Raising attainment in education

Contents

Raising Attainment in Education

Increasing the attainments of under-achieving groups

Summary

Under-achievement is an apparently straightforward, but actually problematic concept. There has been a shift from a view which saw under-achievement as essentially a product of the individual learner and her/his circumstances to one which sees it as a systemic phenomenon, resulting from the relative ineffectiveness of the education system in enabling certain individuals and groups to make adequate progress. In many ways, it is helpful to think in terms of under-achieving groups, and a large number of such groups can be identified. However, individuals often belong to more than one group and are subject to complex interactions between the factors relating to these groups. Moreover, group-specific factors interact with the (under-) performance of the education system as a whole. In this way, many, if not all, learners are at risk of under-achievement.

On the basis of this understanding, it is possible to map out a role for local authorities in combating under-achievement. In brief, local authorities will develop a perspective which sees almost any case of low attainment as a case of under-achievement. They will articulate this view to schools and teachers and encourage them to focus on the effectiveness of their practice (rather than simply external factors) as the key to combating under-achievement.

The approach adopted by local authorities will be multi-dimensional, incorporating strategies at the group, area and systemic levels. These strategies will operate in a way which is responsive to individual differences and will have a focus on the proactive development of resilience rather than simply a reactive response to disadvantage.

Local authorities will use nationally-available headline data on under-achievement to sensitise them to potential under-achievement in their area. However, they will also undertake analyses of the complex manifestations and causes of under-achievement in their own areas.

In terms of particular strategies, local authorities will recognise the key role of schools (usually mainstream schools) and of teachers in combating all forms of under-achievement. They will, therefore, locate any specific strategies within the context of a broad school improvement strategy, which will itself focus on developing the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom. They will develop services for at risk groups and individuals, therefore, which work closely in support of mainstream schools. They will also offer strategic leadership and management which is based on a strategic vision, which involves the co-ordination of resources, services and agencies, which enables them to act as brokers between schools, pupils, parents and communities, which involves targeting resources in support of their strategy

and, crucially involves them in generating and managing high-quality data on the nature of under-achievement in their areas.

Raising Attainment in Education

1. The Structure of the Paper

This paper is divided into three parts:

- In the first part, we set out some of the main dimensions of the issue of under-achievement how the issue is defined, who are underachieving pupils and what the scale of the problem might be.
- In the second part, we outline the broad strategies which, the literature suggests, local authorities might be expected to deploy in combating under-achievement.
- Appended to the paper is a full bibliography of all the literature we have surveyed in its preparation. The literature on under-achievement and under-achieving groups is vast. We have therefore identified separately a small number of key texts which local authority personnel may find particularly helpful in coming to terms with this complex field.

Although this report was commissioned by the Office, the findings and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Raising Attainment in Education

2. The Main Dimensions of Under-Achievement

2.1 What do we mean by under-achievement?

Under-achievement is an apparently straightforward, but actually quite problematic concept. At its simplest level, under-achievement refers to,

> an unexpected discrepancy between the standard of work that the pupil is producing and what, for various reasons, the child is considered capable of producing. , p.38)

As Pumfrey and Reason go on to point out,

Underachievement is related to the concept of potential (loc. cit.)

and it is here that the complexity enters. Older views of underachievement tended to be premised on the notion that each individual had a more-or-less fixed potential (their ability or intelligence), that this potential could be measured accurately (e.g. by IQ tests) and that there was little that could be done to increase a learners potential. Most low achievers, therefore, could not be seen as under-achievers because they were indeed achieving their (limited) potential. Under-achievers were a relatively small group of learners who, perhaps through lack of motivation, were *not* achieving their potential.

The assumptions on which this view is based have long been under attack (see, for instance, . A more recent perspective places much more emphasis on the impact on achievement of environmental factors and therefore sees potential, if the concept is useful at all, as highly malleable. Initially, the debate centred on the impact on achievement of broad structural factors in society social class, poverty, culture and so on together with early familial experience. Although potential was seen as the product (in part at least) of environment, there were doubts about whether educational interventions alone were powerful enough to counteract these broader environmental factors hence the view that education cannot compensate for society . The implication was that those who suffered environmental disadvantages might *in principle* be capable of higher levels of achievement but *in practice* might be condemned to a lifetime of under-achievement (see for a useful account of these changing conceptualisations).

In recent years, however, the influence first of a new sociology of education , p.107) and then of the school effectiveness movement has focused attention on the capacity of educational interventions (better teaching, better school organisation and so on) to make significant differences to the achievement of pupils. This has significant implications for how under-achievement is now coming to be seen. It no longer simply refers to a gap between actual and potential achievement in those cases where lack of potential cannot be adduced as an expectation for low achievement. Nor is it seen as the product of structural factors which education cannot address effectively. Rather, under-achievement is seen as the consequence of ineffective educational practices which prevent the (unknown) potential of learners being realised. The implication, therefore, is that better teaching and schooling might be capable of raising the achievement of large numbers of learners who have previously been regarded as irremediable educational failures.

This educationally-oriented view of under-achievement is one that has informed the pursuit of standards by successive governments in recent years. It has been adopted with particular vigour by the current government, on the grounds, as the Secretary of State for Education puts it, that:

> We must have high expectations of everyone, regardless of background, gender or circumstances. We must target support to those who need most help to reach those high standards and we must change the culture. , p.4)

It is this view, moreover, which underpins the Governments "zero tolerance of under-performance" p.12) and which leads the government to view under-achievement as the product of inadequacies in the education system rather than of poverty or other social factors alone.

The acceptance of this new view of under-achievement, of course, does not mean that older views have to be rejected out of hand. The notion of potential, used sensitively, is important in setting expectations for pupils and their teachers which are realistic rather than demoralising. Likewise, a realistic acknowledgement of the *impact* of structural factors is different from a passive acceptance of their overwhelmingly determining effects on achievement and is important for targeting support appropriately to pupils and schools. Nonetheless, it is reasonable to expect that local authorities would articulate a clear view of under-achievement which would emphasise the part played by the effectiveness of educational practices in generating attainments. Such a view would, therefore, encourage schools and teachers to see almost any case of low attainment as a form of under-achievement to be addressed principally by improving the quality of education.

2.2 Who are the under-achievers?

In an important sense, under-achievement can only be identified and addressed reliably on a case-by-case basis. However, such an individualised approach is limited as a means of building policy at local authority level or above, or in identifying structural weaknesses in educational provision. Typically, therefore, larger-scale patterns of under-achievement are

identified in three ways:

1. On a group basis

In recent years, it has become common to see under-achievement as a phenomenon relating to particular *groups* of learners who experience disadvantages which call for additional support. These are identifiable groups whose levels of attainment tend to be lower than those of other groups for no obvious reason other than their group characteristics (and, of course, the inadequacy of the education system in responding to those characteristics). Hence, for instance, the low attainments of boys as a group compared to girls, or of some ethnic groups compared to others, characterises those groups as underachievers.

