Kuwait Research Journal of
Business Management (KRJBM)

ISSN Print: 2790-6590 | ISSN Online : 2790-6582 Open Access

Influence Of Social Governance On Student Achievement And Learning Outcomes

Hima Bindu Govardhanagiri[1], Dr. Janak Bahadur Choubey[2]
[1]Research Scholar, Department of Social Work, P. K. University, Shivpuri, M.P.
[2]Associate Professor, Department of Social Work, P. K. University, Shivpuri, M.P.

*Corresponding Author

Hima Bindu Govardhanagiri
Research Scholar, Department of Social Work, P. K. University, Shivpuri, M.P.

Article History
Received: 15.08.2025
Revise : 20.08.2025
Accepted: 08.09.2025
Published: 20.09.2025

DOI:10.61705/KRJBM.1.3.2025.1.8

Keywords: Social governance, Student achievement, Educational equity, Community participation, Accountability.

Abstract: In this paper, Students' academic performance in government and aided secondary schools is examined in relation to social governance characteristics, including socioeconomic status, parental engagement, community participation, and school administration techniques. A total of 120 students were chosen at random using a stratified sampling procedure, and data were gathered in a systematic manner using a quantitative and descriptive study methodology. To investigate the interrelationships of the variables, the study used descriptive statistics in addition to inferential tests, such as independent sample t-tests. The results showed that kids' parents were somewhat involved and the community was not very involved, but that open school administration and student participation in decisions greatly enhanced children' academic performance. On top of that, gender did not play a bigger role in determining academic success than social governance variables, as there were no discernible disparities between the sexes. Schools, families, and communities all work together more effectively to improve students' academic performance, according to the research. It also stresses the need of legislative efforts to foster inclusive and participatory school administration. Assuring that schools operate as coherent settings that foster academic success and holistic development for all learners, strengthening such governance processes may lead to fair and lasting advances in student learning.

Introduction

Education is not only a personal development tool but also a fundamental pillar of societal progress. The quality of a nation's educational system depends significantly on the interplay between governance, policy frameworks, and community participation. Social governance, a concept that extends beyond formal government structures, encompasses the collective actions, policies, and institutional mechanisms through which societies organize them to achieve public objectives. In the context of education, social governance influences how educational resources are managed, how accountability is maintained, and how equitable learning opportunities are ensured for all learners. Understanding the influence of social governance on student achievement and learning outcomes is thus critical for developing effective strategies that foster inclusive, equitable, and high-quality education systems. Social governance integrates the efforts of government institutions, non-governmental organizations, civil society, and local communities to ensure that education serves both individual aspirations and collective social goals. It embodies principles such as transparency, participation, accountability, and equity—each of which plays a crucial role in determining the success of educational outcomes. When governance structures are socially responsive and participatory, they tend to create educational environments that are inclusive, well-managed, and adaptable to diverse learning needs. Conversely, weak governance can lead to disparities in resource distribution, inadequate monitoring of school performance, and poor student achievement.

Student achievement and learning outcomes are

ISSN Print: 2790-6590 | ISSN Online : 2790-6582 Open Access

multidimensional indicators influenced by numerous factors, including teacher quality, school infrastructure, curriculum relevance, and socio-economic context. However, the framework within which these components operate—largely determined by social governance—shapes their effectiveness. For instance, strong governance ensures that schools receive adequate funding, teachers receive regular training, and students have access to conducive learning environments. On the other hand, lack of accountability or bureaucratic inefficiency can result in policy failures, resource wastage, and widening educational inequalities. One of the core aspects of social governance in education is community participation. SMCs, PTAs, and local governance bodies play an instrumental role in monitoring school activities, improving attendance, and enhancing transparency. When parents, teachers, and community members are actively involved in school management, it cultivates a sense of ownership and responsibility that directly impacts student performance. Social governance, therefore, transforms education from being merely a state responsibility to a shared societal endeavor.

