

**USMANU DANFODIYO UNIVERSITY, SOKOTO
(POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL)**

**SOCIO - ECONOMIC STATUS AND CHILDREN'S
EDUCATIONAL LIFE CHANCES: A STUDY OF PEASANT
FARMERS IN BASAWA AND BOMO DISTRICTS OF KADUNA
STATE, NIGERIA**

A Dissertation

Submitted to the

Postgraduate School

USMANU DANFODIYO UNIVERSITY, SOKOTO, NIGERIA

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Award of the Degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION (SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION)

BY

**Habib IBRAHIM
(112104021284)**

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIOAL FOUNDATIONS

JUNE, 2015.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my parents, wife and siblings for their staunch support in prayers and encouragement.

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation by Habib Ibrahim Adm. No. (112104021284) has met the requirements for the award of the Degree of Masters of Education (Sociology of Education) of the Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto and is approved for its contribution to knowledge.

Prof. C.O. Daramola
External Examiner

Date

Prof. M.G Mahuta
Major Supervisor

Date

Dr. H.S Abubakar
Co-Supervisor I

Date

Dr. N.C Okolo
Co-Supervisor II

Date

Prof. Aisha M. Isah MFR
H.O.D (Educational Foundations)

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I give my thanks and praises to Allah (SWT) for his unending gift of life, health blessings, guidance, protection, wisdom and perseverance to see this research through. May Allah continue to bless us with the true essentials of a piety, healthy life and good deeds to aid our here after, Amin.

My sincere gratitude goes to my major supervisor Prof. M.G Mahuta for his time, invaluable academic support, encouragement, motivation, mentoring and guidance for the completion of this research. May Allah continue to guide, protect and bless him and his family, Amin.

My equal sincere gratitude extends to my second and third supervisors in persons of Dr. (Mrs.) H.S Abubakar and Dr. (Mrs.) N.C Okolo for their motherly guidance and dedication of their time to supervise this work. Their contributions and efforts constructively shaped and helped this research attain success.

My appreciation and unending gratitude go to my father, Alh. Abdulganiyu Ibraheem, my mother, Hajia (Mrs.) Bilqis Usman, my guardian Mr. & Hajia(Mrs.) S.O Oyebode, brothers and sisters for the support they gave to me. My unending gratitude and love goes to my beloved wife Halimat Sadiya Shehu for her prayer, encouragement, moral support, and patience throughout my course of this study.

I will also be forever grateful to my course mates, post graduate students with whom to some, I became like a brother and to others, like a son and exchanged ideas, offer each other staunch support and help contributing positive inputs in various ways to this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE.....	i
DEDICATION.....	ii
CERTIFICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
ABSTRACT.....	x
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Research Questions.....	7
1.4 Aims and Objectives of the Study	8
1.6 Significance of the Study	9
1.7 Scope and Delimitation of the Study	10
CHAPTER TWO	
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	12
2.1 Introduction.....	12
2.2 Conceptual Framework.....	12
2.2.1 Socio-economic Status.....	12
2.2.2 Social Stratification.....	13
2.2.3 Educational Life Chances	13
2.3 Theoretical Framework.....	14
2.3.1 Karl Marx (1818-1883) Class Theory	15
2.3.2 Marx Weber (1864-1920) Three – Component Theory of Stratification	16

2.3.3	Max Weber (1964-1920) Life chances	19
2.3.4	Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) Cultural Reproduction and Cultural Capital	20
2.4	Socio-Economic Status	22
2.4.1	Income	23
2.4.2.	Education	24
2.4.3	Occupation	25
2.5	Educational Life Chances	26
2.5.1	Social Class	27
2.5.2	Gender	29
2.5.3	Rural-Urban Inequality and Education Life Chances	30
2.5.4	Parent’s Education and Educational Life Chances	31
2.6	Effects of Socio-Economic Status on Child’s Educational Life Chances	32
2.7	Review of Related Empirical Studies	36
2.8	Summary and Uniqueness of the Study	41
	CHAPTER THREE	43
	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	43
3.1	Introduction	43
3.2	Research Design	43
3.3	Population of the Study	43
3.4	Sampling Procedure	44
3.5	Research Instruments	45
3.5.1a	Validity of the Socio-Economic Status Questionnaire	46
3.5.1b	Reliability of the Parental Status Questionnaire	47
3.5.2a	Validity of Unstructured Interview	47
3.5.2b	Reliability of the Unstructured Interview	47
3.5.3a	Validity of Observation Schedule and Anecdotal Records	47
3.5.3b.	Reliability of Observation Schedule and Anecdotal Records	48

3.6.	Method of Data Collection	48
3.7	Method of Data Analysis	48
	CHAPTER FOUR	50
	DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	50
4.1	Introduction	50
4.2	Analysis of Qualitative Data	50
4.3	Presentation and Analysis of Quantitative Data	65
Sex	65	
Frequency	65
Percentage	65
Male	65	
133	65	
52%	65	
Female	65	
121	65	
48%	65	
Total	65	
254	65	
100	65	
Source: field survey, 2014	65
<p>Table 4.2.2 indicates that 133(52%) of the respondents were boys while 121(48%) were girls although from the review of class attendance records, the population of girls just started gaining momentum in reduction due to coming of age and marriage..... 65</p> <p>The table 4.2.3 presented above shows the degree of respondents' responses to the questionnaire. The table shows in percentage the opinion of respondents to all the items which tend to answer the questions on parent's socio-economic status, children's school enrollment, parents' level of education, teacher's expectation in reference to children's socio-economic background, and gender..... 66</p>		
4.3.1	Hypothesis Testing	67

Based on the nature of this study which is a correlational research, finding the relationship between Socio-economic Status and Children’s Educational Life Chances, hypotheses were tested using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient ‘r’.

67

4.4	Summary of major findings	70
4.5	Discussion	71
	CHAPTER FIVE	76
	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	76
5.1	Introduction	76
5.2	Summary of the study	76
5.3	Conclusion	77
5.4	Recommendations	78
5.5	Implications of the study to Sociologists of Education	79
5.6	Suggestions for further research	81
	REFERENCES	82
	APPENDICES	85

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Population of the Study (SS1 Students)	44
Table 3.2: Sampled Population of the Study	45
Table 4.2.1 Questionnaire response figure	65
Table 4.2.2 Demographic information of respondents	65
Table 4.2.3 Questionnaire response percentage table.....	66
Table 4.3.1: Relationship between Parents’ Socio-economic Status and Children’s School Enrollment.....	67
Table 4.3.2 Relationship between Parents’ Socio-economic Status and children’s educational life chances.	68
Table 4.3.3: Relationship between Parents’ Educational Level and Children’s Educational Achievement.	68
Table 4.3.4: Relationship between a Childs’ Socio-economic Status and a Teachers’ Expectation.....	69
Table 4.3.5: Relationship between Gender and Child’s Educational Life Chances.	70

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between socio-economic status and children's educational life chances using the peasant farmers of Basawa and Bomo districts of Sabon Gari Local Government Area of Kaduna State as a case study. The study was embarked upon to find out the impact of socio-economic status on children's educational life chances. Some of the problems of the study area stated in this work are; children's low school enrolment due to their parents' low socio-economic status, children's educational achievement depending on parents' education, and effects of gender on children's education. The population of the study are teachers and students in SS1 in Basawa and Bomo districts and target population of 264 students and 48 teachers were sampled. The study which is a correlational study used both quantitative and qualitative instruments such as: self-designed questionnaire, unstructured interview schedule, anecdotal records, and observation. Some of the findings of the study are: children's school enrollment is determined by parents' socio-economic status and children's educational life chances depends on parents' socio-economic status. Some of the recommendations made in reference to the findings of the study were: Universal Basic Education should implement free education scheme effectively especially in rural areas and urban centres. Teachers should also be supervised concurrently in their service of teaching in schools on how to relate to students without passing biased judgments.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Education is one of the most enduring legacies which a nation can bequeath to her succeeding generations. This is because education serves as an illumination through which people see the path to solving their problems. Education generally is accepted as a vital asset for social mobility, economic mobility, and a societal transformation factor, for both personal and national levels. Mahuta (2007) views formal education as the type of education that is taught in schools which is planned and organized with aims and goals that are intended to be achieved. According to Swift (1996), as cited in Mahuta (2007), education is the way the individual acquires the physical, moral and social capacities demanded of him by the group into which he is born and within which he must function. Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), as cited in Mahuta (2007), sees education as, the influence exercised by adult generations on the younger ones that are not yet ready for social life. It can therefore be said that education arouses and develops in an individual certain number of physical, intellectual and moral skills which are demanded of him by both the political society as a whole and his social environment in which he or she lives.

Emile Durkheim as quoted in Haralambos & Heald (1980) maintains that;

Society can survive only if there exists among its members a sufficient degree of homogeneity; education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing in the child from the beginning the essential similarities which collective life demands. Durkheim argues that to become attached to the society, the child must feel in it something that is real, alive and powerful, which dominates the person and to which he also owes the best part of himself. (p 173)

Education is a sound investment that is expected to enhance the economic growth of individuals which implies that education is a strong factor of social mobility.

This means that education has the ability to influence a person's future socio-economic status in the society. That is to say, a person who has attained higher level of education is likely to have higher chances of getting a good job which in return determines an individual's social class in a society. Socio-economic status is a sociological and economical combined total measure of an individual or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education and occupation. Socio-economic status is typically broken into three categories; high socio-economic status, middle class socio-economic status, and low socio-economic status to describe the three classes a family or an individual may fall into. When placing a family or individual into one of these categories any or all of the three variables (income, education, and occupation) can be assessed. This class division has implications to the type of school a child attends, the type of education a child receives and the limit of educational attainment of a child. It is therefore very clear that children of higher socio-economic class are better off when it comes to attending better schools, colleges and universities. Families with high socio-economic status often have more success in preparing their young children for school because they typically have access to a wide range of resources to promote and support their children's development. They are able to provide their young children with high quality child care, books and materials to encourage children in various learning activities at home.

Reverse is the case for children from low socio-economic class as socio-economic factor pose a big threat to their educational attainment. Parents are left with no option than to send their children to public schools most of which are today in bad and uncondusive teaching and learning conditions. The children of the poor and illiterate parents or low socio-economic status may not be able to get the opportunity of attending better schools or even proceeding to colleges and tertiary institutions. They

are more likely to encounter problems of inequality in educational opportunities more especially in relation to enrollment, retention and completion. This situation widens the gap between the rich elites and the poor thereby further more fueling social stratification and encouraging educational life chance inequality in our society.

Through social stratification and educational inequality, education despite its importance and human cravings for it appears to be nothing but a mirage. Acquiring education has now become a state of concern for the less privileged families regardless of active measures taken by the Federal Government of Nigeria through the Universal Basic Education Programmes (UBE) which is yet to be fully felt. Low socio-economic background child may stand the chance of dropping out of school due to financial problems reinforced with social stratification and inequality, thereby making educational equality a dream to “have not” of our society. According to Mahuta (2007), family background influences the educational life chances of an individual but the influences or impact of formal education is greater. Thus, education is an important means of social mobility. Mahuta (2007) further maintains that the socio-economic status of the family is a significant variable or factor that affects the educational life chances of a child. This therefore means that, the higher the socio-economic status of a child’s home, the higher his or her educational life chances.

With the poor socio-economic state of our country today, with its dwindling system of education which U.B.E itself could not resurrect, the low socio-economic populace which constitutes the majority of Nigeria’s population are stifled in their endeavor to offer their children good education and better life chances. Based on this background, this study investigates how socio-economic status of a child’s background affects his or her educational life chances in Basawa and Bomo district of Sabon-Gari local government, Zaria of Kaduna State.

1.2 **Statement of the Problem**

In Nigeria today, educational attainment and achievement is seen as the most influential factor of social mobility. Social mobility offers a chance of socio-economic status upgrade and that chance is what socio-economically challenged parents are willing to secure for their children so that the children will have better chances in life than their parents. However, family socio-economic background, school accessibility and biological factors stand between these children and better educational life chances. But yet, among all these factors, socio-economic factor is the major factor that affects educational life chances. Education is apparently known for its ability to turn tides of socio-economic status of low socio-economic statuses to high or middle class status. Education plays a major role in enabling individuals to gain the required skill sets for acquiring jobs, as well as specific qualities that stratify people with high socio-economic status from low socio-economic status such as occupation.

The study areas which are Basawa and Bomo are a semi-urban area occupied by peasant farmers whose majority belonged to the low socio-economic stratum. These people are mostly working on their small pieces of farmland which is mainly for subsistence, and engaging in other laborious works for money to cater for their family's needs. The poor socio-economic state they live in does not leave their children out of their daily struggle for survival as the children also have their part to play in the survival of the families by giving their parents helping hands either by helping the father with farm work or helping the mother through hawking. The meager amount earned in the families is barely enough for daily welfare upkeep such as feeding, clothing, shelter, and health care which is primary in nature. Children from such families hardly get enrolled in school solely because educational expenses cannot be afforded by their parents. Even when they manage to get enrolled, the children often lack necessary educational support

in form of educational materials and school uniform. Apart from the enrollment problem faced by the children of these districts, their educational life chances are greatly threatened by parent's educational level. Primary school education may be endured but continuing with secondary school education is another story entirely as these children, aware of their parents' socio-economic status chose to work in farms for money, hawk, engage in motorcycle transportation business and petty trading over secondary school education. The little money they do earn gradually strays them from pursuing education and diminishes from their mind the possibility of the good education can offer, how education can move them up the social ladder and better life chances.

Furthermore, the educational level of parents in these districts is very low and as a result influences their children's attitude towards education. Some parents are unable to go through their children's work or even help them in areas or subjects of difficulties and this detaches the parents from the progress made by their children in school. Many of these parents do not like the schooling experiences (that is if they had any) and have negative attitudes toward education which also discourages their children and instilling in them negative attitude towards western education as well. These parents have lower aspiration which makes them to shun giving their children the great deal of support and encouragement needed to go to school, which as a result gradually, gets the children discouraged educationally and start drifting out of the classrooms and gradually, school due to lack of support, encouragement, motivation and inspiration from their parent. The children thereby in the process step in their parent's shoe of ignorance and continue the legacy of negative attitude towards education.

Some school environments are also not all that welcoming to the children from low socio-economic background because they are subjected to classroom conflicts. Due to lack of well trained teachers, some primary and secondary schools are open to the

problem of teacher expectation. Some of these inexperienced teachers tend to get children pre-judged according to their parent's socio-economic status. In so doing, the social class identity given to a child by the teacher is usually on a good pupil and good parent basis which as a result influences a teacher's perception of the child's educational abilities and outcomes. Teachers do expect better performance from the children of high socio-economic status and low performance from the children of low socio-economic status. This classroom inequality and teacher expectations experienced by the low socio-economic status children makes them think that the classroom is not meant for them and therefore see no sense in schooling especially when their teachers expect them to perform poorly.

