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Executive summary

INTRODUCTION

Aims

In this report we examine why attainment rates amongst Bangladeshi pupils have significantly improved over recent years while Turkish and Somali pupils continue to perform below the national average. We explore the experiences of pupils within the education system, the characteristics and policies of their schools, the support received from the local authorities and the impact of parental involvement and parents’ attitudes to school.

We also suggest the factors and school strategies likely to have contributed to improved outcomes for underperforming ethnic minority pupils. Evidence will include examples of good practice in schools with high performing pupils from these groups. Wherever possible we identify factors that are specific to the three groups in this study, and in particular the factors that explain increasing attainment rates amongst Bangladeshi pupils.

Research questions

There are four research questions; question 1 at school level, questions 2-4 at pupil level:

1. What is the range of support available specifically for Bangladeshi, Turkish and Somali groups, in primary and secondary schools, and how do these impact on pupil attainment and experience of school?

2. What are the attitudes and aspirations of pupils within these groups: how do they differ? What are the pupils’ experiences of school?

3. What level of support do parents or others in the household/community provide for their children’s learning at school and at home? How does this differ between groups?

4. What are the other challenges faced by these pupils which may contribute to poor achievement?

HOW THE REPORT IS ORGANIZED

The report begins with an introduction to the research (chapter 1) and in chapter 2 we provide a summary of the methods used in chapters 3-7.

Part One: Quantitative Evidence

Chapter 3: predictors of attainment amongst Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils

The analysis in this chapter makes use of administrative data on pupils to investigate the patterns, evolution and predictors of attainment amongst Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish (BST) heritage pupils. The aim is to understand how school performance differs across ethnic groups, to evaluate whether these differences change over time, and to investigate the pupil- and school-level factors associated with differences and changes in performance.
This chapter includes analysis of:

- The National Pupil Database (NPD) and Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) administrative data.
- The main predictors of under-attainment amongst Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils.
- The Minority Ethnic Achievement Programme (MEAP) and its effects on the performance of pupils attending the schools included in the programme.
- The use of disaggregated data for selecting a sample of schools for in-depth interviews reported in chapter five.

Chapter 4: attainment of Bangladeshi and Somali students

The focus of this analysis is on attainment at the end of compulsory schooling at age 16. The Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE) includes interviews with a nationally representative sample of over 15,000 young people and their parents/guardians in the year of its inception in 2004. Linked demographic data from the School Census and attainment data from KS2 tests in 2001, KS3 tests in 2004 and GCSE results in 2006 are also available for the cohort.

This chapter explores:

- Historical trends in the attainment of Bangladeshi students in England, in relation to other BME groups and to White British students;
- Recent data on attainment at the end of secondary school for both Bangladeshi and Somali students from the (LSYPE);
- The role of socio-economic factors and pupil and family context in accounting for the attainment of Bangladeshi and Somali students at age 16, both in terms of their performance relative to White British students;
- The factors which account for differences in attainment between Bangladeshi and Somali students;
- The impact, if any, of school level factors, particularly school quality and ethnic composition, on the attainment of Bangladeshi students.

Chapter 5: school survey and analysis

This chapter presents a survey of 284 Heads of Inclusion/Ethnic Minority Achievement in primary and secondary schools with higher than average concentrations of pupils from Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish/Kurdish backgrounds.5

Within each of the three samples, schools with higher than average, lower than average and around average attainment levels were included. We adopted this approach in order to be able to compare practices between schools with different levels of pupil attainment as well as different ethnic profiles. The survey gathers information on:

5 Turkish and Kurdish pupils are grouped together because there is considerable overlap in the way the terms “Turkish” and “Kurdish” are used in the Annual Schools Census data from which the sampling information was taken, which effectively made it impossible to distinguish between the two groups.
• How schools have supported pupils from the selected ethnic minority groups
• Whether the schools have particular policies/programmes in place for the pupils and their parents
• Issues encountered in working with these pupils
• Recruitment of teachers from these backgrounds

The chapter also includes a quantitative analysis of the impact of school practices on pupils’ achievement in secondary school. The aim was to understand whether characteristics of the school workforce and policies implemented at the school level had any impact in raising pupils’ academic achievement at Key Stage 4.

**Part Two: Qualitative Evidence**

**Chapter 6: evidence from Local Authorities, Schools and Pupils**

In this chapter we investigate the factors driving attainment from the perspective of those with knowledge and responsibility for Ethnic Minority Achievement at local authority and school levels, and from the point of view of class teachers, and of the students themselves. We examine the factors shaping the educational experiences of pupils from these three ethnic groups. In particular, this chapter identifies lessons from the experiences of Bangladeshi pupils that may inform initiatives to improve the attainment of pupils from Somali, Turkish and Kurdish backgrounds.

This chapter investigates:

• The factors driving attainment from a local authority and school level perspective, and from the point of view of the students themselves
• The factors shaping the educational experiences of pupils from these three ethnic groups
• Lessons from the experiences of Bangladeshi pupils that may inform initiatives to improve the attainment of pupils from Somali, Turkish and Kurdish backgrounds.

The analysis highlights good practice at local authority and school level, and which has helped to support the learning and attainment of ethnic minority pupils. In relation to schools we consider:

• Factors at the whole school level, such as policies and leadership
• Factors at the classroom level, such as teaching approaches which help schools to meet the needs of pupils from these three groups.

**Chapter 7: evidence from parents**

In this chapter we identify, from the perspective of parents of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils, the factors that may account for the differences in achievement among pupils from these three groups.

• The approach combines both focus groups and in-depth interviews. Twelve focus groups with Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish (including some Kurdish) parents are used to assess community-wide factors and experiences that may impact on children’s educational achievement.
• Separate focus groups are conducted with fathers and mothers, both because of the substantive issues which this research seeks to explore (e.g. aspirations, parental support, barriers to help) and because of the dominant cultural norms in the Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish communities, according to which men and women are generally better at ease when interviewed only with members of their own sex.

• In addition, twelve depth interviews (with one or both parents) are carried out to understand the individual and household level factors that may impact on a child’s achievement.

• The interviews are all conducted in people’s homes, which provides valuable insights into the home environment.

ABOUT THE EVIDENCE

Measures that are effective with one group are not always effective with another, or are more effective at one stage of schooling and less at another. Effective interventions will often have to take account of the varying economic, social and cultural profiles of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils and parents. For example, Bangladeshi and Somali pupils are equally likely to reside in high deprivation inner city areas, and in particular in high deprivation schools within London. However, while these ‘high-level’ features are similar it may be, as our research begins to suggest, that ‘micro-level’ differences in local context are significant, including the relative size and geographic concentration of both groups.

The evidence suggests the following key predictors and challenges.

Key Predictors

• Under-attainment amongst Somali and Turkish pupils, and under-attainment amongst Bangladeshi pupils prior to KS4 appears to be significantly explained by poverty and social deprivation.

• The inclusion of Free School Meal (FSM) eligibility substantially reduces the attainment gaps for all the ethnic minorities considered at all the Key Stages.

• The inclusion of English as an Additional Language (EAL) also reduces the attainment gaps, but to a lesser extent as compared with the introduction on FSM.

• The negative impact of FSM eligibility increases in absolute magnitude as children become older.

• Our evidence does not support the hypothesis that BST lower performance in primary school is due to the fact that they attend on average worse schools.

• The importance of school factors increases over time (larger differences between schools during secondary school than during primary school).

• A positive impact on attainment is associated with a school having in excess of 50% of Bangladeshi pupils in the total school roll.

• For Bangladeshi pupils the following key factors were all significantly related to attainment: parental educational aspirations for their child, the student’s own educational aspirations, Special Educational Needs (SEN), parental supervision, student planning for the future, homework and academic self-concept. This confirms that factors important in comparisons between ethnic groups are also important in accounting for variation in performance within the Bangladeshi group.
• Both Bangladeshi and Somali students are marked by extremely high educational aspirations both by parents for their child and by the students themselves, a positive attitude to school and strong academic self concept. These factors distinguish both groups from similarly disadvantaged White British students and account for the greater resilience to deprivation of the Bangladeshi group in particular.

• However Somali students are not achieving the same return in relation to these positive factors as either White British or Bangladeshi students, and they are not achieving as well as would be expected given these advantaging factors.

• School staff tended to feel that an important determinant of young peoples’ attainment was their parents’ ability to assimilate into UK society, and parental understanding of the British education system. The fact that parents are a key influence on school attainment was echoed in the interviews with pupils. This would provide Bangladeshi pupils with an advantage, having lived in the UK for longer than other groups.

• Issues related to English as an Additional Language (EAL) are likely to be more significant in primary school and in the early stages of secondary school, but appear to play a less significant role in attainment at age 16.

**Key Challenges**

• Teachers were asked what they saw as the main facilitators of pupils’ achievements. In the Bangladeshi and Somali samples, the factors most widely mentioned were strong or dedicated support within the school and parental support for education. In the Turkish/Kurdish sample, within-school support was the factor most widely mentioned. It is a priority to disseminate and build on existing best practices, targeting support measures at pupils with the highest levels of need and lowest levels of attainment.

• EAL is not a measure of English fluency. Whilst the evidence suggests that attainment at KS4 is not simply about the language used at home it is a key question how far English fluency is significant in accounting for progress and achievement throughout the school career, particularly in respect of Key Stages 1-3, and in respect of new arrivals with very low levels of English.

• Unlike Bangladeshi students, the attainment of Somali students does not match the level expected from their high educational aspirations, academic self concept, and attitude to school. And Somali pupils did not appear to benefit from the high Contextual Value Added (CVA) achieved by the schools they attended. There is a need to better understand the factors that support and inhibit the progress and achievement of Somali pupils, and to identify effective measures of support.

• There are considerable structural barriers to success for Bangladeshi students. The challenge now is to ensure that success in educational attainment in school at 16 is reflected in increased participation in education post-16 and in improved employment and life outcomes.

• Across the three communities, there were important differences in expectations of what their children would or could achieve. Bangladeshi parents seemed to maintain more positive expectations than did either Turkish or Somali parents. We need to understand what accounts for these varying levels of expectation, and to identify measures for raising expectations amongst all groups.

• Despite a desire to help their children, the level of parental involvement was often restricted by the parents’ own lack of formal education, difficulties in speaking/reading English, limited
understanding of the education system and of the curriculum, and lack of time. It is a significant challenge to identify and learn from best practice in relation to interventions designed to enable parents to support their children’s learning, and to become involved in their children’s school.

- Somali pupils have progressed faster in Minority Ethnic Achievement Programme (MEAP) schools as compared with Somali pupils in other schools in England. However, there are no significant differences in progress for Turkish/Kurdish and Bangladeshi pupils as compared to White British pupils in the MEAP schools. It is a priority to understand better the progress, or lack of it, amongst these ethnic groups in the context of MEAP schools, and to identify support measures in the context of MEAP that are equally effective for all ethnic groups.

- Many parents, in particular Turkish and Somali parents, are not fully familiar with the education system and do not always know how to support their children’s education. Unless schools dedicate considerable resources towards supporting these parents, they are left unable to engage as full partners in their children’s education.

**Example of good practice: targeted support**

- One Local Authority (LA) gave an example of a research project that preceded Aiming High and MEAP. The project came about as a result of data revealing that Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys were amongst the lowest achieving MEGs in the LA. The project was designed to raise achievement amongst Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys. Seven secondary schools participated in the project, including 3 schools where Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys were achieving as highly as other pupils, as well as selected schools with significant numbers of underachieving Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys.

- The project involved discussions with pupils, parents, subject teachers, support staff, mentors and supplementary schools, with a view to identifying what was happening in schools where boys were performing well, and what wasn’t happening in schools where boys were underachieving. It was found that schools where Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys were achieving highly had good individual pupil assessment. This included a thorough assessment of English language needs and personalised support in EAL all through secondary education. The support provided was tailored to meet the needs of the pupils and modified as pupils moved up through school years. These schools also had good tracking and monitoring systems in place and good relationships with the local community. By contrast, schools with underachieving Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys had limited EAL support, only given in year 7. This support was not structured or thorough and did not last through to examinations.

- The findings were published and disseminated. The LA also wrote a good practice guide that listed headings where schools were doing well. The guide looked at what SLT was doing in schools, and what policies and practices were being used by the school. It also included case studies of what was happening in schools in terms of leadership, ethos, mentoring, EAL and parental and community involvement. The guide gave step by step advice as to how the examples of good practice could be implemented in schools. It was sent to all secondary schools in the LA. Following the publication of the guide, the LA became involved in MEAP. The schools involved in the action research project were also involved in MEAP and, after 2 years, KS3 data showed that attainment had improved across all of the schools.

**Executive Summary**

The findings are organised under key themes, selected in response to the four research questions.
With some exceptions we do not distinguish between the numerous research designs and sources of data used in data gathering and analysis; these are described in the full report.

All findings presented below receive support from at least some of the contributory analyses, and are contradicted by none.

**Full Report**

In the full report quantitative evidence is presented in chapters 3, 4 and 5; many of the themes identified here are elaborated upon in the qualitative evidence, presented in chapters 6 and 7. Research designs and methods are described in these chapters and in appendices.

**ATTAINMENT: TRENDS**

- There are large differences in attainment between the ethnic groups included in this research.
- During the period 2003-08 White British pupils are on average performing best, followed by Bangladeshi, and then Turkish and Somali pupils.
- Ethnic minority under-performance, as compared to White British pupils, is already evident in primary schools.
- The performance of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish (BST) heritage pupils improves over time and their results become closer to those of White British pupils. This is particularly true for Bangladeshi pupils, whose results at Key Stage 4 are higher than those for White British pupils.
- There are significant and continuing improvements in the attainment of all ethnic groups over the period 2003 - 2008, but Bangladeshi students have improved at a faster rate than their White British students.
- The performance of Bangladeshi pupils at age 16 is much stronger than seen in national tests at age 7, 11 and 14.
- In 2003, 45.5% of Bangladeshi students achieved 5+ A*-C grades compared to 51.0% of White British students. By 2008 these figures had increased to 62.3% of Bangladeshi students while the results for White British students were 63.8%. The gap in 2008 stood at just 1.5 percentage points.
- The gender difference in attainment is more marked with the Bangladeshi students than for White British students. In 2008 68.2% of White British girls achieved 5+ A*-C grades compared to 59.5% of White British boys, a difference of 8.7% percentage points. In the same year 68.9% of Bangladeshi girls compared to 56.0% of Bangladeshi boys achieved 5+ A*-C, a difference of 12.9 percentage points.
- Unlike Bangladeshi students, the attainment of Somali students does not match the level expected from their high educational aspirations, academic self concept, and attitude to school.

**Sources of evidence**

- Quantitative evidence on attainment levels is drawn from several data sets, including in particular the National Pupil Database (NPD), reported on in chapter 3, and the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE), reported on in chapter 4. The results of analysis of the NPD are not always identical with results of the analysis of the LSYPE data. It is therefore important to be clear about the status of these separate sources of evidence.
• The NPD has a much larger coverage (the entire pupil population) than the LSYPE (15,000 young people) but includes many fewer variables than the LYSPE. For example, the NPD has only gross measures of social context, as indicated by entitlement to free school meals (FSM), English as an Additional Language (EAL), Special Educational Needs (SEN) and the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI). Using these measures we find that Somali students at KS4 appear to attain slightly better than similarly disadvantaged White British students. However, once we make use of the more detailed and comprehensive variables found in the LSYPE (e.g. pupils’ high educational aspirations, academic self concept, and attitude to school), the full extent of under-achievement among Somali pupils becomes clear.

• Any differences in emphasis in findings from separate datasets reflect, therefore, the nature and quality of the control variables used when adjusting for contextual factors. But it is evidence from the LYSPE that provides the most reliable and nuanced analysis of attainment across the three ethnic groups we report on.

PREDICTORS OF ATTAINMENT

Poverty

• Under-attainment amongst Somali and Turkish pupils and amongst Bangladeshi pupils prior to KS4 appears to be significantly explained by poverty and social deprivation.

• More than 8 out 10 Somali pupils live in a poor household. The proportion of Somali pupils eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) is 82%.

• Over 50% of Bangladeshi pupils receive FSM. Fewer Turkish pupils receive FSM, but the figure of approximately 40% is still nearly 5 times higher than the proportion for White British pupils.

• The negative impact of FSM eligibility increases in absolute magnitude as children become older.

• Both Bangladeshi and Somali students are equally likely to reside in extremely high deprivation inner city areas, and in particular in high deprivation schools within London.

Racism and structural inequality

• Racism and structural inequalities may be important influences on the attainment of many Bangladeshi and Somali students.

• Factors such as high youth unemployment and fear of discrimination in the workplace might also play a part in the high commitment to education evinced by Bangladeshi students.

• Over 40% of Bangladeshi men under 25 years of age are unemployed, compared to 12% of young White men.

English as an Additional Language

• Issues related to English as an Additional Language (EAL) are likely to be more significant in primary school and in the early stages of secondary school, but appear to play a less significant role in attainment at age 16. Strong improvement is seen during KS4 in the attainment of nearly all minority ethnic students, whatever their language
backgrounds, so this improvement is about more than just the language spoken at home (Strand, 2008).

- EAL is not a measure of English fluency. Whilst the evidence suggests that attainment at KS4 is not simply about the language(s) spoken at home it is a key question requiring further research how far English fluency is significant in accounting for progress and achievement throughout the school career, particularly in respect of Key Stages 1-3, and in respect of new arrivals with very low levels of English.

- The comprehension and use of academic language in particular presents barriers to all pupils with English as an additional language.

**Length of residence in England and reasons for migration**

- There are important differences between parents from the three communities as a function both of their length of residence in England and of the reasons for their migration.

- Many Bangladeshi parents in the sample are second-generation migrants: many had been to school in England themselves, spoke and read some English and had already overcome the most pressing issues associated with migration.

- By contrast, most Turkish parents and all Somali parents in the sample are first-generation migrants who had arrived here as young adults, often as asylum seekers or refugees: many still spoke little or no English and were not familiar with the education system. This impacted on their ability to find work and on their standard of living, and also on their ability to support their children and to engage fully with schools.

- The fact that the Bangladeshi community is longer-established also meant that there were many more Bangladeshi professionals working in a range of sectors than were found in the Turkish and Somali communities. These professionals acted as role models and resources for other community members. The Turkish and Somali communities, as recent and impoverished communities, both lacked positive role models for their youth.

**Schools**

- School quality appears to have a greater impact on results in secondary schools than in primary schools; that is, the proportion of the overall variance in pupils’ results explained by differences across schools is higher for secondary than for primary schools.

- A caveat: it may be that children who enrol in these schools have different characteristics that are not fully taken account of in our model; that is, they are not accounted for by observable characteristics and by prior achievement. If so, we may be observing the effect of higher achieving children selecting into these schools, rather than the causal impact of these schools on pupils’ achievement.

- Our evidence does not support the hypothesis that BST lower performance in primary school is due to the fact that they attend on average worse schools.

- The importance of school factors increases over time (larger differences between schools during secondary school than during primary school).

- A positive impact on attainment is associated with a school having in excess of 50% of Bangladeshi pupils in the total school roll.
School factors related to Bangladeshi students’ success

- Bangladeshi students are more likely to have attended single sex schools and schools with high levels of deprivation in inner city areas.

- However these are not low quality schools, at least if Contextual Value Added' (CVA\textsuperscript{6}) is taken as a measure of school quality. Indeed the mean school CVA score for Bangladeshi students was significantly higher than the mean school CVA score for White British students.

- An additional positive compositional factor is a high concentration of Bangladeshi students in the school, with a positive impact on attainment associated with a school having in excess of 50% of Bangladeshi pupils in the total school roll.

- It was notable that Somali pupils did not appear to benefit from the high CVA achieved by the schools they attended.

Local Authorities

- 20% of all Bangladeshi students in England reside in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.

- This LA has seen substantial improvement in the attainment of Bangladeshi students over the last 10 years.

- A focus on the negative impact on attainment of extended absence through visits to Bangladesh is an area the authority is reported to have targeted.

Influence of parents

- An important factor in pupils’ achievement seemed to be parents’ knowledge and understanding of the education system in England; this is also linked to their length of residence in England and ability to speak and read English.

- School staff tended to feel that an important determinant of young peoples' attainment was their parents’ ability to assimilate into UK society, and parental understanding of the British education system.

- Parents as a key influence on school attainment was a prominent theme to emerge from interviews with pupils.

Facilitators to achievement

- In our qualitative research teachers were asked what they saw as the main factors acting as facilitators to achievement for pupils at school.

- In the Bangladeshi and Somali samples, the factors most widely mentioned were strong or dedicated support within the school and parental support for education.

---

\textsuperscript{6} Contextual value-added is a measure used to reach a statistical judgement on the quality of schools, as measured by pupils' results. CVA includes an analysis of pupils’ characteristics, identifying the average results achieved in the past by groups of pupils with similar characteristics. Pupil's actual results are compared against this average number, to determine whether a school is making better than expected progress with its pupils, given their characteristics.
• In the Turkish/Kurdish sample, within-school support was the factor most widely mentioned.

• After this, about two fifths cited another “in school” factor, good systems in schools for assessing students’ needs/target setting/monitoring alongside an “external” factor, parental support for education (in the Turkish/Kurdish sample).

RANGE OF SUPPORT IN SCHOOLS

Support received from the local authority

Schools were asked about the support they received from their local authority for the three ethnic groups:

• Nine in ten schools get advice or training for school staff from their LA
• Seven in ten schools get LA staff to monitor EAL support
• Two-thirds of schools report that their LA helped them with specific projects to support pupils
• Three-fifths of schools report that their LA helps them with specific projects to support parents
• Half of schools get LA staff to help with needs assessment
• Two-fifths of schools report that they received financial support from their local authority specifically to support pupils from the ethnic backgrounds they were being asked about.

In relation to all these types of support, schools are much more likely to report that they received these types of help to support pupils from all backgrounds, than to say they were particularly aimed at pupils from the ethnic backgrounds being asked about.

Support measures used by schools with BST pupils

More than nine out of ten schools use the following general support measures with pupils:

• Involving pupils in school events to celebrate diversity or showcase their culture
• Targeted school attendance or behaviour measures
• Therapists
• Educational psychologist

The following measures to support EAL needs are almost universally used by schools:

• Pupils' EAL needs being flagged up to class or subject teachers
• Regular review of EAL needs for all pupils
• In class support for group work
• English language assessment by school staff for new pupils
• Individual or group support for which pupils are withdrawn from class

Eight out of ten schools or more also use:

• Interpreters or translators
• After school or lunchtime clubs
Special induction programme
Access to specialist professional support
Individual (one to one) support in class

Staff members with formal responsibility for ethnic minority achievement

- Two-fifths of primary schools report that they had one person with formal responsibility for ethnic minority achievement, compared with about one sixth of secondary schools.
- Three-quarters of the secondary schools have a team of people with responsibility for EMA, compared with about half of the primary schools.

Diagnostic procedures used to assess pupils’ level of need for support

- Virtually all schools in the survey said they use the same diagnostic procedures with pupils from the target backgrounds as with pupils from other backgrounds.

Quality of school provisions and parental satisfaction with school

- Overall, more Bangladeshi than either Turkish or Somali parents report being satisfied with their children’s school. Parents from all groups were generally very happy with the ways in which schools addressed cultural, ethnic and faith diversity in the curriculum.
- Parents tend to be more satisfied with the quality of academic support from schools than with the ways in which they cater for the social and emotional needs of children.
- However, they feel that schools have less understanding of, and provision for, children who are unmotivated and disruptive. They feel that these problems are perhaps more common in their communities but that there is no appropriate institutional response to address them.
- Generally, provisions seemed highly variable from one school to another, and from one local education authority to another. For instance, some parents report being treated as full partners in their children’s education, while others feel uninvolved. Some parents report that their local schools had excellent after-school provisions and homework clubs, while others complain about the quantity and quality of those.
- Parents feel that most schools do not provide sufficient information and support to parents around transition periods (from primary to secondary school, from secondary school to sixth form colleges, and on arrival in a new school).

Communications and parental involvement

- One source of influence on parental satisfaction with school (and, indirectly, of pupil achievement) is the quality and timeliness of communications between schools and parents.
- Not all schools seem to share a common ethos around the importance of parental involvement and partnership working with schools, and not all schools have practitioners with the requisite skills to engage parents in a meaningful way.
- Parents sometimes complained of not understanding the information presented to them at parents meetings. It was clear that, given the limited knowledge of many parents, effective communication and engagement methods would have to be tailored to meet their needs; this was not always the case.
- Only some Bangladeshi and Turkish parents talk of communication approaches tailored to their needs (such as translated newsletters, parents evening with interpreters present, etc).
Bangladeshi and Turkish parents are much more likely to be satisfied with their relationships with schools than were Somali parents. As secondary migrants, most Somali mothers had had children in schools elsewhere in Europe (in Scandinavia and Holland), and they systematically complain that communications with schools in England are comparatively poor, incomplete and reactive.

SUPPORT FOR PARENTS AND OTHERS IN THE HOUSEHOLD AND COMMUNITY

Home environment

- The home environment of the pupils is related to parental ability to support their children’s education.
- Parents across the three communities share a broad understanding of what constitutes a good learning environment at home: calm, quiet and stable; separate or designated spaces to do homework; ready access to computers, books and other learning resources; and positive relationships between family members. However, they differ considerably in their assessment of their own homes as suitable places for learning.
- Parents who head large households (typically more common in the Bangladeshi and Somali communities than in the Turkish communities) find it difficult to maintain positive relations at home, to create dedicated spaces for learning, to give individual attention to each child, to occupy some siblings while others were studying, to keep noise levels down, etc. Many live in severely overcrowded conditions, with many siblings sharing small bedrooms and a small “multipurpose” reception room.
- The difficulties are particularly acute in single-parent households, because responsibilities for supervising homework and doing domestic chores are not shared.
- Parents who head large households also found themselves more restricted in their choice of schools because they could not arrange for the safe transport of all their children in the best available local schools: they therefore tend to choose schools based on proximity rather than quality.

Parental knowledge of the education system

- Many Bangladeshi parents had themselves gone to school in England, but very few Turkish and no Somali parents had done so. Parents in the latter two communities are therefore much less familiar with the requirements of the education system in England than were many Bangladeshi parents. Their own schooling experiences did not always prepare them well to support their children in England. Unless schools dedicate considerable resources towards supporting these parents, they are unable to engage as full partners in their children’s education.

Parental involvement in children’s education

- Most parents said that they want to be involved in their children’s education. Overall, mothers tend to be actively involved in their children’s education and to offer all the support they could. Fathers are usually less closely involved than mothers, especially in the Somali and Turkish communities.
- Despite a desire to help their children, the level of parental involvement is often restricted by the parents’ own lack of formal education, difficulties in speaking/reading English, limited understanding of the education system and curriculum, and lack of time. These problems existed across all three communities, but many Bangladeshi respondents argued that their community had come a long way and that parents were now better able to support their children.
Many parents who could not provide the level of academic support which they felt their children needed made use of additional resources: support from older siblings, relatives and friends, homework and after-school clubs and supplementary schools.

Access to additional support

- Often parents offer extensive support and register their children with various homework, after-school clubs and supplementary schools to bolster their performance precisely because their children are not performing well.
- By contrast, a number of parents of high achieving pupils did not feel the need to provide such extensive levels of support, because their children (usually daughters) were doing well. However, it may be expected that the level of parental involvement will be related to the long-term achievement of pupils.

Measures used to support parents

Respondents were asked which of a list of measures their schools use to support parents of pupils from the target ethnic backgrounds. The vast majority of schools provide school-based events for parents, and nine out of ten schools (or more) said they provide the following:

- Involving parents in school events to celebrate diversity or showcase their culture
- Information events or briefing meetings at school
- Social or cultural events at school

The following measures are also used by a majority of schools:

- Outreach work with parents; eg., workshops and courses
- Learning mentors
- Designated member of staff with language skills to act as mediator

IMPACT OF SUPPORT MEASURES

Minority Ethnic Achievement Programme

- Somali pupils have progressed faster in MEAP schools as compared with Somali pupils in other schools in England.
- There are no significant differences in progress for Turkish/Kurdish and Bangladeshi pupils as compared to White British pupils in the MEAP schools.
- Further research is necessary to explore questions about the levels of progress for each of these ethnic groups in the context of MEAP schools.

---

MEAP: the Key Stage 3 National Strategy Minority Ethnic Achievement Project is a two-year project designed to raise the attainment Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish heritage pupils. The project involves 52 schools across 12 LEAs.
School practices and pupils’ achievement

- Lesson format and teacher relationships appear to be the strongest predictors of pupils’ experience of school, and good teacher relationships mattered to pupils when they needed support.
- There appeared to be identifiable areas of good practice in high CVA schools, which were noted and valued by pupils. These areas include: good teacher-pupil relationships, greater positive encouragement for pupils, a strong ethos of celebrating diversity, and fewer barriers to pupils in asking for help and support.

ATTITUDES AND ASPIRATIONS

Aspirations and attitudes

- Qualitative evidence suggests that the parents of Bangladeshi and Somali students appear to have high educational aspirations for the children.
- Bangladeshi and Somali students have positive attitudes to school, teachers and lessons, and high educational aspirations.
- In terms of some of the main attitudinal factors influencing educational attainment, there are greater commonalities between the Bangladeshi and Somali groups, with the Turkish and Kurdish groups holding different attitudes.
- Bangladeshi and Somali groups value the importance of education very highly, and regard educational attainment as a key determinant of success. They also share similar views on desirable careers.
- Bangladeshi pupils had notably more role models available to them in their local communities than did the other groups.

Parental aspirations and expectations for their children

- Across all three communities, parental aspirations usually revolve around obtaining a university degree and/or becoming a professional. There are important differences, however, in their expectations of what their children would or could achieve, given their structural economic factors, household circumstances, the current performance of their children in school, the parents’ own diminishing capacity to help their children through a complex curriculum and widening career options.
- Despite these difficulties, Bangladeshi parents seem to maintain more positive expectations than either Turkish or Somali parents.
- While many parents have similar aspirations for both boys and girls, a minority of parents (especially in the Bangladeshi and Somali community) do not expect that their daughters will work after completing their education. They also consider interrupting their daughters’ education upon marriage. If aspirations are therefore at times lower for girls, expectations usually remain higher for girls than for boys; their educational achievement tends to be higher and their attitudes to school tend to be more positive than the attitudes of boys.

Professional aspirations

- Evidence of parental perceptions suggests that Bangladeshi pupils seem to have more positive attitudes to school, and higher educational and professional aspirations than children from the Somali and Turkish communities.
This would appear to be because Bangladeshi children understand the value of education in terms of securing a “good job” (because they have witnessed their parents’ struggle, have more professional role models from within their community and believe that upwards economic and social mobility are possible), because the children enjoy their schooling experience more (as they do not have to adapt to a new country and are fluent in English), and because more Bangladeshi parents (as second-generation migrants who are more likely to speak English and to have been schooled in England) are able to support their children and to work in partnership with local schools.

AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

• Both Bangladeshi and Somali students are equally likely to reside in extremely high deprivation inner city areas, and in particular in high deprivation schools within London. However while these ‘high-level’ features are similar it may be that ‘micro-level’ differences in local context are significant. For example the Somali community is substantially smaller than the Bangladeshi community, and Bangladeshi students are more likely to be concentrated in specific geographical areas and schools. It is worth exploring whether and how far the size and geographic concentration of ethnic groups helps to explain their levels of attainment.

• Further research is needed to follow Bangladeshi students into their post-16 careers and pathways. Historically Bangladeshi participation in post-16 education has been low, unemployment rates for Bangladeshi men under 25 years have been much higher than for White young men, and Bangladeshi women have been significantly under-represented in admissions to universities. Some recent research has also suggested that the success of gifted and talented Bangladeshi girls may not be maintained post-16 (Proulx, 2008). Research is required to determine to what extent these outcomes are changing in more recent data.

• Other recent initiatives such as the Minority Ethnic Achievement Project (MEAP), particularly focused on raising the attainment of Muslim (Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Somali & Turkish) students, require formal evaluation of their impact and efficacy.

• The existence of a larger gender gap for Bangladeshi students than for White British students indicates the need to explore further the barriers to attainment which Bangladeshi boys in particular might experience.

• A key question for further research is how far English fluency is significant in accounting for progress and achievement throughout the school career, particularly in respect of Key Stages 1-3, and in respect of new arrivals with very low levels of English.
1 Introduction

Aims

In this report we examine why attainment rates amongst Bangladeshi pupils have significantly improved over recent years while Turkish and Somali pupils continue to perform below the national average. We explore the experiences of pupils within the education system, the characteristics and policies of their schools, the support received from the local authorities and the impact of parental involvement and parents’ attitudes to school.

We also suggest the factors and school strategies likely to have contributed to improved outcomes for underperforming ethnic minority pupils. Evidence will include examples of good practice in schools with high performing pupils from these groups. Wherever possible we identify factors that are specific to the three groups in this study, and in particular the factors that explain increasing attainment rates amongst Bangladeshi pupils.

Context

Between 2003 and 2007 the gap between Bangladeshi and all pupils who achieved 5 GCSEs at grades A*-C narrowed from 5.2% to .9%. In 2007 41% of Bangladeshi pupils achieved 5 GCSEs at grades A*-C. The national figures for all pupils was 45%, and for Somali and Turkish pupils 24% and 29% respectively. However a high proportion of pupils from these ethnic groups are from disadvantaged backgrounds. At Key Stage 4, approximately half of Bangladeshi and Turkish pupils were eligible for Free School Meals (FSMs) and over 80% of Somali pupils were eligible for FSM.

At the same time the data suggest that, at least at age 16, the attainment of Bangladeshi students is broadly on a par with that of their White British peers. Hence, Bangladeshi students are simultaneously one of the most socio-economically deprived ethnic groups in England and yet their educational attainment at age 16 is comparable to the White British group. A key research question is why Bangladeshi students appear to succeed ‘against the odds’, that is considering the extent of the social and economic disadvantage they face why do Bangladeshi students perform better than comparable White British students?

Research questions

There are four research questions; question 1 at school level, questions 2-4 at pupil level:

1. What is the range of support available specifically for Bangladeshi, Turkish and Somali groups, in primary and secondary schools, and how do these impact on pupil attainment and experience of school?

2. The attitudes and aspirations of pupils within these groups: how do they differ? What are the pupils’ experiences of school?

3. What level of support do parents or others in the household/community provide for their children’s learning at school and at home? How does this differ between groups?

4. What are the other challenges faced by these pupils which may contribute to poor achievement?
How the report is organized

Evidence from quantitative analysis is presented in chapters 3, 4 and 5; in the course of a more detailed exploration of many of the issues, the qualitative evidence is presented in chapters 6 and 7. The conclusions are presented in chapter 8, details of method are provided in chapter 2, and additional tables and references are included in the Appendices.

Part One: Quantitative Evidence

Chapter 3: determinants of attainment amongst Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils

This chapter includes analysis of:

- The main predictors of under-attainment amongst Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils, using the National Pupil Database (NPD) and Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) administrative data.
- Pupil level data sets
- The effects of the Minority Ethnic Achievement Programme (MEAP) on the performance of pupils attending the schools included in the programme.

Chapter 4: attainment of Bangladeshi and Somali students

This chapter explores:

- Historical trends in the attainment of Bangladeshi students in England, in relation to other BME groups and to White British students;
- Recent data from 2006 on attainment at the end of secondary school for both Bangladeshi and Somali students from the LSYPE;
- The role of socio-economic factors and pupil and family context in accounting for the attainment of Bangladeshi and Somali students at age 16, both in terms of their performance relative to White British students;
- The factors which account for differences in attainment between Bangladeshi and Somali students;
- The impact of school level factors, particularly school quality and ethnic composition, on the attainment of Bangladeshi students.

Chapter 5: school survey and analysis

This chapter presents a survey of Heads of Inclusion/Ethnic Minority Achievement in primary and secondary schools with higher than average concentrations of pupils from Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish backgrounds.

Within each of the three samples, schools with higher than average, lower than average and around average attainment levels were included. We adopted this approach in order to be able to compare practices between schools with different levels of pupil attainment as well as different ethnic profiles. The survey gathers information on:

- How schools have supported pupils from the selected ethnic minority groups
- Whether the schools have particular policies/programmes in place for the pupils and their parents
- Issues encountered in working with these pupils
• Recruitment of teachers from these backgrounds
• Whether these cultures have been reflected in aspects of the curriculum
• Examples of successful work with pupils/parents.

The chapter also includes a quantitative analysis of the impact of school practices on pupils’ achievement in secondary school. The aim was to understand whether characteristics of the school workforce and policies implemented at the school level had any impact in raising pupils’ academic achievement at Key stage 4.

Part Two: Qualitative Evidence

Chapter 6: evidence from Local Authorities, Schools and Pupils

This chapter investigates:
• The factors driving attainment from the perspective of those with knowledge and responsibility at local authority and school levels, and from the point of view of the students themselves
• The factors shaping the educational experiences of pupils from these three ethnic groups
• Lessons from the experiences of Bangladeshi pupils that may inform initiatives to improve the attainment of pupils from Somali Turkish and Kurdish backgrounds.

The analysis highlights good practice at local authority and school level, which has helped to support the learning and attainment of ethnic minority pupils. In relation to schools we consider:
• Factors at the whole school level, such as policies and leadership
• Factors at the classroom level, such as teaching approaches which help schools to meet the needs of pupils from these three groups.

Chapter 7: evidence from parents

In this chapter we identify, from the perspective of parents of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils, the factors that may account for the differences in achievement among pupils from these three minority ethnic groups.
• The approach combined both focus groups and in-depth interviews. Twelve focus groups with Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish (including some Kurdish) parents were used to assess community-wide factors and experiences that may impact on children’s educational achievement.
• Separate focus groups were conducted with fathers and mothers, both because of the substantive issues which this research seeks to explore (e.g. aspirations, parental support, barriers to help) and because of the dominant cultural norms in the Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish communities, according to which men and women are generally better at ease when interviewed only with members of their own sex.
• In addition, twelve depth interviews (with one or both parents) were carried out to understand the individual and household level factors that may impact on a child’s achievement.
• The interviews were all conducted in people’s homes, which also provided valuable insights into the home environment.
2 Methods

In this chapter we describe the methods used in the remainder of this report. Some additional details are included in the chapters to follow and in the appendices.

Predictors of minority ethnic attainment: empirical evidence from the National Pupil Database and the Pupil Level Annual School Census (chapter 3)

Data

The analysis draws on administrative data collected by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) on all pupils in all state schools in England. The data come from two sources. The National Pupil Database (NPD) provides information on pupils’ records in standard national tests (Key stage tests) for all children aged between 7 and 16; the Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) contains pupil-level background characteristics, including ethnicity, gender, month of birth, first language, an indicator of Special Educational Needs (SEN) and English as an Additional Language (EAL) and whether recipient of Free School Meals (FSM).

PLASC is well suited to our purpose: it is a census, and therefore provides information on all children in state schools in England which ensures that the results are not specific to a particular sample of the population. Second, it is longitudinal, and children can be followed throughout their school careers as they progress through primary and secondary school. Third, children can be tracked across schools, and there is scope for linking data from other datasets – for example, on school characteristics or neighbourhoods.

We used the school codes included in PLASC to match individual-level data to national school-level data available in the ‘School Performance Tables’ and the ‘LEA and School Information Service’ (LEASIS). In particular, we used these datasets to get information on measures of school outcomes (exams’ results), inputs (pupil-teacher ratios), disadvantage (the percentage of students eligible for FSM or identified as SEN, or belonging to an ethnic minority group) and other school characteristics (school type; school size; whether single-sex school).

PLASC also provides data on pupils’ neighbourhoods and we include in the analysis a measure of area deprivation (the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index, IDACI) defined at the Super Output Areas (SOA) level. The IDACI shows the percentage of children in each SOA that live in families that are income deprived (i.e. in receipt of Income Support, Income based Jobseeker’s Allowance, Working Families’ Tax Credit or Disabled Person’s Tax Credit below a given threshold). An IDACI score of .24, for example, represents the fact that 24% of children under the age of 16 in that SOA are living in families that are income deprived.

Outcomes

We investigate differences in attainment across BST pupils and measure their academic achievement using results in Key Stage tests contained in the NPD. The Key Stage tests are national achievement tests performed by all children in state schools. Key stage 1 is taken at age 7, Key Stage 2 at age 11, Key Stage 3 at age 14 and Key Stage 4 (GCSE’s and their

---

8 As in Wilson et al. (2006) we focus on state schools (accounting for about 93 percent of all pupils) and exclude private schools, since they do not carry out all the Key-Stage tests.

9 A Super Output Area is a unit of geography created by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) for collecting, aggregating and reporting statistics There are three layers of SOAs In order to match the IDACI index we used the Lower Layer (commonly known as Lower Layer Super Output Area, LSOA), whose mean population is about 1500.
equivalent) at age 16. Throughout Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 3, pupils are assessed in the core
disciplines of English, Mathematics, and Science, while at Key stage 4 pupils take a variety of
subjects on top of the core mandatory subjects of English and Mathematics.

For each key stage we create a synthetic score, averaging scores in different subjects. More
precisely, for Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3, we compute the total score by summing up the
marks in the core subjects of English, math and science. For Key Stage 4, we use a capped
average point score\(^{10}\) - already available in the raw data - that takes into account the pupil's
eight highest grades. The data on Key Stage 1 does not provide the results’ scores, but only
the level obtained. We therefore decided to exclude KS1 from our analysis.

In order to make the results at different Key Stages and in different years comparable, we
standardize all the scores so that they have mean 0 and standard deviation 1 within each
cohort. This allows using measures that are comparable with each other even if the underlying
scores are not.

**Available cohorts**

Throughout the analysis we use information on different cohorts. We first look at the average
performance in Key stages 2, 3 and 4 of BST pupils in the period 2003-07, comparing this with
the performance of White British pupils. We can then assess (descriptively) whether the
performance of BST pupils at a given Key stage exam has changed over time for different
cohorts of pupils.

We then link longitudinally the results at Key Stages 2, 3, and 4 for two cohorts, in order to look
at changes in attainment for the same groups of pupils, followed across their compulsory
education. This allows an investigation of how the Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils’
performances have evolved in comparison with White British pupils over several Key Stages.
The availability of longitudinal data in fact permits to analyse the changes in pupils’ performance
rather than the levels and this helps reducing the probability that omitted variables will bias the
results (see the methodology section where we discuss this issue in more details).

In particular, we follow the two most recent cohorts: the first consists of all pupils born in
1989/90 (cohort 1, who completed compulsory education in 2005/2006) and the second
consists of all pupils born in 1990/91 (cohort 2, who completed compulsory education in
2006/2007). Table 1 summarises the timing of the Key Stages tests for those two cohorts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Timing of Key Stage tests for two cohorts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KS1 (age 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Predictors of attainment gaps: econometric analysis**

The empirical strategy is based on the concept of an educational production function. According
to this approach, a number of inputs (such as family background, educational resources, and
initial ability) are transformed by schools into different outcomes. The standard production
function framework assumes that knowledge acquisition is a cumulative process by which
current and past inputs are combined with a child’s initial (or genetic) ability to produce cognitive

\(^{10}\) According to the new scoring system introduced between 2002–03 and 2003–04, 58 points were
awarded for an A*, 52 for an A, 46 for a B, 40 for a C, 34 for a D, 28 for a E, 22 for F, and 16 for a G.
Marks are allocated for standard GCSEs, but also for all qualifications approved for use pre-16, such as
entry-level qualifications, vocational qualifications, and AS levels taken early.
outcomes\textsuperscript{11} (see Todd and Wolpin, 2003 and 2007). In this way, child educational outcomes at any point in time are modelled as a cumulative function of endowment, family inputs and school experiences, which implies that the education production function should include the cumulative history of inputs that have affected the child’s development. However, such detailed information is rarely available in the data and therefore analyses that study the contemporaneous relationship between school (or family) inputs and pupils achievement are likely to be affected by an omitted variable bias.

A common solution to this problem is to adopt a “value added” approach; that is to focus on the change in pupil outcomes over specific time periods. In its basic form, the value added specification relates educational achievement to contemporaneous measures of school inputs and family inputs and to a lagged achievement measure (Todd and Wolpin, 2007). This approach allows controlling for the prior and often unobserved history of parental and school inputs. As stated in Vignoles et al (2000), the inclusion of the lagged outcome measure “effectively ‘levels the playing field’ at the time of school entry” (p. 5).

The value added specification also helps to reduce the problem of the possible endogeneity of school quality. If pupils are not randomly allocated into schools, then measures of school quality may be correlated with pupil’s characteristics resulting in biased estimates. In other words, if higher ability or more motivated pupils tend to enrol in different schools from lower ability and less motivated pupils, then in a simple model of school effectiveness it will look like some schools are more effective than others, even though in fact this is attributable to different pupil intake characteristics. This situation is likely to occur when wealthier or more educated parents make quite different school choices from less wealthy and less educated parents (defined as ‘school sorting’ in the literature). What this means is that school effect estimates will be biased if the determinants of school assignment are not adequately controlled for. By including measures of outcomes before the pupils started at the school, and controlling for a number of family and pupils characteristics, we are able to control for many of the predictors of school selection and for school intake. In this way we reduce (but not eliminate) the bias of the estimates we produce.

In order to evaluate the role of schools in the production of student achievement, we include a ‘systematic school effects’ in our equation to understand how much of the total variance in the outcome is explained by differences between pupils within the same school and how much by the differences between schools. This will also help us understand whether the attainment gaps experienced by ethnic minorities are partially due to sorting into schools (that is, ethnic minority pupils attending worse schools)\textsuperscript{12}.

The attainment of Bangladeshi and Somali students in England: evidence from the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (chapter 4)

The Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE)

LSYPE has interviewed a nationally representative sample of over 15,000 young people and their parents/guardians in the year of its inception in 2004. Linked demographic data from the School Census and attainment data from KS2 tests in 2001, KS3 tests in 2004 and GCSE results in 2006 are also available for the cohort. As a result LSYPE presents a unique insight into the context, experiences and attitudes of young people and their families with regards to their schools and their education. Key strengths of this dataset are that it is recent, detailed, nationally representative and covers Key Stage 4, the phase in which many Black and Minority Ethnic groups make substantial and extensive gains in attainment relative to White British

\textsuperscript{11} The main outcome variable of interest in the previous literature has been academic achievement proxied by standardised test scores or, exam results or staying on rates (see Vignoles et al, 2000, and Hanushek, 1997 and 2003 for detailed reviews of the literature on education production functions).

\textsuperscript{12} See Appendix 2 for a more formal and detailed explanation of our methodology.
students. For example Bangladeshi students are about a year behind at age 14 but have caught up with White British students by age 16 (Strand, 2008). Some analysis of the LYSPE in relation to ethnicity has been completed (e.g. Strand, 2007; 2008) but a more focussed investigation of the data particularly for Bangladeshi and Somali students is undertaken here.

Sample students

LSYPE includes a nationally representative sample of 757 Bangladeshi students. It has rich data on parents' socio-economic circumstances, their educational aspirations for their children and the resources they provide, their parenting practices, their involvement with school; and also data on students’ own educational aspirations, attitudes to school, academic self-concept, homework completion, and so on.

The LSYPE dataset also includes data from 584 Black African young people. Among these are 98 Somali students. While the absolute size of the Somali sample is relatively small, its strength lies in the fact that the Black African group from which it comes was selected through a two stage probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling procedure, with disproportionate stratification, which ensured that, within a deprivation stratum, all pupils within an ethnic group had an equal chance of selection.

LSYPE does not include sufficient data on Turkish students to support a detailed analysis for this group. LSYPE contains only 21 students in the three categories Turkish-Cypriot, Turkish and Turkish/Turkish Cypriot, too few for reliable estimations.

Analysis

The data are analysed in a hierarchal multiple regression framework. These analyses identify the unique (net) contribution of particular factors to variations in pupil outcomes, while other background factors are controlled. This is important because much of the difference in attainment between ethnic groups may be attributable to the impact of socio-economic and demographic factors. The analysis adopts a hierarchal approach by sequentially entering blocks of variables. The main blocks were composed of:

- Structural features of family background (social class of the home, mother's highest educational qualification, entitlement to free school meal (FSM), home ownership and family composition (single parent households);
- More dynamic aspects of the family context (for example parental involvement in school, parents’ educational aspirations for the pupil, provision of material resources such as a home computer and private tuition, the quality of family relationships);
- Pupil characteristics, both in terms of positive motivational factors (attitudes to school, educational aspirations, frequency of completing homework, academic self concept) and risk factors (Special Educational Needs, truancy, exclusion, long term absence, problems leading to the involvement of police, education welfare or social services);
- School context (school type, mixed/co-educational status, admissions policy and percentage of pupils entitled to FSM) and neighbourhood deprivation (Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index).

For each model the coefficients associated with ethnic groups were evaluated to determine the significance of the variables in explaining ethnic group variation in educational attainment and progress.

School Survey (chapter 5)

This chapter presents a quantitative survey of Heads of Inclusion/Ethnic Minority Achievement in primary and secondary schools with higher than average concentrations of pupils from
Within each of the three samples, schools with higher than average, lower than average and around average attainment levels were included. We adopted this approach in order to be able to compare practices between schools with different levels of pupil attainment as well as different ethnic profiles. The survey gathered information on:

- How schools have supported pupils from the selected ethnic minority groups
- Whether the schools have particular policies/programmes in place for the pupils and their parents
- Issues encountered in working with these pupils
- Recruitment of teachers from these backgrounds.

The questionnaire was drafted by GfK NOP based on diagnostic procedures and support measures which previous research suggested might have a positive influence on the attainment of ethnic minority pupils, with input and advice from DCSF project manager and steering group members. In the survey, schools only answered questions about one of the target ethnic groups for the research. Schools selected for the Bangladeshi sample were only asked about support measures etc used with Bangladeshi pupils, schools in the Somali sample were only asked about support measures used with Somali pupils and so on. This was done in order to avoid excessive interview length for schools with significant numbers of pupils from more than one of the target groups.

For the survey, separate samples of primary and secondary schools with higher than average concentrations of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish/Kurdish pupils were selected. Turkish and Kurdish pupils were grouped together for this purpose because it was felt that there was considerable overlap in the way the terms “Turkish” and “Kurdish” were used in the Annual Schools Census data from which the sampling information was taken, which effectively made it impossible to distinguish between the two groups. The concentration criteria used were 4%+ Bangladeshi pupils for the sample of Bangladeshi schools, 2%+ Somali pupils for the sample of Somali schools and 0.5%+ Turkish/Kurdish for the sample of Turkish/Kurdish schools. These thresholds were chosen because it was considered that they would give sufficient cases to enable 50 interviews with secondary schools to be achieved.

Within the three separate samples, these schools were separated into high CVA, medium CVA and low CVA categories. The high CVA category was defined as being the top quartile of CVA scores within that group of schools; the low CVA category was defined as being the lowest quartile of CVA scores within that group; the medium CVA category was defined as being the two middle quartiles of CVA scores.

Data collection was carried out by telephone by GfK NOP’s Telephone Interviewing Services. Fieldwork was carried out between 23 March and 3 July 2009, with pauses for the school Easter holidays and the summer half-term break. Suitable respondents to take part in the study on behalf of the school had to be identified by carrying out telephone screening during the course of fieldwork.

The aim was to achieve a total of 300 interviews, with equal numbers of interviews in each of a number of categories or quotas, from the limited number of leads available. The categories were based on CVA sector within primary and secondary schools, for each of the three target ethnic groups, giving 18 cells. The target of 300 was selected because it was considered that if split equally between the three ethnic samples and the three attainment categories, this should provide sufficient cases to detect real differences if any existed, while minimising burden on schools and working within the constraints of a limited research budget. The final number of interviews achieved was 284. The overall response rate achieved was 34% - 37% from schools in the Bangladeshi sample, 32% from those in the Somali sample and 34% from those in the
Turkish/Kurdish sample. A higher response rate was achieved from secondary schools than from primary schools (41% compared with 30%).

At the analysis stage, the data were weighted to bring the profile of the aggregated survey sample back into line with the profile of the schools in each of the three ethnic samples. Differences between sub-groups are not commented upon unless they have been found to be statistically significant at the 90% confidence level or higher. The 90% confidence level has been used rather than the more stringent 95% confidence level in order to minimise the risk of overlooking important differences because of the relatively small sample sizes in the categories being compared.

