

EPASI Educational Policies that Address Social Inequality

a programme of observation, analysis and innovation supported by the European Commission's department of Education & Culture, SOCRATES programme 2.1.2



Educational Policies that Address Social Inequality

Country Report: The United Kingdom

This report was written by the UK team:

Carole Leathwood, Alistair Ross, Marie-Pierre Moreau, Nicola Rollock and Katya Williams



Institute for Policy Studies in Education
London Metropolitan University, UK

November 2008

The EPASI project is a programme of analysis of educational programmes in fourteen European countries, designed to address various forms of social inequality. The project analysis was conducted in the period 2007 – 2009. This report is part of the overall project, details of which are at <http://www.epasi.eu>.

The analysis is intended to be used within the overall framework of the EPASI programme.

The project has been funded with support from the European Commission. Each report within the overall project is the responsibility of the named authors.

The EPASI project was conducted by the following institutions:

- The Institute for Policy Studies in Education, London Metropolitan University (UK) (Coordinator)
- Katholieke Hogeschool Zuid-West-Vlaanderen (Belgium)
- Univerzita Hradec Králové (Czech Republic)
- Montpellier III - Université Paul Valéry (France)
- Panepístimio Patron ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ ΠΑΤΡΩΝ (Greece)
- Universitat Autònoma of Barcelona (Spain)
- Malmö högskola (Sweden)



Contents

1. The UK Education System.....	3
2. Which Groups are seen as Disadvantaged?	4
3. The Construction of a Policy Response	8
3.1 <i>Historical Overview: Education and Inequalities in the English Policy Context</i>	9
3.2 <i>Projects designed to address educational disadvantage</i>	13
4. A Summary of Educational Disadvantage in the UK Today	13
5. Conclusions.....	17
Appendix: Project Summaries	23
Appendix: Project overview.....	24

Education Policies to Tackle Social Disadvantage: UK Country Report

Education in the UK has played a central role in both the construction and maintenance of inequalities and social disadvantage, and in their mitigation. Throughout the twentieth century and into the twenty-first, efforts to widen educational opportunities can be seen as one of the main ways in which social and educational disadvantages have been addressed.

1. The UK Education System

In the UK, education is currently compulsory from age 5 to age 16¹ and participation is actively encouraged in the early years and post-16 (in further and higher education). There are differences in the educational provision of the four countries that make up the UK (Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and England), with England, Wales and Northern Ireland following a broadly similar pattern and Scotland having its own distinct education system. Publicly funded education is available for the compulsory years of schooling, with over 90 percent of pupils in the UK attending publicly funded state schools. In addition, there are variable levels of public funding for early years, further and higher educational provision across the UK. Private fee-paying schools (confusingly often called “public schools” in the UK) sit alongside the state system. Nearly all primary schools are coeducational. Twelve percent (410) of state secondary schools are single-sex schools, although the corresponding figure for private fee-paying schools is 26 percent (DfES 2007a:307).

Educational provision in the UK includes both selective and comprehensive secondary schools, and the balance between these has varied by constituent country and/or region, and over time. A persistent theme has been the extent to which academic selection re/produces inequalities. State schools in England, Wales and Northern Ireland are required to follow a national curriculum, first introduced in the Education Reform Act 1988. Scotland has its own qualifications framework, with decisions about the curriculum made at local authority and school level.

One of the more enduring principles of education in the UK has been the concurrent devolvement of decision-making about educational practice and provision alongside the centralisation of decision-making about financial provision and control.

Within the four countries of the UK, education has been devolved to the country level (most recently to Wales), and within each country, the powers and control exercised by local authorities have been progressively reduced. Schools have become more autonomous in deciding their specific policies and practices, including their admissions policies. Nevertheless, they have also been increasingly required to work within nationally agreed frameworks, to publish and explain their policies and results, and to have inspection reports and their attainment results published in “league tables” of schools to facilitate comparison nationally and locally. These policies have been justified in terms of increasing parental choice and control, and in terms of “driving up” national standards of achievement.

The consequences of these policies for addressing educational inequalities is that schools have been faced with the tensions between focussing on those pupils who are seen as best able to demonstrate high and improving standards (of achievement, behaviour, etc.) and serving the needs of the local community. The population of the UK is not homogeneous, and there are concentrations of particular social groups (including disadvantaged groups) in particular localities: schools in these

¹ Legislation currently going through parliament includes proposals to raise the “education participation age” to 17 year olds in 2013 and to 18 year olds in 2015, so that all young people up to age 18 will be required to participate in some form of education or training.

areas may be relatively disadvantaged in a public discourse of comparative standards and achievement. In some cases, focussing on raising provision for disadvantaged groups may be the only policy option for the school. In some others, schools may be tempted to focus their admissions practice on accepting those pupils potentially likely to show the school's results to best advantage. In response to these criticisms and in contrast to the English model of local competition between schools, league tables were abolished in Wales and Northern Ireland in 2001 and Scotland in 2003, but still persist in England.

Funding educational provision has tended at the overall level of educational grant to the school to be more centralised, with national formulae being devised and applied to determine a school's grants. In 1987, approximately 45 percent of local authority spending in England came from central government funds, through grants based on national government's assessment of local needs. In 2006, about 74 percent was provided centrally in formula spending shares determined by central government, and including a specific dedicated schools grant. Most of the central allocation for education has to be directly passed on to schools, with only a small proportion retained for the provision of local support services. These national determined formulae include specific recognition of enhanced financial provision for pupils suffering educational disadvantage. A Deprivation Funding Review (2008-2011) has been set up to determine future needs. There are additional central funds available to schools known as Standards Funds, tied to specific educational provisions (for example, there are additional funds related to ethnic minority achievement, to supporting pupils from poorer backgrounds towards higher education, etc.). Although the above specifically applies to provision in England (84 percent of the UK population), broadly similar principles apply in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

The consequences of these financial policies in addressing educational inequalities is that schools and local authorities are encouraged to use the various available categories to identify pupils and report their numbers, as this has an impact on the resources that will become available to the school. However, the national framework may also overlook particular local groups of pupils at need that are found only in particular localities. Targeted Standards Funds are also monitored and evaluated: the additional work involved in claiming, monitoring and reporting may, however, act as a deterrent in some cases.

A recent study (Jenkins *et al.* 2006) compared social segregation in English secondary schools with that in 27 rich industrialised countries using data from the 2000 and 2003 rounds of the Programme of International Student Assessment (PISA), the international survey sponsored by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). In terms of social segregation, England is in the middle ranks, below high-segregation countries such as Austria, Belgium, Germany, and Hungary, but above Scotland and the Nordic countries, and at about the same level as the USA. Segregation is not driven by the existence of private schools, and about 80 percent is accounted for by the uneven spread of children from different social backgrounds within the state sector.

2. Which Groups are seen as Disadvantaged?

Different social groups have been identified at different periods of history as suffering educational disadvantage. Much effort is given to identifying the scale, location and distribution of these groups. This is done for two purposes: firstly to ascertain where resources should be directed, and in what relative amounts, and secondly to monitor the success or otherwise of any such targeted resource. These different social groups are discussed below. Whilst they are delineated separately for heuristic purposes, it needs to be recognised that social inequalities and identities are complex and intermeshing, and that the categories and groups discussed below are not homogenous.

