

# Accounting for Unequal Academic Performance: Government and Private School Students in Dire Dawa, Ethiopia

**ABDULFETAH MOHAMMED and MIKYAS ABERA**

**Abstract:** Parental socioeconomic status, residence, gender, and type of school, among others, have been identified to affect students' academic performance. This article aims at explaining the effects of cultural, economic, and social capital on the academic performance of students attending government and private preparatory schools in Dire Dawa city, Ethiopia. Employing Bourdieu's analytical framework of cultural capital, it interprets and reports empirical data gathered through desk review, survey, key informant interview (KII), and focus group discussion (FGD), and draws conclusions between students' inherited background and academic performance in government and private schools. The article reports that parents of private school students had significantly better cultural, economic, and social capitals that correspond with their children's superior academic performances compared to parents of government school students. On the other hand, private schools reportedly had strong academic orientation, provided quality education, and actively involved parents in supervising and supporting children's education. With better school organization and management that provides quality education, effective learning facilities, supervision, and support to students of well-to-do families, private-schools are not only ensuring better academic outcomes for these children but also arguably conceal the functional correspondence between inherited privileges and academic performance and play potent transliteration function for cultural reproduction of privileged groups.

**Keywords:** cultural capital, schools, academic performance, Ethiopia

## Introduction

Education is an important factor in a nation's development as it represents the acquisition of knowledge and skills that enhance productivity, economic growth, and better life chances.<sup>1</sup> For individuals, education, as an institutionalized means of cultivating skills and competencies, is a major avenue of social mobility.<sup>2</sup> To serve this modern ideal, equality of educational opportunities

**Abdulfetah Mohammed** is Lecturer of Sociology at Jigjiga University, Ethiopia. His research interests include education, migration, urbanization and globalization.

**Mikyias Abera** is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Gondar, Ethiopia. His research interests include education, gender, science, urbanization, institutional change and community-based rehabilitation.

<https://asq.africa.ufl.edu/files/V21i1a3.pdf>

should be ensured for students of diverse socioeconomic, cultural, etc. backgrounds. Mainstream positivistic approaches such as structural functionalism argue that modern education/schools operate with the principle of universalism that does not discriminate against students based on their social origin.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, differential access, performance, or outcomes in education reflect students' inequalities in talent, academic caliber, or interests. On the other hand, critical theorists argue that modern schools are not neutral institutions but subtle tools of cultural reproduction.<sup>4</sup>

This article draws on the works of critical theorists, mainly Bourdieu and Passeron, i.e., the analytical construct of cultural capital.<sup>5</sup> Bourdieu and Passeron deployed the concept of cultural capital to examine the roles modern education systems plays in the production and reproduction of social structures. Cultural capital refers to cultural skills, dispositions, and competencies whose mastery enable possessors to access societal resources with exclusive rights, privileges, and better life chances.<sup>6</sup>

Bourdieu saw the school system as a 'field,' i.e., a structured social space tasked with learning where actors enter, strategize, and struggle over the distribution of a particular type of valued resource—cultural capital. These actors also compete on how to structure the school system, and what its functions and values should be. For Bourdieu, school structure, values, and functions primarily reflect the values and interests of the dominant group in society.<sup>7</sup> By aligning the school values with its values, especially in how it screens and rewards achievement, Bourdieu argues that the dominant group creates a system through which its young take advantage of and translate their social origin into better educational outcomes.<sup>8</sup> This functional correspondence has been documented in various settings.<sup>9</sup> In contrast, subalterns enter the school system from a position of disadvantage with limited social, economic or cultural capitals. Low parental valuation, interest, and ability to support education negatively influence their children's learning experience and outcomes.<sup>10</sup> Conversely, parents in the dominant group have positive valuation, attitude, and interest in education and they are better educated, resourceful, and networked—with a better understanding of dynamics in the education system—to effectively cultivate their children's values, attitudes, and investment that promote better educational experience and outcomes.<sup>11</sup>

Intergenerational transmission of cultural capital, however, is not automatic. It requires long-term investments and nurturing—through either exposure to cultural capital or deliberate efforts of tutoring, mentoring, and active social learning, etc. that will ultimately embed parents' cultural capital in children's psyche, language, and mannerisms. Moreover, not only cultural capital but its correlate 'habitus'—a set of attitudes and values that define one's worldviews, behaviors, etc.—is acquired and maintained through intergenerational transmission within the family. In schools, the dominant habitus is the habitus of the dominant group, and both share a habitus that values discipline, respect of authority, positive valuation of education, active educational participation, and educational investment, etc.<sup>12</sup> Ultimately, families with substantial cultural capital enable their children to join schools prepared and equipped with favorable attitude and values, qualities that schools value and reward with better scores or grades.

Such a view is critical of the role schools play in social stratification. Specifically, schools are not neutral institutions that employ universalistic criteria to screen and reward students' talents

and cultivate cultural capital. It argues that it is untenable to expect that schools ‘pedagogically’ cultivate cultural capital among students who did not inherit it from their parents.<sup>13</sup> Against this analytical and empirical backdrop, hence, this study aimed at exploring how Ethiopian schools—government versus private schools—create differential access to valued cultural resources for children of parents with unequal cultural capital. Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital provides the framework to interpret the findings and reflect on the role of schooling in promoting education and social equality.

*The Ethiopian Education System: Continuities and Discontinuities*

Eighty percent of the Ethiopian populace reside in rural areas with limited access to infrastructure and social amenities. Agriculture employs the majority of the labor force and social stratification reflect differential access to land, capital, and posts in the technocratic bureaucracy.<sup>14</sup> For most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, education played second fiddle to these sources of power, status and privilege. Since the 1960s, the national relevance of education has been increasingly recognized. Nonetheless, public and private investment, student enrolment, infrastructural development, etc. remained limited.<sup>15</sup> It was not a surprise, hence, that the 1972 Education Sector Review (ESR), the first comprehensive education assessment, reads like an appalling review of a system (initiated in 1908) rife with problems of relevance, access, efficiency, and quality. Education was far from being equally accessible and the curricula at all levels lacked relevance to the predominantly agrarian population and economy.<sup>16</sup> It was only after the 1974 socialist revolution that the new government (The Dergue, 1974-91) managed to implement some of the recommendations of the 1972 ESR. The Dergue prioritized and launched a UNESCO-recognized mass literacy program investing in adult and primary education.<sup>17</sup> Nonetheless, the overall system, its curricula, and performance remained more or less similar to its predecessors in the pre-1974 period.

An overview of priorities, goals, strategies, and programs of the post-1991 Education and Training Policy (ETP) reveals a close reading of the problems of the educational system as identified in the ESR decades ago.<sup>18</sup> The policy particularly links with the government’s poverty reduction strategies and was subsequently translated into successive Education Sector Development Programs (ESDP I-IV, 1995-2015), which outlined strategies and activities to expand opportunities for schooling, human capital development, institutional change, and empowerment. Specifically, the ESDP identified, among others, roles for the private sector to improve education access, relevance, quality, accessibility, and efficiency.<sup>19</sup> These changes brought large-scale diversification in the education system including the increasing involvement of private providers, which aroused the interest of researchers to explore the effects of varying school environments on students’ academic and performance outcomes.<sup>20</sup>

While non-school factors—e.g., community attitude, parental socioeconomic status, etc.—impact students’ experience and outcomes, studies also documented the importance of school factors, i.e., school organization and management, curricula, diversity, and environment.<sup>21</sup> Government, public, church, or private schools avail contrasting scenarios, opportunities, and challenges to students that may not exist in other types of schools. For instance, different types of schools may use different standards of appropriate class size and teacher-student ratio, organizational and management systems, etc. that represent important institutional/school

factors that bear on students' learning outcomes and they significantly overlap in Ethiopia.<sup>22</sup> Government schools have higher class sizes and teacher-student ratios as well as disproportionately many students performing unfavorably in national standardized examinations compared to private schools.<sup>23</sup> Public schools, historically community financed and run, were merged with the government school system in 1995 and lost their distinctiveness. Church-run secular schools are very few and are mostly found in Addis Ababa, making the Ethiopian educational landscape consist primarily of government and private schools. For all practical purposes, policy and public discourses treat church schools as private schools.

