

Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant Cohort 1 (Waves 1 and 2)

CRSP 549

Centre for Research in Social Policy

Monica Magadi
Yekaterina Chzhen
Elspeth Pound
Viet-Hai Phung

National Centre for Social Research

Emily Tanner
Juliet Michaelson
Steven Finch
Helen MacKenzie

September 2006

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

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Policy Context	1
1.2 Financial Support for Learning	1
1.3 The Adult Learning Grant	2
1.4 Survey Design	3
1.4.1 Applicants	3
1.4.2 Non-applicants	5
1.5 Structure of the Report	8
1.6 Report Conventions	9
2 BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS	10
2.1 Definitions of Groups for Analysis	10
2.2 General characteristics	13
2.3 Activity status	21
2.4 Income of Applicants and Non-Applicants	27
2.5 Qualifications	31
2.6 Travel	39
2.7 Childcare	42
2.8 Summary	43
3 MOTIVATIONS AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNING	45
3.1 Attitudes towards Learning	45
3.2 Sources of Information	48
3.3 Reasons for choosing Current Course	52
3.4 Summary	57
4 COSTS AND FUNDING OF LEARNING	59
4.1 Introduction	59
4.2 Costs of Courses	59
4.3 Sources of Funding	65
4.4 Summary	67
5 EXPERIENCES OF ALG	68
5.1 Why non-applicants had not applied for ALG	68
5.2 Experiences with ALG Application at Wave 1	68
5.3 Award of ALG at Wave 1	73
5.4 Receipt of ALG	79
5.4.1 Amount of ALG received weekly	79
5.4.2 Spending ALG	82
5.5 Award and receipt of ALG at Wave 2	85
5.6 Summary	86

6	WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES ALG MAKE?	88
6.1	Importance of ALG on whether to Study Full-Time	88
6.2	Influence of ALG on whether to Study for the Course	91
6.3	Influence of ALG on whether to Continue the Course	93
6.4	Summary	96
7	LEARNING RELATED OUTCOMES	97
7.1	Data Matching Procedure	97
7.2	Extent of Match	99
7.3	Qualification types and levels in ILR	100
7.4	Learning outcomes in ILR at the qualification level	101
	7.4.1 Learning outcomes by background characteristics	102
7.5	Highest qualification outcomes in ILR and survey data	103
	7.5.1 Highest level in ILR and survey data	104
	7.5.2 Highest level by highest outcome in ILR and survey data	105
7.6	Summary	107
8	EMPLOYMENT RELATED OUTCOMES	108
8.1	Activity changes	108
8.2	Reasons for making employment transitions	110
8.3	Employment-related Outcomes	112
	8.3.1 Employment-related outcomes by gender	114
	8.3.2 Differences in employment-related outcomes by Ethnicity	115
	8.3.3 Differences in employment-related outcomes by LSC area	116
	8.3.4 Differences in employment-related outcomes by living arrangement	117
8.4	Income-related outcomes	117
8.5	Occupation groups of ALG recipients and non-applicants	119
8.6	Attitudes to current job	119
8.7	Future plans	121
8.8	Summary	122
9	CONCLUSIONS	123
9.1	Perceived influence of ALG on course choice and retention	123
9.2	Is receipt of ALG associated with improved learning and employment related outcomes?	124
9.3	Sub-group differences in experiences with ALG	124
9.4	Implementation of ALG	125
	REFERENCES	126

INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Eligibility groups for ALG	4
Table 1.2	Selection of Applicant sample: Cohort 1	4
Table 1.3	Learning Aim Codes of qualifications at Level 2 or 3 included in the sample file irrespective of width or awarding body	7
Table 2.1	Proportions of the applicants' sample who were the awardees, non-awardees and recipients	10
Table 2.2	Administrator assigned eligibility status by application outcome as reported by respondent, for applicant sample	11
Table 2.3	Receipt of ALG by application outcome as reported by respondent	12
Table 2.4	Distribution of age at interview of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants	13
Table 2.5	Age group by gender for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants	14
Table 2.6a	Ethnic breakdown for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants	15
Table 2.6b	Ethnicity of ALG awardees, from survey data and administrative data	16
Table 2.7	Living arrangements of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2	17
Table 2.8	Housing tenure of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2	18
Table 2.9	Children under 16 of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2	19
Table 2.10	Level of parental education of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants	19
Table 2.11	Perception of general health by awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2	20
Table 2.12	Long-standing illness, disability and infirmity of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants	20
Table 2.13	Main current and previous activity of awardees and non-applicants at Wave 1	21
Table 2.14	Previous main activity by current main activity for awardees	22
Table 2.15	Previous main activity by current main activity for non-applicants	22
Table 2.16	Number of hours spent in supervised and unsupervised learning by awardees and non-applicants	23
Table 2.17	SOC 2000 groups of awardees and non-applicants	24
Table 2.18	Number of employees at current place of work of awardees and non-applicants	24
Table 2.19a	Main reason for stopping education for awardees and non-applicants studying at Wave 1 and not at Wave 2	25
Table 2.19b	Main reason for awardees and non-applicants leaving full-time work to study at Wave 1	26
Table 2.20a	Distribution of awardees' and non-applicants' earnings from salaried or self-employment	27
Table 2.20b	Distribution of respondents' and partners' earnings from salaried or self-employment	27

Table 2.21	Receipt of state benefits by awardees and non-applicants	28
Table 2.22	Distribution of awardees and non-applicants on benefits by annual gross benefits	28
Table 2.23	Distribution of gross income from salary and benefits for awardees and non-applicants and their partners	29
Table 2.24	Distribution of awardees and non-applicants by total amount of savings	29
Table 2.25	Distribution of awardees and non-applicants by total amount of investments	30
Table 2.26	Distribution of awardees and non-applicants by total amount of personal loans	30
Table 2.27	Distribution of awardees and non-applicants by total amounts outstanding on credit cards	30
Table 2.28	Highest qualification level obtained prior to 2003/4	31
Table 2.29	Highest level study during 2003/4	31
Table 2.30	Proportion of awardees and non-applicants currently studying at Level 2 who had achieved a prior qualification of the specified type	32
Table 2.31	Proportion of respondents currently studying at Level 3 who had achieved a prior qualification of the specified type	34
Table 2.32	Awardees and non-applicants: Qualification types currently being studied by those whose highest level of current study is Level 2	35
Table 2.33	Awardees and non-applicants: Qualification types currently being studied by those whose highest level of current study is Level 3	36
Table 2.34	Most common subjects currently being studied by awardees and non-applicants (by at least 2 % of respondents)	37
Table 2.35	Level of current study by highest level obtained for awardees	38
Table 2.36	Level of current study by highest level obtained for non-applicants	38
Table 2.37	Time taken to travel to college at Waves 1 and 2 for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants	39
Table 2.38	Mode of travel to college at Waves 1 and 2 for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants	40
Table 2.39	Days per week that respondents attended college at Waves 1 and 2 for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants	41
Table 2.40	Weekly travel costs for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Wave 1	42
Table 2.41	Types of childcare used by awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2	43
Table 3.1	Distribution of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants by expressed attitudes towards learning	46
Table 3.2	Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who received information or advice on FE from various sources	48
Table 3.3	Number of sources of information or advice for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants.	49
Table 3.4	Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who cited source as useful or the most useful	50
Table 3.5	Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who cited	51

	source as the most useful	
Table 3.6	Awardees and non-applicants who cited source as the most useful, by age groups	52
Table 3.7a	Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who were studying for non-compulsory, job-related courses or for courses not related to their job, stating reasons for taking current course, at Wave 1	53
Table 3.7b	Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who were studying for job-related courses stating reasons for studying, at Wave 1	53
Table 3.8	Awardees and non-applicants stating reasons for taking current course at Wave 1, by age	54
Table 3.9	Awardees and non-applicants stating reasons for taking current course at Wave 1, by highest level of current qualification aim	55
Table 3.10	Awardees and non-applicants stating reasons for taking current course at Wave 1, by ethnic origin	56
Table 3.11	Awardees and non-applicants stating reasons for taking current course at Wave 2	56
Table 3.12	Recipients stating reasons for taking current course at Wave 1 and Wave 2	57
Table 4.1	Payment of tuition fees by awardees, recipients and non-applicants by background characteristics	59
Table 4.2	Payment of tuition fees by awardees and non-applicants by current and previous activity, qualification level and income	60
Table 4.3	Payment of tuition fees by awardees and non-applicants by living arrangement	61
Table 4.4	Average amount of tuition fees paid by awardees and non-applicants at Wave 1 and Wave 2	61
Table 4.5	Payment of registration or exam fees by awardees and non-applicants by background characteristics	62
Table 4.6	Payment of registration or exam fees by awardees and non-applicants by current and previous activity, qualification level and income	64
Table 4.7	Proportion of awardees and non-applicants who have heard of, applied for and received EMA	65
Table 4.8	Recipients and non-applicants: Application and receipt of Learner Support Funds by LSC area	66
Table 4.9	Application for and receipt of other grants by awardees and non-applicants	66
Table 5.1	Reasons for not applying for ALG	68
Table 5.2	Where applicants obtained application pack, by LSC area (Wave 1)	69
Table 5.3	Where awardees and non-awardees obtained help or advice on ALG application (Wave 1)	69
Table 5.4	How useful is ALG telephone helpline to awardees and non-awardees? (Wave 1)	70
Table 5.5	How useful is ALG telephone helpline to applicants, by current activity, level of study and income (Wave 1)	71
Table 5.6	How useful is ALG telephone helpline to awardees and	72

	non-awardees, by current activity and income (Wave 1)	
Table 5.7	Results of ALG application by LSC area (Wave 1)	73
Table 5.8	Results of ALG application by age, gender, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	74
Table 5.9	Results of ALG application by current activity, level of study and income (Wave 1)	75
Table 5.10	Logistic regression results of factors associated with award or non-award of ALG (Wave 1)	76
Table 5.11	Reasons for rejection of ALG applications (Wave 1)	77
Table 5.12	Reasons for rejection of ALG application by selected Characteristics	78
Table 5.13	Amount of ALG received by LSC area (Wave 1)	79
Table 5.14	Amount of ALG received by age, gender, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	80
Table 5.15	Amount of ALG received by current activity, level of study and income (Wave 1)	81
Table 5.16	Reasons for not receiving ALG (Wave 1)	82
Table 5.17	How ALG was spent, by LSC area	82
Table 5.18	How ALG was spent, by age, gender, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	83
Table 5.19	How ALG was spent, by current activity, level of study and income (Wave 1)	84
Table 5.20	Results of ALG application at Wave 2, by age, gender and current activity	85
Table 5.21	How ALG was spent by age, gender and current activity (Wave 2)	86
Table 6.1	Importance of ALG on decision of ALG recipients to study full-time instead of part-time (Wave 1)	88
Table 6.2	Importance of ALG on decision of recipients to study full-time instead of part-time, by LSC area (Wave 1)	89
Table 6.3	Importance of ALG on decision of ALG recipients to study full-time instead of part-time, by background characteristics (Wave 1)	90
Table 6.4	Importance of ALG on decision of ALG recipients to study full-time instead of part-time, by background characteristics (Cohort 1 Wave 1)	91
Table 6.5	Whether ALG recipients would have still gone ahead with course if ALG had not been awarded, by gender (Wave 1)	91
Table 6.6	Whether ALG recipients in 2003/4 would have still gone ahead with course if ALG had not been awarded, by waves	92
Table 6.7	Whether ALG recipients in 2004/5 would have still gone ahead with course if ALG had not been awarded, by gender (Wave 2)	92
Table 6.8	Whether ALG recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by LSC area	93
Table 6.9	Whether ALG recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by age, gender, ethnicity and living arrangement	94
Table 6.10	Whether ALG recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by current main activity, level of current study and income	95

Table 7.1	Timeline showing periods of learning and dates of data collection	97
Table 7.2	Allocating qualification outcome	98
Table 7.3	Number of qualifications in the survey data and ILR data	99
Table 7.4	Distribution of qualifications across Learning Aim Types for Recipients and Non-applicants: ILR data	100
Table 7.5	Qualification level: ILR data	101
Table 7.6	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants: ILR data	101
Table 7.7	Learning outcomes for qualifications studied by recipients and non-applicants by level: ILR data	102
Table 7.8	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by age: ILR data	102
Table 7.9	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by gender: ILR data	103
Table 7.10	Classification of qualification levels and outcomes in ILR and survey data	103
Table 7.11	Highest level of qualification for recipients and non-applicants who studied at least one L2/L3 qualification: ILR and survey data	104
Table 7.12	Highest qualification outcome for recipients and non-applicants: ILR data	104
Table 7.13	Highest qualification outcome for recipients and non-applicants: survey data	105
Table 7.14	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by highest level: ILR data	105
Table 7.15	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by highest level: survey data	106
Table 7.16	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by highest level: ILR data	106
Table 8.1	Main activity of ALG recipients and non-applicants at Wave 1 and Wave 2	108
Table 8.2	Activity changes among ALG Recipients and non-applicants	109
Table 8.3	Work transitions between Wave 1 and Wave 2 among ALG recipients and non-applicants	110
Table 8.4	Reasons for stopping work	110
Table 8.5	Reasons for starting work	111
Table 8.6	Whether studying helped ALG recipients and non-applicants improve employment – related outcomes	112
Table 8.7	Whether ALG recipients and non-applicants thought studying will help then improve employment related outcomes in the future	113
Table 8.8	Whether qualification 2003/04 helped ALG recipients and non-applicants get jobs	113
Table 8.9	Per cent of ALG recipients and non-applicants reporting various employment related outcomes by gender	114
Table 8.10	Per cent of ALG recipients and non-applicants for whom studying helped get a new job by ethnicity	115
Table 8.11	Per cent of ALG recipients and non-applicants for whom studying helped develop further in career by LSC area	116
Table 8.12	Per cent of ALG recipients and non-applicants for whom	117

	studying helped gain new skills for an existing job by living arrangement	
Table 8.13	Changes in annual salary/earnings for ALG recipients and non-applicants	117
Table 8.14	Changes in annual salary/earnings for ALG recipients and non-applicants by current qualification level	118
Table 8.15	SOC 2000 groups of awardees and non-applicants	119
Table 8.16	Attitudes of ALG recipients and non-applicants towards current job	120
Table 8.17	What ALG recipients and non-applicants would like to do in the near future	121
Table 8.18	How likely ALG recipients and non-applicants thought they would be able to do what they would like to do in the future	122
Table A3.1	"Education is an investment in your future" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	i
Table A3.2	"Learning should be funded by the Government" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	ii
Table A3.3	"I don't have the confidence to learn on their own" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	iii
Table A3.4	"I would prefer to learn in a classroom" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	iv
Table A3.5	"I have a hidden talent that I would love to explore" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	v
Table A3.6	"Learning should be done throughout life" by age, qualifications and living arrangement (Wave 1)	vi
Table A3.7	"I like the idea of learning in new ways," by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	vii
Table A3.8	"Learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	viii
Table A3.9	"Learning is not for people like me" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	ix
Table A3.10	"Courses related to hobbies and interests are just as valuable as work-related courses" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	x
Table A3.11	"Computers are confusing and make things more difficult" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	xi
Table A3.12	"Having fun is an important part of education" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)	xii
Table A7.1	Learning Aim Type codes included in analysis	xiii
Table A7.2a	Learning outcomes for recipients by ethnic group: ILR data	xiv
Table A7.2b	Learning outcomes for non-applicants by ethnic group: ILR Data	xiv
Table A7.3a	Learning outcomes for recipients by living arrangements: ILR data	xv
Table A7.3b	Learning outcomes for non-applicants by living arrangement: ILR data	xv
Table A7.4a	Learning outcomes for recipients by housing	xvi

	tenure: ILR data	
Table A7.4b	Learning outcomes for non-applicants by housing tenure: ILR data	xvi
Table A7.5	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by whether they had children: ILR data	xvii
Table A7.6	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by age: ILR data	xvii
Table A7.7	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by gender: ILR data	xviii
Table A7.8a	Learning outcomes for recipients by ethnic group: ILR data	xviii
Table A7.8b	Learning outcomes for non-applicants by ethnic group: ILR data	xix
Table A7.9a	Learning outcomes for recipients by living arrangements: ILR data	xix
Table A7.9b	Learning outcomes for non-applicants by living arrangements: ILR data	xx
Table A7.10a	Learning outcomes for recipients by housing tenure: ILR data	xx
Table A7.10b	Learning outcomes for non-applicants by housing tenure: ILR data	xxi
Table A7.11	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by whether they had children: ILR data	xxi
Table A7.12	Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by level of prior qualification: ILR data	xxii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

We are grateful to representatives of the Individual Learner Record and the ALG administrative provider for their cooperation with the study. The ALG administrative provider (Manchester City Council) provided administrative data used in the analysis of learning outcomes. Special thanks to learners who participated in the study, for taking their time to respond to the telephone survey.

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 Introduction

There has been a significant change in the locus of job growth within the UK over the past two decades, with managerial, professional and technical occupations experiencing the highest growth rates. Expansion in these sectors has been accompanied by demands for higher levels of skills and qualifications from the workforce, a trend which is predicted to continue. The Skills Strategy White Paper¹ has been central in setting out the Government's aims to ensure that employers have a workforce with the right skills to support their businesses and that individuals have the skills they need to be both employable and personally fulfilled.

The Adult Learning Grant (ALG) was announced as part of the Government's Skills Strategy in 2003. The ALG pilot began in September 2003 in ten areas across England. The ALG aims to support adults in learning through the offer of a means-tested monetary allowance. The allowance is subject to strict eligibility criteria and award relies on learners demonstrating that they meet criteria relating to UK residency, age, proposed course of study, level of prior qualifications, and that they intend to study at a designated learning provider. The grant is targeted at full-time adult learners studying for their first full Level 2 qualification and full-time learners aged 19-30 years studying for their first full Level 3 qualification. The grant is administered by one provider, Manchester City Council (MCC). The table below shows ALG applications and take up in 2003/4 by LSC pilot area.

LSC Pilot Area	No. of ALG applications received	No. of ALGs awarded
Bedfordshire & Luton	201	112
Black Country	330	173
Devon & Cornwall	659	384
Durham	245	150
Humberside	350	215
Lancashire	670	363
Leicestershire	359	196
London West	429	220
Shropshire	134	72
South Yorkshire	570	348
No college*	8	0
Out of scheme [€]	46	2
Total	4001	2235

* Application did not name a learning provider

[€] Named learning provider was not an ALG designated learning provider

¹ Department for Education and Skills (2003). 21st Century Skills - Realising our Potential: Individuals, Employers, Nation. (CM5810). London: HMSO.

2 The Evaluation

The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) has commissioned an evaluation of the ALG, being conducted by a consortium led by the Centre for Research in Social Policy (CRSP) at Loughborough University. The other members of the consortium are: the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen), the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) and the National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling (NICEC). The evaluation comprises both a qualitative study and longitudinal quantitative approaches.

The evaluation has five key objectives, to:

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

This report addresses the first four objectives, while a report on a qualitative study, which addressed the last objective, has already been published.²

3 Survey Design and Methods

The findings presented in this report are based on two waves of surveys from two samples: a sample of Further Education (FE) learners who had applied for ALG in the ten original pilot areas (the 'applicant sample'), and a sample of FE learners in those areas who had not applied for ALG, but were eligible for the grant based on their learning mode, qualifications and age (the 'non-applicant sample'). Eligibility on income grounds was not included in the sample design.

The sample of ALG applicants was drawn from records held by the administrative provider (Manchester City Council). The records contained details of all learners who had applied for ALG as at the 10 March 2004. At this time, there were a total of 3,407 applicants. The applicants were stratified by LSC area and a proportionate sample of 2000 applicants was targeted. The total number of full interviews achieved at Wave 1 for the applicant sample was 1,281, a response rate of 64%. Of the 1,281 cases who completed full interviews at Wave 1, those who were not awarded ALG or who refused to be re-contacted were dropped from the follow-up Wave 2 sample, resulting in an issued sample of 952 cases. The total number of full interviews achieved at Wave 2 was 668, a response rate of 70%. Weights were derived that accounted for potential response bias on the basis of important

² Pound, E., Maguire, M., Middleton, S., Ashton-Brooks, K. (2004). [A qualitative investigation into the first year \(pilot\) implementation of the Adult Learning Grant](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RBX12-04.pdf), Department for Education and Skills Research Brief: RBX12-04, November 2004.

background characteristics (main current activity, age and sex) and took into account the selection and response bias at Wave 1.

The non-applicant sample was drawn from the Individualised Learner Record (ILR) held by the LSC, from the database with the details of all qualifications being studied for by learners within FE. As the records on the database were at the level of individual qualifications, rather than learners, two stages of work on the sample were required: first, constructing a sample frame of eligible learners and then drawing a sample. This gave a sample of 14,682 learners.

A sample of 2,626 records was then randomly selected from the sample frame. All learners in the sample frame had equal selection probabilities. The number of non-applicants who responded to either a screening interview or a full interview at Wave 1 was 938, a response rate of 36%. After ineligible respondents had been removed, the final achieved sample was 462 respondents. Of the 462 eligible non-applicants interviewed at Wave 1, those who refused to be re-contacted (37 cases) or subsequently applied for ALG in 2004-5 (17 cases) were dropped at Wave 2, resulting in an issued sample of 408. The total number of full achieved interviews for non-applicants at Wave 2 was 258, a response rate of 63%. As for applicants, weights were derived for non-applicants sample that corrected for potential response bias on the basis of age and sex and combined with the Wave 1 weight to take into account selection and non-response bias at Wave 1.

Fieldwork for both waves of applicant and non-applicant surveys was carried out by means of computer-assisted telephone interviewing. Wave 1 fieldwork took place between May and July 2004, while Wave 2 fieldwork took place between June and August 2005.

4 Report Structure

Throughout the report (except for ALG experiences), the analysis focuses on comparisons between ALG applicants (or sub-groups: awardees or recipients) and qualification-eligible non-applicants.

The findings presented relate to:

- background characteristics;
- motivations and attitudes towards learning;
- costs and funding of learning;
- application, award and spending of ALG;
- applicants perceptions of what difference ALG made;
- learning-related outcomes associated with receipt of ALG; and
- employment related outcomes associated with ALG receipt.

5 Key Findings

5.1 Profile of ALG awardees and eligible non-applicants

5.1.1 Diversity

The age breakdown for the 2003/4 ALG awardees was as follows:

Age break-down of those awarded ALG

Age	18-19	20	21-24	25-31	Total
% of ALG awardees	27%	28%	31%	14%	100%

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

Please note that over 31s were not included in the evaluation sample, and the take up of ALG by over 30s was low because they were only eligible for level 2 learning, and over 80% of ALG study is at level 3.

The gender split for 2003/04 was 53% female and 47% male, which compares to the gender split in FE as a whole of 59% female, 41% male. Male applicants tended to be slightly younger than females.

The ethnic backgrounds of ALG awardees were quite diverse. There was a particularly high take up by students of Asian origin (18%). The ethnic breakdown of eligible non-applicants was similar except that a larger proportion was of Black origin (14%).

Ethnicity break-down of those awarded ALG

Ethnicity	White	Asian	Black	Mixed/other	Total
% ALG awardees	74%	18%	5%	3%	100%

11% of ALG awardees had a long standing illness or disability (about the same as the proportion of disabled people studying in FE as a whole).

5.1.2 Family and living arrangements

At Wave 1, the majority of ALG awardees (79%) were living with parents. 10% were living with a partner, 3% were living alone, and 9% were living with others. At Wave 2, the proportion living with parents had reduced to 69%. Around 30% of awardees who were living with parents were paying rent. Only 11% of ALG recipients had children under 16. Eligible non-applicants had a similar profile although they were less likely to be living with parents, and more likely to have children.

The educational background of parents of ALG awardees was lower than average; only around 29% of them had stayed on at school after the age of 16.

5.1.3 Employment status

59% of awardees were working while they were doing their course, but prior to taking up the course, only 50% of awardees were working. Of those who were working, the breakdown of their occupation types is as follows: 31% elementary occupations, 34% sales/customer service, and 12% personal service occupations. Most awardees therefore seem to be concentrated in low-skilled jobs.

The distribution of income from salaried or self-employment for ALG awardees was as follows: 82% had a personal income below £10,000 (about half of these claimed to have no earnings at all), only 2% had an income of more than £10,000, and 15% did not reveal their income. The income of awardees' partners tended to be higher: 21% of employed partners earned less than £10,000; 50% earned over £10,000 and there was no information for the remaining 29%.

7% of ALG awardees received means-tested benefits, and another 6% received non-means-tested benefits. A higher proportion of non-applicants received means-tested benefits (13%) but the differences in income and benefits profile between awardees and non-applicant is quite small and only accounts for a small part of the reason why non-applicants didn't apply.

Only 7% of awardees reported having savings of more than £1000; and only 3% had other investments. 38% of awardees had credit cards, and nearly a quarter of these had outstanding debts of more than £1000.

All the above suggests that nearly all ALG awardees have low income and wealth; and many are doing low-skilled work to support themselves while they are building their qualifications.

5.1.4 What qualification types were they studying for?

Over 80% of ALG recipients were studying for level 3 qualifications, and most of the remainder were studying for level 2 qualifications. 54% of level 2 ALG recipients were studying NVQs, 16% for Edexcel/BTEC qualifications, 19% were studying for City and Guilds and 15% were studying GCSEs (note that some students were studying for more than one qualification). For level 3 students: 30% were studying EdExcel/BTEC qualifications; 35% were studying other vocational qualifications; 25% were studying A or AS levels; and 25% were on Access to HE courses.

5.2 Motivation towards learning and choosing a course

ALG non-applicants tended to have a very positive attitude towards learning, but awardees were even more positive. For instance, awardees were more likely than non-applicants to strongly agree with:

- education is an investment in my future (awardees – 86%; non-applicants – 78%)
- I like the idea of learning in new ways (53%; 46%),

Also, awardees were more likely than non-applicants to strongly disagree with:

- learning isn't for people like them (awardees – 84%; non-applicants – 78%),
- computers are confusing and made things more difficult (57%; 49%).

Awardees most commonly used sources of information, advice and guidance (IAG) on FE courses were: education institutions (72%), family/friends (61%), and connexions (26%). The most useful IAG sources were: education institutions (50% of awardees found them the most useful), family and friends (22%), and the Connexions Service (9%).

Nearly all students were enrolled on the course for job-related reasons. Only 8% of awardees were enrolled on courses related to their current job compared to 15% of non-applicants. The most common reasons for study given by awardees at Wave 1 were: to develop a career (95%), change to a different career (66%), to get a new job (61%), and to get more satisfaction from work (54%). Note respondents could select more than one reason.

5.3 Costs and funding of learning

ALG awardees were not automatically entitled to fee remission. Whether or not they received fee remission depended on their personal circumstances and in the policy operated in the local area and college. 14% of ALG awardees, compared to 21% of non-applicants paid tuition fees in 2003/4. There were significant regional variations in payment of tuition fees. Among awardees, the proportion paying tuition fees ranged from less than 5% in County Durham, Humberside and Shropshire to more than 30% in Bedfordshire & Luton, Devon & Cornwall and London West.

Among those who paid tuition fees, awardees reported paying, on average, £325, while the non-applicants reported paying an average of £426 at Wave 1. The average amount of tuition fees paid at Wave 2 by both awardees and non-applicants were higher at £545 and £893, respectively. 21% of awardees paid registration fees and 11% paid exam fees. The proportion of non-applicants who paid registration fees was similar to that of awardees, but the proportion who reported paying exam fees was higher (16%).

Some of the marketing of ALG was aimed at students who had recently received Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA). 23% of awardees aged 19-21 had applied for EMA (compared to 20% of non-applicants). Awardees were also more likely to have applied for and received Learner Support Funds (7%) compared to non-applicants (1%).

5.4 Applying for ALG, and how ALG was spent

There were many full-time first Level 2/Level 3 students who did not apply for ALG in 2003/4. While some of them may not have been eligible on income or benefits grounds, the majority would seem to have been eligible for ALG (as their profiles were similar to ALG awardees). A large proportion (64%) of these non-applicants had not heard of ALG. Another 18% thought they would not be eligible. Around 5% had problems with the application process such as: couldn't be bothered, too much hassle, too difficult, couldn't find documents.

Most ALG applicants said they had obtained an ALG application pack from a college or an education institution (95%). Around 40% of awardees (and 29% of non-

awardees) received help and/or advice on their application for ALG. The most common sources of help were parents (12%), course tutor (11%), and other persons at respondent's college (11%). The vast majority of awardees did not use the ALG telephone helpline but nearly all of the 16% who did found it very or fairly useful.

Overall, 63% of Wave 1 respondents who applied for ALG were awarded the grant. Results from a logistic regression analysis of factors independently associated with ALG award at Wave 1 revealed that applicants were more likely to be awarded the grant if they were:

- studying for qualifications at Level 3;
- had moderate income of £10,000 – £15,000;
- single and living with parents;
- younger (e.g. aged 18 – 20 years);
- of White ethnic origin; or
- in full-time education with a job.

Not studying for their first Level 2 or Level 3 qualification was the most commonly cited reason for having been rejected ALG at Wave 1. Of all Wave 1 applicants, 24% re-applied for ALG at Wave 2, most of whom (84%) were awarded the grant.

