Department for Education

Post-16 Aspirations and Outcomes: Comparison of the LSYPE Cohorts

Research report

May 2019

Steven McIntosh (University of Sheffield)

GSR
GOVERNMENT SOCIAL RESEARCH
Social Science in Government

Contents

List of tables

Executive Summary

This report uses data from the two Longitudinal Studies of Young People in England, who took their GCSEs (year 11) in the 2005/6 and 2014/15 academic years respectively. The data sets contain information from surveys of the individuals undertaken each year from Year 9 to Year 13, and matched administrative data from the National Pupil Database (NPD) and Individualised Learner Record (ILR). The data were used to investigate how attitudes to, and choice of, post-16 education have changed between the two cohorts. The main findings can be summarised as follows:

Aspirations for Post-16 Education

Face value description of the results

- Most common aspiration: in both cohorts, a majority of young people at both Year 9 and 11 aspired to academic rather than vocational study in post-compulsory (post-16) education.
- Trends in aspirations between Cohort 1 and Cohort 2: there was a fall in the proportion intending to leave full-time education between cohorts and growth in the proportion of young people who aspired to an academic rather than a vocational route after GCSEs.
- Most common aspirations for different groups: young women, non-white ethnic groups, those living in London, those from more affluent families and those with higher prior attainment were more likely to favour an academic route.

Do the aspiration results hold when controlling for differences between cohorts?

- Trends in aspirations between Cohort 1 and Cohort 2: holding other factors constant, there was no change between cohorts, in the relative aspirations towards academic or vocational routes, at the whole cohort level.
- However, this overall picture hides differences for particular groups: there has been an increase in aspirations towards academic education between cohorts for women, mixed race and Bangladeshi ethnic groups, and those living in London.

To what extent did young people's actual Year 12 route match their Year 11 aspirations?

- Aspirations to a particular type of education were fulfilled for most individuals. Those who aspired to an academic post-16 education but did not ultimately follow this route were more likely to have lower attainment, but also within attainment levels, were more likely to come from less advantaged family backgrounds.

Aspirations for Post-18 Education

Face value description of the results

- Trends in aspirations between Cohort 1 and Cohort 2: there was an increase in the proportions of young people saying that they intended to apply to university between the two cohorts.
- Most common aspirations for different groups: consistent with the characteristics positively associated with aspiring to an academic route post-16, young women, non-white ethnic groups, those living in London, those from more affluent families and those with higher prior attainment are more likely to say that they intend to apply to university.

Do the aspiration results change when controlling for differences between cohorts?

- Holding other factors constant, analysis still shows an increase between cohorts in the stated likelihood of applying to university, in all waves (though in Wave 4, at age 17, young people in Cohort 2 were less likely than in Cohort 1 to go as far as to say they were 'very likely' to apply to university).

Transition Through Post-16 Education

How do young people's highest learning aims for Year 12 differ according to their GCSE attainment in Year 11, in the raw data? And how do highest learning aims in Year 13 differ according to their choices in Year 12?

- There have been large reductions between cohorts, in terms of the proportions not in any post-16 education, for all levels of GCSE attainment.
- There has been a small fall between cohorts in the proportion taking A levels, and an increase taking vocational Level 3 qualifications overall, which was noticed particularly among groups with some grade A*-C GCSEs, but fewer than 7.
- There has been a clear increase between cohorts in the extent of progression from Level 2 vocational in Year 12 to Level 3 vocational in Year 13.

Which characteristics in both cohorts were predictive of applying for university after controlling for the influence of other factors?

- The same characteristics associated with the likelihood to apply to university (stated pre-GCSE), as listed above, were also positively related to the probability of actually applying to university in Year 13.
- The strength of the relationship between some characteristics and applying to university increased between cohorts for some characteristics, such as for women, non-white ethnic minorities, in particular Bangladeshi, and for those whose parents are graduates.

Types of Post-16 Qualifications

- There has been an increase between cohorts in the popularity of BTEC qualifications, and a corresponding fall in the popularity of City and Guilds and NVQ qualifications, particularly at Level 2.

Apprenticeships

- Participation in apprenticeships by members of the two cohorts between the ages of 16 and 18 was relatively low. The largest increase between cohorts has been in terms of Level 2 Apprenticeships in Year 13.
- Women were more likely, compared with men, to take a Level 2 Apprenticeship at this age (between 16 and 18), but less likely to take a Level 3 apprenticeship. The white ethnic group were more likely than other groups to undertake an apprenticeship, particularly at Level 2.
- Individuals with fewer than seven GCSEs at grades A*-C were most likely to do an apprenticeship at this age, with the gap between this group and those with seven or more such GCSEs widening between cohorts.

Churn Between Low Level Vocational Qualifications and the Labour Market

- There was not widespread evidence of churn between low-level vocational education, employment and unemployment, though the number of sample observations was low, making robust analysis difficult. Comparisons between cohorts were not possible in this case either, due to differences in data collection.
- A majority of learners, at all levels of current learning and with all levels of prior attainment, remained in education throughout the academic year, if they began the year in education. The rate of such students remaining in education declined with both level of prior attainment and current learning results.

- Conversely, the likelihood of moving from education into inactivity increased with a fall in the level of prior attainment, and a fall in the level of current learning.
- A small minority of such leavers did return to education, often waiting until the start of the following academic year.

Subject Choice Amongst University Applicants

- There has been a significant increase between cohorts in the proportion of university applicants applying to study for a STEM subject.
- Males, ethnic minority groups and those with high prior attainment were more likely to apply for STEM subjects.

Active/Passive Choice When Making University Applications: Consistency in Intentions and Information Gathering as Evidence of Making Active Choices

- LSYPE respondents were asked in each survey wave whether they were likely to apply to university. Only a minority said they were ‘very likely’ to apply in each of the first four waves, even amongst those who did end up applying. A majority did however report in each wave being ‘very likely’ or ‘fairly likely’ to apply.
- Giving consistent replies to this question does not necessarily indicate passive movement into university without considering options. However, information-gathering activities such as formal talks with teachers or career advisors at school, or talking to friends and family, were actually undertaken slightly more by those who consistently said they were very likely to apply, than by those who changed their response.
- There was an issue concerning what they gather information about though. Answers to questions specifically concerning gathering information about apprenticeships in Wave 2 revealed that those who never changed their stated likelihood of applying to university were significantly less likely to talk to people about apprenticeships. They may therefore not have been considering a full range of options. There has been an increase in gathering information about apprenticeships between cohorts however.

1 Introduction

The aim of this report is to study the attitudes to, paths followed and outcomes in, post-16 learning amongst two cohorts of young people. The two cohorts observed are those who participated in the two Longitudinal Studies of Young People in England (LSYPE), which were the data sets used. The two cohorts were born nine years apart, the first taking their GCSEs at the end of the 2005/6 academic year, and the second at the end of the 2014/15 academic year[1]. Each were first surveyed in Year 9, when they were aged 13/14, and then subsequently re-interviewed each year that followed. Data from the second cohort are currently available for five years, with the most recent therefore in Year 13 when they were aged 17/18, in 2016/17. This analysis therefore made use of the first five waves of the data from the first cohort, too, for comparability purposes, though data from 2 further waves and an age 25 follow-up survey were also available. The survey data could be matched to administrative data providing more information about attainment in school (the National Pupil Database, NPD), and participation and attainment in Further Education (the Individualised Learner Record, ILR).

Of most interest is whether there have been changes over time between the two cohorts in terms of their attitudes and actions. The almost decade between them was a period of significant change in the post-16 education world, in particular with the significant increase in university tuition fees, the growth of apprenticeships, and the changes in other aspects of vocational provision. Analysis was therefore designed to see whether these changes have had any effect on the attitudes and choices of young people regarding post-16 education. This report also examines how background characteristics, such as family background and prior attainment as well as individual factors (gender, ethnicity, region etc.), were related to such attitudes and choices, and whether the strength of such relationships changed between cohorts.

The first, and largest, section looks at aspirations for post-16 education, both in terms of the immediate period following GCSEs, and whether the young people intended to apply to university. The section also looks at whether such aspirations were fulfilled, and if so, by whom. The following three sections look in more detail at those who undertook vocational qualifications in Further Education, examining their progression from one year to the next, and the particular qualifications, including apprenticeships that they took. Section 7 then examines the issue of ‘churn’ and whether young people in Further

[1] The first Longitudinal Study of Young People is now known as Next Steps. The Centre for Longitudinal Studies at UCL Institute of Education are now responsible for this survey see: https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/cls-studies/next-steps/

Education, particularly those taking lower level qualifications, moved in and out of education, low level employment and inactivity. The following two sections then turn the attention towards university, looking at the degree subject chosen amongst those who applied to university, and finally the extent to which their decision to apply to university was an active choice, or whether they passively drifted into university. A final section offers some conclusions.

2 Methodology

The analysis undertaken for this report was descriptive, focussing on changes in outcome variables between the two cohorts. The results presented will therefore be descriptive statistics on the outcome variables (aspirations, choices etc.), raw correlations between these outcomes and observed characteristics of the young people and their families, and regression analyses, where the relationship between each characteristic and the outcome variable is observed, holding constant the effects of all other characteristics.

The large majority of descriptive statistics presented are proportions, either of the full cohort or of particular subgroups when looking at the correlation between outcomes and characteristics, for example, the proportion of the cohort aspiring to an academic route, or the proportion of males choosing BTECs versus the proportion of females choosing BTECs etc. As mentioned above, much of our interest is on changes between the two cohorts. To determine whether the change in a proportion was statistically significant, a hypothesis test will be performed of the null hypothesis that the proportion in the two cohorts is equal (or equivalently that their difference is zero). The z-statistic for testing this hypothesis is:

$$z = \frac{(p_1 - p_2)}{SE\ (p_1 - p_2)}$$

where p_1 and p_2 are the proportions in Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 respectively, and SE (p_1 – p_2) is the standard error of the difference in proportions. This standard error is calculated by the formula:

$$SE = \sqrt{p * (1 - p) * \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}$$

where n_1 and n_2 are the sample sizes in Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 respectively, and:

$$p = \frac{(p_1 * n_1 + p_2 * n_2)}{(n_1 + n_2)}$$

The calculated z-statistic can then be compared to the critical value of 1.96 at the 5% significance level.

The multivariate regression analyses undertaken throughout the report all have dummy variables (i.e. variables taking the value of 0 or 1) as their dependent variable, indicating for example: yes or no whether individuals aspired to an academic or vocational route, whether they said they were likely to apply to university or not, whether or not they undertook an apprenticeship, etc. The estimated equations take the form:

$$D_i = \boldsymbol{\beta X} + u_i$$

where D_i is the dummy indicator variable as the dependent variable, $\mathbf{X_i}$ is a vector of characteristics, with $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ the attached vector of coefficients, and u_i a disturbance term. When an equation such as this with a dummy dependent variable is estimated by Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) it is known as a Linear Probability Model (LPM), since the coefficients can be interpreted as the effect of that variable on the likelihood (probability) of whatever is indicated by the dummy dependent variable occurring. More precisely, the coefficients measure the marginal effect of that characteristic on the probability of the dependent variable taking the value of 1, with the effect measured in percentage points.

3 Aspirations for Post-16 Education

3.1 Academic and Vocational Aspirations for Post-Compulsory Education

3.1.1 Face value description of results

LSYPE respondents in both cohorts were asked what they intended to do after completing compulsory schooling (GCSESs) at the end of Year 11. This analysis considers their responses when first interviewed (age 14, Year 9) and the responses they gave in Wave 3 of the survey, two years later in Year 11 (age 16), just before completing compulsory schooling. Young people were identified as aspiring to an academic or vocational route, post-16, according to their answers to questions about whether they intended to stay on in full-time education, and if so, whether they wanted to do so in a school sixth form, or sixth form college (assumed to indicate aspiring to an academic route) or in an FE college, or other type of college (assumed to indicate aspiring to a vocational route). In this, and all subsequent tables of descriptive statistics, responses were weighted to make the achieved sample representative of the population of young people in the cohorts observed.

Table 1: Percentage Aspiring to Each Type of Post-Compulsory Education, by Cohort and Wave

	Wave 1 (Year 9)		Wave 3 (Year 11)	
	Cohort 1	**Cohort 2**	**Cohort 1**	**Cohort 2**
Academic	61.61	67.62	55.34	63.39
Vocational	23.45	25.26	29.91	29.41
Neither	14.94	7.13	14.75	7.21
Total	*100.00*	*100.00*	*100.00*	*100.00*
Unweighted Base	*13,881*	*11,601*	*11,862*	*9,569*

X^2 statistic for significant differences by cohort: Wave 1 160.5 (pr=0.00) Wave 3 109.0 (pr 0.00)

A majority of young people, at both waves and in both cohorts, favoured academic over vocational study in post-compulsory education. In Cohort 1, as they approached the end of compulsory education, there is some shift from academic to vocational aspirations, which is less apparent in Cohort 2. At both waves, a higher proportion of Cohort 2 than

Cohort 1 aspired to the academic route, particularly at Wave 3 (a 10% change between cohorts at Wave 1 and a 15% increase at Wave 3). The differences are statistically significant for both waves. In addition, in both waves, there was a fall in the proportion intending to leave full-time education between cohorts, which is again statistically significant.

Table 2: Percentage of Parents Who Want Their Child to Stay On Post GCSE, by Cohort

	Wave 1 (Year 9)	
	Cohort 1	**Cohort 2**
No	18.81	12.68
Yes	81.19	87.32
Total	*100.00*	*100.00*
Unweighted Base	*15,178*	*12,760*

X^2 statistic for significant differences by cohort: 42.5 (pr=0.00)

At Wave 1, parents were asked whether they wanted their children to stay on post-GCSE. A large majority of parents did want their children to remain in education, with the percentage increasing by a significant 8% between cohorts.

Table 3: Cross-Tabulation Between Children's and Parents' Post-Compulsory Plans (Wave 1)

	Parents - Cohort 1		**Parents-Cohort 2**	
Young Person	**Leave**	**Stay on**	**Leave**	**Stay on**
Academic	24.48	70.08	33.31	72.48
Vocational	27.42	22.51	36.11	23.62
Neither	48.10	7.41	30.59	3.90
Total	*100.00*	*100.00*	*100.00*	*100.00*
Unweighted Base	*2,026*	*11,402*	*1,397*	*9,957*

There is a strong relationship between parents' and children's aspirations for post-compulsory education. The relationship was very similar in both cohorts, except for an

increase in Cohort 2 amongst children whose parents did not particularly want them to stay on, but the children nevertheless say that they intended to stay on.

This analysis now considers the characteristics of the LSYPE respondents and the extent to which these were related to their aspirations for post-16 education. For this analysis, the data from the two cohorts were pooled together, separately by wave. The results are reported in the various panels of Table A1 in Appendix A.

All of the differences in post-16 aspirations in the various panels of Table A1 across the various socio-economic and other characteristics were statistically significant, with the exception of the small differences in aspirations between those who had and had not had sessions at school in Year 11 (Wave 3) where they have talked to their teachers about their futures.

Table A1 displays some interesting patterns. The falling proportion of young people aspiring to the academic route (and rising proportion aspiring to the vocational route) between ages 14 and 16 that was noted above in Table 1 (particularly for Cohort 1) is shown in Table A1 to be concentrated within particular groups. In particular, the falling academic route aspirations between ages 14 and 16 were particularly observed for white individuals, and amongst those from more disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds, with lower attainment at Key Stage 2 and who went on to achieve less well at GCSE. With respect to the last result, by Wave 3 the young people were a few months before their GCSEs and probably had a good idea of what they would get. Those who went on to achieve 7 good GCSEs actually increased their aspirations to an academic route compared to Wave 1, while all other GCSE groups were changing their aspirations towards the vocational route, increasingly so for the lower GCSE groups. It therefore seems that the reality of one's own ability begins to modify aspirations, as the time to make decisions draws nearer.

3.1.2 Do the aspiration results hold when controlling for differences between cohorts?

Table 4 below moves onto multivariate analysis. The sample for this equation was all young people, pooled across cohorts, who said that they wanted to continue in full-time education, and the dependent variable is whether they aspire to the academic rather than the vocational route.[2] The two columns of results report separate equations for age 14

[2] The estimation is by Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) which, given that the dependent variable is a dummy variable, implies that the equations are Linear Probability Models. As explained in the Methodology section.

(Wave 1) and age 16 (Wave 3). The coefficients on the explanatory variables are consistent with the cross-tabulations above in terms of sign and significance.

The characteristics that are most strongly associated with a higher likelihood of aspiring to an academic route include non-white ethnic groups, having English as a second language, living in London, high status family background and higher prior attainment. In Wave 3 only, it is also observed that women are slightly, but significantly, more likely to aspire to the academic route.

The aim of the equation was to determine whether there was any change between cohorts in terms of aspirations, after all of these other things were controlled for that may have differed between cohorts. The results show that this was not the case though. **The cohort indicator coefficient was very small and statistically insignificant, showing no change in aspirations between cohorts.** The face-value increase in aspirations towards academic rather than vocational routes between cohorts 1 and 2, as identified in Table 1, is therefore likely to be due to different compositions, for example higher prior attainment, of the two cohorts. This was the case at both age 14 (Wave 1) and age 16 (Wave 3). The statistical significance of the coefficients on the explanatory variables was almost the same in both waves as well (one difference being women becoming more likely to choose the academic route relative to men by Wave 3, as noted above).

The size of the coefficients on many of the explanatory variables did increase between waves, however, showing increasingly larger differences between different groups of the population in terms of their aspirations for academic vs vocational education, as they moved nearer to leaving compulsory schooling.

---

the estimated coefficients can therefore be interpreted as the marginal effects on the probability of an individual choosing the academic route over the vocational route. For example, the first coefficient, on the Cohort2 variable, in the Wave 1 equation, shows that on average, holding other things in the equation constant, then members of the second cohort are 0.7 percentage points less likely to pursue the academic route than members of the first cohort.

