

# Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant Cohort 2 (Wave 1)

**Centre for Research in Social Policy**

Elspeth Pound  
Yekaterina Chzhen  
Monica Magadi  
Viet-Hai Phung

**National Centre for Social Research**

Juliet Michaelson  
Steven Finch  
Emily Tanner  
Helen MacKenzie

## October 2006

On behalf of the Department for Education and  
Skills and the Learning and Skills Council

# CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 The Adult Learning Grant	1
1.2 The Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant	2
1.3 Cohort 2 Survey Design	4
1.3.1 Applicants	4
1.3.2 Non-applicants	5
1.3.3 Response and weighting	7
1.4 Structure of the Report	8
1.4.1 Report conventions	8
<b>2 BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNERS</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Definitions of Groups for Analysis	10
2.2 General Characteristics	11
2.2.1 Age and gender	11
2.2.2 Ethnicity	13
2.2.3 Family and living arrangements	14
2.2.4 Parental education level	17
2.2.5 Health and disability	17
2.2.6 Comparison between survey and administrative data: age, gender, ethnicity	18
2.3 Activity Status	20
2.3.1 Current activity	20
2.3.2 Details of Current Jobs	22
2.3.3 Previous Activity	24
2.3.4 Main reason for stopping previous activity	27
2.4 Income	32
2.5 Qualifications	36
2.5.1 Qualifications achieved prior to 2004/5	36
2.5.2 Qualifications studied in 2004/5	39
2.5.3 Comparison of qualifications obtained with those studied in 2004/5	42
2.6 Summary	45
<b>3 LEARNERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNING, SOURCES OF INFORMATION, AND REASONS FOR STUDYING</b>	<b>46</b>
3.1 Responses to Attitudinal Statements	46
3.2 Sources of Information, Advice and Guidance on Further Education	48
3.3 Reasons for Choosing Current Course	50
3.4 Summary	54

<b>4</b>	<b>COSTS AND FUNDING OF LEARNING</b>	<b>55</b>
4.1	Introduction	55
4.2	Costs of Courses	56
	4.2.1 Payment of tuition fees	56
	4.2.2 Payment of registration and exam fees	66
4.3	Sources of Funding	70
	4.3.1 Education Maintenance Allowance	70
	4.3.2 Other FE funding	73
4.4	Employer Training Pilots	75
4.5	Reasons for Not Applying for ALG	76
4.6	Summary	76
<b>5</b>	<b>APPLICATIONS FOR, RECEIPT AND SPENDING OF ALG</b>	<b>78</b>
5.1	Experiences of ALG Application	78
	5.1.1 Where awardees obtained an ALG application pack	79
	5.1.2 Advice on ALG application	80
5.2	Receipt and Spending of ALG	82
	5.2.1 Receipt of ALG	82
	5.2.2 Recipients' spending of ALG payments	86
5.3	Summary	93
<b>6</b>	<b>WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES ALG MAKE?</b>	<b>94</b>
6.1	Influence of ALG on Whether to Study	94
6.2	Influence of ALG on Whether to Study Full-Time	97
6.3	Influence of ALG on Whether to Continue the Course	101
6.4	Summary	103
<b>7</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>105</b>
7.1	Background Characteristics of Learners	105
7.2	Experiences of Applying for ALG	106
7.3	Effect of ALG on Learner's Decisions and Choices	106
<b>ANNEX A</b>	<b>AWARDEES AND NON-APPLICANTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNING, BY BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS</b>	

## INDEX OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1.1	Take up of ALG by area for 2004/5	2
Table 1.2	Eligibility groups for ALG	4
Table 1.3	Assignment of eligibility groups for Cohort 2 applicant sample	5
Table 1.4	Learning Aim Codes of Qualifications at Level 2 or 3 included in the Sample File irrespective of width or awarding body	7
Table 2.1	Breakdown of applicant and awardee samples	10
Table 2.2	Distribution of age at interview of awardees and non-applicants	11
Table 2.3	Age groups of awardees and non-applicants by gender and ALG area	12
Table 2.4	Ethnicity breakdown of awardees and non-applicants	13
Table 2.5	Living arrangements of awardees and non-applicants	14
Table 2.6	Tenure status of awardees and non-applicants	15
Table 2.7	Whether respondents had children aged Under 16 for awardees and non-applicants	16
Table 2.8	Parental education of respondents for awardees and non-applicants	17
Table 2.9	Gender of ALG awardees, from survey data and administrative data	18
Table 2.10	Age of ALG awardees, from survey data and administrative data	19
Table 2.11	Ethnicity of ALG awardees, from survey data and administrative data	19
Table 2.12	Main current activity of awardees and non-applicants, by ALG Areas	20
Table 2.13	Awardees: activity status by receipt of ALG	21
Table 2.14	Number of hours spent in supervised learning by awardees and non-applicants	22
Table 2.15	SOC 2000 classification of current job	22
Table 2.16	Size of current employer of awardees and non-applicants who worked	23
Table 2.17	Main prior activity of awardees and non-applicants, by ALG areas	24
Table 2.18	Awardees: previous activity of those currently in full-time education, by ALG area	25
Table 2.19	Non-applicants: previous activity of those currently in full-time education, by ALG area	26
Table 2.20	Main reason for stopping previous activity by previous activity group - those who changed from full-time work to part-time work or education with a job	27
Table 2.21	Main reason for stopping previous activity by previous activity group - these awardees who changed from full-time work to not working	28
Table 2.22	Main reason for stopping previous activity by previous activity group – those awardees and non-applicants who changed from part-time work or education with a job to not working	29

Table 2.23	Main reason for stopping previous activity by previous activity group – those awardees and non-applicants who changed from part-time work or education with a job to full-time work	30
Table 2.24	Main reason for stopping previous activity by previous activity group – those awardees and non-applicants who changed from not working to part-time work, full-time work or education with a job	31
Table 2.25	Distribution of respondents' earnings from salaried or self-employment for awardees and non-applicants	32
Table 2.26	Distribution of earnings for respondents and their partners for awardees and non-applicants	33
Table 2.27	Receipt of benefits by awardees and non-applicants	33
Table 2.28	Distribution of amount received annually from benefits by awardees and non-applicants by area	34
Table 2.29	Distribution of total income (earnings and benefits) of awardees and non-applicants (including partner's income, where applicable)	35
Table 2.30	Highest qualification level obtained prior to 2004/5	36
Table 2.31	Qualification types achieved – total and by respondents currently studying at Level 2 and Level 3	37
Table 2.32	Highest vocational qualification level obtained prior to 2004/5 – awardees	38
Table 2.33	Highest academic qualification level obtained prior to 2004/5 – awardees	38
Table 2.34	Highest level of study during 2004/5	39
Table 2.35	Highest level of study during 2004/5 – total and by respondents currently studying at Level 2 and Level 3	40
Table 2.36	Most common subjects currently being studied	41
Table 2.37	Awardees: level of study by highest level obtained	42
Figure 2.1	Highest level of qualifications obtained for awardees currently studying at Level 2	43
Figure 2.2	Highest level of qualifications obtained for awardees currently studying at Level 3	44
Table 2.38	Awardees: level of current study, including whether first Level 2 or 3 studying at Level 3	44
Table 3.1	Distribution of awardees and non-applicants by expressed attitudes towards learning	47
Table 3.2	Sources of information, advice and guidance on further education	48
Table 3.3	Most useful sources of information, advice and guidance on further education	49
Table 3.4	Most useful sources of information, advice and guidance on further education by age	50
Table 3.5a	Awardees' and non-applicants' specific reasons for taking course not related to their job or related but not-compulsory	51
Table 3.5b	Awardees and non-applicants studying for non-compulsory job-related courses - specific reasons for taking current course	52
Table 3.6	Awardees' and non-applicants' reasons for taking current	

	course, by age	52
Table 3.7	Awardees' and non-applicants' reasons for taking current course, by level of current qualification aim	53
Table 3.8	Awardees' and non-applicants' reasons for taking current course, by ethnicity	54
Table 4.1	Payment of tuition fees by awardees, recipients and non-applicants by LSC area	56
Table 4.2	Payment of tuition fees by awardees and by background characteristics	58
Table 4.3	Payment of tuition fees by awardees by activity and income, by old and new areas	59
Table 4.4	Payment of tuition fees by non-applicants by activity and income, by old and new areas	60
Table 4.5	Payment of tuition fees by awardees by current qualification aim, by old and new areas	61
Table 4.6	Payment of tuition fees by non-applicants by current qualification aim, by old and new areas	61
Table 4.7	Payment of tuition fees by awardees by living arrangement	62
Table 4.8	Payment of tuition fees by non-applicants by living arrangement	62
Table 4.9	Amount of tuition fees paid by awardees (and family/partner) by gender, by old and new areas	63
Table 4.10	Amount of tuition fees paid by non-applicants (and family/partner) by gender, by old and new areas	63
Table 4.11	Amount of tuition fees paid by awardees and non-applicants (and family/partner) by background characteristics	64
Table 4.12	Amount of tuition fees paid by awardees and non-applicants (and family/partner) by activity, qualifications and income	65
Table 4.13	Payment of registration and exam fees by awardees and non-applicants by LSC area	66
Table 4.14	Payment of registration and exam fees by awardees and non-applicants by learner characteristics	68
Table 4.15	Payment of registration and exam fees by awardees and non-applicants by activity, qualification, and income	69
Table 4.16	Per cent of awardees and non-applicants who had heard of EMA, by LSC area	70
Table 4.17	Per cent of awardees and non-applicants who had ever applied for and received EMA, by LSC area	72
Table 4.18	Applications for various forms of funding by awardees and non-applicants during academic year ending August 2005	73
Table 4.19	Applied for any source of Learner Support Funds during academic year ending August 2005 by awardees and non-applicants, by area	74
Table 4.20	Discussions about and participation in ETP-type schemes by awardees and non-applicants, by ETP and non-ETP areas	75
Table 4.21	Non-applicants' reasons for not applying for ALG	76
Table 5.1	Where awardees obtained ALG application pack, by age, level of current qualification aim, living arrangement and current activity	79
Table 5.2	Where awardees obtained help or advice on ALG application	80

Table 5.3	How useful ALG telephone helpline is to awardees, by background characteristics	81
Table 5.4	Success rates for ALG applications in 2004-2005, by LSC area	82
Table 5.5	Success rates for ALG applications in 2004-2005, by ethnic origin	83
Table 5.6	Awardees receiving ALG, by LSC area	84
Table 5.7	Awardees receiving ALG, by background characteristics	85
Table 5.8	Reasons for non-take up of ALG in old and new areas	86
Table 5.9	How ALG was spent, by LSC area	87
Table 5.10a	How ALG was spent in old areas, by age, gender and living arrangement	88
Table 5.10b	How ALG was spent in new areas, by age, gender and living arrangement	89
Table 5.11a	How ALG was spent in old areas, by ethnic origin	89
Table 5.11b	How ALG was spent in new areas, by ethnic origin	90
Table 5.12a	How ALG was spent in old areas, by current activity status	90
Table 5.12b	How ALG was spent in new areas, by current activity status	91
Table 5.13a	How ALG was spent in old areas, by level of current qualification aim	91
Table 5.13b	How ALG was spent in new areas, by level of current qualification aim	92
Table 5.14a	How ALG was spent in old areas, by annual income	92
Table 5.14b	How ALG was spent in new areas, by annual income	93
Table 6.1	Whether recipients would still have gone ahead with their course if ALG had not been awarded, by LSC area	94
Table 6.2	Whether recipients would still have gone ahead with their course if ALG had not been awarded, by age, gender, ethnicity, and living arrangement	95
Table 6.3	Whether recipients would still have gone ahead with their course if ALG had not been awarded, by activity, qualification, and income	96
Table 6.4	Whether recipients would have studied part-time if ALG had not been awarded, by decision to study full-time before or after having heard of ALG	97
Table 6.5	Whether recipients would have studied part-time if ALG had not been awarded, by LSC area	98
Table 6.6	Whether recipients would have studied part-time if ALG had not been awarded, by age, gender, ethnicity, and living arrangement	99
Table 6.7	Whether recipients would have studied part-time if ALG had not been awarded, by current activity, level of current study, and income	100
Table 6.8	Whether recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by LSC area	101
Table 6.9	Whether recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by age, gender, ethnicity, and living arrangement	102
Table 6.10	Whether recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by current activity, level of current study, and income	103

Table A1	'I didn't get anything useful out of school', by background characteristics	i
Table A2	'I wish I'd gone to university', by background characteristics	ii
Table A3	'Education as an investment in your future', by background characteristics	iii
Table A4	'I don't' have the confidence to learn on my own', by background characteristics	iv
Table A5	'Learning is something you should do throughout your life', by background characteristics	v
Table A6	'I like the idea of learning in new ways such as through the internet or using CD Roms', by background characteristics	vi
Table A7	'Learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it', by background characteristics	vii
Table A8	'Computers are confusing and make things more difficult', by background characteristics	viii
Table A9	'It is the responsibility of the learner to pay for his or her learning', by background characteristics	ix
Table A10	'Employers should pay for their employees to learn', by background characteristics	x

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The authors wish to express their appreciation to the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and to the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) who sponsored the evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant (ALG). We are particularly indebted to Peter Vallely and to Paul Froggatt for their helpful comments and advice during the design and implementation of the surveys, and continued support throughout the evaluation exercise.

We are grateful to representatives of the Individual Learner Record and the ALG administrative provider for their cooperation with the study. Special thanks to learners who participated in the study, for taking their time to respond to the telephone survey.

Last but not least, our appreciation to Clare Lawson and Rebecca Hand at CRSP for their valuable administrative support to the project and for editing and formatting the study report.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1 Introduction

The Adult Learning Grant (ALG) aims to support adults who have not yet obtained their first Level 2 or first Level 3 qualification. The ALG is intended to help adults with the additional costs of learning (for example, books, travel) through the provision of a means-tested monetary grant. The grant (up to £30 per week paid during term time) is available to learners earning up to £19,000 (or up to £30,000 if the learner cohabits with a partner in paid employment). The grant is subject to strict eligibility criteria and award relies on learners demonstrating that they meet criteria relating to UK residency, age, proposed course of study, level of prior achievement, and that they intend to study at a designated learning provider. The grant is targeted at full-time adult learners studying for their first full Level 2 qualification and aged over 19 years of age, or full-time learners studying for their first full Level 3 qualification and aged between 19 and 30 years of age. Manchester City Council (MCC) administers the grant.

The ALG pilot was announced as part of the 2003 Skills Strategy<sup>1</sup>. In September 2003, ALG was launched in 10 English Learning and Skills Council (LSC) areas. In 2004, the ALG pilot was extended to 9 additional LSC areas in the North East and South East areas. The take up of ALG by area for 2004/5 is shown in the table below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Department for Education and Skills (2003) *21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills – Realising our Potential: Individuals, Employers, Nation* (CM5810) London: HMSO.

ALG awards	
<b>Old pilot areas</b>	
Bedfordshire & Luton	254
Black Country	287
Devon & Cornwall	611
Durham	211
Humberside	438
Lancashire	890
Leicestershire	373
London West	343
Shropshire	134
South Yorkshire	475
<b>New pilot areas</b>	
Berkshire	37
Hampshire & Isle of Wight	232
Kent	209
Milton Keynes, Oxfordshire & Buckinghamshire	126
Surrey	33
Sussex	192
Northumberland	16
Tees Valley	143
Tyne & Wear	171
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,175</b>

## 2 The Evaluation

The Centre for Research in Social Policy (CRSP) at Loughborough University and the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) are evaluating ALG on behalf of the Department for Education and Skills and the National Office of the Learning and Skills Council.

The evaluation comprises both a qualitative study and longitudinal surveys of 2 cohorts of learners in ALG pilot areas.

The evaluation has 5 key objectives, to:

- 1 measure the extent to which ALG improves retention and attainment among the eligible population in pilot areas;
- 2 determine whether ALG graduates progress to further learning or into employment and whether there are any associated improvements in their labour market status;
- 3 examine the effect of ALG on learners' choices on level of qualification, course, type of learning, and working patterns;

- 4 determine differences in the performance of ALG between pilot areas, men and women, and young people who are independent and those living with parents; and
- 5 explore implementation of the ALG at local level and identify good practice.

The report presents findings from Cohort 2 Wave 1, and contributes to objectives 1, 3, and 4.

A second wave survey will report on Cohort 2 learners in 2007, and will present analyses of ALG influence over qualification attainment and transitions in employment and further learning associated with receipt of ALG (evaluation objectives 1 and 2).

A qualitative study, addressing objective 5, has already been published<sup>2</sup>.

Cohort 2 comprises learners studying during the 2004/5 academic year in 1 of 19 pilot areas. Learners consist of FE learners applying for ALG for the first time ('the applicants'), and FE learners screened by age, level and mode of study, and who had not applied for ALG ('the non-applicants'). Cohort 2 learners were surveyed during the summer of 2005 (Wave 1) and will be followed up during the summer of 2006 (Wave 2).

Please note that Cohort 1 comprised learners studying during the 2003/4 academic year in 1 of the 10 original pilot areas. Findings from Cohort 1 Wave 1<sup>3</sup> and Wave 2<sup>4</sup> are reported elsewhere.

### **3 Survey Design and Methods**

The sample of ALG applicants was drawn from records held by the administrative provider, Manchester City Council (MCC). The records contained details of all learners who had applied for ALG as at May 2005. The file was stratified by the local LSC pilot areas, with the same selection probability used for each area. The sampling frame for cohort 2 contained 8,211 cases. A proportionate sample of 3,432 applicants were targeted. The total number of full achieved interviews was 2,248, a response rate of 66%. Weights were derived that accounted for potential response bias on the basis of background characteristics (area, region, age and gender).

The non-applicant sample was drawn from the Individualised Learner Record (ILR) held by the LSC, from the database with the details of all qualifications being studied by learners within FE. Data were extracted from the ILR in April 2005. As the records on the database were at the level of individual qualifications, rather than learners, two stages of work on the sample were required: first, constructing a

---

<sup>2</sup> Pound, E., Maguire, M., Middleton, S., Ashton-Brooks, K. (2004). 'A qualitative investigation into the first year (pilot) implementation of the Adult Learning Grant', Department for Education and Skills Research Brief: RBX12-04, November 2004.

<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RBX12-04.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Cohort 1, Wave 1 findings have already been reported to the DfES (see Pound, E., Magadi, M., Michaelson, J., Finch, S., Stafford, B. (2005) *Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant: Cohort 1 Wave 1*).

<sup>4</sup> Magadi, M. et al., *Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant: Cohort 1 Final Report* (forthcoming).

sample frame of eligible learners and then drawing a sample. This gave a sample frame of 21,096 learners. A sample of 3,572 was randomly selected from the sample frame. During fieldwork, 132 cases were removed for being duplicates with the applicant sample. The total number of full achieved interviews was 1,004, which is a response rate of 29% of the revised issued sample of 3,440. After ineligible respondents had been removed, the final achieved sample was 930 respondents. As for applicants, weights were derived for the non-applicant sample that corrected for potential response bias (area, region, age and gender).

## 4 Report Structure

Throughout the report (except experiences of applying for and receiving ALG) the analysis focuses on comparisons between 'non-applicants' and ALG 'applicant' sub-groups: 'Awardees' ('applicants' awarded ALG) and 'Recipients' (defined as awardees who were receiving ALG payments at the time of survey or had received at least 1 payment before they were stopped or withheld). Where appropriate, area and cohort comparisons are reported.

The findings relate to:

- background characteristics;
- attitudes towards learning;
- costs and funding of learning;
- experiences of applying for and receiving ALG; and
- recipients' perceptions of what difference ALG made.

## 5 Key Findings

### 5.1 Profile of ALG awardees and eligible non-applicants

#### 5.1.1 Diversity of ALG awardees

The age breakdown for ALG awardees (from administrative data) was as follows:

#### Age break-down of those awarded ALG

Age	18-19*	20	21-24	25-31
% of ALG awardees	35	28	24	13

\* Note 18 year olds can apply if close to their nineteenth birthday

Please note, the take up of ALG by over 30s was low because they are only eligible for level 2 learning, and 80% of ALG study was at level 3.

The gender split for 2004/5 was 53% female and 47% male, which was the same as for the previous year. The gender split in FE as a whole is 59% female, 41% male.

A considerable number of learners from ethnic minority groups have taken up ALG (20% of ALG awardees); and those of Asian origin are particularly strongly represented. There was a slight decline on 2003/4 take up by non-white people, but the proportion of non-white people taking up ALG was still much higher than in FE as a whole.

### Ethnicity break-down of those awarded ALG

Ethnicity	White	Asian	Black	Mixed	Total
% ALG awardees	80	13	4	3	100

13% of ALG awardees had a long standing illness or disability (slightly higher than the proportion of disabled people studying in FE as a whole).

#### 5.1.2 Family and living arrangements

The majority of ALG awardees (78%) were living with parents. 11% were living with a partner, 3% were living alone, and 8% were living with others. Eligible non-applicants were less likely to be living with their parents (66%) and more likely to be living with others (16%). About 70% of awardees and eligible non-applicants who were living with parents were not paying any rent. Only 10% of ALG awardees had children under 16, compared to 14% of non-applicants.

Looking at the background of ALG awardees, 60% of their parents had left school at the age of 16 or under.

#### 5.1.3 Employment status

59% of awardees were working while they were doing their course, but prior to taking up the course, only 38% of awardees were working. So ALG students are apparently more likely to be working since they started their full-time course. Since around 70% of students are under 22, this may just reflect increasing engagement with the labour market as they become older.

Of those who were working, the breakdown of their occupation types is as follows: 35% elementary occupations, 35% sales/customer service, 13% personal service, 7% administrative or secretarial occupations. Most awardees therefore seem to be concentrated in low-skilled jobs.

The income distribution of ALG awardees was as follows: 91% had a personal income below £10,000 (nearly half of these claimed to have no income at all), 6% had an income of more than £10,000, and 2% did not reveal their income. The income distribution was very similar for eligible non-applicants although a slightly higher proportion (11%) had an income over £10,000. The income of awardees' partners tended to be higher: 37% had no income or earned less than £10,000; 53% earned over £10,000 and there was no information for the remaining 10%. 8% of awardees were receiving means-tested benefits compared to 17% of non-applicants.

All the above suggests that people in the ALG target group who are working are doing low-skilled work to support themselves while they are building their qualifications.

#### 5.1.4 Prior Qualifications of ALG awardees

Overall, around 13% of ALG awardees were apparently ineligible for ALG because they were studying at a level in which they already had a full qualification. The most likely explanation for these apparent ineligibles is that there were some errors in gathering prior qualifications data by telephone. When asked on the spot, learners with combinations of different academic and vocational qualifications may not be able to remember their precise outcomes and levels for each qualification. Furthermore, in spite of careful questioning, learners sometimes report their current level of study as their highest prior qualification.

Looking at the types of prior qualifications of ALG awardees, for those studying at level 2: 11% did not have any qualifications at all, and 56% held Level 1 qualifications. For level 3 students: 4% had no qualifications, 14% held level 1 qualifications and the majority (70%) held level 2 qualifications.

#### 5.1.5 What were they studying?

Around 80% of ALG awardees were studying for level 3 qualifications, and 20% were studying for level 2 qualifications. 45% of level 2 ALG recipients were studying NVQs, 25% for EdExcel/BTEC qualifications, 23% were studying other vocational qualifications and 11% were studying GCSEs (note that some students were studying for more than one qualification). For level 3 students: 40% were studying EdExcel/BTEC qualifications; 30% were studying other vocational qualifications; 20% were studying A or AS levels; and 23% were on Access to HE courses.

A wide variety of subjects were being studied. The most popular subjects studied were: Arts, Media and publicity (14%), Health, Public Services and Care (11%), Preparation for life and work (11%), Business Administration and Law (9%) and ICT (8%).

## 5.2 Choosing a course

ALG awardees and eligible non-applicants tended to have a very positive attitude towards learning. 96% of awardees agreed with "education is an investment in your future" and 93% agreed with "learning is something you should do throughout your life". The evaluation showed that some people who had a bad experience at school were not necessarily lost as learners. 19% of awardees agreed with "I didn't get anything useful out of school". The groups who were most likely to agree with this statement were: over 25s, people who were living with partners, and people studying for a level 2 qualification.

Learners most commonly used an education institution (76%), and family/friends (61%) as sources of information, advice and guidance (IAG) on FE courses. In terms of usefulness of IAG sources, the most useful sources were: education institutions (48% of awardees in old pilot areas found them useful), family and friends (27%), and the Connexions Service (12%).

