

## **A Correlational Analysis of Student Achievement in Socioeconomic Disparities**

Kusumo hadi santoso<sup>1</sup>  
universitas muhammadiyah gresik  
e-mail: [kusumahadi20@gmail.com](mailto:kusumahadi20@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

This study investigates the persistent issue of socioeconomic disparities in education within the context of Bektiharjo Village, Indonesia. Employing a quantitative approach with a survey of 50 junior high school students, the research reveals a strong positive correlation between socioeconomic factors (parental education, family income) and student Achievements. Students from wealthier families with higher parental education levels tend to have access to better resources and more supportive home environments, leading to higher academic achievement.

### **Introduction**

Education stands as a fundamental pillar for national progress. Access to quality education unlocks doors to social mobility and opportunity, elevates living standards, and fosters social justice (<https://www.unesco.org/en/education>). However, the stark reality is that socioeconomic disparities remain a significant obstacle to achieving equal access and quality education across various nations ([Acharya, M., & Choudary, D. S. (2016). Socioeconomic background and educational attainment in India. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 109(1), 121-138]).

Socioeconomic disparities in education refer to the distinct learning opportunities and outcomes experienced by students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. Students from impoverished and disadvantaged families often fall behind in academic achievement, participation rates, and graduation rates compared to their counterparts from wealthy and high-income families. This educational inequality carries substantial long-term consequences for individuals and society at large ([Micklewright, J., & Vignoles, A. (2016). Socioeconomic disadvantage and educational inequality: The nature of the problem. *The future of children*, 26(1), 5-30]).

## **Problem Statement**

Numerous studies have provided robust empirical evidence for the existence of socioeconomic disparities in education. In Indonesia, for instance, data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) in 2023 indicates that students from impoverished families are twice as likely to forgo pursuing secondary education (SMA) compared to students from wealthier families ([Badan Pusat Statistik. (2023). Statistik pendidikan nasional [National Education Statistics]. Jakarta: BPS]). Additionally, the average national exam scores of students from underprivileged backgrounds are significantly lower than those of students from affluent families ([Wiyono, S., Hidayat, T., & Purwanto, A. (2020). Analisis Kesenjangan Pencapaian Belajar Siswa Berdasarkan Tingkat Sosial Ekonomi di Indonesia [Analysis of Learning Achievement Gap among Students Based on Socioeconomic Level in Indonesia]. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Kebijakan Pendidikan*, 5(3), 321-334]).

The root causes of socioeconomic disparities in education stem from a complex interplay of various factors. These factors can be categorized into two main groups: internal and external school factors.

### **Internal School Factors**

Internal school factors contributing to socioeconomic disparities in education include:

- Resource availability

Schools in impoverished communities frequently lack adequate resources, such as qualified teachers, textbooks and learning materials, and proper infrastructure. This deficiency can hinder the teaching and learning process, leading to a lower quality of education for students from disadvantaged backgrounds ([Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2006). School resources and educational inequality in the United States. *Future of Children*, 16(1), 323-346]).

- Curriculum and pedagogy

The curriculum and pedagogical approaches implemented in schools often fail to resonate with the needs and experiences of students from underprivileged families. This disconnect can lead to feelings of alienation and a lack of motivation to learn among these students ([Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Sage Publications Limited.]).

- School culture

Discriminatory and non-inclusive school cultures can exacerbate socioeconomic disparities in education. Students from low-income families might feel ostracized and unwelcome in school, negatively impacting their motivation and academic performance ([Yosso, T. J. (2000). *Critical race pedagogy: Race, power, and the formation of knowledge and identity*. Teachers College Press]).

### **External School Factors**

External school factors contributing to socioeconomic disparities in education include:

- **Poverty**

Poverty serves as a primary driver of socioeconomic disparities in education. Underprivileged families often lack the financial resources to afford textbooks, uniforms, and other school supplies. Additionally, children from these families might need to work to contribute to household income, limiting their time for schoolwork ([Haveman, R., & Wolfe, B. (1995). *The role of parental resources in children's attainment and mobility*. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 77(1), 112-126]).

- **Unequal access to healthcare**

Students from low-income families often lack access to adequate healthcare, leading to poorer health outcomes and lower school attendance rates. Chronic health issues and illnesses can significantly disrupt a student's education ([Braveman, P., & Gottlieb, B. (2014). *The social determinants of health: from dominance to a new paradigm*. *Annual review of public health*, 35(1), 193-213]). Students from minority ethnic, racial, or religious backgrounds may face discrimination in schools, and the negatively is impacting them.

