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## Motivations

- Most countries in Sub-Saharan Africa implemented Universal Primary Education programs in early 2000s
- Large school construction + fees abolition
- Still no evidence on the effects of these programs on school attendance
- Theoretical predictions are ambiguous:
- Large school construction + fees abolition $\rightarrow$ higher supply of education at lower price
- Fall in quality $\rightarrow$ less incentive for schooling
- Related literature :
- Duflo (2001) in Indonesia : positive effect of school construction on educational attainement
- Deninger (2003) in Uganda : positive effect of fees abolition on attendance
- Harounan et al. (2013) in Burkina-Faso : positive effects of a specific school construction targeted at girls


## This paper :

- The effects of Burkina-Faso's UPE program (PDDEB) on attendance
- Causal identification strategy : difference in trend between exposed and non-exposed birth cohorts
- Heterogenous effects with respect to age, gender, region of residence and grades
- Findings :
- Higher attendance in first grade of primary school
- Larger effects for younger children, girls, and children living in deprived areas
- Significant dropout from the third grade, particularly for girls


## Scope of PDDEB

- Two phases :
- Phase 1:2002-2006, our focus
- Phase 2: 2006-2010
- Nation-wide, but more intense in some initially deprived "PP areas"
- Large school construction + free school supplies + fees abolition + awareness raising campaigns


## Components of PDDEB1

- Large school construction (50\%) + free school supplies


Figure: School construction and Books distribution

## Components of PDDEB1

- Fees abolition was not effective : no legal enforcement before 2007.

Variation wrt the previous year

|  | Av. 1997 | 2002 | 2004 | 2006 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| High schooling cost | 0.512 | $0.072^{* * *}$ | $0.104^{* * *}$ | $-0.047^{* * *}$ |
| No School/Too Far | 0.451 | $-0.129^{* * *}$ | $-0.060^{* * *}$ | $0.018^{*}$ |

Significant at $1 \%\left({ }^{* * *}\right), 5 \%\left({ }^{* *}\right)$ and $10 \%\left(^{*}\right)$.
Table: Reasons for not attending school

## Dataset

- Five repeated cross-sectional household surveys covering the academic years 1993-1994, 1997-1998, 2002-2003, 2004-2005 and 2006-2007.
- Information on school attendance
- Current and previous years attendance of a given grade
-     + The highest grade completed for all individuals that ever attended school
- $\rightarrow$ Outcome variable : having attended grade $g$ as of a given year
- Additional information on year of birth, gender and place of residence
-     + administrative database on the effectiveness of the program


## Identification Strategy : Treated and Control Groups

- Two groups of birth cohorts: exposed (treated) vs. non-exposed (control)
- Non-exposed : cohorts that are more than 14 years old in 2002, i.e. born before 1988.


Figure: Share of individuals attending the first grade

## Identification Strategy : Illustration

- Two-stage estimation :
- Fit the trend in school attendance across birth cohorts in the control group with a polynomial
- Extrapolate on treated cohorts and compare with their rate of school attendance


Figure: First grade attendance in 2006

## Identification Strategy : Econometric model

- First-stage equation :

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{i}=\alpha+\sum_{j=1}^{d} \beta_{j} Y_{i}^{j}+\mu_{i} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$E_{i}$ : dummy variable equals 1 if individual $i$ born in year $Y_{i}$ has attended the first grade as of a given academic year. $d$ is the order of the polynomial, set to 3 in the main results and 2 in robustness checks. $\mu_{i}$ corresponds to the residuals of the model.

- Second-stage equation :

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{i}=\hat{\alpha}+\sum_{j=1}^{d} \hat{\beta}_{j} Y_{i}^{j}+\sum_{y=1986}^{2000} \delta_{y} D_{i y}+\varepsilon_{i} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{j}$ are the estimated coefficients from the first stage regression. $D_{i y}$ is a dummy variable taking 1 if the individual $i$ is born in year $y$; and 0 otherwise.

