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We call it the Pure Ethnic Composition (PEC) effect

## Research question: the PRF

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{j}=\alpha+\beta N_{j}+\gamma I_{j}+\lambda Q_{j}^{n}+\mu Q_{j}^{i}+\epsilon_{j} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The effects of changing class size by varying the number of natives (immigrants) keeping immigrants (natives) constant for given quality of the two ethnicities:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta=\left(\frac{\mathbf{d} V_{j}}{\mathbf{d N}}\right)_{\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{j}}=\overline{\mathrm{I}} ; \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\mathrm{n}}=\bar{Q}^{\mathrm{n}} ; \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{j}}=\bar{Q}^{\mathrm{i}}} \quad \gamma=\left(\frac{\mathbf{d} \mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{j}}}{\mathbf{d l}}\right)_{\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{j}}=\overline{\mathrm{N}} ; \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\mathrm{j}}=\overline{\mathbf{Q}}^{\mathrm{n}} ; \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\mathrm{j}}=\overline{\mathrm{Q}}^{\mathrm{i}}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The PEC effect is then given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta=\left(\frac{d V_{j}}{d l}\right)_{C_{j}=\bar{C} ; Q_{j}^{n}=\bar{Q}^{n} ; Q_{j}^{i}=\bar{Q}^{i}}=\gamma-\beta \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and is the effect of increasing exogenously the number of immigrants keeping class size constant (i.e. reducing natives at the same time ).

## This paper in a nutshell

We explore features of the institutional setting:

- rules of class formation (with a cap of 25 students per class)
- Ministry of Education instructions to allocate immigrants where there is more space for them (e.g. where classes are smaller)
- differences in enrolment between February (pre-enrolment) and September (final enrolment)
the interaction between these features allows us to compare classes:
- that have different numbers of natives and immigrants
- for given students' quality


## Main findings

The Pure Ethnic Composition (PEC) effect on native performance

- is negative and statistically significant at age 7
- $\approx-1.6 \%$ for both language and math
- it does not vanish when children grow up to age 10

When we use instead a more conventional identification strategy

- our estimates of the effects of immigrant inflows on native performance are smaller
- because they are confounded by the endogenous adjustments implemented by principals


## The data

We use INVALSI data for Italian primary schools in 2009-10.

For each student in grades 2 and 5 the data set contains:

- test scores in language and mathematics
- educational institution, school, grade, class and student identifiers
- class size and class composition at the beginning of the year
- immigrant status based parents' nationality
- some individual and family background information

The unit of analysis is the class

We restrict the analysis to

- educational institutions with immigrants and more than one school ( $80 \%$ of the students)


## Descriptive statistics for the language sample

| 2nd grade |  | 5th grade |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | S.D. | Mean |  |

Fraction of correct answers:

- language (natives)

| 0.67 | 0.11 | 0.71 | 0.08 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.61 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 0.10 |
| 0.53 | 0.19 | 0.60 | 0.15 |
| 0.54 | 0.16 | 0.58 | 0.16 |

Number of natives in class
Number of immigrants in class
Class size

| 16.37 | 4.09 | 16.65 | 4.02 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.08 | 2.21 | 3.02 | 2.17 |
| 19.44 | 3.84 | 19.67 | 3.89 |

Sample size (number of classes)
Sample size (number of schools)
Sample size (number of institutions)

12,859
13,084
7,387
2,734
7,496
2,776

## Identification: institutional framework

## In February

Students should pre-enrol in a given school for the year that starts in the following September

The number of classes are tentatively formed by principals according to natives pre-enrolment, following a "Maimonides-type rule" with a cap at 25

The Ministry of Education instructs principals to put immigrants in the schools where, depending on natives enrolment, classes are smaller

## In September

Additional splitting of classes occurs in September if late enrolment requires any further adjustment

No more room for endogenous reaction of principals

## An example

Consider grade $g$ of school $s$.
Predicted class size $\bar{C}_{s g}^{N}$, based on native pre-enrolment and rules of class formation, can take three equally likely values:

$$
H>M>L=\frac{H}{2}
$$

The principal knows that

- if $\bar{C}_{s g}^{N}=H$ in February, with probability $\pi$ that class will be split in September
- splitting will originate two classes each one with (approximately) $L=\frac{H}{2}$ natives
- in the other two cases, instead, there is no risk of splitting


## Principals' decisions in February

Each principal manages three classes (in different schools) and has to allocate a total of I immigrants

With probability $1-\pi$ the class expected to be large in February

- will remain large
- the principal will not put immigrants in it
- immigrants will end up in the other two classes

Therefore, the February allocation of immigrants across the three classes, is:

$$
l_{s g}=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
0 & \text { if } & \bar{C}_{s g}^{N}=H  \tag{4}\\
\frac{1}{2} & \text { if } & \bar{C}_{s g}^{N}=M \\
\frac{1}{2} & \text { if } & \bar{C}_{s g}^{N}=L
\end{array}\right.
$$