ALG recipients were asked at Wave 1 and Wave 2 how they spent the ALG money. The majority of recipients at Wave 1 spent their ALG payments on books (80%) and travel (74%). 37% used ALG to pay for leisure or social activities, 33% for household bills, and 13% spent ALG on rent or mortgage. The pattern of spending at wave 2 was largely similar to that at Wave 1, although slightly higher proportions of recipients at Wave 2 reported spending on course-related travel (77%) and on household bills (37%). Not surprisingly, single recipients living with parents were the most likely to say they spent ALG on social and leisure activities and, the least likely to report spending ALG on rent/mortgage and on household bills.

5.5 What difference does ALG make?

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

ALG was announced very close to the start of the 2003/4 academic year, so it was not expected to have had much impact on Wave 1 applicants, most of whom (94%) had chosen their course before they heard of ALG³. Nevertheless, 36% of ALG recipients at Wave 1 said that ALG was quite/very important in their decision to study full-time. The figures were higher in Bedfordshire & Luton (52%) and The Black Country (44%).

ALG has had considerable impact on student retention. 19% of those who received at least one ALG payment at Wave 1 stated at Wave 2 that they definitely or

³ Note that later surveys of 2004/5 ALG awardees found that around 11% would probably or definitely not have taken their course without ALG.

probably would have dropped out of the course without ALG. Those with no income were most likely to have dropped out of their course if they had not received ALG.

5.6 Learning-related Outcomes Associated with ALG Receipt

Comparisons of the qualification outcomes of recipients and non-applicants were made by matching survey data with administrative data from the Individualised Learner Record (ILR) held by the LSC. There was a high level of match between the two sources of data, with 89% of recipients and 88% of non-applicants from the survey data matched to the ILR data. The analysis was carried out in two stages: first based on all qualifications; and then based on the highest achieved qualification for each learner. The qualification outcomes as recorded on the ILR were occasionally different to those reported by the learner. Both outcomes were analysed but the following summary relates to outcomes as recorded on the ILR only.

When all the qualifications being studied were taken into consideration, 70% of ALG recipients achieved their qualifications compared to 56% of non-applicants. Level 3 qualifications were more likely to be achieved than those at Level 2 (76% compared to 61% for awardees). Women were more likely to achieve their qualifications than men, although the difference was only significant for non-applicants. There were no significant sub-group differences based on age, ethnicity, living arrangements, tenure or having children.

The analysis of highest qualification outcome in the ILR and survey data yielded similar results. 93% of recipients and 80% of non-applicants achieved at least one qualification. Non-applicants studying at Level 3 were more likely to achieve their qualification than those studying at Level 2. Otherwise, there were no other differences in the highest qualification outcome for individuals according to background characteristics.

5.7 Employment-related Outcomes Associated with ALG Receipt

5.7.1 Activity changes between Wave 1 and Wave 2

The analysis compared activity changes and employment-related outcomes between ALG recipients and non-applicants to assess whether receipt of ALG is associated with better outcomes for adult learners. The analysis was based only on respondents interviewed both at Wave 1 and at Wave 2, to allow direct comparisons between the two waves. At wave 1, 57% of recipients were employed compared to 55% of non-applicants. At wave 2, these proportions had increased by 7 percentage points to 64% (recipients) and 62% (non-applicants).

Taking on the course obviously had an impact on the time available to do work and on the necessity to earn money. Half of those who stopped work between Wave 1 and Wave 2 said they were too busy with study to continue working. Most of those who started work between Wave 1 and Wave 2 said they did so because they needed the money.

The patterns in activity changes suggest ALG receipt is associated with better employment outcomes. Of the 12% of ALG recipients who were neither in education nor work at Wave 1, only 9% remained so at Wave 2. In contrast, 19% of non-recipients were neither in education nor work at Wave 1, and 42% remained so at Wave 2.

5.7.2 Employment-related benefits of course

Respondents were asked about the employment outcomes of their course. The most common outcomes were:

- Gave confidence to do more studying (88% of recipients said it helped).
- Developed further in career (70%)
- Able to do job better than before (41%)
- Get more satisfaction from work (37%)

ALG recipients usually reported slightly better outcomes than non-applicants. There was little variation in employment-related outcomes by key background factors except female recipients reported more favourable employment-related outcomes than males, especially gaining new skills (females – 41%; males – 31%) and getting more job satisfaction (41%; 32%). This pattern was not so clear for non-applicants.

ALG recipients were generally more positive about future employment prospects - a significantly higher proportion said the course would lead to a better job in future (93% of recipients compared to 85% of non-applicants) or would help them gain new skills for an existing job (94% compared to 87%).

The analysis of income-related outcomes was limited by the quality of income data – information on respondents' earnings was fairly incomplete at Wave 1. For ALG recipients, the proportion of learners with an annual earning exceeding £10,000 increased from 2% to 14% between Wave 1 and Wave 2. For non-applicants the proportion increased from 1% to 20%.

Among respondents who had a job at the time of the interview, the overall proportion of ALG recipients in the top five occupation categories (i.e. from skilled trade to managers and senior officials) doubled from 15% to 29% between Wave 1 and Wave 2. For the non-applicants, the proportion in the top five occupations was much higher at wave 1 but declined slightly from 31% to 29%. Awardees mostly agreed that they found their job interesting (76%) and they enjoyed it. But only 45% felt it was a step on the career path that they wished to follow; and 31% were actively looking for another job.

5.7.3 Future plans

Respondents were asked about their future plans. In one year's time, 37% thought they would be in full-time work (or in work-based training), most of the remainder would still be studying. In two year's time, 77% thought they would be in full time work (or in work-based training). The future plans of non-applicants were much the same.

5.8 Conclusions

Overall, the evidence presented in this report provides some indication of a positive impact of ALG on learning-related and employment related outcomes. The results suggest that ALG has achieved some additionality as well as had a notable impact on student retention. A sizeable proportion of ALG recipients believed that they definitely or probably would not have gone ahead with their course, or would have dropped out without ALG. These perceptions are supported by findings from analysis of ILR data which show higher qualification achievement of ALG recipients, compared to non-applicants.

Despite data limitations due to the small number of interviews at Wave 2, activity changes and occupation categories between Wave 1 and Wave 2 suggest more favourable outcomes for ALG recipients than non-applicants. Furthermore, the recipients seemed more positive about their future employment prospects.

Finally, the findings suggest that the grant is mainly used as intended, to cover course related expenses, including books and course-related travel.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Policy Context

The UK has seen a significant change in the locus of job growth over the last 2 decades, with managerial, professional and technical occupations experiencing the highest rate of growth. Expansion in these sectors demands higher levels of skills and qualifications from the workforce, a trend which is predicted to continue. The UK government has responded to labour market demands for higher skills and qualifications by attempting to redress perceived deficiencies in the UK workforce. Improving the skills and qualifications of the workforce is viewed as fundamental to improving UK economic competitiveness (Cabinet Office Performance and Innovation Unit, 2001).

The Skills Strategy White Paper (DfES, 2003a) has been central in setting out the Government's aims:

'to ensure that employers have the right skills to support the success of their businesses and that individuals have the skills they need to be both employable and personally fulfilled.' (DfES, 2003a: 11)

The White Paper placed particular emphasis on promoting achievement in skills up to a full Level 2 qualification. Since the publication of the White Paper, some progress has been made in increasing the Level 2 attainment target among adults in the workforce: while in 2001, 7.1 million adults in the workforce had not attained a Level 2 qualification, this has been reduced to 6.7 million in 2003 (Office of National Statistics, 2004).

An important element in the Government's strategy has been an awareness of socio-economic factors in the acquisition of skills and qualifications. A survey conducted by the National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (NIACE) in 2002 (Aldridge and Tuckett, 2002) found that participation rates in learning tended to be lower among respondents living in deprived areas. This finding is supported by the 1997, 2001 and 2002 National Adult Learning Surveys (Beinart and Smith, 1998; La Valle and Blake, 2002; Fitzgerald et al., 2003; respectively). The surveys also found that significant proportions of respondents cited financial difficulties as a major barrier to learning (see also McGivney, 1993; Hillage and Aston, 2001).

The Skills for Life Survey (DfES, 2003b) found that only 18% of respondents achieved Level 2 or above in tests for both literacy and numeracy, with lower levels of literacy associated with socio-economic deprivation.

1.2 Financial Support for Learning

In recent years a number of initiatives have emerged to provide a comprehensive system of financial support for learning. These include Career Development Loans, credits, vouchers, fee remission, discretionary Learner Support Funding (LSF), discretionary awards by LEAs, Individual Learning Accounts, the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA), Level 2 Entitlement, Employer Training Pilots, the

provision of business support services, and improved information, advice and guidance. The Adult Learning Grant (ALG) is one such initiative and was introduced to contribute to the Government's 2010 target to achieve a 40% reduction in the number of adults in the workforce lacking any qualifications up to Level 2.

1.3 The Adult Learning Grant

The ALG was announced as part of the Government's Skills Strategy (DfES, 2003a). The ALG pilot began in September 2003 in 10 areas across England (The Black Country, County Durham, Devon and Cornwall, Humberside, Lancashire, Leicestershire, London West, Luton and Bedfordshire, Shropshire, and South Yorkshire).⁴ The ALG aims to support more adults in learning through the offer of a means-tested monetary allowance. The allowance (up to £30 per week) is paid during term time and is available to learners earning up to £19,000 (or up to £30,000 if the learner lives with a partner in paid employment). The allowance is subject to strict eligibility criteria and award relies on learners demonstrating that they meet criteria relating to UK residency, age, proposed course of study, level of prior qualifications, and that they intend to study at a designated learning provider. The grant is targeted at full-time adult learners studying for their first full Level 2 qualification and full-time learners aged 19 – 30 years of age studying for their first full Level 3 qualification. This upper age limit will be removed from September 2006. The grant is administered by one provider, Manchester City Council (MCC), which provides application packs to learners and colleges, a telephone helpline, assesses eligibility for the grant and issues weekly term-time payments to learners, subject to confirmation of full attendance by students' learning providers. The Learning and Skills Council (LSC) National Office took lead responsibility for publicising and marketing the new grant.

An evaluation of the ALG is being undertaken by a consortium led by the Centre for Research in Social Policy (CRSP) at Loughborough University. The members of the consortium are: the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen); the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS); and the National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling (NICEC). The evaluation comprises both qualitative and longitudinal quantitative methods.

⁴ In 2004/5 the ALG pilot was extended into the whole of the NE and SE regions. It will be extended into the West Midlands and Yorkshire and Humber regions in 2006/7, and national roll-out is planned for 2008/9.

The evaluation has 5 key objectives, to:

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

The study presented in this report, along with evidence reported elsewhere for the second cohort of learners⁵, contributes to the first 4 objectives. A qualitative study, addressing objective 5, has already been published (Pound et al., 2004).

1.4 Survey Design

This section provides a brief overview of the design of the surveys for the applicants and non-applicants.

1.4.1 Applicants

'Applicants' are a sample of Further Education (FE) learners who had applied for ALG.

Cohort 1, Wave 1

The sample of ALG applicants was drawn from records held by the administrative provider, Manchester City Council (MCC). The records contained details of all learners who had applied for ALG as of March 2004.

The sample was grouped according to the eligibility status assigned to each learner by MCC at the time the data were extracted. The eligibility groups are presented in Table 1.1.

⁵ Pound et al., (2006) Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant: Cohort 2 Wave 1 Report.

Table 1.1 Eligibility groups for ALG

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

The learners were then selected with selection probabilities based on eligibility group status. Within each eligibility group, the file was stratified by the 10 local LSC pilot areas, with the same selection probability used for each area.

Table 1.2 Selection of Applicant sample: Cohort 1

Group	Eligibility/application status	Number of applicants	Selection probability	Number sampled
1	Eligible	1951		
	-approved/eligible awaiting approval (1a)	1527	0.75	1151
	-not taken up (1b)	319	0.67	219
	-successful but withdrawn from scheme (1c)	105	0.95	88
2	Eligibility not determined/not known (2)	726	0.50	363
3	<i>Not eligible</i>	729		
	-included in research (3a)	683	0.26	179
	-excluded from research (3b)	46		
4	Automatically removed from sample	1		
Total		3407	0.59	2000

The total number of full achieved interviews was 1281, a response rate of 64% of the issued sample of 2,000. By examining the variables available on the sample frame (age, area, gender and eligibility group) evidence was found that suggested non-response bias relating to age and LSC area. Weights were derived which corrected

for the differential sampling fractions used for the eligibility groups and for non-response bias.

Cohort 1, Wave 2

Of the 1281 cases who completed a full interview at Wave 1, the following were dropped from the follow-up sample:

- 89 cases who refused to be re-contacted;
- 184 respondents who reported at interview that they had not been awarded ALG; and
- 56 cases where both of the following conditions applied:
 - a) respondents said at Wave 1 that they did not know the result of their ALG application or had not heard of or applied for ALG; and
 - b) the final application status on the original MCC file showed that the grant had been refused.

The resulting issued sample comprised 952 cases. The total number of full achieved interviews was 668, a response rate of 70% of the issued sample of 952. The remainder were classified as 144 total non-contacts, 89 total refusals and 51 total other non-productives. Weights were derived that accounted for potential response bias on the basis of main current activity, age and sex and took into account the selection and response bias at Wave 1.

1.4.2 Non-applicants

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

Cohort 1, Wave 1

Constructing the sample frame

Data were extracted from the ILR on 11 June 2004 having been filtered so that qualification records were only included if:

- the local LSC of the provider institution was within 1 of the 10 ALG pilot areas;
- the age of the learner was 18 or older up to and including age 31;
- the learner was active during the academic year 2003/04; or
- the records were not flagged for 'restricted use'.

This resulted in a file of 235,603 records, where each record represented a qualification. Qualification details were encoded as an 8-digit variable, which linked to the LSC's Learning Aim Database (LAD), from which full qualification details were imported. A number of further filters were then applied to the file prior to the drawing

of the sample to include only learners who:

- were studying full-time;
- were aged at least 19 by 1 February 2004 and no older than 30 on 31 August 2003;
- were not flagged as receiving ALG;
- had a complete telephone number;
- had not taken part in a previous pilot on the study; and
- were not included in the file of ALG applicants provided by Manchester City Council.

In addition, records which were duplicates based on learner name, date of birth, postcode and qualification details were removed.

Applying these filters produced a file of 52,314 qualification records. The qualification records for each learner were grouped together and a filter applied to learners based on the qualification types they were studying. The filter criteria were as follows. A learner was only included in the file if:

- at least 1 of the qualifications they were studying was at NVQ Level 2 or 3; and
- 1 of the following conditions (based on variables imported from the LAD) applied to the qualification:
Either
 - the qualification had a notional NVQ width of 100; or
 - the awarding body was City and Guild; or
 - the Learning Aim Type Code was 1 of the values listed in Table 1.3 below.

These qualification criteria were developed through discussions with the DfES in order to get as close as possible a match to ALG eligibility criteria, which specify that the learner should be currently studying for a full Level 2 or Level 3.

Learner records which failed to meet the selection criteria were excluded. This removed 13,048 records from the file with 39,266 records remaining.

The remaining records were then 'flattened' by learner so that the resulting file contained 1 record for each learner which contained information on all of the qualifications for which the learner was registered. Therefore the remaining 39,266 qualification records were converted into 14,682 learner records.

Selecting the sample

A sample of 2,626 records was randomly selected from the sample frame of 14,682 learners in the filtered ILR file. The sample frame was stratified by level of current study and local LSC area, to ensure that distribution of these characteristics in the drawn sample matched that of the sample frame. All learners in the sample frame had equal selection probabilities.

Table 1.3 Learning Aim Codes of qualifications at Level 2 or 3 included in the sample file irrespective of width or awarding body

Learning Aim Type Code	Learning Aim Type Description
0001	GCE AS level
0002	GCE A level
0006	Diploma
0009	Advanced Certificate
0016	Certificate
0024	Higher Diploma
0030	National Certificate
0033	BTEC/EDEXCEL Professional Development Qualification
0035	GNVQ
0036	NVQ
0067	Technicians Certificate
0111	Professional Diploma
0117	Advanced Diploma (also RSA)
0128	Intermediate Certificate
0136	Level 2
0137	Level 3
1413	GCE A2 Level
1414	Conversion from Advanced Subsidiary VCE to Advanced VCE
1415	Conversion from Advanced VCE to Advanced VCE (Double Award)
1416	Advanced Subsidiary VCE
1417	Advanced VCE
1418	Advanced VCE (Double Award)
1421	Edexcel National Award
1423	Edexcel First Diploma (new syllabus)
1424	Edexcel National Certificate (new syllabus)
1425	Edexcel National Diploma (new syllabus)
1429	AES NVQ Equivalents
2006	Intermediate Award
2007	Advanced Award
4342 ⁶	Other

The number of non-applicants who responded to either a screening interview or a full interview was 938, a response rate of 36% of the issued sample of 2,626. (It should be noted that 1 reason for this low response rate was that the telephone number information drawn from the ILR was of poor quality: 29% of the sample had a number listed where the respondent was not known, which was disconnected or unavailable, had telecommunication barriers or was otherwise never answered or not a valid telephone number). When variables on the sample frame were examined (age, gender, area, level of current study) evidence was found for non-response bias relating to an age-sex interaction effect. Weights were derived to correct for this bias.

⁶ Code 4342 'Other' should not have been included in specified learning aim types but should have been left to fall under the 100% width criteria. It was not included in cohort 2.

Of the 571 respondents who completed a full interview and were not screened out at interview for being qualification-ineligible⁷, the following were dropped from the final Wave 1 sample:

- 30 respondents for whom it was clear that they were not studying a first Level 2 or 3 qualification but who had not been screened out at interview;
- 1 case where the respondent stated their age as 17; and
- 78 cases where the respondent said they had applied for ALG.

When ineligible respondents had been removed, the final achieved sample of non-applicants at Wave 1 was 462 respondents.

Cohort 1, Wave 2

Of the 462 respondents remaining in the final Wave 1 sample, the following were dropped in the Wave 2 follow-up:

- 17 respondents who were found to have applied for ALG in 2004-5 in the MCC file of applicants; and
- 37 who refused to be re-contacted.

This resulted in an issued sample of 408. The total number of full achieved interviews was 258, a response rate of 63% of the issued sample of 408. The remainder were classified as 79 total non-contacts, 55 total refusals and 16 total other non-productives. Weights were derived that corrected for potential response bias on the basis of age and sex and combined with the Wave 1 weight to take into account selection and non-response bias at Wave 1. Although no significant differences were found in the response rate according to these variables, using this weight made the analysis more consistent with Wave 1.

1.5 Structure of the Report

The analyses presented in this report are based on 2 Waves of survey for cohort 1 learners. Throughout the analysis, comparisons are made between non-applicants and sub-groups of ALG applicants: awardees or recipients. 'Awardees' are defined as applicants who had been awarded ALG, regardless of whether they took up the grant or not. 'Recipients' are defined as awardees who received at least 1 payment of ALG by the time of the survey, including cases where payment had subsequently been withheld or stopped.

The report comprises a total of 9 chapters:

Chapter 2 details the background characteristics of ALG applicants (broken down by awardees and non-awardees) and non-applicants, including age, gender and ethnicity, current and previous economic activities, income from earnings and benefits, prior qualifications and courses currently being studied.

Chapter 3 examines motivations and attitudes towards learning among ALG awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants, including experiences of obtaining information and advice on FE and reasons for choosing their course.

⁷ This applied to 367 (39%) of the 938 non-applicants who responded at the Wave 1 interview.

Chapter 4 examines costs and funding of learning among ALG awardees and non-applicants, focusing on payment of tuition, exam and registration fees and awareness/applications of other sources of funding for adult learners, besides ALG.

Chapter 5 explores applicants' experiences with the ALG. An analysis of experiences with the application process is followed with an examination of factors associated with award of ALG, reasons for non-award, amount of grant, and what the award was used for.

Chapter 6 focuses on applicants' perceptions about the additionality of ALG, including importance of ALG in choice of course and retention.

Chapter 7 examines learning outcomes associated with receipt of ALG. The analysis focuses on achievement of qualifications studied by ALG recipients and non-applicants, based on administrative data from ILR, matched to survey data.

Chapter 8 compares activity changes and employment-related outcomes between ALG recipients and non-applicants to assess whether receipt of ALG is associated with better employment outcomes.

Finally, *Chapter 9* draws conclusions from the study, paying particular attention to policy implications of key findings.

1.6 Report Conventions

- a) Throughout the report, percentages based on fewer than 50 cases are enclosed in square brackets, and should be interpreted with caution (those based on fewer than 20 cases are not presented and shown as [-]).
- b) All percentages are weighted, while number of cases reflect unweighted base populations.
- c) Percentages are rounded up or down to whole numbers and therefore may not always sum to 100
- d) Percentages less than 0.5 are shown as '**' to distinguish them from absolute 0.
- e) Since the applicants and non-applicant samples were from different sampling frames and used different survey designs, comparisons between the 2 groups or their sub-groups are based on tests for independent samples.

2 BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter describes the background characteristics of applicants⁸ and non-applicants, including age, gender and ethnicity, current and previous economic activities and living arrangements. The courses being studied by awardees and details about their income are compared with non-applicants. The analyses are based on Wave 1 data and comparisons are made with Wave 2 where appropriate. The data are weighted by the separate Wave 1 weights for applicants and non-applicants.

2.1 Definitions of Groups for Analysis

This section describes sub-groups of applicants: awardees; non-awardees; and recipients. It includes administrator assigned eligibility status and application outcome as reported by the respondents.

Table 2.1 Proportion of the applicants' sample who were awardees, non-awardees and recipients

Sub-categories	Column % % of all applicants
Awardees	63
Recipients (subset of awardees)	57
Non-awardees	37
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>1281</i>

Base: All applicants in Wave 1.

The awardees included those who did not know the outcome of their application at Wave 1 but who at Wave 2 confirmed that they had been awarded the grant for the 2003/4 academic year. Non-awardees were those applicants who were not awarded the grant. The recipients were a sub-set of the awardees and comprised those who received at least 1 ALG payment in 2003/4 including those who later had the payments stopped or withheld.

⁸ Focus on awardees but non-awardees are included in sections 2.1 and 2.2 for comparison with awardees.

Table 2.2 Administrator assigned eligibility status by application outcome as reported by respondent, for applicant sample

Application outcome as reported by respondent	Administrator classification					Column %		
	Eligible		Eligibility not determined			Not eligible	All in applicant sample	
	Approved	Not taken up	Withdrawn from scheme	Total				
Awarded	96	18	[55]	85	58	4	63	
Not awarded	1	48	[15]	7	23	85	26	
Result awaited	1	8	[7]	2	9	0	3	
Did not apply	1	17	[9]	4	7	5	5	
Have not heard of ALG	1	9	[15]	3	3	6	4	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>790</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>929</i>	<i>239</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>1281</i>	

Base: All respondents in applicant sample.

Table 2.3 Receipt of ALG by application outcome as reported by respondent

Receipt status	Awardees	Recipients	Non-awardees	Column %
Currently receives	78	86	0	49
Not due yet	*	0	0	*
Due but delayed	1	0	0	1
Received then withheld or stopped	8	8	0	5
Withheld or stopped from start	2	0	0	1
Decided not to take up	1	0	0	1
Reason for non-receipt not stated	10	6	0	6
No award	0	0	100	37
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>939</i>	<i>855</i>	<i>342</i>	<i>1281</i>

Base: All applicants.

Tables 2.2 and 2.3 give a breakdown of the applicant sample, indicating application and receipt status. The first table combines administrator classification of eligibility when the sample was obtained with the information about application status given by respondents at the wave 1 and wave 2 interviews. There are some discrepancies between the sources, for example a small number of learners who became ALG awardees despite having been defined by the administrators as ineligible, which are probably due to reporting error on behalf of respondents. Overall, 63% of the applicants were awarded ALG. Awardees are defined in Tables 2.2 and 2.3 as those who reported that they were awarded ALG in Wave 1 plus those who were awaiting the result of the application and confirmed at Wave 2 that they had been successful.

Whereas Table 2.2 compares the administrator classification and the ALG status of learners, Table 2.3 details the different circumstances with regards to receipt of ALG for awardees, recipients and non-awardees. Overall, just under half of the applicants in the survey received ALG payments in 2003/4. Of the awardees group described in this chapter, 86% received at least 1 payment. A minority of the recipient group later had their payments stopped or withheld.

2.2 General characteristics

This section describes and compares the socio-demographic characteristics of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants.

Table 2.4 Distribution of age at interview of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants

Age	Applicants			Column %
	Awardees	Non-awardees	Total applicants	Non-applicants
18	1	2	1	0
19	26	16	22	30
20	28	22	26	22
21	14	14	14	13
22	9	12	9	7
23	5	7	6	4
24	3	5	4	4
25	2	3	2	3
26	3	5	4	2
27	2	2	2	5
28	4	2	2	2
29	2	3	2	3
30	2	2	2	3
31	2	5	3	3
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>939</i>	<i>342</i>	<i>1281</i>	<i>462</i>

Base: All applicants and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Table 2.5 Age group by gender for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants

Age group	Applicants						Non-applicants			Column %
	Awardees			Non-awardees			M	F	Total	
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total				
18 to 19	28	26	27	19	17	18	33	27	30	
20	33	24	28	24	20	22	25	20	22	
21 to 24	28	33	31	40	38	39	27	27	27	
25 to 31	11	17	14	17	25	22	15	27	21	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>442</i>	<i>497</i>	<i>939</i>	<i>159</i>	<i>183</i>	<i>342</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>248</i>	<i>462</i>	

Base: All respondents at Wave 1.

The majority of learners in all groups were aged between 19 and 21 and tailed off at the upper age limit of 31. Applicants were on average slightly younger than non-applicants (means 21, 22 years). Within the applicant group, awardees were significantly younger than non-awardees: 55% of awardees were aged under 21 compared to 40% of non-awardees.

There was a consistent pattern in gender differences across the applicant and non-applicant groups with male learners, on average, younger than female learners. Among awardees, for example, 61% of men were aged under 21 compared to 50% of women. The gender gap was narrower for non-awardees. For non-applicants, 58% of men were aged under 21 compared to 47% of women. The age differences between male and female learners were significant for awardees and non-applicants.

Overall, 47% of awardees were male and 53% were female. The gender profile of awardee survey respondents was quite similar to that of all awardees in the administrative data (male: 48%, female: 52%).

Table 2.6a Ethnic breakdown for awardees, non-awardees and non applicants

Ethnicity	Applicants		Column %
	Awardees	Non-awardees	Non-applicants
Black	5	12	14
Black of Caribbean origin	2	3	4
Black of African origin	3	9	10
Black of other origin	1	*	*
Asian	18	19	18
Asian of Indian origin	7	9	11
Asian of Pakistani origin	6	6	3
Asian of Bangladeshi origin	1	2	1
Asian of Chinese origin	1	1	1
Asian of other origin	3	1	3
White	74	66	64
Mixed origin	2	2	2
Other origin	1	2	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	939	342	462

Base: All applicants and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

There was a clear ethnic difference between awardees and non-applicants. Awardees were significantly more likely to be of White ethnic origin than non-applicants. While each group had the same proportion of Asian learners, the non-applicants were significantly more likely than awardees to be Black, and in particular, Black of African origin.

There were also differences among applicants demonstrating a higher success rate in securing an ALG award for White applicants and a lower success rate for Black applicants. These differences were highly significant.

Table 2.6b Ethnicity of ALG awardees, from survey data and administrative data

Ethnicity	ALG Awardees		Column %
	Survey respondents	Administrative data	
Black	5	4	
Black of Caribbean origin	2	2	
Black of African origin	3	2	
Black of other origin	1	*	
Asian	18	14	
Asian of Indian origin	7	6	
Asian of Pakistani origin	6	6	
Asian of Bangladeshi origin	1	1	
Asian of Chinese origin	1	*	
Asian of other origin	3	2	
White	74	66	
Mixed origin	2	2	
Other origin	1	*	
Not stated	0	13	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>939</i>	<i>2722</i>	

Base: Survey respondent awardees; administrative data awardees.

A comparison of ethnic profile of ALG awardees in the survey and administrative data (Table 2.6b) shows that a considerably higher proportion of awardees in the administrative data, than the survey data, did not state their ethnicity. Among those who reported their ethnicity, the ethnic profile in the overall administrative data was not significantly different from that of the survey respondents.

Table 2.7 Living arrangements of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2

	Applicants				Non-applicants		Column %
	Awardees		Non-awardees		Wave 1	Wave 2	
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2			
Lives with partner	10	14	[11]	[14]	10	13	
Lives with parents	77	66	[65]	[56]	67	61	
Both partner and parents	2	2	[2]	[6]	2	2	
Neither partner nor parents	9	14	[16]	[21]	15	18	
Lives alone	3	5	[4]	[2]	6	5	
Unknown household composition	*	*	[2]	[0]	0	*	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	628	628	39	39	258	258	

Base: All applicants and eligible non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2.

Shading indicates a significant difference between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Tables 2.7, 2.8 and 2.9 describe family structure. Focusing first on the Wave 1 columns, the majority of all learners were living with their parents, reflecting the age distribution described above. Awardees were significantly more likely than the non-awardees and non-applicants to be living with their parents at Wave 1.

The transitions made between Waves 1 and 2 by awardees were similar to those made by non-applicants. For both groups, a smaller proportion lived with their parents and a large proportion lived with a partner or with neither partner nor parents, indicating increasing independence.

