

Optimizing Talent:

Closing Educational and Social Mobility Gaps Worldwide

SOCIAL MOBILITY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Tessa Blackstone

Life Peer, House of Lords

Former Vice-Chancellor, University of Greenwich

Salzburg Global Seminar

Salzburg, Austria

2-7 October 2012

Abstract

There has been a long-standing failure in all university systems to recruit students in equal proportions from different socio-economic groups. Because free and open societies should promote social mobility by developing talent in every social and ethnic group this is an issue which needs to be addressed by schools, universities, employers and governments.

This paper considers the questions raised by this problem in the context of UK policy and practice. It distinguishes between fair access to the most prestigious universities and widening participation from lower socio-economic groups across higher education generally. Both need tackling but the second is far more important numerically and will therefore have a greater impact on the extent of social mobility. It notes that ethnic minorities are now well represented and women are over-represented in UK universities leaving white males from low socio-economic groups as the least well represented group.

It briefly examines the moves that have been taken in recent years to pay for the costs of undergraduate education by charging fees rather than by government grants to universities and comments on the effects on participation. It also describes outreach work undertaken with schools by universities which is partially supported by government funding and the impact which it has had. The limitations of these activities are noted in the context of the emphasis placed on prior academic achievement in university recruitment policies.

More emphasis on potential rather than focusing exclusively on previous performance is advocated, in particular through contextual approaches to recruitment which take into account students social background and the quality of their secondary schools. The case

is argued for avoiding a rigid stratification of universities in terms of students' grades on entry and for greater diversity in the composition of the student population in individual institutions in this respect.

Large gaps in the funding of teaching in different types of university should be avoided. The emphasis should be on sustaining a world class system of higher education in the UK, rather than putting all the focus on having a small number of world class institutions. There should not be a growing gap in quality between different types of institutions, if social mobility through higher education is to be maximised.

Opportunities for part-time education and mature students are central to allowing young adults a second chance in obtaining a degree level qualification. The UK has a good record in this respect, which other systems might consider emulating. The costs of postgraduate education need to be addressed, as many professions today require study at this level. Universities also need to help new graduates acquire internships and graduate employment more generally.

Lastly employers need to reconsider how they recruit graduates, especially widening the range of universities from which they recruit. In general they need to consider how to promote a more diverse workforce amongst their graduate entry.

Introduction

One of the fundamental qualities of a modern democracy is that it should create opportunities for its people to be socially mobile. Every child should have the potential to improve its social and economic status compared with that of its parents. To deny this potential is to create a stultified society in which effort and ambition are unrewarded, and in which inequalities become rigidly embedded and unbreachable. For those unfortunate enough to be born into a family at the bottom of the heap there can be little hope of improvement. For those lucky enough to be born into a family with wealth and privileges little is required of them to maintain this position. The more unequal a society is the greater the disparities in life chances will be. The first premise then behind this paper is that ways should be sought to promote greater social mobility. There are many ways in which this can be done, one of the most important of which is to reduce inequality by tackling great disparities in income and wealth.

Another way is to promote educational opportunities so that children and young people, whatever their backgrounds, can acquire the knowledge and skills they need to take on positions of responsibility, which will be rewarded by better pay and higher status. These two approaches are of course inter-linked: the greater the inequality in wealth and income the more difficult it is to create equal educational opportunities. However, the second premise behind this paper is that efforts can be and should be made to promote better access to good education for all children and young people even in unequal societies.

The subject of educational opportunities is enormously wide. At this seminar the focus is on the contribution higher education can make to social mobility. There is no difficulty in doing this as long as we recognise that what can take place at the higher education stage is shaped by what happens at earlier stages. Thus if few children from lower socio-economic groups reach the top of secondary schooling completing the years of education required and reaching the standards needed to enter colleges and universities, the contribution higher education can make is to a substantial extent compromised.

However, that is not to say that nothing can be done by higher education even in such circumstances. So the next premise of this paper is that however poor school systems are in creating the conditions for the advancement of less privileged children at school and thence into higher and further education, educational systems after the end of schooling can still make a difference in this respect, and indeed they have an obligation to do so.

My intention is to examine how policies can be shaped to make this happen. This includes financial incentives to the institutions which deliver education, as well as to students who participate in it. I draw most of my conclusions from my knowledge and experience of the United Kingdom. The issues that I examine and the problems I pose are, however, common to all European countries and indeed to North America too. The details of the policy approaches adopted of course vary but even here there are more similarities in a broad sense than differences. Undoubtedly some countries are more successful than others in promoting mobility through higher education, but it is not my intention to draw up league tables. The technical hurdles to doing so in a way that is both valid and reliable are in any case immense. What I shall do instead is to describe some of the policy interventions, which have been made in the UK.

