LONDON LEARNERS

LONDON LIVES

THE IMPACT OF DISADVANTAGE ON YOUNG LONDONERS AND THE ROLE OF SCHOOLS IN OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO SUCCESS

RECONNECT LONDON

Reconnect London

Reconnect London is a practitioner-led network which brings together school leaders from across London. It was founded in 2020, during the COVID-19 pandemic, by a group of school and trust leaders led by Dr Vanessa Ogden, CEO of Mulberry Schools Trust, and David Boyle CBE, CEO of Dunraven Educational Trust.

The aim of Reconnect London is to create new opportunities for information-sharing, knowledge-gathering and practical innovation, by offering a forum for school leaders to share good practice, learn from each other and provide mutual support.

Reconnect London helps schools to build practical and innovative solutions, as they seek to find ways to meet the needs of London's children and young people following the COVID-19 pandemic. Our work focuses particularly on the needs of disadvantaged and vulnerable children, who make up nearly half of London's school-age population and who have been disproportionately affected by the pandemic.

This report was funded by Mulberry Schools Trust as part of its contribution to the development of Reconnect London; it is a 'Mulberry Changemakers' project.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements 2

Introduction 3

Executive Summary 4

Section 1: Understanding Disadvantage in Education 8
Economic Perspectives
Social Perspectives
Gender
Ethnicity
Special Educational Needs and Disabilities
Looked After Children
Place
The Power of Individual Agency to Overcome Disadvantage
Disadvantage in Education – A Working Definition

Section 2: The Impact of Disadvantage on Young Londoners 16
The 'London effect'
London as a global city
Community Collaboration and Inclusivity
Access to Higher Education
Social Mobility
The 'Levelling Up' Agenda – Implications for London

Section 3: The Role of Schools in Tackling Disadvantage 22
Teaching and Learning
Curriculum
School and System Leadership
Creating a Sense of Identity and Belonging
Working Effectively with Parents and Communities

Section 4: The Impact of COVID-19 26
Increased Economic Inequality
Young People's Mental Health and Wellbeing
Access to Higher Education
Learning Losses

Conclusions and Recommendations 31

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Mulberry Schools Trust for all their support for Reconnect London and for funding the publication of this report.

We would also like to thank members of the Reconnect London Steering Group for their advice, support, insight and expertise. As well as David Boyle CBE and Dr Vanessa Ogden, this includes:

- **Aimee Connolly**, GLA
- **Maria Cunningham**, EEF
- **Jo Dibb**, former Executive Headteacher, Islington Futures Federation
- **Professor Qing Gu**, UCL Institute of Education
- **Ruth Holden**, Executive Headteacher, Mulberry Schools Trust
- **Ernest Jenavs**, Edurio
- **Dave Thomson**, FFT Education Datalab
- **Jackie Valin**, CEO and Headteacher, Southfields Academy
- **Julia Waters**, Headteacher, Ursuline High School
- **Becca Weighell**, Fair Education Alliance

We are also grateful to other members of the Reconnect London Network, our partners and supporters. This includes: **Professor Sir George Berwick, Paramjit Bhutta, Sally Brian, Sir Tim Brighouse, Alex Burr, Owen Carter, Gina Cicerone, Mark Emmerson, Sean Hayes, Russell Hobby, Zehra Jaffer, Martin Lavelle, Helen Marriott, Joe McGinn, Bushra Nasir, Sandra Roberts, Gail Tolley, Jill Tuffee and Alice Ward**.

We would like to express special thanks to **Professor Carlo Raffo** and **Dr Laura Winter** for their valuable advice and for feedback on early drafts of the report.

We would like to thank **Sam Freedman** for providing invaluable feedback on drafts of the report.

Any mistakes or omissions are entirely our own.

Dr Katharine Vincent
Sarah Bibi

June 2022

INTRODUCTION

This report aims to provide better understanding of disadvantage in education, how it affects children and young people in London and how the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted this. Through examining existing literature and research, the report attempts to answer the question – how can we best support children and young people in London schools to achieve their full potential?

Our focus is on London because that is where Reconnect London is based. While we are aware that significant levels of poverty, inequality and disadvantage exist elsewhere in the UK, we are specifically interested in the unique challenges and opportunities that exist in the capital.

London has the largest school system in the UK, with over 3,000 schools educating more than one and a half million children. It is a vibrant capital city where it should be possible for all children to thrive, but it is also a divided city, with significant levels of disadvantage and inequality. In 2020, London had the highest rate of child poverty in England, with 700,000 children, about 37%, living in poverty. This is predicted to rise rapidly during 2022-23, owing to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, rising inflation and increases in the cost of living.

Despite high levels of deprivation, children and young people from disadvantaged backgrounds in London schools achieve better than those in similar circumstances elsewhere in the country. There is no clear consensus about exactly what causes this 'London effect', though it is thought to be a combination of policy and demographic factors.

Following the COVID-19 pandemic, the lives of children and young people in London have changed in ways that were unexpected but will have lasting impact. Families who were already living in relative poverty were adversely affected by further economic insecurity, as well as disproportionate levels of illness and bereavement. The school closure periods of summer 2020 and spring 2021 had a devastating impact on children from low-income families, who were much less likely to have access to the resources needed to support effective home learning.

The aftermath of the pandemic is therefore an opportune time to revisit what we know about how disadvantage manifests itself in education, how this impacts on children and young people in London and how this has been affected by the pandemic. This report seeks to provide London's school leaders with the background and context they need, to inform their work to support children and young people. It also sets out recommendations for the steps we believe are needed to support this generation of young people, following the worst educational crisis of modern times.

Dr Katharine Vincent, Director of Reconnect London
Sarah Bibi, Academic Researcher

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Throughout the UK, children and young people from disadvantaged backgrounds achieve less well than their more advantaged peers. Although the 'disadvantage gap' is smaller in London than other parts of the country, young Londoners nonetheless face significant challenges in relation to poverty, inequality and social mobility.

In the 1980s and 1990s, London schools were the lowest achieving in the UK. During the late 1990s and early 2000s, several initiatives were introduced to combat this. Between 2002 and 2012, achievement at GCSE level in London schools improved significantly. At the same time, the achievement gap between rich and poor remained relatively small, with children eligible for free school meals achieving better GCSE results in London than in any other part of the country.

While there is debate about the precise causes of this 'London effect'[1], the success of young Londoners from disadvantaged backgrounds within the school system is irrefutable. There is, nonetheless, still a gap of 15% at GCSE level between low-income pupils and their wealthier peers[2]. The gap is wider for children and young people living in long-term poverty, who do not achieve any better in London than they do elsewhere in the country. London also has a significant social mobility problem, with only 17% of London's professional jobs occupied by people from low-income backgrounds, compared to 30% nationally[3].

Young Londoners face particular challenges and opportunities as a result of the place and the circumstances in which they live. As well as poverty and inequality, they navigate on a daily basis the difficulties of inner city life including street crime, air pollution and overcrowded housing[4]. They are also deeply affected by the complexities of racial, religious and linguistic diversity[5]. While London schools may benefit from the energy and optimism of recent migrants, they must also work hard to create a sense of belonging amongst diverse communities. Although they may be in close proximity to the significant cultural resources on offer in the capital, they must work hard to open up these resources and opportunities to those who may not otherwise have access.

We know that there is a long-standing link between socio-economic circumstances and educational attainment. The impact of this on children and young people in London, in terms of school outcomes, progression and social mobility, is well-documented. We do not have strong evidence about the impact of policies aimed at addressing economic disadvantage, such as the pupil premium. We do, however, have some evidence of approaches that seem to work when it comes to raising the achievement of children and young people in London schools.

There are some schools in London which seem to be particularly successful in addressing and overcoming disadvantage. In many cases, their success is a result of close partnership working with families, communities, trusts, local authorities, charities and other partners. We can learn a great deal

from these examples but they are not, at present, well-researched. Closer examination of their work, and further research into their impact, will help create an evidence base which can tell us more about the approaches which might work elsewhere.

Even before COVID-19, there was evidence that the disadvantage gap had stopped closing[6]. While there was some learning loss for all groups during the pandemic, it is clear that disadvantaged groups were disproportionately affected. Research carried out by EPI and Renaissance Learning for the DfE in 2021 found that primary school pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds were 4.2 months behind in maths and 2.7 months behind in reading[7]. The relatively high levels of learning loss amongst disadvantaged groups therefore negated some of the progress made in previous years narrowing the disadvantage gap[8].

There can be no doubt, then, that COVID-19 has exacerbated the economic and social challenges facing vulnerable and disadvantaged children and young people in London. The national lockdowns of 2020 and 2021 led to increased job losses, illness and bereavement. Families of key workers were significantly affected, as well as single-parent families, employees who worked in the shut-down sectors of the economy and those could not work from home. Many already-disadvantaged families fell below the breadline, ending up in even more difficult circumstances than they had been before.

Schools are also dealing with the impact of the pandemic on pupils' wider personal, social and emotional development. Young people who were already the most vulnerable were often the worst affected by the pandemic. This includes those with special educational needs and those experiencing mental health difficulties. During 2020-21 levels of anxiety, loneliness and depression amongst children and young people increased, while attendance and engagement with school fell. At the same time, the pressure on schools and breadth of their responsibilities expanded, without a significant increase in the resources available to them.

During the crisis phase of the pandemic, schools became lifelines for their communities, taking responsibility for delivering food parcels, distributing free school meals vouchers, advising on health and vaccinations and signposting families to external services and support. Now that the situation has stabilised, London schools are not only dealing with the challenge of trying to close learning gaps and re-engage young people with school life but also rising levels of poverty and inequality, along with all the other issues that existed before the pandemic.

It is clear that additional support is needed to help young Londoners living in disadvantaged circumstances and to ensure London schools are able to succeed in meeting their needs. This should not be seen as an alternative to supporting vulnerable and disadvantaged children in other parts of the country. Instead, there is an opportunity, as we recover from the COVID-19 pandemic, to 'level up' communities in a way that ensures all children and young people are able to succeed.

Drawing on the evidence of existing research, this report makes four recommendations for measures we believe will be beneficial for young Londoners, and which may also help young people in other parts of the country:

Recommendation 1
Measures to provide economic support for disadvantaged families

Although disadvantage is not only about economics, we cannot ignore the importance of financial resources. We know that living in poverty has a significant impact on young people's lives and on their educational outcomes. The financial losses caused by the pandemic have resulted in the worsening of financial circumstances for families that were already living in poverty. To ensure children living in poverty can succeed at school, we recommend:

- Making all families eligible for Universal Credit automatically eligible for free school meals and the pupil premium.
- One-off payments of £250 at the start of each new school year to families of school-age children eligible for the pupil premium, to support with the cost of school uniform and other essentials.
- Ending the current benefits cap and the two-child policy, as this unfairly disadvantages families in London where housing is most expensive.
- Increased investment into Early Years programmes, including increasing the Early Years pupil premium to the same level as the primary school premium.
- Following the Pupil Premium Plus pilot, introduce a Post-16 Premium for all Sixth Form students.

Recommendation 2
Support for schools to collaboratively work with their communities

Collaboration between families, communities and schools lies at the heart of effective educational provision for disadvantaged pupils. At present, there is a dearth of evidence-based guidance about how schools can effectively improve parent and community collaboration. There are also no relevant accountability measures. To address these issues, we recommend:

- Turning the 'Parent Pledge' into a coherent strategy that can help schools to effectively engage with parents and communities.
- Producing further guidance about how to implement effective home-school-community partnerships, and providing the resources to enable schools to implement this guidance effectively.
- Creating a national programme to recruit, train and deploy home-school liaison officers.
- Fund local collective action hubs, providing early intervention and rapid response for families experiencing difficulties.

Recommendation 3
Improving mental health support in schools following the pandemic

Mental health is becoming an increasingly pressing issue for schools, and one which has been further exacerbated by the pandemic. Improving the quality of mental health support that is available in schools has the potential to transform young people's experiences, helping ensure they can succeed in education and beyond. We recommend:

- Greater emphasis on collaboration and information-sharing between schools, local authorities and NHS trusts, to ensure there is joined up thinking in relation to young people's mental health services.
- Significant additional investment into Child and Adolescent Mental Health services (CAMHS), to ensure waiting lists are brought under control, including investment into training more therapists to ensure sufficient supply of staff to meet demand.
- Investment into better provision of school health services, through a national programme that supports and subsidises the training and employment of high quality school counsellors and other mental health services.

