reasons for their immobility than those located in other parts of the country. This could be hampering the choices of those located in areas like the North East. Additional travel bursaries for these students could help to ensure that they are not restricting themselves in their course and university choices.

These geographic disparities in the movement of young people are significant, especially in a post-Brexit society characterised by marginalised 'left behind' localities (largely in the north of England) and a rich prosperous south. It could be that those in the north feel disassociated and distant from the south of England, and that these feelings are tied up in their choices to remain living in the north. Encouraging a greater degree of geographic mixing across different localities and regions of the UK could help to address these kinds of feelings, with university entry a key point of transition where this could happen.

Social class and regional inequality

Disadvantaged and state-educated students are much more likely to stay living at home and attend a local university, with the chances increasing since the 2012 increase in fees. Those from the higher social class groups are more likely to leave home and move a significant distance (91km-244km, 57-152 miles) – with this inequality becoming more engrained since the increase in tuition fees. Since the increase in fees, students from the lowest social class groups are also now more likely to be living at home and commuting a significant distance to university (between 91km and 244km, 57-152 miles). In terms of those leaving home and moving the furthest distance (over 244km, or 152 miles), it is again the most advantaged students who are most likely to do so, though there is little evidence that this pattern has increased since the increase in fees for this particular group of mobile students.

Student mobilities and geographical inequalities in outreach

Our findings here about the geographical unevenness of student recruitment speak to the qualitative findings within our broader research project. When we have been in geographically peripheral areas of the UK such as coastal towns in East Anglia or former mill towns in West Yorkshire, there has been a noticeable lack of meaningful outreach work by national elite universities. There is a stark contrast between the widening participation and outreach apparatus (both university and third-sector provided) that exists in London and what is present in these culturally and economically deprived communities. This was brought home during a fieldwork visit to a sixth form in a deprived coastal town in East Anglia where university visits from providers other than UEA, the University of Suffolk and Anglia Ruskin were non-existent. Given that much outreach work by elite universities also involves some measure of *de facto* recruitment in order to meet OFFA targets, institutions with only a small number of more able students will likely be looked over when it comes to university outreach and recruitment activities.

The contrast in provision of outreach activities was reinforced by visiting a working-class, predominantly Bengali-background school in East London directly after the East Anglia post-16 provider. The head described extensive provision of work-experience placements and mentoring from City banks and consultancy firms alongside multiple visits from elite London universities and other third-sector outreach and widening participation organisations. There is an entire machinery of widening participation that exists in London in a way that is absent in more peripheral parts of the country away from major urban areas.

In some cases, this has been made worse by pressures on school and college budgets, meaning that schools can no longer afford to subsidise or pay for university open day trips further afield. University widening participation departments undertake excellent and innovative work, but their activities often dovetail with meeting student recruitment targets for the 'talented but least likely to apply' group of disadvantaged students. Given the financing of post-16 education, it would make sense if some of the financial resources currently allocated to university widening participation departments were spent collaboratively with post-16 providers to reach a larger number of students than this small group. This is perhaps particularly important in peripheral areas where there is relatively little in the form of cultural enrichment and where university outreach is primarily undertaken by local providers.

6. Conclusion: resolving the policy tensions and contradictions of unequal educational mobilities

As we have highlighted in the report, there are persistent inequalities of class and ethnicity which affect young people's propensity to be spatially mobile on entry to university. These inequalities are mediated by institutional and regional differences. In terms of class, what we see here are deeply entrenched historical differences in how different social classes experience and make mobility decisions about higher education. These fundamental differences have been slightly accentuated by the fee increase but they are underpinned by a system of higher education which still operates a binary divide which is spatial as well as social. There is a tension between universities which serve the majority of working-class commuting students and those elite universities that recruit nationally from more affluent families and are more isolated from their local communities. A key policy implication for this report is that elite universities can do more to recruit locally and ease the university experience for students that live at home. We also need to consider how working-class students can be given a spatially broader range of institutional and subject choices. This must be accompanied by greater financial and other forms of institutional support once they enter university if this involves either a long commute or moving out.

However, there are major policy tensions between encouraging working-class and, to some extent, ethnic-minority mobility and regional inequality. If we encourage spatial mobility of the most able working-class students we improve their chances of finding better paid employment at the end of their studies, as long as they do not return home. But this underlines the tensions in such a policy. If the most able working-class students in peripheral areas leave home and re-locate to more elite institutions in more economically successful urban areas, perversely this could act to entrench the economic inequalities that underpin these geographical inequalities in social and spatial mobility in the first place. A policy which is concerned with the geography of social mobility for individuals could act to entrench regional divisions by drawing able students away from deprived marginalised areas. Furthermore, unlike their peers in the post-1992 sector, elite universities have not traditionally been geared towards serving local working-class students who commute from home. We think it is important that future research explores the possible tensions with a model of widening participation that encourages the most able to leave deprived areas which already have skills shortages of graduates. There are potential tensions between the (partially correct) assumption that spatial mobility is beneficial for job advancement, and thus social mobility, and the desire to encourage the role of local higher education in reducing regional inequality, especially in peripheral, marginalised areas.

Resolving these tensions requires a structural approach to the spatial politics of higher education as well as institutional cultural change at elite universities and additional forms of financial support for students who commute. As Finn and Holton's research has shown commuter students' everyday mobilities involve complex negotiations of student and non-student lives. This is not the norm for students at elite universities. Any policy seeking to encourage more working-class commuter students to attend these institutions or to re-locate, would have to simultaneously encourage cultural change in elite institutions. A policy environment which encourages lecturers to focus on research to the detriment of teaching is likely to only reinforce the dominant white middle-class norms and culture associated with elite universities where moving away is the norm. The culture of elite universities has to change – the onus cannot always be on working-class and ethnic-minority students themselves to be the ones who adapt. This entails thinking about race and class in the classroom where working-class students are likely to face challenges, and how the benefits bestowed by societies can be offered to students who commute and cannot stay late after the teaching day finishes.³⁶

In the current policy environment of high fees, the commuter student is likely to be here to stay. Given this, some imagination in what additional forms of financial support these students might require is necessary. The young persons' railcard is of little use to students who have to commute during peak times when it is not valid. Similarly, in rural areas where train and bus services are inadequate, students are reliant on driving, which is entirely un-supported. Whilst student accommodation has seen large increases in rents, where institution-provided accommodation remains affordable, this still acts as a

³⁶ Reay D, Crozier G and Clayton J. (2010) 'Fitting in' or 'standing out': Working-class students in UK higher education. *British Educational Research Journal* 36: 107-124.

structural form of welfare and financial support for students that move away from home. Why is there no equivalent financial and welfare support for students who commute? In the current tuition fee environment this dearth of institutional and government forms of financial support oriented around the needs of commuter students is particularly problematic.

Lastly, the most difficult problem is how to resolve the contradictory tensions around regional mobility and regional development. For the foreseeable future, most working-class commuter students who are more likely to remain in their marginalised communities and regions on graduation will continue to be educated in the post-1992 sector. Increasing financial resources for local post-1992 universities, which will continue to educate the majority of commuter students from marginalised areas, is vital if a policy which focusses on the social and spatial mobility of a minority is pursued. Furthermore, improving recruitment into elite graduate employers from these universities would alleviate any economic penalty associated with remaining at home and attending a lower-ranked institution. However, a more sustainable regional economic policy would seek to place universities with large numbers of local commuter students, who are far more likely to stay local on graduation, at the centre of regional development. For those who do move away from marginalised communities, policymakers should consider how they can be provided with employment opportunities in their home areas which are of similar quality to those that can be found elsewhere. This would require a structural approach which sees higher education, access and spatial and social mobility as one element in the transformation of the unequal regional economies of the UK. If higher education policy is to rise to the challenge of regional inequalities exposed by Brexit this is precisely what is needed.

