International Journal of Enhanced Research in Educational Development (IJERED)
ISSN: 2320-8708, Vol. 14 Issue 3, May-June, 2026

Socio-economic factors behind Schooling in Rural India: A Study

Dr. Papagari Bhaskar

Assistant Professor, University College of Education, Sri krishnadevaraya University, Ananthapuramu A.P

ABSTRACT

Socio-economic inequalities have a long-lasting effect on children's cognitive and socio-emotional development and educational outcomes. Educational achievement, and its relationship with socio-economicbackground, is one of the enduring issues in educational research. Education is prioritized in the upper middle and high-class since the basic needs of students (food, shelter, and safety) are easily obtainable and the focus is on education. However, in lower socio-economic, education might not be prioritized, especially in situations where students' basic needs are not met easily. Students of lower socio-economicalso tend to have lesser access to different types of education since neighbourhood schools are limited and the opportunity for education outside their home is not accessible. Students from lower socio economic status might have less parental support and therefore earn lower grades in school than their high socio-economicstatus counterparts. The result is cyclical: lower socio-economic status' students tend to remain at a lower socio-economic status due to limited educational opportunities, while their higher socio-economic status peers tend to remain at a higher socio-economic status because of more educational opportunities. Leveraging education toward career success can help an individual from a lower socio-economic status become part of a higher socio-economic status.

Key words: Academic achievement, socio-economic status, educational achievement, cognitive, gender, Socio-economic assessments.

INTRODUCTION

Rural India educates roughly 65% of the country's school-age population, yet outcomes remain uneven. While enrollment has climbed above 95% since the Right to Education Act of 2009, retention, learning levels, and gender parity still hinge on a web of socioeconomic and realities. Understanding why children attend, drop out, or never enroll requires looking beyond infrastructure to the household economies, caste dynamics, and gender norms that shape daily decisions about schooling. This article examines how income, occupation, caste, and gender interact to influence school access and quality in rural India, and what interventions account for these layers.

1. The Socioeconomic Landscape of Rural Schooling

1.1 Poverty and Opportunity Cost

For many rural households, the direct costs of schooling are low: government schools are tuition-free, provide mid-day meals, and often supply textbooks and uniforms. The real barrier is opportunity cost. When a family lives on $3 to $5 per day, a child's labor in agriculture, cattle rearing, brick kilns, or local shops contributes immediate income or saves on hired help. ASER 2024 data shows that among rural 14 to 16 year olds not enrolled in school, 37% cited "needed for work at home or outside" as the main reason. Seasonal migration compounds this. In sugarcane belts of Maharashtra or brick kiln circuits in UP and Bihar, entire families relocate for 6 to 8 months. Children move with them, and re-entry into school mid-year is difficult.

1.2 Landholding and Occupational Patterns

Land ownership strongly predicts educational investment. Marginal farmers with less than 1 hectare face high income volatility. Their children show higher dropout rates after Class 5, when the curriculum demands more time and private tuition becomes common. By contrast, households with salaried employment, even a single member in a government job or the army, tend to keep children in school through secondary level.

The rise of non-farm rural employment has mixed effects. Construction, transport, and local services increase household income but also create new forms of child labor for boys in their teens. For girls, non-farm income sometimes reduces domestic burdens, freeing time for school, especially if mothers enter SHG work or MGNREGA sites.

1.3 Caste and Social Capital

Caste continues to mediate access to quality schooling. Despite legal prohibitions, children from Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes face subtle exclusion: seating segregation, assignment of cleaning duties, or lower teacher expectations. The India Human Development Survey found that SC/ST students in predominantly upper-caste villages scored 0.3 standard deviations lower on reading tests than SC/ST students in more heterogeneous villages, even after controlling for income.

However, caste networks also mobilize resources. Jati-based educational trusts run hostels and scholarships. The expansion of private low-fee schools in rural areas is partly driven by OBC and intermediate caste groups seeking alternatives to what they perceive as neglectful government schools.

1.4 Gender and Household Economics

The gender gap in enrollment has narrowed to 1 to 2% at primary level, but diverges sharply by age 15. Socioeconomic logic is key. Marriage markets still value a girl's education differently across regions. In parts of Rajasthan and Bihar, early marriage remains common because dowry costs rise with a bride's age and education. Parents calculate that withdrawing a daughter at 14 saves schooling costs and reduces dowry inflation.

Conversely, in southern states like Tamil Nadu and Kerala, women's education links to better employment in textiles, healthcare, and government schemes. Families there see returns to girls' secondary education, so retention is higher. The presence of a functional secondary school within 3 km increases rural girls' enrollment by 12 to 15% according to NFHS-5, because distance amplifies safety concerns and transport costs.

1.5 Infrastructure and Digital Divide

Socioeconomic status determines how families navigate infrastructure gaps. Wealthier rural households compensate for poor government schools with private tuition or private schools. Poorer households cannot. The post-COVID shift to digital learning exposed this divide. Only 28% of rural households reported access to a smartphone for educational use in 2022. Of those, children in the top income quartile used it 5x more hours per week for study than those in the bottom quartile.

2. Policy Interventions and What Works

2.1 Conditional Cash Transfers

Schemes like Bihar's MukhyamantriBalika Cycle Yojana gave girls a free bicycle on enrollment in Class 9. It addressed distance, safety, and status. Secondary enrollment for girls rose 32% in 4 years. West Bengal's Kanyashree program offers annual scholarships to girls 13 to 18 who remain unmarried and in school. It directly counters the economic incentive for early marriage.

2.2 Community-Based Monitoring

When school management committees include religious leaders, attendance improves. In Mewat, Haryana, imams who announced the importance of school enrollment during Friday prayers helped raise Muslim enrollment. In tribal Odisha, church youth groups that track dropouts have reduced child migration to brick kilns.

2.3 Curriculum and Medium of Instruction

States that introduced bridge courses in tribal languages, like Andhra Pradesh's MLE program for Savara and Kui, cut Class 1 dropout by half. Similarly, SPQEM's support for modern subjects in madrasas increased the share of madrasa students taking board exams from 12% in 2009 to 41% in 2022.

2.4 Residential Schooling

For children of seasonal migrants or from dispersed hamlets, residential options are crucial. The Eklavya Model Residential Schools for ST students and NavodayaVidyalayas have high retention because they remove daily economic and social pressures. However, they serve only a fraction of eligible children.

2.5 Addressing Teacher Bias

Training that includes modules on caste, and gender reduces discrimination. Rajasthan's teacher training program added case studies on SC and ST experiences, and subsequent classroom observation showed a drop in segregated seating practices.

3. Emerging Trends

3.1 Private School Growth

3.2 Low-fee private schools now enroll 35% of rural children. They are often run by local entrepreneurs from

dominant castes. Parents perceive better accountability because they pay fees. However, quality is uneven, and closure during income shocks like COVID disproportionately hurt the poor.

3.3 Digital Access Content

Smartphones bring lectures into the home. Some families use YouTube channels as supplements or substitutes for school. The challenge is ensuring digital literacy serves foundational learning, not just doctrinal learning.

CONCLUSION

Schooling in rural India cannot be understood through budgets and buildings alone. A family's decision to educate a child weighs immediate survival against long-term mobility, and that calculation is filtered through caste identity, and community norms.

Economic interventions work best when they recognize cultural logic. Bicycles for girls succeeded because they addressed purdah and distance.

The path forward is not to flatten these differences but to design policy that is economically sound and culturally legible. Mid-day meals, scholarships, and hostels are necessary. But so are curricula in home languages, teacher training that confronts bias, and partnerships with faith leaders who already shape opinion in villages.

