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## Introduction

- Children with disabilities continue to face enormous difficulties in accessing education, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, despite the special attention given at the World level to people with disabilities
- Some studies have analyzed the effect of disability status on access to education, poverty, and access to employment in developing countries (Mitra et al, 2013 and Mizunoya \& Mitra, 2013 for example).
- But these studies did not consider differences in skills between students with disabilities and students without disabilities.
- This study aims to analyze the differences between pupils with disabilities and pupils without disabilities in terms of their proficiency in mathematics and in reading/language and it interaction with certain sociodemographic characteristics such as gender, socioeconomic status, and the location area, in sub-Saharan Africa.



## Materials and methods

- Data from the sixth-grade database of the 'Programme d'Analyse des Systèmes Éducatifs" (PASEC, 2014) have been used
- This database contains information on 676 schools and 31,213 pupils across ten sub-Saharan African countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Niger, Senegal, and Togo).
- The level of performance in reading and the level of performance in mathematics are the dependent variables and both were dummies
- Pupil disability status is the explanatory variable of interest
- The other explanatory variables are the pupil's personal characteristics such as age, gender, and pupil's work outside of school hours, socio-economic status, school characteristics, teacher characteristics and class characteristics.
- A binary logit model was used to analyze how disability status affects pupils' proficiency in mathematics and reading/language.

The estimated model to analyze the differences between pupils with disabilities and pupils without disabilities in terms of their proficiency in mathematics and in reading/language, and the interaction of disability with gender, socioeconomic status, and location area, is as follow:
$\operatorname{Prob}(\operatorname{Performance}=1 \mid X)=\alpha_{0}+\alpha_{1} D_{i}+\alpha_{2}$ group $_{i}+\alpha_{3}\left(D_{i} \times \operatorname{group}_{i}\right)+\alpha_{4} K_{i}+\varepsilon_{i}$
Where D denotes the disability status of the pupil; group, the sociodemographic group; $K$ denotes all other explanatory variables

## Results and discussions

- The disability situation seems to reduce the reading and mathematics skills of the students.
- All else equal, the chances of a pupil with a disability to achieve an adequate level of proficiency in reading decreased by more than 6 percentage points compared to pupils without a disability
- Similarly, the chances that a pupil with a disability will achieve an adequate level of proficiency in mathematics decreased by more than 7 percentage points compared to pupils without a disability
- The results also revealed that the effect of disability status on proficiency in mathematics differs by gender, location, and socioeconomic status, while the effect of disability status on reading/language skills differs only by socioeconomic status


Figure1: Descriptive statistics of pupils' proficiency levels in mathematics and reading / language

Table 1: Interaction effect of disability and sociodemographic groups

| Variables | Sufficient level of proficiency in reading /language |  |  | Sufficient level of proficiency in mathematics |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| The pupil has a disability $=$ Yes | $\begin{array}{r} -0.061 \\ (7.27)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.084 \\ (11.62)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.059 \\ (7.98)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.028 \\ (3.63)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.062 \\ (8.67)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.012 \\ (1.85)^{*} \end{array}$ |
| Gender of the pupil | $\begin{gathered} -0.013 \\ (2.17)^{* *} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.016 \\ (3.07)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.016 \\ (2.95)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.028 \\ (4.72)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.029 \\ (5.93)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.030 \\ (6.11)^{* * *} \end{array}$ |
| Location area | $\begin{array}{r} 0.118 \\ (17.88)^{* *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.118 \\ (17.87)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.123 \\ (16.39)^{* * *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.073 \\ (10.43)^{* *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.073 \\ (10.35)^{* *} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.087 \\ (10.82)^{* * *} \end{array}$ |
| Belonging to the poorest SES | -0.033 | -0.048 | -0.033 | 0.004 | -0.022 | 0.005 |
| Disability crossed with the pupil's gender | $\begin{gathered} (5.41) * * * \\ -0.007 \\ (0.58) \end{gathered}$ | (6.86)*** | (5.38)*** | $\begin{aligned} & (0.72) \\ & 0.010 \\ & (0.94) \end{aligned}$ | (3.39)*** | (0.83) |
| Disability crossed with belonging to the poorest SES |  | $\begin{array}{r} 0.052 \\ (4.41)^{* * *} \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 0.089 \\ (8.33) * * * \end{array}$ |  |
| Disability crossed with location area |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.016 \\ (1.38) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} -0.044 \\ (3.62)^{* * *} \end{array}$ |
| Prob > chi2 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Pseudo R2 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.13 |
| $N$ | 28,199 | 28,199 | 28,199 | 28,199 | 28,199 | 28,199 |

## Robustness checks

Table 2: ATT estimates by sociodemographic characteristics

| Sociodemographicgroups | Matching methods |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nearest Neighbor |  |  | Stratification |  |  |  | Radius |  |  |  |  |
|  | Treated | Control | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ATT } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | Treated | Control | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{AT} \\ & \text { (\% } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | reated |  | Control | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ATT } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Sufficient level of proficiency in reading / language |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 8,402 | 18,025 | $\begin{aligned} & -5.9^{* * *} \\ & (0.007) \end{aligned}$ | $8,402$ |  |  |  |  | 8,4 |  | 20,876 | $\begin{aligned} & -6.9^{* * *} \\ & (0.006) \end{aligned}$ |
| Sufficient level of proficiency in mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  | 8,402 | 20,876 | -1.0 | 8,402 |  |  | ,876 |  |  | .0** | 8,400 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.006) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 005) |  |

## Conclusion

- Governments should provide schools with the additional special facilities needed for the particular accommodation of pupils with disabilities
- governments in Sub-Saharan Africa should particularly target students living in rural areas and belonging to disadvantaged groups such as the poorest SES quintiles

