

DOI Link: <https://doi.org/10.61586/OBPwq>
Vol.169, Issue.11, Part1, Nov 2025, PP.2-21

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND ACCESS TO QUALITY EDUCATION

Newman Wadesango

University of Limpopo, Centre for Academic Excellence, Republic of South Africa

Received April 2025 Accepted Oct 2025 Published Nov 2025

ABSTRACT

This literature review has examined the connection between socioeconomic status (SES) and quality education in a multidimensional and complex way in which SES has an impact on educational opportunities and educational outcomes. Despite education being a significant variable that can be used to establish social mobility, the access to quality education remains unequal across the various socioeconomic strata. The review recaps the findings of the different bodies of knowledge, including sociology, education, and economics, in order to provide a comprehensive picture of the impact of SES on educational access and quality. The review highlights the relevance of poverty, income inequality, parental education, and social capital in defining educational opportunities and ways education institutions and policies can alleviate or increase such effects. The findings are suggestive of the fact that the intersectional dynamic between SES and education must be addressed so as to support social equity and redress the already existing educational inequities.

Keywords: Socioeconomic Status, Access, Educational Access, Quality Education.



1. INTRODUCTION

It is not a secret that education is one of the key determinants of social mobility, economic growth, and personal well-being. It is critical in the aspect of defining the future of one person and the level of opportunities for career, salary, and general life quality. However, the education-socioeconomic status (SES) is a complex issue. Despite the overall perception of education as a means of bridging the gap between different classes, the reality of the situation is that educational opportunities are in most instances inclined towards those who represent the high classes of the population.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The socioeconomic status can be defined as a position of an individual in a society founded on his income, education, occupation, and other economic and social aspects (Wilkinson and Pickett, 2018:34). Education is a notable constituent of SES since it is often assumed to be an instrument of social mobility and upward social class movement (Bourdieu and Passeron, 2017).

However, it has continuously been established that individuals with less advanced SES backgrounds possess minimal access to high-quality education that can make them perpetuate social inequalities and limit their future. (Mincy & Pouncy, 2016:45).

According to Card and DiNardo (2022), the contribution of education towards the creation of SES is hard to overestimate. Education provides individuals with skills, knowledge, and qualifications that make them become competitive in order to compete in the labor market and become economically stable. In addition, the education level is linked to improved health, reduced crime, and increased civic engagement (Friedman and Friedman, 2018: 65). On the other hand, the lack of a chance to receive a good education would lead to the decrease of earning power, social status, and poverty (Lundberg et al., 2018).

The variables influencing access to education in terms of SES are varied (e.g., geographic location (e.g., urban vs. rural), race/ethnicity (e.g., minority vs. majority), parental socioeconomic status (e.g., family income), and cultural background (e.g., immigrant vs. native-born) (Ladd et al., 2008). In addition, the systemic aspects, such as the inequity in the financing, the quality of the educators, and the constraints in the curriculum, may also affect the access to good education (Henderson et al., 2017; Kozol, 2015).

1.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A comprehensive review of the existing investigations of the topic under discussion was conducted. The section explains the research methodology that was used to locate, sample, and appraise studies included in this review.

1.2.1 Search Strategy

A list of keywords was then identified following the synonyms of the key words that were related to SES and education, and major scholarly databases like Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar were searched extensively. The search words were as follows: (socioeconomic status or SES or income or poverty or wealth) and



(education or access or quality or achievement). The search was done using articles published in 2010-2022 in English.

1.2.2 Inclusion Criteria

- Inclusion criteria in this review were:
- Looked at the correlation between SES and quality education.
- Were published in English
- Targeting students in post-primary or secondary education.
- Methodology used, quantitative or qualitative.
- Be clear about the research question(s) and objectives.

1.3 Research Objectives:

1.3.1 To critically review the available literature on the association between socioeconomic status and access to quality education, determine the main findings, methodological weaknesses, and theoretical models underlying the association between socioeconomic status and access to quality education.

1.3. 2. To research how much the SES can affect the access to quality education, such aspects as academic achievement, education attainment, and education resources.

1.3.3 To determine whether the factors used as mediators and moderators include gender, ethnicity, disability, and geographic location.

1.3.4. To investigate how various SES groups (e.g., low-income, middle-class, and high-income) perceive barriers to accessing quality education, as well as how they actually exist.

2.0 SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND ITS IMPACT ON EDUCATION

A list of keywords was then identified following the synonyms of the key words that were related to SES and education, and major scholarly databases like Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar were searched extensively. The search words were as follows: (socioeconomic status or SES or income or poverty or wealth) and (education or access or quality or achievement). The search was done using articles published in 2010-2022 in English.

2.1 The concept of socioeconomic status needs to be defined.

Hill and Stafford (2014) state that the measurement of SES normally involves a mixture of variables, such as

- Income: Gross household income, parental income, or family income (Hill and Stafford, 2014)
- Occupation: Father/mother occupation or level of education (Bourdieu, 2017)
- Education: Level of parental education or education level (Chen and Kaplan, 2001)
- Neighborhood factors: Poverty, crime, and housing (Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn, 2000)

2.2.2 The SES is frequently divided into three levels:

High SES: High-income families that are highly educated and employed.

Middle SES: middle-income families of medium education and occupation.