Evidence from Local Authorities, Schools, teachers and pupils (chapter 6)

Research was carried out in 10 secondary schools across 9 Local Authorities in England. Identification of appropriate schools was based on the analysis reported in chapter one. We were provided with a list of schools with varying levels of performance. Schools were selected on the basis of their CVA and proportion of pupils from the target ethnic group. Across each ethnic group, we recruited schools with high, medium and low performance levels. We also recruited an additional high performing school with a large proportion of Bangladeshi pupils in order to further explore practices influencing the improvement in attainment amongst this ethnic group.

Schools were chosen on the basis of having high proportions of pupils from the target ethnic groups. In all of the schools, the target MEG was among the largest population of pupils in the school, with an average of 16% of pupils from the target MEG represented in each school.

The research involved:

- Face to face depth interviews with Ethnic Minority Achievement (EMA) leads within schools
- Face to face depth interviews with key staff members within schools
- Focus groups with pupils from Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish and Kurdish backgrounds
- Paired depth interviews with pupils from Kurdish backgrounds
- Telephone interviews with Local Authority EMA leads

Interview with school EMA Leads

EMA Leads or Heads of Inclusion were interviewed at each school to discuss the implementation of support for pupils from Bangladeshi, Somali, Turkish/Kurdish backgrounds, and explore examples of good practice. These interviews explored topics such as the prevalence of these ethnic groups in the school; implementation of support for Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish, and Kurdish pupils within schools; the level of integration into the wider school community and the issues facing these particular ethnic groups within the school context.

Interviews with teachers

At each school, we interviewed one staff member who worked closely with pupils from Bangladeshi, Somali or Turkish/Kurdish backgrounds. These were either classroom teachers or learning support staff. Interviews with this group explored everyday experiences of classroom activity and how this differed for pupils from different ethnic backgrounds. They helped to identify factors at the level of classroom practice, such as teaching approach and curriculum materials, which support the attainment of ethnic minority pupils.

13 See Appendix 7 for an overview of the sample.
Focus groups with pupils

Focus groups were conducted with pupils from Bangladeshi, Somali, Turkish and Kurdish backgrounds. Groups were conducted across years 7-11 and, where possible, separated into year 7s, years 8-9 and years 10-11. Two focus groups were conducted in each school across these year groups. Each group was conducted as single gender. Groups focused on pupils’ aspirations and attitudes towards doing well in school, the provision of support and key influences both inside and outside of school.

In addition, a number of paired in-depth interviews were conducted with Turkish-speaking pupils from a Kurdish background. Inclusion of Kurdish pupils in this strand allowed us to identify additional issues arising for this group. In some cases, schools were uncertain whether particular pupils came from a Kurdish or Turkish background, and the distinction was only established during the interviews or focus groups.

Local Authority Ethnic Minority Achievement (EMA) leads

Telephone interviews were conducted with Local Authority EMA leads. These interviews provided an overview of the local context and policy and funding issues such as the distribution of the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG). LA leads provided insight into support policies or programmes which applied across the whole of the LA. They also highlighted the social circumstances of pupils from these ethnic minority groups.

Evidence from Parents (chapter 7)

The research used qualitative research methods to explore from the perspective of parents of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils, the factors that may account for the differences in achievement among pupils from these three minority ethnic groups. The approach combined both focus groups and in-depth interviews. Twelve focus groups with Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish (including some Kurdish) parents were used to assess community-wide factors and experiences that may impact on children’s educational achievement. The focus group participants were recruited on the basis of their ethnicity, location, having at least one child in secondary school and the parents’ level of competency in English. Separate focus groups were conducted with fathers and mothers, both because of the substantive issues which this research seeks to explore (e.g. aspirations, parental support, barriers to help) and because of the dominant cultural norms in the Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish communities, according to which men and women are generally better at ease when interviewed only with members of their own sex. Each group contained between six and ten participants.

In addition, twelve depth interviews (with one or both parents) were carried out to understand the individual and household level factors that may impact on a child’s achievement. Parents’ in-depth interviews were selected on the basis of ethnicity, competency in English and location, as well as because at least one of their children of secondary school age was doing either above or below average. This was intended to reveal individual and family level differences in high and low achieving households. The interviews were all conducted in people’s homes, which also provided valuable insights into the home environment.

14 Kurdish pupils were included in those strands of the project where the data allowed for a clear distinction between Kurdish and Turkish cohorts.
15 The focus groups were carried out in the same nine Local Authority areas where the schools, teachers and pupils study was conducted.
16 It was assumed that level of fluency in English would correlate with understanding of the education system and with ability to support children. Thus, the sample included both respondents who were fluent in English and respondents who spoke little or no English, in each community.
17 The following question was asked at screening stage; “How well do you think your child is doing at school? Very well, average, not very well.
The locations for the focus groups and depth interviews were determined based on findings from another strand of the research. The focus groups lasted approximately 90 minutes, while the depth interviews lasted between 45 and 75 minutes, depending on how talkative and informed parents were, as well as how many children they discussed. Professional moderators with extensive experience in research with minority ethnic populations, together with relevant language skills, conducted the discussions.

The tables below provide details of the composition of the groups and depth interviews.

Table 2: Composition of the focus groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Local authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Sylheti</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Composition of the depth interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Educational achievement of pupil</th>
<th>Local authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 School attainment of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils: empirical evidence from the National Pupil Database and the Pupil Level Annual School Census

3.1 Introduction
This analysis makes use of administrative pupils’ level dataset to investigate patterns, evolution and determinants of attainment of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish (BST) heritage pupils. The aim of the analysis is to understand how school performance differs across ethnic groups, to evaluate whether these differences change over time and to investigate what are the pupil-level and school-level factors associated with differences and changes in performance. In particular, we will first look at the average results in Key Stages 2, 3 and 4 by different ethnic groups in various years and compare them with the average results for white British pupils. This will allow us to investigate achievement gaps between White British pupils and ethnic minorities and their evolution over time. We will then analyse differences in attainment by ethnic groups, using regression analysis that allows us to control for other pupil and school characteristics. A main advantage of our data is that they also allow observing pupils’ performance over time (following the same pupils through different Key Stage results). Using this linked longitudinal data, we estimate value-added models between each Key Stage, which permit to take into account pupils’ unobserved heterogeneity. Throughout the analysis we seek to answer the following questions: do the performances differ because children from different ethnic groups have different observable characteristics (such as different languages or different probability to be in poverty)? Or is it rather that the performances differ because children from different ethnic groups choose different types of schools? Or is it for any other (non-observable in the quantitative analysis) reasons?

Finally we shall study the effects of the Minority Ethnic Achievement Programme (MEAP) on the performance of pupils attending the schools included in the programme.

The structure of the chapter is as follows:

- We present the data sets along with definitions of the three ethnic groups
- We describe the distribution of ethnic groups in the sample, and the evolution of attainment gaps of BST pupils across cohort and over time.
- We present and discuss the main results.
- The methodology for assessing the determinants of attainment is set out in Appendix 1.

3.2 Definition of ethnic groups
The Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) has provided detailed information on pupils’ ethnicity since 2003. Before this date, ethnicities were grouped in broad categories that did not allow for identification of Somali and Turkish pupils. We can therefore only identify the three groups of interest from 2003 onwards. We included in the Bangladeshi and Somali groups all those who were described as Bangladeshi and Somali respectively. In the Turkish group we included all those who were described as Turkish, Kurdish, and Turkish/Cypriot.

There was some debate about how widely the Turkish group should be defined and whether there was scope to carry out separate analysis of Turkish and Kurdish pupils. This was problematic for two reasons: first, it seems the numbers are too low to distinguish between
those labelled Turkish and those Kurdish in PLASC data\textsuperscript{18}. But even though distinctions were made between Turkish and Kurdish in terms of labelling within PLASC, we had to accept that in reality we could not disentangle the two groups satisfactorily in the Strand 1 analysis or in sampling schools. Schools and local authorities vary in their approach to coding pupils’ ethnicity. Pupils and their parents also vary in their approach. Ethnic Kurds can be of Turkish, Iranian, Syrian or Iraqi national origin and therefore could also be self-categorised as Turkish, Iranian, Syrian or Iraqi in addition to Kurdish. Among those who are self-categorised as Turkish, we would find those who are ethnically and linguistically Kurdish, as well as Turkish Cypriot and perhaps some other groups as well. The research team felt that Turkish and Kurdish groups have been combined for analysis purposes in the past as an acknowledgement of the natural overlap and the impossibility of disentangling the two satisfactorily. It was also felt that we should accept explicitly for the purposes of this research that when we combined Turkish and Kurdish in the quantitative research, we were combining some groups which did have a natural overlap as well as some which did not necessarily overlap, and that we were gaining only a partial picture of Kurdish pupils, as they may also be categorised in a number of other ways within the PLASC data.

3.3 Descriptive Statistics

This section explores the performance of BST pupils in English schools in Key Stages exams. In particular, we focus on school attainment of BST pupils in relation to white British pupils, and we provide descriptive statistics on key pupils’ characteristics in the three ethnic groups as compared to those of white British.

Table 4 shows the distribution of ethnic minority groups over the last five years. The proportion of Somali pupils in schools has increased substantially over the period 2003-2007. However, these figures are based on the data available for the LAs that used this classification, and we cannot make any assumption about how representative these figures are. Rather, they serve as a guide to the trends over the recent period in those LAs that report the Somali pupils as a distinct category from Black African pupils. Table 5 and Table 6 include a list of LAs that do report this distinct category.

Table 4: Percentages of different ethnic groups in the total population over the 2003-2007 period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5,512,473</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>5,514,524</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>5,019,286</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>5,098,052</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>4,965,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>20,722</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>25,016</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>25,765</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>29,846</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>33,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>19,582</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>20,436</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>18,973</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>19,698</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>19,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>85,084</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>88,766</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>84,013</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>88,566</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>91,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,090,393</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>2,052,531</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>1,997,561</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>2,072,674</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>2,135,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,728,254</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,701,273</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,145,598</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,308,836</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,245,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Table 5 we selected the ten LAs with the highest share of BST pupils in the country. This allows establishing which LAs have the highest concentration of BST pupils in the whole country. The proportion of Bangladeshi pupils is particularly large in two LAs: Tower Hamlets and City of London. The figure for City of London is explained by the fact that many Bangladeshi pupils living in Hackney attend schools in the City of London (an adjacent local

\textsuperscript{18} PLASC data contains the following ethnicity codes: OKRD: KURDISH; WTUR: TURKISH/TURKISH CYPRIOT; WTUK: TURKISH; WTUC: TURKISH CYPRIOT which represented respectively 0.05%, 0.06%, 0.14% and 0.04% of the PLASC sample in 2007.
authority). The figure for the Somali pupils is very similar to previous published findings (Demie et al., 2008). The two boroughs with the highest shares are Ealing and Brent, two neighbouring LAs located in North East London. We also note the prevalence of Turkish pupils in three LAs that all have a share at or above 10% (Haringey, Enfield and Hackney).

Table 5: LAs with the highest percentages of Bangladeshi, Somali, and Turkish pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bangladeshi LA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Somali LA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Turkish LA</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: this table is based on PLASC 2007 data (the most recent at the time the report was written)

Table 6: LAs that account for the highest % of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bangladeshi LA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Somali LA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Turkish LA</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwell</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total in the first 10 LAs: 57 59.5 84.7

Note: this table is based on PLASC 2007 data (the most recent at the time the report was written)

In Table 6, we report the ten LAs that account for the highest number of BST pupils in England. We need to provide this Table in order determine the amount of geographical clustering of the different ethnic groups. If the BST pupils were nearly equally distributed across all LAs in the country, then the 10 LAs with the highest percentage would account for about 10 percent of the each BST group.
We note, however, that it is not the case. Indeed, around 22 percent of all Bangladeshi pupils in the country live in Tower Hamlets, 8% live in Birmingham and 7.82% live in Newham. Together those three authorities account for 38% of all Bangladeshi pupils in England. The corresponding figures for Somali and Turkish pupils are 27% and 58%. This shows that all three groups are geographically concentrated and particularly Turkish pupils; 85% of Turkish pupils attend schools in the ten LAs listed in Table 6.

3.3.1 Evolution of attainment gaps by ethnic group

This section describes attainment gaps of BST pupils with respect to White British pupils. We first examine the evolution of gaps across cohorts before turning to explore the evolution of gaps within cohorts, focusing on the two cohorts described in Table 1. The change of gaps across cohorts is simply how the gaps evolve over time. This change may be due to different characteristics of pupils in different cohorts. Those descriptive figures need, therefore, to be completed in the following section by looking at the evolution of gaps across time for the same pupils.

**Progress across cohorts**

Figure 1 shows the evolution of results in KS2, KS3 and KS4 respectively. Each panel plots the average performance of Turkish, Somali, Bangladeshi pupils, and, for comparison, White British pupils, since 2003.

**Figure 1: evolution of performance in different Key stages over time, by ethnic groups**

Some preliminary comments. First, the graphs highlight large differences in attainment between ethnic groups. Across all key stages White British pupils are on average performing better, followed by Bangladeshi, and then by Turkish and Somali pupils. However these attainment gaps reduce over the Key Stages. The profiles depicted in the panel suggest that the differences in academic achievement between ethnic groups are smaller at KS4 than in previous Key Stages. In particular, there are significant attainment gaps between Bangladeshi
and White British pupils at KS2 and KS3, but this has largely disappeared at KS4. This is not the case for Turkish and Somali pupils, whose scores are below those for Bangladeshi and White British pupils at KS4, even though the gap has diminished compared with the position at KS2 and KS3.

Looking at the evolution of results in each Key Stage over recent years, it appears that the attainment gaps are pretty constant across cohorts. However, it is notable that the performance of BST pupils is improving with respect to that of white British pupils; and this is particularly the case for tests at the end of KS3, and for Somali pupils especially, the ethnic group of most recent immigration.

The observed changes in the average attainment of Somali, Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils over years can be attributed to the composition of these ethnic groups changing over time (technically defined as a composition effect, i.e. different pupils with different characteristics are present in different groups across a different time period). Therefore, the next section examines the evolution of results for the same pupils over different Key Stages.

**Progress within cohorts**

This section, by following the same pupils over time abstracts from composition effect that could potentially impact on the previous analysis.

Figure 2 shows the evolution of results in Key stage 2, 3 and 4 for the two cohorts of pupils born in 1989/90 (cohort 1) and 1990/91 (cohort 2). This allows us to look at the progression of the same sample of pupils observed at different points in time. Each line represents the mean standardised test score at each Key stage by ethnicity. The group mean standardised test scores is plotted on the vertical axis against the different Key Stages on the horizontal axis. The figures for the two cohorts present similar features, indicating that these patterns are rather stable across the two cohorts.

The line for white British pupils is very close to zero and rather flat as a result of the use of standardised scores and the fact that white British pupils constitute the majority of the sample. The figures show that all three ethnic minority groups are disadvantaged at the beginning of the school and start with lower results in KS2, compared with White British pupils. However, their performance improves over time and their results get closer to those of White British pupils. A ‘jump’ in the relative performance of ethnic minority pupils is observed between KS3 and KS4. At KS4, Bangladeshi pupils end up with higher scores at KS4 and Turkish pupils. It is worth noting here that while performance of Bangladeshis is similar in the two cohorts, Turkish pupils drop in the relative ranking in the second cohort compared to Somalis at Key Stage 3 and 4.

---

19 A figure plotting the distribution of results in different key stages by ethnic groups in the two cohorts is reported in Appendix 3, Figure 1.
We also looked at the evolution of results by gender. Figure 3 shows the evolution of the gender gaps (males vs females) for the different ethnic groups at KS2, KS3 and KS4. The bars in this figure show the average scores of male pupils minus the average scores of female pupils. Therefore, where the bars extend to the right side of the vertical line indicating the overall average, males outperform females on average, and where the bars extend to the left side of that vertical line, females outperform males on average.

We find that at KS2 (indicated by the darkest bars) males generally perform better than females for all three ethnic minority groups (the White British cohort is the exception). Then females start to perform better than males and the gender gap increases at KS4, becoming especially wide for Bangladeshi and Turkish pupils.
Section 3.4 will investigate the reasons for the patterns in achievement for BST pupils, but first it will be useful to look at the observable characteristics of BST pupils in relation to White British pupils, and that is the focus of the next section.

3.3.2 Characteristics of the EMGs

Tables 7 and 8 show the distribution of key pupil characteristics in cohort 1 (born in 1989/90) and cohort 2 (born in 1990/91) respectively. The proportions of females, pupils in receipt of free school meals (FSM), special educational needs (SEN), and English as an additional language (EAL) are stable in the two cohorts. The index of social deprivation (IDACI) is also stable across the cohorts. The main finding is that the proportion of Somali pupils with FSMs is large (at 82%), underlining the widespread state of poverty amongst this ethnic group. More than 8 out 10 Somali pupils live in a poor household. This figure should not obscure the prevalence of poverty amongst Bangladeshi pupils as well (applying to more than half of their number). In comparison, a lower proportion of Turkish pupils have free school meals, but the figure of 40%, is still nearly 5 times higher than the proportion for White British. The index of social deprivation at the area level is higher as well for every BST heritage groups than for white British pupils, highlighting the fact that these ethnic groups tend to be concentrated in poor neighbourhoods. The highest figures apply to Somali and Bangladeshi pupils. The proportion of Somali pupils living in areas classified as income deprived is nearly 47%. For Bangladeshi and Turkish pupils, those proportions are 43% and 40% respectively, more than twice the proportion for White British pupils.

Table 7: characteristics of BST (cohort 89-90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>% FEMALE</th>
<th>% FSM</th>
<th>% SEN</th>
<th>% EAL</th>
<th>IDACI SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>49.75</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>50.48</td>
<td>82.21</td>
<td>28.04</td>
<td>96.15</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>49.64</td>
<td>40.96</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td>89.37</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>53.70</td>
<td>54.71</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>95.84</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50.12</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Information on FSM, SEN, EAL and IDACI score are collected in 2006 when pupils are in the last year of compulsory school; The IDACI score shows the percentage of children in each SOA that live in families
that are income deprived An IDACI score of 0.459 for Somali means, for example that about 46% of children under the age of 16 in that SOA are living in families that are income deprived

Table 8: characteristics of BST(cohort 90-91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>% FEMALE</th>
<th>% FSM</th>
<th>% SEN</th>
<th>% EAL</th>
<th>IDACI SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>49.95</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>51.64</td>
<td>82.04</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>94.88</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>86.66</td>
<td>0.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>51.81</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>95.87</td>
<td>0.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50.09</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: information on FSM, SEN, EAL and IDACI score are collected in 2007 when pupils are in the last year of compulsory school. The IDACI score shows the percentage of children in each SOA that live in families that are income deprived An IDACI score of 0.459 for Somali means, for example that about 46% of children under the age of 16 in that SOA are living in families that are income deprived

3.4 Predictors of attainment gaps: econometric analysis

This section presents the results of our econometric analysis. We begin by exploring the role of pupil characteristics (section 3.4.1) and then look at the role of schools (section 3.4.2).

3.4.1 The role of pupil characteristics

The following tables present the results of the analysis of the determinants of pupils’ attainment at different key stages (key stage 2 in Table 9, key stage 3 in Table 10 and key stage 4 in table 11) for cohort 1 (pupils born in 1989/1990). In the first column of each table, the standardised result in each key stage is regressed on ethnicity dummies only, the reference category being white British. Therefore the coefficients in the first column can be interpreted as the raw attainment gaps. These show the average difference in the performance of BST with respect to White British without controlling for any other characteristics. Ethnic minorities’ attainment gaps decrease over time through the course of primary and secondary school. At KS2 Somali, Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils performed on average respectively about 80%, 66%, and 36% of a standard deviation worse than White British pupils and at KS3 these raw gaps decrease to 62%, 60% and 41%. At KS4 the gaps for Somali and Turkish pupils reduced respectively to 28% and 15% of a standard deviation, while Bangladeshi pupils fully caught up and performed on average 8% of a standard deviation better than white British pupils.

The coefficients in the first column of Table 9, 10 and 11 represent the difference in average performance by ethnic groups, without introducing any other variables. The lower attainment of EMG, at least at KS2 and KS3, may be due to different characteristics of pupils belonging to the three ethnic groups with respect to white British. As we move from left to right across the tables we run additional regressions gradually adding more variables available in the data set. Those added variables allow comparing the performance of individuals with similar observable characteristic and living in similar neighbourhood. In particular, we control for gender, special education needs, poverty (whether the pupil is entitled to receive free school meals), English language ability (where English is not the first language) and neighbourhood deprivation. Since these characteristics are not equally distributed in the different ethnic groups (see Table 7), they could explain the lower attainment of BST pupils.

Results for cohort 2 (pupils born in 1990/1991 are reported in 3.4.1.2.
More specifically, in column 2 and 3 we add alternately the controls for FSM and EAL. In column 4 we also control for gender and SEN status, and in column 5 we include the IDACI score at the area level that describes neighbourhood deprivation. As expected, the coefficients of ethnic groups reduce significantly once we control for individual and family characteristics. The inclusion of FSM eligibility substantially reduces the attainment gaps for all the ethnic minorities considered at all the Key Stages. In particular, at KS2 the gaps decrease by around 55%, 33% and 71% for Somali, Turkish and Bangladeshi respectively. At KS3 the gap reduction due to the inclusion of FSM is even larger (about 64% for Somali, 36 for Turkish and 64 for Bangladeshi). By the end of compulsory schooling at KS4, Somali and Turkish pupils have fully caught up\(^{21}\) once we condition on poverty. The raw gaps disappear, suggesting that the disadvantages revealed in column 1 were in fact due to the higher incidence of poverty in these two ethnic groups relative to White British pupils.

When we include the variable on EAL, the attainment gaps also reduce, but to a lesser extent as compared with the introduction on FSM. This suggests that poverty plays a more important role than language difficulties in explaining the disadvantage of ethnic minority pupils in the first stages of their schooling. It is also interesting to observe that the negative impact of FSM increases in absolute magnitude as children become older, while the opposite is true for EAL, whose coefficient decreases over time in absolute terms. At KS4, the EAL coefficient, previously negative, turns positive, implying that a non-English mother tongue constitutes a disadvantage for younger people but becomes a benefit at age 16, when pupils are likely to have become fluent in English. Therefore, and as pointed out in Dustmann et al. (2008), language may feature in an explanation of why ethnic minority pupils improve relative to White British pupils over time.

Once we control in column 4 for all the individual characteristics available in PLASC, the coefficients of ethnic minority groups further reduce. In particular, at KS2 the coefficients for Somali and Turkish decrease by 0.209 (meaning that both Somali and Turkish are performing on average about 21 percent of a standard deviation worse than white British pupils), while the disadvantage for Bangladeshi pupils disappears. At KS3, when we control for pupils' characteristics and family background the BST’s disadvantage disappears for Somali pupils, whose performance on average is not significantly different from that of similar white British pupils. At KS4 both Somali and Bangladeshi seem to outperform White British pupils with similar characteristics, and the coefficient for Turkish pupils becomes insignificant.

In column 5 we add the IDACI score, which allows us to take into account the characteristics of the neighbourhood where pupils live. The higher the index the higher the proportion of children living in income deprived families, and therefore the more deprived the neighbourhood, as defined in terms of SOA.

Unsurprisingly the coefficient of the IDACI score is negative and strongly significant; its inclusion in the regressions further reduces ethnic minority attainment gaps at KS2 and KS3, and reinforces their advantages at KS4. Once we control for area deprivation, all three ethnic minority groups seem to significantly outperform White British pupils, again suggesting that the initial raw gaps are due to the fact that Somali, Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils tend to be poorer, to live in more deprived areas and to be non English native speakers.

In column 6 (for table 10 and 11 only)\(^{22}\) we augment the equation including past achievement and estimate a value added model. This means that the interpretation of the EMGs coefficients changes, and they show the impact of ethnicity on the progress from one Key Stage to the other, rather than on the levels.

\(^{21}\) At KS4 Bangladeshi pupils have caught up even unconditionally (i.e. without controlling for any factors they are on average performing better than white British pupils at KS4).

\(^{22}\) We cannot include past achievement in regressions on KS2 results
A positive coefficient for an ethnic group implies that that group experienced greater progress on average. It seems that between KS2 and KS3 Somali pupils are improving their performance more than the average, as the coefficient of the Somali dummy is positive and significant in column 7 and 8. This is also the case for Bangladeshi pupils, but only when we include LAs dummies. This means that within each LA, Bangladeshi pupils are progressing more than average between KS2 and KS3. This comes from the fact Bangladeshi pupils tend to live in more deprived LA.

Between KS3 and KS4 all coefficients of ethnic minority groups in the valued added specification are positive and significant, suggesting that the increase in the test scores of Bangladeshi, Turkish and Somali is greater than that of White British pupils.

Finally in the last column, we add LA dummies in order to see whether the results are affected by unequal distribution of the BST pupils in LAs. It seems that coefficients are generally similar in column 7 and 8 of the three tables, suggesting that sorting by LA is not playing an important role (except for the Bangladeshi dummy in KS3, as noted above). It is also important to note that the LA dummy variables are jointly significant (see the last row of Table 9, 10 and 11) and substantially improve the fit of the model. Thus it would appear that there are mean differences in school effects across different local areas. Reliable interpretation of these findings is difficult, however: it could be due to different LA education policies, or, more likely, it is due to differences in the characteristics of different areas that are not fully taken account of in the model.
### Table 9: KS2 - whole sample – cohort 89/90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Empty Model</th>
<th>(2) Add FSM</th>
<th>(3) Add EAL</th>
<th>(4) Add all pupils’ characteristics</th>
<th>(5) Add local neighbourhood characteristics</th>
<th>(6) Add LA dummies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FSM</strong></td>
<td>-0.580***</td>
<td>-0.432***</td>
<td>-0.285***</td>
<td>-0.290***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAL</strong></td>
<td>-0.212***</td>
<td>-0.157***</td>
<td>-0.109***</td>
<td>-0.147***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEN</strong></td>
<td>-1.190***</td>
<td>-1.168***</td>
<td>-1.167***</td>
<td>-1.167***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>-0.058***</td>
<td>-0.054***</td>
<td>-0.054***</td>
<td>-0.054***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDACI score</strong></td>
<td>-0.853***</td>
<td>-0.853***</td>
<td>-0.998***</td>
<td>-0.998***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somali</strong></td>
<td>-0.797***</td>
<td>-0.363***</td>
<td>-0.606***</td>
<td>-0.209***</td>
<td>-0.130***</td>
<td>-0.240***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turkish</strong></td>
<td>-0.659***</td>
<td>-0.438***</td>
<td>-0.480***</td>
<td>-0.209***</td>
<td>-0.119***</td>
<td>0.250***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangladeshi</strong></td>
<td>-0.357***</td>
<td>-0.102***</td>
<td>-0.160***</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.123***</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>-0.094***</td>
<td>-0.059***</td>
<td>-0.045***</td>
<td>-0.019***</td>
<td>0.010***</td>
<td>-0.026***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>0.031***</td>
<td>0.104***</td>
<td>0.033***</td>
<td>0.318***</td>
<td>0.456***</td>
<td>0.950***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LA dummies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Observations**

| 507097 | 506789 | 507097 | 506789 | 501817 | 501817 |

**R-squared**

| 0.004 | 0.045 | 0.006 | 0.246  | 0.264  | 0.277  |

**$F$ joint signif. of LA dummies**

- 62.33***

**Notes:** Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. In column 1 to 6, the dependent variable is the standardised Key Stage 2 scores.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empty Model</td>
<td>Add FSM</td>
<td>Add EAL</td>
<td>Add all pupils’ charact.</td>
<td>Add local neighbourhood charact.</td>
<td>Value added specification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KS2 (std scores)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>0.650***</td>
<td>0.632***</td>
<td>0.629***</td>
<td>0.600***</td>
<td>0.583***</td>
<td>0.562***</td>
<td>0.541***</td>
<td>0.520***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>-0.211***</td>
<td>-0.102***</td>
<td>-0.096***</td>
<td>-0.180***</td>
<td>-0.076***</td>
<td>0.024***</td>
<td>0.062***</td>
<td>0.055***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>-0.098***</td>
<td>-0.025***</td>
<td>0.024***</td>
<td>0.062***</td>
<td>0.055***</td>
<td>-0.116***</td>
<td>-0.109***</td>
<td>-0.120***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.024***</td>
<td>0.062***</td>
<td>0.055***</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDACI score</td>
<td>-1.214***</td>
<td>-0.691***</td>
<td>-0.561***</td>
<td>-0.561***</td>
<td>-0.561***</td>
<td>-0.561***</td>
<td>-0.561***</td>
<td>-0.561***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-0.625***</td>
<td>-0.191***</td>
<td>-0.471***</td>
<td>-0.262***</td>
<td>0.076**</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.095***</td>
<td>0.085***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>-0.509***</td>
<td>-0.381***</td>
<td>-0.456***</td>
<td>-0.192***</td>
<td>-0.074**</td>
<td>-0.108***</td>
<td>-0.045*</td>
<td>-0.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>-0.418***</td>
<td>-0.148***</td>
<td>-0.264***</td>
<td>-0.087***</td>
<td>0.057***</td>
<td>-0.102***</td>
<td>-0.019***</td>
<td>0.049***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.043***</td>
<td>-0.005**</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.032***</td>
<td>0.070***</td>
<td>0.033***</td>
<td>0.054***</td>
<td>0.046***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.016***</td>
<td>0.078***</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
<td>0.164***</td>
<td>0.357***</td>
<td>-0.012***</td>
<td>0.103***</td>
<td>0.180***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA dummies</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>494013</td>
<td>494013</td>
<td>493286</td>
<td>493286</td>
<td>491526</td>
<td>490428</td>
<td>488685</td>
<td>488685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F joint signif. of LA dummies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94.88***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 In column 1 to 8, the dependent variable is the standardised Key Stage 3 scores.
Table 11: KS4 - whole sample - cohort 89/90 - value added specification (from col.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add FSM</td>
<td>-0.685***</td>
<td>-0.554***</td>
<td>-0.352***</td>
<td>-0.294***</td>
<td>-0.290***</td>
<td>-0.222***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add EAL</td>
<td>0.138***</td>
<td>0.200***</td>
<td>0.274***</td>
<td>0.245***</td>
<td>0.277***</td>
<td>0.245***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add all pupils’ charact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add local neighbour charact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value added specification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3 (std scores)</td>
<td>0.528***</td>
<td>0.508***</td>
<td>0.510***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM  -0.685***</td>
<td>-0.554***</td>
<td>-0.352***</td>
<td>-0.294***</td>
<td>-0.290***</td>
<td>-0.222***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL  0.138***</td>
<td>0.200***</td>
<td>0.274***</td>
<td>0.245***</td>
<td>0.277***</td>
<td>0.245***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN -1.072***</td>
<td>-1.013***</td>
<td>-0.549***</td>
<td>-0.540***</td>
<td>-0.540***</td>
<td>-0.540***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 0.156***</td>
<td>0.164***</td>
<td>0.141***</td>
<td>0.146***</td>
<td>0.146***</td>
<td>0.145***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDACI score</td>
<td>-1.227***</td>
<td>-0.568***</td>
<td>-0.716***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali -0.280***</td>
<td>0.220***</td>
<td>-0.412***</td>
<td>0.085**</td>
<td>0.193***</td>
<td>0.112***</td>
<td>0.160***</td>
<td>0.102***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish -0.147***</td>
<td>0.070**</td>
<td>-0.268***</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.150***</td>
<td>0.141***</td>
<td>0.196***</td>
<td>0.095***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi 0.080***</td>
<td>0.391***</td>
<td>-0.052***</td>
<td>0.151***</td>
<td>0.290***</td>
<td>0.192***</td>
<td>0.255***</td>
<td>0.160***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 0.054***</td>
<td>0.096***</td>
<td>0.211***</td>
<td>0.063***</td>
<td>0.098***</td>
<td>0.042***</td>
<td>0.060***</td>
<td>0.053***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant -0.001</td>
<td>0.063***</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.119***</td>
<td>0.317***</td>
<td>0.059***</td>
<td>0.153***</td>
<td>0.281***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA dummies No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>510446</td>
<td>510446</td>
<td>509800</td>
<td>509800</td>
<td>507990</td>
<td>493381</td>
<td>491638</td>
<td>491638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F joint signif. of LA dummies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. In column 1 to 8, the dependent variable is the standardised Key Stage 4 scores.

3.4.1.1 Separate regressions by ethnic groups

Tables 12, 13 and 14 (see Appendix 3) show the variable importance of EAL, FSM and other background variables in the three ethnic groups. It emerges that in primary school FSM status is significant for Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils only, and not for Somali pupils. This does not mean that poverty is not an important factor for Somali pupils; rather the result can be explained by the fact that almost all Somali pupils (82 %, see Table 7) are in receipt of FSM and therefore there is little variation to identify the effect. At KS2, speaking English as a second language appears to be significant for Turkish pupils only, but again the variation of EAL among ethnic minorities is very small, as most BTS pupils do not have English as their mother tongue. As we found for the whole sample, area deprivation has a strong negative impact on pupils’ achievement, but at KS2 this effect is significant for Turkish pupils only, whilst at KS3 it becomes strongly significant for Bangladeshi pupils as well. It is interesting to note that at KS3,
for Bangladeshi pupils, the IDACI score remains significant across all the specifications, including the last one where we take account of LA dummies and previous results. This means that, even within the same LA, living in a more deprived area has a negative impact on progression in relation to achievement rates. On gender, it seems that Bangladeshi, Turkish and Somali females tend to underperform with respect to males during KS2, but they then catch up and perform on average better than males in KS3 and KS4; this is particularly a feature amongst Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils.

3.4.1.2 Results for cohort 2

Tables 15-17 (see Appendix 3) report regression tables for cohort 2 (people born in 1990/1991). We will not provide an extensive commentary on these results since they are very similar to those found for cohort 1. This is not surprising, given that the two cohorts are observed in consecutive years, and it is highly likely that the factors affecting pupils’ achievement over that period are stable. What the results for cohort 2 represent is confirmation; they show that our conclusions are similar and valid across the two cohorts investigated.

A few small differences emerge. The raw attainment gaps at KS2 for the three ethnic groups are lower in this cohort than in the previous one, although the difference is not statistically significant. Moreover in the second cohort at KS2 the performance of BST pupils is still lagging behind the one of White British even when we introduce all the variables available in the data.

At KS3 and KS4 the results for the two cohorts are almost identical, and confirm the catching-up observed in the first cohort.

3.4.2 The role of schools

This section examines the role of school sorting in explaining the attainment gaps experienced by ethnic minority pupils. One of the reasons why minority ethnic pupils may underachieve is that they attend weaker schools than White British pupils. As noted in Dustmann et al. (2008) there is considerable segregation at the school level, and minority ethnic pupils tend to attend very different schools than White British pupils. Wilson, Burgess and Briggs (2005) suggest that school quality accounts for around half of the gap between Black and White British, and Kingdon and Cassen (2007) also argue that ethnic minority students are more likely to attend worse quality schools.

One of the channels, therefore, through which ethnicity may affect attainment is through school sorting. We investigate the relevance of this channel by estimating a model with school fixed effects; this allows us to examine the differences in attainment within-school, thus alleviating the problem of school sorting. Should we find significant differences when comparing the coefficients model that includes school effects with a model that does not, then it would be likely there is a bias in the second model. The reason is that the model without school effects does not capture school unobserved characteristics that can be correlated with the other variables included in the model (Kingdon and Cassen, 2007).

Table 18 reports estimates’ results from both fixed effects (FE) and random effects (RE) models using cohort 1. RE estimates are shown in order to be consistent with previous literature. Moreover RE models enable us to quantify how far the observed differences in attainment are due to differences between pupils within the same school as opposed to differences between schools. Columns 1 and 2 refer to Key Stage 2. If we compare the coefficients in column 2 (FE) with those in Table 9 column 4 (which reports the same specification estimated with pooled OLS), it seems that once we control for unobserved school characteristics, the conditional attainment gaps slightly increase in absolute terms for the three ethnic groups. This suggests that the effects found using OLS were not due to ethnic minority pupils attending worse schools during primary education. On the contrary, attainment gaps seem to be higher when we use a within-school approach and the dummy for Bangladeshi pupils now becomes significant.

Regarding the other variables, it is interesting to note that, as expected, the absolute magnitude of FSM decreases in the FE specification with respect to the pooled OLS. This suggests that the
The detrimental effects of FSM on attainment may be over-estimated if we don't take into account
the indirect effect – that is, the fact that a student is more likely to attend worse quality schools.

The RE model provides us with the basic information about the extent of variation in education
achievement that is within schools and between schools. The intra class correlation statistic at
the bottom of column 1 (rho) from the random effects model is useful here. This statistic
indicates that around one sixth of the variation in Key Stage 2 test scores is across schools
(rho=0.159), a finding that is broadly consistent with previous literature. In other word, 16% of
the variation in KS2 is due to differences between schools, while 84% is explained by variations
within schools.

Columns 3, 4 and 5, 6 report the results for Key Stages 3 and 4 respectively. In this case we
only reported the specification in value added, and therefore the coefficients have to be
interpreted as factors affecting pupils’ changes in attainment over time. Looking at KS3 results,
we can note that once we control for previous achievement and school sorting (e.g. if pupils
from disadvantaged backgrounds systematically choose the same schools) the ethnicity
dummies become insignificant, with the exception of the dummy for Turkish pupils which is
significant at 10 percent but considerably lower than in the specification without school effects
(see col. 6 in Table 10). As already shown at KS4 all three ethnic minorities groups seem to
experience greater progress on average, even though the coefficient reduces with respect to
the specification without school effects.

It is interesting to note that the importance of school factors increases over time, as highlighted
by the intra-class correlation coefficient (rho in the tables) which is increasing over key stages.
In particular, it is 0.159 in primary school and 0.225 and 0.215 in secondary school at Key
Stages 3 and 4 respectively. This suggests that the role of school (the proportion of the overall
variance in pupils’ results explained by differences across schools) is higher for secondary than
for primary schools.

---

23 See Appendix 2 for an explanation of intra class correlation.
### Table 18: KS2, KS3 and KS4 - School fixed effects and random effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Key stage 2</th>
<th>Key stage 3</th>
<th>Key stage 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-0.286***</td>
<td>-0.292***</td>
<td>0.00980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0337)</td>
<td>(0.0339)</td>
<td>(0.0280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>-0.241***</td>
<td>-0.248***</td>
<td>-0.0421*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0276)</td>
<td>(0.0278)</td>
<td>(0.0233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>-0.0630***</td>
<td>-0.0731***</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0150)</td>
<td>(0.0155)</td>
<td>(0.0125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.0288***</td>
<td>-0.0295***</td>
<td>-0.00455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00385)</td>
<td>(0.00414)</td>
<td>(0.00372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.0579***</td>
<td>-0.0583***</td>
<td>0.0394***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00230)</td>
<td>(0.00230)</td>
<td>(0.00201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>-0.326***</td>
<td>-0.304***</td>
<td>-0.0897***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00347)</td>
<td>(0.00351)</td>
<td>(0.00303)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>-1.185***</td>
<td>-1.182***</td>
<td>-0.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00312)</td>
<td>(0.00314)</td>
<td>(0.00319)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>-0.125***</td>
<td>-0.115***</td>
<td>0.0631***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00590)</td>
<td>(0.00608)</td>
<td>(0.00506)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2 (std scores)</td>
<td>0.597***</td>
<td>0.595***</td>
<td>0.00113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3 (std scores)</td>
<td>0.299***</td>
<td>0.299***</td>
<td>-0.0252***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00356)</td>
<td>(0.00205)</td>
<td>(0.00648)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.313***</td>
<td>0.299***</td>
<td>-0.0252***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00356)</td>
<td>(0.00205)</td>
<td>(0.00648)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>R-squared overall</th>
<th>R-squared within</th>
<th>R-squared between</th>
<th>sigma_e</th>
<th>sigma_u</th>
<th>Rho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>506789</td>
<td>15521</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>506789</td>
<td>15521</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>490428</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>490428</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>493381</td>
<td>3383</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>493381</td>
<td>3383</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.
FSM, SEN and EAL refer to the year in which key stage tests were taken, namely 2001 for key stage 2 (col. 1, 2), 2004 for key stage 3 (col. 3, 4) and 2006 for key stage 4 (col. 5, 6).

In order to evaluate the impact of school characteristics on school effectiveness, we estimate a second stage regression after the FE model. This second stage involves regressing each estimated school (fixed or mean) effect against schools' characteristics in order to determine whether these effects differ systematically across different types of school. This will help us answering the question on what characteristics of schools are associated with better school effectiveness.

In particular, we included the following variables: proportion of non white British pupils, percentage of pupils receiving FSM, percentage of pupils whose first language is not English, school size and pupil teacher ratio.

The results in Table 19 show that school characteristics matter. It seems that schools that have systematically lower pupil-teacher ratios and proportions of children in receipt...
of FSM have higher rates of progress in pupils between KS2 and KS3 (column 1). Small and single-sex schools are also significantly associated with higher effectiveness for BST pupils. The same school characteristics are significantly associated with school effectiveness from Key stage 3 to Key stage 4 (column 2), excluding pupil teacher ratio and school size that have the opposite sign. Schools with higher proportion of pupils with EAL tend to have pupils who progress more between KS2 and KS3 than other schools.

One point about causality is important here. It may be that children who enrol in these schools have different characteristics that are not fully taken account of in our model; that is, they are not accounted for by observable characteristics and by prior achievement. If so, we may be observing the effect of higher achieving children selecting into these schools, rather than the causal impact of these schools on pupils’ achievement.

Table 19: regressions of predicted fixed effects on school characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS2-KS3</td>
<td>KS3-KS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-sex</td>
<td>0.154***</td>
<td>0.053**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% non white British</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.238***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FSM</td>
<td>-0.015***</td>
<td>-0.005***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>-0.000***</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-Teacher ratio</td>
<td>-0.021***</td>
<td>0.026***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EAL</td>
<td>0.002***</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.532***</td>
<td>-0.643***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3399</td>
<td>3386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. The dependent variable in column 1 is the estimated school effects taken from Table 18, col.4. The dependent variable in column 2 is the estimated school effects taken from Table 18, col. 6.

3.4.3 Separate regressions by ethnic groups

In this section, we replicate the analysis described above and run separate regressions by ethnic groups. The idea is to predict school fixed effects for the sample of Somali, Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils in order to capture school effectiveness for a specific ethnic group. There could be schools that are effective on average but which do not manage to raise the performance of ethnic minorities groups. Contrariwise, some schools might have a low average value added but prove highly effective in helping EMG pupils to improve their achievement. In general, some schools may prove more effective in promoting the progress of ethnic groups more than others.

We investigate which school characteristics are associated with higher school effectiveness for the three ethnic groups separately (see Tables 20 and 21 in Appendix 3). Table 20 reports the results of the FE model for Somali (columns 1 and 2), Turkish (columns 3 and 4) and Bangladeshi pupils (columns 5 and 6). Within each group the first column shows the result on Key stage 3 and the second on Key stage 4. We then extract the predicted fixed effects and regress these on school characteristics in Table
21. It is important to recall that this is essentially a value added model. The school fixed effects therefore measure the mean gain in pupil achievement for that particular school, once we allow for pupil characteristics.

The results do differ with respect to the estimates for the whole sample. The school characteristics included in the model are generally not significant, suggesting that schools where BST children progressed more do not have systematically different observable characteristics. This means with the current data, we are unable to identify school features that explain progress of pupils. However, we find that single sex schools are associated with higher value added from Key stage 2 to key stage 3 for Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils. A high proportion of non White British pupils is also associated with higher value added from Key stage 3 to Key stage 4 for Somali and Bangladeshi pupils, suggesting that schools with high shares of non white-British pupils might be better equipped to help EMG pupils improve their performance. The percentages of FSM and EAL pupils are both negatively correlated with school effectiveness for Somali and Bangladeshi but not Turkish pupils.

3.5 Minority Ethnic Achievement Programme (MEAP) Evaluation

The MEAP was first piloted in October 2004. The primary aim was to address the under-attainment of pupils from Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish backgrounds (PBST). It first involved 12 LAs and 52 schools, and was then extended to involve 17 LAs and 80 schools in October 2006\(^{24}\). The main focus of the programme was on raising attainment of PBST pupils at Key Stage 3. To achieve this, financial help was provided to schools in order to deliver structured programmes of small-group support, delivered by teachers or teaching assistants holding the skills required to help pupils achieve their objectives (see DfES, 2007).

We first examine average performances amongst schools included in the MEAP as compared with similar schools not included in the MEAP. We use performance at KS3 in Maths, English and Science. In order to compare schools of similar characteristics, we include statistics computed at the school level such as the proportion of non White British pupils, the percentage receiving FSM, the percentage of pupils whose first language in not English, the school size and the pupil-teachers ratio.

In a second step, we investigate whether pupils from the three ethnic groups in the MEAP schools have progressed faster than pupils in the same schools not included in the programme. Here the question addressed is whether pupils of BST heritage benefited from being included in the MEAP pilot schools compared with the group of White British pupils in the same schools.

3.5.1 Comparison of average performance for pupils in schools included in the MEAP pilot

We use the full sample of pupils who passed the Key Stage 3 tests in 2006. This is the cohort born in 1991/1992, and the first cohort included in the first phase of the MEAP pilot. The focus here is on the schools included in the MEAP pilot, in comparison with what happened at the same time in other schools not included in the MEAP. We present simple OLS regressions in Table 22 where the dependent (explained) variable is Key Stage 3 results. In columns 1 and 2, we perform similar analysis than the one in Table...

The results show PBST heritage pupils having a lower performance at Key Stage 3 (column 1). And this lower performance is largely explained by characteristics that put them at a disadvantage compared to White British pupils (living in areas more often socially deprived, and a higher prevalence of poverty in their household), as can be seen on column 2.

In column 3 of the same Table 22, we introduce a variable indicating whether the school was included in the MEAP 2004 pilot. We can see that pupils in those schools tend to perform on average 14% of a standard deviation below those in other schools. This is not surprising, given that the schools included in the MEAP were selected based on their lower performance at Key stage 3. An interesting result is that when we combine this single variable with the four ethnic groups included in the report, we find that the BST groups perform on average better than the reference group (White British pupils). As can be seen on column 3, the results for Somali pupils in MEAP schools at Key Stage 3 in 2006 were 24% of a standard deviation higher than those for White British pupils. For Bangladeshi pupils, the figure is a bit lower at 16%.

It is also possible to introduce the past performance for each pupil (mainly Key Stage 2 results). This is shown in columns 4 and 5, where again the coefficients have to be interpreted as progress with reference to White British pupils. The main difference between columns 3 and 4, is that in the second case we have added school level characteristics such as: whether the schools are single sex, the proportion of non-white pupils, the proportion in receipt of FSM, the proportion with EAL, and the school size. So the results we have presented in column 4 show the progress of the three ethnic groups in comparison with White British pupils, holding constant these other characteristics of schools. The most noteworthy result is that progress for Somali pupils between Key Stages 2 and 3 is more extensive than it is for Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils. Using the coefficients in the Table, it is also possible to say more on the performance of the BST group in the MEAP in comparison to the BST group in other schools. For example, the coefficient for Somali (.128) in column 5 measures how this group in non-MEAP schools performed with respect to White British. So by comparing this coefficient with the one for MEAP and the interacted one (MEAP x Somali), we say that Somalis in MEAP schools did perform 23% of a standard-deviation better than White British pupils, whereas Somalis in other schools performed only 13% better than White British pupils. The difference can be attributed to the effect of MEAP for Somalis compared to Somali in other schools. It is 9% of a standard-deviation. Based on this approach, we would conclude that the strongest effect of the MEAP has been on Somali. Indeed, similar computations lead to smaller effects for the other two groups.

But in general, this is encouraging evidence on the effectiveness of the MEAP policy. Indeed, it appears that ethnic minority pupils in schools included in the MEAP pilot have performed better on average than comparable White British pupils in the same schools, and also in comparison with BST pupils attending similar schools not included in the MEAP.
Table 22: Pupils’ performance in schools included and not included in the MEAP pilot (phase 1 that started in October 2004), dependent variable: Key Stage 3 results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-0.549***</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.114***</td>
<td>0.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>-0.591***</td>
<td>-0.170***</td>
<td>-0.174***</td>
<td>-0.094***</td>
<td>-0.076***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>-0.310***</td>
<td>0.057***</td>
<td>0.040**</td>
<td>0.056***</td>
<td>0.075***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.050***</td>
<td>0.052***</td>
<td>0.054***</td>
<td>0.050***</td>
<td>0.034***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2 (std scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.644***</td>
<td>0.630***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in MEAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.145***</td>
<td>-0.105***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAP x Somali</td>
<td>0.244***</td>
<td>0.212***</td>
<td>0.197***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAP x Turkish</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>0.097*</td>
<td>0.124**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAP x Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0.165***</td>
<td>0.070**</td>
<td>0.062**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAP x Other</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.038**</td>
<td>0.053***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>-0.260***</td>
<td>-0.259***</td>
<td>-0.088***</td>
<td>-0.067***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>0.029***</td>
<td>0.039***</td>
<td>0.103***</td>
<td>0.102**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>-0.821***</td>
<td>-0.821***</td>
<td>-0.113***</td>
<td>-0.113***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.048***</td>
<td>0.043***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDACI score</td>
<td>-1.129***</td>
<td>-1.123***</td>
<td>-0.453***</td>
<td>-0.301***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single sex school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.132**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of non white British in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.173***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FSM in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.011***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EAL in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-teacher ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.011***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
<td>0.371***</td>
<td>0.371***</td>
<td>-0.317***</td>
<td>-0.090***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LA dummies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>513052</td>
<td>510109</td>
<td>510109</td>
<td>506220</td>
<td>505926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.2 Comparison pupils results in MEAP schools

In this section, we restrict the analysis to pupils attending schools included in the MEAP pilot. Table 23 provide regressions of Key Stage 2 (column 1) and Key Stage 3 (column 2 to 4) on the same explanatory variables as in previous Tables. A first comment on the results presented in column 1; these are the results for Key Stage 2 results (in 2003) for the 3 ethnic groups investigated in relation to White British pupils (always the reference omitted category). Each of the three ethnic groups performs significantly less well than White British pupils. For example, we observe that Somalis pupils do 61% of a standard-deviation lower at Key Stage 2 as compared with White British pupils.

It is interesting to compare results in columns 2 - 4. In these columns, the dependent variable is Key Stage 3 results obtained in 2006 for the same cohort (born in 1991/1992).

In column 2, the results at Key Stage 3 for Somali, Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils show that all have improved as compared with their results at Key Stage 2. It is also worth observing that the difference between BST groups and White British pupils is much smaller than it is in Table 22, column 1. This suggests that the disparities in performances are significantly lower in the schools included in the pilot. Of course, whether and how far this is due to the MEAP programme is unclear, and would require further analysis.

In column 3, we analyse the progress made by the ethnic groups in comparison to those made by White British pupils. We do this by regressing Key Stage 3 on the results at Key Stage 2, taking account of whether pupils are from one of the three ethnic minorities groups. The figures for Somali, Turkish/Kurdish, and Bangladeshi pupils in this column can be read as showing how any one of these groups has progressed between Key Stages 2 and 3 in comparison to the progress of White British pupils.

Finally, in column 4, we introduce a set of characteristics for pupils that are related to pupils’ progress. These variables are the same as those introduced in Section 3.4.1. We first note that the effects of these characteristics are similar in magnitude to those observed in Table 10. One difference worth noting is that the coefficient for Somali pupils is now larger; Somali pupils have progressed faster in MEAP schools compared to other schools in England. We do not, however, find significant differences in progress for Turkish/Kurdish and Bangladeshi pupils compared to White British pupils in the MEAP schools. The coefficients were statistically significant in the previous column 3 (without the additional characteristics as controls). Hence, once we account for social deprivation, household poverty, gender, SEN and EAL status, progress is similar for Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils as compared with White British pupils.

It is difficult to draw firm conclusions about the effectiveness of the MEAP pilots in raising achievement of PBST pupils, since we are not comparing the same cohorts of pupils. Clearly more work needs to be done in the MEAP evaluation before drawing robust finding. In particular, it appears advisable to perform comparison over time of the same pupils before and after the introduction of the MEAP. This endeavour is beyond the scope of this report, but should be considered as extensions to those initial findings. One consistent result so far, however, is that Somali pupils appear to gain most from the MEAP intervention.
Table 23: Pupils results in MEAP schools (N=82), Keys Stage 2 results (col. 1) and Key Stage 3 results (col. 2 to 4) for the cohort born over 1991/1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dep.var:</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS2</td>
<td>KS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-0.612***</td>
<td>-0.136*</td>
<td>0.275***</td>
<td>0.219***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>(0.081)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>-0.476***</td>
<td>-0.226***</td>
<td>0.073*</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>-0.155***</td>
<td>-0.060*</td>
<td>0.049**</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.196***</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.135***</td>
<td>0.052***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2 (std scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.659***</td>
<td>0.622***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>-0.083***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>0.166***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>-0.192***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.084***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDACI score</td>
<td>-0.217***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.162***</td>
<td>-0.326***</td>
<td>-0.232***</td>
<td>-0.073*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA dummies</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>13788</td>
<td>13521</td>
<td>13408</td>
<td>13344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Conclusions

This chapter has investigated the patterns, evolution and predictors of attainment amongst Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils.