The groups which come to attention in this way and the way in which groups are categorised tend to vary over time. Cox , for instance, lists five groups:

o Ethnic minorities

o Boys

o Poor primary school attenders

o Looked-after children

o Children behaving in disruptive ways

DfEE circular 10/99 on *Social Inclusion: Pupil Support* lists seven:

o Those with special educational needs

o Children in the care of local authorities

o Minority ethnic children

o Travellers

o Young carers

o Those from families under stress

o Pregnant schoolgirls and teenage mothers

It is, of course, possible to add other groups very able children, for instance, or children who are bullied since any group which does not maintain optimum levels of good progress can be regarded as under-achieving.

The *policy response* to group-based under-achievement is typically to devise strategies and provision targeted at the most vulnerable groups Traveller

education services, special educational needs provision, initiatives aimed at raising boys attainment and so on.

2. On an area basis

Closely allied to the group approach is one which sees under-achievement as related to area factors. The argument here is that factors related to disadvantage tend to concentrate in particular geographical areas certain inner cities areas or social housing estates, for instance - and that these factors tend to compound one another . The cumulative disadvantage thus generated not only depresses educational attainment directly, but creates particular challenges for schools serving these areas which further compounds the difficulties that children face).

The *policy response* to area-based under-achievement is typically to target strategies and support at the lowest-attaining areas through, for instance, Education Action Zones or Excellence in Cities initiatives .

3. On a systemic basis

If underachievement is seen as attributable to weaknesses in the education system rather than to the characteristics of particular learners, then it may also be seen as a systemic phenomenon. In other words, large numbers of children, if not all children, under-achieve because they are educated in an education system that is less than totally effective .

The *policy response* to systemic under-achievement is typically to engage in large scale improvement initiatives, possibly, though not necessarily, under a badge such as the Improving the Quality of Education for All Project or the National Literacy Strategy .

There are two important reasons why these ways of defining under-achievers should be handled with caution:

1. Just as individuals can be members of several different groups so they can also come from under-achieving areas or experience systemic ineffectiveness. **The patterns of under-achievement are likely to be interactive rather than exclusive.**
2. Not all individuals who come from under-achieving groups, areas or systems are necessarily themselves under-achievers. It probably makes sense, therefore, to see these factors as determinants of under-achievement in individual cases, but rather as *risk factors* which increase the likelihood of under-achievement but will produce different outcomes in different cases. This then means that children and young people who are exposed to these factors are placed at risk of under-achievement a concept which is common in the USA and has more recently been adopted by OECD .

This concept of children placed at risk has two advantages over a purely categorical approach. First, it enables policy responses to be structured around large units such as groups or areas whilst discouraging crude stereotyping or blanket responses which ignore individual circumstances. Second, it makes it possible to introduce the notion of *resilience* the idea, that is, that some children and young people, although exposed to significant risk factors, nonetheless achieve at an appropriately high level . The notion of resilience is important because it allows policy to be directed towards maximising the strengths and advantages which young people have (and which may include high-quality educational provision) rather than focusing exclusively on their disadvantages.

Given this analysis, it is reasonable to suppose that local authorities will operate with a multi-dimensional approach to under-achievement. In other words:

- **they will have strategies in place at the group, the area and the systemic level rather than at one or other of these;**
- **they will operate these strategies in a way which is responsive to individual differences, which avoids a blanket approach and which targets resources precisely;**
- **they will develop positive strategies for fostering resilience rather than responding only to the disadvantages which children and young people experience.**

2.3 The scale of the problem

Given what we said earlier about the new view of under-achievement as the product of educational ineffectiveness rather than of agap between known potential and actual attainment, it is inevitably difficult to quantify the extent of under-achievement in any way, let alone to find a single measure. Nonetheless, there are some useful indicators that can be used.

At a *systemic level*, it is possible to compare the performance of the national education system against those of other countries. Such comparisons are contentious, not least because the comparisons tend to focus on narrow areas of learning and, more particularly, because the huge differences between countries education systems (e.g. in terms of curriculum, assessment methods and cultural values) make it very difficult to compare like with like (see, for instance, . Nonetheless, there is evidence of what appears to be some scope for improvement:

- In international Mathematics and Science comparisons, English 9 and 13 year olds perform at the level of middle-ranking countries. In Maths, for instance, they perform significantly below the level of students from Australia, Ireland, the Netherlands and Slovenia *inter alia* .
- Similarly, English 9 year olds perform at the level of middle-ranking countries in reading, though there is evidence of a particularly long tail of low attainment . The pattern in reading reflects a stubborn tail of underachievement generally; for instance, despite

overall improvements in attainment at GCSE, the figure of around one in twelve pupils failing to attain even one GCSE remains stubbornly constant .

- More generally, there is evidence that English children tend to under-perform across a range of measures of achievement - particularly in relation to the education systems of the Pacific rim countries and that this under-performance might be related to poor levels of economic performance - though the link to economic performance is disputed .

At the *area* level, there is substantial evidence that attainments in different parts of the country vary significantly. For instance:

- The lowest levels of educational attainment (as indicated by the proportion of pupils obtaining five GCSEs at grade A-C) are overwhelmingly concentrated in inner-city areas, particularly in inner London and the north of England .
- The proportion of pupils obtaining five A-C GCSEs in the most disadvantaged LEA areas is typically less than half that in the most affluent areas .
- Not only are levels of attainment in such areas low, but there is evidence that schools have to work much harder to generate attainment and that the incidence of weak teaching may be higher .

At the *group* level, there is substantial evidence that different groups of pupils perform at widely differing levels. For instance:

- Only 12% to 19% of care leavers go on to further education compared to 68% of the general population .
- Girls outperform boys from the start of schooling up to GCSE, especially in English, with, for instance, 10% more girls than boys achieving five or more A-C grades at GCSE, 15% more girls than boys achieving a high grade in Design and Technology and over 10% more girls than boys achieving level 4 or above in Key Stage 2 national tests).
- There are wide variations in the performance of different ethnic groups. For instance, Bangladeshi pupils on average achieve only level 3 in the National Curriculum core subjects by the end of Key Stage 2, but tend to catch up with their peers as they become older; Black Caribbean pupils tend to make a start to their primary schooling which is broadly in line with national averages, but are under-represented at the highest levels of attainment and under-achieve markedly in secondary school; Pakistani pupils tend to have depressed performance at primary level, but to catch up or overtake other ethnic groups at GCSE level except in terms of the highest grades .

Despite apparently clear-cut evidence such as this, however, some caution has to be exercised in assessing the extent of educational under-achievement. This is for three reasons:

- Good data on achievement is surprisingly difficult to come by. Not only are measures of achievement problematic (as, for instance, in the case of international comparisons, or reliance on non-standardised National Curriculum and GCSE assessments), but cohort

attainments are frequently not disaggregated by group or area.

- Since groups of children or children from particular areas are not homogeneous, fine-grained analysis tends to reveal a more complex picture than headline figures (see, for instance, on the complexities in analysing boys under-achievement).
- Since different group and area factors overlap and interact, the under-achievement of a group may not be due to group characteristics themselves, but to some hidden third factor. For instance, the under-achievement of minority ethnic groups may be attributable as much to class and spatial factors as to ethnicity *per se*, and/or may be the result of complex interactions between ethnic, gender, language and class factors and systemic factors in the form of the differential effectiveness of schools .