Table 2.8 Housing tenure of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2

	Applicants				Non-applicants		Column %
	Awardees		Non-awardees		Wave 1	Wave 2	
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2			
Own or buying the property	6	8	[6]	[6]	5	6	
Living with parents rent free	54	46	[55]	[49]	43	37	
Living with parents and paying rent	26	23	[22]	[15]	26	27	
Renting from council, new town, housing association or privately	12	18	[11]	[18]	21	25	
Other	3	4	[6]	[11]	5	5	
Missing	0	0	[0]	[0]	*	*	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	629	629	39	39	258	258	

Base: All applicants and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1 and 2.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

At Wave 1, the most common housing tenure arrangement was living with parents rent free. Awardees were significantly more likely to be in this situation than the non-applicants. Between a fifth and a quarter of learners lived with their parents and paid rent. Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to be living in rented accommodation.

Between Wave 1 and 2, awardees were less likely to be living rent free with their parents and more likely to be renting other accommodation, reflecting the pattern of increasing independence noted above. Non-applicants were also less likely to be living with their parents rent free at Wave 2 than Wave 1.

Table 2.9 Children under 16 of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2

	Applicants				Column % Non-applicants	
	Awardees		Non-awardees		Wave 1	Wave 2
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2		
Has child(ren) under 16	11	11	[20]	[27]	19	19
Has child who lives with respondent	10	10	[20]	[22]	17	19
Has child who lives away from respondent	1	1	[0]	[6]	2	*
Has both children living with and away from respondent	*	1	[0]	[0]	*	0
No child(ren) under 16	89	89	[78]	[73]	81	81
Missing	0	0	[2]	[0]	0	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>629</i>	<i>629</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>257</i>	<i>257</i>

Base: All applicants and eligible non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to have a child under the age of 16. There were very few differences in the proportion of respondents with children between Waves 1 and 2 for awardees and non-applicants.

Table 2.10 Level of parental education of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants

	Applicants		Column %
	Awardees	Non-awardees	Non-applicants
Parent who stayed on at school past 16	29	28	29
Parent who stayed at school and got a degree	15	15	15
Parent who stayed on at school but no degree	13	13	14
Parent stayed on at school – unknown if got degree	1	*	*
Parents who did not stay on at school	65	66	64
Unknown/missing	6	5	7
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>939</i>	<i>342</i>	<i>462</i>

Base: All applicants at Wave 1.

A little under a third of learners had a parent who stayed on at school past the age of 16 and there were only very small differences between the sample groups.

Table 2.11 Perception of general health by awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2

	Applicants				Non-applicants		Column %
	Awardees		Non-awardees		Wave 1	Wave 2	
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2			
Very good	59	65	[58]	[69]	54	55	
Fairly good	36	31	[35]	[26]	37	36	
Fair	3	4	[7]	[5]	6	6	
Bad	1	1	[0]	[0]	2	2	
Poor	*	*	[0]	[0]	2	2	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	629	629	39	39	258	258	

Base: All applicants and eligible non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2.

Table 2.12 Long-standing illness, disability and infirmity of awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants

	Applicants		Non-applicants	Column %
	Awardees	Non-awardees		
	Yes	11	13	15
Limits daily activities	4	5	8	
Does not limit daily activities	7	8	7	
No	89	87	84	
Missing	0	*	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	939	342	462	

Base: All applicants and eligible non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Most learners (approximately 90%) perceived their health to be either very good or fairly good. A higher proportion of applicants perceived their health as very good at Wave 2 (65%) than at Wave 1 (59%). At Wave 2, applicants were more likely to perceive their health status as very good than non-applicants, although there was no significant difference between the two groups at Wave 1. There were no significant changes in perceived health between Waves 1 and 2 for non-applicants.

A minority of learners reported a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity. For all groups, approximately half of those with an illness or disability found their daily activities to be limited. Awardees were significantly less likely to report such difficulties than non-applicants.

2.3 Activity status

Table 2.13 Main current and previous activity of awardees and non-applicants at Wave 1

Activity Status	Awardees		Non-applicants		Column %
	Pre- W1	W1	Pre- W1	W1	
All in full-time education	48	78	60	35	
<i>Of whom: FT education without job</i>	37	34	38	20	
<i>Of whom: FT education with a job</i>	11	44	22	15	
All in part-time education	2	3	7	8	
<i>Of whom: PT education, no job</i>	1	1	3	2	
<i>Of whom: PT education with a job</i>	1	2	4	6	
Full-time work	33	7	16	25	
Part-time work	5	6	4	10	
Unemployed	5	3	8	11	
Looking after the home or family/taking a holiday	4	3	4	8	
Voluntary work	1	*	1	*	
Sick or disabled	1	0	1	0	
Taking a year off/gap year/travelling	1	*	*	0	
Other activity	2	1	0	1	
Missing	*	*	1	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	939	939	462	462	

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

There were notable differences between these groups with regard both to prior activity and main current activity at the time of the Wave 1 interview. Awardees were less likely than non-applicants to have had a previous activity of full-time and part-time education and were more likely to have been in full-time employment.

At Wave 1, awardees were more likely than non-applicants to be in full-time education and were less likely to be in part-time education, full-time work, part-time work, unemployed or looking after the home/family/taking a holiday.

50% of awardees were in work prior to Wave 1 compared to 59% at Wave 1. 46% of non-applicants were in work prior to Wave 1 compared to 56% at Wave 1.

Table 2.14 Previous main activity by current main activity for awardees

Previous main activity	Current main activity				Column %
	Full-time work/no education	Part-time work (incl. education with job)	Education without a job	No education/no job	Total
Full-time work/no education	18	39	28	27	33
Part-time work (incl. education with job)	31	19	10	21	17
Education without job	46	32	43	50	38
No education/no job	6	10	20	2	13
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>485</i>	<i>326</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>937</i>

Base: Awardees at Wave 1.

The following tables illustrate the shift in activity for awardees and non-applicants. At Wave 1, the majority of awardees were in education, either with a part-time job or with no job. Of those in education without a job, 43% had the same activity prior to this and 28 % came from full-time work with no education.

Table 2.15 Previous main activity by current main activity for non-applicants

Previous main activity	Current main activity				Column %
	Full-time work/no education	Part-time work (incl. education with job)	Education without job	No education/no job	Total
Full-time work/no education	12	17	16	20	16
Part-time work (incl. education with job)	51	25	17	26	30
Education without job	25	50	42	46	41
No education/ no job	12	11	26	9	14
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>145</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>450</i>

Base: Non-applicants at Wave 1.

The non-applicants were more evenly spread across the different categories for current activity. Of those in education without a job, a similar proportion to awardees had the same activity prior to this, and fewer came from full-time work with no education. Half of the learners currently in full-time employment previously had a part-time job and half of those currently in part-time work were previously in

education with no job, suggesting an increase in the need for paid employment for non-applicants.

Table 2.16 Number of hours spent in supervised and unsupervised learning by awardees and non-applicants

	Awardees	Column % Non-applicants
Guided learning hours per week		
Less than 12 hours	4	10
More than 12 hours	84	77
Unknown	1	1
Not asked (not currently studying)	12	12
Unsupervised learning hours per week		
Less than 12 hours	59	65
More than 12 hours	27	20
Unknown	2	3
Not asked (not currently studying)	12	12
<i>Unweighted N</i>	939	462

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

The awardees spent longer, on average, in supervised and unsupervised learning than non-applicants. Awardees were significantly more likely to report spending more than 12 hours a week engaged in each of these forms of study than non-applicants. These differences are most likely to be related to the eligibility criteria for ALG which states that recipients must be studying for at least 12 hours a week. Another possible interpretation (consistent with current main activity) is that the ALG enables learners to spend more of their time in study and less in paid employment.

Table 2.17 SOC 2000 groups of awardees and non-applicants

SOC Groups	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Managers and senior officials	2	1
Professional occupations	1	2
Associate professional and technical occupations	4	6
Administrative and secretarial occupations	8	8
Skilled trades occupations	4	15
Personal service occupations	12	15
Sales and customer service occupations	34	29
Process, plant and machine operatives	3	2
Elementary occupations	31	21
Missing	1	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	549	258

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants with a current job at Wave 1.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Table 2.18 Number of employees at current place of work of awardees and non-applicants

Number of employees	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
1-9	26	21
10-24	25	28
25-499	39	41
500 or more	10	9
Don't know/missing	1	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	533	235

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants with employee status in a current job at Wave 1.

Both the awardees and non-applicants were clustered in the lower occupational classes. Awardees were significantly more likely to be in elementary occupations and less likely to be in skilled trades occupations. The other differences were not significant.

There were no significant differences between awardees and non-applicants in the number of employees at their place of work.

Table 2.19a Main reason for stopping education for awardees and non-applicants studying at Wave 1 and not at Wave 2

	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Course finished	78	70
Didn't enjoy course or college, didn't find it useful/interesting	7	2
Needed to do (more) paid work / couldn't afford to continue	3	7
Preferred to work/preferred work-based experience/training	3	2
Pregnant/caring for baby	2	2
Other change in family circumstances	1	2
On holiday (from college) - will return	1	2
Course was cancelled by college	1	2
Found course too difficult	1	0
Lack of time to study	1	0
Career plans changed	1	0
Illness / health reasons	*	4
Personal problems / family problems	*	0
Was asked to leave	*	0
Lack of support from college or tutors /	*	0
Still studying (including studying part-time)	0	2
Other specific answer	*	2
Vague or irrelevant answer	0	2
Unweighted N	267	52

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants who were in education at wave 1 and not in education at wave 2.

If respondents changed their main activity between Waves 1 and 2, they were asked to give the reasons for this. Subgroups of respondents who had moved into or out of employment were too small for analysis. Of those who were in education at Wave 1 and not at Wave 2 (Table 2.19a), the majority left education because their course had finished. There were no significant differences between awardees and non-applicants in the reasons given for leaving education.

Table 2.19b Main reason for awardees and non-applicants leaving full-time work to study at Wave 1

	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Left to study (full-time or part-time)	69	37
Better job	3	14
Left because pregnant	3	13
Career break	3	2
Did not enjoy job	3	1
Left job for health reasons	2	8
Made redundant	2	4
Moved	2	4
Just did	2	3
Fixed term or temp job ended	2	1
Change in family circumstances	1	2
Completed course of study	1	1
Firm closed down	1	0
Reduced number of working hours	1	0
Started paid job	1	0
Dismissed from job	*	1
More money	*	3
Could not afford to continue	0	1
Other specific answer	4	3
Vague or irrelevant	0	2
Missing	*	0
<i>Unweighted N</i>	305	70

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants who were in full-time employment prior to Wave 1 and in full or part-time education at Wave 1.

Table 2.19b gives the reasons for awardees and non-applicants leaving full-time employment prior to going into part or full-time education at Wave 1. The main reason for awardees and non-applicants leaving full-time employment was that they left to study (69%, 37%). Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to leave for this reason. Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to leave their full-time job because they were pregnant or because they sought a better job.

2.4 Income of Applicants and Non-Applicants

This section examines the financial circumstances of awardees and non-applicants.

Table 2.20a Distribution of awardees' and non-applicants' earnings from salaried or self-employment

Annual salary band	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Up to £10,000	41	18
£10,001 – £15,000	2	2
£15,001 – £25,000	*	*
No earnings	41	46
Missing	15	35
<i>Unweighted N</i>	939	462

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to report a salary and to have a salary in the lowest band. There were no significant differences in the proportion of awardees and non-applicants with no earnings.

Table 2.20b Distribution of respondents' and partners' earnings from salaried or self-employment

Annual salary band	Column %			
	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Respondents	Partners	Respondents	Partners
Up to £10,000	31	21	[16]	[27]
£10,001 – £15,000	2	31	[3]	[27]
£15,001 – £25,000	1	16	[0]	[13]
£25,001 – £75,000	0	3	[0]	[3]
No earnings	57	0	[37]	[0]
Missing	9	29	[44]	[30]
<i>Unweighted N</i>	85	85	40	40

Base: Awardees and non-applicants with a partner in paid employment and their partners.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Where awardees and non-applicants had a partner in employment, the partner earned a higher salary than the learners themselves. Over half (57%) of the awardees and 37% of non-applicants with an employed partner had no salary themselves. Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to have no earnings if they had an employed partner. The income distribution of awardees and non-applicants was similar.

Table 2.21 Receipt of state benefits by awardees and non-applicants

	Awardees	Column % Non-applicants
Receiving means-tested benefits	7	13
Receiving other benefits or tax credits	6	6
Receiving no benefits or tax credits	55	37
Missing/refusal	33	44
<i>Unweighted N</i>	939	462

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Table 2.22 Distribution of awardees and non-applicants on benefits by annual gross benefits

Annual total benefits	Awardees	Column % Non-applicants
Up to £2,500	39	38
£2,501 – £3,750	14	8
£3,751 – £5,000	12	18
£5,001 – £7,500	10	20
More than £7,500	9	8
Missing	17	8
<i>Unweighted N</i>	119	148

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants receiving state benefits at Wave 1.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

As expected, awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to receive means-tested benefits (Table 2.21), since non-receipt of benefits is part of the eligibility criteria for ALG. The receipt of such benefits may explain the high proportion of non-applicants not reporting a salary in Table 2.20a. Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to receive no benefits or tax credits.

The annual benefits received by awardees and non-applicants were mostly small in value with about 40% receiving less than £2,500. The only significant difference between awardees and non-applicants was that the latter were more likely to report an income of £5,001 or more a year from benefits.

Table 2.23 Distribution of gross income from salary and benefits for awardees and non-applicants and their partners⁹

Annual total benefits	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Up to £10,000	43	38
£10,000 – £15,000	4	4
£15,000+	4	3
No income	34	23
Missing	14	32
<i>Unweighted N</i>	939	462

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Taking the income from salary and benefits together, awardees and non-applicants had a similar income distribution. However, awardees were significantly more likely to have no income and less likely to have missing data.

Table 2.24 Distribution of awardees and non-applicants by total amount of savings

Total amount of savings	Column %	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Has savings	36	44
Up to £250	10	10
£251 – £1,000	10	13
More than £1,000	7	10
Unknown amount	9	11
No savings	63	55
Missing	*	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	939	462

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Learners were also questioned about other financial arrangements. A minority of learners reported having some savings: the proportion was significantly lower for awardees than non-applicants. The amounts were generally small as would be expected for young adults. Only 7% of awardees and 10% of non-applicants reported having savings valuing more than £1,000.

⁹ Total income for each respondent has been derived by adding together respondent's salary, partner's salary and the benefits received by the respondent and/or their partner, using whichever of these is applicable. Prior to being added together the amount received from each of these sources of income was classified into bands with the mid-point used to estimate the amount, to ensure consistency with cases where respondents reported the amount within a band. Respondents with a missing value for income include those who had a missing value for respondent salary and reported no partner salary or benefits. Respondents coded as having no income include those who reported no respondent salary and had missing values for partner salary and/or benefits.

Table 2.25 Distribution of awardees and non-applicants by total amount of investments

Total amount of investments	Awardees	Non-applicants	Column %
Has investments	3	4	
Up to £250	1	1	
£251 – £1,000	1	1	
More than £1,000	1	2	
Unknown amount	1	1	
No investments	97	92	
Missing	*	2	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>939</i>	<i>462</i>	

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Table 2.26 Distribution of awardees and non-applicants by total amount of personal loans

Total amount of personal loans	Awardees	Non-applicants	Column %
Has loans	13	10	
Up to £250	*	*	
£251 – £1,000	2	2	
More than £1,000	8	6	
Unknown amount	2	1	
No loans	87	90	
Missing	*	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>939</i>	<i>462</i>	

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Table 2.27 Distribution of awardees and non-applicants by total amounts outstanding on credit cards

Total amount of personal loans	Awardees	Non-applicants	Column %
Has credit cards	38	32	
Up to £250	19	18	
£251 – £1,000	9	7	
More than £1,000	9	7	
No credit cards	62	67	
Missing	*	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>939</i>	<i>462</i>	

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

A minority of learners reported having some loans. Fewer than 10% of learners reported having any investments.

Outstanding payments on credit cards were reported by 38% of awardees and 32% of non-applicants: a statistically significant difference. For most learners, the amount owed was up to £250, but 9% of awardees and 7% of non-applicants owed more than £1,000.

2.5 Qualifications

This section examines the level and type of qualifications studied by awardees and non-applicants including those already obtained and those being studied in 2003/4.

Table 2.28 Highest qualification level obtained prior to 2003/4

Level	Awardees	Non-applicants
1	26	29
2	56	48
3	12	0
4+	1	0
Unknown	1	2
Missing	5	21
Total	939	462

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Awardees were on average more likely to have attained a higher qualification level than non-applicants (Table 2.28). Awardees were significantly more likely to have obtained a highest qualification at level 2 (56%) than non-applicants (48%). However, non-applicants had a higher proportion missing data on highest qualification level obtained.

Table 2.29 Highest level of study during 2003/4

Level	Awardees	Non-applicants
1	1	0
2	8	25
3	69	75
4+	1	0
Unknown	7	0
Missing	15	0
Total	939	462

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants at Wave 1.

Slightly less than one-tenth (8%) of awardees were currently studying at level 2, 69% were studying at level 3, and the highest current qualification level was unknown or

missing for a sizeable proportion of awardees (22%). Among awardees whose highest level of qualification currently studied was known, 10% were studying at level 2 and 88% were studying at level 3. These figures suggest that awardees were on average studying at higher qualification levels than non-applicants¹⁰ for whom 25% were studying at level 2 and 75% at level 3.

Table 2.30 Proportion of awardees and non-applicants currently studying at Level 2 who had achieved a prior qualification of the specified type

Prior qualification type	Column % Respondents studying at Level 2 who had achieved a prior qualification of specified type	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
NVQ (all levels)	20	11
Highest NVQ at Level 1	11	10
Highest NVQ at Level 2	7	0
Highest NVQ at Level 3	1	0
Highest NVQ at other levels (incl. unknown)	2	1
EdExcel / BTEC	2	3
City and Guild	6	3
OCR / RSA	2	4
AVCE	0	1
GNVQ (all levels)	12	4
Highest GNVQ at Foundation level	8	4
Highest GNVQ at Intermediate level	3	0
Key Skills	8	6
Other vocational qualification	6	2
Any vocational qualification	40	25
A Level/A2	0	0
AS-level	3	2
GCSE	67	44
Higher education level qualification	1	0
Other academic qualification	0	0
Any academic qualification	67	44
Any other qualification	7	2
All qualifications	80	58
<i>Unweighted N</i>	102	112

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants currently studying at Level 2 at Wave 1.

¹⁰ The non-applicants sample was pre-selected such that no-one who had previously obtained at least a level 3, or currently studying at levels other than 2 or 3 were automatically excluded.

Note: Percentages do not add up to 100 because learners may have achieved more than 1 type of qualification. Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Of those studying a highest qualification at Level 2 in 2003/4, learners were more likely to have achieved an academic qualification than a vocational qualification. (Most commonly, the academic qualification was GCSE.) Awardees were significantly more likely to have achieved a prior qualification than non-applicants (80%, 58%).

Table 2.31 Proportion of respondents currently studying at Level 3 who had achieved a prior qualification of the specified type

Qualification type	Respondents studying at Level 3 who had achieved a prior qualification of specified type		Column %
	Awardees	Non-applicants	
NVQ (all levels)	18	19	
Highest NVQ at Level 1	3	3	
Highest NVQ at Level 2	14	15	
Highest NVQ at other levels (incl. unknown)	1	2	
EdExcel / BTEC	6	7	
City and Guild	7	7	
OCR / RSA	4	4	
AVCE	2	3	
GNVQ (all levels)	19	15	
Highest GNVQ at Foundation level	1	2	
Highest GNVQ at Intermediate level	17	12	
Highest GNVQ at Level 3	1	1	
Key Skills	9	13	
Other vocational qualification	10	4	
Any vocational qualification	51	48	
A Level / A2	7	6	
AS-level	17	18	
GCSE	86	78	
Higher education level qualification	0	0	
Other academic qualification	2	2	
Any academic qualification	87	80	
Any other qualification	6	5	
All qualifications	95	90	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	751	350	

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants currently studying at Level 3 at Wave 1.

Note: Percentages do not add up to 100 because learners may have achieved more than 1 type of qualification.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Of the learners studying a highest qualification of Level 3 in 2003/4, almost all had achieved a prior qualification. Awardees were more likely to have a prior academic qualification, in particular GCSEs.

Table 2.32 Awardees and non-applicants: Qualification types currently being studied by those whose highest level of current study is Level 2

Qualification type	Respondents currently studying a qualification of specified type	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
NVQ (all levels)	54	67
Highest NVQ at Level 1	1	6
Highest NVQ at Level 2	54	53
Highest NVQ at other levels (incl. unknown)	0	7
EdExcel / BTEC	16	8
City and Guild	19	11
OCR / RSA	4	4
GNVQ (all levels)	15	15
Key Skills	16	1
Other vocational qualification	5	7
Any vocational qualification¹¹	97	91
GCSE	15	8
Other academic qualification	0	5
Any academic qualification	15	17
Any other qualification	3	2
All qualifications	100	100
<i>Unweighted N</i>	74	70

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants currently studying at Level 2 at Wave 1.
Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

¹¹ Three non-applicants who were reported to be studying at Level 2 in the ILR, indicated that they were studying Access to HE which is a Level 3 qualification. They are excluded from this table.

Table 2.33 Awardees and non-applicants: Qualification types currently being studied by those whose highest level of current study is Level 3

Qualification type	Respondents currently studying a qualification of specified type		Column %
	Awardees	Non-applicants	
NVQ (all levels)	11	17	
Highest NVQ at Level 2	1	11	
Highest NVQ at Level 3	11	6	
Highest NVQ at other levels (incl unknown)	*	1	
EdExcel / BTEC	30	27	
City and Guild	3	6	
OCR / RSA	2	1	
AVCE	20	17	
GNVQ (all levels)	2	2	
Key Skills	8	7	
Other vocational qualification	3	7	
Any vocational qualification	65	64	
A Level/A2	15	14	
AS-level	10	13	
Access to HE	25	20	
GCSE	10	9	
Other academic qualification	*	12	
Any academic qualification	49	51	
Any other qualification	1	1	
All qualifications	100	100	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	643	259	

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants currently studying at Level 3 at Wave 1.

Shading indicates a significant difference between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Tables 2.32 and 2.33 explore the types of qualifications being studied by those whose highest level of study is Level 2 or Level 3. At Level 2, the majority of learners were studying vocational qualifications and at Level 3, approximately two-thirds of learners were studying vocational qualifications and half the learners were studying academic qualifications¹². At both levels, similar proportions of awardees and non-applicants were studying vocational and academic qualifications, although there were some differences for specific types of qualifications.

¹² The percentages do not add up to 100 because learners could study more than 1 qualification.

There were few differences between the qualifications studied at Level 2. At Level 3 (Table 2.33), awardees were, in particular, less likely than non-applicants to be studying NVQs at Level 2.

Table 2.34 Most common subjects currently being studied by awardees and non-applicants (by at least 2 % of respondents)

Subject	Column % % of all qualifications	
	Awardees	Non-applicants
Information Technology/ Information and Communication Technology	9	7
Mathematics	5	6
Biology	4	2
Business/Business studies	4	6
Child Care Services	3	3
Hair/Personal Care Services/Beauty Therapy	3	6
Art & Design	3	0
Psychology	3	2
Sociology	2	2
English	2	3
Communication/Media (General)	2	0
Application of number	2	0
Leisure & Tourism/Leisure & Recreation/Travel & Tourism	2	0
Chemistry	2	2
Science: environmental	0	7
Communication skills	0	2
Building/construction operations/painting/decorating/heating/plumbing	0	2
Law	0	2
Other specific answer not in code frame	10	9
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1545	723

Base: All qualifications studied by awardees and non-applicants at Wave 1.
Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Table 2.34 details the most common subjects being studied by awardees and non-applicants only including the subjects which comprised 2% or more of all the qualifications studied. Some subjects have been grouped together, for example Business and Business Studies. The most common subject studied by both awardees and non-applicants was Information (and Communication) Technology. For awardees, the next most common subjects were mathematics, biology and business. For non-applicants, the most common subjects were environmental science, mathematics, business and hair/personal care services/beauty therapy.

Table 2.35 Level of current study by highest level obtained for awardees

Previous highest level obtained	Level 2	Highest level of current study		Column %
		Level 3	Both levels	
Level 1	64	25	28	
Level 2	34	64	61	
Level 3	2	12	11	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>612</i>	<i>669</i>	

Base: Awardees currently studying at Level 2 or 3 at Wave 1.

Table 2.36 Level of current study by highest level obtained for non-applicants

Previous highest level obtained	Level 2	Highest level of current study ¹³		Column %
		Level 3	Both levels	
Level 1	100	25	38	
Level 2	0	75	63	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>303</i>	<i>362</i>	

Base: Non-applicants currently studying at Level 2 or 3 at Wave 1.

Tables 2.35 and 2.36 show the level of current study by the highest level previously obtained. Approximately two-thirds of awardees studying at Level 2 obtained a previous qualification at Level 1 compared to 100% of non-applicants¹⁴ studying at Level 2. Of those studying at Level 3, 64% of awardees and 75% of non-applicants previously obtained a Level 2 qualification.

¹³ The highest level of current study for non-applicants was determined through the ILR whereas for awardees it was derived from the information provided by respondents.

¹⁴ Note that the filtering process used to derive 'eligible non-applicants' automatically dropped from the analysis those learners who had already obtained a Level 3 qualification.

2.6 Travel

Table 2.37 Time taken to travel to college at Waves 1 and 2 for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants

Time taken to travel to college	Column %					
	Applicants				Non-applicants	
	Awardees		Non-awardees		Wave 1	Wave 2
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2
0-10 mins	26	23	15	[33]	18	26
11-20 mins	26	30	27	[16]	29	21
21-30 mins	22	20	30	[10]	19	24
31-40 mins	6	7	6	[9]	5	3
41-50 mins	8	6	5	[10]	10	7
51-60 mins	9	8	11	[10]	11	10
61-90 mins	3	4	5	[0]	6	5
91-120 mins	0	1	0	[0]	1	3
121-180 mins	0	0	1	[6]	0	1
Missing	0	0	0	[6]	1	0
<i>Unweighted N</i>	828	412	269	18	406	137

Base: Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who were currently in education.

Gray shades – significant differences between awardees and non-awardees or non-applicants

74% of awardees and 66% of non-applicants who were in education at Wave 1 spent fewer than 30 minutes travelling to college. Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to spend fewer than 10 minutes travelling to college.

Among those still studying at Wave 2, a similar proportion of awardees and non-applicants spent under 30 minutes travelling to college (73%, 71%).

Table 2.38 Mode of travel to college at Waves 1 and 2 for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants

Mode of travel	Applicants				Column %	
	Awardees		Non-awardees		Non-applicants	
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2
Bus	47	35	47	[43]	51	43
by respondent s own car	29	33	24	[28]	25	26
Walk	28	35	29	[33]	18	32
in other person s car	9	11	5	[4]	9	10
Rail or underground	5	9	7	[20]	12	17
Bicycle	1	2	3	[8]	1	1
Motorcycle or moped	1	1	*	[0]	1	1
Taxi	*	1	1	[5]	2	1
Respondent doesn't usually travel to college	*	1	1	[12]	1	1
Other specific answer	0	*	0	[0]	*	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>828</i>	<i>412</i>	<i>269</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>406</i>	<i>137</i>

Base: Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who were currently in education.

Note: percentages sum to more than 100 because respondents could use more than one mode of travel.

At wave 1, the most common mode of travel for getting to college was bus (47% awardees, 51% non-applicants). Other frequently used means for travelling to college were walking and travelling in the respondent's own car. Awardees were significantly more likely to walk than non-applicants at Wave 1 and were less likely to use rail or underground. 68% of awardees and non-applicants spent money on travelling to college.

There were no significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at Wave 2.

Table 2.39 Days per week that respondents attended college at Waves 1 and 2 for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants

Days per week that respondent attends college	Column %					
	Applicants				Non-applicants	
	Awardees		Non-awardees		Wave 1	Wave 2
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2		
0	*	0	0	[6]	0	0
1	1	7	3	[6]	5	11
2	6	5	7	[3]	7	10
3	28	22	26	[12]	20	24
4	30	34	31	[34]	30	29
5	35	32	33	[39]	37	25
6+	1	*	*	[0]	*	2
Missing	0	0	0	[0]	*	0
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>828</i>	<i>412</i>	<i>269</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>406</i>	<i>137</i>

Base: Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who were currently in education.

The majority of awardees and non-applicants who were in education at Wave 1 spent between 3 and 5 days a week at college. There were no significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Table 2.40 Weekly travel costs for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Wave 1

Amount spent on travel per week	Applicants		Non-applicants
	Awardees	Non-awardees	
£1 - £10	41	44	40
£10.1 - £20	18	19	18
£20.1 - £30	5	4	4
£30.1 - £100	2	2	3
Missing	2	1	3
Did not pay travel costs	32	30	32
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>828</i>	<i>269</i>	<i>405</i>

Base: Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who were currently in education.