Table 4: Determinants of Aspirations for Academic Route, Amongst Pupils Who Want to Continue in Full-Time Education

	Wave 1 (Year 9)	Wave 3 (Year 11)
Cohort2	-0.007	0.008
	(0.007)	(0.008)
Female	-0.000	0.020***
	(0.007)	(0.007)
Ethnic group (ref group: white)		
Mixed	0.016	0.001
	(0.017)	(0.017)
Indian	0.124***	0.197***
	(0.017)	(0.017)
Pakistani	0.129***	0.189***
	(0.019)	(0.019)
Bangladeshi	0.019	0.151***
	(0.022)	(0.023)
Caribbean	-0.018	0.039*
	(0.021)	(0.021)
African	0.120***	0.206***
	(0.021)	(0.021)
Other	0.109***	0.137***
	(0.023)	(0.024)
English as second language	0.056***	0.078***
	(0.015)	(0.015)
Region (ref group: London)		
North East	-0.016	0.004
	(0.020)	(0.020)
North West	-0.096***	-0.088***
	(0.014)	(0.014)
Yorkshire and the Humber	-0.041***	-0.067***
	(0.015)	(0.015)
East Midlands	-0.019	-0.050***
	(0.016)	(0.016)
West Midlands	-0.035**	-0.067***
	(0.014)	(0.014)
East of England	-0.004	-0.028*
	(0.015)	(0.015)
South East	-0.052***	-0.034**
	(0.014)	(0.014)
South West	-0.083***	-0.097***
	(0.016)	(0.016)

Parental Ed. (ref group: no quals)		
Level ½	0.016	0.002
	(0.013)	(0.013)
A levels	0.036**	0.025*
	(0.015)	(0.015)
Level4	0.048***	0.051***
	(0.015)	(0.015)
Degree	0.111***	0.107***
	(0.015)	(0.015)
Parental Occupation (ref group: low skill occupations)		
No occupation	0.024	0.048**
	(0.019)	(0.019)
Intermediate occupations	0.016	0.018*
	(0.010)	(0.010)
Senior occupations	0.063**	0.076***
	(0.010)	(0.010)
Talk with teachers	-0.003	0.015*
	(0.008)	(0.009)
KS2 English marks	0.003***	0.006***
	(0.000)	(0.000)
KS2 Maths marks	0.001***	0.003***
	(0.000)	(0.000)
Constant	0.378***	0.009
	(0.022	(0.022)
Number of obs	15305	14606
R^2	0.070	0.168

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 5 interacted the cohort indicator with all of the other variables. The aim was to determine, even though overall for the cohorts as a whole there was no change in aspirations between cohorts, whether there had been a change for specific sub-groups within the cohorts, as determined by their observed characteristics. The coefficients on the interaction variables indicate whether this was the case. For example, the coefficient on the first interaction term in Table 5 (Cohort2*female) shows the difference in the Cohort 2 effect for women compared to men. Thus at age 14, the increase in the probability of aspiring to the academic route between cohorts was 2.6 percentage points larger for women than for men, holding all other characteristics in the equation constant. This difference in the increased probability between women and men was statistically

significant. Therefore women were *increasingly* more likely to have academic aspirations over time between cohorts.

The table shows that most of the interaction coefficients were statistically insignificant; showing that for most characteristics there were no differences, across groups, in the change in aspirations between cohorts. This is the case at both age 14 (Wave 1) and age 16 (Wave 3). There are some exceptions to this, though.

- For example, female pupils showed a larger increase in preferences towards academic courses than males between cohorts (at both age 14 and age 16).
- Similarly, mixed race and Bangladeshi ethnic groups increasingly aspired more to academic study, relative to whites, across cohorts, though at age 14 only in the latter case.
- With respect to region, the large negative coefficients on the interaction terms show academic aspirations increased much more between cohorts in London than in the other regions. Therefore, the large gaps in aspirations towards academic study between London and other regions for the most part only emerged in Cohort 2. Indeed, at age 14 (Wave 1) London initially lagged some of the other regions in terms of academic aspirations (positive and significant coefficients on some region variables), before this big increase in London's academic aspirations between cohorts.
- There was no change in relative aspirations between groups of pupils when divided by the various family background measures[3] or by prior attainment, in either wave.

[3] There is one family background coefficient, on the interaction between the cohort indicator and the parental degree variable in Wave 1 only, which is statistically significant, though only at the 10% significance level.

Table 5: Determinants of Aspirations for academic study, with cohort interactions

	Wave 1 (Year 9)	Wave 3 (Year 11)
Cohort 2	0.161***	0.111**
	(0.044)	(0.046)
Female	-0.011	0.008
	(0.010)	(0.010)
Cohort2 * female	0.026*	0.030**
	(0.015)	(0.015)
Ethnic group (ref group: white)		
Mixed	-0.027	-0.027
	(0.022)	(0.021)
Indian	0.137***	0.208***
	(0.020)	(0.019)
Pakistani	0.120***	0.199***
	(0.023)	(0.023)
Bangladeshi	-0.004	0.158***
	(0.028)	(0.027)
Caribbean	-0.048*	0.029
	(0.028)	(0.027)
African	0.122***	0.191***
	(0.031)	(0.030)
Other	0.078**	0.124***
	(0.031)	(0.030)
Cohort2 * mixed	0.091***	0.077**
	(0.034)	(0.036)
Cohort2 * Indian	-0.061	-0.063
	(0.041)	(0.044)
Cohort2 * Pakistani	0.022	-0.030
	(0.041)	(0.044)
Cohort2 * Bangladeshi	0.095**	-0.002
	(0.047)	(0.050)
Cohort2 * Caribbean	0.057	0.018
	(0.042)	(0.044)
Cohort2 * African	-0.013	0.024
	(0.042)	(0.043)
Cohort2 * Other	0.055	0.034
	(0.047)	(0.049)
English as second language	0.057***	0.077***
	(0.019)	(0.019)
Cohort2 * English as second language	-0.012	-0.011
	(0.030)	(0.032)
Region (ref group: London)		
North East	0.029	-0.005
	(0.026)	(0.026)
North West	-0.051***	-0.085***
	(0.018)	(0.017)
Yorkshire and the Humber	0.039**	-0.030
	(0.020)	(0.019)

East Midlands	0.037*	-0.014
	(0.021)	(0.020)
West Midlands	0.022	-0.045**
	(0.018)	(0.018)
East of England	0.063***	-0.014
	(0.020)	(0.019)
South East	-0.019	-0.012
	(0.019)	(0.018)
South West	-0.034	-0.075***
	(0.022)	(0.021)
Cohort2 * North East	-0.103***	0.012
	(0.040)	(0.042)
Cohort2 * North West	-0.104***	-0.015
	(0.028)	(0.029)
Cohort2 * Yorkshire/ Humber	-0.189***	-0.104***
	(0.031)	(0.032)
Cohort2 * East Midlands	-0.130***	-0.095***
	(0.031)	(0.033)
Cohort2 * West Midlands	-0.133***	-0.067**
	(0.028)	(0.030)
Cohort2 * East of England	-0.147***	-0.042
	(0.029)	(0.030)
Cohort2 * South East	-0.080***	-0.062**
	(0.027)	(0.029)
Cohort2 * South West	-0.110***	-0.062*
	(0.032)	(0.033)
Parental Ed. (ref group: no quals)		
Level 1/2	-0.001	0.009
	(0.016)	(0.015)
A levels	0.016	0.027
	(0.019)	(0.018)
Level4	0.038*	0.060***
	(0.020)	(0.019)
Degree	0.074***	0.099***
	(0.020)	(0.019)
Cohort2 * Level 1/2	0.019	-0.038
	(0.027)	(0.029)
Cohort2 * A levels	0.023	-0.026
	(0.031)	(0.033)
Cohort2 * Level4	0.004	-0.043
	(0.032)	(0.034)
Cohort2 * Degree	0.060*	-0.005
	(0.032)	(0.034)

Parental Occupation (ref group: low skill occupations)		
No occupation	0.019	0.056**
	(0.024)	(0.024)
Intermediate occupations	0.018	0.032**
	(0.014)	(0.013)
senior occupations	0.080***	0.090***
	(0.013)	(0.013)
Cohort2 * low skill occupations	0.026	-0.016
	(0.038)	(0.041)
Cohort2 * Intermediate occupations	0.002	-0.030
	(0.020)	(0.021)
Cohort2 * senior occupations	-0.030	-0.028
	(0.020)	(0.021)
Talk with teachers	-0.019*	0.000
	(0.011)	(0.011)
Cohort 2 * Talk with teachers	0.038**	0.036**
	(0.017)	(0.018)
KS2 English marks	0.004***	0.006***
	(0.001)	(0.001)
KS2 Maths marks	0.002***	0.003***
	(0.000)	(0.000)
Cohort 2 * KS2 English marks	-0.001	-0.001
	(0.001)	(0.001)
Cohort 2 * KS2 Maths marks	-0.001	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)
Constant	0.298***	-0.026
	(0.030)	(0.028)
Number of obs	15305	14606
R^2	0.077	0.171

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

3.2 Are Post-16 Aspirations Fulfilled?

This section considers the route that individuals followed in Wave 4 (Year 12, first year of post-compulsory education), and compares it to that to which they aspired the previous year (Wave 3). The ILR and NPD data was matched to LSYPE responses, to identify the qualifications being followed, if any.

It is important to make clear the nature of the matching exercise, as it is an important caveat for cross-cohort comparisons. This is because the matching process was not the same for the two cohorts. Cohort 2 was the more straightforward. Permission to link to NPD and ILR data sources was requested at Wave 4 of the survey, so only individuals who participated in that wave could be observed in the administrative data. The sample was therefore restricted to such individuals who gave permission. In Cohort 1, however, permission to link to the NPD beyond Key Stage 4 (the data of interest here) was only requested at Wave 7, so only individuals who participated in the LSYPE survey until the end of the regular survey were observed in the NPD. For the ILR, permission to link was not requested until the age 25 follow-up (whose participants may or may not have participated in Wave 7, since the age 25 follow-up went back to contact all the individuals who originally participated at the start of the survey). It was therefore observed NPD and ILR data for different sets of people, and restricted the analysis to those individuals who participated in both Wave 7 and the age 25 follow-up (participating in one is not sufficient), and who gave permission for their data to be linked. Response weights from the appropriate wave were used in tabulations here, but the fact that the analysis is based on samples from different waves in two cohorts reduces the reliability of cross-cohort comparisons.

Table 6 reports, by cohort, how the young people distributed across post-compulsory routes in Year 12 (Wave 4), according to the route to which they aspired in Year 11 (Wave 3). Route followed in Year 12 was defined according to qualifications observed being followed in the NPD and ILR.

Table 6 shows higher proportions not observed in academic or vocational education in Year 12 in Cohort 1, though this could be related to differences in waves and permission-eliciting between cohorts, discussed above. It is nevertheless still clear that a majority of young people were following the route to which they had aspired in Year 11: around three-quarters of those who aspired to an academic route were following either a wholly academic route or one mixed with some vocational qualifications, in both cohorts. Similarly, around two-thirds to three-quarters of those who aspired to a vocational route ended up following one. One interesting thing to note is that a large proportion of the (admittedly small number) who had not planned to continue in post-compulsory education nevertheless ended up following a vocational route.

Table 6: Wave 3 Aspirations and Wave 4 Outcomes

	Year 12 Route Followed					
Year 11 aspiration	**Academic**	**Vocational**	**Mixed**	**No participation observed**	***Total***	***Unweighted Base***
Cohort 1						
Academic	50.26	11.35	27.55	10.84	*100.00*	*3,448*
Vocational	5.53	65.78	11.68	17.00	*100.00*	*1,130*
Neither	*	61.22	*	36.92	*100.00*	*299*
All	32.35	31.90	20.23	15.51	*100.00*	*4,877*
Cohort 2						
Academic	55.02	14.82	18.52	11.64	*100.00*	*5,011*
Vocational	6.81	75.35	9.81	8.03	*100.00*	*2,300*
Neither	3.06	80.78	2.05	14.11	*100.00*	*523*
All	37.78	36.51	14.94	10.77	*100.00*	*7.834*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

An interesting question concerns the characteristics of those individuals whose aspirations were not fulfilled. Of those who aspired to an academic route in post-compulsory education, analysis compared those who did follow such a route (academic or mixed academic and vocational) against those who did not (vocational only or neither). Not surprisingly, prior attainment was related to whether aspirations were met, which means family background was too[4]. What is interesting though is that *within* prior attainment at GCSE groups, family background was still strongly related to achieved

[4] Prior attainment and family background were strongly positively associated: of those young people for whom at least one parent held a degree, 84.5% achieved 7+ grade A*-C GCSEs in Cohort 1. If parents held at best A levels, this proportion was 57.7%, and was just 30.7% where parents held no qualifications. In Cohort 2, proportions were similar: 74.6%, 58.9% and 29.5% respectively. At the other end of achievement, only 3.5% of those with a graduate parent failed to achieve any grade A*-C GCSEs in Cohort 1 (2.6% in Cohort 2), compared to 39.3% of those whose parents held no qualifications in Cohort 1 (21.1% in Cohort 2).

aspirations. Table 7 shows the proportion of young people, by family background and prior attainment group, whose academic route aspirations were met.

Table 7: Percentage who aspired to academic route in Year 11, who follow academic route in Year 12, by family background and prior attainment

	Highest Parental Education Level				
	No quals	**Level 1/2**	**A Levels**	**Level 4**	**Degree**
Cohort 1					
7+ A*-C	84.47 (289)	88.45 (609)	91.30 (439)	93.57 (509)	95.40 (780)
5-6 A*-C	55.92 (45)	47.93 (63)	48.43 (24)	76.83 (38)	70.15 (27)
1-4 A*-C	*	16.76 (74)	*	36.78 (38)	*
Cohort 2					
7+ A*-C	85.28 (139)	86.01 (858)	89.01 (498)	89.46 (616)	92.08 (1,504)
5-6 A*-C	40.79 (38)	47.74 (159)	48.31 (80)	49.45 (82)	52.98 (163)
1-4 A*-C	*	15.04 (247)	13.44 (82)	13.90 (83)	33.50 (143)

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell. Numbers in brackets give the base sample behind the percentage in that cell (since each cell gives a percentage of a different sample).

Table 7 shows that at high levels of GCSE attainment (7+ GCSEs at grades A*-C) most who wanted to pursue an academic route did so, though even here there was around an 11 percentage point difference in the proportion achieving their aspiration between those with the least and most educated parents, in Cohort 1, and a 7 percentage point difference in Cohort 2. The family background effect was most noticeable amongst those who just failed to reach the so-called ‘Gold Standard’ of 5+ GCSEs at grades C or above, i.e. they had some A*-C passes but not five. For those from a low qualified family, this was usually fatal to their chances of fulfilling their aspirations. Only a very small proportion who wanted to pursue an academic route did so, compared to around one-third of those with graduate parents (though admittedly the percentages are derived from

small sample sizes).[5] The difference between graduate and non-graduate parents in terms of achieved aspirations of their children appeared to be growing over time between cohorts.

3.3 Likelihood of Applying to University

3.3.1 Descriptive Statistics on Likelihood to Apply to University

The following tables have as the variable of interest a dummy variable indicating young people who said at age 14 that they were very likely to apply to university, where 'very likely' was the top category on a four point scale. A similar pattern of results was observed if the top two categories ('very likely' and 'fairly likely') were used to indicate likelihood of applying.

Table 8: Percentage of Young People Very Likely to Apply to University, By Cohort

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Wave 1	33.80 (14,751)	41.09 (12,429)
Wave 3	35.45 (11,844)	41.87 (9,528)
Wave 4	38.40 (11,040)	40.30 (8,873)

Numbers in brackets give the base sample behind the percentage in that cell (since each cell gives a percentage of a different sample).

Table 8 shows that Cohort 2 members were consistently more likely to say they were very likely to apply to university, with the gap between cohorts widest in wave 1 (age 14), at 22% higher. The increase in the stated likelihood of applying for university between cohorts was statistically significant, at each wave.

Next, the association between university application intentions and the various characteristics of individuals was explored. The results are reported in Table A2 in Appendix A. For this exercise, the data were pooled across the two cohorts. All

[55] Note that for even lower levels of GCSE attainment, the numbers pursuing an academic route post-compulsory are too small to analyse.

differences in anticipated application rates between individuals with different characteristics shown in Table A2 were statistically significant, for every group of characteristics and for each wave.

The characteristics that were associated with being very likely to apply for university were predictable, as they were closely related to the observed characteristics of those who attend university.

- Women were more likely to want to apply to university than men;
- Ethnic minority respondents were more likely to want to apply compared with white respondents.
- Individuals in London were much more likely to intend to apply compared with individuals anywhere else in the country.
- Intention to apply to university was also strongly, and predictably, correlated with family background and academic attainment.
- Those who had discussed their future in formal sessions with their teachers were more likely to be applying, though the causation between the two is likely to be running in both directions.

Table A2 also shows that these patterns were reasonably consistent across waves. The largest changes were by attainment groups. As the cohorts aged from age 14 to age 17, their responses became more realistic concerning their intention to apply to university, with a falling proportion of the lower achieving groups intending to apply over time and a higher proportion of the highest achieving group intending to apply over time.

3.3.2 Do the aspiration results change when controlling for differences between cohorts?

Table A3 in the appendix investigates the relationship between intentions to apply to university and the various characteristics in a multivariate context. The dependent variable was a dummy variable for being very likely to apply to university, and the equations were estimated by OLS. In such Linear Probability Models, the estimated

coefficients give the change in the probability of being very likely to apply to university, if that characteristic holds.[6]

Things of note in the table:

- Likelihood of applying to university was strongly related to GCSE attainment, with having 7+ good GCSEs seeming to be crucial (all other groups thought they were much less likely to apply).
- Over and above prior attainment, family background remained important, particularly if at least one parent went to university.
- Over and above prior attainment and family background, whether the young people had formal conversations with teachers in school about their futures was positively related to being very likely to apply to university, though the size of the effect declined as the decision got closer. The direction of causality between these variables could be going either way (i.e. perhaps those who are thinking of applying to university were more likely to talk to their teachers about it).
- Much of the 'London effect' observed in the raw data in Table A2 was shown by the multivariate analysis in Table A3 to be explained by more beneficial family background and prior attainment in London since the coefficients suggested smaller gaps between London and the other regions in Table A3. However, the region coefficients mostly remained negative and statistically significant in each wave, suggesting that there still was a 'London effect' over and above these other characteristics.
- Other statistically significant characteristics associated with a higher likelihood of applying to university, even after controlling for all other factors, were being female, from an ethnic minority group, and having English as a second language.