2.3.3 Educational Influence of Socioeconomic Status.



SES has been found to play a major role in availing good education. According to research, students with low SES backgrounds have always been under a serious barrier to accessing good education (Kozol, 2015), and they include:

- Poor access to resources: The resources of low-SES schools are usually limited in terms of textbooks, technology, and skilled teachers (Kozol, 2015).
- Teacher bias: Instructors can be biased against their higher-income students, and this causes disparities in their education (Ladson-Billings, 1995).
- Limitation of parental participation: Parents with low-SES backgrounds have less time, energy, or knowledge to support their children in their education (Henderson and Berla, 1994).

2.4 VARIOUS WAYS IN WHICH SES IS MEASURED

According to Kozol (2015), the measurement of SES is a significant aspect of understanding the relationship between SES and the likelihood of attaining good education. In addition to that, SES is complex and multi-faceted; Hill and Stafford (2014) state that it can be operationalized in different ways. The following are some of the ways of commonly measuring SES:

2.4.1 Income: Income is one of the measures of SES used the most. It is characterized as the amount of money that an individual or family earns during a specified period of time, which is mostly a year. Median household income is one of the most popular methods of income measurement, which is defined as the level of income that separates the 50 percent middle-range of households and the other 50 percent. Studies have shown that the low-income students are unable to excel in school compared to their high-income counterparts (Henderson and Berla, 1994:54). The National Center of Education Statistics (2019) found that a higher chance of repeating a grade, grade retention, and school dropout was observed among the students who belong to families with annual incomes less than 25,000 compared to the rest.

2.4.2 Education Level: One more important SES characteristic is educational level. According to OECD (2018), this is the highest education that has been attained by a person or head of a household. Research has found out that the better the individual is endowed with education, the better prospect he or she has of obtaining quality education, not to mention the possibility of performing well in school (Bourdieu, 2017).

Indicatively, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2016) came up with the fact that students who had parents with higher education were inclined to go to school regularly and achieve high grades.

2.4.3 Occupation: The other important SES indicator is occupation. It may be described as the type of work that one does or the economic industry that he/she works in. Employees in high-paying occupations are likely to get access to good education and get more resources to help acquire learning as compared to those in low-paying occupations (Kohn and Schooler, 1983:34). As an example, a research study by NCES (2019) established that students whose parents had occupations that were in high occupation, such as professionals or managers, had high probabilities of going to college and achieving better academic outcomes than the students whose parents had performed low-occupational jobs.



2.4.4 Wealth: the other important point of contact as far as SES is concerned, is wealth. According to the Economic Policy Institute (2019), it is the money possessed by an individual or a household, i.e., savings accounts, stocks, bonds, and real estate. According to Lareau (2003), studies have shown that the rich are more likely to obtain a good education and would also tend to invest in the children's education. Theoretically, the Economic Policy Institute (2019) found out that wealthy families were more likely to invest in private schooling institutions and educational resources for their children compared to low-income families.

2.4.5 Neighborhood Characteristics: Neighborhood characteristics are also crucial matters of SES. It has been found that students raised in poor and crime-prone neighborhoods perform poorly academically compared to students raised in economically better neighborhoods that have better living standards (Brooks-Gunn et al., 1997). In the Harvard Family Research Project (2019), the outcomes showed that those students whose lives were spent in the areas that had a high concentration of poverty and crime had greater opportunities to leave school and invest in criminal behavior as compared to students who were brought up in a wealthier neighborhood.

SES is a multi-dimensional and complex notion that can be operationalized in many different ways (Wadesango2022). Income, level of education, occupation, wealth, and neighborhood factors are some of the common measures of SES applied in literature on access to quality education.

2.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Henderson and Berla (1994) suggest that the Socioeconomic Status (SES) measurement is a significant element of the relationship between SES and the attainment of good education because the concept of SES is complex and multifaceted and thus can be understood in various ways. The following are some of the most widespread forms of measuring SES:

2.5.1 Income: Income is also one of the most popular SES indicators. According to Henderson and Berla (1994), it is the amount of money earned by an individual or household at a given period of time that is usually a year. Income is normally measured as a median household income, and median household income refers to the level of income at which half of the 50% of the households fall compared to the second half, or tail, which is the remaining half. The students in poor families have fewer chances of performing well at school as compared to students in rich families (Henderson and Berla, 1994). To elaborate, the National Center of Education Statistics (2019) opines that learners in families whose incomes are lower than 25,000 per year were more likely to repeat a grade, be retained, and drop out of school than their higher-income counterparts.

2.5.2 Education Level: Education level is another important SES indicator. According to Bourdieu (1986), it is the highest education that one has acquired or an individual in the family. He also postulates that the more educated individuals are made accessible to quality education and have higher opportunities of attaining high marks (Bourdieu, 1986). OECD (2018) stated that the better the parents were educated, the higher the chances of school attendance on a regular basis and the higher the academic achievement.



2.5.3 Occupation: The other important indicator of SES is occupation. It is that type of job that the individual is doing or the direction of the economy that the individual is in. It is ascertained (Kohn and Schooler (1983)) that individuals in better-paid jobs are more exposed to good education and stand higher chances of getting resources that help in the learning process. Indicatively, NCES (2019) found out that students whose parents were also professionals or managers of high-status jobs were more likely to get to college and receive a better academic performance as compared to students whose parents were low-status employees.

