

Moving up and moving out: the re-location of elite and middle-class schools from central London to the suburbs

Sol Gamsu, King's College London

This paper examines the role relocation has played in shaping the status of elite and middle-class schools in and around London. A Bourdieusian lens is applied to understand the institutional trajectories of 51 schools which moved from central London out to the suburbs and beyond between the 1860s and 1970s. It is argued that this strategy served to maintain, reinforce and create institutional prestige within the 'field' of schools serving the upper and middle classes. These re-locations have had a lasting effect on London's school system, pushing key institutions of elite social reproduction outwards and away from the city centre. In discussing the motivations for re-location, Bourdieu's (1996) theory of field and elite formation is used with specific reference to urban change, thus developing a Bourdieusian-historical approach to understanding the geography of social reproduction (Thiem, 2009). The focus on London also sets these re-locations in the context of broader socio-spatial shifts within the British upper and middle classes, in which new social formations were emerging, with an aristocratic-financial elite concentrated in the South-East of England (Anderson, 1964; Rubinstein, 1977). Re-location formed part of a broader process of urban and socio-economic transformation which created a powerful educational infrastructure for the upper and middle classes in and around London.

1. Introduction

The suburban growth of British cities and the rising importance of education was central to middle- and upper-class formation over the twentieth century. Education has been dramatically affected by suburban change and suburban schools have played a pivotal role in the social reproduction of the upper and middle classes (Lowe, 1997; Butler and Hamnett, 2011). Whilst these statements are not controversial, the *historical* formation of spatial patterns of social reproduction remains under-researched in geographical and sociological analyses of schooling. Taking a longer-term perspective allows us to examine how geographical location provides symbolic value for schools, allowing them to compete for elite institutional status. This paper examines the re-location of elite and middle-class schools from the centre of London out into the suburbs between the 1860s and the 1970s. It is argued that these re-locations were both a response to and a component of three over-lapping processes of major socio-spatial change, occurring from the 1860s into the 1930s. During this

period, the class-segregated system of schooling became increasingly systematized, major suburbanization occurred in London and other cities, and the British elite and upper-middle class became increasingly concentrated on London and the South-East of England (Simon, 1987; Cain and Hopkins, 1987; Thompson, 1982). In Bourdieu's (1996) terms this was a period in which the rules of the game within the 'field of power' – the scene of social struggle in which the elite is formed, were being re-written.

Re-locating to suburban and rural areas around London had symbolic and economic importance for elite and middle-class schools. From an institutional perspective, re-location was partly a pragmatic concern, reflecting constraints on expansion in crowded, dirty and expensive central London sites. The importance of expansion indicates parallels between school re-locations and industrial decentralisation in London and elsewhere (Keeble, 1968; Scott, 1982). Whilst there are definite similarities surrounding the need to update facilities and the restrictive costs of expanding in central urban areas, the factors relating to labour issues and logistics of industrial production are clearly less relevant. 'Removal', a term used by the Clarendon Commission (1864a: 51), to the suburbs and beyond allowed some schools to cement their institutional position up the hierarchy of a developing 'system' of so-called 'public' schoolsⁱ for the elite and middle classes (Honey, 1977). This paper will show how institutional prestige came to be associated with, and was cultivated in, these new suburban sites, highlighting the broader socio-spatial divisions between inner London and its surrounding suburbs. In doing so it contributes to the urban school choice literature which has previously acknowledged the role of school and neighbourhood histories in shaping the reputations of 'desirable' or 'undesirable' schools (Ball et al., 1995: 74; Butler and Hamnett, 2011: 214-216) without in practice exploring the implications of urban-educational histories in any detail.

In both the analysis of institutional motivations and in how re-locations fitted into shifting patterns of upper and middle-class formation, there are important parallels across the UK and further afield. Analogous re-locations during periods of significant urban and social change have occurred very recently in Santiago de Chile and in Lagos, Nigeria which I will return to later. Closer to home, Seabourne and Lowe (1977: 43) and Marsden (1980) provide evidence of this process elsewhere in the UK (Manchester, Bolton, Liverpool), Seabourne and Lowe in particular in particular noted that acquiring a new site for expansion quickly became associated with attaining ‘a place in the first rank of English schools’. Whilst reasons for re-location in the provinces were broadly similar to those in London, there is little evidence to suggest that London functioned as a model for provincial school relocations which occurred simultaneously but on a much smaller scale, reflecting differing regional demand for upper/middle-class schooling (Bryce, 1868; Rubinstein, 1977).

Re-location of elite and middle-class schools in London has received attention previously but no comprehensive survey of this process has been undertaken. Campbell (1956) closely examined the effects of middle-class suburbanization, noting that this outward residential shift acted as an impetus for schools to re-locate. Since then, Humble (1988) has analysed the influence of the elite male sporting ideology of ‘athleticism’ in encouraging King’s College School (KCS) and Christ’s Hospital School to leave central London. Bartle (1991) examined how City of London School for Boys successfully remained in central London, concluding that re-location of other central schools made survival easier due to a relative lack of competition. This paper draws together these previous analyses in a survey of schools in London which re-located. It sets this within a Bourdieusian frame which sees the role of

athleticism as part of broader shifts in the rules of the game in the field of elite, middle-class schooling. Moreover, London's school system was itself a key component in the socio-spatial re-shaping of the field of power, as the British elite became increasingly concentrated in the 'Crown Heartland' of London and the South-East (Nairn, 2011).

Drawing on a survey of school histories of London and the adjacent rural counties, I map the outward movement of 51 schools, which fall broadly into three periods, from 1853-1914, from 1918 to 1940 and from 1945 to 1977. Following a discussion of the historical-Bourdieuian theoretical approach, methods and the historical context, the paper proceeds with four empirical sections (numbered 5-8). I begin by examining the particular pressures affecting elite, mostly boarding, schools based in London and their re-location to more rural sites, primarily during the first period (5). Section six concentrates on the day schools serving a more middle-class intake, which between the mid-19th century and 1940, frequently used suburban re-location as part of an attempt to increase their social status and ensure economic stability. Following this, I then examine the development of a 'bandwagon effect' which created an increasing pressure on those schools which remained to re-locate to retain their position (7). Finally, I examine the justification behind the post-1945 re-locations in the context of the political Inner-Outer London split over retaining selective state secondary schooling (8).

