

Data Management and Analysis Group

Moving home and changing school - 1

Widening the analysis of pupil mobility



DMAG Briefing 2005/32

November 2005

Moving home and changing school - 1 Widening the analysis of pupil mobility

For more information please contact:

David Ewens
Data Management and Analysis Group
Greater London Authority
City Hall (5 East)
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

Tel: 020 7983 4656
David.ewens@london.gov.uk

Copyright © Greater London Authority,
2005

ISSN 1479-7879

Contents

	page
Summary	1
1 Background and aim	3
2 School-focussed and child-focussed approaches to mobility	4
3 The extent of moving home and changing school in London	5
4 Moving home, changing school and educational attainment at key stage 3	10
5 Conclusion	14
Appendix 1: references	15
Appendix 2: key reference tables	16

Summary

- Pupil mobility is generally understood as the movement of pupils between schools other than at standard times. This briefing assesses whether there would be value in expanding debates on pupil mobility to include the impact on children of moving home as well as changing school.
- There appears to be a relationship between educational attainment on the one hand, and children either moving home or changing school on the other. This briefing concludes that further study of factors associated with children moving home, and the impact this has on educational attainment, is likely to be worthwhile.
- The briefing is based on an analysis of the merged 2002 and 2003 London Pupil Datasets (LPD). Both datasets are largely, though not entirely, derived from the National Pupil Dataset (NPD), and were provided to the GLA by the Analytical Services Branch of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). The London Pupil Datasets contain records for pupils attending maintained schools who either live in London, regardless of where they attend school or who attend school in London, regardless of where they live.
- Schools with a high proportion of pupils arriving at intervals throughout the school year need to invest teacher time and attention in inducting those pupils. Schools with no pupil mobility of that sort will not need to do that. Pupil mobility raises issues of resourcing for schools.
- The association between pupils joining schools at non-standard times, and lower levels of educational attainment, has received a great deal of attention, both locally and nationally. However, young Londoners are more likely to be involved in moving home than in changing school at non-standard times. The circumstances of domestic mobility, and its impact on educational attainment, are both little researched.
- Pupils with records in the LPD, who were in the same school and lived in the same home in January 2002 and January 2003, were most likely to reach nationally expected levels in 2002 key stage 3 English, mathematics and science tests. Pupils whose home and school both differed at these two points in time were least likely to reach nationally expected levels in 2002 key stage 3 tests.
- Pupils who did not change their school between 2002 and 2003, but who did move home, tended to have lower levels of attainment than pupils who neither moved home nor changed school. The association between moving home and lower educational attainment may operate independently of the experience of schooling.
- Analysis of the LPD suggests that there are two main types of pupil mobility. One is short range, and takes place in the same local authority area. The second main type is probably longer range, and involves pupil movement to and from London.
- Moving home across local authority borders within London is less extensive than either of the other two forms of mobility.
- Some pupil mobility is aspirational, involving parents seeking better schools or homes. Across all ethnic groups, pupils attending secondary schools outside the local authority area in which they live, tend to have higher levels of attainment at

the end of primary school than other pupils. In January 2003, pupils entitled to free school meals were slightly less likely than other pupils to attend schools in a different LEA from the one attended in 2002.

- While some cases of mobility are aspirational, other cases may be driven by social disadvantage. Pupils who are entitled to free school meals are more likely than other pupils to experience either or both domestic or school mobility. Pupils for whom English is not the first language are more likely than other pupils to experience either or both domestic or school mobility.
- Some pupils who move home also have missing key stage assessment records. On its own, the LPD cannot demonstrate whether this is because school key stage assessment record keeping practices need to be improved, or whether there is a wider problem of pupils changing home and being lost to the school system. These possibilities warrant further investigation.
- The analysis in the briefing is made possible because pupil level data from 2002 has been linked to 2003 pupil level data. Linking 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 pupil level data would provide a considerable body of additional information on domestic and school mobility and educational attainment over time.
- However, the LPD does not contain information on either domestic or school mobility in the months *between* each annual pupil census. The inclusion of pupils on roll at any point in time between each annual census, with leaving date and destination of leavers, has been achieved in the past in pupil surveys in at least one London authority. The same could be achieved in the annual DfES pupil count. This would add considerably to understanding of the scale and impact of pupil mobility more generally.
- The major aim of the briefing is to assess whether work on pupil mobility might be developed further. The preliminary analysis reported here suggests that there is potential in such work, particularly in respect of the interaction between the operation of the housing market, moving home, educational attainment and social advantage and disadvantage. This would require access to housing information not held within the NPD or LPD.

1. Background and aim

The circumstances of the death of Victoria Climbié provided a stimulus to the provision of co-ordinated children's services by local government. This policy impetus is sometimes referred to as the Children's agenda, which in London has resulted in the merger of council social services and education departments to form children's services departments. These have a responsibility for the well-being of children. They also retain the responsibility for improving education in London's schools, under what is sometimes referred to as the standards agenda. The need for that improvement led to the launch of the DfES London Challenge project, which focuses in particular on school improvement in Hackney, Haringey, Islington, Lambeth and Southwark.

Pupil mobility has primarily been understood in terms of its impact on schools and on educational attainment. It has been approached from the point of view of the standards agenda. However, as the briefing shows, when standard school transfers, for example from primary to secondary school, are put on one side, the incidence of pupils moving home is greater than the incidence of pupils changing school. The wider impact on children also needs to be considered.

Pupils who are entitled to free school meals are more likely than other pupils to be involved in domestic mobility (moving home), and the circumstances which lead to this warrant further investigation. Pupils who move home, but do not change school, tend to have lower levels of attainment at key stage 3 than pupils who neither move home nor change school. Young people's well-being and educational attainment may be affected both by factors associated with, and by the experience of, domestic mobility. Extending the concept of pupil mobility to include moving home *and* changing school may have a relevance for both the Children's agenda and the standards agenda.

The briefing does not claim to provide a comprehensive account of the social circumstances and educational impact of young people moving home and changing school. It is, in a particular sense, a scoping document. The briefing aims to assess whether further work in this area might be of value.

As a first, step the briefing provides evidence of the scale of domestic mobility in London. As a second step it points to the different rates of domestic mobility amongst children entitled to free school meals compared with children who are not entitled to free school meals. Finally, it relates moving home and changing school to attainment at key stage 3, part way through secondary schooling.

The briefing is based on an analysis of pupil level records in the merged 2002 and 2003 London Pupil Datasets (LPD)¹. The LPD is largely, but not entirely, based on extracts from the National Pupil Database (NPD) provided by the Analytical Services Branch of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). The NPD is updated annually, and is based on statutory data collection exercises. In some, though not all, parts of London, the collection of pupil level data on young people's characteristics and attainment dates back to the work of the Inner London Education Authority's Research and Statistics Branch in the 1980s. The data in the LPD can therefore be expected to be of good quality.

2. School-focussed and child-focussed approaches to mobility

The term 'pupil mobility' is generally used to refer to pupils joining and/or leaving school at non-standard times. A non-standard admission time is any time other than in the first week of the first term when admissions take place. For example, a pupil admitted to a school in October, when that school's 'normal' admissions take place in the first week of September, would be classified as mobile. Additionally admissions to schools would be classed as non-standard if pupils are older than the youngest compulsory school age group a school caters. In this case a pupil admitted at age 12 to a school where the normal admission age was 11 would be classified as mobile. Pupils leaving at non-standard times, whether in terms of the month of leaving, or age when leaving, would also be classified as mobile.

Pupil mobility has been seen as an issue at least since the 1980s. In the past much of the work on pupil mobility would have been carried out at local authority level. Addressing a conference on pupil mobility, Janet Dobson² noted

When I was preparing for this conference, it struck me that much of the research that has been done in this country on pupil mobility has been done by people like yourselves: headteachers, local authority researchers and statisticians, LEA advisers, HMIs and OfSTED's own research team.

A case in point involved the inclusion of "pupil length of time" in secondary school in an analysis of public examination results organised jointly by London local authorities and the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)³. Because pupil mobility was seen as a problem for schools, it was not uncommon in the 1990s for local authorities to channel additional funds to schools with high levels of pupil mobility. Pupil mobility was seen as requiring teacher time to induct new pupils, to an extent not the case in schools where there are low levels of mobility. The amount of teacher time needed to induct pupils in school with high levels of mobility may detract from the amount of teacher time available for existing pupils, and this may impair the educational progress of those pupils.

The evidence from London suggests that mobile pupils themselves *tend* to have lower levels of performance than non-mobile pupils⁴. One response has been to identify good practice in schools in meeting the needs of mobile pupils⁵. However, work by Janet Dobson and her colleagues, and by Steve Strand, points towards the need for a wider view of mobility than one which focusses exclusively on what schools experience and what schools do⁶.

