

Exploring the education improvement dimensions from students and teachers' perspective in D.El.ED in Delhi institute

Bhim Singh*

Research Scholar, USE, GGSIPU, Dwarka

Abstract - A recurring problem for pre-service teacher preparation courses is the delicate challenge of selecting outstanding applicants while protecting against the admission of those who lack the necessary ability and devotion to the noble vocation of teaching. The primary goal of the teacher education programme is to assess individuals who exhibit fundamental personal qualities such as sincerity, honesty, dedication, equity, and objectivity, as well as the necessary subject matter expertise and pedagogical understanding to achieve positive results. A problem occurs when persons who lack the necessary competences and attributes for this monumental profession are admitted to the curriculum. As a result, within the area of the education system, this eventually results in the generation of educators of lesser calibre. As a result, it is essential to develop a systematic process for careful identification of persons with the innate ability to flourish in the field of pedagogy.

According to the content analysis of the open-ended interviews, the most often expressed proposals by participants centred on the competitiveness of the curriculum, work placement chances, and the necessity for the development of in-demand skills. Faculty are suggested for a variety of reasons, including policy revisions, training, competitive environment and development, and enhanced human resource policies.

Keyword - Education quality, teaching performance, and students expectation.

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

Education possesses the inherent capacity to ameliorate the plight of poverty and enhance the overall quality of human existence in manifold dimensions. The trajectory of a young individual's existence can be significantly altered by the experience of academic underachievement. Failure to attain a comprehensive education may result in individuals finding themselves ensnared in occupations that offer meagre remuneration, consequently leading to a less fortunate existence. This, in turn, may impede their ability to actively participate in the various facets of contemporary society, both in terms of civic duties and social interactions (Micklewright & Schnepf, 2007). According to projections put forth by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD 2010a), it has been posited that if each adolescent within the OECD region, aged 15, were to successfully achieve a score of 2 or higher in the mathematics component of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), their cumulative economic contributions throughout their lifetimes would surpass a staggering USD 200 trillion. Due to their inherent incapacity to engage in civil and political spheres,

heightened susceptibility to engaging in unlawful conduct and other illicit behaviours (OECD, 2010b, 2013; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001), as well as the plausible emergence of economic and social adversities (Cunha & Heckman, 2009; Heckman, 2008; Psacharopoulos, 2007), the exorbitant expenses incurred as a result of educational shortcomings impose a weighty strain upon society. However, in the context of discontinuing one's education, it is imperative to acknowledge the inherent variability among individuals. The available data suggests that children hailing from low-income households exhibit a higher propensity to encounter academic challenges and exhibit elevated rates of school attrition when compared to their more affluent peers. Let us consider the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) as an illustrative case. It has been ascertained that approximately 20% of students residing in Europe exhibit a deficiency in fundamental mathematical aptitude. An intriguing revelation emerges from the data, indicating that a pupil hailing from a socioeconomically disadvantaged milieu exhibits a 2.37-fold higher probability of exhibiting subpar academic performance, denoted by a score below level 2 on