In the UK, **social class** has been a very longstanding analytic category associated with educational disadvantage, being related to propensity to stay in education after any compulsory leaving age, to educational achievement in examination results, and in entry rates to higher education. Social class was in the UK traditionally categorised by the father's occupational status: this has been amended in the past decade to a nine-point social class categorisation (the NS-SEC or National Standard Socio-Economic Classification), based on parental occupational code. There are persistent inequalities in educational outcome in the UK related to social class. However, these class inequalities also have a high level of correlation with family income. This is related to, but not only dependent on, occupational category. Other factors of gender, ethnicity, disability and linguistic competence may also correlate with occupational category. Over the past century, there has been a consistent decline in the proportion of the population who are classified as belonging to the unskilled, manual and semi-skilled categories of employment: about 75 percent of the population were classified as in manual occupations in 1900, and about 35 percent in 2000 (Heath and Payne 1999). There has also developed a persistent group of the long-term unemployed. The educational attainment of these groups tends to be below the national average in school, and more than 50 percent of a school's performance is accounted for by the social make-up of its pupils. Butler *et al* (Butler *et al.* 2007; Webber and Butler 2007) found that in affluent areas 67 percent of 11-year-olds achieved level 5 in the national English tests and 94 percent of 15-year olds gained five or more passes at GCSE² at grade C and above, while of children growing up in more deprived areas just 13 percent obtained level 5 in the national English tests for 11-year-olds, and only 24 percent of 15-year-olds achieved five-plus GCSEs at grade C and above (see also Reay 2006). Similarly, Archer and colleagues (Archer *et al.* 2003) reported that only 10 percent of entrants to University courses came from unskilled and manual backgrounds, while 58 percent were from professional and intermediate backgrounds.

Inequalities resulting from **gender** have been another longstanding and deeply entrenched characteristic of UK society. In the employment sphere, women have been in the past formally excluded from certain occupations and professions, and subjected to lesser scales of pay for similar work. In educational outcomes, higher hurdles used to be set for girls to advance in the educational system, fewer resources (state and private) were allocated to girls' education, and girls used to have lower rates of educational qualifications and entry into higher education that did boys. Legislative and structural changes have addressed aspects of these inequalities, but in the employment sphere women continue to be paid substantially less than men; there are evident barriers to the promotion of women in many areas of employment; and there are continuing assumptions about the suitability of certain areas of employment for women. In education, girls' levels of achievement and of participation in higher education have now generally outstripped boys. By 1988, it was noted that girls' achievement in schools was significantly greater than boys: a 19 percent difference in attainment of 5 or more GCSEs (A-C grade) at age 16 has been evident since 1993 (63.4 percent of girls, 53.8 percent of boys in 2006) (DfES, 2007). The gender gap is evident from pre-school results onwards, but becomes more pronounced in secondary school. Participation in school post-16 is higher for girls (82 percent to 72 percent), but subject choice becomes more differentiated by gender: girls are more likely to study English, Psychology, Art and Design, Sociology and Media Studies, while boys predominate in Mathematics, Physics, Business Studies, Geography and Physical Education. Girls' participation in Physics is particularly low. However, in all subjects, girls tend to achieve about 4 percent higher than boys, although there is evidence that social class and ethnicity are more significant predictors of attainment than gender (see Gillborn and Mirza 2000). In 2003, 56 percent of all first year undergraduates were women, compared to just 26 percent in 1925. More attention is now being placed on boys' "underachievement" (see Epstein *et al.* 1998 for a discussion of this development), although it is now acknowledged that this can detract attention

² GCSEs are national examinations taken at age 16. In 2006, 62.4 percent of all pupils achieved 5 A-C grade GCSEs (TES <http://www.tes.co.uk/2273409>, accessed 24.09.2007)

away from the disadvantages girls' experience in education and "the fact that large numbers of girls are also low attainers" (DfES 2007a:5).

Educational inequalities around **ethnicity** have been pronounced since the beginning of substantial settlement in the 1950s. The concept of "ethnicity" as a potential category emerged in the late 1970s, and has replaced terms that were increasingly less accurate ("immigrant") or ideologically/scientifically suspect ("race"). It was traditionally seen as only related to groups of colour, although of course also includes white ethnic groups. Ethnicity has necessarily to be self-defined, and categories have increasingly reflected the changing nature of settlement patterns and increasing recognition of different groups and needs. As a result of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, schools are required to collect the details of all pupils' ethnic categories each year (defined by the parents of young children, and by children themselves at secondary school), and to monitor key areas such as academic achievement. Since the 2001 Census, categories of mixed ethnicity have been introduced, and the proportion of mixed White and Black Caribbean pupils in particular has increased substantially over the past decade. Inequalities towards some of these groups include higher levels of exclusion for "behavioural" reasons, non-recognition of varying cultural histories and practices; assigning larger proportions of children to categories of learning difficulty; and variable levels of formal achievement. About 13 percent of the school population is of minority ethnic background, and the most rapidly increasing group is of pupils of mixed ethnic origin. The evidence on attainment is mixed: there are significant variations in school attainment between different minority ethnic groups (and this is also sometimes strongly gendered). Children of Asian Indian and of Chinese origin perform as well as or better than children of White background, while children of Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Black Caribbean backgrounds have tended to be significantly less successful. Social class is also relevant here: black and minority ethnic groups are more likely to experience deprivation than their white counterparts (DFES 2006). In terms of University entrance, the overall enrolment rate for minority ethnic students is proportional to its overall size, but there are significant differences between different ethnicities, and this too is also gendered. Minority ethnic students tend to attend less prestigious universities, and their grades at finals are on average lower than their White counterparts (THES 2007).

Attitudes towards **disability** have changed over the past decades. In terms of physical and behavioural disabilities, there is now a general presumption that efforts should be made to ensure equality of outcome and of opportunity as far as is possible. This attitude is still not true of learning disabilities. An aspect of this has been the development of newly recognised disabilities, and of the difficulties in accurately categorising some of these. Disabilities generally are self-declared, and this leads to some difficulties in monitoring the success of policies designed to address inequalities, as the number, range and types of disability declared can vary over time: disabilities such as Asperger's, Attention Deficit Syndrome and Dyslexia may sometimes be perceived in this way. Disabilities can also become more prevalent (such as asthma and various forms of allergic reaction). Inequalities towards these groups include exclusion from access to learning, either through physical arrangements, the provision of inappropriate learning materials and environments, and exclusion from certain levels of education. Much UK policy derives from the Warnock Report (1978), which suggested that at any one time 2 percent of the school population would be regarded as disabled and in need of specific specialist provision (normally provided within mainstream schools), and about 10 percent of the school population would require specialist provision at some point during their schooling. Changes in the law in recent years have outlawed discrimination against disabled people and required providers to anticipate the needs of disabled staff and students, and to make "reasonable adjustments" to meet these needs.

Inequalities towards **indigenous minorities** have become recognised rather more slowly. Roma groups have suffered considerable educational disadvantage, as educational provision has largely been premised on the assumption of a relatively settled life. Travelling groups have been

differentially provided for (circus people generally ignored, while children of Armed Forces personnel have generally been well provided for). Roma education provision has been largely left to Local Authorities where there is either a strong political will to provide this, or where numbers have been such as to necessitate this: there is a statutory duty to provide such education, but there often appear to be attempts to minimise this. It has become evident that there are also a group known as “Irish Travellers”, who are distinct from (and wish to be differentiated from) Roma. Schools collect both Roma and Irish Traveller categories under the ethnic data noted above. Inequalities here include both the provision of suitable provision, as well as the inequalities relating to minority ethnic groups noted above. The 2003 pupil census for England and Wales recorded almost 4,000 Irish Traveller pupils and 6,000 Gypsy/Roma pupils. The average attendance rate for Traveller pupils is around 75 percent, well below the national average and is the worst attendance profile of any minority ethnic group (Ofsted 2003). About 12,000 Traveller children are not registered with a school, and at ages 14-16 only 53 percent of these pupils are registered. Where results are available for those attending school, both Gypsy and Traveller groups have extremely low attainment: at age 8, 28 percent of Travellers of Irish Heritage and 42 percent of Gypsy/Roma pupils achieved Level 2³ or above in Reading (84 percent for all pupils) and at age 16 only 42 percent of Travellers of Irish Heritage and 23 percent of Gypsy/Roma pupils achieved 5 or more A*-C GCSEs (DfES 2006a).