Turning to the cohort effect, Table A3 shows that at age 14 in Wave 1, controlling for all other factors in the table, the young people in Cohort 2 were 3.8 percentage points more likely to report being very likely to apply to university compared to Cohort 1. By Wave 3 (age 16), there was no difference between the cohorts in this likelihood. Then in Wave 4, once GCSE results were known, and controlled for in the equation, the members of Cohort 2 were 5.8 percentage points less likely to report being very likely to apply to university. There seemed to be a falling propensity in this likelihood over time, at least around the time that the young people were making their decisions. This contrasts with the raw data in Table 8, which showed a higher application rate at Wave 4 for Cohort 2 compared to Cohort 1. This raw difference was due to other changing characteristics between cohorts, in particular prior attainment, so that once GCSEs were held constant

[6] See Methodology section for further explanation.

in Table A3, Cohort 2 were shown to have a lower rate of reporting being very likely to apply to university.

The cohort dummy coefficient becoming negative in wave 4 is nevertheless slightly surprising, suggesting the more recent cohort had lower intentions to apply to university compared with their predecessors nine years previously. One aspect to investigate was whether they had just become a little less certain in their intentions. The dependent variable in Table A3 was for those who said they were very likely to apply to university (the top answer in a four-category variable). It was possible instead to look at the top two answers, i.e. for those who said they were "very likely" or "fairly likely" to apply to university. Table 9 below shows the coefficient on the cohort dummy variable for such a dependent variable, with all other variables from Table A3 included but not reported for space reasons.

These results demonstrate that although the cohort coefficient did still fall in size, it remained positive, and significant, at each wave, showing that the more recent cohort were more likely to say that they were going apply to university compared with the older cohort in each wave. Combined with earlier results it is possible to say that university is increasingly popular, just with a little less certainty to apply.

Table 9: Determinants of Being Very or Fairly Likely to Apply to University

	Wave 1	**Wave 3**	**Wave 4**
Cohort2	0.067***	0.054***	0.020***
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$
Equations include same control variables as reported in Table A3.

Questions asked of the parents in Wave 3 in Cohort 2 (but not in Wave 4 or for Cohort 1 unfortunately) asked why parents thought their children were unlikely to apply to university, if they reported thinking this. The most common response (62%) was that their child had no interest in going. 21% reported that their child was unlikely to get the necessary grades. Money worries ("the family cannot afford it") did not seem to be a dominant issue, being mentioned by just 12% of parents who thought their child was unlikely to apply to university. Unfortunately, the absence of similar questions in Cohort 1 meant it is not possible to see whether such concerns were growing in the era of higher fees.

Table 10 examines interactions between the cohort dummy variable and all other explanatory variables, to determine for whom in particular changes in application likelihood had occurred.

Table 10: Determinants of Being Very Likely to Apply to University, with cohort interactions

	Wave 1	Wave 3	Wave 4
Cohort 2	0.036	0.094**	-0.240***
	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.058)
Female	0.039***	0.092***	0.066***
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Cohort2 * female	0.054***	0.017	0.048***
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)
Ethnic group (ref group: white)			
Mixed	0.068***	0.063***	0.034
	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Indian	0.281***	0.333***	0.297***
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Pakistani	0.224***	0.245***	0.247***
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.023)
Bangladeshi	0.168***	0.202***	0.164***
	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.028)
Caribbean	0.144***	0.169***	0.158***
	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.028)
African	0.325***	0.391***	0.295***
	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.033)
Other	0.185***	0.238***	0.212***
	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.031)
Cohort2 * mixed	0.014	0.043	0.022
	(0.032)	(0.035)	(0.036)
Cohort2 * Indian	-0.121***	-0.082*	-0.126***
	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.044)
Cohort2 * Pakistani	-0.055	-0.016	-0.032
	(0.040)	(0.042)	(0.044)
Cohort2 * Bangladeshi	-0.010	0.025	-0.016
	(0.046)	(0.049)	(0.051)
Cohort2 * Caribbean	-0.014	-0.061	-0.042
	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.045)
Cohort2 * African	-0.024	-0.090**	-0.021
	(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.045)
Cohort2 * Other	0.045	0.020	-0.018
	(0.045)	(0.048)	(0.049)
English as second language	0.025	0.080***	0.055***
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Cohort2 * English as second language	0.083***	-0.007	0.021
	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.033)

Region (ref group: London)			
North East	-0.001	-0.014	-0.032
	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.025)
North West	-0.032*	-0.038**	-0.035**
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)
Yorkshire and the Humber	-0.033*	-0.033*	-0.036*
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)
East Midlands	-0.028	-0.030	-0.062***
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)
West Midlands	-0.035**	0.000	-0.048***
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)
East of England	-0.081***	-0.071***	-0.090***
	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.019)
South East	-0.076***	-0.042**	-0.058***
	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.018)
South West	-0.056***	-0.066***	-0.091***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)
Cohort2 * North East	-0.040	-0.002	0.079**
	(0.037)	(0.039)	(0.040)
Cohort2 * North West	0.022	0.009	0.048*
	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.029)
Cohort2 * Yorkshire and the Humber	-0.037	-0.035	0.012
	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.032)
Cohort2 * East Midlands	-0.075**	-0.048	0.030
	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.032)
Cohort2 * West Midlands	-0.016	-0.073**	0.028
	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.030)
Cohort2 * East of England	0.019	0.025	0.056*
	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.030)
Cohort2 * South East	-0.018	-0.048*	0.025
	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.028)
Cohort2 * South West	-0.028	-0.025	0.086***
	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.033)
Parental Ed. (ref group: no quals)			
Level 1/2	-0.025*	-0.001	-0.026*
	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.015)
A levels	0.002	0.013	-0.009
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.018)
Level4	0.018	0.063***	0.047**
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Degree	0.156***	0.195***	0.140***
	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Cohort2 * Level 1/2	0.045*	-0.008	0.012
	(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.029)
Cohort2 * A levels	0.058**	0.019	0.048
	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.032)

Cohort2 * Level4	0.058**	-0.054*	-0.006
	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.033)
Cohort2 * Degree	0.041	-0.052	0.017
	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.033)
Parental Occupation (ref group: low skill occupation)			
No occupation	0.020	0.005	0.002
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.024)
Intermediate occupations	0.006	0.014	-0.005
	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.013)
senior occupations	0.070***	0.066***	0.039***
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.013)
Cohort2 * low skill occupations	0.025	-0.007	0.006
	(0.036)	(0.039)	(0.042)
Cohort2 * Intermediate occupations	-0.028	-0.021	-0.014
	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Cohort2 * senior occupations	-0.036**	-0.013	-0.004
	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Talk with teachers	0.081***	0.052***	0.029***
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.011)
Cohort 2 * Talk with teachers	0.025	0.003	0.016
	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.018)
KS2 English marks	0.004***	0.006***	0.003***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)
KS2 Maths marks	0.004***	0.004***	0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Cohort 2 * KS2 English marks	0.001	0.000	0.001
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Cohort 2 * KS2 Maths marks	-0.001***	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)
GCSE group (ref: 7+ A*-C)			
5-6 A*-C			-0.249***
			(0.017)
3-4 A*-C			-0.326***
			(0.018)
1-2 A*-C			-0.350***
			(0.018)
5+ D-G			-0.384***
			(0.019)
1-4 D-G			-0.395***
			(0.031)
None			-0.378***
			(0.044)

Cohort 2 * 5-6 A*-C			0.061**
			(0.025)
Cohort 2 * 3-4 A*-C			0.126***
			(0.027)
Cohort 2 * 1-2 A*-C			0.150***
			(0.028)
Cohort 2 * 5+ D-G			0.173***
			(0.039)
Cohort 2 * 1-4 D-G			0.237***
			(0.053)
Cohort 2 * none			0.229***
			(0.088)
Constant	-0.265***	-0.435***	0.189***
	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.036)
Number of obs	17996	16219	14427
R^2	0.192	0.252	0.305

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

The interaction terms in Table 10 show for which characteristics there were differences between cohorts in their reported likelihood of applying to university. Many of the interaction coefficients were statistically insignificant, showing no difference between the two cohorts in terms of the application likelihood for that characteristic. The strongest interaction effects were clearly on the GCSE group variables. The base GCSE results (all negative coefficients relative to the reference group of 7+ A*-C GCSEs) show the latter group were much more likely to be confident of applying to university in Cohort 1. The positive and significant interaction coefficients, however, show that the differences in application likelihood between GCSE groups were significantly smaller in Cohort 2 than in the first cohort. Therefore, those with better GCSEs remained more likely to say they would apply to university than lower GCSE groups in Cohort 2, but the gap in application likelihood between GCSE groups was smaller than in Cohort 1. [7]

[7] If those who actually go on to make an application are looked at, analysis demonstrates a similarly larger change between cohorts for those with lower GCSEs. The proportion of individuals with 7+ good GCSEs who go on to apply to university rises from 61% to 65% between cohorts. The increase for other GCSE groups is from 23% to 35% for those with 5-6 good GCSEs, from 12% to 21% for those with 3-4 good GCSEs and from 3% to 6% for those with 1-2 good GCSEs.

For family background, there is some evidence that the gap in application likelihood widened over time between those with better educated parents and parents with no qualifications, though in Wave 1 only.

4 Transition through Post-16 Education

4.1 How Learning Aims are Related to Past Education Attainment and Participation

In this section, activity in the post-compulsory phase is sub-divided more finely than the academic- vocational distinction in the previous section. In particular, the highest qualification aim at age 17 (Year 12, Wave 4), by level of GCSE attainment at age 16 was examined.

Table 11: Distribution of highest learning aim in Year 12, by prior GCSE attainment

	A levels	Level 3 appren	Level 3 vocat	Level 2 appren	Level 2 vocat	Below Level 2	None	*Total*	*Unwe'ited Base*
Cohort 1									
7+ A*-C	82.91	0.45	6.47	0.96	1.45	0.37	7.39	*100.00*	*3,403*
5-6 A*-C	39.94	*	17.14	7.73	11.78	*	20.56	*100.00*	*366*
3-4 A*-C	19.04	*	18.85	7.71	18.05	9.15	25.65	*100.00*	*299*
1-2 A*-C	4.98	*	11.76	9.98	29.06	15.02	28.80	*100.00*	*292*
5+ D-G	*	*	6.31	9.38	23.95	28.72	29.82	*100.00*	*266*
1-4 D-G	0	0	6.92	*	12.46	45.40	32.10	*100.00*	*79*
none	0	0	0	*	*	48.97	39.87	*100.00*	*42*
Cohort 2									
7+ A*-C	80.15	1.10	9.56	1.08	1.39	0.43	6.30	*100.00*	*4,586*
5-6 A*-C	33.20	2.06	31.53	6.16	7.02	1.26	18.36	*100.00*	*981*
3-4 A*-C	13.14	1.41	41.83	7.60	15.08	4.37	16.45	*100.00*	*881*
1-2 A*-C	2.37	*	42.89	7.91	18.62	13.06	14.04	*100.00*	*896*
5+ D-G	*	*	39.57	8.55	14.13	23.91	12.47	*100.00*	*310*
1-4 D-G	0	0	14.10	*	17.89	46.60	16.60	*100.00*	*220*
none	*	0	*	*	*	37.73	44.95	*100.00*	*121*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

The big difference between cohorts observed in Table 11 was the higher proportion in Level 3 vocational qualifications in the more recent cohort, for all GCSE groups, and the lower proportion not observed in post-compulsory education. Within GCSE groups, the proportion pursuing A-levels was slightly lower in each group. Particularly amongst those who achieved some, but fewer than 7 A*-C GCSEs, there was a fall in the proportion choosing to study A levels in Cohort 2. This was one source of the increased proportion following vocational Level 3 courses, with the other source being more such individuals from these intermediate GCSE groups going straight to Level 3 vocational rather than Level 2 vocational in Year 12.

Table 12 below shows progression between ages 17 and 18 (Years 12 and 13). For those undertaking Level 3 qualifications at age 17, the majority were still doing so one year later (though to a lower extent for vocational Level 3 qualifications). Apprenticeships were also mostly continuing across years. Of interest are those individuals who undertook qualifications at Level 2 or below at age 17, and their progression to Level 3 learning aims by age 18. Progression from vocational Level 2 to vocational Level 3 appears to be more extensive in Cohort 2 than Cohort 1. Regression equations explored the characteristics (demographic, regional, family background, and prior attainment) associated with the likelihood of such progression, for those studying at Level 2 or below at age 17. The majority of characteristics were not associated with the likelihood of progression. The exceptions were that being from a more advantaged family background (a graduate parent in Cohort 1 and a parent in a senior occupation in Cohort 2) was associated with a higher likelihood of progression to Level 3, while having no GCSEs at grade C or above was associated with a lower likelihood of progression (regression results not reported for reasons of space, since they are mostly insignificant).

Table 12: Distribution of highest learning aim in Year 13, by highest learning aim in Year 12

Age 18 / Age 17	A levels	Level 3 appren	Level 3 vocat	Level 2 appren	Level 2 vocat	Below Level 2	None observed	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
Cohort 1									
A levels	88.76	*	2.94	0.51	0.63	*	6.62	*100.00*	*3,308*
Level 3 app	0	92.54	0	*	0	0	0	*100.00*	*21*
Level 3 voc	8.23	*	61.50	4.64	9.14	3.43	11.40	*100.00*	*401*
Level 2 app	*	11.75	*	72.52	*	*	10.84	*100.00*	*122*
Level 2 voc	*	*	29.68	6.69	27.45	9.12	25.49	*100.00*	*317*
Below L2	*	0	3.84	3.95	33.16	32.84	25.92	*100.00*	*250*
None	*	*	4.73	4.16	7.27	3.34	72.26	*100.00*	*644*
Cohort 2									
A levels	95.91	*	1.47	0.34	*	0.04	2.21	*100.00*	*4,151*
Level 3 app	*	86.03	*	*	*	0	*	*100.00*	*91*
Level 3 voc	1.51	2.99	66.92	6.02	5.77	1.70	14.35	*100.00*	*1,712*
Level 2 app	0	19.38	5.76	63.06	*	*	10.99	*100.00*	*271*
Level 2 voc	*	*	47.29	6.62	20.05	3.72	19.47	*100.00*	*541*
Below L2	0	0	17.86	7.26	25.53	30.01	19.34	*100.00*	*443*
None	3.01	1.38	8.86	2.56	4.05	2.65	77.07	*100.00*	*869*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

4.2 Transitions to University

Finally in this section whether individuals reported having actually applied to university at Wave 5 (Year 13, Age 18), by highest learning aim that year was considered. The results are reported in Table 13.

Table 13: Whether applied to university in Wave 5, by highest learning aim in year 13

Year 13 Highest Learning Aim	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
A levels	69.96 (3,069)	71.33 (3,801)
Level 3 apprenticeship	* (56)	* (142)
Level 3 vocational	24.77 (507)	21.75 (1,427)
Level 2 apprenticeship	* (155)	* (301)
Level 2 vocational	* (262)	3.76 (318)
Below L2	* (125)	* (176)
None observed	10.26 (733)	29.96 (1,020)

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell. Numbers in brackets give the base sample behind the percentage in that cell (since each cell gives a percentage of a different sample).

The results show around 70% of those undertaking A-levels had applied to university in Year 13, in both cohorts. Around 25% of those taking a Level 3 vocational qualification had applied to university in Cohort 1, falling to 22% in Cohort 2, a fall of 12%. This fall is statistically significant, though only at the 10% significance level. The large majority of these vocational learners applying to university were undertaking BTEC Level 3 qualifications.

A multivariate equation estimating the characteristics associated with applying to university in Year 13 produced the following results in Table 14, by cohort.

Table 14: Characteristics associated with applying to university, by cohort

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Year 13 Learning aim (ref group: A Level)		
Level 3 app	-0.594***	-0.494***
	(0.060)	(0.039)
Level 3 voc	-0.311***	-0.276***
	(0.023)	(0.019)
Level 2 app	-0.518***	-0.451***
	(0.039)	(0.031)
Level 2 voc	-0.488***	-0.388***
	(0.033)	(0.035)
GCSEs	-0.655*	-0.280**
	(0.393)	(0.122)
Below L2	-0.477***	-0.329***
	(0.050)	(0.051)
None	-0.421***	-0.246***
	(0.021)	(0.021)
Female	0.022*	0.052***
	(0.013)	(0.012)
Ethnic group (ref group: white)		
Mixed	-0.074**	0.090***
	(0.031)	(0.031)
Indian	0.203***	0.134***
	(0.026)	(0.041)
Pakistani	0.078**	0.115***
	(0.033)	(0.040)
Bangladeshi	0.110***	0.208***
	(0.039)	(0.048)
Caribbean	0.041	0.035
	(0.043)	(0.038)
African	0.126***	0.173***
	(0.048)	(0.033)
Other	0.087**	0.184***
	(0.042)	(0.041)
English as second language	-0.019	0.025
	(0.028)	(0.028)
Region (ref group: London)		
North East	-0.004	0.040
	(0.034)	(0.034)
North West	0.010	0.012
	(0.024)	(0.024)

Yorkshire and the Humber	-0.028	-0.014
	(0.026)	(0.027)
East Midlands	-0.013	0.004
	(0.028)	(0.026)
West Midlands	-0.029	-0.006
	(0.025)	(0.025)
East of England	-0.044*	-0.063***
	(0.026)	(0.024)
South East	-0.067***	-0.048**
	(0.025)	(0.023)
South West	-0.093***	-0.077***
	(0.029)	(0.027)
Parental Ed. (ref group: no quals)		
Level 1/2	-0.023	-0.023
	(0.023)	(0.027)
A levels	0.007	0.023
	(0.026)	(0.030)
Level4	0.038	0.022
	(0.027)	(0.030)
Degree	0.061**	0.089***
	(0.027)	(0.030)
Parental Occupation (ref group: low skill occupations)		
No occupation	0.040	0.050
	(0.040)	(0.038)
Intermediate occupations	0.033*	-0.003
	(0.019)	(0.017)
Senior occupations	0.051***	0.025
	(0.018)	(0.017)
Talk with teachers	-0.003	0.024*
	(0.015)	(0.015)
KS2 English marks	0.003***	0.004***
	(0.001)	(0.001)
KS2 Maths marks	0.001	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)
GCSE attainment (Ref group: 7+ A*-C)		
5-6 A*-C	-0.149***	-0.119***
	(0.025)	(0.021)
3-4 A*-C	-0.156***	-0.156***
	(0.029)	(0.024)
1-2 A*-C	-0.198***	-0.197***
	(0.031)	(0.026)
5+ D-G	-0.157***	-0.204***
	(0.035)	(0.039)

1-4 D-G	-0.172***	-0.211***
	(0.062)	(0.052)
none	-0.096	-0.247***
	(0.099)	(0.089)
Constant	0.454***	0.340***
	(0.056)	(0.050)
Observations	4032	4743
R^2	0.393	0.374

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

The results in Table 14 show that those undertaking A levels were by far the most likely to apply to university, unsurprisingly. Amongst individual characteristics, holding other characteristics constant, the following groups were more likely to apply to university:

- Women compared with men.
- Non-white (with the exception of Caribbean)ethnic groups were more likely to apply to university compared with white groups, and increasingly so over time between cohorts (with those from a mixed ethnic background going from being less likely to more likely than whites to apply between cohorts).
- Those living in London were more likely to apply, with the regional differences decreasing slightly between cohorts.
- Prior attainment was strongly associated with the likelihood of applying to university, with having seven or more GCSEs at grade C or above seeming to be the key cut-off point.
- Over and above the effect of prior attainment (with which it is strongly correlated as shown above) family background was important, with those young people having a graduate parent being more likely to apply, and increasingly so in Cohort 2. On the other hand, looking at parental occupation that was significantly related to the likelihood of having made an application in Cohort 1, though not in Cohort 2. Not too much should be made of these changes, however, as the equivalent coefficients for the two cohorts are insignificantly different from each other (equivalently, when a specification including interaction terms between the cohort indicator and the explanatory variables was estimated, the coefficients on the family background interactions were statistically insignificant, indicating no significant change in the effect of family background between cohorts).