## Final allocation in September

The allocation of immigrants based on the final number of natives per class $C_{s g}^{N}$, after late enrolment has occurred, is,

$$
l_{s g}=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
\approx 0 & \text { if } & C_{s g}^{N} \approx H  \tag{5}\\
\frac{1}{2} & \text { if } & C_{s g}^{N} \approx M \\
\approx \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(1+2 \pi)} & \text { if } & C_{s g}^{N} \approx L
\end{array}\right.
$$

The number of immigrants is a hump-shaped function of the final number of natives per class

- some small classes originate from final splitting of classes expected to be large in February and that were thus without immigrants
- classes that remain large have no immigrants
- the highest number of immigrants remains allocated to classes with an intermediate number of natives

Natives and immigrants in a class as a function of predicted class size based on native enrolment, pooling grade 2 and 5


| - Observed number of natives (avg) <br> o Observed number of immigrants (avg) |  |
| :---: | :---: |

## Estimated equation

We apply our identification strategy to equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{j s k g}=\alpha+\beta N_{j s k g}+\gamma l_{j s k g}+\mu X_{j s k g}+\eta_{k g}+f\left(N_{s g}\right)+u_{j s k g}, \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

which includes

- fixed effects defined at the institution $\times$ grade level
- a polynomial in native enrolment at the school $\times$ grade level
- to control for the systematic and continuous components of the relationship between native enrolment and native performance


## Instruments

Instruments are constructed as Angrist and Lang (2004):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi \in\left\{1\left(1 \leq C_{s g}^{N}<2\right), 1\left(2 \leq C_{s g}^{N}<3\right), \ldots ., 1\left(24 \leq C_{s g}^{N}<25\right\}\right. \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

They are indicators defined for each possibile level of the theoretical number of natives in a class, $C_{s g}^{N}$, predicted by

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{s g}^{N}=\frac{N_{s g}}{\operatorname{lnt}\left(\frac{N_{s g}-1}{25}\right)+1} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

They capture in the most flexible way the

- non-linearities and
- discontinuities
generated by the rules of class formation, that relate native enrolment to the numbers of natives and immigrants in a class


## IV-FE estimates: Language

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | OLS-FE | IV-FE |
| Number of natives: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ | 0.0001 | $-0.0019^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.0003)$ | $(0.0007)$ |
| Number of immigrants: $\hat{\gamma}$ | $-0.0049^{* * *}$ | $-0.0177^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.0006)$ | $(0.0054)$ |
| PEC: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ | $-0.0050^{* * *}$ | $-0.0158^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.0006)$ | $(0.0052)$ |
| Observations | 25,943 | 25,943 |
| Institution $\times$ grade FE | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Polynomial in natives enrolment |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Class level controls | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Hansen (p-value) | n.a. | 0.715 |
|  |  |  |
| Natives (F-test) | n.a. | 382.52 |
| Natives (AP-test) | n.a. | 187.98 |
| Immigrants (F-test) | n.a. | 299.19 |
| Immigrants (AP-test) | n.a. | 88.01 |

## IV-FE estimates: Mathematics

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | OLS-FE | IV-FE |
| Number of natives: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ | 0.0002 | -0.0010 |
|  | $(0.0003)$ | $(0.0009)$ |
| Number of immigrants: $\hat{\gamma}$ | $-0.0042^{* * *}$ | $-0.0168^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.0007)$ | $(0.0056)$ |
| PEC: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ | $-0.0044^{* * *}$ | $-0.0158^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.0006)$ | $(0.0053)$ |
| Observations | 25,943 | 25,936 |
| Institution $\times$ grade FE | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Polynomial in natives enrolment |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Class level controls | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Hansen (p-value) | n.a. | 0.972 |
|  |  |  |
| Natives (F-test) | n.a. | 221.76 |
| Natives (AP-test) | n.a. | 193.84 |
| Immigrants (F-test) | n.a. | 46.45 |
| Immigrants (AP-test) | n.a. | 40.90 |

## Analysis by grade

- Qualitatively similar results
- Sometimes less precise
- $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ typically larger in 5th than 2nd grade

Language: Instrumental Variable estimates by grade

Mathematics: Instrumental Variable estimates by grade

## The threat of test scores manipulation by teachers

Angrist, Battistin and Vuri (2014) find evidence that test scores are

- manipulated by teachers in some southern regions of the country
- more as a result of shirking than because of self-interested cheating

Our results are essentially unchanged when we restrict the analysis to different sub-samples in which, according to ABV, score manipulation is likely to be minimal, if at all present

