

An Analysis of Existing Research on Socioeconomic Status and Educational Performance

Sandeep Kumar Verma¹ and Dr. Naresh Kumar²

Research Scholar, Department of Education¹

Professor, Department of Education²

Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan, India

Abstract: *The foundations of socioeconomic inequities and the educational outcomes of efforts to reduce gaps in socioeconomic status are of great interest to researchers around the world, and narrowing the achievement gap is a common goal for most education systems. This review of the literature focuses on socioeconomic status (SES) and its related constructs, the association between SES and educational achievement, and differences among educational systems, together with changes over time. Commonly-used proxy variables for SES in education research are identified and evaluated, as are the relevant components collected in IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). Although the literature always presents a positive association between family SES and student achievement, the magnitude of this relationship is contingent on varying social contexts and education systems. TIMSS data can be used to assess the magnitude of such relationships across countries and explore them over time. Finally, the literature review focuses on two systematic and fundamental macro-level features: the extent of homogeneity between schools, and the degree of centralization of education standards and norms in a society.*

Keywords: Socioeconomic status (SES), Educational achievement.

I. INTRODUCTION

Multiple types of educational inequality exist. Van de Wefhorst and Mijs (2010) attributed the presence of educational disparity to the impact of social background on pupils' test scores and learning, as seen by the distribution of test results. According to the authors, an educational system may have equality in dispersion in educational achievement but inequality in opportunities, but societies that are equal in dispersion are also more equal in opportunities.

Each TIMSS cycle involves different education systems, but 25 participated in the 1995 and 2015 grade eight mathematics student evaluation. Between 1995 and 2015, these 25 systems' average mathematics success score grew by five points (Mullis et al. 2016). Focusing only on recent trends, the 32 education systems that participated in the grade eight mathematics student assessment in 2011 and 2015 gained nine scale score points between 2011 and 2015, suggesting that many of the education systems with the largest gains start from a low base. Limited data on family and home background influences on TIMSS worldwide accomplishment, making it difficult to explain why education systems perform differently. Our research examines how SES background affects educational success, another component of educational inequality. In the following two parts of this chapter, we discuss socioeconomic status and the research on family SES and student academic success. The remainder of this chapter discusses education system disparities and educational disparity changes.

II. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS AND MEASURES

APA defines socioeconomic status as personal or group social class in 2018. Family history typically depends on SES (Bofah and Hannula 2017). The right operationalization term is challenged by empirical investigation. Few research explain why some traits predict SES. (Bornstein, Bradley 2014). The optimal SES measure, according to Liberatos et al. (1988), has conceptual significance, social class role, application, relevance, reliability, validity, quantity of variables, measuring level, simplicity, and comparability

SES was previously perceived differently. SES is father's occupation, according Taussig (1920). Cuff (1934) used Sims (1927)'s score card to evaluate SES, which asked about home belongings, parents' education, father's employment, and other things. After these early studies, factor analysis or model-based SES quantification improved (NCES 2012). By the 1980s, most believed that SES should include education, money, and work since it represents family histories (Brese and Mirazchiyski 2013).

Gathering this data is tricky. Privacy and accuracy matter (Keeves and Saha 1992). The US National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) does not collect household income or parental employment since many children cannot describe it (Musu-Gillette 2016). TIMSS eliminated IEA parental job and income data for reliability and value reasons (Buchmann 2002). Thus, the grade eight TIMSS student surveys only contain three proxy components for SES: parental education, books at home, and household goods (such as a calculator, computer, study desk, or dictionary), with some adjustments over 20 years owing to fast technological improvements

Since SES is abstract, academics may estimate it using proxy variables. Yang (2003) thinks household items imply SES. Some evidence links SES to student achievement despite measurement mistakes (Sirin 2005).

III. FAMILY SES AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Theory and data show SES affects kids' schooling. Family SES affects children's achievement via social, cultural, and economic capital (Bourdieu 1986; Coleman 1988, 1990). Home capital affects kids' academic performance (Buchmann 2002).

Bourdieu (1986) defined three capital categories, beginning with economic. Hidden and recycled capital exist. Family may support after-school activities, elite institutions, and large social networks (Lareau 2011). Poor youngsters are limited by money (Crosnoe and Cooper 2010). Wealth affects parents' education costs.

Cultural symbols help parents impart their advantages and sustain social status and prosperity (Bourdieu 1986). Bourdieu (1986) says cultural capital may be objectified or embodied. Cultural capital is based on "physical capital," where class actions shape the body and social class is shown (Tittenbrun 2016). This may generate socioeconomic eating, handwriting, speech, body language, and appearance disparities. Machine, picture, literature, and dictionary access are uneven. According to Bourdieu, the body and culture fund class inequality and consumerism (Perks 2012).