Gender is also not left behind among the problems by Basawa and Bomo district as most women in the mentioned areas are not educated beyond elementary school before being given out for marriage and those who manage to secondary school rarely get to finish before getting married. Apart from marriage, these girls are disadvantaged when it comes to deciding who is to go to school because the boys get chosen over girls by their parents. Most parents of low socio-economic status find it important to educate the boy child over the girl child. Girl child's education is seen as a waste of efforts and resources as they will finally end up in matrimonial homes while boy child's education is seen as an investment because he is believed to be able to yield meaningful returns to the family. Aside socio-economic status, cultural factors, religious factors among others are playing significant roles in determining the educational life chances of girls in Basawa and Bomo districts of Kaduna state.

Lareau (2003) speaks on the idea of concerted cultivation, where middle class and high class parents take an active role in their children's education and development by using controlled organized activities and fostering a sense of entitlement through

encouraged discussion while parents from lower class do not participate in this movement, causing their children to have a sense constraint educationally. Lareau (2003) further argued that children from poor background are common with weaker language skills compared to children raised in high social class. These language skills affect their abilities to learn and thus exacerbate the problem of educational disparity between low and high socio-economic status neighborhoods. Apart from the socio-economic constraints faced by these less privileged children, the few who manage to get enrolled in schools are faced with class inequality and in partiality from the teachers. And when teachers make judgments about students based on their class and socio-economic class, they are taking the first step in preventing students from having an equal opportunity for education and disparity in their future chances. The main thrust of this study is to find out the implications of socio-economic status and social class stratification on children's educational life chances using the peasant farmers in Basawa and Bomo districts, Sabon-Gari local government, Zaria of Kaduna State as a study area.

1.3 Research Questions

The research questions for this study are as follows:

- i. Is there any relationship between parent's socio-economic status and children's school enrollment?
- ii. Is there any relationship between parents' socio-economic status and to children's educational life chances?
- iii. Is there any relationship between parents' educational level and children's educational achievement?
- iv. Is there any relationship between children's socio-economic background and Teachers' expectation in class?

- v. Is there any relationship between gender and children's educational life chances?

1.4 **Aims and Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the study are as follows:

- i. To find whether there is any relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment.
- ii. To find out whether there is any relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's educational life chances.
- iii. To find out whether there is any relationship between parents' educational level and children's educational achievement.
- iv. To find out whether there is any of relationship between children's socio-economic background and Teachers' expectation in class.
- v. To find out whether there is any relationship between gender and children's educational life chances.

1.5 **Hypotheses**

This study has the following null hypothesis:

- i. There is no significant relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment
- ii. There is no significant relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's educational life chances
- iii. There is no significant relationship between parents' educational level and children's educational achievement
- iv. There is no significant relationship between children's socio-economic background and teachers' expectation in class
- v. There is no significant relationship between gender and children's educational life chances

1.6 Significance of the Study

This finding of this study will be of great importance to the Kaduna State Universal Basic Education Board (KSUBEB), student-teachers, educational planners and the society at large. The findings of this study will help provide the society and various stakeholders a fair understanding of the factor behind high drop-out rates and low literacy level within the low socio-economic stratum of Basawa and Bomo districts, and get more insight on who in our society needs socio-economic elevation through poverty alleviation schemes within the local, state, and federal government levels. The results obtained from this study may be useful in encouraging sensitization programmes by ministry of education and non-governmental organizations on the relevance of education in our society thereby serving as an eye opener to illiterate parents and children.

Nigeria has been battling with illiteracy through attempts by the Federal Government through Universal Basic Education (U.B.E) to provide equal educational opportunities to all children and uplift the standard of education in primary and secondary levels of schooling. Although, these efforts proved abortive. The findings of this study will be of great relevance to teachers as it exposed their flaws in the classroom thereby improving their approach in terms of learning environment conditions for children. Teachers will also be able to understand the problem plaguing less privileged students in relation to the teacher expectations haunting them within the classroom walls. The findings may help create the initiative in various stake holders on organizing workshops and seminars on the ill effects of teacher expectation, teacher perception, negative comments and remarks on children's educational development frequently for inexperienced and unqualified teachers. The findings of this study will further encourage teachers to work harder in class and avoid giving negative remarks or

comments and also avoid pre-judging children according to their parent's socio-economic status. Through these processes, teachers may also be able to play a part in the fight against dropout rate among the less privileged children from school, which will discourage dropout rate among the less privileged students.

Finally, apart from the socio-cultural and religious factors affecting girl child education, socio-economic factors pose a threat to their education as well. Over the years, UNICEF, Federal government, and non-governmental agencies have tried to initiate programmes such as Girl Education Programmes (GEP) in some northern states of Nigeria with Kaduna State inclusive aimed at increasing girl child school enrollment and reducing dropout rates of girls from school. The findings of this study will help expose the factors hindering girl child educational life chances. Low girl-child enrollment problem existing in the study area will also be understood through the help of the findings of this study because when it comes to who is to go to school, girls or women are disadvantaged. The findings of this study will help to enlighten parents on the importance of girl child education in relation to life chances and its impact on the education and development of children, family, and society at large.

1.7 Scope and Delimitation of the Study

Bomo and Basawa districts are situated within Sabon-Gari local government area occupied by peasant farmers and cattle rearers. Both areas which are semi-urban districts and far from town, have 2 schools each. Each district has a public school and a private owned school, making four [4] schools all together. This study focused on secondary school students of SS1 including some parents and teachers of the four [4] sampled secondary schools in Bomo and Basawa district of Sabon-Gari Local Government Area.

The researcher is aware that there are other variables that can be related to educational life chances such as ethnicity, religion, culture, biological, and cognitive factors, etc., this study is limited to socio-economic variables such as income, parental level of education, parental occupation, gender, social class as they relate to educational life chances.

1.8 **Operational Definition of Terms**

For better clarification, the operational terms which include socio-economic status, Educational Life chances, peasant farmers, and who gets what, used in this study are be defined.

- i. **Socio-economic status:** Socio-economic status refers to the societal strata an individual belongs to in a society (low, middle, upper class). Socio-economic status is commonly conceptualized as the social standings or class of an individual or group.
- ii. **Educational Life Chances:** Educational Life Chances refers to the possibility of an individual of a specified status achieving a specified goal of education at all levels or experiencing a particular disadvantage educationally.
- iii. **Peasant Farmers:** A peasant farmer refers to an individual who own or rents a small piece of land for cultivation which is only meant for subsistence of the family.
- iv. **Who Gets What:** The phrase ‘Who Gets What?’ is used to describe the pattern of inequality in relation to socio-economic status, education, and social resources in a society

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the review of related literature under the following sub-headings:-

2.2 Conceptual framework

2.3 Theoretical framework

2.4 Socio-Economic status

2.5 Educational life chances

2.6 Effects of Socio-economic status on child's educational life chances

2.7 Empirical Studies Reviewed

2.8 Summary and uniqueness of the study

2.2 Conceptual Framework

Three main concepts were conceptualized in this study and they are Socio-economic status, social stratification and educational life chances.

2.2.1 Socio-economic Status

Socio-economic status is commonly conceptualized as the social standing or class of an individual or group. It is often measured as a combination of education, income and occupation. Examination of socio-economic status often reveals inequalities in access to resources, including issues related to privilege, power and control. Socio-economic status indices include; parents level of education, occupation, source of income, amount of income and dwelling place. All these tend to explain the nature of parents' influence on their children's education.

2.2.2 Social Stratification

In every society, people differ from one another in resources, housing, education, power, etc. According to Mahuta (2007), Sociologists of education use the concept Social stratification to mean a system by which the categories of people within a society are ranked in a hierarchy.

Bray et al. (1986) also view social stratification as the way society is divided into layers or groups of people, in which some are socially superior to others. Blakemore and Cooksey (1981) also stated that class inequalities are concerned with economic activities and with ownership and control of property and wealth. Haralambos (1980) opined that social stratification is a particular form of social inequality. It refers to the presence of social groups which are ranked one above the other, usually in terms of the amount of power, prestige and wealth their members possess. Those who belong to a particular group or stratum will have some awareness of common interests and a common identity. They will share a similar life style which to some degree will distinguish them from members of other social strata.

2.2.3 Educational Life Chances

According to Meighan and Blatchford (2003), the concept of life chances is one of the more straightforward concepts in sociology. Reading (1977) as cited in Meighan and Blatchford (2003) defined the concept as the probability of a person of specified status achieving a specified goal or suffering a special disadvantage. When the concept of life chances is used to describe general patterns in a society rather than to account for the fate of a particular individual, it provides one kind of answer to the question of “who gets what?”

Educational life chance is derived from the main concept ‘Life chance’ to focus attention on the regular features found in educational biographies and group

experiences. According to Meighan and Blatchford (2003), Educational life chances are related to a variety of factors, including gender, social class, ethnicity, size of family, parents' education and membership of any minority seen as 'special'.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

Conflict theory is chosen as the theoretical framework for this study for there are other theoretical postulations or explanations that examine how socio-economic status can affect child's educational life chances. Conflict theory according to Ogunbameru (2010) is the theoretical approach in social sciences that views social phenomena as the result of conflict between individuals or groups. According to Wallace and Wolf (1980), conflict theorist sees society as a social world of an endless struggle, between man and his needs and between the privileged and less privileged, so also between the dominant and the dominated. Thus, social inequality is clearly explained in the conflict perspective of sociology.

Till date, conflict theory in sociology is believed to be the creation of Karl Marx. According to Ogunbameru (2010), the single most important element in Marx's sociological theorizing is the concept of class. Whereas contemporary sociologists sometimes use the term social class loosely to refer to the relative ranking of individuals on such dimensions as education or income, class for Marx referred to basic structural components of society as a whole.

Generally, educational institutions are viewed as ground a where social change is being promoted and societal values are transmitted for the survival of the society. Going by the conflict theory, education is not a rational institution but a place where class differences is being identified and class value is expressed and seen to the fullest. Wallace and Wolf (1980) are also of the view that, the conflict perspective views education as an instrument of elite domination. Schools convince subordinate groups of

their inferiority, reinforce existing social class inequality, and discourage alternative and more democratic vision of society. In the view of conflict sociologists, education is seen as a channel in which status is gained in society so education remains to make people struggle for status. This is by obtaining degree, diploma and higher degree, the higher the qualification, the closer the chances of being in a high status in the society.

In the education arena, or environment, the conflict perspective theories function to explain the nemesis of class and social stratification to the poor and how it affects a poor child's educational life chances in the society.

2.3.1 **Karl Marx (1818-1883) Class Theory**

In Marxism, Marxian class theory asserts that an individual's position within a class hierarchy is determined by his or her role in the production process, and argues that political and ideological consciousness is determined by class position. Within Marxian class theory, the structure of the production process forms the basis of class construction, Parkin (1979).

Marx's class theory derives from a range of philosophical schools of thought including left Hegelianism, Scottish empiricism and Anglo-French political economics. Marx's view of class originated from a series of personal interests relating to social alienation and human struggle, whereby the formation of class structure relates to acute historical consciousness. Political-economics also contributed to Marx's theories, centering on the concept of "origin of income" where society is divided into three sub-groups: renter, capitalist, and worker. Marx sought to define class as embedded in productive relations rather than social status in his political and economic thought developed towards an interest in production as opposed to distribution, and this henceforth became a central theme in his concept of class.

Marx distinguishes one class from the other on the basis of two criteria; ownership of the means of production and control of the labor power of others. From this, he defines modern society as having three distinct classes:

- i. Capitalist, or bourgeoisie, own the means of production and purchase the labor power of others.
- ii. Workers, or proletariat, do not own any means of production or the ability to purchase the labor power of others. Rather, they sell their own labor power.

A small, transitional class known as the petite bourgeoisie own sufficient means of production but do not purchase labor power. Marx's communist manifesto fails to properly define the petite bourgeoisie beyond "smaller capitalists" (Marx and Engels, 1848; 25) class is thus determined by property relations not by income or status. These factors are determined by distribution and consumption, which mirror the production and power relations of classes. In the view of Meighan and Blatchford (2003), generally the children from higher socio-economic classes have much better educational life chances than the children from lower classes. As a matter of fact, the problem of social class start from the family status, and it leads to the decision and selection of who is to go to school and who will not which seriously affects the educational chances and future of their children.

2.3.2 Marx Weber (1864-1920) Three – Component Theory of Stratification

The concept of social stratification is described by Max Weber under three categories. The three-component theory of stratification saw political power as an interplay between "class", "status" and "power". Weber believed that class position was determined by a person's skills and education, rather than by their relationship to the means of production. Both Marx and Weber agreed that social stratification was undesirable, however where Marx believed that stratification would only disappear along with capitalism and private property. Weber believed that the solution lay in

providing “equal opportunity” within a competitive capitalist system, Kuper (2004). According to Mahuta (2007), in line with Weber’s classification of social stratification, Blakemore and Cooksey (1981) added that class inequalities are concerned with economic activities (how one earns a living) and with ownership and control of property and wealth. Gilbert (1998) opined that Weber derived many of his key concepts on social stratification examining the social structure of Germany. He noted that contrary to Marx’s theories, stratification was based on more than simply ownership of capital. Weber examined how many members of the aristocracy lacked economic wealth yet had strong political power. Many wealth families lacked prestige and power, for example, because they were Jewish. Weber introduced three independent factors that form his theory of stratification hierarchy; class, status and power, Mahuta (2007).

- i. **Class:** Class refers to person’s location in a society’s economic system resulting in differences in the nature of work, income and wealth, class position in society is an important determinant of one’s life style. Class is also used to differentiate people on the grounds of economic considerations and affiliations such as inequality in terms of wealth or income. Sociologist and sociologists of education categorize occupations into hierarchical order of classes as upper, middle and lower classes. There are white-collar jobs and blue-collar jobs. Refer to those jobs that are done by professionals in their own fields. This category of workers are skilled and specialist. They are also highly paid and have relatively job satisfaction. While on the other hand, the blue-collar jobs simply mean manual, as well as unskilled workers. These classes as mentioned above are not equal because some are controlling and some are being controlled. The lower class is always being supervised or overseen by the middle class. Weber differs from Marx in that he does not see this as the

supreme factor in stratification. Weber noted how managers of corporations or industries control firms they do not own.

- ii. **Status:** This refers to a person's prestige, social honor, or popularity in a society. Weber noted that political power was not rooted in capital value solely, but also in one's individual status. Mahuta (2007) defines status as a person's relationship to establish social position in society that varies in terms of prestige. Status also concerns the respect and difference given to individuals and groups. Status can be achieved and linked to occupational achievement. Other kinds of status include family background ascribed status. In the traditional Nigerian context, old people have higher status than young ones, and males have higher respect than female, religious leaders are accorded high status even if they are poor.
- iii. **Power:** Power according to Mahuta (2007) simply refers to the political ability of taking decisions. It is mostly applied in bureaucratic organizations and establishments. It is a person's ability to get their way despite the resistance of others. As stated by Brown (2009), today, concepts of social class often assume three general categories; a very wealthy and powerful upper class that owns and controls the means of production; a middle class of professional workers, small business owners, and low-level managers; and a lower class, who rely on low paying wage jobs for their livelihood and often experience poverty. According to Mahuta (2007), it is common knowledge to find that people differ from one another in many respects and capacities such as in interest, attitudes, beliefs, aspirations and needs. These individual differences might be as a result of their differences in social position or social class. Generally, there are the lower class, middle class and upper class people in society. The differences in the

class and status of people in society may to a large extent, affect their educational life chances and also the educational life chances of their children.