the maths proficiency assessment, in contrast to a student originating from a privileged household (OECD, 2012). The available empirical data derived from meta-analytical studies conducted by esteemed scholars such as Sirin (2005) and White (1982) convincingly indicate a significant correlation between students' socioeconomic status (SES) and their academic achievement. Therefore, both scholars and policymakers express apprehension regarding the existence of socioeconomic disparities in educational attainments, asserting that it is imperative to mitigate such disparities within the framework of a democratic society (Marks, Cresswell, & Ainley, 2006). Henceforth, it is of utmost importance for educational systems on a global scale to ascertain the teaching methodologies that can ensure scholastic triumph for every student (Frempong, Reddy, & Kanjee, 2011). As per the scholarly contributions of Creemers and Kyriakides (2008) and Scheerens (2014), the field of educational effectiveness research (EER) endeavours to elucidate the query of "what works" in the realm of education. This pursuit is achieved through the amalgamation of diverse investigations spanning domains such as curriculum, school organisation, instructional strategies, and teacher conduct. However, as Scheerens (2013, 2016) astutely observes, in order to comprehensively assess the findings of the study and construct a robust efficacy theory, it is imperative to undertake a meticulous analysis of the underlying factors that contribute to its success. Only by delving into the depths of this inquiry can we truly grasp the essence of why the intervention yields positive outcomes. Moreover, in the contemplation of both the calibre and impartiality of education, it becomes imperative to inquire as to the beneficiaries and circumstances under which it proves efficacious. This assertion holds particular veracity when considering the empirical evidence from effectiveness studies, which indicate that educational institutions possess a heightened capacity to influence and ameliorate the educational outcomes of marginalised student populations. Moreover, it has been observed that these underprivileged groups tend to exhibit more pronounced responses to the educational environment, thereby magnifying the effects of schooling on their academic performance (Scheerens & Bosker, 1997). The elucidation of the import of investigating egalitarianism through the discernment of varying degrees of achievement among specific cohorts of students, as well as the arduous task of formulating theoretical frameworks of efficacy, are both underscored by these overarching research concerns. To effectively address the initial disparities in academic performance among diverse student cohorts, it is imperative to ascertain the factors that facilitate learning for specific groups. This can be discerned by investigating the beneficiaries and circumstances under which said factors manifest their efficacy. While prioritising the pursuit of educational parity during its nascent phase, the EER organisation has presently realigned its efforts towards enhancing the calibre of educational institutions with the aspiration that this endeavour shall engender a greater sense of fairness and impartiality (Kyriakides,

Creemers, & Charalambous, 2018). Gustafsson et al. (2017) astutely observed that notwithstanding indications of a positive correlation between equity and enhanced student outcomes, a rather limited number of empirical educational research studies have comprehensively encompassed both facets of efficacy. Within the confines of this theoretical framework, the primary objective of this particular edition is to draw focus towards matters of equity, with the intention of expanding the conceptual and methodological boundaries of the field of Educational Effectiveness Research (EER) and enhancing educational institutions. While perusing the literary contributions on the subject of equity, one cannot help but discern a unifying theme that pervades the diverse perspectives of the authors. This common thread, woven delicately through the fabric of their works, is none other than an unwavering focus on the concept of justice. Let us now direct our attention towards the concept of equity in education, examining it through the lens of two interrelated perspectives: equity as a manifestation of fairness and equity as a manifestation of inclusion. These various perspectives may provide valuable insights into the intricate dynamics through which academic underachievement impacts not only the educators themselves, but also the educational institutions and broader systems at large. When considering the phenomenon of academic failure, it is crucial to acknowledge the existence of two distinct perspectives. One could argue that the observation of an educational system's inability to adequately cater to the diverse educational requirements of its students may be indicative of its shortcomings and potential inadequacies in delivering a high standard of education. In the context of rectifying underperforming educational institutions, the imperative lies in ensuring inclusivity and equitable access to quality education for all students. To effectively mitigate the issue of high dropout rates and guarantee equitable access to educational opportunities, it is imperative to duly contemplate the inclusion perspective when formulating comprehensive national reform initiatives. Moreover, as expounded by Kyriakides et al. (2018), the notion of fairness, which posits that various external factors beyond the purview of students exert an influence on their educational achievements, emerges as a plausible elucidation for the phenomenon of academic underperformance. As per the scholarly works expounded upon in this particular compilation (Field, Kuczera, & Pont, 2007; Charalambous, Kyriakides, & Creemers, 2017), it is posited that an individual's socioeconomic standing ought not to serve as a decisive factor in their aptitude for achieving academic accomplishments. Henceforth, the primary objective of this particular edition is to elucidate the research, policy, and practical ramifications by accentuating the importance of employing diverse methodologies in the examination and quantification of equity within the realm of education.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- 1- To explore the different dimension from teachers and students' perspective to improve the education quality.
- 2- To explore the diversified approach to get the improved quality of education system through reviewing literature.