That work, and other work cited above, tends to confirm that mobile pupils are more likely than other pupils to have low levels of attainment *before* they enter a new school, to be entitled to free school meals and, if their mother tongue is other than English, to have low levels of fluency in English. The authors of that work tend to agree in their conclusions that social and educational disadvantage, rather than pupil mobility in itself, drive the lower levels of attainment amongst pupils who change schools at non-standard times.

A further approach to pupil mobility is suggested in one review of cross-border pupil mobility in London⁷. Cross-border mobility occurs where a child lives in one local authority area, but attends school in another. Such pupils are geographically mobile in the sense that the school attended is not necessarily the nearest local school which the child might be expected to attend, rather than in the sense of the time or age of admission to school. The evidence on cross-border mobility in London confirms that pupils who transfer to 'out-borough' secondary schools at age 11 tend

to have higher levels of attainment at the end of primary schooling than those who do not. This applies across all ethnic groups.

The trend in the attainment of pupils who are mobile in the sense of living in one borough and attending school in another, is not consistent with the view that pupil mobility is driven by social disadvantage. Some mobility may be best described as aspirational mobility, where parents of children with higher levels of attainment seek to better their child's educational prospects by seeking out 'better' schools, regardless of where those schools may be. Aspirational mobility is not the main focus of this briefing, but its existence should be borne in mind.

While pan-London evidence is available on cross-border pupil mobility, there is no equivalent pan-London analysis of education and pupils moving home, though the views of head teachers in individual authorities on the scale and impact of this have been reported⁸. The current briefing provides initial evidence suggesting that this evidence gap could usefully be closed.

3. The extent of moving home, changing school in London.

Individual pupil records in the 2002 and 2003 London Pupil Datasets have been linked using a code for each pupil which is the same in both years for pupils who were on roll in January of the two years. Some pupils were too young to attend school in 2002, and only have a record for 2003. Other had been on roll in 2002, but had reached school leaving age and had left school by January 2003. Table 1 shows the number of pupils in the merged 2002 and 2003 datasets who had different postcodes in January 2003 and January 2002, or who attended different schools at the two points in time. It also shows the number of pupils who had an LPD record in one year, but not the other, or who had a GCSE record which could not be linked to other pupil level or school level data.

While there are limits, as with any dataset, to what the LPD can tell us, the present data have the advantage of size over individual studies in a single or a limited number of small London local authorities. With nearly one and a quarter million records, the merged 2002 and 2003 LPD will, as far as the data allow, provide a pan-London view of 'moving home and changing school'.

Table 1. Home and school mobility, January 2003 compared with January 2002

	Frequency	Percent
Home and school do not differ 2002 to 2003	739,185	60.4
Both home and school differ 2002 to 2003	44,589	3.6
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs	106,072	8.7
2002 and 2003 home differs but school remains same	70,453	5.8
Pupil has 2002 record only	126,681	10.3
Pupil has 2003 record only	129,526	10.6
Unattached 2002 GCSE record	7,579	0.6
Total	1,224,085	100.0

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs.

Table 1 refers to all pupils, including pupils who had transferred in the normal course of event from infant to junior school, or from primary to secondary school. Nonetheless, of pupils with records for both January 2002 and January 2003, 44,589 had different homes and schools at those two points in time, and a further 70,453 had moved home but not school. In total 115,042 pupils had home postcodes which

differed from one January to the next. Additionally, some pupils who have a record for only one of the two years will do so because they have moved to or from homes outside London. Domestic mobility is widespread in London.

Table 2 provides the same information, but excludes pupils who had reached the end of a particular phase of schooling in summer 2002, and who would have changed or left school in the ordinary way by January 2003. For example, pupils aged 15 in 2002 were in the last year of compulsory schooling and could have moved into employment or further education outside the school system in that year. They are excluded from table 2. On the other hand, pupils aged 15 in 2003, would have been of compulsory school age in 2002, and are included in the table.

Looked at in the same way as in table 1, a total of 74,471 pupils had different home postcodes in January 2002 and January 2003. Table 2 confirms that, amongst pupils who are not at the end of a phase of education, moving home occurs more frequently than changing school. Given the available evidence, caution is needed in drawing conclusions from that point at this stage. Type of housing tenure is associated with educational attainment⁹ and housing tenure has been used over a number of years as one of several indicators of more complex measures of socio-economic status¹⁰. Pupil records in the LPD now have ecological measures of housing tenure attached, taken from the national census.

Table 2. Mobility amongst pupils who would not have been mobile in the ordinary way between January 2002 and January 2003.

	Frequency	Percent
Home and school do not differ 2002 to 2003	583,007	78.4
Both home and school differ 2002 to 2003	17,693	2.4
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs	19,595	2.6
2002 and 2003 home differs but school remains same	56,778	7.6
Pupil has 2002 record only	36,128	4.9
Pupil has 2003 record only	30,101	4.0
Total	743,302	100.0

Pupils who were not 'end of phase' were those aged 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, or 14 in 2002 or were aged 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, or 15 in 2003. Harrow operates a middle school system in which pupils do not always transfer to an upper school at age 11. Records for pupils attending a Harrow school in either year have been excluded from this table.

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs

Whether housing tenure has an independent effect on attainment when other factors are taken into account, or whether it is what tenure indicates, i.e. socio-economic status, which is the actual factor influencing attainment, is a moot point at this stage. Similarly, the evidence base needed to assess the impact of quality of housing on attainment is at present weak though, intuitively, it might be supposed that there is a link¹¹.

Nonetheless, data in the LPD do point to a possible line of inquiry. Table 3 gives mobility figures for pupils who were, and who were not, entitled to free school meals (FSM). Entitlement to free school meals is a common measure of poverty amongst children attending maintained schools. Domestic and school mobility occurs amongst pupils who are not entitled to FSM as well as amongst pupils who are, but the likelihood of moving home and/or changing school is greater amongst those entitled to FSM.

Table 3. Mobility and entitlement to free school meals (FSM) in 2002, amongst pupils who were not 'end of phase'

	Number			Percentage		
	FSM	No record of FSM	Total	FSM	No record of FSM	Total
Home and school do not differ 2002 to 2003	151,587	431,420	583,007	78.3	83.0	81.7
Both home and school differ 2002 to 2003	7,935	9,758	17,693	4.1	1.9	2.5
2002 and 2003 home but school differs	6,008	13,587	19,595	3.1	2.6	2.7
2002 and 2003 home differ but school remains same	18,961	37,817	56,778	9.8	7.3	8.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	9,128	27,000	36,128	4.7	5.2	5.1
Total	193,619	519,582	713,201	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs.

Pupils who were not 'end of phase' were those aged 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, or 14 in 2002 or were aged 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, or 15 in 2003. Harrow operates a middle school system in which pupils do not always transfer to an upper school at age 11. Records for pupils attending a Harrow school in either year have been excluded from this table.

Note: Because the table is restricted to pupils with 2002 records of free school meal entitlement, or lack of entitlement, the total differs from the total in table 2.

Similarly, table 4 shows that pupils whose first language is other than English are more likely to be mobile than pupils for whom English is a first language, though domestic and school mobility also exist amongst the latter. Allowing for this, there is an association in the capital between pupil mobility and factors such as entitlement to FSM and pupil fluency in English, both of which are associated with lower levels of educational attainment.

Taking the information in tables 3 and 4 with the existing finding that children who change school at non-standard times are more likely than other children to be socially disadvantaged, suggests that at least some domestic mobility does not take place as a matter of choice as households climb the property ladder. There is a need to investigate the relationship between social disadvantage, the workings of the housing market and educational attainment.

Table 4. 2002 to 2003 mobility and 2002 EAL

	Number				Percentage			
	Pupil mother tongue is English	Pupil mother tongue is other than English	Missing Data	Total	Pupil mother tongue is English	Pupil mother tongue is other than English	Missing Data	Total
Home and school do not differ 2002 to 2003	408,860	173,452	695	583,007	83.0	79.0	51.8	81.7
Both home and school differ 2002 to 2003	8,790	8,817	86	17,693	1.8	4.0	6.4	2.5
2002 and 2003 home postcode same, but school differs	13,360	6,224	11	19,595	2.7	2.8	0.8	2.7
2002 and 2003 home postcode differs but school remains same	36,622	20,127	29	56,778	7.4	9.2	2.2	8.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	24,774	10,834	520	36,128	5.0	4.9	38.8	5.1
Total	492,406	219,454	1,341	713,201	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Also see table A1 for an analysis at local authority level.

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs

At the 2005 launch of the report for the Mayor of London, *The State of the London Child*¹², social service professionals stressed a related line of inquiry, focussing on the problems of securing continuity of support when households move across local authority or other borders. Moves the individuals convicted of the murder of Victoria Climbié, from one local authority area to another in London provide a case in point, though continuity was not the only issue in that case.