Recommendation 4
Further research

This report has identified some areas where further research is needed and we therefore also recommend support for further research into:

- How different types of disadvantage affect pupils, particularly the impact of persistent disadvantage, which is an under-researched area.
- The experience of White British students, particularly those living in low income circumstances, and strategies that work to raise their achievement.
- The experience of looked after children within the school system, in order to identify the best ways of supporting them to achieve their full potential.
- The educational experiences and achievement of transgender and non-binary pupils and how this is impacted by other forms of disadvantage.
- Models that work in relation to school-community collaboration and working with parents.

SECTION 1

UNDERSTANDING DISADVANTAGE IN EDUCATION

The formation, experience and impact of disadvantage in education is multifaceted. There are various ways in which disadvantage in education has been conceptualised in research, policy and practice. While some emphasise socio-economic disadvantage, others draw attention to the implications of social class, gender, ethnicity, special educational needs and disabilities, experience of the care system and the importance of place.

Economic perspectives

Throughout the UK education system, children and young people living in low-income circumstances achieve significantly less well than their wealthier peers. Despite numerous policy initiatives introduced to tackle the effects of disadvantage in education, the link between poverty and disadvantage remains significant[9].

Attainment gaps for disadvantaged pupils are present at every stage of the UK education system. The impact of disadvantage is evident before a child starts formal schooling[10]. By the end of primary school, children from low-income backgrounds are about 9 months behind their peers[11]. The gap widens with age: disadvantaged pupils achieve a grade lower than their counterparts in GCSE Maths and three-quarters of a grade lower in GCSE English[12]. In 2020, children eligible for the Pupil Premium achieved 1.24 GCSE grades lower on average than those who were not eligible. Those in long-term poverty fare worst, trailing their advantaged peers by 1.6 grades on average at GCSE[13]. These gaps are also mirrored in data on higher education, training, entry to the professions and social and corporate leadership[14].

Schools serving disadvantaged pupils receive additional funding in a number of ways, though most are not ring-fenced and it is therefore difficult to evaluate the impact. One of the most significant additional funding streams is the pupil premium grant (PP), which provides an annual payment to schools for every student who has been eligible for free school meals at least once in the last six years, as well as children in care and children whose parents are serving in the armed forces.

The aim of the pupil premium policy was to increase resources on offer for disadvantaged pupils, as well as improving outcomes and reducing social segregation[15]. There is some evidence that it has led to less social segregation in schools, by reducing the clustering of persistently disadvantaged pupils[16]. There is no clear evidence, however, that it has helped to close the attainment gap. This may be because the funding is not ring-fenced; Ofsted (2012) found that only one in ten school leaders used PP funds for intended purposes[17]. Since then, accountability standards have been raised to ensure the funding is not simply used to maintain existing provision.

One reason for the difficulty in evaluating the impact of the pupil premium is that it was introduced at the same time as austerity measures following the financial crisis of 2008. As a result, families living in the poorest communities of England experienced increased taxation[18], local council funding cuts[19] and other adverse economic consequences[20]. This led to an increase in the number of families living in poverty and the weakening of local services and facilities. The impact of PP was therefore diluted, owing to the wider social and economic context.

Any benefit to schools of the introduction of the pupil premium is also likely to have been negated by other changes to school funding. Since 2018, there has been a relative re-distribution of funding away from schools serving poorer communities, with a 1.2% real terms funding cut for schools serving the most deprived areas, compared with a 2.9% funding increase for those serving wealthier areas[21]. Meanwhile, the amount of PP funding per pupil has not increased in line with inflation since it was introduced in 2012.

We know, then, that there is a strong link between economic circumstances and educational outcomes. We do not yet, however, have good evidence about how to overcome this problem. Some have argued that PP should be increased in line with inflation, increased for persistently disadvantaged pupils or extended to early years providers and post-16 pupils. We cannot, however, be certain how these changes would impact on disadvantaged pupils. To gain a better idea, we need to understand more about this complex socio-economic problem.

Social Perspectives

Some believe that disadvantage should be regarded a social issue. Passaretta, Skopek and Huizen (2022), for example, argue that disadvantage in education is informed by multiple factors that are simultaneously at play at an individual, community and societal level, such as family lifestyle and heritage, parenting, value systems, housing, community infrastructure, quality of external support services and access to healthcare and legal advice. Parsons (2016), meanwhile, argues that economic inequalities are sustained by national policies that purportedly aim to alleviate disadvantage but in fact have the effect of sustaining and reproducing inequality[22].

Drawing on Bourdieu (1979), sociologists categorise the factors that influence disadvantage into three types of 'capital', which individuals use to access and participate in society: economic, cultural and social capital. For individuals to progress and achieve in society, they must have a balance of all three types of capital:

1. Economic Capital - the amount of household income and wealth that determines the quality and standards of material resources such as, but not limited to food, housing, clothing, transport, health, leisure and educational equipment and resources and technology.
2. Cultural Capital - the implicit and explicit quality and standards of modelling, stimulation, motivations, expectations, discourse, values, beliefs, traditions, resources, programmes, guidance and support that influence an individual's understanding of their identity, society and life.
3. Social Capital - the skill, experience, knowledge, understanding, ability and competency that equips and empowers individuals to access, participate in, benefit from and progress in the systems, organisations and institutions of wider society and support networks.

From this stance, educational success is dependent on the economic, social and cultural capital which young people are able to accrue, based on their experiences of individual, community and societal factors. This helps explain why one of the strongest influences on student attainment is the educational attainment of parents[23]. Parents who have themselves successfully navigated the education system are likely to have knowledge of the education system and how to achieve well within it. They are also more likely to have higher aspirations for their children and to be better able to provide additional support when it is needed[24].

This highlights the complex nature of the challenges faced by schools educating disadvantaged pupils. Kellaghan (2001), writing in the Irish context, argues that the definition of educational disadvantage is the existence of discontinuity between 'home life' and 'school life'. The more alignment between home and school contexts, he argues, the less chance of young people experiencing disadvantage. One of the ways in which Kellaghan envisages this happening is through interventions which develop in young children the social and cultural capital which will help them to engage more successfully in 'middle-class institutions' like schools[25].

Others argue that, rather than trying to force home contexts to align with schools, it is the responsibility of the education system to find ways of forming positive relationships with parents and families and of overcoming any social or cultural differences. Lupton (2014), for example, argues that it is essential for schools to cater for the specific needs of children, their families and their communities, starting with a clear understanding of their life experiences and realities[26]. In this way, educators can ensure the delivery and development of high-quality standards, knowledge and skills that children can then in turn use to navigate the world outside of school.

This debate is particularly relevant to London, because the city has such a diverse population, including high numbers of migrants, and such high levels of poverty and disadvantage.

Gender

In the twentieth century, the underachievement of girls within the education system was a key concern amongst UK researchers and policymakers. That gender gap has now been largely reversed, with girls now achieving better outcomes than boys at every stage of the education system[27].

There are some differences in the gender-based attainment gap between school subjects, with girls historically achieving better in English, humanities and the arts and boys achieving better in maths and science. Calvin et al's (2010) large-scale study of primary school pupils found that girls showed stronger verbal reasoning skills, supporting increased performance in English, whereas boys had stronger quantitative reasoning skills and were therefore achieving better in Maths[28]. Girls' attainment in maths and science has now overtaken boys, however, with girls achieving better results than boys in A-level Maths for the first time in summer 2021. Meanwhile, boys' attainment in English is getting worse, leading to increased concerns about boys' underperformance and the risks of disillusionment.

Pinkett and Roberts (2019) emphasize the compounding effects of socio-economic disadvantage and gender, arguing that the under-achievement of boys from disadvantaged backgrounds is partly caused by misplaced assumptions within the education system about aspiration, parental engagement and motivation[29]. There is certainly evidence that, for some groups, the achievement gap is exacerbated by a combination of gender, ethnicity and socio-economic circumstances. White British boys who are eligible for FSM have the lowest attainment scores of any group at GCSE level[30]. There is also significant evidence of under-achievement amongst Black Caribbean and Mixed White and Black Caribbean boys, particularly those living in low income circumstances[31].

It is worth noting that virtually all research on gender attainment in the UK focuses on differences between girls and boys. The experience of transgender and non-binary-identifying pupils is an area where research is underdeveloped.

Ethnicity

There are significant differences in educational attainment between different ethnic groups. The lowest performing group at GCSE level, by a significant margin, are Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils. Other groups with below average attainment within the UK education system are Black Caribbean, Black Other, Mixed White & Black Caribbean and Pakistani pupils[32]. There is also a significant attainment gap for White British pupils who are eligible for FSM.

There are complexities in the relationship between ethnicity and educational attainment in the UK. For example, Indian and Chinese pupils achieve above average outcomes at the end of primary school and show the strongest prospects of attainment at 16, whereas Bangladeshi pupils achieve particularly well at GCSE level compared to their below average attainment at KS2. Meanwhile, Black Caribbean, Black Other, Mixed White & Black Caribbean and Pakistani pupils perform the least well at every stage but particularly under-achieve at KS4 and KS5.

There is also a significant link between poverty and ethnicity. Rates of eligibility for free school meals are particularly high amongst non-White groups[33]. There is also a correlation with social exclusion; the groups with the highest rates of eligibility for free school meals and the lowest rates of educational attainment are Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children, who are also more likely to experience other forms of social exclusion.

In recent years, there has been an increased focus on the low educational attainment of White British pupils from low income backgrounds, often referred to as 'white working class' and recently described by the House of Commons Education Select Committee as 'let down, left behind and forgotten'[34]. Almost 80% of school-age children in England identify as White British, and White British FSM-eligible pupils are the largest FSM group, making this group a significant factor in relation to the disadvantage gap. They are also the lowest attainers within the education system and have the lowest levels of university entry[35].

The causes of under-achievement amongst this group are uncertain. Demie and Lewis's (2010) research found two potential reasons behind low performance of white working-class pupils – low parental aspirations and social deprivation[36]. Others have found that White British parents without degree-level qualifications themselves held low aspirations for their children because they felt they were limited by the education system. Research commissioned by Lambeth Council, meanwhile, concludes that White British pupils are the ethnic group most polarised by the impact of disadvantage, and that the challenges faced by this group have been masked by the success of their wealthier counterparts[37]. Further research is needed to better understand the experience of White British students within the education system.

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

Children with special educational needs and disabilities achieve less well within the education system than those without additional needs. In 2021, the Department for Education reported that only 22% of pupils with SEND achieved expected levels in reading, writing and maths at the end of primary school compared to their counterparts[38]. Furthermore, at age 16, 30% of those with SEND achieved an equivalent of five GCSEs at grade 9-4, whereas the same level was achieved by 75% of those without SEND.

Progression rates into higher education for pupils with SEND are almost half of those without SEND, with only 8.9% of pupils with a statement or EHCP progressing into higher education by the age of 19[39]. In addition, rates of absence and exclusion are significantly higher for pupils with SEND than for those without, with pupils who have EHCPs forming the highest proportion of this group. It is clear, therefore, that SEND is a significant cause of disadvantage in education.

Looked After Children

Despite efforts to improve educational outcomes for looked after children during the 2000s, a negative attainment gap persists for this group. Contributory factors include the socio-economic implications of family breakdown and admission into care, as well as experiences of disruption, uncertainty and abuse[40]. There is also evidence that care-experienced children feel that the system does not work for them, with policies and guidance, while intended to be supportive, at times contributing to the problem[41].

The recent independent review of children's social care highlights the extent to which looked after children are one of the most vulnerable groups in society who often experience multiple overlapping forms of disadvantage. Recognising the significant challenges faced by care-experienced children, the review advocates for an investment of £2 billion to improve standards and provision for children in care and for new legislation to make experience of care a protected characteristic[42].

Place

The nature of disadvantage in education can also be related to the experience of a particular geographical or physical place. One of the reasons the educational success of London has prompted so much interest is because it seems to subvert the expectation that schools in poorer, inner city areas will be less successful than those in more affluent areas. London has higher rates of persistent poverty than any other region in England[43]. London pupils achieve better GCSE results, however, than any other region in England[44].