There is, then, evidence from a range of sources of significant under-achievement in the education system. However, it is more difficult to quantify that under-achievement precisely and the picture becomes more complex as the evidence is analysed in finer detail. In the circumstances, **it would seem to be unwise for local authorities to rely on necessarily crude headline figures of under-achievement, or to develop single-lever strategies for combating under-achievement in respect of particular groups or areas. Rather, it makes more sense to undertake robust analyses of the complex roots of under-achievement in particular situations and to develop multi-lever strategies with a better chance of addressing these complex causes.** Headline figures can then be utilised as sensitising information rather than as the unproblematic basis for policy decisions.

Although this report was commissioned by the Office, the findings and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Raising Attainment in Education

3. The Local Authority Role in Combating Under-Achievement

In broad terms, local authorities can play a part in combating under-achievement across three areas:

- work with schools
- the provision of services to under-achieving groups
- strategic leadership and management

3.1 Work with schools

In recent years, the relationship between local authorities and schools has been redefined. **The responsibility for pupils attainments rests more firmly with schools, giving local authorities the role of offering challenge and support in a process of continuous school improvement** . Whilst the school improvement process as a whole is beyond the scope of this paper, this role is crucial for addressing systemic under-achievement and something can be said about how it might be discharged.

- Although school improvement ultimately has to be generated by the school itself, there is good evidence that advocacy from local administrations and the intervention of external change agents are important facilitators of the process .
- Local authorities are in a position to make available to schools proven programmes of school improvement which schools might find it difficult to sustain unaided (see the examples cited in . Some of these programmes, moreover, explicitly address the issue of under-achieving or otherwise excluded groups - e.g. Success for All , Improving the Quality of Education for All , the Talent Development Model .
- Whether or not improvement is based on an established programme, there is evidence that a focus on *proximal* variables and *universal* strategies is likely to be most effective for under-achieving pupils. In other words, the focus should be on improving teaching and learning processes in ordinary classroom for all pupils rather than exclusively on school-level organisation or on special programmes .

3.2 The provision of services to under-achieving groups

Local authorities provide directly, or through commissioning processes, a range of

services to (potentially) under-achieving pupils and their parents. These include Special Needs Support Services, Pupil Referral Units, residential care facilities, Travelling Childrens Services and so on. Although it is difficult to generalise across all these services and all groups, at least one common theme emerges from the literature.

There is a danger of education services for at-risk groups becoming detached from mainstream schools and of non-education services making little educational contribution. In both these cases, there is a tendency for mainstream schools to transfer responsibility for problematic pupils to external services, for rates (and hence costs) of referral to increase and for the expertise of the services to become detached from mainstream settings (see, for instance, . **The most effective strategy to counteract these tendencies appears to be for services to work as closely as possible in partnership with mainstream schools, with the development of expertise in those schools as a central aim** (see, for instance, DfEE, 1999e; . This in turn may demand the delegation of resources (funding or personnel) to schools and some professional development for both mainstream and service staff.

3.3 Strategic leadership and management

A key role for local authorities is in providing a level of strategic leadership and management over and above that which schools can provide for themselves. This can have a number of dimensions:

- *The development of a vision.*

In a situation where schools are set individual targets and are in competition with each other, **it is particularly important that local authorities acquire some moral authority which enables them to articulate a strategic vision based on principles of equity and social inclusion**. This moral authority is vital when local authorities seek to intervene on behalf of disadvantaged groups in the face of entrenched prejudice (Liegeois, 1998). The local authority, for instance, is well-placed to advocate for inclusive provision for pupils whom schools find problematic, such as those with special educational needs or those at risk of disciplinary exclusions .

- *The co-ordination of inter-agency, clustering and area approaches.*

Given the complex causation of under-achievement and the fact that many causes lie beyond the immediate control of schools, **the LEA has a major role in co-ordinating wide-ranging strategies and resources to supplement what schools alone can achieve**. This co-ordination can take a number of forms.

- One is the promotion of collaborative approaches between schools so that they can share resources and expertise .
- Another is the promotion of inter-agency collaboration both within and beyond the local authority itself . This might well include the development of full-service schools in which

non-education agencies locate their services in or in close relationship with schools .

- A third is the development of area approaches to raising attainment (see, for instance , particularly where these bring together educational, social and economic strategies in a coherent regeneration initiative Unit, 1998b).
- A fourth is the involvement of business and industry in initiatives (such as additional funding, mentoring or work experience schemes) aimed at combating under-achievement .
- *Liaison with parents, pupils and other stakeholders.*

An important role of the local authority is to act as broker between schools on the one hand and pupils, parents and communities on the other. This brokerage can take many forms, ranging from encouraging the involvement of parents in supporting their childrens learning, through enabling parents and communities to participate in school governance to the promotion of community education (see , for a review). It seems to be particularly important for the local authority to act as an advocate for vulnerable pupils and their parents, ensuring that their voices are heard in shaping the education system .

- *The management of resources.*

Although schools are directly responsible for the management of most education funding and resources, **local authorities retain a major role in the management of resources over and above those which are delegated to schools and in managing a strategic resourcing framework for their areas. They therefore have considerable scope for targeting resources in support of strategies to address under-achievement**. They can:

- ensure the overall efficiency and equity of resource-deployment within their areas, in terms, for instance, of formulae for devolved funding , the elimination of surplus places in mainstream schools and the redeployment of special education funding from surplus special school places ;
- manage resources to encourage the development of effective provision in mainstream schools rather than to sustain increasingly costly external services (see , for an outline of the strategic options which local authorities have in the field of special needs education);
- target resources towards early intervention ;
- monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of their own services and of the way in which schools use their delegated resources ; and
- bid effectively for additional funding from central government, European and other funding sources (DfEE, 1999f).
- *The management of information.*

Given the complexities of the phenomenon of under-achievement, **local authorities have a major role in the management of information regarding the incidence of under-achievement in their areas and the effectiveness of strategies aimed at combating it.** Across the literature relating to all at-risk groups, a common theme is the lack of good

information on which sound policies can be based (see, for instance, , on the lack of data on minority ethnic group attainment, , on the lack of data regarding the effectiveness of special needs provision, , on the lack of monitoring of the educational achievements of children who are looked-after, and so on). The principal needs seem to be for: ensuring that information passes efficiently around the system, for instance, amongst schools, between schools and the local authority and between the Education department and other local authority and non-local authority agencies so that action can be co-ordinated efficiently (see, for instance, ; using the identification of at risk children as the basis for early intervention (see, for instance, ; and for evaluating the effectiveness of intervention strategies (see, for instance, .

Raising Attainment in Education

4. Conclusion: The Local Authority and Under-Achievement

Perhaps the key message to emerge from this review is that under-achievement cannot be understood simply in terms of the unique disadvantages experienced by different groups of learners and therefore that a response which focuses simply on providing isolated forms of support to each of those groups in turn is unlikely to be successful. Rather, under-achievement has to be understood as the product of complex and interacting risk factors to which many children are subject and of the ineffectiveness of the education system in overcoming those factors.