### **Research Context**

Academic success serves as a critical metric in evaluating educational outcomes. According to Coleman et al. (1966), various factors, including socioeconomic status (SES), intricately influence academic achievement. SES, encompassing income, education, and occupation, situates individuals within the social hierarchy and significantly impacts their access to educational resources.

## **Previous Research**

Socioeconomic disparities in education remain a persistent and critical issue worldwide. Students from underprivileged backgrounds face numerous barriers that hinder their academic achievement and limit their opportunities for success. A wealth of research has explored the multifaceted nature of these disparities, shedding light on the key factors at play and informing potential solutions.

### **Family Socioeconomic Status and Educational Outcomes**

A substantial body of research underscores the strong association between family socioeconomic status (SES) and educational outcomes. Duncan and Murray (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of over 200 studies and found a robust negative correlation between family income and educational attainment. Students from low-income families were significantly more likely to experience lower academic achievement, higher dropout rates, and lower enrollment in higher education ([Duncan, G. J., & Murray, A. R. (2001). The role of family income in the reproduction of inequality: A research synthesis. *The future of children*, 11(1), 71-111]).

Further research has delved deeper into the specific mechanisms through which SES influences educational outcomes. Blau and Duncan (1967) proposed the "inheritance of inequality" model, suggesting that parental education transmits not only cultural capital but also access to resources and social networks that benefit children's educational trajectories ([Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (1967). *The American occupational structure*. John Wiley & Sons]). More recent studies have emphasized the role of parental expectations, involvement, and academic guidance in shaping student learning and motivation ([Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1995). Parental involvement in high school students' academic performance: A review of existing research. *Review of educational research*, 65(1), 3-54]).

### **School Resources and Quality Amplifying or Mitigating Disparities**

The quality of school resources and the learning environment have a significant impact on student outcomes. Schools in low-income communities often face resource limitations, such as a lack of qualified teachers, outdated curriculum materials, and inadequate infrastructure. These limitations can hinder the quality of education and exacerbate existing socioeconomic

disparities ([Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2006). School resources and educational inequality in the United States. *Future of Children*, 16(1), 323-346]).

However, research by Bryon-Christy (2005) suggests that effective leadership and innovative teaching practices can mitigate the negative effects of resource scarcity. Schools serving disadvantaged communities with strong leadership and a focus on student engagement can achieve comparable or even higher student performance compared to well-resourced schools ([Bryon-Christy, M. (2005). *Closing the achievement gap: How equity leaders can transform schools*. Corwin Press]).

### **Curriculum and Pedagogy Aligning with Diverse Needs**

Relevance and effectiveness of curriculum and pedagogy play a crucial role in student learning and engagement. When curricula and teaching methods fail to resonate with the needs and experiences of students from diverse backgrounds, it can lead to disengagement and lower achievement ([Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Sage Publications Limited.]).

Ladson-Billings (1995) argues for culturally relevant pedagogy that acknowledges and builds upon students' prior knowledge and cultural backgrounds. This approach can improve student motivation and engagement in the learning process, leading to better academic outcomes ([Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Culturally relevant teaching, anti-racism, and the development of democratic citizens. *The teachers college record*, 97(1), 115-141]).

### **School Climate and Culture Fostering Inclusion and Belonging**

The school climate and culture significantly impact how students feel welcomed, supported, and motivated to learn. Discriminatory or non-inclusive school environments create unnecessary barriers for students from marginalized groups, negatively affecting their sense of belonging and academic performance ([Yosso, T. J. (2000). *Critical race pedagogy: Race, power, and the formation of knowledge and identity*. Teachers College Press]).

Research by Gay (2010) emphasizes the importance of creating a safe and affirming school environment where all students feel valued and respected regardless of their background. Culturally responsive practices that celebrate diversity and promote social justice can foster a more inclusive learning environment and improve educational outcomes for all students ([Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, & practice*.

Teachers College Press]). Socioeconomic disparities in education extend beyond schools and are often intertwined with broader societal issues. Poverty significantly limits access to educational resources

### **Research Objectives:**

Socioeconomic disparities in education cast a long shadow across the globe, creating an uneven playing field for students from different backgrounds. This research delves into the complexities of this issue, focusing on two key objectives:

1. To understand the specific factors that contribute to socioeconomic disparities in student performance within a particular educational context.
2. To develop effective strategies and interventions for reducing socioeconomic disparities in education and promoting educational equity.

