BAR STANDARDS BOARD

REGULATING BARRISTERS

Exploring differential attainment at BPTC and Pupillage

BSB Research Team, Oliver Jackling

Executive Summary

- The Bar Standards Board is engaged in a major programme of reform of legal education and training known as Future Bar Training, in the context of which a series of research projects have been undertaken. Those projects aim to provide a qualitative and quantitative evidence base to inform the development of proposed changes to the system for qualification as a barrister so as to support the BSB's statutory and strategic regulatory objectives.
- This research report contributes quantitative analysis of high level, aggregate data in relation to the performance of students on the compulsory Bar Professional Training Course (BPTC) and in the extent to which BPTC graduates succeed in progressing to the final stage of training, known as pupillage.

Background

- High-level descriptive analysis of BPTC average (mean) module scores shows that Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) students scored lower than white students; female students scored lower than male students; students who declared a disability scored lower than students who did not declare a disability; and students from lower socio-economic backgrounds (using parental degree or type of school attended as a proxy) scored lower than students from higher socio-economic backgrounds.
- Descriptive analysis of rates of obtaining pupillage also indicates that among BPTC graduates, BME graduates obtained pupillage at lower rates than white graduates, graduates with lower socio-economic status (using parental degree or type of school attended as a proxy) obtained pupillage at lower rates than higher socio-economic status graduates, and female graduates obtained pupillage at lower rates than male graduates.
- This paper presents the results of regression modelling to determine if these differences in mean module scores and success at obtaining pupillage can be accounted for by other characteristics of these students such as academic ability (measured by prior educational achievement) or other characteristics (such as domicile).

BPTC Module Scores

- The findings of this research, based on regression modelling, suggest that even after other variables are controlled for, ethnicity has a significant predictive effect on average module scores, with BME students scoring lower on average than equivalent white students.

- This predictive effect is largest across centrally assessed modules, but also exists in advocacy modules and other compulsory BPTC modules set by providers rather than the BSB.
- Socio-economic status (using parental degree as a proxy) has a small predictive effect for centrally assessed and advocacy modules, but not for other compulsory BPTC modules, where students with no parent with a degree score slightly lower than students with at least one parent with a degree.
- Gender and disability do not have a significant predictive effect for any modules once other variables are controlled for.
- These sorts of educational attainment differences by ethnicity are not unique to the BPTC. There is a substantial body of research which highlights similar differences in other disciplines and at other academic stages.

Obtaining Pupillage

- The findings suggest that even once other variables are controlled for, ethnicity has a significant predictive effect on whether BPTC graduates obtain pupillage. BME BPTC graduates are roughly half as likely to obtain pupillage as white graduates with similar prior educational attainment.
- Socio-economic status (using parental degree as a proxy) also has a significant predictive effect on whether BPTC graduates obtain pupillage, although the statistical model predicts a smaller effect than that of ethnicity. BPTC graduates with no parent with a degree are around two thirds as likely as graduates with at least one parent with a degree to obtain pupillage.
- Gender and disability do not have a significant predictive effect one once other variables are controlled for.

Conclusions and Implications

- The findings of this research indicate that ethnicity has a significant predictive value for BPTC average module scores, and that ethnicity and socio-economic status both have a significant predictive value for success at obtaining pupillage, and add to the evidence base regarding differential attainment in the professional and vocational stages of training for the Bar. Further investigation into the experiences of providers and students has the potential to improve our understanding of these issues and identify how attainment levels among apparently disadvantaged students can be improved. A further analysis of data in relation ethnicity and socio-economic status, particularly based on actual pupillage applications rather than BPTC graduate status alone, may lead to additional and more refined insights which can support the development of the reform programme. Such research could also investigate the extent to which the findings for BME students as a whole may mask different levels of attainment between different groups of BME students.

Background

1. The BSB collects and analyses a range of data on the outcomes of BPTC students, both in terms of their success on the course, and in terms of their success rates at obtaining pupillage. The BSB also collects data on a range of equality and diversity characteristics of BPTC students, in part to monitor if there are any emerging issues around differential attainment on either the BPTC or the award of pupillage that might impact on our regulatory objective to encourage 'an independent, strong, diverse and effective legal profession'.

2. The BSB Risk Outlook[1] identified "lack of diversity; discriminatory working culture and practices" at the Bar as risks to address through its strategic plan. We recognise the potential significance of barriers faced during training, at both the vocational (BPTC) and professional (pupillage) stages of qualifying for the Bar. Any evidence which suggests that certain groups may face disadvantage either on the BPTC or when applying for pupillage is of concern for the BSB as a regulator.

3. The BSB has published since 2014 an annual report[2] summarising both the attainment of students on the BPTC and their success in obtaining pupillage. Since 2014 the BSB has been working with providers both to improve and standardise the way that these data are collected, so as to allow more detailed and accurate comparisons and analysis of the performance of students on the BPTC.

4. The BSB has long noted different levels of attainment on the BPTC between different groups, in particular between white and BME students, male and female students, and home and overseas students, reported in our BPTC Key Statistics publications. While in and of themselves any differential attainment levels are not necessarily a source of concern to the BSB (attainment on the BPTC is likely to reflect, for example, prior educational attainment at degree level, which may differ between different groups of students) we have continued to monitor the data and work to improve our understanding of what it can tell us about performance on the BPTC.

5. As the quality of the data we have collected on BPTC students has improved[3], this has enabled us to look into the performance of different groups of students on the BPTC in more depth. Among a number of points revealed by review of these data were:

    - Those from BME backgrounds achieved an Outstanding or Very Competent grade at a far lower rate than those from White ethnic backgrounds for both UK domiciled and non-UK domiciled groups, and had a higher failure rate on the course, even when grouped by first degree classification.
    - For UK/EU domiciled students, a higher proportion of male graduates from the BPTC achieved an Outstanding or Very Competent overall grade in comparison to females, even when grouped by first degree classification.
    - People who declared a disability achieved an Outstanding or Very Competent grade at a lower rate than those without a disability.

[1] BSB (2016) Risk Outlook - An overview of the legal market and our regulatory priorities
[2] BSB (2017) BPTC Key Statistics Report
[3] The BSB has worked closely with providers to improve the detail and quality of data on BPTC students provided to the BSB, as well as using data collected via the Bar Course Aptitude Test

6. In order to get a more accurate picture of the differences in attainment on the BPTC according to gender, ethnicity and disability, average BPTC module results were compared using BPTC performance data from 2011 to 2016. BPTC students take 12 modules on the course, each of which contributes equally to the final grade they receive. For the purposes of these analyses, only the 10 compulsory modules are included, as the remaining two modules are chosen from a range of different options offered by providers, and as a result including these modules in the average would not have involved comparing like with like across the dataset. In addition, only students who sat all 10 compulsory modules were included, in order to avoid results from students who only sat some of the modules skewing the analysis. This resulted in a dataset of 5,623 students who had taken all compulsory modules (2,190 students who had not sat all of the modules were excluded from the analysis).