The majority of awardees and non-applicants who were in education at Wave 1 spent £20 or less on travel per week (59%, 58%). 41% of awardees and 40% of non-applicants spent £10 or less each week. 32% of learners did not pay for travel. Of those who did pay travel costs, the mean expenditure was £12.02 for awardees and £12.52 for non-applicants. There were no significant differences between awardees and non-applicants in the amount spent on travel.

2.7 Childcare

Respondents who had children (10% of awardees, 15% of non-awardees and 19% of non-applicants had children¹⁵) were asked about the types of childcare they used.

¹⁵ In all cases, these proportions constituted fewer than 100 cases.

Table 2.41 Types of childcare used by awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants at Waves 1 and 2

Types of childcare	Applicants				Column %	
	Awardees		Non-awardees		Non-applicants	
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2
Nursery/Nursery school/crèche	39	26	21	[-]	35	[12]
The child's other parent	22	24	19	[-]	18	[28]
Child goes to school/college	20	30	23	[-]	26	[27]
The child's grandparent	15	34	29	[-]	22	[16]
Childminder	8	12	11	[-]	4	[12]
Other family member	3	7	11	[-]	9	[11]
Friend	3	2	2	[-]	2	[10]
No-one: I take my child with me	2	7	2	[-]	3	[2]
No-one: I study/work from home	1	0	0	[-]	1	[5]
Other	13	0	6	[-]	2	[2]
Refusal	2	0	0	[-]	0	[0]
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>44</i>

Base: awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants with children who specified the type of childcare. Note: percentages sum to more than 100 because respondents could use more than one type of childcare.

The most commonly used type of childcare by awardees and non-applicants at Wave 1 was nursery/nursery school.

2.8 Summary

- Awardees and non-applicants were mostly young adults, aged between 19 and 21. Male learners were younger than female learners in both the awardee and non-applicant groups.
- There were clear ethnic differences between the awardees and non-applicants. Awardees were more likely to be White and less likely to be Black than non-applicants. Among the applicants, awardees were more likely to be White than non-awardees.
- Most learners lived with their parents. Awardees were more likely than non-applicants to live with their parents but were also more likely to make a transition towards independence between Waves 1 and 2.
- Awardees were less likely to have children than non-applicants.
- Awardees were more likely to state their main current activity as full-time education than non-applicants and were less likely to be in paid employment.
- Prior to the current activity, awardees were more likely to be in paid employment than non-applicants.
- Awardees spent longer in supervised and unsupervised study each week than non-applicants.

- Awardees were more likely than non-applicants to report a salary and less likely to receive state benefits. Despite this, the income distributions of awardees and non-applicants were similar.
- There were few differences in the qualification types being studied by awardees and non-applicants. Of those learners studying at Level 2, most were studying vocational qualifications. Of those studying at Level 3, there was a more even split between vocational and academic qualifications.
- The most common subjects for study were Information Technology, Mathematics and Business.
- Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to walk to college or spend fewer than 10 minutes travelling to college

3 MOTIVATIONS AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNING

This chapter examines respondents' attitudes towards learning, where they received information and advice on further education from, how useful they found these sources, and why they chose to take their current courses. Responses of ALG applicants (particularly awardees) and qualification-eligible non-applicants are compared. Findings for applicants are presented by 2 subgroups: awardees and non-awardees. Also, ALG recipients' reasons for studying at Wave 1 and Wave 2 are analysed.

3.1 Attitudes towards Learning

At Wave 1 respondents were asked to answer 12 attitudinal questions relating to learning (e.g. 'Education is an investment in your future?'), and the extent of their agreement or disagreement was recorded on a 5-point scale (Table 3.1).

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

Attitude statement ¹⁶	Awardees						Non-Awardees						Non-Applicants						Row %
	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	N	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	N	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	N	
Education is an investment in your future	86	12	1	1	*	939	84	14	1	1	*	342	78	18	1	1	1	462	
Learning should be funded by Government	73	20	5	1	1	939	71	22	4	2	1	342	71	19	7	3	1	462	
I don't have confidence to learn on my own	6	12	6	26	50	939	9	12	4	25	50	342	5	15	5	23	52	462	
I would prefer to learn in a classroom	51	28	12	6	3	939	48	27	14	7	5	342	52	24	13	8	4	462	
I've got a hidden talent I would love to explore	30	28	16	14	11	939	38	23	14	15	8	342	33	27	18	15	7	462	
Learning should be lifelong	74	19	3	3	2	939	72	20	2	4	2	342	70	21	4	4	3	462	
I like the idea of learning in new ways	53	29	5	8	4	939	51	30	8	6	5	342	46	35	6	7	7	462	
Learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it	20	20	7	28	25	939	22	21	8	22	26	342	27	20	4	27	22	462	
Learning isn't for people like me	2	3	1	10	84	939	3	4	3	11	81	342	4	4	2	12	78	462	
Courses related to hobbies are just as valuable as work-related courses	58	31	5	5	1	939	58	30	6	5	2	342	54	35	4	5	1	462	
Computers are confusing	4	9	5	25	57	939	7	11	6	23	54	342	5	13	7	26	49	462	
Having fun is an important part of education	76	20	2	1	1	939	75	18	2	2	4	342	72	23	*	3	1	462	

Base population: All respondents

1 – Agree Strongly 2 – Agree Slightly 3 – Neutral 4 – Disagree Slightly 5 – Disagree Strongly

Shading indicates a significant difference between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

¹⁶ The statements summarize, but do not exactly reproduce attitude statements used in the survey.

Table 3.1 shows the distribution of the results from the set of 12 attitudinal questions about learning. Overall, awardees and non-awardees showed similar attitudes, though non-awardees (38%) were significantly more likely than awardees (30%) to strongly agree that they have “a hidden talent that they would love to explore”. Awardees were generally more likely to agree that “having fun is an important part of education” than non-awardees.

Though applicants and non-applicants exhibited broadly similar attitudes towards learning, on some of the statements awardees (and to some extent non-awardees) demonstrated somewhat more positive attitudes than non-applicants. Awardees (86%) were significantly more likely to strongly agree that education was an investment in their future than non-applicants (78%). Furthermore, over half of awardees (53%) strongly agreed that they liked “the idea of learning in new ways” compared to 46% of non-applicants.

A similar pattern emerged where the statements were phrased negatively. For example, awardees (84%) were significantly more likely to strongly disagree that learning is not for people like them than non-applicants (78%). Also, awardees (20%) were significantly less likely to strongly agree that learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it than non-applicants (27%). However, awardees (11%) were significantly more likely to strongly disagree that they had a hidden talent they would love to explore than non-applicants (7%).

The results of further analysis of applicants’ and non-applicants’ responses by selected background characteristics are presented in the Annex (Tables A3.1-A3.12). There were differences in responses by ethnicity to some of the attitude questions. Black respondents and Asian respondents were more likely than White respondents to agree with the following statements:

- “I have a hidden talent that I would love to explore”,
- “Learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it”,
- “Learning is not for people like me”,

and less likely to agree with:

- “Having fun is an important part of education”.

3.2 Sources of Information

Table 3.2 Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who received information or advice on FE from various sources

	Awardees %	Non- Awardees %	Column %_ Non- applicants %
School, college, adult education or evening institute	72	72	73
Friends or relatives	61	55	63
Connexions	26	20	22
Work colleague(s)	17	20	25
Websites (Learndirect or Worktrain)	12	12	15
Training centre	10	12	13
Telephone helpline (Learndirect or Connexions)	8	7	9
Learning and Skills Council	8	9	8
Employer	8	10	12
New Deal or JSA	7	9	11
Local information advice and guidance partnership	5	5	5
Another person or organisation	7	7	7
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>939</i>	<i>342</i>	<i>462</i>

Base population: All respondents

Shading indicates a significant difference between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

_ – percentages do not sum up to 100 due to multiple response

Table 3.2 shows the sources of information, advice or guidance on further education received by applicants and non-applicants. The most common sources for applicants were an education institution – school, college, adult education or evening institution (72%), friends or relatives (awardees 61%; non-awardees 55%) and the Connexions service (26%; 20%). Awardees were significantly more likely than non-awardees to have gone to friends or relatives for information or advice, as well as to the Connexions service.

Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to name employers (8%; 12%), work colleagues (17%; 25%), and New Deal, JSA advisors or Jobcentres (7%; 11%) as sources of advice. Non-awardees (55%) were significantly less likely than non-applicants (63%) to say they obtained information or advice from friends or relatives.

Table 3.3 Number of sources of information or advice for awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants.

Number of sources of IAG	Column %		
	Awardees %	Non-Awardees %	Non-applicants %
None	10	13	7
1	21	23	23
2	29	23	24
3	19	15	18
4	10	14	15
5	8	8	6
6 or more	4	4	7
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>939</i>	<i>342</i>	<i>462</i>

Base population: All respondents

Amongst applicants, 10% of awardees and 13% of non-awardees did not name any sources of information or advice. Non-awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants (7%) to cite no sources. The most frequent number of sources was 2 for awardees (29%), non-awardees (23%) and non-applicants (24%), although 1 source was just as frequent for both non-awardees and non-applicants. The maximum number of sources was 9 for awardees, 10 for non-awardees and 12 for non-applicants, though only 4% of awardees or non-awardees and 7% of non-applicants named more than 5 sources. Respondents who obtained information from at least 1 source did so from 3 sources on average.

The questions about sources of information, advice or guidance on further education were not asked at Wave 2.

Table 3.4 Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who cited source as useful or the most useful

	Awardees					Non-Awardees					Non-applicants					Row %
	Very useful %	Fairly useful %	Not very useful %	Not at all useful %	N	Very useful %	Fairly useful %	Not very useful %	Not at all useful %	N	Very useful %	Fairly useful %	Not very useful %	Not at all useful %	N	
School, college, adult education or evening institute	63	32	5	1	672	58	38	3	1	247	56	36	5	3	342	
Friends or relatives	50	47	3	*	561	53	43	3	1	184	42	54	3	1	292	
Connexions	47	42	7	4	242	47	42	7	4	69	41	46	8	5	105	
Website	46	42	10	2	114	[36]	[52]	[9]	[3]	41	46	41	11	3	69	
Telephone helpline	42	36	16	7	73	[45]	[39]	[12]	[4]	29	[45]	[34]	[10]	[12]	43	
Employer	34	56	10	0	68	[52]	[34]	[11]	[2]	34	53	41	2	4	54	
LSC	33	58	9	0	77	[36]	[46]	[16]	[2]	35	[20]	[59]	[17]	[5]	36	
Work colleague(s)	33	66	1	0	161	51	43	5	1	66	39	55	6	0	115	
Training centre	31	54	11	4	95	[40]	[40]	[12]	[9]	41	44	42	8	6	61	
Local IAG	[31]	[56]	[14]	[0]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	17	[24]	[59]	[8]	[9]	25	
New Deal or JSA	23	56	16	5	66	[52]	[33]	[14]	[0]	35	42	45	7	6	49	
Another person or organisation	75	23	2	0	63	[69]	[23]	[8]	[69]	24	[65]	[25]	[6]	[3]	31	

Base population: Respondents who said they used information or advice on FE from specific sources

Shading indicates a significant difference between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Respondents were then asked how useful they found each of these sources of advice and information (Table 3.4). The numbers of cases were too small for meaningful comparison of awardees and non-awardees.

Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to say they found advice obtained from friends or relatives (50%; 42%), and education institutions (63%; 56%) very useful. On the other hand, awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to find the advice they received from employers (34%; 53%), and New Deal, JSA advisors or Jobcentres (23%; 42%) very useful. A significantly higher proportion of non-awardees than non-applicants cited friends or relatives as a very useful source (53%; 42%).

Table 3.5 Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who cited source as the most useful

	Awardees %	Non- Awardees %	Column % Non- applicants %
School, college, adult education or evening institute	50	51	45
Friends or relatives	22	24	28
Connexions	9	8	6
Work colleague(s)	4	2	3
Websites, such as Learndirect or Worktrain	3	3	5
Helpline, such as Learndirect or Connexions	2	2	1
Training centre	1	2	2
Learning and Skills Council	1	*	1
Employer	1	2	5
New Deal or JSA	1	2	2
Local information advice and guidance partnership	1	2	*
Another person or organisation	5	3	3
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>638</i>	<i>218</i>	<i>318</i>

Base population: Respondents who reported more than 1 source.

Shading indicates a significant difference between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Respondents who named more than one source of information and advice on further education were asked which source they had found the most useful (Table 3.5). Education institutions and friends or relatives were the two most commonly cited sources. However, awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to cite friends or relatives (22%; 28%) or employers (1%; 5%) as the most useful source of advice on further education.

Table 3.6 Awardees and non-applicants who cited source as the most useful, by age groups

	Column %							
	Awardees				Non-applicants			
	18-19 %	20 %	21-24 %	25-31 %	18-19 %	20 %	21-24 %	25-31 %
Education institution	50	49	51	48	41	47	44	51
Friends or relatives	26	21	22	17	35	25	24	22
Connexions	10	9	7	10	8	7	4	4
Websites	3	4	2	6	4	6	4	9
Work colleague(s)	2	4	4	4	3	1	4	2
Training centre	1	1	1	1	2	3	4	0
Employer	1	2	2	0	2	4	8	6
Local IAG	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Telephone helpline	1	1	4	1	0	1	0	2
Learning and Skills Council	0	1	3	3	1	0	0	2
New Deal or JSA	0	1	1	1	2	3	3	2
Another person or organisation	5	6	2	7	3	3	4	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>174</i>	<i>198</i>	<i>184</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>128</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>50</i>

Base population: Respondents who reported more than 1 source.

Significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at the 5% level are shaded

Table 3.6 shows the sources of advice awardees and non-applicants of different age groups named as the most useful. Due to low numbers of non-awardees, they have been dropped from the analysis by age groups. Awardees aged 18-19 were the most likely to name friends or relatives as the most useful source of information and advice on further education, while those aged 25-31 were more likely to mention websites (Learndirect or Worktrain) than younger awardees. Awardees aged 21-24 were significantly less likely than non-applicants in this age group to name employers as the most useful source of information (2%; 8%). The numbers of cases were too small for meaningful analysis by other background characteristics.

3.3 Reasons for choosing Current Course

Amongst awardees, 8% were enrolled in a course related to the job they were doing at the time, which was compulsory in 5% of these cases. By contrast, 15% of non-awardees were doing courses related to their job, for 18% of whom it was compulsory. The trend for non-applicants was closer to that for non-awardees: 20% of non-applicants took a course related to the job they were doing, for 38% of whom it was compulsory.

Table 3.7a Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who were studying for non-compulsory, job-related courses or for courses not related to their job, stating reasons for taking current course, at Wave 1

Reasons for taking course	Awardees %	Non- awardees %	Cell % Non- applicants %
Develop career	95	91	92
Change to a different type of career	66	70	65
Get a new job	61	68	62
Get more satisfaction from work	54	59	57
Start up own or a family business	20	25	29
Help with work problems related to health or disability	4	7	5
<i>Unweighted N</i>	499	178	172

Base population: Respondents who were studying in 2003-2004 for non-compulsory, job-related courses or for courses not related to the job. Shading indicates a significant difference between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

At Wave 1, amongst applicants who were taking non-compulsory job-related courses or courses not related to their job, the most common reasons for pursuing the course were career development (awardees 95%, non-awardees 91%), changing to a different career (66%, 70%) and getting a new job (61%, 68%). The only significant difference between awardees and non-awardees was with respect to career development as a reason for studying. Non-applicants' pattern of responses did not differ significantly from that of awardees or non-awardees, though awardees (20%) were significantly less likely than non-applicants (29%) to say they studied to start their own or family business.

Table 3.7b Awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants who were studying for job-related courses stating reasons for studying, at Wave 1

Reasons for taking course	Awardees %	Non- awardees %	Cell % Non- applicants %
Gain new skills for current job	[78]	[89]	[88]
Get a pay rise	[30]	[31]	[43]
Keep a job you might have lost if you didn't study	[11]	[8]	[20]
<i>Unweighted N</i>	44	22	27

Base population: Respondents who were studying in 2003-2004 for non-compulsory, job-related courses.

Though this is based on very few cases, for both applicants (awardees 78%, non-awardees 89%) and non-applicants (88%), who were taking non-compulsory courses related to their current job at Wave 1, gaining new skills for the job was the most commonly mentioned reason for studying (Table 3.7b).

Table 3.8 Awardees and non-applicants stating reasons for taking current course at Wave 1, by age

Reasons for taking course	Awardees				Non-applicants				Cell %
	18-19 %	20 %	21-24 %	25-31 %	18-19 %	20 %	21-24 %	25-31 %	
Develop career	97	97	94	92	95	[100]	84	[91]	
Change to a different career	46	61	75	88	54	[57]	[71]	[83]	
Get a new job	45	53	71	77	52	[69]	[64]	[69]	
Get more satisfaction from work	45	47	62	66	43	[62]	[56]	[75]	
Start up own or a family business	13	21	23	25	28	[46]	[22]	[22]	
Help with work problems related to health or disability	5	3	5	3	5	[6]	[0]	[9]	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	108	156	153	81	64	35	41	32	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who were studying in 2003-2004 for non-compulsory, job-related courses or for courses not related to the job. Shading indicates a significant difference between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Awardees aged 25-31 were significantly more likely than awardees aged 18-19 to cite getting a new job (77% compared to 45%), changing to a different career (88% compared to 46%), and getting more satisfaction from work (66% compared to 45%) as reasons for studying (Table 3.8). A similar trend was observed amongst non-applicants, except that there were no significant differences by age in citing getting a new job as a reason for studying.

Awardees aged 21-24 (94%) were significantly more likely than non-applicants in this age group (84%) to cite career development as a reason, while younger awardees (18-20) were significantly less likely than non-applicants in this age group to name starting up own business as a reason for studying. Due to low numbers of non-awardees, they have been dropped from the analysis by background characteristics.

Table 3.9 Awardees and non-applicants stating reasons for taking current course at Wave 1, by highest level of current qualification aim

Reasons for taking course	Awardees		Non-applicants		Cell%
	Level 2	Level3	Level 2	Level3	
	%	%	%	%	
Develop career	[96]	96	[91]	92	
Change to a different career	[85]	65	[71]	64	
Get a new job	[78]	58	[77]	58	
Get more satisfaction from work	[63]	53	[74]	52	
Start up own or a family business	[42]	18	[31]	28	
Help with work problems related to health or disability	[0]	5	[6]	4	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	33	341	33	139	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who were studying in 2003-2004 for non-compulsory, job-related courses or for courses not related to the job. Shading indicates a significant difference between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Awardees studying for qualifications at Level 3 were significantly less likely than those studying for Level 2 qualifications to name career change (65% compared to 85%) and starting up own business (18% compared to 42%) as reasons for studying (Table 3.9). Amongst non-applicants, those studying for Level 2 qualifications were significantly more likely to name getting a new job and getting more satisfaction from work as reasons. Awardees studying for Level 3 qualifications (18%) were significantly less likely than non-applicants studying at this level (28%) to name starting up a business as a reason for learning.

Table 3.10 Awardees and non-applicants stating reasons for taking current course at Wave 1, by ethnic origin

Reasons for taking course	Awardees			Non-applicants			Cell %
	Asian %	Black %	White %	Asian %	Black %	White %	
Develop career	95	[91]	96	[93]	[100]	90	
Get a new job	51	[48]	63	[45]	[53]	69	
Change to a different career	48	[48]	71	[57]	[63]	68	
Get more satisfaction from work	43	[27]	58	[57]	[26]	62	
Start up own or a family business	18	[17]	21	45	[16]	26	
Help with work problems related to health or disability	9	[0]	4	[7]	[5]	4	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	68	29	386	29	19	118	

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who were studying in 2003-2004 for non-compulsory, job-related courses or for courses not related to the job. Shading indicates a significant difference between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

White awardees were significantly more likely than those of Black ethnic origin to name career change (71% compared to 48%) and getting more satisfaction from work (58% compared to 27%) as reasons for taking current course (Table 3.10). White awardees (96%) were significantly more likely than White non-applicants (90%) to cite career development as a reason for studying, while Asian awardees (18%) were significantly less likely than Asian non-applicants (45%) to mention starting up own business as a reason.

Table 3.11 Awardees and non-applicants stating reasons for taking current course at Wave 2

Reasons for taking course	Cell %	
	Awardees %	Non-applicants %
Develop career	91	87
Get more satisfaction from work	67	62
Get a new job	58	58
Change to a different type of career	54	36
Start up own or a family business	26	25
Help with work problems related to health or disability	0	0
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>54</i>

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

Respondents in paid employment who were enrolled in courses in 2004-2005 that were either not related to their current job or related but not compulsory were asked what their reasons for studying were. Similarly to Wave 1 findings, career development was the most commonly cited reason for those who re-applied for ALG and were awarded at Wave 2 (91%) and for non-applicants (87%). A higher proportion of awardees (54%) than non-applicants (36%) named career change as a reason for studying, but the difference was not significant, possibly due to low number of cases. At Wave 2, the unweighted base for non-awardees was only 11, hence, they have been excluded from the analysis.

Table 3.12 Recipients stating reasons for taking current course at Wave 1 and Wave 2

	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 %	Cell %
Develop career	96	93	
Change to a different type of career	66	57	
Get a new job	61	60	
Get more satisfaction from work	54	69	
Start up own or a family business	20	27	
Help with work problems related to health or disability	4	0	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>451</i>	<i>50</i>	

Base population: ALG recipients who were studying for non-compulsory, job-related courses or for courses not related to the job at Wave 1 and Wave 2.

Table 3.12 shows that ALG recipients at Wave 2 (69%) were more likely to undertake their course to get more satisfaction from work than recipients at Wave 1 (54%). Recipients at Wave 2 (27%) were also more likely to choose their course to start own or family business than recipients at Wave 1 (20%). On the other hand, recipients at Wave 1 were more likely to cite career change as a reason for studying (66% compared to 57%).

3.4 Summary

- Applicants and non-applicants exhibited broadly similar attitudes towards learning, though awardees (and to some extent non-awardees) were significantly more likely than non-applicants to strongly agree that education was an investment and that they liked the idea of learning in new ways.
- Non-awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to fail to name a source of information or advice on further education, though both applicants (awardees/non-awardees) and non-applicants who referred to at least one source did so from three sources on average.
- Education institutions were the most common source of information on further education respondents named.

- Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to say they found advice from friends and relatives, and from education institutions very useful. Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to find advice from employers, and New Deal, JSA or Jobcentre advisors very useful.
- Overall, education institutions and friends or relatives were the most commonly cited as the most useful sources by awardees, non-awardees and non-applicants alike.
- At Wave 1, amongst both applicants and non-applicants who were studying for courses either not related to their jobs or related but not compulsory, the most common reasons for taking the course were career development, getting a new job, and career change.
- Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to name starting own business as a reason for studying.

4 COSTS AND FUNDING OF LEARNING

4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the costs associated with learning and sources of funding. The payment of tuition, registration and exam fees is broken down by LSC area and background characteristics including current and previous activity, income and qualification level. The analysis then turns to sources of funding other than the ALG, including EMA and Learner Support Funds, before reporting the reasons why non-applicants did not apply for ALG.

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

4.2 Costs of Courses

Table 4.1 Payment of tuition fees by awardees, recipients and non-applicants by background characteristics

	Awardees		Recipients		Non-applicants	
	Row %	Unweighted N	Row %	Unweighted N	Row %	Unweighted N
LSC Area*						
Bedfordshire & Luton	[36]	49	[35]	44	[-]	17
Black Country	8	76	9	71	[15]	45
Devon & Cornwall	34	126	33	121	25	60
County Durham	2	60	2	56	[-]	3
Humberside	3	85	3	83	[10]	32
Lancashire	8	109	8	103	25	51
Leicestershire	20	79	21	77	[16]	44
London West	33	83	35	74	37	104
Shropshire	[4]	39	[4]	35	[-]	7
South Yorkshire	5	120	4	115	[5]	42
Age group						
18-19	8	217	9	199	10	140
20	15	244	15	234	26	92
21-24	21	240	20	227	32	102
25-31	20	127	20	120	19	71

Gender						
Male	18	385	17	358	21	183
Female	14	443	14	422	22	222
Ethnic group						
Asian or Asian British	15	156	17	143	27	78
Black or Black British	[24]	47	[23]	44	33	57
White	15	599	15	568	17	254
Mixed/other	[32]	26	[15]	25	[-]	16
Living arrangement						
Single, lives parents	15	627	15	591	19	259
Lives with partner	17	94	17	87	[25]	45
Other	21	107	21	102	24	101
All	16	828	16	780	21	405

Base: Awardees, recipients and non-applicants who studied for a course or qualification in 2003-04.

*2 cases from colleges outside scheme are omitted.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Awardees were significantly less likely to pay tuition fees (16%) than non-applicants (21%) (Table 4.1). This was particularly so for those in Lancashire, aged 20-24 years, female, or of Asian ethnic origin.

Awardees were more likely to pay tuition fees if they lived in the South East (Bedfordshire & Luton, London West) than the North of England (County Durham, Humberside, Lancashire, South Yorkshire) and if they were aged 20 and over.

Non-applicants were more likely to pay tuition fees if they were aged 20 and over and of ethnic origin other than White. There was no clear difference according to region.

There were no significant changes between Waves 1 and 2.

Table 4.2 Payment of tuition fees by awardees and non-applicants by current and previous activity, qualification level and income

	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Row %	Unweighted N	Row %	Unweighted N
Current main activity				
FT education without job	14	320	22	92
FT education with job	17	414	25	69
FT/PT work	[20]	48	23	126
Unemployed/other	[13]	46	17	112
Previous main activity				
FT education without job	12	286	23	162
FT education with job	17	86	19	89
FT/PT work	20	326	20	78
Unemployed/other	13	129	24	75
Current qualification aim				
Level 2	21	74	27	91
Level 3	15	643	20	314
Annual income band				
Up to £10,000	15	398	18	156
£10,001 – 15,000	[23]	35	[-]	18
£15,001 – 25,000	[19]	35	[-]	12
No income	14	291	24	100
All	16	828	21	405

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants who studied for a course or qualification in 2003-04.

*2 cases from colleges outside scheme are omitted.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Awardees whose previous activity was employment were significantly more likely to pay tuition fees than those who were in full-time education without a job. The same pattern did not apply to non-applicants.

Table 4.3 Payment of tuition fees by awardees and non-applicants by living arrangement

Who paid fees	Awardees			Non-applicants			Column %
	Single, lives with parents %	Lives with partner %	Other %	Single, lives with parents %	Lives with partner %	Other %	
Only respondent	55	[-]	[79]	[50]	[-]	[50]	
Only family/partner	26	[-]	[11]	[33]	[-]	[42]	
Both respondent and family	19	[-]	[11]	[17]	[-]	[8]	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>25</i>	

Base population: Respondents who paid course fees for study.

Table 4.3 examines the relationship between who paid fees and the living arrangements of the respondent. There were no notable differences between the payment arrangements of awardees and non-applicants who had the same living arrangements. Approximately half of the learners who were single and living with their parents paid the fees themselves.

The number of awardees and non-applicants paying fees was too low to allow a meaningful analysis of the amount of fees paid by background characteristics. At Wave 1, awardees paid, on average, £325 in tuition fees and non-applicants paid £426, a difference that was not statistically significant. At Wave 2, the mean fee paid by awardees and non-applicants were higher at £521 (N=81) and £894 (N=19), respectively (Table 4.4). This difference cannot be explained by outliers or a different base. It may be the case that learners still studying at Wave 2 are pursuing more expensive courses.

Table 4.4 Average amount of tuition fees paid by awardees and non-applicants at Wave 1 and Wave 2

	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Mean (£)	Unweighted N	Mean (£)	Unweighted N
Wave 1	325	89	426	46
Wave 2	545	77	[893]	19

Base population: Awardees and non-applicants who paid tuition fees

Table 4.5 Payment of registration or exam fees by awardees and non-applicants by background characteristics

	Awardees			Non-applicants			Row %
	Registration %	Exam %	Unweighted N	Registration %	Exam %	Unweighted N	
LSC Area							
Beds & Luton	[40]	[16]	49	[-]	[-]	17	
Black Country	13	14	76	[35]	[28]	46	
Devon & Cornwall	28	15	126	34	20	59	
County Durham	[12]	[8]	60	[-]	[-]	3	
Humberside	14	5	85	[7]	[13]	32	
Lancashire	18	11	109	[10]	[10]	51	
Leicestershire	42	20	79	[23]	[16]	43	
London West	44	22	83	47	23	103	
Shropshire	[25]	[7]	39	[-]	[-]	7	
South Yorkshire	11	4	120	[2]	[10]	42	
Age group							
18-19	16	8	217	16	14	140	
20	27	15	244	33	13	92	
21-24	26	13	240	34	26	101	
25-31	27	14	127	27	20	70	
Gender							
Male	26	12	385	23	19	183	
Female	22	12	443	31	17	220	
Ethnic group							
Asian/Asian British	24	16	156	35	29	78	
Black/Black British	[42]	[24]	47	38	19	56	
White	23	11	599	21	13	254	
Mixed/other	[9]	[5]	26	[-]	[-]	15	
Living arrangement							
Single, with parents	23	13	627	25	19	259	

Lives with partner	21	7	94	[30]	[19]	44
Other	30	13	107	30	15	100
All	21	11	828	23	16	403

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants who studied for a course or qualification in 2003-04.
Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

A slightly higher proportion of awardees and non-applicants paid registration fees than exam fees (Table 4.5). Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to pay exam fees, particularly those aged 21-24, male, of Asian ethnic origin, or living with a partner.

