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## HEADLINE FINDINGS

- Urban areas in Scotland were more likely to be rated as good for bringing up children than urban areas in the other countries of the UK. Thirty six percent of Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) parents living in urban Scotland rated their urban areas as 'excellent' for children to grow up in, compared with 26\% in urban England and 29\% in urban Wales.
- Lone parents in Scotland had larger flows into partnerships than in the rest of the UK. Thirty-six percent of lone parents in Scotland at sweep 1 (2001-02) had become a two parent family by sweep 2 (2003-05) compared with a flow of $28 \%$ for the rest of the UK, and this trend was particularly marked for younger mothers (aged 16-24).
- Paternal grandparents were far less likely to be alive in Scotland than in the rest of the UK: $65 \%$ of paternal grandmothers from Scotland's families were alive compared with $74 \%$ in the rest of the UK, and $56 \%$ of paternal grandfathers in Scotland compared with $64 \%$ in the rest of the UK. However, parents of Scottish cohort children were slightly older on average than those in the rest of the UK, so this may partially explain the difference.
- More mothers and fathers from the MCS cohort in Scotland had achieved higher levels of educational attainment than those in other UK countries. Sixty-three percent of mothers and $61 \%$ of fathers in Scotland had an education level of NVQ level 3 or above, in comparison with $52 \%$ (mothers) and $55 \%$ (fathers) in other UK countries. This may go towards explaining the higher frequency of reading with children reported overall by parents in the Scottish cohort.
- Rates of child injuries among girls in Scotland were higher than those for girls in the rest of the UK ( $35 \%$ in Scotland compared with $31 \%$ across the rest of the UK countries).
- Children in Scotland were ahead of those in the rest of the UK on expressive language skills (vocabulary) development at this stage. Results from the (BAS) British Ability Scales for vocabulary indicate higher scores for children in Scotland which could only be partly explained by further analysis. After taking other factors into consideration Scottish children were 1.5 months ahead of children in the rest of the UK at the same stage. (This issue is further analysed and discussed in a separate report).
- While the majority of parents across all UK countries reported drinking some alcohol, the numbers were slightly higher for Scottish mothers ( $88 \%$ ) and fathers ( $93 \%$ ) than in the rest of the UK ( $82 \%$ for mothers; $91 \%$ for fathers). However, those mothers and fathers in Scotland who were older, in higher socio-economic groups and had higher educational qualifications reported drinking larger amounts of alcohol per week than in the rest of the UK.
- Scotland's MCS mothers, who were employed when last contacted, had lower flows out of employment than those in the rest of the UK. Twelve percent of employed Scottish mothers moved out of employment between sweep 1 and sweep 2 in
comparison with $16 \%$ for the rest of the UK. Scotland's MCS mothers, who were not employed when last contacted, had higher flows into employment than those in the rest of the UK. Almost $30 \%$ of non-employed Scottish mothers had moved into employment by sweep 2 , compared with only $25 \%$ of MCS mothers in the other UK countries.
- Families in Scotland were both significantly less likely to flow into poverty (between sweeps 1 and 2) and significantly more likely to move out of it, than families in the rest of the UK. Of families in other UK countries living above the poverty line when last contacted, $15 \%$ had moved into poverty by sweep 2, whereas in Scotland this percentage was $12 \%$. Of families in other UK countries who were living in poverty when last contacted, $36 \%$ had moved out of poverty compared to $44 \%$ of such families in Scotland in the same period. (Issues surrounding family poverty differences are further analysed and discussed in a separate report).
- Mothers who had had another child since MCS sweep 1 showed a similar pattern in reported instances of post-natal depression across Scotland (30\%) and the rest of the UK ( $33 \%$ ). However, this rate was much higher for Scottish mothers in no-earner families ( $63 \%$ ) and indicates that they may be particularly vulnerable to post-natal depression, in comparison even to those in equivalent family circumstances in the rest of the UK ( $45 \%$ ).


## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Scotland's User Guide to Millennium Cohort Study Data

1. This report presents some of the main initial findings of a focus on Scotland's families in the Second Survey of the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS2) conducted by the Centre for Longitudinal Studies, which is based at the Institute of Education, University of London. It is intended to provide an introduction to potential users of the survey and to stimulate further in-depth and longitudinal analysis.

## 1 Introduction to Millennium Cohort Study

2. The Millennium Cohort Study offers large-scale information about children born into the New Century and the families who are bringing them up, for the four countries of the United Kingdom. Its second survey, with which this report is concerned, conducted in 20035 when the children were age 3 , is the first in a planned series of follow-ups, building on the first survey, carried out during 2001-2002.
3. The second sweep of the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS2) collected information from 1,814 families in Scotland who were part of 15,590 families of children born across the UK in 2000-2. The study's first sweep, carried out during 2001-2, when the children were aged 9-10 months old laid the foundations for this major new longitudinal research resource. It recorded the circumstances of pregnancy and birth, the all-important early months of life, and the social and economic backgrounds of the families into which the children were born.
4. The second survey data allow researchers for the first time to chart the changing circumstances of these children and their families and offer some direct measurements of the children's development at the age of three. Percentages reported here are re-weighted to provide representative estimates. There were differential rates of attrition by country from MCS1 to MCS2; a loss of $20 \%$ of Scotland's Sweep 1 MCS families from the sample at MCS2, compared with a $15 \%$ loss from England, $17 \%$ from Wales and $22 \%$ from Northern Ireland (Table 1.5). In addition, the loss of families from the Scotland sample was biased towards those without any educational qualifications although the rate of attrition in Scotland was higher than for England at all levels of education (Table 1.5). Low income families were less likely to respond than those with higher incomes in all countries. Among Scotland's families, the higher non-response rate than for England's families was visible at both high and low levels of family income (Table 1.5). Fortunately MCS3 has picked up and interviewed 1444 families across the UK who were not interviewed at sweep 2.
5. All references to Tables in this Executive Summary refer to the Annex Tables.

## 2 Housing, neighbourhood and community

6. Moving home is often an important event in the lives of families with young children. Over one third ( $38 \%$ ) of UK families interviewed when their child was $9-10$ months had changed their address by the time the child was 3, and this figure was higher in Scotland ( $41 \%$ ) (Table 2.1).The average distance moved was also much higher in Scotland ( 35 kms ) compared with the lowest average of only 11 kms in Northern Ireland (Table 2.2). Mobility
was more common among those on low incomes, but families in Scotland on very low incomes (under $£ 10,400$ p.a in 2001) were more likely to have moved (54.9\%) than those in the same income group in the rest of the UK (47.8\%) (Table 2.5). Similar findings were evident among families with no earners where $56.8 \%$ of such families in Scotland had moved address compared with only $43.5 \%$ in the rest of the UK (Table 2.6).
7. Parents in Scotland (41\%) were more likely to rate the area they lived in as 'excellent' for children to grow up in than parents in England (32\%) or Wales (35\%) (Table 2.8), and this more favourable rating persisted holding constant parents' socio-economic positions (Table 2.10). People living in rural areas were far more likely than those living in urban areas to rate their area as 'excellent' for their children to grow up in, for every UK country (Table 2.9) and people in rural Scotland were similar to those in rural England in this respect. However, people living in urban Scotland had the highest percentage of parents (36.4\%) across UK countries who rated their urban areas as 'excellent' for children to grow up in, compared with $26.1 \%$ in urban England and $29 \%$ in urban Wales. Parents in Scotland rated their area 'very safe' for children to grow up in $42 \%$ of cases which was higher than the rest of the UK (38\%) (Table 2.11) and especially higher among manager or professional parents in Scotland ( $49 \%, 44 \%$ in rest of UK) and small employers or self employed ( $55 \%, 41 \%$ in rest of UK) (Table 2.13). Employees in the lower NS-SEC groups were similar in Scotland and in the rest of the UK, in their thoughts about the safety of their area. Again people living in rural Scotland were far more likely than those in urban areas to say they felt very safe in their area, $62 \%$ of cases in rural Scotland compared with $58.5 \%$ in Rural England, $55.8 \%$ in rural Wales. But also people living in urban Scotland had a higher percentage (36.3\%) rating their area 'very safe', than those living in urban England ( $31.8 \%$ ), but not than those living in urban Wales (39.2\%) (Table 2.12).

## 3 Family demographics and relationships

8. Focusing on family demographics presents a picture of both change and stability in the membership of the cohort families (Tables.3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6). The Millennium child was more likely to be the first child in the family in Scotland than in the other UK countries giving families in Scotland smaller family size than families in the other UK countries at the outset of this study (Table 3.7, 3.8, 3.9). However, mothers in Scotland were catching up on family size but not quite eliminating the gap with those in other UK countries, especially Northern Ireland (Table 3.7) by sweep 2. By the time the cohort child was aged 3, it was slightly more likely that mothers in Scotland would have had another child than those in the rest of the UK. Mothers in Scotland between ages 30 and 40 were most likely to have had another child and have closed the family size gap with the rest of the UK (Table 3.8, 3.10). Families in Scotland were slightly less likely (8.5\%) than those in the rest of the UK ( $10 \%$ ) to have a half sibling to the cohort child in the family (Table 3.11, 3.12).
9. The proportion of families where parents were legally married was higher in MCS2 than in MCS1 by $4 \%$ with corresponding falls in the proportions of cohabitating couples and lone parents (Table 3.1). The rise in the proportion of families in Scotland who were married over this period was higher than in the rest of the UK and it was due to those mothers in Scotland aged 35 and above at MCS2 being more likely than mothers of the equivalent age in the rest of the UK to be married at this point. Younger mothers in Scotland at MCS2 (16-24) were slightly less likely than the rest of the UK to be married and far more likely to be cohabiting when the cohort child was aged 3 (Table 3.2). By the second sweep of MCS, the
percentage of lone mothers in Scotland's MCS families was lower than in the rest of the UK, especially marked where the mother is aged 16-24. This was a change from sweep 1 where England had the lowest rate of lone mothers. Scotland's drop in the percentage of lone mothers over this period should be seen against a slight rise in the UK as a whole (Table 3.1).
10. These net figures result from flows between having two or one parent families and between the state of marriage and cohabiting. Outflows from cohabiting to marriage were the lowest among mothers in Scotland compared with the other UK countries (Table 3.5). However, families in Scotland exhibited larger flows than the rest of the UK from being a lone parent at sweep 1, to being in a two parent family at sweep $2 ; 36 \%$ of lone parents in Scotland at sweep 1 had moved to be a two parent family by sweep 2 compared with a flow of $28 \%$ for the rest of the UK (Table 3.3, 3.4). Younger mothers (16-24) in Scotland stood out in this higher flow into 2-parent families compared with the those of equivalent age in the rest of the UK (Table 3.4). Scotland also had the highest rate, across the UK, of non-resident natural fathers moving back to live with the mother and their child, particularly higher than the rest of the UK in the youngest (16-24) and 35 or older age groups (Table 3.4, 3.17, 3.18). Non-resident fathers who moved into being resident fathers were more likely to have been married to the mother previously, or to have been a relationship (Table 3.19), and to have kept in contact with the child over the period (Table 3.30). Families in Scotland (84.6\%) were more likely than those in the rest of the UK (82.6\%) to have a natural father living in the household (Table 3.2, 3.15). However, the gap is much larger ( $58.5 \%$ in Scotland compared with $48.9 \%$ in the rest of the UK) when the mother was aged 16-24 (Table 3.16).
11. Similarly, in terms of the break up of 2-parent partnership families, couple families in Scotland had the lowest outflow rate, $6 \%$, from 2-parent families across the UK (Table 3.3, 3.4). Again the younger age group of mothers in Scotland had a particularly lower outflow rate compared to mothers of the same age across the rest of the UK (Table 3.4).
12. Families in Scotland were also less likely to have grandparent living in the household than families in the rest of the UK (Table 3.13), except where the mother was over 40 years of age (although this is a very small sample in Scotland) (Table 3.14).
13. Overall, the patterns of changes that have occurred to millennium families from 2001 to 2003-04 have some distinctive elements where Scotland stands out from the rest of the UK. There has been more movement in Scotland from lone parenthood into two parent families and towards marriage, partly from mothers getting back together with their earlier partners and in some cases getting married. This trend is more noticeable among mothers in Scotland who were young when having the Millennium child and are more likely than their counterparts in the rest of the UK to have moved to a 2 parent family.

## 4 Grandparents

14. Almost all the cohort children had at least one living grandparent at sweep 2 (Table 4.1, 4.2). However, the paternal grandparents of millennium children were less likely to be alive for families in Scotland than was the case for families in the rest of the UK; $65 \%$ of paternal grandmothers from Scotland's families were alive compared with $74 \%$ in the rest of the UK and $56 \%$ of paternal grandfathers in Scotland compared with $64 \%$ in the rest of the UK (Table 4.1, 4.2). Mothers and to a lesser extent fathers in Scotland were both slightly older on average than parents in the rest of the UK which would explain part of their having
fewer parents alive; $39.8 \%$ of mothers in Scotland were over 34 compared with $34.5 \%$ in the rest of the UK. Despite there being fewer grandparents alive among Scotland's families, care from grandparents for the cohort child up to age 3 was more common among families in Scotland than in the rest of the UK (Table 4.5); in $32 \%$ of couple families in Scotland grandparents provided some care for the cohort child compared with $26 \%$ in the rest of the UK, and for $34 \%$ of lone parent families in Scotland compared with $23 \%$ in the rest of the UK.
15. Although there were similar levels of being in contact with grandparents by families in Scotland and the rest of the UK, the frequency of contact of cohort parents with their own parents was slightly higher in Scotland than in the rest of the UK (Table 4.4).
16. Twenty-five per cent of the children had some form of childcare from a grandparent and 90 per cent of cohort families had received financial support from grandparents (Table 4.5). Financial support for couple families took place to the same extent in Scotland as in the rest of the UK, but financial support for lone parents from their own parents was higher for mothers in Scotland ( $88 \%$ ) than in the rest of the UK ( $79 \%$ ).
17. Maternal grandmothers in Scotland were the most likely of grandmothers across the UK families to have been in employment ( $70 \%$ ) when the cohort child's mother had been 14 years old (Table 4.7, 4.8). This is in contrast to Northern Ireland, where maternal grandmothers stood out as being far less likely to have been employed (53\%) than those in other countries when the cohort child's mother was 14.

## 5 Parenting

18. The study provides a rich resource to look at different aspects of parenting, particularly in relation to fathers. Both parents (where there were two living with the child) were asked a wide range of questions regarding their activities and behaviours with their children and their different parenting styles and beliefs. Their responses provide a unique picture of what parents were doing with their children at the age of three, and how well they felt they were managing as parents. There are many similarities in parenting practices and beliefs between mothers and fathers but the practices varied in ways that were consistent with men and fathers tending to work more and longer hours than women and mothers.
19. When asked about whether parents had enough time to spend with their child at age 3, thinking they had 'plenty of time' declined with the age of the mother and with the age of the father (Table 5.1). However, among families in Scotland fewer mothers than in the rest of the UK thought they had plenty of time, and this gap was evident across all age groups of mothers. The opposite was the case for fathers in Scotland, where fathers were more likely than fathers in the rest of the UK to say they had 'plenty of time' to spend with their 3-year old child (Table 5.2). Again the gap was still evident when fathers were compared at the same age (Table 5.3).
20. The frequency with which parents read to their 3 year old also displayed some country differences (Table 5.4). There was a higher frequency of reading among both mothers in Scotland than the rest of the UK, and fathers in Scotland compared with fathers in the rest of the UK (Table 5.5, 5.6); in both cases the gap remained when fathers were compared at the same age group. MCS mothers in Scotland had the higher levels of education than those in
other UK countries which is partly responsible for this higher frequency of reading with children; $62.8 \%$ of mothers in Scotland had NVQ level 3 or above compared with the UK MCS mothers' average of $51.7 \%$ (Table 9.2). Fathers in Scotland had the highest frequencies of reading to their children of fathers across the four UK countries (Table 5.5). This too is probably related to higher levels of education for fathers in Scotland; 61.2\% of MCS2 fathers had education of NVQ level 3 or above compared with $54.8 \%$ for the MCS UK average for fathers (Table 9.10). Fathers in Wales, however, were most likely to say they never read to their children ( 7 per cent) while fathers in Scotland were least likely to say this ( 3 per cent).
21. The regularity of children's routines varied a little by country but with Wales, not Scotland, standing out. In Wales, children had both the highest rates of regular bedtimes, always, but also the highest rate of never having regular bedtimes (Table 5.7, 5.8). Wales and Northern Ireland children also had higher percentages with regular mealtimes than children in Scotland or England (Table 5.9, 5.10). Regular bedtime had some relationship with families' employment in that no earner households tended to have the highest rates of irregularity in bedtime routines (Table 5.8).
22. Virtually all mothers said they wanted to impart such values as independence, obedience and respect (Table 5.13). But mothers in Northern Ireland were keener to instil religious values in their children than mothers in the other UK countries. Eighty-five per cent of Northern Irish mothers considered religious values important, compared with just over half in England, Wales and Scotland.
23. However, when asked about the things of most importance, families in Scotland were more likely $(55 \%)$ than those in the other UK countries ( $40-50 \%$ ) to select wanting children 'to think for themselves' (Table 5.12). This emphasis in Scotland persisted after controlling for mother's ages. However, these responses also varied by mothers' ages. More emphasis ( $59-60 \%$ ) was given to the importance of children thinking for themselves by older mothers in Scotland ( 35 years and over). In consequence mothers in Scotland placed a bit less emphasis than in other countries on obeying parents and helping others. Wanting children to be liked or popular or to learn religious values were pretty uncommon as the most important qualities in all countries
24. There was also an age divide on religious values. Older mothers wanted their children to adopt religious values ( 64 per cent of 35 to 39 -year-olds) but only a minority of 16 to 24 -year-old mothers ( 38 per cent) felt they were important. When mothers of the same age were compared, responses in Scotland indicated a slightly lower level of importance for religious values than the rest of the UK (Table 5.14).
25. In bringing up their children, mothers in Scotland reported the most use of 'lots of rules' ( $33 \%$ ) compared with a UK average of $31 \%$ (Table 5.15). However, at the same time, of mothers in Scotland who used rules, $46 \%$ suggested they 'strictly enforced' these rules, a lower percentage than gave this reply among similar mothers in England (50\%) and Wales ( $47 \%$ ), but a greater extent than mothers in Northern Ireland (41\%) (Table 5.16).
26. It will be interesting to discover whether these systematic and individual differences in parenting styles (Table $5.15,5.16,5.7$ ) and attitudes will change as the child gets older and whether they will be related to behaviour and attainment later on. This is something that MCS data will be able to reveal in the future.

## 6 Child health

27. This preliminary look at the health data collected by sweep 2 suggests that while the majority of pre-school children in the four UK countries were healthy, a minority were in poor health. One in six had a longstanding illness (Table 6.1). The survey also showed that children starting out in disadvantaged communities were more likely to suffer disability and ill health, and to experience more problems with vision and hearing, as well as asthma and other longstanding conditions, chronic infections and injuries (Table 6.1).
28. Families in Scotland were slightly less likely to report that millennium children had longstanding illnesses (Table 6.2). This could have been a result of differences in income since families at different income levels tend to have different levels of health or illness. When comparing families at the same broad level of income, families in Scotland did not have lower rates of longstanding illness (Table 6.3) although the MCS2 sample had a higher rate of attrition among low income than among higher income families (see Section 2). At levels of income that categorise a family as living in poverty ( $60 \%$ of the national median income), families in Scotland were slightly more likely than the rest of the UK to report that children had longstanding illnesses, although among those who had such illnesses, those in Scotland were less likely, than those in the rest of the UK, to find it limiting (Table 6.3).
29. On some other illness and health indicators, children in Scotland had a slight advantage; they were slightly less likely than in the rest of the UK to report having hearing problems (Table 6.6), speech problems (controlled for gender), asthma and wheezing; the latter two differences were not explained by either living in a disadvantaged area (Table 6.4), the gender of the child (Table 6.5), or whether mothers smoked during pregnancy (Table 6.6).
30. On hearing problems, families in Scotland reported the lowest rates across UK country-wards (2.6-2.8\%), compared with a UK average of $4.8 \%$ (Table 6.1). While this can represent a health advantage to children in Scotland, it can also represent lower levels of awareness and therefore needs to be considered in the light of country policies and practices on screening children for hearing problems.
31. Overall rates of immunisation were similar in Scotland as in the rest of the UK and slightly higher in Scotland on the combined MMR (Table 6.10, 6.11). The boost to the rate of opting for the separate MMR, visible in more advantaged wards in England, was absent in Scotland.
32. The rate of child injuries among girls in Scotland was higher than in the rest of the UK (Table 6.7, 6.8), although on some other health problems, such as recurring ear infections, rates were higher in Scotland than in England and Northern Ireland, but not Wales, when living in a disadvantaged ward (Table 6.4, 6.5, 6.6). The higher injury rate for families in Scotland with low income, visible in the sweep one MCS data, was not present at sweep 2 (Table 6.9).
33. Across the UK, $5 \%$ of children were obese and a further $18 \%$ were overweight ${ }^{1}$ (Table 6.12). Children in disadvantaged areas tended to be a little more likely to be

[^0]overweight and obese. In Scotland the rate of obesity was the same as in the rest of the UK with a slightly higher rate of children being overweight but not obese (19.2\%) in Scotland. Girls aged 3 in Scotland had a slightly higher rate of being overweight but not obese than girls in the rest of the UK and children living at incomes above the poverty line had slightly higher rates of problem levels of BMI in Scotland than in the rest of the UK (Table 6.13). The relationship between BMI and mothers' education was complicated. In general, having a mother with a degree was associated with lower rates of problem BMI values, and appeared, therefore, to work as a protection factor across the UK, but not to the same extent in Scotland (Table 6.14).
34. There were no statistically significant differences in obesity rates between boys and girls. However, some early and important gender differences in other health indicators were observed which were mostly evident across boys and girls in the rest of the UK. These differences were evident in boys and girls in Scotland, although not always reaching levels of statistical significance, probably due to smaller sample sizes. Boys were more likely than girls in Scotland and the rest of the UK to be delayed in toilet training and speech (Table 6.15), to have a longstanding illness, to have suffered from wheezing and asthma, recurring ear infections and to have required medical attention for injuries. Girls were more likely than boys to have had chickenpox and to have received the combined MMR vaccine. These variations may relate in part to different social expectations and early social experiences and may in turn influence access to early-years provision and later health.

## 7 Cognitive development and behaviour

35. The survey pioneered the mass collection of data on three-year-olds' cognitive skills in their own home. Two established assessments were used: the Naming Vocabulary Subtest of the British Ability Scales and the School Readiness Composite (SRC) of the Revised Bracken Basic Concept Scale. The first is part of a set of cognitive assessments designed to assess children's expressive language skills. The Bracken SRC consists of six tests that measure 'readiness' for formal education by assessing knowledge of colours, letters, numbers/counting, sizes, comparisons and shapes. Both of these age 3 child assessments were administered by survey team members in computer-assisted interviews.
36. The results show marked differences between children from advantaged and disadvantaged backgrounds in Scotland and the rest of the UK. Better cognitive scores were achieved by children from families who were highly educated and had above poverty incomes. The vocabulary assessment revealed that girls had marginally better expressive language skills than boys (Table 7.1).
37. Children in Scotland were ahead of those in the rest of the UK on expressive language skills (BAS) by an amount that represents about three months of development at this age (Table 7.1). Controlling separately for a range of other factors did not explain the higher BAS score for children in Scotland; the differential was not explained by differences of gender, family type, parental education, parental employment, parental occupation and annual family income (Table 7.2), when examined separately. However, in the rest of the UK children in families with two working parents had a higher BAS score than children in
families with one working parent; whereas in Scotland there was no difference according to whether there was one or two employed parents ${ }^{2}$.
38. Children in Scotland and girls also did better in the Bracken school readiness assessment than children in the rest of the UK and boys respectively (Table 7.3). The lead in average scores in Scotland is equivalent to about two months' progress while girls, on average, are three months ahead of boys. These differences were not explained by differences in gender, family type, parental education, parental employment, parental occupation and annual family income when examined as separate factors. Parents with highest education as NVQ level 2, and parents in small employer or self employed occupations did have the same mean Bracken scores in Scotland as in the rest of the UK (Table 7.4) ${ }^{3}$.
39. The children's emotional and behavioural problems were assessed using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. This was included in a computer-assisted self-completion exercise undertaken by parents (usually the mother). The results suggest that most children are relatively well-behaved and emotionally adjusted. However, children from more advantaged families were assessed as having fewer behavioural problems than the more disadvantaged. This was seen consistently across parental education, occupation and income. Girls were assessed as having fewer behavioural problems than boys (Table 7.5). These relationships were evident in the mean scores for children from Scotland as well as children from the rest of the UK (Table 7.6).
40. Children in Scotland had lower mean scores on this behavioural scale signalling they had fewer behaviour problems than children in the rest of the UK, and than children in England and Wales but not children in Northern Ireland (Table 7.5). The improved behaviour scores for children in Scotland over the rest of the UK were not explained by differences in gender, family type, annual family income and most levels of parental education, parental employment, parental occupation (Table 7.6), when examined as separate factors. 4

[^1]41. Lastly, the BAS and Bracken cognitive scores were linked to other age 9-10 month development indicators (Table 7.7, 7.8, 7.9). Children who were delayed in their gross or fine motor development at this younger age also had lower (BAS and Bracken) cognitive scores and higher (SDQ) problem behaviour scores at age 3.

## 8 Parental health and wellbeing

42. The health of parents matters in our account of the millennium children's lives as an important part of the context in which they are growing up. MCS2 collected data on health and related behaviours, including general self-rated health, longstanding illnesses, cigarette smoking, alcohol and recreational drug use, psychological morbidity, life satisfaction and height and weight. Each of these is considered for mothers and fathers in relation to age, country of residence, occupation, educational qualifications, family structure and employment status.
43. Most parents seem to be in reasonably good health, as would be expected of parents with children aged three. A minority rated their general health as fair or poor (Table 8.1). Mothers in Scotland had the lowest percentage rating themselves in this way (15.1\%), mothers in Wales the highest (17.7\%). Fathers in Scotland were in the middle range (13.5\%) between the highest percentages or poor health in England (14.1\%) and the lowest in Wales (12.1\%). The ranking of percentages with long standing illness by country (Table 8.2) differed from that of general self assessed health; parents in Scotland lay in the middle of a fairly narrow range for UK countries ( $22.7 \%$ of mothers; $22.1 \%$ of fathers), with parents in Northern Ireland appearing to be the most healthy on this measure ( $19.4 \%$ of mothers and $16.8 \%$ of fathers).
44. Both general self assessed health and longstanding illness of both mothers and fathers had relationships with socio-economic status, parents' education, marital status and being a lone parent (Table 8.3). Ill health was worse for parents with low or no educational qualifications, lower socio economic status groups (and among the self employed for long standing illness), no-earner families, or lone mothers. General ill health declined with age, although this was not so clearly the case for longstanding illness. In all of these relationships with parents' health indicators, parents in Scotland exhibited the same relationships as parents in the rest of the UK, where the sample sizes for parents in Scotland were sufficient to make the comparison. Deviations of Scotland from the rest of the UK tended to be found where sample sizes were low in Scotland.
45. In health-related behaviour we examined smoking and alcohol consumption. On parents' smoking, $28.9 \%$ of mothers and $30.5 \%$ of fathers in Scotland were smokers at MCS2 (Table 8.5). These statistics were similar to the rest of the UK statistics although with some variation in that mothers in Wales had a higher percentage (32.6\%) and fathers in Northern Ireland ( $25.2 \%$ ) a lower percentage of smokers.
46. Smoking was more prevalent among the youngest parents (Table 8.6). More than half of younger mothers (under 25) were smoking at the time of interview ( $52.2 \%$ in Scotland mothers, $54.4 \%$ in the rest of the UK) compared with about one in five of those aged 35 and over. Smoking was slightly higher among fathers than among mothers. The prevalence of smoking among both mothers and fathers varied with age, socio-economic circumstances, educational qualifications, employment status and marital status in the same ways in Scotland
as in the rest of the UK. There was a small tendency for fathers, but not mothers, in Scotland to be more likely to smoke than those in the rest of the UK when they were in the lowest socio-economic or educational group or were in a no-earner family (Table 8.6).
47. The large majority of parents also drank some alcohol (Table 8.7). Mothers in Scotland ( $88 \%$ ) were more likely than those in the rest of the UK ( $82 \%$ ) to drink alcohol at some time, although the gap was smaller for fathers with $93 \%$ in Scotland compared with $91 \%$ of fathers in the rest of the UK drinking alcohol. In terms of drinking alcohol five or more times a week, this was unusual among mothers ( $4 \%$ in Scotland and $8 \%$ in the rest of the UK) and $10 \%$ of fathers in Scotland, compared with $16 \%$ in the rest of the UK, drank alcohol frequently. Alcohol consumption was related to age, socio-economic status, education level and parents' employment in similar ways in Scotland as in the rest of the UK and for both mothers and fathers. Larger amounts of alcohol in-take went hand in hand with having higher amounts of income. However, mothers in Scotland tended to drink larger amounts per week than mothers in the rest of the UK, when they were at the high end of the alcohol spectrum - that is they drank more at higher ages, higher socio-economic status, higher educational qualifications and when they were in a two-earner compared no-earner or one earner families (Table 8.8). The same relationship was evident for Scotland's fathers but to a lesser extent. CAGE scores examine the frequency of drinking alcohol among those who do drink it. CAGE scores of drinkers in Scotland and the rest of the UK showed less of a gradient with socio-economic classifications, but highlighted problem drinking more clearly in lone parent and no earner families. Such problems were less notable in Scotland than in the rest of the UK (Table 8.9, 8.10).
48. Admitting to ever having used recreational drugs in the past year was slightly higher in Scotland than in the rest of the UK, $4.5 \%$ for mothers and $9.4 \%$ for fathers in Scotland compared with $3.8 \%$ for mothers and $8.2 \%$ for fathers in the rest of the UK (Table 8.11). For mothers and fathers, the likelihood of recreational drug use declined with age, and with higher socio-economic status or educational qualification groups. Usage rates were much higher among lone mothers, cohabiting mothers and fathers and in no earner families, and possibly at higher rates in Scotland than in the rest of the UK (Table 8.12).
49. A number of different indicators of mothers' mental health were used in the surveys. Mothers who had another baby since MCS1 were asked questions to identify post natal depression (Table 8.13). $30.5 \%$ of such mothers in Scotland and $33 \%$ in the rest of the UK said they had felt low or sad for two weeks or more, although this Scotland advantage was reversed for no earner families but not for lone parent families (Table 8.14). In terms of having been diagnosed with depression, $31 \%$ of mothers in Scotland and 28\% in the rest of the UK said they had been diagnosed with depression by a GP (Table 8.15). Mothers in Scotland ( 9.8 per cent) were less likely than mothers in Northern Ireland (11.3 per cent) but more likely than mothers in Wales ( 8.7 per cent) or England ( 7.4 per cent) to be receiving treatment for depression. However, the vast majority of cohort children's parents (around 5 out of 6) said they were reasonably satisfied with their lives, $83 \%$ of mothers and $87 \%$ of fathers in Scotland on a par with $82 \%$ of mothers and $87 \%$ of fathers in the rest of the UK (Table 8.19, 8.20).
50. Parents' height and weights were collected in order to calculate their BMI values. Mothers and fathers in Scotland were slightly less likely than those in the rest of the UK to have BMI problem scores (Table 8.21). In Scotland $12.9 \%$ of mothers were obese on this calculation and a further $24 \%$ classified as overweight but not obese. In comparison, in the
rest of the UK, $14 \%$ of mothers were obese and $23.5 \%$ were overweight but not obese. Among Scotland's fathers, $14.8 \%$ were obese and a further $46.4 \%$ were overweight but not obese compared with $16.8 \%$ obese and $45.6 \%$ overweight but not obese in the rest of the UK. For both mothers, and fathers, problem BMI values were more common at lower levels of both socio-economic status and educational qualifications, but seemed unrelated to family employment, marital status or ages of parents (Table 8.22). These relationships were similar for the rest of the UK and for Scotland, as far as it was possible to tell given the small sample sizes.

## 9 Parental employment and education

51. The economic activity of parents is another vitally important element of the context in which the cohort child is growing up. It influences not only the income level and household resources but the time available to spend with the child. Just over half (54\%) of the UK millennium cohort mothers were employed when their child was three, up from around $50 \%$ in the first survey, although in Scotland $64 \%$ of mothers were employed at age 3 (Table 9.1). However, Scotland's MCS mothers at MCS2 were more highly qualified than those in the rest of the UK (Table 9.2). Mothers in Scotland with degree level qualifications were more likely to be employed than degree qualified mothers in the rest of the UK; $21.5 \%$ of mothers in Scotland worked full time at MCS2 compared with $19.8 \%$ in the rest of the UK, and $52.1 \%$ in Scotland worked part time, $49.7 \%$ in the rest of the UK (Table 9.3). The split between full and part-time hours was similar in Scotland and the rest of the UK at one quarter full-time and three quarters part-time hours (Table 9.1). However, at lower levels of education (NVQ3 and below), employed mothers in Scotland were more likely to work part-time hours and less likely to be not working than those in the rest of the UK (Table 9.3). The share of part-time working among employed mothers was not related to whether or not they had a grandparent alive in Scotland or the rest of the UK.
52. There were sizeable changes of status for mothers between MCS1 and MCS2 interviews and Scotland's MCS mothers had lower flows out of employment and higher flows into employment than those in the rest of the UK; 12.5\% of mothers in Scotland employed at MCS1 were not employed at MCS2 ( $15.6 \%$ in the rest of the UK), and $29.5 \%$ of Scotland's mothers who were not employed at MCS1 were employed at MCS2 $(25 \%$ for the rest of the UK) (Table 9.4). These flows are despite the fact that Scotland's mothers had higher rates than the rest of the UK of having a new baby by MCS2 (Section 2).
53. The proportion of MCS fathers who were self employed was lower in Scotland (14\%) than in the rest of the UK (18\%) at this time (Table 9.9), although this MCS figure for the UK was higher than the UK national average in 2003-04. The overall employment rates for MCS fathers was similar in Scotland and the rest of the UK (Table 9.9).
54. Combining of mothers' and fathers' employment rates, to give a family classification of employment types, gives families in Scotland a higher proportion of families with 2 earners than in the rest of the UK (Table 9.13); 13.7\% of families in Scotland had 2 full-time earners ( $10.8 \%$ in the rest of the UK), and 36.7 per cent had 1.5 earners ( $34.1 \%$ in the rest of the UK). The higher rates of employment and socio-economic status (below) of mothers in Scotland is due to the disproportionate loss of lower educated and low income families from the MCS2 sample of families in Scotland.
55. There were some small differences between the socio-economic profiles of Scotland's mothers, employed mothers in Scotland having $42.1 \%$ in professional or managerial occupations compared with $39.6 \%$ in the rest of the UK (Table 9.14). However, fathers in Scotland were slightly less likely to be in this top group of occupations than fathers in the rest of the UK (Table 9.15).
56. Scotland had the highest country percentage of employed mothers working on Saturdays ( $16.3 \%$ ) and the highest percentage using job share arrangements (Table 9.16). Also, when not employed, mothers in Scotland were slightly less likely to say they preferred to look after their own family or their own children, than those in the other UK countries (Table 9.21).

## 10 Income and poverty

57. The survey was able to estimate whether parental net income fell below a given threshold ( 60 per cent of the national median) after our own adjustment for family size and composition. The proportion of cohort families in this poverty category, in the UK, remained stable between MCS1 and MCS2 at 26\%. The proportion of families in Scotland falling below this threshold in sweep 2 was lower at $21 \%$ (Table 10.1). At MCS sweep, 1 Scotland's rate of family income poverty was $23 \%$ which was the same as the rate in England and Northern Ireland, but less than in Wales (27\%). Part of this improvement in Scotland was found to be due to the higher drop-out rate between surveys of families in Scotland, and especially higher drop-out rates from the lower income groups. ${ }^{5}$
58. Groups at higher risk of being in family income poverty at the second survey in Scotland as in the rest of the UK (Table 10.2, 10.3), included:

- lone parents without employment;
- lone parents with employment;
- no-earner couples;
- couples with the mother employed but the father not employed;
- families with three or more children;
- having a mother or a father with no qualifications; or
- having an employed father in a semi-routine or routine occupation.

59. Living in poverty in Scotland and the rest of the UK was also more common among mothers who were under 20 and also those who were 21-25 years old. In most of these cases, these additional factors, when examined separately, did not explain the lower levels of poverty and risk attached to families in Scotland compared with the rest of the UK. One exception, although based on a very small sample, was lone parents who were not employed

[^2]who were more likely in Scotland to be living in poverty (94.8\%) compared with the rest of the UK ( $91.2 \%$ ) (Table 10.2). One other difference was that mothers in Scotland who had NVQ qualifications to levels 1 or 2 had well above average rates of living in poverty where in the rest of the UK, this level of qualification was associated with well below average rates of family poverty (Table 10.3).
60. A majority of those who were struggling to manage financially were in poverty, and could accurately be said to be 'suffering' poverty. However, the link between poverty status and subjective poverty was not always direct. Over four in ten of those finding it difficult to manage were estimated to have income above the poverty line both in Scotland and in the rest of the UK, and 9 per cent of those in the UK ( $5 \%$ in Scotland) who said they were 'living comfortably' had income below the threshold (Table 10.4). Almost one half of those living below the poverty threshold indicated they had lower levels of satisfaction with their lives in both Scotland and the rest of the UK (Table 10.4).
61. Changes took place in families' financial circumstances between MCS sweeps 1 and 2. The flows between living in and out of poverty showed distinctive differences in Scotland from the rest of the UK (Table 10.5). Families in Scotland were both significantly less likely to flow into poverty over this period, and significantly more likely to flow out of it, than families in the rest of the UK. Whereas $12 \%$ of families who were not in poverty in Scotland at MCS1 ended up in poverty at MCS2 in Scotland, the equivalent figure for the rest of the UK was $15 \%$. Also, $44 \%$ of families who were in poverty in Scotland at MCS1 moved out of this state by MCS2, compared with $36 \%$ of families in the rest of the UK. The relative sizes of these flows helped families in Scotland to have a lower rate of family poverty at MCS2 compared to the rest of the UK. However, differential attrition from MCS1 to MCS2 of families in Scotland, and low income families in particular, compared with England, also contributed to this lowering of Scotland's rate of family poverty. The data collected will be able to throw further light on how families spend their money and what they cannot afford, and on movements in and out of poverty.

## 11 Childcare and early education

62. The majority of pre-school children now experience some non-maternal care. Childcare outside the family at age 3 is not solely 'custodial' arrangements for working mothers. About six out of ten children in MCS2 were in at least one form of childcare (usually just one). Mothers making these arrangements were both employed and not employed. Compared with all mothers who were employed who had made arrangements about childcare, 22 per cent of non-employed mothers had made childcare arrangements. Arrangements were broadly similar between Scotland and the rest of the UK. It was Northern Ireland children that had a more distinct profile of childcare from the other UK countries.
63. The main arrangement was classified as 'formal group care' if it involved a group setting such as a day nursery or nursery school, slightly less in Scotland ( $27.7 \%$ families) compared with the rest of the UK ( $31.8 \%$ ) (Table 11.1). Formal childcare in a non-group setting, such as childminder or nanny were at similar percentages in Scotland (13\%) and the rest of the UK $(12 \%)$. Formal care, of both types, was more commonly used by mothers in higher socio-economic status groups, among the more highly educated, and in higher family income groups in Scotland, as in the rest of the UK (Table 11.2). The other 57 per cent of
arrangements, classified as 'informal', involved family members, mainly grandparents ( $31.3 \%$ in Scotland, $28.9 \%$ in the rest of the UK), and neighbours or other relatives $(8.1 \%$ in Scotland, $5.9 \%$ in the rest of the UK). Grandparent care was more commonly used as the main source of care by those in lower socio-economic groups, by those with lower education qualifications, and by those working part time. In addition, some employed mothers or their partners looked after their children themselves while working ( $19.9 \%$ in Scotland, $21.4 \%$ in the rest of the UK). This was less common among mothers in manager and professional jobs, and among the highly educated. These relations were similar across the rest of the UK and Scotland (Table 11.2).
64. Children of employed mothers were in childcare for 21 hours a week on average (21.2 hours in Scotland and 20.6 hours per week in the rest of the UK) (Table 11.4). Children whose mothers were not employed were in care approximately 9 hours less per week than those whose mothers were in employment; for an average of 13.7 hours per week in Scotland and 12.1 hours per week in the rest of the UK (Table 11.3). Children looked after by their working mothers spent 25.5 hours per week on average in Scotland in that form of care, 32.6 hours a week in the rest of the UK (Table 11.4). When partners provided care while the mother was at work, fathers' weekly hours of care were similar, 20.4 hours per week in Scotland and 18.8 hours in the rest of the UK. However, when childcare was provided by partners (mainly fathers of the child) to children whose mother was not employed, fathers average hours of care were longer in Scotland (23.3 per week) than in the rest of the UK (15 hours per week) (Table 11.4). However, it is perhaps surprising that amounts of time fathers cared for the children were not more dissimilar according to whether the mother was employed or not.
65. On average, nurseries and crèches offered the most expensive form of childcare and the prices were all slightly higher per hour in the rest of the UK than in Scotland (Table 11.5). The average price for childminder, nanny, au pair and other non-relative care was $£ 3.16$ per hour in Scotland, $£ 3.57$ per hour in the rest of the UK, nurseries were $£ 3.54$ in Scotland and $£ 3.79$ per hour in the rest of the UK.
66. Although the use of formal care was higher in the highest income group, relatively high percentages of children from the most socio-economically disadvantaged groups were also receiving formal care, higher in Scotland (33.4\%) than in the rest of the UK (29.7\%) in the lowest income group (below $£ 181$ per week in 2003-4).

## 12 Potential for further use

67. The basic analyses carried out for this Report point to a number of ways in which families in Scotland appear to be distinctive from families in the rest of the UK. These are areas that could be investigated further, as listed below.

- Urban areas are more likely to be rated as good for bringing up children than urban areas in the other countries of the UK
- Lone parents have larger flows into partnerships in Scotland than in the rest of the UK.
- Paternal grandparents were far less likely to be alive in Scotland than in the rest of the UK. Fathers of the cohort child in Scotland were slightly older than those in the rest of the UK, so this will explain part of the difference.
- It would be interesting for the rest of the UK to know why fewer relatively advantaged families in Scotland declined the combined MMR vaccination for their children.
- Rates of child injuries among girls in Scotland was higher than in the rest of the UK although some other health problems such as recurring ear infections, were higher in Scotland than the rest of the UK, when living in a disadvantaged ward.
- Mothers and fathers in Scotland tended to drink larger amounts per week when they were older, in higher socio-economic groups and with higher educational qualifications.
- There may be higher rates of post natal depression among mothers in no-earner or lone parent families in Scotland than the rest of the UK.
- Children in Scotland appear to experience different numbers of weekly hours of childcare, for the different types of care they are given, and according to whether their mother is employed or not employed.

