National Child Development Study
User Support Group

Working Paper
No 30

EARLY ADULT OUTCOMES OF TRUANCY, II:

The effects of truancy after allowing for other factors

by

Angelika Hibbett
and
Ken Fogelman

Social Statistics Research Unit

This is a draft paper and comments are welcome.
The views expressed are those of the authors only.
Please do not quote or reproduce this paper without
the permission of the authors.

Social Statistics Research Unit
City University
Northampton Square
LONDON EC1V 0HB
MARCH 1988

NCDSUSGWP30:AH,KF;230388

EARLY ADULT OUTCOMES OF TRUANCY, II: THE EFFECTS OF TRUANCY AFTER ACCOUNTING FOR OTHER FACTORS

Angelika Hibbett and Ken Fogelman

1. Introduction

This paper is the second to describe the findings of an investigation based on the National Child Development Study (NCDS) designed to examine the relationships of truancy from school with a wide range of outcomes in early adulthood.

Truancy, particularly in the final years of compulsory secondary schooling has been identified as a substantial phenomenon. However, both the underlying causes and the implications for the young people concerned are less well understood. Thus, the purposes of the current project have been not only to provide descriptive information on how former truants were faring later in their lives, but thereby to shed some light on possible explanations. For example, if truancy is part of a more comprehensive maladjustment, this would be consistent with subsequent problems in early adulthood, in areas such as family relationships and mental health. If, as others have suggested, truancy represents a move away from the values of the school and towards those of adulthood, then we should not expect former truants to encounter particular difficulties in their labour market experiences.

The breadth of data available in the National Child Development Study and its longitudinal structure make it possible to examine the relationship between reported truancy from school, based on information obtained during the school years, and a number of areas explored during interview at the age of twenty-three, including occupational, financial and educational progress and aspects of family formation and health-related behaviour.

The earlier paper (1) summarised the literature on this topic, outlined the results of investigating the inter-relationships of a number of measures of truancy and school attendance which were available from the study, and presented the results of

preliminary investigation of their association with twenty-three measures of outcomes in early adulthood.

The present paper takes this analysis forward in a number of ways, concentrating on those people who had been said to be truanting by their teachers at the time of the study's sixteen-year follow-up (it had also been hoped to differentiate a group who had also been reported as truanting at the age of eleven, but these proved to be too few to allow for multivariate analysis). Three main issues underlie the analyses reported in this paper.

Firstly, as reported below, the preliminary analyses demonstrated a consistent relationship between truancy and virtually all the outcomes examined. This however is the result of comparing the truants with all other members of the 1958 Cohort, and earlier work (2) had established that truants differ from other young people in a number of respects which might be expected to explain such relationships. For example, they came predominantly from families where the fathers were in manual occupations, they were likely to be in larger families, they were not equally distributed in different parts of the country, and they showed poorer educational ability and attainment even before they were identified as truanting. Thus the first stages of the analyses reported here are designed to assess whether taking such differences into account eliminates or reduces the relationship between truancy and the outcomes. In other words they investigate whether the outcomes for truants differ once they are compared with people who are similar in these respects.

Secondly, although there are other reasons for being absent from school, it seems likely - and the preliminary analyses confirmed - that truants have lower than average school attendance. It is known that poor school attendance, for whatever reason, is associated with lowered attainment (3). Thus, one stage of the analyses is designed to establish whether any differences in outcome for the truants (after allowing for the background factors as described above) are explained by their depressed attendance levels.

Thirdly, one of the limited number of previous studies in this area (4) suggested that difficulties encountered by truants, particularly in the labour market, were the result of their depressed examination performance and lack of qualifications at the end of their schooling; and that thereafter their problems were no greater than others with similarly poor qualifications.

The final stages of our analyses address this issue.

A fuller account of the National Child Development Study, and the details of the preliminary results are given in the earlier paper (1), but brief summaries are provided below in order to set the present findings in context.

2. The National Child Development Study

NCDS is a longitudinal, multi-disciplinary study of all the people in Great Britain who were born in the week 3-9 March, 1958. It has its origins in the 1958 Perinatal Mortality Survey, carried out by the National Birthday Trust Fund. Subsequent follow-ups of the 15,000 or so survivors were carried out by the National Children's Bureau at the ages of 7, 11, 16 and 23. In addition schools were approached in 1979 for the results of public examinations taken up to that time and there has been a number of special exercises to collect data on specific sub-groups (5).

For the full follow-ups during the school years, information was collected on each occasion by interviews with parents, medical examinations carried out by the school health service, questionnaires completed by schools and tests of ability and attainment administered by schools. At 11 and 16 only, questionnaires were also completed by the subjects themselves.

At 23, lengthy interviews of the subjects were carried out by professional interviewers, and covered employment and unemployment, education and training, housing, family formation, income and savings, health and health-related behaviour and leisure activities.

Response has generally been high, at about 90% during the school years and 76% at 23. A discussion of response patterns can be found later in this paper.

3. Preliminary Findings

The information obtained during the school years included a number of measures of school attendance. At each stage schools provided details of individual attendance rates in the current

school year. Indicators of truancy, usually individual items from standard behaviour scales (6), were available from teachers, parents and the young people themselves.

The first stage of preliminary analysis investigated the relationships among these measures. Correlation among the truancy measures at age 16 was high, though with an indication that parents understated their children's truancy compared with teachers' ratings. Their relationship with teachers' reports of truancy at age 11 was necessarily restricted, as the number of truants at the earlier age was much lower. All the truancy ratings showed the expected negative correlation with attendance rates, but the relationships were strongest for the teachers' ratings. However, the relationship was not altogether linear, as the poorest attenders (<60%) did not contain the highest proportion said to be truanting, suggesting that this group was likely to be dominated by the chronically ill.

For the remainder of the preliminary analysis, two composite measures were created, of truancy (based on the teachers' ratings) and attendance, in order to examine their simple relationships with early adult outcomes. The truancy measure identified those said to be truanting at 16, and at both 11 and 16, and the comparison group who were not said to be truanting at either age. Although even at this stage it was apparent that the last group was too small to be included in the eventual multivariate analysis it was felt useful to continue to explore their simple associations. This was not the case for the very small group identified as truanting at age 11 but not at 16. The attendance measure was similarly constructed to differentiate those whose attendance was poor (<80%) at one or both of 11 and 15 (i.e. for the Autumn term of the year in which they were 16), or neither.

The relationship between the truancy and the attendance measure was reasonably strong, but the association of attendance with the outcomes examined was generally weaker. The remainder of this summary concentrates on the relationships of the outcomes with truancy.

With few exceptions there was a regular correlation between truancy and the outcomes, with truants at 16 only in an intermediate position between truants at 11 and 16 and non-truants.

Regarding occupational outcomes, truancy was associated with an

unstable job history: a shorter mean length of jobs, and a higher total number of jobs. There was not on the whole less job satisfaction. Truants were more often unemployed, with the proportion of economically active time unemployed and the mean length of all unemployment spells also being longer. For those who were in work, there was found to be little difference in pay between truants and non-truants, with the exception of female truants who earned somewhat less in their current job, though not their first job. However, truancy was associated with a lower family income, a measure which takes into account family size and structure.

Truants were less likely to have had any education or training since leaving school, and subsequently had fewer qualifications, with 80% of male and 70% of female truants having none at all.

Truants were found to be on average younger at the birth of their first child, and to be more likely to have children in their present family. The average number of children was also higher.

They were more likely to smoke heavily (over 30 cigarettes a day), but there was little difference regarding frequency of drinking. Truants were more likely to score highly on a scale of tendency to depression, and this was more pronounced for female truants .

These findings, interesting though they are, are descriptive and cannot establish the influence of truancy on early adult outcomes. As mentioned in the introduction above, although there were found to be certain differences between truants and non-truants, these could be due to other factors, like social background and educational ability. The multivariate analyses described below attempt to take such factors into account and thus come closer to identifying the particular influence of truancy, and its nature.

4. Design of the Multivariate Analysis

As mentioned in the introduction, for each outcome variable a sequence of analyses was carried out, each stage designed to test a different question concerning the relationship between

truancy from school and the outcome.

Two kinds of analyses were used: analysis of variance where the dependent variable was continuous (for example, pay in current job); and loglinear analysis where the outcome was categorical (for example, economic status).

Irrespective of the kind of analysis and the particular outcome, the structure and sequence of analyses was the same for all outcome variables. In all cases the contrast of interest was between the truants and non-truants, according to the teachers' ratings at 16. Firstly, the simple contrast between the two groups was produced; the second stage included social background factors as independent variables and adjusted the truancy contrast for the relationship with those factors; the third stage additionally incorporated and adjusted for measures of ability and attainment at the age of eleven; the fourth also included the subject's attendance rate at 15; and the fifth and final stage also included a measure of public examination attainment by the time of leaving school.

Thus at each stage it would be possible to identify the particular contribution to the relationship between truancy and the outcome of the variable, or set of variables, added in at that stage.

For inferences drawn from comparisons across the stages to be valid, it was clearly important that each stage should be based on the same sample; that each analysis should be of those with data on all the variables included in the final, fullest analysis. However, this requirement introduces a potential problem. Because of the differing examination systems between Scotland and the rest of Great Britain, it was not possible to devise a common scale of examination attainment for the final stage of analysis. Therefore, where possible, separate analyses have been carried out for Scotland, on the one hand, and England and Wales on the other. In fact this provides a useful test of the generalisability of the results. However, this was possible only for the analyses of variance (where the dependent variable was continuous). For the loglinear analyses of categorical dependent variables, the Scottish sample was too small to provide reliable results. Therefore, for these variables results are provided for England and Wales only.

For all the above, separate analyses were carried out for men and women.

5. Independent variables

The variables referred to above, incorporated into the various stages of the analysis in addition to the truancy variable, are now described in more detail.

Social background

Social class of father's occupation at the 16-year follow-up (non-manual; skilled manual; semi-skilled/ unskilled)

Region of residence at 16 (Northern England; Southern England; Wales)

Number of children under 21 living in the household, at 11 (1 or 2 children; 3 or more children)

Educational Ability and attainment at 11

General Ability Test score

Reading Comprehension Test score

Mathematics Test score

These tests were constructed by the National Foundation for Educational Research for use in the study (7).

Attendance rate

Quotient of attended half days divided by total possible in the Autumn term of the school year of the 16-year follow-up.

End-of-school qualifications

Details of entries and results on CSE, GCE O-level and A-level (and their Scottish equivalents) had been obtained from schools. For the present study a scale of overall achievement was used, ranging from 'no graded results' to 'three or more good A-level passes' (9+ points on the UCCA scale).