## Main Results : Older cohorts

- Significant effect on older cohorts

|  | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Born in 1986 | 0.933 | 1.091 | 1.391 | 1.399 | $1.410^{*}$ | $1.410^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.0751)$ | $(0.157)$ | $(0.311)$ | $(0.318)$ | $(0.280)$ | $(0.280)$ |
| Born in 1987 | 1.122 | $1.318^{*}$ | 1.325 | 1.333 | 1.243 | 1.244 |
|  | $(0.0904)$ | $(0.190)$ | $(0.296)$ | $(0.303)$ | $(0.247)$ | $(0.247)$ |
| Born in 1988 | $1.175^{* *}$ | $1.380^{* *}$ | $1.479^{*}$ | $1.469^{*}$ | $1.490^{* *}$ | $1.490^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.0947)$ | $(0.199)$ | $(0.330)$ | $(0.334)$ | $(0.296)$ | $(0.296)$ |
| Born in 1989 | $1.164^{*}$ | $1.367^{* *}$ | 1.352 | 1.341 | $1.473^{*}$ | $1.461^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.0937)$ | $(0.197)$ | $(0.302)$ | $(0.305)$ | $(0.292)$ | $(0.290)$ |
| Born in 1990 | $1.411^{* * *}$ | $1.640^{* * *}$ | $1.683^{* *}$ | $1.659^{* *}$ | 1.311 | 1.288 |
|  | $(0.114)$ | $(0.236)$ | $(0.376)$ | $(0.377)$ | $(0.260)$ | $(0.256)$ |
| Born in 1991 | $1.230^{* *}$ | $1.438^{* *}$ | $1.887^{* * *}$ | $1.856^{* * *}$ | $1.438^{*}$ | $1.414^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.0991)$ | $(0.207)$ | $(0.422)$ | $(0.422)$ | $(0.285)$ | $(0.281)$ |
| Born in 1992 | $1.536^{* * *}$ | $1.791^{* * *}$ | $1.789^{* * *}$ | $1.697^{* *}$ | 1.270 | 1.211 |
|  | $(0.124)$ | $(0.258)$ | $(0.400)$ | $(0.386)$ | $(0.252)$ | $(0.241)$ |
| Born in 1993 | $1.447^{* * *}$ | $1.652^{* * *}$ | $1.878^{* * *}$ | $1.795^{* *}$ | $1.461^{*}$ | 1.344 |
|  | $(0.117)$ | $(0.238)$ | $(0.420)$ | $(0.408)$ | $(0.290)$ | $(0.267)$ |
| Born in 1994 | $1.496^{* * *}$ | $1.681^{* * *}$ | $1.684^{* *}$ | $1.535^{*}$ | 1.313 | 0.994 |
|  | $(0.120)$ | $(0.242)$ | $(0.376)$ | $(0.349)$ | $(0.260)$ | $(0.197)$ |

## Main Results in 2006

- Larger effects on younger cohorts $==>$ kids enter earlier at school
- Larger effects on girls $==>$ lower gender inequality
- Larger effects in initially deprived areas $==>$ lower regional inequality

|  | YC | Girls | PP areas |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Born in 1995 | $2.188^{* * *}$ | $2.731^{* * *}$ | $3.805^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.176)$ | $(0.276)$ | $(0.704)$ |
| Born in 1996 | $1.728^{* * *}$ | $2.305^{* * *}$ | $2.972^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.139)$ | $(0.233)$ | $(0.550)$ |
| Born in 1997 | $1.974^{* * *}$ | $2.862^{* * *}$ | $3.926^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.159)$ | $(0.289)$ | $(0.726)$ |
| Born in 1998 | $1.720^{* * *}$ | $2.608^{* * *}$ | $3.868^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.138)$ | $(0.263)$ | $(0.715)$ |