2.3.3 **Max Weber (1864-1920) Life chances**

Life chances (Lebenschancen in German) is a political theory of the opportunities each individual has to improve his or her quality of life. The concept was introduced by German sociologist Max Weber. It is a probabilistic concept, describing how likely it is, given certain factors, that an individual's life will turn out a certain way. According to this theory, life chances are positively correlated with one's socio-economic status (William, 1999). Opportunities in this sense refer to the extent to which one has access to resources, such as food, clothing and shelter, education and health care. Quality of life comprises the individual's ability to procure life's essentials, have a career and obtain inner satisfaction; in other words, the ability to satisfy one's needs (Diana, 2009). Weberian life chances can be seen as an expansion on some of Karl Marx's ideas. Both Weber and Marx agreed that economic factors were important in determining one's future, but Weber's concepts of life chances are more complex; inspired by but different from Marx's views on social stratification and social class. Weber (1978) correlated life chances with material wealth, and also introduced such additional factors as social mobility and social equality. Other factors include those related to one socio-economic status, such as gender, race and ethnicity. While some of those factors, like age, race or gender are random, Weber stressed the link between life chances and the non-random elements of the three-component theory of social stratification – how social class, social status and political affiliation impact each individual's life. In other words, individuals in certain groups have in common a specific causal component of their life chances; they are in similar situation, which tends to imply a similar outcome to their actions. Weber notes the importance of

economic factors. How the power of those with property, compared to those without property, gives the former great advantages over the latter.

Weber (1978) opined that life chances are to a certain extent subjective; when an individual thinks of one's life chances will affect their actions, therefore if one feels that one can become or is a respected and valued member of society, then it is likely to become a reality and results in one being more successful and respected than somebody without this conviction. In social engineering, life chances may have to be balanced against other goals, such as eliminating poverty, ensuring personal freedom or ensuring equality at birth.

This theory in reference to socio-economic impact on child's educational life chances, families with low socio-economic status often lack the financial, social, and educational supports that characterize families with high socio-economic status poor families also may have inadequate or limited access to community resources that promote and support children's development and school readiness. Achievable opportunities unachieved due to social inequality, educational inequality affects one's life chances old educational life chances.

2.3.4 Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) Cultural Reproduction and Cultural Capital

Cultural reproduction is the transmission of existing cultural values and norms from generation to generation. Cultural reproduction refers to the mechanisms by which continuity of cultural experience is sustained across time. Cultural reproduction often results in social reproduction, or the process of transferring aspects of society such as class from generation to generation.

The term cultural capital refers to non-financial social assets, for example educational or intellectual, which might promote social mobility beyond economic means. The concept of cultural reproduction was first developed by French sociologist

and cultural theorist Pierre Bourdieu in the early 1970's when he attempted to explain differences in educational outcomes in France. Initially, Bourdieu's work was on education in the modern society. He believed that for the education system was used solely to "reproduce" the culture of the dominant class in order for the dominant class to continue to hold and release power and his approach is strongly influenced by Marxian perspectives. One of Bourdieu's and his colleague Jean-Claude Passeron's main concepts on Cultural reproduction was in their book Cultural reproduction and Social Reproduction. Bourdieu's main focus was the structural reproduction of disadvantages and inequalities that are caused by cultural reproduction. According to Bourdieu, inequalities are recycled through the education system and other social institutions. Bourdieu believed that the prosperous and affluent societies were becoming the "cultural capital". High social class, familiarity with the bourgeois culture and educational credentials determined one's life chances.

According to Haralambos & Heald (1980), Bourdieu refers to the dominant culture as 'cultural capital' because via educational system, it can be translated to wealth and power. Cultural capital is not evenly distributed throughout the class structure and this largely accounts for class differences in educational attainment. Students with upper class backgrounds have a built-in advantage because they have been socialized into the dominant culture. Bourdieu & Passeron (1977) stated that:

Through Cultural Reproduction, only those members of the dominant culture can acquire knowledge in relation to the way it is taught from within this cultural system. Therefore, those who are not members of the dominant culture are at a disadvantage to receive cultural information, and therefore will remain at a disadvantage. Capitalist societies depend on a stratified social system, where the working class has an education suited for manual labour: levelling out such inequalities would break down the system. (p. 205)

Bourdieu (1977) maintains that education leads to social reproduction and creation of a stratified society through honouring the cultural capital of the elite class. Bourdieu's approach being strongly influenced by Marxian theory believes that society is full of different social groups with different aspirations, different access to life chances and gain different social rewards. Relations in society in this view are mainly based on exploitation, oppression, domination and subordination. Bourdieu maintained that social inequality is reproduced in the educational system and as a result, it is legitimated. Generally Parents provide their children with cultural capital by transmitting the attitudes and knowledge needed to succeed in the current educational system. Children exposed to elite culture at home are advantaged in schools because teachers recognize and reward this advantage thus excluding other children who lack similar cultural capital. As such children from higher socio economic status have an advantage over other children that give them better educational success and consequently higher status in society. The privileged position of the dominant class is justified by educational success so does the underprivileged position of the lower class is legitimated by educational failure.

2.4 Socio-Economic Status

Socio-economic status is the measure of the influence that the social environment has on individuals, families, communities, and schools. In many ways, socio economic status is related to the concept of social class. Both have financial stability as a foundation for classification. Both are important to a child's optimal development and an adult's satisfaction with life. However, the concept of social class is considered to be continuous throughout one's lifetime and from one generation to the next. The socio economic status classifications are established in an effort to find the means of identifying and changing inequalities. In addition, social class has economic

differences as a primary influence. The concept of socio economic status considers other influences such as the chance for social or economic advancement, influence on policy, availability of resources, and prestige of the primary occupation. The definitions of socio economic status emphasize that, as a construct.

- i. It is conditional,
- ii. It is imposed on people,
- iii. It is used for comparisons,
- iv. It is based on economics, opportunity, and means of influence.

Santrock (2004) defines it as “the grouping of people with similar occupational, educational, and economic characteristics”. Woolfolk (2007) calls socio economic status “the relative standing in society based on income, power, background and prestige”. Santrock (2004) adds that an important qualification is “the ability to control resources and participate in society’s rewards”. Woolfolk (2007) also notes that every researcher will define it differently based on the nature of the study. In most discussions, there are three levels of socio economic status; low, average, and high. Because most problems associated with how socio economic status is related to poverty, sometimes poverty level is used as a similar concept to low socio economic status. The main factors determining an individual’s socio economic status are income, education and occupation. Other variables include wealth and health.

2.4.1 Income

Income refers to wages, salaries, profits or any flow of earnings received. Income can also come in the form of unemployment or workers compensation, social security, pensions, interest or dividends, royalties, trusts, or family financial assistance. As theorized by economist John Mayard Keynes, income can be looked at in two terms, relative and absolute. Absolute income is the relationship in which as income increases,

so will consumption, but not at the same rate and relative income dictates a person or family's savings and consumption based on the family's income in relation to others. Income is a commonly used measure of socio-economic status because it is relatively easy to figure for most individuals. Low income families focus on meeting immediate needs and do not accumulate wealth that could be passed on to future generations, thus increasing inequality, families with higher and expendable income can accumulate wealth and focus on meeting immediate needs while being able to consume and enjoy luxuries.

2.4.2. **Education**

Education also plays a role in income. Earnings increase with each level of education. High level of education is associated with better economic outcomes (i.e. more income, more control, and greater social support and networking). Education plays a major role in skill sets for acquiring jobs, as well as specific qualities that stratify people with higher socio-economic status from lower status. Lareau (2003) speaks on the idea of "concerted cultivation", where middle class parents take an active role in their children's education and development by using controlled organized activities and fostering a sense of entitlement through encouraged discussion. She further argues that families with lower income do not participate in this movement, causing their children to have a sense of constraint. Parents from lower socio-economic background are more likely to give orders to their children in their interaction while parents with a higher socio-economic status are more likely to interact and play with their children. A division in educational attainment is thus born out of these two differences in child rearing. Studies by researchers in the field of sociology and sociology of education have shown how children who are born in lower socio-economic families have weaker language skills compared to children raised in higher socio-economic families. These language

skills affect their abilities to learn and thus exacerbate the problem of education disparity between low and high socio-economic neighborhoods. Lower income families can have children who do not succeed to the levels of the middle income children, who can have a greater sense of entitlement, be more argumentative, or be better prepared for adult life.

2.4.3 Occupation

Occupational prestige as one component of socio-economic status encompasses both income and educational attainment. Occupational status reflects the educational attainment required to obtain the job and income levels that vary with different jobs and within ranks of occupations. Additionally, it shows achievement in skills required for the job. Occupational status measures social position by describing job characteristics, decision making ability and control and psychological demands on the job. Some of the most prestigious occupations are physicians and surgeons, lawyers, chemical and biomedical engineers, and communication analysts. These jobs, considered to be grouped in the high socio-economic classification, provide more challenging work and greater control over working conditions but require more ability. The jobs with lower rankings include food preparation workers, janitors, messengers, housekeepers, etc. The jobs that are less valued also offer significantly lower wages, and often are more laborious, very hazardous, and provide less autonomy. Occupation is the most significant measure of socio-economic status because so many exist, and there are so many competing scales. Many scales rank occupations based on the level of skill involved, from unskilled to skilled manual labor to professional, or use a combined measure using the education level needed and income involved.

In sum, majority of researchers agree that income, education and occupation together best represent socio-economic status, while some others feel that changes in

family structure should also be considered. Also, the relationship between these three (3) variables of socio-economic status clearly depicts the effects of low socio-economic status on families and how it can drastically affect children's cognitive abilities, academic achievement and attainment.

2.5 Educational Life Chances

The concept of life chances is one of the more straight forward concepts in sociology. According to Reading (1977) in Meighan and Blatchford (2003), Life Chances has been defined as the probability of a person of specified status achieving a specified goal or suffering a special disadvantage. The term was coined by German sociologist Max Weber in his book titled *Economy and Society* in 1978. Weber defines the term Life Chances as a political theory of the opportunities each individual has to improve his or her quality of life. It is a probabilistic concept, describing how likely it is given certain factors than an individual life will turn out a certain way. According to this theory, life chances are positively correlated with one's socio-economic status and affiliated with social stratification. When the concept of life chances is used to describe general pattern in a society rather than to account for the fate of a particular individual, it provides one kind of answer to the question of who gets what? The assumption that there are regular patterns to biographies of individuals and groups under-pins the concept of life chances. According to Nash (1973) Educational Life chances refer to the possibility of a person of a specified status achieving a specified goal of education at all levels or experiencing a particular disadvantage educationally. Educational Life chance refers to the opportunity or access an individual has to education at all levels in the society, which depends on variety of factors.

According to Meighan and Blatchford (2003), Educational Life chances are related to factors such as gender, social class, ethnicity, size of family, parental

educational level and attitude. In this view Mahuta (2007) further added that the factors of Educational Life chances explain the effects of social stratification on education in Nigeria. These factors include social class, gender inequality, and problem of rural urban imbalances in education and parental level of education. These are some of the factors that influence educational life chances of a child in any given society. These factors also render some group of people to be educationally disadvantaged in the society and thereby relegating them in terms of status.

2.5.1 **Social Class**

This refers to an individual's location in a society's economic system resulting in differences in the nature of work, income, and wealth. Class position in society is an important determinant of one's lifestyle. Sociologists and sociologist of education categorize people into hierarchical order of classes as upper, middle and lower classes. Based on this classification, educational opportunity of people varies as the socio-economic status of parents is known to influence to a great extent the educational life chances of a child. This means that the higher the socio-economic inclination of the child, the greater his or her educational opportunities as well as educational attainments. Mahuta (2007) also asserted that students from poor family backgrounds are likely to face problems of school enrolment and dropout since their parents may not be able to bear the school fees and expenses. Sociologists and sociologists of education agree that parents have powerful influence on the educational life chances of their children. In the view of Meighan and Blatchford (2003), generally the children from higher socio-economic classes have much better educational life chances than the children from lower classes. As a matter of fact, the problem of social class starts from the family status, and it leads to the decision and selection of who is to go to school and who will not which seriously affects the educational chances and future of their children.

There are so many ways in which parent's social class affects the educational opportunities of their children. Such ways include:

- i. The living standard of parents,
- ii. Parental level of education,
- iii. Lack of provision of guidance and counseling services which may lead to motivation and encouragement,
- iv. Encouragement in regular school attendance,
- v. The provision of extra lessons at home by way of employing private teachers to teach at home,
- vi. Parent's ability to check and monitor their children's exercise books after school hours thereby making children to work hard.

Children from poor homes encounter problems in relation to education in the likes of:

- i. Drop-out syndrome
- ii. Lack of role models
- iii. Parents' negative attitude to schooling
- iv. Children's negative attitude to schooling
- v. Poverty state of parents
- vi. Lack of proper awareness of parents and guardians on the need and value of education.

On the other hand, parents of higher socio-economic status are likely to have better educational life chances as well as the ability to use their resources for supporting the schooling of their children. The higher socio-economic parents have the following advantages in relation to the education of their children.

- i. Starting school early
- ii. Availability of school materials

iii. Parents who are educated tend to serve as role model for their children

It is evidently clear from the above, that social stratification works hand in hand with social class. In determining an individual's educational life chances, thus, children of the middle and upper class background parents are better prepared for school education more adequately than children of parents from the low social class structure in the society.

2.5.2 Gender

In the case of educational life chances and gender, boys gain much opportunity than the girls especially the working class children. Gender refers to the social aspects of difference and hierarchies between male and female and it always captivates the interest of sociologists (Macionis and Plummer 2005). Girls and women from middle and upper class parents are likely to have the advantages of getting access to school even where there are boys and girls in the family (Mahuta, 2007). As for the upper class parents, they stand a better chance of educating both boys and girls. While on the other hand, parents that are poor are likely not to be able to send all their children to school. Thus, when it comes to who is to go to school, girls or women are placed at a disadvantage. It is common in Africa for sons to receive education before daughters and for the latter to catch up only as schooling becomes universal for boys. Even then, considerable inequalities of enrolment are common at the post primary level. The main reason, for example, girls and women are taken for marriage and therefore, it is more important to educate the boy-child. This trend is more pronounced in northern Nigeria. In the eastern part of Nigeria, reverse is the case as boys are mostly used for trading and commercial activities while the girls go to school. Therefore, economic factor, cultural factors, religious factors, and so on is laying a significant role in determining the educational life chances of boys and girls in Nigeria. An example of Nigerian situation

concerning female education reported by Action Aid Cited in Giddens (2010), that Nigeria has the highest proportion of children not educated. Rural families in very poor situation educate boys rather than girls.

David Archer at Action Aids as Cited in Giddens (2010) explains that there are a lot of different reasons why parents don't send their girls to school. Some are to do with traditional attitudes, which hold that investing in the education of girls is not worthwhile because they won't be able to bring the economic return to the families that boys will, and also because they are likely to get married and leave the family home. There are also issues around early pregnancy, fear of violence towards girls on their way to, at, and from school, inappropriate teaching and absence of basic facilities like toilet for girls. It is a gamble sending the girl child to school when you are poor and need support in the families, and it is often girls who lose out.

