

EXPLORING YOUNG PEOPLE'S PERCEPTION AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS THEIR POTENTIAL PROGRESSION TO UNIVERSITY – A SCOTTISH RURAL PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to provide an exploratory analysis of young people's perception and attitudes towards their potential progression to higher education (HE). These young people belonged to three Scottish state secondary schools whose catchment areas are mainly rural. Our investigation has three objectives. Firstly, it wishes to determine whether these pupils perceived barriers to HE access. Secondly, it wants to reveal how they felt about going to university. Thirdly, it seeks to give an indication on their perception of their parents, school and peers' enthusiasm about them going to HE.

This investigation builds on Lasselle *et al.* (2015) and complements Lasselle (2016). Lasselle *et al.* (2015) started to gather evidence on the access to HE from some Scottish rural communities, in particular Argyll & Bute, Highlands and Islands. They notably reported that (1) most of these communities are not located in the 20% most deprived areas in Scotland and (2) the three-year average progression rate to HE of the 47 state secondary schools located in these areas is lower than the Scottish national average of 36%. It is in the light of these two facts that they examined real and perceived barriers to HE access from these communities. In this paper, we focus on some quantitative aspects of this research, the qualitative aspect having been presented in Lasselle (2016).

The literature usually distinguishes four types of real or perceived barriers to HE in the UK: financial barriers, geographical barriers, educational barriers and personal barriers (*cf.* for instance Connor and Dewson 2001; Forsyth and Furlong 2003; Gorard *et al.* 2007; Kintrea *et al.* 2011; Hartas 2016). Lasselle *et al.* (2015) explored each of them in the case of these rural communities. They highlighted that all pupils from these areas faced large pecuniary and non-pecuniary costs to study in HE. In many cases, these costs were thought to be higher because of where these young people lived.

Links between geographical factors and low participation in HE have recently been studied in Ireland by Walsh *et al.* (2015), in England and Wales by Gibbons and Vignoles (2013) and in Scotland by Skerratt *et al.* (2012). Frenette (2004) explained the low participation of rural young people by the costs of moving from 'home' and the fact that they might not see the benefits resulting from tertiary education. However, it is the link between socio-economic factors and participation in HE that is usually studied (Gorard *et al.* 2007; Croxford and Raffe 2013; Riddell 2014; Raffe and Croxford 2015). Multiple factors affect progression to HE, including parents' occupations and income, peers, low educational attainment or the area where young people live.

The overrepresentation of students from the most affluent backgrounds studying at university has made widening access to HE a priority for the Scottish government. The geographical aspect has driven the government agenda and its dimension is measured by the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation¹ (SIMD thereafter). In November 2014, the First Minister of Scotland strongly advocated that her government's ambition is that "*a child born today in one of the most deprived communities should, by the time he or she leaves school have the same chance of going to university as a child born in one of the least deprived communities*" (Scottish Government 2014). The Scottish government appointed

¹ Cf. Appendix A for more information.

a Commission on Widening Access whose final report with 37 recommendations² was published in March 2016. Recommendation 32 clearly states 2030 as the deadline year to achieve the First Minister's ambition of equality of access to HE in Scotland and sets intermediate targets for each Scottish HE institution to meet in order to progress towards the equality goal (Commission on Widening Access 2016). All these targets and the equality goal are set against the 20% most deprived areas, *i.e.* the first SIMD quintile.

This is problematic for Scottish rural areas³ as the SIMD is known to better capture deprivation in urban areas than that in rural areas (Scottish Government, 2012, p 7 and Skerratt *et al.*, 2014, p 79). Lasselle *et al.* (2015, p 6) pointed out that none of the 47 state schools have a postcode in the 20% most deprived areas, ten have a postcode in the 40% most deprived areas, while 19 have a postcode in the 40% least deprived areas. They also highlighted the greater variation of progressions to HE year on year than other areas of Scotland. They noted that 28 out of 47 schools have a lower than three-year average progression rate to HE. These differences in terms of SIMD quintiles and progression are expected and need to be interpreted with cautious. Only the pupils who live in the close vicinity of the school share the school's postcode. As the secondary schools in rural areas usually have large catchment areas, most of their pupils' home address does not have the school's postcode. As these schools can be very small, any change in number can lead to large variations in percentage.