About the authors

Michael Donnelly is Lecturer and ESRC Future Research Leader in the Department of Education, University of Bath. His research draws on theories from education, human geography and sociology, with a particular interest in developing innovative approaches that combine quantitative and qualitative methods. He leads the ESRC-funded Spatial and Social Im/Mobilities project, a far reaching study of the links between spatial and social mobility.

Sol Gamsu is Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Education, University of Bath. He has a key interest in how the structures of power and inequality in education are reproduced over time and through different geographies. He has a PhD in geography from King's College London, which focused on how regional inequality shapes the geography of young people's post-16 education trajectories.

7. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Detailed descriptive tables

Table 5: Social Class and Student Mobility 2014-15 with absolute numbers and column percentages

NS-SEC	Migration type 2014-15						Total
	1. Short distance commuter	2. Short distance mover	3. Medium distance commuter	4. Medium distance mover	5. Long distance commuter	6. Long distance mover	
1 Highest	8200	19750	765	24500	210	9070	62500
	13.1 %	31.6 %	1.2 %	39.2 %	0.3 %	14.5 %	100 %
	11.3 %	19.4 %	18.3 %	24.8 %	22.9 %	26.9 %	19.9 %
2	14150	25675	1040	27005	230	9375	77480
	18.3 %	33.1 %	1.3 %	34.9 %	0.3 %	12.1 %	100 %
	19.4 %	25.2 %	25 %	27.3 %	24.9 %	27.8 %	24.7 %
3	6875	10535	395	9990	85	3375	31260
	22 %	33.7 %	1.3 %	32 %	0.3 %	10.8 %	100 %
	9.4 %	10.3 %	9.5 %	10.1 %	9.2 %	10 %	10 %
4	6645	6340	300	5685	60	1850	20880
	31.8 %	30.4 %	1.4 %	27.2 %	0.3 %	8.9 %	100 %
	9.1 %	6.2 %	7.2 %	5.8 %	6.6 %	5.5 %	6.6 %
5	3290	4225	185	3420	25	955	12095
	27.2 %	34.9 %	1.5 %	28.3 %	0.2 %	7.9 %	100 %
	4.5 %	4.1 %	4.4 %	3.5 %	2.7 %	2.8 %	4 %
6	10895	11295	435	8595	95	2435	33750
	32.3 %	33.5 %	1.3 %	25.5 %	0.3 %	7.2 %	100 %
	15 %	11.1 %	10.4 %	8.7 %	10 %	7.2 %	10.8 %
7	6295	6075	215	4085	35	1145	17850
	35.3 %	34 %	1.2 %	22.9 %	0.2 %	6.4 %	100 %
	8.6 %	6 %	5.1 %	4.1 %	3.8 %	3.4 %	5.7 %
8 Lowest	500	385	20	140	5	65	1120
	44.9 %	34.2 %	1.8 %	12.7 %	0.5 %	5.9 %	100 %
	0.7 %	0.4 %	0.5 %	0.1 %	0.6 %	0.2 %	0.3 %
Unclassified	14760	16565	700	14820	155	5175	52175
	28.3 %	31.7 %	1.3 %	28.4 %	0.3 %	9.9 %	100 %
	20.3 %	16.3 %	16.8 %	15 %	16.9 %	15.4 %	16.7 %
Unknown	1240	1010	110	545	20	240	3170
	39.1 %	31.9 %	3.5 %	17.1 %	0.7 %	7.6 %	100 %
	1.7 %	1 %	2.7 %	0.5 %	2.4 %	0.7 %	1 %
Total	72850	101855	4165	98790	925	33690	312280
	23.3 %	32.5 %	1.2 %	31.5 %	0.3 %	10.9 %	100 %
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Note: Dark blue values are row percentages and light blue values are column percentages

Table 6: Ethnicity and Student Mobility 2014-15 with absolute numbers and column percentages

Ethnicity	Migration type 2014-15						Total
	1. Short distance commuter	2. Short distance mover	3. Medium distance commuter	4. Medium distance mover	5. Long distance commuter	6. Long distance mover	
White	44720	79685	3320	80935	690	28375	237725
	18.8 %	33.5 %	1.4 %	34 %	0.3 %	11.9 %	100 %
	61.4 %	78.2 %	79.8 %	81.9 %	74.2 %	84.2 %	76.1 %
Black Caribbean	1205	1575	45	1200	5	215	4245
	28.4 %	37.1 %	1.1 %	28.3 %	0.1 %	5 %	100 %
	1.7 %	1.5 %	1.1 %	1.2 %	0.5 %	0.6 %	1.4 %
Black African	3655	4325	170	3935	40	1050	13175
	27.7 %	32.8 %	1.3 %	29.9 %	0.3 %	8 %	100 %
	5 %	4.2 %	4.1 %	4 %	4.3 %	3.1 %	4.3 %
Other Black	340	285	15	235	0	75	955
	35.8 %	29.9 %	1.5 %	24.8 %	0 %	8 %	100 %
	0.5 %	0.3 %	0.3 %	0.2 %	0 %	0.2 %	0.3 %
Indian	4065	3760	115	3280	25	680	11920
	34.1 %	31.5 %	1 %	27.5 %	0.2 %	5.7 %	100 %
	5.6 %	3.7 %	2.8 %	3.3 %	2.5 %	2 %	3.8 %
Pakistani	7345	2205	100	1115	35	360	11155
	65.9 %	19.8 %	0.9 %	10 %	0.3 %	3.2 %	100 %
	10.1 %	2.2 %	2.4 %	1.1 %	3.8 %	1.1 %	3.6 %
Bangladeshi	3520	905	40	370	30	90	4945
	71.1 %	18.3 %	0.8 %	7.5 %	0.6 %	1.8 %	100 %
	4.8 %	0.9 %	0.9 %	0.4 %	3 %	0.3 %	1.5 %
Chinese	550	1025	35	940	10	380	2935
	18.7 %	34.9 %	1.1 %	32 %	0.3 %	13 %	100 %
	0.8 %	1 %	0.8 %	1 %	0.9 %	1.1 %	0.9 %
Other Asian	2335	2050	80	1470	25	410	6375
	36.6 %	32.2 %	1.3 %	23.1 %	0.4 %	6.5 %	100 %
	3.2 %	2 %	2 %	1.5 %	2.6 %	1.2 %	2 %
Other (incl. mixed)	4550	5485	210	4775	60	1850	16925
	26.9 %	32.4 %	1.2 %	28.2 %	0.4 %	10.9 %	100 %
	6.2 %	5.4 %	5 %	4.8 %	6.7 %	5.5 %	5.5 %
Unknown/NA	570	560	30	535	15	205	1915
	29.7 %	29.3 %	1.6 %	27.9 %	0.7 %	10.8 %	100 %
	0.8 %	0.5 %	0.7 %	0.5 %	1.5 %	0.6 %	0.7 %
Total	72850	101855	4165	98790	925	33690	312280
	23.4 %	32.7 %	1.3 %	31.8 %	0.2 %	10.7 %	100 %
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Note: Dark blue values are row percentages and light blue values are column percentages