6. Dependent Variables

A total of 24 outcome measures, described below, were examined. Corresponding table numbers are also listed. Where two tables are indicated, the second refers to the separate analyses for Scotland.

All measures are derived from responses to the 23-year interview.

Current economic status (Table 1). Four categories: in work; full-time education; unemployed; out of the labour force.

Social class of first job (Table 2). Four categories: professional or managerial; skilled or semi-skilled non-manual; skilled or semi-skilled manual; unskilled manual.

Social class of current or most recent job (Table 3). Most recent job was taken for those not working at the time of interview. Four categories, as for first job.

Number of full-time and part-time jobs since completing full-time education (Table 4 and Table 4A). A continuous variable.

Total months in full-time and part-time jobs (Table 5 and 5A). A continous variable.

Mean length of all jobs, in months (Table 6 and Table 6A). A continuous variable.

Job satisfaction in current job (Table 7). For those currently working only. A five point scale was collapsed to give three categories: satisfied or very satisfied; neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

Job satisfaction in last job (Table 8). As above, for those not currently working.

Total months unemployed (Table 9 and Table 9A). A continuous variable.

Total time unemployed as percentage of economically active time (Table 10 and Table 10A). A continuous variable.

Mean length of all unemployment spells, in months (Table 11 and Table 11A). A continuous variable.

Pay per week in first job, in pounds (Table 12 and Table 12A). A continuous variable. In order to avoid confounding by inflation this analysis is restricted to those who left school and obtained their first job in 1974.

Pay per week in current job, in pounds (Table 13 and Table 13A). For those currently working. A continuous variable.

Weekly equivalent net family income, in pounds (Table 14 and Table 14A). A continuous variable which takes into account income from all sources and adjusts for family size and structure, using Supplementary Benefit weightings (8).

Education, apprenticeship and training (Table 15). A summary measure of experience since leaving school. Four categories: apprenticeship or other less formal job-related training; education; both education and training; none. The distinction between education and training is, of course, not always altogether clear. For the NCDS 23-year interview, training had to be in conjunction with a job, and of 2 weeks or 100 hours duration to be counted; education had to be not in conjunction with a job, and on a course aimed at a qualification.

Educational achievements and qualifications (Table 16). A summary measure of the highest qualification obtained by the time of the 23-year interview. Collapsed into four categories: degree or equivalent (includes HNC and other higher level technical qualifications); A-level and equivalent (includes ONC and similar qualifications); other qualifications up to O-level (includes craft qualifications and CSEs); none.

Marital status (Table 17). Three categories: married; single; separated, divorced or widowed.

Partnership status (Table 18). Three categories: married; cohabiting; alone.

Type of current family unit (Table 19). Four categories: married with children; married, no children; single, separated, divorced, widowed with children; single, separated, divorced, widowed, no children.

Age at birth of first child, in years (Table 20 and Table 20A). A continuous variable.

Number of children in the family (Table 21 and Table 21A). A continuous variable.

Smoking (Table 22). Four categories: Over 30 cigarettes per day; 10 to 30 cigarettes per day; up to 10 per day; none.

Frequency of Drinking (Table 23). Four categories: most days; once or twice per week; less often; never.

Depression (Table 24). As indicated by scores above the conventional cut-off on a self-completed 'Malaise Inventory' constructed to indicate tendency to depression (9)

7. Response Patterns

It will be seen in the tables that, considering those analyses not based on a restricted sample and combining the numbers in the England and Wales analyses with the Scots, there are typically some 6,500 cases included in these analyses. This represents about 40% of all study members believed to be alive and in this country, and just over 50% of those successfully interviewed at age 23.

Some of this reduction is due to legitimate exclusions from analyses. For example, there are those who could not be assigned to a social class at 16 because there was no male head of household (about 8% of respondents at 16); a further small number could not be included in analyses of employment-related outcomes as they had not had a job by the age of 23.

However most of the reduction is due to missing data, which can result from failure to trace, refusal, or failure for administrative, resource or other reasons to get one or more survey instruments completed. Where analyses, such as these, draw on data collected at several ages and by more than one instrument within any one follow-up, the effect is cumulative and can be substantial.

It is possible to make some assessment of the effects of

non-response in a longitudinal study, as the earlier characteristics of subsequent non-respondents are known. General analyses of NCDS are reasonably reassuring. Respondents are slightly more middle class, and certain disadvantaged groups are becoming under-represented, but in general such biases are small. The one more troubling bias is that ethnic minority groups are substantially under-represented.

Perhaps most relevantly, it has been demonstrated that repeating earlier analyses omitting subsequent non-respondents has no more than trivial effects on the results (10).

More specifically for the present project, it is possible broadly to compare the unadjusted results in the tables in this paper with the tables in the earlier paper. As the former are constrained to include only those who have data on all the independent variables in the final stage of the multivariate analysis, whereas the latter require data on only the truancy variable and the outcome, any contrast between the two gives an assessment of the implications of response patterns.

In addition, for a selection of outcomes, we have recalculated the earlier stages of the multivariate analyses without omitting the cases which were excluded because of missing data on variables included in later stages of the analysis.

In fact, in neither case does this point to any real difference in the results - certainly not of a size which could have led to different conclusions. This strongly suggests both that the analysis sample is reasonably representative of the total cohort, and that any biases are not sufficiently great to affect statistical relationships. We cannot discount the possibility of systematic bias throughout, such as the under-representation of ethnic minorities, but it appears extremely unlikely that any such groups would be large enough to change the overall relationships.

8. Presentation of Results

The results of the multivariate analyses are given in tables 1-24. Each table summarises all the stages of analysis described above for any one outcome.

Although the tables do not differ in appearance, the figures within them have very different meanings according to whether

they are based on analysis of variance (i.e. for continuous variable outcomes) or loglinear analysis (for categorical outcomes).

Interpretation of the tables based on analysis of variance is relatively straightforward, as the figures represent differences on the scale of the outcome measure. For example, in table 4, the first such table, the first column shows that the simple difference, without adjusting for other factors, between truants and non-truants in the number of jobs held is, for men, 1.34. In other words, by the age of 23 those men said to be truanting at 16 had had an average of 1.34 more jobs than had others. The second column gives the result of adjusting for the social background factors described above, which in this case reduces the average difference to 1.22 (jobs). Adjusting additionally for test scores at 11 further reduces the contrast to 1.07; allowing also for attendance rate brings it to 0.91; and finally, in the fifth column, we see that after allowing for social background, attainment at 11, attendance rate at 15 and examination qualifications at the end of schooling, male truants have on average had 0.7 more jobs by the age of 23.

For each adjusted result, the probability level is given of the F value associated with the difference between the truants and non-truants.

The tables based on loglinear analysis follow the same structure and relate to the same adjustments, but report the results as relative odds. For each outcome variable, one category is selected as the reference category against which the relative odds of other categories are calculated. More concretely, in Table 1, the first column shows, for men, that before any adjustment for other factors, truants are - compared to non-truants - .45 times as likely to be in full-time education rather than in work; 2.37 times as likely to be unemployed rather than in work; and 1.43 times as likely to be out of the labour force rather than in work.

Subsequent columns adjust these contrasts for the same factors as described above. In these analyses 95% confidence intervals are presented in order to indicate statistical significance.

9.Findings

Before turning to the findings, it is important to note that their interpretation must be in the context of this particular cohort, when it was studied and their age at that time.

NCDS members could first leave school in 1974 (they were in fact the first year group to be affected by the raising of the school leaving age to 16). Their first entry into the labour market could be from that year through to 1981 - a small number had still not taken up employment by the time of the 23-year interview. Thus, although unemployment levels were steadily rising during this time, they will not have experienced the dramatic rise in unemployment, with its disproportionate affect on school-leavers, encountered in the 1980's. Equally, their entry into employment generally pre-dated those schemes which were introduced to assist young school-leavers, and also school-based initiatives such as TVEI. On the other hand, other job-related training opportunities, most notably apprenticeships in manufacturing industries, have diminished in the intervening years.

Thus, the employment opportunities for this cohort, at least in their first few years after completing their education, were certainly greater than for more recent year groups. If, as the preliminary results suggested, those who had truanted from school were experiencing difficulties in the labour market in the late seventies, we might expect these to be increased by subsequent economic difficulties. It seems likely that any contrasts we may identify for the 1958 cohort will be, if anything, greater for younger age groups.

The second general point relevant to all our findings concerns the age at which our most recent data were collected, that is twenty-three. This is clearly relatively early in the adult lives of the cohort (although it is also likely to be at a relatively early age that the impact of school truancy is most direct and less affected by other life events). By this age most will have entered the labour market, but many only relatively recently. In particular those who continued into higher or further education, though working, may not yet have settled into the careers which will typify their working lives. Their current earnings will be relatively low compared to their lifetime potential, whereas manual workers' earnings will, in real terms, vary relatively little as they become older.

Such considerations apply equally to other major transitions of early adulthood. By the age of twenty-three about half the cohort were married, and about one third had had children. Again therefore we shall not be examining a static or completed picture.

Most importantly, the rate and sequence of progress through the transitions of early adulthood are not random phenomena. There are substantial differences according to class of origin and according to sex (11). Young people from working class backgrounds tend to leave school and enter the labour market at an earlier age than those from middle class backgrounds. In turn, they leave the parental home, marry and have children earlier, as do young women compared to men. And of course women are more likely to leave the labour force, if only temporarily, when they have young children.

In basing this study on information which covers the period up to the age of twenty-three, we are describing an age when progress through the life cycle varies substantially, and this variation relates to background and sex. Since it is known that truants differ in similar ways, these general patterns will help to explain some of the contrasts which we find, between truants and non-truants, how this varies between the sexes, and how accounting for background variables affects the results. These points also reinforce the case for the kind of multivariate analysis which has been carried out.

10.Occupational outcomes

More than half of the outcomes examined relate to aspects of the employment experience and income of the Cohort, at the time of the 23-year interview or in the years preceding it.

Table 1 compares the current (i.e. at 23) economic status of the truants and non-truants. Among men, before adjusting for other factors and relative to being in work, truants are just under half as likely to be in full-time education, and more than twice as likely to be unemployed. They are also almost 1.5 times more likely to be out of the labour force, but this is a small group (note the large confidence intervals) composed mainly of the long-term sick.