5 Types of Post-16 Vocational Qualifications

The previous section showed the level at which young people are studying in each of the cohorts. This section looks in more detail at the particular qualifications being undertaken. Table 15 looks at the proportion of young people, within levels taking each type of qualification. Thus, for example, the first box shows that, of the first cohort members who were studying for a Level 1 qualification as their highest learning aim in Year 12, 45% were studying for a City and Guilds qualification. A similar proportion were taking a Key Skills qualification, while 31% of Level 1 learners were taking a BTEC qualification[8] . NVQ and OCR qualifications were less popular.

At Level 2, a higher proportion were taking NVQ qualifications (39%), which was the most popular choice. At Level 3, BTEC qualifications were very dominant, with over three-quarters of learners at this level taking such qualifications.

Moving into Year 13, the pattern of qualification choices was very similar to that observed in Year 12, with the largest changes at Level 2, where over one half of Level 2 learners were now taking an NVQ, with City and Guilds also becoming more popular relative to the earlier year, and BTECs declining in proportional terms.

Comparing Cohort 2 to Cohort 1, some differences over the near decade between cohorts were apparent. Most obviously, there was the disappearance of GNVQ and Key Skills qualifications, which were no longer offered. Amongst the remaining qualifications, the largest changes were observed for those whose highest learning aim was at Level 2. At this level, there was a big (30%) increase in the popularity of BTEC qualifications in the later cohort compared to the earlier cohort, with almost one half of Level 2 learners in Year 12 taking a BTEC qualification. At Level 3, BTECs, already dominant in the first cohort, increased their share further, by a small amount (6% in Year 12 and 5% in Year 13). In Year 12, BTECs were therefore the most popular choice at Levels 2 and 3 in Cohort 2. These changes were matched by a large fall in the second cohort participating in NVQs.

[88] Within a level, the percentages taking each qualification can sum to more than 100% since individuals can have more than one learning aim. The percentages can also sum to less than 100%, if individuals took some of the minor qualifications that are not included in one of the major groups shown in the table.

Table 15: Participation in each Type of Qualification, by Level and Cohort

	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Year 12	**Year 13**	**Year 12**	**Year 13**
Level 1				
City and Guilds	45.22	43.05	45.13	39.69
BTEC	30.60	22.25	36.01	28.05
NVQ	16.81	12.41	*	*
GNVQ	*	*	*	*
OCR	10.27	9.58	*	*
Key Skills	45.23	31.33	*	*
Base	*291*	*138*	*371*	*121*
Level 2				
City and Guilds	34.53	42.86	26.75	40.79
BTEC	36.97	21.82	47.91	38.68
NVQ	39.02	53.89	11.58	18.41
GNVQ	1.91	*	*	*
OCR	4.09	4.74	2.48	1.33
Key Skills	35.16	30.41	*	*
Base	*680*	*503*	*1,611*	*1,028*
Level 3				
City and Guilds	6.66	7.07	3.70	6.82
BTEC	78.67	75.81	83.09	79.75
NVQ	2.99	8.81	2.60	5.31
GNVQ	*	*	*	*
OCR	12.84	12.85	13.33	8.79
Key Skills	28.74	20.70	*	*
Base	*1,165*	*1,277*	*1,996*	*2,141*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

Table 16 investigates multivariate determinants of the choice of type of qualification, amongst those individuals who undertook vocational learning. Separate equations were estimated for Years 12 and 13, and for individual qualifications. As with earlier regression equations, the dependent variable in each column was a dummy variable, and since OLS was used, the equations were again Linear Probability Models. The coefficients showed the estimated change in the probability of taking that qualification, holding other factors in the equation constant. The results showed that, controlling for all other characteristics, BTEC qualifications were more popular amongst Cohort 2 than Cohort 1, in both Years 12 and 13, by 8 and 10 percentage points respectively. Correspondingly, City and Guilds and NVQ qualifications became less popular, particularly the latter.

Table 16: Determinants of Qualification Choice, Amongst Vocational Learners

	BTEC year12	BTEC year13	C&G year12	C&G year13	NVQ year12	NVQ year13
Cohort 2	0.079***	0.103***	-0.075***	-0.055***	-0.120***	-0.155***
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.010)	(0.011)
Female	-0.006	-0.016	-0.010	-0.005	-0.029***	-0.051***
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.010)	(0.011)
Ethnic group (ref group: white)						
Mixed	0.016	0.091***	-0.049	-0.084***	-0.061***	-0.096***
	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.023)	(0.026)
Indian	0.124***	0.053	-0.157***	-0.121***	-0.081***	-0.082**
	(0.043)	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.039)	(0.030)	(0.033)
Pakistani	0.104**	0.060	-0.141***	-0.080**	-0.090***	-0.080**
	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.030)	(0.034)
Bangladeshi	0.053	0.014	-0.149***	-0.116**	-0.083**	-0.101**
	(0.054)	(0.052)	(0.052)	(0.051)	(0.038)	(0.043)
Caribbean	0.083**	0.106***	-0.096**	-0.070*	-0.069**	-0.062*
	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.028)	(0.032)
African	0.108**	0.043	-0.066	-0.108***	-0.049	-0.050
	(0.044)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.031)	(0.034)
Other	0.022	-0.023	0.008	-0.086	-0.057	-0.073
	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.053)	(0.053)	(0.039)	(0.045)
English as second language	-0.068**	-0.027	-0.028	-0.037	-0.009	-0.011
	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.025)	(0.028)
Region (ref group: London)						
North East	-0.085**	-0.153***	0.019	0.018	0.034	0.080***
	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.027)	(0.031)
North West	-0.092***	-0.079***	-0.015	-0.002	0.032*	0.044**
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.019)	(0.022)
Yorkshire and the Humber	-0.078***	-0.103***	0.004	-0.040	0.045**	0.056**
	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.021)	(0.024)
East Midlands	-0.075**	-0.093***	0.022	0.038	0.031	0.067***
	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.022)	(0.025)
West Midlands	-0.019	-0.074***	0.007	0.001	0.003	-0.004
	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.020)	(0.023)
East of England	-0.046	-0.103***	0.014	0.038	0.014	0.007
	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.021)	(0.023)
South East	0.001	-0.053*	-0.045*	-0.026	-0.004	-0.008
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.020)	(0.023)
South West	-0.053*	-0.086***	0.015	0.043	0.013	0.023
	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.022)	(0.025)

Parental Ed. (ref group: no quals)						
Level 1/2	-0.035	-0.059**	0.028	0.037	-0.011	0.030
	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.016)	(0.019)
A levels	-0.026	-0.058**	0.027	0.007	-0.003	0.045**
	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.018)	(0.022)
Level4	-0.032	-0.046	0.016	0.020	0.008	0.033
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.020)	(0.023)
Degree	-0.014	-0.020	0.028	-0.019	-0.033	0.011
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.020)	(0.024)
Parental occ. (ref group: low skill occupations)						
No occupation	-0.009	-0.001	0.010	0.004	-0.034	0.003
	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.026)	(0.030)
Intermediate occupations	-0.006	0.011	-0.006	0.010	0.003	0.021
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.012)	(0.014)
Senior occupations	-0.000	-0.009	-0.034**	-0.014	-0.004	0.009
	(0.01 8)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.012)	(0.014)
Talk with teachers	-0.000	0.020	-0.008	-0.016	0.010	-0.010
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.011)	(0.013)
KS2 English marks	0.000	-0.000	-0.002***	-0.001**	0.000	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)
KS2 Maths marks	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.001**	-0.000	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
GCSE attainment (Ref group: 7+ A*-C)						
5-6 A*-C	0.020	-0.045**	0.033	0.065***	0.034**	0.076***
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.015)	(0.017)
3-4 A*-C	0.116***	-0.006	0.026	0.102***	-0.007	0.047***
	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.018)
1-2 A*-C	0.178***	0.083***	0.088***	0.108***	-0.039**	-0.008
	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.019)	(0.020)
5+ D-G	0.134***	0.054*	0.118***	0.085***	0.046**	0.009
	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.023)	(0.025)
1-4 D-G	0.069	0.010	0.178***	0.238***	0.015	0.045
	(0.045)	(0.050)	(0.043)	(0.048)	(0.032)	(0.041)
none	0.222***	0.071	0.094	0.167**	0.015	-0.061
	(0.074)	(0.080)	(0.071)	(0.078)	(0.052)	(0.066)
Highest aim (ref: group Level 1)						
Highest aim Level 2	0.203***	0.162***	-0.001	0.085***	0.153***	0.224***
	(0.025)	(0.034)	(0.024)	(0.033)	(0.017)	(0.027)
Highest aim Level 3	0.629***	0.648***	-0.184***	-0.136***	-0.022	-0.007
	(0.028)	(0.034)	(0.027)	(0.033)	(0.020)	(0.028)

Constant	0.321***	0.348***	0.577***	0.440***	0.152***	0.145***
	(0.055)	(0.060)	(0.053)	(0.058)	(0.039)	(0.049)
Observations	4333	4136	4333	4136	4333	4136
R^2	0.196	0.258	0.167	0.171	0.119	0.161

Standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Considering the other factors in the table, women were less likely to choose each qualification type than men, though only significantly so for NVQs, in both years. With respect to ethnic groups, a number were more likely to choose BTECs compared with white individuals (Indian, Pakistani, African and Caribbean), with white individuals being much more likely than other groups to undertake City and Guilds and NVQs. On region, those living in London and the South-East were more likely to choose BTECs, controlling for other factors, with individuals in the northern regions (North-East, North-West and Yorkshire) being less likely to take BTECs and more likely to do NVQs. Family background appeared to play no role in choice of particular qualification, once individuals had decided to pursue the vocational route. Finally with respect to prior attainment, BTECs appeared most popular amongst those with intermediate levels of attainment at GCSE (some grade Cs but fewer than 5).

6 Apprenticeships

The number of individuals observed in the ILR to have started an apprenticeship in Wave 4 or 5 (age 16-18, Years 12-13) is quite low. Nevertheless, a similar analysis was run to that estimated in the previous section above for vocational qualifications, this time looking at the determinants of choosing to enrol on an apprenticeship. As above, the analysis was conditional on having chosen a vocational route in the first place. The equations were estimated separately by level of apprenticeship and by academic year (Year 12 and Year 13), pooled across the two cohorts. The equations were again Linear Probability Models. The results are reported in Table 17. The estimated coefficients show how the probability of undertaking an apprenticeship varied with the characteristics.

Table 17: Determinants of Apprenticeship Enrolment, Amongst Vocational Learners

	Level 2 apprenticeship Year 12	Level 2 apprenticeship Year 13	Level 3 apprenticeship Year 12	Level 3 apprenticeship Year 13
Cohort 2	0.003	0.156***	0.013***	0.002
	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Female	0.018**	0.009	-0.028***	-0.027***
	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Ethnic group (ref group: white)				
Mixed	-0.052**	-0.076***	-0.009	-0.003
	(0.020)	(0.026)	(0.011)	(0.012)
Indian	-0.049*	-0.065*	-0.011	-0.029*
	(0.027)	(0.034)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Pakistani	-0.068***	-0.090***	-0.016	-0.026
	(0.026)	(0.035)	(0.015)	(0.016)
Bangladeshi	-0.006	-0.105**	-0.029	-0.026
	(0.034)	(0.043)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Caribbean	-0.031	-0.072**	-0.005	0.012
	(0.025)	(0.032)	(0.014)	(0.015)
African	-0.038	-0.119***	0.003	0.010
	(0.028)	(0.035)	(0.015)	(0.016)
Other	-0.059	-0.076*	0.018	0.004
	(0.036)	(0.046)	(0.020)	(0.021)
English as second language	-0.010	-0.058**	0.011	0.006
	(0.022)	(0.028)	(0.012)	(0.013)

Region (ref group: London)				
North East	0.052**	0.027	-0.019	-0.006
	(0.023)	(0.031)	(0.013)	(0.014)
North West	0.036**	-0.029	-0.008	0.000
	(0.018)	(0.022)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Yorkshire and the Humber	0.050**	-0.010	-0.004	-0.001
	(0.019)	(0.025)	(0.011)	(0.011)
East Midlands	0.023	0.020	0.001	-0.001
	(0.020)	(0.026)	(0.011)	(0.012)
West Midlands	0.010	-0.015	-0.005	-0.005
	(0.019)	(0.024)	(0.010)	(0.011)
East of England	-0.012	-0.011	-0.013	-0.010
	(0.019)	(0.024)	(0.010)	(0.011)
South East	0.008	-0.040*	-0.027***	-0.020*
	(0.018)	(0.023)	(0.010)	(0.011)
South West	0.033	0.003	-0.002	0.000
	(0.020)	(0.026)	(0.011)	(0.012)
Parental Ed. (ref group: no quals)				
Level 1/2	-0.006	-0.010	0.007	0.015
	(0.015)	(0.020)	(0.008)	(0.009)
A levels	0.003	-0.028	0.002	0.009
	(0.017)	(0.022)	(0.009)	(0.010)
Level4	0.010	-0.026	0.017*	0.017
	(0.018)	(0.023)	(0.010)	(0.011)
Degree	-0.014	-0.054**	-0.003	0.000
	(0.018)	(0.024)	(0.010)	(0.011)
Parental occ. (ref group: low skill occ.)				
No occupation	-0.011	-0.027	0.003	0.006
	(0.023)	(0.030)	(0.013)	(0.014)
Intermediate occupations	-0.001	0.022	0.002	0.008
	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.006)	(0.007)
Senior occupations	-0.011	-0.007	-0.001	0.005
	(0.011)	(0.015)	(0.006)	(0.007)
Talk with teachers	0.023**	-0.007	-0.001	-0.000
	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.006)	(0.006)
KS2 English marks	-0.000	-0.002***	-0.000	-0.000*
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)
KS2 Maths marks	0.001*	-0.001	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)

GCSE attainment (Ref group: 7+ A*-C)				
5-6 A*-C	0.079***	0.084***	-0.003	-0.005
	(0.013)	(0.017)	(0.007)	(0.008)
3-4 A*-C	0.085***	0.138***	-0.007	0.003
	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.008)	(0.008)
1-2 A*-C	0.081***	0.148***	-0.022***	-0.014
	(0.015)	(0.019)	(0.008)	(0.009)
5+ D-G	0.083***	0.147***	-0.021**	-0.024**
	(0.019)	(0.024)	(0.010)	(0.011)
1-4 D-G	0.067**	0.272***	-0.034**	-0.025
	(0.026)	(0.039)	(0.014)	(0.018)
none	0.058	0.233***	-0.029	-0.032
	(0.043)	(0.063)	(0.024)	(0.029)
Constant	0.003	0.170***	0.038**	0.046**
	(0.033)	(0.044)	(0.018)	(0.020)
Observations	4452	4214	4452	4214
R^2	0.034	0.150	0.022	0.019

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

As can be seen, the largest difference between cohorts was that the second cohort were much more likely to be undertaking a Level 2 apprenticeship in Year 13, with a 15.6 percentage point higher probability. Given there was no significant difference in such apprenticeship engagement between cohorts in Year 12, this later difference could be due to efforts to increase the duration of apprenticeships, at Level 2 in particular which saw them more likely to extend into Year 13. At Level 3, there was a small, but nevertheless statistically significant, increase in the likelihood of Cohort 2 to engage with Advanced Apprenticeships in Year 12, relative to Cohort 1.

Other results showed that:

- Women were more likely compared with men to undertake a Level 2 Apprenticeship (in Year 12), but less likely to undertake a Level 3 Apprenticeship in either year, though the differences were not large (in all cases less than 3 percentage points difference).
- White individuals were more likely than a number of ethnic minority groups to enrol on a Level 2 apprenticeship, though there are no differences across ethnicity groups at Level 3 (with the exception of a small negative effect for those from an Indian background in Year 13).
- With respect to region, individuals living in the three most northern regions of England were more likely to join a Level 2 Apprenticeship than young people in other regions. At Level 3, the only regional difference was a lower propensity to engage in the South-East region.

- Parental background again generally appeared to play no role in choosing an apprenticeship, once young people have already chosen the vocational route.
- Teachers can influence the choice, however, with those young people who had discussed their future in sessions with teachers or advisors at school being more likely to have engaged with a Level 2 apprenticeship in Year 12.
- Finally, with respect to prior attainment, those with 7+ good GCSEs, followed by those with 5-6 good GCSEs, were least likely to enrol on a Level 2 apprenticeship, unsurprisingly since they had already reached Level 2. There were not large differences across the remaining GCSE groups. At Level 3, those with the best GCSEs were more likely to engage with apprenticeships, conditional on being on a vocational route, though the differences across GCSE groups were not large (at most 3 percentage point differences in engagement probabilities across GCSE groups).