METHODOLOGY

For the present study, qualitative approach for research is adopted. 162 students are interviewed and 72 teachers were interviewed. Moreover, natural language processing was adopted to get the key words suggested by the teachers and students for improving the educational contents in D.El. Ed. System. Furthermore, thematic literature review is being followed to get the idea of the standard reforms and work in education system.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In light of the seminal research conducted by Coleman et al. (1966) and Jencks et al. (1972) pertaining to the crucial matter of educational parity within the United States, the field of educational equity research (EER) has undergone a progressive evolution, characterised by four discernible stages. The quantification of the extent to which educational parameters account for the variability in student learning outcomes was equally ascertained by these two pioneering inquiries, originating from disparate fields of study, namely sociology and psychology. Although these studies did not definitively negate the significance of education, they did ascertain that the impact of school choice on student outcomes was rather minimal. The aforementioned studies were subject to criticism by Madaus, Kellagham, Rakow, and King (1979) on the grounds that they purportedly failed to adequately assess the paramount educational attributes. Nevertheless, these two scholarly investigations posited that, subsequent to factoring in the influence of attributes associated with students' aptitude and familial circumstances (e.g., socioeconomic status, gender, and ethnicity), the influence of school and educational factors could merely elucidate a minute proportion of the heterogeneity observed in students' academic accomplishments. The perceived lack of success exhibited by expansive educational compensatory initiatives such as 'Headstart' and 'Follow Through' in the United States, which were predicated upon the notion that early childhood and school-based education could ameliorate disparities among students, has played a significant role in fostering this pessimistic perspective regarding education's capacity to mitigate educational and societal inequities. The scholarly works of Driessen & Mulder (1999), MacDonald (1991), Sammons et al. (2003), Schon (1971), and Taggart & Sammons (1999)

collectively reference various research endeavours which have yielded results indicating the ineffectiveness of compensation schemes in foreign jurisdictions. As a result, the principal objectives of the initial two investigations on school effectiveness carried out during the 1970s - one in the United States by Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1979), and the other in England by Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, and Smith (1979) - were to amass empirical data and present persuasive rationales supporting the notion that education possesses the potential to enhance individuals' prospects in the times to come. This perspective was imbued with optimism, as it was informed by a plethora of scholarly investigations conducted during that epoch. These studies revealed a disheartening reality: educational institutions, educators, and the educational system as a whole had failed to yield the anticipated outcomes. Moreover, they furnished compelling evidence that students' academic achievements were profoundly influenced by their socioeconomic circumstances (White, 1982). Therefore, it can be argued that these two endeavours can be perceived as groundbreaking endeavours aimed at showcasing how educational institutions and instructors can contribute to the amelioration of the disparity in students' academically evaluated achievements, which are often assessed in a manner that lacks logical coherence. The establishment of a scientific domain focused on educational effectiveness became feasible due to the presence of two distinct research endeavours conducted in different nations. These projects, while independent, shared the commonality of posing similar inquiries and employing comparable quantitative methodologies. Notably, the works by Kyriakides (2008) and Scheerens (2013) played a pivotal role in this development. Based on the seminal research conducted by Brookover et al. (1979) and Rutter et al. (1979), a multitude of efficacy investigations conducted across various nations have consistently demonstrated the capacity of educational institutions and educators to substantially enhance the scholastic achievements of students. In the course of its development, the field of Educational Effectiveness Research (EER) has traversed a trajectory encompassing four discernible epochs, each of which has made noteworthy contributions to the theoretical framework of EER by tackling distinct and pertinent research inquiries. Initially, the focus was on establishing the significance of educational institutions, followed by an exploration of variables associated with student outcomes. Subsequently, the discipline advanced by constr Since the inception of Educational Effectiveness Research (EER), scholars have made significant strides in employing advanced methodologies, such as multilevel modelling techniques, to effectively gauge the impact of teachers and schools on enhancing educational quality. These methodological advancements have enabled researchers to accurately estimate the effects and identify various factors associated with

