CEPaLS 11

The ultimate privatization: the case of grammar schools

Helen M Gunter

University of Manchester

This text was original posted on my Tumblr Blog on 7th January 2017. This Blog has now been deleted and so I am presenting it as a CEPaLS paper.

At Prime Minister's Question time on 14th September 2016 Theresa May responded to a question from Jeremy Corbyn about Grammar Schools by saying:

> We want to ensure that children have the ability to go where their talents take them. I gently remind the right hon. Gentleman that he went to a grammar school and I went to a grammar school, and it is what got us to where we are today—but my side might be rather happier about that than his.

https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2016-09-14/debates/16091429000002/PrimeMinister

This is the ultimate form of privatization.

What Theresa May is essentially saying is that public policy is based on the life experience of individuals who have benefitted.

I wrote to my MP to ask for the evidence base for the expansion of grammar schools policy. I had done a speedy review myself and could not find anything to support this major shift. I have now received letter in reply, and I am finding it hard to accept that the evidence I have been supplied with is actually underpinning the policy. Should we now conclude that it is the private opinion of a person in public office that is determining the education of children in England?

I now present the four types of evidence provided to me, together with further evidence that challenges the evidence base.

1. Academic Success

The evidence provided in the letter is as follows:

> "Virtually all pupils in grammar schools achieve five or more good passes at GCSE or equivalent compared to 2/3 at comprehensives".
>
> "At least 95% of pupils achieved five or more GCSEs at A* to C grades, including England and Maths in all but two Grammar schools in 2015".
>
> "These statistics show that academically, students at grammar schools perform better".
>
> "A University of Bristol study found that *"the quarter of children educated in grammar schools do substantially (around 3.5 grade points) better than their peers in similar non-selective areas. This is equivalent to raising 31/2 GCSEs from a grade 'C' to a 'B'".*
>
> "England's grammar schools are among **the most successful schools for exam results**. Grammar schools especially **raise the attainment of pupils from poorer**

backgrounds (CMPO: The Result of 11 Plus Selection: an investigation into Opportunities and Outcomes for Pupils in Selective LEAs, April 2006).

There is a need to raise questions about this evidence:

- It is to be expected that grammar schools do better because they are academically selective. The children who do not score highly at GCSE are in other schools.

- The evidence I have assembled below shows how and why historically and currently children in grammar schools do well. But importantly research shows that "there is robust evidence that attending a grammar school is good for the attainment and later earnings of those who get in. But there is equally good evidence that those in selective areas who don't pass the eleven plus do worse than they would have done in a comprehensive system" (Sibeita 2016 p18). So the issue we have to address as a nation is how do we enable ALL children to do well, and not some children at the expense of others.

- The University of Bristol study is interesting. Note the following complete picture of the project in the Abstract:

  "This paper assesses the impact of academic selection at age 11 on children in the minority of areas that still operate such a system. The answers are very clear. Overall there is little or no impact on attainment, but those educated in grammar schools do substantially better (around four grade points more than pupils with the same Key Stage 2 (KS2) points in similar, but non-selective, areas). This is equivalent to raising four GCSEs from a grade 'C' to a 'B'. Other children within selective areas who do not gain a place in a grammar school are disadvantaged by a little under one grade point. In part these effects stem from the substantive under representation of poorer and special needs children in grammar schools. Only 32% of high ability children eligible for free school meals (FSM) attend grammar schools compared with 60% of non-FSM pupils. So whilst the net effect of selection is not substantive it does result in gains for those attending the grammar schools and a slight disadvantage for the rest. The paradox is that grammar schools bestow greater advantages to poor children than more affluent children, but very few make the cut" (Atkinson et al. 2006 p1).

  So there is a need to use the full data and analysis provided by the project. There is evidence from research that generates a more nuanced understanding than that provided in the letter.

There is a need to examine the range of evidence available. Here are some examples:

Buckinghamshire is regarded as an important site for the study of grammar schools because all children in state primary schools are entered for the 11+ (unless parents opt out). The following is quoted from a Durham University private report for Buckingham grammar schools by Millar (2016 p40): "so if the test was resistant to coaching we should by now be seeing substantial narrowing of results between children from different backgrounds. The fact that the evidence shows the reverse raises uncomfortable questions about why a test that consistently selects on the basis of prior opportunity and social background is still allowed".

