Young people not in education, employment or training
Our vision is to help the nation spend wisely.

We promote the highest standards in financial management and reporting, the proper conduct of public business and beneficial change in the provision of public services.

The National Audit Office scrutinises public spending on behalf of Parliament. The Comptroller and Auditor General, Tim Burr, is an Officer of the House of Commons. He is the head of the National Audit Office which employs some 850 staff. He and the National Audit Office are totally independent of Government. He certifies the accounts of all Government departments and a wide range of other public sector bodies; and he has statutory authority to report to Parliament on the economy, efficiency and effectiveness with which departments and other bodies have used their resources. Our work leads to savings and other efficiency gains worth many millions of pounds; at least £9 for every £1 spent running the Office.
Young people not in education, employment or training
In July 2008 the Children, Schools and Families Committee requested that the National Audit Office undertake research on the profile of 16 to 18 year olds not participating in education, employment or training. This memorandum has been prepared in response.
Summary

1 In July 2008 the Children, Schools and Families Committee requested that the National Audit Office undertake research on the profile of 16 to 18 year olds not participating in education, employment or training (NEET). This memorandum has been prepared in response and combines data from various sources to:

- examine the extent to which personal and family characteristics are associated with the likelihood of having a period out of education, employment or training;
- quantify the likelihood of a young person experiencing one or more periods NEET, the number of young people persistently NEET, the length of spells NEET and the number of periods NEET;
- show what young people NEET do next; and
- illustrate regional and local variations.

2 The memorandum is based on our analysis of three key data sources: the Connexions Service data on young people’s activities, the Labour Force Survey which provides a count and headline characteristics, and the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE) which provides a wealth of data on attitudes, characteristics and behaviour of young people aged 13/14 and their career status at 16/17. We also draw on extant research reports where appropriate.

3 NEET stands for ‘not in education, employment or training’. It is a residual category and does not well define the wide range of young people who can, at some time, find themselves in the category for positive or negative reasons. Nevertheless, being NEET as a young person is associated with poor outcomes such as being unemployed or in low-paid employment as an adult.

4 The analysis undertaken for this memorandum shows that 16 to 18 year olds NEET are, on average, measurably different from their peers who are in education, employment or training even by the age of 13/14. The differences, though significant, are not extreme. But even where the differences appear small, they are consistently ‘worse’ for the NEET group on every indicator we have examined.

Numbers and location

5 The 2007 estimate of the number of 16 to 18 year olds NEET was around 189,000 or 9.4 per cent of the total relevant population. But many more individuals experience a spell NEET in a year than this figure suggests. The length of the first spell NEET in 2007-08 was 32 weeks on average.
The figure for the United Kingdom appears to be higher than in most Organisation for Economic and Cultural Development (OECD) countries, but lower than in the other home nations – Scotland has a relatively high proportion at over 11 per cent.

The number of 16 to 18 year olds NEET varies between regions, from just over 5 per cent in the South East to 10 per cent in the North East. The proportion of young people NEET can vary greatly between local authority areas within a region. Many parts of the country consider the issue to be important. A reduction in the number of 16 to 18 year olds NEET is the most commonly selected indicator of progress in agreements between local authorities and central government: 115 out of 150 Local Area Agreements adopted this indicator.

**Characteristics of young people NEET**

Over time, more young people ‘collect’ in the NEET group than leave it. Among 16 to 18 year olds, the proportion of 18 year olds NEET is more than twice that of 16 year olds, and there are slightly more young men NEET than young women. There is a substantial core of young people who are persistently NEET (around 25,000).

A higher proportion of white young people are NEET than is seen among most ethnic minority groups.

Young people NEET are more likely than their peers to have a disability or longer-term health problem. Children in local authority care are much more likely than their peers to be NEET.

16/17 year olds NEET are more likely to have engaged in risky behaviours (smoking or vandalism, for example) by age of 13/14.

**Family background**

Disadvantage in its many forms is a more common feature of early life for 16/17 year olds NEET. When they were 13/14, their parents reported greater financial constraints, were placed in the lower socio-economic groupings, and had a greater likelihood of being out of employment.

The families of young people NEET tend to have less ‘social capital’ – the non-financial resources available within a family, such as knowledge and range of experience. For example, the parents of young people NEET are less likely to be confident in their abilities to advise their children about educational choices, and to have relatively low levels of qualification themselves. Many are families headed by a female lone-parent, whereas young people in education, employment or training are much more likely to live in families formed of married/cohabiting couples with dependent children.

The families of young people NEET also tend to report relatively poorer home relationships. For example, three-quarters of parents of young people in education, employment or training said they had got on very well with their child at age 13/14, compared with two-thirds of parents whose children were NEET by 16/17.
The families of young people NEET also tend to have greater involvement with social services or education welfare services, though the proportions reporting such involvement were not high: around 12 per cent of parents of 16/17 year olds NEET had been in contact with social services about their son or daughter’s behaviour by age 13/14, and 17 per cent had been in contact with educational welfare services.

**Young people’s engagement with education, employment and society**

Sixteen year olds NEET were less likely to have engaged with the Connexions Service at 13/14 and, as noted, their families often felt poorly qualified to give advice on qualifications.

Peer pressure is strongly indicated as a factor in young people’s decisions about whether to stay in education: young people who think that their friends are likely to stay in full-time education are much more likely to do so themselves, and vice versa.

Doing well at school is fundamental to a successful transition into education, employment or training at 16/17. But 16/17 year olds NEET are much more likely to have no or low qualifications – one fifth of 16/17 year olds NEET have no qualifications at all. 16/17 year olds NEET were less confident about their academic abilities at age 13/14 than those who entered education, employment or training, and held more negative attitudes to their school and school work (such as not wanting to go to school). These results suggest that attitudes to education become established before entering the teenage years.

Young people NEET at 16/17 reported a less satisfactory experience of school. The group was more likely to say that misbehaviour in lessons was commonplace, and that school discipline in Year 9 (age 13/14) was too strict. The experience of being bullied at school around the age of 13/14 was more common for 16/17 year olds NEET, and they were much more likely to have played truant.

Many young people NEET have unfulfilled ambitions. For example, six in 10 had expected to stay on in full-time education.

At 13/14, the preferred career destination for the four in 10 not wanting to continue in education was employment, though not necessarily jobs with training. Young people in jobs without training have a relatively high risk of becoming NEET.

**Family attitudes to education and employment**

Parents of young people NEET at 16/17 were more likely to express dissatisfaction with aspects of school quality and their child’s progress than other parents, but for both groups, the majority of parents were satisfied, with the parents of young people in education, employment or training more strongly so.
The parents of 16/17 year olds NEET strongly wanted their children to have a better education than they had received themselves. The majority would like their sons and daughters to stay on in education but predicted that some would be drawn towards jobs and training. The parents of 16/17 year olds NEET and in education, employment or training were equally likely to have spoken to their son or daughter about staying on in full-time education by age 13/14.

**Future work on young people NEET**

Four new sources of information relevant to young people NEET will be available shortly which the Committee may also find useful to consider. Full details are in paragraphs in Part 3 (paragraphs 3.2 to 3.6). Briefly they are:

- two studies commissioned by the Department for Children, Schools and Families, one about drivers and barriers to educational success, and the second an exploration of the issues surrounding post-16 participation in education and training;

- a Nuffield review of 14-19 education and training, in collaboration with Rathbone, set up the Engaging Youth Enquiry in September 2007 to listen to the voices of young people NEET. The findings are presented in the form of a consultative report and they are welcoming comments until March 2009; and

- a recent consultation by the Welsh Assembly about young people NEET which will be issuing a final report and action plan in December 2008.

Part 3 of this memorandum concludes by suggesting three possible broad areas of inquiry, which we have identified largely from the results of our analyses, which the Committee may wish to consider (paragraph 3.7).
Part One

Young people NEET: contextual information

1.1 This part sets out:

- the definition of not in education, employment or training and why this is an important topic (paragraphs 1.2 to 1.14);
- how the Department for Children, Schools and Families (the Department) calculates the official statistics on young people not in education, employment or training (paragraphs 1.15 to 1.17);
- the size of the group and trends in their numbers over time (paragraphs 1.18 to 1.19);
- the numbers of young people not in education, employment or training in England compared to other countries and between regions and local authorities across England (paragraphs 1.20 to 1.26); and
- the incidence and duration of spells not in education, employment or training (paragraphs 1.27 to 1.33).

Definition of NEET

1.2 Young people not in education, employment or training are often referred to as NEET. They are the residual, i.e. those who are left when young people in education, employment or training have been deducted from the total number of young people. The Department has analysed the activities of 16 to 18 year olds NEET which shows the wide range of young people covered by the definition – over half are seeking employment or training (Figure 1).

1.3 A 16 to 18 year old is defined\(^1\) as being in:

- **Education or training** if they are in full-time education, employer-funded training, or other education and training. It includes those attending independent colleges or training centres; at any college in part-time study not reported as released from a job; or receiving training or in part-time education but not currently employed.

- **Employment** if they are an employee, self-employed, on a work-based learning programme or an unpaid family worker. This is the International Labour Organisation definition and includes young people in full-time education who also have part-time jobs.
Though many people view NEET as having negative connotations, young people in the NEET category are a broad and heterogeneous group with differing needs. It includes those who may be in a transition phase, and young people with a long or short-term experience of being NEET (Figure 1). (More details can be found in Appendix 1).