7. Figure 1 below illustrates the size of any disparity for BPTC graduates, for those with a 2:2, 2:1 or 1st in their first degree. The differences for ethnicity (both by 2:2, 2:1 and 1st class degree class) gender (for 1st class degree) and parents with a degree (both by 2:1 and 1st class degree) are statistically significant at the 5% significance level[4] or better and highlighted in bold text in Figure 1. Note that for parental degree, the sample is significantly smaller than for the other indicators, as the BSB did not systematically collect this information until 2013 onwards.

Figure 1: Average Compulsory Module Score[5] on the BPTC

	Male	Female	White	BME	Parent with Degree	No parent with Degree	No disability declared	Disability declared
With a 2:2 Degree								
Average module score	68.1	68.0	**70.8**	**67.7**	67.9	67.0	68.1	67.7
With a 2:1 Degree								
Average module score	73.9	73.9	**76.3**	**71.6**	**74.1**	**73.3**	74	74
With a 1st Degree								
Average module score	**79.5**	**78.4**	**80.4**	**74.7**	**79.9**	**78.1**	78.9	79.9

8. While these figures show no differential achievement on the BPTC between those with and without a disability, the indications are that certain groups perform worse than others on the BPTC. For BME students and students with no parents educated to degree level, differential attainment is apparent both for those with a 2:", 2:1 and a 1st in their first degree, while for students with no parents educated to degree level, differential attainment is apparent both for those with a 2:1 and a 1st in their first degree.

[4] This used an independent samples t-test for differences in the mean value across groups

[5] This represents the mean score across all compulsory modules for students who sat all 10 compulsory modules at least once. For students who sat a given module more than once, their final module score was used.

9. Improved data collection has also enabled the BSB to look in more detail at the success rates of different groups in obtaining pupillage. Among a number of points revealed by review of these data were:

    - BME students are less likely to have secured pupillage compared to those of a white ethnic background, even when broken down by first degree classification or by BPTC grade.
    - Students who attended a state school, or whose parents do not have a degree, are less likely to have secured pupillage compared to those who attended a fee-paying school, even when broken down by first degree classification or by BPTC grade.
    - Male students gain pupillage at higher rates than female students, even when broken down by first degree classification or BPTC grade.

10. Figure 2 below illustrates the size of the disparity for home-domiciled BPTC graduates both for those with a 2:1 for their first degree, and for those with a Very Competent grade on the BPTC. The analysis has been restricted to home students who had passed the BPTC course. An unpublished snapshot BSB survey[6] suggests that a large majority of home students (94.5%) intended to practise at the Bar in England and Wales, in sharp contrast to overseas students (where the equivalent proportion was 16.3%). The analysis was also restricted to BPTC graduates – individuals must have completed the vocational stage of training (i.e. the BPTC) before they start the professional stage of training (i.e. pupillage).[7] All the group differences in Figure 2 are statistically significant for those with a 2:1 Degree (aside from gender), for those with a Very Competent BPTC grade, and for those with a 1st Class degree, at the 5% significance level or better.[8] Although there are differences between groups in the proportions gaining pupillage with an 'Outstanding' BPTC grade, none of these are statistically significant.

Figure 2: Success Rates at Obtaining Pupillage, Home-Domiciled BPTC Graduates 2011-2016

	Male	Female	White	BME	Fee-paying School	State School
With a 2:1 Degree						
% obtaining pupillage	36.4%	32.5%	**39.3%**	**18.0%**	**35.7%**	**25.2%**
With a 'Very Competent' BPTC grade						
% obtaining pupillage	39.3%	**33.8%**	**39.4%**	**21.9%**	**40.3%**	**25.3%**
With a 1st Class Degree						
% obtaining pupillage	**61.5%**	**53.0%**	**59.4%**	**41.6%**	**64.1%**	**44.9%**

[6] Stats taken from the internal BSB *2013-14 BPTC Perceptions Survey*.
[7] 2017 *BSB Handbook*
[8] This used a Pearson's chi-squared test for group differences.

With a 'Outstanding' BPTC grade						
% obtaining pupillage	72.5%	71.5%	73.1%	59.0%	66.7%	63.1%

11. These findings raise concerns for the BSB as a regulator that certain groups of students may be less likely to do as well on the BPTC – and less likely to obtain pupillage - than others with equivalent academic ability and attainment. This suggests they might be facing additional barriers and difficulties at both the vocational and professional stages of training.

12. However, there are some limitations to this type of analysis. Grouping students by first degree class, for example, does not take account of factors such as the university at which they studied or the mode of study. Those undertaking the BPTC part-time, for example, may find it more difficult to obtain a high mark, and some groups (such as female students or students from lower socio-economic status backgrounds) may be more likely to be in this situation.

13. As a result, the BSB decided to undertake more advanced statistical analysis to enable a better understanding of the relationship between demographic factors, previous educational attainment and success on the BPTC or success in obtaining pupillage by taking into account a number of different predictive factors simultaneously.

Research Design

14. The following analysis is intended to determine the extent to which the disclosed ethnicity, gender, socio-economic status, or disability, of BPTC students can predict their performance on the BPTC or their success at obtaining a pupillage on graduating from the course.

15. This research uses data from BPTC students over the period 2013-2016, covering module scores, prior educational achievement, and key demographic categories. The key questions addressed in this analysis are:

    - To what extent can the differences in module scores between different groups of students on the BPTC be explained by other characteristics of these students such as academic ability (measured by prior educational achievement) or domicile?
    - To what extent can the differences in success rates at obtaining pupillage between different groups of home graduates from the BPTC be explained by other characteristics of these students such as academic ability (measured by prior educational achievement)?

16. If the analysis indicates that the observed differences between groups of students cannot be explained by other characteristics for which data are available, this suggests that some groups of students may perform differently on the BPTC course or in obtaining pupillage as a result of other factors that we do not have data for, such as, for example, aspects of the teaching, structure or marking on the BPTC, or in selection for pupillage.

17. This analysis uses data from the 2013/14, 14/15, and 15/16 cohorts on the BPTC[9]. This gives an initial dataset of 4,444 students (although the dataset used for individual statistical models in this report is smaller due to excluding students who did not meet certain conditions or who had missing data for one or more of the variables in the analysis). This is the same dataset which is used in the BPTC Key Statistics reports.[10] The data are taken from annual monitoring reports submitted to the BSB by BPTC providers, which is submitted to the BSB by the BPTC providers, alongside additional data collected via the Bar Course Aptitude Test (BCAT). A full table covering the sources of data has been in included in the Technical Annex to this report (page 21).