It has long been recognised that access to universities is very different for some socio-economic groups compared to others. The proportion of young people going to university from families in professional and managerial groups now exceeds eighty per cent in most OECD countries; the proportion from semi and unskilled backgrounds is still less than twenty per cent in the same countries. It is an intractable problem which some commentators have despaired of ever resolving.

However, there is evidence that in the UK policy interventions designed to widen participation in universities have had some effect even if rather limited in their extent. It should also be noted that shifts in participation have tended to be greater amongst intermediate groups than in the lowest socio-economic categories. This is a reflection both of the failure of young people from these latter groups to remain in secondary schools beyond the statutory school leaving age of sixteen and of their lack of any aspiration or confidence about returning to education in their twenties or later.

The Parameters of the Debate in the UK

The debate about changing the composition of the student population in the UK to reflect better that of the general population is not new. Every important report on higher education has commented on it since the 1960s. More recently the debate has been slightly distorted by a preoccupation among some of the participants with questions of access to what are popularly known as ‘top’ universities, in other words those institutions with great prestige based on their research reputations. These universities, led by Oxford, Cambridge and the internationally renowned colleges of the University of London, such as the London School of Economics, Imperial and University College London, attract

many postgraduate students from around the world, but are also able to be highly selective in their intake of British undergraduates, recruiting students with high grades in their school leaving examinations (A levels). In the last two decades the competition for places has become more intense with private schools continuing to win a high proportion of places at the expense of pupils from state secondary schools. A philanthropist who made a large fortune after going to Oxford as a working class boy from a state school, became so concerned about this that he set up a charity (the Sutton Trust) dedicated to trying to increase access to a dozen or so research intensive universities by young people from similar backgrounds to his own. Whilst it is important that these universities should reach out to a wider range of students including those from ethnic minorities, who are notably underrepresented in them, it is not the main issue. Social selection as well as academic selection undoubtedly takes place even if unwittingly at these prestigious universities. However, to place so much emphasis on a few thousand additional working class students going to them rather than to other perfectly respectable institutions slightly lower in the pecking order, is emphasising a small concern at the cost of where our focus should be, which is getting more young people from homes where there is no tradition of entering higher education to any university at all.

Before exploring this further it is important to consider who the underrepresented groups are. Forty years ago students in the UK and indeed across Europe were predominantly white, male and middle or upper middle class. Since then a social revolution has taken place in the role of women, which has led to a dramatic improvement in their participation in higher education. The academic performance of girls in the school system exceeds that of their male peers at each level; and their aspirations now match

their achievement in a way which was not the case in the past, when social expectations about their roles as adults were so different. Consequently there are now more female than male undergraduates in the UK and in most other European countries. This has been reinforced because routes into traditionally female occupations such as primary school teaching and nursing have changed to embrace a university education. Consequently women are overrepresented rather than underrepresented in the undergraduate population today.

There has also been a change, if less dramatic, in the participation of ethnic minority groups in British higher education. In the 1980s there was great concern about second generation Afro-Caribbean and Asian immigrants' lack of opportunity to gain access to higher education. Many explanations were given ranging from low expectations of them from school teachers, language difficulties and family poverty. However salient these may have been, and possibly in some cases still are, they appear to have been overcome at least to the extent that there are more Black and Asian students at British universities than there are in the population as a whole in the relevant age groups. There are differences between participation rates for different ethnic groups; nevertheless the generalisation applies across most groups today. This is especially true if we consider participation by the age of thirty rather than at eighteen. There is evidence to suggest that young people from the ethnic minorities who may fail to gain entry to university initially are more likely than white students to reapply later if they fail to get a place or to apply for the first time later and that their persistence pays off. They may start later, they may take longer; in some cases choosing to study part-time, but they graduate eventually.

The focus of concern has shifted from these groups to white working class males, as the group that is most alienated from education in secondary schools, most likely to leave school at the earliest opportunity and least likely to pursue any kind of post school training let alone aspire to going to university. Their prospects are poor and they are likely to face periods of unemployment in a downturn and no more than dead-end jobs in periods of economic growth. Work based learning and training is often advocated as the best way of engaging them. However, the current shortage of apprenticeships and the likelihood that these will be allocated to more motivated young people means their routes to social mobility are largely blocked. Nevertheless, with some subtle shifts in policy, even this group may be helped into higher education eventually.