The importance of this topic

Having young people NEET has implications for the individual and society. Being NEET between 16 and 18 years of age is associated with a range of negative outcomes later in life. In summary:

- Being NEET at 16 to 18 has been found to be a major predictor of unemployment at age 21.2
- Being NEET at the age of 16 to 18 is strongly correlated with early parenthood. Seventy-one per cent of women who experience a significant spell of NEET (six months or more between 16 and 18) are parents by the age of 21 compared with 16 per cent of other young women.3

Figure 1
Status of 16 to 18 year olds NEET

Source: Department for Children, Schools and Families

NOTE
1 Department’s analysis of Connexions Service data; Calculated from three month average from November 2006 to January 2007.
Other long term outcomes at 21 of young women NEET aged 16 to 18 are poor health, having full-time home care responsibility and living in rented accommodation. Research looking at the impact on 21 year olds (born in 1970) of being NEET concluded that for young men the consequences lie mainly in subsequent poor labour market experience. A recent report by the Scottish Executive found evidence that young people NEET were also at particular risk of offending, drugs/substance misuse, homelessness and emotional behavioural problems. Many young people NEET could also be classed as unemployed. The effects of long term unemployment include a negative impact on health and well-being. There are financial cost implications for the individual and the taxpayer, during the period NEET as well as in the long term. For example, in 1999 a calculation estimated the additional life-time cost of having young people NEET at 16 to 18 to be £7 billion in resource costs and £8.1 billion in public finance costs (figures are based on 2000-01 prices). For 16 to 24 year olds, the productivity loss to the economy from youth unemployment has been estimated at £10 million every year (excluding those who are ‘inactive’ for other reasons), in addition to approximately £20 million each week in Jobseeker’s Allowance for 18 to 24 year olds. For individuals it has been estimated that an additional year of schooling increases average earnings by around 5 to 10 per cent, and that having formal qualifications brings measurably higher earnings. It seems likely that young people NEET, who have a truncated education and lower qualifications, will miss out on these effects. Long term costs of being unemployed include foregone earnings at the time and lower earnings in the future. There is research to suggest that early unemployment reduces income by 12 to 15 per cent at age 42. However, this penalty is lower, at 8 to 10 per cent, if individuals avoid repeated spells of unemployment. The Department has a Public Service Agreement (PSA 14) to reduce the proportion of 16 to 18 year olds NEET by two percentage points between 2004 and 2010. This is against a baseline figure of 9.6 per cent. There is no specific data collection exercise which routinely collects data on young people NEET. But there are three main data sources which contain some information on young people NEET. They are:

- the Labour Force Survey – a quarterly survey of the economic activity among the population of the United Kingdom;
- the Connexions Service – which collects statistics monthly on young people using its services;
the combined Youth Cohort Survey and Longitudinal Study of Young People in England – which allows the comparison of young people’s own and family characteristics, attitudes and behaviours at age 13/14 with their economic status at 16.

1.11 The Department also pulls together a range of data sources (for example, population estimates and higher education participation figures) to provide regular statistical summaries.

1.12 These data sources are large and complex – one of the data files created for this memorandum contained 4.5 million individuals, 12 activity measurement points and was 500 megabytes in size. Analysis of the data sources therefore takes considerable time and resources. Consequently, this memorandum draws on these data sources to illustrate the profile of young people NEET, but does not exhaust their full potential.

1.13 There are, however, limitations of the data sources which mean that there are a number of groups about whose propensity to be NEET and personal characteristics we cannot comment. Limitations include:

• issues with the inclusion, identification and representation of particular groups of young people, for example ethnic minorities, homeless young people, but most especially those young people who have disengaged with Connexions Service and do not participate in surveys. The memorandum is based only on information on young people included in the data sources;

• limited availability of information about young people, for example, data on arrests and prosecutions, and some behavioural difficulties;

• the tracking of young people’s progress across time, for example, the longer-term implications for those who drop in and out of being NEET or are in a core of persistently NEET between 16 and 18; and

• many of the data sources are samples, so any estimates of young people NEET or their characteristics will have some sampling error.

1.14 Perhaps the biggest limitation in our knowledge about young people NEET is the issue of causality. This memorandum shows that young people NEET display early differences to those who are in education, employment or training. But the differences, though significant, are not extreme. Many young people who enter education, employment or training share the same characteristics. Also, these differences are associated with becoming NEET, but do not necessarily cause someone to be NEET. The best that statisticians can do is look at which combination of early features of a young person’s profile, if any, are strongly associated with becoming NEET. Our work on this is set out in Appendix 2.
Number of young people NEET

1.15 Measuring the number of young people NEET is complex owing to the transient nature of the group, which makes it difficult to track movements and outcomes over time. The method of calculation of the official national estimate combines a number of data sources. To produce its estimate, the Department firstly calculates the number of young people who are not in education or training, by subtracting the number of young people known to be in education and training from the total population. It then uses the Labour Force Survey to estimate what proportion of the residual not in education or training is NEET.\(^\text{13}\)

1.16 The Department estimated the proportion of 16 to 18 year olds NEET as 9.4 per cent at the end of 2007, or 189,000 young people (Figure 2).\(^\text{14}\)

1.17 Young people NEET can be divided into those who are active and inactive in the labour market. The former includes those who are unemployed (5.2 per cent of 16 to 18 year olds or 55 per cent of young people NEET).\(^\text{15}\) The latter includes parents and carers; the sick or disabled; and students not currently studying (4.2 per cent or 45 per cent respectively).

---

**Figure 2**
Activity of 16 to 18 year olds, England, 2007 (provisional figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time education</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-based learning</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer-funded training</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other education and training(^1)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in education and training</strong>(^2)</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in any education or training – in employment</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not in any education, employment or training</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total not in any education or training</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Statistical First Release 13/2008, Table 1*

**NOTES**

1. Includes part-time education not funded by employers or through work-based learning; also full- or part-time education in independent further education and higher education institutions.

2. Total of all full-time education and work-based learning (less work-based learning in full-time education) plus employer-funded training and other education and training.
Trends in the number of young people NEET

1.18 The proportion of 16 to 18 year olds NEET has fluctuated between 8 and 11 per cent between 1994 and 2007, with no clear trend across the period. It was at its lowest in 1999 (8.1 per cent) and peaked in 2005 (10.7 per cent) (Figure 3). To meet the target by 2010 the Department will have to achieve a reduction of 0.6 percentage points each year from 2007 to 2010.

1.19 The number of young people NEET varies across the year, showing traditional seasonal patterns of a rise in the summer and autumn and a fall in winter, reflecting the academic year.¹⁵

The United Kingdom in comparison with other countries

1.20 Estimates by the OECD cover 15 to 19 year olds, and care needs to be exercised because the way in which the figures are calculated varies between countries. In addition, different national systems of education, cultural norms and a host of other factors are likely to influence the proportion of young people NEET. Nevertheless, OECD estimates allow a rough comparison to be made with other countries. The United Kingdom has one of the highest proportions of young people NEET, and is above the OECD average (Figure 4). The only four OECD countries that appear to have a higher proportion of young people NEET than the United Kingdom are Greece, Italy, Israel and Turkey.

Figure 3
16 to 18 year olds NEET in England (1994-2007)

Source: Statistical First Release (SFR 13/2008, Table 5)

NOTE
1 Provisional figure.
Figure 4
Young people NEET (as a percentage of 15 to 19 year olds) in 2005 across the OECD

England in comparison with Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland

1.21 The proportion of young people NEET is highest in Scotland and similar in Northern Ireland and Wales (Figure 5). According to the Labour Force Survey estimates, there were around 21,000 young people NEET in Scotland, 12,000 in Wales and 8,000 in Northern Ireland between October and December 2007.

Regional patterns

1.22 The number of 16 to 18 year olds NEET varies between regions, from just over 5 per cent in the South East to 10 per cent in the North East (Figure 6).

Figure 5
Comparison of 16 to 18 year olds NEET by country in the United Kingdom (2007)


Figure 6
Regional variation in the proportion of 16 to 18 year olds NEET (Nov 2007–Jan 2008 average)

Source: Department for Children, Schools and Families, NEET Statistics – Quarterly Brief, 28 August 2008, Table 2
Variation between local authorities

1.23 The proportion of young people NEET can vary greatly between local authority areas within a region (Figure 7). In some places, adjoining areas may have extreme differences in the proportion of young people NEET.

Figure 7
Proportion of 16 to 18 year olds NEET in 2007 by local authority area

Source: National Audit Office analysis of Connexions’ data

NOTE
2007 data are an average of the figures provided by Connexions at the end of November 2007, December 2007 and January 2008. They include all young people known to Connexions who were aged 16, 17 or 18 on these dates. 16 to 18 year olds in education are counted in the area in which their education establishment is located (except those in higher education). The percentage and number NEET has been adjusted to assume that a proportion of young people whose current activity is not known are NEET.
1.24 The Department has joint responsibility to reduce the number of young people NEET, which they will do through working in partnership with other bodies. Local Area Agreements set out the priorities for a local area agreed between central government, a local authority and its partners at the local level. The Improvement and Development Agency for Local Government has compiled details of around 200 indicators used in 150 Local Area Agreements to measure progress. Local areas select, on average, 31 indicators from the 200. A reduction in the number of 16 to 18 year olds NEET is the most commonly selected indicator: 115 out of 150 Agreements have adopted this indicator.

1.25 Regional priorities differ. In general, regions with high rates of young people NEET have a relatively high number of areas that selected the NEET indicator when drawing up their Local Area Agreements (Figure 8).

Variation within local authorities

1.26 The proportion of young people NEET in different wards across a local authority can vary considerably. In our literature review we identified that the Greater Merseyside Connexions Service had used the Connexions’ data to generate a detailed picture of where young people NEET were at local level and they were happy to supply the results as an illustration (Figure 9 overleaf). Such information can help local targeting of services.

Figure 8
Comparison of proportions, by region: localities choosing the NEET indicator and young people NEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage of localities choosing the indicator</th>
<th>Percentage of 16 to 18 year olds NEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of Improvement and Development Agency for Local Government data on Local Area Agreements and NEET Statistics — Quarterly Brief, 28 August 2008, Table 2
Figure 9
Proportion of young people NEET across Liverpool, by ward, August 2008

Adjusted NEET (percentage)
- 0 – 5.00
- 5.01 – 10.00
- 10.01 – 15.00
- 15.01 – 20.00
- 20.01 +

Source: Connexions, Great Merseyside Partnership, © Crown Copyright 2007

NOTE
Adjusted NEET: the agreed national counting methodology for arriving at a consistent measure of NEET. It involves an adjustment or count back from the number of young people whose status is ‘not known’ where a proportion of those not known are assumed to be NEET.
Frequency, length and duration of periods NEET

Proportion of young people experiencing a spell in NEET

1.27 Analysis of the 2007-08 Connexions’ data shows that in any particular month the proportion of 16 to 18 year olds NEET was around 7 per cent but that closer to 15 per cent experienced a spell outside of education, employment or training across the year (Figure 10). This implies that a snapshot figure on the proportion NEET is likely to underestimate the incidence of being NEET. Further scrutiny showed that:

- there was a small number of young people who were continuously NEET – around 25,000 in total;
- churn was relatively high – around six times as many people came in and out of NEET status as stayed in it for a year;
- around 85 per cent of young people of each age were consistently in education, employment or training across 2007-08; and
- virtually no 16 year olds were recorded as NEET for the whole year as most will have been in school for part of it.

