About Capital Mobility

This project started life with the working title ‘Social Mobility Goldspots’. We were looking for communities, schools, programmes or business sectors that could be said to buck the trend of poor social mobility in Britain.

Time and again, that search led back to London, so the project morphed into one looking at London’s exceptionalism, in terms of educational attainment and social mobility. Why does the capital outperform? What could be learned and, ideally, copied?

We are not academic researchers and we do not pretend that this work would stand up to the rigorous examination that academic studies must. In general we have gone ‘broad’ rather than ‘deep’. Some of our conclusions and recommendations are necessarily speculative to a degree. But we wanted to put the hypotheses and invite others to challenge, disprove or develop them.
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School days (and earlier) are the key to social mobility

Seven key truths about social mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Truth</th>
<th>Policy challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The point of greatest leverage for social mobility is what happens</td>
<td>A massive premium on ‘parenting’ skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between birth and age three, primarily in the home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You can also break the cycle through education…</td>
<td>Children must be able to access learning (school readiness; reading ability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. …the most important controllable factor being the quality of your</td>
<td>Focus first on quality of teachers &amp; teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. But it’s also about what happens after the school bell rings</td>
<td>Find ways to level the playing field on out-of-school opportunities, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University is the top determinant of later opportunities – so pre-18</td>
<td>Reinforces importance of school years – but also raises questions about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attainment is key</td>
<td>university admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. But later pathways to mobility are possible, given the will and</td>
<td>Find the exemplar programmes, analyse and demonstrate impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal resilience and emotional wellbeing are the missing link in</td>
<td>Recognise that social/emotional ‘skills’ underpin academic and other success –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chain</td>
<td>and can be taught</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seven Key Truths about Social Mobility, APPG on Social Mobility, May 2012 – see http://www.appg-socialmobility.org/
London vs the rest (1)
London has overtaken the rest of England

% Pupils achieving 5+C+ at GCSE including English & Maths

Source: PQ 159000 12/6/13    Note: In graph GCSE 'equivalents' are included from 2004.
London vs the rest (2)
London outperformance is especially striking among disadvantaged pupils

% of all pupils achieving 5+C+ GCSEs including English & Maths

% of FSM pupils achieving 5+C+ GCSEs including English & Maths

Source: DfE Achievements at GCSE and equivalent for pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 by free school meal eligibility and Local Authority, 2011/12. State funded schools.
The London premium widens through school, especially for disadvantaged youngsters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-school</th>
<th>Infants</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>GCSEs</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Top university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>in line</td>
<td>in line</td>
<td>1.02x</td>
<td>1.05x</td>
<td>1.3x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02x</td>
<td>1.05x</td>
<td>1.3x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantaged</strong></td>
<td>1.2x</td>
<td>up to 1.1x</td>
<td>1.1x</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>2.4x</td>
<td>up to 4x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 %pts</td>
<td>3 to 6 %pts</td>
<td>8 %pts</td>
<td>16 %pts</td>
<td>19 %pts</td>
<td>4% vs 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- in line
- 2 %pts
- 3 %pts
- 12 %pts
- 1.2x
- 8 %pts
- 3 to 6 %pts
- 1.1x
- 8 %pts
- 16 %pts
- 1.5x
- 19 %pts
- 2.4x
- 4% vs 1%

Sources: Various. See “London outperforms at every stage...” in Appendix 1 for details. Note these figures are meant to be illustrative only; definitions of ‘disadvantaged’ can vary.

On average, London FSM pupils do half a grade better per GCSE than those elsewhere

‘good level of development’
Level 2+ in Reading, writing, maths, science
Level 4+ in maths & English
5+C+ including maths & English
In HE at age 19
Go to a Russell Group university
Disadvantaged in London vs disadvantaged elsewhere...

**outperform**
before school even begins

almost

**50%**

more likely to get five good GCSEs

**twice**

as likely to go to university

**pull away**

as school progresses

up to

**4 times**

as likely to go to a top university
What’s different about London?

- smaller classes
- more diverse
- new teachers
- more museums
- bigger families
- more languages
- shorter distances
- bigger primaries
- more universities
- less deprivation
- more gaming
- more senior teachers
- more assistants
- more tutors
- top firms
- better educated mums
What are the likely key factors, and which could be replicated?

*Individual causal factors cannot be isolated with certainty, but these seem likely...*

![Diagram showing factors and their likelihood of replicability](image)
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In the early 2000s, London schools were seen as a problem child, needing special attention...

