



UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES ADMISSIONS SERVICE

## Applicants to higher education courses through UCAS with an Access Qualification, 2002 entry

Liz Peters, UCAS

This paper provides data on applicants and accepted applicants to higher education courses through UCAS for 2002 entry, and compares the profile of applicants holding an Access qualification with 'Other' non-access holding applicants. A range of applicant characteristics are analysed throughout the report including age, gender, ethnicity, MOSAIC lifestyle, and socio-economic status (which has replaced social class in UCAS data). Socio-economic classifications are based on an applicant's parental occupation, or for mature applicants their own occupation, and use a simplified version of the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification.

UCAS data covers applicants to full-time degree, foundation degree, DipHE or HND courses. All applicant and accepted applicant data tables are based on UK domiciled applicants only. Where unknown categories exist within data and a proportional breakdown is given, the unknowns have been excluded from the calculations for comparative purposes.

UCAS no longer makes a distinction as to the best qualification held by an applicant, therefore in this report an Access applicant is defined as a person who holds an Access qualification regardless of any other qualifications held. For this reason we would advise caution in making comparisons between the 2002 UCAS Access report data and earlier UCAS Access data, which is based on people who have Access as their best qualification. 'Other' applicants are those that do not hold an Access qualification. Please note that the UCAS Access data in this report does not distinguish between Access courses validated by the QAA Access recognition scheme and other Access qualifications.

### 1) UCAS Applicants and accepted applicants

Table 1A shows the proportion of applicants and accepted applicants who held an Access qualification. For reference purposes the table also disaggregates Access applicants/accepts into those who only held an Access qualification, and those who held Access in combination with one or more other qualifications.

Looking at the overall picture, some 4.6% of applicants held an Access qualification, and for the majority of these applicants it was their sole qualification. The corresponding proportion for accepted applicants was slightly lower at 3.9%.

**TABLE 1A - Applicants and accepted applicants by qualification held**

Qualification held	Applicants	%	Accepts	%
Access only	12873	3.2%	8921	2.7%
Access and other	5419	1.3%	4109	1.2%
<b>Access sub-total</b>	<b>18292</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>13030</b>	<b>3.9%</b>
Other	383562	95.4%	318695	96.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>401854</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>331725</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## 2) Age and gender profile

The tables in this section examine the age distribution amongst Access applicants compared with Other applicants. Since the Access qualification is specifically intended for mature applicants we would expect to see a very different, generally older, age profile for applicants/accepts. (UCAS applicants are defined as mature if they are aged 21 years or over at the 30<sup>th</sup> of September in the year of application).

Tables 2A and 2B clearly show this contrasting age distribution. Access applicants have an older profile, with virtually all applicants being in the mature age range; one-quarter in the 21-to-24 range and almost three quarters in the 25-to-39 or 40-and-over ranges. Further analysis shows that just over half of Access applicants are aged 30 years or over - the comparative proportion of Other applicants aged 30 or over was just 5.2%.

As you might expect, the vast majority (over three-quarters) of Other applicants were aged under 21 years of age.

**TABLE 2A - Applicants by age range**

Age Range	Qualification					
	Access	%	Other	%	Total	%
20 and under	509	2.8%	311948	81.3%	312457	77.8%
21 to 24	4604	25.2%	38290	10.0%	42894	10.7%
25 to 39	10593	57.9%	26521	6.9%	37114	9.2%
40 and over	2586	14.1%	6803	1.8%	9389	2.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>18292</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>383562</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>401854</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 2B - Accepts by age range**

Age Range	Qualification					
	Access	%	Other	%	Total	%
20 and under	350	2.7%	264364	83.0%	264714	79.8%
21 to 24	3225	24.8%	29642	9.3%	32867	9.9%
25 to 39	7546	57.9%	19480	6.1%	27026	8.1%
40 and over	1909	14.7%	5209	1.6%	7118	2.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>318695</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>331725</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Tables 2C and 2E explore the gender balance within each age range for Access applicants/accepts, and shows a distinct under-representation of male applicants with Access qualifications in all age groups. This contrast in gender is generally more apparent as the age ranges increase, and of the Access applicants/accepts aged 40 or over, less than one-quarter are male.