Figure 10
‘Career’ patterns of 16 to 18 year olds across 2007-08, England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Always NEET</th>
<th>Always in employment, education or training</th>
<th>In and out of employment, education or training/NEET status</th>
<th>Number of young people '000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 year olds</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 year olds</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 year olds</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 16 to 18 year olds</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of Connexions’ data, 2007/08 financial year
1.28 Of those in and out of NEET status, the number of times young people changed status was low. On average, 76 per cent of 16 to 18 year olds only changed their status once, and around 10 per cent had changed twice (Figure 11). A very small proportion had fractured career patterns, and had changed their status four or more times over the year. Propensity to move in and out of NEET status was less common in 18 year olds, but they were much more likely to have been NEET for the whole year.

1.29 Some localities have high churn – the Greater Merseyside Connexions Partnership’s analysis showed that in its area about 1,000 young people were leaving the NEET group and another 1,000 joined each month.\(^18\)

### Duration of spells in NEET

1.30 We calculated the length of the spell young people had been NEET in 2007-08, (carrying forward any weeks they had been NEET at the end of 2006-07). In total, the first spell NEET averaged 32 weeks. The average length of spell NEET for young people who had been NEET for all of 2007-08 was 74 weeks (Figure 12). In general, for those who began the year in education, employment or training but had one or more periods NEET, the duration of the first spell was shorter than for those who began the year NEET.

#### Figure 11
Number of times that 16 to 18 year olds NEET moved in/out of NEET status over 2007-08 (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spells NEET</th>
<th>16 year olds</th>
<th>17 year olds</th>
<th>18 year olds</th>
<th>16 to 18 year olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEET once</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET twice</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET three times</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET four times</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET five times</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always NEET</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of Connexions’ data, 2007-08 financial year

NOTE
England only; all those experiencing one or more spells NEET.
– fewer than 20 cases.
Previous activity and immediate destinations of young people NEET

1.31 Around one-third of 16 to 18 year olds recorded as NEET in 2007-08 began the year NEET, and another 42 per cent joined the NEET group from education (Figure 13). The majority (64 per cent) of 16 year olds beginning a spell NEET came direct from school. Seventeen and 18 year olds were more likely to become NEET following a spell of employment.

Figure 12
Average duration of first spell NEET among 16 to 18 year olds starting 2007-08 in education, employment or training or NEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of spells NEET</th>
<th>Started 2007 in education, employment or training weeks</th>
<th>Started 2007 NEET weeks</th>
<th>All weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEET once</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET twice</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET three times</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET four times</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET five times</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always NEET</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of weeks</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of Connexions’ data, 2007-08 financial year

NOTES
England only; all those experiencing one or more spells NEET.
– fewer than 20 cases.

Figure 13
Activity immediately before¹ being NEET in 2007-08 (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>16 year olds</th>
<th>17 year olds</th>
<th>18 year olds</th>
<th>16 to 18 year olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were previously NEET</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory education age</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time education post-16</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-supported training</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In custody</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of Connexions’ data, 2007-08 financial year

NOTES
¹ or in the case of those NEET for the whole year, their activity in the last month of 2006-07; England only.
– fewer than 20 cases.
1.32 One third of young people NEET moved into employment and another quarter began some form of education or training (Figure 14). But at the year end, 38 per cent remained NEET.

1.33 Around 240,000 young people are in jobs without training at age 16 to 18, 51,000 more than the number of young people NEET.19 Young people in jobs without training are three times more likely to be NEET at 17 than young people who go onto full-time education at 16.20 Around 16 per cent of those experiencing a spell NEET did so immediately after a period of employment (Figure 13). Further work could be done to analyse the characteristics of this kind of work and the young people who take it, but this was beyond the remit and resources of this study. Further information on jobs without training is presented in Appendix 3.

**Figure 14**
Activity immediately after¹ being NEET (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>16 year olds</th>
<th>17 year olds</th>
<th>18 year olds</th>
<th>16 to 18 year olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued to be NEET</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory education age</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time education post-16</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-supported training</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In custody</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: National Audit Office analysis of Connexions’ data, 2007-08 financial year*

NOTES
¹ or in the case of those NEET for the whole year, their activity in the first month of 2008-09; England only.
– fewer than 20 cases.
Part Two

Characteristics of young people NEET and their families

2.1 Young people NEET are not a homogenous group. The group comprises of individuals from a variety of backgrounds with a range of experiences. The reasons behind a young person’s non-participation in education, employment or training can be wide-ranging and include social, economic, cultural and motivational factors, and may result from a combination of these factors and influences.

2.2 There are, nevertheless, certain characteristics that are common in the NEET group. The analysis undertaken for this memorandum shows that 16 to 18 year olds NEET are, on average, measurably different from their peers in many ways, even by the age of 13/14. And even where the differences appear small, they are consistently ‘worse’ for the NEET group on every indicator we have examined. However, as Appendix 2 to this memorandum illustrates, predicting who will become NEET is a very large and complex undertaking. Further work on the prospects for predicting NEET status is currently being undertaken by the Institute for Fiscal Studies (paragraphs 3.2 to 3.3).

2.3 This part:
- reviews the personal characteristics of young people NEET in comparison to others (paragraphs 2.5 to 2.14);
- looks at their families’ characteristics and features of their home life (paragraphs 2.15 to 2.29);
- examines engagement with education, employment and society of young people NEET (paragraphs 2.30 to 2.52); and
- considers family attitudes to education and employment (paragraphs 2.53 to 2.62).

2.4 Using the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE), wherever possible, 16/17 year olds’ characteristics at an earlier stage in life (Year 9 or when aged 13/14) are presented to illustrate differences between those who go on to be NEET and those who enter education, employment or training.
Personal characteristics

2.5 Young people NEET share many of the characteristics of those usually found to be at a disadvantage in education generally – especially having a disability or having been a looked-after child, and involvement in some kinds of risky behaviour.

Age

2.6 It appears that young people more often join the NEET category over the two years following the end of compulsory education, rather than being NEET initially then finding suitable education, employment or training. The proportion of young people NEET increases with age – the proportion of young people NEET more than doubles for 18 year olds compared to the proportion of NEET aged 16 (92,000 compared with 36,000) (Figure 15).

Gender

2.7 Overall young men are more likely to be NEET than women of the same age (Figure 16). The differential narrows with age.

Ethnicity

2.8 The data sources do not support an accurate calculation of the number of young people from ethnic minorities NEET. When looking at 16/17 year olds only, it appears that a slightly higher proportion of young people who are of white, Pakistani or from mixed ethnic backgrounds are NEET. Generally ethnic minority groups have fewer young people NEET, and young people from homes where languages other than English were spoken (either as the first or as an additional language), are more likely to be in education, employment or training.

**Figure 15**
Young people NEET, by age (per cent), England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007 (provisional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Statistical First Release, 2008 (SFR 13/2008, Table 1)*

**NOTE**
Age at beginning of academic year.
Disability

2.9 Young people NEET are twice as likely as others to have a disability of some kind – 16 per cent compared to 8 per cent of young people in education, employment or training (Figure 17). Their health issues are longer lasting too – 16 to 18 year olds NEET are also more likely to report having a health problem that has lasted more than one year (Figure 18 overleaf).

Figure 16
Proportion of young people NEET by gender and age, England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistical First Release, 2008 (SFR 13/2008, Table 1)

NOTE
Age at end of academic year.

Figure 17
Disability and employment status of 16 to 18 year olds, England, 2007

Looked after children

2.10 The data sources either do not ask about young people’s care history, or when they do, have too few respondents to be sure of the accuracy of any analysis. However, the Department produces summary statistics about the destinations, at age 19, of children who were looked after at 16. There were 5,800 young people in this group on 31 March 2008 and destinations were known for all but 380. Of this group 270 (5 per cent) were NEET because of illness or disability. A larger proportion, 1,400 (24 per cent), were NEET for other reasons. The proportion in each group has remained steady over the last five years but at 29 per cent in total, is much larger than that seen among young people as a whole (about 9-10 per cent).  

2.11 Care leavers NEET do not appear to be a specific priority in Local Area Agreements. Unlike the commonly selected 16 to 18 year olds NEET indicator (as already mentioned in paragraphs 1.24 to 1.25), which was adopted in 77 per cent, or 115, of all Agreements, only eight Local Area Agreements have adopted an indicator to increase the number of care leavers in education, employment or training. They are: South Tyneside, Stockton, Cambridgeshire, Bromley, Greenwich, Kensington and Chelsea, Southwark and Hampshire. It is possible that some other areas may consider care leavers who are NEET as a sub-set of the 16 to 18 year olds NEET indicator.

Caring responsibilities

2.12 Young people may have caring responsibilities, for example caring for family members with disabilities or who are ill or looking after younger siblings. The caring responsibilities of 16/17 year olds NEET were marginally greater (at age 13/14) than those of others (7 per cent, compared to 5 per cent of those who entered education, employment or training).
Risky behaviours

2.13 The Longitudinal Study of Young People in England asks 13/14 year olds a series of questions about their participation in risky behaviours. It appears that young people NEET at 16/17 were more likely to have engaged in risky behaviours when they were 13/14 than others (Figure 19).

2.14 At age 21, around 13 per cent of young people who were NEET between the ages of 16 and 18 mentioned a criminal record being a barrier to employment, compared to only 1 per cent of those in education, employment or training. And in a Home Office survey of police arrests in 1993/94, three-quarters of males aged 16-17 who were charged and appeared in the Youth Court were NEET.

Family background

2.15 Young people from disadvantaged backgrounds have been found to be more likely to have difficult home lives and problems within their families. Their situation tends to have a negative impact on young people’s ability to concentrate and engage at school, leading to lower attainment and reduced likelihood of participation in post-16 education.