It follows from this that the major responsibility for combating disadvantage has to rest with those ordinary schools where the majority of children are educated and the majority of educational resources are lodged. Given, however, that schools have their own priorities to pursue and have necessarily limited resources at their disposal, there is a clear role for a local authority which can provide strategic leadership and co-ordination, supplement in limited cases the provision which schools can make for themselves and, above all, lock strategies for combating under-achievement into wider school improvement strategies. Not only is such an authority likely to be more effective in raising attainments, it will also be promoting an educational response to under-achievement which is in line with the governments avowed commitment to developing an inclusive education system.

Raising Attainment in Education

Appendix: Key References on Under-achieving Groups

Local Authorities will, of course, have access to the information disseminated by the Department for Education and Employment, the Department of Health and the Department of the Environment, Transport and Regions. In this appendix, we highlight texts which may provide a starting point for local authorities wishing to focus on services for particular under-achieving groups.

General

Cox, T. (Ed.) (2000) *Combating Educational Disadvantage: Meeting the needs of vulnerable children.* London: Falmer Press.

Children with Special Educational Needs

Croll, P. & Moses, D. (2000) *Special Needs in the Primary School: One in five?* London: Cassell.

Moore, J. (1999) Developing a local authority response to inclusion *Support for Learning* Vol.14, No.4, pp.174-178.

Wolfendale, S (1997) *Partnership with Parents in Action* Stafford: NASEN

Gifted Children

Lee-Cobin, H. & Denicolo, P. (1998) *Recognising and Supporting Able Children in Primary Schools* London: David Fulton.

Kent County Council Education (1995) *Able children: Six spheres, seven skills. Guidance for teachers parents and governors on supporting the very able* Canterbury: Kent County Council.

Sick Children

Closs A. (2000) *The Education of Children with Medical Conditions* London: David Fulton.

Present (Enabling sick children to continue learning) (1998) *Education for Sick Children* London: NAESC.

Children Educated Out of School

Philbrick, D. & Tansey, K. (2000) *School Refusal: Children who are anxious and reluctant to attend school* Stafford: NASEN.

Looked After Children

Fletcher-Campbell, F. (1997) *The Education of Children who are Looked After*, Slough: NFER.

Morris, J. (2000) *Having Someone who Cares? Barriers to change in the public care of children,* London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation/National Childrens Bureau.

Bullied Children

Olweus, D. (1993) *Bullying at School* Cambridge: Blackwell

Randall, P. (1996) *A Community Approach to Bullying* Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books

Truants and Excluded Children

Carroll, T. (2000) Pupil absenteeism in the primary school in Cox, T. (Ed.) (2000) *Combating Educational Disadvantage: Meeting the needs of vulnerable children* London: Falmer Press.

National Foundation for Educational Research (1999) *The Role of the LEA in Reducing Truancy* Slough: NFER.

Underachieving Boys

Gorard, S., Rees, G. & Salisbury, J. (1999) Re-appraising the apparent under achievement of boys at school *Gender and Education* Vol.11, No.4, pp.441-454.

Sukhnandan L., Lee, B. & Kelleher, S. (2000) *An Investigation into Gender Differences in Achievement. Phase 2: School and classroom strategies* Slough: NFER.

Teenage Parents

Dawson, N. (1994). *The 1994 Survey of Educational Provision for Pregnant Schoolgirls and Schoolgirl Mothers in the LEAs of England.* Bristol, School of Education, University of Bristol.

Hobcraft, J. & Kiernan, K. (1999). *Childhood Poverty, Early Motherhood, and Adult Social Exclusion. Analysis for the Social Exclusion Unit.* London, LSE.

Refugee Children

Candappa, M. & Egharevba, I. (2000) *Extraordinary Childhoods: The social lives of refugee children* London: Institute of Education/ The Refugee Council

Rutter, J & Jones, C. (1988) *Refugee Education: Mapping the field* Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books

Bilingual Children

Cline, T & Shamsi, T (2000) *Language Needs or Special Needs? The assessment of learning difficulties in literacy among children learning English as an additional language: A literature review* DfEE Research Briefs Research Report no.184

Garcia, O. & Baker, C. (Eds.) (1995) *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Traveller Children

Liegeois, J.-P. (1988) *School Provision for Ethnic Minorities: The gypsy paradigm* Hatfield: Gypsy Research Centre/ University of Hertfordshire Press

Naylor, S., Waterson, M. & Whiffin, M. (Eds.) (1993) *The Education of Gypsy and Traveller Children: Action research and co-ordination* University of Hertfordshire: Centre for Gypsy Research

Children of Minority Ethnic Origin

Bastiani, J. (Ed.) (1997) *Home-School Work in Multicultural Settings* London: David Fulton

Tomlinson, S. (2000) Ethnic minorities and education: new disadvantages in Cox, T. (Ed.) *Combating Educational Disadvantage: Meeting the needs of vulnerable children* London: Falmer

Although this report was commissioned by the Office, the findings and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Raising Attainment in Education

Bibliography

Advisory Centre for Education (1999) Education of Sick Children *Bulletin 89*

Ainscow, M., Farrell, P., Tweddle, D. & Malki, G. (1999) *Effective Practice in Inclusion and in Special and Mainstream Schools Working Together* London: DfEE.

Alcock, P., Craig, G., Lawless, P., Pearson, S., & Robinson, D. (1998) *Inclusive Regeneration: Local authorities' corporate strategies for tackling disadvantage. A Report for the DETR.* Sheffield: Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research.

Audit Commission & HMI (1992a) *Getting in on the Act: Provision for Pupils with Special Educational Needs: the National Picture.* London: HMSO.

Audit Commission & HMI. (1992b) *Getting the Act Together: Provision for Pupils with Special Educational Needs: A Management Handbook for Schools and Local Education Authorities.* London: HMSO.

Audit Commission (1996) *Misspent Youth* London: Audit Commission.

Audit Commission (1998a) *Getting in on the Act: A review of progress on SEN* London: Audit Commission.

Audit Commission. (1998b) *Changing Partners*. London: Audit Commission.

Audit Commission (1999a) *Held in Trust: The LEA of the future*. London: Audit Commission.

Audit Commission (1999b) *Missing Out: LEA management of school attendance and exclusion.* London: Audit Commission.

Bald, J., Bean, J. & Meegan, F. (1995) *A Book of my Own* London: Who Cares? Trust.

Baldry, A.C. & Farrington, D.P. (1999) Types of bullying among Italian school children *Journal of Adolescence* Vol.22, pp.423-426.

Barber, M., & Johnson, M. (1996) Collaboration for school improvement: the power of partnership. In M. Barber & R. Dann (Eds.), *Raising Educational Standards in the Inner Cities: Practical initiatives in action.* London: Cassell.

Basic Skills Agency (1997) *Basic Skills and Young Offenders.* London: BSA.

Bastiani, J. (Ed.) (2000) *Home-school Work in Multicultural Settings.* London: David Fulton

Bernstein, B. (1970) Education cannot compensate for society. *New Society*, 344 - 347.

