Online at: https://researchtrendsjournal.com
Indexed Journal

ISSN No: 2584-282X
Peer Reviewed Journal

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TRENDS IN EMERGING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Volume 2; Issue 6; 2024; Page No. 234-240

Received: 02-09-2024
Accepted: 06-10-2024

To the important parts of education include students' educational mobility and success

[1]Basalingamma Hiremath and [2]Prof. Dr. Mahalaxmi Johri

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, P.K. University, Shivpuri, Madhya Pradesh, India

[2]Dean Faculty of Arts HOD, Department of Sociology, P.K. University, Shivpuri, Madhya Pradesh, India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17100278

Corresponding Author: Basalingamma Hiremath

Abstract

Social inequality is a direct cause of differences in educational opportunities, which further restricts the choices open to those who are already at a disadvantage. This study examines the many ways that social status inequality restricts educational chances. It draws attention to the fact that some people with low incomes cannot afford to go to college because of the high cost of living. Because of this, the "educational threshold" has also increased, requiring greater levels of education to achieve the same jobs that formerly needed lower levels of educational achievement. A diversified population with a broad variety of educational levels is revealed when comparing this country to others, even though the absolute rate of educational mobility has been rather high.

Keywords: Students', Educational, Mobility, inequality and social

Introduction

Among the many determinants of social mobility in human societies, education plays a particularly pivotal role in bringing about advancement for members of lower castes, albeit it is not the only one. Education mobility is influenced by a number of factors, which in turn affect people's prospects of mobility, as pointed out by Siva Prasad. Several things affect the educational mobility of a group. Factors such as one's family, social network, rural/urban upbringing, caste/class, and location of living are among the many determinants. Another factor that affects a group's correlation between a person's caste affiliation, social movement membership, and the probability that they will get a bachelor's degree, government policies, etc.

Higher education opportunities, in turn, increase the likelihood of social mobility. (100–101; 1987). Many individuals are pursuing degrees in higher education because they want to climb the social ladder and get the perks that come with it. But that doesn't mean that all college grads will be able to get well-paying employment. "Replacement of low-skill jobs with new jobs requiring greater expertise is actually responsible for only 15% of the increase in educational requirements for jobs this century," "Collins" from 1971, page 1004. There is a severe shortage of employment opportunities for recent college graduates.

The "educational threshold" has also risen because of this, meaning that individuals now need higher levels of education to attain the same positions that required lower educational attainment levels historically. When discussing financial liberalization and growth, Emran and Shilpi (2012) [16] pointed out that "the rise in cross-sectional inequality becomes a serious concern when it is primarily a result of inequality of opportunity, i.e., the inability of children born into poorer families and disadvantaged social groups to move beyond their parents' position in economic ladder by their own effort and choices". "An immobile society may require policies, public investments and reforms to ensure both efficiency and equality of opportunity" (ibid.) is what they say further.

According to studies conducted in industrialized nations, individuals strive for higher levels of education regardless of whether it is essential for the careers they want. One of

the most common justifications for going back to school is the hope of landing a more prominent job, even though studies have shown no link between degree completion and solid employment success. Conversely, those who are unable to further their education may find it difficult to attain better-paying or more prestigious employment, which may limit their opportunities for social advancement. Income inequality, also known as the distribution of income, is the unequal distribution of a person's salary or wages from one person to another.

Wealth inequality, also known as the unequal distribution of a person's wealth from one owner to another, and consumption inequality, also known as the unequal distribution of a person's spending habits, are all components of economic inequality. You can measure each of these things between different countries, within a single country, or even between different sub-populations (like low-income, high-income, age, gender, intergenerational, etc.) within the same country or between different nations.

Literature Review

Marginson, Simon. (2018) [1]. An increase in both the number and quality of higher education institutions in the Chinese civilizational zone (East Asia) is occurring simultaneously with the growth of middle classes and the attainment of complete social mobility. significant improvement. Are they, however, helping to increase relative social mobility and provide more equitable opportunities for kids from diverse backgrounds? The essay takes a look at the US as an example, describing how the middle class grew and how people could climb the economic ladder in the '50s and '70s by furthering one's education, only to see a decline in and education disparity skyrocket and social mobility decline in the 1980s and beyond. Can we expect to see a similar turn of events in Korea and China?

