Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on International Law and Legal Policy
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37618

Educational Opportunity or Social Reproduction? An Analysis of the Impact of Education Policies on Social Mobility among Low-Income Youth

Liang Xu

Department of Sociology, USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, USA
xuliang1130@outlook.com

Abstract. Education is often seen as an essential channel through which social mobility can be achieved, making it important for governments to establish targeted policies to facilitate access to education for low-income students. However, increased access to education does not necessarily equate to equitable social and economic outcomes. This research aims to explore the impacts of education policies on the social mobility of low-income youth and explain why gaps persist even when policies have been implemented. Through qualitative research approach, this study will examine the sociological literature on the subject and selected case studies of education policies, focusing on issues of financial aid, access to education, family background, and social capital. The selected cases are primarily drawn from existing empirical studies of U.S. financial-aid programs and college-access interventions for low-income students. This study draws on theories of social reproduction, cultural capital, and social mobility. It is found that education policies may increase access to higher education and remove financial constraints; however, its impacts are limited due to the differences in family background, cultural capital, social capital, and socio-economic factors.This study can provide a more comprehensive sociological analytical perspective for designing educational support policies targeted at low-income youth.

Keywords: Social Mobility, Education Policy, Low-Income Youth, Social Inequality, Public Policy

1. Introduction

Inequality and social mobility are the topics that attract considerable attention within sociology. Social mobility represents the possibility to advance to a better position regarding one's social status and economic position, regardless of one's starting point. Accordingly, access to education is considered one of the main ways of upward mobility, especially for youths who come from poor families. As a result, various measures are implemented by the government including aid programs, scholarships, and other types of educational policies. However, access to education does not guarantee equal results.

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37618

Recent studies show that even with such possibilities, inequality persists. According to Skinner and Doyle, income-based inequality persists in post-secondary education in the USA [1]. At the same time, recent research highlights the fact that students' aspirations and educational agency are affected by broader economic and social context [2]. Policies related to financial aid can influence the educational decisions of low-income students. Moreover, uncertainty regarding this type of policy can hinder long-term plans of people regarding their education [3]. Thus, these studies show that despite the possibility to create more opportunities through educational policies, inequality can still remain unchanged.

The current paper analyzes how education policies impact the social mobility of low-income youth and why inequalities persist even when educational opportunities are expanded. In the course of the research, a qualitative approach to the literature review will be applied. The following review focuses on major empirical research about education policy made since 2000 in relation to sociological literature on social reproduction, cultural capital, and intergenerational mobility. The analysis is based on two major types of policies implemented in the United States: financial aid policies for disadvantaged youth and college access programs.

2. Theoretical framework: social mobility and social inequality

Education is widely viewed as a way of upward mobility as higher education offers better job prospects, salaries, and occupations. However, mobility is not achieved through education alone. According to Breen, social mobility processes are tied to class structures and institutions of society and thus show that educational chances work within already established patterns of inequality [4]. Hence, having access to education does not mean that all young people have equal chances for upward mobility.

Family background plays a significant role in determining these different chances for upward mobility. Young people growing up in different classes have different amounts of economic, cultural, and social resources. Several types of resources are explained by Bourdieu [5]. Economic resources include material and financial means. Social resources refer to social connections and networks. Cultural resources encompass knowledge, skills, language, behaviors, and cultural background that may be considered valuable by educational institutions. Such resources determine how young people understand the education system, how they interact with teachers, how they prepare themselves for higher education, and how they deal with expectations imposed upon them.

Such a relationship is directly connected to the notion of social reproduction. According to Bourdieu & Passeron [6], the education system can reproduce social inequalities because schools favor the knowledge and behaviors of students from upper-class backgrounds. Therefore, the education system does not reduce social differences but, on the contrary, turns pre-existing social advantages into educational ones. It means that even with tuition support or access programs, children from poor families can face difficulties.