2.5.3 Rural-Urban Inequality and Education Life Chances

One of the factors affecting life chances tremendously is the imbalance of the rural and urban areas. People in urban areas have direct access to quality educational opportunities which is mostly occupied by the middle and upper class people, while people from the rural area who are mostly of the lower class are less privileged in such educational opportunity. This is because people living in the urban centers have better access to more quality resources, which is not the case with the rural areas. Hence, they have no option other than to send their children to the poor and ill equipped schools in the village while some have even no schools. According to Blakemore and Cooksey (1981), there is the rural-urban difference in educational opportunity in the society. In this view, Bray et al. (1986) opined that it is social stratification in this respect that leaves rural groups and the poor people to remain deprived of educational opportunities from generation to generation.

According to Mahuta (2007) there are various factors that account for the difference in educational life chances between the children of the rural and urban area. Some of these include;

- i. Parental attitude towards the value and relevance of education for their children.
- ii. Child labor determines the educational life chances of regionalities (especially urban and rural area). Children in the rural areas or villages are used for farming and other hard labor activities. In this context, parents therefore consider labor more important than schooling.
- iii. Most parents in the rural areas, who are usually farmers are not educated and therefore have not experienced the goodness in education. This may cause them to have low educational aspirations for their children.
- iv. Lack of social amenities and infrastructural facilities in the rural areas such as school, good roads, hospitals, and basic essentials also contribute.

Therefore, one can say that the rural-urban dimension of access to schooling is an important independent cause of educational inequalities. According to Blakemore and Cooksey (1981), having to run ten miles to school and back may be good for training future long-distance running champions, but not so good for academic performance.

2.5.4 Parent's Education and Educational Life Chances

Parent's education and attitudes have greater impact on the educational life chances of the child in a society. This is because parents who are educated tend to serve as role models for their children. This helps in motivating and encouraging children to learn. The parents can do this in various ways such as;

- i) Checking and monitoring children's book and educational development.

- ii) Encouraging good performance and discouraging failure through for example motivating the children through gifts.
- iii) Extra lesson.
- iv) Controlling late going to school and absenteeism.

2.6 **Effects of Socio-Economic Status on Child's Educational Life Chances**

Socio-economic status heavily affects the quality of education children receive. Education which is valued by our society may be achieved through certain factors such as status, income, etc. Socio-economic status depends on a combination of variables including occupation, education income, wealth and place of residence. Educational life chances of a child or an individual depends on these variables. Lareau (2003) stated that lower income families have children who do not succeed to the level of the middle income children, who feel entitled, are argumentative, and better prepared for life. As a result of the financial and material issues surrounding the low socio-economic status families or parents, parents or families are most concerned with providing basic survival needs like food and shelter before considering education. Educational level creates differences between people in terms of access to information and the level of proficiency in benefiting from new knowledge, whereas income creates differences in access to scarce material goods. Parent's socio-economic status, parental level of education, income, and occupation are variables that heavily affect child's educational life chances.

Max Weber developed a similar view of status. He considers status to be prestige or honor in the community. Weber also considers status to imply "access to life chances" based on social and cultural factors such as family background, lifestyle and social networks. According to Mahuta (2007), the problems encountered by poor homes in relation to education are

- i. Drop-out syndrome
- ii. Parent's negative attitude to schooling
- iii. Children's negative attitude to schooling
- iv. Poverty state of parents
- v. Lack of proper awareness of parent and guardians on the need and value education
- vi. Lack of role models.

The stated problems above are mostly associated with low socio-economic status homes. Children from such homes are most likely to encounter problems of inequality, in educational opportunities more especially when it comes to access or enrolment, retention and completion. This is not the case with higher socio-economic status parents and children. They are opportune with better educational life chances as well as the ability to use their resources for supporting the schooling of their children.

Therefore, simply put, one can say socio-economic differences leads to differences in educational life chances through educational inequality. Educational inequality as stated by Blakemore and Cooksey (1980) are of different kinds:

- i. Not all children have the same chance of going to school. This we call unequal access to schooling.
- ii. There are wide differences in performance between children. Some drop out before completing primary school or secondary school, some have to repeat classes, the majority of candidates fail the secondary entrance examinations.
- iii. Within the education system there are different streams which can be followed leading to a variety of qualifications and possible occupations. These streams may be officially equal but are generally considered to be unequal. For example,

in Africa, technical education is generally considered to be inferior to academic education.

- iv. Schools and colleges which are theoretically equal (following the same syllabus and leading to the same qualifications) vary widely in status, quality, and the market value of the qualification obtained. Thus private schools may be of a higher or lower quality than government schools, places in high-status schools will be more difficult to obtain than places in low-status schools, and the qualifications earned from the best-known schools, colleges and universities may be more marketable than the same qualifications earned elsewhere.
- v. The question of what causes these educational inequalities stated above now haunts. Factors such as race, sex, ethnicity, culture, religion, region, birthplace and intelligence contributes but not without the major contribution of socio-economic status and class background.

The low socio-economic status families have issues to contend with and their child's education may be the least as it is considered as a secondary issue. Major problems of these classes of people include feeding, clothing, shelter and health. Low socio-economic status children have their own problems to contend with which include lack of personal sense of security and safety, low self-esteem and increased violent behavior, resulting in increased self-harm, violence, apathy and truancy. This impairs their emotional, cognitive and behavioral maturity, and often means social isolation, feelings of worthlessness, loneliness and alienation, leading to decreased achievement and participation at school, which eventually most a times results to drop-out from school. "Emotions are the gate keepers to the intellect. Emotional hooks are necessary for long term learning: negative emotions can become blocks to learning" (Eggen & Kauchak, 2004). Low socio-economic status families have less educational activities

outside of school such as computers, books, magazines and encyclopedias, and have fewer chances to travel or visit museums, exhibitions, etc. Generational poverty and lack of resources impacts on the level of children's literacy and logical development leading to decreased literacy and numeracy achievement. Many low socio-economic status parents did not like their schooling experiences and have negative attitudes. These parents have lower aspirations, require a great deal of encouragement and support to become involved and allow their children to drift into classes and rely on the decisions of others, which is reflected in their lower levels of educational achievement (Kaplan and Kaplan 2001) as cited in (Eggen and Kauchak, 2004).

The detrimental effect of socio-economic status on child's educational life chances compounds within the classroom. Teachers fall victim to the fundamental attribution error when interpreting the behaviors of children. When a child of low socio-economic status answers a question incorrectly, the teacher may attribute this to the child's disposition. That is, the teacher assumes that the child could not answer the questions because he or she is not capable of answering that kind of questions because he or she does not have the intelligence to do so. However, when a child of low socio-economic status answers a question correctly, the teacher attributes the child's answer to situation factors. That is, the teacher assumes that the child simply got lucky or that someone told the child the answer. The opposite is true for a child of high socio-economic status. When they answer a question correctly the teacher attributes their answer to their disposition – the child is intelligent. However, when they answer a question incorrectly the teacher attributes their incorrect answer to situation factors such as the way the child is feeling that day or the manner in which the question was asked. Harvey & Slatin (1976) in Meighan & Blatchford (2003) maintained after their research that socio-economic status contributes immensely to classroom conflicts. Banks (1968)

explains that socio-economic status is expressed in dress, style of speech etc. Wrong assumptions are mostly made by teachers that slower and less likable children come from low socio-economic status home. This is very detrimental to children who came from poor home and they get discouraged from participating in school activities and gradually, may stop going to school.

2.7 Review of Related Empirical Studies

Socio-economic status of the family is a very significant variable or factor that affects the educational life chances of a child. This view is also emphasized on by Mahuta (2007) as he maintains that the higher the socio-economic status of the child's home, the higher his educational life chances. He further stated that parent's economic position in addition to their attitude to education may to a larger extent determine the child's chances of having access to schooling.

Decas (1997) observed in a study that children from lower socio-economic status homes or families are likely to encounter problems of inequality in educational opportunities more especially in relation to access or enrolment, retention and completion. Families with low socio-economic status often lack the financial, social, and educational supports that characterize families with high socio-economic status. Poor families also may have inadequate or limited access to community resources that promote and support children's development and school readiness. Similarly, Aakvik et al. (2005) have analyzed the effect of aspects of family background such as family income and parental education on the educational attainment of persons born from 1967 to 1972 in Norway. Standard OLS regression was applied to compute study estimates, where the dependent variable accounted for the level of education of the individual, and the independent variables included family income, family education and mother's labor supply. The individual and families characteristics are clearly very important

determinants of school enrollment, particularly for girls. A child's probability of enrollments is increasing in parental education, with mother's education being relatively important in encouraging girls' enrollment.

Zill, et al. (1995) conducted a study which maintained that "having inadequate resources and limited access to available resources can negatively affect families' decisions regarding their young children's development and learning. As a result, children from families with low socio-economic status are at greater risk of entering school unprepared than their peers from families with median or high socio-economic status – that is if the poor children get enrolled. According to Bradley and Corwyn (2010), individual's socio-economic status is usually determined by the socio-economic status of their family. The socio-economic status of the family is calculated based on the measure of the known factors which are income, status, education, power, occupation amongst others. For each of these factors, the consideration of how fixed each one is also contributes to socio-economic status. The factors mentioned earlier are characterized with questions such as:

- i. How well can the family members meet their financial responsibilities?
- ii. What prestige is associated with the occupation of the head of the families?
- iii. What level of education have the parents achieved?
- iv. What is the safety and upkeep of the neighborhood in which the family lives?
- v. What hope do the family members reasonably have to influence the government and community policies that affect their lives?

The last question exists because a school's socio-economic status is determined by the neighborhood in which it is located and by the socio-economic status of the families whose children attend the school. Santrock (2004) states that when comparing high socio-economic status parents to low socio-economic status parents, the high

socio-economic status tend to be less directive and more conversational in their communication with their children. Poor parents are more likely than the high class parents to expect obedience without question from their children. Low socio-economic status parents encourage their children to conform to society's expectations, while the high socio-economic status parents encourage creativity and exploration. These differences foster self-confidence in the high socio-economic status students and an uncertainty about life in the low background students. Parents may have inadequate skills for such activities as reading to and with their children, and they may as well lack information about childhood immunizations and health life chances. Also, according to Nash (2004), young children in the low socio-economic status neighborhood report many unpleasant experiences. Children growing up in a less privileged family and neighborhood are more likely to experience distressing events than their counter parts that are socio-economically privileged. These include physical punishments at home, domestic violence in their home, and serious crimes in the neighborhood. Such demoralizing experiences lead to higher rates of depression, low-self-esteem, and juvenile delinquency among children from the low socio-economic neighborhoods.

Lee and Burkam (2002) maintained that schools in low socio-economic status neighborhoods tend to have fewer resources that is, if the neighborhood have a school. Their students, beginning school with little preparation, require an educational system with a more skillful and focused approach. However, the teachers in the low socio-economic status schools are often less paid and less trained than the teachers in the higher class schools. The results are low achievement rates for the students. Few secondary school students in low socio-economic schools plan to go further; therefore, the graduation rate is low. One of the big problems in school for children of low socio-economic status is the self-fulfilling prophecy of failure. If the children do not dress

well, passive or are too shy to participate fully in classroom activities, the teacher may not feel they are very bright. The teacher will call on these students less often and not regularly engage them in class discussion. These students are often left feeling as they do not belong in school and as if they do not have hope of doing well. If learned helplessness builds in the students' self-concept, they will look for experiences that confirm this self-concept. This process is especially strong if the students are from an ethnic minority and face discrimination.

Harvey and Slantin (1975) conducted a study which investigated the criteria for teachers' expectations in classrooms. Some sampled teachers were presented with photographs of students from different socio-economic background and asked about their expected academic performance on each of the students. It was found that teachers have lower expectations on low socio-economic status students. All the students identified in the photograph as slow learners by teachers are from low socio-economic background.

Santrock (2004) conducted a study in mixed socio-economic status schools and observed that the practice of tracking can negatively affect the low socio-economic status students. Tracking involves assigning students to classes in one grade based on their achievement level in the previous year. There are different expectations for the hierarchy of tracks; the high tracks set higher academic priorities and offer more encouragement than the lower tracks. Tracking disproportionately assigns low- socio-economic status students to low achieving classrooms. Thus, the students who need the most stimulation and motivation are given the least. The original disparity between the achievement levels of the high-track students and the low-track students widens as tracking continues.

Woolfolk (2007) conducted a study on schools in low socio-economic status neighborhoods. He finds that the schools in low socio-economic status neighborhoods suffer from lack of support from the students' homes because the students' homes are also socio-economically less privileged to support their own family talk less of the school. The home environment contributes substantially to the development of academic skills. Enriching experiences in the home can contribute up to one-half of the measured achievement in verbal skills, reading, and mathematics. Three main factors distinguish the home environment of the high socio-economic status student from that of the low socio-economic status student. The high socio-economic status student is likely to do more reading and more skill building than the low socio-economic status student, even during vacation. These factors are most closely associated with the educational level of the mother. The mother in the high socio-economic status family can be expected to have graduated from a college or a university. An educated mother recognizes the need for home enrichment; the low-education mother likely does not.

Boyle et al (2002) conducted a study on gender practices within families. Survey conducted reveals that gendered practices at the families' level affect the opportunities of girls and boys to access and complete education. In low socio-economic status families decision making processes around educational access, trade-offs between children are made. Studies indicate the preference many families have for the education of boys over girls, with girl's education often deemed less important and drop out consequently more likely. Similarly, Boadu (2000) observed that boys from wealthier families in Ghana had enrolment rates 34 percentage points higher than boys from poor families; the gap in favor of girls from rich background compared with girls from low-income background was 55.4 percentage points. Wealth gaps in enrolment greatly exceed gender gaps in enrolment. The allocation of scarce families' resources affects

girls more than boys. Early domestic responsibilities especially among young girls conflict with the pursuit of education. Retrogressive cultural practices such as female genital mutilation (FGM) and early marriages prevent the advancement of girls in education. The willingness of parents to educate girls is reduced by socio-economic and cultural effects such as their expected change of allegiance after marriage to the husband's family. In the study, Boadu (2000) also observed that the distribution of female teachers has an important impact on school quality for girls. Their presence is important to provide girls with role models and to provide counseling, especially on issues related to puberty. Girls are shy of approaching male teachers, where consequently male teachers advising girls on sex education may be taken as sexual provocation. Also, Vavrus (2002) study reveals, 'the demand for girls' schooling is generally high, but cultural and economic forces keep this desire from becoming a reality for many girls.