There is no doubt that children and young people in London face significant levels of challenge as a result of the place in which they live. Power (2007) emphasizes the challenges facing low income families who are raising children in 'troubled city neighbourhoods'[45]. Parents with children are, she argues, particularly affected by the kind of difficulties that can arise in inner city areas because they are dependent on local infrastructure such as schools, shops and doctors surgeries. Power also, however, highlights the considerable social capital which exists within inner city communities, and the way in which families can make an important contribution to the development of cities, including through their resilience and adaptability.

For Raffo, place is not a fixed or physical thing but a social construct that is relational and dynamic[46]. In this analysis, the experience of 'place' depends on a young person's involvement, engagement and perception of it. This might help to explain why London schools have managed to be so successful, despite the high levels of deprivation which exist in the communities they serve. If place is a social construct, it is possible for young people living in even the most challenging inner city context to thrive, if they are able to experience it in a way that provides them with a positive experience of community, relationship and belonging.

Riley (2013), meanwhile, argues that schools need to have as their guiding principle the need to create a sense of belonging, by striving to create places where young people feel they have roots, connections and positive relationships[47]. This may be more difficult in our uncertain, liquid world[48] but nonetheless increasingly critical. Riley draws attention to the importance of schools working to create spaces where young people feel safe, confident and included. She also provides examples of where this has been done effectively, confirming that it is possible in practice to overcome dislocation and disaffection, to create places where young people can find their place in the world and understand how to shape it.

In recent years, following the significant improvement of London schools, there has been increased awareness about the issues facing other parts of the UK, including coastal cities, rural areas in the south-west and de-industrialised northern cities. Each of these places has its own unique characteristics and particular challenges. It is sometimes argued that London enjoys advantages over other parts of the country, in terms of school funding and other resources[49]. It is important that this does not detract from the need to ensure that all young people have access to the support they need. Poor communities in London and those in other parts of the UK should not be in competition with each other, but should be equally entitled to receive the help they need in order to learn, succeed and thrive.

The Power of Individual Agency

While there is strong evidence that pupils who experience economic and social disadvantage are less likely to succeed at school[50], this is not a certainty. There is evidence that pupils can overcome disadvantage and achieve[51]. The presence of disadvantage factors does not guarantee that disadvantage in education will be experienced.

This could be explained through the paradigm of perception. Things that hinder one student's academic success may accelerate it for another[52]. In addition, some pupils who experience socio-economic disadvantage early in their lives are able to develop qualities such as resilience and perseverance, which help them to overcome challenges and succeed[53].

Thiele et al's (2017) study of students from disadvantaged backgrounds at Russell Group universities found two key determining factors behind their success: a strong sense of identity and positive educational engagement[54]. They found that students' strong sense of identity, both internally and within social contexts, positively affected their engagement with education. This triggered the motivation and aspiration to succeed, which enabled them to overcome acknowledged obstacles which included lower-quality education provision and negative stereotypes.

These findings suggest how disadvantage trajectories can be broken in education and demonstrate the importance of paying attention to student attitudes and engagement with their schools, teachers and educational provision, as well as considering the levels of social, cultural and economic capital of disadvantaged pupils.

Disadvantage in Education – A Working Understanding

Based on the research and literature explored above, our working definition of disadvantage in education is as follows:

Disadvantage in education is produced through the existence of systemic barriers in society which result in reduced outcomes and experiences for young people.

We acknowledge the wide span and depth of the notion of disadvantage in education, driven by the systemic obstacles which exist in society, such as unequal economic resources and facilities, spatial deprivation, prejudice and discrimination and personal identity formation.

Our working definition also frames disadvantage in education as a social construct. The experience of disadvantage depends on the experiences of individual children and young people and their families, which are difficult to account for when exploring the origins, effects and impacts of disadvantage.

SECTION 2

THE IMPACT OF DISADVANTAGE ON YOUNG LONDONERS

'The urban poor face educational disadvantages that limit the exercise of their right to education. As they pass through schooling, they do not achieve an adequate mastery of fundamental learnings and capacities in order to fully participate in society. These deprivations may also have prejudicial effects in other areas, as education is considered necessary for the full exercising of civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights, as well as a strategic tool to overcoming the cycle of poverty and progressing towards sustainable development.'[55]

The 'London effect'

Historically, London schools were the worst performing in the UK. It was often argued that the distinctive characteristics of the city presented insurmountable levels of challenge when it came to school improvement. This includes high levels of poverty and inequality, as well as large numbers of recent migrants, pupils from ethnic minorities and those who speak English as an additional language. Since the emergence of the 'London effect' in the mid-2000s, some have suggested that these urban characteristics are themselves responsible for the relative success of London schools[56].

Baars et al (2014) carried out an extensive mixed methods study aimed at understanding the rapid improvement seen in London schools between 2000 and 2014[57]. They identify several contributory factors, including policy initiatives such as the London Challenge, the introduction of Teach First and the academies programme. Their research suggests that, although demographics and the existence of economic and cultural opportunities in London could have contributed towards the London effect, there were specific policies and initiatives that also made a significant difference.

Blanden, Greaves, Macmillan and Sibieta (2014), meanwhile, focus on the success of London primary schools and the extent to which they were able to improve attainment levels of disadvantaged children during the late 1990s and early 2000s. This, they argue, led to increased outcomes for disadvantaged pupils at the end of secondary school several years later. They make the case against attributing the 'London effect' to the policy initiatives mentioned above, since they 'either happened too late, were focused on secondary schools or were longstanding, and therefore are unlikely to account for the rapid improvements we see'[58].

Meanwhile, Ross et al (2020), argue that the presence of particular ethnic groups, such as Black African and Bangladeshi pupils, was a key cause of the success of London schools. They also identify a number of 'agency' factors which, they argue, help account for what they refer to as 'the London advantage'[59] This includes aspirations and self-belief, increased time spent on homework and the expectations and involvement of parents.

In both cases, however, they do not account for the potential role of schools in creating these 'advantage' factors. If children in London schools spend more time on homework, this may be a result of the way in which schools have successfully engaged and motivated them. If parents of children in London schools are more involved with their education, this may be a result of the way in which schools have, over time, successfully encouraged parental engagement.

The picture is similarly complex when it comes to ethnicity. Bangladeshi pupils were previously seen as an under-achieving group[60]. The significant concentration of Bangladeshi pupils in Tower Hamlets, in east London, was cited as a reason for the poor achievement of schools in this area during the 1980s and 1990s. Bangladeshi pupils, and particularly Bangladeshi girls, only started to achieve significant levels of educational success within UK schools during the mid-2000s[61]. This coincided with significant improvement in the performance within Tower Hamlets schools of all pupils, not only those of Bangladeshi heritage. The high levels of educational achievement by this group in later years, therefore, can equally be seen as a result, rather than a cause, of the success of London schools.

There is, then, no consensus about exactly how a combination of policy and demographic factors came together to make London schools more successful than those outside the capital. There is some evidence that the cause may lie in policy factors, and some that it may be related to the specific characteristics and demographics of London as a place.

London as a global city

It has been argued that the 'London effect' is partly a result of its unique economic, demographic and social make-up[62] London schools are profoundly affected by their location in this global city, with diverse communities including migrants from all over the world, speaking different languages, living alongside each other amidst vibrancy and opportunity along with extreme levels of poverty and inequality. To understand the nature of educational disadvantage in London, it is important to consider the unique challenges and opportunities that are faced by schools in the capital.

Sassen describes London, like other global cities, as a 'thick and complex' place with 'multiple social groups, neighbourhoods, contestations, claims, and inequalities.'[63]. Social and economic inequality is inevitable in this context, she argues, because of the need for large numbers of low paid and manual workers, often drawn from marginalised neighbourhoods within the city and usually comprising large numbers of migrants. The existence of 'marginalised neighbourhoods' within London is not a new phenomenon[64]. The way in which they manifest in 21st century London, however, is something schools must understand and take account of in order to effectively meet the needs of disadvantaged pupils.

The borough of Newham, in east London, is a good example of an area that could be described as a 'marginalised neighbourhood'. As well as the most ethnically diverse population in the whole of England and Wales, it also has significantly above average rates of unemployment and high numbers of low-paid workers. The sense of energy and opportunity in the area has increased significantly in recent years, most markedly since the London 2012 Olympic games. While this provides important context, it cannot in itself explain the changes that have taken place in the local education system over the last two decades.

Up to the late 1990s, there was ongoing concern about the relatively poor performance of Newham schools[65] Since that time, Newham schools have achieved considerable success in a number of ways. The area now has a successful Research School, based at Sheringham Nursery, which has been able to effectively improve Early Years provision in the local area through a project involving collaboration between seven local nursery schools, the local authority and a local primary school[66]. Their approach is centred on an Early Years Hub, which supports other local providers with professional development, quality assurance and inclusion[67]. Outcomes in the local area have improved as a result, and Sheringham is working with the EEF to evaluate the impact of the project.

Other local success stories include Brampton Manor Academy, which has become famous for the number of Sixth Form students it sends to Oxford and Cambridge University each year[68]. Elmhurst Primary School, in Forest Gate, which was recently judged 'outstanding' for the second time, leads both an English hub and a Maths hub[69]. Like Elmhurst, School 21, in Stratford, has a strong focus on oracy and has developed its own programme for other schools, 'Voice 21'[70]. Forest Gate Community School, meanwhile, has become well known for its rigorous approach to teaching, learning and curriculum, as well as its strong student outcomes and consecutive 'outstanding' judgements[71].

These are just some examples of schools in Newham which have demonstrated significant success in improving outcomes for disadvantaged pupils. Further research is need to ascertain whether there is anything that can explain their relative success in this regard, or if there are any things they have in common. What is certain, however, is that they have proved that it is possible to break the link between socio-economic disadvantage and educational achievement.

Community Collaboration and Inclusivity

Ainscow argues that the effects of disadvantage can only be adequately dealt with through collaborative action from all areas and institutions of social life[72]. To create inclusive educational provision, all the social institutions, organisations and agencies that affect a child's life must work together to remove the barriers that disadvantaged children face. Schools can make an impact in reducing these disparities, and they are more likely to succeed in doing so if they are able to work effectively with strong local partners. This approach emphasizes the importance of schools being responsive to their contexts, rather than attempting to integrate disadvantaged pupils into existing arrangements.

There is evidence that collaboration between schools, parents and the community is particularly important in relation to reducing the effects of disadvantage. This suggests that community collaboration needs to be at the heart of schools' strategies to address disadvantage. By engaging with and including parents, families and the community, schools are able to improve teacher-pupil relationships, fostering personal trust and helping to create learning environments that support pupils' achievement[73].

There are several examples of schools in London that have developed approaches to working with families and communities in a way that promotes inclusion and collaboration. There is more evidence of this from the primary sector, perhaps because of the increased involvement which parents have during the early years of a child's education. In west London, Reach Academy and the Reach Foundation have pioneered a 'cradle to career' approach involving intensive work with families from the earliest stage of a child's educational journey[74]. In a similar way, the West London Zone have developed an approach based on the model of the Harlem Children's Zone in New York City, focused on providing intensive support to at-risk children and their families[75].

Access to Higher Education

The UK as a whole has a significant problem when it comes to disadvantaged pupils accessing higher education. In 2021, the university progression rate for FSM-eligible and non-FSM-eligible pupils differed by 19.1%, the highest gap since 2005[76]. Despite relatively high levels of attainment, London has one of the lowest acceptance rates to Oxbridge and Russell Group universities[77]. The lowest rates were in Waltham Forest (15.2%), Croydon (13.7%) and Lewisham (11.3%), areas with overall high levels of disadvantage.

Examining the experience of disadvantaged pupils who have been successful in gaining places at top universities can help provide further understanding of the issue. O'Sullivan, Robson and Winters (2019) interviewed twenty disadvantaged students who had attended state schools and had secured university places at Oxford to find out the reasons and barriers to their success[78]. Reasons given for their success included positive role modelling in the school and wider community, fostering solidarity and building a support network with other pupils who were having similar experiences and increased levels of agency and resilience to overcome barriers to their learning and success.

