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**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.
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.
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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.
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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 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.

It is this view, moreover, which underpins the Governments "zero tolerance of under-performance" 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:

   - Ethnic minorities
   - Boys
   - Poor primary school attenders
   - Looked-after children
   - Children behaving in disruptive ways

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

   - Those with special educational needs
   - Children in the care of local authorities
   - Minority ethnic children
   - Travellers
   - Young carers
   - Those from families under stress
   - 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.
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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 children’s 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, .
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.
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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.
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.
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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


Children with Special Educational Needs


Gifted Children


Sick Children


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.


**Bullied Children**


**Truants and Excluded Children**


**Underachieving Boys**


**Teenage Parents**


**Refugee Children**


Bilingual Children


Traveller Children


Children of Minority Ethnic Origin
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