Allowing for social background reduces the contrasts in full-time education and unemployment, though not substantially. The

confidence intervals associated with both full-time education and being out of the labour force indicate that it would be unsafe to conclude that the truants are significantly different in these respects, but the contrast in the odds of being unemployed are highly significant. These differences appear to be unaffected by allowing for further factors, suggesting that the increased odds of unemployment for truants are not explained by their poor attendance or their poor examination qualifications, once social background has been taken into account.

The patterns for women are very similar, except that the truants' relative odds of being out of the labour force are considerably greater. The confidence intervals associated with this are smaller than for men, as this is of course more common for women of this age, including as it does those who are not working and not seeking work because they are caring for children. It is possible that this group includes some who report that they are not seeking work, but would do so if they thought that suitable work was available. This may therefore reflect some additional 'hidden' unemployment.

Tables 2 and 3 examine the social class of, respectively, the first job on completing education and the current job (or most recent for those not currently working). Broadly, the results are very similar in the two tables, for both jobs and for each sex. Relative to being in unskilled manual occupations truants are, or were for their first job, about one tenth as likely to be in professional, managerial or intermediate non-manual occupations (classes I & II), a fifth to a quarter as likely to be in skilled or semiskilled non manual occupations (III & IV Non-manual), and a half to two thirds as likely to be in skilled or semi-skilled manual occupations (III & IV Manual). As for economic status, the contrasts are slightly reduced by allowing for social background, but then barely affected by the introduction of further factors into the analysis.

There is a slight suggestion, at least with regard to the distinction between skilled or semi-skilled as against unskilled jobs - which are the main destinations of the truants- of a widening of the gap in the period between first and current jobs.

Truants have, by the age of 23, held more jobs than have non-truants (Table 4). The average difference in the number of jobs held is greater for men (1.34) than for women (0.59). However, this contrast is reduced at each stage of the analysis; that is, each of the other factors contributes to the explanation of the difference. Nevertheless, the final difference remains statistically significant, though much reduced (0.70 for men and 0.38 for women).

The separate analysis for Scotland produces a similar pattern, but the final differences between truants and non-truants are smaller and are not statistically significant at the 5% level.

Of course differences in the number of jobs held could simply reflect the fact that truants will have left school earlier and been in the labour market longer, rather than necessarily any tendency to change jobs more frequently. That truants have been in employment longer is confirmed, at least for men, by Table 5. On average, the former truants have been in employment some 15 months longer by 23. However this difference is reduced to only 5 months when social background and attainment at 11 are taken into account, and further reduced by the introduction of attendance rate and examination performance, to where it is no longer statistically significant.

For women, the pattern is very different. The raw mean difference between truants and non-truants is very small, but increases when other factors are allowed for. Later tables will help to interpret this, but it is extremely likely that this is the result of departure from the labour force as seen in Table 1. Female non-truants' time in the labour force is truncated because they stay in education, and truants' because they leave employment when they marry and have children. These two effects are complimentary and more or less offset each other in terms of the raw difference, but the table shows that, once the truants are compared with others similar in their social background, attainment at 11 and examinations attainment (attendance contributing relatively little), they have spent considerably less time in employment.

Table 6 provides a more direct test of job changing, as it examines the average duration of all jobs held. This does confirm that the truants have on average held their jobs for a shorter time. Furthermore, the contrast with non-truants is generally increased as account is taken of further factors (again attendance rate is the exception, producing a small reduction in the mean difference). The final difference in average job length, of 9 months for men and 11 months for women, is quite dramatic given the relatively short time all cohort members can have been in employment by the age of twenty-three.

Whilst such job changes cannot all be assumed to have been voluntary, job satisfaction is likely to be an important element. Table 7 shows that the truants are less likely to declare themselves satisfied with their current job (but the differences are small in relation to the confidence intervals). The extent to

which they do this is unaffected by the other factors included in the analyses.

The analyses in Table 7 are restricted to those currently working. We have seen that this will exclude a disproportionate number of former truants, because they are unemployed or, for women particularly, out of the labour market. Their job dissatisfaction may therefore be under-rated. For this reason, we have also looked at satisfaction in their last job of those not working at the time of the 23-year interview (Table 8).

For men, there is little contrast between truants and non-truants in the relative odds of being satisfied with their last job. Among women, however the truants express much less satisfaction, although the main contrast is in the odds of saying they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied rather than outright dissatisfaction. Perhaps female truants who are not working are more indifferent to the attributes of their former employment.

11. Unemployment Outcomes

As can be seen in Table 9, men who had played truant from school at 16 have, by 23, experienced an average of 4.22 months more unemployment. Each of the factors introduced into the analysis explains a portion of this difference, to the point where it is reduced to 2.3 months but still highly statistically significant. The pattern for women is very similar, but with a slightly smaller difference.

Of course, as a measure of amount of unemployment, total length of all spells will again be confounded with the length of time in the labour market. A better measure which takes this into account is provided in Table 10, where time unemployed is expressed as a proportion of total time in the labour market. Before the introduction of other factors, truants have spent just less than 2% more of their economically active time unemployed. The effect on this of allowing for the other factors is not very consistent or very great, but comparing with others of similar social background does reduce the contrast enough to make it no longer significant at the 5% level. However the contrast is increased again when adjusted for differences in examination attainment. Far from explaining the greater unemployment of the truants, their disadvantage is greater than others of similar attainment.

For women, the contrast in the proportion of time unemployed is

greater, almost 5% before allowing for other factors. It is reduced slightly by allowing for background and then barely affected by the subsequent stages of analysis.

In Scotland (Table 10A), the contrast is greater again, 8.4% for men and 7.8% for women. Although somewhat reduced at each stage of analysis (although again allowing for examination performance is the exception for men), the final contrasts between truants and non-truants are greater than those for England and Wales. This may suggest that the difficulties for truants are greater in areas with more severe general economic problems.

However, these differences, particularly in England and Wales, amount to relatively small proportions of the total economically active time. Table 11 provides further confirmation that the unemployment histories of the truants are not markedly worse, in this case with respect to the mean length of any periods of unemployment. The raw average difference amounts to 1.5 months for men and 2.3 months for women, but this is reduced to a non-significant level when allowance is made for social background and ability (background alone for the women). The results for Scotland are similar (Table 11A).

12. Earnings and Income

Table 12 gives the results of analyses of weekly earnings in the first job. Of course, a straight comparison in ths respect would be extremely misleading because of the varied timing of entry into the labour market and the effects of inflation. These analyses are therefore limited to those who took their first job in 1974, when they were 16. Average differences in earnings at that time were not very large, with the truants in fact earning slightly more. For men the raw difference is not statistically significant, and is further reduced as, in particular, attendance rate and qualifications are allowed for. For women the initial differences are larger (again in favour of the former truants), but still only border on significance once social background is taken into account. The Scottish results show a similar pattern.

Results are very similar when the current earnings of those in employment are examined (Table 13). Among men, truants earn

slightly more on average and the difference is increased when other factors are taken into account, but is not statistically significant throughout these analyses. Among women, the raw difference in average earnings is quite large (just over 7 per week), and truants earn less. However, this is reduced to a few pence when social background and ability are taken into account, and the contrast is reversed, but still not statistically significant, when allowance is made for attendance and examination attainment.

These results cannot be taken to mean that those who had played truant are no worse off than others. As explained, they are limited to those currently working. The unemployed and those out of the labour force are therefore excluded, both accounting for disproportionate numbers of truants, as we saw in table 1. Furthermore, the meaning of a particular income will differ according to other circumstances. The same amount would feel quite different to, say, someone who is single and still living with their parents, and someone who is married, has children and is paying for their own home. The preliminary tables showed how the latter is more likely to be the situation at 23 of those who had played truant at school.

For these reasons, a better measure of current financial circumstances is provided by 'equivalent net family income' as examined in table 14. This measure takes into account income to the family (i.e. the unit of which the cohort member is head or joint head, thus not including parents etc if not yet established as an independent household) from all sources. This measure is then weighted according to the structure and size of the family, using the weightings (e.g. for children of different ages) incorporated in calculations of Supplementary Benefit.

On this measure truants are considerably less well off, almost 15 per week on average for men and 27 per wek for women. For both sexes, allowing for other factors reduces this considerably. For men, adjusting the comparison for social background alone brings it down to less than 10, which is no longer significant at the 5% level. For women, the contrast remains greater. It is for example still over 11 on average when comparing with those of similar background and tested ability. Allowing additionally for attendance and examination attainment reduces the difference to 6.75 per week and the borderline of statistical significance.

The more marked relationship between truancy and family income for women is confirmed by the Scottish analyses (Table 14A), although,

perhaps because of smaller numbers, it is also more compatible with chance variation.

13. Post-school Education and Training

The first variable examined in this area is a summary measure of whether the cohort member has experienced any education or training since leaving school (Table 15 - see introduction for an explanation of the definitions used to differentiate education and training).

Truants, of both sexes, are about one tenth as likely to have taken some educational course since leaving school, or about one fifth as likely to have done both this and undertaken work-related training. Male truants are about half as likely to have had just some training compared with their peers, and the relative odds for females are about three in four.

None of these figures are affected more than marginally by allowing for other factors. However, the small reduction in the contrast for women in the odds of having undertaken some training alone, once social background is allowed for, does result in a confidence interval which includes the value of one, i.e. we cannot discount the possibility of truants and non-truants being the same in this respect.

Not surprisingly, these differences in education and training are reflected in the qualifications obtained by the age of 23 (Table 16). At the extreme, truants of both sexes are between one twentieth and one tenth as likely to have obtained a degree level qualification. At a more moderate level, they are about one third (men) or one quarter (women) as likely to have obtained any qualification up to O-level standard. These contrasts are barely affected by adjusting for other factors.

14. Marriage and Family Formation

In interpreting some of the findings on employment histories, we have already suggested that the truants are progressing more rapidly through the major events and transitions of early adult life. Further evidence of this is provided by Tables 17 and 18. The

first of these is concerned with legal marital status, the second with current living situation. In table 17 we see that, compared with the non-truants, truants are just over half as likely to be single rather then married, whereas the equivalent figure for women is two-thirds. For men, it is only adjusting for background which reduces the contrast, and that only marginally. Although the same is true for women, the reduction is sufficient to bring the difference to the borderline of statistical significance.

The more dramatic figures in this table relate to the odds of being separated, divorced or widowed (and the last of these is of course very rare at this age). Although overall the number whose marriages have broken up by 23 is not large, as evidenced by the relatively large confidence intervals, the differences are highly significant; and suggest thst male truants are about twice as likely to have experienced a broken marriage by the age of twenty-three, and female truants more than three times as likely.