Awardees aged 20 and over were more likely to pay registration and exam fees than those aged 18-19. The same pattern applied to non-applicants for registration fees only.

A significantly smaller proportion of the awardees studying at Wave 2 than at Wave 1 paid registration and exam fees (13% and 6%).

Table 4.6 Payment of registration or exam fees by awardees and non-applicants by current and previous activity, qualification level and income

	Awardees			Non-applicants			Row %
	Registration %	Exam %	Unweighted N	Registration %	Exam %	Unweighted N	
Current main activity							
FT education without job	21	11	320	28	24	92	
FT education with job	26	14	414	28	28	70	
FT/PT work	[20]	[18]	48	25	12	124	
Unemployed/other	[23]	[5]	46	28	15	112	
Previous main activity							
FT education without job	22	14	286	29	18	162	
FT education with job	25	17	86	21	15	88	
FT/PT work	27	12	326	32	24	78	
Unemployed/other	18	6	129	23	15	74	
Current qualification aim							
Level 2	21	3	74	25	12	91	

Level 3	23	14	643	28	20	312
Annual income band						
Up to £10,000	27	14	398	24	16	157
£10,001 – 15,000	[19]	[7]	35	[-]	[21]	18
£15,001 – 25,000	[23]	[7]	35	[-]	[8]	11
No income	21	10	291	34	[30]	99
All	21	11	828	23	16	403

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants who studied for a course or qualification in 2003-04.
Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

Awardees whose previous activity was unemployment/other were less likely to pay registration and exam fees than those who were previously in employment. The difference was significant for registration fees and almost significant for exam fees (p=0.058).

Awardees studying at Level 2 were generally less likely to pay exam fees than those studying at Level 3. In particular, awardees whose main current activity was full-time education, or whose previous main activity was not full-time education, or who had no income were significantly to pay exam fees compared to their non-applicant counterparts.

4.3 Sources of Funding

Table 4.7 Proportion of awardees and non-applicants who have heard of, applied for and received EMA

	Awardees %	Non-applicants %	Column %
Heard of EMA	52	55	
Applied for EMA	23	20	
Received EMA	20	17	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>644</i>	<i>312</i>	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants aged 21 years and younger. Percentages do not add up to 100 because those who applied for and received EMA were a subset of those who heard of EMA.

Respondents were questioned about their application for and receipt of other sources of funding associated with their study.

A little over half of the younger respondents had heard of EMA (Table 4.7), a learning grant available to 16-18 year olds. When they were of an eligible age to apply for the grant, the EMA was at a pilot stage, operating in some parts of England only¹⁷. Table 4.7 therefore presents the data in the aggregate rather than broken down by region.

¹⁷ EMA has since been rolled out across England.

Table 4.8 Recipients and non-applicants: Application and receipt of Learner Support Funds by LSC area

LSC area	ALG awardees			Non-applicants			Row %
	Applied %	Currently receives %	Unweighted N	Applied %	Currently receives %	Unweighted N	
Bedfordshire & Luton	10	2	52	[8]	[0]	24	
Black Country	18	8	85	12	2	53	
Devon & Cornwall	17	5	149	3	0	71	
County Durham	13	9	69	[-]	[-]	3	
Humberside	23	10	93	3	3	33	
Lancashire	11	6	124	7	2	61	
Leicestershire	10	3	93	6	0	48	
London West	4	1	94	8	0	113	
Shropshire	[16]	[-]	44	[-]	[-]	10	
South Yorkshire	13	5	134	4	0	46	
All	14	5	939	7	1	462	

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants.

Awardees were significantly more likely to have applied for Learner Support Funds than non-applicants and to have received them. The application for LSF among awardees ranged from a low of 4% in London West to a high of 23% in Humberside.

Table 4.9 Application for and receipt of other grants by awardees and non-applicants

	Awardees		Non-applicants	
	Applied (%)	Received (%)	Applied (%)	Received (%)
Any source of funding	12	6	7	1
Childcare Support Funds	2	2	2	1
Travel Grant	7	4	4	-
Other grants	5	2	3	*
All	939	939	462	462

Base: Awardees and eligible non-applicants.

Shading indicates significant differences between awardees and non-applicants at 5% level.

A small proportion of respondents applied for other sources of funding. Awardees were significantly more likely than non-applicants to apply for and receive other sources of funding, although there were no observable differences in Childcare Support Funds between awardees and non-applicants.

4.4 Summary

- Awardees were significantly less likely than non-applicants to pay tuition fees.
- Awardees were more likely to pay tuition fees if they lived in the South East than other regions, were aged 20 and over rather than 18-19 and if their previous main activity was employment rather than full-time education without a job.
- Awardees were less likely than non-applicants to pay exam fees.
- Awardees were more likely to pay registration and exam fees if their previous activity was employment rather than unemployment.
- Awardees were more likely than non-applicants to have applied for and received Learner Support Funds and other grants.
- The main reason cited by non-applicants for not applying for the ALG was that they thought they would not be eligible.

5 EXPERIENCES OF ALG

This chapter starts by examining reasons why the non-applicants had not applied for ALG before focusing on applicants' experiences of applying for and receiving ALG, including application outcomes, background characteristics associated with ALG award, and the ways in which ALG was spent. Questions relating to experiences with ALG application were asked at Wave 1 only, and findings were broken down by awardees and non-awardees where the numbers of cases were sufficient.

5.1 Why non-applicants had not applied for ALG

Table 5.1 Reasons for not applying for ALG

Reason	%
Had not heard of ALG	64
Didn't think I would be eligible	18
Couldn't be bothered/too much hassle	3
Heard about it too late	2
Don't need the money	2
Found the application process too difficult	1
Couldn't get hold of required documents	1
Still planning to apply	1
Didn't know enough about it	1
Too busy to apply	1
Didn't want to pass financial details to someone else	*
Left education	*
Mention of EMA as reason for not applying	*
Heard about it very recently	*
Worried about effect on other benefits/grant	*
Lost application form	*
Was not interested	*
Other reasons	3
<i>Unweighted N</i>	459

Base: Eligible non-applicants.

Non-applicants were asked for the reasons why they did not apply for ALG. The majority (64%) of non-applicants had not heard of ALG. Another 18% thought they would not be eligible. Around 5% had problems with the application process such as: couldn't be bothered, too much hassle, too difficult, or couldn't find the documents.

5.2 Experiences with ALG Application at Wave 1

ALG application status reported by respondents at Wave 1 did not always correspond with that assigned by the grant administrator. 7% of the applicant sample said they had either not applied for ALG or not heard of it. These respondents were excluded from the questions relating to their experiences with ALG application, such as where they had obtained an ALG application pack and how useful they had found the ALG telephone helpline.

Table 5.2 Where applicants obtained application pack, by LSC area (Wave 1)

ALG application status	Row%			N
	College/ Institution %	Learndirect %	Other %	
Awardees	95	1	4	939
Non-awardees	96	1	3	250
All Cases	95	1	3	1189

Base population: All applicants who confirmed they had applied for ALG.

The vast majority of ALG applicants who confirmed they had applied for ALG said they had obtained an ALG application pack from a college or education institution. Only about 1% had obtained a pack from Learndirect and only 3% from other sources (Table 5.2). Similar proportions of awardees and non-awardees obtained their application packs from each of the main sources. There were no significant differences by any of the background characteristics on the basis of where applicants obtained application packs from.

Table 5.3 Where awardees and non-awardees obtained help or advice on ALG application (Wave 1)

Source of help or advice	Column%	
	Awardees %	Non-awardees %
No help/advice received (**)	60	71
Respondent's parents	12	9
Course tutor/teacher (**)	11	5
Someone else at respondent's college (*)	11	7
ALG telephone helpline (*)	4	1
Student services/advisors	1	0
Friends	1	*
Respondent's partner	*	0
Connexions/Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG) Advisor	1	1
Other	2	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	939	342

Base population: All applicants.

(*) – significant at 5%, (**) – significant at 1%

The majority of applicants, especially non-awardees, received no help or advice on their ALG application: 60% of awardees compared to 71% of non-awardees. Where help or advice was sought, it was most commonly received from parents or respondent's college (course tutor/teacher or someone else) (Table 5.3). Awardees were significantly more likely to obtain advice from a course tutor/teacher, someone else at respondent's college, and the ALG telephone helpline than non-awardees.

Those who had been awarded ALG at Wave 1 but had not re-applied at Wave 2, though had thought about reapplying, were asked at Wave 2 whether they had spoken to anyone to get advice about applying for ALG for the year 2004/2005. However, the numbers were too few for analysis (20 cases).

Table 5.4 How useful is ALG telephone helpline to awardees and non-awardees? (Wave 1)

ALG application status	Row%			N
	Not used %	Very/Fairly useful %	Not very/at all useful %	
-Awardees	84	15	1	939
-Non-awardees	89	7	4	250
All cases	86	13	2	1189

Base population: Applicants who confirmed they had applied for ALG.

ALG applicants who have either named the ALG telephone helpline as a source of advice on ALG application or confirmed that they had used the telephone helpline were asked to assess it. Most applicants (86%) had not used the helpline, but of those who did, the vast majority (87%) found it very or fairly useful (Table 5.4). Awardees were significantly more likely to state they had used the helpline and found it useful than non-awardees ($p < 0.001$). Applicants did not differ significantly by LSC area, age, gender, ethnicity or living arrangement in their assessment of the ALG telephone helpline.

Table 5.5 How useful is ALG telephone helpline to applicants, by current activity, level of study and income (Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Row%			N
	Not used %	Very/Fairly useful %	Not very/at all useful %	
Current main activity (*)				
- FT education without job	81	18	2	389
- FT education with job	88	10	3	517
- FT/PT work	91	9	0	162
- PT education/Unemployed/Other	84	13	3	121
Current qualification aim ϕ (*)				
- Level 2	86	9	5	120
- Level 3	85	14	1	755
Annual income band $\phi\psi$ (**)				
- Up to £10000	87	9	4	536
- £10001-15000	[88]	[10]	[3]	41
- >£15000	82	19	0	53
- No income	80	19	1	374
All cases	85	13	2	1189

Base population: All applicants who confirmed they had applied for ALG.

ϕ Total number of cases fewer than overall total due to missing data

ψ Includes partner's income for those with partner.

(*) – significant at 5%, (**) – significant at 1%

Applicants in part-time or full-time employment were significantly more likely to have forgone the ALG telephone helpline, while those in full-time education without a job were the most likely to have used it and to have found it very or fairly useful (Table 5.5).

Applicants studying for a qualification at Level 2 were significantly less likely to say they had found the ALG telephone helpline very or fairly useful than those studying at Level 3.

Applicants with annual incomes of under £10,000 were significantly more likely to report not having used the telephone helpline and less likely to have found it useful than those with no income.

Table 5.6 How useful is ALG telephone helpline to awardees and non-awardees, by current activity and income (Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Awardees				Non-awardees				Row%
	Not used %	Very/Fairly useful %	Not very/at all useful %	Unweighted N	Not used %	Very/Fairly useful %	Not very/at all useful %	Unweighted N	
Current main activity									
- FT education without job	79	20	1	320	85	11	4	69	
- FT education with job	86	12	1	414	91	4	4	103	
- FT/PT work	87	13	0	118	[98]	[2]	[0]	44	
- PT education/ Unemployed /Other	86	11	3	87	[81]	[15]	[4]	34	
Annual income band $\phi\psi$	86	12	2	405	90	4	6	131	
- Up to £10000									
- £10001-15000	84	13	3	36	[-]	[-]	[-]	5	
- >£15000	85	15	0	38	[-]	[-]	[-]	15	
- No income	79	20	*	324	83	15	3	50	
All	84	15	1	939	89	7	4	250	

Base population: All applicants who confirmed they had applied for ALG.

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

ψ Includes partner's income for those with partner.

Although the differences were not significant, the pattern of variation by current activity and income seemed to differ between awardees and non-awardees. For example, amongst awardees, those who were in full-time education without a job were the least likely to say they had not used the ALG telephone helpline, while amongst non-awardees, those who were neither in full-time education nor in employment were the least likely to say so (Table 5.5).

5.3 Award of ALG at Wave 1

Applicants who did not know the result of their application for ALG at Wave 1 but confirmed the award for academic year 2003/2004 at the interview at Wave 2 were treated as awardees at Wave 1. Those who stated that their application had been rejected at Wave 1 or, if result was awaited at Wave 1 and had not subsequently confirmed award, were defined as non-awardees.

Table 5.7 Results of ALG application by LSC area (Wave 1)

LSC Area	Row%		Unweighted N
	Awardees %	Non-awardees %	
- Bedfordshire and Luton	64	36	70
- Black Country	64	36	117
- Devon and Cornwall	66	34	199
- Durham	68	32	86
- Humberside	70	30	117
- Lancashire	59	41	172
- Leicestershire	64	37	126
- London West	54	46	146
- Shropshire	67	33	58
- South Yorkshire	58	42	188
All	63	37	1279

Base: All applicants (Note: 2 cases from college outside scheme have been excluded).

The proportion of applicants awarded ALG at Wave 1 varied from 54% in London West to 70% in Humberside, though the differences by LSC area were not statistically significant (Table 5.7).

Table 5.8 Results of ALG application by age, gender, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Row%		Unweighted N
	Awardees %	Non-awardees %	
Age group (**)			
- 18-19	72	28	306
- 20	69	32	365
- 21-24	57	42	400
- 25-31	53	48	210
Gender			
- Male	64	36	601
- Female	62	38	680
Ethnic group (**)			
- Asian or Asian British	61	39	241
- Black or Black British	43	57	96
- White	65	35	904
- Mixed /other	[59]	[41]	40
Living arrangement (**)			
- Single, lives with parents	68	32	927
- lives with partner	50	51	168
- other	51	49	186
All	63	37	1281

Base: All applicants.

(*)- significant at 5% level, (**) - significant at 1% level.

There were no significant differences by gender in rates of award, but the differences by the other background characteristics in the bivariate analyses were highly significant ($p < 0.001$).

- Younger applicants were more likely to be awarded ALG: 72% of those aged 18-20 years compared to only 53% of applicants aged 25-31.
- Applicants of Black ethnic origin had the lowest award rate: 43% of Black applicants compared to 65% of White applicants were awarded ALG.
- Single applicants living with parents had the highest rate of award: 68% of them were awarded ALG compared to only one-half of those living with partners.

Table 5.9 Results of ALG application by current activity, level of study and income (Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Row%		Unweighted N
	Awardees %	Non-awardees %	
Current main activity (**)			
- FT education without job	68	32	415
- FT education with job	65	35	540
- FT/PT work	55	45	185
- PT education/Unemployed/Other	50	50	141
Current qualification aim ϕ (**)			
- Level 2	43	57	127
- Level 3	73	27	795
- Level 1/Level 4	26	75	36
Annual income band $\phi\psi$ (**)			
- Up to £10000	58	42	573
- £10001-15000	[74]	[26]	43
- >15000	59	41	56
- No income	73	28	402
All cases	63	37	1281

Base: All applicants.

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

ψ Includes partner's income for those with partner.

(*)- significant at 5% level, (**) - significant at 1% level

There were also significant differences in award of ALG by current main activity, qualification level and income. Applicants in full-time education were more likely to be awarded ALG, and so were those studying for qualifications at Level 3 (Table 5.9). Also, applicants with no income were more likely to be awarded ALG than those on incomes below £10,000.

The fact that applicants in part-time education and those studying for Level 1 or Level 4 qualifications were relatively less likely to be awarded ALG (Table 5.8) reflects the ALG eligibility criteria, such as studying full-time rather than part-time, and studying for a first full Level 2 or Level 3 qualification.

Although ALG is means-tested, applicants on joint annual incomes from salary and benefits between £10,000 and £15,000 appeared to be more likely to be awarded ALG than those on incomes of under £10,000. The reasons for this are unclear but the evidence is not conclusive due to low numbers of cases in the higher income categories.

Some of the observed associations between each of the background characteristics and ALG application outcome may have resulted from the confounding factors not having been controlled for. For example, the apparent lower award rate of older applicants may be due to these applicants earning higher incomes. To examine what factors are independently associated with award of ALG, controlling for other

important characteristics of applicants, logistic regression analysis has been used. The results are presented in Table 5.10.

Table 5.10 Logistic regression results of factors associated with award or non-award of ALG (Wave 1)

Characteristic	Odds ratio	Significance
LSC Area (Bedfordshire)		
- Black County	1.37	ns
- Devon and Cornwall	0.98	ns
- Durham	0.60	ns
- Humberside	1.10	ns
- Lancashire	0.60	ns
- Leicestershire	0.83	ns
- London West	0.66	ns
- Shropshire	1.75	ns
- South Yorkshire	0.62	ns
Age group (18-19)		
- 20	0.76	ns
- 21-24	0.61	*
- 25-31	0.77	ns
Gender (Male)		
- Female	1.10	ns
Ethnic group (Black or Black British)		
- Asian or Asian British	1.85	ns
- White	2.62	*
- Mixed /other	1.65	ns
Living arrangement (Single, lives with parents)		
- lives with partner	0.48	*
- other	0.57	*
Current main activity (FT education without job)		
- FT educ with job	1.59	ns
- PT educ, FT/PT work, Unemployed /Other	0.74	ns
Current Qualification aim (Level 3)		
- Level 2	0.24	**
- Level 1 or Level 4	0.12	**
Annual income band ψ (up to £10000)		
- £10001-15000	4.07	*
- > £15000	2.09	ns
- No income	2.84	*

Note: Categories in brackets () are used as reference.

ψ Includes partner's income for those with partner

ns – not significant, * - significant at 5% level, ** - significant at 1% level.

Table 5.10 largely confirms the patterns observed in the descriptive analysis. Current qualification aim is the most important factor associated with award of ALG, when other factors are taken into account.

- Those studying at Level 3 are the most likely to be awarded ALG, and are 4 times more likely to be awarded ALG than those studying at Level 2 .
- Applicants with a moderate annual income (£10,001-£15,000) have the highest chances of being awarded ALG .
- Single applicants living with parents are almost twice as likely to be awarded ALG as those living with partner .
- White applicants are about 2.5 times more likely to be awarded than applicants of Black or Black British origin.¹⁸ There are no statistically significant differences in the odds of award between other ethnic groups.
- Applicants aged 18-19 have higher chances of a successful ALG application outcome, but unlike in the descriptive analysis that showed applicants aged over 25 to be the least likely to be awarded, it is those in 21-24 age group who have the lowest chance of being awarded when other personal characteristics are taken into account.
- Applicants in full-time education with a job have the highest chance of being awarded ALG and are 1.6 times as likely to be awarded as those in full-time education without a job, when other personal characteristics are accounted for.
- Women are about as likely as men to be awarded ALG, controlling for other personal characteristics.

Table 5.11 Reasons for rejection of ALG applications (Wave 1)

Reason	%
Not studying for first Level 2 or Level 3	22
Other reasons why qualification not eligible	20
Problem with information provided	9
Income too high	6
Not studying full time	5
Currently in receipt of job seekers allowance, income support or incapacity benefit	5
Problem with residency (duration or area)	5
Other reasons	25
Missing	4
All Cases	197

Base population: Applicants who reported that their applications were rejected at Wave 1

Amongst applicants who reported that they were rejected for ALG, the most commonly cited reason related to problems with qualification eligibility requirements, such as not studying for the first Level 2 or Level 3 qualification (Table 5.11).

¹⁸ DfES were concerned about these findings and asked Manchester City Council to investigate. MCC re-examined a large sample of rejected applications from Black Students and found that the correct decision has been made in all cases.

Table 5.12 Reasons for rejection of ALG application by selected characteristics

Selected characteristic	Row%			Unweighted N
	Not first Level %	Other qualification ineligible %	Other reasons %	
Ethnic group (**)				
- Asian or Asian British	[12]	[16]	[72]	26
- Black or Black British	[36]	[3]	[62]	26
- White	20	24	56	137
- Mixed /other	[-]	[-]	[-]	8
Current main activity ϕ (**)				
- FT education without job	23	6	71	54
- FT education with job	25	30	46	85
- FT/PT work	[18]	[8]	[74]	32
- PT education, Unemployed/Other	[15]	[26]	[59]	26
Current Qualification aim ϕ				
- Level 2	[17]	[28]	[55]	38
- Level 3	23	21	55	89
Annual income band $\psi\phi$				
- up to £10000	19	25	56	109
- £10001-15000	[-]	[-]	[-]	4
- >£15000	[-]	[-]	[-]	13
- no income	[29]	[10]	[61]	35
All	22	20	58	197

Base population: Applicants who confirmed that they had applied for ALG at Wave 1.

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

ψ Includes partner's income for those with partner.

(*) - significant at 5% level, (**) - significant at 1% level.

The factors associated with rejection of ALG are difficult to analyse because of the small number of cases in most sub-categories (Table 5.12). However, there is some indication that:

- Applicants of Black or Black British origin are more likely than applicants of other ethnic origins to be rejected because of not studying for their first Level 2 or Level 3 qualification.
- Applicants in full-time education with a job are more likely to be rejected than those in full-time education without a job because of other reasons relating to qualification ineligibility.
- Applicants with no incomes were more likely to be rejected than those on low incomes (i.e. £10,000 or less) because their current level of study would not lead to their first Level 2 or Level 3 qualification, while those on low incomes were more likely to be rejected for other qualifications ineligibility related reasons.

5.4 Receipt of ALG

5.4.1 Amount of ALG received weekly

The vast majority of those who had received at least 1 ALG payment related to the 2003/2004 award reported payments of £30 per week (92%), which is the maximum amount of award. Less than 1% of recipients reported receiving payments of more than £30 per week and 7% said they received less than £30 weekly.

Table 5.13 Amount of ALG received by LSC area (Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Weekly Amount		Unweighted N
	< £30 %	£30 or more %	
LSC Areaϕ			
- Bedfordshire	[6]	[94]	44
- Black County	5	95	69
- Devon and Cornwall	9	91	133
- Durham	4	96	60
- Humberside	9	91	87
- Lancashire	4	96	111
- Leicestershire	7	93	86
- London West	7	94	80
- Shropshire	[13]	[88]	34
- South Yorkshire	7	93	122
All	7	93	826

Base population: Recipients who provided information on amount of award

Table 5.14 Amount of ALG received by age, gender, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Row % Weekly Amount		Unweighted N
	< £30 %	£30 or more %	
Age group (**)			
- 18-19	1	100	205
- 20	4	96	255
- 21-24	9	92	243
- 25-31	23	77	124
Gender			
- Male	7	94	381
- Female	8	92	446
Ethnic group			
- Asian or Asian British	2	98	150
- Black or Black British	[3]	[97]	43
- White	9	91	608
- Mixed /other	[0]	[100]	26
Living arrangement (**)			
- Single, lives with parents	5	95	629
- lives with partner	18	83	92
- other	12	88	106
All	7	93	827

Base population: Recipients who provided information on amount of award.

* - significant at 5% level, ** - significant at 1% level.

Older recipients (especially those aged 25 years and over), and those living with partners rather than with parents were significantly more likely to report receiving less than £30 per week.

Table 5.15 Amount of ALG received by current activity, level of study and income (Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Row% Weekly Amount		Unweighted N
	< £30 %	At least £30 %	
Current main activity ϕ			
- FT education without job	6	94	296
- FT education with job	8	92	380
- FT/PT work	8	92	86
- PT education/Unemployed/Other	9	91	65
Current Qualification aim ϕ	11	89	64
- Level 2	7	93	593
- Level 3			
Annual income band $\psi\phi$			
- up to £10000	8	92	366
- £10001-15000	[8]	[92]	30
- >£15001	[26]	[74]	35
- no income	4	96	291
All	7	93	827

Base population: Recipients who provided information on amount of award.

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

ψ Includes partner's income for those with partner.

As expected, recipients with no incomes are more likely to say they received at least £30 per week, while those with higher incomes were more likely to report receiving less than £30 weekly (Table 5.15).

Table 5.16 Reasons for not receiving ALG (Wave 1)

Reason	%
Payments have been withheld or stopped	78
- end of course/supervised lessons/FT course/grant	63
- decided not to stay in education	10
- problems with attendance	7
- changed course	3
- did not keep to learning agreement	2
- problems with information on application form	0
- other	13
- vague/ irrelevant/ missing	2
Decided not to take up grant	9
Payment are due, but have been delayed	8
Payments are not due yet	3
Missing	3
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>286</i>

Base population: Successful applicants not currently receiving ALG at Wave 1

The main reason why awardees were not receiving ALG at the time of the Wave 1 survey was because payments had been withheld or stopped (Table 5.16). This was most commonly because the respondent had completed his/her course.

5.4.2 Spending ALG

Awardees who received at least 1 payment from the 2003/2004 ALG award were asked at Wave 2 how they spent the grant.

Table 5.17 How ALG was spent, by LSC area

LSC areas	Books %	Travel %	Row% Leisure %	Rent %	Bills %	Unweighted N
- Bedfordshire and Luton	[81]	[73]	[39]	[8]	[31]	33
- Black Country	[90]	[70]	[37]	[5]	[38]	48
- Devon and Cornwall	72	77	44	9	28	94
- Durham	[81]	[78]	[33]	[24]	[37]	40
- Humberside	81	68	40	13	34	61
- Lancashire	78	67	31	19	29	75
- Leicestershire	79	67	50	10	31	55
- London West	[87]	[81]	[40]	[5]	[41]	49
- Shropshire	[71]	[77]	[18]	[12]	[42]	23
- South Yorkshire	[84]	84	39	6	25	80
All	80	74	37	13	33	558

Base population: Recipients of ALG award in 2003/2004 who reported their ALG spending at Wave2. Significant differences by region at the level of 5% are shaded.

The majority of recipients spent their ALG payments on books (80%) and travel (74%). About one-third used ALG to pay for leisure or social activities (37%) and household bills (33%), and about 1 in 10 (13%) spent ALG on rent or mortgage. Out of 62 recipients with children under the age of 16 who answered the questions about ALG spending, less than half said they used ALG to pay for childcare. There was significant variation by LSC area in proportions of recipients spending ALG on rent/mortgage, ranging from 5% in London West to 24% in Durham (Table 5.17).

Table 5.18 How ALG was spent, by age, gender, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Books %	Travel %	Leisure %	Rent %	Bills %	Row% Unweighted N
Age group						
- 18-19	82	71	48	11	29	145
- 20	75	80	46	8	32	164
- 21-24	84	73	31	16	32	161
- 25-31	77	71	14	19	43	89
Gender						
- Male	76	73	43	16	34	270
- Female	84	75	31	10	32	289
Ethnic group						
- Asian or Asian British	86	73	37	4	30	108
- Black or Black British	[75]	[90]	[35]	[0]	[26]	25
- White	79	73	38	16	34	409
- Mixed /other	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	17
Living arrangement						
- Single, lives with parents	80	76	41	10	29	430
- lives with partner	86	72	23	19	44	62
- other	74	61	28	28	46	67
All	80	74	37	13	33	559

Base population: Recipients of ALG award in 2003/2004 who reported their ALG spending at Wave2. Significant differences by background characteristics at the level of 5% are shaded.

Younger recipients (i.e. 18-19) were significantly more likely to report spending their ALG payments on social and leisure activities than older recipients ($p < 0.001$).

Female recipients were significantly more likely to report spending ALG on books than male recipients, while male recipients were more likely to say they spent their grant on leisure and social activities, and rent/mortgage.

Single recipients living with parents were the most likely to say they spent ALG on social and leisure activities and, as expected, the least likely to report spending ALG on rent/mortgage or household bills.

Table 5.19 How ALG was spent, by current activity, level of study and income (Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Row%					Unweighted N
	Books %	Travel %	Leisure %	Rent %	Bills %	
Current main activity						
- FT education without job	85	75	38	12	30	206
- FT education with job	76	75	37	12	33	263
- FT/PT work	[77]	[68]	[34]	[9]	[32]	49
- PT education/ Unemployed/Other	[81]	[71]	[37]	[23]	[49]	41
Current qualification aim ϕ						
- Level 2	[76]	[57]	[27]	[11]	[26]	45
- Level 3	81	76	38	13	34	411
Annual income band $\psi\phi$						
- up to £10000	78	75	39	10	33	254
- £10001-15000	[79]	[58]	[26]	[26]	[53]	22
- >£15000	[77]	[77]	[17]	[18]	[41]	26
- No income	84	76	39	14	30	198
All	80	74	37	13	33	559

Base: Recipients of ALG award in 2003/2004 who reported their ALG spending at Wave2.

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

ψ Includes partner's income for those with partner.

Significant differences by background characteristics at 5% level are shaded.

There were hardly any differences by current main activity or current qualification aims in spending ALG, apart from recipients studying at Level 3 being significantly more likely to say they spent ALG on course-related travel than those studying at Level 2.

5.5 Award and receipt of ALG at Wave 2

Table 5.20 Results of ALG application at Wave 2, by age, gender and current activity

Background characteristic	Row%		Unweighted N
	Awarded %	Rejected / result awaited %	
Age group (Wave 1)			
- 18-19	[81]	[19]	34
- 20	94	6	55
- 21-24	[77]	[23]	42
- 25-31	[74]	[26]	25
Gender			
- Male	86	14	73
- Female	83	17	83
Current main activity (Wave 2) (*)			
- FT education without job	[76]	[24]	33
- FT education with job	[72]	[28]	39
- FT/PT work	91	9	55
- PT education/Unemployed/Other	[93]	[7]	29
All	84	16	156

Base population. Applicants at Wave 2.