"There is no aggregate improvement in results in areas that are selective. The most important change is a clear distributional shift in *who* does well. In short, the minority of children streamed into the grammars do better. The remaining majority of children – who are not educated in grammars – do slightly worse" (Cook 2016).

Sibieta (2016) reports for the ESRC the following:

> "It does appear that those who attend grammar schools do, on average, somewhat better than similar children in the comprehensive system. Grammar schools may thus be a way of improving the performance of very bright pupils. On the other hand, those in selective areas who don't get into grammar schools do worse than they would in a comprehensives system. And as children from poorer families are significantly less likely to attend grammar schools, the expansion of grammar schools in the current form would seem more likely to reduce than increase social mobility" (p18).

So we have to ask some very serious questions about targeted segregation, and how it is replicating the structural disadvantages in society.

2. Social Mobility

The evidence provided in the letter is as follows:

> "The Sutton Trust lists that 16 of the top 100 schools sending pupils to university in 2008 were grammar schools, whereas only 1 of these schools was a faith-based comprehensive; this suggests grammar schools are better able than comprehensives at getting pupils into leading universities"
>
> "2011: **47.6% of pupils in selective state schools were accepted in the most highly selective universities**, compared to 18% in non-selective schools. **4.2% of selective state school pupils were accepted into Oxbridge**, whereas 0.8% were accepted from non-selective schools. (The Sutton Trust, Degrees of Success, July 2011)"
>
> "Comprehensives schools, sadly tend to be highly selective on wealth, as good schools are found disproportionately in wealthier areas. Grammar schools, by comparison, have county-wide catchment-areas, and select on ability – meaning that pupils of all income levels have access to them (BBC News: Local Schools Drive Inequality, October 2015)".

There is a need to raise questions about this evidence:

This data is partial and selective.

The Sutton Trust has given recognition to how their reports are accessed and used, and they conclude:

> "The Sutton Trust's *position* is that the government should ensure that existing grammar schools get it right before opening more grammar schools. Our most recent research has found that existing grammar schools are *highly socially selective*, with only 3% of pupils eligible for free schools meals getting into grammar schools. Our recommendations for how grammar schools could expand their FSM pupil intake may be found in our 2013 report *Poor Grammar.* This recommendations recently informed Kent County Council's *social mobility committee report* into grammar schools that the full council endorsed this summer" (Sutton Trust 2016 unpaged, original emphasis).

Hence it is inappropriate to select data out of context, and miss the underlying (and often complex) story that the data suggests.

The issue of location of a home and the local school is an important one, where the evidence does show that middle class parents use their resources to gain advantage in the school system. This includes grammar and comprehensive schools. So there is a need to (a) study how markets work in relation to localities; and (b) to study how schools choose children through access requirements (such as passing a test, faith, home location, family links, and biological sex).

The evidence missing from the letter regarding grammar schools and social mobility:
The letter did not demonstrate evidence of a different kind in regard to social mobility. This is detailed and substantial. Here I provide an overview.

Historically grammar schools have not enabled social mobility:

"… despite the changes introduced into secondary education by the Education Act of 1944, it remains the case that a boy has a greater chance of entering a Grammar School if he comes from a middle-class rather than a working-class home… Middle-class boys tend to have superior academic records despite the fact that, as a group, they do not differ in measured intelligence from working-class boys in the same schools. The latter, especially those from larger families, seem to have less aspiration and parental pressure towards achievement. They tend to be rated by their masters on personality traits such as industriousness and sense of responsibility at a lower level than middle class boys, and they confess less interest in extra-curricula activities organized by the school" (Halsey and Gardner 1953 p75).

"How was it that the upper reaches of the Marburton grammar schools were – quite against the run of the population – dominated by middle class children? These accounts have suggested an answer. We have seen that in a host of small but telling ways the middle-class families had an educational inheritance with which to endow their children… In a variety of social and educational dilemmas which might have damaged another child, the family was able to prevail. It could support him through periods of dissatisfaction, apparent unintelligence, patent idleness. These fathers and mothers were not able to bequeath to their children any vast amount of capital, but they were able to hand on an increasing skill in commanding the state system wuch that their sons and daughters ultimately received a high standard of education, and one which helped them move smoothly into satisfied and energetic citizens" (Jackson and Marsden 1962 p42).