Because of family, privileged kids gain from school. Culture may affect academics. Yang (2003) claims culture impacts most countries' children's math and science achievement. If family history affects cultural resources and school viewpoint, socioeconomic position may effect success (Barone 2006). Barone (2006) says SES affects kids' verbal, social, curriculum, and teacher judgments. Shavit and Blossfeld (1993) say parental school choice improves US private school students. Class and status affect education. Middle-class parents practice "concerted cultivation," planning activities to develop their children's skills, whereas working-class parents offer them more free time, according to Lareau (1987, 2011). Schools urge middle-class parents to prepare youngsters.

Benefits from social relationships (Bourdieu 1986). Higher household social capital levels may impact academic success (Rogošić & Baranović 2016). Coleman (1988) claimed family, community, and school develop social capital. Family-community interactions may affect kids' academic achievement more than money (Mikiewicz et al. 2011).

Finally, theoretical and empirical evidence links parental SES to children's academic aptitude, albeit strength differs by country. Legal frameworks, education, and long-term social changes may explain this.

IV. DIFFERENCES IN EDUCATION SYSTEMS AND CHANGES OVER TIME

Two systematic and essential macro-level aspects in every culture show how education systems have developed throughout time. Education system uniformity comes first. Second, a society's education standard and norm centralization. Family background affects children's success depending on the school system and social setting. Students from various backgrounds may have higher accomplishment disparities in educational inequality.

Homogeneous Versus Heterogeneous

Education systems with reduced inequality aid impoverished kids (Ornstein 2010). Some education systems support schools evenly. Finnish households are poor, hence schools get equal funding (Mostafa 2011).

Mostafa (2011) found that large-scale school homogeneity reduces school characteristics' impact on performance scores, promoting equality. Finland's uniform curriculum and high school commonalities reduce school factors' impact on performance (Kell and Kell 2010; Mostafa 2011). Montt (2011) found that teacher quality homogeneity decreased learning variability and perhaps educational inequality in over 50 school systems, including Finland, in the 2006 PISA cycle.

The income disparity is largest in Hong Kong (Hong Kong Economy 2010). The lowest association between socioeconomic status and math performance was seen in 2012 PISA education systems (Ho 2010; Kalaycıoğlu 2015). Polls show that education benefits Hong Kong students of all socioeconomic backgrounds. Good reading, math, and science results in Hong Kong show a solid foundation (Ho 2010).

Social, resource, and geographic stratification cause schooling inequities. Unlike many countries, US public education is regional. Local property taxes pay public schools, domicile allocates students, and race and income stratify communities. Cheema and Galluzzo (2013) identified gender, ethnic, and socioeconomic inequalities in US arithmetic ability using 2003 PISA data. Academic success in US schools is uneven (Lareau 2011; Lee and Burkam 2002).

Lithuanians increasingly recognize that a poorly planned or run formal youth education system widens the social and economic divide and marginalises certain groups (Gudynas 2003). Lithuania promotes student housing for great education. Gudynas (2003) discovered that rural Lithuanian children fared worse than urban students owing to lower parental education. New Zealand likewise considers home location an educational barrier. Kennedy (2015) revealed that rural students had lower SES and shorter educations than urban students, worsening education disparity.

Centralized Versus Decentralized

Beyond consistency, education systems might be centralized or decentralized. Decentralized education systems allow municipalities fund public and private schools, whereas centralized systems use national funding with minimal local autonomy. Standardising curriculum, teaching, and examinations may reduce family background inequality (Van de Wefhorst and Mijs 2010). Decentralized local finance may increase educational inequality (Mostafa 2011).

After substantial changes, Sweden decentralized education in the early 1990s (Hansen et al. 2011). Swedish education is decentralized and deregulated due to more autonomous schools and parental school choice (Björklund et al. 2005). Between-school SES differences on reading performance in Sweden increased in 2001 compared to 1991 (Hansen et al. 2011).

Korean discourses have addressed educational inequality. Using 1999–2007 grade eight Byun and Kim (2010) indicate SES now affects student success more, TIMSS data. Growing economic disparity, recent educational innovations that supported school choice, and decentralized education system-driven academic ability streaming and curricular differentiation increase academic inequality, they thought.

Research suggests that decentralized education systems in industrialized nations work better for students (e.g., Rodríguez-Pose and Ezcurra 2010). However, Causa and Chapuis (2009) found using PISA data that decentralized school systems enhanced educational fairness in OECD nations. PISA 2000 and 2006 found that decentralized European education systems minimize inequity while centralized ones enhance it (Oppedisano and Turati 2015).

Efficiency and equality may coexist, argued Mullis et al. (2016). Multiple nations' TIMSS averages have improved, reducing the performance gap between low- and high-performing children. National average 1999–2007 TIMSS scores were adversely linked with within-country score dispersion. Equity in education does not sacrifice justice or efficiency.