Methodology and Limitations

18. All statistical analysis included in this report has been undertaken in the SPSS statistical software package. Where differences or variables are described as 'statistically significant', this indicates that they have been tested and found to be statistically significant at the 5% significance level or below (the standard significance level for social research).

19. This research makes use of multiple linear and binary logistic regression analysis to enable a number of different factors that appear to impact on BPTC module scores and success at obtaining pupillage to be considered simultaneously. This ensures the

[9] Earlier BPTC cohorts were not included in the analysis as they had higher levels of missing data for a number of indicators (such as previous degree), and did not collect data at all for certain indicators (such as whether a student attended a fee-paying school).
[10] BSB (2017) BPTC Key Statistics Report

analysis can identify which factors have the strongest predictive effect. Regression analysis is a statistical technique that examines the relationship between a single outcome variable[11] and one or more explanatory variables.[12] Regression analysis models the size of any predictive relationship, and its statistical significance, while controlling for the effects of the other explanatory variables. However, it should be noted that the size of the predictive relationships identified are statistical estimates and thus may be over or under estimated.

20. The data used in this report also have limitations that could potentially impact on the reliability of the findings. The data are primarily based on self-reported demographic information collected from BPTC students, and therefore is reliant on students providing accurate data to BPTC providers and the BSB. In addition, despite overall improvements in the availability of BPTC data, there are still missing data within the sample, ranging from 0.2% for gender to 15.7% for school attended. Cases with any missing data have been excluded from the analysis. As a result, an element of caution should be taken with the findings of the statistical models, as the exclusion of cases with missing data may result in less reliable statistical estimates than if all cases could be included with no missing data. The sample size for each of the regression models is given in the relevant sections of the report.

21. Another limitation is that this statistical approach can only control for variables which are known – other factors, for which data are not available, could also contribute to success at the BPTC and pupillage. As a result, the analysis presented here may present only part of the picture.

22. A further issue to consider (which relates to the pupillage section of the analysis) is that BPTC graduates have up to five years to obtain pupillage after passing the BPTC. As a result, concentrating on three recent BPTC cohorts presents a snapshot of success at obtaining pupillage at a particular point in time rather than representing all of the graduates from these cohorts who will go on to obtain pupillage.

23. In addition, for the pupillage section of the analysis, the sample has been restricted to BPTC graduates rather than actual pupillage applicants, as with the data available there was no way to confirm whether individual students had actually applied for pupillage after completing the BPTC. While available survey data (see paragraph 10) suggests the vast majority of UK domiciled BPTC students intend to apply for pupillage, it cannot be verified with the data available whether they had actually applied in the period covered by the data. As such this analysis should not be read as directly covering the application stage for pupillage, as the analysis may include BPTC graduates who had not applied for pupillage in the period covered. This should be taken into account when interpreting the findings of the analysis – the pupillage findings represent differential attainment in terms of BPTC graduates obtaining pupillage, rather than differential attainment of actual applicants in obtaining pupillage. The BSB proposes to undertake more detailed research on the data from actual pupillage applicants if this can be reliably accessed.

[11] In this case, BPTC module marks, or obtaining a pupillage.
[12] In this case, characteristics associated with BPTC module marks.

Variables

24. Key demographic characteristics available to the BSB on BPTC students were included. The following identifiers were included in the analysis:

    - **Ethnicity** (BME or White) – the ethnicity of the student
    - **Domicile** (Home, EU and Overseas) - the domicile classification of the student (for analysis of BPTC scores but not pupillage success)
    - **Gender** – (Male and Female) the gender of the student
    - **Disability** – Whether the student had declared that they have a disability

    It should be noted here in particular that the ethnicity identifier has not been sub-categorised further than the binary BME / white categories, despite more detailed data on ethnicity sub-categories being available. This has been done to help ensure as robust findings as possible for non-white ethnicities as a whole, but may mask different levels of attainment between different groups of BME students.

25. The analysis also included proxy indicators[13] of socio-economic status available to the BSB. The following variables were included in the analysis:

    - **Parental degree** – whether one or both of the student's parents was educated to at least degree level
    - **School attended** – whether the student went to a fee-paying school or a non-fee paying/state school.

26. The analysis also included indicators of previous educational achievement available to the BSB, as well as whether the student studied the BPTC part time. The following variables were included in the analysis:

    - **Degree Class** (1st, 2:1, or 2:2/other) – the grade the student had received for their previous degree
    - **Degree Institution** (Oxbridge, Russell Group, Overseas, Other) – whether the student attended Oxford of Cambridge, a non-Oxbridge member of the Russell Group, an approved Overseas university, or any other UK university
    - **Part Time** – Whether the student studied the BPTC on a part time basis
    - **BPTC grade** (Outstanding, Very Competent, or Competent) – for the analysis of pupillage success rates, the grade the student obtained on the BPTC is also included in the analysis.

27. For the analysis of BPTC module results, we tested for Centrally Assessed Modules, Advocacy modules, and all other compulsory modules. Initial analysis indicated that differences between groups varied across different groups of modules, and the types of skills assessed and approaches taken to examining them differs for different types of modules on the BPTC. As a result, the decision was taken to group similar sets of module results and analyse each group separately. The three centrally assessed modules (Civil Litigation, Criminal Litigation, and Ethics) were grouped together – these are examined by a mix of multiple choice questions and short answer questions, and are assessed externally rather than by the providers. The three Advocacy modules were also grouped together as they are focused on advocacy skills and grades are determined via an assessed performance. Finally, the remaining four

[13] Both parental levels of education and attendance at a fee-paying school are widely used proxy measures for determining socio-economic status in the UK. Proxy measures are often used in preference to more direct measures (such as parental income) as respondents are more likely to be able to provide an accurate response.

compulsory modules – Opinion Writing, Drafting, Conference Skills, and Resolution of Disputes out of Court – were also grouped together. In contrast, only a single statistical model was run for the analysis of success at obtaining pupillage.

BPTC Module Scores Analysis

Centrally Assessed Modules

28. This analysis investigated the impact of a range of student characteristics on average module scores across the three centrally assessed modules on the BPTC (Civil Litigation, Criminal Litigation, and Ethics). Previous analysis undertaken for the Bar Standards Board Education and Training Committee in 2016 had indicated that differences in average scores (particularly across ethnicity) for these modules were higher than for other modules on the BPTC, and so these modules were grouped together for this analysis. Average scores were analysed only for those students who had sat all three centrally assessed modules, and any cases with missing data for any of the variables included in the model were also excluded. This resulted in a sample size of 2,766 students.