2.5.4 Wealth: Another important measure of SES is wealth. Lareau (2003) states that wealth is the money of an individual or household, i.e., savings accounts, stocks, bonds, and real estate. The richer they are, the higher the access to good education and the chances of investing in the education of their children (Lareau, 2003). In a pointer, a report by the Economic Policy Institute (2019) concluded that wealthy families would invest more in private schools and investment materials on behalf of their children than poor families did.

2.5.5 Neighborhood Characteristics: The other SES factor is the neighborhood characteristics. It has been identified that children growing up in poor neighborhoods prone to high-poverty and crime rates have a high possibility of attaining low grades in comparison to their counterparts growing up in rich neighborhoods of high living standards (Brooks-Gunn et al., 1997). According to the postulates of the Harvard Family Research Project (2019), the assumption was that the students raised in poor and criminal communities were more likely to drop out of school and commit a crime compared to students raised in more prosperous communities.

2.6 Adverse effect of poor SES on education and educational achievements and attainment.

The issue of the relationship between the socioeconomic status (SES) and the quality of education opportunities is a controversial topic in the educational field (Horn and Nolin, 2016). The students with low SES are forced to deal with many barriers to quality education, which can have long-term implications on their educational success and performance. The negative effect of low SES on educational achievements and attainment will be elucidated with reference to certain studies indicating the same in this literature review.

According to Horn and Nolin (2016), the inability to access quality educational resources is one of the biggest problems facing students with low SES backgrounds. As the National Education Association (2019) says, the location of the school in high-poverty districts reduces the chances of qualified teachers, outdated versions of textbooks, and lack of technology, which may impede their performance and learning. Similarly, Henderson and Berla (1994) claim that low-SES students are likely to be enrolled in the schools with a high student-to-teacher ratio, due to which students might not get as much attention and support as offered by teachers. Another major challenge facing students from low SES backgrounds is poverty. Poverty can lead to food insecurity, housing insecurity, and accessibility to medical attention, thereby impacting negatively on the concentration of the child in school studies (Duncan et al., 2007). As observed by McLoyd et al. (2005), poverty was



a significant predictor of poor performance amongst elementary school children regardless of the presence of other factors such as family set up and parent education.

In addition to these barriers, the students having low SES backgrounds are exposed to much stigmatization and stereotyping that may affect their self-efficacy and motivation to study. The researchers (Wigfield and Eccles, 2000) found out that it was more likely that students with low SES backgrounds viewed themselves as incapable of achieving academic success due to their socioeconomic status. This perceived failure to define their educational outcomes can lead to a lack of motivation and dropping out of school.

Moreover, the students with low SES are less likely to be provided with extracurricular activities and programs that can make their learning experiences more intensive (Horn and Nolin, 2016). Furthermore, as Horn and Nolin (2016) put the question, low-income students were less inclined to participate in school extracurricular activities that provide substantial opportunities to socialize and acquire skills in such forms as sports or clubs.

The sources highlight the radical negative effects of low SES on educational success and achievement. LSE students go through numerous challenges that include failure to access good educational sources, poverty, stigma, and failure to access extracurricular activities. These problems can become irreversible consequences of the capacity of a student to excel in school and obtain tertiary education.

In the situation when educators and policymakers are trying to establish strategies that will help to eradicate these issues, one should pay attention to strategies that should work to eliminate the sources of inequality and provide some assistance to low-SES students.

2.7 SES IMPACTS ON EDUCATION ACCESS AND QUALITY MECHANISM.

2.7.1 Educational accessibility to good education is influenced by poverty and income inequality.

Poverty is one of the greatest reasons behind the inability to receive a good education. According to Ladd (2003), children within the low-income families are likely to attend under-resourced schools, which have poor infrastructure, whose textbooks are aged, and only a small number of them have access to technology. This can predispose its non-involvement, underperformance in academics, and lowered educational aims (Dornbusch et al., 2001). In addition to that, poverty can affect the health, nutrition, and general welfare of children and thus negatively affect the learning abilities of children (Katz et al., 2013). At the point of example, malnutrition can ruin cognitive growth, and starvation and lack of medical attention can lead to absenteeism and low educational achievements (Summerbell et al., 2001).

2.7.2 Quality Education and Fewer Earnings Disparities.

Income inequality can also have a great impact on access to good education. In the highly income-inequality nations, individuals of high-income origin have greater access to the privatized schools and education institutions than their low-income



counterparts, who are normally left out in the underfunded state schools (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977). This can further enhance social and economic inequality since people with affluent backgrounds have better opportunities of improving their social mobility through education (Duncan et al., 2004). However, the opposite is also true; that is, low-income backgrounds may be the significant barrier to social mobility, irrespective of how hard they work and the achievements in their academics (Khan and Weisleder, 2018).

2.7.3 Impact of Little Quality Education.

The aftermath of lack of accessibility to quality education may be far-reaching and devastating. Children not receiving a good education have high chances of:

- Had less academic success and decreased education levels (Kirsch et al., 2007).
- Experience greater rates of unemployment and poverty as adults (Shavit et al., 2007).
- Get more health issues and reduced life expectancy (Katz et al., 2013).
- Reduced social mobility and low socio-economic status (Duncan et al., 2004)

Poverty and income inequality can significantly compromise access to good education, which leads to poor academic performance, poor education aspirations, and social mobility. In order to fight these issues, policy interventions that would assist in alleviating poverty, inequality of incomes, and access to quality education should be taken into consideration.