Table 7: Home region and student mobility 2014-15 with absolute numbers and column percentages

Home region/nation	Migration type 2014-15						Total
	1. Short distance commuter	2. Short distance mover	3. Medium distance commuter	4. Medium distance mover	5. Long distance commuter	6. Long distance mover	
North East	3595	3050	75	2920	55	1120	10820
	33.2 %	28.2 %	0.7 %	27 %	0.5 %	10.4 %	100 %
	4.9 %	3 %	1.8 %	3 %	5.9 %	3.3 %	3.5 %
North West	10965	13385	255	7965	115	3045	35725
	30.7 %	37.5 %	0.7 %	22.3 %	0.3 %	8.5 %	100 %
	15.1 %	13.1 %	6.1 %	8.1 %	12.2 %	9 %	11.5 %
Yorkshire & the Humber	5030	9460	180	6680	80	2180	23610
	21.3 %	40.1 %	0.8 %	28.3 %	0.3 %	9.2 %	100 %
	6.9 %	9.3 %	4.4 %	6.8 %	8.7 %	6.5 %	7.5 %
East Midlands	3445	8205	250	7385	20	1050	20355
	16.9 %	40.3 %	1.2 %	36.3 %	0.1 %	5.2 %	100 %
	4.7 %	8.1 %	6 %	7.5 %	2.2 %	3.1 %	6.5 %
West Midlands	8615	8500	305	9355	20	1060	27850
	30.9 %	30.5 %	1.1 %	33.6 %	0.1 %	3.8 %	100 %
	11.8 %	8.3 %	7.3 %	9.5 %	1.9 %	3.1 %	8.9 %
East of England	3645	6605	590	13795	115	4115	28860
	12.6 %	22.9 %	2 %	47.8 %	0.4 %	14.3 %	100 %
	5 %	6.5 %	14.1 %	14 %	12.6 %	12.2 %	9.2 %
London	16420	15830	540	12610	190	6075	51665
	31.8 %	30.6 %	1 %	24.4 %	0.4 %	11.8 %	100 %
	22.5 %	15.5 %	13 %	12.8 %	20.6 %	18 %	16.6 %
South East	5030	14385	840	17230	155	6455	44090
	11.4 %	32.6 %	1.9 %	39.1 %	0.3 %	14.6 %	100 %
	6.9 %	14.1 %	20.1 %	17.4 %	16.6 %	19.2 %	14.1 %
South West	2565	5685	465	10135	95	3860	22805
	11.2 %	24.9 %	2 %	44.4 %	0.4 %	16.9 %	100 %
	3.5 %	5.6 %	11.2 %	10.3 %	10.4 %	11.5 %	7.1 %
Wales	3135	5150	190	4525	25	970	13995
	22.4 %	36.8 %	1.4 %	32.3 %	0.2 %	6.9 %	100 %
	4.3 %	5.1 %	4.5 %	4.6 %	2.8 %	2.9 %	4.4 %
Scotland	7500	8190	275	4500	35	1150	21650
	34.6 %	37.8 %	1.3 %	20.8 %	0.2 %	5.3 %	100 %
	10.3 %	8 %	6.6 %	4.6 %	3.7 %	3.4 %	6.9 %
Northern Ireland	2910	3420	200	1685	20	2615	10850
	26.8 %	31.5 %	1.8 %	15.5 %	0.2 %	24.1 %	100 %
	4 %	3.4 %	4.8 %	1.7 %	2.4 %	7.8 %	3.4 %
Total	72850	101855	4165	98790	925	33690	312280
	23.4 %	32.5 %	1.5 %	31.4 %	0.1 %	10.7 %	100 %
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Note: Dark blue values are row percentages and light blue values are column percentages

Appendix 2 – University tables

Table 8: Short distance commuter top and bottom 20 universities by proportion of intake (percentages of all students entering that year)

Uni - Top 20	Short Distance Commuter		2014-15
	2009-10	Uni - Top 20	
STRANMILLIS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	80.2	UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND	77.5
NEWMAN UNIVERSITY	75	NEWMAN UNIVERSITY	76.2
UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON	73.9	GLASGOW CALEDONIAN	74.1
GLASGOW CALEDONIAN	69.5	THE CITY UNIVERSITY	71.3
UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND	69.4	STRANMILLIS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	67.8
GLYNDWR UNIVERSITY	68	UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON	67.2
THE CITY UNIVERSITY	63.6	UNIVERSITY OF SUNDERLAND	63.2
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SUFFOLK	63.6	MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY	62.3
UNIVERSITY OF BRADFORD	60.5	UNIVERSITY OF BRADFORD	62.2
THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER	60.3	UNIVERSITY OF EAST LONDON	61.1
UNIVERSITY OF SUNDERLAND	59.9	THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER	60.3
MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY	56.9	UNIVERSITY OF BOLTON	57.6
UNIVERSITY OF EAST LONDON	56.5	STAFFORDSHIRE UNIVERSITY	57.6
UNIVERSITY OF GREENWICH	56.3	LONDON METROPOLITAN	54.4
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST	55.1	UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SUFFOLK	53.7
UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD	54.5	SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES	53.4
TEESSIDE UNIVERSITY	54	BIRKBECK COLLEGE	53.3
QUEEN MARY UNIVERSITY OF LONDON	52.5	RAVENSBOURNE	52.7
LONDON METROPOLITAN	52	QUEEN MARY UNIVERSITY OF LONDON	52.2
UNIVERSITY OF BOLTON	51.8	TEESSIDE UNIVERSITY	51.3

Bottom 20	2009-10	Bottom 20	2014-15
THE LIVERPOOL INSTITUTE FOR PERFORMING ARTS	0	UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE	0
ROYAL ACADEMY OF MUSIC	0	UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE	0
UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE	0	CRANFIELD UNIVERSITY	0
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE	0	UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	0
CRANFIELD UNIVERSITY	0	UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL	0.8
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	0	UNIVERSITY OF ABERYSTWYTH	1
UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER	0.2	UNIVERSITY OF EXETER	1
HARPER ADAMS UNIVERSITY	0.9	UNIVERSITY OF YORK	1.2
UNIVERSITY OF ABERYSTWYTH	1	UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM	1.3
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS	1.2	UNIVERSITY OF BATH	1.5
UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL	1.2	ROYAL NORTHERN COLLEGE OF MUSIC	1.6
UNIVERSITY OF EXETER	1.4	UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS	2.1
LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS	1.5	UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK	2.1
UNIVERSITY OF YORK	1.7	LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY	2.3
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM	1.8	HARPER ADAMS UNIVERSITY	2.7
UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM	1.9	ROYAL AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY	2.8
UNIVERSITY OF Birmingham	2.2	UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM	3.2
UNIVERSITY OF BATH	2.2	LONDON SOUTH BANK UNIVERSITY	3.2
UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK	2.5	UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN	3.4
LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY	2.6	FALMOUTH UNIVERSITY	3.9

Table 9: Short distance mover top and bottom 20 universities by proportion of intake (percentages of all students entering that year)