Social policies and governance frameworks also influence equity in education. Inclusive governance ensures that marginalized groups—such as girls, economically disadvantaged children and those with disabilities—receive equal opportunities for learning. In many developing countries, social governance mechanisms have been introduced to promote gender equity, reduce dropout rates, and improve literacy levels through targeted interventions like scholarships, mid-day meals, and conditional cash transfers. These initiatives demonstrate that when governance is rooted in social justice and community empowerment, it leads to improved student achievement and sustainable learning outcomes. Furthermore, transparency and accountability mechanisms within governance systems play a decisive role in determining educational performance. The introduction of data-driven monitoring tools, school audits, and public reporting systems allows for the identification of gaps and the implementation of timely corrective measures. Such governance-driven practices ensure that educational institutions operate efficiently, thereby enhancing both teacher performance and student learning.

In the contemporary world, where globalization and digitalization are reshaping educational paradigms, social governance must evolve to address new challenges. Effective governance now requires integrating technology into education, ensuring digital equity, and protecting students from social and digital exclusion. The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 in India, for example, highlights the importance of participatory governance, decentralization, and accountability as vital components of an inclusive education system. Through innovative and socially responsive governance, the policy aims to improve learning outcomes, foster critical thinking, and bridge the learning gaps that exist among different social strata. In essence, the influence of social governance on student achievement is both direct and indirect. It shapes educational access, defines the quality of instruction, influences student engagement, and ensures the equitable distribution of opportunities. A well-governed education system promotes not only academic excellence but also social cohesion and civic responsibility. The interdependence between governance and learning outcomes underscores the need for continuous evaluation and reform of governance structures to align them with changing social and educational needs.

I. Literature Review

Pham, Sy. (2024). Despite the growing consensus that SEL is critical to student success in school, its effective implementation is hindered in certain settings by issues like a lack of funding, insufficient teacher preparation, and the need to accommodate diverse cultural backgrounds. Examining the definition, implementation, and effects of SEL on students' mental health and academic achievement as well as the challenges faced by educators in implementing SEL in their classrooms is the goal of this research review. By combining results from many studies—including meta-analyses, longitudinal studies, and case studies—the study determines if SEL programs are successful in enhancing student outcomes. It examines the obstacles to effective implementation and suggests solutions, such as

ISSN Print: 2790-6590 | ISSN Online : 2790-6582 Open Access

providing more resources and enhancing teacher training. Developing the five fundamental competencies of socio-emotional learning—self-awareness, self-regulation, social awareness, responsible decision-making, and relationship skills—may significantly improve students' academic achievement, emotional control, and interpersonal connections. Children' academic performance is boosted by social-emotional learning, according to studies. This is because children acquire better executive functions, such attention and task retention, via social-emotional learning. In addition to fostering resilience, increasing empathy, and decreasing anxiety, SEL supports emotional wellness. Still, many schools, especially in areas with few resources, face challenges such a lack of funding, unprepared teachers, and the need to make cultural adjustments.

Fasco, Pamba et al., (2024) This article explores the significant link between active participation from students and enhanced academic performance in the classroom. The study's overarching objective is to provide teachers with the tools they need to design interactive lessons that spark students' interest, participation, and critical thinking. If the article's examination of current research and best practices can help educators and institutions boost student engagement and academic achievement, it will be a huge boon. Research on student engagement looks at how it affects learning outcomes from a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral perspective. Individualized instruction, group projects, active learning, and the use of technology are just a few of the successful methods covered. The article continues by exploring the problem at hand and explains why the creation of a flexible learning environment requires support from both policy and institutions. This study provides a strong foundation for understanding and implementing techniques that improve engagement by combining data from numerous educational contexts. The findings show that these engagement-focused programs have the ability to greatly improve student learning outcomes, which provides educators and policymakers with practical advice. This study not only adds to the expanding body of literature on educational efficacy, but it also offers useful information to those who are working to raise the bar for education in traditional classrooms.