As Table 17 shows, there was some evidence of an increase in engagement in apprenticeships between cohorts, particularly for Level 2 apprenticeships in Year 13. An interesting question is therefore for whom there has been an increase in engagement. This was investigated by adding interaction terms between the Cohort2 indicator and all of the explanatory variables (as was done for other models in earlier sections). The results were that the coefficients on every interaction term in the equivalents of the four equations in Table 17 were all statistically insignificant, with one group of exceptions, (and so they are not reported in full in tabular form), so the increase in the likelihood to engage in Level 2 apprenticeships in Year 13 for Cohort 2 was similar for most demographic groups. The exceptional group that saw a larger increase than other groups in such engagement in Cohort 2 were those individuals with some A*-C GCSEs but fewer than 7. The growth in engagement in Level 2 apprenticeships at age 17/18 was therefore observed more amongst those with good, but not the best, set of GCSE results.

6 Churn Between Low Level Vocational Qualifications and the Labour Market

The aim of this section was to examine the extent to which young people taking low-level vocational qualifications churn in and out of learning, employment and unemployment. The activity history in Years 12 and 13 was not recorded consistently across cohorts, making cross-cohort comparisons difficult, however. In Cohort 1, the activity history files recorded the broad activity in each month, while in Cohort 2, the current activity at the time of the survey was recorded, if this was different to the previous observed activity, and if so when the current activity started. However, there could have been multiple activity changes between waves of the survey, which were therefore unrecorded. For this reason, the two cohorts were considered separately, rather than compared explicitly as in previous sections.

6.1 Cohort 1

First, the extent to which individuals remained continuously in education was examined. Table 18 looks at whether individuals reported being in education in every month throughout Year 12, conditional on being in education in the first month, tabulated by level of attainment at GCSE.

Table 18: Percentage Remaining in Education Throughout Year 12, by GCSE Attainment

	Left before end of Year 12	**Remain in Education Throughout Year 12**	***Total***	***Unweighted Base***
7+ A*-C	7.39	92.61	*100.00*	*5,549*
5-6 A*-C	23.75	76.25	*100.00*	*707*
3-4 A*-C	31.55	68.45	*100.00*	*611*
1-2 A*-C	30.26	69.74	*100.00*	*669*
5+ D-G	34.13	65.87	*100.00*	*640*
1-4 D-G	27.68	72.32	*100.00*	*154*
none	27.74	72.26	*100.00*	*72*

Overall, 85% of all young people observed in education in the first month of Year 12 (September 2006), reported being in education for each of the next 11 months as well. Table 18 shows that a majority of each GCSE attainment group remained in continuous education, with the highest GCSE group being most likely to remain consistently in education.

Table 19 looks at the continuous participation rate, by highest learning aim in Year 12. The dropout rate from A-levels during Year 12 was very low. For the vocational learning aims, the proportion completing the full year was significantly lower, though still a majority in each case. The continuation rate was slightly higher for below Level 2 aims than for Level 2 aims. This may be because of a greater need to stay in education longer for the former group, due their lower prior attainment.

Table 19: Percentage Remaining in Education Throughout Year 12, by Highest Learning Aim

	Left before end of Year 12	**Remain in Education Throughout Year 12**	***Total***	***Unweighted Base***
A levels	3.42	96.58	*100.00*	*4,700*
Vocational Level 3	26.66	73.34	*100.00*	*437*
Vocational Level 2	34.95	65.05	*100.00*	*326*
Vocational Below Level 2	30.82	69.18	*100.00*	*228*

Of those who left education before the end of Year 12, analysis looked at how many months they remained, before leaving. On average, those who left their A levels course did so after 9.6 months. For the vocational learning aims, the average time spent, amongst those who left education, was shorter, being 7.9 months at Level 3, 8.1 months at Level 2, and 8.1 months below Level 2.

Running a multivariate equation to examine the characteristics associated with the likelihood of leaving, conditional on learning aim and prior attainment at Key Stage 2 and GCSE, all characteristics except for gender attracted statistically insignificant coefficients, the gender coefficient showing that women were 10 percentage points more likely than men to remain in education for the full year (full results not reported due to all coefficients bar gender being insignificant).

Table 20 focuses on those studying for vocational qualifications who did not stay in education for the full 12 months of Year 12, and looks at what they did next. The sample was split by level of GCSE attainment, though with a more grouped categorisation than previously used, because of the small numbers of observations on education leavers available.

Table 20: Percentage of Education-Leavers in Each Subsequent Activity, by GCSE attainment

	Employed	Apprenticeship	Inactive	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
7+ A*-C GCSEs	71.52	*	20.75	*100.00*	*66*
1-6 A*-C GCSEs	57.14	10.2	32.64	*100.00*	*100*
No A*-C GCSEs	40.21	14.28	45.51	*100.00*	*75*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

There was a monotonic link between the level of GCSE attainment and the likelihood of entering employment after leaving education – the higher the level of attainment, the higher the likelihood of going into employment. Almost half of the education-leavers in the lowest GCSE attainment group became inactive in the labour market after leaving education. Note however, the small number of observed leavers, meaning that differences across groups were not statistically significant, and may have been due to chance.

Similarly by learning aim, the higher the aim, the higher the percentage who moved into employment after leaving education, amongst vocational learners (there were too few A level learners to subdivide) – see Table 21. For those undertaking a qualification below Level 2, around one-half moved into inactivity after ending their period of learning.

Table 21: Percentage of Education-Leavers in Each Subsequent Activity, by Highest Learning Aim

	Employed	Apprenticeship	Inactive	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
Vocational Level 3	66.51	9.10	24.40	*100.00*	*108*
Vocational Level 2	55.60	11.91	32.49	*100.00*	*103*
Vocational Below Level 2	40.96	*	49.11	*100.00*	*67*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

Some who left education nevertheless returned, within Year 12, suggesting churning between the education and labour market. In total 12% of those who left education, subsequently returned before the end of Year 12. This percentage represents only 152 raw observations though, which made further analysis of their characteristics difficult, since further sub-divisions led to small numbers, and therefore unreliable results. The findings, which should therefore be taken as indicative only, suggested that those who left Vocational Level 2 or below Level 2 course were most likely to return to education in Year 12, though still very much a minority of leavers (13% for Level 2 and 11% for below Level 2). Those who entered employment had the lowest return rate to education within Year 12 (7%), compared to 22% for those who started an apprenticeship or training course, and 15% for those who were inactive.

Looking at Year 13, and considering those who left education in Year 12, there were almost the same number of such individuals observed in education in September of Year 13 (September 2007) as who returned in Year 12 (150 individuals, compared to 152 who return in Year 12). For some who left education, they were therefore clearly waiting for the next academic year to start before returning to education. Again, the numbers were too small to sub-divide by characteristics successfully, but they do seem to suggest that those who had a period of inactivity were much more likely to return to education at the start of Year 13 (30% of such individuals) compared to those who left education in Year 12 for employment (14% return) or training/apprenticeship (19% return). The figures also suggested (with the caveat of small numbers) that the most likely level to which individuals returned was the same level as that which they had left in Year 12 (so that there was churning at low levels rather than progression). Unfortunately, the numbers

were too small to then investigate subsequent exits from education, for those who already had one previous exit.

Turning therefore instead to all individuals in education at the start of Year 13 (as opposed to only those who returned after a period out of education), similar analysis as above for those observed in education at the start of Year 12 was undertaken. The results are reported in Tables A4-A7 in Appendix A, since they were mostly qualitatively similar to those for year 12 above. To summarise the results, those with higher GCSE attainment were more likely to remain in education for all of Year 13 than those with fewer GCSEs (Table A4). Similarly, with respect to learning aim (Table A5), those who were studying A-levels were more likely to be still in education a year later, compared to those taking vocational Level 3 courses in Year 13, of whom just under one half were still in education a year later.[9] Looking at activity after leaving education, individuals with lower GCSEs were again more likely to move into inactivity than those with better GCSEs (Table A6), while for Year 13 learning aim, those who were studying for a vocational qualification below Level 2 were least likely to move into employment (Table A7).

6.2 Cohort 2

As discussed at the start of this section, the activity history for Cohort 2 is not as detailed. There were only three observations: initial activity (at the start of Year 12, i.e. September 2015) and activity at the time of the Wave 4 and Wave 5 surveys (usually in March or April of 2016 and 2017 respectively).

Table 22 considers who remained in education at the time of the Wave 4 survey, conditional on having previously been in education in Year 12. The results show that the vast majority, from all GCSE attainment groups, were still in education at the time of the Wave 4 survey. It is difficult to conclude from this, however, that retention had improved since the first cohort, since that cohort looked at activity in each month, and exit was considered in any month in the full year. There is therefore more opportunity to observe exit from education for Cohort 1.

[9] The analysis compared the main activity of respondents at the start of Year 13 to their main activity one year later. Thus, the third of individuals observed in Table A5 taking A levels who had left education one year later had therefore not left before the end of their A levels, barring an odd exception, but rather had completed their A levels but then chosen not to progress further, so that they did not appear in full-time education one full year later.

Table 22: Percentage Remaining in Education by Time of Wave 4 Survey, by GCSE Attainment

	Left before Wave 4 Survey	Remain in Education at Wave 4 Survey	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
7+ A*-C	2.22	97.78	*100.00*	*4,387*
5-6 A*-C	6.51	93.49	*100.00*	*812*
3-4 A*-C	8.83	91.17	*100.00*	*694*
1-2 A*-C	10.20	89.80	*100.00*	*632*
5+ D-G	10.05	89.95	*100.00*	*220*
1-4 D-G	13.40	86.60	*100.00*	*139*
none	*	*	*100.00*	*82*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell (therefore both redacted since only two options and knowledge of one informs the other).

Similarly, the continuous participation rate, by highest learning aim in Year 12, showed almost all individuals still in education by the time of the Wave 4 survey (Table 23).

Table 23: Percentage Remaining in Education by Time of Wave 4 Survey by Highest Learning Aim

	Left before Wave 4 Survey	Remain in Education at Wave 4 Survey	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
A levels	1.02	98.98	*100.00*	*4,051*
Vocational Level 3	8.58	91.42	*100.00*	*1,257*
Vocational Level 2	8.91	91.09	*100.00*	*375*
Vocational Below Level 2	8.61	91.39	*100.00*	*269*

Given the lack of variation in the continuation rate, it would not be expected that the characteristics of individuals would correlate with the likelihood of continuation in a multivariate setting, and this was indeed the case (results therefore not reported here).

The analysis looks at the activity of those who did leave education,[10] though obviously the above tables make clear that such analysis is based on very small numbers. As far as such numbers can be relied upon, they again suggest that the best qualified at GCSE level were more likely to move into employment if they left post-compulsory education (Table 24).

Table 24: Percentage of Education-Leavers in Each Subsequent Activity, by GCSE attainment

	Employed	Apprenticeship	Inactive	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
7+ A*-C GCSEs	64.38	*	*	*100.00*	*22*
1-6 A*-C GCSEs	41.71	24.77	30.28	*100.00*	*109*
No A*-C GCSEs	*	*	51.72	*100.00*	*29*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

By learning aim (Table 25), it is now those with the lowest learning aim who were more likely to move into employment if they left education, contrary to Cohort 1, although not much should be made of this, given the very small number of observations involved. Those with a vocational Level 3 learning aim were more likely to be involved in an apprenticeship if they left education.

[10] Since the survey was in March/April, in most case such individuals leaving education will not have completed their course.

Table 25: Percentage of Education-Leavers in Each Subsequent Activity, by Highest Learning Aim

	Employed	Apprenticeship	Inactive	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
Vocational Level 3	45.71	26.74	27.55	*100.00*	*110*
Vocational Level 2	49.68	*	*	*100.00*	*32*
Vocational Below Level 2	58.73	*	*	*100.00*	*18*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

Of those who left education, no further analysis could be conducted to subdivide them further (for example to see whether they returned to education) so it was difficult to get an indicator of churning for Cohort 2.

In summary, the numbers are not large enough for the evidence to be completely convincing, but there is nevertheless evidence, for Cohort 1 at least where the data were better, that churning between low level vocational learning and the labour market and back to learning at the same level was still a feature of the FE system. This is not to say that such churning occurs for all individuals (seen in Section 4 evidence for improved progression from vocational Level 2 to Level 3), but for some there seems the possibility, at least in the years studied, of being trapped in a cycle of low level learning and insecure labour market attachment. At the very least, these results suggest that further research into the issue would be useful, to establish the extent of such churning, and the characteristics associated with successful exit from it.

8 Subject Choice Amongst University Applicants

Table 26 tabulates how young people in each cohort were distributed across degree subject of choice. The survey question was asked of all those had or who thought they might apply to university. The sample in Table 26 was restricted to those who reported in Wave 5 of the survey that they had actually applied to university.

Table 26: Subject Choice of University Applicants (%)

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Medicine	2.95	3.24
Subjects allied to medicine	7.72	9.80
Biology	7.70	9.91
Veterinary science	0.05	1.56
Physical science	5.74	7.01
Maths	2.81	2.88
Computing	3.68	4.79
Engineering	4.11	6.25
Architecture	2.40	1.68
Social science	8.50	10.42
Law	5.89	4.64
Business	10.27	11.04
Information	5.30	3.01
Languages	7.94	5.53
Humanities	5.80	5.37
Arts and design	11.37	9.60
Education	3.03	3.28
Combined subjects	4.74	0
Total	*100.00*	*100.00*
Unweighted Base	*3,848*	*3,543*

Note that the coding of subjects was different in each cohort, which required some recoding to a common classification across cohorts. This may explain some of the change across cohorts, in particular the absence of anyone in Cohort 2 reporting a combined degree (given that such degrees certainly still exist, it seems that in Cohort 2 that Combined degrees were coded to the appropriate group for the combination of subjects).

Any trend across cohorts seemed to be in favour of STEM subjects, with subjects allied to Medicine, Biology, Veterinary Science, Physical Science, Computing and Engineering showing the largest increase in share, in addition to Social Sciences, while Arts, Languages and Information showed the largest falls in share.

Table 27 reports the multivariate determinants of subject choice, here aggregated into a binary STEM vs non-STEM dichotomy, with Medicine and Subjects allied to Medicine classified as STEM. Given the dependent variable was therefore a dummy variable, and OLS was used, the equation was therefore again a Linear Probability Model, with the coefficients indicating the change in the probability of the individual applying for a STEM subject.

Table 27: Determinants of Applying for a STEM subject at University

Cohort2	0.076***
	(0.015)
Female	-0.071***
	(0.015)
Ethnic group (ref group: white)	
Mixed	-0.067*
	(0.037)
Indian	0.084***
	(0.029)
Pakistani	0.153***
	(0.038)
Bangladeshi	0.098**
	(0.044)
Caribbean	0.091*
	(0.050)
African	0.073*
	(0.040)
Other	0.118***
	(0.043)
English as second language	-0.000
	(0.028)
Region (ref group: London)	
North East	0.053
	(0.039)
North West	0.013
	(0.027)
Yorkshire and the Humber	0.067**
	(0.031)
East Midlands	0.051*
	(0.030)
West Midlands	0.014
	(0.028)
East of England	0.023
	(0.029)
South East	0.004
	(0.026)

South West	0.011
	(0.033)
Parental Ed. (ref group: no quals)	
Level 1/2	-0.003
	(0.033)
A levels	0.002
	(0.035)
Level4	0.005
	(0.035)
Degree	0.002
	(0.035)
Parental Occupation (ref group: low skill occupations)	
No occupation	0.038
	(0.051)
Intermediate occupations	-0.019
	(0.024)
Senior occupations	-0.007
	(0.022)
Talk with teachers	-0.016
	(0.018)
KS2 English marks	-0.004***
	(0.001)
KS2 Maths marks	0.006***
	(0.001)
GCSE group (ref: 7+ A*-C)	
5-6 A*-C	-0.104***
	(0.033)
3-4 A*-C	-0.039
	(0.054)
1-2 A*-C	0.089
	(0.122)
5+ D-G	-0.290
	(0.481)
A level points	0.001***
	(0.000)
Constant	0.100
	(0.064)
Observations	4636
R^2	0.068

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 27 confirms the suggestion from Table 26 that there has been a proportional increase in applications to STEM subjects between cohorts., Possible reasons for such a change include the promotion of STEM subjects by the government, and also that the later cohort, who have to pay higher fees, may have been attracted to subjects with higher returns. This change remained after controlling for all other differences between cohorts, as listed in Table 27, and was large, with individuals in Cohort 2 being 7.6 percentage points more likely to apply for a STEM subject degree compared with individuals in Cohort 1.

Other results in Table 27 were as expected. Men were 7 percentage points more likely to apply for a STEM subject compared with women, while all ethnic groups, except Mixed, were more likely to pursue a STEM subject compared with white groups. With respect to region, there were few statistically significant differences, with the exception that STEM subjects were more popular amongst people from Yorkshire and the East Midlands than amongst people from London. Family background appeared to play no role in STEM choice over and above the other characteristics in the table. Prior attainment was important however, with those performing better at GCSE and at A-level being more likely to apply for a STEM subject. Even at Key Stage 2 at age 11, those who performed better on the Maths test were more likely to go on to apply for a STEM subject, while those who performed better on the English test were more likely to go on to apply for a non-STEM subject (holding maths marks constant).

A second specification was estimated, interacting the cohort indicator with all other characteristics in the table. None of the interaction terms were statistically significant however, showing no change in the relative importance of characteristics between cohorts for choosing STEM (except for individuals from the North-East becoming relatively more likely to apply for a STEM subject in Cohort 2).

9 Active-Passive Choice in Decision to Apply to University

The aim of this, final, section was to investigate the extent to which young people were making an active or passive choice whether to apply to university. The hypothesis to test here was whether young people were 'passively' drifting into university because they thought that was what was expected of them, without really considering the options available to them and whether university was in fact the best choice they could make. While exact indicators of active/passive choices in the LSYPE cohorts were not recorded in the data, various variables from across the various waves could be used to provide information. First, consistency in responses to the question about intentions to apply for university across waves of the survey was examined.

9.1 Consistency in likelihood of applying to university

The sample here was all those who reported in Wave 5 (in each cohort) that they had applied to university. The aim was to discover to what extent that was an active choice, and to what extent it was passive such that they had just drifted into university without considering alternatives.

The basis of the analysis was the questions, already analysed in previous sections above, that ask the LSYPE respondents how likely they were to apply to university. Their responses in each of the first four waves were taken, and individuals who consistently reported being very likely to apply to university in each of the four waves were identified. Those who consistently reported being "very likely" or "fairly likely" to apply to university in each of the first four waves was also considered. The idea was that those who reported consistently each wave that they were very likely to apply to university were potentially the most likely to be making a passive decision to apply (those who changed their likelihood of application across waves must have been making a considered, active choice). The results are in Table 28 below.