[2. A historical and Bourdieusian approach to urban schooling](#)

In this section I not only argue that a historical approach is essential but also that it needs to be theoretically informed and empirically supported. The theoretical approach taken here adds a historical angle to the expanding literature (Butler and Hamnett, 2007; McCreary et al., 2013) examining the links between contemporary urban and educational change, which

has also drawn on Pierre Bourdieu (Butler and Robson, 2003; Reay et al., 2011). It thus draws on the recent spatial turn within the history of education (Burke et al., 2010; Saint, 2010) and owes an intellectual debt to Bill Marsden (1977; 1980; Goodenow and Marsden, 1993) who called for schooling to be understood ‘in a trinity of contexts: of time, of place and of society’ (Marsden, 1987: 1). By examining how re-location contributed to shifting patterns of middle and upper class schooling, it also extends our understanding of geographies of social reproduction (Thiem, 2009) – albeit amongst a specific elite and middle-class group. The interest here in elite schools is not an attempt to fetishize these institutions, but rather it is an attempt drawing on a “history from above” [to develop an understanding] of the intricate machinery of class domination’ (Anderson, 1974: 11). The aim in what follows is to reveal the symbolic importance of site and location for elite and middle-class schools and their ability and need to respond to urban change in order to ensure their position within a changing field of upper and middle-class social reproduction; this is what Bourdieu (1996) refers to as the ‘field of power’.

Bourdieu (1996: 264-265) understood the field of power as ‘a gaming space in which those agents and institutions possessing enough specific capital [...] to be able to occupy the dominant positions within their respective field confront each other’. The agents and institutions he was referring to were the dominant classes and the elite universities, *grandes écoles*, providing access to elite cultural and economic occupations. The *grandes écoles* themselves sat within the field of power and the field of higher education where they formed a sub-field of elite universities, itself stratified by geography, cultural or economic focus and alumni links to prestigious occupations (Bourdieu 1996: 133, 197-8). Conceptually Bourdieu framed the stratification of field and sub-field in terms of institutions’ and agents’ stocks of cultural, economic, social and, especially, symbolic capital. The latter provides the capacity

to impose the legitimate world vision, hence defining the rules of the game and field's structure, a '*worldmaking power*' (Original emphasis. Bourdieu, 1987: 17). Within the field of power, there is a constant struggle to 'dictate the *dominant principle of domination*' and 'over the *legitimate principle of legitimation*' (Original emphasis. Bourdieu 1996: 265). Within the sub-field of *grandes écoles* these conflicts work relationally so that institutions employ 'collective and individual strategies aimed at the accumulation of symbolic capital' (Ibid: 198) which affect other actors within the field. These strategies rely on recognition by their target audience (students and their families) for success (Ibid: 198-200). Historical changes to a particular institution, they argue, can only be understood relationally because of the over-lapping effects within the sub-field and the field of power when agents and institutions change (Bourdieu, 1996: 236-7).

As has already been noted above (Seabourne and Lowe 1977: 43), elite and middle-class schools saw their buildings and location as central to asserting their status and legitimacy within the 'field' of elite and middle-class schools. The site of a school, its immediate arrangement of buildings and grounds and its local neighbourhood, became a key element in the struggle for legitimacy and survival. The concept of field has previously been used tentatively to describe how schools are affected by socio-economically segregated neighbourhoods (Byrne and Rogers, 1996); Savage (2013) has suggested field is central to a Bourdieusian urban sociology. Bourdieu (1996) noted the domination of the Parisian elite over the field of *grandes écoles* and the concentration of elite secondary feeder schools in fashionable Paris neighbourhoods. However, only later did he more explicitly acknowledge the overlap between social fields and the spatial domain:

The capital city is – no pun intended – the site of capital, that is, the site in physical space where the positive poles of all the fields are concentrated along with most of the agents occupying these dominant positions

(Bourdieu, 1999: 125)

London's elite schools operate both within the context of the city's residential divisions, within a national and regional hierarchy of schooling and within the contested socio-spatial field of power of British elite and middle-class formation. Their geographical sites and buildings have become, 'site[s] of capital' and re-location was central to this, allowing the development of spacious facilities for sport and a specific architecture associated with elite schools (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009: 1108-1109). As re-location became an accepted strategy for re-positioning an institution, a bandwagon effect (Abrahamson and Rosenkopf, 1993), as we see below developed with schools re-locating due to potential loss of legitimacy or competitive advantage as their peer institutions moved out. Although the focus in what follows is on understanding one strategy for the accumulation of symbolic capital, namely re-location, it requires a similar understanding of overlapping structural histories of different fields. This requires a contextual understanding of the elite and middle-class 'public' schools within the nascent field (and system) of schooling, the historical residential development of London, and the broader developments with the emergence in the UK of London and the South-East as its key geographical pole of power. These three overlapping histories and necessary contexts are discussed in section 4.

3. Methods

To ascertain which schools re-located the school websites of secondary schools in and around London were surveyed. This provided a list of 51 schools (Table 1) which first re-located between 1853 and 1977. Using Booth's maps (LSE Library and Senate House Library, 2002)

and individual school histories, the school sites were mapped using QGIS (2012). Figure 1 shows schools in the original or mid-19th century location, Figure 2 shows their final or current location. In this survey of London school histories, the majority of re-located schools, 41 out of 51, moved before 1940. Re-location involved 22 of the approximately 74 secondary schools mapped and analysed by Fearon (1868) in his review of London's 'middle class' schools for the Taunton Commission.

4. Context: Suburbs, schooling and the formation of the 'Crown Heartland' elite

Suburbanization is used here primarily to denote the outward residential movement of the middle classes from central locations in London from the mid-19th century onwards.