Table 5 indicates that, amongst pupils who had different home postcodes in 2002 and 2003, those entitled to free school meals tended to have moved a shorter distance than pupils who were not entitled to free school meals. The difference in the two average figures is not great, but may be consistent with a pattern, particularly for families where children are entitled to free school meals, of localised movement within, rather than between, local authorities.

Table 5. Average distance of move of home, pupils with different home postcodes in 2002 and 2003

	Entitled to FSM	Not entitled to FSM
Kilometres	5.9	6.6
Miles	3.7	4.1

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs

Table 6 takes this point further. It provides information on pupils who were not 'end of phase', and who had different postcodes in January 2002 and January 2003. Over 60,000 pupils in this group had moved home between January 2002 and 2003. Some may have moved home more than once. Of these, 43,472 (71 per cent) moved home within the same local authority area, though it is possible that some may have moved out of the local authority area, and then returned to it, in the 12 months between January 2002 and January 2003.

Table 6. Pupils with different home postcodes in 2002 and 2003. Movement within and between London local authority (LA) areas, by pupil entitlement to free school meals. Pupils are those who are not 'end of phase'

Pupil 2002 home local authority (LA) area	Pupils entitled to free school meals			Pupils with not record of entitlement to free school meals		
	Home postcodes differ in 2002 and 2003 but are in same LA area	Home postcodes differ in 2002 and 2003 and are in different LA areas	Total	Home postcodes differ in 2002 and 2003 but are in same LA area	Home postcodes differ in 2002 and 2003 and are in different LA areas	Total
Number						
LA in inner London	7,384	3,197	10,581	7,510	5,564	13,074
LA in outer London	8,552	2,603	11,155	20,028	6,521	26,549
LA in Greater London	15,936	5,800	21,736	27,536	12,085	39,621
Percentage						
LA in inner London	69.8	30.2	100.0	57.4	42.6	100.0
LA in outer London	76.7	23.3	100.0	75.4	24.6	100.0
LA in Greater London	73.3	26.7	100.0	69.5	30.5	100.0

Pupils who were not 'end of phase' were those aged 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, or 14 in 2002 or were aged 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, or 15 in 2003. Harrow operates a middle school system in which pupils do not always transfer to an upper school at age 11. Records for pupils attending a Harrow school in either year have been excluded from this table.

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPD. See tables A2 to A7 for more detail

Allowing for that caveat, pupils entitled to free school meals, who moved home, were more likely than other pupils to move *within* the same local authority area. This may indicate that some households move home over considerable distances as a matter of choice, while others move more locally as a matter of necessity.

Appendix tables A5 and A6 provide more information, at local authority level as well as London-wide. Consistent with the summary given in table 3, pupils in the not end-of-phase group who were entitled to free school meals were more likely than other pupils to have different postcodes in January 2002 and January 2003. This was so in both inner and outer London. It was also so in all of the individual outer London boroughs. However, in inner London pupils entitled to free school meals who lived in Hackney, Islington, Kensington and Chelsea, Southwark and Westminster were slightly more likely than other local pupils to retain the same home postcode.

The same appendix tables also provide a comparison at local authority level of domestic mobility rates within and between local authorities. There are only two local authorities where the percentage of pupils moving home within a borough is less than the percentage of pupils moving to a home in another borough. These are Islington and Kensington and Chelsea, and the pupils are those not entitled to free school meals.

While there are cases of disadvantaged pupils moving home across borough boundaries, the majority move locally, and this is so in all London boroughs. While the Victoria Climbié case will continue to inform national policy, there may also be potential in developing understanding of social disadvantage, and the workings of local housing markets.

However, a further note of caution is needed. Table 2 shows that 66,229 pupils who were not 'end of phase' had records for only one year in the merged 2002 and 2003 LPD. Some of these were pupils aged 5 in 2003 who, contrary to the general pattern in London, had not attended a primary reception class in 2002. Allowing for that, pupils with records in only one year are likely to have moved to, or left London between January 2002 and January 2003, and there are more pupils in this category than pupils who moved within or between London local authority areas. Some pupils will have only one record because of short-range home moves to or from counties which border London. Others will have moved over greater distances. The DMAG briefing *Ethnicity and Attainment (2005/31)* confirms that pupils moving to or from London have different characteristics than those living in London in both 2002 and 2003, and that those differences have educational implications. There may be potential in developing understanding of the interaction of longer-range domestic mobility, housing markets and educational improvement.

4. Moving home, changing school and educational attainment at key stage 3

Key stage 1 tests are taken at the end of infant schooling, after which pupils attending those schools transfer to junior schools. Key stage 2 takes place at the end of primary schooling, after which pupils ordinarily transfer to secondary schooling. Public examinations taken at the end of key stage 4 are sat by pupils who have reached school leaving age, and can leave school that summer. Reviewing domestic and school mobility in the light of those tests and examinations will inevitably include pupils involved in ordinary end of phase transfer. Key stage 3 tests provide the exception. These are taken in the year which pupils begin aged 13. This is not an age at which a pupil would transfer from one school to another because they had reached the end of a phase of education.

Table 7 is restricted to pupils aged 13 in 2002 or 14 in 2003, and shows summer 2002 key stage 3 test results in English, mathematics and science. Pupils are grouped in terms of domestic as well as school mobility. Additionally, numbers of pupils with records in only one of the two years are shown.

Table 7. Mobility and 2002 key stage 3 English, mathematics and science tests. Pupils aged 13 in 2002 or 14 in 2003

	Number				Percentage			
	No assessment, absent or disapplied	Assessed at below level 5	At level 5 or above	Total	No assessment, absent or disapplied	Assessed at below level 5	At level 5 or above	Total
English								
Home and school do not differ 2002 to 2003	5,392	17,949	44,273	67,614	8.0	26.5	65.5	100.0
Both home and school differ 2002 to 2003	253	189	200	642	39.4	29.4	31.2	100.0
2002 and 2003 home postcodes same, but school differs	371	463	594	1,428	26.0	32.4	41.6	100.0
2002 and 2003 home postcodes differ but school remains same	1,003	2,334	3,790	7,127	14.1	32.7	53.2	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	1,391	693	1,127	3,211	43.3	21.6	35.1	100.0
Pupil has 2003 record only	3,071			3,071	100.0			100.0
Mathematics								
Home and school do not differ 2002 to 2003	3,774	19,957	43,883	67,614	5.6	29.5	64.9	100.0
Both home and school postcode differ 2002 to 2003	235	192	215	642	36.6	29.9	33.5	100.0
2002 and 2003 home postcodes same, but school differs	325	452	651	1,428	22.8	31.7	45.6	100.0
2002 and 2003 home postcodes differ but school remains same	698	2,681	3,748	7,127	9.8	37.6	52.6	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	1,347	750	1,114	3,211	41.9	23.4	34.7	100.0
Pupil has 2003 record only	3,071			3,071	100.0			100.0
Science								
Home and school do not differ 2002 to 2003	3,889	20,802	42,923	67,614	5.8	30.8	63.5	100.0
Both home and school differ 2002 to 2003	239	214	189	642	37.2	33.3	29.4	100.0
2002 and 2003 home postcodes same, but school differs	330	506	592	1,428	23.1	35.4	41.5	100.0
2002 and 2003 home postcodes differ but school remains same	760	2,790	3,577	7,127	10.7	39.1	50.2	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	1,359	745	1,107	3,211	42.3	23.2	34.5	100.0
Pupil has 2003 record only	3,071			3,071	100.0			100.0

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs. Also see tables A8 to A10

At each key stage, the pupils most likely to reach nationally expected levels had the same home postcodes and attended the same schools in January 2002 and January 2003. By contrast, amongst assessed pupils, those who had moved home *and* changed schools were least likely to have reached nationally expected levels.

A substantial number of pupils, who were recorded as being on roll in a maintained school in January 2002, had no 2002 key stage 3 test record. Ten point five per cent, 8,410 in a total of 80,022 pupils in roll in January 2002, had no test results, were absent or were disapplied. Pupils who were 'disapplied' are generally pupils with special educational needs, for whom assessments are not deemed appropriate. In London these are few in number. Pupil absences do occur, but an absence rate of more than 5 per cent would be thought exceptional. Figures for pupils who had no 2002 record are not included in these calculations, since 2002 key stage 3 results are not available for pupils with no LPD record before 2003.

Pupils who had no LPD record in 2002 aside, a high proportion of those missing a key stage 3 record had no 2003 LPD record, or had different home postcodes and attended different schools in 2002 and 2003.

The LPD includes records for pupils who attend maintained schools and who live in London regardless of where the school attended is, or who attend a school in London, regardless of where they live. Some pupils with no summer 2002 key stage 3 record will simply have moved out of London, and will therefore no longer be included within the LPD. No such explanation is available for pupils with an LPD record in both January 2002 and January 2003.