In considering how to increase the contribution higher education can make to promoting greater social mobility we need to examine several different aspects of policy. They include the cost of higher education to the individual; the transition from school to university and the selection policies used by universities; the range of universities in terms of status and quality and their composition; access to higher education for mature and part-time students; and the transition from university into employment whether or not via further postgraduate study. In considering the policy challenges raised we need to cover decisions made by government, by universities themselves and ultimately by employers.

How much do students or graduates pay?

In recent years governments of all political hues in the UK have argued in favour of widening participation and have introduced policies designed to achieve this goal.

Universal free tuition and generous maintenance grants were thought in the past to create the conditions in which students from poor families could flourish. Over the years criticism of this system has grown as a result of its very high cost and the regressive nature of this expenditure, because of the high proportion of students from middle and high income backgrounds. Maintenance grants became much more targeted on students from low income backgrounds and maintenance loans were substituted for those from middle and higher income groups. Tuition fees for undergraduates were introduced for the first time in the late 1990s. However, the system was strictly regulated by the government so that they amounted to only twenty five per cent of the average cost of a course, and were means-tested, leading to approximately forty per cent of students paying no fees at all. Those who were responsible for this policy, and I was one of them, were vindicated when it was found to have no impact on the representation of students from lower socio-economic groups.

At that time fees were paid up-front by parents. A few years later the government trebled the level of fees that could be charged to £3,000 but abandoned up-front payment.

Instead a system of fee loans was introduced in which universities received tuition fees direct from the government and students repaid the loans through the tax system after they graduated; and the time they had to repay related to their income once they were in the labour force. Once again this had no impact once the scheme had become established in the social class representation of students.

A third change was introduced when the Coalition government came in, which is being implemented this year. This initiative introduces variable fees giving universities some say in what they charge undergraduates. There is a ceiling of £9,000 which again trebles

the fees charged under the scheme before – meaning that, for a three-year course, students will need to repay £27,000 plus interest plus whatever they have borrowed for their maintenance costs. What effect this will have on the social composition of university undergraduate populations is still unknown. Some commentators have argued that the outcome will be the same as under the earlier schemes i.e. no impact. They reason that because repayment will take place after graduation and in the case of graduates who do not have high incomes, over many years, thus ‘forking out’ is all so far away that young people will not be deterred. Others have argued that the size of the debt they are taking on is now so large that it is bound to put some of them off, particularly if they come from families or social groups who are debt adverse.

For these reasons some universities, especially those without big research incomes, which are located in the inner cities, and which recruit a high proportion of their students from lower socio-economic groups and ethnic minorities have decided to charge somewhat less. Since government grants will not compensate them for their lower income from fees that results in these institutions having less funding to pay for their staff and other facilities. As a consequence the gap in the quality of what is provided by universities with socially advantaged students and those with more disadvantaged students is likely to widen. This has implications for social mobility to which I will return later. The storm of protest that erupted when the government announced these reforms largely failed to notice the institutional impact they would have. They focused instead on: the enormous jump in fees all at once and the consequent debt which graduates would incur; the implied rejection of the concept of ‘public good’ in relation to undergraduate education in removing all government grant to universities for arts, humanities and social science

programmes substituting grants with fees; and the unrealistic calculations made by the government on the likely extent of default in repaying the loans leading to a high burden on tax payers. While differences in the funding provided for research is justifiable, it is hard to justify large differences in the funding available to teaching the same subject in different universities. It is particularly inequitable if the already disadvantaged are to be further disadvantaged as a result of choosing to go to their now underfunded local university attended by many of their peers.

It is far too soon to be confident about the outcome of these changes. The jury is certainly still out. However, what can be said is that the UK government has embarked on a vast untried experiment. As such it has taken a big risk, which I would counsel any other country considering following suit, to avoid.

From School to University

In this section I do not propose to look in any detail at how schools may or may not prepare their pupils for entry to university. It suffices to say that some are much better at it than others, that the crucial hurdle is the retention of pupils with potential from lower socio-economic groups through to the completion of school leaving examinations, and that the quality of the advice and guidance they give about both career options and the different university courses open to pupils is also vital. I want instead to focus on what universities can do and how governments can incentivise them to widen participation rates by providing funding for this purpose.