68. When future sweeps are available, other analyses will be possible: for example,

- There are differences in parenting styles between mothers in Scotland and the other UK countries. It would be possible, with future sweeps on MCS to examine whether differences in parenting style at age 3 affect child outcomes measures at older ages.
- Differences visible in transitions from MCS sweep 1 to sweep2 into and out of family poverty between Scotland and the rest of the UK will be able to be analysed. The data collected will also be able to throw further light on how families spend their money and what they cannot afford.


## CHAPTER ONE. THE MILLENNIUM COHORT STUDY DETAILS

## Note on sample sizes in rest of the Report's Annex

1.1 In the rest of this Report the Tables report the sample sizes, even when the base and cell sizes are small. Where the base or any individual cell statistics is based on less than 50 cases, the statistic is put in parentheses.

## Note on Table numbering in rest of the Report's Annex

1.2 Tables on Scotland only are given an ' $a$ ' in addition to their number. For the equivalent table for the rest of the UK (England, Wales and Northern Ireland) the same table number is adopted and a ' $b$ ' added.

## Weights

1.3 All of the statistics have been weighted by, in the case of Scotland, the country weight, and, in the case of the rest of the UK, by a specially constructed weight to reflect these 3 countries. The sample sizes given in each table are the unweighted sample sizes, unless otherwise specified.

## Units of analysis in case of children

1.4 Where analyses are reported about children, only one child in families of twins and triplets are included.

## Details of Millennium Cohort Study

Table 1.1 Achieved Samples in MCS1 and MCS2


## Notes to table

* counting 'superwards' as a single unit
** all productive contacts
*** excluding proxy interviews
All numbers unweighted

Table 1.2 MCS1 productives by MCS1 and MCS2 country

| MCS1 <br> UK <br> Country |  |  |  | MCS2 | K Country |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland | Country <br> Unknown | Total |
|  | England | 83.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 16.5 | 100 |
|  |  | 9305 | 24 | 22 | 7 | 2175 | 11533 |
|  | Wales | 2.0 | 80.3 | 0.0 | 0 | 17.7 | 100 |
|  |  | 56 | 2204 | 1 | 0 | 499 | 2760 |
|  | Scotland | 1.6 | 0.2 | 76.7 | 0.1 | 21.4 | 100 |
|  |  | 33 | 4 | 1775 | 2 | 522 | 2336 |
|  | Northern Ireland | 1.1 | 0 | 0.1 | 76.2 | 22.6 | 100 |
|  |  | 22 | 0 | 2 | 1441 | 458 | 1923 |
|  | Total | 49.5 | 13.2 | 10.6 | 8.6 | 18.0 | 100 |
|  |  | 9416 | 2232 | 1800 | 1450 | 3654 | 18552 |

## Notes to table

Unweighted numbers and row percents.
Country unknown combines unproductive and ineligiible'

Table 1.3 MCS2: Summary of MCS2 Survey Elements

| Respondent | Mode | Summary of Content |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mother/Father | Interview | Household Module |
| Mother/main | Interview | Household Module <br> Module A: Non-resident parents <br> Module C: Pregnancy, labour and delivery <br> Module D: Baby's health and development <br> Module E: Childcare <br> Module F: Grandparents and friends <br> Module G: Parent's health |
|  | Self-completion | Module H: <br> - Child's temperament \& behaviour <br> - Relationship with partner <br> - Previous relationships <br> - Domestic tasks <br> - Previous pregnancies <br> - Mental health <br> - Attitudes to relationships, parenting, |
|  | Interview | Module J: Employment, income, education <br> Module K: Housing and local area <br> Module L: Interests and time with baby <br> Module N : Older Siblings |
| Father/Partner | Interview | Module B: Father's involvement with baby Module C: Pregnancy, labour and delivery Module F: Grandparents and friends Module G: Parent's health |
|  | Self-completion | Module H: Self-completion <br> - Baby's temperament \& behaviour <br> - Relationship with partner <br> - Previous partners <br> - Previous children <br> - Mental health <br> - Attitudes to marriage, parenting, work, |
|  | Interview | Module J: Employment and education Module L: Interests |
| Interviewer | Observations | Home Environment Neighbourhood |
| Child | Assessment | BAS Naming Vocabulary Bracken Basic Concept Scale Height \& Weight Oral fluids |
| Older Siblings <br> (England only) | Self-completion |  |

[^3]Table 1.4 Distribution of cohort member's age at MCS2

| Age (Months) | UK- N | UK $-\%$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| $31-34$ | 10 | 0.063 |
| 35 | 1756 | 11 |
| 36 | 6802 | 43 |
| 37 | 3294 | 21 |
| 38 | 1506 | 9.5 |
| 39 | 731 | 4.6 |
| 40 | 410 | 2.6 |
| 41 | 267 | 1.7 |
| 42 | 179 | 1.1 |
| 43 | 158 | 1.0 |
| 44 | 140 | 0.89 |
| 45 | 149 | 0.94 |
| 46 | 104 | 0.66 |
| 47 | 102 | 0.65 |
| $48-54$ | 191 | 1.2 |
| Total number of children, $\%$ | 15799 | 100 |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 main sample
Note: Interview date is missing for 9 cases.

Table 1.5 Rates of attrition MCS1 to MCS2 by country by NVQ at MCS1 and family income at MCS1

## Percent of MCS1 sample non-productive at MCS2

| Status At MCS1 | England |  | Wales |  | Scotland |  | Northern Ireland |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | ( N$)$ | \% | (N) | \% | (N) | \% | (N) |
| NVQ5 | 9 | (364) | 7 | (53) | 13 | (98) | 16 | (83) |
| NVQ4 | 9 | (2853) | 10 | (665) | 11 | (676) | 15 | (486) |
| NVQ3 | 14 | (1466) | 17 | (379) | 19 | (484) | 21 | (269) |
| NVQ2 | 16 | (3256) | 19 | (881) | 25 | (615) | 24 | (579) |
| NVQ1 | 20 | (1033) | 18 | (271) | 30 | (99) | 28 | (156) |
| Overseas | 25 | (436) | 19 | (44) | 32 | (37) | 30 | (34) |
| None | 27 | (1989) | 29 | (446) | 37 | (287) | 30 | (295) |
| Total | 15 | (11397) | 17 | (2739) | 20 | (2296) | 22 | (1902) |
| * Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above 60\% median income | 13 | (7470) | 15 | (1809) | 17 | (1613) | 19 | (1191) |
| Below 60\% | 25 | (3719) | 24 | (900) | 29 | (662) | 29 | (696) |
| Total* | 16 | (11426) | 17 | (2744) | 20 | (2303) | 22 | (1912) |

[^4]
## CHAPTER TWO. HOUSING, NEIGHBOURHOOD AND COMMUNITY

## Mobility of residence

Table 2.1 Residential mobility by UK country at MCS 1

| Country at MCS1 | Mobile <br> percent | Base <br> (N) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| England | 38.1 | 11426 |  |
| Wales | 34.8 | 2744 |  |
| Scotland | 40.6 | 2303 |  |
| Northern Ireland | 32.6 | 1912 |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 3 8 5}$ |  |

## Notes to table

Base: Country MCS1 main sample
Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
Chi square: $17, \mathrm{P}$ value: 0.0041

Table 2.2 Mean distance moved by UK country living in at MCS1

| Country at MCS1 | Distance moved (Km) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Mean (n) | Std. Err. | $\mathbf{9 5}$ \% CI |
| England | $24.6(3960)$ | 1.6 | $21.4-27.8$ |
| Wales | $12.6(891)$ | 1.3 | $10.1-15.1$ |
| Scotland | $35.1(874)$ | 6.0 | $23.3-46.9$ |
| Northern Ireland | $10.8(576)$ | 1.7 | $7.4-14.2$ |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS1 Main respondents at MCS2 whose contact address had moved house since MCS1 excluding those ineligible (international migrants and deaths) for MCS2. Unweighted sample numbers

Table 2.3a (Scotland) Residential mobility by type of accommodation at MCS1

| Type of accommodation ay MCS1 | Mobile <br> \% (n) | Base <br> (N) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| House or bungalow | 32.6 | 1581 |  |
| Flat or maisonette | 60.5 | 708 |  |
| Other (studio flat, rooms, bedsit, etc) | $72.4(5)$ | $(7)$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 0 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 9 6}$ |  |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS1 main sample in Scotland living in type of accommodation at MCS1
Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers
Chi square: $151, \mathrm{P}$ value $<0.001$

Table 2.3b (Rest of UK) Residential mobility by type of accommodation at MCS 1

| Type of accommodation at MCS1 | Mobile <br> \% | Base <br> (N) |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| House or bungalow |  | 34.8 |
| Flat or maisonette | 58.4 | 14006 |
| Other (studio flat, rooms, bedsit, etc) | 73.5 | 1942 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 7 . 7}$ | 97 |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS1 main sample in England, Wales and NI living in accommodation at MCS1
Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers
Chi square: $425, \mathrm{P}$ value: 0.0012

Table 2.4a (Scotland) Residential mobility by tenure at MCS 1

| Housing tenure at MCS1 | Mobile <br> $\%$ | Base <br> (N) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Buying | 32.9 | 1393 |
| Renting | 51.3 | 749 |
| Other* | 65.4 | 153 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 9 5}$ |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS1 main sample in Scotland with housing tenure at MCS1
Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers
*Other includes living with parents, living rent-free, squatting.
Chi square: 106, P value: $<0.001$

## Table 2.4b (Rest of UK) Residential mobility by tenure at sweep 1

| Housing tenure at MCS 1 | Mobile <br> \% | Base <br> (N) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Buying |  | 30.7 |
| Renting | 47.6 | 9210 |
| Other* | 62.8 | 5809 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 7 . 7}$ | 1013 |

[^5]Table 2.5a (Scotland) Residential mobility by family income at MCS 1

| Family income at MCS1 <br> (banded) | Mobile <br> \% (n) | Base <br> (N) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $£ 0-£ 10,400 \mathrm{pa}$ | 54.9 | 539 |
| $£ 10,400-£ 20,800 \mathrm{pa}$ | 39.5 | 677 |
| $£ 20,800-£ 31,200 \mathrm{pa}$ | 36.2 | 424 |
| $£ 31,200-£ 52,000 \mathrm{pa}$ | 36.7 | 359 |
| $£ 52,000-\mathrm{plus}$ pa | $29.3(35)$ | 115 |
| Don't know | 37.1 | 125 |
| Refused to answer | $28.5(18)$ | 58 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 9 7}$ |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS1 main sample in Scotland by income response at MCS1.
Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers
Chi square: 58: P value: $<0.001$

Table 2.5b (Rest of UK) Residential mobility by family income at MCS 1

| Family income at MCS1 <br> (banded) | Mobile <br> \% | Base <br> (N) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $£ 0-£ 10,400 \mathrm{pa}$ |  | 47.8 |
| $£ 10,400-£ 20,800 \mathrm{pa}$ | 36.5 | 4162 |
| $£ 20,800-£ 31,200 \mathrm{pa}$ | 33.3 | 4913 |
| $£ 31,200-£ 52,000 \mathrm{pa}$ | 33.9 | 2851 |
| $£ 52,000-\mathrm{plus}$ pa | 38.5 | 2018 |
| Don't know | 34.3 | 732 |
| Refused to answer | 35.7 | 958 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 7 . 7}$ | 418 |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS1 main sample in England, Wales or NI .
Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers
Chi square: 191: P value: $<0.001$

Table 2.6a (Scotland) Residential mobility by combined labour market status of main and partner respondents at MCS 1

| Paid work status of the cohort families at MCS1 | Mobile <br> \% (n) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Both in work/on leave | Base <br> (N) |  |
| Main in work/on leave, partner not in work/on leave | 34.8 | 1067 |
| Partner in work/on leave, main not in work/on leave | $49.0(34)$ | 69 |
| Both not in work/on leave | 36.3 | 629 |
| Total | 56.8 | 163 |

Notes to table
Base: MCS1 families in Scotland with two resident parents.
Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers
Chi square: $31, \mathrm{P}$ value: $<0.001$

Table 2.6b (Rest of UK) Residential mobility by combined labour market status of main and partner respondents at MCS 1

| Paid work status of the cohort families at MCS1 | Mobile <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ (n) | Base <br> (N) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Both in work/on leave | 33.2 | 6437 |
| Main in work/on leave, partner not in work/on leave | 42.7 | 355 |
| Partner in work/on leave, main not in work/on leave | 37.3 | 5125 |
| Both not in work/on leave | 43.5 | 1350 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 5 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 2 6 7}$ |

[^6]Table 2.7a (Scotland) Reasons for moving given by movers by MCS2

| What were the main reasons you moved to this address? | Per cent (n) | Base |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wanted larger home | 47.8 | 551 |
| Wanted to move to better area | 20.4 |  |
| Wanted better home | 20.2 |  |
| To be nearer relative(s) | 11.4 |  |
| For children's education | 10.9 |  |
| Wanted place of my own | 9.6 |  |
| Relationship breakdown | 9.0 |  |
| Wanted to buy | 4.9 (27) |  |
| Job change/nearer work | 7.5 (37) |  |
| Problem with neighbours | 6.5 (36) |  |
| Spouse or partner job change | 5.1 (25) |  |
| Just wanted a change | 2.4 (14) |  |

## Notes to table

Base: Mover Families in Scotland MCS1 to MCS2
Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
Respondents could give more than one response.

Table 2.7b (Rest of UK) Reasons for moving given by movers by MCS2

| What were the main reasons <br> you moved to this address? | Per cent (n) |
| :--- | ---: |
| Base |  |
| Wanted larger home | 47.2 |
| Wanted to move to better area | 22.9 |
| Wanted better home | 20.8 |
| To be nearer relative(s) | 12.0 |
| For children's education | 12.4 |
| Wanted place of my own | 9.9 |
| Relationship breakdown | 7.4 |
| Wanted to buy | 6.4 |
| Job change/nearer work | 6.0 |
| Problem with neighbours | 4.8 |
| Spouse or partner job change | 3.4 |
| Just wanted a change | 3.9 |

[^7]
## Families' views about the area

Table 2.8 Whether respondent thought "Good area to bring up children" by UK country of residence

|  |  | Country |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | England | Wales | Scotland | N Ireland | Total \% |
| MCS2 <br> "Good area to bring up children" | Excellent | 32.3 | 35.3 | 41.3 | 45.5 | 33.7 |
|  | Good | 40.1 | 39.9 | 37.0 | 38.4 | 39.7 |
|  | Average | 19.4 | 18.1 | 16.2 | 11.7 | 18.8 |
|  | Poor | 5.1 | 4.3 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 4.8 |
|  | Very poor | 3.1 | 2.4 | (2.1) | (1.6) | 2.9 |
|  | Total \% Unweighted | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | 9264 | 2219 | 1792 | 1445 | 14720 |

## Notes to table

Base: Country MSC2 main respondents
Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
Chi Square: $75.7, \mathrm{P}$ value: $<0.001$

Table 2.9 Whether respondent thought "Good area to bring up children" by UK country

| MCS2 <br> "Good area to bring up children" | COUNTRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All UK Total } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | England |  | Wales |  | Scotland |  | N Ireland |  |  |  |
|  | Urban | Rural | Urban | Rural | Urban | Rural | Urban | Rural | Urban* | Rural** |
| Excellent | 26.1 | 59.0 | 29.0 | 50.2 | 36.4 | 59.9 | 33.5 | 63.9 | 27.3 | 58.7 |
| Good | 41.9 | 32.9 | 41.5 | 34.6 | 38.8 | 28.8 | 43.9 | 29.9 | 41.6 | 32.5 |
| Average | 22.4 | 6.3 | 21.3 | 11.6 | 18.5 | 8.3 | 15.9 | 5.6 | 21.9 | 6.9 |
| Poor / Very Poor | 9.6 | 1.8 | 8.2 | 3.6 | 6.3 | 2.9 | 6.7 | 0.6 | 9.2 | 2.0 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted N | 7942 | 1296 | 1674 | 569 | 1477 | 326 | 881 | 566 | 11974 | 2757 |
| Total unweighted sample size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14731 |  |

[^8]Table 2.10a (Scotland) Main respondent's NS-SEC (five-fold classification) by 'Good area to bring up children'

|  |  | NS-SEC five classes at MCS1 interview (main respondent) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Management and professional | Intermediate | Small employer and self-employed | Low supervisory and technical | Semiroutine and routine | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| MCS2 <br> 'Good area to bring up children' | Excellent | 52.2 | 40.3 | (63.6) | (38.3) | 27.5 | 41.6 |
|  | Good | 37.4 | 38.2 | (23.3) | (35.6) | 37.8 | 37.1 |
|  | Average | 8.1 | 15.0 | (6.3) | (20.1) | 26.3 | 15.8 |
|  | Poor | (1.7) | (5.7) | (1.2) | (5.3) | (4.7) | 3.6 |
|  | Very poor | (0.4) | (0.9) | (5.6) | (0.7) | (3.7) | (1.7) |
|  | Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | Base | 642 | 351 | 58 | 102 | 583 | 1739 |

Notes to table
Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
Base: MCS2 main respondents who were given NS-SEC at MCS1
Chi square: 167.0 P value $:<0.001$

Table 2.10b (Rest of UK) Main respondent's NS-SEC (five-fold classification) by 'Good area to bring up children'

|  |  | NS-SEC five classes at MCS1 interview (main respondent) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Management and professional | Intermediate | Small employer and selfemployed | $\qquad$ | Semi- routine and routine | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| MCS2 <br> 'Good area to bring up children' | Excellent | 44.1 | 33.9 | 44.3 | 30.3 | 23.0 | 34.0 |
|  | Good | 40.3 | 43.7 | 37.4 | 34.8 | 38.5 | 39.9 |
|  | Average | 12.2 | 16.9 | 14.2 | 22.9 | 25.9 | 18.6 |
|  | Poor | 2.4 | 3.4 | (2.6) | 6.8 | 7.3 | 4.5 |
|  | Very poor | 0.8 | 1.8 | (0.7) | 4.9 | 5.0 | 2.7 |
|  | Total \% <br> Base | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 3542 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 2200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 472 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 100 \\ & 704 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 4573 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 11491 \end{array}$ |

[^9]Table 2.11 "How safe you feel in area" by UK country of interview

|  |  | Country |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | England | Wales | Scotland | N Ireland | Total \% |
| MCS2 <br> "How safe you feel in area" | Very safe | 37.0 | 43.8 | 41.7 | 51.8 | 40.3 |
|  | Fairly safe | 50.6 | 46.1 | 49.2 | 42.8 | 48.9 |
|  | Neither safe nor unsafe | 6.5 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 2.4 | 5.7 |
|  | Fairly unsafe | 4.2 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 3.7 |
|  | Very unsafe | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.4 |
|  | Total \% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Base, N | 9302 | 2222 | 1795 | 1445 | 14764 |

## Notes to table

Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
Chi Square: 165.4, P value: $<0.001$
Base: Main respondents at MCS2.

Table 2.12"How safe you feel in area" by UK country and urban/rural location

| MCS2 <br> "How safe you feel in area" | COUNTRY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All UK Total } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | England |  | Wales |  | Scotland |  | N Ireland |  |  |  |
|  | Urban | Rural | Urban | Rural | Urban | Rural | Urban | Rural | Urban* | Rural** |
| Very safe | 31.8 | 58.5 | 39.2 | 55.8 | 36.3 | 62.0 | 42.9 | 65.3 | 32.7 | 59.1 |
| Fairly safe | 53.8 | 38.4 | 48.4 | 39.1 | 53.2 | 32.6 | 49.5 | 32.9 | 53.4 | 37.6 |
| Neither safe nor unsafe | 7.5 | 1.9 | 6.6 | 3.1 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 7.2 | 2.1 |
| Fairly/very unsafe | 7.0 | 1.2 | 5.8 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 4.7 | 0.4 | 6.7 | 1.3 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted N | 7979 | 1297 | 1676 | 570 | 1479 | 326 | 882 | 566 | 12016 | 2759 |
| Total unweighted sample size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14775 |  |

[^10]Table 2.13a (Scotland) 'How safe you feel in area' by Main respondent's NS-SEC (fivefold classification)

|  |  | NS-SEC five classes at MCS1 interview (main respondent) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Management and professional | Intermediate | Small employer and self-employed | Low supply and technical | Semi- routine and routine | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| MCS2 <br> 'How <br> safe you <br> feel in <br> area' | Very safe | 49.3 | 38.7 | (55.0) | (38.6) | 32.3 | 41.4 |
|  | Fairly safe | 44.8 | 53.5 | (35.5) | (48.6) | 54.6 | 49.5 |
|  | Neither safe nor unsafe | (4.2) | (4.0) | (8.3) | (6.0) | (7.8) | 5.5 |
|  | Fairly unsafe | (1.7) | (2.9) | (0.0) | (6.0) | (3.6) | (2.7) |
|  | Very unsafe | (0.0) | (0.8) | (1.2) | (0.7) | (1.8) | (0.8) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total \% } \\ & \text { Base,N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 645 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 351 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 58 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 102 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 583 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 1739 \end{array}$ |

Notes to table
Note Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
Chi square: $65, \mathrm{P}$ value: $<0.001$
Base: MCS2 main respondents who were given NS-SEC at MCS1

Table 2.13b (Rest of UK) Main respondent's NS-SEC (five-fold classification) by 'How safe you feel in area'

|  |  | NS-SEC five classes at MCS1 interview (main respondent) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Management and professional | Intermediate | Small employer and selfemployed | Low supply and technical | Semiroutine and routine | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| MCS2 <br> 'How safe you feel in area' | Very safe | 44.3 | 39.5 | 40.8 | 35.0 | 32.0 | 38.4 |
|  | Fairly safe | 49.4 | 50.6 | 52.7 | 50.6 | 50.9 | 50.4 |
|  | Neither safe nor unsafe | 3.9 | 6.0 | (4.7) | 7.7 | 8.1 | 6.0 |
|  | Fairly unsafe | 2.0 | 3.0 | (1.1) | (4.6) | 6.4 | 3.8 |
|  | Very unsafe | 3.0 | 0.9 | (0.7) | (2.1) | 2.7 | 1.4 |
|  | Total \% Base, N | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 3542 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 2200 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 472 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 704 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 4573 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 11491 \end{array}$ |

## Notes to table

Note: Weighted percentages; unnweighted sample numbers. Chi square: 356.4, P value: $<0.001$
Base: Main respondents at MCS2 in England, Wales and NI who were given NS-SEC at MCS1.

## Home atmosphere

2.1 There are three variables, each with five ordered categories, which relate to the atmosphere of the home ('disorganised', 'hearing yourself think' and 'calm atmosphere'). These variables are correlated - the values of Kendall's tau vary between 0.33 and 0.41 - and so they can be added together to form a scale measuring 'home activity' or 'home atmosphere' that varies between zero ('hectic') and 12 ('calm'). This scale is skewed towards the calm end with a median of eight, with 11 percent scoring 11 or 12 but less than 1 percent scoring below two.

Table 2.14 Home atmosphere scale (weighted means) by UK country at MCS 2

|  |  | Mean | Standard <br> Error | 95 percent CI |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Country <br> $(\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 5 4 4 6})$ | England | 8.0 | 0.048 | $7.9-8.1$ |
|  | Wales | 7.9 | 0.052 | $7.8-8.0$ |
|  | Scotland | 7.9 | 0.064 | $7.8-8.1$ |
|  | NI | 8.2 | 0.078 | $8.1-8.4$ |

## Notes to table

Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
Base: Country MCS2 main respondents.

Table 2.15a Home atmosphere (weighted means) at MCS 2 by parents' labour market status (couples) and number of parents/carers. (Scotland)

|  |  | Mean | Standard <br> Error | 95 percent CI |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Parental Work Status <br> $(\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 5 4 4})$ | Both in work | 8.2 | 0.075 | $8.0-8.3$ |
|  | Only main in work | 7.4 | 0.368 | $6.7-8.1$ |
|  | Only partner in work | 7.8 | 0.087 | $7.6-8.0$ |
|  | Neither in work | 6.7 | 0.234 | $6.2-7.1$ |
| Parents in $\mathbf{H} / \mathbf{H}$ <br> $(\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 8 0 5})$ | One | 7.9 | 0.069 | $7.8-8.1$ |
|  | Two | 7.8 | 0.161 | $7.5-8.2$ |

## Notes to table

Note:Weighted mean; unweighted sample numbers.
Base: MSC2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 2.15b Home atmosphere (weighted means) at MCS 2 by parents' labour market status (couples) and number of parents/carers (Rest of UK).

|  |  | Mean | Standard <br> Error | 95 percent CI |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Parental Work Status <br> $(\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 0 7 3 5})$ | Both in work | 8.4 | 0.052 | $8.1-8.3$ |
|  | Only main in work | 7.7 | 0.167 | $7.4-8.0$ |
|  | Only partner in work | 7.9 | 0.055 | $7.8-8.0$ |
|  | Neither in work | 7.1 | 0.119 | $6.9-7.4$ |
| Parents in $\mathbf{H} / \mathbf{H}$ <br> $(\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 2 9 7 0})$ | One | 8.0 | 0.046 | $7.9-8.1$ |
|  | Two | 7.8 | 0.073 | $7.7-8.0$ |

Notes to table
Note: Weighted mean; unweighted sample numbers.
Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI.

## CHAPTER THREE. FAMILY DEMOGRAPHICS

## Family type

Table 3.1 Family type at MCS1 and MCS2 by country

|  | Country at MCS1 |  |  |  |  | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family Type | England | Wales | Scotlan d | Northern Ireland | UK | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland | UK |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Both natural parents | 86.2 | 81.8 | 85.3 | 83.2 | 85.8 | 81.7 | 80.6 | 84.4 | 84.1 | 82.0 |
| Married | 61.6 | 57.1 | 59.9 | 68.3 | 61.4 | 62.7 | 58.6 | 63.7 | 71.6 | 62.9 |
| Cohabiting | 24.3 | 24.3 | 24.8 | 14.0 | 24.0 | 14.7 | 16.8 | 17.0 | 8.5 | 14.8 |
| Other/ unknown relationship | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.3 |
| Lone natural mother | 13.3 | 17.6 | 14.3 | 16.7 | 13.7 | 15.1 | 16.3 | 12.8 | 14.7 | 14.9 |
| Other family type | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 3.1 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base <br> (unweighted) | 11533 | 2760 | 2336 | 1923 | $\begin{array}{r} 1855 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 10107 | 2233 | 1800 | 1450 | $\begin{array}{r} 1559 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

## Notes to table

MCS1 Chi2: $171.9397 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base $=$ All families interviewed at MCS1
MCS2 Chi2: $118.2893 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base=All families interviewed at MCS2

Table 3.2a Family type by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Scotland)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Family Type | $\mathbf{1 6 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 - 2 9}$ |  | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 - 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 +}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Both natural parents | 58.5 | 74.8 | 89.4 | 92.4 | 91.9 | 84.6 |
| Married | 18.2 | 45.3 | 72.1 | 79.2 | 77.1 | 64.1 |
| Cohabiting | 38.0 | 27.0 | 12.7 | 10.2 | 12.2 | 17.2 |
| Otherl <br> unknown relationship | 2.4 | 2.5 | 4.6 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.3 |
| Lone natural mother | 31.7 | 21.6 | 8.9 | 6.6 | 8.1 | 12.9 |
| Other family type | 9.8 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 0.9 |  | 2.5 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 230 | 304 | 549 | 515 | 187 | 1785 |

## Notes to table

Chi2: $1601.6719 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base=All MCS2 families in which the main respondent was a mother (any type of mother) and in which mothers age was known.

Table 3.2b Family type by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Rest of UK)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family Type | 16-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40+ | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Both natural parents | 48.9 | 77.0 | 88.7 | 90.8 | 90.1 | 82.6 |
| Married | 20.8 | 52.4 | 72.5 | 76.6 | 72.4 | 64.0 |
| Cohabiting | 25.1 | 20.3 | 12.5 | 10.5 | 13.8 | 14.9 |
| Other/ unknown relationship | 3.0 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| Lone natural mother | 43.6 | 19.7 | 9.9 | 8.1 | 8.7 | 15.0 |
| Other family type | 7.6 | 3.3 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 2.4 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 1925 | 2696 | 4281 | 3362 | 1186 | 13450 |

## Notes to table

Chi2: $1655.1196 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base $=$ All families in which the main respondent was a mother (any type of mother) and in which mothers age was known.

## Change in family type

Table 3.3 Change in family type by country

| Family Type at MCS1 | Family Type at MCS2 | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland | UK |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Two parent family | Two-parent family | 92.8 | 93.3 | 94.3 | 94.7 | 93.1 |
|  | One-parent family | 7.2 | 6.7 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 6.9 |
| Total\% |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (weighted) |  | 7242 | 1843 | 1544 | 1249 | 13201 |
| Base (unweighted) |  | 7956 | 1770 | 1527 | 1180 | 12433 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| One parent family | Two-parent family | 26.7 | 29.5 | 35.9 | 31.3 | 27.9 |
|  | One-parent family | 73.3 | 70.5 | 64.1 | 68.7 | 72.1 |
| Total \% |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) |  | 1307 | 428 | 250 | 264 | 2249 |

## Notes to table

Two-parent family at MCS1 Chi2: $9.7279 \mathrm{p}=0.0630$
One-parent family at MCS1 Chi2: $10.5980 \mathrm{p}=0.0269$
Base=All families who took part in both MCS1 and MCS2 and were in either a two-parent family or a one parent family at both MCS1 and MCS2

Table 3.4a Change in family type by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Scotland)

| Family Type at MCS1 | Family Type at MCS2 | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 16-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40+ | Total |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Two parent family | Two-parent family | 85.1 | 89.0 | 97.0 | 95.8 | 96.1 | 94.4 |
|  | One parent family | (14.9) | (11.0) | (3.0) | (4.2) | (3.9) | 5.6 |
| Total \% |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base <br> (unweighted) |  | 121 | 238 | 493 | 489 | 175 | 1516 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| One parent family | Two-parent family | (43.5) | (33.0) | (28.1) | (37.1) | (23.9) | 36.0 |
|  | One parent family | 56.5 | (67.0) | (71.9) | (62.9) | (76.1) | 64.0 |
| Total \% |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base <br> (unweighted) |  | 100 | 61 | (52) | (24) | (12) | 249 |

## Notes to table

Two-parent family at MCS1 Chi2: $325.7482 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
One-parent family at MCS1 Chi2: $43.2715 \mathrm{p}=0.3243$
Base=All families who took part in both MCS1 and MCS2 and were in either a two-parent family or a one parent family at both MCS1 and MCS2 and in which the main respondent at MCS2 was a mother (any type of mother) for whom age was known.

Table 3.4b Change in family type by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family Type at MCS1 | Family Type at MCS2 | 16-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40+ | Total |
|  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Two parent family | Two-parent family | 76.7 | 89.5 | 95.5 | 96.7 | 96.7 | 93.6 |
|  | One parent family | 23.3 | 10.5 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 6.4 |
| Total \% |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) |  | 949 | 2044 | 3737 | 2926 | 1013 | 10669 |
| One parent family | Two-parent family | 28.1 | 32.3 | 25.3 | 20.7 | (24.8) | 27.2 |
|  | One parent family | 71.9 | 67.7 | 74.7 | 79.3 | 75.2 | 72.8 |
| Total \% |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) |  | 758 | 471 | 359 | 269 | 112 | 1969 |

## Notes to table

Two-parent family at MCS1 Chi2: $511.0613 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
One-parent family at MCS1 Chi2: $14.8792 \mathrm{p}=0.0470$
Base=All families who took part in both MCS1 and MCS2 and were in either a two-parent family or a one parent family at both MCS1 and MCS2 and in which the main respondent at MCS2 was a mother (any type of mother) for whom age was known.

## Transition from cohabitation to marriage

Table 3.5 Transition from cohabitation to marriage by country

|  |  | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Family Type at <br> MCS1 | Family Type at <br> MCS2 | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland | UK Total |
|  |  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | \% |
| Cohabiting <br> natural parents | Married natural <br> parents | 30.2 | 27.0 | 24.4 | 44.8 | 29.7 |
|  | Cohabiting <br> natural parents | 69.8 | 73.0 | 75.6 | 55.2 | 70.3 |
| Total \% |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base <br> (unweighted) |  | 1687 | 472 | 355 | 154 | 2668 |

## Notes to table

Chi2: $23.6938 \mathrm{p}=0.0001$
Base=All families who took part in both MCS1 and MCS2, who were in a family with cohabiting natural parents at MCS2 and are in a family in which the same two parents are still present at MCS2 and the relationship between the parents at MCS2 is known.

Table 3.6a Transition from cohabitation to marriage by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Scotland)

|  |  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Family Type <br> at MCS1 | Family Type <br> at MCS2 | $\mathbf{1 6 - 2 4}$ <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 - 2 9}$ <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 4}$ <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 - 3 9}$ <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 +}$ <br> $\%$ | Total |
| Cohabiting <br> natural <br> parents | Married <br> natural <br> parents | $(19.3)$ | $(25.2)$ | $(26.3)$ | $(29.2)$ | $(15.2)$ | 24.4 |
|  | Cohabiting <br> natural <br> parents | 80.7 | 74.8 | 73.7 | 70.8 | $(84.8)$ | 75.6 |
| Total \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base <br> (unweighted) |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Notes to table

Chi2=25.2801 p=0.5457
Base=All families who took part in both MCS1 and MCS2, who were in a family with cohabiting natural parents at MCS2 and are in a family in which the same two parents are still present at MCS2 and the relationship between the parents at MCS2 is known and where the main respondent was a mother (any type of mother) for whom age is known.

Table 3.6b Transition from cohabitation to marriage by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family Type at MCS1 | Family Type at MCS2 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 16-24 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 25-29 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30-34 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35-39 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40+ \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \% \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Cohabiting natural parents | Married natural parents | 23.2 | 34.9 | 30.4 | 32.6 | 23.2 | 30.2 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 76.8 | 65.1 | 69.6 | 67.4 | 76.8 | 69.8 |
| Total \% |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) |  | 440 | 604 | 654 | 432 | 177 | 2307 |

## Notes to table

Chi2=20.5951 p=0.0108
Base=All families who took part in both MCS1 and MCS2, who were in a family with cohabiting natural parents at MCS2 and in a family in which the same two parents are still present at MCS2 and the relationship between the parents at MCS2 is known and where the main respondent was a mother (any type of mother) for whom age is known.

## Having a another baby by MCS2

Table 3.7 Whether cohort mother had a subsequent birth at MCS 2 by Country at MCS 2

| New child at MCS 2 | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | NI |  |
| NO | 78.1 | 79.6 | 75.8 | 70.7 | 77.8 |
| YES | 21.9 | 20.4 | 24.2 | 29.3 | 22.3 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted Sample <br> Size | 9987 | 2222 | 1795 | 1444 | 15448 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 mothers. Chi sq $=22.051 \mathrm{P}=0.0000$

## Number of siblings

Table 3.8 Number of siblings in household at MCS1 and MCS2 by country

|  | Country at MCS1 |  |  |  |  | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of siblings in HH | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland | UK | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland | UK |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| None | 42.7 | 42.5 | 45.3 | 39.1 | 42.8 | 24.9 | 27.7 | 26.3 | 22.5 | 25.0 |
| One | 36.2 | 36.8 | 35.7 | 32.6 | 36 | 48.0 | 45.2 | 49.5 | 39.5 | 47.7 |
| Two | 14.5 | 14.3 | 14.1 | 18.0 | 15 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 18.0 | 23.8 | 18.4 |
| Three or more | 6.6 | 6.5 | 4.9 | 10.3 | 6.6 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 6.2 | 14.2 | 8.8 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base <br> (unweighted) | 11533 | 2760 | 2336 | 1923 | 18552 | 9987 | 2222 | 1795 | 1444 | 15448 |

## Notes to table

MCS1 Chi2 $=89.6411 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
MCS1 Base=All families who were interviewed at MCS1
MCS2 Chi2=125.4253p=0.0000
MCS2 Base=All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed.

Table 3.9a Number of siblings in household by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Scotland)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of siblings in HH | 16-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40+ | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| None | 52.2 | 30.6 | 23.9 | 18.7 | 19.2 | 26.2 |
| One | 37.4 | 49.4 | 52.4 | 52.2 | 46.7 | 49.5 |
| Two | (9.1) | (15.4) | 17.1 | 22.2 | 23.2 | 18.1 |
| Three or more | (1.3) | (4.7) | (6.6) | (6.9) | (11.0) | 6.2 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 230 | 304 | 549 | 515 | 187 | 1785 |

## Notes to table

Base=All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed and in which the main respondent was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age in known.
Chi2 $=1003.0542 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$

Table 3.9b Number of siblings in household by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Rest of UK)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number of <br> siblings in HH | $\mathbf{1 6 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 - 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 - 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 +}$ | Total |
|  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| None | 49.0 | 27.7 | 22.8 | 17.7 | 16.0 | 24.7 |
| One | 39.5 | 48.0 | 50.7 | 49.4 | 42.2 | 47.7 |
| Two | 9.1 | 17.2 | 18.0 | 21.4 | 26.1 | 18.5 |
| Three or more | $(2.4)$ | 7.1 | 8.5 | 11.5 | 15.6 | 9.0 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base <br> (unweighted) | 1921 | 2693 | 4275 | 3360 | 1185 | 13434 |

## Notes to table

Chi2 $=860.8427 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base $=$ All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed and in which the main respondent was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age in known.

## Older and younger siblings

Table 3.10 Older and younger siblings in household by country

|  | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Older and younger siblings <br> in HH | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland | UK |
|  | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Both older and younger | 9.3 | 8.7 | 6.9 | 13.5 | 9.2 |
| Older siblings only | 47.8 | 49.5 | 48.6 | 47.6 | 48.0 |
| Younger siblings only | 17.9 | 14.1 | 18.2 | 16.4 | 17.7 |
| No siblings | 24.9 | 27.7 | 26.3 | 22.6 | 25.1 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 9987 | 2222 | 1795 | 1444 | 15448 |

Notes to table
Chi2=73.9135 p=0.0000
Base $=$ All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed.

Table 3.11a Older and younger siblings in household by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Scotland)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Older and younger siblings in HH | 16-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40+ | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Both older and younger | (6.9) | (8.9) | (7.5) | (6.3) | (4.3) | 6.9 |
| Older siblings only | (16.9) | 43.8 | 45.5 | 58.3 | 73.0 | 48.7 |
| Younger siblings only | 24.1 | 16.8 | 23.1 | 16.7 | (3.5) | 18.1 |
| No siblings | 52.2 | 30.6 | 23.9 | 18.7 | 19.2 | 26.2 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 230 | 304 | 549 | 515 | 187 | 1785 |

[^11]Table 3.11b Older and younger siblings in household by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Rest of UK)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Older and younger siblings in HH | 16-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40+ | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Both older and younger | 7.8 | 12.4 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 5.7 | 9.4 |
| Older siblings only | 17.0 | 40.1 | 46.9 | 59.5 | 71.4 | 48.1 |
| Younger siblings only | 26.2 | 19.8 | 20.6 | 13.5 | 6.8 | 17.8 |
| No siblings | 49.0 | 27.7 | 22.8 | 17.7 | 16.0 | 24.7 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 1921 | 2693 | 4275 | 3360 | 1185 | 13434 |

## Notes to table

Chi2 $=1371.8181 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base=All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed and in which the main respondent was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age in known.

## Half siblings

Table 3.12 Half-siblings in household by country

|  | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Half-siblings | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland | UK |
|  | $\%$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Half-siblings in HH | 10.2 | 11.9 | 8.5 | 3.4 | 9.9 |
| No half-siblings in <br> HH | 89.8 | 88.1 | 91.5 | 96.6 | 90.1 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 9987 | 2222 | 1795 | 1444 | 15448 |

## Notes to table

Chi2=92.4564 p=0.0000
Base $=$ All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed.

Table 3.13a Half-siblings in household by family type (Scotland)

|  | Family type |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Half-siblings | Married natural parents | Cohabiting natural parents | Natural parents - other/unkown rel | Lone natural mother | Other | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Half-siblings in HH | 5.5 | (14.8) | (7.9) | 13.5 | (18.7) | 8.5 |
| No half-siblings in HH | 94.5 | 85.2 | 92.1 | 86.5 | (81.3) | 91.5 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base <br> (unweighted) | 1104 | 327 | 59 | 250 | 55 | 1795 |

Notes to table
Chi2=370.0834 p=0.0000
Base $=$ All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed.

Table 3.32b Half-siblings in household by family type (Rest of UK)

|  | Family type |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Half-siblings | Married natural parents | Cohabiting natural parents | Natural parents - other/unkown rel | Lone natural mother | Other | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Half-siblings in HH | 6.2 | 16.6 | 8.0 | 16.7 | 31.2 | 10.1 |
| No half-siblings in HH | 93.8 | 83.4 | 92.0 | 83.3 | 68.8 | 89.9 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 8319 | 2015 | 581 | 2325 | 413 | 13653 |

## Notes to table

Chi2=538.1163 p=0.0000
Base $=$ All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed.

## Grandparents

Table 3.14 Grandparents in the household by country

|  | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Grandparents in HH | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland | UK |  |
|  | $\%$ |  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ | $\%$ |  |
| Grandparents in HH | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 3.8 |  |
| No grandparents in HH | 96.2 | 97.0 | 97.0 | 95.5 | 96.2 |  |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Base (unweighted) | 9987 | 2222 | 1795 | 1444 | 15448 |  |

## Notes to table

Chi2 $=9.9647 \mathrm{p}=0.0557$
Base $=$ All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed.

Table 3.15a Grandparents in household by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Scotland)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grandparents in HH | 16-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40+ | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Grandparents in HH | (9.0) | (3.5) | (1.9) | (1.0) | (3.3) | 2.8 |
| No grandparents in HH | 91.0 | 96.5 | 98.1 | 99.0 | 96.7 | 97.2 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 230 | 304 | 549 | 515 | 187 | 1785 |

## Notes to table

Chi2 $=330.7989 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base=All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed and in which the main respondent was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age in known.

Table 3.15b Grandparents in household by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Rest of UK)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grandparents in HH | 16-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40+ | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Grandparents in HH | 9.7 | 6.2 | 2.3 | 1.6 | (1.2) | 3.6 |
| No grandparents in HH | 90.3 | 93.8 | 97.7 | 98.4 | 98.8 | 96.4 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 1921 | 2693 | 4275 | 3360 | 1185 | 13434 |

## Notes to table

Chi2 $=301.3344 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base=All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed and in which the main respondent was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age in known.