All twenty participants said they felt they were held to lower standards and expectations by their teachers and that they did not receive sufficient support from their schools when applying to Russell Group universities. They also said they believed this would have not been the case if they were wealthier or if they attended private schools. Although these findings cannot be taken to be representative of all state schools, they corroborate other evidence suggesting that low standards and expectations, as well as deficiencies in advice and guidance, can hold back disadvantaged pupils from accessing elite universities[79].

Wyness (2017) argues that the odds remain stacked against pupils from less advantaged backgrounds, as a result of the way in which the university admissions system in the UK works[80]. Although universities are required to demonstrate that they are actively working to widen access, few have made significant progress in this area[81]. There are also issues when it comes to the ability of disadvantaged pupils to succeed within elite institutions.

This is not a London-specific problem, but it has significant implications for young people in London, given the high numbers of disadvantaged children in London's schools. There are also significant gaps between the achievement of different ethnic groups at university, with lower rates of completion and attainment at university level for Black and Asian pupils, who make up a majority of young people in London schools[82].

Social Mobility

Compared to other places in the UK, London has high levels of social and economic inequality and low levels of social mobility. Despite their academic success at school, young people from London's most deprived neighbourhoods fare relatively badly in comparison with their peers in the rest of England, in terms of both jobs and pay[83]. There are a number of reasons for this, and significant differences between London boroughs. What is clear is that going to school in the nation's economic capital does not necessarily lead young people to have a better chance of securing professional, well paid employment.

One of the challenges for schools is that social mobility is a long-term issue over which they do not have a great level of control. There are many examples of London schools which have succeeded in raising the achievement of disadvantaged pupils; there are also many that have succeeded in increasing the number of students being accepted at elite universities. It is much more difficult to find a way of evaluating whether or not schools have had a significant impact on social mobility.

Elliot Major and Machin (2018) propose some radical measures to address the issue, including the randomisation of school and university admissions[84]. They also argue against the economic dominance of London, arguing that major employers should be relocated outside the capital in order to create opportunities elsewhere. While this may be helpful to those living in other parts of the country it is also important to consider ways to ensure young disadvantaged Londoners have access to the opportunities they need.

At present, young Londoners from deprived neighbourhoods achieve better at school than those in other parts of the country, but do worse when it comes to employment. Measures that might improve this problem include the creation of stronger cross-sector leadership to drive forward interventions relating to social mobility in London.

The 'Levelling Up' Agenda – Implications for London

In recent years, the focus of research and policy in the UK has shifted from analysis of the 'London effect' to awareness of the need to support those areas of the country where children achieve less well and schools are less successful. The government's 'Levelling Up' white paper, published in February 2022, focuses on ending geographic inequality by moving resources away from London towards other parts of the UK. This follows the establishment of 55 education investment areas, all outside London, each of which have specific resources allocated to them to improve achievement and social mobility.

The 'levelling up' agenda is predicated on the assumption that there is a need to re-direct resources away from the capital, despite the fact that London still has the highest levels of poverty, overcrowding and unemployment in the country[85]. Levels of child poverty and persistent disadvantage are also high and rapidly increasing in London, partly as a result of the fact that government welfare policy since 2016 has particularly affected families in areas with the highest housing costs.

Although educational performance in London schools is better than any other region of England, this should not be a reason to assume that schools in the capital are more advantaged than those elsewhere. If 'levelling up' is the key to increasing social inclusion and equality, it must also pay heed to the reality that young Londoners are more likely to experience poverty and disadvantage than those outside the capital. They also experience particularly extreme inequality and significant issues in relation to social mobility. An alternative approach to 'levelling up' could focus on improving the lives of all those living in disadvantaged circumstances, ensuring every community across the UK is lifted out of poverty.

SECTION 3

THE ROLE OF SCHOOLS IN TACKLING DISADVANTAGE

While schools do not create social inequality, they do have the power to reduce the disparities that already exist when young people enter the education system[86]. They also have a responsibility to ensure they do not contribute to the reinforcement or reproduction of existing inequalities.

Our focus, in this section of the report, is to outline some specific examples where it seems that London schools have been able to make a significant difference for disadvantaged pupils. These examples are drawn from our own knowledge and experience and are by no means definitive, exhaustive or exclusive.

Teaching and Learning

In recent years, there has been an increased emphasis on the importance of improving the quality of classroom teaching, rather than focusing on leadership or other school-based factors[87]. There is now considerable consensus about the need for teaching and learning in the UK to move towards an 'evidence-based' model. The movement has been led by Coe (2013) and others, who have created a persuasive set of arguments about the potentially transformative impact of moving towards approaches that focus on knowledge creation and transmission[88].

There is already a considerable body of literature in this area, and we will therefore not explore this in detail here. The one area where we believe it would be helpful for further research to be undertaken is in relation to the teaching of disadvantaged students, and whether there might be some approaches that are particularly appropriate or successful with this group.

Curriculum

The content, structure and organisation of the school curriculum has become a key focus for schools. In the meantime, there is ongoing debate about the extent to which the curriculum should reflect cultural diversity. Some argue that the role of a school curriculum is to induct young people into the norms and values of a particular shared or agreed national culture, in order to facilitate 'cultural literacy'[89] or imbue them with 'powerful knowledge'[90]. Others draw attention to issues of power and status, arguing that the curriculum should be shaped around young people's cultural knowledge, values and beliefs and that it should reflect the diversity of society[91].

Gay (2013) argues that the education of culturally diverse pupils should connect in-school learning to out-of-school life experiences, to increase educational equity and excellence, empower communities and develop pupils' efficacy in their learning[92]. One way in which schools can make a positive difference to disadvantaged students is through ensuring young Londoners benefit from the wealth of social and cultural opportunities that

exist within the city. It could be argued that this is an area where London schools have an inherent advantage over those outside the capital, but this is not necessarily the case. London's status as the nation's capital, and its history as the centre of the British Empire, mean that it can be an alienating and intimidating place for young Londoners from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Schools can have a transformative impact, if they can find ways to open up opportunities for young people to develop their cultural and social capital. At Mulberry Schools Trust, where the report's authors are based, an extensive programme of extra-curricular activities and enrichment is on offer, both in individual schools and across the trust[93]. The trust's arts programme regularly takes performances to Edinburgh and has won a Fringe First Award. It has also collaborated with Michelle Obama on the 'Let Girls Learn' initiative[94]. More recently, the trust has worked with Mercedes Benz F1 Grand Priz Ltd to develop a STEM Academy, providing a supplementary school, work experience and other opportunities aimed at opening up careers within motor sports and engineering to a more diverse workforce[95].

School and System Leadership

NFER's (2009) report on whether leadership reduces the attainment gap specified six key approaches[96]: the prioritising of vulnerable pupils, championing the voice of vulnerable groups and encouraging their participation, using good quality data to identify needs and provide services for vulnerable groups, fostering partnership working around vulnerable groups, developing and motivating the workforce to improve outcomes for vulnerable groups and having an unrelenting drive and passion to improve outcomes for vulnerable groups.

Leithwood et al (2020) argue that the most successful leaders are those who are attuned to the dynamism of their contexts, where responsiveness and proportionality are important aspects of effective leadership[97]. Additionally, research commissioned by the Department for Education found that successful leaders in disadvantaged contexts tend to use a range of interventions in four key areas: academic extension, cultural enrichment, personal development and removal of financial barriers for attainment[98].

Kidson and Norris[99] argue that one of the things that was distinctive about the London Challenge was the commitment of school leaders to working together to contribute to a collective effort to improve London's schools. London Challenge was a de-centralised and practitioner-led strategy which set out to build on existing strengths and to develop capacity within the system. Kidson and Norris identify the way in which teachers and leaders were mobilised around this approach as a key aspect of the programme's success; it was crucial that 'those in successful schools were willing to help those facing the greatest challenges'[100]. There is a need for a new mobilisation around poverty and disadvantage in London schools, with a new London-wide strategy with the vision and resources to make a positive impact on those with the most need.

Creating a Sense of Identity and Belonging

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation argues that creating a positive sense of identity and belonging, through positive engagement with place, is crucial to the success of disadvantaged pupils[101]. Raffo (2011), similarly, argues that a strong sense of identity cannot be achieved by a young person without knowledge of a particular place and how they belong to it[102]. This is important for London schools, which must ensure they become places where young people feel they belong, that they are included and have a voice. Since schools clearly cannot do this alone, it is important for local authorities, community groups and others to work together, to ensure young people and their families can develop a positive sense of belonging to a particular place.

One local area where significant efforts were made to create a sense of identity and belonging within a community in London was in Tower Hamlets in the 1990s and early 2000s. Several community-building and regeneration projects were launched, some through alliances between Bangladeshi entrepreneurs and community leaders. Outcomes included the establishment of monuments, dedicated community spaces, museums, TV and radio channels, mosques and festivals celebrating Bangladeshi identities and culture[103].

In an area with the largest Bangladeshi community in the country, the task of creating a sense of belonging was complicated by the need to take account of colonial history and residents' affiliation to Bangladesh, as well as the desire to encourage positive participation in British society. These projects aimed to create a legitimate space for British Bangladeshis to participate in wider society as equal citizens, to achieve better educational outcomes and to have their heritage, traditions and culture recognised, reflected and respected.

Ofsted (2004) found that there were specific things which schools could do to improve the achievement of Bangladeshi pupils[104]. They draw attention to the role of schools in building relationships with parents, making a contribution to community life and creating a sense of belonging. One of the key things they found, in schools that were successful in improving the achievement of Bangladeshi pupils, was the provision of a calm and purposeful atmosphere that is conducive to learning and 'a counterbalance to the often volatile world of the streets'[105].

Working Effectively with Parents and Communities

There is evidence that some of the success of London schools is related to the way in which they have been able to build relationships with children, families and communities in a way that was conducive to educational success. There is no doubt that effective parental engagement makes a positive difference, and there is now considerable evidence about the approaches that work most effectively[106].

One organisation in London that has achieved considerable success in this regard, against considerable odds, is Kensington Aldridge Academy in west London[107]. The school is located in extremely close proximity to the Grenfell Tower fire of 2017. Following the tragedy, there has been widespread recognition of the efforts made by the school to support and engage with not only students but also parents, families and the wider community. Similarly, Surrey Square Primary School in south London has a longstanding reputation for excellence in the way it works to support the communities it serves and to find innovative ways of overcoming barriers to success[108].

Further research is needed into the impact of these schools and others like them across the capital, so that we can learn from their success.

SECTION 4

THE IMPACT OF COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic created extraordinary challenges for the education sector. In the space of two years, schools endured three prolonged periods of lockdown, an overhaul of examination and accreditation protocols and an operational shift from the classroom to home learning and back again.

Whilst buildings remained open for the children of key workers, pupils with EHCPs and looked after children, school staff delivered food parcels to those in need, taking on a whole raft of other responsibilities outside their normal remit with virtually no extra funds, staff, resources or time[109].

Although we have moved beyond the crisis phase of the pandemic, schools continue to deal with the significant after-effects, including an education recovery-related workload that continues without an obvious endpoint. In addition, the pandemic has exacerbated the problems, challenges and barriers schools were already contending with.

Increased Economic Inequality

Ongoing research into the impact of COVID-19 is revealing that certain groups of people have been disproportionately affected and are therefore more likely to be in need of additional support. There is a strong link between income, or job type, and an individual or family's ability to cope with the challenges of the pandemic[110].

The Institute for Fiscal Studies conducted one of the most comprehensive analyses of the impact of COVID-19. It found a correlation between higher levels of education and qualifications in a household, or professionals that were not required to be in a particular work environment to fulfil their work duties during lockdown, and higher incomes, more stable jobs and better health security[111].

An analysis of the shut-down sectors of the economy revealed that the vast majority of workers in these sectors were low-paid and young, with an estimated 40% of single mothers working in these sectors. They also found that workers under the age of 25 were twice as likely to work in shut-down sectors, whereas ethnic minority groups, particularly Pakistanis and Bangladeshis, were over-represented in transport services as well as the food and beverage sector, and therefore suffered greater financial strain and loss[112].

Key worker families suffered significant negative impacts. Many key workers were low-income workers, lived in poorer areas with poor facilities and faced greater health risks. This includes bus drivers, supermarket staff, cleaners, nurses and teachers.

Low-income earners were also concentrated in the retail and hospitality sectors. Low-income earners tend to be young people, women and people belonging to an ethnic minority[113]. This reveals the lack of social, economic and professional mobility for certain groups, highlighting the persistent and systemic nature of disadvantage for young people who belong to these groups.