There are a range of **linguistic minorities** and bilingual pupils in the UK. Welsh is one of the most widely spoken languages other than English, and increasing numbers of areas of Wales now teach primarily in Welsh, particularly at primary level. Nearly all Welsh speakers are in practice bilingual, with equal fluency in English. Other minority languages are less well catered for. There are no schools teaching only in Gaelic in Scotland. The languages of children and families from minority ethnic backgrounds are now more widely recognised, and sometimes valued, than was the case twenty or thirty years ago. Schools in some areas will offer examination courses in, for example, Urdu, Punjabi or Turkish. Pupils for whom English is an additional language (EAL) are identified, and additional resources channelled to schools - particularly primary schools - where there are significant numbers. Inequalities include the non-recognition (and sometimes denigration) of minority languages.

Religious minorities: the introduction of state education into the UK in the late 19th Century was marked by an accommodation with the various Church authorities who had offered some education (generally primary level, often urban, up to that date). This means that many schools are of Church of England or Roman Catholic foundation: they are divided into “voluntary aided schools” and “voluntary maintained schools”. In the former, a church owns the land and buildings, but the governing body is responsible for running the school, and the local authority funds the school and employs the staff. The local authority usually sets the admissions policy. In a voluntary aided school, the governing body employs the staff and partly funds the school, and the governors in consultation with the local authority set the admissions policy. In both types, all pupils follow the national curriculum. A few Jewish schools were established in the early 20th Century following the same principles. The growth of new religious minorities in the UK has in the past decade led to the establishment of very small numbers of Hindu, Sikh and Muslim schools (all now known as “faith schools”, rather than the earlier “church schools”). Admission to faith schools is supposed to allow for up to 25 percent of places to be reserved for pupils of another or no faith, if there is demand for such places. Inequalities are varied, including variable provisions of services and choices for those of no religious conviction, particularly in parts of inner London, where for historical reasons there are often high proportions of Church of England and Roman Catholic schools. In Northern Ireland and parts of south-western Scotland there is discrimination in educational provision, in that education tended to be segregated between Catholic schools and state education, which is

³ Level 2 refers to a nationally expected level of achievement for 7 year olds.

effectively Protestant. The disadvantage here is not strictly educational, but is part of more fundamental social segregation, which has subsequent impact on career and other social opportunities. There is currently some debate about potential curriculum discrimination arising from the possibility that faith schools may elect not to provide sex education, may discriminate against lesbian or gay students and staff, or may adopt a creationist curriculum.

This list is not exclusive. Other groups that experience educational disadvantage include older learners; adults with low levels of basic skills; lesbian and gay young people; looked after children; offenders in penal institutions.

This overview of different forms of educational disadvantage for different groups must also recognise that the way in which the curriculum is constructed – in official discourses of national curricula, and in the “hidden curriculum” – which inevitably constructs and defines, and excludes, particular social categories, and this impacts on the learning of different social groups, and the recognition of, and learning about, other social groups. These aspects are not easy to identify (Ross 2000), but see Quinn (2003) for an example of the ways in which the higher education curriculum in two disciplinary areas remains highly masculinist and ethnocentric.

Educational disadvantage is further entrenched by the recruitment of educational professionals, particularly teachers, from a relatively narrow social band. The proportion of teachers drawn from minority ethnic groups has always been disproportionately low, though it has been increasing at an accelerating pace over the past decade. This had meant that the teaching profession has lacked the cultural variety necessary to reflect the socio-cultural range of the school population, and that many pupils have had little opportunity to work with minority ethnic professionals. Similarly, there are disproportionately fewer disabled teachers, or teachers from indigenous minorities. There are also low numbers of male teachers in schools: the number of primary male teachers was always historically low, but is falling, and while secondary education used to have approximately equal numbers of male and female teachers, the number of male entrants has declined significantly since the 1980s⁴. It is possible that the non-representative nature of the profession may impact deleteriously on educational disadvantage.

3. The Construction of a Policy Response

Much of the emphasis in UK policies has been placed on provision of equal opportunities. This could be construed as an aspect of the way in which UK policy is often conceived of around metaphors of game-playing: the description “achieving a level playing field” in educational opportunities perhaps epitomises this. This seems to visualise different groups (boys and girls, different ethnicities, the abled and the disabled, etc.) engaged in some vast “game of life” with inevitable winners and losers, the object of policy makers apparently being to ensure that either “side” has an equal chance of success (and thus also of failure). The implicit assumption is that once this is achieved, any unequal outcomes that persist must be the result of individual or group lack – of ability, motivation, etc.

However, the monitoring of outcomes, where this is carried out, should be used as a marker for the general success of targeted support or targeted resource redistribution. The object is not to make all individuals achieve equal outcomes, but to ensure that where there are group differences, these are not the result of either policies or prejudice (knowing or unknowing), and that socio-economic inequalities are not a consequence of these differences.

⁴ Despite this, however, men still occupy the majority of management posts in higher level educational institutions.

There is a substantial public rhetorical discourse around equalities in the UK, perhaps partly related to the sense of “fair play” and “games culture” mentioned earlier. However, much of the rhetoric is couched in terms of giving others a “fair start” or an “equal chance”, and is acceptable provided it involves “levelling up” rather than “levelling down” - it is more acceptable to provide additional resources for the deprived than it is to redistribute existing resources from the advantaged to the disadvantaged. Several initiatives at different times have involved the provision of additional resources to schools in disadvantaged areas. Examples include Education Action Zones and the Excellence in Cities programme set up to tackle low achievement and social exclusion. Whilst policy developments such as these explicitly recognise *social* disadvantage and the responsibility of the State, there has still been a tendency in some policy discourse to assume that the young people themselves and/or their families/communities are “lacking” - in the right attitude, motivation, aspiration etc., thereby individualising blame and responsibility. Furthermore, the rhetoric of providing additional resources for all kinds of groups has also included the advantaged, so that “gifted and talented” pupils are also eligible for additional resources.

These attitudes and beliefs have been at the basis of successive phases of UK educational policy over the past decades. The following brief historical overview focuses on the English context to illustrate the ways in which these different strands have variously come to the fore and interwoven with each other over time. There are parallels with the histories of education for the other countries of the UK, but also some differences, for example the specific history of religious segregation in Northern Ireland’s schools.

3.1 Historical Overview: Education and Inequalities in the English Policy Context

Historically, access to formal education was restricted to the elite, ie predominantly to white upper or middle class men. Yet from the late nineteenth century, there were increasing demands from socialist, labour and feminist movements to widen educational opportunities. In 1896, for example, the Trades Union Congress passed a motion “that our education system should be completely remodelled on such a basis to secure the democratic principle of equality of opportunity” (Silver 1973:xi).

During the first half of the twentieth century, social disadvantage was largely conceptualised in terms of social class. A number of policy initiatives were directed at increasing educational opportunities for working-class children, although the motivation for these developments was as much (or more) about meeting the needs of the economy as a concern for social justice. These developments did, however, increase educational provision, with some, albeit minor, benefits for working class children. The 1902 and 1907 Education Acts, for example, provided for a rapid development in the number of places in secondary schools and the provision of some free places, which marginally increased the proportion of working-class children in such schools. Most working-class children at this time, however, were still excluded from secondary education.

It was not until the 1944 Education Act, following the recommendations of the Spens Report (Consultative Committee on Grammar and Technical High Schools 1938) and the Norwood Committee Report (Committee of the Secondary School Examination Council 1943), that free secondary education for all children according to their “ages, aptitude and abilities” became a reality. This Act established a tripartite system of secondary schools, with each type of school designed for a different “type” of pupil: the grammar school for those deemed to be academically able and to enjoy learning for its own sake, the technical school for those seen to have abilities in the applied sciences or applied arts, and the secondary modern school for those pupils who “deal more easily with concrete things than with ideas” (ibid.:3). The Act also extended a range of school welfare services such as free milk, free or subsidised school meals, medical examinations etc.. Despite the promises and hopes that the Act would result in inequalities being reduced, as

Tomlinson (2005:13-14) notes, “education persisted as a means by which inequalities were created, legitimised and justified, and privileged groups continued to use the divisions and distinctions of schooling to confirm and reproduce their own position”. It was perhaps inevitable that the three types of school would fail to acquire parity of esteem, given the valorising of academic study over technical and practical education in the UK’s class-based society, and the differential value of the outcomes they produced for pupils (Ryder and Silver 1970). It was, therefore, no surprise that the grammar schools commanded the highest level of resources, including teachers, and that the pupils attending them were overwhelmingly middle class.