Tables 2D and 2F show the gender balance by age group for Other applicants/accepts, and show an overall female majority. The only age group with a higher proportion of males is the 21-to-24 age range.

**TABLE 2C - Gender balance of Access applicants by age group**

Age Group	Gender					
	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
20 and under	222	43.6%	287	56.4%	509	100.0%
21 to 24	1951	42.4%	2653	57.6%	4604	100.0%
25 to 39	3030	28.6%	7563	71.4%	10593	100.0%
40 and over	587	22.7%	1999	77.3%	2586	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5790</b>	<b>31.7%</b>	<b>12502</b>	<b>68.3%</b>	<b>18292</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 2D - Gender balance Other applicants by age group**

Age Group	Gender					
	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
20 and under	145106	46.5%	166842	53.5%	311948	100.0%
21 to 24	20246	52.9%	18044	47.1%	38290	100.0%
25 to 39	11985	45.2%	14536	54.8%	26521	100.0%
40 and over	2600	38.2%	4203	61.8%	6803	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>179937</b>	<b>46.9%</b>	<b>203625</b>	<b>53.1%</b>	<b>383562</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 2E - Gender balance Access accepts by age group**

Age Group	Gender					
	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
20 and under	145	41.4%	205	58.6%	350	100.0%
21 to 24	1388	43.0%	1837	57.0%	3225	100.0%
25 to 39	2190	29.0%	5356	71.0%	7546	100.0%
40 and over	424	22.2%	1485	77.8%	1909	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4147</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	<b>8883</b>	<b>68.2%</b>	<b>13030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 2F - Gender balance of Other accepts by age group**

Age Group	Gender					
	Male	%	Female	%	Total	%
20 and under	123524	46.7%	140840	53.3%	264364	100.0%
21 to 24	16162	54.5%	13480	45.5%	29642	100.0%
25 to 39	9038	46.4%	10442	53.6%	19480	100.0%
40 and over	1972	37.9%	3237	62.1%	5209	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>150696</b>	<b>47.3%</b>	<b>167999</b>	<b>52.7%</b>	<b>318695</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### 3) Ethnic Origin

Ethnic origin data is voluntarily provided by applicants on the UCAS application form and is withheld from institutions until the end of the selection process. Please note that the mixed category was only introduced in 2001. Trend observations should, therefore, be treated with caution as the introduction of a new category may affect applicants who might previously have assigned themselves to another ethnic grouping. The tables for this section include only those applicants with a known ethnic group to allow a clearer proportional representation among ethnic groups. The proportion of people with an unknown category was slightly higher for the Access applicants (11.5% unknown) than for the Other applicants (8.5%). Analysis of ethnic origin is only available for UK domiciled applicants.

The percentage of Access applicants and Access accepted applicants who were from an ethnic minority background (including mixed categories) was 24.8% and 22.1% respectively. This is higher than the corresponding figure for people with Other qualifications (16.7% and 16.5% respectively). This highlights the success of Access courses in widening participation. The qualification appears to be particularly popular within certain ethnic groups such as people of Black ethnic origin. The proportional representation within the Black ethnic groups is considerably higher than the overall picture. This does not extend to all ethnic minority groups however, with the proportion of Indian and Pakistani applicants being lower than the overall picture.