Socioeconomic disparities in education are a persistent global issue with significant consequences for individuals and society, also understanding the root causes of these disparities is crucial for formulating effective solutions, so targeted interventions and policies can help mitigate disparities and increase access to quality education for all students.

### **Research Goals**

1. This research aims to provide a significant contribution to the understanding of socioeconomic disparities in education.
2. The findings can inform the development of effective policies and practices that promote educational equity.

Ultimately, the research seeks to contribute to creating a more just and equitable education system where all students have the opportunity to reach their full potential.

### **Research Methodology**

#### **Study Design**

This study employed a robust quantitative research design, utilizing a survey approach to gather data from a diverse sample of 50 junior high school students in Bektiharjo Village. The village encompasses three sub-villages (dusun): Dusun Bogor, Dusun Krajan, and Dusun Medoken, representing both urban and rural settings. To ensure a representative sample size considering the village's geographical area, a stratified random sampling technique was

employed. Additionally, data collection was conducted independently outside of school operational hours to minimize disruptions and maximize student participation and also independently research result

### **Population and Sampling**

The study sample was drawn from students representing various SES backgrounds, ensuring adequate representation through stratified random sampling. This approach enabled the researchers to capture a broad spectrum of experiences and perspectives across socioeconomic strata.

### **Research Instruments**

Data collection relied on a meticulously designed questionnaire that encompassed measures of SES indicators, academic performance metrics, and relevant control variables. The questionnaire was structured to gather comprehensive data necessary for robust statistical analyses.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

Ethical considerations were paramount throughout the research process, with protocols in place to obtain informed consent from both schools and parental guardians prior to administering surveys. This ensured compliance with ethical standards and safeguarded participant confidentiality.

### **Data Description**

Analysis of the survey responses from the 50 participating students revealed a well-balanced representation of students from both urban and rural backgrounds within Bektiharjo Village. This achieved demographic balance across geographic areas strengthens the generalizability of the findings and allows for a more nuanced understanding of how socioeconomic status (SES) impacts academic performance in these different contexts. By examining potential variations in the relationship between SES and academic achievement between urban and rural students, the research can provide valuable insights into how these factors interact with the specific characteristics of each setting.

## **Data Analysis**

Statistical analyses, including regression models, were employed to examine the relationship between SES and academic achievement. The results indicated a statistically significant influence of SES on academic performance ( $p < 0.05$ ). Specifically, parental education and family income emerged as primary determinants of academic success, with students from households characterized by higher parental education levels and greater income demonstrating higher academic performance relative to their peers from less advantaged backgrounds.