Figure 19
Participation in risky behaviours (by age 13/14)

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
2.16 Our analysis has confirmed that family disadvantage was a more common feature of early life for 16/17 year olds NEET. When they were 13/14, their parents reported greater financial constraints, were in the lower socio-economic groupings, had lower levels of qualification and a greater likelihood of being out of employment and their children were more likely to be entitled to free school meals. More 16 to 18 year olds NEET live in lone-parent families than do those in education, employment or training. Relationships at home were generally good, though with some areas of inter-generational conflict, for example over curfews.

Material disadvantage

2.17 Receipt of free school meals is a proxy for family income. Young people who received free school meals in Year 11 were more than twice as likely to be NEET at 16/17 as those who did not have free school meals (Figure 20). Similarly, the parents of young people in education, employment or training were more likely to say, when their child was 13/14, that they were managing quite well on their household income and that they were able to spend on leisure or save (Figure 21).

**Figure 20**
Receipt of free school meals in Year 11 (England, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of families where the 16/17 year old was NEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not in receipt of free school meals</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In receipt of free school meals</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSYPE, wave 4 and YCS, Cohort 13, sweep 1 (Statistical Bulletin, DCSF, 2008)

**Figure 21**
How well the household is managing on its income (at age 13/14) and young peoples’ status (at age 16/17)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of families managing household income](image_url)

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
2.18 Young people were more likely to be NEET at 16/17 if their parents were from less advantaged socio-economic groups (Figure 22).

Parents’ educational achievement

2.19 Analysis of parental qualifications show that parents with fewer qualifications (Figure 23), or who left school at a younger age, have children who were more likely to be NEET at 16/17. This confirms previous analysis of the Youth Cohort Survey.27

Parents’ employment status

2.20 The parents of 16/17 year olds NEET had a different pattern of economic activity than the parents of those who enter education, employment or training. As 13/14 year olds, their main parent was less likely to be in employment (though half were, compared with around two-thirds of the parents of young people in education, employment or training), and were much more likely to be looking after home/family (Figure 24 overleaf).

2.21 The parents of young people NEET at 16/17 were more likely to say that they had never had a paid job or been self-employed (23 per cent compared with 17 per cent).

---

**Figure 22**

Parents’ socio-economic status1 of 16/17 year olds NEET (England, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic status</th>
<th>Percentage of families where the 16/17 year old was NEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher professional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower professional</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower supervisory</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/not classified</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSYPE, wave 4 and YCS, Cohort 13, sweep 1 (Statistical Bulletin, DCSF, 2008, Table 6.1.2)

**Figure 23**

Parental qualifications of 16/17 year olds NEET (England, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest qualification of parents</th>
<th>Percentage of families where the 16/17 year old was NEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one A-level</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below A-level/Not sure</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSYPE, wave 4 and YCS, Cohort 13, sweep 1 (Statistical Bulletin, 2008, Table 6.1.2, DCSF)

NOTE

1 Using the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification, measured when 16/17 year old was in Year 9.
Family structures

2.22 Sixteen to 18 year olds who are in education, employment or training were much more likely to live in families formed of married/cohabiting couples with dependent children than were those who were NEET (Figure 25). Many more young people who were NEET lived in families headed by a female lone-parent.
2.23 Sixteen to 18 year olds NEET were more likely to live independently, outside of the parental home than is the case for those who were in education, employment or training (Figure 26 overleaf).

Relationships at home

2.24 Overall, relationships between parents and their sons or daughters were generally rated to be good, though parents of 16/17 year olds NEET were on average somewhat less happy than other parents about their relationship when their child was 13/14. For example, three-quarters of parents of young people in education, employment or training claimed to get on very well with their child at age 13/14, compared with two-thirds of parents whose children were NEET at 16/17.

2.25 Sixteen year olds NEET were more likely to be arguing with their parents more than once a week/most days at age 13/14 (according to their main parent) than their peers in education, employment or training (49 per cent compared with 37 per cent).
Nearly half of young people in education, employment or training at 16/17 said when they were 13/14 that their parents often talked to them about their day at school (47 per cent), compared with around one-third (34 per cent) of those who went on to become NEET.

Families’ activities, such as going out together as a family (Figure 27) or regularly eating meals together were more commonly reported in families where the sons and daughters are in education, employment or training at 16/17.

**Figure 26**
Relationship to head of family at 16 to 18 and proportion of young people NEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Head of Family</th>
<th>Not in education, employment or training</th>
<th>In education, employment or training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child of head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife or partner of head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of family⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 27**
How often they go out together as a family (excluding shopping, at age 13/14) and young person’s economic status at 16/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Going Out Together</th>
<th>Not in education, employment or training</th>
<th>In education, employment or training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or more often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three times a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never or hardly ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: This category will include single people and lone-parents, for example.


2.26 Nearly half of young people in education, employment or training at 16/17 said when they were 13/14 that their parents often talked to them about their day at school (47 per cent), compared with around one-third (34 per cent) of those who went on to become NEET.

2.27 Families’ activities, such as going out together as a family (Figure 27) or regularly eating meals together were more commonly reported in families where the sons and daughters are in education, employment or training at 16/17.
2.28 Parents’ rules about going out at night were also associated with whether or not their children enter education, employment or training. Sixteen year olds NEET were more likely to have been given a fixed time to be home and to have been out six or more times in the week when 13/14. The whereabouts of young people going out was more likely to be known for young people who went on to education, employment or training at 16/17. Where a set time to come home was established (as it was in over 80 per cent of all families), young people in education, employment or training at 16/17 were more likely to comply (91 per cent compared with 77 per cent of young people NEET at 16/17). The parents of 16/17 year olds in education, employment or training were more likely to say that they did not allow their son or daughter to go out (9 per cent compared with 2 per cent of the NEET group).

Involvement of professionals

2.29 Very few parents had been in contact with social services about their son or daughter’s behaviour by age 13/14 – 4 per cent overall. But the parents of young people NEET were much more likely to have done so – around 12 per cent. A similar pattern is seen in respect of contact with educational welfare services (17 per cent of parents of young people NEET, compared with 5 per cent overall), and ‘any other similar services’ (16 per cent compared with 6 per cent overall).

Young people’s engagement with education and employment

2.30 Research has found educational under-achievement to be one of the main factors associated with non-participation in education, employment or training at 16 to 18. Our analysis shows that young people NEET have much lower levels of educational attainment, tend to have poorer experiences of schooling and be less engaged with education. While many aspire to continue their education at 16/17, a significant number would prefer to work.

Level of qualification achieved

2.31 Prior attainment has been found to be the single most important influence on post-16 activity – 16/17 year olds NEET are much more likely to have no or low qualifications than those who enter education, employment or training (Figure 28 overleaf). They are also much less likely to have had private tuition in subjects also taught at the young person’s school (only 5 per cent compared to 13 per cent of those in education, employment or training at 16/17).
Engagement with school

2.32 Actual attainment is a reflection of many things, including engagement with school and learning. 16/17 year olds NEET were less engaged with most aspects of their school experience at 13/14, for example being more likely to say that they did not want to be at school. They were also more likely to express dissatisfaction with what their school offered, for example, reporting that lessons were a waste of time, or that lessons were boring (Figure 29). But the majority of 13/14 year olds, including those who were NEET at 16/17, said they worked as hard as they could, though slightly fewer 16/17 year olds NEET did so.

Figure 28
GCSE attainment of 16/17 year olds in 2007 (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In education, employment or training</th>
<th>Not in education, employment or training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or more GCSE grades A*-C, of which</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 GCSE grades A*-C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more GCSE grades D-G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 GCSE grades D-G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 29
‘I am bored in lessons’ in Year 9, and activity at age 16/17

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
2.33 A greater proportion of 16/17 year olds NEET reported that their work was not always marked in Year 9 (Figure 30). Nearly three-quarters of young people in education, employment or training at 16/17 said that in Year 9 their teachers tried hard to make them work as well as they were able (74 per cent). By contrast, only 60 per cent of 16/17 year olds NEET said the same, and 31 per cent said their teachers were fairly easily satisfied (compared with 24 per cent of young people in education, employment or training).

Figure 30
Reported teacher’s behaviour in Year 9, and activity at age 16/17

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003-04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
Attitudes to school discipline

2.34 It cannot be assumed that 16/17 year olds NEET and in education, employment or training experienced the same style of school behaviour management, but when in Year 9, 16/17 year olds NEET report being subject to excessive rules and greater disruption in school. For example, school discipline in Year 9 was considered too strict by many more young people NEET at 16/17 (Figure 31). This group was also more likely to say that there had been too many or too few rules in school (Figure 32).

**Figure 31**
Young people’s opinion on level of discipline in school

![Figure 31]

**Source:** National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates

**Figure 32**
Young people’s opinion on the number of rules in school

![Figure 32]

**Source:** National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
2.35 Many more 16/17 year olds NEET reported that at age 13/14, misbehaviour or troublemaking by others in their class was a common problem than did young people who entered education, employment or training (Figure 33). However, much smaller numbers in both groups admitted to being involved in troublemaking themselves (Figure 34).

**Figure 33**
Frequency of misbehaviour or troublemaking in classes, by others

![Bar chart showing frequency of misbehaviour or troublemaking in classes, by others](image)

- Not in education, employment or training
- In education, employment or training

*Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates*

**Figure 34**
Frequency of misbehaviour or troublemaking in classes, by self

![Bar chart showing frequency of misbehaviour or troublemaking in classes, by self](image)

- Not in education, employment or training
- In education, employment or training

*Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates*
Truancy and exclusion

2.36 Truancy can be seen as a response to unhappiness with the school experience, and at 13/14, those who were subsequently in NEET were more likely to have played truant in the previous 12 months (Figure 35) or to have been excluded.

2.37 Among young people who had played truant, those who were NEET at 16/17 were more likely to report longer periods of absence and repeated missing of particular lessons than those who went on to education, employment or training. The most common reason for playing truant was that they ‘just don’t like school’ (26 per cent). Among those who went on to education, employment or training, the most common reason is that they ‘don’t like a particular lesson or subject’ (23 per cent). There is a strong association between educational underachievement and persistent truancy.30

2.38 Departmental statistics reveal that over 7,500 young people were permanently excluded from secondary schools in 2006-07.31 Their career destinations at 16 are not collated. Overall, in the Youth Cohort Study the level of permanent exclusion was very low by age 13/14. But a higher proportion of those who went on to be NEET at age 16/17 had been temporarily excluded by this point – 3 per cent compared with less than 1 per cent of those who entered education, employment or training.