(*) – significant at 5%, (**) – significant at 1%.

Of all applicants at Wave 1, 24% re-applied for ALG at Wave 2, most of whom (84%) were awarded the grant, 13% were rejected and 3% were still awaiting the result. There were no significant differences in the award of ALG at Wave 2 by age, gender or current activity (Table 5.20). Because of the relatively small number of applicants at Wave 2, the award rates were not analysed by other background characteristics.

Of applicants who were awarded at Wave 2, the vast majority (94%) said they had received at least 1 ALG payment. In most cases (94%) the amount of grant had been £30 a week and 6% said they received £20 weekly.

Table 5.21 How ALG was spent by age, gender and current activity (Wave 2)

Background characteristic	Books %	Travel %	Leisure %	Rent %	Bills %	Row%
						N
Age group (Wave 1)						
- 18-19	[79]	[79]	[41]	[14]	[36]	26
- 20	[79]	[83]	[46]	[4]	[44]	49
- 21-24	[82]	[73]	[36]	[19]	[30]	32
- 25-31	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	16
Gender						
- Male	73	73	50	14	45	59
- Female	82	80	29	7	32	64
Current main activity (Wave 2)						
- FT education without job	[80]	[76]	[48]	[16]	[54]	24
- FT education with job	[88]	[72]	[56]	[12]	[40]	25
- FT/PT work	[67]	[80]	[32]	[10]	[22]	48
- PT education/Unemployed/Other	[89]	[77]	[25]	[8]	[48]	26
All	79	77	38	11	37	123

Base population. Recipients of 2004/2005 ALG award.

Significant differences by background characteristics at the level of 5% are shaded.

Those who were awarded ALG for the 2004/2005 academic year and had received at least 1 payment were asked how they spent the grant. Though the pattern of spending was largely similar to that at Wave 1, slightly higher proportions of recipients at Wave 2 reported spending on course-related travel and on household bills, while a lower proportion said they spent ALG on rent/mortgage at Wave 2 than at Wave 1.

The personal characteristics associated with spending ALG to pay for various course-related and living expenses at Wave 2 are difficult to analyse due to low numbers in some of the sub-categories. However, recipients in full-time education without a job were the most likely to report using ALG to pay for household bills.

5.6 Summary

- Most ALG applicants at Wave 1 said they had obtained an ALG application pack from a college or an education institution.
- A higher proportion of non-awardees than awardees received no help or advice on their ALG application at Wave 1. The most common sources of advice for both awardees and non-awardees were parents, someone at respondent's college, and course tutor or teacher.
- The vast majority of applicants did not use the ALG telephone helpline but of those who did, most found it very or fairly useful.
- According to the logistic regression analysis of ALG award at Wave 1, applicants who were more likely to be awarded ALG were:
 - applicants studying for qualifications at Level 3,
 - applicants with moderate joint annual incomes (£10,000-£15,000),
 - single applicants living with parents,
 - younger applicants (e.g. aged 18-20 years),

- applicants of White ethnic origin,
- those in full-time education with a job.
- Applicants less likely to be awarded ALG were:
 - applicants studying for a Level 1 or Level 4 qualification,
 - applicants with annual incomes of £15,000 and over,
 - those living with partner,
 - applicants aged 21-24,
 - applicants of Black ethnic origin.
- Not studying for their first Level 2 or Level 3 qualification was the most commonly cited reason for having been rejected ALG at Wave 1.
- Most recipients of ALG at Wave 1 were receiving £30 a week or more.
- The most commonly reported reason for not receiving ALG at Wave 1 was because payments had been withheld or stopped, which was usually related to the end of course.
- The majority of ALG recipients spent their grant on course-related equipment (books) and travel, at both Wave 1 and Wave 2.
- Over four-fifths of ALG applicants at Wave 2 were awarded the grant, and most of them received at least 1 ALG payment.

6 WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES ALG MAKE?

This chapter describes recipients' perceptions of the importance of ALG on their decisions to study full- or part-time, to take up study and to continue the course. Recipients were asked about the importance of ALG to their decision to study full-time in Wave 1 only. Those who received ALG in 2003/2004 and were interviewed in Wave 2 were retrospectively asked about the perceived likelihood of dropping out of the course without ALG.

6.1 Importance of ALG on whether to Study Full-Time

Table 6.1 Importance of ALG on decision of ALG recipients to study full-time instead of part-time (Wave 1)

Decided to study full-time before/after heard about ALG	Row %			N
	Not important %	Quite important %	Very important %	
- Before	66	20	14	794
- After	36	45	19	50
All	64	21	14	844

Base population: ALG recipients at Wave 1

At Wave 1, 94% of ALG recipients stated they had decided to study for a full-time course *before* they heard about ALG. However, a significantly greater proportion of those who said they decided to study for a full-time course *after* they had heard of ALG (64%) than those who said they had decided to study full-time *before* they heard about ALG (34%) stated that receiving ALG was quite or very important for their decision (Table 6.1).

Table 6.2 Importance of ALG on decision of recipients to study full-time instead of part-time, by LSC area (Wave 1)

LSC areas	Row %			N
	Not important %	Quite important %	Very important %	
- Bedfordshire and Luton	[49]	[29]	[23]	45
- Black Country	57	28	16	71
- Devon and Cornwall	67	16	18	135
- Durham	64	24	12	61
- Humberside	61	25	15	89
- Lancashire	70	17	13	113
- Leicestershire	62	27	10	88
- London West	70	16	14	81
- Shropshire	[62]	[23]	[15]	37
- South Yorkshire	66	20	14	123
All	64	21	15	843

Base population: ALG recipients at Wave 1

Recipients in the Black Country (44%) were the most likely to say that ALG was quite or very important in their decision to study full-time, while those in Lancashire and London West (30%) were the least likely to (Table 6.2). However, these differences were not significant.

Table 6.3 Importance of ALG on decision of ALG recipients to study full-time instead of part-time, by background characteristics (Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Row %			N
	Not important %	Quite important %	Very important %	
Age group (*)				
18-19	67	23	11	209
20	56	28	16	258
21-24	67	18	15	249
25-31	72	12	16	128
Gender				
Male	65	22	14	393
Female	64	21	15	451
Ethnic group				
Asian or Asian British	55	29	16	154
Black or Black British	[59]	[18]	[24]	43
White	67	20	13	621
Mixed/other	[59]	[18]	[23]	26
Living arrangement				
Single, lives with parents	63	23	14	643
Lives with partner	74	12	13	93
Other	65	18	17	108
All	64	21	15	844

Base population: ALG recipients at Wave 1

(*) Significant difference at 5% level

None of the differences by background characteristics was statistically significant.

Table 6.4 Importance of ALG on decision of ALG recipients to study full-time instead of part-time, by background characteristics (Cohort 1 Wave 1)

Background characteristic	Row %			N
	Not important %	Quite important %	Very important %	
Current main activity				
- FT education without job	58	24	18	302
- FT education with job	67	21	11	386
- FT/PT work	68	16	16	88
- PT education, Unemployed/Other	68	18	14	68
Current Qualification aim ϕ				
- Level 2	55	33	13	66
- Level 3	64	21	15	602
Annual income band $\psi\phi$ (*)				
- up to £10000	66	22	12	400
- £10001-15000	[70]	[7]	[22]	36
- >£15000	[81]	[7]	[13]	38
- no income	58	25	17	317
All	64	21	15	844

Base population: ALG recipients at Wave 1.

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

ψ Includes partner's income for those with partner.

(*) – significant at 5% level.

Recipients with no income were significantly more likely to say that ALG was quite or very important in their decision to study-full time than recipients with incomes from salary/benefits.

6.2 Influence of ALG on whether to Study for the Course

Table 6.5 Whether ALG recipients would have still gone ahead with course if ALG had not been awarded, by gender (Wave 1)

Gender	Row %				N
	Definitely would have %	Probably would have %	Probably would not have %	Definitely would not have %	
Male	60	28	8	4	153
Female	65	25	6	4	180
All	63	26	7	4	303

Base population: ALG recipients at Wave 1 who stated that the grant was quite/very important in decision to study for a full-time course.

About 1 in 10 (11%) of ALG recipients at Wave 1 who stated that ALG was quite or very important in their decision to study for a full-time course said that they definitely/probably would not have gone ahead with the course if ALG had not been awarded (89%). There were no significant differences in perceived ALG influence on the decision to go ahead with the course by any of the studied background characteristics.

Table 6.6 Whether ALG recipients in 2003/4 would have still gone ahead with course if ALG had not been awarded, by waves

Wave 1	Row % Wave 2		N
	Definitely/ probably would have %	Definitely/ probably would not have %	
- Definitely/probably would have	82	18	187
- Definitely/probably would not have	[58]	[42]	22
All	80	20	209

Base population: 2003/4 ALG recipients (at Wave 1) who stated that the grant was quite/very important in decision to study for a full-time course.

Those who received at least one ALG payment at Wave 1 were asked at Wave 2 whether they would have gone ahead with the course in 2003/2004 had they not received ALG. 20% of those who had received ALG at Wave 1 subsequently said at Wave 2 that they definitely/probably would not have gone ahead with the course. Of those who said at Wave 1 they definitely/probably would still have gone ahead with the course, most (82%) responded similarly at Wave 2. However, of those who said at Wave 1 they definitely/probably would not have gone ahead with the course, 42% responded the same way retrospectively at Wave 2. This finding has to be interpreted with caution, due to low numbers of cases in some of the subcategories.

Table 6.7 Whether ALG recipients in 2004/5 would have still gone ahead with course if ALG had not been awarded, by gender (Wave 2)

Gender	Row %				N
	Definitely would have %	Probably would have %	Probably would not have %	Definitely would not have %	
- Male	77	10	8	4	50
- Female	67	20	9	4	52
All	72	16	9	4	102

Base population: ALG recipients in 2004/5 (Wave 2)

Of those who received ALG during the 2004/2005 academic year, 9% stated they probably would not and 4% said they definitely would not have gone ahead with the course without ALG (Table 6.7). This is rather similar to recipients at Wave 1, though routing to the question differed between the 2 waves. Valid cases were too few for the analysis by most background characteristics.

6.3 Influence of ALG on whether to Continue the Course

Table 6.8 Whether ALG recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by LSC area

LSC area	Row %				N
	Definitely would have %	Probably would have %	Probably would not have %	Definitely would not have %	
- Bedfordshire and Luton	[3]	[24]	[31]	[41]	32
- Black Country	7	13	26	54	50
- Devon and Cornwall	5	12	35	49	99
- Durham	[3]	[15]	[28]	[54]	41
- Humberside	7	12	18	64	62
- Lancashire	2	11	27	61	77
- Leicestershire	9	19	25	47	54
- London West	7	9	22	63	52
- Shropshire	[5]	[16]	[21]	[58]	23
- South Yorkshire	6	16	28	50	86
All	5	14	27	54	576

Base population: Recipients of ALG in 2003/2004 responding at Wave 2

About one-fifth (19%) of those who received at least 1 ALG payment at Wave 1 stated at Wave 2 that they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG. The majority, however, said they would definitely not have dropped out if they had not been awarded ALG.

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

Background characteristic	Row %				N
	Definitely would have %	Probably would have %	Probably would not have %	Definitely would not have %	
Age group (Wave 1)					
- 18-19	5	14	28	54	151
- 20	6	16	27	51	168
- 21-24	7	14	23	56	167
- 25-31	2	8	34	55	91
Gender					
- Male	5	13	31	52	279
- Female	5	15	24	56	298
Ethnic group					
- Asian or Asian	4	11	26	59	111
- British					
- Black or Black	[4]	[16]	[20]	[60]	28
- British					
- White	5	15	28	53	421
- Mixed /other	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	17
Living arrangement					
- Single, lives with parents	6	15	25	55	444
- lives with partner	2	9	42	47	63
- other	7	12	27	54	70
All	5	14	27	54	577

Base population: Recipients of ALG in 2003/2004 responding at Wave 2.

Recipients who were 25-31 years old at Wave 1 were the least likely to say retrospectively that they would definitely/probably have dropped out of the course without ALG. Also, single recipients living with parents were most likely to state they would definitely/probably have dropped out of their course without ALG. None of the differences by background characteristics were significant, however.

Table 6.10 Whether ALG recipients would have dropped out of the course if ALG had not been awarded, by current main activity, level of current study and income

Background characteristic	Row%				N
	Definitely would have %	Probably would have %	Probably would not have %	Definitely would not have %	
Current main activity					
- FT education without job	7	16	29	47	215
- FT education with job	3	12	26	59	267
- FT/PT work	7	15	20	58	52
- PT education, Unemployed/Other	[11]	[7]	[33]	[49]	43
Current qualification aimϕ					
- Level 2	[9]	[11]	[31]	[49]	48
- Level 3	5	15	26	55	417
Annual income band $\psi\phi$					
- up to £10000	3	13	24	60	261
- £10001-15000	[9]	[5]	[27]	[59]	22
- >£15000	[4]	[11]	[52]	[33]	27
- no income	8	16	29	47	206
All	5	14	27	54	577

Base population: Recipients of ALG in 2003/2004 responding at Wave 2.

Recipients in full-time education without a job and those in full-time or part-time work were the most likely to say they definitely/probably would have dropped out of their course without ALG. Recipients with no income were more likely to state they definitely/probably would have dropped out without ALG than recipients with incomes from salary or benefits.

Of those who received ALG in 2004/2005, on the other hand, 5% said they would definitely have dropped out and 10% said they would probably have dropped out of their course (N=95).

The vast majority of ALG recipients at Wave 1 (97%) said the opportunity to receive ALG for a particular level of course did not make any difference to their choice of course (N=844). Similarly at Wave 2, 98% of learners receiving ALG during the 2004/2005 academic year said ALG did not make a difference for their choice of course (N=102).

Most of recipients at Wave 1 (92%) said that ALG did not influence their decision to study for a full award course rather than for a part course (N=844). Of those receiving ALG in 2004/2005, on the other hand, 74% responded so (N=100). However, 21% of those who received ALG in both waves and had responded negatively at Wave 1, said that ALG influenced their decision to study for a full award course at Wave 2 (N=85).

6.4 Summary

- About one-third of ALG recipients at Wave 1 said that ALG was quite/very important in their decision to study full-time, of whom about 1 in 10 said they probably/definitely would not have gone ahead with their course if ALG had not been awarded.
- Of those who received ALG during the 2004/2005 academic year, 13% said they definitely/probably would not have gone ahead with their course without ALG.
- About one-fifth of those who received at least 1 ALG payment at Wave 1 stated at Wave 2 that they definitely/probably would have dropped out of the course without ALG.
- Of those who received ALG during the 2004/2005 academic year, 15% said they definitely/probably would have dropped out of the course without ALG.

7 LEARNING RELATED OUTCOMES

This chapter compares the qualification outcomes of recipients and non-applicants and includes breakdowns by background characteristics in order to ascertain whether some groups were more likely to achieve their qualifications than others.

While the responses at Wave 2 provide some information about the learning outcomes of recipients and non-applicants, the analysis also drew on the Individualised Learner Record (ILR) held by the LSC to provide as robust and complete a picture as possible. This chapter explains the process of matching the cohort 1 learners in the survey (studying in the academic year 2003/4) to the ILR and assesses the completeness of the match before presenting the findings about learning outcomes.

7.1 Data Matching Procedure

Table 7.1 Timeline showing periods of learning and dates of data collection

	2003				2004				2005			
	Jan	Apr	Jul	Oct	Jan	Apr	Jul	Oct	Jan	Apr	Jul	Oct
Period of study in survey				← Wave 1 →					← Wave 2 →			
Survey fieldwork						Wave 1 May-Jul					Wave 2 Jun-Aug	
Period of study in ILR	← Jan 03 – Dec 04 →											
Data extracted from ILR												Dec

Table 7.1 sets out the time frame for the period of study for learners in the survey and ILR, the survey fieldwork and the date the data were extracted from the ILR. In the Wave 1 survey, learners were asked about the qualifications they studied between September 2003 and August 2004 regardless of the start date. After the data had been accessed, we were informed that the ILR 2003/4 data set covers the calendar year rather than the academic year and therefore includes learners studying between January 2003 and December 2004.

Having accessed the ILR data from the LSC, the following steps were taken in order to prepare the data for analysis:

- 1 The data were matched via name, address and date of birth. Data were only matched for the learners who gave consent in the Wave 1 interview for details about their learning and qualifications to be collected from other sources.
- 2 The file was 'flattened' so that each case became a learner rather than a qualification. (Note that there were up to 21 qualification records per learner.)

- 3 Duplicate records were removed. There were 75 cases (50 for recipients and 25 for non-applicants) where the learner and the learning aim reference¹⁹ were the same but the qualification outcome (variable A35) different. A contact from the LSC advised taking the record with the most positive outcome, since it was possible for a learner to stop and restart a course within 1 academic year. The following table was used to remove duplicates²⁰.

Table 7.2 Allocating qualification outcome

A35 value 1	A35 value 2	Final A35 value
9	3	9
1	3	1
9	1	1
2	3	2
1	4	1
3	4	4

Value labels:

- 1 achieved
- 2 partial achievement
- 3 no achievement
- 4 exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known
- 9 study continuing²¹

- 4 Data from the Learning Aims Database was merged in order to identify the qualification types and derive filters for analysis.
- 5 The same qualification filters were applied as for the original sampling frame. Qualifications were retained if they were Level 2 or 3 AND met at least 1 of the following criteria:
 Either
 - NVQ notional width of 100 (indicating a full qualification); or
 - Awarding body City & Guilds; or
 - Learning Aim Type code included in Table A7.1 (in Appendix).

¹⁹ The ILR refers to qualifications as 'learning aims'. In this document, the 2 terms are used interchangeably.

²⁰ With hindsight, it would have been helpful to remove Level 1 qualifications at this stage.

²¹ It was later decided to eliminate those still studying from the calculation of achievement rates, following the 'benchmarking' method used by the LSC. Ideally in Table 7.2, 'no achievement' should have been the final A35 final value rather than 'study continuing'.

7.2 Extent of Match

Table 7.3 Number of qualifications in the survey data and ILR data

	Recipients		Non-applicants	
	ILR	Survey	ILR	Survey
Number of qualifications	1478	1160	724	644
Number of learners	651	729	406	461
Rate of qualifications per learner	2.3	1.6	1.8	1.4

Table 7.3 illustrates the match between the ILR data and survey data by comparing the number of learners and qualifications. A high proportion of the learners in the survey data was found in the ILR – 89% of recipients and 88% of non-applicants.

Learners in the ILR were recorded as studying more qualifications than in the survey data²². The most likely reason for the discrepancy in the number of qualifications between the survey data and ILR is that the ILR data included learners studying in the 2 years between January 2003 and December 2004 and the survey data included learners in the academic year of September 2003 to August 2004²³ (Table 7.1). Other possible reasons are that the survey respondents may have:

- only reported the qualifications they considered to be most important;
- grouped together qualifications that were listed separately in the ILR;
- forgotten about qualifications studied earlier in the academic year;
- been reluctant to report qualifications that they did not achieve; or
- incorrectly reported qualifications as being at Level 1.

The analysis proceeds as follows:

- The qualification types and levels of recipients and non-applicants are compared using the ILR data.
- The learning outcomes associated with the qualifications studied by recipients and non-applicants are compared using the ILR data. This analysis is conducted at the level of qualification rather than individual in order to include all the relevant qualifications studied in the analysis.
- The learning outcomes of recipients and non-applicants are compared at the individual level, based on the highest qualification outcome and highest level (across all learning aims) for each learner.

²² For all the learning aims recorded in the ILR, there was a corresponding outcome.

²³ The figure for the survey includes those qualifications reported in the Wave 1 survey as well as those reported at Wave 2 as beginning any time since September 2003. It is possible, therefore, that some of the 173 qualifications reported at Wave 2 for recipients and some of the 104 qualifications reported at Wave 2 for non-applicants may have begun in the academic year 2004/5.

7.3 Qualification types and levels in ILR

Table 7.4 Distribution of qualifications across Learning Aim Types for Recipients and Non-applicants: ILR data

Learning Aim Type	Column %	
	Recipients	Non-applicants
Access Certificate	9	8
Access Diploma	*	0
Advanced Certificate	*	0
Advanced Diploma	*	*
Advanced National Certificate	0	*
Advanced VCE	1	2
Advanced VCE (Double Award)	6	5
Advanced Subsidiary VCE	*	1
City & Guilds Certificate	*	1
Certificate	11	10
Conversion from Advanced VCE to Advanced VCE (Double Award)	1	1
Diploma	6	6
Edexcel First Diploma (new syllabus)	1	1
Edexcel National Award	*	*
Edexcel National Certificate (new syllabus)	1	2
Edexcel National Diploma (new syllabus)	13	11
GCE A level	1	1
GCE A2 level	11	11
GCE AS level	12	15
GCSE	3	3
GNVQ	1	3
Intermediate Award	*	0
Intermediate Certificate	*	*
Introductory Certificate	0	*
Level 2	*	*
Level 3	*	0
National Certificate	*	2
National Diploma	1	2
NVQ	5	9
NVQ/GNVQ Key Skills Unit	13	5
Professional Diploma	0	*
Other	1	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1478	726

Base: Qualifications at Level 2 or 3 AND width is 100 OR awarding body is City & Guilds OR eligible Learning Aim Type code.

Shading indicates significant differences between recipients and non-applicants.

Table 7.4 shows the distribution of the total number of qualifications being studied as detailed in the ILR across different learning aim types. The proportion of qualifications studied by recipients and non-applicants within each category was similar. The qualifications studied by recipients were significantly more likely than those studied by non-applicants to be NVQ/GNVQ Key Skills Unit (13%, 5%). Non-applicants were significantly more likely to be studying GCE AS level and NVQ.

Table 7.5 Qualification level: ILR data

Level	Column %	
	Recipients	Non-applicants
Level 2	27	30
Level 3	73	70
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1478	726

Base: Eligible qualifications studied by recipients and non-applicants

There was no significant difference in the level of qualifications studied by recipients and non-applicants.

7.4 Learning outcomes in ILR at the qualification level²⁴

The following tables show the learning outcomes associated with the qualifications described above, broken down by the level of qualification and the age, gender, ethnic group, family structure and housing tenure of recipients and non-applicants. The tables exclude the qualifications which learners were still in the process of studying – 13% of qualifications for recipients and 9% of qualifications for non-applicants.

Table 7.6 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants: ILR data

Learning Outcome	Column %	
	Recipients	Non-applicants
Achieved	70	56
Partial achievement	4	5
No achievement	25	38
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	2	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	1293	661

Base: Eligible qualifications, excluding qualifications not yet completed.

Shading indicates significant differences between recipients and non-applicants.

The qualifications being studied by recipients were significantly more likely to be achieved than those being studied by non-applicants (70%, 56%). Similarly, recipients were less likely to have not achieved their qualification.

²⁴ The approach to calculating achievement rates in this section is similar to the approach taken by LSC. LSC Statistical First Release: ILR/SFR07 states on p.7, "The achievement rate is calculated as the number of qualifications achieved divided by the number of completed qualifications. These tables relate to learning aims so learners with more than 1 learning aim are included once for each aim". That is, the LSC achievement rates exclude those still studying and include all qualifications studied.

Table 7.7 Learning outcomes for qualifications studied by recipients and non-applicants by level: ILR data

Learning Outcome	Recipients			Non-Applicants			Column %
	Level 2	Level 3	Total	Level 2	Level 3	Total	
Achieved	55	76	70	46	61	56	
Partial achievement	6	3	4	6	4	5	
No achievement	36	20	25	44	35	38	
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	3	2	2	4	*	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	372	921	1293	194	467	661	

Base: Eligible qualifications, excluding qualifications not yet completed.
Shading indicates significant differences between Levels 2 and 3 for recipients and non-applicants.

Level 3 qualifications studied by recipients and non-applicants were significantly more likely to be achieved than Level 2 qualifications.

7.4.1 Learning outcomes by background characteristics

Table 7.8 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by age: ILR data

Learning Outcome	Recipients					Non-applicants					Column %
	18-19	20	21-24	25-31	Total	18-19	20	21-24	25-31	Total	
Achieved	68	65	74	78	70	62	48	51	61	56	
Partial achievement	4	4	4	2	4	4	9	2	2	5	
No achievement	25	30	21	19	25	33	40	45	34	38	
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	3	2	*	1	2	1	3	2	2	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	424	401	339	129	1293	307	160	119	75	661	

Base: Eligible qualifications, excluding qualifications not yet completed.

There are no clear patterns in achievement according to age. Although the lowest achievement rates for recipients and non-applicants were among 20 year olds, whereas recipients of this age also had the highest rate of non-achievement, this was not the case for non-applicants.

Table 7.9 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by gender: ILR data

Learning Outcome	Recipients			Non-applicants			Column %
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
Achieved	68	72	70	51	61	56	
Partial achievement	4	4	4	5	5	5	
No achievement	26	23	25	43	33	38	
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	2	1	2	1	1	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>593</i>	<i>700</i>	<i>1293</i>	<i>278</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>661</i>	

Base: Eligible qualifications, excluding qualifications not yet completed.

Shading indicates significant differences between male and female non-applicants.

Women had higher rates of achievement than men, although the gender gap in attainment was smaller for recipients than non-applicants and only significant for the latter.

There were no other significant differences by background characteristics. The tables with the breakdowns by ethnicity, living arrangements, housing tenure and children are provided in the Appendix (Tables A7.2a - A7.5).

7.5 Highest qualification outcomes in ILR and survey data

This section describes the highest level of qualification studied and highest qualification outcome for individual learners as reported in the ILR and survey data. For example, if a learner was studying for a level 2 qualification which they achieved and a level 3 qualification which they partially achieved, their highest level was level 3 and their highest qualification outcome was 'achieved'. Therefore, the highest qualification outcome may be for a qualification which was different from the highest level qualification. This is illustrated in Table 7.10.

Table 7.10 Classification of qualification levels and outcomes in ILR and survey data

Level of 1 st qualification	Outcome of 1 st qualification	Level of 2 nd qualification	Outcome of 2 nd qualification	Highest qualification level	Highest qualification outcome
L3	Achieved	L3	Failed	L3	Achieved
L3	Failed	L3	Failed	L3	Failed
L3	Achieved	L2	Achieved	L3	Achieved
L3	Failed	L2	Achieved	L3	Achieved

Throughout this section, the findings from the survey data and the ILR are compared. As explained above, the ILR records the learning outcomes for all

learners and therefore provides a robust check for the survey data. (See section 7.3 for the learning types and qualification levels as recorded in the ILR.)

7.5.1 Highest level in ILR and survey data

Table 7.11 Highest level of qualification for recipients and non-applicants who studied at least one L2/L3 qualification: ILR and survey data

Level	Recipients	Non-applicants ILR	Recipients ²⁵	Column % Non-applicants Survey
Level 2	10	22	10	25
Level 3	90	78	90	75
<i>Unweighted N</i>	766	410	675	462

Base: Recipients and non-applicants with at least 1 learning aim meeting the criteria for inclusion. Shading indicates significant differences between recipients and non-applicants in the ILR and survey data.

The highest qualification level across all learning aims for each learner was calculated. Individuals were only included in the analysis if they were studying for at least 1 qualification that met the criteria for inclusion²⁶. The proportions of learners studying at each level were similar in the ILR and survey data. In both cases, the highest level qualification being studied by recipients was significantly more likely to be Level 3 than the highest qualification studied by non-applicants.

Table 7.12 Highest qualification outcome for recipients and non-applicants: ILR data

Highest Learning Outcome	Recipients	Column % Non-applicants
Achieved	93	80
Partial achievement	3	2
No achievement	4	18
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	*	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	725	385

Base: Recipients and non-applicants with at least 1 learning aim meeting the criteria for inclusion, excluding those still studying²⁷. Shading indicates differences between recipients and non-applicants.

²⁵ For the sake of comparison, this table includes only those recipients who indicated that they were studying at Level 2 or 3. This excludes 67 who were apparently studying at Level 1, Level 4 or an unknown level and 84 for whom there was missing data.

²⁶ Qualifications were retained if they were Level 2 or 3 AND met at least 1 of the following criteria: they were either NVQ notional width of 100 (indicating a full qualification) OR the Awarding body was City & Guilds OR the Learning Aim Type code was included in Table A6.1.

²⁷ The base for recipients only includes the learners who had at least 1 learning aim in the ILR that met the criteria for inclusion. However, it may be the case that for some individuals with more than 1 learning aim, the highest level applies to a learning aim at Level 1.

Table 7.13 Highest qualification outcome for recipients and non-applicants: survey data

Highest Learning Outcome	Column %	
	Recipients	Non-applicants
Completed at least 1 qualification	95	87
Achieved	85	76
Failed	*	3
Unknown result	10	9
Stopped qualification before completed	5	13
<i>Unweighted N</i>	510	174

Base: Recipients and eligible non-applicants who completed at least 1 qualification.

Note that 'achieved', 'failed' and 'unknown result' are subcategories of 'completed at least 1 qualification'.

Shading indicates differences between recipients and non-applicants.