The spending ratios of high and low-income households also contributed towards widened economic inequality. It was found that households in the top quintile of income distribution spent almost a third of their overall expenditure on services limited by lockdown such as travel, hospitality and leisure. As a result, high-income households saw automatic savings.

Conversely, over half of the expenditure of low-income families is on necessities such as food, housing and utilities. As these were the households that were negatively affected by the wider implications of the pandemic, many of these households experienced greater poverty and disadvantage. It is estimated that an additional 200,000 children are living in poverty[114] and it is forecasted that the poorest quarter of families in England will see an income reduction of 6% in 2022 and 2023, partly due to rising living costs[115].

It is clear that the pandemic has led to families that were already struggling being further entrenched into poverty and disadvantage. This has led to a widening of economic disparities in society and a reduction in social and economic capital. At the time of writing, the UK is also in the midst of a significant cost of living crisis, with inflation rates hitting a forty-year high and energy costs increasing exponentially. Meanwhile, welfare benefits have not increased and salaries for key workers and the public sector remain static, meaning that quality of life is likely to decrease for the poorest households.

Young People's Mental Health and Wellbeing

Lockdown periods forced children to stay at home, losing months of learning and interaction time[116]. Research conducted by the Royal College of Psychiatrists, meanwhile, found that children's mental health referrals to the NHS doubled during the pandemic, intensifying the need for better mental health care for young people[117]. Looking at the impact of the pandemic on a young person's ability to self-regulate, research found that to date the pandemic has had a 25% adverse effect on pupils' ability to self-regulate at school[118]. Girls have been disproportionately affected in all age groups, with a 33% overall decline, and by the time girls reach the age of 18, they will have twice as many self-regulatory risks as boys.

As a result of isolation, young people demonstrated higher levels of internalised control, which can lead to long-term serious mental health problems, particularly in girls aged 14-18. Independent schools saw similar increases but were from a lower pre-pandemic baseline and to a lower extent[119]. It has also been found that young people who identify as non-binary showed lower levels of mental health[120].

Reviewing school leaders' response to the pandemic, NFER (2021) found that the urgency to address student wellbeing and emotional development was prioritised above academic catch-up as schools reopened[121]. It was found that school leaders' initial response was to make sure their pupils were feeling well, as this was the area where pupils displayed the greatest obvious deficits.

The need to provide enhanced levels of mental health and wellbeing support has been challenging for many schools. One example from London of a project that has the potential to help others in this regard is the Mental Health Trailblazer initiative in South West London[122]. This involves an innovative way of close partnership working between schools and health services to ensure young people have access to the support they need. The model is one of early intervention, with a focus on creating nurturing and supportive environments where all children can thrive, as well as better provision of services to those with more acute problems when they arise, such as those requiring referral to CAMHS.

Access to Higher Education

The university admissions process was complicated by the cancellation of GCSE and A-Level examinations in 2020 and 2021, and the ways in which results were awarded at those times. In 2020, after the application of the ill-fated algorithm, poor results were received by many disadvantaged pupils, exacerbating existing disparities in a way that was so problematic that the system eventually had to be replaced. The following year, for the 2021 cohort, GCSE and A-Level results were awarded based on Centre Assessed Grades (CAGs) alone.

Research into grade predictions found that high achieving state school pupils were more likely to be under-predicted compared to their private school counterparts[123]. There is also evidence that CAGs unfairly benefitted those with graduate parents[124]. To understand the problematic nature of this approach, research conducted by The Sutton Trust highlighted how conscious and unconscious bias of teachers could have detrimentally impacted grade predictions of particular groups of pupils, including those from poor or working-class and ethnic minority backgrounds[125].

The Sutton Trust also evaluated the viability of the university appeals process. Before the pandemic, the appeals process for official examinations was complex with a financial cost involved. If we consider poorer pupils who do not have the monetary means or support to navigate the process, we can question the usefulness of the appeals process for disadvantaged pupils.

Regarding university admission, caution has been expressed over the increase of unconditional offers as a result of the pandemic, as unconditional offers can put pressure on pupils to accept offers that are not the most suitable or in their best interests. The Sutton Trust therefore called for an increased effort on behalf of universities, particularly Russell Group universities, to make contextual offers to widen the attendance of disadvantaged pupils.

Learning Losses

There is evidence of significant learning loss for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds (EEF, 2022). The Department for Education reported loss of learning for primary school pupils of 1.9 months in reading and 4.5 months in mathematics. When compared to their peers, the data shows that disadvantaged pupils experienced similar learning losses at primary level in reading, half a month more at secondary level in reading and approximately a month more at primary level in mathematics[126].

There are many factors contributing to this. Analysis of young peoples' accounts of their experience of COVID-19 reveals more negative experiences expressed by young people living in more disadvantaged households and areas, compared with those living in more advantaged circumstances[127]. During the pandemic, issues around internet access, technology, home-based support and learning environments negatively affected disadvantaged pupils and replicated conditions that contribute towards the attainment gap[128].

Special schools and colleges faced additional challenges during the pandemic, leading to not only learning loss but, in some cases, a lack of access to essential therapy and other services[129]. There is evidence of learning loss of up to four months in literacy and numeracy for SEND pupils. This is due to several factors, including the difficulty of accommodating pupils in their usual setting with full support during lockdowns, the feasibility of having all those with ECHPs on-site due to 'vulnerable' or 'shielding' status and higher staff absence rates. There is also evidence that pupils with SEND faced additional obstacles in accessing online and home learning packages[130].

There is some evidence that both the impact of the pandemic and the speed of education recovery were different in particular areas of the country. The impact was particularly severe in the North East and Yorkshire and the Humber, in terms of the adverse impact of COVID-19 on pupils' progress and outcomes[131]. This may be related to the resilience of the school system in these areas, as well as to high levels of disadvantage in particular communities. It was also found that young people who did not come from disadvantaged households, but lived in disadvantaged areas, suffered particularly negative impacts. Teachers in schools with the highest levels of disadvantage reported the lowest scores for student engagement and parental support, as well as their own preparedness to teach the curriculum[132].

One facet of disadvantage which was particularly significant, in terms of the impact of the pandemic, was ethnicity. It became clear at an early stage that people with Black and Asian heritage were more at risk from the virus, though it was some time before there was clear evidence about the reasons for this. As well as genetic factors, it is now evident that the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on ethnic minorities in the UK was also a result of other factors, including poverty, overcrowded housing and access to quality healthcare[133]. The intersection of these different factors makes it likely that disadvantaged pupils from ethnic minority backgrounds will face greater and more intense challenges moving forward.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The experience of disadvantage remains a key determining factor in relation to educational outcomes in the UK. Wider social and economic circumstances affect disadvantaged pupils in profound ways, creating entrenched and systemic barriers that can seem insurmountable. It is possible, however, for schools to make a positive difference in helping young people to overcome these barriers to success.

At an early age, children's educational experiences are adversely affected by low household income, levels of parental education, low expectations or aspirations and restricted access to resources, facilities and support. Disadvantage is also shaped by a range of individual factors such as ethnicity, gender, special educational needs and disabilities. These intersect in ways that affect the life chances of disadvantaged young people, determining their levels of economic, social and cultural capital and shaping their future outcomes.

There is also a strong correlation between educational disadvantage and place. It is within the borders of a particular place, be it physical or socially constructed, where individual, community and societal factors interact. Certain groups of people living in certain neighbourhoods almost inevitably end up with the lowest-paid jobs, continuing for generations to live in poorer areas and to have reduced access to welfare, housing, healthcare, legal advice, employment and training. As a result, disadvantage is repeated generationally, unless an opportunity is found to break the cycle.

The examples given in Sections 2 and 3 of this report provide evidence that disadvantage can be challenged and overcome. Some have been the focus of research but many have not. More evidence is needed about exactly how these examples, and others like them, have made a positive difference to disadvantaged children and their communities.

There is no doubt that the impact of COVID-19 on disadvantaged children, their families and communities has been severe. It has led to increased levels of poverty, health inequality and food insecurity. It has negatively impacted on mental health, wellbeing and school attendance, has caused learning loss and led to difficulties with phase to phase transition. Those groups that were already facing significant disadvantage are the same groups who have been most negatively affected.

The opportunity to overcome disadvantage has been further reduced because of the heavy burdens placed on young people during this time. COVID-19 has also weakened the capacity of the education system to deal with existing challenges, as a result of the intense pressures faced by schools during the pandemic. At the same time, life is getting harder for families in disadvantaged areas, as they deal with intensified versions of the challenges they were already facing, owing to inflation, technology deficits, rising housing costs, rising fuel costs, food poverty and poor standards of social provision and facilities.

In this context, it seems inevitable that achievement gaps will start to widen again, if action is not taken to support disadvantaged children and their families. Support is also needed for schools, beyond that already made available as part of the DfE's education recovery strategy, to ensure that schools serving disadvantaged communities can successfully meet the increased challenges of the post-pandemic context.

Based on what we know from existing literature and research, we make the following recommendations for measures we believe will help young Londoners following the pandemic, and which may also be helpful for young people in other parts of the country:

Recommendation 1
Economic support for disadvantaged families

Although disadvantage is not only about economics, we cannot ignore the importance of financial resources. We know that living in poverty has a significant impact on young people's lives and on their educational outcomes. The financial losses caused by the pandemic have resulted in the worsening of financial consequences for families that were already living in poverty. To ensure children living in poverty can succeed at school, we recommend:

- Making all families eligible for Universal Credit automatically eligible for free school meals and the pupil premium.
- One-off payments of £250 at the start of each new school year to families of school-age children eligible for the pupil premium, to support with the cost of school uniform and other essentials.
- Ending the current benefits cap and the two-child policy, as this unfairly disadvantages families in London where housing is most expensive.
- Increased investment into Early Years programmes, including increasing the Early Years pupil premium to the same level as the primary school premium.
- Following the Pupil Premium Plus pilot, introduce a Post-16 Premium for all Sixth Form students.

Recommendation 2
Support for schools to collaboratively work with their communities

Collaboration between families, communities and schools lies at the heart of effective educational provision for disadvantaged pupils. At present, there is a dearth of evidence-based guidance about how schools can effectively improve parent and community collaboration. There are also no relevant accountability measures. To address these issues, we recommend:

- Turning the 'Parent Pledge' into a coherent strategy that can help schools to effectively engage with parents and communities.
- Producing further guidance about how to implement effective home-school-community partnerships, and providing the resources to enable implement this guidance effectively.
- Creating a national programme to recruit, train and deploy home-school liaison officers.
- Building on the work of Reach Academy and the West London Zone, develop and fund local collective action hubs, providing early intervention and rapid response for families experiencing difficulties.

Recommendation 3
Improving mental health support in schools

Mental health is becoming an increasingly pressing issue for schools, and one which has been further exacerbated by the pandemic. Improving the quality of mental health support that is available in schools has the potential to transform young people's experiences, helping ensure they can succeed in education and beyond. We recommend:

- Greater emphasis on collaboration and information-sharing between schools, local authorities and NHS trusts, to ensure there is joined up thinking in relation to young people's mental health services.
- Significant additional investment into Child and Adolescent Mental Health services (CAMHS), to ensure waiting lists are brought under control, including investment into training more therapists to ensure sufficient supply of staff to meet demand.
- Investment into better provision of school health services, through a national programme that supports and subsidises the training and employment of high quality school counsellors and other mental health services.

Recommendation 4
Further research

This report has identified some areas where further research is needed and we therefore also recommend support for further research into:

- How different types of disadvantage affect pupils, particularly the impact of persistent disadvantage, which is an under-researched area.
- The experience of White British students, particularly those living in low income circumstances, and strategies that work to raise their achievement.
- The experience of looked after children within the school system, in order to identify the best ways of supporting them to achieve their full potential.
- The educational experiences and achievement of transgender and non-binary pupils and how this is impacted by other forms of disadvantage.
- Models that work in relation to school-community collaboration and working with parents.

NOTES

[1] DfE (2020) *Examining the London advantage in attainment: evidence from LSYPE.* [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/937114/London_effect_report_-_final_20112020.pdf.