However, substantial working-class suburbanization also occurred (Clapson, 1998) with poor educational provision in London's suburban social housing (Jackson, 1973). Suburban development was also inter-twined with inner-city decline, as the diversion of capital and middle-class residents outwards contributed to 'slum' creation (Dyos and Reeder, 1973).

There was also considerable differentiation between and within the suburbs (Johnson, 1964; Thompson, 1982), the development of Paddington and Kensington being 'visible evidence of the formation of an upper-middle class', with the aristocratic reputation of Kensington attracting to the western suburbs those members of the middle class aspiring to greater 'gentility' (Reeder, 1968). This reflected how suburban development was linked to middle-class aspirations of acquiring lesser forms of aristocratic status (Anderson, 1964: 31-32; Thompson, 1982: 16). It is this later wave of suburbanization, from the 1860s onwards and inter-war suburbanization, combined with changes in central London which provided the context for most school re-locations.

With the rise of the salaried professional middle classes, formal educational qualifications became increasingly important for social mobility and social reproduction (Banks, 1955: 4). The state was increasingly involved, commissioning three national inquiries into Elementary Education for the working classes (The Newcastle Commission, 1861), elite ‘public’ schools (Clarendon Commission, 1864), and grammar schools (The Taunton Commission, 1868). These commissions aimed to resolve legal regularities, update curricula – particularly to include science, and in practice, and often explicitly, to maintain and augment class stratification between the three systems (Simon, 1974). London’s secondary schools remained the preserve of the middle and upper classes (Smith, 1892: 261). Fearon (1868: 233), charged with reviewing ‘middle class education in the metropolis’ for Taunton defined the lower-middle class as those parents who could not afford for their children to study beyond 12-13 whilst more affluent studied until 14-19.

The period following these reports represents a period of flux for elite middle-class schooling as with the exception, perhaps, of the historically elite Clarendon schools, many more middle-class schools were in a ‘process of “becoming” rather than that of “being”’ a public school (Leinster-Mackay, 1981: 63-64). Risk of closure was real and buildings were a key way to assert public school status symbolically to ensure economic survival (Ibid: 62). This was a period of ‘symbolic struggles’ (Bourdieu, 1996: 197-207) to define the criteria by which a public school for the elite and middle classes would be defined and judged. Honey (1977: 145) argued that by 1900 this was likely to include the quality of staff, buildings, characteristics of the clientele, playing fields, academic and sporting successes, traditions (songs, chapel) and Old Boy networks. In this context, Clarendon (1864a: 50) found that historically elite central London schools faced ‘obvious disadvantages’ and Taunton similarly noted the ‘remarkable effects’ of suburbanization and the railways on older, central, middle-

class schools (Fearon, 1868b: 247-248) . ‘Removal’ as it was termed by Clarendon and the schools (Davies, 1921: 276-277; Clarendon Commission, 1864a: 51), to larger green-field sites further out offered the apparent solution to problems which were both urban and educational in origin. The development of a bandwagon effect as more schools left the city centre, is indicative of how site and buildings became central to affirming institutional status.

In class terms, the growing demand for ‘public’ schools with its upper-class connotations and reproductive function was indicative of broader shifts at the higher end of the social structure. In the early 19th century the aristocracy was under-represented in the public schools but by the 1870s public school attendance ‘became the common experience of the sons of the English upper classes’ (Honey, 1977: 146). What was occurring within elite and middle-class schools was ‘a deliberate, systematized symbiosis’ of the rising professional upper-middle class, the growing commercial-financial elite and the aristocracy with the ‘polymorphous reservoir’ of the aspirant middle class beneath them (Anderson, 1964: 32-33). Schooling served as a “unifying influence” (Wilkinson, 1962: 321) within the new upper classes though the field of public schools was also stratified. Older boarding schools like Eton and Rugby, became more aristocratic, at least until 1850 (Bamford, 1961), but there were relatively few schools dominated by the aristocratic-financial elite (Rubinstein, 1986: 173-174) and many new schools offered similar schooling more cheaply for the middle classes (Honey, 1977: 124-125). This distinction between older, historically elite boarding schools and newer middle-class day schools is also reflected in their re-locations as will be seen below. The term elite and middle-class schools is used to reflect this stratification of intake and prestige within the public school system, whilst emphasising the substantial over-lap in the culture, academic attainment and traditions the schools developed.

These new schools were, largely, concentrated in the South of England and particularly around London (Rubinstein, 1977: 113-114). This reflected the growth of financial wealth based in London and the cultural-political fusion we have already noted between the landed aristocracy and London's financial elite (Cain and Hopkins, 1987: 5). Nairn (2011: 243-244) described this regional political-economic constellation within the UK as the 'Crown Heartland' which formed 'a Southern-lowland hegemonic bloc uniting an hereditary elite to the central processing unit of commercial and financial capital.' This political and economic concentration of power on London and the South-East has, of course, continued to grow (Martin, 1988), which has sustained a continuing regional bias in fee-paying schooling (Bradford and Burdett, 1989; Gamsu, 2015). The scale of re-location that took place in London compared to other British cities was a reflection, though clearly not a direct causal influence, of the distinctive process of class formation and the spatial shifts that were already occurring in South-Eastern England more than a century ago. Re-location contributed to the creation of an infrastructure for middle/upper-class education which, in its scale and size, remains without parallel in the UK.

[Table 1 about here. Figure 1 and 2 follow directly on a separate page.]

5. Clarendon removals: Re-location gains elite connotations

Though re-location pre-dated the Clarendon Report of 1864, the report's serious consideration of removal for the most elite schools in London indicated the shifting rules of legitimacy and survival. Removal from the centre became an established strategy for schools seeking to bolster or assert their position in relation to other elite and middle-class secondary schools in London and the country as a whole. In this section I outline how this strategy

became associated with older, historic schools of the elite by examining the case for removal Clarendon laid out.