2.8 Summary and Uniqueness of the Study

This chapter reviewed studies previously carried out that is related to this study which tries to find out the impact of socio-economic status on child's educational life chances. Researches and works of scholars from sociology, sociology of education and psychology were reviewed. Work of conflict theorists Karl Marx, Max Weber and Pierre Bourdieu made it understood on how major social class and social stratification is on an individual's life. Weber's classification of social stratification explains how correlated class inequality is with economic activities through the three independent factors that form his theory of stratification hierarchy which are class, status and power. Max Weber further zoomed on individual living in social world through his life chances theory. Life chances theory tends to describe how likely it is, given certain factors, that an individual's life will turn out a certain way. This theory further highlights on how

correlated life chances are with one's socio-economic status. Life chances is used to describe general patterns in a society rather than to account for the fate of a particular individual, it provides one kind of answer to the question of who gets what? The notion educational life chances are derived from the main concept to focus attention on the regular features found in educational experiences of individuals. Different studies in this chapter indicate impact of socio-economic status on an individual's life chances. Families with low socio-economic status often lack the financial, social, and educational supports that characterize families with high socio-economic status. Based on various studies, impact of contribution of reviewed factors such as social class, gender inequality, rural-urban imbalances in education, parental level of education, are some of the factors characterized by socio-economic status in relation to educational life chances. This chapter also spotlighted the effects of socio-economic status on child's educational life chances. Some of the effects include educational inequality, unequal future outcomes, negative attitude towards education from the parent and child due to unpleasant school and after school experiences, low self-esteem, truancy, and drop-out rates of children from poor homes.

The uniqueness of this study borders around the scope it tends to cover. Most studies tend to find out the relationship between socio-economic status and academic attainment, this study relates socio-economic and educational life chances and also using Weber's Life Chances Theory as a theoretical base aside Karl Marx's social class theory and the three component theory of stratification of Max Weber, and Pierre Bourdieu's theory of Cultural Reproduction and Cultural Capital. That is to say, this research focuses on various theories under the conflict theoretical paradigm.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the research methodology used in this study which includes research design, the population of the study, sample size, sampling procedure, data collection instruments, validity and reliability of the instruments and method of data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

The research design employed for this study is correlational research. Correlational research is the type of research design that is interested in attempting to determine whether there is a relationship or not between two or more quantifiable variables and to what degree this relationship exists. The function of correlational research is to establish relationship or lack of it or to use relationship in making predictions. What makes this research design an appropriate choice is due to the fact that the study seeks to ascertain the impact of socio-economic status which is an independent variable on educational life chances which is a dependent variable.

3.3 Population of the Study

Population in research can be defined as the total number of people or objects that the research work will cover. Therefore, the population of this study includes all the schools in Basawa and Bomo districts of Sabon Gari Local government area of Kaduna state. The target population of this study includes all SS 1 students and teachers where students' sample is 879 and teachers' sample is 56. Below is the population of the study:

Table 3.1: Sample of the Study (SS1 Students)

S/N	Schools	Boys	Girls	Teachers	Total
1.	Government Day Secondary School Basawa	114	187	13	301
2.	Knowledge is Power Secondary School Basawa	92	121	15	213
3.	Government Day Secondary School Bomo	124	103	12	227
4.	Merit college Bomo	54	84	16	138
Total		384	495	56	879

Source: Field survey, 2013.

3.4 Sampling Procedure

The sample for this study is drawn from the population of the study given in the table 3.1. Sample size can be defined as portion of the population that is selected for the study. In order to achieve the objective of this study, the four (4) schools found in Basawa and Bomo districts were sampled through deliberate sampling procedure because the researcher found the number of schools in the study area manageable. Out of the total population of 879 students in SS1, 264 students were used as sample using the Kraycie & Morgan (1970) table for determining sample size and out of 56 teachers, 48 teachers were used as sample through the same procedure. Proportional sampling procedure was used to sample respondents in each school based on its population. The choice of this sampling procedure is to give every school in Basawa and Bomo districts and every student due to their fragile stage of school the opportunity of equality in selection.

Table 3.2: Population of the Study

S/N	Schools	No. of students	No. of Sampled students	No. of teachers	No. of Sampled teachers
1.	Government Day Secondary School Basawa	301	91	13	11
2.	Knowledge is Power Secondary School Basawa	213	63	15	13
3.	Government Day Secondary School Bomo	227	68	12	10
4.	Merit college Bomo	138	42	16	14
	Total	879	264	56	48

Source: Field survey, 2013.

3.5 Research Instruments

Research data were collected for this study using self-designed questionnaire, observation, interview schedule and anecdotal records (documentary analysis).

- i. **Self-Designed Socio-Economic Status Questionnaire:** The questionnaire is specifically designed and responded to by the students of SS 1 of the sampled schools of this study. The questionnaire is a closed ended four point Likert scale type. It was divided into two parts, A and B. Part A collects information about personal data and part B measures facts about education level of parents, parent's socio economic status, family background, relationship with teacher in school and girl child enrollment in schools.
- ii. **Interview Schedule:** Unstructured interviews were used to interview the teachers and few randomly selected students and parents as well. In the case of the teachers, the sampled teachers and head teachers were talked to, and engaged in discussions while their responses were recorded, while re-organizing the report later, clarification are sought for later. According to Borg and Gall (1979), as quoted in Musaaazi (2006), in the unstructured interviews: "the interviewer does not employ a detailed interview guide but has a general plan and usually asks

questions or make comments indented to lead the respondent toward giving data to meet the interviewer's objectives. Questions about parents' ability to meet school associated costs, sources of financial assistance, contribution of Parents-Teachers-Association (P.T.A) to the school, language of instruction in the school, drop-out rates, among others are among the items on the interview guide used in this study.

- iii. Observation: This instrument is chosen for this study so as to gain more firsthand information to compliment other methods. This technique was used to collect information on students and teachers such as how teachers relate to the students individually, observe students activeness in class in relation to his or her social class background, and other relevant observations that will provide relevant information on the study. Observation about in and out of class activities was also made.
- iv. Anecdotal Records: Another instrument used is archival records. The schools keep variety of records ranging from student records, mock scores, enrollment information, school fees payment register and school register (to provide absenteeism records) and drop-out rates.

3.5.1a Validity of the Socio-Economic Status Questionnaire

The self-designed questionnaire was given to the supervisory team, and the judgment of experts in tests and measurement, psychology was also sought for. Their careful scrutinization, suggestions and reconstruction of the instrument certified that the content of the instrument could give valid information on the subject matter. They also converted all the questionnaire's open ended items to closed ended questions for ease of response on the part of respondents and accuracy of data.

3.5.1b Reliability of the Parental Status Questionnaire

The test-retest measure of reliability was obtained by administering it to 40 students from other district schools. The second administration took place two weeks after with the same students. The first and second scores were correlated using Person Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient 'r' at 0.05 level of significance and the reliability index obtained was 0.64 which was considered high enough for use in this study.

3.5.2a Validity of Unstructured Interview

To ensure the validity of the unstructured interview, the instrument was given to the supervisory team in the Faculty of Education and Extension Services, UDUS, Sokoto, for careful examination and scrutinization. The item to get the data was determined through their independent face validity of the instrument and also converting all the questionnaire's items to closed ended questions for ease of response on the part of respondents and accuracy of data.

3.5.2b Reliability of the Unstructured Interview

In order to obtain the reliability of unstructured interview items, the instrument was administered to the non-selected respondents from other school. This was recorded by the use of tape recorder, and with the help of a trained research assistant. The two records were compared, the higher the percentage of consensus between the two records, the higher the reliability of the interview guides.

3.5.3a Validity of Observation Schedule and Anecdotal Records

In order to obtain the validity of the observation schedule and Anecdotal Records, the supervisory team in the Faculty of Education and Extension Services scrutinized and examined the instrument. The item to get data was determined through their independent face validity of the instrument.

3.5.3b. **Reliability of Observation Schedule and Anecdotal Records**

In order to ensure the reliability of the observation schedule and Anecdotal Records, the assistance of a trained observer was employed during the process. The results collected by the researcher and the additional observer were compared. The reliability of the instruments was determined by percentage of agreement obtained (the higher the percentage of agreement between the two the more the reliability of the instrument).

3.6. **Method of Data Collection**

The following methods were used to collect data for this study;

- i. Self-designed Students' Socio-economic Status Questionnaire: The researcher was assisted with two teachers from each school to administer the questionnaires to the sampled students.
- ii. Unstructured Interview Schedule: The researcher personally talked to the respondents and interviewed them while recording their responses.
- iii. Non Participant Observation: The researcher mingled with the students, staffs, and within the school environment to collect first-hand information relevant to the study.
- iv. Anecdotal Records: The researcher collected relevant information related to the study through analyzing information about students' enrollment, absenteeism drop-out-rate, and school fees payment register. Academic performance records will also be reviewed.

3.7 **Method of Data Analysis**

The qualitative data were analyzed on the basis of themes and sub-themes so as to obtain emerging patterns and trends from observations, questionnaires, interview schedule and anecdotal records.

To analyze the quantitative data collected, descriptive statistics was used. And because this study is aimed at establishing a relationship between independent variable socio-economic status and dependent variable educational life chances, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient 'r' was used in this study to analyze the data.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of the major findings from the qualitative and quantitative research instruments that were used for collecting the data.

4.2 Analysis of Qualitative Data

This section deals with the reviewed data collected through interviews, observations, anecdotal records, and field notes. The information relevant to this study was analyzed in the following order of themes and sub themes.

- i. Parent's socio-economic status as it relates to children's school enrollment
- ii. Parents socio-economic status as it relates to children's educational life chances
- iii. Parent's educational level as it relates to children's educational achievement
- iv. Children's socio-economic status as it relates to teacher's expectation
- v. Gender as it relates to children's educational life chances

Parent's Socio-economic Status and children's school enrollment

According to the findings of this study through in-depth interview, observation and responses relevant to parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment from questionnaire show that without a good socio-economic background, getting a child enrolled in school is an issue. Through observation, it was observed that low socio-economic status background parents tend to bother more over feeding, clothing, sheltering and health of the families rather than education. Low socio-economic status background families in the study areas tend to be poorer, access to schooling difficult, families members less educated and pressures on children to work to support the families (e.g. in domestic and agricultural duties), greater. School enrollment of children

in these areas in relation to their parents' socio-economic status is measured through factors such as parents' income and financial circumstances.

i. Parent's Income and Financial Circumstances

Parents' income is found to be an important factor in determining access to education as schooling potentially incurs a range of costs, both upfront and hidden. Upfront costs include school fees, while the more hidden costs include uniforms, transportation and educational materials. Parents' income is linked to a range of factors such as when children start school, how often they attend, whether they have to temporarily withdraw and also when and if they drop out.

Research findings of this study through in-depth interview highlights the link between poverty and school enrollment as respondents paint poverty as the most common primary and contributory reason for children to be out of school. Series of questions to parents about the circumstances surrounding children's school enrollment in the study area reveal that some families' main barrier to sending children to school was financial and their inability to pay schooling cost. Investigations identifies that children from better off families are more likely to remain in school, whilst those who are less privileged are more likely never to have attended, or to drop out even when they somehow get enrolled. Less privileged families tend to have lower demand for schooling than rich families. Whatever the benefits of schooling, the cost for them, are more difficult to meet than is the case for richer families.

ii. School Fees and Indirect Costs of Schooling

According to information from anecdotal records, schooling costs such as fees and other more indirect costs impact on parents' decisions about their children's access to school. Findings indicate that direct and indirect schooling costs are important factors in whether children enroll in and attend school. Interview with parents, teachers and

students in the districts in order to gain information about the constraints affecting the enrollment of children in school, reveal inability to pay the direct costs of schooling to be one of the main causes of non-attendance in both districts, with those dropping out most frequently citing a lack of money to pay for school expenses as an important reason for dropping out. In interviews, parents often talked about difficulties in paying school fees, especially prior to harvest, the ability to buy exercise books, pens and the necessary clothing for school also influenced whether children could enroll or were withdrawn from school. Some parents described their children dropping out after enrollment because they could not meet the costs of schooling. Additional costs e.g. registration payments, junior secondary school certificate examination fees, textbooks and uniform costs, were all indirect costs many parents found difficult to meet.

Not only do school fees lead to under-enrolment and drop out, they also limit attendance at school and lead to temporary withdrawals. Findings reveal that children may be sent home if they cannot pay school fees. The inability to pay school fees meant children withdrawing from school for periods of time, temporarily.

Parents' socio-economic status and children's educational life chances

Socio-economic status of parents in relation to their children's enrollment has been established by this study but the long run effect on child's life chances cannot be overlooked. Parents' socio-economic status determine the educational life chances of the children in Basawa and Bomo districts through the following highlighted factors such as drop out, inability of parents to give their children quality education and the children's financial contribution to the families.

i. School drop out

Research findings in this study revealed drop out as an end result of being from a low socio-economic status family in the long run. Through observation, this study confirmed that children defaulting in school fees payment are always driven home and

weren't allowed to attend classes. This leads to temporary withdrawal from school pending when the parents would get money to pay. In some cases, the child never returns to school and gradually shun or forget the idea of pursuing education and rather go about engaging in one commercial activities or the other. A teacher during an interactive session said:

For children from low socio-economic background, the pressure on them to withdraw from school increases as they get older, especially as the cost of their education increases. Though most parents know the importance of education and the kind of opportunity it could give their children but the cost is too much for them to afford when food, health, clothing, and basic daily needs are still yet to be covered.

Interviews reveal that most children hardly get to write their senior secondary school certificate examination before dropping out of school in contrast to their counterparts from average and high socio-economic status parents. An interview with a teacher also revealed that school population drastically reduces when it comes to paying a fee or the other. He said:

Side talks and murmuring always ensues when announcement about any payment comes up. You will find out that few are absent the following day. Just half of the required populations of students pay for qualifying examinations especially now that it is more expensive. And if they should write, they never get to re-write in case of any deficiency in their results and when asked why, they give financial constraint as a reason.

Such instances sometimes bring regret in the long run in the life of the disadvantaged children as they miss educational opportunities that could turn their life around for the better thereby enhancing their likelihood of better life chances.

ii. Parents' inability to provide quality education

Observation and interview in both districts reveal that though some parents want good education for their children to enable them compete with the advantaged children, the high cost of quality education is difficult for them to afford. They are left with no

choice than to send their children to public schools which most lack the standard of quality education, facilities and structures. During an interactive session with a student in one of the district after school hours, he said:

Some teachers cannot even speak proper English language to communicate and teach in class. How could such a person pass quality knowledge to students? How could our level of education be compared to that of children going to good schools? Any student here who has aspirations to further his or her education after secondary school has no idea of the kind of challenge awaiting them. We cannot even face them in competitions because they are ahead of us educationally.

The quality of education they receive determines the likelihood of how their education may turn out. A teacher during an interview said:

Most candidates who have deficiencies in their WAEC or NECO results hardly re-write and a few that struggled to correct their deficiencies always find it hard to correct. They mostly end up dumping the result and shunning the idea of furthering school gradually.

The public schools that are very accessible to the low socio-economic stratum are usually in a poor dilapidated state. Some children don't even have good desk as they are to hang around in class by sitting either on the floor or by the window which is a very uncondusive environment for learning.

iii. Children's financial contribution to the family

Interview and observation showed that patterns of access and non-access in both districts indicated that the income of the father was linked to the continuity or discontinuity of the child in school. If income levels are low, children may be called on to supplement the families' income, either through wage-earning employment or taking on additional tasks to free up other members of the family for work.