- Below average exam results
- High teacher vacancy rates
- Higher turnover of teachers
- Perception of poor discipline
- Particular crises in Hackney and Islington leading to those boroughs losing control of education

“Radical structural reform is essential to raise standards [...] Nowhere is the challenge to create this new system greater than in Inner London.”

Tony Blair
Preface to *The London Challenge*

....prompting the London Challenge in 2003

Key elements

- 20 new schools, 30 academies, 15 new 6th form colleges
- £25m over three years for new initiatives, including leadership training and Gifted & Talented centre
- Particular focus on Haringey, Hackney, Islington, Lambeth and Southwark; and on underperforming ‘Keys to Success’ schools
- ‘Competitive collaboration’ with a strong data underpinning
- Call for school-level innovation and attracting more talented teachers and leaders: Teach First; the recruitment allowance; addressing housing issues
- A new London Commissioner

Other possible effects

- From ‘the embattled’ to ‘the leading edge’
- Feeling of shared ownership / responsibility (+ proximity)
- The particular leadership of Tim Brighouse and David Woods
- Cumulative effects of innovation
- Resourcing
- Combined with LAs’ reaction to the (pre-2003) fate of Islington and Hackney losing control of education

Within the London Challenge, what were the most important elements? And, what other factors may also have been at play?

London’s relative improvement was already underway by 2003

% Pupils achieving 5+C+ at GCSE incl English & Maths

Parents’ perception of their child’s secondary school

The crossover point in secondary performance was 2003

Some indications that parents’ perceptions of London schools were turning by 2003*

Sources: PQ 159000 12/6/13; DfES First Survey of London Parents’ Attitudes to London Secondary Schools 2003 RR493. Note: In graph GCSE ‘equivalents’ are included from 2004. *Survey also says: “Parents in key London Challenge boroughs were more likely than those in other boroughs to feel there had been a significant improvement (21% felt there had been vs. 8%)”
And there are other reasons to seek additional and/or more granular factors

- London Challenge’s success did not ‘translate’ as well for Manchester and the Black Country after 2008
- London outperformance is so much more marked among FSM recipients
- Indeed London’s poor children seem to be already ahead, even before school has begun
- London has a markedly different mix of people
- And there is a range of other potential ‘London exceptionalism’ factors, worthy of examination
What’s different about London?

- Very different families
- Different schools
- Different teachers
- More opportunities
London schools are larger than average, especially at primary level

Source: DfE Schools, pupils and their characteristics: January 2011 tables 10e and 10f
London schools do get more money

Total income per pupil: Primary

- Low FSM
- Medium FSM
- High FSM
- Overall

Total income per pupil: Secondary

- Low FSM
- Medium FSM
- High FSM
- Overall

Source: DfE Performance Tables 2012 data.
But class sizes are not smaller than elsewhere

- Except at Key Stage 3 (age 11-14), London classes have actually been bigger than elsewhere
- London’s ratio of teaching assistants to teachers is close to the national average (higher in inner London, lower in outer London)

Sources: Class Size and Education in England Evidence Report (2009), pages 28-34; Table 9a and 9b in Local Authority Tables SFR09/2010 in Schools, pupils and their characteristics: January 2010; Underlying Data 2, SFR06/2012, School Workforce in England: November 2011
The mix of schools in London is not that remarkable

Source: Analysis of KS2 and KS4 performance tables. The different VC/VA split in London seems to be for historic reasons in the C of E
But one type of school – Sponsored Academies – did disproportionately help London’s improved results

Our estimate is based on a sample of 37 schools, accounting for approx 70% of sponsored academies in London and 8% of all London Year 11 pupils.


Notes: * 2012 data including English and Maths.
What’s different about London?

- Very different families
- Different schools
- Different teachers
- More opportunities
Compared to the rest of England, London’s teachers are...

- Paid 9% more in outer London and 16% more in inner London, compared to outside the capital
- Less white, younger (especially inner London)
- More likely to be full-time
- More likely to be or have been on the Teach First programme
- More likely to be on main pay scales, less likely to be on upper and/or advanced skill scale
- Among Teaching Assistants, less likely to be HLTAs

Source: Underlying Data 2: SFR06/2012, School Workforce in England: November 2011
The actual difference in the average pay packet is less than the ‘headline’ difference

London teachers’ premium of up to 25% (inner London, bottom of main range)
But actual pay gap is smaller ... consistent with London teachers being younger and further down the pay banding

Sources: DfE Teacher pay scales from Sept 2013; workforce survey
London teachers are somewhat more likely to come from abroad. There is little difference in the degree classes of those from the UK.

