

Starting off on the right foot – Language learning classes and the educational success of immigrant children

Lisa Sofie Höckel¹ and Pia Schilling²

¹*RWI – Leibniz Institute of Economic Research, IZA*

²*Free University of Bolzano*

Abstract

This study is the first empirical analysis to identify the causal effect of a separate preparatory language learning class on the academic success of newly immigrated primary school-aged children in comparison to their direct integration into regular classrooms. Employing unique administrative panel data from the German federal state Hamburg between 2013 and 2019, we use the quasi-random allocation of refugee children to neighborhoods and therewith schools to measure the effect of the two educational integration models on standardized test scores and the probability of attending an academic track in secondary school. Our results show that primary school-aged refugees who visit a preparatory class perform significantly worse in standardized test scores in fifth grade. The negative effect is particularly strong for Math and German. They further have a slightly lower probability to attend the academic track. Overall, our results indicate that integrating newly immigrated children directly into regular classrooms fosters their academic achievement more than schooling them first in preparatory classes with a focus on language learning.

JEL-Classification: I24, I21, J13, J15

Keywords: Academic achievement, education economics, language skills, migration, integration policy.

We thank Tobias Brändle, Christian Möller, and their teams at the Institute for Educational Monitoring and Quality Development (IFBQ) as well the Hamburg education authorities for providing the data and giving helpful feedback. We are grateful to Leah Boustan, Scott Carell, Mette Foged, Daniele Paserman, João Pereira dos Santos, Steven Stillman, as well as participants of the CIDER-LEARN conference, the UPF Applied Student and Postdoc Workshop, the First Joint Workshop for Applied Macro- and Microeconomics in Bolzano, the 6th Understanding Voluntary and Forced Migration Conference, the IZA summer school in labor economics, the 35th Annual Conference of the European Society for Population, the 12th International Workshop on Applied Economics of Education, the CEMIR Junior Economist Workshop on Migration Research, the EEA-ESEM 2022 Congress, EALE Conference 2022, the 7th IZA Workshop on the Economics of Education, the Princeton Stratification Workshop, and the Economics of Migration Junior Seminar for valuable comments and suggestions, and Lena Von Deylen for excellent research assistance. All remaining errors are our own.

1 Introduction

In 2020, international migration consisted of 281 million people, and 36 million of them were children (UNICEF, 2020). Changes in the composition of international migration flows increasingly affect receiving countries such as the United States, where over 5 million English learners made up for 10% of the student body in 2019 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2022). Few consistent strategies exist on how to integrate newly immigrated children into the countries' education system although industrialized countries often establish elaborate policies on how to integrate adult immigrants into their labor force. The economic literature has shown the benefit of a fast language acquisition for the long term social and economic integration of adult immigrants and direct spillovers to their children (e.g., Alan *et al.*, 2021b; Dustmann and van Soest, 2001; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2003; Foged and Werf, 2022; Foged *et al.*, 2022b,a; Kanas and Kosyakova, 2022; Lochmann *et al.*, 2019; Zorlu and Hartog, 2018). For immigrated children, a school integration strategy which focuses on fast language acquisition could have similar effects, helping to overcome the large and persistent achievement gaps between native and immigrant students in many industrialized countries (e.g., Algan *et al.*, 2010; Giannelli and Rapallini, 2016; OECD, 2018; Schnepf, 2007).

This study is the first empirical analysis to identify the causal effect of an educational integration model which focuses on language acquisition on the academic achievement of primary school-aged refugee children. Employing unique administrative data from the German federal state of Hamburg, we can follow three cohorts of students between 2013 and 2019. We use the quasi-random allocation of newly immigrated refugee children to schools and an instrumental variable approach to study the effect of attending a preparatory class in primary school on standardized test scores in secondary school and the probability of choosing an academic track.