"… one of the consequences of throwing open grammar school education has been that middle class families who have collapsed through ill-health, bankruptcy, foolishness or any of the stray chances of life, have been able to educate their children out of their fallen condition and reclaim the social position of their parents and grandparents" (Jackson and Marsden 1962 p56).

"Middle class families who have previously paid the relatively low fees charged by grammar schools (before the war), or captured the few scholarships available, were now faced with increased competition for places at these academically selective secondary schools" (Todd 2014 p167).

"In 1960 Joan Brothers, a Liverpool University postgraduate, found that the Catholic Church's resistance to social and educational change remained strong. Her investigation of the relationship between the Church and school discovered that most priests would have preferred their working-class parishioners to remain in Catholic elementary schools. Their major grievance, however, was that grammar school pupils had the confidence and capacity to question the priest's religious and social status" (Todd 2014 p226-227).

The current evidence demonstrates that grammar schools are not enabling social mobility:

"Only 3% of grammar school pupils receive free school meals" (Benn 2016, Cribb et al. 2013).

Alan Milburn (social mobility tsar) "said pupils at England's remaining 163 selective state schools were four or five times more likely to have come from independent prep schools than from the most disadvantaged backgrounds" (Asthana 2016).

“Nearly all grammar schools – 161 out of the 164 remaining – have fewer than 10% of pupils eligible for Free School Meals, 98 have fewer than 3%, and 21 have fewer than 1%. It is undeniably the poor who are losing out” (Policy Exchange 2014).

“By the time that children take the test, there is already a large educational divide. In 2013, there were 1,591 16 year-olds in still-selective Kent eligible for free school meals. Of those children, only 2% had got key stage 2 results by the age of 11 that put them in the top tenth of results for the county. A Kentish child not on free school meals would be five times more likely to achieve that feat. So a test at 11 should, by design, select out lots of poorer children. There is a further wrinkle: the tests can be gamed, too. Parents in Kent who can afford it pay a fortune for tutors, so they can coach their children over the line. The tests, therefore, are skewed even further in favour of the county’s wealthier residents” (Cook 2016).

“There was relatively little difference in English as a first language by school type, grammar schools had a considerably higher proportion of non-white pupils than secondary moderns and above the national average. The differences in the other three categories were much greater. The proportion of pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) with statements or Education, Heath and Care (EHC) plans was less than 0.1% in grammars, 2.4% in secondary modern schools and 1.8% across all schools. The proportion of pupils with SEN, but not sufficiently severe to be statemented or have an EHC plan was 4.2% at grammar schools, 13.5% at secondary modern schools and 12.4% nationally. While one might expect many types of SEN to limit a pupil’s performance at an entrance exam, the impact of free school meal status (a proxy for poverty/deprivation) is well recognized, but less direct. The rates were 2.6% at grammars, 12.7% at secondary modern schools and 14.9% across all school types. In 2008 the then Department for Children, Schools and Families looked at the intake of grammar schools in comparison to that of their local area. This found that free school meal rates in grammars were not representative of their local areas. They were around one-fifth of the level in their local area in 2007. In addition they also had fewer pupils from the low attaining ethnic groups, Black African, Black Caribbean, Bangladeshi and Pakistani, than their local area. The gap varied somewhat by ethnic group, but was typically around half the rate in their local area in 2007. This study also looked at the level of deprivation affecting children in the areas that different types of schools took their pupils from. In grammar schools in 2007 the proportion of pupils from the least deprived quartile was just over 40%, compared to around 25% in their local area. The proportion of their intake from the most deprived quartile was around 8%, compared to just over 20% in their local area”. (Bolton 2016).

“…the poorest children in Kent and Medway… have a less-than-10% chance of getting into a grammar. For children in the very richest neighbourhoods, it is over 50%. This means poorer children are pressed into the non-grammars” (Cook 2016).

