

Youth Transitions in the 1990s: Evidence from the Youth Cohort Study

Vernon Gayle, Paul Lambert, Susan Murray

Stirling University

vernon.gayle@stir.ac.uk

Changing Times Consensus

- Collapse of the youth labour market
- The sharp decline in the number of apprenticeships and suitable jobs for young people
- The introduction of youth training schemes
- Changes to state benefits
- Expansion of F.E. (and later H.E.)

Sociology of Youth

- End of social structure ideas... Individualisation theses (e.g. drawing on Beck & Giddens)

“individuals have a greater scope beyond traditional markers of class, race and gender to create complex subjectivities and lifestyles”

Critiques youth transitions approaches

The field of study has produced little of substance and certainly nothing fresh or original for nearly two decades. It has become more inward-looking. As a sub-discipline it is unlikely to disappear (although perhaps it should) as too many have invested too much in it...[but] it is likely to become increasingly irrelevant. Exhausted, reduced to picking over the minutiae of young people's lives and reworking its own tired models [of transition] it will stagger on...' (Jefferies and Smith 1998, p.59)

Critiques youth transitions approaches

“Empiricist youth research...By insisting on the persistence of class divisions (even if only as conventionally defined), by tracking the gendered patterns of adolescent transition strategies, and (to some extent) racial inequalities in educational outcomes, this body of work provided a skeletal picture of social realities...” (Cohen & Ainley 2000, p.81)

Our General Position

We share the view of Roberts (2003)

In the course of making school-to-work transitions social class, gender and ethnic divisions among young people widen, deepen and are consolidated... These divisions are then reproduced... It is impossible to explain what is occurring elsewhere until the substructure of young people's lives has been analysed properly (see p.19).

Focus on Early Transitions (exist from education)

- Certain social groups?
- Possible link with social disadvantage
- Potentially lower qualifications?
 - Likely to lead to lower status jobs?
 - Possibility of worse life chances (e.g. lower lifetime earnings)

The 1990s

A lot of these structural (and policy) changes took place in the mid to late 1980s

What went on in the 1990s?

GCSE settled in

Schools under pressure (reforms)

Better economy

Changes in government

A Quick Cultural Comment...

“Youth culture in the 1990s was characterized by environmentalism and entrepreneurship. Fashions were often individualistic, tattoos and body piercing gained popularity, and "retro" styles inspired by fashions of the 1960s and 1970s were also prevalent.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1990s#Cultural_Trends

(accessed 1st September 2007)

Data

- Youth Cohort Study of England & Wales
- Postal survey (Govt monitoring tool)
- Nationally representative data
- Pooling cohorts of data




Limitations

- Changes in survey
- Weakness in parental occupational info
- Ethnicity information

Main Activity Spring (after Yr11)

Activity	Year 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)							
	1984	1986	1988	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Education	41	41	48	58	72	71	69	71
Unemployed	9	8	4	7	6	5	5	5
Gov. Training	26	26	22	14	11	10	11	9
Employment	21	24	26	19	11	10	13	12
Other (inc. family)	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Missing	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
<i>Column %; Weighted data- population size 115,179</i>								

Main Activity Spring (after Yr11)

	Year 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)							
	1984	1986	1988	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Education	41	41	48	58	72	71	69	71
								
Gov. Training	26	26	22	14	11	10	11	9
								
Employment	21	24	26	19	11	10	13	12
								
<i>Column %; Weighted data- population size 115,179</i>								

First Transition...

- Movement out of education
- Our focus is on the 1990s cohorts

Education Main Activity Spring (after Yr11) by Gender 1990s Cohorts

%	Year 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Females in Education	64	75	76	73	76
<i>Weighted data, pop size 37585 (40996 observations)</i>					
Males in Education	54	69	69	66	68
<i>Weighted data, pop size 38814 (35502 observations)</i>					

Education Main Activity Spring (after Yr11) by Ethnicity 1990s Cohorts

% (weighted)	Year 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
White	58	71	71	68	70
Black (all)	71	86	86	83	84
Indian	78	95	91	92	92
Pakistani	70	79	83	82	81
Bangladeshi	69	81	83	80	82
Other Asians	87	90	100	87	90
Other Groups	-	75	87	84	85

Missing 1,211.

Education Main Activity Spring (after Yr11) by Family (RG) Social Class 1990s Cohorts

% (weighted)	Year 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Professional (I)	86	91	93	91	85
Intermediate (II)	74	83	83	81	80
Skilled Non-Man (III_n)	59	73	72	68	72
Skilled Manual (III_m)	44	60	60	56	61
Partly Skilled (IV)	39	58	59	55	59
Unskilled (V)	38	51	62	47	52
Armed Forces (all)	55	94	84	34	28

Highest social class of either parent; Obs=75,580; Missing 7,712.