Kearney, Melissa *et al*. (2016) [3]. Lower rates of social mobility are associated with more economic disparity, as has been shown in several studies. However, whether and how more inequality causes lower mobility rates remains an unanswered subject. We argue that a drop in human capital investment among low-income people could be one way that income disparity reduces opportunities for upward mobility. We argue that young people from low-income families may see less value in investing in their own human capital if economic inequality is high. Higher educated salary premiums may have an "aspirational" impact, although this would counteract it. This prediction is supported by the data: Living in an area with a wider financial disparity increases the likelihood a large number of low-income pupils will not complete their education. This conclusion holds up when subjected to several tests for confounding variables and checks for specifications.

Rauscher, Emily *et al*. (2014) [4]. One reason why class immobility is so pervasive in American culture is the large disparity in college completion rates between students from privileged and disadvantaged backgrounds. In this article, we will first go over the causes of college completion gaps and then provide assets as one explanation that stratification researchers tend to overlook. We go on to talk about how minority and low-income students are at a disadvantage when negotiating financial assistance packages due to the long-term effects of wealth disparity. To wrap up, we'll go over how kids' savings accounts and other asset-building programs might be a good way to level the playing field and change the distributional effects of the existing financial assistance system.

Sommet, Nicolas *et al*. (2024) [5]. Adults have been the primary subjects of research on the impact of exposure to economic disparity in their daily lives. Our central argument in this review is that these impacts are felt by students in the classroom as well. First, we show that students' competitive incentives are enhanced by economic disparity. Next, we'll take a look at three major ways this phenomenon changes our understanding of how inequality affects kids' emotional, relational, and academic results. To begin, exam anxiety and other negative accomplishment feelings are predicted by economic disparity, which may be explained by competitive impulses. But because competition makes us nervous about losing and excited about winning, we argue that inequality could also foretell feelings of pleasure in accomplishment. Second, economic disparity predicts both prosocial and antisocial behaviors, such as cheating and tactical collaboration, and this is because people are motivated to compete with one another. Indeed, students may resort to cheating or colluding in order to boost their relative performance, as a result of competitiveness.

Torraco, Richard. (2018) [6]. There has been a widening disparity in income recently, a phenomenon known as economic inequality. College completion A factor contributing to the expanding achievement gap is the fact that rates for pupils from lower-income homes are lower than those from higher-income ones. As the gulf between the learnt and the uneducated widens, the work opportunities available to those with less education become more limited and provide lower wages. Concerning economic disparity, we state in this research that educational inequality, and diminished job opportunities are all part of a vicious cycle. After outlining potential solutions to the cycle, it finishes by pinpointing problem areas that need further study and action.

Research Methodology

Data analysis

The distribution of respondents by religion and educational achievement is shown in Table 1. In a survey of 777 participants, 518 (or 66.67%) identified as Hindu, 231 (or 29.72%) as Muslim, and 28 (or 3.60%) as members of various tiny Christian and Shiksi groups.

Table 1: The Educational Attainments of Respondents Categorised By Their Religion

Res.Edu 4 4· Res. Rel.	Illiterate	Primary education or functional Literacy	High School	high School	Higher secondary	Graduate	G/ P D/R. D	total
Hindu	7	32	25	73	90	226	65	518
	1 35%	6 18%	4 83%	1409%	17 37%	43 63%	12 54%	66 67%
Muslim	36	66	9	41	31	30	18	231

	15 58%	28 57%	3 89%	17 74%	13 41%	12 98%	7 79%	29 72%
Others	0	0	0	9	6	10	3	28
				32 14%	21 42%	35 71%	10 71%	3 60%
Total	43	98	34	123	127	266	86	
.	5 53%	12 61%	4 37%	15 83%	16 34%	34 23%	11 07%	777

Determination of x^2 using data in table 1

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	184.182a	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	182.838	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	27.370	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	777		

is statistically significant with 12 degrees of freedom at the.05 level.

Of the 777 participants, 43 (or 5.53%) were illiterate. 98 (12.61% of the total) had finished elementary school or functional literacy. 34 (4.37% of the total) had finished middle school. 123 (15.83%) had finished high school. 127 (16.34%) had finished higher secondary education. 266 (34.23% of the total) had graduated. And 86 (11.07% of the total), including the three with research degrees, had postgraduate or professional degrees.

In a population of 518 Hindus, accounting for 66.67 percent of the total, there were 7 illiterates (1.35 percent), 32 with only elementary school or functional literacy, 25 with 4.83% middle school completion, 73 with 14.09% high school completion, 90 with 17.37% higher secondary completion, 226 with 43.63% graduation, and 65 with 12.54% research or postgraduate degrees. All three of the research degree holders were Hindus.

Of the 231 Muslims who made up the 29.72% of the population, 36 (15.58%) were illiterate, 66 (28.57%) had only completed primary or functional literacy, 9 (3.89%) had finished middle school, 41 (17.74%) had finished high school, 31 (13.4%) had finished higher secondary education, 30 (12.98%) had graduated, and 18 (3.7%) had postgraduate or professional degrees.

The other twenty-eight people included both Christians and Sikhs, and every single one of them had a high school graduation or above. Their degree levels were as follows: nine (32.14%), six (21.42%), ten (35.71%), and three (10.71%) held advanced degrees.

Among men in Bagalkot's urban regions, this data reveals that 43 (or 5.53%) were illiterate when they were 18 years old. There was no illiteracy among the other respondents (including Christians and Sikhs), but 98.64% of Hindus and 84.32% of Muslims were literate; in comparison, 1.35% of Muslims and 15.58% of Christians were illiterate. Hindus had the largest share of graduates at 43.62%, followed by others at 35.71%, and Muslims at a dismal 12.99%. Hindus also had the largest percentage of those with doctorates, master's degrees, and other advanced degrees, as well as those who had conducted research.

At least 8 years of primary school education was completed by 81.86% of the people in our sample. On the other hand, this percentage was 92.47%, which was in the middle of the pack, while it was 100% among "others" and 56.85% among Muslims. As a result, overall, Muslims had the lowest levels of education, Hindus the highest, and others somewhere in the middle. There is evidence from the results of the chi-square test indicate that the null hypothesis is false, suggesting that religious affiliation influences academic success. Muslims are at a disadvantage in this area, whilst Hindus have the highest rates of educational advancement and minor religious groups fall somewhere in the center.

Education and Category of the Respondents

Table 2 shows the distribution of respondents according to their educational background and category.

The following breakdown of the 777 respondents is shown in the table: 567 (or 72.97%) were from the general group, 96 (12.35%) were from the OBC/MOBC category, 100 (12.87%) were from the SC category, and 14 (1.87%) were from the ST category of the 567 people who said they were from the general category, 72.97% couldn't read or write, 72.69% could only read and write at a basic level, 18.17% had finished middle school, 13.22% had finished high school, 14.46% had finished higher secondary, 35.62% were graduates, and 14.28% had postgraduate or professional degrees, including 3 with research degrees.

Table 2: The Respondents' Education Distribution By Category

R Edu. 4 4	Illiterate	Primary; education or Functional Literacy	High School	High School	Higher Secondary	Graduate	/G'cl/D	lEt0I
R Caste								
Gen.	37	72	18	75	82	202	81	567
	6.52%	12.69%	3.17%	13.22%	14.46%	35.62%	14.28%	72.97%
OBC/	0	18	9	13	12	43	1	96
MOBC		18.75%	9.37%	13.54%	12.5%	44.79%	1.04%	12.35%
SC	6	8	7	32	25	18	4	100
	6%	8%	7%	32%	25%	18%	4%	12.87%
ST	0	0	0	3	8	3	0	14
				21.42%	57.14%	21.42%		1.80%
Total	43	98	34	123	127	266	86	777
	5.53%	12.61%	4.37%	15,83%	16.34%	34.23%	11.07%	

Determine x^2 using the data in table 2.

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	95.373a	18	.000
Likelihood Ratio	102.231	18	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.637	1	.031
N of Valid Cases	777		

Using 18 degrees of freedom, it is significant at the.05 level.
One hundred and ninety-three people (12.35%) in the OBC/MOBC group reported different degrees of education: Of them, 18 (18.75%) had merely a primary or functional literacy certificate, while 9 (9.37%) had a middle school diploma., 13 (13.54%) had completed high school, 12 (12.5%) had completed higher secondary, 43 (44.79%) had graduated, and 1 (1.04%) had postgraduate or professional degrees.
Six percent of the 100 SC category respondents were illiterate, eight percent had completed elementary school or functional literacy, seven percent had completed middle school, eighteen percent had graduated, and four percent had advanced degrees. The overall percentage of SC category respondents was twelve percent.
Out of 14 responses (1.80% of the total), 3(21.42%) were high school graduates, 8 of them (57.14%), had finished their junior year of high school, and 3(21.42%) had a bachelor's degree or above.

Respondents' And Fathers' Education

According to the level of education held by the respondents' dads, the educational attainments of the respondents are shown in Table 3.
According to the table, 204 out of 777 participants (or 26.25%) came from a home where neither of the parents could read or write. At least one parent in another 47 households had finished basic school or was functionally literate, making up 6.05% of the total. Among the individuals who were born into these households, 65 (or 8.36%) had parents with a bachelor's degree, 251 (or 32.31%) had a high school diploma, 55 (or 7.08% of the parents' education level), 119 (or 15.35%) had parents with a master's, doctorate, or doctorate degree, and 36 (or 4.65% of the total) were born into these households with at least one parent having earned such a degree.
A quarter of the 204 fathers who were illiterate, 37(18.14%) had boys who were also uneducated, while 80(39.2%) had sons who had completed basic school or were functionally literate. Thirty-one (or 14.70%) had boys who had completed high school, whereas eleven (or 5.39%) had sons who had completed middle school. Twenty-three (11.27% of the total) had boys with a bachelor's degree or above, nineteen (9.31%) had sons with master's degrees or above, and four (1.96% of the total) had sons with doctoral or higher degrees:

Table 3: The Educational Attainments of the Respondents Are Distributed According to the level of Education Their Fathers Had.

F. Edu. 4 4· R Edu.	Illiterate	Primary Education or Functional Literacy	Middle School	High School	Higher Secondary	Graduate	G·11/(I'd /9'd	Total
Illiterate	37	80	11	30	23	19	4	204
	18.14%	39.21%	5.39%	14.70%	11.27%	9.31%	1.96%	26.25%
Primary								
Education/		5	9	11	7	15		47
Functional	0	10.63%	19.14%	23.40%	14.89%	31.91%	0	6.05%
Literacy								
Middle	6	12	2	16	15	8	6	65
School	9.23%	18.46%	3.07%	24.61%	23.07%	12.30%	9.23%	8.36%
High School	0	1	12	60	49	102	27	251
		0.39%	4.78%	23.90%	19.52%	40.63%	10.75%	32.31%
Higher	0	0	0	3	16	29	7	55
Secondary				5.45%	29.09%	52.72%	12.72%	7.08%
	0	0	0	3	17	78	21	119
Graduate				2.52%	14.28%	65.55%	17.64%	15.31%
P.G/P. D/	0	0	0	0	0	15	21	36
R. D						41.66%	58.33%	4.63%
Total	43	98	34	**123**	127	266	86	777
	5.53%	12.61%	4.37%	15.83%	16.34%	34.23%	11.07%	

Finding x^2 using the data in table 3.

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	538.222a	36	.000
Likelihood Ratio	554.587	36.000	
Linear-by-Linear Association	339.919	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	777		

a: statistically significant with 36 degrees of freedom at the.05 level.

Five (10.63%) of the 47 dads who had completed basic school or were functionally literate themselves had kids who had done the same. Nineteen percent (19.14%) of the sons had completed middle school, eleven percent (23.40%) had completed high school, fourteen percent (14.89%) had completed postsecondary education, and fifteen percent (31.91%) had completed college. Out of the 65 fathers, (8.36%) who had completed middle school, 6(9.23%) had

boys who were illiterate, 12(18.46%) had sons who had completed elementary school or functional literacy, boys had finished middle school for 2 (or 3.07%) of the families. Among the sons, sixteen (or 24.61%) had just finished high school, fifteen (or 23.07%) had attended some college, eight (or 12.30%) had a bachelor's degree or higher, and six (or 9.23%) had no degree at all had earned a master's or doctorate.

None of the 251 (or 32.31% of the total) boys whose dads had completed high school had any degree of education below that of a primary school graduate or were illiterate. One son (0.39%) had only completed elementary school or functional literacy, twelve (4.78%) had completed middle school, sixty (23.90%) had completed high school, fifty-nine (19.52%) had completed higher secondary education, one hundred and ten (40.63%) had completed bachelor's degree programs, and twenty-seven (3.47%) had completed master's or doctoral programs.

Out of 55 fathers who had completed secondary education, 7.08% did not have any sons who had completed high school. Among those who did have sons, 5.45% had those individuals holding a high school diploma, 2.06% holding a diploma from an advanced secondary school, 29 holding a bachelor's degree or above, and 5.72% holding a master's degree master's or doctorate. Three of the seven post-graduate and professional graduates (or 42.85%) had sons who went on to get doctorates. Three sons (2.52%) had only a high school diploma, seventeen (14.28%) had completed secondary school, eighty-five (65.55%) had earned bachelor's degrees, and twenty-one (17.64%) had master's or doctoral degrees. This means that none of the sons of the 119 fathers who had earned a graduate degree had an education below that of a high school graduate.

None of the offspring of Only 36 fathers (4.63%) with a master's or doctorate degree in postgraduate or professional research really had a bachelor's degree or less. Fifteen dads (41.68%) had sons who had completed bachelor's degrees, while twenty-one dads (58.33%) had sons who had completed master's degrees. Among the 777 respondents, 219 (28.18%) remained educationally stationary, indicating no educational mobility; 53 (6.82%) moved downwards, indicating lower educational attainments than their fathers; and 505 (64.9%) moved upwards, indicating higher educational attainments than their fathers.

Education of the respondents' and their mother

Table 4. displays the distribution of respondents' educational attainments based on their mother's level of education.

Among the 777 respondents, 340 (or 43.64 percent) were sons of mothers who were illiterate, as can be seen from the table. Among the sons of mothers with functional literacy at the primary school level, 71 (9.14%) were found. Among the sons of these mothers, 109 (14.02% of the total) had only completed middle school, 167 (21.49% of the total) had completed high school, 25 (3.21% of the total) had completed secondary school and beyond, out of the total, 62 individuals, or 7.97%, had earned a graduate degree, while 3 individuals, or 0.38%, had earned a postgraduate, professional, or research degree.

Of the 340 illiterate moms (43.75 percent), 43 also had illiterate sons. Of these, 90 (26.47%) had at least one son who had completed elementary school or functional literacy, 25 (7.35%) had one who had finished middle school, 70 (20.58%) had one who had finished high school, 50 (14.70%) had one who had finished higher secondary, 45 (13.23%) had one who had graduated, and 17 (5%).

Table 4: Index of respondents' education by the education of their mothers.

M Edu 40 R. Edu.	Illiterate	Primary Education or Functional Literacy	Middle School	100143S	Higher Secondary	Graduate	CI'll /CI'd/0'd	Total
	43	90	25	70	50	45	17	340
Illiterate	12.64%	26.47%	7.35%	20.58%	14.70%	13.23%	5%	43.75%
Primary								
Education/			3	14	16	32	6	71
Functional	0	0	4.22%	19.72%	22.53%	45.07%	8.45%	9.14%
Literacy								
Middle	0	6	3	20	20	56	4	109
School		5.50%	2.75%	18.35%	18.35%	51.38%	3.67%	14.02%
High School	0	2	3	19	33	81	29	167
		1.19%	1.79%	11.38%	19.76%	48.50%	17.36%	21.49%
Higher	0	0	0	0	5	13	7	25
Secondary					20%	52%	28%	3.21%
Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	39	23	62
						62.90%	37.09%	7.97%
P.G/P. D/	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
R. D					100%			0.38%
Total	43	98	34	123	127	266	86	777
	5.53%	12.61%	4.37%	15.83%	16.34%	34.23%	11.07%	

Finding x^2 using the data in table 4.

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	363.786[a]	36	.000
Likelihood Ratio	416.774	36	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	241.706	I	.000
N of Valid Cases	777		

with 36 degrees of freedom, a: statistically significant at the.05 level.

None of the 71 moms (9.14%) who reported having completed elementary school or functional reading had a level of education lower than that of a middle school graduate. 3 boys (4.22% of the total) had completed middle school, 14 boys (19.22%) had completed high school, 16 boys (22.53% of the total) had completed upper secondary education, 32 boys (45.07% of the total) had graduated from college, and 6 boys (8.45% of the total) had completed postgraduate or professional degrees.

None of the 109 moms (or 14.02%) who reported having a secondary education or above had less than a basic school diploma as well as functional literacy. Three sons (2.75% of the total) had completed middle school, and six (5.50% of the total) had completed elementary school or were functionally literate. Out of the total number of boys, 20 (18.35%) had completed high school, 20 (18.35%) had completed upper secondary, 56 (51.35%) had graduated, and 4 (3.67%) had completed postgraduate or professional studies. Among the 167 moms who had completed high school, or 21.49 percent of the total, not a single one had completed elementary school or was illiterate. 2 boys (1.19% of the total) had completed elementary school or functional literacy, 3 boys (1.79% of the total) had completed middle school, 19 boys (11.38% of the total) had completed high school, 33 boys (19.76%) had completed higher secondary education, 81 boys (48.50%) had graduated from college, and 29 boys (17.36%) had earned master's or doctoral degrees in business, computer science, or a related field. (From a pool of 29 advanced degree and professional A total of three sons (10.34%) received doctoral degrees.