The Clarendon Report sought to outline the state of, and prognosis for, British elite schooling (Shrosbree, 1988). It covered only nine boys schools, Winchester, Eton, Rugby, Shrewsbury, Harrow, Westminster, Merchant Taylor's, Charterhouse and St. Paul's. The latter four were all situated in what had become densely built-up central-London neighbourhoods. These locations restricted sport and expensive local land was prohibitive to new buildings. Moreover, sport was increasingly important the Commission (1864a: 50) noted, and this dominant cultural-educational role within elite English schools made it a key measure of public school identity (Mangan, 2000). Sporting prowess provided schools with a form of symbolic capital, involving recognition from both parents and other institutions. This was key both for elite Clarendon schools which re-located, particularly Charterhouse, and for newer day schools like KCS and other boarding schools like Christ's Hospital (Humble, 1988; Allan and Morpurgo, 1984).

In another sign of change, boarding, considered a 'hallmark' of the status provided by elite schooling (Honey, 1977: 151-153), was increasingly vulnerable in London. Railway expansion increased competition from new rural boarding schools (Usher et al., 1981: 33). In contrast, central-London boarding was seen as increasingly unattractive by wealthy, elite parents who desired 'country air' for their children (Clarendon Commission, 1864b: 393). In recommending removal for boarding schools, the Clarendon commission was reflecting upon growing middle-class demand for day schooling. Whilst Westminster and Charterhouse's numbers were declining, day schools like Merchant Taylor's and KCS were, in the 1860s,

highly successful without the spatial or financial demands of boarding facilities (Clarendon Commission, 1864b: 171, 404-405). London's railways also enabled day schooling to become the norm for wealthier metropolitan middle-class parents whilst the lower-middle class remained reliant on local schools (Fearon, 1868: 242-247). School choice thus indicated distinctions within the middle classes, with the urban upper-middle class, like the aristocracy, still preferring boarding. Within the Clarendon schools there were also significant distinctions with a larger lower-/professional middle class presence at the London day schools compared with than the boarding schools which were more aristocratic (Bamford, 1961; Allen, 1982). As wealthier elite parents increasingly opted for rural boarding schools, the number of aristocratic boys at Westminster declined (Clarendon Commission, 1864a: 170-171). Charterhouse's head noted that whilst day schools primarily served the professional middle classes 'we are principally a boarding school for gentlemen's sons' (Clarendon Commission, 1864c: 4). As a boarding school, the head argued, 'there is nothing local in its objects of character, and very few of our boys actually come from London', moreover recruiting local day boys would be unattractive given the large number of 'tradesmen' working in local warehouses. At the educational apex, neighbouring locality apparently mattered only insofar as it hindered teaching or recreation through lack of space, or the recruitment of students through being off-putting to prospective parents.

Despite internal resistance to removal during the Clarendon Commission (1864c: 4), a new head at Charterhouse succeeded in re-locating by 1872 (Quick, 1990: 61-62). The schools' new buildings in rural Surrey reveal the overlap between school architecture and other major elite cultural institutions. Charterhouse was part-designed by Arthur Blomfield, who built Bancroft's, Royal Hospital School, parts of Eton and several Oxbridge colleges. Sir Aston

Webb, who designed the Royal Russell School, also built/re-designed the Victoria and Albert Museum, King's College Cambridge and Buckingham Palace. These architects built the key cultural institutions of Britain's national and imperial elite. Re-location thus allowed schools to reflect and strengthen their links to these elite architectural forms. This underlines the central role of new buildings in enhancing the symbolic capital of schools. Moreover, it indicated how these institutions were physically incorporated within the literal and figurative architecture of the field of power in South-East England.

Charterhouse's re-location was a success, numbers more than doubling four years after removal, though Westminster resisted removal and remains in central London. Though not exceptional in surviving as a fee-paying, elite central London school (See Bartle, 1991), Westminster is one of only two inner-London *boarding* schools in their original site. In contrast, Charterhouse, whilst not the first removal, set the benchmark for several older schools like Merchant Taylors and Christ Hospital which would also purchase expansive, rail-accessible sites outside London, either building lavish new buildings or developing former aristocratic mansions. These schools saw removal as ultimately necessary to retain their position amongst the elite schools and by re-locating they added to a cluster of elite boarding schools which still surround London.

6. Suburban re-locations and schools for the 'spacious middle-class suburbs'ⁱⁱ

The suburbanization of London's middle classes provides the contextual backdrop for many of the re-locations described here. For the newer middle-class day schools, which were almost entirely financially dependent on fee-income, lacking the endowments of the sub-set

of historic elite schools, success was more closely tied to the whims and desires of London's middle classes. However, whilst Marsden (1987: 129) saw 'locational shifts' as 'the stuff of the adjustment of the middle-class day school system to social change' referring in particular to suburbanization, only in a handful of school histories is there explicit mention of clientele suburbanization as a direct cause. For most schools, overcrowding and the need to expand triggered re-location with other factors such as sanitary conditions, disease, high land costs in central London and compulsory purchase orders also significant. Where data is available, however, the increasing outward movement of intake plays a role in re-location.

For some schools such as St. Olave and St. Saviour's (re-located 1968), clientele suburbanization occurred over a long period with slower effects, but for Haberdasher's Aske Boys and Girls schools and University College School (UCS) clientele suburbanization contributed to pre-1914 removal. The head of Aske Girls proposed the move as a means of protecting 'her girls from the "unseemly behaviour" of "street toughs"' and reversing falling numbers by removing to the Northern suburbia of her clientele (Wigley, 2007: 14). The gendered nature of siting private girls schools in rural locations away from the apparent moral dangers of the inner-city has been covered in greater depth by Goodman (2005). Marsden (1987: 127-128) also noted that the girls and boys who were actually commuting into these central neighbourhoods, experienced little anxiety, despite parents' concerns. Here, as with North London Collegiate School (NLCS), the demographic 'decline' of the local neighbourhood went in tandem with intake suburbanization, indicating how schools were affected by the dual development of slums as the middle classes vacated certain neighbourhoods (Dyos and Reeder, 1973). NLCS had previously recruited professional middle-class girls, 'principally from the neighbourhood' (Fearon, 1868: 288-289) of Camden and Kentish Town. However, by the 1890s inspectors noted the increase in professionals'

daughters commuting in from Middlesex, as the local area declined (Watson, 2000: 58-60). For UCS intake from these two neighbourhoods also halved between 1876 and 1887 (Usher et al., 1981: 40). Intake increased by 20% from affluent Hampstead, which lacked a boys' school and the school re-located there in 1907. NLCS however, waited until 1940 to move and preserve institutional autonomy, as declining inner London fee-income was forcing reliance on state scholarships and re-location allowed proximity to suburban middle-class fee-payers.