the dimension of educational effectiveness. (Creemers, Kyriakides, & Sammons, 2010). As a result, EER has redirected its attention towards the dimension of quality, driven by the underlying belief that the advancement of quality can potentially lead to the achievement of equity. In the past two decades, considerable attention has been directed towards the examination of teacher and school efficacy. However, it is noteworthy that a substantial portion of this research has predominantly concentrated on investigating overarching attributes that contribute to performance, rather than delving into the identification of factors that bear relevance to the concept of equality. Given the extensive array of efficacy investigations conducted across various nations, aimed at elucidating the attributes that may enhance quality while not exacerbating inequality, this paradigm shift within the realm of Educational Effectiveness Research (EER) has resulted in notable methodological ramifications. Regarding the matter of equity, it is disconcerting to observe that this transformation has not transpired, despite the abundance of global studies on effectiveness that have unequivocally demonstrated the significance of evaluating student learning outcomes while accounting for various factors associated with their backgrounds, such as socioeconomic status, gender, and ethnicity. In this particular matter, we posit the proposition that EER should expand its theoretical framework and furnish appropriate methodological instruments to address the concepts of quality and equality. Given the aforementioned factors, the authors of this particular edition offer a diverse array of methodological approaches aimed at promoting equity. These approaches are informed by statistical data derived from various countries and academic spheres. It is imperative to acknowledge that scholarly investigations pertaining to the influence of group composition on academic performance have the potential to serve as a pivotal determinant in elucidating the persistent disparities in achievement observed among students hailing from economically disadvantaged backgrounds (Verhaeghe, Vanlaar, Knipprath, De Fraine, & Van Damme, 2017). The underlying rationale for this assertion lies in the findings of meta-analytic studies, which have unequivocally shown that even minute variations in group composition can yield discernible impacts on student achievement, regardless of the specific lens through which one examines it, be it ability, gender, social dynamics, or ethnic background (Driessen, 2007). Verhaeghe et al. employed data derived from a longitudinal study conducted within primary educational institutions situated in Belgium's Flanders region, with the aim of ascertaining the impact of children's socioeconomic and ethnic class divisions on the disparities in mathematical achievement experienced by at-risk students. In light of the various avenues through which group composition can impact student achievement, such as interpersonal dynamics within the classroom, educational resources and personnel, and familial networks, the authors have undertaken an examination of the progression of achievement disparities among vulnerable students

from the onset of primary education (Grades 1-6) until the culmination of the academic year. The primary objectives of this inquiry are to ascertain the presence of group composition effects at each phase of schooling and to determine whether the influence of students' social and ethnic group makeup on their learning disparities surpasses that of their individual attributes. The findings of the study contribute substantively to the ongoing discourse surrounding the issue of school desegregation, thereby highlighting the imperative nature of this debate. It is crucial to acknowledge that while desegregation policies hold promise, they may not singularly eradicate the persistent educational disparities experienced by vulnerable students. In conjunction with the ramifications of group composition, it is imperative to scrutinise the efficacy of an educational institution through the lens of equity. One can undertake an investigation into the various facets of the educational institution that possess the potential to ameliorate the influence of students' socio-economic backgrounds on their academic achievements, as elucidated by Creemers and Kyriakides (2015) and Kelly (2012). The scholarly works of Gustafsson et al. (2017) and Sammons et al. (2017) present the outcomes of two sequential investigations that aimed to delve into the matter of the significance of educational institutions for children hailing from underprivileged socio-economic backgrounds. The study conducted by Gustafsson et al. (2017) undertakes a comprehensive analysis of 50 educational systems, with a particular focus on examining the unique variations within schools regarding the connections between students' socioeconomic status and their level of mathematical proficiency. Furthermore, they delve into the potentiality that the correlation between socioeconomic status and academic achievement within educational institutions can be elucidated by various school-related variables, including the quantity and calibre of pedagogy, the overall atmosphere of the school, and the socioeconomic status of the school itself. Mullis, Martin, Foy, and Arora (2012) conducted an analysis of the data derived from the TIMSS 2011 research, which specifically targeted a cohort of eighth-grade students, in order to accomplish this endeavour. Given the inherent limitations of observational studies, which often restrict the range of variables being examined within a single nation, the researchers sought to enhance their likelihood of identifying educational factors that influence the correlation between socioeconomic status and academic performance. To achieve this, they judiciously employed an expansive international comparative database, thereby broadening the scope of their investigation. Based on the scholarly literature examined in the course of this article, it has been determined that there exist numerous elements that exert influence on the overall ambiance within educational institutions, with one such factor being the socioeconomic status (SES) of the school (Brantlinger, 2003; Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Hoy, Tarter, & Hoy, 2006; Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013). Therefore, it is