The ETP identifies basic standards of curricula, facilities, and personnel that any school must meet before accepting students. But private schools tend to enrich the basic standards with modifications, among others; introducing English as a medium of instruction before grade 9; designing additional subjects/courses, mostly language courses on *Ge'ez*, French, or Arabic; and, implementing interactive and engaging activities such as tutorials and field visits. Consequently, private schools usually have a student-centered approach, better library and laboratory facilities, and higher parental involvement in school affairs.<sup>24</sup>

Private schools, compared to government schools, are usually selective in their admission process and have smaller class sizes as only a minority of parents can afford their tuition and fees. Private school enrollment is also a response to parents' dissatisfaction with public schools performance.<sup>25</sup> Studies found evidence to support the beliefs of parents, policymakers, and the interested public that private schools are not only better equipped and better resources but also academically stronger to offer children better learning opportunities and outcomes.<sup>26</sup> In addition to the student-centered approach, academic and non-academic resources, primarily more learning time and teacher attention, students generally achieve better in private schools.<sup>27</sup> Private schools resources and student support, on the other hand, benefit both high and low ability students, which is very difficult to accomplish in government schools where classes are managed in shifts and teachers' attention to students' academic progress is affected by the size of the student population.

Private schools recruit teachers who they engage intensely and motivate with better than government-rate salaries. They are comparatively small in size, i.e., smaller class-size and the lower pupil-teacher ratio.<sup>28</sup> This allows them to better manage the learning environment, support students, and engage parents in school plans and activities, which improves students' learning outcomes.<sup>29</sup> In light of this, the interactional effects of type of school and parental socioeconomic status (and involvement) on students' academic performance has to be researched. Since the school system provides the institutional framework that broadly defines the parameters of learners' experience and outcome, exploring the relationship between parental socioeconomic status (cultural and economic capitals in particular), on the one hand, and student's academic performance in government- and private-schools, on the other, has a policy and developmental significance.<sup>30</sup> Specifically, its findings would shed light on the current government-school versus private-school debates in terms of differential students learning outcomes and the possible bearings on (in-)equality of educational opportunities vis-à-vis structural inequalities among families.

The Ethiopian education system is structured into five levels.<sup>31</sup> Pre-primary contains formative curricula for children aged six and below. Primary education (cycle-I: grades 1-4;

cycle-II: grades 5-8) starts at age seven. General secondary education runs for two years (grades 9-10), and the ETP requires all students to sit for the Ethiopian General Secondary Education Certification Examination (EGSECE) after grade 10. At this stage, the policy uses curriculum tracking—based on scores on the EGSECE—to enroll students in either Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET: levels 1-5) or College Preparatory Program (CPP: grades 11-12). Tertiary education provides training towards bachelor's, master's, doctoral, and specialty programs, and to join these institutions, students must pass through the CPP and meet the required score on the Ethiopian Higher Education Entrance Certification Examination (EHEECE) after grade 12.

### *Study Setting*

Dire Dawa is located 515 km southeast of Addis Ababa. The city was founded in 1902 as one of the connections in the Ethio-Djibouti railway. The 2015 population of Dire Dawa was approximately 440,000, with 63 percent living in the city and the remaining 37 percent inhabiting the rural *kebeles*. In 2016, the literacy level for Dire Dawa residents was 80-90 percent among males and 70 percent among females.<sup>32</sup> Seventy-six percent of the total adult population was deemed economically active. A quintessential commercial center, the city employs the majority of its residents in trade and commerce with fewer people working as professionals, technicians, and civil servants.<sup>33</sup> In 2011, the top 20 percent of households contributed 4.01 times as much in expenditures as the lowest 20 percent of households.<sup>34</sup> Typical of chartered cities, Dire Dawa inhabitants are diverse in their ethnicity (Oromo, Somali, Amhara, and Gurage, among others) and religious affiliations (Islam and Christianity).

In 2016, Dire Dawa had 104 kindergarten (63 percent government), 113 primary (64 percent government), and 21 secondary (48 percent government) schools. This makes Dire Dawa one of the three cities (along with Harari and Addis Ababa) where the number of non-government schools is higher than government-schools.<sup>35</sup> Not all secondary schools have CPPs (grades 11 and 12). In 2017, there were only three government and six private schools with CPPs.<sup>36</sup>

## **Methods and Procedures**

### *Study Design*

This study employed a cross-sectional design and focused on college preparatory students, their parents, teachers, school counselors, and directors at four schools in Dire Dawa city. A mixed-method approach collected data through document review, survey, key informant interviews (KII), and focus group discussions (FGD). A blended approach is used to present, analyze, and interpret results and draw insights about students' educational experiences and outcomes in government and private schools. Further large-scale studies are needed that compare different parts of the country over time.

### *Sampling*

From three government and six private preparatory schools found in Dire Dawa city, we selected two government (Dire Dawa Comprehensive Secondary School [D] and Sabian Secondary School [S]) and two private (Addis Hiwot School [A] and Notre Dame School [N])

preparatory schools of similar sizes. We specifically covered preparatory students (grades 11-12) in these four schools. Fieldwork was conducted between May and June 2017.

There were 3261 preparatory students in the four schools. We excluded students who transferred to a different type of school after writing their EGSECE to control for the effects of school type on academic performance. Using probabilistic sampling procedure for a single population formula, we randomly selected a sample of 346 students and determined proportionate to size subsamples for each school.<sup>37</sup> In each school, we conducted KIIs with directors and FGDs with parents, school counselors and teachers. KII and FGD participants were selected for their knowledge, expertise and experience with learning experiences and outcomes.

### *Data Collection*

We used self-administered questionnaire with open and close ended items for the survey. Through the questionnaire, we gathered information on respondents' basic profile, family background, parental and school support and involvement in education and academic performance. Questionnaire response rate was 100 percent as it was administered in classrooms. We designed KIIs and FGDs guides to facilitate discussion and gather detailed and contextual data on school culture, educational support, parent-school interactions, etc. During KIIs and FGDs, we probed and encouraged participants to expand on their views and opinions and/or establish understanding or consensus on themes under discussion.

### *Data organization, Presentation and Analysis*

Questionnaires were converted into datasets by entering each students' responses on close-ended items into SPSS (v.20), which were then cleaned and prepared for statistical analysis. For open-ended questionnaire items, we post-coded and thematized, and entered responses into SPSS as numeric variables. We entered much of the survey data directly into SPSS and used them in advanced statistical procedures and tests. There were two exceptions however. Data on parental education and occupation were, however, collected at ordinal level i.e., each parent's 'highest grade completed,' with response categories of 'can't read or write,' 'read-and-write only,' 'grades 1-4,' etc. To increase its statistical power, we transformed the ordinal survey data on parental education into 'number of years of schooling' using Bennett's formula of approximation.<sup>38</sup> Finally, to account for both parents' education, we averaged maternal and paternal years of schooling into a single numeric value for each respondent (see Table 1).

Similarly, we collected survey data on parental occupation (main current or last economic engagement) as a nominal variable. During data organization, we assigned each parents' occupations with corresponding International Socioeconomic Index (ISEI) Occupational Status scores—a widely validated scoring procedure.<sup>39</sup> For each respondent, we estimated their parents' occupational status by averaging for maternal and paternal ISEI occupational scores, which upgraded occupational data from nominal to scale variable (see Table 2) and permitted the use of high-precision statistical procedures.