Outward re-location to spacious sites in suburban middle-class neighbourhoods was a key strategy in asserting themselves as middle-class day schools. Whilst the importance of architecture, sports and buildings was comparable to the older elite schools, these day schools were also competing within a market of suburban day schooling with a clientele perhaps inclined towards shorter commutes as was the case at Aske's Boys school whilst located in West Hampstead (Blessley, 1999). The latter was considered a lower-middle-class school by Fearon (1868: 239), but following the move the school 'rebranded itself and went upmarket' (Wigley, 2007: 40). This new identity was deliberately consolidated after 1918 with expansion of post-16 'sixth form' study, adoption of elite sports and membership of the Head Master's Conferenceⁱⁱⁱ (Ibid: 52-57). For these less-established schools proximity to their clientele was perhaps more important financially and re-location resolved this problem whilst allowing them to assert their public school identity, gaining the symbolic capital, traditions, buildings and sports associated with elite public schools.

7. Bandwagon effects 1890s-1930s: 'the tide [is] running rather against us...'

Another factor encouraging removal was the simple fact that already by the 1890s several schools had already re-located, 12 of the 51 included here. There is a clear development of a bandwagon effect in the late 19th century and early 20th century as schools jostled to keep up with their relocating peers and retain their position and status. When deciding to move, both UCS and KCS noted that their rivals had already re-located which threatened their competitiveness (Usher et al., 1981: 42; Hinde, 1995: 32-41). The development of a bandwagon effect combined with other local factors meant 26 removals occurred between 1853 and 1914, a further 14 moved in the inter-war period. Larger, suburban sites became key signs of legitimate belonging to elite and middle-class schools in and around London.

Writing to Merchant Taylor's head in 1928, Cyril Norwood, a well-known headteacher, predicted 'a belt of good secondary schools' for the middle class would be built around London (Draper, 1962: 214). Norwood's prediction revealed how the model for day schools in London's periphery and suburbs had become established. Before removal in 1933, Merchant Taylor's head wrote:

"We can carry on where we are for a few years to come, the tide running rather against us, and continue to do good work; but the tide will increase in strength as years go on, our handicaps will grow and we are likely eventually to find ourselves outstripped and left. At Charterhouse we can never re-join the number of the great schools of England."

(Draper, 1962: 214)

Merchant Taylor's perceived itself to be out of step with its competitors, revealing the role of field effects (Bourdieu, 1996: 132) and how location and site had become central to maintaining status. For newer 19th century schools like UCS or KCS, this was a question of

asserting their position as elite, middle-class London schools, where their position was recognized but not yet secure. For others, like Haberdasher's, the period following re-location coincided with an upgrading aspirations, breaking with previous charitable functions for the poor and becoming 'public schools'.

Though prestigious West-London day schools remained, London's geography of middle-class and elite schools had been transformed by the inter-war period. The City of London and the East End in particular (Fearon, 1868: 247-248), had been almost emptied of their fee-paying middle-class schools due to closure or re-location. Suburban grammar schools did not experience the same decline in middle-class intake as inner-London schools as suburbanization occurred, and generally did not share the fate of certain inner-London schools of financial difficulties, closure, amalgamation, LCC take-over or removal (Campbell, 1956: 55-64). These changes indicated how the location of elite, middle-class schooling had been geographically pushed outwards by suburbanization and re-location with the remaining inner London schools of the elite clustered in historic upper/middle-class inner suburbs (e.g. Kensington, Dulwich).

8. Re-locations after 1945 and the educational dominance of the South-East

After 1945 the major institutions for middle-class and elite secondary education in and around London, and the norms to which they adhered, were largely established. Particularly amongst the sub-set of schools which were wholly independent of state-funding, there has been relatively little change since 1945 in their institutional composition, as these fee-paying 'public' schools have remained impervious to dramatic government-led reform. Nevertheless,

re-location did occur but these removals were not implicated in the same earlier process of establishing legitimacy, instead it was rather a question of preserving academic selection within the state sector. Compulsory secondary schooling after 1944, and the gradual ending of selection at 11 in Inner London, reinforced a structural division within London's secondary schools, now accessible to all. In this final section, I examine how the later school re-locations were both caused by and reinforced educational divisions between Inner and Outer London.

Suburban growth of 'Greater' London created 'an arena of entrenched territorial conflict' (Pimlott and Rao, 2002: 21) between the divergent interests of the old LCC area and Outer London's generally more affluent suburbs. From the mid-1960s one axis of this conflict was the comprehensive school reform of secondary schooling to end selection at 11. After local government reform in 1965, schools in boroughs of what had been the LCC were governed by the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA, see Figure 2) whilst the more affluent, Conservative-voting Outer London boroughs were individually responsible for education. Suburban authorities tended to be largely governed by Conservative local councils (Walks, 2005), who implemented comprehensive reform slowly if at all (Kerckhoff et al., 1996). Of the twenty Outer London boroughs, seven kept grammar schools, as did several Conservative counties surrounding London.

Whilst re-locating schools after 1945 again acted on diverse and individual logics, including over-crowding and suburbanization, in the case of at least three schools, Wilson's, Dame Alice Owen's and Parmiter's, avoiding comprehensivization along ILEA lines was central to re-location to Outer London and beyond. This strengthened, and helped create, a major

suburban state-sponsored conduit to elite universities and, in terms of Oxbridge successes, a sub-set of these Outer London selective schools now compete with the most established elite private schools. Re-location acted to reinforce this structural division between London's schools, which was for a long time exacerbated by what educationalist Peter Newsam described in 1983 as 'an irreversible downward spiral' of Inner London state schools due to continuing middle-class suburbanization, racial tensions and mass migration (Kerckhoff et al., 1996: 78-79).