“The overall effect of these decisions is visible in Kent’s GCSE results. I have taken each child’s top 5 GCSE results (from 2013), including English and maths, and turned that into a points score – from 0 points for no passes through to 40 points for 5 straight starred As. I’ve plotted the averages for a national scale using the same data. And, for contrast, I have included high-performing London and the rest of England. In Kent and Medway, poorer children lag further behind, richer children move further ahead – and the losses at the bottom are much larger than the gains at the top. This is a feature of the selective areas in England, as a whole. Even in the very best areas, it steepens the rich-poor gradient. It is possible to imagine fixes to some of the problems: fixing the proportion of poorer children, for example, who get into the schools. You could also imagine a world of selective schools aimed just at the top tip of the distribution, which would in effect be special needs schools for children whose high academic attainment means they find conventional schooling difficult. But be wary. These findings have been repeated time and again by researchers in different selective systems. Furthermore, the highest performing school systems in the world, according to the PISA tests, are comprehensive. So are England’s highest-performing boroughs and counties – especially when you look at results for poorer children” (Cook 2016).

Children who leave grammar schools: "The Gurney-Dixon Report (1954), 'Early Leaving'", identified that even if children of semi-skilled and unskilled workers got into grammar schools they were more likely to leave early without gaining qualifications. Two thirds of the children, of those unskilled workers who did attend Grammar Schools, left without 3 O levels" (Stewart 2015).

"• Grammar schools contain a significantly lower proportion of deprived pupils than live in the local area.

• Non-white pupils are more likely to attend grammar schools than pupils from white backgrounds even before we condition on prior attainment and socio-economic background. Previous research (Wilson, Burgess and Briggs, 2011) has indicated that non- white pupils also outperform white students once one controls for socio-economic background.

• Pupils born in the autumn are more likely to attend grammar schools than pupils born in the summer, consistent with the finding from previous research that summer-born children have lower achievement (see, for example, Crawford, Dearden and Greaves (2013).

• Pupils who get into grammar schools tend to have higher KS2 results, particularly in maths.

• Conditional on achievement in both English and maths, poorer pupils are still less likely to attend grammar schools, particularly in London.

As has been shown before (Atkinson, Gregg and McConnell, 2006), grammar schools contain a much smaller proportion of pupils from deprived backgrounds than other state-funded schools in the same local authority. Poorer students are significantly less likely to attend a grammar school. This is true both in terms of the proportion of pupils eligible for FSM and based on their IDACI scores" (Cribb et al. 2013 p 6-7) (see also Cribb, Jesson, Sibieta, Skipp and Vignoles 2013).

Social mobility cannot be enabled through amending grammar school processes.

It is argued that a number of the outlined issues could be dealt with:

(a) Changing admissions: Reserving places for children from low socio-economic families (Weale 2016b)
(b) Changing admissions: Setting a lower score for children from low socio-economic families (Weale 2016b)
(c) Enabling families to know and access, and to provide financial support for uniform and transport costs etc (Weale 2016b).

But:

(a) The test cannot be tutor proofed (Weale 2016b)
(b) The test has generated a booming private tuition industry (Cribb et al. 2013a, Weale 2016b)
(c) It is a test that is exclusionary – even if more are enabled to pass (Weale 2016b).
(d) The impact of disadvantage is earlier than age 11 (Benn 2016, Weale 2016b).
(e) Recent research in regard to the test showed "a continuing strong bias against children from the most deprived postcodes" (Millar 2016 p40). In addition, the ResPublica report for Knowsley Council does recommend grammar schools but notes: "For grammar schools to enable social mobility, it is essential to ensure that middle class parents can not exploit the system – to provide an entrance exam that does not advantage the 'tutored', allowing for a level playing field – and that those

children who fail to pass the entry exam are not abandoned to a second rate education" (Crawford and Morrin 2016, p22).

(f) In sum, more children lose out than gain, particularly by the positioning of the secondary modern school (Professor Stephen Gorard quoted by Weale 2016b).

Social mobility is related to other factors/more complex issue than the debate so far suggests:

"A whole raft of evidence from a range of studies in recent years shows convincingly how increased social mobility post war reflected a one off structural shift in the economy with an expansion of white collar jobs; and that grammar schools may have provided a better outcome for those few who attend them, but such benefits are entirely cancelled out, and more besides, by the negative consequences for the majority in these areas who attend secondary modern…" (Policy Exchange 2014).

