

Teenage Mothers and Young People with Special Needs: Evidence from the Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots Database

Kim Perren and Sue Middleton

Centre for Research in Social Policy (CRSP)

*Teenage Mothers and Young People with Special
Needs:
Evidence from the Education Maintenance
Allowance Pilots Database*

Kim Perren and Sue Middleton

Centre for Research in Social Policy (CRSP)

CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
INTRODUCTION	1
PART A	
A1 TEENAGE MOTHERS AND PREGNANT 16 YEAR-OLDS	3
A1.1 Focus	3
A1.2 Definition of Young Parent	4
A1.3 The Sample and Analysis	5
A1.4 Young Mothers and Ethnicity	5
A2 CURRENT HOUSEHOLD CIRCUMSTANCES AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND	7
A2.1 Household Composition	7
A2.2 Housing Tenure	8
A2.3 Home Life During Years 10 and 11	9
A2.4 Parental Marital Status at Young Women's Birth	11
A2.5 Parental Socio-economic Group and Highest Educational Qualifications	12
A3 SCHOOL EXPERIENCES AND TRANSITIONS	14
A3.1 Special Needs and Disability	14
A3.2 Problems at School and Attendance	16
A3.3 Careers Advice and Work Experience	18
A3.4 Parental Involvement at Year 11	20
A3.5 Year 11 Achievement	21
A3.6 Sources of Advice	23
A3.7 Hopes for the Future During Year 11	24
A3.8 Year 11 Decision-making	25
A4 DESTINATIONS AND HOPES FOR THE FUTURE	28
A4.1 Economic Activity after Year 11	28
A4.2 Achieving Year 11 Aims	29
A4.3 Factors Limiting and Facilitating Remaining in Education Post Year 11	31
A4.4 Support Networks and Participation in Education	32
A4.5 The Influence of EMA Availability	33
A4.6 Attitudes to Education and Employment	35
A4.7 Future Plans	36

A5	THE POST-16 TRANSITIONS OF 16 YEAR OLD MOTHERS	39
A5.1	Economic Activity at Ages 16, 17 and 18	40
A5.2	Household Composition at Ages 16, 17 and 18	43
A5.3	Household Composition and Economic Activity	46
A5.4	Post-Year 11 Education	47
A5.5	Employment	48
A5.6	Economic Activity at Age 16 and Preferences for the Future	48
A5.7	Preferences and Attainment	50
A6	THE POST-16 TRANSITIONS OF PREGNANT 16 YEAR OLDS	53
A6.1	Economic Activity at Ages 16, 17 and 18	53
A6.2	Household Composition at Ages 16, 17 and 18	54
A6.3	Economic Activity at Age 16 and Preferences for the Future	55
A7	CONCLUSION	57
PART B		
B1	YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SPECIAL NEEDS	61
B1.1	Focus	61
B1.2	Definition of Special Needs and Disability	61
B2	THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF SPECIAL NEEDS AND DISABILITY	63
B2.1	Prevalence of Special Needs and Disability	63
B2.2	Type of Special Needs	64
B2.3	Gender	65
	B2.3.1 Gender and special needs and disability	65
	B2.3.2 Gender and specific special needs	66
B2.4	Overlap between Special Needs and Disability	67
B3	GENDER, ETHNICITY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND	70
B3.1	Gender	70
B3.2	Ethnicity	71
B3.3	Parents' Qualifications	72
B3.4	Parents' Socio-economic Group	73
B4	YEAR 11 SCHOOL EXPERIENCES	75
B4.1	Negative School Experiences	75
B4.2	Educational Achievement, Special Needs and Gender	76
B4.3	Lack of Year 11 Qualifications, Special Needs and Gender	78
B4.4	Factors Associated with Special Needs	79
	B4.4.1 Predicting a statement of SEN	79
	B4.4.2 Predicting a parental assessment of SEN	84
B5	TRAINING, ADVICE AND DECISIONS	86
B5.1	Careers Advice, Personal and Social Education (PSE) and Work Experience in Years 10 and 11	86
B5.2	Sources of Advice	87
B5.3	Year 11 Aspirations for Post-Year 11 Future	89

B6	POST-YEAR 11 DESTINATIONS	93
B6.1	Economic Activity at Age 16	93
B6.2	Multivariate Models	97
B6.3	Achievement of Aspirations	101
B6.4	Reasons for Leaving Education	103
B6.5	Willingness to Return to Education	104
B7	EMA AWARENESS AND APPLICATIONS IN PILOT AREAS	106
B7.1	Importance of Education Grants	107
B8	ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AT AGE 16	108
B8.1	Characteristics of Young People by Destination at Age 16	108
B8.2	Full-time Education at Age 16	110
B8.2.1	Year 12 institution	110
B8.2.2	Travel to school or college	113
B8.2.3	Combining employment and study	114
B8.2.4	Type of course studied	115
B8.3	Work or Work-based Training at Age 16	117
B8.3.1	Job characteristics	117
B8.3.2	Getting to work	118
B8.3.3	Finding work	119
B8.4	Being NEET at Age 16	120
B9	ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AT AGE 17 AND 18	122
B9.1	Economic Activity at Age 17	122
B9.2	Economic Activity at Age 18	125
B10	POST-16 QUALIFICATIONS ATTAINMENT	132
B10.1	Improvements in Year 11 Attainment by Age 18	132
B11	CONCLUSION	137
	REFERENCES	140
	ANNEX A	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report uses quantitative data collected as part of the evaluation of the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) Pilots to follow the life course trajectories of two groups of vulnerable young people as they aged from 16 to 18. Part A investigates the experiences of young women who had a child, or were pregnant, when they were first interviewed a few months after finishing compulsory education. Part B outlines the transitions of young people who had special educational needs and/or a health problem that limited their daily lives.

The EMA evaluation was designed to yield a random sample of two cohorts of young people in ten pilot areas and 11 control areas. The two cohorts finished compulsory education in the summers of 1999 and 2000 respectively and were interviewed three times at yearly intervals, that is, when they were approximately 16, 17 and 18 years old. About a quarter of the young people in the full sample were ineligible for EMA on the grounds that the income of their parents exceeded £30,000 a year. These relatively affluent young people were excluded from this report for two reasons. Firstly, this facilitates an exploration of how EMA affects the choices made by vulnerable young people. Secondly, the two vulnerable groups tended to have parents with low or moderate incomes; consequently, the removal of high-income households increases the similarities between vulnerable and non-vulnerable young people. This selection process resulted in a sample of 7415 young women and 7319 young men. This sample has been weighted to be representative of all EMA eligible young people (from these cohorts) in the pilot and control areas.

In both parts of the report, the analysis commences with a retrospective look at the Year 11 experiences of the vulnerable group and compares their situation to that of their ‘non-vulnerable’ counterparts (respectively, young women who were neither mothers nor pregnant (Part A) and young people who had neither special needs nor a limiting health condition (Part B)). This is followed by an account of their economic activity a few months after the end compulsory education. Finally, the report concentrates on the experiences of young people who remained in the study until the age of 18.

PART A TEENAGE MOTHERS AND PREGNANT 16 YEAR-OLDS

1 Household Composition and Housing Tenure

In the months following the end of compulsory education, around three-quarters of young mothers were living with a parent or guardian (76 per cent) compared with 88 per cent of pregnant teenagers and 97 per cent of those who were neither mothers nor pregnant. **(Section A2.1)**. Only a small minority of young mothers and pregnant 16 year-olds lived in owner-occupied homes (17 per cent and 23 per cent respectively) compared with three-fifths of the non-vulnerable group (60 per cent). One in six young mothers, and one in eight pregnant teenagers, lived in private rented accommodation (16 per cent and 12 per cent respectively); by contrast, just six per cent of the non-vulnerable group held this tenure. **(Section A2.2)**

2 Parental Characteristics

Among young women living with a parent, three-fifths of vulnerable teenagers (who either had a child or were pregnant) had no working parent (61 per cent) compared with just 29 per cent of their counterparts in the non-vulnerable group. The parents of vulnerable teenagers also tended to have low educational qualifications. Almost three-fifths of the parents of young mothers and pregnant teenagers had no qualifications (59 per cent) compared with a third of those whose daughters were neither mothers nor pregnant (32 per cent). **(Section A2.5)**

3 School experiences

When asked about their Year 11 experiences, young women in the two vulnerable groups were much more likely to report having regularly played truant than their counterparts in the non-vulnerable group. Two-fifths of young mothers (42 per cent), and the same proportion of pregnant teenagers, said they had played truant for days or weeks at a time, compared with just one in seven young women who did not have a child and were not pregnant (14 per cent). Similarly, about a quarter of the two vulnerable groups had been excluded from school at some time compared with six per cent of non-vulnerable young women. **(Section A3.2)**

Of the three groups, young mothers were least likely to have attended a Personal and Social Education (PSE) class at Year 11 (57 per cent) while those in the non-vulnerable group were most likely to have done so (83 per cent); pregnant teenagers occupied an intermediate position (71 per cent). Just over half of the young mothers reported having work experience at Year 10 or 11 (54 per cent) compared with 78 per cent of pregnant teenagers and 90 per cent of young women who were neither mothers nor pregnant. **(Section A3.3)**

Almost two-fifths of young women in the non-vulnerable group (39 per cent) had attained five or more GCSEs (or their GNVQ equivalent) at grades A*-C by the end of Year 11. This level of attainment was achieved by one in ten young mothers (ten per cent) and just four per cent of pregnant teenagers. While only eight per cent of non-vulnerable teenagers had gained no qualifications, this rose to a third of pregnant teenagers (33 per cent) and two-fifths of mothers (40 per cent). Despite these low levels of attainment, two-thirds of young mothers (65 per cent), and the same proportion of pregnant teenagers, had hoped to remain in full-time education following the end of compulsory education. Among non-vulnerable young women, 82 per cent wanted to remain in education. **(Section A3.5)**

4 Economic Activity at Age 16

In the months following the end of compulsory schooling, three-quarters of young women who were not mothers or pregnant were in full-time education (75 per cent). This contrasts with just 14 per cent of young mothers and 17 per cent of pregnant 16 year-olds. While only one in ten of the non-vulnerable group was NEET at this point in their lives, more than four-fifths of young mothers held this status (82 per cent) along with two-thirds of pregnant teenagers (69 per cent). **(Section A4.1)** Despite this apparent mismatch between their hopes and their actual situation, the majority of vulnerable young women felt they had definitely or probably made the right decision (81 per cent of young mothers and 75 per cent of pregnant teenagers). **(Section A4.2)**

5 Attitudes to Education and Employment

Although few vulnerable young women remained in education at the end of compulsory education, three-quarters of young mothers and pregnant teenagers felt that qualifications were necessary for any job that was worth having (76 per cent and 78 per cent respectively). In the non-vulnerable group, this figure was 80 per cent. Similarly, at least two-thirds of each the three groups felt that qualifications led to higher earnings (69 per cent of mothers; 73 per cent of pregnant 16 year-olds; and 68 per cent of those who were neither mothers nor pregnant). **(Section A4.6)**

6 Hopes for the Future

Half of all young mothers interviewed at the age of 16, and two-fifths of pregnant teenagers, hoped to be in full-time education in a year's time (50 per cent and 42 per cent respectively); this contrasts 70 per cent of non-vulnerable young women. Where vulnerable young women wanted to be in full-time education in the next year, 92 per cent of young mothers and 76 per cent of pregnant teenagers believed it was fairly or very likely that they would attain this goal. **(Section A4.7)**

7 Economic Activity at Ages 17 and 18

Only a minority of vulnerable young women remained in the study two years after the first interview (27 mothers and 22 pregnant teenagers). Given this substantial attrition, the subsequent experiences of the minority of vulnerable young women who remained in the study cannot be viewed as representative of all teenage mothers and pregnant 16 year-olds. Consequently, the post-16 lives of the remaining vulnerable young women were explored on a case by case basis and without reference to the non-vulnerable 'controls'.

In all, 14 out of 27 young mothers were involved in further education at some point between the ages of 16 and 18, including 13 who studied full-time. Across the three interviews, six had some experience of employment. Only one of these positions (as a waitress) involved training and none of the mothers were in the same job at two successive waves. Nineteen young mothers had some experience of being in neither education nor work or training; this includes nine who were NEET at each of the three waves. **(Section A5.1)** Among young

women who had been mothers at the age of 16, living with a parent changed from being the majority status (18 out of 27 at the age of 16) to be a minority one (nine out of 27 at the age of 18). At the age of 16, six young mothers lived with a partner. This rose to seven at the age of 17 and then fell to just three at the age of 18. Six young women had given birth to an additional child by the age of 18. **(Section A5.2)**

Of the 22 young women who had been pregnant at the age of 16, and who had remained in the study for two years after the first interview, just three had been in part-time education at some point after the birth of their child (i.e. at the age of 17 or 18); none had undertaken full-time study. Three had some experience of being a working mother (all at the age of 18; two part-time). Twenty-one of the 22 had been NEET at some time since the birth of their child, including 17 who had been NEET at both age of 17 and 18. By the age of 18, seven young women were living with their parents; five were with a partner, and ten were living with neither a parent nor a partner. **(Section A6.1)**

PART B SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITY

1 Prevalence of Special Needs and Disability

Sixteen per cent of EMA eligible young people had special educational needs while 17 per cent had a disability (i.e. a health problem that limited their daily lives). **(Section B2.1)**

Among young people with special needs, the most commonly mentioned problems were literacy or numeracy (71 per cent), difficulties with sight, hearing or speech (21 per cent), and emotional or behavioural problems (16 per cent). **(Section B2.2)**

2 Gender and Ethnicity

Nineteen per cent of young men had SEN compared with 12 per cent of young women. Gender differences in disability were minimal. Among young people with special educational needs, more males than females were identified as having emotional or behavioural problems (19 per cent compared with 11 per cent). **(Section B2.3)**

White teenagers were more likely to be identified as having special needs than teenagers from minority ethnic groups. Seventeen per cent of white young people had special needs

compared with 12 per cent of Black young people, seven per cent of those with a Bangladeshi or Pakistani heritage, and just six per cent of those with an Indian heritage. White teenagers were also more likely to say they had a health problem that limited their daily life. **(Section B3.2)**

A multivariate analysis, controlling for Year 11 qualifications and parental characteristics, revealed that, compared with females, males were more than twice as likely to have been given a statement of special needs. Compared with white teenagers, the likelihood that teenagers from minority ethnic groups had been given a statement ranged from 37 per cent to 54 per cent. **(Section B4.4)**

3 Parental Characteristics

The parents of young people with special needs tended to have low educational qualifications, particularly where having special needs was combined with a disability. More than half of young people with special needs and a disability (55 per cent) had no parent with a Level 2 qualification (GCSE or equivalent) along with 47 per cent of parents whose child had special needs only. This contrasts with 43 per cent of parents whose child had a disability only and 39 per cent of those whose child had neither problem.

Three-fifths of young people with both special needs and a disability had no parent in work (59 per cent). Among those with special needs only this dropped to two-fifths (40 per cent). Where young people had a disability only, 37 per cent lived in homes where no parent was employed, while among the non-vulnerable group (with neither special needs nor a disability) 30 per cent had no working parent. **(Section B3.4)**

4 School experiences

Almost three-fifths of young people with both special needs and a disability had been bullied at school (59 per cent) compared with around two-fifths of those with only one of these problems (41 per cent of the special needs only group and 44 per cent of the disability only group) and a quarter of those with neither problem (25 per cent). The three vulnerable groups were more likely to have been accused of bullying (between 29 per cent and 33 per cent compared with 18 per cent of the non-vulnerable group); more likely to have played truant for ‘days or weeks at a time’ (between 18 per cent and 22 per cent compared with 13 per cent in the non-vulnerable group); and more likely to have been excluded from school (between 13 and 18 per cent compared with nine per cent). **(Section B4.1)**

Twelve per cent of teenagers with special needs and a disability, and ten per cent of those with special needs only, had attained five or more GCSEs at grade C or above (or the vocational equivalent) compared with a third of those who had a disability only (32 per cent) and two-fifths of those with neither special needs nor a disability (42 per cent). Among young people who had both special needs and a disability, more than a third (36 per cent) had not achieved any qualifications, as had almost a quarter (23 per cent) of those who had special educational needs only. This contrasts with 13 per cent of those with a disability only and just seven per cent of those with neither a disability nor special needs. **(Section B4.2)**

Compared with the non-vulnerable group, young people with both a disability and special needs were much less likely to have attended a PSE class in Year 11 (61 per cent compared with 82 per cent), to have had work experience (77 per cent compared with 89 per cent), and to have attended a Careers Service session (46 per cent compared with 63 per cent). Teenagers with special needs only also had low rates of involvement in these three activities (83 per cent attended a PSE class, 57 per cent had work experience and 57 per cent had attended a Careers Service session). **(Section B5.1)**

5 Hopes for the Future

Despite generally poor Year 11 attainment, the majority of young people with special needs had hoped to remain in education. Two-thirds of those with special needs and a disability (67 per cent) had hoped to continue along with three-fifths of those with special needs only (59 per cent). Teenagers with a disability only were most likely to want to remain in education (78 per cent compared with 77 per cent of those with neither a disability nor special needs). **(Section B5.3)**

6 Economic Activity at Age 16

In the months following the end of Year 11, teenagers in the special needs only group were least likely to be in full-time education (58 per cent compared with between 70 per cent and 73 per cent of the other three groups). The three vulnerable groups had higher rates of being NEET than the non-vulnerable group (between 17 per cent and 19 per cent compared with ten per cent). **(Section B6.1)** A multivariate model controlling for gender and Year 11 attainment showed that young people with a disability and special needs, and those with a disability only, had a decreased likelihood of being in work or work-based training at the age of 16. **(Section B6.2)**

7 Courses Studied by Full-time Students at Age 16

At the age of 16, almost two-thirds of non-vulnerable students (64 per cent) were following an academic course compared with around half of those with a disability only (52 per cent), just over a third of those with special needs only (36 per cent) and just over a quarter of those with both special needs and a disability (28 per cent). Correspondingly, the non-vulnerable group and the disability only group had the lowest rates of taking a vocational course - 28 per cent and 35 per cent respectively, compared with half of students with special needs only and 44 per cent of those with both special needs and a disability. At the age of 16, 29 per cent of students with both special needs and a disability were studying a non-standard course leading to 'other' or no qualifications. Non-standard courses were followed by 14 per cent of students with special needs only, 12 per cent of those with a disability only and just eight per cent of those with neither special needs nor a disability. **(Section B8.1)**

8 Economic Activity at Age 17

At the age of 17, teenagers with special needs but no disability were least likely to be in full-time education (45 per cent compared with between 57 per cent and 63 per cent of the other groups) and most likely to be in work or work-based training (38 per cent compared with between 21 per cent and 26 per cent of the other groups). The three vulnerable groups had high rates of being NEET (between 17 per cent and 19 per cent compared with eight per cent in the non-vulnerable group).

9 Economic Activity at Age 18

At the age of 18, teenagers with special needs but no disability were less likely to be in full-time education than those in the other three groups (27 per cent compared with between 37 per cent and 41 per cent). The two groups with a disability were much less likely to be at university than the group with neither a disability nor special needs. Fifteen per cent of teenagers with a disability only were in higher education at the age of 18 compared with almost a quarter of those with no disability or special needs (24 per cent). Where young people had both a disability and special needs, just seven per cent were at university; this is the same proportion as among young people with special needs only. **(Section B9.1)**

More than a third of 18 year-olds with both special needs and a disability were NEET (37 per cent), along with over a quarter of those with special needs only (28 per cent) and a fifth of those with a disability only (21 per cent). By contrast, just 15 per cent of the non-vulnerable group were NEET at the age of 18. Multivariate analysis controlling for gender, Year 11 qualifications and economic activity at the age of 17, revealed that young people with special needs (both with and without a disability) had an increased risk of being NEET at the age of 18 compared with 18 year-olds with neither special needs nor a disability. **(Section B9.2)**

10 Qualification Attainment after Year 11

More than three-fifths of 18 year olds with special needs had not gained any new qualifications in the two years since they left school (64 per cent of those with special needs and a disability and 62 per cent of those with special needs only). This contrasts with just under half of young people with a disability only (47 per cent) and two-fifths of those with

neither special needs nor a disability (39 per cent). Controlling for gender and Year 11 qualifications, and compared with the non-vulnerable group, the likelihood of having attained new qualifications was around two-fifths for teenagers with special needs and a disability (odds ratio of 0.42) and three-fifths for those with special needs only and a disability only (odds ratio of 0.61 in both cases). **(Section B10.1)**

INTRODUCTION

This report is one of a series of three commissioned by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) to further exploit data from the large scale surveys of young people that have formed part of the evaluation of the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) Pilots. The quantitative element of this evaluation has focussed on two cohorts of young people who completed compulsory education (Year 11) in the summers of 1999 and 2000 (the first two cohorts of young people who were potentially eligible for EMA). Large random samples of young people (and their parents) from each cohort were interviewed face-to-face in ten EMA pilot areas and 11 control areas. The first interview took place between four and nine months after the end of Year 11, when the young people were aged 16 or 17. In total, information about more than 20,000 young people is available for analysis when the two cohorts, pilot and control areas are combined. Of these, around 14,700 came from lower income households (where parental income did not exceed £30,000 per annum) and so were potentially eligible for EMA. Follow-up telephone interviews were sought approximately 12 and 24 months after the first one (i.e. when the young people were aged 17-18 and 18-19).

This report considers the Year 11 school experiences, and subsequent transitions, of two groups of young people who may be considered vulnerable; young women who had a child, or were pregnant, when they were first interviewed, and young people who had special needs and/or a health problem that limited their daily lives. The other two reports in this series contain findings relating to young people not in education, employment or training (Rennison et al., 2004) and young people from minority ethnic groups (Cebulla et al., 2004). These four sub-groups of young people are currently of major concern to policy makers and have in common a lack of empirical evidence about their circumstances and experiences, largely because of their relatively small numbers in the population of young people as a whole. The EMA evaluation has provided a unique opportunity to gather such evidence.

Further details about the surveys and their methodology can be found in earlier reports from the consortium of organisations that is responsible for the EMA evaluation. However, it should be noted here that the pilot areas (and, hence, their controls) were not chosen randomly, rather they were selected as areas of relatively high deprivation and where young people were historically less likely to remain in education after the end of compulsory schooling. All except three of the pilot and control areas are urban; the one rural pilot area

and its two controls are exceptions to the ‘high deprivation’, ‘low post 16 participation’ pattern of the urban pilots areas. Nevertheless, the sample of young people is biased towards those in deprived urban areas. Furthermore, in light of the continued interest in the possible impact of EMA on the destinations of young people, the decision was made to limit the analysis presented in this report to EMA eligible young people. Data have been weighted to be representative of all EMA eligible young people in the pilot and control areas and to account for differential non-response. However, the populations under consideration are not representative of young people in the UK as a whole, but of a relatively deprived sub-group¹.

This current report is divided into Part A and Part B which relate to teenage mothers and young people with special needs respectively. Each part begins by exploring young people’s Year 11 experiences, before moving on to look at their lives in the months following the end of compulsory education. Following on from this, the longitudinal design of the study is utilised to follow the circumstances of those young people who remained in the study up to the age of 19. For convenience, young people are referred to as aged 16 at the time of the first interview in the months following the end of compulsory schooling (although some of them would have been 17 years old). In the following year, they are referred to as being 17 years old and in the third year of the study they are considered to have been 18.

¹ It should be noted that all young people with a co-resident child of their own are automatically classified as EMA eligible without reference to their parents’ income.

PART A

A1 TEENAGE MOTHERS AND PREGNANT 16 YEAR-OLDS

A1.1 Focus

A reduction in the teenage pregnancy rate is one of the government's 'Opportunities for All' indicators for reducing poverty and social exclusion (Department for Work and Pensions, 1999). A range of initiatives, discussion of which is beyond the scope of this report, is in place to reduce the number of young people who become parents during their teenage years.

This part of the report explores the circumstances of young women from the first and second EMA cohorts who were living with a child of their own, or who were pregnant, when they were interviewed a few months after the end of compulsory education (see further below)². They were, therefore, 16 or 17 years old at the time of interview and so include only a proportion of 'teenage parents' who, by definition, can include all those who have a child between the ages of 13 and 19 years. However, this age group of young parents is of particular policy interest since it includes those who will have become pregnant whilst still of compulsory school age, or very shortly afterwards. Much policy attention has been focussed on encouraging and assisting these young parents to remain in, or to return to, education as well as on seeking to reduce the numbers of teenagers who become pregnant. The School Standards Grant: Teenage Pregnancy was launched in 2000 to try and reintegrate school-age parents and pregnant teenagers into education and to provide subsequent support. In addition, from September 2000 flexibilities in the EMA scheme were introduced in a number of pilot areas with the specific aim of encouraging 'vulnerable' young people to continue their education, with teenage parents one of the initial priority groups³. Childcare Pilots have also been introduced in a number of areas aimed at assisting teenage parents with the costs of childcare.