Whilst this is no longer true of Inner London state schools (Greaves et al., 2014), the suburban and rural grammars in and around London, remain a key component for upper-middle and middle-class reproduction. Contemporary data suggests the continued clustering of schools which send high numbers of students to Oxbridge in the South-East of England (DfE, 2014). In 2011-12, re-located Outer London schools such as St Paul's Boys, KCS, NLCS and St Olave's sent very large numbers of students to Oxbridge both in absolute and relative terms, and 12 of the re-located schools were in the top 100 English schools for the proportion of students attending Oxbridge as a percentage of each school (See Table 1). The regional bias to Oxbridge access has been corroborated by the Sutton Trust (2011), who found that of the 12 local authority areas sending over 2% of their students to Oxbridge only one, Trafford in Manchester, was from outside of the South-East. Whilst re-location played only a small part in structuring and concentrating these elite schools in the broader South-East, it has had a significant legacy on London's school system. The schools of London and the South-East, in flux in the late 19th century period of expansion, have firmly cemented themselves as schools for the elite and middle-classes, providing the educational infrastructure of the Crown Heartland and the English-British field of power.

9. Conclusion

Removal to the suburbs began as a strategy to permit expansion of buildings and facilities reflecting new trends within elite and middle-class schools in England and especially in the South-East. The late 19th and early 20th century was a key period in fixing many legitimate forms of symbolic capital which belonging to and competition within this field required. For a large number of schools, central London no longer offered a suitable locality to sustain their position. The specificities of individual removals from central London reflected the subtle hierarchy between older, historically elite schools and newer arrivals whose financial and symbolic position within the field was less secure. These re-locations reinforced two powerful images of elite and middle-class schooling – the Southern fee-paying ‘public’ school with its elite 19th century architecture, rural but within easy reach of London, and in ‘the more spacious suburbs’ the middle-class grammar and day schools (Hall, 1974: 54). Post-1945 these re-locations reflected growing political divisions within London between the affluent suburbs and inner London. However, these re-locations also reflected the broader changes within the field of power which saw the British elite concentrated on London and South-East England. During 1870-1940, when re-locations primarily occurred, a cultural-political fusion cemented the aristocracy and the financial elite together, with the aspirant pool of the middle classes beneath it. This re-shaping of the field of power required an expanded system of elite/middle-class schooling to provide this shared cultural and educational culture. Re-locations were one strand of this broader process which both confirmed many of the norms and rules of legitimacy within the field of elite, middle-class

schooling and created an educational infrastructure in South-East England to reproduce this hegemonic English elite.

Whilst this process may appear peculiarly English in its idiosyncrasies, re-location of elite schools as sub-/urban change occurs and upper and middle-class educational and residential preferences change also has international parallels. The most direct and interesting comparisons come from Santiago de Chile where the development of upper- and upper-middle-class suburbs in the North-East over the last two decades have seen the re-location of elite schools like Santiago College which moved from the old centre to the new suburb of La Dehesa in 2011 (Mendez, 2015). Several historic state-funded schools of the elite in Lagos also re-located from Lagos island in the 1950s out to what were then rural or peripheral urban areas, allowing space for new building and sports grounds (Osime, 2014). There are also parallels in Philadelphia, USA with site selection and re-location of a white middle-class high school in response to white flight and African American migration (Clapper, 2006). In the UK, as in Chile and perhaps Nigeria too, these re-locations contributed to the creation of an educational infrastructure for social reproduction of the elite and middle class in and around London, which continues to influence the city's geography of schooling.

The theoretical approach developed here provides a means of extending our analysis of the geography of social reproduction. A Bourdieusian framing of field, allows a relational understanding of processes of institutional change and this paper examines the spatial dimension of elite and middle-class institutional strategies to retain status relative to their peers. This underlines the scope to spatialize Bourdieu's analysis of elite and middle-class formation and reproduction, but also points to the need to join his approach to structural

historical analysis of French elites with local structural analyses of systems of social reproduction and the development of capitalism, in this case in the UK (Anderson, 1964; Cain and Hopkins, 1987). Further work needs to be done to understand how contemporary structural shifts in capitalism at a national, and international, scale are transforming patterns of social reproduction within the school system at a regional and local level. This study of London's schooling over a century indicates that issues of social reproduction are key to understanding the slowly evolving changes in the social as well as economic structure of capitalist societies, not only in London and the UK but also elsewhere.

Notes

¹ The term 'public school' is used to describe the older private, fee-paying schools in the UK. Shrosbree (1998: 11-16) discusses the ambiguities and the 19th century roots of this term.

² (Hall, 1974: 51).

³ The Headmaster's Conference (HMC) is now a membership group of 200 private schools, primarily in the UK.

References

- Abrahamson E and Rosenkopf L. (1993) Institutional and competitive bandwagons: Using mathematical modeling as a tool to explore innovation diffusion. *Academy of management review* 18: 487-517.
- Allan GA and Morpurgo JE. (1984) *Christ's Hospital*, London: Town & County.
- Allen EA. (1982) Public School Elites in Early-Victorian England: The Boys at Harrow and Merchant Taylors' Schools from 1825 to 1850. *The Journal of British Studies* 21: 87-117.
- Anderson P. (1964) Origins of the present crisis. *New Left Review* 23: 20-77.
- Anderson P. (1974) *Lineages of the absolutist state*, London: NLB.
- Ball SJ, Bowe R and Gewirtz S. (1995) Circuits of schooling: a sociological exploration of parental choice of school in social class contexts. *Sociological Review* 43: 52-78.
- Bamford TW. (1961) Public Schools and Social Class, 1801-1850. *British Journal of Sociology*: 224-235.
- Banks O. (1955) *Parity and prestige in English secondary education: A study in educational sociology*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bartle GF. (1991) Surviving in central London: problems of a boys' public day school between the wars. *History of Education* 20: 359-376.
- Blessley K. (1999) *The Happiest Days? A nostalgic wander down Westbere Road in the Twenties*. Available at: <http://www.oldhabs.com/main.php?p=hapdays1920>.
- Bourdieu P. (1987) What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of groups. *Berkeley journal of sociology*: 1-17.
- Bourdieu P. (1996) *The state nobility: Elite schools in the field of power*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu P. (1999) *The weight of the world*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bradford M and Burdett F. (1989) Spatial polarisation of private education in England. *Area*: 47-57.
- Bryce J. (1868) *General report on the County of Lancaster*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Burke C, Cunningham P and Grosvenor I. (2010) 'Putting education in its place': space, place and materialities in the history of education. *History of Education* 39: 677-680.