A key assumption underpinning these developments was that intelligence was fixed and measurable. The growth of educational psychology during the 1920s and 1930s had led to an increasing emphasis on the needs for different types of learning, and hence different types of school, for different types of pupil – and it was this assumption, articulated in the Spens Report (discussed above), that resulted in the tripartite system. This, along with a belief in the objectivity of intelligence testing and the moral value of selection according to meritocratic principles, meant that educational success and failure, and the associated social advantage and disadvantage, was seen as a consequence of immutable individual ability.

Concern began to mount, however, about the extent to which the tripartite system reflected social class differences. In 1959, the Crowther Report (Ministry of Education 1959) on education for 15-18 year olds, highlighted the “wastage of talent” of working-class young people, something that was also stressed by the Newsom Report (Ministry of Education 1963) on education of 13-16 year olds which specifically argued against the assumption that intelligence and ability were fixed. This was supported by a growth in sociological work on the social determinants of inequality, including research on the social class bias of the 11-plus test used to select pupils for secondary school (Floud *et al.* 1957). These developments led to a gradual, though partial, movement towards a comprehensive system of secondary education, although in many areas selective grammar schools persisted and private fee-paying schools have always existed alongside the state sector.

At this time, educational and social disadvantage began to be conceptualised as a consequence of family background and poverty, rather than (solely) as a consequence of individual ability. This did not, however, completely transfer the responsibility for disadvantage from the individual to the state. Although the need for positive discrimination to support schools in areas of disadvantage was argued for in the Plowden Report on primary education (Central Advisory Council for Education 1967), and a number of policies since then have attempted to mitigate the impact of poverty on educational opportunity, the lack of attention to wider structural inequalities and the emphasis on family background still resulted in working-class families being seen as to blame for their own disadvantage.

During the 1960s and 1970s, the principle of equality of opportunity was well established, and was influential not only in schools and colleges, but also in higher education, a sector which expanded rapidly following the Robbins report (Committee on Higher Education 1963). Robbins also rejected fixed notions of ability, and the growth of higher educational opportunities was seen as a further contribution to redressing inequalities.

During this period far greater attention began to be paid to disadvantage and inequalities related to ethnicity and gender, rather than with social class. The 1950s and 1960s saw an increased number of children from the Caribbean and Africa entering schools in the UK, and experiencing both overt and covert racism (Coard 1971). Growing evidence of the discrimination and disadvantage experienced by minority ethnic young people, and a growth in Black community activism, began to influence dominant policy approaches. In 1976 the Race Relations Act outlawed direct and indirect discrimination (although this did not, of course, mean that such discrimination ceased), and in 1979

the Labour Government established an inquiry into the education of African Caribbean children, the interim report of which also acknowledged institutional racism in schools (DES 1981).

Assumptions of innate gender differences in ability, along with the belief that girls and boys were inevitably destined for very different roles in society, had long underpinned educational policy. For example, the Crowther Report (1959) argued that education policy should take account of girls and boys “natural” interests and roles. However, the 1960s and 1970s saw increasing concern about girls’ education with the emergence of the second wave women’s movement. Growing evidence of the relative underachievement of girls, the extent of gender subject segmentation in schools, the under-representation of women in higher education and the discrimination women experienced in the labour market *all* began to inform policy (eg the Equal Pay Act, 1970 and the Sex Discrimination Act, 1975).

In the 1960s and 1970s, there was also an increasing focus on a more radical interpretation of equality, with an emphasis on equality of outcomes, and hence on the discriminatory practices of/in institutions, rather than simply on equality of opportunity. The late 1970s and early 1980s, largely as a result of the work of anti-racist and feminist activists, including teachers themselves, and in response to research highlighting the persistence of sexist and racist policy and practice in schools and colleges, was a time of considerable activity around equality issues, with specific training for teachers, revisions to the curriculum and challenges to traditional cultures and practices.

At this time new ideas about the education of children with disabilities also began to emerge. The medical model of disability, with many children assumed to be uneducable and the barriers they faced assumed to be a consequence of their impairment, had been dominant from the early twentieth century. In 1978 the Warnock Committee, set up to inquire into the education of “handicapped” children (Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People 1978), challenged this medical model, and it was gradually replaced, at least in part, by a social model which transferred the focus of attention away from the individual and on to the discriminatory practices of institutions and society as a whole. As a consequence, the term “handicapped”, indicative of that medical model, was subject to sustained criticism and began to be replaced by reference to children with special needs. The Warnock Committee recommended that all children should attend ordinary schools where possible, and in the early 1980s, as a result of the work of the Warnock committee, the “statementing” of pupils was introduced, whereby pupils with special educational needs were entitled to an assessment and statement of their special needs and the additional support they required.

Issues of sexuality and the discrimination and disadvantage experienced by lesbian and gay young people did not begin to feature on the educational agenda until the 1980s when research highlighting the difficulties faced by lesbian and gay teenagers (Trenchard and Warren 1984), and growing levels of activism within education, emerged. The response of the Conservative Government was to legislate, and Section 28 of Local Government Act 1988 prohibited the “intentional promotion of homosexuality by local authorities”. The intention was to ban any positive discussion of lesbian and gay issues in schools, and although the section was legally flawed, it successfully hindered moves towards equality (see Epstein 1994 for a discussion of these issues).

The 1980s and 1990s, following the election of a Conservative Government led by Margaret Thatcher in 1979, saw an increasing emphasis on the market. Parental choice, competition, a reduction in public spending, privatisation, a reassertion of educational selection and a “discourse of derision” (Ball 1990) in relation to teachers and other public sector professionals were all increasingly evident, and in this context, equality issues began to disappear from the agenda.

Reynolds (1989) argued that policy in the 1980s was committed to entrenching and reaffirming existing inequalities rather than tackling the inequalities faced by disadvantaged groups.

The election of a Labour Government in 1997, with the slogan “education, education, education”, and a commitment to “Third Way” politics aimed at combining market economics with a concern for social justice, provided new hope that inequalities and disadvantage would be tackled. The new Government rapidly set up a Social Exclusion Unit, commitments were made to tackle child poverty, and an emphasis was placed on raising educational standards, skills and achievements. A whole raft of equality legislation has been enacted which provides legal protection for different groups and contributes to cultural expectations of equality, some of which has placed a duty on educational organisations and others to ensure not only that they do not discriminate against students and/or staff, but also that they actively monitor and promote equality. The following legislation all has implications for education and educational institutions:

- The Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 provided legal protection against discrimination by schools and required that all education providers make “reasonable adjustments” to ensure disabled pupils and students are not disadvantaged.
- The Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation, Religion or Belief) Regulations 2003 outlawed discrimination in employment on the basis of sexual orientation, religion or belief.
- The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 instigated a Race Equality Duty requiring all public authorities to take steps to tackle racial discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and to promote good race relations. Educational institutions are required to have a race equality policy, and to assess and monitor the impact of policies on different ethnic groups.
- a Disability Equality Duty came into force in December 2006 requiring all public bodies to actively look at ways of ensuring that disabled people are treated equally.
- a Gender Equality Duty came into force in April 2007 requiring all public bodies to promote equality for women and men and demonstrate that they are eliminating sexual discrimination and harassment.
- The Sexual Orientation Regulations 2007 outlawed discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation in the provision of goods and services.
- The Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006 made it illegal for employers to discriminate against employees, trainees or job seekers because of their age and ensure that all workers, regardless of age, have the same rights in terms of training and promotion.