## Natural father in household

Table 3.16 Natural father in household by country

|  | Country at MCS1 |  |  |  |  | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Natural father in HH | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland | UK | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland | UK |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Natural father in HH | 86.4 | 81.9 | 85.4 | 83.3 | 85.9 | 82.2 | 80.8 | 84.6 | 84.4 | 82.5 |
| Natural father not in HH | 13.6 | 18.1 | 14.6 | 16.7 | 14.1 | 17.8 | 19.2 | 15.4 | 15.6 | 17.5 |
| Total\% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 11533 | 2760 | 2336 | 1923 | 18552 | 10107 | 2233 | 1800 | 1450 | 15590 |

## Notes to table

MCS1 Chi2=44.5824 p=0.0007
Base $=$ All families interviewed at MCS1
MCS2 Chi2 $=15.7829 \mathrm{p}=0.0563$
Base $=$ All families interviewed at MCS2

Table 3.17a Natural father in household by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Scotland)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Natural father in HH | $\mathbf{1 6 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 - 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 - 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 +}$ | Total |
|  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Natural father in HH | 58.5 | 74.8 | 89.6 | 92.4 | 91.9 | 84.6 |
| Natural father not in HH | 41.5 | 25.2 | 10.4 | $(7.6)$ | $(8.1)$ | 15.4 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 230 | 304 | 549 | 515 | 187 | 1785 |

Notes to table
Chi2 $=1515.5648 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base=All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age is known.

Table 3.17b Natural father in household by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Rest of UK)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Natural father in HH | $\mathbf{1 6 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 - 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 - 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 +}$ | Total |
|  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Natural father in HH | 48.9 | 77.1 | 88.7 | 90.8 | 90.1 | 82.6 |
| Natural father not in HH | 51.1 | 22.9 | 11.3 | 9.2 | 9.9 | 17.4 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 1925 | 2696 | 4281 | 3362 | 1186 | 13450 |

## Notes to table

Chi2 $=1653.0368 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base $=$ All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age is known.

## Transition from non-resident to resident natural father

Table 3.18 Transition from non-resident to resident natural father by country

|  | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Change in natural father <br> in HH | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland | UK |
|  | $\%$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\boldsymbol{\%}$ |
| Non-resident at MCS1, <br> resident at MCS2 | 18.5 | 20.9 | 25.4 | 27.9 | 19.7 |
| Non-resident at MCS1 <br> and MCS2 | 81.5 | 79.1 | 74.6 | 72.1 | 80.3 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 1337 | 440 | 255 | 266 | 2298 |

## Notes to table

Chi2=16.5761 $\mathrm{p}=0.0019$ Base=All families interviewed at MCS1 and MCS2 in which the natural father was non-resident at MCS1.

Table 3.19a Transition from non-resident to resident natural father by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Scotland)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Change in natural <br> father in HH | $\mathbf{1 6 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 - 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 - 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 +}$ | Total |
|  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1, <br> resident at MCS2 | $(31.3)$ | $(23.7)$ | $(17.4)$ | $(23.9)$ | $(28.6)$ | 25.6 |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1 and MCS2 | 68.7 | $(76.3)$ | $(82.6)$ | $(76.1)$ | $(71.4)$ | 74.4 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 101 | 62 | 52 | $(24)$ | $(13)$ | 252 |

Notes to table
Chi2 $=33.4978 \mathrm{p}=0.4117$
Base=All families interviewed at MCS1 and MCS2 in which the natural father was non-resident at MCS1 and the main respondent at MCS2 was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age was known.

Table 3.19b Transition from non-resident to resident natural father by mother's age at MCS2 interview (Rest of UK)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview (grouped) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Change in natural <br> father in HH | $\mathbf{1 6 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 - 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 - 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 +}$ | Total |
|  | $\%$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1, <br> resident at MCS2 | 18.3 | 24.2 | 17.4 | $(15.2)$ | $(21.9)$ | 19.3 |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1 and MCS2 | 81.7 | 75.8 | 82.6 | 84.8 | 78.1 | 80.7 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 780 | 481 | 362 | 273 | 113 | 2009 |

## Notes to table

Chi2=13.8036 p=0.0459
Base=All families interviewed at MCS1 and MCS2 in which the natural father was non-resident at MCS1 and the main respondent at MCS2 was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age was known.

Table 3.20a Transition from non-resident to resident natural father by prior relationship from MCS1 (Scotland)

|  | Prior relationship from MCS1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Change in natural father in HH | Previously married/ lived together | In a relationship | Not in a relationship | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Non-resident at MCS1, resident at MCS2 | (28.6) | (36.8) | (7.5) | 25.8 |
| Non-resident at MCS1 and MCS2 | 71.4 | (63.2) | 92.5 | 74.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Base (unweighted) | 111 | 77 | 63 | 251 |

## Notes to table

Chi2 $=146.5597 \mathrm{p}=0.0002$
Base=All families interviewed at MCS1 and MCS2 in which the natural father was non-resident at MCS1 and the prior relationship was known from MCS1 main interview.

Table 3.20b Transition from non-resident to resident natural father by prior relationship from MCS1 (Rest of UK)

|  | Prior relationship from MCS1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Change in natural father in HH | Previously married/ lived together | In a relationship | Not in a relationship | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Non-resident at MCS1, resident at MCS2 | 21.3 | 23.4 | (7.5) | 19.1 |
| Non-resident at MCS1 and MCS2 | 78.7 | 76.6 | 92.5 | 80.9 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 834 | 752 | 418 | 2004 |

[^12]Table 3.21a Transition from non-resident to resident natural father by contact patterns from MCS1 (Scotland)

|  | Contact patterns from MCS1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Change in natural <br> father in HH | Frequent contact (3 or <br> more times a week) | Less frequent <br> contact (weekly <br> or less often) | Not in any contact | Total |
|  | \% | \% | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1, <br> resident at MCS2 | $(47.7)$ | $(25.6)$ | $(10.8)$ | 25.7 |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1 and MCS2 | $(52.3)$ |  |  |  |
| Total \% | 100 | 74.4 | 89.2 | 74.3 |
| Base (unweighted) | 72 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Notes to table
Chi2=272.7124 p=0.0000
Base=All families interviewed at MCS1 and MCS2 in which the natural father was non-resident at MCS1 and contact patterns was known from MCS1 main interview.

Table 3.21b Transition from non-resident to resident natural father by contact patterns from MCS1 (Rest of UK)

|  | Contact patterns from MCS1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Change in natural <br> father in HH | Frequent contact (3 or <br> more times a week) | Less frequent <br> contact (weekly <br> or less often) | Not in any contact | Total |
|  | \% | \% | $\mathbf{\%}$ |  |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1, <br> resident at MCS2 | 34.3 | 16.8 | 8.3 | 19.2 |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1 and MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| Total \% | 65.7 | 83.2 | 91.7 | 80.8 |
| Base (unweighted) | 100 | 100 |  | 100 |

## Notes to table

Chi2 $=167.9992 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base=All families interviewed at MCS1 and MCS2 in which the natural father was non-resident at MCS1 and contact patterns was known from MCS1 main interview.

Table 3.22a Transition from non-resident to resident natural father by maintenance payments from MCS1 (Scotland)

|  | Maintenance payments from MCS1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Change in natural <br> father in HH | Regular maintenance <br> payments | Irregular <br> maintenance <br> payments | No maintenance <br> payments | Total |
|  | $\%$ | \% | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1, <br> Resident at MCS2 | $(38.7)$ | $(11.1)$ | $(21.3)$ | 25.4 |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1 and MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| Total \% | $(61.3)$ | $(88.9)$ | 78.7 | 74.6 |
| Base (unweighted) | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Notes to table
Chi2=84.5303 p=0.0036
Base=All families interviewed at MCS1 and MCS2 in which the natural father was non-resident at MCS1 and maintenance payments was known from MCS1 main interview.

Table 3.22b Transition from non-resident to resident natural father by maintenance payments from MCS1 (Rest of UK)

|  | Maintenance payments from MCS1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Change in natural <br> father in HH | Regular maintenance <br> payments | Irregular <br> maintenance <br> payments | No maintenance <br> payments | Total |
|  | \% | \% |  |  |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1, <br> Resident at MCS2 | 30.8 | 22.5 | 14.5 | 19.2 |
| Non-resident at <br> MCS1 and MCS2 | 69.2 | 77.5 | 85.5 | 80.8 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 466 | 220 | 1321 | 2007 |

## Notes to table

Chi2 $=69.8709 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Base $=$ All families interviewed at MCS1 and MCS2 in which the natural father was non-resident at MCS1 and maintenance payments was known from MCS1 main interview.

## Contact and maintenance payments

Table 3.23 Contact with non-resident natural father and maintenance payments by nonresident natural father by country

|  | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contact and maintenance payments at MCS2 | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland | UK |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Frequent contact (3 or more time a week) | 22.4 | 25.4 | 24.2 | 37.9 | 23.2 |
| Less frequent contact (weekly or less often) | 44.9 | 36.8 | 42.1 | 29.0 | 43.7 |
| Not in any contact | 32.7 | 37.9 | 33.7 | 33.1 | 33.1 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 1634 | 495 | 296 | 259 | 2684 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regular maintenance payments | 43.6 | 41.6 | 45.7 | 44.3 | 43.6 |
| Irregular maintenance payments | (12.0) | (11.3) | (9.6) | (11.3) | 11.9 |
| No maintenance payments | 44.4 | 47.1 | 44.7 | 44.4 | 44.5 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 1074 | 307 | 193 | 173 | 1747 |

[^13]Base=All families interviewed at MCS2 (except new families) in which the natural father was non-resident and contact patterns/maintenance payments was known from main interview

Table 3.24a Contact with non-resident natural father and maintenance payments by non-resident natural father by mother's age (Scotland)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contact and maintenance payments | 16-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40+ | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Frequent contact (3 or more time a week) | (28.0) | (20.6) | (22.5) | (19.5) | (38.8) | 24.2 |
| Less frequent contact (weekly or less often) | (30.7) | (44.3) | (44.8) | (60.3) | (37.4) | 42.1 |
| Not in any contact | (41.3) | (35.1) | (32.7) | (20.2) | (23.8) | 33.7 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 97 | 79 | 63 | (42) | (15) | 296 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regular maintenance payments | (51.7) | (46.6) | (39.9) | (47.4) | (28.8) | 45.7 |
| Irregular maintenance payments | (9.8) | (6.9) | (11.7) | (8.3) | (17.8) | (9.6) |
| No maintenance payments | (38.5) | (46.5) | (48.5) | (44.3) | (53.4) | 44.7 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | (55) | (51) | (43) | (33) | (11) | 193 |

## Notes to table

Contact Chi2 $=128.2408 \mathrm{p}=0.1084$
Maintenance Chi $2=34.6023 \mathrm{p}=0.8284$
Base=All families interviewed at MCS2 (except new families) in which the natural father was non-resident and contact patterns/maintenance payments was known from main interview and in which main respondent was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age was known.

Table 3.24b Contact with non-resident natural father and maintenance payments by non-resident natural father by mother's age (Rest of UK)

|  | Mother's age at MCS2 interview |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contact and maintenance payments | 16-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40+ | Total |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Frequent contact (3 or more time a week) | 23.3 | 21.9 | 24.8 | 22.2 | (26.6) | 23.3 |
| Less frequent contact (weekly or less often) | 34.3 | 48.6 | 48.0 | 48.5 | 49.1 | 43.6 |
| Not in any contact | 42.4 | 29.4 | 27.3 | 29.3 | (24.2) | 33.1 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 855 | 582 | 480 | 338 | 128 | 2383 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regular maintenance payments | 38.5 | 38.0 | 51.6 | 49.8 | (40.1) | 43.3 |
| Irregular maintenance payments | 10.7 | 13.3 | 12.1 | (12.6) | (13.7) | 12.2 |
| No maintenance payments | 50.8 | 48.7 | 36.3 | 37.6 | (46.2) | 44.5 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 486 | 402 | 338 | 228 | 98 | 1552 |

## Notes to table

Contact Chi2 $=67.0004 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Maintenance Chi2=33.2205 p=0.0096
Base=All families interviewed at MCS2 (except new families) in which the natural father was non-resident and contact patterns/maintenance payments was known from main interview and in which main respondent was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age was known.

Table 3.25a Contact with non-resident natural father at MCS2 and maintenance payments by non-resident natural father at MCS2 by whether natural father previously resident at MCS1(Scotland)

| Contact and maintenance <br> payments | Non-resident <br> natural father at <br> MCS2 in HH at <br> MCS1 | Non-resident <br> natural father at <br> MCS2 not in HH at <br> MCS1 | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| At MCS 2 | \% | \% | \% |
| Frequent contact (3 or <br> more time a week) | $(28.9)$ | $(21.3)$ | 24.2 |
| Less frequent contact <br> (weekly or less often) | 55.9 | 33.6 | 42.1 |
| Not in any contact | $(15.2)$ | 45.1 | 33.7 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 109 | 187 | 296 |
| At MCS 2 | $(52.6)$ | $(39.1)$ | 45.7 |
| Regular maintenance <br> payments | $(4.8)$ | $(14.2)$ | $(9.6)$ |
| Irregular maintenance <br> payments | $(42.6)$ | $(46.7)$ | 44.7 |
| No maintenance <br> payments | 100 |  | 100 |
| Total \% | 92 |  | 101 |
| Base (unweighted) |  |  | 103 |

## Notes to table

Contact Chi2 $=257.4583 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Maintenance Chi $2=59.5048 \mathrm{p}=0.0402$
Base=All families interviewed at MCS2 (except new families) in which the natural father was non-resident and contact patterns/maintenance payments was known from main interview.

Table 3.25b Contact with non-resident natural father and maintenance payments by non-resident natural father by whether natural father previously resident (Rest of UK)

| Contact and maintenance payments | Non-resident natural father at MCS2 in HH at MCS1 | Non-resident natural father at MCS 2 not in HH at MCS1 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% |
| Frequent contact (3 or more time a week) | 26.6 | 21.1 | 23.2 |
| Less frequent contact (weekly or less often) | 56.3 | 35.6 | 43.7 |
| Not in any contact | 17.1 | 43.4 | 33.1 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 819 | 1569 | 2388 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Regular maintenance payments | 49.3 | 37.6 | 43.3 |
| Irregular maintenance payments | 9.8 | 14.3 | 12.1 |
| No maintenance payments | 40.9 | 48.1 | 44.6 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Base (unweighted) | 654 | 900 | 1554 |

Notes to table
Contact Chi2 $=204.5385 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
Maintenance Chi2=26.4873 p=0.0003
Base=All families interviewed at MCS2 (except new families) in which the natural father was non-resident and contact patterns/maintenance payments was known from main interview.

## CHAPTER FOUR. THE GRANDPARENTS OF THE COHORT CHILD

## Presence of Grandparents

Table 4.1a Proportion of respondents reporting their parents as alive (Scotland)

|  | Main Respondent, \% | Partner Respondent, \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Mother Alive | 90.4 | 64.5 |
|  | $[88.8,91.8]$ | $[61.4,67.4]$ |
| Father Alive | 78.9 | 55.6 |
|  | $[76.4,81.3]$ | $[52.3,58.8]$ |
| Unweighted N | 1800 | 1544 |

Notes to table
Note: Those reporting their parent as dead at MCS1 are accounted for here. Percentages are weighted (using weight1) and observations are unweighted. Confidence intervals for each cell percentage are presented.
Base: all MCS2 main respondents (mothers) and partner respondents (fathers of cohort child) in Scotland

Table 4.1b Proportion of respondents reporting their parents as alive (Rest of UK)

|  | Main Respondent, \% | Partner Respondent, $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Mother Alive | 90.5 | 74.4 |
|  | $[89.9,91.0]$ | $[73.1,75.7]$ |
| Father Alive | 79.2 | 63.9 |
|  | $[78.3,80.1]$ | $[62.4,65.4]$ |
| Unweighted N | 13790 | 11312 |

## Notes to table

Note: Those reporting their parent as dead at MCS1 are accounted for here. Percentages are weighted (using whnotsco) and observations are unweighted. Confidence intervals for each cell percentage are presented. Base: all MCS2 main respondents and partner respondents in England, Wales and NI

## Grandparent Contact

Table 4.4a Contact between respondents' and their parents (Scotland)

|  | Main Respondent |  | Partner Respondent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contact with | Mother, \% | Father, \% | Mother, \% | Father, \% |
| MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Contact | $\begin{array}{r} 26.2 \\ {[22.8,30.0]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.9 \\ {[13.7,18.4]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.2 \\ {[4.8,7.9]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.7 \\ {[4.9,8.9]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Weekly Contact | $\begin{array}{r} 45.0 \\ {[41.7,48.3]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 42.9 \\ {[39.6,46.3]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 52.5 \\ {[47.7,57.2]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 45.2 \\ {[41.2,49.4]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Monthly Contact | $\begin{array}{r} 24.1 \\ {[21.0,27.4]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 28.1 \\ {[25.0,31.4]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34.4 \\ {[30.1,39.1]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 36.0 \\ {[31.9-40.4]} \end{array}$ |
| Yearly or less | $\begin{array}{r} 2.7 \\ {[2.1,3.5]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.12 \\ {[4.9,7.7]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.5 \\ {[4.0,7.3]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.6 \\ {[5.3-8.3]} \end{array}$ |
| Never Contact | $\begin{array}{r} 2.1 \\ {[1.5,2.9]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.0 \\ {[5.9,8.3]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.5 \\ {[0.9,2.3]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.4 \\ {[4.0-7.4]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Total, \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted N | 1623 | 1418 | 1009 | 865 |

## Notes to table

Note: Daily includes those living with their own parent; this table is constructed for those with an appropriate living grandparent only. The main respondents include lone parents and those with partner respondents.
Percentages are weighted (using weightl) and observations are unweighted.; Confidence intervals for each cell percentage are presented.
Base: All MCS2 respondents in Scotland with own parent alive.

Table 4.4b Contact between respondents' and their parents (Rest of UK)

|  | Main Respondent's |  | Partner Respondent's |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Contact with | Mother, \% | Father, \% | Mother, \% | Father, \% |
| MCS2 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Contact | 20.0 | 11.6 | 6.9 | 7.1 |
|  | $[18.6,21.5]$ | $[10.5,12.7]$ | $[6.0,7.8]$ | $[6.3,8.1]$ |
| Weekly Contact | 44.9 | 39.3 | 42.8 | 36.9 |
|  | $[43.0,46.8]$ | $[37.2,41.4]$ | $[40.2,45.4]$ | $[34.5,39.4]$ |
| Monthly Contact | 26.1 | 32.1 | 40.0 | 39.6 |
|  | $[24.1,28.2]$ | $[30.0,34.3]$ | $[37.4,42.5]$ | $[37.1-42.1]$ |
| Yearly or less | 7.0 | 9.8 | 8.0 | 10.0 |
|  | $[6.1,7.9]$ | $[8.9,10.8]$ | $[7.1,9.2]$ | $[5.7-11.3]$ |
|  |  | 2.1 | 7.3 |  |
| Never Contact | $[1.8,2.4]$ | $[6.7,7.9]$ | $[2.0,2.8]$ | $[5.7-7.1]$ |
|  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 6.4 |
| Total \% | 12374 | 10721 | 8089 | 100 |
| Unweighted N |  |  |  | 6857 |

## Notes to table

Note: Daily includes those living with their own parent; this table is constructed for those with an appropriate living grandparent only. The main respondents include lone parents and those with partner respondents.
Percentages are weighted (using whnotsco) and observations are unweighted.
Confidence intervals for each cell percentage are presented
Base: All MCS2 respondents in England, Wales and NI with own parent alive.

## Child care and financial support from Grandparents

Table 4.5a Child care and financial support provided by at least one grandparent (Scotland)

|  | At least one grandparent <br> undertaking <br> \% |
| :--- | ---: |
| Any type of child care |  |
| Couples | 31.7 |
| Lone Parent | 33.8 |
| Total \% | 32.0 |
| Unweighted N | 1800 |
| Financial help | 90.5 |
| Couples | 87.6 |
| Lone Parent | 90.1 |
| Total \% | 1800 |
| Unweighted N |  |

## Notes to table

Note:
Child care: chi2 $(1)=3.3787 \quad \mathrm{p}=0.5544$
Financial help: chi2(1)=15.95 $\quad \mathrm{p}=0.1281$
Child care here refers to any type of child care undertaken since MCS1.
Financial support consists of: buying essentials for the baby, paying for other household costs, buying gifts and extras for the baby, paying for childcare and other financial help.
Percentages are weighted (using weight1) and observations are unweighted.
Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 4.5b Child care and financial support provided by at least one grandparent (Rest of UK)

|  | At least one grandparent undertaking, \% |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Any type of child care |  |  |
| Couples |  |  |
| Lone Parent |  |  |
| Total |  |  |
| Unweighted N |  |  |
| Financial help | 25.6 |  |
| Couples | 25.2 |  |
| Lone Parent | 13606 |  |
| Total |  |  |
| Unweighted N | 90.1 |  |

## Notes to table

Child care: $\operatorname{chi} 2(1)=7.32 \quad p=0.037$
Financial help: $\operatorname{chi} 2(1)=246.89 \quad p<0.01$
Child care here refers to any type of child care undertaken since MCS1.
Financial support consists of: buying essentials for the baby, paying for other household costs, buying gifts and extras for the baby, paying for childcare and other financial help.
Percentages are weighted (using whnotsco) and observations are unweighted.
Base: MCS2 main respondents in England, Wales and NI

## Employment in the Previous Generation

Table 4.7 Percentage of respondents whose parents were employed when they were 14 by country at MCS2 (Scotland)

|  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland | Chi Square <br> P Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Main Respondent |  |  |  |  |  |  | 66.3 | 67.3 | 70.2 | 52.6 | chi2 6$)=156.26$ |
| Own mother Worked | 9851 | 2184 | 1789 | 1439 | $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unweighted N | 86.8 | 84.7 | 87.3 | 81.6 | chi2 $26=42.43$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Own father Worked | 9851 | 2126 | 1766 | 1426 | $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unweighted N | 67.2 | 67.0 | 68.4 | 50.8 | chi2(6)=126.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partner Respondent | 6757 | 1490 | 1174 | 895 | $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Own mother Worked | 90.3 | 88.2 | 89.9 | 88.2 | chi2(6)=20.43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unweighted N | 6598 | 1456 | 1158 | 892 | $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Own father Worked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes to table
Note: Percentages are weighted (using weight 2) and observations are unweighted.
Base: Country MCS2 main and partner respondents who reported parents employment (including lone parents).

Table 4.7b Percentage of respondents whose parents were employed when they were 14 ( Rest of UK)

|  | Main Respondent, \% | Partner Respondent, \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Own mother Worked | 65.8 | 66.6 |
|  | $[64.3,67.4]$ | $[65.0,68.1]$ |
| Unweighted N | 13474 | 9142 |
| Own father worked | 86.5 | 90.1 |
|  | $[85.5,87.3]$ | $[89.2,90.9]$ |
| Unweighted | 13133 | 8946 |

## Notes to table

Note: Percentages are weighted (using whnotsco) and observations are unweighted. Confidence intervals for each cell percentage are presented.
Base: all MCS2 main and partner respondents in England, Wales and NI who report their parents' employment. Lone parents are included.

Table 4.8a Respondents' parents' social class, based on their occupation when the respondent was 14 (Scotland)

|  | Mothers, \% | Fathers, \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Their mother's Social Class |  |  |
| Managerial \& Professional | $\begin{array}{r} 17.9 \\ {[15.6,20.4]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16.0 \\ {[13.8,18.6]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Intermediate | $\begin{array}{r} 22.0 \\ {[19.0,25.4]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22.1 \\ {[18.5,26.2]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Small Employers and OwnAccount Workers | $\begin{array}{r} 6.9 \\ {[5.8,8.2]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.8 \\ {[5.3,8.6]} \end{array}$ |
| Lower Supervisory and Technical | $\begin{array}{r} 0.7 \\ {[0.4,1.5]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0 \\ {[0.05,1.9]} \end{array}$ |
| Semi-routine and Routine | $\begin{array}{r} 52.4 \\ {[48.6,56.2]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 54.1 \\ {[50.3,58.0]} \end{array}$ |
| Unweighted N | 1234 | 780 |
| Their father's Social Class |  |  |
| Managerial \& Professional | $\begin{array}{r} 27.8 \\ {[24.5,31.3]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26.7 \\ {[23.4,30.2]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Intermediate | $\begin{array}{r} 8.8 \\ {[7.4,10.3]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.6 \\ {[6.1,9.3]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Small Employers and OwnAccount Workers | $\begin{array}{r} 18.7 \\ {[16.4,21.2]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.5 \\ {[15.0,20.3]} \end{array}$ |
| Lower Supervisory and Technical | $\begin{array}{r} 13.5 \\ {[12.1,15.1]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.2 \\ {[13.3,17.3]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Semi-routine and Routine | $\begin{array}{r} 31.3 \\ {[28.4,34.3]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.1 \\ {[29.5,36.8]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Unweighted N | 1507 | 1025 |

## Notes to table

Note: The data for this table is based on an approximation of the SOC codes to the NS-SEC.
Base: MCS2 respondents in Scotland with employed parents when the respondent was 14.
Percentages are weighted (using weight1) and observations are unweighted. Confidence intervals for each cell percentage are presented.

Table 4.8b Respondents' parents' social class, based on their occupation when the respondent was 14 (Rest of the UK)

|  | Mothers, \% | Fathers, \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Their mother's Social Class |  |  |
| Managerial \& Professional | $\begin{array}{r} 16.8 \\ {[15.8,17.9]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16.5 \\ {[15.1-17.9]} \end{array}$ |
| Intermediate | $\begin{array}{r} 19.0 \\ {[18.0,20.1]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.5 \\ {[18.2,20.9]} \end{array}$ |
| Small Employers and OwnAccount Workers | $\begin{array}{r} 8.6 \\ {[7.6,9.6]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.1 \\ {[8.1,10.3]} \end{array}$ |
| Lower Supervisory and Technical | $\begin{array}{r} 0.8 \\ {[0.6,1.1]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.7 \\ {[0.5,1.0]} \end{array}$ |
| Semi-routine and Routine | $\begin{array}{r} 54.8 \\ {[52.8,56.7]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 54.2 \\ {[52.0,56.4]} \end{array}$ |
| Unweighted N | 8061 | 5537 |
| Their father's Social Class |  |  |
| Managerial \& Professional | $\begin{array}{r} 27.7 \\ {[25.8,29.6]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 27.3 \\ {[25.1,29.6]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Intermediate | $\begin{array}{r} 9.9 \\ {[9.0,10.8]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.5 \\ {[9.5,11.4]} \end{array}$ |
| Small Employers and OwnAccount Workers | $\begin{array}{r} 18.0 \\ {[17.1,19.0]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.4 \\ {[16.3,18.5]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Lower Supervisory and Technical | $\begin{array}{r} 13.8 \\ {[12.8,14.8]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14.2 \\ {[13.2,15.3]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Semi-routine and Routine | $\begin{array}{r} 30.7 \\ {[29.0,32.5]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 30.7 \\ {[28.8,32.7]} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Unweighted N | 10794 | 7782 |

## Notes to table

Note: The data for this table is based on an approximation of the SOC codes to the NS-SEC.
Base: MCS2 respondents in England, Wales and NI with employed parents when the respondent was 14.
Percentages are weighted (using whnotsco) and observations are unweighted. Confidence intervals for each cell percentage are presented.

## CHAPTER FIVE. PARENTING

## Time with child

Table 5.1a Mothers' time with child at age 3 (Scotland)

|  | How much time mother has with child |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Plenty | Just <br> enough |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes to table
Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in Scotland

Table 5.1b Mothers' time with child at age 3 (Rest of UK)

|  | How much time mother has with child |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Plenty | Just enough | Not quite enough | Nowhere near enough | Not sure | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Total Unweighted N |
| All Rest of UK Mother's by age | 66 | (15) | (14) | (4) | (<1) | (100) | 13401 |
| Mothers age 16-24 | 78 | 11 | 9 | 3 | $<1$ | 100 | 1915 |
| Mothers age 25-29 | 71 | 14 | 12 | 3 | $<1$ | 100 | 2688 |
| Mothers age 30-34 | 65 | 16 | 14 | 5 | $<1$ | 100 | 4266 |
| Mothers age 35-39 | 61 | 18 | 17 | 5 | $<1$ | 100 | 3350 |
| Mothers age 40+ | 63 | 15 | 17 | 5 | <1 | 100 | 1182 |
| Chi Square | 211.091 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parent's employment situation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two earner household | 50 | 22 | 22 | (7) | $(<1)$ | 100 | 5737 |
| Mother only earner | 44 | 24 | 25 | (8) | (0) | 100 | 255 |
| Father only earner | 87 | 8 | 5 | (1) | $(<1)$ | 100 | 4166 |
| No earner family | 88 | 7 | (4) | (1) | $(<1)$ | 100 | 880 |
| Chi Square | 1954.38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes to table
Note: All MCS2 main respondents mothers in England, Wales and NI.

Table 5.2 Fathers' time with child at age 3 by UK country

|  | How much time father has with child |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Plenty $\%$ | Just enough $\qquad$ | Not quite enough $\%$ | Nowhere near enough \% | Not sure $\%$ | Total $\%$ | Total Unweighted N |
| All UK | 25 | 23 | 37 | 15 | $<1$ | 100 | 10256 |
| England | 24 | 23 | 37 | 16 | $<1$ | 100 | 6707 |
| Wales | 29 | 22 | 35 | 14 | 0 | 100 | 1488 |
| Scotland | 29 | 22 | 34 | 14 | <1 | 100 | 1169 |
| Northern Ireland | 24 | 28 | 39 | 9 | 0 | 100 | 892 |
| Chi Square | 72.98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.01$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^14]Table 5.3a Fathers' time with child at age 3 (Scotland)

|  | How much time father has with child |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Plenty | Just <br> enough |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 Scotland partner respondent fathers . Unweighted observations, weighted percentages (Scotland only using weight 1 Other uk country analysis which uses whnotsco.)

Table 5.3b Fathers' time with child at age 3 (Rest of UK)

|  | How much time father has with child |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Plenty | $\begin{gathered} \text { Just } \\ \text { enough } \end{gathered}$ | Not quite enough | Nowhere near enough | Not sure | Total \% | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ |
| All Rest of UK Fathers by age | 24 | 23 | 37 | 16 | <1 | 100 | 9038 |
| Fathers age $16-24$ | 34 | 28 | 27 | 10 | 2 | 100 | 345 |
| Fathers age 25-29 | 27 | 24 | 31 | 17 | $<1$ | 100 | 1141 |
| Fathers age $30-34$ | 23 | 24 | 38 | 16 | <1 | 100 | 2636 |
| Fathers age 35-39 | 21 | 22 | 40 | 16 | $<1$ | 100 | 2921 |
| Fathers age $40+$ | 28 | 22 | 36 | 15 | $<1$ | 100 | 1995 |
| Chi Square | 124.288 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{P}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parents 'employment situation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two earner family | 20 | 24 | 40 | 16 | <1 | 100 | 4881 |
| Mother only earner | 78 | (14) | (6) | (3) | (0) | 100 | 216 |
| Father only earner | 19 | 23 | 39 | 19 | $<1$ | 100 | 3261 |
| No earner family | 80 | 11 | (6) | (2) | (1) | 100 | 684 |
| Chi Square | 1409.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 partner respondent fathers in England, Wales and NI.

## Family Activities

Table 5.4a Mothers reading with the child at age 3 (Scotland)

|  | How often mothers read with child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Every <br> day <br> \% | Several times a week \% | Once or twice a week \% | Once or twice a month \% | Less often $\%$ | Never $\%$ | Total $\%$ | Total Unweighted N |
| All Scotland Mothers age | 65 | 19 | 13 | 2 | (2) | (1) | (100) | (1785) |
| Mothers age 16-24 | 55 | (19) | (19) | (3) | (4) | (1) | 100 | 230 |
| Mothers age 25-29 | 58 | 24 | (14) | (2) | (1) | (2) | 100 | 304 |
| Mothers age 30-34 | 67 | 18 | 11 | (2) | (2) | 1) | 100 | 549 |
| Mothers age 35-39 | 70 | 16 | 12 | (1) | (1) | (1) | 100 | 515 |
| Mothers age 40+ | 68 | (19) | (11) | (1) | (1) | $(<1)$ | 100 | 187 |
| Chi Square | 367.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parent's employment situation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two earner family | 67 | 19 | 11 | (2) | (1) | $(<1)$ | 100 | 931 |
| Mother only earner | (31) | (13) | (24) | (2) | (0) | (2) | 100 | 53 |
| Father only earner | 69 | 13 | (11) | (1) | (1) | (1) | 100 | 461 |
| No earner family | (34) | (24) | (30) | (3) | (3) | (5) | 100 | 85 |
| Chi Square | 599.98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in Scotland

Table 5.4b Mothers reading with the child at age 3 (Rest of UK)

|  | How often mothers read with child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Every day \% | Several times a week \% | Once or twice a week $\%$ | Once or twice a month $\%$ | Less often <br> \% | Never $\%$ | Total $\%$ | Total <br> Unweighted N |
| All Rest of UK Mothers age | 61 | 19 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 13424 |
| Mothers age 16-24 | 50 | 21 | 19 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 1917 |
| Mothers age 25-29 | 54 | 20 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 2692 |
| Mothers age 30-34 | 64 | 18 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 100 | 4271 |
| Mothers age 35-39 | 66 | 19 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 100 | 3359 |
| Mothers age 40+ | 65 | 19 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 100 | 1185 |
| Chi Square | 328.99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parent's employment situation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two earner family | 67 | 19 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 5735 |
| Mother only earner | 57 | 20 | (17) | (2) | (3) | (1) | 100 | 255 |
| Father only earner | 63 | 18 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 100 | 4184 |
| No earner family | 39 | 20 | 23 | 6 | (4) | 9 | 100 | 883 |
| Chi Square | 499.99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | $\mathrm{P}=(0.00)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in England, Wales and NI.
Table 5.5 Fathers reading with the child at age 3 by UK country

|  | How often fathers read with child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Every day \% | Several times a week \% | Once or twice a week \% | Once or twice a month \% | Less often \% | Never <br> \% | Total <br> \% | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ |
| All UK | 23 | 27 | 32 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 10250 |
| England | 23 | 27 | 32 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 100 | 6702 |
| Wales | 22 | 23 | 33 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 100 | 1488 |
| Scotland | 26 | 29 | 32 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 100 | 1169 |
| Northern Ireland | 22 | 25 | 30 | 11 | 7 | 5 | 100 | 891 |
| Chi Square | 70.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | $\mathrm{P}<0.01$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Base: All MCS2 partner respondent fathers in country. Unweighted observations, weighted percentages (using weight 2 except country analysis which uses Weight 1 ).

Table 5.6a Fathers reading with the child at age 3 (Scotland)

|  | How often fathers read with child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Every <br> day <br> \% | Several times a week \% | Once or twice a week \% | Once or twice a month \% | Less <br> often $\%$ | Never $\%$ | Total <br> \% | Total Unweighted N |
| All Scotland Fathers age | 26 | 29 | 32 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 100 | 1166 |
| Fathers age (16-24) | (11) | (21) | (52) | (4) | (10) | (2) | 100 | (42) |
| Fathers age $(25-29)$ | 26 | (22) | 37 | (7) | (5) | (3) | 100 | 154 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fathers age } \\ & (30-34) \end{aligned}$ | 22 | 30 | 32 | (9) | (4) | (3) | 100 | 317 |
| Fathers age $(35-39)$ | 27 | 31 | 30 | (5) | (4) | (3) | 100 | 370 |
| Fathers age $(40+)$ | 30 | 29 | 27 | (8) | (5) | (2) | 100 | 283 |
| Chi Square | 256.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}<0.10$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parents employment situation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two earner family | 28 | 30 | 31 | (6) | (3) | (2) | 100 | 729 |
| Mother only earner | (36) | (30) | (27) | 0 | (7) | 0 | 100 | (42) |
| Father only earner | 22 | 26 | 33 | (9) | (6) | (3) | 100 | 325 |
| No earner family | (12) | (26) | (30) | (10) | (14) | (9) | 100 | 68 |
| Chi Square | 404.65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 partner respondent fathers in Scotland

Table 5.6b Fathers reading with the child at age 3 (Rest of UK)

|  | How often fathers read with child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Every day \% | Several times a week $\%$ | Once or twice a week $\%$ | Once or twice a month \% | Less often $\%$ | Never <br> $\%$ | Total $\%$ | Total Unweighted N |
| All Rest of UK Fathers age | 23 | 27 | 32 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 100 | (9032 |
| Fathers age (16-24) | (13) | (15) | 47 | (10) | (8) | (8) | 100 | 345 |
| Fathers age (25-29) | 15 | 20 | 38 | 11 | 6 | 10 | 100 | 1141 |
| Fathers age (30-34) | 25 | 28 | 29 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 100 | 2634 |
| Fathers age (35-39) | 23 | 29 | 31 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 100 | 2919 |
| Fathers age (40+) | 24 | 26 | 32 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 100 | 1993 |
| Chi Square | 219.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | $\mathrm{P}=0.00$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parents' employment situation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two earner family | 25 | 28 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 100 | 4879 |
| Mother only earner | 35 | 28 | 26 | (5) | (2) | (3) | 100 | 216 |
| Father only earner | 20 | 24 | 33 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 100 | 3258 |
| No earner family | 15 | 19 | 31 | 9 | 11 | 16 | 100 | 683 |
| Chi Square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | $\mathrm{P}=0.00$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes to table
Base: All MCS2 partner respondent fathers in England, Wales and NI.

## Parenting Competence - Regularity of Bedtime

Table 5.7 Regularity of bedtimes at age 3 by UK country

|  | Regular bedtimes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never <br> \% | Some times \% | Usually $\%$ | Always <br> $\%$ | Total <br> \% | Total <br> Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| All UK | 7 | 12 | 3 | 43 | 100 | 14541 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 7 | 13 | 38 | 43 | 100 | 9802 |
| Wales | 9 | 11 | 34 | 46 | 100 | 2200 |
| Scotland | 5 | 11 | 43 | 40 | 100 | 1785 |
| Northern Ireland | 7 | 12 | 41 | 41 | 100 | 1433 |
| Chi Square | 67.36 |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |

[^15]Table 5.8a Regularity of bedtimes at age 3 - (Scotland)

|  | Regular bedtimes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never <br> \% | Some times \% | Usually $\%$ | Always $\%$ | Total <br> \% | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ |
| All Scotland <br> mothers <br> Parent's <br> employment <br> situation | 5 | 10 | 44 | 41 | 100 | 1530 |
| Two earner family | (4) | 8 | 48 | 40 | 100 | 931 |
| Mother only earner | (13) | (6) | (36) | (45) | 100 | 53 |
| Father only earner | (5) | 13 | 37 | 45 | 100 | 461 |
| No earner family | (9) | (33) | (32) | (27) | 100 | 85 |
| Chi Square | 585.35 |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in Scotland

Table 5.8b Regularity of bedtimes at age 3 - (Rest of UK)

|  | Regular bedtimes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never <br> \% | Some times \% | Usually $\%$ | Always \% | Total \% | Total Unweighted N |
| All Rest of UK mothers Parent's employment situation | 6 | 12 | 39 | 43 | 100 | 11057 |
| Two earner family | 5 | 10 | 42 | 43 | 100 | 5735 |
| Mother only earner | (12) | (17) | 37 | 34 | 100 | 255 |
| Father only earner | 7 | 13 | 36 | 45 | 100 | 4184 |
| No earner family | 14 | 19 | 31 | 36 | 100 | 883 |
| Chi Square | 200.77 |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in England, Wales and NI

## Regularity of Mealtimes

Table 5.9 Regularity of mealtimes at age 3 by UK country

|  | Regular mealtimes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never <br> \% | Some times \% | Usually $\%$ | Always $\%$ | Total \% | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ |
| All UK | 2 | 7 | 45 | 47 | 100 | 14541 |
| England | 2 | 7 | 45 | 47 | 100 | 9802 |
| Wales | 3 | 7 | 39 | 52 | 10 | 2200 |
| Scotland | 1 | 4 | 47 | 48 | 100 | 1785 |
| Northern Ireland | 1 | 5 | 40 | 54 | 100 | 1433 |
| Chi Square | 101.98 |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in country
Unweighted observations, weighted \%s (using weight 2 except country analysis which uses Weight 1 ).