² The analysis in this report has included only young people who were notionally eligible for EMA because their parents' incomes were £30,000 per annum or less. The sample is, therefore, of a relatively deprived sub-group of young people living in areas that were themselves relatively deprived.

³ See Dobson et al., 2002 and 2003 for an evaluation of the EMA vulnerable pilots, which include a qualitative description of the experiences of teenage parents.

Despite this policy attention, very little is known in detail about the characteristics, background circumstances, school experiences and aspirations of those who become teenage parents during or immediately after compulsory education. This report seeks to begin to fill this knowledge gap. It describes the socio-economic characteristics of young mothers, their school experiences during Years 10 and 11, their main activity at the time of their first interview (several months after the end of Year 11) and their aspirations for the future. Follow-up interviews were conducted approximately one and two years later and give an insight into the early adult lives of women raising a family at such a young age. Although the focus of the report is not EMA, awareness of its availability among young mothers is briefly considered to explore the extent to which EMA might potentially play a role in assisting young mothers of the future to remain in education.

A1.2 Definition of Young Parent

Young women were identified as mothers where analysis of the household questionnaire, usually completed by young people's parents, showed that another household member was the young person's child. A total of 95 young mothers were identified in this way (from a sample of 7415 EMA eligible young women). The original analysis plan envisaged exploring the experiences of **all** teenage parents, including young people whose children were not living with them at the time of interview. The intention was to use information from the household questionnaire that asked whether the young person had a child outside of the household. Unfortunately, it seems that some of the young people's parents misunderstood the question and reported their own non-resident children (i.e. the young person's siblings). Hence there were reports of 62 young women having a non-resident child - an implausibly high number given that only 95 had a child living with them. Therefore, these cases have been excluded from the analysis. A further consequence of this misinterpretation of the question about non-resident children is that very little can be said about parenthood among young men (of whom only three lived with a child and a further 81 were reported to have a child outside of the household).

The report also considers EMA eligible young women who were not mothers, but who were identified as being pregnant at the time of the first interview, a further 93 cases. Young women were only asked if they were pregnant if they appeared to be so, with the result that this will under-estimate the extent of pregnancy among the sample. On average, these

women were due to give birth three months later, so included a mixture of those who became pregnant while still in compulsory education and those who did so very soon afterwards.

A1.3 The Sample and Analysis

This sample of 188 young women who were mothers or pregnant at the age of 16 or 17, is large in comparison to samples usually available. However, some of the sub-group analysis in what follows is based on very small numbers and the findings should be treated as indicative rather than conclusive.

Young mothers and pregnant young women are considered to be ‘vulnerable’ in policy terms. In the following analysis, their experiences are contrasted with those in their peer group who were neither mothers nor pregnant at the time of interview, in order to identify and highlight differences that might be illuminating for future policy.

A1.4 Young Mothers and Ethnicity

Within the EMA sample, very few vulnerable young women were from minority ethnic groups. None of the British Indian young women had a child or was pregnant. None of those with a Pakistani or Bangladeshi heritage had a child, although two were pregnant. Two Black young women had a child and an additional two were pregnant. This finding may appear inconsistent with research that has found teenage pregnancy and parenthood to be more prevalent among certain minority ethnic groups than among the white majority but this may be indicative of the very restricted age range of the EMA sample. Berthould’s (2001) analysis of Labour Force Survey data from 1987 to 1999 identified high rates of teenage childbearing among British Pakistani and Bangladeshi young women. However, these predominantly reflected births at the age of 18 and 19. Furthermore, teenage pregnancy rates among these groups have fallen dramatically since the 1980s.

The EMA pilot is not representative of all young women in this age group because it excludes those with a household income of above £30,000 a year; this selection may have attenuated the ethnic differences in teenage pregnancy and birth rates that are evident in the wider population. In addition, the sample contained only 101 Black Caribbean young women (identified by Berthould (2001) as at increased risk of being teenage mothers) and this limits

the validity of findings relating to this ethnic group. In any event, given the small numbers of young mothers from minority ethnic groups in this sample this report may be best viewed as indicative of the experiences of white teenage mothers.

A2 CURRENT HOUSEHOLD CIRCUMSTANCES AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

This section of the report explores, first, the household circumstances of the group of young mothers and pregnant teenagers in terms of who the young women were living with at the time of interview and the type of housing they were occupying. Existing research has shown that parental characteristics are strong predictors of teenage parenthood among the next generation (Hobcraft 1998), so the section goes on to consider parental and childhood characteristics known to be associated with early motherhood.

A2.1 Household Composition

All the young mothers were living with just one child, although two reported being pregnant again. Two-thirds (69 per cent) of the children were under the age of one year; a quarter (27 per cent) were aged one year; and five per cent (N=4) were aged two years.

The arrival of a child is often associated with young women setting up home away from their family of origin. This change of residence may reflect ‘push’ factors associated with having a child, such as over-crowding in the parental home or deteriorating relationships with parents. It may also indicate the operation of ‘pull’ factors, with young mothers wanting to live with their partner or having priority for social housing tenancies. In addition, it is known that young women who have spent their teenage years in care are at an increased risk of early pregnancy and so are unlikely to have the option of raising their child in their parents’ home (Social Exclusion Unit 1999).

Three-quarters of young mothers lived with at least one of their parents (Table A2.1). Ten per cent (N=19) did not live with a parent but lived with a partner. The remaining 15 per cent (N=20) lived with neither a parent nor a partner. Of these, 16 lived with just their child, two shared a home with a sibling and two lived with non-relatives. The likelihood of living with a parent was not significantly associated with either the age of the child or the age of the mother (analysis not shown).

Among pregnant teenagers, 88 per cent lived with a parent. In addition, two lived with a grandparent and one with foster parents. Five per cent of pregnant teenagers (N=8) lived

with a partner while five per cent (N=10) lived with neither a parent/guardian nor partner (four of these shared with a non-relative).

These living arrangements of young mothers and pregnant teenagers are in sharp contrast with young women who had not embarked upon parenthood; among these young women, 99 per cent lived with a parent or other parental figure.

Table A2.1 Household Composition

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Parent(s)	76	88	97
Other parental figure	0	3	0
No parental figure, with partner	10	5	0
No parental figure, no partner	15	5	1
Unweighted N	95	93	7227

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A2.2 Housing Tenure

Social housing was the most common tenure for young mothers and pregnant women, with almost two-thirds of each of these groups living in council or housing association properties (Table A2.2). In addition, 16 per cent of young mothers (N=16) and 12 per cent of pregnant women (N=12) were in private rented accommodation. Rented accommodation in the private sector may provide less stable tenure and suggests a high level of material disadvantage among these already vulnerable young women. Among those who were not mothers and were not pregnant, owner-occupation was the majority tenure (60 per cent) while just under one third lived in social housing. Few of this non-vulnerable group lived in privately rented accommodation (just six per cent).

Table A2.2 Housing Tenure

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Owner occupied	17	23	60
Social rented	65	64	32
Private rented	16	12	6
Other	3	1	2
Unweighted N	95	93	7209

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

To an extent, the disadvantaged housing position of young mothers reflects the fact that many were not living with their family. However, vulnerable teenagers were disproportionately likely to live in disadvantaged circumstances even when they were living with their family; fewer than a quarter of those who lived with a parent (21 per cent), lived in an owner-occupied home (analysis not shown).

A2.3 Home Life During Years 10 and 11

Most socio-economic information about the family background of young people who were not living with their parents at the time of interview was missing, as these items were included on the parental questionnaire. However, a set of questions in the young person's questionnaire gives some insight into family circumstances during the young person's last two years in compulsory education; Years 10 and 11. These questions asked whether the young person had her own bedroom at this point in her school career; whether she had access to a quiet place to study; and whether she had ever received free school meals during this period. These 'home-life' indicators offer a limited insight into the socio-economic backgrounds of all of the women who entered parenthood in their mid-teens, not just those who still lived with their parents. In addition, they illuminate whether those who were living away from their families differed substantively from those who continued to live with their parents. In relation to these indicators, there is no a priori reason to expect that the

backgrounds of young mothers would differ substantively from those who were pregnant so for this analysis the two groups were combined.

A comparison of the backgrounds of young women who entered parenthood early and those who did not reveal that many more of the mothers/pregnant teenagers experienced disadvantage in Years 10 and 11 (Table A2.3). Almost a third did not have their own bedroom compared with less than a quarter of non-vulnerable teenagers. Eighteen per cent had no quiet place to study compared with 11 per cent of others; and over half received free school meals compared with less than a third of those who did not have a child and were not pregnant.

Receipt of free school meals is arguably the best measure to check that the two groups of vulnerable young women did not differ substantially from each other in terms of background economic disadvantage. Indeed, there was no significant difference between the two groups; 50 per cent of young mothers had received free school meals compared with 55 per cent of pregnant teenagers (analysis not shown).

When comparisons are made between vulnerable young women living with their parents and those who were not, the results are inconsistent. A similar proportion had shared a bedroom in their mid-teens. Those currently living with their parents were less likely to say that there had been no quiet place for them to study (16 per cent compared with 26 per cent); however, they were more likely to have received free school meals than those who were not living with their parents (57 per cent compared with 35 per cent), suggesting that those who remained with their parents came from economically more deprived families than those who had left the parental home. In other respects, these indicators do not indicate that the family backgrounds of those who remained with their parents and those living independently were substantially different. Nevertheless, where socio-economic information is only available for those who were living with their parents, the possibility that this group was somewhat less affluent than those living away from their parents needs to be borne in mind.

Table A2.3 Percentage Reporting Disadvantaged Home Circumstances at Years 10 or 11

				Cell per cent
	Child in home/pregnant			No child/ not pregnant
	With parent	No parent	All	
Did not have own bedroom	32	32	32	22
No quiet place to study	16	26	18	11
Received free school meals	57	35	53	30
Minimum unweighted N	127	60	187	7214

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A2.4 Parental Marital Status at Young Women's Birth

Table A2.4 shows the marital status of the young mother's parent at the time of their birth⁴. Confirming the findings of other research (Hobcraft, 1998), the parents of young mothers were less likely to have been married when their daughter was born than the parents of those who had not embarked upon parenthood (73 per cent compared with 82 per cent). Almost twice as many young mothers had been born into a lone parent household than those who were not mothers (17 per cent compared with nine per cent).

⁴ This information is derived from the parental questionnaire and so is only available for those who were living with their parents at the time of interview.

Table A2.4 Parental Marital Status at Young Women's Birth (where young woman lives with a parent)

	Column per cent	
	Child in home/pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Married	73	82
Cohabiting	11	9
Lone, previously married	4	2
Lone, never married	13	7
Unweighted N	127	6940

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A2.5 Parental Socio-economic Group and Highest Educational Qualifications

Table A2.5 confirms the expectation that teen pregnancies and births would be strongly associated with family socio-economic disadvantage. Among young women living with a parent, 61 per cent of young mothers and pregnant teenagers had no parent in work compared with 29 per cent of those in the non-vulnerable group. Correspondingly, just 13 per cent of young women in the vulnerable group had a parent in a non-manual occupation (either professional/managerial or routine non-manual) compared with 40 per cent of those in the non-vulnerable group.

This disadvantage is replicated in the statistics for parents' educational attainment. Among pregnant teenagers and young mothers, three-fifths had no parent with an educational qualification compared with only a third of those in the non-vulnerable group. Three times as many young women in the non-vulnerable group had a parent with a degree or other higher education than in the vulnerable group.

Table A2.5 Parental Characteristics (where young woman lives with a parent)

	Column per cent	
	Child or pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Parental SEG		
Professional/managerial	4	15
Routine non-manual	9	25
Skilled manual	8	16
Semi/unskilled manual	18	15
No working/retired parent	61	29
Unweighted N	124	6827
Parental highest qualifications		
Degree/other higher qualification	6	17
A level	6	13
Trade/other	2	7
GCSE grade A*-C or equivalent	17	23
Below GCSE grade C	10	8
None	59	32
Unweighted N	124	6841

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A3 SCHOOL EXPERIENCES AND TRANSITIONS

Previous research has revealed that the association between teenage parenthood and negative school experiences is complex (Social Exclusion Unit 1999). Young women who become pregnant while still in compulsory education may face a range of problems, including bullying, interrupted attendance and poor Year 11 attainment. Conversely, teenagers who have a history of truancy and exclusion, and who anticipate gaining few qualifications at the end of their school career, may feel that they have little to lose by entering parenthood early. Finally, a number of factors (such as parental socio-economic disadvantage) may be independently associated with both negative school experience and early motherhood. This section explores some of the experiences of young mothers during school Years 10 and 11.

A3.1 Special Needs and Disability

The parents of young people were asked whether their child had ever had any special needs. It may be expected that young women who were pregnant and/or gave birth in the course of their school career might be more likely to be viewed as having special needs; however, this does not appear to be the case, at least from their parents' perspectives (Table A3.1).

Among young women living with a parent, one in ten young mothers was identified as having had special needs in her school career (n=7) which is similar to the proportion of non-vulnerable teenagers. However, twice as many pregnant teenagers were said to have had special needs (n=15). Among young mothers identified as having special needs, six had problems with literacy or numeracy (two in combination with a medical condition or sensory impairment), while one was categorised as having 'other' problems only. None of the young mothers was identified as having emotional or behavioural problems. Among pregnant teenagers with special needs, 12 had literacy or numeracy problems (with one also having a sensory impairment), while two had emotional or behavioural problems (one in combination with a medical condition).

The young women themselves were asked whether they had any long-term health condition that limited their day to day life; they were also asked if they were registered disabled. As Table A3.1 shows, levels of disability were not significantly different between the three groups of young women.

Table A3.1 Special Needs and Disability

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Any special needs (parent co-resident)			
No special needs	90	80	89
Yes, stated	4	7	4
Yes, but not stated	5	13	6
Yes, but don't know if stated	1	0	2
Unweighted N	56	72	6947
Disability			
Registered disabled	0	0	1
Health limits daily life	7	8	7
Health does not limit daily life	93	92	92
Unweighted N	94	93	7218

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

The fact that young mothers were no more likely to have special needs than non-vulnerable young women is surprising on several counts. First, young mothers tended to come from less advantaged homes and, as the special needs part of this reports shows, socio-economically disadvantaged parents had an increased likelihood of saying that their child had special needs. In addition, young women who have a child during their compulsory school years may be expected to face substantial problems combining the roles of mother and student and may need help if they are to fulfil their academic potential (Hosie 2003).

A3.2 Problems at School and Attendance

Compared with non-vulnerable young women, those with a child were much more likely to have played truant regularly and to have been excluded from school either temporarily or permanently (Table A3.2). In these respects, teenagers who subsequently became pregnant reported almost identical behaviour to young mothers. Among these two vulnerable groups, 42 per cent played truant for days at a time compared with just 14 per cent of non-vulnerable young women. Similarly, about a quarter of the two vulnerable groups had been excluded from school at some time compared with around one in fifteen of those who were neither mothers nor pregnant. Eight per cent of young mothers, and five per cent of pregnant young women, had been excluded permanently compared with just one per cent of the non-vulnerable group. Poor school attendance among young women who were not pregnant at Year 11 but were soon to become pregnant, highlights a potential link between truancy and exclusion and early parenthood.

There is some indication that young mothers were more likely to have been bullied at school than those who were neither mothers nor pregnant (43 per cent compared with 34 per cent). In addition, young women with a child were much more likely to have been accused of bullying than the non-vulnerable group (41 per cent compared with 18 per cent). This suggests that having a child whilst still in compulsory education may have a negative impact on peer relationships and this may be manifested in bullying activity. Qualitative research in this field identifies that pregnant schoolgirls are often taunted by other children and accused of being promiscuous (Allen et al., 2003). For both bullying items, young women who were pregnant at the time of interview (i.e. several months after the end of compulsory schooling) had very similar responses to non-vulnerable teenagers.

Table A3.2 Problems at School

	Cell per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Played truant regularly	42	42	14
Excluded	26	24	6
Permanently excluded	8	5	1
Bullied	43	37	34
Accused of bullying	41	23	18
Minimum unweighted N	94	93	7210

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Table A3.3 identifies the last time the young women attended school in Year 11, either for lessons or to sit exams. Whereas only a tiny minority of young women in the non-vulnerable group failed to attend school at any time in Year 11 – just two per cent - among the two vulnerable groups, this proportion rose to over one in ten. Nine out of ten of the non-vulnerable group remained in school until June or July compared with approximately two-thirds of those in the vulnerable groups. This is consistent with the high levels of truancy and exclusion manifested by these two groups shown above (Table A3.2), and confirms evidence from small scale studies that many young mothers had ‘effectively disengaged themselves from school education or were erratic attenders prior to pregnancy’, (Hosie 2003). Poor school attendance among young women who subsequently became pregnant suggests that negative school experiences and low expectations may have informed the decisions they made about having a child. The Social Exclusion Unit’s report on teenage pregnancy (1999) identifies the educational aspirations of pregnant teenagers as a major influence on their decision to have an abortion or continue with the pregnancy.

Table A3.3 Last School Attendance

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
No attendance at Year 11	12	11	2
Before Easter	16	7	2
April/May	10	17	6
June/July	63	66	
Unweighted N	95	92	7219

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

The report now turns to experiences during Year 11 that might have been expected to assist young women, either in preventing early pregnancy or in offering them advice and support when the situation arose. Experiences of Personal Social Education (PSE), contact with the Careers Service, parental support and sources of advice are considered, followed by an analysis of young women's aspirations for their future when they were in Year 11.

A3.3 Careers Advice and Work Experience

In Year 11, 83 per cent of the non-vulnerable group had attended Personal and Social Education classes covering careers topics (Table A3.4); among young mothers this figure fell to just 57 per cent. Three-fifths (60 per cent) of the non-vulnerable group had attended a group session with the Careers Service compared with only a third of those who had a child⁵. Young women who had subsequently become pregnant were less likely to have attended PSE classes or group sessions than the non-vulnerable group, but more likely to have done so than young mothers. Given that the two vulnerable groups had almost identical school attendance records (in terms of regularly playing truant and leaving education before sitting exams), the higher rate of attendance at careers-related events among young women who later became pregnant may indicate either a greater interest in their post-Year 11 future or fewer restrictions in accessing these resources.

⁵ Since these data were collected the Careers Service has been absorbed into the Connexions Service which was phased in nationally from April 2001 to provide advice and information to 13 to 19 year olds.

With regards to having had an individual interview with the Careers Service in Year 11, differences between the experiences of the three groups of teenagers diminish slightly, although young mothers were still less likely to have had an individual careers interview than the non-vulnerable group. In addition, only around half of young mothers had undertaken work experience in Years 10 or 11 compared with three-quarters of pregnant teenagers and nine out of ten of the non-vulnerable group.

Following the end of compulsory education, very few young mothers had been interviewed by the Careers Service (14 per cent) or had spoken to them on the phone (seven per cent). Pregnant women were most likely to have had recent contact with the Careers Service; forty per cent had had an interview since finishing compulsory education and 28 per cent had spoken to them on the phone about what they were doing. These proportions are higher than among non-vulnerable young women, perhaps reflecting the fact fewer of the group of young women who were pregnant were in education or employment and, hence, were among those groups of young people specifically targeted by the Careers Service.

Table A3.4 Percentage who Received Careers Advice and Work Experience during Years 10 and 11 and Subsequently

	Cell per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
PSE class in Y11	57	71	83
Group session in Y11	34	48	60
Individual interview in Y11	67	79	85
Work experience in Y10 or Y11	54	78	90
Individual interview after Y11	14	40	23
Phone contact after Y11	7	28	17
Minimum unweighted N	93	93	7209

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A3.4 Parental Involvement at Year 11

The parental questionnaire asked parents about the role they had played in their daughters' education and Year 11 decisions; consequently, it is only available where the young woman was still living in the family home. The parents of young women who had embarked upon motherhood before finishing school may have felt that advice about careers or continuing in education was irrelevant at this stage in their daughter's life. In addition, socio-economically disadvantaged parents may have felt ill-equipped to contribute to their daughter's school life and post-Year 11 decisions.

Our analysis supports these hypotheses. The parents of young mothers were least likely to have attended a parents evening in the course of Year 11 and the parents of young women who subsequently became pregnant were least likely to have read Careers Service literature (Table A3.5). In the two vulnerable groups, around three-quarters of parents agreed with the statement that they did not 'know enough about modern qualifications to give their child proper advice about what to do'; this contrasts with only around half of parents among the non-vulnerable group.

The parents of pregnant teenagers were most likely to say that they had been involved 'only a little' or 'not at all' in the decision made by their daughters about what to do after Year 11. This may reflect the fact that, in these cases, the decision-making process included the decision to have a baby.

Table A3.5 Parental Involvement at Year 11 (where young woman lives with a parent)

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Attended parents evening			
Yes	48	61	81
No	53	39	19
Read Careers Service literature			
Yes	59	54	68
No	41	46	32
Don't know enough to help child			
Agree	75	72	53
Neither agree nor disagree	8	6	12
Disagree	18	22	34
Involvement in decision-making			
A great deal	31	33	42
A fair amount	45	36	39
Only a little/not at all	24	32	19
Minimum unweighted N	58	75	7080

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A3.5 Year 11 Achievement

It is clear that teenage mothers and pregnant teenagers were likely to have socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds (Section A2). In both of these groups, the majority came from households where no parent was in work and where no parent had an educational qualification. Compared with non-vulnerable teenagers, these young women were much more likely to have missed schooling through regular truancy and/or exclusion and many did not remain in school long enough to sit exams in the summer (Section A3.2). These factors are reflected in young mothers' generally low educational achievements at the end of Year 11.

Among non-vulnerable young women, 39 per cent attained five or more GCSEs (or their GNVQ equivalent) at grades A*-C (Table A3.6). This is less than the national average, reflecting that young people from higher income households (above £30,000 a year) were excluded from this analysis and that the areas selected for the EMA evaluation tended to be deprived. Nevertheless, this level of achievement among non-vulnerable young women was achieved by just one in ten young mothers and even fewer pregnant teenagers (four per cent). Further, while eight per cent of non-vulnerable teenagers had gained no qualifications, this rose to 33 per cent of pregnant teenagers and 40 per cent of mothers.

Table A3.6 Year 11 Achievement

Year 11 GCSEs passed	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
None/missing	40	33	8
D-G only	29	41	19
1-4 A*-C	21	22	34
5+ A*-C	10	4	39
Unweighted N	95	93	7226

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

An alternative way of viewing this association between early motherhood and Year 11 achievement is to consider how many young women who were not mothers in the course of Year 11 became pregnant in the next few months (analysis not shown). Excluding young mothers, six per cent of EMA eligible young women who had not attained any Year 11 qualifications were known to be pregnant at the time of interview (it will be recalled that young women were only asked if they were pregnant where the pregnancy was visible). This contrasts with three per cent who gained one or more GCSE at grades D to G, one per cent of those who gained between one and four GCSEs at grade C or above, and 0.1 per cent of those who attained five or more.

A3.6 Sources of Advice

In general young mothers and those who were pregnant were less likely to say that they had received advice about what they might do after Year 11 from each of a range of sources than non-vulnerable young women. Among non-vulnerable young women, four-fifths said that they had been given advice about what they might do after Year 11 by their school and a similar proportion by their parents (Table A3.7). Among pregnant teenagers, around two-thirds had been advised by their school and the same proportion had received advice from their parents. Young mothers were the least likely to report having received advice from their school (just 56 per cent) but were only slightly less likely than non-vulnerable young women to have been advised by their parents (77 per cent). The Careers Service (or a training provider) had been a source of advice for just under half of the non-vulnerable group and half of pregnant teenagers, but fewer than a third of young mothers. The two vulnerable groups were less likely to have sought advice from their friends than their non-vulnerable counterparts and were more likely to say that they did not receive advice from anyone.

Table A3.7 Sources of Advice about Post-Year 11 Destinations

	Cell per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
School	56	69	81
Parents	77	68	80
Careers Service/training provider	30	50	46
Friends	32	32	43
Siblings	16	17	22
Other	7	4	5
None	8	6	3
Unweighted N	95	93	7226

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Where young women named one or more source of advice, they were asked which source had been most helpful (Table A3.8). Compared with non-vulnerable young women, those with a child were more likely to say that the best advice had come from their parents (46 per cent

compared with 33 per cent) and less likely to say that it came from their schools or the Careers Service (44 per cent compared with 56 per cent). This is despite the fact that the parents' of these young women were most likely to have said that they felt ill-equipped to assist their daughters in making such decisions (Table A3.5).