2.8 PARENTAL EDUCATION AND SOCIAL CAPITAL: EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.

2.8.1 Parental Education: According to the way it is stated by Holloway et al. (2018), parental education level is one of the significant predictors of the educational achievements of children. Parents in higher education are able to provide access to better resources, opportunities, and support to their children with ease (Kao and Rutherford, 2007). The reason behind this is that, well, educated parents are more aware of the education system and will tend to show more interest in the education of their child and are better equipped to lobby for the needs of their child (Pong and Norton, 2000). To take the former as an illustration, Baker et al. (2013) have already established that the children of the more educated parents were in a better position to participate in preschool, have a tutor, and even participate in extracurricular activities, all of which were correlated with better academic outcomes. In the same line of thought, a study by Lareau (2000) found out that the middle-class parents used cultural capital, such as taking their children to education-enhancing activities and experiences, to their children's advantage in the educational system.

Quite on the contrary, it is also possible that less educated parents lack the knowledge and resources to assist their children in receiving an education (Holloway et al., 2018). Indicatively, a study by Bradley and Corwyn (2002) found out that children in low-income families would not be able to access educational resources, such as access to computers and internet access, which would hamper their accomplishment of their homework and receipt of educational opportunities.



2.8.2 Social Capital: Social capital is the social relationship/bond that exists among people in their social environment (Coleman, 1988). Holloway et al. (2018) clarify that social capital may be highly crucial to identify the results of education through the provision of resources, information, and support.

Indicatively, a study conducted by Coleman (1988) made the establishment that students who had positive relationships with the teachers and other students performed better in their academics. In the same breath, an article by Putnam (2000) found out that higher educational achievement in communities with a high social capital was possible since more resources and support would be available.

One more example is that, as Holloway et al. (2018) discovered, the parental social capital also implied the educational outcomes of the children, with parents who have close social contacts with their peers and community members being more likely to be involved in the educational process of their children and provide them with the opportunity to find resources and support.

2.8.3 Correlation between Parental Education and Social Capital: the correlation between parental level of education and social capital is positive. Only the highly educated parents can find opportunities to access the network of social capital, which might become open to them to provide resources and assistance to their children's education (Kaufman and Pontusson, 2016). Incidentally, Farkas et al. (1991) determined that highly educated parents were likely to have friends and acquaintances who had also been well educated, and this provided them with access to good social capital. In a similar vein, Lin et al. (1981) also arrived at the same conclusion and assessed that parents with higher education had a more favorable opportunity of being affiliated with the community groups and volunteering, which could afford them an opportunity to network and earn social capital.

According to Kaufman and Pontusson (2016), the level of education of parents and their social capital is significant in dictating the educational opportunities. The better educated the parent is, the greater the chances of the parent providing good educational resources, opportunities, and assistance to the children. In addition, the social capital of parents can provide the children with access to the helpful resources and help them in their studies.

2.9 EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND POLICIES MITIGATE THE IMPACT THAT SES HAS ON EDUCATION.

The following is a discussion of how the institutions and policies of education can either create or mitigate the effect of Socioeconomic Status (SES) on access to quality education:

2.9.1 Exacerbation of SES effects

2.9.1.1 Inequality in resources: The more resources, facilities, and teachers per student, the richer the educational institution and the higher the quality of the education that the students of higher SES backgrounds receive (Ladson-Billings, 1995). This is not the case as compared to schools in high-SES neighborhoods, as in the low-SES neighborhoods the resources at their disposal are very minimal, the textbooks they use are outdated, and the classes are more crowded, which hinders the learning process of students from lower-SES backgrounds (Kozol, 2005).



Tracking and ability grouping: Tracking and ability grouping are prevalent in most of the learning institutions, and they can lead to the continuation of SES segregation. Students with higher SES are typically enrolled in more advanced classes, and those of lower SES are enrolled in lower classes, which makes them have unequal access to high-level education opportunities (Oakes, 1985).

Lack of access to higher-level courses: It may limit the opportunities of college preparation and higher education, as the students with low SES backgrounds may not attend higher-level courses, e.g., Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) courses (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977). Teacher bias: There is a possibility that teachers are also prejudiced about lower SES, and it can affect their academic expectations and performance (Kozol, 2005). Such a bias can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy where students who have low SES backgrounds are presumed to be poor academic workers and hence guided to easier coursework.

2.9.1.2 Mitigation of SES effects:

Desegregation policies: Desegregation policies may be helpful in the minimization of low-SES students' concentration in certain schools and in the increased equal access to resources and opportunities (Orfield and Lee, 2006). Thus, the abundant resources in rich and low-SES schools can be countered with funding (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). The magnet schools: with various degrees of SES, students can be attracted into magnet schools with specialized topics or themes, and the schools will be able to provide equal access to the high-quality school (Hanushek et al., 2007).

Socio-emotional support: Schools that provide the services of socio-emotional support, e.g., counseling and mentorship, are able to decrease the negative influence of the SES on the performance of students (Henderson and Berla, 1994).

Parental involvement: "Schools that have policies that enable parents to be involved can assist them in ensuring they give equal opportunities to all students and lessen the disparity existing between the home and school environment" (Epstein et al., 2002).

2.9.1.3 Policies that augment the influence of SES.

School choice policies School choice policies that allow parents to choose between the public and the private schools can further increase the SES segregation by allowing rich families to abandon schools that have poor performance (Ladd and Ladd, 1998). Voucher schemes: Vouchers can be employed to provide funding assistance to the tuition of the private schools, which in turn pass into the state schools, hence further propagating inequality (McDonnell and Elmore, 1987).