Figure 35
Whether young people in Year 9 had played truant in the last 12 months

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
Engagement with the curriculum

2.39 In general, 16/17 year olds NEET were less confident about their academic abilities at age 13/14 than young people in education, employment or training (Figure 36). They are also less likely to believe that their teachers rate their abilities as above average or very good. Their enjoyment of, and confidence with, the mathematics, English and science curriculum was also measurably lower.

**Figure 36**

How good the young person thinks they are at school work

**How good the young person thinks they are at school work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not in education, employment or training</th>
<th>In education, employment or training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How good the young person believes teachers think they are at school work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not in education, employment or training</th>
<th>In education, employment or training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
Relationships at school

2.40 Bullying is not uncommon but young people NEET at age 16/17 were more likely to say, aged 13/14, that they had been bullied in the last 12 months (Figure 37). Bullying can take many forms and the Youth Cohort Study asks about a range of experiences – young people NEET at 16/17 were more likely to report experience of all of them, for example being threatened with, or experiencing violence by, other students.

2.41 Young people NEET at 16/17 were more likely to report being excluded from a group of friends (25 per cent compared with 17 per cent of those who went on to education, employment or training). Many young people experiencing friendship-group exclusion said it made it harder to attend school regularly and so their school attendance had suffered, as had their ability to do their schoolwork. Young people NEET at 16/17 were disproportionately affected.

Young people’s satisfaction with advice and guidance

2.42 Young people receive advice on their education and careers choices from a range of sources including parents and the Connexions Service. Those NEET at 16/17 were much less satisfied with their formal careers advice they had received by the age of 13/14, and had parents who felt less able to ‘fill the gap’.

2.43 Our analysis showed that awareness of Connexions was generally high, but a higher proportion of 16/17 year olds NEET had not heard of Connexions by the time they were 13/14, than young people in education, employment or training (21 per cent compared with 15 per cent). The Department’s own analysis shows that by Year 11 young people NEET or in education, employment or training at 16/17 were equally likely to have seen a Connexions adviser, and that around 70 per cent had done so.

Figure 37
Experience of bullying?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not in education, employment or training</th>
<th>In education, employment or training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
Looking at those who had heard of Connexions by the age of 13/14, young people NEET at 16/17 were more likely to have:

- talked to a Connexions adviser (42 per cent compared with 38 per cent of young people in education, employment or training);

but were less likely to have:

- talked about plans for the future in a Connexions interview;
- found the information gleaned from this source quite or very useful.

Parents of 16/17 year olds NEET were more likely to agree strongly that young people did not get enough advice about what to do after Year 9 at school – 32 per cent compared with 26 per cent of the parents of others. Moreover they were also more likely to say that they did not know enough about modern qualifications to give their child proper advice about what to do after Year 9 – 41 per cent compared with 25 per cent agreed strongly.

Expectations and ambitions of young people

Young people NEET at 16/17 did have ambitions to pursue education, employment or training when they were 13/14, but many do not realise them. The majority – six out of ten – stated a preference for continuing their education (as did 86 per cent of 16/17 year olds in education, employment or training) (Figure 38). Given the levels of qualification of young people NEET, it seems likely that educational attainment is one deciding factor – that is, many young people feel disenfranchised from further education because of poor grades – though this hypothesis has not been tested in our analysis.

Figure 38
Young people’s intentions after Year 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stay on in full-time education</th>
<th>Leave full-time education</th>
<th>Leave full-time education but return later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
2.47 Those who think that their friends are likely to stay on in full-time education are much more likely to do so themselves, and vice versa suggesting peer pressure may play a role in shaping young people’s expectations (Figure 39).

2.48 Of the one third of those NEET at 16/17 who had expected at 13/14 that they would leave full-time education, the overwhelming majority were looking forward to employment. They expressed a greater preference for a full-time job than their classmates (44 per cent compared to 37 per cent). Young people NEET were less likely to want to start learning a trade or work-based training than those in education, employment or training (45 per cent compared with 53 per cent).

Attitudes about work

2.49 Young people were asked a series of questions at age 13/14 about their attitudes to work and their future career progress. Virtually all agreed at age 13/14 that ‘having a job or career in future was important to me’ and most agreed that ‘raising a family in the future is important to me’ (Figure 40), but those who became NEET at age 16/17 were less strong in their agreement.

2.50 Young people NEET at 16/17 displayed slightly more ‘laissez faire’ attitudes to their future; for example, they were more likely to agree that ‘I’ll just wait and see where I end up’ (35 per cent compared to 19 per cent) or ‘I don’t really think much about what I might be doing in a few years time’ (13 per cent compared with 6 per cent).

2.51 Young people NEET at 16/17 had, however, appreciated the benefits of employment: when asked at 13/14 if they agreed that ‘having a job is better than being unemployed’ the majority in each group (young people NEET and those in education, employment or training at age 16/17) strongly agreed. Both groups of young people agreed that ‘having a job that leads somewhere is important’, though young people in education, employment or training were a little more likely to agree strongly with the statement (71 per cent compared to 66 per cent).

Figure 39
What the young person thinks most of their friends will do after Year 11

- Not in education, employment or training
- In education, employment or training

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
In terms of the characteristics of work that appealed to young people when still at school, young people who found themselves NEET expressed a stronger preference for self-employment and well paid work than those who went on to enter education, employment or training (Figure 41 overleaf). The majority of young people wanted interesting work, though this had mattered a little less to young people NEET when in Year 9.

**Family attitudes to education and employment**

The parents of 16/17 year olds NEET strongly desired a better education for their children than they had themselves, even more so than the parents of young people in education, employment or training at age 16/17 (82 per cent compared with 75 per cent). Parents’ satisfaction with schooling was generally high, but parents of young people who were NEET at 16/17 were a little less satisfied than others and often felt they did not have the knowledge to help with their children’s education. The parents of 16/17 year olds NEET had high ambitions for their sons and daughters at 13/14 – often to pursue training and education. But they felt less able to offer financial support.

**Figure 40**

Importance of career and family in the future to young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Having a job or career in future is important to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raising a family in the future is important to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
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Figure 41
How much these factors matter to young people in deciding on a job

To be my own boss or have my own business

- Matters a lot
- Matters a little
- Doesn’t matter

To have a job that’s interesting and not routine

- Matters a lot
- Matters a little
- Doesn’t matter

To have a job where I can get promoted and get ahead

- Matters a lot
- Matters a little
- Doesn’t matter

To have a job with regular hours

- Matters a lot
- Matters a little
- Doesn’t matter

To have a job which pays well

- Matters a lot
- Matters a little
- Doesn’t matter

To have a job where I help other people

- Matters a lot
- Matters a little
- Doesn’t matter

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
2.54 There was very little association between how involved parents felt in the young person’s school life at 13/14 and whether they were in education, employment or training or not. Likewise, nearly all parents talked to their son or daughter about their school reports at 13/14, with little difference between the groups (99 per cent compared with 96 per cent).

Parents’ satisfaction with schooling

2.55 Parents were asked when their son or daughter was 13/14 how they felt about the quality of their school (Figure 42). The parents of young people not in education, employment or training at 16/17 were generally satisfied, but less so than other parents. They were also more likely to express dissatisfaction with school quality.

2.56 Parents of young people in education, employment or training at age 16/17 were more likely to be very satisfied with a range of aspects of school provision, for example, their son or daughter’s school progress at 13/14, than parents of children who were NEET (48 per cent compared with 26 per cent). Parents of young people NEET were less effusive but still generally satisfied, though a substantial proportion were dissatisfied (22 per cent compared to 8 per cent). A similar pattern was seen in satisfaction with:

- the range of subjects on offer;
- discipline at school;
- how much interest the teachers showed in the young person; and
- how well their child got on with other young people in the school.

Figure 42
Parents’ satisfaction with the overall quality of their son or daughter’s school

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
2.57 Parents of 16/17 year olds NEET expressed lower levels of satisfaction with communications between themselves and school, and the extent to which they knew all they needed to know about how they could help with their child’s education (Figure 43).

Parents’ education and career ambitions for their sons and daughters

2.58 The parents of young people NEET and young people in education, employment or training were equally likely to have talked to their son or daughter about staying on in full-time education (around 80 per cent).

2.59 Parents were asked when their son or daughter was 13/14 what they would like them to do and what they expected them to do when reaching the education leaving age (Figure 44). The parents of young people NEET had a greater preference for work and training options over full-time education, but expected more of their children to choose work and training than they would have liked. Very few parents predict their child will be NEET at 16/17.

2.60 All parents agree that “leaving school at 16 limits young people’s career opportunities later in life” with the parents of young people in education, employment or training agreeing more strongly. Yet the attitudes of parents towards the importance of having qualifications in order ‘to get a job worth having’ did not appear to be strongly associated with their son or daughter’s activity at age 16/17.

Figure 43
‘I know all I need to know about how I can help my child’s education’

---

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
Covering the costs of post-16 education

2.61 Previous research has found that financial concerns were one reason for young people deciding against staying on in education. When asked how their Year 9 child would be supported financially if he or she stayed on in education, the parents of 16/17 year olds NEET were a little more likely to mention the Educational Maintenance Allowance (25 per cent compared with 21 per cent) and less likely to mention working full- or part-time (35 compared to 39 per cent). An evaluation of the Education Maintenance Allowance Pilot, which ran from 1999-2004, found that the Allowance had a positive impact in reducing the numbers of young people NEET in pilot areas.

Figure 44
Parent’s preferences and expectations of their son or daughter’s options at school leaving age

What parents would LIKE their son or daughter to do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue full-time education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training course/trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start apprenticeship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What parents EXPECT their son or daughter will do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue full-time education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training course/trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start apprenticeship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
Parents of young people in education, employment or training were more likely to have suggested they would support their children financially (86 per cent compared with 74 per cent of the parents of young people NEET at 16/17), usually out of their wages/earnings (77 per cent compared with 67 per cent), and that they were likely to:

- save money specifically for education (24 per cent compared with 16 per cent of the parents of young people NEET at 16/17);
- give money from existing savings (23 per cent compared with 12 per cent); and
- pay school or college fees (25 per cent compared with 17 per cent).
Part Three

Areas for future consideration

3.1 In this section we outline:

- four forthcoming strands of evidence which the Children, Schools and Families Committee may wish to consider; and
- drawing on the analysis we have presented, possible areas of interest for the Committee for a future inquiry concerning young people NEET.