Refugee children arriving in Germany with their parents are initially allocated to a federal state based on a quota system. In Hamburg, families are then centrally allocated to accommodations and school-aged children to schools by the school information center

(SIZ) (Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung, Hamburg, 2018). From the perspective of refugee families, the school they are allocated to and whether it offers a preparatory class is random and unrelated to student characteristics. Typically students in preparatory classes are in a separate class and have a curriculum that focuses largely (18h per week) on the acquisition of German language skills before being integrated into regular classes after approximately one year. On the contrary newly immigrated students in regular classes join the normal curriculum and get additional language classes. Given the sudden demand for preparatory classes in 2015/16 due to the large refugee influx to Germany, not all students ended up being taught in preparatory classes.

Our results show that refugees who have attended a preparatory class in elementary school perform significantly worse in their average standardized test score in fifth grade. This effect is strongest for Math and German tests. We further see a slightly lower probability for them to attend the academic track after fourth grade. Overall, our results show that – different to adults – newly immigrated children do not seem to universally benefit from an integration program that first focuses on language acquisition.

One possible mechanism is that children who visit a preparatory class upon arrival are more likely to remain in the same classes in secondary school as peers from their first visited classroom, typically other newly immigrated students, than children in regular classes. This finding suggests that the initial language acquisition could be negatively affected by the exposure to a higher concentration of other immigrant students.

The main contribution of the paper is to add to the scant evidence on the causal relationship between educational integration models for newly immigrated children and their academic achievement. To our knowledge, this paper provides the first causal evidence on an educational integration model which separates newly immigrated children to focus on their language acquisition before they are integrated into regular classes. In relation to this important question, our paper makes an important contribution to the economic literature discussing peer effects, educational integration programs, and the role of language in learning.

The strand on peer effects shows that children benefit from heterogeneous classrooms

(Burgess and Platt, 2021; Hoxby, 2000; Maestri, 2017; Matthewes, 2021; Morales, 2022). Studies by Bredtmann *et al.* (2021); Schneeweis (2015), and Jensen and Rasmussen (2011) find a negative effect for immigrant children (and descendants of immigrants) for being taught in classes with a high share of immigrant children. The effect is particularly strong for students in classes with a high share of same origin countries (Schneeweis, 2015) but does not vary by linguistic distance within a class (Bredtmann *et al.*, 2021).¹ Chuard *et al.* (2022) find clustering of students speaking the same foreign language leading to a higher probability of vocational track attendance and lower predicted earnings, with one of the drivers being held back at language acquisition. Using the quasi-random allocation of guest workers in Germany, Danzer *et al.* (2022) find that children’s acquisition of host country language skills and educational attainment suffer from exposure to a higher concentration of individuals with their own ethnicity. On the contrary, Morales (2022) shows that a higher share of refugee students increase Math scores in the US for both native and immigrant children. Maestri (2017) finds for the Netherlands that ethnic diversity has a positive impact on the test scores of minority students.²

Our study adds to this field by providing evidence on peer effects for the recent refugee influx to Europe. We investigate the impact of different class compositions over time and therewith provide new insight into how to integrate a diverse body of newly arriving students into the educational system.

Second, our paper builds upon the economic literature that analyses different educational integration models for newly immigrated children. Using quasi-random allocation of Ethiopian refugees in Israel in the 1990s, Gould *et al.* (2004) find that the initial elementary

¹Using within-school variation Frattini and Meschi (2019) show that an increase in the immigrant share in the classroom has a small negative impact on the Math scores of low-achieving students in Italian vocational schools, finding the outcomes to be driven by high average linguistic distance.