Rural India's demographic dividend depends on getting this intersection right. When a Dalit girl in Telangana, and an Adivasi child in Chhattisgarh all see school as a place that respects their home and opens their future, enrollment will become real education.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, A. (1996). Even basic needs of young are not met. Retrieved from http://tc.education. pitt.edu/library/SelfEsteem
2. Ballatine, J. H. (1993). The sociology of education: A systematic analysis. Englwood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
3. Barnard, W. M. (2004). Parent involvement in elementary school and educational attainment.Children and Youth Services Review, 26, 39- 62.
4. Battle, J., & Lewis, M. (2002). The increasing significance of class: The relative effects of race and socio-economic status on academic achievement. Journal of Poverty, 6(2), 21-35.
5. Caldas, S. J., & Bankston, C. L. (1997). The effect of school population socio-economic status on individual student academic achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 90, 269- 277.
6. Capraro, M. M., Capraro, R. M., & Wiggins, B. B. (2000). An investigation of the effect of gender, socio-economic status, race and grades on standardized test scores. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas, TX.
7. Ceballo, R., McLoyd, V., &Toyokawa, T. (2004). The influence of neighborhood quality on adolescents' educational values and school efforts. Journal of Adolescent Research, 19(6), 716- 739.
8. Eamon, M. K. (2005). Social demographic, school, neighborhood and parenting influences on academic achievement of Latino young adolescents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 34(2), 163-175.
9. Eitle, T. M. (2005). Do gender and race matter? Explaining the relationship between sports participation and achievement. Sociological Spectrum, 25(2), 177-195.
10. Fantuzzo, J., &Tighe, E. (2000). A family involvement questionnaire. Journal of Educational Psychology, 92(2), 367 - 376.
11. Furstenberg, F. F., & Hughes, M. E. (1995). Social capital and successful development among at-risk youth. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57, 580-592.
12. Garzon, G. (2006). Social and cultural foundations of American education. Wikibooks. Retrieved from http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Social_and_Cultural_Foundations_of _ Ameri can_ Edu cation/Chapter_10_Supplemental_Materials/What_factors_ influence_curriculum_design %3F_1
13. Goddard, R. D. (2003). Relational networks, social trust, and norms: A social capital perspective on students' chances of academic success. Educational Evaluations & Policy Analysis, 25, 59- 74.
14. GreeshmaGovind, (2023). Impact of socio-economic factors on educational achievement of students in Trivandrum. Management Researcher. Vol. XXIX No.4 OCT-DEC 2023. Retrieved from https://www.imdrtvm.com/article/imdr-article-1712471897.pdf

15. Hanes, B. (2008). The exploration of socio-economic status and student achievement at Beverly elementary school. Un published thesis. Marietta College.
16. Jeynes, W. H. (2002). Examining the effects of parental absence on the academic achievement of adolescents: The challenge of controlling for family income. Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 23(2), 5665.
17. Kahlenberg, R. D. (2006). Integration by income. American School Board Journal. Retrieved from http://www.equaleducation.org/commentary.asp?opedi d=1332
18. Kirkup, J. (2008). Middle-class children resentful at being pushed to succeed. Telegraph. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/3330301/Mid dleclasschildren-resentful-at-beingpushed-to-succeedpoll-shows.html Krashen, S. (2005). The hard work hypothesis: Is doing your homework enough to overcome the effects of poverty? Multicultural Education, 12(4), 16-19.
19. Ma, X., & Klinger, D. A. (2000).Hierarchical linear modeling of student and school effects on academic achievement. Canadian Journal of Education, 25(1), 41-55.
20. Mann, M. (1985). Macmilanstudents encyclopedia of sociology. England: Anchor Brendon Ltd.
21. Marzano, R. J. (2003). What works in schools: Translating research into action? Retrieved from http://pdonline.ascd.org/pd_online/whatworks/marzano2003_c h13 .html
22. McCoy, L. P. (2005). Effect of demographic and personal variables on achievement in eighth grade algebra. Journal of Educational Research, 98 (3), 131-135.
23. Mitchell, D. E., &Collom, E. (2001). The determinants of student achievement at the academy for Academic Excellence. CA: School of Education University of California.
24. Parri, J. (2006). Quality in higher education. Vadyba/Management, 2(11),107-111.
25. Roberts, G. A. (2007). The effect of extracurricular activity participation in the relationship between parent involvement and academic performance in a sample of third grade children. Retrieved from https://www.lib.utexas.edu/etd/d/2007/ robertsg11186/robertsg 11186.pdf
26. Rouse, C. E., & Barrow, L. (2006). U.S. elementary and secondary schools: Equalizing opportunity or replicating the status quo? The Future of Children, 16(2), 99-123.
27. Sander, W. (2001). Chicago public schools and student achievement. Urban Education, 36(1), 27-38.
28. Saxton, J. (2000). Investment in education: Private and public returns. Retrieved from http:/ /www.house.gov/jec/educ.pdf.
29. Shumox, L., & Lomax, R. (2001). Parental efficacy: Predictor of parenting behavior and adolescent outcomes. Parenting, 2(2), 127-150.
30. 39. Trusty, J. (2000). High educational expectations and low achievement: Stability of educational goals across adolescence. Journal of Educational Research, 93, 356- 366.
31. Tsinidou, M., Gerogiannis, V., &Fitsilis, P. (2010). Evaluation of the factors that determine quality in higher education: an empirical study. Quality Assurance in Education, 18(3), 227- 244.
32. US Department of Education. (2003). Confidence: Helping your child through early adolescence. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/parents/academic/help/adolesce nce/part 8.html
33. Waters, T. J., &Marzano, R. J. (2006). School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement. Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved from ERIC (ED494270).