New strands of evidence

3.2 The Department has commissioned two pieces of work that include sections on young people NEET. The first is *Drivers and Barriers to Educational Success: Evidence from the Longitudinal Survey of Young People in England*, being carried out by the Institute of Fiscal Studies. A second study called *Exploring Issues Surrounding Post-16 Participation in Education and Training* is being carried out by the National Foundation for Educational Research. These reports will be available in early 2009.

3.3 *Drivers and Barriers to Educational Success* is looking at the determinants of educational outcomes for young people. It is based on an analysis of the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England. The study team is also examining peer effects and the effectiveness of Department-funded programmes to minimise the number of young people NEET.

3.4 The aim of the second study is to achieve a better understanding of those who are NEET or in jobs without training at 16 and 17. It is undertaking a statistical ‘segmentation analysis’ of the Youth Cohort Study data, a literature review, and qualitative interviews. The study is focusing on three main sub-groups:

- young people who were NEET for a short time and ultimately re-engaged in learning (40 per cent);
- ‘sustained NEET’ who often faced challenging personal issues that have prevented them from re-engaging (38 per cent); and
- ‘undecided NEET’ who appeared to remain NEET due to dissatisfaction with the options available to them (22 per cent).
3.5 The Nuffield review of 14-19 education and training, in collaboration with Rathbone set up the Engaging Youth Enquiry in September 2007 to listen to the views of young people NEET. The following questions inspired their Enquiry:

- Why is it proving so difficult to persuade some young people of the merits of staying in education and training?
- Why do so many young people who want to work not find employment?

They have published their findings titled New Approach to Engaging Youth: Understanding the problems and implementing the solutions (October 2008) in the form of a consultative report for which they are inviting contributions until 31 March 2009.  

3.6 The Welsh Assembly has recently commissioned a consultation on young people NEET: Delivering Skills that Work for Wales: Reducing the proportion of young people not in education, employment or training in Wales.  

The paper sets out proposals to reduce the number of young people NEET and is one of a series of themed papers which address skills issues identified in Wales’ draft skills and employment strategy. Responses were submitted up to August 2008 and the Assembly will publish a report and action plan in December 2008.

Possible areas of interest for further work on young people NEET

3.7 Our analysis has suggested a number of areas which may reward further investigation. They are:

- **Empowering ‘lost learners’**

We have found that over 60 per cent of young people NEET had aspirations at age 13/14 to continue their education beyond 16. However, they also have much lower levels of qualification than young people who enter education, employment or training, which is likely to have some bearing on them not achieving their aspirations. The Committee may wish to inquire into policies and practices that are designed to encourage and advise young people who have achieved limited academic success during compulsory education up to age 16. In addition, young people in jobs without training are both more likely to find themselves NEET and to have few or no qualifications. The Committee may wish to inquire into the provision that exists to help them re-engage with learning and development.

- **Addressing the needs of young people persistently NEET and/or who do not engage with Connexions or other services**

Our analysis found there is a small number of young people who are persistently NEET and there are also some young people NEET who are totally disengaged and will not appear in any of the datasets (sometimes referred to as ‘hard to reach’). The Committee may wish to carry out some further analysis of these groups, including an assessment of how far existing relevant programmes are accessed by them.
Supporting young people to become more engaged in their own learning and development

Young people NEET are more likely to say they will ‘see where they end up’, and to feel the formal careers advice offered through the Connexions Service is less useful. As responsibility for providing Connexions services moved from Connexions Partnerships to local authorities earlier this year, the Committee may wish to explore what new services are being developed to encourage young people to be proactive and plan ahead. Some schools and local authorities are developing practices, usually involving some use of information technology, to help children think about their education and career goals from an early age, rather than depending on later careers guidance of a more ‘one-off’ nature that many young people respond to in a relatively passive way. There would be the possibility for such an inquiry to include efforts to support families and teachers as continuous facilitators, as well as examples of raising aspirations across a cohort of young people, to take advantage of the finding that young people’s attitudes are often strongly influenced by their peers.
Study methodology

1 This section presents the data sources and describes the methods used to compile the information in this memorandum. There is no data source specifically about young people NEET. We therefore analysed three main sources of data which include young people NEET: the Labour Force Survey, data collected by Connexions about its clients, and a combined data set built from the Youth Cohort Study and Longitudinal Study of Young People in England. We have referred to additional statistical resources as necessary, the major one being the official national estimate produced by the Department for Children, Schools and Families.

The Labour Force Survey

2 Description: The Labour Force Survey has some detail about young people NEET and their families. It is a quarterly survey of economic activity among the population of the United Kingdom. It is a sample of approximately 60,000 households, and their answers are weighted using population estimates to represent the whole country. The most recent data (October – December quarter 2007) was obtained from the Office for National Statistics.

3 Analysis: Young people NEET are identified by calculating firstly those not in education or training from a series of questions regarding educational status. The result is then combined with a question on economic activity to identify those 16 or over whose economic activity is either unemployed or inactive.

4 Our statistical methods took two forms. Firstly, we established that the unadjusted Labour Force Survey figures produced an acceptable estimate of the number of young people NEET in comparison to the official figures. Having established that it did, we produced a series of cross-tabulations to illustrate the personal and family characteristics of young people NEET and in education, employment or training.
Connexions' data

5 Description: The ‘Client Caseload Information System’ (CCIS), to give it its full title, was provided by the Department. The Connexions Service provides advice and guidance to young people on education, employment or training. All local Connexions Services maintain databases which they use to record and track the progress of young people aged 13-19. This includes their current activity, which is established either through exchange of information with learning providers, or through direct contact with young people themselves. These databases must meet the CCIS specification published by the Department each year. Connexions providers supply the Department with an extract of their database each month from which information on the number of young people in education, employment or training or NEET can be drawn.

6 This source also allows measurement at local authority and ward level, and can be used to identify the characteristics of young people NEET such as age, disability, or gender. The estimate of the number of young people NEET is not directly comparable with other sources, as it uses a different definition (for example, those taking gap year or in custody are not counted as NEET) and relates only to those young people whose status is known to Connexions.

7 Analysis: Young people NEET are identified through a series of questions about their education, employment or training activities, with young people NEET being coded separately. We linked the 12 monthly data sets for the financial year 2007-08 together to track what happens to young people across the year. These analyses provided the information included in Part One (paragraphs 1.27 to 1.32) on the incidence and duration of periods NEET.

Youth Cohort Study and Longitudinal Study of Young People in England

8 Description: The Youth Cohort Study is a major programme of longitudinal research designed to monitor the activities and decisions of representative samples of young people aged 16 upwards as they make the transition from compulsory education to further or higher education, or to the labour market. It tries to identify and explain the factors which influence post-16 transitions, for example, educational attainment, training opportunities, and experiences at school. The Youth Cohort Study follows the same individuals in a single cohort rather than across the 16 to 18 age range. To date the Youth Cohort Study covers thirteen cohorts and over thirty surveys. The first survey was carried out in 1985 and the most recent in 2008.
9 The Longitudinal Study is a panel survey of young people and brings together a wide range of data on a cohort of young people and their personal and family characteristics. It began in 2004 when its sample of young people was aged 13/14 (issued sample was 21,000 approximately); further waves were carried out annually, with the most recent in 2008. It brings together data on family background, parents’ socio-economic status, personal characteristics, attitudes, experiences and behaviours, attainment in education, parental employment and information about school.

10 Analysis: The wave 4 Longitudinal Study dataset contains the post-16 status of young people and allows young people’s activity aged 16/17 to be linked to their attitudes and characteristics when in wave 1 aged 13/14. Also, the thirteenth cohort of the Youth Cohort Study covers the same cohort of young people as the Longitudinal Study so that the Longitudinal Study wave 4 and Youth Cohort Study 13, wave 1 can be combined to give a larger dataset of post-16 young people. Although not all the same analysis is possible from the two studies, the methodologies were synchronised to ensure that many measures, such as NEET, were the same and for many analyses, a larger, combined dataset can be used. The Department provided a combined data set.

11 The data was analysed in two stages. Firstly we undertook a series of cross-tabulations to illustrate the early characteristics of young people NEET, followed by the logistic regression to determine which of these were of greatest importance in predicting who would become NEET (Appendix 2).

Issues and limitations

Differences in definitions of young people NEET

12 Each of the data sources uses a slightly different definition of NEET, and covers a different set of young people. Consequently, their estimates of the proportion of young people NEET will differ, but the insight each offers on the personal and family characteristics remains useful.

Young people NEET’s likelihood of being included in data sources

13 This memorandum only includes information on young people included in the data sources. There may be young people who are disengaged, and have not taken part in surveys or have lost contact with the Connexions Service. When the estimated number of young people in England from the Labour Force Survey (1,947,000) is compared with the numbers included in the Connexions’ data, (1,331,000) there is a ‘gap’ of approximately 617,000 people. Though a minority will be at independent schools and therefore not included in the Connexions’ data base, there is still a large number of missing young people. Connexions’ data only includes young people who are known about and with whom Connexions have had contact.
Likewise, the longitudinal design of both the Youth Cohort Study and the Longitudinal Study means that respondents in later stages may only represent a proportion of the initial sample. It is reasonable to suggest that those who are disengaged are likely to be heavily over-represented within the non-participants, though weighting is used to counteract this effect. Some young people in special schools, including those with moderate to severe social, emotional and learning difficulties, are not included in samples. At the same time they are known to be over-represented among the NEET group, together with young carers, looked-after children and those with disability or mental health difficulties. In the Longitudinal Study, deprived schools were over sampled by a factor of one and an half. In the Youth Cohort Study, low attainers were over sampled by a factor of two.

Sampling error

The Labour Force Survey and the combined Youth Cohort Study/Longitudinal Study are samples, so any estimates of young people NEET or their characteristics will have some sampling error. The margin of error on the Labour Force Survey has been estimated at +/- 1 per cent. As this is a key source in the Department’s headline statistic, the margin of error can be no smaller. The Connexions’ data should effectively be a census of all young people, but given the likely number of missing cases, the margin of error is likely to be significant.