Anecdotal record on drop outs cases shows that they start drifting out of school from the ages of 13 – 17 years. And out of the cases they have had, just a handful (1%)

stop coming to the school due to either relocation or parent's decision to change their child's school. Most that stopped coming to school end up doing bike transportation (achaba), laborers on construction sites, petty trading, getting paid to join in large scale cultivation, wheel barrow pushing, water seller (mai ruwa), etc. to support their family while the girls hawk. Attendance register shows habitual absenteeism of students known from low socio-economic background, especially during raining season. It is evident that these students work in farms within those periods of time either for family subsistence or to get wages.

During a conversation with a bike operator that took the researcher to one of the sampled schools not knowing he used to be a student of the school:

How could I continue school when my family needs my support? As at the time I stopped schooling, my father was seriously ill and we were left with no one to fend for me and my six (6) siblings. I and my sister had to quit school. I joined the Nigerian British American Tobacco Company (NBATC) as a casual worker while my sister joined our mother in selling fried yam and akara (bean cake) by the road side. And when our father got better, we could not stop working because my sister was about getting married which means we will be lacking a helping hand. Our contribution made a difference and its impact is fully felt even with our parent's income included.

This trend shows that some children stop schooling as a last resort. Most parents often do not want to remove their children from school as they see it as an investment for the future while some see it as a waste of time and resources due to the high unemployment rate prevalent in our country today. They see the future investment as an uncertain bet though their socio-economic state further gives them no choice. However, some children make their choices depending on what their family goes through day by day to survive.

Parents' level of education and children's educational achievement

Through observation, it was observed that most children of school going age in the study area with no access to schooling are from parents with low educational background. Investigations in this study indicate that the educational level of parents is particularly influential in determining whether and for how long children can have access to schooling. Higher parental level of education is associated with increased access to education, higher attendance rates and low dropout rates while low parental level of education is associated with decreased access to education, lower attendance rates and high dropout rates.

Observation of families' education pattern in the study area revealed evidence that the gender and education level of the parents can influence which child is more likely to access and remain in school and for how long. Often it is the mother's educational level in particular which is seen to have an effect on access. Observation shows that the father's education has a greater influence on boys' schooling and the mother's on girls'. Educated mothers give preference to girls' schooling, implying that mothers have a relatively stronger preference for their daughter's education and that their education affords them either increased family decision-making power or increased economic status. Improvements in fathers' education raise the schooling of both sons and daughters (favouring the latter). The following investigated factors such as negative attitude and perception towards education, lack of supervision and help from parents, and lack of good role modelling highlights the outcomes of child's educational achievement depending on parent's level of education.

i. **Parents' negative attitude and perception towards education**

This is one of the main reasons behind low educational attainment in the study area. How parents regard education and the importance placed on it at times shapes interactions between schooling, family income and enrollment.

Interviews indicated that individuals' anticipation for returns from education as an important part in whether and for how long children receive education. In some families, children are seen as family assets whose education could, to varying extents, benefit the family. Thus, perceptions of how education affects future prospects appears important to retention. Investigative interaction indicates that many low socio-economic status families see a child's education as a way out of poverty.

During an interview with a teacher, he said:

Low socio-economic status parents (who he believe to be uneducated) have little or no understanding of the benefits of education and many of their children do not attend school (or attend irregularly) because their parents do not value education.

Observations indicate a reluctance and lack of support towards a child's education by parents and family members. This lack of interest in the child's schooling is a contributing factor in dropping out or infrequent attendance which eventually results into child's limited educational life chances. For some district members, mostly farmers, schooling is considered not worthwhile as they suspect it as irrelevant to future prospects. Some parents state the reasons for not sending their children to school because they thought there would be no job at the end of it and as such, no returns to their investment. During an interview with a parent, he said:

The state of the country is not encouraging as the rich continues getting richer while the poor keeps on getting poorer. How would a parent who went through hell in giving their children education feel if there is no good outcome out of it? I am talking about unemployment and what is the essence of education if my children don't get employed at the end of it. I rather not let them waste their time. Instead, I will involve them in something more worthwhile like farming.

When interviewing another parent, he said:

I would not want my children to experience what I went through when I was in school. We trek for long distances to get to school and my parents were not rich so it was tough. I would love sending my children to school but I cannot afford it. So they rather stay at home than suffer like I did. I did not finish my school because of the hardship. I had to drop out in Form 2.

Parents in the study areas see education as a waste of time and also show no interest in it due to either their bad short termed schooling experience, or lack of it and non-knowledge of its long run benefits to an individual's life chances.

ii. **Lack of supervision, help and good role modeling from parents**

Interviews and observation reveal that the children from low socio-economic status in the study areas suffer from lack of parental support, supervision, help and good role modeling when it comes to education. Some parents do not care to know what their children are going through in school or how smooth or bumpy schooling is going for them. Though some parents may enquire about their children's educational well-being but can't help them in solving areas of trouble concerning difficult subjects, or even help them with their homework or assignments. During an observatory interaction with a school student about parental help and support, he said:

Till I finished secondary school, neither my father nor my mother ever asked me how was school today. I could remember a day my father quarreled with me for asking him how to write a letter in Hausa language because we were given an assignment by our language teacher to write an informal letter. I forcefully tried to finish my secondary school though obviously, my parents see it as a waste of time. Maybe it is because they did not have any education at all or a way to discourage me from going to school due to their inability to sponsor my education.

During an interview with a teacher, she stated that:

Some of these children lack good role modeling from home. You as an experienced teacher will notice a child's attitude towards education in class. Positive or negative behavior to schooling starts from home. How would you expect a child who lacks motivation, encouragement and optimism on education from his or her parents to last in school? There are very little we the teachers can do to help them succeed academically.

Findings indicates that most children from low socio-economic status background of Basawa and Bomo districts lack the push every child needs from home to succeed academically.

Children's socio-economic background and teachers' expectation in class

Students from low background are easy to identify through appearance, speech skills, and ability to keep up with financial requirements in school. Some teachers, mostly inexperienced judge children according to their socio-economic status and treat them in relation to that as well. Study through observations and interactions with students reveal existence of teacher expectation in relation to a child's socio-economic status. They regard students with full complete educational material as very serious students and portray students with none or few educational materials as unserious without putting the student's family financial state into consideration. A student said:

Our teacher never encourages students without his subject text book. He will always say we will never learn to understand it when he can actually explain it to us through examples in class. He always emphasize on “buy, borrow or steal” without wanting to know if we can afford it or not. It is unfair because not everyone in the class can afford the text book.

Observations in all the sampled schools indicate that students are categorized in reference to their neatness and punctuality to school. Low socio-economic status students always fall victim because most of them hardly have an extra uniform to supplement their uniforms and most of them have to trek for long distances to get to school every day. As a result they always get to school late and tired. The first to third or fourth periods of each day at school perceived to be the time when a child’s brain is at best for assimilation is used by these children to rest, some even dose off. Teachers mostly inexperienced handle these situations badly. They call them names like lazy idiots, dumb, good for nothing or even give them punishments when in contrast, they need understanding, psychological moral boosting, and encouragement. During an interaction with a student, she said:

I always pray for our principal because he is a good man. He paid for my J.S.S.C.E and he don’t even know my parents. I know some other students he paid for their examination fees too. Although he said he did it because he knows am intelligent in class. If our teachers are like that too, we children from poor homes will not be discouraged from coming to school ever.

Some students end up hating subjects they are supposed to embrace just because of the way their teacher maltreats them in class. They end up getting absent minded in class because they believe their presence is not noted by the teacher, they may not even contribute to classroom activities even when they know it, they start running out of class when it is time for the subject they despise because of the teacher and gradually start finding reasons not to go to school. What would a child who is socio-economically

disadvantaged do when he or she gets no motivation from home, get little or no financial support, had to struggle to cover long distances each day to get to school, and finally end up getting unfair treatment and judgment from teachers in class than to quit school when he or she sees no sense in it?

In other words, the fundamental attribution error teachers fall victim to in interpreting a child's behavior surely puts a dent on a child's determination to persevere in achieving educational attainment.

Gender and children's educational life chances

Gender cuts across a wide range of constraints that hinders better educational life chances for girls in the study area. Studies on gender and access tend to be around the education of girls and enabling the retention of girls in school most especially in the northern part of Nigeria. Though socio-economic factors are a huge constraint, socio-cultural practices cannot be overlooked. Gendered practices at the families' level affect the opportunities of girls to access and complete education. In families decision making processes around educational access, trade-offs between children are made. Factors such as priority on boy child education due to socio-economic state of parents, early marriage, fear of social vices and unwanted pregnancies, and families and financial contribution are observed to affect the educational life chances of girls in the study research area.

i. Priority on boy child education over girls due to socio-economic state of parents

Findings from interview and attendance of girl's records in school reveals that parents of low socio-economic stratum who are not capable of sending all their children to school are left with no choice than to make decision on who is to go to school between their boys or girls. They do weigh the prospect of sending their boys to school as they do girls and the outcomes determines who goes to school. It is observed that

boys are always chosen over girls in this part of the country. Educating a girl is always seen as a waste of time and resources. The nature of marriage, where girls move into the husband's families, brings less perceived benefits to their families, thereby restricting the perceived need for continued schooling. Perceptions of the value of girls education differed from those of boys suggest that families tend to see boys' education bringing greater future economic rewards, which was not to be the case with girls whose future was expected to lie in family care and marriage.

According to some parents, they believe any positive outcome that may accrue from educating a girl will not be yielded by them but her matrimonial home since she will be given out for marriage early while they believe spending their limited resources on boys as an investment with returns. This gendered practice is observed to hinder girl's education and placing a barrier on their educational life chances.

ii. **Early marriage**

In the long fight for higher girl child education rate, early marriage has always been a barrier to improve educational life chances of girls. The study area which is also not left out in the fight against low girl child education tend to give out most of their girls off to marriage before completing secondary school education. Though it has been observed that girls turn out impressively for basic primary education, their numbers start thinning down when they get to secondary school.

During an interview with a teacher, she said:

Girls who got married while still in school just stop coming to school. That is the end of their schooling because hardly do their husbands let them continue with their education then or in the nearest future. We have lost so many intelligent girls that compete with boys academically in class to early marriage.

In this study, it has been observed that the girls getting married to husbands with no educational foresight cripples the possibility of them furthering their education.

Some short sighted husbands are known with selfish reasons for doing so which is fear of their wife surpassing them educationally and dominating decision making in the family. They rather keep them at home claiming home is where women belong. Some parents claim those twelve years of schooling would mean their daughters could not perform housework and as a result may not be able to find husbands if they cannot perform house chores as they should. Study highlights the propensity for girls to be excluded or withdrawn from school earlier than boys, in the belief that, as a girl, she does not need to be educated or should not be too educated so as not to spoil her marriage potential. Educating a girl is often seen as a poor investment because the girl will marry and leave home, bringing the benefits of education to the husband's family rather than to her own parents.

iii. **Social vices and unwanted pregnancies**

Social vices prevalent in our society presently make some parents prefer having their children at home most especially the girls. Children from low socio-economic status are often more prone to physical contact with social vices than children from high socio-economic status. Observation of the study areas unveils the environment they live in, and pass through on their way to school threaten their moral value and puts their dignity at risk. Sometimes they get in contact with these social vices in their daily errand of giving their own financial contribution to their family. For example, it is observed that children of high socio-economic status parents are always taken to school and taken back home with a fixed transportation source while children of low socio-economic status parents go to school themselves and go back home alone too with no supervision. Some parents are very wary of the kind of sexual harassment their children could be going through or the kind of indecent behaviors they might be exposed to on their way to and from school. The girls who help their parents in hawking to support

their family are always exposed to bad influences, sexual harassment, and even rape in some cases which leads to unwanted pregnancies.

The socio-economic status of these children placed them in such situations in the first place because their counter parts from high socio-economic status parent hardly encounter such problems. Any child inflicted with social vices or pregnancy coupled with a low socio-economic background is held down in achieving a better educational life chances.

iv. **Family and financial contribution**

Through interaction and observation in the study areas, the girls talk about wanting to continue their education in some ways, but the economic hardships made this difficult and almost impossible. A teacher during an interview said:

There is this girl who used to hawk groundnut in the school premises. We noticed that this girl is always reading a book or the other which made us curious to interview her. She said her parents cannot afford to send her and her brother to school at the same time. We never knew her brother is a student in our school. We asked her to introduce her brother whom she did and he also said the same thing. So instead of her schooling, she was called upon to contribute to the family financially and also helping her mother in families chores pending when she will be given out for marriage while her brother continues schooling.

In another interview, a teacher said:

Most of the girls in this district engage in hawking to support their families. Take a look at the school premises, road side and filling stations in this district. Before you see a male hawking, you must have seen like a dozen of girls hawking.

The gendered division of labor within families in the study area often sees girls taking on families' duties, commercial activities and child care duties which take them out of school and limiting their educational life chances.

4.3 Presentation and Analysis of Quantitative Data

The quantitative data of this study was obtained through questionnaire and presented in tables, analyzed and presented with results. It also includes the interpretation of findings of the study based on inferential statistic technique selected from statistical methods (Pearson Product Moment Correlation co-efficient 'r') that was used to test and analyze the formulated hypotheses.

Table 4.2.1 Questionnaire response figure

Issued questionnaire	264
Answered questionnaire	256
Unanswered questionnaire	10

Source: field survey, 2014

Table 4.2.1 shows that out of 264 questionnaires distributed to students, 256 were answered and returned, while 10 were unanswered. Information obtained from respondent's responses were analyzed and presented in table 4.2.2.

Table 4.2.2 Demographic information of respondents

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	133	52%
Female	121	48%
Total	254	100

Source: field survey, 2014

Table 4.2.2 indicates that 133(52%) of the respondents were boys while 121(48%) were girls although from the review of class attendance records, the population of girls just started gaining momentum in reduction due to coming of age and marriage.

Table 4.2.3 Questionnaire responses percentage table

s/n	Items	N	A	D
1.	Socio-economic status of your parents affect how early you were enrolled in school	256	235/93%	21/7%
2.	You were enrolled early in school.	256	74/29%	182/71%
3.	All the children in your families got enrolled in school early	256	116/47%	138/55%
4.	Your parents earn good income per month	256	94/37%	160/63%
5.	You are well equipped with educational materials	256	88/34%	168/66%
6.	You have been sent home most a times for being unable to pay your school fees.	256	186/72%	70/28%
7.	You receive after school coaching.	256	27/10%	229/90%
8.	Students stop coming to school because their parents can't afford their education.	256	221/85%	35/15%
9.	You have been held back several times from coming to school by your parents because they needed your helping hand at home, market or farm	256	79/30%	177/70%
10.	Your parents are well educated.	256	98/38%	158/62%
11.	Your parents help you with your school work and assignment.	256	90/35%	164/65%
12.	Your parents encourage you to study hard.	256	131/51%	125/49%
13.	Your parents emphasize on the importance of education	256	106/41%	150/59%
14.	Teachers expect students to perform according to their socio-economic background.	256	157/62%	99/38%
15.	There is difference in teacher's treatment of students from low socio-economic background and high socio-economic background in your school.	256	207/81%	49/19%
16.	Students from low socio-economic status get scolded by teachers over inadequate learning materials and poor class performance.	256	179/69%	77/31%
17.	Teachers encourage students regardless of their family background.	256	117/46%	139/54%
18.	Girls come to school as much as boys in your school.	256	88/34%	168/66%
19.	Girls stop coming to school as a result of marriage.	256	216/84%	40/16%
20.	Poor parents prefer sending boys to school instead of girls.	256	247/97%	9/3%
21.	A child's education and future chance of higher education depends on parent's sponsorship	256	214/84%	42/16
22.	A child's progress in school can be affected by parent's low level of education	256	132/52%	124/48%

The table 4.2.3 presented above shows the degree of respondents' responses to the questionnaire. The table shows in percentage the opinion of respondents to all the items which tend to answer the questions on parent's socio-economic status, children's school enrollment, parents' level of education, teacher's expectation in reference to children's socio-economic background, and gender.