"Our findings suggest that comprehensive schools were as good for mobility as the selective schools they replaced" (Boliver and Swift 2011 p89).

What might improve social mobility? Sibieta (2016) argues that there are two important areas for investment:

"… there is now a robust body of evidence suggesting that early interventions can have profound effects on child development, particularly if followed up with high-quality schooling throughout childhood" (p19).

",,, schools in London have some of the best exam results in the country, particularly amongst deprived pupils. Around half of pupils eligible for free school meals in inner London achieve five or more GCSEs at A*-C, double the proportion outside of London… This high level of school performance has been put down to a variety of factors, including improved past primary school performance, greater numbers of high-achieving ethnic minorities and improved practices within and across schools…" (p19).

3. Parental Demand

The evidence provided in the letter is as follows:

"YouGov Survey found that 35% of the public believed that grammar schools improved social mobility – compared to 19% who thought it damaged it (TES: the case for and against grammar schools – find the article in full at https://www.tes.com/news/school-news/breaking-views/big-debate-case-and-against-grammar-schools)".

"A recent Comres survey found that half of those surveyed support the reintroduction of grammar schools, with 10% opposed (TES: same as above).

There is a need to raise questions about this evidence:

YouGov (Smith 2016) reports the following data in response to the question: do you think grammar schools are good for social mobility?

Good for social mobility: 35%
Make no difference: 27%
Bad for social mobility: 19%
Don't know: 20%

The concerns that need to be raised about the selection of the data are:

1. The 35% is based on an opinion of social mobility. Surely we should not base major policy change on this one indicator? The educative function of the policy process should mean that all citizens should have access to data about social mobility and how all citizens have a responsibility for the education of all children. So perhaps this quotation might open up a different conversation with parents?

   "we know that an expansion of grammars didn't help the poor in the past. In 1959, when grammars educated the top 20% or so of the cohort, nearly 40% of these pupils failed to pass more than three O-levels" (Policy Exchange 2014).

2. 46% of respondents are not positive in their opinions. Why has this not been engaged with in the letter?

3. YouGov (Smith 2016) provides some really important additional evidence in their report. Here are a couple of examples:

   "Opinion is more split among those who attended Secondary Moderns – the schools which those who were not able to get in to grammar school attended. A third of former pupils of these schools are in favour of more grammar schools, whilst 23% want to scrap the last remaining ones and a further 13% support the status quo. Former students of comprehensive schools are similarly divided although slightly more anti-grammar, with 29% wanting more grammars, 27% wanting to scrap them and 21% supporting the status quo".

   "Politically, grammar schools are the most popular choice of Conservative, UKIP and Lib Dem voters, with 59%, 51% and 38% of those who voted for these parties in 2015 backing more academic selection in schools. Only Labour voters are more likely to oppose them, with 42% wanting to scrap all grammar schools".

   Shouldn't we examine in more detail the views of people regarding their position on grammar schools, and how their opinions have been formed, and what happens when they have access to independent research evidence?

ComRes presents itself as "the leading research consultancy specializing in Corporate Reputation, Public Poicy and Communications" (see http://www.comresglobal.com).

The ComRes webpage reports that it conducted a commissioned 'poll' for the NGSA or National Grammar Schools Association, where it reports in favour of grammar schools. It would be helpful if policy was based on independent primary research.

There is a need to examine polling evidence (not least the framing of the questions), and set it within a wider context. In examining the polling evidence Pavett (2015) reports:

> "It is also worth noting that a **YouGov** poll reported in **Prospect Magazine** in February 2013 recorded 83% of primary schools parent and 77% of secondary school parents agreeing with the proposition 'Our local state schools generally provide a good quality education'. The battle for public opinion has indeed to be fought and won but the results of the above polls and others show, I believe, that there is every reason to believe that a clear majority of the electorate is ready to listen to the case for good quality comprehensive schooling. The arguments are there in plenty. The research has been done." (original emphasis).

4. Drives up standards in all schools

The evidence provided in the letter is as follows:
"Writing in TES, teacher John David Blake said: 'Just as the threat of forced academisation of failing schools, or the imminent arrival of a new free school, was a strong incentive to poor providers to improve their schools, so the challenge of introducing selective schooling into an area should spur on those who have taken for granted the support of local parents. If those who deliver schools wish to keep their area 'free' from selection, they had better ensure that their non-selective schools are delivering the education that local parents want and children need' (TES: same as above)".