Nearly all students were enrolled on the course for job-related reasons. Only 4% of students were enrolled on courses related to their current job, but 89% of awardees said their course would help with a job they were thinking of doing in the future. When asked more specifically, the most common reasons for study given by awardees (in old pilot areas) were: to develop a career (93%), to get more satisfaction from work (70%), to get a new job (58%), and to change to a different career (54%). 95% of awardees said they intended to get a job in the future where they would use some or all of the skills attained on the course.

### **5.3 Costs and funding of learning**

ALG awardees were not automatically entitled to fee remission. Whether or not they received fee remission depended on their personal circumstances and in the policy operated in the local area and college. Around 25% of ALG awardees paid some of their course fees in Bedfordshire, Devon & Cornwall, Leicestershire and London West (which is similar to the percentage of all FE students who pay course fees), whereas less than 12% paid fees in the other six old pilot areas. The pattern of fee remission by area was similar for non-applicants, and was very similar with the pattern observed in 2003/4.

Awardees were more likely to pay tuition fees in new areas than in old areas (28% compared to 16%). Again, some LLSCs only charged fees for a small proportion of students (Tees Valley (6%) and Tyne & Wear (4%)), whereas other areas charged much higher fees to their students. Overall, as in 2003/4, learners were more likely to pay tuition fees if they were aged 20 or above.

Awardees who paid fees said they paid an average of £503 compared to an average of £688 for non-applicants. This represents a 40% increase on the amount reported for 2003/4. 20% of awardees paid registration fees and 11% paid exam fees. This was similar to the proportion of non-applicants who paid, and wasn't significantly different to the 2003/4 situation.

Some of the marketing of ALG was aimed at students who had recently received Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA). 72% of awardees aged 19-21 had heard of EMA (compared to 61% of non-applicants). 25% of awardees (aged 19-21) had applied for EMA and 19% had received it. The corresponding figures for non-applicants were four percentage points lower.

### **5.4 Applying for ALG, and how ALG was spent**

Most ALG applicants said they had obtained an ALG application pack from a college or an education institution (94%). Nearly one-half of awardees in old pilot areas and just over one-third in new areas received no help or advice on their application for ALG, compared to two-thirds of awardees in 2003/4. The most common sources of help for ALG application were student services/advisors (23%), parents (13%), and course tutors or teachers (10%). The vast majority of awardees did not use the ALG telephone helpline (85%) but most of those who did found it very or fairly useful.

All ALG recipients were asked how they spent the money from their Adult learning Grant. In old pilot areas, 74% spent their grant on books and course-related

equipment; 71% on course-related travel, 40% on bills, 40% on leisure, and 19% on rent or mortgage. The pattern in new pilot areas was similar. Compared to 2003/4, more recipients were spending their grant on rent/mortgage and bills.

Not surprisingly, older learners, and people not living with their parents were more likely to use their grant for paying rent/mortgage and bills. In old pilot areas, recipients of Asian or Asian British ethnic origin were the most likely to report spending their payments on course books (85%), recipients of Black or Black British ethnic origin were the most likely to say they spent their ALG on travel (87%), and White recipients were the most likely to report spending ALG on rent or mortgage (21%) compared to other ethnic groups.

## **5.5 What difference does ALG make?**

Recipients of ALG were asked whether ALG had influenced their decisions to study, whether to study full - or part-time, and whether they believed they would have dropped out of the course without the grant.

ALG has achieved some additionality as 11% of recipients in old pilot areas said they probably or definitely would not have gone ahead with their course without ALG. In new pilot areas, only 7% said they probably or definitely would not have gone ahead with the course without ALG but this reflects the lower level of marketing in the new areas.

One-third of recipients in old areas and one-quarter in new areas said they would have studied part-time without ALG. In old areas, 38% of recipients studying for qualifications at Level 2 said they would definitely/probably have studied part-time without ALG (compared to 28% for recipients studying at Level 3).

ALG has had considerable impact on student retention. 18% of ALG recipients in old pilot areas said they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG (compared to 16% in new pilot areas). The groups most likely to drop out without ALG included: Level 2 students (25%); recipients aged 21-24 (22%); recipients in full-time education without a job (21%); and recipients with no income (21%). These figures are for recipients in old pilot areas, the pattern was similar in new pilot areas.

## **5.6 Conclusions**

Evidence suggests that ALG continues to be attractive to young learners with few financial responsibilities (i.e. living with parents), and to be more attractive to learners studying at Level 3.

Evidence also suggests that ALG is having a positive effect on learner retention and their decisions to study full-time. A sizeable proportion of recipients said they would have dropped out of their course if they had not received ALG, and that ALG had influenced their decision to study full-time.

The grant is most commonly being used as intended, that is, to help learners to pay for books and course-related equipment, and course-related travel.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 The Adult Learning Grant

The Adult Learning Grant (ALG) aims to support adults who have not yet obtained their first Level 2 or first Level 3 qualification. The ALG is intended to help adults with the additional costs of learning (for example, books, travel) through the provision of a means-tested monetary grant. The grant (up to £30 per week paid during term time) is available to learners earning up to £19,000 (or up to £30,000 if the learner cohabits with a partner in paid employment). The grant is subject to strict eligibility criteria and award relies on learners demonstrating that they meet criteria relating to UK residency, age, proposed course of study, level of prior achievement, and that they intend to study at a designated learning provider. The grant is targeted at full-time adult learners studying for their first full Level 2 qualification and aged over 19 years of age, or full-time learners studying for their first full Level 3 qualification and aged between 19 and 30 years of age. The upper age limit will be removed from September 2006. Manchester City Council (MCC) administers the grant. MCC assesses eligibility for the grant and makes weekly term-time payments into learners' bank accounts, subject to confirmation of full attendance by the relevant learning providers.

The ALG pilot was announced as part of the 2003 Skills Strategy<sup>5</sup>. In September 2003, ALG was launched in 10 English Learning and Skills Council (LSC) areas: The Black Country, County Durham, Devon and Cornwall, Humberside, Lancashire, Leicestershire, London West, Luton and Bedfordshire, Shropshire, and South Yorkshire. In 2004/5, two full LSC regions, the North East and South East, were added, so that the ALG now covers 19 local LSC areas. It will be extended into the West Midlands and Yorkshire and Humber regions in 2006/7; and national roll-out is planned for 2008/9.

---

<sup>5</sup> Department for Education and Skills (2003) *21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills – Realising our Potential: Individuals, Employers, Nation* (CM5810) London: HMSO.

**Table 1.1 Take up of ALG by area for 2004/5**

LLSC area	Applications	Awards	Success rate of applications (%)
<b>Old areas</b>			
- Bedfordshire and Luton	363	254	70
- The Black Country	514	287	56
- Devon and Cornwall	996	611	61
- Durham	278	211	76
- Humberside	722	438	61
- Lancashire	1400	890	64
- Leicestershire	635	373	59
- London West	630	343	54
- Shropshire	204	134	66
- South Yorkshire	826	475	58
<b>New areas</b>			
- Berkshire	72	37	51
- Hampshire and Isle of Wight	339	232	68
- Kent	314	209	67
- Milton Keynes, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire	218	126	58
- Surrey	51	33	65
- Sussex	318	192	60
- Northumberland	28	16	57
- Tees valley	237	143	60
- Tyne and Wear	271	171	63
<b>Total</b>	<b>8416</b>	<b>5175</b>	<b>61</b>

## 1.2 The Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant

The Centre for Research in Social Policy (CRSP) at Loughborough University and the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) are evaluating ALG on behalf of the Department for Education and Skills and the National Office of the Learning and Skills Council.

The evaluation comprises longitudinal surveys of 2 cohorts of learners in ALG pilot areas:

### ***Cohort 1***

Cohort 1 comprises learners studying during the 2003/4 academic year in 1 of 10 original pilot areas. Cohort 1 learners were surveyed during the summer of 2004 (Wave 1)<sup>6</sup> and again, during the summer of 2005 (Wave 2)<sup>7</sup>.

### ***Cohort 2***

Cohort 2 comprises learners studying during the 2004/5 academic year in 1 of 19 pilot areas – that is, studying during 2004/5 in 1 of the 10 original ALG pilot areas ('old areas'), or studying during 2004/5 in 1 of the 2004 extended pilot areas ('new areas'). Learners consist of FE learners applying for ALG for the first time ('the applicants'), and FE learners screened by age, level and mode of study, and who had not applied for ALG ('the non-applicants'). Cohort 2 learners were surveyed during the summer of 2005 (Wave 1) and will be followed up during the summer of 2006 (Wave 2).

The evaluation has 5 key objectives, to:

- 1 measure the extent to which ALG improves retention and attainment among the eligible population in pilot areas;
- 2 determine whether ALG graduates progress to further learning or into employment and whether there are any associated improvements in their labour market status;
- 3 examine the effect of ALG on learners' choices on level of qualification, course, type of learning, and working patterns;
- 4 determine differences in the performance of ALG between pilot areas, men and women, and young people who are independent and those living with parents; and
- 5 explore implementation of the ALG at local level and identify good practice.

The report presents findings from Cohort 2 Wave 1, and contributes to objectives 1, 3, and 4.

A second wave survey will report on Cohort 2 learners in 2007, and will present analyses of ALG influence over qualification attainment and transitions in employment and further learning associated with receipt of ALG (evaluation objectives 1 and 2).

A qualitative study, addressing objective 5, has already been published<sup>8</sup>.

Surveys were conducted using computer-assisted telephone interviews. The length of interviews averaged 30 minutes.

---

<sup>6</sup> Cohort 1, Wave 1 findings have already been reported to the DfES (see Pound, E., Magadi, M., Michaelson, J., Finch, S., Stafford, B. (2005) *Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant: Cohort 1 Wave 1*).

<sup>7</sup> Magadi, M. et al., *Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant: Cohort 1 Final Report* (forthcoming).

<sup>8</sup> Pound, E., Maguire, M., Middleton, S., Ashton-Brooks, K. (2004). 'A qualitative investigation into the first year (pilot) implementation of the Adult Learning Grant', Department for Education and Skills Research Brief: RBX12-04, November 2004.  
<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RBX12-04.pdf>

### 1.3 Cohort 2 Survey Design

This section provides a brief overview of the design of the surveys.

#### 1.3.1 Applicants

'Applicants' are a sample of Further Education (FE) learners who had applied for ALG. The sample of ALG applicants was drawn from records held by the administrative provider, Manchester City Council (MCC). The records contained details of all learners who had applied for ALG as of May 2005.

The sample was grouped according to the eligibility status assigned to each learner by MCC at the time the data were extracted. The eligibility groups are presented in Table 1.2.

**Table 1.2 Eligibility groups for ALG**

Group	Subgroup
1 Eligible for ALG	a Approved/eligible waiting approval b Not taken up c Successful but withdrawn (included in research)
2 Eligibility not determined/ not known	
3 Not eligible	a Income too high (included in research) Studying part-time (included in research) Not studying for first Level 2/3 (included in research) Application refused (excluded from research) b Studying HE qualification (excluded from research) At college outside pilot areas (excluded from research) Too old (excluded from research) Too young (excluded from in research)
4 Automatically removed from sample	Deceased

The learners were then selected with selection probabilities based on eligibility group status. Within each eligibility group, the file was stratified by the local LSC pilot areas, with the same selection probability used for each area. Cohort 2 included learners in the original 10 pilot areas plus an additional 9 local LSC areas.

The sampling frame for Cohort 2 contained 8,211 cases. The process for assigning learners to eligibility groups is shown in Table 1.3.

**Table 1.3 Assignment of eligibility groups for Cohort 2 applicant sample**

Code	Description	Eligibility group
APPR	Application approved	1a
ELIG	Applicant eligible (awaiting approval)	2a
NT	Not taken up	1b
WIDR	Successful but withdrawn from scheme	1c
ENQ	Enquiry on application being made	2b
NOBANK	Learner does not have bank account	1a
PEND	Application not yet processed	1a
QRY	Query on application	2b
QRY2	Query on application	1a
OVER	Income too high	3
PTIME	Studying part-time	3
QUAL	Not studying for first L2/3	3
QUAL2	Not studying for first L2/3	3
QUAL4	Not studying for first L2/3	3
REF	Application refused	3
HE	Not eligible – studying HE qual	3
NLLSC	College outside scheme	3
OAGE	Too old	3
UAGE	Too young	3
DECD	Learner deceased	4

Following the assignment to eligibility groups, the following steps were taken in drawing the applicant sample for Cohort 2:

- 1 All those within categories 3 (not eligible) and 4 (automatically removed from the sample) – totalling 2,620 cases – were excluded.
- 2 2 cases were dropped for missing information on LSC area.
- 3 503 cases were dropped for failing to meet the age criteria of at least 19 on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2005 and no older than 30 on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2004.
- 4 880 cases were dropped for having no phone number.
- 5 569 cases were dropped because it was not their first year of application for ALG.
- 6 The 3,637 cases remaining were divided into 'old' or 'new' area.
- 7 Within each area, the sample was stratified by qualification level<sup>9</sup> within 'LSC area'. A sample of 2500 was drawn from the 'old area' group and all cases (932) were taken from the 'new area' group<sup>10</sup>.

### 1.3.2 Non-applicants

'Non-applicants' are a sample of FE learners in the same pilot areas who had not applied for ALG, but were eligible for the grant based on their learning mode, qualifications and age.

The aim was to draw a sample of learners who had not applied for ALG but who would nevertheless be, as far as could be ascertained, *eligible* to receive ALG.

<sup>9</sup> This is the level of the qualification currently being studied, according to the MCC data.

<sup>10</sup> 10 of the 932 cases were used for the pilot sample.

(Eligibility on income grounds could not be determined in the sample design). The non-applicant sample was drawn from the Individualised Learner Record (ILR) held by the LSC, from the database with details of all qualifications being studied for by learners within further education (FE). As the records on the database were at the level of individual qualifications, rather than learners, 2 stages of work on the sample were required: first, constructing a sample frame of eligible learners and then drawing a sample.

### ***Constructing the sample frame***

Further work was undertaken on the file:

- Duplicate cases based on learner name, date of birth and qualification were removed.
- The file was 'flattened'; a process which converted the data from qualification-level to learner-level.
- Filters were applied for age and mode of study such that learners were only included if they were studying full-time and aged at least 19 by 1 February 2005 and no older than 30 on 31 August 2004.

Records were then removed from the file based on qualification details. The qualification records for each learner were grouped together and a filter applied to learners based on the qualification types they were studying. The filter criteria were as follows. A learner was only included in the file if:

- at least one of the qualifications they were studying was at NVQ Level 2 or 3,
- AND one of the following conditions (based on variables imported from the LAD) applied to the qualification:

EITHER

- the qualification had a notional NVQ width of 100,
- OR the awarding body was City and Guild,
- OR the Learning Aim Type Code was one of the values listed in Table 1.4 below.

Further records were removed from the file as follows:

- Those identified as ALG applicants (either through a flag on the ILR data or by matching to MCC files) were removed, as were those who appeared in the cohort 1 non-applicant sample.
- Cases were deleted where the postcode was blank, the address was foreign or the phone number was missing.

The final sampling frame comprised 21,096 learners.

**Table 1.4 Learning Aim Codes of Qualifications at Level 2 or 3 included in the Sample File irrespective of width or awarding body**

Learning Aim Type Code	Learning Aim Type Description
0001	GCE AS level
0002	GCE A level
0006	Diploma
0009	Advanced Certificate
0016	Certificate
0024	Higher Diploma
0030	National Certificate
0033	BTEC/EDEXCEL Professional Development Qualification
0035	GNVQ
0036	NVQ
0067	Technicians Certificate
0111	Professional Diploma
0117	Advanced Diploma (also RSA)
0128	Intermediate Certificate
0136	Level 2
0137	Level 3
1413	GCE A2 Level
1414	Conversion from Advanced Subsidiary VCE to Advanced VCE
1415	Conversion from Advanced VCE to Advanced VCE (Double Award)
1416	Advanced Subsidiary VCE
1417	Advanced VCE
1418	Advanced VCE (Double Award)
1421	Edexcel National Award
1423	Edexcel First Diploma (new syllabus)
1424	Edexcel National Certificate (new syllabus)
1425	Edexcel National Diploma (new syllabus)
1429	AES NVQ Equivalents
2006	Intermediate Award
2007	Advanced Award

### 1.3.3 Response and weighting

#### *Applicants*

The total number of full achieved interviews was 2,248, which was a response rate of 66% the issued sample of 3,432. Weights were calculated to correct for unequal probabilities of selection (learners in old LSC areas had a lower chance of being included in the sample) and for potential biases due to non-response – response rates varied by region, age and sex.

#### *Non-applicants*

During fieldwork, 132 cases were removed for being duplicates with the applicant sample. The total number of full achieved interviews was 1,004, which is a response rate of 29% of the revised issued sample of 3,440. As with Cohort 1, this low response rate reflected the poor quality of much of the telephone number information provided in the ILR. 23% of the sample was screened out due to having applied for

ALG (3% of the sample) and for qualifications being too high (20% of the sample). The procedure for deriving weights for the Cohort 2 non-applicants mirrored that for the Cohort 2 applicants. The weight derived, therefore, took into account the greater likelihood of learners in old LSC areas being selected and potential biases due to non-response on the basis of region, age and sex.

## **1.4 Structure of the Report**

The report presents findings from Cohort 2 Wave 1.

Where relevant, chapters compare 'non-applicants' with sub-groups of the 'applicant' sample: 'Awardees' ('applicants' awarded ALG) and 'Recipients' (defined as awardees who were receiving ALG payments at the time of survey or had received at least 1 payment before they were stopped or withheld). 'Old' and 'new' areas have been analysed separately to enable comparisons between the areas. In addition, analysing 'old' and 'new' areas separately enables cohort comparisons in 'old' areas only.

There are 6 substantive chapters:

Chapter 2 describes the background characteristics of applicants, awardees and non-applicants, including age, gender and ethnicity, current and previous main activities and courses being studied.

Chapter 3 examines awardees' and non-applicants' attitudes towards learning, their experiences of finding information, advice and guidance on further education from various sources, and their reasons for studying.

Chapter 4 reports the costs and funding of learning among awardees and non-applicants.

Chapter 5 reports awardees' experiences of applying for and receiving ALG, including the ways in which their ALG was spent.

Chapter 6 examines recipients' perceptions of the influence of ALG on their decisions to take up study, to study full-time or part-time, and to continue the course.

Chapters 2-6 each provide a summary of key findings.

Chapter 7 presents overall conclusions from the Cohort 2 Wave 1 findings.

### **1.4.1 Report conventions**

- a) Throughout the report, percentages based on fewer than 50 cases are enclosed in square brackets, and should be interpreted with caution (those based on fewer than 20 cases are not presented and shown as [-]).
- b) All percentages are weighted, while number of cases reflect unweighted base populations.
- c) Percentages are rounded up or down to whole numbers and therefore may not always sum to 100

- d) Percentages less than 0.5 are shown as '\*' to distinguish them from absolute 0.
- e) Since the applicants and non-applicant samples were from different sampling frames and used different survey designs, comparisons between the 2 groups or their sub-groups are based on tests for independent samples.
- f) Shading in tables refers to significant differences at  $p < 0.05$  between awardees and non-applicants unless otherwise stated.

## 2 BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNERS

This chapter describes the background characteristics of awardees and non-applicants, including age, gender and ethnicity, living arrangements, current and previous economic activities and courses being studied. Throughout, results are presented for awardees and non-applicants and any significant differences between the profiles of these groups are highlighted. Breakdowns of findings for old and new areas are also shown and significant differences between these areas types are highlighted where relevant. The data are weighted by the separate weights for applicants and non-applicants.

### 2.1 Definitions of Groups for Analysis

Table 2.1 Breakdown of applicant and awardee samples

	Old areas	New areas	Column % Total
All applicants (excluding those classified by administrator as not eligible)			
Awardees	95	95	95
Non-awardees	5	5	5
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1630</i>	<i>618</i>	<i>2248</i>
All awardees			
- recipients	87	89	88
- non-recipients	13	11	12
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1546</i>	<i>588</i>	<i>2134</i>

Base: All applicants.

The awardee group was identified by interviewing a sample of ALG applicants which excluded those who were classified by the administrative provider as being not eligible for the grant but included some whose eligibility had not been determined at the time when the sample was drawn. In the interview, 95% of this group of applicants were found to have been awarded the grant (see Table 2.1). This proportion was the same for both old ALG areas and new areas.

There is no comparable statistic for Cohort 1, for 2 reasons. Firstly, the Cohort 1 study surveyed a wider group of applicants which also included those who had been classified as not eligible for the grant. Second, the Cohort 1 sample included a much higher proportion of cases where eligibility had not yet been determined when the sample was drawn, so comparisons would not be meaningful.

Among awardees, 88% reported that they had received at least 1 ALG payment in 2004/5, including those who later had the payments stopped or withheld. The same proportion was found in the Cohort 1 survey.

75% of awardees were in old areas and 25% in new areas. This reflects larger numbers of awardees in old areas where the award was more established.

The non-applicant group was made up of learners who were qualification eligible for ALG. 54% of these were from old ALG areas and 46% for new areas.

## 2.2 General Characteristics

This section describes and compares the socio-demographic characteristics of awardees and non-applicants. Findings for recipients are not shown since these were generally extremely similar to those for awardees. Results are shown separately for old ALG areas, that is those where the grant was introduced in 2003/4, new ALG areas, where the award was introduced in 2004/5, and total ALG areas.

### 2.2.1 Age and gender

Table 2.2 Distribution of age at interview of awardees and non-applicants

Age	Awardees	Non-applicants	Column %
19	37	45	
20	26	20	
21-24	23	20	
25-31	14	15	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>930</i>	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

The majority of learners in all groups were aged 19 or 20. The age distribution tailed off towards the upper age limit of 31.

A significantly higher proportion of awardees than non-applicants were aged 20 while a higher proportion of non-applicants than of awardees were aged 19.

**Table 2.3 Age groups of awardees and non-applicants by gender and ALG area**

Age group	Male			Female			Column %		
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total
<b>Awardees</b>									
19	37	29	35	34	29	33	39	32	37
20	34	32	33	26	21	25	27	25	26
21 to 24	22	26	23	23	27	24	21	27	24
25 to 31	7	12	8	18	22	19	13	16	15
<i>Unweighted N</i>	754	292	1046	792	296	1088	1546	588	2134
<b>Non-applicants</b>									
19	46	43	45	38	43	40	44	46	45
20	24	28	26	15	23	19	18	22	20
21 to 24	18	19	18	25	21	23	21	19	20
25 to 31	12	10	11	22	14	18	17	12	15
<i>Unweighted N</i>	229	293	522	190	218	408	419	511	930

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

The shading refers to significant differences between awardees in old and new areas.

The proportion of awardees aged under 21 was higher in old areas than in new areas (66% compared with 57%). Moreover, the proportion of awardees who were aged under 21 in old areas had increased since the first cohort when 49% of applicants were aged under 21. This suggests that the age profile of ALG awardees has shifted towards younger adults as the grant has become established.

Female learners comprised just over half of awardees in both old and new areas (53% and 52% respectively). This was in keeping with findings for the first cohort when 54% of the applicants were female.

In old ALG areas, female awardees tended to be slightly older than male awardees (40% of female awardees in old areas were aged 21 or over compared with 29% of male awardees). The same trend was observed in new areas and for the first cohort of applicants in old areas.

The gender profile of non-applicants was the reverse of that for awardees: female learners comprised just under half of non-applicants in old and new areas (49% and 45% respectively) whereas the majority of awardees were female.

## 2.2.2 Ethnicity

Table 2.4 Ethnicity breakdown of awardees and non-applicants

Ethnicity	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total	
Black	4	2	4	8	2	5	
<i>Black of Caribbean origin</i>	2	1	2	3	1	2	
<i>Black of African origin</i>	2	1	2	4	2	3	
<i>Black of other origin</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Asian	16	5	13	19	7	14	
<i>Asian of Indian origin</i>	7	1	6	8	2	5	
<i>Asian of Pakistani origin</i>	5	2	4	6	3	5	
<i>Asian of Bangladeshi origin</i>	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<i>Asian of Chinese origin</i>	0	0	0	1	1	1	
<i>Asian of other origin</i>	2	0	1	3	1	2	
White	76	91	80	66	86	75	
Mixed origin	2	1	2	3	2	2	
Other origin	1	1	1	4	3	3	
Not stated	*	0	0	1	0	0	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1546</i>	<i>588</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>511</i>	<i>930</i>	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

The ethnic profile of ALG awardees in old areas was comparable with that for the first cohort of learners.

The ethnic profile of awardees in new areas was significantly less diverse: 91% were white, 2% were Black and 5% were Asian. This reflected the different profile of learners in old and new areas as there were also fewer non-white non-applicants in new areas than in old areas.