Since 1997, major changes to the education system, including to its structure, curriculum, and staffing, have also been instigated in the name of raising educational standards and levels of achievement, and increasing parental choice. A few indicative examples include:

- provision for free nursery school places for all three and four year olds
- new numeracy and literacy strategies and the introduction of pupil performance targets in primary schools
- an increasingly diversified secondary school system with the creation of new privately sponsored and specialist schools. In 2005, Tomlinson listed a “hierarchy of thirteen kinds of schooling” (Tomlinson 2005:103)
- a renewed emphasis on vocational education, and a new qualification framework, for 14-19 year olds
- changes to student funding for higher education including the introduction of student fees.

In addition, there has been some targeting of resources aimed to meet the needs of disadvantaged groups (eg UK46: [Sure Start](#) programmes, the Educational Maintenance Allowance⁵ and widening participation in higher education (eg UK47: [Aimhigher](#), UK48: [Fair enough?](#) and UK59: [Widening Participation](#)) initiatives), and a range of specific programmes and initiatives have been developed, both by the government and by voluntary groups, to address educational disadvantage. A selection of these is discussed below.

3.2 Projects designed to address educational disadvantage

A sample of projects designed to address educational disadvantage experienced by different groups have been examined, and these are detailed in Appendix 1. Several projects were selected in relation to each disadvantaged group based on the themes identified for the EPASI project: minority ethnic, socio economic, religious minorities, linguistic minorities, disabilities, indigenous minorities and gender.

The selection of these projects was designed to give some indication of the type, size and range of projects and initiatives that have been instigated to address educational disadvantages experienced by different groups. The selection was, however, limited by the availability of information on different projects and should be seen as an ad hoc selection rather than a comprehensive or definitive list. Some of the projects reflect dominant education policy concerns at the time (such as [Sure Start](#) UK46 or [Aim Higher](#) UK47), whilst others, (for example [Traveller Education Services](#) UK54), provide for a particular disadvantaged group but do not have the same kind of high profile in terms of educational policy overall. [Education for All](#) UK55 was selected precisely because it is atypical in focusing on disadvantage in relation to lesbian and gay pupils. On the whole, more larger, national and/or well-developed projects have been included because of the availability of information on these (eg [Aiming High](#) UK43, the [Gender Equality Duty](#) UK58). In contrast, the [Teachability](#) UK60 project was fairly unique when it started although the process has since been imitated by a growing number of higher education institutions across the UK. Some prominent policy concerns are not reflected in the selection of projects, for example the concern about boys “underachievement” within the gender theme, as most of the initiatives in relation to this take place at school and classroom level and are not widely reported.

Table 1 lists the projects according to the thematic group that each is primarily targeted at and Table 2 lists the projects individually with the target age group also identified. Four of these projects are described in more detail in case study reports: click on the Case Study links where appropriate for these reports.

4. A Summary of Educational Disadvantage in the UK Today

Despite the developments outlined above, significant educational inequalities persist. These are considered below in relation to seven indicators:

- literacy levels
- exclusion/expulsion rates
- attainment levels at end of compulsory education.
- continuing in education post compulsory leaving age
- participation rate in higher education
- employment rates

⁵ Sure Start is an early years programme bringing together childcare, education, health and parental support services. The Educational Maintenance Allowance is a means tested small grant available to young people aged 16-19 if they continue in full time education.

- evidence of social exclusion, being bullied etc.

Consistent and comparable data is not always available in relation to these indicators for all disadvantaged groups. There are, therefore, gaps in the evidence provided here, and a number of different sources are used. Some clear patterns of educational disadvantage do, however, emerge.

Literacy levels

Socio-economic disadvantage is the main predictor of poor literacy levels for children and adults. Five-year olds from deprived areas do less well than other children in communication, language and literacy. There is a similar attainment gap in national curriculum tests at age 7, 11, 14 and 16 between those children entitled to free school meals and all other children. Furthermore, even amongst those children receiving free school meals, “there are differences in attainment depending on social class⁶” (DfES 2006c:14). The attainment gap related to social class is evident from the age of 22 months, and widens further throughout schooling.

Amongst adults, lower levels of literacy are also strongly associated with socio-economic disadvantage, and those with English as their first language tended to score higher than people with a first language other than English. Gender was not a significant factor in adult literacy levels in this study, although men were more likely to attain higher levels in numeracy and ICT than women (DfES 2003). A separate study found that adults from black or South Asian ethnic groups tend to have poorer literacy skills than their white counterparts, and this was particularly marked for women (Grinyer 2006).

Exclusion/expulsion rates

Boys represent approximately 80 percent of pupils permanently excluded from school, and pupils with statements of special educational needs are more than three times more likely to be excluded than other pupils (DfES 2007c). However, although girls are less likely to be formally excluded, self-exclusion and being removed from class but not formally excluded appear to be significant but unrecognised issues for girls (Osler *et al.* 2002).

Ethnicity is also an important factor here, with travellers and black young people far more likely to be excluded than other groups (DfES 2006b). The evidence suggests that ethnicity operates independently of other factors as even when entitlement to free school meals and special educational needs status were controlled for, black Caribbean pupils were over two and a half times more likely to be excluded than their white peers (*ibid.*). Excluded pupils tend to have poorer levels of attainment, higher levels of post-school unemployment and lower lifetime earnings.

Attainment levels at end of compulsory education.

A standard measure of attainment at the end of compulsory schooling is the proportion of pupils achieving 5 GCSE⁷ passes with A to C grades. Results for 2006-07 for England (DCSF 2007) show that 5 A-C passes were achieved by:

59.3 percent of all pupils

35.5 percent of pupils eligible for free school meals

⁶ Free school meals are available (but not always taken up) by children in families reliant on state welfare benefits, and is therefore a measure of income deprivation. It is not directly related to occupation. Social class, in contrast, reflects occupational groupings from professional and managerial to manual/routine occupations.

⁷ GCSE: General Certificate in Secondary Education. These are individual subject specific qualifications, with pupils usually taking between 5 and 9 different GCSEs. Grades A to C are the higher grades generally considered necessary for progression on to higher level courses.

59.5 percent of white, 62.7 percent of Asian and 52.5 percent of black ethnicity
54.8 percent of boys and 63.9 percent of girls
59.4 percent of pupils with English as their first language, 58.2 percent of pupils with a first language other than English.

Levels of achievement vary significantly between different ethnic groups, with only 14 percent of Gypsy/Romany and 15.6 percent of Irish Travellers attaining 5 A-C passes compared to 74.4 percent of Indian pupils and 83.3 percent of Chinese pupils.

There is, therefore, considerable evidence for differential levels of achievement related to ethnicity (DfES 2006a), gender (DfES 2007a) and socio-economic group. A recent study showed that many children from disadvantaged backgrounds are up to a year “behind” their more privileged peers educationally at the age of three (see <http://www.cls.ioe.ac.uk/news.asp?section=000100010003&item=409>). Although attempts have been made to ensure that children do not grow up in poverty, considerable numbers still do so including approximately one third of those living in one-parent families, and significant numbers of Pakistani and Bangladeshi children (ibid.). In addition, research for the Equal Opportunities Commission shows that although a considerable amount of attention is given to gender and attainment levels, with continuing concerns about “underachieving” boys, when social class and ethnicity are also taken into account the picture is far more complex with social class “a stronger factor for achievement than gender, regardless of ethnic group” (Skelton *et al.* 2007:v.).

Continuing in education post compulsory leaving age

Young people from lower socio-economic groups are less likely to remain in education beyond the age of 16. More women than men continue in education (DfES 2007b), but gendered patterns of subject “choice” remain and women continue to face discrimination in the labour market (Leathwood 2007). Young people from minority ethnic groups are more likely than white young people to stay on post-16 (Bhattacharyya *et al.* 2003). Young people with special educational needs (SEN) are more than twice as likely to be classified as Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) than other young people (27 percent compared to 13 percent for all young people) (DfES 2006c).

