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Aims of this presentation

• Consider the Lambeth data on educational attainment by disadvantage, ethnicity and gender

• Report on recent analyses of national data to place Lambeth results in broader context

• Consider explanatory factors: What role do school composition factors play? Is there a ‘magic bullet’ for school intervention with white working class pupils? Are good schools good for all?

• Raise some questions for debate on national and local policy.
Measuring disadvantage

- Need a measure that reflects both disadvantaged and advantaged ends of the socio-economic status (SES) spectrum
- Combined entitlement to FSM with area deprivation (IDACI) to provide differentiation among the two-thirds not entitled to FSM
- Formed three groups
  - Entitled FSM (36% of sample)
  - Not entitled FSM but living in one of the 20% most deprived neighbourhoods in England (43% of sample)
  - Not entitled FSM and relatively advantaged neighbourhoods (for Lambeth) (21% of sample)
SES and attainment at age 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>KS2 average marks</th>
<th>Level 4+ English &amp; maths</th>
<th>Level 5+ English &amp; maths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Entitled FSM</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No FSM &amp; IDACI =&lt;20%</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No FSM &amp; IDACI &gt;20%</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attainment gaps at age 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>KS2 average test marks - Gap (standardised)</th>
<th>Level 4+ in English &amp; maths - Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic status (low vs. high)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group (Black Caribbean vs. White British – adjusted for SES)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (boy vs. girl)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Ethnic gap adjusted for association with SES (e.g. 41% of White British pupils from high SES backgrounds compared to 17% of Black Caribbean pupils)
Attainment at age 11 by all factors

**Note:** Also includes controls for age, gender, SEN, stage fluency in English, mobility and school composition variables. See Lambeth report, Section 2, pages 19-21.
Lambeth - summary

- **Effect of SES is strongest for White British pupils:** the highest achieving ethnic group (among high SES) and the lowest achieving group (among low SES)

- **Low attainment at age 11:** The lowest attaining groups are both White British boys and Black Caribbean boys from low SES backgrounds

- **Black Caribbean underachievement:** pupils from medium and high SES backgrounds (particularly boys) underachieve relative to White British

- **Progress age 7-11:** For most ethnic minority groups low SES and high SES pupils make approximately the same progress age 7-11, but for White British high SES pupils pull even further ahead.
National picture

• Data from the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE) provide a recent national picture (See Strand 2008). LSYPE is a large DCSF funded study using a nationally representative sample of over 15,000 pupils, including GCSE results at age 16 in 2006.

• Substantially the same results as found in Lambeth for both attainment and progress (shown in the next two slides respectively).
National – Age 16 score by ethnicity, class & gender

[Graph showing trends in scores for girls and boys, categorized by ethnicity and class.]
White British working class pupils (both boys and girls) show a marked relative decline age 11-16. Most minority ethnic groups make strong progress, particularly in the last two years of secondary school.
What does LSYPE say about the causes of WWC gap?

• Many factors had a significant association with progress (e.g. maternal education, parental resources and monitoring, family discord, family structure, attitude to school, truancy, SEN etc)

• But the largest influences were:
  • Parents’ educational aspirations for their child (to stay in FTE post 16 or to attend university);
  • Pupils’ own educational aspirations;
  • Pupils’ academic self concept;
  • Frequency of completing homework.
  • Low educational aspirations, poor academic self concept and low motivation = disaffection
Educational aspirations

Family socio-economic classification

Gender

Male

Female

Ethnic group
- White British
- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Black Caribbean
- Black African

Continue in FTE post 16

Managerial & intermediate superv., professional & Lower superv.

Routine, semi-routine & LT Unemployed
School effects

• In Lambeth tested a wide range of school composition effects in addition to pupil data (%girls, % White British, % mobile, % fluency stage 1-3, %SEN, school size, denomination, mean IDACI score, mean age)

• Two key school composition effects were:
  – Mean IDACI score (ES=0.12)
  – % of mobile pupils (ES=0.13)
  – Greater progress of White British high SES pupils partly due to attending schools with high proportion of SES pupils and low mobility. Inverse also true.

• Substantial variation between schools remain, even after adjustment. Is this specific to WWC?
Differential effectiveness

• Series of Lambeth reports
  – Lambeth (2009). *Raising the achievement of White working class pupils: Barriers and school strategies*.

• Common features – family aspirations & support, parental involvement in school, engaging curriculum, good use of data, additional support (breakfast/homework clubs, use of mentors) etc.
Differential effectiveness – national data

- Schools that do well for their Black Caribbean pupils also do well for their White British pupils.

Differential effectiveness – national data

- Schools that do well for their FSM pupils also do well for non-FSM pupils.

Source:
Conclusions

• Focus on low attainment of White Working Class pupils is valid - but remember Black working class also.
• Should not obscure other concerns such as the underachievement of Black Caribbean pupils from otherwise advantaged circumstances
• Key factors to address particularly in secondary school are disaffection and the perceived irrelevance of the curriculum
• Schools do make a difference, but there are limits to what schools alone can achieve
• There is no magic bullet for separate social or ethnic groups – effective schools appear effective for all.
Some questions for debate

• **Early HLE and parenting:** Given the large SES differences at age 3 (e.g., Hart & Risley, 1995, MCS) parenting is key, but how far is it legitimate for the government to intrude into the private family sphere (e.g. parenting classes, PEIP, FIP etc)? Should we expect schools to be able to equalise all educational outcomes?

• **Curriculum** – is not seen as relevant and engaging by White British & Black Caribbean working class pupils in particular. Do we value non-academic education appropriately? What is wrong with a vocational route?

• **Resources** - Are we willing to pay to address these issues, e.g., through increased redistribution of resources between schools?
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