Overall, awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to be white. This was also found to be the case in Cohort 1.

### 2.2.3 Family and living arrangements

Table 2.5 Living arrangements of awardees and non-applicants

Living with partner/parents	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total	
Living with partner	11	11	11	13	9	11	
Living with parents	76	74	75	61	71	66	
Living with both partner and parents	2	1	2	1	1	1	
Living with neither partner nor parents	9	9	9	17	14	16	
Lives alone	3	4	3	7	5	6	
Unknown household	*	*	*	0	*	*	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1546	588	2134	419	511	930	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Three-quarters of awardees lived with their parents (76% in old areas and 74% in new areas). 11% of awardees lived with a partner while 2% lived with both a parent and a partner. 12% lived with neither a parent nor a partner, including 3% who lived alone. This pattern was broadly similar to that observed for awardees in the first cohort of learners.

The proportion of awardees who lived with their parents was significantly higher than that for non-applicants (75% compared with 66%). The difference was greatest in old areas where 76% of awardees lived with their parents compared with only 61% of non-applicants. Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to live with neither a parent nor a partner, including those who lived alone (12% of awardees compared with 22% of non-applicants).

**Table 2.6 Tenure status of awardees and non-applicants**

Tenure	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total	
Own or buying the property	6	5	6	5	4	5	
Living with parents rent free	56	53	55	48	56	52	
Living with parents and paying rent	23	24	24	20	20	20	
Renting from council, new town, housing association or privately	11	14	11	21	16	19	
Other	1	1	1	3	1	2	
Missing	2	3	3	4	1	3	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1546</i>	<i>588</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>511</i>	<i>930</i>	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

When asked about their tenure status, just over half of awardees in old and new areas stated that they were living with their parents rent-free (56% and 53% respectively), which was comparable with awardees in Cohort 1 (54%). Just under a quarter of awardees in old and new areas (23% and 24% respectively) said they were living with their parents and paying rent, while 11% of awardees in old areas and 14% in new areas stated that they were renting.

The proportion of awardees who rented from the council or privately was lower than that for non-applicants (11% compared with 19%). This difference was mainly apparent for old areas where 11% of awardees rented compared with 21% of non-applicants.

**Table 2.7 Whether respondents had children aged Under 16 for awardees and non-applicants**

Whether have children under 16	Awardees			Non-applicants		
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total
<b>Has a child/children under 16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>
Has child who lives with respondent	9	8	9	15	9	12
Has child who lives away from respondent	1	*	1	2	1	1
Has both children living with and away from respondent	*	0	*	1	*	1
No children under 16	90	92	90	82	90	86
Missing	*	*	*	0	0	0
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1546</i>	<i>588</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>511</i>	<i>930</i>

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

10% of awardees reported having children aged under 16 and the majority of these lived with their children. The proportion of awardees who had children was similar in old and new areas.

Overall, awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to have children aged under 16. This difference was most evident in old areas where 10% of awardees had children compared with 18% of non-applicants.

## 2.2.4 Parental education level

**Table 2.8 Parental education of respondents for awardees and non-applicants**

Level of parental education	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total	
<b>Parent who stayed on at school past 16</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>32</b>	
Parent who stayed at school and got a degree	15	16	15	17	20	18	
Parent who stayed at school but got no degree	12	11	12	10	13	11	
Parents who stayed on at school – unknown if got degree	3	4	3	2	3	2	
Parents who did not stay on at school	60	58	60	56	52	54	
Unknown/Missing	11	11	11	15	13	14	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1546</i>	<i>588</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>511</i>	<i>930</i>	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

As was the case for the first cohort of learners, respondents were asked first whether their parents stayed on at school after the age of 16, and those who answered 'yes' were then asked whether either of their parents obtained a qualification at degree level or above. The majority of awardees and non-applicants reported that their parents had not stayed on at school. More than 10% of learners were unable to answer the question.

30% of awardees said that they had a parent who had stayed at school past the age of 16, while half of this group (15%) said that a parent had got a degree. There were no significant differences between awardees and non-applicants or between old and new areas for these measures.

## 2.2.5 Health and disability

In keeping with findings from the first cohort of learners, nearly all awardees in old and new areas (100% and 98% respectively) reported that their health was 'fair' to 'very good'.

13% of awardees in old areas said that they had a disability or long-standing illness and, of these, just under half (47%) felt that it limited their daily activities. Awardees in new areas reported similar levels of disability.

Awardees' characteristics in terms of health and disability were comparable with those of non-applicants. 97% of non-applicants stated that their health was 'fair' to 'very good'. 15% of non-applicants in old areas reported that they had a disability or long-standing illness and just over half of these (51%) said that it limited their daily activities.

## 2.2.6 Comparison between survey and administrative data: age, gender, ethnicity

This section compares the profile of ALG awardees who responded to the Wave 1 survey with the group of ALG awardees taken from MCC administrative data used as the sampling frame. This is not the full set of all awardees in the year 2004/05, however this data was received from MCC on 9 May 2005 and would therefore be expected to hold details of the vast majority of ALG applications for the 2004/05 year.

The definition of 'awardee' for survey respondents is based on respondents' answers as to whether or not they had been awarded ALG. The definition for awardees in the administrative data is based on all applicants within the administrative dataset who had been given an 'eligible' status (even if they had not yet received payment). This definition for the administrative dataset therefore excludes applicants who were originally included on the sampling frame with an 'unknown eligibility' status.

Survey respondent awardees whose awardee status was recorded in the sampling frame are also included in the sample of awardees from the administrative data.

**Table 2.9 Gender of ALG awardees, from survey data and administrative data**

Gender	ALG awardees		Column %
	Survey respondents	Administrative data	
Male	48	47	
Female	52	53	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>4320</i>	

Base: Survey respondent awardees; administrative data awardees.

The gender profile of awardee survey respondents is similar to that of all awardees from administrative data.

**Table 2.10 Age of ALG awardees, from survey data and administrative data**

Age	ALG awardees		Column %
	Survey respondents	Administrative data	
19	37	35	
20	26	28	
21-24	23	24	
25-31	14	13	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>4230</i>	

Base: Survey respondent awardees; administrative data awardees.

The age profiles of survey respondents awardees and administrative data awardees were similar.

**Table 2.11 Ethnicity of ALG awardees, from survey data and administrative data**

Ethnicity	ALG Awardees		Column %
	Survey respondents	Administrative data	
<b>Black</b>	4	3	
<i>Black of Caribbean origin</i>	2	1	
<i>Black of African origin</i>	2	2	
<i>Black of other origin</i>	0	0	
<b>Asian</b>	13	11	
<i>Asian of Indian origin</i>	6	5	
<i>Asian of Pakistani origin</i>	4	4	
<i>Asian of Bangladeshi origin</i>	1	1	
<i>Asian of Chinese origin</i>	0	0	
<i>Asian of other origin</i>	1	1	
<b>White</b>	80	67	
<b>Mixed origin</b>	2	2	
<b>Other origin</b>	1	0	
<b>Not stated</b>	*	16	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>4320</i>	

Base: Survey respondent awardees; administrative data awardees.

There was a considerably higher proportion of awardees in the administrative data who did not state their ethnicity, while nearly all respondent awardees reported their ethnicity during the survey.

## 2.3 Activity Status

### 2.3.1 Current activity

Table 2.12 Main current activity of awardees and non-applicants, by ALG areas

Activity status	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total	
<b>All in full-time education</b>	58	55	57	30	30	30	
Of whom: Full-time education without a job	28	22	26	16	12	14	
Of whom: Full-time education with a job	31	33	31	15	17	16	
<b>All in part-time education</b>	1	2	1	4	3	3	
Of whom: Part-time education without a job	*	*	0	2	1	2	
Of whom: Part-time education with a job	1	2	1	2	1	2	
<b>Full-time work</b>	11	12	12	22	24	23	
<b>Part-time work</b>	14	18	15	20	23	21	
<b>Unemployed and looking for work</b>	9	7	8	13	10	11	
<b>Unemployed and not looking for work</b>	1	1	1	1	2	2	
<b>Looking after the home or family/taking a holiday</b>	4	3	4	9	7	8	
<b>Voluntary work</b>	*	*	0	1	1	1	
<b>Sick or disabled</b>	*	*	0	1	1	1	
<b>Taking a year off/gap year/travelling</b>	*	*	0	0	*	0	
<b>Looking for a place at college</b>	*	0	0	*	0	0	
<b>Other activity</b>	*	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Missing</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1546	588	2134	419	511	930	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

When asked to state their main current activity, the majority of awardees (58% in old areas and 55% in new areas) said they were in full-time education. In old areas this group was fairly evenly divided between those who combined study with a job (31%) and those who had no job (28%). In new areas this group comprised more awardees who had a job than those who didn't have 1 (33% compared with 22%).

Just 1% of awardees in old areas and 2% of those in new areas said that their main activity was part-time education (with or without a job).

27% of awardees were in full-time or part-time work. 8% of awardees described their main activity as being unemployed and looking for work while 1% described it as being unemployed and not looking for work. 4% said that their main activity was looking after their home or family or taking a holiday.

This activity profile of awardees differed notably from that for non-applicants. Compared to non-applicants, awardees were significantly more likely to be in full-time education (57% compared with 30%). They were significantly less likely than non-applicants to say that their main activity was full-time work, part-time work or looking after the home or family. Overall, 59% of awardees were doing some kind of work, compared to 62% of non-applicants.

**Table 2.13 Awardees: activity status by receipt of ALG**

Activity status	Recipients				Non-recipients			Column %
	Currently receives	Not yet due	Due but delayed	Received then withheld or stopped	Withheld or stopped from start	Decided not to take up	Reason for non-receipt not stated	Total
Full-time education without a job	40	25	[-]	14	17	[24]	[33]	26
Full-time education with a job	43	29	[-]	22	12	[26]	[33]	31
Part-time education without a job	1	0	[-]	0	0	[0]	[0]	
Part-time education with a job	1	1	[-]	1	2	[3]	[0]	1
Full-time work	4	10	[-]	19	17	[18]	[5]	12
Part-time work	5	17	[-]	24	25	[15]	[16]	15
Not in education or paid employment	6	18	[-]	21	26	[15]	[13]	14
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>896</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>983</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>2134</i>

Base population: All awardees.

When current main activity is analysed by receipt of ALG for awardees, 83% of current recipients of the grant stated that they were in full-time education. Among those who received ALG at 1 point but had since had it withheld or stopped, the proportion in full-time education was just 36%. These findings reflect those for Cohort 1 and show that respondents' current activities generally corresponded with their reported ALG status (discrepancies were possible, for example where there was a time lag between changes in activity and ALG status or where respondents resumed study after having ALG stopped or withheld).

**Table 2.14 Number of hours spent in supervised learning by awardees and non-applicants**

	Awardees	Non-applicants	Column %
Less than 12 hours	2	11	
More than 12 hours	92	79	
Unknown	1	2	
Not asked (not currently studying)	4	8	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	2134	930	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Awardees spent longer, on average, in supervised learning than non-applicants. Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to spend more than 12 hours per week on supervised learning. Similarly, in Cohort 1, awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to spend more than 12 hours on supervised learning.

### 2.3.2 Details of Current Jobs

**Table 2.15 SOC 2000 classification of current job**

SOC 2000 classification	Awardees	Non-applicants	Column %
Managers and senior officials	1	1	
Professional occupations	*	2	
Associate professional and technical occupations	4	6	
Administrative and secretarial occupations	7	7	
Skilled trades occupations	4	10	
Personal service occupations	13	10	
Sales and customer service occupations	35	33	
Elementary occupations	35	31	
Missing	*	*	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1262	585	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants with a current job.

Both awardees and non-applicants were clustered in the lower occupation classes, especially sales and customer service occupation and elementary occupations. The occupation profile of awardees did not differ significantly from that of non-applicants and was similar to the profile at Cohort 1.

**Table 2.16 Size of current employer of awardees and non-applicants who worked**

Number of employees	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
1-9	25	28
10-24	24	24
25-499	40	39
500 or more	9	8
Don't know/missing	2	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1227</i>	<i>568</i>

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants with a current job.

About half of the awardees and non-applicants who had a current job worked for an organisation that employed fewer than 25 people. About 40% worked in an organisation employing between 25 and 499 people while about 10% worked in one employing 500 or more people.

### 2.3.3 Previous Activity

Table 2.17 Main prior activity of awardees and non-applicants, by ALG areas

Activity status	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total	
<b>All in full-time education</b>	62	56	61	67	71	69	
Of whom: Full-time education without a job	39	32	38	42	38	40	
Of whom: Full-time education with a job	23	24	23	25	33	29	
<b>All in part-time education</b>	1	3	2	5	3	4	
Of whom: Part-time education without a job	1	1	1	3	1	2	
Of whom: Part-time education with a job	1	2	1	2	2	2	
<b>Full-time work</b>	21	24	22	12	14	13	
<b>Part-time work</b>	6	6	6	4	5	5	
<b>Unemployed and looking for work</b>	3	4	4	3	3	3	
<b>Unemployed and not looking for work</b>	1	*	1	*	*	*	
<b>Looking after the home or family/taking a holiday</b>	3	3	3	5	3	4	
<b>Voluntary work</b>	*	0	*	1	*	1	
<b>Sick or disabled</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Taking a year off/gap year/travelling</b>	1	1	1	*	*	*	
<b>Looking for a place at college</b>	*	0	*	0	0	0	
<b>Other activity</b>	*	*	*	1	*	*	
<b>Missing</b>	0	*	*	0	0	0	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1546	588	2134	419	511	930	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

When asked to state their main previous activity, that is the one before the current activity (see Table 2.12), 61% of awardees and 69% of non-applicants said that this was full-time education. Relatively few awardees or non-applicants had previously been in full-time work (12%, 23%) or part-time work (15%, 21%).

**Table 2.18 Awardees: previous activity of those currently in full-time education, by ALG area**

Previous activity status	Current activity						Column %
	Full-time education without a job			Full-time education with a job			Total
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total	
Full-time education with a job	6	8	7	18	14	17	
Part-time education with a job	0	1	0	1	3	2	
Full-time work	23	24	23	36	42	38	
Part-time work	8	8	8	8	11	9	
Not in paid employment	62	60	62	36	30	34	
Missing	*	0	*	0	1	*	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>428</i>	<i>132</i>	<i>560</i>	<i>475</i>	<i>192</i>	<i>667</i>	

Base population: Awardees currently in full-time education.

Table 2.18 shows the previous main activity of those awardees who were currently in full-time education, in old and new ALG areas.

For many of these awardees, whether they currently combined study with work reflected whether or not they had been working before they started their course. Thus, the majority of awardees who were in full-time education without a job had not been in paid employment (62%) before they started their course. On the other hand, most awardees who currently combined full-time education with a job had either done this before (17%) or had a full-time job (38%) or part-time job (9%).

The relationship between awardees' current and previous activity did not differ notably between old and new areas.

**Table 2.19 Non-applicants: previous activity of those currently in full-time education, by ALG area**

Previous activity status	Current activity						Column %
	Full-time education without a job			Full-time education with a job			Total
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total	
Full-time education with a job	11	9	10	20	29	24	
Part-time education with a job	2	0	1	5	3	4	
Full-time work	5	14	9	24	27	25	
Part-time work	4	7	5	3	5	4	
Not in paid employment	78	70	75	48	37	42	
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>129</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>157</i>	

Base population: Non-applicants currently in full-time education.

Table 2.19 shows the previous main activity of those non-applicants currently in full time education, in old and new ALG areas. The same relationships between current and previous activities that was observed for awardees was observed for these non-applicants, namely that most of those who were currently studying without working had not been working previously while most of those who were currently combining study with work had previously been working.

### 2.3.4 Main reason for stopping previous activity

Tables 2.20 to 2.24 show the reasons awardees gave for stopping their previous activity, broken down by the previous activity.

**Table 2.20 Main reason for stopping previous activity by previous activity group - those who changed from full-time work to part-time work or education with a job**

{Note: reasons have been reordered in the next 5 tables}

Main reason for change of activity	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Started studying	68	71
Did not enjoy job or course	9	9
Job ended/dismissed/made redundant/firm closed down	6	8
Better job/more money	5	5
Moved away	4	2
Left because pregnant/for health reasons	2	0
Change in family circumstances	2	0
Career break	1	4
Reduced number of working hours/wanted different hours	1	1
Difficulties studying and working at the same time	1	0
Started paid job	*	0
Went travelling/took a gap year	*	0
Completed course of study	0	0
Didn't stop previous activity	*	0
Other	0	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>282</i>	<i>54</i>

Base: All awardees and non-applicants whose previous activity was full-time work and current activity was either part-time work or education with a job.

Most awardees and non-applicants who had changed their working status from full-time work into part-time work or education with a job typically gave starting studying as the main reason for making this change. In a few cases (6% of applicants and 8% of non-applicants), the reason was the loss of their previous job.

**Table 2.21 Main reason for stopping previous activity by previous activity group - these awardees who changed from full-time work to not working**

Main reason for change of activity	Column %
Started studying	56
Job ended/dismissed/made redundant/firm closed down	11
Did not enjoy job or course	9
Left because pregnant/for health reasons	8
Better job/more money	4
Completed course of study	3
Could not afford to continue	2
Moved away	2
Location of activity caused problems	1
Went travelling/took a gap year	1
Difficulties studying and working at the same time	1
Reduced number of working hours/wanted different hours	1
Career break	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	146

Base: All awardees whose previous activity was full-time work and current activity was not working. (Figures are not shown for non-applicants due to low base sizes)

A little over half (56%) of awardees who changed their working status from full-time work to not working gave starting studying as the reason. Other common reasons were losing the previous job (11%), not enjoying the job (9%) and leaving for pregnancy or health reasons (8%).

**Table 2.22 Main reason for stopping previous activity by previous activity group – those awardees and non-applicants who changed from part-time work or education with a job to not working**

Main reason for change of activity	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Started studying	31	20
Completed course of study	27	46
Job ended/dismissed/made redundant/firm closed down	13	10
Left because pregnant/for health reasons	6	9
Did not enjoy job or course	6	3
Difficulties studying and working at the same time	4	7
Better job/more money	2	0
Reduced number of working hours/wanted different hours	1	2
Went travelling/took a gap year	1	1
Career break	1	0
Could not afford to continue	1	0
Started paid job	1	0
Change in family circumstances	1	0
Moved away	1	0
Location of activity caused problems	1	0
Didn't stop previous activity	1	0
Other	3	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	170	74

Base: All awardees and non-applicants whose previous activity was part-time work or education with a job and current activity was not working.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants whose previous activity was part-time work or education with a job and current activity was not working

Awardees who changed their working status from part-time work or education with a job to not working most commonly explained this in terms of starting studying (31%), completing a course of study (27%) or losing their previous job (13%). Non-applicants who made this activity change most commonly explained it in terms of completing a course of study (46%).

**Table 2.23 Main reason for stopping previous activity by previous activity group – those awardees and non-applicants who changed from part-time work or education with a job to full-time work**

Main reason for change of activity	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Completed course of study	65	58
Better job/more money	7	8
Did not enjoy job or course	6	11
Started paid job	6	7
Started studying	5	3
Could not afford to continue	5	1
Reduced number of working hours/wanted different hours	2	1
Job ended/dismissed/made redundant/firm closed down	1	4
Left because pregnant/for health reasons	1	1
Moved away	1	1
Difficulties studying and working at the same time	1	1
Location of activity caused problems	1	0
Didn't have the right qualifications to continue	1	0
Change in family circumstances	0	3
Career break	0	2
Didn't stop previous activity	0	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>142</i>	<i>118</i>

Base: All awardees and non-applicants whose previous activity was part-time work or education with a job and current activity was full-time work.

The majority of awardees and non-applicants (65%, 58%) who changed their working status from part-time work or education with a job to full-time work gave completing a course of study as the main reason why they had been able to take up a full-time job.

**Table 2.24 Main reason for stopping previous activity by previous activity group – those awardees and non-applicants who changed from not working to part-time work, full-time work or education with a job**

Main reason for change of activity	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Completed course of study	44	42
Started studying	27	26
Started paid job	11	14
Better job/more money	5	7
Could not afford to continue	4	3
Did not enjoy job or course	2	3
Left because pregnant/for health reasons	1	3
Change in family circumstances	1	*
Job ended/dismissed/made redundant/firm closed down	1	*
Reduced number of working hours/wanted different hours	*	0
Career break	*	0
Moved away	*	0
Location of activity caused problems	*	0
Went travelling/took a gap year	*	0
Difficulties studying and working at the same time	*	0
Didn't have the right qualifications to continue	*	0
Didn't stop previous activity	*	0
Other	3	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	477	227

Base: All awardees and non-applicants whose previous activity not working and current activity was part-time work, full-time work or education with a job.

Awardees and non-applicants who went from not working to having some form of job most commonly gave their reason as having completed a course of study (44%, 42%). However, more than a quarter of this group (27%, 26%) gave starting studying as their main reason for their change of activity.

## 2.4 Income

**Table 2.25 Distribution of respondents' earnings from salaried or self-employment for awardees and non-applicants**

Annual earnings	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	All awardees	Old areas	New areas	All non-apps	
Up to £10,000	49	55	50	45	50	47	
£10,001 – £15,000	5	6	5	8	9	8	
Over £15,000	1	1	1	3	4	3	
No earnings	43	35	41	42	35	39	
Missing	2	3	2	1	3	2	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1546</i>	<i>588</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>511</i>	<i>930</i>	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees in old and new areas

50% of awardees reported annual earnings of £10,000 or below, with 41% reporting no earnings because they were not in employment. Awardees in old areas were slightly less likely than those in new areas to be in the lowest income band (old areas 49%; new areas 55%) and more likely to report no earnings (43%; 35%).

The distribution of non-applicants' earnings was similar to that of awardees, with a similar pattern between old and new areas, although only 6% of awardees earned more than £10,000 compared to 11% of non-applicants.

The distribution of awardees' earnings was similar to that for Cohort 1 awardees, although there was missing data for a higher proportion of respondents at Cohort 1 than at Cohort 2 (15% compared to 2%). Comparing the distributions excluding those with missing data showed a higher proportion of awardees at Cohort 1 with no earnings (49%) than in old areas at Cohort 2 (43%).

**Table 2.26 Distribution of earnings for respondents and their partners for awardees and non-applicants**

Annual earnings	Awardees		Non-applicants		Column %
	Respondent	Partner	Respondent	Partner	
Up to £10,000	46	23	35	13	
£10,001 – £15,000	7	28	10	16	
Over £15,000	0	25	7	22	
No earnings	46	14	44	15	
Missing	1	10	3	33	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>245</i>	<i>245</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>94</i>	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who lived with partners.

Awardees who lived with a partner had a similar distribution of earning to those who did not live with a partner. Non-applicants who lived with a partner were less likely to report earnings in the lowest band (35%) than those who did not (49%).

Awardees' partners were more likely to have earnings than the awardees themselves and typically had higher earning levels (25% of partners earned over £15,000). The same pattern was observed for non-applicants who had partners. It is not possible to compare the relative earning levels of partners of awardees and non-applicants because a third of non-applicants who had partners were unable or unwilling to report their partner's income level.

**Table 2.27 Receipt of benefits by awardees and non-applicants**

Type of benefit received	Awardees			Non-Applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	All Areas	Old areas	New areas	All areas	
Receiving means-tested benefits	9	6	8	20	13	17	
Receiving other benefits or tax credits	7	7	7	8	5	7	
Receiving no benefits or tax credits	84	86	84	71	82	76	
Not receiving means-tested benefits (i.e. potentially eligible for ALG)	90	93	91	80	87	83	
Missing/refusal	1	1	1	*	*	*	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1546</i>	<i>588</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>511</i>	<i>930</i>	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

The vast majority of awardees (and their partners<sup>11</sup>) (84%) were not in receipt of any state benefits. Those who did receive benefits were in receipt of between 1 and 6 different benefits. The proportion of awardees receiving each benefit type was low and was similar in old and new areas.

8% of awardees reported receiving means-tested benefits or Jobseeker's Allowance and so were apparently ineligible to receive ALG. However, the remaining 91% were apparently not ineligible. Among awardees, a higher proportion were ineligible to receive ALG for this reason (17% compared with 9% for non-applicants).

The difference in the proportions receiving means-tested benefits or Jobseeker's Allowance was greatest in old areas where 9% of awardees received benefits compared with 20% of non-applicants.

A lower proportion of awardees in old areas received no benefits (84%) than the proportion of awardees in Cohort 1 (88%).