Tables 7.12 and 7.13 present the highest qualification outcome achieved by recipients and non-applicants according to the ILR and survey data and the findings are similar. Of the recipients who were no longer studying, 93% were reported to have achieved at least 1 qualification in the ILR compared to between 85% and 95% in the survey data. Of the non-applicants who were no longer studying, 80% were reported to have achieved at least 1 qualification in the ILR compared to between 76% and 85% in the survey data. (The range given in the survey data takes into account the unknown results.) In both the ILR and survey data, recipients were significantly more likely to have achieved at least 1 qualification than non-applicants.

7.5.2 Highest level by highest outcome in ILR and survey data

Table 7.14 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by highest level: ILR data

Highest Learning Outcome	Recipients			Non-Applicants		
	Level 2	Level 3	Total	Level 2	Level 3	Total
	2	3		2	3	
Achieved	97	92	93	69	83	80
Partial achievement	0	3	3	4	1	2
No achievement	3	5	4	28	16	18
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	0	*	*	0	*	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	69	653	722	80	305	385

Base: Recipients and non-applicants with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion, excluding those still studying²⁸.

Shading indicates significant differences between Level 2 and 3.

²⁸ Three learners at Level 4 were excluded from the base.

Table 7.15 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by highest level: survey data

Highest Learning Outcome	Recipients			Non-applicants			Column %
	Level 2	Level 3	Total	Level 2	Level 3	Total	
Completed at least 1 qualification	[95]	95	95	[73]	92	87	
Achieved	[83]	85	85	[69]	79	77	
Failed	[3]	*	1	[4]	2	3	
Unknown result	[10]	10	10	[0]	12	9	
Stopped qualification before completed	[5]	5	5	[27]	9	13	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	46	412	458	43	131	174	

Base: Recipients and eligible non-applicants who completed at least 1 qualification.

A similar pattern of findings is given in Tables 7.14 and 7.15. Whereas the outcomes across levels are similar for the recipients, according to the ILR data, the non-applicants studying at Level 3 were more likely to have achieved at least 1 qualification. (The difference was not significant in the survey data.) In the ILR data, non-applicants at Level 2 were significantly more likely to have not achieved their qualification and in the survey data they were more likely to have stopped their qualification before it was completed.

Table 7.16 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by highest level: ILR data

Highest Learning Outcome	Recipients			Non-Applicants			Column %
	Level 2	Level 3	Total	Level 2	Level 3	Total	
Achieved	[93]	94	94	[69]	91	85	
Partial achievement	[3]	3	3	[3]	0	1	
No achievement	[3]	3	3	[28]	9	14	
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	[0]	0	0	[0]	1	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	[34]	365	399	38	118	156	

Base: Recipients and non-applicants who gave qualification outcomes in survey data (i.e., the same respondents as in Table 7.14).

Shading indicates significant differences between Level 2 and 3.

To improve the comparability of the findings between the ILR and survey data, the qualification outcomes by level in the ILR was re-calculated retaining only those learners who responded with a qualification outcome in the survey. (Tables 7.15 and 7.16 therefore have the same base, aside from missing values.)

It was still the case that non-applicants studying at Level 3 were more successful in their qualification outcomes than those at Level 2. However, whereas in Table 7.14, recipients were significantly more likely than non-applicants to achieve their qualifications at both Level 2 and Level 3, in Table 7.16 there was no significant difference between recipients and non-applicants in the achievement of Level 3 qualifications.

There were no further differences in the highest qualification outcome by background characteristics. The tables for age, ethnicity, living arrangements, housing tenure and children are provided in the Appendix (Tables A7.6 to A7.11).

7.6 Summary

This chapter has compared the qualification outcomes of recipients and non-applicants drawing on the survey data and data within the Individualised Learner Record held by the LSC. There was a high level of match between the 2 sources of data, with 89% of recipients and 88% of non-applicants from the survey data found in the ILR. Recipients were studying for more learning aims than non-applicants in 2003/4. The analysis was divided into 2 sections, based first on all qualifications and then on the highest achieved qualification for each learner.

The main findings were as follows:

- When all qualifications being studied were taken into consideration, those studied by recipients were more likely to be achieved than those studied by non-applicants (70%, 56%) (ILR data)
- The learning aims at Level 3 were more likely to be achieved than those at Level 2 (recipients: 76%, 55%, non-applicants: 61%, 46%) (ILR data)
- The qualifications studied by women were more likely to be achieved than those studied by men, although the difference was only significant for non-applicants. (ILR data)
- According to the qualification outcomes reported in the ILR, there were no subgroup differences based on age, ethnicity, living arrangements, tenure or having children.
- The analysis of highest qualification outcome in the ILR and survey data yielded similar results. In the ILR, 93% of recipients and 80% of non-applicants achieved at least 1 qualification. The equivalent figures in the survey data were 85-95% of recipients and 76-85% of non-applicants. (A range is given to take into account unknown results.)
- Recipients were studying at a higher level than non-applicants (90%, 78% at Level 3).
- Non-applicants studying at Level 3 were more likely to achieve their qualification than those studying at Level 2.
- There were no other differences in the highest qualification outcome for individuals according to background characteristics.

8 EMPLOYMENT RELATED OUTCOMES

This chapter compares activity changes and employment-related outcomes between ALG recipients and non-applicants to assess whether receipt of ALG is associated with better outcomes for adult learners. The analysis is based only on respondents interviewed at both Wave 1 and Wave 2, to allow direct comparisons between the 2 waves. ALG recipients refer to status at Wave 1, that is those who had received at least 1 ALG payment during the 2003/4 academic year, with receipt confirmed at Wave 2 for those whose payments were not yet due (or delayed) at Wave 1.

8.1 Activity changes

Table 8.1 compares reported main activity at Wave 1 and Wave 2 for ALG recipients and non-applicants.

Table 8.1 Main activity of ALG recipients and non-applicants at Wave 1 and Wave 2

Main activity	ALG recipients		Non-applicants		Column%
	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 %	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 %	
Total in work	57	64	55	62	
<i>Of whom: Full-time work</i>	6	28	23	36	
<i>Of whom: Part-time work or education with job</i>	51	36	32	26	
Education and no job	37	24	22	20	
No education nor work ²⁹	6	11	23	19	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	589	589	258	258	

Base Population: Respondents who provided information on activity status at Waves 1 & 2.

Only 6% of ALG recipients were in full-time work at Wave 1, compared to 28% at Wave 2. These proportions were somewhat lower than those of non-applicants (Wave 1 – 23%; Wave 2 – 36%). However, the proportion of ALG recipients in part-time work or in education with a job were relatively higher than of non-applicants, especially at Wave 1. The proportions neither working nor learning were lower among ALG recipients, compared to the non-applicants, at both waves. In order to be able to get an indication on whether receipt of ALG is associated with better employment-related outcomes of adult learners, it is necessary to examine changes in activity status at Waves 1 and 2 among ALG recipients and non-applicants (Table 8.2).

²⁹ Comprises those who reported main activity as unemployed, looking after the home/family, taking a holiday, doing voluntary work, sick or disabled, taking a gap year/travelling, or any other activity besides education or employment.

Table 8.2 Activity changes among ALG Recipients and non-applicants

Main activity at Wave 2	Main activity at Wave 1				Column%
	Full-time work %	PT work or educ. with job %	Education and no job %	No educ. nor work %	All %
ALG Recipients					
Full-time work	[63]	31	21	[18]	28
Part-time work or education with job	[32]	48	22	[30]	36
Education and no job	[0]	16	36	[42]	24
No education nor work	[5]	5	22	[9]	12
<i>Unweighted N</i>	32	205	223	29	589
Non-applicants					
Full-time work	71	37	10	22	35
Part-time work or education with job	14	47	17	15	26
Education and no job	2	8	53	20	20
No education nor work	14	7	19	42	19
<i>Unweighted N</i>	59	85	57	57	258

Base Population: Respondents interviewed at Waves 1 and Wave 2.

Grey shades - difference between ALG recipients and non-applicants significant at 5% level.

There were notable differences between ALG recipients and non-applicants in activity transitions at Wave 1 and Wave 2.³⁰ Overall, the patterns in Table 8.2 provide some indication of ALG receipt being associated with better employment outcomes of adult learners. For example, the boxed cells in Table 8.2 suggest that:

- Only 5% of ALG recipients who were in full-time work at Wave 1 were neither working nor learning at Wave 2, compared to 14% of non-applicants;
- 21% of ALG recipients who were in education with no job at Wave 1 had moved to full-time work at Wave 2, compared to 10% of non-applicants.
- Compared to non-applicants, ALG recipients who were neither in education nor work at Wave 1 were significantly more likely to have moved to education (42% vs 20%), and less likely to remain unemployed and not in education (9% vs 42%).

An examination of activity transitions with respect to increasing or decreasing work (Table 8.3) suggests that, overall, ALG recipients were more likely to have increased work between Wave 1 and Wave 2, compared to non-applicants. It is interesting to note that ALG recipients were more likely to move from full-time work to no work, even though they were less likely to move from part-time work to no work, compared to the non-applicants.

³⁰ Note, however, that most of these differences are not conclusive due to the relatively small number of learners in specific activity groups interviewed at Wave 2. In particular, percentages enclosed in square brackets should be interpreted with caution since they are based on less than 50 cases.

Table 8.3 Work transitions between Wave 1 and Wave 2 among ALG recipients and non-applicants

Work transition	Recipients	Column % Non-applicants
Reduce working	13	12
- Full-time to part-time work	2	3
- Full-time work to no work	*	4
- Part-time work to no work	11	5
Increase working	34	27
- part-time to full-time work	16	12
- no work to full-time work	8	7
- no work to part-time work	10	8
Working status unchanged	53	61
- remain in full-time work	3	16
- remain in part-time work	24	15
- remain not working	25	30
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>589</i>	<i>258</i>

Base Population: Respondents interviewed at Waves 1 and Wave 2.
 Grey shades - difference between ALG recipients and non-applicants significant at 5% level.

8.2 Reasons for making employment transitions

Table 8.4 Reasons for stopping work

Reason	ALG Recipients	Unweighted N Non-applicants
Too busy with studying/needed to concentrate on studying	24	3
Too busy generally	5	
Job was temporary/holiday job	4	1
Problem with job location	4	
Made redundant/company folded	3	
Not paid enough or given enough hours	2	
Went on holiday and could not keep job	2	
Didn't enjoy it/didn't get along with other staff	1	
Hours not suitable	1	
Other reasons	1	
All	47	4

Base Population: Respondents in FT or PT education who were in education with a job at Wave 1, but had stopped working at Wave 2

Table 8.5 Reasons for starting work

Reason	ALG Recipients	Unweighted N Non-applicants
Need money for basic living expenses	13	1
Need money for costs relating to education	6	
Need extra spending money	3	3
To build general work experience		1
For enjoyment/make use of spare time	2	
Was doing a job at Wave 1	1	
Other reasons	1	
All	26	5

Base Population: Respondents in FT or PT education who were in education without a job at Wave 1, but had started working at Wave 2.

The number of cases were too few to allow a meaningful comparison of reasons for leaving or starting work between ALG recipients and non-applicants (Table 8.3, 8.4). Among those who had stopped or started working between Waves 1 and 2:

- The predominant reason for stopping work was because the respondents (both ALG recipients and non-applicants) were too busy with studying and needed to concentrate more on their education.
- The main reason for starting work was the need for money for basic living expenses, for costs relating to education or for extra spending.

8.3 Employment - related Outcomes

Table 8.6 Whether studying helped ALG recipients and non-applicants improve employment – related outcomes

Employment-related outcome	ALG Recipients			Non-applicants		
	helped a lot %	helped a little %	Did not help %	Helped a lot %	helped a little %	Did not help %
Gain confidence to do more studying	74	14	13	59	23	18
Develop further in a career	58	12	30	52	10	38
Do a job better than before	30	11	60	36	11	53
Get more satisfaction from work in a job	26	11	63	27	9	64
Gain new skills for existing job	24	12	64	26	11	63
Get a more interesting job	23	7	70	22	6	72
Get a new job	22	6	72	21	7	72
Change to a different career	22	6	72	20	6	74
Get a better paid job	13	7	80	15	9	76
Get a pay rise in an existing job	4	3	94	9	4	87
Set up own or a family business	4	3	93	7	2	91
<i>Unweighted N</i>		571			234	

Base population: Respondents who studied any qualification since September 2003.

Grey shades – difference between ALG recipients and non-applicants significant at 5% level.

Slightly more than one-quarter of ALG recipients (28%) and non-applicants (26%), said that the course helped them get a new job (Table 8.6). ALG recipients were significantly more likely than non-applicants to state that studying helped them a lot to gain confidence to do more studying (74% vs 59%). Although the overall patterns of employment related outcomes were fairly similar between ALG recipients and non-applicants, ALG recipients seemed somewhat more positive about future prospects (Table 8.7).

Table 8.7 Whether ALG recipients and non-applicants thought studying will help them improve employment –related outcomes in the future

Employment-related outcome	In Future	
	ALG recipients %	Non-applicants %
Will help them get a better job	93	87
Will help them develop a career	93	90
Will help them gain new skills for a job	94	87
Will help them get more satisfaction from a job	91	88
Will help them do an existing job better	53	56
<i>Unweighted N</i>	571	234

Base population: Respondents who studied any qualification since September 2003.

Grey shades – difference between ALG recipients and non-applicant significant at 5% level.

A significantly higher proportion of ALG recipients said the course would lead to a better job in future (93%) or would help them gain new skills for an existing job (94%), compared to non-applicants (better job - 87%; new skills - 87%).

Those who studied any qualifications in 2003 or 2004 and were employed at the time of Wave 2 survey were asked if they thought the qualifications they studied helped them to get the job. 31% of ALG recipients and 35% of the non-applicants reported that the qualifications they studied for helped them get the job (Table 8.8).

Table 8.8 Whether qualifications studied in 2003/04 helped ALG recipients and non-applicants get jobs

Whether qualification studied helped get job	ALG recipients	Non-applicants
Yes – helped to get job	31	35
No – didn't help to get job	64	58
Got job prior to achieving qualification	6	7
<i>Unweighted N</i>	358	142

Base population: Respondents who studied a qualification in 2003/2004 and were employed at Wave 2.

Grey shades – difference between ALG recipients and non-applicant.

An examination of employment-related outcomes by background characteristics showed little variation by some of the key background factors including age, qualification achieved and current qualification aim for both ALG recipients and non-applicants. The main differences observed were by gender (i.e. with respect to gaining new skills for an existing job, getting more job satisfaction, and doing a job better). Other significant differences were by ethnicity (for getting a new job), area (for career development), and living arrangements (for gaining new skills).

8.3.1 Employment - related outcomes by gender

Table 8.9 Per cent of ALG recipients and non-applicants reporting various employment related outcomes by gender

Studying helped	ALG Recipients		Non-applicants	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Gain confidence to do more studying	83	91	79	85
Develop further in a career	68	71	61	63
Do a job better than before	37	44	56	40
Get more job satisfaction	32	41	38	34
Gain new skills for an existing job	31	41	40	34
Get a more interesting job	26	33	33	24
Got a new job	25	31	32	25
Change to a different career	25	30	27	26
Get a better paid job	17	24	33	17
Get a pay rise in an existing job	4	9	16	11
Set up own or family business	7	7	10	9
<i>Unweighted N</i>	272	299	112	122

Base population: Respondents who studied a qualification since September 2003.

Grey shades – difference between males and females significant at 5% level.

_ - percentages do not sum up to 100% due to multiple response.

Among ALG recipients, females were consistently more likely to report favourable employment outcomes than males, especially gaining confidence to do more studying, getting more job satisfaction, gaining new skills for an existing job, getting a better paid job and pay rise in an existing job ($p < 0.05$). This pattern does not hold for non-applicants for whom the only significant differences (helping do a job better than before and getting a better paid job) were in favour of males. This may suggest that receipt of ALG is associated with more positive employment-related outcomes for females than for males.

8.3.2 Differences in employment - related outcomes by Ethnicity

Table 8.10 Per cent of ALG recipients and non-applicants for whom studying helped get a new job by ethnicity

Ethnic background	ALG Recipients		Non-applicants		Row%
	%	Cases	%	Cases	
Asian or Asian British	23	108	39	48	
Black or Black British	[31]	28	[14]	29	
White	29	418	29	147	
Mixed/other	[-]	17	[-]	10	
All	28	571	28	234	

Base population: Respondents who studied a qualification since September 2003.

Grey shade – difference between ALG recipients and non-applicants significant at 5% level.

Whilst ALG recipients of white ethnic origin were as likely to state that studying helped them get a new job as their non-applicant counterparts (29%), those of Asian origin were less likely to report that studying helped them get a new job (23%) compared to their non-applicant counterparts (39%) ($p < 0.05$). This pattern may suggest that receipt of ALG is associated with less favourable employment outcomes for learners of Asian origin. The pattern seems reversed for learners of Black ethnic origin, but the cases are too few for conclusive results.

8.3.3 Differences in employment - related outcomes by LSC area

Table 8.11 Per cent of ALG recipients and non-applicants for whom studying helped develop further in career by LSC area

LSC Area	ALG Recipients*		Non-applicants		Row%
	%	Unweighted N	%	Unweighted N	
Bedfordshire	[83]	33	[-]	6	
Black County	70	52	[59]	32	
Devon and Cornwall	70	93	[69]	42	
Durham	[61]	40	[-]	1	
Humberside	68	61	[-]	13	
Lancashire	73	75	[65]	27	
Leicestershire	60	56	[63]	22	
London West	88	50	66	64	
Shropshire	[50]	24	[-]	2	
South Yorkshire	70	86	[48]	25	
All	70	570	62	234	

Base population: Respondents who studied a qualification since September 2003.

1 – 1 ALG recipient from college outside scheme omitted.

Grey shade – difference between ALG recipients and non-applicants significant at 5% level.

ALG recipients in London West were the most likely to report that studying helped them develop further in their career (88%), where as those in Shropshire³¹ (50%) and Leicestershire (60%) were the least likely. In both London West and South Yorkshire, ALG recipients were more likely than non-applicants to state that studying helped them develop further in their career.

³¹ Result should be interpreted with caution due to relatively few cases (n<50).

8.3.4 Differences in employment - related outcomes by living arrangement

Table 8.12 Per cent of ALG recipients and non-applicants for whom studying helped gain new skills for an existing job by living arrangement

Living arrangement at W1	ALG Recipients		Non-applicants		Row%
	%	Cases	%	Cases	
Single, lives with parents	38	437	39	162	
Lives with partner	34	64	52	23	
Other	34	70	25	49	
All	36	571	37	234	

Base population: Respondents who studied a qualification since September 2003.

Grey shade – differences by living arrangement significant at 5% level.

ALG recipients living with neither parent(s) nor partner were as likely as those living with a partner to report that studying helped them gain new skills. This does not apply to non-applicants for whom those living with neither parents nor partner were significantly less likely to report that studying helped them gain new skills for an existing job (25%), compared to those living with a partner (52%) or with parents (39%) .

8.4 Income-related outcomes

Table 8.13 Changes in annual salary/earnings for ALG recipients and non-applicants

Salary/earnings band	ALG Recipients		Non-applicants		Column%
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2	
	%	%	%	%	
Up to £10,000	43	46	20	37	
£10,001-£15,000	1	11	1	14	
More than £15,000	1	4	0	6	
No earnings	42	36	45	39	
Missing	13	3	34	4	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>589</i>	<i>589</i>	<i>258</i>	<i>258</i>	

Base population: Respondents interviewed at Wave 1 and Wave 2.

15% of ALG recipients in Wave 2 reported earning more than £10,000 per year compared to only 2% in Wave 1. This pattern is similar to that of non-applicants. The proportion of respondents with no earnings declined at Wave 2 by a similar margin (6 percentage points) among both ALG recipients and non-applicants, while the proportion in each of the salary/earning bands increased. It should be noted that more detailed comparisons of changes in earnings is limited by the fact that information on respondents' salaries and earnings was fairly incomplete at Wave 1,

especially the non-applicants' for whom one-third did not provide information on salary or earnings at Wave 1.

A breakdown of the earnings by qualification level (Table 8.14) is useful in establishing whether the patterns in salary/earnings observed here are attributable to differences in qualification levels between ALG recipients and non-applicants (see section 7.5.1).

Table 8.14 Changes in annual salary/earnings for ALG recipients and non-applicants by current qualification level

Salary /earnings band	ALG Recipients				Non-applicants				Column%
	Level 2		Level 3		Level 2		Level 3		
	W 1 %	W 2 %	W 1 %	W 2 %	W 1 %	W 2 %	W 1 %	W 2 %	
Up to £10,000	[39]	[29]	47	48	13	30	23	40	
£10,001-£15,000	[4]	[7]	1	11	1	14	1	14	
More than £15,000	[0]	[13]	1	3	0	6	0	6	
No earnings	[52]	[42]	44	37	58	48	40	35	
Missing	[4]	[9]	9	1	28	3	36	5	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>424</i>	<i>424</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>189</i>	<i>189</i>	

Base population: Respondents interviewed at Wave 1 and Wave 2.

Among ALG recipients studying for a Level 3 qualification at the time of the survey, almost half had annual salary/earnings of £10,000 or less at both waves. The proportion of Level 3 non-applicants with annual salary/earnings of £10,000 or less was relatively lower, but increased from 23% at Wave 1 to 40% at Wave 2. For both ALG recipients and non-applicants, the proportion of learners earning more than £10,000 increased considerably between Waves 1 and 2, while the proportion with no earnings declined. Similar patterns in earnings were observed for learners currently studying for Level 2 qualifications as for Level 3, although Level 2 learners were generally more likely to have no earnings at both waves.

8.5 Occupation groups of ALG recipients and non-applicants

Table 8.15 SOC 2000 groups of awardees and non-applicants

SOC groups	ALG recipients		Non-applicants	
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 1	Wave 2
Managers and senior officials	2	4	1	3
Professional occupations	*	1	1	3
Associate professional and technical occupations	3	8	7	6
Administrative and secretarial occupations	6	9	8	6
Skilled trades occupations	4	7	14	11
Personal service occupations	14	22	15	21
Sales and customer service occupations	35	26	28	23
Process, plant and machine	3	3	2	3
Elementary occupations	32	20	24	24
<i>Unweighted N</i>	336	374	144	160

Base: Respondents interviewed at wave 1 and wave 2 who had a job at the time of the interview. Shading indicates significant differences between ALG recipients and non-applicants at 5% level.

The vast majority of ALG recipients were in unskilled occupations (sales and customer service, elementary or personal service occupations) at both Wave 1 and Wave 2. The same pattern applies to the non-applicants who, however, had a higher proportion in skilled trade occupations, especially at Wave 1, compared to ALG recipients. Among ALG recipients, the proportion in professional or skilled occupations increased at Wave 2, while the proportion in sales and customer service or elementary occupations decreased. Although there was some decline in the proportion of non-applicants in sales and customer service occupations as well, the proportion in skilled trade occupations declined whilst elementary occupations remained unchanged. Overall, the proportion of ALG recipients in the top five occupation categories (i.e. from skilled trade to managers and senior officials) about doubled from 15% to 29% between Wave 1 and Wave 2. For the non-applicants, the proportion declined slightly from 31% to 29%.

8.6 Attitudes to current job

The majority of ALG recipients who had a job at Wave 2 strongly agreed with the statements 'My work colleagues are supportive', 'I have a plan for how I want my career', 'My employer is supportive' and 'I enjoy my job'. The same patterns were observed for the non-applicants for whom at least half also strongly agreed with these statements. Although the patterns for ALG recipients and non-applicants were largely similar, the recipients were significantly more likely to strongly disagree with the statement 'My job is a step along career path I wish to follow', and less likely to strongly disagree with the statement 'I have a plan for how I want my career'.

Table 8.16 Attitudes of ALG recipients and non-applicants towards current job

Statement	ALG Recipients					Non-Applicants					Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	
My job is step along career path I wish to follow	33	12	3	10	42	36	16	4	13	32	
I find my job interesting	45	31	5	9	10	49	26	3	9	13	
I enjoy my job	53	30	5	6	6	56	26	4	6	8	
My employer is supportive	53	32	6	4	6	57	22	10	5	5	
My work colleagues are supportive	63	26	7	3	1	70	19	8	1	2	
I would prefer to be doing a different job at the same or similar organization	34	10	7	8	41	32	12	6	15	35	
I would prefer to do a different type of job altogether	12	12	12	27	38	14	13	13	21	39	
I am actively looking for another job	22	9	5	12	53	17	9	7	10	57	
I have a plan for how I want my career	59	23	7	7	4	50	24	9	7	9	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	374					160					

Base population: respondents who had a job at the time of Wave 2 interview.

Grey shade - Significant difference between ALG recipients and non-applicants at 5% level.

8.7 Future plans

Table 8.17 What ALG recipients and non-applicants would like to do in the near future

Activity	ALG Recipients*		Non-applicants		column%
	A year's time	2 years' time	A year's time	2 years' time	
Full-time work or work based training	37	77	43	78	
Full-time education with a part-time job	35	6	30	4	
Full-time education with no job	18	5	12	2	
Part-time education	3	3	3	2	
Part-time work	3	3	5	3	
Looking after the home or family	*	1	1	1	
Taking a break /on holiday	2	2	2	2	
Voluntary work	1	0	0	0	
Part-time education with a job	*	0	1	1	
Doing something else	1	1	2	1	
Vague or irrelevant answer	*	*	*	2	
Don't know	1	4	1	4	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>589</i>	<i>292</i>	<i>258</i>	<i>160</i>	

Base population: 1 year's time: All Respondents ; 2 years' time: not intending to go into higher education.

Grey shade – difference between ALG recipients and non-applicants significant at 5% level.

The single most aspired future activity by both ALG recipients and non-applicants was full-time work or work -based training. 37% of ALG recipients would like to be in full-time work or work-based training in a years time. This increases to 77% with reference to two year's time. Full-time education, with or without a part-time job was also commonly reported (more so by ALG recipients than non-applicants) as what respondents would like to do in a year's time. Among those who would like to be in full-time education in future, the vast majority (91 % of ALG recipients and 85% of non-applicants) would prefer to go to University or a Higher Education College.

ALG recipients seemed fairly certain about their future plans, with 95% reporting that it was very or fairly likely that they will be able to do what they had reported that they would like to do in a year's or two years' time (Table 8.18). There was no significant difference between ALG recipients and non-applicants, although the proportion of non-applicants reporting that it was very or fairly likely that they would be able to realise their future plans was slightly lower.

Table 8.18 How likely ALG recipients and non-applicants thought they would be able to do what they would like to do in future.

How likely?	ALG Recipients*		Non-applicants		column%
	A year's time	2 years' time	A year's time	2 years' time	
Very likely	67	58	63	57	
Fairly likely	28	38	26	35	
Fairly unlikely	3	3	7	6	
Very unlikely	2	2	4	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	577	277	246	151	

Base population: 1 year's time: All Respondents; 2 years' time: not intending to go into higher education

8.8 Summary

- Patterns in activity changes provide some indication that ALG receipt is associated with better employment outcomes:
 - Compared to non-applicants, ALG recipients who were neither in education nor work at Wave 1 were significantly more likely to have moved to education, and less likely to remain unemployed and not in education at Wave 2.
- Overall patterns of employment-related outcomes were not significantly different between ALG recipients and non-applicants. However:
 - ALG recipients were significantly more likely than non-applicants to state that studying helped them develop better in their career; and
 - ALG recipients were generally more positive about future employment prospects - a significantly higher proportion said the course would lead to a better job in future or would help them gain new skills for an existing job, compared to non-applicants.
- Among ALG recipients, females were more likely to report favourable employment outcomes than males, especially gaining new skills and getting more job satisfaction.
- Unlike other ethnic groups, ALG recipients of Asian ethnic origin were less likely to report that studying helped them get a new/better job than their non-applicant counterparts
- Unlike ALG recipients, non-applicants living with neither parents nor partner were less likely to report that learning helped them gain new skills for an existing job.
- For both ALG recipients and non-applicants, the proportion of learners with and annual earning exceeding £10,000 increased considerably between Wave 1 and Wave 2, while the proportions with no earnings declined.
- ALG recipients showed a more consistent increase between Wave 1 and Wave 2 in the proportion of those employed in professional and skilled occupation groups, compared to the non-applicants.

9 CONCLUSIONS

The analysis in this report address three main aspects of the ongoing evaluation of ALG. These are as follows:

- the extent of ALG influence on course choice and retention;
- whether receipt of ALG is associated with improved learning and employment related outcomes; and
- sub-group differences in ALG experiences.

In addition, the results provide some insights on the grant's implementation. The findings are based on 2 survey waves of the first cohort of learners (2003/4) from the initial 10 LSC pilot areas. Evidence is also available from the second cohort of learners which is reported elsewhere³².

9.1 Perceived influence of ALG on course choice and retention

Evidence suggests that ALG had been important in influencing recipients' decisions to study full-time rather than part-time in about one-third of cases across local LSC areas. This is a respectable proportion, given the fact that ALG was announced very close to the start of the 2003/4 academic year when the vast majority of Wave 1 applicants had already chosen their courses. Of recipients who stated that ALG was important in their decision to study full-time, 11% said that they probably or definitely would not have gone ahead with the course without ALG, and about one-fifth (19%) of ALG recipients at Wave 1 stated at Wave 2 that they definitely/probably would have dropped out of the course without ALG. These results suggest that receipt of ALG is associated with full-time course choice and retention for a sizeable proportion of recipients.