The high level of missing assessments amongst pupils who had moved home and changed school raises the possibility that pupils experiencing social turbulence are in some sense falling through the net. That possibility warrants further exploration. If it applies, then there are implications for our understanding of the vulnerability of mobile pupils.

Tables A8 to A10 also provide information on mobility and key stage 3 assessments, but for pupils grouped by entitlement to free school meals in 2002. Because this condition is imposed, pupils with a 2003 record but no 2002 record are excluded, and totals differ from those in table 7. The same two groups of pupils, those with only a 2002 LPD record, and those with different home postcodes and attending different schools in January 2002 and January 2003, were again most likely to have no 2002 key stage 3 test record. Table 8 gives a summary of that information. Pupils in the two groups entitled to free school meals were particularly likely to have a missing key stage 3 test record. This was also true in other groups, including pupils who had neither changed school nor moved home.

Table 8, percentage of pupils aged 13 in 2002 or 14 in 2003 who had no 2002 key stage 3 test record

	Pupils with 2002 record only		Pupils have different home postcodes and attend different schools in January 2002 and January 2003	
	Pupils Entitled to free school meals in 2002	Pupils with no record of entitlement to free school meals in 2002	Pupils Entitled to free school meals in 2002	Pupils with no record of entitlement to free school meals in 2002
English	56.3	38.6	43.0	37.1
Mathematics	54.3	37.4	46.6	30.2
Science	54.6	37.8	44.2	32.7

See tables A8 and A9 for further details
Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPD

However, as suggested above, it may be the case that pupils recorded as being on roll in January 2002, who had no summer key stage 3 test result, may simply have moved out of London. This is not consistent with the wider analysis of the London Pupil Dataset reported in *Ethnicity and Attainment in Schools*. Pupils entitled to free school meals are statistically significantly under-represented amongst pupils who had a 2002 roll record but no equivalent 2003 record. The alternative explanation, that mobile children are particularly at risk of falling through the school record keeping system, remains a possibility.

Tables A8 to A10 also compare the extent to which pupils experiencing different forms of mobility reach nationally expected levels in key stage 3 tests. Table 9 give a summary of key information from those tables. Table 9 shows that a consistent pattern exists across each subject area. Pupils who had the same postcode and attended the same school in January 2002 and January 2003 were most likely to reach nationally expected levels at key stage 3. Pupils whose home postcode *and* school differed in those two years were least likely to reach nationally expected levels. This is so regardless of whether pupils were entitled to free school meals or not, though pupils entitled to free school meals were consistently less likely than other pupils to reach those levels.

Pupils who had moved home, but had not changed schools, were the next most likely group to reach nationally expected levels. Pupils who had the same postcode in 2002 and 2003, but had changed schools, were the next to least likely group to reach nationally expected levels in key stage 3 tests. This suggests that disrupted education may be more important in depressing attainment than moving home. It also suggests that the two taken together are most likely to depress attainment.

Table 9. Pupils aged 13 in 2002 or 14 in 2003. Percentage reaching nationally expected levels in 2002 key stage 3 tests, by entitlement to free school meals in 2002.

2002 and 2003 home postcode and school attended	Pupils entitled to FSM in 2002	Pupils with no record of entitlement to free school meals in 2002	Total
English			
Home and school are the same in both years	46.3	71.8	65.5
Home differs, school remains the same	38.7	61.3	53.2
Home remains the same, school differs	25.5	48.5	41.6
Home and school differ	23.1	36.3	31.2
Mathematics			
Home and school are the same in both years	45.4	71.3	64.9
Home differs, school remains the same	37.9	60.8	52.6
Home remains the same, school differs	30.4	52.1	45.6
Home and school differ	22.3	40.7	33.5
Science			
Home and school are the same in both years	42.6	70.4	63.5
Home differs, school remains the same	33.6	59.4	50.2
Home remains the same, school differs	25.2	48.4	41.5
Home and school differ	19.9	35.5	29.4

See tables A8 and A9 for further details
Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPD

5. Conclusion

As indicated, this briefing aims to provide no more than an initial assessment of whether there is potential in further work on the circumstances and impact of moving home and changing school. On a preliminary view, there is potential in that work. Analyses of the LPD could be refined, as indicated, using more sophisticated statistical tests to assess the relative impact on attainment of moving home and changing school. The analysis could be extended to test for differential effects with particular groups of pupils, and further refinements added. The age range catered for by Junior and Mixed Infant (JMI) primary schools means that pupils in those schools are not 'end' of phases when key stage 1 tests are taken. Similarly, the age range catered for by Middle schools means that pupils attending those schools are not 'end of phase' when key stage 2 tests are taken. It is, technically, possible to extend the analyses shown in this briefing to include those two groups of pupils.

Additionally, with more recent data, it may be possible to review the impact of mobility over longer ranges of time, for instance comparing the attainment of pupils who had the same postcodes in 2002, 2003 and 2004 with the attainment of pupils who had different postcodes in each of those years.

However, the briefing has also pointed to the impact of the local housing market on domestic mobility, and housing market data are not included in the LPD, other than in the form of housing tenure type at 1991 census enumeration district level and 2001 census output area level. This suggests that analyses of other longitudinal datasets, and possibly work based on newly collected data, may be of value.

It would be particularly useful if the data collection exercises which provide information for the NPD were in future to collect information on leaving date and destination for young people on roll at any point in the twelve months leading up to the annual pupil census.

The potential field of enquiry is extensive, but the preliminary analysis of the LPD does provide a number of suggestive conclusions. When pupils transferring from one school to another at the end of a phase of education are allowed for, moving home is more common in London than changing school. Pupils entitled to free school meals are more likely than other pupils to experience domestic mobility. Regardless of entitlement to free school meals, domestic mobility is more likely to take place within rather than between local authority areas, though pupils entitled to free school meals are more likely than other pupils to move home within their existing home local authority area. Longer-range mobility, to and from London, needs to be taken into account, as does aspirational mobility not caused by deprivation.

There is an association between domestic mobility and lower levels of attainment, which is particularly marked when associated with a change of school and for pupils entitled to free school meals. There is also an association between free school meal entitlement, moving home, changing school, and pupils slipping through the assessment net. Additionally, there may be a similar association with pupils slipping through the school system entirely, and that possibility could usefully be tested further using national, rather than pan-London, data.

Appendix 1: References

1. David Ewens *The National and London Pupil Datasets. An introductory briefing for researchers and research users* DMAG briefing 2005/8).
2. Janet's Dobson. Revised and expanded version of *Mobility, Disadvantage and the Secondary School System: Some recent Research Findings*, presented to the DfES 2003 conference on pupil mobility.
3. For example, see Lesley Kendall and Lara Ainsworth *Examination Results in Context. Analysis of 1996 examination results* Local Government Association, 1997. Also see Peter Mortimore, Pamela Sammons, Louise Stoll, David Lewis and Russell Ecob, *School Matter. The Junior Years* Reprinted by Paul Chapman 1995 and originally published by Open Books, 1988).
4. See *Breaking point. Examining the disruption caused by pupil mobility* Association of London Government, 2005).
5. For example see *Pupil mobility in Lambeth schools. Implications for raising achievement and school standards* Inclusion and Standards Division, Lambeth Education, 2004, and *Managing Pupil Mobility*, Office for Standards in Education, reference number HMI 403, March 2002).
6. Janet Dobson and Claire E. Pooley *Mobility, Equality Diversity: a study of pupil mobility in the secondary school system* Department of Geography, University College London, 2004. Additionally, see Steve Strand *Pupil Mobility, Attainment and Progress During Key Stage 1: a study in cautious interpretation* British Educational Research Journal, volume 28, Number 1 2002, pages 63-78).
7. David Ewens *Cross-border pupil mobility: an analysis of the London Pupil Dataset* DMAG briefing 2003/24).
8. See Feyisa Demie, Kirtin Lewis and Anne Taplin *Pupil mobility in schools and implications for raising achievement* Education Studies, volume 31, number 2, 2005, pages 131-147).
9. Linda Croxford *Social Justice Annual Report Scotland 2001 Socio-economic inequalities and Educational Attainment in Scotland* Scottish Executive).
10. For example see Richard Rose *The Problem of Party Government* Penguin books, 1976, pages 30-42).
11. See *The Impact of Overcrowding on Health and Education: A review of the Evidence and Literature* Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004).
12. Greater London Authority *The State of London's Children Report* The Mayor of London, December 2004.