There is a need to raise questions about this evidence:
This quote from John David Blake is from a 'For and Against' debate in the TES 12th August 2016. This article in not in the public domain.

There are some serious problems in using this quotation:

- This is one quotation from one teacher in one context.
- There is no evidence from independent primary research provided in this quotation.
- Your letter does not contain any quotations from Tom Richmond who in the 'For and Against' argues against.
- You could have drawn on claims that supports the assertions made by John David Blake from the Government Frontbench, for example:

  "we are fortunate in Kent we have a grammar school system… and parents have a choice" (Michael Fallon quoted by Elgot 2016).

  Also Amber Rudd and Justine Greening (see Mason and Walker 2016 p9).

  Collective responsibility demands that those who are in Cabinet support government policy. So such quotations are unsurprising.

- The only report that I can find to support a proposed link between grammar schools and standards is from ResPublica (Crawford and Morrin 2016) in a commissioned report for Knowsley Borough Council. However, the published report (October) was challenged in relation to the report submitted earlier in the year (May):

  "…the Council questions the credibility of the [ResPublica] report when its authors are now saying something completely different to when the report was published a few months ago. In particular, the authors are now making references to grammar schools which were not included in the report in May. To be absolutely clear, the Council fundamentally disagrees with the suggestion that grammar schools might be part of the solution to the challenges we face in the borough" (London Bulletin 2016, unpaged).

Policy by quotation: if we want to undertake policy by individual quotations from people, then here I supply a list of quotations from people from across the political spectrum (including people from your own party) who argue against the position taken by John David Blake:

> "they are elitist institutions that entrench, rather than disrupt or disperse, privilege" (Benn 2016).
>
> "grammar schools entrench social division, rather than solve it" (Policy Exchange 2014).

The plan “is so flawed that it does not stand up to the most basic scrutiny” (Tim Farron quoted in Walker and Elgot 2016).

“The prime minister has said that she wants to create a country that works for all, but education experts are united that the evidence shows grammar schools harm social mobility” (Sam Freedman, Teach First, quote in Walker and Elgot 2016).

“a massive distraction from the real issues facing our education system” (Association of Teachers and Lecturers quoted in Walker and Elgot 2016).

“selection by ability is currently the very antithesis of an evidence-informed policy” (Stephen Gorard quoted by Weale 2016b).

“…ending the ban on grammars risked creating an ‘us and them divide’” (Alan Milburn, government’s social mobility tsar, quoted by Elgot 2016).

“To tell a kid at 10 or 11, you’re second best, they then have to arrive at that school and the teachers have a huge task to persuade them, you can still do well, you’ve got talent, you’ve still got ability. You shouldn't do that to kids at 10 or 11” (Ed Balls quoted by Elgot 2016).

“I appreciate that many grammar schools do a fine job in equipping their students with an excellent education. But we all know that their record of admitting children from non-middle-class backgrounds is pretty woeful. The notion that the poor stand to benefit from the return of grammar schools strikes me as quite palpable tosh and nonsense – and is very clearly refuted by the London experience” (HMCI Michael Wilshaw quoted by Weale 2016a).

“Schools financed by the state should be social integrators, not dividers. Grammars are dividers. Gove may have deserved praise for caring about standards, but his ideological obsession with selective free schools and dodgy academies was a disaster” (Jenkins 2016).

“If you look overall, not just in Britain but around the world, at those school systems we admire that have got high performance and high standards, from Shanghai to Finland, by and large they don't put their effort into trying to pick which kids they educate; they put their effort into raising standards for all the kids” (David Willetts, former Conservative Universities Minister, and chair of thinktank the Resolution Foundation, quoted in Stewart 2016).

“Ruth Davidson, the leader of the Scottish Conservatives, has ruled out backing a return for grammar schools in Scotland, despite Theresa May pushing for more selective education in England… “It’s never been in any manifesto I’ve written and it won’t be in any manifesto that I write for Scotland as long as I am leader of the Scottish Conservative Party… It’s not the way in which we’ve been looking at academic policy. We’re going to continue looking at empowering individual schools and individual school-leavers” (Mason and Walker 2016 p9).