The mitigation policies against the effects of the SES are

2.9.2.2.1 Universal free lunch programs: Universal free lunch programs have the potential to help reduce food-insecure students in low-SES and provide them with equal access to nutrition (U.S. Department of Agriculture, n.d.). Early childhood education program:

The early childhood education programs can provide equal opportunity to early education and reverse the effects of poverty on children's development (Hart and Risley, 2003).



2.9.2.2.2 Higher education policies: Policies that may be implemented to increase accessibility of higher education by low-SES students include offering financial aid as well as scholarships (Bowen et al., 2005).

In the analysis, the authors assume that intersections are instrumental in the determination of relations between SES and education (Garcia, 2010).

2.10 INTERSECTIONAL PERSPECTIVES OF THE SES-EDUCATION RELATIONSHIP

SES is a quality indicator of the academic achievements, and students with the higher background of SES are more likely to succeed in academic achievements and also have access to more resources and opportunities to access (Kozol, 2005). The relationship between the SES and education is, however, not always the same throughout the entire population. In fact, these social factors, such as race, gender, ethnicity, and other demographic characteristics, play a significant role in the development of educational outcomes (Kaufman and Pontusson, 2016).

2.10.1 Race and SES

According to Ladson-Billings (1995), the low-SES racial and ethnic minority are faced with a major challenge of accessing quality education. As an example, the likelihood of African American children attending underfunded schools with low resources and qualified teachers is high compared to their White counterparts due to low-income families. Similarly, Hispanic students with low-income families are more likely to attend schools in which teachers have high turnover and higher courses are offered (Orfield and Lee, 2005). This has also attracted the attention of researchers in understanding how racial stereotypes and prejudices have the potential to influence the outcomes of education. The reason is that teachers would expect poor performance among the African American students compared to White students in terms of academic performance (Eitle & Holland, 2003). The threat of stereotyping can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy in which that belief that the students will perform poorly in their studies has a bad influence on them.

2.10.2 Gender and SES

Gender is another significant issue that defines the outcome of education with regard to the SES. The low-income families tend to pressure girls more in vocational trainings or teen pregnancies than in college preparation programs (Katzman et al., 2012). This could limit their opportunities and access to resources required in conducting higher education and economic mobility. In addition, low-income families are more likely to have their children suspended/expelled from school due to discipline issues or behavior issues (Skiba et al., 2011).

It can lead to the impossibility of receiving a good education and the likelihood of dropping out of school (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

2.10.3 Ethnicity and SES

Ethnicity is another powerful variable that intersects with SES in order to define educational outcomes. To illustrate, Native Americans that have low-income families tend to have no access to good education due to a lack of resources and the application of culturally insensitive means of teaching (Duran and Firestone, 2002). As Kim et al. (2012) confirm, the Asian American underprivileged students may be pressured to fulfill their gender roles and their cultural expectations, which



may force them into vocational training or early marriages rather than getting higher education. There are other factors of social identity, which are not mentioned specifically here, yet they influence these findings.

2.10.4 Other Social Identity Factors

There are other factors of social identity, which are not described in specific detail here, but which have an impact on these findings. Other social identity determinants that interact with SES to produce educational outcomes include sexual orientation, disability status, immigration status, and others. To illustrate the point, low-income fathers of LGBTQ+ students can be discriminated against and harassed in schools, thus making them more stressed and worse in their academic performance (Russell et al., 2012). The low-income families of students with disabilities may also not be able to get as many accommodations and supports as needed to meet the education equally (Madaus et al., 2007).

The relationship between the SES and the possibility of obtaining quality education is complex, and it is tightly connected with various factors of social identity. Race, gender, ethnicity, and other demographic attributes have a very strong dependence on educational outcomes (Kim et al., 2012). Teachers, policymakers, and researchers must acknowledge such intersections and endeavor to make the educational system fairer, one that can support the special needs of all learners.

2.11 HOW DOES INTERSECTIONALITY IMPACT THE ACCESS TO QUALITY EDUCATION?

2.11.1 Race and Ethnicity

Research has always pointed out that minority students of racial and ethnic descent have a huge obstacle in attaining a good education (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Kozol, 2005). For example, Orfield and Lee (2005) found out that African American students had a high tendency of going to schools whose teachers were poorly performing, teachers that were of low experience, and had fewer resources as compared to the white students.

Similarly, Fryberg et al. (2013) noted that the Latino/a students were more likely to be placed in lower-level courses and had less access to the advanced-level courses in comparison with the white students. These disparities could be attributed to the different factors, one of them being the discriminatory nature, lack of diversity among teaching staff, and availability of resources and opportunities (Ladson-Billings, 1995). It has also been discovered that minority students have more opportunities to be culturally biased in their academic assessments, and this factor can influence their achievement in school (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Kozol, 2005).

2.11.2 Gender

Gender is another aspect that has a tremendous influence on access to quality education. LSES girls will be better suited to a poorer educational experience than is the case with LSES boys (Kimmel and Stephens-Davidowitz, 2017). As an example, Crosnoe et al. (2004) indicate that girls who had low-SES origins were more likely to drop out of school compared to their counterparts, boys of the same origin. Additionally, gender stereotyping and gender bias in schools also exist,



which can also influence access to good education. It has been proven that girls are usually socialized to be quiet and conforming in the classroom, and it can make them not be regarded as having opportunities and experiences (Kimmel and Stephens-Davidowitz, 2017). Furthermore, gender-based bullying and harassment can also make girls have a hostile learning environment (Hart et al., 2017).