Appendix 2: Key reference tables

A1	Pupils on roll in 2003 with a matching 2002 London Pupil Dataset record. Mobility and entitlement to free school meals	16
A2	Pupils entitled to free school meals and not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 - 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (number)	17
A3	Pupils with no record of entitlement to free school meals and not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 - 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (number)	18
A4	All pupils not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 - 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (number)	19
A5	Pupils entitled to free school meals and not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 - 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (percentage)	20
A6	Pupils with no record of entitlement to free school meals, and not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 - 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (percentage)	21
A7	All pupils not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 - 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (percentage)	22
A8	2002 key stage 3 English, science and mathematics test results by home and school mobility. Pupils aged 13 in 2002 or 14 in 2003 and entitled to free school meals in 2002	23
A9	2002 key stage 3 English, science and mathematics test results by home and school mobility. Pupils aged 13 in 2002 or 14 in 2003 with no record of entitlement to free school meals in 2002	24
A10	2002 key stage 3 English, science and mathematics test results by home and school mobility. All pupils aged 13 in 2002 or 14 in 2003	25

Appendix. Key reference tables

A1. Pupils on roll in 2003 with a matching 2002 London Pupil Dataset record. Mobility and entitlement to free school meals

LEA area in which pupils live	Pupils on roll in 2003 with a matching 2002 record						
	Number	Number Entitled to FSM	% entitled to FSM	% of pupils entitled to FSM with different 2003 and 2002 home postcode	% of pupils not entitled to FSM 2003 and 2002 home postcodes	% of pupils entitled to FSM at school in a LEA in 2003 and 2002	% of pupils not entitled to FSM at school in a different LEA in 2003 and 2002
City of London	141	63	44.7	4.8	16.7	1.6	6.4
Camden	17,004	7,140	42.0	12.6	8.5	4.5	4.2
Hackney	26,509	11,444	43.2	12.6	11.1	4.0	5.7
Hammersmith and Fulham	13,449	5,832	43.4	13.9	9.5	5.2	5.9
Haringey	29,576	10,865	36.7	17.7	10.7	4.0	4.3
Islington	20,071	7,968	39.7	11.0	7.4	4.1	5.5
Kensington and Chelsea	7,641	3,112	40.7	10.2	8.3	6.3	6.9
Lambeth	29,818	11,249	37.7	11.4	9.9	5.4	6.2
Lewisham	34,304	10,108	29.5	16.1	13.4	3.7	5.1
Newham	42,548	16,676	39.2	16.9	12.2	2.0	2.8
Southwark	29,977	11,682	39.0	12.3	11.3	2.9	4.3
Tower Hamlets	29,200	17,675	60.5	11.5	9.9	1.0	2.2
Wandsworth	22,607	6,395	28.3	14.5	9.1	3.8	3.6
Westminster	12,000	5,139	42.8	13.8	10.3	5.1	4.9
Barking and Dagenham	27,614	6,843	24.8	14.1	9.1	2.7	3.7
Barnet	38,998	6,509	16.7	16.8	8.3	5.5	4.8
Bexley	35,286	4,281	12.1	15.7	10.6	2.2	3.0
Brent	34,912	8,981	25.7	19.8	11.5	4.8	4.2
Bromley	38,548	4,898	12.7	15.1	10.9	3.3	3.0
Croydon	46,537	9,271	19.9	17.4	11.2	3.1	3.8
Ealing	39,733	10,538	26.5	15.3	9.0	2.9	3.7
Enfield	41,708	8,938	21.4	19.2	9.7	4.7	2.8
Greenwich	32,398	10,499	32.4	15.2	10.6	2.6	4.7
Harrow	28,119	4,031	14.3	18.1	9.4	4.7	5.5
Havering	33,017	3,782	11.5	14.8	9.6	2.8	3.0
Hillingdon	37,739	5,896	15.6	17.4	9.4	2.8	2.6
Hounslow	31,044	6,599	21.3	17.2	9.3	3.3	3.1
Kingston upon Thames	17,495	1,453	8.3	20.4	9.3	4.1	3.3
Merton	21,492	3,239	15.1	15.3	9.7	4.5	3.9
Redbridge	37,272	6,062	16.3	19.0	9.2	3.8	3.3
Richmond upon Thames	14,935	1,757	11.8	12.1	7.4	3.8	2.7
Sutton	25,344	2,876	11.3	13.1	9.7	3.2	3.6
Waltham Forest	32,650	8,610	26.4	15.6	9.6	2.6	2.4
Other	9,173	457	5.0	44.9	22.5	4.2	3.0
Inner London	314,845	125,348	39.8	13.6	10.6	3.5	4.5
Outer London	614,841	115,063	18.7	16.6	9.8	3.5	3.5
Greater London	929,686	240,411	25.9	15.1	10.0	3.5	3.8
All	938,859	240,868	25.7	15.1	10.2	3.5	3.8

Source: Merged 2002 and 2003 London Pupil Datasets.

See table 1 for information on the number of pupils on roll in 2003 who did not have a matching 2002 record. This table provides information on pupils on roll in 2003 whose records have been matched with those from 2002.

A2. Pupils entitled to free school meals and not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 to 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (number)

Pupil 2002 home local authority	Stability and mobility across and within LA areas				Total
	Pupil home postcode does not differ in 2002 and 2003	Pupil home code differs 2002 203 but is in same LA area	Pupil home postcode is in different LAs in 2002 2003	Pupil does not have record for both years	
Camden	4,664	394	156	266	5,480
Hackney	7,793	708	291	440	9,232
Hammersmith and Fulham	3,907	341	124	212	4,584
Haringey	6,895	905	475	434	8,709
Islington	5,507	319	205	280	6,311
Kensington and Chelsea	2,082	130	99	84	2,395
Lambeth	7,783	545	360	479	9,167
Lewisham	6,725	709	253	316	8,003
Newham	10,719	1,282	508	757	13,266
Southwark	7,695	599	249	472	9,015
Tower Hamlets	11,393	746	198	484	12,821
Wandsworth	4,243	440	150	198	5,031
Westminster	3,262	266	129	115	3,772
Barking and Dagenham	4,408	449	123	301	5,281
Barnet	3,994	418	172	208	4,792
Bexley	2,838	340	78	181	3,437
Brent	5,211	774	251	307	6,543
Bromley	3,240	313	89	143	3,785
Croydon	6,167	790	172	389	7,518
Ealing	6,492	841	282	352	7,967
Enfield	5,518	740	354	391	7,003
Greenwich	6,983	838	147	336	8,304
Harrow*	234	11	19	9	273
Havering	2,510	275	45	124	2,954
Hillingdon	3,501	457	73	174	4,205
Hounslow	4,253	518	154	229	5,154
Kingston upon Thames	895	155	26	42	1,118
Merton	2,188	238	99	98	2,623
Redbridge	3,610	511	243	213	4,577
Richmond upon Thames	1,136	87	41	54	1,318
Sutton	1,780	194	47	94	2,115
Waltham Forest	5,716	603	188	209	6,716
Inner London	82,668	7,384	3,197	4,537	97,786
Outer London	70,674	8,552	2,603	3,854	85,683
Greater London	153,342	15,936	5,800	8,391	183,469
Other	230	13	37	40	320
Total	153,572	15,949	5,837	8,431	183,789

Note: pupils in this table, who would not have changed schools at the end of a phase in the ordinary way in 2002, were those aged 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 or 14 in 2002 and those aged 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 or 15 in 2003.

*Figures for pupils attending Harrow schools, several which are middle schools, and for pupils living in the City of London, are excluded from this table

Source: merged 2002 2003 LPDs

A3. Pupils with no record of entitlement to free school meals and not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 to 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (number)

Pupil 2002 home local authority	Stability and mobility within and between LA areas				Total
	Pupil home postcode does not differ in 2002 and 2003	Pupil home code differs 2002 203 but is in same LA area	Pupil home postcode is in different LAs in 2002 2003	Pupil does not have record for both years	
Camden	6,114	339	245	452	7,150
Hackney	9,556	649	536	695	11,436
Hammersmith and Fulham	4,900	291	199	343	5,733
Haringey	11,858	750	666	716	13,990
Islington	8,050	318	344	533	9,245
Kensington and Chelsea	3,009	115	135	256	3,515
Lambeth	12,174	598	584	783	14,139
Lewisham	14,859	994	607	825	17,285
Newham	16,595	1,293	743	1,064	19,695
Southwark	12,002	728	541	804	14,075
Tower Hamlets	7,943	504	292	461	9,200
Wandsworth	10,297	651	469	659	12,076
Westminster	4,446	280	203	318	5,247
Barking and Dagenham	13,516	671	405	610	15,202
Barnet	21,129	1,137	386	1,145	23,797
Bexley	20,042	1,437	298	639	22,416
Brent	15,579	1,208	516	841	18,144
Bromley	22,191	1,712	285	839	25,027
Croydon	24,785	1,866	464	1,377	28,492
Ealing	18,345	1,063	536	973	20,917
Enfield	21,390	1,378	398	1,056	24,222
Greenwich	13,845	964	490	683	15,982
Harrow*	2,593	75	91	102	2,861
Havering	20,610	1,217	150	618	22,595
Hillingdon	20,068	1,367	221	1,048	22,704
Hounslow	15,559	968	309	829	17,665
Kingston upon Thames	10,323	748	194	569	11,834
Merton	11,662	711	438	655	13,466
Redbridge	19,476	1,022	497	801	21,796
Richmond upon Thames	9,468	486	160	491	10,605
Sutton	15,003	939	258	630	16,830
Waltham Forest	16,173	1,059	425	785	18,442
Inner London	121,803	7,510	5,564	7,909	142,848
Outer London	311,757	20,028	6,521	14,691	352,997
Greater London	433,560	27,538	12,085	22,600	495,845
Other	5,032	198	254	375	5,859
Total	438,642	27,737	12,344	22,981	501,704

Note: pupils who would not have changed schools at the end of a phase in the ordinary way in 2002 were those aged 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 or 14 in 2002 and those aged 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 or 15 in 2003.