29. In order to more accurately determine the relationship between the different variables and average module scores, a multiple linear regression model was run including all the characteristics identified in paragraphs 24-26. This enables a range of different variables to be controlled for simultaneously, in contrast to Figure 1 in the 'Background' section, which compared module scores only grouped by previous degree class.

30. Variables were coded into dummy variables[14] in order to conduct the regression analysis. Five variables were coded as single variables – gender, declared disability, school attended, parental degree, and studied part time. Three variables – degree class, university attended, and domicile – were represented as multiple dummy variables to enable three or more categories to be represented (1st, 2:1, 2:2 degree; Home, EU and overseas student, and Oxbridge, Russell Group, overseas or other university attended.

31. Following an initial analysis, five variables identified in paragraphs 24-26 (gender, fee-paying school, part-time, attended an overseas university, declared a disability) were excluded from the model as they did not lead to a significant improvement in model validity – ie once the other variables were controlled for, they did not significantly predict the mark a student achieved across the three centralised modules.

32. The 'constant' value for this model was 65.24 – this indicates the baseline value for average scores predicted by the model. In this model the constant indicates the average score across all centralised modules on the BPTC (Civil Litigation, Criminal Litigation, and Ethics) predicted for a white, home domiciled student who went to a university that was not Oxbridge and was not in the Russell group, whose parents did not attend university, and who achieved a grade other than a 1st or 2:1. The other coefficients indicate the difference in predicted scores between a student with that characteristic and the 'constant' value, while holding all other listed variables constant.

[14] A dummy variable is one that takes the value 0 or 1 to indicate the absence or presence of a characteristic, used to sort data into mutually exclusive categories for analysis.

33. The full results of this analysis are included in the Technical Annex (page 22). The regression model was statistically significant, and identified seven variables as having a significant predictive effect on a student's average mark across the three centralised modules when other significant predictors are controlled for:

- **Ethnicity** – BME students scored 4.69 marks lower than white students
- **Domicile** – Overseas domiciled students scored 1.81 marks higher than home or EU domiciled students
- **Parental Degree** - students with at least one degree-educated parent scored 1.57 marks higher than students with no degree-educated parents
- **1st Class Degree** – students with a first-class degree scored 11.27 marks higher compared to students with a 2:2 degree
- **2:1 Class Degree** – students with a 2:1 class degree scored 6.48 marks higher compared to students with a 2:2 degree
- **Oxbridge** – students who went to the universities of Oxford or Cambridge scored 10.91 marks higher compared to students who attended universities outside Oxbridge or the Russell Group
- **Russell Group** - students who went to Russell Group scored 5.60 marks higher compared to students who attended universities outside Oxbridge or the Russell Group.

34. The main predictors are students' previous educational background: whether they obtained a 1st, 2:1 or lower for their previous degree, and whether they attended Oxbridge, Russell Group, or other university. This shows that there is a significant link between prior educational attainment and performance on the BPTC.

35. Once other significant predictors are controlled for, gender and disability no longer significantly predict average module scores for the centrally assessed modules. This suggests that observed differences for these groups are a function of other factors correlated with average module scores, and that once these factors are taken into account, gender or disability no longer have a significant effect on BPTC performance across centralised modules. Similarly, studying part time or attending an overseas university also no longer have a significant effect on BPTC performance once other factors are accounted for.

36. However, as shown by the model, the effect of ethnicity remains significant even after other variables for the previous educational achievement, demographic data and student status are controlled for. This not only suggests that BME students score lower on centralised BPTC modules, but that this difference cannot be accounted for by prior educational attainment or other demographic factors.

37. The model also shows that the predicted effect of having a degree-educated parent remains significant even after other variables for the previous educational achievement, demographic data and student status are controlled for. However, the effect is substantially smaller than the effect observed for ethnicity – being from a BME background is associated with module scores being 4.69 marks lower, whereas having no degree-educated parents is associated with only a 1.57 mark difference. This indicates that students from lower socio-economic backgrounds score lower on centralised BPTC modules, and that this difference cannot be accounted for by prior educational attainment or other demographic factors. While attending a fee-paying school no longer significantly predicts module scores when other factors are controlled for, this does not of itself rule out that students from lower socio-economic

backgrounds face a disadvantage on the BPTC, but rather suggests that having no parents with a degree acts as a better proxy for socio-economic status in this analysis.

38. There are significant correlations between whether a student is BME or has no parent with a degree and several of the other predictors of their average module score for centrally assessed modules. BME students are less likely to have attended an Oxbridge or Russell Group university, and less likely to have a 1st or a 2:1 degree, which are variables associated with higher average marks on centrally assessed modules (although they are more likely to be overseas students, which is associated with higher marks on centralised modules once other variables are controlled for). Similarly, students with no degree-educated parent are also less likely to have attended an Oxbridge or Russell Group university. However, BPTC students with no degree educated parents are also less likely to be BME, which is associated with lower module scores. This analysis indicates that these relationships between ethnicity and socio-economic status and educational predictors of BPTC module scores are not enough of themselves to account for differences in module scores.

39. Once the other variables are controlled for, overseas students are predicted to score higher than the baseline (i.e. home students) which appears to conflict with the fact that overseas students generally perform worse on the BPTC. However, there are significant correlations between whether a student is home or overseas domiciled and several of the other predictors of BPTC module score. Overseas students are more likely to have lower prior educational achievement– overseas students are less likely to have attended Oxbridge or other Russell group universities (despite the fact the majority obtained their degree in the UK), and less likely to have a 1st or 2:1 degree, when compared to home students. As a result, once the prior attainment of overseas students is controlled for, overseas students actually score slightly higher than home students with equivalent levels of prior educational attainment.

Non-Centralised Modules – Advocacy

40. The next analysis investigates the impact of a range of student characteristics on average module scores across the three advocacy modules on the BPTC. Feedback from BPTC students and providers had suggested that overseas students (a higher proportion of whom are BME compared to home students) were more likely to find advocacy modules difficult, as they involve verbal presentation and teamwork which are seen as more challenging for overseas students for whom English is often not their first language. As a result, these modules were also grouped together for analysis. Average scores were analysed only for those students who had sat all three advocacy modules, and any cases with missing data for any of the variables included in the model were also excluded. This resulted in a sample size of 2,827 students.