We adopted a quantitative approach based on analysis of NPD and PLASC data, which contains information on all pupils enrolled in schools; this is an advantage of our analysis, as compared to studies based on survey data that focus on a specific sample of the population.

Our analysis was divided into two stages: we first provided a descriptive picture of attainment gaps between BST and white British pupils, and we then used an econometric analysis to investigate the individual and school factors affecting school performance.
Descriptive evidence

- The proportion of BST pupils in schools has increased over the period 2003-2007, and that increase was especially significant for Somali pupils.

- BST pupils tend to be geographically clustered, particularly Turkish pupils. Around 58% of Turkish pupils are concentrated in 3 LAs. The corresponding figures for Somali and Bangladeshi pupils are 27% and 38%.

- BST pupils are more likely to receive FSM, and to live in a deprived area compared to white British pupils. This highlights the widespread state of poverty amongst these ethnic groups and in particular among Somali pupils.

- Looking at attainment gaps in relation to BST pupils over time we found that:
  - There are large gaps in attainment by ethnic groups (White British pupils are on average performing better, followed by Bangladeshi, and then Turkish and Somali pupils).
  - There are significant gaps between Bangladeshi and White British pupils at KS2 and KS3, but Bangladeshi pupils fully make up that gap at KS4.
  - This is not the case for Turkish and Somali who still lag behind at KS4.
  - Overall there is less dispersion across ethnic groups at KS4 than at previous Key Stages.

- Looking at the progression of the same pupils over time, we noticed that:
  - BST pupils are disadvantaged at the beginning of their school career and have significantly lower results at KS2, as compared with White British pupils.
  - Their performance improves over time and their results get closer to those of White British pupils. In particular, a ‘jump’ in the relative performance of BST pupils is observed between KS3 and KS4.
  - At KS4, Bangladeshi pupils end up with higher scores compared to white British pupils.

In the econometric analysis we compared the performance of BST pupils controlling for all the observable characteristics available in the data; namely gender, special education needs, poverty (whether the pupil is entitled to receive free school meals), English language ability (where English is not the first language) and neighbourhood deprivation.

The aim of the analysis was twofold: first, to understand if differences in observable characteristics are able to explain differences in attainment; secondly, to understand the role of school on pupils’ progress.

Econometric analysis: results

- The inclusion of FSM eligibility substantially reduces the attainment gaps for all the ethnic minorities considered at all the Key Stages.

- The inclusion of EAL also reduces the attainment gaps, but to a lesser extent as compared with the introduction on FSM.

- The negative impact of FSM increases in absolute magnitude as children become older.

- Once we control for all the individual characteristics available in PLASC and for area deprivation, the gaps of BST pupils reduce significantly at KS2 and disappear at KS3 and KS4. In particular, at KS4 both Somali and Bangladeshi seem to outperform White British pupils with similar characteristics, while the performance of Turkish pupils is not significantly different from that of white British pupils.
• The Value Added regressions showed that between KS3 and KS4, the increase in the test scores of Bangladeshi, Turkish and Somali is greater than that of White British pupils with similar characteristics.

• Our estimates do not support the hypothesis that BST lower performance in primary school is due to the fact that they attend on average worse schools.

• The importance of school factors (captured by the proportion of the overall variance in attainment explained by differences between schools) increases over time (larger differences between schools during secondary school than during primary school).
4 The attainment of Bangladeshi and Somali students in England: evidence from the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE)

4.1 Purpose

The aim of this chapter is to:

1. Consider historical trends in the attainment of Bangladeshi students in England, in relation to other BME groups and to White British students;

2. Consider in detail recent data from 2006 on attainment at the end of secondary school for both Bangladeshi and Somali students from the LSYPE;

3. To consider the role of socio-economic factors and pupil and family context in accounting for the attainment of Bangladeshi and Somali students at age 16 in terms of their performance relative to White British students;

4. To determine which if any factors can account for differences in attainment between Bangladeshi and Somali students;

5. To consider the impact, if any, of school level factors, particularly school quality and ethnic composition, on the attainment of Bangladeshi students.

4.2 Introduction

Bangladeshi students: context and demographics

Migration to the UK from Bangladesh began in the late 1950s and early 1960s. These were mostly men who found unskilled and poorly paid work in factories. A large number of Bangladeshi men settled in East London, where they found work in the garments industry while others settled in the textile areas of the North West and the Midlands. The families of many Bangladeshi migrants came to Britain much later, in the 1980’s, but the vast majority of Bangladeshi 16 years olds in 2006 (85%) were born and have lived continuously in Britain. Good summaries of the history and context of Bangladeshi migration to England can be found in DCSF (2008b), Haque (2000) and OFSTED (2004).

The most recent ethnic monitoring data reported by the DCSF (2008) is from the January 2008 school census and identifies 50,209 Bangladeshi students in maintained primary schools and 36,280 students in maintained secondary schools in England. Overall Bangladeshi students represent quite a small proportion of the population, just 1.5% of all primary school students and 1.1% of secondary school students. Bangladeshi students are unevenly distributed around the country with concentrations in particular geographical area. 50% of all Bangladeshi primary school students live in

---

25 See Appendix 1 for an extract from the DCSF MEAP project (2008) that gives the historical background on Bangladeshi, Turkish & Somali groups.
London, where they constitute 5.3% of the primary school population\textsuperscript{26}. Even more markedly half of these students, and indeed 21% of all Bangladeshi primary aged students in England, reside in the single London Borough of Tower Hamlets. In Tower Hamlets, Bangladeshi students account for 64% of the primary school population. Other areas of London with high concentrations of Bangladeshi students (based on primary school data) are: Camden (19%), Newham (17.9%), Islington (6.4%), Hackney (5.4%). Outside of London other areas of high concentration are in Oldham (13.3%), Luton (10.6%), Birmingham (5.1%) and Bradford (3.1%). Together these nine LAs (from the total 150 LAs in England) account for 54% of all Bangladeshi students of primary school age. These 2008 data concur with the analyses of 2003-2007 data conducted and reported in Section 1 of the current study.

4.2.1 Bangladeshi students

The attainment of Bangladeshi students

National data on the attainment of different ethnic minority groups has historically been collected through the Youth Cohort Study. This is (typically) a biannual survey of a representative sample of around 15,000 students aged 16. Prior to 1991 no distinction was made within the overall Asian group, but from 1991 separate Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Other Asian categories were identified. Figure 4 plots data from the Youth Cohort Study (YCS) between 1991 and the most recent data from 2006.

---

\textsuperscript{26} DCFS data are given separately by primary and secondary age groups, a combined total is not produced. To be consistent with this published data the primary school figures are quoted in this report. There are only small differences between primary and secondary age groups.
The thick black line indicates the performance of White students, other minority ethnic groups are indicated by different coloured lines as identified in the key. The results indicate that Bangladeshi students have made significant improvements over the period 1991-2006. In 1991 14% of Bangladeshi students achieved the benchmark of 5+ GCSE A*-C grades compared to 37% of White students. In 2006 57% of Bangladeshi students achieved this benchmark against 58% of White students. The improvement was particularly pronounced between 2003 and 2006 during which time the gap between Bangladeshi and White students effectively disappeared.

A more detailed focus on change over the period since 2003 can be achieved through analysing national population data collected through the National Pupil Database (NPD). 2003 is a natural base year considering the trends illustrated in Figure 4, but also appropriate because a new ethnic coding system including mixed heritage categories was introduced that year, making direct comparisons with earlier NPD data problematic. Being population data the sample size is sufficient to also break down the result separately by gender within each ethnic group. It is also possible to add 2007 and 2008 results to include the most recent available data. The results are presented in Figure 5.

The data indicate the following:

- There are significant and continuing improvements in the attainment of all ethnic groups over the period, but Bangladeshi students have improved at a faster rate than their White British students. In 2003, 45.5% of Bangladeshi students achieved 5+ A*-C grades compared to 51.0% of White British students. By 2008 these figures had increased to 62.3% of Bangladeshi students (an improvement of 16.8 percentage points) while the results for White British students were 63.8%, an increase of 12.5 percentage points. The gap in 2008 stood at just 1.5 percentage points.

- The gender difference in attainment is more marked with the Bangladeshi students than for White British students. In 2008 68.2% of White British girls achieved 5+ A*-C grades compared to 59.5% of White British boys, a difference of 8.7 percentage points. In the same year 68.9% of Bangladeshi girls compared to 56.0% of Bangladeshi boys achieved this benchmark, a difference of 12.9 percentage points.

- The improvement in examination results is most pronounced for Bangladeshi girls whose average score in 2008 actually exceeded that of White British girls (68.9% vs. 68.2%). A slightly larger gap remains for Bangladeshi boys in comparison to White British boys (56.0% vs. 59.5%). However this gap is small compared to that between White British and Pakistani boys or particularly Black Caribbean boys.

The overall picture for Bangladeshi students’ attainment at the end of compulsory schooling is therefore one of significant and substantial improvement over the last 20 odd years, from a starting point of significant under-achievement relative to the White British majority group, through to near parity in the most recent results, and indeed with the attainment of Bangladeshi girls narrowly exceeding that of White British girls. Bangladeshi boys have also significantly narrowed the gap with White British boys, although the existence of a larger gender gap for Bangladeshi students than for White British students indicates the need to explore further the barriers to attainment which Bangladeshi boys in particular might experience.
Figure 5: Five or more GCSE A*-C grades by ethnic group and gender 2003-2008 (England averages)

Boys and Girls graphs show the percentage of students achieving five or more GCSE A*-C grades by ethnic group from 2003 to 2008.
4.2.2 Somali students

National data collection does not require the separate identification of ethnic groupings within the overall Black African group. There is therefore no comprehensive national data available specifically on the attainment of Black Somali students. However Local Authorities do have access to and can choose to use an extended set of over 90 ethnic categories that do include Somali students. The DCSF has extracted data from those LAs which have over 90% usage of the extended ethnic codes to estimate attainment figures for the Somali groups.

In 2005, it was estimated that 29% of Somali students achieved 5+A*-C grades against a Bangladeshi average of 55% (DfES, 2006). In 2007, it was estimated that 24% of Somali students achieved 5+A*-C including English and mathematics against 41% of Bangladeshi students and a national average of 45% (Drivers & challenges tender document, 2008, p4).

Data drawn from a survey of Somali students across 10 London Local authorities for 2006 gave a higher estimate of 34% 5+A*-C grades (Demie, McLean & Lewis, 2007) and subsequent 2007 data from 26 London LAs suggested 42% against an all pupil average of 62% (Demie, Lewis & Mclean, 2008).

The estimates for Somali attainment are therefore variable, ranging from 29% to 42% 5+ A*-C grades, but there does seem to be a consistent picture of substantially lower attainment by Somali students relative to White British students and against most other ethnic minority groups. Certainly the results reported in Figure 1 (see Chapter 3) indicate that the average KS4 score for Somali students is -0.60 SD27 below the national average, a result broadly in line with the finding from the analysis of the LSYPE sample to be reported here, where Somali pupils’ average total points score is -0.52 SD below the national average.

4.2.3 Explanations for Bangladeshi and Somali achievement

Previous academic literature has focused on explaining the low attainment of Bangladeshi students (e.g., Haque, 2000, OfSTED, 2004). Suggestions have included social and economic deprivation, limited proficiency in the English language, low level of parental involvement with schools, poor or ineffective schools, racism, extended absence from school for trips back to Bangladesh and cultural factors related to low educational expectations for girls and duties of religious observance for boys. This trend continues in many more recent papers. For example Richardson & Wood (2005) state “The serious under attainment of many Muslim students, particularly those of Pakistani/Kashmiri and Bangladeshi heritage, requires closer scrutiny and concerted action to close the attainment gap” (Richardson & Wood, 2005, italics added).

However the data presented here suggest, at least at age 16, the attainment of Bangladeshi students is broadly on a par with that of their White British peers. It appears that Bangladeshi students are simultaneously one of the most socio-economically deprived ethnic groups in England and yet their educational attainment at age 16 is comparable to the White British group. From the outset this sets a strong challenge to traditional explanations of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) underachievement which posit socio-economic factors as the key element in explaining the low attainment of BME groups; this explanation is clearly challenged by the Bangladeshi data. A key research question is why Bangladeshi students appear to succeed ‘against the odds’, that is considering the extent of the social and economic disadvantage they face why do Bangladeshi students perform better than comparable White British students?

27 SD means Standard Deviations.
The nature of the explanation for the low attainment of Somali pupils is much less clear since little or no published data exists. However a not dissimilar set of explanations have been posited (lack of fluency in English, lack of understanding of the education system, single parent families, overcrowding, poor school attendance, negative teacher perceptions and poor home-school liaison, (Demie et al, 2008). The analysis will explore what relationships emerge from the data.

4.3 Analysis of the LSYPE dataset

4.3.1 Focus of this analysis

The focus of this analysis is on attainment at the end of compulsory schooling at age 16. LSYPE has interviewed a nationally representative sample of over 15,000 young people and their parents/guardians in the year of its inception in 2004. Linked demographic data from the School Census and attainment data from KS2 tests in 2001, KS3 tests in 2004 and GCSE results in 2006 are also available for the cohort. As a result LSYPE presents a unique insight into the context, experiences and attitudes of young people and their families with regards to their schools and their education. Key strengths of this dataset are that it is recent, detailed, nationally representative and covers Key Stage 4, the phase in which many Black and Minority Ethnic groups make substantial and extensive gains in attainment relative to White British students. For example Bangladeshi students are about a year behind at age 14 but have caught up with White British students by age 16 (Strand, 2008). Some analysis of the LSYPE in relation to ethnicity has been completed (e.g. Strand, 2007; 2008) but a more focussed investigation of the data particularly for Bangladeshi and Somali students is undertaken here.

4.3.2 Sample students

LSYPE includes a nationally representative sample of 757 Bangladeshi students. It has rich data on parents’ socio-economic circumstances, their educational aspirations for their children and the resources they provide, their parenting practices, their involvement with school; and also data on students’ own educational aspirations, attitudes to school, academic self-concept, homework completion, and so on. The following section examines to what extent such factors can account for the success of the Bangladeshi group.

The LSYPE dataset also includes data from 584 Black African young people. Among these are 98 Somali students, identified from extended ethnic codes collected in the school census. While the absolute size of the Somali sample is relatively small, the strength of the sample is that it is a randomly selected from the national population and so is likely to be representative of England. Nevertheless a degree of caution must be used in interpreting the data due to the relatively small sample size.

LSYPE does not include sufficient data on Turkish students to support a detailed analysis for this group. LSYPE contains only 21 students in the three categories Turkish-Cypriot, Turkish and Turkish/Turkish Cypriot, too few for reliable estimations.

The particular focus here is on contrasts between Bangladeshi, Somali and White British students. Pakistani students are not a particular focus of this analysis, but they are in many ways an ethnic group with much in common with Bangladeshi students so some tables also include Pakistani students as a further comparison group. The data for all other ethnic groups are combined and reported as a single group to ensure averages are not skewed by omitting this large group of students.
### 4.3.3 GCSE attainment

Table 24 presents the age 16 results for each ethnic group using three overall measures:

- percentage achieving 5 or more A*-C grades
- percentage achieving 5 or more A*-C grades including English and mathematics
- the total points score (TPS), normalized to have a mean of zero and a SD of 1.28.

#### Table 24 Public exam results at age 16 by ethnic group (LSYPE, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Unweighted Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five GCSEs A*-C</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five GCSE A*-C incl. English and maths</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total points score</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Five GCSEs A*-C</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five GCSE A*-C incl. English and maths</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total points score</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Five GCSEs A*-C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five GCSE A*-C incl. English and maths</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total points score</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Five GCSEs A*-C</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>3786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five GCSE A*-C incl. English and maths</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>3786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total points score</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>3786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other ethnic groups</td>
<td>Five GCSEs A*-C</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>9896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five GCSE A*-C incl. English and maths</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>9896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total points score</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>9896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>Five GCSEs A*-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five GCSE A*-C incl. English and maths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total points score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

*All results are weighted by the combined design and non-response weights using the SPSS complex samples module V17.0.*

---

28. This means that the average score across the whole population is represented by zero and two-thirds of students will score between -1 and 1. Such transformations are undertaken to support statistical analysis and for ease of interpretation, since negative scores indicate below average performance and positive scores above average performance.
The results indicate that:

- Somali students are by far the lowest attaining group. On average the mean total points score is -.52 SD below the population mean. Only 32% achieve 5+ A*-C grades compared to 59% of White British students, and only 16% achieve 5+ A*-C including English and mathematics compared to 48% of White British students.

- Somali students have much lower achievement than the Black African average, which was 55% for the percentage achieving 5+ A*-C passes and 42% for the percentage achieving 5+ A*-C passes including English and mathematics. Although Somali students are aggregated within the Black African group in national statistics, their attainment is substantially lower than the majority of Black African students.

- Bangladeshi students have very similar attainment on average to White British students. On total points score and 5+ A*-C grades they do not differ significantly from White British students, although on the 5+ A*-C including English and mathematics measure a slightly lower proportion (41%) pass the threshold compared to White British (48%) students.

The LSYPE data therefore reflect the general trends in the population data described in the introduction, and this provides confirmatory evidence of the representative nature of the LSYPE sample. It also provides estimates of Somali attainment which are not dissimilar to those estimated by the DCSF.

4.3.4 Analysis by ethnic group, social class and gender

The analysis of NPD data in Chapter 3 had access to only limited data on socio-economic background, specifically whether the student was or was not entitlement to a FSM. In contrast in the LSYPE contains access to more refined data on the social class of the home, based on the socio-economic classification (SEC) of the occupation of the head of the family. Research has confirmed the strong role played by the social class of the home in relation to educational attainment at age 16, and also indicates that the relationship between social class and attainment varies across different ethnic groups (e.g. Strand, 2009). The same research also indicates that gender differences are not consistent across ethnic groups, with the gender gap being particularly large for Bangladeshi and Black Caribbean students. The following analysis is therefore aimed at exploring how ethnicity, social class and gender interact in relation to attainment for our target ethnic groups.

With the relatively small sample sizes available for some groups when results are broken down by ethnic group, SEC of the home and gender, figures for the percentage of students passing certain thresholds (such as 5 or more GCSE Grades A*-C) become quite unstable and easily influenced by small changes for individual students. Therefore the focus of subsequent analyses is total points score which counts each and every examination attainment providing a more reliable measure of overall examination performance.

Social class here is based on the Office for National Statistics socio-economic classification (NS-SEC) and based on the occupation of the head of the students’ household (see Strand, 2007). Table 25 presents the proportion of each ethnic group in each of the eight SEC categories.

The results indicate:

- Bangladeshi students have a very skewed profile in relation to the SEC of the home. Nearly 40% come from homes where the Head of the household has never worked or was long term unemployed, and only 8.2% are from managerial or professional backgrounds. These figures compare to 3.4% and 41.7% respectively for White British students.
Somali students are even more disadvantaged. Fully 75% come from homes where the head of the household has never worked or is long term unemployed and only 7.3% are from managerial or professional backgrounds.

Table 25  
Socio-economic classification (SEC) of the Household Reference Person by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic class of the home</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Somali</th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>All Other groups</th>
<th>All students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher managerial and professional</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower managerial and professional</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small employers and own account</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower supervisory and technical</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-routine</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never worked/long term unemployed</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of cases where SEC is missing</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Percentage figures indicate the percentage of cases where SEC was classified. SEC could not be coded in 17% of cases. In approximately half these cases this was because the parent was not interviewed, in the other half it was because the job was not classifiable, inadequately stated or the parent was a full-time student. All figures are weighted by design and non-response weights.

A three-way (ethnicity, SEC and gender) regression was completed with total point score as the outcome. SEC was grouped into three classes: managerial and professional (40%), intermediate, small employer/own account workers and lower supervisory and technical (32%) and semi-routine, routine or long term unemployed (28%). These are termed high, medium and low SEC respectively. Table 26 presents the mean scores by ethnicity, gender and SEC.
Table 26  Mean total points score at age 16 by family SEC, ethnic group and gender (LSYPE, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family socio-economic classification</th>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Mean TPS</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Un-weighted Count</th>
<th>Mean TPS</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Un-weighted Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial &amp; Professional</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other ethnic minority</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate &amp; Lower superv.</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other ethnic minority</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine, semi-routine &amp; LT Unemployed</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other ethnic minority</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Mean total points score for students from low SEC homes (LSYPE, 2006)

It is clear that levels of attainment are generally substantially lower in low SEC homes. One way of exploring ethnic differences, net of SEC, is to compare ethnic groups within different levels of SEC. The results need to be interpreted with some caution for intermediate and high SEC homes because of small sample sizes, for example there were only 35 Bangladeshi and six Somali students in the high SEC group. The pattern of ethnic group
differences within the low SEC group, as shown in Figure 6, contrasts strongly with the overall data as presented in Table 26.

- Somali students from low SEC homes do not underachieve relative to their equally disadvantaged White British peers. Both groups have equally low attainment.
- Bangladeshi students, particularly girls, actually achieve significantly better results than their low SEC White British peers, and do not differ at intermediate levels of SEC.
- At high SEC the results are strongly split by gender, with Bangladeshi boys substantially underachieving relative to their high SEC White British peers but Bangladeshi girls achieving better than comparable White British girls.

From this analysis we can conclude that social class substantially accounts for the overall low attainment of the Somali group. Because over 84% of Somali students are in the low SEC group, compared to only 34% of White British students, the average GCSE score for the Somali group as a whole is well below the White British average (as seen in Table 24). However social class does not account for the performance of Bangladeshi students. Among Bangladeshi students 64% are in the low SEC group, and if social class were the only determinant of attainment then the overall Bangladeshi age 16 score should be substantially lower than White British students, which it clearly is not.

4.3.5 Including other measures of socio-economic status (SES)

The above analysis has utilized just the SEC of the home as the major indicator of socio-economic status (SES). However, the model explained a relatively small amount of the variation in KS4 outcome, only around 12%. Socio-economic status (SES) can be indicated by a wider set of factors than just parental occupation (White, 1987, Sirin 2005). A wider set of factors can be drawn from LSYPE to include the following six variables:

- Socio-economic classification (SEC) of the home
- Mother’s highest educational qualification
- Family poverty (entitlement to a FSM)
- Family composition (Single parent households)
- Rented accommodation
- Neighbourhood disadvantage (IDACI)

Ethnic group differences varied in magnitude on different measures, but Bangladeshi and Somali groups were substantially more disadvantaged than White British on all six measures. Table 27 (see Appendix 4) presents data on the proportion of each ethnic group in relation to these six factors:

Maternal Education: 16% of White British students had mothers with no educational qualifications compared to 59% of Bangladeshi and 83% of Somali students.

Entitlement to Free School Meal: 13% of White British students were entitled to a FSM compared to 59% of Bangladeshi and 90% of Somali students.

Owner occupation: 75% of White British students families owned the house they lived in compared to 46% of Bangladeshi and 1% of Somali students.

Family composition: 23% of White British students were from single parent homes compared to 15% of Bangladeshi but 57% of Somali students.
Neighbourhood deprivation: 24% of White British students resided in the 25% most deprived neighbourhoods in England, compared to 82% of Bangladeshi and 80% of Somali students. Conversely 28% of White British students resided in the 25% least deprived neighbourhoods, compared to just 1% of Bangladeshi and Somali students.

Regression models were computed to consider the impact of these six SES factors on the ethnic group differences in attainment. The results are presented in Table 28. Model 1 gives the coefficients association with each ethnic group before any control for other relevant factors, in effect the ‘raw’ results. Model 2 gives the ethnic coefficient after adjustment for the six SES Factors. Both Bangladeshi and Somali groups achieve significantly better age 16 scores than comparable White British students after control for SES. Bangladeshi students had an average score .55 SD higher than would be expected and Somali students .42 SD higher than would be expected after controlling for the full range of SES variables.

Table 28: Regression coefficients associated with ethnic group in regression models with varying independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.548***</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.151***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>-.086*</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.222***</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.114***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-.506***</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.416***</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.251**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic minorities</td>
<td>.059*</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.336***</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.078***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R squared value: 23.4% 49.2% 49.3% 50.9%

Notes:
Model 1 contrasts the mean scores for Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Somali and Other ethnic minority groups with White British students before control for any contextual variables.
Model 2 controls for six socio-economic status (SES) factors (SEC of the home, maternal educational qualifications, entitlement to FSM, family composition, owner occupation, and neighbourhood disadvantage).
Model 3 also controls for variables positively associated with attainment (parental aspirations, computer in the home, private tuition, parental supervision, student aspiration, academic self concept, attitude to school, homework).
Model 4 adds date of arrival in the UK and a language other than English as first or main language.
Model 5 adds school factors (school mean KS2-KS4 CVA score averaged over the three years 2005-2007, % entitled to FSM, single sex vs. mixed sex school, and selective status (comprehensive, grammar or secondary modern).

*** p<.0001; ** p<.001; *p<.01.

Interpretation: in the table above, in the columns for coefficients, the attainment level that would be expected (given the effects of the other factors), if ethnic background had no effect on attainment, is assumed to be 0. The larger the number, the stronger the relationship between ethnic origin and attainment. Negative values are therefore lower than expected while positive values are higher than expected. The "p" value (indicated by the asterisks) tells us how likely it is that these differences have occurred by chance. The smaller the "p" value, and the larger the number of asterisks, the less likely it is that these differences have occurred by chance. For instance, a "p" value of 0.05 indicates a 1 in 20 chance that the coefficient is not achieved by chance.
Table 27 (Appendix 4) also includes a breakdown by ethnic group for variables that were positively associated with attainment (see Strand, 2007 for a full description of these variables and their relationship with attainment). The key findings are:

**Parent's educational aspirations for their child:** The parents of 76% of White British students wished their child to continue in FTE after the age 16, compared to 94% of Bangladeshi and 99% of Somali parents.

**Private tuition:** 19% of Somali students were receiving private tuition in subjects of the national curriculum, compared to 12% of Bangladeshi and 11% of White British students.

**Students' educational aspirations:** 77% of White British students themselves aspired to continue in FTE after age 16, but this rose to 91% of Bangladeshi and 94% of Somali students.

**Attitude to school:** 27% of White British students fell in the top quartile in terms of attitude to school, teachers and lessons, but this rose to 38% of Bangladeshi and 55% of Somali students.

**Academic self-concept:** 18% of White British students were in the highest group for academic self-concept, compared to 28% Bangladeshi and 40% Somali students.

**Homework:** 34% of White British students completed homework at least four evenings a week. A roughly similar figure were observed for Somali students (32%) and a slightly higher figure (39%) for Bangladeshi students.

Model 3 of Table 28 adds these factors positively associated with attainment to the model. These variables can explain a large part (but not all) of the resilience to deprivation of Bangladeshi students, since the Bangladeshi coefficient declines from .55 SD to .15 SD but remains highly statistically significant. Although they experience extreme socio-economic disadvantage, other advantaging factors (particularly high levels of parental and student educational aspiration, a strong academic self-concept, positive attitudes to school) can account for a large proportion of their (adjusted) exam score.

A different picture emerges for Somali students. They tend to have the highest mean score of all ethnic groups on all these positive variables (with the highest levels of parental and student educational aspiration, the strongest academic self-concept, the most positive attitudes to school etc). However after including these variables the Somali coefficient becomes negative -.25 SD. Thus Somali students achieve significantly higher results than expected when accounting for social disadvantage but significantly lower results than would be expected after also taking into account their high level on the positive parental and attitudinal factors listed above.

### 4.3.6 Factors that may account for the difference in Bangladeshi and Somali attainment

What other factors might be possible candidates in accounting for the differential success of Bangladeshi and Somali students? The next section evaluates three possible factors: recency of arrival to the UK, English language facility and school level variables.

**Length of residence in the UK**

Table 29 presents data on the proportion of each ethnic group who were born in the UK. For those not born in the UK the table also records the year they first lived in the UK or, if they had not lived continuously in the UK since they first came here, the year their current spell in the UK started.
Table 29. Year young person arrived in the UK by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year arrived UK</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Somali</th>
<th>All other minority</th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK born</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of Bangladeshi students (83%) are UK born. Those that were not UK born have typically been in the UK for some time and all but 3% had been in the UK since before the year 2000 (roughly Y5/Y6). In contrast only 9% of Somali students were UK born. Those that arrived in the country typical have done so much more recently, and nearly half (46%) entered the UK from as recently as the year 2000 onwards.

Year of entry was related to attainment, with a particular pronounced association with lower attainment for those who entered from 2001 or later (Y6/Y7). Overall students arriving in the UK in the three years prior to Y9 (2001-2004) achieved -.24 SD below the mean, those arriving in 1995-2000 scored .17 SD above the mean and those arriving in 1989-1994 scored .34 SD above the mean. However the relationship does not appear particularly strong within the Somali group with a fairly uniform negative association with attainment whatever the year of arrival. While Somali students are distinctive in terms of the recency of their arrival in the UK, this does not appear to directly account for their relatively low attainment.
Table 30. Mean total points score by year of arrival in UK and ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-.420</td>
<td>-.601</td>
<td>-.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other ethnic minority</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation: in the table above, the average attainment level for the whole sample is assumed to be 0. Negative values are therefore lower than average while positive values are higher than average. The larger the number, the more different it is from the average value. However, if the standard error (SE) is greater than the value itself, this indicates that the value is not statistically significantly different from zero.

English language factors

There is no direct measure of the fluency in English of individual students within LSYPE. However the young person was asked whether English was their first or main language. The results are given in the table below.
Table 31. English as a first or main language by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Yes - English only</th>
<th>Yes - English first/main and speaks other languages</th>
<th>No, another language is first or main language</th>
<th>Respondent is bilingual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other ethnic minority</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A higher proportion of Somali students (59%) reported a language other than English was their first or main language, compared to 42% of Bangladeshi students. For analytic purposes if English was the only, first or main language, or the student was bilingual, this was assumed to indicate a higher degree of fluency in English and was contrasted with students where a language other than English was the first or main language. The relationship between first language and GCSE attainment is shown in Table 32. Generally having a first language other than English is associated with lower attainment at age 16. This is true for Bangladeshi (-0.24 SD difference), Pakistani (-0.17 SD) and all other ethnic minorities (-0.27 SD). However again Somali students do not appear to follow the same rule, if anything the attainment of Somali students with English as their only, first or main language is actually lower than for Somali students with a language other than English as their first or main language.

Table 32. Mean total points score (and standard error) by first language and ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>English only/first/main or bilingual estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Unweighted n</th>
<th>Other first language estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Unweighted n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.0457</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.0416</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.1016</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other minority</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.0301</td>
<td>3036</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.0189</td>
<td>9892</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation: in the table above, the average attainment level for the whole sample is 0. Negative values are therefore lower than average while positive values are higher than average. The larger the number, the more
different it is from the average value. However, if the standard error (SE) is greater than the value itself, this indicates that the value is not statistically significantly different from zero.

Model 4 in Table 28 adds the year of arrival and first language variables to the model. This makes very little difference to the Bangladeshi and Somali coefficients, confirming these variables are not able to account for the attainment differences between these groups.

**School level variables**

The next analysis asks whether school factors, particularly school quality as indicated by the school mean KS2-KS4 contextual value added score over the three years 2005-2007, varies across ethnic group. The data are presented in the table below. It is apparent that the average CVA for schools attended by Bangladeshi students is substantially higher than for White British students (CVA 1006.3 vs. CVA 999.8). There are problems of endogeneity here, i.e. do Bangladeshi students achieve so well because they attend ‘better’ schools, or do the schools have high CVA scores at least partly because they are attended by Bangladeshi students? However it is also true that Somali students attend ‘good’ schools, the average CVA of the schools they attended was 1009.3. Despite this fact there is no evidence that Somali students are achieving as highly as Bangladeshi students. There is no obvious link therefore with school quality, as indexed by CVA, in accounting for differential performance between Bangladeshi and Somali students.

**Table 33:** Mean KS2-KS4 Contextual Value Added (CVA) score by ethnic group and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Mean CVA score</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Unweighted Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>1003.4</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>999.7</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>1011.0</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>1007.8</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other ethnic minority</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>1003.6</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>1002.0</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>999.8</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>4539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>999.8</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>4803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 5 in Table 28 adds four significant school level variables to the model: school quality as indicated by average CVA score, the proportion of students in the school entitled to FSM, whether the school was selective in its intake and whether the school was single sex or co-educational. The positive association particularly with school quality accounts for a small part of the higher attainment of Bangladeshi students, reducing their coefficient from .17 to .15 SD. However the high CVA of the schools attended by Somali pupils is not reflect in improved attainment, dropping the Somali coefficient further from -.26 to -.32 SD. Relative to White British students, Bangladeshi students are still attaining higher GCSE scores than
would be expected and Somali students achieving lower GCSE scores than would be expected after accounting for school quality, coeducational and selective status and deprivation.

4.3.7 Summary
It is clear that Somali students are similar to Bangladeshi students in a number of ways. Both groups experience extreme social and economic disadvantage relative to White British students, especially the Somali group. Both groups are achieving significantly better scores than expected given the level of deprivation they experience. Both Bangladeshi and Somali students are marked by extremely high educational aspirations both by parents for their child and by the students themselves, a positive attitude to school and strong academic self concept (among other factors). These factors distinguish both groups from similarly disadvantaged White British students and account for the greater resilience to deprivation of the Bangladeshi group in particular. However Somali students are not achieving the same return in relation to these positive factors as either White British or Bangladeshi students, and when they are included the Somali coefficient becomes negative at -.25 SD, they are not achieving as well as would be expected given these advantaging factors.

The two groups also differ in significant ways. Somali students are much more recent arrivals to the UK than their Bangladeshi peers who are a more established community. They are also more likely to have a first or main language other than English. However these later two factors do not seem to explain, in a statistical sense, the difference between the Bangladeshi and Somali groups and do not substantially change the regression coefficients for each group. Neither do school level factors explain the gap. The strong influence in particular of school quality as measured by school mean CVA score does not appear to be reflected in the performance of the Somali students attending these schools. Given the distinctiveness of the time of arrival in the UK of many of the Somali students, it is surprising that this has so little discernable effect on their attainment. This may suggest that there are other (unmeasured) factors that negatively impact on the attainment of all Somali students, even those who have been in the country for four or more years.

4.3.8 Within group analysis for Bangladeshi students
This section explores variation in attainment within the Bangladeshi group. The analysis focuses specifically on Bangladeshi pupils (n=721) because there are too few Somali pupils (n=99) to support analysis. The purpose of the analysis is to:

- Determine whether the factors that are important in explaining variation in attainment between ethnic groups are also important in understanding variation within the Bangladeshi group.
- Explore possible reasons for the large gender difference in attainment within the Bangladeshi group, which is significantly larger than the gender gap among White British students.
- Explore the possible role of the concentration of Bangladeshi students within a school on the attainment of Bangladeshi students.

The results of a multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 34. This presents the association of each variable with attainment, while simultaneously adjusting for the other variables in the model. Given the reduced sample size in this within group analysis it was important not to over-specify the model (that is not to include too many independent or explanatory variables). Therefore variables that were not statistically significant, or had a small impact as indicated by a low WALD statistic\(^{29}\), were dropped from the analysis. The

\(^{29}\) The Wald test is a statistical test, typically used to determine whether an effect exists or not. In other words, it tests whether an independent variable has a statistically significant relationship with a dependent variable.
resulting model including all factors listed in Table 34 accounted for 53.6% of the variance in age 16 points score within the Bangladeshi group, indicating this was a good model (multiple $R=.73^{30}$). The key results are discussed below.

**SES, parenting and student variables**

A longitudinal analysis was adopted to assess the impact of background factors collected at age 14 on attainment at age 16. The SEC of the home and neighbourhood deprivation (IDACI) assessed at age 14 were poor predictors of attainment at age 16 within the Bangladeshi group. Pupils from working class backgrounds were as likely to do well as those from more advantaged homes. Maternal education also only had a weak association with attainment. These factors were therefore excluded from the model. However other measures of SES were associated with attainment in the expected direction (entitlement to a FSM, living in rented accommodation and living in a single parent household were all associated with lower attainment).

The key factors of parental educational aspirations for their child, the students own educational aspirations, SEN, parental supervision, student planning for the future, homework and academic self-concept were all significantly related to attainment. This confirms that factors important in comparisons between ethnic groups are also important in accounting for variation in performance within the Bangladeshi group.

**Gender differences**

It was noted earlier that the gender difference is significantly larger within the Bangladeshi group than the White British students. In addition to the variables described above, two other variables were evaluated, the frequency of attending religious classes and single sex schooling.

A much higher proportion of Bangladeshi boys (30%) than girls (15%) report they attend religious classes more than once per week. Previous work (Strand, 2007) has suggested this variable may have a negative association with educational attainment, primarily through a negative association with time spent on homework. However the results of this analysis were inconsistent. While students who attended religious classes at least twice a week had lower attainment than those who did not attend such classes (after adjusting for all other factors in the model), those who attended ‘about once a week’ actually had higher attainment than non-attenders. The interaction term between gender and religious attendance was not significant$^{31}$, so this factor did not account for the large Bangladeshi gender gap in attainment.

Another factor considered in relation to gender differences within the Bangladeshi group was the high proportion of Bangladeshi girls (35%) compared to the proportion of Bangladeshi boys (20%) attending single sex schools. However single sex schooling did not have a significantly larger impact on girls than on boys, and indeed school sex status (mixed sex, single sex boys or single sex girls) had a low WALD and was removed from the model. Thus school sex status does not appear to be a direct factor influencing the large gender difference within Bangladeshi students.

---

$^{30}$ Multiple R is the correlation between the best linear combination of predictor variables entered into a multiple regression analysis and the dependent variable. The higher the value of Multiple R, the stronger the correlation.

$^{31}$ In other words, gender and religious attendance were both found to have an effect on attainment – these factors act independently of each other.
Table 34 Bangladeshi within group regression model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable &amp; value</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-15.323</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>-9.156</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>2.544</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; the Humber</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-2.455</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-1.321</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-1.474</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>-.339</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-3.913</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>-.304</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-2.205</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-1.067</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>4.856</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM Missing</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not entitled FSM</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>3.781</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entitled FSM</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership unknown</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rented</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-4.262</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single parent missing</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>2.749</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual parent household</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision missing</td>
<td>-.663</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>-3.898</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low supervision</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.563</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High supervision</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent aspiration missing</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not wish YP to stay at school P</td>
<td>-.393</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-4.406</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wishes student to stay</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN (Statemented or SAP)</td>
<td>-.697</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-8.606</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not statement/SAP</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not wish to stay post-16</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-4.648</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wishes to stay post-16</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student planning - Very low</td>
<td>-.494</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-7.289</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student planning -low</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-3.527</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student planning - high</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-2.577</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student planning -very high</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework missing</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>2.184</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 evening a week</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 evenings a week</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 evenings a week</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>2.452</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 evenings a week</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 evenings a week</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>2.490</td>
<td>168.000</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The model also includes parental and student educational aspirations, the extent to which students had clear plans for their future careers, homework and academic self concept. However all the variables included in the model only reduced the gender gap from 0.33 SD to 0.27 SD (a reduction of 16%) so a sizeable gender gap, larger than that for White British students (.09 SD), remains unexplained. The factors accounting for the large gender difference in attainment in the Bangladeshi group are not apparent from the model. All we can say is that it does not seem to relate to socio-economic deprivation, parental supervision, parental educational aspirations, student educational aspirations, SEN, student planning for the future, Academic Self Concept, frequency of completing homework, attitude to school or attendance at single sex schools or religious classes. The factors underlying the large gender difference within the Bangladeshi group require further research.

**School and regional variables**

The following four variables were also significantly associated with attainment within the Bangladeshi group:

- Geographic region (the nine government office regions)
- % students in the school entitled to a FSM (taken from School Census 2006)
- % of the total school roll of Bangladeshi heritage (taken from School Census 2006)
- School mean KS2-KS4 CVA, averaged over the three years 2005-2007

As indicated in the introduction, Bangladeshi students are geographically concentrated in London. In the LSYPE sample 53% of Bangladeshi students were resident in London (as were 69% of Somali students), compared to 18% of Pakistani students, 41% of other ethnic minority groups and just 8% of White British students. There was significant variation in the attainment of Bangladeshi students by region. After controlling for all other variables in the analysis, and in comparison to students in London, Bangladeshi students from Yorkshire and the Humber, the East of England and the South-East of England had significantly lower age 16 scores. Those in the North-East had slightly higher age 16 scores than those in London (see Table 34).

It is notable that London schools have the highest concentrations of Bangladeshi students. The average proportion of Bangladeshi students in the schools attended by the Bangladeshi sample was 27% (SD=32.0), but in London this rose to 40%. The distribution was negatively skewed, as illustrated in Figure 7, with one-third (31%) of Bangladeshi students in the LSYPE sample attending schools with 0-5% Bangladeshi students, but 21% of Bangladeshi students attending schools with 50% or more Bangladeshi students. All but one of these later schools were located in London (one was in the North West). The regression analysis indicates that percentage of Bangladeshi students on the school roll was positively related to attainment. For each percentage point increase in the percentage of Bangladeshi students the average attainment increased by .003 SD. Taking the range of Bangladeshi pupils from the minimum of 0% up to the maximum of 98%, this would be associated with a maximum difference of .30 SD between the lowest and highest concentration schools.

Given the skewed distribution in the percentage of Bangladeshi students, with low percentages of Bangladeshi students found more frequently than high percentages, the relationship was also tested by recoding percentage Bangladeshi into quintiles and using the quintiles in the regression (using dummy variables). This revealed the effect of the Bangladeshi concentration arose from a strong positive association with attainment for schools with 50%-100% Bangladeshi students who scored around .20 SD higher than each of the other four groups (<2%, 2%-8%, 9%-17%, 18%-49%). It appears that a high
concentration of Bangladeshi students is positively associated with the attainment of individual Bangladeshi students.

Figure 7 Number of Bangladeshi students in the LSYPE sample attending schools with different proportions of Bangladeshi students (total school roll)

4.4 Conclusions

- Parents of both Bangladeshi and Somali students have high educational aspirations for the children, and offer high levels of parental support (though not necessarily in high levels of parental involvement with school which may be impeded by linguistic or cultural barriers).
- The students themselves have extremely positive attitudes to school, teachers and lessons, high academic self concept, and high educational aspirations.
- Unlike Bangladeshi students the educational attainment of Somali students does not match the level expected from their high educational aspirations, academic self concept, and attitude to school.
- Both Bangladeshi and Somali students are equally likely to reside in extremely high deprivation inner city areas, and in particular in high deprivation schools within London. However while these ‘high-level’ features are similar it may be that ‘micro-level’ differences in local context are significant. For example the Somali community is substantially smaller.
than the Bangladeshi community, and Bangladeshi students are more likely to be concentrated in specific geographical areas and schools.

- Although this analysis emphasises cultural factors such as high educational aspirations underlying Bangladeshi students’ success in overcoming socio-economic disadvantage, this should not detract from recognizing that racism and structural inequalities may be important influences on the attainment of many Bangladeshi and Somali students. Factors such as high youth unemployment and fear of discrimination in the workplace might also play a part in the high commitment to education evinced by Bangladeshi students. For example over 40% of Bangladeshi men under 25 years of age are unemployed, compared to 12% of young White men (OfSTED, 2004). There are considerable structural barriers to success for Bangladeshi students and the challenge now is to ensure that success in educational attainment in school at 16 is reflected in increased participation in education post-16 and in improved employment and life outcomes.

- The performance of Bangladeshi pupils at age 16 is much stronger than seen in national tests at age 7, 11 and 14. Issues related to English as an Additional Language (EAL) are likely to be much more significant in primary school and in the early stages of secondary school, but appear to play a less significant role in attainment at age 16.

- The improvement at age 16 for many minority ethnic groups does not simply relate to the wider range of examinations available at age 16 in contrast to national tests and assessment at age 7, 11 and 14 which focus exclusively on English, mathematics and science. Strand (2008) reports similar results for Bangladeshi pupils when using a KS4 ‘core’ points score based on GCSE for English, mathematics and science.

- The current analysis has shed light on three important school factors related to Bangladeshi students’ success. Bangladeshi students are more likely to attended single sex schools and schools with high levels of deprivation in inner city areas. However these are not poor schools, if CVA is taken as a measure of school quality, indeed the schools attended by Bangladeshi students on average have significantly higher school mean CVAs scores than their White British peers. An additional positive compositional factor is a high concentration of Bangladeshi students in the school, with a positive impact associated with a school having >50% of Bangladeshi pupil in the total school roll. It was notable though that Somali pupils did not appear to benefit from the high CVA achieved by the schools they attended. Generally there has been very little research on differential school effectiveness in relation to ethnicity, either in the UK or the US. What research there has been has tended to support the conclusion that ‘good’ schools are good for all their pupils: boys and girls, majority or minority, disadvantaged or advantaged (Strand, 1999, 2009). However the results for Somali students suggest this may not always be the case.

- Because LSYPE is only a sample of students it has not been possible here to adequately address the role of the Local Authority in contributing to the high attainment of Bangladeshi students. As noted in the introduction fully 20% of all Bangladeshi students in England reside in the single London Borough of Tower Hamlets. This LA has seen substantial improvement in the attainment of Bangladeshi students over the last 10 years. A focus on the negative impact on attainment of extended absence through visits to Bangladesh is an area the authority is reported to have targeted. It is noticeable from LSYPE that only 1.6% of Bangladeshi pupils had taken extended leave of more than one month during Y9, substantially lower than the sample average of 4.2% (Strand, 2007, p42).
5 School Survey

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a quantitative survey of Heads of Inclusion/Ethnic Minority Achievement in primary and secondary schools with higher than average concentrations of pupils from Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish/Kurdish backgrounds.

5.2 Objectives

Within each of the three samples, schools with higher than average, lower than average and around average attainment levels were included. We adopted this approach in order to be able to compare practices between schools with different levels of pupil attainment as well as different ethnic profiles. The survey gathered information on:

- How schools have supported pupils from the selected ethnic minority groups
- Whether the schools have particular policies/programmes in place for the pupils and their parents
- Issues encountered in working with these pupils
- Recruitment of teachers from these backgrounds.

5.3 Methodology

GfK NOP and NRDC drew samples of maintained primary and secondary schools in England with higher than average concentrations of pupils from Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish/Kurdish backgrounds. The concentration thresholds used were 4%+ Bangladeshi pupils for the sample of Bangladeshi schools, 2%+ Somali pupils for the sample of Somali schools and 0.5%+ Turkish/Kurdish for the sample of Turkish/Kurdish schools. The concentration levels set as thresholds for sampling varied between the three groups because of the widely differing numbers of schools which have significant concentrations of pupils from these backgrounds. GfK NOP carried out a telephone survey among 284 Heads of Inclusion/Heads of Ethnic Minority Achievement in those schools, between March and July 2009. The interviewed sample achieved was split roughly equally between the Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish/Kurdish samples. Within each sample, there were roughly equal numbers of primary and secondary schools, and roughly equal numbers of schools with high, medium and low levels of attainment. At the analysis stage, the sample profile was weighted to ensure that aggregated data were representative of schools with the selected levels of concentration of the target ethnic group.

5.4 Key Findings

Main issues or challenges for pupils from target group

The Heads of EMA or inclusion were asked what they thought were the main issues or challenges they were aware of, for the target group. Most frequently mentioned, for all three target groups, was the issue of fluency in English, cited by just over a third of those representing schools in the Bangladeshi and Somali samples and just under a third of those
in the Turkish/Kurdish sample. In all three samples, fluency in English was mentioned considerably more often than any other issue.

**Bangladeshi pupils**

In addition to the issue of fluency in English (cited by 36% of schools in the Bangladeshi sample), respondents most frequently identified the following as the main issues or challenges for Bangladeshi pupils:

- Parents’ lack of ability to help children with their homework because of language difficulties or lack of formal education
- Irregular attendance
- Getting parents involved/the isolation of parents.

Comparing schools by CVA sector within the Bangladeshi sample, only one issue is mentioned by a significantly higher proportion of low CVA schools than high CVA ones – this is pupils’ literacy/written fluency. There is also only one issue mentioned by a significantly higher proportion of high CVA schools than low CVA schools – this is the language barrier with parents/parents’ lack of English.

**Somali pupils**

In addition to fluency in English (37%), a large number of other issues or challenges for Somali pupils were all identified by very similar proportions of respondents. The ones mentioned by at least one in ten schools in the Somali sample included:

- Challenging behaviour or behavioural difficulties
- Family or community expectations in relation to education or career
- Poverty/deprivation/limited educational opportunities of parents
- Getting parents involved/the isolation of parents
- Cultural/attitudinal differences between pupils and parents
- Emotional difficulties/post traumatic stress/shock for refugee children
- Difficulty in settling/detachment because of repeated moves
- Language difficulties caused by having had to learn a number of different languages before English
- Parents’ lack of ability to help children with their homework because of language or lack of formal education
- Difficulty in accessing the curriculum because the education/learning style is different in England.

**Turkish/Kurdish pupils**

In addition to fluency in English (28%), the main issues or difficulties for Turkish or Kurdish pupils outlined by schools were the following, all of which were mentioned by at least one in ten schools in the Turkish/Kurdish sample:

- Language difficulties caused by having had to learn a number of different languages before English
- Getting parents involved/the isolation of parents
• Language gap with parents/parents’ lack of English
• Parents’ lack of ability to help children with their homework because of language difficulties or lack of formal education
• Lack of resources/funding/not enough teachers/translators/materials.

Comparison of responses

Several issues or challenges were mentioned more frequently by respondents from secondary schools compared with those from primary schools. These were

• Challenging behaviour
• The parental language barrier
• Gendered expectations
• Difficulty in settling/detachment because of repeated moves
• Literacy/written fluency
• Difficulties in accessing the curriculum because the style of education is different in England
• Home culture clashing with school culture or acting to hold children back
• Involvement in gangs.

Comparing responses between each of the ethnic samples overall, there were two issues or challenges which respondents in the Bangladeshi sample were more likely to mention, in relation to pupils from Bangladeshi backgrounds, compared with those in the Somali and Turkish/Kurdish samples. These were:

• Irregular attendance
• Parents’ inability or limited ability to help their children with home due to language difficulties or lack of formal education.

The issues mentioned more often in relation to the Somali pupils, compared with Bangladeshi and Turkish/Kurdish pupils, were:

• Challenging behaviour or behavioural issues
• Family/community expectations in relation to education or career
• Gendered expectations/parents having different expectations for boys and girls
• Emotional difficulties/post traumatic stress/shock for refugee children.

Respondents in the Turkish/Kurdish sample of schools were the most likely to say there were no issues or challenges they were aware of for the target group. However, there was one issue which came up more often in that sample than in the Bangladeshi one, which was language difficulties caused by having had to learn a number of different languages before English.
Facilitators to achievement

Respondents were also asked what they saw as the main factors acting as facilitators to achievement for pupils from the target background, at school. In the Bangladeshi and Somali samples, the facilitating factors most widely mentioned were strong support/dedicated support within the school and parental support for education. In the Turkish/Kurdish sample, within-school support was the facilitating factor most widely mentioned; behind this, parental support for education and good systems in school for assessing needs/target setting/monitoring were mentioned by very similar proportions of respondents.

Bangladeshi pupils

About half of respondents in the schools in the Bangladeshi sample identified strong support/dedicated support within the school and parental support for education as key facilitating factors, and these were cited considerably more frequently than any other. A second group of factors cited by between a quarter and a third of schools in the Bangladeshi sample were:

- School ethos or attitude
- Good systems in school for assessing students' needs/target setting/monitoring
- The school’s expectations of success/having high expectations.

A large number of other factors were identified by quite similar numbers of respondents but none was mentioned by more than about one in eight schools in the Bangladeshi sample. This third group of factors included:

- Good role models
- Regular contact with parents/parental involvement/home-school links
- Community involvement/support
- Acquisition of language/literacy.