**Table 2.28 Distribution of amount received annually from benefits by awardees and non-applicants by area**

Annual total benefits	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	All areas	Old areas	New areas	All areas	
Up to £2,500	42	44	42	30	37	32	
£2,501 – £3,750	15	15	15	11	11	11	
£3,751 – £5,000	9	17	10	10	12	11	
£5,001 – £7,500	19	8	16	24	14	21	
Over £7,500	6	8	6	14	13	14	
Missing	10	9	10	10	13	11	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>220</i>	<i>68</i>	<i>288</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>177</i>	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants receiving 1 or more benefits.  
Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

42% of awardees in receipt of benefits reported that they received £2,500 or less per year from these benefits, with just 6% receiving over £7,500 per year. These were significantly different to the amount received in benefits by non-applicants. The distribution of amount of benefits received by awardees was similar in old and new areas.

A lower proportion of awardees than non-applicants received over £7,500 per year in benefits (6% compared with 14%).

<sup>11</sup> Respondents were asked about any benefits received by either themselves or their partner (where applicable).

The distributions of amount of benefits received by awardees and non-applicants were similar to those for Cohort 1.

**Table 2.29 Distribution of total income (earnings and benefits) of awardees and non-applicants (including partner's income, where applicable)<sup>12</sup>**

Total income	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	All areas	Old areas	New areas	All areas	
Up to £10,000	50	54	51	59	58	59	
£10,001 – £15,000	7	6	7	9	8	9	
£15,001 – £25,000	6	8	6	6	6	6	
£25,001 – £75,000	2	1	2	3	3	3	
Over £75,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	
No income	34	28	32	21	23	22	
Missing	2	3	2	1	2	2	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1546</i>	<i>588</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>511</i>	<i>930</i>	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Total income is defined as the respondent's earnings from employment, their partner's earnings plus their income from benefits<sup>13</sup>. Where just 1 or 2 of these sources are applicable they constitute total income on their own. Where neither the respondent nor their partner is employed and they do not receive benefits the respondent is treated as having no income.

51% of ALG awardees had a total income of £10,000 or less, and 32% had no income from either earnings or benefits. A higher proportion of those in old areas had no income (34%) than in new areas (28%).

More non-applicants had a total income of £10,000 or less than awardees (59% compared to 51%) and fewer had no income (22% compared to 32%). Distribution of total income was similar for non-applicants in old and new areas.

<sup>12</sup> Total income for each respondent has been derived by adding together respondent's salary, partner's salary and the benefits received by the respondent and/or their partner, using whichever of these is applicable. Prior to being added together the amount received from each of these sources of income was classified into bands with the mid-point used to estimate the amount, to ensure consistency with cases where respondents reported the amount within a band. Respondents with a missing value for income include those who had a missing value for respondent salary and reported no partner salary or benefits. Respondents coded as having no income include those who reported no respondent salary and had missing values for partner salary and/or benefits. This definition of 'income' is used throughout the remainder of the report.

<sup>13</sup> The earnings of both the respondent and their cohabiting partner are taken into account as this reflects the method of eligibility assessment for ALG.

Excluding cases with missing data, fewer awardees at Cohort 2 in old areas had no income (34%) than at Cohort 1 (40%)<sup>14</sup>.

## 2.5 Qualifications

This section examines the level and type of qualifications studied by awardees and non-applicants including those already obtained and those being studied in 2004/5.

### 2.5.1 Qualifications achieved prior to 2004/5

**Table 2.30 Highest qualification level obtained prior to 2004/5**

Highest full level of qualification achieved	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New areas	Total	
Level 1	21	26	22	30	23	27	
Level 2	62	58	61	56	68	62	
Level 3	11	10	11	0	0	0	
Level 4 or above	*	*	*	0	0	0	
Unknown level	*	*	*	1	0	*	
Missing	6	5	6	14	9	11	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1546</i>	<i>588</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>511</i>	<i>930</i>	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

22% of applicants had achieved Level 1 for their highest full qualification and 61% had achieved Level 2. 11% stated that they had achieved a full Level 3 qualification which, if this was accurate, would have made them ineligible for ALG. However, it is possible that some respondents may have incorrectly identified their qualification.

Non-applicants who reported prior full qualifications of Level 3 or above were screened out of the survey and so only those who reported a highest full qualification of Levels 1 or 2 or gave no answer were interviewed. When this inconsistency between the 2 samples is taken account of it can be seen that awardees' qualification profile was comparable to that of non-applicants.

A difference was observed in the relationship between the qualification profiles of awardees and non-applicants between old areas and new areas. In old areas, awardees were more likely than non-applicants to have achieved a qualification at Level 2 whereas in new areas it was non-applicants who were more likely to have achieved a qualification at Level 2. This suggests the possibility that ALG was more effective in attracting learners who had already achieved Level 2 in the old areas, where the award was better established.

<sup>14</sup> 14% of awardees at Cohort 1 had missing data for total income.

**Table 2.31 Qualification types achieved – total and by respondents currently studying at Level 2 and Level 3**

Qualification type	Awardees			Non-applicants			Cell %
	Studying at Level 2	Studying at Level 3	Total	Studying at Level 2	Studying at Level 3	Total	
	NVQ	25	20	21	21	19	19
EdExcel/BTEC	9	16	15	6	14	12	
City and Guild	16	9	10	12	9	9	
OCR/RSA	5	6	6	10	5	6	
AVCE	1	5	4	0	3	3	
GNVQ	19	25	23	11	22	18	
Other vocational qualification (full)	3	3	3	*	1	1	
Other vocational qualification (non-full)	15	14	14	16	13	14	
Any vocational qualification	61	64	62	49	57	55	
A Level/A2	2	7	6	1	8	6	
AS-Level	2	21	17	3	25	18	
GCSE	82	93	90	72	90	83	
Access to Higher Education	1	1	1	86	0	0	
Higher education level qualification	*	0	*	0	0	0	
Other academic qualification (non-full)	0	1	1	1	*	1	
Any academic qualification	82	94	90	72	91	84	
Any other qualification	2	2	2	2	1	2	
All qualifications	89	96	94	83	95	90	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	310	1550	2134	141	603	930	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Table 2.31 shows the qualification types that learners had achieved prior to their current course.

90% of awardees reported having achieved a prior academic qualification. This was usually a GCSE although 17% had an AS-Level and 6% had an A Level or A2. 62% of awardees had achieved a vocational qualification including 23% who had a GNVQ.

The types of prior academic and vocational qualifications held by awardees were comparable with those held by non-applicants.

**Table 2.32 Highest vocational qualification level obtained prior to 2004/5 – awardees**

Highest level of qualification achieved	Awardees with relevant type of qualification						Column %
	NVQ	BTEC/ EdExcel	City and Guilds	OCR/RSA	AVCE	GNVQ	Highest of all vocational qualifications
Level 1	21	14	46	60	11	18	17
Level 2	69	55	37	23	50	77	66
Level 3	6	20	7	5	35	5	13
Level 4	0	1	0	1	0	0	*
Unknown level	4	11	11	11	3	*	3
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>403</i>	<i>281</i>	<i>178</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>501</i>	<i>1207</i>

Base population: Awardees with a known number of each type of qualification.

**Table 2.33 Highest academic qualification level obtained prior to 2004/5 – awardees**

Highest level of qualification achieved	Awardees with relevant type of qualification			Column %
	A2	AS-level	GCSE	Highest of all academic qualifications
Level 1	-	41	58	56
Level 2	73	49	42	40
Level 3	27	10	-	4
Level 4	-	-	-	*
Unknown level	0	0	0	0
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>127</i>	<i>371</i>	<i>211</i>	<i>1928</i>

Base population: Awardees with a known number of each type of qualification.

The highest level of qualification obtained was examined by specific qualification types in order to show at which levels particular types of qualification had most commonly been obtained.

The most common level of vocational qualification reached by awardees who had obtained GNVQs, NVQs, BTEC or EdExcel and AVCE qualifications was Level 2. Those who had taken City and Guilds or OCR/RSA qualification, however, had more commonly obtained a Level 1 qualification.

Quite high proportions of awardees who had obtained any GCSEs or AS-Levels had only reached Level 1, which indicates fewer than 5 GCSEs at grades A\*-C or 1 AS Level. Similarly, most awardees who reported obtaining an A2 qualification had only

achieved Level 2, which indicates that they had achieved 1 A2, rather than Level 3 (2 or more A2s).

## 2.5.2 Qualifications studied in 2004/5

**Table 2.34 Highest level of study during 2004/5**

Highest level of current qualification	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Old areas	New areas	Total	Old areas	New Areas	Total	
Level 1	1	2	2	3	2	2	
Level 2	13	18	15	21	12	17	
Level 3	73	70	72	60	67	63	
Level 4 or above	1	1	1	1	2	1	
Unknown level	1	1	1	1	3	2	
Missing	10	8	10	16	14	15	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1602</i>	<i>531</i>	<i>2133</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>511</i>	<i>930</i>	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Table 2.34 shows the highest level of qualification that learners were studying in the current academic year of 2004/5.

15% of awardees were studying at Level 2 and 72% at Level 3. Collectively, these constituted 87% of awardees who reported a level that made them eligible for ALG funding (so long as it was their first qualification of that level). A further 10% of awardees could not be classified while 3% reported inappropriate Level 1 or Level 4.

The breakdown of awardees between Levels 2 and 3 was fairly similar to that for non-applicants of whom 17% reported studying at Level 2 and 63% at Level 3.

The trend that was noted earlier for a higher proportion of awardees in old areas than in new areas to have a prior Level 2 qualification was reflected in these findings for current qualification whereby a slightly higher proportion of awardees in old areas than in new areas were studying at Level 3. Although this difference was not statistically significant it is worth noting that it contrasted with the pattern among non-applicants whereby learning at Level 3 was less common in old areas than in new areas.

**Table 2.35 Highest level of study during 2004/5 – total and by respondents currently studying at Level 2 and Level 3**

Qualification type	Awardees			Non-applicants			Cell %
	Level 2	Level 3	Total	Level 2	Level 3	Total	
NVQ	45	9	14	50	12	18	
EdExcel/BTEC	25	40	34	19	52	37	
City and Guild	14	5	6	16	6	8	
OCR/RSA	6	2	3	1	1	2	
AVCE	0	14	10	0	15	10	
GNVQ	10	1	3	10	2	3	
Other vocational qualification (full)	4	4	3	3	3	3	
Other vocational qualification (non-full)	7	7	7	10	7	7	
Any vocational qualification	93	70	68	92	83	74	
A Level/A2	0	13	9	0	17	11	
AS-Level	4	7	8	2	9	9	
GCSE	11	7	7	11	4	5	
Access to Higher Education	0	23	17	0	5	3	
Higher education level qualification	0	0	*	0	0	*	
Other academic qualification (non-full)	0	*	*	0	0	0	
Any academic qualification	11	41	34	11	27	22	
Any other qualification	1	2	3	6	1	4	
All qualifications	100	100	94	99	100	90	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>310</i>	<i>1550</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>141</i>	<i>603</i>	<i>930</i>	

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Table 2.35 shows the types of qualifications that learners studied during the academic year, in total and broken down according to qualification level.

Among awardees who were studying at Level 2, 93% were studying a vocational qualification and this was most commonly identified as an NVQ (45%), a BTEC or EdExcel qualification (25%), a City and Guilds qualification (14%) or a GNVQ (10%). 11% of awardees at Level 2 were studying for GCSEs.

Among awardees who were studying at Level 3, 70% were studying a vocational qualification and this was most commonly identified as a BTEC or EdExcel qualification (40%) or an AVCE (14%). 41% of awardees at Level 3 were studying for academic qualifications with Access to Higher Education qualifications (23%) and A2 qualifications (13%) being most common.

A significantly higher proportion of awardees than non-applicants were studying for an Access to Higher Education qualification (23% compared with 5% of those studying at Level 3). Otherwise, the profile of qualifications studied by awardees was not appreciably different from that for non-applicants.

**Table 2.36 Most common subjects currently being studied**

Subject	Cell %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Arts, Media and Publishing	15	18
Health, Public Services and Care	11	8
Preparation for Life and Work	11	8
Business, Administration and Law	9	11
Information and Communication Technology	8	8
Retail and Commercial Enterprise	7	8
Languages, Literature and Culture	6	6
Leisure, Travel and Tourism	5	4
Science and Mathematics	4	2
Engineering and Manufacturing Technology	4	6
Agriculture, Horticulture and Animal Care	3	3
Construction, Planning and the Built Environment	3	4
Social Sciences	3	3
Education and Training	2	3
History, Philosophy and Theology	1	0
Other	2	1
Missing	5	9
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>930</i>

Base population: All awardees and non-applicants.

The most common categories of subjects studied by awardees were arts, media and publishing (15% of awardees), health, public services and care (11%), preparation for life and work (11%), business, administration and law (9%) and information and communications technology (8%).

The subjects studied by awardees were generally similar to those studied by non-applicants.

### 2.5.3 Comparison of qualifications obtained with those studied in 2004/5

Table 2.37 Awardees: level of study by highest level obtained


Previous highest full level obtained	Level of current study					Column %
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Unknown	All levels
No qualifications obtained	[13]	11	4	[-]	[-]	5
Level 1	[46]	56	14	[-]	[-]	22
Level 2	[38]	27	70	[-]	[-]	62
Level 3	[4]	5	12	[-]	[-]	11
Level 4 or above	[0]	1	*	[-]	[-]	*
Unknown	[0]	*	*	[-]	[-]	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	35	310	1550	18	17	1930

Base population: Awardees studying for a known number of qualifications, by level of highest qualification being studied.

Boxed area = qualification-eligible for ALG

Table 2.37 compares awardees current level of study with the highest full level of qualification they had already obtained. This allows qualification-related eligibility for ALG to be assessed – the boxed area in the tables shows the combinations of old and new qualification levels that were eligible for ALG funding.


**Figure 2.1 Highest level of qualifications obtained for awardees currently studying at Level 2**



Base population: Awardees studying a known number of qualifications at Level 2 (N=310)

Among awardees who were studying at Level 2, 11% had no previous full qualifications and 56% had a highest full qualification at Level 1. Taking these groups together, 67% of awardees studying at Level 2 were eligible for ALG in terms of their previous qualifications. 27% indicated that they had already achieved a full Level 2 while 5% claimed to have already achieved a full Level 3. Quite possibly, some of these students may have incorrectly remembered the level and grade of the qualifications which they had attained a few years previously.

**Figure 2.2 Highest level of qualifications obtained for awardees currently studying at Level 3**



Base population: Awardees studying a known number of qualifications at Level 3 (N=1550)

Among awardees who were studying at Level 3, 4% had no previous full qualifications, 14% had their highest full qualification at Level 1 and 70% at Level 2. Taking these groups together, 88% of awardees studying at Level 3 were eligible for ALG in terms of their previous qualifications. 12% indicated that they had already achieved a full Level 3.

**Table 2.38 Awardees: level of current study, including whether first Level 2 or 3**

Level of current study (including whether first L2 or L3)	Column % Awardees
Below Level 2	2
Level 2 - first at this level	10
Level 2 - not first at this level	5
Level 3 - first at this level	64
Level 3 - not first at this level	8
Above Level 3	1
Current unknown level	1
Not currently studying/unknown number of current qualifications	10
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>2134</i>

Base population: All awardees

Table 2.38 summarises the qualification eligibility information for all awardees and shows that the conjunction of prior and current levels of qualification was generally consistent with ALG eligibility rules. However, 5% of awardees appeared to be studying for a Level 2 qualification that was not their first qualification at that level and 8% appeared to be studying for a Level 3 qualification which was not their first qualification at that level. Thus, 13% of awardees overall appeared to be ineligible for ALG in terms of their prior qualifications. This compares with 74% who appeared to be eligible as studying a first Level 2 (10%) or first Level 3 (64%). A further 3% claimed to be studying below Level 2 or above Level 3 while 10% gave insufficient information for this classification to be completed.

## 2.6 Summary

- Awardees were mostly young adults, aged 19 or 20. Non-applicants were of similar age.
- Awardees in old areas had a younger age profile than awardees in new areas or awardees in old areas in Cohort 1. This suggests that the age profile of awardees had shifted further towards younger adults as the grant became established.
- Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to be white (as for Cohort 1).
- Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to live with their parents (as for Cohort 1).
- Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to have children.
- 30% of awardees had a parent who had stayed on at school including 15% who had a parent who had got a degree. These proportions were similar for non-applicants.
- Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to be in full-time education at the time of the interview and were less likely than non-applicants to be in paid employment.
- Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to spend more than 12 hours per week on supervised learning.
- Awardees typically earned under £15,000 per year or had no earnings. Awardees who lived with a partner typically had lower earnings than their partner.
- Only 15% of awardees received benefits, which was a significantly lower proportion than for non-applicants (24%).
- 22% of awardees had achieved Level 1 as their highest prior qualification and 61% had achieved Level 2. In old ALG areas, awardees were more likely than non-applicants to have achieved a level 2 qualification while the opposite was true for new areas.
- A significantly higher proportion of awardees than non-applicants were studying for an Access to Higher Education qualification (23% compared with 5% of those studying at Level 3).
- Based on their reported prior and current qualifications, 10% of awardees were studying for a first Level 2 and 64% for a first Level 3. 5% appeared to be studying for a Level 2 qualification that was not their first and 8% appeared to be studying for a Level 3 qualification that was not their first.

### **3 LEARNERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNING, SOURCES OF INFORMATION, AND REASONS FOR STUDYING**

This chapter examines awardees' and non-applicants' attitudes towards learning, their experiences of finding information, advice and guidance on further education from various sources, and their reasons for studying. Section 3.1 presents findings from old and new pilot areas combined, while in sections 3.2 and 3.3, the results are tabulated by old and new areas, unless broken down by other background characteristics.

#### **3.1 Responses to Attitudinal Statements**

Respondents were asked 10 questions about their attitudes towards learning:

- 1 I didn't get anything useful out of school
- 2 I wish I'd gone to university
- 3 Education is an investment in your future
- 4 I don't have the confidence to learn on my own
- 5 Learning is something you should do throughout your life
- 6 I like the idea of learning in new ways such as through the internet or using CD Roms
- 7 Learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it
- 8 Computers are confusing and make things more difficult
- 9 It is the responsibility of the learner to pay for his or her learning
- 10 Employers should pay for their employees to learn

The extent to which learners agreed or disagreed with the statements was recorded on a 5-point scale (i.e. agree strongly, agree slightly, neither agree nor disagree, disagree slightly, disagree strongly).

Awardees in old and new areas exhibited similar attitudes towards learning. The exception was 'It is the responsibility of the learner to pay for his or her learning', where awardees in new areas were significantly more positive about the idea than awardees in old areas.

Non-applicants in old and new areas exhibited similar attitudes towards learning with respect to all statements except 'Learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it', where non-applicants in old areas showed somewhat more agreement with the notion.

**Table 3.1 Distribution of awardees and non-applicants by expressed attitudes towards learning**

Attitudes towards learning	Awardees					Non-applicants					Row %
	Agree strongly	Agree slightly	Neither	Disagree slightly	Disagree strongly	Agree strongly	Agree Slightly	Neither	Disagree slightly	Disagree strongly	
I got nothing useful out of school	10	9	3	24	55	9	10	3	24	55	
I wish I'd gone to university $\phi$	31	17	12	22	19	26	17	10	24	23	
Education is an investment in your future	82	14	2	1	1	84	12	1	2	1	
I don't have the confidence to learn on my own	5	11	5	30	49	6	12	6	31	46	
Learning should be for a lifetime	74	19	2	3	2	74	19	3	3	1	
I like the idea of learning in new ways	45	34	6	11	5	49	31	6	10	5	
Learning is only worthwhile if leads to qualification	19	17	5	34	24	23	18	7	31	22	
Computers are confusing	5	11	4	30	50	5	11	5	29	51	
Learners should pay for their education	7	14	17	32	30	9	18	17	32	25	
Employers should pay for employees to learn	42	34	11	10	3	39	36	11	11	3	
<i>Unweighted N</i>											
			2134					930			

Base: Awardees and non-applicants.

$\phi$  Excluding those who have gone to university by the time of survey.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Table 3.1 presents awardees and non-applicants responses to attitudinal statements. Although awardees and non-applicants showed broadly similar attitudes towards learning, a number of differences were observed:

- A significantly higher proportion of awardees than non-applicants (31%; 26%) strongly agreed with the statement 'I wish I'd gone to university'.
- Significantly more non-applicants than awardees (49%; 45%) strongly agreed with the statement 'I like the idea of learning in new ways such as through the internet or using CD Roms'.
- Non-applicants were significantly more likely to agree strongly than awardees that 'Learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it' (23%; 19%).
- Non-applicants were also significantly more likely to agree slightly that 'It is the responsibility of the learner to pay for his or her learning' (18%; 14%).

Further analysis of awardees' and non-applicants' attitudes towards learning by background characteristics is provided in the Annex (Tables A1-A10). There were some interesting differences in responses by ethnicity to some of the attitude questions. Black respondents and Asian respondents were more likely than White respondents to agree with the following statements:

- "I wish I'd gone to university"
- "Learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it" (also found in Cohort 1).

Over 25s and people living with partners were more likely to agree with "I didn't get anything useful out of school".

### 3.2 Sources of Information, Advice and Guidance on Further Education

Table 3.2 Sources of information, advice and guidance on further education

Source of information and advice on FE	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Old	New	Old	New
School, college, adult education or evening institute	76	76	68	74
Friends and relatives	62	61	55	61
Connexions service	27	19	29	23
Work colleagues	17	15	17	20
Website (Learndirect or Worktrain)	13	12	14	17
A training centre	10	7	14	10
Local LSC	9	8	13	7
Employer	7	8	10	11
New deal or Jobcentre Plus	7	7	7	7
Telephone helpline (Learndirect or Connections Direct)	7	8	4	5
Local information, advice and guidance partnership	4	5	5	4
Other persons or organisations	4	5	5	6
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1546	588	419	511

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

The most common sources of information, advice and guidance (IAG) on further education for awardees were an education institution (i.e. school, college, adult education or evening institution) (76%), and friends and relatives (old 62%; new 61%). There were negligible differences by sources between old and new areas, except that a significantly higher proportion of awardees in old areas than in new areas said they received advice on further education from the Connexions Service (27%; 19%). Likewise, non-applicants in old and new areas gave broadly similar responses, except that non-applicants in old areas were significantly more likely than those in new areas (13%; 7%) to say they had obtained advice from a local Learning and Skills Council.

In old pilot areas, significantly higher proportions of awardees than non-applicants named friends and relatives (62%; 55%) and an education institution (76%; 68%) as sources of IAG on further education, while significantly lower proportions of awardees than non-applicants named a training centre (10%; 14%) and employer (7%; 10%) as sources of IAG. In new areas, on the other hand, significantly lower proportions of awardees than non-applicants mentioned work colleagues (15%; 20%) and websites (12%; 17%).

In old and new areas combined, 7% of awardees and 9% of non-applicants did not name any source of IAG, while 24% in each group only mentioned 1 source. The maximum number of sources was 11 for both awardees and non-applicants. Awardees and non-applicants who received IAG did so from 3 sources on average.

**Table 3.3 Most useful sources of information, advice and guidance on further education**

Most useful source of information and advice on FE	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Old	New	Old	New
School, college, adult education or evening institute	48	51	42	44
Friends and relatives	27	26	22	27
Connexions service	12	7	15	9
Website (Learndirect or Worktrain)	4	6	7	9
Other persons or organisations	3	2	3	3
Work colleagues	2	2	3	2
Telephone helpline (Learndirect or Connections Direct)	2	3	1	1
Employer	1	2	4	2
New deal or Jobcentre Plus	1	1	2	2
Local information, advice and guidance partnership	*	1	*	0
A training centre	*	*	2	1
Local LSC	0	0	*	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1055	381	284	342

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who reported more than 1 source of advice on FE. Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Respondents who named more than one source of IAG were asked which one they had found the most useful. An education institution was most commonly cited by awardees

in old and new areas (old - 48%; new - 51%), followed by friends and relatives (27%; 26%), and Connexions (12%; 7%).

In old areas, a significantly higher proportion of awardees than non-applicants found an education institution to be the most useful source of IAG (48%; 42%). Significantly lower proportions of awardees than non-applicants mentioned websites (4%; 7%) and employers (1%; 4%). There were no significant differences between awardees' and non-applicants' responses in new pilot areas.

