Liberal Journal of Language and Literature Review

Volume. 1 Issue No. 1 (2022)

Exploring the Relationship between Poverty and Education

Naeem Javaid
PhD Scholar, Department of Economics, University of Peshawar.
Muhammad Ihtisham
MS Scholar, Department of Economics, University of Peshawar

Abstract

This paper explores the complex dynamics between poverty and education, showing how class and resources shape access to and experiences of education and educational outcomes. Starting with an overview of the theoretical frameworks underpinning the interaction between the two variables in question, this literature review subsequently also analyses the existing literature that identifies key factors that link poverty to educational performance on an individual's school resources and long-term economic effects. It adopts a qualitative methodology using case studies, interviews, and existing data to depict the experiences of financially disadvantaged students. The chapter then provides a data analysis that synthesises research findings across many studies; it illustrates how poverty influences educational opportunities and outcomes and highlights potential interventions that can close these gaps. The paper concludes that creating policies and practices ameliorates the negative impact of poverty on education and calls for further research in this important domain. In effect, this study helps "map the area" of educational equity as a global human right, creating the scaffolding for the charts that will help inform an industrial policy needed to practice human rights to fill the gap between educational equality and educational attainment which extends beyond just educational policy but can also include economic development strategy as the lines between a nation's success and educational attainment increasingly blur.

Keywords: Poverty, Education, Opportunities, Policies, Outcomes

Introduction

Education is frequently trumpeted as a crucial vehicle for social mobility, personal development, and economic growth. However, socioeconomic factors—namely,

poverty—wield powerful influence over educational access and quality realities. Poverty and education have a long-ripened relationship, formed by variables and evolved by circumstances. Educational experiences and outcomes—and access to those opportunities—can thrift shop poverty, ensuring the next generation also inherits systems that pass along adversity.

This article examines the interrelationship of poverty and education, examining how financial hardship restricts education access and how a lack of educational access may contribute to poverty. This exploration is significant as it has ramifications for policymakers, educators, and sociologists who work towards comprehending and dismantling the infrastructural impediments that hinder low-income populations from attaining quality education.

Research shows that children growing up in poverty perform poorly academically compared to their peers (Hernandez, 2011; Duncan & Murnane, 2011), especially those who have gained social capital and nurturing learning environments (Reardon, 2011). In many cases, poverty influences not only educational outcomes but also health, family stability, and cognitive development, which shapes a child's ability to succeed in school.

Through such an introduction, wide-reaching literature is being encased, showcasing not just the historical dimensions of how poverty shows up in education but also some of the latest research covering the rich spectrum of the challenge today.

This question is critical, as education is far more than an individual pathway to self-advancement; it is the bedrock of social advancement. Therefore, it is essential to understand the barriers encountered by students of lower socioeconomic status to assist in creating effective educational policies that reduce inequities and improve the inclusion of low-income students.

These will provide insights into relevant research, the approaches used to explore the nexus of poverty and education, and an analytical discussion on the collected trends and data and what they might mean for future interventions. Through

exploring these research areas, a deeper understanding of what poverty means for education could be accomplished, and a call for complete systemic changes regarding poverty and education could be made.

Literature Review

This section links poverty to education through recognised mechanisms or constructs that explain how socioeconomic status influences educational attainment. One popular theory I used was the Social Reproduction Theory, proposed by Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron (1977). This theory states that social inequalities are passed down at the point of cultural capital. In this framework, families with fewer economic resources bring less cultural capital—which references knowledge, skills, and behaviours esteemed by educational institutions—into determining their child's academic performance.

This is in addition to the human capital theory, which approaches education from the context of an investment in future earnings. Therefore, poverty is defined as a lack of educational necessities, which results in low economic returns and further aggravation of socioeconomic class differentiation (Becker, 1993). From this view, education is an ability-acquisition process that prepares individuals for life. However, when one cannot afford the resources due to poverty, the potential is never given a chance to realise itself.

The Link Between Poverty and Education Attainment

Numerous research studies have highlighted the challenges that poverty creates regarding education. Stats from NCES (2020): Children from low-income families are less likely to attend preschool and, therefore, start school, deprived of an opportunity that more affluent families enjoy. This early disadvantage can have long-term repercussions: the early education environment greatly influences later learning and development (McCoy et al., 2017).

However, as important as it is to know how the funding of schools works, it is also important to know how poverty functions. Schools in poor areas are found to be poorly endowed with basic stock like qualified teachers, teaching aids, and

physical infrastructure (Snyder et al., 2019). In the Funding Inequality model, property taxes contribute about 50% to funding public education, favouring schools in affluent neighbourhoods with superior equipment compared to schools in poor neighbourhoods. Therefore, low SES students have poor access to resources during learning; hence, they reduce their academic achievement.