A second problem for rural areas arises from the Commission's final report. Access to HE for those from rural areas could not be examined due to lack of time to the regret of the commissioners (Commission on Widening Access 2016, p 69). This led them to require "further work to support equal access for other group of learners (...)."

Our paper aims to fill this absence. It gathers evidence to provide a better understanding of the perception of access to HE and attitudes towards HE from those living in these areas. We focus on S5/Year 12 and S6/Year 13 pupils from three secondary schools whose catchment areas are mainly rural. We analyse their answers to a questionnaire these pupils filled in on two occasions, in November 2014 and again in March 2015.

Our paper is organised as follows. Section 2 provides some background information about rurality, perception and attitudes. Section 3 presents the research questions and the methodology. Research findings are gathered in Section 4 and discussed in Section 5. Section 6 concludes.

Rurality, perceptions and attitudes

Our approach is close to James *et al.* (1999) in spirit. The latter examined "the attitudes, goals and plans of Australian senior high school students via a survey of over 7,000 students in grades 10-12 in three states, complemented by interviews with about 350 students in 20 rural schools" (James *et al.*, 1999, 1). Their findings were threefold. Firstly, the participation in HE for people in these areas was more influenced by socio-economic circumstances than distance to university and "the cost of HE [was] a serious barrier to rural students". Secondly, these rural students were more likely to perceive the direct costs of going to university (*e.g.* living away from home) and its indirect costs such as the

² The government accepted the Commission's targets and indicated that it will give careful consideration to its other recommendations (BBC, 14 March 2016).

³ We refer to the six-fold classification (*cf.* Appendix A for more information). As highlighted by OECD (1997), Scotland is mainly rural (more than 75% of the territories are rural, but 75% of the population live in urban areas).

loss of friendship. Thirdly, these students were less likely to be encouraged by their parents to attend university and might not see the benefit of HE in terms of careers.

Our work departs from theirs on several aspects. Our scale was much smaller. Our research questionnaire was not only filled in by senior high school students, but also by some junior high school ones. It was less detailed and was not designed to capture the community aspect. However, it had the advantage to be used on two occasions.

More recent research in the UK and Australia extended the results of the analysis of James *et al.* (1999). For instance, the Victoria Auditor-General's Office (2014, p 3) reported that “one in three rural school leavers defer their university offer, compared with one in 10 metropolitan school leavers” and “fewer rural school leavers apply for university, fewer were offered places and fewer accept the places they are offered”. Spielhofler *et al.* (2011) explained how rural young people's aspirations could be impacted by some structural factors such as transport and distance between education and training providers. So did the Commission for Rural Communities in England⁴ (2012) when it emphasised the problem of public transport and the lack of careers advice in some areas in rural England.

Generally speaking, the main obstacles to access to HE faced by rural young people are financial and usually linked to the lack of access to convenient public transport and work-related features. As most educational providers are located in urban areas, relocation expenses and housing costs are rather large. The lack of public transport prevents young people's mobility. The work-related features can also affect their aspirations towards HE. Indeed, there are limited work opportunities in these rural communities, few of these request a tertiary education and earnings are usually low. These conditions might prevent people to leave their community. On the one hand, they cannot leave because it is too expensive. On the other hand, why should they enter into HE and build up debt if their wish is to return to live in their communities at the end of their studies? Finally, low participation of rural people in HE can be explained by the lack of educational choices and poor educational attainment in some communities.⁵

Research questions and methods

This paper explores young people's perception and attitudes towards their potential progression to university. It rests on the exploratory analysis of a serial questionnaire filled in by some S5/Year 12 and S6/Year 13 pupils from three Scottish state secondary schools with rural catchment areas in November 2014 and again in March 2015. It addresses three research questions:

- What obstacles to their going to university did S5 or S6 pupils in these three schools perceive?
- How much were they enthusiastic or motivated about going to university?
- Did they perceive their parents, school or peers' enthusiasm about them going to university?

The serial questionnaire was first distributed in November 2014. S6 and some S5 pupils wishing to enter into HE then were in the process of completing their application to an

⁴ It aimed to tackle rural disadvantage and was abolished in 2013.