Somali pupils

The pattern of responses about main facilitating factors for Somali pupils from schools in the Somali sample was broadly similar to that seen above for the Bangladeshi pupils, from the schools in the Bangladeshi sample. About half the schools in the Somali sample identified strong support/dedicated support within the school and parental support for education as key facilitating factors, and these were cited more frequently than any other. A second group of factors cited by between a quarter and a third of schools in the Somali sample were:

- Good systems in school for assessing students' needs/target setting/monitoring
- School ethos or attitude
- The school’s expectations of success/having high expectations.

In the case of the Somali schools, however, unlike the Bangladeshi schools, this second group of factors was joined by a fourth one, community involvement/support, cited by a quarter of respondents.
Good role models and regular contact with parents/parental involvement/home-school links again feature strongly in a third group of factors. No other factor was mentioned by more than 9% of respondents.

**Turkish/Kurdish pupils**

In the Turkish/Kurdish sample of schools, just over half of respondents cited strong support/dedicated support within the school as a key factor facilitating achievement. After this, about two fifths cited another “in school” factor, good systems in schools for assessing students’ needs/target setting/monitoring alongside an “external” factor, parental support for education. A quarter mentioned the school’s ethos or attitude while slightly fewer talked specifically about the school having high expectations or expectations of success. Just two further factors were mentioned by one in ten or more of the schools in the Turkish/Kurdish sample. These were community involvement/support and good role models.

**Comparison of responses**

Comparing the factors mentioned by schools as facilitators to achievement for the target groups, there are very few differences which are statistically significant.

The primary schools in the survey were more likely than the secondary schools to focus on parental support or enthusiasm as a facilitator, and at a lower level, on parental involvement or home-school links. The secondary schools, on the other hand, were more likely than primary schools to focus on strong support within the school, good systems for assessing students’ needs/target setting/monitoring, high expectations and good role models.

High CVA schools were particularly likely to mention the school having high expectations and the school ethos or attitude. Low CVA schools were slightly more likely than medium and high CVA schools to mention good resources or good equipment and materials.

Schools in the Somali sample were particularly likely to mention community involvement or support. However, they were the least likely to mention language acquisition or literacy as a facilitator to achievement.

**Diagnostic procedures used to assess pupils’ level of need for support**

Virtually all the schools reported that they used the same diagnostic procedures to assess the need for support of pupils from the specific target group being asked about as for pupils from all other backgrounds. The majority of schools (three-quarters or more) reported using the following diagnostic procedures to assess their pupils’ level of need for support:

- Consultation with the school’s SENCo
- Informal in school assessment of English language level by teachers for new arrivals
- Regular in school assessment of English language level by teachers for all pupils from the target background (both formal and informal)
- Formal in school assessment of English language level by teachers for new arrivals
- QCA/NASSEA steps to assess English language level.

About half of schools reported that they carried out assessment of vocabulary development in mother tongue. Three further diagnostic procedures were reported by between a quarter and a third of schools in the survey:

- Formal tests of cognitive ability for new arrivals
• Assessment of new arrivals by LA staff
• Psychometric testing/assessments covering attitudes to learning.

In total, just over nine in ten schools reported that they carried out some formal assessment of English language level: virtually all of those in the low CVA sector did so compared with nine in ten of those in the medium and high CVA sectors.

The survey found that secondary schools were slightly more likely than primary schools to report using some kind of formal assessment of English language level (virtually all secondary schools did so compared with nine in ten primaries). A number of the specific diagnostic procedures covered were more widely used in secondary schools than in primary schools. Those mentioned by 30% of secondary schools or more included:

• Formal in school assessment of English language level by teachers for new arrivals
• Regular, informal in school assessment of English language level by teachers for all pupils from this background
• Formal tests of cognitive ability for new arrivals
• Psychometric testing/assessments covering attitudes to learning.

The survey did not identify any diagnostic procedures which were more widely used by high CVA primary schools than by low CVA primary schools. However, there were some which were more widely used by low CVA primary schools than by high CVA primary schools, and these were:

• Formal in school assessment of English language level by teachers for new arrivals
• Use of QCA/NASSEA steps to assess English language level (however, this difference was entirely driven by the schools in the Bangladeshi primary sample, as no such contrast was observed between the sectors in the Somali and Turkish/Kurdish primary schools)
• Assessment of new arrivals by LA staff; this difference was driven by schools in the Turkish/Kurdish and Bangladeshi samples, as the pattern in the Somali schools was not similar.

Among the secondary schools we found two examples of diagnostic procedures used more widely by high CVA schools than by low CVA schools, and, perhaps slightly surprisingly, these include two of the three measures listed above: formal, in school assessment of English language level by teachers for new arrivals and higher levels of use of QCA/NASSEA steps. In the case of formal, in school assessment by teachers for new arrivals, this difference is driven by the Somali and Turkish/Kurdish samples, as there is no equivalent contrast between the high and low secondary school sectors of the Bangladeshi sample. In the case of QCA/NASSEA steps, schools from all three ethnic samples contributed to this difference.

Low CVA secondary schools were more likely than medium and high CVA secondary schools to carry out formal tests of cognitive ability for new arrivals; this contrast was also found in all three ethnic samples (between low and high CVA secondary schools).

**Support received from the local authority**

Schools were asked whether they received specific types of support from their local authority. Across all the schools in the survey, the headline levels of receipt of these types of support were as follows:
• Nine in ten schools got advice or training for school staff from their LA
• Seven in ten schools got LA staff to monitor EAL support
• Two-thirds of schools reported that their LA helped them with specific projects to support pupils
• Three-fifths of schools reported that their LA helps them with specific projects to support parents
• Half of schools got LA staff to help with needs assessment
• One in nine schools had a community assistant who was based at another school in the area
• One in twenty schools had a community assistant to aid with pupils’ learning, based at their school
• In addition, two-fifths of schools reported that they received financial support from their local authority specifically to support pupils from the ethnic backgrounds they were being asked about.

In all cases, schools were much more likely to say that they received these types of help to support students from all backgrounds, rather than particularly for the ethnic group we were asking about.

By and large, schools’ likelihood of receiving each type of support did not appear to vary markedly by CVA sector, between primary and secondary schools or by ethnic group of sample, except where noted below.

• Within primary schools overall, it was those in the high CVA sector which were most likely to report that they received financial support, whereas within secondary schools, those in the low CVA sector were most likely to report receiving financial assistance.
• Schools in the low CVA sector were more likely to say they get LA staff to help with needs assessment. The difference is particularly driven by primary schools. Looking within each of the three ethnic samples of schools, in the Somali and Turkish/Kurdish samples, low CVA primary schools were more likely to get staff to help with needs assessment. The same pattern applied to secondary schools in the Turkish/Kurdish and Bangladeshi samples.
• Schools in the Bangladeshi sample were more likely to report getting help from LA staff to help with needs assessment than schools in the two other samples.
• Schools in the Bangladeshi sample were more likely to give a positive response to receiving financial support than were schools in the Somali or Turkish/Kurdish samples.

Support measures used by schools with pupils from target backgrounds

Respondents were asked whether they used each of a list of measures to support pupils from the target ethnic backgrounds.

The vast majority of schools (more than nine out of ten) used the following:

• Involving pupils in school events to celebrate diversity or showcase their culture
• Targeted school attendance or behaviour measures
• Therapists
• Educational psychologist
Between eight and nine out of ten schools reported using:

- Counsellors/behaviour support service
- Extended school services
- Social workers
- Dedicated after school activities such as homework clubs
- Other activities/materials for pupils intended to help them get a better understanding of their own culture or heritage (apart from culturally specific national curriculum materials)
- Bilingual support for induction processes or settling in new pupils
- Learning mentors

About seven out of ten schools reported using:

- Activities to raise pupils’ aspirations
- Targeted/adapted SEAL programme
- One to one tuition for EAL
- Links with other schools
- Other mentors or role models (apart from learning mentors)

About three in five schools reported using:

- Home school link workers
- Culturally specific national curriculum materials

About half of schools reported using:

- Links with supplementary schools or weekend schools
- Smaller class sizes.

The vast majority of schools in the survey (80%) said that they used the same general support measures for pupils from the target ethnic group they were being asked about as for pupils from other backgrounds, and this did not vary much between the three ethnic samples of schools.

There were a couple of examples of support measures which schools in both the Bangladeshi and Somali samples were more likely to use than their comparators in the Turkish/Kurdish sample. These were:

- Targeted school attendance or behaviour measures
- Home school link workers
- Culturally specific national curriculum materials.

There were several examples of support measures used more widely by schools in the Somali sample than by schools in the other samples:

- learning mentors
• links with other schools
• mentors/role models other than learning mentors.
• links with supplementary or weekend schools.

Support for EAL needs

Respondents were asked specifically about measures used to support the EAL needs of pupils from the target backgrounds. Again, the vast majority of schools interviewed (81%) said that they used the same EAL support methods for pupils from the target backgrounds as for pupils from other backgrounds.

The following measures were virtually universally used by schools:
• Pupils’ EAL needs being flagged up to class or subject teachers
• Regular review of EAL needs for all pupils
• In class support for group work
• English language assessment by school staff for new pupils
• Individual or group support for which pupils are withdrawn from class

Another group of measures were used by eight out of ten schools or more:
• Interpreters or translators
• After school or lunchtime clubs
• Special induction programme
• Access to specialist professional support
• Individual (one to one) support in class.

Other measures used by a majority of schools included:
• Special resource packs
• Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) teacher
• Language needs checklists for teachers
• Some degree of bilingual teaching.

The only support measure asked about in this question which was used by a minority of schools was English language assessment by LA staff for new pupils, mentioned by one third.

The research identified just two support measures more strongly identified with high CVA schools than with medium and low CVA schools overall. These were:
• Special resource packs; usage of this measure was only higher among high CVA primary schools, not high CVA secondary schools
• EMAG teachers; this difference was noted among both primary schools and secondary schools. However, it was driven by the schools in the Somali and Turkish/Kurdish samples,
as no such difference existed between the CVA categories of schools in the Bangladeshi sample.

There were, in addition, a number of support measures more strongly identified with high CVA schools than with low CVA schools within primary/secondary and within individual ethnic samples. These were:

- Among Bangladeshi secondary schools, some degree of bilingual teaching
- Among Somali secondary schools,
  - English language assessment by school staff for new pupils
  - Special induction programme
  - Individual/one to one support in class.

**Measures used to support pupils with Special Educational Needs**

Schools were asked what specialised support, if any, was given to pupils from the target groups who had Special Educational Needs.

Virtually all schools in the survey said they offered the majority of support measures asked about:

- Access to educational psychologist
- Access to professional support other than educational psychologist, inside or outside school
- Assessment process
- Individual learning plan
- Regular meetings with pupils’ parents to review progress
- Regular meetings between SENCo and class teachers or subject teachers to review progress
- Individual/targeted support in class.

The other support measures covered were offered by the majority of schools though they were not as close to universal as those mentioned above. Three-quarters offered learning mentors and three fifths offered special resource packs and outreach workers.

Schools in the low CVA sector were more likely than those in the medium and high CVA sectors to use learning mentors for this purpose, and schools in the Somali sample were also more likely than those in the Bangladeshi sample to use them.

**Measures used to support parents**

Respondents were asked which of a list of measures their schools used to support parents of pupils from the target ethnic backgrounds.

The vast majority of schools provide school-based events for parents, and nine out of ten schools or more said they provided the following types of events to support parents of pupils:

- Involving parents in school events to celebrate diversity or showcase their culture
- Information events or briefing meetings at school
- Social or cultural events at school

The following measures are also used by a majority of schools:

- Outreach work with parents eg workshops, courses
• Learning mentors
• Designated member of staff with language skills to act as mediator

Around half of schools use the following to support parents:

• English language/literacy classes for parents
• Written “parents’ guide” for new parents in home language
• Bilingual home school link workers or family link workers
• Non-bilingual home school link workers or family link workers

The survey was unable to identify any parental support measures that were consistently more associated with high CVA schools than with low CVA ones, across all three ethnic samples of schools. It did identify three examples of parental support measures that were more frequently provided by high CVA schools as a whole than by schools in other CVA sectors, across the whole sample:

• Providing English language/literacy classes for parents was done more widely by schools in the high CVA sector than by those in the low CVA sector. However, these contrasts between high and low CVA schools were almost entirely driven by primary schools in the Bangladeshi sample – other types of school were much more consistent in the extent to which they used this to support parents;
• Involving parents in school events to celebrate diversity or showcase their culture was done more widely by schools in the medium and high CVA sectors than by those in the low CVA sector
• Providing non-bilingual home school link workers or family link workers was done more widely by schools in the high CVA sector than by those in the low or medium CVA sectors. This difference was driven most strongly by the schools in the Turkish/Kurdish sample.

There were also some differences between the schools based on the ethnic sample they fall into, with schools in the Turkish/Kurdish sample less likely than those in other samples to use several of the support measures asked about:

• Social or cultural events at school
• Information events or briefing meetings at school
• Outreach work such as workshops or courses
• Designated member of staff with language skills to act as mediator
• Bilingual link workers
• Audiovisual background information about the school in parents’ own language.

The proportions of schools in the Bangladeshi and Somali samples offering each support measure to parents tended to be similar. There was one example of a support measure less widely used in the Bangladeshi sample, and this was learning mentors.

Culturally specific national curriculum materials

It was noted earlier that three-fifths of respondents said their schools made use of culturally specific national curriculum materials. In the schools where these were used, a further question was asked about the subjects in which they were used.

• About seven in ten said that they were used in history/geography
• About two-thirds mentioned English/literacy
• Three fifths mentioned religious education
• About half mentioned PSHE
• About a quarter mentioned Maths
• About one fifth mentioned Science
• About one seventh mentioned Art.

Smaller proportions also mentioned using them in music, dance, drama, citizenship and other subjects. About one tenth of schools said they were used in all subjects, or as needed.

Use of materials produced by the National Strategy

In the early stages of the survey, respondents were asked whether their schools had made any use of materials produced by the national strategy to support pupils from the target ethnic groups. These findings should be treated as being more indicative than definitive as they are based on only a partial sample, and possibly not a representative cross-section. (This is because these questions had to be dropped from the questionnaire after a limited number of interviews had been completed, in order to reduce the overall interview length.)

Of those who were asked this question32, across the board, two-fifths of schools indicated that they had done so, half said definitely not and the remainder were not sure. Primary and secondary schools were similarly likely to give a positive response to this question. Schools in the Bangladeshi sample appeared more likely than others to say they had done so, at around half compared with about a third of schools in the Somali sample and Turkish/Kurdish sample. There was no difference between CVA sectors at the overall level, and no significant differences could be identified between low and CVA sectors within the three ethnic samples of schools on this issue.

What else could DCSF or the local authority do to help?

A quarter of those asked this question said they needed more funding; a similar proportion said they needed more resources, free equipment or materials; a similar proportion again mentioned more bilingual staff or bilingual teaching. Parental outreach workers or more link work or development of parental participation were mentioned by about one sixth of schools.

School workforce issues

Two-fifths of primary schools reported that they had one person with formal responsibility for ethnic minority achievement, compared with about one sixth of secondary schools. Three-quarters of the secondary schools in the survey had a team of people with responsibility for EMA, compared with about half of the primary schools.

The mean number of people in the EMA team was 3.38; primary schools reported an average EMA team size of 2.58 while secondary schools reported a higher average EMA team size of 4.11. (These figures include the schools which had only a single person with formal responsibility for EMA.) The schools in the Somali sample had the highest average number of staff in their EMA teams at 3.61, compared with 2.67 for Bangladeshi schools and 2.53 for Turkish/Kurdish schools.

One quarter of schools surveyed reported having teachers of the same ethnic background as the target group of pupils about which they were being questioned, and there was a marked difference between primary and secondary schools on this issue. One fifth of primary schools but half of secondary schools reported having teachers of the target ethnic group.

32 The sample size for this questions was 161.
One third of schools in the Bangladeshi sample reported having teachers of Bangladeshi origin, and a third of schools in the Turkish/Kurdish sample had teachers of Turkish/Kurdish origin, both markedly higher than the eighth of schools in the Somali sample having teachers of Somali origin. The presence of teachers from these backgrounds in the schools is not directly linked to the concentration of pupils from these backgrounds in the school and hence in the surrounding area, as it was the schools in the Turkish/Kurdish sample which had the lowest thresholds for concentration of pupils of that origin.

Three-fifths of schools in the survey reported having support staff of the same ethnic background as the target group of pupils about which they were being questioned, so overall they were about twice as likely to have support staff of that background as they were to have teachers of that background. The schools in the Bangladeshi sample were considerably more likely to report having Bangladeshi support staff than the schools in the Somali and Turkish/Kurdish samples were to report having support staff from those backgrounds (two-thirds compared with about half respectively).

Within the three ethnic samples, the proportion reporting having teachers of the same origin as the pupils about which they were being questioned did not vary significantly between the low, medium and high CVA sectors.

Where schools did have teachers of the same ethnic background as the target group of pupils, the mean number of such teachers in the school was 1.73: 1.37 in primary and 2.17 in secondary schools. Mean numbers of teachers of these ethnic backgrounds per school were very consistent between the different CVA sectors within primary and secondary.

The survey therefore found no strong evidence to support a hypothesis that having teachers or support staff from a particular ethnic background was positively related with high attainment of pupils from that background, though the evidence from the Somali schools suggests that there may be an effect.

5.5 Analysis of the role of school practices on pupils’ achievement

This final section presents the findings of a quantitative analysis of NPD and PLASC datasets, looking at the impact of school practices on pupils’ achievement in secondary school. A value added approach is adopted, as described in chapter 3. The aim is to understand whether characteristics regarding school workforce and policies implemented at the school level have had any impact in raising pupils’ academic achievement at Key stage 4, in the last year of compulsory school. Full details of this analysis, including details of methods, are included in Appendix 5.

5.5.1 Findings

The results suggest that the only significant variable is the implementation of measures to support parents of pupils from BST background (see Appendix 4, Table 35): pupils who are in schools where at least one measure is in place perform 32% of a standard-deviation higher at Key Stage 4. The measures include bilingual (and non-bilingual) home-school link workers, information events or briefing meetings at school; regular newsletters in parents’ home language, English language/literacy classes for parents or designated member of staff.

The reason why we focus only on secondary schools is that we want to adopt a value added approach and therefore we need to have previous measures of achievement. Unfortunately, test scores at KS1 are not available and this motivates our choice to analyse secondary school only.
with language skills to act as mediator. It seems that these measures are particularly relevant for Bangladeshi pupils, while they do not seem to have a statistically significant impact on Somali and Turkish pupils.

Looking at the specific supports measures adopted it emerges that home-school link workers, the presence of social workers in the school, smaller class sizes, dedicated activities after school such as homework clubs and activities to raise pupils’ aspirations, such as visits to universities tend to be associated with higher performance at Key Stage 4 (taken in 2007).

These measures seem to be effective in raising the average performance of pupils in a given school but somewhat surprisingly no effect can be found when doing separate analysis for each ethnic group (Appendix 5, Table 36, columns 2, 3 and 4). The coefficients in those columns are never significant, suggesting that we cannot find evidence that these policies are effectively helping Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils improve their achievement. Two exceptions to this finding are the activities to raise pupils’ aspirations and activities to help pupils understand better their own culture which seem to have a greater impact on Bangladeshi pupils. It does not, however, mean that the measures are not effective at raising BST pupils achievement; for the sample size decreases dramatically when using the sub-samples of BST pupils, and it is therefore more difficult to find significant results.

In general these results underline the importance of the link between parents and school. They also show the importance of involving pupils in extra-curricular activities.

Many of the variables that we have introduced in the analysis turn out to be not statistically significant, but this should not be interpreted as an evidence of their lack of effectiveness. It may be due to the fact that the data do not show sufficient variation to allow the identification of any impact.
6 Evidence from Local Authorities, Schools, teachers and pupils

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter we investigate the factors driving attainment from the perspective of those with knowledge and responsibility for Ethnic Minority Achievement at local authority and secondary school levels, and from the point of view of class teachers, and of the students themselves. We examine the factors shaping the educational experiences of pupils from these three ethnic groups. In particular, this strand identified lessons from the experiences of Bangladeshi pupils that may inform initiatives to improve the attainment of pupils from Somali Turkish and Kurdish backgrounds.

The qualitative research aimed to highlight good practice, at both local authority and secondary school level, which has helped to support the learning and attainment of ethnic minority pupils. In our work with secondary schools, we have considered both factors at the whole school level, such as policies and leadership, and factors at the classroom level, such as teaching approaches which help schools to meet the needs of pupils from these three groups.

Quantifying words such as ‘all’, ‘some’ or ‘many’ have not been used in the reporting, as the qualitative sample was not large enough to be statistically robust. This is usual practice for qualitative research.

6.2 Local authority research

6.2.1 Participant overview

Participants in this element of the research held leadership roles in the area of EMA, working in a local authority context. Variations in the structuring of EMA within the local authorities meant that job titles and remits varied. Job titles included Heads of EMA, Learning Consultants and Schools Development Advisors. All worked full time in the local authority. Some participants had a background in teaching, and a number had worked for several years in the EMA team before taking on a leadership role.

Those interviewed tended to have overall responsibility for the activities of their department, holding line management responsibility for staff implementing EMA programmes. The main remits of the EMA departments included co-ordination of EMA support in schools across the borough; monitoring and tracking of achievement, particularly amongst lower achieving groups; supporting schools in delivering EMA programmes; and engaging directly with the relevant MEGs in the community. There was a varied focus on each of these major remits: some participants were strongly oriented towards discussion of their activities in supporting school staff, where others focused on engagement with local minority ethnic communities.

Some further variations emerged between LAs based on ethos and approach. One or two participants questioned the approach of raising achievement only in the context of ethnicity. They made the point that under-achieving groups were not always those from MEGs, and that a preferable approach was one which aimed to close all gaps in achievement, not only those relating to minority ethnic communities.

A further variation emerged in relation to the extent of their focus on EAL as a core issue. Where some emphasised the importance of EAL, others focused more on different issues pertaining to achievement such as community support or culturally inclusive curriculum.
As might be expected, remit was driven by the nature of the challenges in the local area, and programmes were tailored to match local needs. Departments tended to have a focus on a particular low achieving group, in response to monitoring data and shifting requirements created by changes in the population of the borough.

6.2.2 Local context

Without exception, boroughs included in the study were ethnically diverse, and included significant populations of the MEGs relevant to this study. Rather than focusing on just one of the key groups, participants tended to additionally discuss issues relevant to other MEGs, taking a holistic view of the borough.

Some of the boroughs are affected by considerable inward migration from abroad; one participant described their borough as a ‘migration centre’. This resulted in particular patterns of need amongst newly arrived communities, but also in a dynamic, shifting scenario, in which families may live in the borough for only a short time before moving on to other areas. In addition, asylum seekers might be placed in temporary housing in the borough, before eventually moving on to other areas. This level of transience of some minority ethnic populations created difficulties in provision of sustained EMA programmes in schools.

An additional feature of many of the boroughs was the high level of deprivation, affecting the relevant MEGs. Many boroughs contained a high proportion of young people from the relevant MEGs who were eligible for free school meals.

One participant noted that a lack of obvious ethnic tension did not necessarily mean that there was true integration in the sense of young people having friends from different backgrounds, even if they lived on the same street as people from other communities.

“Pupils have learned to work together and cooperate within the schools but that doesn’t necessarily mean they have friends from different communities from outside school and that could lead to some tensions outside the school” (LA4)

Almost all participants raised the issue of a lack of parental engagement in their children’s education amongst some MEGs. This was more often highlighted as a problem amongst Turkish and Somali groups than Bangladeshi groups. It was usually attributed to a poor understanding of the schools system amongst parents, something that participants aimed to support schools to improve.

A number of participants mentioned low confidence and self-esteem as a key problem for young people, and that increasing parental involvement and understanding of education would be essential to improving this.

Participants emphasised the difficulty in generalising about the background to low attainment amongst the key MEGs. They pointed to evidence that attainment varies considerably within MEGs, with pupils attaining well in some schools and poorly in others. This highlighted the school effect in influencing attainment.

Some issues were raised in relation to particular MEGs, and these are outlined below. It should be noted that these are not intended to provide an exhaustive description of the issues faced by the various MEGs in each area, but rather a summary of the issues raised by the LAs in the context of the discussion of local initiatives.
Somali

Participants described a varied picture in terms of the background and migration of Somali communities in the borough. As well as asylum seekers, Somali communities included those who had lived in other European countries. The latter group appeared to have fewer difficulties in adjusting to the schools system, and to life in the UK in general.

Participants described the fact that some Somali pupils may have been affected by war in Somalia, and may suffer emotional and psychological effects of this. Additionally, pupils may be affected by the fact that some Somali communities are less ‘settled’ in the sense that their parents have not yet had a chance to fully integrate into society. Parents’ educational background was thought to have a major bearing on achievement, with pupils whose parents were well educated achieving well regardless of their past experiences.

There was thought to be a high incidence of one parent households amongst Somali groups, resulting in specific barriers to achievement amongst young people. One participant also mentioned that Somali pupils tended to have little space in which to do homework in the household. One participant also mentioned that women often have a poor status in Somali households, and that this had the result that female teachers found it more difficult to gain the respect of Somali boys.

Difficulties in engaging effectively with parents were described, and these were felt to result from the language barrier, as well as a poor understanding of the school system. Participants thought that schools tended to blame parents for these difficulties, rather than seeking solutions to the problem. This had the result that little progress was made, as no active steps were taken by schools to help resolve the problems.

It was noted that Somali girls tend to outperform Somali boys, and a number of theories were posited to explain this. One Local Authority (LA) suggested this may be to do with the fact that boys have less sense of commitment or belonging to the UK. Another thought that boys were more often influenced by street culture, which may have a negative effect on their achievement.

Turkish and Kurdish

Turkish speaking populations in the boroughs included those from the Turkish mainland, Kurdish pupils from the Turkish mainland, and Turkish Cypriot groups. Kurdish communities and those from the Turkish mainland were generally less affluent than Turkish Cypriot groups, and were likely to be recent migrants. This resulted in a low level of English spoken amongst parents, and also a poor understanding of the schools system, and of the education system in general. One participant mentioned that although there was aspiration amongst Turkish and Kurdish groups, there was a lack of knowhow about how, for example, to go about getting their child into University.

Participants mentioned that Turkish-speaking communities were very close-knit, and that this may result in a lack of integration. Building of trust between the school and the community was seen to be important, and as part of this, building cultural understanding. Celebrations of Turkish culture would help with this, such as events in the community and in schools, although these had only just recently begun to take place.

Bangladeshi

Participants talked of the considerable improvement in Bangladeshi pupils’ attainment over the last five years.

In making a comparison between Bangladeshi communities and the Somali and Turkish groups, one participant commented that there were fewer barriers to attainment for
Bangladeshi groups in their view. There were fewer problems in engagement with Bangladeshi parents, and a greater level of parental involvement amongst Bangladeshi groups. There were also fewer issues around EAL for Bangladeshi groups than for other groups.

One local authority suggested that differences in attainment could be attributed to the length of time that a community has been settled in the UK. Compared with those from a Somali or Turkish background, Bangladeshi pupils had started school at primary level, and their parents may have been schooled in this country. It was suggested that these factors improved pupils’ prospects of achieving well.

“The Bangladeshi community is now settled – this has a very positive impact on education.” (LA7)

One participant, however, pointed to a mixed picture in relation to achievement for Bangladeshi young people. Although attainment may have improved based on GCSE grades, this did not necessarily translate into good grades for those who went on to take A’ levels, and achievement tended to diminish with age.

Gender differences were described in the achievement for Bangladeshi pupils. Girls were thought to be disadvantaged by a lack of appropriate teaching styles such as a lack of opportunity for group work, and barriers relating to use of academic language. Boys, however, were felt to be negatively influenced by street culture, and by feelings of disaffection and alienation.

6.2.3 Policy and practice

Policy and practice for supporting MEGs varied within LAs, according to the priorities of the EMA department. The majority of LAs advocated a ‘holistic approach’ to support, which saw services benefitting schools, pupils and parents, and involved creating opportunities for all parties to engage with each other.

Policies were mainly centred on the long term provision of academic and pastoral support, rather than short term initiatives, as it was suggested that short term interventions did not yield significant improvements in the performance of pupils from the MEGs. LAs felt that continuous and consistent support was required to ultimately raise attainment. All were taking their lead from schools in making decisions about what was required.

LAs differed in how they allocated support to specific MEGs. Where there was a specific need amongst a particular MEG, work was being done to devise and implement initiatives to support that group. Across the LAs, there were examples of specific initiatives for all Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish and Kurdish groups. This support took the form of additional staff, particularly home-school link workers who could liaise with both the schools and the local community, and targeted initiatives such as MEAP. All LAs were using their data to identify underachieving groups and engaging with National Strategies to determine how best to offer training and support to schools.

Focus of activities

Activities within LAs were divided between the local community and the provision of support within schools. LAs often focussed on EAL and language issues amongst the target MEGs, and resources for these groups tended to concentrated on EAL provision. The majority of LAs felt that underperformance amongst target MEGs was due to issues of language and literacy, particularly academic language. Resources were often dedicated to improving language provision within schools, developing pupils’ academic language and supporting parents in developing their English language skills.
Community support

LAs were working to create community cohesion by providing support outside of the immediate school context. Examples were given of LAs working with supplementary schools and community groups to encourage joined up working with schools, training school staff to provide out of hours tuition for pupils and parents in core subjects and bringing hard to reach parents into schools to address their concerns and share information.

It was suggested that, while parents had high aspirations for their children, they were often unable to support them and had low self esteem due to their own limited education and understanding of English. By improving the language competence of parents, it was felt that communications between parents and schools would increase. This in turn would increase parents' confidence and ability to understand the British education system and also allow them to support their children in the home. One LA cited a 3 strand approach, including coffee mornings for parents to provide general information, parents' workshops providing guidance on how practically to support their children, and bringing parents in to schools to work directly with their children.

Schools based support

LA EMA teams were working closely with schools to establish their needs and provide training and support. LA EMA staff had regular meetings with EMA staff in schools to assess the progress of MEGs, to agree areas of support and to develop initiatives. LAs offered a broad range of training programmes, including EAL-specific and broader EMA training, from which schools were able to select courses they felt were most relevant to their needs. Training included tools to use in teaching EAL pupils, and developing teachers' understanding of EAL assessments. In most cases, schools were allocated a set number of days of support from their LA.

Teacher training

The majority of LAs were concerned about the high turnover of teaching staff in schools in deprived areas and many were concentrating their efforts on ensuring that teachers were better equipped to cope with the challenges of working in schools with high proportions of EAL. There were some concerns that teachers were not proficient enough in assessing the capabilities and needs of minority ethnic pupils and this often meant they were unable to understand how these pupils should be supported. Some felt that the teacher training did not fully prepare teachers to work with EAL pupils, which created a learning barrier in the classroom. This was compounded by the lack of bilingual provision in schools, which made access to mainstream lessons difficult for pupils.

It was suggested that high CVA schools had teachers who were more confident in assessing pupils' needs and were therefore better able to deliver lessons in a manner suited to minority ethnic pupils. LAs were working on training Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs) to be more confident in assessing and supporting EAL pupils. Also, training for teachers focussed on connecting EAL issues with specific subjects, as well as broadly addressing teaching and classroom management skills.

Culturally inclusive curriculum

In some cases, LAs had developed their own strategies for supporting EAL pupils. LAs were working with schools to develop a culturally inclusive curriculum, which included developing classroom strategies, teaching materials such as texts containing culturally inclusive characters from a range of different ethnic backgrounds, and training and guidance for teachers on how to understand the needs of MEG pupils, such as additional support with language.
LAs recognised that MEG pupils required both academic and emotional support as part of a holistic approach to providing support. Schools were encouraged to address issues of confidence amongst MEGs, and it was suggested that making the target ethnic groups more visible in the curriculum and in the classrooms would help to increase motivation and raise aspirations.

Factors affecting the success of initiatives

In order for policies and initiatives to work effectively, all LAs felt that they needed to be able to identify groups most in need of support and work with school Senior Leadership Teams (SLTs) to implement this support.

From the LA perspective, using attainment data on MEGs was the main method of identifying support needs. They therefore place a high importance on data being accurate and up to date, and felt that this was not always the case. Despite this, most LAs felt that the data they were provided with had helped them to successfully pinpoint areas where support was required and to provide interventions. It was suggested that ethnic codes could be further extended to better allow LAs to target particular MEGs that were not fully represented in current data.

In some instances, dialogue with school SLTs was seen as a more effective method of ascertaining the extent to which particular MEGs required support than utilising attainment data. All LAs felt that they had good relationships with schools, and ongoing communications allowed them to address the support needs of minority ethnic pupils. In many cases, data provided directly from the schools was said to be more useful than national data as it painted a more specific picture of the achievement levels of MEGs within each school. Staff in some schools commented that they used school data to pinpoint attainment issues with particular MEG pupil groups by breaking their data down by information such as ethnic group, year of arrival in the country/at the school, EAL level and gender to provide a more accurate picture of specific groups that had attainment issues.

Where initiatives had been successful, many LAs felt strongly that this was due to the commitment of SLTs. It was felt that initiatives and interventions needed to be effectively managed by schools in order to be implemented properly. It was suggested that schools should appoint a member of SLT oversee initiatives in order to ensure that they were implemented in a consistent and thorough manner. As stated above, LAs were particularly positive about schools that effectively tracked and monitored pupil achievement, and felt this greatly improved their ability to provide targeted support.

Long term initiatives

Where initiatives had been successful, LA’s believed that this was due to long term implementation and consistency of provision. LAs praised schools that were committed to sustaining initiatives and rolling out training and learning from initiatives across the school. Although short term measures were sometimes used to tackle particular attainment issues and improve exam results, it was felt that continuous one-on-one and in classroom support was needed to generally improve attainment across Socio-Economic Groups (SEGs). LAs saw long term initiatives as part of the preferred holistic approach to providing support.

Funding

Views on funding varied across the LAs. They had limited input into how EMAG funding was used by schools. The large majority of EMAG was distributed to schools based on LA data, which determined the schools that were most in need. Once funding was allocated, schools had the freedom to decide how it should be used. Schools were also receiving additional funding that was not ring-fenced but should have been used for EMA projects. Some LAs
worked on the assumption that the additional funding was being used for EMA but were unable to confirm this.

It was suggested that schools should use funding to provide targeted support for underachieving pupils. However, some LAs felt that schools were not always using funding for this purpose. Some LAs felt that there was a lack of understanding amongst some SLTs about how EMAG should be used. In a few cases, funding was being used to employ support staff, but these staff did not provide specialist support for MEGs and EAL pupils. It was also suggested that EMAG was too restrictive, as in cases where white British pupils were underachieving; the funding could not be used to support these pupils. Overall, it was felt that schools intended to use their funding in a manner that best supported the needs of the school as a whole. However, LAs felt that it should be reiterated to schools that funding should not go into the general pot, but should be dedicated to supporting EAL and EMA.

6.2.4 Good practice

Across the interviews, LAs gave examples of policies and initiatives that they felt were working well and having a positive impact on achievement. Many of the initiatives they had put into place were in their early stages and had not yet had any tangible impact on raising the achievement of MEGs. Despite this, LAs were positive that their initiatives would increase attainment amongst all underachieving groups in the longer term. There were positive indications from their initial work that the initiatives they had introduced had resulted in improvements in pupils attitudes and motivation.

The following are examples of some of the initiatives LAs were involved in and were particularly positive about. These examples are not exhaustive and do not reflect the totality of the work of all the LAs, but are instances of initiatives that were more developed, and reflected the focus of activities and of the success factors highlighted above.

Culturally inclusive curriculum

One LA gave an example of an initiative to develop a culturally inclusive curriculum. The initiative involved creating a ‘story stack’, which consisted of a pack of standalone materials such as books and classroom texts that could be used as needed within currently existing lesson plans. The purpose of the creating the story stack was to get parents and pupils more engaged with the curriculum by providing materials that were relevant to them and reflected their cultural background. Parents and pupils from MEGs were involved in creating a published pack of guidance, documents for training, and classroom materials and a DVD that was culturally inclusive and could be used to provide guidance for global curricula rather than individual lessons. Once the story stack had been produced, it was made available to schools within and outside of the borough.

This was a one-off project, but supported the LAs holistic approach to developing support. The project was funded by money won by the LA through a bidding process. The LA was able to commission the initiative after a review of existing funding for EMA projects. However, it was felt that culturally inclusive curricula that could be sustained in the longer term needed to be reviewed regularly, and funding needed to be made available to maintain initiatives in this area. Although the LA was unable to say if the initiative had directly affected the attainment of BST pupils, it was anticipated that this story stack would be able to fill this purpose in the longer term.

Community cohesion

Another example of good practice was having co-educators work in secondary schools with targeted students who were under-attaining. Co-educators were role models from the local community who were able to provide mentoring and support to underachieving groups. The LA used their data to identify secondary schools with high levels of under-attaining pupils;
following this four co-educators were placed in each school with the purpose of providing classroom support, mentoring pupils and working with the parents of pupils who had been identified as under-attaining.

Each term the LA tracked any improvements made by under-attaining pupils. Through monitoring the progress of the pupils, it was shown that pupils had made improvements at GCSE level. The programme was deemed to be a success given the improvement in attainment of the target groups. It was suggested that the holistic approach of being in the schools, working with parents and having monitoring from the LA yielded the positive results.

Targeted support

One LA gave an example of a research project that preceded Aiming High and MEAP. The project came about as a result of data revealing that Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys were amongst the lowest achieving MEGs in the LA. The project, which was funded for 18 months, was specifically dedicated to raising achievement of Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys. Seven secondary schools participated in the project, including 3 schools where Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys were achieving as highly as other pupils, as well as selected schools with significant numbers of underachieving Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys.

The project involved discussions with pupils, parents, subject teachers, support staff, SLTs, mentors and supplementary schools, with a view to identifying what was happening in schools where boys were performing well, and what wasn’t happening in schools where boys were underachieving. It was found that schools where Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys were achieving highly had good individual pupil assessment. This included a thorough assessment of English language needs and personalised support in EAL all through secondary education. The support provided was tailored to meet the needs of the pupils and modified as pupils moved up through school years. These schools also had good tracking and monitoring systems in place and good relationships with the local community. By contrast, schools with underachieving Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys had limited EAL support, only given in year 7. This support was not structured or thorough and did not last through to examinations.

The findings of the research were published and conferences were held in the LA to disseminate findings. The LA also wrote a good practice guide that listed headings where schools were doing well. The guide looked at what SLT was doing in schools, and what policies and practices were being used by the school. It also included case studies of what was happening in schools in terms of leadership, ethos, mentoring, EAL and parental and community involvement. The guide gave step by step advice as to how the examples of good practice could be implemented in schools. It was sent to all secondary schools in the LA. Following the publication of the guide, the LA became involved in MEAP. The schools involved in the action research project were also involved in MEAP and, after 2 years, KS3 data showed that attainment had improved across all of the schools.

6.2.5 Future challenges

LAs were asked to discuss what they felt were the priorities for work in EMA/EAL, and how they could be facilitated in achieving their aims going forward. Responses varied considerably, although there were some commonalities.

Participants felt that there should be improved sharing of research data on a national scale. They felt that schools often need to seek resources themselves, where a nationally co-ordinated resource of research would be beneficial. In addition, data should be shared more quickly, rather than in some cases a one-year turnaround. Sharing of best practice across and within LAs would also be beneficial. Currently, although sharing of best practice is
acknowledged as useful, it was not thought to be given adequate priority over operational activity.

The importance of improving confidence and self-esteem amongst the target groups was emphasised, and this was seen as an important focus for their work going forward. Participants tended to focus on the role of community programmes in achieving this aim.

The importance of continued funding for this area of work was emphasised, particularly in the context of the need for sustained programmes of work to see longer term results. It should be ensured that funding was allocated specifically to EMA, and not incorporated into a general 'pot'. This would improve staff morale.

Participants raised concerns about EAL, saying that in their view it is not currently developed enough, and risks declining as a result of poor allocation of funding and high staff turnover. It was felt that a greater leadership nationally could improve this situation.

“EMA and EAL are key as I keep saying and level of EAL expertise across the country I think is declining…schools are not using the money correctly and they are losing skills” (LA4)

Other suggestions were as follows:

- One LA emphasised the importance of integrating EMA into the main school curriculum rather than EAL teaching being restricted to separate lessons with specific pupils.
- On a related point, one LA called for improved equalities training for all senior teachers, in order to improve SLTs understanding of the importance of targeted programmes for MEGs. This was as a result of schools sometimes regarding EMA programmes as representing ‘positive action’, when in fact they were improving opportunities for a disadvantaged group.
- The suggestion was made that improvements in community resources such as housing and access to technology would improve the chances of pupils from communities where these resources were inadequate or scarce.

6.3 Staff research

6.3.1 School context

Interviews were conducted with EMA leads and another key member of staff in each school with a particular knowledge of or responsibility for pupils from the target MEG. Respondents in the EMA lead role included both heads of EMA and EAL departments. In most cases the departments performed dual functions of co-ordinating both EAL and EMA support within the school. The sample for the staff research also included one deputy head teacher, one head of Teaching and Learning, and one head of Inclusion, all of whom had responsibilities for EMA.

Other staff members interviewed included home-school link workers for the target MEG, EAL support staff, teaching staff, pupil mentors and one attendance co-ordinator. Some staff appeared to be chosen for interview by the school on the basis of their ethnicity rather than the work they were involved in with students. These staff members were able to offer insight into the culture and traditions of the MEGs.

Prevalence of ethnic group

School staff often spoke of how the overall school population was fluid, influenced by local patterns of immigration. Due to this, MEG populations tended to change quite quickly, often varying throughout the school year. Patterns of immigration amongst pupils from the target
groups were fairly stable and in recent years there were fewer numbers of new arrivals than, for example, pupils from Eastern European countries. However, across all MEGs within the research, there were still a small number of recently arrived pupils. This group tended to be larger for Somali and Kurdish groups than for Turkish or Bangladeshi groups.

All schools had extremely high levels of pupils with EAL and in some schools up to 90% of pupils fell into the EAL category. The majority of EAL pupils were advanced bilinguals and pupils from the target MEGs were mainly in this category. Despite this, schools still had to contend with a large number of languages spoken and were not able to provide enough staff to cover the range of languages spoken.

**Level of integration between ethnic groups**

Staff described varying levels of integration amongst pupils from target MEGs. On the whole, staff were positive about the levels of integration within schools and many schools were active in encouraging integration. The general consensus was that pupils with lower competence in English were less likely to integrate with other pupils but would integrate more as their confidence and language skills improved.

“I think they tend to stay in their own groups initially and I think that gives them some sort of security. Or if they don’t feel very confident in the language they tend to stay together.”

Bangladeshi - Low CVA (988-979)

There were some examples of tensions between Turkish and Kurdish pupils in schools. There was a mixed picture, however, as Turkish and Kurdish pupils would also create friendship groups around ethnicity and language. Staff described scenarios where Turkish speaking pupils (including Kurdish pupils) would gather together in class and hold conversations in their mother tongue.

In other schools, there were tensions between Somali and Bangladeshi pupils or between Somali and Pakistani pupils, although some staff were reluctant to put these tensions down to ethnicity. In one case, it was said that tensions were reflective of ‘postcode wars’, which existed outside of the school, but appeared to be based along ethnic lines because large proportions of pupils from particular ethnic groups tended to live in the same areas.

“There is always that Somalian and Pakistani thing. It’s not racially motivated, it’s just a case of whoever’s gang you’re in ... people make an issue of it being racist and it’s gang warfare between the two cultures but it’s just a normal fight.”

Bangladeshi - Low CVA (988-979)

**Patterns of attainment**

Patterns of attainment for the target MEGs did not always reflect the CVA of the school as a whole. The results of pupils from the target MEGs across the schools was said to vary primarily by subject. In many cases, it was said that Bangladeshi and Somali pupils showed particular aptitude for Maths and Science and were performing extremely well in these subjects. This was reflected in the pupil focus groups, where several Bangladeshi and Somali pupils stated a preference for these subjects and said they felt they were doing well in them. In separate instances both Somali and Bangladeshi pupils were also praised by staff for their artistic and creative capabilities and again, a preference for creative subjects was expressed in the pupil groups.

34 Attributions refer to the target MEG and CVA level of each school. The bracketed numbers refer to the CVA band allocated to high, medium and low CVA school.
Many of the staff comments reflected the national picture of underachievement of some groups and a particular disparity between genders. In line with national data, it was said that female pupils tended to outperform males. Also, schools reported that the average attainment of Somali and Turkish/Kurdish pupils tended to be lower than other MEGs. In particular, Turkish/Kurdish pupils tended to be amongst the lowest attaining groups across subjects. The overall view was that attainment was primarily affected by language capability and, where pupils lacked sufficient skills in English, they were more likely to underachieve. Staff pointed to lower performance in English, and other subjects where proficiency in English is particularly important, as evidence of this.

“We may have Somali pupils being better in terms of the scientists and mathematicians. More the technical side and some of the arts. But then they fall a bit lower when it comes to the literacy side.”

Somali - High CVA (1036-1025)

There were instances where staff expressed views of pupil attainment that were somewhat divergent from national performance statistics. This was particularly the case for Somali pupils who, in several cases, were said to be performing above expectations, particularly in ‘practical’ subjects such as Science and Maths. In one instance, it was suggested that, while Bangladeshi pupils were relatively high attaining, their attainment levels had stalled and in some cases dipped. One staff member felt that this was a result of ‘western’ influences, which had resulted in Bangladeshi pupils becoming lazier and less focussed.

“I think if you looked a few years ago, you'd have found that they [Bangladeshis] were among the highest achieving groups. But I think that people's perceptions of Bangladeshi children are not reality especially outside of urban areas. People's perceptions are that they sit down, they are quiet, they're studious, and they try really, really hard but that's not necessarily the reality. The reality is that a lot of them... they're lazy some of them, they don't see the point of stuff, so it can be quite a challenge. (...) Basically they've become very westernised in the way that they deal with things, and I think that those old perceptions are not true.”

Bangladeshi - Medium CVA (1000-997)

6.3.2 Key factors influencing the attainment of these MEGs

The following section outlines staff's perceptions of the factors affecting the attainment of pupils from the target MEGs. There was an overall view that the factors affecting pupils were wide ranging and often complex. In their comments, staff drew on their own experiences and the issues they faced within their particular schools, but also reflected more generally on the wider factors they felt affected the performance of the target MEG. While schools were working to tackle these issues, it was felt by many that their efforts could only be successful if pupils and parents in particular were willing to engage. The comments in this section of the report are drawn from what was ultimately a small sample of staff selected from particular schools. Staff commented were based on their own knowledge and opinions and where often generalised. The staff perspective needs to be considered in conjunction with that of pupils and parents, as there were some points of contention. These are highlighted throughout the report.

Within schools, the main challenges facing staff were related to resources and time available to dedicate to pupils from target MEGs. However, schools were also attempting to work with the local community to improve relations and encourage a culture of support from all sides. Schools were often short of the resources required to effectively address the perceived barriers to attainment.
Parental engagement

Overwhelmingly, the relationship between parents and schools was described as a core factor affecting attainment. Most schools were struggling to engage with parents across all MEGs as they did not have the resources to communicate with parents who often had a limited grasp of English. Schools were working to rectify this by employing liaison officers who were able to speak the language of the target MEG. In many cases staff used as ‘translators’ were in administrative or other positions within the school as often there were no teaching or support staff from the target MEG. In some cases, schools were relying on the pupils themselves to interpret information for their parents. It was recognised across the board that this was not ideal as pupils were being given a responsibility that they could potentially abuse; however this was sometimes the only option.

“So the home school link workers, the work is mostly this very delicate sensitive work of interpreting.”

Somali - Low CVA (988-979)

As a result of language difficulties within all of the BST groups, communication levels between parents and schools were sometimes lower than with other ethnic groups. Some staff members gave examples of non-response to letters or invitations to attend meetings or school activities. This meant that parents had little awareness of what was going on at the school or with their children. It was suggested that the culture within some BST groups was to allow the school to take full responsibility for their child, which only exacerbated difficulties of communicating.

When parents did come to meetings, a translator was often needed, which sometimes made for strained communications. Many commented that parents were often shocked if they were called to a meeting about their child’s behaviour as they were often unaware of any issues. There was some suspicion that, where the child had responsibility for translating, a few pupils were miscommunicating information in order appease their parents.

“So some parents do not speak any English. The children translate for the parents. Some parents come with their other son or daughter who does all the translating.”

Bangladeshi – Low CVA (988-979)

Staff also pointed to the absence or reticence of fathers’ involvement in their children’s schooling across all the target MEGs. This meant that schools were having to communicate with mothers who were often housewives and may have had less command of English due to their limited engagement with wider society. It was suggested that some mothers may feel intimidated because of this and avoided communication with the school as a result.

Difficulties in engaging parents were often put down to overinflated expectations of ability and future prospects, which was primarily the case for Somali and Bangladeshi pupils. Staff described parents’ insistence that their children enter traditional professions such as medicine or law and felt they were under pressure to manage what, in many cases they felt, were unrealistic expectations. Staff explained that it was unrealistic that all pupils from Somali and Bangladeshi backgrounds would end up in medical or legal professions and felt that parents sometimes focussed too rigidly on these professions instead of engaging in conversations with staff about their child’s strengths and talents. Conversely, within Turkish and Kurdish communities, some staff felt expectations were quite low. One staff member suggested that parents placed little value on education as children were expected to enter into family businesses upon leaving school.
“Maybe with the boys it’s expected that when they finish school they're just going to go and work in their dad's shop or garage and help the family out. Just go into the family business, whatever that is.”

Turkish/Kurdish – Low CVA (988-979)

Communication between parents and school appeared to be most problematic amongst Somalis. One view was that many Somali families had migrated from other European countries so that their children could have what they deemed to be a higher standard of education, as British qualifications were seen to be more portable and widely recognised than qualifications from other European countries. Due to this, there were extremely high expectations within this group. However, some staff commented that there was a lack of understanding of the British education system amongst this group in particular, which made it especially difficult for schools to explain the role of the school and the school's expectations of parents. Staff took the view that parents felt it was the schools’ responsibility to ensure their children’s success but that parents did not work in partnership with the school or support their children enough at home. Therefore, parents often had unrealistic perceptions of their child’s capabilities and potential.

“The parents don’t have much information about the British education system even though we try our best in the school to give them some awareness.”

Somali - Medium CVA (1000-997)

Behaviour/disciplinary issues

Behaviour and disciplinary issues were often associated with boys from Somali and Turkish and Kurdish backgrounds. In some cases, it was said that Somali and Turkish boys in particular were among the worst behaved pupils. Boys from these MEGs were said to display disruptive behaviour inside the classroom and were often disrespectful of teachers and other staff. Some felt that male pupils, Somali in particular, showed a lack of respect for female authority and would purposely disobey female staff.

“But very often teachers will complain that they don’t show respect for women. And they can be quite difficult to teach so there’s a lot of gender issues going on.”

Somali – Low CVA (988-979)

Although behaviour was a concern for both groups, staff offered interpretations of how the surrounding factors affecting poor behaviour were different for Somali and Turkish pupils. As a more recently arrived group, proportions of Somali boys were sometimes much smaller and less well established than other MEGs and staff spoke of Somali boys’ attempts to assimilate with other groups within a school. One possible explanation given by staff at some schools was that in their efforts to be liked and respected, Somali boys replicate and magnify poor behaviour, which would potentially draw admiration from other boys. Conversely, it was suggested that the behaviour of Turkish and Kurdish boys was a reflection of a lack of discipline within the home. There was a view amongst staff in all schools with high proportions of Turkish and Kurdish pupils that boys had elevated status in the home. In some cases, their position as the eldest male meant they could be seen as head of the household. Staff were of the opinion that there were few restrictions placed on boys of this MEG. As a result, it was felt that these boys were especially resistant to authority and acted out in response to the boundaries set within a school environment.

There were far fewer reports of behavioural issues with girls, although there were a few references to occurrences amongst Turkish and Kurdish girls. Girls were described as much more focussed and studious overall. A few reasoned that education was viewed as a route to freedom, particularly for Bangladeshi and Somali pupils girls. Some staff speculated that
girls were at high risk of being expected to marry soon after leaving school, although this view was not always supported by pupils. However, it was still suggested by that continuing in education was a method of delaying early marriage by female pupils.

Perceived barriers to attainment

There were a range of perceived barriers to attainment existing outside of the schools. There were issues that impacted heavily on attainment but, in many cases, were outside of the schools’ control.