As would be expected, the findings for the odds of not being currently in a partnership ('lone' in Table 18) are similar to those of being single, since they are overwhelmingly the same group. However, some of the single (and some of the separated or divorced) were cohabiting at the time of the 23-year interview, and here there is a marked sex difference in the relationship with truancy. Male truants are slightly less likely to be cohabiting, but the dfference is not statistically significant. On the other hand, female truants are much more likely to be cohabiting than are the non-truants.

Further insight is provided in Table 19, which summarises analyses of current family type. Although we have seen fairly substantial differences in the likelihood of being married at 23, truants and non-truants differ only slightly in the likelihood of being married without children. There is a much greater contrast in the odds of being married with children and single with children (this last group includes the separated, divorced or widowed and those cohabiting). Female truants are particularly more likely to be in this last situation - as much as six or seven times more likely than non-truants. A small proportion of these differences are explained by social background, but there is no additional contribution from other factors in the analyses.

Tables 20 and 21 look further at the children of the cohort members, in terms of the cohort member's age when their first child was born, and the number of children they have had by the age of 23. For those men with children, truants are only about three

months younger on average at the time of the birth of their first child - a difference which is not statistically signficant and is further reduced when adjusted for other factors. Among women the initial difference is larger, about 10 months. Allowing for social background and 11-year ability reduces this to about 6 months, and allowing additionally for attendance and examination attainment brings it to a level which is no longer statistically significant.

Intriguingly, the results for the Scottish sample are very different (Table 20A), at least for the men. The numbers in this analysis are relatively small, the figures do suggest that in Scotland the male truants were as much as a year younger at the time of the birth of their first child. Allowing for other factors has no effect on this.

A sex difference and a regional contrast is also apparent in relation to the number of children in the family (Tables 21 and 21A). In England and Wales, male truants have slightly larger families, but after allowing for social background and attainment this is no longer statistically significant. For women, the difference is larger and remains significant, though substantially reduced by the other factors. The results for Scottish women are not very different, although the effect of other factors in explaining the difference associated with truancy is less. For Scottish men this difference is greater than for the English and Welsh and remains significant, though reduced, when other factors are taken into account.

15.Health and health-related behaviour

As can be seen in Table 22, truants of both sexes are considerably more likely to smoke and to smoke heavily. By contrast they differ hardly at all from truants in their drinking habits (Table 23). The confidence intervals indicate that the only noteworthy contrast is that female truants are more likely to report that they drink less often than once or twice a week or never, but even these differences are no longer significant once social background is taken into account.

Finally, the analysis reported in Table 24 is of scores on the 'Malaise Inventory', a screening instrument designed to detect tendency to depression. Differences are substantial for both sexes, with truants almost three times as likely to obtain scores above

the cut-off indicating depression. The effect on this of taking social background into account is small, and of other factors trivial.

16. Discussion

These findings have clearly demonstrated that young people who had been identified by their teachers as truanting from school at the age of 16 could be distinguished from others in terms of their characteristics and lifestyles in the years after leaving school and up to the age of 23. They have lower status occupations, less stable career patterns and more unemployment. It was perhaps predictable that they would be less likely to continue, or resume, their education, but they are also less likely to have experienced any work-related training and by 23 they have far fewer qualifications than others of their age. Among those who are working, their incomes from employment are not lower (indeed among men they are a little higher), but they are considerably less well off once their family situation is taken into account. Furthermore, their apparently high earnings are probably somewhat artificial as they are mainly in manual jobs and at or near the peak of their earning power, while many of their peers, particularly those who have not long finished their education, will substantially increase their earnings as they grow older.

Their differences are not limited to occupational experiences. They tend to marry and have children at an earlier age and by 23 they have more children. They are by this age considerably more likely to be separated or divorced, often with children in their care.

Although, because of small numbers, it was not possible to confirm this through multivariate analysis, the simpler relationships in the preliminary analyses suggest that such differences are even more marked for those who had additionally been identified by their teachers as truanting towards the end of their primary schooling.

17. The role of social background

However, it is known that truants are drawn disproportionately from children of less advantaged backgrounds and of lower ability (12). It would be possible that this alone might explain some or all of the above; that truants are no different when they are compared with other young people of similar backgrounds and ability. The analyses described above were designed in part to assess whether this was the case. In fact they suggest that these factors do explain some part of the differences in the early adult situations of truants and non-truants, but generally only a small part. The two areas where it does appear that the raw differences are largely accounted for in this way are unemployment history (as distinct from current unemployment at 23) and income. For example, on what is probably the most useful unemployment history measure - time unemployed as a proportion of economically active time - initial differences were fairly small (truants having been unemployed for about 2% more of their economically active lives), and the small reduction when social background was allowed for was sufficient to make this no longer statistically significant. Raw differences in family income showed truants much less well off at 23, but, for men only, this was not at a statistically significant level once social background was taken into account. Female truants do, however, appear to have considerably lower family incomes than others of similar background and tested ability.

For most outcome variables this was the pattern, with social background contributing not at all to explaining the contrasts between truants and non-truants, or a small amount which still left a substantial and significant difference between the two groups.

The contrasts in occupational experience are substantially in agreement with those found by Cherry (13) for the cohort born in 1946, despite the changes which there would have been in the labour market in the intervening twelve years. As for the 1958 cohort, she found that former truants reported less job satisfaction and changed jobs more frequently, but that their average earnings were not lower. In this last respect both studies contradict the American findings of Robins and Ratcliffe (14).

18.Truancy or Absenteeism

Some previous research in this area has not made the distinction between truancy and absenteeism (e.g. (14)). It has also been suggested that the distinction is not important in the context of subsequent effects, as it is missing school, irrespective of the reasons, that leads to subsequent problems (15).

If this were the case, then we should expect to find that, after adjusting for differences in background and ability, further adjustments for attendance rate would explain any remaining differences between truants and non-truants. In other words, we would be testing whether truants differ in their outcomes from others whose attendance was equally poor, but who were not labelled truants.

Our analyses offer little support for such a hypothesis. The effect on the contrast between truants and non-truants of allowing for attendance rate in the Autumn term of the final compulsory year is not consistent and rarely more than trivial. In no case did it prove to explain a previously significant difference. Thus, it does seem that truants are distinct from other poor attenders in terms of their early adult outcomes.

It has not been possible to examine a full attendance history, but only that in one term. However, in view of its near negligible contribution, and the high correlation with attendance at earlier stages (16), it does not seem likely that a fuller history would have led to a different conclusion.

19.End of School Qualifications

Absence from school, particularly in the final years, is associated with depressed attainment (17). Truants do leave school with fewer qualifications. It does appear likely that subsequent difficulties in the labour market could result from this, as was claimed by Gray, Smith and Rutter (18).

The NCDS findings do not support this. Allowing for end-of-school qualifications does have some effect on labour market outcomes associated with truancy, but not substantial nor sufficient to explain the differences found. Indeed for two of the main indicators of employment experience, average job length and

proportion of economically active time unemployed, the introduction of qualifications into the analysis increased the contrast between truants and the rest. Former truants appear to have more unemployment and job instability than others of similar social background and ability who leave school with similar qualifications (or, more commonly, similarly unqualified).

20. Explanations of Truancy

The underlying purpose of these analyses has been to attempt to cast light on competing explanations for truancy from school.

The results do not seem compatible with those explanations which suggest that the truant has simply outgrown school and that he is ready for the world of work. The evidence presented here does not suggest that he has no further problems once school is behind him and that he progresses smoothly and happily through employment. On the contrary, he experiences more unemployment, more job changes and less job satisfaction. At the age of 23 he is more than twice as likely to be unemployed, and the average duration of each job held is nine months less for men and eleven months less for women. These last figures are particularly striking when we bear in mind that they left school and entered employment at most seven years previously.

A more subtle explanation might have been that the difficulties encountered by the former truants are the result of their more accelerated rate of progress through the major events and transitions of early adulthood. This is most apparent in other areas of their lives. They were married at an earlier age, were younger when they had their first child and had more children by the age of 23. In these respects they are showing a more extreme version of the pattern of other young people of similar background. Further evidence that such patterns may be largely culturally determined is perhaps provided by the greater contrasts on these measures between truants and non-truants in Scotland.

Even the higher rates of marital breakdown of the truants may be compatible with their having reached this stage at an earlier age; their peers may experience similar problems as they grow older. However, when male former truants are twice as likely to have experienced marital breakdown, and females three times as likely, it does not seem probable that these are difficulties only temporarily greater than those of their peers.

On the contrary, it seems more reasonable to interpret this as one symptom of their generally greater problems in adult life. A further important sign of this, in addition to their employment difficulties, is their high scores on the 'Malaise' inventory. Although not synonymous with clinical depression, scores above the conventional cut-off do indicate a greater likelihood of depression and were more than twice as frequent for the truants.

Such outcomes do seem more compatible with the explanations proffered by those who characterise truancy as evidence of psychological problems (19). Perhaps the 'reluctant adolescent' (20) has grown up to be a reluctant adult.

This is not to suggest that the problem is located solely in the individual. If truants have difficulty coping with life, this may be the result of what life is like at least as much as what they are like. The school system may be such, through internal organisation, competitive examinations etc, that some individuals will inevitably feel unvalued and alienated. This study has shown that there are continuities in this respect with adult life, and that the difficulties experienced by those who withdraw from school are greater than would be predicted by their school failure alone.

21. Some Practical Implications

This interpretation does imply that there are limits to what schools can do, at the institutional level, to reduce truancy levels and their impact. Particularly in the present educational climate, it is not realistic to expect that schools can structure themselves or their curricula in a way that will ensure a successful and fulfilling experience for every one of their pupils. (Moves towards greater uniformity in the curriculum, for example, do not appear likely to be helpful in this respect.)

This is not to imply that schools and their supporting services should ignore truancy. On the contrary, these findings do show that for the individual they are often a sign of more general and longer-term difficulties. Of course, schools with high truancy levels should examine themselves and look to the literature on school effectiveness for ideas as to how this might be improved. But beyond this, the individual act of truancy should be taken as a sign that some help is needed. Most certainly it should not be ignored on the grounds that the individual has merely outgrown

school.

Firstly, it is a predictor of employment problems, and of a more severe kind than will be experienced by others who share the disadvantaged background and low attainment which typify the truant. This emphasises the need for individual careers counselling, probably additional to what the school would normally provide. It is not difficult to envisage the difficulties for a careers teacher or a local authority employment officer of providing guidance to those who are frequently not in school, but the collective effort must be made. And since the school or teacher concerned may have lost the confidence or trust of that pupil, this may well imply the need for additional, external resources.