**TABLE 3A - Applicants by qualification, gender and ethnicity\***

	Qualification/ Gender						Other Total	Total
	Access		Access Total	Other				
	male	female		male	female			
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
White British	64.1%	74.0%	<b>70.9%</b>	78.4%	80.1%	<b>79.3%</b>	<b>78.9%</b>	
White Irish	1.3%	1.4%	<b>1.4%</b>	2.0%	2.1%	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	
White Other	3.3%	2.7%	<b>2.9%</b>	1.8%	2.0%	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	
Black Caribbean	3.5%	5.1%	<b>4.6%</b>	0.9%	1.3%	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	
Black African	11.8%	6.7%	<b>8.3%</b>	2.3%	2.1%	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	
Black Other	0.9%	0.9%	<b>0.9%</b>	0.2%	0.3%	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	
Indian	2.3%	1.6%	<b>1.8%</b>	5.0%	4.2%	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	
Pakistani	3.1%	1.8%	<b>2.2%</b>	3.2%	2.4%	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	
Bangladeshi	1.4%	0.5%	<b>0.8%</b>	1.0%	0.7%	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	
Chinese	0.9%	0.5%	<b>0.6%</b>	1.2%	0.9%	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	
Other Asian	3.3%	1.2%	<b>1.8%</b>	1.4%	1.1%	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	
White and Black Caribbean	0.6%	1.2%	<b>1.0%</b>	0.4%	0.5%	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	
White and Black African	0.4%	0.5%	<b>0.5%</b>	0.2%	0.2%	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	
White and Asian	0.5%	0.4%	<b>0.4%</b>	0.8%	0.7%	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	
Other mixed	0.7%	0.8%	<b>0.8%</b>	0.5%	0.7%	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	
Other	1.8%	0.9%	<b>1.2%</b>	0.7%	0.7%	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

\* excluding those with unknown ethnicity

**TABLE 3B - Accepts by qualification, gender and ethnicity\***

	Qualification/ Gender						Other Total	Total
	Access		Access Total	Other				
	male	female		male	female			
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
White British	68.3%	76.1%	<b>73.6%</b>	79.1%	80.7%	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>79.7%</b>	
White Irish	1.3%	1.4%	<b>1.4%</b>	1.9%	1.9%	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	
White Other	3.1%	2.9%	<b>3.0%</b>	1.7%	1.9%	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	
Black Caribbean	3.0%	4.6%	<b>4.1%</b>	0.8%	1.2%	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	
Black African	10.1%	5.4%	<b>6.9%</b>	2.0%	1.8%	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	
Black Other	0.9%	0.9%	<b>0.9%</b>	0.2%	0.3%	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	
Indian	2.2%	1.5%	<b>1.7%</b>	5.0%	4.4%	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	
Pakistani	2.5%	1.8%	<b>2.0%</b>	3.1%	2.3%	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	
Bangladeshi	1.3%	0.5%	<b>0.7%</b>	0.9%	0.7%	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	
Chinese	0.6%	0.5%	<b>0.5%</b>	1.2%	1.0%	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	
Other Asian	3.1%	1.1%	<b>1.7%</b>	1.3%	1.1%	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	
White and Black Caribbean	0.6%	1.1%	<b>0.9%</b>	0.3%	0.4%	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	
White and Black African	0.3%	0.4%	<b>0.4%</b>	0.2%	0.2%	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	
White and Asian	0.5%	0.4%	<b>0.4%</b>	0.9%	0.7%	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	
Other mixed	0.6%	0.7%	<b>0.7%</b>	0.5%	0.7%	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	
Other	1.7%	0.9%	<b>1.1%</b>	0.7%	0.7%	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

\* excluding those with unknown ethnicity

#### 4) Socio-economic profile

UCAS now reports the socio-economic status of applicants rather than the social class. UCAS assigns socio-economic status based on an applicant's parental occupation (or for mature applicants their own occupation) and uses a simplified version of the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification - since UCAS does not collect employment status or size of organisation from applicants. The method employs the Standard Occupation Classification 2000 (SOC2000), which replaces the SOC 1991 used up to and including 2001 entry.

It is strongly advised that caution is taken when interpreting socio-economic data since a significant proportion have an unknown grouping. This particularly affects Access applicants who witness a far larger proportion of unknown (37.8%) social backgrounds than do Other applicants (18.3%).

Table 4A shows the socio-economic breakdown of applicants/accepts for 2002, together with the proportion within each socio-economic band (excluding unknowns). This shows a lower proportion of Access applicants than Other applicants within the two highest socio-economic categories, and is particularly evident within the Higher managerial and professional occupations category. It can be seen that Access applicants have a higher proportion from the Intermediate, Semi-routine and Routine occupation backgrounds.