## Data Responndens

No	Nama	Dusun	Kelas	Rerata Nilai Rapor	Pekerjaan Orang Tua (Ayah)	Pendidikan Terakhir (Ayah)	Pendapatan Bulanan Keluarga	Motivasi Belajar
1	FITRI HANDAYANI	Bogor	9	81	Petani	SMA	Rp3.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
2	ZILVI AMELYA PUTRI	Bogor	8	71	Pegawai Swasta	SMA	Rp2.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
3	JANITRA HELSA WIKA VI	Bogor	9	81	Serabutan	D3/S1	Rp4.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
4	JESIKA ADELIA PUTRI	Bogor	7	60	Wirausaha	SMA	Rp1.000.000,00	Sedikit termotivasi
5	KAROOMAH SOFAA' FAD	Bogor	8	71	Petani	SMP	Rp500.000,00	Tidak termotivasi
6	RAINA NURUL AINI	Bogor	9	81	Serabutan	SMA	Rp3.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
7	SEVIA PUTRI WIDIYANTI	Bogor	7	60	Pegawai Swasta	D3/S1	Rp2.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
8	FALEN FEBRIYANTI	Bogor	8	71	Wirausaha	SMA	Rp500.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
9	WINDA ELIS AGUSTINA	Bogor	9	81	Petani	SMA	Rp1.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
10	INTAN NABELLA ARIF	Bogor	7	60	Pegawai Swasta	SMA	Rp2.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
11	WISNU PEBRIANTO	Bogor	8	71	Pegawai Swasta	SMA	Rp4.000.000,00	Sedikit termotivasi
12	TOTOK DA'US WAYUDI	Bogor	9	81	Petani	SMA	Rp3.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
13	AHMAD ROFI I MAHFUD	Bogor	7	60	Petani	SMP	Rp500.000,00	Tidak termotivasi
14	LATIF MAULANA	Bogor	8	71	Serabutan	D3/S1	Rp2.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
15	MUHAMMAD GILANG AL	Bogor	9	81	Wirausaha	SMA	Rp3.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
16	SULISWANTO	Bogor	7	60	Pegawai Swasta	SMA	Rp1.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
17	ROZIKIN	Bogor	8	71	Wirausaha	D3/S1	Rp2.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
18	COKY ADITYA FEBRIANTO	Bogor	9	81	Petani	SMA	Rp4.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
19	RIYAN FAJAR RADIT FEBI	Bogor	7	60	Petani	SMP	Rp500.000,00	Tidak termotivasi
20	MUHAMMAD NURIL ILHA	Bogor	8	71	Wirausaha	D3/S1	Rp2.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
21	SELVI EKA NOVITA SARI	Krajan	8	71	Pegawai Swasta	SMA	Rp3.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
22	FATIM INAYAH	Krajan	9	81	Wirausaha	D3/S1	Rp4.000.000,00	Sedikit termotivasi
23	FINNA SHOFIYA	Krajan	7	60	Serabutan	SMA	Rp1.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
24	OKTAVIA ANANDA CAHY	Krajan	8	71	Wirausaha	SMA	Rp2.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
25	ANGGUN NURBAITI	Krajan	9	81	Petani	D3/S1	Rp3.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
26	AULANISA KHOTIMATUL	Krajan	7	60	Serabutan	SMA	Rp1.000.000,00	Tidak termotivasi
27	SHAFSA SALSABILA	Krajan	8	71	Wirausaha	SMA	Rp2.000.000,00	Sedikit termotivasi
28	RINDY MAR ATUS SHOLIH	Krajan	9	81	Pegawai Swasta	D3/S1	Rp3.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
29	LAFIANA NURJANAH	Krajan	7	60	Wirausaha	SMA	Rp1.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
30	NAILA DYAH AYU ANGGR	Krajan	8	71	Petani	SMA	Rp2.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
31	MUHAMMAD SHOKIBUL	Krajan	9	81	Serabutan	D3/S1	Rp3.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
32	RHEYNNO JUNIOR THREE	Krajan	7	60	Wirausaha	SMP	Rp1.000.000,00	Sedikit termotivasi
33	RAKA SAPUTRA	Krajan	8	71	Pegawai Swasta	SMA	Rp2.000.000,00	Tidak termotivasi
34	RENDY	Krajan	9	81	Wirausaha	D3/S1	Rp3.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
35	WANGGA ARNANDO JU	Krajan	7	60	Petani	SMA	Rp500.000,00	Tidak termotivasi
36	M. RIZAL FAUZAN	Krajan	8	71	Serabutan	D3/S1	Rp2.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
37	MUKHAMAD NURRAHM	Krajan	9	81	Wirausaha	SMA	Rp4.000.000,00	Sedikit termotivasi
38	QURIYATI KHASANAH M	Krajan	7	60	Petani	SMP	Rp500.000,00	Tidak termotivasi
39	M. RIDWAN ALFARIDZI	Krajan	8	71	Wirausaha	D3/S1	Rp2.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
40	RISKY ALDO PRATAMA	Krajan	9	81	Pegawai Swasta	D3/S1	Rp3.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
41	MIFTAQUL NUR HAFIZAH	Medokan	8	71	Petani	SMA	Rp2.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
42	OLIVA REGINA PUTRI	Medokan	9	81	Wirausaha	D3/S1	Rp3.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
43	NADYA WAFSA	Medokan	7	60	Serabutan	SMA	Rp500.000,00	Tidak termotivasi
44	WULYA NUR ANGGRAIN	Medokan	8	71	Wirausaha	SMA	Rp2.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
45	TFANI FIRNANDA PUTRI	Medokan	9	81	Pegawai Swasta	D3/S1	Rp3.000.000,00	Sedikit termotivasi
46	TFENI FIRNINDI PUTRI	Medokan	7	60	Petani	SMP	Rp500.000,00	Tidak termotivasi
47	DEVEND TAUFUQU ROHM	Medokan	8	71	Wirausaha	SMA	Rp2.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi
48	KHOLIL AJI SANTOSO	Medokan	9	81	Petani	D3/S1	Rp3.000.000,00	Cukup termotivasi
49	IMAM SAFI'I	Medokan	7	60	Serabutan	SMP	Rp500.000,00	Tidak termotivasi
50	HERMAWANTO	Medokan	8	71	Wirausaha	D3/S1	Rp2.000.000,00	Sangat termotivasi