*Figures for pupils attending Harrow schools, several which are middle schools, and pupils living in the City of London, are excluded from this table

Source: merged 2002 2003 I PDs

A4. All pupils not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 to 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (number)

Stability and mobility within and between LA areas

Pupil 2002 home local authority	Pupil home postcode does not differ in 2002 and 2003	Pupil home code differs 2002 203 but is in same LA area	Pupil home postcode is in different LAs in 2002 2003	Pupil does not have record for both years	Total
Camden	10,778	733	401	718	12,630
Hackney	17,349	1,357	827	1,135	20,668
Hammersmith and Fulham	8,807	632	323	555	10,317
Haringey	18,753	1,655	1,141	1,150	22,699
Islington	13,557	637	549	813	15,556
Kensington and Chelsea	5,091	245	234	340	5,910
Lambeth	19,957	1,143	944	1,262	23,306
Lewisham	21,584	1,703	860	1,141	25,288
Newham	27,314	2,575	1,251	1,821	32,961
Southwark	19,697	1,327	790	1,276	23,090
Tower Hamlets	19,336	1,250	490	945	22,021
Wandsworth	14,540	1,091	619	857	17,107
Westminster	7,708	546	332	433	9,019
Barking and Dagenham	17,924	1,120	528	911	20,483
Barnet	25,123	1,555	558	1,353	28,589
Bexley	22,880	1,777	376	820	25,853
Brent	20,790	1,982	767	1,148	24,687
Bromley	25,431	2,025	374	982	28,812
Croydon	30,952	2,656	636	1,766	36,010
Ealing	24,837	1,904	818	1,325	28,884
Enfield	26,908	2,118	752	1,447	31,225
Greenwich	20,828	1,802	637	1,019	24,286
Harrow*	2,827	86	110	111	3,134
Havering	23,120	1,492	195	742	25,549
Hillingdon	23,569	1,824	294	1,222	26,909
Hounslow	19,812	1,486	463	1,058	22,819
Kingston upon Thames	11,218	903	220	611	12,952
Merton	13,850	949	537	753	16,089
Redbridge	23,086	1,533	740	1,014	26,373
Richmond upon Thames	10,604	573	201	545	11,923
Sutton	16,783	1,133	305	724	18,945
Waltham Forest	21,889	1,662	613	994	25,158
Inner London	204,566	14,895	8,766	12,455	240,682
Outer London	382,431	28,580	9,124	18,545	438,680
Greater London	586,997	43,475	17,890	31,000	679,362
Other	5,262	211	291	415	6,179
Total	592,259	43,686	18,181	31,415	685,541

Note: pupils who would not have changed schools at the end of a phase in the ordinary way in 2002 were those aged 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 or 14 in 2002 and those aged 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 or 15 in 2003.

*Figures for pupils attending Harrow schools, several which are middle schools, and pupils living in the City of London, are excluded from this table

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs.

A5. Pupils entitled to free school meals and not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 to 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (percentage)

Stability and mobility within and between LA areas					
Pupil 2002 home local authority	Pupil home postcode does not differ in 2002 and 2003 in same LA area	Pupil home code differs 2002 2003 but is in same LA area	Pupil home postcode is in different LAs in 2002 2003	Pupil does not have record for both years	Total
Camden	85.1	7.2	2.8	4.9	100.0
Hackney	84.4	7.7	3.2	4.8	100.0
Hammersmith and Fulham	85.2	7.4	2.7	4.6	100.0
Haringey	79.2	10.4	5.5	5.0	100.0
Islington	87.3	5.1	3.2	4.4	100.0
Kensington and Chelsea	86.9	5.4	4.1	3.5	100.0
Lambeth	84.9	5.9	3.9	5.2	100.0
Lewisham	84.0	8.9	3.2	3.9	100.0
Newham	80.8	9.7	3.8	5.7	100.0
Southwark	85.4	6.6	2.8	5.2	100.0
Tower Hamlets	88.9	5.8	1.5	3.8	100.0
Wandsworth	84.3	8.7	3.0	3.9	100.0
Westminster	86.5	7.1	3.4	3.0	100.0
Barking and Dagenham	83.5	8.5	2.3	5.7	100.0
Barnet	83.3	8.7	3.6	4.3	100.0
Bexley	82.6	9.9	2.3	5.3	100.0
Brent	79.6	11.8	3.8	4.7	100.0
Bromley	85.6	8.3	2.4	3.8	100.0
Croydon	82.0	10.5	2.3	5.2	100.0
Ealing	81.5	10.6	3.5	4.4	100.0
Enfield	78.8	10.6	5.1	5.6	100.0
Greenwich	84.1	10.1	1.8	4.0	100.0
Harrow*	85.7	4.0	7.0	3.3	100.0
Havering	85.0	9.3	1.5	4.2	100.0
Hillingdon	83.3	10.9	1.7	4.1	100.0
Hounslow	82.5	10.1	3.0	4.4	100.0
Kingston upon Thames	80.1	13.9	2.3	3.8	100.0
Merton	83.4	9.1	3.8	3.7	100.0
Redbridge	78.9	11.2	5.3	4.7	100.0
Richmond upon Thames	86.2	6.6	3.1	4.1	100.0
Sutton	84.2	9.2	2.2	4.4	100.0
Waltham Forest	85.1	9.0	2.8	3.1	100.0
Inner London	84.5	7.6	3.3	4.6	100.0
Outer London	82.5	10.0	3.0	4.5	100.0
Greater London	83.6	8.7	3.2	4.6	100.0
Other	71.9	4.1	11.6	12.5	100.0
Total	83.6	8.7	3.2	4.6	100.0

Note: pupils who would not have changed schools at the end of a phase in the ordinary way in 2002 were those aged 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 or 14 in 2002 and those aged 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 or 15 in 2003.

*Figures for pupils attending Harrow schools, several which are middle schools, and pupils living in the City of London, are excluded from this table

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs.

A6. Pupils with no record of entitlement to free school meals and not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 to 2003 mobility within and between LA areas (percentage).

Stability and mobility within and between LA areas						
Pupil 2002 home local authority	Pupil home postcode does not differ in 2002 and 2003	Pupil home code differs 2002 203 but is in same LA area	Pupil home postcode is in different LAs in 2002 2003	Pupil does not have record for both years	Total	
Camden	85.5	4.7	3.4	6.3	100.0	
Hackney	83.6	5.7	4.7	6.1	100.0	
Hammersmith and Fulham	85.5	5.1	3.5	6.0	100.0	
Haringey	84.8	5.4	4.8	5.1	100.0	
Islington	87.1	3.4	3.7	5.8	100.0	
Kensington and Chelsea	85.6	3.3	3.8	7.3	100.0	
Lambeth	86.1	4.2	4.1	5.5	100.0	
Lewisham	86.0	5.8	3.5	4.8	100.0	
Newham	84.3	6.6	3.8	5.4	100.0	
Southwark	85.3	5.2	3.8	5.7	100.0	
Tower Hamlets	86.3	5.5	3.2	5.0	100.0	
Wandsworth	85.3	5.4	3.9	5.5	100.0	
Westminster	84.7	5.3	3.9	6.1	100.0	
Barking and Dagenham	88.9	4.4	2.7	4.0	100.0	
Barnet	88.8	4.8	1.6	4.8	100.0	
Bexley	89.4	6.4	1.3	2.9	100.0	
Brent	85.9	6.7	2.8	4.6	100.0	
Bromley	88.7	6.8	1.1	3.4	100.0	
Croydon	87.0	6.5	1.6	4.8	100.0	
Ealing	87.7	5.1	2.6	4.7	100.0	
Enfield	88.3	5.7	1.6	4.4	100.0	
Greenwich	86.6	6.0	3.1	4.3	100.0	
Harrow*	90.6	2.6	3.2	3.6	100.0	
Havering	91.2	5.4	0.7	2.7	100.0	
Hillingdon	88.4	6.0	1.0	4.6	100.0	
Hounslow	88.1	5.5	1.7	4.7	100.0	
Kingston upon Thames	87.2	6.3	1.6	4.8	100.0	
Merton	86.6	5.3	3.3	4.9	100.0	
Redbridge	89.4	4.7	2.3	3.7	100.0	
Richmond upon Thames	89.3	4.6	1.5	4.6	100.0	
Sutton	89.1	5.6	1.5	3.7	100.0	
Waltham Forest	87.7	5.7	2.3	4.3	100.0	
Inner London	85.3	5.3	3.9	5.5	100.0	
Outer London	88.3	5.7	1.8	4.2	100.0	
Greater London	87.4	5.6	2.4	4.6	100.0	
Other	85.9	3.4	4.3	6.4	100.0	
Total	87.4	5.5	2.5	4.6	100.0	

Note: pupils who would not have changed schools at the end of a phase in the ordinary way in 2002 were those aged 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 or 14 in 2002 and those aged 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 or 15 in 2003.