⁵ The Victoria Auditor-General's report (2014, p 23) emphasised two “*additional challenges (...): the difficulty [to retain or attract] qualified teaching staff and the difficulty [to provide] a breadth of subjects and a range of education models that suit all learning types*”.

undergraduate HE course to one of the UK HE institutions.⁶ The questionnaire was again circulated in March 2015. Most pupils then knew if their application was either rejected or accepted with or without conditions. All participants gave their written consent prior to fill in the survey. Parents or guardians gave their written consent for their child to be part of this research.⁷

The catchment area of each of these three schools is mainly rural. One school is small and is located on one of the Scottish islands. The other two schools are in Scottish mainland; one being relatively larger than the other one. Each school has a three-year progression rate to HE equal or less than the three-year Scottish national average of 36%. Two schools are located in the 40% least deprived areas in Scotland and the third one in the 40% most deprived areas in Scotland.

161 pupils⁸ responded to all questions about perception and attitudes in November 2014 and March 2015. The majority of these pupils were in S5 (52.2%), 16 years old (54.7%) and female (51.6%). Almost of these pupils lived with their parents or guardians during weekdays and weekends during school-term time. The vast majority had both parents or guardians in paid work. A significant minority of the participants (29.2%) declared that their parents or guardians went to university and completed a degree course. However, 13.7% of our respondents were unable to say if their parents or guardians went to university. Almost three-quarters of them (72%) indicated that one of their relatives went to university.

The majority of our participants thought that they would go on to education and training when they leave school, their preferred destination being university. Three-quarters of them indicated that their parents had encouraged them to go to university. Half of them acknowledged their teacher's encouragement and only 30% of them that of their peers. More than three-quarters of them thought that they will get a job when they finish their schooling, training or education! More than 45% of them stated that they needed a degree to do what they wanted to do in their life and a small majority were already ready to go into paid work.

The questionnaire was designed to measure the qualitative change in pupils' perception and attitudes. It comprised three sections. The first section collected the research participants' characteristics including gender, where they lived during weekdays or weekends during school-term time, the educational background of their parents or guardians. In the second section, young people could indicate whether they had the intention to apply to university, to go to further education and training when they leave school and their likelihood to get a job. The third and final section addressed their perception of barriers to their going to university, their own attitudes or the perceived attitudes from those who knew them best towards this potential progression. This final

⁶ Applications to most HE undergraduate courses taught in the UK have to be submitted by mid-January every year. Each candidate can apply up to five courses. Applications to some courses (e.g. medicine) or those taught at the University of Cambridge and the University of Oxford must be completed by mid-October of the previous calendar year.

⁷ The research underwent the University of St Andrews ethics approval process (UTREC code: MN11198).

⁸ A total of 218 questionnaires were returned on both occasions. For this research, we excluded all participants who (1) gave blank responses when a response was expected or (2) did not follow the instructions, e.g. they ticked more than one category when only one category should have been ticked.

section was mainly composed of a list of statements. The research participants could either 'strongly agree' (SA), or 'agree' (A), or 'strongly disagree' (SD), or 'disagree' (D), or 'neither agree or neither disagree' (NA/ND) with the statement. The list of possible options followed the format of a typical five-level Likert scale.

Our exploratory analysis was twofold. On the one hand, we wanted to characterise the perception and attitudes of pupils towards their potential progression to university. On the other hand, we wanted to measure if this perception or these attitudes changed over time.

We measured perception and attitudes from the response frequencies to statements. To facilitate our analysis, we grouped the 'I agree' and the 'I strongly agree' options. We also gathered the 'I disagree' and the 'I strongly disagree' options. The number of categories for each statement then dropped from five to three: 'Strongly Agree, Agree' (SA/A), 'Neither Agree, Neither Disagree' (NA/ND), and 'Strongly Disagree, Disagree' (SD/D). Secondly, we aggregated answers of each of the three categories for each statement regardless gender, class and location and we examined the result. So we considered that our respondents perceived financial barriers to their going to university if most participants agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "*it will cost too much for me to go to university*". In the same way, we considered that many respondents did not perceive geographical barriers to their going to university if a significant proportion of participants disagreed or strongly agreed with the statement "*I would like to attend a university as close to home as possible*". We interpreted the statement 'neither agree/neither disagree' as 'don't have much of an opinion'.