Table 5.10a Regularity of mealtimes at age 3 - (Scotland)

|  | Regular mealtimes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never <br> \% | Some times \% | Usually $\%$ | Always $\%$ | Total <br> $\%$ | Total Unweighted N |
| All mothers | (1) | 4 | 47 | 48 | 100 | 1785 |
| Mothers age 16-24 | (2) | (8) | 46 | 45 | 100 | 230 |
| Mothers age 25-29 | (1) | (6) | 42 | 52 | 100 | 304 |
| Mothers age 30-34 | (1) | (3) | 49 | 47 | 100 | 549 |
| Mothers age 35-39 | $(<1)$ | (3) | 48 | 49 | 100 | 515 |
| Mothers age 40+ | (1) | (4) | 52 | 43 | 100 | 187 |
| Chi Square | 194.03 |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | $(<0.05)$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in Scotland

Table 5.10b Regularity of mealtimes at age 3 - (Rest of UK)

|  | Regular mealtimes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never <br> \% | Some times \% | Usually $\%$ | Always $\%$ | Total <br> \% | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ |
| Rest of UK <br> Mothers age | 2 | 7 | 44 | 47 | 100 | 13424 |
| Mothers age 16-24 | 3 | 11 | 40 | 45 | 100 | 1917 |
| Mothers age 25-29 | 2 | 8 | 40 | 49 | 100 | 2692 |
| Mothers age 30-34 | (1) | 6 | 44 | 49 | 100 | 4271 |
| Mothers age 35-39 | 2 | 5 | 46 | 47 | 100 | 3359 |
| Mothers age 40+ | 2 | 7 | 50 | 40 | 100 | 1185 |
| Chi Square | 178.559 |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes to table
Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in England, Wales and NI

## Parenting beliefs and values

Table 5.11 Important qualities for children at age 3 by UK country

|  | Most important quality for child to have |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | To be well liked/ popular $\%$ | ```To think for themselves %``` | To work hard \% | To help others \% | To obey parents $\%$ | To learn religious values \% | Total <br> \% | Total Unweighted N |
| All UK | 5 | 50 | 13 | 19 | 11 | 3 | 100 | 14651 |
| England | 5 | 50 | 13 | 19 | 11 | 3 | 100 | 9310 |
| Wales | 5 | 47 | 15 | 20 | 11 | 2 | 100 | 2152 |
| Scotland | 3 | 55 | 12 | 19 | 9 | 2 | 100 | 1778 |
| Northern Ireland | 2 | 40 | 13 | 20 | 20 | 6 | 100 | 1421 |
| Chi Square | 257.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^16]Table 5.12a Important qualities for children at age 3 - (Scotland)

|  | Most important quality for child to have |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | To be well liked/ popular \% | ```To think for themselves %``` | To work hard \% | To help others $\%$ | To obey parents $\%$ | To learn religious values \% | Total $\%$ | Total Unweighted N |
| All Scotland Mothers age | 3 | 55 | 12 | 19 | 9 | 2 | 100 | 1768 |
| Mothers age $16-24$ | (3) | 51 | (20) | (18) | (7) | (1) | 100 | 229 |
| Mothers age 25-29 | (2) | 48 | (13) | 23 | (11) | (3) | 100 | 304 |
| Mothers age 30-34 | (3) | 54 | 11 | 22 | (7) | (2) | 100 | 547 |
| Mothers age 35-39 | (5) | 59 | 10 | 17 | 9 | (1) | 100 | 512 |
| Mothers age 40+ | (4) | 60 | (12) | (12) | (9) | (2) | 100 | 186 |
| Chi Square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | $(\mathrm{p}=0.00)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes to table
Base All MCS2 main respondent mothers in Scotland

Table 5.12b Important qualities for children at age 3 -( Rest of UK)

|  | Most important quality for child to have |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | To be well liked/ popular \% | ```To think for themselves %``` | To work hard \% | To help others $\%$ | To obey parents $\%$ | To learn religious values \% | Total $\%$ | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ |
| All rest of UK Mothers age | 4 | 46 | 14 | 19 | 14 | 4 | 100 | 12873 |
| Mothers age 16-24 | 2 | 38 | 19 | 22 | 16 | 3 | 100 | 1855 |
| Mothers age $25-29$ | 3 | 46 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 3 | 100 | 2528 |
| Mothers age 30-34 | 5 | 51 | 11 | 19 | 11 | 3 | 100 | 4099 |
| Mothers age $35-39$ | 7 | 54 | 10 | 17 | 9 | 3 | 100 | 3260 |
| Mothers age 40+ | 4 | 54 | 9 | 19 | 9 | 5 | 100 | 1131 |
| Chi Square | 386.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | $(\mathrm{p}=0.00)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in England, Wales and NI

Table 5.13 Important values for children by UK country

| Values mother would want child to have |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Independence <br> $\%$ | Obedience <br> and respect <br> \% | Art of <br> negotiation <br> $\%$ | Respect for <br> elders <br> $\%$ | Doing well <br> at school <br> $\%$ | Religious <br> values <br> $\%$ | Total <br> Unweighted <br> ( |
| All UK | 99 | 99 | 97 | 100 | 99 | 56 | 14006 |
| England | 99 | 99 | 97 | 100 | 99 | 56 | 9282 |
| Wales | 100 | 99 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 52 | 2157 |
| Scotland | 100 | 99 | 97 | 100 | 99 | 52 | 1773 |
| Northern <br> Ireland | 100 | 100 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 85 | 1422 |
| Chi Square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value |  |  |  |  |  |  | 565.08 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in country
Unweighted observations, weighted \%s (using weight 2 except country analysis which uses Weight 1 ).

Table 5.14a Important values for children - (Scotland)

| Values mother would want child to have |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Independence $\%$ | Obedience and respect $\%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Art of } \\ \text { negotiation } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ```Respect for elders \%``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { Doing well } \\ \text { at school } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Religious } \\ \text { values } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total <br> Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| All Scotland <br> Mothers age | 100 | 99 | 97 | 100 | 99 | 52 | 1607 |
| Mothers age 16-24 | 99 | 99 | 95 | 100 | 99 | 33 | 191 |
| Mothers age $25-29$ | 100 | 99 | 96 | 100 | 99 | 41 | 278 |
| Mothers age $30-34$ | 100 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 99 | 52 | 493 |
| Mothers age 35-39 | 100 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 99 | 60 | 473 |
| Mothers age 40+ | 100 | 98 | 98 | 99 | 98 | 65 | 172 |
| Chi Square | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | $(\mathrm{p}=0.00)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^17]Table 5.14b Important values for children - (Rest of UK)

| Values mother would want child to have |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Independence $\%$ | Obedience and respect \% | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Art of } \\ \text { negotiation } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Respect for elders \% | Doing well at school $\%$ | Religious values \% | Total Unweighted N |
| All Rest of UK <br> Mothers age | 99 | 99 | 97 | 100 | 99 | 56 | 11654 |
| Mothers age 16-24 | 99 | 99 | 95 | 99 | 100 | 38 | 1670 |
| Mothers age 25-29 | 99 | 99 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 48 | 2260 |
| Mothers age 30-34 | 100 | 100 | 97 | 100 | 99 | 58 | 3672 |
| Mothers age 35-39 | 100 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 99 | 64 | 3008 |
| Mothers age 40+ | 99 | 99 | 97 | 99 | 99 | 68 | 1044 |
| Chi Square | 445.42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}=0.00$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in England, Wales and NI

## Rules

Table 5.15 Mothers rules at age 3 by UK country

|  | Type of rules |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lots of rules \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not many } \\ \text { rules } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Varies <br> \% | Total \% | Total Unweighted N |
| All UK | 31 | 42 | 27 | 100 | 15219 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 31 | 43 | 26 | 100 | 9801 |
| Wales | 30 | 43 | 27 | 100 | 2200 |
| Scotland | 33 | 37 | 30 | 100 | 1785 |
| Northern Ireland | 25 | 42 | 33 | 100 | 1434 |
| Chi Square | 58.60 |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | ( $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ) |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in country
Unweighted observations, weighted percentages (using weight 2 except country analysis which uses Weight 1.)

Table 5.16 Whether mother reports rules were strictly enforced: child age 3 by UK country

|  | Whether rules strictly enforced |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Strictly <br> enforced | Not very <br> strictly <br> enforced <br> \% | It Varies | Total | Total <br> Unweighted <br> N |
|  | $\%$ | 24 | $\mathbf{\%}$ | \% |  |
| All UK | 49 |  | 27 | 100 | 15219 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 50 | 24 | 26 | 100 | 9801 |
| Wales | 47 | 46 | 23 | 30 | 100 |
| Scotland | 41 | 25 | 29 | 100 | 2200 |
| Northern Ireland | 27.0639 |  | 35 | 100 | 1785 |
| Chi Square | $(\mathrm{p}<0.001)$ |  |  |  | 1434 |
| P. Value |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes to table
Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in country
Unweighted observations, weighted percentages (using weight 2 except country analysis which uses Weight 1.)

## Parenting Style

Table 5.17 Mothers' parenting style at age 3 by UK country

|  | Mothers parenting style |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Firm rules and discipline $\%$ | Lots of fun $\%$ | Not really thought about it \% | Firm rules with fun \% | Doing my best \% | Total <br> \% | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ |
| All | 2 | 5 | 2 | 42 | 50 | 100 | 14723 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | 2 | 5 | 2 | 44 | 47 | 100 | 9350 |
| Wales | 2 | 5 | 2 | 41 | 50 | 100 | 2165 |
| Scotland | 2 | 5 | 2 | 40 | 51 | 100 | 1780 |
| Northern Ireland | 2 | 3 | 1 | 31 | 63 | 100 | 1428 |
| Chi Square | 144.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P. Value | (p<0.001) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in country
weighted percentages (using weight 2 except country analysis which uses Weight 1.)
CHAPTER SIX. CHILD HEALTH
Disability and general health
Table 6.1 Parental concerns about eyesight, hearing and long-standing IIness at MCS2, by country and type of ward at MCS1

| Country at MCS1 | England | England | England | Wales | Wales | Scotland | Scotland | N.Ireland | N.Ireland | UK |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of ward at MCS1 | Not disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Minority Ethnic | Not disadvantaged | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dis- } \\ \text { advantaged } \end{gathered}$ | Not disadvantaged | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dis- } \\ \text { advantaged } \end{gathered}$ | Not disadvantaged | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Dis- } \\ \text { advantaged } \end{gathered}$ | Total | Chi square (P Value) |
| Any problem with eyes | 6.1 | 7.1 | 5.3 | (4.9) | 8.3 | 6.1 | 7.1 | 4.7 | 8.8 | 6.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 12.62 \\ (0.0458) \end{array}$ |
| N (unweighted) | 4122 | 3735 | 1875 | 676 | 1531 | 912 | 861 | 569 | 834 | 15115 |  |
| Any problem with hearing | 5.5 | 4.4 | 3.3 | (4.0) | 5.3 | (2.6) | (2.8) | (4.4) | (4.0) | 4.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 27.67 \\ (0.0001) \end{array}$ |
| N (unweighted) | 4111 | 3737 | 1878 | 671 | 1526 | 913 | 859 | 567 | 833 | 15095 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Long-term } \\ & \text { illness } \end{aligned}$ | 15.6 | 17.4 | 13.2 | 13.4 | 16.9 | 14.0 | 17.3 | 11.0 | 15.0 | 15.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 20.89 \\ (0.0145) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| N (unweighted) | 4139 | 3765 | 1884 | 677 | 1536 | 915 | 861 | 571 | 836 | 15184 |  |

Table 6.2a Longstanding illness by children's gender (Scotland)

|  | Male | Female | Total | Chi square <br> (p value) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Longstanding illness (per cent) | 15.5 | 14.0 | 14.8 | 0.92 |
| Unweighted n | 921 | 874 | 1795 | $(0.3388)$ |

Notes to table
Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 6.2b Longstanding illness at ag e3 by children's gender (Rest of UK)

|  | Male | Female | Total | Chi square <br> (p value) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Longstanding illness (per cent) | 16.8 | 14.9 | 15.9 | 5.09 |
| Unweighted n | 6950 | 6692 | 13642 | $(0.0247)$ |

Notes to table
Base: MCS2 main respondents in England, Wales and NI.

Table 6.3a Longstanding illness at age 3 by family income at MCS1 (Scotland)

|  |  | Above 60 per cent <br> median <br> equivalised income | Below 60 per cent <br> median equivalised <br> income | Total | p value |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Family income at nine months |  |  |  |  |  |

[^18]Table 6.3b Longstanding illness at age 3 by family income at MCS1 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Above 60 per cent median equivalised income | Below 60 per cent median equivalised income | Total | p value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Family income at nine months |  |  |  |
| Longstanding illness |  | 15.9 | 15.4 | 15.8 | 0.32 |
|  | Unweighted n | 8804 | 3918 | 12722 | (0.5701) |
| Among those with longstanding illness: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Limiting condition |  | 17.1 | 24.9 | 18.9 | 11.41 |
|  | Unweighted n | 1381 | 606 | 1980 | (0.0008) |
|  |  | Family income at three years |  |  |  |
| Longstanding illness |  | 16.1 | 16.8 | 16.3 | 0.56 |
|  | Unweighted n | 7667 | 3767 | 11434 | (0.4556) |
| Among those with longstanding illness |  |  |  |  |  |
| Limiting condition |  | 16.8 | 24.5 | 18.8 | 15.01 |
|  | Unweighted n | 1210 | 633 | 1836 | (0.0001) |

Notes to table
Base: MCS2 main respondents in England, Wales and NI.
Asthma and acute illnesses
Table 6.4 Asthma, wheezing and chickenpox by country and type of ward at MCS1

| Country at MCS1 | England | England | England | Wales | Wales | Scotland | Scotland | N.Ireland | N.Ireland | UK |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of ward at MCS1 | Not disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Minority Ethnic | Not disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Not disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Not disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Total | Chi square (P Value) |
| Ever had asthma | 10.3 | 14.8 | 11.0 | 12.4 | 16.2 | 7.5 | 12.7 | 12.3 | 15.8 | 11.5 | $\begin{array}{r} 76.97 \\ (<0.0001) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Unweighted N | 4072 | 3691 | 1861 | 669 | 1504 | 905 | 852 | 562 | 829 | 14945 |  |
| Wheezing/ whistling | 29.5 | 33.9 | 25.4 | 30.3 | 36.8 | 25.3 | 32.5 | 26.8 | 32.8 | 30.5 | $\begin{array}{r} 53.42 \\ (<0.0001) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Unweighted N | 4139 | 3765 | 1884 | 677 | 1536 | 915 | 861 | 571 | 836 | 15184 |  |
| Recurring ear infections | 6.8 | 6.6 | 4.4 | 7.8 | 9.3 | 6.2 | 7.7 | (5.3) | (5.0) | 6.5 | $\begin{array}{r} 16.88 \\ (0.2679) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| N (unweighted) | 4139 | 3765 | 1884 | 677 | 1536 | 915 | 861 | 571 | 836 | 15184 |  |
| Ever had chickenpox*** | 49.6 | 40.0 | 31.1 | 51.3 | 43.8 | 50.0 | 38.7 | 44.7 | 35.9 | 44.7 | $\begin{array}{r} 187.05 \\ (<0.0001) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| N (unweighted) | 4098 | 3719 | 1872 | 671 | 1522 | 907 | 857 | 564 | 830 | 14990 |  |

Table 6.5a Asthma and wheezing, chickenpox and recurring ear infections at MCS2 by gender (Scotland)

|  | Male | Female | Total | Chi <br> square <br> (p value) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Asthma | 11.6 | 7.0 | 9.4 | 10.81 |
| Unweighted n | 910 | 866 | 1776 | $(0.0011)$ |
| Wheezing in chest | 32.2 | 23.4 | 27.9 | 22.3 |
| Unweighted n | 921 | 874 | 1795 | $(0.0000)$ |
| Chickenpox | 44.8 | 47.9 | 46.3 | 2.31 |
| Unweighted n | 913 | 868 | 1781 | $(0.1291)$ |
| Recurring ear infections | 7.7 | 5.6 | 6.7 | 2.90 |
| Unweighted n | 919 | 872 | 1791 | $(0.0893)$ |

Notes to table
Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland.

Table 6.5b Asthma and wheezing, chickenpox and recurring ear infections at MCS2 by gender (Rest of UK)

|  | Male | Female | Total | Chi <br> square <br> (p value) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Asthma | 14.0 | 9.8 | 11.9 | 39.02 |
| Unweighted n | 6826 | 6590 | 13416 | $(0.0000)$ |
| Wheezing in chest | 33.9 | 27.5 | 30.7 | 48.3 |
| Unweighted n | 6950 | 6692 | 13642 | $(0.0000)$ |
| Chickenpox | 44.4 | 47.0 | 45.6 | 7.19 |
| Unweighted n | 6877 | 6632 | 13509 | $(0.0077)$ |
| Recurring ear infections | 8.0 | 5.6 | 6.7 | 14.74 |
| Unweighted n | 6937 | 6687 | 13624 | $(0.0001)$ |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 main respondents in England, Wales and NI

Table 6.6a Child asthma, wheezing and recurring ear infections at MCS2 by maternal smoking (Scotland)

|  | Mother smoked in pregnancy |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | No |  | Yes | Total |
|  |  | Chi square <br> $(\mathrm{p}$ value $)$ |  |  |
| Asthma | 8.0 | 12.4 | 9.5 | 9.44 |
| Unweighted n | 1120 | 627 | 1747 | $(0.0023)$ |
| Wheezing or whistling in the chest | 25.3 | 31.7 | 27.5 | 6.68 |
| Unweighted n | 1131 | 634 | 1765 | $(0.0101)$ |
| Recurring ear infection | 6.2 | 8.1 | 6.8 | 2.65 |
| Unweighted n | 1128 | 633 | 1761 | $(0.1044)$ |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 main respondents for Scotland

Table 6.6b Child asthma, wheezing and recurring ear infections at MCS2 by maternal smoking (Rest of UK)

|  | Mother smoked in pregnancy |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | No |  | Yes | Total |
|  | Chi square <br> $(\mathrm{p}$ value) |  |  |  |
| Asthma | 10.3 | 14.9 | 11.8 | 34.6 |
| Unweighted n | 8271 | 4264 | 12535 | $(0.0000)$ |
| Wheezing or whistling in the chest | 28.1 | 63.1 | 30.7 | 66.5 |
| Unweighted n | 8402 | 4349 | 12751 | $(0.0000)$ |
| Recurring ear infection | 6.0 | 7.8 | 6.6 | 10.3 |
| Unweighted n | 8393 | 4342 | 12735 | $(0.0015)$ |

[^19]
## Injuries

Table 6.7 Injuries by country and type of ward at MCS1

| ENGLAND | Accident of injury prompting <br> health service attendance | Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Not disadvantaged | 31.4 | 4140 |
| Disadvantaged | 38.6 | 3765 |
| Minority ethnic | 26.0 | 1884 |
| SCOTLAND |  | 38.9 |
| Not disadvantaged | 39.1 | 676 |
| Disadvantaged |  | 1536 |
| WALES | 34.4 |  |
| Not disadvantaged | 40.3 | 915 |
| Disadvantaged |  | 861 |
| NORTHERN IRELAND | 34.5 |  |
| Not disadvantaged | 36.1 | 571 |
| Disadvantaged | 35.4 | 836 |
| UK Total |  | 15184 |

## Notes to table

Chi square (P Value)76.3494 ( $<0.0001$ )
Base: MCS2 main respondents in country and ward

Table 6.8a Health service attendance for accidental injury by child gender (Scotland)

|  | Males | Females | Total | Chi square <br> $(\mathbf{p}$ value $)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 37.6 | 35.2 | 36.4 | 1.24 |
| Unweighted n | 921 | 874 | 1795 | $(0.2670)$ |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 6.8b Health service attendance for accidental injury by child gender (Rest of UK)

|  | Males | Females | Total | Chi square <br> $(\mathrm{p}$ value $)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 39.5 | 30.9 | 35.3 | 79.96 |
| Unweighted n | 6951 | 6691 | 13642 | $(0.0000)$ |

[^20]Table 6.9a Health service attendance for accidental injury at MCS2 by family income at nine months and three years (Scotland)

|  |  | Above 60 per cent <br> median equivalised income | Below 60 per cent <br> median equivalised income | Total | Chi square <br> (p value) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Income at <br> nine months |  | 35.0 | 41.4 | 36.6 | 7.19 |
|  | Unweighted n | 1313 | 457 | 1770 | $(0.0077)$ |
| Income at <br> three years |  | 34.8 | 39.5 | 35.8 | 3.29 |
|  | 1200 | 381 | 1581 | $(0.0706)$ |  |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 6.9b Health service attendance for accidental injury at MCS2 by family income at nine months and three years (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Above 60 per cent median <br> equivalised income | Below 60 per cent median <br> equivalised income | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Income at nine <br> months |  | 34.8 | 36.5 | 35.2 | 1.82 |
|  |  | 8804 | 3918 | 12722 | $(0.1778)$ |
| Income at <br> three years |  | 34.9 | 38.5 | 35.9 | 9.01 |
|  | Unweighted n | 7667 | 3767 | 11434 | $(0.0029)$ |

Notes to table
Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI
Table 6.10 Immunisation for Measles, Mumps and Rubella by country and type of ward at MCS1

| Country at MCS1 | England | England | England | Wales | Wales | Scotland | Scotland | N. Ireland | N. Ireland | UK |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of ward at MCS1 | Not disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Minority Ethnic | Not disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Not disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Not disadvantaged | Disadvantaged | Total \% | Chi square (P Value) |
| Immunisation for measles, mumps or rubella |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 5.6 | 6.8 | 7.6 | (6.6) | 9.0 | 5.7 | 6.0 | (3.3) | (4.7) | 6.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 9.581 \\ (0.0575) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Combined MMR vaccine | 86.6 | 89.7 | 89.9 | 89.2 | 88.0 | 90.9 | 91.4 | 94.1 | 94.1 | 88.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 55.81 \\ (0.0002) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| At least one separately | 7.8 | 3.5 | 2.5 | (4.2) | 3.0 | (3.4) | (2.6) | (2.6) | (1.2) | 5.6 | $\begin{array}{r} 149.23 \\ (0.0001) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Total N unweighted | 4140 | 3765 | 1884 | 677 | 1536 | 915 | 861 | 571 | 836 | 15185 |  |

Notes to table
Base: MCS main respondents in country and ward.

Table 6.11a Immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella by gender (Scotland)

|  | Male | Female | Total | Chi square <br> (p value) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| None | 6.2 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 0.17 |
| Unweighted n | 921 | 874 | 1795 | $(0.6818)$ |
| Combined MMR vaccine | 90.3 | 91.6 | 91.0 | 0.72 |
| Unweighted n | 921 | 874 | 1795 | $(0.3953)$ |
| At least one separately | 3.5 | $(2.7)$ | 3.1 | 0.89 |
| Unweighted n | 921 | 874 | 1795 | $(0.3473)$ |

Notes to table
Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland.

Table 6.11b Immunisation for measles, mumps and rubella by gender (rest of UK)

|  | Male | Female | Total | Chi square <br> (p value) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| None | 6.5 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 4.39 |
| Unweighted n | 6951 | 6692 | 13643 | $(0.0369)$ |
| Combined MMR vaccine | 87.2 | 88.9 | 88.0 | 6.0 |
| Unweighted n | 6951 | 6692 | 13643 | $(0.0148)$ |
| At least one separately | 6.3 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 2.17 |
| Unweighted n | 6951 | 6692 | 13643 | $(0.1418)$ |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 main respondents in England, Wales and NI.

## Height and weight

Table 6.12a. Overweight and obesity by children's gender (Scotland)

|  | Male <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | Female <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | Total <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | p value |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Normal weight | 77.3 | 74.0 | 75.7 |  |
| Overweight (excluding obesity) | 17.8 | 20.7 | 19.2 |  |
| Obesity | $(5.0)$ | $(5.3)$ | 5.1 |  |
| Total $\%$ | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Unweighted $n$ | 814 | 804 | 1,618 | $\mathrm{p}=.28$ |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 singleton children with valid data. In Scotland

Table 6.12b Overweight and obesity by children's gender (Rest of UK)

|  | Male <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | Female <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | Total <br> $\mathbf{\%}$ | p value |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Normal weight | 78.0 | 76.7 | 77.3 |  |
| Overweight (excluding obesity) | 17.7 | 18.0 | 17.8 |  |
| Obesity | 4.3 | 5.3 | 4.8 |  |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Unweighted n | 6,151 | 6,002 | 12,153 | $\mathrm{p}=.08$ |

Notes to table
Base: MCS2 singleton children with valid data .in England, Wales and NI.

Table 6.13a Childhood overweight and obesity by equivalised family income (Scotland)

|  | Above 60\% <br> national median | Below 60\% <br> national median | Total \% | p value |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Normal weight | 75.8 | 75.9 | 75.8 |  |
| Overweight <br> obesity) | 19.9 | 18.2 | 19.5 |  |
| Obesity | 4.4 | $(5.9)$ | 4.7 |  |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Unweighted n | 1,091 | 335 | 1,426 | $\mathrm{p}=.41$ |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 singleton children with valid data. In Scotland

Table 6.13b Childhood overweight and obesity by equivalised family income (Rest of UK)

|  | Above 60\% <br> national median | Below 60\% <br> national median | Total \% | p value |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Normal weight | 77.8 | 76.8 | 77.5 |  |
| Overweight (excluding <br> obesity) | 18.0 | 17.4 | 17.8 |  |
| Obesity | 4.2 | 5.8 | 4.6 |  |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Unweighted n | 6,942 | 3,317 | 10,259 | $\mathrm{p}=.02$ |

[^21]Table 6.14a Childhood overweight and obesity by mother's highest academic qualification at MCS1 (Scotland)

|  | Degree | Diploma | A/AS/S levels | GCSE grades A-C or above | GCSE grades D-G or below | Other academic qualification | None of these qualifications | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | p value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Normal weight | 76.0 | 74.4 | 78.6 | 74.6 | (68.1) | (91.2) | 75.2 | 75.6 |  |
| Overweight (excluding obesity) | 20.0 | (23.2) | (15.0) | 20.3 | (24.2) | (8.8) | (17.8) | 19.3 |  |
| Obesity | (4.0) | (2.4) | (6.5) | (5.2) | (7.7) | (0) | (6.9) | 5.1 |  |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Unweighted n | 353 | 158 | 293 | 511 | 73 | 19 | 209 | 1,616 | $\mathrm{p}=.27$ |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 singleton children with valid data. in Scotland
Table 6.14b Childhood overweight and obesity by mother's highest academic qualification at MCS1 (Rest of UK)

|  | Degree | Diploma | A/AS/S levels | GCSE grades A-C or above | GCSE grades D-G or below | Other academic qualification | None of these qualifications | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $p$ value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Normal weight | 79.0 | 78.0 | 80.3 | 77.3 | 74.2 | 77.1 | 74.9 | 77.3 |  |
| Overweight (excluding obesity) | 17.4 | 16.7 | 16.2 | 18.4 | 18.9 | (17.0) | 18.5 | 17.9 |  |
| Obesity | 3.6 | 5.4 | (3.5) | 4.4 | 6.9 | (5.9) | 6.6 | 4.8 |  |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Unweighted n | 2,015 | 1,083 | 1,031 | 4,140 | 1,357 | 342 | 2,159 | 12,127 | $\mathrm{p}=.001$ |

## Toilet training

Table 6.15a Toilet training and concerns about speech by gender (Scotland)

|  | Male | Female | Total | Chi square <br> $(\mathbf{p ~ v a l u e ) ~}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Always dry by day | 78.6 | 89.6 | 83.9 | 32.80 |
| Unweighted n | 920 | 874 | 1794 | $(0.0000)$ |
| Always clean by day | 78.4 | 91.2 | 84.6 | 67.29 |
| Unweighted n | 919 | 873 | 1792 | $(0.0000)$ |
|  |  |  |  | 67.29 |
| Concerns about speech | 15.1 | 8.9 | 12.1 | $(0.0000)$ |
| Unweighted n | 921 | 874 | 1795 | 23.77 |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 sample in Scotland

Table 6.15b Toilet training and concerns about speech by gender (Rest of UK)

|  | Male | Female | Total | Chi square <br> $(\mathbf{p ~ v a l u e ) ~}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  | 176.08 |
| Always dry by day | 77.8 | 87.9 | 82.7 | $(0.0000)$ |
| Unweighted n | 6941 | 6691 | 13632 | 184.99 |
| Always clean by day | 78.1 | 88.7 | 83.3 | $(0.0000)$ |
| Unweighted n | 6945 | 6686 | 13631 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 132.77 |
| Concerns about speech | 17.4 | 9.8 | 13.7 | $(0.0000)$ |
| Unweighted n | 6951 | 6692 | 13643 |  |
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## CHAPTER 7. CHILD DEVELOPMENT

## British Ability Scales (BAS) Naming Vocabulary

Table: 7.1 BAS Mean and Percentile Scores by Country and Child Gender

| BAS | Mean | Standard Error | $\begin{gathered} 10^{\text {th }} \\ \text { percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25^{\text {th }} \\ \text { percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }} \\ \text { percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75^{\text {th }} \\ \text { percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90^{\text {th }} \\ \text { percentile } \end{gathered}$ | unweighted $\qquad$ N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 50.6 | 0.21 | 38 | 43 | 49 | 58 | 64 | 12096 |
| England | 50.4 | 0.24 | 38 | 43 | 49 | 58 | 63 | 7780 |
| Wales | 50.6 | 0.49 | 38 | 44 | 49 | 56 | 63 | 1871 |
| Scotland | 53.0 | 0.41 | 41 | 45 | 51 | 59 | 67 | 1361 |
| Northern Ireland | 51.8 | 0.48 | 41 | 45 | 49 | 56 | 67 | 1084 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{F}=11.15 \quad$ Prob $>\mathrm{F}=0.0000$ |  |
| Males | 49.3 | 0.23 | 37 | 41 | 49 | 56 | 63 | 6133 |
| Females | 52.0 | 0.24 | 39 | 44 | 51 | 58 | $\mathrm{F}=157.06$ Prob $>\mathrm{F}=0.0000$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Mean scores weighted using weight 2.
Base: singleton children in UK country where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bas scores were specified.

Table 7.2a BAS naming Vocabulary Score: means and percentile scores (Scotland)

| BAS | Mean | SE | $10^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $25^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | 75th Percentile | $\mathbf{9 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 51.6 | 0.47 | 38 | 44 | 50 | 58 | 67 | 873 |
| Female | 54.3 | 0.50 | 41 | 47 | 56 | 63 | 71 | 853 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,60)=21.82 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lone parent | 51.4 | 0.80 | 40 | 44 | 49 | 58 | 67 | 237 |
| Two natural parents | 53.3 | 0.39 | 41 | 47 | 53 | 59 | 67 | 1098 |
| Step-parent family | 50.6 | 2.58 | (38) | (41) | (47) | (56) | (64) | (26) |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,59)=3.66 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.032$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 48.8 | 1.88 | (34) | (41) | (49) | (56) | (67) | (43) |
| NVQ 1 | 47.4 | 1.81 | (39) | (41) | (45) | (50) | (56) | (27) |
| NVQ 2 | 49.7 | 0.97 | 37 | 41 | 49 | 56 | 64 | 193 |
| NVQ 3 | 52.7 | 0.64 | 41 | 45 | 51 | 58 | 67 | 308 |
| NVQ 4+ | 54.6 | 0.52 | 41 | 49 | 56 | 63 | 71 | 540 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,57)=11.23 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workless household | 47.5 | 0.69 | 36 | 41 | 47 | 54 | 61 | 187 |
| 1 person working | 53.5 | 0.63 | 41 | 47 | 53 | 59 | 68 | 464 |
| 2 or more people working | 53.9 | 0.39 | 41 | 47 | 53 | 59 | 68 | 710 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,59)=44.10 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest parental Occupation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial/professional | 55.1 | 0.49 | 41 | 47 | 56 | 63 | 71 | 626 |
| Intermediate | 53.4 | 0.99 | 41 | 47 | 52 | 58 | 67 | 145 |
| Small employer and self-employed | 52.0 | 1.13 | 39 | 44 | 51 | 58 | 64 | 68 |
| Lower supervisors and technical | 51.5 | 0.99 | 39 | 44 | 50 | 56 | 67 | 121 |
| Semi-routine and routine | 49.2 | 0.96 | 38 | 41 | 48 | 56 | 67 | 169 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,57)=11.04 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above $60 \%$ of median | 54.3 | 0.43 | 41 | 47 | 56 | 63 | 68 | 1148 |
| Below $60 \%$ of median | 49.3 | 0.63 | 38 | 41 | 49 | 56 | 64 | 364 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,60)=57.83 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: singleton children in Scotland where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bas scores were specified. Unweighted N values

Table 7.2b BAS naming Vocabulary Score: means and percentile scores (Rest of UK)

| BAS | Mean | SE | 10 | 25 | 50 | 75 | 90 | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 48.9 | 0.24 | 36 | 41 | 49 | 56 | 63 | 6531 |
| Female | 51.6 | 0.25 | 38 | 44 | 49 | 58 | 67 | 6312 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=154.50 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lone parent | 46.9 | 0.30 | 36 | 41 | 47 | 54 | 58 | 2165 |
| Two natural parents | 51.2 | 0.23 | 38 | 44 | 51 | 58 | 67 | 8381 |
| Step-parent family | 47.6 | 0.83 | 38 | 41 | 47 | 56 | 59 | 174 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,328)=123.55 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 43.4 | 0.79 | 28 | 36 | 44 | 49 | 58 | 493 |
| NVQ 1 | 46.2 | 0.60 | 35 | 41 | 47 | 51 | 58 | 377 |
| NVQ 2 | 49.3 | 0.32 | 38 | 41 | 49 | 56 | 63 | 2087 |
| NVQ 3 | 51.2 | 0.35 | 38 | 44 | 51 | 58 | 63 | 1613 |
| NVQ 4+ | 53.3 | 0.25 | 41 | 47 | 56 | 58 | 67 | 3800 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,326)=70.17 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workless household | 45.2 | 0.34 | 32 | 38 | 44 | 51 | 58 | 2098 |
| 1 person working | 50.2 | 0.33 | 38 | 42 | 49 | 58 | 64 | 3926 |
| 2 or more people working | 52.3 | 0.20 | 41 | 45 | 51 | 58 | 67 | 4711 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,322)=220.39 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest parental <br> Occupation       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial/professional | 52.9 | 0.26 | 41 | 47 | 54 | 58 | 67 | 4293 |
| Intermediate | 50.7 | 0.37 | 38 | 44 | 51 | 56 | 63 | 1066 |
| Small employer and selfemployed | 49.6 | 0.47 | 36 | 41 | 49 | 56 | 64 | 882 |
| Lower supervisors and technical | 49.0 | 0.46 | 36 | 41 | 49 | 56 | 63 | 827 |
| Semi-routine and routine | 46.2 | 0.50 | 32 | 41 | 45 | 53 | 59 | 1414 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,325)=44.57 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above $60 \%$ of median | 52.1 | 0.21 | 41 | 44 | 51 | 58 | 67 | 7355 |
| Below $60 \%$ of median | 45.9 | 0.32 | 32 | 39 | 44 | 52 | 59 | 3460 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=401.29 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Bracken Basic Concept Scale - Revised (BBCS-R)

Table: 7.3 Bracken Mean and Percentile Scores at MCS2 and Gender of Child by country

| Bracken | Mean | Standard <br> Error | $\mathbf{1 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> percentile | $\mathbf{2 5}^{\text {th }}$ <br> percentile | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> percentile | $\mathbf{7 5}^{\text {th }}$ <br> percentile | $\mathbf{9 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> percentile | unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| All | 105.6 | 0.40 | 84 | 96 | 106 | 117 | 126 | 11553 |
| England | 105.6 | 0.47 | 83 | 96 | 106 | 117 | 126 | 7398 |
| Wales | 104.6 | 0.83 | 84 | 94 | 105 | 115 | 125 | 1811 |
| Scotland | 107.5 | 0.75 | 86 | 97 | 108 | 118 | 127 | 1248 |
| Northern <br> Ireland | 102.5 | 0.85 | 81 | 91 | 104 | 114 | 122 | 1096 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males | 103.7 | 0.41 | 81 | 93 | 105 | 115 | 125 | 5796 |
| Females | 107.4 | 0.47 | 86 | 99 | 108 | 118 | 126 | 5757 |

## Notes to table

Mean scores weighted using weight 2 .
Base: singleton children in UK country where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bracken scores were specified.

Table 7.4a Bracken School Readiness Test Scores: means and percentile scores (Scotland)

| Bracken | Mean | SE | $\begin{gathered} 10{ }^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $25^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | 75th <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{9 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 105.8 | 0.82 | 84 | 94 | 106 | 117 | 127 | 776 |
| Female | 109.4 | 0.82 | 90 | 100 | 110 | 119 | 127 | 803 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,60)=21.15 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lone parent | 103.1 | 1.19 | 83 | 94 | 104 | 112 | 125 | 223 |
| Two natural parents | 108.5 | 0.80 | 87 | 99 | 110 | 119 | 128 | 1003 |
| Step-parent family | 100.7 | 2.31 | 86 | 94 | 103 | 110 | 115 | 22 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,59)=11.85 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 97.0 | 2.48 | 73 | 88 | 99 | 106 | 112 | 35 |
| NVQ 1 | 100.7 | 2.91 | 81 | 90 | 102 | 115 | 116 | 24 |
| NVQ 2 | 102.0 | 1.42 | 83 | 91 | 104 | 111 | 123 | 177 |
| NVQ 3 | 106.8 | 1.12 | 86 | 98 | 107 | 117 | 126 | 286 |
| NVQ 4+ | 112.5 | 0.77 | 94 | 105 | 114 | 122 | 131 | 505 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,57)=18.49 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workless household | 97.4 | 1.27 | 79 | 86 | 97 | 106 | 118 | 167 |
| 1 person working | 108.1 | 0.98 | 88 | 100 | 109 | 119 | 127 | 428 |
| 2 or more people working | 109.4 | 0.74 | 88 | 100 | 110 | 119 | 128 | 653 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,59)=42.06 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest parental Occupation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial/professional | 112.1 | 0.77 | 93 | 104 | 113 | 122 | 130 | 584 |
| Intermediate | 107.7 | 1.02 | 89 | 100 | 108 | 116 | 126 | 131 |
| Small employer and self-employed | 102.5 | 2.28 | 83 | 91 | 105 | 112 | 121 | 64 |
| Lower supervisors and technical | 104.7 | 1.56 | 84 | 94 | 104 | 117 | 128 | 109 |
| Semi-routine and routine | 100.1 | 1.54 | 79 | 88 | 102 | 110 | 120 | 145 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,57)=18.59 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above $60 \%$ of median | 109.8 | 0.71 | 89 | 102 | 111 | 120 | 129 | 1062 |
| Below $60 \%$ of median | 100.5 | 1.09 | 81 | 89 | 100 | 110 | 120 | 330 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,60)=80.98 \quad \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Mean scores weighted using weight 2.
Base: singleton children in Scotland where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bracken scores were specified. Unweighted N values

Table 7.4b Bracken School Readiness Test Scores: means and percentile scores (Rest of UK)

| Bracken | Mean | SE | 10 | 25 | 50 | 75 | 90 | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 103.2 | 0.42 | 81 | 91 | 104 | 115 | 124 | 6177 |
| Female | 106.9 | 0.49 | 86 | 97 | 107 | 118 | 126 | 6087 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=115.26 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lone parent | 99.1 | 0.52 | 79 | 88 | 99 | 110 | 120 | 2053 |
| Two natural parents | 106.9 | 0.44 | 86 | 97 | 107 | 118 | 126 | 8066 |
| Step-parent family | 98.1 | 1.43 | 77 | 86 | 102 | 108 | 118 | 171 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,328)=149.32 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 94.4 | 1.05 | 75 | 83 | 94 | 105 | 118 | 471 |
| NVQ 1 | 97.5 | 0.95 | 75 | 8 | 98 | 110 | 117 | 371 |
| NVQ 2 | 102.1 | 0.45 | 83 | 91 | 103 | 112 | 121 | 1996 |
| NVQ 3 | 105.9 | 0.52 | 86 | 97 | 106 | 116 | 125 | 1551 |
| NVQ 4+ | 111.2 | 0.50 | 93 | 103 | 111 | 121 | 129 | 3682 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,326)=116.13 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workless household | 96.0 | 0.57 | 75 | 84 | 96 | 107 | 117 | 1986 |
| 1 person working | 105.2 | 0.56 | 83 | 94 | 106 | 116 | 116 | 3767 |
| 2 or more people working | 108.6 | 0.41 | 89 | 100 | 109 | 119 | 127 | 4552 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,322)=283.90 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest parental Occupation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial/professional | 110.5 | 0.47 | 92 | 102 | 111 | 120 | 128 | 4126 |
| Intermediate | 106.6 | 0.61 | 86 | 97 | 107 | 116 | 125 | 1036 |
| Small employer and selfemployed | 102.5 | 0.73 | 81 | 91 | 103 | 115 | 124 | 859 |
| Lower supervisors and technical | 101.4 | 0.69 | 81 | 91 | 102 | 112 | 120 | 794 |
| Semi-routine and routine | 98.3 | 0.61 | 77 | 86 | 99 | 108 | 118 | 1352 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,325)=112.28 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above $60 \%$ of median | 108.4 | 0.42 | 88 | 99 | 108 | 118 | 127 | 7081 |
| Below $60 \%$ of median | 97.4 | 0.47 | 77 | 86 | 97 | 108 | 118 | 3300 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=644.82 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Mean scores weighted using weight 2. Unweighted N values
Base: singleton children in England Wales and NI where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the
partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bracken scores were specified.

## Behavioural adjustment

Table: 7.5 Total Difficulties Score Mean and Percentiles at MCS2 by country


## Notes to table

Mean scores weighted using weight 2.
Base: singleton children in UK country where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents. N.B. Analysis by ethnicity uses the child's ethnicity; parental qualifications and occupation relate to the higher of either of the parents in two carer families or the highest qualification or occupation of lone parents

Table 7.6a Total Difficulties Score: means and percentile scores (Scotland)

| Total difficulties score | Mean | SE | $\begin{gathered} 10^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | 75th Percentile | $\mathbf{9 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 9.2 | 0.22 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 904 |
| Female | 8.4 | 0.20 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 854 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,60)=13.45 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lone parent | 10.1 | 0.37 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 13 | 17 | 244 |
| Two natural parents | 8.5 | 0.19 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 1120 |
| Step-parent family | 13.0 | 1.11 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 19 | 22 | 26 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,59)=16.02 \quad \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 12.3 | 0.85 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 20 | 52 |
| NVQ 1 | 11.7 | 1.08 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 19 | 33 |
| NVQ 2 | 10.5 | 0.33 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 247 |
| NVQ 3 | 8.8 | 0.28 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 374 |
| NVQ 4+ | 7.5 | 0.18 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 700 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,57)=28.79 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workless household | 11.6 | 0.39 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 15 | 20 | 192 |
| 1 person working | 8.7 | 0.20 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 471 |
| 2 or more people working | 8.3 | 0.21 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 727 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,59)=35.76 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest parental Occupation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial/professional | 7.6 | 0.18 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 644 |
| Intermediate | 9.2 | 0.33 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 148 |
| Small employer and self-employed | 8.6 | 0.51 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 17 | 68 |
| Lower supervisors and technical | 9.4 | 0.54 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 18 | 123 |
| Semi-routine and routine | 11.3 | 0.45 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 14 | 19 | 172 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,57)=21.28 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above $60 \%$ of median | 8.1 | 0.17 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 14 | 1184 |
| Below $60 \%$ of median | 11.0 | 0.32 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 15 | 18 | 372 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,60)=73.39 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Mean scores weighted using weight 2. Unweighted N values
Base: singleton children in Scotland where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bracken scores were specified.

Table 7.6bTotal Difficulties Score: means and percentile scores (Rest of UK)

| Total difficulties score | Mean | SE | 10 | 25 | 50 | 75 | 90 | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 9.9 | 0.10 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 13 | 17 | 6455 |
| Female | 8.8 | 0.10 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 6197 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=117.78 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lone parent | 11.3 | 0.17 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 15 | 20 | 2170 |
| Two natural parents | 8.9 | 0.08 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 8266 |
| Step-parent family | 11.7 | 0.48 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 20 | 178 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,328)=119.16 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 11.8 | 0.34 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 16 | 20 | 536 |
| NVQ 1 | 11.1 | 0.37 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 19 | 439 |
| NVQ 2 | 10.2 | 0.13 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 13 | 17 | 2381 |
| NVQ 3 | 9.1 | 0.14 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 1856 |
| NVQ 4+ | 7.9 | 0.09 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 4295 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,326)=84.78 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parental employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workless household | 12.3 | 0.17 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 21 | 2057 |
| 1 person working | 9.4 | 0.13 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 13 | 16 | 3836 |
| 2 or more people working | 8.4 | 0.09 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 14 | 4735 |
| $\mathrm{F}(2,322)=239.28 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest parental Occupation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial/professional | 8.0 | 0.09 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 4305 |
| Intermediate | 9.0 | 0.17 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 1075 |
| Small employer and self-employed | 9.3 | 0.206 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 845 |
| Lower supervisors and technical | 10.5 | 0.20 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 14 | 17 | 809 |
| Semi-routine and routine | 11.4 | 0.19 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 15 | 19 | 1346 |
| $\mathrm{F}(4,325)=74.94 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above $60 \%$ of median | 8.6 | 0.08 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 7404 |
| Below $60 \%$ of median | 11.4 | 0.13 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 15 | 19 | 3389 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=529.32 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Mean scores weighted using weight 2. Unweighted N values
Base: singleton children in England Wales and NI where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bracken scores were specified.