²For native students in Norway, Green and Vaag Iversen (2020) find notable negative effects of refugee children on the test scores of their native peers. These effects are strongest for native students who are most at risk of low performance such as boys and children from lower-educated backgrounds. Similarly Gould *et al.* (2009) find a higher concentration of Ethiopian refugees to reduce the probability to pass the high school matriculation in Israel. Exploiting rules of class formation in Italy, Ballatore *et al.* (2018) and find that adding one immigrant student and taking out one native reduces the Math and language test scores of natives by 0.16 standard deviations. In related work, Tonello (2016) finds a weak negative impact of non-native student share on the test scores of native peers, which are nonlinear and marginally increasing.

school environment has an effect on students' high school dropout rates, repetition rates, and on the passing rate on matriculation exams. More recently, Alan *et al.* (2021a) evaluate an educational program designed to develop social skills and build social cohesion through perspective-taking in Turkish schools. Empathy from native classmates enhances the formation of inter-ethnic social ties, reception of emotional and academic support by classmates, and improves the language skills of refugee children. Related, Boucher *et al.* (2021) find that exposure to classes with a larger proportion of Turkish children improves Turkish skills for Syrian preschool refugee children. US literature has vastly focused on bilingual education provision finding them to not significantly impact the standardized test scores of students (Chin *et al.*, 2013; Valentino and Reardon, 2015). In contrast, our paper analyzes a program in which children are separated into a parallel classroom for language learning.

For Denmark, Damm *et al.* (2021) analyze the effect of busing quasi-randomly selected dual language learners to school districts with students with a higher socio-economic background but with less resources per student. They find negative effects on the academic achievement and well-being of students bused to a different district. The results suggest that language learners benefit from higher school resources and a peer group with similar characteristics, which may be due to the schools being more specialized and offering better teaching to language learners.

Third, our paper adds to the literature on language proficiency and academic achievement of immigrant students. A different language than the school instruction language spoken at home is one of the main explanations for foreign origin students scoring lower than native students in Math and reading (Dustmann and Glitz, 2011; Dustmann *et al.*, 2010). Figlio and Özek (2020) find that early grade retention of English learners and, therefore, an additional year of schooling with additional support improves English skills as well as the likelihood of taking advanced Math and Science courses. Using age at arrival to instrument for language proficiency, Fenoll (2018) finds no effect of English skills on Math results, while Isphording *et al.* (2016) find a strong influence of reading performance on Math using PISA waves.

While the literature mainly focuses on the determinants of the large and persistent achievement gap between native and immigrant students, our paper studies an education program targeted at improving immigrant students performance. This evidence fills an important gap in the scarce literature on education programs to reduce the achievement gap. Our paper’s unique administrative data allows us to derive policy recommendations for fostering the school integration of newly immigrated elementary school-aged children.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives a short institutional overview of the German education system and the integration program studied. Section 3 discusses the empirical strategy and section 4 introduces the data. Section 5 presents the findings and section 6 concludes.

2 Background

2.1 Refugees Immigration to Germany

In recent years, a huge migration flow to the EU has been determined by refugee migration. In 2015 and 2016, the EU received around 2.6 million asylum applications, with over 75% of these individuals fleeing from war in Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan (Eurostat, 2020; Spindler, 2015). Germany was a leading destination country for new arrivals in these years with around 1.22 million registered asylum seekers between 2015 and 2016 (BAMF, 2017; Eurostat, 2020). Afterwards, the number of non-EU immigrants to Germany declined as the Western Balkan countries closed access to migrants and the EU-Turkey deal was established which implied refugees being deported back to Turkey. In 2015 and 2016, around 75% of Non-European immigrants were asylum applicants. Figure 1 shows the number of asylum applications between 2008 and 2020. We can see a large increase in 2015 and 2016. The peak in 2016 can be explained by the registration delays due to the large number of applications. Figure 1 further shows that around 25% of the asylum applications in Germany come from children below the age of fifteen, with the share increasing in later years.