Chisebe, Sylvester et al., (2024) there is a significant difference between rural and urban settings when it comes to the significance of educational leadership on student achievement. The purpose of this study was to examine the pros and cons of urban and rural school settings, as well as the impact of different leadership styles on student achievement. Leadership in education has a different impact on student achievement in urban and rural settings. This study compares the two settings and the effects of leadership practices on student achievement. It finds that rural schools are able to overcome their resource constraints and succeed in creating tight-knit communities, while urban schools have more resources and more opportunities for community involvement. Through illuminating these clear advantages and downsides, the study offers valuable information to educators and policymakers in their pursuit of effective leadership strategies. The results of this comparison study were based on the combined use of qualitative and quantitative methods. The survey was filled out by 300 pupils from 6 schools in the Lusaka region that were selected at random. The sample population consisted of school administrators, teachers, and students. The study used questionnaires, academic records, and leadership evaluations for the quantitative data. It used focus groups and interviews to get the qualitative data. For numerical data, we used descriptive statistics in SPSS with Excel, and for qualitative data, we employed theme analysis. Students in urban schools outperformed their suburban and rural counterparts in academic performance, according to the study's authors. However, rural schools do a fantastic job of building inclusive communities and providing kids with tailored lesson plans despite having fewer resources.

Baria, Karen & Gomez, Dan. (2022). The purpose of this research was to identify the aspect of social support that has the greatest impact on the personal and academic growth of sixth graders. Using a quantitative, non-experimental technique, the research relied on causal impact. Researchers in the Division of Davao del Norte randomly selected 179 sixth students from Zone two of the New Corella District to participate in

ISSN Print: 2790-6590 | ISSN Online : 2790-6582 Open Access

the research. This study made use of a number of statistical methods, including linear regression analysis, mean, and Pearson's r. This research indicated that sixth graders had a relatively high level of social support from a variety of sources, including family, friends, and acquaintances. Students also did very well in areas such as social and emotional development, physical and mental health, educational possibilities, and recreational pursuits. The research found a statistically significant and positive link between students' social support and their learning and progress. Nonrelative adult assistance was the strongest predictor of sixth graders' academic performance and personal growth.

Luschei, Thomas & Jeong, Dong. (2020). Despite data from several countries showing a favorable correlation between student success and decentralized educational governance, studies in this area often ignore the unique contributions of school boards, teachers, administrators, and governments. Using data from the 2015 Programme for International Student Assessment, we analyze school leaders' perspectives on governance arrangements in 68 countries and determine whether there is a significant correlation between variations in perceived patterns of governance and differences in student success. We find that, even when school governance arrangements vary greatly among countries, there is a positive correlation between increases in teacher decision-making tasks and student development in math, reading, and science, everything else being equal. It seems that principals' conduct and manner do not determine whether instructors have an impact on student achievement since the positive and strong connections between teacher decision making and student performance persist even after controlling for leadership style.

Aspelin, Jonas. (2012). This article explores the impact of relationships on students' academic achievement by using a theory from social psychology together with actual evidence. At the outset, the issue is examined from the broader Swedish viewpoint. Following this, two general questions are posed: How do relationships impact students' academic success, according to studies? (2) How can we think about how students' connections affect their grades? The first question is based on research on what makes for good classroom instruction generally, and it draws from studies done in Scandinavia and elsewhere. We will start by reading this literature. Emphasizing the significance of teacher-student contact, a paradigm shift occurs as a result of the argument. Regarding the second matter, we analyze it via the lens of social psychology as proposed by Kenneth Gergen. According to the findings, understanding academic accomplishment in the classroom is greatly aided by making connections. As an essential aspect of being a student, the connection process serves as the bedrock for bolstering performance. The importance of linkages in comprehending student performance becomes apparent when both perspectives are combined. At the end of the article, using a tale of a young student's understanding progress as an example, the author discusses the practical-pedagogical consequences.

II. Research Methodology

Research Design

This study used a descriptive and quantitative approach to investigate how social governance variables, such as students' socioeconomic position, parental engagement, and school governance participation, impact their academic performance and learning outcomes. The rationale for this design's selection is its capacity to systematically gather and analyze quantitative data in order to characterize patterns, correlations, and discrepancies across variables within a specified population.

Sample Size

Students attending public and publicly-funded secondary schools in the study's designated area made up the population. A stratified random selection approach was used to pick 120 respondents from this cohort. The goal was to ensure that gender, socioeconomic background, and levels of parental and school participation were well represented. In an effort to keep comparisons free of bias, the sample consisted of 62 male and 58 female pupils.

Data Collection Instrument

The researcher used a structured questionnaire she had created to gather data. The tool measured student engagement in governance, socioeconomic status, parental involvement, and

ISSN Print: 2790-6590 | ISSN Online : 2790-6582 Open Access

demographics. The data on academic accomplishments was collected from official school records and standardized examinations to guarantee neutrality. After education and social science specialists reviewed the questionnaire for accuracy, we ran a pilot test to ensure its reliability using Cronbach's Alpha; the result was a value more than 0.70, suggesting satisfactory internal consistency.

Data Collection Procedure

In order to carry out the study, the researcher first sought and received approval from the school administration. While the students were in class, we individually handed out the surveys to those who had been chosen. Everyone who participated was made to feel safe and told that their answers would remain private. For the sake of precision, all of the surveys were gathered on the same day.

III. Data Analysis And Interpretation

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	62	51.67%
Female	58	48.33%
Total	**120**	**100.00%**

The data presented in Table 1 illustrates the gender distribution of respondents participating in the study. Out of a total of 120 respondents, 62 are male, constituting 51.67% of the total sample, while 58 are female, accounting for 48.33%. This near-equal distribution indicates a balanced representation of both genders in the research sample, ensuring that the findings are not biased toward one gender. The small difference of 3.34% between male and female participants suggests that both groups are almost equally involved and their opinions or experiences are likely to be comparably reflected in the study results. Such gender balance is significant for enhancing the reliability and generalizability of the research outcomes. It implies that the perspectives and responses gathered provide an inclusive understanding of the topic under investigation, whether it relates to social, educational, or behavioral parameters. The equal representation also allows for meaningful gender-based comparisons, if required, in further analysis. In summary, the table demonstrates that the sample is well-distributed by gender, minimizing any potential gender bias and supporting a fair interpretation of the study's results.

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic Status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Low	32	26.67%
Middle	60	50.00%
High	28	23.33%
Total	**120**	**100.00%**

Table 2 presents the distribution of respondents based on their socioeconomic status. Out of the total 120 participants, 32 respondents (26.67%) belong to the low socioeconomic category, 60 respondents (50%) fall under the middle socioeconomic group, and 28 respondents (23.33%) represent the high socioeconomic class. The data clearly indicates that the majority of respondents come from the middle socioeconomic background, comprising half of the total sample. This dominance suggests that middle-class individuals are more prominently represented in the study and may have relatively stable living conditions and access to resources. The low and high socioeconomic groups are nearly comparable in proportion, though slightly fewer participants belong to the high-income category. This distribution reflects a realistic social composition where the middle class forms the largest segment, followed by smaller portions of low and high classes. The balanced inclusion of respondents from all three socioeconomic levels ensures that the study captures diverse perspectives and experiences across economic strata. Such representation is vital for understanding how socioeconomic status influences the variables under study, allowing for comprehensive and equitable interpretation of the results

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents by Level of Parental Involvement

ISSN Print: 2790-6590 | ISSN Online : 2790-6582 Open Access

Level of Parental Involvement	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Low	40	33.33%
Moderate	50	41.67%
High	30	25.00%
Total	**120**	**100.00%**

Table 3 displays the distribution of respondents according to the level of parental involvement. Among the 120 respondents, 40 (33.33%) reported low parental involvement, 50 (41.67%) indicated moderate involvement, and 30 (25%) experienced high parental involvement. The data reveals that the majority of respondents fall within the moderate level, suggesting that most parents show a balanced engagement in their children's educational and developmental activities. The proportion of respondents with low parental involvement is also relatively high, indicating that a considerable number of parents may not be consistently active in their children's academic or extracurricular pursuits. This could be due to factors such as limited time, work pressures, or lack of awareness about the importance of involvement. On the other hand, a smaller yet significant group of respondents reported high parental involvement, reflecting families that prioritize close monitoring, motivation, and support for their children's education

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by Participation in School Governance Activities

Level of Participation	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not Involved	70	58.33%
Occasionally Involved	30	25.00%
Actively Involved	20	16.67%
Total	**120**	**100.00%**

Table 4 presents the distribution of respondents according to their level of participation in school governance activities. Out of 120 respondents, 70 (58.33%) reported that they are not involved in any school governance activities, 30 (25%) indicated occasional involvement, and only 20 (16.67%) stated that they are actively involved. The data clearly shows that the majority of respondents do not take part in school governance, which highlights a limited level of community and parental engagement in decision-making processes related to school functioning. The relatively small percentage of respondents who are occasionally or actively involved suggests that only a minority contribute to governance-related activities such as parent-teacher meetings, school committees, or educational planning initiatives. This limited participation may result from factors like lack of awareness, time constraints, or inadequate encouragement from school authorities

Table 5: Distribution of Respondents by Academic Achievement Levels

Academic Achievement Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Below Proficiency	28	23.33%
At Proficiency	62	51.67%
Above Proficiency	30	25.00%
Total	**120**	**100.00%**

Table 5 illustrates the distribution of respondents according to their academic achievement levels. Among the total of 120 respondents, 28 students (23.33%) fall below the proficiency level, 62 students (51.67%) are at the proficiency level, and 30 students (25%) perform above proficiency. The data indicates that the majority of students demonstrate satisfactory academic performance, achieving at the expected proficiency level. This suggests that more than half of the respondents possess the necessary understanding and skills in their academic pursuits. However, a notable portion of 23.33% of students performing below proficiency highlights the presence of learning gaps or challenges that may require targeted academic support and interventions. The 25% of students performing above proficiency reflect a group of high achievers who excel beyond the standard academic expectations, indicating effective learning strategies, motivation, and possibly higher parental or institutional support.

Table 6: Independent Sample t-Test Comparing Academic Achievement by Gender

ISSN Print: 2790-6590 | ISSN Online : 2790-6582 Open Access

Gender	N	Mean Score	SD	t-Value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Interpretation
Male	62	72.35	8.24	1.97	118	0.051	Not Significant
Female	58	74.90	7.68				

Table 6 shows that we compared the academic attainment of male and female respondents using an independent sample t-test. The results demonstrate that out of a total of 62 male students, the average academic score was 72.35 with a standard deviation of 8.24; in comparison, out of 58 female students, the average score was 74.90 with a standard deviation of 7.68. A p-value of 0.051 is produced by the calculated t-value of 1.97 with 118 degrees of freedom. This finding does not have statistical significance as the p-value is more than the typically accepted threshold of 0.05. This suggests that the gender gap in respondents' academic performance is not statistically significant. While females show a marginally higher mean score, the difference cannot be considered statistically reliable and may be due to random variation rather than gender-based factors.

IV. Conclusion

The influence of social governance on student achievement and learning outcomes is profound and multidimensional. Effective governance ensures that education systems are equitable, transparent, and accountable, thereby enhancing both access and quality. When communities, governments, and institutions work collaboratively, they create an educational ecosystem that fosters student motivation, teacher commitment, and institutional efficiency. Conversely, weak governance structures often lead to inefficiencies, inequities, and poor learning results. Strengthening social governance through participatory decision-making, regular evaluation, and data-driven accountability is therefore essential for sustainable educational development. Policies must prioritize inclusivity, ensure that marginalized groups are not left behind, and promote holistic learning that extends beyond academic performance. Ultimately, strong social governance builds the foundation for an education system that not only imparts knowledge but also nurtures responsible, innovative, and socially conscious citizens who can contribute meaningfully to national and global progress.

References:

1. Aspelin, J. (2012). How do relationships influence student achievement? Understanding student performance from a general, social psychological standpoint. International Studies in Sociology of Education, 22(1), 41–56.
2. Baria, K., & Gomez, D. (2022). Influence of social support to student learning and development. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 11(2), 1–13.
3. Chisebe, S., Chanda, T., Mwansa, P., Mulenga, D., Gilbert, M., & Phiri, V. (2024). The impact of educational leadership on student achievement: A comparative analysis of urban and rural schools. Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 50(1), 444–461.
4. Domitrovich, C. E., Durlak, J. A., Staley, K. C., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Social-emotional competence: An essential factor for promoting positive adjustment and reducing risk in school children. Child Development, 88(2), 408–416.
5. Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. Child Development, 82(1), 405–432.
6. Dusenbury, L., Yoder, N., Dermody, C., & Weissberg, R. (2019). An examination of frameworks for social and emotional learning (SEL) reflected in state K–12 learning standards. Measuring SEL: Using Data to Inspire Practice, 3(1), 1–29.
7. Fasco, P., Asiimwe, S., Ssekabira, G., & Atwongire, T. (2024). Enhancing student engagement and learning outcomes: Effective strategies in institutional pedagogy. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 1(2), 1–7.
8. Gimbert, B. G., Miller, D., Herman, E., Breedlove, M., & Molina, C. E. (2023). Social emotional learning in schools: The importance of educator competence. Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 18(1),

ISSN Print: 2790-6590 | ISSN Online : 2790-6582 Open Access

3–39.
9. Im-Bolter, N., & Cohen, N. J. (2007). Language impairment and psychiatric comorbidities. Pediatric Clinics of North America, 54(3), 525–542.
10. Jagers, R. J., Rivas-Drake, D., & Williams, B. (2019). Transformative social and emotional learning (SEL): Toward SEL in service of educational equity and excellence. Educational Psychologist, 54(3), 162–184.
11. Jannah, S. R., & Sugiarto, S. (2022). The influence of social-emotional development on early childhood learning outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic. Bulletin of Early Childhood, 1(2), 110–118.
12. Jones, S. M., & Bouffard, S. M. (2012). Social and emotional learning in schools: From programs to strategies and commentaries. Social Policy Report, 26(4), 1–33.
13. LaBelle, B. (2023). Positive outcomes of a social-emotional learning program to promote student resiliency and address mental health. Contemporary School Psychology, 27(1), 1–7.
14. Luschei, T., & Jeong, D. (2020). School governance and student achievement: Cross-national evidence from the 2015 PISA. Educational Administration Quarterly, 57(1), 1–13.
15. Martin, A. J. (2013). Academic buoyancy and academic resilience: Exploring 'everyday' and 'classic' resilience in the face of
22. 1
academic adversity. School Psychology International, 34(5), 488–500.
16. Mathrani, A., Han, B., Mathrani, S., Jha, M., & Scogings, C. (2021). Interpreting academic integrity transgressions among learning communities. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 17, 1–16.
17. McCall, C. S., Romero, M. E., Yang, W., & Weigand, T. (2023). A call for equity-focused social-emotional learning. School Psychology Review, 52(5), 586–607.
18. Pham, S. (2024). The influence of social and emotional learning on academic performance, emotional well-being, and implementation strategies: A literature review. Journal of Education and Research, 9(12), 381–391.*
19. Purwaningsih, E. (2024). The role of metacognition in character education: A case study on students' moral and ethical formation strategies. Society, 12(1), 1–13.
20. Reicher, H. (2010). Building inclusive education on social and emotional learning: Challenges and perspectives – A review. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14(3), 213–246.
21. Taylor, R. D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. Child Development, 88(4), 1156–117