**Table 3.4 Most useful sources of information, advice and guidance on further education by age**

Most useful source of information and advice on FE	Awardees				Non-applicants				Column %
	19	20	21-24	25-31	19	20	21-24	25-31	
Education institution	49	51	44	50	45	45	36	39	
Friends and relatives	30	26	27	16	26	27	23	17	
Connexions service	12	13	8	7	16	12	9	2	
Website	4	4	5	8	8	6	7	9	
Other	2	2	5	3	2	2	4	8	
Work colleagues	2	1	5	1	1	2	4	5	
Telephone helpline	*	1	2	10	*	0	3	0	
Employer	1	1	2	1	2	4	5	3	
New Deal or Jobcentre Plus	1	*	2	1	*	1	3	6	
Local IAG	*	0	*	2	0	0	0	2	
A training centre	*	*	1	1	0	1	5	9	
Local LSC	0	0	0	0	*	1	0	0	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>538</i>	<i>440</i>	<i>305</i>	<i>153</i>	<i>317</i>	<i>163</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>50</i>	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who reported more than 1 source of advice on FE. Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

A significantly lower proportion of 19-year-old awardees than non-applicants of this age found websites to be the most useful source (4%; 8%). Awardees aged 25-31 years were significantly more likely than non-applicants of this age to name the telephone helpline, but significantly less likely to mention New Deal or Jobcentre Plus or a training centre.

### 3.3 Reasons for Choosing Current Course

Respondents who were studying during 2004-2005 academic year were asked why they were taking their courses. 7% of them (6% of all awardees) were enrolled on a course related to the job they were doing at the time, although learning was compulsory in only 6% of these cases (less than 1% of all awardees). Of learners who were enrolled on courses not related to the job they were doing at the time, 89% (80% of all awardees) believed it would help them with a job they were thinking of doing in the future. Of those who were taking a course related to the job there were doing, 83% studied in their own

free time and 17% did it in both their own and employer's time.<sup>15</sup> 95% of awardees said they intended to get a job in the future where they would use some of the skills they have learned during their studies in 2004-2005.

Among non-applicants who studied in 2004-2005, 12% (11% of all non-applicants) said they were studying for a course related to the job they were doing at the time, for 24% of whom (3% of non-applicants) it was compulsory. Similarly to awardees, of non-applicants studying for a course not related to their job, 89% (73% of non-applicants) believed it would help them with a future job. Of those who were taking a course related to the job there were doing, 40% said they studied in their own time, 7% did it in employer's time, while the majority did it in both their own and the employer's time. Overall, 92% of non-applicants who were studying in 2004-2005 said they intended to get a job in the future where they would use some of the skills they have learned.

**Table 3.5a Awardees' and non-applicants' specific reasons for taking course not related to their job or related but non-compulsory**

Reasons for taking course	Awardees		Non-applicants		Cell %
	Old	New	Old	New	
Develop a career	93	94	93	92	
Get more satisfaction from work	61	68	57	56	
Get a new job	58	67	51	51	
Change to a different career	54	63	48	49	
Start up own or family business	26	29	30	28	
Help with work problems related to disability	3	3	7	4	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1467	566	371	463	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who were studying in 2004-2005 for non-compulsory, job-related courses or studying for a course not related to the job.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

Amongst awardees taking non-compulsory courses related to the job they were doing at the time or courses not related to their job, the most common reason for enrolling on the course was career development (old - 93%; new - 94%) (Table 3.5a). Significantly more awardees in new areas than in old areas (68%; 61%) named work satisfaction as a reason for taking the course. Awardees in new areas were also significantly more likely than awardees in old areas to state getting a new job (67%; 58%) and changing to a different career (63%; 54%) as reasons.

In old areas, significantly higher proportions of awardees than non-applicants named getting a new job (58%; 51%) and changing to a different career (54%; 48%) as reasons for studying. However, awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants (3%; 7%) to mention helping with disability-related work problems as a reason for studying.

In new areas only, awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to say they were studying to get more satisfaction from work (68%; 56%).

<sup>15</sup> Activity status of some of the respondents has changed since they enrolled on their courses.

**Table 3.5b Awardees and non-applicants studying for non-compulsory job-related courses - specific reasons for taking current course**

Reasons for taking course	Awardees		Non-applicants		Cell %
	Old	New	Old	New	
Gain new skills for a job	78	[82]	[89]	[81]	
Get a pay rise	28	[34]	[24]	[18]	
Keep a job that might have been lost if did not study	8	[8]	[11]	[18]	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>34</i>	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who were studying in 2004-2005 for non-compulsory, job-related courses

Only respondents who were studying for non-compulsory courses related to the jobs they were doing at the time were routed to questions presented in Table 3.5b. For both awardees and non-applicants, gaining new skills for the job was the predominant reason for studying, in old and new areas alike.

**Table 3.6 Awardees' and non-applicants' reasons for taking current course, by age**

Reasons for taking course	Awardees				Non-applicants				Cell %
	19	20	21-24	25-31	19	20	21-24	25-31	
Develop a career	94	93	92	93	93	93	93	89	
Get more satisfaction from work	52	63	68	79	50	52	65	71	
Get a new job	48	55	71	83	43	48	67	60	
Change to a different career	37	50	72	88	40	48	59	61	
Start up own or family business	24	27	29	30	23	30	37	32	
Help with work problems related to disability	3	2	3	6	3	4	5	19	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>726</i>	<i>613</i>	<i>452</i>	<i>245</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>213</i>	<i>145</i>	<i>77</i>	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who were studying in 2004-2005 for non-compulsory, job-related courses or studying for a course not related to the job.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Awardees aged 25-31 years were significantly more likely to name getting a new job, changing to a different career and getting more satisfaction from work as reasons for taking their courses than younger awardees ( $p < 0.001$ ). 25-31 year old awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants of the same age to state getting a new job (83%; 60%) or changing career as reasons for studying (88%; 61%). Awardees aged 21-24 years were significantly more likely than non-applicants of this age to name career change as a reason (72%; 59%), while 20-year-old awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants of this age to say they were studying to get more satisfaction from work (63%; 52%).

Non-applicants aged 25-31 years were significantly more likely than awardees of the same age to say they were studying to help with work problems related to disability (19%; 6%).

**Table 3.7 Awardees' and non-applicants' reasons for taking current course, by level of current qualification aim**

Reasons for taking course	Awardees		Non-applicants		Cell %
	Level 2	Level 3	Level 2	Level 3	
Develop a career	95	93	95	92	
Get more satisfaction from work	73	61	65	57	
Get a new job	67	59	60	49	
Change to a different career	62	55	55	48	
Start up own or family business	45	23	43	25	
Help with work problems related to disability	7	2	8	5	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	308	1542	134	590	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who were studying in 2004-2005 for non-compulsory, job-related courses or studying for a course not related to the job for qualifications at Level 2 or Level 3  
 Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Awardees studying for Level 2 qualifications were significantly more likely than awardees studying for Level 3 qualifications to cite getting a new job, getting more satisfaction from work, starting up a business, and helping with work problems related to disability ( $p < 0.001$ ) as reasons for studying. Among learners studying for Level 3 qualifications, awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to say that getting a new job (59%; 49%) or changing career (55%; 48%) were their reasons for studying. Awardees studying at Level 3 were significantly less likely than non-applicants studying at the same level to name helping with disability-related work problems as a reason (2%; 5%).

**Table 3.8 Awardees' and non-applicants' reasons for taking current course, by ethnicity**

Reasons for taking course	Awardees				Non-applicants				Cell %
	Asian	Black	White	Mixed	Asian	Black	White	Mixed	
Develop a career	94	96	93	90	96	[89]	91	[98]	
Get more satisfaction from work	52	43	66	58	53	[36]	58	[60]	
Get a new job	45	39	64	58	48	[32]	53	[58]	
Change to a different career	43	42	59	49	49	[50]	48	[50]	
Start up own or family business	29	26	27	24	37	[31]	26	[44]	
Help with work problems related to disability	5	5	3	4	8	[14]	5	[2]	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>269</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>1594</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>632</i>	<i>47</i>	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who were studying in 2004-2005 for non-compulsory, job-related courses or studying for a course not related to the job.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

White awardees were more likely to state getting a new job, changing to a different career, and getting more satisfaction from work as reasons for their studies than awardees from other ethnic groups ( $p < 0.001$ ). White awardees were also significantly more likely than White non-applicants to state these reasons for studying, while they were less likely to say they were studying to help with work problems related to a disability (3%; 5%). Awardees of mixed ethnic origin were significantly less likely to say they were studying to set up their own family business than non-applicants of mixed ethnic origin (24%; 44%). However, this finding should be interpreted with caution because of the low base size in the non-applicant sample.

### 3.4 Summary

- Awardees and non-applicants exhibited broadly similar attitudes towards learning, although awardees were more likely to strongly agree they wished that had gone to university than non-applicants.
- Awardees studying for qualifications at Level 2 were more likely to agree that they had got nothing useful out of school than those studying for Level 3 qualifications.
- Learners most commonly used an education institution, and family and friends as sources of information, advice and guidance (IAG) on FE.
- The most useful sources of IAG were education institution, family and friends, and the Connexions Service.
- Overall, learners most commonly gave career development as a reason for studying.
- Very few learners in work were enrolled on courses related to their job. For learners in work who were enrolled on non-compulsory job-related courses, the main reason for studying was to gain new skills for the job.
- For learners in work who were enrolled on non-job-related courses, the main reason for studying was to get a job they were thinking of doing in the future.
- Awardees studying at Level 3 were more likely than non-applicants studying at Level 3 to say they were studying in order to change job or career.

## **4 COSTS AND FUNDING OF LEARNING**

### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter focuses on the costs associated with learning and sources of funding. The payment of tuition, registration and exam fees is broken down by LSC area and background characteristics including current and previous activity, income and qualification level. The analysis then turns to sources of funding other than the ALG, covering EMA, funding from the LEA or college, Learner Support Funds and Employer Training Pilots.

Since the findings for recipients were very similar to those for awardees, they are not presented separately after the first table.

## 4.2 Costs of Courses

### 4.2.1 Payment of tuition fees

Table 4.1 Payment of tuition fees by awardees, recipients and non-applicants by LSC area

Local LSC area	Awardees				Non-applicants	
	All awardees		ALG recipients		Row %	Unweighted N
	Row %	Unweighted N	Row %	Unweighted N		
<b>Old areas</b>						
- Bedfordshire & Luton	23	94	24	79	[30]	25
- Black Country	8	99	9	91	10	54
- Co Durham	5	76	6	64	[-]	10
- Devon & Cornwall	33	214	33	195	[24]	47
- Humberside	11	155	9	134	[4]	24
- Lancashire	12	331	10	293	[14]	44
- Leicestershire	21	155	19	134	[22]	41
- London West	26	126	26	105	36	91
- Shropshire	0	51	[0]	43	[-]	8
- South Yorkshire	8	170	8	151	[9]	40
<b>All old areas</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1471</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1289</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>New areas</b>						
- Berkshire	[-]	18	[-]	15	37	56
- Hants/IOW	40	120	39	106	23	103
- Kent and Medway	34	90	32	81	26	71
- Milton Keynes/Ox/Bucks	52	67	53	62	[41]	41
- Northumberland	[-]	10	[-]	9	[-]	12
- Surrey	[-]	17	[-]	16	[35]	44
- Sussex	37	81	38	69	28	54
- Tees Valley	6	83	6	79	[5]	29
- Tyne & Wear	4	89	2	76	5	64
<b>All new areas</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>474</b>
All cases	19	2046	19	1802	22	858

Base: Awardees and non-applicants who reported having studied for a course or qualification in 2004-05. The shading refers to significant differences between old and new areas.

Overall, just under a fifth of awardees who had studied during 2004-05 (19%) reported that they or their family or partner had paid course fees or tuition fees in order for them to study (Table 4.1).

There was considerable variation by area on payment of fees, with significantly fewer awardees in old areas paying fees (16%) than in new areas (28%), and even larger variation between local LSC areas. For example, under 5% of awardees paid tuition

fees in the Shropshire and Tyne and Wear areas, compared to 23% in Bedfordshire and Luton, 40% in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, and 52% in Milton Keynes, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire. The results show that the pattern has persisted from cohort 1 in which Bedfordshire and Luton, Devon and Cornwall, Leicestershire and London West charged tuition fees to more than 20% of students, whereas the other local LSCs only charged tuition fees to a small percentage of students.

The proportions of ALG recipients paying fees were very similar to those of awardees as a whole; separate figures for recipients will not be reported further in this section.

A similar overall proportion of non-applicants paid fees as awardees (22% compared with 19%), and there was similar variation in the proportions paying fees by local LSC area, although there was no overall significant difference between non-applicants in old areas and new areas.

The similar proportions of awardees and non-applicants who paid tuition fees was a change from Cohort 1, where awardees were significantly less likely to pay tuition fees than non-applicants (awardees 14%; non-applicants 21%).

**Table 4.2 Payment of tuition fees by awardees and non-applicants by background characteristics**

Background characteristic	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>
<b>Age group</b>				
- 19	12	728	11	408
- 20	21	617	29	219
- 21-24	26	454	30	150
- 25-31	22	247	32	81
<b>Gender</b>				
- Male	22	1005	22	485
- Female	17	1041	22	373
<b>Ethnic group*</b>				
- Asian or Asian British	15	272	22	116
- Black or Black British	14	79	[19]	37
- White	20	1619	21	656
- Mixed/other	20	73	[31]	47
<b>Living arrangement</b>				
- single, lives with parents	19	1577	21	614
- lives with partner	18	235	18	84
- other	23	234	26	160
All cases	19	2046	22	858

Base: Awardees and non-applicants who reported having studied for a course or qualification in 2004-05.  
 \*Total cases smaller than total due to missing data.

Considerably fewer awardees aged 19 paid tuition fees (12%) than older awardees (for example, 21% of 20-year-olds). A similar pattern was seen among non-applicants. Fewer female awardees paid fees (17%) than male awardees (22%) (Table 4.2).

There were no significant differences in payment of tuition fees by ethnic group or living arrangement.

**Table 4.3 Payment of tuition fees by awardees by activity and income, by old and new areas**

Activity and income	Old areas		Awardees New areas		All areas	
	Row	<i>Unweighted</i>	Row	<i>Unweighted</i>	Row	<i>Unweighted</i>
	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>
<b>Current main activity</b>						
- FT education with no job	17	411	22	129	18	540
- FT education with a job	16	455	37	189	21	644
- FT/PT work	16	374	21	173	18	547
- Unemployed/Other	15	231	29	84	19	315
<b>Previous main activity</b>						
- FT education with no job	13	585	25	188	15	773
- FT education with a job	15	344	25	143	18	487
- FT/PT work	22	391	34	170	26	561
- Unemployed/Other	17	150	25	73	20	223
<b>Annual income band</b>						
- Up to £10,000	16	736	32	315	21	1051
- £10,001 to £15,000	10	96	[25]	31	13	127
- £15,000+	19	96	26	50	21	146
- no income	18	512	21	164	18	676
All cases	16	1471	28	575	19	2046

Base: Awardees who reported having studied for a course or qualification in 2004-05.  
Those with missing data for a for activity or income are shown in the 'All cases' row.

**Table 4.4 Payment of tuition fees by non-applicants by activity and income, by old and new areas**

Activity and income	Non-applicants					
	Old areas		New areas		All areas	
	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>
<b>Current main activity</b>						
- FT education with no job	24	65	28	61	26	126
- FT education with a job	17	63	25	93	21	156
- FT/PT work	19	160	24	211	21	371
- Unemployed/Other	20	95	22	105	21	204
<b>Previous main activity</b>						
- FT education with no job	18	169	24	185	21	354
- FT education with a job	23	105	22	166	23	271
- FT/PT work	23	52	34	79	29	131
- Unemployed/Other	15	58	[16]	44	15	102
<b>Annual income band</b>						
- Up to £10,000	19	224	21	272	20	496
- £10,001 to £15,000	[22]	35	[21]	38	22	73
- £15,000+	[3]	31	[36]	34	17	65
- no income	28	90	27	119	28	209
All cases	20	384	24	474	22	858

Base: Non-applicants who reported having studied for a course or qualification in 2004-05. Those with missing data for activity or income are shown in the 'All cases' row.

For awardees overall, there were no significant differences in payment of tuition fees by current activity. Of awardees in new areas, a higher proportion of those in full-time education with a job paid fees (37%) than those in full-time education with no job (22%) (Table 4.3).

A higher proportion of awardees previously in full-time or part-time employment paid fees (26%) than those previously in full-time education without a job (15%) or full-time education with a job (18%). While this pattern was observed in both old and new areas, the differences were significant in old but not new areas.

There was no significant variation in payment of fees by current or previous activity for non-applicants.

A smaller proportion of awardees with an annual income between £10,001 and £15,000 paid tuition fees (13%) than those with an income of £10,000 or less (21%). In new areas, more awardees with an income of £10,000 or less paid tuition fees (32%) than those with no income (21%). In both old and new areas, fewer non-applicants with incomes of £10,000 or less (20%) paid tuition fees than those with no income (28%).

**Table 4.5 Payment of tuition fees by awardees by current qualification aim, by old and new areas**

Current qualification aim	Old areas		Awardees New areas		All areas	
	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>
Level 2	24	206	24	104	24	310
Level 3	15	1136	29	414	18	1550
All cases	16	1471	28	575	19	2046

Base: Awardees and non-applicants who reported having studied for a course or qualification in 2004-05.

Those with 'unknown level', Levels 1 or 4, or missing data for qualifications are shown in the 'All cases' row.

**Table 4.6 Payment of tuition fees by non-applicants by current qualification aim, by old and new areas**

Current qualification aim	Old areas		Non-applicants New areas		All areas	
	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>
Level 2	13	83	21	58	16	141
Level 3	20	254	26	349	23	603
All cases	20	384	24	474	22	858

Base: Awardees and non-applicants who reported having studied for a course or qualification in 2004-05.

Those with 'unknown level', Levels 1 or 4, or missing data for qualifications are shown in the 'All cases' row.

Awardees studying in 2004-05 at Level 3 were significantly less likely to pay tuition fees (18%) than those studying at Level 2 (24%). This difference was seen in old areas but not new areas. The differences in payment of tuition fees by level of study for non-applicants were not significant (Tables 4.5 and 4.6).

Awardees studying in new areas were significantly more likely to pay tuition fees (28%) than those in old areas (16%).

**Table 4.7 Payment of tuition fees by awardees by living arrangement**

Who pays fees	ALG Awardees			
	Single, lives with parents	Lives with partner	Other	All
Only respondent	47	[32]	51	46
Only family/partner	28	[36]	20	28
Both respondent and family	25	[32]	27	26
<i>Unweighted N</i>	302	42	53	397

Base: Awardees who pay tuition fees for study (or whose family/partner pays)  
 Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

**Table 4.8 Payment of tuition fees by non-applicants by living arrangement**

Who pays fees	Non-applicants			
	Single, lives with parents	Lives with partner	Other	All
Only respondent	34	[-]	[54]	40
Only family/partner	35	[-]	[35]	36
Both respondent and family	32	[-]	[11]	24
<i>Unweighted N</i>	131	15	40	186

Base: Non-applicants who pay tuition fees for study (or whose family/partner pays)  
 Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

Respondents who paid tuition fees were asked whether only they paid the fees, only their family or partner paid or both. Of awardees who paid tuition fees, nearly half (46%) paid the fees themselves, as did a similar proportion of non-applicants. Significantly more awardees who lived with their parents paid their own tuition fees (47%) than non-applicants who lived with their parents (34%). Awardees' living arrangements were not significantly related to who paid their tuition fees (Tables 4.7 and 4.8).

**Table 4.9 Amount of tuition fees paid by awardees (and family/partner) by gender, by old and new areas**

Gender	Old areas		Awardees New areas		All areas	
	Mean (£)	<i>Unweighted N</i>	Mean (£)	<i>Unweighted N</i>	Mean (£)	<i>Unweighted N</i>
Male	693	106	360	80	564	186
Female	441	95	428	65	436	160
All cases	572	201	391	145	503	346

Base: Awardees who pay, or whose family/partner pays, a known amount of tuition fees for study.<sup>16</sup>

**Table 4.10 Amount of tuition fees paid by non-applicants (and family/partner) by gender, by old and new areas**

Gender	Old areas		Non-applicants New areas		All areas	
	Mean (£)	<i>Unweighted N</i>	Mean (£)	<i>Unweighted N</i>	Mean (£)	<i>Unweighted N</i>
Male	[928]	33	435	59	652	92
Female	[889]	36	[500]	38	727	74
All cases	906	69	461	97	688	166

Base: Non-applicants who pay, or whose family/partner pays, a known amount of tuition fees for study.<sup>17</sup>

The average amount of tuition fees paid by awardees and their families/partners<sup>18</sup> was £503. The amount paid ranged from £5 to £6,000. This was not significantly different from the £688 paid by non-applicants, with a range from £19 to £12,200. Some differences in the amounts paid were identified (Tables 4.9 and 4.10).

- There appeared to be area differences in the amount of tuition fees paid. Awardees in old areas paid a higher amount of fees on average (£572) than awardees in new areas (£391): this difference was significant for male awardees but female awardees in old and new areas paid similar amounts. Non-applicants in old areas also paid more fees on average (£906) than in new areas (£461).

<sup>16</sup> Note that the table excludes respondents whose tuition fees were paid by both themselves and their family/partner who did not know the amounts paid by both themselves and by their family/partner

<sup>17</sup> Note that the table excludes respondents whose tuition fees were paid by both themselves and their family/partner who did not know the amounts paid by both themselves and by their family/partner

<sup>18</sup> Henceforth 'paid by awardees (or non-applicants)' will refer to the amount paid by the learners themselves and, if applicable, their family or partner. These figures exclude respondents who did not know the full amount paid i.e. respondents able to report the amount they themselves paid but not that paid by their family/partner are excluded.

- In Cohorts 1 and 2, the average amount of fees paid by non-applicants was higher than that paid by awardees but in both cases the difference was not significant.

**Table 4.11 Amount of tuition fees paid by awardees and non-applicants (and family/partner) by background characteristics**

Background characteristic	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Mean (£)	<i>Unweighted N</i>	Mean (£)	<i>Unweighted N</i>
<b>Age group</b>				
- 19	262	68	[728]	39
- 20	413	120	703	58
- 21-24	683	105	[659]	44
- 25-31	582	53	[670]	25
<b>Living arrangement</b>				
- single, lives with parents	473	266	652	114
- lives with partner	[480]	38	[-]	14
- other	[703]	42	[720]	38
All cases	503	346	688	166

Base: Awardees and non-applicants who pay, or whose family/partner pays, a known amount of tuition fees for study<sup>19</sup>

The amount of tuition fees paid by awardees increased with age, with those aged 20 paying significantly less than those aged 21 to 24, and those aged 19 paying significantly less still. There was no significant variation by age for non-applicants (Table 4.11).

<sup>19</sup> Note that the table excludes respondents whose tuition fees were paid by both themselves and their family/partner, who did not know the amounts paid by both themselves and by their family/partner

**Table 4.12 Amount of tuition fees paid by awardees and non-applicants (and family/partner) by activity, qualifications and income**

Activity, qualifications and income	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Mean (£)	Unweighted N	Mean (£)	Unweighted N
<b>Current main activity</b>				
- FT education with no job	714	78	[422]	29
- FT education with a job	379	131	[585]	28
- FT/PT work	394	87	877	70
- Unemployed/Other	675	50	[613]	39
<b>Previous main activity</b>				
- FT education with no job	407	101	804	61
- FT education with a job	467	76	741	52
- FT/PT work	609	132	[540]	36
- Unemployed/Other	[444]	37	[-]	17
<b>Current qualification aim <math>\phi</math></b>				
- Level 2	818	62	[1376]	22
- Level 3	422	252	554	120
<b>Annual income band</b>				
- no income	692	96	[622]	48
- Up to £10,000	412	198	736	89
- £10,001 and over	[495]	46	[669]	25
All cases	503	346	688	166

Base: Awardees and non-applicants who pay, or whose family/partner pays, a known amount of tuition fees for study.<sup>20</sup>

Those with missing data for a for activity, qualifications or income are shown in the 'All cases' row.

$\phi$  Rows for respondents with 'unknown level', Level 1 and Level 4 not shown.

Awardees currently in full-time education with no job paid more tuition fees on average than those in full-time education with a job. Awardees who were previously in full or part-time work paid more tuition fees than those previously in full-time education without a job. There were no significant differences in the amounts of tuition fees paid by current or previous activity for non-applicants (Table 4.12).

Overall, awardees studying at Level 2 paid considerably higher tuition fees (£818) than those studying at Level 3 (£422). This difference was seen in old areas but not in new areas, where (although the base size for those studying at Level 2 was low) the amounts paid by those studying at Levels 2 and 3 were similar. There were no significant differences for non-applicants in amounts paid by level of qualification.

<sup>20</sup> Note that the table excludes respondents whose tuition fees were paid by both themselves and their family/partner, who did not know the amounts paid by both themselves and by their family/partner

Awardees who earned up to £10,000 paid significantly lower tuition fees (£412) than those with no income (£692).