For the over-time analysis, we compared the aggregated answers (in each of the three categories per statement) obtained in November 2014 and those obtained in March 2015. We assumed that any five percentage-point difference⁹ between the aggregated answers represented a change in perception (or attitudes). For instance, if the percentage-point change from November 2014 to March 2015 for the category 'D/SD' was + 7.0 for a given statement, we considered that there was a change in perception (or attitudes) regarding this statement over time. If the percentage-point change from November 2014 to March 2015 for the category 'SA/A' was - 2.3, we considered that there was no change in perception (or attitudes) over time.

Key findings from the analysis of the serial questionnaire

Perception of barriers

We shall begin by highlighting that almost 40% of the respondents¹⁰ felt that there were no obstacles to their going to university. This relatively high percentage should not shadow two facts. Firstly, a significant minority of participants (almost 30%) felt that there were obstacles to their going to university. Secondly, respondents reported specific types of barriers in other parts of the questionnaire.

With the noticeable exception of the financial barriers, more than 60% of participants in November 2014 or in March 2015 did not feel geographical or qualifications obstacles to their access to HE or did not have much of an opinion about them.

Specifically, the strongest barriers felt by our participants were the financial barriers. More than half of them indicated their concerns that "*it will cost too much [for them] to*

⁹ The five percentage-point cut-off point is arbitrary. In the context of this paper, it represents a movement of eight responses (out of 161) from one of our three categories to the other two.

¹⁰ Responses to each of the three categories per statement are gathered in Table 1 available in Appendix B.

go to university” in November 2014. Our participants did not think that distance was an issue. Only a quarter of them would like to attend a university as close to home as possible regardless the time period they filled in the questionnaire. However, qualifications were perceived as an obstacle by a stronger minority of our respondents, i.e. almost a third of them in November 2014.

The perception of financial and geographical obstacles seemed to decrease over time. The percentage of pupils reporting financial barriers decreased by eight percentage points between November 2014 and March 2015. There was a five percentage-point increase in the volume of answers in the ‘D/SD’ category for the statement “*I would like to attend a university as close to home as possible*”, making it close to 47%!

Own attitudes and others’ perceived attitudes to their potential progression to HE
We shall begin by highlighting that the vast majority of our participants had positive attitudes about their potential progression to university. Almost three-quarters of them (73.3%) felt that they would enjoy going to university and almost two-thirds of them (64.6%) were motivated to go to university in November 2014. Although these positive attitudes continued to dominate a few months later, the former decreased by more than six percentage points and the latter by slightly less than three in March 2015. In both cases, it is the category ‘D/SD’ to the statements “*I feel that I will enjoy going to university*” and “*I am motivated to go to university*” which marks the change in attitude, a seven percentage-point increase for the former and an eight percentage-point increase for the latter!

More than 70% of our participants reported that their parents were enthusiastic about them going to university. The percentages were also high when they referred to their school (58.4%) and their peers (49.7%). However, there was a change in these perceived attitudes over time. Less respondents acknowledged the positive perceived attitudes from their parents and their peers in March 2015. More pupils recognised their school’s enthusiasm. Indeed, there were noticeable increase in the number of pupils disagreeing with the statement “*My peers are enthusiastic about me going to university*” and decrease in that agreeing with the statement “*My parents are enthusiastic about me going to university*”. The percentage-point increase regarding the perceived school’s enthusiasm almost reached seven, making the percentage similar to that of parents, i.e. 65.2%.

Discussion

Our exploratory analysis of our participants’ responses has addressed our initial three research questions concerning young people’s perceived barriers to their university access and their attitudes towards their potential progression to university. Four main research findings emerge. Firstly, a significant minority of research participants did not perceive any barriers to their going to university. Secondly, if the majority of them considered cost as a major issue, their perceived obstacles tended to decrease over time. Thirdly, although their positive attitudes remained high over time, they were weaker in March 2015 than in November 2014. Finally, although the enthusiasm they perceived from their parents persisted over time, less pupils acknowledged it in March 2015 and more recognised their school’s enthusiasm.

Some of our results on barriers to HE access are similar to those available in the literature. For instance, costs were a major issue for our rural pupils as in James *et al.* (1999). As Gibbons and Vignoles (2013) already highlighted, the geographical factor had little or no impact to their going to university for the majority of our respondents.