Table 1. Table of approximation for parental years of formal schooling

Parental educational attainment	App. years of schooling (Bennett 2011)	Preparatory school sector		Total
		Government (m+f)	Private (m+f)*	
		(n (%))	(n (%))	(n (%))
Illiterate	0	22 (6.4)	10 (2.9)	32 (4.6)
Read and write	1	32 (9.2)	13 (3.8)	45 (6.5)
Primary 1-4	2.5	41 (11.8)	21 (6.1)	62 (8.9)
Primary 5-8	6.5	60 (17.3)	33 (9.5)	93 (13.4)
Secondary 9-10	9.5	53 (15.3)	37 (10.7)	90 (13.0)
Preparatory 11-12	11.5	56 (16.2)	53 (15.3)	109 (15.8)
Certificate and Diploma	13.5	36 (10.4)	78 (22.5)	114 (16.5)
Bachelors' degree	16	32 (9.2)	60 (17.3)	92 (13.3)
Masters' degree	18	9 (2.6)	31 (8.9)	40 (6.4)
PhD degree and above	20	5 (1.4)	10 (2.9)	15 (2.2)
<b>Total</b>		<b>346 (100)</b>	<b>346 (100)</b>	<b>692 (100)</b>

\*The frequencies (and percentages) are combined observations for mothers (m) and fathers (f) under the respective response categories.

(Source: Survey 2017)

Table 2. Parental occupational status and their corresponding ISEI status scores

Occupational categories	ISEI code	ISEI score	Preparatory school	
			Private=n	Government=n
<b>Fathers' occupation</b>				
Unemployed	0000	00	3	14
Businessman/Manager	1230	67	57	53
Doctor/Engineer	2200	78	15	3
University/College lecturer	2300	78	2	1
School teacher	2300	70	10	13
Auditor/Accountant	2400	69	2	1
Judge	2420	90	3	0
Priest/Religious leader	2460	55	1	0
Civil servant, police	3400	49	32	45
Operator	4000	32	0	1
Security-guard, Solider	5160	39	1	2
Farmer, pastoralist	6000	22	2	6
Mechanic, Tailor, Driver	7230	34	20	4
Daily laborer	9160	22	2	14
<b>Total</b>			<b>150</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>Mothers' occupation</b>				
Unemployed, housewife	0000	00	79	92
Businesswoman, manager	1230	67	40	36
Doctor, engineer	2200	78	0	1
Health officer	2230	43	1	0
University/College lecturer	2300	78	1	1
School teacher	2300	70	10	4
Accountant	2400	69	2	0
Civil servant	3400	49	13	16
Service workers	5000	40	4	0
Farmer	6000	26	0	1
Daily laborer	9160	22	1	2
<b>Total</b>			<b>151</b>	<b>153</b>

(Source: Survey, 2017)

We used descriptive (frequencies and percentages) and inferential (independent sample t-tests and correlations) statistical procedures to describe and establish probable relationships pertaining to the research questions. We transcribed audio-recorded KIIs and FGDs, and we thematically organized qualitative narratives under: (a) parental cultural capital and education support; and (b) the role of schools in academic outcomes.

In the spirit of mixed methods approach, we integrated qualitative narratives with quantitative results as interpretations and explanations. In presenting views and opinions from KIIs and FGDs, we used codes that describe their profile and sources: *Sex*: M, F; *School-sector*: Govt, Pvt; *Name of school*: D, S, A, N; *Role*: T, P; *Data-source*: KII, FGD; *Date*: May, June 2017. For instance, quoting a narrative from an FGD conducted at Notre Dame School where a male teacher talked about the relevance of parental support in schooling, we used the following code: M, Govt, N, T: June 2017.

## Results

### *Respondents' Socio-demographic and Schooling Profile*

As Table 3 reports, mean ages of the 346 government and private school students were 17.9 and 17.5 years, respectively. Forty-nine percent (n=167) were males. Respondents were 45 percent from grade 11 and 55 percent from grade 12. The distribution of respondents was proportionate to the student population in each school: 77 at Dire Dawa Secondary School (D), 102 at Sabian Secondary School (S), 91 at Addis Hiwot School (A), and 74 at Notre Dame School (N).

**Table 3. Summary of the study participants' profiles**

Participants' profile	Preparatory school				Total, or Mean
	Government		Private		
	Dire Dawa (D)	Sabian (S)	Addis Hiwot (A)	Notre Dame (N)	
Age ( $\bar{x}$ )	18.04	17.84	17.55	17.51	17.72
	17.92		17.53		
Sex					
Boys ( $\bar{x}$ )	44	43	42	38	167
Girls ( $\bar{x}$ )	30	59	49	36	174
Grade 11 (n)	27	43	42	40	152
Grade 12 (n)	47	59	50	38	194
Grade 10 CGPA ( $\bar{x}$ )	3.26	3.14	3.30	3.68	3.33

(Source: Survey, 2017)

Table 4 shows that on the EGSECE ( $t = -7.067$ ;  $p < .001$ ) government school students performed (CGPA, 3.19;  $s = .36$ ) significantly lower than those in private schools (CGPA, 3.47;  $s = .36$ ). The standard deviation of .36 for both government and private school students indicates the similarity in the distribution of CGPAs within the respective respondents' sub-groups.

**Table 4. Students' EGSECE scores i.e. CGPA by preparatory school**

Measurements and tests	Preparatory school	
	Government	Private
Grade 10 CGPA ( $\bar{x}$ )	3.19	3.47
Std. Deviation (s)	.36	.37
t-value	-7.067	
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

(Source: Survey, 2017)



### Parental Socioeconomic Status

The literature establishes parental socioeconomic status as a significant correlate of students' educational outcomes.<sup>40</sup> Parents with higher socioeconomic status are more likely to value education, motivate or support children in schooling, and cultivate children's cultural capital—values, language, reading habit, artistic expressions, etc.—that promote success in a school system that values and rewards such competencies, sensibilities, and cultural refinement.

In this study, parental socioeconomic status—measured as a composite variable of parental educational attainment, occupational status and income level—is hypothesized to affect their attitudes towards and involvement in children's learning. The survey results show that parental socioeconomic status is unequally distributed between private and government school students. Specifically, parental educational attainment ( $t = -7.072$ ;  $p < .001$ ) was significantly higher for private school ( $\bar{x} = 11.89$  years;  $s = 4.13$ ) than government school ( $\bar{x} = 8.75$  years;  $s = 4.12$ ) students (see Table 5). In other words, parents of private school students have more cultural capital and associated social capital due to their higher educational attainment. The distribution of academic credentials, an indicator of cultural capital among parents of private and government school students shows that the former were more than twice as likely to have college education.

**Table 5. Parental socioeconomic status and students' academic performance**

Variables	Preparatory school	
	Private	Government
Parental education ( $\bar{x}$ (s))	11.89 (4.13)	8.75 (4.12)
t-value (sig. 2-tailed)	-7.072 (.000)	
EduGini	0.22	0.35
Variables	Preparatory school	
	Private	Government
Parental ISEI Score ( $\bar{x}$ (s))	39.65 (20.84)	35.35 (18.66)
t-value (sig. 2-tailed)	-2.644 (.008)	
Variables	Preparatory school	
	Private	Government
Monthly household income ( $\bar{x}$ (s))	16,376 (3017)	5,758 (5075)
t-value (sig. 2-tailed)	-3.488 (.001)	

(Source: Survey, 2017)

Table 5 also reports EduGini coefficients of 0.35 and 0.22 for parents of government and private school students, respectively, which shows parental educational attainment was distributed relatively better among the latter.<sup>41</sup> Not only do private school students have better educated parents as a group but each student was also more likely to have better educated parents with first-hand experience about the structure and dynamics of the education system to provide relevant guidance and support.