Blunkett, D. (1999) *Excellence for the Many, Not Just the Few: Raising standards and extending opportunities in our schools.* The CBI President's Reception Address by the Rt. Hon. David Blunkett MP 19 July 1999. London: DfEE.

Blunkett, D. (2000) *Raising Aspirations for the 21st Century.* Speech to the North of England Education Conference, Wigan, 6 January 2000 .

Boushek, J. & Walters, B. (1998) The structure of provision for very able children: a case study from one LEA *Gifted and Talented* Vol.2 pp.23-31.

Boykin, A. W. (2000) The talent development model of schooling: placing students at promise for academic success. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 5(1&2), 3-25.

Bridges, D., & Husbands, C. (Eds.) (1996) *Consorting and Collaborating in the Education Market Place.* London: Falmer Press.

Brodie, I. (2000) Children's homes and school exclusion: redefining the problem *Support for Learning* Vol.15, No.1, pp.25-29.

Brooks, G., Pugh, A. K., & Schagen, I. (1996) *Reading Performance at Nine.* Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research/Open University.

Brown, M. (1998) The tyranny of the international horse race. In R. Slee, G. Weiner, & S. Tomlinson (Eds.), *School Effectiveness for Whom? Challenges to the School Effectiveness and School Improvement Movements*. London: Falmer Press.

Bunting, C. (1999) Schools to take on truancy control *Times Educational Supplement* p.6, November 5th.

Carroll, T. (2000) Pupil absenteeism in the primary school in Cox, T. (Ed.) *Combating Educational Disadvantage: Meeting the Needs of Vulnerable Children*. London: Falmer.

Cline, T. (1998) The assessment of special educational needs for bilingual children *British Journal of Special Education* vol.25 no.4.

Cline, T. & Shamsi, T. (2000) *Language needs or special needs? The assessment of learning difficulties in literacy among children learning English as an additional language: a literature review.* London: DfEE.

Closs A. (2000) *The Education of Children with Medical Conditions* London: David Fulton.

Connor, M. (1999) Children on the autistic spectrum: guidelines for mainstream practice

Support for Learning vol.14 no.2., 80-86.

Coopers & Lybrand (1996) *The SEN Initiative: Managing budgets for pupils with special educational needs: Phase 1 report* London: Coopers & Lybrand.

Coopers & Lybrand (1998) *The SEN Initiative:Managing budgets for pupils with special educational needs Phase 2 report* London: Coopers & Lybrand.

Coppard, R. (2000) Thinking and provision for the able and talented children in the EU *Educating Able Children* Spring, 43-45.

Coulling, N. (2000) Definitions of successful education for the 'looked after' child: a multi-agency perspective *Support for Learning* Vol.15, No.1, pp.30-35.

Cox, T. (Ed.). (2000a) *Combating Educational Disadvantage: Meeting the needs of vulnerable children.* London: Falmer Press.

Cox, T. (2000b) Pupils' perspectives on their education. In T. Cox (Ed.), *Combating Educational Disadvantage: Meeting the needs of vulnerable children.* London: Falmer Press.

Craig, W.M. (1998) The relationship among bullying, victimisation, depression, anxiety and aggression in elementary school children *Personality and Individual Differences* Vol.24, pp.123-130.

Croll, P. & Moses, D. (2000) *Special Needs in the Primary School: One in Five?* London: Cassell.

Crowther, D., Dyson, A., & Millward, A. (1998) *Costs and Outcomes for Pupils with Moderate Learning Difficulties in Special and Mainstream Schools (RR89)* London: DfEE.

Croydon Community Trust (1994) *The Health of Young Mothers in Fieldway and New Addington.* Croydon: Croydon Community Trust.

Dawson, N. (1989).Report on the Survey of Educational Provision for Pregnant Schoolgirls and Schoolgirl Mothers *Journal of Adolescent Health and Welfare* 2 (1): 7-8.

Dawson, N. (1994) *The 1994 Survey of Educational Provision for Pregnant Schoolgirls and Schoolgirl Mothers in the LEAs of England.* Bristol, University of Bristol.

Dawson, N. (1997) *In a Class of Their Own: A study of schoolgirl pregnancy and motherhood.* Bristol, University of Bristol.

Demack, S., Drew, D. & Grimsley, M. (1998) Myths about underachievement: gender, ethnic and social class differences in GCSE results *Paper presented at BERA Annual Conference, Queen's University, Belfast.*

Department for Education and Employment (1997) *Excellence in Schools.* London: The Stationery Office.

Department for Education and Employment (1999a) *Social Inclusion: Pupil support. Circular 10/99* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment (1999b) *Code of Practice: LEA-school relations.* London: Stationery Office

Department for Education and Employment (1999c) *Excellence in Cities.* DfEE. Available: http://www.standards.dfee.gov.uk/library/publications.

Department for Education and Employment (1999d) *Meet the Challenge: Education Action Zones.* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment (1999e) *Tackling Truancy Together: A strategy document* London: DfEE

Department for Education and Employment (1999f) *Learning Elements of the Single Regeneration Budget: Case studies and thematic good practice.* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment (1999g) *Exclusion Statistics 1995-1998,* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment (1999h) *Schools Plus: Building learning communities* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment/Department of Health (1999) *Draft Guidance on the Education Of Children Looked After by Local Authorities* London: DfEE/DoH,.

Department for Education and Employment/Department of Health (2000) *Guidance on the Education of Young People in Public Care.* London: DfEE/DoH.

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (1998) *Local Government: Improving Services Through Best Value.* London: Stationery Office.

Department of Health (1999) *Bulletin 26,* 7th October 1999 London: DoH.

Department of Health Social Care Group (1998) *Quality Protects: objectives for social services children* London: DHSCG.

Derrington, C., Bradley, J. & Kendall, S (in progress) *Secondary Transfer and Retention in Key Stage Three: A longitudinal study of gypsy traveller pupils* Slough: NFER.

Derrington, C., Evans, C. & Lee, B. (1997) *The Code in Practice: The impact on schools and LEAs* Slough: NFER.

Dew-Hughes, D, Brayton, H. & Blandford, S. (1998) A survey of training and professional development for learning support assistants *Support for Learning* 13(4),179-183

Diamond, C. (1993) A reconsideration of the role of SEN support services: will they get in on

the Act? *Support for Learning*, 8(3), 91 - 98.

Docking, J. (2000) What is the problem? In J. Docking (Ed.), *New Labour's Policies for Schools: Raising the standard?* London: David Fulton.

Dreyfoos, J. (1994) *Full-Service Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dyson, A., & Robson, E. (1999) *School, Family, Community: Mapping school inclusion in the UK*. Leicester: Youth Work Press for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Dyson, A., Lin, M. & Millward, A, (1998) *Effective Communication between Schools, LEAs, Health and Social Services in the Field of SEN* London: DfEE.

Dyson, A., Lin, M., & Millward, A. (1998) Inter-agency co-operation for children with special educational needs: an analytical framework. In D. van. Veen, C. Day, & G. Walraven (Eds.), *Multi-Service Schools: Integrated services for children and youth at risk*. Leuven: Garant.