Together, these theories support the paper's central argument that educational opportunity and social reproduction are not mutually exclusive. They prove that an increase in educational opportunity is not automatically equated to the removal of the societal processes through which students capitalize on educational opportunity. This process depends on the uneven distribution of economic, cultural, and social capital. In this regard, the assessment of educational policy needs to take into account not only its effectiveness in providing access to education but also the ability of students from different classes to navigate educational institutions, gain their degrees, and turn them into occupational success.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37618

3. Education policy and opportunities for low-income youth

Education policies can promote social mobility by reducing financial and informational barriers to higher education. Dynarski shows that student aid can increase college attendance and completion, while Hoxby and Turner find that college information and application support can improve enrollment among high-achieving, low-income students [7, 8]. Bernal et al. further demonstrate that uncertainty about financial aid can shape low-income students' higher education choices [3]. Together, these studies suggest that access depends not only on cost, but also on information and policy stability.

However, expanding access does not necessarily produce equal outcomes. Skinner and Doyle show that large income-based differences in post secondary attendance remain in the United States [1]. Duncan and Murnane argue that class inequalities in family resources, neighborhoods, schools, technology, and guidance begin long before college application [9]. As a result, low-income students may enter higher education with fewer resources to take full advantage of available opportunities.

Therefore, education policy should be evaluated not only in terms of college access, but also in terms of persistence, degree completion, and the ability to convert education into occupational mobility. Financial pressures, family responsibilities, and limited social networks can continue after admission. This means that access is only the first stage of social mobility, and explaining unequal outcomes requires attention to the broader social resources students possess.

4. Social factors affecting educational mobility

While economic resources are significant in determining educational mobility, family background influences educational mobility through the types of resources students learn to utilize in educational settings. The work of Lareau indicates that family social-class background affects the organization of activities for children, communication with schools, and development of familiarity with institutional practices. Sullivan, likewise, demonstrates a link between cultural capital and educational achievement [10, 11]. Therefore, this research suggests that policy resources and family resources are not equivalent. For example, while middle-class parents maintain regular communication with their children's teachers, arrange for extracurricular activity involvement, seek additional academic help and assist the child in learning what requirements are necessary for college, the low-income parent may place as much importance on education, but face limitations in terms of time, knowledge or familiarity with the institutional process. As a result, although two students may receive similar amounts of financial backing, there may be a difference in their ability to communicate with their teachers, receive help and take advantage of educational resources [10]. The fact is that these differences also explain why equally ambitious students do not enjoy the same advantages because of their ambitions and why mobility outcomes are different depending on neighborhood school and socio-economic context [2, 12]. In other words, inequality may persist since while low-income students might be motivated, what matters is whether the education system rewards knowledge and institutional practices learned prior to college entry.

Individual agency and aspirations are important variables, but they are moderated by the role of social background in determining educational mobility. According to Mele et al. individual agency and socioeconomic origin play a role in the transition into a challenging educational pathway [2]. Importantly, low-income students do not gain from ambitious occupational aspirations as much as their better-off counterparts. This finding refutes the idea that educational success is a function of motivation or individual agency alone. While low-income students might have ambitious occupational aspirations, what counts is whether they can translate such aspirations into action. In

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37618

other words, aspirations are important, but they cannot operate independently of social structures. The social environment is also relevant to the determination of educational mobility. According to Chetty et al., intergenerational mobility differs depending on the neighborhood across the US. In other words, the results suggest that the neighborhood where students grow up, the institutions operating there and their social environment affect mobility prospects [12]. These variables influence the students' opportunities and ability to make the most out of these opportunities in a cumulative way. This demonstrates that education policy should not be studied independently of spatial inequality. While children may receive equal chances of education, they grow up in communities with disparities in schooling, peer groups, institutions, networks, and economic opportunity.

5. Policy implications and future directions

Educational policy may serve to increase opportunities for disadvantaged students; however, merely providing access to education will not solve issues related to social inequalities. This analysis reveals that inequalities extend beyond economic capital to include cultural capital, social networks, and institutional support. Therefore, education policy must take into account several types of inequalities in order to help students use educational opportunities effectively.

The first type of intervention aims to reduce financial capital inequalities. Providing enough and predictable funds to cover the cost of higher education is important since low-income students might benefit from receiving financial aid. However, students' choices remain constrained by uncertainty about future aid availability. According to Bernal et al., uncertainty concerning financial aid influences higher education preferences of low-income students [3]. Thus, apart from providing enough money, it is important to make sure that financial aid is stable and clear. The government is supposed to be accountable for need-based assistance that is steady, with the institutions informed of the amount and time length of the assistance that is being provided.