Our simple quantitative investigation complements the qualitative analysis presented in Lasselle (2016). The latter rested on the analysis of the interviews of young people and

their educators living in some Scottish remote and rural communities. Our exploratory analysis of our participants' responses to a serial questionnaire allows us to shed a new light on these interviews. We are now able to mitigate the height of perceived barriers of these young people. We could say that some participants felt obstacles to their HE access, but these might not be as high as those elaborated in some interviews. Nevertheless, in terms of perceived obstacles to university access, we have two unexpected results: (1) the absence of perceived barriers for a strong minority of respondents and (2) the feeling that perceived barriers decreased over time. Their absence could be explained by the fact that some respondents did not want to go to university in the first place. Recall that the three-year progression rate to HE in each of these three schools is equal or below the Scottish national average of 36%. The decline could be explained twofold. It may result from the decision of some respondents not to go to university after all. It could also be linked to the fact that some of the respondents received offers from the universities they had applied for. Remember that the questionnaire was circulated the second time in March 2015 when unconditional or conditional offers were usually known to applicants. It is easy to imagine that when an applicant receives one or more offers, potential geographical or educational obstacles to HE access can 'automatically' disappear.

The results on attitudes detailed those available in Lasselle *et al.* (2015). When asked who encouraged them to go to university, the vast majority of respondents indicated their parents or guardians and, to a lesser extent, their school. Therefore it is perhaps not surprising that similar percentages were found on young people's perceived enthusiasm from both groups. The role of parents and teachers on the decision-making process of young people towards the pursuit of HE study is documented in the literature (*cf.* Blenkinsop *et al.* 2006 or Gorard *et al.* 2007). Nevertheless, we have two surprising results. The level of perceived enthusiasm from parents remained high, but it decreased over time and that from the school grew. In the first case, it is unexpected. Indeed, it is usually perceived that parents are less supportive towards potential HE progression in rural areas (*cf.* James *et al.* 1999). The decrease could be explained by the fact that the outcomes of applications were known by March 2015. The change in perceived enthusiasm from school could be explained twofold. Firstly, teachers in rural communities are among the rare members of the community to have experienced HE. In the eyes of our participants, they could be well placed to show their encouragement and enthusiasm. Recall that many reported that their parents or guardians did not go to HE. Secondly, as some of our respondents were in the second half of the academic year of S5/Year 12 when they filled in the questionnaire in March 2015, it was the time when schools might give more information about tertiary education.

This above discussion highlights the importance of the class level and the deadline for applications to HE courses when one investigates perception and attitudes towards potential progression to HE. In November 2014, S6/Year 13 pupils were more likely to apply to university than S5/Year 12 pupils. Information sessions on the HE admissions process organised by schools were then at their pick for the S6/Year 12 pupils. As a result, perception of barriers and perceived attitudes from the school between year groups could be different. In March 2015, S6/Year 13 pupils knew the outcomes of their applications while S5/Year 12 pupils gave more thoughts of HE. It was then the time for their applications to university summer schools and subject choices in S6.

Concluding comments

This short paper investigated the perception and the attitudes of young people towards their potential progression to HE. These young people were S5/Year 12 and S6/Year 13 pupils attending three Scottish state secondary schools whose catchment areas are mainly rural. Our investigation was based on a questionnaire filled in by 161 pupils in November 2014 and again in March 2015. It led to four outcomes. Firstly, we highlighted that a significant minority of participants felt that there were no barriers to their going to HE. Nevertheless, pecuniary obstacles to university access were the most likely to be perceived, although they tended to decrease over time. Thirdly, our research participants were very positive about their going to university but fewer reported these good spirits in March 2015. Finally, the vast majority perceived the enthusiasm about them going to university from their parents. However, fewer acknowledged it in March 2015 and many more recognised their school's enthusiasm.

We are in the process of extending our results in two directions. On the one hand, we will analyse the perception and attitudes of these young people according to gender, location or class. On the other hand, we will make a panel data analysis. Indeed, as our dataset contains all the responses of the same individuals to the same questionnaire over two dates, we can track if each of our research participants change their mind over time. For instance, if a female respondent ticked 'I agree' in November 2014 and 'I neither agree, nor disagree' in March 2015 for a given statement, we could conclude that she has changed her mind regarding this statement overtime. However, if a male pupil ticked 'I agree' in November 2014 and 'I strongly agree' in March 2015, we could conclude that he did not change his mind. By aggregating these movements, we will be able to assess whether these young people are likely to change their mind regarding barriers to HE access or their attitudes towards their potential progression to HE. These two directions should allow us to examine more accurately perception and attitudes over time.