Elliott, J. (1999) School refusal: issues of conceptualisation, assessment and treatment *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry* 40(7), 1001-1002.

Evans, J. (1999) The impact of the SEN tribunal on LEAs policy and planning for SEN *Support for Learning* 14(2)74-79.

Evans, J., Lunt, I., Wedell, K., & Dyson, A. (1999) *Collaborating for Effectiveness: Empowering schools to be inclusive* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Fletcher, B. (1996) *Who Cares? About Education: The education of children who are looked after by local authorities, a guide for school governors* London: Who Cares? Trust.

Fletcher, B. (1998) *Who Cares? About Education: The education of children who are looked after by local authorities, a guide for elected members* London: Who Cares? Trust in collaboration with the Local Government Association.

Fletcher-Campbell, F. (1997) *The Education of Children who are Looked-After*. Slough: NFER

Fletcher-Campbell, F. (1999) *Alternative Educational Provision at Key Stage 4* Slough: NFER.

Fletcher-Campbell, F. & Cullen, M.A. (2000) Schools' perceptions of support services for special educational needs *Support for Learning* 15(2), 90-94.

Francis, J. (2000) Investing in children's futures: enhancing the educational arrangements of 'looked after' children and young people *Child and Family Social Work* Vol.5, pp.23-33, 2000.

Fullan, M., & with Stiegelbauer, S. (1991) *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. (2nd. ed.). London: Cassell.

Garcia, O. & Baker, C. (Eds.) (1995) *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gilligan, R. (1999) Enhancing the resilience of children and young people in public care by mentoring their talents and interests *Child and Family Social Work* Vol.4, pp.187-196.

Goddard, J. (2000) The education of looked after children *Child and Family Social Work* Vol.5, pp.79-86.

Godfrey & Parsons (1996) *Follow up Survey of Permanent Exclusions 1996-97*. London: HMSO

Goodin, S. (1998) *Removing Barriers: Inspection of services to disabled children and their families* London: Department of Health

Gorard, S., Rees, G. & Salisbury, J. (1999) Re-appraising the apparent underachievement of boys at school *Gender and Education* 11(4), pp.441-54.

Grant, D. & Brooks, K. (2000) School exclusion of black pupils: an LEA response *Support for Learning* 15(1), 19-44.

Gray, P. & Panter, S. (2000) Exclusion or inclusion? A perspective on policy in England for pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties *Support for Learning* 15(1), 4-7.

Hambleton. R., Essex, S., Mills, L. & Razzaque, K. (1996) *The Collaborative Council: A study of inter-agency working in practice* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Hammersley, M. (1997). Educational inequality as a social problem: the case of England. In B. Cosin & M. Hales (Eds.), *Families, Education and Social Differences*. London: Routledge.

Harland, J. (1999) *Exclusion: Effective practice* Slough: NFER.

Harris, S., Keys, W., & Fernandes, C. (1997) *Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), Second National Report, Part* 1. Slough: National foundation for Educational Research.

Haynes, J., Atkinson, M. & Kinder, K. (1999) *Starting to Join: A baseline study of multi agency activity* Slough: NFER

HMI (1985) *The Education of Travellers' Children* London: HMSO

HMI (1992) *The Education of Very Able Children in Maintained Schools* London: HMSO

HMSO (1999) *Statistics of Education, Pupil Absence and Truancy from Schools in England 1998-99* London: HMSO.

Hobcraft, J. & Kiernan, K. (1999) *Childhood Poverty, Early Motherhood, and Adult Social Exclusion. Analysis for the Social Exclusion Unit*. London: LSE.

Holland, V. (1998) Underachieving boys: problems and solutions *Support for Learning* Vol.13, No.4, pp.174-178.

Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M., & West, M. (1994) *School Improvement in an Era of Change*. London: Cassell.

Hopkins, D., West, M., & Ainscow, M. (1996) *Improving the Quality of Education for All: Progress and Challenge*. London: David Fulton.

Housden, P. (1993) *Bucking the Market: LEAs and Special Needs.* Stafford: NASEN.

Howarth, C., Kenway, P., Palmer, G., & Street, C. (1998) *Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion: Labour's inheritance*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Hoyle, D. (1998) Constructions of Pupil Absence in the British Education Service *Child and Family Social Work* Vol.3, pp.99-111.

IMICH (1994) Exclusion from schools: current trends and issues in Social Exclusion Unit (1998) *Truancy and Exclusions* London: SEU.

INCLUDE (1998) Response to the Social Exclusion Unit's consultation on teenage parenthood in Social Exclusion Unit (1999) *Teenage Pregnancy*. London, SEU

Jackson, S. (2000) Promoting the educational achievement of looked after children in Cox, T. (2000) (Ed.) *Combating Educational Disadvantage: Meeting the needs of vulnerable children.* London: Falmer Press.

Johnstone, D. & Warwick, C. (1999) Community solutions to inclusion: some observations on practice in Europe and the United Kingdom *Support for Learning* Vol.14, No.1, pp.8-12.

Jordan, E. (1996) *Promoting Education for Travellers in Scotland* Edinburgh: Moray House Institute.

Jordan, E. (2000) Traveller pupils and Scottish Schools *Spotlights* at http//www.scre.ac.uk.

Kamin, L. J. (1977) *The Science and Politics of IQ*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Kent County Council Education (1995) *Able children: Six spheres, seven skills. Guidance for Teachers Parents and Governors on Supporting the Very Able* Canterbury: Kent County Council.

Keys, W., Harris, S., & Fernandes, C. (1996) *Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), First National Report, Part 1.* Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Kiernan, K. (1995) *Transition to Parenthood: Young mothers, young fathers - associated factors and later life experiences*. London, LSE.

Kinder, K., Halsey, K., Kendall, S., Atkins, M., Moor, H., Wilkin, A., White, R. & Rigby, B. (2000) *Working out well: effective provision for excluded pupils* Slough: NFER.

Kumpulainen, K. (1999) Children involved in bullying: psychological disturbance and the

persistence of the involvement *Child Abuse and Neglect* Vol.23, No.12, pp.1253-1262.

Lee, B. (1996) *Integration in progress: Pupils with SEN in mainstream schools* Slough: NFER.

Lee, T. (1996). *The Search for Equity: The funding of additional educational needs under LMS.* Aldershot: Avebury.

Lee-Cobin, H. & Denicolo, P. (1998) *Recognising and Supporting Able Children in Primary Schools* London: David Fulton.

Liegeois, J-P. (1998) *School Provision for Ethnic Minorities: The gypsy paradigm* Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Lincolnshire County Council (nd*) Learning Support (Gifted and Able)* Boston: Lincolnshire County Council.

Lucey, H. & Walkerdine, V. (2000) Boys' underachievement: social class and changing masculinities in Cox, T. (2000) (Ed.) *Combating Educational Disadvantage: Meeting the Needs of Vulnerable Children.* London: Falmer Press.

Lunt, I. & Evans, J. (1994) *Allocating Resources for SEN Provision* Stafford: NASEN.