Table A3.8 Best source of Advice at Year 11

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
School/Careers Service	44	50	56
Parents	46	39	33
Other	10	11	11
Unweighted N	85	88	7047

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A3.7 Hopes for the Future During Year 11

During Year 11 around two-thirds of the two groups of vulnerable young women (65 per cent) had hoped to remain in education after Year 11 compared with 82 per cent of non-vulnerable teenagers (Table A3.9). Pregnant teenagers were mostly likely to have wanted to work (30 per cent) while non-vulnerable teenagers were least likely to have hoped to work (15 per cent). Fifteen per cent of young mothers had seen their future as being something other than education or work compared with six per cent of pregnant teenagers and just three per cent of those in the non-vulnerable group.

Although the parents of vulnerable young women had tended to be less involved in their daughter's school career than those in the non-vulnerable group, the large majority of parents in each of the three groups revealed a preference for their daughter remaining in education. The gap between the preferences of the young women and those of their parents was greatest where the daughter was pregnant (24 percentage points) or had a child (21 percentage points). In the non-vulnerable group the difference was just 12 percentage points.

Table A3.9 Young Women's and Parents' Preferences for the Future

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Young women's preference			
Continue in education	65	65	82
Work/work-based training	20	30	15
Other	15	6	3
Unweighted N	94	93	7224
Parents' preference			
Continue in education	86	89	94
Work/work-based training	14	11	6
Other	0	0	0
Unweighted N	51	71	6333

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A3.8 Year 11 Decision-making

Young people who did not remain in education after Year 11 were asked to elaborate upon their decision by choosing reasons from a list (Table A3.10). Overall, the responses of young mothers and, to a lesser extent, pregnant teenagers seem to suggest that they felt their choices to be severely constrained. Almost all young mothers cited family responsibilities as a reason for not remaining in education (by far the highest percentage for any item by each of the three groups), along with two-fifths of pregnant teenagers and just four per cent of those who had not embarked upon parenthood.

Despite their very limited Year 11 achievement, young mothers were less likely to cite poor exam results as a reason for not remaining in education than non-vulnerable young women. In addition, although many had reported negative school experiences, young mothers were unlikely to refer to a dislike of their old school as a reason for not continuing in education. For these two items the responses of pregnant teenagers were similar to the non-vulnerable group. Young mothers and pregnant teenagers were less likely to say they couldn't find a suitable course than non-vulnerable young women. Compared with non-vulnerable young

women, those who had a child were less likely to talk of the need to earn money. This perhaps reflects a perception that their earning potential would be severely restricted by their child-care responsibilities. They were also less likely to say that they left education because they had already found a job.

Table A3.10 Reasons for not Remaining in Education

	Cell per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Educational obstacles			
Bad exam results	16	32	34
Disliked old school	25	38	35
Couldn't get a place	9	10	9
Problems travelling	3	5	9
Couldn't find a course	12	16	31
Financial constraints			
Needed to earn money	18	29	45
Couldn't find a part-time job	5	17	21
Couldn't afford to stay in education	15	14	20
Wanted/had found a job			
Wanted to look for a job	24	50	75
Had already found a job	5	32	52
Influence of other people			
Friends weren't continuing	7	13	15
Parents wanted me to leave	2	1	4
Parents couldn't afford it	3	5	7
Family responsibilities	94	41	4
Unweighted N	82	77	1704

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16 not in full-time education.

Young women with a child were most likely to say that they had found the decision about what to do after year 11 easy, while those who were neither mothers nor pregnant were most likely to say they had found the decision difficult (Table A3.11). Again, this possibly reflects the fact that decisions may be easier to make where choice is perceived to be constrained.

Table A3.11 Ease of Decision

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Very/fairly easy	68	58	58
Neither easy nor difficult	11	19	12
Very/fairly difficult	21	23	30
Unweighted N	93	93	7222

Base: All eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

This section has highlighted the very different experiences of young women who entered parenthood at a very early age compared with their peers. We now turn to an examination of how these experiences may have impacted on young women's actual destinations after Year 11 and on their hopes for the future.

A4 DESTINATIONS AND HOPES FOR THE FUTURE

A4.1 Economic Activity after Year 11

Table A4.1 describes the main economic activity of young women several months after the end of compulsory education. Three-quarters of non-vulnerable teenagers were in full-time education and a further 15 per cent were in work or work-based training; just one in ten was not in education, employment or training (NEET). By contrast around two-thirds of pregnant teenagers were in the NEET category while 17 per cent were in full-time education and 14 per cent were in work. Finally, 82 per cent of young mothers were in the NEET category, 14 per cent were in full-time education and four per cent were in work.

Table A4.1 Main Economic Activity

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Full-time education	14	17	75
Work/work-based training	4	14	15
NEET	82	69	10
Unweighted N	95	93	7227

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

None of the young women reported their main economic activity to be part-time study. However, three young mothers were undertaking part-time education; all identified themselves as mainly ‘looking after the family’. Five pregnant teenagers were engaged in part-time education, of whom two were employed, two were unemployed and one was ‘taking a break’. Among non-vulnerable young women who were not full-time students, 15 per cent were undertaking part-time studying; of these, 93 per cent were in full-time work or work-based training.

A4.2 Achieving Year 11 Aims⁶

Whatever their Year 11 aspirations had been, a large majority of the two vulnerable groups had not achieved these in the months following the end of compulsory education (with the exception of those who had no destination in mind, see further below). Among young mothers who had wanted to remain in education, more than three-quarters were actually in the NEET group and under a quarter were students (Table A4.2). Among pregnant young women who had hoped to be students, over two-thirds were in the NEET group and under a quarter were in education. This contrasts with the situation of non-vulnerable young women who had intended to remain in education, of whom 87 per cent had attained this goal.

Four-fifths of young mothers who had hoped to work were actually in the NEET group, along with two-thirds of their counterparts who were pregnant and just over a quarter of those who were neither mothers nor pregnant. While half of the non-vulnerable group were working as planned, fewer than a quarter of young mothers and pregnant young women had attained their goal. Among young women who had intended to be in neither education nor employment, all of those with a child were indeed in this category, along with three-fifths of pregnant teenagers and a quarter of the non-vulnerable group.

⁶ In the following analysis, young women who were not in work (or work-based training) but were involved in part-time study were categorised as being in education. This recoding removes three young mothers and three pregnant teenagers from the NEET group, along with three per cent of the non-vulnerable group.

Table A4.2 Current Economic Activity by Year 11 Aspirations

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Wanted to continue in education			
Education	21	22	87
Work or work-based training	0	8	7
NEET	79	70	6
Unweighted N	64	55	5968
Wanted to work			
Education	0	10	20
Work or work-based training	20	23	53
NEET	80	68	28
Unweighted N	16	31	1035
Wanted other outcome			
Education	0	0	47
Work or work-based training	0	40	28
NEET	100	60	25
Unweighted N	14	7	221

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Among young women who were neither mothers nor pregnant, nine out of ten felt that their decision about what to do after Year 11 had been right (Table A4.3). This proportion was lower among women who had a child (four-fifths) and among those who were pregnant (three-quarters). Similarly, only two-thirds of the parents of vulnerable young women felt that their child had made the right decision compared with 88 per cent of parents of the non-vulnerable group. Only 12 women with a child had remained in education; all these women, and their parents, felt this had been the right decision (analysis not shown).

Table A4.3 Young Women's and Parents' View on whether Decision was Right

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Young woman			
Probably/definitely right	81	75	90
Probably/definitely wrong	19	25	10
Unweighted N	89	93	7155
Parent			
Probably/definitely right	65	67	88
Probably/definitely wrong	35	33	12
Unweighted N	52	73	7057

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A4.3 Factors Limiting and Facilitating Remaining in Education Post Year 11

Table A4.4 considers some personal circumstances which might be expected to impact upon young women's opportunity to engage in education, namely their health, any 'adult-care' responsibilities and the time they spent on household chores such as cooking, cleaning and washing up. Again, for young mothers in particular, their personal circumstances were far worse than non-vulnerable young women on each measure.

Compared with non-vulnerable teenagers, vulnerable young women were less likely to say their health was very good and more likely to say it was fairly good. Between two and six per cent of the three groups reported having bad or very bad health.

It has already been established that vulnerable young women tended to come from socio-economically disadvantaged families (Section A1); consequently, they may be expected to have a greater risk of having a disabled family member. However given the child-care responsibilities of young mothers, it is perhaps surprising to find that these teenagers were the group most likely also to be providing personal care for a disabled relative. Fourteen per cent (N=11) of teenage mothers provided this form of care, compared with just five per cent of

pregnant teenagers (N=4) and seven per cent of non-vulnerable young women. Furthermore, six young mothers spent more than 20 hours a week in this role.

Less surprisingly, young women with a child tended to do considerably more housework than those who had no child in the home. Well over a quarter of young mothers spent at least 20 hours a week performing household chores, compared with just four per cent of pregnant teenagers and three per cent of those who neither had a child nor were pregnant.

Table A4.4 Barriers to Continuing in full-time Education

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Health			
Very good	34	37	46
Fairly good	51	51	44
Fair	13	7	8
Bad/very bad	2	6	2
Care provided for relative or friend			
None	86	95	93
1-20 hours per week	6	5	6
21+ hours per week	8	0	2
Domestic work			
None	3	16	18
1-19 hours per week	68	80	80
20+ hours per week	29	4	3
Minimum unweighted N	94	93	7218

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A4.4 Support Networks and Participation in Education

There is some evidence that living in the family home makes it easier for young mothers to remain in education; of the twelve full-time student mothers, 11 lived with their parents.

Student mothers were asked who provided care for their child when they were at school or college and, of the 11 who responded, nine named a family member as their main source of

help, one used a nursery and one mainly studied from home (analysis not shown). Only two named a partner or ex-partner as an additional source of child-care for the time they spent at school or college.

However, young mothers who lived with a parent were also more likely to provide care for an elderly or disabled adult than those who lived away from their family (17 per cent and four per cent respectively; analysis not shown). Evidence that some teenage mothers undertake a dual caring role indicates that the provision of support within the families of vulnerable teenagers cannot be assumed to flow uni-directionally from parent to child.

The domestic load of young mothers also varied by whether or not they lived with their parents (analysis not shown). Among those who lived away from their family home (N=39), half (50 per cent) spent at least 20 hours a week undertaking domestic chores; among those who lived with a parent (N=56) the proportion fell to fewer than a quarter (22 per cent).

A4.5 The Influence of EMA Availability

The availability of EMA in the pilot areas could have offered a crucial source of income for teenage students who had a child or were pregnant. Table A4.5 shows the proportions of young women who had remained in full-time education after Year 11, broken down by whether they were in the pilot or control areas⁷. Although numbers are small, a fifth of young mothers and pregnant teenagers living in the pilot areas had remained in full-time education compared with only just over a tenth of those living in the control areas. Among non-vulnerable young women, about three-quarters of those in both the pilot and control areas were studying full-time.

⁷ This sub-division of the sample results in small cell sizes for young mothers and pregnant teenagers so results for the two groups have been combined.

Table A4.5 Full-time Education, by Pilot and Control Area

	Column per cent	
	Pilot	Control
Has child or is pregnant		
Full-time education	20	11
Other	80	89
Unweighted N	117	71
No child/not pregnant		
Full-time education	76	75
Other	24	25
Unweighted N	4535	2692

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Among full-time students living in the pilot areas, all vulnerable young women, and almost all non-vulnerable young women had heard of EMA (Table A4.6). However, among those not in full-time education only a minority of mothers and pregnant teenagers (43 per cent) had heard of EMA compared with a majority of those in the non-vulnerable group (59 per cent).

Table A4.6 Heard of EMA, by whether in Full-time Education – Pilot Areas Only

	Column per cent	
	Child or pregnant	No child, not pregnant
In full-time education		
Heard of EMA	100	97
Not heard of EMA	0	3
Unweighted N	20	3496
Not in full-time education		
Heard of EMA	43	59
Not heard of EMA	57	41
Unweighted N	97	1039

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 in pilot areas in the study at age 16.

There is obviously scope for improvement in awareness of the availability of EMA among young mothers and pregnant teenagers, and there is some indication that its availability may have encouraged/enabled some young mothers to remain in education. In fact, 17 out of the 18 vulnerable young women who were in education in the pilot areas had applied for EMA; none had been rejected although some were still awaiting a decision.

Altogether about half of all young women not in education said that they would have considered remaining in education if they were paid a weekly amount, and responses did not differ significantly by whether or not they had a child or were pregnant (Table A4.7).

Table A4.7 If Non-students would Consider Education if Paid a Weekly Amount

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
For £40 a week or less	35	25	35
For more than £40 a week	13	23	20
Would not consider it	52	52	46
Minimum unweighted N	65	53	1298

Base: All EMA income eligible young women not in full-time education from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A4.6 Attitudes to Education and Employment

Earlier sections of this report have shown that young women who were mothers or pregnant had very different school experiences, and current activities, to those who were neither mothers nor pregnant. Only a minority of vulnerable young women had attained a Level 2 qualification, a substantial minority had regularly played truant and/or been excluded from school (Section A3) and most were currently neither in education nor employment (Section A4). Yet the attitudes of the three groups of young women on a range of educational and employment issues were remarkably, and encouragingly, similar (Table A4.8).

At least three-quarters of each group felt that young people needed qualifications for any job that was worth having and at least two-thirds of each group viewed qualifications as a route to higher earnings. Half of young mothers, and a similar proportion of the non-vulnerable group, felt that leaving school at 16 limited a young person's career (although pregnant teenagers were slightly less likely to hold this view). However, despite holding broadly similar views on the value of education, young mothers and pregnant teenagers were more likely to say that earning was more important than education (although only between a quarter and a third held this view). They were also somewhat more likely to say that work-based training qualifications were as good as those gained through attending college.

Table A4.8 Percentage Agreeing with Educational Statements

	Cell per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Need quals for any job worth having	76	78	80
Quals lead to higher earnings	69	73	68
Leaving at 16 limits career	52	41	54
Earning more important than education	28	34	13
Training quals as good as college	62	60	54
Minimum unweighted N	92	93	7087

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A4.7 Future Plans

Qualitative research of the EMA Vulnerable Pilots found that many young mothers hoped to spend the first year or two after compulsory education caring for their child full-time, after which they saw themselves as returning to education (Allen et al., 2003). This reflects a desire among young mothers to gain qualifications and a good job so that they will be able to provide for their child in the future.

Young people in the EMA surveys were asked what they would like to be doing in a year's time. Confirming the findings of the qualitative research, compared with non-vulnerable young women, those who had a child or were pregnant were less likely to want to be in

education in one year's time (Table A4.9). A third of mothers and pregnant young women expressed a preference for working compared with a quarter of their non-vulnerable counterparts. A quarter of pregnant teenagers said that they did not see themselves as being in education or work.

Table A4.9 Preferred Activity One Year Later

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Education	50	42	72
Work	35	33	26
Other	15	25	3
Unweighted N	92	90	7162

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Among young mothers who expressed a preference for education, more than nine out of ten felt it was fairly or very likely that they would achieve this aim (Table A4.10). This figure is higher than among pregnant teenagers (where only three-quarters thought this outcome likely) but lower than that of the non-vulnerable group (97 per cent).

Four-fifths of young mothers who wanted to work were optimistic that this would happen, compared with only a minority of pregnant teenagers (44 per cent) and nine out of ten in the non-vulnerable group. Where young women expressed a preference for neither education nor employment, four-fifths of each of the vulnerable groups saw this as likely to come to pass compared with two-fifths of young women who neither had a child nor were pregnant.

Table A4.10 Likelihood of Achieving Preference by Preferred Activity

	Column per cent		
	Child in home	No child, pregnant	No child, not pregnant
Prefer education			
Very/fairly likely	92	76	97
Very/fairly unlikely	8	24	3
Unweighted N	43	33	5150
Prefer work			
Very/fairly likely	79	44	91
Very/fairly unlikely	21	56	9
Unweighted N	34	30	1771
Other			
Very/fairly likely	80	81	42
Very/fairly unlikely	20	19	58
Unweighted N	15	26	206

Base: All EMA income eligible young women from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A5 THE POST-16 TRANSITIONS OF 16 YEAR OLD MOTHERS

At the age of 16, at the time of the first interview, 95 young women were living with a child of their own. An additional 93 had no child in the home but reported being pregnant. By the third interview, when these young women were 18 or 19 years old, a large majority of these vulnerable young women had either declined to be interviewed or were untraceable. Among those who had a child when they were first interviewed, only 27 (28 per cent) completed an interview two years later. Among those who were pregnant, 24 (26 per cent) remained in the survey after two years.

There is a strong association between young mothers' economic activity at age 16 and the likelihood that they remained in the survey at the age of 18. Of the 12 who were in full-time education at the time of the first interview, nine were re-interviewed two years later (75 per cent). Two of the four mothers in work or work-based training took part in the third interview. By contrast, just 20 per cent of those who were not in education, work or training remained in the survey at the third interview. This indicates that those young mothers who were in the most disadvantaged situation at the time of the first interview were most likely to disappear from view in subsequent years. This pattern was not evident among pregnant teenagers. Only a third (33 per cent) of pregnant students were retained in the study at age 18, along with a quarter (25 per cent) of those in employment and a similar proportion (24 per cent) of those who were NEET.

In the light of this substantial attrition, the subsequent experiences of the remaining young women cannot be viewed as representative of all teenagers who had given birth before, or soon after, reaching school leaving age. Therefore, the post-16 transitions of young mothers and pregnant 16 year olds are considered on a case by case basis. The rest of this section considers those who already had a child when they were first interviewed at age 16 (and who remained in the survey at the third wave). Section A6 explores the circumstances of those who did not have a child at this point, but who reported being pregnant. The tables in these sections reflect their circumstances at the first, second and third interviews. The first interviews took place between the October and April following the end of compulsory schooling (Year 11) when the young women were all aged either 16 or 17. The second interview was conducted a year later when they were aged 17 or 18 and the third took place a year after this, when they were 18 or 19. In the tables this has been simplified so that all

vulnerable young women are considered to be 16 at the first interview, 17 at the second and 18 at the third.

A5.1 Economic Activity at Ages 16, 17 and 18

Table A5.1 presents the young mothers' educational attainment at the end of Year 11, and their economic activity at the ages of 16, 17 and 18. Generally, economic activity refers to their reported main activity at the point of interview. However, where the teenagers give their main activity as neither education nor work (i.e. NEET), but say they are undertaking part-time study, they are categorised as being in part-time education rather than NEET.

The bold font on six of the cases indicates that, by that particular interview, the young woman had given birth to an additional child. In the second and third interviews, respondents were not asked if they were pregnant. However, at the age of 18, two young mothers (cases 5 and 14) reported their current economic activity to be 'waiting to have a baby'.

- At the age of 16, nine young women were in full-time education and another was studying part-time. Two were working - one part-time and one full-time. The remaining 15 were not in education, employment or training (i.e. they were NEET).
- A year later, at the age of 17, 11 mothers were in full-time education while another was studying part-time. Two teenagers gave their main occupation as working (one part-time and one full-time) while the rest (N=13) were NEET.
- At the age of 18, four young women were in full-time education while six studied part-time. Another three teenagers were working full-time while one had a part-time job. Thirteen young women were NEET two years after leaving compulsory education.

It was unusual for young mothers to combine education and employment (analysis not shown).

- In Year 12 (at the age of 16), only one full-time student (case 6) reported having a part-time job.
- A year later, again, only one mother was in this situation (case 7).
- At 18, two teenagers combined full-time education with part-time work (cases 2 and 8) while one (case 18) combined full-time work with part-time study.

Of the nine young women who were in full-time education at the age of 16;

- four were students at both of the following two interviews (with one in part-time education at the age of 18).
- Three were in full-time education at the age of 17 but had left by the age of 18 (with two entering full-time work or work-based training and one being NEET).
- Two teenagers moved from full-time education at 16 years of age to being NEET the following year. Both subsequently rejoined education with one (case 9) studying part-time.
- One young mother (case 10) studied part-time at the age of 16, full-time at 17, and part-time at 18.

Only two of the young mothers had been in work or work-based training at the age of 16. One of these remained in this state for the following two years while the other was NEET at both subsequent years.

Of the 15 teenagers who were not in education, work or training in the months following the end of compulsory schooling;

- nine remained NEET at the ages of 17 and 18.
- One teenager who had been NEET at the age of 16 entered full-time work or work-based training after one year and remained in this state at age 18 (case 17).
- Another was NEET for two years before entering full-time work or work-based training (case 18).
- The final four young women who had been NEET at the age of 16 had some experience of education in the following two years. One (case 13) was a full-time student at the age of 17 and a part-time student at the age of 18. Another (case 16) was in part time education at the ages of 17 and 18. The final two (cases 14 and 15) were full-time students at the age of 17 but had returned to being NEET the following year.

At each wave of the survey, between ten and 12 young mothers engaged in education. In all, 14 teenagers were involved in further education at some point. Over time, the conditions under which they studied became more complex. In the months following the end of compulsory schooling, only one young woman combined studying with employment (case 6)

and only one student studied part-time (case 10). In the following year, again, only one full-time student worked (case 7) and only one young mother studied part-time (case 16). By the age of 18, two full-time students also held down a job (cases 2 and 8), while six mothers studied part-time (including one – case 18 – who combined this with full-time work). By this age, only two teenagers were studying full-time without holding down a job.

Across the first two interviews, only three teenagers reported their main activity to be employment; by the third interview this had risen to seven. At the age of 16, more than half the mothers were NEET (N=15). A year later this had fallen to 13, but a year after this the figure remained the same. In all, 19 of the 27 mothers had some experience of being in neither education nor work or training; this includes nine who were NEET at each of the three waves.

The data suggest a possible link between the level of qualifications attained at the end of Year 11 and the destinations of young mothers over the next three years. Of the six Year 11 high achievers (who had attained five or more GCSEs at grades A*-C) four were in education at the age of 16, 17 and 18 (cases 1 to 4). However, one Year 11 high achiever (case 19) was NEET for the next two years while another (case 18) was NEET at the age of 16 and 17 (before moving into full-time work and education). Of the ten mothers with no Year 11 qualifications, seven were NEET for the next two years. However, three mothers with no Year 11 qualifications (cases 9, 13 and 14) had subsequent experience of education. Three out of six Year 11 moderate achievers (with between one and four GCSEs at grades A*-C), spent some time in education as did three of the five low achievers (with one or more GCSE at grades D-G).

Table A5.1 16 Year Old Mothers: Economic Activity at Ages 16, 17 and 18

Case	Year 11 qualifications	Economic activity		
		Age 16	Age 17	Age 18
1	5+ A*-C	FT education	FT education	FT education
2	5+ A*-C	FT education	FT education	FT education
3	5+ A*-C	FT education	FT education	FT education
4	5+ A*-C	FT education	FT education	PT education
5	1-4 A*-C	FT education	FT education	FT work
6	1+ D-G	FT education	FT education	FT work
7	1+ D-G	FT education	FT education	NEET
8	1+ D-G	FT education	NEET	FT education
9	None	FT education	NEET	PT education
10	1+ D-G	PT education	FT education	PT education
11	1+ D-G	PT work	PT work	PT work
12	1-4 A*-C	FT work	NEET	NEET
13	None	NEET	FT education	PT education
14	None	NEET	FT education	NEET
15	1-4 A*-C	NEET	FT education	NEET
16	1-4 A*-C	NEET	PT education	PT education
17	1-4 A*-C	NEET	FT work	FT Work
18	5+ A*-C	NEET	NEET	FT work
19	5+ A*-C	NEET	NEET	NEET
20	None	NEET	NEET	NEET
21	1-4 A*-C	NEET	NEET	NEET
22	None	NEET	NEET	NEET
23	None	NEET	NEET	NEET
24	None	NEET	NEET	NEET
25	None	NEET	NEET	NEET
26	None	NEET	NEET	NEET
27	None	NEET	NEET	NEET

A5.2 Household Composition at Ages 16, 17 and 18

Table A5.2 shows the young women's living arrangements across the same two years of their lives. It identifies those who lived with a parent; those who were cohabiting with a partner; and those who lived with neither a parent nor a partner. In each household situation it is possible that other family or non-family members were present. As in Table A5.1, bold print indicates that the young woman reported having had an additional child by that interview.

At the age of 16, 18 of the 27 young mothers lived with a parent (including two who additionally shared their home with their partner). Four lived away from their family but with a partner, while the remaining five lived with neither a parent nor a partner. A year later, 14 lived with a parent (including one who also lived with a partner); six cohabited with a partner but no parent while seven lived with neither a parent nor a partner. At the age of 18, nine lived with a parent, three with a partner and 15 with neither. Of the six young women who had additional children, two were living with a partner at the time while four were living with neither a partner nor a parent.