Nicky Morgan “told a fringe meeting at the Birmingham party conference: ‘For me, I do worry that a return to more selection risks undermining the progress that we have seen over the course of the last decade in our schools, by throwing something else into the education debate rather than focusing on every school offering an excellent education” (Mason and Walker 2016 p9).

“I wouldn't support more grammars on the grounds of social mobility” (Professor Robert Coe, Durham University, Millar 2016 p40).

“The 11+ plus is a legalized form of discrimination” (Rafiq Raja, Muslim Parents Association, Millar 2016 p40).

Evidence: there is evidence that shows that Grammar Schools may not be driving standards through the impact on other schools in the locality. Mansell (2016) examines *Bright Futures* with evidence that a grammar school rated as outstanding has not been able to spread its excellence to other schools as the policy proposal suggests is necessary and possible. Mansell (2016) quotes Lucy Powell MP talking about Altrincham Girls Grammar School and its work with other schools in the *Bright Futures* network:

> "What this case shows is that the experience people have of running grammar schools is not necessarily transferable to running very different schools… [Altrincham Girls] is full of highly able, well motivated girls who are financially and socially secure. You cannot assume that it follows that you are somehow well qualified to run a challenging school with a difficult history in a different part of the city"

It seems that the evidence is patchy with a view given from those involved that change takes time:

> "Our analysis shows that there are 16 MATs in England where at least one grammar school is partnered with non-selective secondaries or primaries. Within these trusts, are 13 non-selective secondary schools. One - Valley Park in Maidstone, Kent, which has a well established partnership with neighbouring Invicta grammar – is rated, 'outstanding'. A further seven are 'good'. But Ofsted judges three as 'requires improvement' and the remaining two… as 'inadequate'. Three of these ratings are an improvement over the previous inspection; one… has fallen. Overall, the Ofsted record for these schools is worse than the national average" (Mansell 2016 p36).

And finally, have we been here before? Professor Sir William Taylor shows how Secondary Moderns responded to children's needs by adopting a Grammar School curriculum and the same end-of-school examinations:

> "Now that the work of Grammar, Technical and Modern Schools is tending to converge in terms of pragmatic, rather than theoretical, conceptions of what secondary education should involve, there is even less justification than before for the educational and social inequalities of the tripartite system" (Taylor 1963 p163).

One of the reasons for the common school was not only that the 11+ examination did not do its job (far too many children in secondary moderns who could benefit from a grammar school curriculum and opportunities), but that other schools in the area did respond by making the necessary changes to bring their curriculum up to the same standards. And so, why do we have to destroy the common school in order to have it reinvented?

If you wish to reference this paper:

Gunter, H.M. (2017) *CEPaLS 11 The ultimate privatization: the case of grammar schools* Manchester: University of Manchester.

References

Asthana, A. (2016) More grammar schools would be a disaster, says social mobility tsar. https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/sep/07/grammar-schools-expansion-disaster-social-mobility-tsar-alan-milburn
Accessed 9th September 2016.

Atkinson, A., Gregg, P. and McConnell, B. (2006) *The result of 11+ selection: an investigation into opportunities and outcomes for pupils in selective LEAs*. Working paper: 06/150. Bristol: Centre for Market and Public Organisation, University of Bristol.

Benn, M. (2016) Grammar schools don't help social mobility – we need to start earlier. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/sep/06/grammar-schools-social-mobility-theresa-may-early-years

Accessed 9th September 2016.

Bolton, P. (2016) *Grammar School Statistics. Briefing Paper Number 1398, 29th June 2016*. London: House of Commons Library.

Boliver, V. and Swift, A. (2011) Do comprehensive schools reduce social mobility? *The British Journal of Sociology*. 62 (1), 89-110.

Crawford, E. and Morrin, M. (2016) *Achieving Educational Excellence in Knowsley: a review of attainment*. London: ResPublica.

Cook, (2016) Why not bring back grammar schools?
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-36662965
Accessed 9th September 2016

Coughlan, S. (2016) Grammar schools: PM seeks to ensure places for poorer pupils.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-37311023
Accessed 9th September 2016

Cribb, J., Jesson, D., Sibieta, L., Skipp, A. and Vignoles, A. (2013) Poor Grammar, Entry into Grammar Schools for disadvantaged pupils in England. London: The Sutton Trust.
http://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/poorgrammarreport-2.pdf
Accessed 9th September 2016.