Uni - Top 20	Short Distance Mover		2014-15
	2009-10	Uni - Top 20	
UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE	83.6	UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE	86.9
ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	68.1	LONDON SOUTH BANK UNIVERSITY	74.7
UNIVERSITY OF SURREY	62.8	UNIVERSITY OF SURREY	61
UNIVERSITY OF STIRLING	61.3	UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX	59.8
LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS	60.1	ROYAL HOLLOWAY COLLEGE AND BEDFORD NEW COLLEGE	54
UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX	59.5	SHEFFIELD HALLAM UNIVERSITY	54
ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY, TWICKENHAM	58.8	YORK ST JOHN UNIVERSITY	53
ROYAL HOLLOWAY COLLEGE AND BEDFORD NEW COLLEGE	58	UNIVERSITY OF BRIGHTON	51.8
BRUNEL UNIVERSITY	55.3	BISHOP GROSSETESTE UNIVERSITY	50.7
BISHOP GROSSETESTE UNIVERSITY	54.9	UNIVERSITY OF HERTFORDSHIRE	50.4
THE CONSERVATOIRE FOR DANCE AND DRAMA	54.5	UNIVERSITY OF BEDFORDSHIRE	49.9
UNIVERSITY OF HERTFORDSHIRE	51.7	ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	49.8
UNIVERSITY OF LANCASTER	51.4	ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY, TWICKENHAM	49.6
ROYAL ACADEMY OF MUSIC	50.8	OXFORD BROOKES UNIVERSITY	49.6
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON	50.7	THE UNIVERSITY OF BUCKINGHAM	49.5
LONDON SOUTH BANK UNIVERSITY	50.5	IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE	48.8
ST. GEORGE'S, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON	49.6	UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX	48.7
OXFORD BROOKES UNIVERSITY	49.1	BRUNEL UNIVERSITY	47.7
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	48.6	UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	47.1
IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE	48.6	LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS	47

Bottom 20	2009-10	Bottom 20	2014-15
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM	8.6	FALMOUTH UNIVERSITY	8.7
UNIVERSITY OF EXETER	8.7	UNIVERSITY OF EXETER	8.8
UNIVERSITY OF THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS	12.1	UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM	10.1
STRANMILLIS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	12.6	UNIVERSITY OF THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS	11
UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL	13.5	UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA	12.1
FALMOUTH UNIVERSITY	14.7	THE UNIVERSITY OF CUMBRIA	12.3
NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY	15.3	HEYTHROP COLLEGE	12.8
PLYMOUTH UNIVERSITY	16.1	UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND	14.8
UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON	16.1	GLASGOW CALEDONIAN	14.8
THE UNIVERSITY OF CUMBRIA	18.1	NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY	15
GLASGOW CALEDONIAN	18.2	PLYMOUTH UNIVERSITY	15.1
NEWMAN UNIVERSITY	18.2	UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL	15.2
BIRMINGHAM CITY UNIVERSITY	18.7	UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON	15.4
GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART	19.3	STRANMILLIS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	15.9
BOURNEMOUTH ARTS UNIVERSITY	19.9	STAFFORDSHIRE UNIVERSITY	16.4
UNIVERSITY OF BATH	20.2	SRUC	18.2
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SUFFOLK	20.2	NEWMAN UNIVERSITY	18.2
UNIVERSITY OF YORK	20.3	THE CITY UNIVERSITY	18.6
UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK	20.5	UNIVERSITY OF ABERYSTWYTH	18.7
BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY	20.8	UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK	18.8

Table 10: Medium distance commuter top and bottom 20 universities by proportion of intake (percentages of all students entering that year)

Uni - Top 20	Medium Distance Commuter		2014-15
	2009-10	Uni - Top 20	
UNIVERSITY OF THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS	25	UNIVERSITY OF THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS	31.1
SRUC	22	UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA	27.1
UNIVERSITY FOR THE CREATIVE ARTS	11.1	SRUC	23.4
ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY	8.4	STRANMILLIS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	13.1
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST	6.8	UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF ENGLAND, BRISTOL	13.1
UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF ENGLAND, BRISTOL	6.4	STAFFORDSHIRE UNIVERSITY	12.4
STRANMILLIS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	6.3	HEYTHROP COLLEGE	10.6
UNIVERSITY OF WORCESTER	4.6	UNIVERSITY FOR THE CREATIVE ARTS	10.5
CANTERBURY CHRISTCHURCH UNIVERSITY	4.2	THE UNIVERSITY OF CUMBRIA	10
UNIVERSITY OF KEELE	4.1	UNIVERSITY OF KEELE	9.2
UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER	4	BUCKINGHAMSHIRE NEW UNIVERSITY	7.2
UNIVERSITY OF KENT	3.2	CARDIFF METROPOLITAN	7.1
BIRMINGHAM CITY UNIVERSITY	2.9	SWANSEA UNIVERSITY	6.9
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SUFFOLK	2.9	NORWICH UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS	6.4
LIVERPOOL HOPE	2.8	COURTAULD INSTITUTE OF ART	6.2
ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	2.7	BATH SPA UNIVERSITY	5.8
ROEHAMPTON UNIVERSITY	2.3	ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY	5.5
UNIVERSITY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE	2.3	UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER	3.8
UNIVERSITY OF BRIGHTON	2.3	GOLDSMITHS' COLLEGE	3
UNIVERSITY OF BEDFORDSHIRE	2.1	UNIVERSITY OF ST MARK & ST JOHN	2.7

Note: Bottom 20 not included as a majority of institutions have no students in this category

Table 11: Medium distance movers top and bottom 20 universities by proportion of intake (percentages of all students entering that year)

Uni - Top 20	Medium Distance Mover		2014-15
	2009-10	Uni - Top 20	
UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL	73.7	UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK	76
UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK	73.3	UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL	74.8
LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY	69.6	LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY	69.5
BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY	69.3	UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM	66.7
UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM	68.5	UNIVERSITY OF BATH	66.2
UNIVERSITY OF BATH	67.9	BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY	65.6
BOURNEMOUTH ARTS UNIVERSITY	61	UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM	62.4
UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA	59.9	BOURNEMOUTH ARTS UNIVERSITY	62.1
UNIVERSITY OF ABERYSTWYTH	59.8	UNIVERSITY OF ABERYSTWYTH	59.5
ROYAL AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY	58.6	ROYAL AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY	58.2
UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM	58.1	UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER	57.7
UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER	57.5	UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON	56.9
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON	57.2	UNIVERSITY OF PORTSMOUTH	55.7
UNIVERSITY OF EXETER	55.3	UNIVERSITY OF EXETER	53.3
HARPER ADAMS UNIVERSITY	55.2	SOUTHAMPTON SOLENT UNIVERSITY	51.8
THE UNIVERSITY OF CUMBRIA	54.3	UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN	51.8
BATH SPA UNIVERSITY	53.5	HARPER ADAMS UNIVERSITY	51.7
UNIVERSITY OF PORTSMOUTH	53.5	CARDIFF UNIVERSITY	51.5
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE	51.5	UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE	50.5
CARDIFF UNIVERSITY	50.9	UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD	49.7