Participation rate in higher education

Although participation in higher education has increased significantly in recent years, this increase has been largely due to an increase in participation amongst those from higher socio-economic groups, with the proportion of students from poorer backgrounds changing very little. Students from the lowest socio-economic group (SEC Group 7: Routine occupations) constituted only 4.36 percent of all accepted degree applicants in 2007. Although women students are now in the majority at undergraduate level (women constituted 54.1 percent of total applicants accepted on to undergraduate degree courses in the UK for the 2007-08 academic year⁸), the majority of these were also from higher socio-economic groups, with only slightly more women from SEC Group 7 than men⁹. Minority ethnic students are more likely to go to university than their white peers, although there is evidence that black African-Caribbean applicants are significantly less likely to be accepted on to degree courses than their white and Asian counterparts (Tolley and Rundel 2006). There is also evidence that students from lower socio-economic groups, minority ethnic students and women are more likely to study in universities with lower levels of resourcing and prestige (Leathwood 2004; Leathwood and Read 2008).

⁸ University and Colleges Admissions Service

http://wwwucas.ac.uk/about_us/stat_services/stats_online/data_tables/abusgender/ Accessed 15 March 2008

⁹ UCAS data 2007: http://wwwucas.ac.uk/about_us/stat_services/stats_online/annual_datasets_to_download/

Employment rates

Disadvantaged groups tend to have lower employment rates:

“The working-age unemployment rates of those facing some disadvantage are historically higher than in the general working-age population. Minority ethnic groups, lone parents, and people without formal qualifications had an unemployment rate of about 10 percent in 2003. This was roughly twice the rate for the total working-age population. Among the 7 million people of working age who had a disability, the unemployment rate was 8 percent”¹⁰.

Berthoud suggests that this formal unemployment rates for people with disabilities are an underestimate as it tends to include people with minor health problems. If such people are excluded, the employment rates for those with a disability is closer to 30 percent. Minority ethnic disabled people and those who left school early are also less likely to be in employment (Berthoud 2006).

On average, the higher the level of qualification attained, the higher the employment rate: “In spring 2003, 88 percent of working age adults with a degree were in full-time employment compared with 50 percent of those with no qualifications”¹¹. However, employment opportunities for graduates are variable: “research shows that women graduates, graduates from ‘new’ universities, minority ethnic groups and/or working-class backgrounds are likely to benefit less from having a degree in terms of employment opportunities and/or salary” (Moreau and Leathwood 2006:307). The gender pay gap in employment, standing at 17.2 percent for full-time and 35.6 percent for part-time workers in 2007 (TUC 2007) continues to disadvantage women.

Evidence of social exclusion, being bullied etc.

Bullying can affect any child in school, but there is evidence that it is a particularly serious problem for minority ethnic pupils in mainly white schools, 25 percent of whom had experienced racist name calling in a 7 day period (Cline *et al.* 2002) . Bullying also appears to be a significant factor for girls, and is implicated in their decisions to self-exclude (Osler *et al.* 2002), whilst high rates of homophobic bullying have also been reported in schools. Warwick and colleagues note that a range of studies have suggested that between 30-50 percent of lesbian, gay and bisexual young people have experienced bullying in educational settings (Warwick *et al.* 2004). A survey of pupils in Northern Ireland also identified socio-economic group as a factor:

46 percent of 16-year olds whose families were “not at all well off” had been bullied at school, compared to 31 percent of those with “average” incomes and only 24 percent of those whose families were “well-off” (Burns 2006:2)

The evidence presented here suggests that educational disadvantage persists and that those from lower socio-economic groups, regardless of gender, ethnicity or dis/ability are most likely to continue to experience relatively high levels of disadvantage. The data does, though, illustrate the complexity of patterns of equality/inequality in education, and of the importance of an intersectional analysis that pays attention to different patterns of attainment and educational experience for different groups.

¹⁰ National Statistics Online <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=1004> Accessed 18.10.2008

¹¹ National Statistics Online <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=1003>. Accessed 18.10.2008.

5. Conclusions

The UK government has made an explicit commitment to challenging social and educational disadvantage, evident from the legislative developments and the range of educational policy initiatives discussed in this report. The selection of projects designed to ameliorate disadvantage summarised for this report is a very small selection of a much larger range of projects and initiatives, but they do illustrate a commitment to tackle educational disadvantage for a broad range of groups, not only on the part of government, but amongst voluntary groups too. Indeed, it has been the campaigning activities of non-governmental groups and organisations that has so often prompted action on the part of government. The projects described also illustrate the range of strategies used to tackle disadvantage and inequality, including efforts to raise awareness of the disadvantages faced by particular groups, the provision of additional and targeted activities for pupils or students, staff development strategies, legislative changes and resource (re)allocation. Whilst the majority are still focused on changing the disadvantaged groups themselves, such as raising the aspirations of working class and minority ethnic students to go to higher education, some do at least implicitly recognise the need to adapt institutional policies, cultures and practices. An example of a project that explicitly focuses on creating an inclusive school environment is the 'No Outsiders'¹² project, in which teachers work to develop strategies and materials to address lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender equality in their own primary schools. There is, therefore, some recognition that educational institutions and majority cultures need to change if institutionalised racism, sexism and other forms of discriminatory practices are to be seriously challenged, although many campaigners feel that this does not go far enough.

The extent to which projects have been formally evaluated is variable. There has been an increasing tendency to evaluate at national level, but such evaluations are conducted in a political context and hence need to be read with this in mind. In some cases, evaluation reports have not been published (or only published at a much later date) because of political priorities and concerns at the time. Some projects do not appear to have been formally evaluated at all, and hence it is often difficult to make judgements about the effectiveness of these projects. There are clearly some successes, for example with evidence of higher levels of achievement for targeted pupils in some projects. The Sure Start programme (see footnote⁵ and [UK46](#)), for example, appears to be producing results, with evidence that children from the most deprived family backgrounds are now beginning to catch up with their more advantaged peers in levels of social development (Melhuish *et al.* 2008). It is also likely that projects aimed to raise awareness or to promote staff development will have an impact over the longer term. Many of the projects also result in recommendations for further work, and hence inform policy and practice into the future.

Despite the Government's stated commitment to challenging inequalities and disadvantage, however, and the initiatives designed to meet this commitment, as has been seen, considerable inequalities persist. Despite policies to tackle poverty and support schools in disadvantaged areas, and various projects to raise levels of achievement, stark differences in educational attainment related to socio-economic group, gender and ethnicity continue. There is also growing recognition that the statementing of children with special needs and the drive to integrate all such children into mainstream schools have not necessarily been in the best interests of such children, with Baroness Warnock, key instigator of these developments 30 years ago, now seriously questioning these policies and practices (Bovell 2006). In addition, many local authorities lack sufficient resources to meet the growing demand for support for pupils and students with disabilities. Although there is now a legislative framework to prevent discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, as has been seen, homophobic bullying in school remains an on-going problem (Hunt and Jenson 2007). There is also particular concern about the numbers of young people who leave school without qualifications and are not in education, training or employment, hence a recent legislative initiative

¹² See <http://www.nooutsiders.sunderland.ac.uk/> Accessed 21 November 2008.

to raise the education and training leaving age to 18 by 2015. Despite the dramatic increase in participation in higher education in recent years, and the numerous policy initiatives and projects designed to widen participation, the considerable gap between those from the highest and lowest social class groups accessing HE has not significantly changed.