2.11.4 Thinking Cap, Social Identity Factors.

Along with the three factors mentioned above, i.e., race, ethnicity, and gender, there are other social identity factors such as sexual orientation, disability status, and socioeconomic status that can also influence access to quality education. In this example, LGBTQ students are very ambitious to achieve quality education due to marginalization and discrimination (Russell et al., 2013). On the same note, students with disabilities may also encounter barriers relating to accessibility and accommodation in the educational institution (Mason et al., 2017). Good education is also a requirement for a socioeconomic level. The low-SES background students have an increased likelihood of attending school with limited resources and opportunities compared to high-SES background students (Kozol, 2005). Moreover, the barriers of high-quality education could also be encountered by low-SES families due to the lack of affordable childcare offers and transportation (Hart et al., 2017).

2.12 IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

Educators and policymakers should address the systemic barriers faced by those students who represent different social identity groups as the literature lets them see the light. Some promotion strategies in the education sector include the following:

- Staffing the teaching faculty with diversity: Research has been able to find out that students are more likely to perform better in school when they have racially or ethnically similar teachers (Ladson-Billings, 1995).
- Delivery of special support services: Underrepresented students can be served by provision of some of the special support services that can be offered, such as tutoring and mentorship services (Kim et al., 2012).
- Reducing systemic barriers: Policymakers can make efforts to reduce barriers to systems such as poverty and lack of health care access by working at the community level.
- Promoting the sense of belonging and inclusivity: The inclusive and diverse-minded curricula may be applied to promote the feeling of belonging and inclusivity among all students.

2.13 THE BEST FINDING OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW.

2.13.1 Education and Social Economic Status.

SES is a good indicator of education level (Kim et al., 2012). Coleman et al. (1966) have discovered that pupils with an upper-SES background had higher chances of having a high degree of high school and college attendance compared to the pupils with lower-SES backgrounds. Going further with the same, Hanson and Haworth (2014) mention that Technicum was more probable, and college attendance was less probable in low-SES students. Bradley and Corwyn (2002) discovered that



SES was a strong predictor of educational achievement, in which the better the SES, the greater the accessibility of resources and opportunities that translated to high educational achievement among the students. A study carried out by Kao and Rutherford (2008) supported this argument, as it was determined that SES was a better predictor of education than race or ethnicity.

2.13.2 SES and Academic Achievement.

SES is related to academic performance, and students belonging to the higher SES experience a high level of academic performance compared to the low-SES students (Kim et al., 2012). Besides this, Parcell and Menaghan (1993) hypothesize that the SES had a positive relationship with the academic performance of students, yet Crosnoe et al. (2004) posit that students with the poorest background tracked into low-quality track programs with courses that were not challenging. It was revealed that the SES was a great predictor of academic performance, as it explained a 20 percent difference between student performance (Sirin, 2005). This implies that SES has a significant predictive effect on education success regardless of the consideration that other variables like intelligence and parental involvement have been included.

2.13.4 Social Economic Status and Education Opportunities.

SES also plays a very important role in the development of learning opportunities. The resources and opportunities, which help in the attainment of education for students with higher-SES status, are more (Kim et al., 2012). Lareau (2011) concluded that the middle-class parents were more inclined to take the child to activities like reading, parent-teacher conferences, and lobbying on the educational needs of the child. It is a fact, as Heath (1983) posits, that there was a positive association between SES and parental involvement in education, and the higher the SES, the more the parents would be interested in the education of their children. To support this, a study conducted by Henderson and Berla (1994) discovered that one such determinant was parental involvement, which proved to be very significant in the result of the education process, especially among lower-SES students. The results indicate that policymakers and the teachers must focus on the need to resolve such inequalities with the aim of offering special support to the needy students. The policy and practice are based on the following rationale.

2.14 RATIONALE OF POLICY AND PRACTICE.

There is a high correlation between good education and access and socioeconomic status (SES) (Kim et al., 2012). Ladd (2007) argues that the students in low SES do not have access to quality educational materials, which would lead to their disadvantage in terms of their academic performances and opportunities. It is what is termed the SES-education achievement gap. There are various causes of this gap, as it has been researched, including:

2.14.1 Inequality in Funding: The schools in the low SES regions are likely to be underfunded and, therefore, lack sufficient infrastructure, obsolete textbooks, and technology (Hoxby, 2000).

2.14.2 Teacher quality: teachers in the low SES schools are inexperienced, untrained, and under resourced, and this may interfere with the effectiveness of their instructions (Darling-Hammond, 2000).



2.14.3 Curriculum constraints: In schools that are poorer, then the curriculum may be less challenging or more involved with the life of the students, which leads to disengagement and a lack of motivation (Kozol, 2005).

2.14.4 Parental involvement: The parents who have the lower SES backgrounds might not be fully knowledgeable about the opportunity of education or have neither time nor resources to help their children receive education (Lareau, 2011).

2.15 THE OUTCOME OF THE SES-EDUCATION GAP IS AS FOLLOWS:

The consequences of the SES-education gap are gigantic consequences to the academic achievement and future of the learners. In comparison with the low-income students having other backgrounds of the less advantaged SES, the former has a tendency to:

- Quit school: Low levels of economic mobility and poverty would result due to high dropout rates among the low-income students (Kozol, 2005).
- Record poor results at school: Low-SES students may fail to excel in school due to few advanced courses undertaken and other after-school programs (Gardner et al., 2013).
- Alienation with the society: Socioeconomic stratification could lead to social isolation, and this would mean that you are not exposed to other views and decisions (Massey and Denton, 1993).