Bottom 20	2009-10	Bottom 20	2014-15
STRANMILLIS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	1	STRANMILLIS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	3.3
UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND	4.2	UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND	4.2
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST	4.7	NEWMAN UNIVERSITY	4.8
NEWMAN UNIVERSITY	5.6	THE CITY UNIVERSITY	6
THE CITY UNIVERSITY	5.9	BIRKBECK COLLEGE	6.9
UNIVERSITY OF GREENWICH	7.4	STAFFORDSHIRE UNIVERSITY	8.9
GLYNDWR UNIVERSITY	8	GLASGOW CALEDONIAN	8.9
UNIVERSITY OF EAST LONDON	8.4	GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART	9.2
THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER	8.4	ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	9.3
UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON	8.8	LONDON METROPOLITAN	9.5
UNIVERSITY OF BRADFORD	8.9	UNIVERSITY OF BRADFORD	9.5
ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY, TWICKENHAM	9	UNIVERSITY OF SUNDERLAND	9.8
EDGE HILL UNIVERSITY	9	UNIVERSITY OF BOLTON	10.2
UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD	9.2	QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST	10.2
MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY	9.3	ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY, TWICKENHAM	10.3
GLASGOW CALEDONIAN	10	UNIVERSITY OF EAST LONDON	10.4
UNIVERSITY OF BOLTON	10	MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY	10.7
LONDON SOUTH BANK UNIVERSITY	10.2	UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD	10.7
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SUFFOLK	10.4	UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE	10.8
UNIVERSITY OF HERTFORDSHIRE	10.7	ROEHAMPTON UNIVERSITY	11.6

Table 12: Long distance commuter top and bottom 20 universities by proportion of intake (percentages of all students entering that year)

Uni	Long Distance Commuter		2014-15
	2009-10	Uni	
UNIVERSITY OF THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS	2.9	THE UNIVERSITY OF CUMBRIA	5.6
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH	2.7	HEYTHROP COLLEGE	5.3
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST	1.7	SWANSEA UNIVERSITY	3.9
UNIVERSITY OF KENT	1.1	UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA	3.6
LIVERPOOL HOPE	1	BUCKINGHAMSHIRE NEW UNIVERSITY	3.1
ROEHAMPTON UNIVERSITY	0.9	STAFFORDSHIRE UNIVERSITY	2.9
UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF ENGLAND, BRISTOL	0.8	UNIVERSITY OF THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS	2.3
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SUFFOLK	0.8	COURTAULD INSTITUTE OF ART	2.1
UNIVERSITY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE	0.7	UNIVERSITY OF KEELE	1.9
GOLDSMITHS' COLLEGE	0.6	THE CONSERVATOIRE FOR DANCE AND DRAMA	1.3
LIVERPOOL JOHN	0.6	THE ROYAL CENTRAL SCHOOL OF SPEECH AND DRAMA	1.3
LONDON METROPOLITAN	0.6	PLYMOUTH UNIVERSITY	1.3
UNIVERSITY OF HUDDERSFIELD	0.6	UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH	1.2
CANTERBURY CHRISTCHURCH UNIVERSITY	0.6	BATH SPA UNIVERSITY	1.1
NORTHUMBRIA UNIVERSITY	0.5	GOLDSMITHS' COLLEGE	1.1
SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES	0.5	UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF ENGLAND, BRISTOL	1.1
UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE	0.4	GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART	1
SWANSEA UNIVERSITY	0.4	CARDIFF METROPOLITAN	1
TEESSIDE UNIVERSITY	0.4	UNIVERSITY OF BOLTON	0.9
BATH SPA UNIVERSITY	0.4	UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW	0.7

Note: Bottom 20 not included as a majority of institutions have no students in this category

Table 13: Long distance mover top and bottom twenty universities by proportion of intake (percentages of all students entering that year)

Uni	Long Distance Mover		2014-15
	2009-10	Uni	
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM	61.10	FALMOUTH UNIVERSITY	65.1
FALMOUTH UNIVERSITY	58.80	UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM	61
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS	49.90	UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS	45.3
ROYAL NORTHERN COLLEGE OF MUSIC	38.60	GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART	42.5
UNIVERSITY OF YORK	38.10	UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH	42
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH	37.10	UNIVERSITY OF YORK	38.4
NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY	35.40	UNIVERSITY OF EXETER	36.5
UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS	34.60	NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY	36.3
UNIVERSITY OF EXETER	34.20	PLYMOUTH UNIVERSITY	34.1
PLYMOUTH UNIVERSITY	33.40	UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS	32.5
UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN	30.60	TRINITY LABAN CONSERVATOIRE OF MUSIC AND DANCE	29.3
ROYAL CONSERVATOIRE OF SCOTLAND	27.50	THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER	29
GLASGOW SCHOOL OF ART	27.40	ROYAL COLLEGE OF MUSIC	28.8
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER	27.00	ROYAL ACADEMY OF MUSIC	28.3
THE CONSERVATOIRE FOR DANCE AND DRAMA	24.20	UNIVERSITY OF LANCASTER	26.2
ROSE BRUFORD COLLEGE	23.80	ROYAL NORTHERN COLLEGE OF MUSIC	25.6
GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND DRAMA	23.50	ROYAL CONSERVATOIRE OF SCOTLAND	24.4
THE ROYAL CENTRAL SCHOOL OF SPEECH AND DRAMA	23.50	THE CONSERVATOIRE FOR DANCE AND DRAMA	23.9
BANGOR UNIVERSITY	22.40	BANGOR UNIVERSITY	23.1
THE LIVERPOOL INSTITUTE FOR PERFORMING ARTS	22.40	UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN	22.1

Bottom 20	2009-10	Bottom 20	2014-15
ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	0	STRANMILLIS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	0
STRANMILLIS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	0	ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	0.4
UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER	0.5	NEWMAN UNIVERSITY	0.6
UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON	0.7	BISHOP GROSSETESTE UNIVERSITY	0.7
NEWMAN UNIVERSITY	1.2	ASTON UNIVERSITY	1
GLYNDWR UNIVERSITY	1.4	UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER	1
UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND	1.4	UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF SCOTLAND	1.1
BISHOP GROSSETESTE UNIVERSITY	1.6	COVENTRY UNIVERSITY	1.2
DE MONTFORT	1.8	UNIVERSITY OF NORTHAMPTON	1.2
COVENTRY UNIVERSITY	1.8	SRUC	1.3
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE BIRMINGHAM	1.9	DE MONTFORT	1.6
BIRMINGHAM CITY UNIVERSITY	1.9	BIRMINGHAM CITY UNIVERSITY	1.6
GLASGOW CALEDONIAN	2	GLASGOW CALEDONIAN	1.7
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHAMPTON	2	UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON	1.7
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST	2.1	STAFFORDSHIRE UNIVERSITY	1.8
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SUFFOLK	2.1	SHEFFIELD HALLAM UNIVERSITY	2.2
UNIVERSITY OF WORCESTER	2.1	UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE	2.2
UNIVERSITY OF HERTFORDSHIRE	2.2	UNIVERSITY OF WORCESTER	2.2
UNIVERSITY OF DERBY	2.3	UNIVERSITY OF HERTFORDSHIRE	2.4
SHEFFIELD HALLAM UNIVERSITY	2.3	NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY	2.5

Appendix 3 – Regression models

Short distance:

Table 14: Short distance mobilities - regression models 2009-10 and 2014-15

	Short distance commuter - 2009-10		Short distance commuter - 2014-15		Short distance mover 2009-10		Short distance mover 2014-15	
	S.E.	Exp(B)	S.E.	Exp(B)	S.E.	Exp(B) with sig asterisks	S.E.	Exp(B) with sig asterisks
White British (reference)		***		***		***		***
Black Caribbean	.037	1.229***	.037	1.112**	.035	1.269***	.033	1.167***
Black African	.028	0.930*	.023	1.148***	.024	1.330***	.021	0.973
Other Black	.091	1.374***	.072	1.635***	.086	1.114	.071	0.846*
Indian	.023	2.084***	.023	2.204***	.021	1.005	.021	0.895***
Pakistani	.027	5.292***	.023	6.296***	.028	0.493***	.025	0.433***
Bangladeshi	.042	6.054***	.035	6.633***	.046	0.416***	.038	0.425***
Chinese	.052	1.078	.051	1.091	.040	1.155***	.040	1.097*
Other Asian	.037	2.154***	.030	2.057***	.034	1.102**	.028	0.952
Mixed	.024	1.364***	.020	1.507***	.020	1.070***	.018	0.972
Other/not recorded	.044	1.225***	.056	1.751***	.038	1.120**	.051	0.816***
NS-SEC 1 Higher and managerial (reference)		***		***		***		***
NS-Sec 2	.017	1.129***	.016	1.136***	.012	1.012	.012	1.037
NS-Sec 3	.020	1.244***	.020	1.242***	.015	1.032*	.015	1.042**
NS-Sec 4	.023	1.301***	.022	1.424***	.019	0.954*	.018	0.968
NS-Sec 5	.026	1.535***	.026	1.475***	.022	1.006	.022	1.055*

NS-Sec 6	.020	1.400***	.019	1.490***	.017	1.029	.015	1.022
NS-Sec 7	.025	1.553***	.022	1.644***	.022	0.989	.019	1.028
NS-Sec 8	.100	1.386	.067	1.724***	.101	0.761**	.065	1.074
NS-Sec Unclassified	.017	1.426***	.017	1.462***	.014	0.990	.013	0.984
NS-Sec Unknown	.042	1.678***	.043	1.833***	.040	0.899**	.041	1.029
Parental higher education (reference - yes)		***		***		***		***
Parental HE - No	.012	1.449***	.011	1.461***	.010	1.044***	.009	1.062***
Parental HE - Unrecorded	.018	1.150***	.019	1.282***	.014	1.281***	.016	1.109***
Parental HE - Missing	.015	1.346***	.019	1.331***	.013	1.020	.016	1.059***
Subject studied (reference = medicine)		***		***		***		***
(2) Subjects allied to medicine	.051	1.582***	.051	2.155***	.032	0.849***	.032	0.907**
(3) Biological sciences	.050	1.521***	.051	1.732***	.031	0.862***	.031	0.997
(4) Veterinary science	.198	0.731	.200	0.648*	.098	0.559***	.086	0.834*
(5) Agriculture & related subjects	.081	0.814*	.079	1.124	.057	0.801***	.055	0.872*
(6) Physical sciences	.054	1.067	.054	1.176**	.033	0.838***	.033	0.901
(7) Mathematical sciences	.059	1.399***	.060	1.469***	.037	0.905**	.038	0.984
(8) Computer science	.052	1.910***	.052	2.491***	.034	0.874***	.034	0.963
(9) Engineering & technology	.052	1.322***	.053	1.459***	.033	0.818***	.033	0.937*
(A) Architecture, building & planning	.057	1.221***	.061	1.663***	.039	0.783***	.042	0.900*
(B) Social studies	.050	1.347***	.051	1.735***	.031	0.792***	.032	0.904
(C) Law	.052	1.663***	.053	1.957***	.033	0.932*	.035	1.024
(D) Business & administrative studies	.049	1.508***	.051	1.807***	.031	0.885***	.031	0.989

(E) Mass communications & documentation	.054	1.100	.055	1.383***	.035	0.940	.036	0.989
(F) Languages	.052	1.160**	.054	1.303***	.032	0.800***	.033	0.914**
(G) Historical & philosophical studies	.054	1.101	.055	1.341***	.033	0.752***	.034	0.903**
(H) Creative arts & design	.050	0.998	.051	1.388***	.031	0.893***	.032	0.909**
(I) Education	.052	2.092***	.053	2.636***	.035	0.915*	.035	1.095**
(J) Combined	.097	1.281*	.130	1.829***	.076	0.726***	.100	0.686***
State or private (reference = private)		***		***		***		***
State educated	.025	2.364***	.027	2.611***	.014	1.315***	.015	1.300***
Other school type	.034	2.485***	.034	2.126***	.025	1.243***	.023	1.124***
Gender (reference = male)				***				*
Female (binary variable in 2009-10 data)	.011	1.160***	.010	1.139***	.009	0.999	.008	0.977**
'Undetermined' (only present in 2014-15 data)			0.539497	0.448			0.32623332	1.388
At Oxbridge	524.104	1.484	1.000	0.003***	0.030	1.661***	0.031	1.972***
At a Sutton Trust 30 University	.017	0.307***	.015	0.286***	.012	0.941***	.011	0.881***
Tariff Percentile of Students' grade (reference = lowest 10% of scores)		***		***		***		***
Tariff percentile2	.034	0.415***	.027	0.759***	.024	1.038	.021	0.971
Tariff percentile3	.022	0.840***	.021	0.896***	.021	1.038	.019	1.036
Tariff percentile4	.025	0.750***	.025	0.823***	.023	1.097***	.022	1.049*
Tariff percentile5	.022	0.687***	.019	0.872***	.020	1.110***	.018	1.043*
Tariff percentile6	.023	0.652***	.020	0.879***	.021	1.139***	.018	1.045*
Tariff percentile7	.025	0.588***	.022	0.877***	.022	1.150***	.019	1.036
Tariff percentile8	.025	0.601***	.022	0.899***	.022	1.131***	.019	1.024

Tariff percentile9	.027	0.530***	.023	0.972	.022	1.079***	.020	1.012
Tariff percentile10 (highest)	.029	0.481***	.024	0.802***	.023	1.118***	.019	1.014
Tariff Percentile unknown or unnecessary for entry	.020	1.005	.023	1.318***	.019	1.090***	.021	0.973
Home Region/country (reference=Scotland		***		***		***		***
North East	.028	1.170***	.028	0.994	.027	0.516***	.026	0.625***
North West	.021	0.601***	.021	0.637***	.018	1.061***	.018	0.965
Yorkshire and the Humber	.024	0.433***	.024	0.337***	.020	0.993	.020	1.094***
East Midlands	.026	0.272***	.026	0.278***	.021	1.042*	.021	1.067
West Midlands	.022	0.516***	.022	0.513***	.020	0.672***	.020	0.719***
East of England	.025	0.234***	.025	0.207***	.020	0.465***	.020	0.469***
London	.021	0.552***	.021	0.521***	.019	0.769***	.019	0.738***
South East	.023	0.235***	.023	0.212***	.018	0.730***	.018	0.780***
South West	.028	0.189***	.027	0.207***	.022	0.465***	.021	0.517***
Wales	.027	0.401***	.027	0.408***	.023	0.978	.023	0.888***
Northern Ireland	.027	0.684***	.028	0.491***	.026	0.524***	.026	0.679***
Constant	.059	0.211***	.060	0.117***	.038	0.544***	.039	0.523***

Note: * = p<.05, ** = p<.01, *** = p<.001

Medium distance:

Table 15: Medium distance mobilities - regression models 2009-10 and 2014-15

	Short distance commuter - 2009-10		Short distance commuter - 2014-15		Short distance Mover 2009-10		Short distance Mover 2014-15	
	S.E.	Exp(B)	S.E.	Exp(B)	S.E.	Exp(B)	S.E.	Exp(B)
White British (reference)		***		***		***		***
Black Caribbean	.179	1.198	.151	0.729*	.043	0.767***	.036	1.029
Black African	.118	1.489***	.085	0.841*	.029	0.908***	.022	1.083***
Other Black	.414	1.320	.272	0.949	.107	0.726**	.077	0.863
Indian	.104	1.344**	.097	0.775**	.024	0.648***	.022	0.754***
Pakistani	.150	0.787	.105	0.671***	.040	0.276***	.033	0.277***
Bangladeshi	.248	0.676	.167	0.532***	.073	0.202***	.055	0.223***
Chinese	.218	1.163	.178	0.974	.044	0.818***	.041	0.897**
Other Asian	.189	1.156	.116	0.883	.044	0.507***	.031	0.693***
Mixed	.111	0.946	.074	0.887	.022	0.779***	.019	0.804***
Other/not recorded	.248	0.583*	.187	1.079	.044	0.748***	.054	0.812***
NS-SEC 1 Higher and managerial (reference)		***		***		***		***
NS-Sec 2	.062	1.052	.049	1.033	.012	0.981	.012	0.940***
NS-Sec 3	.080	0.901	.064	0.965	.016	0.924***	.015	0.906***
NS-Sec 4	.087	1.057	.071	1.108	.020	0.951*	.019	0.869***
NS-Sec 5	.110	0.874	.084	1.084	.023	0.859***	.023	0.809***
NS-Sec 6	.084	0.918	.064	0.981	.018	0.843***	.016	0.791***

NS-Sec 7	.106	1.000	.081	0.888	.025	0.773***	.021	0.709***
NS-Sec 8	.416	1.061	.231	1.400	.111	0.939	.092	0.439***
NS-Sec Unclassified	.068	1.058	.055	1.053	.014	0.816***	.014	0.816***
NS-Sec Unknown	.116	2.659***	.108	2.170***	.054	0.539***	.050	0.523***
Parental higher education (reference - yes)				**		***		***
Parental HE - No	.049	1.027	.037	0.882***	.011	0.808***	.010	0.818***
Parental HE - Unrecorded	.067	1.177*	.065	0.893	.016	0.830***	.018	0.882***
Parental HE - Missing	.059	1.041	.062	0.979	.014	0.895***	.017	0.890***
Subject studied (reference = medicine)		***		***		***		***
(2) Subjects allied to medicine	.255	1.643	.151	0.789	.034	0.861***	.032	0.753***
(3) Biological sciences	.251	1.815*	.148	0.655**	.031	0.866***	.031	0.837***
(4) Veterinary science	.477	4.912***	.596	0.477	.088	1.201*	.080	1.145
(5) Agriculture & related subjects	.275	5.522***	.232	0.609*	.057	1.190**	.054	1.098
(6) Physical sciences	.268	1.540	.158	0.784	.033	0.965	.032	0.954
(7) Mathematical sciences	.282	2.431	.194	0.623*	.038	0.954	.037	0.948
(8) Computer science	.260	1.818*	.157	0.691*	.037	0.669***	.035	0.665***
(9) Engineering & technology	.257	1.919*	.156	0.686*	.033	1.042	.033	0.992
(A) Architecture, building & planning	.259	3.292***	.183	0.722	.040	1.161***	.042	1.033
(B) Social studies	.250	2.637***	.149	0.813	.032	0.959	.031	0.831***
(C) Law	.260	1.940*	.161	0.830	.035	0.786***	.035	0.773***
(D) Business & administrative studies	.250	1.735*	.147	0.706*	.031	0.906	.031	0.855***
(E) Mass communications & documentation	.267	1.458	.163	0.692*	.037	1.020	.036	0.972

(F) Languages	.258	1.993**	.156	0.870	.032	0.943	.032	0.855***
(G) Historical & philosophical studies	.261	2.279	.157	0.973	.033	0.945	.033	0.853***
(H) Creative arts & design	.248	2.591***	.145	0.861	.032	1.025	.031	0.899***
(I) Education	.268	1.307	.166	0.523***	.038	0.618***	.037	0.523***
(J) Combined State or private (reference = private)	1.030	0.265	1519.763	.000	.079	0.903	.094	0.805*
State educated	.082	0.901	.064	0.925	.014	0.850***	.014	0.853***
Other school type	.124	0.753*	.092	0.956	.029	0.717***	.023	0.917***
Gender (reference = male)				*				***
Female (binary variable in 2009-10 data)	.042	0.967	.034	0.917*	.009	0.910***	.009	0.954***
'Undetermined' (only present in 2014-15 data)			6135.624	0			0.337282	1.235
At Oxbridge	1.005	0.078*	0.712	0.121**	0.030	1.077*	0.031	1.033
At a Sutton Trust 30 University	.085	0.257***	.072	0.152***	.012	1.350***	.011	1.589***
Tariff Percentile of Students' grade (reference = lowest 10% of scores)		***		***		***		***
Tariff percentile2	.158	0.633**	.090	0.673***	.025	1.678***	.022	1.202***
Tariff percentile3	.095	1.080	.067	0.724***	.024	1.172***	.021	1.152***
Tariff percentile4	.105	1.016	.078	0.736***	.026	1.247***	.024	1.245***
Tariff percentile5	.094	0.947	.060	0.743***	.023	1.384***	.019	1.208***
Tariff percentile6	.096	1.059	.064	0.758***	.024	1.414***	.020	1.234***
Tariff percentile7	.108	0.872	.070	0.763***	.024	1.530***	.020	1.218***
Tariff percentile8	.110	0.763*	.071	0.744***	.024	1.507***	.020	1.199***

Tariff percentile9	.114	0.793*	.075	0.792	.024	1.669***	.021	1.126***
Tariff percentile10 (highest)	.124	0.785	.078	0.688***	.024	1.622***	.020	1.246***
Tariff Percentile unknown or unnecessary for entry	.083	1.382***	.071	0.878	.022	0.878***	.025	0.725***
Home Region/country (reference=Scotland)		***		***		***		***
North East	.139	1.111	.133	0.632***	.029	1.633***	.028	1.369***
North West	.122	0.425***	.090	0.562***	.022	1.304***	.022	1.167***
Yorkshire and the Humber	.121	0.732*	.099	0.629***	.024	1.753***	.023	1.638***
East Midlands	.107	1.216	.091	0.955	.024	2.624***	.023	2.317***
West Midlands	.110	0.794*	.087	0.819*	.023	2.764***	.022	2.324***
East of England	.095	1.624***	.077	1.573***	.022	4.044***	.021	3.656***
London	.110	0.507***	.082	0.843*	.022	1.465***	.021	1.440***
South East	.091	1.591***	.073	1.548***	.021	2.646***	.020	2.352***
South West	.104	1.283*	.079	1.541***	.023	3.813***	.022	3.054***
Wales	.126	0.804	.097	0.906	.026	2.045***	.025	1.994***
Northern Ireland	.094	4.187***	.097	1.161	.033	0.724***	.032	0.769***
Constant	.277	0.005***	.171	0.036***	.041	0.255***	.040	0.342***

Note: * = p<.05, ** = p<.01, *** = p<.001

Long distance:

Table 16: Long distance mobilities - regression models 2009-10 and 2014-15

	Long distance commuter 2009-10		Long distance commuter 2014-15		Long distance mover 2009-10		Long distance mover 2014- 15	
	S.E.	Exp(B)	S.E.	Exp(B)	S.E.	Exp(B)	S.E.	Exp(B)
White British (reference)								
Black Caribbean	.349	1.376	.454	0.348*	.094	0.364***	.073	0.497***
Black African	.257	1.218	.175	0.840	.048	0.644***	.036	0.762***
Other Black	1.005	0.948	1268.055	1.837	.180	0.609**	.123	0.784*
Indian	.311	0.564	.217	0.764	.048	0.410***	.042	0.501***
Pakistani	.343	0.630	.180	1.151	.074	0.341***	.055	0.417***
Bangladeshi	.586	0.534	.205	1.849**	.113	0.318***	.109	0.220***
Chinese	.505	0.783	.359	1.038	.062	1.022	.058	1.028
Other Asian	.366	1.136	.216	1.175	.068	0.516***	.053	0.564***
Mixed	.217	0.926	.138	1.144	.033	0.855***	.027	0.885***
Other/not recorded	.389	0.919	.278	1.942*	.061	0.934	.077	0.909
NS-SEC 1 Higher and managerial (reference)				*		***		***
NS-Sec 2	.118	1.153	.096	0.855	.018	0.940***	.017	0.975
NS-Sec 3	.151	1.092	.131	0.795	.024	0.888***	.023	0.945*
NS-Sec 4	.206	0.823	.152	0.829	.030	0.914**	.029	0.905***
NS-Sec 5	.269	0.663	.215	0.605*	.040	0.703***	.037	0.823***
NS-Sec 6	.180	0.879	.132	0.790	.029	0.775***	.026	0.833***

NS-Sec 7	.259	0.817	.189	0.583**	.043	0.727***	.035	0.793***
NS-Sec 8	1733.501	.000	.421	1.227	.219	0.827	.130	0.829
NS-Sec Unclassified	.135	1.110	.110	0.832	.021	0.866***	.020	0.928***
NS-Sec Unknown	.403	1.017	.237	1.580	.066	1.029	.072	0.850*
Parental higher education (reference - yes)				***		***		***
Parental HE - No	.103	0.836	.082	0.735***	.016	0.760***	.015	0.747***
Parental HE - Unrecorded	.160	0.852	.123	1.198	.027	0.685***	.029	0.688***
Parental HE - Missing	.121	1.045	.125	1.121	.020	0.763***	.026	0.765***
Subject studied (reference = medicine)		***		***		***		***
(2) Subjects allied to medicine	.400	0.883	.304	1.147	.047	0.758***	.044	0.724***
(3) Biological sciences	.362	1.489	.299	0.759	.042	0.817***	.040	0.764***
(4) Veterinary science	.785	2.399	1.038	0.753	.107	1.370**	.104	0.912
(5) Agriculture & related subjects	.461	2.969*	.643	0.474	.082	1.106	.075	1.184*
(6) Physical sciences	.403	0.956	.310	1.284	.044	1.061	.042	1.023
(7) Mathematical sciences	.406	2.160	.384	0.840	.053	0.724***	.051	0.759***
(8) Computer science	.407	1.106	.319	0.853	.055	0.611***	.051	0.521***
(9) Engineering & technology	.398	0.911	.303	1.334	.045	0.843***	.043	0.803***
(A) Architecture, building & planning	.397	2.130	.435	0.568	.057	0.763***	.064	0.660***
(B) Social studies	.364	1.579	.296	1.257	.041	0.924	.040	0.905*
(C) Law	.420	0.810	.354	0.664	.050	0.704***	.049	0.672***
(D) Business & administrative studies	.377	0.725	.298	0.848	.043	0.654***	.042	0.638***

(E) Mass communications & documentation	.439	0.706	.334	0.947	.053	0.915	.053	0.857**
(F) Languages	.366	1.874	.307	1.427	.042	1.102*	.041	1.088*
(G) Historical & philosophical studies	.366	2.491*	.307	1.687	.043	1.169***	.042	1.046
(H) Creative arts & design	.364	1.377	.293	1.135	.042	1.245***	.040	1.262***
(I) Education	.462	0.539	.309	1.905*	.058	0.593***	.058	0.463***
(J) Combined	.788	1.261	1570.639	.000	.103	1.313**	.111	1.240
State or private (reference = private)		***		***		***		***
State educated	.119	0.540***	.113	0.706**	.018	0.551***	.017	0.564***
Other school type	.235	0.637	.161	1.228	.039	0.685***	.030	0.963
Gender (reference = male)				**				*
Female (binary variable in 2009-10 data)	.086	0.934	.072	0.783***	.014	0.944***	.013	0.965**
'Undetermined' (only present in 2014-15 data)			6063.989	0			0.488778	1.237
At Oxbridge	533.971	.000	548.471	.000	0.046	0.364***	0.048	0.291***
At a Sutton Trust 30 University	.119	0.536***	.112	0.295***	.017	2.578***	.016	2.528***
Tariff Percentile of Students' grade (reference = lowest 10% of scores)						***		***
Tariff percentile2	.255	1.034	.172	1.138	.040	1.274***	.033	1.070*
Tariff percentile3	.223	1.024	.153	0.757	.041	1.081	.034	0.944
Tariff percentile4	.230	1.325	.168	0.956	.045	1.089	.039	0.930
Tariff percentile5	.210	1.193	.130	1.076	.039	1.083*	.031	0.868***
Tariff percentile6	.222	1.005	.144	0.887	.039	1.081*	.032	0.808***

Tariff percentile7	.231	1.051	.160	0.762	.040	1.077	.033	0.846***
Tariff percentile8	.221	1.228	.152	0.949	.039	1.077	.032	0.851***
Tariff percentile9	.235	0.934	.163	0.961	.039	1.039	.033	0.876***
Tariff percentile10 (highest)	.229	1.300	.160	1.002	.039	1.148***	.032	0.894***
Tariff Percentile unknown or unnecessary for entry	.199	1.083	.163	0.962	.037	1.027	.037	0.855***
Home Region/country (reference=Scotland		***		***		***		***
North East	.247	2.359***	.223	3.920***	.046	1.661***	.045	2.196***
North West	.207	1.680*	.200	2.126***	.037	1.449***	.037	2.090***
Yorkshire and the Humber	.224	1.719*	.209	2.387***	.039	1.709***	.039	2.274***
East Midlands	.281	0.715	.285	0.641	.046	0.956	.045	1.158
West Midlands	.262	0.706	.295	0.408**	.045	0.823***	.045	0.967
East of England	.216	1.487	.199	2.631***	.035	2.952***	.036	3.539***
London	.222	0.979	.197	2.410***	.035	2.890***	.036	3.435***
South East	.202	1.503*	.194	2.297***	.033	2.894***	.034	3.244***
South West	.209	2.211***	.203	2.685***	.035	3.799***	.036	4.158***
Wales	.301	0.724	.263	1.035	.048	1.385***	.046	1.784***
Northern Ireland	.276	1.267	.278	1.111	.039	7.625***	.040	9.505***
Constant	.439	0.002***	.362	0.003***	.060	0.088***	.058	0.091***

Note: * = p<.05, ** = p<.01, *** = p<.001

The Sutton Trust
9th Floor
Millbank Tower
21-24 Millbank
London, SW1P 4QP

T: 020 7802 1660

F: 020 7802 1661

E: info@suttontrust.com

W: www.suttontrust.com

Twitter: [@suttontrust](https://twitter.com/suttontrust)