Variation in the estimate of young people NEET

Each of the three main data sources can provide an estimate of the number of young people NEET, but these vary because of differences in coverage and definition as outlined above.

However, the range of estimates, from 6.3 per cent (Connexions) to 9.9 per cent (Labour Force Survey) is relatively small, especially considering that calculation of the proportion of young people NEET is not the primary purpose of these surveys (Figure 45). From this analysis, the figure produced by the method used in the Statistical First Release and used to calculate progress towards the Public Service Agreement, appears to be a reasonable estimate.

**Figure 45**
Proportion of young people NEET across different data sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connexions’ data base (December 2007)</td>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Cohort Survey/Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (Spring/summer 2007)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Force Survey (October-December quarter, 2007)</td>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical First Release (31 December 2007)</td>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size and complexity

18 These data sources are large and complex. The Connexions’ dataset contains data on 4.5 million individuals, at 12 activity measurement points. The combined file, after stripping out all unnecessary data items, was 500 mega-bytes. The Labour Force Survey is multi-layered, which means that in analysing the data, a decision has to be made about whether to analyse at household level, or the family units within households, or individuals within family units, and the weightings adjusted accordingly. Analysis of these data sources takes considerable time and resources.

Granularity

19 The Department’s estimate of the number of young people NEET cannot be disaggregated to regional level. Data collected by the Connexions Service can be used for regional, local authority and ward level analysis, although it is not comparable with the annual statistics published by the Department since the definition of young people NEET is different.

Literature review

20 An extensive search was carried out to source key literature, including newspaper articles, research reports, departmental publications (such as the Statistical First Release) and academic journal articles. The literature was reviewed and the relevant literature is referenced throughout the report.
Appendix Two

Predicting who will be NEET using logistic regression

1. Young people who went on to be NEET at 16/17 appear to have different characteristics, attitudes and behaviours at age 13/14 than those in education, employment or training. But which of these data predict who will become NEET? Given that many of the personal characteristics overlap, for example, attitude to school and success in examinations will interlink, which are most important?

2. The analysis we have conducted suggests that predicting who will become NEET is difficult. A statistical model (‘logistic regression’) has been built, using the data in the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England which has been described in more detail in Appendix 1. This type of analysis allows a large number of characteristics to be tested. Simpler methods of predicting NEET can only handle a very few characteristics at a time and therefore may leave out other factors which could be just as important in predicting who will be NEET, or suggest some characteristics are important when they are influenced by other factors. For example, young people entitled to free school meals are more likely to be NEET in a simple analysis. However, it is influenced by whether young people’s parents are working, and when this is included in the logistic model, free school meal status is no longer relevant. The model attempted to predict from characteristics at age 13/14 who will be NEET or in education, employment or training at 16/17 (Figure 46 overleaf). The model:

• predicted the NEET/in education, employment or training destinations of 92 per cent of young people correctly;

• under-estimated the number of young people NEET – only 2 per cent of young people in the survey were identified as likely to be NEET at 16/17, compared to the true figure of 8 per cent;

• was right about the activity of 61 per cent of those it expected would be NEET (128 out of 209);

• but out of those known to be NEET, only 14 per cent were correctly identified;

• was successful at predicting who would be in education, employment or training – 99 per cent of those known to be in education, employment or training were correctly identified.
The model has limitations. For example, characteristics of the home area, such as the level of deprivation and the local availability of education, employment or training are not included. The Institute of Fiscal Studies is developing a more sophisticated model that is scheduled to be published in 2009 (paragraphs 3.2 to 3.3). This model will include a broader range of data items from additional waves of the Longitudinal Study, local area characteristics and Key Stage 4 data, and is likely to have greater predictive power.

Our model suggests that the factors that appear to be most important in predicting at age 13/14 who would become NEET are:

- **Educational attainment** – young people with lower scores at Key Stage 3 were more likely to become NEET.

- **Personal characteristics** – white young people were more likely to become NEET; it appears those with special educational needs were less likely to become NEET when other factors are taken into account.

- **Being at risk of disengaging with school** – being in contact with Educational Welfare Services, being suspended from, or not liking school were associated with being NEET.

- **Some features of the home/school environment** – when young people did not have help with homework and teachers who did not make sure they do their homework, or where they did not mention having a personal computer (PC) or laptop at home, they were more likely to be NEET.

- **Ambitions and expectations** – being part of a peer group that expected to leave education, having that expectation for themselves, or being happy to ‘wait to see where I end up’ was associated with young people being NEET.

- **Smoking** – young people NEET were more likely to have smoked.

- **Arguing with parents** – parents of young people NEET reported more arguments.

- **Disadvantage** – having parents without qualifications, living in a family facing financial difficulties, having parents not working were associated with young people being NEET at 16/17.

### Figure 46
Model success in predicting who will be NEET or in education, employment or training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Education, employment and training</th>
<th>Predicted NEET</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage predicted correctly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education, Employment and Training</td>
<td>10,264</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10,345</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>11,044</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>11,253</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
From this point on, this Appendix presents the detail of the modelling for a technical audience.

**Logistic regression – a technical description of the technique and methodology**

**Choice of data and method**

**Structure of the NEET data used**

For this modelling exercise we used the data in the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (Appendix 1). This Study collects responses from young people and their parents and information about their family background. The young people and their parents were first interviewed in spring 2004 and have each been re-interviewed every year. The responses collected in the first interview round, ‘wave 1’, took place when the cohort of young people was in Year 9 (age 13/14) in the academic year 2003/04. The same cohort of young people reached Year 12 (age 16/17) in spring 2007 (‘wave 4’).

The wave 1 data are stored in three separate files: Young People, Main Parent and Family Background. These three separate files and the file containing Key Stage 3 average point score data are then linked to wave 4 data using the survey identifier number given by the Department for Children, Schools and Families. The wave 4 data give the outcomes – ‘in Education, Employment and Training’ or ‘Not in Education, Employment and Training (NEET)’.

By linking wave 1 data with wave 4 data the characteristics and experiences of young people at Year 9 can be compared with whether young people find themselves NEET or in education, employment or training at 16/17.

The data were weighted (using the variable ‘mainwt_scrv’ as advised by the Department). The weighting is applied to compensate for differential selection chances in the sample design and, secondly, to remove non-response biases.

**Choice of logistic regression**

Logistic regression is appropriate for this exercise because:

- the outcome variable has only two potential answers (in education, employment or training or NEET). When a dependent variable takes on only two values like this, it is appropriate to use a binary choice model. This is because such circumstances cannot be modelled in the same way as a linear model since it could lead to heteroscedasticity. This is a well known problem in statistics/econometrics where the variance of the error term is not constant, leading to estimators potentially becoming biased. A logistic regression is one of the main binary choice models, the other being a probit model, and hence is applicable in these circumstances; and

- the predictor variables are mainly categorical in nature.
11 The Longitudinal Study file contains two different types of data: categorical or continuous. The nature of each type of data is as follows:

- categorical data (for example: education, employment or training/NEET; yes/no; gender; different ethnic groups; strongly agree to strongly disagree). The majority of data in the Longitudinal Study are categorical; and

- continuous (for example: age).

Having predominantly categorical variables does not differ in any way, in terms of results, to a model that contains mainly continuous variables, i.e. this is not a disadvantage.

12 There are not many multivariate models that can be used for this kind of data. Logistic regression is one of the few models that can be used to identify the likelihood of an individual becoming NEET based on a set of predictor variables.

How logistic regression works

13 A logistic regression model examines the relationship between the outcome variable (called the ‘dependent’ variable) and one or more predictors (or ‘independent’ variables). For this exercise, the outcome variable measures an individual’s status as in education, employment or training or NEET.

14 The SPSS software package was used to run the logistic regression model. Firstly, the NEET status was entered into the model as the dependent variable, and the model tested the relationship between NEET status and a number of independent variables. The model identified those variables that have a significant effect on the likelihood of being NEET.

15 The model goes through a process of elimination to identify whether or not an independent variable has a significant effect on the outcome of interest and provides two separate lists of significant and non-significant variables.

Checking the usefulness of the model

16 When the independent variables are entered into the model each time, there are checks within the software to inform how well the data fit the model as follows:

- R square (Nagelkerke’s) – this quantifies how much the independent variables together can explain the outcome. It is between 0 per cent and 100 per cent. A higher percentage means a better explanatory power.

- Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness of fit test – this test shows whether or not the independent variables are suitable for use in a logistic regression.

- A classification table which shows the observed number of young people in education, employment or training and NEET and how many the model predicted, and displays the percentage correctly predicted.

17 For the variables selected by the model, a table gives the odds ratio and contrasts it with the comparator and gives the likeliness of becoming NEET.
Creating the model

Stage one: selecting variables for the logistic regression

18 The first stage of the analysis involved looking at the whole range of variables (about 1,650 variables). A list of top level variables was selected for the logistic regression analysis. For example, the top level question asked whether young people had any caring responsibilities and there are eight second level questions which asked about caring responsibility for various family members. Another example is a question regarding special education needs. The top level question asked whether young people had ever been identified as having special education needs leading to 11 second level questions about the nature of special needs.

19 The software calculated a frequency count on these variables in order to select those that have about 10,000 valid cases for analysis. These variables were also cross-tabulated with NEET status, to test for statistical significance using a Chi-Square test of association and two-sample test of proportions. Variables that were significant at 1 per cent or below (p<0.01) were subsequently short-listed for the logistic regression. A Bonferroni correction was applied to the results to adjust for multiple testing and reduce the risk of identifying significant variables by chance.

20 About 100 variables (6 per cent of all the available variables) were selected in the above testing process for the logistic regression analysis.

Stage two: short-listing variables and dealing with missing data

21 Firstly, around 20 variables from the Young Persons’ file were put into the model. The model identified a set of variables as significant predictors of NEET status. A few variables were added to the model each time and re-tested for significance. Variables from the Young Persons’ file were entered into the model first, followed by variables from the Main Parent, Family Background and Key Stage 3 data files.

22 Where possible, derived variables were used in the analysis instead of individual data items. For example, a derived variable on bullying was constructed from a combination of five variables which are related to bullying.