This implies that the research has the following policy and practice implications.

To avoid the SES-education gap, the policymakers and the practitioners can take into consideration the following:

Fund equity: It should assign more funds to the school with low SES so as to even the playing field, to be parallel in terms of the resources and opportunities to be availed.

Hire and keep great teachers: Be involved in teacher recruiting and retention efforts that bring and keep the best teachers in failing schools.

Design specific curricula: Design interesting and relevant curricula for various students.

Encourage parent involvement: Implement interventions that will allow parent involvement, e.g., parent-teacher conferences and volunteer programs.

Minimize systemic inequality: Establish policies that would help in eradicating systemic inequality, e.g., fight off housing segregation and discrimination.

3. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the general finding suggests that SES is a significant variable that influences educational achievements, and high-SES students possess greater resources, opportunities, and support than low-SES students that are required to achieve success. Furthermore, the literature indicates that the reasons that cause these disparities are highly complicated, and they might consist of the differences in family income, level of education of parents, quality of neighborhood, and cultural capital.

Whereas other studies have suggested that certain policies and interventions can be applied in reducing such inequalities, like special school funding and teacher training programs, more research is needed to have a clear picture of the mechanisms that lead to such inequalities. Lastly, this review ends by indicating



that policymakers, educators, and researchers are in urgent need to underline the need for curbing the inequities in education that have been maintained by socioeconomic status. It will be necessary to make this a complex strategy that will acknowledge the interlinking of these issues and will seek to institute a more balanced and inclusive system of education.

4. REFERENCES

- Baker, C., Johnstone, C., & Mayerhofer, P. (2013). Parental involvement in children's education: A systematic review. *Educational Review*, 65(4), 443-458.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (2017). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2012). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 371-399.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G., & Aber, J. L. (1997). The effects of poverty on children's socio-emotional development: Results from the Children's Defense Fund longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 68(2), 379-394.
- Card, D., & DiNardo, J. E. (2022). Skill-based technical change in U.S. manufacturing. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity Microeconomics*.
- Chen, X., & Kaplan, S. B. (2021). Poverty and mental health: The role of socioeconomic factors in mental health disparities. *American Journal of Public Health*, 91(9), 1451-1455.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(5), 95-120.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1996). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Harvard University Press. US Government Printing Office.
- Crosnoe, R., Feliciano, C., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2004). The social dynamics of adolescent dropping out: A longitudinal study of school experiences and relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33(2), 155-167.
- Crosnoe, R., Mistry, R. S., & Elder Jr., G. H. (2004). Socioeconomic disadvantage and developmental experiences: A framework for policy development. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(3), 565-587.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy options for improving teacher quality*. The Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ramey, S. L., & Steinberg, L. D. (2001). The relations between socioeconomic status and child outcomes: A comprehensive review. *Child Development*, 72(2), 246-273.
- Duncan, G. J., Dowsett, C. J., & Brody, G. H. (2007). The effects of poverty on children's mental health. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58(1), 495-521.
- Duncan, G. J., Dowsett, C. J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2004). The effects of poverty on children's achievement: A review of the evidence. *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 55-60.
- Duran, E., & Firestone, W. A. (2002). Exploring the intersection of race and class: A study of Native American students' experiences in urban high schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 95(5), 253-264.



- Economic Policy Institute. (2019). How much do parents spend on their kids? Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/how-much-do-parents-spend-on-their-kids/>
- Eitle, T. M., & Holland, C. P. (2003). Racial stratification in education: A look at the experiences of African American students. *Sociology of Education Quarterly*, 84(2), 137-155.
- Farkas, G., Johnson Jr., P. B., & Tilly Jr., L. W. (1991). The effects of family socioeconomic status on high school completion among whites and blacks. *Sociology of Education*, 64(2), 75-91.
- Fryberg, S. A., Markus, H. R., & Fuhrman-Orazem, M. (2013). How does changeable is too much change? Cultural differences in perceptions of anxiety and changeability affect well-being after a major life event. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 142(2), 246-256.
- Gardner, M., Davidson, S., & Aviram, A. (2013). The relationship between socioeconomic status and student achievement: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(2), 441-456.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. *Sociological Theory*, 1(1), 201-233.
- Hanson, T. L., & Haworth-Rieger, K. (2014). The effects of socioeconomic status on academic achievement: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 106(2), 241-254.
- Hart, S., Burstein-Nebelciuc, M., & LeBlanc-Laporteriequebecois-Morissette Côtés-Poussinquebecois-Freeman-Skogalbère D. (2017). School-based prevention programs for bullying: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Educational Research Review* (6) pp 34-42
- Harvard Family Research Project. (2019). The effects of neighborhood poverty on children's educational attainment: A review of the literature. Retrieved from <https://www.hfrp.org/publications/the-effects-of-neighborhood-poverty-on-childrens-educational-attainment>
- Harvard Family Research Project. (2019). The effects of neighborhood poverty on children's educational attainment: A review of the literature. Retrieved from <https://www.hfrp.org/publications/the-effects-of-neighborhood-poverty-on-childrens-educational-attainment>
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Henderson, A. T., & Berla, N. (1994). A new framework for thinking about school-family connections. *Elementary School Journal*, 94(4), 346-355.
- Henderson, A. T., & Berla, N. (1994). A review of research on school-based programs for disadvantaged students. *The Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 27(2), 1-16.
- Henderson, A. T., & Berla, N. (1994). A review of research on school-based programs for disadvantaged students. *The Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 27(2), 1-16.
- Henderson, A. T., & Berla, N. (1994). A review of research on school-based programs for prevention of violence. *Journal of Research in Education*, 3(1), 1-28.