## Developmental Milestone Measures by British Ability Scores (BAS)

Table 7.7a BAS naming Vocabulary Score: means and percentile scores (Scotland)

| BAS | Mean | SE | $\begin{gathered} 10^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | 75th <br> Percentile | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{9 0}^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | Unweighted N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Motor Development at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No gross motor delays | 53.2 | 0.43 | 41 | 46 | 52 | 59 | 67 | 1536 |
| 1 or more gross motor delays | 51.1 | 1.19 | 39 | 42 | 49 | 58 | 67 | 190 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,60)=3.08 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.084$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine Motor Development at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Fine motor delays | 53.1 | 0.42 | 41 | 44 | 51 | 59 | 67 | 1620 |
| 1 or more fine motor delays | 51.8 | 1.21 | 38 | 47 | 51 | 58 | 67 | 106 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,60)=1.20 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.278$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: singleton children in Scotland where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bracken scores were specified. Mean scores weighted using weight 2 .

Table 7.7b BAS naming Vocabulary Score: means and percentile scores (Rest of UK)

| BAS | Mean | SE | $\begin{gathered} 10^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $25^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | 75th Percentile | $\begin{gathered} 90^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | Unweighted N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Motor Development at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No gross motor delays | 50.9 | 0.21 | 38 | 44 | 50 | 58 | 64 | 10942 |
| 1 or more gross motor delays | 47.8 | 0.41 | 34 | 41 | 47 | 56 | 63 | 1901 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=75.26 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine Motor Development at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Fine motor delays | 50.7 |  | 38 | 43 | 49 | 58 | 64 | 11447 |
| 1 or more fine motor delays | 48.2 |  | 36 | 41 | 47 | 56 | 63 | 1396 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=49.45 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Developmental Milestone Measures by Bracken School Readiness

Table 7.8a Bracken School Readiness Test Scores: means and percentile scores (Scotland)

| Bracken | Mean | SE | $10^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $25^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | 75th <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{9 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | Unweighted N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Motor Development at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No gross motor delays | 106.1 | 0.42 | 84 | 96 | 107 | 117 | 126 | 10466 |
| 1 or more gross motor delays | 101.6 | 0.71 | 77 | 89 | 102 | 115 | 124 | 1798 |
| 皿 $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=75.26 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine Motor Development at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Fine motor delays | 105.8 | 0.43 | 84 | 96 | 106 | 117 | 126 | 10939 |
| 1 or more fine motor delays | 102.1 | 0.70 | 79 | 89 | 103 | 115 | 125 | 1325 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=43.27 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7.8b Bracken School Readiness Test Scores: means and percentile scores (Rest of UK)

| Bracken | Mean | SE | $\mathbf{1 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{2 5}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | 75th <br> Percentile | $\mathbf{9 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Gross Motor <br> Development <br> at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No gross motor <br> delays | 107.6 | 0.78 | 86 | 98 | 108 | 118 | 127 | 1415 |
| 1 or more gross <br> motor delays | 106.9 | 1.56 | 85 | 94 | 107 | 118 | 126 | 164 |
| Fine Motor <br> Development <br> at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Fine motor <br> delays | 107.4 | 0.75 | 86 | 97 | 108 | 118 | 127 | 1488 |
| 1 or more fine <br> motor delays | 108.8 | 2.14 | 86 | 99 | 108 | 120 | 129 | 91 |
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## Developmental Milestone Measures by total difficulties score

Table 7.9a Total Difficulties Score: means and percentile scores (Scotland)

| Total difficulties score | Mean | SE | $10{ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | $\begin{gathered} 25^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | 75th Percentile | $\mathbf{9 0}^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | Unweighted N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Motor Development at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No gross motor delays | 8.8 | 0.18 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 1564 |
| 1 or more gross motor delays | 9.4 | 0.45 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 194 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,60)=1.75 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.191$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine Motor Development at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No fine motor delays | 8.8 | 0.18 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 1644 |
| 1 or more fine motor delays | 10.7 | 0.72 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 19 | 114 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,60)=8.08 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.006$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Mean scores weighted using weight 2.
Base: singleton children in Scotland where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bracken scores were specified.

Table 7.9b Total Difficulties Score: means and percentile scores (Rest of UK)

| Total difficulties score | Mean | SE | $\begin{gathered} 10^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | $25^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | 75th <br> Percentile | $\begin{gathered} 90^{\text {th }} \\ \text { Percentile } \end{gathered}$ | Unweighted N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Motor Development at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No gross motor delays | 9.2 | 0.09 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 10788 |
| 1 or more gross motor delays | 10.3 | 0.20 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 14 | 18 | 1864 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=35.11 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine Motor Development at 9 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Fine motor delays | 9.2 | 0.09 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 11289 |
| 1 or more fine motor delays | 10.6 | 0.22 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 14 | 19 | 1363 |
| $\mathrm{F}(1,329)=48.56 \mathrm{P}>\mathrm{F}=.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## CHAPTER EIGHT. PARENTAL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

## Self rated health

Table 8.1 Parental general health, MCS 2 by country

|  |  | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ | Percentage fair or poor health |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mother |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 15,229 | 17.4 |
| Country | England | 9,810 | 17.7 |
|  | Wales | 2,200 | 16.5 |
|  | Scotland | 1,785 | 15.1 |
|  | N. Ireland | 1,434 | 15.6 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0519 \\ 10.8805 \end{array}$ |  |
| Father |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed partner interview) |  | 10,256 | 14.0 |
| Country | England | 6,707 | 14.1 |
|  | Wales | 1,488 | 12.1 |
|  | Scotland | 1,169 | 13.5 |
|  | N. Ireland | 892 | 13.3 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.29 \\ & 4.39 \end{aligned}$ |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weights2
Base: MCS2 main respondents

Table 8.2a Parental general health, MCS2 (Scotland)

|  |  | Total Unweighted N | Percentage fair or poor health |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mother |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 1785 | 15.1 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 230 | 24.2 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 304 | 21.4 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 549 | 12.5 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 515 | 11.5 |
|  | 40 and over | 187 | (12.9) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 272.3724 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 437 | (7.5) |
|  | Intermediate | 251 | (9.0) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 59 | (4.4) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 40 | (19.0) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 287 | (15.1) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0026 \\ 121.8302 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 931 | 8.5 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 53 | (28.2) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 461 | 18.6 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 85 | (45.2) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 805.0283 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 71 | (31.5) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 445 | 21.4 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 389 | (12.0) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 602 | (8.0) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 84 | (4.0) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 27 | (26.1) |
|  | None of the above | 164 | (32.0) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 854.3507 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 1,103 | 11.3 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 327 | 21.5 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 56 | (15.7) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 250 | (22.8) |
|  | Other | 49 | (27.0) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 332.6396 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |


|  |  | Total Unweighted N | Percentage fair or poor health |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Father |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed partner interview) |  | 1166 | 13.5 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 42 | (25.9) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 154 | (13.7) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 317 | (13.1) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 370 | (11.3) |
|  | 40 and over | 283 | (15.1) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.1083 \\ 64.9031 \end{array}$ |  |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 462 | (9.0) |
|  | Intermediate | 103 | 9.7 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 131 | (7.6) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 181 | (16.9) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 287 | (22.8) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 315.2586 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 729 | 9.7 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 42 | (50.1) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 325 | (12.1) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 68 | (45.2) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 931.2407 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 40 | (30.4) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 278 | (13.3) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 238 | (14.0) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 342 | (7.9) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 86 | (6.4) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 25 | (16.5) |
|  | None of the above | 107 | (27.6) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 363.1461 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 857 | 11.1 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 243 | (22.7) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 44 | (11.4) |
|  | Other | 25 | (17.5) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0002 \\ 187.9760 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |

[^27]Table 8.2b Parental general health, MCS 2 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{n}$ | Percentage fair or poor health |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mother |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 13,698 | 17.6 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 1,921 | 24.5 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 2,693 | 22.0 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 4,274 | 15.1 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 3,360 | 14.6 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,185 | 18.9 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 127.5899 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 2,429 | 9.9 |
|  | Intermediate | 1,597 | 12.1 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 463 | 11.9 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 271 | 19.4 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,813 | 18.3 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 73.4774 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 5,738 | 12.2 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 255 | 19.9 |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 4,186 | 18.5 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 884 | 36.2 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 276.1745 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 1,163 | 22.8 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 3,869 | 18.7 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,837 | 16.2 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 3,702 | 11.9 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 498 | (9.9) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 450 | 27.7 |
|  | None of the above | 1,896 | 30.8 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 330.7059 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 8,281 | 14.3 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 2,012 | 21.4 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 507 | 19.4 |
|  | Lone natural mother | 2,325 | 26.1 |
|  | Other | 319 | 28.0 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 211.3916 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |


|  |  | Total Unweighted $n$ | Percentage fair or poor health |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Father |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed partner interview) |  | 9,841 | 14.0 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 345 | 21.2 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 1,141 | 19.5 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 2,636 | 13.6 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,921 | 11.2 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,995 | 14.9 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 57.9456 \end{array}$ |  |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 3,466 | 9.2 |
|  | Intermediate | 660 | 12.7 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 1,364 | 14.2 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 1,239 | 20.0 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 2,288 | 20.6 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 180.6358 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 4,881 | 11.0 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 216 | 31.2 |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 3,261 | 13.2 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 684 | 43.5 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 439.4731 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 606 | 21.8 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 2,350 | 16.4 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,224 | 11.9 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 2,646 | 8.7 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 536 | 5.4 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 373 | 21.4 |
|  | None of the above | 999 | 27.9 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 281.1687 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 6,818 | 12.5 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,609 | 19.0 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 460 | 14.1 |
|  | Other | 200 | 27.9 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 74.4377 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
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## Longstanding illness

Table 8.3 Parental longstanding illness, MCS 2 by country

|  |  | Total Unweighted n | Percentage <br> longstanding illness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mother |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 15,229 | 21.4 |
| Country | England | 9,810 | 21.3 |
|  | Wales | 2,200 | 22.8 |
|  | Scotland | 1,785 | 22.7 |
|  | N . Ireland | 1,434 | 19.4 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.11 \\ & 8.61 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Father |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed partner interview) |  | 10,256 | 21.2 |
| Country | England | 6,707 | 21.3 |
|  | Wales | 1,488 | 22.1 |
|  | Scotland | 1,169 | 20.7 |
|  | N . Ireland | 892 | 16.8 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0373 \\ 12.1732 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |

[^29]Table 8.4a Parental longstanding illness, MCS 2 (Scotland)

|  |  | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{n}$ | Percentage longstanding illness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mother |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 1785 | 22.7 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 230 | 25.6 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 304 | 28.7 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 549 | 23.3 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 515 | 18.4 |
|  | 40 and over | 187 | (21.0) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0287 \\ 111.2127 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 437 | 16.4 |
|  | Intermediate | 251 | (16.2) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 59 | (21.3) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 40 | (35.4) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 287 | 23.1 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0148 \\ 95.2838 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 931 | 18.2 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 53 | (26.1) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 461 | 26.4 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 85 | (39.6) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 219.5530 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 71 | (33.1) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 445 | 29.4 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 389 | 21.1 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 602 | 18.9 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 84 | (7.5) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 27 | (20.3) |
|  | None of the above | 164 | (29.2) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 311.3798 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 1,103 | 20.4 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 327 | 24.2 |
|  | $\qquad$ | 56 | (28.8) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 250 | 27.6 |
|  | Other | 49 | (39.8) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0030 \\ 136.1684 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |


|  |  | Total Unweighted n | Percentage <br> longstanding illness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Father |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed partner interview) |  | 1166 | 20.7 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 42 | (22.7) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 154 | 22.1 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 317 | 18.3 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 370 | 19.9 |
|  | 40 and over | 283 | 23.1 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.5329 \\ 22.6136 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 462 | 20.7 |
|  | Intermediate | 103 | (16.3) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 131 | (17.2) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 181 | (15.5) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 287 | 27.5 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0205 \\ 113.8378 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 729 | 18.4 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 42 | (49.8) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 325 | 19.3 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 68 | (37.9) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 298.8503 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 40 | (23.7) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 278 | 21.4 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 238 | (20.4) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 342 | 18.7 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 86 | (18.8) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 25 | (19.6) |
|  | None of the above | 107 | (24.0) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.8816 \\ 17.9368 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 857 | 20.0 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 243 | (21.7) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 44 | (29.9) |
|  | Other | 25 | (18.7) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.4247 \\ 24.9780 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weight 1 Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 8.4b Parental longstanding illness, MCS2 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Total Unweighted n | Percentage longstanding illness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mother |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 13,698 | 21.3 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 1,921 | 21.4 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 2,693 | 22.6 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 4,274 | 19.9 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 3,360 | 21.1 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,185 | 23.9 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0278 \\ 13.3612 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 2,429 | 18.1 |
|  | Intermediate | 1,597 | 17.3 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 463 | 23.2 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 271 | 20.9 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,813 | 19.1 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0590 \\ 10.7304 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 5,738 | 18.5 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 255 | 22.9 |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 4,186 | 21.4 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 884 | 32.9 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 77.8709 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 1,163 | 22.4 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 3,869 | 23.1 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,837 | 19.1 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 3,702 | 19.7 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 498 | 17.3 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 450 | 20.2 |
|  | None of the above | 1,896 | 24.1 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0005 \\ 32.6194 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 8,281 | 19.5 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 2,012 | 23.5 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 507 | 20.8 |
|  | Lone natural mother | 2,325 | 25.5 |
|  | Other | 319 | 29.3 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 53.3895 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |


|  |  | Total <br> Unweighted n | Percentage <br> longstanding <br> illness |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Father |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed partner interview) | 9,841 | 21.3 |  |
| Father's age at <br> interview | Under 25 | 345 | 22.7 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 1,141 | 20.6 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 2,636 | 19.1 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,921 | 19.7 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,995 | 26.0 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | 0.0000 | 41.5097 |

[^30]Health-related behaviour
Cigarette smoking
Table 8.5 Current parental smoking status, MCS2 by country

|  |  | Total | Current smoking status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Non-smoker | Under 10 cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | $10-19$ cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | $20+$ cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | Other tobacco products |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 15,229 | 72.5 | 9.2 | 12.2 | 6.0 | 0.1 |
| Country | England | 9,810 | 73.1 | 9.1 | 12.0 | 5.8 | (0.1) |
|  | Wales | 2,200 | 67.4 | 11.0 | 13.7 | 7.8 | (0.0) |
|  | Scotland | 1,785 | 71.1 | 8.7 | 13.5 | 6.5 | (0.2) |
|  | N . Ireland | 1,434 | 71.4 | 7.4 | 12.9 | 8.2 |  |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0005 \\ 56.64 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed partner interview) |  | 10,256 | 69.6 | 8.1 | 12.1 | 8.8 | 1.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Country | England | 6,707 | 69.6 | 8.5 | 11.8 | 8.7 | 1.4 |
|  | Wales | 1,488 | 69.9 | 7.3 | 12.8 | 8.6 | 1.4 |
|  | Scotland | 1,169 | 69.5 | 6.3 | 14.0 | 8.9 | 1.3 |
|  | N . Ireland | 892 | 74.8 | (3.1) | 10.3 | 10.9 | (0.9) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0002 \\ 54.5307 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes to table
NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weights2 Base: MCS2 main respondents
Table 8.6a Current parental smoking status, MCS 2 (Scotland)

|  |  | Total | Current smoking status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unweighted } \\ & \mathbf{N} \end{aligned}$ | Non-smoker | Under 10 cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | 10-19 cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | $20+$ <br> cigarettes <br> (inc. roll-ups) | Other tobacco products |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 1785 | 71.1 | 8.7 | 13.5 | 6.5 | 0.2 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 230 | 47.8 | (13.7) | 25.8 | (12.7) |  |
|  | 25 to 29 | 304 | 59.6 | (9.6) | 22.4 | (8.4) |  |
|  | 30 to 34 | 549 | 74.6 | (7.4) | 11.6 | (6.2) | (0.1) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 515 | 78.6 | (9.0) | (8.3) | (3.9) | (0.2) |
|  | 40 and over | 187 | 82.3 | (5.1) | (7.3) | (4.7) | (0.6) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 1061.5770 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 437 | 87.4 | (5.7) | (5.1) | (1.8) |  |
|  | Intermediate | 251 | 77.7 | (8.6) | (9.7) | (3.9) |  |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 59 | (79.1) | (11.0) | (7.9) | (2.0) |  |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 40 | (62.7) | (12.0) | (12.0) | (13.3) |  |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 287 | 61.4 | (9.4) | 21.0 | (8.2) |  |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 620.3816 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 931 | 80.4 | 7.0 | 9.4 | (3.2) |  |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 53 | (56.9) | (12.8) | (21.5) | (8.7) |  |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 461 | 70.9 | (9.0) | 12.0 | (8.1) |  |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 85 | (37.8) | (9.2) | (32.2) | (19.8) | (1.1) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 943.0009 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current smoking status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Non-smoker | Under 10 cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10-19 \\ \text { cigarettes } \\ \text { (inc. roll-ups) } \end{gathered}$ | 20+ cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | Other tobacco products |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 71 | (44.7) | (22.2) | (19.9) | (13.3) |  |
|  | NVQ 2 | 445 | 60.5 | 11.6 | 17.4 | (9.9) | (0.5) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 389 | 68.8 | (11.8) | 15.0 | (4.5) |  |
|  | NVQ 4 | 602 | 86.6 | (4.6) | (6.4) | (2.4) |  |
|  | NVQ 5 | 84 | 90.3 | (4.6) | (3.7) | (1.4) |  |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 27 | (65.1) | (7.7) | (16.5) | (10.7) |  |
|  | None of the above | 164 | 40.8 | (6.2) | 32.9 | (19.2) | (0.9) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 2188.0952 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 1,103 | 80.7 | 6.9 | 8.3 | (4.2) |  |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 327 | 54.8 | (12.5) | 23.1 | (9.5) |  |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 56 | (73.7) | (8.9) | (13.6) | (2.6) | (1.3) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 250 | 47.1 | (13.8) | 25.6 | (12.4) | (1.1) |
|  | Other | 49 | (58.0) | (3.3) | (20.5) | (18.2) |  |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 1628.8171 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fathers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who com | leted partner interview) | 1,166 | 69.6 | 6.3 | 14.0 | 8.8 | (1.3) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 42 | (27.9) | (17.5) | (35.7) | (18.9) |  |
|  | 25 to 29 | 154 | 48.2 | (8.3) | (29.1) | (14.4) |  |
|  | 30 to 34 | 317 | 71.9 | (4.7) | (13.8) | (8.4) | (1.2) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 370 | 73.1 | (6.7) | (11.3) | (6.8) | (2.1) |
|  | 40 and over | 283 | 78.0 | (5.2) | (7.6) | (8.0) | (1.2) |
|  | p -value chi2 | 0.0000 842.2051 |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current smoking status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Non-smoker | Under 10 cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | 10-19 cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | 20+ cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | Other tobacco products |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 462 | 80.6 | (6.2) | (6.8) | (4.1) | (2.3) |
|  | Intermediate | 103 | 76.0 | (8.4) | (10.0) | (4.4) | (1.2) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 131 | 72.8 | (4.8) | (8.2) | (14.2) |  |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 181 | 67.9 | (7.5) | (16.4) | (7.6) | (0.7) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 287 | 46.7 | (5.7) | 30.1 | (16.9) | (0.6) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 1322.1370 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment | Both partners employed | 729 | 74.9 | (5.5) | 11.7 | (6.4) | (1.4) |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 42 | (41.7) | (14.1) | (30.1) | (14.1) |  |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 325 | 69.3 | (6.3) | (13.7) | (9.3) | (1.4) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 68 | (19.6) | (12.2) | (33.5) | (34.8) |  |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 1001.3082 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 40 | (55.1) | (2.0) | (21.7) | (21.2) |  |
|  | NVQ 2 | 278 | 59.7 | (9.1) | (15.6) | (14.8) | (0.7) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 238 | 69.4 | (4.1) | (18.9) | (4.9) | (2.7) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 342 | 83.9 | (6.1) | (5.7) | (3.4) | (0.9) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 86 | 88.4 | (7.2) | (0.8) |  | 3.6 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 25 | (54.6) | (6.2) | (33.0) | (6.2) |  |
|  | None of the above | 107 | (45.7) | (1.6) | (27.1) | (25.6) |  |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 1580.7734 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current smoking status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Non-smoker |  | 10-19 cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) |  | Other tobacco products |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 857 | 76.1 | (5.2) | 10.7 | 6.4 | (1.6) |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 243 | 46.9 | (12.2) | (23.7) | (16.8) | (0.3) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 44 | (68.9) | (1.6) | (18.0) | (11.4) |  |
|  | Other | 25 | (38.4) |  | (39.6) | (22.0) |  |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 939.2542 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8.6b Current parental smoking status, MCS 2 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Total | Current smoking status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Non-smoker | Under 10 cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | $\begin{gathered} 10-19 \\ \text { cigarettes } \\ \text { (inc. roll-ups) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 20+ \\ \text { cigarettes } \\ \text { (inc. roll-ups) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Other tobacco products |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 13,698 | 72.7 | 9.2 | 12.1 | 6.0 | (0.1) |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 1,921 | 45.6 | 16.1 | 28.1 | 10.2 | (0.0) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 2,693 | 62.2 | 14.3 | 15.6 | 7.8 | (0.1) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 4,274 | 76.6 | 7.8 | 10.1 | 5.5 | (0.1) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 3,360 | 82.8 | 6.2 | 6.9 | 4.0 | (0.1) |
|  | 40 and over | 1,185 | 82.1 | 5.2 | 7.4 | 5.2 |  |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 1064.1384 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Mother's occupational } \\ \text { class } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Managerial \& professional | 2,429 | 86.8 | 6.4 | 5.0 | (1.8) | (0.1) |
|  | Intermediate | 1,597 | 80.7 | 9.8 | 7.1 | (2.4) | (0.1) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 463 | 81.6 | (6.5) | (8.7) | (3.2) |  |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 271 | 65.3 | (15.0) | (13.7) | (6.0) |  |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,813 | 64.4 | 12.0 | 16.4 | 7.1 |  |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 370.8861 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 5,738 | 81.6 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 2.7 | (0.0) |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 255 | 63.2 | (11.8) | (17.2) | (7.8) |  |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 4,186 | 76.3 | 7.7 | 10.2 | 5.6 | (0.1) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 884 | 53.1 | 9.6 | 20.9 | 16.3 | (0.1) |
|  | $\mathrm{p} \text {-value }$ chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 442.0480 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current smoking status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Non-smoker |  |  |  | Other tobacco products |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 1,163 | 53.4 | 11.5 | 23.7 | 11.4 | (0.1) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 3,869 | 66.1 | 11.2 | 16.0 | 6.6 | (0.1) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,837 | 74.1 | 11.3 | 10.2 | 4.3 | (0.1) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 3,702 | 87.2 | 6.5 | 4.3 | 2.0 | (0.0) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 498 | 93.2 | (4.3) | (1.5) | (1.0) |  |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 450 | 76.9 | (5.8) | 9.2 | 7.8 | (0.3) |
|  | None of the above | 1,896 | 50.8 | 10.2 | 23.0 | 15.9 | (0.1) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 1427.8895 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 8,281 | 83.6 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 2.9 | (0.0) |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 2,012 | 56.3 | 13.4 | 19.7 | 10.4 | 0.1 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 507 | 77.4 | (6.6) | 9.7 | (6.2) | (0.1) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 2,325 | 44.7 | 16.0 | 25.8 | 13.3 | (0.1) |
|  | Other | 319 | 48.7 | (11.7) | 25.2 | (14.4) | (0.0) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 1748.0786 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fathers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who con | pleted partner interview) | 9,841 | 69.6 | 8.3 | 11.9 | 8.8 | 1.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 345 | 42.3 | (13.8) | 30.9 | (13.0) |  |
|  | 25 to 29 | 1,141 | 51.7 | 14.7 | 20.6 | 12.6 | (0.4) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 2,636 | 68.5 | 8.0 | 13.4 | 8.7 | (1.4) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,921 | 75.8 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.3 | (1.2) |
|  | 40 and over | 1,995 | 73.6 | 5.6 | 9.8 | 8.8 | (2.4) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 433.7460 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current smoking status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Non-smoker |  |  |  | Other tobacco products |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 3,466 | 80.1 | 6.5 | 7.6 | 4.1 | (1.7) |
|  | Intermediate | 660 | 79.8 | 7.9 | (6.9) | (4.1) | (1.3) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 1,364 | 63.2 | 10.4 | 12.7 | 12.2 | 1.5 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 1,239 | 59.9 | 8.8 | 16.1 | 13.7 | 1.6 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 2,288 | 54.0 | 10.6 | 20.1 | 14.7 | 0.6 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 646.3346 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 4,881 | 74.3 | 7.8 | 10.0 | 6.5 | 1.4 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 216 | 52.0 | (14.4) | (20.3) | (13.2) | (0.1) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 3,261 | 68.1 | 8.3 | 12.4 | 9.6 | 1.6 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 684 | 38.3 | 10.8 | 25.1 | 25.6 | (0.2) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 412.4443 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 606 | 54.9 | (8.1) | 19.8 | 15.8 | (1.4) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 2,350 | 64.3 | 8.6 | 14.9 | 10.7 | (1.5) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,224 | 68.8 | 8.5 | 11.5 | 9.2 | (1.9) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 2,646 | 80.6 | 7.5 | 7.1 | 3.3 | (1.4) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 536 | 87.9 | (6.3) | (2.1) | (2.0) | (1.7) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 373 | 59.3 | (10.9) | 16.3 | 13.0 | (0.6) |
|  | None of the above | 999 | 48.7 | 10.4 | 19.7 | 20.3 | (0.8) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 663.9086 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current smoking status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Non-smoker | Under 10 cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | $10-19$ cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | $20+$ cigarettes (inc. roll-ups) | Other tobacco products |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 6,818 | 74.4 | 7.5 | 9.5 | 7.1 | 1.5 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,609 | 50.5 | 11.8 | 21.7 | 14.7 | (1.2) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 460 | 68.5 | (8.3) | 12.0 | 9.9 | (1.3) |
|  | Other | 200 | 50.3 | (8.6) | (20.6) | (19.6) | (1.0) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 420.4873 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Alcohol consumption and problem drinking
Table 8.7 Current frequency of parental alcohol use, MCS 2 by country

|  |  | Total | Current alcohol use |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Never | Less than monthly | Monthly | 1 to 4 times a week | 5 or more times a week |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all | leted main interview) | 15,229 | 17.3 | 18.5 | 18.2 | 38.7 | 7.4 |
| Country | England | 9,810 | 18.0 | 18.3 | 17.6 | 38.2 | 8.0 |
|  | Wales | 2,200 | 13.3 | 18.2 | 19.6 | 42.2 | 6.8 |
|  | Scotland | 1,785 | 12.0 | 20.0 | 22.1 | 42.0 | 3.9 |
|  | N . Ireland | 1,434 | 17.0 | 21.8 | 21.2 | 38.9 | 1.2 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 217.6002 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all | eted partner interview) | 10,256 | 9.0 | 9.6 | 13.6 | 52.2 | 15.6 |
| Country | England | 6,707 | 9.2 | 9.1 | 13.0 | 52.0 | 16.7 |
|  | Wales | 1,488 | 5.8 | 10.2 | 14.9 | 54.7 | 14.5 |
|  | Scotland | 1,169 | 6.9 | 12.9 | 16.8 | 53.6 | 9.7 |
|  | N . Ireland | 892 | 10.8 | 13.5 | 18.0 | 54.0 | (3.7) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 200.8879 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

[^31]Table 8.8a Current frequency of parental alcohol use, MCS 2 (Scotland)

|  |  | Total | Current alcohol use |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Never | Less than monthly | Monthly | 1 to 4 times a week | 5 or more times a week |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 1785 | 12.0 | 20.0 | 22.1 | 42.0 | 3.9 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 230 | (15.4) | 29.5 | 28.0 | 26.6 | (0.4) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 304 | (14.9) | 26.7 | 29.2 | 27.5 | (1.6) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 549 | 12.8 | 19.5 | 23.4 | 41.4 | (2.9) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 515 | 9.3 | 14.2 | 17.5 | 53.1 | (6.0) |
|  | 40 and over | 187 | (9.7) | (16.9) | (14.5) | 50.6 | (8.2) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 1104.6363 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 437 | (5.6) | 12.9 | 21.3 | 55.7 | (4.6) |
|  | Intermediate | 251 | (7.3) | 21.5 | 20.2 | 45.5 | (5.5) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 59 | (10.0) | (14.6) | (17.0) | (49.4) | (9.1) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 40 | (10.1) | (15.2) | (17.8) | (53.1) | (3.8) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 287 | (9.7) | 26.7 | 29.3 | 33.9 | (0.5) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 459.7262 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment | Both partners employed | 931 | 6.9 | 18.2 | 21.4 | 49.0 | (4.5) |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 53 | (15.5) | (19.0) | (28.2) | (35.7) | (1.5) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 461 | 18.5 | 20.5 | 20.1 | 35.8 | (5.2) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 85 | (34.6) | (26.5) | (18.0) | (20.9) |  |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 817.3035 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current alcohol use |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Never | Less than monthly | Monthly | 1 to 4 times a week | 5 or more times a week |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 71 | (21.8) | (23.8) | (27.2) | (27.2) |  |
|  | NVQ 2 | 445 | 14.2 | 23.2 | 25.7 | 36.2 | (0.8) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 389 | (8.8) | 23.5 | 25.0 | 39.2 | (3.5) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 602 | 9.9 | 13.9 | 19.2 | 50.1 | (6.8) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 84 | (6.3) | (14.2) | (13.0) | (56.8) | (9.7) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 27 | (10.0) | (13.6) | (36.8) | (39.7) |  |
|  | None of the above | 164 | (22.7) | 30.1 | (17.6) | 29.1 | (0.5) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 1177.0170 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 1,103 | 12.4 | 16.3 | 20.0 | 46.1 | 5.2 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 327 | (10.6) | 28.9 | 24.8 | 33.6 | (2.2) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 56 | (5.5) | (24.6) | (22.9) | (42.7) | (4.2) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 250 | (12.6) | 24.4 | 29.0 | 33.2 | (0.7) |
|  | Other | 49 | (19.3) | (22.1) | (21.5) | (37.1) |  |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 561.6102 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who com | eted partner interview) | 1,166 | 6.9 | 12.9 | 16.8 | 53.6 | 9.7 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 42 | (13.0) | (11.1) | (23.9) | (48.7) | (3.2) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 154 | (10.1) | (19.1) | (23.7) | 39.5 | (7.6) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 317 | (7.1) | (14.7) | 19.1 | 53.3 | (5.9) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 370 | (5.2) | (12.3) | (13.7) | 58.6 | (10.1) |
|  | 40 and over | 283 | (6.4) | (9.4) | (14.2) | 55.1 | (14.9) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0008 \\ 407.4571 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current alcohol use |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ | Never | Less than monthly | Monthly | 1 to 4 times a week | 5 or more times a week |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 462 | (3.0) | (9.2) | 15.1 | 57.9 | 14.8 |
|  | Intermediate | 103 | (9.1) | (11.2) | (16.8) | 59.2 | (3.7) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 131 | (7.4) | (13.5) | (18.0) | 49.5 | (11.6) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 181 | (8.5) | (14.8) | (24.1) | 45.2 | (7.4) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 287 | (12.0) | 19.2 | (14.0) | 51.1 | (3.7) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 691.4126 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 729 | (3.5) | 11.7 | 17.1 | 58.1 | 9.6 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 42 | (12.4) | (5.8) | (14.1) | (53.7) | (14.0) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 325 | (9.5) | (14.4) | 18.0 | 47.8 | (10.2) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 68 | (33.1) | (24.8) | (9.5) | (26.4) | 6.1) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 894.1122 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 40 | (13.9) | (11.2) | (9.2) | (58.4) | (7.2) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 278 | (6.2) | (16.2) | 23.2 | 48.4 | (5.8) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 238 | (5.1) | (13.0) | (21.0) | 51.1 | (9.8) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 342 | (4.0) | (9.1) | (13.0) | 59.8 | (14.1) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 86 | (4.1) | (8.3) | (10.9) | 65.2 | (11.4) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 25 | (22.7) | (10.2) | (19.6) | (39.2) | (8.2) |
|  | None of the above | 107 | (17.5) | (20.6) | (14.1) | (43.3) | (4.4) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 781.1491 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current alcohol use |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Never | Less than monthly | Monthly | 1 to 4 times a week | 5 or more times a week |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 857 | 6.2 | 11.8 | 17.5 | 54.3 | 10.2 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 243 | (9.5) | (14.2) | (16.8) | 51.2 | (8.3) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 44 | (2.7) | (24.5) | (10.4) | (53.8) | (8.7) |
|  | Other | 25 | (18.7) | (23.0) | (3.3) | (48.3) | (6.6) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0476 \\ 191.0927 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes to table
NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weight1
Table 8.8b Current frequency of parental alcohol use, MCS 2 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Total | Current alcohol use |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Never | Less than monthly | Monthly | 1 to 4 times a week | 5 or more times a week |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 13,698 | 17.8 | 18.3 | 17.8 | 38.4 | 7.7 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 1,921 | 21.8 | 23.9 | 24.8 | 28.2 | 1.3 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 2,693 | 25.5 | 20.3 | 19.5 | 31.7 | 3.0 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 4,274 | 16.8 | 18.0 | 18.7 | 40.1 | 6.3 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 3,360 | 13.8 | 15.8 | 14.9 | 43.0 | 12.5 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,186 | 13.3 | 16.3 | 11.8 | 43.6 | 15.0 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 754.5217 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 2,429 | 9.6 | 13.8 | 16.9 | 48.1 | 11.6 |
|  | Intermediate | 1,597 | 11.6 | 19.3 | 20.2 | 43.4 | 5.5 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 463 | 11.5 | 14.1 | 15.8 | 46.3 | 12.3 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 271 | (10.1) | 23.7 | 25.5 | 35.2 | (5.5) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,813 | 14.1 | 21.7 | 20.9 | 38.3 | 5.0 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 195.5632 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 5,738 | 11.1 | 17.3 | 18.8 | 44.0 | 8.8 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 255 | (18.8) | 18.6 | 19.5 | 37.9 | (5.2) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 4,186 | 23.2 | 18.3 | 15.2 | 35.0 | 8.4 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 884 | 40.2 | 20.4 | 12.3 | 22.6 | (4.4) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 553.4382 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current alcohol use |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Never | Less than monthly | Monthly | 1 to 4 times a week | 5 or more times a week |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 1,163 | 19.8 | 25.6 | 20.9 | 29.5 | 4.2 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 3,869 | 14.4 | 21.9 | 19.5 | 38.5 | 5.7 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,837 | 17.3 | 17.4 | 20.5 | 37.1 | 7.6 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 3,702 | 11.8 | 14.4 | 16.5 | 46.1 | 11.3 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 498 | 15.2 | 9.8 | 12.2 | 48.6 | 14.2 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 450 | 52.7 | 16.7 | 10.6 | 15.5 | (4.5) |
|  | None of the above | 1,896 | 37.9 | 19.9 | 15.0 | 24.0 | 3.3 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 1216.1610 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 8,281 | 18.1 | 16.6 | 16.5 | 40.1 | 8.6 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 2,012 | 13.3 | 23.6 | 20.0 | 36.2 | 6.9 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 507 | 24.1 | 15.0 | 12.9 | 38.5 | (9.5) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 2,325 | 19.3 | 20.8 | 22.1 | 33.4 | 4.4 |
|  | Other | 319 | 16.8 | 20.6 | 21.5 | 35.9 | (5.2) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 202.2531 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who com | eted partner interview) | 9,841 | 9.1 | 9.3 | 13.3 | 52.1 | 16.2 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 345 | 16.9 | 13.4 | 19.6 | 44.5 | (5.7) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 1,141 | 14.4 | 12.2 | 16.2 | 49.0 | 8.2 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 2,636 | 9.2 | 9.7 | 14.1 | 53.4 | 13.7 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,921 | 7.1 | 8.2 | 12.7 | 55.2 | 16.9 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,995 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 11.2 | 48.7 | 23.2 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 255.7951 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current alcohol use |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Never | Less than monthly | Monthly | 1 to 4 times a week | 5 or more times a week |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 3,466 | 5.3 | 6.5 | 12.4 | 57.0 | 18.8 |
|  | Intermediate | 660 | (6.5) | 12.8 | 15.0 | 54.7 | 11.0 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 1,364 | 11.8 | 7.8 | 11.3 | 48.6 | 20.5 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 1,239 | 7.4 | 11.2 | 16.0 | 52.4 | 12.9 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 2,288 | 17.1 | 14.1 | 14.6 | 43.2 | 11.1 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 457.0384 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 4,881 | 4.7 | 8.0 | 14.2 | 56.2 | 16.8 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 216 | (14.2) | (12.6) | (14.0) | 48.2 | (10.9) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 3,261 | 12.9 | 9.8 | 12.0 | 49.1 | 16.2 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 684 | 27.9 | 17.5 | 12.8 | 30.3 | 11.5 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 486.7933 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 606 | 9.7 | 14.2 | 18.9 | 45.1 | 12.0 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 2,350 | 8.1 | 10.8 | 14.2 | 52.1 | 14.8 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,224 | 5.0 | 8.7 | 15.4 | 52.1 | 18.8 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 2,646 | 5.5 | 7.3 | 11.7 | 58.2 | 17.2 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 536 | 9.3 | 4.3 | 9.7 | 54.4 | 22.3 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 373 | 28.7 | (12.2) | (10.8) | 33.7 | 14.5 |
|  | None of the above | 999 | 23.0 | 12.9 | 12.7 | 39.1 | 12.4 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 552.9748 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Notes to table
NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: whnotsco

Table 8.9 Parental CAGE scores, MCS2 by country


## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weights2 Base: MCS2 main respondents

Table 8.10a Parental CAGE scores, MCS 2 (Scotland)

|  |  | Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { CAGE } \\ \text { (excludes no } \end{array}$ | cores <br> -drinkers) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Problem drinker (CAGE score 2 or more) | Not problem drinker (CAGE score less than 2) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers completion in main | o completed selfterview) | 1,493 | 4.5 | 95.5 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 185 | (2.8) | 97.2 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 247 | (3.4) | 96.6 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 460 | (4.9) | 95.1 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 440 | (4.5) | 95.5 |
|  | 40 and over | 160 | (6.4) | 93.6 |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.4383 \\ 25.5594 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Mother's | Managerial \& professional | 394 | (3.8) | 96.2 |
|  | Intermediate | 221 | (4.6) | 95.4 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 53 | (3.6) | 96.4 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 36 | (9.1) | (90.9) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 248 | (3.2) | 96.8 |
|  | p-value Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.4837 \\ 20.8167 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Couple's | Both partners employed | 832 | (4.0) | 96.0 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 43 | (3.1) | (96.9) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 356 | (5.2) | 94.8 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 54 | (6.2) | 93.8 |
|  | p -value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.6509 \\ 10.3072 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Mother's | NVQ 1 | 53 | (1.6) | 98.4 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 362 | (4.4) | 95.6 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 344 | (2.6) | 97.4 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 511 | (5.6) | 94.4 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 75 | (4.1) | 95.9 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 24 | (3.4) | (96.6) |
|  | None of the above | 121 | (7.0) | 93.0 |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.2287 \\ 53.4438 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |


|  |  | Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { CAGE } \\ \text { (excludes no } \end{array}$ | cores <br> -drinkers) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Problem drinker (CAGE score 2 or more) | Not problem drinker (CAGE score less than 2) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 920 | (3.7) | 96.3 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 280 | (6.6) | 93.4 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 52 | (6.0) | 94.0 |
|  | Lone natural mother | 202 | (5.2) | 94.8 |
|  | Other | 38 | (3.6) | (96.4) |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.3368 \\ 35.4805 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Father |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who in partner interview) | completed self-completion | 1,076 | 14.4 | 85.6 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 36 | (28.3) | (71.7) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 135 | (11.5) | 88.5 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 293 | (15.1) | 84.9 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 347 | 15.1 | 84.9 |
|  | 40 and over | 260 | (11.9) | 88.1 |
|  | p-value Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.1011 \\ 63.8380 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Father's | Managerial \& professional | 446 | 15.4 | 84.6 |
|  | Intermediate | 94 | (14.1) | 85.9 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 120 | (9.8) | 90.2 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 162 | (13.2) | 86.8 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 247 | 15.5 | 84.5 |
|  | p -value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.5564 \\ 23.6373 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Couple's | Both partners employed | 698 | 13.3 | 86.7 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 36 | (29.2) | (70.8) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 292 | (14.1) | 85.9 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 42 | (27.9) | (72.1) |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0053 \\ 98.0394 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |


|  |  | Total <br> Unweighted <br> N | CAGE scores(excludes non-drinkers) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Problem drinker (CAGE score 2 or more) | Not problem drinker (CAGE score less than 2) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 32 | (21.1) | (78.9) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 257 | (15.0) | 85.0 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 225 | (12.1) | 87.9 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 328 | 13.8 | 86.2 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 83 | (12.1) | 87.9 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 19 | (14.7) | (85.3) |
|  | None of the above | 83 | (19.6) | 80.4 |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.5964 \\ 35.2964 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 795 | 12.8 | 87.2 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 215 | (19.6) | 80.4 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 43 | (12.8) | (87.2) |
|  | Other | 20 | (33.8) | (66.2) |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0237 \\ 96.4006 \end{array}$ |  |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weightl
Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 8.10b Parental CAGE scores, MCS 2 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Total | CAGE <br> (excludes no | cores <br> -drinkers) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Problem drinker (CAGE score 2 or more) | Not problem drinker (CAGE score less than 2) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers completion in main | o completed selfterview) | 10,623 | 5.8 | 94.2 |
| Mother's age at | Under 25 | 1,339 | 5.3 | 94.7 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 1,732 | 4.7 | 95.3 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 3,100 | 5.3 | 94.7 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,544 | 6.1 | 93.9 |
|  | 40 and over | 883 | 8.5 | 91.5 |
|  | p -value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0041 \\ 19.2678 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Mother's | Managerial \& professional | 2,076 | 6.5 | 93.5 |
|  | Intermediate | 1,305 | 3.9 | 96.1 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 382 | (4.4) | 95.6 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 228 | (5.1) | 94.9 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,414 | 4.8 | 95.2 |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0581 \\ 13.0513 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Couple's | Both partners employed | 4,748 | 5.2 | 94.8 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 181 | (4.2) | 95.8 |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 2,605 | 5.2 | 94.8 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 418 | 8.0 | 92.0 |
|  | p-value | 0.1993 5.1276 |  |  |
| Mother's | NVQ 1 | 824 | 5.0 | 95.0 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 2,983 | 5.1 | 94.9 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,391 | 5.5 | 94.5 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 2,994 | 6.0 | 94.0 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 373 | (8.5) | 91.5 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 161 | (3.9) | 96.1 |
|  | None of the above | 860 | 7.4 | 92.6 |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.1198 \\ 14.1188 \end{array}$ |  |  |


|  |  | Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { CAGE } \\ \text { (excludes no } \end{array}$ | cores <br> -drinkers) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Problem drinker (CAGE score 2 or more) | Not problem drinker (CAGE score less than 2) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 5,749 | 5.0 | 95.0 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,627 | 5.9 | 94.1 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 331 | (7.6) | 92.4 |
|  | Lone natural mother | 1,632 | 8.5 | 91.5 |
|  | Other | 263 | (6.1) | 93.9 |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0001 \\ 27.9476 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Father |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers w in partner interview | completed self-completion | 8,785 | 13.0 | 87.0 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 282 | (13.5) | 86.5 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 874 | 13.6 | 86.4 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 2,222 | 13.1 | 86.9 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,561 | 12.6 | 87.4 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,682 | 13.0 | 87.0 |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.9660 \\ & 0.7002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Father's | Managerial \& professional | 3,168 | 12.7 | 87.3 |
|  | Intermediate | 586 | 11.1 | 88.9 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 1,088 | 13.6 | 86.4 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 1,077 | 12.4 | 87.6 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,681 | 14.1 | 85.9 |
|  | p -value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.4694 \\ & 4.3653 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Couple's | Both partners employed | 4,507 | 12.1 | 87.9 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 170 | (14.0) | 86.0 |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 2,521 | 13.7 | 86.3 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 406 | 19.7 | 80.3 |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0041 \\ 16.2410 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |


|  |  | Total | CAGE scores(excludes non-drinkers) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Problem drinker (CAGE score 2 or more) | Not problem drinker (CAGE score less than 2) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 520 | 13.8 | 86.2 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 2,058 | 12.5 | 87.5 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,116 | 12.0 | 88.0 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 2,405 | 12.6 | 87.4 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 460 | (10.1) | 89.9 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 207 | (12.3) | 87.7 |
|  | None of the above | 624 | 20.7 | 79.3 |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0005 \\ 31.3230 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 5,632 | 12.8 | 87.2 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,464 | 15.4 | 84.6 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 360 | (10.4) | 89.6 |
|  | Other | 183 | (6.7) | 93.3 |
|  | p-value <br> Chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0081 \\ 14.6934 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: whnotsco
Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI

## Recreational drug use

Table 8.11 Current parental drug use, MCS 2 by country


## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weights2
Base: MCS2 main respondents

Table 8.12a Current parental drug use, MCS2 (Scotland)

|  |  | Total | Use of recreational drugs in past year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Ever | Never | Can't say |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed self-completion in main interview) |  | 1,690 | 4.5 | 94.5 | (1.1) |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 218 | (11.2) | 86.2 | (2.6) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 290 | (7.4) | 91.2 | (1.4) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 528 | (3.7) | 95.2 | (1.1) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 488 | (2.1) | 97.5 | (0.4) |
|  | 40 and over | 176 | (1.8) | 97.8 | (0.4) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 364.1079 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 421 | (2.0) | 97.2 | (0.8) |
|  | Intermediate | 239 | (1.7) | 98.0 | (0.3) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 57 | (2.2) | 97.8 |  |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 40 | (5.8) | (91.1) | (3.1) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 274 | (6.2) | 91.9 | (1.9) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0400 \\ 131.7107 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 896 | (2.2) | 96.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 50 | (4.90 | (91.9) | (3.2) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 438 | (4.5) | 95.0 | (0.4) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 80 | (10.8) | 85.8 | (3.4) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0001 \\ 196.5346 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 69 | (4.4) | 93.6 | (2.0) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 423 | (6.5) | 91.0 | (2.5) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 377 | (4.9) | 94.3 | (0.8) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 571 | (2.7) | 96.9 | (0.3) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 81 | (2.7) | 97.3 |  |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | (26) | (3.0) | (94.0) | (3.0) |
|  | None of the above | 150 | (6.7) | 92.7 | (0.6) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0060 \\ 199.2731 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Use of recreational drugs in past year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Ever | Never | Can't say |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 1,052 | (1.4) | 97.8 | (0.8) |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 316 | (10.4) | 87.9 | (1.7) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 54 | (4.0) | 94.6 | (1.3) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 231 | (12.3) | 85.8 | (1.9) |
|  | Other | (47) | (3.5) | (96.5) |  |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 662.6666 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers wh in partner interview | completed self-completion | 1,155 | 9.4 | 89.4 | (1.3) |
| Father's age at | Under 25 | 42 | (14.3) | (75.4) | (10.4) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 150 | (20.5) | 76.4 | (3.1) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 316 | (8.7) | 90.2 | (1.2) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 368 | (8.8) | 90.7 | (0.5) |
|  | 40 and over | 279 | (5.0) | 95.0 |  |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 558.7275 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father's | Managerial \& professional | 461 | (6.5) | 92.9 | (0.6) |
|  | Intermediate | 103 | (6.0) | 92.5 | (1.4) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 131 | (11.4) | 85.9 | (2.7) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 179 | (8.3) | 91.3 | (0.4) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 280 | (16.3) | 81.9 | (1.8) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0003 \\ 239.8433 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Couple's | Both partners employed | 724 | 8.4 | 90.8 | (0.7) |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 41 | (21.0) | (69.9) | (9.2) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 324 | 7.6 | 91.1 | 1.3 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 64 | (26.9) | (71.7) | (1.4) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 428.0864 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 39 | (16.1) | (81.9) | (2.0) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 274 | (10.6) | 87.8 | (1.6) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 238 | (8.6) | 90.6 | (0.8) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 342 | (6.2) | 93.6 | (0.2) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 86 | (9.0) | 91.0 |  |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 25 | (5.1) | (94.9) |  |
|  | None of the above | 101 | (13.9) | 82.2 | (3.9) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0415 \\ 197.3007 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Use of recreational drugs in past year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Ever | Never | Can't say |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 850 | 7.2 | 92.3 | (0.5) |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 239 | (19.0) | 76.9 | (4.1) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | (44) | (9.3) | (90.7) |  |
|  | Other | (25) | (3.3) | (93.4) | (3.3) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 445.4052 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |

Notes to table
NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weightl Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 8.12b Current parental drug use, MCS 2 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Total | Use of re | ational dr year | gs in past |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\underset{\mathbf{N}}{\text { Unweighted }}$ | Ever | Never | Can't say |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers w in main interview) | o completed self-completion | 12,495 | 3.8 | 95.1 | 1.1 |
| Mother's age at | Under 25 | 1,711 | 6.5 | 91.1 | (2.4) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 2,270 | 5.2 | 92.8 | (2.0) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 3,767 | 3.7 | 95.3 | (1.0) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,983 | 2.7 | 96.9 | (0.4) |
|  | 40 and over | 1,029 | 1.5 | 98.0 | (0.5) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 124.2978 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's | Managerial \& professional | 2,306 | 2.9 | 96.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Intermediate | 1,510 | (2.2) | 96.9 | (0.9) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 434 | (5.4) | 93.3 | (1.2) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 258 | (2.7) | 95.5 | (1.8) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,669 | 3.8 | 94.3 | 1.9 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0008 \\ 35.8753 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Couple's | Both partners employed | 5,407 | 2.5 | 96.7 | 0.7 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 230 | (6.6) | 89.0 | (4.4) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 3,457 | 3.0 | 96.1 | 0.9 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 626 | 7.4 | 91.0 | (1.6) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 77.1862 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's | NVQ 1 | 1,055 | (3.4) | 95.3 | (1.3) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 3,562 | 4.1 | 94.7 | (1.2) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,713 | 4.2 | 94.7 | (1.1) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 3,467 | 3.5 | 96.0 | (0.6) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 447 | (2.4) | 97.3 | (0.3) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 268 | (3.9) | 94.0 | (2.1) |
|  | None of the above | 1,231 | 4.6 | 92.4 | 3.0 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0001 \\ 54.2732 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Use of recreational drugs in past year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Ever | Never | Can't say |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 7,131 | 2.2 | 97.1 | 0.7 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,897 | 6.3 | 92.0 | (1.7) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 412 | (1.9) | 97.6 | (0.5) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 2,016 | 8.3 | 89.3 | 2.3 |
|  | Other | 308 | (4.1) | 93.8 | (2.1) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 230.8586 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers wh in partner interview | completed self-completion | 9,553 | 8.2 | 89.8 | 2.0 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 333 | 16.3 | 79.4 | (4.3) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 1,063 | 14.5 | 82.5 | (2.9) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 2,524 | 9.3 | 88.8 | (1.8) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,810 | 6.7 | 91.5 | 1.8 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,894 | 5.3 | 93.2 | (1.6) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 123.5955 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father's | Managerial \& professional | 3,431 | 6.5 | 92.0 | 1.5 |
|  | Intermediate | 647 | 5.8 | 93.2 | (1.0) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 1,283 | 11.2 | 86.3 | (2.5) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 1,191 | 9.4 | 88.3 | (2.4) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 2,061 | 10.1 | 87.0 | 2.9 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 66.8868 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Couple's | Both partners employed | 4,797 | 7.0 | 91.4 | 1.6 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 203 | (19.8) | 75.0 | (5.2) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 3,056 | 8.6 | 89.4 | 2.0 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 562 | 15.0 | 79.0 | (5.9) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 118.5735 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 590 | 10.4 | 86.5 | (3.1) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 2,288 | 10.7 | 86.8 | (2.5) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,204 | 7.9 | 90.3 | (1.8) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 2,618 | 6.2 | 92.4 | (1.4) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 530 | (5.3) | 94.0 | (0.6) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 309 | (6.0) | 89.6 | (4.4) |
|  | None of the above | 810 | 10.7 | 87.2 | (2.2) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 78.3249 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Use of recreational drugs in past <br> year |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ | Ever | Never | Can't say |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 6,459 | 6.2 | 92.3 | 1.6 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,569 | 17.6 | 78.7 | 3.7 |
|  | Natural parents <br> (other/unknown relationship) | 435 | $(7.0)$ | 90.9 | $(2.1)$ |
|  | Other | 197 | $(9.2)$ | 86.3 | $(4.4)$ |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | 0.0000 <br> 250.4514 |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: whnotsco
Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI

## Psycho-social health

## Post-natal depression and diagnosed depression

Table 8.13 Maternal post-natal depression by country (natural mothers who had had another child since MCS1), MCS2

|  |  | Total <br> Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ | Percentage low or sad <br> for 2 weeks or more |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Mother |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) | 4,109 | 32.8 |  |
| Country | England | 2,766 | 32.8 |
|  | Wales | 490 | 37.0 |
|  | Scotland | 440 | 30.5 |
|  | N. Ireland | 413 | 34.0 |
|  | p-value | 0.2845 |  |
|  | chi2 | 5.5360 |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weights2
Base: MCS2 natural mothers who had another baby by MCS2.

Table 8.14a Maternal post-natal depression (Scotland)

## (natural mothers who had had another child since MCS1), MCS 2



## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 natural mothers who had another baby by MCS2 in Scotland: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weight1

Table 8.14b Maternal post-natal depression (Rest of UK) (natural mothers who had had another child since MCS1), MCS 2


## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: whnotsco
Base: Base: MCS2 natural mothers who had another baby by MCS2 in England Wales and NI

Table 8.15 Mother diagnosed depression or serious anxiety, MCS 2

|  |  | Total Unweighted N | Never diagnosed depression or serious anxiety | Diagnosed but not currently treated | Diagnosed and currently being treated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 15,229 | 71.4 | 20.8 | 7.8 |
| Country | England | 9,810 | 71.7 | 20.8 | 7.4 |
|  | Wales | 2,200 | 69.6 | 21.7 | 8.7 |
|  | Scotland | 1,785 | 69.0 | 21.3 | 9.8 |
|  | N . Ireland | 1,434 | 71.6 | 17.1 | 11.3 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 45.0670 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |

Notes to table
NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weights 2
Base: MCS2 main respondents

Table 8.16a Parental diagnosed depression or serious anxiety, MCS2 (Scotland)

|  |  | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ | Never diagnosed depression or serious anxiety | Diagnosed but not currently treated | Diagnosed and currently <br> being treated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 1785 | 69.0 | 21.3 | 9.8 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 230 | 59.4 | 25.4 | (15.2) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 304 | 62.1 | 25.7 | (12.2) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 549 | 72.3 | 20.8 | (6.9) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 515 | 72.5 | 18.3 | (9.2) |
|  | 40 and over | 187 | 70.5 | (19.6) | (9.9) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0008 \\ 228.3323 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 437 | 76.3 | 17.0 | (6.7) |
|  | Intermediate | 251 | 74.1 | 20.0 | (5.9) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 59 | (83.1) | (14.9) | (2.0) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | (40) | (63.9) | (29.8) | (6.3) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 287 | 71.1 | 19.2 | (9.6) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.2001 \\ 81.5794 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 931 | 76.1 | 17.8 | 6.0 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 53 | (71.3) | (23.7) | (5.1) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 461 | 66.5 | 23.5 | (10.0) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 85 | (49.1) | (31.9) | (19.1) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 316.0515 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 71 | (62.2) | (21.4) | (16.4) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 445 | 65.4 | 20.8 | 13.8 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 389 | 68.7 | 21.7 | (9.6) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 602 | 74.5 | 20.0 | (5.5) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 84 | 78.9 | (16.2) | (4.9) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | (27) | (64.3) | (30.9) | (4.8) |
|  | None of the above | 164 | 54.5 | 28.6 | 16.9 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 421.7122 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total Unweighted N | Never diagnosed depression or serious anxiety | Diagnosed but not currently treated | Diagnosed and currently being treated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 1,103 | 73.8 | 19.2 | 7.0 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 327 | 66.7 | 23.8 | (9.5) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 56 | (70.7) | (17.0) | (12.3) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 250 | 51.1 | 27.3 | 21.6 |
|  | Other | (49) | (51.5) | (32.0) | (16.5) |
|  | p-value chi2 | 0.0000 616.9371 |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weight 1
Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 8.16b Parental diagnosed depression or serious anxiety, MCS2 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ | Never diagnosed depression or serious anxiety | Diagnosed but not currently treated | Diagnosed and currently being treated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 13,698 | 71.6 | 20.7 | 7.6 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 1,921 | 64.5 | 27.3 | 8.2 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 2,693 | 65.3 | 24.6 | 10.1 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 4,274 | 72.8 | 19.7 | 7.5 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 3,360 | 75.4 | 18.2 | 6.4 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,185 | 76.6 | 16.8 | 6.5 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 140.8269 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 2,429 | 80.4 | 15.4 | 4.2 |
|  | Intermediate | 1,597 | 76.1 | 18.3 | 5.6 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 463 | 71.9 | 23.4 | (4.7) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 271 | 68.3 | 23.2 | (8.5) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,813 | 69.0 | 24.0 | 7.0 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 86.0021 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Couple's } \\ & \text { employment } \\ & \text { status } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Both partners employed | 5,738 | 77.1 | 17.9 | 5.0 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 255 | 70.8 | 21.1 | (8.1) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 4,186 | 71.4 | 21.1 | 7.5 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 884 | 62.4 | 21.2 | 16.5 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 160.1797 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 1,163 | 64.1 | 25.6 | 10.3 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 3,869 | 67.5 | 23.5 | 9.0 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,837 | 71.7 | 20.8 | 7.5 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 3,702 | 77.4 | 17.5 | 5.1 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 498 | 85.8 | 10.9 | (3.2) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 450 | 73.7 | 15.4 | 10.9 |
|  | None of the above | 1,896 | 64.9 | 24.6 | 10.5 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 240.8077 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total <br> Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ | Never <br> diagnosed <br> depression or <br> serious anxiety | Diagnosed but <br> not currently <br> treated | Diagnosed and <br> currently <br> being treated |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 8,281 | \% | \% | \% |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 2,012 | 76.6 | 17.4 | 6.1 |
|  | Natural parents <br> (other/unknown <br> relationship) | 507 | 67.3 | 24.2 | 8.5 |
|  | Lone natural mother | 70.5 | 22.4 | $(7.2)$ |  |
|  | Other | 2,325 | 58.1 |  | 28.5 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | 319 | 51.6 | 38.7 | $(9.7)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: whnotsco
Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI

## Psychological distress

Table 8.17 Parental psychological distress, MCS 2 by country

|  |  | Total | Low or none | Medium | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers completion in main | who completed self interview | 12,320 | 67.5 | 29.4 | 3.1 |
| Country | England | 7,645 | 66.8 | 30.1 | 3.0 |
|  | Wales | 1,906 | 69.3 | 27.4 | 3.3 |
|  | Scotland | 1,576 | 71.4 | 25.4 | (3.2) |
|  | N. Ireland | 1,193 | 70.7 | 25.8 | (3.5) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0039 \\ 23.1928 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed self-completion in partner interview) |  | 9,204 | 69.8 | 28.6 | 1.6 |
| Country | England | 5,885 | 69.2 | 29.2 | (1.7) |
|  | Wales | 1,387 | 72.6 | 25.9 | (1.5) |
|  | Scotland | 1,105 | 74.1 | 24.6 | (1.3) |
|  | N . Ireland | 827 | 73.3 | 26.0 | (0.7) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0073 \\ 21.0319 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weights2
Base: MCS2 main respondents

Table 8.18a Parental psychological distress, MCS 2 (Scotland)

|  |  | Total | Low or none | Medium | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed selfcompletion in main interview) |  | 1,576 | 71.4 | 25.4 | (3.2) |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 184 | 63.9 | (26.3) | (9.8) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 264 | 65.1 | 29.0 | (6.0) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 494 | 74.2 | 24.2 | (1.6) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 464 | 73.5 | 24.8 | (1.7) |
|  | 40 and over | 170 | 73.3 | (24.8) | (1.8) |
|  | $\mathrm{p} \text {-value }$ chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 339.1048 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 410 | 74.1 | 25.5 | (0.5) |
|  | Intermediate | 225 | 76.6 | 22.9 | (0.5) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 56 | (88.4) | (11.6) |  |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | (35) | (74.4) | (23.5) | (2.1) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 246 | 72.2 | 25.2 | (2.6) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0640 \\ 104.9238 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 850 | 75.5 | 23.8 | (0.8) |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | (47) | (74.3) | (22.3) | (3.5) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 403 | 70.1 | 25.3 | (4.7) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 66 | (42.2) | (42.0) | (15.7) |
|  | $\mathrm{p} \text {-value }$ chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 518.3699 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 58 | (55.5) | (37.9) | (6.6) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 391 | 67.4 | 27.8 | (4.8) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 354 | 72.8 | 23.0 | (4.2) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 547 | 75.3 | 24.0 | (0.6) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 79 | 78.8 | (21.2) |  |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | (23) | (68.6) | (28.0) | (3.4) |
|  | None of the above | 122 | 62.1 | (29.9) | (8.1) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0001 \\ 328.4419 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 991 | 75.0 | 23.4 | (1.6) |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 283 | 67.8 | 27.8 | (4.4) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 53 | (64.1) | (33.2) | (2.7) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 205 | 64.0 | 28.2 | (7.9) |
|  | Other | 44 | (47.0) | (37.6) | (15.4) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 431.0306 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Low or none | Medium | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | \% | \% | \% |
| Father |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed self-completion in partner interview) |  | 1,102 | 74.2 | 24.5 | (1.3) |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | (38) | (60.2) | (39.8) |  |
|  | 25 to 29 | 140 | 67.9 | (27.6) | (4.5) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 301 | 75.8 | 23.5 | (0.7) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 356 | 76.7 | 22.7 | (0.6) |
|  | 40 and over | 267 | 73.8 | 24.5 | (1.7) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0206 \\ 162.6407 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 451 | 76.6 | 22.4 | (1.0) |
|  | Intermediate | 100 | 72.4 | (27.6) |  |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 123 | 78.3 | (21.7) |  |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 175 | 73.4 | (25.5) | (1.1) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 254 | 68.3 | 28.3 | (3.4) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0586 \\ 135.6295 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 699 | 77.1 | 22.2 | (0.7) |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | (35) | (52.5) | (43.9) | (3.7) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 308 | 74.5 | 24.4 | (1.1) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 58 | (40.9) | (48.9) | (10.2) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 515.7334 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | (36) | (54.3) | (41.3) | (4.4) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 262 | 68.7 | 30.4 | (0.9) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 231 | 75.9 | 22.6 | (1.5) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 337 | 78.1 | 21.5 | (0.3) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 83 | (83.8) | (15.3) | (0.9) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | (23) | (78.6) | (18.0) | (3.4) |
|  | None of the above | 87 | 65.4 | (29.4) | (5.2) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0005 \\ 287.1669 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Low or none | Medium | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | \% | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 814 | 76.3 | 22.7 | (1.0) |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 225 | 63.6 | 34.3 | (2.2) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | (43) | (85.5) | (11.1) | (3.4) |
|  | Other | (23) | (68.3) | (31.7) |  |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0015 \\ 174.5578 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weight1 Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 8.18b Parental psychological distress, MCS 2 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Total | Low or none | Medium | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed selfcompletion in main interview) |  | 11,593 | 67.1 | 29.8 | 3.1 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 1,488 | 56.1 | 38.0 | 5.9 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 2,035 | 61.2 | 34.0 | 4.8 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 3,481 | 71.1 | 26.2 | 2.7 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,777 | 70.8 | 27.6 | (1.6) |
|  | 40 and over | 959 | 65.4 | 32.2 | (2.4) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 178.8601 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 2,226 | 72.9 | 25.9 | (1.2) |
|  | Intermediate | 1,417 | 71.7 | 26.6 | (1.7) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 411 | 77.6 | 20.7 | (1.7) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 241 | 69.1 | 26.1 | (4.7) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,507 | 67.1 | 31.0 | (1.8) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0003 \\ 39.8398 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 5,095 | 72.8 | 25.9 | 1.4 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 208 | 67.8 | 27.5 | (4.7) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 3,110 | 65.7 | 31.2 | 3.0 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 521 | 54.0 | 36.1 | 10.0 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 180.6010 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 909 | 63.1 | 31.7 | (5.2) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 3,232 | 66.3 | 30.3 | 3.4 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,601 | 67.1 | 30.1 | (2.8) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 3,312 | 72.5 | 26.1 | (1.5) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 439 | 68.0 | 31.3 | (0.7) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 224 | 50.5 | 41.3 | (8.2) |
|  | None of the above | 1,010 | 53.2 | 39.1 | 7.7 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 220.6973 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 6,572 | 71.6 | 26.5 | 1.9 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,724 | 63.2 | 33.1 | 3.6 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 380 | 64.4 | 31.0 | (4.5) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 1,787 | 53.2 | 39.7 | 7.1 |
|  | Other | 281 | 56.8 | 38.6 | (4.7) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 276.7470 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Low or none | Medium | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | \% | \% | \% |
| Father |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed self-completion in partner interview) |  | 9,048 | 69.4 | 28.9 | 1.6 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 300 | 59.6 | 38.1 | (2.4) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 971 | 68.5 | 28.9 | (2.6) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 2,372 | 70.2 | 28.4 | (1.4) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,648 | 69.1 | 29.4 | (1.5) |
|  | 40 and over | 1,778 | 70.7 | 27.7 | (1.6) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0503 \\ 19.6082 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 3,298 | 70.2 | 28.8 | (1.0) |
|  | Intermediate | 624 | 67.1 | 31.0 | (2.0) |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 1,175 | 71.2 | 27.4 | (1.4) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 1,094 | 69.4 | 28.6 | (2.0) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,867 | 67.2 | 29.8 | (2.9) |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0033 \\ 31.9128 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 4,557 | 72.2 | 26.7 | (1.1) |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 178 | 62.9 | 35.7 | (1.3) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 2,834 | 67.9 | 30.5 | (1.6) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 490 | 48.5 | 42.9 | (8.6) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 182.4878 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 538 | 69.1 | 28.3 | (2.6) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 2,138 | 70.8 | 27.8 | (1.4) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,132 | 71.2 | 28.0 | (0.8) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 2,526 | 69.1 | 29.4 | (1.6) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 507 | 68.0 | 31.5 | (0.4) |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 273 | 63.4 | 32.9 | (3.7) |
|  | None of the above | 706 | 67.4 | 28.7 | (3.9) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0004 \\ 44.3361 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Low or none | Medium | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | \% | \% | \% |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 6,052 | 70.5 | 28.2 | (1.3) |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,465 | 66.0 | 31.5 | (2.5) |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 403 | 64.7 | 31.9 | (3.4) |
|  | Other | 179 | 69.9 | 27.8 | (2.3) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0025 \\ 27.3228 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: whnotsco Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI

## Life satisfaction

Table 8.19 Parental life satisfaction, MCS 2, by country


## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 main respondents

Table 8.20a Parental life satisfaction, MCS 2 (Scotland)

|  |  | Total Unweighted N | Percentage life satisfaction 7 or above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mother |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed self-completion in main interview) |  | 1,687 | 83.4 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 214 | 68.6 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 289 | 75.8 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 525 | 88.0 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 484 | 88.0 |
|  | 40 and over | 175 | 84.4 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 467.4108 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 421 | 89.8 |
|  | Intermediate | 239 | 87.1 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 57 | (91.0) |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | (40) | (86.6) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 269 | 80.2 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0176 \\ 99.9596 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 893 | 89.6 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 50 | (64.1) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 434 | 85.6 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 80 | 60.5 |
|  | $p$-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 496.8822 \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 68 | (68.1) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 420 | 78.5 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 375 | 81.3 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 569 | 91.0 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 81 | 91.8 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | (25) | (88.7) |
|  | None of the above | 147 | 69.4 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 531.3288 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 1,048 | 89.8 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 312 | 76.7 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 54 | (76.4) |
|  | Lone natural mother | 226 | 62.5 |
|  | Other | (47) | (76.4) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 883.3097 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |


|  |  | Total Unweighted $\mathbf{N}$ | Percentage life satisfaction 7 or above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Father |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed self-completion in partner interview) |  | 1,151 | 87.2 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | (42) | (79.3) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 149 | 80.0 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 316 | 89.6 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 365 | 89.5 |
|  | 40 and over | 279 | 86.0 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0264 \\ 103.6707 \end{array}$ |  |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 460 | 90.8 |
|  | Intermediate | 103 | 89.3 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 131 | 89.7 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 179 | 86.2 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 278 | 79.6 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0006 \\ 173.3321 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 723 | 90.8 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | (40) | (58.8) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 324 | 87.9 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 63 | (54.1) |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 750.2711 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | (39) | (85.2) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 273 | 86.3 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 238 | 84.4 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 341 | 92.0 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 86 | 90.0 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | (25) | (93.8) |
|  | None of the above | 100 | 77.6 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0030 \\ 159.9406 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 848 | 89.6 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 238 | 80.5 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | (43) | (83.4) |
|  | Other | (25) | (68.3) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0001 \\ 182.1551 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

Table 8.20b Parental life satisfaction, MCS2 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Total Unweighted N | Percentage life satisfaction 7 or above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mother |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed self-completion in main interview) |  | 12,423 | 82.3 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 1,700 | 69.9 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 2,249 | 77.5 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 3,741 | 85.6 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,961 | 85.8 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,017 | 84.4 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 239.6920 \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 2,300 | 88.9 |
|  | Intermediate | 1,500 | 86.3 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 433 | 87.4 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 257 | 78.7 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,655 | 81.7 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 51.5565 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 5,385 | 88.7 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 230 | 75.2 |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 3,440 | 85.4 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 612 | 66.4 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 203.2513 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 1,042 | 75.5 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 3,539 | 79.7 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,705 | 83.5 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 3,453 | 88.1 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 446 | 89.9 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 264 | 78.4 |
|  | None of the above | 1,202 | 70.5 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 247.3227 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 7,089 | 88.8 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,891 | 78.5 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 409 | 82.0 |
|  | Lone natural mother | 1,977 | 59.4 |
|  | Other | 306 | 73.3 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 857.0550 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |


| Father |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total (all fathers who completed self-completion in partner interview) |  | 9,497 | 86.6 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 329 | 75.0 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 1,048 | 82.0 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 2,506 | 87.7 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,788 | 87.6 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,878 | 87.3 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 53.6732 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 3,419 | 89.6 |
|  | Intermediate | 644 | 86.3 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 1,267 | 88.5 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 1,181 | 84.1 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 2,026 | 79.9 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 103.4031 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 4,782 | 88.2 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 199 | 77.9 |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 3,018 | 86.9 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 543 | 68.9 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 129.8340 \end{array}$ |  |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 582 | 82.2 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 2,274 | 86.2 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,196 | 87.6 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 2,605 | 88.1 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 530 | 91.7 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 302 | 80.0 |
|  | None of the above | 793 | 82.3 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 47.9664 \end{array}$ |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 6,410 | 88.9 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,553 | 79.1 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 428 | 79.7 |
|  | Other | 192 | 78.7 |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 124.5598 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: whnotsco
Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI

## Height and Weight

Table 8.21 Parental Body Mass Index (BMI), MCS 2 by country

|  |  | Total | Current BMI |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Less than 18.5 (Underweight) | $\begin{gathered} 18.5 \text { to25.0 } \\ \text { (Normal) } \end{gathered}$ | Over 25 to 30 <br> (Overweight) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Over } 30 \\ \text { to } 35 \\ \text { (Obese) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Over 35 <br> (Morbidly obese) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 12,822 | 2.9 | 57.9 | 25.3 | 9.9 | 4.0 |
| Country | England | 8,228 | 3.0 | 57.9 | 25.2 | 9.9 | 4.0 |
|  | Wales | 1,879 | 3.3 | 56.5 | 26.0 | 10.3 | 3.9 |
|  | Scotland | 1,482 | 2.4 | 60.7 | 24.0 | 9.0 | 3.9 |
|  | N . Ireland | 1,233 | 2.0 | 55.3 | 30.3 | 8.8 | 3.6 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0690 \\ 27.7456 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed partner interview) |  | 8,726 | 0.5 | 37.2 | 45.7 | 13.2 | 3.5 |
| Country | England | 5,674 | 0.5 | 37.3 | 45.4 | 13.2 | 3.5 |
|  | Wales | 1,256 | 0.4 | 34.1 | 48.5 | 14.2 | 2.8 |
|  | Scotland | 1,024 | 0.5 | 38.2 | 46.4 | 12.2 | 2.6 |
|  | N . Ireland | 772 | 1.2 | 33.1 | 47.6 | 13.7 | 4.5 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0576 \\ 24.4591 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weights2
Base: MCS2 main respondents

Table 8.22a Parental Body Mass Index (BMI), MCS 2 (Scotland)

|  |  | Total | Current BMI |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Less than 18.5 (Underweight) | $\begin{aligned} & 18.5 \text { to25.0 } \\ & \text { (Normal) } \end{aligned}$ | Over 25 to 30 (Overweight) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Over } 30 \\ \text { to } 35 \\ \text { (Obese) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Over 35 (Morbidly obese) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 1,482 | 2.4 | 60.7 | 24.0 | 9.0 | 3.9 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 169 | (5.7) | 60.6 | 17.4 | (12.0) | (4.3) |
|  | 25 to 29 | 240 | (3.9) | 58.3 | 22.5 | (10.1) | (5.2) |
|  | 30 to 34 | 465 | (1.6) | 64.2 | 22.8 | (6.9) | (4.5) |
|  | 35 to 39 | 443 | (1.5) | 60.0 | 27.8 | (8.5) | (2.3) |
|  | 40 and over | 165 | (1.9) | 56.8 | 24.9 | (11.9) | (4.4) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0183 \\ 271.5771 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 381 | 1.0 | 63.9 | 25.2 | 8.1 | 1.8 |
|  | Intermediate | 218 | 1.8 | 63.4 | 19.3 | 10.4 | 5.1 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | (49) | 4.9 | 61.0 | 22.1 | 1.4 | 10.5 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | (32) |  | (43.6) | (29.8) | (20.2) | (6.4) |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 236 | (3.0) | 52.0 | 24.9 | (13.5) | (6.7) |
|  | p -value chi2 | $\begin{gathered} 0.0013 \\ 288.3958 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 791 | 1.2 | 61.0 | 24.0 | 9.7 | (4.1) |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | (44) | (7.9) | (54.1) | (17.2) | (10.1) | (10.6) |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 370 | (1.9) | 62.5 | 24.8 | (7.3) | (3.6) |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 67 | (4.1) | (53.3) | (35.0) | (4.1) | (3.6) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0288 \\ 203.5118 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | (49) | (6.3) | (60.1) | (14.8) | (9.7) | (9.1) |
|  | NVQ 2 | 359 | 3.8 | 54.9 | 26.4 | (10.9) | (4.0) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 332 | 1.2 | 56.7 | 26.5 | (8.3) | (7.4) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 516 | 1.6 | 66.4 | 21.7 | 8.4 | (2.0) |
|  | NVQ 5 | 70 | (1.0) | 73.6 | (21.0) | (4.4) |  |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | (21) | (10.0) | (59.9) | (9.6) | (13.2) | (7.3) |
|  | None of the above | 134 | (3.2) | 56.1 | (27.7) | (10.4) | (2.7) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0009 \\ 500.5801 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |



|  |  | Total | Current BMI |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Less than 18.5 (Underweight) | $\begin{gathered} 18.5 \text { to25.0 } \\ \text { (Normal) } \end{gathered}$ | Over 25 to 30 <br> (Overweight) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Over } 30 \\ \text { to } 35 \\ \text { (Obese) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Over 35 <br> (Morbidly obese) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | (33) |  | (28.4) | (56.6) | (15.0) |  |
|  | NVQ 2 | 250 | (1.3) | 37.2 | 46.6 | (11.2) | (3.7) |
|  | NVQ 3 | 223 |  | 34.9 | 44.5 | (16.2) | (4.4) |
|  | NVQ 4 | 327 |  | 38.4 | 49.4 | 10.9 | 1.3 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 77 |  | (46.8) | (44.3) | (7.4) | (1.5) |
|  | Other/Other/Overse as qualifications | (20) |  | (35.5) | (46.0) | (18.5) |  |
|  | None of the above | 93 | (2.4) | (45.7) | (36.4) | (12.2) | (3.3) |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.1498 \\ 294.6763 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 773 | 0.1 | 36.8 | 48.1 | 12.2 | 2.9 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 186 | 1.9 | 44.2 | 39.3 | 12.7 | 1.9 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | (43) | 2.8 | 29.6 | 52.0 | 15.6 |  |
|  | Other | (22) |  | 64.1 | 29.6 |  | 6.3 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0115 \\ 253.4183 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

[^32]Table 8.22b Parental Body Mass Index (BMI), MCS2 (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Total | Current BMI |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Less than 18.5 (Underweight) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 18.5 \text { to } \\ 25.0 \\ \text { (Normal) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Over 25 to 30 (Overweight) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Over } 30 \\ \text { to } 35 \\ \text { (Obese) } \end{gathered}$ | Over 35 (Morbidly obese) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Mother |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all mothers who completed main interview) |  | 11,750 | 3.0 | 57.6 | 23.5 | 10.0 | 4.0 |
| Mother's age at interview | Under 25 | 1,527 | 6.8 | 56.3 | 22.4 | 10.2 | 4.2 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 2,170 | 3.9 | 53.2 | 25.9 | 12.2 | 4.8 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 3,643 | 2.6 | 57.6 | 26.3 | 9.9 | 3.7 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,933 | 1.7 | 59.8 | 26.0 | 8.9 | 3.6 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,061 | 2.0 | 60.3 | 23.8 | 9.2 | 4.7 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 129.2623 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mother's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 2,129 | 1.6 | 63.9 | 22.9 | 8.9 | 2.8 |
|  | Intermediate | 1,386 | 2.6 | 56.8 | 26.5 | 10.0 | 4.1 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 406 | 2.7 | 60.4 | 25.4 | 9.4 | 2.0 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 233 | 0.8 | 51.8 | 28.0 | 12.3 | 7.1 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,609 | 3.2 | 52.5 | 26.7 | 12.2 | 5.4 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 0.0000 \\ 81.0758 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 5,010 | 2.0 | 58.6 | 25.2 | 10.3 | 3.8 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 214 | 3.2 | 59.3 | 21.1 | 10.5 | 5.9 |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 3,459 | 2.5 | 57.6 | 26.8 | 9.4 | 3.7 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 662 | 6.7 | 51.7 | 23.7 | 10.6 | 7.3 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 66.5149 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mother's education level | NVQ 1 | 987 | 4.4 | 53.6 | 25.5 | 11.0 | 5.6 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 3,340 | 3.3 | 54.1 | 26.8 | 11.2 | 4.7 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,555 | 1.9 | 58.7 | 24.2 | 11.4 | 3.9 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 3,213 | 1.9 | 62.9 | 24.4 | 7.9 | 3.0 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 435 | 3.7 | 71.3 | 18.3 | 6.1 | 0.6 |
|  | Other/Overseas qualifications | 365 | 4.7 | 50.0 | 30.1 | 10.0 | 5.1 |
|  | None of the above | 1,440 | 5.3 | 47.8 | 28.9 | 12.4 | 5.5 |
|  | p-value | 0.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current BMI |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Less than 18.5 (Underweight) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 18.5 \text { to } \\ 25.0 \\ \text { (Normal) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Over 25 to 30 (Overweight) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Over } 30 \\ \text { to } 35 \\ \text { (Obese) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Over } 35 \\ \text { (Morbidly } \\ \text { obese) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | chi2 | 215.4494 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 6,986 | 2.0 | 58.2 | 25.8 | 10.0 | 3.9 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,731 | 4.2 | 57.0 | 25.7 | 9.3 | 3.8 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 415 | 2.0 | 55.8 | 25.3 | 13.0 | 3.9 |
|  | Lone natural mother | 1,960 | 5.9 | 56.1 | 24.3 | 9.8 | 4.0 |
|  | Other | 248 | 3.4 | 58.4 | 22.0 | 9.0 | 7.3 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 95.4672 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fathers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (all fathers who completed partner interview) |  | 8,543 | 0.5 | 37.0 | 45.6 | 13.3 | 3.5 |
| Father's age at interview | Under 25 | 259 | 1.3 | 50.0 | 34.6 | 9.7 | 4.3 |
|  | 25 to 29 | 925 | 1.2 | 43.9 | 38.0 | 13.0 | 3.9 |
|  | 30 to 34 | 2,245 | 0.6 | 37.1 | 44.7 | 14.8 | 2.7 |
|  | 35 to 39 | 2,534 | 0.5 | 35.4 | 47.7 | 12.6 | 3.9 |
|  | 40 and over | 1,709 | 0.2 | 35.0 | 48.3 | 13.0 | 3.5 |
|  | p-value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 70.8979 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Father's occupational class | Managerial \& professional | 3,102 | 0.3 | 36.8 | 46.7 | 13.3 | 3.0 |
|  | Intermediate | 573 | 0.5 | 33.5 | 48.5 | 13.6 | 3.9 |
|  | Small employer \& self employed | 1,133 | 0.3 | 38.7 | 46.4 | 11.3 | 3.3 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 1,055 | 0.6 | 36.6 | 46.6 | 12.6 | 3.6 |
|  | Routine and semi routine | 1,797 | 1.2 | 38.2 | 40.8 | 14.9 | 5.0 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0013 \\ 50.8560 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Couple's employment status | Both partners employed | 4,285 | 0.3 | 36.2 | 47.0 | 12.9 | 3.5 |
|  | Main employed, partner not employed | 163 | 1.7 | 43.2 | 45.1 | 8.1 | 1.9 |
|  | Partner employed, main not employed | 2,714 | 0.5 | 37.5 | 45.0 | 14.0 | 2.9 |
|  | Both partners unemployed | 506 | 3.6 | 41.5 | 33.0 | 12.5 | 9.4 |
|  | p -value <br> chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 139.2619 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Total | Current BMI |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unweighted N | Less than 18.5 (Underweight) | 18.5 to 25.0 (Normal) | Over 25 to 30 (Overweight) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Over } 30 \\ \text { to } 35 \\ \text { (Obese) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Over 35 (Morbidly obese) |
|  |  |  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Father's education level | NVQ 1 | 539 | 2.3 | 31.0 | 40.9 | 19.9 | 5.9 |
|  | NVQ 2 | 2,072 | 0.5 | 34.9 | 46.9 | 14.2 | 3.5 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 1,129 | 0.6 | 35.3 | 47.1 | 13.5 | 3.5 |
|  | NVQ 4 | 2,423 | 0.1 | 38.6 | 46.1 | 12.3 | 2.8 |
|  | NVQ 5 | 483 | 0.6 | 44.6 | 45.8 | 8.5 | 0.5 |
|  | Other/Other/Over seas qualifications | 278 | 1.5 | 42.2 | 42.3 | 8.9 | 5.1 |
|  | None of the above | 774 | 0.3 | 37.2 | 41.1 | 13.8 | 7.5 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0000 \\ 151.9597 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family type | Married natural parents | 5,834 | 0.4 | 36.5 | 46.7 | 12.9 | 3.5 |
|  | Cohabiting natural parents | 1,287 | 0.7 | 38.9 | 42.3 | 14.7 | 3.3 |
|  | Natural parents (other/unknown relationship) | 418 | 0.4 | 38.0 | 43.6 | 13.8 | 4.2 |
|  | Other | 163 | 2.9 | 42.2 | 35.2 | 14.9 | 4.8 |
|  | p-value chi2 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0057 \\ 33.3787 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: whnotsco Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI

## CHAPTER NINE. EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION

## Mother's economic activity at age 3

Table 9.1 Mother's economic activity status by country at age 3

| Mother's current economic activity <br> status | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | All UK <br> Total \% |  |  |  |  |  |
| England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland |  |  |  |
| Currently working full-time | 12.6 | 15.8 | 15.4 | 22.1 | 13.2 |  |
| Currently working part-time | 40.6 | 42.7 | 47.0 | 37.8 | 41.1 |  |
| Looking after family and home | 43.2 | 37.3 | 33.5 | 36.2 | 42.0 |  |
| Not employed and seeking work | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.2 |  |
| Other not employed | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 1.2 |  |
| In education or government training <br> scheme | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 1.2 |  |
| Total percent | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Unweighted sample size | 9811 | 2200 | 1785 | 1434 | 15230 |  |
| Of those employed |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Works full-time | 23.6 | 27.1 | 24.7 | 36.9 | 24.3 |  |
| Works part-time | 76.4 | 72.9 | 75.3 | 63.1 | 75.7 |  |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Unweighted sample size | 4687 | 1197 | 1101 | 820 | 7805 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 mothers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) including 692 families who were not interviewed at MCS1. This table excludes any natural mothers not interviewed and any fathers or grandparents who completed the main interview. Within country weighted by weight 1 , all UK weighted by weight 2 . Chi-sq $=70.3731, \mathrm{P}=0.0000$.