Only just over one-third of those who applied to university were always very sure that they would do so, although when analysis included those who were 'fairly' sure as well, the proportion rises to over 80%.[11] The results were remarkably similar in both cohorts.

[11] Therefore, it is clear that the vast majority of those who did not consistently report that they were very likely to apply at every wave, change their response to being fairly likely to apply, rather than any more extreme reduction in likelihood to apply.

From this point on the analysis considers only the ‘very likely’ to apply responses, though the pattern of results remained similar, if the ‘fairly likely’ were included too.

Table 28: Percentage of Those who Apply to University who Always Previously Reported being Very, or Very or Fairly, Likely to Apply

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Consistently say very likely to apply	37.56	37.89
Consistently say very or fairly likely to apply	81.01	83.31***
Unweighted Base	*4,022*	*3,596*

*** Difference between cohorts statistically significant at the 1% significance level.

Looking at those who were not always consistently very sure they would apply, Table 29 reports the percentage who said they were very likely to apply in each separate wave.

Table 29: Percentage Who Report being Very Likely to Apply at Each Wave, Amongst those who Eventually Apply to University but who did not Always Report They Were Very Likely To Do So

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Wave 1	29.47	35.63***
Wave 2	35.72	36.85
Wave 3	49.17	48.76
Wave 4	70.98	52.53***
Unweighted Base	*2,267*	*2,121*

*** Difference between cohorts statistically significant at the 1% significance level

In both cohorts, those applicants who did not consistently report being “very likely” to apply, but nevertheless eventually did, were more likely to report their negative aspirations in earlier waves. As they got nearer to the application date, they were more likely to say they were very likely to apply. This was particularly the case in the first cohort, where 70% of those who had changed their attitudes across the waves were saying they were very likely to apply by Wave 4 (the significantly lower certainty in Cohort

2 is consistent with the lower certainty of applying to university by Cohort 2 that was noted in Table 8 earlier). Overall, then, and particularly within Cohort 1, something was increasing young people's certainty of applying over time as they aged between 14 and 17. Information gathering may have been a possible influencer.

9.2 Information Gathering about Future Options

Table 30 reveals only small differences in information gathering, or reported usefulness of that information, between those who did and did not consistently report being very likely to apply to university (remembering, amongst those who do go on to apply), though the differences were all statistically significant, as shown by the various Chi-squared statistics. Those who were consistent in being very likely to apply were slightly more likely to have received careers advice or been told about careers websites at school, and to have discussed their future with teachers. They were also significantly more likely to have discussed their future with their family, and here the difference was larger (37% more likely to have talked). In each case, they also reported their information gathering to have been more useful. The lack of variation in their likelihood of applying to university therefore does not seem to have been due to a lack of information gathering in Year 9 – if anything they had more information, and more useful information, but were still consistently very likely to apply to university.

Comparing across cohorts in Table 30, for the two measures available in both cohorts, there was a slight increase in the incidence of talking to teachers and family about their future in Cohort 2, and also the usefulness of those talks, amongst those who consistently reported being very likely to apply to university. There was a 7% increase in the propensity to talk to teachers and an 11% increase in the propensity to talk to family, amongst such individuals. Conversely, those who did change their response from being very likely to apply to university became slightly *less* likely to have gathered information in Year 9 in Cohort 2.[12] These changes in the incidence of talks between cohorts are mostly statistically significant, and in some cases the changes in usefulness are too, as shown by the asterisks in the Cohort 2 columns.

[12] If the analysis in Table 30 was based on those who consistently reported being very or fairly likely to apply to university, the frequency count in each cell obviously increased, but the percentages across categories were almost exactly the same as those reported in Table 30.

Table 30: Information Received in Year 9 (Wave 1), by Cohort and Whether Consistently Reported being Very Likely to Apply to University

	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Not consistently very likely to apply	**Consistently very likely to apply**	**Not consistently very likely to apply**	**Consistently very likely to apply**
Helpfulness of career advice at school, Year 9				
no advice			56.72	53.81
not at all			2.39	2.57
not much			6.01	6.72
Little			24.21	24.09
Lot			10.68	12.81
Total			*100.00*	*100.00*
Chi-squared			9.02*	
Helpfulness of career websites, Year 9				
no advice			67.26	63.51
not at all			1.66	1.51
not much			4.85	4.21
Little			17.64	20.11
Lot			8.59	10.66
Total			*100.00*	*100.00*
Chi-squared			12.03**	

Usefulness of talks with teachers about future studies, Year 9				
No talks	80.95	77.46	81.96	75.92***
Not at all	#	#	#	#
Not very	#	1.36	0.75	#
A little bit	3.83	4.40	2.77**	2.49***
Quite useful	10.99	11.81	10.70	15.07***
Very useful	3.72	4.77	3.70	6.30*
Total	*100.00*	*100.00*	*100.00*	*100.00*
Chi-squared	18.06***		33.35***	
Usefulness of talks with family about future studies, Year 9				
No talks	48.55	39.62	51.40*	33.18***
Not at all	#	#	#	#
Not very	1.16	1.01	#	0.89
A little bit	7.26	6.46	7.21	8.51**
Quite useful	28.62	31.00	26.30*	33.48
Very useful	14.29	21.85	14.57	23.94
Total	*100.00*	*100.00*	*100.00*	*100.00*
Chi-squared	75.67***		138.18***	
Unweighted Base	2,469	1,551	2,236	1,360

Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

***, **, * Difference between cohorts statistically significant at the 1%, 5% and 10% significance levels.

Chi-squared statistics test for differences in usefulness of information between those with and without consistent responses to views on applying to university. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Turning to Year 10, there were additional questions in the survey about apprenticeships, for both cohorts. In particular, the respondents were asked whether they had spoken to teachers/careers advisers at school, to family members, or to other people (national careers service, local employers) about apprenticeships.[13]

Table 31: Information Received in Year 10 (Wave 2), by Cohort and Whether Consistently Reported being Very Likely to Apply to University

	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Not consistently very likely to apply	**Consistently very likely to apply**	**Not consistently very likely to apply**	**Consistently very likely to apply**
Helpfulness of career advice at school, Year 10				
no advice			48.77	47.96
not at all			3.43	4.10
not much			8.13	7.33
little			26.85	26.17
lot			12.82	14.44
Total			*100.00*	*100.00*
Chi-squared			8.77*	
Helpfulness of career websites, Year 10				
no advice			81.14	82.18
not at all			1.82	1.04
not much			2.35	3.01
little			10.57	8.44
lot			4.12	4.97

[13] There was also a question asking whether they had heard of apprenticeships, but since almost all had, the answers to this question were not analysed.

	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
Total			*100.00*	*100.00*
Chi-squared			8.91*	
Percentage who talked about future studies in Year 10[14]				
With teachers	15.39	17.79	18.24***	25.78***
With Family	54.36	60.83	49.47***	69.32***
Percentage who talked about apprenticeships in Year 10				
With someone at school	8.20	3.20	14.65***	6.19***
With a family member	6.27	4.76	15.07***	10.19***
With someone else	5.84	2.48	3.20***	2.41
Unweighted Base	*2,449*	*1,552*	*2,223*	*1,353*

***, **, * Difference between cohorts statistically significant at the 1%, 5% and 10% significance levels.

Chi-squared statistics test for differences in usefulness of information between those with and without consistent responses to views on applying to university. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

The upper panels of Table 31 show that, exactly the same as in Wave 1 (Year 9), those who were consistent in their belief that they were very likely to apply to university were slightly more likely than those not consistent in their beliefs to have discussed their future with careers advisors or teachers at school, and much more likely to have discussed their future with their family (40% more likely). However, perhaps all of these discussions were

[14] The usefulness of these talks was not asked for in Wave 2, as it had been in Wave 1 (as reported in Table 30).

only about going to university. When the questions specifically asked about information gathering on apprenticeships, those consistently very likely to apply to university were much less likely to have asked about apprenticeships, particularly at school, where they were 58% less likely to have had discussions. Note also that those who eventually applied to university, i.e. those included in the table, were also much less likely to have talked about apprenticeships than those who did not apply. In Cohort 1, 28% of those who did not go on to apply had talked to someone about apprenticeships, compared to just 10% of those who did go on to apply (64% lower). In Cohort 2, these numbers were 34% and 20% respectively (41% lower).

Two other things to note in passing from Table 31 – compared to Year 9 in Table 30, careers advice in schools was now more likely to involve interaction with advisers, and less direction towards careers websites. Second, though the numbers remained relatively small amongst this sample of university applicants, there was a clear increase in finding out about apprenticeships between cohorts. This increase in information gathering in Cohort 2 was statistically significant, as shown by the asterisks in the Cohort 2 columns in Table 31.

In Wave 3, the same information questions were asked, except the apprenticeship questions were dropped again. There was the addition of a question asking whether respondents had participated in a work experience placement in Year 11, which was included in Table 32 below on the basis that work experience is an alternative form of information gathering.

Table 32: Information Received in Year 11 (Wave 3), by Cohort and Whether Consistently Reported being Very Likely to Apply to University

	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Not consistently very likely to apply	**Consistently very likely to apply**	**Not consistently very likely to apply**	**Consistently very likely to apply**
Helpfulness of career advice at school, Year 11				
no advice			26.02	25.46
not at all			8.09	7.26
not much			11.69	12.67
little			35.24	36.02

	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
lot			18.97	18.58
Chi-squared			2.71	
Helpfulness of career websites, Year 11				
no advice			83.55	82.78
not at all			0.97	1.11
not much			2.48	1.73
little			8.82	10.11
lot			4.19	4.27
Chi-squared			3.08	
Percentage who talked about future studies in Year 11				
With teachers			30.76	38.33
With Family			68.50	78.44
% who did a placement	32.12	31.15	17.64***	18.62***
Unweighted Base	*2,456*	*1,550*	*2,218*	*1,360*

***, **, * Difference between cohorts statistically significant at the 1%, 5% and 10% significance levels.

Chi-squared statistics test for differences in usefulness of information between those with and without consistent responses to views on applying to university. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 32 shows similar patterns to the previous two tables for the two previous waves, in that those who consistently reported being very likely to apply to university were slightly more likely to have gathered information. The difference was less marked in terms of careers advice, but the former group were still much more likely to discuss their future

with teachers and with family. Note also again the increased incidence of careers information via advisors and less by website, as the young people neared the time that they could leave school.

In terms of the one aspect observed in both cohorts, both those consistent in their stated likelihood of applying to university and those not consistent were significantly less likely to have undertaken a placement in Year 11 in Cohort 2 than in Cohort 1, falling by 40% and 45% respectively (in fact, overall in the full cohorts, and so including those who do not apply to university as well, there was a large and significant fall in the engagement in placements in Year 11 between cohorts).

9.3 Individual characteristics and information gathering

This section considers who was more likely to gather information via the various routes discussed above, in terms of individual characteristics. To do so, it would be useful to have a summary measure of the information gathering, in each wave. Such a summary measure was created by simply summing the observed information variables discussed in the previous sub-section, i.e. summing the various usefulness measures in Wave 1, while summing the number of types of information gathered in Waves 2 and 3 (since the usefulness measures were not asked of all types of information gathering in those waves). Such aggregations therefore give equal weight to each activity.[15] Note from this point on, all analysis is for Cohort 2 only, because some of the key variables were not asked in Cohort 1 and so would be missing from the aggregate measures.

[15] An alternative was to undertake a principal component analysis, which identifies one or more indices of the existing measures, which are a weighted average of those measures, thereby potentially giving different weights to different measures. Such an analysis was undertaken, however the resulting loadings in the first component were approximately equal anyway across each of the information-gathering activities, even after rotating the factor loadings. It therefore seemed more straightforward to use the simple unweighted aggregations, as described in the text. None of the patterns of correlations with other characteristics discussed below were altered by using principal components rather than simple aggregations, and in the multivariate regression reported below, using principal component measures produced almost exactly the same t-statistics as when using the simple aggregation measures.

Table 33: Average Aggregated Information Measures, by Individual Characteristics, for those who Apply to University

	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 2 (appr)	Wave 3
Gender:				
Male	5.21	1.78	0.30	1.66
Female	5.69	1.87	0.25	1.80
Ethnicity:				
White	5.17	1.78	0.27	1.67
Mixed	5.82	1.86	0.28	1.84
Indian	6.47	1.94	0.24	1.93
Pakistani	6.53	2.11	0.35	2.06
Bangladeshi	6.56	2.04	0.27	2.04
Caribbean	6.40	2.03	0.37	1.95
African	7.51	2.33	0.39	2.19
Other	6.04	1.75	0.22	1.69
Region:				
North East	5.82	2.10	0.32	1.92
North West	5.48	1.99	0.27	1.83
Yorkshire	5.61	1.77	0.21	1.71
East Midlands	4.81	1.73	0.32	1.57
West Midlands	5.63	1.88	0.30	1.82
East England	5.57	1.69	0.26	1.64
London	5.88	1.82	0.25	1.80
South East	5.04	1.69	0.27	1.64
South West	5.50	1.97	0.32	1.78

	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 2 (appr)	Wave 3
Highest parent ed:				
No qualifications	5.73	1.99	0.36	1.80
Level 1/2	5.30	2.00	0.34	1.85
A levels	5.56	1.85	0.31	1.70
Level 4	5.37	1.82	0.29	1.74
Degree	5.53	1.74	0.22	1.69
Highest parent occ:				
No occupation	5.62	1.91	0.29	1.84
Low skill occ	5.43	1.95	0.32	1.82
Intermediate occ	5.26	1.87	0.31	1.75
Senior occ	5.53	1.78	0.25	1.71
GCSE attainment group:				
7+ A*-C	5.52	1.83	0.27	1.74
5-6 A*-C	4.90	1.78	0.31	1.59
3-4 A*-C	5.52	1.91	0.20	1.96
1-2 A*-C	6.92	2.06	0.47	1.95
5+ D-G	*	*	*	*
1-4 D-G	*	*	*	*
None	*	*	*	*
Unweighted Base	*3,596*			

Overall	**Wave 1**	**Wave 2**	**W2 (appr)**	**Wave 3**
All who apply to university	5.47	1.83	0.27	1.74

	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 2 (appr)	Wave 3
All who do not apply to university	4.74	1.95	0.51	1.64

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

- Wave 1 measure sums the usefulness scores for career advice, career websites, talks with teachers and talks with family. It has a range of 0-18
- Wave 2 measure counts involvement in group career advice, individual career advice, career websites, talks with teachers, talks with family, talks with people at school about apprenticeships, talks with family about apprenticeships and talks with others about apprenticeships. It has a range of 0-8
- Wave 2 (appren) counts involvement in the three apprenticeship measures listed in the previous paragraph. It has a range of 0-3.
- Wave 3 measure counts involvement in group career advice, individual career advice, career websites, talks with teachers, talks with family and involvement in a work experience placement. It has a range of 0-6.

Despite the different measures making up the different indices across waves, Table 33 shows very similar patterns across characteristics in each wave. Females who applied to university engaged in more information gathering than males. With respect to ethnicity, the minority ethnic groups (particularly black and Asian) gathered more information compared with white, mixed and other groups. There were not large differences by region, though young people in the East Midlands generally gathered the least information and young people in the North-East the most. There was little variation by family background, and certainly, no evidence of more information gathered by the more advantaged. If anything, if there was a social gradient at all, it ran the other way. Finally, by GCSE attainment group, the group who consistently gathered the least information was perhaps surprisingly those who went on to achieve 5-6 good GCSEs. It is this group, who were not in the highest achieving group but nevertheless had shown some potential, who perhaps had the biggest decision to make about applying to university, but nevertheless gathered the least information.

In Wave 2 only, some of the information variables asked specifically about apprenticeships, and these were extracted from the overall Wave 2 measure and reported in a separate column in Table 33. There were some differences in the results of this column compared to the other columns, which reflected different groups' interests in and attitudes to apprenticeships. In particular, males were more likely to gather information on apprenticeships than females, while the amount of information gathered about apprenticeships, amongst those who went on to apply to university, fell monotonically with the education level of parents. In terms of young people's own

attainment, the most likely to gather information about apprenticeships were those with only 1 or 2 good GCSEs.

The final two rows in Table 33 show the information variables averaged across all who went on to apply to university, compared to all who did not. There was no clear pattern across waves – in Waves 1 and 3, those who applied to university gathered more information, while in Wave 2, they gathered less (though none of the differences are large). The latter result was due to the inclusion of the questions specifically about apprenticeships in Wave 2. The separate column focussing just on these questions shows that those who went on to apply to university were much less likely to ask about apprenticeships than those who did not.

9.4 Multivariate Analysis of Consistency in Likelihood of Applying to University

Finally, analysis looked at the effect of information gathering on whether or not individuals were consistent in their stated likelihood of applying to university across waves, controlling for all the other characteristics that affected both information gathering and university applications. As above, the analysis was for the sample of individuals who went on to actually apply to university. The dependent variable was a dummy variable, so the estimated equation was once again a Linear Probability Model. The results are in Table 34.

Table 34: Determinants of Consistency in Likelihood of Applying to University

Wave 1 information	0.014***
	(0.002)
Wave 2 information	-0.058***
	(0.011)
Wave 3 information	0.091***
	(0.013)
Female	0.068***
	(0.016)
Ethnic group (ref group: white)	
Mixed	0.003
	(0.039)
Indian	0.137***
	(0.042)
Pakistani	0.115***
	(0.043)
Bangladeshi	0.035
	(0.064)

Caribbean	-0.050
	(0.081)
African	0.140***
	(0.042)
Other	0.060
	(0.044)
English as second language	0.054*
	(0.032)
Region (ref group: London)	
North East	-0.094**
	(0.041)
North West	0.031
	(0.030)
Yorkshire and the Humber	-0.055
	(0.035)
East Midlands	-0.008
	(0.035)
West Midlands	-0.070**
	(0.031)
East of England	0.006
	(0.032)
South East	0.010
	(0.028)
South West	-0.090***
	(0.035)
Parental Ed. (ref group: no quals)	
Level 1/2	0.035
	(0.049)
A levels	0.082
	(0.051)
Level4	0.118**
	(0.051)
Degree	0.266***
	(0.049)
Parental Occupation (ref group: low skill occupation)	
no occupation	0.051
	(0.060)
Intermediate occupations	0.007
	(0.026)
Senior occupations	0.052**
	(0.024)
GCSE group (ref: 7+ A*-C)	
5-6 A*-C	-0.032
	(0.026)
3-4 A*-C	-0.008

	(0.036)
1-2 A*-C	-0.202***
	(0.070)
5+ D-G	-0.384
	(0.256)
1-4 D-G	-0.158
	(0.195)
None	-0.191
	(0.623)
Constant	0.023
	(0.055)
Observations	3487
R^2	0.121

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

The results showed that those who stated in the survey year after year that they were very likely to apply to university could not be said to be making a passive choice, and simply drifting into university. In fact, they were more likely to have gathered information, as measured by the wave-specific summary measures used also in the previous section, than those who altered their views on likelihood of applying to university. Note that the negative coefficient on the Wave 2 information measure was a result of the inclusion of the apprenticeship information variables. If those were removed, the coefficient became positive and significant at the 10% level.

