

OUTCOMES OF EDUCATIONAL WELFARE OFFICER CONTACT WITH TEENAGERS IN ENGLAND Sin Yi Cheung Cardiff University

Morag Henderson Institute of Education

ABOUT THE PROJECT



- Part of a larger project funded by the Nuffield Foundation with the aim to examine children, young people and families using social work services (and other professional support services, including Educational Welfare Officers)
- Research Team: Jonathan Scourfield (PI: Cardiff), Elaine Sharland (Sussex)
- We started with Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE)
- British Panel Household Study (BHPS)
- Millennium Cohort Study (MCS)
- Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC)

BACKGROUND

- Successive government initiatives aimed at greater participation and reducing educational inequalities
- Raising of minimum school leaving age, introducing teaching assistants, EMA, FSM, and educational welfare officers
- Education welfare officers (EWOs) provide support for families and pupils with behavioural and attendance issues
- However, is educational welfare service targeted to those who most need it? What effects does EWO contact have on a young person's educational aspirations and outcomes?

ROLE OF EDUCATIONAL WELFARE OFFICERS

- Largely deals with school attendance matters
- Encourage parents to form good relationships with school
- Identify attendance problems and support parents and pupils to resolve them
- Advise parents on legal responsibility for their children's enrolment and attendance at school
- Reintegrating non-attenders: adapting timetables, acting as learning mentors, befriending pupils and collecting them to schools
- Concerned with pupils' behaviour, underachievement, health and general welfare
- Advise on child protection issues and special educational needs

TRUANCY AND RISKY BEHAVIOURS

- Risk-taking behaviour often trigger for EWO contacts
 Heavy smoking (Hibbett & Fogelman 1990),
- Truancy and persistent absenteeism related to exclusion (Bratby 1998), youth offending (Ball & Connolly 2000), alcohol consumption (Miller & Plant 1999), lower educational outcomes and higher risk of unemployment (Attwood & Croll 2006)
- Involvement of EWO may be important to pupils' educational achievement and aspiration

ACHIEVEMENT AND ASPIRATION

- Inequalities in educational achievement: early achievement gaps (Kitchen et al. 2013); 21% poorest quintile compared to 75% richest quintile achieve five GCSEs A*-C (Chowdry et al 2010); and in aspiration (Goodman & Gregg 2010)
- Earlier achievement gaps critical to later educational decisions: Primary vs. secondary effects (Boudon 1974, Jackson et al. 2007)
 - Children from more advantaged backgrounds have more ambitious educational aspirations

PREDICTORS AND OUTCOMES OF EWO CONTACT

We seek to establish both predictors and outcomes of EWO contact as a result of teenager's problem behaviour

- Using four domains in Bronfenbrenner's ecological model (Strand 2011):
 - Structural parents' social class, family structure
 - Neighbourhood whether from disadvantaged neighbourhood
 - Familial quality of relationships with parents, degree of parents' involvement of teenagers' schooling, parental style
 - Individual —ethnicity, gender, risk-taking behaviour

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- What (structural, neighbourhood, familial and individual) characteristics predict EWO contact among young people in England? (associative differences)
- What effect does EWO contact have on a young person's educational attainment and aspiration? (causal effects of EWO contact)

DATA

- Longitudinal Study of Young People in England
- LSYPE began in 2004 when sample members were aged between 13 and 14
- 7 waves where young people and parents are interviewed
- LSYPE are linked to The National Pupil Database to capture GCSE results
- All models are adjusted for 654 school clusters

LSYPE MEASURES

- "In the last 12 months, have you been in touch with educational welfare services because of the young person's behaviour at home or at school? This includes both you getting in touch with them and them contacting you?"
- For the purpose of this analysis EWO was measured at Wave 2 and 3 (ever) and outcome measures examined between Wave 3 and Wave 4

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Logistic Regression

Ever had EWO contact from the age of 13

Treatment Model

GCSE attainment - A benchmark for government achievement and a prerequisite to progress to further study

Educational aspiration and confidence – Secondary effects are important for educational inequality (Boudon 1974; Jackson 2007)

THE CAUSALITY CHALLENGE

- The problem is that we can at most observe one of these outcomes because the unit can be exposed to only one level of the treatment
- To address the "fundamental problem of causal inference." (Holland 1986; Imbens & Woolbridge 2009)
- Inverse-probability-weighted regression-adjusted results (IPWRA)

IPWRA

- IPWRA is a doubly robust estimator (Wooldridge 2010): it estimates two models:
- The treatment status model predicts the likelihood of the young person to have EWO contact
- The outcome model we are interested in the young person's educational outcomes and aspirations. And we can input a number of dependent variables that we know to influence the outcome.

IPWRA

- POM: Potential Outcome Mean which measures the average linear GCSE score for those with EWO contact and the average linear GCSE score for those with no contact.
- ATE: Average Treatment Effect
 ATE = E (Y¹-Y⁰)
 where Y is the outcome of interest (0/1)
- ATET: Average Treatment Effects on the Treated ATET=E(Y¹-Y⁰|D=1)

where Y is the outcome of interest (0/1) and D is the treatment status (0/1)





Number of risk factors

Regression Lines for the Observations



Number of risk factors

Regression Lines for the Observations



Number of risk factors

Regression Lines for the Observations



Number of risk factors

Inverse Probability Weights



Number of risk factors



FINDINGS

THE TREATMENT MODEL

What social factors predict EWO contact among young people in England, including structural, neighbourhood, familial and individual factors characteristics?

ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

- Following the analytic strategy of Bronfenbrenner (1977,1979) human action should be considered through the lens of multiple nested influences
- Strand (2007) identified four broad domains using the LSYPE data including:
 - Structural
 - Neighbourhood
 - Familial
 - Individual

STRUCTURAL



NEIGHBOURHOOD

None of the neighbourhood characteristics are significant, over and above the structural, familial and individual characteristics.



[Ref: Teacher's meeting: Do not attend] Parents attended specially arranged meetings*** [Ref: Parents are very involved in schooling] Fairly involved Not very involved* Not at all involved [Ref: Hardly ever argue with YP] Most days*** More than once a week*** Less than once a week Never ** [Ref: Parents attend parents evening]

Parents did not attend parents' evening***

INDIVIDUAL



[Ref: No special education needs]

SEN***

[Ref: has not smoked cannabis]

Smoked cannabis***

[Ref: has not smoked cigarettes]

Smoked cigarettes***

[Ref: Has not played truant]

Played truant***

[Ref: fought or taken part in public disturbance]

Fought***

(THE OUTCOME MODEL)

What effect does EWO contact have on a young person's educational outcomes?

IPWRA: GCSE

Model 1: Linear GCSE score			Model 2: Five GCSEs A*-C (inc English & Maths)			
			Reference Category: No educational welfare			
Reference Category: No educational welfare contact			contact			
Educational Welfare Officer			Educational Welfare			
Contact ATE	-62.49***	(7.20)	Officer Contact ATE	0.88***	(0.03)	
Educational Welfare Officer			Educational Welfare			
Contact ATET	-73.36***	(5.38)	Officer Contact ATET	0.90***	(0.01)	
Observations	10,328		Observations	10,328		

COMPARISON: OLS AND LOGISTIC REGRESSION

	OLS GCSE sc	ore	Logistic Regression 5 A*-C GCSEs		
	ß	SE	OR	SE	
Educational Welfare Officer Contact	-95.27***	(5.17)	0.34***	(0.04)	
Constant	510.85***	(4.26)	5.36***	(0.41)	
Log Likelihood	-		-6918.68		
R2/Pseudo R2	0.33	3	0.17		
Number of observations	10,32	28	10,328		

IPWRA: UNIVERSITY ASPIRATION

Model 3: Likely to apply to University						
			Model 4: Likely to be accepte	ed if apply to	University	
Reference Category: No educational welfare						
contact			Reference Category: No educational welfare contact			
Educational Welfare			Educational Welfare Officer			
Officer Contact ATE	0.93**	(0.02)	Contact ATE	0.93**	(0.02)	
Educational Welfare			Educational Welfare Officer			
Officer Contact ATET	0.95**	(0.02)	Contact ATE	0.92**	(0.02)	
	10220			80		
Observations	10,320		Observations	0,700		

COMPARISON: LOGISTIC REGRESSION

	Logistic Reg Aspire to Un	ression iversity	Logistic Regression Confidence in being accepted		
	OR	SE	OR	SE	
Educational Welfare Officer Contact	0.49***	(0.05)	0.44***	(0.06)	
Constant	14.31***	(1.23)	51.07***	(6.99)	
Log Likelihood	-6442.74		-3132.86		
R2/Pseudo R2	0.14		0.12		
Number of observations	10,328		8,900		

CONCLUSIONS

All else being equal, the following characteristics significantly associated with an **increase** in the odds of EWO contact:

- Lower social class background
- Parents attending specially arranged meetings
- Arguing with parents frequently
- Not attending scheduled parents' evening
- Special Educational Needs (SEN)
- Smoking cannabis, truanting, fighting and smoking cigarettes

CONCLUSIONS

All else being equal, the following characteristics significantly associated with a **reduction** in the odds of EWO contact:

- Parents who report feeling not very involved in their child's schooling (relative to being very involved)
- Never arguing with parents

CONCLUSIONS: ATET & ATE EFFECTS

- GCSE EWO contact lowers the odds of achieving five GCSEs A*-C (and the GCSE scores) significantly
- UNIVERSITY CONFIDENCE AND ASPIRATION There is no difference in the odds for the 'treated' and 'untreated' for aspiration to apply to university, however the odds of confidence in being accepted if they apply are lower for those who receive EWO contact (at 5% sig. level)

EXPLANATIONS

- Unobserved characteristics which distinguish EWO recipients from the rest (e.g. adverse childhood experiences)
- Labelling theory
- Learned helplessness
- Poor quality EWO and not enough use of effective help
- Or beneficial effects cannot be experienced in the short-term
- Limitation of data: Measure of EWO contact does not tell us the nature of this contact



SUGGESTIONS, COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

<u>M.Henderson@ioe.ac.uk</u> <u>Cheungsy@cardiff.ac.uk</u>

Tetrachoric correlation between risky behaviours and educational welfare contact

Variables	Y	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7
X1 Truant	0.43*							
X2 Alcohol	0.20*	0.40*						
X3 Cigarettes	0.41*	0.63*	0.60*					
X4 Cannabis	0.37*	0.63*	0.65*	0.76*				
X5 Graffiti	0.32*	0.55*	0.32*	0.49*	0.55*			
X6 Vandalism	0.30*	0.59*	0.42*	0.48*	0.57*	0.68*		
X7 Shoplift	0.29*	059*	0.41*	0.51*	0.54*	0.54*	0.62*	
X8 Fighting	0.33*	0.56*	0.36*	0.50*	0.56*	0.61*	0.69*	0.54*
Y= Education Welfare Contact, 0/1								
*p<0.01								