Between the ages of 16 and 18, living with a parent changed from being the majority status (18 out of 27) to be a minority one (nine out of 27). Only one young woman made the transition from living independently to living with a parent (case 27 at age 18). Case 19 is remarkable because, at the time of the third interview, the young woman reported having given birth to a new baby but also said that she was no longer living with her first-born child. She is the only mother to report this form of household change.

Five young women reported living with a partner at more than one wave; in each case this was the same partner at each time point. Fewer teenage mothers were cohabiting at the age of 18 than in the previous two years. Of the seven young women who had been living with a partner at the age of 17, five were no longer cohabiting a year later. Of the six young mothers who had had another child, only one was living with a partner at the age of 18.

Table A5.2 16 Year Old Mothers: Household Composition at Ages 16, 17 and 18

Case	Age 16	Age 17	Age 18
1	Parent	Parent	Parent
2	Parent	Parent	Parent
3	Parent	Parent	Parent
4	Parent+partner	Parent+partner	Parent
5	Parent	Parent	Parent
6	Parent	Parent	Neither
7	Parent	Parent	Parent
8	Neither	Neither	Neither
9	Parent	Partner	Neither
10	Parent	Parent	Partner
11	Partner	Partner	Partner
12	Parent	Parent	Parent
13	Parent	Parent	Neither
14	Partner	Partner	Neither
15	Partner	Partner	Neither
16	Parent+partner	Parent	Parent
17	Neither	Neither	Neither
18	Neither	Neither	Neither
19	Parent	Parent	Neither
20	Parent	Neither	Neither
21	Neither	Neither	Neither
22	Partner	Partner	Partner
23	Parent	Parent	Neither
24	Parent	Neither	Neither
25	Parent	Parent	Neither
26	Neither	Neither	Neither
27	Parent	Partner	Parent

A5.3 Household Composition and Economic Activity

Information from Table A5.1 and Table A5.2 is incorporated into Table A5.3 to reveal a clear association between being in full-time education and living with a parent or guardian. In the months following the end of compulsory schooling (at the age of 16), eight out of nine full-time students lived with a parent. By contrast, only about half of the NEET teenagers (eight out of 15) lived with a parent. A year later – at the age of 17 – nine of the 11 full-time students lived with a parent compared with just four of the 13 teenagers who were NEET. At the age of 18, three of the four full-time students lived at home compared with three of the 13 young mothers who were NEET. At this point in time, four of the six part-time students lived away from their parents, perhaps indicating that part-time study is attractive to young mothers who have limited support from their family.

Table A5.3 16 Year Old Mothers: Economic Activity and Household Composition at Ages 16, 17 and 18

	Parent	No parent
Age 16		
FT ed	8	1
PT ed	1	0
Work	1	1
NEET	8	7
Age 17		
FT ed	9	2
PT ed	1	0
Work	0	2
NEET	4	9
Age 18		
FT ed	3	1
PT ed	2	3
Work	1	4
NEET	3	10

A5.4 Post-Year 11 Education

This section presents additional information about the 16 year old mothers who spent time in education following the end of compulsory schooling. Among those in full-time education at Year 12, two attended a school, four were at a sixth form college and three were at a college of further education. The one teenager in part-time education was at a college of further education.

Seven teenagers remained in full-time education in the following year and all stayed at their Year 12 institution. Of the two who left, one (case 9) had been at a sixth form college while the other (case 8) had been at an FE college. An additional five young women had begun to study by the age of 17, all at a college of further education. At the age of 18, two young women (cases 1 and 3) reported that they had a university place for that academic year. Another (case 2) remained in school at the age of 18. She had applied to go to university the following year but had not yet received an offer. The remaining seven young women who were in education at the age of 18 attended an FE college.

Mothers who gave their main activity as education were asked who cared for their child while they were at school or college. At Year 12 (age 16) - of the eight who responded - all identified a family member (usually a parent) as the primary source of child-care. At Year 13 (age 17) five students reported that their primary source of child-care was their own parent or grandparent; five relied on a nursery; one relied on their child's father and one used a childminder. At the age of 18, three mothers relied on their own parents and three used a nursery.

Where young people left education across waves, they were asked why (analysis not shown). Between the ages of 16 and 17, this applied to just two young mothers (cases 8 and 9) both of whom had become NEET. One did not give a response, but the other (case 9) offered the explanation that she had become pregnant. Between the ages of 17 and 18, two teenage mothers moved from full-time education into work. One (case 6) left because her course had finished. The other (case 5) said she had left education because she was pregnant. Three changed from full-time education to part-time education. Of these, one (case 4) reported that she needed to be able to combine studying with working part-time; one (case 14) had not enjoyed her previous course and one (case 10) was pregnant. Finally, three teenagers

switched from full-time education at 17 to being NEET at 18. Of these, two (cases 7 and 15) said that their course had finished while one (case 14) gave the explanation of pregnancy.

A5.5 Employment

The next section explores the working lives of young women who were mothers at the age of 16 and who gave their main occupation as employment at any interview. From the ages of 16 to 18, this applies to just six teenagers. As Table A2.4 indicates, none of these young women had the same job at successive waves.

Table A5.4 16 Year Old Mothers: Work Experience at Ages 16, 17 and 18

Case	Job title		
	Age 16	Age 17	Age 18
5			Accounts assistant
6			Hairdresser
11	Sales assistant		
12	Waitress		
17		Warehouse operative	Cleaner
18			Checkout operator

Three of the above positions were originally offered to the young women on a permanent basis (those of hairdresser, waitress and cleaner). The others were either temporary or casual (this information was missing for the accounts assistant position). The waitress position was the only one offering recognised training (a modern apprenticeship).

A5.6 Economic Activity at Age 16 and Preferences for the Future

At the age of 16, young people were asked what they hoped to be doing one year's and two years' time. Most 16 year old mothers hoped to be in education in the following year (16 full-time and two part-time). Six wanted to be in work or work-based training (three full-time and three part-time). Three teenagers intended to be looking after their home and family. Respondents were also asked how likely they felt it was that they would attain their

goal. Three mothers (cases 7, 14 and 19) acknowledged it was fairly unlikely; each of these three hoped to be in full-time education. The remaining 24 young women thought it very or fairly likely that they would attain their goal.

When asked about two years into the future, the most popular choice was work or work-based training (N=13). Of these, eight hoped to be working full-time and five part-time. Eleven young mothers wanted to be in education (10 full-time and one part-time) while three intended to be engaged in family care. Two young women thought they were fairly unlikely to attain their goal. Of these, one hoped to be in full-time work (case 10); the other in part-time education (case 21). The rest of the young women thought they were fairly or very likely to be successful.

There is a strong association between the young women's economic activity at the age of 16, and their stated preferences for the future. Of the ten who were in education, nine hoped to remain in that state in the following year (the tenth hoped to be in full-time work). The two who were in work or work-based training both hoped to be in the same situation in a year's time. None of the teenagers who were in education, work or work-based training saw themselves being NEET in the following year. Of the fifteen who were NEET, nine wanted to return to education by the age of 17 (including one who wanted to return part-time); three wanted to be in work or work-based training (one full-time and two part-time) and three wanted to remain NEET.

Looking ahead two years, only three who were currently in education hoped to carry on studying (all full-time), while seven saw themselves in work or work-based training (five full-time). The two in work or work-based training hoped to remain in that situation. None of these young women saw themselves as being NEET in two years time. Of the fifteen teenagers who were NEET at the age of 16, eight wanted to be in education in two years time (seven full-time) while four hoped to be in work or work-based training (two full-time). Three intended to be looking after their family at this point in time. These were the same three young women who expected to be in this situation in a year's time.

Table A5.5 16 Year Old Mothers: Economic Activity at Age 16 and Preferences for the Future

Case	Activity at age 16	Preference one year on	Preference two years on
1	FT education	FT education	FT education
2	FT education	FT education	FT work
3	FT education	FT education	FT work
4	FT education	FT education	FT education
5	FT education	FT education	FT education
6	FT education	FT education	FT work
7	FT education	FT education	PT work
8	FT education	FT education	FT work
9	FT education	FT work	PT work
10	PT education	PT education	FT work
11	PT Work	PT work	PT work
12	FT Work	FT work	FT work
13	NEET	FT education	FT education
14	NEET	FT education	FT education
15	NEET	FT education	FT education
16	NEET	FT education	FT work
17	NEET	FT work	FT work
18	NEET	FT education	FT education
19	NEET	FT education	FT education
20	NEET	NEET	NEET
21	NEET	PT education	PT education
22	NEET	PT work	PT work
23	NEET	PT work	PT work
24	NEET	NEET	NEET
25	NEET	FT education	FT education
26	NEET	NEET	NEET
27	NEET	FT education	FT education

A5.7 Preferences and Attainment

A comparison of Table A5.5 and Table A5.1 reveals that ten of the 16 who wanted to be in full-time education at the age of 17 were indeed studying full-time (while another was studying part-time). The remaining five were all NEET. Of the two mothers who had hoped to be studying part-time, one ended up studying full-time while the second was NEET. Of the six who had wanted to be in work or work-based training, two had attained this goal but the other four were NEET. The three who intended to be engaged in family care were NEET.

Only about a quarter (N=7) of the 16 year old mothers attained their ambitions for two years into the future. These 'successful' outcomes included the three young women who had hoped to be looking after their family. Of the ten who had wanted to be in full-time education at the age of 18, one was studying full-time; two were studying part-time; two were in work or work-based training and five were NEET. The one young woman who had hoped to be in part-time education at the age of 18 was in fact NEET. Of the thirteen who had expected to be in work or work-based training at the age of 18, only three were actually in this situation. Six more were in education (three part-time) and three were NEET.

The nine young mothers who were in full-time education at the age of 16 were the most successful in attaining their ambitions for one year ahead. Eight had hoped to remain in full-time education and seven were successful (case 8 was NEET). One full-time student (case 9) wanted to be in work or work-based training in a year's time but she was NEET at the age of 17. Case 10, who had been studying part-time at the age of 16, had said she wanted to remain in part-time education but in fact she was in full-time education a year later. The two young mothers who were in work or training at the age of 16 had both hoped to remain in this status. A year later, one had achieved this but the other was NEET.

The remaining 15 young women had been NEET when they were asked what they hoped to be doing in a year's time. Nine hoped to make the transition into education (one part-time); three hoped to be in work or training; and three stated that they wanted to be looking after their home and family. Of the nine who wanted to be in full-time education, three were full-time students in the following year and one was studying part-time. However, the remaining five were NEET. Of the three wanting to be in work or training, two were successful and one was NEET. The three who wanted to stay at home were indeed NEET a year later.

The 16 year old mothers in full time education were less successful in attaining their stated ambitions for two years later than for one year later. Three of the nine had hoped to be in full-time education. Of these, one was studying full-time, another was part-time while the third was in work or work-based training. Six had seen themselves in work or work based training but only one was in this situation two years later. Four were in education (including one who was studying part-time) while the sixth was NEET. The one 16 year old who had been in part-time education at the age of 16 had hoped to be in work or work-based training in two years time but instead she was studying part-time.

The two who had been in work or work-based training at the age of 16 had hoped to remain in this situation. One was successful but the other was NEET. Finally, of the seven young mothers who had been NEET but had hoped to be in full-time education, one was studying part-time, one was in work or work-based training and the remaining five were NEET. The one NEET 16 year old who had hoped to be studying part-time in two years' time was still NEET.

A6 THE POST-16 TRANSITIONS OF PREGNANT 16 YEAR OLDS

Of the 24 pregnant 16 year olds who remained in the survey at the third interview, two were not living with a child two years later. As there is no information on whether these teenagers had a child outside of the household they have been excluded from all subsequent analysis. Table A6.1 outlines the economic activity of the remaining 22 young women. The bold font used for their activity at the age of 17 acts as a reminder that this is the year when they first reported having a child. One young woman (case 8) had a second child at the age of 18. In addition, two new mothers mentioned that they were pregnant at the third interview (cases 6 and 20).

A6.1 Economic Activity at Ages 16, 17 and 18

At the age of 16, six pregnant teenagers were in education (one part-time); two were in full-time work and the rest were not in education or work. In the months following the birth of their child (at the age of 17) one was in part-time education and the rest were NEET. A year later, at the age of 18, two were in part-time education, two were in part-time work and one was in full-time work. The rest were NEET. The jobs held at the age of 18 were as a shop assistant (case 10) an assistant hairdresser (case 11) and a crew member (case 12). The shop assistant and crew member positions were permanent; none of the three involved recognised training. There was no association between Year 11 qualifications and being NEET at age 18, or between economic activity at age 16 and being NEET at age 18. Those who had been in full-time education at the time they were pregnant were as likely to be NEET at the age of 18 as those who had been NEET during pregnancy. Similarly, having one or more Year 11 qualifications at grade C or above did not make young women any less likely to be NEET once they had had a child

Table A6.1 Wave One Pregnant Teenagers: Year 11 Qualifications and Economic Activity at Ages 16, 17 and 18

Case	Year 11 qualifications	Economic activity		
		Age 16	Age 17	Age 18
1	1-4 A*-C	FT education	PT education	PT education
2	1+ D-G	FT education	NEET	NEET
3	1-4 A*-C	FT education	NEET	NEET
4	1+ D-G	FT education	NEET	NEET
5	1+ D-G	FT education	NEET	NEET
6	None	PT education	NEET	NEET
7	1+ D-G	FT work	NEET	NEET
8	1+ D-G	FT work	NEET	NEET
9	None	NEET	NEET	PT education
10	1+ D-G	NEET	NEET	PT work
11	1-4 A*-C	NEET	NEET	PT work
12	1-4 A*-C	NEET	NEET	FT work
13	1-4 A*-C	NEET	NEET	NEET
14	1+ D-G	NEET	NEET	NEET
15	5+ A*-C	NEET	NEET	NEET
16	1+ D-G	NEET	NEET	NEET
17	5+ A*-C	NEET	NEET	NEET
18	1-4 A*-C	NEET	NEET	NEET
19	None	NEET	NEET	NEET
20	1-4 A*-C	NEET	NEET	NEET
21	None	NEET	NEET	NEET
22	None	NEET	NEET	NEET

A6.2 Household Composition at Ages 16, 17 and 18

Table A6.2 shows the living arrangements of teenagers who were pregnant at the age of 16. All were living with a parent in the months following the end of compulsory schooling. A year later, seven had moved out of their family home. Of these, three were living with a partner while four were living with neither a parent nor a partner. By the age of 18, most of the young women had moved away from their parents. Five were living with a partner while ten were living with neither a partner nor a parent. The three young women who were cohabiting at the age of 17 remained with the same partner a year later.

Table A6.2 Pregnant Teenagers: Household Composition at Ages 16, 17 and 18

Case	Age 16	Age 17	Age 18
1	Parent	Parent	Neither
2	Parent	Parent	Parent
3	Parent	Parent	Neither
4	Parent	Parent	Parent
5	Parent	Parent	Parent
6	Parent	Parent	Neither
7	Parent	Parent	Neither
8	Parent	Partner	Partner
9	Parent	Partner	Partner
10	Parent	Parent	Parent
11	Parent	Parent	Partner
12	Parent	Neither	Neither
13	Parent	Parent	Parent
14	Parent	Parent	Partner
15	Parent	Parent	Parent
16	Parent	Partner	Partner
17	Parent	Neither	Neither
18	Parent	Parent	Parent
19	Parent	Neither	Neither
20	Parent	Neither	Neither
21	Parent	Parent	Neither
22	Parent	Parent	Neither

A6.3 Economic Activity at Age 16 and Preferences for the Future

Twenty pregnant 16 year olds answered the questions on what they hoped to be doing in the future. Just five wanted to be NEET in a year's time; ten hoped to be in education (including two part-time); and the remaining five wanted to be in full-time work. Nine pregnant teenagers thought it was very or fairly unlikely that they would attain their goal. Of these, three hoped to be in full-time education (cases 2, 15 and 21); three wanted to be in full-time work (cases 10, 14 and 22); and three wanted to be in neither education nor work. The remaining 11 teenagers felt it was very or fairly likely that they would achieve their goal. In the event, as Table A6.3 revealed, all of the pregnant 16-year olds were NEET when they were interviewed the following year, with the exception of one who was undertaking part-time study.

Looking ahead two years, seven wanted to be in full-time education, nine wanted to be working (including two part-time) and four hoped to be NEET. Only three pregnant teenagers thought it unlikely that they would attain their goal for two years into the future. Two of these wanted to be in full-time education (cases 2 and 5) while the third (case 10) hoped to be in full-time work. The remaining 17 felt it was very or fairly likely that they would achieve their goal. With the exception of the four who intended to be NEET, none of the pregnant 16 year olds achieved their ambitions two years later (see Table A6.1). At the age of 18, two young women were studying part-time (case 1 had hoped to work full-time; case 9 had wanted to study full-time). Two were in part-time work (case 10 had intended to study full-time, case 11 had wanted to work full-time). Just one young woman was working full-time at the age of 18 (case 12); she had hoped to be working part-time at this age.

Table A6.3 Pregnant Teenagers: Economic Activity at Age 16 and Preferences for the Future

Case	Activity at age 16	Preference one year on	Preference two years on
1	FT education	FT education	FT work
2	FT education	FT education	FT education
3	FT education	FT education	FT work
4	FT education	FT education	FT work
5	FT education	NEET	FT education
6	PT education	NEET	NEET
7	FT work	NEET	PT work
8	FT work	FT work	NEET
9	NEET	FT education	FT education
10	NEET	FT work	FT work
11	NEET	PT education	FT education
12	NEET	PT education	PT work
13	NEET	NEET	NEET
14	NEET	FT work	FT work
15	NEET	FT education	FT education
16	NEET	NEET	NEET
17	NEET	FT work	FT work
18	NEET	FT education	FT education
19	NEET	N/A	N/A
20	NEET	N/A	N/A
21	NEET	FT education	FT education
22	NEET	FT work	FT work

A7 CONCLUSION

Part A of this report has investigated the lives of 16 year old mothers and pregnant 16 year olds. Their experiences at Years 10 and 11, and in the months following the end of compulsory education, are contrasted with those of young women who had not embarked upon motherhood at this early age. To an extent, the negative school experiences reported by 16 year old mothers reflects socio-economic disadvantages that pre-dated their pregnancy, such as having parents who had no educational qualifications. In other respects, it seems that becoming pregnant whilst still in compulsory education had made their experience of school more challenging. The Year 11 experiences and transitions of these young women can be compared with those who did not have a child, but who were pregnant, in the months following the end of Year 11. This latter group had similar levels of family disadvantage but had not been constrained by pregnancy or child-care demands during Year 11.

Section A2 confirmed that young women who embarked upon parenthood in their mid-teens tended to come from less-advantaged homes than those who were neither mothers nor pregnant. The majority of vulnerable young women came from homes where no parent had any qualifications, and where no parent was employed. Reports of being bullied, and accusations of bullying, were more prevalent among young mothers than among the other two groups, suggesting that pregnancy may have damaged their relationships with their peers. This interpretation is supported by the fact that the incidence of bullying behaviour was only slightly higher among young women who subsequently became pregnant than among the non-vulnerable group.

Perhaps surprisingly, the truancy and exclusion rates of women who subsequently became pregnant were on a par with those of the women who had taken this course earlier in their school career. Two-fifths of young women in each of the vulnerable groups had played truant for days or weeks at a time while around a quarter had been excluded from school at some point. Similarly, a third of each group had effectively left school before they were able to sit their Year 11 exams in June. Despite this poor attendance record, two-thirds of young mothers had hoped to continue in education after Year 11.

Poor Year 11 attendance among young women who subsequently became pregnant may be associated with their high rate of special needs. One in five of this group was reported to

have special needs compared with one in ten of young mothers and the non-vulnerable group. Part B of this report identifies a positive association between having special needs and truancy and exclusion. However, it is unclear whether learning difficulties discourage attendance or whether, in some circumstances, truancy and exclusion prompt parents and educational professionals to assess the young person as having special needs. It is possible that the concept of special needs currently in circulation does not adequately address the problems faced by young mothers. For instance, absenteeism may generally trigger a concern that a young woman may have special needs, but not when there is an 'explanation' for her absence, i.e. she has child-care responsibilities.

Although young women who went on to become pregnant tended to have poor school attendance records, many took greater advantage of the careers advice and training made available through their school and the Careers Service than 16 year old mothers. Compared with young mothers, they were more likely to have attended PSE classes and careers sessions, and were more likely to have undertaken work experience in Years 10 or 11. However, of the three groups, non-vulnerable young women had the highest rates of involvement in each of these activities.

The parents of vulnerable young women tended themselves to have very low academic attainment and, perhaps as a consequence, about three-quarters of them reported not knowing enough about modern qualifications to offer their daughters useful advice. This sense of inadequacy may have been behind their limited attendance at parents evenings. Despite this lack of educational credentials, the majority of parents in the two vulnerable groups reported having been involved 'a great deal' or 'a fair amount' in the decisions of their daughters. In addition, almost half of young mothers said that their parents had been the best source of advice compared with just a third of non-vulnerable young women. In each of the three groups, a large majority of parents had hoped that their daughter would remain in education after Year 11.

Vulnerable young women tended to have very low Year 11 attainment. Only about a third of young mothers, and a quarter of those who subsequently became pregnant, passed one or more GCSE at grade C or above. This in part reflects their disadvantaged family backgrounds and poor attendance records. For young mothers, there are likely to have been additional barriers associated with pregnancy and child-care.

Despite their hopes of being in education, four-fifths of young mothers were neither in education nor employment a few months after the end of compulsory education. Two-thirds of those who were pregnant were also in this NEET category compared with just one in ten of the non-vulnerable group. Despite this poor outcome, the majority of young women in each of the vulnerable groups felt that they had made the right decision, as did around two-thirds of their parents.

In the pilot areas, all the vulnerable young women who remained in full-time education had heard of EMA and all but one had applied for it. However, levels of awareness of EMA were low among young mothers and pregnant women not in education. Overall, almost half of vulnerable non-students said that a weekly allowance would have encouraged them to remain in education.

The qualitative evaluation of the EMA Vulnerable Pilots found that many young mothers received valuable support from their family, and in particular their parents. However, the analysis presented in this report identifies that a minority of young mothers were involved in the care of a disabled adult; this caring role was much less evident among pregnant teenagers and the non-vulnerable group.

Despite poor educational experiences and outcomes and low rates of economic activity in the months following the end of compulsory education, three-quarters of young mothers and pregnant teenagers believed that qualifications were essential for any job worth having. Half of young mothers, and slightly fewer pregnant teenagers hoped to be in education in twelve months' time and the majority of these felt that they were likely to attain this goal.

The hopes for the future reported in the months following the end of compulsory education were not borne out by the experiences of those who remained in the survey two years later. Most 16 year old mothers wanted to be in either education or work in one year's and two years' time, and most thought this goal was achievable. However, a year later, and similarly two years later, almost half were NEET. Of those who hoped to be in education in the future, mothers who were students at the age of 16 were most likely to have succeeded. Nine of the young mothers in education at the age of 16 wanted to be in education at some point in the next two years and eight were successful. Conversely, of the nine NEET 16 year old mothers

who hoped to return to education in the next two years, only four actually did so. At the ages of 16, 17 and 18, young mothers who lived with their own parents were more likely to be in education than those who lived independently.

Among pregnant 16 year olds, hopes for the future were similarly high. Only three wanted to remain economically inactive for the following two years, while 11 hoped to return to education at some point. However, the large majority of pregnant 16 year olds were NEET both one year and two years later (17 out of 22).

Where 16 year old mothers found employment, the jobs were generally low skilled and offering little in the way of training or career development. In addition, none of the vulnerable young women remained in the same job from one interview to the next.

The lives of these vulnerable young women are characterised by a mixture of significant disadvantage, unfounded optimism and unfulfilled ambition. At the age of 16 many appreciated the value of qualifications and intended to improve their prospects by remaining in, or re-entering, education. Others saw engaging in full-time work as desirable and achievable. For most (especially the pregnant 16 year olds) these goals proved unattainable.

Six of the 16 year old mothers had given birth to another child by the age of 18. This suggests that, for some teenagers, the birth of a first child marks the beginning of a family-building period, even where it occurs at a very young age. Four of the six young women who had a second child were NEET at the age of 18. However the remaining two were engaged in part-time education (despite the fact that neither was living with her parents at the time).

This may be seen as an indication of these young women's continued commitment to improving their situation in spite of the demands of motherhood. The task for policy-makers is to facilitate success within the domain of education and/or employment whilst acknowledging the complexities and constraints inherent in the family lives of teenage parents.