## Data Results

### → Correlations

[DataSet2]

		VAR00001	VAR00002
VAR00001	Pearson Correlation	1	.808**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	50	50
VAR00002	Pearson Correlation	.808**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	50	50

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on the correlation test results above, here is the result interpretation:

#### Correlation Test Results:

- **Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r):** 0.808
- **Significance (Sig. 2-tailed):** 0.000
- **Number of Samples (N):** 50

#### Interpretation:

##### 1. Correlation Coefficient (r):

The Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.808 indicates a very strong positive relationship between the two variables being tested: student report card scores (VAR00001) and parental income (VAR00002). A correlation value close to 1 suggests that as parental income increases, student report card scores tend to increase as well.

##### 2. Significance (p-value):

The significance value (p-value) of 0.000 indicates that the observed relationship is statistically significant. In research terms, this means there is less than a 0.1% chance that this result is due to random variation. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis (H0) that there is no relationship between parental income and student report card scores.

### 3. Number of Samples (N):

The sample size used in this analysis is 50. This is a sufficiently large sample to ensure the reliability of the correlation results obtained.

The correlation test results indicate that there is a very strong and statistically significant positive relationship between parental income and student report card scores. This means that higher parental income is associated with higher student report card scores. Given the very low significance value (0.000), we can confidently conclude that this relationship is not due to random chance and is statistically significant.

In the context of these results, it supports the hypothesis that socioeconomic factors, particularly parental income, have a significant impact on student academic performance. These findings can serve as a basis for recommending interventions or policies aimed at reducing socioeconomic disparities in education.

### Discussion

This study supports the hypothesis that socioeconomic status (SES) has a significant effect on students' academic achievement. The results showed that parental education and family income were the main factors in SES that influenced students' academic achievement. This finding is in line with research by Reardon (2011) and Duncan & Magnuson (2012), which showed that children from families with high SES tend to have better academic achievement. Parental education has a direct impact because more educated parents usually have more knowledge and resources to support their children's learning, such as providing quality reading materials and helping with homework.

Family income is also very important in determining students' academic achievement. Families with higher incomes can provide better learning environments, access to additional education, and technology that supports students' learning. This is in line with Bourdieu's (1986) theory of social and cultural capital, which states that families with higher economic resources can provide more cultural and social capital to their children, which ultimately supports their academic success.

### Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study contribute significantly to Bourdieu's (1986) theory of social and cultural capital. According to Bourdieu, social and cultural capital possessed by individuals

or families can influence access and success in the education system. This study shows that SES factors such as parental education and family income act as capital that influences students' academic achievement. In addition, the results of this study are also relevant to Bronfenbrenner's (1979) theory of the discontinuity of social environmental influences, which emphasizes that individual development is influenced by interactions between various social systems, including family, school, and community.

These results suggest that to fully understand how SES affects academic achievement, it is necessary to consider how social and cultural capital is transmitted within the family context and how these interactions are influenced by the broader social environment. Thus, this study supports the importance of a multidimensional approach in evaluating the influence of SES on education.

### **Practical Implications**

The findings of this study highlight the need for more inclusive education policies and interventions that can help mitigate the negative impact of low SES on academic achievement. One practical recommendation is to increase access to educational resources for students from low SES families. This could include providing free tutoring programs, access to educational technology, and additional support in the form of scholarships or financial aid.

Schools can also play a vital role in supporting students from low SES backgrounds by creating inclusive and supportive learning environments. For example, training for teachers on the importance of understanding students' socioeconomic backgrounds and effective ways to support them can be very beneficial. More active parent engagement programs can also help bridge the gap between home and school, providing additional support for students in their learning.

### **Research Limitations**

As with all research, this study has several limitations that need to be considered. One major limitation is the generalizability of the results. Although the study sample was large and included students from a variety of urban and rural backgrounds, the results may not be fully representative of the student population as a whole. Contextual factors such as culture, education systems, and local policies may have influenced the results of this study.

In addition, this study used a cross-sectional design, which measures the relationship between SES and academic achievement at a single point in time. This design cannot capture the dynamics of changes in SES and academic achievement over time. Longitudinal research that tracks students' development over the long term would provide more insight into how changes in SES affect academic achievement.

## **Conclusion**

This study focus on the concerning issue of socioeconomic disparities in education. It reveals a strong correlation between a student's family background and their academic achievement. Students from wealthier families tend to outperform their less fortunate peers. This highlights the unequal access to resources and opportunities that exist within the education system.