As part of successive British governments' commitment to widening participation they have encouraged the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), which

allocates resources from the government to individual universities, to set aside funding for widening participation. I will not describe how this is done in any detail as the mechanisms are complex and have changed somewhat over time. It suffices to say that all universities are required to use some of their income from tuition fees to promote greater access to their institution including bursaries for maintenance and fee remission. Those universities with above average proportions of students from lower socio-economic groups also receive some funding to support their retention and the extra teaching and pastoral support these students may need. Most Vice-Chancellors who head these latter universities claim that, whilst helpful, this extra funding does not compensate them adequately for the extra cost of recruiting and teaching marginal students, who have not been well prepared to study at university level, but who can, nevertheless, graduate successfully given the right support. This is not surprising since the £140 million allocated currently accounts for only about 2.6 per cent of the total HEFCE grant.

Partly as a result of the government commitment to widening participation there has been an extension of outreach schemes through which universities work with secondary schools, and occasionally even primary schools, as well as further education colleges, whose main mission is to provide vocational education for young people and adults. They include training students at university to work in local schools mentoring young people and inspiring them to be ambitious, to be more confident and to take the prospect of going to university seriously. They involve special summer programmes where young people from homes where there is no tradition of going to university can come and spend some time in a university environment. Few schemes have approached the harder to reach groups such as those on programmes for unemployed young people or those who

live in care home due to family breakdown. Nor have there been many attempts to create routes for young people on work-based training programmes to move on to university education eventually. Were it possible to do so successfully it might address some of the poor representation of white working class males at university. However, because success rates may be lower, there is less incentive to work with such groups.

It is hard to evaluate the effectiveness of widening participation schemes in general partly because of their long-term nature but more important because of the other factors which effect participation, particularly the prior attainment of students discussed below.

However, a review of the “value for money” of these programmes by the UK National Audit Office found that in the decade between 1998 and 2007 participation from young people living in deprived areas had increased by 4.5 per cent compared to an increase of 1.8 per cent in the least deprived areas. Figures from the government department responsible for higher education compiled on a somewhat different basis also found a narrowing of the gap between the top three socio-economic classes and the remaining four groups had reduced by 3.7 per cent in the five years up to 2008/09 and that the gap had reduced more for females than for males.

Currently universities in the UK recruit students from school through a selective process which is centrally organised through a national body: the University Central Admissions Scheme (UCAS). School leavers do not normally apply direct to universities. Instead they fill out UCAS application forms listing a maximum of five universities chosen from around 125 in total. Their choices will be shaped by what part of the country they favour as a location, the nature of the degree courses offered, whether they prefer an out of town campus university to an inner city university, and above all by what grades the university

is likely to require in their school leaving examinations (A levels). Universities make offers to young applicants having considered their earlier academic performance at school, particularly in national examinations taken at age 16 and 17. Their offers of a place are nearly always conditional on the grades obtained by applicants in their A levels. Prestigious universities require very high grades; less well known institutions require significantly lower grades. At first sight this might appear meritocratic and fair. In practice, however, because prior achievement is paramount it leads to socially segregated universities with unfortunate implications for social mobility. How does this happen?

The secondary schools with the best A level results turn out unsurprisingly to be those with large numbers of pupils from privileged backgrounds. They include fee paying schools, selective state schools and non-selective schools in prosperous areas. Pupils who do not attend such schools are immediately at a disadvantage if they wish to attend a high status university. There are two approaches, which can be taken to mitigate this situation. The first is that universities can stop being so selective and take on a wider range of students with more diverse grades. This does not necessarily mean admitting less able students, although it may mean admitting less prepared students. The debate in the UK is whether or not to look at contextual data, that is, should universities consider the area where an applicant grew up and the quality of the school the pupil went to?

Undoubtedly they should if social justice is to prevail. Thus many pupils may have gone to schools where few transfer to university and where the overall performance in examinations is low. Those pupils who manage to get above average grades even though they do not make top grades are therefore doing well to 'buck the trend' in their poor

schools. Universities should therefore examine the contextual data using information on school performance which is available in the UK as well as on pupil performance.

The view sometimes expressed that students admitted on this basis will not thrive in the hothouse of very selective universities has no basis in fact and is a counsel of despair.

Moreover, it raises questions about the quality of teaching provided in these universities if they fail to develop the potential of these students. The criticism sometimes made by right-wing journalists that admissions policies which compensate for students'

backgrounds is social engineering should be met head on. Social engineering is desirable if it promotes the life chances of young people who have done well academically against the odds, even if they have not done quite as well as their more privileged peers. In the interests of social mobility all universities, but prestigious universities in particular, should become less selective with more diversity in the academic composition of their intake as well as in its social composition. This contrasts with a focus which concentrates entirely on creaming off the very best students into such institutions, many of whom have benefitted from the proverbial silver spoon.