Appendix A: Clarification of some terms

Scottish index of multiple deprivation (SIMD)

In Scotland, deprivation is measured by the Scottish index of multiple deprivation. Scotland is divided in datazones. Each zone measures the level of deprivation according to different factors, including employment, health, education, geographical access to basic public services or crime. All zones are aggregated by quintile from the 20% most deprived zones to the 20% least deprived zones.

Scottish Government 6 fold Urban Rural Classification (more information at <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/About/Methodology/UrbanRuralClassification>)

Our definition of rural and remote areas in Scotland follows the 6 fold Urban Rural Classification. Each of our three state secondary schools is in one of the categories defined by this classification. Two are in 'remote rural areas' and one is 'in other urban areas'. As their respective catchment area is rather large and mainly rural, their pupils are very likely to come from categories 5 or 6.

- 1 - Large Urban Areas: Settlements of 125,000 or more people.
- 2 - Other Urban Areas: Settlements of 10,000 to 124,999 people.
- 3 - Accessible Small Towns: Settlements of 3,000 to 9,999 people and within 30 minutes drive of a settlement of 10,000 or more.
- 4 - Remote Small Towns: Settlements of 3,000 to 9,999 people and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more.
- 5 - Accessible Rural: Areas with a population of less than 3,000 people, and within a 30 minute drive time of a settlement of 10,000 or more.
- 6 - Remote Rural: Areas with a population of less than 3,000 people, and with a drive time of over 30 minutes to a settlement of 10,000 or more.

Appendix B: Table

Table 1: Section 3 of the questionnaire

Statement	Response	November 2014 (frequency)	November 2014 (in percentage)	Change from November 2014 to March 2015 (frequency)	Change from November 2014 to March 2015 (in percentage points)
I do not feel that there are any obstacles to my going to university.	SA/A	63	39.1%	+ 0	+ 0.0
	NA/ND	52	32.3%	+ 1	+ 0.6
	D/SD	46	28.6%	- 1	- 0.6
I would like to attend a university as close to home as possible.	SA/A	41	25.5%	- 2	- 1.2
	NA/ND	45	28%	- 6	- 3.7
	D/SD	75	46.6%	+ 8	+ 5.0
I feel concerned that	SA/A	84	52.2%	- 13	- 8.1

it will cost too much for me to go to university.	NA/ND	40	24.8%	+ 0	+ 0.0
	D/SD	37	23.0%	+ 13	+ 8.1
I do not think I will have the right qualifications to go to university.	SA/A	53	32.9%	- 5	- 3.1
	NA/ND	47	29.2%	+ 2	+1.2
	D/SD	61	37.9%	+ 3	+1.9
I feel that I will enjoy going to university.	SA/A	119	73.9%	- 10	- 6.2
	NA/ND	29	18.0%	- 3	- 1.9
	D/SD	13	8.1%	+ 13	+ 8.1
I am motivated to go to university.	SA/A	104	64.6%	- 6	- 3.7
	NA/ND	25	15.5%	- 6	- 3.7
	D/SD	32	19.9%	+ 12	+ 7.5
My parents are enthusiastic about me going to university.	SA/A	113	70.2%	- 8	- 5.0
	NA/ND	24	14.9%	+ 7	+ 4.3
	D/SD	24	14.9%	+ 1	+ 0.6
My peers are enthusiastic about me going to university.	SA/A	80	49.7%	+ 3	+ 1.9
	NA/ND	41	25.5%	+ 6	+ 3.7
	D/SD	40	24.8%	- 9	- 5.6
My school is enthusiastic about me going to university.	SA/A	94	58.4%	+ 11	+ 6.8
	NA/ND	41	25.5%	- 8	- 5.0
	D/SD	26	16.1%	- 3	- 1.9
I do not need a degree to do what I want to do in my life.	SA/A	43	26.7%	- 8	- 5.0
	NA/ND	44	27.3%	+ 9	+ 5.6
	D/SD	74	46.0%	- 1	- 0.6
I am not ready to go into paid work yet.	SA/A	45	28.0%	- 10	- 6.2
	NA/ND	30	18.6%	+ 14	+ 8.7
	D/SD	86	53.4%	- 4	- 2.5

NB:

SA/A: strongly agree / agree; NA/ND: neither agree / neither disagree; D/SD: disagree / strongly disagree.