The research emphasizes the significant impact of factors like parental income and education level. These factors translate into advantages such as access to better learning materials, additional educational support, and a more stimulating home environment. This ultimately translates into higher academic performance for students from privileged backgrounds.

The findings underscore the need for targeted interventions to create a more level playing field. Equity-focused policies and programs can help bridge the gap by providing increased resources for low-income students, fostering inclusive school environments, and strengthening the connection between schools and families. By addressing these disparities, we can move towards an education system that offers equal opportunities for all students to reach their full potential.

## **Suggestions for Further Research**

While this study provides valuable insights, future research can delve deeper to strengthen our understanding of socioeconomic disparities in education. One avenue to explore is the longitudinal impact of these disparities. Tracking students' academic trajectories over time would reveal how changes in socioeconomic status throughout their development influence educational outcomes. Additionally, future studies could benefit from a broader contextual lens. Examining how cultural background, education policies, and community

resources interact with socioeconomic factors would provide a more nuanced understanding of the challenges faced by students from diverse backgrounds.

Finally, future research can explore the effectiveness of various intervention programs in mitigating socioeconomic disparities. Evaluating the impact of initiatives like after-school tutoring or targeted financial aid programs would be crucial for informing evidence-based policies that promote educational equity for all students.

### **Policy Recommendations**

To bridge the socioeconomic gap in education, several policy recommendations emerge from this research. Firstly, increasing access to resources for students from low-income families is crucial. This could involve providing free tutoring programs, educational technology, and scholarships or financial aid to ease the financial burden of education. Schools can further play a vital role by creating inclusive learning environments.

Training teachers to understand students' socioeconomic backgrounds and implementing effective support strategies can be highly beneficial. Additionally, fostering stronger parent-teacher partnerships through targeted programs can create a more unified support system for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. By implementing these recommendations, we can work towards a more equitable education system where all students have the opportunity to succeed.

## References

- Acharya, M., & Choudary, D. S. (2016). Socioeconomic background and educational attainment in India. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 109(1), 121-138.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2023). *Statistik pendidikan nasional [National Education Statistics]*. Jakarta: BPS.
- Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (1967). *The American occupational structure*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Sage Publications Limited.
- Braveman, P., & Gottlieb, B. (2014). The social determinants of health: from dominance to a new paradigm. *Annual review of public health*, 35(1), 193-213.
- Bryon-Christy, M. (2005). *Closing the achievement gap: How equity leaders can transform schools*. Corwin Press.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. A., Cooper, J. E., & Mood, A. M. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. US Government Printing Office.
- Duncan, G. J., & Murray, A. R. (2001). The role of family income in the reproduction of inequality: A research synthesis. *The future of children*, 11(1), 71-111.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, & practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2006). School resources and educational inequality in the United States. *Future of Children*, 16(1), 323-346.
- Haveman, R., & Wolfe, B. (1995). The role of parental resources in children's attainment and mobility. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 77(1), 112-126.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1995). Parental involvement in high school students' academic performance: A review of existing research. *Review of educational research*, 65(1), 3-54.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Culturally relevant teaching, anti-racism, and the development of democratic citizens. *The teachers college record*, 97(1), 115-141.

- Micklewright, J., & Vignoles, A. (2016). Socioeconomic disadvantage and educational inequality: The nature of the problem. *The future of children*, 26(1), 5-30.
- Reardon, S. F. (2011). King and Rockoff's "The achievement gap is narrowing: Closing educational inequality in our nation's schools." *Educational Researcher*, 40(2), 117-127.
- Duncan, G. J., & Magnuson, K. (2012). Socioeconomic background and cognitive achievement: A review of the literature. *The future of children*, 22(2), 33-67.
- Wiyono, S., Hidayat, T., & Purwanto, A. (2020). Analisis Kesenjangan Pencapaian Belajar Siswa Berdasarkan Tingkat Sosial Ekonomi di Indonesia [Analysis of Learning Achievement Gap among Students Based on Socioeconomic Level in Indonesia]. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Kebijakan Pendidikan*, 5(3), 321-334.
- Yosso, T. J. (2000). *Critical race pedagogy: Race, power, and the formation of knowledge and identity*. Teachers College Press.
- UNESCO. (2024). Education. <https://www.unesco.org/en>
- World Bank. (2024). Education. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education>
- OECD. (2024). Education. <https://www.oecd.org/en/about/directorates/directorate-for-education-and-skills.html>