It is often argued that higher education systems should be diverse. It is hard to come out against diversity. Of course research has to be concentrated to be truly productive especially in science and technology but in the UK research funding is now too selective.

All universities should by definition do some research. If they do not they are not universities and do not merit being described as such. There is a place for variations in size, in comprehensiveness in the subjects taught, in the extent to which they prepare students for particular vocations and so on. However, diversity should not mean vast differences in quality and standards with respect to the teaching that is provided, the

assessment that is done, and the preparation of students for employment in graduate level careers. For this reason we should eschew an obsession with so-called world class universities at the expense of creating a world class system of higher education. It is unfortunate if huge gaps are allowed to develop between high status research universities at one end of the spectrum and large comprehensive universities with a vocational orientation at the other end of the spectrum. If this happens it encourages the concentration of rich and privileged students in the former, and poor and underprivileged students in the latter. There is then a danger of a somewhat rigid stratification of institutions becoming embedded. This endangers the role of higher education in supporting social mobility on a wider scale, as I will seek to demonstrate in my concluding section.

Part-time and mature students

There is one respect in which UK policy and practice is more advanced than in most countries in Continental Europe. There are now many opportunities to enter higher education as a mature student and to study part-time. The latest figures (2010-11) show that 38.6 per cent of UK undergraduates start their degrees after the age of twenty five or over and 30.5 per cent of undergraduates study part-time. Thirty years ago such students were concentrated in the Open University and at Birkbeck in the University of London with only small numbers in most other universities. Today many universities cater for them and make efforts to recruit them. This has implications for social mobility because it allows students, who did not proceed directly from school to university, to have a second chance.

Most of these students are in their twenties and early thirties when they embark on a university course, although some of them are much older. For many years part-time students had to pay fees, although they were usually quite low, and they had no access to any form of student support towards their expenses such as books and travel. The supposition was that they were employed and could support their studies out of their earnings or that their employers could help them. Slowly governments have been persuaded to take a different position, providing first some access to the student finance budget to support the costs of their study, and very recently a decision has been made to grant them access to fee loans to be repaid on the same basis as full-time students. Full-time mature students have also received for sometime some additional help with respect to maintenance grants or loans. Moreover institutions have received pro-rata per student funding for part-timers from the government for and there have been fewer restrictions on the expansion of places for them than for full-time students. Many universities recruit part-time and mature students without conventional school leavers' qualifications. Instead they recruit them through special access courses or admit them on the basis of a wide range of alternative vocational qualifications. They also take into account their employment experience. This widens the range of people they are able to consider and avoids forcing older people to follow what can be an off-putting and dispiriting option of taking or retaking school leaving examinations.

It is thus part of the culture of British higher education to support lifelong learning.

These students, often combining study with jobs and with families too in some cases, are not rare birds in the flock without companions in the same position. They are now part of the mainstream. Moreover, they often make good students in spite of earlier failures,

because of their commitment to study and their high aspirations. They want to improve their opportunities for rewarding employment. Many of them do so, although some are thwarted by the attitudes of employers about recruiting people who are older than most new graduates.

The transition from university to employment

To get to university and then to graduate is an enormously important staging post to reach on the route to social mobility. But it is only a beginning. There are further hurdles to surmount before entry into the professions, public and private sector management and other graduate level careers can be attained. Many higher level occupations require further qualifications at postgraduate level before they can be secured. Those that do not such as the higher echelons of the civil service or general management positions in large companies have rigorous and highly competitive selection systems, which ruthlessly weed out all those candidates who do not appear to have sufficiently well developed soft skills as well as high levels of intellectual ability measured both by performance in degree level examinations and further entrance tests before traineeships are offered.

Unquestionably some new graduates are at a considerable disadvantage compared to their peers. First, the cost of additional postgraduate programmes are high in many areas.

Unlike at the undergraduate stage there is no automatic right to a loan to cover the fees that are charged, nor is there support for maintenance for the most part. Thus students without families, who can help finance them through this next stage may feel the burden is too great. Although research evidence about this is scanty, there is anecdotal evidence that students without any means abandon entry into professions such as law because of

the high cost of further study. The introduction of high fees at undergraduate level seems likely to make matters worse since many students will not wish to take on further debt when they graduate. How great an impact this will have is yet to be seen. More opportunities for part-time study combined with paid internships might alleviate the problem as would a large increase in bursaries and scholarships. Were bursaries at undergraduate level to be abandoned, where there is little evidence they make much difference given the universal government loan scheme and the difficulties of accessing information about them, the resources that fund them could be transferred to support postgraduate training.