41. In order to more accurately determine the relationship between the different variables and average module scores, a multiple linear regression model was run including all the characteristics identified in paragraphs 24-26. This enables a range of different variables to be controlled for simultaneously, in contrast to Figure 1 in the 'Background' section, which compared module scores only grouped by previous degree class.

42. Variables were coded as described in paragraph 30 in order to carry out the regression analysis. Following an initial analysis, four variables identified in paragraphs 24-26

(gender, fee-paying school, overseas university, declared a disability) were excluded from the model as they did not lead to a significant improvement in model validity – ie once the other variables were controlled for, they did not significantly predict the mark a student achieved across the three advocacy modules.

43. The 'constant' value for this model was 71.93 – this indicates the baseline value for average scores predicted by the model. In this model the constant indicates the average score across all three advocacy modules on the BPTC predicted for a white, home domiciled student who went to a university that was not Oxbridge and was not in the Russell group, whose parents did not attend university, who studied the BPTC full-time, and who achieved a grade other than a 1st or 2:1 for their first degree. The other coefficients indicate the difference in predicted scores between a student with that characteristic and the 'constant' value, while holding all other listed variables constant.

44. The full results of this analysis are included in the Technical Annex (page 23). The multiple linear regression model was statistically significant, and identified eight variables as having a significant predictive effect on a student's average mark across the three advocacy modules when other significant predictors are controlled for:

- **Ethnicity** – BME students scored 3.94 marks lower than white students
- **Domicile** – Overseas domiciled students scored 0.65 marks lower than home or EU domiciled students
- **Parental Degree** - students with at least one degree-educated parent scored 0.53 marks higher than students with no degree-educated parents
- **Part-time** – Students who studied the BPTC part-time scored 0.96 marks lower than students who studied the BPTC full-time
- **1st Class Degree** – students with a first-class degree scored 5.46 marks higher compared to students compared to students with a 2:2 degree
- **2:1 Class Degree** – students with a 2:1 class degree scored 2.88 marks higher compared to students compared to students with a 2:2 degree
- **Oxbridge** – students who went to the universities of Oxford or Cambridge scored 4.77 marks higher compared to students compared to students who attended universities outside Oxbridge or the Russell Group
- **Russell Group** - students who went to Russell Group scored 2.43 marks higher compared to students who compared to students who attended universities outside Oxbridge or the Russell Group

45. The main predictors are students' previous educational background: whether they obtained a 1st, 2:1 or lower for their previous degree, and whether they attended Oxbridge, Russell Group, or other university. This shows that there is a significant link between prior educational attainment and performance on the BPTC.

46. Once other significant predictors are controlled for, gender or disability do not significantly predict average module scores for advocacy modules. This suggests that observed differences for these groups are a function of other factors correlated with average module scores, and that once these factors are taken into account, gender or disability no longer have a significant predictive effect for BPTC performance across these modules on the BPTC. Similarly, attending an overseas university also no longer has a significant effect on a student's score on advocacy modules once other factors are accounted for.

47. However, as shown by the model, the effect of ethnicity remains significant even after other variables for the previous educational achievement, demographic data and student status are controlled for. This not only suggests that BME students score lower on advocacy BPTC modules, but that this difference cannot be accounted for by prior educational attainment or other demographic factors.

48. The model also shows that the predicted effect of having a degree-educated parent remains significant even after other variables for previous educational achievement, demographic data and student status are controlled for. However, the effect is substantially smaller than the effect observed for ethnicity – being from a BME background is associated with module scores being 3.94 marks lower, whereas having no degree-educated parents is associated with only a 0.53 mark difference. This indicates that lower socio-economic status students score slightly lower on advocacy BPTC modules, and that this difference cannot be accounted for by prior educational attainment or other demographic factors. While attending a fee-paying school no longer significantly predicts module scores when other factors are controlled for, this does not of itself rule out that students from lower socio-economic backgrounds face a disadvantage on the BPTC, but rather suggests that having no parents with a degree acts as a better proxy for socio-economic status in this analysis.

49. For advocacy modules (unlike other BPTC modules) studying part time also acts as a significant predictor of module marks, even after other significant predictors are controlled for, with part-time students scoring lower than full time students – although the predicted difference is small (0.96 marks) when compared to the predictive difference associated with ethnicity or previous education. This suggests that there may be some elements to the teaching or assessment of advocacy modules on the BPTC that pose additional challenges for part-time students.

50. There are significant correlations between whether a student is BME or has no parent with a degree and several of the other predictors of their average score for advocacy modules. BME students are less likely to have attended an Oxbridge or Russell Group university, and less likely to have a 1st or a 2:1 degree, which are variables associated with higher average marks on advocacy modules (although they are more likely to be overseas students, which is associated with lower marks on advocacy modules once other variables are controlled for). Similarly, students with no degree-educated parent are also less likely to have attended an Oxbridge or Russell Group university. However, BPTC students with no degree educated parents are also less likely to be BME, which is associated with lower module scores. However, this analysis indicates that these relationships between ethnicity and socio-economic status and educational predictors of BPTC module scores are not enough of themselves to account for differences in module scores.

51. Unlike the model for centrally assessed modules, once the other variables are controlled for, whether a student is overseas domiciled is significantly associated with average module scores, with overseas students scoring lower than the baseline (ie home students) for advocacy modules, although the predicted difference is small (0.65 marks) when compared to the predictive difference associated with ethnicity or previous education. This suggests that while student feedback suggesting that overseas students perform worse on advocacy modules is accurate, ethnicity is a far stronger predictor of their score than the fact they are overseas students.

Non-Centralised Modules - Other Compulsory Modules

52. The next analysis investigates average module scores across the remaining four compulsory modules on the BPTC (Resolution of Disputes out of Court, Drafting, Opinion Writing, and Conference Skills). The two additional optional modules required to complete the BPTC were not analysed as the range of different topics covered mean direct comparisons would be of limited value. Average scores were analysed only for those students who had sat all four remaining compulsory modules (ie the compulsory modules that are not advocacy-based or centrally assessed), and any cases with missing data for any of the variables included in the model were also excluded. This resulted in a sample size of 2,291 students.

53. In order to more accurately determine the relationship between the different variables and average module scores, a multiple linear regression model was run including all the characteristics identified in paragraphs 24-26. This enables a range of different variables to be controlled for simultaneously, in contrast to Figure 1 in the 'Background' section, which compared module scores only grouped by previous degree class.

54. Variables were coded as described in paragraph 30 in order to carry out the regression analysis. Following an initial analysis, seven variables identified in paragraphs 24-26 (gender, fee-paying school, parental degree, overseas domicile, EU domicile, overseas university, declared a disability) were excluded from the model as they did not lead to a significant improvement in model validity – ie once the other variables were controlled for, they did not significantly predict the mark a student achieved across the across the remaining four compulsory modules.