PART B

B1 YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

B1.1 Focus

Part B of this report explores how young people's Year 11 experiences, and their transitions out of compulsory education, may be affected by the presence of special needs (SEN) and/or a disability. The experiences of young people who had one or both of these problems are contrasted with those who had neither. In this part of the report, EMA eligible young people who have special needs and/or a disability are viewed as vulnerable while those with neither of these problems are considered to be non-vulnerable.

Questions about the young person's special needs were included in the questionnaire administered to parents as part of the first wave of interviews and were not included in the questionnaire administered to the young person. Therefore, this analysis is based on parents' perceptions of young people's special needs rather than the perceptions of the young people themselves. This information was missing for 548 young people, most commonly because there was no parent or guardian in the household. These young people have been excluded from all analysis. In contrast, the disability measure is derived from questions asked of the young person in their first interview at the age of 16.

B1.2 Definition of Special Needs and Disability

According to the DfES, young people with special needs have '**learning difficulties** or **disabilities** that make it harder for them to learn than most children of the same age' (DfES 2001). Schools have a statutory duty to identify, and respond to, the special needs of children in their care. In some cases, the local education authority may undertake an assessment of a child's needs, leading to a statement of SEN. However, many young people are recognised as having special needs by their education providers without having a statement.

As discussed, the information on whether a young person had SEN was collected from their parents. Consequently, this may not reflect the assessment of education professionals. Some parents may have felt that their child's special needs were not acknowledged. It is also

possible that other parents had not taken on board the fact that their child had been categorised as having SEN, although, under the DfES Code of Practice, they would have been informed of this. Parents were asked if their child had ever had any special needs. Those who said yes were subsequently asked if the young person had received a statement of SEN.

The young person's questionnaire collected information on any long-standing illness or disability or infirmity; where young people reported having a problem, they were asked whether this limited their daily activities and whether they were registered disabled (i.e. whether they had a green card).

B2 THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF SPECIAL NEEDS AND DISABILITY

This section of the report considers the extent and nature of the special needs and disabilities experienced by EMA eligible young people using each of the definitions described in Section B1.1. There is likely to be considerable overlap between the groups of young people so defined, for example, many young people with special needs will also have a long standing illness. The section concludes by considering the extent of this overlap.

B2.1 Prevalence of Special Needs and Disability

Fifteen per cent of parents of EMA eligible young people identified their child as having had special needs (Table B2.1). Around half of these had not had a statement; in the remaining cases, either there had not been a statement or the parent was unsure. One in six young people (17 per cent) had a long-standing health problem, although the majority of these said that it did not limit their daily life. One per cent was registered as disabled, while an additional six per cent had a limiting health condition but no green card.

Table B2.1 Special Needs and Disability

	Column per cent	
	Per cent	Unweighted N
Special needs		
SEN with statement	6	803
SEN, no statement	8	1044
SEN, don't know if statement	2	257
No special needs	85	12063
Disability		
Registered disabled	1	85
Health limits daily life	6	865
Health does not limit daily life	10	1455
No long-standing health problem	83	11762

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B2.2 Type of Special Needs

Table B2.2 looks in greater depth at the subset of young people who were said by their parents to have had SEN. It explores the nature of their needs, and compares the prevalence of each type of problem among young people who had been given a statement of SEN with those who had not. It should be borne in mind that all of these data are based on parents' reports of their children's circumstances; the next section explores the extent to which parents' reports of SEN overlap with their children's reports of ill-health and/or disability.

The majority of young people with special needs (71 per cent) were reported to have difficulties with reading, writing, spelling or mathematics. Overall, one in five (21 per cent) of young people with special needs was said to have problems with their sight, hearing or speech while one in six (16 per cent) had emotional or behavioural problems. Smaller proportions were described as having other health or medical problems (eight per cent) or a physical disability (five per cent). Just two per cent had a mental disability. With the exception of 'other' needs, each of these problems was more common among young people who had been given a statement of SEN than among those who had not; however, for literacy or numeracy difficulties and medical or health problems this difference was slight. Young people with a mental or physical disability, or emotional or behavioural problems, were particularly likely to have been given a statement.

Where parents reported that their child had SEN, almost four-fifths (79 per cent) specified just one type of problem; 18 per cent named two types and just three per cent identified three or more. Multiple problems were most common among young people who had received a statement; however, even among this group, two-thirds (66 per cent) had a single listed problem.

Table B2.2 Prevalence of Specific Special Needs by whether has Statement of Special Education Need

	Cell per cent			
	Statement	None	Don't know	All SEN
Type of problem				
Literacy or numeracy	73	71	66	71
Sight, hearing, speech	24	18	21	21
Emotional or behavioural	22	11	16	16
Medical or health	8	7	8	8
Physical disability	8	2	4	5
Mental disability	4	0	1	2
Other	3	3	3	3
Number of problems				
One	66	87	84	79
Two	28	12	13	18
Three or more	6	1	3	3
Unweighted N	803	1044	257	2104

Base: All EMA income eligible young people with SEN from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B2.3 Gender

B2.3.1 Gender and special needs and disability

Young men were much more likely than young women to be reported as having special needs (Table B2.3). One in five young men had SEN compared with around one in ten of young women. In addition, more young men than young women had a statement of SEN (eight per cent and four per cent respectively). This marked gender difference in special needs may, in part, reflect concerns about academic under-achievement among young men on the part of both parents and education professionals. By contrast, gender differences in disability were minimal. Young women were marginally more likely to have a health problem that limited daily life (seven per cent compared with six per cent), but were no more likely to be registered disabled than young men.

Table B2.3 Special Needs and Disability by Gender

	Column per cent	
	Male	Female
Special needs		
SEN with statement	8	4
SEN, no statement	9	6
SEN, don't know if statement	2	2
No special needs	80	89
Unweighted N	7102	7065
Disability		
Registered disabled	1	1
Health limits daily life	6	7
Health does not limit daily life	10	11
No long-standing health problem	83	82
Unweighted N	7102	7065

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B2.3.2 Gender and specific special needs

The figures presented in Table B2.4 outline the specific problems faced by the subset of young people who were said by their parents to have special needs, broken down by gender. For both young men and young women, literacy or numeracy problems were the most commonly cited difficulty, followed by sensory problems and emotional or behavioural problems. For six of the seven items the difference between young men and women was no more than three percentage points. However, many more young men than young women were identified as having emotional or behavioural problems (19 per cent and 11 per cent respectively).

Table B2.4 Specific Special Needs among Young People with SEN by Gender

	Cell per cent	
	Male	Female
Type of problem		
Literacy or numeracy	71	71
Sight, hearing, speech	22	19
Emotional or behavioural	19	11
Medical or health	7	10
Physical disability	5	4
Mental disability	2	2
Other	3	4
Number of problems		
One	77	82
Two	19	16
Three or more	3	2
Unweighted N	1360	744

Base: All EMA income eligible young people with SEN from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B2.4 Overlap between Special Needs and Disability

The previous section has described parents' reports of their children's special needs. It is important to consider the extent to which these data overlap with young people's own descriptions of their health/disability status (Table B2.5).

Young people who described themselves as having a long-standing health problem had an increased likelihood of being reported by their parents as having SEN, even where they said that their day-to-day activities were not hindered. Unsurprisingly, the more severe the health problem, the more likely they were to have special needs, although the overlap was by no means complete. Although two-thirds of young people who reported having a green card were said by their parents to have had a statement of SEN (66 per cent), 15 per cent were said to have had no special needs. By contrast, the parents of two-thirds of young people who themselves said they had a life-limiting health condition, said that the young person had no SEN and just 14 per cent said that the young person had been given a statement. Among those young people who said that they had a long-standing problem that did not limit their

daily activities, a fifth were said by their parents to have had special needs, and fewer than half of these had a statement.

Table B2.5 Overlap between Special Needs and Disability

	Column per cent			
	Has long-term health problem			No long-term problem
	Registered disabled	Limits life	Life not limited	
SEN with statement	66	14	8	5
SEN, no statement	12	14	9	7
SEN, don't know if statement	7	4	3	2
No SEN	15	69	80	87
Unweighted N	85	865	1455	11762

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Given that there was considerable overlap between special needs and disability in this sample of young people, although this was by no means complete, it was necessary to choose how the group of young people having special needs should be defined so that double counting was avoided in the remainder of the analysis. It was decided to focus on the following groups:

- Young people who were considered by their parents to have special needs, regardless of whether a statement of SEN had been drawn up, who also themselves said that they had a disability (i.e. a long-standing health problem that limited day to day life) ('SEN and disability').
- Young people who were considered by their parents to have special needs, again regardless of whether a statement had been obtained, but who did not report themselves as having a disability ('SEN only').
- Those who described themselves as having a long-standing health problem that limited their daily life but whose parents had not said that they had special needs ('disability only').

Young people in any of these three groups are considered vulnerable. Throughout the remainder of this report their current situation and their Year 11 experiences are contrasted with the 'non-vulnerable' group, that is, young people who had neither special needs nor a disability. However, it should be recognised that young people who fall into the doubly vulnerable group ('disability and special needs') are likely to have a higher level of disability than those who are categorised as 'disabled only'. Correspondingly, they may also have more substantial special needs than those in the 'special needs only' category.

B3 GENDER, ETHNICITY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

It is widely accepted that gender, ethnicity and socio-economic background all play a part in young people's educational and labour market experiences and performance. Young women are currently performing better in Year 11 examinations and are more likely to enter higher education than young men. Certain ethnic groups perform better in education than others and have different labour market experiences. Young people from relatively affluent homes may have access to better schools than those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds and may also be able to access more educational resources such as text books and school trips. Highly educated parents may also have more opportunity to promote their child's school career, by helping with school work, maintaining contact with teachers and other education professionals and advising on crucial decisions. Variations in socio-economic group, education, and ethnicity may also be reflected in differing attitudes to the value of further education as opposed to employment. Each of these background characteristics might ameliorate or exacerbate the effects of having special needs, therefore this section describes the associations between gender, ethnicity and socio-economic background and SEN in this relatively deprived sample of young people.

B3.1 Gender

Although there were equal numbers of males and females in the sample, Table B3.1 reveals that young men substantially outnumbered young women in both the 'SEN and disability' and the 'SEN only' groups. This disparity is particularly apparent for the 'SEN only' category, in which two-thirds of young people were male. This is consistent with Table B2.3, which revealed that an assessment of SEN was much more prevalent among young males than young females. By contrast, three-fifths of the 'disability only' group were young women. This reflects the fact that young men with a disability were more likely to combine this problem with special needs than young women (57 per cent compared with 43 per cent; analysis not shown). Young men were also marginally under-represented in the non-vulnerable group.

Table B3.1 Gender Composition of Special Needs and Disability Groups

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Male	57	66	40	48
Female	43	34	60	52
Unweighted N	312	1792	638	11425

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B3.2 Ethnicity

An attribution of special needs was most common among the parents of white young people. In total, 17 per cent of white young people were identified by their parents as having special needs (three per cent had both special needs and a disability and 14 per cent had special needs only). This contrasts with 12 per cent of Black young people, seven per cent of those with a Bangladeshi or Pakistani heritage, and just six per cent of those with an Indian heritage. This ranking is not consistent with ethnic group differences in Year 11 attainment (Cebulla et al 2004). The ethnic minority report that forms part of this series identified that, among young people, those who were of Indian extraction performed best at Year 11 (with 40 per cent attaining five or more GCSEs at grades A*-C), followed by the white group (35 per cent) and Black young people (30 per cent). Year 11 attainment was lowest among young people with a Pakistani or Bangladeshi heritage. This inconsistency between attribution of special needs and Year 11 attainment may indicate that parents from minority ethnic groups were less likely to interpret under-achievement, or problems at school, as a special needs issue.

White young people were also more likely to identify themselves as having a health problem that limited their daily life than any of the minority ethnic groups. Eight per cent of white young people were classified as disabled (five per cent were disabled but had no special needs and an additional three per cent had a disability and special needs). This compares with between four and five per cent of their counterparts with a minority ethnic heritage.

Table B3.2 Ethnicity

	Column per cent			
	White	Indian	Pakistani/ Bangladeshi	Black
SEN and disability	3	1	1	2
SEN only	14	5	6	10
Disability only	5	4	4	2
No SEN, no disability	79	90	89	85
Unweighted N	12884	313	648	242

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Teachers and other education professionals may also have been less likely to view young people from minority ethnic groups as having special needs. Among EMA eligible young people, 6.5 per cent of the white group had a statement of SEN compared with 3.5 per cent of those with a minority ethnic heritage (analysis not shown). Later in this report, this association is explored further using multivariate techniques.

B3.3 Parents' Qualifications

Table B3.3 shows the highest educational attainment of the parents of EMA eligible young people. At least one GCSE pass at grade C or above has been defined as a Level 2 qualification and this has been combined with successful completion of a trade apprenticeship. Level 1 equates to a GCSE qualification at Grades D-G.

The parents of young people with special needs tended to have relatively low educational qualifications, particularly where their special needs were combined with a disability; 11 per cent of parents of young people in the 'SEN and disability' group had a degree or other higher qualification compared with 19 per cent of those with no special needs or disability. More than half (55 per cent) of parents of young people with special needs and a disability had only Level 1, or no qualifications, compared with only 39 per cent of those whose child had neither problem. Parents of young people with either special needs or a disability had qualification levels in between these two extremes.

Table B3.3 Parents' Highest Qualification

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Degree/ other higher	11	15	14	19
A Level (or vocational equivalent)	11	11	16	13
Trade/Level 2	23	27	28	29
Level 1/ none	55	47	43	39
Unweighted N	297	1736	621	11102

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B3.4 Parents' Socio-economic Group

The relative disadvantage of parents of young people with special needs is also evident from their socio-economic group (Table B3.4)⁸. Parents in a professional or managerial occupation were most prevalent in the non-vulnerable group (16 per cent) followed by disability only and special needs only; they were least prevalent where young people had both special needs and a disability (eight per cent). The same trend was evident among parents in routine non-manual jobs; a quarter of the non-vulnerable group had a parent in a routine non-manual occupation compared with one in eight of those with both SEN and a disability. Among non-vulnerable young people, 30 per cent had no working parents; this contrasts with 59 per cent of those with both special needs and a disability.

⁸ This measure indicates the current socio-economic group of employed parents or the most recent location of those who were retired. Where two parents were employed or retired, the highest socio-economic group was used.

Table B3.4 Parents' Socio-economic Group

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Professional/managerial	8	11	12	16
Routine non-manual	13	20	23	25
Skilled manual	11	16	16	16
Semi-/unskilled manual	10	14	12	14
No parent in work/retired	59	40	37	30
Unweighted N	298	1719	614	11092

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

It may be that the low levels of employment in households with doubly vulnerable young people (with both special needs and a disability) are partly the result of children's health problems impacting upon parents' employment opportunities, either currently or in the past. In addition, given the shared socio-economic location of family members, disability may be concentrated in households. Among EMA eligible young people, 17 per cent of those with special needs and a disability had at least one parent who was her/himself economically inactive due to a long-term disability (analysis not shown). This contrasts with 10 per cent of young people who had special needs only, and seven per cent where young people had either a disability only or no vulnerability.

It seems clear that special needs and disability are disproportionately concentrated among young people from poorer socio-economic backgrounds. The next section of this report returns the focus to young people themselves, exploring their school experiences during Year 11.

B4 YEAR 11 SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

It might be anticipated that having special needs would be positively associated with problems at school. However, the direction of the association is not easily predictable. School children who struggle to keep up with their peers may be at greater risk of being victimised and may respond by bullying others, playing truant or being disruptive. Alternatively, disruptive behaviour and non-attendance may prompt parents and teachers to view the young person as having special needs. In addition, it has been established that young people with special needs and/or a disability tended to come from disadvantaged homes. It may be that disadvantaged young people are concentrated in schools where bullying and non-attendance are more frequent. This section highlights the extent to which having special needs and/or a disability is associated with negative school experiences.

B4.1 Negative School Experiences

It seems that the greater the extent of reported special needs and disability, the more likely young people were to report having been bullied at school. Young people with both special needs and a disability were more likely to have been bullied at school than those with only one of these problems, while young people with neither special needs nor a disability were least likely to have been bullied (Table B4.1). However, the three vulnerable groups were also more likely to say that they had been accused of bullying (between 29 per cent and 33 per cent compared with 18 per cent in the non-vulnerable group). Vulnerability was also associated with an increased likelihood of having played truant during Years 10 and 11 for 'days or weeks at a time' (between 18 per cent and 22 per cent compared with 13 per cent in the non-vulnerable group). Finally, compared with non-vulnerable young people, around twice as many of those in the two special needs groups had been temporarily or permanently excluded from school at some time.

Table B4.1 Problems at School

	Cell per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Bullied	59	41	44	25
Accused of bullying	33	29	29	18
Truant for days at a time	18	22	18	13
Ever excluded from school	17	18	13	9
Excluded permanently	4	5	2	2
Minimum unweighted N	310	1788	636	11417

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

The report on ethnicity, commissioned as part of this series, revealed ethnic differences in each of these aspects of school life (Cebulla et al., 2004). In addition, with the exception of regularly playing truant, these behaviours varied by gender. However, multivariate analysis controlling for ethnicity and gender confirmed that having special needs and/or a disability was independently associated with an increased likelihood of each of these negative occurrences (analysis not shown).

B4.2 Educational Achievement, Special Needs and Gender

Year 11 achievement was measured using the number of GCSE/GNVQ examinations passed and the grade. Table B4.2 outlines the strong association between having special needs and/or a disability and low Year 11 achievement. As it has been established that the two special needs groups have a different gender composition to the ‘disability only’ and non-vulnerable groups, achievement has been additionally broken down by gender.

Overall, only around one in ten young people with special needs had attained five or more GCSEs at grade C or above (or the vocational equivalent) compared with about a third of those who had a disability only, and 41 per cent of those with neither special needs nor a disability. Among young people who had both special needs and a disability, more than a third had not achieved any qualifications, as had almost a quarter of those who had special

needs but no disability. This contrasts with 13 per cent of those with a disability only and just seven per cent of those with neither a disability nor special needs.

The association between having special needs and/or a disability and educational outcomes tended to be similar for young men and young women. However, the disparity in the proportions of the four groups who gained no qualifications at all was greater among young men than among young women. Among young men, 45 per cent of those with both special needs and a disability had gained no qualifications compared with eight per cent of those with neither (a difference of 37 percentage points). Among young women the difference between these two groups was just 20 percentage points (26 per cent and six per cent respectively).

In general, non-vulnerable young people had the most success, followed by those with a disability only while those with both special needs and a disability tended have the lowest achievement. The exception to this was among young women, where the proportions passing five or more GCSEs at grade A*-C was actually higher among those with special needs and a disability than among those with just special needs.

Table B4.2 Year 11 Attainment by Gender

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
All EMA eligible				
None	36	23	13	7
D-G only	27	39	23	19
1-4 A*-C	25	28	33	33
5+ A*-C	12	10	32	41
Unweighted N	312	1791	638	11423
Males				
None	45	26	14	8
D-G only	24	37	19	23
1-4 A*-C	24	27	36	31
5+ A*-C	7	10	31	38
Unweighted N	177	1182	250	5491
Females				
None	26	17	11	6
D-G only	31	42	26	16
1-4 A*-C	26	30	30	35
5+ A*-C	18	11	32	43
Unweighted N	135	609	388	5932

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B4.3 Lack of Year 11 Qualifications, Special Needs and Gender

Young people who leave compulsory education with no qualifications may be viewed as having severely limited career options or educational opportunities. However, among young people who failed to attain any qualifications by the end of Year 11, just 38 per cent were considered to have special needs (Table B4.3). In addition, there was a clear gender effect. Among young men who left compulsory education with no qualifications, almost half were deemed to have special needs, with a quarter having had a statement. Among unqualified young women, a quarter had special needs, with just one in eight having had a statement.

Table B4.3 Special Needs among Young People with No Year 11 Qualifications, by Gender

	Column per cent		
	Male	Female	All
SEN with statement	26	13	21
SEN, no statement	13	10	11
SEN, don't know if statement	7	4	6
No special needs	54	74	62
Unweighted N	726	467	1193

Base: All EMA income eligible young people with no Year 11 qualifications from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B4.4 Factors Associated with Special Needs

This report has shown that young people with special needs were particularly likely to come from homes where no parent had any qualifications and where no parent was employed. This is consistent with research investigating the transmission of socio-economic disadvantage from generation to generation. In effect, children from disadvantaged homes find it harder to achieve than their more advantaged peers. However, minority ethnic groups were under-represented in the SEN groups despite relatively high levels of socio-economic disadvantage among some groups (Cebulla et al., 2004). In addition, almost twice as many males as females had special needs (20 per cent compared with 11 per cent; Table B2.3). These discrepancies highlight the fact that an assessment of special needs may include a degree of subjectivity on the part of parents, teachers and other professionals involved in the lives of the young people. Further investigation of the association between interlinked socio-demographic characteristics and an attribution of special needs requires the use of multivariate modelling.

B4.4.1 Predicting a statement of SEN

Table B4.4 presents the results of a logistic regression analysis investigating socio-demographic factors associated with having a statement of SEN, which is a more rigorous

test of special needs than has been utilised in the combined SEN/disability variable. A statement is viewed as an indicator that a young person has been identified by his or her educational provider as needing a substantial level of additional help in order to fulfil her or his academic potential⁹.

The first model presented in Table B4.4 includes whether the young person had a health condition that hindered daily life; parental qualifications; parental socio-economic group; gender; and ethnicity. If a statement of SEN acts as a marker of potential under-achievement, socio-demographic factors known to be linked to low school achievement should be also be associated with a statement of SEN. The second model adds Year 11 educational attainment. This illuminates any residual links between the socio-demographic characteristics of young people and the likelihood that they have received a statement over and above educational outcomes at Year 11. It is possible, for instance, that the children of highly educated parents may have an increased likelihood of having a statement because their parents have higher expectations and have a better understanding of the educational system than those parents with lower academic achievements.

In the models, one category of each variable has been designated the reference category and given the value 1.00. The other categories of the variable are contrasted with this. Values statement of SEN than the reference category; values below 1.00 indicate a lesser likelihood of having been statemented. The reference categories are: having no limiting health condition; having a parent with a degree or other higher qualification; having a parent in a professional or managerial occupation; being white; and being female. In the second model, attaining five or more GCSEs at grades A*-C is the reference category for the attainment variable.

Model One (excluding Year 11 attainment)

Model One reveals that the odds of having a statement of SEN were four times higher among EMA eligible young people with a limiting health problem than among those with no disability¹⁰. Controlling for ill-health, other characteristics emerged as significantly increasing the likelihood of having a statement of SEN.

⁹ Cases where parents did not know if there was a statement have been excluded from the analysis.

¹⁰ The odds reflect the probability of the outcome event (statement of special needs) occurring divided by the probability of the event not occurring. The odds ratio for each category of a predictor variable (e.g. special

The children of parents with a trade apprenticeship or Level 2 qualifications (GCSEs at grade C or above, or the vocational equivalent) were more likely to have been statemented than those whose parents had a degree or other higher education qualification (with the odds increasing by almost a half). Among young people whose parents had no Level 2 qualifications, the odds of having received a statement were twice as great as among those whose parents had a degree or other form of higher education. A similar association was evident for parent's socio-economic group, with the children of skilled manual workers being more likely to have a statement of SEN than those of professional/managerial workers. The level of special needs was highest where no parent was in work.

Controlling for parental characteristics, young people of Indian and Pakistani/ Bangladeshi heritage were substantially **less** likely to have had a statement of SEN than the white group (OR of 0.41 and 0.29 respectively). There was also evidence that Black young people were less likely to have been statemented than the white majority (OR of 0.56), although statistically this was only borderline significant (at $p=.092$).

As was expected, there was a huge negative association between Year 11 attainment and having a statement of SEN. The odds of having been statemented were 19 times higher among young people with no Year 11 qualifications than among those with five or more GCSEs at grade A*-C. Among those with grades D-G only, the odds increased nine-fold. In the second model, the effect associated with health status was slightly attenuated but remained strongly significant.

Controlling for the young person's Year 11 qualifications, parental characteristics no longer predicted having a statement of SEN. In Model Two, the likelihood that a young person had received a statement was not significantly associated with parental qualifications or parental

needs only) shows the relative amount by which the odds increase or decrease among members of this category compared with those in the reference category (no special needs, no disability).

socio-economic group. This is consistent with the hypothesis that a statement acts as a marker for educational under-achievement. Young people from disadvantaged households tend to perform less well in school and hence are more likely to be identified as having special needs and given a statement (Model One). However, controlling for academic performance (Model Two) these household-level characteristics were no longer associated with the likelihood of having been statemented. This does not support the contention that highly educated parents influenced the decisions of the education providers.