Second, the information and guidance available to some students is paltry compared with their better-off peers. Those from homes with no contacts in the professions and senior management will find entry into these worlds more difficult. Their families will not know people who offer work experience in vacations or internships for new graduates; because many internships are not publicly advertised 'knowing the right people' is crucial. Nor will those from lower socio-economic backgrounds receive family help on how to navigate the routes into higher level employment. It is therefore imperative that universities improve the information and guidance, which they provide for such students, about their possible destinations and their prospects of attaining them when they graduate. British universities and I believe most European universities are less good at providing such services than in the USA where students are frequently supported through placements with employers when they graduate.

Universities also need to invest in the employability of their students so that they not only acquire knowledge which is relevant and up to date, but also have the soft skills that will

be necessary to make progress in graduate level jobs. More attention is now given to employability than in the past. However, there is still much to be done. For example, schemes using alumni as mentors on a one-to-one basis could become more widespread. Preference should be given to allocating mentors to students without access to informal mentoring at home. The use of employers' panels to advise academic departments, especially but not exclusively in vocational areas, on what they expect from new graduates in terms of up to date knowledge, and technical skills is also valuable. In participating in such activities employers can also learn more about how to reach out to students who will be the first members of their families to become graduates.

Unfortunately the attitudes of many employers of graduates are a third barrier to the social mobility of graduates from lower socio-economic backgrounds. Not only is there little incentive to employers, especially in the private sector, to promote social diversity amongst their employees, their recruitment procedures often unwittingly block mobility. The reason is that they exercise a strong preference for graduates from research-intensive universities quite often to the exclusion of even considering graduates from institutions, which are not on their short list of acceptable places from which to recruit. This means that even the most brilliant students with strong claims to be considered may not even get to the starting gate. The business case for focusing on recruitment from a narrow segment of so-called top institutions is that it is less expensive for employers than drawing their net wider. There is also an in-built prejudice that the best students go to such institutions. Whilst this is obviously true measured in terms of the achievement of students when they left school, it takes too little account either of the progress some

students may have made since, or of the fact that not all able school leavers go to these universities. Moreover they never will.

This restrictive recruitment also has its origins in perceptions about the quality of universities and their teaching which are not necessarily accurate; they may instead be based as much on snobbery or simply familiarity with certain long established institutions and ignorance about others, rather than on the facts. Whatever the causes of employers' behaviour we will not maximise social mobility through higher education until they can be persuaded to be more open-minded about the higher education sector.

This brings me back to the importance of doing everything possible to ensure that all universities are well resourced, able to attract competent academics and leaders with vision, able to be international in their outlook and innovative in their research and teaching. If this is achieved it will be easier to persuade employers that they should see it as part of their social responsibility to have a level playing field across universities in their recruitment policies, which will be equitable with respect to the merit of candidates coming forward. It will also promote greater social mobility because universities vary so much in the social backgrounds and ethnicity of their students.

Conclusion

Schools, universities and employers all play a critical role in opening the doors to responsible, rewarding, highly skilled jobs in knowledge economies. Governments also have an important part to play in developing policies which enhance mobility. If we are to have open societies, which develop talent and support it amongst young people and adults from diverse social backgrounds, we need to be conscious all the time of the need

to intervene to make this happen. Without such intervention those who “already have” will continue to get at the expense of those who “have not”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Panel on Fair Access to the Profession, *Unleashing Aspirations: Summary and Recommendations*, www.thecabinetoffice.gov.uk

HEFCE, *Trends in Young Participation in Higher Education: Core Results for England*, www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2010/201003/

National Audit Office, *Widening Participation in higher education*, HC 725 Session 2007-08/June 2008, www.nao.org.uk

Department for Business Innovation & Skills, *Full-time Participation by Socio-economic Class*, (2010 Update, July), www.bis.gov.uk

The Bridge Group, *Social Mobility through Higher Education, Bridging the Gaps: Current Issues and Focus for 2011/12*, May 2011 www.thebridgegroup.org.uk

European Commission, Eurostat Statistical Books, *Europe in Figures, Eurostat yearbook 2011*, www.ec.europa.eu/eurostat/

Department for Business Innovation & Skills, *Social Mobility: A Literature Review*,

March 2011, www.bis.gov.uk