### UK educated teachers by degree class, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Class</th>
<th>England excl London</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of teachers educated abroad, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England excl London</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Teach First is concentrated in London**

2011 NQTs that qualified through Teach First

Number of Teach First secondary participants, 2011/12

London represents 49% of the total

Sources: Teach First June NCTL Report, 2013; Employment of the 2009/10 cohort of newly qualified teachers in 2011

Notes: The England excl London data is unweighted, so does not take into account regional size variability; There have not been any Teach First participants in the South West or East England regions, hence their lack of representation on the graph.
What’s different about London?

Very different families
Different schools
Different teachers

More opportunities
A gap between disadvantaged Londoners and those elsewhere is already apparent at Age 5

Early Years Foundation Stage Profile 2013
% of FSM children reaching “A good level of development”

Source: EYFSP Teacher Assessments 2013
The average London child’s family background is different in a number of ways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence on outcome¹</th>
<th>How London differs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of mother</td>
<td>• London mothers tend to be somewhat older with the greatest incidence at 30-34 age group²*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of siblings</td>
<td>• Larger families: London has the highest proportion of families with 3 or more children³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Household size has been growing in London, bucking the wider trend¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>• No significant difference¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth weight</td>
<td>• Very slightly lighter babies⁴*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in year</td>
<td>• No significant difference¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>• London state secondary schools are 32% White British vs 82% in the rest of England⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation immigrants</td>
<td>• 39% of London secondary school leavers have English as additional language (EAL) vs 8% elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At the end of primary, the London figure is now 48% (and even higher in inner London)¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• But EAL pupils come close to native speakers’ on GCSEs, and actually just beat them in London⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Parents</td>
<td>• London is estimated to be above average for the proportion of families where the parents are married⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education</td>
<td>• An estimated 35% of the parents of school age (5-15) children had a degree or higher qualification vs 24% in the rest of the country⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended pre-school (&amp; pre-school quality)</td>
<td>• Lower % of homes with either two working parents or a single mother⁹ i.e. more with a parent at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slightly lower participation in pre-school provision¹¹ and less formal childcare¹⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home learning environment</td>
<td>• Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes & sources: (1) The list of influences is loosely adapted from the EPPSE 3-14 Final Report from the Key Stage 3 Phase: Influences on Students’ Development from age 11-14.; (2) Parliamentary Question 163064 2/7/13; (3) House of Commons Library, taken from Nomis, 2011 Census, QS118EW; (4) Parliamentary Question 163065 2/7/13; (5) House of Commons Library, taken from School, pupils and their characteristics: January 2013, and earlier, DfE; (6) 2012 data from GCSE and equivalent attainment by pupil characteristics in England: 2011 to 2012; (7) House of Commons Library, taken from ONS, Families and Households, 2012 and ONS, Labour Force Survey Q4 2012. Numbers are crude estimates, and would suggest that London has a higher proportion of families with dependent children that in the UK as a whole; (8) Labour Force Survey household dataset, April-June quarter 2012, ONS, House of Commons Library; (9) House of Commons Library analysis of ONS Labour Force Survey micro data, household data. (10) 2011 Census first results – GLA Intelligence (11) WPQ 171129, 21/10/13 (12) WPQ 170936, 14/10/13 (13) WPQ 170937, 14/10/13 (14) Jan 2013 data from WPQ 170671, 16/10/13 – the inner London Year 6 figure is 57%; (15) Early Years Survey of Parents data for 2011
London has a much more diverse population and a different pattern of achievement

Note there has also been significant change in the London mix since 2000. The biggest apparent increase has been among Black African pupils, and probably non-British/Irish White.
There are some possibly telling attitude differences apparent in London children

"Doing something that I enjoy is more important than something that will help get a job later on"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern England</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humber</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Having a job or career in the future is important to me"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Raising a family in the future is important to me"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Having a job or career in the future is important to me"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSYPE waves 1-7. Statements young people strongly agreed with at age 13, re-cut. PQ 163091, 8/7/13.
London children are more likely to be tutored

Tutor use by region

Tutor use by ethnicity

Source: Sutton Trust / IPSOS-Mori Young People Omnibus 2011: Young people aged 11-16
What’s different about London?

- Very different families
- Different schools
- Different teachers
  
  More opportunities
London has a high proportion of knowledge industry jobs, creating a pull factor.