[2] Trust for London (2020) *London's Poverty Profile: 2020.* [Online]. Available at: https://trustforlondon.fra1.cdn.digitaloceanspaces.com/media/documents/Londons_Poverty_Profile_2020.pdf.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Power, A. (2007) *City Survivors: Bringing up children in disadvantaged neighbourhoods.* Bristol: Policy Press

[5] Block, D (2006) *Multilingual Identities in a Global City*. London: Palgrave Macmillan

[6] EPI 2020 *Education in England: Annual Report 2020*. [Online] Available at: https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/education-in-england-annual-report-2020/.

[7] DfE (2021) *Understanding Progress in the 2021/21 Academic Year*. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/994364/Understanding_Progress_in_the_2020_21_Academic_Year_Initial_Report_3_.pdf

[8] Ibid.

[9] Smith, G., and Smith, T. (2014). Targeting educational disadvantage by area: continuity and change in urban areas in England. *Oxford Review of Education.* 40 (6). 715-738.

[10] Passaretta, G., Skopek, J., and Huizen, T. (2022). Is Social Inequality in School-Age Achievement Generated before or during Schooling? A European Perspective (Germany, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands). *European Sociological Review*. 1-17.

[11] EP (2020) *Education in England: Annual Report 2020*. [Online] Available at: https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/education-in-england-annual-report-2020/.

[12] EPI (2018) *Educational disadvantage: How does England compare?*. [Online]. Available at: https://epi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Educational-Disadvantage-England-EPI-IOE.pdf

[13] DfE (2022) Understanding Progress in the 2020/21 Academic Year Extension report covering the first half of the autumn term 2021/22. [Online] Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1063488/Understanding_Progress_in_the_2020_to_2021_Academic_Year_Extension_report_covering_the_first_half_of_the_autumn_term_2021.pdf.

[14] EPI (2018) *Educational disadvantage: How does England compare?.* [Online]. Available at: https://epi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Educational-Disadvantage-England-EPI-IOE.pdf

[15] Freedman, S and Horner, S (2008) *School Funding and Social Justice: A guide to the pupil premium*. [Online] https://www.policyexchange.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/school-funding-and-social-justice-oct-08-3.pdf.

[16] Gorard, S. (2010). Education Can Compensate for Society - a Bit. *British Journal of Education Studies.* 58 (1). 47-65.

[17] Ofsted (2012) The Pupil Premium: How schools are spending the funding. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/413197/The_Pupil_Premium_-_How_schools_are_spending_the_funding.pdf.

[18] Winter, l., Burman, E., Hanley, T., Kalambouka, A., and Mccoy, L. (2016). Education, Welfare Reform and Psychological Well-Being: A Critical Psychology Perspective. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 1-17.

[19] Fitzgerald, A., and Lupton, R. (2015). The limits of Resilience? The Impact of Local Government Spending Cuts in London. *Local Government Studies*. 41 (4). 582-699.

[20] Lupton, R., Thompson, S., and Obolenskaya, P. (2016). *Social policy in a cold climate: Policies and their consequences since the Crisis*. Bristol University Press.

[21] House of Commons Public Accounts Committee (2021) *School Funding: Twenty-First Report of Session 2021-22*. [Online]. Available at https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/7577/documents/79574/default/.

[22] Parsons, C. (2016). Ethnicity, gender, deprivation and low educational attainment in England: Political arithmetic, ideological stances and the deficient society. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*. 11 (2). 160-183.

[23] Spera, C., Wentzel, K., and Matto, H. (2009). Parental Aspirations for Their Children's Educational Attainment: Relations to Ethnicity, Parental Education, Children's Academic Performance, and Parental Perceptions of School Climate. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 38. 1140-1152.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Kellaghan, T. (2001). Towards a Definition of Educational Disadvantage. *The Irish Journal of Education*. 3-22, p.17.

[26] Lupton, R. (2014). Raising Teachers' Voice in Achievement in Urban Schools in England: An Afterword. *The Urban Review*. 46 (5). 919 - 923.

[27] Ringrose, J. (2013) *Postfeminist Education? Girls and the social politics of schools.* London: Routledge

[28] Calvin, C., Fernandes, C., Smith, P., Visscher, P., and Deary, J. (2010). Sex, intelligence and educational achievement in a national cohort of over 172,000 11-year-old schoolchildren in England. *Intelligence*. 28. 424-432.

[29] Pinkett, M., & Roberts, M. (2019). *Boys Don't Try?: Rethinking Masculinity in Schools* (1st ed.). Routledge.

[30] DfE (2018) *Research to understand successful approaches to supporting the most academically able disadvantaged pupils*. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/915619/Research_to_understand_successful_approaches_to_supporting_the_most_academically_able_disadvantaged_pupils.pdf

[31] Strand, S. (2021). Ethnic, socio-economic and sex inequalities in educational achievement at age 16: An analysis of the Second Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE2). Report for the Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities (CRED), Department of Education, University of Oxford. Available online at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-report-of-the-commission-on-race-andethnic-disparities-supporting-research/ethnic-socio-economic-and-sex-inequalities-ineducational-achievement-at-age-16-by-professor-steve-strand

[32] Parsons, C. (2016). Ethnicity, gender, deprivation and low educational attainment in England: Political arithmetic, ideological stances and the deficient society. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice.* 11 (2). 160-183.

[33] Ibid.

[34] House of Commons Education Committee (2022) *The forgotten: how White working-class pupils have been let down, and how to change it.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.roberthalfon.com/sites/www.roberthalfon.com/files/2021-06/The%20forgotten.pdf

[35] Ibid.

[36] Demie, F., and Lewis, K. (2011). White working class achievement: an ethnographic study of barriers to learning in schools. *Educational Studies*. 37 (3). 245-264.

[37] Lambeth Council (2014) *The Educational Attainment of White Working Class Pupils.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/rsu/sites/www.lambeth.gov.uk.rsu/files/The_Educational_Attainment_of_White_Working_Class_Pupils_-_Empirical_Evidence_2014.pdf

[38] DfE (2021) *Understanding Progress in the 2021/21 Academic Year.* [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/994364/Understanding_Progress_in_the_2020_21_Academic_Year_Initial_Report_3_.pdf

[39] Ibid.

[40] Hayden, C. (2005) 'More than a piece of paper? Personal Education Plans and 'Looked After' Children in England.' Child & Family Social Work, 10, 343-352.

[41] Mannay D, Evans R, Staples E, Hallett S, Roberts L, Rees A, Andrews D. The consequences of being labelled 'looked-after': Exploring the educational experiences of looked-after children and young people in Wales. Br Educ Res J. 2017 Aug;43(4):683-699.

[42] MacAlister, J. (2022) The independent review of children's social care: final report. [Online]. Available at: https://childrenssocialcare.independent-review.uk/final-report/.

[43] Leeser, R. (2022) 'Poverty in London 2020/21', London Datastore, 7 April. Available at: https://data.london.gov.uk/blog/poverty-in-london-2020-21/.

[44] Leeser, R. (2022) 'Poverty in London 2020/21', *London Datastore,* 7 April. Available at: https://data.london.gov.uk/blog/poverty-in-london-2020-21/ .

[45] Power, A. (2007) *City Survivors: Bringing up children in disadvantaged neighbourhoods.* Bristol: Policy Press, p.1.

[46] Raffo, C. (2011). Educational Equity in Poor Urban Contexts - Exploring Issues of Place/Space and Young People's Identity and Agency. *British Journal of Education Studies.* 59 (1). 1-19.

[47] Riley, K. (2013) Leadership of Place: Stories from Schools in the UK, US and South Africa. London: Bloomsbury

[48] Bauman, Z. (2010) Living on Borrowed Time. Cambrige: Polity Press

[49] Bright, S. 2022 Fortress London: Why we need to save the country from its capital. London: Harper Collins

[50] Silva-Laya, M., D'Angelo, N., García, Zúñiga, E., and Fernández, T. (2019). Urban poverty and education. A systematic literature review. *Educational Research Review.* 29. 1-20.

[51] Smith, G., and Smith, T. (2014). Targeting educational disadvantage by area: continuity and change in urban areas in England. *Oxford Review of Education.* 40 (6). 715-738.

[52] O'Sullivan, K., Robson, J., and Winters, N. (2019). 'I feel like I have a disadvantage': how socio-economically disadvantaged students make the decision to study at a prestigious university. *Studies in Higher Education.* 44 (9). 1676-1690.

[53] Bellibas, M. (2016). Who are the Most Disadvantaged? Factors Associated with the Achievement of Students with Low Socio-Economic Backgrounds. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice.* 16 (2). 691-710.

[54] Thiele, T., Pope, D., Singleton, A., Snape, D. & Stanistreet, D. (2017), Experience of disadvantage: The influence of identity on engagement in working class students' educational trajectories to an elite university. Br Educ Res J, 43: 49–67.

[55] Silva-Laya, M., D'Angelo, N., García, Zúñiga, E., and Fernández, T. (2019). Urban poverty and education. A systematic literature review. Educational Research Review. 29. 1-20.

[56] Burgess, S. (2014). Understanding the success of London's schools. Bristol, England: The Centre for Market and Public Organisation.

[57] Baars, S., et al. (2014). Lessons from London schools: Investigating the success. London, UK: CfBT Education Trust.

[58] Blanden, J., Greaves, E., Gregg, P., Macmillan, L., & Sibieta, L. (2015). Understanding the improved performance of disadvantaged pupils in London. London, UK: Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion.

[59] DfE (2020) *Examining the London advantage in attainment: evidence from LSYPE*. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/937114/London_effect_report_-_final_20112020.pdf, p.9.

[60] Ofsted (2004) *Achievement of Bangladeshi heritage pupils.* [Online]. Available at https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/4836/7/Achievement%20of%20Bangladeshi%20heritage%20pupils%20%28PDF%20format%29_Redacted.pdf.

[61] Strand, S. (2021). Ethnic, socio-economic and sex inequalities in educational achievement at age 16: An analysis of the Second Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE2). Report for the Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities (CRED), Department of Education, University of Oxford. Available online at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-report-of-the-commission-on-race-andethnic-disparities-supporting-research/ethnic-socio-economic-and-sex-inequalities-ineducational-achievement-at-age-16-by-professor-steve-strand

[62] Brighouse, T., Fullick, L., & University of London. (2007). *Education in a global city: Essays from London.* London: Institute of Education.

[63] Sassen, S. (2018) *Cities in a World Economy* (5th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, p.4

[64] Young, M. and Willmott, P. *Family and Kinship in East London*. London: Penguin

[65] Tabberer, R., Saunders, L. and Kendall, L. (1997) *Raising Achievement in Newham Schools: A review by NFER for Newham LA*. [Online] Available at: https://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/91133/91133.pdf.

[66] https://www.sheringham-nur.org.uk/

[67] https://eyhub.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Working-Together-Collaboration-Case-Study.pdf

[68] https://www.newhamrecorder.co.uk/news/education/brampton-manor-academy-a-level-results-2021-8226250

[69] https://elmhurstprimary.co.uk/

[70] https://voice21.org/

[71] https://www.forestgatecst.org/

[72] Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international perspectives. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy.* 6 (1). 7-16.

[73] Silva-Laya, M., D'Angelo, N., García, Zúñiga, E., and Fernández, T. (2019). Urban poverty and education. A systematic literature review. *Educational Research Review.* 29. 1-20.

[74] https://www.reachacademyfeltham.com/

[75] https://www.westlondonzone.org/

[76] DfE (2021) *Understanding Progress in the 2021/21 Academic Year.* [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/994364/Understanding_Progress_in_the_2020_21_Academic_Year_Initial_Report_3_.pdf

[77] Ibid.

[78] O'Sullivan, K., Robson, J., and Winters, N. (2019). 'I feel like I have a disadvantage': how socio-economically disadvantaged students make the decision to study at a prestigious university. *Studies in Higher Education*. 44 (9). 1676-1690.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Wyness, G. (2017) *Rules of the Game: Disadvantaged students and the university admissions process.* [Online] Available at: https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Rules-of-the-Game.pdf

[81] Heselwood, L. (2018) *Gaining access: Increasing the participation of disadvantaged pupils at elite universities.* [Online] Available at: https://reform.uk/research/gaining-access-increasing-participation-disadvantaged-students-elite-universities.