**TABLE 4A - Socio-economic status of applicants and accepts by qualification held**

<b>Socio-economic Status</b>	<b>Applicants</b>				<b>Accepts</b>			
	Access	%	Other	%	Access	%	Other	%
Higher managerial and professional occ's	516	4.5%	70538	22.5%	403	4.9%	61016	23.3%
Lower managerial and professional occ's	2326	20.4%	97078	31.0%	1742	21.0%	81734	31.2%
Intermediate occupations	2985	26.2%	48017	15.3%	2191	26.4%	39921	15.2%
Small employers and own account workers	616	5.4%	23919	7.6%	457	5.5%	19599	7.5%
Lower supervisory and technical occ's	286	2.5%	15273	4.9%	221	2.7%	12609	4.8%
Semi-routine occupations	3567	31.3%	39918	12.7%	2486	30.0%	32161	12.3%
Routine occupations	1087	9.5%	18818	6.0%	790	9.5%	15065	5.7%
Unknown	6909	-	70001	-	4740	-	56590	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>18292</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>383562</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>13030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>318695</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 4B compares the socio-economic status by qualification for mature applicants/accepts only. This may be more comparative since some 97% of Access applicants are of a mature age. This shows similar, but less prominent, socio-economic variations between Access applicants and Other applicants when compared with the whole age cohort in Table 4A. For example, there is still a larger proportion of Access than Other mature applicants from the Semi-routine background, but the difference is approximately 9%, rather than 19%.

**TABLE 4B - Socio-economic status of mature applicants and accepts by qualification held**

<b>Socio-economic Status</b>	<b>Applicants</b>				<b>Accepts</b>			
	Access	%	Other	%	Access	%	Other	%
Higher managerial and professional occ's	458	4.2%	4574	10.7%	356	4.4%	3324	10.5%
Lower managerial and professional occ's	2227	20.2%	11785	27.5%	1674	20.9%	8620	27.3%
Intermediate occupations	2911	26.5%	9928	23.1%	2137	26.7%	7301	23.1%
Small employers and own account workers	583	5.3%	2258	5.3%	433	5.4%	1643	5.2%
Lower supervisory and technical occ's	273	2.5%	1373	3.2%	212	2.6%	1081	3.4%
Semi-routine occupations	3501	31.8%	9629	22.5%	2439	30.4%	7073	22.4%
Routine occupations	1051	9.6%	3340	7.8%	766	9.6%	2540	8.0%
Unknown	6779	-	28727	-	4663	-	22749	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>17783</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>71614</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>12680</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>54331</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## 5) Subject Groups

UCAS subject classifications now employ the Joint Academic Coding System (JACS). JACS, introduced for 2002 entry, replaces UCAS' Standard Classification of Academic Subjects (SCAS), which was used up to and including 2001 entry. The new JACS classifications, the result of a joint UCAS-HESA subject code harmonisation project, offer a greater variety of codes to allow finer distinction between courses. These changes mean that many subjects may show exaggerated increases or decreases when compared as a time series, and should therefore not be directly compared to previous years.

Tables 5A and 5B compare the numbers, and proportions, of Access to Other applicants/accepts within each JACS subject group. The large proportion of Access applicants to subjects allied to medicine is particularly prominent in table 5A, with over one-fifth of the overall Access applicants. The proportion of Access applicants in this subject group is almost four times greater than it is for Other applicants, showing how Access qualification are being particularly effective in certain subjects. Other popular subject groups include Social studies and Education.

Note, when looking at Table 5A, that applicants can apply to subjects in different subject groups. Where applicants apply to subjects in more than one group, the group listed most frequently on the application form is counted (preferred subject). For some subject groups such as Physical sciences, this can create the impression that there are more people accepted than applied. Where a preferred subject group cannot be established, the applicant is counted in the category 'No preferred subject group'.