% of working population in knowledge-based industries

- London: 30%
- New York: 25%
- Boston: 20%
- Los Angeles: 15%
- Hong Kong: 10%

Source: Deloitte - London Futures - Globaltown report 2013
Note: Definition includes technology, media, telecomms, business & professional services, financial services, education, culture and life sciences
London also has more university places chasing customers

Number of full-time undergraduate places per hundred 18-20 year olds

A much higher proportion of disadvantaged Londoners go to university – and London universities take more disadvantaged young people

% of former FSM recipients going into Higher Education, 2009/10

% of former FSM recipients going to a Russell Group university, 2009/10

Sources: LHS: BIS PQ 163994, 10 July 2013; RHS: “University guide 2012: download the Guardian tables and see how the rankings have changed” https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AonYZs4MziZbdHVtczAwZDhCY2tkdVc3Z3laQ2daRWc&hl=en#gid=0, “How many privately-educated students attend each university?” http://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/2010/dec/22/oxbridgeandelitism-oxforduniversity#data

Note: PQ data refers to estimated proportions of maintained schools pupils with free school meals at age 15, who progressed to higher education and to Russell Group institutions by age 19 in 2009/10
And a recent American survey suggests density per se assists social mobility

- The Harvard Equality of Opportunity Project found that metro areas’ size and density were factors in upward mobility.
- Some areas, such as Salt Lake City and San Jose, have similar upward mobility rates as Denmark. Atlanta on the other hand, had a rates as low as for any developed country where data are available.
- “Upward mobility tended to be higher in metropolitan areas where poor families were more dispersed among mixed-income neighbourhoods.”
- “In Atlanta, the most common lament seems to be precisely that concentrated poverty, extensive traffic and a weak public-transport system make it difficult to get to the job opportunities.”
- “When poor communities are segregated, everything about life is harder”

Summary

Background

Possible factors

Appendix 1: The London Premium by stage of education

Appendix 2: Additional data & analysis
London outperforms at every stage, especially for disadvantaged youngsters (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stage</th>
<th>London – all pupils</th>
<th>London – disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EY Pre-school</td>
<td>• In 2013, 53% of London children were said to have achieved a ‘good level of development’, marginally ahead of the rest of England</td>
<td>• 43% of London FSM children reached the ‘good level’ benchmark vs 35% elsewhere in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Infants</td>
<td>• Level pegging or marginally behind other regions in each discipline: reading, writing, maths, science</td>
<td>• London FSM recipients already ahead of those elsewhere. % getting level 2 or above:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% FSM pupils Level 2+ in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Juniors</td>
<td>• Higher number of pupils reached Level 4 than in other regions: 87% vs 85% in English and 86% vs 84% in maths</td>
<td>• Eight percentage points higher in FSM recipients reaching Level 4 in maths than counterparts elsewhere (79% vs 71%) and nine in English (81% vs 72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 18 of Top 25 local authorities for FSM pupils’ junior school results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: DfE *Early Years Foundation Stage Profile Attainment by Pupil Characteristics, England 2013; DfE Phonics screening check and national curriculum assessments at Key Stage 1 in England: 2012 / PQ 160738, 24/6/1; DfE Achievements at level 4 or above in Key Stage 2 by free school meal eligibility and Local Authority Table 24. Level 5 achievement derived from overall KS2 Performance Tables. Note we got slightly different results for Level 4 achievement this way than from published analysis, but directionally the same,
London outperforms at every stage, especially for disadvantaged youngsters (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stage</th>
<th>London – all pupils</th>
<th>London – disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 GCSEs</td>
<td>In 2012, 62% achieved 5+C+ at GCSE, including maths &amp; English, vs 59% elsewhere</td>
<td>A 16 %pt gap: 49% of FSM Londoners got 5+C+ at GCSE including maths &amp; English, against 33% outside London. So, FSM Londoners were almost 50% more likely to get the key benchmark qualification at age 16 compared to their peers elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 of the top 25 local authorities for FSM pupils’ GCSEs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sixth form</td>
<td>In 2009/10, 64% of London non-FSM students went to school 6th form or 6th form college (as opposed to FE college) vs 50% outside London</td>
<td>52% of London FSM recipients went to school 6th form or 6th form college, vs 27% outside London (Londoners were less likely, by 31% to 42%, to go to FE College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE University</td>
<td>2011/12(p) Young participation rate in London of 48% vs 38% in England as a whole (approx 36% ex-London)</td>
<td>Pupils on FSM at age 15 are more than twice as likely to be in HE at age 19 as those in other areas (33% vs 14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London includes 8 of the Top 10 areas for state school pupils going to university</td>
<td>…and up to four times as likely to be at a top (Russell Group) university (4% vs 1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: DfE Achievements at GCSE and equivalent for pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 by free school meal eligibility and Local Authority; HoC Library. DfE Percentage of 2009/10 KS4 cohort going to, or remaining in, an education or employment destination in 2010/11; HEFCE Trends in young participation in higher education, Oct 2013; PQ 163994, 10/7/13. Note that recent KS5 destinations reporting suggests a smaller gap for Russell Group. Note also that the 4% and 1% figures are rounded.
At Key Stage 1 (Infants), London’s overall performance is unremarkable – but among disadvantaged children there is already a ‘London premium’