In the second model, the difference between the two South Asian minority ethnic groups and the white group diminished slightly; however, these young people remained substantially less likely to have been statemented. For the Indian group, the odds of having received a statement of SEN were around half those evident among the white majority group; among the Pakistani/Bangladeshi group the odds were just a third. Controlling for Year 11 attainment, the difference between Black young people and their white counterparts became statistically significant; the odds of a Black young person having received a statement of SEN were half those of a white young person (OR 0.48). Controlling for educational outcomes at the end of compulsory schooling, young men remained much more likely to have had a statement of SEN than young women (OR 2.21).

Table B4.4 Odds Ratios for having a Statement of Special Education Need

	Model 1		Model 2	
	Odds ratio	Sig.	Odds ratio	Sig.
Health limits daily life				
No	1.00		1.00	
Yes	4.21	***	3.58	***
Highest parental qualification		***		Ns
Degree or other higher education	1.00		1.00	
A-Levels, vocational level 3	1.12	Ns	0.82	
Trade /Level 2	1.47	**	0.92	
Less than Level 2	2.11	***	1.02	
Parental socio-economic group		***		Ns
Professional/managerial	1.00		1.00	
Routine non-manual	1.20	Ns	1.14	
Skilled manual	1.63	**	1.23	
Semi-/unskilled manual	1.38	Ns	1.02	
No parent in work	2.36	***	1.26	
Ethnic group		***		***
White	1.00		1.00	
Indian	0.41	***	0.54	*
Pakistani/Bangladeshi	0.29	***	0.37	***
Black	0.56	Ns	0.48	*
Other	0.87	Ns	0.95	Ns
Gender				
Female	1.00		1.00	
Male	2.61	***	2.21	***
Year 11 GCSE/GNVQs passed				***
5+ A*-C	-		1.00	
1-4 A*-C	-		3.75	***
D-G only	-		9.31	***
None	-		19.44	***
Unweighted N	13157			

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A statement of SEN may be viewed as a resource for young people with educational problems, while poor Year 11 results may be seen as an indicator of ‘learning difficulty’. The above results (and those discussed in sections 2.3 and 4.2) suggest that this resource was not distributed strictly according to need among young people. Young people from minority ethnic groups, and young women, were disproportionately likely to have been denied this resource.

It could be hypothesised that negative school behaviours among white school children, and young males, contributed to their having received a statement of SEN. A third model was tested which included indicators of regular truancy and bullying (analysis not shown). The inclusion of these indicators had a negligible impact upon the associations presented in Model Two. However, this additional analysis revealed that regular truancy was in fact associated with a **lesser** likelihood of having been given a statement of SEN (OR 0.56) while the association between accusations of bullying and being statemented was not statistically significant.

B4.4.2 Predicting a parental assessment of SEN

The analysis presented in Table B4.4 considered whether a young person had received a statement of SEN. An additional logistic regression was performed to predict whether the parent reported that their child had ever had special needs (with or without a statement; analysis not shown). In the first model, the young people with the highest likelihood of being viewed as having special needs were those who: had parents with no qualifications; had no parent in work; had a limiting health problem; were white; and, were male.

In the second model (controlling for Year 11 outcomes) the effect of parental socio-economic group was no longer significant while the effect of having a health condition remained. Young men and white young people remained most likely to have SEN according to their parents. In each of these respects, the association between the socio-demographic characteristics and a parental assessment of SEN was very similar to that for a statement of SEN. In part, this reflects the large overlap between the predictor variables in the two logistic regressions (44 per cent of young people with SEN had received a statement). Among young people without a statement, it is plausible that white parents, and the parents of young males, were taking their cue from teachers in equating their child’s under-achievement with special needs. In addition, cultural barriers within minority ethnic groups may render parents less

familiar with the concept of SEN than within the white majority. This does not mean that they are more accepting of under-achievement on the part of their child, but rather that they are unaware of the processes that could address the problem.

The one substantial difference in the two logistic regressions was that young people with the most highly educated parents (a degree or other higher educational qualification) were significantly more likely to be viewed as having had special needs than those with lower qualifications (where the odds ranged between 0.68 and 0.64). This association was not present in Table B4.4. This may indicate that highly educated parents have particularly high expectations with regards to their child's academic performance.

B5 TRAINING, ADVICE AND DECISIONS

Special provision is supposed to be made for young people who have been identified as having special needs, whether or not they have a statement, as they make the transition from compulsory education (DfES, 2001). For those young people with a statement, a Transition Plan has to be drawn up in Year 9 '*to plan coherently for the young person's transition to adult life*'. (DfES, 2001, p.130). A range of specialists are supposed to be involved in assisting in the preparation of the plan. In addition, young people with special needs were one of three groups initially targeted by the EMA Vulnerable Pilots, along with teenage parents and homeless young people, which aimed to encourage vulnerable young people to remain in education following the end of compulsory education (Allen et al., 2003, Dobson et al., 2003). It might be expected, therefore, that young people with special needs in this sample would have received more support, advice and guidance from their school and the Careers Service than non-vulnerable young people.

This section explores young people's sources of advice and training during Year 11, their aspirations and actual destinations at the end of Year 11, and the actual and potential role of EMA in their lives.

B5.1 Careers Advice, Personal and Social Education (PSE) and Work Experience in Years 10 and 11

In the course of Year 11, the majority of EMA eligible young people had attended Personal and Social Education (PSE) classes or group tutorials covering careers topics (Table B5.1). However, this was less common among young people with special needs, particularly where this was combined with a disability. Only three-quarters of young people with special needs only (74 per cent) had attended a PSE class in Year 11; this figure fell to 61 per cent where there was also a limiting health problem. These rates contrast with 79 per cent for those with a disability only and 82 per cent of the non-vulnerable group. Young people with both special needs and a disability were also least likely to have had work experience while the non-vulnerable group was most likely to have done so.

Young people with special needs and a disability had also had less contact with the Careers Service during Year 11. Fewer than half had attended a group session, compared with

between 57 per cent and 63 per cent of the other three groups. Although there were smaller differences in the likelihood of the four groups having had an individual interview (ranging from 79 per cent to 85 per cent), those with special needs were still slightly less likely than those without to report having had an individual interview with the Careers Service.

Table B5.1 Careers Advice, PSE and Work Experience in Year 11

	Cell per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
PSE class	61	74	79	82
Work experience in Y10 or Y11	77	83	84	89
CS group session	46	57	63	63
CS individual interview	79	81	82	85
Minimum unweighted N	308	1785	636	11402

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B5.2 Sources of Advice

Previous tables have shown that vulnerable young people tended to have parents with few educational qualifications and limited labour market participation. This may have made them less able to rely on advice from parents when they made decisions about their post-Year 11 future. Similarly, vulnerable groups often had troubled school relationships. They were more likely to have played truant regularly and to have been excluded from school than young people who had no special needs; they were also less likely to have attended PSE lessons or to have contact with the Careers Service. All of these factors may have impacted on their perceptions of the sources of advice available to them at the end of their compulsory schooling.

The most common sources of advice in the course of Year 11 were teachers and parents. Advice from schools was reported more frequently by non-vulnerable young people than by those in any of the vulnerable categories (Table B5.2). Receiving advice from parents was most common among young people with a disability but no special needs; there is little

evidence that young people with special needs were less likely to have received advice from parents than were other young people. Less than half of non-vulnerable young people cited the Careers Service as a source of advice and, although differences are small, this was most commonly mentioned by the disability only group (52 per cent) and least often by the special needs only group (43 per cent).

Although only a small minority of each group had not received advice from any source, the proportions were higher in the two SEN groups (four and five per cent) than in the two groups with no SEN (two and three per cent). In addition, young people in the two special needs groups reported having fewer sources of advice (with a mean of 2.8 sources) than those in the non-vulnerable group (mean of 3.1) and the disabled only group (mean of 3.2).

Table B5.2 Sources of Advice

	Cell per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
School	75	72	77	81
Parents	78	77	84	79
Careers Service	48	43	52	46
Friends	26	37	43	41
Siblings	18	22	23	23
Other	5	6	8	6
None	4	5	2	3
Mean number of sources	2.8	2.8	3.2	3.1
Unweighted N	311	1792	638	11423

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Young people who reported more than one source of advice were asked who had given the best advice. At least half of each of the four groups reported that their school or the Careers Service had given them the best (or, in some cases, only) advice. However, this response was marginally less common among the three vulnerable groups than among those who had neither special needs nor a disability. Correspondingly, non-vulnerable young people were least likely to say that their parents had given the best advice.

Table B5.3 Source of Best Advice

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
School/Careers Service	53	50	52	56
Parents	37	38	37	32
Other	10	11	11	12
Unweighted N	301	1730	623	11134

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B5.3 Year 11 Aspirations for Post-Year 11 Future

Young people were asked to reflect back on what they had wanted to do at the end of compulsory education when they were still in Year 11. The majority of each of the four groups had hoped to remain in education. However, there is some indication that special needs and disability were pulling in opposite directions. Young people who had a disability but no special needs had the highest rates of wanting to remain in education (78 per cent) while those with special needs but no disability had the lowest (59 per cent). Young people with both special needs and a disability held an intermediate position, with 67 per cent intending to remain in education. More than a third of young people who had special needs but no disability had hoped to join the labour market; this contrasts with fewer than a quarter of the other three groups.

Table B5.4 Year 11 Preferences

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Continue in education	67	59	78	77
Work/work-based training	22	35	18	20
Other	11	6	4	3
Unweighted N	311	1791	638	11421

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

It might be anticipated that young people's expected level of achievement at the end of Year 11 would be strongly associated with their aspirations for the future, with those who expected to do well in end of Year 11 examinations being more likely to aspire to remain in education, irrespective of whether they had special needs or not. Since the data do not contain information on expected levels of achievement, young people have been grouped according to their actual achievement at the end of Year 11 (Table B5.5).

Among the low achievers, 55 per cent of the non-vulnerable group had hoped to remain in education. Compared with this, the 'SEN only' group were less likely to have wanted to remain in education (50 per cent) while the 'disability only' group were more likely to have wanted to do so (63 per cent). Rates were also slightly higher where young people had both SEN and a disability (58 per cent). In effect, there is a very similar pattern of preferences among Year 11 moderate and low achievers. Compared with non-vulnerable young people, those with SEN but no disability were less likely to have wanted to remain in education while those with a disability but no SEN were more inclined to have done so.

Among moderate achievers (who attained between one and four GCSEs at Grades A*-C), 76 per cent of non-vulnerable young people had hoped to remain in education. Figures for the 'SEN only' group were lower (68 per cent) while figures for the 'disability only' group were higher (80 per cent). Rates for young people who had both SEN and a disability were slightly above those of the non-vulnerable group (78 per cent).

Where young people eventually gained five or more A*-C GCSE grades at the end of Year 11, there was little difference in the preferences of those with special needs and/or a disability and those with none. Between 91 per cent and 93 per cent of each group had hoped to remain in education.

Table B5.5 Aspiring to Continue in Education, by Year 11 Achievement

Year 11 attainment	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
None at A*-C				
Full-time education	58	50	63	55
Other	42	50	37	45
Unweighted N	187	1041	203	2700
1-4 at A*-C				
Full-time education	78	68	80	76
Other	22	32	20	24
Unweighted N	81	541	206	3798
5+ at A*-C				
Full-time education	91	91	93	93
Other	9	9	7	7
Unweighted N	43	208	229	4921

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

A preference for full-time education among young people with disabilities may indicate their recognition that certain jobs commonly undertaken by teenage school-leavers might be unavailable to them on health grounds. This constraint may, in turn, make Year 11 decision-making easier. However, as Table B5.6 shows, the two groups with a disability were least likely to say that their decision about what to do after compulsory education had been easy.

Table B5.6 Ease of Decision

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Very/fairly easy	51	59	53	61
Neither easy nor difficult	15	11	15	12
Very/fairly difficult	34	31	33	27
Unweighted N	308	1791	636	11412

Base: All eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B6 POST-YEAR 11 DESTINATIONS

B6.1 Economic Activity at Age 16

When interviewed in the months following the end of compulsory schooling, almost three-quarters of young people with neither SEN nor a disability were in full-time education, along with the same proportion of those who had both SEN and a disability (Table B6.1). This similarity in post-16 destination stands in contrast to the differences in Year 11 attainment between the two groups. Young people with a disability but no SEN also had high rates of remaining in education (70 per cent); this contrasts with just 58 per cent of young people with SEN but no disability. High retention rates among the two groups with a disability reinforces the idea that these young people may have more restricted options: each of the three vulnerable groups were also more likely to have become NEET after compulsory education than those who were not vulnerable.

Table B6.1 Destination after Year 11

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Education	73	58	70	73
Work/work-based training	10	23	14	17
NEET	18	19	17	10
Unweighted N	312	1792	638	11425

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Table B4.2 identified that young people with special needs and/or a disability tended to pass fewer GCSEs or GNVQs at Year 11 than those with no special needs or disability.

Unsurprisingly, there is a strong association between Year 11 attainment and remaining in full-time education at the end of compulsory education. Table B6.2 indicates that the presence of a disability and/or special needs exerts an additional impact upon the destinations of young people with low or moderate Year 11 attainment.

Among young people with low/no qualifications at Year 11, more than two-thirds of those with both a disability and special needs had remained in full-time education. Among low achievers with a disability but no special needs the figure was slightly lower at 62 per cent. This compares with just under half of low achievers with special needs only and around half of those with neither a disability nor special needs. Few disabled low achievers with special needs were in work or work-based training (eight per cent); along with 14 per cent of those who had a disability but no special needs. This contrasts with around quarter of those in the other two groups. About a quarter of each of the four groups of low achievers were not in employment, education or training (NEET) at age 16.

Where young people had attained between one and four A*-C GCSEs or vocational equivalents at Year 11, those with special needs but no disability were least likely to be in full-time education at the age of 16 (65 per cent compared with between 71 per cent and 73 per cent of the other three groups). Among moderate achievers, those with a disability (with or without SEN) were least likely to be in work or work-based training (13 per cent) while those with SEN but no disability were mostly likely to be in this situation (25 per cent).

Among Year 11 high achievers (with five or more GCSE/GNVQs at grades A*-C) there is no evidence that the presence of a disability, or special needs, had an impact upon destinations.

Table B6.2 Economic Activity at Age 16 by Special Needs and Year 11 Qualifications

Year 11 attainment	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
None at A*-C				
Full-time education	69	47	62	49
Work/based training	8	25	14	27
NEET	23	28	25	24
Unweighted N	188	1042	203	2701
1-4 at A*-C				
Full-time education	73	65	71	72
Work/based training	13	25	13	21
NEET	14	10	17	7
Unweighted N	81	541	206	3799
5+ at A*-C				
Full-time education	90	90	94	91
Work/based training	3	6	5	7
NEET	7	4	2	2
Unweighted N	43	208	229	4923

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 who were present at Waves 1,2 and 3.

Overall, Table B6.2 indicates that, among low and moderate achievers, disabled young people were less likely to move into work or work-based training at the end of compulsory education than those with no disability. Among low achievers, those with a disability were more likely to remain in full-time education. This may reflect a belief among disabled young people that they would face more hurdles in the job market than they would in further education.

The next table (Table B6.3) compares EMA eligible young people living in the control and pilot areas and considers whether the availability of EMA interacted with the presence of special needs and/or a disability to influence post-Year 11 destinations. For young people with neither special needs nor a disability, those in the pilot areas were slightly more likely to remain in education than their counterparts in the control areas (74 percent and 72 percent respectively). This supports the idea that the availability of EMA increased retention in

education. Where young people had special needs (with or without a disability) there is no suggestion that the availability of EMA increased the likelihood of remaining in full-time education after the end of Year 11. Similar proportions of young people in the control and pilot areas were to be found in each of the three destinations. However, for the ‘disability only’ group there is a ten percentage points difference between the destinations of EMA eligible young people in the pilot and control areas. In the pilot areas, three-quarters of this group were in full-time education at Year 12 compared with under two-thirds of those in the control areas. Correspondingly, in the pilot areas, five per cent fewer young people with a disability were in work or work-based training and five per cent fewer were NEET, compared with their counterparts in the control areas.

Table B 6.3 Economic Activity at Age 16 in Control and Pilot Areas

	Column per cent	
	Control	Pilot
SEN and disability		
Full-time education	73	71
Work/training	9	10
NEET	17	19
Unweighted N	124	188
SEN only		
Full-time education	58	58
Work/training	22	24
NEET	19	18
Unweighted N	705	1087
Disability only		
Full-time education	65	75
Work/training	17	11
NEET	19	14
Unweighted N	255	383
No SEN, no disability		
Full-time education	72	74
Work/training	18	16
NEET	10	10
Unweighted N	4167	7258

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B6.2 Multivariate Models

Table B6.2 indicated that having special needs and/or a disability exerted an influence on the young person's destinations at the age of 16, even taking account of the effect that these difficulties had on their Year 11 attainment. Table B6.4 explores this more fully using multinomial logistic regression analysis. This model evaluates whether there is an additional effect of special needs and/or disability on young people's destinations at the ages of 16 when Year 11 qualifications and gender are controlled for. In the interests of simplicity, only the effects of disability and special needs are discussed.

Table B6.4 considers how economic activity at the age of 16 varies for young people with special needs and/or a disability (controlling for qualifications and gender). The model takes the economic activity of non-vulnerable young people as its reference point and depicts how the destinations of young people in the three vulnerable groups differ from this. Pairs of destinations are considered in succession: full-time education (state a) and NEET (state b); work or work-based training (state a) and NEET (state b); and full-time education (state a) and work or work-based training (state b). For each of these pairs of destinations, and for each of the three vulnerable groups, the model addresses the question: *Is the likelihood of being in state 'a' rather than state 'b' higher or lower for this vulnerable group than for the non-vulnerable group?*

In the models, the non-vulnerable group is given a value of one in each of the three columns. Any vulnerable group that has a value lower than one has a lesser likelihood of being in that destination (and conversely a greater likelihood of being in its pair) than their non-vulnerable counterparts. Any group that has a value above one has a greater likelihood of being in that destination (and a lesser likelihood of being in its pair) than the non-vulnerable group.

Table B 6.4 Odds Ratios for being in Full-time Education, Work/-based training or NEET at age 16

	FT ed and NEET		FT ed and W/bt		W/bt and NEET	
	OR	Sig	OR	Sig	OR	Sig
SEN and disability	1.34	*	3.18	***	0.42	***
SEN only	0.96	Ns	1.03	Ns	0.93	Ns
Disability only	0.74	*	1.28	*	0.58	***
No SEN, no disability	1.00		1.00		1.00	
Male	0.97	Ns	0.72	***	1.36	***
Female	1.00		1.00		1.00	
No A*-C at Year 11	0.04	***	0.14	***	0.30	***
1-4 A*-C at Year 11	0.22	***	0.25	***	0.88	Ns
5+ A*-C at Year 11	1.00		1.00		1.00	
Intercept (B)	3.79	***	2.74	***	1.04	***

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

The first pair of destinations considered in Table B6.4 is full-time education and NEET. Compared with the non-vulnerable group, young people with both special needs and a disability have an increased likelihood of being in full-time education (OR 1.34) and a correspondingly lower likelihood of being NEET. However, for young people with a disability only the association is reversed. Compared with the non-vulnerable group, those who have a disability only are less likely to be in full-time education (OR 0.76), and are more likely to be NEET. The destinations of young people with special needs only do not differ significantly from those with no vulnerability.

When the destinations of full-time education and work (or work-based training) are compared, young people with both special needs and a disability are much more likely to be in full-time education than their counterparts who have no vulnerability (OR 3.12). Those with a disability only are also more likely to be in full-time education than those with neither vulnerability but the association is much weaker (OR 1.28). Again, there is no significant

difference between the destinations of young people with special needs only and those with neither special needs nor a disability.

The final column considers the two destinations of work (or work-based training) and NEET. Compared to the reference group (who have neither special needs nor a disability) both of the disabled groups (i.e. with and without special needs) have an decreased likelihood of being in work or work-based training (and so have a higher likelihood of being NEET).

Overall, Table B6.4 reveals no significant difference in the destinations of young people who have special needs only, compared with the non-vulnerable group. However, the two disabled groups (both with and without special needs) differ from the non-vulnerable group in each of the three contexts. Both groups have a decreased likelihood of being in work or work-based training. This is evident for the full-time education and work contrast (with disabled young people being more likely to be in education) and for the work and NEET contrast (with disabled young people being less likely to be in work).

Multivariate analysis also allows a closer inspection of the destinations of young people with different types of special need. Table B6.5 considers how specific types of problem are associated with the likelihood that the young person was in full-time education, work or work-based training, or NEET at the age of 16. The model controls for Year 11 qualifications and gender but does not include a separate measure of disability. As discussed in Section B2, many young people who reported having an illness or disability that limited their daily activities were not identified by their parents as having special needs. Indeed, of all disabled young people, only one-fifth of parents specified that their child had physical, sensory or medical special needs. Consequently, the following analysis offers only a partial account of the factors influencing the destinations of vulnerable young people.

In order to ensure that the model is stable, the number of special needs items included in the following analysis has been limited. Special needs arising from a physical disability, and problems relating to sight, hearing or speech, have been combined to form one measure. In addition, the small number of young people reported as having a mental disability (N=40) have been excluded from the analysis. This process resulted in three two-category measures of special need reflecting the presence or absence of: a medical or health condition; a physical or sensory disability; and emotional or behavioural problems. A fourth measure

reflects where the young person had literacy or numeracy problems but no other form of special needs (this measure is coded 'no' if the young person has literacy or numeracy problems combined with other special needs). Because these four items are included in the same model, the reference group comprises young people with none of these characteristics (i.e. no special needs).

Table B6.5 first considers the paired destinations of full-time education and NEET. The presence of medical or health-related special needs almost doubles the likelihood that the young person entered full-time education (and correspondingly halves the likelihood that they were NEET)(OR 1.93). By contrast, young people who had emotional or behavioural special needs were less likely to have remained in education than those with no special needs (and, correspondingly, were more likely to be NEET)(OR 0.69). For this pair of destinations, the activities of young people with a physical or sensory disability, and those with literacy or numeracy problems only, did not differ significantly from those with no special needs.

Comparing full-time education and work or work-based training, young people with medical or health problems were substantially more likely to have remained in education (and less likely to have become employed) than those with no special needs (OR 2.49). Among young people with a physical or sensory disability, the likelihood of being in full-time education rather than work is slightly elevated (OR 1.25); however, statistically, this is not significant (at $P=0.77$). The final two types of special need (emotional/behavioural and literacy or numeracy only) are not found to impact upon the relative chances of entering these two states.

Finally, a comparison of work (or work-based training) and NEET suggest that young people with emotional or behavioural problems are less likely to be in work than young people who do not have special needs (and so are more likely to be NEET)(OR 0.68). The other types of special need do not reveal a significant association.

Table B6.5 Odds Ratios for being in Full-time Education, Work/-based training or NEET at age 16

Type of SEN	FT ed and NEET		FT ed and W/bt		W/bt and NEET	
	OR	Sig	OR	Sig	OR	Sig
Medical or health	1.96	**	2.44	***	0.80	Ns
Physical or sensory	1.11	Ns	1.25	Ns	0.89	Ns
Emotional/behavioural	0.66	**	0.96	Ns	0.68	*
Literacy/numeracy only	1.12	Ns	1.04	Ns	1.08	Ns
Male	1.00	Ns	0.72	***	1.39	***
Female	1.00		1.00		1.00	
No A*-C at Year 11	0.04	***	0.14	***	0.29	***
1-4 A*-C at Year 11	0.22	***	0.25	***	0.87	Ns
5+ A*-C at Year 11	1.00		1.00		1.00	
Intercept (B)	3.76	***	2.75	***	1.01	***

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Overall, Table B6.5 shows that, compared with young people with no special needs, those who have medical or health-related problems have an increased likelihood of being in full-time education at Year 12 (that is, they are more likely to be in full-time education than NEET and also more likely to be in full-time education than work or work-based training). Meanwhile, those who have emotional or behavioural problems have a higher risk of being NEET (there is a lower likelihood that they are in full-time education rather than NEET and, additionally, a lower likelihood of being in work compared with NEET). There is no evidence that the presence of literacy or numeracy problems alone influences the destinations of young people, once Year 11 qualifications and gender have been taken into account.

B6.3 Achievement of Aspirations

Among young people who had hoped during Year 11 to continue in education after the end of compulsory schooling, between 80 per cent and 88 per cent had achieved their aim (Table

B6.6). The non-vulnerable group who had aspired to remain in education had the highest rate of actually being in education in Year 12 and the lowest proportion in the NEET group.

Although participation rates were also relatively high among young people with special needs who had hoped to remain in education, those with a disability but no special needs were least likely to have achieved their aim (80 per cent).