- Henderson, A. T., & Berla, N. (1994). A review of research on the effectiveness of school-based programs for children at-risk of school failure: A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Henderson, K., Mappes-Dorfman-Khalsa et al., Tippins et al. (2017). Teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for teaching science: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research*
- Hill, H., & Stafford, L. (2014). The impact of socioeconomic status on educational attainment in the United States. *Sociological Inquiry*, 84(2), 143-164.
- Holloway, J., Whitehead, D., & Lewis-Jones, B. (2018). Parental involvement in children's learning: A review of the literature. *Educational Research Review*, 22(1), 100-117.
- Horn, L., & Nolin, J. M. (2016). Extracurricular activity participation among low-income youth: An examination of the role of family resources and social capital. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(1), 141-155.
- Hoxby, C. M. (2000). The effects of class size on student achievement: New evidence from population variation. *Journal of Public Economics*, 72(1), 141-166.
- Kao, G., & Rutherford, T. (2008). The effects of parental involvement on children's educational outcome: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(2), 1181-1212.
- Katz, L. F., Gottfried, A., & Robison-Srebnik, A. (2013). The effects of poverty on children's cognitive development: A review of the evidence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 34(2), 134-144.
- Katzman, N., Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2012). Patterns of service use among low-income girls: Implications for service delivery systems. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 38(3), 257-274.
- Khan, S. R., & Weisleder, A. (2018). The impact of parental socioeconomic status on children's educational outcomes: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(2), 157-192.
- Kim, S., Lee, S., & Park, H. (2012). Asian American parents' perceptions of their children's academic achievement: An examination of cultural values and family environment. *Journal of Family Issues*, 33(14), 3331-3354.
- Kimmel, E., & Stephens-Davidowitz S. I. (2017). In Pursuit of equality: A review of the literature on school-based programs designed to reduce gender-based violence among adolescents. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*.
- Kirsch, I. S., Jungelbutt, A., Jenkins, L., & Kolstadsson, Y. (2007). *Adult Literacy in OECD Countries: Evidence from PIAAC (Programme for International Assessment of Adult Competencies)*. OECD Publishing.
- Kohn, M. L., & Schooler, C. (1983). *Work and personality: An introduction to occupational psychology*. Sidney Halsted Press.
- Kozol, J. (2015). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Ladd H. F., Levanon G., & Rockoff J. E. (2008). How do public school teachers matter? *National Bureau of Economic Research*, (6) pp 23-34
- Ladd, H. F. (2003). Parent-child interactions and the transition to high school: Implications for the study of student adjustment during adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(2), 245-257.



- Ladd, H. F. (2007). Teacher effects on student achievement: A review of the literature. In W. R. Penuel & R. Rumberger (Eds.), *Choosing wisely: Assessing decisions about teachers at risk of dismissal* (pp. 105-136).
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 159-165.
- Lareau A. (2022). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. California: University of California Press
- Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000). The neighborhoods they live in: The effects of neighborhood residence on child and adolescent outcomes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(2), 155-190.
- Lundberg S., Pollak R. A., & Taubman P. J. (2018). The Bell Curve and crime: A replication study of a classic paper on race and crime. *Journal of Human Resource* (3):45-54.
- Madaus, G. F., Rustici-Morgan-Wunschmann & Chen, J. (2007). *Developing inclusive assessment systems: A framework for assessing student learning in diverse settings*. Routledge.
- Mason C., Moore B., & Martin M. E. (2017). Disability status as a predictor of academic achievement: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* (6): 34-45
- Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. London: Harvard University Press.
- McLoyd, V. C., Cauce, A. M., Takeuchi, D., & Wilson-Mitchell, J. E. (2005). Marital discord and child behavior problems: The role of family processes as a mediator. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(4), 799-813.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). *The condition of education 2019: Highlights from the 50-state report card on American education*.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). (2018). *PISA 2018 results: What students know and can do: Students' background characteristics: An overview*.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). (2018). *PISA 2018 results: What students know and can do: Students' background characteristics: An overview*.
- Orfield G., & Lee C. (2005). *Why segregation matters: Poverty & educational inequality Down South*. Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Parcel, T. L., & Menaghan, E. G. (1993). Young children's socioemotional development: The contribution of family structure and family economic hardship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55(2), 341-354.
- Russell S.T.H., Clarke T.B., & Porter L.C.T. (2013). Who cares about sexual orientation? A review of the literature on sexual orientation in school settings with recommendations for education policymakers. *Journal of School Violence*.
- Shavit, Y., Buchmann, N., & Premoehler-Müller-Raviv, R. (2007). Increasing inequality in school systems: How do different educational systems make it happen? *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 612(1), 127-144.



Sirin, S.R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analysis of research using the Hollingshead four-factor index. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 242-257

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2015). Expectations for academic achievement: The relationship between student and teacher expectations for self-achievement in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(2), 350-363.