Of course change takes time, but there are also many contradictions in New Labour policy, not least reliance on the market which inevitably produces inequalities, and the continuing emphasis on individual and parental “choice”. There is plenty of evidence (Ball 2003; Reay and Lucey 2003) to show that middle-class parents play the system and continue to be able to get their children into the highest performing schools, whether by paying for private education or private tutoring, or by moving house to ensure they are in a catchment area of a popular school. The move away from a commitment to comprehensive schooling, an acceptance of some forms of academic selection and the increasing differentiation of, and competition between, types of school has reinforced inequalities. In addition, although the Labour Government has made many attempts to address disadvantage, this has tended to be with a focus on social inclusion to meet the needs of the labour market rather than significant levels of redistribution of resources. Indeed, a prominent member of New Labour argued that “the truth is that any government entering the 21st century cannot hope to create a more equal or egalitarian society simply by taking from one set of people and redistributing it to others” (David Blunkett, Education Spokesperson, cited by Levitas 1998). Furthermore, this spokesperson went further, placing responsibility for underachievement not on structural and economic inequalities but on assumptions of working class deficit: “Poverty cannot be an excuse for failure. It is poverty of aspiration and not poverty of income which prevents a child from taking full advantage of their talent” (ibid.:136). In this discursive framing, failure becomes the responsibility of the individual, and the state, which has enshrined equality of opportunity in law and made efforts to support the disadvantaged, is thereby largely absolved.

The neo-liberal ideological underpinnings of government policy are very evident, and can also be seen from the partial shift of funding for higher education away from the state and on to the student. Indeed higher education provides a good example of the contradictions in policy, with a number of policy initiatives and resource allocation decisions aimed at encouraging working class students to attend university, whilst at the same time the personal financial cost of doing so has risen. Most of the increase in higher education participation has comprised of students from middle class groups, whilst policies of encouraging institutional diversity have ensured that such students continue to dominate the better resourced elite university sector, with most working class and minority ethnic students in lower status institutions.

The emphasis on equality of opportunity rather than equality of outcomes, the continued dominance of a fixed notion of “ability” with assumptions of a limited pool of “bright” young people, and a belief in the fairness of meritocracy supported by a high stakes assessment regime, all effectively legitimise educational inequalities (Leathwood 2005). The practice of assessing pupils repeatedly throughout their school years, of “setting”¹³ according to performance in school tests and of identifying “gifted and talented” pupils for special help are all indicative of this belief in the virtues of meritocracy. Yet as Michael Young, who coined the term “meritocracy” (Young 1971 [1958]), has recently argued “it is hard indeed in a society that makes so much of merit to be judged as having none” (Young 2001). The “individualisation of social risks” where “social problems are increasingly perceived in terms of psychological dispositions: as personal inadequacies” that Beck identified as part of the new modernity is evident (Beck 1992:100) in policy discourse. There is insufficient recognition of the ways in which the structures, cultures and practices of the education

¹³ “Setting” is the allocation of pupils to subject specific groups/or classes according to levels of achievement in that subject. So the “bottom” set will include those pupils with the lowest levels of achievement. The psycho-social effects of such assessment practices can be highly detrimental. See Reay, D. and D. William (1998). 'I'll Be a Nothing': Structure, Agency, and the Construction of Identity through Assessment. *British Educational Research Journal* 25(3): 343-54.

system, including relatively recent developments in the name of competition, choice and diversity, reinforce and reconstruct inequalities.

So the picture in the UK is very mixed. There is no doubt that many more people benefit from educational opportunities than in the past, and that the government is attempting to ameliorate educational and social disadvantage. There are, of course, limits to the extent to which wider social inequalities can be tackled through the education system, and the legislative changes that have been enacted to challenge inequalities are very welcome. However, if the present contradictions in government education policy continue, educational inequalities and disadvantages are unlikely to be significantly reduced.

References

- Archer, L, M Hutchings, A Ross, with, C Leathwood, R Gilchrist and D Phillips (2003) *Social Class and Higher Education: Issues of Exclusion and Inclusion*. London, Routledge Falmer
- Ball, S (1990) *Politics and Policy Making in Education: Explorations in Policy Sociology*. London, Routledge
- Ball, SJ (2003) *Class Strategies and the Education Market: The Middle Classes and Social Advantage*. London, Routledge Falmer
- Beck, U (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London, Sage
- Berthoud, R (2006) *The Employment Rates of Disabled People: Research Report 298*. London, Department for Work and Pensions
- Bhattacharyya, G, L Ison and M Blair (2003) *Minority Ethnic Attainment and Participation in Education and Training: The Evidence: Research Topic Paper Rtp01-03*. Nottingham, Department for Education and Skills
- Bovell, V (2006) Time to Spell out the Line on Special Needs. The Guardian. London. **Tuesday 4 July**
- Burns, S (2006) *School Bullying in Northern Ireland - It Hasn't Gone Away You Know: Research Update*. Londonderry and Belfast, ARK
<http://www.ark.ac.uk/publications/updates/update48.pdf> Accessed 18.10.2008
- Butler, T, C Hamnett, M Ramsden and R Webber (2007) The Best, the Worst and the Average: Secondary School Choice and Education Performance in East London. *Journal of Education Policy* 22(1): 7-29
- Central Advisory Council for Education, E (1967) *Children and Their Primary Schools (the Plowden Report)*. London, HMSO
- Cline, T, Gd Abreu, C Fihosy, H Gray, H Lambert and J Neale (2002) *Minority Ethnic Pupils in Mainly White Schools: Research Report 365*. Nottingham, DfES
- Coard, B (1971) *How the West Indian Child Is Made Educationally Subnormal in the British School System: The Scandal of the Black Child in Schools in Britain*. London, New Beacon Books Ltd
- Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People (1978) *Special Educational Needs (the Warnock Report)*. London, HMSO
- Committee of the Secondary School Examination Council, C. E. i. S. S. (1943) *Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools (the Norwood Report)*. London, HMSO
- Committee on Higher Education (1963) *Higher Education Report of the Committee Appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-1963*. London, HMSO
- Consultative Committee on Grammar and Technical High Schools (1938) *Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools (the Spens Report)*. London, HMSO
- DCSF (2007) *National Curriculum Assessment, Gcse and Equivalent Attainment and Post-16 Attainment by Pupil Characteristics, in England 2006/07: Srf 38/2007*. London, Department for Children, Schools and Families
- DES (1981) *West Indian Children in Our Schools (the Rampton Committee Report)*. London, HMSO
- DfES (2003) *The Skills for Life Survey: A National Needs and Impact Survey of Literacy, Numeracy and Ict Skills. Dfes Research Brief Rb490*. Norwich, HM Stationery Office

- DfES (2006a) *Ethnicity and Education: The Evidence on Minority Ethnic Pupils Age 5-16*. London, Department for Education and Skills
- DfES (2006b) *Exclusion of Black Pupils: Getting It. Getting It Right*. London, DfES
- DfES (2006c) *Social Mobility: Narrowing Social Class Educational Attainment Gaps*. London, DfES <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/STA/t000657/index.shtml> Accessed 17 October 2008
- DfES (2007a) *Gender and Achievement: The Evidence on Pupils in England*. London, Department for Education and Skills
- DfES (2007b) *Gender and Education: The Evidence on Pupils in England*. Nottingham, Department for Education and Skills
- DfES (2007c) *National Statistics First Release: Permanent and Fixed Period Exclusions from Schools and Exclusion Appeals in England, 2005/06*. London, Department for Education and Skills
- Epstein, D, Ed (1994) *Challenging Lesbian and Gay Inequalities in Education*. Buckingham, Open University Press
- Epstein, D, J. Elwood, V Hey and J Maw, Eds (1998) *Failing Boys? Issues in Gender and Achievement*. Buckingham, Open University Press
- Floud, J, AH Halsey and FM Martin (1957) *Social Class and Educational Opportunity*. London, Heinemann
- Gillborn, D and HS Mirza (2000) *Educational Inequality. Mapping Race, Class and Gender: A Synthesis of Research Evidence*. London, Office for Standards in Education
- Grinyer, J (2006) *Literacy, Numeracy and the Labour Market: Further Analysis of the Skills for Life Survey*. London, Department for Education and Skills
- Heath, A and C Payne (1999) *Twentieth Century Trends in Social Mobility in Britain. Working Paper No. 70*. Oxford, University of Oxford Centre for Research into Elections and Social Trends
- Hunt, R and J Jenson (2007) *The School Report: The Experiences of Young Gay People in Britain's Schools*. London, Stonewall
- Jenkins, S, J Micklewright and S Schnepf (2006) *Social Segregation in Secondary Schools: How Does England Compare with Other Countries? Iser Working Paper 2006-2*. Colchester, University of Essex.
- Leathwood, C (2004) A Critique of Institutional Inequalities in Higher Education (or an Alternative to Hypocrisy for Higher Educational Policy). *Theory and Research in Education* 2(1): 31-48
- Leathwood, C (2005) Assessment Policy and Practice in Higher Education: Purpose, Standards and Equity. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 30(3): 307-324
- Leathwood, C (2007) Gender Equity in Post Secondary Education. *Gender and Education*. C. Skelton, B. Francis and L. Smulyan. London, Sage
- Leathwood, C and B Read (2008) *Gender and the Changing Face of Higher Education: A Feminised Future?* London, SRHE & Open University Press
- Levitas, R (1998) *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*. Basingstoke and London, Macmillan Press
- Melhuish, E, J Belsky, AH Leyland, J Barnes and NR Team (2008) Effects of Fully-Established Sure Start Local Programmes on 3-Year-Old Children and Their Families Living in England: A Quasi-Experimental Observational Study. *Lancet* 372: 1641-1647