While immigrants with a permit to reside can choose freely where to settle, asylum seekers are randomly allocated to initial reception facilities (Zentrale Erstaufnahmeeinrichtung) all over Germany. The overall allocation of refugees follows the quota of the so-called “Königsteiner Schlüssel”, which is based on tax revenue ($\frac{2}{3}$) and population ($\frac{1}{3}$) of each federal state (§45 AsylG) (BAMF, 2019). Hamburg receives around 2.5% of all asylum seekers that arrive in Germany (BAMF, 2019). Relative to the overall share in Germany, Hamburg receives a higher percentage of asylum seekers from Afghanistan (Appendix Figure A1). As shown in Appendix Figure A2, this is also true for our sample, with 47% of children being born in Syria and 31% from Afghanistan, while on average, asylum seekers from Afghanistan make up only 9% of all applications in Germany, but 32% in Hamburg.

2.2 The School System and Refugee Children

In Germany, school education is not the responsibility of the federal government but of the sixteen German federal states. However, it is the goal of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs to harmonize education policies to guarantee uniformity and comparability of degrees and quality standards across all federal states. Accordingly, main conditions like mandatory school ages and degrees are typically similar across federal states. In Hamburg, a child is supposed to attend school in August, if it turned six before July 1st.³ Similar to many other states, in Hamburg schooling lasts for eleven school years and ends the latest at the age of 18. Primary school lasts four years,⁴ providing general education in Math, German, Science, Art, Music, Physical Education, Religion, English, and school specific classes such as Turkish, for example.

At the end of primary school, around the age of ten years, teachers evaluate the performance and ability of the students and give a recommendation for the secondary track school. In Hamburg, the teacher’s recommendation is informational and non-binding, leaving the final decision on the school choice to the parents.

Regarding secondary schools, Hamburg does not offer the school types general and

³In Germany compulsory schooling starts with six years. The threshold dates vary by federal state.

⁴In Berlin, Brandenburg as well as at selected schools in Hamburg, primary school lasts for six school years.

intermediate secondary school (*Hauptschule and Realschule*) as an addition to high school (*Gymnasium*). Instead, parents have the choice between two school tracks, the so-called city district school (*Stadtteilschule*) and high school (*Gymnasium*). Gymnasium prepares high-achieving students to take the A-Level after the twelfth year, which qualifies students to continue their education either at a university, a college, or begin vocational training. While city district schools offer preparation for apprenticeship and other forms of vocational education after grade nine or ten, students can also continue their school education and do their A-levels after the thirteenth school year, which also qualifies them to enter a university or college.⁵

In Hamburg, both for refugee and immigrant children, schooling is compulsory from the beginning they reside in Hamburg and regardless of their resident status. Typically, refugee children who have just arrived in Germany live in initial reception facilities until their asylum status is processed.⁶ There, they are taught German daily for five to six hours by specially trained teachers and social workers in non-age-specific study groups. After approximately three months, families are assigned to group accommodations, and children start entering the school system (Pittelkow, b). Newly immigrated students are admitted throughout the school year, and until the age of 16 they are referred to a school by the SIZ.

2.3 School Integration Models

While the government requires the federal states to implement the law on compulsory schooling, few guidelines on how to organize the school integration of newly immigrated children exist (Massumi *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, how newly immigrated children are schooled varies dramatically along federal states. The two most common models are the parallel and the integrative model which are illustrated in Figure 3. The parallel model separates newly immigrated children from regular classes. It is supposed to provide

⁵Figure 2 illustrates that the share of foreign and native students in city district schools in Hamburg resembles the German average for general and intermediate schools. It shows the share of all German and all foreign children visiting either of the two schools. While the share is 50/50 for Germans, only 26% of all foreign students visit the Gymnasium and 74% the city district school.

⁶An exception are recently arrived refugees from Ukraine, often living in private accommodations.

a protected space for (refugee) children, who are unable to understand the teaching language and might have been affected by traumatizing incidents. In parallel classes, newly immigrated students focus on the German language and are slowly prepared for a transition into regular classes.

The integrative model includes refugee children into regular classes from the start and provides them with additive language training. Even though they interact early on with their native peers, the model bears the danger that they are exposed to overly excessive demands regarding language requirements (Brüggemann and Nikolai, 2016).

Like many other states, Hamburg uses both models. Up to the second class, newly arrived children are typically integrated directly into the regular class. They have additional language tuition but are otherwise assumed to catch up relatively fast (Pittelkow, a). For third graders and older students, Hamburg implemented the parallel model with separate preparatory classes in 2014 (Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung, Hamburg, 2018). While the main focus of these classes lies in learning German (18 hours per week), immigrant students also attend Math (4 hours per week), Science (2 hours per week), Physical Education (2 hours per week), and other elective subjects. The duration is planned for no longer than twelve months, and according to the guideline, classes should consist of no more than 15 students. Afterwards the children are assigned to regular classes, with up to four newly immigrated students in the same class, where they receive additive language training for another year (Bürgerschaft der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg, 2018).

Underaged immigrants who never, or only to a small extent, visited a school before, lack basic skills in writing and reading, or cannot read the Latin alphabet first attend a so-called base class (or previously called alphabetization class) for a maximum period of one year to acquire basic words and write in the Latin alphabet. Only afterward they attend a preparatory or regular class (Pittelkow, a; Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung, Hamburg, 2019).

The decision which school a newly arrived refugee child attends is made centrally, by the SIZ. The decision which schools offer preparatory classes is the responsibility of the

authority for school and vocational training (“Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung”) and is based on the identified need of each region and good accessibility (Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung, Hamburg, 2018; Bürgerschaft der Freien Hansestadt Hamburg, 2015). Overall, the demand for preparatory classes increased dramatically after the refugee influx. While in 2013, 206 elementary school children visited preparatory classes, at it’s peak in the school year 2017/18 1175 children attended separate preparatory classes (Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung IfBQ, 2021). This stark expansion hints at the use of preparatory classes to manage the integration of large numbers of refugee students without overwhelming the capacity of regular classes.

3 Empirical Strategy

We are interested in the educational success of newly immigrated refugee children visiting a preparatory class compared to those that are directly integrated into a regular class. Therefore, we estimate the following equation:

$$Y_{ics} = \alpha + \beta PrepClass_i + \delta Ind_i + \nu School_s + \gamma Neigh_s + \lambda Class_c + \varepsilon_{ics} \quad (1)$$

where Y_{ics} is our main outcome of interest, capturing the standardized test scores in grade five or the academic school track which refugee child i , in class c of school s is visiting. The key regressor of interest, $PrepClass_i$ is a binary variable indicating whether the child has ever visited a parallel preparatory class. We control for individual characteristics (Ind_i) gender, country of birth area, whether the child visited a school offering a preparatory class, whether the child has diagnosed educational needs, and the RISE development index.⁷ To ensure that the time in the German school system or age at migration does not drive our results, we also control for month and year of birth, dummies for the year of

⁷The RISE development index is a framework program for integrated urban district development defined by the city of Hamburg for the residence of the child. It is based on the indicators of the share of children and youth with migration background, single parents, recipients of social benefits and asylum benefits, unemployed, children receiving minimum security benefits (Mindestsicherung), seniors receiving minimum security benefits (Grundsicherung), and share without a school leaving degree (Behörde für Stadtentwicklung und Wohnen, Hamburg, 2021; Amt für Wohnen, Stadterneuerung und Bodenordnung, Hamburg, 2010).

immigration, and the first grade entered at the individual level.

School characteristics $School_s$ include the number of children per school in the three cohorts, whether it is a full-day school and which type. We include neighborhood characteristics $Neigh_s$ which include decile categories of the unemployment share in 2012, the purchasing power in 2012, and the foreign population in 2012 at the 1x1 kilometer grid around the current school. Finally, we also control for characteristics $Class_c$ at the class level including the number of children per class and the migrant share per class.⁸ For the regressions on the standardized tests, we also include the average class result of the standardized test to account for peer effects. Standard errors are clustered at the class level to account for similarity within the classrooms (Cameron and Miller, 2015).