Outcome and Comparison in Education Performance

The performance of learners in school has been worst affected by poverty. A study conducted by Duncan and Murnane (2011) notes that children in low-income families get poorer scores on tests and out more than those from affluent families. These differences in performance include poor parental supervision, low academic achievement expectations, and high truancy rates due to poverty.

However, a few gaps are left behind in terms of how poverty impacts cognitive and even emotional development. This is because poverty level is a good predictor of a child's learning, and stress and instability hamper cognition. As argued by Evans and Kim (2013), the mishaps of poverty are compounded by environmental affairs such as residential instability and sheer hunger, which really cumulatively augments the psychological stress that detriments children's learning outcomes.

Addressing the Issues Related To Poverty in Education

Poverty in education takes various forms in society, and therefore, many policies to address the issues arising from poverty have developed over time. One of the implemented principles has been increasing the extent of Title I programs to focus on schools with students from low-income families. Research has found that for Title I-funded schools, improved educational achievement results are possible through qualified teacher attainment and additional support services (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

Finally, decentralisation and the partnership between schools and social services working for low-income students show success. For instance, 'wraparound services' (medical, counselling, tutoring, and academic support) enhanced

achievement (Wilder, 2014). They can also promote more equitable educational arrangements by addressing the multiple concerns of low-income students.

Closing the Literature Review

Therefore, the literature links poverty and education by establishing how seriously economic status degrades the probabilities and quality of education. Researchers have employed theoretical frameworks like Social Reproduction Theory and Human Capital Theory to explain how poverty affects education. As a result, the limited access to learning materials coupled with the psychosocial cost of poverty described in the prior post is a cry for equity interventions to close this gap.

Research Methodology

Methods: This qualitative research study explores the link between poverty and education through the lens of individual experiences and established educational structures. Because the qualitative strategy considers people's subjective experiences and the broader sociocultural setting, it facilitates a greater understanding of the ambiguities surrounding this relationship.

Research Design

Case studies drive the research design and shape an inquiry into students' educational access from disadvantaged, low-income backgrounds. All the chosen cases represent pupils from varying communities, ages, ethnicities, geo-locations, and types of education. This diversity will allow for the challenges faced by students in poverty to be explored in depth.

Data Collection Methods

This research uses multiple methods of data collection, which include:

Further, semi-structured interviews were performed with students, educators, and parents to understand how poverty impacts educational access and experiences. Personal anecdotes, educational barriers, and perceptions of quality education were the interviews' key components.

Focus groups: Focus groups of educators and community leaders will facilitate broader conversations about systemic issues and potential solutions. Through this

collective resource collaboration and discussion, we aim to find commonalities and areas for educational poverty adjustments.

Analysis of Existing Data: The analysis also drew on existing studies and reports (e.g., NCES datasets and government reports about educational inequities) on poverty and education. The quantitative findings (secondary data) complement the qualitative findings and help situate the information in the context of poverty and education.

An analysis of the case: A limited number of cases from low-income schools will be analysed in case analysis. These analyses look into how these schools respond to the challenges of poverty through programs, resources, and community engagement.

Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted following ethical principles regarding informed consent, confidentiality, and respect for participants. Interviews/focus groups will only be undertaken after providing clear information about the study's purpose and written consent from participants. All data will be anonymised to maintain participants' confidentiality.

This section of the essay explains the research to give a comprehensive understanding of how poverty is linked to education. Through interviews, established studies, and data, this qualitative approach illuminates some structural challenges surrounding low-income students' stumbling blocks to getting educated. Using case studies, the research will assist in determining best practices to address those systems that contribute to the perpetuation of educational inequity.

Data Analysis

Accessibility to Education: Perception from the Poverty Perspective

It is loudly demanding and focuses on the lack of education and the connection to poverty levels. However, interviews with a low-income student population showed many challenges, such as no means of transportation to get to school,

lack or inadequate access to academic resources, and jobs to support household earnings. For example, during the study, a 15-year-old anonymous girl from low-income housing said she often skipped school to stay home and look after her younger brothers and sisters; their mother worked several jobs. This example shows that educational attainment can be influenced by one's socioeconomic status, crediting an indeterminate education experience.