Other noteworthy results in Table 34 were the strong family background effects. Even controlling for prior attainment and all information gathering, those from more advantaged backgrounds were much more likely to consistently report being very likely to apply to university. Also, not surprisingly, those with only one or two good GCSEs were the most likely to waiver in their certainty of applying to university.

In summary, there was little evidence that those who applied to university were simply making passive choices and not thinking about the decisions they made. In fact, those who applied to university gathered more information than those who did not, while those who always reported being very likely to apply to university also gathered more information than those whose stated intention changed (and therefore presumably were thinking about their decision to apply). What is not known in most cases is the type of information being gathered, since most questions asked individuals about information concerning ‘their future’. The one exception was the batch of Wave 2 questions on apprenticeships, and here a different pattern was witnessed. In this case, those who applied to university, and those who consistently said they were very likely to apply, were less likely to have gathered information about apprenticeships. It could be, therefore, that those individuals heading to the university route were discussing their futures a lot, but were only considering a narrow range of options.

10 Conclusion

The analysis in the preceding sections has studied two cohorts of young people, who took their GCSEs in 2006 and 2015 respectively. The aim was to investigate changes that have occurred during the nine years between the two cohorts, in terms of their aspirations for their post-compulsory education and what choices they actually made. The motivation for the study was to investigate whether the changes that have occurred in Further and Higher Education, such as the growth in apprenticeships and the increase in university tuition fees, have altered young people's aspirations and choices.

The answer to this main over-arching question is that not too much changed. Certainly, there has been no large shift from academic to vocational choices, inspired by the relative costs of undertaking each. The academic post-16 route of A-levels then university remained as the most popular route to take, particularly amongst those with high prior attainment and those from an advantaged family background. The strength of the relationship between some characteristics and applying to university increased between cohorts. For example women and non-white ethnic minorities, already more likely to apply in Cohort 1, became even more likely relative to men and white individuals in Cohort 2. Within the academic route, there was some evidence of change, with an increased popularity of STEM subjects for university degrees, and a corresponding relative fall in the popularity of arts based degrees.

There was also some evidence that those who followed this academic route were not simply passively standing on a treadmill, but were actively making choices; the results showed that those who attended university had gathered more information and discussed their future more, than those who did not attend, while those young people who consistently replied in each wave of the survey that they were very likely to apply to university similarly tended to have gathered more information. It may be that such individuals were only gathering information on a limited range of options, however, linked to university attendance. When questions were asked specifically about discussing apprenticeships, individuals in these groups were less likely to have done so. This suggests that there is still work to be done in terms of spreading information about apprenticeships and vocational options in general, so that young people can make informed choices, aware of all the options that they have.

There were some positive messages for vocational education in the report, however. In particular, there was a growth between the cohorts in the proportion of young people taking vocational Level 3 courses, and an increased progression from vocational Level 2 to Level 3 in Years 12 and 13. Such progression routes, and looking forward to levels higher than Level 3 as well, are crucial for making the vocational route a more attractive option. This improved progression is also important, giving the churning that was observed in Cohort 1, between low-level vocational education and the labour market and back into education at the same level. While a minority of lower level learners had such

experiences, they still represented significant numbers. When vocational education leads to progression rather than churning, it is potentially more likely to change aspirations and choices, in a way that changing relative costs of different routes does not seem to have done so far.

Appendix A

Table A1: Characteristics Associated with Post-Compulsory Aspirations of Young People, By Wave (Pooled Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 Data)

	Wave 1				Wave 3			
	Acad	**Vocat**	**Neither**	***Unweighted Base***	**Acad**	**Vocat**	**Neither**	***Unweighted Base***
Gender								
Male	61.74	22.67	15.59	*12,855*	55.61	29.07	15.32	*10,672*
Female	67.03	25.92	7.05	*12,627*	62.66	30.27	7.07	*10,573*
Ethnicity								
White	61.94	25.27	12.79	*18,014*	56.18	31.08	12.74	*15,540*
Mixed	70.16	22.89	6.95	*1,219*	65.29	29.33	5.38	*983*
Indian	83.38	14.24	2.38	*1,219*	84.06	13.93	2.01	*990*
Pakistani	76.65	19.38	3.87	*1,275*	71.51	23.42	5.07	*1,032*
Bangladeshi	75.49	21.29	3.32	*968*	74.88	21.66	3.47	*782*
Caribbean	64.22	29.34	6.45	*899*	57.97	34.91	7.12	*664*
African	81.44	16.70	1.86	*1,148*	82.26	15.75	1.99	*805*
Other	81.53	14.96	3.51	*702*	77.42	18.48	4.11	*540*
Region								
North East	59.78	25.80	14.42	*1,102*	59.03	25.81	15.16	*1,023*
North West	58.64	29.70	11.66	*3,250*	54.96	32.73	12.31	*3,083*
Yorkshire	61.57	25.91	12.53	*2,282*	54.01	31.88	14.11	*2,277*
East Midlands	63.35	23.11	13.54	*1,949*	56.33	29.28	14.39	*1,886*
West Midlands	66.35	23.89	9.77	*2,692*	60.14	31.40	8.45	*2,539*
East England	69.53	20.34	10.13	*2,344*	62.71	27.81	9.48	*2,211*
London	78.04	17.49	4.47	*3,791*	74.53	20.49	4.98	*3,412*
South East	67.02	23.38	9.60	*3,370*	63.91	27.07	9.01	*3,202*
South West	60.43	28.57	11.00	*1,882*	53.50	33.72	12.78	*1,784*
Highest parent ed:								
No quals	52.38	28.00	19.61	*3,792*	44.67	36.39	18.93	*2,915*
Level 1/2	55.11	29.52	15.37	*8,426*	46.84	37.72	15.44	*6,993*
A levels	61.96	26.39	11.66	*3,707*	55.94	31.64	12.41	*3,246*
Level 4	67.51	24.22	8.27	*3,671*	64.63	27.22	8.15	*3,144*
Degree	83.24	13.64	3.12	*4,941*	82.00	14.99	3.01	*4,429*
Highest parent occ:								
No occupation	58.71	28.68	12.60	*1,569*	54.00	32.51	13.49	*1,102*
Low skill occ	53.15	29.91	16.94	*8,160*	45.00	38.97	16.03	*6,564*
Intermediate	57.68	28.04	14.28	*5,197*	50.89	34.65	14.46	*4,469*
Senior occ	74.55	18.83	6.61	*10,556*	71.36	21.62	7.02	*9,296*
Young person talked with teachers	64.20	23.80	12.00	*5,628*	60.32	29.06	10.62	*4,514*
Did not talk with teachers	65.12	25.92	8.96	*19,790*	58.80	29.79	11.41	*16,679*
KS2 English:								
Level 2	38.71	27.12	34.17	*196*	25.36	48.00	26.64	*160*
Level 3	41.59	30.68	27.73	*3,464*	28.46	44.97	26.58	*2,755*
Level 4	61.19	27.69	11.13	*10,076*	54.40	33.28	12.32	*8,660*
Level 5	79.51	17.33	3.16	*6,060*	80.80	15.57	3.62	*5,403*
KS2 Maths:								
Level 2	40.40	26.81	32.79	*186*	27.24	50.13	22.63	*137*
Level 3	45.67	31.37	22.96	*4,176*	33.20	44.53	22.27	*3,412*
Level 4	60.89	27.30	11.81	*9,626*	54.48	32.78	12.74	*8,206*

	Wave 1				Wave 3			
Level 5	79.41	16.98	3.60	*5,906*	79.63	15.43	4.94	*5,313*
Future GCSE group								
7+ A*-C	78.58	18.33	3.09	*10,621*	80.23	16.83	2.95	*11,273*
5-6 A*-C	61.39	29.45	9.16	*1,964*	53.64	35.84	10.53	*2,132*
3-4 A*-C	56.24	30.94	12.83	*1,834*	41.85	44.74	13.41	*2,001*
1-2 A*-C	47.48	32.49	20.03	*2,076*	29.42	48.14	22.44	*2,270*
5+ D-G	37.61	31.82	30.57	*1,481*	20.82	51.15	28.04	*1,586*
1-4 D-G	36.99	26.03	36.99	*666*	18.65	46.32	35.03	*747*
None	33.89	25.62	40.49	*338*	22.97	37.54	39.49	*385*

Table A2: Percentage of Young People Very Likely to Apply to University, By Characteristics (Pooled Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 Data)

	Wave 1	Wave 3	Wave 4
Gender			
Male	33.10 (13,854)	32.49 (10,620)	33.05 (9,820)
Female	41.36 (13,326)	44.56 (10,568)	45.91 (9,913)
Ethnicity			
White	33.54 (19,312)	34.78 (15,490)	36.08 (14,514)
Mixed	46.85 (1,319)	48.21 (960)	45.91 (885)
Indian	62.01 (1,275)	68.07 (1,010)	67.34 (959)
Pakistani	50.72 (1,320)	52.17 (1,036)	54.05 (953)
Bangladeshi	48.75 (993)	52.79 (778)	49.03 (721)
Caribbean	46.37 (969)	42.71 (658)	44.14 (579)
African	68.20 (1,194)	71.43 (805)	69.47 (704)
Other	63.74 (753)	62.42 (541)	61.06 (503)
Region			
North East	34.10 (1,162)	34.29 (1,031)	35.85 (957)
North West	38.63 (3,403)	36.46 (3,040)	38.37 (2,817)
Yorkshire	33.15 (2,455)	34.86 (2,263)	35.88 (2,140)
East Midlands	32.89 (2,097)	33.80 (1,917)	34.10 (1,760)
West Midlands	38.83 (2.850)	39.31 (2,522)	39.80 (2,355)
East England	34.72 (2,502)	35.40 (2,204)	35.56 (2,078)
London	53.18 (4,037)	53.84 (3,408)	53.44 (3,081)
South East	36.11 (3,621)	37.97 (3,211)	40.00 (3,020)
South West	32.66 (2,049)	32.30 (1,760)	33.97 (1,671)

Highest parent ed:			
No qualifications	27.84 (3,983)	25.70 (2,900)	27.11 (2,611)
Level 1/2	25.26 (9,083)	25.18 (6,966)	24.91 (6,421)
A levels	33.69 (3,951)	34.06 (3,225)	36.05 (3,017)
Level 4	38.48 (3,909)	40.53 (3,153)	43.39 (2,965)
Degree	61.14 (5,261)	65.00 (4,424)	64.98 (4,264)
Highest parent occ:			
No occupation	35.53 (1,651)	32.75 (1,098)	34.61 (958)
Low skill occ	26.83 (8.661)	25.39 (6,531)	25.46 (6,008)
Intermediate occ	28.38 (5,596)	29.11 (4,448)	30.17 (4,131)
Senior occ	47.37 (11,272)	50.65 (9,295)	52.22 (8,816)
Young person talked w teachers	43.89 (5,893)	42.68 (4,529)	42.56 (4,189)
Did not talk with teachers	35.41 (21,214)	37.38 (16,605)	38.66 (15,492)
KS2 English Level			
Level 2	14.91 (214)	7.90 (162)	8.54 (148)
Level 3	14.54 (3,696)	11.45 (2,729)	13.15 (2,486)
Level 4	29.99(10,803)	30.32 (8,633)	31.24 (8,013)
Level 5	55.01 (6,375)	61.32 (5,436)	63.37 (5,200)
KS2 Maths Level			
Level 2	11.81 (194)	7.01 (137)	16.48 (122)
Level 3	17.55 (4,457)	14.31 (3,370)	16.54 (3,065)
Level 4	29.73(10,316)	31.90 (8,199)	33.22 (7,617)
Level 5	55.26 (6,232)	59.04 (5,341)	60.20 (5,119)
Future GCSE attainment group			
7+ A*-C	51.36 (11,244)	58.05 (11,288)	59.75 (10,825)
5-6 A*-C	31.73 (2,100)	31.14 (2,113)	29.76 (1,956)
3-4 A*-C	26.10 (1,979)	20.61 (1,983)	19.98 (1,791)
1-2 A*-C	16.34 (2,215)	12.22 (2,259)	11.90 (2,025)
5+ D-G	12.06 (1,575)	6.26 (1,598)	5.88 (1,421)
1-4 D-G	12.59 (723)	3.82 (729)	5.63 (628)
None	10.35 (373)	5.17 (375)	3.49 (325)

Numbers in brackets give the base sample behind the percentage in that cell (since each cell gives a percentage of a different sample).

Table A3: Determinants of Being Very Likely to Apply to University

	Wave 1	Wave 3	Wave 4
Cohort2	0.038***	0.010	-0.058***
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Female	0.063***	0.098***	0.085***
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Ethnic group (ref group: white)			
Mixed	0.074***	0.078***	0.040**
	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Indian	0.250***	0.318***	0.279***
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.017)
Pakistani	0.195***	0.238***	0.237***
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Bangladeshi	0.153***	0.203***	0.159***
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.023)
Caribbean	0.138***	0.148***	0.143***
	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.022)
African	0.319***	0.347***	0.285***
	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.022)
Other	0.209***	0.242***	0.202***
	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.024)
English as second language	0.064***	0.078***	0.062***
	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)
Region (ref group: London)			
North East	-0.020	-0.017	-0.005
	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)
North West	-0.023*	-0.036***	-0.018
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)
Yorkshire and the Humber	-0.050***	-0.047***	-0.033**
	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.015)
East Midlands	-0.063***	-0.049***	-0.050***
	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)
West Midlands	-0.042***	-0.027**	-0.039***
	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)
East of England	-0.073***	-0.064***	-0.071***
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)
South East	-0.085***	-0.063***	-0.051***
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)
South West	-0.070***	-0.078***	-0.059***
	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.016)

Parental Ed. (ref group: no quals)			
Level 1/2	-0.004	0.001	-0.024*
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.013)
A levels	0.029**	0.024*	0.007
	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.015)
Level4	0.045***	0.047***	0.041***
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)
Degree	0.174***	0.176***	0.142***
	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Parental Occupation (ref group: low skill occupation)			
No occupation	0.027	0.002	0.002
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.020)
Intermediate occupations	-0.009	0.005	-0.012
	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Senior occupations	0.051***	0.060*f**	0.036***
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.010)
Talk with teachers	0.091***	0.053***	0.033***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
KS2 English marks	0.005***	0.007***	0.004***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
KS2 Maths marks	0.003***	0.004***	0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
GCSE group (ref: 7+ A*-C)			
5-6 A*-C			-0.226***
			(0.012)
3-4 A*-C			-0.278***
			(0.013)
1-2 A*-C			-0.296***
			(0.014)
5+ D-G			-0.344***
			(0.016)
1-4 D-G			-0.320***
			(0.025)
None			-0.320***
			(0.038)
Constant	-0.264***	-0.405***	0.136***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.028)
Number of obs	17996	16219	14427
R^2	0.188	0.249	0.300

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table A4: Percentage Remaining in Education Throughout Year 13, by GCSE Attainment

	Left before end of Year 13	Remain in Education Throughout Year 13	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
7+ A*-C	34.86	65.14	*100.00*	*4971*
5-6 A*-C	47.77	52.23	*100.00*	*543*
3-4 A*-C	41.55	58.45	*100.00*	*442*
1-2 A*-C	43.92	56.08	*100.00*	*487*
5+ D-G	49.27	50.73	*100.00*	*453*
1-4 D-G	49.38	50.62	*100.00*	*129*
none	30.53	69.47	*100.00*	*62*

Table A5: Percentage Remaining in Education Throughout Year 13, by Highest Learning Aim

	Left before end of Year 13	Remain in Education Throughout Year 13	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
A levels	32.04	67.96	*100.00*	*4,358*
Vocational Level 3	34.98	65.02	*100.00*	*488*
Vocational Level 2	53.38	46.62	*100.00*	*226*
Vocational Below Level 2	38.36	61.64	*100.00*	*90*

Table A6: Percentage of Education-Leavers in Each Subsequent Activity, by GCSE attainment

	Employed	Apprenticeship	Inactive	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
7+ A*-C GCSEs	69.03	*	27.27	*100.00*	*100*
1-6 A*-C GCSEs	69,28	*	24.81	*100.00*	*121*
No A*-C GCSEs	52.03	*	36.59	*100.00*	*66*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

Table A7: Percentage of Education-Leavers in Each Subsequent Activity, by Highest Learning Aim

	Employed	Apprenticeship	Inactive	*Total*	*Unweighted Base*
Vocational Level 3	69.15	6.31	24.54	*100.00*	*165*
Vocational Level 2	65.25	*	28.21	*100.00*	*114*
Vocational Below Level 2	46.34	*	48.47	*100.00*	*37*

* Fewer than 10 sample members in cell.

Appendix B – University Attendance Statistics in Cohort 1

University Attendance Rates per Head of Population

This appendix provides some statistics on university attendance in Cohort 1 (in the data currently available for Cohort 2 the cohort members have not yet reached the age where they are attending university). .

Table B1 presents information on the percentage of the cohort who had attended university by age 25, as recorded in the follow up survey (wave 8), by ethnic group. This recorded whether they had ever been to university, or were currently attending at that point – weighted for response at wave 8, to allow for the fact that the better educated are more likely to still respond to the survey by that point.

Table B1: Ever Attended University by Ethnicity

	Percentage attended university
White	33.50
Mixed	42.42
Indian	65.31
Pakistani	39.78
Bangladeshi	42.33
Black Caribbean	43.34
Black African	67.45
Other	58.34
All	36.15

The majority white ethnic group clearly had the lowest participation rate in university. Table B2 further splits the data by gender as well as ethnicity. Whites had the lowest participation rate for both males and females. Within ethnic groups, females were more likely to have attended university within every group, with the exception of the mixed

ethnicity group. The gap between males and females was smaller for the Asian-origin ethnic groups, and larger for the white and black groups.