#### 4.2.2 Payment of registration and exam fees

**Table 4.13 Payment of registration and exam fees by awardees and non-applicants by LSC area**

Local LSC area	Awardees			Non-applicants		
	Registration Row %	Exam Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Registration Row %	Exam Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>
<b>Old areas</b>						
Bedfordshire & Luton	41	18	94	[20]	[19]	25
Black Country	31	13	99	20	23	54
Co Durham	7	2	76	[-]	[-]	10
Devon & Cornwall	23	14	214	[18]	[8]	47
Humberside	12	8	155	[6]	[15]	24
Lancashire	10	8	331	[10]	[12]	44
Leicestershire	29	12	155	[18]	[14]	41
London West	46	13	126	36	13	91
Shropshire	10	4	51	[-]	[-]	8
South Yorkshire	9	8	170	[6]	[9]	40
<b>All old areas</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1471</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>384</b>
<b>New areas</b>						
Berkshire	[-]	[-]	18	42	18	56
Hants/IOW	20	12	120	14	17	103
Kent and Medway	35	14	90	22	15	71
Milton Keynes/Ox/Bucks	21	13	67	[20]	[18]	41
Northumberland	[-]	[-]	10	[-]	[-]	12
Surrey	24	17	17	[12]	[16]	44
Sussex	29	19	81	22	10	54
Tees Valley	8	2	83	[8]	[15]	29
Tyne & Wear	2	5	89	2	12	64
<b>All new areas</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>474</b>
All cases	20	11	2046	18	14	858

Base: Awardees and non-applicants who reported having studied for a course or qualification in 2004-05.

20% of awardees (or their families or partner) paid registration fees for their studying in 2004-05 and 11% paid exam fees. These proportions were very similar for old and new areas overall, but there was considerable variation between local LSC areas. The proportion paying registration fees ranged from 2% in Tyne and Wear to 41% in Bedfordshire and Luton. The range in proportions of those paying exam fees was not as great, but did range from 2% in Tees Valley and County Durham to 19% in Sussex (Table 4.13). The results show a similar pattern to cohort 1, where the four local LSCs who were more likely to charge tuition fees (i.e. Bedfordshire and Luton, Devon and Cornwall, Leicestershire and London West) were also more likely

to charge registration fees. The Black Country charged registration fees for a higher proportion of cohort 2 students than cohort 1 students.

A similar proportion of awardees paid registration fees as non-applicants. Fewer awardees overall paid exam fees than non-applicants (11% compared to 14%) and there was a similar significant difference between them in old areas (but not in new areas).

Table 4.14 Payment of registration and exam fees by awardees and non-applicants by learner characteristics

Background	Registration Row %	Awardees Exam Row %	<i>Unweighted N</i>	Registration Row %	Non-applicants Exam Row %	<i>Unweighted N</i>
<b>Age group</b>						
- 19	14	10	728	11	11	408
- 20	22	11	617	20	15	219
- 21-24	25	11	454	25	16	150
- 25-31	23	10	247	25	22	81
<b>Gender</b>						
- Male	20	9	1041	20	14	373
- Female	20	13	1005	17	15	485
<b>Ethnic group*</b>						
- Asian or Asian British	25	18	272	28	24	116
- Black or Black British	38	13	79	[13]	[11]	37
- White	18	10	1619	16	12	656
- Mixed/other	27	7	73	[27]	[19]	47
<b>Living arrangement</b>						
- lives with parents	20	11	1577	17	14	614
- lives with partner	19	9	235	17	19	84
- other	21	10	234	22	14	160
All cases	20	11	2046	18	14	858

Base: Awardees and non-applicants who reported having studied for a course or qualification in 2004-05.

\*Total number of cases fewer than overall due to missing data.

A smaller proportion of the youngest awardees, those aged 19, paid registration fees (14%) than those in older age groups, of whom at least 22% paid these fees. A similar pattern was seen for non-applicants. Payment of exam fees did not vary by age for awardees. More of the oldest non-applicants, those aged 25-31, paid exam fees (22%) than the youngest, aged 18-19 (11%) (Table 4.14).

Slightly more female awardees paid exam fees (13%) than male awardees (9%). The same proportion of men and women (20%) paid registration fees.

Variations in payment of registration and exam fees occurred by ethnicity. More Black and Asian awardees paid registration fees (25% and 28% respectively) than White awardees (18%). More Asian awardees paid exam fees (18%) than White awardees (10%). Similarly more Asian non-applicants paid registration fees (28%) and exam fees (24%) than White non-applicants (16% and 12% respectively).

**Table 4.15 Payment of registration and exam fees by awardees and non-applicants by activity, qualification, and income**

Background	Awardees			Non-applicants		
	Registration Row %	Exam Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Registration Row %	Exam Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>
<b>Current main activity</b>						
- FT education with no job	20	11	540	24	12	126
- FT education with a job	21	12	644	21	18	156
- FT/PT work	18	10	547	16	15	371
- Unemployed/Other	21	10	315	16	11	204
<b>Previous main activity</b>						
- FT education with no job	18	12	773	15	11	354
- FT education with a job	19	11	487	19	15	271
- FT/PT work	22	9	561	20	19	131
- Unemployed/Other	23	10	223	22	18	102
<b>Highest level of current qualification aim<sup>φ</sup></b>						
- Level 2	21	10	310	23	14	141
- Level 3	20	11	1550	17	15	603
<b>Annual income band</b>						
- no income	20	11	676	17	12	209
- Up to £10,000	20	11	1051	18	13	496
- £10,001 to £15,000	21	7	127	17	13	73
- £15,000+	21	10	146	19	31	65
All cases	20	11	2046	18	14	858

Base: Awardees and non-applicants who reported having studied for a course or qualification in 2004-05.

Those with missing data for activity, qualifications or income are shown in the 'All cases' row.

<sup>φ</sup> Rows for respondents with 'unknown level', Level 1 and Level 4 not shown.

There were no large differences in payment of registration or exam fees by activity, qualification or income for awardees or non-applicants.

### 4.3 Sources of Funding

#### 4.3.1 Education Maintenance Allowance

**Table 4.16 Per cent of awardees and non-applicants who had heard of EMA, by LSC area**

Local LSC area	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Row %	<i>Unweighted N</i>	Row %	<i>Unweighted N</i>
<b>Old areas</b>				
- Bedfordshire & Luton	69	84	[47]	22
- Black Country	84	90	[82]	44
- Co Durham	72	61	[-]	11
- Devon & Cornwall	77	157	[67]	39
- Humberside	75	118	[-]	17
- Lancashire	60	278	[57]	35
- Leicestershire	81	121	[65]	34
- London West	71	119	57	74
- Shropshire	[64]	41	[-]	6
- South Yorkshire	83	128	[87]	39
<b>All old areas</b>	73	1197	67	321
<b>New areas</b>				
- Berkshire	[-]	13	47	51
- Hants/IOW	64	90	55	95
- Kent and Medway	73	72	52	60
- Milton Keynes/Ox/Bucks	[52]	48	[42]	41
- Northumberland	[-]	7	[-]	8
- Surrey	[-]	16	[49]	39
- Sussex	[44]	44	[47]	47
- Tees Valley	81	63	[68]	28
- Tyne & Wear	77	57	79	56
<b>All new areas</b>	68	410	56	425
<b>All cases</b>	72	1607	61	746

Base: Awardees and non-applicants aged 19 to 21.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

The Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) is a learning grant available to 16-19 year olds. It was piloted in various areas and rolled out in 2004, and so was available nationally at a time which overlapped with some of the respondents being of an eligible age.

Only respondents aged 19 to 21 were asked about EMA, and the following paragraphs refer to those of this age group. 72% of awardees of this age had heard

of EMA, a significantly higher proportion to that of non-applicants (61%). This marked a difference to Cohort 1, where the proportions of awardees and non-applicants who had heard of EMA were similar. The proportion of awardees who had heard of EMA was also higher than the proportion of Cohort 1 awardees who had heard of it (52%), but there was not a significant difference between the cohorts for non-applicants. A growing awareness of EMA is what would be expected given the national roll-out of the scheme (Table 4.16).

Non-applicants in old areas were significantly more likely to have heard of EMA than those in new areas (67% vs 56%); more awardees in old areas said they had heard of EMA than those in new areas but this difference was not significant.

**Table 4.17 Per cent of awardees and non-applicants who had ever applied for and received EMA, by LSC area**

Local LSC area	Awardees			Non-applicants		
	Applied for EMA Row %	Received EMA Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Applied for EMA Row %	Received EMA Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>
<b>Old areas</b>						
- Bedfordshire & Luton	28	18	84	[15]	[15]	22
- Black Country	54	42	90	[42]	[29]	44
- Co Durham	5	3	61	[-]	[-]	11
- Devon & Cornwall	26	20	157	23	21	39
- Humberside	27	19	118	[-]	[-]	17
- Lancashire	10	7	278	[22]	[17]	35
- Leicestershire	43	39	121	[35]	[21]	34
- London West	31	24	119	23	18	74
- Shropshire	[0]	[0]	41	[-]	[-]	6
- South Yorkshire	53	47	128	[57]	[44]	39
<b>All old areas</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1197</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>321</b>
<b>New areas</b>						
- Berkshire	[-]	[-]	13	2	0	51
- Hants/IOW	12	5	90	10	6	95
- Kent and Medway	0	0	72	7	3	60
- Milton Keynes/Ox/Bucks	[6]	[2]	48	[0]	[0]	41
- Northumberland	[-]	[-]	7	[-]	[-]	8
- Surrey	[-]	[-]	16	[8]	[5]	39
- Sussex	[5]	[0]	44	[2]	[0]	47
- Tees Valley	29	19	63	[29]	[21]	28
- Tyne & Wear	40	26	57	41	27	56
<b>All new areas</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>425</b>
All cases	25	19	1607	21	15	746

Base: Awardees and non-applicants aged 19 to 21.

Students are not allowed to receive ALG and EMA at the same time. This analysis looks at whether previously receiving EMA influences the likelihood of applying for ALG. Both awardees and non-applicants in old areas were significantly more likely to have applied for and received EMA than those in new areas. The proportions of awardees applying for and receiving EMA in old and new areas were similar to those of non-applicants in each area. There was considerable variation in these proportions by local LSC area, although small base sizes for the age group for many areas mean the figures should be treated with caution (Table 4.17).

#### 4.3.2 Other FE funding

Following DfES advice, the questions on other sources of FE funding were different for Cohort 2 from those used with Cohort 1<sup>21</sup>. Therefore the answers to these questions cannot be directly compared across cohorts, and particular care should be taken with the answers to questions about Learner Support Funds, which have different meanings for each cohort.

**Table 4.18 Applications for various forms of funding by awardees and non-applicants during academic year ending August 2005**

Funding type	Awardees	Column % Non-applicants
<b>Any source of LEA or college funding</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>23</b>
- Learner Support Funds	28	14
- Access Funds	17	10
- Childcare Support Funds	3	3
- Residential Bursary Funds	1	*
Other support	5	3
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>2134</i>	<i>930</i>

Base: Awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Half of ALG awardees (51%) said they had applied for a source of funding from an LEA or college, compared to 23% of non-applicants. 28% of awardees had applied for 1 of the sources of Learner Support Funds: the most commonly applied for type were Access Funds which 17% had applied for. More respondents said they had applied for Learner Support Funds than those who identified a specific type of these funds (Table 4.18).

<sup>21</sup> Cohort 1 respondents were asked a general question about whether they had received a grant from an LEA or college, described as including Learner Support funds, Childcare Support Funds, travel grants for learners or other grants. Respondents who said yes, were then asked about whether they had applied for each of these grants in turn. At Cohort 2, the general question did not name specific types of grant. If learners said yes to the general question, they were then asked about whether they had applied for Learner Support Funds, which was treated as an over-arching category of funds, including Access Funds, Childcare Support Funds and Residential bursaries. If respondents answered yes to this second question they were then asked about each of these in turn. Respondents who said they had not applied for any types of Learner Support Funds were then asked if they had applied for other types of support.

**Table 4.19 Applied for any source of Learner Support Funds during academic year ending August 2005 by awardees and non-applicants, by area**

Local LSC area	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Row %	<i>Unweighted N</i>	Row %	<i>Unweighted N</i>
<b>Old areas</b>				
- Bedfordshire & Luton	22	100	[14]	30
- The Black Country	33	106	19	61
- Co Durham	33	77	[-]	11
- Devon & Cornwall	34	223	[13]	49
- Humberside	33	164	[30]	25
- Lancashire	23	342	[8]	46
- Leicestershire	32	163	[10]	44
- London West	25	136	15	98
- Shropshire	20	55	[-]	8
- South Yorkshire	32	180	[12]	47
<b>All old areas</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1546</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>419</b>
<b>New areas</b>				
- Berkshire	[30]	21	11	61
- Hants/IOW	28	123	13	114
- Kent and Medway	19	93	10	79
- Milton Keynes/Ox/Bucks	28	67	[12]	46
- Northumberland	[-]	10	[-]	12
- Surrey	[-]	17	[10]	46
- Sussex	16	82	14	55
- Tees Valley	20	84	[6]	33
- Tyne & Wear	24	91	20	65
<b>All new areas</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>511</b>
<b>All cases</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2134</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>930</b>

Base: Awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Overall 28% of awardees had applied for a source of LSF, with a significantly greater proportion applying for Learner Support Funds in old areas (29%) than in new areas (23%). A considerably smaller proportion of non-applicants had applied for Learner Support Funds (14%) than awardees (Table 4.19).

#### 4.4 Employer Training Pilots

**Table 4.20 Discussions about and participation in ETP-type schemes by awardees and non-applicants, by ETP and non-ETP areas**

Discussion and participation	Awardees			Non-applicants		
	ETP areas	Non-ETP areas	All areas	ETP areas	Non-ETP areas	All areas
Have discussed paid time off for study with employer	8	8	8	11	15	14
Have been studying in paid time off	1	2	2	4	7	6
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>228</i>	<i>1030</i>	<i>1258</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>416</i>	<i>584</i>

Base: Awardees and non-applicants whose current main activity included employment.  
Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

New questions were introduced for Cohort 2 which attempted to measure participation in Employer Training Pilots (ETP) and similar schemes. ETP is a scheme which compensates employers for giving their employees paid time off in which to study for a work-related qualification. It was only operating in some of the ALG LSC areas during 2004-05: County Durham, Berkshire, Kent and Medway, Northumberland, Tees Valley and Tyne and Wear. Learners are not eligible to participate in ETP at the same time as receiving ALG.

The questions, asked to respondents whose current activity included employment, were:

“Has your employer ever discussed with you the idea of giving you paid time off work to study for a work-related qualification?”

and , if yes,

“Have you been studying for a work-related qualification in paid time off work during the academic year from September 2004 to August 2005?”.

8% of awardees who were currently working had discussed ETP type schemes with their employer, and 2% had studied in paid time off. Higher proportions of non-applicants had discussed (14%) and had paid time off to study (6%). There were no significant differences between ETP and non-ETP areas (Table 4.20).

## 4.5 Reasons for Not Applying for ALG

Table 4.21 Non-applicants' reasons for not applying for ALG

Reasons for not applying	Column %
Had not heard of ALG	62
Didn't think I would be eligible	15
Don't need the money	6
Couldn't be bothered/too much hassle	4
Heard about it too late	4
Never heard of it*	1
Didn't know enough about it	2
Found the application process too difficult	1
Still planning to apply/thinking about applying/in process of applying	1
Worried about effect on other benefits/rant	1
Didn't want to pass financial details to someone else	*
Couldn't get hold of requested documents	*
Process took too long	*
Left education	*
Available money too little	*
Mention of EMA as reason for not applying	*
Too busy to apply	1
Was not interested in it	*
Other reason	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>930</i>

Base: Eligible non-applicants.

\*These respondents had said earlier in the questionnaire that they had heard of ALG.

62% of non-applicants said they had never heard of ALG. The other main reasons for not applying for ALG were: they thought they would not be eligible (15%), they did not need the money (6%), they couldn't be bothered or it was too much hassle to apply (4%), and they heard about the grant too late (4%) (Table 4.21).

## 4.6 Summary

- Awardees were more likely to pay tuition fees in new areas than in old areas. However learners in old areas paid a higher amount of fees on average than those in new areas.
- As with Cohort 1, learners were more likely to pay tuition fees if they were aged 20 or above.
- Unlike Cohort 1, similar proportions of awardees and non-applicants paid tuition fees. Payment of registration fees was also similar for awardees and non-applicants. Fewer awardees paid exam fees than non-applicants.
- More awardees had heard of EMA than non-applicants, which was different to what was seen for Cohort 1.
- Awardees were more likely to have applied for sources of funding other than ALG from their LEA or college than non-applicants.

- Awardees were less likely than non-applicants to have discussed opportunities for paid time off work for study with their employer, or to have taken up such opportunities.
- As for Cohort 1, the main reason cited by non-applicants for not applying for ALG was that they did not think they would be eligible.

## **5 APPLICATIONS FOR, RECEIPT AND SPENDING OF ALG**

This chapter covers awardees' experiences of applying for and receiving ALG, including the ways in which their ALG was spent. Recipients are defined as awardees who were receiving ALG payments at the time of the survey or had received at least 1 payment before they were stopped or withheld. Awardees studying for qualifications at Levels 1 or 4 were excluded from the analysis, since these levels are inappropriate under the ALG eligibility criteria. There were very few cases in these sub-groups.

### **5.1 Experiences of ALG Application**

This section examines awardees' experiences with ALG application, such as where they had obtained an application pack from, what kind of help or advice on the application they had received and whether they had used the ALG telephone helpline.

### 5.1.1 Where awardees obtained an ALG application pack

**Table 5.1** Where awardees obtained ALG application pack, by age, level of current qualification aim, living arrangement and current activity

Background characteristic	College/ Institution	Learndirect	Other	Row % <i>Unweighted N</i>
<b>Age group</b>				
- 19	97	1	2	757
- 20	95	2	3	646
- 21-24	93	2	5	470
- 25-31	93	4	3	255
<b>Level of current qualification aim</b>				
- Level 2	92	3	5	308
- Level 3	96	2	3	1547
<b>Living arrangement</b>				
- Single, lives with parents	96	1	3	1638
- lives with partner	93	4	3	244
- other	92	4	4	246
<b>Current main activity</b>				
- FT education without job	93	2	5	556
- FT education with job	96	2	2	664
- FT/PT work	96	2	2	569
- PT education/Unemployed/ Other	94	1	5	339
All cases	95	2	3	2128

Base population: ALG awardees

Similarly to Cohort 1 awardees in Wave 1, most ALG awardees said they had obtained an ALG application pack from a college or education institution in both old LSC areas (95%) and new LSC areas (93%). Overall, only 2% of awardees had obtained a pack from Learndirect, compared to 1% in Cohort 1 Wave 1. There were no significant differences between old and new areas with respect to where awardees had obtained an application pack.

Awardees aged 19 years were significantly more likely to obtain an application pack from a college or education institution than older awardees. Those studying for qualifications at Level 3 were significantly more likely to say they had obtained an application pack from an education institution than awardees studying for Level 2 qualifications. Single awardees living with their parents were significantly more likely to state they had obtained an application pack from an education institution than those living with their partners. Awardees in full-time education with a job as well as those in full-time or part-time work were significantly more likely to obtain an application pack from an education institution than other groups.

### 5.1.2 Advice on ALG application

**Table 5.2 Where awardees obtained help or advice on ALG application**

Source of help or advice	Old Areas	Column % New areas
No help/advice received	49	34
Student services/advisors	18	29
Respondent's parents	15	10
Course tutor/teacher	8	12
Someone else at respondent's college	5	9
ALG telephone helpline	2	2
Friends	1	1
Respondent's partner	1	0
Connexions/Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG) Advisor	*	1
Other	1	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1541	588

Base population: ALG awardees.

Shading refers to significant differences between old and new areas

Nearly one-half of awardees received no help or advice on their application for ALG in old areas (49%), and just over one-third in new areas (34%), with the differences between the areas being statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). However, a significantly higher proportion of Cohort 1 Wave 1 awardees said they received no help or advice on their ALG application (60%) compared to awardees in old areas at Cohort 2.

Otherwise, student services or advisors were the most commonly cited source of help (old areas - 18%; new areas - 29%), followed by parents (15%; 10%) and course tutors (8%; 12%). Only 2% of awardees named the ALG telephone helpline as a source of help or advice. Respondents' parents were the most common source of advice amongst Cohort 1 Wave 1 awardees (12%).

**Table 5.3 How useful ALG telephone helpline is to awardees, by background characteristics**

Background characteristic	Not used	Very/Fairly useful	Not very/at all useful	Row % <i>Unweighted N</i>
<b>Age group (**)</b>				
- 19	89	10	1	758
- 20	87	12	1	649
- 21-24	83	15	2	470
- 25-31	75	23	3	257
<b>Gender (*)</b>				
- Male	87	11	1	1039
- Female	83	16	1	1095
<b>Level of current qualification aim <math>\phi</math></b>				
- Level 2	86	14	1	310
- Level 3	85	14	1	1550
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>				
- Asian or Asian British	89	11	1	290
- Black or Black British	89	12	0	79
- White	85	14	1	1687
- Mixed /other	81	15	4	75
<b>Living arrangement</b>				
- Single, lives with parents	86	13	1	1642
- lives with partner	82	17	2	245
- other	84	15	1	247
All cases	85	14	1	2134

Base population: ALG awardees

$\phi$ Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

\* Statistically significant at the level of  $p < 0.05$  \*\* Statistically significant at the level of  $p < 0.001$

ALG applicants who either named the ALG telephone helpline as a source of advice on ALG application or who said they had used the telephone helpline were asked to assess it. Most awardees had not used the ALG telephone helpline (old areas - 86%; new areas - 83%). Of those that used the helpline, however, the vast majority had found it very or fairly useful (93%). There were no significant differences between Cohort 2 awardees in old areas and Cohort 1 Wave 1 awardees in proportions of those who had not used the ALG telephone helpline (86%; 84%).

Awardees aged 19 years old were most likely to state they had not used the ALG telephone helpline, while those aged 25-31 were the most likely to say they had used it. Older awardees were also the most likely to find the telephone helpline very or fairly useful ( $p < 0.001$ ). Female awardees were significantly more likely than male awardees to say they had used the telephone helpline and to have found it very or fairly useful.

## 5.2 Receipt and Spending of ALG

This section focuses on the proportions of awardees in old and new pilot areas receiving ALG broken down by various background characteristics, the reasons for not receiving ALG, and the ways in which ALG was spent. Recipients are defined as awardees who were receiving ALG payments at the time of survey or had received at least 1 payment before they were stopped or withheld.

### 5.2.1 Receipt of ALG

Table 5.4 Success rates for ALG applications in 2004-2005, by LSC area

LSC area	N applications	N awards	Success rate %
<b>Old areas</b>			
Bedfordshire and Luton	363	254	70
The Black Country	514	287	56
Durham	278	211	76
Devon and Cornwall	996	611	61
Humberside	722	438	61
Lancashire	1400	890	64
Leicestershire	635	373	59
London West	630	343	54
Shropshire	204	134	66
South Yorkshire	826	475	58
All cases	6568	4016	61
<b>New areas</b>			
Berkshire	72	37	51
Hants/IOW	339	232	68
Kent and Medway	314	209	67
Milton Keynes/Ox/Bucks	218	126	58
Surrey	51	33	65
Sussex	318	192	60
Northumberland	28	16	57
Tees Valley	237	143	60
Tyne and Wear	271	171	63
All cases	1848	1159	63

Base population: ALG applicants 2004-2005

Source: Manchester City Council

According to Manchester City Council (MCC), 61% of ALG applications in 2004-2005 in old areas were awarded, from a low of 54% in London West to a high of 76% in Durham. 63% of applications were awarded in new areas, ranging from 51% in Berkshire to 68% in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.

**Table 5.5 Success rates for ALG applications in 2004-2005, by ethnic origin**

Ethnic group	N Applications	N Awards	Success rate %
Asian or Asian British	902	559	62
Black or Black British	416	191	46
Chinese or other	66	37	56
White	5551	3506	63
Mixed	186	119	64
Not declared	637	351	55
Does Not Want Ethnicity Recorded	658	412	63
All cases	8416	5175	61

Base population: ALG applicants 2004-2005  
 Source: Manchester City Council

White (63%) and Asian (62%) applicants had the highest application success rates, according to MCC. Applicants of Black ethnic origin (46%) had the lowest success rate in 2004-2005.