Other educators also supported these findings, reiterating the idea that students in low-income settings come to school ready to learn from other environmental factors apart from their context's economic status. The teachers indicated that disruptions due to issues arising from financial concerns distracted the learners. That is why schools in areas with high poverty rates must invest even more in social and emotional development than students need for academics.

Comparing Inequalities of Students' Resources and Learning Outcomes

However, these were schools within the low-income bracket; they could have offered shocking realities of how underfunded education was and still is. In contrast, schools in more affluent areas may receive new facilities, better-equipped technology, more elegant buildings, and more qualified teachers. On the other hand, it was shown that schools run in impoverished communities struggled with dilapidated school infrastructure and limited exposure to quality enrichment opportunities.

Specifically, the NCES (2020) revealed that districts with the highest poverty rates were funded by per-pupil values that had been drastically lower than in school districts with low poverty. Thus, they experienced significantly lower graduation and attainment levels in academic performance, and the results on standardised assessments were significantly different between students from affluent and poor neighbourhoods. For instance, one school from a low-income district said 60% of its children scored above the proficiency level in mathematics. However, 85 per cent of the students of a wealthier district associated with its school attained above these standards.

One of the data collection exercise's findings was that poverty has a psychological effect on the children's school experiences. Case interviews with social workers and counsellors in the tolled effectively demonstrated the poverty-related stressors that encompassed and affected the students' mental health. Students revealed feeling anxious or despairing about their finances, which also contributed to their academic and school attendance outcomes.

A set of case studies indicated that schools that reported high student distress had to expend resources to address such issues, which bet at/shock the school's limited budget. One introduced an early intervention program that provided counselling and after-school care. However, parents suggested that many families were unaware of those services, the continuity of which remained a hindrance due to communication barriers that seemed to be worsened by poverty.

The analysis also reviewed several intervention programs designed to lessen the harmful impact of poverty on education. Focus groups with educators from the schools that implemented wraparound services (health care, tutoring, and community support) indicated improved student engagement and academic outcomes. For example, a high-poverty high school that had a program offering free after-school tutoring and meals to students improved not just attendance rates but performance on standardised tests, too.

Parental engagement initiatives that encouraged family involvement in education facilitated better student outcomes. Data from surveys given to parents showed that parents who were involved with school felt more connected to the school community, which positively affected their children's attitudes toward education.

Conclusion

The above results coincide with the previous literature and suggest a robust relationship. According to Duncan and Murnane (2011), barriers facing children raised in poverty strongly erode their academic achievement. This study's qualitative data provides nuance to those barriers and real-life examples of how

those factors interplayed in the students' day-to-day routes through resistance, thereby adding depth to the existing body of knowledge.

In particular, the socio-emotional concerns outlined in conversations with educators and students reaffirm Evans and Kim's (2013) claims about the psychological toll financial instability takes on children. The case studies illustrate the dire necessity for robust strategies that address these issues, embracing a whole-child approach to ensure educational equity for all.

Policy and Practice Implications

This research highlights the need for fundamental changes in educational policy to address the needs of low-income students. Policymakers need to visibly address equitable funding and the need for schools to use their resources holistically to help these students cope with their ever-compounding challenges. Facilitating parental engagement, mental health mechanisms, and inclusive schooling centres are critical. Investing in academic and social-emotional support services can blunt the effects of poverty on educational achievement.

References

Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (R. Nice, Trans.). Sage Publications.

Duncan, G. J., & Murnane, R. J. (Eds.). (2011). *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Duncan, G. J., & Murnane, R. J. (Eds.). (2011). *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Evans, G. W., & Kim, P. (2013). Childhood poverty, cumulative risk exposure, and stress regulation. *Psychological Science*, 24(3), 410-418. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612451476

Evans, G. W., & Kim, P. (2013). Childhood poverty, cumulative risk exposure, and stress regulation. *Psychological Science*, 24(3), 410-418. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612451476

Hernandez, D. J. (2011). *Double jeopardy: How third-grade reading skills and poverty influence high school graduation*. Annie E. Casey Foundation.

McCoy, D. C., et al. (2017). The impact of early childhood education on later educational outcomes: A systematic review. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 25(1), 1-28. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.2333

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2020). *The condition of education 2020* (NCES 2020-144). U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2020144

Reardon, S. F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. *Innocenti Working Paper No. 2011-02*. UNICEF Office of Research.

Snyder, T. D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S. A. (2019). *Digest of education statistics 2018* (NCES 2019-003). National Center for Education Statistics.

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *Title I, Part A: Improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/index.html

Wilder, S. (2014). A study of the effectiveness of wraparound services in schools. *Journal of School Health*, 84(9), 639-647. https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12160