[82] https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2020

[83] Mayor's Fund for London (2020) *One City, Two Worlds: London's Social Mobility Puzzle.* [Online] Available at: https://www.mayorsfundforlondon.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/One-City-Two-Worlds_Londons-social-mobility-puzzle-February-2020-spreads-.pdf.

[84] Elliot Major, L. and Machin, S. (2018) *Social Mobility: And Its Enemies*. London: Pelican Books

[85] Leeser, R. (2022) 'Poverty in London 2020/21', *London Datastore,* 7 April. Available at: https://data.london.gov.uk/blog/poverty-in-london-2020-21/.

[86] JRF (2007) JRF (2007) *Experiences of poverty and educational disadvantage.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/2123.pdf

[87] DfE (2010) *The Importance of Teaching: Schools White Paper.* [Online] Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175429/CM-7980.pdf.

[88] Coe, R. (2013) *Improving Education: A triumph of hope over experience*. [Online] Available at: http://eachandeverydog.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/ImprovingEducation2013.pdf.

[89] Hirsch (1996) *The Schools We Need: And why we don't have them*. New York: Doubleday

[90] Young, M. (2014) *The Curriculum and the Entitlement to Knowledge*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/166279-the-curriculum-and-the-entitlement-to-knowledge-prof-michael-young.pdf.

[91] Apple, M.W. (2013) *Knowledge, Power, and Education: The Selected Worlds of Michael W. Apple*. New York, NY: Routledge

[92] Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and Through Cultural Diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry.* 43 (1). 48-70.

[93] www.mulberryschoolstrust.org

[94] https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/letgirlslearn

[95] https://www.mercedesamgf1.com/en/news/2020/11/mulberry-schools-trust-launches-stem-academy-mercedes-f1-team/

[96] Martin, K., Lord, P., White, R. and Atkinson, M. (2009). Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes: Leadership (LGA Research Report). Slough: NFER

[97] Leithwood, K., Harris, A., and Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management.* 40 (1). 5-22.

[98] DfE (2018) *Research to understand successful approaches to supporting the most academically able disadvantaged pupils.* [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/915619/Research_to_understand_successful_approaches_to_supporting_the_most_academically_able_disadvantaged_pupils.pdf

[99] Kidson, M. and Norris, E. *Implementing the London Challenge.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Implementing%20the%20London%20Challenge%20-%20final_0.pdf

[100] Ibid., p.15.

[101] JRF (2007) *Education and poverty: A critical review of theory, policy and practice.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/2028-education-poverty-theory.pdf.

[102] Raffo, C. (2011). Educational Equity in Poor Urban Contexts - Exploring Issues of Place/Space and Young People's Identity and Agency. *British Journal of Education Studies.* 59 (1). 1-19.

[103] Eade, J., and Garbin, D. (2006). Competing visions of identity and space: Bangladeshi Muslims in Britain. *Contemporary South Asia*. 15 (2). 181-193.

[104] Ofsted (2004) *Achievement of Bangladeshi heritage pupils.* [Online]. Available at https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/4836/7/Achievement%20of%20Bangladeshi%20heritage%20pupils%20%28PDF%20format%29_Redacted.pdf.

[105] Ibid., p.16

[106] https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/parental-engagement

[107] www.kaa.org.uk

[108] https://www.surreysquareprimary.co.uk/

[109] NFER (2021) *Recovery during a pandemic: the ongoing impacts of COVID-19 on schools serving deprived communities.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.nfer.ac.uk/recovery-during-a-pandemic-the-ongoing-impacts-of-COVID-19-on-schools-serving-deprived-communities/

[110] Holt, L., and Murray, L. (2021). Children and COVID-19 in the UK. *Children's Geographies.* 1-9.

[111] Blundell, R., Costa Dias, M., Joyce, R., and Xu, X. (2020). COVID-19 and Inequalities. *Fiscal Studies.* 41 (2). 291-319.

[112] Ibid.

[113] Ibid.

[114] Holt, L., and Murray, L. (2021). Children and COVID-19 in the UK. *Children's Geographies.* 1-9.

[115] Harari, D, Francis-Devine, B, Bolton, P. and Keep, M. (2022) Rising Cost of Living in the UK. [Online] Available at https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-9428/CBP-9428.pdf

[116] The Children's Society (2020) *Life on Hold: Children's Wellbeing and COVID-19.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.childrenssociety.org.uk/sites/default/files/2020-10/life-on-hold-childrens-well-being-and-covid-19.pdf

[117] Royal College of Psychiatrists (2021) Written evidence submitted by the Royal College of Psychiatrists (CYP0090), March 2021. Available at: https://committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/23291/pdf/.

[118] STEER (2022) *Navigating the Road of Adolescence: Young People's Mental Health in the UK.* [Online]. Available at: https://steer.education/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Young-Peoples-Mental-Health-in-the-UK-STEER-Report-Feb-2022.pdf

[119] Ibid.

[120] Edurio (2021) *Pupil Learning Experience and Wellbeing Review: Pupil Experience in Schools and Multi-Academy Trusts.*

[121] NFER (2021) *Recovery during a pandemic: the ongoing impacts of COVID-19 on schools serving deprived communities.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.nfer.ac.uk/recovery-during-a-pandemic-the-ongoing-impacts-of-covid-19-on-schools-serving-deprived-communities/

[122] https://democracy.merton.gov.uk/documents/s26586/CYP%20Emotional%20Wellbeing%20Programme.pdf.

[123] Anders, J. et al (2020). Grade Expectations: How well can we predict future grades based on past performance? CEPEO Working Paper No.20-14. Centre for Education Policy and Equalising Opportunities, UCL. Available at: https://repec-cepeo.ucl.ac.uk/cepeow/new-style/cepeowp20-14.pdf.

[124] Anders, J. et al (2021) 'Pupils with graduate parents received an unfair advantage in their A-level results last year', *LSE COVID-19*, 9 June. Available at: https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/covid19/2021/06/09/pupils-with-graduate-parents-received-an-unfair-advantage-in-their-a-level-results-last-year/.

[125] The Sutton Trust (2020) *Social Mobility and COVID-19: Implications of the COVID-19 crisis for educational inequality.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/COVID-19-and-Social-Mobility-1.pdf

[126] Department for Education (2021) *Understanding Progress in the 2021/21 Academic Year.* [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/994364/Understanding_Progress_in_the_2020_21_Academic_Year_Initial_Report_3_.pdf

[127] Holt, L., and Murray, L. (2021). Children and COVID-19 in the UK. *Children's Geographies.* 1-9.

[128] Pokhrel, S., and Chhetri, R. (2021). A Literature Review on Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education for the Future.* 8 (1). 133-141.

[129] NFER (2021) *Recovery during a pandemic: the ongoing impacts of COVID-19 on schools serving deprived communities.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.nfer.ac.uk/recovery-during-a-pandemic-the-ongoing-impacts-of-covid-19-on-schools-serving-deprived-communities/

[130] Pokhrel, S., and Chhetri, R. (2021). A Literature Review on Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education for the Future.* 8 (1). 133-141.

[131] Department for Education (2021) *Understanding Progress in the 2021/21 Academic Year.* [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/994364/Understanding_Progress_in_the_2020_21_Academic_Year_Initial_Report_3_.pdf

[132] NFER (2021) *Recovery during a pandemic: the ongoing impacts of COVID-19 on schools serving deprived communities.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.nfer.ac.uk/recovery-during-a-pandemic-the-ongoing-impacts-of-covid-19-on-schools-serving-deprived-communities/

[133] Hooper, W. M., Napolés, M. A., and Pérez-Stable, E. (2020). COVID-19 and Racial/Ethnic Disparities. *American Medical Association.* 323 (24). 2466-2468

REFERENCES

Adams, C. (1987) *Across seven seas and thirteen rivers: Life stories of pioneer Sylhetti settlers in Britain*. THAP Books.

Ainscow, M., and Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: the role of organisational cultures and leadership. I*nternational Journal of Inclusive Education.* 14 (4). 401-416.

Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international perspectives. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy.* 6 (1). 7-16.

Amoore, L. (2020) 'Why 'Ditch the Algorithm,' is the future of political protest', *The Guardian, United Kingdom*, 19 August. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/aug/19/ditch-the-algorithm-generation-students-a-levels-politics.

Anders, J., Dilnot, C., Macmillan, L., and Wyness, G. (2020). Grade Expectations: How well can we predict future grades based on past performance? CEPEO Working Paper No.20-14. Centre for Education Policy and Equalising Opportunities, UCL. Available at: https://repec-cepeo.ucl.ac.uk/cepeow/new-style/cepeowp20-14.pdf.

Anders, J., Macmillan, L., Sturgis, P., and Wyness, G. (2021) 'Pupils with graduate parents received an unfair advantage in their A-level results last year', *LSE COVID-19*, 9 June. Available at: https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/covid19/2021/06/09/pupils-with-graduate-parents-received-an-unfair-advantage-in-their-a-level-results-last-year/.

Baars, S., et al. (2014). Lessons from London schools: Investigating the success. London, UK: CfBT Education Trust.

Ball, S., Bowe, R., and Gewirtz, S. (1996). School choice, social class and distinction: the realization of social advantage in education. *Journal of Education Policy.* 11 (1). 89-112.

Ball, S. (2021). Against school: an epistemological critique. *Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education.* 1-15.

Batty, E. (2013). Addressing Disadvantage in Deprived Communities: Evidence from the New Deal for Communities [NDC] Programme in England. *Urban Studies*. 50 (8). 1523-1539.

Bauman, Z. (2010) Living on Borrowed Time. Cambrige: Polity Press

Bellibas, M. (2016). Who are the Most Disadvantaged? Factors Associated with the Achievement of Students with Low Socio-Economic Backgrounds. *Educational Sciences:* Theory & Practice. 16 (2). 691-710.

Blanden, J., Greaves, E., Gregg, P., Macmillan, L., & Sibieta, L. (2015). Understanding the improved performance of disadvantaged pupils in London. London, UK: Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion.

Block, D. (2006) *Multilingual Identities in a Global City*. London: Palgrave Macmillan

Blundell, R., Costa Dias, M., Joyce, R., and Xu, X. (2020). COVID-19 and Inequalities. *Fiscal Studies*. 41 (2). 291-319.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Brighouse, T., Fullick, L., & University of London. (2007). Education in a global city: *Essays from London*. London: Institute of Education.

Bright, S. 2022 Fortress London: Why we need to save the country from its capital. London: Harper Collins

Burgess, S. (2014). Understanding the success of London's schools. Bristol, England: The Centre for Market and Public Organisation.

Calvin, C., Fernandes, C., Smith, P., Visscher, P., and Deary, J. (2010). Sex, intelligence and educational achievement in a national cohort of over 172,000 11-year-old schoolchildren in England. *Intelligence.* 28. 424-432.

Cavanagh, T. (2012). Creating peaceful and effective schools through a culture of care. *Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. 33 (3). 443-455.

The Children's Society (2020) *Life on Hold: Children's Wellbeing and COVID-19.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.childrenssociety.org.uk/sites/default/files/2020-10/life-on-hold-childrens-well-being-and-covid-19.pdf

Cortés-Morales, S., Holt, L., Acevedo-Rincón, J., Aitkin, S., Ekmen Ladru, D., Joelsson, T., Kraftl, P., Murray, L., and Tebet, G. (2021). Children living in pandemic times: a geographical, transnational and situated view. *Children's Geographies.* 1-12.

Demie, F., and Lewis, K. (2011). White working class achievement: an ethnographic study of barriers to learning in schools. *Educational Studies*. 37 (3). 245-264.

Department for Children, Schools and Families (2008) *Minority Ethnic Pupils in the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England.* [Online]. Available at: https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/7916/1/DCSF-RR029.pdf

Department for Education (DfE) (2018) *Research to understand successful approaches to supporting the most academically able disadvantaged pupils*. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/915619/Research_to_understand_successful_approaches_to_supporting_the_most_academically_able_disadvantaged_pupils.pdf

Department for Education (DfE) (2020) *Examining the London advantage in attainment: evidence from LSYPE.* [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/937114/London_effect_report_-_final_20112020.pdf.