55. The 'constant' value for this model was 70.57 – this indicates the baseline value for average scores predicted by the model. In this model the constant indicates the average score across all four modules predicted for a white student who went to a university that was not Oxbridge and was not in the Russell group, and who achieved a grade other than a 1st or 2:1. The other coefficients indicate the difference in predicted scores between a student with that characteristic and the 'constant' value, while holding all other listed variables constant.

56. The full results of this analysis are included in the Technical Annex (page 24). The multiple linear regression model was statistically significant, and identified five variables as having a significant predictive effect on a student's average mark across the four remaining compulsory modules when other significant predictors are controlled for:

- **Ethnicity** – BME students scored 3.56 marks lower than white students
- **1st Class Degree** – students with a first-class degree scored 6.03 marks higher compared to students with a 2:2 degree
- **2:1 Class Degree** – students with a 2:1 class degree scored 3.05 marks higher compared to students compared to students with a 2:2 degree
- **Oxbridge** – students who went to the universities of Oxford or Cambridge scored 6.97 marks higher compared to students who compared to students who attended universities outside Oxbridge or the Russell Group
- **Russell Group** - students who went to Russell Group scored 3.48 marks higher compared to students who attended universities outside Oxbridge or the Russell Group

57. Once educational predictors are controlled for, gender and disability do not significantly predict average module scores for advocacy modules. This suggests that any observed differences for these groups are a function of other factors correlated with average module scores, and that once these factors are taken into account, gender or disability no longer have a significant effect on BPTC performance across these modules on the BPTC.

58. In contrast to the models for centrally assessed modules and advocacy modules, neither of the socio-economic status proxies (parental degree or school attended) significantly predict average module scores for the four remaining compulsory BPTC modules. Similarly, a student's domicile or attending an overseas university also no longer has a significant effect on BPTC performance once other factors are accounted for. This suggests that observed differences for these groups are a function of other factors correlated with average module scores, and that once these factors are taken into account, these factors no longer have a significant effect on BPTC performance across these four modules.

59. However, as shown by the model, the effect of ethnicity remains significant even after other variables for the previous educational achievement, demographic data and student status are controlled for. This suggests that BME students not only score lower on other centralised BPTC modules, but that this difference cannot be accounted for by prior educational attainment or other demographic factors.

60. There are also significant correlations between whether a student is BME and several of the other significant predictors of their average module score for other compulsory BPTC modules. BME students are less likely to have attended an Oxbridge or Russell Group university, and less likely to have a 1st or a 2:1 degree, (both of which are variables associated with higher average marks for other compulsory modules). However, this analysis indicates that these relationships between ethnicity and educational predictors of BPTC module scores are not enough of themselves to account for differences in module scores.

Obtaining Pupillage Analysis

61. Unlike the regression models for BPTC module scores, binary logistic regression was used to model the factors that impact on likelihood of obtaining pupillage. While multiple linear regression models the predicted effect of variables on a continuous output variable (ie one with a range of possible values) logistic regression enables the modelling of the predictive effect of variables on a binary output variable (ie one with only two possible values, in this case obtaining or not obtaining a pupillage).

62. For this part of the analysis, the data were restricted to home students who had passed the BPTC course. This was done to reflect the fact that students generally do not take up a pupillage until they have completed the BPTC, and the majority of overseas students do not intend to practise in England and Wales upon completion of the BPTC[15]. By excluding overseas students and students who have not passed the course, this prevents students who cannot yet obtain, or have no intention of obtaining, pupillages from skewing the results of the analysis. In addition, any cases with missing

[15] *BPTC Course Perceptions 2013-14*, BSB internal research

data for any of the variables included in the model were also excluded. This resulted in a sample size of 1,219 students. It should be reiterated here that it cannot be confirmed with the data available for this analysis that each person in the sample was in fact a pupillage applicant**,** rather they are the pool of people most eligible to apply and highly likely to be doing so.

63. Variables were coded as described in paragraph 30 in order to carry out the regression analysis. In addition, the grade a student obtained on the BPTC was included as two dummy variables (Outstanding, Very Competent). Following an initial analysis, five variables identified in paragraphs 24-26 (fee-paying school, gender, declared disability, part-time, 2:1 degree) were not included in the model as they did not lead to a significant improvement in model validity – ie once the other variables were controlled for, they did not significantly predict whether a student obtained a pupillage.

64. The full results of this analysis are included in the Technical Annex (page 25). The logistic regression model was statistically significant, and identified seven variables as having a significant predictive effect on whether a BPTC graduate obtained pupillage when other significant predictors are controlled for. Values given are odds ratios – ie the difference in predicted odds between two groups. Values over one represent a greater chance of obtaining pupillage, while values less than one represent a decreased chance – an odds ratio of 0.5, for example, represents a 50% likelihood compared to the reference category, whereas an odds ratio of 1.5 represents a 150% likelihood.

- **Ethnicity** – BME students were 0.53 times as likely to obtain pupillage than white students
- **Parental Degree** – students with at least one degree-educated parent were 1.58 times as likely to obtain pupillage than students with no degree-educated parents
- **Outstanding** – students who obtained an Outstanding degree on the BPTC were 5.37 times as likely to obtain pupillage than students who obtained a Competent BPTC grade
- **Very Competent** – students who obtained a Very Competent grade on the BPTC were 2.38 times as likely to obtain pupillage than students who obtained a Competent BPTC grade
- **1st Class Degree** – students with a first-class degree were 2.21 times as likely to obtain pupillage compared to students without a 1st Class degree
- **Oxbridge** – students who went to the universities of Oxford or Cambridge were 5.47 times as likely to obtain pupillage compared to students who attended universities outside Oxbridge or the Russell Group
- **Russell Group** - students who went to Russell Group universities were 2.12 times as likely to obtain pupillage compared to students who attended universities outside Oxbridge or the Russell Group

65. This analysis shows that BME graduates from the BPTC are significantly less likely to obtain pupillage than white graduates who have similar prior attainment at degree level and on the BPTC itself. Similarly, graduates from lower socio-economic backgrounds (the fact that fee-paying school is no longer significant suggests parental degree functions better as an indicator of socio-economic status in this analysis) are also significantly less likely to obtain pupillage than other graduates who have similar prior attainment at degree level and on the BPTC.