*Figures for pupils attending Harrow schools, several which are middle schools, and pupils living in the City of London, are excluded from this table

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs.

A7. All pupils not at the end of a phase of education in 2002. 2002 to 2003 mobility within and between local authority areas (percentage)

Stability and mobility within and between LA areas					
Pupil 2002 home local authority	Pupil home postcode does not differ in 2002 and 2003	Pupil home code differs 2002 203 but is in same LA area	Pupil home postcode is in different LAs in 2002 2003	Pupil does not have record for both years	Total
Camden	85.3	5.8	3.2	5.7	100.0
Hackney	83.9	6.6	4.0	5.5	100.0
Hammersmith and Fulham	85.4	6.1	3.1	5.4	100.0
Haringey	82.6	7.3	5.0	5.1	100.0
Islington	87.1	4.1	3.5	5.2	100.0
Kensington and Chelsea	86.1	4.1	4.0	5.8	100.0
Lambeth	85.6	4.9	4.1	5.4	100.0
Lewisham	85.4	6.7	3.4	4.5	100.0
Newham	82.9	7.8	3.8	5.5	100.0
Southwark	85.3	5.7	3.4	5.5	100.0
Tower Hamlets	87.8	5.7	2.2	4.3	100.0
Wandsworth	85.0	6.4	3.6	5.0	100.0
Westminster	85.5	6.1	3.7	4.8	100.0
Barking and Dagenham	87.5	5.5	2.6	4.4	100.0
Barnet	87.9	5.4	2.0	4.7	100.0
Bexley	88.5	6.9	1.5	3.2	100.0
Brent	84.2	8.0	3.1	4.7	100.0
Bromley	88.3	7.0	1.3	3.4	100.0
Croydon	86.0	7.4	1.8	4.9	100.0
Ealing	86.0	6.6	2.8	4.6	100.0
Enfield	86.2	6.8	2.4	4.6	100.0
Greenwich	85.8	7.4	2.6	4.2	100.0
Harrow*	90.2	2.7	3.5	3.5	100.0
Havering	90.5	5.8	0.8	2.9	100.0
Hillingdon	87.6	6.8	1.1	4.5	100.0
Hounslow	86.8	6.5	2.0	4.6	100.0
Kingston upon Thames	86.6	7.0	1.7	4.7	100.0
Merton	86.1	5.9	3.3	4.7	100.0
Redbridge	87.5	5.8	2.8	3.8	100.0
Richmond upon Thames	88.9	4.8	1.7	4.6	100.0
Sutton	88.6	6.0	1.6	3.8	100.0
Waltham Forest	87.0	6.6	2.4	4.0	100.0
Inner London	85.0	6.2	3.6	5.2	100.0
Outer London	87.2	6.5	2.1	4.2	100.0
Greater London	86.4	6.4	2.6	4.6	100.0
Other	85.2	3.4	4.7	6.7	100.0
Total	86.4	6.4	2.7	4.6	100.0

Note: pupils who would not have changed schools at the end of a phase in the ordinary way in 2002 were those aged 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 or 14 in 2002 and those aged 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 or 15 in 2003.

*Figures for pupils attending Harrow schools, several which are middle schools, and pupils living in the City of London, are excluded from this table

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs.

A8. 2002 key stage 3 English, mathematics and science test results by home and school mobility. Pupils aged 13 in 2002 or 14 in 2003 and entitled to free school meals in 2002

	Number				Percentage			
	No assessment absent or disapplied	Assessed at below level 5	At level 5 or above	Total	No assessment absent or disapplied	Assessed at below level 5	At level 5 or above	Total
English								
Home and school do not differ, 2002 and 2003	2,440	6,561	7,764	16,765	14.6	39.1	46.3	100.0
Both home and school differ 2002 and 2003	108	85	58	251	43.0	33.9	23.1	100.0
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs	131	188	109	428	30.6	43.9	25.5	100.0
2002 and 2003 home differs but school remains same	495	1,070	986	2,551	19.4	41.9	38.7	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	486	214	164	864	56.3	24.8	19.0	100.0
Total	3,660	8,118	9,081	20,859	17.5	38.9	43.5	100.0
Mathematics								
home and school do not differ, 2002 and 2003	1,590	7,572	7,603	16,765	9.5	45.2	45.4	100.0
Both home and school differ 2002 and 2003	117	78	56	251	46.6	31.1	22.3	100.0
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs	108	190	130	428	25.2	44.4	30.4	100.0
2002 and 2003 home differ but school remains same	332	1,253	966	2,551	13.0	49.1	37.9	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	469	234	161	864	54.3	27.1	18.6	100.0
Total	2,616	9,327	8,916	20,859	12.5	44.7	42.7	100.0
Science								
home and school do not differ, 2002 and 2003	1,679	7,937	7,149	16,765	10.0	47.3	42.6	100.0
Both home and school differ 2002 and 2003	111	90	50	251	44.2	35.9	19.9	100.0
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs	125	195	108	428	29.2	45.6	25.2	100.0
2002 and 2003 home differs but school remains same	376	1,318	857	2,551	14.7	51.7	33.6	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	472	229	163	864	54.6	26.5	18.9	100.0
Total	2,763	9,769	8,327	20,859	13.2	46.8	39.9	100.0

Pupils without 2002 records are not included in this table

Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs

A9. 2002 key stage 3 English, mathematics and science test results by home and school mobility. Pupils aged 13 in 2002 or 14 in 2003 with no record of entitlement to free school meals in 2002

	Number				Percentage			
	No assessment absent or disapplied	Assessed at below level 5	At level 5 or above	Total	No assessment absent or disapplied	Assessed at below level 5	At level 5 or above	Total
English								
Home and school do not differ, 2002 and 2003	2,952	11,388	36,509	50,849	5.8	22.4	71.8	100.0
Both home and school differ 2002 and 2003	145	104	142	391	37.1	26.6	36.3	100.0
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs	240	275	485	1,000	24.0	27.5	48.5	100.0
2002 and 2003 home differs but school remains same	508	1,264	2,804	4,576	11.1	27.6	61.3	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	905	479	963	2,347	38.6	20.4	41.0	100.0
Total	4,750	13,510	40,903	59,163	8.0	22.8	69.1	100.0
Mathematics								
Home and school do not differ, 2002 and 2003	2,184	12,385	36,280	50,849	4.3	24.4	71.3	100.0
Both home and school differ 2002 and 2003	118	114	159	391	30.2	29.2	40.7	100.0
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs	217	262	521	1,000	21.7	26.2	52.1	100.0
2002 and 2003 home differs but school remains same	366	1,428	2,782	4,576	8.0	31.2	60.8	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	878	516	953	2,347	37.4	22.0	40.6	100.0
Total	3,763	14,705	40,695	59,163	6.4	24.9	68.8	100.0
Science								
Home and school do not differ, 2002 and 2003	2,210	12,865	35,774	50,849	4.3	25.3	70.4	100.0
Both home and school differ 2002 and 2003	128	124	139	391	32.7	31.7	35.5	100.0
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs	205	311	484	1,000	20.5	31.1	48.4	100.0
2002 and 2003 home differs but school remains same	384	1,472	2,720	4,576	8.4	32.2	59.4	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only	887	516	944	2,347	37.8	22.0	40.2	100.0
Total	3,814	15,288	40,061	59,163	6.4	25.8	67.7	100.0

NB: pupils without 2002 records are not included in this table.
Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs

A10. 2002 key stage 3 English, mathematics and science test results by home and school mobility. All pupils aged 13 in 2002 or 14 in 2003 with or without a record of free school meal entitlement in 2002