## Mothers' education and employment

Table 9.2 Mothers' education qualifications at MCS 2 by Country

| Mothers education at MCS 2 | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  | All UK <br> Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | NI |  |
| NVQ 4/5 | 35.9 | 34.8 | 41.1 | 38.2 | 36.6 |
| NVQ 3 | 13.7 | 15.1 | 21.7 | 15.4 | 15.1 |
| NVQ 1/2 | 37.6 | 38.3 | 27.7 | 33.9 | 36.1 |
| OVERSEAS | 2.5 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.2 |
| NONE OF THESE | 10.3 | 10.0 | 8.1 | 11.3 | 10.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Sample Size | 10050 | 2226 | 1793 | 1440 | 15509 |

[^33]Table 9.3a Mother's current economic activity by highest educational achievement Scotland

| Mother's current economic activity status | Mother's highest education (academic or vocational) MCS1 |  |  |  | All <br> Scotland total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NVQ level 4/5 Degree+ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NVQ level } \\ 1 / 2 \\ \text { O level } \\ \text { GSE } \end{gathered}$ | Overseas, other unclassified and No qualifications |  |
| Currently employed full-time | 21.5 | 15.1 | 9.5 | (7.9) | 15.5 |
| Currently employed part-time | 52.1 | 51.8 | 44.2 | 23.4 | 47.1 |
| Not currently working* | 26.4 | 33.1 | 46.4 | 68.7 | 37.4 |
| Total percent ** | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 696 | 388 | 517 | 190 | 1791 |
| Of those currently employed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Works full-time | 29.3 | 22.6 | 17.7 | (25.3) | 24.8 |
| Works part-time | 70.7 | 77.4 | 82.4 | (74.7) | 75.2 |
| Total percent | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 516 | 259 | 275 | 59 | 1109 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 mothers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step). This table excludes any natural mothers not interviewed and any fathers or grandparents who completed the main interview. * Not currently working includes those who were at home looking after the family and home, non-employed and those in education. ${ }^{* *}$ Chi-sq $=143.05 \quad \mathrm{P}=0.0000$ for economic activity by NVQ in upper Table only. Degree+ means this level is degree level or above .

Table 9.3b Mother's current economic activity by highest educational achievement Rest of UK

| Mother's current economic activity status | Mother's highest education (academic or vocational) MCS1 |  |  |  | Rest of UK total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NVQ level } \\ 4 / 5 \\ \text { Degree+ } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NVQ level } \\ 1 / 2 \\ \text { O level } \\ \text { GSE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Overseas, other unclassified and No qualifications |  |
| Currently employed full-time | 19.8 | 14.7 | 8.9 | 4.1 | 13.0 |
| Currently employed part-time | 49.7 | 43.3 | 38.9 | 17.1 | 40.7 |
| Not currently working* | 30.6 | 42.1 | 52.1 | 78.8 | 46.3 |
| Total percent ** | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 4191 | 1838 | 5031 | 2347 | 13407 |
| Of those currently employed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Works full-time | 28.5 | 25.3 | 18.7 | 19.3 | 24.3 |
| Works part-time | 71.5 | 74.7 | 81.3 | 80.7 | 75.7 |
| Total percent | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 2929 | 1053 | 2287 | 423 | 6692 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 mothers in England Wales and NI (natural, adoptive, foster and step). This table excludes any natural mothers not interviewed and any fathers or grandparents who completed the main interview. * Not currently working includes those who were at home looking after the family and home, non-employed and those in education ${ }^{* *}$ Chi-sq $=1359.07 \quad \mathrm{P}=0.0000$ for economic activity by NVQ in upper Table only. Degree+ means this level is degree level or above.

## Changes in employment status MCS1 to MCS2

Table 9.4a Mother's employment transitions from MCS1 to MCS 2 - Scotland

| Mother's employment status at MCS 1 | Mother's employment <br> status at MCS 2 |  | Total | Sample <br> Size |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employed | Not <br> Employed |  |  |
| Employed | 87.5 | 12.5 | 100 | 992 |
| Not employed | 29.5 | 70.5 | 100 | 798 |
| All Scotland Total | 62.5 | 37.5 | 100 | 1790 |

[^34]Table 9.4b Mother's employment transitions from MCS1 to MCS 2 - Rest of UK

| Mother's employment status at MCS 1 | Mother's employment <br> status at MCS 2 |  | Total | Sample <br> Size |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employed | Not <br> Employed |  |  |
|  | 84.4 | 15.6 | 100 | 5851 |
| Not employed | 25.0 | 75.0 | 100 | 6922 |
| Rest of UK Total | 54.7 | 45.3 | 100 | 12773 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS mothers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) in England Wales and NI interviewed in sweep 1 and 2.
** Chi-sq $=4541.09 \quad \mathrm{P}=0.0000$.

Table 9. 5a Employed mother's NS-SEC (4) classification at MCS2 by highest education level by MCS1. Scotland

| Mothers highest <br> education level | NS-SEC(4) |  |  |  | All <br> Scotland <br> Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  <br> professional | Intermediate | Small employer, self- <br> employed \& low <br>  <br> technical | Semi- <br>  <br> routine |  |
| NVQ level 4/5 <br> Degree+ | 75.8 | 37.0 | $(40.9)$ | 16.2 | 48.5 |
| NVQ level 3 <br> A level | 15.3 | 32.1 | $(22.1)$ | 28.8 | 23.2 |
| NVQ level 1/2 <br> O level GSE | $(7.7)$ | 28.8 | $(33.0)$ | 42.5 | 23.7 |
| Overseas, unclassified <br> and other | $(1.3)$ | $(2.2)$ | $(4.0)$ | $(12.5)$ | 4.6 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Sample Size | 443 | 254 | 97 | 289 | 1083 |

[^35]Table 9.5b Employed mother's NS-SEC (4) classification at MCS2 by highest education level by MCS1 in Rest of UK

| Mothers highest <br> education level | NS-SEC(4) |  |  |  | Rest of <br> UK <br> Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  <br> professional | Intermediate | Small employer, <br>  <br> low supervisory <br> \& technical |  <br> routine |  |
| NVQ level 4/5 <br> Degree+ | 74.5 | 33.7 | 36.6 | 18.6 | 46.4 |
| NVQ level 3 <br> A level | 10.0 | 22.3 | 16.3 | 15.6 | 15.1 |
| NVQ level 1/2 <br> O level GSE | 14.7 | 41.2 | 41.5 | 52.6 | 33.6 |
| Overseas, unclassified <br> and other | $(0.9)$ | 2.9 | 5.6 | 13.2 | 4.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Sample Size | 2423 | 1593 | 734 | 1810 | 6560 |

Notes to table
Base: All employed MCS2 mothers in England Wales and NI (natural, adoptive, foster and step) in England Wales and NI . Chi-sq $=1685.51 \mathrm{p}$ value $=0.00$

Table 9.6a Mother's economic activity status at child's age 3 by type of ward - Scotland

| Mother's current economic activity status | Type of ward at MCS1 |  | All Scotland Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nondisadvantaged | Other Disadvantaged |  |
| Currently working full-time | 15.2 | 16.1 | 15.5 |
| Currently working part-time | 49.5 | 42.8 | 47.0 |
| Not currently working* | 35.4 | 41.2 | 37.5 |
| Total percent ** | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 924 | 870 | 1794 |
| Of those currently employed |  |  |  |
| Works full-time | 23.5 | 27.3 | 24.8 |
| Works part-time | 76.6 | 72.7 | 75.2 |
| Total percent | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 597 | 512 | 1109 |

[^36]Table 9.6b Mother's economic activity status at child's age $\mathbf{3}$ by type of ward - Rest of UK

| Mother's current economic activity status | Type of ward at MCS1 |  |  | Rest of UK Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nondisadvantaged | Other Disadvantaged | Minority Ethnic (Disadvantaged) |  |
| Currently working full-time | 13.9 | 12.0 | 8.9 | 13.0 |
| Currently working part-time | 45.1 | 35.6 | 16.6 | 40.6 |
| Not currently working* | 41.1 | 52.5 | 74.5 | 46.4 |
| Total percent ** | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 5401 | 6166 | 1869 | 13436 |
| Of those currently employed |  |  |  |  |
| Works full-time | 23.6 | 25.2 | 34.8 | 24.3 |
| Works part-time | 76.5 | 74.8 | 65.2 | 75.7 |
| Total percent | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 3259 | 2960 | 477 | 6696 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 mothers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) in England Wales and NI. This table excludes any natural mothers not interviewed and any fathers or grandparents who completed the main interview. * Not currently working includes those who were at home looking after the family and home, non-employed and those in education. ${ }^{* *}$ Chi-sq $=403.67 \mathrm{P}=0.00$ for economic activity by area of residence in upper Table only.

Table 9.7a Mother's economic activity status by number of children at child's age 3 Scotland

| Mother's current economic activity status | Number of children living in household |  |  | All <br> Scotland <br> Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Cohort <br> baby only | Two <br> children | Three or more <br> children | 15.9 <br> Currently working full-time$\quad 25.3$ | 14.2 |

[^37]Table 9.7b Mother's economic activity status by number of children at child's age 3 Rest of UK

| Mother's current economic activity status | Number of children living in household |  |  | Rest of <br> UK |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Cohort <br> baby only | Two <br> children | Three or more <br> children | Total |  |
| Currently working full-time | 20.4 | 12.4 | 7.8 | 13.0 |  |
| Currently working part-time | 45.3 | 43.7 | 31.3 | 40.6 |  |
| Not currently working* | 34.3 | 43.9 | 60.9 | 46.4 |  |
| Total percent** | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Unweighted sample size | 3251 | 5974 | 4211 | 13436 |  |
| Of those currently employed |  | 31.0 | 22.0 |  |  |
| Works full-time | 69.0 | 78.0 | 20.0 | 24.3 |  |
| Works part-time | 100 | 100 | 80.0 | 75.7 |  |
| Total percent | 2027 | 3193 | 100 | 100 |  |
| Unweighted sample size |  |  | 1476 | 6696 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 mothers in England Wales and NI (natural, adoptive, foster and step).

* Not currently working includes those who were at home looking after the family and home, non-employed and those in education
** Chi-sq $=611.64 \mathrm{P}=0.0000$ for economic activity by number of children in upper table only

Table 9.8 Mean weekly hours of employed mothers by whether works full or part-time

|  | Scotland | Scotland | Rest of UK | Rest of UK |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Mean weekly hours | Mother works <br> full time at <br> MCS2 | Mother works <br> part time at <br> MCS2 | Mother works <br> full time at <br> MCS2 | Mother works <br> part time at <br> MCS2 |
|  | 38.4 | 19.1 | 39.5 | 18.2 |
| CI | $37.8-39.0$ | $18.7-19.6$ | $39.1-39.9$ | $17.9-18.4$ |
| N | 296 | 705 | 1758 | 4215 |

[^38]
## Father's economic activity at age 3

Table 9.9 Father's economic activity by country at child's age 3

| Father's current economic activity status | Country at MCS2 |  |  |  | All UK <br> Total \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |  |
| Employee | 73.7 | 76.0 | 77.4 | 68.7 | 74.0 |
| Self-employed | 18.8 | 15.3 | 14.3 | 24.1 | 18.4 |
| Not employed | 7.5 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 7.2 | 7.6 |
| Total percent | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 6707 | 1488 | 1169 | 892 | 10256 |
| Of those currently employed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Works full-time | 94.4 | 94.4 | 94.9 | 94.9 | 94.5 |
| Works part-time | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.1 | (5.1) | 5.5 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 6032 | 1333 | 1059 | 811 | 9235 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 fathers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) including 692 families who were not interviewed at MCS1. Excludes proxy fathers and other carers who completed the partner interview (mothers and grandparents). Within country weighted by weight 1 , all UK weighted by weight2. Chi-sq $=20.09 \mathrm{P}=0.001$.

Table 9.10 Fathers' education qualifications at MCS 2 by country

| Fathers education at MCS 2 | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  | All UK <br> Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | NI |  |
| NVQ 4/5 | 40.2 | 39.0 | 41.1 | 36.0 | 40.0 |
| NVQ 3 | 14.2 | 15.0 | 20.1 | 13.9 | 14.8 |
| NVQ 1/2 | 32.8 | 34.5 | 28.3 | 36.1 | 32.7 |
| OVERSEAS | 3.6 | 2.8 | $(2.0)$ | $(2.1)$ | 3.4 |
| NONE OF THESE | 9.1 | 8.7 | 8.6 | 11.9 | 9.2 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Sample Size | 7484 | 1634 | 1397 | 1023 | 11538 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 fathers. Chi $-\mathrm{sq}=74.78 \mathrm{P}=0.006$

Table 9.11a Father's current economic activity status at child's age $\mathbf{3}$ by highest educational achievement at MCS1 - Scotland

| Father's current economic activity status | Father's highest education (academic or vocational) MCS1 |  |  |  | All <br> Scotland total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NVQ level } \\ 4 / 5 \\ \text { Degree+ } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NVQ level } \\ 1 / 2 \\ \text { O-level + } \\ \text { GCSE } \end{gathered}$ | Overseas and other unclassified Qualification None of these |  |
| Employee | 86.0 | 75.4 | 77.4 | 64.8 | 79.1 |
| Self-employed | 12.4 | (17.4) | 14.7 | (10.9) | 13.9 |
| Not employed | (1.7) | (7.3) | (7.9) | (24.3) | 7.0 |
| Total percent* | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 434 | 236 | 320 | 131 | 1121 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Of those currently employed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Works full-time | 95.8 | 96.9 | 93.7 | 90.0 | 95.0 |
| Works part-time | (4.2) | (3.1) | (6.3) | (10.0) | 5.1 |
| Total percent | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 427 | 215 | 291 | 99 | 1032 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 fathers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step). Excludes proxy fathers and other carers who completed the partner interview (mothers and grandparents). Education is based on education reported in MCS1 and updated with any new qualifications reported in MCS 2.

* Chi-sq=79.97 $\mathrm{P}=0.0000$ for father's economic activity by NVQ level in upper Table only.

Table 9.11b Father's current economic activity status at child's age 3 by highest educational achievement at MCS1 - Rest of UK

| Father's current economic activity status | Father's highest education (academic or vocational) MCS1 |  |  |  | Rest of UK total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NVQ level } \\ 4 / 5 \\ \text { Degree+ } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NVQ level } \\ \text { 1/2 } \\ \text { O-level + } \\ \text { GCSE } \end{gathered}$ | Overseas and other unclassified Qualification None of these |  |
| Employee | 81.1 | 76.2 | 71.1 | 56.6 | 74.3 |
| Self-employed | 15.8 | 19.4 | 21.4 | 21.2 | 18.8 |
| Not employed | 3.1 | 4.4 | 7.5 | 22.3 | 7.0 |
| Total percent* | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 3172 | 1219 | 2943 | 1340 | 8674 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Of those currently employed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Works full-time | 95.8 | 95.5 | 94.9 | 85.9 | 94.5 |
| Works part-time | 4.2 | 4.5 | 5.1 | 14.1 | 5.5 |
| Total percent | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 3067 | 1144 | 2678 | 1008 | 7897 |

[^39]Table 9.12a Employed father's NS-SEC (4) by highest education level at MCS1 Scotland

| Fathers highest education level | NS-SEC(4) |  |  |  | All <br> Scotland Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Managerial \& professional | Intermediate | Small employer, selfemployed \& low supervisory \& technical | Semiroutine \& routine |  |
| NVQ level 4/5 Degree+ | 71.3 | (39.2) | 18.8 | (8.8) | 40.8 |
| NVQ level 3 A level | 15.0 | (32.5) | 27.0 | 20.2 | 21.0 |
| NVQ level 1/2 <br> O level GSE | 10.5 | (24.8) | 42.7 | 44.3 | 27.7 |
| Overseas and other unclassified Qualification None of these | (3.2) | (3.6) | (11.6) | 26.6 | 10.5 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Sample Size | 458 | 105 | 293 | 265 | 1121 |

## Notes to table

Base: All employed MCS2 fathers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step). Excludes proxy fathers and other carers who completed the partner interview (mothers and grandparents). Education is based on education reported in MCS1 and updated with any new qualifications reported in MCS 2.
Note: chi-sq $=412.38 \mathrm{p}$ value -0.000 .

Table 9.12b Employed father's NS-SEC (4) by highest education level at MCS1 - Rest of UK

| Fathers highest education level | NS-SEC(4) |  |  |  | Rest of UK <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Managerial \& professional | Intermediate | Small <br> employer, <br> self-employed <br> $\&$ low <br>  <br> technical | Semiroutine \& routine |  |
| NVQ level 4/5 Degree+ | 65.6 | 48.7 | 20.2 | 10.7 | 41.0 |
| NVQ level 3 A level | 12.4 | 18.3 | 18.8 | 11.9 | 14.5 |
| NVQ level 1/2 <br> O level GSE | 18.6 | 28.1 | 45.8 | 50.5 | 33.1 |
| Overseas and other unclassified Qualification None of these | 3.4 | (5.0) | 15.3 | 26.9 | 11.5 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Sample Size | 3402 | 622 | 2506 | 2135 | 8665 |

## Notes to table

Base: All employed MCS2 fathers in England Wales and NI (natural, adoptive, foster and step). Excludes proxy fathers and other carers who completed the partner interview (mothers and grandparents). Education is based on education reported in MCS1 and updated with any new qualifications reported in MCS 2.
Note: chi-sq= 2434.35 p value -0.000 .

## Couples' employment status at age

Table 9.13 Parents' partnerships and economic status by country

| Parents' partnerships and economic statuses | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  | All UK <br> Total \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |  |
| Both employed full-time | 10.1 | 12.6 | 13.7 | 19.7 | 10.8 |
| Both employed, father ft and mother pt | 33.8 | 35.5 | 36.7 | 30.2 | 34.1 |
| Both employed, father pt and mother ft | 2.2 | 2.5 | (2.5) | (2.3) | 2.2 |
| Mother employed, father not employed | 2.0 | (1.7) | (2.8) | (2.3) | 2.1 |
| Father employed, mother not employed | 29.6 | 23.1 | 23.6 | 23.0 | 28.6 |
| Both not employed | 4.6 | 5.7 | 4.2 | (3.7) | 4.6 |
| Lone parent employed | 6.4 | 6.3 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 6.4 |
| Lone parent not employed | 11.3 | 12.7 | 8.8 | 11.0 | 11.2 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 8646 | 1949 | 1432 | 1152 | 13179 |

## Notes to table

All MCS2 mothers and fathers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) including 692 families who were not interviewed at MCS1. Excludes mothers whose partners did not complete the interview (approximately 2,056 cases) and interviews completed by grandparents or proxy interviews. Weighted by all UK weight. Chi-sq $=90.07 \mathrm{P}=0.0000$.

## Employed parents' NS-SEC statuses

Table 9.14 Employed mother's NS-SEC by country

| Mother's socio-economic status | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  | All UK <br> Total <br> \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |  |
| High managerial/professional | 7.8 | 7.0 | 7.9 | 7.0 | 7.7 |
| Low managerial/professional | 31.5 | 34.7 | 34.2 | 31.5 | 31.9 |
| Intermediate | 24.4 | 21.7 | 23.3 | 27.8 | 24.2 |
| Small employer \& self-employed | 8.5 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 5.2 | 7.9 |
| Low supervisory | 3.9 | 5.1 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 3.9 |
| Semi-routine | 17.4 | 18.2 | 18.0 | 19.8 | 17.6 |
| Routine | 6.6 | 7.7 | 7.2 | 5.9 | 6.7 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 4591 | 1178 | 1074 | 804 | 7647 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 employed mothers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) including 692 families who were not interviewed at MCS1 whose occupations were known. Within country weighted by weight 1 . All UK weighted by weight 2 . Chi-sq $=$ $22.94 \mathrm{P}=0.08$.

Table 9.15 Employed father's NS-SEC when child aged 3 by country

| Father's socio-economic status | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  | All UK <br> Total \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland |  |
| High managerial/professional | 15.7 | 11.2 | 14.5 | 11.0 | 15.2 |
| Low managerial/professional | 29.7 | 29.0 | 26.7 | 22.1 | 29.1 |
| Intermediate | 7.5 | 7.3 | 9.1 | 10.2 | 7.8 |
| Small employer \& self-employed | 14.7 | 12.4 | 11.2 | 20.9 | 14.6 |
| Low supervisory | 12.5 | 16.4 | 15.9 | 12.3 | 12.9 |
| semi-routine | 9.3 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 8.3 | 9.3 |
| routine | 10.6 | 14.8 | 13.4 | 15.0 | 11.2 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 6656 | 1476 | 1164 | 885 | 10181 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 employed fathers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) including 692 families who were not interviewed at MCS1. Excludes proxy fathers and other carers who completed the partner interview (mothers and grandparents). Within country weighted by weight 1 . All UK weighted by weight 2 . Chi-sq $=64.13 \mathrm{P}=0.0000$

## Employed mother's atypical working patterns

Table 9.16 Employed mother's working at atypical hours per week, by country

| Mother's working weekly <br> atypical hours | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  | All UK <br> Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland | 30.4 |
| Works after 6 pm* | 35.4 | 33.4 | 35.4 | 9.8 | 10.8 |
| Works nights** | 10.8 | 10.8 | 11.5 | 10.5 | 14.0 |
| Works Saturdays*** | 13.7 | 15.2 | 16.2 | $(4.1)$ | 8.4 |
| Works Sundays**** | 8.4 | 9.8 | 8.8 | 826 | 7917 |
| Unweighted sample size | 4779 | 1205 | 1107 |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 employed mothers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) including 692 families who were not interviewed at MCS1, who reported working these atypical patterns on a weekly basis. Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed.
*Chi-sq $=4.91 \mathrm{P}=0.25$.
** Chi-sq $=4.03 \mathrm{P}=0.28$
*** Chi-sq=16.86 $\mathrm{P}=0.01$.
**** Chi-sq=19.09 $\mathrm{P}=0.01$.

Table 9.17a Employed mother's atypical weekly working patterns by NS-SEC Scotland

| Mother's working <br> weekly atypical hours | Mothers NS-SEC (4) |  |  |  | All <br> Scotland <br> Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Managerial <br>  <br> professional | Intermediate | Small employer, <br>  <br> low supervisory <br> \& technical |  <br> routine | Sten |
| Works after 6 pm* | 34.7 | 20.8 | $(49.0)$ | 45.1 | 35.4 |
| Works nights** | 13.6 | $(4.2)$ | $(12.0)$ | 17.5 | 12.2 |
| Works Saturdays*** | $(7.5)$ | 10.4 | $(33.0)$ | 30.9 | 16.4 |
| Works Sundays**** | $(4.5)$ | $(5.9)$ | $(13.3)$ | 17.9 | 9.0 |
| Unweighted sample <br> size | 447 | 254 | 98 | 290 | 1089 |

## Notes to table

Base: All employed MCS2 mothers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step) who reported working these atypical patterns on a weekly basis. Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed.
$*$ Chi-sq $=80.94 \mathrm{P}=0.000$.
** Chi-sq $=46.84 \mathrm{P}=0.000$
*** Chi-sq=139.13 $\mathrm{P}=0.000$.
**** Chi-sq=85.94 $\mathrm{P}=0.000$.

Table 9.17b Employed mother's atypical weekly working patterns by NS-SEC - Rest of UK

| Mother's working <br> weekly atypical hours | Mothers NS-SEC (4) |  |  |  | Rest of <br> UK <br> Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Managerial <br>  <br> professional | Intermediate | Small employer, <br>  <br> low supervisory <br> \& technical |  <br> routine | ( |
| Works after 6 pm* | 35.2 | 22.5 | 43.4 | 43.8 | 35.2 |
| Works nights** | 10.2 | 5.6 | 12.4 | 15.8 | 10.7 |
| Works Saturdays*** | 7.9 | 7.4 | 24.0 | 24.3 | 13.7 |
| Works Sundays**** | 5.5 | 4.5 | 10.6 | 15.4 | 8.3 |
| Unweighted sample <br> size | 2457 | 1605 | 758 | 1849 | 6669 |

## Notes to table

Base: All employed MCS2 mothers in England Wales and UK (natural, adoptive, foster and step), who reported working these atypical patterns on a weekly basis. Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed.
*Chi-sq $=411.45 \mathrm{P}=0.000$.
** Chi-sq $=226.83 \mathrm{P}=0.000$
*** Chi-sq=524.36 P = 0.000.
**** Chi-sq=354.12 P = 0.000.

## Employee mother's use of flexible working arrangements

Table 9.18 Percent of employee mothers in each country who reported using flexible working arrangements with their current employer at age 3

| Mothers report of flexible working <br> arrangements used | Country |  |  |  | All UK <br> Total | P <br> value |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland |  |  |
| Part-time working | 64.6 | 64.3 | 60.0 | 44.3 | 63.4 | 0.00 |
| Job-sharing | 8.6 | 7.8 | 11.2 | 6.7 | 8.7 | 0.02 |
| Flexible working hours | 30.0 | 30.4 | 27.4 | 27.7 | 29.7 | 0.29 |
| Working at or from home occasionally | 14.0 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 7.8 | 13.3 | 0.00 |
| Working at or from home all the time | 3.0 | $(2.3)$ | $(1.5)$ | $(1.7)$ | 2.8 | 0.08 |
| Special shifts (i.e. evenings, school <br> hours) | 16.9 | 17.4 | 15.3 | 10.6 | 16.6 | 0.00 |
| 9-day fortnights/ 4.5 day working week | 1.3 | $(1.3)$ | $(1.1)$ | $(2.3)$ | 1.3 | 0.28 |
| School term-time contracts | 7.8 | 9.8 | 5.7 | 7.6 | 7.7 | 0.01 |
| Ability to change from full to part-time | 24.0 | 22.4 | 20.5 | 22.6 | 23.5 | 0.41 |
| None of these | 10.4 | 11.9 | 11.4 | 19.2 | 10.8 | 0.00 |
| Unweighted maximum sample size | 4279 | 1109 | 1025 | 775 | 7188 |  |

[^40]Table 9.19a Percent of employee mothers in each NS-SEC group who reported using flexible working arrangements with their current employer, by NS-SEC (4) at child's age 3 - Scotland

| Mother's flexible working <br> arrangements used | Mother's NS-SEC |  |  | All <br> Scotland <br> Total | P <br> value |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Managerial <br>  <br> professional | Intermediate | Low <br> supervisory <br> \& technical | Semi- <br>  <br> routine |  |  |
| Part-time working | 53.2 | 64.4 | $(57.6)$ | 68.3 | 60.3 | 0.00 |
| Job-sharing | 15.1 | $(12.4)$ | $(10.1)$ | 3.8 | 11.1 | 0.00 |
| Flexible working hours | 30.6 | 33.1 | $(31.1)$ | 17.1 | 27.6 | 0.00 |
| Working at or from home <br> occasionally | 19.0 | $(10.0)$ | $(10.1)$ | 0.7 | 11.4 | 0.00 |
| Working at or from home all the <br> time | $(1.3)$ | $(2.9)$ | $(3.8)$ | 0.3 | $(1.5)$ | 0.04 |
| Special shifts (i.e. evenings, <br> school hours) | 13.4 | $(13.2)$ | $(8.2)$ | 23.0 | 15.8 | 0.00 |
| 9-day fortnights/ 4.5 day <br> working week | $(1.2)$ | $(1.5)$ | $(0.0)$ | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.56 |
| School term-time contracts | $(5.7)$ | $(5.5)$ | $(7.0)$ | 5.7 | 5.7 | 0.98 |
| Ability to change from full to <br> part-time | 26.4 | 21.3 | $(22.2)$ | 10.3 | 20.5 | 0.00 |
| None of these | 12.7 | $(10.1)$ | $(15.2)$ | 9.5 | 11.3 | 0.47 |
| Unweighted maximum sample <br> size | 427 | 254 | $(40)$ | 290 | 1011 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All employee MCS2 mothers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step). Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed. Note: This table is based on employees only. Employees were asked "which, if any, of these arrangements have you made use of in your current main job, or, plan to make use of".

Table 9.19b Percent of employee mothers in each NS-SEC group who reported using flexible working arrangements with their current employer, by NS-SEC (4) at child's age 3 - Rest of UK

| Mother's flexible working arrangements used | Mother's NS-SEC |  |  |  | Rest of UK Total | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{P} \\ \text { value } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Managerial } \\ \& \\ \text { professional } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Intermediate | Low supervisory \& technical | Semi- routine \& routine |  |  |
| Part-time working | 58.2 | 66.7 | 57.1 | 71.7 | 64.1 | 0.00 |
| Job-sharing | 11.2 | 10.0 | (6.0) | 3.6 | 8.6 | 0.00 |
| Flexible working hours | 32.4 | 33.7 | 26.3 | 22.4 | 29.8 | 0.00 |
| Working at or from home occasionally | 24.0 | 10.3 | (4.0) | 1.6 | 13.3 | 0.00 |
| Working at or from home all the time | 3.4 | 4.3 | (0.7) | 1.0 | 2.9 | 0.00 |
| Special shifts (i.e. evenings, school hours) | 13.7 | 15.0 | 25.7 | 22.1 | 16.9 | 0.00 |
| 9-day fortnights/ 4.5 day working week | 2.2 | 1.1 | (0.8) | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.00 |
| School term-time contracts | 8.4 | 7.1 | (6.1) | 8.5 | 8.0 | 0.32 |
| Ability to change from full to part-time | 29.8 | 26.8 | 22.3 | 11.8 | 23.7 | 0.00 |
| None of these | 11.2 | 10.1 | 14.8 | 9.9 | 10.7 | 0.12 |
| Unweighted maximum sample size | 2307 | 1604 | 275 | 1849 | 6035 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All employee MCS2 mothers in England Wales and NI (natural, adoptive, foster and step). Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed. Note: This table is based on employees only. Employees were asked "which, if any, of these arrangements have you made use of in your current main job, or, plan to make use of".

Table 9.20 Percent of employee mothers in each country with access to employerprovided family-friendly arrangements by country at child's age 3

| Employers' offers of family friendly provisions | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { All UK } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | p value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |  |  |
| Financial help with childcare/childcare vouchers | 9.5 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 4.3 | 8.7 | 0.00 |
| Workplace nursery or crèche | 5.3 | 5.2 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 0.00 |
| Other nurseries supported by employer | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.65 |
| Help with finding childcare facilities away from the workplace | 2.8 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 0.06 |
| Care for children after school hours or during school holidays | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 4.5 | 5.9 | 0.45 |
| Time off for family emergencies | 53.2 | 57.8 | 53.2 | 60.0 | 53.7 | 0.00 |
| Career breaks for personal reasons | 7.0 | 8.5 | 9.8 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 0.13 |
| Paternity leave | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 0.51 |
| Parental leave | 15.9 | 15.8 | 18.7 | 17.2 | 16.2 | 0.43 |
| A telephone to use for family reasons | 44.3 | 50.0 | 46.3 | 50.3 | 45.1 | 0.00 |
| None of these | 24.4 | 20.5 | 24.5 | 19.7 | 24.1 | 0.00 |
| Unweighted sample size | 4202 | 1104 | 1021 | 770 | 7097 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 employee mothers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) including 692 families who were not interviewed at MCS1. Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed. Note: This table is based on employees only therefore does not include self employed mothers. Employees were asked "which, if any, of these arrangements have you made use of in your current main job, or, plan to make use of".

## Non-employed mothers' reasons for not working at age 3

Table 9.21 Non-employed mothers' reasons for not working, by country

| Mothers' reasons why not currently employed | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  | All UK <br> Total | $P$ value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |  |  |
| Prefer to be at home looking after family | 64.8 | 60.0 | 56.4 | 70.2 | 63.7 | 0.00 |
| Prefer to look after children myself | 59.4 | 59.4 | 55.9 | 47.2 | 57.9 | 0.00 |
| I cannot earn enough to pay for childcare | 11.4 | 11.3 | 7.9 | 8.6 | 10.7 | 0.07 |
| I cannot find suitable childcare | 4.7 | 5.8 | 7.6 | (3.4) | 5.1 | 0.00 |
| There are no suitable jobs for me | 10.1 | 8.2 | 10.8 | (5.1) | 9.9 | 0.18 |
| I am on a training course | 3.0 | (4.3) | (3.0) | (1.6) | 3.1 | 0.00 |
| My family would lose benefits if I was earning | 4.0 | (4.8) | (3.7) | (2.9) | 4.0 | 0.34 |
| I am caring for an elderly or ill relative or friend | 1.8 | (2.9) | (1.9) | (3.3) | 2.1 | 0.04 |
| I prefer not to work | 5.2 | (2.7) | (6.8) | (3.7) | 4.9 | 0.41 |
| My husband/partner disapproves | 2.1 | (0.5) | (1.1) | (0.4) | 1.6 | 0.05 |
| I have a new baby | 9.3 | 7.9 | 9.2 | (6.2) | 8.8 | 0.03 |
| Other | 11.0 | 12.1 | 16.3 | 9.4 | 11.6 | 0.00 |
| Maximum unweighted sample size | 4619 | 892 | 600 | 529 | 6640 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 mothers who were no working, nor seeking work when cohort child aged 3, (natural, adoptive, foster and step) including 692 families who were not interviewed at MCS1. Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed.

Table 9.22a Non-employed mothers' reasons for not working at MCS2 by partner's employment status at MCS2 Scotland

| Mothers' reasons why not currently employed at MCS2 | Partner employed at MCS 2 |  |  | All Scotland Total | $P$ value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Employed Full time | Employed Part time | Nonemployed |  |  |
| Prefer to be at home looking after family | 62.2 | (45.0) | (57.4) | 60.8 | 0.20 |
| Prefer to look after children myself | 57.1 | (53.5) | (44.7) | 55.3 | 0.31 |
| I cannot earn enough to pay for childcare | (7.9) | (0.0) | (12.1) | (8.1) | 0.20 |
| I cannot find suitable childcare | (5.1) | (4.3) | (7.7) | (5.4) | 0.69 |
| There are no suitable jobs for me | (9.5) | (18.2) | (16.5) | (10.9) | 0.14 |
| I am on a training course | (1.9) | (7.0) | (0.0) | (1.9) | 0.21 |
| My family would lose benefits if I was earning | (1.9) | (0.0) | (9.4) | (2.7) | 0.02 |
| I am caring for an elderly or ill relative or friend | (2.0) | (4.3) | (3.3) | (2.3) | 0.65 |
| I prefer not to work | (9.5) | (0.0) | (1.7) | (8.0) | 0.05 |
| My husband/partner disapproves | (2.1) | (7.0) | (0.0) | (2.1) | 0.30 |
| I have a new baby | (10.9) | (0.0) | (2.7) | (9.3) | 0.09 |
| Other | (14.0) | (8.5) | (26.5) | 15.3 | 0.08 |
| Unweighted cases sample size | 287 | (19) | 53 | 359 |  |

Notes to table
Base: MCS2 mothers in Scotland who were not employed at the MCS2 interview and had partners. Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed.

Table 9.22b Non-employed mothers' reasons for not working at MCS2 by partner's employment status at MCS2 Rest of UK

| Mothers' reasons why not currently <br> employed at MCS2 | Partner employed at MCS 2 |  | Rest of <br> UK Total | value |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employed <br> Full time | Employed <br> Part time | Non- <br> employed |  |  |
| Prefer to be at home looking after family | 68.0 | 69.8 | 66.0 | 67.9 | 0.64 |
| Prefer to look after children myself | 63.3 | 62.7 | 55.8 | 62.3 | 0.00 |
| I cannot earn enough to pay for childcare | 11.2 | $(4.9)$ | 7.8 | 10.4 | 0.00 |
| I cannot find suitable childcare | 3.8 | $(3.0)$ | $(2.0)$ | 3.5 | 0.10 |
| There are no suitable jobs for me | 9.2 | $(9.8)$ | 8.9 | 9.2 | 0.93 |
| I am on a training course | 2.4 | $(1.6)$ | $(2.3)$ | 2.3 | 0.70 |
| My family would lose benefits if I was earning | 1.7 | $(4.2)$ | $(6.9)$ | 2.6 | 0.00 |
| I am caring for an elderly or ill relative or friend | 1.6 | $(1.9)$ | $(5.1)$ | 2.1 | 0.00 |
| I prefer not to work | 5.7 | $(6.9)$ | $(4.8)$ | 5.6 | 0.66 |
| My husband/partner disapproves | 2.4 | $(2.7)$ | $(1.5)$ | 2.3 | 0.47 |
| I have a new baby | 11.1 | $(6.9)$ | 11.3 | 10.8 | 0.17 |
| Other | 9.3 | $(9.0)$ | 16.8 | 10.3 | 0.00 |
| Unweighted cases sample size | 2666 | 304 | 633 | 3603 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 mothers in England Wales and NI who were not employed at the MCS2 interview and had partners. Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed.

Table 9.23a Non-employed mothers' reasons for not working at MCS2 by household income at MCS2 Scotland

| Mothers' reasons why not currently <br> employed at MCS 2 | Income Poverty status at MCS 2 |  | All <br> Scotland <br> Total | P <br> values |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Above 60\% median <br> income level | Below 60\% median <br> income level |  |  |
| Prefer to be at home looking after family | 62.7 | 46.3 | 56.2 | 0.00 |
| Prefer to look after children myself | 62.2 | 48.9 | 56.9 | 0.00 |
| I cannot earn enough to pay for childcare | $(6.7)$ | $(9.7)$ | $(7.9)$ | 0.15 |
| I cannot find suitable childcare | $(5.8)$ | $(10.0)$ | $(7.5)$ | 0.07 |
| There are no suitable jobs for me | $(10.6)$ | $(13.6)$ | 11.8 | 0.22 |
| I am on a training course | $(1.9)$ | $(5.2)$ | $(3.2)$ | 0.02 |
| My family would lose benefits if I was earning | $(1.4)$ | $(8.4)$ | $(4.2)$ | 0.00 |
| I am caring for an elderly or ill relative or friend | $(1.6)$ | $(3.1)$ | $(2.2)$ | 0.21 |
| I prefer not to work | $(9.8)$ | $(2.4)$ | $(6.8)$ | 0.00 |
| My husband/partner disapproves | $(2.0)$ | $(0.0)$ | $(1.2)$ | 0.15 |
| I have a new baby | $(12.6)$ | $(5.7)$ | 9.9 | 0.02 |
| Other | $(13.5)$ | $(17.7)$ | 15.1 | 0.18 |
| Unweighted cases sample size | 288 | 225 | 513 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 mothers in Scotland who were not employed at the MCS2 interview. Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed.

Table 9.23b Non-employed mothers' reasons for not working at MCS2 by household income at MCS2 Rest of UK

| Mothers' reasons why not currently <br> employed at MCS 2 | Income Poverty status at MCS 2 |  | Rest of <br> UK <br> Total | P <br> values |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Above 60\% median <br> income level | Below 60\% median <br> income level | 58.5 | 63.5 |
| Prefer to be at home looking after family | 67.5 | 63.0 | 55.5 | 59.7 |
| Prefer to look after children myself | 11.3 | 13.4 | 12.2 | 0.00 |
| I cannot earn enough to pay for childcare | 3.9 | 6.5 | 5.0 | 0.06 |
| I cannot find suitable childcare | 9.8 | 11.2 | 10.4 | 0.18 |
| There are no suitable jobs for me | 2.7 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 0.03 |
| I am on a training course | 2.0 | 7.3 | 4.3 | 0.00 |
| My family would lose benefits if I was earning | 1.7 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 0.03 |
| I am caring for an elderly or ill relative or <br> friend | 2.2 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 0.00 |
| I prefer not to work | 2.1 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 0.38 |
| My husband/partner disapproves | 11.0 | 7.7 | 9.5 | 0.00 |
| I have a new baby | 9.6 | 12.9 | 11.1 | 0.00 |
| Other | 2162 | 2609 | 4771 |  |
| Unweighted cases sample size |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 mothers in England Wales and NI who were not employed at the MCS2 interview. Columns do not add to 100 percent as multiple responses allowed.