66. As might be expected, there is a strong correlation between prior attainment, both on the BPTC and at first degree level, and success at obtaining pupillage. An 'Outstanding' BPTC grade is associated with being 5.37 times as likely to obtain pupillage, while attending Oxbridge is associated with being 5.47 times as likely. In addition, having a first class degree, attending a Russell Group university, or obtaining a Very Competent grade on the BPTC, are all also associated with an increased chance of obtaining pupillage. The fact that Outstanding and Very Competent grades are stronger than other educational predictors of success at obtaining pupillage (other than attending Oxbridge) is particularly noteworthy given that some pupillage places are awarded to students before they graduate from the BPTC. This suggests that those who eventually perform best on the BPTC are highly likely to possess the sorts of skills and attributes sought by pupillage providers, even where their final grade is not available to pupillage providers when making an offer.

67. There are significant correlations between whether a BPTC graduate is BME or has no parent with a degree and several of the other predictors of successfully obtaining pupillage. BME graduates are less likely to have attended Oxbridge, less likely to have a 1st class degree, and less likely to have obtained an Outstanding grade on the BPTC, which are variables associated with higher likelihood of obtaining pupillage. Similarly, students with no degree-educated parent are less likely to have attended an Oxbridge or Russell Group university, and less likely to have obtained an Outstanding grade on the BPTC, all variables associated with higher likelihood of obtaining pupillage. However, this analysis indicates that these relationships between ethnicity and socio-economic status and educational predictors of BPTC module scores are not enough of themselves to account for differences in successfully obtaining pupillage.

Summary and Conclusions

BPTC

68. The findings for the three regression models analysing BPTC module scores show that once other variables are controlled for, ethnicity has a significant predictive effect on average module scores. The analysis suggests that the effect is largest across centrally assessed modules, but also exists in advocacy modules and other compulsory modules.

69. Similarly, socio-economic status also has a significant predictive effect on BPTC module scores for centrally assessed module scores and advocacy module scores, even after other predictors are controlled for. In contrast to ethnicity, the effect for socio-economic status is relatively small, particularly for advocacy modules, and as such might not present cause for concern in the same order as the findings relating to ethnicity. Gender and disability, in contrast, do not have a significant predictive effect for any of the grouped BPTC modules once other variables are controlled for, suggesting that differences observed across male and female students and disabled and non-disabled students on the BPTC are the function of factors other than their gender or disability status.

70. The fact that ethnicity significantly affects average module scores, even after variables such as prior educational achievement are controlled for, raises potential concerns that

BME students may face disadvantage on the BPTC. The implication of this research is that BME students achieve lower marks on the BPTC than white students of equivalent academic ability.

71. These sorts of educational disparities by ethnicity are not unique to the BPTC. There is a substantial body of past research which highlights similar disparities at other academic stages such as degree attainment[16] and in examinations for those studying medicine[17]. Studies which have controlled for other factors associated with academic performance have shown that differences in attainment for ethnicity cannot be fully accounted for even when other variables are controlled for.[18] Further research highlights that this difference for ethnicity regularly occurs in Multiple Choice Question tests, with BME candidates scoring notably lower than their white counterparts.[19]

72. Understanding the reasons for differential achievement across ethnic groups is challenging and complex. Factors suggested by the research evidence have included cultural bias in exams and assessment, differences in cultural context, differences in social capital, different learning and personality styles, cultural stereotyping, and other factors.

Pupillage

73. The findings for the regression model analysing success at obtaining pupillage shows that even once other variables are controlled for, ethnicity has a significant predictive effect on whether BPTC graduates obtain pupillage. The size of this predictive effect indicates that BME graduates are around half as likely as equivalent white graduates to obtain pupillage, according to the statistical model.

74. Similarly, the statistical model indicates that being from a lower socio-economic background (using parental degree as a proxy for socio-economic status) also has a significant predictive effect on whether BPTC graduates obtain pupillage, even when other predictive characteristics are controlled for. The size of this predictive effect is lower than the predictive effect of ethnicity, with graduates with no degree-educated parents being around two-thirds as likely to obtain pupillage as equivalent graduates with degree-educated parents.

75. The fact that ethnicity and socio-economic status both significantly affect success at obtaining pupillage, even after variables such as prior educational achievement are controlled for, raises potential concerns that BME graduates and lower socio-economic status graduates might face particular barriers in applying for pupillage that contribute to their lower success rates at obtaining pupillage. The implication of this research is that BME and lower socio-economic students are significantly less successful at obtaining pupillage than higher socio-economic status, white students of equivalent academic ability and achievement. As discussed in paragraph 23, this analysis reflects the success of BPTC graduates (rather than pupillage applicants) at obtaining pupillage, and thus the analysis cannot identify whether the barriers faced are at the

[16] Richardson, J (2008) *The Attainment of Ethnic Minority Students in UK Higher Education,* Studies in Higher Education, 33, No 1, 33-48
[17] Woolf, K (2011) *Ethnicity and academic performance in UK trained doctors and medical students,* BMJ, 2011; 342, d901
[18] Fielding et al (2008) *Degree Attainment, Ethnicity and Gender – Interactions and the modifications of effects*
[19] Klein et al (1997) *Gender and Racial/Ethnic Differences in Performance Assessments in Science,* Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19(2), 83-97

stage of application for pupillage or occur earlier in the training pathway. As such, the differences observed may reflect differing approaches to applying for pupillage, as well as a range of different factors (such as relevant legal work experience, social capital, access to accurate information, and the structure of the pupillage application process) that contribute to differential levels of success between different groups. Qualitative research undertaken for the BSB investigates the nature of barriers faced by different groups in more detail.[20]

76. While differences in educational attainment for ethnicity on the BPTC are mirrored in other educational contexts, there is less evidence that could serve as a direct comparison for differential success in obtaining pupillage due to the unique role pupillage plays as a gateway to the profession and the limited number of places available each year. However, there is a range of past research that suggests BME applicants or lower socio-economic status can face disadvantage in job applications and at interview, which may in part mirror the differential attainment found between groups in applying for pupillage.

Implications

77. For a regulator, the findings of this research are a potential source of concern. Diminished access to the profession among BME students, or students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, raises issues for the BSB as we have a statutory regulatory objective to promote a diverse profession, and obligations under the Equality Act 2010 (see our Equality Objectives for 2017-19). A lack of diversity within the profession was identified as one of the key Risk Themes in our 2016 Risk Outlook.

78. Further investigation into the experiences of providers and students on the BPTC, and BPTC graduates in applying for pupillage, have the potential to improve our understanding of these issues and identify how attainment levels among apparently disadvantaged students can be improved. In addition, further analysis of data in relation ethnicity and socio-economic status, particularly if based on actual pupillage applications rather than BPTC graduate status alone, may lead to further and more refined insights which can support the development of the reform programme. Such research could also investigate the extent to which the findings for BME candidates as a whole may mask different levels of attainment between different groups of BME students.