Table B2: Ever Attended University by Ethnicity and Gender

	Female	Male
White	36.65	30.49
Mixed	41.84	42.60
Indian	68.15	63.18
Pakistani	41.10	38.01
Bangladeshi	43.47	41.12
Black Caribbean	48.41	37.71
Black African	70.56	63.62
Other	62.84	54.18
All	39.15	33.26

Table B3: Ever Attended University by Region

	Percentage attended university
North East	27.98
North West	34.95
Yorkshire and The Humber	33.50
East Midlands	34.84
West Midlands	33.65
East of England	37.49
London	50.58
South East	37.91
South West	29.81

By region (Table B3), young people from London were much more likely to have attended university than from any other region. Attendance rates were lowest for young people from the North-East and the South-West, with little difference across the remaining regions. When looking by region and gender, the regional differences for females were small across all regions except London. The overall low attendance rates for the North-East and South-West noted above were therefore particularly driven by low rates amongst males in these regions. Females had a higher likelihood of attending university than males in every region, with the gender difference being smallest in London.

Table B4: Ever Attended University by Region and Gender

	Female	Male
North East	35.36	20.92
North West	36.51	34.17
Yorkshire and The Humber	37.51	29.37
East Midlands	37.20	32.27
West Midlands	36.28	30.85
East of England	39.79	34.56
London	51.26	49.91
South East	40.05	35.46
South West	36.04	24.07

University Attendance Rates Amongst those who Applied

Table B5 reports university attendance rates by age 25, based this time on a sample who said in wave 5 of the survey (i.e. age 17/18, Year 13 of school) that they had applied to university. Others might have applied after wave 5 of the survey, of course, but they were not observed.

Table B5: Ever Attended University by Ethnicity, Amongst those who Applied in Wave 5 (Year 13)

	Percentage attended university
White	79.86
Mixed	75.56
Indian	78.46
Pakistani	71.38
Bangladeshi	70.71
Black Caribbean	72.56
Black African	81.17
Other	76.54
All	79.14

The highest rate of successful applications was amongst two of the groups with lower overall attendance rates – whites and black African. It therefore seems that the groups with the higher participation rates achieve this by making more applications: although they have a lower success rates, overall they have a higher absolute number of acceptances.

Splitting the sample of university applicants by gender as well as ethnicity (Table B6), males had a higher attendance rate amongst those who had applied amongst whites, but in all other ethnic groups (except for 'other') females were more successful in turning applications into places, in most cases by a significant margin.

Table B6: Ever Attended University by Ethnicity and Gender, Amongst those who Applied in Wave 5 (Year 13)

	Female	Male
White	78.92	80.68
Mixed	75.55	75.28
Indian	81.88	75.17
Pakistani	74.23	65.46
Bangladeshi	73.72	65.85
Black Caribbean	74.62	66.73
Black African	87.59	73.28
Other	76.07	76.94
All	78.76	79.30

Note – much higher success rate for applications by females in ethnic minority groups, but not for white groups. Some cell sizes are very small here, down to just 19 for Black Caribbean males – probably not of publishable standard.

Turning to region (Table B7), London had by far the highest HE attendance rate of any region, but again, as with ethnicity, this was not because a higher success rate of turning applications into places, and so was determined more by a higher number of applications. The South-East was the region where those young people who applied were most likely to have attended university, with this rate being lowest in the North-East and South-West (which therefore had the lowest attendance rate per head of population *and* per applicant).

Splitting the sample of applicants by region and gender (Table B8) revealed some interesting differences between genders. While females were more successful in turning applications into places in regions such as the North-East, Yorkshire and the South-West, in other regions, noticeably the North-West, West Midlands and the South-East in particular, the reverse was true and males were more successful in this respect.

Table B7: Attended University by Region, Amongst those who Applied in Wave 5 (Year 13)

	Percentage attended university
North East	74.11
North West	82.97
Yorkshire and The Humber	75.70
East Midlands	80.39
West Midlands	72.03
East of England	81.22
London	79.53
South East	85.35
South West	73.25

Table B8: Ever Attended University by Region and Gender, Amongst those who Applied in Wave 5 (year 13)

	Female	Male
North East	78.33	67.73
North West	81.43	84.01
Yorkshire and The Humber	77.91	72.68
East Midlands	81.38	78.60
West Midlands	70.69	73.41
East of England	81.08	81.13
London	79.24	79.72
South East	82.42	88.13
South West	74.65	71.36

University Attendance Rates by Prior GCSE Attainment

The following tables consider the proportion who applied to university within each ethnic group and region, by level of GCSE attainment, to determine for example whether lower GCSE attainers were more likely to apply in some ethnic groups and regions than others. Note that some aggregations of categories was necessary due to small cell sizes, for example just looking at white vs non-white.

Table B9: Percentage Applied to University in Wave 5 for each level of GCSE Attainment, by Ethnicity

	White	Non-White
7+ A*-C GCSEs	59.43	74.97
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	20.19	41.26
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	5.41	16.84
No A*-C GCSEs	0.88	4.45

Table B9 shows clearly that young people from non-white ethnic groups were much more likely to apply to university, within every band of GCSE attainment. There higher application rate was therefore not due to a higher level of attainment. Of those who applied, the relative success rate in terms of who eventually went to university across GSCE attainment groups was broadly similar for both whites and non-whites (Table B10): whites had a slightly higher success rate amongst the highest GCSE achievers, while non-whites were more successful amongst intermediate GCSE achievers.

Table B10: Ever Attended University by Ethnicity and Prior Attainment, Amongst those who Applied in Wave 5 (year 13)

	White	Non-White
7+ A*-C GCSEs	82.59	80.36
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	63.93	66.55
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	43.05	49.81
No A*-C GCSEs	*	*

* fewer than 10 observations in cell.

Finally, looking at regions and GCSE attainment (Table B11), London's higher application rate was observed within all GCSE attainment levels, suggesting that the capital's advantage was due to something other than prior attainment.

Table B11: Percentage Applied to University in Wave 5 for each level of GCSE Attainment, by Region

North-east	
7+ A*-C GCSEs	57.43
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	29.63
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	11.18
no A*-C GCSEs	2.04
North-west	
7+ A*-C GCSEs	65.75
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	20.00
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	6.48
no A*-C GCSEs	0.59
Yorkshire	
7+ A*-C GCSEs	62.96
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	14.08
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	7.25
no A*-C GCSEs	0.74
East Midlands	
7+ A*-C GCSEs	58.98
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	20.33
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	7.77
no A*-C GCSEs	1.07
West Midlands	
7+ A*-C GCSEs	56.77
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	26.04
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	7.47
no A*-C GCSEs	0.21
East of England	
7+ A*-C GCSEs	57.64
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	18.81
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	5.77

no A*-C GCSEs	0.70
London	
7+ A*-C GCSEs	71.59
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	38.58
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	11.98
no A*-C GCSEs	4.04
South-east	
7+ A*-C GCSEs	63.97
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	26.32
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	5.03
no A*-C GCSEs	1.34
South-west	
7+ A*-C GCSEs	50.55
5-6 A*-C GCSEs	21.44
1-4 A*-C GCSEs	2.57
no A*-C GCSEs	2.29

London is different to the rest of the country, in terms of a higher proportion at each level of GCSE attainment applying to university.

Cell sizes are too small in the low attainment groups to further disaggregate by region those who have applied into those who go to university and those who do not.

Appendix C – LSYPE Survey Questions Used in the Analysis

Variable Description	Wave	Variable name Cohort 1	Variable name Cohort 2
What MP thinks YP WILL do when they reach 16	1	W1parasp2MP	Parasp1_W1_MP
How likely MP thinks it is that YP will go on to university	1	W1hepossMP	Heposs_W1_MP
MP's current activity	1	wrk1a	Wrk1_W1_SP
MP's current activity	1	wrk1a	Wrk1_W1_MP
Government office region	1	gor	gor_name_w1_geo
MP's highest qualification (other answers not backcoded)	1	W1hiqualgdad	Equal_W1_MP
MP's highest qualification (other)	1		EqualO_W1_MP
SP's highest qualification (other answers not backcoded)	1	W1hiqualgmum	Equal_W1_SP
SP's highest qualification (other)	1		EqualO_W1_SP
YP gender	1	W1sexYP	Sex_W1_YP
YP's ethnic group	1	W1ethgrpYP	Ethnic_W1_YP
Whether English is YP's first or main language	1	W1englangHH	EngLang_W1_YP
Whether school offer careers advice from a careers advisor who comes into the school	1		CarAdv1_W1_YP
Whether YP has ever received careers advice from this careers advisor - Yes - as part of a group	1		CarAdv2_1_W1_YP
Whether YP has ever received careers advice from this careers advisor - Yes individually/on my own	1		CarAdv2_2_W1_YP
Whether YP has ever received careers advice from this careers advisor - No	1		CarAdv2_3_W1_YP
Whether YP has ever received careers advice	1		CarAdv2_4_W1_YP

from this careers advisor - Don't know			
Whether the careers advice (from this careers advisor) helped YP to think about what they might do in the future	1		CarAdv3_W1_YP
Whether YP has ever been told about any careers advice websites at school	1		CarAdv4_W1_YP
Whether YP has ever accessed any of the careers advice websites that they were told about	1		CarAdv5_W1_YP
Whether these careers advice websites helped YP to think about what they might do in the future	1		CarAdv6_W1_YP
How often YP talks about plans for studying in the future with teachers	1	W1advfrsYP	AdvFrS_W1_YP
How often YP talks about plans for studying in the future with family	1	W1advfamYP	AdvFam_W1_YP
How useful YP found the information about future studies they got from teachers	1	W1infofrnYP	InfoFrN_W1_YP
How useful YP found the information about future studies they got from family	1	W1infofamYP	InfoFam_W1_YP
What YP thinks they will do when they are 16	1	W1plann16YP	Plann16_W1_YP
What sort of full time education YP thinks they will do when they are 16	1	W1plast16YP	Plast16_W1_YP
What YP thinks they will do when they are 16 rather than staying in education	1	W1pladk16YP	Pladk16_W1_YP
Likelihood YP will ever apply to go to university to do a degree	1	W1heposs9YP	Heposs9_W1_YP
Main parent SOC 2010	1	W1socmajorMP	SOC_W1_MP
Second parent SOC 2010	1	W1socmajorSP	SOC_W1_SP
How likely MP thinks it is that YP will go on to university	2		Heposs_W2_MP
Will not get necessary grades - Reason MP thinks	2		Henot_01_W2_MP

it's unlikely that YP will go to university			
Family can't afford it - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_02_W2_MP
He/she has no interest in going - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_03_W2_MP
Has job in mind already/does not need the qualification to do what wants - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_04_W2_MP
SEN/learning problems - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_05_W2_MP
Wants to start working/earning money - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_06_W2_MP
Taking education at college/elsewhere other than university - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_07_W2_MP
Not academic/not good at studying - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_08_W2_MP
Does not want the debt - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_09_W2_MP
Lack of confidence - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_10_W2_MP
Lack of drive/ commitment - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_11_W2_MP
Unsure what he/she wants to do at the moment - Reason MP thinks it's	2		Henot_12_W2_MP

unlikely that YP will go to university			
Other - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_13_W2_MP
Don't know - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	2		Henot_14_W2_MP
MP's highest qualification (other answers not backcoded) (IP section for MPs who did not complete IP interview at W1)	2		Equal_W2_MP
MP's highest qualification (other) (IP section for MPs who did not complete IP interview at W1)	2		EqualO_W2_MP
Whether school has offered careers advice from a careers advisor who comes into the school since the last interview	2		CarAdv1_W2_YP
Whether YP has received careers advice from this careers advisor since the last interview - Yes - as part of a group	2		CarAdv2_1_W2_YP
Whether YP has received careers advice from this careers advisor since the last interview - Yes - individually/on my own	2		CarAdv2_2_W2_YP
Whether YP has received careers advice from this careers advisor since the last interview - No	2		CarAdv2_3_W2_YP
Whether YP has received careers advice from this careers advisor since the last interview - Don't know	2		CarAdv2_4_W2_YP
Whether the careers advice (from this careers advisor) helped YP to think about what they might do in the future	2		CarAdv3_W2_YP
Whether YP has ever been told about any careers advice websites at school if not asked at W1	2		CarAdv4_W2_YP

Whether YP has ever accessed any of the careers advice websites that they were told about if not asked/used at W1	2		CarAdv5_W2_YP
Whether these careers advice websites helped YP to think about what they might do in the future if not asked at W1	2		CarAdv6_W2_YP
How often YP talks about plans for studying in the future with teachers	2	W2AdvFrsYP	AdvFrS_W2_YP
How often YP talks about plans for studying in the future with family	2	W2AdvFamYP	AdvFam_W2_YP
What YP thinks they will do when they are 16	2	W2plann16YP	Plann16_W2_YP
What sort of full time education YP thinks they will do when they are 16	2	W2plast16YP	Plast16_W2_YP
Likelihood YP will ever apply to go to university to do a degree	2	W2heposs9YP	Heposs9_W2_YP
Whether YP had heard of Apprenticeships	2	W2modapYP	ModAp_W2_YP
Whether YP has spoken to anyone about starting an Apprenticeship after Year 11	2	W2modap2YP	ModAp2_W2_YP
Their parent(s) - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_01_W2_YP
Other family member (brother, sister, uncle etc.) - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_02_W2_YP
School careers advisor - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_03_W2_YP
Careers advisor who came into the school - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_04_W2_YP
Teacher at school - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_05_W2_YP

National Careers Service or other careers service - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_06_W2_YP
Friends / Neighbours - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_07_W2_YP
A local employer - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_08_W2_YP
Someone else - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_09_W2_YP
Don't Know - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_10_W2_YP
Refused - People YP has spoken to about starting an Apprenticeship	2	W2ModAp3YP0a	ModAp3_11_W2_YP
Likelihood of YP applying for an Apprenticeship after he/she leaves school	2	W2modap3aYP	ModAp3a_W2_YP
Whether YP has a specific job in mind	2	W2modap4aYP	ModAp4a_W2_YP
Post year 11 aspirations (What YP thinks they will do)	2		Aspir_W2_DER
Post year 11 aspirations including don't know (What YP thinks they will do)	2		Aspir2_W2_DER
Post year 11 aspirations including don't know and A level intentions (What YP thinks they will do)	2		Aspir3_W2_DER
What MP would LIKE YP to do when they reach 16 - COMBINED	2		Parasp1_comb_W2_DER
What MP would LIKE YP to do when they finish Year 11	3		Parasp2_W3_MP
How likely MP thinks it is that YP will go on to university	3		Heposs_W3_MP
Will not get necessary grades - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_01_W3_MP

Family can't afford it - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_02_W3_MP
He/she has no interest in going - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_03_W3_MP
Has job in mind already/does not need the qualification to do what wants - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_04_W3_MP
SEN/learning problems - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_05_W3_MP
Wants to start working/earning money - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_06_W3_MP
Taking education at college/elsewhere other than university - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_07_W3_MP
Not academic/not good at studying - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_08_W3_MP
Does not want the debt - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_09_W3_MP
Lack of confidence - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_10_W3_MP
Lack of drive/ commitment - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_11_W3_MP
Unsure what he/she wants to do at the moment - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_12_W3_MP

Wants to do an apprenticeship - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_13_W3_MP
Other reason - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_14_W3_MP
Don't know - Reason MP thinks it's unlikely that YP will go to university	3		Henot_15_W3_MP
Whether YP had a short term work experience placement during Year 11	3	W3outschbYP	OutSchb_W3_YP
Whether school has offered careers advice from a careers advisor who comes into the school since the last interview	3		CarAdv1_W3_YP
Whether YP has received careers advice from this careers advisor since the last interview - Yes - as part of a group	3		CarAdv2_1_W3_YP
Whether YP has received careers advice from this careers advisor since the last interview - Yes - individually/on my own	3		CarAdv2_2_W3_YP
Whether YP has received careers advice from this careers advisor since the last interview - No	3		CarAdv2_3_W3_YP
Whether YP has received careers advice from this careers advisor since the last interview - Don't know	3		CarAdv2_4_W3_YP
Whether the careers advice (from this careers advisor) helped YP to think about what they might do in the future	3		CarAdv3_W3_YP
Whether YP has ever been told about any careers advice websites at school if not asked at W1 or W2	3		CarAdv4_W3_YP
Whether YP has ever accessed any of the careers advice websites that they	3		CarAdv5_W3_YP

were told about if not asked/used at W1 or W2			
Whether these careers advice websites helped YP to think about what they might do in the future if not asked at W1 or W2	3		CarAdv6_W3_YP
How often YP talks about plans for studying in the future with teachers	3		AdvFrS_W3_YP
How often YP talks about plans for studying in the future with family	3		AdvFam_W3_YP
What YP thinks they will do when they have finished Year 11	3	W3plann16YP	Plann16_W3_YP
Likelihood YP will ever apply to go to university to do a degree	3	W3heposs9YP	Heposs9_W3_YP
		W3plast16YP	plast16_w3_yp
Whether YP is still at the same school they were attending at the end of Year 11	4	W4OldSkuleYP	OldSkule_W4_YP
Current Activity of YP (dummy variable used for routing purposes)	4	W4mainactYP	TCurrentAct_W4_YP
Whether YP is currently studying at school or college full or part-time	4		SchPart_W4_YP
Likelihood YP will ever apply to go to university to do a degree	4	W4Heposs9YP	Heposs9_W4_YP
Whether still doing Wave 4 activity now	5		ActStill_W5_YP
Whether been doing this activity continuously since Wave 4 interview	5		ActCont_w5_YP
Whether break of a month or more was due to being on holiday or off sick and have since returned to the job	5		JobHolChk_W5_YP
Current Activity of YP (dummy variable used for routing purposes)	5	W5actYP	TCurrentAct_W5_YP
Likelihood of ever applying to university	5	W5Heposs9YP	Heposs9_W5_YP

Whether YP is currently studying at school or college full or part-time	5		SchPart_W5_YP
Whether applied for a university course for this year or next year	5	W5HeapplyYP	HEApply_W5_YP
Whether accepted any university offers yet	5	W5AcceptYP	Accept_W5_YP
Intended degree course		W5UnisubBYP0a	unisubb_*_w5_yp

Reference: DFE-RR905

ISBN: 978-1-83870-026-3

The views expressed in this report are the author's and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at: www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications