

The relationship between parents' access to social capital and children's educational outcomes
in a global context

Author's name,: Yafen Ding

Completion date: 1st of August 2020

Table of Contents

Abstract	4
CHAPTER1 INTRODUCTION	5
Statement of the problem	5
Assumptions	6
Definitions	6
CHAPTER2 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Introduction	9
Historical context	9
9CHAPTER3 METHODOLOGY	16
CHAPTER4 RESULTS	19
England	19
United States	22
China	29
CHAPTER5 DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS	33
Discussion: Similarities & Differences	33
Conclusions	36
CHAPTER6 LISTS OF TABLES	
Table1	38
Table2	39
Table3	40
Table4	41
Table5	43
Table 6	44
References	

Abstract

This piece of research project has demonstrated that there is a gap in educational achievement between parents' access to social capital and children's educational outcomes in a global context by examining England, United States and China specifically. Through examining educational resources, from in-school factors, such as facilities, teacher quality and teacher to student ratio, to out-of-school factors, such as family structure, socioeconomic status, and community values. This research paper evaluates several theories of social capital in the hopes of providing an explanation for why this achievement gap exists. The literature review outlines an analogy between Diamond's (1999) geographic luck theory and the education system in a global context. The review of the literature also examines the relationship between parents' access to socioeconomic background and academic performance across diverse backgrounds. This paper shows the importance of all kinds of resources to academic achievement and how social capital plays a consequential role in the students' educational outcomes. The relationship between parents' access to social capital and children's educational outcomes in a global context

The relationship between parents' access to social capital and children's educational outcomes
in a global context

Chapter1 Introduction:

This piece of research examines not only the relationship between social capital and children's academic performance and their socioeconomic status in the future but also takes into account the effect of cultural and geographic factors. The phrase "geographic luck theory" can be used to describe global inequality (Diamond,1999). Some societies become extremely powerful and innovative more so than other societies around the world because their irreplaceable geographic advantages bring them more resources to develop. This fact could also be used to explain the education outcomes. For some children, they have the luck to be born into a higher social capital family and more opportunities. According to Diamond's geographic luck theory in 1999, the geographic luck theory varies from region to region according to the cultural background, economic development, and country policy. For instance, "In Africa, some people were much luckier than others, in the suites of domesticable wild plant and animal species that they inherited from their environments" (Diamond, 1999, P389). In contrast, in the United States public education system, some students are considered luckier because of their parents' socioeconomic status and education level. Those people who have parents from a higher socioeconomic background would be at an advantage over the students who have parents from a lower socioeconomic background (Diamond, 1999). Therefore, the geographic luck theory (Diamond,1999) could also be applied to the education system.

Statement of Problem

The No Child Left Behind Report in 2010 required that schools endeavor to alleviate academic disparities and resolve concerns about the academic failure from economically disadvantaged students. However, there is still a huge gap when it comes to education outcomes across socioeconomic groups. There are six social capital variables that can influence students, and they can be divided into two groups: family factors and school factors. Family factors include income/socioeconomic status, parent education level, and family structure; school variables include school facilities, teacher quality, and

community values (Zeisler, 2012). These six factors are inseparable and intertwined with each other. For instance, income/ socioeconomic status is usually defined by the family structure and parents' education level. Studies show that children who live with two biological parents tend to have a better-off life than those children who live with a stepparent or single parent. Furthermore, children who come from a higher socioeconomic background have a higher probability of attending schools that have better facilities, a lower teacher-student ratio, and higher teacher quality (Zeisler, 2012). The purpose of this research project is to examine the relationship between family background (socioeconomic status and parents' education level) and children's education outcomes in a global context. In order to examine the topic in a global context, three countries would be used as case studies. They are United Kingdom, USA, and China.

Assumptions:

The first assumption is that the relationship between education outcomes and socioeconomic status is positively related; i.e. students who come from a family in which their parents have higher socioeconomic status are more likely to have excellent performance and are able to attend universities. This is to assume socioeconomic status as the most dominating factor when it comes to academic performance. Another assumption is other factors except for socioeconomic status are more crucial when it comes to children's academic performance.

Definitions:

Social capital is defined by Coleman as "a variety of entities with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structure, and they facilitate certain actions of actors...within the structure" (Coleman, 1988, p. 89). In Coleman's view, social capital is a resource which is neutral and facilitates any manner of action, but whether society is better off as a result depends entirely on how the individuals take advantage of it. (Foley, M. W. & Edwards, B. 1997). In the context of this research, social capital is defined as the sum of capital and human resources embedded in the society, which

parents use for their children's education, leading to the achievement gap both in their education outcomes and their future life prospects.

Concerted cultivation is defined as parents' attempts to foster their child's talents by incorporating organized activities for their children in which they would offer their children more opportunities for their development and is characterized by the conscious development of language use and interaction. Concerted cultivation is commonly exhibited in middle-class and upper-class families. Children would form a certain sense of entitlement when interacting with adults (Lareau, 2003).

The achievement gap refers to the difference between the academic achievement of white, middle-class students and their peers from other social and cultural backgrounds such as African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, and Asian Pacific islanders (Nieto, 2010, p.90).

Socioeconomic status (SES) is defined as a combination of education, income, and occupation. It is commonly conceptualized as the social standing or class of an individual or group. When viewed through a social class lens, privilege, power, and control are emphasized. Furthermore, an examination of SES as a gradient or continuous variable reveals inequities in access to and distribution of resources. Low socio-economic group refers to the students in the school who are qualified to receive free meals. (apa.org, 2010)

A Title 1 school is a school that is identified as having high numbers or a high percentage of poor children (economically disadvantaged) (gov US Department of Education

Parenting styles: Authoritarian parenting is a restrictive, punishment-heavy parenting style in which parents make their children follow their directions with little to no explanation or feedback and focus on the child's and family's perception and status. (Santrock, 2007)

The parent is demanding and responsive. When this style is systematically developed, it grows to fit the descriptions of propogative parenting or concerted cultivation. (Santrock, 2007)

Neglectful parenting refers to parents who are emotionally unsupportive of their children but will still provide their basic needs. Providing basic needs means food, housing, and toiletries or money for the aforementioned. (Santrock, 2007)

Indulgent parenting is a style of parenting in which parents are very involved with their children but place few demands or controls on them.(Santrock, 2007)

Introduction

This piece of research focuses on the relationship between social class and education in Britain and the reasons why they are closely connected. There are a plethora of research studies on children's learning outcomes, drawing on variables that are related to the parents' income levels, education background, and degrees of financial dependence on the state (Wyness, 2012). The following sections include the positive relation between social class and learning outcomes in three countries: Britain (with a particular focus in England), U.S.A., and China.

*1. historical context: views from Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam.

*2. The positive relationship between socioeconomic status and academic performance

*3. International context

1. historical context

This section will focus on three main theoretical approaches, with relation to social capital. It will explore the similarities and differences between the approaches of Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam.

Bourdieu

According to Field (2009), Bourdieu's research focus is slightly divergent from Coleman's and Putnam's due to a certain extent of being based on different institutions and geographical contexts. Bourdieu's theory arose from his analysis of the French education and is a European-based theory on social capital and the achievement gap. Meanwhile, Coleman and Putnam's research are more about the phenomenon in America (Field, 2009). According to Bourdieu's research, cultural capital is not closely connected to financial capital, so these two factors need to be considered independently (Field, 2009). Furthermore, Bourdieu reinforced that "economic capital is at the root of all other types of capital" (Field, 2009, P18). According to Bourdieu, people from the upper class take full advantage of the social capital for their children's education.

Coleman

Coleman's report has also done some research on the factors which could determine children's academic achievement mainly based in the United States. Oates and Condrón (2009) carried out research in the same area as Coleman: comparing school factors and home factors when it comes to determining children's academic performance. However, they disagreed with Coleman's view. According to Oates's research (2009), family and community factors, such as cultural capital and social capital, do not play a dominant role. Instead, school factors, such as the quality of the teachers, teacher-to-student ratio, and teachers' biases and expectations towards students are the dominating factors which explain the huge gap among students of different races. Condrón supports Oates' view regarding the comparison of school factors and family factors. Within the same social class level, there are still differences between various races, which proves that race is not connected to social class when it comes to factors which determine children's academic performance. Moreover, Coleman also considered religion as one of the factors that determines academic performance. According to Coleman's theory, those children who attend religious institutes such as Catholic schools performed better than the students who attended private schools (Coleman, 1988). The research also includes other factors such as social class (Field, 2009).

Putnam

In Putnam's view, the definition of social capital should change as time goes by, and social capital is reducing at a high rate (Zeisler, 2012). Putnam considered "social capital as a resource that functions at a societal level" (Field, 2009, P44). The previous studies demonstrate the views from different researchers putting emphasis on different aspects of social capital collaborating or working against each other in terms of determining academic performance. These factors include ethnicity, cultural capital, family income levels, etc.

The positive relationship

The positive relationship Social class is measured by parents' education level, occupational level, and income level. One of the best predictors of whether a child will one day graduate from university is whether his or her parents are university graduates (Laureau, 2009,P348). Working-class parents might not be able to afford the private school tuition fees, but they still have access to state-funded education. The children of working-class parents tend to be at a disadvantage for many different reasons. From research done by Evans (2007), illustrating that children's developmental scores are related to the parents' social class, it was found that children who have highly educated parents are more likely to have higher developmental scores. Johnson and Kossykh's research demonstrated that by the age of 22 months, children's developmental index is already different according to parents' social class, which is measured by the parents' employment status, income level, and education background. (Johnson and Kossykh, 2008). Similar findings from Evans also reveal that children of wealthy or educated parents, who scored poorly on the developmental index in the early years, were still likely to achieve better results in later years. In contrast, this is not the case with the children of poor parents. Those children from impoverished families who scored highly were likely to fall behind their wealthier peers in the later years. The most significant factor associated with the developmental index is the educational level of the mother (Evans, 2007). The educational level of the mother plays a more significant role when compared to the educational level of the father. The reason could be that those highly educated mothers could incorporate literacy, numeracy, and motor skills into their daily caring relationship in a playful way. This type of informal learning in their earlier years could have some effect on children's learning later on. More research done by Bradley (2002) on middle class families demonstrates that middle class families take the investment in education for granted. Parents are more willing to invest time, energy, and resources into their children's education, such as sending their children to more expensive private schools which provide higher quality academic performance. These type of schools are more likely to help their children in terms of achieving their academic potential at school. "Education is central to middle class values" (Bradley, 2002, p. 9). Family factors and other outside school factors definitely have an impact on children's education at school. Coleman's research demonstrates that family factors had a larger impact on children's

learning outcomes than factors connected to the school factors. The Coleman report was a study done by Coleman and overseen by the United States Office of Education (Field, 2009). "The Coleman report in 1966 was the first study to examine the effects of students' home factors and school factors on academic success" (Zeisler, 2012, p. 12). According to the Coleman report, when it comes to the factors which determine children's academic achievement, family and community factors such as parents' income level, education background and family structure play a more important role than school factors, such as teacher to student ratio, the quality of tutors, etc. Furthermore, family factors determine which type of schools the children would study at to a large extent. Children from well-off families have a higher probability of attending private schools and receiving private tuitions outside classes. Similar research done by Laureau (2009) demonstrates the same results as Evans' research: A child's academic performance depends on their parents' access to economic resources. Middle-class families have a relatively higher income level and so tend to have more disposable income to invest in their children's tuitions to receive a better education.

In terms of parents' attitude towards education, Evans' (2007) findings suggest that middle-class parents usually achieve higher academic performance in terms of their own education, which demonstrates that they have more experience and practical solutions to help their children when they have difficulties. Nevertheless, middle-class families might have had negative experiences in school or problems they never solved at school, or may lack the ability to help their children fix their problems. In terms of parents' attitude towards school work, working class mothers usually consider school work such as homework to be the responsibility of both the school and the children. In contrast, middle-class mothers have higher expectations of their children's academic performance. Parents' access to social and cultural capital determine children's learning outcomes to some extent. This can be best illustrated with the example where children from lower-income families may have adequate reading books and fewer opportunities to visit museums and theaters (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002). This is not the case for lower class families. According to Lam, the lack of these types of activities and experiences "inhibit the learning habits, opportunities and learning motivation of the

children" (Zeisler,2014, P134). On the other hand, less access to these opportunities would hinder children's development both mentally and physically.

Evaluation: Opposite side of the relation between learning outcome and social class

There is a plethora of academic research elucidating the positive relation between socioeconomic statuses and learning outcomes. However, Bradley and Corwyn (2002) argue that the effect is less important during adolescence, but social class still plays an important role during early and middle childhood. The relationship between socioeconomic status and academic performance is more intricate than what we thought, in terms of family factors against each other. I don't understand the sentence where Bourdieu states that cultural capital is not necessarily linked to financial capital, which means that people who have adequate financial capital, such as lower class families, may not have access to cultural capital. Families where the parents have received a higher education are more likely to have a positive attitude towards school and university and have the idea of education installed in their daily life; however, it does not necessarily mean that these parents have a higher income level. Furthermore, parents' social class is not the sole determining factor of children's education outcomes. Many others factors also contribute to children's education outcomes, such as teachers and parents' attitude towards the child, and parenting styles. Furthermore, some argue that "the gradient between socioeconomic status and academic performance does not exhibit a monotonic effect." The third factor related to students' academic performance includes variables such as parents' expectation, teachers' expectation, and parenting styles. McLoyd (1998) argues that impoverished parents tend to have negative attitudes in terms of goals and ambitions, and they lack motivation and efforts to get rid of poverty. As a consequence, these parents are more likely to lack confidence in terms of their children's academic performance and so they are less likely to encourage their children in the learning process. Parenting style can be detrimental to a child's success (Lam, 2013). There are four types of parenting styles: authoritarian parenting, authoritative parenting, permissive parenting and uninvolved parenting. "Parenting is the reflection of parents' psychological well-being" (Lam, 2014, P329) Authoritative parents tend to treat their

children in a harsh way, which leads to the consequence that children have less ability to solve problems and obstacles on their own. "Neglecting parenting lies at the heart of setting a low developmental goal for the children" (Ram & Hou, 2003, P309). To be more specific, parents invest less in social capital and devote less effort to the children's development. For example, they spend less time on children's school-related activities and less time monitoring children doing their homework. Not only do these parents have low expectations towards children's learning outcomes but so do the children themselves and the teachers. "This nexus of triad expectation among parents, children, and teachers intertwines with each other and exerts large influence on children's academic performance" (Lam, 2013, P329). Another reason is that parents also predict their children to be common—what do you mean?—or unlikely to be eminent in their education and career later on instead of believing their children will achieve an excellent academic performance (Lam, 2014). The expectations of the children themselves also determine their academic achievement. Learning motivation could contribute to the expectations of the children. Learning motivation is defined as a student tendency to find academic activities meaningful and worthwhile and to try to derive the intended academic benefits from them (Brophy, 1998, P205-206). Learning motivation could alleviate the relation between social class and academic achievement. Rist's research (1970) confirms this phenomenon by giving out an IQ test and reporting the results to both teachers and students. Those students who were classified into the superb group achieved higher results at the end of the term. In contrast, those students who were classified into the slower group ended up getting lower results. However, the group assignments were not actual; the researcher made up the classifications. This research illustrates the direct and positive impact of self-fulfillment and learning motivations on the learning outcomes. Family values also play an important role. For most working class families, they consider education and school to be the responsibility of the school and teachers. In contrast, for most middle-class families, formal learning is considered to be one of the ways of caring for children. Middle-class families value education more, so they are more willing to send their children to fee-paying, academically selective private schools and have the notion in mind that education is the key to their children's future opportunities. Also, middle-class parents spend plenty of time with their children to read books, have useful

conversations in order to nurture their children's reading habits, and assist their children stretching to achieve their full academic potential. Paradoxically, working class parents would prefer to choose a free state education system. In terms of the family value, they consider it depends more on the children themselves, the school, and the teachers. The children's learning attitude is highly dependent on the parents' attitude towards education (Evans, 2007). Another issue related to working class families is that children from working class families usually need to take on a job earlier than the middle-class children; they might not be able to go to universities, because the family needs the children's incomes for the household expenses.(Evans, 2007)

United States

the US Coleman's report was mainly the research about the United States. Coleman's report was published by the US Government in 1966, under the title Equality of Educational Opportunity. The co-authored report was based on an extensive survey involving almost 650,000 students and teachers in the United States (Field, 2009). Coleman's report demonstrated that family factors such as parents' education background, income level, and family structure were stronger factors contributing to students' academic performance than the school factors, such as the teachers' expectation, teacher-student ratios in the United States society (Field, 2009). The positive relationship between education outcome and parents' socioeconomic status and the achievement gap between socioeconomic groups also exist in the United States. Zeisler carried out research in the United States in 2012 and demonstrated that parents' socio-economic status (SES) had a positive impact on children's academic performance; i.e., students who have parents with higher incomes and education levels tended to attain better grades in school and graduate from college (Zeisler, 2012). Barton's research illustrated the fact that all students in the United States have access to free public education, but it does not lead to equal achievement. However, it can be argued that programs like Summer Search are trying to provide students with some social capital, which they do not have on their own, in order to decrease the achievement gap in the US (Summer Search, 2011).

International Context:China

Education was seen as the major path to climb the social ladder and change one's socioeconomic status in China because of the ancient civil exam systems. "This was intertwined with the supreme status given to civil servants (officials), and because of the civil exam system, only scholars could become officials. A circular causality is at work here, where social status, officialdom, scholarship, and education became synonymous in people's minds" (OECD, 2010, P84). Thus, success in education through the form of getting good grades during exams is seen as the only respectable success, even in contemporary China. This is in contrast to other societies, where economic wealth can also lead to high socioeconomic status (OECD, 2010).

Chapter 3 Methodology

The research project will use the documentary research method to address the research topic. According to Platt (1981, P58), the documentary research method is an effective method of illustrating a social phenomenon. Furthermore, documentary less expensive compared to other popular research methods.

Use of documentary research:

According to Scott (2006, P228), documentary research has long been assumed to be the preserve of historians even though its application in social research is quite crucial. There are many researchers who continue to view descriptive research as a method that is not clear-cut. However, these perceptions and assumptions are wrong in that the documentary method, which uses sources such as government files, and reports from the past, presents a clear way of looking not just at the present but also at the future. In education, using the documentary research method makes it easy to understand the patterns that various theories have had when addressing various contemporary issues. It is these patterns that are then used to show a clear picture of the advantages and

disadvantages of each theory. It is important to include a definition of what documentary research involves. A document can be defined as a written text, which includes the physical and electronic copies. This study will rely on two types of documents. The primary, secondary, and tertiary documents will include the materials that relate to the relevant education theories written by those who have firsthand information. The study will also rely on documents such as government reports and reports done by professional organisations. All the data from the documentary sources has to be treated in a scientific way. Gaborone (2006, P224) states that when handling documentary sources, a quality control protocol must be used to guide the process. Important concepts in this protocol include representativeness, authenticity, meaning, and credibility. Authenticity of sources will be upheld by ensuring that the data is derived from genuine and implacable sources. In terms of credibility, Gaborone (2006, 229) says that the evidence has to be typical of its kind; in turn, representativeness refers to the consistency of the information derived from a source, such as what is derived from other sources is representative of the whole document. The last part of the criteria will be meaning, which refers to the clarity of the information sources and their comprehensibility. The study intends to ensure that all the information used in the study passes the criteria and will, therefore, subject all sources to this test. After subjecting the documents to the selection criteria, the process of handling information under the documentary research method has to be systemic. Terre (2006, 31) maintains that researchers who choose the documentary research have to be careful to ensure that information is read in an engaged, as opposed to using a detached, manner. The research ought to start with an analysis of the common sense rules that were used in developing a given document. The researcher would then move to a higher level where interpretation is made based on a wider sociopolitical or economic context. Furthermore, it becomes important for researchers to carry out a critical review of the information contained in different sources. This includes not just the process of analysing the author's relationship to a given document but also the application of the information gained from different documents in a contemporary context. This is usually a weakness for most researchers in that information is just churned out from the authors without explaining how that information can be used in addressing contemporary issues related to the researcher's goals. Data Analysis Data analysis is a signifi-

cant process that will determine the goals and the aims of the piece of research. The documentary research method will require an effective method of analyzing the data. Terre (2006, 40) asserts that analysis is the process of searching for explanations and comprehensible information of enhancing certain concepts or theories. Data analysis will be performed to ensure that the information gathered is put into perspective and to make the process of interpretation easier. In this regard, the process of analyzing the data will start with the reduction process. Data reduction will be done with the intention of translating the qualitative information into another form with the intention of making it easier to analyze, store, and distribute. This study will rely on a thematic analysis where information gained will be categorized into the various themes. Categorizing the information gained based on their themes will help in reducing the volume of data without losing significant information. Before coding, theoretical sensitivity will be considered, which may be defined as being sensitive to concepts, meanings, and relationships within the data that will be shaped by the underlying theory of this study. The following steps were used in the preparation: Immersion in data – this step involves reading and re-reading the data several times where sensitivity to meanings was enhanced. Keep memos – It involves coming up with informal notes of phrases and broad impressions that were deemed significant to the study. Open coding - coding line-by-line/sentence-by-sentence to ensure that each part of the data is treated the same. Open codes would, therefore, be portions of data that captured something of the literal essence of the data. Ethical considerations -- Ethical sanctions for this study will be sought from the university and from the supervisor. Ethical considerations were centred on the principles guiding research ethics as hypothesised by Terre Blanche, et al. (2006). Respect for the privacy and anonymity was considered. Permission was requested before commencing with data collection in cases where it was private. The aims of this study will unequivocally be clarified to the participants prior to obtaining informed written accord from them. This will let them participate in the study. Challenges -- The researcher anticipates several challenges that are characteristic of the documentary research method. The first one is with regard to time and finances, which are needed in plenty for the research study to fully reach its goals. The challenge of getting the needed data may also be tedious to the extent that most researchers who use the documentary research method

rely on the services of research assistants. The researcher also anticipates a challenge with regard to getting access to some of the information needed for the study. While a majority of the sources needed are publicly available, a few of them are restricted, which may be a problem for the researcher.

Chapter 4 Results on England, United States and China

1. England

Compulsory education (for 5 to 16 year olds) is free. Compulsory education is the outcome of the Education Act of 1944. This act set out the structure for the post-war British education system, raising the school leaving age to 15 (Department for Education, 2016). The Department for Education has calculated that the attainment gap at the A-level, between the state and private sectors, more than doubled over the last 13 years. That's in spite of the billions of pounds New Labour spent on "improving" state schools. Children are three times more likely to secure top A-level grades if their parents can afford for them to go to private schools.

Table1: Attainment by type of institution in England

The table below illustrates the A-level results in England. 2014/2015 report, which was released by the Department for Education. In 2015, the average point score (APS) per A-level entry ranged from 177.6 to 242.5 (a range of 64.9 points). Independent (private) schools have the highest A-level APS compared to all other types of schools; a similar pattern to previous years as well (DfE, 2015). In other words, those students who attend private schools are more likely to attain better grades than other students who attend other types of schools, such as free school. The ability of the student's intake may vary significantly across institution types and, therefore, have an impact on the patterns seen in the results. For example, sponsored academies may have lower prior attainment due to their background since under-performing schools are taken over by a sponsor. However, it can be argued that the comparison across institution types is due to significant

differences in cohort sizes. For example, there are very few students who attended free schools, university technical colleges, and studio schools compared with other institution types. This suggests that the comparison might be biased due to the different numbers of various institutions (DfE, 2015). Furthermore, private schools in England perform better in international League tables, while state schools seem to fall behind in the international League tables. The figures from the Roedean school suggest that 87.23 percent of Roedean students achieved A level results from A* to C in 2015, compared to the national 77.3 percent of students who attained A* to C in 2015 (GOV.UK).

Family Factor:

Middle-class parents in England value education above anything else (Evans, 2007). The logic between education and work is that working class British have low socio-economic status in society because they are not able to get a decent job due to their poor performance at school (Evans, 2007). However, the reasons why they did not achieve good grades at school are not because they are not clever. The context of this research project focused on the impact of their socioeconomic status on their academic performance. One reason could be that middle class parents are very likely to achieve good grades in higher education, so they are more confident in their children's learning outcome, which leads to them encouraging their children all along to do well at school. While working class parents may have had negative experiences at school, such as failing, as a consequence, they are less likely and not able to support their children throughout education (Evans, 2007). Another reason could be that middle class mothers literally devote more effort to their children's educational experiences. When it comes to educational experience later on, there is also a huge gap in terms of parents' attitude. For the working class families, parents may expect their children to go out to work after they finish their GCSEs in order to pay part of the housekeeping expenses. Thus, they are more likely to give up opportunities for further education such as going to universities, which is an investment in the future. It is also an indication that they are receiving higher incomes throughout their whole lives. Higher education is more for middle class

children who do not need to subsidize their parents' housekeeping expenses, even at an early age.

University Level:

University Admission According to the destinations of the key stage 4 and key stage 5 students report, which was released by the Department for Education in 2014, private schools tend to have a higher proportion of students attending universities than those students from state-funded schools. Sixty-four percent of young people from private schools went to universities while 53% of students from state-funded schools and colleges attended universities. Forty-six percent of those students from private schools went to an institution in the top third of higher education institutions. When it comes to the University of Cambridge and University of Oxford, private school students have a much higher chance of getting into these two universities compared to state schools. One in 20 students from private schools went on to study at Oxford or Cambridge University. In contrast, one in 100 from state schools went to the University of Oxford or Cambridge (Department for Education, 2014). In terms of Russell Group Universities admission rates, the data suggested that private school students were also more likely to attend Russell Group Universities. Eleven percent of state school students went to Russell Group institutions, the most select of the UK university groups, compared with 38% of private school students (Department for Education, 2014).

However, it can be argued that there are also excellent state schools which send a lot of their students to the University of Oxford or Cambridge. Mossbourne Community Academy in London's Hackney sent 7% of its pupils to the University of Oxford and University of Cambridge. Furthermore, 91% of all pupils at Mossbourne Community Academy attained grade A* to C in mathematics, compared to the national level of 70% (Ofsted, 2015). % pupils go to a university at age 18/19: the highest SES quintile group including only state school pupils.

The relationship between parents' access to social capital and students and educational outcomes in the United States

During the twentieth century, the gap between the rich and the poor in the United States has increased, which has made the United States the most wealth-unequal country among the developed nations (Smeeding, 2005). Higher socioeconomic-status people tend to have more access to social capital and cultural capital, while the lower socioeconomic-class people have limited access to them.

The research done by Zeisler is to examine the relationship between the social capital and academic achievement in the public education system in the United States. It is widely acknowledged that social capital is positively correlated with educational achievement; students with parents who have access to more social capital have a higher chance to perform better regarding their academic results compared to students from a lower socioeconomic background. The reason could be that those children who come from upper- or middle-class backgrounds usually attend private schools (Domhoff, 2006), which have high teaching quality and take good care of students both physically and mentally.

Table2 College choice by high school types

Table 2 demonstrates the survey done by US Census Bureau to examine the relationship between high school type and students' university choice; 10 out of 11 private-school students only consider Ivy League universities as their choices. Besides, the parenting styles are different according to factors like parents' education level (Rank, 2004). Middle-class parents are more likely to have received university degrees. On the one hand, different parenting styles and parental involvement would bring middle-class children more advantages. On the other hand, the children from poorer backgrounds

may suffer from environment disadvantages, such as housing conditions, and the family might have to move and not have a stable place to live. These problems would hinder children's cognitive development in their early years (Rank, 2004). Early years' experiences are crucial for the children and influence them throughout their whole lives to a large extent. There is an achievement gap in the public system in the United States across racial and socioeconomic groups (Zeisler, 2012). Those factors, which could affect students' academic achievement, can be divided into two types: in-school factors and out-of-school factors. In-school factors include school facilities and teacher quality. Out-of-school factors include family structure, socioeconomic status, and community values in the United States.

Parental support

When it comes to parental support, Kim and Schneider (2005) studied how parental support affects children's educational outcomes. This research demonstrates that parents' education level has a more significant impact on children's education than parents' income level. Furthermore, children who have parents who are willing to spend time to support their children's education issues at school are more likely to get into university than those students who have parents who are not being able to support them throughout their education. The reason could be that the parents themselves had negative experiences back when they went to school (Kim&Schneider, 2005). It is found that parents who received higher education are more likely to support their children throughout their education. Furthermore, wealthier parents spend more time with their children when they are at a young age to build the foundation for their children's education, which puts their children at an academic advantage. According to Winerip's research done in 2012, children who come from a higher socioeconomic background can read 35 million more words than those children who come from a lower socioeconomic background (Winerip, 2012).

Health Factor:

Children who are born into those families who are at the bottom of the society are more likely to face more health-related problems such as lower birth weight or a lack of health insurance, which would hinder their education success to a certain extent (Rothstein, 2004). Furthermore, poor health conditions would make them have less energy to study, and their attendance might be lower than the rest of the students.

Family factors in the United States

According to the study done by Shriner, Mullis, & Shriner in 2012, the research results demonstrate that children who live with two biological parents have the best academic performance; those children who live with only one parent are less likely to perform well academically. Those children who live with stepparents are in the middle (Shriner, Mullis, Shriner, 2010). Not only family structure but also family size matters. Children who are born into larger families, which are more common in the working class and poor, are less likely to perform well than those children who come from smaller families (Downey, 1995). The main reason could be the economic circumstances of the family, and other reasons would also contribute to this phenomenon (McLanahan, 1999). Bigger families are more likely to experience poverty because of higher consumption compared to small families. Furthermore, the family structure also decides families' income level and the available funds which the parents can use for their children's education (Zeisler, 2012). For instance, those children who live with a single parent (usually the mother), tend to be at a disadvantage compared to low-income households, while those children who live with their biological two parents are more likely to have more time with their parents, when it comes to comparing to those children who are from single-parent families. Furthermore, unstable families make children fail at school or affect them in a negative way. It is undeniable that unstable families (usually single-parent families or stepparent households) can hinder students' fulfilling their academic potential (Zeisler, 2012). So, both time spent with children and financial factors have an influence on children's academic performance and potential. Most pre-schools in the United States are private, so many students from low socioeconomic backgrounds can't afford their fees, which leaves them at a disadvantage from the beginning. However, students who come

from higher socioeconomic backgrounds have a much higher rate of pre-school classes attendance. (Zeisler, 2012). Early years of development affect people's academic performance to a large extent and have a tremendous impact throughout their adult lives. However, a lot of parents from lower social backgrounds might not be aware of the fact that the early years matters a lot in children's development. Wealthier parents put more effort into providing their children with a solid educational foundation, for example, by reading to their children. According to the research done by Winerip in 2012, "By the year they are four years old, children of wealthier families will have been exposed to 35 million more words than a child from a lower-income family" (Winerip, 2012, P39). However, the fact can be evaluated that many programs are intended to provide affordable early years education to those children who come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, such as Headstart and Jumpstart (United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2007).

Family factor:

Parents' education level:

According to the research done by Zeisler in 2012, parents' education level also plays an important role in family's incomes. Those people who received higher education are more likely to have an above-average income level throughout their whole lives compared to those people who never received higher education. Those people who have higher incomes could afford for their children to go to private schools where higher-quality education is being offered. Secondly, parents who received higher education have higher expectations for their children's educations, and these parents tend to instill in their children values of education in their daily conversation (Lareau, 2009). Furthermore, the factor which could determine the students' graduation from university is whether their parents graduated from college or not.

Table 3:College choice by student's family background

Table 3 shows the survey done by the US Census Bureau, which demonstrates how students' parental education level relates to their choice of Yale University (one of the Ivy League universities). 37 out of 50 of these students have parents who have undergraduate or graduate degrees, which illustrates that majority of these students who would attend the Ivy League come from families with highly-educated parents. The main reason could be that those parents who received higher education are more likely to support their children throughout their education and encourage them to pursue university degrees because of their own positive experiences in education. When it comes to school factors, they are closely connected to students' family factors (such as parents' income level). For example, school facilities and teacher quality are both connected to parents' income level (Zeisler, 2012). Parents with higher incomes can afford to send their children to private schools where school facilities are more advanced than state-run schools because of the adequate funds. The funds of private schools could come from parents and community donations so that they have enough funds to hire higher quality teachers to keep the class size small and efficient. On the other hand, teachers have more passion to teach when class size is appropriate because it is easier for them to know the progress of each student and adapt to it.

University Level

Introduction of Ivy League universities:

Ivy League universities are a group of universities in the northeast part of the United States that are viewed as some of the most prestigious and are ranked among the best universities both nationwide and worldwide (U.S. Department of Education). Ivy League universities are like the Russell Group in the United Kingdom. Students from various socioeconomic backgrounds hold a disproportional share of places at top universities in the United States, especially Ivy League universities (Bowen & Bok, 1998). According to a Forbes report in 2013, 46% of Harvard University undergraduate students came from families in the top 3.8% of all American households, which have incomes over \$200,000 per year (Forbes, 2013). Additionally, the phenomenon is not just at Harvard University.

Other Ivy League universities also have the same preference for students from middle/upper families. Sixty-nine percent of Ivy League freshmen are from families with annual incomes of over \$120,000 (Forbes, 2013). Table 3 is a U.S. Census Bureau survey about family income levels, which demonstrates that 19 out of 50 come from a family with an annual income over \$100,000. Mullen's research done in 2013 demonstrates that students who have exceptional academic performance but are from a low socioeconomic background still need to overcome a series of hurdles to arrive at an Ivy League university. In contrast, students who come from a high socioeconomic background (either parent has a bachelor's degree or a job as an executive, managerial position) are more likely to get into Ivy League universities even if their academic performance is not as good as those students who come from a low socioeconomic background (Mullen, 2013). The first reason for this fact could be the legacy statuses held by Ivy League admission offices. Some privileged families foster a tradition of sending their children to the same elite institutions they themselves attended. Furthermore, institutions acknowledge this process through giving legacy students preference in admissions. Ivy League admission offices tend to give out offers to children and families of alumni. For the students, if they have family members who attended the Ivy League, such as parents or elder brothers, these children are exposed to the cultural capital and their parents' attitudes toward going to Ivy League universities, so they would usually have faith in attending these institutions (Mullen, 2009). In contrast, those students who are from a low socioeconomic background might face disagreement from their own parents because of the higher expenses at the private universities. Their parents usually prefer these students to attend local colleges, which are free. They might also have not adequate application support and guidance from the state schools. The second reason could be that students from lower-income families are less likely to apply to those elite private institutions such as Ivy League universities in the first place, simply because it could be a huge burden to pay for the high tuition fees. (Mullen, 2009). The third reason is that the university admission process is complex. Parents without little or no university experience find it difficult to support their children through the application process. Schools also play a very important role in the process. High schools attended by high SES background students are more likely to provide extensive and specific guidance

and support through the application process. Furthermore, those schools are more likely to encourage students to apply to elite, private institutions (Power et al., 2003). According to data from the US Department of Education, in 2002, over half of the Ivy League students had attended private high schools compared with only 1.7 percent of students nationwide (US Department of Education, 2002). So, the type of high school that students attend influences the higher institution into which they are going to be admitted to a large extent. Table 3 below shows data from the U.S Department of Education, collected in 2003 to examine how federal education funds for low-income students are distributed among states.

Table 4 demonstrates that rich states are rewarded with richer federal education funding packages and poor states get less money. Ivy League universities tend to overvalue the academic performance of students who come from high socioeconomic backgrounds and are likely to undervalue the academic performance of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. So, exceptional academic performance does not necessarily get students into Ivy League universities.

China

Introduction in Historical and Cultural Context

"China has a long tradition of valuing education highly" (OECD,2010,p84).resulting from the civil examination system established in 603 AD. It was a very competitive exam for selecting officials to work at high positions in the ancient dynasties, and these positions represented rigor and honor. There were no formal institutions, such as schools, that existed back then, and it was a self-study system. Wealthier families were able to afford teachers to have their children home-schooled. This civil exam system has a history of

more than 16 centuries, which has had an enormous impact on Chinese attitudes toward education and exams. It has also led to the phenomenon of emphasis (almost an exclusive emphasis) on exam results (OECD, 2010). "The term 'education' carries a special meaning for China: education (basically, exam preparation) is viewed as the sole route for upwards social mobility" (OECD, 2010, P84).

The education system in China

Public education is free nationwide for nine years in China, so all Chinese have access to state schools for nine years, also known as the nine-year compulsory education, which is funded by the government (Ministry of Education, 2003). The nine-year compulsory education system has a lot of limitations; for example, children can only attend school in local areas. The primary factor that leads to the achievement gap in China is the Hukou system because this system differentiates the opportunity structures for rural and urban populations (Knight & Li, 1993). The Hukou system plays an important role in influencing education and economic outcomes (Ministry of Education, 2008). There are two types of Hukou, urban and rural, pertaining to urban and rural population, respectively. The Hukou system requires people to receive education in their local area (Ministry of Education of China, 2003), i.e., children who are born in rural areas do not have access to the public education in urban areas.

Cultural Capital

Education is seen as the main path to climb the social class ladder and change one's social status (OECD 2010). Therefore, parents would endeavor to provide their children with the best available educational resources and cultivate good learning habits, such as being diligent and having a passion for studying, to give their children a competitive advantage in the society after their graduation from university. (OECD, 2010). The above is the cultural capital aspect of most Chinese families. Apart from the cultural capital, financial capital also plays an important role. For those families who have come

from a high socioeconomic background, their children have more access to better education resources, such as attending a school with excellent teaching quality and relatively advanced settings that would lead to a higher learning efficiency starting from a very young age. Furthermore, this could lead to a positive attitude towards higher education for the children (Gao, Liu, 2015).

The school factor: Using the example of Shanghai

"Shanghai is indeed an education hub in China" (OECD, 2010, P91). Shanghai represents the positive side of the Chinese education system. According to the PISA tests done by OECD, Shanghai ranked first in the International Table in terms of students' reading, writing, and mathematics performance (OECD, 2012). According to Shanghai's municipal government statistics of 2010, enrollment at compulsory education was above 99.9%, 97% of Shanghai citizens attended senior secondary school, and 98% of the parents in Shanghai chose to send their children to preschool.

Class sizes:

Furthermore, Class size in mainland China is generally large; the national class standard is 50 students. However, in rural areas, it is not unusual to see classes of over 80 or, in extreme cases, over 100. However, in urban areas, especially in Shanghai, there is a drastic decline in class size (OECD, 2010). Shanghai education authorities spend more on education than other cities in China. Local governments can afford to offer small classes and employ more teachers. This has significantly reduced teachers' workloads and increased teaching quality as a whole because teachers can pay more attention to each student, so that students have a higher chance of getting good grades. Statistics also demonstrated that over 80% of Shanghai's secondary school graduates are admitted to higher education institutions, compared to the national figure of 24% (Ministry of Education, 2010). In other words, all those who would like to pursue higher education are able to do so, because there were 61 higher education institutions in Shanghai in 2009, plus quite a few private institutions yet to be officially recognised (Shanghai mu-

nicipal government statistics, 2010). Another reason for the high admission rates into higher education for secondary school graduates is that over 80% of parents in Shanghai send their children to private schools. These schools are different from public education institutions in that parents have to pay for them. These private-tuition schools operate after school, during weekdays or at weekends, and tend to use small groups to focus on particular subjects. Parents see such private tuitions outside of school as essential for enabling students to perform well in the national university entry exams and get into good universities (OECD, 2010). So, children who are born in cities are at an advantage of receiving a higher education because of several variables: the school facility, the curriculum, their parents' access to social capital, and their parents' income levels. Furthermore, a higher education experience gives these students a competitive advantage and head start in their future careers.

Family Factors

Family factors play an important role in learning, including English Learning in China. This can be best illustrated with the example of the English fluency tests, CET-4 and CET-6. The survey is about the relationship between social capital and the English proficiency of university students in China by using the examining methods of CET-4 and CET-6. CET-4 and CET-6 are tests designed for university students in China to test their English proficiency levels. Since CET-6 is more difficult than CET-4, students need to pass CET-4 before taking the CET-6 test. Students from higher-income families have a higher rate of passing the CET-6 than those students from lower-income households while students from lower-income families pass CET-4 at a much higher rate than students who come from higher-income households.(Ministry of Education,2003)All students have to pass the CET-4 in order to get the Bachelor's degree:Students from low-income families would work harder to pass the test and achieve the final Bachelor's degree. However, those students from low-income families tend to be at a disadvantage when it comes to learning English in their early years (Gao&Liu, 2015).

Chapter5:Discussion & Conclusion

Similarities and Differences

Information gleaned from these data revealed some similarities and differences among these three countries. The first similarity is that the three countries all have access to free public education nationwide. England has over 60 years of free access to compulsory education, which started in 1944, while China only started compulsory free education in 1990 (Ministry of Education, China).

The second similarity is that there is a huge achievement gap within the three countries. According to the OECD, Britain's independent schools lead the world whereas our state schools continue to slip further and further down the international league tables. However, there is no data from the department of education in China suggesting that private schools perform better or give students more guidance than state schools when it comes to university admissions. In terms of China, Shanghai achievement first in the PISA tests for all three areas, while China did not make the list as a whole country (OECD, 2010). Among these three countries, the United States is less probably to be the 'land of opportunity' for people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds where individuals from humble origins can succeed with their efforts. Rather, family background matters more in the United States when compared to other two countries. (Anders & Jerrim, 2014)

When it comes to cultural differences: As the result of the historical background of China, success in exams is still seen as the only respectful success, unlike the other two societies, where economic wealth can also attract social respect (OECD, 2010).

The data in the findings session from the Department for Education in England and the United States Department of Education demonstrate that private schools provide better teaching quality that allows students to get accepted by universities because of the school facilities, low teacher-student ratios, and extensive guidance throughout the application process in these two countries. (DfE, England & Department of Education, United States).

Table 5: Differences in Higher Education institutions by country

Table 5 illustrates the differences in higher education among England, the United States, and China, which involves comparisons in the areas of undergraduate enrolment percentage, university tuition fees, and university scholarship. In terms of the per-

centage of students starting an undergraduate degree before 20, China has a much lower percentage(20.4 percent)of students attending higher education facilities. The United States has the highest percentage of starting an undergraduate degree, but it also has the highest percentage of students who are not able to finish the degree.

Table 6: A summary of social gradients in educational attainment across UK,USA and Shanghai(China)

Shanghai is chosen to represent China because China did not participate in the PISA test as a whole country(OECD, 2010). Table 6 shows that people from low socioeconomic backgrounds in the United States earn 75 percent less than those people from high socioeconomic backgrounds. This is notably bigger than the other two countries. A similar cross-country pattern holds for parental education differences in adult numeracy skills. The figures in this table illustrate the relationship between family background and education outcomes, which tends to be stronger in the United States than in the other two countries in the table. This phenomenon is at odds with the notion that the United States is the 'land of opportunity', where individuals from humble origins can successfully fulfil dreams through their own efforts (Anders & Jerrim, 2014).This table also provides a summary throughout the whole process of the education and labour market outcomes. It is obvious to see from the figures given in the table that socio-economic inequalities are large in the UK and the US. When it comes to primary school, socio-economic gaps in reading and maths skills in the United Kingdom and the United States are equally as large, with both of them around 1.2 standard deviations

In terms of secondary school, the United States has a particularly strong relationship between parents' socioeconomic status and children's test scores at the end of secondary education when compared to the other two countries. PISA assessed the competencies of 15-year-olds in reading, mathematics, and science (with a focus on mathematics) in 65 countries and economies(OECD,2012). The PISA results table of 3 countries demonstrates that Shanghai ranked first in three areas while the UK ranked 26th

and the USA ranked 36th. However, Shanghai does not represent the secondary education level in China. Shanghai's PISA results ranked first, the result of factors such as the fact that most schools in Shanghai have adopted small class sizes and embraced high teaching quality. The high percentage of students attending secondary schools (97 percent) (OECD,2012) is also a factor. The standard deviation also shows the strong association between family background and PISA test scores in the UK and the USA, where access to 'elite' universities potentially offers greater economic rewards. There is a positive relationship between parents' education levels and the percentage of students getting into 'elite' universities. Furthermore, the link between parental education levels and access to 'elite' institutions is larger than entry into higher education in general. This phenomenon and relationship is true for the UK, the USA, and Shanghai. Those children who have highly educated parents are a further eight percentage points more likely to attend selective institutions of higher learning. The link between socioeconomic status and access to tertiary education is strong in the United Kingdom and the United States, where the links between family background and achievement in secondary school are strong, because wealthier parents in the UK and the USA have more scope to choose what type of school they send their children to. In addition, they can more often afford private schools (Anders & Jerrim 2014)

Conclusion

Understanding the relationship between family background and educational attainment is of crucial importance to reduce the achievement gap between students from high socioeconomic backgrounds and low socioeconomic backgrounds and to break the association between a disadvantaged upbringing and disadvantages in later life (Anders & Jerrim, 2014). This research project reviewed evidence on this topic using a cross-national comparison approach, specifically the association between education and family background, including socioeconomic status, parents' education level, and educational outcomes, across England, the United States, and China. Shanghai is the representative of the successful side of Chinese education (OECD, 2012). In order to examine the urban versus rural achievement gap in China, the data and figures of the Municipal Statistics Bureau were also being studied. It is apparent that socio-economic inequality influences educational achievement in these countries in different ways. In China, the urban and rural achievement gap is representative of the national achievement gap. Students from rural areas have difficulty in accessing educational resources, which puts them at a disadvantage. However, students from urban areas, such as Shanghai specifically, have access to all sorts of resources, both in and out of school, that they can take advantage of and put to good use (OECD, 2012). There is also variation in the magnitude of academic achievement gaps, suggesting that some countries are more successful in equalizing opportunities across all social class groups (Anders & Jerrim, 2014).

According to the data above, the United States is the country that has strongest correlation between socioeconomic status and children's academic performance (Anders & Jerrim, 2014). In other words, students from high socioeconomic status are most likely to have better education outcomes than students from low socioeconomic status among these three countries.

Based on the findings from each country, there is a positive relationship between socioeconomic status and educational outcomes; i.e. students who come from parents with more access to social capital are more likely to be able to attend universities, which matches my first assumption. However, the degree of achievement is different in each

country. Due to the importance of academic performance, it is important to reduce the achievement gap by improving the academic performances of impoverished children (Caldwell & Ginther, 1996).

Lists of Tables:

Table1: Attainment by type of institution in England

Average point score per entry ALEVEL cohort and institution type	Number of each type of institution	Average point score	Average Level
Local Authority maintained mainstream schools	48921	209.9	C
Sponsored academics-mainstream	13850	198.9	C-
Converter academics-mainstream	94,168	217.5	C+
Free schools	292	204.1	C-
Free schools 16-19	394	220.3	C+
University Technical Colleges	317	177.6	D
Studio schools	120	181.4	D
Independent (Private) schools	34813	242.5	B
Six form colleges	52669	209.8	C
FE sector colleges excluding sixth form colleges	20,250	203.0	C-

Source: department for education, England 2015

Table 1

Table 2

Table2 College choice by high school types

High school type	Elite only	Best	Best Fit	Ath- letic Re- cruit	Whim or in- terven- tion	Total
TOTAL=50						
Private	10	4	7	1	1	23
Public	1	2	7	3	8	21
N=50 6missing cas- es						44

Table 3

Table 3: College choice by student's family background

	Elite only	Best	Best Fit	Athletic Recruit	Whim or intervention
TOTAL=50	11	7	14	7	11
Highest level of parental education					
Less than undergraduate degree	1	1	0	2	6
Undergraduate degree	0	1	1	1	2
Graduate degree	10	4	12	3	3
N=50 3cases missing					
Annual family income					
less than \$40,000	1	0	0	1	4
\$40,000-99,999	2	3	3	3	2
\$100,000 or above	7	2	7	3	2
N=50,10 missing cases					
					US census report, 1999

:

Table

Table 4: state comparison

	A		B		C	
	Poor children		Title I allocation		Title I allocation per poor child	
Wyoming	9,796	0.1	\$28,964,809	0.3	\$2,957	
Massachusetts	112,570	1.3	260,050,569	2.3	2,310	
New Hampshire	13,140	0.2	29,733,465	0.3	2,263	
Alaska	14,330	0.2	30,431,327	0.3	2,124	
Connecticut	55,987	0.7	106,557,518	1.0	1,903	
New York	638,992	7.6	1,184,751,800	10.7	1,854	