Language

Pupils’ capability in English was identified by staff as a primary factor affecting attainment. This primarily applied to recent arrivals who had not been fully integrated into the education system before being required to sit exams. However, in some instances it was said that pupils who were settled in the UK, and sometimes British born, had still not developed sufficient language skills at Key Stage 4. For these groups, there was a distinction made between everyday spoken English and the academic language required to pass exams. It was felt that Somali and Turkish groups in particular struggled to acquire a high level of academic English, possibly because of the ‘interference’ of other languages spoken.

For Somali pupils, it was suggested that the fact that as many pupils had migrated from other European countries, English was often their third language, meaning the opportunities to use English outside of school were even more restricted.

In the case of Turkish and Kurdish pupils, there was the view that this group had a ‘monocultural’ existence outside of school due to a limited integration. This meant that pupils did not always have a proper grasp of cultural concepts that may set the context for exam questions.

"Even when students were born here and they've lived here all their lives there's often a very limited vocabulary academically, generally and culturally. Their cultural awareness encompasses all things Turkish and that's it."

Turkish - Medium CVA (1000-997)

Bangladeshi pupils were described as more ‘anglicised’ in language terms and were thought to be more likely to use English at home and in their community. Amongst the pupil groups, there were some instances of Bangladeshi pupils not being competent in their mother tongue and using English as their first language. Using English as a first language meant that Bangladeshi pupils’ language skills were often highly developed, which may have presented an advantage in being able to understand academic and conceptual language. Within Somali and Turkish groups, other languages were commonly widely spoken outside of school.

“When they go home, they’ll [Somali pupils] mainly speak Somali or Dutch and because their parents are limited linguistically they won’t get any support with language at home at all (...) Whereas on the Bangladeshi side, because the integration and influx has been earlier on, this should be second generation so although they’re EAL they’re not really EAL. They’ve been in the country long enough to acquire all the language and they’re fine and they can practice at home.”

Somali - High CVA (1036-1025)
Pupil mobility

Disrupted schooling was also thought to be problematic, particularly for Somali pupils and new arrivals from other MEGs. For pupils who had entered primary or secondary education in the UK at a later stage, the view was that pupils had not had sufficient time to assimilate themselves into a new school environment and master the language. Some pupils had entered the UK as refugees and it was suggested by some that the difficult nature of their journey affected their confidence and emotional stability. Once in the UK, pupils would possibly still be in transition, which could make it difficult for them to settle and focus on education.

The influence of past schooling in other countries was also said to make it more difficult for these pupils to adjust to a new school environment as they had to adapt to new rules and expectations. Some commented that, pupils were likely to have had more freedom in schools in other European countries that were deemed to have a more relaxed approach to restricting pupils’ movements throughout the school day. It was suggested that pupil may have been resentful of the restrictions placed on them in British schools, such as being unable to go out for lunch or leave school during free periods, and acted out as a result.

It was suggested by some that Bangladeshi pupils were achieving at a higher level because they did not have to contend with the same of the issues of mobility faced by other groups. As a settled community, it was felt that they had more distance from their parents’ home countries and were therefore less likely to be in transition.

Traditions/religion

There was some suggestion that religion may affect pupils’ ability to integrate and may affect time spent on school work, although on the whole religion was seen as a positive influence. This was primarily mentioned by Bangladeshi pupils who said that, religion promoted discipline, respect and focus, which aided pupils in their ability to learn and concentrate in school.

The primary issue surrounding religion was female pupils’ attitudes towards lessons such as PE. There were examples given of females from Somali and Bangladeshi backgrounds feeling uncomfortable or refusing to take part in PE because they did not want to have to get changed. Somali and Bangladeshi girls were more likely to wear traditional dress to school so changing into PE kit was potentially more problematic.

SEG/living conditions

Staff commonly mentioned living conditions as a potential hindrance to attainment. It was suggested that pupils often lived in overcrowded conditions and did not have adequate space to study. It was also suggested that pupils, particularly females from all of the target MEGs, would have other duties in the home which would allow them less time for study. This was particularly in reference to girls who were said to take on a domestic role in support of their mothers. Many pupils from Somali and Turkish/Kurdish groups were thought to be part of single parent families or living with members of their extended family instead of their parents, who may not have travelled to the UK with them. It was suggested that they may also be living in crime-ridden areas where they did not feel safe and, for Somali groups in particular, there may not be an established community to support them.

Although the general view was that pupils from the target MEGs have to contend with living in poor areas with limited resources, there was a sense that, for Bangladeshi and Somali pupils, this did not affect their academic self-concept. Despite their apparent disadvantage, pupils still had high expectations, as did their parents. Economic disadvantage was said to have more of an impact on Turkish and Kurdish groups. It was suggested that pupils,
especially males, may be required to work in family run businesses and take over these businesses from their parents, rather than pursuing other careers that could potentially be more lucrative.

**Perceptions of target MEGs**

During the interviews, staff offered their insights into how the target MEGs were viewed by other staff members and how they were perceived overall by the school. This was particularly the case for Turkish and Kurdish and Somali groups, who were sometimes positioned as ‘problematic’ by teaching staff and management.

Staff perceptions of the target MEGs were often reflected upon by the pupils in their descriptions of their relationships with staff. It appeared that, where pupils had difficult relationships with staff, this was partly based on how they felt they were being positioned as a group.

In the interviews, staff comments sometimes took the form of generalisations made about the MEGs and some of the barriers facing them. In a few cases staff appeared to make assumptions about religion and traditions, socio-economic status, living conditions, friendships and language issues which, from the pupils' perspective, demonstrated a lack of understanding. For example, several staff member commented that Muslim girls would be expected to marry after leaving school, while in the pupil groups, several girls spoke of their parents' expectations that they would continue in education and go to university. In another example, Turkish and Kurdish pupils were viewed negatively for speaking in their mother tongue in lessons, while pupils explained that they were not being disruptive, but helping each other with their work.

While the positioning of MEGs often yielded positive engagement through targeted support and training, pupils were sometimes hostile to support based on their perceived deficiencies and in some cases felt patronised by staff views. In quite a few cases, this led to tensions between pupils and staff, often manifested by what staff perceived as disruptive behaviour in the classroom on the part of pupils. However, pupils had a very different perception of this, stating that they were viewed with suspicion by staff and were unfairly punished. These issues are explored further in the pupil research chapter (section 4). Overall, there was a sense that schools were struggling to find a balance between stereotyping their pupils, and offering them support based on real issues.

**Prevalence of EAL (support and resources for EMA)**

In the large majority of schools, EAL encompassed over 75% of the total pupil population, although this was spread over EAL levels, with the majority being advanced bilingual pupils. EMA and EAL departments typically had fewer than 5 staff responsible for the large percentage of EAL pupils within their school. Pupils classified as EAL were spread over levels of competency, with the majority being advanced bilinguals at stages 4 and 5.

However, in all cases, it was said that the departments did not have enough staff to actively support all pupils requiring language support.

---

35 EAL language levels are based on Westminster's Stages of English for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing. **Stage 4 learners are described as** 'Bilingual learners who are confident users of English in most contexts and can engage in all learning activities with a considerable degree of independence...' **Stage 5 learners are described as** 'bilingual pupils' who are competent users of English, and whose use of English in speaking, reading and writing is effectively no different to what might be expected from a pupil of a similar age for whom English is a first language. See Appendix 6 for full details.
“There are only 4 of us. So it's not really a big department. But the need for the school is huge. Unfortunately we can't be in all places so we do as much as we can do.”

Bangladeshi – Low CVA (988-979)

Departments tended to have different focuses depending on whether they classified themselves as EAL or EMA. For the majority of EAL departments, their primary focus was the integration of new arrivals with beginner status into mainstream teaching, while EMA departments had a wider remit for the support of ethnic minorities and advanced bilinguals along with responsibilities for EAL beginners.

Although EAL learners at beginner stages 1 and 2 were relatively small in number in comparison to pupils at more advanced levels, resources seemed to be geared more towards these pupils. Staff in these departments tended to have fewer resources dedicated to advanced bilinguals. Depending on the number of new arrivals, staff time could primarily be taken up with running induction courses or providing additional support lessons for EAL beginners.

In the majority of schools, resources also often appeared to be stretched for EAL Stage 3 learners who fell between beginner and advanced bilingual status, in all target MEGs. These pupils were typically too advanced to require additional support outside of the classroom, but were perceived as still requiring some support within it. However, where support was provided in class, there were many cases where support staff were required to help a large number of pupils across the entire class rather than focusing on these individuals.

“We'll sometimes not have the time for those stage 3 kids, so sometimes they can get slightly ignored and really we need to start looking at how we can move those more advanced learners to move forward.”

Bangladeshi – Low CVA (988-979)

Staff were working hard to implement initiatives for all pupils but without the necessary resources, they were often unable to do this. A main concern was having staff within the departments who were representative of the MEGs in the school or could speak pupils’ native languages. With such high numbers of EAL pupils, there was a vast array of languages spoken across the school with varying numbers of speakers. Departments were unable to accommodate all languages and in some cases did not have any staff who spoke the native languages of pupils. Also, in a few instances, support staff also had additional teaching responsibilities which detracted from time dedicated to EMA projects.

Staff capacity and training opportunities

Schools sought to have a representative staff reflecting the ethnic make up of the school. One staff member explained that the school was purposely overstuffed in order to try and include as many staff across ethnic groups. In other schools, home liaison or link workers were employed specifically to provide support for a target ethnic group.

“We're overstuffed purposely to provide support for our students who are in need.”

Somali – High CVA (1036-1025)

However, it was often suggested, particularly by teaching staff, that it was a struggle to stretch the available resources to accommodate all MEGs. Where schools did have teaching staff from the target MEGs, there were minimal numbers, usually under 5. Schools were sometimes addressing this by employing staff who were close to the target MEG, for example, employing staff from across the Indian subcontinent to accommodate all South
Asian pupils. Across the target MEGs, there were higher numbers of Bangladeshi teaching and support staff than those from Turkish and Kurdish or Somali backgrounds. However, one staff member from a school with high proportions of Somali pupils stated that, while it was not ideal, teaching staff could only be employed on the basis of application, not on the basis of their ethnicity. Four home-school liaison officers were employed in schools. Two of these were based in schools with high proportions of Somali pupils – both were Somali and worked with Somali pupils. The remaining two home-school liaison officers were Turkish and worked with Turkish pupils in schools with large Turkish pupil populations.

In some schools, home liaison officers regularly received training from the EMA department. In these schools, it was deemed important to develop and support officers in their role in order to help them to progress. Training also focussed on the needs of pupils from the target MEG from the perspective of the school, which was especially important as officers were employed for their knowledge and understanding of the local community rather than for their knowledge of educational requirements and the needs of the school.

“Many of the home-school link workers are just superbly capable people ... I would hope that this particular job is a step for them on a ladder that is going up and up and I would suspect that it is. So I think that their training and support is hugely important, both for the needs of the students, but for themselves and for the development of those communities.”

Somali – Low CVA (988-979)

A few EMA heads described good relationships between themselves and LA leads and praised the training they received from the LA. Some schools were involved in the LILAC scheme in which EAL and English advisors from the LA provide training directly to staff. One school was also involved in the Local Authority Improvement Partnership which involved LA staff coming to schools to train teaching staff and share best practice from other schools.

In most cases, training received from the LA was rolled out to teaching and support staff by the EMA teams, who were primarily responsible for providing training in EMA issues. This included developing an understanding of the needs of EAL children amongst staff, giving teachers tools to use in teaching EAL pupils, and providing an understanding of EAL assessments. Many schools had a policy of providing EAL training to all NQTs. Outside of this, training seemed to primarily be delivered through INSET.

There were few examples of staff training dedicated to diversity and integration. Outside of INSET training, opportunities for staff to engage in training were fairly limited. In some schools teaching staff were permitted to take a set number of external courses over the school year. Staff were able to select training courses of their choice, permitted that they were related to their role. In one instance, an EAL support teacher was taking an EMA course in order to her extend her role within the department.

6.3.3 Policy and Practice in raising attainment

Schools had a number of policies in place to tackle the factors affecting the attainment of their pupils. Policies were typically school-wide and did not focus specifically on the target MEG. Instead, schools were working to raise the attainment of all pupils and tackling issues pertinent to the target MEGs at the whole school level.

Ethos of integration

With such high levels of minority ethnic pupils attending, schools were using a number of methods to encourage integration. Primarily, integration was based around encouraging pupils to celebrate and teach others about their culture in order to promote understanding and appreciation of diversity. Several schools held regular ‘diversity days’ in which each
MEG within the school had a number of events dedicated to their culture. This often included assemblies organised by the pupils where they were able to tell the rest of the school about some element of their culture.

Some schools also had a week of activities dedicated to each MEG. These activities often took place in the classroom and outside of it, such as in the evening. In these instances, parents were often invited into the schools to teach pupils about an aspect of their culture such as cooking, dress or dance. Teaching took place in lessons where projects were designed to incorporate learning about culture of a specific ethnic group. Traditional meals from the relevant culture were usually served for lunch and parents were also invited to take part in cooking in the schools’ canteens. Schools also invited special guests in, often well-known figures from the MEG, to talk to pupils about their experiences and their success. Some schools also had celebrations around religious events such as Eid or Ramadan as recognition of the religious mix within the schools.

“We get people in from that culture. It might be African drumming, it might be poetry, arts from that culture. It makes students aware of what kinds of things these cultures get up to.”

Bangladeshi – High CVA (1036-1025)

Generally, where projects were targeted at particular MEGs, some schools tried to ensure that a staff member from that MEG either headed or was substantially involved in the project.

Another way schools celebrated diversity was through displays in corridors highlighting students’ cultures and, in some cases, their journeys as immigrants to the UK. With the large influx of immigrants to some schools, it was said to be important to demystify the culture of pupils who were newly-arrived in order to avoid stereotyping and stigmatisation.

Pupils were central to the organisation and implementation of integration policies and in one school pupils had a role in developing the policy themselves. This school had been involved in developing a European youth charter on Inclusion and Diversity in Education (INDIE). Pupils had then taken elements of the charter and generated a list of statements on how diversity should be practised within the school.

More implicit methods of encouraging integration involved creating opportunities for pupils to mix with each other. Some schools used seating plans to ensure that pupils from different ethnicities sat together in classes. Where certain MEGs were more likely to select particular subject options, for example in their native language, one school had allocated pupils a particular option rather than allowing them to choose. The justification for this was that pupils from a particular MEG would be spread across classes rather than congregating in one or two classes. Integration of this kind was encouraged early on, sometimes even before pupils entered the school. When organising form groups, one staff member commented that pupils from the same MEG were purposely spread across forms to allow for more opportunities to mix.

“We’ve got a policy at the school which is a seating plan policy, which our head when she first came here, she put into place. We tell the kids where to sit, and none of the kids really argue about it. That’s our main integration policy.”

Bangladeshi – Medium CVA (1000-997)

Integration was also encouraged through the diversity of staff within the schools. It was suggested by many that diversity within the staff was positive for pupils, as they would see themselves reflected in the faculty. Having teaching staff from a range of ethnicities was thought to be especially important as it was said that this provided pupils with role models. Also, it was suggested that pupils were more likely to respond well in lessons to staff from their own ethnic group.
“We’ve had learning mentors who are specifically Somalian, we’ve had teachers who are specifically Somalian, we’ve had role models within the school to help out with those [Somali] families and communities.”

Somali – Low CVA (988-979)

Where racial tensions emerged within some schools, pupils were brought together and encouraged to speak openly about their issues. Parents were often brought in under these circumstances to discuss the problem and offer potential solutions.

**Recognition of diversity in the curriculum**

Many of the activities celebrating diversity were incorporated into classroom teaching. Pupils were often involved in projects where there were encouraged to represent their culture in their work. Some examples given were of English lessons where pupils were able to write poems about their culture or write stories in their mother tongue which they would then translate into English and read out to the class. Artwork was also encouraged as a medium of expressing cultural identity. Creative work produced in lessons was often displayed around the school as another measure of celebrating diversity.

The subject area where diversity was most incorporated into the curriculum was Humanities. Geography, History and Citizenship were the main subjects mentioned where pupils learned about different cultures and ethnic groups. In some cases it was said that Schemes of Work were specifically designed to reflect all of the MEGs in the school. This meant that even MEGs with small numbers of pupils were included. One staff member suggested that these lessons were no longer Anglocentric, as there were so many minority ethnic backgrounds to cover.

Religious Education was also used to teach pupils about other cultures, and here pupils were primarily taught about Christianity and Islam. Many schools had a high proportion of Muslim pupils, and it was said that these pupils tended to engage more with Religious Education when they were being taught about Islam. In these cases, RE was seen by staff as a key way through which the school could engage Muslim pupils, and to encourage diversity. In the pupil focus groups, some said that they often had to correct the teachers when being taught about their religion, but this seemed to be a positive, as pupils felt they were in a position of authority.

Many schools also offered the pupils the opportunity to take a GCSE in their mother tongue. There were varying levels of support for this within the schools. Some schools offered extra lessons in reading and writing, while others expected that pupils would receive extra support outside of school if it was required. In the pupils’ groups, it emerged that the large majority of pupils could not read or write competently in their mother tongue and often struggled in taking the GCSE. It was suggested by the pupils that there could be more support for pupils in school if they chose to do a GCSE in their first language.

In schools where some subject teachers were the same ethnicity as the pupils, this was seen as an advantage to learning. Some examples were given of teachers being able to use examples from the culture in order to get children to connect with the subject matter. In this way, pupils were able to engage with the wider curriculum as it was tailored to incorporate a context they were familiar with.

**6.3.4 School resources dedicated to target MEGs**

Targeted support for specific MEGs depended on the extent to which the attainment of the target MEG was an identified priority for the school. Targeted support was more prevalent in schools with high proportions of Turkish and Kurdish or Somali pupils. Four of the schools participating in the research had been involved in the Minority Ethnic Achievement
Programme (MEAP). The programme had been used in several ways by schools. This included implementing partnership teaching, which involved EMA support staff working alongside teaching staff to deliver mainstream lessons and drawing on teaching methods that supported the learning needs of EAL pupils. Other initiatives included providing extra lessons for pupils from the target MEG and providing opportunities for pupils to be involved in dissemination of cultural knowledge. For example, at one school, Turkish pupils had been given responsibility for running a lesson in which they taught other pupils about their culture and language.

“We are very aware that Turkish speaking pupils are one of our main underachieving groups by ethnicity and we have been involved in the MEAP programme. Last year and the year before we did a lot of work with Turkish students.”

Turkish/Kurdish – Medium CVA (1000-997)

Where schools had dedicated resources to target MEGs, this was primarily through the employment of home-school liaison officers. Where home-school liaisons were not employed, schools sought to provide interpreters for parents and pupils from all MEGs. However, schools often lacked the resources to do this and sometimes relied on volunteers from the local community to help with communications.

It was felt by many that having a person from their community in the school would also curb some of the behaviour issues experienced with pupils from particular MEGs. As pupils may have had sole responsibility for communicating with their parents on behalf of the school, it may have been the case that parents were not being told about any problematic behaviour displayed by their children. With liaison officers in place, it was suggested that pupils feared that the school would have a way of communicating any issues to parents. In interviews with liaison officers, it was said that much of their role involved controlling pupils in the classroom and around the school. Sometimes the simple ‘threat’ of being reported to their parents was enough to make pupils behave responsibly.

6.3.5 Parental engagement policies

As engagement with parents was a high priority for the all schools, maximum effort was being made to include parents in the school. Home-school liaison officers were the key way schools engaged parents. They acted as a key channel through which the school communicated with parents, and provided a voice for parents who had difficulties communicating with the school.

Some schools had struggled to get parents to attend the school for individual meetings and had tackled this by having meetings for all parents of pupils from a particular MEG. It was suggested that having these meetings was a good way of addressing general issues across the target MEG rather than focussing on any one student. By holding these meetings at the beginning of the school year, staff were also able to tell parents what they were expected to do in support of the school.

A few schools had regular meetings with parents, as often as once a month, as a method of sustaining engagement. It was suggested that this continuous dialogue built up a relationship of trust between the school and the parents and enabled parents to develop a better understanding of the British education system. This in turn allowed them more opportunity to engage with their children’s learning. As a result, parents were able to readily engage with the school beyond these meetings, as they would have built up the confidence to do so.

“So one of the things that happens are monthly meetings specifically for Somali parents and carers, which have been set up to achieve a real dialogue and sense of partnership between the school and the parents and carers (...) I can see that the trust is developing between the
parents and us and that takes time and it's a process, but it's happening and also there is a growing understanding of the English education system.”

Somali – Low CVA (988-979)

The majority of schools were providing adult learning opportunities for parents. Classes for parents included creative and practical skills such as textiles or IT but primarily focused on language. As so many parents were thought to have minimal language skills in English, ESOL classes were seen as a way of both aiding parents’ development and creating links with the school. Such classes were said to be beneficial to both groups as, again, parents were able to develop both their language skills and their confidence and this also provided a platform for the schools to maintain contact. With improved language skills, it was hoped that parents would also be more able to aid their children with their studies at home.

6.3.6 Support and resources for EMA

Although under-resourced for the most part, EMA departments were working hard to provide support for all EAL and minority ethnic pupils across the school. As previously mentioned, EMA leads often spoke highly of their LA and felt that they had good relationships with EMA departments at LA level. The support received from the LA allowed EMA staff to provide training for teaching and support staff which would equip them to manage EAL and EMA needs in the classroom. This meant that EMA staff were able to use their own time more effectively in working with pupils who were most in need. EMA leads had regular meetings with the representatives from the LA and other EMA leads from the LA. These meetings gave EMA departments the opportunities to share experiences and hear about initiatives that other schools were using. EMA leads also had the opportunity to discuss the national EMA agenda. Overall, EMA staff were happy with the level of support they received from their LA. They welcomed the opportunity to share ideas with other EMA leads and were complimentary about the level and effectiveness of training provided.

“We have strong links with the Local Authority, particularly with the EMA person. I also have good links with one of the school improvement officers who are Turkish speaking.”

Turkish – Medium CVA (1000-997)

There was some debate about the most effective method of providing support for pupils, particularly recently arrived pupils with beginner levels of English. Staff commented that beginners often arrived at the schools with low or no literacy in their first language meaning that the concept of writing in any language was unfamiliar to them. For this reason, they required a massive amount of support before entering mainstream lessons. Quite a few schools had induction courses for these pupils in order to assess their language levels and support needs. Once EAL pupils had been assessed by the EAL/EMA department, pupils were then integrated into mainstream classes. Mainstream teaching staff were given guides on how to induct EAL pupils into the classroom, including information on teaching methods that could be used with these pupils. In most schools, there was a culture of information sharing, which allowed all staff to understand the needs and requirements of EAL pupils. By providing the maximum amount of information to staff, it was thought that they would be more effective in managing EAL pupils, and pupils would be able to integrate more easily into the classroom. [Can any of this be cut to reduce the detail and keep the overall length of the report down.]

Many EMA leads identified targeted interventions as the best use of resources. Targeted intervention allowed EMA staff to provide support for pupils who were most in need, however, this was often at the expense of pupils with wider support needs. Typically, there were difficulties of supporting more advanced bilingual pupils who were at stages 3-5.

36 See appendix 6 for full breakdown of bilingual learner stages.
Amongst these groups, schools would identify the lowest achievers and additional support would be provided in order to try and raise attainment. For example, one EMA department had moved from having their staff working within subject areas to working with year groups in order to obtain a wider picture of pupils’ needs across subjects. At KS4, many schools would track and monitor the progress of these groups and decide on the best methods of providing additional support. For example, schools were using initiatives such as the MEAP programme to target low achieving Turkish, Kurdish and Somali pupils. In one school, pupils identified as lower level EAL were given the option at KS4 to opt out of 1 GCSE and attend EAL classes instead.

High CVA schools tended to have better tracking and monitoring systems in place, which allowed them to pinpoint attainment issues amongst particular MEGs, and provide the relevant support. These schools were also better able to focus equally on EAL and EMA pupils within the schools, whereas low CVA schools tended to focus more on EAL and specific language issues. In high CVA schools, staff appeared to be working harder to implement initiatives that were joined up with mainstream teaching, such as partnership teaching, and saw removing pupils from the classroom for additional support as a last resort. Low CVA schools tended to use out of classroom support more frequently, particularly as they spent most of their time working with early stage EAL pupils.

EMA departments seemed to be struggling to find the best methods of supporting pupils, especially more advanced bilinguals across the school. There was some tension between methods that were preferred but did not yield the best results and methods that were less favourable but seemed to be more effective. The main issue raised by staff members was the use of partnership teaching in the classroom or alternatively, removing targeted pupils from lessons in order to provide additional support. The majority of schools had used partnership teaching but with varying results. Staff were positive about partnership teaching and felt this was the most effective method of implementing support. However, they suggested that partnership teaching could only operate successfully if EMA departments had adequate resources to implement it. Some felt that they did not receive enough support from senior management to be able to use partnership teaching effectively. It was suggested that senior management did not fully recognise or understand the issues related to EAL and EMA. Therefore, resources dedicated to these departments were sometimes limited. It was also said that teaching staff needed to be accomplished in managing their pupils in order for partnership teaching to work. In one case, a staff member felt she had spent more time managing behaviour in the classroom, which limited partnership teaching’s effectiveness. It was also suggested that classroom teachers did not always engage with EMA as they felt EAL was a more relevant issue.

Although staff had used partnership teaching, most had found that, at some point, they had been required to remove pupils from the classroom in order to provide them with more targeted support. Although this was not the preferred method, staff generally felt that they had progressed further with these pupils when they had been out of the classroom. There was a general sense that pupils had benefitted from being in smaller groups and having access to one-on-one support if required. It seemed as though pupils were more able to concentrate and grew more confident under these circumstances. However, staff were generally unhappy with having to remove pupils from the classroom and felt that it was not conducive to integration. There were also questions over which lessons pupils should be removed from. In some schools, pupils were removed from ‘non core’ subjects such as PE as it was felt that they would not miss out on essential subject teaching. In other schools, pupils were removed from core subjects since it was felt they would benefit more from covering the same work in a more supportive environment. Pupils also stated that they felt more comfortable when they were offered one-to-one support, although they did not make a distinction between this type of support being given in the classroom or outside of mainstream lessons. Some pupils commented that being taken out of lessons for additional
support affected their ability to keep up with mainstream teaching. Overall, there was a lack of consensus on this issue.

“We should be changing practice in the mainstream. By taking Turkish speaking kids out and having them in here you're just reinforcing that separateness.”

Turkish/Kurdish – Medium CVA (1000-997)

“I was really interested to find out whether actually withdrawing students from the classes would be beneficial and what the students feel about it because it's been proved by many linguists that it should not be practiced in schools and that is what we do here.”

Bangladeshi – Low CVA (988-979)

It was suggested that the provision of resources for EMA was based on how highly it was prioritised by the schools' senior management team. In some cases, staff felt that they did not receive the support required to implement support in the classroom and roll out initiatives across the school. Where funding was being directly filtered into the department, its uses varied. In some cases, funding was specifically allocated to the support of pupils from the target MEG, sometimes through the employment of home-school liaison officers or through the provision of resources such as books and dictionaries. In other instances, the funding was used simply to cover the salaries of staff in the EMA department. Some staff were unaware of how funding for EMA was being used by the school and there was some suspicion that it was not always being received by the most relevant department.

6.3.7 Future challenges and the role of DCSF

The primary challenge for EMA departments going forward was spreading their resources to manage the increasing number of new arrivals and large number of advanced bilingual pupils within schools. All departments were stretched and said that they were unable to be as effective as they would like. The main issues was with staff numbers, and all departments required more staff to be able to deliver the level of support required.

Also, schools wanted translators for a wider range of MEGs and wanted to employ more staff who were not only able to interpret for pupils and parents, but understand the needs of each MEG and provided targeted support both inside and outside of the classroom in the form of language support and emotional support, perhaps in the form of mentoring for pupils, and creating and maintaining links between the schools and the local community. There was a general consensus that more staff were needed within departments to be able to provide adequate levels of support for all pupils.

Funding was also required to increase the quality and range of support on offer to pupils. At the moment, schools were only able to concentrate on certain groups, be it particular MEGs or lower level EAL pupils. This meant that support for other pupils was minimal and only available at certain times. With more funding, departments would be able to provide mentoring and support and cater to pupil needs. Also, language resources were not always available for pupil use outside of EAL or EMA departments. It was suggested that a wider range or bilingual resources should be available for pupils both inside and outside of the classroom in order to aid learning.

“I think interpreting is an area that needs a lot more discussion and actually a lot more money going into it. It's an unbelievably complex thing for somebody to do.”

Somali – Low CVA (988-979)

While attainment of the target MEG was a high priority for staff, the view amongst many was that the issue of attainment was not always being tackled from the right perspective. It was suggested that many pupils did not have the confidence to succeed for a number of reasons.
Some examples given were difficult journeys to the UK, low expectations or living conditions. There were numerous mentions of the emotional support required for all pupils. Staff were generally in agreement that support required to address emotional needs was overshadowed by attainment targets and should be taken into more consideration when designing support for pupils. Staff stressed that support for pupils should take the form of the ‘holistic’ approach described by LAs. This included support, such as mentoring, to address behavioural issues and increase pupils’ confidence.

There were varying levels of recognition of EMA departments within schools. In some circumstances, departments did not have a proper base within the school meaning pupils did not have one place they could go to if they needed support. In other schools, EMA staff had multiple duties and could not always concentrate on implementing EMA initiatives for pupils. It was suggested that, in some cases, senior management did not prioritise EMA and did not provide departments with the support they required. It was said that if DCSF wanted to support EMA departments, they first had to ensure that schools were allocating funding correctly and allowing EMA staff to perform their roles effectively.

“Although we must get a lot of funding for the high majority of EAL pupils we have in the school I don't know if the chunk of money that we get for EMA or EAL pupils was necessarily going in the pot and getting spread out.”

Turkish – Low CVA (988-979)

6.4 Pupils’ research

6.4.1 Pupil context

This section will describe characteristics of pupils’ lives outside of the school context. It will look at background including migration, family of origin, household and languages spoken. It will also describe findings on pupils’ perceptions of their local area, and the extent to which they feel integrated with people from other cultures.

Migration and languages spoken

Pupils’ descriptions of their minority ethnic background and place of birth revealed a complex picture, even within each of the main minority ethnic groups. There was considerable variation within groups in terms of place of birth, length of time in the UK, and other languages spoken in addition to English. There were also variations in the extent to which English is an additional rather than primary language. All groups said that they spoke a language other than English at home, although in some cases this was in addition to English. We refer to languages other than English which are spoken regularly in the home as ‘mother tongue’.

Pupils identified in this report as ‘Turkish’ included those who described themselves as Turkish or Turkish Cypriot. This may also have included some Kurdish pupils. It should be noted that it was sometimes difficult to identify Kurdish pupils within the Turkish groups. Schools themselves were not certain of the ethnic background of the pupils, and pupils may have chosen not to self-identify as Kurdish within a Turkish focus group. Where we mention findings relating to ‘Kurdish’ students, therefore, we refer to findings from groups and interviews where pupils did choose to self-identify as Kurdish. All pupils in the Turkish and Kurdish groups said that they spoke Turkish fluently, and that this was the main language spoken at home, with a few saying that they spoke both English and Turkish at home.
Most pupils describing themselves as Turkish had been born in the UK, or in mainland Turkey. Turkish Cypriot pupils tended to have been born in the UK, with only one or two born in Cyprus. There were also one or two Turkish pupils who said that they had been born in Germany and that they spoke a little German in addition to their main languages of Turkish and English.

The number of Turkish pupils in the sample could not be established definitively, as schools may not be aware whether pupils were from a Turkish or Kurdish background, and pupils did not always choose to identify themselves as Turkish. Seven pupils who took part in the research identified themselves as Kurdish. Kurdish pupils had invariably been born in Turkey, and had often moved to the UK within recent years. They tended to speak Kurdish or Turkish as a first language, and some faced difficulties in following lessons in English. It was observable during the fieldwork that some Kurdish participants were less confident in English than tended to be the case for pupils identifying themselves as 'Turkish'. There were, however, some Kurdish pupils who had moved to the UK as small children and were fluent English speakers.

There was a complex picture also for the Somali pupils. As well as those born in the UK and in Somalia, some had been born in Holland, Denmark, Germany and Sweden and this was reflected in languages spoken. Somali pupils tended to speak Somali as a first language, and this was the main language spoken at home, although some also spoke German, Dutch or Swedish at home in addition to Somali and English.

Those not born in the UK tended to have arrived from Somalia or from other European countries around 8 – 10 years ago, with only one or two having arrived in the last year or two. As might be expected, those few who had arrived most recently described some difficulties with following lessons in English, and their lower confidence in English was observable in the focus groups.

Bangladeshi pupils, by contrast with the other two groups, were overwhelmingly born in the UK, with just one or two born in Bangladesh. English was much more often described by Bangladeshi pupils as their first language, or joint first language, than was the case for other groups. Bangladeshi pupils were split evenly between those saying their first language was English, and those saying Bengali. Amongst those who said Bengali, however, many described both Bengali and English as their first language. Also in contrast to the other minority ethnic groups, one or two Bangladeshi pupils had one parent who had been born in the UK, and although not explored in this research it could be supposed from general patterns of migration to the UK (Cohen, 1995) that a number of Bangladeshi pupils’ parents may have come to the UK at a young age.

It was clear that language was a defining element of pupils’ cultural identity, and that a great deal of communication between pupils in the school environment took place in their mother tongue. This represented another identifiable difference between the Bangladeshi groups and the other ethnicities: Turkish and Somali pupils spoke their mother tongue frequently at school with their peers, where Bangladeshi pupils did not appear to do this. Some of the participants in the Turkish and Somali focus groups reverted to their mother tongue between themselves during the groups, sometimes to assist a colleague who had not understood a question, but also simply as the default language for informal chatting between themselves. This was not the case in the Bangladeshi groups. It seems likely that this propensity for Somali and Turkish pupils to speak their mother tongue is a reflection of their preferred language in the home environment, but was also significant in their relationship with teachers. Where some teachers allowed pupils to speak their mother tongue in class, others did not. From the pupil perspective, this could seem unnecessarily punitive and compromise

---

the relationship of trust between pupil and teacher. This is discussed further in subsequent sections.

**Local environment and integration**

Pupils were asked to discuss the local area in which they lived. There were very mixed feelings in terms of like or dislike of the local environment, regardless of ethnicity or school CVA score. There were clear themes, however, contributing to young people’s views on their local area. Pupils tended to live in the immediate area surrounding the school, and often within local communities where there were plenty of people from their own ethnic background. Many pupils from all ethnic groups said that they had extended family living close by, and pupils often described close extended family relationships, including close friendships with their cousins.

Although pupils described a close-knit local community environment, they were conscious of potential threats existing in their local area. An impression was created of pupils existing in an environment where there were contrasting protective influences from family and community, existing alongside an acute awareness of external dangers.

“The people outside, they don't know you and you don't know them. So you can't actually trust them”

Kurdish High CVA (1036-1025) - Year 8&9 - Female

There were frequent mentions of the evidence of crime in the local neighbourhood, and visible antisocial or aggressive behaviour. Pupils were highly conscious of these threats, and found them concerning and upsetting.

"Some people shout at night times. Swearing and fights. I don't like those things."

Kurdish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Year 8&9 - Female

Racially motivated aggression was also occasionally mentioned as a feature of the local area, and this was more frequently mentioned by the Turkish, Kurdish and Somali pupils than by the Bangladeshi pupils. A few Turkish and Somali participants described bullying or fights motivated by race, and also that they had been verbally abused in their local area because of their race. It was noted that not all had witnessed specific aggressive acts at first hand, but that pupils had a sense that hostility may exist towards them based on their ethnicity. This was particularly the case where there was no significant presence of their particular ethnic community in their local area.

“Some people when they're with their friends, they make racist comments”

Somali - Low CVA (988-979) – Year 9 - Female

Overwhelmingly, pupils valued integration between people of different ethnicities, and felt it was important that people from different backgrounds should have the opportunity to mix together. They rejected the idea of selecting friends based on their ethnicity, and described having friends from many different minority ethnic groups. Participants often saw school as an opportunity to mix with people from other minority ethnic groups.

"In school there are different cultures and backgrounds so you do have to work with them and get along. It's a really good experience."

Somali - High CVA (1036-1025) - Year 10&11 – Male
"When we're outside it's just the Bengalis but in school we'll mix."

Bangladeshi - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 9&10 - Mixed

The only exceptions to this were for participants attending schools with a very high concentration of people from their own minority ethnic background. These pupils saw more opportunity to mix in the outside world than in school.

"Now that we're in year 11 we're going to leave soon so I tend to mix with everyone a bit more than I would before"

Bangladeshi - Medium CVA (1000-997) – Year 11 - Female

This opportunity to mix within the school environment seemed to have a particular significance for Kurdish pupils, who felt that divisions between Turkish and Kurdish people existed in Turkey, and occasionally in their local area, but not at school.

“Turkish and Kurdish people stick together - there's no difference, we speak the same language, and we have the same culture.”

Turkish - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 10 – Male

Having said this, pupils also described feeling closer to friends from their own minority ethnic group. This was most often mentioned by Turkish pupils, who expressed the importance of their identity as a group. There was also a sense of loyalty towards people from a similar minority ethnic background, and Turkish boys in particular talked about the fact that they would be more likely to band together along ethnic lines in the face of aggression from another group.

“You mix better with Turkish people cos you understand them more... you have the same feelings. But Somali people are different.”

Turkish – Low CVA (988-979) - Year 10 – Male

Cultural identity

This was a complex issue from the perspective that variations existed within as well as between ethnicities. As already described, Somali pupils had followed a number of different routes to the UK, and there were as many as 3 groups incorporated in the Turkish sample, including Turkish mainland, Turkish Cypriot and Kurdish. In addition, there were those born in the UK and those born elsewhere included in the same focus groups. Findings are therefore necessarily generalised to a certain extent, and do not necessarily apply to all participants in each group.

Bangladeshi pupils had a strong sense of cultural identity, as expressed in their religion, values and customs. They accepted Bangladeshi culture, and had an expectation that they would live their lives according to it. Bangladeshi pupils described their background and culture with pride, and had an understanding that Bangladeshi cultural values, particularly in relation to school and career achievement, would support and assist them in achieving their goals.

Although overwhelmingly born in the UK, Bangladeshi pupils had strong links with ‘back home’, in the form of frequent visits to Bangladesh. Such contact gave them an understanding of hardships faced by people living in their country, and an appreciation of the opportunities that exist for them. Having said this, they did not always speak fluent Bengali or Sylheti, and so could be considered to have less of a ‘connection’ in linguistic terms.
Turkish and Kurdish pupils also felt a strong connection with ‘homeland’, and made regular visits. Turkish pupils appeared to have a strong identity as a group, based on their shared cultural heritage and language. It was clear that Turkish media was consumed at home, and this influenced some of the Turkish and Kurdish young people’s responses to the research questions. For example, participants referred to the influence of Turkish TV programmes when asked about future aspirations.

Turkish and Kurdish pupils mixed together within friendship groups, and there was an acknowledgement of their shared cultural heritage. There was also evidence, however, of tensions between the two groups in some cases, both inside and outside schools. This tended to take the form of some of the Kurdish pupils feeling that they were victimised to some extent by Turkish pupils. A few Turkish pupils also described a level of enmity between Turkish and Kurdish people, saying that Kurdish people disliked Turkish people. This tension appeared to be more of a concern outside school than within school.

“These days its like split up. Turkish and Kurdish people. It's like different people but they come from the same culture.”

Turkish - High CVA (1036-1025) – Years 8&9 - Female

"Some of the Turkish people are racist...In Turkey, we were enemies to them."

Kurdish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 – Female

"It's not something affecting our friendship"

Turkish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 - Female

Somali pupils were less likely to talk about ‘back home’, although they did have a strong sense of cultural heritage, particularly as expressed in their religion. As with the Bangladeshi group, Somali pupils understood that the values of their culture highlighted the importance of learning and achievement. Parents were felt to exert a strong pressure on Somali pupils to succeed at school.

Somali pupils had features of a ‘transitional’ population, in that many of them had migrated to a different country more than once in the last ten years. Of the 3 groups, they were most likely to say that they were victimised in the classroom by teachers who did not understand them. There was also a sense that Somali pupils felt the more acute need to find acceptance in the school environment. This will be explored further in subsequent sections.

Home influences

Participants were asked about their household size in a self-completion questionnaire, and this raised some notably different responses between minority ethnic groups. Bangladeshi households had an average of six members, and Somali six and a half members. For both the Somali and Bangladeshi pupils in our sample, household size ranged from 4 to 12 members. For Turkish and Kurdish pupils, the average household size was smaller, at 4.5 members. As well as this lower average household size for Turkish pupils, the range was also much narrower, ranging from 3 to 8 members. There were differences also in the ratio of adults to children within households, with Turkish and Somali groups having a greater proportion of lone parent families.

Some household factors were explored during the discussions as potentially having an influence on pupils’ learning. These included the level of encouragement from parents or other family members to achieve at school and to complete homework, monitoring of homework by parents, and also the extent to which pupils could get support with their homework from parents or other family members.
Each minority ethnic group felt that their parents were keen for them to do well in school, and that their family and wider community placed a strong emphasis on achievement as a cultural value. This came across particularly strongly for the Somali and Bangladeshi pupils. Pupils from these groups felt that their parents’ high aspirations for them to succeed were based on a desire that their children should take advantage of improved opportunities, and do better in life than their parents had. For these two groups, there was a strong emphasis on the established professions, such as medicine, law and engineering. Turkish and Kurdish pupils were less likely than Bangladeshi and Somali pupils to say that their parents thought that it was important for them to join one of the established professions.

Pupils from Bangladeshi and Somali groups expressed pride in the fact that achievement in school was important in their culture and in their family, but high expectations also created a sense of pressure to succeed. This pressure to achieve extended beyond the immediate household environment, and into the realm of the wider community. Many pupils from all 3 minority ethnic groups therefore felt a pressure to succeed based on the concern that they would not achieve as well as others in their community.

“If you don’t get as good as what they’ve got, they won’t respect you as much in the family, so you have to be as good as them, or better. They just want you to do well.”

Turkish - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 10 - Male

Somali pupils in particular were often sent to private tutors to improve their school work, and recognised this as a reflection of their parents’ keenness for them to succeed. Many Turkish pupils also attended classes in core subjects at local community colleges. It emerged that several of their parents were also attending college to study English. It may be the case that pupils attended such additional classes because they were unable to get the help they needed at home.

For all ethnicities, parents were quite often cited as pupils’ single most important support in achieving well at school. They were thought to provide pupils with the motivation and impetus to succeed, as well as help with homework where they were able to.

“When I come home, my mum says ‘do you have any homework’, and if I say yes then she tells me to do it. But we don’t really get homework.”

Turkish - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 10 – Male

“I hate school and she knows that and I always get in trouble cos I hate it and I don’t want to come here and she pushes me to come, she nags about it and all that. If she weren’t there, there would be no such thing in school.” –

Somali - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 9 - Female

Others in the household also provided valued support with homework. Older siblings and cousins were in some cases preferred over parents as a source of support, as they had sat similar exams themselves in the past.

“My cousin (helps me) as she’s been through it. She knows what will come up in the exam.”

Bangladeshi – Medium CVA (1000-997) - Year 11 - Female

Parental enthusiasm for their children to achieve well in school did not always translate, however, into checking homework or supporting young people with their school work. There was a highly mixed picture, but some parents did not routinely check homework or support pupils with homework, although they emphasised its importance. This apparent paradox may be as a result of parents having difficulty in assisting their children with homework, or of
parents believing that the school should be responsible for ensuring that homework is completed.

The value on homework varied, especially by age group. As pupils moved into Key Stage 4, they placed a lower value on homework, and more on course work that would affect their grades. Transition into Key Stage 4 also increased pressure from parents upon pupils to demonstrate that their children were completing home work. It is possible that due to lack of understanding of the education system, parents were unable to distinguish between homework and coursework but simply looked for evidence of additional study.

Some pupils also described deceiving their parents by saying that they had done homework when they had not, or saying that they didn’t have any homework. There were indications from the staff research that where parents were not confident in English, or less confident about engaging with the school generally, they became highly reliant on their children to communicate honestly about their homework obligations, something that pupils did not always do.

"They (parents) do care about me doing my homework but they never see me do homework."

Kurdish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 - Female

**Attendance of supplementary schools**

Three main types of supplementary schooling were attended by pupils: religious education in the mosque or mardrasah, language classes in pupils’ mother tongue, and extra tutoring in academic subjects.

A number of students across all minority ethnic groups were attending religious instruction in their mosque or mardrasah. This was most frequent amongst Somali pupils, boys, and younger pupils. Older girls may have attended classes in the past, but had stopped upon reaching a certain age. This was also the case for some older boys. Attendance also seemed to be less frequent amongst older pupils overall, and amongst Turkish and Kurdish pupils.

In the classes, time was spent learning the Quran, and learning about prophets and events significant in their religion. Time spent on these lessons seemed to vary considerably, from daily to once a week. Most felt that classes did not interfere with their school work, and argued that they still had plenty of time for homework and revision. Only one or two instances were described where a conflict had occurred, resulting in pupils having to reduce time spent at the mosque in the run up to exams, or to ask the school for an extension on their homework. Some pupils felt that certain teachers understood their additional commitments, where others were harsh and inflexible regarding homework deadlines.

Kurdish and Turkish pupils were often attending a community centre or club where they received lessons in the Kurdish and Turkish languages, with a view to improving their skills, or achieving a GCSE.

Pupils from all minority ethnic groups were using tutors outside of school, usually in Maths, Science and English. This was most common amongst Somali pupils. Outside tutoring was considered helpful in providing one-to-one help that may be lacking in the school context. Pupils could ask for support in particular areas, and feel confident to ask questions in a private setting. It was noted in the staff research that outside tutoring might not necessarily link appropriately with the school curriculum, but this was not mentioned by pupils, however, many expressed a preference for extra-curricular classes provided by school over classes from external providers.
Gender issues

Pupils tended to feel strongly that there were no differences in expectations between girls and boys, in terms of the importance that their parents and communities placed on success at school and achievement in their careers. Further discussion, however, revealed differences in the experiences of boys and girls within the home, and insights as to the link between education and freedom for girls.

"Girls work more [in the home] than boys."

Kurdish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 – Female

"Because boys are more free, they go out more, they don't concentrate on their work... They go, oh' I'll do it later."

Turkish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 - Female

When asked to explain the differences in achievement between the genders at school, pupils tended to point to the differing roles of boys and girls within the home. Girls tended to spend more time in the home, and felt that they held a position of responsibility for supporting their parents. Girls were thought to be naturally more mature and focused, and to achieve more highly as a result of this. Female pupils also said that they had less free time than boys, and were more educationally focused as a result.

Boys, on the other hand, were thought to spend more time going out and enjoying relative freedom from responsibility. Boys described this freedom in terms of ‘having more things to do’ than girls. Boys were more likely to attend supplementary schools for religious instruction, and to spend more time there.

"They (girls) don't go out. They just stay at home and revise. But the boys go out."

Somali - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 10&11 – Male

"Boys mostly go out. They go inside a gang and then they come home at 10 or 11."

Kurdish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 – Female

"Because they're a boy, they're allowed to go out."

Turkish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 - Female

This was thought to be reflected in the classroom, where boys were more often responsible for bad behaviour, and therefore less focused than girls were on their school work during lessons. Interestingly, one Somali girl described what she perceived as the conflicting position of boys in the classroom, in the form of a greater pressure than girls to gain ‘respect’ from peers through bad behaviour.

"I think it's because like boys are more like worried about how people from their own age, their own group think of them, rather than like on a bigger scale ... girls probably like want to do well in everything and they don't like think about ‘oh if I do this, well someone's going to call me this or that or this or that.’ Boys feel pressure to like ... to you know people not going to give them respect and stuff like that. Like gangs."

Somali - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 9 - Female

Girls were more likely than boys to spontaneously describe strong female role models within their families, schools or wider community. The importance of role models was echoed in the staff research, with some staff attributing poor behaviour from boys to the lack of a strong
male role model in one-parent families. Role models were also more frequently mentioned by Bangladeshi participants than by other minority ethnic groups. There were more Bangladeshi staff in teaching roles, and more examples of people holding professional occupations in the Bangladeshi community.

Gender differences were also apparent when pupils discussed their future aspirations. Although they maintained that parental aspirations were similar for boys and girls, there was an acceptance amongst girls that marriage would have a bearing on their future. Educational achievement was viewed by some girls across all groups as a route to independence and freedom, and an opportunity to delay marriage. However, this did not appear to be a dominant issue, as many girls were pushed by their mothers to pursue their education rather than to marry early as they had.

"I don't get it. You learn a lot yeah, but at the end of the day you're gonna get married and have kids, you're not gonna do anything else."

Somali - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 9 – Female

"If my husband isn't ok with it [letting me work after marriage], then I'm not marrying him"

Bangladeshi – High CVA (1036-1025) - Year 11 – Female

"Hopefully I won't have to get married first. I don't mind getting married but I don't want to be married and not be able to finish my education."

Bangladeshi - Low CVA (988-979) - Years 9&10 – Mixed

6.4.2 Teaching and learning

Relationships with teachers

Pupils’ perceptions of their relationships with teachers had an important effect on their overall experience of school. Pupils were animated when discussing their experiences of interactions with particular teachers, both positive and negative, and raised this topic spontaneously. The importance of this aspect of the school experience was highlighted by the fact that some groups found it difficult to ‘get beyond’ the issue of relationships with teachers to discuss subject preferences. When asked which subjects they liked best, pupils simply talked about those subjects where they felt they had a good relationship with the teacher, or respected the teacher’s ability to control the class, rather than discussing their reasons for liking the subject itself.

"If you like the teacher you’ll do the work but if you don't like the teacher you don't want to do it."

Turkish - Medium CVA (1000-997) - Year 8 – Male

"Sometimes you want to go to the lesson because you know you're going to have fun but if you know the teacher is moody and can't teach you're like 'oh I don't want to go to that lesson.'"

Bangladeshi - Low CVA (988-979) - Years 9&10 – Mixed

Classroom disruption and bad behaviour was frequently cited as the major barrier to learning, and a teacher’s ability to handle classroom disruption well was important in defining pupil perceptions of their teacher. Pupils described an ideal relationship with a teacher as one where the teacher was able to control the class as a result of fostering mutual respect...
between themselves and the pupils. An ideal classroom environment was therefore one where pupils could trust their teacher to be ‘strict’ when required, but where pupils felt that they had some leeway in terms of how they were expected to behave in class. For example, one pupil talked about preferring lessons where the environment was quiet rather than chaotic, but that he would not necessarily be expected to sit quietly for the whole lesson. This sentiment was mirrored by many pupils across the research.

"You know how some teachers yeah, they like, they try to understand like what is going on from the student's point of view and that's what makes them a good teacher. It doesn't like necessarily mean they have to be so kind or so strict, but they have to be, when it's appropriate they have to be strict and they have to keep calm and like try to understand. Some teachers, if a student's upset they just add more fuel to the fire, because …. they don't even try to understand what's happened. (I have one teacher who) because of the whole class behaviour she takes it out on our grades and that's not ethical."

Somali - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 9 - Female

Incidences where pupils felt that classroom disruption was not handled well tended to involve a teacher ignoring a chaotic situation in the classroom, or failing to take action to handle a disruptive environment. In these situations, pupils felt that it was made difficult for them to concentrate on the lesson, as the lesson was out of control.

Even more serious were scenarios where pupils felt that they had been punished unfairly, or that the reason for the disruption had not been understood by the teacher. This had the effect of seriously undermining trust in the teacher, and in some cases pupils felt victimised by their teachers. There were a number of examples from young people who said that they felt victimised or disliked by teachers, or judged on the basis of past bad behaviour. Where this was the case, it tended to dominate pupils’ perceptions of a particular subject class. It was notable that these scenarios were more frequently mentioned in low CVA schools.

In the case of one particular school, pupils mentioned, albeit tentatively, that they felt their teachers were ‘prejudiced’, and that they didn’t like certain pupils. Although the topic was initially raised by a pupil when discussing their dissatisfaction with the uniform policy, further discussion revealed what seemed to be an adversarial relationship between teachers and pupils, which pupils partly attributed to teachers’ ‘prejudice’. Although pupils did not expressly say that some of their teachers displayed racial prejudice, this was inferred. There was a sense amongst pupils in this school that they were not well understood by teachers, and that this resulted in victimisation.