- Ministry of Education (1959) *The Crowther Report: Fifteen to Eighteen* London, Central Advisory Council for Education/HMSO
- Ministry of Education (1963) *Half Our Future (the Newsom Report)*. London, HMSO.
- Moreau, M-P and C Leathwood (2006) Graduates' Employment and the Discourse of Employability: A Critical Analysis. *Journal of Education and Work* 19(4): 305-324
- Ofsted (2003) *Provision and Support for Traveller Pupils, Hmi 455* London, Ofsted.
- Osler, A, C Street, M Lall and K Vincent (2002). *Not a Problem? Girls and School Exclusion* London, National Children's Bureau and the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Quinn, J (2003) *Powerful Subjects: Are Women Really Taking over the University?* Stoke on Trent, Trentham.
- Reay, D (2006) The Zombie Stalking English Schools: Social Class and Educational Inequality *British Journal of Educational Studies* 54(3): 288-307
- Reay, D and H Lucey (2003) Stigmatised Choices: Social Class, Social Exclusion and Local Secondary School Markets in the Inner City. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society* 12(1): 45-82
- Reay, D and D William (1998) 'I'll Be a Nothing': Structure, Agency, and the Construction of Identity through Assessment. *British Educational Research Journal* 25(3): 343-54
- Reynolds, D (1989) Better Schools? Present and Potential Policies About the Goals, Organisation and Management of Secondary Schools. *Education Policies: Controversies and Critiques*. A. Hargreaves and D. Reynolds. London, Falmer
- Ross, A (2000) *Curriculum: Construction and Critique*. London, Falmer
- Ryder, J and H Silver (1970) *Modern English Society: History and Structure 1850-1970*. London, Methuen and Co Ltd
- Silver, H (1973) *Equal Opportunity in Education*. London, Methuen
- Skelton, C, B Francis and Y Valkanova (2007) *Breaking Down the Stereotypes: Gender and Achievement in Schools*. <http://www.eoc.org.uk> Accessed 13.09.2007, Equal Opportunities Commission
- THES (2007) For Some, Campus Is Still Another Country. 31 August
- Tolley, J and J Rundel (2006) *A Review of Black and Minority Ethnic Participation in Higher Education*. <http://64.233.183.104/search?q=cache:vf71w0ocyBkJ:www.actiononaccess.org/download.php%3Ff%3D367+ethnicity+higher+education&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=17&gl=uk> Accessed 15 March 2008, The National BME Education Strategy Group, Action on Access
- Tomlinson, S (2005) *Education in a Post-Welfare Society. 2nd Edition*. Maidenhead, Open University Press
- Trenchard, L and H Warren (1984) *Something to Tell You*. London, London Gay Teenage Group
- TUC (2007) *Closing the Gender Pay Gap: An Update Report for Tuc Women's Conference 2008*. London, TUC
- Warwick, I, E Chase, P Appleton, with and S Sanders (2004) *Homophobia, Sexual Orientation and Schools: A Review and Implications for Action*. Nottingham, DfES
- Webber, R and T Butler (2007) Classifying Pupils by Where They Live: How Well Does This Predict Variations in Their Gcse Results? *Urban Studies* 44(7): 1229 - 1254
- Young, M (1971 [1958]) *The Rise of the Meritocracy*. Harmondsworth, Penguin
- Young, M (2001) Down with Meritocracy. *The Guardian*. Friday June 29

Appendix: Project Summaries

Theme	Project	subsidiary themes
Minority ethnic groups	Aiming High: Raising the achievement of African Caribbean pupils UK43 [Case Study 1]	
	National Resource Centre for Supplementary Education UK44	
Socio-economic	16-24 Job Ready UK45	C
	Sure Start UK46	L E
	Aim Higher UK47	L
	Fair Enough? Wider access to university by identifying potential to succeed UK48	L D E
	Health E-mentoring Project UK49	
	Widening Participation Initiative UK59 [Case Study 2]	
Religious Minorities	Religious Education Council for England and Wales UK50	
	Northern Ireland Council for Integrated Education UK51	
Linguistic Minorities	Mother Tongue Education UK52	E
	Primary National Strategy UK62	
	Making the Grade UK63	
Disabilities	Statementing Policy UK53	
	Teachability UK60 [Case Study 3]	
	School Access Initiative UK61	
	AchieveAbility UK64	
Indigenous Minorities	Traveller Education Services UK54	C
	Scottish Traveller Education Programme UK57	
Gender	Education for All UK55	
	The Women into Science, Engineering and Construction Campaign (WISE) UK56	
	Gender Equality Duty UK58 [Case Study 4]	

Key: **E** ethnic minorities; **C** social class; **R** religious minorities;
L linguistic minorities; **D** disability; **I** indigenous minorities; **G** gender

Appendix: Project overview

Project	target age range					target theme(s)						
	pre-school	primary	secondary	higher	working life	minority ethnic	Socio-economic	religious minority	linguistic minorities	disability	indigenous minorities	gender
Aiming High: Raising the achievement of African Caribbean pupils UK 43 [Case Study 1]			✓			✓✓						
National Resource Centre for Supplementary Education UK44		✓	✓			✓✓						
16-24 Job Ready UK45			✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓					
Sure Start UK46	✓					✓	✓✓		✓			
Aim Higher UK47			✓	✓			✓✓		✓			
Fair Enough? Wider access to university by identifying potential to succeed UK48				✓		✓	✓✓		✓	✓		
Health E-mentoring Project UK49			✓				✓✓					
Widening Participation Initiative UK59 [Case Study 2]			✓	✓			✓✓					
Religious Education Council for England and Wales UK50			✓	✓				✓✓				
Northern Ireland Council for Integrated Education UK51		✓	✓					✓✓				
Mother Tongue Education UK52		✓				✓			✓✓			
Primary National Strategy UK62		✓							✓✓			
Making the Grade UK63			✓						✓✓			
Statementing Policy UK53		✓	✓							✓✓		
Teachability UK60 [Case Study 3]				✓						✓✓		

School Access Initiative UK61	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓✓
AchieveAbility UK64			✓				✓✓
Traveller Education Services UK54		✓	✓			✓	✓✓
Scottish Traveller Education Programme UK57		✓	✓				✓✓
Education for All UK55		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓✓
The Women into Science, Engineering and Construction Campaign (WISE) UK56	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓✓
Gender Equality Duty [Case Study 4] UK58	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓✓

✓✓Indicates main theme addressed,

✓Indicates additional themes also addressed