Among young people who had not wanted to remain in education when they were in Year 11, almost half of those with both SEN and a disability were actually in full-time education along with a third of those with a disability. In the two groups with no disability, fewer than a quarter were in education, while around half were in work or work-based training (46 per cent of those with special needs SEN only and 51 per cent of those with no vulnerability). A third of each of the three vulnerable groups had ended up in the NEET category compared with just a quarter of the non-vulnerable group.

Table B6.6 Current Economic Activity by Whether Wanted to Remain in Education at Year 11

Year 11 preference	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Education				
Full-time education	85	84	80	88
Work or work-based training	4	8	8	7
NEET	11	8	11	6
Unweighted N	216	1103	511	8854
Not education				
Full-time education	48	20	32	23
Work or work-based training	21	46	34	51
NEET	32	34	35	25
Unweighted N	95	688	127	2567

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B6.4 Reasons for Leaving Education

Young people who were not in education at the time of interview (several months after the end of Year 11) were asked why they left education and were offered a list of possible reasons (Table B6.7). It should be noted that most young people remained in education so that relatively small numbers of vulnerable young people responded to this question.

Young people who had both SEN and a disability were most likely to mention poor exam results as a reason for not remaining in education, while non-vulnerable young people were least likely to do so. This is in keeping with the fact that this doubly vulnerable group had the lowest Year 11 attainment.

Almost one in five (19 per cent) of the 'SEN and disability' group said that they would have faced problems with travelling if they had remained in education, as did 13 per cent of those with a disability but no SEN. It should be borne in mind that 85 per cent of the most severely disabled young people (who were registered disabled) also had a SEN and so fell into the doubly vulnerable category. Just eight per cent of the 'SEN only' group, and seven per cent of those who had neither SEN nor a disability, cited transport problems as a reason for not staying on. In addition, around a quarter of the two groups with a disability said they could not afford to remain in education, compared to fewer than one in five of those with no disability.

Young people with both SEN and a disability were least likely to mention that they wanted to look for a job, followed by those who had a disability but no SEN. These two groups of young people were also least likely to say that they had already found a job. Finally, around one in six young people with a disability, and a similar proportion of those with both a disability and SEN, reported that their parents could not afford for them to remain in education. This is more than twice the number who gave this response in the 'SEN only' and non-vulnerable groups.

Overall, these responses indicate that many young people with a disability believed the cost of remaining in education would be prohibitive. At the same time, they were less likely to have been optimistic that they would find a job. This may help to explain why these young

people were less likely to have found Year 11 decision-making easy than those with no disability.

Table B 6.7 Reasons for not Remaining in Education

	Cell per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Educational obstacles				
Bad exam results	50	40	41	33
Disliked old school	42	42	37	34
Couldn't get a place	17	12	10	9
Problems travelling	19	8	13	7
Couldn't find a course	30	30	30	29
Financial constraints				
Needed to earn money	44	50	41	46
Couldn't find a part-time job	17	25	21	21
Couldn't afford to stay	25	17	23	19
Wanted/had found a job				
Wanted to look for a job	63	85	68	79
Had already found a job	45	53	41	57
Influence of other people				
Friends weren't continuing	22	21	19	19
Parents wanted me to leave	6	3	5	4
Parents couldn't afford it	16	7	17	7
Family responsibilities	6	5	8	6
Minimum unweighted N	85	712	170	2949

Base: All EMA income eligible young people not in education from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B6.5 Willingness to Return to Education

Young people who were not in education at the time of interview were asked if they would seriously consider returning to school, or going to college, if they were paid a weekly amount. Just over half of each of the four groups said they would seriously consider going to school or college if they were paid; this proportion was constant across the four groups (Table B6.8). About a third would have considered it for £40 a week or less (the maximum

amount available in one variant of the EMA pilots). This similarity across groups is surprising given the higher propensity of young people with a disability to cite financial concerns as a reason for leaving school (Table B5.9).

Table B 6.8 If Would Consider Full-time Education for Weekly Payment (non-students only)

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
For £40 per week	35	30	37	33
For more than £40 per week	20	25	18	21
Would not consider it	46	45	46	46
Unweighted N	60	548	122	2225

Base: All EMA income eligible young people not in education from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B7 EMA AWARENESS AND APPLICATIONS IN PILOT AREAS

In the EMA pilot areas, the vast majority of young people in full-time education had heard of the EMA scheme. However, rates of awareness were substantially lower among those with both special needs and a disability; 12 per cent of young people in this group were unaware of EMA, compared with between two and four per cent in the other groups (Table B7.1). Far fewer young people who were not in education had heard of EMA and rates were particularly low among those with special needs. In the two special needs groups almost three-fifths had not heard of EMA, compared with around two-fifths in the disabled only and non-vulnerable groups.

Table B7.1 If Heard of EMA by whether in Full-time Education - Pilot Areas only

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Full-time education				
Heard	88	96	98	97
Not heard	12	4	2	3
Unweighted N	136	654	297	5429
Not in full-time education				
Heard	42	41	62	59
Not heard	58	59	38	41
Unweighted N	52	433	86	1829

Base: All EMA income eligible young people in pilot areas from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Among EMA eligible students in the pilot area who had heard of the scheme, three-quarters had applied for it. Application rates, and award rates did not differ significantly among the four groups (Table B7.2).

Table B7.2 EMA Applications and Outcomes among Full-time Students in the Pilot Areas who had Heard of EMA

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Awarded	76	75	75	74
Waiting	12	10	10	9
Rejected	0	2	3	3
Not applied	12	13	12	15
Unweighted N	121	620	288	5268

Base: All EMA income eligible young people in full-time education in pilot areas from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B7.1 Importance of Education Grants

Young people were also asked about the role of education grants such as EMA in their decision to remain in education. Among the two groups of EMA recipients who had no special needs, around two-fifths reported that receipt of grants had not been an important factor in their decision to remain in education (Table B5.13). This contrasts with just over a quarter of the two groups of special needs EMA recipients. EMA recipients with special needs but no disability were most likely to have said that receipt had been very important in their decision to stay on.

Table B7.3 Importance of Education Grants to Decision to Remain in Education among EMA Recipients

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Not important	29	26	42	41
Quite important	44	38	29	37
Very important	27	36	29	23
Unweighted N	81	429	200	3617

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B8 ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AT AGE 16

B8.1 Characteristics of Young People by Destination at Age 16

The next section reviews the experiences of young people according to their economic status at age 16. Table B8.1 shows the unweighted number of EMA eligible young people in each of the three destinations (full-time education, work or work-based training or NEET) broken down by whether they had special needs and/or a disability.

For young people in full-time education, there are hundreds of cases for each of the four groups. However, among those in work or work-based training, there are just 36 who have both special needs and a disability and 86 with a disability only. In the NEET group, there are 53 young people with both special needs and a disability. These relatively small cell sizes indicate that caution should be exercised when interpreting results.

Table B8.1 Number of EMA Eligible Young People, by Activity at Age 16

	Full-time education	Work/-based training	NEET
SEN and disability	223	36	53
SEN only	1073	436	283
Disability only	466	86	86
No SEN, no disability	8460	1951	1014

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

An earlier section of this report identified that young people with special needs (and to a lesser extent, those with a disability but no special needs) had poorer Year 11 qualifications than young people with no special needs. Table B8.2 reveals the extent to which the Year 11 qualifications of young people with special needs and/or a disability differed from those of young people who were not vulnerable in these ways, broken down by their economic status at age 16.

Among those who remained in full-time education, there was a large difference in the qualification level of students with special needs and those with no vulnerability. While half of non-vulnerable students had five or more GCSE passes at grades A*-C, this was the case for only 14 per cent of those with special needs and a disability and 16 per cent of those with special needs only. Students with a disability but no special needs were closer to non-vulnerable students in this respect; around two-fifths had five or more GCSE passes (or their vocational equivalent) at grade C or above. Three-fifths of students with both special needs and a disability, and a half of those with special needs only, had not achieved any Level 2 qualifications (GCSEs at grade C or above). This contrasts with the disability only group - where a quarter had not reached this threshold - and the non-vulnerable group, where just 17 per cent were low achievers.

Among workers the differences were less pronounced. Among workers with no special needs and no disability, 17 per cent were high achievers (having passed five or more GCSEs at grade C or above). Only a handful of workers with special needs had achieved this level (three per cent of those with both special needs and a disability and the same proportion of those with special needs but no disability). Among workers who were disabled but had no special needs, 14 per cent were Year 11 high achievers. Among workers with special needs but no disability, two-thirds had not attained any Level 2 qualifications. Workers with special needs and a disability also had low attainment rates, with 57 per cent not achieving a GCSE at grade C or above. This contrasts with two-fifths of those with a disability and no special needs, and just under two-fifths of non-vulnerable young people.

Where young people were NEET, a large majority of all four groups had no Level 2 qualifications. The rate was highest among those with special needs but no disability, where almost nine out of ten young people had not passed any GCSEs at grade C or above.

Overall, the difference in Year 11 attainment associated with having special needs and/or a disability was greatest among full-time students and least among those who were NEET.

Table B8.2 Year 11 Qualifications by Destination

Destination	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Full-time education				
5+ A*-C	14	16	42	51
1-4 A*-C	25	33	32	32
Less	61	51	27	17
Unweighted N	223	1073	466	8460
Work/based training				
5+ A*-C	3	3	14	17
1-4 A*-C	40	29	46	41
Less	57	68	40	43
Unweighted N	36	436	86	1951
NEET				
5+ A*-C	8	1	6	8
1-4 A*-C	15	11	23	23
Less	77	88	71	69
Unweighted N	53	282	86	1012

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B8.2 Full-time Education at Age 16

B8.2.1 Year 12 institution

There is an association between having special needs and/or a disability and the type of institution the young person attended at Year 12 (Table B8.3). Students in the three vulnerable groups were less likely to have attended the sixth form of a school than those with no vulnerability. Students with special needs (with or without a disability) were also less likely to have attended a sixth form college than those with no special needs (the non-vulnerable and disability only groups). The three vulnerable groups of Year 12 students were all more likely to have been enrolled at a college of further education than students with no vulnerability. Between 52 per cent and 64 per cent of the three vulnerable groups went to an

FE college compared with just 44 per cent of students with no special needs and no vulnerability.

To a large extent, these differences reflect disparities in Year 11 educational attainment among the four groups. Among all Year 12 students, high achievers (with five or more GCSEs at A*-C) were disproportionately likely to attend either a school or a sixth form college and were unlikely to attend a college of further education (analysis not shown). However, special provision for students with a statement of special needs is only guaranteed within further education institutions funded by local education authorities (i.e. schools). Consequently, a transition into a sixth form college or further education college may not be in the best interests of young people with a statement of special needs.

Among young people with special needs and a disability one in ten students attended an institution categorised as 'other'. This contrasts with between two and three per cent of the other three groups. This may indicate that they attended a specialist institution tailored to support students with a significant disability.

Vulnerable Year 12 students were less likely to have remained in their Year 11 institution than their counterparts in the non-vulnerable group. Between 14 per cent and 15 per cent of young people with special needs and/or a disability were in the same institution Year 11 and year 12 compared with one in five of those with neither of these vulnerabilities. This largely reflects the positive association between high Year 11 achievement and being educated in a school at Year 12 (and the relatively low levels of attainment among the three vulnerable groups).

Table B8.3 Year 12 Institution

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Year 12 institution				
School	17	16	14	22
Sixth form college	12	17	32	32
Further education college	61	64	52	44
Other	10	3	2	2
Same as Year 11				
Yes	14	15	14	20
No	86	85	86	80
Unweighted N	223	1073	465	8455

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

Section B7 revealed that, in the pilot areas, Year 12 students with both a disability and special needs were less likely to have heard of EMA than their counterparts in the other three groups (Table B7.1). Tables in this current section may offer some insight into this association.

Table B8.3 shows that, among all EMA eligible students, those who had both a disability and special needs were disproportionately likely to have attended a Year 12 institution coded as ‘other’ (i.e. not the sixth form of a school, or a sixth form college or a further education college). Additional analysis (presented in Table B8.4) reveals an association (among full-time students in the pilot areas) between attending a Year 12 institution coded ‘other’ and a lack of knowledge of EMA. In the ‘mainstream’ Year 12 institutions, only a tiny minority of full-time students in the pilot areas had not heard of EMA; of those attending an institution categorised as ‘other’ this rose dramatically to 30 per cent.¹¹

¹¹ For cohort 1 the figure was 28 per cent; for Cohort 2 it was 33 per cent.

Table B8.4 If Heard of EMA by Year 12 Institution – Pilot areas only

	Column per cent			
	School	Sixth form college	FE college	Other
Yes	96	97	97	70
No	4	3	3	30
Unweighted N	1314	2104	2992	105

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16 and in full-time education.

B8.2.2 Travel to school or college

Under a quarter of students who had both special needs and a disability walked or cycled to school or college (Table B8.5). This compares with around a third of those in each of the other three groups. They were correspondingly more likely to use a car (22 per cent compared with between ten and 12 per cent). Similar proportions of each of the four groups of students relied upon public transport.

Among Year 12 students, only 15 per cent of those with both special needs and a disability lived within two miles of their school or college. Among students with special needs only, the figure was slightly higher at 22 per cent. This may reflect differences in the types of institutions the four groups attended with further education colleges and specialist institutions having larger catchment areas than schools and sixth form colleges. A similar proportion of each of the four groups lived five or more miles from their school or college.

Students with both special needs and a disability were least likely to be able to reach their educational institution within half an hour. A similar proportion of the four groups spent an hour or more travelling.

Table B8.5 Getting to School or College at Age 16

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Main mode of travel				
Walk/bicycle	22	32	35	35
Car/moped	22	12	10	11
Public transport	57	57	55	54
Distance				
Under 2 miles	15	22	28	28
2-4 miles	51	40	37	38
5+ miles	34	38	35	34
Travel time				
Under 30 minutes	53	57	64	61
30–59 minutes	39	31	25	30
1+ hour	8	12	12	9
Minimum unweighted N	209	1057	459	8398

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16 and 2 in full-time education.

B8.2.3 Combining employment and study

Table B8.6 outlines the proportion of full-time students who also had part-time jobs.

Students who had both special needs and a disability were unlikely to combine full-time studying and employment with just one in six taking this course of action. This contrasts with a third of those with special needs only. Students with a disability but no special needs had employment rates that were similar to those of the non-vulnerable group (around two-fifths of both groups had a part-time job).

Table B8.6 Part-time Work among Full-time Students at Age 16

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Part-time work				
Yes	16	33	43	41
No	84	67	57	59
Unweighted N	223	1073	466	8460

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16 and in full-time education.

B8.2.4 Type of course studied

Year 12 students were asked to identify the type of qualification associated with the course(s) they were on (Table B8.7). The list presented to them included GCSEs, AS, A levels, GNVQs and NVQs as well as the response options ‘other work-related’, ‘other not mentioned’ and ‘none’. Students with no vulnerability were most likely to be taking a course than would lead to an academic qualification (almost two-thirds), followed by those with a disability only (about a half). This contrasts with just over a third of those with special needs only and just over a quarter of those with both special needs and a disability.

A small minority of Year 12 students said the course they were following led to an atypical qualification (i.e. ‘other work-related’ or ‘other’). This response was most common among young people with special needs. Nineteen per cent of those with both special needs and a disability said the course they were on led to an unspecified qualification along with 13 per cent of those with special needs only. In addition, young people with both special needs and a disability were most likely to say that their Year 12 course would not lead to any qualification (14 per cent compared with between four and six per cent for the other three groups).

Table B8.7 Type of Course Studied by Full-time Students at Age 16

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Academic	27	36	52	64
GNVQ or NVQ only	44	50	35	28
Other only	15	8	6	4
None	14	6	6	4
Unweighted N	222	1069	464	8454

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16 and in full-time education.

Given the differences in Year 11 attainment, it is to be expected that the four groups differed in the type of course they studied. The next table presents the results of a multivariate analysis that models the type of course followed at Year 12. As in the previous multinomial models, this controls for Year 11 attainment and gender. Three possible types of course are modelled, 'standard academic' (leading to GCSEs, AS levels or A levels), 'standard vocational' (leading to GNVQs or NVQs) and 'non-standard' (leading to 'other work', 'other non-work' or no qualifications). Two combinations of these are investigated, 'standard vocational' compared with 'standard academic' and 'non-standard' compared with 'standard academic'.

For the first pair of destinations – standard vocational and standard academic - each of the three vulnerable groups were more likely to follow a vocational rather than academic course (with ORs ranging from 1.33 to 1.50) compared with students who had neither special needs nor a disability. For the second set of destinations – non-standard and standard academic - the three vulnerable groups had an increased likelihood of following a non-standard course compared with students who had neither special needs nor a disability. The effect is particularly strong for students with both special needs and a disability (OR 3.70).

Overall, there is strong evidence that, controlling for Year 11 attainment and gender, young people with special needs and or a disability were less likely to follow an academic route through further education than those with neither of these vulnerabilities. They were also

more likely to follow courses that lead to qualifications that are not widely recognised, or that result in no qualifications at all.

Table B8.8 Odds Ratios for Following a Standard Vocational, Non-standard or Standard Academic Course at Age 16

	Vocational and academic		Non-stand/none and academic	
	OR	Sig	OR	Sig
SEN and disability	1.50	*	3.70	***
SEN only	1.44	***	1.78	***
Disability only	1.33	*	1.48	**
No SEN, no disability	1.00		1.00	
Male	0.90	*	0.75	***
Female	1.00		1.00	
No A*-C at Year 11	23.72	***	7.74	***
1-4 A*-C at Year 11	8.70	***	3.16	***
5+ A*-C at Year 11	1.00		1.00	
Intercept (B)	-2.37	***	-2.36	***

Base: All EMA income eligible young people in full-time education from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B8.3 Work or Work-based Training at Age 16

B8.3.1 Job characteristics

A third of workers with both special needs and a disability worked part-time (i.e. under 31 hours a week) compared with 28 per cent of those with a disability only, 21 per cent of those with special needs only and 24 per cent of workers with neither special needs nor a disability (Table B8.9). Workers with both special needs and a disability were also the group most likely to work more than 40 hours a week (29 per cent compared with between 16 per cent and 22 per cent of the other three groups).

Workers with both special needs and a disability were less likely to have a permanent job than the other groups; they were also less likely to have a job that included training towards a recognised qualification (such as a modern apprenticeship or a national traineeship). However, their hourly take home pay did not fall below that of the other three groups.

Table B8.9 Job Characteristics of Young People in Work or Work-based Training at Age 16

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Work hours per week				
1-30	34	21	28	24
31-40	37	58	50	61
41+	29	21	22	16
Permanent				
Yes	37	49	54	53
No	63	51	46	47
Recognised training				
Yes	37	41	40	46
No	63	59	60	54
Take home pay per hour				
Up to £1.50	24	25	29	23
£1.51-£2.50	27	31	22	31
More than £2.50	49	44	48	46
Minimum unweighted N	34	419	83	1883

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16 whose main activity was work or work-based training.

B8.3.2 Getting to work

Workers with both special needs and a disability were less likely to walk or cycle to their place of work than workers in the other three groups (Table B8.10). Just under a quarter of those with both a disability and special needs got to work this way compared with about a third of those in the other groups. Compared with workers with just special needs, and workers with just a disability, those with both vulnerabilities were more likely to use public

transport. The four groups were very similar in the distance between home and work and the time it took to get to work.

Table B8.10 Getting to Work at Age 16

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Main mode of travel				
Walk/bicycle	23	34	33	30
Car/moped	34	31	33	29
Public transport	43	35	34	41
Distance				
Under 2 miles	29	29	29	27
2-4 miles	34	34	28	39
5+ miles	37	37	43	35
Travel time				
Under 30 minutes	71	64	69	68
30–59 minutes	20	28	27	25
1+ hour	9	7	4	7
Minimum unweighted N	35	421	85	1911

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16 whose main activity was work or work-based training.

B8.3.3 Finding work

Workers were asked how they found out about the job they were currently in. Table B8.11 outlines the main source. There is little differences in the source of the four groups; however, workers who had both special needs and a disability were the group least likely to have found the job through a newspaper. This may reflect that they were more likely to have someone to prepare the ground before approaching a potential employer. However, it should be remembered that this group was very small (only 35 workers had both special needs and a disability).

Table B8.11 How Found Job or Training

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Job centre/careers office	35	29	32	32
Newspaper	3	11	8	11
Personal contact	50	47	50	44
Other	12	13	10	13
Unweighted N	36	432	85	1928

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16 whose main activity was work or work-based training.

B8.4 Being NEET at Age 16

Among the NEET group, 62 per cent of those with both special needs and a disability and 66 per cent of those with a disability only considered themselves to be unemployed and looking for work (Table B8.12). This contrasts with the other two groups where around three quarters gave this response. Similar proportions of the four groups said that they were engaged in family care. Thirteen per cent of NEET young people with both special needs and a disability classified themselves as disabled or long-term ill, along with five per cent of those with a disability only. A further eight per cent of NEET young people with special needs and a disability, and nine per cent of those with a disability only, said they had a short term illness. This contrasts with just one per cent of those in the other two groups.

Table B8.12 Economic Activity among the NEET Group at Age 16

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Unemployed, looking for work	62	77	66	78
Family care	8	5	6	9
Taking a break	8	17	14	12
Disabled or ill	13	0	5	0
Short term sick	8	1	9	1
Unweighted N	46	259	81	939

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16 whose main activity was not full-time education or work or work-based training.

B9 ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AT AGE 17 AND 18

So far, this part of the report has considered the lives of EMA eligible young people up to the age of 16. The next section draws upon the longitudinal design of the study to review their experiences in the two years following the end of compulsory education. Not all of the young people interviewed at the age of 16 remained in the survey at the time of the third interview, two years later. New weights were constructed to compensate for this attrition.

Table B9.1 outlines attrition rates among young people, broken down by whether they had special needs and/or a disability. Overall, almost three-fifths of non-vulnerable young people remained in the study at the age of 18 (59 per cent) compared with between 53 per cent and 55 per cent of those who had special needs and/or a disability.

Table B9.1 EMA Eligible Young People Interviewed at Age 18

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Interviewed	53	53	55	59
Not interviewed	47	47	45	41
Unweighted N	312	1792	638	11425

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2 interviewed at age 16.

B9.1 Economic Activity at Age 17

At the age of 17, young people with special needs but no disability were less likely to be in full-time education than the other three groups (45 per cent compared with between 57 per cent and 64 per cent) and were more likely to be in work or work-based training (38 per cent compared with between 21 per cent and 26 per cent). Young people with neither special needs nor a disability had the lowest rates of being NEET at the age of 17 (ten per cent compared with between 17 per cent and 19 per cent).

Table B9.2 Economic Activity at Age 17

Year 11 attainment	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Full-time education	59	45	57	64
Work/based training	21	38	26	26
NEET	19	17	17	8
Unweighted N	164	954	347	6692

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2, interviewed at age 18.

Table B9.3 reviews changes in economic activity between the ages of 16 and 17. Among young people in work or work-based training at age 16, there were just 16 who had both special needs and a disability and 35 who had a disability only. Among those who were NEET, only 20 had special needs and a disability while 28 had a disability only. In the light of these small group sizes, the destinations of these four sets of young people are not discussed.

Among young people who had been in full-time education at the age of 16, those with neither special needs nor a disability were most likely to have remained in education at the age of 17 (82 per cent); however, retention among those with both special needs and a disability was also high (80 per cent). Young people in this doubly vulnerable group were least likely to have moved from education into work or work-based training (nine per cent compared with between 13 per cent and 17 per cent) but were most likely to have moved from education to NEET (11 per cent compared with between five and eight per cent).

Among young people who had been in work or work-based training at the age of 16, those who had special needs only were more likely to have remained in this situation at the age of 17 than the non-vulnerable group (86 per cent compared with 82 per cent). They were correspondingly somewhat less likely to have rejoined full-time education (four per cent compared with seven per cent of the non-vulnerable group).

Where young people had been NEET at the age of 16, those with special needs only were more likely to have remained in this situation at the age of 17 than their non-vulnerable

counterparts (54 per cent and 48 per cent respectively). They were also considerably less likely to have returned to full-time education (five per cent and 20 per cent respectively).

Table B9.3 Economic Activity at Age 17 by Economic Activity at Age 16

Activity at Age 16	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Full-time Education				
Full-time education	80	75	75	82
Work/based training	9	17	18	13
NEET	11	8	7	5
Unweighted N	128	632	284	5413
Work/-based training				
Full-time education	5	4	3	7
Work/based training	79	86	86	82
NEET	16	10	11	11
Unweighted N	16	220	35	934
NEET				
Full-time education	3	5	6	20
Work/based training	41	40	25	32
NEET	57	54	69	48
Unweighted N	20	102	28	345

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2, interviewed at age 18.