## IV-FE estimates in the north and centre: Language

|  | Baseline <br> specification | Classes with <br> cheating <br> indicator $=0$ | Externally <br> monitored <br> institutions |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of natives: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ | $-0.0026^{* * *}$ | $-0.0022^{* * *}$ | $-0.0033^{* *}$ |
| Number of immigrants: $\hat{\gamma}$ | $-0.0155^{* * *}$ | $-0.0172^{* * *}$ | $-0.0180^{* *}$ |
| PEC: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ | $(0.0053)$ | $(0.0055)$ | $(0.0075)$ |
|  | $-0.0129^{* *}$ | $-0.0149^{* * *}$ | $-0.0147^{* *}$ |
| Observations | $(0.0051)$ | $(0.0052)$ | $(0.0072)$ |
| Institution $\times$ grade FE | 19,001 | 18,636 | 4730 |
| Polynomial in natives enrolment | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Class level controls | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Hansen (p-value) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Natives (F-test) | 0.373 | 0.197 | 0.475 |
| Natives (AP-test) | 243.61 | 230.40 | 92.60 |
| Immigrants (F-test) | 130.66 | 125.43 | 49.28 |
| Immigrants (AP-test) | 159.90 | 156.49 | 13.17 |

## IV-FE estimates in the north and centre: Math

|  | Baseline <br> specification | Classes with <br> cheating <br> indicator $=0$ | Externally <br> monitored <br> institutions |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of natives: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ | -0.0008 | -0.0010 | -0.0019 |
| Number of immigrants: $\hat{\gamma}$ | $-0.0129^{* *}$ | $-0.0155^{* * *}$ | $-0.0160^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.0055)$ | $(0.0055)$ | $(0.0084)$ |
| PEC: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ | $-0.0121^{* *}$ | $-0.0145^{* * *}$ | $-0.0141^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.0052)$ | $(0.0052)$ | $(0.0079)$ |
| Observations | 19,005 | 18,697 | 4733 |
| Institution $\times$ grade FE | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Polynomial in natives enrolment | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Class level controls | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Hansen (p-value) | 0.878 | 0.832 | 0.694 |
| Natives (F-test) | 165.09 | 169.27 | 103.96 |
| Natives (AP-test) | 137.02 | 135.53 | 50.37 |
| Immigrants (F-test) | 39.65 | 34.42 | 14.35 |
| Immigrants (AP-test) | 33.28 | 28.70 | 9.52 |

## Concluding remarks

Anecdotal evidence of class disruption involving immigrants often generates concerns in the public opinion and drives policy reactions

We clarify that a useful policy parameter is the PEC effect

- the effect of substituing one native with one immigrant in class
- net of endogenous principals' reactions (in numbers and quality)
- net of the mechanical class size effects that these inflows entail

The institutional setting in Italy allows us to identify the PEC
Adding one immigrant to a class while taking away one native,

- reduces native performance in both language and math by approximately $1.6 \%$
- these estimates are larger than conventional ones because they are not confounded by principals' reactions


## Thank You

## Questions and comments are welcome You can contact us at

rosariomaria.ballatore@bancaditalia.it margherita.fort@unibo.it andrea.ichino@eui.eu

## IV-FE estimates: Language

|  | Pooled <br> $(1)$ | 2nd grade <br> $(2)$ | 5th grade <br> $(3)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of natives: $\hat{\beta}$ | $-0.0019^{* *}$ | $-0.0025^{* *}$ | -0.0011 |
| Number of immigrants: $\hat{\gamma}$ | $-0.0177^{* * *}$ | $-0.0150^{*}$ | $-0.0182^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.005)$ | $(0.008)$ | $(0.006)$ |
| (Pure) composition effect: $\hat{\delta}$ | $-0.0158^{* * *}$ | -0.0125 | $-0.0171^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.005)$ | $(0.008)$ | $(0.006)$ |
| Observations |  |  |  |
| Institution $\times$ grade FE | 25,943 | 12,859 | 13,084 |
| Polynomial in natives enrolment | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Class level controls | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Hansen (p-value) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| F test (excluded instruments) | 0.716 | 0.717 | 0.718 |
| Natives |  |  |  |
| Immigrants | 382.52 | 185.09 | 231.93 |

## IV-FE estimates: Math

|  | Pooled <br> $(4)$ | 2nd grade <br> $(5)$ | 5th grade <br> $(6)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of natives: $\hat{\beta}$ | -0.0010 | -0.0013 | -0.0005 |
|  | $(0.001)$ | $(0.001)$ | $(0.001)$ |
| Number of immigrants: $\hat{\gamma}$ | $-0.0168^{* * *}$ | -0.0134 | $-0.0174^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.005)$ | $(0.008)$ | $(0.006)$ |
| (Pure) composition effect: $\hat{\delta}$ | $-0.0158^{* * *}$ | -0.0121 | $-0.0169^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.005)$ | $(0.008)$ | $(0.007)$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 25,936 | 12,854 | 13,082 |
| Institution $\times$ grade FE | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Polynomial in natives enrolment | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Class level controls | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Hansen (p-value) | 0.972 | 0.778 | 0.866 |
| F test (excluded instruments) |  |  |  |
| Natives | 221.76 | 141.52 | 194.88 |
| Immigrants | 46.46 | 48.59 | 76.97 |

Actual and predicted number of natives in a class based on native enrolment, pooling grade 2 and 5