The means and the standard deviation associated with each statement (at both time periods) are available upon request from the author.

References

BBC (2016). Report aims to tackle Scottish university inequality. Retrieved 27 February 2016 from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-35804363>.

Blenkinshop, S., Mc Crone, T., Wade, P. & Morris M. (2006). How do young people make choices at 14 and 16? Research Report No 773. National Foundation for Educational Research, Department for Education and Skills.

Commission for Rural Communities (2012). Barriers to education, employment and training for your people in rural areas. Retrieved 16 April 2017 from <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/15199/1/Barriers-to-education-employment-and-training-for-young-people-in-rural-areas.pdf>.

Commission on Widening Access (2016). *A blueprint for fairness*. Retrieved 27 February 2017 from <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0049/00496535.pdf>.

Connor, H. & Dewson, S. (2001). *Social class and higher education: Issues affecting decisions on participation by lower social class groups*. Nottingham: Department for Education and Employment.

Croxford, L. & Raffe, D. (2013). Differentiation and social segregation of UK higher education 1996-2010, *Oxford Review of Education*, 39 (2), 172-192.

Forsyth, A. & Furlong, A. (2003). *Losing out? Socioeconomic disadvantage and access to higher education*. Bristol: The Policy Press/Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Frenette, M. (2004). Access to college and university: does distance to school matter? *Canadian Public Policy/Analyse de Politiques*, 30 (4), 427-443.

Gibbons, S. & Vignoles, A. (2012). Geography, choice and participation in higher education in England, *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 42, 98-113.

Gorard, S., Adnett, N., May, H., Slack, K., Smith, E. & Thomas, L. (2007). *Overcoming the barriers to higher education*. Oakhill, VA: Trentham Books.

Hartas, D. (2016). Young people's educational aspirations: psychological factors and the home environment, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 19 (9), 1145-1163.

James, R., Wyn, J., Baldwin, G., Hepworth, G., McInnis, C. & Stephanou, A. (1999). Rural and isolated schools students and their higher education choices. Commissioned Report No. 62. Centre for the Study of Higher Education and Youth Research Centre, the University of Melbourne and the National Board of Employment, Education and Training, Higher Education Council.

Kintrea, K., St Clair, R. & Houston, M. (2011). *The Influence of parents, places and poverty on educational attitudes and aspirations*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Lasselle, L. (2016). Barriers to higher education entry – a Scottish rural perspective, *Scottish Educational Review*, 48(1), 78-88.

Lasselle, L., Kirby, G. & Macpherson, R. (2015). *Access to higher education for rural communities: An exploratory analysis*. Retrieved 27 February 2016 from <https://hdl.handle.net/10023/7553>.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2008). *OECD rural policy reviews Scotland, UK*. Paris: OECD.

Raffe, D. & Croxford, L. (2015). How stable is the stratification of higher education in England and Scotland? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36 (2), 313-335.

Riddell, S. (2014). *Key informants' views of higher education in Scotland*, Working Paper 5, Centre for Research in Education Inclusion and Diversity, University of Edinburgh.

Scottish Government (2012). *SIMD, Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation*. Retrieved 27 February 2017 from <http://simd.scotland.gov.uk/publication-2012>.

Scottish Government (2014). *First Minister – Programme For Government*. Retrieved 27 February 2017 <http://news.scotland.gov.uk/Speeches-Briefings/First-Minister-Programme-for-Government-12b1.aspx>.

Skerratt, S., Atterton, J., Brodie, E., Carson, D. et al. (2014). *2014: Rural Scotland in focus report*. Edinburgh: Rural Policy Centre, SRUC, Scotland's Rural College.

Spielhofler, T., Golden, S. & Evans, K. (2011). *Young people's aspirations in rural areas*. Slough: NFER.

Victorian Auditor-General (2014). *Access to education for rural education*, PP No 305, Session 2010-14.

Walsh, S., Flannery, D. & Cullinan, J. (2015). Geographic accessibility to higher education on the island of Ireland, *Irish Educational Studies*, 34 (1), 5-23.