Secondly, just as schools do not exist solely in order to prepare people for employment, so are the difficulties of truants not limited to their careers. Seven years after leaving school, former truants are considerably more likely to be suffering from depression and to have experienced marital breakdown. Of course, we cannot rule out the possibility that these are the consequences of their unemployment, low status occupations and relative poverty, but the pattern of these findings appears more compatible with the suggestion that such outcomes have a common cause. At the very least, schools should be aware that truancy may be a sign of wider problems, and be sensitive to the possible need to involve both internal and external guidance services at an early stage.

Above all, truancy should not be perceived as solely a problem of school discipline. Not only is such an approach likely to increase the disaffection of the pupils concerned, but the pressures in schools are such that it will then only receive serious attention when the school is unable to cope. The absence of a truant is not directly contributing to disruption in the classroom (it may even reduce it); and the temptation to condone it if the end of compulsory schooling is near is understandable. That may make life easier within the school, but it will be at the expense of the quality of the continuing life of that pupil, and of their future family.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to the ESRC who funded this study, and to our colleagues in the Social Statistics Research Unit, City University, for their advice and support, particularly Orly Manor for her guidance on the statistical analysis.

FOOTNOTES

(1) A.Hibbett (1987) Early adult outcomes of truancy. NCDS User Support Group Working Paper no. 24, City University.

(2) K. Fogelman & K.Richardson (1974) School attendance: some results from the National Child Development Study, in B. Turner (ed) Truancy Ward Lock Educational.

K.Fogelman, A.Tibbenham & L.Lambert (1980) Absence from school: findings from the National Child Development Study, in L.Hersov & I.Berg (eds) Out of School John Wiley & Sons

(3) K.Fogelman (1978) 'School attendance, attainment and behaviour' B.J.Ed.Psych.,48,2,148-158

(4) G.Gray, A.Smith & M.Rutter (1980) School attendance and the first year of employment' in Hersov & Berg, op. cit.

(5) For general information on NCDS, see:

N.R.Butler & D.G.Bonham (1963) Perinatal Mortality Livingstone

R.Davie, N.R.Butler & H.Goldstein (1972) From Birth to Seven Longman

K.Fogelman (ed) (1983) Growing Up in Great Britain MacMillan

P.Shepherd (1985) The National Child Development Study: an introduction to the origins of the study and the methods of data collection. NCDS User Support Group Working Paper no. 1, City University

(6) For details of the behaviour scales, see:

M.Rutter, J.Tizard & K.Whitmore (1970) Education, Health and Behaviour Longman

(7) For further information on these tests, see Fogelman (1983 op cit)

(8) For information on the construction of this measure, see:

P.Shepherd (1984) Earnings, income and other aspects of the financial circumstances of the NCDS Cohort at 23. NCDS4 Working Paper no 19, NCDS User Support Group, City University.

(9) M.Rutter, J.Tizard, W.Yule & P.Graham (1976) 'Isle of Wight studies: 1964-1974' Psych. Medicine, 6,313-332.

N.Richman (1978) 'Depression in mothers of young children' J. Royal Soc. Med., 71, 489-493

(10) R.Iyer (1984) Analysis of response. NCDS4 Working Paper no 25, NCDS User Support Group, City University.

H. Goldstein (1983) A study of response rates of 16-year-olds in the National Child Development Study in Fogelman (1983 op cit)

(11) K.Kiernan (1986) Transitions in young adulthood. NCDS User Support Group Working Paper no 16, City University

(12) D. Farrington (1980) 'Truancy, delinquency, the home and the school', in L. Hersov and I. Berg (op cit)

K.Fogelman & K.Richardson (op cit)

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools (1978) Truancy and Behavioural Problems in some Urban Schools HMSO

(13) N. Cherry (1976) 'Persistent job changing - is it a problem?' J. Occ. Psych., 49, 203-221

(14) L.N. Robins & K.S.Ratcliffe (1980) The long term outcome of truancy in Hersov & Berg (op cit)

(15) Robins & Ratcliffe (op cit)

K. Reid (1985) Truancy and School Absenteeism Hodder and Stoughton

(16) Hibbett (1987 op cit)

(17) M. J. Tyerman (1968) Truancy University of London Press

P. Tyrer & S. Tyrer (1974) 'School refusal, truancy and adult neurotic illness' Psych. Medicine, 4, 416-421

(18) G. Haigh (1976) The Reluctant Adolescent Temple Smith

Table 1 : Economic Status (England and Wales) (Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2806)

Odds relative to 'Work'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

		Adjusted for :			
		Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications at 16+
Full-time Education	.45 (.22/.90)	.55 (.27/1.12)	.57 (.26/1.26)	.58 (.26/1.31)	.59 (.26/1.33)
Unemployed	2.37 (1.84/3.14)	2.03 (1.54/2.68)	2.04 (1.54/2.71)	2.05 (1.54/2.72)	2.04 (1.53/2.71)
Out of Labour Force	1.43 (.74/2.77)	1.56 (.79/3.11)	1.60 (.76/3.39)	1.62 (.76/3.45)	1.60 (.75/3.41)

WOMEN (2843)

Odds relative to 'Work'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

		Adjusted for :			
		Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications at 16+
Full-time Education	.46 (.12/1.76)	.54 (.12/2.51)	.52 (.09/2.93)	.53 (.10/2.66)	.61 (.13/2.81)
Unemployed	2.76 (1.90/4.00)	2.32 (1.57/3.41)	2.42 (1.63/3.57)	2.42 (1.64/3.59)	2.41 (1.63/3.56)
Out of Labour Force	3.29 (2.62/4.14)	2.59 (2.04/3.28)	2.67 (2.08/3.43)	2.68 (2.09/3.44)	2.56 (1.99/3.31)

Table 2 : Social Class of First Job (England and Wales)
(Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2678)

Odds relative to 'Unskilled Manual' (V)
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

		Back-ground	AND	Educ. Ability at 11	AND	Atten-dance at 15	AND	Qualifi-cations at 16
I + II	.11 (.06/.18)	.15 (.09/.26)		.15 (.09/.27)		.16 (.09/.29)		.16 (.09/.28)
III + IV Non-Manual	.19 (.13/.29)	.26 (.17/.40)		.27 (.17/.41)		.28 (.18/.43)		.27 (.17/.43)
III + IV Manual	.68 (.50/.93)	.73 (.53/1.01)		.74 (.54/1.02)		.74 (.54/1.03)		.77 (.55/1.07)

WOMEN (2794)

Odds relative to 'Unskilled Manual'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

		Back-ground	AND	Educ. Ability at 11	AND	Atten-dance at 15	AND	Qualifi-cations at 16
I + II	.05 (.02/.15)	.09 (.03/.27)		.10 (.03/.29)		.07 (.02/.20)		.07 (.02/.21)
III + IV Non-Manual	.25 (.11/.56)	.34 (.14/.79)		.36 (.15/.87)		.37 (.16/.87)		.37 (.16/.89)
III + IV Manual	.73 (.33/1.64)	.85 (.36/2.00)		.87 (.36/2.12)		.89 (.38/2.07)		.89 (.38/2.09)

Table 3 : Social Class of Current Job (England and Wales)

(Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2666)

Odds relative to 'Unskilled Manual' (V)
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

		Back-ground	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability at 11	Educ. Ability AND Atten-dance at 15	Atten-dance AND Qualifi-cations at 16+
I + II	.12 (.08/.20)	.18 (.11/.29)	.18 (.11/.29)	.17 (.10/.29)	.17 (.10/.29)
III + IV Non-Manual	.11 (.07/.18)	.15 (.09/.25)	.15 (.09/.26)	.15 (.09/.26)	.16 (.09/.26)
III + IV Manual	.59 (.41/.85)	.66 (.45/.96)	.65 (.45/.96)	.64 (.43/.94)	.64 (.43/.95)

WOMEN (2778)

Odds relative to 'Unskilled Manual'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

		Back-ground	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability at 11	Educ. Ability AND Atten-dance at 15	Atten-dance AND Qualifi-cations at 16+
I + II	.07 (.04/.13)	.11 (.06/.21)	.13 (.06/.28)	.13 (.06/.28)	.12 (.05/.26)
III + IV Non-Manual	.12 (.07/.22)	.16 (.09/.30)	.16 (.08/.32)	.16 (.08/.31)	.16 (.08/.32)
III + IV Manual	.51 (.28/.90)	.53 (.29/.96)	.55 (.28/1.06)	.54 (.28/1.05)	.56 (.29/1.10)

Table 4 : Number of Full- and Parttime Jobs (England and Wales)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (2815)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (525)	1.09	0.99	0.87	0.74	0.57
Not Truant (2290)	-0.25	-0.23	-0.20	-0.17	-0.13
Mean Difference	1.34	1.22	1.07	0.91	0.70
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.01

WOMEN (2848)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (398)	0.51	0.53	0.49	0.42	0.33
Not Truant (2450)	-0.08	-0.09	-0.08	-0.07	-0.05
Mean Difference	0.59	0.62	0.57	0.49	0.38
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Table 4A : Number of Full- and Parttime Jobs (Scotland)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (388)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (92)	0.91	0.78	0.52	0.39	0.23
Not Truant (296)	-0.28	-0.24	-0.16	-0.12	-0.07
Mean Difference	1.19	1.02	0.68	0.51	0.30
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.005	0.02	0.11

WOMEN (438)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (73)	0.59	0.45	0.38	0.30	0.20
Not Truant (365)	-0.12	-0.09	-0.08	-0.06	-0.04
Mean Difference	0.71	0.54	0.46	0.36	0.24
Signif. of F-Value	<0.005	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.14

Table 5 : Total Months in Full- and Parttime Jobs (England and Wales)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (2514)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (397)	13.01	9.57	4.28	3.62	-2.18
Not Truant (2117)	-2.44	-1.79	-0.80	-0.68	0.41
Mean Difference	15.45	11.36	5.08	4.30	2.59
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.001	0.01	0.02	0.41

WOMEN (2620)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (349)	-1.25	-3.30	-6.51	-6.77	-10.10
Not Truant (2271)	0.19	0.51	1.00	1.04	1.55
Mean Difference	1.43	3.81	7.51	7.81	11.65
Signif. of F-Value	0.09	0.91*	0.14	0.09	0.001

* This is due to a significant interaction between truancy and social class in this instance.

