
Inequalities of Educational Opportunity and Social Origin: The Case of Primary Schools in Sfax City and its Suburbs

Aicha DJASSI ^{1*}, Ali ELOUMI ², Imen BEN AMAR ³ & Chawki DERBALI ⁴

1-ECUMUS Laboratory / University of Sfax / Tunisia

2-TEC Laboratory / Paris Descartes University / France

3-ECUMUS Laboratory / University of Sfax / Tunisia

4-University of Jendouba / Tunisia

Abstract: The main objective of this study was to identify the links between social origin and the academic performance of students attending grades 4, 5 and 6 of primary schools in the Sfax region. Secondary objectives were to test the hypotheses of the influence of the status of the family of origin of each student and the level of education of the parents on the academic performance of their children and the importance of school-based parent-student interactions. At the end of this, we find that school performance is influenced by several factors related to social origin, including socio-economic conditions, the status of the family and the level of education of parents. These results also highlight the relationship between the parental determinant of the family and the school performance obtained by the different pupils surveyed. Finally, they establish a link between the level of education of biological parents and the results of their children. Indeed, the issue of academic performance is a fairly complex phenomenon that requires the consideration of several dimensions including socioeconomic factors, but also individual or personal factors to students and finally school order factors. It is therefore an opportunity for us to refute any perception of boundless determinism of social class theory and to show the important place of individual, personal and academic variables in explaining the results observed at school.

Keywords: Unequal opportunities, school performance, pupils, parents, socio-economic and cultural background.

1. INTRODUCTION

The history of education had begun with the civilization of ancient Greece: thus, the term school had taken the meaning of leisure but its role is not only to educate and train because the educational system has exceeded its functions by going more away leaving impacts on future individuals. Indeed, the school plays a triple role that consists of educating, integrating and subsequently classifying. In the first phase, the child learns to be autonomous and rational in relation to his environment and afterwards, he must also undergo the norms transmitted through the education he has received in order to function and act correctly in the within society. Now that he has become a social being modeled with a certain guilt of integration, classifications will be assigned to him according to diplomas that will specify a job, giving him his true value, obviously its true social status.

For this study, we have chosen the subject of inequality of opportunity in school because we are convinced as a teacher by its sensitivity and its destructive consequences on the schooling of schoolchildren as well as their future. From my experience in basic education, the phenomenon of school inequality has naturally become a subject of study. In fact, it has been found to be the oldest and most persistent obstacle in school and takes a variety of forms despite all the efforts made to identify and reduce its accentuation. The phenomenon represents the greatest injustice that can be committed against innocent people. It is therefore necessary to focus on inequalities at school and to determine their resources because all children deserve a quality education centered on fundamental rights and rooted in the concept of equal opportunities to flourish and ensure a productive and productive future. The purpose of this memoir is to understand this phenomenon, whose purpose is to analyze these creative mechanisms.

Formerly, teaching in France (Pierre BOURDIEU, 1986, pp. 17-33) was long reserved for a certain elite but over time, it has experienced significant democratization. Thus, the education system is now evolving; extension of study duration, modification of curricula and methods, use of the growth of information and communication technology.

According to the work of (Pierre BOURDIEU and PASSERON, 1986, p.19) school is a kind of social inequality so that they consider it as an instrument of a ruling class to establish its domination over the dominated class and that the education system is accused of masking the school reproduction mechanisms that in fact reflect social inequalities because the school is only a tool for maintaining social order. But the thesis of Bourdieu & al. was severely criticized by Raymond BOUDON, (1972, p.13) in his famous book "Unequal Opportunities" or, he rejected the deterministic analysis of the two authors who thought that individuals act according to "Social provisions "Integrated in an unconscious way and who will influence their attitudes thereafter. Boudon opposes the macro-social interpretations of the school's functioning and largely breaks with the decisive role of the cultural heritage while starting from another conception, that of the rational actor, by adopting an actionist approach. According to him, there is no social reproduction, no absolute fear but obviously individual strategies adopted by rational actors while being based on the calculation of the costs and interest, as he sees that the fundamental creative mechanism of inequality is the existence of hierarchical social positions at the social superposition which thus seems incompatible with equality of opportunity, socio-economic inequalities are no longer analyzed as the result of the action of the school but as one of the leading causes of inequality in school. Francois DUBET (2005, p.9) proposes another perspective while taking into consideration all the paradigms, deterministic, individualist and interactionist and he interprets education as a social action. The general problem of this study is about inequality of opportunity in school and we will try to answer the following question: Does the inequality of opportunity in school vary according to social origin, individual strategies adopted by students and their parents. Is it rational? Deterministic? Or global? Based on the previous sociological approach to equality of opportunity, we unveil our problematic by highlighting the sociological disagreement to explain the phenomenon of inequalities of educational opportunity between sociologists. On the one hand, Bourdieu insists on the symbolic domination in the relations that the classes maintain with each other and his sociology is marked by the structuralist tradition, in fact the attitudes, the judgments, the motivations of the individuals that compose the society are largely determined by the structure and more specifically by the place these agents occupy in society. On the other hand, this macro-sociological analysis at the level of the school system as a whole has been criticized by Raymond Boudon who starts from an inverse postulate, while developing an individualistic approach of which he considers the social phenomena as the products of actions and of beliefs of individuals. Despite the theoretical confirmation that social factors are decisive in a student's academic success, we note, however, that we must identify the key factors of social origin that impact academic success. Some argue that socio-economic factors are determinative (the actionalists), others place the cultural (structuralist) factors in pedestal. Intensity is the relative permanent inequality in education is mainly due to the effects of the influence of social position and to a much more limited extent to the effect of cultural inequalities (1998, p.105). This thesis breaks considerably with the commonly proposed interpretations that favor the role of cultural heritage. The essential generating mechanism of inequality, according to Boudon (1972, p. 17), is the existence of hierarchical social positions with a social distribution which thus appears to be discordant with equal opportunities. Socioeconomic divergences are not studied as the product of school action, but as one of the determining causes of opportunities in school. However, despite the fact that some authors prioritize one or the other of this group of factors. It seems obvious as François DUBET (2009, 31) points out that all these factors intervene together either to handicap or to favor the student's academic success. So, how do Tunisians explain the equality of educational opportunities? Does the Tunisian school produce the same influences or vice versa? What influence does social origin have on the school performance of students in Tunisia and more precisely in the city of Sfax? To answer our questions, this study was initiated based on the research methodology that follows.

2. METHODS

In this part we will present the main lines that will guide our research work. He will present the methodological steps that will allow us to verify our research hypotheses. It includes successively the definition of the environment and the survey population, the sample, the tools and techniques of data production, the field policy, the data analysis strategy, the limits and the difficulties of the study. .

The present research took place in the city of Sfax and its suburbs, two primary schools were selected (Alexandre Dumas school and el Bahri school 4). The study looked at a school population of both sexes (male and female) attending grades 4, 5 and 6 in two schools.

The sampling of the study was carried out on the basis of the combination of two techniques: the quota method and the random draw method. A series of compromises has been undertaken between the combination of quota sampling techniques and the random draw, in particular systematic draw and the constraints of reality (temporal, financial, administrative constraints, etc.).

For the sake of representativeness, the application of a sample rate of 10% gives us this: In the distribution of this number (98 students) at the school level, we took into account the proportion of each school. ie the weight it represents. We chose all the students in the class to do our work. From the school register we made three categories (or strata).

- 1- Low general average learners
- 2- average general average learners
- 3- high general average learners

This process is similar to the strata sampling technique (probabilistic sampling technique). Thus learners are chosen from their overall average and this choice is made randomly. (See table.1)

Table.1: Summary table of the size of our sample

School attended Age	Sfax city	Sfax suburbs	Total
8-10 years	10	9	19
10-12 years	40	39	79
Total	50	48	98

Depending on the objectives of the study, the quantitative method seems the most appropriate. A data collection instrument was selected: the questionnaire. It was administered to all students in the survey sample. The purpose of this data collection tool is to collect information on:

- * The socio-economic characteristics of the respondents;
- * The structure and family characteristics of these;
- * The educational level of their parents and family monitoring;
- * The school characteristics of the respondents.

Our questionnaire has two parts. The first part contains socio-demographic information, and the characteristics of the student's family (age, sex, parents' educational level, socio-professional category of parents, family structure). From these different categories we will establish a treatment index. This index will be scored in points, as is the logic of the Likert scales (scale added). The questionnaire is divided into three categories of questions. These three categories cover the three categories of our independent variable. The answers are listed as follows:

1= Never	2= Sometimes	3= Often	4= Always
-----------------	---------------------	-----------------	------------------

To determine the level of self-reported interaction by the students, we will sum the points obtained by the students from the answers given.

Items:

We use the technique we call in the scientific literature: "the technique of forced choice items", these items are designed to ask the respondent to choose among the answers those that correspond best to his choice. We chose this technique because it "forces the subject to make choices that he would have avoided if the items had been presented in a classical format" (François DESINGLY, 1992, pp. 42-57). We minimize the risk of having unanswered questions.

Items can be classified into two groups. Those aiming to obtain students' perceptions of the different types of parental interactions (items: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8, 9,10, 11) and those aimed at checking the accuracy of respondents' answers, internal consistency of questionnaire (item 8,12,7). The rating of the items used to check the participants' response (8 inversion of 6, 12 inversions of 2, 13 inversion 7) is reversed.

4= Never	3= Sometimes	2= Often	1= Always
----------	--------------	----------	-----------

3. PARENT-CHILD INTERACTIONS FOCUSED ON SCHOOL

The following questions relate to the relationship your parents (or caregiver) have with you regarding your school activities. . These types of questions relate to the relationship of students and their parents, and reflect the interaction between these two actors (pupil / parent) regarding the follow-up of school activities outside school.

As an illustration we present in the table below some examples of random questions, asked to our respondents.

Illustration questions	Never	Sometimes	Often	Always
After a day of class my parents ask me about what I did in class				
When I have difficulties at school my parents talk to me and support me morally.				
When I bring a bad notebook home my parents talk to me and encourage me to do better				
When I have problems in class my parents totally ignore me				
At home my parents are trying to find out what are the academic spots I have for the next day of class				
After school my parents help me in my homework (or pay lessons)				
My parents help me plan my time for school and family tasks				
During school days my parents do not want to know if I did my schoolwork				
When I bring a bad book my parents punish me				

Parent-student interaction treatment grid focused on academic performance

We sum the points associated with each answer of each modality, then the sum total. This sum, according to the number of points obtained by the learner, defines the level of interaction (constructive high-average-low). The level of interaction will be related to the overall average of the student found in the school register.

Treatment unit

13-25 points (weak interactions)

26-38 points (moderate interactions)

-39-52 points (high interactions)

Our questionnaire is based on the logic of the Likert scale, which is an ordinal scale, this level of perception will be determined by the number of points given to each of the respondent's answers. This way of proceeding was besides recommended by Jean Paul GREMY (2003, p.22) for which "any attempt to describe the" social facts "imposes an effort of abstraction, selection of the information that one judge " interesting ", or " relevant ". This approach is not specific to " quantitative " methods: methods of content analysis or observation do not proceed otherwise. The data collected from the student questionnaire were analyzed and processed manually (frequency distribution techniques using cross-tabulations, comparison of percentages, etc.) to calculate the distribution. frequencies within the survey population.

4. RESULTS

Following our theoretical scan based on previous scientific sources in the sociology of education, one of the ideas that emerges clearly is that academic outcomes are influenced by social origin as emphasized by all sociologists in the field who generally advanced that academic success is strongly and positively correlated with the social background of students. The main objective of this chapter will be to see to what extent socio-economic determinants influence school performance in the city of Sfax in Tunisia.

1. Socio-demographic characteristics, the characteristics of the student's family and the socio-occupational category of the parents.

Sociodemographic characteristics of our study population

The statistical data collected during our field survey of students were the subject of a statistical treatment presented in different tables. The following tables present successively a presentation of the students surveyed

according to certain characteristics such as school and geographical area attended, age, class attended and finally according to the profession of the parents.

School and social space attended

Table.2: Distribution of students by school and area attended

School	Number	Percentage (%)
Sfax city	50	51
Sfax suburbs	48	49
Total	98	100

The results in Table 2 show that only 49% of the respondents attend the suburban school while 51% come from the city center.

Age of students and school attended

Table.3: Distribution of the surveyed population by age

School attended Age	Effective N	Percentage %
8-10 years	19	19.4
10-12 years	79	80.6
Total	98	100

Based on the table above, we can see that 19.4% of the students in the study have an age between 8-10 years and 80.6% between 10-12 years. These statistics show that the vast majority is between 10 and 12 years old.

Socioprofessional classes of parents

The table below gives some indication of the occupation exercised by the parents of the pupils surveyed.

Table.4: Distribution of students by socio-professional class of parents

Profession of parents	Effective (N)	percentage (%)
Workers	27	28%
Officials	54	55%
Liberal professions	17	17%
Total	98	100.00

According to the data in Table 4, 55% of our study population have one parent, 28% come from a working-class family, and only 17% of students have a parent who practices professionally. Through these data, we see that the majority of students come from a middle socio-professional class (parents civil servants), workers and finally liberal professions. These figures are not surprising because they only reflect the general characteristics of the social environments in which the schools attended are located, the more the parents are connected to the downtown core, the more their children attend downtown schools. In addition, schools in the suburbs are marked by attendance of pupils whose parents are mostly workers or in a situation of precarious employment.

2. Social and school life

The living conditions of the family are factors that can influence school results. The following tables thus show the conditions in which the respondents live and in which they engage in school activities.

The effect of living conditions on the school curriculum according to the pupils

Table.5: Profession of parents and impact of living conditions on pupils' school curriculum

Profession of parents	Family living condition				Effective Total	%
	Favorable Effective	%	unfavorable Effective	%		
Workers	03	11	24	89	27	100
Officials	33	61	21	39	54	100
Liberal professions	16	94	01	6	17	100
Total	52	53	46	47	98	100

This table reports on the relationship observed between the parents' profession and the students' assessment of their living conditions on the studies. In fact, 47% of students say they have poor living conditions compared to 53% who say they have conditions conducive to studies. The distribution by occupation of parents shows that a majority of children of workers (89%) against a minority of children of civil servants (39%) and of children whose father exercises a liberal profession (6%) estimate that their living conditions are not an asset for their studies. As for favorable opinions, 94% of children of parents exercising a liberal profession, 61% of children of civil servants, 11% of workers' children think that their living conditions allow them to perform well in school. These data thus attest to a relationship between the parents' profession and living conditions, which in turn have a link with educational outcomes. The reasons given by students to show the influence of their living conditions on education are manifold. These words summarize and reflect the situation in which live a large number of students who, in spite of the many difficulties (lack of means of travel, food and health problems, demanding domestic work ...) are forced to succeed at the school. Unlike others who enjoy good living and learning conditions because they come from well-to-do social groups.

3. Socio-economic factors and their determination in school performance

Many empirical studies have come to the conclusion that social origin determines school performance (Pierre BOURDIEU, 1970, p.29). The various tables that follow, make the distribution of the school performance of the respondents according to the profession of the parents, an element which gives indications on the social origin.

Profession of parents and cultural capital

Table.6 : Distribution of the parents' occupation by cultural capital

Profession of parents	Level of education									
	un schooled		Primary		Secondary		Superior		Total	
	Effective	%	Effective	%	Effective	%	Effective	%		%
workers	3	11	13	48	6	22	5	19	27	100
officials	3	6	5	9	14	26	32	59	54	100
Liberal professions	0	0	4	24	11	64	02	12	17	100
Total	6	6	22	22	31	32	39	40	98	100

This table shows that, in general, there is a relationship between the educational level and the occupation of the parents of the respondents. It will be assumed in this analysis that educational levels and socio-professional categories are correlated. This correlation is well highlighted in the table above. In fact, when the level of the diploma increases, the professional status improves. Of all those with a higher level, 59% are civil servants, 12% are professionals and 19% are blue-collar workers. In addition, the statistical data in the table show a low percentage of out-of-school, ie illiterate (11%) among workers (6%) among civil servants, whereas this percentage is (0%) in the liberal professions but specify that they are large traders or businessmen economically well-off even if they are illiterate.

School failure report and institution attended by the student

Table .7: School performance by attended school

School attended	SCHOOL PERFORMANCE (General averages)							
	< to 10		between 10 and 15		> to 15		Effective Total	%
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		
Downtown	4	8	18	36	28	56	50	100
Suburbs	9	19	28	58	11	23	48	100
Total	13	13	46	47	39	40	98	100

The results in this table reveal that only 40% of the students surveyed, (all ages and schools attended combined), have an average above 15/20 during this school year, 47% have an average of between 10 and 15, and 13% have an average below 10/20. These statistics show that there is a low percentage of students who fail school in both types of schools (downtown and suburbs) of our survey because 13% of students have a poor school performance against

87% who have had their average. However, there is a slight difference in school failure between the two institutions (8% for downtown versus 19% for the suburbs). The distribution of students according to school performance and school attended reveals more realities. Indeed, for students with a general average, we have a percentage of 58% for the suburbs and only 36% for the city center. For those who do not have a general average, we have 19% for the suburbs and 8% for the city center. As for children with good school performance, we can confirm a significant percentage difference in favor of downtown 56% against 23% for the suburbs. These data therefore indicate that the suburban school reaches month school excellence as the downtown school. Moreover, in the suburbs there are more students with an average level of education than the city center.

Profession report of the parents and student's academic performance

Table.8 : Distribution of students by academic performance and parent's occupation

Profession of parents	SCHOOL PERFORMANCE (General averages)							
	< to 10		Between 10 and 15		> to 15		Effective Total	%
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		
workers	4	15	19	70	4	15	27	100
officials	4	8	24	44	26	48	54	100
Liberal profession	4	23	4	23	9	54	17	100
Total	12	12	47	48	39	40	98	100

The scores in this table reflect a correlation between students 'academic performance and the parents' profession. Indeed, through this table, we note that 54% of students whose father has a liberal profession have an average greater than 15, while the percentage is respectively 15%, 48% for workers and civil servants. Of those with an average of less than 10, 15% have a worker father, 8% are civil servants and 23% are professionals. For those with an average of between 10 and 15, 70% come from working parents, 44% from civil servants, and 23% from liberal professions. According to these different statistical figures, we can see that the better we have the socio-economic conditions, as many of the liberal professions and civil servants, the more the frequency of the average, increases as it decreases as as the conditions are precarious as in most children whose parents are workers.

Parenting report and student achievement

In the previous chapter, it was discussed to analyze the mechanisms by which socio- economic conditions related to social origin intervened in the student's academic performance in Sfax. The objective now pursued by the following section is to see to what extent parental status and educational attainment can influence the success or failure of children. The following tables show the influence of marital status on student achievement

Parental support and student's academic performance

Table. 9: Breakdown of students by their school performance and parental determinant

Parental Determinant	SCHOOL PERFORMANCE (General averages)							
	< to 10		Between 10 and 15		> to 15		Effective Total	%
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		
Living with parents	10	13	35	44	34	43	79	100
Living with your father	0	0	3	100	0	0	3	100
Living with your mother	2	13	9	56	5	31	16	100
Total	12	12	47	48	39	40	98	100

This table shows the respondents according to the parents' load. These results indicate that 79 children live with both parents under the same roof, while a minority live with either the mother (16) or the dad (3). Through this table, the difference in the load of pupils according to the family situation of the parents, deserves that we take into account the effect of this situation on the school performance of children. Analysis of the data in the table shows that school performance is a function of family balance. Indeed, children living with both parents have a higher school performance than other family situations (79 subjects who represent 81% against 19 who represent 19%). The percentage of school performance of children in both parents' care is 13% (average less than 10/20), 44%

(average greater than 10/20) and 43% (average greater than 15/20). For those who live with the mother have a better school performance than live with the father, (13% vs. 0%) at the average level below 10/20, and 31% against 0% at the upper average level at 15/20. On the other hand, subjects who live with the father have a higher average at the level of the average higher than 10/20 than with the mother 100% against 56%. According to these figures, we can see that the more the child lives with both parents, the higher the frequency with which the children's school performance increases, while it decreases as the child lives with his mother is with his father. This situation is made possible by the socio-economic environment specific to each of these families. The analysis of these figures shows that there is a link between parental status and school performance. All of these data support our hypothesis and suggest that living with one parent is more associated with low educational outcomes than both.

Parents' educational level and student's academic performance

In the sociology of education, there are many research findings that establish relationships between parents' educational attainment and their children's school performance. The following tables therefore give some indication of the relationship between parents' level of education and the school results of the pupils surveyed.

Table.10: *Distribution of students according to their school performance and the cultural determinant of parents*

School performance	Level of education									
	unschooled		Primary		Secondary		Superior		Total	
	Effective	%	Effective	%	Effective	%	Effective	%		%
< 10/20	8	67	3	25	1	8	0	0	12	100
from 10/20 to 15/20	1	2	6	13	11	24	28	61	46	100
> 15/20	2	5	4	10	12	30	22	55	40	100
Total	11	11	13	13	24	25	50	51	98	100

The data in this table shows the relationship between the educational level of the parents of students and their school performance. These results reveal that students with a school performance of less than 10/20 have one of the parents with a level of education that represents the following percentage: out of school 67%, primary 25%, secondary 8% and 0%. In addition, statistics show that students who have an average between 10/20 and 15/20 have a school performance that varies according to the level of education of parents: 61% higher level against only 24% of parents of level secondary school and 13% of primary school parents versus 2% of parents who are out of school. It can be seen that the low rate of out-of-school and primary-school parents has an effect on the educational performance of their children. This could be explained by the disengagement of some parents of students but especially by their inability to take charge of their child pedagogically either because they are out of school or have a low level of schooling. This distribution according to the educational level of the parents, however, reveals contrasts. In fact, the vast majority of parents who still follow the academic performance of their children have a secondary and higher level. While these figures establish a link between parents' educational attainment and children's school performance, they also show that a special effort is made by parents who are not in school or at primary level despite their level to learn about the academic performance of their children. The averages between 10/20 and 15/20 of children of out-of-school parents represent 2%, and 13% of primary-level parents. This shows that parents are aware that grades are an important condition for the academic success of their children and give them a special look even if the situation differs when it comes to their school supervision.

From these numbers, it is clear that the higher the parents' level of education, the more likely they are to have a good school performance. Particularly favorable socio-economic conditions have certainly made real the commitment and determination of parents for the success of their child. But also in this success, the level of education of these has been decisive because it explains the effectiveness of home monitoring in order to obtain good returns. However, note that these percentages represent only global trends and do not mean that, taken individually, a student coming from higher-level parents performs more than one having parents who are not in school.

After the analysis of these different tables above relating the level of education of parents and the school performance of their children, we see that children of parents of different grade levels can have an average of less

than 10 but those whose parents have a high level of education perform better than others. These results confirm our hypotheses and have certainly been made possible by economic conditions that induce an effective commitment to the student's success. But in terms of observed performance, parents' level of education seems to be a determining factor in school success.

4- Parent-child interaction and school performance

Authors such as Lahire (1998, p.56) have pointed out that discussions about the importance of school are one of the most valuable elements of the study in the family configuration. They represent, according to the latter, an element that plays on the educational success of the learner of popular circles. This element may to some extent explain this discrepancy between the overall average and the level of interaction. Indeed in the table presenting the elements of analysis, we can notice that the majority of the parents discuss with their children on their projects of future in connection with the school. In order to give an overall view of the prevailing trend in the study population, we present the data from the (98) respondents.

This comparison is based on data found in the field. We classified the students in our sample into three categories:

- 1) class of interactions (low school attendance).
- 2) class of moderate interactions.
- 3) high interaction class.

In each category we check the percentage of students with a low overall average, those with a moderate overall average and those with a high overall average.

Table .11: Overall Distribution of Population by Interaction Categories (Low, Moderate, and High) and Academic Performance

School performance	School monitoring of parents						Total	
	Low interaction		Moderate interaction		High interaction		Effective	%
	Effective	points	Effective	points	Effective	points		
< à 10/20	11	24	1	37	0	0	12	10
From 10/20 to 15/20	7	17	15	33	23	50	46	49
> A 15/20	6	14	14	27	20	42	40	41
Total effective/ points	24 (24%)	55/3= 18.33	30 (31%)	97/3= 32.33	43 (55%)	92/2= 46	N=98	100

Interaction Low and academic performance

In the category of students who report that their parents interact very little or not on school monitoring, respectively, 24 points for averages <10/20, 17 points for averages between 10/20 and 15/20 and finally 14 points for the average at 15/20, (see Figure.1), low school performance does not predominate despite weak interaction with parents. According to the data, in this class, 24 out of 98 children have an average of between 5/20 and 15/20. In other words, the majority of children in this category 13 out of 24 (which represents 54%) had their general average in the quarter in which this study was conducted, only 11 students in this category have an average <10/20 (see tab.11).

The data found is contrary to those advanced in the literature. In fact, the children in our sample who live in an environment where their parents do not manage their school activities, did not obtain a low average over the period selected for this study. We can say that there is no concordance between the level of parental interaction (school attendance) and the children's school performance. This ambiguity may be due, as Boudon (1973, p.77) emphasizes, to the fact that this group of children has developed certain individual strategies that enabled them to compensate for or remedy the absence or lack of parental supervision in the children. school activities.

Moderate Interaction and Academic Performance

At the level of the category of respondents who self-report that they sometimes interact with their parents on the school (moderate interaction), or who receive periodic school monitoring (n = 30). 29/30 of them (nearly 30%) have a general average of between 10/20 and > 15/20 in the last quarter compared to only one student with an

average of less than 10/20. The relationship between the level of interaction with parents and academic success is consistent. In other words, when the level of support is limited or not regular, the vast majority of children manage to have a general average even if the interaction with the parents is moderate with 32.33 points (see tab.11).

We can say that in this category, reality corresponds to the elements found in the research, especially in the ecological model: family-school, developed by Ryan and Adam (1996, 2000). According to this model, the more a student receives support from his parents, the better his success (his academic performance) will be. More clearly according to this conception, the pupil's average is proportional with the level of supervision found. From there, when the child does not receive supervision, he will not succeed. When supervision is medium or seasonal, school success will also be average. When parental support is present, the students' academic success will be high.

High interaction and academic performance

In the category of children (n = 43) who report that their parents regularly supervise them in their school activities (High Interaction with 46 points). High school performance is not dominant. Indeed, in this category, we notice that there are no students who have a school performance lower than 10/20. We would expect, according to our theoretical framework, that this percentage in this category is the highest. In addition, 23/46 students in this category have an average of between 10/20 and 15/20 (with 50 pointsS). In the same category we find half of the workforce (20/40) which has an average > to 15/20 (with 42 points, see Tab.11).

These data are very different from what we expected. They are very different from what theoretical points of view predict. It should be expected in this sample (population of children with high parental school attendance) that the percentage of respondents who have an average > 15/20 is higher than the other performance indicators (low or moderate) . On the contrary, we have found the opposite reality. It is true that at this level, this average seems to be very difficult to reach by the vast majority of learners.

We have seen in a general way, in spite of the fact that the perception of the two actors (parents and pupils) is concordant, the general average corresponds very rarely to the two perceptions.

From a general point of view, the trend is the same. At the level of the population of children who self-report a low level of interaction the percentage of general average <10/20 (18.33 points) is the lowest (24%). On the other hand, the population level of pupils who self-report a moderate level of interaction (32.33 points) and at the level of high interactions is higher (46 points). The results found in the relationship between high interactions and academic performance appear to be more effective than other levels. We say effective, to the extent that these results reflect a reality contrary to what we expected. The overall average rate is increasing as we move towards moderate and high interactions. The high general average rate increases from 24% at the level of weak interactions to 31% at the level of moderate interactions to 55% at the level of high interactions. According to our survey, the more students feel that their parents are engaged, involved in their training the less they perform at school.

5. DISCUSSION

The comparison of the socio-economic and cultural level with the academic performance of the students in our study revealed that they are not the only clues that would determine their academic success. From there, we explored other avenues that may explain or may affect the student's academic success in a disadvantaged environment. We mentioned as contextual elements: The learner's aspiration to school, his motivation and in correlation with these elements the level of autonomy of the learner vis-à-vis school tasks. These different elements if they all appear important in the learning of any learner of any social category they are rather central for the learners of the popular milieus, considering the precariousness of their environment (absence of didactic materials, libraries, food, access to the most basic health care, etc.) but also the lack of support that can be found in the family environment, generally dominated by a high level of illiteracy and the lack of availability of parents. We believe that, faced with all these constraints, the individual characteristics of the learners seem to be a rather interesting exploration track. We conclude this discussion by saying that, in our opinion, the impact of socio-economic factors on students can indeed influence their success, however, they are not, in our view, the proximal variables that influence the child's success. . The personal characteristics of the child, his motivation to go as far as possible, to change his life, could be the central element that drives the Tunisian child to success. Family factors can be seen as

distal variables that will reinforce or diminish children's personal abilities. We will focus in our subsequent research on personal abilities as a rather interesting way of explaining the educational success of learners living in disadvantaged areas. While being aware that other factors affect the academic success of adolescents. For as Dubet has argued (1997, p. 76): "There is a set of processes that articulate each other. Some are built in the family, others in the school, and the result depends on the articulation of the whole "

6. CONCLUSION

This work allowed us to understand that the learner is the key element of his learning and success. Individual characteristics are elements that can be considered as priorities in the child's academic success. However, we must never omit environmental factors, as they influence children's personal beliefs. However, while most of our social origin variables are related to academic outcomes and thus confirm our assumptions, other factors may also be involved in explaining issues of failure or academic success. . Indeed, the issue of academic performance is a fairly complex phenomenon that requires the consideration of several dimensions including socioeconomic factors, but also individual or personal factors to students and finally school order factors. It is therefore an opportunity for us to refute any perception of boundless determinism of social class theory (any theory being contextual, historical and dynamic ...) and to show the important place of the individual, personal and social variables. in the explanation of the results observed at school. Our study has allowed us to see that any study that is intended to be holistic must take into account environmental aspects and individual aspects, in short, integrate it into a sociological approach to social action and experience (DUBET, 2009 p. 69). It would therefore be important for the social actors involved in the education system to emphasize school practices aimed at strengthening the intrinsic abilities of learners.

REFERENCES

- BOUDON Raymond et al, (1996). Dictionnaire de sociologie, Paris, Larousse, 280 pages
- BOUDON Raymond. (1993). L'inégalité des chances. La mobilité sociale dans les sociétés industrielles. Paris, Arman Colin.
- BOUDON Raymond, (1973). L'inégalité des chances : la mobilité dans les industrielles, Paris, Arman Colin, , 237 pages
- BOURDIEU Pierre, & PASSERON, Jean-Claude. (1970). La Reproduction, Paris, éd Minuit.
- BOURDIEU Pierre, & PASSERON Jean-Claude, (1964). Les héritiers : les étudiants et la culture, Paris, édition. Minuit, 189 pages.
- BOURDIEU Pierre, (1970). La reproduction : élément pour une théorie du système d'enseignement, Paris, édition Minuit, 279 pages
- BOURDIEU Pierre, (1978). Classement, déclassé, reclassement, in *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, Paris, N°24.
- DESINGLY François (1992), *L'enquête et ses méthodes : le questionnaire*, Paris, Nathan.
- DUBET François, (1997). *Ecole, Familles : Le Malentendu*, Paris, Textuel.
- DUBET François, (2009). *Les pièges de l'égalité des chances*, le Monde.
- GREMY Jean Paul, (2003). La formulation des questions d'enquête : réponse médiane et sans avis. Dans *The European Tradition In Qualitative Research* (Sage., Vol. I, p. 217-235). Londres.
- LAHIRE Bernard, (1998). La réussite scolaire en milieux populaires ou les conditions sociales d'une schizophrénie heureuse. *Revue Ville-École - Intégration*, 114 pp 104-109.