## Main Results : Higher grades

- Early dropout from the third grade, particularly for girls

|  | 1st grade (G1) |  | 2nd grade (G2) |  | 3rd grade (G3) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | All | Girls | All | Girls | All | Girls |
| Born in 1990 | $1.411^{* * *}$ | $1.350^{* * *}$ | $1.680^{* * *}$ | $1.608^{* * *}$ | $1.766^{*}$ | 1.934 |
|  | $(0.114)$ | $(0.136)$ | $(0.149)$ | $(0.200)$ | $(0.570)$ | $(1.043)$ |
| Born in 1991 | $1.230^{* *}$ | $1.299^{* * *}$ | $1.535^{* * *}$ | $1.565^{* * *}$ | 1.508 | 1.707 |
|  | $(0.0991)$ | $(0.131)$ | $(0.136)$ | $(0.195)$ | $(0.487)$ | $(0.920)$ |
| Born in 1992 | $1.536^{* * *}$ | $1.718^{* * *}$ | $2.001^{* * *}$ | $1.957^{* * *}$ | $1.780^{*}$ | 1.863 |
|  | $(0.124)$ | $(0.173)$ | $(0.177)$ | $(0.244)$ | $(0.574)$ | $(1.004)$ |
| Born in 1993 | $1.447^{* * *}$ | $1.610^{* * *}$ | $1.904^{* * *}$ | $1.709^{* * *}$ | 1.511 | 1.440 |
|  | $(0.117)$ | $(0.162)$ | $(0.169)$ | $(0.213)$ | $(0.488)$ | $(0.776)$ |
| Born in 1994 | $1.496^{* * *}$ | $1.672^{* * *}$ | $2.052^{* * *}$ | $1.739^{* * *}$ | 1.426 | 1.229 |
|  | $(0.120)$ | $(0.169)$ | $(0.182)$ | $(0.217)$ | $(0.460)$ | $(0.662)$ |
| Born in 1995 | $2.188^{* * *}$ | $2.731^{* * *}$ | $3.106^{* * *}$ | $2.768^{* * *}$ | $1.780^{*}$ | 1.563 |
|  | $(0.176)$ | $(0.276)$ | $(0.275)$ | $(0.345)$ | $(0.575)$ | $(0.843)$ |
| Born in 1996 | $1.728^{* * *}$ | $2.305^{* * *}$ | $2.565^{* * *}$ | $2.110^{* * *}$ | 1.160 | 0.918 |
|  | $(0.139)$ | $(0.233)$ | $(0.227)$ | $(0.263)$ | $(0.374)$ | $(0.495)$ |
| Born in 1997 | $1.974^{* * *}$ | $2.862^{* * *}$ | $2.867^{* * *}$ | $2.433^{* * *}$ | 0.803 | 0.630 |
|  | $(0.159)$ | $(0.289)$ | $(0.254)$ | $(0.303)$ | $(0.259)$ | $(0.339)$ |
| Born in 1998 | $1.720^{* * *}$ | $2.608^{* * *}$ | $2.118^{* * *}$ | $1.642^{* * *}$ | $0.334^{* * *}$ | $0.219 * * *$ |
|  | $(0.138)$ | $(0.263)$ | $(0.188)$ | $(0.205)$ | $(0.108)$ | $(0.118)$ |

## Robustness Checks

- No effect if rate of entry followed a quadratic trend.

|  | Primary G1 |  | Secondary G1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | Cubic | Quadratic |  | Cubic |
| Born in 1990 | $1.419^{* * *}$ | $1.492^{* *}$ | Born in 1982 | 1.100 |
|  | $(0.163)$ | $(0.273)$ |  | $(0.071)$ |
| Born in 1991 | $1.214^{*}$ | 1.243 | Born in 1983 | $1.175^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.139)$ | $(0.227)$ |  | $(0.076)$ |
| Born in 1992 | $1.482^{* * *}$ | $1.472^{* *}$ | Born in 1984 | 0.970 |
|  | $(0.170)$ | $(0.269)$ |  | $(0.063)$ |
| Born in 1993 | $1.362^{* * *}$ | 1.306 | Born in 1985 | 0.961 |
|  | $(0.156)$ | $(0.239)$ |  | $(0.062)$ |
| Born in 1994 | $1.370^{* * *}$ | 1.263 | Born in 1986 | $0.801^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.157)$ | $(0.231)$ |  | $(0.052)$ |
| Born in 1995 | $1.943^{* * *}$ | $1.713^{* * *}$ | Born in 1987 | 1.019 |
|  | $(0.223)$ | $(0.314)$ |  | $(0.066)$ |
| Born in 1996 | $1.484^{* * *}$ | 1.245 | Born in 1988 | 1.060 |
|  | $(0.170)$ | $(0.228)$ |  | $(0.069)$ |
| Born in 1997 | $1.634^{* * *}$ | 1.297 | Born in 1989 | 1.019 |
|  | $(0.188)$ | $(0.237)$ |  | $(0.066)$ |
| Born in 1998 | $1.368^{* * *}$ | 1.021 | Born in 1990 | 0.958 |
|  | $(0.157)$ | $(0.187)$ |  | $(0.062)$ |

## Conclusions and Extensions

- Higher attendance rate in the first grade of primary school : larger effects for younger children, girls, and children living in deprived areas
- $==>$ reduced delayed enrolment and gender and regional inequalities
- But significant dropout from the third grade, particularly for girls
- Reduced cost of entry into school, but lower quality
- Improvement : using a logistic trend and provide statistical tests for heterogenous effects.
- Extension : Investigate the effects on educational achievements.
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