- Butler T and Hamnett C. (2007) The geography of education: Introduction. *Urban Studies* 44: 1161-1174.
- Butler T and Hamnett C. (2011) *Ethnicity, class and aspiration: understanding London's New East End*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Butler T and Robson G. (2003) *London calling: the middle classes and the re-making of inner London*, Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Byrne D and Rogers T. (1996) Divided spaces: divided schools. *Sociological Research Online* 1.
- Cain PJ and Hopkins AG. (1987) Gentlemanly capitalism and British expansion overseas II: new imperialism, 1850-1945. *The Economic History Review* 40: 1-26.
- Campbell F. (1956) *Eleven plus and all that: the grammar school in a changing society*, London: Watts.
- Clapper M. (2006) School Design, Site Selection, and the Political Geography of Race in Postwar Philadelphia. *Journal of Planning History* 5: 241-263.
- Clapson M. (1998) *Invincible green suburbs, brave new towns: social change and urban dispersal in post-war England*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Clarendon Commission. (1864a) Report of the commissioners on the revenues and management of certain colleges and schools and the studies pursued and instruction given therein. Vol I. REPORT. London: Houses of Parliament.
- Clarendon Commission. (1864b) Report of the commissioners on the revenues and management of certain colleges and schools and the studies pursued and instruction given therein. Vol III. Evidence Part 1. Eton, Winchester, Westminster. London: Houses of Parliament.
- Clarendon Commission. (1864c) Report of the commissioners on the revenues and management of certain colleges and schools and the studies pursued and instruction given therein. Vol IV. Evidence Part 2. Charterhouse, St. Paul's, Merchant Taylors', Harrow, Rugby, Shrewsbury. London: Houses of Parliament.
- Davies G. (1921) *Charterhouse in London*, London: John Murray.
- DfE. (2014) Key stage 5: institution level tables (including characteristics) - SFR19/2014. In: Department for Education (ed) 1 ed. London: HMS Government.
- Draper FWM. (1962) *Four Centuries of Merchant Taylors' School, 1561-1961*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dyos HJ and Reeder D. (1973) Slums and suburbs. In: Dyos HJ and Reeder D (eds) *The Victorian city: images and realities*. London: Taylor & Francis, pp. 359-386.
- Fearon DR. (1868) *Vol. X London Division*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Gamsu S. (2015) *Geographies of class, place and education: Deepening North-South divisions in independent schooling*. Available at: <https://berarespectingchildren.wordpress.com/2015/02/17/geographies-of-class-place-and-education-deepening-north-south-divisions-in-independent-schooling/>.
- Gaztambide-Fernández R. (2009) What is an elite boarding school? *Review of Educational Research* 79: 1090-1128.
- Goodenow RK and Marsden WE. (1993) *The city and education in four nations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodman J. (2005) A cloistered ethos? Landscapes of learning and English secondary schools for girls: an historical perspective. *Paedagogica historica* 41: 589-603.
- Greaves E, Macmillan L and Sibieta L. (2014) Lessons from London schools for attainment gaps and social mobility. In: Commission SMaCP (ed). London: Institute for Fiscal Studies and the Institute of Education.
- Hall S. (1974) Education and the crisis of the urban school. In: Raynor J (ed) *Open University, Issues in Urban Education*. Milton Keynes: Open University, 49-53.
- Hinde T. (1995) *A Great Day School in London: A History of King's College School*, London: James and James.

- Honey J. (1977) *Tom Brown's universe: The development of the public school in the 19th century*. London: Millington.
- Humble N. (1988) Leaving London: a study of two public schools and athleticism 1870–1914. *History of Education* 17: 149-162.
- Jackson AA. (1973) *Semi-detached London: suburban development, life and transport, 1900-39*: Allen & Unwin.
- Johnson JH. (1964) The suburban expansion of housing in London 1918–1939. In: Coppock JT and Prince HC (eds) *Greater London*. London: Faber and Faber, 142-166.
- Keeble DE. (1968) Industrial decentralization and the metropolis: the north-west London case. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*: 1-54.
- Kerckhoff AC, Fogelman K, Crook D, et al. (1996) *Going comprehensive in England and Wales: A study of uneven change*, London: Woburn Press.
- Leinster-Mackay D. (1981) Victorian quasi-public schools: A question of appearance and reality or an application of the principle of the survival of the fittest? *British Journal of Educational Studies* 29: 54-68.
- Lowe R. (1997) *Schooling and social change: 1964-1990*, London: Routledge.
- LSE Library and Senate House Library. (2002) *The Charles Booth Online Archive*. Available at: <http://booth.lse.ac.uk>.
- Mangan JA. (2000) *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian public school: The emergence and consolidation of an educational ideology*, London: Routledge.
- Marsden W. (1980) Travelling to School: Aspects of Nineteenth-century Catchment Areas. *Geography*: 19-26.
- Marsden WE. (1977) Historical geography and the history of education. *History of Education* 6: 21-42.
- Marsden WE. (1987) *Unequal educational provision in England and Wales: the nineteenth-century roots*, London: Woburn Press.
- Martin R. (1988) The political economy of Britain's north-south divide. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*: 389-418.
- McCreary T, Basu R and Godlewska A. (2013) Critical Geographies of Education: Introduction to the Special Issue. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien* 57: 255-259.
- Mendez ML. (2015) Upper middle class reproduction in Santiago: how to reproduce privilege in a context of increasing wealth. *American Association of Geographer's Annual Meeting*. Chicago.
- Nairn T. (2011) *The enchanted glass: Britain and its monarchy*, London: Verso.
- Osime E. (2014) *Queen's College Lagos: About Us*. Available at: <http://queenscollegelagos.com/about-us.html>.
- Pimlott B and Rao N. (2002) *Governing London*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quantum GIS Development Team. (2012) Quantum GIS geographic information system.
- Quick A. (1990) *Charterhouse: a History of the School*, London: James & James.
- Reay D, Crozier G and James D. (2011) *White Middle Class Identities and Urban Schooling*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Reeder D. (1968) A Theatre of Suburbs: Some Patterns of Development in West London, 1801-1911. In: Dyos HJ (ed) *The Study of Urban History*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Rubinstein W. (1977) Wealth, elites and the class structure of modern Britain. *Past and Present*: 99-126.
- Rubinstein W. (1986) Education and the Social Origins of British Elites 1880-1970. *Past and Present*: 163-207.
- Saint A. (2010) Battersea: education in a London parish since 1750. *History of Education* 39: 681-693.
- Savage M. (2013) The lost urban sociology of Pierre Bourdieu. In: Bridge G and Watson S (eds) *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Chichester: Wiley and Sons, 511-520.