Lunt, I., Evans, J., Norwich, B., & Wedell, K. (1994) *Working Together : Inter-School Collaboration for Special Needs.* London: David Fulton.

Macbeth, A., McCreath, D., & Aitchison, J. (Eds.) (1995) *Collaborate or Compete? Educational partnerships in a market economy.* London: Falmer Press.

Martin, M. (1999) Raising achievement through study support *Support for Learning*14(2), 68-71.

McCarthy, E. (1999) Scoping and hoping: the provision of speech and language therapy services for children with special educational needs *British Journal of Special Education* 26(4), 196-200.

Mellor, A (1990) Bullying in Scottish secondary schools, *Spotlights* 23, Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Mellor, A (1997) Finding out about bullying, *Spotlights* 43, Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Metropolitan Police (1996) *Performance Information* London: Metropolitan Police.

Miller, A. (1997) *Business and Community Mentoring in Schools.* Warwick: University of Warwick for DfEE.

Mills, M. & Lingard, B. (1997) Masculinity politics, myths and boys' schooling: a review essay *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol.45, No.3, pp.276-292.

Millward, A. & Skidmore, D. (1995) *Local Authorities' Management of Special Needs* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Montgomery, D. (1996) *Educating the Able* London: Cassell

Moore, J. (1999) Developing a local authority response to inclusion *Support for Learning* Vol.14, No.4, pp.174-178.

Morris, E. (1996) *Boys will be Boys? Closing the Gender Gap* London: Labour Party Consultation Paper.

Morris, J. (2000) *Having Someone Who Cares? Barriers to Change in The Public Care of Children* London: National Children's Bureau/Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Mortimore, P. & Whitty, G. (1997) *Can School Improvement Overcome the Effects of Disadvantage?* London: Institute of Education.

Munn, P. & Johnstone, M. (1992) Truancy and attendance in Scottish Secondary Schools, *Spotlight* 38,pp.1-5 http//www.scre.ac.uk.

National Association for the Education of Sick Children (1996) *Report on Research into Provision of Education By LEAs to Children who are out of School for Reasons of Sickness* London: NAESC.

National Foundation for Educational Research (1999) *The Role of the LEA in Reducing Truancy* Slough: NFER.

National Foundation for Educational Research (2000) *Raising Attendance: Working practices and current initiatives within the Education Welfare Service* Slough: NFER.

National Literacy Task Force (1997) *The Implementation of the National Literacy Strategy.* London: National Literacy Task Force.

Naylor, P. & Cowie, H. (1999) The effectiveness of peer support systems in challenging school bullying: the perspectives and experiences of teachers and pupils *Journal of Adolescence* Vol.22, pp.467-479.

Naylor, S., Waterson, M. & Whiffin, M. (Eds.) *The Education of Gypsy and Traveller Children: Action research and co-ordination* Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Nettles, S. M., Mucherah, W., & Jones, D. S. (2000). Understanding resilience: the role of social resources. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 5(1 & 2), 47-60.

Nilan, P. (2000) You're hopeless I swear to God: shifting masculinities in classroom talk *Gender and Education* Vol.12, No.1, pp.53-68.

Nottingham County Council Working Party (1981) *Report on the Survey of LEA Provision for Pregnant Schoolgirls.* Nottingham: Nottingham County Council.

O' Connell, P., Pepler, D. & Craig, W. (1999) Peer involvement in bullying: insights and challenges for intervention *Journal of Adolescence* Vol.22, pp.437-452.

O'Brien, P. (1999)How do we identify the more able pupil in science? And LEA research project in *Educating Able Children* Spring, 14-18.

OECD (1995) *Our Children at Risk.* Paris: OECD.

OECD (1996) *Successful Services for Children At Risk* Paris: OECD

OECD (1998) *Co-ordinated Services for Children and Youth At Risk: A world view* Paris: OECD

Office for Standards in Education (1993). *Access and Achievement in Urban Education.* London: HMSO.

Office for Standards in Education (1995a) *Access, achievement and attendance in secondary schools* London: Ofsted.

Office for Standards in Education (1995b) *Pupil Referral Units: The first twelve inspections.* London: Ofsted.

Office for Standards in Education (1996) *The Teaching of Reading in 45 Inner London Primary Schools.* London: Ofsted.

Office for Standards in Education (1999) *Raising the Attainment of Minority Ethnic Pupils: School and LEA responses.* London: Ofsted.

Office for Standards in Education (2000) *Improving City Schools.* London: Ofsted.

Office of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector (1997) *Improving Attendance and Behaviour: An evaluation of Welsh Office funded projects in nine LEAs* Cardiff: OHMCI.

Office of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector (1997) *The Relative Performance of Boys and Girls* Cardiff: OHMCI

Olweus, D. (1993) *Bullying at School* Cambridge: Blackwell.

Parsons, C. (1999) Social inclusion and school improvement *Support for Learning* Vol.14, No.4, pp.179-183.

Parsons, C., Castle, F., Howlett, K. & Worral, J. (1996) *Exclusions from School: The public cost* Canterbury: Christchurch College.

Pathak, S. (2000) *Race Research for the Future: Ethnicity in education, training and the labour market* London: DfEE.

Pearce, N., & Hillman, J. (1998) *Wasted Youth: Raising achievement and tackling social*

exclusion. London: IPPR.

Phelps, F., McCarthy, M., Stoker, R. & Chang, J. (2000) Developing thinking and learning for all pupils in schools *Educating Able Children* Spring.

Philbrick, D. & Tansey, K. (2000) *School Refusal:Cchildren who are anxious and reluctant to attend school* Stafford: NASEN.

Phillips, A. (1998) It's just so unfair *Times Educational Supplement* pp.14-15, Nov. 13th.

Pinsent, P. (1992) *Language, Culture and Young Children* London: David Fulton.

Power, A. & Mumford, K. (1999) *The Slow Death of Great Cities? Urban abandonment or urban renaissance*. York: YPS.

Powney, J., McPake, J., Hall, S. & Lyall, L. (1998) *Education of minority ethnic groups in Scotland: a review of research* Edinburgh: SCRE.

Present (Enabling sick children to continue learning) (1998) *Education for Sick Children* London: NAESC.

Pumfrey, P. D., & Reason, R. (1991).*Specific Learning Difficulties (Dyslexia): Challenges and responses*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

Pye, D. (1999) What goes around comes around: DfEE and LEA relation in the context of EAZ *Paper presented at BERA Annual Conference, University of Sussex*.

Radnor, H. & Ball, S. (1995) *Local Education Authorities: Accountability and control* Stoke on Trent: Trentham.

Randall, P. (1996) *A Community Approach to Bullying* Stoke on Trent: Trentham.

Reed, L.R. (1999) Troubling boys and disturbing discourses on masculinity and schooling: a feminist exploration of current debates and interventions concerning boys in school *Gender and Education* Vol.11, No.1, pp.93-110.

Reynolds, D., & Farrell, S. (1996) *Worlds Apart? A Review of International Surveys of Educational Achievement Involving England*. London: Ofsted.