Table 5A : Total Months in Full- and Parttime Jobs (Scotland)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (342)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (71)	8.09	4.77	-1.24	1.71	-5.35
Not Truant (271)	-2.12	-1.25	0.32	-0.45	1.40
Mean Difference	10.21	6.02	1.56	2.16	6.75
Signif. of F-Value	0.01	0.22	0.85	0.71	0.04

WOMEN (398)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (62)	-1.67	-3.64	-5.65	-3.89	-6.58
Not Truant (336)	0.31	0.67	1.04	0.72	1.21
Mean Difference	1.98	4.31	6.69	4.61	7.79
Signif. of F-Value	0.68	0.47	0.23	0.44	0.19

Table 6 : Mean Length of All Full- and Parttime Jobs (Months)

(England and Wales) (Analysis of Variance)

MEN (2666)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (499)	-3.48	-4.01	-5.70	-4.62	-7.31
Not Truant (2167)	0.80	0.92	1.31	1.06	1.68
Mean Difference	4.28	4.93	7.01	5.68	8.99
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.17	0.02	0.09	<0.005

WOMEN (2689)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (368)	-5.97	-7.20	-8.92	-8.08	-9.70
Not Truant (2321)	0.95	1.14	1.41	1.28	1.54
Mean Difference	6.92	8.34	10.33	9.36	11.24
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.005	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Table 6A : Mean Length of All Full- and Parttime Jobs (Months)

(Scotland) (Analysis of Variance)

MEN (362)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (84)	-4.11	-4.26	-4.46	-0.71	-2.60
Not Truant (278)	1.24	1.29	1.35	0.21	0.78
Mean Difference	5.35	5.55	5.81	0.92	3.38
Signif. of F-Value	0.10	0.18	0.17	0.57	0.23

WOMEN (413)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (68)	-8.21	-7.67	-8.20	-6.30	-7.33
Not Truant (345)	1.62	1.51	1.62	1.24	1.44
Mean Difference	9.83	9.18	9.82	7.54	8.77
Signif. of F-Value	<0.005	0.10	0.07	0.19	0.13

Table 7 : Satisfaction in Current Job (England and Wales)

(Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2379)

Odds relative to 'Satisfied'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	AND	Educ. Ability at 11	AND	Atten-dance at 15	AND	Qualifi-cations at 16+
Neither	1.36 (.97/1.91)		1.36 (.96/1.92)		1.37 (.96/1.95)		1.40 (.99/1.99)		1.42 (1.00/2.01)
Dissatisfied	1.43 (1.08/1.91)		1.39 (1.03/1.86)		1.36 (1.00/1.84)		1.33 (.97/1.83)		1.36 (.98/1.88)

WOMEN (1877)

Odds relative to 'Satisfied'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	AND	Educ. Ability at 11	AND	Atten-dance at 15	AND	Qualifi-cations at 16+
Neither	1.34 (.78/2.30)		1.38 (.79/2.40)		1.39 (.79/2.45)		1.47 (.82/2.64)		1.47 (.82/2.64)
Dissatisfied	1.25 (.80/1.97)		1.28 (.81/2.02)		1.25 (.78/2.01)		1.37 (.83/2.26)		1.37 (.82/2.28)

Table 8 : Satisfaction in Last Job (England and Wales)

(Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (360)

Odds relative to 'Satisfied'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	AND	Educ. Ability at 11	AND	Atten-dance at 15	AND	Qualifi-cations at 16+
Neither	.97 (.52/1.80)		1.13 (.58/2.19)		1.02 (.52/1.98)		1.16 (.67/2.01)		1.36 (.80/2.33)
Dissatisfied	.85 (.54/1.36)		.95 (.59/1.56)		.94 (.58/1.53)		.93 (.59/1.48)		.96 (.61/1.51)

WOMEN (912)

Odds relative to 'Satisfied'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	AND	Educ. Ability at 11	AND	Atten-dance at 15	AND	Qualifi-cations at 16+
Neither	2.15 (1.29/3.58)		2.78 (1.61/4.82)		2.49 (1.36/4.59)		2.49 (1.40/4.45)		2.48 (1.41/4.38)
Dissatisfied	1.24 (.85/1.83)		1.40 (.94/2.08)		1.30 (.84/2.03)		1.33 (.87/2.05)		1.33 (.87/2.03)

Table 9 : Total Months Unemployed (England and Wales)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (2814)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (524)	3.43	2.79	2.44	1.99	1.87
Not Truant (2290)	-0.79	-0.64	-0.56	-0.46	-0.43
Mean Difference	4.22	3.43	3.00	2.45	2.30
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

WOMEN (2846)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (396)	2.96	2.22	1.82	1.45	1.31
Not Truant (2450)	-0.48	-0.36	-0.29	-0.23	-0.21
Mean Difference	3.44	2.58	2.11	1.68	1.52
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Table 9A : Total Months Unemployed (Scotland)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (388)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (92)	7.35	6.06	4.44	2.06	2.31
Not Truant (296)	-2.29	-1.88	-1.38	-0.64	-0.72
Mean Difference	9.64	7.94	5.82	2.70	3.03
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.001	0.001	0.04	0.02

WOMEN (438)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (73)	4.51	3.84	3.22	2.01	1.88
Not Truant (365)	-0.90	-0.77	-0.64	-0.40	-0.38
Mean Difference	5.41	4.61	3.86	2.41	2.26
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.005	0.01	0.07	0.08

Table 10: Total Time Unemployed as Percent of Economically Active Time

(England and Wales) (Analysis of Variance)

MEN (2767)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (518)	1.59	1.36	1.86	1.18	2.55
Not Truant (2249)	-0.37	-0.31	-0.43	-0.27	-0.59
Mean Difference	1.96	1.67	2.29	1.45	3.14
Signif. of F-Value	0.005	0.28	0.12	0.28	0.03

WOMEN (2806)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (393)	4.09	3.30	3.41	2.98	3.19
Not Truant (2413)	-0.67	-0.54	-0.56	-0.49	-0.52
Mean Difference	4.76	3.84	3.97	3.47	3.71
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.01	0.005	0.01	0.01

Table 10A: Total Time Unemployed as Percent of Economically Active Time

(Scotland) (Analysis of Variance)

MEN (380)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (90)	6.41	5.40	5.21	2.51	4.23
Not Truant (290)	-1.99	-1.68	-1.62	-0.78	-1.31
Mean Difference	8.40	7.08	6.83	3.29	5.54
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.05	0.04	0.20	0.04

WOMEN (430)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (73)	6.47	5.81	5.29	3.98	3.91
Not Truant (357)	-1.32	-1.19	-1.08	-0.81	-0.80
Mean Difference	7.79	7.00	6.37	4.79	4.71
Signif. of F-Value	0.001	0.01	0.02	0.07	0.07

Table 11 : Mean Length of All Unemployment Spells (Months)

(England and Wales) (Analysis of Variance)

MEN (1251)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (308)	1.13	0.87	0.50	0.42	0.33
Not Truant (943)	-0.37	-0.28	-0.16	-0.14	-0.11
Mean Difference	1.50	1.15	0.66	0.56	0.44
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.01	0.07	0.08	0.11

WOMEN (1171)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (202)	1.90	1.27	0.88	0.36	0.21
Not Truant (969)	-0.40	-0.27	-0.18	-0.07	-0.04
Mean Difference	2.30	1.54	1.06	0.43	0.25
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.07	0.20	0.78	0.98

Table 11A : Mean Length of All Unemployment Spells (Months) (Scotland)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (196)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for :			
		Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (67)	1.53	1.31	0.82	0.25	0.42
Not Truant (129)	-0.80	-0.68	-0.42	-0.13	-0.22
Mean Difference	2.33	1.99	1.24	0.38	0.64
Signif. of F-Value	<0.005	0.04	0.17	0.38	0.26

WOMEN (193)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for :			
		Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (45)	2.14	2.03	1.73	0.69	0.68
Not Truant (148)	-0.65	-0.62	-0.52	-0.21	-0.21
Mean Difference	2.79	2.65	2.25	0.90	0.89
Signif. of F-Value	0.18	0.23	0.33	0.57	0.58

Table 12 : First Job (1974 only) - Pay Per Week (£s)

(England and Wales) (Analysis of Variance)

MEN (1705)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for :			
		Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (472)	0.51	0.51	0.44	0.23	0.11
Not Truant (1233)	-0.20	-0.20	-0.17	-0.09	-0.04
Mean Difference	0.71	0.71	0.61	0.32	0.15
Signif. of F-Value	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.16	0.19

WOMEN (1472)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for :			
		Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (324)	1.13	1.03	1.03	0.83	0.64
Not Truant (1148)	-0.32	-0.29	-0.29	-0.23	-0.18
Mean Difference	1.45	1.32	1.32	1.06	0.82
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.05	0.05	0.09	0.18

Table 12A : First Job (1974 only) - Pay Per Week (£s) (Scotland)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (240)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (82)	0.71	0.57	0.39	0.39	0.22
Not Truant (158)	-0.37	-0.30	-0.20	-0.20	-0.11
Mean Difference	1.08	0.87	0.59	0.59	0.33
Signif. of F-Value	0.48	0.70	0.65	0.64	0.52

WOMEN (232)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (60)	5.12	5.58	5.49	5.81	5.44
Not Truant (172)	-1.79	-1.95	-1.92	-2.03	-1.90
Mean Difference	6.91	7.53	7.41	7.84	7.34
Signif. of F-Value	<0.005	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.17

Table 13 : Current Job - Pay Per Week (£s) (England and Wales)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (2285)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (394)	1.38	1.75	2.63	2.58	2.07
Not Truant (1891)	-0.29	-0.36	-0.55	-0.54	-0.43
Mean Difference	1.67	2.11	3.18	3.12	2.50
Signif. of F-Value	0.52	0.40	0.62	0.58	0.49

WOMEN (1833)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (166)	-6.41	-4.27	-0.24	0.80	1.84
Not Truant (1667)	0.64	0.42	0.02	-0.08	-0.18
Mean Difference	7.05	4.69	0.26	0.88	2.02
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.001	0.11	0.23	0.39

Table 13A : Current Job - Pay Per Week (£s) (Scotland)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (300)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (62)	5.87	3.73	4.95	7.33	6.78
Not Truant (238)	-1.53	-0.97	-1.29	-1.91	-1.77
Mean Difference	7.40	4.70	6.24	9.24	8.55
Signif. of F-Value	0.06	0.58	0.43	0.23	0.31