## Changes in parent's employment from 9-10 months to age 3

Table 9.24a Changes in mother's employment status and hours of work from 9-10 mths to age 3 Scotland

| Mother's employment status when <br> cohort child aged 9-10 months | Mother's employment status <br> when cohort child aged 3 |  |  | Total | Sample <br> Size |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Full- <br> time |  | Part- <br> time |  |  |
| Full-time | 65.8 | 24.7 | 9.5 | 100 | 296 |
| Part-time | 8.6 | 77.8 | 13.5 | 100 | 705 |
| non-employed | 3.9 | 25.9 | 70.2 | 100 | 809 |
| All Scotland Total | 15.9 | 46.7 | 37.4 | 100 | 1810 |

Notes to table
Base: All MCS2 mothers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and followed-up in sweep 2, therefore excluding 692 families who were not interviewed at sweep one. Chi-sq $=1212.90 \quad \mathrm{P}=0.0000$

Table 9.24b Changes in mother's employment status and hours of work from 9-10 mths to age 3 Rest of UK

| Mother's employment status when <br> cohort child aged 9-10 months | Mother's employment status <br> when cohort child aged 3 |  |  | Total | Sample <br> Size |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Full- <br> time |  | Part- <br> time |  |  |
| Full-time | 62.0 | 26.0 | 12.0 | 100 | 1758 |
| Part-time | 9.8 | 72.9 | 17.3 | 100 | 4215 |
| non-employed | 4.6 | 21.3 | 74.1 | 100 | 7090 |
| Rest of UK Total | 14.1 | 40.9 | 45.0 | 100 | 13063 |

Notes to table
Base: All MCS2 mothers in England Wales and NI (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and followed-up in sweep 2, therefore excluding 692 families who were not interviewed at sweep one. Chi-sq $=7690.36 \quad \mathrm{P}=$ 0.0000

Table 9.25a Changes in father's employment status and hours of work from 9-10 mths to age 3 Scotland

| Father's employment status when <br> cohort child aged 9-10 months | Father's employment status <br> when cohort child aged 3 |  |  | Total | Sample <br> Size |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Full- <br> time |  | Part- <br> time |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time | 95.4 | $(2.5)$ | $(2.2)$ | 100 | 889 |
| Part-time | $(44.5)$ | $(45.3)$ | $(10.2)$ | 100 | $(26)$ |
| non-employed | 31.0 | 14.2 | 54.8 | 100 | 108 |
| All Scotland Total | 87.8 | 4.7 | 7.5 | 100 | 1023 |

[^41]Table 9.25b Changes in father's employment status and hours of work from 9-10 mths to age 3 Rest of UK

| Father's employment status when <br> cohort child aged 9-10 months | Father's employment status <br> when cohort child aged 3 |  |  | Total | Sample <br> Size |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Full- <br> time |  | Part- <br> time |  |  |
| Full-time | 94.2 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 100 | 6666 |
| Part-time | 46.3 | 44.0 | $(9.7)$ | 100 | 384 |
| non-employed | 35.8 | 11.6 | 52.5 | 100 | 825 |
| Rest of UK Total | 87.9 | 5.0 | 7.1 | 100 | 7875 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 employed fathers in England Wales and NI (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and followed-up in sweep 2. Chi-sq=3235.43 $\mathrm{P}=0.0000$
Changes in parents' combined partnership and economic status
Table 9.26a Parents' partnerships and economic statuses at child's age 9-10 months and age $\mathbf{3}$ - Scotland

| Partnership and economic status when cohort child aged 9-10 months | Partnership and economic status when cohort child aged 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total percent | Unweighted sample size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both employed full-time | Both employed, father ft and mother pt | Both employed, father pt and mother ft | ```Mother only employed``` | Father only employed | Both not employed | Lone parent employed | Lone parent not employed |  |  |
| Both employed fulltime | 62.8 | 23.5 | (1.2) | (0.0) | (9.1) | (0.4) | (2.9) | (0.0) | 100 | 202 |
| Both employed, father ft and mother pt | (7.6) | 71.1 | (1.7) | (1.5) | 12.0 | (0.3) | (4.2) | (1.6) | 100 | 430 |
| Both employed, father pt and mother ft | (5.8) | (22.2) | (49.9) | (9.3) | (5.8) | (3.5) | (0.0) | (3.5) | 100 | (20) |
| Mother only employed | (11.0) | (15.4) | (9.8) | (31.9) | (7.9) | (4.9) | (19.1) | (0.0) | 100 | (43) |
| Father only employed | (3.2) | 24.1 | (1.5) | (0.4) | 59.4 | (3.4) | (2.5) | (5.6) | 100 | 366 |
| Both not employed | (0.9) | (6.8) | (4.8) | (9.6) | (20.4) | (38.5) | (0.9) | (18.2) | 100 | 90 |
| Lone parent employed | (2.6) | (15.7) | (1.0) | (4.5) | (1.9) | (0.0) | (57.6) | (16.7) | 100 | 84 |
| Lone parent not employed | (0.0) | (3.1) | (0.0) | (2.9) | (13.5) | (8.6) | (17.5) | 54.4 | 100 | 136 |
| All Scotland total | 13.2 | 35.8 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 24.4 | 4.4 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 100 | 1371 |

Base: All MCS2 families in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step mothers and fathers) interviewed in sweep 1 and followed-up in sweep 2, excluding mothers whose partners were not
interviewed. Other carers and proxy interviews are excluded. Chi $s q=2226.06 \mathrm{P}=0.0000$
Table 9.26b Parents' partnerships and economic statuses at child's age 9-10 months and age $\mathbf{3}$ - Rest of UK

| Partnership and | Partnership and economic status when cohort child aged 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total percent | Unweighted sample size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both employed full-time | Both employed, father ft and mother pt | Both employed, father pt and mother ft | ```Mother only employed``` | Father only employed | Both not employed | Lone parent employed | Lone parent not employed |  |  |
| Both employed full-time | 54.5 | 24.1 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 12.5 | 0.7 | 3.8 | 0.5 | 100 | 1262 |
| Both employed, father ft and mother pt | 7.4 | 68.5 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 15.7 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 100 | 3006 |
| Both employed, father pt and mother ft | (10.8) | 31.7 | 34.6 | (3.9) | (13.6) | (3.0) | (1.7) | (0.7) | 100 | 179 |
| Mother only employed | (11.6) | (21.9) | (9.0) | 22.9 | (15.8) | (8.3) | (5.0) | (5.4) | 100 | 239 |
| Father only employed | 3.1 | 21.0 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 60.5 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 6.3 | 100 | 3453 |
| Both not employed | 0.6 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 25.8 | 43.9 | 3.3 | 19.0 | 100 | 792 |
| Lone parent employed | (5.6) | (10.5) | (1.8) | (1.5) | (3.7) | (0.5) | 56.9 | 19.5 | 100 | 421 |
| Lone parent not employed | 0.3 | 3.9 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 9.0 | 6.1 | 12.4 | 66.9 | 100 | 1417 |
| Rest of UK total | 10.6 | 34.3 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 29.6 | 4.6 | 6.0 | 10.8 | 100 | 10769 |

[^42]
## Mother's new qualifications by age 3

Table 9.27 Whether mothers had acquired new qualifications by MCS2 country

\left.| Acquired new qualifications since cohort | Country at MCS 2 |  |  |  | All UK |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| child was 9-10 months old |  |  |  |  |  |$\right)$ Total \%

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 mothers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and followed-up in sweep 2, who gave valid information.
Chi-sq=6.83 P =0.02

Table 9.28a Mother's new qualifications by MCS2 by NVQ level at MCS1 - Scotland

| Mothers acquired new qualification by MCS 2 | Level of original MCS 1 qualification |  |  |  | All Scotland Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NVQ <br> level 4/5 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NVQ } \\ \text { level } 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NVQ } \\ \text { level } 1 / 2 \end{gathered}$ | Overseas qualification only None of these |  |
| percent Yes | 18.0 | 14.7 | 13.3 | (9.8) | 15.2 |
| Unweighted sample size | 678 | 387 | 520 | 200 | 1785 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 mothers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and followed-up in sweep 2 who had acquired a new qualification since sweep one interview.
Chi-sq $=9.78 \mathrm{P}=0.01$ in upper table only.
Note: Figures assume an NVQ qualification at any level is higher than an overseas qualification; and an overseas qualification is higher than 'None'.

Table 9.28b Mother's new qualifications by MCS2 by NVQ level at MCS1- Rest of UK

| Mothers acquired new |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| qualification by MCS 2 |$\quad$| Rest of |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | NVQ <br> level 4/5 | NVQ <br> level 3 | NVQ <br> level 1/2 | Overseas qualification <br> only <br> NK Total <br> None of these |
| percent Yes | 19.6 | 20.2 | 16.6 |  |
| Unweighted sample size | 3874 | 1726 | 4869 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 mothers in England Wales and NI (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and followedup in sweep 2 who had acquired a new qualification since sweep one interview.
Chi-sq $=133.15 \mathrm{P}=0.000$ in upper table only
Note: Figures assume an NVQ qualification at any level is higher than an overseas qualification; and an overseas qualification is higher than 'None'.

## Father's new qualifications by age 3

Table 9.29 Whether fathers had acquired new qualifications by MCS2 by country

| Acquired new qualifications since cohort child <br> was 9-10 months old | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern <br> Ireland | All UK <br> Total \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 20.6 | 22.9 | 17.4 | 17.9 | 20.3 |
| No | 79.4 | 77.1 | 82.7 | 82.1 | 79.7 |
| Total \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Unweighted sample size | 5719 | 1312 | 1029 | 775 | 8835 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 fathers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and followed-up in sweep 2, excluding those with missing information.
Chi-sq=6.69 $\mathrm{P}=0.02$

Table 9.30a Father's new qualifications by MCS2 by NVQ at MCS1- Scotland

| Fathers acquired new qualification by MCS 2 | Level of original MCS 1 qualification |  |  |  | All Scotland Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NVQ <br> level 4/5 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NVQ } \\ \text { level } 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NVQ } \\ \text { level } 1 / 2 \end{gathered}$ | Overseas qualification only None of these |  |
| Percent Yes | 18.2 | 21.5 | 16.0 | (12.8) | 17.9 |
| Unweighted sample size | 400 | 232 | 277 | 102 | 1011 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 fathers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and followed-up in sweep 2 who had acquired a new qualification since sweep one interview.
Chi-sq $=4.34 \mathrm{P}=0.00$ in upper table only.
Note: Figures assume an NVQ qualification at any level is higher than an overseas qualification; and an overseas qualification is higher than 'None'.

Table 9.30b Father's new qualifications by MCS2 by NVQ level at MCS1 - Rest of UK

| Fathers acquired new qualification by MCS 2 | Level of original MCS 1 qualification |  |  |  | Rest of <br> UK <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NVQ } \\ \text { level 4/5 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NVQ } \\ \text { level } 3 \end{gathered}$ | NVQ <br> level $1 / 2$ | Overseas qualification only None of these |  |
| Percent Yes | 21.1 | 23.2 | 20.3 | 13.7 | 20.4 |
| Unweighted sample size | 2845 | 1136 | 2573 | 1058 | 7612 |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 fathers in England Wales and NI (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and followedup in sweep 2 who had acquired a new qualification since sweep one interview.
Chi-sq $=27.92 \mathrm{P}=0.00$ in upper table only.
Note: Figures assume an NVQ qualification at any level is higher than an overseas qualification; and an overseas qualification is higher than 'None'.

## CHAPTER TEN. INCOME AND POVERTY

## Methods

We follow the same procedures we used in MCS1. The derivation of an income poverty rate for the MCS is not straightforward. In order to maintain response rates, respondents were asked to specify which of 18 income bands their family income ${ }^{7}$ belonged to, instead of asking them to specify an actual figure for their income. The survey questionnaire used separate income bands for lone parents and for couples. In order to produce an estimate of family income we assigned the central value of the income band to all the families belonging to that particular band. For the top and bottom categories of the income bands, we took respectively, the top and bottom thresholds of the band as the household income. This procedure artificially reduces the estimated range of family income somewhat.

Having established income we need to "equivalise" it to take account of the needs of families of different sizes and compositions. For the calculation of equivalent income we used a version of the McClements equivalence scale ${ }^{8}$, also used by the government in its annual publication of Households Below Average Income. We did not take account of the detailed child weights in the McClements scale partly on the grounds that it gives a weight of only 0.09 for babies, 0.18 for a child aged 3. Instead we assigned to children under 16 in the household the average of the child weights of 0.23 . The McClements scale was used instead of the newer OECD scale in these first analyses, since this was the scale used in analyses of MCS1, so that comparisons can be made.
Figure 1 shows the distribution of total family income for MCS2 families. The mean was $£ 341.33$ per week and the median was $£ 281.43$ per week.

## Income poverty

The poverty threshold was defined as 60 percent of national median income before housing costs. This is the conventional relative poverty measure used by the government in the Households Below Average Income series. In 2003/4 the median before housing costs was $£ 333$ per week for a childless couple (DWP 2005). The proportion of families with equivalent income below a threshold based on this level (£200 per week) was 26.8 percent. This is higher than the national child poverty estimate of 21 percent in the HBAI (DWP 20005) because the MCS2 poverty rate is a family poverty rate for families with a very young child. The median income band for couples in our sample was $£ 22,000-£ 28,000$ per annum. The median for single parents was just $£ 5,500-£ 7,500$ per annum.

[^43]$8 \quad$ McClements equivalence scale

| Number of people in family | Equivalence scale |
| :--- | :--- |
| Head | 0.61 |
| Spouse | 0.39 |
| Each additional adult (over 16) | 0.45 |
| Each child | $0.09-0.36$ |

## By country

Table 10.1 Percent families in poverty at MCS2 by country

|  |  | Percentage Below 60 <br> percent (N) | Total N <br> unweighted |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Country at MCS 2 | England | 25.3 | 8184 |  |
|  | Wales | 30.3 | 1850 |  |
|  | Scotland | 21.3 | 1489 |  |
|  | Northern Ireland | 29.3 | 1064 |  |
|  | UK | 26.0 | 12587 |  |
|  | Chi Square | 45.56 |  |  |
|  | p | 0.001 |  |  |

## Notes to table

Notes: All MCS 2 families (includes natural, adoptive, foster and step families) who answered the family income question ( $\mathrm{n}=12,954$ ). Weighted by weight 2 . Country weighted by weight one for within country analysis and weight 2 for all UK.

Table 10.2a Incidence of family income poverty at MCS2, by ward type, partnership, number of children and mother's age at birth (Scotland)

|  |  | Percentage below 60 per <br> cent | Total <br> Unweighted n |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Ward at MCS1 | Other disadvantaged | 33.5 | 744 |
|  | Non-disadvantaged | 14.4 | 749 |
|  | Chi square | 31.1640 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 | 9.2 |

[^44]Table 10.2b Incidence of family income poverty at MCS2, by ward type, partnership, number of children and mother's age at birth (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Percentage below 60 per cent | Total unweighted $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ward at MCS1 | Minority ethnic | 57.2 | 750 |
|  | Other disadvantaged | 39.2 | 2071 |
|  | Non-disadvantaged | 17.3 | 824 |
|  | Chi square | 122.1803 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Partnership status at | Married | 14.4 | 6902 |
|  | Co-habiting | 29.5 | 1848 |
|  | Lone parent | 72.3 | 1525 |
|  | Chi square | 227.573 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Number of children at | One child | 28.7 | 2831 |
|  | Two children | 20.1 | 5077 |
|  | Three children or more | 37.6 | 3269 |
|  | Chi square | 129.5838 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Mother's age at birth | Up to 20 | 70.0 | 1271 |
|  | 21-25 | 41.6 | 2061 |
|  | 26-30 | 21.5 | 3423 |
|  | 31-35 | 15.2 | 3069 |
|  | 36+ | 18.9 | 1353 |
|  | Chi square | 232.8768 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |

Notes to table
Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI with valid data

Table 10.3a Family poverty at MCS2 by employment and by education of parents (Scotland)

|  |  | Percentage below 60 percent threshold | Total Unweighted n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment status* | Both employed full-time | (2.9) | 182 |
|  | Father full-time, mother part-time | 4.886 | 465 |
|  | Mother full-time, father part-time | (2.9) | (24) |
|  | Mother employed, father not employed | (59.2) | (38) |
|  | Father employed, mother not employed | (17.5) | 275 |
|  | Both not employed | (90.4) | 56 |
|  | Lone parent employed | (32.5) | 100 |
|  | Lone parent not employed | 94.8 | 117 |
|  | Chi square | 94.9982 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Mothers' social class, NS-SEC** | Managerial \& professional | (2.2) | 384 |
|  | Intermediate | (6.7) | 220 |
|  | Small employers, own account | (11.4) | 46 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | (18.2) | 36 |
|  | Semi-routine and routine | 24.4 | 241 |
|  | Chi square | 17.9828 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Fathers' social class, NS-SEC** | Managerial and professional | 5.6 | 423 |
|  | Intermediate | (8.7) | 95 |
|  | Small employers, own account | (14.1) | 106 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | (12.4) | 166 |
|  | Semi-routine and routine | 31.3 | 246 |
|  | Chi square | 19.2158 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Fathers' education | NVQ 4/5 | 4.2 | 449 |
|  | NVQ 3 | (12.5) | 229 |
|  | NVQ 1/2 | (13.1) | 302 |
|  | Overseas | (23.7) | 18 |
|  | None | (38.4) | 85 |
|  | Chi square | 24.7780 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Mothers' education *** | NVQ 4/5 | 7.9 | 417 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 19.2 | 340 |
|  | NVQ 1/2 | 33.6 | 596 |
|  | Overseas | (30.9) | 17 |
|  | None | 63.5 | 123 |
|  | Chi square | 55.9395 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |

Notes to table
Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland with valid data

Table 10.3b Family poverty at MCS2 by employment and by education of parents (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Percentage below 60 percent threshold | Total Unweighted n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment status* | Both employed full-time | 5.2 | 1074 |
|  | Father full-time, mother part-time | 6.8 | 3099 |
|  | Mother full-time, father part-time | 17.4 | 224 |
|  | Mother employed, father not employed | 50.4 | 182 |
|  | Father employed, mother not employed | 20.8 | 2680 |
|  | Both not employed | 83.8 | 544 |
|  | Lone parent employed | 35.3 | 623 |
|  | Lone parent not employed | 91.2 | 1400 |
|  | Chi square | 56.786 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Mothers' social | Managerial \& professional | 5.0 | 2195 |
|  | Intermediate | 8.1 | 1404 |
|  | Small employers, own account | (12.1) | 376 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | (16.1) | 234 |
|  | Semi-routine and routine | 24.8 | 1503 |
|  | Chi square | 63.9741 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Fathers' social class, | Managerial and professional | 5.4 | 3085 |
|  | Intermediate | 10.2 | 601 |
|  | Small employers, own account | 22.5 | 1050 |
|  | Lower supervisory and technical | 19.3 | 1091 |
|  | Semi-routine and routine | 36.3 | 1929 |
|  | Chi square | 169.1441 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Fathers' education | NVQ 4/5 | 6.0 | 2888 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 13.2 | 1123 |
|  | NVQ 1/2 | 19.2 | 2464 |
|  | Overseas | 32.5 | 294 |
|  | None | 45.0 | 730 |
|  | Chi square | 139.1094 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Mothers' education | Mother - NVQ 4/5 | 8.7 | 3593 |
|  | NVQ 3 | 21.8 | 1508 |
|  | NVQ 1/2 | 31.8 | 3991 |
|  | Overseas | 54.2 | 299 |
|  | None | 65.1 | 1233 |
|  | Chi square | 279.8705 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI with valid data

Table 10.4a Subjective indicators at MCS2 by income poverty (Scotland)

|  |  | Percentage with family income below 60 per cent threshold | Total unweighted $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mothers' reports of managing financially | Living comfortably | (4.7) | 416 |
|  | Doing all right | 19.3 | 568 |
|  | Just about managing | 32.6 | 381 |
|  | Finding it difficult | 57.6 | 131 |
|  | Chi square | 64.9031 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Mothers' reports of coping with the mortgage/rent* | Very easy to manage | 11.2 | 417 |
|  | Fairly easy | 13.7 | 539 |
|  | Neither | 20.7 | 249 |
|  | Fairly/very difficult to manage | (49.0) | 72 |
|  | Don't have rent/mortgage | 87.0 | 121 |
|  | Chi Square | 87.0584 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |
| Life satisfaction 010 ( 10 is most satisfied)* | 6 or less | 46.1 | 240 |
|  | 7-8 | 19.3 | 611 |
|  | 9-10 | 13.8 | 567 |
|  | Chi Square | 52.8431 |  |
|  | p | 0.0000 |  |

## Notes to table

Base: Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland with valid data

Table 10.4 b Subjective indicators at MCS 2 by income poverty (Rest of UK)

|  |  | Percentage with <br> family income below <br> $\mathbf{6 0}$ per cent threshold | Total <br> unweighted <br> n |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Mothers' reports of <br> managing <br> financially | Living comfortably | 8.715 | 2747 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Doing all right | 20.9 | 4242 |
|  | Just about managing | 40.3 | 3063 |
|  | Finding it difficult | 56.4 | 1084 |
|  | Chi square | 300.7066 |  |
| Mothers' reports of <br> coping with the <br> mortgage/rent* | Very easy to manage | 0.0000 | 17.8 |
|  |  |  | 17.1 |

## Notes to table

Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI with valid data

Table 10.5a Poverty at MCS1 and MCS2 (Scotland)

|  | MCS2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Family income | Above 60 per cent | Below 60 per cent | Total \% <br> (n) |
| MCS1 | Above 60 per cent | 87.9 | 12.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ (1128) \end{array}$ |
|  | Below 60 per cent | 43.9 | 56.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ (343) \end{array}$ |
|  | Total | 78.2 | 21.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ (1471) \end{array}$ |

[^45]Table 10.5b Poverty at MCS1 and MCS2 (Rest of UK)

|  | MCS2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Family income | Above 60 per cent | Below 60 per cent | Total \% <br> (n) |
| MCS1 | Above 60 per cent | 84.7 | 15.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ (7567) \end{array}$ |
|  | Below 60 per cent | 36.3 | 63.7 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ (2852) \end{array}$ |
|  | Total | 67.6 | 32.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ (10419) \end{array}$ |

[^46]
## CHAPTER ELEVEN. CHILDCARE

## Main childcare arrangement at MCS 2

Table 11.1 Main Childcare Arrangement at Age 3 by users of care by country

|  | Self/partner <br> Percent | Grandparent <br> Percent | Other relative/ <br> friend/neighbour <br> Percent | Childminder/ <br> nanny/au pair/ <br> non-relative <br> Percent | Nursery/crèche/ <br> nursery school/ <br> playgroup <br> Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| All UK main childcare <br> arrangements at MCS2 | $22.3(1663)$ | $27.7(2254)$ | $6.5(555)$ | $13.4(941)$ | $30.2(2150)$ |
| England | $22.8(1102)$ | $26.5(1282)$ | $6.2(328)$ | $13.4(593)$ | $31.1(1516)$ |
| Wales | $22.6(262)$ | $35.8(418)$ | $5.2(65)$ | $8.1(89)$ | $28.3(296)$ |
| Scotland | $19.9(189)$ | $31.3(305)$ | $8.1(80)$ | $13.0(114)$ | $27.7(256)$ |
| Northern Ireland | $15.9(110)$ | $36.5(249)$ | $11.4(82)$ | $21.6(145)$ | $14.7(82)$ |
|  | Chi2(12)=78.78 $\mathrm{P}=0.0000$ |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Base: All MCS2 main respondents users of child care. Unweighted sample sizes

Table 11.2a Main Childcare Arrangement at Age Three by users of care (Scotland)

|  | Self/partner | Grandparent | Other relative/ friend/ neighbour | Childminder/ nanny/ aupair/ nonrelative | Nursery/ creche/ nursery school/ playgroup | Total \%(N) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All main childcare arrangements at MCS2 | 19.0 (162) | 33.9 (301) | 7.2 (66) | 10.9 (88) | 28.9 (243) | 100 (860) |
| Mother's employment status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mother does not work | 10.8 (17) | 28.9 (44) | 3.2 (6) | 6.2 (9) | 50.9 (79) | 100 (155) |
| Mother works part-time | 23.0 (116) | 37.0 (193) | 8.0 (43) | 10.8 (51) | 21.2 (104) | 100 (507) |
| Mother works full-time | 15.0 (29) | 30.1 (64) | 8.2 (17) | 15.1 (28) | 31.5 (60) | 100 (198) |
| $\mathrm{F}=6.83, \mathrm{P}<.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest qualifications of parents |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NVQ5 / NVQ4 | 15.6 (55) | 31.0 (117) | 4.1 (15) | 12.6 (44) | 36.8 (132) | 100 (363) |
| NVQ3 | 29.0 (54) | 31.8 (63) | 9.8 (20) | 8.4 (16) | 21.0 (38) | 100 (191) |
| NVQ2 | 30.0 (32) | 41.2 (44) | 7.6 (8) | 5.0 (4) | 16.0 (17) | 100 (105) |
| NVQ1 / no qualifications | 8.4 (2) | 49.8 (10) | 25.1 (6) | 4.2 (1) | 12.5 (3) | 100 (22) |
| $\mathrm{F}=5.19, \mathrm{P}<.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest parental occupation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial / professional | 16.4 (73) | 29.7 (142) | 6.5 (31) | 12.7 (56) | 34.7 (153) | 100 (455) |
| Intermediate | 27.4 (28) | 41.5 (45) | 6.6 (7) | 11.5 (11) | 13.0 (13) | 100 (104) |
| Small employee / selfemployed | 19.6 (7) | 31.2 (10) | 10.1 (3) | 10.1 (3) | 28.9 (9) | 100 (32) |
| Low support / technical | 24.8 (16) | 44.4 (30) | 10.6 (8) | 3.0 (2) | 17.3 (12) | 100 (68) |
| Semi-routine / routine | 10.2 (9) | 44.9 (32) | 8.2 (6) | 9.0 (6) | 27.7 (20) | 100 (73) |
| $\mathrm{F}=2.55, \mathrm{P}<.005$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equivalised family income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| £478-£1329 | 8.3 (19) | 29.4 (70) | 4.3 (10) | 11.4 (26) | 46.6 (105) | 100 (230) |
| £330-£477 | 25.1 (57) | 35.8 (87) | 6.1 (15) | 12.3 (26) | 20.7 (47) | 100 (232) |
| £182-£329 | 26.9 (59) | 36.1 (81) | 10.8 (26) | 9.8 (20) | 16.3 (37) | 100 (223) |
| >=£181 | 13.8 (14) | 38.2 (41) | 6.4 (7) | 8.2 (8) | 33.4 (36) | 100 (106) |
| $\mathrm{F}=6.42, \mathrm{P}<.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Unweighted sample sizes. Percentages weighted using weight 1.
Base: MCS2 Families in Scotland where the main respondent uses child care and is a natural, step, or adoptive mother and the partner respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive father and data are available on both carers, including lone parents, and where the main childcare provision specified is ongoing at the time of the MCS2 interview.
Notes: Self in self/partner category relates to self-provision while working and does not include non-working mothers who look after their children. Highest parental qualifications and occupation is the higher of either of the two parents in twoparent families or the highest qualification or occupation of lone parents.

Table 11.2b Main Childcare Arrangement at Age Three by users of care (Rest of UK)

|  | Self/partner | Grandparent | Other relative/ friend/ neighbor | Childminder/ nanny/ aupair/ nonrelative | Nursery/ creche/ nursery school/ playgroup | Total \% <br> (N) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All main childcare arrangements at MCS2 | 21.4 (1272) | 28.9 (1906) | 5.9 (404) | 12.0 (665) | 31.8 (1762) | 100 (6009) |
| Mother's employment status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mother does not work | 10.6 (164) | 21.4 (373) | 5.7 (105) | 8.4 (100) | 53.9 (745) | 100 (1487) |
| Mother works part-time | 26.4 (870) | 32.2 (1148) | 5.8 (210) | 11.9 (352) | 23.8 (695) | 100 (3275) |
| Mother works full-time | 19.9 (238) | 28.4 (384) | 6.2 (89) | 17.0 (213) | 28.4 (322) | 100 (1246) |
| $\mathrm{F}=43.08, \mathrm{P}<.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest qualifications of parents |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NVQ5 / NVQ4 | 18.1 (458) | 23.8 (640) | 4.0 (118) | 15.4 (373) | 38.6 (839) | 100 (2428) |
| NVQ3 | 30.2 (276) | 29.6 (308) | 5.3 (55) | 10.6 (88) | 24.4 (214) | 100 (941) |
| NVQ2 | 29.2 (307) | 36.1 (389) | 8.1 (85) | 7.3 (72) | 19.4 (192) | 100 (1045) |
| NVQ1 / no qualifications | 30.7 (85) | 33.2 (96) | 5.0 (19) | 5.1 (12) | 26.0 (84) | 100 (296) |
| $\mathrm{F}=19.21, \mathrm{P}<.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest parental occupation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial / professional | 18.6 (560) | 25.9 (851) | 4.7 (160) | 15.5 (453) | 35.3 (965) | 100 (2989) |
| Intermediate | 24.1 (175) | 33.5 (270) | 6.7 (58) | 10.8 (81) | 24.8 (164) | 100 (748) |
| Small employee / selfemployed | 23.9 (86) | 31.7 (120) | 8.4 (34) | 6.5 (22) | 29.5 (107) | 100 (369) |
| Low support / technical | 31.5 (129) | 32.0 (132) | 8.2 (27) | 5.0 (19) | 23.3 (79) | 100 (386) |
| Semi-routine / routine | 16.2 (79) | 35.2 (193) | 6.1 (35) | 8.6 (35) | 33.8 (166) | 100 (508) |
| $\mathrm{F}=7.41, \mathrm{P}<.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equivalised family income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| £478-£1329 | 10.8 (188) | 24.9 (426) | 4.4 (81) | 18.5 (294) | 41.4 (612) | 100 (1601) |
| £330-£477 | 26.0 (351) | 29.0 (453) | 5.4 (82) | 11.2 (150) | 28.4 (351) | 100 (1387) |
| £182-£329 | 28.6 (366) | 34.0 (476) | 6.0 (93) | 7.6 (99) | 23.9 (311) | 100 (1345) |
| >=£181 | 26.0 (220) | 30.0 (336) | 8.1 (91) | 6.3 (56) | 29.7 (292) | 100 (995) |
| $\mathrm{F}=23.39, \mathrm{P}<.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Observations unweighted. Percentages weighted using weight 1.
Base: MCS2 Families in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland using child care where the main respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive mother and the partner respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive father and data are available on both carers, including lone parents, and where the main childcare provision specified is ongoing at the time of the MCS2 interview.
Notes: Self in self/partner category relates to self-provision while working and does not include non-working mothers who look after their children. Highest parental qualifications and occupation is the higher of either of the two parents in twoparent families or the highest qualification or occupation of lone parents.

## Hours of Care

Table 11.3a Mean weekly hours of care for each childcare arrangement of non-working mothers (Scotland)

|  | Mean <br> hours of <br> care | Standard <br> error | Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| All non-working mothers with a childcare <br> arrangement who reported hours | 13.7 | 1.03 | 143 |
| Partner/husband | $(23.3)$ | 6.83 | 13 |
| Grandparent | $(11.9)$ | 1.80 | 38 |
| Other relative/friend/neighbour | $(21.5)$ | -- | 6 |
| Childminder/manny/au pair/non-relative | $(13.7)$ | 3.45 | 9 |
| Nursery/creche/nursery school/playgroup | 12.6 | 1.12 | 77 |
|  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Observations unweighted. Mean scores weighted using weight 1.
Base: MCS2 families in Scotland using child care where the main respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive mother and the partner respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive father, including lone parents, and where main childcare provision has been specified.
-- = Number of observations too small to allow estimation of standard error.

Table 11.3b Mean weekly hours of care for each childcare arrangement of non-working mothers (Rest of UK)

|  | Mean <br> hours of <br> care | Standard <br> error | Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| All non-working mothers with a childcare <br> arrangement who reported hours | 12.1 | 0.34 | 1315 |
| Partner/husband | 15.0 | 2.14 | 102 |
| Grandparent | 12.3 | 0.85 | 304 |
| Other relative/friend/neighbour | 12.3 | -- | 94 |
| Childminder/manny/au pair/non-relative | 14.0 | -- | 88 |
| Nursery/creche/nursery school/playgroup | 11.3 | 0.36 | 727 |

## Notes to table

Observations unweighted. Mean scores weighted using weight 1.
Base : Families in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland using child care where the main respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive mother and the partner respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive father, including lone parents, and where main childcare provision has been specified.
-- = Number of observations too small to allow estimation of standard error.

Table 11.4a Mean weekly hours of care for each childcare arrangement of working mothers (Scotland)

|  | Mean <br> hours of <br> care | Standard <br> error | Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| All working mothers with a childcare arrangement <br> who reported hours | 21.2 | 0.40 | 645 |
| Self-provision whilst working | $(25.5)$ | 8.56 | 5 |
| Partner/husband | 20.4 | 1.12 | 115 |
| Grandparent | 17.7 | 0.71 | 235 |
| Other relative/friend/neighbour | 19.9 | 1.75 | 56 |
| Childminder/manny/au pair/non-relative | 24.1 | 1.54 | 73 |
| Nursery/creche/nursery school/playgroup | 25.5 | 0.72 | 161 |

## Notes to table

Observations unweighted. Mean scores weighted using weight 1.
Base: MCS2 families in Scotland using child care where the main respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive mother and the partner respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive father, including lone parents, and where main childcare provision at age three has been specified and care is not by the respondent or partner.
-- = Number of observations too small to allow estimation of standard error.

Table 11.4b Mean weekly hours of care for each childcare arrangement of working mothers (Rest of UK)

## England, Wales, and Northern Ireland only

|  | Mean <br> hours of <br> care | Standard <br> error | Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| All working mothers with a childcare arrangement <br> who reported hours | 20.6 | 0.29 | 4037 |
| Self-provision whilst working | $(32.6)$ | 4.88 | 45 |
| Partner/husband | 18.8 | 0.45 | 833 |
| Grandparent | 17.3 | 0.36 | 1397 |
| Other relative/friend/neighbour | 18.4 | 0.94 | 270 |
| Childminder/manny/au pair/non-relative | 24.8 | 0.67 | 528 |
| Nursery/creche/nursery school/playgroup | 23.7 | 0.47 | 964 |

## Notes to table

Observations unweighted. Mean scores weighted using weight 1.
Base: MCS2 families in England, Wales and NI users of child care where the main respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive mother and the partner respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive father, including lone parents, and where main childcare provision at age three has been specified and care is not by the respondent or partner.
-- = Number of observations too small to allow estimation of standard error

## Price

Table 11.5a Mean price per hour of formal childcare arrangements (Scotland)

|  | Mean <br> price per <br> hour (£) | Standard <br> error | Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Childminder/nanny/au pair/non-relative | 3.16 | 0.20 | 66 |
| Nursery/creche | 3.54 | 0.12 | 142 |
| Playgroup | $(2.37)$ | -- | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |

## Notes to table

Observations unweighted. Mean scores weighted using weight 1.
Base: MCS families in Scotland users of child care where the main respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive mother and the partner respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive father, including lone parents, and where main childcare provision at age three has been specified, hours of use and price paid have been specified, and care is not by the respondent or partner. Includes working and non-working mothers.
$--=$ Number of observations too small to allow estimation of standard error.

## Table 11.5b Mean price per hour of formal childcare arrangements (Rest of UK)

## England, Wales, and Northern Ireland only

|  | Mean <br> price per <br> hour (£) | Standard <br> error | Unweighted <br> $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Childminder/nanny/au pair/non-relative | 3.57 | 0.22 | 470 |
| Nursery/creche | 3.79 | 0.21 | 833 |
| Playgroup | 2.69 | 0.12 | 58 |

## Notes to table

Observations unweighted. Mean scores weighted using weight 1. Base: MCS2 families in England Wales and NI users of child care where the main respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive mother and the partner respondent is a natural, step, or adoptive father, including lone parents, and where main childcare provision at age three has been specified, hours of use and price paid have been specified, and care is not by the respondent or partner. Includes working and non-working mothers. -- = Number of observations too small to allow estimation of standard error.

## Longitudinal relationships between childcare arrangements

Figure 11.1a Changes in Use of Childcare Arrangement between MCS1 and MCS2 Scotland Only


## Notes to figure

Observations unweighted. Percentages weighted using weight1. Base: MCS2 families in Scotland users of child care at MCS1 with natural, step, or adoptive parents. Childcare arrangement at MCS1 is the arrangement reported by respondent at MCS1, with possible correction at MCS2. Arrangements at MCS2 were ongoing at the time of the interview.

Figure 11.1b Changes in Use of Childcare Arrangement between MCS1 and MCS2 England, Wales, and Northern Ireland Only


## Notes to figure

Observations unweighted. Percentages weighted using weight2. Base: MCS2 families with natural, step, or adoptive parents in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland users of child care at MCS1. Childcare arrangement at MCS1 is the arrangement reported by respondent at MCS1, with possible correction at MCS2. Arrangements at MCS2 were ongoing at the time of the interview.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The BMI overweight cut off at 3 year ( 36 months) are $17.9 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m} 2$ for boys and 17.6 for girls. The corresponding obesity cut offs are 19.6 for boys and 19.4 for girls.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ This difference between families in Scotland and the rest of the UK was explored through multivariate analysis. This analysis confirmed that children in Scotland still had higher BAS vocabulary scores than the rest of the UK which could not be explained by the above range other factors when they were all combined. However, the amount children in Scotland were ahead of those in the rest of the UK narrowed as a result of including all the above factors combined. (see Dex,S (ed) (2007) Millennium Cohort Study: Exploring some of the Distinctive results for Scotland, Report to Scottish Government.) This means therefore, it is a feature of the MCS sample in Scotland, rather than other factors that are responsible for the finding that children in Scotland were ahead in their vocabulary than children in the rest of the UK.
    ${ }^{3}$ A multivariate analysis of Bracken school readiness scores found that the advantage of children in Scotland over the rest of the UK was fully accounted for by all the above factors combined. (see Dex,S (ed) (2007) Millennium Cohort Study: Exploration of some distinctive results for Scotland, Report to Scottish Government.)
    ${ }^{4}$ A multivariate analysis found that the advantage of children in Scotland over the rest of the UK in their total difficulties scores was fully accounted for by the set of all the above factors when combined (see Dex,S (ed) (2007) Millennium Cohort Study: Exploration of some distinctive results for Scotland, Report to Scottish Government.)

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ A multivariate analysis of living in poverty found that the difference between poverty rates in Scotland and the rest of the UK was fully accounted for by the above range of factors combined, (see Dex,S (ed) (2007) Millennium Cohort Study: Exploring some of the Distinctive results for Scotland, Report to Scottish Government.)
    ${ }^{6}$ MCS was not able to ask the detailed questions about household income that would have enabled us to reproduce the government's official child poverty measures for children of all ages, For household income before housing costs, this stood at 23 per cent below the UK median at the time of the first survey and 22 percent in 2003-4. In any case, the MCS survey covered family income rather than household income (the latter would include the income of any other adults in the home).

[^3]:    Notes to table

    * In the vast majority of cases the Main interview was undertaken by the natural mother and the Partner interview was undertaken by the father/father figure.

[^4]:    Notes to table

    * missing on income at MCS1 included in total

[^5]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS1 main sample in England, Wales and NI with housing tenure at MCS1
    Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers
    *Other includes living with parents, living rent-free, squatting.
    Chi square: 655, P value: $<0.001$

[^6]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS1 families with two resident parents in England, Wales or NI
    Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
    Chi square: 57, P value: $<0.001$

[^7]:    Notes to table
    Base. MCS mover families in England, Wales and NI, MCS1 to MCS2
    Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
    Respondents could give more than one response.

[^8]:    Notes to table
    Base: ALL MSC2 main respondents.
    Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
    *Chi Square: 72.1, P value: 0.002
    **Chi Square: 20.7, P value: 0.119
    Urban/rural distinction in Scotland is based on Scottish Executive 2-fold division. In England And Wales rural/urban distinction is based on ONS2005 Urban-Rural Morphology code ( 3 cats collapsed to 2 ; urban is $>10 \mathrm{k}$ population). Northern Ireland is based on Northern Ireland 3-fold distinction collapsed to 2 (urban and missed urban are combined into urban).

[^9]:    Notes to table
    Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
    Chi square: $808.0, \mathrm{P}$ value: $<0.001$
    Base: Main respondents at MCS2 in England, Wales and NI who were given NS-SEC at MCS1.

[^10]:    Notes to table
    Base: ALL MSC2 main respondents. Note: Weighted percentages; unweighted sample numbers.
    *Chi Square: 49.9, P value: $0.000 \quad * *$ Chi Square: $12.2, \mathrm{P}$ value: 0.116
    Urban/rural distinction in Scotland is based on Scottish Executive 2-fold division. In England And Wales rural/urban distinction is based on ONS2005 Urban Rural Morphology code ( 3 cats collapsed to 2; urban is $>10 \mathrm{k}$ population). Northern Ireland is based on Northern Ireland 3-fold distinction collapsed to 2 (urban and missed urban are combined into urban).

[^11]:    Notes to table
    Chi2 $=1660.0861 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
    Base=All families who were interviewed at MCS2 in which the main respondent was interviewed and in which the main respondent was a mother (any kind of mother) for whom age in known.

[^12]:    Notes to table
    Chi2 $=53.4468 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$
    Base=All families interviewed at MCS1 and MCS2 in which the natural father was non-resident at MCS1 and the prior relationship was known from MCS1 main interview.

[^13]:    Notes to table
    Contact Chi2 $=43.2922 \mathrm{p}=0.0000$ Maintenance Chi2 $=1.8211 \mathrm{p}=0.9512$

[^14]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS2 partner respondent fathers in country
    Unweighted observations, weighted percentages (using weight 2 except country analysis which uses Weight 1.)

[^15]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in country
    Unweighted observations, weighted \%s (using weight 2 except country analysis which uses Weight 1 ).

[^16]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in country
    Unweighted observations, weighted $\%$ s (using weight 2 except country analysis which uses Weight 1 ).

[^17]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS2 main respondent mothers in Scotland

[^18]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

[^19]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS2 main respondents for England, Wales and NI

[^20]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS2 main respondents in England, Wales and NI

[^21]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS2 singleton children with valid data. In England Wales and NI

[^22]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS2 sample in England, Wales and NI.

[^23]:    Notes to table
    Base: singleton children in England Wales and NI where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bas scores were specified. Unweighted N values

[^24]:    Notes to table
    Mean scores weighted using weight 2.
    Base: singleton children in England Wales and NI where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bracken scores were specified.

[^25]:    Notes to table
    Mean scores weighted using weight 2.
    Base: singleton children in Scotland where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bracken scores were specified.

[^26]:    Notes to table
    Mean scores weighted using weight 2.
    Base: singleton children in England Wales and NI where the main respondent is natural, step or adoptive mother and the partner respondents is a natural, step or adoptive father, including lone parents and where Bracken scores were specified.

[^27]:    Notes to table
    NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weight1
    Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

[^28]:    Notes to table
    NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: whnotsco Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI

[^29]:    Notes to table
    NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weights2 Base: MCS2 main respondents

[^30]:    Notes to table
    NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: whnotscoBase: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI

[^31]:    Notes to table
    NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weights2 Base: MCS2 main respondents

[^32]:    Notes to table
    NB: Total bases are unweighted. Percentages are weighted. Variable used for weighting: weight1 Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland

[^33]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS2 mothers.
    Chi - sq $=109.32 \mathrm{P}=0.000$

[^34]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS mothers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and 2.
    ** Chi-sq $=630.74 \quad \mathrm{P}=0.0000$.

[^35]:    Notes to table
    Base: All employed MCS2 mothers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step) in Scotland Chi-sq $=310.40 \mathrm{p}$ value $=$ 0.00

[^36]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS2 mothers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step). This table excludes any natural mothers not interviewed and any fathers or grandparents who completed the main interview. * Not currently working includes those who were at home looking after the family and home, non-employed and those in education ${ }^{* *}$ Chi-sq $=7.88 \mathrm{P}=0.00$ for economic activity by area of residence in upper Table only.

[^37]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS2 mothers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step).

    * Not currently working includes those who were at home looking after the family and home, non-employed and those in education
    ** Chi-sq $=105.51 \mathrm{P}=0.0000$ for economic activity by number of children in upper table only

[^38]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS1 Employed mothers sample in Scotland or England, Wales or NI.

[^39]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS2 fathers in England Wales and NI (natural, adoptive, foster and step). Excludes proxy fathers and other carers who completed the partner interview (mothers and grandparents). Education is based on education reported in MCS1 and updated with any new qualifications reported in MCS 2.

    * Chi-sq=523.92 $\mathrm{P}=0.0000$ for father's economic activity by NVQ level in upper Table only.

[^40]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS2 employee mothers (natural, adoptive, foster and step) including 692 families who were not interviewed at MCS1.

[^41]:    Notes to table
    Base: All MCS2 employed fathers in Scotland (natural, adoptive, foster and step) interviewed in sweep 1 and followed-up in sweep 2. Chi-sq $=499.51 \mathrm{P}=0.0000$

[^42]:    
    Notes to table
    Base: All MC
    partners were not interviewed. Other carers and proxy interviews are excluded. Chi $\mathrm{sq}=15400.0 \mathrm{P}=0.0000$

[^43]:    ${ }^{7}$ Family income is only asked of lone parents and couples and does not include income earned by other adults living in the household.

[^44]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland with valid data

[^45]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS2 main respondents in Scotland with valid data. Unweighted sample sizes

[^46]:    Notes to table
    Base: MCS2 main respondents in England Wales and NI with valid data.
    Unweighted sample sizes