Cribb, J., Sibieta, L., Vignoles, A. (2013) *Entry into Grammar Schools in England*. London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.
https://www.ifs.org.uk/docs/Grammar_Schools2013.pdf
Accessed 9th September 2016.

Elgot, J. (2016) Grammar schools give parents more choice, says Michael Fallon.
https://www.theguardian.com/education/2016/sep/08/grammar-schools-give-parents-more-choice-says-michael-fallon
Accessed 9th September 2016.

Halsey, A.H. and Gardner, L. (1953) Selection for Secondary Education and Achievement in Four Grammar Schools. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 4 (1), 60-75.

Jackson, B. and Marsden, D. (1962) *Education and the Working Class*. London: Routledge and Keegen Paul Ltd.

Jenkins, S. (2016) Thatcher new grammars were poison. Theresa May is playing a risky game.
https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/sep/07/thatcher-grammars-poison-theresa-may-tories
Accessed 9th September 2016.

London Bulletin (2016) *Grammar School row erupts between Knowsley Council and ResPublica.*
http://londonbulletin.co.uk/grammar-school-row-erupts-between-knowsley-council-and-respublica-p2430-246.htm
Accessed 16th December 2016.

Mansell, W. (2016) Can grammars really sprinkle fairy dust on struggling secondaries. *The Guardian* 6th December 2016.

Mason, R. and Walker, P. (2016) Grammars Davidson widens the party rift over selection. *The Guardian*. 4th October 2016 page 9.

Millar, F. (2016) 'Tutor proof' 11-plus prof admits test doesn't work. *The Guardian* 13th September 2016, p40.

Pavett, M. (2015) How strong is the support for grammar schools?
https://educevery.wordpress.com/2015/11/10/how-strong-is-the-support-for-grammar-schools/
Accessed 19th December 2016.

Policy Exchange (2014) 5 reasons why a return to grammar schools is a bad idea.
http://www.policyexchange.org.uk/media-centre/blogs/category/item/5-reasons-why-a-return-to-grammar-schools-is-a-bad-idea
Accessed 9th September 2016.

Sibieta, L. (2016) Grammar Lessons. *Society Now*. Autumn 2016, Issue 26. 18-19.

Smith, M. (2016) *Two thirds of people would send their child to a grammar school*.
https://yougov.co.uk/news/2016/08/15/two-thirds-people-would-send-their-child-grammar-s/
19th December 2016.

Stewart, H. (2015) Eleven grammar school myths, and the actual facts.
http://www.localschoolsnetwork.org.uk/2015/03/eleven-grammar-school-myths-and-the-actual-facts
Accessed 9th September 2016.

Stewart, H. (2016) Former Tory minister says grammar schools fail disadvantaged children.
https://www.theguardian.com/education/2016/sep/07/former-tory-minister-grammar-schools-fail-disadvantaged-children
Accessed 9th September 2016.

Sutton Trust (2016) Sutton Trust Influences Grammar Schools Debate.
http://www.suttontrust.com/newsarchive/sutton-trust-influences-grammar-schools-debate/
Accessed 16th December 2016.

Taylor, W. (1963) *The Secondary Modern School*. London: Faber and Faber.

Todd, S. (2014) *The People. The Rise and Fall of the Working Class 1910-2010*. London: John Murray.

Walker, P. and Elgot, J. (2016) *Justine Greening indicates ban on grammar schools will be lifted.*
https://www.theguardian.com/education/2016/sep/08/justine-greening-confirms-plan-lift-ban-grammar-schools-11-plus
Accessed 9th September 2016.

Weale, S. (2016a) Ofsted chief warns May over 'retrograde step' of grammar schools.
https://www.theguardian.com/education/2016/sep/05/michael-wilshaw-ofsted-chief-grammar-schools-theresa-may-poorer-children
Accessed 9th September 2016.

Weale, S. (2016b) Can grammar schools ever by 'inclusive'?
https://www.theguardian.com/education/2016/sep/08/can-grammar-schools-ever-be-inclusive
Accessed 9th September 2016.