Education Main Activity Spring (after Yr11) by Father's (male) Camsis Score 1990s Cohorts

Mean (weighted)	Year 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
(Upper estimate)	55	54	54	54	54
In Education	54	53	53	53	54
(Lower estimate)	54	53	53	53	53
(Upper estimate)	44	44	44	44	47
Not in Education	43	44	44	44	46
(Lower estimate)	43	43	43	43	45

Mean 52; Max 96; Min 10; Obs=75,580; Missing 14,007.

Education Main Activity Spring
(after Yr11) by Fathers Social Class
(CASMIN) 1990s Cohorts

% (weighted)	Yr 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Higher-grade professionals (I)	87	91	92	90	85
Lower-grade professionals (II)	80	88	87	86	85
Routine non-manual (III)	75	85	83	84	81
Routine non-manual employees (IIIb)	52	76	64	71	71
Small proprietors (IV)	74	80	87	80	73
Small proprietors no employees (IVb)	70	82	84	78	80
Farmers & smallholders (IVc)	62	75	69	75	71
Lower-grade technicians (V)	65	76	72	70	78
Skilled manual workers (VI)	51	67	65	61	67
Semi-skilled and unskilled man (VII)	43	60	63	58	62
Agricultural workers (VIIb)	64	55	65	52	67

Father's social class; Obs=75,580; Missing 14,007.

Fathers Social Class (NS-SEC)

- Deposited by Croxford *et al.* based on simplified derivation of NS-SEC
- Re-computed NS-SEC using ONS macro (incorporating employment status)
- Two examples of differences are highlighted...

Simplified Derivation

1. We note that in particular some trades (e.g. carpenters [SOC90 570]) are placed in NS-SEC category 4 (small employers) rather than category 7 (routine)

Comment: Here ONS method using status is probably better than simplified method (Croxford) potentially a flaw in the NS-SEC simplified derivation

ONS Macro Derivation

2. SOCs in major group 1 (managers) with parents said not to be self-employed - Using ONS macro they go to NS-SEC category 2, but under Croxford coding they are assumed to be 'missing employment status' and go to 1.1

Comment: Here Croxford coding (i.e. simplified derivation) is probably better the full derivation using status

Education Main Activity Spring
(after Yr11) by Fathers Social Class
(NS-SEC) 1990s Cohorts

	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
1.1 Large employers & higher man.	78 (97)	87 (86)	85 (88)	84 (87)	85 (91)
1.2 Higher professional occupations	87 (88)	92 (92)	93 (93)	92 (92)	86 (85)
2 Lower managerial & professional	78 (80)	86 (88)	86 (88)	83 (85)	83 (83)
3 Intermediate occupations	68 (67)	80 (80)	79 (78)	78 (78)	80 (80)
4 Small employers and own account	56 (73)	72 (83)	70 (83)	66 (80)	71 (82)
5 Lower supervisory & technical	54 (55)	67 (68)	67 (68)	63 (63)	67 (67)
6 Semi-routine occupations	47 (49)	61 (63)	66 (66)	60 (61)	65 (66)
7 Routine occupations	38 (41)	58 (60)	59 (60)	55 (56)	59 (63)
8 Never worked & long-term unemp.	49 (49)	63 (63)	65 (65)	64 (64)	65 (64)

Education Main Activity Spring (after Yr11) by Parents Social Class (NS-SEC 3 Classes) 1990s Cohorts

% (weighted)	Year 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Managerial & prof	77 (83)	86 (89)	86 (89)	83 (87)	83 (85)
Intermediate	58 (65)	72 (77)	71 (77)	67 (74)	71 (77)
Routine	41 (43)	58 (60)	60 (60)	55 (56)	59 (60)

*Parent's social class; Obs=75,580; Croxford Missing 7,855; Our Measure 7,712;
Disagreement 174 cases.*

Qualifications Year 11 (5+GCSE passes A* - C)

% (weighted)	Year 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
5+ passes A* - C	35	43	45	46	51

In all of these cohorts at least 90% of those with 5+ passes (A* - C) stay in education

Education Main Activity Spring (after Yr11) pupils with low qualifications (Less than 5+GCSE passes A* - C)

% (weighted)	Year 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Not in education	58	42	43	49	44
Education	42	58	57	51	56

A Comment

- A interesting pattern emerges across the 1990s cohorts
- A trend of increasing participation
- *Predictors of participation seem stable?*
 - *GCSE attainment is the most important factor*
Higher proportion of girls stay in education
 - Class effect (however measured)
 - Ethnicity effects

Logistic Regression: Education Main Activity Spring

(svy weighted regression) t values	Yr 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Less than 5 GCSE passes (A* - C)	-51	-45	-46	-48	-39
Boys	-8	-4	-5	-5	-6
Black (all)	5	6	6	7	5
Indian	7	8	7	8	5
Pakistani	7	5	6	7	3
Bangladeshi	3	4	4	4	3
Other Asians	5	4	4	4	3
Other Groups	-	1	4	5	3