**TABLE 5A - Applicants by qualification and subject group**

JACS Subject Group	Qualification				Total	%
	Access	%	Other	%		
A Medicine and dentistry	134	0.7%	10896	2.8%	<b>11030</b>	<b>2.7%</b>
B Subjects allied to medicine	3802	20.8%	20338	5.3%	<b>24140</b>	<b>6.0%</b>
C Biological sciences	1210	6.6%	28578	7.5%	<b>29788</b>	<b>7.4%</b>
D Veterinary sciences, agriculture and related subjects	50	0.3%	4071	1.1%	<b>4121</b>	<b>1.0%</b>
F Physical sciences	243	1.3%	12554	3.3%	<b>12797</b>	<b>3.2%</b>
G Mathematical and computer sciences	1335	7.3%	28176	7.3%	<b>29511</b>	<b>7.3%</b>
H Engineering	235	1.3%	14928	3.9%	<b>15163</b>	<b>3.8%</b>
J Technologies	30	0.2%	1179	0.3%	<b>1209</b>	<b>0.3%</b>
K Architecture, building and planning	72	0.4%	4894	1.3%	<b>4966</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
L Social Studies	1770	9.7%	19900	5.2%	<b>21670</b>	<b>5.4%</b>
M Law	724	4.0%	15173	4.0%	<b>15897</b>	<b>4.0%</b>
N Business and administrative studies	830	4.5%	41586	10.8%	<b>42416</b>	<b>10.6%</b>
P Mass communications and documentation	185	1.0%	8284	2.2%	<b>8469</b>	<b>2.1%</b>
Q Linguistics, Classics and related studies	504	2.8%	10094	2.6%	<b>10598</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
R European languages, literature and related studies	23	0.1%	3783	1.0%	<b>3806</b>	<b>0.9%</b>
T Non-European languages and related studies	37	0.2%	1379	0.4%	<b>1416</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
V Historical and philosophical studies	543	3.0%	12033	3.1%	<b>12576</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
W Creative arts and design	1207	6.6%	43183	11.3%	<b>44390</b>	<b>11.0%</b>
X Education	1462	8.0%	12877	3.4%	<b>14339</b>	<b>3.6%</b>
Combined sciences	78	0.4%	2010	0.5%	<b>2088</b>	<b>0.5%</b>
Combined social sciences	131	0.7%	2079	0.5%	<b>2210</b>	<b>0.5%</b>
Combined arts	453	2.5%	8040	2.1%	<b>8493</b>	<b>2.1%</b>
Sciences combined with social sciences or arts	521	2.8%	8845	2.3%	<b>9366</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
Social sciences combined with arts	240	1.3%	5971	1.6%	<b>6211</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
No preferred subject group	2297	12.6%	61392	16.0%	<b>63689</b>	<b>15.8%</b>
General, other combined and unknown	176	1.0%	1319	0.3%	<b>1495</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>18292</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>383562</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>401854</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 5B shows that the subject group with the largest proportion of accepted Access applicants was again Subjects allied to medicine, with almost one-fifth of all accepted Access applicants. Further analysis shows that nearly half (46.9%) of these were for Nursing courses (representing 8.6% of all Access accepts).

Over one-third of accepted Access applicants were accepted into either Subject allied to medicine (18.2%), Social studies (10.3%) or Education (8.0%).