- Scott AJ. (1982) Locational patterns and dynamics of industrial activity in the modern metropolis. *Urban Studies* 19: 111-141.
- Seaborne MVJ and Lowe R. (1977) *The English School: Its Architecture and Organization. Vol. 2, 1870-1970*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Shrosbree C. (1988) *Public schools and private education: the Clarendon Commission, 1861-64, and the Public Schools Acts*: Manchester University Press.
- Simon B. (1974) *The two nations and the educational structure 1780-1870*: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Simon B. (1987) Systematization and segmentation in education: The case of England. In: Müller D, Ringer F and Simon B (eds) *The Rise of the Modern Educational System (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 88-110.
- Smith HL. (1892) Secondary education - Boys. In: Booth C (ed) *Life and Labour of the People in London: Blocks of buildings, schools and immigration*. London: Macmillan and Company, pp. 247-289.
- Sutton Trust. (2011) Degrees of Success. University Chances by Individual School. *London: The Sutton Trust*.
- Thiem CH. (2009) Thinking through education: the geographies of contemporary educational restructuring. *Progress in Human Geography* 33: 154-173.
- Thompson FML. (1982) *The rise of suburbia*, Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Usher H, Black-Hawkins CD, Carrick G, et al. (1981) *An angel without wings: the history of University College School 1830-1980*, London: University College School.
- Walks RA. (2005) City-suburban electoral polarization in Great Britain, 1950-2001. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30: 500-517.
- Watson N. (2000) *And Their Works Do Follow Them: The Story of North London Collegiate School*, London: James & James.
- Wigley J. (2007) *Serve and Obey: The Story of The Haberdashers' Aske's Boys' School*. London: James & James.
- Wilkinson R. (1962) Political leadership and the late Victorian public school. *British Journal of Sociology*: 320-330.

Table 1. List of re-located schools

Figure 1: Map showing original sites of re-located schools.

Figure 2: Map showing current or final sites of re-located schools.

Map No.	School Name (Date of second move)	Current school type and status	Date moved	Map No.	School Name (Date of second move)	Current school type and status	Date moved
1	Royal Masonic School Girls (1934)	Independent	1853	27	Strand Grammar School	Defunct Grammar	1913
2	Royal Russell School (1924)	Independent	1866	28	The Alfred School (London)	Independent	1921
3	Reeds School (1946)	Independent	1871	29	City of London Freeman's School	Independent	1926
4	Charterhouse*	Independent	1872	30	St. Clement Danes (1975)	Partially selective academy	1928
5	St John's School Leatherhead	Independent	1872	31	Valentines High School (prev. Ilford County High)	Comprehensive	1929
6	Merchant Taylor's School (1933)*	Independent	1875	32	Notting Hill and Ealing High School	Independent	1930
7	Lady Eleanor Holles School (1937)*	Independent	1878	34	Whitgift School	Independent	1931
8	Emanuel School	Independent	1883	33	Trinity School (1965)	Independent	1931
9	Caterham School	Independent	1884	35	Royal Hospital School	Independent	1933
10	St Paul's School (1968)*	Independent	1884	36	Ashlyns School	Comprehensive	1935
11	St Joseph's College (1903)	Faith-based academy	1885	37	Ilford County High School	Grammar	1935
12	St. Dunstan's College	Independent	1888	38	The Mount School (London)	Independent	1935
13	Bancroft School*	Independent	1889	39	Tring Park School	Independent	1939
14	Royal Naval School	Independent	1889	40	North London Collegiate School*	Independent	1940
15	Northwood College	Independent	1892	41	Royal Naval School for Girls (now The Royal School)	Independent	1940
16	Stationer's School	Defunct Grammar	1894	42	Jewish Free School (2003)	Religious comprehensive	1958
17	Streatham and Clapham High School	Independent	1895	43	Purcell School (1997)	Independent	1963
18	King's College School*	Independent	1897	44	Davenant Foundation School	Faith-based academy	1966
19	St Margaret's School Bushey	Independent	1897	45	St Olave's and St Saviour's Grammar School*	Grammar	1968
20	Haberdasher's Aske Girls School (1974)*	Independent	1898	46	St. Ignatius College	Religious comprehensive	1968
21	Christ's Hospital*	Independent	1902	47	The Coopers' Company and Coborn School	Comprehensive	1971
23	Royal Caledonian School	Defunct Orphan	1902	48	Colfe's School	Independent	1973
22	Haberdasher's Aske Boys School (1961)*	Independent	1902	49	Dame Alice Owen's School	Partially selective academy	1973
24	Royal Masonic School Boys	Defunct Independent	1903	50	Wilson's School	Grammar	1975
25	University College School*	Independent	1907	51	Parmiter's School	Partially selective academy	1977
26	Eltham College	Independent	1912		* indicates in top 100 English schools for proportion of students sent to Oxbridge 2011-12		