Generally speaking, better educated parents have cultural capital that improves children's schooling experiences and outcomes: they possess favorable dispositions, attitudes and knowledge about educational system; appreciate educational objects (e.g., books, computers, credentials, etc.); build connections with institutions (e.g., schools, universities, cultural centers,

libraries); etc.<sup>42</sup> Conversely, such cultural capital exists in limited amounts among parents with no or substantially less schooling. With no or limited personal experience, they lack familiarity with the formal education system and community resources to support children's education. Their unfavorable valuation of education (see Table 8) makes their influence on children's educational investment, decisions, and outcomes performance usually low, indifferent, or even negative.

Table 2 presents parents' main (current or last) occupations. Occupational status represents parent economic and social capital. The categorical data on parent occupations was transformed into scale data using the ISEI occupational scores.<sup>43</sup> Parental occupational status is a powerful variable that could be used as proxy for parental socioeconomic status, or in cases where data on parental education attainment and income level were not forthcoming.<sup>44</sup> Table 2 shows that mean ISEI occupational scores significantly ( $t = -2.644$ ;  $p < .01$ ) favored parents of private-school students ( $\bar{x} = 39.65$ ;  $s = 20.84$ ) than their counterparts ( $\bar{x} = 35.35$ ;  $s = 18.66$ ), which implies that the former occupied more high-status and rewarding occupations. The literature has established that parents with better occupational status were more likely to finance quality education, tutoring resources, and provide curricular and extracurricular support to their children thereby promoting better educational outcomes.<sup>45</sup> Though these parents are more likely to send their children to private schools, this study did not find direct and statistically significant correlation between parental ISEI occupational status and students' academic performance (see Table 6). This is probably because with Dire Dawa being primarily a commercial city, parental occupational status is strongly linked to their income and determines whether they enroll their children in private schools. But on the other hand, it is poorly linked to their children's academic performance as most commercial occupations in the city do not require advanced education which means they do not necessarily have the social and cultural capital to directly support, supervise, and guide their children in schooling.

Participants in KIIs and FGDs explored the nuanced connections between parental occupation and students' academic performance. An FGD participant at a government-school commented,

Most of our students come from poor families with low-income jobs. Their family situation forces many students to put in extra shift and work as, for instance, Bajaj drivers [or shopkeepers, informal traders, etc.] to get money that finances their schooling and/or subsidize their family's income. They lose focus [time], and [ultimately] perform poorly in their grades.<sup>46</sup>

Other FGD participants explained how teenagers from poor families are not treated as 'kids' but as "young men who can work or hustle for money" to cover school expenses or meet the demands of peer pressure by dressing well, visiting entertainment venues, etc. This is not the story of all students from poor families, however. FGD participants recognized there are those who work to generate income, support their families and stay active and perform well in their education.

In an FGD with teachers and parents in a private-school, discussants raised structural factors that affect community and students' valuation of education:

Nowadays, most residents in poor neighborhoods value trade and commerce than education, which is reflected on how children see the role of education in their

future. [Besides] they see many university graduates unemployed and living off parent/family support while the less educated and school dropouts successfully making a life for themselves. This adds to their low valuation of schooling [and/or education success]. Ultimately, their education becomes less of a priority, which negatively impacts their academic motivation, investment and performance.<sup>47</sup>

Conversely, they added,

Well-to-do city residents have better aspiration and prioritize quality education for their children. Since they believe that we [private schools] provide quality, though expensive, education, they enroll their children with us. Hence, [to meet our standards and parents' expectations] we create a system that delivers quality education to students.<sup>48</sup>

On the other hand, private schools do not only enroll children of parents with better education and occupational status; they also attract households with better income i.e., economic capital. This is understandable as private education is an expense that even households with decent income may not afford. Specifically, as Table 5 reports, the average monthly household income of government school students was 5,759ETB (US\$252); and it was almost three times greater ( $\bar{x} = 16,376$ ETB, approximately US\$717) for households of private-school students ( $t = -3.488$ ;  $p < .05$ ). Private-schools are better equipped and structured for intensive learning, and coincidentally avail well-to-do households the opportunity to advance their children's educational experience and outcomes.

Conversely, poor households cannot afford private education or may even struggle to adequately support their children through higher grades in government schools. Low economic capital constrains their capabilities to provide their children with resources, support, and diverse sources of learning. Furthermore, their major priorities lay in meeting basic needs which explains why their children were more likely to detest school authority, self-exclude, or perform below par.<sup>49</sup> We found similar results in this study that corroborate existing literature i.e., students from low income households are more likely to enroll in government schools (see Table 5) where they, as a group, perform poorly (see Table 6).<sup>50</sup>

Table 6 presents correlation test results on parental educational attainment, occupational status, and household income. Parental education was significantly correlated with household income ( $r = .169$ ;  $p = .001$ ), and both—parental education ( $r = .302$ ;  $p = .01$ ) and household income ( $r = .138$ ;  $p = .05$ )—were positively correlated with students' academic performance. When we run separate correlation tests by school-type, only parental education was significantly correlated with students' academic performance and only for private school students ( $r = .274$ ;  $p = .01$ ). Better educated parents, who were also economically well-off, were more likely to value education, enroll children in private schools, provide them with learning resources at home, and use their cultural capital to motivate, guide, and supervise children's schooling. These findings broadly concur with reports in the literature.<sup>51</sup>

Table 6 also shows that parental occupation was not significantly correlated with students' academic performance at all levels. This is a significant deviation from the literature, and the possible reasons for it are discussed above.<sup>52</sup> On the other hand, parental occupation and household income were significantly correlated with the type of school students enroll in, but neither was significantly correlated with variation in students' academic performances within

each type of school. Alternatively put, the association established in the literature between parental economic capital and students' academic performance has to be indirect in Dire Dawa through enrollment in government or private schools. Once we take out type of school from the equation, the variation in household income becomes statistically insignificant in relation to students' academic performance.

**Table 6. Correlations: Parental socioeconomic status and students' academic performance**

<b>Government and private combined (n=346)</b>	<b>Parental educational attainment</b>	<b>Parental occupational status</b>	<b>Household income</b>	<b>Academic performance</b>
Parental educational attainment	1			
Parental occupational status	.037	1		
Household income	.169**	.012	1	
Academic performance	.302**	-.004	.138*	1
<b>Government only (n=176)</b>				
Parental educational attainment	1			
Parental occupational status	.039	1		
Household income	.152	.112	1	
Academic performance	.127	.011	-.061	1
<b>Private only (n=170)</b>				
Parental educational attainment	1			
Parental occupational status	.100	1		
Household income	.121	.013	1	
Academic performance	.274**	.054	.115	1

\*\*Sig. at p=.01; \*Sig. at p=.05 (Source: Survey, 2017)

#### *Parental Education Valuation and Support*

We measured parental education valuation and support in terms of four indicators: parent learning habits; parent encouragement and support of learning at home; parent interactions or communications with schools; and parent valuation of educational success. As Table 7 shows, parents of private school students, compared to their counterparts, were better in their reading habits ( $\chi^2 = 33.327$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), encouraging reading ( $\chi^2 = 20.320$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) and other learning activities for children at home ( $\chi^2 = 6.806$ ;  $p < 0.009$ ), and checking on children's school work ( $\chi^2 = 4.990$ ;  $p < 0.025$ ). This shows that they were more interested and involved in children's education where they can teach by example and impart their valuation of education. Parental involvement and support is very important in children's academic investment and performance, FGD participants in a government-school noted:

Parental supervision at home is essential to success in school, for students spend more time at home than they do in school. At home, they need direction and supervision to spend their time wisely and engage in learning. From my experience, parents who manage to do this have children who [are highly motivated and] achieve better in school.<sup>53</sup>