challenging to disentangle the precise impacts of these factors. The secondary study revealed that the socioeconomic status of schools emerged as the preeminent determinant in elucidating the disparities in educational outcomes across diverse educational systems and individual schools. The notion that the quantity and calibre of education exert a substantial influence on one another was further substantiated by empirical evidence. Nevertheless, upon careful examination of the pedagogical endeavours, it became apparent that significant moderation was observed solely in four nations with regards to the quantity of educational guidance. Similarly, when scrutinising the calibre of pedagogy, it was discerned that such discerning attributes were only identified in five nations. The utilisation of secondary analyses derived from international comparative studies such as TIMSS and PISA presents a promising avenue for the pursuit of additional systematic inquiry into the intricate interplay between equality and quality within the realm of education. This exploration encompasses not only the broader context of schools but also delves into the specific dynamics within classrooms. In the third article, the authors demonstrate the practise employed by EER researchers wherein they selectively isolate specific student populations for the purpose of scrutinising the impact of school-level variables on said populations (Sammons, Toth, & Sylva, 2017). The third article within this distinctive edition delves into the intricate journey of intellectually astute yet socioeconomically challenged students within the English secondary education system. Commencing at the tender age of eleven and culminating at the ripe age of eighteen, this study meticulously traces their developmental trajectory while discerning the multifaceted factors that underpin their triumphs. Insufficient attention has been devoted to longitudinal investigations pertaining to the effects of the domestic learning environment across diverse educational stages and age groups. It is disconcerting to note that the disparity in educational opportunities becomes increasingly pronounced with the passage of time, particularly during the secondary school phase (Crawford, Macmillan, & Vignoles, 2017; Ermisch, 2012; Sammons, 2010). The scholarly work conducted by Sammons et al. in 2015 is of notable significance. Therefore, in light of the empirical evidence presented by Sammons et al. (2017) regarding the influence of the domestic educational milieu across different developmental stages, it can be deduced that mere reliance on said environment is inadequate in fostering academic achievement up until the culmination of secondary education. Furthermore, it has been ascertained that students hailing from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds can derive substantial advantages from an enhanced secondary educational institution in relation to their academic achievements. This implies that educational institutions that place emphasis on fostering teacher collaboration, diligently strive to enhance instructional quality, meticulously monitor formative assessment, and implement a comprehensive system for monitoring student progress may possess the potential to

alleviate the impact of socioeconomic status on students' scholastic achievements. These findings align with other extensive efficacy studies conducted in various nations, which have demonstrated that educational institutions and educators possess the capacity to substantially enhance the calibre of education (Muijs et al., 2014; Reynolds et al., 2014). The preceding articles within this particular edition have diverged in their respective methodologies when addressing the concept of equality. Charalambous et al. (this issue) conducted an empirical investigation to ascertain the impact of a school-level intervention on the dimensions of equity and quality. In a similar vein, Antoniou and Griaznova (2017) employed qualitative methodologies to explore the effects of a school-based intervention on student outcomes within the context of a solitary primary school, thus presenting an exploratory case study. By emphasising the importance of implementing educational enhancements within a theoretical framework that has undergone empirical scrutiny, both research endeavours have employed the dynamic approach to school improvement (DASI) in educational institutions situated in socioeconomically disadvantaged regions (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2012; Creemers & Kyriakides, 2015). Consequently, and in accordance with the tenets of this methodology, we have been providing support to educational administrators and faculty members in formulating strategies to augment the calibre and impartiality of education through the refinement of pedagogical protocols and the creation of nurturing educational milieus. Furthermore, the concluding two articles within this publication delve into the concept of equality by examining the degree to which educational institutions and educators successfully counteracted the impact of diverse contextual factors on students' mathematical educational outcomes. The study conducted by Charalambous et al. involved the active participation of a total of forty elementary schools located in the country of Cyprus. The research findings indicate that the implementation of DASI in the experimental schools yielded superior student learning outcomes compared to the control schools. Moreover, the equity aspect of the study reveals that solely the experimental schools succeeded in mitigating the direct impact of socioeconomic status on student achievement. Antoniou and Griaznova embarked upon a scholarly endeavour in the year 2017, wherein they endeavoured to unravel the merits and demerits of the DASI intervention. To achieve this noble pursuit, they engaged in the methodical process of conducting semi-structured interviews with a cohort of sixteen esteemed English primary school teachers. Through this process, the authors of the paper acquire a deeper understanding of the contextual factors that contribute to the efficacy of school development programmes in yielding favourable outcomes for students. The incorporation of the recent research findings holds the potential to enhance educational equity and excellence. These studies have the capacity to enrich the theoretical

underpinnings of educational effectiveness research (EER) and foster closer connections between EER and the field of school improvement research.

Content analysis of the open interview and major suggestion for improving the D.EL. ED system:



Figure 1:

Figure 1 illustrates the results of the content analysis conducted on the open-ended questionnaire responses regarding suggestions for quality improvement. The most commonly mentioned suggestions were related to the competitiveness of the curriculum, job placement, and the development of in-demand skills.



Figure 2: Open ended questionnaire suggestion

Figure 2 illustrates the process of conducting content analysis on open-ended questionnaires. The faculties are highly recommended for policy updates, training, competitive environment and development, and improved HR policies, among other factors.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the literary investigation have revealed a pressing demand for further exploration, both in quantitative and qualitative terms, regarding the intricate interplay between educational equity and quality. The articles featured in this particular edition not only underscore this imperative, but also shed light on the pivotal role that educational institutions and educators themselves play in ameliorating the impact of students' individual backgrounds on their scholastic achievements. Given the enduring focus on quality

advancement within the realm of EER over the past two decades, it becomes imperative to contemplate the supplementary ramifications pertaining to research, policy, and practise. In order to delve further into the ways in which educators, educational institutions, and nations can effectively foster both quality and fairness, it is imperative for scholars in the field of Educational Equity Research (EER) to direct their attention towards pertinent scholarly inquiries that assess the notion of equity (Allison, 1978; Atkinson, 1970; Kelly, 2012, 2015; Sen & Foster, 1997) and employ suitable methodologies for gauging equity (Caro & Lenkeit, 2012; Caro, Sandoval-Hernández, &) To effectively evaluate educational establishments, curricula, and individuals in terms of their capacity to cultivate educational parity and exceptional learning, it becomes imperative to undertake a comprehensive examination encompassing both experimental and longitudinal investigations (Gustafsson, Nilsen, & Yang Hansen, 2017; Sammons et al., 2017; Charalambous et al., 2017). It is imperative to acknowledge that the research encompassed within this special issue has yielded no substantiating evidence to support the assertion that there exists an inverse relationship between quality and equity. The research suggests that educational institutions, educators, and countries that demonstrate exceptional proficiency in delivering high-quality education also exhibit a commendable commitment to ensuring equal opportunities for all individuals.

The comprehensive examination of the unstructured interviews yielded insights indicating that the respondents frequently expressed apprehensions regarding the competitive nature of the curriculum, the dearth of avenues for securing gainful employment, and the significance of cultivating proficiencies that are sought after in the current job market. Faculty recommendations are formulated due to a multitude of factors, including but not limited to policy modifications, training initiatives, enhancements to human resource policies, and the dynamic nature of the competitive landscape and its corresponding evolution.

REFERENCES

1. Allison, P. (1978). Measures of inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 43(6), 865–880.
2. Antoniou, P., & Griaiznova, J. A. (2017). Promoting quality and equity: An exploratory case study of a primary school in England exploring barriers and facilitators in implementing the Dynamic Approach to school improvement. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2017.03.002>
3. Atkinson, A. (1970). On the measurement of economic inequality. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2(3), 244–263.
4. Brantlinger, E. A. (2003). Dividing classes: How the middle class negotiates and