Source: Phonics screening check and national curriculum assessments at Key Stage 1 in England: 2012’ Statistical First Release (SFR)
Note: Ex-London numbers are derived
At Key Stage 2 (Juniors), the London premium is again more marked for disadvantaged pupils

All children 2012

Disadvantaged children 2012

Source: derived from DfE KS2 results tables, 14 March 2013. Maths + English
The London premium for disadvantaged pupils is stark at GCSE

All children 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% 5+C+ at GCSE inc E&amp;M +equivs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Mids</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Mids</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humber</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSM-eligible children 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% 5+C+ at GCSE inc E&amp;M +equivs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Mids</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humber</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Mids</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of DfE KS4 results tables for 2012
London tops the lists for university admissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 Local Authorities for state school pupils going to university</th>
<th>% students accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 for state school pupils going to a highly selective university</th>
<th>% students accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 of the Top 10 areas for pupils going to university

5 of the Top 10 areas for pupils going to a top university

Source: Sutton Trust *Degrees of Success: University Chances by Individual School*, July 2011 which used data from 2007, 2008 and 2009. ‘Highly selective’ here refers to the ‘Sutton Trust 30’ grouping which is the same set as the 30 most selective according to the Times University Guide.
London outperforms on key measures of attainment and future earnings potential

**Highest qualification by age 20**

- **London**
- **Eastern England**
- **South East**
- **North West**
- **West Midlands**
- **South West**
- **Yorks & Humber**
- **East Midlands**

**At university at age 19**

- **London**
- **North West**
- **South East**
- **West Midlands**
- **Eastern England**
- **East Midlands**
- **South West**
- **Yorks & Humber**
- **North East**

Source: *Youth Cohort Study and Longitudinal Study of Young People in England: The Activities and Experiences of 19 Year Olds: England 2010* (LSYPE Wave 7 and YCS Cohort 13 Sweep 4) Table A.1.1 and Table 2.1.4 re-cut by government office region, per PQ 163092, 8/7/13
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Appendix 1: The London Premium by stage of education

Appendix 2: Additional data & analysis
London’s better performance for poorer students is not achieved at the expense of the better-off

Sources: DfE Achievements at GCSE and equivalent for pupils at the end of Key Stage 4 by IDACI decile of pupil residence. IDACI = Income Deprivation Affecting Children Indices
Poverty in London is not dramatically more evenly spread than in other cities

**Free School Meals entitlement**  
*Secondary schools distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of school population</th>
<th>% of children on Free School Meals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disadvantage**  
*Secondary schools distribution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Schools with &gt;50% of pupils disadvantaged</th>
<th>Schools with &lt;10% of pupils disadvantaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London (38% disadvantaged)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham area (36% disadvantaged)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester (32% disadvantaged)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Schools, pupils and their characteristics: January 2013*, School level underlying data and local authority level alternative provision underlying data:SFR21/2013  
Note: Based on secondary schools only, excluding independent and special schools, Free School Meal eligibility based on Performance Tables. Birmingham boundaries based on West Midlands Conurbation. Note LHS analysis is on FSM basis. ‘Disadvantaged’ analysis gives a similar shape, but higher numbers.
London schools are not especially big users of GCSE equivalents to improve apparent GCSE performance

Source: Analysis of DfE KS4 results tables for 2012
Each ethnic grouping does better in London; this is especially marked for children of Pakistani ethnicity.