Table 7. Parental educational involvement and students' academic performance

Aspects of parental educational involvement	Responses	Preparatory school		Total	
		Government	Private		
Parents' reading habit	Frequently	n (%)	26 (7.5)	56 (16.2)	82 (23.8)
	Occasionally	n (%)	47 (13.6)	63 (18.3)	110 (31.9)
	Rarely	n (%)	64 (18.6)	25 (7.2)	89 (25.8)
	None	n (%)	39 (11.3)	25 (7.2)	64 (18.6)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>176 (51)</b>	<b>169 (49)</b>	<b>345 (100)</b>
Parental encouragement of reading	Yes	n (%)	131 (76.2)	153 (93.9)	284 (84.8)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>172 (100)</b>	<b>163 (100)</b>	<b>335 (100)</b>
Parental encouragement of educational engagements	Yes	n (%)	136 (78.6)	147 (89.1)	283 (83.7)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>173 (100)</b>	<b>165 (100)</b>	<b>338 (100)</b>
Parents hire private tutor for children at home	Yes	n (%)	24 (13.8)	31 (18.6)	55 (16.1)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>174 (100)</b>	<b>167 (100)</b>	<b>341 (100)</b>
Parents check on children's home works and assignments	Yes	n (%)	56 (32.0)	73 (43.7)	129 (37.7)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>175 (100)</b>	<b>167 (100)</b>	<b>342 (100)</b>

Sig. at  $p < .05$  (Source: Survey, 2017)

Parental supervision comes in different forms. As Table 8 shows, parents of private school students were more likely to check-in with schools ( $\chi^2 = 5.631$ ;  $p < 0.018$ ) and/or discuss children's progress with teachers and school administrators ( $\chi^2 = 3.590$ ;  $p < 0.058$ )—and they were more likely to do so frequently ( $\chi^2 = 22.865$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), which puts them in better position to provide support and/or take corrective measures when required and before escalation. However, this does not mean all parents are the same, as a private-school teacher explains:

I've met parents who think educating children is teachers' responsibility. The reality is far from it. Parents need to play their part in supervising their children's activities and progress in school and outside. As a teacher, I called parents to school when their children get into trouble [academic or non-academic]; and those who underplay their roles in their children's education say to me, 'please feel free to handle things as you see fit!'<sup>54</sup>

As a policy, he adds,

We [private-schools] always tell parents that effective education requires the school, teachers and parents doing their parts. Parents should supervise their children when they are at home and communicate with the school to see how they are doing. Teachers should also fulfill their responsibilities at school and maintain regular communication with parents. Most parents who send their children to our school are clear with this [expectation], and, to those who are not, we try to educate them on the importance of their role in their children's education. [Through time,] many improved their views and become actively involved in their children's education.<sup>55</sup>

Table 8. Parental involvement at school and students' academic performance

Parental school involvement	Responses		Preparatory school		Total
			Government	Private	
Children's extracurricular engagement	Yes	n (%)	57 (32.8)	65 (38.9)	122 (35.8)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>174 (100)</b>	<b>167 (100)</b>	<b>341 (100)</b>
Parental encouragement of children's extracurricular engagements	Yes	n (%)	77 (46.7)	86 (53.4)	163 (50)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>165 (100)</b>	<b>161 (100)</b>	<b>326 (100)</b>
Parents checking-in with school and teachers	Yes	n (%)	49 (28.7)	68 (41.0)	117 (34.7)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>171 (100)</b>	<b>166 (100)</b>	<b>337 (100)</b>
Parents visit school to follow up children progress in education	Yes	n (%)	57 (33.1)	70 (43.2)	127 (38.0)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>172 (51.5)</b>	<b>162 (48.5)</b>	<b>334 (100)</b>
Parental school visit frequency in a year	2x and less	n (%)	38 (65.5)	24 (34.8)	62 (48.8)
	4x	n (%)	6 (10.3)	32 (46.4)	38 (29.9)
	12x or more	n (%)	14 (24.1)	13 (18.8)	27 (21.1)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>n (%)</b>	<b>58 (100)</b>	<b>69 (100)</b>	<b>127 (100)</b>

Sig. at  $p < .05$  (Source: Survey, 2017)

The communication and support system that private schools create to ensure better educational outcomes for students is usually an exception than a norm in government schools, as an FGD participant comments,

The problem we face in our [i.e., government] school is that parents have no idea about their children's education or their role in the process. Parents don't come to school unless we called them. When we ask students to bring their parents [for various reasons], several of them bring strangers from the neighborhood who they convinced and prepped to pose as their parents...It's when students get into serious trouble and things escalate that they finally bring their actual parents to school—and most parents complain that they had no idea their children were doing badly in school.<sup>56</sup>

At the base of these observable differences between parents, we have to note that parents of students in both types of schools may harbor misgivings about their roles in children's education. This is exactly where the role of school system comes into play. We found that when parents act indifferently, private schools, unlike government schools, have a system that makes parental involvement in their children's learning a requirement. With parents of private school students better educated and knowledgeable about the school system, they are more likely to meet this requirement i.e., engagements in children's learning that promote better academic performance. Ultimately, private school students enjoy better parental supervision and engagement in their education. Their parents are more involved in their education, which reflects their belief that they share responsibilities with schools and teachers in the education of their children.<sup>57</sup>

**Table 9. Parental expectation, school sector and students' academic performance**

Items (measured in scales of 1 through 5)		Preparatory school-sector	
		Government	Private
Parents/family expects me to perform excellently in school.	$\bar{x}$ , s	4.57, 0.85	4.64, 0.71
Parents/family prioritize my education and learning.	$\bar{x}$ , s	2.13, 1.36	1.70, 1.17
School requires strong parental involvement in my education.	$\bar{x}$ , s	3.07, 1.34	3.22, 1.23
Teachers encourage me to work hard in my education.	$\bar{x}$ , s	3.46, 1.20	3.60, 1.28
School academic achievement is mostly because of my teachers' hard work.	$\bar{x}$ , s	3.02, 1.32	3.04, 1.30
Teachers always make efforts to make sure I understand the subjects taught.	$\bar{x}$ , s	3.55, 1.09	3.59, 1.23
My teachers give me strong academic support.	$\bar{x}$ , s	3.30, 1.12	3.43, 1.25
My teachers motivate me to succeed in my education.	$\bar{x}$ , s	3.29, 1.13	3.54, 1.25

**Sig. at  $p < .05$  (Source: Survey, 2017)**

More on the discussion on differences, Table 9 shows that private school academic performance benefited from significantly better parental valuation of learning/education ( $F = 9.778$ ;  $p < 0.002$ ) and encouragement of academic success ( $F = 3.865$ ;  $0.050$ ). Generally speaking, the academic performance of students in government schools parallels their parents' low educational expectation and valuation.<sup>58</sup> Teachers and schools also value and see parental involvement in schooling as a reflection of their better valuation of education, which this study found to be the norm in private schools.<sup>59</sup>

#### *School Organization and Management*

As a rule, the school system and its resources, facilities, management, academic ambiance and, mainly, teachers' quality and motivation, bear on students' educational experience and outcomes.<sup>60</sup> These factors differ in design and practice when we consider Ethiopian government and private schools. All schools draw on the ETP to design a ten month academic calendar with two semesters. But most private schools run a full-day program (morning and afternoon during weekdays) while most government schools can only manage their large student population through a shift-based, half-day schedule. This means private schools engage with their students more than government schools.

Administrators and teachers in private schools therefore have more time to teach, build rapport, and support their students. The relationship and trust they build with their students have positive impacts on students' academic motivation and performance.<sup>61</sup> A director of a private-school reported,

In our school, we employ a student-centered approach that mainly focuses on providing our students with quality education and preparing them for successful life. Most of our students have been with us since kindergarten who go on to complete their CPP here. This has helped us understand our students' strengths and weaknesses and provide them with useful guidance and support.<sup>62</sup>

Private schools student-centered approach creates more space for teacher and parent involvement in education:

Our staff put great efforts into improving students' academic performance. The school has adequate facilities [laboratory, library, educational materials, smaller teacher-students ratio, etc.] and teachers also play their part...We involve parents

and teachers in setting goals for each academic year. Moreover, we require parents to supervise their children when they are not in school. With such efforts, we strive to improve students' academic performance.<sup>63</sup>

The director of a comprehensive government secondary school explains the different scenario at his school:

Every year, we admit many students into the CPP from the city's general secondary schools. This makes it challenging for our teachers to follow up and deal with each student. But currently we are working on solving this problem by hiring more teachers every year and providing tutorial classes to our students so that they can get better education.<sup>64</sup>

He added,

Teachers do not get paid well to put extra efforts and support a large number of students in a way that improve academic engagement and performance. So, we engage and motivate teachers in different ways so that they will encourage and support students' academic activities. We pay teachers to deliver tutorials to students. We offer competitive scholarships to teachers to pursue advanced degrees at Dire Dawa University.<sup>65</sup>

There is a downside to motivating teachers with attractive scholarships, however. "Teachers with advanced degrees leave our schools as soon as they fulfill their mandatory service time and join schools that pay better or provide better professional advancement."<sup>66</sup> Consequently, government schools remain inadequately staffed—in number and experience—to guide, supervise and provide individualized support to their ever increasing student population.

To reduce the growing burden on school and improve students' educational engagement and outcomes, FGD and KII participants in government and private schools underlined the importance of involving and working closely with parents. Both types of schools design and implement several programs to motivate teachers, parents and students and improve educational outcomes. But the comparatively better scores of private school students on standardized exams show that the programs did not bring uniform results thereby drawing our attention to the organization of government and private schools.

Notably, private schools transform their primal challenge for survival into a motivating factor to create a system that provides quality education. Unlike government schools, private schools depend on tuition fees to equip their facilities, hire, and motivate qualified staff, and, of course, make profit. As a result, their fees are high and makes them unaffordable to an average Ethiopian family. By design, their advertisements and recruitment processes target well-to-do families. As the Ethiopian academic year starts in Fall, private schools pack their Summer (July-September) with programs and activities that publicize their ranking in the district or region (based on students' grade completion and progression rates), quality of facilities and staff, etc. Demand is high in urban areas, but they still need to convince target groups that they provide quality education better than others in the market. They cannot simply claim a strong academic orientation but must prove it with tangible and recognized achievement—such as the annual school ranking produced by the Ministry of Education (MoE). To exploit the school ranking



system to enroll more students, they must organize themselves in a system that prepares students to perform excellently, at least on those standardized examinations the MoE uses to rank schools.

Private schools also involve parents in management and learning processes to create a sense of ownership that does not usually exist in government schools. Parents are regularly asked to check and sign off their children's homework and assignments. They are informed of academic performance and progress that highlight areas where parental supervision and support is required. Teachers also provide adequate academic support, encouragement, and motivation to students. They utilize the full-day program to design detailed syllabus and ensure students understand subjects taught. The peculiarity of private school organization in creating a favorable learning environment and engaging parents in the school management and learning processes could be cited as one of the main factors that account for the better performance of their students, which parents with higher socioeconomic status take advantage of.

## Discussion

Bourdieu argued that student educational outcomes primarily reflect the amount of parental cultural capital and habitus.<sup>67</sup> Many found empirical evidence to support his argument, and others, within the critical tradition, have also underlined the importance of economic capital.<sup>68</sup> This study found that parental cultural (education) and economic (income) capital were significantly associated with student scores on a standardized examination.

The direct effects of parental cultural capital on academic performance could be observed in tutoring, supervising, and supporting educational activities as well as positive valuation of educational success. Generally speaking, better parental cultural capital means better academic performance for students; and this study also found that private school students who have parents with better education performed significantly better on standard examination.<sup>69</sup> This study also found that the low education involvement of government school students' parents matches their low cultural capital and habitus i.e., poor communication skills, inadequate knowledge about schooling and its requirements, or unfavorable school experience.

On the other hand, though potent, the effects of household income are mostly indirect through financing private education, purchasing educational materials, and creating favorable home environment for learning, among others.<sup>70</sup> Parents with better education and income enrolled their children in private schools. By providing children of well-off parents with quality education that ensures better academic performance and admission to advanced education—an opportunity their counterparts cannot afford—private schools play subtle but significant roles in the correspondence between family background and student educational outcomes.

As Bourdieu wrote, damning critiques of class reproduction have forced dominant groups in postmodern society to adopt cultural reproduction in its stead, whereby education became an avenue for the intergenerational transmission of privilege. This trend has amounted to the creation of what Collins calls a credential society.<sup>71</sup> In a world that values credentials, dominant groups advance their interests by investing in their children's education. Though class hierarchy has not matured in Ethiopia to a degree comparable in the West, the differences in power, status and prestige between dominant and subaltern groups are evident.<sup>72</sup> With expanding educational opportunities and democratization in the later part of 20<sup>th</sup> century, there

has been a growing view that the definition and boundary of class has grown more fluid. Nonetheless, dominant groups always had better access to land, capital, power, etc., and they have increasingly become aware of education as a tool to reproduce their privilege across generations. With private schools creating a system that makes success a greater probability, the dominant group invests significantly and enrolls their children thereby exploiting the systemic imbalance to further their interests. This peculiar role of private schools undermines the appealing argument that education provides an opportunity for lower class children to acquire marketable skills and advance themselves through the societal ladder. Some—but not all—schools, in effect, have become tools of cultural reproduction rather than social mobility.

## Conclusion

This study aimed at assessing the interactive effects of school-type and parental cultural capital on academic performance in college preparatory programs in Dire Dawa, Ethiopia. It found significant associations between parental cultural and economic capital, choice of school-type, and student performance on standardized examination. Results underlined the roles schools play in the functional correspondence between inherited background and academic performance. Specifically, private schools create a strong and student-centered academic culture, promote parental involvement in school management and student supervision, and hire and motivate educators to teach and guide students. This enables students from well-off families to perform well on standardized examination which opens doors for advanced education and better life chances.

On the other hand, most government schools enrolled students from less or uneducated families with limited resources, willingness, and motivation to support better educational engagement and outcomes. They are usually overcrowded, poorly resourced, and teachers therein are variously constrained to design and teach syllabi that accommodate and/or meet the diverse needs of students. With large class-sizes, it is practically impossible for government schoolteachers and administrators to supervise and support students in ways that promote improved academic performance. Cumulatively, these scenarios leave the quality of education in government schools with so much to be desired in cultivating desirable cultural capital in students who have not inherited it from parents and brought to their educational experience.

Given the importance of education to personal and national development and the gap between government and private schools in resources, facilities, organization, etc., changes in policy, strategy, and programming are necessary to ensure students attending any school receive equal educational opportunities. Education programming in government schools needs to provide adequate facilities to deliver quality education and opportunities; institutionalize a strong academic orientation among teachers and students; create and diversify professional advancement opportunities to staff; and engage parents and the community to support the learning process. Such programming must be informed by detailed, policy-relevant and action research that identifies ways to build on the strengths of government schools and adapt the successful mechanisms of private schools. This does not mean a replacement of the government model with private one, as there are reports that private schools focus more on preparing students for standardized exams than cultivating well-rounded development as their attractiveness to clientele depends on school ranking based on student scores.<sup>73</sup> Though

standardized exams are a poor tool to assess student educational caliber, private schools are able to graduate their students to higher levels of education and, ultimately, enjoy better educational and professional successes. At the least, we argue, this requires a systematic examination and, if relevant, broader adoption of their valuable traits with the objective of creating equality of educational opportunities for Ethiopian children.

## References

- Ahmad, I. and N. Khan. 2012. "Relationship between parental socio-economic conditions and students' academic achievements: A case of district dir, Timergara, Pakistan." *Global Advanced Research Journal of Educational Research and Review* 1.7: 137-42.
- Alemayehu, B. and J. Lasser. 2012. "Education in Ethiopia: Past, present and future prospects." *African Nebula* 5: 53-69.
- Aregay, W. and D. N. Paul, 2006. *Jimma University VLIR-OUS programming mission report*. Brussels: Kristien Verbrugghen, VLIR-UOS.
- Aschaffenburg, Karen, and Ineke Maas. 1997. "Cultural and Educational Careers: The Dynamics of social reproduction." *American Sociological Review* 62.4: 573-87.
- Astone, N. M., and S. S. McLanahan. 1991. "Family structure, parental practices and high school completion." *American Sociological Review* 56: 309-20.
- Barnard, W.M. 2004. "Parent involvement in elementary school and educational attainment." *Children and Youth Services Review* 26: 39-62.
- Barry, J. 2005. *The Effect of Socioeconomic Status on Academic Achievement*. Wichita: Wichita State University.
- Battle, J. and M. Lewis. 2002. "The increasing significance of class: The relative effects of race and socioeconomic status on academic achievement." *Journal of Poverty* 6.2: 21-35.
- Bekele T. 2012. "Quality of Education in General Secondary school in Debre Markos Town." MA Thesis: Addis Ababa University.
- Bennett, Daniel. 2011. *Educational Inequality in the United States: Methodology and Historical Estimation of Education Gini Coefficients*. Washington, DC: The Center for Affordability and Productivity.
- Berhanu, Seboka. 2003. "School Choice and Policy Response: A Comparative Context Between Private and Public Schools in Urban Ethiopia." International Conference on Development Studies in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa, July 11-12. ([https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/africancenter\\_icad\\_archive/59](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/africancenter_icad_archive/59))
- Bourdieu, P. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." In Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research in the Sociology of Education* (New York: Greenwood Press).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996a. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Cambridge: Polity.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996b. *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. and J. Passeron. 1990 [1970]. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. (R. Nice, trans. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Sage Publications.
- Bryk, A. S. et al. 1993. *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Buckingham, J. 2000. "School Funding for All." Sydney: Centre for Independent Studies.
- Center on Education Policy. 2007. *Are Private High Schools Better Academically than Public High Schools?* Washington, D.C.: Center on Education Policy.
- Chubb, J. E., and T. M. Moe. 1990. *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Coleman, J. 1968. "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity." *Harvard Educational Review* 38.1: 7-22
- Coleman, J. and T. Hoffer. 1987. *Public and Private High Schools: The Impact of Communities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Coleman, J. et al. 1982. *High School Achievement: Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared*. New York: Basic Books.
- Collins, R. 1979. *The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*, Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.
- Crosnoe, R. et al. 2004. "School size and the interpersonal side of education: An examination of race/ethnicity and organizational context." *Social Science Quarterly* 85.5: 1259-1274.
- CSA 2012a. *Reports of the 2007 Population and Housing Census and the 2012 Inter-censal Survey*.
- CSA 2012b. *Ethiopian Welfare Monitoring Survey 2011: Summary report*. CSA, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- CSA 2012c. *Analytical Report: Household consumption and expenditure (HCE) Survey 2010/11*. Statistical Bulletin 563. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- CSA 2016. *The 2016 Urban Employment-unemployment Survey*. Statistical Bulletin 581. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Damtew T. and P. Altbach. 2003. *African Higher Education: An International Reference Handbook*. Indiana University Press.
- DiMaggio, P. 1982. "Cultural Capital and School Success: The Impact of Status Culture Participation on the Grades of US High School Students." *American Sociological Review* 47.2: 189-201.
- DiMaggio, P. and J. Mohr. 1985. "Cultural Capital, Educational Attainment and Marital Selection." *American Journal of Sociology* 90.6: 1231-261.
- Eamon, M. K. 2005. "Socio-demographic, school, neighborhood, and parenting influence on academic achievement of Latino young adolescents." *Journal of Youth and Adolescents* 34: 163-74.

- Eigbiremolen, G. 2019. "Estimating Private School Premium for Primary School Children in Ethiopia: Evidence from Individual-level Panel Data." *Progress in Development Studies* 20.1: 26-44.
- Downey, D. B. 1995. "When Bigger is not Better: Family Size, Parental Resources, and Children's Educational Performance." *American Sociological Review* 60: 746-61.
- Emiru G. 2012. "Assessment of Factors Affecting Quality of Secondary Education in Preparatory Schools of East Wollega Zone of Oromia Region." MA thesis: Addis Ababa University.
- Fan, X. T. 2001. "Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A growth modeling analysis." *Journal of Experimental Education* 70: 27-61.
- Farkas, G. et al. 1990. "Cultural Resources and School Success: Gender, Ethnicity, and Poverty Groups within an Urban School District." *American Sociological Review* 55.1: 127-42.
- Ganzeboom, H. and D. J. Treiman. 1996. "Internationally Comparable Measures of Occupational Status for the 1988 International Classification of Occupations." *Social Science Research* 25.3: 201-39.
- Getachew R. 2011. "The socioeconomic and cultural factors affecting the Manjo children's participation in primary education in Kaffa zone." MA thesis: Addis Ababa University.
- Getahun, W. 2002. "School Based Factors Contributing to Differences in Students' Achievement at High and Low Passing Rate Scorers of Government Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa at National Examination." MA thesis: Addis Ababa University.
- Goldthorpe, J. H. 2007. *On Sociology* (2 vols). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Habtamu W. 2004. "Gender and regional disparities in opportunities to higher education in Ethiopia: Challenges for promotion of social justice." *Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education* 1.2: 1-25.
- Hagos G. 1966. "Token education in Ethiopia." *Africa Today* 13.2: 12-14.
- Hoover, K.V. et al. 2005. "Why Do Parents become Involved? Research Findings and Implications." *The Elementary School Journal* 106.2: 105-30.
- Kirkup, J. 2008. "Middle-class children resentful at being pushed to succeed." London: *The Telegraph*. Oct. 31. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/3330301/Mid> [accessed 18 March 2019].
- Lareau, A. and E. B. Weininger. 2003. "Cultural Capital in Educational Research: A Critical Assessment." *Theory and Society* 32.5/6: 567-606.
- Lee, J., and N. Bowen. 2006. "Parent involvement, cultural capital, and the achievement gap among elementary school children." *American Educational Research Journal*, 43: 193-218.
- Lemi A. 2012. "Factors Affecting the Quality of secondary school Education in preparatory schools of East Arsi Zone of Oromia Region." MA thesis: Addis Ababa University.
- Majoribanks, K. 1996. "Family Learning Environments and Students' Outcomes: A Review." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 27.2: 373-94.