- rationalizes school advantage. New York: Routledge Falmer.
5. Brookover, W. B., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). *School systems and student achievement: Schools make a difference*. New York: Praeger.
 6. Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
 7. Caro, D. H., & Lenkeit, J. (2012). An analytical approach to study educational inequalities: 10 hypothesis tests in PIRLS 2006. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 35(1), 3–30.
 8. Caro, D. H., Sandoval-Hernández, A., & Lüdtke, O. (2014). Cultural, social, and economic capital constructs in international assessments: An evaluation using exploratory structural equation modeling. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 25(3), 433–450.
 9. Charalambous, E., Kyriakides, L., & Creemers, B. P. M. (2017). Promoting quality and equity in socially disadvantaged schools: A group-randomisation study. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.06.001>.
 10. Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. F., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
 11. Crawford, C., Macmillan, L., & Vignoles, A. (2017). When, and why do initially high-achieving poor children fall behind? *Oxford Review of Education*, 43(1), 88–108.
 12. Creemers, B. P. M., & Kyriakides, L. (2008). *The dynamics of educational effectiveness: A contribution to policy, practice and theory in contemporary schools*. London and New York: Routledge.
 13. Creemers, B. P. M., & Kyriakides, L. (2012). *Improving quality in education: Dynamic approaches to school improvement*. London and New York: Routledge.
 14. Creemers, B. P. M., & Kyriakides, L. (2015). Developing, testing and using theoretical models of educational effectiveness for promoting quality in education. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(1), 102–119.
 15. Creemers, B. P. M., Kyriakides, L., & Sammons, P. (2010). *Methodological advances in educational effectiveness research*. London and New York: Routledge.
 16. Cunha, F., & Heckman, J. J. (2009). The economics and psychology of inequality and human development. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7(2-3), 320–364.
 17. Driessen, G. (2007). 'Peer group'. Retrieved from ITS-Radboud Universiteit. <http://its.ruhosting.nl/publicaties/pdf/r1730.pdf>.
 18. Driessen, G. W. J. M., & Mulder, L. W. J. (1999). The enhancement of educational opportunities of disadvantaged children. In R. J. Bosker, B. P. M. Creemers, & S. Stringfield (Eds.). *Enhancing educational excellence, equity and efficiency: Evidence from evaluations of systems and schools in change* (pp. 37–64). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
 19. Ermisch, J. (2012). *Latest international social mobility comparisons*. Sutton trust–report on crita project London. Sutton Trust <http://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/sutton-trust-latest-international-social-mobility-comparisons.pdf>.
 20. Field, S., Kuczera, M., & Pont, B. (2007). *No more Failures: Ten steps to equity in education*. Paris, France: OECD.
 21. Frempong, G., Reddy, V., & Kanjee, A. (2011). Exploring equity and quality education in South Africa using multilevel models. *Compare*, 41(6), 819–835.
 22. Gustafsson, J.-E., Nilsen, T., & Yang Hansen, K. (2017). School characteristics moderating the relation between student socio-economic status and mathematics achievement in grade 8. Evidence from 50 countries in TIMSS 2011. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.09.004> [this issue].
 23. Heckman, J. (2008). *The case of investing in disadvantage young children. Big ideas for children: Investing in our nation's future*. Washington, DC: First Focus.
 24. Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, A. W. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 425–446.
 25. Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., et al. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effects of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.
 26. Kelly, A. (2012). Measuring 'equity' and 'equitability' in school effectiveness research. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(6), 977–1002.
 27. Kelly, A. (2015). Measuring equity in educational effectiveness research: The properties and possibilities of quantitative indicators. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 38(2), 115–136.
 28. Kyriakides, L. (2008). Testing the validity of the comprehensive model of educational effectiveness: A step towards the development of a dynamic model of