**Table 5.6 Awardees receiving ALG, by LSC area**

LSC area	Row %	<i>Unweighted N</i>
<b>Old areas</b>		
- Bedfordshire and Luton	81	100
- The Black Country	92	106
- Durham	85	77
- Devon and Cornwall	92	223
- Humberside	85	164
- Lancashire	89	342
- Leicestershire	86	163
- London West	84	136
- Shropshire	83	55
- South Yorkshire	89	180
<b>All Cases</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>1546</b>
<b>New areas</b>		
- Berkshire	[83]	21
- Hants/IOW	89	123
- Kent and Medway	90	93
- Milton Keynes/Ox/Bucks	92	67
- Northumberland	[-]	10
- Surrey	[-]	17
- Sussex	86	82
- Tees Valley	96	84
- Tyne and Wear	86	91
<b>All Cases</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>588</b>

Base population: ALG awardees.

The vast majority of awardees had received at least one ALG payment (old areas – 88%; new areas – 89%), with little variation within old and new LSC areas. A similar proportion of Cohort 1 awardees had received at least one ALG payment at Wave 1 (91%).

**Table 5.7 Awardees receiving ALG, by background characteristics**

Background characteristic	Old areas		New areas	
	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>	Row %	<i>Unweighted</i> <i>N</i>
<b>Age group</b>				
- 19	90	574	88	184
- 20	88	482	91	167
- 21-24	86	322	89	148
- 25-31	83	168	89	89
<b>Gender</b>				
- Male	86	748	88	291
- Female	89	798	91	297
<b>Living arrangement</b>				
- Single, lives with parents	88	1197	89	445
- lives with partner	90	177	91	68
- other	80	172	89	75
<b>Ethnic group<math>\phi</math></b>				
- Asian or Asian British	86	261	[88]	29
- Black or Black British	90	67	[-]	12
- White	88	1157	89	530
- Mixed/other	78	58	[-]	17
<b>Current main activity</b>				
- FT education without job	89	426	88	132
- FT education with job	89	473	91	192
- FT/PT work	85	394	90	178
- Unemployed/Other	86	253	86	86
<b>Level of current qualification aim <math>\phi</math></b>				
- Level 2	88	206	91	104
- Level 3	88	1136	90	414
<b>Annual income band <math>\psi</math></b>				
- Up to £10000	87	772	91	322
- £10001-15000	84	104	84	34
- >£15000	88	103	92	50
- No income	89	567	87	182
<b>All cases</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>1546</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>588</b>

Base population: ALG awardees.

$\phi$ Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

Awardees living with their partner were the most likely to have received at least 1 ALG payment in both old and new areas, but the differences by living arrangement were statistically significant in old areas only. There were no significant differences

in receipt of ALG amongst awardees by other background characteristics in either old or new pilot areas.

**Table 5.8 Reasons for non-take up of ALG in old and new areas**

Reason	Old areas	Column % New areas
Payments are not due yet	52	[52]
Payments have been withheld or stopped	26	[20]
- Problems with information on application form	[0]	[-]
- Problems with attendance	[23]	[-]
- Decided not to stay in education	[12]	[-]
- Changed course	[5]	[-]
- Other	[61]	[-]
Decided not to take up the grant	15	[20]
Payments are due, but have been delayed	7	[7]
<i>Unweighted N</i>	169	48

Base population: ALG awardees who did not receive any ALG payments.

Amongst awardees who said they had not received any ALG payments by the time of the survey, just over one-half in both pilot areas said the payments had not been due yet. The second most common reason for not receiving ALG was because payments had been withheld or stopped (old - 26%; new - 20%). Furthermore, 15% in old areas and 20% in new areas said they decided not to take up the grant. There were no statistically significant differences in reasons for not receiving ALG between old and new areas. In Cohort 1 Wave 1, the main reason for non-receipt was completion of course, the differences between the two cohorts are probably related to the timing of the fieldwork.

### 5.2.2 Recipients' spending of ALG payments

This section describes the ways in which ALG recipients spent their ALG payments, i.e. contributing towards the costs of books and course-related equipment, course-related travel, social or leisure activities, rent or mortgage, and household bills.

**Table 5.9 How ALG was spent, by LSC area**

LSC areas	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	Row % <i>Unweighted N</i>
<b>Old areas</b>						
- Bedfordshire and Luton	75	76	45	16	38	82
- The Black Country	84	71	47	16	38	98
- Durham	78	49	54	14	30	65
- Devon and Cornwall	70	67	36	27	46	204
- Humberside	73	69	43	19	37	140
- Lancashire	75	71	39	17	37	303
- Leicestershire	74	52	49	24	50	141
- London West	70	87	33	11	44	114
- Shropshire	[82]	[91]	36	[7]	[31]	46
- South Yorkshire	74	83	34	20	34	160
<b>All Cases</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>1353</b>
<b>New areas</b>						
- Berkshire	[88]	[73]	[20]	27	[47]	18
- Hants/IOW	60	61	33	27	41	109
- Kent and Medway	[62]	[77]	[29]	[10]	[27]	84
- Milton Keynes/ Ox/Bucks	60	72	33	28	40	62
- Northumberland	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	9
- Surrey	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	16
- Sussex	66	75	31	30	47	70
- Tees Valley	74	80	40	19	29	80
- Tyne and Wear	73	73	53	27	45	78
<b>All Cases</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>526</b>

Base population: ALG recipients

Shading refers to significant differences between old and new areas

In old areas, the highest proportion of ALG recipients used their ALG payments to help pay for books and course-related equipment (74%), while in new areas the highest proportion of recipients spent their payments on course-related travel expenses (73%). There were significant differences between old and new pilot areas with regard to spending ALG on books (old - 74%; new - 67%) and on rent or mortgage (19%; 23%). In old areas, significant variations were observed between LSC area and spending ALG on each of the following: travel, leisure, rent/mortgage and household bills. In new areas, LSC area was significantly associated with spending ALG on rent or mortgage only. Cohort 2 recipients spent less on books and more on rent and bills than cohort 1 recipients in 2003-2004.

**Table 5.10a How ALG was spent in old areas, by age, gender and living arrangement**

Background characteristic	Old areas					Row %
	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	<i>Unweighted N</i>
<b>Age group</b>						
- 19	74	70	50	14	37	514
- 20	73	72	44	18	36	422
- 21-24	74	72	33	24	44	277
- 25-31	80	70	17	28	48	139
<b>Gender</b>						
- Male	71	71	50	22	41	645
- Female	78	71	32	16	38	708
<b>Living Arrangement</b>						
- Single, lives with parents	75	73	45	16	36	1055
- lives with partner	73	63	19	25	48	160
- other	71	64	37	29	54	138
All Cases	74	71	40	19	40	1353

Base population: ALG recipients.

φTotal number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

In old pilot areas, age of learner was significantly associated with spending on leisure, rent, and bills. Younger recipients spent more on leisure, but less on rent and bills. Male recipients were significantly less likely to spend on books but more likely to spend on leisure and rent. Recipients living with partners were significantly less likely to spend on travel and leisure but more likely to spend on rent and bills than single recipients living with parents.

**Table 5.10b How ALG was spent in new areas, by age, gender and living arrangement**

Background characteristic	New areas					Row %
	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	<i>Unweighted N</i>
<b>Age group</b>						
- 19	68	73	47	16	28	162
- 20	71	78	42	22	33	153
- 21-24	70	73	32	24	40	132
- 25-31	53	65	16	37	57	79
<b>Gender</b>						
- Male	62	72	39	27	40	257
- Female	71	74	33	20	36	269
<b>Living Arrangement</b>						
- Single, lives with parents	69	77	41	20	32	397
- lives with partner	62	65	10	33	48	62
- other	59	60	33	30	59	67
All Cases	67	73	36	23	38	526

Base population: ALG recipients.

φTotal number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

In new areas, recipients aged 19-24 were significantly more likely to spend on books than over 25's. Younger learners were significantly more likely to spend ALG on leisure, but less likely to spend on rent and bills. Female recipients were significantly more likely to spend ALG on books. Learners living with partners were less likely to spend on travel and leisure, but more likely to spend on rent and bills than those living with parents.

**Table 5.11a How ALG was spent in old areas, by ethnic origin**

Ethnic group	Old areas					Row %
	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	<i>Unweighted N</i>
- Asian	85	67	39	9	42	225
- Black	63	87	42	13	38	60
- White	73	71	41	21	39	1021
- Mixed /other	67	72	37	13	35	45
All Cases	74	71	40	19	40	1351

Base population: ALG recipients

In old pilot areas, recipients of Asian or Asian British ethnic origin were the most likely to report spending their payments on course books (85%), recipients of Black or Black British ethnic origin were the most likely to say they spent their ALG on travel (87%), and White recipients were the most likely to report spending ALG on rent or mortgage (21%) compared to other ethnic groups.

**Table 5.11b How ALG was spent in new areas, by ethnic origin**

Ethnic group	New areas					Row %
	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	<i>Unweighted N</i>
- Asian	82	82	41	14	57	26
- Black	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	11
- White	67	73	36	24	36	473
- Mixed /other	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	16
All Cases	67	73	36	23	38	526

Base population: ALG recipients

In new areas, Asian recipients were more likely to spend on books, travel, leisure and bills than White recipients, who were more likely to spend ALG on rent.

**Table 5.12a How ALG was spent in old areas, by current activity status**

Current main activity $\phi$	Old areas					Row %
	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	<i>Unweighted N</i>
- FT education without job	77	71	49	15	44	380
- FT education with job	75	74	39	22	40	419
- FT/PT work	70	69	35	22	35	336
- PT educ/Unemployed/Other	76	69	36	14	36	218
All Cases	74	71	40	19	40	1353

Base population: ALG recipients.

$\phi$ Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

In old areas, recipients in full-time education without a job (49%) were significantly more likely to say they spent ALG on social and leisure activities than those in full-time or part-time work (35%). Recipients in full-time education with a job (22%) as well as those in full-time or part-time work (22%) were the most likely to report spending ALG on rent/mortgage ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 5.12b How ALG was spent in new areas, by current activity status**

Current main activity $\phi$	New areas					Row %
	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	<i>Unweighted N</i>
- FT education without job	67	66	46	22	36	116
- FT education with job	64	73	37	28	41	175
- FT/PT work	67	79	32	23	35	161
- PT educ/Unemployed/Other	73	70	28	16	37	74
All Cases	67	73	36	23	38	526

Base population: ALG recipients.

$\phi$ Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

In new areas, recipients in full-time education with a job were less likely to spend on books, but were more likely to spend on rent and bills than recipients in full-time or part-time work or full-time education without a job. Those in full-time education were more likely to spend on leisure than recipients in full-time or part-time work.

**Table 5.13a How ALG was spent in old areas, by level of current qualification aim**

Level of current qualification aim $\phi\psi$	Old areas					Row %
	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	<i>Unweighted N</i>
Level 2	70	73	38	24	47	182
Level 3	75	72	41	18	39	997
All cases	74	72	40	19	40	1179

Base population: ALG recipients.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

**Table 5.13b How ALG was spent in new areas, by level of current qualification aim**

Level of current qualification aim $\phi$	New areas					Row %
	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	<i>Unweighted N</i>
Level 2	61	79	29	24	37	94
Level 3	68	72	38	24	39	371
All cases	66	73	36	23	38	465

Base population: ALG recipients.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data

Recipients studying for qualifications at Level 3 were more likely to say they spent ALG payments on course books than those studying for Level 2 qualifications, but the differences were not statistically significant (Tables 5.13 a,b).

**Table 5.14a How ALG was spent in old areas, by annual income**

Annual income band $\psi$	Old areas					Row %
	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	<i>Unweighted N</i>
Up to £10000	74	71	40	21	38	669
£10001-15000	72	76	21	22	40	88
>£15001	71	64	20	24	41	90
No income	76	71	49	14	41	506
All cases	74	71	40	19	40	1353

Base population: ALG recipients

$\psi$  Includes partner's income for those with partner

In old areas, recipients with no income were significantly more likely to say they were spending their ALG on leisure activities than those with joint annual income from salary and benefits over £15,000 (49%; 20%), but significantly less likely to report spending ALG on rent or mortgage (14%; 24%).

**Table 5.14b How ALG was spent in new areas, by annual income**

Annual income band $\psi$	New areas					Row %
	Books	Travel	Leisure	Rent	Bills	<i>Unweighted N</i>
Up to £10000	71	79	39	20	35	293
£10001-15000	[52]	[63]	[22]	[44]	44	29
>£15001	[51]	[62]	[11]	[36]	49	46
No income	69	68	42	20	38	158
All cases	67	73	36	23	38	526

Base population: ALG recipients.

$\psi$  Includes partner's income for those with partner.

In new areas, recipients with no income were the most likely to spend ALG on books, travel, and leisure, while those with moderate annual incomes (£10,001-£15,000) were the most likely to say they spent ALG on rent or mortgage.

No meaningful associations were observed with respect to spending ALG on childcare-related expenses due to low numbers of recipients with children under 16.

### 5.3 Summary

- Most ALG applicants said they had obtained an ALG application pack from a college or an education institution.
- Nearly one-half of awardees in old pilot areas and just over one-third in new areas received no help or advice on their application for ALG, compared to two-thirds of awardees at Cohort 1 Wave 1. The most common sources of advice in both Cohort 2 areas were student services/advisors, parents, and course tutors or teachers.
- The vast majority of awardees did not use the ALG telephone helpline but most of those who did found it very or fairly useful.
- Most awardees had received at least 1 ALG payment in both old and new areas and there was very little variation in rates of receipt by background characteristics.
- The most common reason for not receiving ALG was because payments had not been due yet, cited by just over one-half of awardees.
- The majority of ALG recipients spent their grant on books and course-related equipment and course-related travel.

## 6 WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES ALG MAKE?

This chapter examines recipients' perceptions of the influence of ALG on their decisions to take up study, to study full-time or part-time, and to continue the course.

### 6.1 Influence of ALG on Whether to Study

**Table 6.1 Whether recipients would still have gone ahead with their course if ALG had not been awarded, by LSC area**

LSC area	Definitely/probably would have	Definitely/probably would not have	Row % Unweighted N
<b>Old areas</b>			
- Bedfordshire and Luton	94	6	82
- The Black Country	85	15	98
- Durham	88	12	65
- Devon and Cornwall	88	12	203
- Humberside	88	12	137
- Lancashire	90	10	303
- Leicestershire	92	8	139
- London West	88	12	114
- Shropshire	[91]	[9]	45
- South Yorkshire	89	11	159
<b>All Cases</b>	89	11	1345
<b>New areas</b>			
- Berkshire	[-]	[-]	17
- Hants/IOW	94	7	109
- Kent and Medway	96	4	84
- Milton Keynes/Ox/Bucks	94	6	62
- Northumberland	[-]	[-]	9
- Surrey	[-]	[-]	16
- Sussex	99	1	70
- Tees Valley	93	7	79
- Tyne and Wear	86	14	78
<b>All Cases</b>	93	7	524

Base population: ALG recipients.

A significantly higher proportion of ALG recipients stated they would definitely/probably not have gone ahead with the course without ALG in old areas than in new areas (11%; 7%). Recipients in The Black Country (15%), amongst the old pilot areas, and those in Tyne and Wear (14%), amongst the new areas, were most likely to say that they definitely/probably would not have gone ahead with the course without receiving ALG. However, the differences within old and new areas were not statistically significant.

**Table 6.2 Whether recipients would still have gone ahead with their course if ALG had not been awarded, by age, gender, ethnicity, and living arrangement**

Background characteristic	Old areas			New areas			Row %
	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely probably would not have	<i>N</i>	
<b>Age group</b>							
- 19	92	8	513	95	5	162	
- 20	89	11	418	93	7	152	
- 21-24	87	13	275	92	8	132	
- 25-31	87	14	139	93	7	78	
<b>Gender</b>							
- Male	90	10	642	94	6	255	
- Female	88	12	703	93	7	269	
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>							
- Asian or Asian British	88	12	223	[100]	[0]	26	
- Black or Black British	95	5	60	[-]	[-]	11	
- White	89	11	1015	93	7	471	
- Mixed/other	[87]	[13]	45	[-]	[-]	16	
<b>Living arrangement</b>							
- Single, lives with parents	90	10	1048	94	6	396	
- lives with partner	87	11	160	95	5	62	
- other	86	14	137	90	10	66	
All cases	89	11	1345	93	7	524	

Base population: ALG recipients.

$\phi$ Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

None of the background characteristics presented in Table 6.2 were statistically significant with respect to the perceived likelihood of going ahead with the course without ALG, though in old areas there is some indication that ALG is slightly more of an important factor as age increases.

**Table 6.3 Whether recipients would still have gone ahead with their course if ALG had not been awarded, by activity, qualification, and income**

Background characteristic	Old areas			New areas			Row %
	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>	
<b>Current main activity</b>							
- FT education without job	88	12	377	93	7	116	
- FT education with job	91	9	415	97	3	175	
- FT/PT work	88	12	336	89	11	160	
- PT education Unemployed /Other	89	11	217	96	5	73	
<b>Current qualification aim<sup>φ</sup></b>							
- Level 2	86	14	182	91	9	370	
- Level 3	90	10	991	95	6	464	
<b>Annual income band <sup>ψ</sup></b>							
- Up to £10000	89	11	665	94	6	292	
- £10001-15000	91	9	88	[93]	[7]	29	
- >£15000	92	8	90	[94]	[6]	46	
- No income	89	11	502	93	7	157	
All cases	89	11	1345	93	7	524	

Base population: ALG recipients.

<sup>φ</sup> Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

<sup>ψ</sup> Includes partner's income for those with partner.

In new pilot areas, recipients in part-time or full-time work were significantly more likely to say they would definitely/probably not have gone ahead with the course without ALG. ALG seems to be slightly more influential for Level 2 students, although no significant variation was observed with respect to recipients' current level of study or annual income in either old or new areas.

## 6.2 Influence of ALG on Whether to Study Full-Time

**Table 6.4** Whether recipients would have studied part-time if ALG had not been awarded, by decision to study full-time before or after having heard of ALG

Decided to study full-time before/after heard about ALG	Old areas			New areas			Row %
	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>	
- Before	28	72	1207	23	77	462	
- After	42	58	133	32	68	59	
All cases	30	70	1340	24	76	521	

Base population: ALG recipients.

90% of recipients in old areas and 89% in new areas said they had decided to study full-time before they heard of ALG. However, in old areas, a significantly higher proportion of those who decided to study full-time *after* they heard of ALG (42%) than those who said they decided to study full-time *before* they heard of ALG (28%) reported that they would definitely/probably would have studied part-time without ALG. The difference was not significant in new areas, though.

**Table 6.5 Whether recipients would have studied part-time if ALG had not been awarded, by LSC area**

LSC area	Definitely/probably would have	Definitely/probably would not have	Row % Unweighted N
<b>Old areas</b>			
- Bedfordshire and Luton	25	75	80
- The Black Country	32	68	98
- Durham	28	72	65
- Devon and Cornwall	29	71	202
- Humberside	35	65	138
- Lancashire	29	72	302
- Leicestershire	35	65	139
- London West	28	72	114
- Shropshire	[27]	[73]	46
- South Yorkshire	27	73	159
<b>All Cases</b>	30	70	1343
<b>New areas</b>			
- Berkshire	[-]	[-]	17
- Hants/IOW	28	72	109
- Kent and Medway	18	82	84
- Milton Keynes/Ox/Bucks	21	79	62
- Northumberland	[-]	[-]	9
- Surrey	[-]	[-]	16
- Sussex	24	76	70
- Tees Valley	28	72	78
- Tyne and Wear	21	79	77
<b>All Cases</b>	24	76	522

Base population: ALG recipients.

A significantly higher proportion of recipients stated they would definitely/probably have studied part-time without receiving ALG in old pilot areas than in new areas (30%; 24%). The proportion of recipients stating they would definitely/probably have studied part-time had they not received ALG was highest in Leicestershire and Humberside amongst old areas (35%), and in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight and Tees Valley amongst new pilot areas (28%). Cohort 1 recipients were not asked an identical question at Wave 1. However, ALG was more important for the decision to study full-time for students in the Black Country, Humberside and Leicestershire.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Question in Cohort 1 Wave 1: "How important was receiving the Adult Learning Grant in your decision to study a full-time course instead of a part-time course..."

**Table 6.6 Whether recipients would have studied part-time if ALG had not been awarded, by age, gender, ethnicity, and living arrangement**

Background characteristic	Old areas			New areas			Row %
	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>	
<b>Age group</b>							
- 19	25	75	512	15	85	162	
- 20	32	68	419	28	72	151	
- 21-24	31	69	274	30	70	132	
- 25-31	33	67	138	24	79	77	
<b>Gender</b>							
- Male	27	73	641	20	80	254	
- Female	32	68	702	27	73	268	
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>							
- Asian or Asian British	34	67	223	27	73	26	
- Black or Black British	25	75	60	22	78	11	
- White	29	71	1014	24	76	469	
- Mixed /other	31	69	44	7	93	16	
<b>Living arrangement</b>							
- Single, lives with parents	29	71	1049	23	77	395	
- lives with partner	26	74	159	28	72	61	
- other	36	64	135	23	77	66	
All cases	30	79	1343	24	76	522	

Base population: ALG recipients.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

In new areas, recipients aged 20-24 were most likely to state they would definitely/probably have studied part-time without ALG ( $p < 0.05$ ), while age was not significant in old areas. There were no significant differences by gender, ethnicity or living arrangement with respect to whether recipients would have studied part-time without ALG, although ALG seems to be a more important factor for Asian students than other ethnic groups.

**Table 6.7 Whether recipients would have studied part-time if ALG had not been awarded, by current activity, level of current study, and income**

Background characteristic	Old areas			New areas			Row %
	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>	
<b>Current main activity</b>							
- FT education without job	30	70	377	23	77	115	
- FT education with job	27	73	415	20	80	174	
- FT/PT work	30	70	334	28	72	160	
- PT education Unemployed/Other	33	67	217	26	74	73	
<b>Current qualification aim<sup>φ</sup></b>							
- Level 2	38	62	180	28	72	93	
- Level 3	28	72	991	22	78	369	
<b>Annual income band <sup>ψ</sup></b>							
- Up to £10000	29	71	663	24	76	291	
- £10001-15000	28	72	88	[22]	[78]	29	
- >£15000	27	73	89	[26]	[75]	46	
- No income	31	69	503	23	78	156	
All cases	30	70	1343	24	76	522	

Base population: ALG recipients.

<sup>φ</sup> Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

<sup>ψ</sup> Includes partner's income for those with partner.

In old areas only, recipients studying for Level 2 qualifications were significantly more likely to state they would have definitely/probably studied part-time without ALG than those studying for Level 3 qualifications.

### 6.3 Influence of ALG on Whether to Continue the Course

**Table 6.8 Whether recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by LSC area<sup>†</sup>**

LSC area	Definitely/probably would have	Definitely/probably would not have	Row % Unweighted N
<b>Old areas</b>			
- Bedfordshire and Luton	14	86	78
- The Black Country	24	76	93
- Durham	11	89	63
- Devon and Cornwall	21	79	196
- Humberside	15	85	132
- Lancashire	17	83	289
- Leicestershire	17	83	133
- London West	20	80	112
- Shropshire	[18]	[82]	45
- South Yorkshire	16	84	150
<b>All Cases</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>1291</b>
<b>New areas</b>			
- Berkshire	[-]	[-]	17
- Hants/IOW	21	79	109
- Kent and Medway	9	91	82
- Milton Keynes/Ox/Bucks	7	94	61
- Northumberland	[-]	[-]	9
- Surrey	[-]	[-]	16
- Sussex	15	85	66
- Tees Valley	21	79	77
- Tyne and Wear	16	85	76
<b>All Cases</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>513</b>

Base population: ALG recipients.

<sup>†</sup> an extra answer code was provided for those who said they dropped out of the course.

In both old and new areas, similar proportions of ALG recipients said they would definitely/probably have dropped out of their course without receiving ALG (18%; 16%). Amongst old pilot areas, The Black Country recipients (24%) were most likely to say that they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG, followed by recipients in Devon and Cornwall (21%) and London West (20%) while Durham recipients (11%), were least likely to say this. A similar proportion (19%) of Cohort 1 recipients during 2003-2004 said they definitely/probably would have dropped out of their course without ALG, though the question was asked retrospectively at Wave 2 and the pattern of responses among areas was different.

Among new pilot areas, the proportion stating they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG ranged from a low of 7% in Milton Keynes to a high of 21% in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, and Tees Valley.