It's commonly established that family helps kids prosper. Social and educational factors affect relationship size. Children from varied origins do worse in education systems with high wealth disparity. Most educational systems aim to close achievement discrepancies. Stable scores for low-SES pupils and reductions for high-SES students worsen inequality. Instead, education systems should improve all students' performance and fast improve low-SES kids' success to close achievement disparities (Mullis et al. 2016). We examine low-SES*2 students' performance and how socioeconomic status affects educational results in different TIMSS systems. We created a consistent family SES* measure for trend analysis using a modified TIMSS HER.

V. CONCLUSION

The review of the literature on socioeconomic status (SES) and educational achievement consistently demonstrates a strong correlation between higher SES and better educational outcomes. Children from wealthier families generally have access to more resources, such as quality schooling, extracurricular activities, and academic support, which enhance their educational performance. Additionally, parental education levels and involvement play a significant role in shaping a child's academic success. Conversely, students from lower SES backgrounds often face challenges such as limited access to educational resources, less parental support, and higher levels of stress and instability, which negatively impact their academic achievements. This body of research underscores the importance of addressing socioeconomic disparities to promote educational equity and improve outcomes for all students.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Barone, C. (2006). Cultural capital, ambition and the explanation of inequalities in learning outcomes: A comparative analysis. *Sociology*, 40(6), 1039–1058.
- [2]. Björklund, A., Clark, M. A., Edin, P.-A., Fredriksson, P., & Krueger, A. (2005). *The market comes to education in Sweden: An evaluation of Sweden's surprising school reforms*. London: Russell Sage Foundation.
- [3]. Bofah, E. A., & Hannula, M. S. (2017). Home resources as a measure of socio-economic status in Ghana. *Large-scale Assessments in Education*, 5(1), 1–15.
- [4]. Böhlmark, A., & Lindahl, M. (2008). Does school privatization improve education achievement? Evidence from Sweden's Voucher Reform. IZA Discussion paper no. 3691. Bonn: Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit. Retrieved from <http://ftp.iza.org/dp3691.pdf>
- [5]. Bornstein, M. H., & Bradley, R. H. (Eds.). (2014). *Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- [6]. Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood.
- [7]. Byun, S., & Kim, K. (2010). Educational inequality in South Korea: The widening socioeconomic gap in student achievement. *Research in Sociology of Education*, 17, 155–182.
- [8]. Causa, O., & Chapuis, C. (2009). Equity in student achievement across OECD countries: An investigation of the role of policies. OECD Economics Department working papers no.708. Paris: OECD.
- [9]. Cheema, J. R., & Galluzzo, G. (2013). Analyzing the gender gap in math achievement: Evidence from a large-scale US sample. *Research in Education*, 90, 98–112.
- [10]. Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94(1) Supplement. Organizations and institutions: Sociological and economic approaches to the analysis of social structure, pp. 95–120.
- [11]. Crosnoe, R., & Cooper, C. E. (2010). Economically disadvantaged children's transitions into elementary school: Linking family processes, school contexts, and educational policy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(2), 258–291.
- [12]. Cuff, N. B. (1934). The vectors of socio-economic status. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 12(3), 114–117.
- [13]. Freeman, R. B., Machin, S., & Viarengo, M. (2010). Variation in educational outcomes and policies across countries and of schools within countries. NBER Working paper series no. 16293. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w16293>
- [14]. Gudynas, P. (2003). Education and social inclusion in Lithuania. *Prospects*, 33(1), 63–76. Hansen, K. Y., Rosén, M., & Gustafsson, J. E. (2011). Changes in the multi-level effects of socio-economic status on reading achievement in Sweden in 1991 and 2001. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 55(2), 197–211.
- [15]. Ho, E. S. (2010). Assessing the quality and equality of Hong Kong basic education results from PISA 2000+ to PISA 2006. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 5(2), 238–257.
- [16]. Hong Kong Economy. (2010). Hong Kong's Gini coefficient compared with other economies. The Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, Special Topics, Research Notes. Retrieved from

- https://www.hkeconomy.gov.hk/en/pdf/gini_comparison.pdf
- [17]. Horn, D., Balázs, I., Takács, S., & Zhang, Y. (2006). Tracking and inequality of learning outcomes in Hungarian secondary schools. *Prospects*, 36(4), 433–446.
- [18]. Iceland, J., & Wilkes, R. (2006). Does socioeconomic status matter? Race, class, and residential segregation. *Social Problems*, 53(2), 248–273.
- [19]. Kalaycıoğlu, D. B. (2015). The influence of socioeconomic status, self-efficacy, and anxiety on mathematics achievement in England, Greece, Hong Kong, the Netherlands, Turkey, and the USA. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 15(5), 1391–1401.
- [20]. Keeves, J. P., & Saha, L. J. (1992). Home background factors and educational outcomes. In J. P.