WOMEN (273)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (27)	-10.54	-7.98	-3.44	0.58	1.25
Not Truant (246)	1.16	0.88	0.38	-0.06	-0.14
Mean Difference	11.70	8.86	3.82	0.64	1.39
Signif. of F-Value	0.05	0.23	0.33	0.75	0.80

Table 14 : Equivalent Net Family Income (£s) (England and Wales)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (2658)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (498)	-12.04	-7.95	-6.03	-3.49	-4.81
Not Truant (2160)	2.78	1.83	1.39	0.81	1.11
Mean Difference	14.82	9.78	7.42	4.30	5.92
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.13	0.27	0.55	0.42

WOMEN (2751)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (386)	-23.28	-16.52	-9.67	-7.85	-5.80
Not Truant (2365)	3.80	2.70	1.58	1.28	0.95
Mean Difference	27.08	19.22	11.25	9.13	6.75
Signif. of F-Value	>0.001	>0.001	0.01	0.03	0.05

Table 14A : Equivalent Net Family Income (£s) (Scotland)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (359)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (85)	-14.49	-11.83	-5.50	0.26	0.16
Not Truant (274)	4.49	3.67	1.71	-0.08	-0.05
Mean Difference	18.98	15.50	7.21	0.34	0.21
Signif. of F-Value	<0.005	0.26	0.68	0.89	0.86

WOMEN (432)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (73)	-23.61	-20.31	-14.63	-8.80	-6.91
Not Truant (359)	4.80	4.13	2.98	1.79	1.41
Mean Difference	28.41	24.44	17.61	10.59	8.32
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.04	0.10	0.37	0.46

Table 15 : Education, Apprenticeship, Training (England and Wales)

(Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2814)

Odds relative to 'None'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

	Adjusted for :				
		Back-ground AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Atten-dance AND at 15	Qualifi-cations at 16 +
Training/ Apprenticeship	.55 (.42/.73)	.64 (.48/.85)	.63 (.47/.85)	.63 (.47/.85)	.64 (.48/.86)
Training/Education	.22 (.16/.29)	.28 (.20/.38)	.28 (.20/.38)	.28 (.20/.38)	.30 (.21/.42)
Just Education	.07 (.05/.12)	.11 (.07/.18)	.11 (.06/.18)	.11 (.06/.18)	.13 (.07/.23)

WOMEN (2848)

Odds relative to 'None'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

	Adjusted for :				
		Back-ground AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Atten-dance AND at 15	Qualifi-cations at 16+
Training/ Apprenticeship	.73 (.56/.96)	.79 (.60/1.04)	.80 (.60/1.06)	.80 (.61/1.06)	.81 (.62/1.08)
Training/Education	.23 (.17/.32)	.30 (.22/.42)	.30 (.21/.43)	.30 (.21/.44)	.30 (.21/.43)
Just Education	.11 (.08/.16)	.16 (.11/.24)	.17 (.12/.25)	.17 (.12/.26)	.17 (.11/.25)

Table 16 : Qualifications (England and Wales) (Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2815)

Odds relative to 'None'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability at 11	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability AND Atten-dance at 15	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability AND Atten-dance AND Qualifi-cations at 16+
Degree level	.05 (.03/.08)	.07 (.04/.11)	.10 (.06/.17)	.10 (.06/.17)	.07 (.04/.14)
A-levels/ONC/TEC or equivalent	.15 (.11/.21)	.19 (.14/.26)	.24 (.17/.34)	.24 (.16/.35)	.22 (.15/.33)
O-levels/CSE/Other	.31 (.25/.39)	.36 (.29/.46)	.41 (.32/.52)	.40 (.32/.52)	.40 (.31/.51)

WOMEN (2848)

Odds relative to 'None'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability at 11	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability AND Atten-dance at 15	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability AND Atten-dance AND Qualifi-cations at 16+
Degree level	.08 (.05/.12)	.08 (.04/.13)	.08 (.04/.15)	.08 (.04/.16)	.09 (.05/.19)
A-levels/ONC/TEC or equivalent	.12 (.08/.19)	.10 (.06/.18)	.11 (.05/.22)	.11 (.05/.23)	.11 (.05/.25)
O-levels/CSE/Other	.22 (.17/.28)	.25 (.20/.32)	.26 (.20/.33)	.26 (.20/.34)	.26 (.21/.34)

Table 17 : Marital Status (England and Wales) (Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2815)

Odds relative to 'Married'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability at 11	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability AND Atten-dance at 15	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability AND Atten-dance AND Qualifi-cations at 16+
Single	.58 (.47/.70)	.66 (.54/.81)	.64 (.52/.79)	.64 (.52/.79)	.64 (.52/.80)
Separated/ Divorced/Widowed	2.19 (1.31/3.68)	2.07 (1.21/3.54)	1.99 (1.12/3.52)	2.00 (1.13/3.54)	2.01 (1.12/3.61)

WOMEN (2848)

Odds relative to 'Married'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability at 11	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability AND Atten-dance at 15	Back-ground AND Educ. Ability AND Atten-dance AND Qualifi-cations at 16+
Single	.67 (.53/.84)	.78 (.61/.99)	.79 (.61/1.02)	.82 (.63/1.08)	.78 (.58/1.06)
Separated/ Divorced/Widowed	3.50 (2.43/5.05)	3.57 (2.42/5.26)	3.44 (2.34/5.08)	3.33 (2.25/4.93)	3.40 (2.28/5.07)

Table 18 : Partnership Status (England and Wales) (Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2815)

Odds relative to 'Married'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	AND	Educ. Ability at 11	AND	Atten-dance at 15	AND	Qualifi-cations at 16+
Lone	.60 (.49/.73)		.68 (.56/.84)		.66 (.53/.81)		.66 (.53/.81)		.66 (.53/.81)
Cohabiting	.82 (.54/1.25)		.96 (.62/1.47)		.86 (.55/1.36)		.87 (.55/1.38)		.87 (.55/1.38)

WOMEN (2848)

Odds relative to 'Married'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	AND	Educ. Ability at 11	AND	Atten-dance	AND	Qualifi-cations at 16+
Lone	.77 (.61/.96)		.88 (.70/1.12)		.89 (.69/1.14)		.87 (.68/1.13)		.81 (.62/1.07)
Cohabiting	1.62 (1.14/2.28)		1.86 (1.29/2.70)		1.96 (1.36/2.83)		1.90 (1.30/2.80)		1.79 (1.21/2.66)

Table 19 : Family Type (England and Wales) (Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2815)

Odds relative to 'Single (incl. Separated/Divorced/Widowed) No Children'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Background	Background AND Educ. Ability at 11	Background AND Educ. Ability at 11 AND Attendance at 15	Background AND Educ. Ability at 11 AND Attendance at 15 AND Qualifications at 16+
Single with Children	2.65 (1.46/4.80)	2.07 (1.12/3.82)	2.22 (1.25/3.95)	2.76 (1.62/4.70)	2.83 (1.66/4.83)
Married With Children	2.64 (2.07/3.39)	2.08 (1.61/2.69)	2.41 (1.84/3.14)	2.53 (1.94/3.29)	2.47 (1.88/3.23)
Married No Children	1.21 (.95/1.54)	1.15 (.90/1.47)	1.16 (.90/1.48)	1.15 (.90/1.47)	1.14 (.89/1.45)

WOMEN (2848)

Odds relative to 'Single No Children'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Background	Background AND Educ. Ability at 11	Background AND Educ. Ability at 11 AND Attendance at 15	Background AND Educ. Ability at 11 AND Attendance at 15 AND Qualifications at 16+
Single with Children	7.55 (5.21/10.93)	5.67 (3.86/8.35)	6.10 (4.00/9.28)	6.06 (3.95/9.28)	6.06 (3.93/9.34)
Married With Children	3.09 (2.38/4.02)	2.27 (1.73/2.97)	2.28 (1.70/3.07)	2.28 (1.70/3.06)	2.28 (1.65/3.14)
Married No Children	.74 (.53/1.04)	.73 (.52/1.03)	.74 (.52/1.04)	.74 (.52/1.04)	.74 (.52/1.05)

Table 20 : Age at Birth of First Child (England and Wales)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (441)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (150)	-0.15	-0.10	-0.13	-0.06	-0.07
Not Truant (291)	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.04
Mean Difference	0.23	0.15	0.20	0.09	0.11
Signif. of F-Value	0.10	0.30	0.23	0.40	0.41

WOMEN (919)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (250)	-0.64	-0.47	-0.40	-0.34	-0.25
Not Truant (669)	0.24	0.17	0.15	0.13	0.09
Mean Difference	0.88	0.64	0.55	0.47	0.34
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.02	0.04	0.09	0.31

Table 20A : Age at Birth of First Child (Scotland)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (86)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (36)	-0.61	-0.61	-0.59	-0.55	-0.56
Not Truant (50)	0.44	0.44	0.43	0.40	0.40
Mean Difference	1.05	1.05	1.02	0.95	0.96
Signif. of F-Value	<0.005	<0.005	0.01	0.02	0.02

WOMEN (146)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (48)	-0.67	-0.63	-0.57	-0.38	-0.29
Not Truant (98)	0.33	0.31	0.28	0.18	0.14
Mean Difference	1.00	0.94	0.85	0.56	0.43
Signif. of F-Value	<0.005	0.49	0.71	0.98	0.74

Table 21 : Number of Children in Family (England and Wales)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (2815)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (525)	0.15	0.12	0.10	0.06	0.05
Not Truant (2290)	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01
Mean Difference	0.18	0.15	0.12	0.07	0.06
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	0.01	0.17	0.70	0.87

WOMEN (2848)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (398)	0.50	0.38	0.30	0.22	0.19
Not Truant (2450)	-0.08	-0.06	-0.05	-0.04	-0.03
Mean Difference	0.58	0.44	0.35	0.26	0.22
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.005	0.02

Table 21A : Number of Children in Family (Scotland)

(Analysis of Variance)

MEN (388)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (92)	0.25	0.19	0.14	0.15	0.14
Not Truant (296)	-0.08	-0.06	-0.04	-0.05	-0.04
Mean Difference	0.33	0.25	0.18	0.20	0.18
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

WOMEN (438)

	Deviations from Overall Mean	Adjusted for : Background AND	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Attendance AND at 15	Qualifications 16+
Truant at 16 (73)	0.55	0.52	0.44	0.37	0.33
Not Truant (365)	-0.11	-0.10	-0.09	-0.07	-0.07
Mean Difference	0.66	0.62	0.53	0.44	0.40
Signif. of F-Value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.001