23 Although the ‘Children in Care’ variable contributed significantly to the model, it was not included because there were only 120 valid cases for analysis. The large number of missing data associated with this variable would lead to a decrease in observations, resulting in possible misrepresentation of the sample.

24 From the list of variables which appeared to have a relationship with NEET status, 46 independent variables were then short listed for the re-run. For each of the 46 independent variables, dummy codes were created in order to avoid missing cases. Therefore the total number of cases was always included in the analysis.

25 ‘Comparator’ codes were also created in order to look at the likelihood of becoming NEET when compared with a baseline (the comparator). For example, white British was nominated as a comparator baseline code and different ethnic groups were compared with it.
Stage three: testing for multicollinearity

26 The term multicollinearity means that the independent variables are inter-related. This is when two or more of the independent variables are highly correlated or causated. For example the variable ‘expelled from school’ was closely related to ‘suspended from school’. These variables must be identified as multicollinearity may result in incorrect conclusions about the relationship between independent and outcome variables. In statistical terms, it would have a bias effect in the prediction. Multicollinearity affects t-ratios, and therefore significance, possibly leading to variables appearing significant and vice versa.

27 The logistic regression function within SPSS is unable to identify multicollinearity. We looked for multicollinearity using the diagnostic tests for correlation between all variables available in a standard multiple regression.

28 The diagnostic tests were applied to the 46 short listed independent variables. Two variables did not pass the diagnostic tests as being closely related. In our expelled/suspended example, being expelled from school did not pass the diagnostic test, and it was removed from the short list while suspended from school was retained for analysis.

Stage four: choice of the backwards method

29 When running the logistic analysis, the model requires a choice of data entry order: either the enter, forward or backward methods. Backward method was selected because it retains independent variables which have significant effect, when controlling for the effect of other independent variables. This is called the suppressor effect. The forward method runs a higher risk of excluding these variables involved in the suppressor effects.

The results

30 The R square showed that the independent variables together could explain 27 per cent of the variation in the outcome i.e. who is in education, employment or training or NEET. This is a fairly low proportion, but not unacceptably so. It is desirable to have as high an R square as possible. However a lower R square, as in this case, does not necessarily mean a poor model.

31 The overall prediction for education, employment or training/NEET is good at 92.4 per cent (10,392 out of 11,253). When broken down however, the model is better at identifying those in education, employment or training (99.2 per cent predicted correctly), but much less successful at predicting NEET (14.1 per cent predicted correctly) (Figure 46).

32 The backwards selection method identified 17 variables as significant predictors of NEET status (Figure 47 overleaf). Other variables were rejected by the model as they were not significant predictors (Figure 48 on page 64).
Figure 47
Seventeen significant predictors of who will be NEET at 16 – variables selected by ‘backward logistic regression’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young people in this group...</th>
<th>were more/less likely to be NEET...</th>
<th>than this group...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With a Key Stage 3 average point score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the bottom 25%</td>
<td>5 x more likely</td>
<td>Top 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the bottom 25-50%</td>
<td>3 x more likely</td>
<td>Top 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From ethnic minorities, specifically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>All less likely</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever identified as having special education needs</td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>Never identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose parents had been in touch with educational welfare services in last 12 months because of young person’s behaviour</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>Not been in touch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever temporarily suspended or excluded from school</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>Never suspended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who agree that ‘On the whole I like being at school’</td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With someone at home who helps them with homework</td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>No one at home helping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who say that all or most of their teachers who set home-work make sure they did it</td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>Hardly any or no teachers make sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the use of a PC or laptop computer at home</td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>Did not mention IT equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe that most of friends will stay in full-time education after Year 11</td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>Believe friends will leave full-time education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intend to stay in full-time education after Year 11</td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>Intend to leave full-time education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree that after Year 11 they will ‘just wait and see where I end up’</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who have ever smoked cigarettes</td>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>Never smoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose parents say they argue with young person</td>
<td>2 x more likely</td>
<td>Never argue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With parents who hold a qualification</td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>Parents with no qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose parents say that the household is managing well or getting by on income</td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>Getting into difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a ‘main’ parent working full or part time</td>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>Main parent currently not working</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates
Figure 48
Variables not selected by ‘backward logistic regression’ as significant predictors of who will be NEET at 16/17

Variable description
MP: Whether young person has ever been off school for three months or more
YP: Whether anyone at home makes sure they do homework
YP: Whether ever shoplifted
YP: Whether ever taken part in fighting or public disturbance
DV: Whether young person bullied in any way in last 12 months
MP: Whether talked to young person about young person staying on in full-time education
MP: Whether Main Parent ever talked about young person school report with them
MP: Agreement with statement: I know all I need to know about how I can help with young person’s education
MP: Whether police have got in touch because of something young person has done
Sex of young person
YP: Whether played truant in last 12 months
YP: Whether ever had proper alcoholic drink
YP: Whether ever tried cannabis
YP: Whether ever graffitied on walls
YP: Whether ever vandalised public property
YP: Whether young person has any caring responsibilities within household
DV: Whether young person has any disability/long-term illness or health problem
MP: Overall quality of young person’s school
MP: How involved does Main Parent personally feel in young person’s school life?
MP: Whether in the last 12 months Main Parent has paid for private classes in subjects also taught at young person’s school?
MP: Agreement with statement: young person’s school makes it easy for me to get involved in young person’s education
MP: Young people don’t get enough advice about what to do after Year 9 at school
MP: Agreement with statement: About education, work and training for young people: nowadays you need qualification in order to get a job worth having
MP: Agreement with statement: Leaving school at 16 limits young people’s career opportunities later in life
MP: How often go out together as a family (excluding shopping)
Entitled to free school meal

Source: National Audit Office analysis of LSYPE wave 1 (2003/04) and wave 4 (spring 2007), weighted estimates

NOTE
YP = young person’s file; MP = main parent’s file; DV = derived variables.
Jobs without training

1. Young people who take jobs without training share many of the characteristics of young people NEET and often find themselves NEET.

2. By jobs without training we mean young people who are in full-time work and not in receipt of training which reaches NVQ level 2 or above (equivalent to GCSE grades A*-C). As with NEET, the definition of jobs without training is problematic; for example, it catches young people working to save for international travel with others who are not so privileged and have limited choices. Like young people NEET, those in jobs without training are heterogeneous.

The importance of the ‘jobs without training’ group

3. Young people in jobs without training are at greater risk of joining the NEET group than those taking other early career destinations. Those in jobs without training at 16 were three times more likely to be NEET at 17 than those in full-time education.36

4. Young people in jobs without training are a large group: around 11.9 per cent of 16 to 18 year olds are in jobs without training, 240,000 people in 2007 (compared with around 189,000 young people NEET).37 And more young people have jobs without training than hold jobs with training (12 per cent compared with 11 per cent) (Figure 49).

5. In terms of their experiences of, and attitudes to, education and employment young people in jobs without training appear to have a similar profile to young people NEET. Actions to reduce the risks of young people entering the NEET group will also be relevant to those who take jobs without training and vice versa.

6. From 2015 Government policy requires that all young people, including those who currently take jobs without training, will participate in either education or training to age 18.

Trends in the number of young people in jobs without training

7. The proportion of young people in jobs without training has remained fairly constant since 1994 (Figure 49). Twelve per cent of young people were in a job without training in 2007, similarly 11 per cent were in jobs with training. However, the proportion of young people in jobs with training decreased by 5.5 percentage points from 1994 to 2007, whereas the proportion of those in jobs without training only decreased by 1.6 percentage points.
Characteristics of those in jobs without training

8 There have been a few qualitative studies on this subject, but fewer statistical studies. There is scope for additional analysis to better understand the profile of this group.

Personal characteristics

9 Most young people in jobs without training were found to be living at home with their parents and were white working-class.

Engagement with education

10 Young people in jobs without training come from diverse backgrounds and have varied characteristics. While one piece of research found that these young people were not successful at school and went to schools that were impersonal and experienced bullying, other research evidence contradicts this finding. Most of those in jobs without training had a relatively normal school experience and only a small number had a negative experience of school. Another research report also found little evidence of negative experiences at school and the majority of those who participated in this research completed Year 11 and took GCSEs.

Figure 49
Jobs with and without training

![Graph showing per cent of jobs with and without training from 1994 to 2007](image)

Source: Statistical First Release (SFR 13/2008, Table A13)

NOTE
1 Provisional figure; Jobs with training includes work-based training and employer training.
11 Young people in jobs without training have lower levels of qualification than those in jobs with training, but are generally better qualified than young people NEET (Figure 50). Most left school with few qualifications.44

Engagement with and experience of employment

12 The motivations for progressing to jobs without training were a dislike for school, poor performance and a desire to get a job and earn money.46 More recently, however, it was found that young people do not enter the labour market for money, but soon became accustomed to it.46

13 The work done by those in jobs without training was mainly unskilled and low-skilled, requiring few qualifications. There were gender distinctions among the sectors in which those jobs without training were employed. Young women were employed in retail,47 while young men were employed in assembly, packing and sorting type jobs.48 Job turnover was high49 and wages low – the average wage was £4.67 per hour.50

Outcomes

14 There are various destinations of young people in jobs without training. They include other jobs, a spell NEET and accredited training.51 Some experienced extended periods NEET, from one month to one year, while others were in between jobs for a short period of time.52

Figure 50
Qualifications of 16/17 year olds by education, employment or training status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jobs without training %</th>
<th>NEET %</th>
<th>Full-time Education %</th>
<th>Employed with training %</th>
<th>Other education/training %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5+ GCSE grades A*-C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 GCSEs A*-C</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ GCSE grades D-G</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 GCSE grades D-G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Audit Office calculation from Department for Children, Schools and Families (2008), YCS and LSYPE – the activities and experiences of 16 year olds: England, 2007, Table 6.1.2
Attitudes to training

15 Those in jobs without training were not against training per se and knew they could obtain better jobs and wages if they participated in training or learning. Some had firm ambitions to pursue training in the future. Others said they would take up training if it was offered by their employer, but did not want to participate in formal learning. Income was important and they wanted to earn while they learned.

16 Young people in jobs without training mainly faced structural barriers in getting the jobs they really wanted. These included a lack of transport, housing difficulties, personal problems related to poverty, family difficulties and accidents and ill-health.
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