- effectiveness. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 19(4), 429–446.
30. Kyriakides, L., Creemers, B. P. M., & Charalambous, E. (2018). Equity and quality dimensions in educational effectiveness. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
 31. Lenkeit, J., Caro, D. H., & Strand, S. (2015). Tackling the remaining attainment gap between students with and without immigrant background: An investigation into the equivalence of SES constructs. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 21(1), 60–83.
 32. MacDonald, B. (1991). Critical introduction from innovation to reform: A framework for analysing change. In J. Rudduck (Ed.). *Innovation and change: Developing involvement and understanding* (pp. 1–13). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
 33. Madaus, G. G., Kellaghan, T., Rakow, E. A., & King, D. (1979). The sensitivity of measures of school effectiveness. *Harvard Educational Review*, 49(2), 207–230.
 34. Marks, G. N., Cresswell, J., & Ainley, J. (2006). Explaining socioeconomic inequalities in student achievement: The role of home and school factors. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, 12(2), 105–128.
 35. Micklewright, J., & Schnepf, S. V. (2007). Inequality of learning in industrialized countries. In S. P. Jenkins, & J. Micklewright (Eds.). *Inequality and poverty re-examined* (pp. 129–145). Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
 36. Muijs, R. D., Kyriakides, L., van der Werf, G., Creemers, B. P. M., Timperley, H., & Earl, L. (2014). State of the art-teacher effectiveness and professional learning. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 25(2), 231–256.
 37. Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., & Arora, A. (2012). TIMSS 2011 international results in mathematics. Chestnut Hill, MA: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.
 38. OECD (2010a). PISA 2009 results: Overcoming social background: Equity in learning opportunities and outcomes, Vol. II. Paris, France: OECD. OECD (2010b). PISA 2009 results: What students know and can do: Student performance in reading, mathematics and science, Vol. I. Paris, France: OECD.
 39. OECD (2012). Equity and quality in education: Supporting disadvantaged students and schools. Paris: OECD Publishing Available in: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264130852-en>. OECD (2013). PISA 2012 Results: Excellence through equity: Giving every student the chance to succeed. Paris, France: OECD.
 40. Psacharopoulos, G. (2007). The costs of school failure: A feasibility study. Analytical report prepared for the European Commission.
 41. Reynolds, D., Sammons, P., De Fraine, B., Van Damme, J., Townsend, T., Teddlie, C., et al. (2014). Educational effectiveness research (EER): a state-of-the-art review. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 25(2), 197–230. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 57 (2018) 1–5 4
 42. Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 43. Sammons, P. (2010). Equity and educational effectiveness. In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGaw (Eds.). *International encyclopedia of education, volume 5, leadership and management–politics and governance* (pp. 51–57). Oxford: Elsevier.
 44. Sammons, P., Power, S., Elliot, K., Campbell, C., Robertson, P., & Whitty, G. (2003). *New community schools in Scotland: Final report–national evaluation of the pilot phase* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department.
 45. Sammons, P., Toth, K., Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Siraj, I., & Taggart, B. (2015). The long-term role of the home learning environment in shaping students' academic attainment in secondary school. *Journal of Children's Services*, 10(3), 189–201.
 46. Sammons, P., Toth, K., & Sylva, K. (2017). The drivers of academic success for 'bright' but disadvantaged students: A longitudinal study of AS and A level outcomes in England. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2017.10.004>
 47. Scheerens, J. (2013). The use of theory in school effectiveness research revisited. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 24(1), 1–38.
 48. Scheerens, J. (2014). School, teaching, and system effectiveness: Some comments on three state-of-the-art reviews. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 25(2), 282–290.
 49. Scheerens, J. (2016). *Educational effectiveness and ineffectiveness: A critical review of the knowledge*. Base Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
 50. Scheerens, J., & Bosker, R. J. (1997). *The foundations of educational effectiveness*. Oxford, England: Pergamon. Schon, D. A. (1971). *Beyond the stable state*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
 51. Sen, A., & Foster, J. (1997). *On economic inequality*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
 52. Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 417–453.
 53. Strand, S. (2010). Do some schools narrow the gap? Differential school effectiveness by ethnicity, gender, poverty, and prior

- achievement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 21(3), 289–314.
54. Strand, S. (2011). The limits of social class in explaining ethnic gaps in educational attainment. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 197–229.
55. Taggart, B., & Sammons, P. (1999). Evaluating the impact of raising school standards initiative. In R. J. Bosker, B. P. M. Creemers, & S. Stringfield (Eds.). *Enhancing educational excellence, equity and efficiency: Evidence from evaluations of systems and schools in change* (pp. 137–166). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
56. Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research? *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 357–385.
57. Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. IEA: Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
58. Verhaeghe, J. P., Vanlaar, G., Knipprath, H., De Fraine, B., & Van Damme, J. (2017). (this issue), Can group composition effects explain socioeconomic and ethnic achievement gaps in primary education? *Studies in Educational Evaluation*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2017.07.006>
59. White, K. (1982). The relation between socioeconomic status and academic achievement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91(3), 461–481.

Corresponding Author

Bhim Singh*

Research Scholar, USE, GGSIPU, Dwarka