Department for Education (DfE) (2021) *Understanding Progress in the 2021/21 Academic Year.* [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/994364/Understanding_Progress_in_the_2020_21_Academic_Year_Initial_Report_3_.pdf

Department for Education (DfE) (2022) *Understanding Progress in the 2020/21 Academic Year Extension report covering the first half of the autumn term 2021/22.* [Online] Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1063488/Understanding_Progress_in_the_2020_to_2021_Academic_Year_Extension_report_covering_the_first_half_of_the_autumn_term_2021.pdf.

Department for Work and Pensions (2002) 'Children in low income families: local area statistics, financial year ending 2021', 31 March. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/children-in-low-income-families-local-area-statistics-2014-to-2021/children-in-low-income-families-local-area-statistics-financial-year-ending-2021.

Eade, J., and Garbin, D. (2006). Competing visions of identity and space: Bangladeshi Muslims in Britain. *Contemporary South Asia*. 15 (2). 181-193.

Education Policy Institute (EPI) (2018) *Educational disadvantage: How does England compare?*. [Online]. Available at: https://epi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Educational-Disadvantage-England-EPI-IOE.pdf

Education Policy Institute (EPI) 2020 *Education in England: Annual Report 2020.* [Online] Available at: https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/education-in-england-annual-report-2020/.

Edurio (2021) P*upil Learning Experience and Wellbeing Review: Pupil Experience in Schools and Multi-Academy Trusts.*

Evidence Based Education (2020) *Great Teaching Toolkit: Evidence Review.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.cambridgeinternational.org/Images/584543-great-teaching-toolkit-evidence-review.pdf

Fitzgerald, A., and Lupton, R. (2015). The limits of Resilience? The Impact of Local Government Spending Cuts in London. *Local Government Studies*. 41 (4). 582-699.

Freedman, S and Horner, S (2008) School Funding and Social Justice: A guide to the pupil premium. [Online] https://www.policyexchange.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/school-funding-and-social-justice-oct-08-3.pdf.

Freedman, S (2022) 'I helped design pupil-premium funding, but it needs an urgent update' https://www.tes.com/magazine/analysis/general/i-helped-design-pupil-premium-funding-it-needs-urgent-update

Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and Through Cultural Diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry.* 43 (1). 48-70.

Gorard, S. (2010). Education Can Compensate for Society - a Bit. *British Journal of Education Studies*. 58 (1). 47-65.

Greaves, E., Macmillan, L., & Sibieta, L. (2014). Lessons from London schools for attainment gaps and social mobility. London, UK: Social Mobility & Child Poverty Commission.

Harris, A., and Jones, M. (2019). Teacher leadership and educational change. *School Leadership & Management.* 39 (2). 123-126.

Hamnett, C., and Butler, T. (2010). 'Geography matters': the role distance plays in reproducing educational inequality in East London. *Transactions of the Institution of British Geographers.* 36. 479-500.

Harari, D, Francis-Devine, B, Bolton, P. and Keep, M. (2022) Rising Cost of Living in the UK. [Online] Available at https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-9428/CBP-9428.pdf

Holt, L., and Murray, L. (2021). Children and COVID-19 in the UK. *Children's Geographies.* 1-9.

Hooper, W. M., Napolés, M. A., and Pérez-Stable, E. (2020). COVID-19 and Racial/Ethnic Disparities. *American Medical Association*. 323 (24). 2466-2468.

House of Commons Education Committee (2022) *The forgotten: how White working-class pupils have been let down, and how to change it.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.roberthalfon.com/sites/www.roberthalfon.com/files/2021-06/The%20forgotten.pdf

How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top. Presentation by McKinsey and Co (2007). [Online]. Available at: https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/education/our-insights/how-the-worlds-best-performing-school-systems-come-out-on-top

Inman, P. (2022). 'UK inflation hits 40-year high of 9% as cost of food and energy soars'. *The Guardian, United Kingdom,* 18 May. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/business/2022/may/18/uk-inflation-soars-to-highest-level-in-more-than-40-years.

Institute of Education (2021) *Learning through Disruption: Using schools' experiences of COVID to build a more resilient education system.* [Online]. Available at: https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10136102/1/Learning%20Through%20Disruption%20Main%20Report.pdf

International Academy of Education (2016) *Task, Teaching and Learning: Improving the Quality of Education for Economically Disadvantaged Students.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.ibe.unesco.org/sites/default/files/resources/practices_series_27_v3_002.pdf

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (2011) *Policy Brief. Socioeconomically disadvantaged students who are academically successful.* [Online]. Available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED557616.pdf

Jerrim, J. (2014). The Socio-Economic Gradient in Teenagers' Reading Skills: How Does England Compare with Other Countries? *Fiscal Studies.* 33 (2). 159-184.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) (2006) *The persistence of poverty across generations.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/9781861348531.pdf

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) (2007) *Experiences of poverty and educational disadvantage.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/2123.pdf

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) (2007) *Education and poverty: A critical review of theory, policy and practice.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/2028-education-poverty-theory.pdf.

Kellaghan, T. (2001). Towards a Definition of Educational Disadvantage. *The Irish Journal of Education.* 3-22.

Kidson, M. and Norris, E. *Implementing the London Challenge.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Implementing%20the%20London%20Challenge%20-%20final_0.pdf

Lahtero, T. J., and Riksu, M. (2012). Symbolic leadership and leadership culture in one unified comprehensive school in Finland. *School Leadership & Management.* 32 (5). 523-535.

Lambeth Council (2014) *The Educational Attainment of White Working Class Pupils.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/rsu/sites/www.lambeth.gov.uk.rsu/files/The_Educational_Attainment_of_White_Working_Class_Pupils_-_Empirical_Evidence_2014.pdf

Leeser, R. (2022) 'Poverty in London 2020/21', *London Datastore,* 7 April. Available at: https://data.london.gov.uk/blog/poverty-in-london-2020-21/.

Leithwood, K. (2021). A Review of Evidence about Equitable School Leadership. *Education Sciences*. 11 (337). 1-49.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., and Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management.* 40 (1). 5-22.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets (2021) *Poverty Review.* [Online]. Available at: https://democracy.towerhamlets.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=191230

Lupton, R. (2014). Raising Teachers' Voice in Achievement in Urban Schools in England: An Afterword. *The Urban Review*. 46 (5). 919 - 923.

Lupton, R., Thompson, S., and Obolenskaya, P. (2016). Social policy in a cold climate: Policies and their consequences since the Crisis. Bristol University Press.

McCallum, I., and Demie, F. (2010). Social class, ethnicity and educational performance. *Educational Research.* 43 (2). 147-159.

National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) (2021) *Recovery during a pandemic: the ongoing impacts of COVID-19 on schools serving deprived communities.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.nfer.ac.uk/recovery-during-a-pandemic-the-ongoing-impacts-of-covid-19-on-schools-serving-deprived-communities/

NFER (2022) *Four things we learned about the impact of COVID-19 on mainstream schools and special education settings in 2020 and 2021.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.nfer.ac.uk/covid-research-mainstream-special-four-things/

OECD (2018) *Equity in Education: Breaking Down Barriers to Social Mobility.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/equity-in-education_9789264073234-en

'Ofqual Analytics' (2021). *Map of GCSE (9 to 1) grade outcomes by county in England.* Available at: https://analytics.ofqual.gov.uk/apps/GCSE/County/.

Ofsted (2004) *Achievement of Bangladeshi heritage pupils.* [Online]. Available at https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/4836/7/Achievement%20of%20Bangladeshi%20heritage%20pupils%20%28PDF%20format%29_Redacted.pdf.

O'Sullivan, K., Robson, J., and Winters, N. (2019). 'I feel like I have a disadvantage': how socio-economically disadvantaged students make the decision to study at a prestigious university. *Studies in Higher Education.* 44 (9). 1676-1690.

Parsons, C. (2016). Ethnicity, gender, deprivation and low educational attainment in England: Political arithmetic, ideological stances and the deficient society. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice.* 11 (2). 160-183.

Passaretta, G., Skopek, J., and Huizen, T. (2022). Is Social Inequality in School-Age Achievement Generated before or during Schooling? A European Perspective (Germany, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands). *European Sociological Review.* 1-17.

Pokhrel, S., and Chhetri, R. (2021). A Literature Review on Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education for the Future.* 8 (1). 133-141.

Power, A. (2007) *City Survivors: Bringing up children in disadvantaged neighbourhoods.* Bristol: Policy Press

Raffo, C. (2011). Educational Equity in Poor Urban Contexts - Exploring Issues of Place/Space and Young People's Identity and Agency. *British Journal of Education Studies.* 59 (1). 1-19.

Riley, K. (2013) Leadership of Place: Stories from Schools in the UK, US and South Africa. London: Bloomsbury

Royal College of Psychiatrists (2021) Written evidence submitted by the Royal College of Psychiatrists (CYP0090), March 2021. Available at: https://committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/23291/pdf/.

Sassen, S. (2018) *Cities in a World Economy* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Silva-Laya, M., D'Angelo, N., García, Zúñiga, E., and Fernández, T. (2019). Urban poverty and education. A systematic literature review. *Educational Research Review.* 29. 1-20.

Singh, P., Märtsin, M., and Glasswell, K. (2013). Knowledge work at the boundary: Making a difference to educational disadvantage. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction.* 2. 102-110.

The Smith Institute (2019) *The unspoken decline of outer London: Why is poverty and inequality increasing in outer London and what needs to change?* [Online]. Available at: https://trustforlondon.fra1.cdn.digitaloceanspaces.com/media/documents/The-unspoken-decline-of-outer-London.pdf

Smith, G., and Smith, T. (2014). Targeting educational disadvantage by area: continuity and change in urban areas in England. *Oxford Review of Education.* 40 (6). 715-738.

Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission (2014) *Lessons from London schools for attainment gaps and social mobility.* [Online]. Available at: https://ifs.org.uk/uploads/publications/docs/london_schools_june2014.pdf

Spera, C., Wentzel, K., and Matto, H. (2009). Parental Aspirations for Their Children's Educational Attainment: Relations to Ethnicity, Parental Education, Children's Academic Performance, and Parental Perceptions of School Climate. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence.* 38. 1140-1152.

STEER (2022) *Navigating the Road of Adolescence: Young People's Mental Health in the UK.* [Online]. Available at: https://steer.education/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Young-Peoples-Mental-Health-in-the-UK-STEER-Report-Feb-2022.pdf

Stoll, L., and Temperley, J. (2009). Creative leadership: a challenge of our times. *School Leadership & Management.* 29 (1). 65-78.

The Sutton Trust (2014) *What makes great teaching? Review of the underpinning research.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/What-makes-great-teaching-FINAL-4.11.14-1.pdf

The Sutton Trust (2018) *Access to Advantage: The influence of schools and place on admissions to top universities.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/AccesstoAdvantage-2018.pdf

The Sutton Trust (2020) *Social Mobility and COVID-19: Implications of the COVID-19 crisis for educational inequality.* [Online]. Available at: https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/COVID-19-and-Social-Mobility-1.pdf

Thiele, T., Pope, D., Singleton, A., Snape, D. & Stanistreet, D. (2017), Experience of disadvantage: The influence of identity on engagement in working class students' educational trajectories to an elite university. Br Educ Res J, 43: 49–67.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2020) *COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: a social crisis in the making*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpub/article/PIIS2468-2667(20)30084-0/fulltext

Whitty, G. (2001). Education, social class and social exclusion. *Journal of Education Policy*. 16 (4). 287-295.

Winter, l., Burman, E., Hanley, T., Kalambouka, A., and Mccoy, L. (2016). Education, Welfare Reform and Psychological Well-Being: A Critical Psychology Perspective. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 1-17.

Mulberry Schools Trust

Mulberry Schools Trust is a multi-academy trust which was founded by Mulberry School for Girls based in Tower Hamlets, east London. The trust currently includes eight primary and secondary schools, as well as the East London Teaching School Hub and the Mulberry STEM Academy, a partnership with Mercedes Benz F1 Grand Priz Ltd. The trust's CEO, Dr Vanessa Ogden, is a National Leader of Education and co-founder of Reconnect London.

Mulberry
Schools Trust

Dunraven Educational Trust

Dunraven Educational Trust is a multi-academy trust in south-west London. The trust comprises three primary schools, one secondary and one all-through school. The trust's CEO, David Boyle CBE, is a National Leader of Education and co-founder of Reconnect London.

DUNRAVEN EDUCATIONAL TRUST