![Bar chart showing % point difference between pupils in London, and pupils in England excluding London achieving 5+C+ including Maths and English 2012]

Source: Written Parliamentary Question 167449, 6/9/2013
Note: In the previous two years the %pts gaps for children of Pakistani ethnicity London vs elsewhere were 13.3%pts and 11.3%pts (WPQ 171983, 24/10/13)
Other capital cities of the world

- The limited information we have from the rest of the world does not suggest that capital cities (or big cities) necessarily underperform versus elsewhere.

- In Australia, mean achievement results in English, Mathematics and Science indicate that major cities outperform elsewhere. The average results decline as remoteness increases.

- Paris (Ile de France region) outperforms France and Amsterdam outperforms the Netherlands in terms of the percentage of the population that have obtained higher, or tertiary education.

- In the USA, big cities outperform their state and national averages in terms of the percentage of the population that have attained Bachelors Degrees.

Source: Persons aged 25-64 with tertiary education attainment as a percentage in Eurostat; Reviews of Higher Education in Amsterdam in OECD page 38; U.S. Census Bureau, 2009 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates and George Mason University Center for Regional Analysis
The majority of the common objectives were achieved. This was clearly the case in London, where the Challenge was well-established, and built on the previous London Challenge work.”

Greater Manchester secondary schools showed the greatest improvement in Ofsted grades, but were less successful than other areas in closing attainment gaps.”

The Black Country had some remarkable success in improving attainment, particularly in secondary schools, but ended the period with more schools in Ofsted categories than there were at the outset.”
London babies

Source: (1) PQ 163065, 2/7/13 (2) PQ 163064, 2/7/13
London has a significantly higher incidence of 2-parent households where only one of the parents works...

### Employment status of couples with dependent children: UK, April-June 2012

**Thousands, not seasonally adjusted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of residence</th>
<th>Both members employed</th>
<th>One member employed</th>
<th>Neither member employed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% with both members employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of UK</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4,970</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
1. Figures are rounded to the nearest 10,000 and may not sum due to rounding.
2. Count of couple families with dependent children where at least one member of the couple is aged 16-64.

Source: HC Library analysis of ONS Labour Force Survey microdata, household dataset

### Employment status of lone parents with dependent children: UK, April-June 2012

**Thousands, not seasonally adjusted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of residence</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Not employed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of UK</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
1. Figures are rounded to the nearest 10,000 and may not sum due to rounding.
2. Count is of lone parent families with dependent children where head of family unit is aged 16-64, by employment status of head of family unit.

Source: HC Library analysis of ONS Labour Force Survey microdata, household dataset
...which is consistent with a lower level of pre-school participation, and lower use of childcare

Source: WPQ 171129, 21/10/13., citing (LHS) DFE annual Early Years Census and School Census data for January 2013, Table 1b, Provision for children under 5 years of age in England and FE's Childcare and (RHS) Early Years Survey of Parents data for 2011. Note Formal child care includes: nursery school, nursery class attached to a primary or infants' school, reception class at a primary or infants' school, special day school or nursery or unit for children with SEN, day nursery, playgroup or pre-school, child minder, nanny or au pair, babysitter who came to home, breakfast club, after school club and holiday club.
London children are estimated to be somewhat more likely to have married parents than children elsewhere in England.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Married couple with dependent children</th>
<th>All families with dependent children</th>
<th>Married couple with dependent children</th>
<th>All families with dependent children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humberside</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London</strong></td>
<td><strong>709</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,103</strong></td>
<td><strong>64%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Kingdom</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,739</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: House of Commons Library, taken from ONS, Families and Households, 2012; ONS Labour Force Survey Q4 2012. These are crude estimates.

1. A family is a married, civil partnered or cohabiting couple with or without children, or a lone parent with at least one child. Children may be dependent or non-dependent.
2. Dependent children are those living with their parent(s) and either (a) aged under 16, or (b) aged 16 to 18 in full-time education, excluding children aged 16 to 18 who have a spouse, partner or child living in the household.
3. Non-dependent children are those living with their parent(s), and either (a) aged 19 or over, or (b) aged 16 to 18 who are not in full-time education or who have a spouse, partner or child living in the household. Non-dependent children are sometimes called adult children.
4. Regional figures have been estimated by distributing ONS estimates for the whole of the UK into each region using Labour Force Survey data.
Most students don’t go far from home; Oxbridge is convenient for Londoners

Acceptances at university by distance from home (UK students)

Average distance between home and university

Average distance (as the crow flies) between home and Higher Education Institute of study is 59 miles

cf...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: UCAS End of Cycle Rpt 2012 / WPQ 10 Apr 2013 : Column 1117W