"They're kind of racist yeah, because they don't let us wear our religious thing, the abbaya, and they let the Asians wear their traditional thing."

"One thing I think could be improved is that I feel like our school is, can sometimes be quite prejudiced"

"They look down on us, just because we're different" (Why are you different?) "I don't know, like basically they look down on most people"

Somali - Low CVA (988-979) – Year 9 - Female

In another of the low CVA schools, pupils discussed the fact that they were not allowed to speak their mother tongue in lessons. They saw this as a misjudgement by the teacher, who made the erroneous assumption that pupils must be using bad language or making negative comments about the teacher. Pupils said that, in fact, they were often helping their friends with work, or having a discussion about the lesson. This did not help to foster an environment of trust between teachers and pupils. Also, as mentioned previously, it was observed during the research that pupils helped classmates who were less confident in
English to contribute to the focus group. It may be that preventing mother tongue discussion during lessons could inhibit this supportive peer interaction.

There was strong evidence that pupils respond well to positive support and encouragement from their teachers. Pupils were very aware of the extent to which their teachers had high expectations of them, and this positively influenced their feelings about a subject. Pupils felt supported by high expectations, and thought that teachers who expected them to succeed really cared about them. Given the importance of teacher relationships to the school experience, it was clear that those who lacked this sense of high expectations and encouragement were likely to have a more negative experience of school overall. In classrooms where pupils felt more supported, they displayed more confidence and willingness to ask for help where required. In classrooms where pupils felt uncomfortable they were less likely to ask for help for fear of being ignored or embarrassed by the teacher.

There were many more mentions of positive teacher relationships and verbal encouragement from teachers in the groups within higher CVA schools. Pupils in the higher CVA schools appeared to have more respect for their teachers, and to feel that teachers were on their side. In one example, it was said that teachers would recognise that pupils had not understood elements of the work and would re-explain concepts to the whole class, rather than singling out pupils who did not understand. In another example, teachers would quietly approach pupils who appeared to be struggling, and offer one-on-one support.

"There's some teachers that, if there's bad behaviour or something happening in the classroom they don't really care but some teachers care about the situation. They try to find out what's happening."

Somali - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 10&11 - Male

Turkish pupils in particular mentioned the positive effects of being able to 'connect' with teachers of the same ethnicity. This is of interest given the strong group identity that could be observed amongst Turkish pupils, based on their common culture and language. Turkish pupils felt that they could be properly understood by a teacher who spoke their language.

"Our French teacher is Turkish as well, so he understands us, how we feel. But because all the other teachers are English, they can't quite understand us. We're Turkish so they can't understand us that much."

Kurdish - High CVA (1036-1025) Years 8&9 - Female

Preferences for learning formats

Pupils spoke passionately about their preferences for the lesson formats, teaching styles, and classroom atmospheres that were most conducive to their learning. They expressed their views on preferred lesson format in an animated and articulate way and, as with teacher relationships, lesson format was clearly something that was important to them in determining their overall school experience. In many cases lesson format, combined with like or dislike of the teacher, were the main determining factors in pupils' subject preferences. Lesson format was therefore highlighted as one of the primary reasons for preferring some subjects over others. Subject preferences are therefore included in this section, although there was little consistency around subject preferences across the sample as a whole, or any of the sub-samples based on ethnicity or CVA scores.

There was a strong preference overall for lessons that demanded pupils to give something of themselves, rather than simply receiving information from the teacher. Lessons that included, for example, opportunity for discussion or to express creativity, were strongly preferred, as were those that were considered more hands on, or practical, than simply
theoretical. Science, English, Art and Drama offered such opportunities. Particularly disliked were lessons which consisted solely of copying from the board.

Pupils preferred classroom environments offering a balance between order and quiet, and the ability to relax and engage in some discussion with classmates. They also preferred lessons where the teacher provided plenty of verbal explanation of the subject to help pupils improve their understanding.

Many pupils from all ethnicities described difficulty in understanding what the teacher was saying in certain lessons, and that certain teachers provided clearer verbal explanations. This could be linked to concerns raised in the staff interviews that teachers’ use of academic language could inhibit access to the curriculum. Visual representations on the whiteboard, or use of pictures and graphics were considered helpful to pupils’ understanding, and made lessons more engaging.

“Teachers should use simpler sentences, like words we can understand.”

“That single word makes sure you understand the whole subject”

"There's too much English involved."

Somali - High CVA (1036-1025) – Years 10&11 – Male

"It's hard when they're talking about something you don't know. You just don't understand ... but they'd explain it if you don't understand it."

Kurdish - Medium CVA (1000-997) - Years 7&8 – Mixed

Subject preferences, therefore, were more often about teacher and lesson format preferences than about particular subject preferences. Somali pupils at all levels often said that they liked Maths, and is consistent with a view presented in the staff research that there is a strong value placed on learning in Maths and Science for Somali pupils. Although some Somali pupils were clearly performing well in this area, there were also those who did not enjoy Maths.

There was little consistency in terms of subject preferences across other groups. However, Maths, Science and English were often seen as ‘important’ subjects in order to prepare for the future. It emerged that many pupils disliked foreign language subjects.

In high CVA schools there was a policy of showing pupils how their grades had progressed throughout the year in order to give them the impetus to improve.

Support available for pupils in improving attainment

The issue of support available in schools was a difficult one for students to reflect upon. Although it was clear from staff interviews that young people were receiving support of various kinds within schools, pupils did not necessarily mention these or identify measures as supportive. When asked what support was available to them, pupils often focused on aspects such as individual support given to them by the teacher in the lesson, or on support coming from influences outside the school context.

As well as specific support to improve performance in a particular subject, pastoral support was also mentioned. This could take the form of informal counselling, or even reminders about the importance of learning, or the need to start revising in advance of exams. Positive encouragement was also regarded as highly supportive.

Pupils mentioned a number of potential sources of support within the school. Teachers, learning mentors, form tutors, and teaching assistants could be approached for help.
Although pupils were aware of these sources of support, it was not clear whether they would be likely to approach them. Some pupils felt that it would be difficult or embarrassing to ask for support. Propensity to ask for help seemed to be at least in part down to their perceptions of the likely response from the teacher, with some teachers seen as more likely to be helpful. Given the importance of trust in teachers it is clear that more trusted teachers would be more likely to be approached. Pupils in higher CVA schools were more likely to be able to identify an individual who would be likely to respond to requests for support.

"I reckon I can just go and ask her anything and she'll help me out, because she's quite good at helping, but if she doesn't know something, then she'll go and try and ask someone else to help you."

Bangladeshi - Medium CVA (1000-997) - Year 11 – Female

"He'll (Deputy Head and EMA lead) always be there for you if you need him. He'll try and solve a problem that you probably couldn't do on your own."

Somali - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 10&11 – Male

"My teacher, she says 'I'm your parent'. She looks after us."

Turkish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 - Female

Individual support from class teachers was valuable, although not all teachers offered this, and it could be difficult to ask for support within the lesson. After school clubs were available in some schools, and these were seen as helpful where they were available.

"Sometimes the teacher will see you struggling but they won't come and ask if you're ok."

Bangladeshi - Low CVA (988-979) - Years 9&10 – Mixed

"They just put it in front of us sometimes. They do explain but if you don't get it they just say 'just get on with it.'"

Kurdish - Medium CVA (1000-997) - Years 7&8 - Mixed

Staff research revealed that learning mentors and learning support teachers had had a very positive influence on performance in some schools, particularly in improving attendance and behaviour. Pupils also said that they found their learning mentors helpful and supportive in a pastoral sense, as well as in discussing difficulties with particular subjects. Learning mentors also provided learning support to pupils who had difficulty in understanding aspects of the lesson.

"Some Turkish teachers come into our lesson and if you don't understand something they explain in Turkish."

Turkish - Low CVA (988-979) - Years 8&9 – Male

There was also evidence from the pupil perspective, however, that being assigned a learning mentor could be stigmatising. A few pupils mentioned that they could feel that they had been singled out as in need of support, or even that they had been targeted because of their ethnicity. Instances were described of pupils being teased for receiving learning support.

"That learning support teacher, she always go to the Turkish people...She thinks Turkish people are dumb."

Turkish - Medium CVA (1000-997) - Year 8 - Male
Some pupils were removed from their main lessons for learning support, often to improve their English. Although this was described as helpful, pupils were also concerned about falling behind in lessons that they missed in order to attend learning support.

"You miss out on maths and your level goes down...but you still go to English."

Turkish - Medium CVA (1000-997) - Year 8 – Male

"Always further English can't just help your education. There has to be maths and science too. Maths, Science and English are the most important lessons for me."

Kurdish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 - Female

Peers were also seen as an important source of support, both within lessons and outside school. Classmates could provide support in lessons where it was difficult to understand the teacher.

"Sometimes if you don't understand something and there's someone sitting next to you, you can ask them."

Bangladeshi - Low CVA (988-979) - Years 9&10 – Mixed

When asked about their most important source of support, pupils most often mentioned their parents. Parents provided the necessary impetus to encourage pupils to want to perform well in school, and also provided help with homework and revision.

Tutors were also mentioned by Somali and Bangladeshi students as a source of support with their learning.

"My mum takes me like to some tutoring thing… and she pays a lot of money and she tells me to learn"

Somali - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 9 - Female

When asked to describe what support they would like that was not already available to them, pupils tended to focus on the classroom teacher, saying that they would prefer more individual attention within the class. It appeared that pupils did not always feel able to ask school staff for support that was needed, resulting on a reliance on peers and other sources. This was the case even where support had clearly been offered, and the appropriate source in the shape of a form tutor or mentor had been identified. This reticence to proactively seek support could stem from problems in pupils’ relationships with teachers, or in pupils feeling too embarrassed to ask for support. These barriers to seeking support were less likely to be mentioned in the high CVA schools.

“Sometimes you have to ask for support and you will get it but sometime you’re scared to ask because you feel dumb.”

“Sometime the teacher asks you ‘are you doing ok? Do you need any help?’ That’s nice, when they come up to you individually, because then you don’t need to put your hand up in front of everyone.”

“Sometimes you don’t want to speak up because then you think you're the odd one out.”

Bangladeshi - Low CVA (988-979) - Years 9&10 – Mixed

When discussing their attainment, pupils said that they sometimes found it difficult to ascertain how well they were doing in school. This was most often mentioned by pupils in
low CVA schools, who felt that it would be helpful to have a clearer understanding of their progress.

"They could tell you your weak points, but they never do ... so you don't know like where to improve on, what's making you have a low level"

Somali - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 9 – Female

"He'll (mentor) tell us if we're doing bad or if we're doing good. Most teachers won't tell us if we're bad or good, they'll just say we're ok."

Bangladeshi - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 9&10 - Mixed

Acknowledgement of diversity within schools

Ethnic diversity was acknowledged and celebrated within schools in a number of different ways. There were specific events, acknowledgement of religious festivals, and some content within the curriculum, mainly in RE. Younger pupils in one or two schools talked of opportunities to bring in items or to talk about their culture in school, although this was less frequent than had been the case when they were at primary school.

Pupils saw benefits to learning about other cultures within the school, though not necessarily their own. It was considered interesting and informative to learn about other cultures, and one pupil commented that this would help newcomers from different countries. If other pupils understood more about their culture, they would be less likely to bully a newcomer. In this sense, pupils saw inclusion of information about cultures other than their own as protective against prejudice and exclusion. As well as benefiting newcomers, there were comments that indicated pupils also felt that events celebrating their culture would help other groups in the school to understand them.

"RE also prevents people from judging other religions without knowing about them. You learn more about your friends because you learn about their religions."

Somali - Low CVA (988-979) – Years 9&10 – Female

"It's good. It puts everyone together and you get to know about each other."

"It's like they care about Turkey, not just about England."

Turkish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 - Female

Despite this, it was not particularly seen as a priority for pupils to learn about their own culture within the school, as this was something they were able to do at home. They had adequate opportunities to learn about their language, religion and customs at home or as part of religious instruction, where it was more appropriate for school work to be the main focus at school.

"It's not really important. you can learn it at home...I think like English, those lessons are more important."

Kurdish - High CVA (1036-1025) - Years 8&9 - Female

In some schools, there appeared to be a particularly strong ethos of valuing diversity and inclusion, and there was a strong awareness amongst pupils that this was part of the identity of the schools. This was more often the case in high or medium CVA schools. In such schools, there were also notably fewer negative comments about relationships with teachers. In one high CVA school in particular, pupils were aware that diversity and inclusion were strongly valued by the senior leadership team in the school. It is hypothesised that,
given the critical importance of relationships with teachers, that this had a considerable positive impact on pupils’ experience of school.

6.4.3 Future aspirations
Pupils were asked to describe their aspirations for the future, as well as any barriers to achieving their goals, and support needed to achieve them.

The family and wider community clearly had a strong influence on young people’s aspirations for their future. Pupils of all ethnicities experienced a pressure to succeed, but there were differences between the minority ethnic groups in terms of what represented a successful career. Somali and Bangladeshi groups were strongly oriented towards established professions, such as law and medicine. Turkish and Kurdish pupils were often less clear in their career aspirations, and some talked of joining their family business.

Other desirable professions for males included being a business person, airline pilot, engineer, teacher, policeman or footballer. Girls more often mentioned professions such as teaching and child care. In the Bangladeshi community, they were already aware of women who do these jobs. Some focused on the desire to go to University rather than on their career aims.

When asked how to go about achieving their goals, few had a clear understanding of the steps required. More often, they described the need to ‘work hard’, or to ‘stay focused’. Though pupils understood the need to get ‘good grades’ in order to achieve their goals, there was a poor understanding of precise grades, qualifications or application processes required.

“Not get a criminal record, get good grades.”
Turkish - Low CVA (988-979) – Year 10 – Male

“Work, work and more work”
Somali - Low CVA (988-979) - Year 9 – Female

“You need to get good grades.”
Bangladeshi - Low CVA (988-979) - Years 9&10 - Mixed

This would be consistent with the notion that although families were supportive in providing positive pressure and encouragement to young people to achieve well at school, they were not necessarily able to provide the specific knowledge and support required to help young people to achieve their goals.

6.5 Conclusions
The evidence of this chapter demonstrates that in terms of some of the main attitudinal factors influencing educational attainment, there are greater commonalities between the Bangladeshi and Somali groups, with the Turkish and Kurdish groups holding different attitudes. Bangladeshi and Somali groups value the importance of education very highly, and regard educational attainment as a key determinant of success. They also shared similar views on desirable careers. Bangladeshi pupils had notably more role models available to them in their local communities than did the other groups.

School staff tended to feel that an important determinant of young peoples’ attainment was their parents’ ability to assimilate into UK society, and parental understanding of the British
education system. The fact that parents are a key influence on school attainment was echoed in the pupils' research. Clearly, this would provide Bangladeshi pupils with an advantage, as they had lived in the UK for longer than other groups.

Although language did appear to be an important barrier to attainment amongst the key groups, this was not necessarily straightforward. Rather than comprehension of English per se, it appeared that use of academic and conceptual language presented barriers to all pupils with English as an additional language.

Local authorities and teachers also highlighted the importance of cultural context. They felt that it may be important not to assume that learners had a full understanding of UK culture when planning lessons and classroom materials. If lessons were heavily reliant on examples from UK culture, this could mean that those not born in the UK could be disadvantaged. Of the three groups relevant to this study, Bangladeshi pupils would be most likely to benefit.

Lesson format and teacher relationships appeared to be the strongest determinants of pupils' experience of school, and good teacher relationships mattered to pupils when they needed support. In circumstances where this was poor, pupils found it hard to 'get beyond' this issue to think about their subject preferences. There appeared to be identifiable areas of good practice in high CVA schools, which were noted and valued by pupils. This included good teacher-pupil relationships, greater positive encouragement for pupils, a strong ethos of celebrating diversity, and fewer barriers to pupils in asking for help and support.
7 Parents

7.1 Introduction
The research used qualitative research methods to explore from the perspective of parents of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils, the factors that may account for the differences in achievement among pupils from these three minority ethnic groups. The approach combined both focus groups and in-depth interviews.

7.2 Profile of minority ethnic communities in the sample
While each of the three minority ethnic communities on which the research focuses is internally diverse, they can also be broadly profiled as followed.

The Bangladeshi community is well-established. The vast majority of Bangladeshi parents in the sample had migrated to the UK as young children and had lived in England ever since. In nearly all Bangladeshi households, one parent spoke at least basic English. The migration of both the Turkish and Somali communities to the UK is more recent. Some of the Turkish and Somali respondents in the research had themselves migrated very recently and were still grappling with the difficulties which new migrants face.

“
In our community, some parents were born and brought up here. That’s why they [Bangladeshi children] are doing better. They [parents] know exactly what to do, where they want to send them to school and what to get out of education. They are educated now. Before they did not know.” (Bangladeshi father)

Both the Bangladeshi and the Turkish respondents had come to the UK as economic migrants. The Somali research participants were all first-generation migrants who had arrived in the UK as refugees between 5 and 20 years ago. Somali parents tended to be better educated than first-generation Bangladeshi and Turkish parents. The vast majority of the Somali parents in the sample were secondary migrants who had initially lived for more than a decade in various European countries (mainly the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and Norway) and then moved to the UK. Many continued to dream of returning to Somalia when the political situation allowed them to do so. As refugees, many had lived in temporary accommodation and had to be moved from one area to another, often at short notice. Both parents and children found it extremely difficult to have to adjust, repeatedly and with limited support, to new social environments and new schools. Most of the Somali women in the sample were also lone-parents.

“We came here as refugees. A lot were against regime. They fear for their lives but they are city people, professionals back home, not all but some. They have an education. They want their children to do well but here they don’t really understand and they are very confused.” (Somali father)

Across all three communities, respondents tended to live in areas of high deprivation. They complained of poor environmental conditions, poor housing and welfare services, high crime rates and general anti-social behaviour (especially among male youth).

“Where we live, there is fighting all the time, not just in schools and everywhere around. Sometimes the police come. Rough. Very rough area.” (Somali mother)

“It is also a geographical issue. Hackney, Haringey, Finsbury Park, Manor House, Newton Green, certain areas where there’s lots of concentration of Turks, Turkish
Cypriots and other communities. These are areas where people go because they are comfortable with the communities. But these are not good areas. The schools are probably not as good as in more affluent areas. There is a lot of crime but also because these are new communities that are poor, all services are a bit stretched. They can't cope.” (Turkish father)

Most fathers were poorly educated, but spoke and read some English and worked in low-paid jobs. Most mothers were poorly educated, spoke little or no English and were economically inactive. However, because the Bangladeshi community had been established for a longer period of time, as a whole, more Bangladeshi than either Turkish or Somali parents now spoke and read English, were working, had become somewhat acculturated and had at least some understanding of the English educational system.

In the Bangladeshi and Somali communities, households were considerably larger than in the Turkish community. It was the norm for Bangladeshi and Somali parents in the sample to have four or more children. This created a range of economic, housing and logistical difficulties which the Turkish community was less likely to have to face. Many Somali mothers in the sample headed their households. Fathers were often absent (sometimes because they were dead, still in Somalia or estranged from their wives, sometimes due to domestic violence) and therefore had no input in their children's education.

7.3 Experience of migration

Regardless of their individual circumstances, the research participants who were themselves migrants all reported that the experience of migration had been very difficult. Communication in English was problematic in all communities, especially among women, those who migrated as adults, and those who were not literate in their mother tongue. This was an ongoing problem in the three communities.

“Definitely lack of being able to speak English is the biggest barrier to our community. And personally, I think, you know, this doesn’t change. I mean, some people learn, they speak a bit, but it is very difficult.” (Turkish father)

Research participants widely reported difficulties doing shopping, finding paid work, banking, obtaining adequate health care, getting a house, and dealing with schools. Many were also separated from their nuclear and extended families, and experienced social isolation, discrimination and racial harassment. As a result, they tended to lead their lives largely within the confines of their own community and to rely on English-speaking members of the community, as well as their own children, to act as interpreters and to pass on essential information. In some cases, people’s immigration status further complicated matters and made it difficult for individuals to seek help or to report problems to authorities.

“We had difficulties understanding the systems here. We couldn’t read any letters. We found it hard to understand what the doctors were telling us and what the teachers used to tell about our children.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“It was difficult because I did not understand English and communication with others was difficult. The weather was too cold and we did not have enough money to buy warm clothes. We were also staying with relatives in an overcrowded two bedroom flat.” (Somali mother)

“You have the children, the college. If you are not speaking English, you can’t get work. You have to think about the house, family, all these things. It is too much, too much going on in your head, and you can’t do anything.” (Turkish mother)
In all communities, some respondents also discussed experiencing a “culture shock”. Even basic social norms, such as how to greet people, needed to be learned. The process of adapting and integrating was coupled with anxieties over losing one’s cultural identity, language and faith. Parents were particularly concerned over youth culture.

“I did not know even how to address a non-Muslim, whether to say to them: Assalamu Aleykum.” (Somali mother)

“We are afraid to lose our identity, our culture and our religion and, because of that, we do not want to assimilate with the other communities. But we have good relations with other Muslim communities.” (Somali father)

“There are many things to adapt to and many things that you don’t want to adapt to! I thought the food was not good, the way women dressed did not appeal to me and youth violence scares me. I don’t have confidence in leaving my children out here.” (Bangladeshi father)

While all these factors taken individually may have been hard to manage, it was their cumulative impact which took its toll. Thus, a number of respondents said that they experienced feelings of disempowerment, chronic anxiety, stress and depression. These were most acute in the period immediately following migration – and thus more likely to be experienced still among Turkish and Somali households (by both parents and children) - but many of the feelings endured and were discussed as ongoing stresses.

“It is like a weight on my head, really, a depression. I feel as though I am never without worries about something. Every day I am worrying about this and that, work, children, children’s school. I have no one who can help me.” (Turkish father)

“It is too much. You can’t deal with things. You don’t understand and you feel completely alone. I get very, very low so I take medication [for depression].” (Bangladeshi mother)

Among the respondents who arrived in the UK as young children or who were born here, many of the above difficulties were discussed in relation to their parents. They personally felt the burden of having to support their parents and to honour their sacrifices by seeking to achieve more and to behave in ways which would please their parents (especially among the Bangladeshi community). But they also reported finding it difficult to learn English, to adapt to school and to make friends. Many commented that society in general, and schools in particular, had now become more diverse, better able to cater for this growing diversity and less tolerant of racial discrimination compared to when they or their parents first arrived.

“Now it is improving, education, facilities, all these things. That time we couldn’t find *halal* food. It was the big problem for our Muslim community. Now everything has opened. There is a big community there, community facilities, good food, relatives, transport. So many things are improving in this country.” (Bangladeshi mother)

Thus, despite important differences between and within the Bangladeshi, Turkish and Somali communities, all three groups shared similar difficulties linked to their relatively recent migrant status. Since communication in English and understanding of the ways in which institutions work in the UK, including education, tended to be poor across all three communities, parents’ general self-confidence and ability to understand what is happening in schools, to support their children’s curricular work, and to engage meaningfully with schools when they perceive the need to do so, were all more limited than in the general population.
7.4 Comparative experiences of education

As the profile of the communities indicates, most parents in the sample had not been schooled in England (except for some in the Bangladeshi community and a handful in the Turkish community). Parents were therefore invited to compare their schooling experiences (usually in their country of birth) with that of their children. The aim was to better understand in what ways and to what extent parents' own educational experiences and achievements impacted on their understanding of their children’s education, on their ability to support their children and, ultimately, on their children’s educational achievements.

Across all three minority ethnic groups, the main differences noted between English schools and schools in Bangladesh, Turkey and Somalia were the fact that:

- **Education takes place in English:** This basic fact was noted by all. Difficulty with the English language was not only a problem for the pupils. It was also an issue for parents, because they had no simple way of acquiring information about what is going on in school, what is expected of their children and of them as parents, how the education system works, how to assess the quality of local schools (other than through word of mouth), what children are learning, how to help with homework, etc.

  “It’s all in English so we don’t really know what is happening in school. We can’t even read the letters sent by school.” (Somali mother)

- **Education in England is free and compulsory until the age of 16:** Many parents were very positive about the fact that education is free and compulsory in England until the age of 16. This was not the case in parents’ country of origin, which often led to the prioritisation of education for boys and to highly variable standards of education according to people’s ability to pay for their schooling.

  “In Bangladesh, you have to pay fees after 5th standard [primary school], so parents who can’t afford to pay the fees don’t send the children to school. Many children don’t get the chance to study because their parents can’t afford to pay the school fees.” (Bangladeshi mother)

- **The system is different:** Many parents lacked an understanding of the education system in England. They understood how primary schools functioned, but then began to struggle around the time of transition to secondary schools, when different topics are being taught and children eventually have to prepare for their GCSEs. The importance of GCSEs was not uniformly understood, with Bangladeshi parents being much more likely than either Turkish or Somali parents to understand what these exams are about and how determinant they are of their children’s educational and professional future. Many Somali parents, in particular, did not understand that children automatically progress from year to year in English schools, regardless of their performance. In Somalia, if pupils do not meet the required standards, they fail yearly exams and need to start the entire school year again. Some Somali parents therefore assumed that their children were doing well because they saw them progressing each year; they were shocked to learn of the poor academic performance of their child.

  “When they get to GCSEs, I will try to move them to do much better. I will get a good teacher. I guide them. The other generation could not do that. They were not educated. They did not know the system.” (Bangladeshi father)

  “Most of them, they don’t speak English. They don’t know how the system works. How can they tell their children what to do to pass their exams? They don’t even know what exams they have to pass!” (Turkish mother)
“They always tell you that your child is fine. But then at the end of school year, you find out that the children were not doing well after all. That was a big shock. Depressing.” (Somali father)

- **The academic standards are different:** Parents across the three communities agreed that the academic standards were different in England, but Bangladeshi parents thought that they were generally higher in England, Turkish parents thought that they were higher in Turkey, and Somali parents thought that standards were higher in England than in Somalia, but lower than in the other European countries where they had lived prior to migration to England.

  “It’s good in this modernised system. It is quite, very good. More improved in this country, England or France or other countries. In our third world countries like Bangladesh, Pakistan, Afghanistan, education is not very good.” (Bangladeshi father)

  “When I came to this country, everyone thought I was a genius! Because I came here in, it would have been Year 11, and I had already done the work they were doing in A Levels. They were all asking me to do their work for them.” (Turkish mother)

  “My children were doing very well when they first came here but then they started to fall behind. They had a very good education in Denmark but here it is not so good.” (Somali mother)

- **The curriculum includes a broader range of subjects:** Many parents commented that there were many more subjects being taught in English schools (such as IT, art, drama, music, comparative religious education, PSHE, foreign modern languages) than in their own country. They often did not understand these “new” topics, and found it very difficult to engage with their children on these issues, and to advise them on subject choices in preparation for further or higher education.

  “Sometimes my children try to tell me what they study but I have never heard of such things.” (Turkish father)

  “We do not understand their lessons sometimes. There are new topics that they have that we did not have, and topics that we have that they do not have.” (Somali mother)

- **Children are encouraged to think for themselves instead of learning by rote:** Many parents (especially in the Bangladeshi and Somali communities) commented on the fact that the pedagogical methods in England are very different to what they are used to and that children are encouraged to think for themselves. They generally valued this and thought it was positive, although some had concerns about the way it impacted on their children’s more general relation to “authority”.

  “In Bangladesh, learning was based on repetition without any questioning of what you were taught.” (Bangladeshi mother)

  “I was a teacher in Somalia and I think the Somali method is better. The teachers explained the lessons on the blackboard and tried to put the lessons into the children’s heads. The children also copied the lessons and studied at home. The teachers supervised while the children copied.” (Somali mother)

- **Relationships with teachers are more egalitarian, open and “friendly”:** Across all three communities, parents noted that the relationships which their children were expected to have with their teachers were more egalitarian and “friendly” than what they had experienced. Some
(especially in the Bangladeshi community and among parents who were better educated) felt that this was very positive and that it prepared pupils better for their working and social lives in England. Others (often fathers) felt that it impacted negatively on discipline and authority at school, but also that it undermined parental authority at home.

“Teachers need to be more strict rather than being friends so that the children have more fear and don’t think they can get away with it.” (Bangladeshi father)

“Teachers should be role models and if they are not dressed properly or they have piercing in all over their faces, then the children will not respect them.” (Somali father)

“Students now say to teachers: “Listen, you can’t touch me, I can do whatever I want to do and the worse that you can do is get me expelled.” Everyone has that attitude in school now. The teachers then don’t get involved. So it’s making it difficult for us to control our children because they are not used to control in school.” (Turkish father)

• **Facilities and educational resources are generally better and more “modern”**: All parents felt that the schools had better facilities and were better resourced (in terms of computers, interactive whiteboards, books, libraries, access to the internet, etc) than what they were used to. This was universally regarded as positive in terms of the children’s education, but it also disempowered many parents who did not speak or read English because they could not keep pace with their children’s learning at all.

“The children have good things in the school. I didn’t do education higher. Especially at that time, there was not like now the technology. You have to go internet, SMS, email, reply and all that. We had to go phone. We only have to speak. Now they have to read, write, learn the computer. It is very good, but difficult for parents.” (Bangladeshi father)

• **Children have less homework to do**: Most parents across all communities, but especially Turkish parents, felt that their children in English schools were given significantly less homework than what they had experienced abroad. They reported that even as primary school children, they always had school bags with books to read and daily homework and revision. They felt that English schools did not give sufficient homework, did not instil the value and the experience of hard work, and generally failed to develop the potential of their children. Nearly all parents wanted their children to have more homework.

“There is no culture of giving homework to kids here, unless you go to a private school. It does not start until well into secondary school but by then, they have already their routine and they have not got into the habit of working hard. In Turkey, you would have homework every single day, but in England, it’s only on Friday, they have one page of maths, maybe a couple of paragraphs of written English, and that’s it. Not enough.” (Turkish mother)

• **The curriculum is more inclusive and positive in its approach to cultural diversity**: Many parents were aware of, and valued, the fact that the curriculum in English schools tends to be inclusive and to celebrate various cultures and faiths. This contrasted positively with their own educational experiences, which usually took place in single-faith contexts (in Bangladesh and Somalia) or in nationalistic cultures (in Turkey) where the curriculum was much less diverse and positive in relation to difference. Parents who had themselves attended school in England also noted that this was a major improvement on their own educational experiences.

• **Parents are expected to be more involved in their children’s education**: Most parents understood that they were supposed to be actively involved in their children’s education, but there was little in their own experiences which prepared them for the expected level and nature of
parental involvement. This was the case across the three communities, although many Bangladeshi parents (because they had lived in England longer, had had many of their children through the English school system, and knew more people in their community who had completed higher education) had a better understanding of what they were supposed to do. Turkish and Somali parents were more likely to report that they were “supposed” to be involved in their children’s education because they had been told so, but to be at a loss as to exactly how they could help.

“This is not like Somalia. Here we have to be involved. It is not the school responsibility only. But what can we do?” (Somali mother)

- Physical punishment is not permitted: Finally, many parents commented on the fact that discipline in English schools was managed very differently than in their own country, where physical punishment was much more commonly used. They were aware that this was forbidden in English schools, as well as in people’s homes.

Given the wide range of differences in schooling experiences, it is apparent that not all parents are equally well prepared to support their children’s education. In subsequent chapters, we explore some of the key variables that may account for the overall poorer educational outcomes of Bangladeshi, Turkish and Somali pupils at GCSE level, as well as for the better recent performance of Bangladeshi pupils (especially girls). The variables considered are:

- The children’s attitudes to education and experiences in schools, as perceived by their parents;
- The aspirations and expectations of parents with respect to their children’s education and career;
- The quality of school provisions, as perceived by parents;
- The level and nature of parental involvement in their children’s education, as well as the main barriers to parental involvement; and the home environment of children and its impact on their learning.

### 7.5 Children’s attitudes to school and educational aspirations

In seeking to understand why pupils from certain minority ethnic communities do better than pupils in other communities, it was hypothesised that the children’s own attitudes to school and their educational aspirations may be important factors impacting on their different educational achievements. Parents were therefore asked to describe their children’s attitudes to school and their educational aspirations.

**General attitudes and aspirations**

Overall, in the three communities, research participants generally reported that their children had positive attitudes to school. The norm was for parents to describe their children as positive about school, interested in learning, motivated to do well, wishing to pursue higher education and, ideally, to become professionals. The majority of children were said to be enjoying their experiences in schools and to have high aspirations.

“My son worked really hard for his exams. I even got him private tuition because he wanted to do so well. He got good results.” (Bangladeshi mother)
“My child loves school. He enjoys it. There is no pressure, he enjoys it. He has got
time to work and time to play. He can do both. He likes studying. I tell him off for
waking up at 6 o’clock because school is across the road, but he is eager to go
and learn. I think he is following the other two ahead. The brother and sister: he
sort of wants to show he is working hard.” (Turkish mother)

“They know school is important and it is their future. We want them to do well and
to finish university education and they know that.” (Somali mother)

In all three communities, most parents generally felt that there was no difference in their children’s
attitudes to education and aspirations compared to those of other children. However, some parents
disagreed. A number of Bangladeshi parents argued that children in their community tended to
have a more positive and highly aspirational approach to education than British children. Many
Bangladeshi parents argued that this had changed in recent years, as parents became more aware
of the importance of education for their children’s future, spoke and read English, schooled in
England, understood the education system and were much better able to support their children’s
education. They also felt that the Bangladeshi community began to have more educated “role
models” to pave the way for others, so that children now had a broader range of career options to
consider. For all these factors, parents felt that boys and girls were more motivated, and better
able, to achieve more.

“Asian children take education more seriously. The other thing is that Asian
parents have high aims for their children and children know from the beginning
that they have to have a good education to get good jobs in the future.”
(Bangladeshi father)

“Earlier parents were not educated and had no idea of what they could do to help
their children. These days parents have a better idea of how can they help. The
other thing is that there are more children from the community going to university
and college so every parent wants their child to also do better. And also the
children themselves, they see that and they think they can do it too. That’s a very
important factor.” (Bangladeshi father)

“Now our children want to work in banks and council instead of working in
restaurants. In our generation, the only thing they knew was to join the restaurant.
Now children have other options. No one wants to work in the restaurant. They
want good jobs.” (Bangladeshi mother)

A few Turkish parents described their community as highly aspirational. However, Turkish
respondents also described their community as being more focussed on securing some material
success, generally through self-employment in the catering business or in retail, than in pursuing
education per se. Some fathers felt that there were very limited job prospects for young Turkish
people, even those who had completed their university degree, and that this acted as a disincentive
for young people to study. They also deplored the lack of role models for young Turkish people.
They discussed how many boys, in particular, seemed to have very low educational aspirations, to
envisage very limited careers, to behave poorly in school and to feel disaffected more generally.
Parents whose children entered school in England without speaking English often reported that
their children had difficulties making friends and understanding what was going on, and generally
disliked school as a result.

“The majority of Turkish families stick to a working culture. The majority are self-
employed, they’ve got their own businesses, restaurants or whatever it is,
everyone likes to start earning money, everyone likes showing off, so everyone
wants to earn money, buy things to beat the Simpsons! That’s very strong in our
communities, but not necessarily around education so the kids also are more into money and things than school.” (Turkish father)

“Young people, they see these people working in a takeaway, and they think: “It’s OK, it’s a job, you get money”. I don’t think they understand. It’s not a job you should want, not a job to make you a success: work all the time, late at night, low pay. They only compare it to these other jobs, working in a shop, sweeping the roads, and it seems OK to them. I try to tell them about other jobs, jobs where you could get respect in England. I don’t want them to do what I do. I want more for them. I want them to go to school, but I don’t know if I can show them the way.” (Turkish father)

“Our young boys in our community are very boisterous and that can be misinterpreted, there is a lot of competition, peer pressure to be a bad boy, that’s something that everyone tries to be hard, to make quick money, to do this and that. There are also a lot of sensible people but there’s a lot of people that do the “street thing”.” (Turkish father)

“Because they did not speak English, they really hated school. They had no friends. It was tough for them.” (Turkish mother)

Somali children seemed to occupy the middle ground between the Bangladeshi and the Turkish community with respect to their attitudes to school and aspirations. According to some parents, Somali children are highly aspirational, focussed, hard working and seeking to become professionals. They do not think Somali children are any less determined to do well than other children. They think that the children have positive attitudes but that they also need more support, which they do not always get. However, a significant minority described their children as experiencing difficulties, both academically and socially, in schools and generally “hating” school. Mothers felt strongly that the absence of fathers in the community contributed to the lack of positive role models and impacted negatively on children’s attitudes and aspirations.

“My children are doing well, insh Allah. They work hard. They are very good. They make good progress.” (Somali mother)

“The oldest two were bullied in their first year of school. They never recovered from it. They still talk about how other kids made fun of them. They hated school. Now it’s too late.” (Somali mother)

“I think Somali children do not have the right mind set and aspirations to do well. Many of the children do not get support at home so they fall behind and they begin to dislike school.” (Somali mother)

“There are no fathers in our community. No authority. No one to show children how to work and what you have to do to keep a good job because most of the ladies don’t work either.” (Somali mother)

• Gender and individual differences in attitudes and aspirations

In all three communities, some parents reported both gender and individual differences in their children’s attitudes to school and educational aspirations. When gender differences were noted, it was almost always to state that girls were enjoying school more, were more self-motivated and hard-working, and were doing better than boys.

“There is difference in attitude between my daughter and son. I don’t have to tell my daughter to study or do her homework. She takes it very seriously. But my
son, who is 15 years, has to be constantly told to study. He doesn’t seem that interested and looks for excuses to not do his work.” (Bangladeshi father)

“My daughter is so hard working and wants to do something in life. But my son is just not interested. He bunks school and gets into trouble. I take him to school everyday, even though he is in secondary school, to make sure that he doesn’t bunk school. He just doesn’t study. I don’t know why and I don’t know what to do about it.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“My daughter loves school. She is always ready to go in the morning, she tells me what she did when she gets back, all that. But with my son, it’s a battle. Everyday.” (Turkish mother)

“The boys tend to get more easily distracted. They go and play football, play video games, go on the internet, go out with their friends. It is more difficult to get them to study.” (Somali mother)

Because research participants generally had large families, parents also often reported stark individual differences between their children, which they were at a loss to explain. This suggests that household level factors may not be the main determinant of academic achievement.

“Out of my five children, my son who is in secondary school is not interested in studying. He just doesn’t like schools and shows no interest. My other children are hard working and doing well, but I don’t know why my son is like that. I guess all children can’t be the same.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“My older child cannot be bothered. School work doesn’t interest him. My youngest is a totally different kettle of fish to the older boy. They’ve got different skills. Neither of them are dumb but, like the little one, he picks up a book and he reads it until he’s finished. The older one picks up books and he can’t be bothered. He’s not interested.” (Turkish father)

“My oldest two hated school. The other three are OK.” (Somali mother)

**Parental aspirations and expectations**

It was assumed that parents who had high aspirations and expected their children to do well would be more likely to have children who are high achievers. Thus, in both focus groups and face-to-face interviews, parents were asked to talk about what they would want their children to do (their aspirations), and what they thought they would actually do (their expectations), when they grow up. Focus group discussions were most useful to elicit community-wide views around educational and professional aspirations, while depth interviews generated more detailed information about how aspirations and expectations may differ from child to child, as well as the factors that account for such differences.

- **Aspirations: Professional and educational aspirations**

All parents said that what they wanted, first and foremost, was for their children to be “happy” and to have a “good life”. Pressed to clarify what this meant for them, almost all parents said they wanted their children to have a “good education”, a “good job” and a happy family. Thus, education and work were almost universally seen as central to leading a good life.

“All parents want their children to have a good education and a good job.” (Somali mother)
“If they have a good education, then they will have a good job and have a decent life and will be able to be out of poverty.” (Bangladeshi father)

Across all communities, nearly all parents shared the dream that their children would go to university. “Having a degree” was a powerful driver for many parents, although for those who themselves lacked education, this was often more a “free-floating” aspiration than a concrete goal backed by a series of actual educational achievements

“M: I want them to go to university for better life.
F: We try to. We want them to go. I would like up to Masters. I like that.
M: I don’t mind anything at university. I think it’s completely their choice.
F: I desire Masters. I would like it. I would have liked to have gone up to Masters. So my children can get to university, finish education and Masters.” (Bangladeshi parents)

“I would want my children to go to university, get a degree. They should have good education to find a good job.” (Turkish father)

“I hope my children go to university.” (Somali father)

Very often, parental aspirations revolved around specific jobs, usually being a doctor, a lawyer, an engineer, an accountant, a pharmacist, a teacher, a businessman, an architect or a police officer. Parents dreamed of their children becoming “professionals”. Again, however, many parents had only a very limited understanding of what would be required to achieve this goal.

Some of the parents who were born in England, who had lived in England for a long time, or who were highly educated were well aware of these aspirations, but they distanced themselves from them. They felt that it was important to give greater freedom to their children over their career choices.

“In the previous generation, all our parents wanted us to do was being a doctor, an engineer or an accountant. That was it. I think that is still there but it is dying out now." (Bangladeshi mother)

“Our intention is to give them a good education and the rest is up to them. They can choose what they want to become. We will support them.” (Bangladeshi father)

“They want to tell their neighbour: “Look at my kid: a doctor, a lawyer!”, so they push the children into these kinds of jobs without caring what they really want, whether they are happy or not. It's something to show-off about to the neighbours, and I guess back in Turkey too, you know, “Got the car, the kid, I've made it!” It’s an immigrant mentality. You’ve got something to prove.” (Turkish mother)

“I will help the children until they get into university and I will try to let them choose what they want to be.” (Somali father)

Across all three communities, parental aspirations with respect to education were not related to the educational achievements of the parents. Highly educated parents could have either high or low aspirations for their children, just as poorly educated parents could have either high or low aspirations for their children. However, many parents who experienced financial hardship and led difficult lives were keen for their children to avoid the difficulties they had personally endured.
“We work very hard in catering business. We work long hours and in tough conditions. Our children will not be able to take this hard work. Also, we don’t want them to do the jobs we are doing. We want them to have a better life. That is why they have to go to college. Doing just GCSEs is not good enough.” (Bangladeshi father)

“I do not want my children to depend on others. Have their own house, own money. Honest. Decent. Not asking help from government like we do.” (Somali mother)

Some mothers in particular felt that their own dream of pursuing higher education had been thwarted and sought to ensure that their daughters would go as far as they wanted in their education.

“I was taken out of school when I was thirteen […] I don’t want my daughter to miss out on her education like I did. I want my daughter to be a GP.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“I myself wanted to go further [in education] but because of what my mum believes, she sort of put a block on that: ‘You’re not going to go. Secondary school and then that’s it for you”. I myself wanted so much to do it. I couldn’t do it because of my parents, but I don’t think I should be like that towards my kids. I think they’re going to go to uni. If they are smart enough, they will take that chance and do it and have an education. I didn’t, so I do want it for my children and I hope one day my children will want it for their children.” (Turkish mother)

“These days, mothers want their daughters to get university degree, because some of them were denied that opportunity and married before they could do that.” (Somali father)

In the Somali community, an additional reason mentioned for wanting children to do well was that children would be responsible for looking after their parents in their old age. Parents therefore had a direct personal stake in their children’s educational and professional success.

“Children are our insurance when we grow older, and we expect them to do well and achieve something in life.” (Somali mother)

“We take care of them now and they will take care of us later.” (Somali father)

- **Differences in professional and educational aspirations for boys and girls**

Gender differences in professional and educational aspirations were difficult to probe. Almost always, research participants started by saying that they had exactly the same aspirations for their sons and daughters. They were aware of dominant cultural norms in favour of gender equality in Britain and seemed keen to endorse those.

“Times are changing. Girls should have an education as well. Same as boys. If they have an education, they can stand on their own two feet. Nowadays, it is acceptable for girls to continue with their education, even after marriage.” (Bangladeshi father)

“I do care a lot about my daughter. She is my only daughter.

I: Some parents say: “Well if she finds a good husband, then my daughter can give up her education or her job.”

No! Never, ever, ever! Not at all. She’ll go to university. She’s still little but I want her to complete her education.” (Bangladeshi mother)
“M: I will not allow my daughter to think of marrying until she finishes university and gets a good job. Then she can do whatever she wants to do, but now I have to guide her […]

P: The time to pressure the girls to marry at early age has passed. My husband and I equally push the children to do well.” (Somali parents)

“We [the Turkish community] don’t think in terms of differences for boys and girls. Only very traditional people would think like that.” (Turkish father)

Many parents in all three communities did indeed have the same educational and professional aspirations for their daughters and sons. They had children of both sexes who were in higher education and who pursued challenging careers, sometimes in non-traditional sectors. However, these parents also reported that it was common, in the Bangladeshi and Somali cultures, to marry girls before they finish their education, or to encourage them to get educated, but not necessarily with the view that they would practice in their chosen profession. Indeed, a university education seemed central to the goals of achieving a high social standing in the community and of marrying a well-educated man, rather than as a prerequisite for working in a given profession. Some of these cultural norms continued to prevail in the discourses of a minority of Bangladeshi and Somali parents. Moreover, the career options considered for boys and girls seemed to be somewhat different (with girls commonly being encouraged to be school teachers).

“Some parents say: “No need to go [to university]. No need [for girls] for too much educated because after 20, 25 they will be married and do housework and all these things. Why do you want to be a barrister and all these things?” I say: “No, take them more higher educated, then you can take a good job like a barrister, solicitor, accountant”. If you have a good degree you can get all these jobs. If you have no degree, how can you find a good job? If you are not educated, how can you get an accountant or lawyer [as a husband]?” (Bangladeshi father)

“This country is boys and girls equal. You can have boys and girls equal, if you keep your religion. Many scholars out there are ladies and teachers in school.” (Bangladeshi father)

“My daughter is in year 9 now. If she wants to get married before she gets a university degree, I would support her.” (Somali mother)

“I would like my daughters to get university degrees, preferably education, nursing. These are more women environments.” (Somali father)

- **Parents’ expectations**

The above section focused on parental aspirations. However, there was often a considerable gap between these aspirations and parents’ expectations of what their children would actually achieve. In depth interviews in particular, it became clear that many children (even some of those who were doing well academically) may not live up to their parents’ aspirations. In many cases, especially in the Somali and Turkish communities, children seemed prepared for very different working lives to the ones their parents aspired to.

“My daughter is training to be a social worker.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“I think he is brilliant with computers. Unless he surprises me, that is probably what he will end up doing.” (Turkish mother)

“Right now, I really don’t know what he will do. I honestly just hope he can keep a job.” (Turkish father)
“The oldest two will go to do vocational training and get qualifications in something, maybe builders, electricians. They have to decide that.” (Somali mother)

“My daughter has her own child now. She does not work.” (Somali mother)

Thus, in reality, there were very many constraints which meant that children would not study as far as parents said they wanted them to. Many parents realised that their children were not performing sufficiently well to go into their preferred professions, or that their own interests lay elsewhere. Parents and children also became aware that there were difficult entry requirements associated with the professions they aspired to. Thus, many parents discussed how they had reviewed their aspirations in light of their children’s academic performance.

“Everybody’s mind doesn’t get too much knowledge in the brain. So far as I see it, my oldest son is not much technical. Not growing like an adult. He will try to get more achievement but maybe he can’t. The medium one is going more knowledge and is clever as well.” (Bangladeshi father)

“We want them to go to college, university, but depending on their results, we will see.” (Somali father)

“I’ll do my best to encourage him but I’ve got no expectations. Whatever the outcome is the outcome. Getting him on track has been one of the hardest things I’ve had to do. I don’t know how he will turn out.” (Turkish father)

While most parents (especially mothers) seemed to share a positive outlook and to have a very strong sense of self-efficacy – they firmly believed that if they and their children wanted to achieve something and they worked hard for it, they could get it – others (especially fathers) felt that there were important structural constraints weighing against them.

“The reality is that many children will not be able to get where they want to because of their background - overcrowding, housing and poor financial situation. These factors play a big role in a child’s education and growth.” (Bangladeshi father)

“I want my children to go to university because I want them to earn but sometimes I think if they can earn now too, that is better because we would need the money.” (Somali mother)

“My son looks at me, and what does he see? He looks anywhere around here, and he sees Turkish people, men, working in a shop, a takeaway. Is that going to be his life as well? I can say to him: “Work hard, go to university”, but he just thinks he is going to end up like this, working in a takeaway, so why should he bother? And, for me this is a dilemma because perhaps he will work in a takeaway or some similar job, not because this is what he wants, but because this is all the jobs that there are. Can I tell him differently?” (Turkish father)

“What do I tell them if they work hard, go to college and then nothing? This happened to my two older daughters. They went to college, and now, no job, nothing for them. My other children, they see this, they see there are no jobs, and why should they go to college, work hard for that, if there are no jobs? It would not be good advice from me to say that they should do this.” (Turkish father)

Thus, there were few differences in the “idealised” aspirations of Bangladeshi, Turkish and Somali parents, all of which revolved around getting a university degree and/or becoming a professional
(although the expectations that children would work were slightly less frequent in relation to daughters than to son). However, many parents had to review these aspirations and develop more realistic “expectations”. This adjustment process was generally based on the realisation that children were not doing very well in school, that the requirements associated with their chosen professions would not be met, that the children had different aspirations themselves, or that they did not like school. In the sample, more Turkish and Somali parents than Bangladeshi parents had to revise their aspirations in light of their children’s circumstances. It may be worth noting that financial considerations (the affordability of higher education and related costs) were very rarely invoked as a factor for lowering expectations.

7.6 Parental satisfaction with schools

While school-level factors are explored more systematically in other strands of the research, this qualitative study also considered whether parents were happy with their children’s schools, if they felt that their children were reaching their full potential in school, if teachers expected enough of their children, if local schools understood and catered for their children’s needs, if they had any concerns about the quality of provisions and whether there was anything they felt could be improved in their children’s schools. Parents were also asked if they had a preference for single-sex or co-educational schools.

Across the Bangladeshi, Turkish and Somali communities, there were similar drivers of parental (dis)satisfaction with schools. However, the level of parental satisfaction with schools seemed to be consistently higher among Bangladeshi parents than among Turkish or Somali parents.

- **Quality of teaching:** Generally, most parents seemed broadly satisfied with the quality of teaching in their children’s schools. Some respondents felt that the quality of teaching was perhaps not as uniformly good as it should be, others expressed concerns over the use of supply teachers and the perceived difficulties their schools experienced in recruiting permanent teachers, and others still felt that the quality of teaching was either superior or inferior to that found in other countries. But overall, the quality of teaching was judged satisfactory. Parents felt that the curriculum was rich and that most teachers were technically proficient and had a positive attitude towards their children (when the latter were well-behaved and motivated).

  “We are happy with the teaching. Good teachers. Very caring and they don’t speak harshly to the children. Patient.” (Bangladeshi mother)

  “There are always supply teachers teaching my child’s class and the school cannot bring good teachers.” (Somali mother)

  “We’ve had good teachers and we’ve had bad teachers. If you haven’t “got it” and you’re just doing it for the money, as a job, it shows. There’s a big difference with the ones that really do want to do it. It’s like you are either good with people or you’re not. I mean there is a way of teaching but there is an art to teaching as well. You have to know all your students, you’ve got to have an aim with every individual. Everyone has a different style of learning and I don’t think that’s really addressed. I think it’s a bit random, but generally teaching is OK, yes.” (Turkish father)

- **Discipline, respect and pupil behaviour in schools:** The level of parental satisfaction with schools seemed to depend not so much on the quality of teaching and the academic performance of children (indeed, parents of both high achieving and low achieving children could both be equally happy with schools), as on the school’s management of discipline and pupil behaviour. There was a sense that schools are well equipped to provide academic support to under-performing pupils, as long as these are well behaved and keen to learn, but that they are less able to address the emotional support needs of unmotivated, disruptive or challenging pupils. In the sample, such
pupils were more likely to be adolescent boys and to come from single parent households (usually in the Turkish and Somali communities).

“There is a lot of peer pressure to be a bad boy. A lot of kids that are unfortunate, that don’t have that [good] family environment, they go to school, they just sit there, not interested and these tend to be the ones sitting on the “below average” ability tables, even if they can be very smart, because teachers are only equipped to deal with pupils that want to respond. If the rest are not responding, they are not equipped to deal with those pupils." (Turkish father)

“The school is not helping my son. They say he is disturbing the other children.” (Somali father)

Some parents were satisfied with their children’s school friends, but many were concerned that other pupils might influence their children negatively (by encouraging them to smoke, drink alcohol, take drugs, go out in the evening, become less studious, etc). They reported instances where their child had been bullied and harassed in school, when drugs were said to be consumed in schools, where the schools’ ethos did not seem conducive to academic success, etc.