	Number				Percentage				
	No assessment absent or disapplied	Assessed at below level 5	At level 5 or above	Total	No assessment absent or disapplied	Assessed at below level 5	At level 5 or above	Total	
English									
home and school do not differ, 2002 and 2003	5,392	17,949	44,273	67,614	8.0	26.5	65.5	100.0	
Both home and school differ 2002 and 2003	253	189	200	642	39.4	29.4	31.2	100.0	
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs	371	463	594	1,428	26.0	32.4	41.6	100.0	
2002 and 2003 home differs but school remains same	1,003	2,334	3,790	7,127	14.1	32.7	53.2	100.0	
Pupil has 2002 record only	1,391	693	1,127	3,211	43.3	21.6	35.1	100.0	
Total	8,410	21,628	49,984	80,022	10.5	27.0	62.5	100.0	
Mathematics									
home and school do not differ, 2002 and 2003		3,774	19,957	43,883	67,614	5.6	29.5	64.9	100.0
Both home and school differ 2002 and 2003		235	192	215	642	36.6	29.9	33.5	100.0
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs		325	452	651	1,428	22.8	31.7	45.6	100.0
2002 and 2003 home differs but school remains same		698	2,681	3,748	7,127	9.8	37.6	52.6	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only		1,347	750	1,114	3,211	41.9	23.4	34.7	100.0
Total		6,379	24,032	49,611	80,022	8.0	30.0	62.0	100.0
Science									
home and school do not differ, 2002 and 2003		3,889	20,802	42,923	67,614	5.8	30.8	63.5	100.0
Both home and school differ 2002 and 2003		239	214	189	642	37.2	33.3	29.4	100.0
2002 and 2003 home same, but school differs		330	506	592	1,428	23.1	35.4	41.5	100.0
2002 and 2003 home differs but school remains same		760	2,790	3,577	7,127	10.7	39.1	50.2	100.0
Pupil has 2002 record only		1,359	745	1,107	3,211	42.3	23.2	34.5	100.0
Total		6,577	25,057	48,388	80,022	8.2	31.3	60.5	100.0

NB: pupils without 2002 records are not included in this table.
Source: merged 2002 and 2003 LPDs

Regular Briefings from the GLA Data Management and Analysis Group

Recent *DMAG Briefings*:

DMAG 2005/1	County of Birth and Labour Market Outcomes	Lorna Spence
DMAG 2005/2	2001 Census: London Country of Birth Profiles	Giorgio Finella
DMAG 2005/3	2001 Census: Economic Activity in London	Giorgio Finella
DMAG 2005/4	2001 Census Profiles: Pakistanis in London	Gareth Piggott
DMAG 2005/5	Indices of Deprivation 2004: Ward analysis	Lovedeep Vaid
DMAG 2005/6	London – The World in a City	Marian Mackintosh
DMAG 2005/7	Claimant Count Model: Technical Note	Lorna Spence/ Georgia Hay
DMAG 2005/8	The National and London Pupil Datasets. An introductory briefing for researchers and research users	David Ewens
DMAG 2005/9	Borough Fertility Rates 2000-02	John Hollis/ Georgia Hay
DMAG 2005/10	Borough Life Tables 2000-02	John Hollis/ Georgia Hay
DMAG 2005/11	Demography Team Workplan 2005-06	John Hollis
DMAG 2005/12	Ethnic Diversity Indices	Baljit Bains
DMAG 2005/13	London Borough and Sub-Regional Demographic Profiles (2003)	Georgia Hay
DMAG 2005/14	Guide to accessing the LHS at the ESRC Data Archive	Lovedeep Vaid
DMAG 2005/15	GLA Ward Population Projection Manual	Georgia Hay
DMAG 2005/16	Income Poverty in London: 2003/04	Lovedeep Vaid
DMAG 2005/17	Focus on London's Demography	John Hollis
DMAG 2005/18	Census Information Note 2005-1	Eileen Howes
DMAG 2005/19	2001 Census: London Country of Birth Profiles – The Arab League	Giorgio Finella
DMAG 2005/20	Benefits Data for London: No 1 Income Support	Lovedeep Vaid
DMAG 2005/21	Transgenerational Ethnicity	Baljit Bains/John Hollis/Vicky Clarke
DMAG 2005/22	Workless Households in London	Lorna Spence
DMAG 2005/23	2001 Census Economic Activity Rates	Georgia Hay
DMAG 2005/24	Ward Risks of Population Change	John Hollis
DMAG 2005/25	Child Yield	John Hollis
DMAG 2005/26	Religious Diversity Indices	Baljit Bains
DMAG 2005/27	ONS Mid-2004 Population Estimates	Georgia Hay
DMAG 2005/28	Benefits Data for London: No 2 Incapacity Benefits and Severe Disability Allowance	Lovedeep Vaid
DMAG 2005/29	Paycheck 2005: An analysis of Household Income Data for London	Lovedeep Vaid
DMAG 2005/32	Moving home and changing school - 1. Widening the analysis of pupil mobility	David Ewens
DMAG 2005/33	GLA 2005 Round Interim Demographic Projections	John Hollis/ Georgia Hay
DMAG 2005/34	Introducing the Annual Population Survey	Lorna Spence
DMAG 2005/35	Trends in Household Worklessness in London	Lorna Spence
DMAG 2005/36	Options. Improving the evidence base for school places planning in London	David Ewens
DMAG 2005/37	Benefits Data for London: No 3 Children in Benefit Claiming Families	Lovedeep Vaid

A full list of the 2004 DMAG Briefings is available to internal customers through the GLA Intranet; otherwise please contact Jackie Maguire who can also provide a CD containing PDF versions of the Briefings or hard copies, jackie.maguire@london.gov.uk.

Contact details for the Data Management and Analysis Group are as follows:

Rob Lewis (020 7983 4652) is Head of the Data Management and Analysis Group.
rob.lewis@london.gov.uk

Bill Armstrong (020 7983 4653) works in the **Census Team** with particular responsibilities for **commissioned tables, workplace data and mapping**. bill.armstrong@london.gov.uk

Baljit Bains (020 7983 4613) works in the **Demography Team** and is responsible for **ethnic demography**, including **ethnic group projections**. baljit.bains@london.gov.uk

Gareth Baker (020 7983 4965) works on **GIS** issues. gareth.baker@london.gov.uk

Shen Cheng (020 7983 4889) works on **Education data** and is responsible for **school roll projections**. shen.cheng@london.gov.uk (maternity leave until early 2006)

David Ewens (020 7983 4656) is responsible for **Education research and data analysis**.
david.ewens@london.gov.uk

Giorgio Finella (020 7983 4328) works in the **Census Team**. giorgio.finella@london.gov.uk

Dennis Grenham (020 7983 4532) works mostly on **statistical compendia, election statistics and special publications**. dennis.grenham@london.gov.uk

Georgia Hay (020 7983 4347) works in the **Demography Team** and is responsible for **ward level projections, the Demography Extranet and borough liaison**.
georgia.hay@london.gov.uk

John Hollis (020 7983 4604) is responsible for the work of the **Demography Team** and the **Social Exclusion Team**, and particularly for **demographic modelling**.
john.hollis@london.gov.uk

Eileen Howes (020 7983 4657) is responsible for the work of the **Census Team** and the **SASPAC** project. eileen.howes@london.gov.uk

Ed Klodawski (020 7983 4694) works in the **Demography Team**. His post is joint with the **London Health Observatory** and specialises in **ethnic and health** issues.
edmund.klodawski@london.gov.uk

Rachel Leeser (020 7983 4699) works in the **Social Exclusion Team** with particular responsibilities for **indicators and income data**. rachel.leeser@london.gov.uk

Alan Lewis (020 7983 4348) works on the **SASPAC** project. alan.lewis@london.gov.uk

Jackie Maguire (020 7983 4655) is responsible to the Group Head and co-ordinates the **administrative and financial** work of the Group. jackie.maguire@london.gov.uk

Michael Minors (020 7983 4654) is responsible for the work of the **General Statistics, Education, and GIS** team. michael.minors@london.gov.uk

Karen Osborne (020 7983 4889) works on **Education data** and is responsible for **school roll projections**. Karen.Osborne@london.gov.uk (maternity cover until early 2006)

Gareth Piggott (020 7983 4327) works in the **Census Team**. gareth.piggott@london.gov.uk

Lorna Spence (020 7983 4658) is a member of the **Social Exclusion Team**, with particular responsibilities for the **Labour Force Survey and benefits data**.
lorna.spence@london.gov.uk

Lovedeep Vaid (020 7983 4699) works in the **Social Exclusion Team** with particular responsibilities for **indicators and income data**. lovedeep.vaid@london.gov.uk (maternity cover until late 2005)

Please use the above descriptions in deciding whom to contact to assist you with your information needs.