Earlier in this part of the report, Table B6.4 indicated that the presence of a disability had an impact on destinations at the age of 16 (controlling for Year 11 qualifications and gender). Young people with a disability (both with and without special needs) were found to be under-represented in the work sphere at the age of 16 and were correspondingly over-represented in full-time education and NEET. In addition, Table B8.2 revealed that, within each economic activity at the age of 16, young people with special needs and/or a disability differed from the non-vulnerable group with regards to their Year 11 attainment. With these associations in mind, a multinomial analysis of economic activity at age 17 was performed, controlling for economic activity at age 16, Year 11 attainment and gender. This set out to explore whether

the presence of special needs and/or a disability appeared to have an impact upon the transitions of young people between the ages of 16 and 17.

The results of this analysis did not support the hypothesis that the presence of special needs and/or a disability influenced the transitions of young people at this point in their lives; consequently, the model is not reproduced in this report. The only statistically significant association between the four special needs/disability groups and economic activity at the age of 17 was for the group of young people who had a disability but no special needs. Compared with the (non-vulnerable) reference group this group had a lower likelihood of being in full-time education rather than NEET at the age of 17. Predictably, economic activity at the age of 16, Year 11 attainment, and gender were all strongly associated with the young people's destinations at the age of 17.

B9.2 Economic Activity at Age 18

The next table (Table B9.4) presents the economic activity of the four groups of young people at the age of 18. Among non-vulnerable 18 year olds, about two-fifths (41 per cent) were in full-time education (just under a quarter were beginning a higher education course while 17 per cent were in further education). Young people with a disability but no special needs had the same rate of being in full-time education as the non-vulnerable group, but fewer of them were in higher education (15 per cent). Among 18 year olds with special needs and a disability, over a third were in full-time education (37 per cent); however, just seven per cent were beginning a higher education course. Young people with special needs but no disability were least likely to be in full-time education at the age of 18; seven per cent were in higher education while 20 per cent were in some other educational institution.

At the age of 18, young people with special needs but no disability had a marginally higher rate of being in work or work-based training than their counterparts in the non-vulnerable group (46 per cent compared with 44 per cent). Young people with both special needs and a disability were least likely to be in work or work-based training at this age (26 per cent). This doubly vulnerable group had the highest rate of being NEET at this point in their lives (37 per cent). Those with special needs only, and those with a disability only, were also more likely to be NEET than young people with no special needs and no disability (28 per cent and 21 per cent respectively compared with 15 per cent).

Table B9.4 Economic Activity at Age 18

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Full-time education	37	27	41	41
Higher	(7)	(7)	(15)	(24)
Other	(31)	(20)	(26)	(17)
Work/-based training	26	46	39	44
NEET	37	28	21	15
Unweighted N	163	953	345	6672

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2, interviewed at age 18.

Table B9.5 presents this information broken down by economic activity at the age of 17. Among young people who were in work or work-based training at the age of 17, only 33 had special needs and a disability. Among those who were NEET at the age of 17, 22 had special needs and a disability while 35 had a disability only. The destinations of these sets of young people at the age of 18 are not discussed.

Of the young people who were in full-time education at the age of 17 (Year 12), three of the four groups had similar rates of being in full-time education at the age of 18 (between 61 per cent and 62 per cent); those who had a disability but no special needs were less likely to have remained in education (54 per cent). However, the proportions of the four groups who went on to higher education at the age of 18 differed dramatically. Among the non-vulnerable group who had been in full-time education at the age of 17, more than a third (37 per cent) were at university (or other higher education institution) at the age of 18. For those who had a disability but no special needs, this fell to just under a quarter (23 per cent), while rates for young people with special needs only, and special needs with a disability were even lower (15 per cent and 12 per cent respectively). Where young people had been full-time students at the age of 17, a low proportion of those with both special needs and a disability were engaged in work or work-based training at the age of 18 (11 per cent compared with between 27 per cent and 34 per cent of the other three groups). More than a quarter of this doubly

vulnerable group had become NEET (28 per cent compared with between nine and 12 per cent for the other three groups).

Where young people had been in work or work-based training at the age of 17, more than four-fifths of the non-vulnerable group (82 per cent) remained in this status a year later compared with around two-thirds of those in the special needs only and disability only groups (69 per cent and 66 per cent respectively).

Among young people who had been NEET at the age of 17, those with special needs only were more likely to have remained NEET at the age of 18 than their counterparts in the non-vulnerable group (57 per cent compared with 47 per cent). The special needs only group were more likely to have made the transition into work or work-based training than those with neither special needs nor a disability (38 per cent compared with 33 per cent) but were less likely to have returned to full-time education (six per cent compared with 21 per cent).

Table B9.5 Economic Activity at Age 18 by Economic Activity at Age 17

Activity at Age 17	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Full-time Education	61	54	62	61
Higher	(12)	(15)	(23)	(37)
Other	(50)	(40)	(38)	(25)
Work/based training	11	34	27	30
NEET	28	12	11	9
Unweighted N	108	501	226	4667
Work/-based training				
Full-time education	5	4	12	4
Work/based training	66	69	72	82
NEET	30	27	16	14
Unweighted N	33	337	84	1573
NEET				
Full-time education	0	4	14	6
Work/based training	28	26	23	41
NEET	72	70	63	53
Unweighted N	22	115	35	432

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2, interviewed at age 18.

Table B9.6 presents the results of a multinomial regression modelling the impact of special needs and/or a disability on economic activity at the age of 18, controlling for gender, Year 11 qualifications and economic activity at age 17. The first and third columns take NEET as the comparator and consider whether the presence of special needs and/or a disability is associated with a change in the relative risk of being in full-time education compared with NEET and ii) work or work-based training compared with NEET. The middle column designates work or work-based training as the comparator and considers whether the risk of being in full-time education, as opposed to this destination, is increased where young people have special needs and/or a disability.

The odds ratios for the full-time education and NEET pair reveal that the two groups with special needs are less likely to be in full-time education, and more likely to be NEET, at the age of 18 than their counterparts in the non-vulnerable group. For the group with special needs and a disability, the likelihood of being in full-time education rather than NEET is 0.59; for those with special needs but no disability the likelihood is 0.73. The group with a disability but no special needs does not differ significantly from the (non-vulnerable) reference group.

For the full-time education and work/work-based training pair of destinations, there is an association between having a disability and being in full-time education rather than work or work-based training. Compared with young people with no special needs and no disability, those with both special needs and a disability are almost twice as likely to be in full-time education (OR 1.90) compared with work or work-based training. Those with a disability but no special needs have an odds ratio of 1.45 (i.e. an increase of 45 per cent compared with the non-vulnerable group). Young people with special needs but no disability do not differ significantly from those with neither vulnerability.

The final comparison (work/work-based training and NEET) reveals that having special needs was associated with a decreased likelihood of being in work or work-based training rather than NEET. For the doubly vulnerable group (with both special needs and a disability) the chances of being in work or work-based training rather than NEET were less than a third of those for the non-vulnerable group (OR of 0.31). For young people with special needs but no disability, the likelihood of being in work or work-based training rather than NEET was around three-quarters of that for the non-vulnerable group (OR of 0.73). The odds ratio associated with the disability only group was very similar to that of the special needs only group (0.76); however this was non-significant ($P=0.10$) reflecting that the disability only group had many fewer cases than the special needs only group (345 compared with 953).

Overall, this analysis indicates that, controlling for gender, Year 11 qualifications and economic activity at the age of 17, young people with special needs stood an increased risk of being NEET at the age of 18. This is reflected in the education and NEET comparison as well as in the work and NEET comparison.

Table B9.6 Odds Ratios for being in Full-time Education, Work/-based training or NEET at age 18 (controlling for gender, Year 11 qualifications and economic activity at age 17)

	FT ed and NEET		FT ed and W/bt		W/bt and NEET	
	OR	Sig	OR	Sig	OR	Sig
SEN and disability	0.59	**	1.90	**	0.31	***
SEN only	0.73	**	1.00	Ns	0.73	***
Disability only	1.11	Ns	1.45	*	0.76	Ns
No SEN, no disability	1.00		1.00		1.00	
Male	1.18	*	1.26	***	1.18	*
Female	1.00		1.00		1.00	
No A*-C at Year 11	0.21	***	0.65	***	0.21	***
1-4 A*-C at Year 11	0.49	***	0.64	***	0.49	***
5+ A*-C at Year 11	1.00		1.00		1.00	
FT ed at age 17	33.85	***	11.77	***	2.88	***
W/wbt at age 17	2.23	***	0.35	***	6.30	***
NEET at age 17	1.00		1.00		1.00	
Intercept	-1.10	***	-1.66	***	0.56	***

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2, interviewed at age 18.

The next table in this section takes a closer look at those young people who were not in education, employment or training at the age of 18. However, it must be borne in mind that only 44 young people had both special needs and a disability.

Among those young people who were NEET at the age of 18, between 51 per cent and 65 per cent of the four groups reported that they were looking for work. Almost a third of those with special needs and a disability reported their current economic activity as long-term disabled, as did 16 per cent of those who had a disability but no special needs. Among those with special needs only, and those with no vulnerability, two per cent of those who were NEET gave their economic activity as long-term disabled. An additional six per cent of NEET 18 year olds with both special needs and a disability gave their current economic

activity as short-term sick along with four per cent of those with a disability but no special needs; this contrasts with no more than one per cent of the other three groups. Just four per cent of NEET young people with both special needs and a disability said they were engaged in family care compared with between 16 per cent and 20 per cent of the other three groups. As may be expected, almost all the young people who gave this response were female (analysis not shown). Among young women who were NEET at the age of 18, 56 per cent of those with special needs only gave their current activity as family care, as did 39 per cent of the non-vulnerable group and 28 per cent of those with a disability but no special needs. By contrast, just two young women with both a disability and special needs gave their current economic activity as ‘family care’.

Table B9.7 Economic Activity of Young People who were NEET at Age 18

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Looking for work	55	65	51	60
Long-term disability	31	2	16	2
Short-term illness	6	0	4	1
Family care	4	19	16	20
Other	4	14	12	16
Unweighted N	44	192	64	734

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2, interviewed in all years to 2002.

B10 POST-16 QUALIFICATIONS ATTAINMENT

B10.1 Improvements in Year 11 Attainment by Age 18

This section includes an analysis of post-Year 11 qualifications attained. Although the EMA study collected information about attainment from the young people themselves, the decision was made to use qualifications data returned by awarding bodies and utilised for official statistics. In 2002, the EMA interview schedules requested permission to access this information. For the first cohort, this was the fourth interview conducted and they were aged 20 (or 21); for the second cohort this was the third interview and they were aged 19 (or 20). Some of the young people in the first cohort had dropped out of the study between the third and fourth interviews. These young people were included in the analysis of economic activity at the age of 18 (because this information was obtained from the third interview) but information on any post-Year 11 qualifications attained by this age is missing. This problem does not affect the second cohort; however, some cases were lost from both cohorts due to problems matching qualifications to individuals. As a result, 38 per cent of cases are missing qualifications data from the first cohort and 13 per cent are missing data from the second cohort.

Table B10.1 identifies the proportions of the four groups that had valid data on post- Year 11 qualification attainment. Information was most likely to be missing for young people with both special needs and a disability (35 per cent) followed by those with special needs only (32 per cent). In part, this reflects that young people with special needs were more likely to have taken vocational qualifications than those with no special needs and it proved to be more difficult to match vocational qualifications than academic ones.

Table B10.1 Qualifications Data among EMA Eligible Young People Interviewed at Age 18

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
Data valid	65	68	72	75
Data missing	35	32	28	25
Unweighted N	164	956	348	6708

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2, interviewed at age 18.

The next table (Table B10.2) describes the highest qualification attained in the two years following the end of Year 11. For young people who remained in education this reflects attainment by the end of academic Year 13. However, many young people will have attained vocational or occupational qualifications without remaining in full-time education and these achievements are also included. Level 1 indicates a GCSE pass at grade D-G, or the vocational or occupational equivalent. Level 2 equates to a GCSE pass at grade A*-C, or the vocational or occupational equivalent. Level 3 refers to an AS or A Level or the vocational or occupational equivalent.

The majority of 18 year olds with special needs had not gained any new qualifications in the two years since they left school (64 per cent of those with special needs and a disability and 62 per cent of those with special needs only). This contrasts with just under half of young people with a disability only (47 per cent) and fewer than two-fifths of those with neither special needs nor a disability. Between five per cent and ten per cent of the four groups gained a new Level 1 and between 13 per cent and 16 per cent gained a Level 2. In the two special needs groups, only around one in seven young people attained an AS or A Level (or equivalent) compared with almost twice as many of those with a disability and no special needs (29 per cent) and almost three times as many of the non-vulnerable group (43 per cent).

Table B10.2 Post-Year 11 Qualification Level Attained by Age 18

	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
No new qualification	64	62	47	39
Level 1	6	7	10	5
Level 2	15	16	14	13
Level 3	15	15	29	43
Unweighted N	106	648	249	5036

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2, with valid qualifications data at age 18.

Table B10.3 outlines the proportions of the four groups who improved upon their Year 11 attainment level. Low achievers (who did not achieve any GCSEs at grades A*-C, or their vocational or occupational equivalents) are considered to have improved upon their Year 11 qualifications if they subsequently attained one or more GCSE at grade C or above (or a vocational or occupational equivalent). For Year 11 moderate achievers (who gained between one and four GCSEs at grades A*-C) and high achievers (who passed five or more GCSEs at grades A*-C) an improvement reflects passing one or more Level 3 qualification (i.e. an AS or A Level an advanced GNVQ or a Level 3 NVQ). In addition, for moderate achievers the table identifies those who did not attain a Level 3 qualification, but who did pass additional Level 2 qualifications. Only a small number of young people with special needs and a disability fell into the moderate and high attainment categories. Consequently these results are not discussed.

Among Year 11 low achievers, subsequent achievement was highest among the non-vulnerable group (22 per cent) and lowest among those with both special needs and a disability (five per cent).

Among moderate achievers at Year 11, fairly similar proportions of the three groups under consideration had not improved upon their Year 11 qualifications two years later (between 54 per cent and 59 per cent). However, non-vulnerable young people were more likely to have attained a Level 3 qualification than their counterparts with special needs only or a disability

only. Correspondingly, the two vulnerable groups (disability only and special needs only) were more likely to have additional Level 2 qualifications than the non-vulnerable group.

Among Year 11 high achievers, subsequent attainment was somewhat lower among those with a disability only than among those with special needs only or with no vulnerability.

Table B10.3 Qualification Level Change by Age 18 by Special Needs and Year 11 Qualifications

Year 11 attainment	Column per cent			
	SEN and disability	SEN only	Disability only	No SEN, no disability
None at A*-C				
No Level 2	95	86	89	78
Level 2 or 3	5	14	11	22
Unweighted N	50	292	54	771
1-4 at A*-C				
No new Level 2	47	59	54	55
New level 2 only	35	29	30	23
Level 3	19	12	16	22
Unweighted N	31	234	77	1491
5+ at A*-C				
No Level 3	38	25	30	23
Level 3	63	75	70	77
Unweighted N	25	122	118	2774

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2, with valid qualifications data at age 18.

A logistic regression analysis was conducted which modelled improvements in qualification level in the two years following the end of compulsory education and the results are displayed in Table B10.4. For young people with one or more Level 2 at Year 11, a Level 3 qualification is considered to be an improvement but any additional Level 2 qualification is not. For those who did not attain any Level 2 qualifications by the end of Year 11, any Level 2 or 3 qualification is considered to be an improvement.

Table B10.4 shows that the three vulnerable groups were much less likely to have improved upon their Year 11 qualifications in the two years following the end of compulsory education than young people with neither vulnerability. For young people with special needs only, and young people with a disability only, the likelihood of attaining better qualifications was around three-fifths of that for the non-vulnerable group. For those with both special needs and a disability, the likelihood of improving on Year 11 qualifications was around two-fifths of that for the non-vulnerable group.

Table B10.4 Odds Ratios for improving on Year 11 Qualification Level by Age 18

	OR	Sig
SEN and disability	0.42	***
SEN only	0.61	***
Disability only	0.61	**
No SEN, no disability	1.00	
Male	1.00	Ns
Female	1.00	
No A*-C at Year 11	0.08	***
1-4 A*-C at Year 11	0.08	***
5+ A*-C at Year 11	1.00	

Base: All EMA income eligible young people from Cohorts 1 and 2, with valid qualifications data at age 18.

B11 CONCLUSION

Part B of this report has explored the school experiences and post-Year 11 transitions of young people who had special needs and/or a disability. It highlights that having special needs was associated with household socio-economic disadvantage; these young people with special needs were likely to have parents with few qualifications and more likely to have parents who were unemployed or in low status jobs, than their counterparts in the non-vulnerable group. This association was most marked where young people had both a disability and special needs.

The three vulnerable groups had an increased risk of negative school experiences. Compared with non-vulnerable young people, they were more likely to have been bullied and accused of bullying and to have played truant regularly. Young people with special needs (with or without a disability) also had high rates of exclusion from school, both temporary and permanent. These features of their school life may have contributed to their low levels of achievement at the end of Year 11. However, the majority of young people who ended compulsory education without achieving any qualifications were not viewed as having special needs. Among young people who left Year 11 with no qualifications, half of all young men and three-quarters of all young women were not defined as having special needs.

While it is clear that special needs and disability are linked to socio-economic disadvantage, there is also evidence that an attribution of special needs, by parents and education professionals, reflects factors other than socio-economic disadvantage and academic achievement. Controlling for Year 11 achievement, there was no significant association between having a statement of SEN and parental education or socio-economic group. However, strong associations between special needs and ethnicity and gender remained.

Among Year 11 low and moderate achievers, young people with special needs only were least likely to have hoped to remain in education following the end of compulsory education while the two disabled groups were most likely to have aspired to this. In addition, among those young people who had not intended to remain in education after Year 11, the two disabled groups were much more likely to subsequently be in education than young people with no disability and those with special needs only. This may indicate that many young people with a disability are pushed into further education by their limited opportunities within

the youth labour market. This may reflect negatively on their attachment to education and commitment to their studies.

The multivariate model of destinations at age 16 revealed that having a disability (with or without special needs) is associated with a decreased likelihood of being in work or work-based training in the months following the end of compulsory education (compared with the non-vulnerable group). However, destinations at the age of 16 appear to be influenced by the form of special needs. Special needs classified as medical or health problems increased the likelihood that the young person would remain in full-time education while emotional or behavioural problems increased the likelihood that the young person would be NEET.

In the pilot areas, among young people in full-time education at the age of 16, more than one in ten of those with both special needs and a disability had not heard of EMA, compared with between two and four per cent of the other three groups. Many of these doubly disadvantaged young people attended Year 12 institutions classified as ‘other’ (i.e. not a school sixth form, sixth form college, or college of further education) and attendance at these institutions was associated with a low likelihood of having heard of EMA. It may be that some of these specialist institutions have not been fully briefed on the EMA scheme.

Among EMA recipients, the two special needs groups were most likely to say that receipt of educational awards had been quite or very important in their decision to remain in education. Among young people in the pilot areas who were not in full-time education at the age of 16, awareness of the EMA scheme was lowest among the two special needs groups.

The longitudinal section of this part of the report outlined the trajectories and achievements of young people up to the age of 18. Multinomial regressions explored changes in economic status between the ages of 16 and 17 and 17 and 18. For the first transition (age 16 to 17), the presence of special needs and/or a disability was not shown to play a part (controlling for Year 11 qualification and gender). However, between the ages of 17 and 18, the presence of special needs (both with and without a disability) was associated with an increased risk of being NEET (this was evident for both the education and NEET contrast and the work and NEET contrast). In addition, the presence of a disability (both with and without special needs) increased the likelihood that the young person was in full-time education as opposed to work.

By the age of 18, young people with special needs and/or a disability were less likely to have improved upon their Year 11 qualifications than their counterparts with neither vulnerability (controlling for Year 11 attainment and gender). This is despite the fact that the presence of a disability (both with and without special needs) was associated with an increased likelihood of remaining in full-time education at the age of 16. This apparent under-achievement may be linked to the type of course they embarked upon following the end of compulsory education. The measure of improvement utilised in this report identified where the young person had attained a recognised qualification, such as an A Level or vocational equivalent (or for Year 11 low achievers, a GCSE or vocational equivalent). A substantial minority of 16-year old students with both special needs and a disability followed courses that led to a non-standard qualification or no qualification at all. Pursuing non-mainstream courses was also more common among young people with special needs only and a disability only compared with young people in the non-vulnerable group.

The continued under-achievement of young people with special needs and/or a disability is a social policy concern. A minority of disabled 16 year olds remained in education despite their Year 11 preference for getting a job. This may reflect a lack of enthusiasm for education and a belief that they could not succeed in the youth labour market. Other vulnerable young people appear to have embarked upon qualifications which may be of limited value in the labour market. In some cases, non-standard courses may have been devised to cater for the needs of young people with significant handicaps; however, it is possible that others embarked on non-mainstream courses due to insufficient confidence or guidance. Vulnerable young people who enrolled in specialist institutions were most likely to have followed a non-standard course at the age of 16. In the pilot areas, a large minority of EMA eligible students in these institutions had never heard of EMA.

REFERENCES

Allen, T., Dobson, B., Graham, J., Hardman, J., Maguire, S., Middleton, S. and Woodfield, K. (2003) Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots for Vulnerable Young People and Childcare Pilots: Implementation and Reported Impacts in the First Year. Department for Education and Skills. Research Report 396.

Berthould, R. (2001), *Teenage Births to Ethnic Minority Women*, Population Trends, Summer, pp.12-17.

Department for Work and Pensions (1999), Opportunities for All – Tackling poverty and social exclusion, The Stationary Office.

Hobcraft, J. (1998), Intergenerational and Life-course Transmission of Social Exclusion: Influences of childhood poverty, family disruption and contact with police, Population Trends, CASE paper 15, LSE.

Hosie, A. (2003) 'Briefing paper: Re-engagement and re-integration of pregnant young women and young mothers of school age'. Newcastle: University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Social Exclusion Unit (1999), Teenage Pregnancy, The Stationary Office.

ANNEX A

ANNEX A – PUBLISHED REPORTS OF THE EDUCATION MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE PILOTS EVALUATION

Allen, T., Dobson, B., Hardman, J., Maguire, S., Middleton, S., Graham, J. and Woodfield, K. (2003), Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots for Vulnerable Young People and Childcare Pilots: Implementation and Reported Impacts in the First Year. DfES RR 396

Ashworth, K., Hardman, J., Woon-Chia, L., Maguire, S., Middleton, S., Dearden, L., Emmerson, C., Frayne, C., Goodman, A., Ichimura, H. and Meghir, C. (2001), Education Maintenance Allowance: The First Year. A Quantitative Evaluation. DfEE RR257.

Ashworth, K., Hardman, J., Hartfree, Y., Maguire, S., Middleton, S., Smith, D., Dearden, L., Emmerson, C., Frayne, C. and Meghir, C. (2002), Education Maintenance Allowance: The First Two Years. A Quantitative Evaluation. DfES RR352.

Heaver, C., Maguire, M., Middleton, S., Maguire, S., Youngs, R., Dobson, B. and Hardman, J. (2002), Evaluation of Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots: Leeds and London First Year Evidence. DfES RR353.

Knight, T. and White, C. (2003), The Reflections of Early Leavers and Second Year Participants on the Education Maintenance Allowance Scheme. A Qualitative Study. DfES RR411.

Legard, R., Woodfield, K. and White, C. (2001), Staying Away or Staying On? A Qualitative Evaluation of the Education Maintenance Allowance. DfEE RR256.

Maguire, M., Maguire, S. and Vincent, J. (2001), Implementation of the EMA Pilots: The First Year. DfEE RR255.

Maguire, S., Maguire, M. and Heaver, C. (2002), Implementation of the EMA Pilots: The Second Year. DfES RR333.

Maguire, S. and Maguire, M. (2003), Implementation of the EMA Pilots: The Third Year. DfES RR395.

Middleton, S., Maguire, S., Ashworth, K., Legge, K., Allen, T., Perren, K., Battistin, E., Dearden, L., Emmerson, C., Fitzsimons, E. and Meghir, C. (2004) The Evaluation of Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots: Three Years Evidence; A Quantitative Evaluation. Department for Education and Skills Research Report.

Copies of this publication can be obtained from:

DfES Publications
P.O. Box 5050
Sherwood Park
Annesley
Nottingham
NG15 0DJ

Tel: 0845 60 222 60
Fax: 0845 60 333 60
Minicom: 0845 60 555 60
Online: www.dfespublications.gov.uk

© Loughborough University 2005

Produced by the Department for Education and Skills

ISBN 1 84478 437 1
Ref No: RR629
www.dfes.go.uk/research