“R1: Bullying and fighting are very common. Safety is not good in my daughter’s school.

R2: Yes. I am worried about my son because there is a lot of bullying and fighting in and out of school.” (Somali mother)

“I went to the parent’s meeting of my boys, and I used the student toilet that time and in the toilet I saw there was all this burned foil paper in the sink. I was shocked, I spoke to my child. I said: “Who are the people?” He said: “Everyone at school. Lunch time. Girls. Boys”.” (Bangladeshi father)

- **Homework**: Another major concern across all three communities was the low level of homework set by schools. Parents generally believed that their children would progress faster and would be more likely to reach their full potential if they were given more frequent and more demanding homework. As it was, not a single respondent felt that schools set too much homework, a small minority thought that schools set about the right amount, and the large majority wanted their children to have more homework. Many had requested this from schools but with no result.

“No matter how much we help them, the teachers are holding them back. They don’t expect enough of them. Even if we ask for more homework, the children do not get it.” (Somali mother)

“The teaching is OK but the school does not give them enough homework.” (Bangladeshi mother)

- **Homework and after-school clubs**: Related to the above was the view that schools should offer better homework and after-school club provisions. Parents of children who took part in homework and after-school clubs were generally satisfied with these. Especially among those parents who were personally unable to support their children academically (perhaps because they did not speak English, lacked the knowledge to understand their children’s tasks, had too many children to be able to provide individual help or worked long hours), who felt that their homes were not appropriate environments for their children to study (perhaps because there was overcrowding, noise, no computers, no adult supervision or dysfunctional relationships) or who could not afford to pay for private tuition, the provision of homework and other after-school clubs was seen as a lifeline.
“They find if classes are not very good for children, they increase learning for extra classes in holiday time. That is why our children are making better progress now.” (Bangladeshi father)

“The schools understand. That’s why they give support as well, come in and try to put them on the right track and to help them with homework and with the language. They are giving help from the school because their second language is English. We cannot help the children with their work. Because the lessons they have to understand, that’s why the school gives special class after school, two or three days a week. They are improving because they are behind. If they don’t understand, speak or write, they can’t get on GCSEs. That’s why they help them in school. I feel the school is doing their best.” (Bangladeshi father)

In almost every focus group and depth interview, some parents requested more homework and after-school clubs. There seemed to be fewer provisions for Turkish and Somali children than for Bangladeshi children. It was not possible to determine whether the difference in provisions was actual or perceived.

- **Access to preferred schools:** Despite a limited understanding of the education system, many parents in all three communities understood that they could choose their children’s state school within particular catchment areas and that there were also selective and private schools to choose from. They were often aware of “good” and “bad” schools in their areas (largely through word of mouth), but most did not understand the precise mechanisms to get into “good” schools. Some parents, especially in the Turkish and Somali communities, felt that their children would not do so well because they were not in “good” schools. Sometimes, this was because their preferred schools were oversubscribed; sometimes it was because parents chose to send children to poorer schools located closer to home (this tended to be the case in large families because parents could not accompany all their children to different and distant schools, especially since this responsibility usually befell on mothers who often did not drive); sometimes it was because parents did not know how to get into a “good” school.

  “I chose another school and they gave me a letter that he [son] did not pass to the school. My friend’s children are going to that school and they told me that the school was good and the exam results are good and that’s why I wanted to send my son there but I had to send him to [local school] instead.” (Bangladeshi mother)

  “I had to send all my children [of secondary school age] to the same school which is close to home because I am worried about them on the bus. They are not safe on the bus for a long distance and they would have had to take three different buses to get to the good school. The only way was to go to the school close to our house, which is not very good.” (Somali mother)

- **Communications with parents and parental involvement:** Communications with parents was another key determinant of satisfaction with schools. Views on communications ranged from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. Generally, parents who felt that the schools communicated regularly, proactively and in a way which is personalised were happy with their schools, even if the schools reported difficulties with their children’s work or attitude. Parents expected to be able to communicate with schools on a needs basis and they wanted schools to have an open-door policy. They expected to be treated with courtesy and as respected partners in their children’s education. They wanted to be able to access their children’s teachers if they perceived any problems. Parents appreciated parents’ meetings in which information about the school (such as school ethos, curriculum, typical day, parental involvement, etc) is given. They liked receiving weekly newsletters that informed them about what had taken place in the school that week and what was planned in the coming weeks. Parents who read English and had easy access to computers liked accessing
information on school websites. Parents found the formal individual parent-teacher consultations which typically took place three times a year most informative and valuable. Those were thought especially valuable if they gave them a clear sense of their children’s current level of achievement (ideally compared with the rest of the class/year group), tracked progress since the last meeting, identified areas for improvement, and gave parents some indication of what they could do to support their children at home.

“They do not tell us how the children are doing or which areas they need help with. They do not tell you. You don’t know how well they are doing and if they are getting better or worse.” (Somali mother)

“If parents want to talk something about their children, they answer but not specifically. They don’t clarify. We can’t talk to the teacher as much as we need to.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“Every Friday, they send newsletter about the whole group, the school, what they are going to do, if they did their best this week, teachers’ views on them, if they are proud of them, things like that.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“When I go to parent’s evening, they say: “Look, you know, he is here now but come next year, we’ve got to help him to move up the next hurdles, so we’ve got to work with him, like with all the children and move him up”. The better the kids do, the better for the school, isn’t it? The slightest thing that is wrong and I will be summoned to the school. They are doing good. If [child] had any needs, the school understands. If there is a child that needs help, they pick it up straight away, they’ve got the support ready for that child who needs it and gives it to them. This is the first school I’ve known of that shuts the school down half a day on Thursday and has a meeting and any child that needs support is talked about and a plan is set for that child.” (Turkish mother)

However, some parents missed out on most or all of the above information because they did not understand, speak or read English and their children’s schools had limited provisions for communication in languages other than English. They had to rely on other parents or on their children to translate the information, with all the omissions and distortions which this can entail. Although not all parents were prompted specifically on this issue, schools seemed to have very different policies and practices in relation to translating materials for parents or using interpreters for face-to-face meetings38.

“My older boys’ school, they translate the newsletter and the most important documents in Turkish and they have Turkish volunteers who come to interpret when the school needs to talk to the parents and at parents evenings.” (Turkish mother)

“There is no information in our language about school and the education system. The school sometimes invite parents but we don’t understand so for us it is a waste of time.” (Somali father)

In the sample, Somali parents were the most dissatisfied with communications. Perhaps because many parents had experienced “better” relationships with schools in other European countries,

---

38 It may be that parents themselves, for a range of different reasons ranging from distrust of teachers and school management, lack of confidence and knowledge about how to approach schools, fear of being judged as a failing parent, lack of time or inflexible working schedules, past experiences of discrimination, fear of being excluded from school and so on, do not make full use of the communications opportunities that are open to them. However, these issues were not explored in any depth and were too rarely spontaneously mentioned by respondents to warrant separate discussion.
communications were thought to be reactive and untimely, and to uncover problems that should have been addressed much earlier. In one case, a Somali mother had been asked to sign a form endorsing the permanent exclusion of her daughter from school, without any knowledge of what she had been asked to sign.

“They gave me this form to sign and I could not read it because it was in English but they wanted me to sign there and then and they did not tell me what it was about. I refused. Thank God because it was a form to say I agreed for my daughter to be permanently excluded from school. That is their response: to exclude. They don’t want to help the child and to help you.” (Somali mother)

**Transition:** Parents generally felt that the quality of teaching and academic support for their children was good. However, they also thought that more support could be given to children when they are making their transition from primary to secondary schools, from secondary schools to sixth form colleges, or when children join a new school at any other point in their educational career. As many parents had a limited understanding of the system and did not fully understand what they should be doing to ensure their children’s successful transition to the next stage in their education, they often felt very anxious and unsupported. Many parents relied on word of mouth to access information. In the Bangladeshi community, there were several adults (usually siblings, relatives or family friends) who had been schooled in England, pursued higher education, worked as professionals, acted as private tutors, knew of Ofsted reports and league tables, understood admission processes and requirements, and could support pupils and their families. This was not the case in the Turkish and Somali communities. Concerns around transition and settling into a new school were most widespread in the Somali community. As refugees, many Somali families lived in temporary accommodation provided by local housing authorities and frequently moved from one home, and from one school, to another.

“They would need to give us some leaflet about the schools. We don’t know what to do to find out about schools.” (Somali mother)

“I know some families that had to move two or three times and to get their children into different schools every time. They didn’t have help from schools to make sure that the children are happy in the new school.” (Somali father)

In all communities, some respondents felt that the schools needed to increase their demands on the children in their final year in preparation for the enhanced workload ahead.

“They are very strict in year 7. I think that’s good. They are strict from the beginning. I think the decision is good to be disciplined, to get them to know the rules for secondary school, but it was not easy for my older one. He has had to learn. Now he is ok but he was not ready for that.” (Bangladeshi father)

“You have got to start early, by the time they get to secondary school, it is too late. You start early with them, teach them, have expectations, teach them to behave, to do their work, otherwise, down the line, how can you expect them to be ready for university? They won’t get there. I am not sure that they are prepared for the amount of work they have to do. I know it came as a big shock to my son [when he moved to secondary school].” (Turkish mother)

**Single-sex schools:** Finally, parents were asked if they had a preference for single-sex or coeducational schools. The main reasons invoked across communities in favour of single-sex schools were their higher academic performance (with Catholic schools generally regarded as achieving the best academic results), the view that pupils in such schools are less “distracted” from their studies (compared to mixed gender schools where teenage boys and girls may be more preoccupied with each other than with their studies), and the view that pupil behaviour may be better in single-sex schools.
“The only reason I chose to send my daughter to a single-sex school is because that school had excellent academic results and I wanted her to do well [...] She’s got brothers and she does lots of after-school activities with boys as well, so I did not feel that she would miss out on the social element.” (Turkish mother)

“Here it is common for boys to have girlfriends. If girls and boys are together, then they will have more chance to have girlfriends and they will spend more time on such things instead of their studies.” (Bangladeshi father)

“We don’t mind. Any school [single sex or mixed], they can go. Education is the important thing, the main thing. We’re not extreme religious.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“Single-sex schools discourage vice like teenage pregnancies and things like that.” (Somali father)

The main reasons for preferring coeducational schools were the view that single-sex schools do not prepare pupils well for adult social life in British society (because sustained contact with members of the opposite sex in school is seen as essential to learn how to behave appropriately) and that such schools tend to be too “conservative” (a view which tends to be expressed only by those who portray themselves as “progressive”). No-one favoured or opposed single-sex schools explicitly on religious grounds.

“Look at our community. Most women don’t work even if they can. We need to change attitudes in our community. Going to a mixed school will influence people’s thinking - both the parents’ and the children’s. They will see girls studying and planning their future and this will open their eyes.” (Bangladeshi father)

“I don’t mind. Maybe girls and boys only have bigger problems. If boys and girls respect each other in school, it is OK.” (Somali father)

“We would never consider [a single sex school]. This is not something that is supported amongst us at all; it is not how we think.” (Turkish father)

“I think a mixed school is better in the long run because boys and girls should meet. I went to a girls’ school and for me, talking to a man was a very frightening thing. I’d never, ever had any contact before, even spoken to a boy. I think girls and boys together are better because then she gets to know males and what men are all about and won’t have problems.” (Turkish mother)

“For my kids, I would prefer them to go to a mixed school. Everyone enjoys it now. I think being mixed is good, especially if there is a nice girl in your class: it gives you the incentive to show up!” (Turkish father)

Views were divergent both between and within communities. In terms of community differences, the majority of respondents in the Turkish community were opposed to single-sex schools, some strongly so. By contrast, in both the Bangladeshi and Somali communities, more than half of parents (especially fathers) favoured single-sex schools (especially in secondary schools), although opinions for or against were not strongly held.
7.7 Parental involvement in children’s education

This section discusses the level and nature of parental involvement and support in children’s education. To assess whether there are community and household differences with respect to the support which pupils get from their parents, the latter were asked to what extent and in what ways they get involved in their children’s education, whether they are satisfied with their involvement, and whether there is anyone else (either informally or formally) who also supports their children with their school.

Level and nature of parental involvement

- **Parental responsibility:** Across the three minority ethnic communities, the vast majority of mothers reported that they were actively involved in their children’s education, while fathers reported variable levels of involvement. Most Bangladeshi, Turkish and Somali parents said that they believed that the education of their children was neither a matter for the schools alone nor for the children themselves, but that parents needed to be closely involved in their children's education for them to achieve academic success. They consistently saw it as their duty to ensure that children attended school regularly and on time, and that they did their homework as needed.

  “Our responsibility is to make sure that the children are on time, they are regular with their attendance, and they do their homework. The school’s responsibility is to make sure they teach the children well, maintain discipline and provide good education.” (Bangladeshi mother)

  “In Somalia, education was school’s responsibility, but here it is a shared responsibility by both parents and school and I have to do my part to help my children.” (Somali mother)

  “If the school doesn't achieve its aim, then who are you going to blame? Ideally, the school is responsible for children getting educated but then if they don’t? It is their responsibility but, to a certain degree, your children’s education is your responsibility.” (Turkish father)

  “We can point out problems we have with the system, but at some point it’s down to parenting as well. They have to do it, bring up their children. Every day, spend 10 minutes, instead of doing the washing up or something, sit down and do homework together.” (Turkish mother)

- **Nature of parental involvement:** Across all communities, the specific ways in which parents support their children’s education were very similar. Typically, the majority of parents (especially mothers) engaged in the following activities: they accompanied their children to school (especially the younger ones) and ensured attendance and punctuality, asked children questions about the school day, made sure that children did their homework, read weekly newsletters (when able to), attended parents meetings in school and, in a smaller number of cases, contacted teachers to discuss their children’s progress (especially in case of problems).

In terms of attendance and punctuality, all parents said they tried to ensure that their children were always in school for the entire school day. They believed that the recent emphasis on attendance in school was a positive thing, especially since they recognised that some families (especially in the Bangladeshi and Somali communities) had sometimes taken their children out of school for extended periods of time to visit relatives “back home” and that this had been highly detrimental to their education.

  “My mum took me out of school when I was thirteen. She took me to Bangladesh because she wanted me to learn about my culture. I never went back to school
even though I came back to England two years later. It was too late for me. So now I think it is a very good thing that the government is forcing children to be in school until 16. They can't be taken out of school like we were. It's good.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“I took my daughter to Yemen to visit some relatives during the summer but then she got ill and she had to stay there and she could not go back to school. Now she has lost her place in school.” (Somali mother)

Responsibility for supervising homework was usually attributed to mothers. Many mothers checked their children’s schoolbags daily, read and responded to any comments made by teachers in their children’s notebooks, signed off completed homework, discussed school reports with their children, etc.

“Sometimes I check their folders and diaries to see what they have because they don’t always tell you. Some children don’t give the letters they get from school so we have to check constantly to see what is happening.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“Every day, we ask them what they did in school, how their day was, which subjects they were taught, if they had any problems with other children and if they have homework. We encourage them to study, to read, to do their homework. We check their homework when they are done to make sure that they have completed everything.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“I check if they have homework and I make sure they finish their work for the following day.” (Turkish mother)

“This is my routine when I come home: “Hi, how was your day?” I open his diary about what homework they have and haven’t. I check through that. He has homework, he has to sit down and do his homework. I also go through the books to see if there is anything the teacher marks. If there is something where he is a bit poor, therefore we have to correct it. All my kids, I make sure their work is done and if they need any help, I will help them. I take quite a lot of notice of what they are doing in school. I go through their books. It’s the only way I am going to know, isn’t it? He’s a boy, he isn’t going to come and tell me. So I do check books, bags, diaries. And if there is anything the school isn’t happy with, they say write in my son’s diary a comment: “Come and see me” or “[child] is not doing so and so” so I do take good notice. I don’t just leave the school and let them deal with it.” (Turkish mother)

“I spend at least one hour everyday telling them what to do and helping them with their homework.” (Somali mother)

“I take the children to school and then back from school. I ask them about their homework and I help them with their work if they need me. I ask their teachers how they are doing. I attend parents evenings. I read school reports. I set appointments with the teachers to discuss how the children are doing. With all of them, that takes about three hours each day, which my husband also helps with.” (Somali mother)

Mothers reported spending between ten minutes and three hours each day supporting all their children in one way or another. Many spontaneously mentioned that they found it much more difficult to get their boys to do their homework. Girls were said to be more responsible and to communicate more readily with their parents about their school days and the homework they had to do. It seemed harder to extract a similar amount of information from boys and to get them to do their work. Generally, children who had a strict and regular homework routine seemed to be higher achievers than those who did not have an established routine.
The involvement of fathers was less frequent. It was more likely to consist in asking broad questions about the school day, in telling children to do their homework, in reiterating the importance of education for the children’s future and, in some cases, in attending parents’ evenings at school. Bangladeshi fathers were comparatively more involved than Turkish fathers, while Somali fathers were often altogether absent (either because they never migrated to the UK in the first place, or because the marriage broke down, or because the fathers were working long hours and were not at all involved in their children’s education).

“I spend time with my children and talk to them every week. We all sit together and have a general chat about education, importance to have good education, future etc. I ask them how things are in their school, if they have any problems. We do this every week.” (Bangladeshi father)

“I do ask: “If you do your homework first thing you can go upstairs, wash, change your clothes and take a rest, then finish your homework and after you can watch TV”. Sometimes they say: “Dad, can I watch a bit of TV first?” That’s alright. Sometimes children can say that. “But don’t forget you should finish your homework”. Some children say: “Not today. I will do it tomorrow”. I say: “No, it is no good. Tomorrow is another day. You should finish the routine today. It is good for you, good for your teacher. If you continue like that tomorrow, day after tomorrow, it is no good, it’s lazy. Whatever you have to do, finish it.” (Bangladeshi father)

Some Somali parents felt strongly that the absence of father figures was detrimental, especially for their sons’ development. They reported a lack of parental authority at home, and very limited involvement in their children’s education.

“Men are busy with other things. Sometimes they waste time doing silly things, such as talking about politics back home rather than helping the children. They do not really help.” (Somali father)

“It is difficult without a father in the home. The kids don’t listen. It is hard to control them and get them to do what they should be doing.” (Somali mother)

Nearly all mothers and some fathers said that they attended parents evenings to discuss their children’s achievement and progress in school, as well as more general parents evenings held by the school. However, some parents complained that they often did not understand what the teachers were talking about at such meetings and the “numbers” presented to parents.

“All the mothers go to the meeting. It is mainly women because the men are too busy working. They come if they can.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“They have these meetings two and three times a year. Yes, I go to all of them. All my kids. I have always turned up. I never missed a parents’ evening. I think it is very important.” (Turkish mother)

“We would never miss such a meeting. The school provides translators and it is very useful because then we do not have to rely on our children to interpret and we can ask the questions and get the answers straight from the teachers.” (Turkish mother)

“I go to the parents meetings but sometimes I don’t understand what they are telling me. They show lots of numbers and I don’t know how my child is doing. It is not clear and there is not enough time to ask questions.” (Somali mother)
Finally, a handful of parents in each community also volunteered at their children’s school, either as helpers in classrooms, as interpreters on an ad hoc basis, as members of the PTA or as parent governors. These tended to be unemployed mothers or, in the case of governors, to be male professionals.

**Barriers to parental involvement**

As demonstrated above, the desire to be involved was strong among most parents and the nature of the involvement varied and was broadly appropriate. But the level of parental involvement also depended on parents’ own educational level, ability to speak and read English, understanding of the education system and of the curriculum, as well as on the amount of time they could dedicate to educational support.

- **Poor educational attainment of parents:** Parents who were not highly educated themselves found it difficult to support their children. Their ability to help decreased at pupils progressed. By the time pupils reached secondary schools, most mothers in the sample struggled to understand the academic content of the lessons and related homework. They could encourage them to study but could not check the content of their work and found it difficult to talk meaningfully with their children about what they did in school.

  “I can't help them as much as I want to because I am not educated myself. Also things get very difficult when they get to secondary school so we can't help them with their homework. But I still tell them that they have to sit and study and make sure they complete their homework. I have told the teacher that she must inform me if my son creates any problem.” (Bangladeshi mother)

  “Bangladeshi children are falling behind because of the lack of education of their parents. The parents can’t help their children with their homework and so the children can’t cope.” (Bangladeshi father)

  “Now, when their work gets a bit more complicated, I have to stop because I wouldn’t know how to help them, but I will make sure still they are doing it and keeping up. I wish I knew more. I would help them all the way but obviously I don’t.” (Turkish mother)

  “I am not highly educated enough to help them.” (Somali mother)

- **Ability to speak or read English:** Those who did not understand, speak or read English were highly restricted in their ability to support their children. As schools varied a great deal in their provisions for parents whose first language is not English, many such parents found themselves unable to help their children. They did not understand the education system enough to be able to formulate specific questions about what they did not understand, lacked the confidence to approach schools, did not know what additional resources they could access and, depending on the quality of their relationships with their children and with the schools, may not be aware of whether their children were doing well or not, of if they had homework to do or not. Moreover, children in homes where adults did not speak English often enjoyed a great deal of power, as they controlled communications with the outside world. This made it difficult for parents to restore their authority.

  “I would be a much better father if I spoke English. I can’t help my children. They help me. We were taught to respect elders but our children don’t have respect for us because we actually don’t know as much as they do.” (Turkish father)

  “What can I do if I don’t speak the language? He is telling me what he wants and I can’t argue because I just don’t know.” (Somali mother)
Although many Bangladeshi parents still do not speak English, this seems to have become less of an issue in the community, partly because there is greater social capital within the community for these parents to draw on and partly because schools may have developed better provisions for this community.

• **Lack of understanding of the education system and the curriculum:** Lack of understanding of the education system and of the curriculum was another important barrier to parental involvement, especially among those who were poorly educated themselves, had not schooled in England or did not speak English. This issue was more prevalent in the Turkish and Somali communities than in the Bangladeshi communities because very few parents had themselves schooled in England. Because mothers tended to take greater responsibility for their children’s education than fathers, they also had a better understanding of the system (all other things being equal) than fathers. In all three communities, quite a few women said it was easy to find out information about schools, but many parents also struggled.

  “There is a lack of understanding of the education system and that may keep the parents from fully committing themselves in helping their children.” (Somali father)

**I:** Do you think you have a good understanding about the English education system?

All: [laughter]

**I:** You don’t? What don’t you understand?

R1: Everything, anything [laughter]

**I:** Why is that? Is it because you don’t know where to find information or..?

R1: Yes, and you know, in English.

**I:** The information is in English? But you speak good English?

R2: No, not for that. Good enough for chit chat; not good enough for that. (Turkish fathers)

• **Lack of time:** Lack of time was a major barrier in some households. This was typically the case among fathers because they tended to work full-time, and often long and anti-social hours, in the catering industry or as minicab drivers, for instance. It was also the case among parents who headed large families (which is the norm in both the Bangladeshi and Somali communities) and among single-parent households. Lack of time to support children seemed especially acute in the Somali community, as mothers were often alone in charge of many children. They generally had too much to “juggle” to be able to support each child’s education.

  “I have seven children. It is difficult to help all of them. You do your best but there is no time because they all need something different.” (Somali mother)

  “I would like to get more involved but I can’t. I have five children. I cannot give them all the time they need. My children speak English better than me and they know more than me what they have to do, or they think they know more than me [laugh], so I can’t help them.” (Somali mother)

Yet, there were exceptions to this pattern. One Bangladeshi family, for instance, comprised of one retired father who had previously worked as a waiter, one economically inactive mother whose English was very limited and who had received no formal education, and eight daughters who had all either attended university or were set to do so (except one). Some already worked as
professionals. These young women had enjoyed limited parental support with their academic work, but were clearly raised in a highly aspirational household.

**Additional support: homework clubs, supplementary schools and private tutors**

Against a background of high parental aspirations and a widespread sense that parents are largely responsible for their children’s education, but given that many parents’ ability to support children in their education remained limited for the reasons identified above, it was common for children across the three communities to access additional support, either informally or formally.

Informally, it was very common for younger siblings to get help with their homework from older ones. Some parents (usually in the Somali and Turkish communities) were rewarding older siblings for helping their brothers and sisters (through a small fee, free time, cinema tickets, video games, “treats”, etc). In the Bangladeshi community, it was also relatively common for other adult relatives and family friends to give broad guidance to children and to help them in their career choices or choices of subject matter.

“When the lady [a substitute part-time lecturer] is free, she comes over and supports them in maths, but not all the time. She is my friend. She comes when she can.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“Her uncle, he is a lawyer, and he comes most weeks to help her with her revision because we can’t help her. He’s very good.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“I have to give my daughter £2 when she helps her younger brother with his maths homework.” (Somali mother)

“My son is well below average and the only reason why he really is where he’s got to is because of the involvement that me, my sister-in-law, my other sister-in-law, my sister, my brother… They sit down and read and read and go through exercises and you can spend hours doing exercises with him.” (Turkish father)

Formally, parents reported that their children accessed various types of additional support (besides religious education, which is discussed separately): 1) homework and after-school clubs run by local schools; 2) supplementary schools that are held in local community centres; 3) private (individual or group-based) tutoring sessions.

The quantity and quality of provision of additional support offered by schools seemed to vary a great deal by local authority and by school, which impacted on take-up and satisfaction. Some parents reported that these provisions were excellent (especially in the Bangladeshi community), that their children attended them many hours a week, and that they benefited considerably (in their linguistic ability, academic performance and social skills) from taking part in such activities. Others felt that the clubs in their area were ill-resourced, low-quality and over-subscribed. There was no clear pattern in the level of achievement of the pupils attending such clubs: both high achievers and under-performers took part.

“My son attended a science club they had. That was the one he managed to get into, but come next year, he’s got three after school that he wants to join in. Last year he did science club which was very good. They took them to all sorts of exhibitions that were going on to do with science. Every Friday, he has never missed it. He really enjoyed it.” (Turkish mother)

“The extra classes they put after school are very good, very helpful. My daughter progresses a lot. They help with English, Maths, Science.” (Bangladeshi father)
“I don’t know if I’m going to stay in Haringey or not. I would like to have access to more supplementary school, supplementary lessons. One day, we went to do an after-school club, but when we went there, it is a bit crowded, not enough chairs to sit down, there isn’t enough room in this school. You would not have learned anything there.” (Turkish mother, Haringey, depth)

“I am not aware that they have these homework activities in our school. I never heard about them.” (Somali father)

Some children from all three communities attended supplementary schools either after their school day or at the week-end, for a few hours a week. Some of these were fee-paying, others were free. Roughly half of all Somali parents reported that their children attended (non-religious) supplementary schools. Uptake was lower among Turkish and Bangladeshi children. Many Turkish parents reported that they found it difficult to convince their children to attend such classes. The reasons for the lower uptake of supplementary classes in the Bangladeshi community were not clear.

With respect to private tutors, the research found significant differences between the three communities. Very few Bangladeshi and Turkish parents hired private tutors because they said that they could not afford the fees.

“We can’t afford. Private tuition is good. I have no problem. But we can’t pay this.” (Bangladeshi mother)

“I am a single mother of four children. I want them to go to university, get a better education, get a better job, but I have to get a private teacher for all of the children, all four of them, and I can’t afford this. But if I can’t afford this, what is going to happen then? One child, OK, four children, not OK, but how can I say: “OK, I’ll pay for the oldest one, but not the others”? It is a big question-mark for me” (Turkish mother)

By contrast, a very high proportion of Somali parents had their children privately tutored. In the focus group with English-speaking Somali mothers, all participants hired private tutors; in the other groups with Somali respondents, roughly half of parents bought the services of private tutors. This tended to be the case mainly at GCSE level. The amount of additional private tuition varied a great deal, from two hours a week to five hours a day at the week-end. The hourly cost also varied between £6 and £25, depending on the number of children attending. Most of the tutors were Muslims, though not necessarily Somali themselves.

7.8 Home environment

Focus groups and depth interviews explored what attributes made for a good learning environment at home and whether parents felt that their own homes provided a good environment for their children to study.

Across the three communities, mothers and fathers shared a broad understanding of what constitutes a good learning environment at home. Four main attributes were identified: calm, quiet and stability; separate or designated spaces to do homework; ready access to computers, books and other learning resources; and positive relationships between family members. But these were often the very attributes which they felt were most lacking in their own homes.

In all the focus groups with Bangladeshi and Somali respondents and in two of the focus groups with Turkish respondents, the majority of parents complained of overcrowding. As most parents headed large families, it was very difficult to keep the house calm and quiet, and to provide dedicated space for the children to study. Living rooms typically housed a computer and a
television set (sometimes with video games). Bedrooms were very small, shared by two or three siblings, and with no space for a desk. Some parents also liked to be near their children when they studied to be able to supervise their work and monitor their use of the internet. Thus, for a range of reasons, children tended to do their homework on the dining room table, on the sofa, on a desk in a corner of the living room, on beds, etc. As living rooms had to accommodate many children, as well as adults of various ages, all with their different requirements, living rooms quickly became noisy. The problem was exacerbated by the lack of suitable outdoor space for children to play among the majority living in flats, and the lack of after-school or homework clubs in some schools.

“How can children concentrate in studies if they are not happy? I have five children and we live in a two bedroom flat. They can’t sleep properly and when they get to school, they are tired and can’t concentrate.” (Bangladeshi father)

“Our home is overcrowded. It is a small four bedroom flat and there is no space for table and chairs. It is noisy, with the busy road and the neighbours, and children find it difficult to concentrate.” (Somali mother)

“The problem is they [local housing authorities] put large families in small flats. They sometimes move two or three times in a few years. That unsettles the children and it affects their education. Children need calm.” (Somali father)

“I have a one bedroom flat, four children. It is not good for anyone, but for the older child especially. She is very good, works very hard, but there is no place for her to work without the younger children, screaming, playing. I tell them, I keep them away from the bedroom, but they are children…” (Turkish mother)

“At the school, they showed the clip with children. “If you are parents together don’t fight,” especially mother and father. Children have to get well. Teach them and talk them nicely. It says all the advisable. I’ve been many times to parents meeting. For me, I do whatever they advise. Not good to fight with wife and children.” (Bangladeshi father)

Parents tried their best to create a suitable atmosphere, but only a handful of respondents in the sample felt that they had succeeded in creating a home environment conducive to children’s learning (despite their household sizes varying between three and ten people). They felt that their children had “enough space to study”. They had created a space in the house dedicated to homework, where they could permanently leave educational resources and computers. They turned off the television set and the video games for set periods. They did not invite friends over. They allocated set periods of time for each child to spend on the computer. One Somali mother described her house as being “like a library during study time”. Another said: “I do not allow disturbances when the children are studying. No running. No TV. I do not even invite my friends.” Another had set a routine whereby some children went to study at the local library so that other siblings could do their homework at home in peace.

As may be expected, there were important differences in the quality of the home environment as a function of people’s generation of migration, of people’s ability to speak and read English, of their educational level and general socio-economic position. Second-generation migrants who were fluent in English, who had completed their higher education and who were in full-time employment tended to have more spacious houses, fewer children and domestic environments altogether more conducive to learning. But these were the exception in the sample.
7.9 Conclusions

The aims of research reported on in this chapter were to determine, from the perspective of the parents of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils, what are the factors that account for the differences in achievement among pupils from these three minority ethnic groups and what can be done to raise achievement in under-performing groups. The key emerging findings are the following:

• **Length of residence in England and reasons for migration:** Many Bangladeshi parents in the sample were second-generation migrants: many had been to school in England themselves, spoke and read some English and had already overcome the most pressing issues associated with migration. By contrast, most Turkish parents and all Somali parents were first-generation migrants who had arrived here as young adults, often as asylum seekers or refugees: many still spoke little or no English and were not familiar with the education system. This impacted on their ability to support their children and to engage fully with schools.

• **Home environment:** The home environment of the pupils was found to be related to parental ability to support their children’s education. Parents who headed large households found it difficult to maintain positive relations at home, to create dedicated spaces for learning, to give individual attention to each child, to occupy some siblings while others were studying, to keep noise levels down, etc. Many lived in severely overcrowded conditions, with many siblings sharing small bedrooms and a small “multipurpose” reception room. The difficulties were particularly acute in single-parent households because responsibilities for supervising homework and doing domestic chores were not shared.

• **Parental aspirations and expectations for their children:** There were no important differences between the communities in the aspirations of parents in relation to their children’s education. Across all three communities, these usually revolved around obtaining a university degree and/or becoming a professional. There were important differences, however, in their expectations of what their children would or could achieve in their circumstances. Bangladeshi parents seemed to maintain more positive expectations than did either Turkish or Somali parents. While many parents had similar aspirations for both boys and girls, a minority of parents (especially in the Bangladeshi and Somali community) did not expect that their daughters would work after they had completed their education. They also considered interrupting their daughters’ education upon marriage.

• **Parental knowledge of the education system:** An important factor in pupils’ achievement seemed to be the parents’ knowledge and understanding of the education system in England. Many Bangladeshi parents had themselves gone to school in England, but very few Turkish and no Somali parent had done so. Parents in the latter two communities were therefore much less familiar with the requirements of the education system in England than were many Bangladeshi parents. Their own schooling experiences did not always prepare them well to support their children in England. Many were poorly educated, did not speak English, were unfamiliar with many of the subjects taught as part of the mainstream curriculum, were used to single sex schools and very different pedagogical methods, and had little or no experience of many of the tools and resources used in classrooms. Other Turkish and Somali parents were well educated, and understood, spoke and read English, but they still struggled with the difficulties of adapting to a new culture and society. Unless schools dedicated considerable resources towards supporting these parents, they were left unable to engage as full partners in their children’s education.

• **Children’s education and professional aspirations:** Parental perceptions suggest that Bangladeshi pupils seem to have more positive attitudes to school and higher educational and professional aspirations than children from the Somali and Turkish communities. This would
appear to be because Bangladeshi children understand the value of education in terms of securing a “good job”, because the children enjoy their schooling experience more, and because more Bangladeshi parents are able to support their children and to work in partnership with local schools. Discussions with Turkish and Somali parents suggest that their children have more basic needs unmet. In these two communities, a number of parents believe that Turkish and Somali children (especially boys) are more likely to present with emotional and behavioural problems, to dislike school and to feel generally disaffected than children in other communities. Parents are less able to support them and to work in partnership with schools. There is a lack of positive role models in both communities, especially for boys.

• **Quality of school provisions and parental satisfaction with school:** Overall, more Bangladeshi than either Turkish or Somali parents reported being satisfied with their children’s school. Overall, parents tended to be more satisfied with the quality of academic support which school gave than with the ways in which they catered for the social and emotional needs of children. Parents felt that schools were equipped and made excellent provisions to support children that are underachieving in their education if these children were well-behaved and motivated to learn. However, they felt that schools had less understanding of, and provisions for, children who were unmotivated and disruptive. Parents also felt that most schools did not provide sufficient information and support to parents around transition periods (from primary to secondary school, from secondary school to sixth form colleges, and on arrival in a new school).

• **Communications and parental involvement:** One key driver of parental satisfaction with school is the quality and timeliness of communications between schools and parents. Not all schools seemed to share a common ethos around the importance of parental involvement and partnership working, and not all schools had practitioners with the requisite skills to engage parents in a meaningful way. Bangladeshi and Turkish parents were much more likely to be satisfied with their relationships with schools than were Somali parents. As secondary migrants, most Somali mothers had had children in schools elsewhere in Europe and they systematically complained that communications with schools in England were comparatively poor: they felt they could have addressed problems more successfully if schools had notified them of emerging issues much earlier on.

• **Parental involvement in children’s education:** Despite a desire to help their children, the level of parental involvement was often restricted by the parents’ own lack of formal education, difficulties in speaking/reading English, limited understanding of the education system and of the curriculum, and lack of time. These problems existed across all three communities but many Bangladeshi respondents argued that their community had come a very long way and that parents were now much better able to support their children.
8 Summary and Conclusions

In this chapter we summarise the influences on attainment amongst BST pupils, together with evidence on related themes; present an exploratory discussion of the conclusions to be drawn, including conclusions relating in particular to Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils; and we identify areas for further research.

8.1 Influences on Attainment

Overview

Measures that are effective with one group are not always effective with another, or are more effective at one stage of schooling and less at another; moreover, effective interventions will often have to take account of the varying economic, social and cultural profiles of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils and parents. For example, Bangladeshi and Somali pupils are equally likely to reside in high deprivation inner city areas, and in particular in high deprivation schools within London. However, while these ‘high-level’ features are similar, our research suggests that ‘micro-level’ differences in local context may be significant, including the relative size and concentration of both groups.

Improving attainment will require action at more than one level and from more than one area of policy. Previous research provides evidence in support of ameliorating levels of poverty, racism and structural inequality. Our research provides, in addition, evidence in favour of measures to support: pupils’ parents, including language and literacy support, and enabling their engagement in the life and curriculum of the school; and improving teaching and learning inside the classroom – for example, the adoption of a culturally inclusive curriculum that allows for contributions from pupils and parents; using role models from the local community to act as co-educators to work in secondary schools with targeted students who are under-attaining.

Trends

- There are large differences in attainment between the ethnic groups included in this research.
- Over the period 2003-08 White British pupils are on average performing best, followed by Bangladeshi, and then Turkish and Somali pupils.
- Ethnic minority under-performance, as compared to White British pupils, is already evident in primary schools.
- The performance of Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish heritage pupils improves over time and their results become closer to those of White British pupils. This is particularly true for Bangladeshi pupils, whose results at Key Stage 4 are higher than those for White British pupils.
- There are significant and continuing improvements in the attainment of all ethnic groups over the period 2003 - 2008, but Bangladeshi students have improved at a faster rate than their White British students.
• The performance of Bangladeshi pupils at age 16 is much stronger than seen in national tests at age 7, 11 and 14.

• In 2003, 45.5% of Bangladeshi students achieved 5+ A*-C grades compared to 51.0% of White British students. By 2008 these figures had increased to 62.3% of Bangladeshi students while the results for White British students were 63.8%. The gap in 2008 stood at just 1.5 percentage points.

• The gender difference in attainment is more marked with the Bangladeshi students than for White British students. In 2008 68.2% of White British girls achieved 5+ A*-C grades compared to 59.5% of White British boys, a difference of 8.7% percentage points. In the same year 68.9% of Bangladeshi girls compared to 56.0% of Bangladeshi boys achieved 5+ A*-C, a difference of 12.9 percentage points.

• Unlike Bangladeshi students, the attainment of Somali students does not match the level expected from their high educational aspirations, academic self concept, and attitude to school.

**Key Predictors**

• Under-attainment amongst Somali and Turkish pupils and amongst Bangladeshi pupils prior to KS4 appears to be significantly explained by poverty and social deprivation.

• The inclusion of FSM eligibility substantially reduces the attainment gaps for all the ethnic minorities considered at all the Key Stages.

• The inclusion of EAL also reduces the attainment gaps, but to a lesser extent as compared with the introduction of FSM.

• The negative impact of FSM increases in absolute magnitude as children become older.

• Our analysis does not support the hypothesis that BST lower performance in primary school is due to the fact that they attend on average worse schools.

• The importance of school factors increases over time (larger differences between schools during secondary school than during primary school).

• A positive impact on attainment is associated with a school having in excess of 50% of Bangladeshi pupils in the total school roll.

• For Bangladeshi pupils the following key factors were all significantly related to attainment: parental educational aspirations for their child, the student’s own educational aspirations, SEN, parental supervision, student planning for the future, homework and academic self-concept. This confirms that factors important in comparisons between ethnic groups are also important in accounting for variation in performance within the Bangladeshi group.

• Both Bangladeshi and Somali students are marked by extremely high educational aspirations both by parents for their child and by the students themselves, a positive attitude to school and strong academic self-concept. These factors distinguish both groups from similarly disadvantaged White British students and account for the greater resilience to deprivation of the Bangladeshi group in particular.

• However Somali students are not achieving the same return in relation to these positive factors as either White British or Bangladeshi students and they are not achieving as well as would be expected given these advantaging factors.

• School staff tended to feel that an important determinant of young peoples’ attainment was their parents’ ability to assimilate into UK society, and parental understanding of the British
education system. The fact that parents are a key influence on school attainment was echoed in the pupils’ research. This would provide Bangladeshi pupils with an advantage, having lived in the UK for longer than other groups.

- Issues related to English as an Additional Language (EAL) are likely to be more significant in primary school and in the early stages of secondary school, but appear to play a less significant role in attainment at age 16.

**Key Challenges**

- Teachers were asked what they saw as the main facilitators of pupils' achievements. In the Bangladeshi and Somali samples, the factors most widely mentioned were strong or dedicated support within the school and parental support for education. In the Turkish/Kurdish sample, within-school support was the factor most widely mentioned. It is a priority to disseminate and build on existing best practices, targeting support measures at pupils with the highest levels of need and lowest levels of attainment.

- EAL is not a measure of English fluency. Whilst the evidence suggests that attainment at KS4 is not simply about the language used at home it is a key question how far English fluency is significant in accounting for progress and achievement throughout the school career, particularly in respect of Key Stages 1-3, and in respect of new arrivals with very low levels of English.

- Unlike Bangladeshi students, the attainment of Somali students does not match the level expected from their high educational aspirations, academic self concept, and attitude to school. And Somali pupils did not appear to benefit from the high CVA achieved by the schools they attended. There is a need to understand better the factors that support and inhibit the progress and achievement of Somali pupils, and to identify effective measures of support.

- There are considerable structural barriers to success for Bangladeshi students. The challenge now is to ensure that success in educational attainment in school at 16 is reflected in increased participation in education post-16 and in improved employment and life outcomes.

- Across the three communities, there were important differences in expectations of what their children would or could achieve. Bangladeshi parents seemed to maintain more positive expectations than did either Turkish or Somali parents. We need to understand what accounts for these varying levels of expectation, and to identify measures for raising expectations amongst all groups.

- Despite a desire to help their children, the level of parental involvement was often restricted by the parents’ own lack of formal education, difficulties in speaking/reading English, limited understanding of the education system and of the curriculum, and lack of time. It is a significant challenge to identify and learn from best practice in relation to interventions designed to enable parents to support their children’s learning, and to become involved in their children’s school.

- Somali pupils have progressed faster in MEAP schools as compared with Somali pupils in other schools in England. However, there are no significant differences in progress for Turkish/Kurdish and Bangladeshi pupils as compared to White British pupils in the MEAP schools. It is a priority to understand better the progress, or lack of it, amongst these ethnic groups in the context of MEAP schools, and to identify support measures in the context of MEAP that are equally effective for all ethnic groups.

- Many parents, in particular Turkish and Somali parents, are not fully familiar with the education system and do not always know how to support their children’s education. Unless
schools dedicate considerable resources towards supporting these parents, they are left unable to engage as full partners in their children’s education.

Example of good practice: targeted support

- One LA gave an example of a research project that preceded Aiming High and MEAP. The project came about as a result of data revealing that Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys were amongst the lowest achieving MEGs in the LA. The project was designed to raise achievement amongst Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys. Seven secondary schools participated in the project, including 3 schools where Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys were achieving as highly as other pupils, as well as selected schools with significant numbers of underachieving Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys.
- The project involved discussions with pupils, parents, subject teachers, support staff, SLTs, mentors and supplementary schools, with a view to identifying what was happening in schools where boys were performing well, and what wasn’t happening in schools where boys were underachieving. It was found that schools where Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys were achieving highly had good individual pupil assessment. This included a thorough assessment of English language needs and personalised support in EAL all through secondary education. The support provided was tailored to meet the needs of the pupils and modified as pupils moved up through school years. These schools also had good tracking and monitoring systems in place and good relationships with the local community. By contrast, schools with underachieving Bangladeshi and Pakistani boys had limited EAL support, only given in year 7. This support was not structured or thorough and did not last through to examinations.
- The findings were published and disseminated. The LA also wrote a good practice guide that listed headings where schools were doing well. The guide looked at what SLT was doing in schools, and what policies and practices were being used by the school. It also included case studies of what was happening in schools in terms of leadership, ethos, mentoring, EAL and parental and community involvement. The guide gave step by step advice as to how the examples of good practice could be implemented in schools. It was sent to all secondary schools in the LA. Following the publication of the guide, the LA became involved in MEAP. The schools involved in the action research project were also involved in MEAP and, after 2 years, KS3 data showed that attainment had improved across all of the schools.

Poverty

- Under-attainment amongst Somali and Turkish pupils and amongst Bangladeshi pupils prior to KS4 appears to be significantly explained by poverty and social deprivation.
- Poverty plays a more important role than language difficulties in explaining the disadvantage of ethnic minority pupils in the first stages of their schooling.
- More than 8 out 10 Somali pupils live in a poor household. The proportion of Somali pupils with Free School Meals (FSM) is 82%.
- This figure should not obscure the prevalence of poverty amongst Bangladeshi pupils; over 50% of whom receive FSM. Fewer Turkish pupils receive? FSM, but the figure of approximately 40%, is still nearly 5 times higher than the proportion for White British.
- The negative impact of FSM increases in absolute magnitude as children become older.
- Both Bangladeshi and Somali students are equally likely to reside in extremely high deprivation inner city areas, and in particular in high deprivation schools within London.
Racism and structural inequality

- Racism and structural inequalities may be important influences on the attainment of many Bangladeshi and Somali students.
- Over 40% of Bangladeshi men under 25 years of age are unemployed, compared to 12% of young White men. High levels of unemployment levels may have an impact on motivation in ways pupils are not immediately aware of.

English as an Additional Language

- Issues related to English as an Additional Language (EAL) are likely to be more significant in primary school and in the early stages of secondary school, but appear to play a less significant role in attainment at age 16. Strong improvement is seen during KS4 in the attainment of nearly all minority ethnic students, whatever their language backgrounds, so this improvement is about more than just the language spoken at home’ (Strand, 2008).
- EAL is not a measure of English fluency. Whilst the evidence suggests that attainment at KS4 is not simply about the language(s) spoken at home it is a key question requiring further research how far English fluency is significant in accounting for progress and achievement throughout the school career, particularly in respect of Key Stages 1-3, and in respect of new arrivals with very low levels of English.
- The comprehension and use of academic language in particular presents barriers to all pupils with English as an additional language.

Length of residence in England and reasons for migration

- There were important differences between interviewees from the three communities as a function of their length of residence in England and of the reasons for their migration.
- Many Bangladeshi parents in the sample were second-generation migrants: many had been to school in England themselves, spoke and read some English and had already overcome the most pressing issues associated with migration, including isolation and difficulties in accessing services.
- By contrast, most Turkish parents and all Somali parents were first-generation migrants who had arrived here as young adults, often as asylum seekers or refugees: many still spoke little or no English and were not familiar with the education system. This impacted on their ability to find work and on their standard of living, but also on their ability to support their children and to engage fully with schools.
- The fact that the Bangladeshi community was longer-established also meant that there were many more Bangladeshi professionals working in a range of sectors than was found in the Turkish and Somali communities. These professionals acted as role models and resources for other community members. The Turkish and Somali communities, as recent and impoverished communities, both lacked positive role models for their youth.

Schools

- School quality appears to have a greater impact on results in secondary schools than in primary schools; that is, the proportion of the overall variance in pupils’ results explained by differences across schools is higher for secondary than for primary schools.
- A caveat: it may be that children who enrol in these schools have different characteristics that are not fully taken account of in our model; that is, they are not accounted for by
observable characteristics and by prior achievement. If so, we may be observing the effect of higher achieving children selecting into these schools, rather than the causal impact of these schools on pupils’ achievement.

- Our evidence does not support the hypothesis that BST lower performance in primary school is due to the fact that they attend on average worse schools.

- The importance of school factors increases over time (larger differences between schools during secondary school than during primary school).

- A positive impact on attainment is associated with a school having in excess of 50% of Bangladeshi pupils in the total school roll.

**School factors related to Bangladeshi students’ success**

- Bangladeshi students are more likely to have attended single sex schools and schools with high levels of deprivation in inner city areas.

- However these are not low quality schools, at least if Contextual Value Added' (CVA) is taken as a measure of school quality. Indeed the mean school CVA score for Bangladeshi students was significantly higher than the mean school CVA score for White British students.

- An additional positive compositional factor is a high concentration of Bangladeshi students in the school, with a positive impact associated with a school having >50% of Bangladeshi pupil in the total school roll.

**Influence of parents**

- An important factor in pupils’ achievement seemed to be the parents’ knowledge and understanding of the education system in England; this is also linked to their length of residence in England and ability to speak and read English.

- School staff tended to feel that an important determinant of young peoples’ attainment was their parents’ ability to assimilate into UK society, and parental understanding of the British education system.

- Parents as a key influence on school attainment was a prominent theme to emerge from interviews with pupils.

**Facilitators to achievement**

- Teachers were asked what they saw as the main factors acting as facilitators to achievement for pupils at school. In the Bangladeshi and Somali samples, the factors most widely mentioned were strong or dedicated support within the school and parental support for education. In the Turkish/Kurdish sample, within-school support was the factor most widely mentioned.

- After this, about two fifths cited another “in school” factor, good systems in schools for assessing students’ needs/target setting/monitoring alongside an “external” factor, parental support for education.
8.2 Support for Parents and Others in the Household and Community

Home environment

- The home environment of the pupils was found to be related to parental ability to support their children’s education. Parents who headed large households found it difficult to maintain positive relations at home, to create dedicated spaces for learning, to give individual attention to each child, to occupy some siblings while others were studying, to keep noise levels down, etc. The difficulties were particularly acute in single-parent households because responsibilities for supervising homework and doing domestic chores were not shared.

- Parents across the three communities shared a broad understanding of what constitutes a good learning environment at home: calm, quiet and stability; separate or designated spaces to do homework; ready access to computers, books and other learning resources; and positive relationships between family members. However, they differed considerably in their assessment of their own homes as suitable places for learning.

- Parents who headed large households (typically more common in the Bangladeshi and Somali communities than in the Turkish communities) found it difficult to maintain positive relations at home, to create dedicated spaces for learning, to give individual attention to each child, to occupy some siblings while others were studying, to keep noise levels down, etc. Many lived in severely overcrowded conditions, with many siblings sharing small bedrooms and a small “multipurpose” reception room.

Parental knowledge of the education system

- Many Bangladeshi parents had themselves gone to school in England, unlike most Turkish and all Somali parents in the sample. Parents in the latter two communities were therefore much less familiar with the requirements of the education system in England than were many Bangladeshi parents. Their own schooling experiences did not always prepare them well to support their children in England. Many had experienced little formal education, did not speak English, were unfamiliar with many of the subjects taught as part of the mainstream curriculum, were used to very different pedagogical methods, were used to single-sex schools, and had little or no experience of many of the tools and resources used in classrooms.

- Other Turkish and Somali parents were well educated, had lived and worked in different countries, and understood, spoke and read English, but they still struggled with the difficulties of adapting to a new culture and society. They were not fully familiar with the education system and did not always know how to support their children’s education. Unless schools dedicated considerable resources towards supporting these parents, they were left unable to engage as full partners in their children’s education.

Parental involvement in children’s education

- Most parents said that they wanted to be involved in their children’s education. Overall, mothers tended to be actively involved in their children’s education and to offer all the support they could. Fathers were usually less closely involved than mothers, especially in the Somali and Turkish communities.
• The nature of parental involvement varied a great deal, from ensuring attendance and punctuality to monitoring and supervising homework, from liaising with teachers and schools to attending parents meetings, from discussing the importance of education at home to becoming involved as school governors.

• Despite a desire to help their children, the level of parental involvement was often restricted by the parents’ own lack of formal education, difficulties in speaking/reading English, limited understanding of the education system and curriculum, and lack of time. These problems existed across all three communities, but many Bangladeshi respondents argued that their community had come a very long way and that parents were now much better able to support their children.

• Many parents who could not provide the level of academic support which they felt their children needed made use of additional resources: support from older siblings, relatives and friends; homework and after-school clubs, supplementary schools, and private tutors (mainly in the Somali community and in preparation for GCSEs).

• Parents, teachers and pupils interviewed mentioned that Turkish and Somali children are more likely to present with emotional and behavioural problems, to dislike school and to feel generally disaffected. Parents are less able to support them and to work in partnership with schools. There is a lack of positive role models in both communities.

8.3 Impact of Support Measures

Minority Ethnic Achievement Programme

• Somali pupils have progressed faster in MEAP schools as compared with other schools in England.