**TABLE 5B - Accepted applicants by qualification and subject group**

JACS Subject Group	Qualification				Total	%
	Access	%	Other	%		
A Medicine and dentistry	75	0.6%	7084	2.2%	<b>7159</b>	<b>2.2%</b>
B Subjects allied to medicine	2377	18.2%	16221	5.1%	<b>18598</b>	<b>5.6%</b>
C Biological sciences	991	7.6%	25993	8.2%	<b>26984</b>	<b>8.1%</b>
D Veterinary sciences, agriculture and related subjects	62	0.5%	3641	1.1%	<b>3703</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
F Physical sciences	257	2.0%	13336	4.2%	<b>13593</b>	<b>4.1%</b>
G Mathematical and computer sciences	942	7.2%	27076	8.5%	<b>28018</b>	<b>8.4%</b>
H Engineering	235	1.8%	16605	5.2%	<b>16840</b>	<b>5.1%</b>
J Technologies	34	0.3%	1904	0.6%	<b>1938</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
K Architecture, building and planning	76	0.6%	5294	1.7%	<b>5370</b>	<b>1.6%</b>
L Social Studies	1346	10.3%	20628	6.5%	<b>21974</b>	<b>6.6%</b>
M Law	626	4.8%	13779	4.3%	<b>14405</b>	<b>4.3%</b>
N Business and administrative studies	597	4.6%	37831	11.9%	<b>38428</b>	<b>11.6%</b>
P Mass communications and documentation	173	1.3%	7887	2.5%	<b>8060</b>	<b>2.4%</b>
Q Linguistics, Classics and related studies	530	4.1%	9641	3.0%	<b>10171</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
R European languages, literature and related studies	24	0.2%	3671	1.2%	<b>3695</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
T Non-European languages and related studies	44	0.3%	2032	0.6%	<b>2076</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
V Historical and philosophical studies	525	4.0%	11731	3.7%	<b>12256</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
W Creative arts and design	907	7.0%	34017	10.7%	<b>34924</b>	<b>10.5%</b>
X Education	1037	8.0%	9376	2.9%	<b>10413</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
Combined sciences	170	1.3%	5253	1.6%	<b>5423</b>	<b>1.6%</b>
Combined social sciences	151	1.2%	4379	1.4%	<b>4530</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
Combined arts	560	4.3%	10786	3.4%	<b>11346</b>	<b>3.4%</b>
Sciences combined with social sciences or arts	662	5.1%	15796	5.0%	<b>16458</b>	<b>5.0%</b>
Social sciences combined with arts	331	2.5%	9137	2.9%	<b>9468</b>	<b>2.9%</b>
General, other combined and unknown	298	2.3%	5597	1.8%	<b>5895</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>318695</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>331725</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## 6) MOSAIC lifestyle

MOSAIC lifestyle categories use a combination of census, electoral roll, housing and financial data to classify households into distinct social types based on applicants' postcodes.

Table 6A shows the MOSAIC lifestyle breakdown for applicants and accepts, and shows the proportional breakdown (excluding unknowns). Conversely to the socio-economic data, the proportion of Access applicants with an unknown MOSAIC lifestyle is less than for Other applicants - 3.9% and 6.4% unknown respectively.

It can be clearly seen that there is a lower proportion of Access applicants within the two highest and most prosperous MOSAIC categories (A and B). This is especially apparent in the High Income Families group, which is by far the largest group in the overall applicant population, but only the sixth largest for Access applicants. There is also a lower proportion of Country Dwellers amongst the Access applicants.

MOSAIC categories in which the proportion of Access applicants is significantly higher than Other applicants include Council Flats (almost a three times greater), Low Rise Council and Victorian Low Status. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the Access qualification in widening participation within HE, by encouraging applicants in under-represented MOSAIC groups.

Chart 6B graphically illustrates the difference in MOSAIC lifestyles between accepted Access and accepted Other applicants.

**TABLE 6A - MOSAIC Lifestyle of Access and Other Applicants and Accepts**

MOSAIC Lifestyle	Applicants				Accepts			
	Access	%	Other	%	Access	%	Other	%
A High Income Families	1452	8.3%	74064	20.6%	1119	9.0%	64155	21.4%
B Suburban Semis	1494	8.5%	48394	13.5%	1123	9.0%	41054	13.7%
C Blue Collar Owners	2008	11.4%	42904	11.9%	1454	11.6%	36193	12.1%
D Low Rise Council	2506	14.3%	25674	7.2%	1705	13.6%	20354	6.8%
E Council Flats	1578	9.0%	12442	3.5%	1023	8.2%	9499	3.2%
F Victorian Low Status	2794	15.9%	32961	9.2%	1900	15.2%	26373	8.8%
G Town Houses and Flats	1660	9.4%	33415	9.3%	1179	9.4%	27735	9.3%
H Stylish Singles	1395	7.9%	19042	5.3%	992	7.9%	15254	5.1%
I Independent Elders	576	3.3%	10784	3.0%	433	3.5%	8969	3.0%
J Mortgaged Families	1272	7.2%	24771	6.9%	922	7.4%	20506	6.8%
K Country Dwellers	777	4.4%	33833	9.4%	609	4.9%	28729	9.6%
L Institutional Areas	59	0.3%	762	0.2%	41	0.3%	602	0.2%
X Not Known	721	-	24516	-	530	-	19272	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>18292</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>383562</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>13030</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>318695</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**CHART 6B - Accepted applicants by qualification held and MOSAIC Lifestyle, 2002 entry**