Out of the 25 moms who reported having a higher secondary education, 3.21 percent had no children with a lower level of education; 5.2 percent had boys who had completed high school; 5.3 percent had sons who had completed college; and 7.2 percent had sons who had completed graduate school. Out of the 62 moms who graduated (7.97%), no one had a degree below that. Of the 39 sons who graduated (62.9%), 23 had sons who earned master's degrees or above (31.09%). Out of the three mothers (0.38 percent) who have master's or doctoral degrees, all three of their boys have completed high school. Looking at the data in the table, we can see that out of 777 respondents, 109 (14.02%) were educationally stationary, meaning they had no change in their educational attainments compared to their mother. Similarly, 14 (1.8%) had a decrease in educational mobility compared to their mother, meaning they had downward mobility. Upward educational mobility was experienced by 654 respondent's 84.17 percent), whose educational level was higher than that of their moms.

Conclusion

A diversified population with a broad variety of educational levels is revealed when comparing this country to others, even though the absolute rate of educational mobility has been rather high. The most significant implication of the aforementioned findings is that education encourages upward social mobility. A person's religious affiliation, the kind of patents they own, and the educational, professional, and financial status of their grandparents all have an impact on their children's academic performance in addition to their fathers' success in the workplace. In general, Muslims have the lowest degree of education whereas Hindus have the highest. Although it is not the sole one, education is one of the most important factors in human cultures that contributes to the progress of people from lower castes. Social inequality is a direct cause of differences in educational opportunities, which further restricts the choices open to those who are already at a disadvantage.

References

1. Marginson S. Higher education, economic inequality and social mobility: Implications for emerging East Asia. International Journal of Educational Development. 2018;63:4–11. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.03.002.
2. Yang J, Qiu M. The impact of education on income inequality and intergenerational mobility. China Economic Review. 2016;37:110–125. doi:10.1016/j.chieco.2015.12.009.
3. Kearney M, Levine P. Income inequality, social mobility, and the decision to drop out of high school. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity. 2016;2016(1):333–396. doi:10.1353/eca.2016.0017.
4. Rauscher E, Elliott W. The effect of wealth inequality on higher education outcomes: A critical review. Sociology Mind. 2014;4(4):282–297. doi:10.4236/sm.2014.44029.
5. Sommet N, Claes N, Elliot A. Economic inequality and student outcomes: What we know and where to go from here. Motivation Science. 2024;10(1):1–16. doi:10.1037/mot0000335.
6. Torraco R. Economic inequality, educational inequity, and reduced career opportunity: A self-perpetuating cycle? New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development. 2018;30(1):19–29. doi:10.1002/nha3.20206.
7. Akram S, Pervaiz Z, Chaudhary A. The impact of income inequality and intergenerational mobility on human development: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development. 2021;12(12):263–268.
8. Neidhöfer G, Ciaschi M, Gasparini L, Serrano J. Social mobility and economic development. Journal of Economic Growth. 2024;29:1–28. doi:10.1007/s10887-023-09234-8.
9. Browman A, Destin M, Kearney M, Levine P. How economic inequality shapes mobility expectations and behaviour in disadvantaged youth. Nature Human Behaviour. 2019;3:214–220. doi:10.1038/s41562-018-0523-0.
10. Blanden J, Doepke M, Stuhler J. Educational inequality. arXiv preprint. 2022. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2204.04701.
11. Olupona T. The impact of education on income inequality. Unpublished manuscript. 2023.
12. Fifeková E, Nezinsky E, Valachová A. Social mobility as an income inequality determinant. DANUBE: Law and Economics Review. 2022;13(3):226–239. doi:10.2478/danb-2022-0014.
13. Munir J, Faiza M, Daud S. The impact of socio-economic status on academic achievement. Journal of Social Sciences Review. 2023;3(2):695–705.

doi:10.54183/jssr.v3i2.308.
14. Borgonovi F, Marconi G. Inequality in higher education: Why did expanding access not reduce skill inequality? Open Education Studies. 2020;2(1):312–343. doi:10.1515/edu-2020-0110.
15. Mitnik P, Cumberworth E, Grusky D. Social mobility in a high-inequality regime. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 2016;663(1):140–184. doi:10.1177/0002716215596971.
16. Emran MS, Shilpi F. The extent of the market and stages of agricultural specialization. Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique. 2012;45(3):1125-1153.