• There are no significant differences in progress for Turkish/Kurdish and Bangladeshi pupils as compared to White British pupils in the MEAP schools

School practices and pupils’ achievement

• Quantitative analysis identified only one significant factor affecting attainment: the implementation of measures to support parents of pupils from BST background. These measures are particularly relevant for Bangladeshi pupils; they do not seem to have a significant impact on Somali and Turkish pupils.

• The measures include bilingual (and non-bilingual) home-school link workers, information events or briefing meetings at school; regular newsletters in parents’ home language, English language/literacy classes for parents or designated member of staff with language skills to act as mediator.

• The specific support measures associated with higher performance (at a school level?) at Key Stage 4 (taken in 2007) included: home-school link workers, the presence of social workers in the school, smaller class sizes, dedicated activities after school such as homework clubs and activities to raise pupils’ aspirations, such as visits to universities.

In general these results underline the importance of the link between parents and school, and show the importance of involving pupils in extra curricular activities.
Teaching and learning

- Lesson format and teacher relationships appeared to be the strongest determinants of pupils’ experience of school, and good teacher relationships mattered to pupils when they needed support.
- There appeared to be identifiable areas of good practice in high CVA schools, which were noted and valued by pupils. This included good teacher-pupil relationships, greater positive encouragement for pupils, a strong ethos of celebrating diversity, and fewer barriers to pupils in asking for help and support.

8.4 Aspirations

Aspirations and attitudes

- Evidence from teachers and pupils suggests that Bangladeshi and Somali students have positive attitudes to school, teachers and lessons, and high educational aspirations.
- In terms of some of the main attitudinal factors influencing educational attainment, our qualitative evidence suggests that there are greater commonalities between the Bangladeshi and Somali groups, with the Turkish and Kurdish groups holding different attitudes.
- Bangladeshi and Somali groups value the importance of education very highly, and regard educational attainment as a key determinant of success. They also shared similar views on desirable careers.
- Bangladeshi pupils had notably more role models available to them in their local communities than did the other groups.

Parental aspirations and expectations for their children

- The parents of Bangladeshi and Somali students have high educational aspirations for the children
- Across all three communities, parental aspirations usually revolved around obtaining a university degree and/or becoming a professional. There were important differences, however, in their expectations of what their children would or could achieve, given their structural economic factors, household circumstances, the current performance of their children in school, the parents’ own diminishing capacity to help their children through a more complex curriculum and widening career options.
- Despite these difficulties, Bangladeshi parents seemed to maintain more positive expectations than did either Turkish or Somali parents.
- While many parents had similar aspirations for both boys and girls, a minority of parents (especially in the Bangladeshi and Somali community) did not expect that their daughters would work after they had completed their education. They also considered interrupting their daughters’ education upon marriage. If aspirations were therefore at times lower for girls, expectations usually remained higher for girls than for boys, as both their educational achievement tended to be higher and their attitudes to school more positive than boys.
Professional aspirations

- Evidence of parental perceptions suggested that Bangladeshi pupils seem to have more positive attitudes to school and higher educational and professional aspirations than children from the Somali and Turkish communities.

- This would appear to be because Bangladeshi children have more professional role models from within their community, they do not have to adapt to a new country and they are fluent in English. In addition, as second-generation migrants who are more likely to speak English and to have been schooled in England, Bangladeshi parents are able to support their children and to work in partnership with local schools.

8.5 Bangladeshi and Somali pupils³⁹

The results presented here lend some support to accounts of what has been described as the "immigrant paradigm" (e.g., Ogbu, 1978). This predicts that ethnic groups who have migrated by choice to new countries are strongly motivated in regard to education, seeing it as a way to economic and social advancement and in particular to improvements in the prospects for their children relative to their own status in their new countries (e.g., Kao & Thompson, 2003). This analysis is consistent with the findings included in this report that the parents of both Bangladeshi and Somali students have high educational aspirations for the children; offer high levels of parental support (though not necessarily in high levels of parental involvement with school which may be impeded by linguistic or cultural barriers); that the students themselves have extremely positive attitudes to school, teachers and lessons, high academic self concept, and high educational aspirations. Ogbu contrasts such "voluntary" minorities with "involuntary" minorities, those who have resided within the country for a much greater period of time and whose past experience of discrimination make them dubious of that fact that education will lead to socio-economic mobility for them. Ogbu's analysis would identify African American students in the US and Black Caribbean students in England as 'involuntary' minorities.

However when we consider educational attainment, this line of reasoning does not appear to hold well for Somali students; they are very recent immigrants in terms of entry to the country, and they do indeed have the highest level of educational aspirations, academic self-concept and so forth. However unlike the Bangladeshi students their educational attainment does not match the level expected from their high educational aspirations, academic self-concept, and attitude to school. There may be significance in Zhou and Bankston's (1998) argument for the concept of 'segmented assimilation' in understanding differential outcomes for different immigrant groups.

Kao & Thompson (2003) summarise the argument as follows: “because immigrants attempt to assimilate into their local communities, what assimilation means for immigrants varies a great deal. If the local majority population are inner-city African Americans, as was the case in Zhou & Bankston's study of Vietnamese American youth, then assimilation may have a very negative implication to the educational and delinquent outcomes of youth. In contrast, if immigrants hope to assimilate to a high-SES suburban community, then that desire should lead to positive educational outcomes” (Kao & Thompson, 2003, p435).

³⁹ The analysis in this section is exploratory, and confined to looking at theoretical accounts of differences in attainment between Bangladeshi and Somali pupils. This comparison was chosen by the researchers. It would also be worthwhile to explore the contrasts between these two groups and Turkish pupils.
This study has demonstrated that both Bangladeshi and Somali students are equally likely to reside in extremely high deprivation inner city areas, and in particular in high deprivation schools within London. However while these ‘high-level’ features are similar it may be that ‘micro-level’ differences in local context are significant. For example the Somali community is substantially smaller than the Bangladeshi community, and Bangladeshi students are more likely to be concentrated in specific geographical areas and schools. What is now required is a better understanding of the relationship between attainment levels and the size and geographical concentration of ethnic groups.

Although this analysis emphasises cultural factors (personal and professional aspirations for example) underlying Bangladeshi students’ success in overcoming socio-economic disadvantage, this should not detract from recognizing that racism and structural inequalities may be important influences on the attainment of many Bangladeshi and Somali students. Factors such as high youth unemployment and fear of discrimination in the workplace might also play a part in the high commitment to education evinced by Bangladeshi students. For example over 40% of Bangladeshi men under 25 years of age are unemployed, compared to 12% of young White men (OfSTED, 2004). There are considerable structural barriers to success for Bangladeshi students and the challenge now is to ensure that success in educational attainment in school at 16 is reflected in increased participation in education post-16 and in improved employment and life outcomes.

The performance of Bangladeshi pupils at age 16 is much stronger than seen in national tests at age 7, 11 and 14. Issues related to English as an Additional Language (EAL) are likely to be much more significant in primary school and possibly in the early stages of secondary school, but appear to play a relatively minor role in attainment at age 16. Strong improvement is seen during KS4 in the attainment of nearly all minority ethnic students, whatever their language backgrounds, so this improvement does not appear to be simply about increasing fluency in English (Strand, 2008). Neither does the improvement at age 16 for many minority ethnic groups simply relate to the wider range of examinations available at age 16 in contrast to national tests and assessment at age 7, 11 and 14 which focus exclusively on English, mathematics and science. Strand (2008) reports similar results for Bangladeshi pupils when using a KS4 ‘core’ points score based on GCSE for English, mathematics and science.

The current analysis has shed light on three important school factors related to Bangladeshi students’ success. Bangladeshi students are more likely to attended single sex schools and schools with high levels of deprivation in inner city areas. However these are not poor schools, if CVA is taken as a measure of school quality, indeed the schools attended by Bangladeshi students on average have significantly higher school mean CVAs scores than their White British peers. An additional positive compositional factor is a high concentration of Bangladeshi students in the school, with a positive impact associated with a school having in excess of 50% of Bangladeshi pupil in the total school roll. It was notable though that Somali pupils did not appear to benefit from the high CVA achieved by the schools they attended. We did not uncover evidence of what would account for this, and further research in this area is therefore called for. Generally there has been very little research on differential school effectiveness in relation to ethnicity, either in the UK or the US. What research there has been has tended to support the conclusion that ‘good’ schools are good for all their pupils: boys and girls, majority or minority, disadvantaged or advantaged (Strand, 1999, 2009). However the results for Somali students suggest this may not always be the case.

It has not been possible here to adequately address the role of the Local Authority in contributing to the high attainment of Bangladeshi students. 20% of all Bangladeshi students in England reside in the single London Borough of Tower Hamlets. This LA has seen substantial improvement in the attainment of Bangladeshi students over the last 10 years. A focus on the negative impact on attainment of extended absence through visits to
Bangladesh is an area the authority is reported to have targeted. It is noticeable from LSYPE that only 1.6% of Bangladeshi pupils had taken extended leave of more than one month during Y9, substantially lower than the LSYPE sample average of 4.2% taking extended leave (Strand, 2007, p42).

8.6 Areas for Further Research

- Both Bangladeshi and Somali students are equally likely to reside in extremely high deprivation inner city areas, and in particular in high deprivation schools within London. However while these ‘high-level’ features are similar it may be that ‘micro-level’ differences in local context are significant. For example the Somali community is substantially smaller than the Bangladeshi community, and Bangladeshi students are more likely to be concentrated in specific geographical areas and schools. It is worth exploring whether and how far the size and geographic concentration of ethnic groups helps to explain their levels of attainment.

- Further research is needed to follow Bangladeshi students into their post-16 careers and pathways. Historically Bangladeshi participation in post-16 education has been low, unemployment rates for Bangladeshi men under 25 years have been much higher than for White young men, and Bangladeshi women have been significantly under-represented in admissions to universities. Some recent research has also suggested that the success of gifted and talented Bangladeshi girls may not be maintained post-16 (Proulx, 2008). Research is required to determine to what extent these outcomes are changing in more recent data.

- Other recent initiatives such as the Minority Ethnic Achievement Project (MEAP), particularly focused on raising the attainment of Muslim (Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Somali & Turkish) students, require formal evaluation of their impact and efficacy.

- It is a priority to understand better the progress, or lack of it, amongst BST pupils in the context of MEAP schools, and to identify support measures in the context of MEAP that are equally effective for all ethnic groups.

- The existence of a larger gender gap for Bangladeshi students than for White British students indicates the need to explore further the barriers to attainment which Bangladeshi boys in particular might experience.

- A key question for further research is how far English fluency is significant in accounting for progress and achievement throughout the school career, particularly in respect of Key Stages 1-3, and in respect of new arrivals with very low levels of English.

40 Michael Stark - personal communication with Steve Strand.
APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Brief descriptions of the Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish communities in Britain

The Pakistani community
The partition of India in 1947 led to the creation of Pakistan, including East Pakistan. In 1971 East Pakistan became independent as Bangladesh. Migration from Pakistan to Britain started in the 1950s in response to labour shortages after the Second World War. Young men, often from rural communities, came as economic migrants to work in factories with a view to returning home as more wealthy people. The four major areas of settlements were London, the West Midlands, Yorkshire and the Humber and the North West.

In the 1960s and 1970s migration to Britain increased as men brought over their families to join them. In Britain their families could enjoy a higher standard of living, better education and could help in family businesses, such as grocery stores and restaurants. Some second and third generation children have done well educationally and a growing number are becoming professionals, such as lawyers, doctors and teachers.

By the year 2001, 55% of the Pakistani population was British born. Religion forms a very important aspect of the Pakistani community’s life. The religious needs of the Muslim community in Britain were initially satisfied through mosques that were adapted from private housing and as the community grew, mosques were purpose built to give religious instruction to the young and to teach Arabic. Urdu is the main language spoken by Pakistanis and has a high status. Some speak Panjabi. Pashto is a minority language, more commonly used in Afghanistan. Mirpuri is spoken by migrants from the rural Mirpur area of Kashmir.

The Bangladeshi community
Although there were some earlier seamen who settled in Britain, migration from Bangladesh began in the late 1950s and early 1960s, somewhat later than migration from Pakistan. These were mostly men from the rural north eastern region of Sylhet who came in the hope of eventually returning home. They found unskilled and often poorly paid work in factories and lived in overcrowded sub-standard accommodation; many supplemented their income by working in restaurants. By the late 1970s, recession closed many of the factories and many Bangladeshis, with contacts in the restaurant trade opened their own restaurants to cater for the growing taste in ‘Indian’ food. Even today many of the so called Indian restaurants are actually Bangladeshi owned.

A large number of Bangladeshi migrants settled in East London, where they also found work in the garment industry; others settled in the textile areas of the North West and the Midlands. Bangladeshi men did not bring their families to Britain until the 1980s, much later than Pakistani men. Today, about three-quarters of Britain’s Bangladeshis live in the East London borough of Tower Hamlets. In 2001 just over half (52%) of Bangladeshis living in the UK were born in Bangladesh and 45% in Britain.

41 Source: DCSF MEAP report (2008): Raising the attainment of Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish heritage pupils
Most (92%) Bangladeshi adults classify themselves as Muslim, a similar proportion to that among Pakistani British. Sylheti is the language spoken by many Bangladeshis in Britain. It differs from Bengali, the standard written language in Bangladesh.

Recent surveys show that the Bangladeshi group is one of the most deprived communities, with up to 68% living on low income and 40% of the men unemployed. Free school meals (FSM) data also offers an indicator of deprivation. Between 50–60% of Bangladeshi pupils are eligible for FSM at each key stage. Like most other immigrant groups, Bangladeshi parents see educational achievement as a means to better job opportunities and greater social status. There is some evidence that children from the Bangladeshi community are now beginning to improve their educational achievement and are engaging successfully in business and professional careers.

**The Somali community**

Somalis came to Britain as early as the end of the 19th century as workers on ships, and then more came during the two World Wars. Most settled in the ports of London, Cardiff and Liverpool and later, cities like Sheffield and Manchester. Somaliland, a former British protectorate, is now independent and relatively stable. It was from the late 1980s that many refugees, who fled the civil war between the government army and rebels, arrived from northern Somalia, the former Italian colony. As the war spread during the 1990s, a large number of refugees from all parts of Somalia arrived in Britain.

Since then Somali migrants have moved here after a period spent in European countries such as Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, and Norway where they had previously lived as refugees. Some have also lived in the Gulf States and arrive as literate in Arabic.

Somalis are split into many clans and sub-clans, and family membership of a particular clan continues to play an important part in Somali culture and politics. Due to this and the effects of the civil war, there are still tensions within the community in Britain which mean that different groups will not willingly mix. The impact of the war within Somalia also means that educational opportunity for many has been severely disrupted.

An appreciation and sensitivity to such factors would be helpful when settling a Somali pupil into school, fostering friendships between individuals and when working with groups of parents.

Somali is the common language spoken; however various dialects are spoken by different clans. It has a strong oral tradition as the written form of the language was agreed only in 1972. Prior to this, culture, history and religion was passed on orally, often through story telling. Somalis are practising Muslims and much of the children’s previous schooling will have been based on the Koran.

**The Turkish and Kurdish communities**

The Turkish and Kurdish communities are amongst Britain’s smaller ethnic minority groups and there is very little research evidence on how they are adapting to their lives in Britain. The wider Turkish community constitutes three main groups: Turkish Cypriots, Turkish mainlanders and Kurdish. Their patterns of migration and settlement into Britain vary. In 2001 it was estimated that there were around 180000-200000 Turkish speakers in Britain, a number which has increased to possibly 400000. Turkish Cypriots migrated to Britain during the 1950s and early 1960s. They came from rural agricultural backgrounds with little or no English and very little formal education. The majority came to Britain as a direct result of political events in Cyprus and chose Britain because of the colonial link and good employment opportunities. Some regarded it as an opportunity to earn money and then
return to Cyprus within a few years. The majority found jobs in catering and the textile industries and most households increased their earnings by both partners working very long hours. Many saved to buy their own businesses and moved to areas that offered better housing. Very few returned to Cyprus.

In the 1970s another group of Turkish Cypriots came to Britain as refugees because of the war on the island. Some of these settlers came for educational purposes and eventually took up professional positions. Although there are small Turkish communities scattered in Manchester, Edinburgh and the Midlands, the majority initially settled in Euston and Camden town and then moved to Haringey and Enfield. Many young Turkish Cypriots in Britain today classify themselves as British born third or fourth generation Turkish Cypriots. Many speak English and Turkish, but this is developing into a new dialect which is a cross between the two.

The majority of Turkish mainland settlers came between the 1960s and the 1980s following military coups in Turkey. The migration to Britain was part of a wider migration pattern to Europe for both political and economic reasons. Initially the men arrived on their own and later brought their wives and children. They settled and worked in areas where there were already small Turkish Cypriot businesses and soon began to start up businesses of their own.

The Kurds from Turkey arrived in the late 1980s and early 1990s, mostly as political refugees and seeking asylum in Britain (some more recently arrived Kurdish pupils are from Iran and Iraq). Many Kurdish families settled in Haringey and Hackney and used their family and friends to network and to buy their own businesses together such as shops and restaurants. They often speak both Turkish and Kurdish, but for many Kurds in Britain today, learning Kurdish is an important part of their identity as education in their first language has previously been denied to them.

Many parents, from all three groups, are keen for their children to attend supplementary school to continue to learn their mother tongue and to study Turkish/Kurdish culture and heritage. Most Turkish Cypriots identify themselves as different from Turkish mainlander and prefer to make that distinction. Similarly the Kurdish community prefer not to be classified as Turkish.
Our empirical strategy is based on the theoretical concept of an educational production function. According to this approach, a number of inputs (such as family background, educational resources, and initial ability) are transformed by schools into different outcomes. The standard production function framework assumes that knowledge acquisition is a cumulative process by which current and past inputs are combined with a child’s initial (or genetic) ability to produce cognitive outcomes (see Todd and Wolpin, 2003 and 2007). Following Todd and Wolpin (2003), the process of skill formation can be modelled as follows:

\[ A_1 = g_0(F_0, \mu) \]  

Where \( A_1 \) is the child achievement in period 1 (the first year of school), \( F_0 \) are family inputs in \( t=0 \) (pre-school period) and \( \mu \) is a measure of the child's endowed ability. In \( t=2 \), the child's achievement depends on the entire story of family inputs, on initial endowment and on school inputs (\( S_1 \)) and therefore the equation will be:

\[ A_2 = g_1(F_0, F_1, S_1, \mu) \]  

In this way, child educational outcomes at any point in time are modelled as a cumulative function of endowment, family inputs and school experiences, which implies that the education production function should include the cumulative history of inputs that have affected the child’s development. However, such detailed information is rarely available in the data and therefore analyses that study the contemporaneous relationship between school (or family) inputs and pupils achievement are likely to be affected by an omitted variable bias.

A common solution to this problem is to adopt a “value added” approach; that is to focus on the change in pupil outcomes over specific time periods. In its basic form, the value added specification relates educational achievement to contemporaneous measures of school inputs and family inputs and to a lagged achievement measure (Todd and Wolpin, 2007). Therefore, equation (2) is augmented by pupils’ educational achievement (test scores, for example) in the previous period:

\[ A_2 = g_1(F_1, S_1, \mu, A_1) \]  

This approach allows controlling for the prior and often unobserved history of parental and school inputs. As stated in Vignoles et al (2000), the inclusion of the lagged outcome measure “effectively ‘levels the playing field’ at the time of school entry” (p. 5).

---

42 The main outcome variable of interest in the previous literature has been academic achievement proxied by standardised test scores or, exam results or staying on rates (see Vignoles et al, 2000, and Hanushek, 1997 and 2003 for detailed reviews of the literature on education production functions).

43 Along with the technology of education achievement production, Todd and Wolpin (2003) also model family and school decision on inputs. Family inputs depend on families’ permanent resources and family decisions are assumed to be made subsequent to the actual realisations of the school inputs applied to their children. Schools are assumed to choose input levels for a particular child purposefully, taking into account the child's achievement level and the endowment and this decision does not depend directly on the level of family resources (Todd and Wolpin, 2003, p. F8).
The value added specification also helps to reduce the problem of the possible endogeneity of school quality. If pupils are not randomly allocated into schools, then measures of school quality may be correlated with pupil’s characteristics resulting in biased estimates. In other words, if higher ability or more motivated pupils tend to enroll in different schools from lower ability and less motivated pupils then in a simple model of school effectiveness it will look like some schools are more effective than others, even though in fact this is attributable to their different pupil intake characteristics. This situation is likely to occur when wealthier or more educated parents make quite different school choices from less wealthy and less educated parents. What this means is that school effect estimates will be biased if the determinants of school assignment are not adequately controlled for. By including measures of outcomes before the pupils started at the school and controlling for a number of family and pupils characteristics, we are able to control for many of the determinants of school selection and for school intake. In this way we reduce (but not eliminate) the bias of the estimates we produce.

We apply this value added approach to model pupil’s educational achievement, and to examine how this varies according different pupils’ characteristics, with a particular focus on ethnicity. Following Todd and Wolpin (2003) we model a pupil’s outcome as a linear, additive function of the full history of inputs received to date (captured by a lagged outcome measure) and therefore our econometric specification will be the following for each outcome:

\[ A_{jt} = \alpha_i + \beta A_{jt-1} + \gamma_k \sum_{k} X_{kt} + \phi_k \sum_{k} F_{kt} + e_{ij} \]  

where i, j, and t denote respectively pupil, school and period. At is pupil’s attainment in different Key Stages tests and At-1 is pupil’s attainment in the previous grade. Xk and Fk are a set of k pupil characteristics and background variables44.

In order to evaluate the role of schools in the production of student achievement, we include ‘school effects’ in our equation to understand how much of the total variance in the outcome is explained by differences between pupils within the same school and how much by the differences between schools. This will also help understanding whether the attainment gaps experienced by ethnic minorities are partially to sorting into schools (i.e. ethnic minority pupils attending worse school).

The error term (eit) is then decomposed into two components: a component \( \vartheta_i \) which is specific to each school and constant across pupils in the same school, and a component \( \epsilon_{ij} \) which is specific to each pupil.

\[ e_{it} = \vartheta_i + \epsilon_{ij} \]

There are two approaches to estimating school effects \( \vartheta_i \). The first approach treats school effects as random (random effect or multilevel models), while the second approach treats school effects as fixed (fixed effect models). Most of the literature on school effectiveness has used a multilevel model approach which treats the school effect as random. In this paper, we focus largely on a fixed effect model, although we estimate both random and fixed effects models to make our results comparable to the existing literature.

An advantage of the random effects model is that it allows us to calculate the variance of school effects – which is the between school variance (\( \sigma^2 \)). This can be one way to measure the size of the school effect. In particular, we will measure the “intra-class correlation” (\( \bar{r} \)), defined as:

---

44 PLASC does not provide detailed information about pupils’ background. As mentioned in section 2, we will use eligibility for FSM to describe parental background and to proxy poverty.
\[ \rho = \frac{\sigma^2_b}{\sigma^2_b + \sigma^2_\epsilon} \], which measures the relative size of the between school variance with respect to the overall variance.

However, a disadvantage of the random effects model is that identification requires what is known as the assumption of strict exogeneity, i.e. the model requires us to assume that school effects are unrelated to other covariates. What this means is that we have to assume that the effectiveness of a school is unrelated to variables that we have in our model, such as pupils’ prior achievement. This assumption is problematic as it is likely that students who will experience large gains in their test scores, for example, will tend to go to particular schools with particular characteristics (e.g. with socio-economically advantaged intakes - see Kramarz et al., 2008). The fixed effect model allows us to relax the assumption of non-correlation between the school effects and the regressors and therefore the FE model is our preferred specification.

We incorporate school characteristics into our analysis by estimating a second stage regression after the FE model. This second stage involves regressing each estimated school (fixed or mean) effect against each school’s characteristics to determine whether certain types of school are more or less effective. In other words having obtained estimates of school effects, we then explore whether these effects differ systematically across different types of school. We do this by first estimating the fixed effect model and extracting a school effect for each school. This effect measures the mean difference in attainment for that school, taking account of all the other individual level factors included in the model. We can then undertake the second stage regression mentioned above where we model the impact of specific school characteristics, such as school size or proportion of children in receipt of FSM on the magnitude of the school effect. This will help us in answering the question on what characteristics of schools are associated with better school effectiveness; we will repeat the analysis for Somali, Turkish and Bangladeshi pupils separately in order to be able to highlight the school characteristics that are more relevant to improve the performance of the different ethnic groups.
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White British  ---  Somali  ------  Turkish  ---  Bangladesh
Table 10: KS2 - by ethnic groups - cohort 98/90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Somali</th>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th></th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FSM</strong></td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
<td>-0.211</td>
<td>-0.324***</td>
<td>-0.238***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
<td>(0.125)</td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEN</strong></td>
<td>-0.816***</td>
<td>-0.789***</td>
<td>-0.768***</td>
<td>-0.863***</td>
<td>-0.872***</td>
<td>-0.853***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>(0.094)</td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>-0.185**</td>
<td>-0.179**</td>
<td>-0.202**</td>
<td>-0.226***</td>
<td>-0.222***</td>
<td>-0.223***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAL</strong></td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.334***</td>
<td>-0.192**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
<td>(0.146)</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>(0.149)</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDACI</strong></td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.703**</td>
<td>0.456***</td>
<td>-0.456***</td>
<td>-0.498**</td>
<td>-0.498**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.236)</td>
<td>(0.274)</td>
<td>(0.173)</td>
<td>(0.206)</td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td>(0.106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>-0.633***</td>
<td>-0.754***</td>
<td>-0.332*</td>
<td>-0.449**</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td>-0.463***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>(0.177)</td>
<td>(0.208)</td>
<td>(0.277)</td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEA dummies</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Somali</th>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th></th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEA dummies</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: KS3 - by ethnic groups - cohort 98/90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Somali</th>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th></th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS2 (std scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.482***</td>
<td>0.504***</td>
<td>0.609***</td>
<td>0.617***</td>
<td>0.549***</td>
<td>0.568***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>-0.359***</td>
<td>-0.344***</td>
<td>-0.376***</td>
<td>-0.177***</td>
<td>-0.305***</td>
<td>-0.184***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.094)</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.243***</td>
<td>-0.268***</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.139***</td>
<td>-0.074***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.110)</td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>-0.740***</td>
<td>-0.370***</td>
<td>-0.612***</td>
<td>-0.113*</td>
<td>-0.778***</td>
<td>-0.186***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.082)</td>
<td>(0.076)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.323***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.108*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.167***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.133**</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.091*</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.111***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.127*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.119***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>-0.483***</td>
<td>-0.225**</td>
<td>-0.435***</td>
<td>-0.290***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.212)</td>
<td>(0.199)</td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.079)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>(0.170)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td>(0.076)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>(0.171)</td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDACI score</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>-0.899***</td>
<td>-0.709***</td>
<td>-0.596***</td>
<td>-0.854***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.211)</td>
<td>(0.212)</td>
<td>(0.186)</td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
<td>(0.081)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.175)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.300***</td>
<td>-0.688***</td>
<td>-0.396***</td>
<td>-0.156*</td>
<td>-0.226***</td>
<td>-0.177***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.106)</td>
<td>(0.208)</td>
<td>(0.186)</td>
<td>(0.207)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.223</td>
<td>(0.230)</td>
<td>(0.135)</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.078)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>(0.196)</td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
<td>(0.087)</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.297</td>
<td>(0.232)</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
<td>(0.098)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.399***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.264**</td>
<td>0.167*</td>
<td>0.332***</td>
<td>0.324***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.106)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
<td>(0.175)</td>
<td>(0.081)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.156*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.087)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.226***</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.081)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA dummies</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3 (std scores)</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>0.424***</td>
<td>0.426***</td>
<td>0.434***</td>
<td>0.452***</td>
<td>0.465***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.199**</td>
<td>0.218**</td>
<td>0.219**</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.102)</td>
<td>(0.096)</td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
<td>(0.088)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>-0.833***</td>
<td>-0.429***</td>
<td>-0.476***</td>
<td>-0.696***</td>
<td>-0.342***</td>
<td>-0.338***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.082)</td>
<td>(0.080)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td>(0.061)</td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.186***</td>
<td>1.88***</td>
<td>0.210***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.203)</td>
<td>(0.189)</td>
<td>(0.165)</td>
<td>(0.184)</td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
<td>(0.099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDACI score</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.338**</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.212)</td>
<td>(0.188)</td>
<td>(0.221)</td>
<td>(0.172)</td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
<td>(0.177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.395***</td>
<td>-0.537***</td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>-0.228</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.128***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.092)</td>
<td>(0.199)</td>
<td>(0.223)</td>
<td>(0.196)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA dummies</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: KS4 - by ethnic groups - cohort 98/90
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>-0.584***</td>
<td>-0.417***</td>
<td>-0.277***</td>
<td>-0.283***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>-1.196***</td>
<td>-1.175***</td>
<td>-1.180***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.110***</td>
<td>-0.105***</td>
<td>-0.106***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>-0.188***</td>
<td>-0.141***</td>
<td>-0.086***</td>
<td>-0.148***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-0.761***</td>
<td>-0.326***</td>
<td>-0.582***</td>
<td>-0.206***</td>
<td>-0.148***</td>
<td>-0.243***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>-0.664***</td>
<td>-0.443***</td>
<td>-0.494***</td>
<td>-0.243***</td>
<td>-0.173***</td>
<td>-0.305***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>-0.375***</td>
<td>-0.144***</td>
<td>-0.194***</td>
<td>-0.031**</td>
<td>0.068***</td>
<td>-0.037**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.108***</td>
<td>-0.068***</td>
<td>-0.059***</td>
<td>-0.018***</td>
<td>0.009***</td>
<td>-0.015***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDACI score</td>
<td>-0.827***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.988***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.037***</td>
<td>0.112***</td>
<td>0.038***</td>
<td>0.394***</td>
<td>0.528***</td>
<td>1.022***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA dummies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>510572</td>
<td>510525</td>
<td>510572</td>
<td>510525</td>
<td>504650</td>
<td>504650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14: KS3 - whole sample - cohort 90/91 - value added specification (from col.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KS2 (std scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.625***</td>
<td>0.609***</td>
<td>0.606***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>-0.531***</td>
<td>-0.434***</td>
<td>-0.251***</td>
<td>-0.178***</td>
<td>-0.087***</td>
<td>-0.083***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>-0.137***</td>
<td>-0.074***</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.030***</td>
<td>0.063***</td>
<td>0.056***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>-0.814***</td>
<td>-0.775***</td>
<td>-0.099***</td>
<td>-0.096***</td>
<td>-0.104***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.043***</td>
<td>-0.035***</td>
<td>0.009***</td>
<td>0.012***</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-0.600***</td>
<td>-0.192***</td>
<td>-0.470***</td>
<td>-0.072**</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.054*</td>
<td>0.100***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>-0.638***</td>
<td>-0.437***</td>
<td>-0.521***</td>
<td>-0.308***</td>
<td>-0.201***</td>
<td>-0.161***</td>
<td>-0.108***</td>
<td>-0.076***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>-0.355***</td>
<td>-0.123***</td>
<td>-0.223***</td>
<td>-0.072***</td>
<td>0.059***</td>
<td>-0.062***</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.079***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.067***</td>
<td>-0.029***</td>
<td>-0.033***</td>
<td>0.007**</td>
<td>0.044***</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
<td>0.031***</td>
<td>0.044***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDACI score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.109***</td>
<td>-0.590***</td>
<td>-0.477***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.023***</td>
<td>0.079***</td>
<td>0.023***</td>
<td>0.192***</td>
<td>0.369***</td>
<td>0.010***</td>
<td>0.108***</td>
<td>0.078***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEA dummies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>499633</td>
<td>499633</td>
<td>498618</td>
<td>498618</td>
<td>497020</td>
<td>495187</td>
<td>493603</td>
<td>493603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: KS4 - whole sample - cohort 90/91 - value added specification (from col. 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KS3 (std scores)</strong></td>
<td>0.491***</td>
<td>0.473***</td>
<td>0.475***</td>
<td>0.471***</td>
<td>0.473***</td>
<td>0.475***</td>
<td>0.471***</td>
<td>0.473***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FSM</strong></td>
<td>-0.645***</td>
<td>-0.517***</td>
<td>-0.335***</td>
<td>-0.295***</td>
<td>-0.211***</td>
<td>-0.223***</td>
<td>-0.295***</td>
<td>-0.211***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAL</strong></td>
<td>0.139***</td>
<td>0.207***</td>
<td>0.276***</td>
<td>0.233***</td>
<td>0.267***</td>
<td>0.229***</td>
<td>0.267***</td>
<td>0.229***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEN</strong></td>
<td>-1.035***</td>
<td>-0.982***</td>
<td>-0.573***</td>
<td>-0.562***</td>
<td>-0.562***</td>
<td>-0.562***</td>
<td>-0.562***</td>
<td>-0.562***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>0.135***</td>
<td>0.143***</td>
<td>0.146***</td>
<td>0.150***</td>
<td>0.150***</td>
<td>0.150***</td>
<td>0.150***</td>
<td>0.150***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somali</strong></td>
<td>-0.151***</td>
<td>0.319***</td>
<td>-0.284***</td>
<td>0.180***</td>
<td>0.288***</td>
<td>0.206***</td>
<td>0.257***</td>
<td>0.191***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turkish</strong></td>
<td>-0.190***</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.307***</td>
<td>-0.053*</td>
<td>0.062**</td>
<td>0.101***</td>
<td>0.154***</td>
<td>0.097***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangladeshi</strong></td>
<td>0.077***</td>
<td>0.352***</td>
<td>-0.056***</td>
<td>0.128***</td>
<td>0.257***</td>
<td>0.159***</td>
<td>0.222***</td>
<td>0.135***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>0.043***</td>
<td>0.084***</td>
<td>0.010***</td>
<td>0.056***</td>
<td>0.093***</td>
<td>0.051***</td>
<td>0.070***</td>
<td>0.059***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDACI score</strong></td>
<td>-1.133***</td>
<td>-0.570***</td>
<td>-0.734***</td>
<td>-1.133***</td>
<td>-0.570***</td>
<td>-0.734***</td>
<td>-1.133***</td>
<td>-0.570***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>0.009***</td>
<td>0.067***</td>
<td>0.008***</td>
<td>0.140***</td>
<td>0.322***</td>
<td>0.067***</td>
<td>0.162***</td>
<td>0.335***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEA dummies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>514511</td>
<td>514511</td>
<td>513811</td>
<td>513811</td>
<td>511984</td>
<td>498965</td>
<td>497199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: KS3 and KS4 - School fixed effects by EMGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Somali</th>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th></th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>KS4</td>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>KS4</td>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>KS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2 (std scores)</td>
<td>0.539***</td>
<td>(0.0384)</td>
<td>0.555***</td>
<td>(0.0292)</td>
<td>0.563***</td>
<td>(0.0129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3 (std scores)</td>
<td>0.471***</td>
<td>(0.0396)</td>
<td>0.523***</td>
<td>(0.0332)</td>
<td>0.488***</td>
<td>(0.0117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.0735</td>
<td>(0.0817)</td>
<td>-0.0145</td>
<td>(0.0547)</td>
<td>0.166***</td>
<td>(0.00280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>(0.0808)</td>
<td>0.116***</td>
<td>(0.0601)</td>
<td>0.217***</td>
<td>(0.0242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>-0.165</td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
<td>(0.0533)</td>
<td>0.0246</td>
<td>(0.0257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.181*</td>
<td>(0.0928)</td>
<td>0.0246</td>
<td>(0.0592)</td>
<td>0.0356</td>
<td>(0.0223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>-0.401***</td>
<td>(0.0883)</td>
<td>-0.202***</td>
<td>(0.0607)</td>
<td>-0.321***</td>
<td>(0.0376)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.509***</td>
<td>(0.0922)</td>
<td>-0.321***</td>
<td>(0.0660)</td>
<td>-0.319***</td>
<td>(0.0318)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>-0.0566</td>
<td>(0.228)</td>
<td>0.0669</td>
<td>(0.0880)</td>
<td>0.270***</td>
<td>(0.0924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0391</td>
<td>(0.230)</td>
<td>0.270***</td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>(0.0765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.0570</td>
<td>(0.243)</td>
<td>-0.263***</td>
<td>(0.0880)</td>
<td>-0.0289</td>
<td>(0.0918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0271</td>
<td>(0.233)</td>
<td>-0.263***</td>
<td>(0.103)</td>
<td>-0.330***</td>
<td>(0.0759)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.263***</td>
<td>(0.0880)</td>
<td>-0.0289</td>
<td>(0.103)</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>(0.0759)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Observations | 590 | 599 | 920 | 925 | 4382 | 4440 |
| Number of schools | 181 | 183 | 176 | 177 | 784  | 788  |
| R-squared overall | 0.364 | 0.301 | 0.386 | 0.290 | 0.353 | 0.388 |
| R-squared within | 0.413 | 0.384 | 0.413 | 0.342 | 0.401 | 0.397 |
| R-squared between | 0.329 | 0.161 | 0.430 | 0.302 | 0.436 | 0.442 |
| sigma_u | 0.642 | 0.737 | 0.677 | 0.622 | 0.630 | 0.523 |
| sigma_e | 0.705 | 0.698 | 0.657 | 0.725 | 0.696 | 0.611 |
Table 19: regressions of predicted fixed effects on school characteristics by EMGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS2-KS3</td>
<td>KS3-KS4</td>
<td>KS2-KS3</td>
<td>KS3-KS4</td>
<td>KS2-KS3</td>
<td>KS3-KS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-sex</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.213</td>
<td>0.296**</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.205***</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td>(0.117)</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% non white British</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>1.296**</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>-0.281</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.438**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.400)</td>
<td>(0.547)</td>
<td>(0.391)</td>
<td>(0.394)</td>
<td>(0.186)</td>
<td>(0.171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FSM</td>
<td>-0.012***</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.013***</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-Teacher ratio</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EAL</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.011*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>-0.936</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>-0.699</td>
<td>0.353*</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.447)</td>
<td>(0.628)</td>
<td>(0.466)</td>
<td>(0.516)</td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
<td>(0.187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4 Table 4 (chapter 3)

#### Table 4. Demographic and educational factors by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Somali</th>
<th>All other</th>
<th>White British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family socio-economic classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial &amp; prof.</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intermediate/superv.</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>routine &amp; unemployed</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers Highest Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or equivalent</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE below degree level</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE A Level or equiv</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE grades A-C</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualifications</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualification</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fsm</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>owner occupier</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent household</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private tuition</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent wishes YP to continue in FTE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YP wishes to continue in FTE</td>
<td>Leave/DK</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay in FTE</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homework</strong></td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2days</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3days</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>All other</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4days</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5days</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none/DK</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic self concept quartiles</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude quartile</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSMband</td>
<td>35%+</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%-35%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%-21%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%-13%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%-9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood deprivation (IDACI)</td>
<td>most deprived 25%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>middle 50%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>least deprived 25%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: missing values have been excluded from the table.
Appendix 5 Analysis of the role of school practices on pupils’ achievement (chapter 4)

This Appendix analyses the impact of school practices on pupils’ achievement in secondary school.

A first caveat of importance is that the information at the school level was collected during Spring 2009, while the data on pupils’ performance refer to the academic year 2006/2007, which is the most recent dataset available in NPD/PLASC.

We adopt a value added approach, described in detail in chapter 245. The aim of the analysis is to understand whether characteristics regarding school workforce and policies implemented at the school level have had any impact in raising pupils’ academic achievement at Key stage 4, in the last year of compulsory school.

In particular, we regress a measure of educational achievement (standardised results in Key Stage 4) on some pupil characteristics46, on school practices and on past achievement (standardised results in Key Stage 3). By including measures of outcomes before the pupils started at the school, we are able to control for many of the determinants of school selection. This allows us to identify the impact of school characteristics, taking into account school intake.

In order to take into account clustering of pupils into schools, we adopt a multilevel approach by including in the model school random effects.

The role of school characteristics included in PLASC has already been studied and discussed in chapter 2 (see section 5.2). Therefore here we focus only on the variables and the information obtained through telephone interviews in Chapter 5. This implied that we restricted the sample only to the sub-sample of schools interviewed by GfK NOP. More specifically, we have created the following variables derived from schools’ answers to the questionnaire regarding school workforce and policies and support measures/programmes implemented:

- **Whether the school has at least one person with formal responsibility for ethnic minority achievement**
- **Whether there are any teachers of Bangladeshi, Somali, Turkish/Kurdish (BST) ethnic origin at school**
- **Whether there are any support staff of BST ethnic origin at school**
- **Whether the school receives financial support from the local authority, to support pupils from BST backgrounds**

45 The reason why we focus only on secondary schools is that we want to adopt a value added approach and therefore we need to have previous measures of achievement. Unfortunately, test scores at KS1 are not available and this motivates our choice to analyse secondary school only.

46 As in Chapter 2 we control here for gender, for Free School Meals eligibility status, for an indicator of Special Educational Needs (SEN) and English as an Additional Language (EAL) and for neighbourhood deprivation captured by the IDACI score.
• Whether the school has adopted at least one measure to support the EAL needs of BST pupils\textsuperscript{47}

• How many types of measures the school has adopted to support the EAL needs of BST pupils

• Whether the school has adopted at least one measure to support parents of pupils from BST background\textsuperscript{48}

• How many types of measures the school has adopted to support parents of pupils from BST background

• Whether a range of specific measures have been adopted to support pupils from BST background (see the full list on Table 1).

Table 1 shows summarises the school-level variables we have used and provides some relevant descriptive statistics.

\textsuperscript{47} This variable is equal to 1 if the school has adopted at least one of the measures listed in Q24

\textsuperscript{48} This variable is equal to 1 if the school has adopted at least one of the measures listed in Q27
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>obs.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>person with formal responsibility for ethnic minority achievement</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers of NST ethnic origin</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support staff of BST ethnic origin</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial support from the LA to support pupils from BST backgrounds</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures to support EAL needs of BST pupils (whether any)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures to support EAL needs of BST pupils (number)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>30.13</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures to support parents of pupils from BST (number)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures to support parents of pupils from BST (number)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIFIC MEASURES TO SUPPORT BST PUPILS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning mentors</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mentors or role models</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-school link workers</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational psychologist</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapists</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellors or behaviour support service</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of culturally specific NC materials</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities to help pupils get a better understanding of their own culture or heritage</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving pupils in school events to celebrate diversity</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links with supplementary schools or weekend schools</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to One tuition for EAL</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended school services</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted school attendance or behaviour measures</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted/adapted SEAL programme</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller class sizes</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated after school activities such as homework clubs</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual support for induction processes or settling in new pupils</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links with other schools</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities to raise pupils’ aspirations (such as visits to universities)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned before, the aim of the analysis is to identify which (if any) particular school practices have helped in improving the academic performance of pupils at Key Stage 4. We control for pupil characteristics and previous achievement in Key Stage 3 so that the coefficients of the different school policies/practices should be interpreted as the marginal effect of that particular school characteristic once we have taken into account pupil characteristics and school intake.
The following two tables of regressions report only the coefficients of the relevant variables and omit those of the other independent variables (indicated in the notes). Each column shows the coefficient of separate regressions where the different measures of school practices were alternatively included.

We first look at the impact on the whole sample of pupils in the observed schools (col. 1) and we then run separate regressions for each ethnic group (col. 2, 3, and 4). The first table (Table 3) focuses on the characteristics of the schools’ workforces and on the implementation of policies to support Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils. The coefficients with asterisks are statistically significant.

### Table 3: Impact of school practices (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whole sample</th>
<th>Somali</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>person with formal responsibility for ethnic minority achievement</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
<td>(0.179)</td>
<td>(0.339)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers of BST ethnic origin</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.099)</td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(0.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support staff of BST ethnic origin</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial support from the LA to support pupils from BST backgrounds</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures to support EAL needs of BST pupils (number)</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.149)</td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures to support parents of pupils from BST (whether any)</td>
<td>0.328**</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.446**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.437)</td>
<td>(0.184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures to support parents of pupils from BST (number)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Standard errors in parentheses: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, which means that coefficients with three asterisks are the more reliable, followed by 2 and 1 asterisk. The coefficient without asterisk are not significantly different from 0 and can be said to be NOT related to the dependent variable.

The table reports the coefficients of separate regressions where the school level variables were alternatively included. The dependent variable is standardised scores in KS4 and the other explanatory variables are: results in previous key stage (standardised scores in KS4); gender, FSM, EAL and SEN status, IDACI score and ethnic dummies (in col.1). The model includes random effects at the school level.

The results suggest that the only significant variable is the implementation of measures to support parents of pupils from BST background: pupils who are in schools where at least one measure is in place perform 32% of a standard-deviation higher at Key Stage 4. The measures include for example bilingual (and non-bilingual) home-school link workers, information events or briefing meetings at school; regular newsletters in parents’ home language, English language/literacy classes for parents or designated member of staff with language skills to act as mediator. It seems that these measures are particularly relevant for Bangladeshi pupils, while they do not seem to have a statistically significant impact on Somali and Turkish pupils.

The following table (Table 4) looks at the impact of the adoption of specific measures to support pupils from BST background.
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Table 4: Impact of school practices (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whole sample</th>
<th>Somali</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning mentors</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.192)</td>
<td>(0.198)</td>
<td>(0.104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mentors or role models</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-school link workers</td>
<td>0.079*</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>(0.077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational psychologist</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.088)</td>
<td>(0.235)</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>(0.125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>0.136**</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>(0.079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapists</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.158)</td>
<td>(0.158)</td>
<td>(0.077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellors or behaviour support service</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.088)</td>
<td>(0.357)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of culturally specific NC materials</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.102)</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities to help pupils get a better understanding of their own culture or heritage</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>-0.216**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.149)</td>
<td>(0.166)</td>
<td>(0.088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving pupils in school events to celebrate diversity</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.089)</td>
<td>(0.214)</td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
<td>(0.188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links with supplementary schools or weekend schools</td>
<td>0.087**</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
<td>(0.107)</td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to One tuition for EAL</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
<td>(0.168)</td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended school services</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.135)</td>
<td>(0.168)</td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted school attendance or behaviour measures</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.094)</td>
<td>(0.238)</td>
<td>(0.490)</td>
<td>(0.202)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted/adapted SEAL programme</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
<td>(0.107)</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller class sizes</td>
<td>0.096**</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td>(0.112)</td>
<td>(0.136)</td>
<td>(0.076)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated after school activities such as homework clubs</td>
<td>0.257**</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.110)</td>
<td>(0.500)</td>
<td>(0.493)</td>
<td>(0.192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual support for induction processes or settling in new pupils</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.080)</td>
<td>(0.200)</td>
<td>(0.226)</td>
<td>(0.144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links with other schools</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(0.130)</td>
<td>(0.088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities to raise pupils’ aspirations (e.g. visits to universities)</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.713*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.170)</td>
<td>(0.314)</td>
<td>(0.312)</td>
<td>(0.379)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Standard errors in parentheses: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, which means that coefficients with three asterisks are the more reliable, followed by 2 and 1 asterisk. The coefficient without asterisk are not significantly different from 0 and can be said to be NOT related to the dependent variable. The table reports the coefficients of separate regressions where the school level variables were alternatively included. The dependent variable is standardised scores in KS4 and the other explanatory variables are: results in previous key stage (standardised scores in KS4); gender, FSM, EAL and SEN status, IDACI score and ethnic dummies (in col.1).

The model includes random effects at the school level.
Again in Table 3, we only report the coefficients of the relevant variables and omit those of the other independent variables (indicated in the notes). Each column shows the coefficient of separate regressions where the different measures of school practices were separately introduced in order to explain KS4 performance.

Looking at the specific supports measures adopted it emerges that home-school link workers, the presence of social workers in the school, smaller class sizes, dedicated activities after school such as homework clubs and activities to raise pupils’ aspirations, such as visits to universities tend to be associated with higher performance at Key Stage 4 (taken in 2007).

These measures seem to be effective in raising the average performance of pupils in a given school but somewhat surprisingly no effect can be found when doing separate analysis for each ethnic groups (columns 2, 3 and 4). The coefficients in those columns are never significant suggesting that we cannot find evidence that these policies are effectively helping Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish pupils improve their achievement. Two exceptions to this finding are the activities to raise pupils’ aspirations and activities to help pupils understand better their own culture which seem to have a greater impact on Bangladeshi pupils. It does not, however, means that the measures are not effective at raising BST pupils achievement for two main reasons. First the sample size decreases dramatically, when using the sub-samples of BST pupils. It is therefore more difficult to find significant results. Second, any changes that happened in the schools under-study between 2007 and 2009 are not captured in this analysis as we are using Key Stage 4 in 2007 while the measures were recorded in 2009.

In general these results underline the importance of the link between parents and school. They also show the importance of involving pupils in extra curricular activities. Many of the variables that we have introduced in the analysis turn out to be not statistically significant, but this should not be interpreted as an evidence of their lack of effectiveness. It may be due to the fact that the data do not show sufficient variation to allow the identification of any impact.
Appendix 6 Westminster’s bilingual learner’s stages of English language development (chapter 5)

The term bilingual refers to all pupils who have access to or need to use two (or more) languages at home and at school. It does not imply fluency in both languages and includes pupils just beginning to learn English.

Bilingual learners’ development of English can be considered in terms of 5 stages:

**Stage 1** Bilingual learners who are just beginning to learn English and may engage in classroom activities using their first language only, or who many join in group activities but are not yet able to work independently.

They may join in group activities but many not be willing to participate orally, and may need to go through a silent period where they are given opportunities to listen, without being required to speak unless they are ready. They can begin to engage in some reading and writing activities in English with support, and may be able and willing to write in their first language if the opportunity is provided.

**Stage 2** Bilingual learners who are beginning to develop confidence in moving between languages and in using the English they are learning.

They many show an increasing control of the English tense system in particular contexts, especially personal writing, and evidence of a growing vocabulary. They are developing listening and speaking skills in English, but they need considerable support in order to participate in most reading and writing activities in the classroom. They will continue to benefit from opportunities to use the first language.

**Stage 3** Bilingual learners who are becoming more confident users of English, and can participate in a variety of classroom activities.

They can understand most classroom and social language, and can engage in a variety of oral and written activities. They are increasingly able to express ideas and feelings in English and communicate effectively with teachers and pupils in a variety of situations. They are developing fluency and experience as a reader and are able to read independently with good recall and understanding although still need support with technical and non-narrative texts, and with culturally specific references. They are able to write independently in most situations, with a growing command of English sentence structure and an increasingly wide vocabulary, but need support in taking on new registers.

**Stage 4** Bilingual learners who are confident users of English in most contexts and can engage in all learning activities with a considerable degree of independence; they may continue to need support in using certain genres or registers, and in understanding culturally specific references in oral and written English.

They can understand spoken English in a wide range of contexts, and are independent and experienced readers and writers, who are able to tackle a wide range of texts and reading and writing activities. They may move with ease between English and the first language; depending on learning opportunities both in the home and at school, some pupils at this stage will continue to develop cognitively and linguistically in their first language, while for others English may be emerging as the preferred or dominant language.
**Stage 5** A bilingual pupil who is a competent user of English, and whose use of English in speaking, reading and writing is effectively no different to what might be expected from a pupil of a similar age for whom English is a first language. Culturally specific references should not present pupils at this stage with a barrier. Pupils at this stage will include those who have continued to develop cognitively and linguistically in their first language and those for whom English is the preferred language or dominant language.

The stages should be related to the range of what would be expected from a monolingual English speaking pupil of the same age. When assessing bilingual learners in the early years it may be appropriate to take into consideration only a pupil's stage of development in talking and listening skills.
Appendix 7 Overview of qualitative sample (chapter 5)

Each focus group included between 4 and 10 pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bangladeshi sample</th>
<th>Local Authority 1:</th>
<th>Local Authority 2:</th>
<th>Local Authority 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority EMA leads</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview by phone</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview by phone</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview by phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>School 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School EMA leads/heads of inclusion</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interviews</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interviews</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils: boys</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils: girls</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
<th>Local Authority 4:</th>
<th>Local Authority 5:</th>
<th>Local Authority 6:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority EMA leads</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview by phone</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview by phone</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview by phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School EMA leads/heads of inclusion</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interviews</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interviews</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils: boys</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils: girls</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Somali sample</th>
<th>Local Authority 7:</th>
<th>Local Authority 8:</th>
<th>Local Authority 9:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority EMA leads</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview by phone</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview by phone</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview by phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School EMA leads/heads of inclusion</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interviews</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interviews</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interview</td>
<td>1 x in-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils: boys</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupils:</strong> girls</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
<td>1x focus group</td>
<td>1 x focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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