Reynolds, D., & Teddlie, C. (2000) The processes of school effectiveness. In C. Teddlie & D. Reynolds (Eds.), *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness* Research . London: Falmer Press.

Reynolds, D., Teddlie, C., with Hopkins, D., & Stringfield, S. (2000) Linking school effectiveness and school improvement. In C. Teddlie & D. Reynolds (Eds.), *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research.* London: Falmer Press.

Rigby, K. (1997a) *Bullying in Australian Schools-and what to do about it* London: Kingsley.

Rigby, K. (1997b) What children tell us about bullying in schools *Children Australia* Vol.22, pp.28-34.

Rigby, K. (2000) Effects of peer victimisation in schools and perceived social support on adolescent well being *Journal of Adolescence* Vol.23, No.1, pp.57-68.

Rigby, K.(1998c) Suicidal ideation and bullying among Australian secondary school children *Australian Educational and Developmental Psychologist* Vol.15, No.1, pp.45-46.

Roaf, C., & Lloyd, C. (1995) *Multi-agency Work with Young People in Difficulty*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Robinson, P. (1997) *Literacy, Numeracy and Economic Performance*. London: Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics.

Ruddock, J., Chaplain, R., & Wallace, G. (1996) *School Improvement: What can pupils tell us?* London: David Fulton.

Rutter, J. (1994) *Refugee Children in the Classroom* Stoke on Trent: Trentham

Rutter, J. & Jones, C. (1988) *Refugee Education: Mapping the field* Stoke on Trent: Trentham

Sadler, K. (2000) Attributions and solutions for the underachievement of able pupils *Educating Able Children* Spring, 17-22.

Salisbury, J., Rees, G. & Gorard, S. (1999) Accounting for the differential attainment of boys and girls at school *School Leadership and Management* Vol.19, No.4, pp.403-426.

Salmivalli, C. (1999) Participant role approach to school bullying: implications for interventions *Journal of Adolescence* vol. 22, 453-459.

Scottish Executive (1999a) *Advisory Committee Report into the Education of Children with Severe Low Incidence Disabilities.* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive

Scottish Executive (1999b) *Improving our Schools: Special Educational Needs.* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive

Scottish Office (1998) *New Community Schools: The prospectus.* Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Sebba, J. & Sachdev, D. (1997) *What Works in Inclusive Education?* Ilford: Barnardo's

Shaw, C. (1998) *Remember My Messages: The experiences and views of 2000 children in public care in the UK* London: Who Cares? Trust.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1996) *Every Child, Every School: Success for all.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Smith, G. (1996) Urban education: current position and future possibilities. In M. Barber & R.

Dann (Eds.), *Raising Educational Standards in the Inner Cities.* London: Cassell.

Smith, P.K. & Madsen, K. (1996) *A Follow up Survey of the DFEE Anti-Bullying Pack for Schools: Its use and the development of anti-bullying work in schools, Research Report 3,* London: DfEE.

Social Exclusion Unit (1998a) *Truancy and Exclusions* London: SEU.

Social Exclusion Unit (1998b) *Bringing Britain Together: A national strategy for neighbourhood renewal, Cm. 4045.* London: The Stationery Office.

Social Exclusion Unit (1999). *Teenage Pregnancy.* London, SEU.

Social Services Inspectorate & Ofsted. (1995) *The Education of Children who are Looked After by Local Authorities.* London: Department of Health.

Society of Education Officers (1996) LEAs *Value added and School Improvement* London: SEO.

Stead, J., Closs, A. & Arshad, R. (1999) Refugee pupils in Scottish schools *Spotlights* at http//www.scre.ac.uk.

Stein, M. & Wade, J. (1999) *Helping Care Leavers: problems and strategic responses* London: DETR.

Stevens,V., Van Oost, P. & De Bourdeaudhuij, L. (2000) The Effects of an Anti-Bullying Intervention Programme on Peers' Attitudes and Behaviour *Journal of Adolescence* Vol.23, No.1, pp.21-34.

Stopover, M. (no date) *Who are the gifted?* Boston: Lincolnshire County Council.

Strand, S. (1999) Ethnic group, sex and economic disadvantage: associations with pupils' educational progress from Baseline to the end of Key Stage 1. *British Educational Research Journal,* 25(2), 179-202.

Street, P., & Rennie, J. (1996) *Business as Co-Educators.* Coventry: Community Education Development Centre.

Sukhnandan L., Lee, B. & Kelleher, S. (2000) *An Investigation into Gender Differences in Achievement. Phase 2: School and classroom strategies* Slough: NFER.

Sutherland, M.B. (1999) Gender equity in success at school *International Review of Education* Vol.45, No.5-6, pp.431-443.

Sylva, K. (2000). Early childhood education to ensure a 'fair start' for all. In T. Cox (Ed.), *Combating Educational Disadvantage: Meeting the Needs of vulnerable children.* London: Falmer Press.

Tabberer, R., Saunders, L. & Kendall, L. (1997) *Raising Achievement in Newham Schools: A*

review by NFER for Newham LEA Slough: NFER

Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (Eds.). (2000) *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research.* London: Falmer Press.

Thrupp, M. (1999) *Schools Making a Difference: Let's be realistic!* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Tomlinson, S. (2000) Ethnic minorities and education: new disadvantages in Cox, T. (Ed.) *Combating educational disadvantage: meeting the needs of vulnerable children* London: Falmer.

Torrance, D.A. (2000) Qualitative studies into bullying within special schools *British Journal of Special Education* Vol.27, No.1, pp.16-21.

van Veen, D., Day, C., & Walraven, G. (Eds.). (1998). *Multi-Service Schools*. Leuven/Apeldoom: Garant.

Walker, T. (1990) *The Teaching Service for the Social Services Department* Manchester: Manchester City Council Education Department.

Walker, T. (1994) Educating children in public care: a strategic approach *Oxford Review of Education* Vol.20, No.3, pp.339-349.

Wang, M. C., & Gordon, E. W. (Eds.) (1994) *Educational Resilience in Inner-City America: Challenges and prospects*. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1997) Fostering educational resilience in inner-city schools. *Children and Youth,* 7, 119-140.

Warwick, D. (1995). Schools and businesses. In A. Macbeth, D. McCreath, & J. Aitchison (Eds.), *Collaborate or Compete? Educational Partnerships in a Market Economy*. London: Falmer Press.

Welsh Office (1999) *Draft Guidance on School Attendance, Behaviours and Discipline* Cardiff: Welsh Office.

Wolfendale, S (1997) *Partnership with Parents in Action* Stafford: NASEN

Wolfendale, S. & Cook, G. (1997) *Evaluation of SEN parent partnership schemes* London: DfEE

Wragg, E. C., Wragg, C. M., Haynes, G. S. & Chamberlin, R. P. (1998) *Improving Literacy in the Primary School* London: Routledge.

Wragg, T. (1997) Oh boy! *Times Educational Supplement* 2, 16 May 1997.

Younger, M. & Warrington, M. (1996) Differential achievements of girls and boys at GCSE: some observations from the perspective of one school *British Journal of Sociology of*