**Table 6.9 Whether recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by age, gender, ethnicity, and living arrangement<sup>†</sup>**

Background characteristic	Definitely/ probably would have	Old areas Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>	Definitely/ probably would have	New areas Definitely/ probably would not have	Row %
						<i>N</i>
<b>Age group</b>						
- 19	15	85	501	10	90	160
- 20	17	83	401	19	81	149
- 21-24	22	78	260	21	79	128
- 25-31	18	82	129	11	89	76
<b>Gender</b>						
- Male	16	85	616	14	86	252
- Female	19	81	675	17	83	261
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>						
- Asian or Asian British	19	81	216	[23]	[77]	26
- Black or Black British	22	78	59	[-]	[-]	10
- White	17	83	970	16	84	462
- Mixed/other	[21]	[80]	44	[-]	[-]	15
<b>Living arrangement</b>						
- Single, lives with parents	17	83	1009	16	84	389
- lives with partner	13	87	150	7	93	59
- other	24	76	132	21	79	65
All cases	18	83	1291	16	84	513

Base population: ALG recipients.

<sup>†</sup> an extra answer code was provided for those who said they dropped out of the course.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

In new areas, recipients aged 21-24 years were significantly more likely to state they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG than other age groups.

**Table 6.10 Whether recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by current activity, level of current study, and income<sup>†</sup>**

Background characteristic	Old areas		<i>N</i>	New areas		Row %
	Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have		Definitely/ probably would have	Definitely/ probably would not have	<i>N</i>
<b>Current main activity</b>						
- FT education without job	21	79	369	24	76	116
- FT education with job	14	86	410	10	90	169
- FT/PT work	15	85	305	19	81	156
- PT education Unemployed /Other	20	80	207	9	91	72
<b>Current qualification aim<sup>φ</sup></b>						
- Level 2	25	75	174	16	84	93
- Level 3	16	84	956	15	86	364
<b>Annual income band <sup>ψ</sup></b>						
- Up to £10000	17	83	638	16	84	286
- £10001-15000	13	87	82	[15]	[85]	28
- >£15000	8	92	83	[5]	[95]	42
- No income	21	79	488	19	81	157
All cases	18	83	1291	16	84	513

Base population: ALG recipients

<sup>†</sup> an extra answer code was provided for those who said they dropped out of the course.

<sup>φ</sup> Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

<sup>ψ</sup> Includes partner's income for those with partner.

In both old and new areas, recipients in full-time education without a job were significantly more likely than other recipients to state they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG.

In old areas, recipients studying for Level 2 qualifications (25%) were significantly more likely to say they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG than those studying for Level 3 qualifications (16%), while in new areas the differences by level of current qualifications were minor.

In old areas, recipients with no income were significantly more likely than those with annual incomes of over £15,000 (21%; 8%) to say they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG.

## 6.4 Summary

- One-third of recipients in old areas and one-quarter in new areas said they would have studied part-time without ALG.

- In old pilot areas recipients were significantly more likely to state they would definitely/probably not have gone ahead with the course without ALG and to say they would have definitely/probably studied part-time without ALG than recipients in new areas.
- In old pilot areas, recipients studying for qualifications at Level 2 were significantly more likely to say they would definitely/probably have studied part-time without ALG and to definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG than those studying for Level 3 qualifications.
- Roughly similar proportions of ALG recipients in old and new pilot areas said they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG.
- In both old and new areas, recipients aged 21-24 were the most likely to say they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG, while those aged 19 were the least likely to say so.
- Recipients in full-time education without a job were most likely to state they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG in both old and new areas.
- In old areas, recipients with no income were significantly more likely than those with annual incomes of over £15,000 to say they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG.

## 7 CONCLUSIONS

The report presents findings from Cohort 2 Wave 1, and contributes to objectives 1, 3, and 4, to:

- measure the extent to which ALG improves retention and attainment among the eligible population in pilot areas;
- examine the effect of ALG on learners' choices on level of qualification, course, type of learning, and working patterns;
- determine differences in the performance of ALG between pilot areas, men and women, and young people who are independent and those living with parents.

A second wave survey will report on Cohort 2 learners in 2007, and will present analyses of ALG influence over qualification attainment and transitions in employment and further learning associated with receipt of ALG (evaluation objectives 1 and 2).

The findings are based on the first wave survey of the second cohort of learners (2004/5) in old and new pilot areas.

### 7.1 Background Characteristics of Learners

The majority of learners were aged between 19 and 21. An interesting area and cohort age profile difference was observed with old areas exhibiting a younger age profile of awardees compared with new areas and Cohort 1. This suggests that the age profile of awardees has shifted further towards younger adults as the grant has become established.

Some interesting differences between awardees and non-applicants were observed. Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to be white (as for Cohort 1), to live with their parents (as for Cohort 1), to be in full-time education at the time of the interview and less likely than non-applicants to be in paid employment. Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to have children. These differences, other than the difference relating to ethnicity, suggest that ALG may be more attractive to learners who have fewer financial responsibilities. The ethnic dimension warrants further investigation.

The majority of awardees reported having achieved prior academic or vocational qualifications (90%; 62%, respectively). The proportions were similar for non-applicants. Looking at the types of prior qualifications of ALG awardees, for those studying at Level 2: 11% did not have any qualifications at all, and 56% held Level 1 qualifications. For Level 3 awardees: 4% had no qualifications, 14% held Level 1 qualifications, and 70% held Level 2 qualifications. Awardees in old areas were more likely than non-applicants to have achieved a Level 2 qualification (as in Cohort 1) while the opposite was true for new areas. This area difference may partly reflect the slightly lower proportions of awardees in new areas studying for Level 3 qualifications.

Although awardees and non-applicants exhibited broadly similar positive attitudes towards learning, awardees were more likely to strongly agree they should have

gone to university than non-applicants. This might in part explain the higher numbers of awardees studying for an Access to Higher Education qualification.

Most learners' jobs were in the lower occupational classes, but interestingly, awardees studying at Level 3 were more likely than non-applicants studying at Level 3 to say they were studying in order to change their job or career.

A higher proportion of awardees than non-applicants were earning less than £15,000 per year or had no earnings, and a significantly smaller proportion of awardees received benefits than non-applicants. These differences will partly reflect the eligibility criteria of ALG.

## **7.2 Experiences of Applying for ALG**

Cohort 2 learners' experiences of applying for ALG broadly reflect those of Cohort 1 learners. Most ALG applicants obtained an application pack from a college or an education institution, and most had not used the ALG telephone helpline. Of the minority that had, most had found it to be very or fairly useful. Most awardees had received at least one ALG payment at the time of the survey, and the most common reason for not receiving ALG was because payments had not been due.

Help and advice on applying for ALG most commonly came from student services and advisors, parents, and course tutors or teachers. Interestingly, more awardees in Cohort 2 had received help and advice on their application compared with Cohort 1, with more Cohort 2 awardees in new than old areas receiving help or advice. This suggests that as ALG has become established in old areas, the numbers of learners receiving help and advice on their application has improved. However, learners in new areas have received the most help and advice.

The majority of non-applicants had never heard of ALG. As for Cohort 1, the main reason cited by non-applicants who had heard of ALG for not applying was that they did not think they would be eligible. This may reflect a true assessment of some learners' situations but it also suggests that ALG criteria are still not adequately understood by learners.

## **7.3 Effect of ALG on Learner's Decisions and Choices**

In terms of what perceived difference ALG had made to recipients' decisions, a minority of recipients felt they would not have gone ahead with their course at all if they had not received ALG. Interestingly, significantly more recipients in old areas said this, suggesting that ALG may have more influence over learners' decisions to study as it becomes established.

Nearly one-fifth of recipients said they would have dropped out of their course if they had not received ALG, and this was particularly true for learners in full-time education without a job. This may suggest that ALG in some cases provides a protective function for full-time learners, perhaps by reducing the need for these learners to financially support themselves in ways that are less conducive to studying full-time.

ALG's influence is most apparent in learners' decisions to study full-time. ALG influenced nearly one-third of recipients in old areas and one-quarter of recipients in new areas to study full-time rather than part-time. This suggests that ALG's influence over learners' decisions to study full-time is greater where the grant has become more established.

Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to spend more than 12 hours per week on supervised learning. This will partly reflect the eligibility criteria of ALG.

On the whole, ALG was being spent as intended, with the majority of ALG recipients spending their grant on books and course-related equipment and course-related travel. Perhaps not surprisingly, younger recipients were more likely to spend ALG on social and leisure activities, and older recipients were more likely to spend the grant on rent or mortgage repayments.

15% of awardees chose to study at Level 2 and 72% at Level 3. More awardees were studying vocational courses at Level 2 than Level 3 whilst more awardees were studying academic qualifications at Level 3 than Level 2. As for Cohort 1, this suggests that ALG continues to be more attractive to learners studying at Level 3. In addition, significantly more awardees than non-applicants chose to study for an Access to Higher Education qualification.

Based on their reported prior and current qualifications, 10% of awardees were studying for a first Level 2 and 64% for a first Level 3. 5% appeared to be studying for a Level 2 qualification that was not their first and 8% appeared to be studying for a Level 3 qualification that was not their first. To some extent these percentages will reflect learners' difficulties recalling qualification levels. Evidence therefore suggests that ALG is being awarded in accordance with the eligibility criteria.

## **ANNEX A**

### **AWARDEES' AND NON-APPLICANTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNING, BY BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS**

Table A1 'I didn't get anything useful out of school', by background characteristics

Background characteristics	Awardees					N	Non-applicants					Row %
	Agree		Neither	Disagree			Agree		Neither	Disagree		
	strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly		strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly	
<b>Current qualification level <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Level 2	17	11	5	26	41	309	16	13	1	27	42	141
- Level 3	7	9	3	23	59	1549	6	9	2	23	61	602
All cases	9	9	3	24	59	1858	8	10	2	24	57	743
<b>Age group</b>												
- 19	7	7	3	23	61	758	5	8	2	23	62	436
- 20	9	8	3	26	55	647	6	9	5	23	59	236
- 21-24	8	11	4	24	53	470	9	10	1	31	49	161
- 25-31	21	11	3	24	41	257	25	16	2	22	35	95
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Asian or Asian British	9	6	2	27	57	289	11	7	1	20	61	125
- Black or Black British	9	10	1	22	57	79	[9]	[9]	[4]	[17]	[62]	45
- White	10	9	3	24	54	1687	9	10	2	25	54	705
- Mixed/other	11	4	8	17	60	74	6	14	2	33	45	50
<b>Living arrangement</b>												
- Single, lives with parents	7	9	3	23	58	1640	6	8	3	22	61	655
- lives with partner	19	11	3	16	51	245	17	11	2	18	53	94
- other	13	8	4	36	39	247	12	15	3	35	36	179
All cases	10	9	3	24	55	2132	9	10	3	24	55	928

Base: All Awardees and non-applicants.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Table A2 'I wish I'd gone to university', by background characteristics

Background characteristics	Awardees					N	Non-applicants					Row %
	Agree		Neither	Disagree			Agree		Neither	Disagree		N
	strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly		strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly	
<b>Current qualification level <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Level 2	23	15	11	27	23	291	20	23	6	24	27	129
- Level 3	32	17	13	20	18	1048	27	17	11	23	22	408
All cases	30	17	12	22	19	1339	25	18	10	23	23	537
<b>Age group</b>												
- 19	21	15	15	26	23	519	28	18	14	23	18	308
- 20	31	18	14	20	17	489	25	16	12	25	22	170
- 21-24	36	17	10	19	19	355	23	16	6	27	28	133
- 25-31	41	16	8	20	15	198	27	18	6	20	30	85
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Asian or Asian British	52	20	7	15	6	190	49	24	7	14	7	90
- Black or Black British	59	11	4	11	16	55	[58]	[10]	[7]	[10]	[16]	31
- White	26	16	14	24	21	1265	18	16	12	27	27	533
- Mixed/other	[46]	[19]	[4]	[10]	[21]	48	[51]	[20]	[0]	[12]	[17]	39
<b>Living arrangement</b>												
- Single, lives with parents	29	16	13	23	20	1205	22	19	12	24	22	472
- lives with partner	33	20	11	17	19	182	25	16	9	18	32	81
- other	36	18	12	20	15	174	36	13	6	26	19	143
All cases	31	17	12	22	19	1561	26	17	10	24	23	696

Base: Awardees and non-applicants who have not gone to university by the time of the survey.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Table A3 'Education is an investment in your future', by background characteristics

Background characteristics	Awardees					N	Non-applicants					Row %
	Agree strongly	Agree slightly	Neither	Disagree slightly	Disagree strongly		Agree strongly	Agree slightly	Neither	Disagree slightly	Disagree strongly	N
<b>Current qualification level <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Level 2	78	17	2	1	2	310	88	7	1	3	1	140
- Level 3	83	14	1	1	1	1549	86	11	1	1	1	601
All cases	82	14	2	1	1	1859	86	11	1	2	1	741
<b>Age group</b>												
- 19	80	15	2	1	1	758	85	13	1	1	1	436
- 20	82	14	2	3	1	648	80	14	2	4	2	234
- 21-24	82	14	2	1	1	470	89	7	2	2	1	161
- 25-31	87	10	1	*	2	257	83	15	0	2	0	96
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Asian or Asian British	82	15	*	3	*	289	89	9	0	2	0	125
- Black or Black British	81	12	0	4	4	79	[93]	[4]	[2]	[0]	[0]	45
- White	82	14	2	1	1	1687	82	14	1	2	1	705
- Mixed/other	85	14	1	0	0	75	[96]	[4]	[0]	[0]	[0]	49
<b>Living arrangement</b>												
- Single, lives with parents	81	15	2	2	1	1642	83	13	1	2	1	653
- lives with partner	86	11	1	*	1	244	92	3	1	3	2	94
- other	82	13	2	2	2	247	82	16	1	2	1	180
All cases	82	14	2	1	1	2133	84	12	1	2	1	927

Base: Awardees and non-applicants.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

Table A4 'I don't' have the confidence to learn on my own', by background characteristics

Background characteristics	Awardees					N	Non-applicants					Row %
	Agree		Neither	Disagree			Agree		Neither	Disagree		N
	strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly		strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly	
<b>Current qualification level <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Level 2	9	15	3	29	45	310	7	14	3	34	43	141
- Level 3	4	11	5	29	51	1548	4	10	6	32	47	601
All cases	5	11	5	29	50	1858	5	11	6	33	46	742
<b>Age group</b>												
- 19	4	10	5	33	48	756	5	12	5	33	46	435
- 20	6	11	5	26	51	648	6	11	4	33	46	236
- 21-24	6	12	4	30	49	470	3	9	7	32	50	161
- 25-31	4	14	6	28	47	257	11	15	10	24	41	96
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Asian or Asian British	6	13	4	32	45	290	7	15	7	30	42	126
- Black or Black British	6	10	0	38	46	79	[4]	[15]	[4]	[33]	[44]	45
- White	5	11	5	30	49	1684	5	11	6	31	47	704
- Mixed/other	7	12	8	18	55	75	14	12	2	35	37	50
<b>Living arrangement</b>												
- Single, lives with parents	5	12	5	29	49	1640	5	12	5	30	48	654
- lives with partner	5	12	5	28	51	245	9	11	7	29	44	94
- other	6	8	4	37	45	246	5	10	7	37	40	180
All cases	5	11	5	30	49	2131	6	12	6	31	46	928

Base: Awardees and non-applicants.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

Table A5 'Learning is something you should do throughout your life', by background characteristics

Background characteristics	Awardees					N	Non-applicants					Row %
	Agree strongly	Agree slightly	Neither	Disagree slightly	Disagree strongly		Agree strongly	Agree slightly	Neither	Disagree slightly	Disagree strongly	N
<b>Current qualification level <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Level 2	77	18	2	1	2	308	78	15	3	5	0	141
- Level 3	74	20	3	3	2	1550	74	19	3	3	1	602
All cases	75	19	2	2	2	1858	75	18	3	3	1	743
<b>Age group</b>												
- 19	72	21	3	4	1	758	73	19	3	5	1	436
- 20	71	21	2	3	2	648	75	17	3	3	2	235
- 21-24	76	18	2	2	1	469	83	14	2	2	0	161
- 25-31	83	14	2	1	1	257	63	26	5	2	4	96
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Asian or Asian British	77	16	2	3	2	290	76	11	1	8	4	125
- Black or Black British	77	15	4	4	0	79	[67]	[26]	[7]	[0]	[0]	45
- White	74	20	2	3	2	1685	72	20	4	3	1	705
- Mixed/other	73	20	1	4	1	75	90	10	0	0	0	50
<b>Living arrangement</b>												
- Single, lives with parents	73	20	3	3	2	1640	72	20	3	4	2	654
- lives with partner	83	14	2	2	*	245	75	18	4	3	1	94
- other	76	18	1	5	1	247	78	14	4	3	1	180
All cases	74	19	2	3	2	2132	74	19	3	3	1	928

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

**Table A6** 'I like the idea of learning in new ways such as through the internet or using CD Roms', by background characteristics

Background characteristics	Awardees					N	Non-applicants					Row %
	Agree		Neither	Disagree			Agree		Neither	Disagree		N
	strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly		strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly	
<b>Current qualification level <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Level 2	49	30	5	10	7	309	58	27	5	8	2	140
- Level 3	43	36	6	10	4	1550	46	33	6	10	6	602
All cases	44	35	6	10	4	1859	48	32	6	9	5	742
<b>Age group</b>												
- 19	44	35	5	11	5	757	52	29	5	11	4	436
- 20	48	36	5	9	3	648	45	38	3	11	5	235
- 21-24	41	35	7	11	6	470	49	28	8	10	5	160
- 25-31	47	27	7	12	6	257	45	28	10	8	9	94
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Asian or Asian British	50	33	3	11	3	290	51	28	3	12	6	124
- Black or Black British	44	38	4	10	4	79	[48]	[30]	[9]	[9]	[4]	45
- White	45	34	6	11	4	1685	48	31	6	10	5	703
- Mixed/other	32	38	7	11	12	75	53	35	2	6	4	50
<b>Living arrangement</b>												
- Single, lives with parents	44	36	6	10	4	1640	49	31	5	10	5	654
- lives with partner	46	28	9	12	6	245	48	29	6	11	6	94
- other	48	30	4	14	4	247	47	30	8	9	6	177
All cases	45	34	6	11	5	2132	49	31	6	10	5	925

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

Table A7 'Learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it', by background characteristics

Background characteristics	Awardees					N	Non-applicants					Row %
	Agree		Neither	Disagree			Agree		Neither	Disagree		
	strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly		strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly	
<b>Current qualification level <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Level 2	25	18	6	33	18	310	27	15	5	33	21	141
- Level 3	18	18	5	34	25	1549	21	18	6	32	23	602
All cases	19	18	5	34	24	1859	22	18	6	32	22	743
<b>Age group</b>												
- 19	18	20	6	35	21	757	23	18	7	30	21	436
- 20	21	21	5	33	20	649	22	16	7	32	23	236
- 21-24	19	14	5	35	28	470	23	16	8	31	22	161
- 25-31	14	12	6	35	34	257	20	23	5	30	22	95
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Asian or Asian British	34	21	3	24	18	290	42	23	7	16	12	125
- Black or Black British	26	26	3	25	20	79	[30]	[24]	[7]	[24]	[15]	45
- White	15	17	6	36	25	1686	18	17	7	35	24	705
- Mixed/other	21	18	4	30	27	75	31	18	4	26	22	50
<b>Living arrangement</b>												
- Single, lives with parents	19	20	5	33	22	1641	23	18	7	29	23	655
- lives with partner	16	8	6	37	33	245	19	17	5	31	28	94
- Other	17	13	6	35	29	247	24	20	6	36	14	179
All cases	19	18	5	34	24	2133	23	18	7	31	22	928

Base: Awardees and non-applicants.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

Table A8 'Computers are confusing and make things more difficult', by background characteristics

Background characteristics	Awardees					N	Non-applicants					Row % N
	Agree strongly	Agree slightly	Neither	Disagree slightly	Disagree strongly		Agree strongly	Agree slightly	Neither	Disagree slightly	Disagree strongly	
<b>Current qualification level <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Level 2	8	11	7	32	42	309	5	18	2	36	40	141
- Level 3	4	10	4	29	53	1548	4	9	5	29	53	602
All cases	5	1	4	30	51	1857	4	11	5	30	50	743
<b>Age group</b>												
- 19	5	11	4	31	50	758	5	10	5	27	53	436
- 20	4	10	5	30	52	648	5	9	4	28	55	236
- 21-24	7	10	5	27	52	468	4	13	4	32	47	161
- 25-31	6	12	5	33	44	257	5	15	5	33	41	96
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Asian or Asian British	4	10	1	34	51	290	4	8	7	29	52	126
- Black or Black British	6	13	5	33	42	79	[2]	[15]	[4]	[40]	[38]	45
- White	5	11	5	29	50	1684	5	11	4	29	50	705
- Mixed/other	8	8	7	27	49	75	2	14	2	25	58	50
<b>Living arrangement</b>												
- Single, lives with parents	5	11	4	29	52	1640	5	9	5	26	55	655
- lives with partner	4	10	5	30	50	244	4	17	3	32	45	94
- other	7	10	5	38	40	247	5	12	5	39	39	180
All cases	5	11	5	30	50	2131	5	11	5	29	51	929

Base: Awardees and non-applicants.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

Table A9 'It is the responsibility of the learner to pay for his or her learning', by background characteristics

Background characteristics	Awardees					N	Non-applicants					Row %
	Agree		Neither	Disagree			Agree		Neither	Disagree		N
	strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly		strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly	
<b>Current qualification level <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Level 2	12	16	16	26	31	307	7	21	9	34	30	141
- Level 3	6	14	17	34	30	1544	9	16	17	33	24	600
All cases	7	14	17	32	30	1851	9	17	16	33	25	741
<b>Age group</b>												
- 19	6	15	16	36	27	754	8	16	16	35	25	435
- 20	7	15	17	33	28	646	8	22	18	27	26	236
- 21-24	9	14	19	29	30	468	10	20	19	29	22	160
- 25-31	7	12	15	28	38	257	11	15	18	31	25	96
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Asian or Asian British	10	21	9	33	27	287	18	15	14	28	26	126
- Black or Black British	5	9	17	33	36	78	[13]	[17]	[13]	[28]	[28]	45
- White	7	14	18	32	30	1683	7	18	19	33	24	703
- Mixed/other	8	11	25	28	29	74	14	25	8	27	27	50
<b>Living arrangement</b>												
- Single, lives with parents	7	15	16	33	29	1633	8	19	16	33	25	654
- lives with partner	7	13	18	28	34	245	8	17	18	26	31	94
- other	11	12	18	32	27	247	13	16	20	31	21	179
All cases	7	14	17	32	30	2125	9	18	17	32	25	927

Base: Awardees and non-applicants.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data.

Shading refers to significant differences between awardees and non-applicants

Table A10 'Employers should pay for their employees to learn', by background characteristics

Background characteristics	Awardees					N	Non-applicants					Row %
	Agree		Neither	Disagree			Agree		Neither	Disagree		N
	strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly		strongly	slightly		slightly	strongly	
<b>Current qualification level <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Level 2	46	30	10	11	4	307	42	33	9	13	3	141
- Level 3	41	35	11	10	3	1542	38	35	13	12	2	601
All cases	42	34	11	10	3	1849	39	34	12	12	2	742
<b>Age group</b>												
- 19	37	35	11	13	4	751	33	40	11	14	2	435
- 20	40	35	12	10	3	647	38	33	13	13	3	236
- 21-24	44	34	11	8	2	468	50	30	10	7	3	161
- 25-31	51	30	9	9	*	256	43	35	12	7	4	95
<b>Ethnic group <math>\phi</math></b>												
- Asian or Asian British	43	33	6	14	4	287	43	33	11	9	5	125
- Black or Black British	44	24	14	14	4	79	[43]	[13]	[17]	[21]	[6]	45
- White	41	36	12	10	2	1678	37	38	11	11	2	704
- Mixed/other	48	19	19	9	4	75	51	29	10	8	2	50
<b>Living arrangement</b>												
- Single, lives with parents	40	35	11	11	3	1632	36	38	11	12	3	654
- lives with partner	45	34	13	6	2	244	43	36	10	10	2	94
- other	45	32	13	9	*	246	47	28	13	8	3	179
All cases	42	34	11	10	3	2122	39	36	11	11	3	927

Base: Awardees and non-applicants.

$\phi$  Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data

Learning and Skills Council  
National Office

Cheylesmore House  
Quinton Road  
Coventry CV1 2WT  
T 0845 019 4170  
F 024 7682 3675  
[www.lsc.gov.uk](http://www.lsc.gov.uk)

© LSC October 2006  
Published by the Learning and Skills Council

Extracts from this publication may be reproduced for non-commercial educational or training purposes on condition that the source is acknowledged and the findings are not misrepresented.

This publication is available in electronic form on the Learning and Skills Council website:  
[www.lsc.gov.uk](http://www.lsc.gov.uk)

If you require this publication in an alternative format or language, please contact the LSC Help Desk: 0870 900 6800

Publication reference: LSC-P-NAT-060572