The second type of policy intervention targets inequalities in cultural and social capital. Apart from monetary help, some low-income students may need other kinds of assistance to be able to benefit from educational opportunities. Academic advising, tutoring, application help, mentoring, and better connections with teachers and peers may help disadvantaged students use their opportunities in a more effective way. The institutions are supposed to be accountable for delivering academic counseling, tutoring, mentoring and career counseling, while the community organizations might assist in linking students with local mentors and educational resources.

Thirdly, it is necessary to consider inequalities that occur before students get into college. Duncan and Murnane note that disparities in income, neighborhood, schools, access to technology, and extracurricular activities among students influence the quality of their educational experience well before college [9]. Since these differences accumulate over time, policies that aim to promote social mobility should also include helping students in primary and secondary education and not only in college. Federal and local governments can fund intervention initiatives, while schools and community organizations can assist in family outreach, application processes, computer technology, and extracurricular activities.

Lastly, evaluation of the policy must also focus on outcomes besides access. Access indicators include college application rates, enrollment rates, and the proportion of low-income students enrolled. In-school indicators must include persistence, course failures, and graduation rates. Social outcome indicators include post-graduation employment, starting salaries, and occupational status. Skinner and Doyle state that there are still great income-related disparities in post secondary outcomes. Thus, increasing the enrollment rate is just one part of policy success [1] .

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37618

6. Conclusion

Overall, educational expansion ought to be viewed as a powerful tool for achieving mobility, but not as a panacea for inequality.

In this study, the effect of education policies on the social mobility of lower class youth is examined and the reasons for unequal outcomes despite increased educational opportunities are explained. The results reveal that financial aid, college access programs, and information provision can alleviate some of the major barriers to education. However, simply providing access to education does not ensure equal opportunities for upward social mobility.

One of the basic reasons behind this issue is that students receive their education in different social and economic circumstances. Factors such as family income, cultural capital, social connections, neighborhoods, and access to institutional support determine how effectively students can capitalize on their education. With regard to social reproduction theory, this diversity partially explains the reason why education can reduce some inequalities and at the same time perpetuate others.

Thus, the research results suggest that educational opportunity and social reproduction are not mutually exclusive effects of the education policy. The same education system can promote educational opportunities for disadvantaged youth while reproducing inequalities in the utilization and conversion of these opportunities. It means that education policy must be evaluated not only in terms of access to education, but also in terms of persistence in school, degree completion, career advancement, and social and economic mobility.

The current research is hindered by the qualitative nature of its literature review and its reliance on a few policy studies. Therefore, the research cannot estimate the impacts of each individual policy or the effect of different capitals on the effectiveness of such policies. In future research, quantitatively based data must be used in order to analyze the influence of economic, cultural, and social capitals on the mobility effects of education policies. Moreover, longitudinal studies that follow up the graduates are essential in determining the outcomes of their employment and career advancement.

References

[1] Skinner, B. T., & Doyle, W. R. (2024). Predicting postsecondary attendance by family income in the United States using multilevel regression with poststratification. *Economics of Education Review, 99*, 102508.

[2] Mele, F., Buchmann, M., & Burger, K. (2023). Making it to the academic path in a tracked education system: The interplay of individual agency and social origin in early educational transitions. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 52*, 2620–2635.

[3] Bernal, G. L., Abadía, L. K., Álvarez-Arango, L. E., & De Witte, K. (2024). Financial aid uncertainty and low-income students' higher education preferences. *Higher Education, 87*, 1845–1863.

[4] Breen, R. (Ed.). (2004). *Social mobility in Europe*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

[5] Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press, New York.

[6] Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). Sage, London.

[7] Dynarski, S. M. (2003). Does aid matter? Measuring the effect of student aid on college attendance and completion. *American Economic Review, 93*(1), 279–288.

[8] Hoxby, C. M., & Turner, S. (2013). *Expanding college opportunities for high-achieving, low-income students*. SIEPR Discussion Paper No. 12-014. Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research, Stanford, CA.

[9] Duncan, G. J., & Murnane, R. J. (Eds.). (2011). *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

[10] Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life* (2nd ed.). University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37618

[11] Sullivan, A. (2001). Cultural capital and educational attainment. *Sociology, 35*(4), 893–912.
[12] Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Kline, P., & Saez, E. (2014). Where is the land of opportunity? The geography of intergenerational mobility in the United States. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 129*(4), 1553–1623.