4.3.1 Hypothesis Testing

Based on the nature of this study which is a correlational research, finding the relationship between Socio-economic Status and Children's Educational Life Chances, hypotheses were tested using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient 'r'.

- i. Hypothesis 1 (H_{01}): There is no significant relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment.

The hypothesis was tested by subjecting the respondents' scores of parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment to Pearson's correlation analysis as shown in table 4.3.1.

Table 4.3.1: Relationship between Parents' Socio-economic Status and Children's School Enrollment.

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	r-Cal	p-Value	Decision
Socio-economic Status	256	6.78	1.775	.658	.000	H0
School Enrollment	256	7.28	2.554			Rejected

Results on table 4.3.1 indicated that parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment was positively related and significant, Pearson's $r(254) = .658$, $p < .001$. This indicates a significant relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment because the p-value is less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, H_{01} which states that there is no significant relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment was rejected.

- ii. Hypothesis 2 (H_{02}): There is no significant relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's educational life chances.

The hypothesis was tested by subjecting the respondents' scores of parent's socio-economic status and children's educational life chances to Pearson's correlation analysis as shown in table 4.3.2.

Table 4.3.2 Relationship between Parents' Socio-economic Status and children's educational life chances.

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	r-Cal	p-Value	Decision
Socio-economic Status	256	6.78	1.775	.304	.031	H0 Rejected
Educational Life Chances	256	9.77	1.207			

Results on table 4.3.2 indicated that parents' socio-economic status and children's educational life chances was positively related and significant, Pearson's $r(254) = .304$, $p = .031$. This indicates relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's educational life chances because the p-value is less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, H₀₂ which states that there is no significant relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's educational life chances was rejected.

- iii. Hypothesis 3 (H₀₃): There is no significant relationship between parents' educational level and children's educational achievement.

The hypothesis was tested by subjecting the respondents' scores of parent's educational level and children's educational achievement to Pearson's correlation analysis as shown in table 4.3.3.

Table 4.3.3: Relationship between Parents' Educational Level and Children's Educational Achievement.

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	r-Cal	p-Value	Decision
Educational Level	256	6.25	3.144	.055	.380	H0 Accepted
Educational Achievement	256	10.77	1.267			

Results on table 4.3.3 indicated that parent's educational level and children's educational achievement though positively related were not significant, Pearson's $r(254) = .055$, $p = .380$. This indicates no significant relationship between parents' educational level and children's educational achievement because the p-value is more

than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, H₀₃ which states that there is no significant relationship between parents' educational level and children's educational achievement was accepted.

- iv. Hypothesis 4 (H₀₄): There is no significant relationship between children's socio-economic status and teachers' expectation in class.

The hypothesis was tested by subjecting the respondents' scores of children's socio-economic status and teachers' expectation to Pearson's correlation analysis as shown in table 4.3.4.

Table 4.3.4: Relationship between Children's Socio-economic Status and Teacher's Expectation.

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	r-Cal	p-Value	Decision
Socio-economic Status	256	6.78	1.775	.426	.000	H ₀ Rejected
Teacher's Expectation	256	8.18	1.484			

Results on table 4.3.4 indicated that children's socio-economic status and teachers' expectation were positively related and significant, Pearson's $r(254) = .426$, $p < .001$. This indicates a significant relationship between children's socio-economic status and teachers' expectation because the p-value is less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, H₀₄ which states that there is no relationship between child's socio-economic status and teacher's expectation in class was rejected.

- v. Hypothesis 5 (H₀₅): There is no significant relationship between gender and children's educational life chances.

The hypothesis was tested by subjecting the respondents' scores of gender and child's educational life chances to Pearson's correlation analysis as shown in table 4.3.5.

Table 4.3.5: Relationship between Gender and Child’s Educational Life Chances.

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	r-Cal	p-Value	Decision
Gender	256	8.63	1.210	-.128	.041	H0 Rejected
Educational Life Chances	256	9.77	1.207			

Results on table 4.2.5 indicated that gender and children’s educational life chances though negatively related were significant, Pearson’s $r(254) = -.128$, $p = .041$. This indicates a significant relationship between gender and children’s educational life chances because the p-value is less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, H_{05} which states that there is no significant relationship between gender and children’s educational life chances was rejected.

4.4 Summary of major findings

The following are the major findings of the study accrued from both qualitative and quantitative data analysis:

- i. Parents’ socio-economic status determine how early children get enrolled into school. Children from low socio-economic status in the study area do not get enrolled into school early due to their parents’ financial inability to put them into school.
- ii. Children’s educational life chances depend on their parents’ ability to cover their educational costs continuously. That is to say, the more financial support a child gets from his or her parent, the more educational chances he or she gets.
- iii. Children’s educational progress and development may not be affected by their parents’ level of education.
- iv. Children’s socio-economic background contributes to teachers’ expectation in class. That is, some inexperienced teachers attribute a child’s socio-economic background, appearance and verbal skills to academic performance in class.

- v. Gender determines a child's educational life chances. That is to say, low socio-economic parents who cannot afford to send all their children to school make decisions of who to go to school based on the gender of their children. And boys always get the upper hand and advantage over girls.

4.5 Discussion

Researches and studies reviewed in this study reveals concerns on how parent's socio-economic status affects a child's educational outcome and how such outcome determines the child's future chances in the society. Studies on factors determining life chance outcomes of an individual shows socio-economic status as a major determining factor. Scholars and researchers embarked on different studies correlating factors such as gender, ethnicity, religion, culture, biological, and cognitive factors with child's educational outcomes. So is socio-economic status studied in relation to variables such as academic performance, educational achievement and women participation in schooling. This study attempts to capture child's educational life chances in relation to socio-economic status where educational life chances covers factors such as social class, gender, rural-urban inequality and parental level of education.

Review of related empirical studies on child enrollment reveals children from low socio-economic background often encounter problem of educational inequality as their families lacks the financial, social, and educational support that characterizes families from high socio-economic status. Research findings obtained reveal that children from low socio-economic backgrounds do not get enrolled in school early as a result of their parents' financial status. This study finds a significant relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment. Results on table 4.3.1 indicated that parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment was positively related and significant, Pearson's $r(254) = .658, p < .001$.

This indicates a significant relationship between parent's socio-economic status and children's school enrollment because the p-value is less than the .05 level of significance. Likewise, results from interviews, non-participant observations and anecdotal records also show significant relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's school enrollment. The low enrollment of children from the study area is attributed to the socio-economic status of most of the parents in the area who are mostly peasant farmers. This finding is consistent with the findings of Zill, Colling, West, and Hausken (1995) which found that having inadequate resources and limited access to available resources can negatively affect family's decisions regarding their young children's learning and development.

The finding of this study reveals that parents' socio-economic status has significant relationship with children's educational life chances through interviews, observations, and interactions. Quantitative data collected through questionnaire analyzed with Pearson correlation presented in table 4.3.2 also indicated that parents' socio-economic status and children's educational life chances were positively related and significant, Pearson's $r(254) = .304, p = .031$. This indicates relationship between parents' socio-economic status and children's educational life chances because the p-value is less than the .05 level of significance. The qualitative result of this finding agrees with William (1999) who found socio-economic status positively related to one's life chances while the quantitative result disagrees. The findings of this study try to confirm reviewed literature where many researches and studies try to reveal the effects of socio-economic status on children's educational life chances.

The findings of this study also established relationship between parental level of education and children's educational achievement. Findings through interview and observation reveal the likelihood effect of parents' level of education on children's

educational achievement. However, results from quantitative data through questionnaire presented in table 4.3.3 indicated that parents' educational level and children's educational achievement though positively related were not significant, Pearson's $r(254) = .055$, $p = .380$. This indicates no significant relationship between parents' educational level and children's educational achievement because the p-value is more than the .05 level of significance. It was observed in this study that the reason of this outcome is the effort of some questionnaire respondents in trying to cover their background in the information required from them due to shyness of disclosure and not wanting their peers to know their parents' educational level. To explain this conflicting outcome, independent approach will be used qualitatively and quantitatively. The qualitative result of the study agrees with Lareau (2003) who speaks on how middle and high class parents who are obviously educated take active role in their children's education and development through encouraged discussions and close monitoring on their children's educational progress which is most unlikely with uneducated parents. The report from table 4.3.3 do not support this assertion though however, through observations, and review of anecdotal records, some children from low socio-economic background whose parents' education level was very low proved outstanding than children whose parents were better educated. This disagrees with Ersado (2005) who talks of 'the widely accepted notion that parental education is the most consistent determinant of child education'. Higher parental level of education is associated with increased access to education, higher attendance rates, lower dropout rates and academic achievement. It would mean that children whose parents do not read with them can find other people to read with or to encourage them. That is, children whose parents are less educated could have friends whose parents are better educated to learn from those parents. Sometimes the disadvantages that low educated parents face may be a

motivation for their children to be more attentive in class so that they can perform better in order not to face the same problems they witnessed. In addition elder brothers or sisters or other relatives may encourage children from lower education background to work hard since extended family is evident in most lower class families as mentioned by Lareau (2003). One can also note that some children whose parents have higher education still perform poorer than those from worse off education backgrounds. So it is possible that these educated parents do not have time with their children to encourage them to do better.

Results of table 4.3.4 indicated that children's socio-economic status and teachers' expectation were positively related and significant, Pearson's $r(254) = .426, p < .001$. This indicates a relationship between children's socio-economic status and teachers' expectation because the p-value is less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, H_{04} which states that there is no significant relationship between children's socio-economic status and teachers' expectation in class was rejected. Similarly, results accrued from qualitative data also showed significant relationship between children's socio-economic status and teachers' expectation in class. This finding agrees with literatures and reviewed studies such as Banks (1968) that explains that socio-economic status is expressed in dress, style of speech, etc. and wrong assumptions are mostly made by teachers that slower and less likable children come from low socio-economic background. This is consistent with Harvey and Slantin (1976) in Meighan & Blatchford (2003) that maintained that their research reveals that socio-economic status contributes immensely to classroom conflicts. From classroom observations, findings show that teachers prone to classroom attribution error are mostly young, inexperienced and unqualified to handle classroom situations without making bias judgments. They tend to segregate the classroom by encouraging children with complete educational

materials and tag them as serious students while those who lack educational materials are tagged as dull due to their inability to cope in class solely because they couldn't catch up without educational materials used in the classroom. Some teachers also tend to see children from good social class as a good student and the child from low social class as bad. Their neatness and school uniform too is used as a judgment scale by some inexperienced teachers.

Results of table 4.3.5 indicated that gender and children's educational life chances though negatively related were significant, Pearson's $r(254) = -.128, p = .041$. This indicates a relationship between gender and children's educational life chances because the p-value is less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, H_{05} which states that there is no significant relationship between gender and child's educational life chances was rejected. Likewise, results from qualitative instruments such as observation, interview and anecdotal records also revealed significant relationship between gender and child's educational life chances. The result of this finding supports Vavrus (2002) who states, the demand for girls schooling is generally high, but cultural and most especially socio-economic forces keep this desire from becoming a reality for many girls in the society. Findings reveals that girls from the study area rarely return to school if they are given away for marriage before rounding up secondary school education. Also, when it comes to deciding on whom to go to school due to scarce socio-economic resources, the boys get chosen over the girls. This outcome supports findings of Boyle et al (2002) who suggests that families in their study tended to see boy's education bringing greater future economic rewards, which was not to be the case with girls (whose futures were expected to lie in family care and marriage).

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter consists of summary, conclusion, recommendations, implications of the study to sociologists of education, and suggestions for further studies.

5.2 Summary of the study

This study investigates the relationship between socio-economic status and children's educational life chances using the peasant farmers of Basawa and Bomo districts of Sabon Gari Local Government Area of Kaduna State as a case study. The problems of the study area stated in this work are; children's low school enrolment due to their parents' low socio-economic status, children's education achievement depending on parent's education and socio-economic status, teachers' expectation due to children's socio-economic background, and effect of gender on children's education.

The works and researches of Sociologists and Sociologists of Education were reviewed to explain the stated problems of the study area. Works of conflict theorists Karl Marx on Class Theory, Max Weber on Life Chance Theory and Three-Component Theory of Stratification, and Pierre Bourdieu on Cultural Reproduction and Cultural Capital were used as theoretical base to explain effect of social class and social stratification on the life of an individual. And studies of related empirical studies were also reviewed in this study.

The population of the study were teachers and students in SS1 in Basawa and Bomo districts and a sample of 264 students and 48 teachers were used. The study which is a correlational study used both quantitative and qualitative instruments such as: self-designed questionnaire, unstructured interview, anecdotal records, and observation. In analysing and interpreting qualitative data, field notes and recordings were

transcribed in detail while analysis of quantitative data was carried out using quantitative instruments which is Pearson Product Moment Correlation co-efficient 'r'. Some of the findings of the study are: children's school enrolment is determined by parents' socio-economic status, children's educational life chances depends on parents' socio-economic status, parents' educational level may and may not affect children's educational achievement, teachers' judgement of students can be influenced by students' family socio-economic status, and gender also has significant impact on children's educational life chances.

Recommendations made in reference to the findings of the study were: Universal Basic Education should implement free education scheme effectively especially in rural areas, and urban centres and the supply of basic educational materials will create more enthusiasm on parents who find it difficult in meeting school costs and giving their children education, parents should be encouraged through awareness programmes on giving their children full encouragement and support be it emotional or financial regardless of their own educational experience or their dull prospect of getting employed after education, teachers should be supervised concurrently in their service of teaching in schools on how to relate to students without passing biased judgments, and girl child education awareness be initiated on full scale with more emphasis on the rural areas with inaccessible areas be accessed to provide education to the girls. Married uneducated women should also be sensitized into adult educational programmes through awareness programmes on relevance of education.

5.3 Conclusion

From the analysis of data and discussions of findings, it can be concluded that:

- i. Children's enrolment in school depends on parents' socio-economic status and financial capacity to meet school enrolment costs.

- ii. A child's immediate and long run educational life chances are determined by parents' ability to give present and future educational support to their children.
- iii. Parents' educational level may and may not affect children's educational achievement.
- iv. Socio-economic status of the child's parents stands as a contributing factor to teachers' expectation and scale of judging children's performance and attitudes. Children from low socio-economic status families are perceived to be dull while children from high socio-economic status are intelligent.
- v. Gender has significant impact on children's educational life chances because gender based decisions like sending boys to school over girls affects and contributes to hindering girl child education.