[20] Bar Standards Board (2017) *Barriers to training for the Bar – A qualitative Study*

Technical Annex

This technical annex includes a fuller breakdown the details and sources of the data used in this analysis. It also includes statistical details of the regression models detailed in the main report.

Sources of Data

Variable	Description	Source
Ethnicity	(BME or White) – the ethnicity of the student	Data from BPTC providers via ARR[21]
Domicile	(Home, EU and Overseas) - the domicile classification of the student	Data from BPTC providers via ARR
Gender	(Male or Female) the gender of the student	Data from BPTC providers via ARR
Disability	(Yes or No) Whether the student had declared that they have a disability	Data from BPTC providers via ARR
Parental degree	(Yes or No) whether one or both of the student's parents was educated to at least degree level	Monitoring data collected via BCAT[22]
School attended	(Fee paying or State/other) Whether the student went to a fee-paying school or a non-fee paying/state school.	Monitoring data collected via BCAT
Degree Class	(1st, 2:1, or 2:2/other) – the grade the student had received for their previous degree	Data from BPTC providers via ARR
Degree Institution	(Oxbridge, Russell Group, Overseas, Other) - whether the student attended Oxford or Cambridge, a non-Oxbridge member of the Russell Group, an approved Overseas university, or any other UK university	Data from BPTC providers via ARR
Part Time	(Yes or No) Whether the student studied the BPTC on a part time basis	Data from BPTC providers via ARR
BPTC grade	(Outstanding, Very Competent, or Competent) the grade the student obtained on the BPTC	Data from BPTC providers via ARR
Centrally Assessed Module Score	(Score out of 100) Mean score across the three centrally assessed BPTC modules - Criminal Litigation, Civil Litigation and Ethics	Data from BSB Centralised Assessments Team
Advocacy Module Score	(Score out of 100) Mean score across the three BPTC advocacy modules	Data from BPTC providers via ARR
Other Compulsory Module Score	(Score out of 100) Mean score across the four remaining compulsory BPTC modules - Resolution of Disputes out of Court, Drafting, Opinion Writing, and Conference Skills	Data from BPTC providers via ARR
Pupillage Obtained	(Yes or No) Whether the student had obtained a pupillage, as of end of June 2017	Pupillage registration data from the BSB

Regression Model – Centrally Assessed Modules

See page 11 of the report for discussion of this analysis.

[21] BPTC institutions must provide the BSB with data on each year's cohort of students as part of the Annual Reflective Review process. This includes demographic data held on their student cohort and data held on their previous degree attainment, as well as all module scores and final grades obtained by their students.
[22] The Bar Course Aptitude Test collects a range of demographic information from those taking the test as part of the BSB's monitoring work.

Model Summary			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.597	0.356	0.354	9.335214

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	132775.73	7	18967.962	217.65675	<.000
Residual	240349.27	2758	87.146217		
Total	373125	2765			

Coefficients							
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	65.243	0.561		116.301	<.000	64.143	66.343
BME	-4.692	0.500	-0.201	-9.384	<.000	-5.672	-3.712
Overseas Domicile	1.813	0.497	0.077	3.648	<.000	0.838	2.787
Parental Degree	1.570	0.377	0.065	4.164	<.000	0.831	2.310
Degree 1st	11.272	0.611	0.383	18.440	<.000	10.074	12.471
Degree 2:1	6.475	0.464	0.275	13.950	<.000	5.565	7.385
Oxbridge	10.905	0.636	0.295	17.146	<.000	9.658	12.152
Russell Group	5.599	0.398	0.228	14.058	<.000	4.818	6.380

Regression Model – Advocacy Modules

See page 13 of the report for discussion of this analysis.

Model Summary			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.595	0.354	0.352	5.697056

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	50018.639	8	6252.330	192.638	<.000
Residual	91462.275	2818	32.456		
Total	141480.914	2826			

Coefficients							
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	71.932	0.347		207.268	<.000	71.251	72.612
BME	-3.939	0.302	-0.277	-13.027	<.000	-4.532	-3.346
Overseas Domicile	-0.654	0.303	-0.045	-2.157	.031	-1.248	-0.060
Parental Degree	0.531	0.228	0.036	2.323	.020	0.083	0.979
Part Time	-0.961	0.454	-0.033	-2.117	.034	-1.852	-0.071
Degree 1st	5.456	0.370	0.302	14.744	<.000	4.730	6.181
Degree 2:1	2.882	0.279	0.201	10.340	<.000	2.336	3.429
Oxbridge	4.768	0.389	0.210	12.257	<.000	4.005	5.530
Russell Group	2.426	0.241	0.162	10.049	<.000	1.953	2.899

Regression Model – Other Compulsory Modules

See page 15 of the report for discussion of this analysis.

Model Summary			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.621	0.385	0.384	5.666896

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	46017.269	5	9203.454	286.590	<.000
Residual	73379.816	2285	32.114		
Total	119397.084	2290			

Coefficients							
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	70.571	0.344		205.004	<0.000	69.896	71.247
BME	-3.556	0.271	-0.242	-13.113	<0.000	-4.088	-3.024
Degree 1st	6.029	0.409	0.315	14.752	<0.000	5.227	6.830
Degree 2:1	3.049	0.297	0.209	10.266	<0.000	2.467	3.632
Oxbridge	6.965	0.432	0.292	16.135	<0.000	6.118	7.811
Russell Group	3.483	0.264	0.228	13.186	<0.000	2.965	4.001

Regression Model – Pupillage

See page 17 of the report for discussion of this analysis.

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients			
	Chi-square	df	Sig.
Model	310.688	7	<0.000

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test			
	Chi-square	df	Sig.
Model	10.025	8	0.263

Model Summary		
-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1275.504	0.225	0.309

Classification Table			
	Predicted		
	Pupillage		Percentage Correct
	0	1	
0	648	138	82.4
1	190	243	56.1
			73.1

Variables in the Equation								
	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
BME	-0.636	0.205	9.634	1	0.002	0.530	0.355	0.791
Parent Degree	0.459	0.147	9.795	1	0.002	1.582	1.187	2.109
Degree 1st	0.795	0.145	29.857	1	<0.000	2.213	1.665	2.943
Outstanding	1.680	0.363	21.470	1	<0.000	5.367	2.637	10.924
Very Competent	0.866	0.337	6.616	1	0.010	2.378	1.229	4.602
Oxbridge	1.700	0.196	75.233	1	<0.000	5.473	3.727	8.035
Russell Group	0.753	0.170	19.591	1	<0.000	2.123	1.521	2.963
Constant	-2.833	0.347	66.484	1	<0.000	0.059		