Family Social Class (RG)

(svy weighted regression) t values	Yr 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Less than 5 GCSE passes (A* - C)					
Boys					
Ethnicity					
Professional (I)	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate (II)	-5	-4	-4	-5	-1
Skilled Non-Man (III_n)	-8	-6	-7	-8	-3
Skilled Manual (III_m)	-12	-10	-10	-10	-5
Partly Skilled (IV)	-12	-10	-10	-9	-5
Unskilled (V)	-9	-9	-6	-9	-3
Armed Forces (all)	-2	1	-1	-4	-3

Father's Male CAMSIS (1-Score)

(svy weighted regression) t values	Yr 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Less than 5 GCSE passes (A* - C)					
Boys					
Ethnicity					
Father male Camsis (1-score)	-20	-16	-15	-15	-9

Father's CASMIN (3 Classes)

(svy weighted regression) t values	Yr 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Less than 5 GCSE passes (A* - C)					
Boys					
Ethnicity					
Service	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate	-7	-5	-6	-7	-3
Working	-17	-14	-13	-15	-8

Family NS-SEC (3 Classes)

(svy weighted regression) t values	Yr 11 (Minimum School Leaving Age)				
	1990	1993	1995	1997	1999
Less than 5 GCSE passes (A* - C)					
Boys					
Ethnicity					
Managerial and professional occs	0	0	0	0	0
Intermediate occupations	-8	-6	-7	-9	-3
Routine and manual occupations	-17	-14	-14	-15	-8

ONS macro derived measure

A Comment..

“This lack of clear lines of social difference amongst young people today suggests a process of *individualisation*: one in which young people’s experiences have become more varied and are no longer predictable on the basis of social class” (Furlong *et al.* 2006 p.28).

Estimating the Social Class Effect

- 1990 YCS cohort

Logit Model

5+ GCSE passes (A* - C)

Gender

Ethnicity

NS-SEC (3 fold)

Sample Enumeration Results

Intermediate Occupations NS-SEC

	1990	1995	1999
Observed difference	18%	12%	8%
Diff due 'directly' to class	4%	10%	3%
Difference due to other things	14%	2%	5%

Sample Enumeration Results

Routine & Manual Occupations NS-SEC

	1990	1995	1999
Observed difference	40%	29%	25%
Diff due 'directly' to class	16%	22%	6%
Difference due to other things	24%	7%	19%

Sample Enumeration Results

Intermediate Occupations CASMIN

	1990	1995	1999
Observed difference	15%	9%	7%
Diff due 'directly' to class	12%	8%	6%
Difference due to other things	3%	1%	1%

Sample Enumeration Results

Working CASMIN

	1990	1995	1999
Observed difference	36%	25%	21%
Diff due 'directly' to class	25%	19%	14%
Difference due to other things	11%	6%	7%

Conclusions

- Little support for the end of social stratification

“individuals have a greater scope beyond traditional markers of class, race and gender to create complex subjectivities and lifestyles”

Final Comment

- A interesting pattern emerges across the 1990s cohorts
- A trend of increasing participation
- *Predictors of participation seem stable?*
 - *GCSE attainment is the most important factor*
Higher proportion of girls stay in education
 - Class effect (however measured)
 - Ethnicity effects

Examining 'substantive' effects

- Davies (1992) Sample Enumeration
- Payne (1998) Labour Party campaign data
- Gayle *et al.* (2002)
- War against the uninformed use of odds (e.g. on breakfast t.v.)

Sample Enumeration Methods

In a nutshell...

“What if” – what if the gender effect was removed

1. Fit a model (e.g. logit)
2. Focus on a comparison (e.g. **CLASS I / II**)
3. Use the fitted model to estimate a fitted value for each individual in the group obtaining $y=1$
4. Sum these fitted values and construct a sample enumerated % for the group

Sample Enumeration Results 1990

Percentage in education spring after yr11	
All	60%
Managerial & professional occs	83%
Intermediate occupations	65%
<i>(Samp enum est. Intermediate occs)</i>	69%
Observed difference	18%
Difference due 'directly' to Int occ effect	4%
Difference due to other things	14%

Pseudo Confidence Interval

<i>Sample Enumeration Male Effect</i>	
Upper Bound	69.34%
Estimate	68.77%
Lower Bound	68.20%

Bootstrapped with 1000 Replications

Sample Enumeration Results 1990

Percentage in education spring after yr11		
	All	60%
	Managerial & professional occs	83%
	Routine and manual occupations	43%
	<i>(Samp enum est. routine & manual occs)</i>	<i>59%</i>
	Observed difference	40%
	Diff due 'directly' to routine & man effect	16%
	Difference due to other things	24%

Sample Enumeration Results

Gender effects (boys)

	1990	1995	1999
Observed difference	10%	8%	8%
Diff due 'directly' to class	7%	3%	3%
Difference due to other things	3%	5%	5%