5.4 **Recommendations**

Based on the findings and emerging trends in the course of this study, the following suggestions are hereby made

- i. Universal Basic Education should implement free education scheme effectively especially in rural areas and urban centers so as to lend helping hands to parents finding it difficult to enroll their children into schools due to lack of school cost affordability. Supply of basic educational materials will create more enthusiasm on parents who find it difficult in giving their children education. Government should also endeavor to implement an effective National Poverty Alleviation Programmes with the low socio-economic strata as its main focus.
- ii. Parents should be sensitized on how education is cheaper than ignorance. The 'silver linings' of every hardship should be counseled to them regarding the education of their children. Parents should be encouraged through awareness programmes on giving their children full encouragement and support be it

emotional or financial regardless of their own educational experiences or their dull prospect of getting employed after education. Students from low socio-economic status should be lectured, encouraged and sensitized by teachers, parents and education stakeholders to endeavor to persevere through financial hardships, shake off low self-esteem and negative comments and remain in school because schooling eventually has redeeming effects on their poor plight.

- iii. Teachers should be supervised concurrently in their service of teaching in schools on how to relate to students without passing biased judgments. The teachers should be steered into helping students who are facing challenges in school or from home, encourage them regardless of their socio-economic background and try to understand their financial situation if they are found defaulting paying a fee or getting educational materials.
- iv. It will be very helpful if girl Child Education awareness is initiated on full scale with more emphasis on the rural areas. Inaccessible areas should be accessed to provide education to the girls. Married uneducated women should be sensitized into adult educational programmes through awareness programmes on relevance of education. Though philanthropically, support is reaching some parts of the study area, government intervention will definitely turn more heads to girl child Education.

5.5 Implications of the study to Sociologists of Education

This study covers socio-economic status in relation to children's educational life chances. The study highlights how socio-economic variables such as income, parental level of education, parental occupation, gender and social class relate to a child's educational life chances. Sociology of education studies the society as a stratification of system that is based on a hierarchy of power (the ability to direct someone else's

behavior), privilege (honor and respect), and prestige (income, wealth and property), which leads to patterns of social inequality. Inequality of opportunity which is the unequal distribution of “life chances” across individuals is one of the main areas of interest to sociologists of education. This study is a contribution to the work of sociologists of education on society as it reveals the likelihood of how a child’s life may turn out depending on his or her socio-economic status background. This study is an extension to the work of sociologist of education in the society as it highlights the effects of low socio-economic status on the educational life chances of children in the Basawa and Bomo districts of Kaduna state.

Scholars and researchers have raised concern over other factors that affect children’s educational life chances but socio-economic status constitute cause for more concern as it is seen as a major role in determining an individual’s life chances in the society. In an attempt to improve the educational chances of children from low socio-economic status background, government implemented the Universal Basic Education (U.B.E) in Nigeria with the purpose of providing equal educational chances for children. Despite this effort, the programme itself has a short coming and its limit is the secondary school stage herby leaving the children from low socio-economic status to struggle to get into the tertiary institution. This study hereby brings into focus how socio-economic status relates to child’s educational life chances. Sociologists of education examine all the factors limiting educational life chances of an individual in relation to socio-economic status so as to understand how it affects a child and his or her future chances (both socially and educationally). For example Mahuta (2007) asserted that students from poor family backgrounds are likely to face problems of school enrolment and dropout since their parents may not be able to bear the school fees and expenses. Sociologists and sociologists of education agree that parents have powerful

influence on the educational life chances of their children. Similarly, Meighan and Blatchford (2003), opined that children from higher socio-economic classes have much better educational life chances than the children from lower classes. As a matter of fact, the problem of social class starts from the family status, and it leads to the decision and selection of who is to go to school and who will not which seriously affects the educational chances and future of their children. This research therefore studies socio-economic status as one of the major factors affecting child's educational life chances.

5.6 **Suggestions for further research**

- i. Other researchers should work on this study with the rural center as a focal point of research.
- ii. Other factors such as gender, cognitive factors, and culture should be measured against child's educational life chances in other researches.
- vi. Deviance, juvenile delinquency, and truancy should also be measured as depending variables against socio-economic status in relation to child's educational life chances.

REFERENCES

- Aakvik, A., Salvanes, K.G. and Vaage, K. (2005). Educational Attainment and Family Background. *German Economic Review*, Volume 6(3), Veriein fur Social Politik and Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Garsington Road, Oxford ox4 2DQ: UK.
- Banks, O. (1968). *Sociology of Education*. London: B.T Bastford Ltd.
- Blakemore, K. and Cooksey, B. (1981). *The Sociology of Education for Africa*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Boadu, E. A. (2000). *Gender Disparities in Education, Health, and Labour Force Participation in Ghana*. University of Ghana. Population impact project.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction, in J. Karabel and A. H. Halsey (eds) *Power and Ideology in Education*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Pp. 487-511.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Boyle, S., Brock, A., Mace, J. and Sibbons, M. (2002). *Reaching the Poor: The 'Costs' of Sending Children to School*. Synthesis Report. London: DFID.
- Bradley, R. H. and Corwyn, R. F. (2010). *Socio-economic Status and Child Development*. Ashgate Publishing Group. United Kingdom: Farnham, Sureey,
- Bray, M., Clarke, P. B and Stephens, D. (1986). *Education and Society in Africa*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Brown, D. F. (2009). *Social Class and Status*. Concise encyclopedia of Pragmatics. Elsevier.
- Decas, P. L. (1997). *Readiness for Kindergarten: What does it mean?* Sacramento, C.A: California Research Bureau, Carlifornia state Library.
- Diana, K. (2009). *Sociology in Our Times: The Essentials*. Cengage Learning.
- Eggen, P., and Kauchak, D. (2004). *Educational Psychology: Windows on Classrooms*. New Jersey: U.S.A Pearson Education Inc.
- Ersado, L. (2005). Child Labor and Schooling Decisions in Urban and Rural Areas: Comparative Evidence from Nepal, Peru, and Zimbabwe. *World Development*, 33(3): 455-480.
- Giddens, A. (2010). *Sociology*. New Delhi.
- Gilbert, D. (1998). *The American Class Structure*. New York: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Haralambos, M. and Heald R. M. (1980). *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- Haralambos, M. (1980). *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*. Slough, University Tutorial Press Limited.
- Harvey, D. G and Slatin, G. T. (1975). The Relationship between Child's SES and Teacher's Expectations: A Test of The Middle-Class Bias Hypothesis. *Social Forces*, V54, 1, Pp. 140-159.
- Kraycie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 30.607-610.
- Kuper, A. (2004). *Class, Social: The Social Science Encyclopedia*. Taylor & Francis.
- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal Childhoods: Race, Class, and Family Life*. U.S.A: University of California Press.
- Lee, V.E and Burkam, D.T. (2002). *Inequality at the Starting Gate: Social Background Differences in Achievement as Children Begin School*. Washington, D.L: Economic Policy Institute.
- Macionis, J. J. and Plummer, K. (2005). *Sociology: A Global Introduction (3rd ed.)*. Harlow: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Mahuta, M. G. (2007). *An Introduction to Sociological Foundation of Education*. Sokoto: But – Bass Educational Books (B.E.B).
- Marx, K. and Engles, F. (1848). *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Selected Works, Volume I. London.
- Meighan, R. and Blatchford, S. (2003). *A Sociology of Educating*. London: Continuum.
- Musaazi, J. C. S. (2006). *Educational Planning, Principles, Tools and Applications in The Developing World*. Kampala: Makere University Printery.
- Nash, R. (1973). *Classroom Observed*. London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.
- Nash, R. (2004). The Explanation of Social Differences in Reading Attainment: An Inspection of the P.I.R.L.S. New – Zealand Data. In School of Education (Ed), *Waikato Journal of Education*, Vol. 10. Hamilton. University of Waikato.
- Ogunbameru, O.A. (2010). *Sociology Theory*. Ibadan: Penthouse Publication (Nig).
- Parkin, F. (1979). *Marx's Theory of History: A Bourgeois Critique*. New York: Columbia.
- Reading, H. F. (1977). *A Dictionary of Social Sciences*. London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.
- Santrock, J. W. (2004). *Child Development (10th ed.)*. New York: McGraw – Hill.

- Vavrus, F. (2002) Making Distinctions: Privatisation and the (un)educated Girl on Mount Kilimanjaro, Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 22: 527–547.
- Wallace, R. A, and Wolf, A. (1980). Contemporary Sociological Theory. Engle Word Cliffs, N.J: Prentice – Hall.
- Weber, M. (1978). Economy and Society. University of California Press.
- William, C. C. (1999). Health and Social Change in Russia and Eastern Europe. Routledge.
- Woolfolk, A. (2007). Educational Psychology (10th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Zill, N., Collins, M., West, J., and Hausken, E. G. (1995). School Readiness and Children's Development Status. ERIC Digest. Retrieved online <http://ceep.crc.uiuc.edu/rceceahive/digest/1995/zill95.html>

APPENDICES

Appendix A : Students' Socio-economic Status Questionnaire

Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto
Faculty of Education and Extension Services,
Department of Educational Foundations.

The researcher is a postgraduate student from the institution named above on an academic research to find out the relationship between socio-economic status and children's educational life chances in Bomo and Basawa districts of Sabon-Gari Local Government Area, Kaduna. Please answer the questions in the questionnaire following the instructions.

Instructions

1. Your name is not required on the questionnaire and your responses will be considered confidential and anonymous.
2. Tick your chosen answers and write on the spaces provided for answers as well.
3. Please your experiences and ideas will be needed while answering these questions. Your assistance is much appreciated and will enable us to comprehend the issues raised in this questionnaire better.

Thank you.

Section A: Personal Data

1. Age:
Specify.....
2. Sex
Male [] Female[]
3. Class:.....

Section B:

s/n	Items	SA	A	SD	D
1.	Socio-economic status of your parents affect how early you were enrolled in school				
2.	You were enrolled early in school.				
3.	All the children in your families got enrolled in school early				
4.	Your parents earn good income per month				
5.	You are well equipped with educational materials				
6.	You have been sent home most a times for being unable to pay your school fees.				
7.	You receive after school coaching.				
8.	Students stop coming to school because their parents can't afford their education.				
9.	You have been held back several times from coming to school by your parents because they needed your helping hand at home, market or farm				
10.	Your parents are well educated.				

11.	Your parents help you with your school work and assignment.				
12.	Your parents encourage you to study hard.				
13.	Your parents emphasize on the importance of education				
14.	Teachers expect students to perform according to their socio-economic background.				
15.	There is difference in teacher's treatment of students from low socio-economic background and high socio-economic background in your school.				
16.	Students from low socio-economic status get scolded by teachers over inadequate learning materials and poor class performance.				
17.	Teachers encourage students regardless of their family background.				
18.	Girls come to school as much as boys in your school.				
19.	Girls stop coming to school as a result of marriage.				
20.	Poor parents prefer sending boys to school instead of girls.				
21.	A child's education and future chance of higher education depends on parent's socio-economic status				
22.	A child's progress in school can be crippled by parent's low level of education				

Appendix B: Teachers' Interview Schedule

1. Do you think parent's socio-economic status affect the enrollment of children into school?
2. Do parents withdraw their children from school due to inability to continue sponsoring their education?
3. Are your students well equipped with educational material
4. Teacher's perception of the students in relation to their socio-economic background.
5. How do teachers know their students' socio-economic background?
6. Do you think socio-economic status determines a student's educational life chances?
7. How often do students drop-out of school?
8. What do you think causes drop-out from school?
9. Marital status of girls in your school
10. Do their marital status affect their schooling
11. Recommendations

Appendix C: Observation Schedule

1. Observation of the school environment
2. Observation of the proximity of the school to the community
3. Observation of the community
4. Classroom conditions will be put under a microscope
5. The relationship between the teacher and the students will be observed within the classroom walls and school environment.
6. Punctuality of the students to school every day will be observed.
7. Student's uniform and outfit will be observed in relation to their classroom and school environment behaviors.
8. Student's parents socio-economic status will be investigated through classroom through dressing, language skills, and educational materials possession.
9. Aspiration and desire for education will be investigated through classroom activities participation and punctuality in class.
10. The effects of each student's parent socio-economic status on their education will be observed.
11. Observe the attendance of boys compared to girls.
12. Observation of the marital status of the female students.
13. Means of transportation to and from school

Appendix D: Correlations

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
SES	6.78	1.775	256
CSE	7.28	2.554	256
PEL	6.25	3.144	256
CEA	10.77	1.267	256
TE	8.18	1.484	256
G	8.63	1.210	256
ELC	9.77	1.207	256

Correlations

		SES	CSE	PEL	CEA	TE	G	ELC
SES	Pearson Correlation	1	.658**	.627**	.108	.426**	.110	.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.084	.000	.078	.951
	N	256	256	256	256	256	256	256
CSE	Pearson Correlation	.658**	1	.715**	-.031	.542**	.366**	-.170**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.624	.000	.000	.006
	N	256	256	256	256	256	256	256
PEL	Pearson Correlation	.627**	.715**	1	.055	.299**	.314**	-.242**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.380	.000	.000	.000
	N	256	256	256	256	256	256	256
CEA	Pearson Correlation	.108	-.031	.055	1	-.145*	-.114	.188**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.084	.624	.380		.021	.068	.002
	N	256	256	256	256	256	256	256
TE	Pearson Correlation	.426**	.542**	.299**	-.145*	1	.159*	-.102
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.021		.011	.105
	N	256	256	256	256	256	256	256
G	Pearson Correlation	.110	.366**	.314**	-.114	.159*	1	-.128*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.078	.000	.000	.068	.011		.041
	N	256	256	256	256	256	256	256
ELC	Pearson Correlation	.004	-.170**	-.242**	.188**	-.102	-.128*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.951	.006	.000	.002	.105	.041	
	N	256	256	256	256	256	256	256

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Appendix E

Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population

N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	N	S
10	10	100	80	280	162	800	260	2800	338
15	14	110	86	290	165	850	265	3000	341
20	19	120	92	300	169	900	269	3500	246
25	24	130	97	320	175	950	274	4000	351
30	28	140	103	340	181	1000	278	4500	351
35	32	150	108	360	186	1100	285	5000	357
40	36	160	113	380	191	1200	291	6000	361
45	40	180	118	400	196	1300	297	7000	364
50	44	190	123	420	201	1400	302	8000	367
55	48	200	127	440	205	1500	306	9000	368
60	52	210	132	460	210	1600	310	10000	373
65	56	220	136	480	214	1700	313	15000	375
70	59	230	140	500	217	1800	317	20000	377
75	63	240	144	550	225	1900	320	30000	379
80	66	250	148	600	234	2000	322	40000	380
85	70	260	152	650	242	2200	327	50000	381
90	73	270	155	700	248	2400	331	75000	382
95	76	275	159	750	256	2600	335	100000	384

Note:

N = Population Size S = Sample size

Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement. 30.607-610.