- McWayne, C. et al. 2004. "A multivariate examination of parent involvement and the social and academic competencies of urban kindergarten children." *Psychology in the Schools* 41: 363-77.
- Mganga, B. C., and E. Mizambwa. 1997. "Parents' Involvement in Primary Education in Tanzania. A Case Study of Morogoro Municipality." MEd thesis: Åbo Akademi University.
- Mikyas, A. and P. Murugan. 2018. "Cultural capital and students' academic performance: the case of Ethiopian higher educational institutions." *Eastern Africa Social Science Research Review* 34.1:249-76.
- MoE 2002. *The Education and Training Policy and Its Implementation*. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education
- MoE 2017. *Education Statistics Annual Abstract (2016/17)*. EMIS, Directorate for planning and resource mobilization, Ministry of Education, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Mueller, C. and T. Parcel. 1981. "Measures of socioeconomic status: Alternatives and recommendations." *Child Development*, 52(1): 13-30.
- Ottaway, M. 1976. "Social classes and corporate interests in the Ethiopian Revolution." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 14.3: 469-86.
- Paterson, L. 1991. "Socioeconomic status and educational attainment: A multi-dimensional and multi-level study." *Evaluation and Research in Education* 5.3: 97-121
- Raudenbush, S. V. and A.S. Bryk. 1988. "Methodological advances in analyzing the effects of schools and classrooms on student learning." *Review of Research in Education* 15: 423-75.
- Ruge, J. 1998. "Raising expectations: achieving quality education for all." DSP Discussion Paper. Sydney: NSW Department of Education and Training.
- Saxton, J. 2000. "Investment in education: Private and public returns." <http://www.house.gov/jec/educ.pdf> [accessed 19 May 2018].
- Seyoum W. 1999. "Survey of the major factors influencing household demand for schooling in rural Bale zone." MA thesis: Addis Ababa University.
- Sparkes, J. 1999. "Schools, Education and Social Exclusion." CASE Paper 29, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.
- Tariku T. 2015. "The influence of socio-economic status of parents on academic achievement of grade ten students in Addis Ababa city administration with special reference to Kirkos sub-city administration." MA thesis: Addis Ababa University.
- Teshome W. 1990. *The development of higher education and social change: The Ethiopian experience*. Michigan: Michigan University Press.
- TGE. 1994. *Education and Training Policy*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- Thomas, V. et al. 2001. "Measuring Education Inequality: Gini Coefficients of Education." The World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper 2525.

Willis, Paul. 2013. *Learning to Labor: How Working-class Kids get Working-class Jobs*. Nanjing: Yilin Press.

Yalew, E. et al. 2010. "Investigation of Causes of Low Academic Performance of Students in Grade 8 Regional Examination in Amhara National Regional State." Bahir Dar: Amhara National Regional State Education Bureau.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> See Saxton 2000; Battle and Lewis 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Davis and Moore 1944; Parsons 1959; Levin 1976; Epps 1995.

<sup>3</sup> Davis and Moore 1944; Parsons 1959

<sup>4</sup> Bourdieu and Passeron 1977; Aschaffenburg and Maas 1997; De Graaf 2000; Willis 2013.

<sup>5</sup> Bourdieu and Passeron 1990.

<sup>6</sup> Goldthorpe 2007.

<sup>7</sup> See Bourdieu 1996a, p. 215; Bourdieu 1996b.

<sup>8</sup> Bourdieu and Passeron 1990, p. 82.

<sup>9</sup> Ahmad and Khan 2012.

<sup>10</sup> See Barnard 2004; Eamon 2005; Lee and Bowen 2006.

<sup>11</sup> McWayne et al. 2004.

<sup>12</sup> See Bourdieu and Passeron 1990; Lareau 2003.

<sup>13</sup> Bourdieu and Passeron 1990.

<sup>14</sup> Ottaway 1976.

<sup>15</sup> See Hagos 1966; Teshome 1990; Habtamu 2004; Aregay and Paul 2006.

<sup>16</sup> See Damtew and Altbach 2003.

<sup>17</sup> Alemayehu and Lasser 2012.

<sup>18</sup> Transitional Government of Ethiopia (TGE) 1994.

<sup>19</sup> See TGE 1994; Seifu 2000; MoE 2002. ESDP-I specifically identified several factors to support and justify private investment in education: constraints for expanding public funding in education; poor performance of government-schools; changes in the economic and cultural/technological environment; and successful international experiences in private-sector delivery of education (Seifu 2000).

<sup>20</sup> See Coleman 1968; Bourdieu and Passeron 1990; Bourdieu 1986; Crosnoe et al. 2004.

<sup>21</sup> See Majoribanks 1996; Ahmad and Khan 2012; Eamon 2005; Barry 2005.

<sup>22</sup> Crosnoe et al. 2004; MoE 2017.

<sup>23</sup> See Getahun 2002; Berhanu 2003; Yalew et al. 2010.

<sup>24</sup> Amogne 2015.

<sup>25</sup> See Bryk et al. 1993; Berhanu 2003.

<sup>26</sup> See Coleman et al. 1982; Coleman and Hoffer 1987; Raudenbush and Bryk 1988; Chubb and Moe 1990; CEP 2007; Amogne 2015.

<sup>27</sup> See Buckingham 2000; Eigbiremolen 2019.

<sup>28</sup> MoE 2017.

- <sup>29</sup> See Seyoum 1999; Getachew 2011; Bekele 2012; Emiru 2012; Lemi 2012; Amogne 2015; Tariku 2015.
- <sup>30</sup> See Barry 2005; Fan 2001; Eamon 2005; Kirkup 2008.
- <sup>31</sup> MoE 2017.
- <sup>32</sup> CSA (Central Statistical Authority) 2012a, 2012b, 2016.
- <sup>33</sup> CSA 2016.
- <sup>34</sup> CSA 2012c.
- <sup>35</sup> MoE 2017, p. 67.
- <sup>36</sup> Dire Dawa City Administration Education Bureau 2016.
- <sup>37</sup> Krejcie and Morgan 1970.
- <sup>38</sup> Bennett 2011.
- <sup>39</sup> Ganzeboom and Treiman 1996. See Hauser and Warren 1996; Prokic-Breuer 2011.
- <sup>40</sup> Paterson 1991; Mganga and Mizambwa 1997.
- <sup>41</sup> See Thomas et al 2001. EduGini coefficient (ranging between 0 and 1) estimates the relative distribution of parental education for students in government- and private-schools i.e. 0 implies that all parents in a group have exactly the same number of years of schooling, and 1 implies that only one person attained the aggregate education of an entire group.
- <sup>42</sup> Mganga and Mizambwa 1997; Lee and Bowen 2006.
- <sup>43</sup> Ganzeboom and Treiman 1996.
- <sup>44</sup> Mueller and Parcel 1981, p. 16.
- <sup>45</sup> Downey 1995.
- <sup>46</sup> M, Govt, D, T, FGD. June 2017.
- <sup>47</sup> M, Pvt, A, P, FGD. June 2017.
- <sup>48</sup> M, Pvt, A, P, FGD. June 2017.
- <sup>49</sup> See Eamon 2005; Rouse and Barrow 2006.
- <sup>50</sup> Eamon 2005.
- <sup>51</sup> See Mganga and Mizambwa 1997; Lee and Bowen 2006; Eamon 2005.
- <sup>52</sup> Downey 1995.
- <sup>53</sup> M, Pvt, N, P, FGD. June 2017.
- <sup>54</sup> M, Pvt, A, T, FGD. June 2017.
- <sup>55</sup> M, Pvt, A, T, FGD. June 2017.
- <sup>56</sup> M, Govt, D, T, FGD. June 2017.
- <sup>57</sup> Hoover et al. 2005.
- <sup>58</sup> Ruge 1998.
- <sup>59</sup> Hill and Craft (2003) cited in Lee and Bowen 2006, pp. 198-99.
- <sup>60</sup> Sparkes 1999.
- <sup>61</sup> See Crosnoe et al. 2004; Eamon 2005.
- <sup>62</sup> F, Pvt, N, T, KII. June 2017.
- <sup>63</sup> F, Pvt, N, T, KII. June 2017.
- <sup>64</sup> F, Pvt, N, T, KII. June 2017.
- <sup>65</sup> M, Govt, S, T, KII. June 2017.
- <sup>66</sup> M, Govt, S, T, KII. June 2017.
- <sup>67</sup> Bourdieu 1990.



<sup>68</sup> See DiMaggio 1982; DiMaggio and Mohr 1985; Eamon 2005; Rouse and Barrow 2006.

<sup>69</sup> See Astone and McLanahan 1991; Lee and Bowen 2006.

<sup>70</sup> See DiMaggio 1982; DiMaggio and Mohr 1985.

<sup>71</sup> Collins 1979.

<sup>72</sup> Ottaway 1976.

<sup>73</sup> Mikyas and Murugan 2018.