Table 4: state comparison

	A		B		C	
New Jersey	155,082	1.9	272,032,782	2.4	1,754	
Pennsylvania	274,088	3.3	438,337,029	3.9	1,599	
Rhode Island	27,313	0.3	43,155,247	0.4	1,580	
Maryland	101,153	1.2	153,983,710	1.4	1,522	
Hawaii	26,720	0.3	36,094,503	0.3	1,351	
California	1,288,493	15.4	1,649,697,459	14.8	1,280	
Kentucky	138,101	1.6	162,957,050	1.5	1,180	

Table 5: Differences in Higher Education institutions by country

	England	US	China
Avg. length of bachelor's degree course (years)	3	4	4
Tuition cost of a bachelor's degree (\$US)	14,193	46,419	3200
University scholarships			
% of pupils receiving grant / scholarship	58	65	10
% of pupils receiving public loans	87	50	16
% NOT receiving loan, scholarship or grant	6	24	5
			Source: Institute of Education, University of London(2014) & Ministry of education, China

Table 6: A summary of social gradients in educational attainment across UK, USA and Shanghai(China)

	SES:socioeconomic status	UK	US	Shanghai, China
Pre-school				
Vocabulary skills	ED	0.97	1.21	0.85
Socio-emotional skills	ED	0.80	0.64	0.50
Primary school				

Table 6: A summary of social gradients in educational attainment across UK, USA and Shanghai(China)

	SES:so- cioeconom- ic status	UK	US	Shanghai,C hina
Reading skills	ED	1.18	1.21	1.28
Maths skills	ED	0.96	0.99	1.08
Secondary school				
PISA reading	OCC	0.93	1.06	0.85
Higher education				
Access to university	ED	10.6	9.0	8.0
Access to elite university	ED	11.8	16.4	10.8
Labour market outcomes				
Earnings gap (unconditional)	% difference	51	75	25
Earnings (controlling for ed)	% difference	20	14	7

Table 6: A summary of social gradients in educational attainment across UK,USA and Shanghai(China)

	SES:socioeconomic status	UK	US	Shanghai,China
				Source: OECD,2012 & Shanghai Municipal Statistics Bureau

References

Anders&Jerrim (2014) The socio-economic gradient in educational attainment and labour market outcomes:a cross-national comparison Institute of Education,University of London

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Barton, P. E. (2004). Why does the gap persist? *Educational Leadership*, 62(3), 9-13

Brophy, J. (1988) *classroom organisation and the management* Washington DC National Institute of Education

Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 371-400

Caldwell, G. P. & Ginther, D. W. (1996). Differences in learning styles of low socioeconomic status for low and high achievers. *Education*, 117, 141-148.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95-S120. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2780243>

Currie, J.; Thomas, D. (1995). "Does Head Start Make A Difference?" (PDF). *American Economic Review* 85 (3): 341.

Destinations of key stage 4 and key stage 5 pupils, Department for education, 2014. Retrieved from

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/destinations-of-key-stage-4-and-key-stage-5-pupils-2011-to-2012>

Education and Socioeconomic Status Factsheet 2010, *American psychology association*

Evans, G. (2007). *Educational failure and working class white children in Britain*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Field, J. (2009). *Social capital*. New York: Routledge

Gaborone, B 2006, The use of documentary research methods in social research.
African sociological review, 10(1), 221-230.

Information Office of Shanghai Municipality and Shanghai Municipal Statistics Bureau (2010), 2010 Shanghai Basic Facts, *Shanghai literature and art Publishing group*, Shanghai.

Kornich, S. & Furstenburg, F. (2011). Investing in children: Changes in parental spending on children, 1972 to 2007. Retrieved March 16, 2012 from <http://paa2011.princeton.edu/download.aspx?submissionId=110077>

Kim, D. H., & Schneider, B. (2005). Social capital in action: Alignment of parental support in adolescents' transition to postsecondary education. *Social Forces*, 84(2), 1181-1206. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3598495>

Lareau, Annette (2003), *Unequal Childhoods*, Berkeley: University of California Press

Lam(2014),A Theoretical Framework of the Relation between Socioeconomic Status and Academic Achievement of Students, *Eric 134,3,P326-331*

Laureau (2009).Unequal childhood,race, class and gender : An anthology p342-353
Canada : Wadworth Publishing company.

Leonhardt,D(2005) the college dropout boom In *class matters*(P87-104) New York:Macmillian

Mullen, Ann L. Elite Destinations: Pathways to Attending an Ivy League University, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, v30 n1 p15-27 Jan 2009 Retrived :<http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ825360>

Ministry of Education(2003) *guidelines on the reform and development of early childhood education*.Beijing: General Office of the State Council

National Educational Development Report to the 48th Session of the International Conference on Education— Inclusive Education in China.Ministry of Education of the P. R. China Chinese National Commission for UNESCO October 2008 Retrieved from:
http://www.ibe.unesco.org/National_Reports/ICE_2008/china_NR08_ec.pdf

Nieto, S. (2010). Language, culture, and teaching: Critical Perspectives. New York, NY: Routledge.

No Child Left Behind Report-save the children, A Child Poverty Strategy,2011-2014 Retrieved fromhttps://www.savethechildren.org.uk/sites/default/files/docs/No_Child_Left_Behind_1.pdf

Platt, J 1981, Evidence and Proof in Documentary Research: 2: Some Shared Problems of Documentary Research. *The Sociological Review*, 29(1), 53-66.

PISA 2012 results in focus,What 15-year-olds know and what they can do with what they know,OECD,2012, Retrieved from
<http://www.oecd.org/pisa/keyfindings/pisa-2012-results-overview.pdf>

Scott, J 2006, Social research and documentary sources. *Documentary research*, 1,

6-7.

Shanghai Municipal Statistics Bureau (2010), Shanghai Statistical Yearbook 2010, china Statistics Press, Shanghai.

Ram, B., & Hou, F. (2003). Changes in family structure and child outcome: *Roles of economies and family resources*. *Policy Studies Journal*, 31,309.

Revised A level and other level 3 results in England, 2014/ 2015,Department for education,2015

Santrock, W. (2007). A topical approach to life-span development, third Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Summer Search. (2011). Summer search: About us

School data Dashboard,Ofsted 2015 available from: <http://dashboard.ofsted.gov.uk/dash.php?urn=134693>

U.S. Department of Education Budget Tables, ESEA Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies by State, 2003

US Department of Education. 2002. *Digest of education statistics 2001*. NCES 2000-130. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

United States Census Bureau, 2015,<http://www.census.gov/hhes/school/about/index.html>

United States Department of health and human services,2012 Retrieved from

http://www.acf.hhs.gov/opa/fact_sheets/headstart_factsheet.html

Valerie Strauss, "Does Head Start work for kids? The bottom line", The Washington Post, March 5, 2013

Terre B. M. D 2006, *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.4. Wyness (2012), *childhood an society* 2nd edition

Wyness(2006) *childhood and society* An introduction to the sociology of childhood

MeLoyd,V. C. (1998). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. *American Psychology*, 53,185-204.

Zeisler ,K The impact of resources on Education: A position Paper on How theories of social capital provide insight on the achievement gap in the United States Education system Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED530790.pdf>