Table 22 : Smoking (England and Wales) (Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2815)

Odds relative to 'Over 30 cigarettes per day'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

	Adjusted for :				
		Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications at 16+
None	.17 (.12/.26)	.20 (.13/.31)	.20 (.13/.31)	.20 (.13/.31)	.20 (.13/.30)
Up to 10 cigarettes per day	.34 (.20/.58)	.44 (.26/.77)	.43 (.25/.74)	.41 (.24/.69)	.40 (.24/.69)
10 to 30 cigarettes per day	.59 (.39/.89)	.64 (.41/.97)	.63 (.41/.97)	.65 (.42/.99)	.65 (.42/.99)

WOMEN (2848)

Odds relative to 'Over 30 cigarettes per day'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

	Adjusted for :				
		Background AND	Educ. Ability at 11 AND	Attendance at 15 AND	Qualifications at 16+
None	.11 (.07/.19)	.13 (.08/.23)	.11 (.07/.20)	.10 (.06/.18)	.09 (.05/.16)
Up to 10 cigarettes per day	.20 (.11/.37)	.27 (.14/.50)	.25 (.13/.46)	.23 (.12/.42)	.17 (.09/.32)
10 to 30 cigarettes per day	.50 (.30/.84)	.50 (.29/.87)	.46 (.27/.79)	.44 (.26/.74)	.41 (.24/.70)

Table 23 : Frequency of Drinking (England and Wales)

(Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2814)

Odds relative to 'Most days'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Background	Background AND Educ. Ability at 11	Background AND Educ. Ability AND Attendance at 15	Background AND Educ. Ability AND Attendance AND Qualifications at 16+
Once or twice per week	.89 (.72/1.10)	.84 (.68/1.04)	.85 (.68/1.06)	.85 (.68/1.05)	.84 (.68/1.05)
Less often	.86 (.64/1.17)	.76 (.56/1.04)	.73 (.53/1.01)	.72 (.52/.98)	.71 (.52/.98)
Never	1.21 (.70/2.07)	1.03 (.59/1.80)	.97 (.54/1.72)	.88 (.50/1.56)	.88 (.49/1.56)

WOMEN (2848)

Odds relative to 'Most days'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Background	Background AND Educ. Ability at 11	Background AND Educ. Ability AND Attendance at 15	Background AND Educ. Ability AND Attendance AND Qualifications at 16+
Once or twice per week	1.23 (.84/1.81)	.95 (.64/1.41)	.93 (.62/1.39)	.94 (.63/1.39)	.94 (.63/1.39)
Less often	1.61 (1.09/2.36)	1.09 (.73/1.63)	1.09 (.73/1.63)	1.11 (.74/1.65)	1.08 (.72/1.61)
Never	1.87 (1.12/3.14)	1.23 (.72/2.12)	1.23 (.71/2.14)	1.28 (.74/2.21)	1.24 (.72/2.14)

Table 24 : Depression (Malaise-Score Categorized)

(England and Wales) (Loglinear Analysis)

MEN (2813)

Odds relative to 'Normal'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Atten-dance AND at 15	Qualifi-cations at 16+
Depressed	2.64 (1.75/3.98)	2.26 (1.48/3.47)	2.24 (1.37/3.68)	2.38 (1.47/3.85)	2.40 (1.48/3.90)

WOMEN (2842)

Odds relative to 'Normal'
Truants at 16 v. Non-truants
(95% Confidence Intervals in Brackets)

Adjusted for :

	Back-ground	Educ. Ability AND at 11	Atten-dance AND at 15	Qualifi-cations at 16+
Depressed	2.75 (2.08/3.63)	2.16 (1.61/2.90)	2.26 (1.68/3.06)	2.23 (1.63/3.06)	2.22 (1.61/3.07)

National Child Development Study User Support Group Working Paper Series

This Working Paper is one of a number, available from the National Child Development Study User Support Group, which report on the background to the Study and the research that has been based on the information collected over the years. Other Working Papers in the series are listed below.

No.	Title	Author(s)	Date
1.	The National Child Development Study: an introduction to the origins of the Study and the methods of data collection	Peter Shepherd (SSRU)	October 1985
2.	Publications arising from the National Child Development Study	NCDS User Support Group (SSRU) & Librarian, National Children's Bureau	October 1985
3.	After School: the education and training experiences of the 1958 cohort	Ken Fogelman (SSRU)	October 1985
4.	A Longitudinal Study of Alcohol Consumption Amongst Young Adults In Britain: I Alcohol consumption and associated factors in young adults in Britain	Chris Power (SSRU)	December 1985
5.	A Longitudinal Study of Alcohol Consumption Amongst Young Adults In Britain: II A national longitudinal study of Alcohol consumption between the ages of 16 and 23	Mayer Ghodsian & Christine Power (SSRU)	December 1985
6.	A Longitudinal Study of Alcohol Consumption Amongst Young Adults In Britain: III Childhood and adolescent characteristics associated with drinking behaviour in early adulthood	Mayer Ghodsian (SSRU)	December 1985
7.	Report on the longitudinal exploitation of the National Child Development Study in areas of interest to DHSS	Mildred Blaxter (Univ of Cambridge)	April 1986

National Child Development Study User Support Group Working Paper Series

No.	Title	Author(s)	Date
8.	Health and social mobility during the early years of life	Chris Power Ken Fogelman & John Fox (SSRU)	May 1986
9.	Effects of ability grouping in secondary schools in Great Britain	Alan Kerckhoff (Duke University, N. Carolina)	June 1986
10.	Leaving the parental home: an anlysis of early housing careers	Gill Jones (Thomas Coram Research Unit)	July 1986
11.	Stratification in youth	Gill Jones (Thomas Coram Research Unit)	July 1986
12.	Social class changes in weight-for-height between childhood and early adulthood	Chris Power (SSRU) & Clare Moynihan (Royal Marsden Hospital)	July 1986
13.	Response to a national longitudial study: policy and academic implications for the study of change	Dougal Hutchison (NFER)	August 1986
14.	Drop out from apprenticeship: an application of survival methods to grouped data	Dougal Hutchison (NFER)	August 1986
15.	Event history and survival analysis in the social sciences: review paper and introduction	Dougal Hutchison (NFER)	August 1986
16.	Transitions in young adulthoood	Kath Kiernan (SSRU)	October 1986
17.	The NCDS5 Development Programme	Peter Shepherd (SSRU)	October 1986
18.	A note on household income data in NCDS3	John Micklewright (Inst of Economics and Statistics, Univ of Oxford)	December 1986
19.	Unemployment, apprenticeships and training - does it pay to stay on at school?	Joan Payne (Dept of Social & Admin Studies, Univ of Oxford)	December 1986

National Child Development Study User Support Group Working Paper Series

No.	Title	Author(s)	Date
20.	The Fourth Follow-up of the National Child Development Study: an account of the methodology and summary of the early findings	NCDS4 Research Team (National Children's Bureau)	March 1987
21.	Class and tenure mobility, do they explain social inequalities in health among young adults in Great Britain	Ken Fogelman, Chris Power & John Fox (SSRU)	April 1987
22.	Handedness in Twins: the right shift theory	Marian Annett (Dept of Applied Social Studies, Coventry Poly)	March 1987
23	Trade union membership and activism among young people in Great Britain	Joan Payne (Dept of Social & Admin Studies, Univ of Oxford)	December 1987
24.	Early adult outcomes of truancy	Angelika Hibbett (SSRU)	July 1987
25.	Family breakdown, social mobility and health inequalities	Ken Fogelman Chris Power & John Fox (SSRU)	July 1987
26.	New possibilities for longitudinal studies of intergenerational factors in child health and development	John Fox & Ken Fogelman (SSRU)	December 1987
27.	Smoking in pregnancy and development into early adulthood	Ken Fogelman (SSRU)	February 1988
28.	Health selection: an explanation of social inequalities in young adults?	Chris Power Orly Manor John Fox & Ken Fogelman (SSRU)	February 1988
29.	A longitudinal study of housing and social circumstances in childhood and early adulthood	Mayer Ghodsian & Ken Fogelman (SSRU)	March 1988
30.	Early adult outcomes of truancy, II: The effects of truancy after allowing for other factors	Angelika Hibbett & Ken Fogelman (SSRU)	March 1988

NCDS User Support Group, City University, LONDON EC1V OHB Tel: (01) 253 4399

N A T I O N A L C H I L D D E V E L O P M E N T S T U D Y

The National Child Development Study (NCDS) is a continuing longitudinal study which is seeking to follow the lives of all those living in Great Britain who were born between 3 and 9 March, 1958.

It has its origins in the Perinatal Mortality Survey (PMS). This was sponsored by the National Birthday Trust Fund and designed to examine the social and obstetric factors associated with the early death or abnormality among the 17,000 children born in England, Scotland and Wales in that one week.

To date there have been four attempts to trace all members of the birth cohort in order to monitor their physical, educational and social development. These were carried out by the National Children's Bureau in 1965 (when they were aged 7), in 1969 (when they were aged 11), in 1974 (when they were aged 16) and in 1981 (when they were aged 23). In addition, in 1978, details of public examination entry and performance were obtained from the schools, sixth-form colleges and FE colleges.

For the birth survey information was obtained from the mother and from medical records by the midwife. For the purposes of the first three NCDS surveys, information was obtained from parents (who were interviewed by health visitors), head teachers and class teachers (who completed questionnaires), the schools health service (who carried out medical examinations) and the subjects themselves (who completed tests of ability and, latterly, questionnaires). In addition the birth cohort was augmented by including immigrants born in the relevant week in the target sample for NCDS1-3.

The 1981 survey differs in that information was obtained from the subject (who was interviewed by a professional survey research interviewer) and from the 1971 and 1981 Censuses (from which variables describing area of residence were taken). Similarly, during the collection of exam data in 1978 information was obtained (by post) only from the schools attended at the time of the third follow-up in 1974 (and from sixth-form and FE colleges, when these were identified by schools). On these last two occasions case no attempt was made to include new immigrants in the survey.

All NCDS data from the surveys identified above are held by the ESRC Data Archive at the University of Essex and are available for secondary analysis by researchers in universities and elsewhere. The Archive also holds a number of NCDS-related files (for example, of data collected in the course of a special study of handicapped school-leavers, at age 18; and the data from the 5% feasibility study, conducted at age 20, which preceded the 1981 follow-up), which are similarly available for secondary analysis.

Further details about the National Child Development Study can be obtained from the NCDS User Support Group.