It should be noted that the survey measured learners' perceptions, and the findings therefore may not provide an objective measure of ALG additionality. Also, the small proportions of recipients who said they would not have gone ahead with their course without ALG is likely to reflect, in part, a policy decision to permit retrospective applications. It is therefore possible that learners already studying for a Level 2 or 3 qualification subsequently submitted back-dated applications for ALG. Interpretations of findings should therefore take this into account.

³² Pound et al. (2006) Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant: Cohort 2 Wave 1 Report.

9.2 Is receipt of ALG associated with improved learning and employment related outcomes?

The analysis of the association between receipt of ALG and learning-related or employment-related outcomes provide some evidence that being an ALG recipient was associated with improved outcomes. The ILR data show that for both Level 2 and Level 3, qualifications studied by ALG recipients were significantly more likely to be achieved than those studied by non-applicants. The analysis of highest qualification outcome in the ILR and survey data yielded similar results, confirming that being an ALG recipient was associated with improved learning outcomes.

Despite data limitations, the patterns in activity changes provide some indication that being an ALG recipient was also associated with better employment outcomes. ALG recipients who were neither in education nor employment at Wave 1 were significantly more likely to have moved to education, and less likely to have remained unemployed and not in education, compared to their non-applicant counterparts. ALG recipients showed a more consistent increase between Wave 1 and Wave 2 in the proportion of those employed in professional and skilled occupation groups, compared to the non-applicants. In addition, ALG recipients were significantly more likely than non-applicants to state that studying helped them develop further in their career, and were generally more positive about future employment prospects.

Nevertheless, it is important that interpretations of the findings on the associations between receipt of ALG and learning or employment outcomes recognize the fact that ALG recipients may represent a self-selecting group who had chosen to apply for ALG and may have been previously different from learners who had not applied for ALG. Therefore, we cannot determine the extent to which the differences observed are attributable to ALG receipt or prior differences between the 2 groups.

9.3 Sub-group differences in experiences with ALG

The patterns of ALG award and employment outcomes by age and gender suggest more favourable outcomes for younger or female learners. Awardees were generally younger than non-awardees or non-applicants. Among applicants, those aged below 20 years were the most likely to be awarded ALG. On gender differences, qualifications studied by women were more likely to be achieved than those studied by men. Furthermore, unlike non-applicants, female ALG recipients were more likely to report favourable employment outcomes than their male counterparts.

The findings with respect to award of ALG and employment-related outcomes reveal interesting patterns by ethnicity. A lower proportion of non-applicants than awardees were White and a higher proportion were Black. Further analysis based on logistic regression confirmed that Black applicants were less likely to be awarded ALG than White applicants, even after taking into account other important factors associated with award of ALG. An examination of employment-related outcomes by ethnicity showed that ALG recipients of Asian origin were less likely to report that studying helped them get a new job. These results tend to suggest less favourable experiences for ethnic minorities which may or may not be linked to ALG and warrant further investigation.

ALG seems to be utilized mostly by learners who have fewer financial responsibilities. A higher proportion of awardees than non-applicants lived with their parents, did not pay rent, and had no dependent children. It is possible that the maximum amount of ALG award of £30 per week would be insufficient for learners with greater financial responsibilities. More non-applicants than awardees were in receipt of state benefits, including a greater proportion in receipt of out-of-work benefits such as Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) and Income Support (IS). As JSA and IS are not compatible with ALG, it is likely that the non-applicant sample contains a proportion of qualification-eligible learners who would choose to retain state benefits rather than apply for ALG and/or who would define themselves as not eligible for the grant. The lack of significant differences in learning or employment related outcomes by background factors such as age, living arrangements, tenure, or having dependent children suggest that it is unlikely the ALG has any differential impact by these background factors.

9.4 Implementation of ALG

Evidence suggests that the administrative provider has been applying qualification eligibility criteria effectively. Most applicants and non-applicants already held a qualification, most commonly an academic qualification although sizable proportions also held vocational qualifications. Most applicants and non-applicants held Level 2 qualifications or below. Nearly three-quarters of applicants were studying for a Level 3 qualification (this was particularly the case for applicants studying academic qualifications), and 80% of these were studying for a first qualification at that level. ALG has been relatively more successful in attracting learners with some sort of qualification to study at Level 3 rather than Level 2. Evidence suggests the ALG eligibility criterion relating to full-time education was being applied effectively. Nevertheless, the discrepancy between self-defined descriptions of education (i.e. full-time or part-time) and actual guided learning hours suggests that marketing needs to clearly and accurately portray ALG requirements on guided learning hours.

Although sources of information and advice used were generally very similar across the 2 samples, it may be worthwhile promoting ALG more rigorously among employers, New Deal and Jobcentre Plus advisers as a greater proportion of non-applicants receive information and advice from these sources, and a greater proportion of non-applicants in paid employment had enrolled on compulsory courses or on courses related to their job. Similarly, as a higher proportion of non-applicants said they were studying in order to 'start up their own or a family business', it may be worthwhile promoting ALG among organisations that support business enterprise and entrepreneurship.

Given the early implementation of ALG, an awareness level of 39% among non-applicants at Wave 1 is arguably respectable. Nevertheless, it is important to find ways to raise learners' understanding as well as their general awareness of ALG as a significant proportion of non-applicants believed, perhaps mistakenly, they would not be eligible for the grant. It may be the case that ALG has, initially at least, tended to attract learners who have a greater degree of awareness of a range of sources of education funding.

REFERENCES

Aldridge, F. and Tuckett, A. (2002). Two steps forward, one step back: The NIACE Survey on Adult Participation in Learning 2002. NIACE.

Beinart, S. and Smith, P. (1998). National Adult Learning Survey 1997. DfEE Research Report 49.

Cabinet Office Performance and Innovation Unit (2001). In Demand: Adult Skills in the 21st Century. London, PIU.

Department for Education and Skills (2003a). 21st Century Skills - Realising our Potential: Individuals, Employers, Nation. (CM5810). London: HMSO.

Department for Education and Skills (2003b). A skills for life survey: A national needs and impact survey of literacy, numeracy and ICT skills. DfES Research Brief RB490. HMSO.

Fitzgerald, R., Taylor, R. and La Valle, I. (2003). National Adult Learning Survey (NALS) 2002. DfES Research Brief No. RB415. HMSO.

Hillage, J. and Aston, J. (2001). Attracting New Learners: a literature review. LSDA.

La Valle, I. and Blake, M. (2002). National Adult Learning Summary 2001. DfES.

McGivney, V. (1993). 'Participation and non-participation: a review of the literature', in Edwards, R., Sieminski, S & Zeldin, D., Adult Learners, Education and Training, London: Routledge, pp 11-30.

Office of National Statistics (2004) Labour Force Survey, Winter 2003/4.

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

ANNEX A

Table A3.1 "Education is an investment in your future" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	
Age													
- 18-19	81	18	0	1	*	306	75	21	2	2	0	156	
- 20	83	15	1	2	0	365	77	21	0	1	1	103	
- 21-24	87	11	2	1	0	400	79	18	2	1	1	115	
- 25-31	92	6	1	1	1	210	83	12	1	1	3	87	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	84	15	1	0	0	127	74	20	2	2	3	112	
- Level 3	86	12	1	*	*	795	79	17	1	1	1	350	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	86	13	*	*	*	241	80	15	1	4	1	84	
- Black	91	8	*	*	1	96	91	5	2	2	2	62	
- White	84	13	1	1	1	904	75	22	2	1	1	296	
- Mixed/other	[90]	[8]	[0]	[3]	[0]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	84	14	1	1	0	927	76	21	2	1	*	295	
- lives with partner	87	10	1	1	1	168	85	10	0	3	2	55	
- other	88	8	2	2	0	186	80	15	1	2	3	111	
All cases	85	13	1	1	0	1,281	78	18	2	1	1	461	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Significant differences between proportions of awardees and non-applicants at the level of $p < 0.05$ are shaded

Table A3.2 “Learning should be funded by the Government” by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	<i>N</i>	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	<i>N</i>	
Age													
- 18-19	73	20	5	1	1	306	72	20	6	1	1	156	
- 20	73	20	5	1	1	365	77	12	9	3	0	103	
- 21-24	71	21	5	2	1	400	64	25	7	3	1	115	
- 25-31	71	24	4	1	0	210	70	18	6	4	1	88	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	71	21	6	1	0	127	69	21	7	3	0	112	
- Level 3	72	22	4	1	1	795	71	19	7	2	1	350	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	76	20	2	*	2	241	66	25	5	2	1	84	
- Black	79	16	2	3	0	96	71	14	10	3	2	62	
- White	71	22	6	2	1	904	71	19	7	3	*	297	
- Mixed/other	[72]	[21]	[5]	[3]	[0]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	73	21	5	1	1	927	74	18	6	2	*	296	
- lives with partner	70	21	7	2	1	168	64	26	7	3	0	55	
- other	72	20	4	3	1	186	67	19	9	4	2	111	
All cases	72	21	5	1	1	1,281	71	19	7	3	1	462	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Significant differences between proportions of awardees and non-applicants at the level of $p < 0.05$ are shaded

Table A3.3 “I don’t have the confidence to learn on their own” by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	<i>N</i>	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	<i>N</i>	
Age													
- 18-19	7	14	5	26	47	306	4	13	7	20	57	156	
- 20	5	11	7	26	53	365	5	15	5	27	49	103	
- 21-24	9	11	5	24	51	400	5	20	3	22	50	115	
- 25-31	8	12	6	28	46	210	7	12	5	24	52	88	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	11	13	4	29	44	127	9	18	6	23	44	112	
- Level 3	6	11	6	27	50	795	4	14	5	23	55	350	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	10	20	3	20	47	241	4	15	5	18	59	84	
- Black	10	9	1	31	49	96	3	12	5	21	59	62	
- White	6	10	6	27	51	904	6	16	6	24	48	297	
- Mixed/other	[8]	[15]	[8]	[26]	[44]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	7	12	5	26	50	927	4	16	5	24	51	296	
- lives with partner	5	10	6	27	52	168	7	16	2	28	47	55	
- other	10	11	5	25	49	186	6	12	8	17	58	111	
All cases	7	12	5	26	50	1,281	5	15	5	23	52	462	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Significant differences between proportions of awardees and non-applicants at the level of $p < 0.05$ are shaded

Table A3.4 “I would prefer to learn in a classroom” by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	<i>N</i>	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	<i>N</i>	
Age													
- 18-19	48	29	13	6	4	306	45	27	14	9	6	156	
- 20	47	29	12	8	5	365	52	26	11	9	3	103	
- 21-24	51	25	13	7	4	400	54	21	11	9	5	115	
- 25-31	55	28	13	3	2	210	59	21	14	4	2	88	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	53	29	6	8	5	127	62	22	6	9	1	112	
- Level 3	52	27	12	6	3	795	48	24	15	8	5	350	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	64	20	7	5	3	241	61	19	6	6	7	84	
- Black	57	24	8	6	5	96	68	15	5	8	5	62	
- White	45	30	15	6	4	904	44	28	17	8	3	297	
- Mixed/other	[54]	[23]	[13]	[8]	[3]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	50	28	11	6	4	927	49	26	13	8	4	296	
- lives with partner	44	26	21	8	3	168	47	24	12	12	5	55	
- other	54	25	13	5	4	186	62	17	11	6	4	111	
All cases	50	28	13	6	4	1,281	52	24	12	8	4	462	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Table A3.5 “I have a hidden talent that I would love to explore” by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	
Age													
- 18-19	28	30	12	17	11	306	31	29	18	14	7	154	
- 20	29	27	15	18	10	365	36	22	22	16	5	101	
- 21-24	37	23	16	13	10	400	33	28	18	12	10	115	
- 25-31	37	26	19	11	6	210	31	28	15	21	5	87	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	37	24	14	17	8	127	36	24	15	15	10	111	
- Level 3	32	27	16	15	10	795	32	28	20	16	6	346	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	39	30	9	14	8	241	47	21	11	12	9	82	
- Black	51	26	2	11	8	96	43	33	7	12	5	60	
- White	29	25	19	16	10	904	26	27	23	17	7	297	
- Mixed/other	[45]	[32]	[13]	[5]	[5]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	18	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	31	29	14	16	10	927	34	27	20	13	7	294	
- lives with partner	30	24	24	13	10	168	22	28	10	28	12	55	
- other	47	18	13	12	9	186	36	26	18	15	4	108	
All cases	33	26	15	15	10	1,281	33	27	18	15	7	457	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Significant differences between proportions of awardees and non-applicants at the level of $p < 0.05$ are shaded

Table A3.6 "Learning should be done throughout life" by age, qualifications and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	
Age													
- 18-19	67	22	3	4	3	306	71	18	5	4	2	156	
- 20	72	19	3	5	2	365	66	20	4	6	4	103	
- 21-24	73	20	2	3	2	400	63	29	3	2	2	115	
- 25-31	82	15	1	2	0	210	80	14	1	2	2	88	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	72	20	1	7	1	127	64	23	4	7	2	112	
- Level 3	73	20	2	3	2	795	72	20	3	2	3	350	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	79	12	2	5	2	241	69	17	5	6	4	84	
- Black	76	12	1	6	5	96	71	11	2	5	11	62	
- White	71	22	3	3	1	904	68	24	4	3	1	297	
- Mixed/other	[69]	[26]	[3]	[3]	[1]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	71	21	3	4	2	927	67	24	3	4	2	296	
- lives with partner	76	17	3	4	0	168	81	10	5	2	2	55	
- other	80	15	2	2	2	186	72	17	3	3	5	111	
All cases	73	19	3	4	2	1,281	70	21	4	4	3	462	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Significant differences between proportions of awardees and non-applicants at the level of $p < 0.05$ are shaded

Table A3.7 "I like the idea of learning in new ways," by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	
Age													
- 18-19	54	28	6	7	4	306	49	34	5	5	7	156	
- 20	54	35	5	4	2	365	43	44	3	7	3	103	
- 21-24	52	29	6	8	5	400	46	32	7	7	9	115	
- 25-31	48	25	9	11	7	210	44	30	9	8	9	88	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	46	31	6	13	4	127	51	27	5	6	11	112	
- Level 3	53	31	5	7	4	795	44	37	6	7	6	350	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	57	26	6	6	5	241	54	34	4	4	5	84	
- Black	52	29	7	7	5	96	60	26	5	2	8	62	
- White	51	30	6	8	5	904	42	36	7	8	7	297	
- Mixed/other	[56]	[33]	[8]	[3]	[0]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	53	31	5	7	4	927	47	36	4	7	7	296	
- lives with partner	51	27	8	10	4	168	46	32	7	7	9	55	
- other	53	23	10	6	8	186	43	33	9	7	8	111	
All cases	52	30	6	7	4	1,281	46	35	6	7	7	462	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Significant differences between proportions of awardees and non-applicants at the level of $p < 0.05$ are shaded

Table A3.8 “Learning is only worthwhile if there is a qualification at the end of it” by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	<i>N</i>	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	<i>N</i>	
Age													
- 18-19	29	20	6	20	24	306	26	21	4	27	22	156	
- 20	23	21	6	27	24	365	31	24	6	23	16	103	
- 21-24	18	20	7	27	28	400	33	22	3	19	23	115	
- 25-31	13	20	11	24	32	210	18	14	3	39	27	87	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	33	19	7	24	17	127	34	22	4	27	14	111	
- Level 3	18	22	6	29	25	795	25	20	5	26	25	350	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	40	20	8	18	14	241	42	26	1	20	12	83	
- Black	40	19	7	12	21	96	44	15	2	24	16	62	
- White	14	21	7	29	29	904	19	21	6	29	25	297	
- Mixed/other	[31]	[15]	[8]	[23]	[23]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	23	20	5	26	25	927	27	21	5	26	21	296	
- lives with partner	10	22	16	28	24	168	24	22	2	20	32	55	
- other	22	20	6	22	29	186	27	19	3	31	20	110	
All cases	21	20	7	26	26	1,281	27	20	4	27	22	461	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Significant differences between proportions of awardees and non-applicants at the level of $p < 0.05$ are shaded

Table A3.9 "Learning is not for people like me" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	
Age													
- 18-19	2	4	3	15	76	306	3	2	3	12	79	156	
- 20	3	4	2	11	81	365	2	4	3	23	69	103	
- 21-24	2	2	1	9	85	400	5	7	1	10	77	115	
- 25-31	1	3	1	6	89	210	5	2	0	5	88	88	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	4	2	0	15	80	127	7	4	3	14	72	112	
- Level 3	2	3	2	9	84	795	3	4	2	11	80	350	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	5	6	3	9	77	241	7	6	5	6	76	84	
- Black	8	2	5	9	76	96	10	5	0	5	81	62	
- White	1	2	1	11	85	904	2	4	2	15	78	297	
- Mixed/other	[0]	[3]	[0]	[13]	[85]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	3	3	1	12	81	927	3	5	3	15	74	296	
- lives with partner	1	1	2	8	89	168	2	3	0	5	90	55	
- other	3	3	4	5	85	186	8	3	1	7	82	111	
All cases	2	3	2	10	83	1,281	4	4	2	12	78	462	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Significant differences between proportions of awardees and non-applicants at the level of $p < 0.05$ are shaded

Table A3.10 "Courses related to hobbies and interests are just as valuable as work-related courses" by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants					<i>N</i>	Non-Applicants					Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %		Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	<i>N</i>
Age												
- 18-19	57	33	5	5	1	306	52	37	9	2	0	156
- 20	52	36	5	5	2	365	52	39	1	6	0	103
- 21-24	61	27	6	5	2	400	50	39	3	7	1	114
- 25-31	63	26	6	3	1	210	65	24	3	7	1	88
Current qualification level												
- Level 2	52	39	3	6	1	127	45	41	1	11	2	111
- Level 3	58	29	6	6	1	795	57	34	6	4	1	350
Ethnicity												
- Asian	50	33	7	6	3	241	55	31	7	7	0	84
- Black	52	31	6	8	2	96	44	39	2	11	5	61
- White	61	30	5	4	1	904	55	36	4	4	*	297
- Mixed/other	[54]	[28]	[5]	[10]	[3]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19
Living arrangement												
- Single, lives with parents	55	33	6	5	2	927	54	34	6	5	1	296
- lives with partner	64	30	3	2	0	168	68	26	2	4	0	54
- other	64	21	6	7	1	186	48	43	2	6	2	111
All cases	58	31	5	5	2	1,281	54	35	4	5	1	461

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Significant differences between proportions of awardees and non-applicants at the level of $p < 0.05$ are shaded

Table A3.11 “Computers are confusing and make things more difficult” by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	
Age													
- 18-19	6	8	6	24	57	306	4	12	8	24	52	156	
- 20	4	9	3	27	57	365	4	10	7	29	51	103	
- 21-24	6	10	6	22	57	400	7	19	8	23	44	115	
- 25-31	5	15	8	23	49	210	8	12	3	27	50	88	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	9	17	6	22	47	127	6	19	6	26	43	112	
- Level 3	4	8	4	24	60	795	5	11	7	25	51	350	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	4	10	3	25	59	241	4	12	5	16	63	84	
- Black	6	11	1	24	58	96	3	10	3	27	57	61	
- White	6	9	7	24	55	904	6	14	9	29	43	297	
- Mixed/other	[5]	[15]	[5]	[15]	[59]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	5	9	4	24	58	927	3	13	6	27	51	296	
- lives with partner	4	11	8	27	51	168	9	10	7	22	52	55	
- other	6	14	9	20	52	186	8	14	8	25	46	111	
All cases	5	10	5	24	56	1,281	5	13	7	26	50	462	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Significant differences between proportions of awardees and non-applicants at the level of $p < 0.05$ are shaded

Table A3.12 “Having fun is an important part of education” by age, qualifications, ethnicity and living arrangement (Wave 1)

	Applicants						Non-Applicants						Row %
	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	Agree Strongly %	Agree Slightly %	Neutral %	Disagree Slightly %	Disagree Strongly %	N	
Age													
- 18-19	73	22	2	1	2	306	75	21	1	2	0	156	
- 20	70	22	2	2	3	365	67	27	1	4	1	103	
- 21-24	78	17	1	2	2	400	72	24	0	2	2	115	
- 25-31	80	16	1	1	2	210	73	21	0	4	2	88	
Current qualification level													
- Level 2	75	19	1	1	4	127	70	21	1	8	0	112	
- Level 3	75	20	1	2	2	795	73	24	0*	1	1	350	
Ethnicity													
- Asian	74	17	2	3	4	241	72	23	0	5	0	84	
- Black	66	21	3	3	7	96	74	18	0	5	2	62	
- White	77	20	1	1	1	904	71	25	1	2	1	297	
- Mixed/other	[80]	[13]	[5]	[3]	[0]	40	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]	19	
Living arrangement													
- Single, lives with parents	76	20	2	1	1	927	71	25	1	3	1	296	
- lives with partner	76	20	1	2	2	168	81	19	0	0	0	55	
- other	72	17	3	3	6	186	72	21	0	4	3	111	
All cases	75	19	2	2	2	1,281	73	23	0*	3	1	462	

Base: Awardees and non-applicants

Table A7.1 Learning Aim Type codes included in analysis

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

Table A7.2a Learning outcomes for recipients by ethnic group: ILR data

Learning outcome						Column %
	Asian	Black	White	Mixed	Other	Total
Achieved	74	66	69	[90]	[64]	70
Partial achievement	6	8	3	[0]	[0]	4
No achievement	20	26	26	[10]	[36]	25
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	0	0	2	[0]	[0]	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>227</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>967</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>1293</i>

Base: Eligible qualifications studied by recipients, excluding qualifications not yet completed.

Table A7.2b Learning outcomes for non-applicants by ethnic group: ILR data

Learning outcome						Column %
	Asian	Black	White	Mixed	Other	Total
Achieved	62	53	55	-	[50]	56
Partial achievement	1	1	7	-	[0]	5
No achievement	36	46	37	-	[50]	38
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	1	0	2	-	[0]	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>132</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>432</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>661</i>

Base: Eligible qualifications studied by non-applicants, excluding qualifications not yet completed.

Table A7.3a Learning outcomes for recipients by living arrangements: ILR data

Learning outcome	Lives with partner	Lives with parents with or without partner	Lives with neither partner nor parents, lives alone	Column %
				Total
Achieved	77	69	70	70
Partial achievement	5	4	3	4
No achievement	18	25	25	25
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	0	2	1	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>1029</i>	<i>147</i>	<i>1289</i>

Base: Eligible qualifications studied by recipients, excluding qualifications not yet completed.

Table A7.3b Learning outcomes for non-applicants by living arrangement: ILR data

Learning outcome	Lives with partner	Lives with parents with or without partner	Lives with neither partner nor parents, lives alone	Column %
				Total
Achieved	53	56	59	56
Partial achievement	2	6	2	5
No achievement	41	37	38	38
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	5	1	0	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>472</i>	<i>124</i>	<i>660</i>

Base: Eligible qualifications studied by non-applicants, excluding qualifications not yet completed.

Table A7.4a Learning outcomes for recipients by housing tenure: ILR data

Learning outcome	Own or buying property	Lives with parents, rent free	Lives with parents, paying rent	Rents from council, HA, privately	Column %	
					Other	Total
Achieved	[78]	70	67	76	[76]	70
Partial achievement	[8]	4	4	2	[3]	4
No achievement	[15]	25	27	22	[18]	25
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	[0]	2	2	0	[3]	2
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>765</i>	<i>287</i>	<i>152</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>1293</i>

Base: Eligible qualifications studied by recipients, excluding qualifications not yet completed.

Table A7.4b Learning outcomes for non-applicants by housing tenure: ILR data

Learning outcome	Own or buying property	Lives with parents, rent free	Lives with parents, paying rent	Rents from council, HA, privately	Column %	
					Other	Total
Achieved	[92]	58	46	55	[57]	56
Partial achievement	[4]	6	6	2	[3]	5
No achievement	[4]	35	48	41	[40]	38
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	[0]	1	1	3	[0]	1
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>341</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>660</i>

Base: Eligible qualifications studied by non-applicants, excluding qualifications not yet completed.

Table A7.5 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by whether they had children: ILR data

Learning outcome	Recipients			Non-applicants			Column %
	Had child(ren)	No children	Total	Had child(ren)	No children	Total	
Achieved	76	70	70	60	56	56	
Partial achievement	6	4	4	2	5	5	
No achievement	19	25	25	37	38	38	
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	0	2	2	0	1	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>1191</i>	<i>1293</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>585</i>	<i>661</i>	

Base: Eligible qualifications studied by recipients and non-applicants, excluding qualifications not yet completed.

Table A7.6 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by age: ILR data

Highest learning outcome	Recipients					Non-applicants					Column %
	18-19	20	21-24	25-31	Total	18-19	20	21-24	25-31	Total	
Achieved	94	92	93	94	93	84	77	80	74	80	
Partial achievement	4	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	0	2	
No achievement	2	6	4	4	4	13	21	17	26	18	
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	0	0	1	0	*	0	0	1	0	*	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>228</i>	<i>204</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>725</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>385</i>	

Base: Recipients and non-applicants with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion.

Table A7.7 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by gender: ILR data

Highest learning outcome	Recipients			Non-applicants			Column %
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
Achieved	91	94	93	78	81	80	
Partial achievement	3	2	3	2	1	2	
No achievement	5	4	4	19	17	18	
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	*	0	*	1	0	*	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>333</i>	<i>392</i>	<i>725</i>	<i>163</i>	<i>222</i>	<i>385</i>	

Base: Recipients and non-applicants with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion.

Table A7.8a Learning outcomes for recipients by ethnic group: ILR data

Highest learning outcome						Column %
	Asian	Black	White	Mixed	Other	Total
Achieved	90	[93]	93	[100]	-	93
Partial achievement	5	[7]	2	-	-	3
No achievement	5	[0]	5	-	-	4
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	0	[0]	*	-	-	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>128</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>541</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>725</i>

Base: Recipients with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion.

Table A7.8b Learning outcomes for non-applicants by ethnic group: ILR data

Highest learning outcome						Column %
	Asian	Black	White	Mixed	Other	Total
Achieved	80	[74]	81	-	-	80
Partial achievement	0	[2]	2	-	-	2
No achievement	21	[25]	16	-	-	18
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	0	[0]	*	-	-	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>251</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>385</i>

Base: Non-applicants with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion.

Table A7.9a Learning outcomes for recipients by living arrangements: ILR data

Learning outcome				Column %
	Lives with partner	Lives with parents with or without partner	Lives with neither partner nor parents, lives alone	Total
Achieved	92	93	92	93
Partial achievement	3	3	3	3
No achievement	5	4	5	4
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	0	*	0	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>560</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>724</i>

Base: Recipients with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion.

Table A7.9b Learning outcomes for non-applicants by living arrangements: ILR data

Learning outcome				Column %
	Lives with partner	Lives with parents with or without partner	Lives with neither partner nor parents, lives alone	Total
Achieved	[85]	79	79	80
Partial achievement	[0]	3	0	2
No achievement	[15]	17	22	18
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	[0]	*	0	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>253</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>384</i>

Base: Non-applicants with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion.

Table A7.10a Learning outcomes for recipients by housing tenure: ILR data

Learning outcome						Column %
	Own or buying property	Lives with parents, rent free	Lives with parents, paying rent	Rents from council, HA, privately	Other	Total
Achieved	[91]	92	93	92	[95]	93
Partial achievement	[6]	3	3	0	[0]	3
No achievement	[3]	4	4	8	[5]	5
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	[0]	*	0	0	[0]	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>170</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>725</i>

Base: Recipients with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion.

Table A7.10b Learning outcomes for non-applicants by housing tenure: ILR data

Learning outcome						Column %
	Own or buying property	Lives with parents, rent free	Lives with parents, paying rent	Rents from council, HA, privately	Other	Total
Achieved	[100]	78	80	77	[82]	80
Partial achievement	[0]	4	1	0	[0]	2
No achievement	[0]	18	19	23	[18]	18
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	[0]	1	0	0	[0]	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>180</i>	<i>84</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>384</i>

Base: Non-applicants with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion.

Table A7.11 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by whether they had children: ILR data

Learning outcome	Column %					
	Recipients			Non-applicants		
	Had child(ren)	No children	Total	Had child(ren)	No children	Total
Achieved	91	93	93	79	80	80
Partial achievement	3	3	3	0	2	2
No achievement	6	4	4	21	17	18
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	0	*	*	0	*	*
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>650</i>	<i>725</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>320</i>	<i>385</i>

Base: Recipients and non-applicants with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion.

Table A7.12 Learning outcomes for recipients and non-applicants by level of prior qualification: ILR data

	Highest current qual L3 with L1 prior		Highest current qual L3 with L2 prior		Column %
	Recipients	Non-applicants	Recipients	Non-applicants	
	Achieved	93	78	93	84
Partial achievement	4	3	3	1	
No achievement	4	19	4	14	
Exam taken/assessment completed but result not yet known	0	0	0	1	
<i>Unweighted N</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>403</i>	<i>207</i>	

Base: Recipients and non-applicants with at least 1 qualification meeting criteria for inclusion.

Learning and Skills Council
National Office

Cheylesmore House
Quinton Road
Coventry CV1 2WT
T 0845 019 4170
F 024 7682 3675
www.lsc.gov.uk

© LSC September 2006
Published by the Learning and Skills Council

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

This publication is available in electronic form on the Learning and Skills Council website:
www.lsc.gov.uk

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

Publication reference: LSC-P-NAT-060573