The key identification assumption of our empirical strategy relies on the random allocation of refugee children, from the SIZ to the schools. The decision is made by the SIZ based on proximity and availability in schools although the SIZ tries to consider the parents' preferences (Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung, Hamburg, 2018). Therefore, from the perspective of the refugee child and family the assigned school and whether this school offers a preparatory class is random or based on a random feature such as age, location, or immigration year. A threat to our identification strategy would be if children were allocated to preparatory classes based on their ability or if schools offering preparatory classes were systematically better or worse schools in comparison to those who do not. In our main specification, we use both within and across-school variation in the attendance of preparatory classes. We verify our results using only between-school variation in the robustness checks. As an alternative identification, we exploit the availability of preparatory classes in the same schools over time. With this within-school variation, we can compare students in the same schools attending preparatory classes based on their arrival time. Furthermore, to address possible selection on unobservables, we use the rollout of preparatory classes and that older students were more likely to attend it by interacting the birthdate with the immigration year as an instrument for participating in

⁸With Gymnasium as our outcome variable, we use school and class control variables at the last observed elementary school. Since some students are still preparatory classes, we use the migrant share of the school instead of the classroom as a control variable.

a preparatory class.

Table 1 illustrates summary statistics for refugee students based on whether they attended a preparatory class or not.⁹ While some personal characteristics are significantly different between children visiting preparatory classes and those who do not, (girls and children with educational needs are less likely to visit preparatory class, while children arriving at the age of going to the third grade are more likely) importantly, school quality and neighborhood characteristics are not significantly different between the two groups. Further, the table shows that a school's distance to a refugee accommodation is not different for children who visit a preparation class and those who do not.

To ensure that refugee children are not systematically sorted in lower quality classrooms within schools once they go to regular classes, Table 2 illustrates that the allocation of refugees into the classroom is compatible with random assignment with respect to the average RISE development index of students, which regularly updates socio-economic context data of urban areas on a small scale. We regress the RISE development indexes in third grade on the share of new refugee children arriving in the classroom in grade four. In Column (2) with class controls included, there is a positive and significant sorting of refugees to classrooms with a higher average RISE development index. However, once we include school fixed effects in Column (3) there is no significant relationship between the refugee share within the classroom and the RISE development index in grade three.¹⁰ We further show that refugee students who visited a preparatory class do not have a higher exposure to refugees in their classroom in elementary school once they attend a regular class compared to students who start at a regular classroom (Appendix Table A2).

Although we do not observe which refugee accommodations the children live in, we do know that refugee accommodations in Hamburg are spread all over the city. Figure 4 shows the location of both refugee accommodations and elementary schools in Hamburg. It illustrates that refugee accommodations do not systematically cluster in one part of

⁹The observation numbers are slightly higher, as we use every observation defined as a refugee in elementary school, unconditional of the student still being observed in secondary school.

¹⁰We use the RISE development index in third grade and sorting in fourth grade, as this is the first grade we have standardized test scores for the children. Using test scores as outcomes, we also do not find any evidence for sorting within schools (Appendix Table A1).

the city or by the RISE development index, but that refugee children usually have several elementary schools nearby.

4 Data and Descriptive Statistics

Measuring educational success of refugee students on the individual level in Germany is very difficult due to data limitations. We received unique and confidential administrative data from the city state of Hamburg which consist of all children visiting a public primary school in Hamburg who were of school starting age in the school years 2013/2014, 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 (Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung, Hamburg, 2020b,g,c,d,e,f,h).¹¹ The data allows to follow these children from the first grade they attend in Hamburg until the school year 2019/2020 irrespective of how often they changed public schools within Hamburg. As the residence status of children is not collected in the data, we define refugee children as children who have immigrated in 2013 or later and are born in Afghanistan, Syria, Iran, Iraq, or Eritrea.¹²

A great asset to our dataset from Hamburg is that the city state implements its own standardized tests, the KERMIT („Kompetenzen ermitteln“- *Identify competencies*) in second, fifth, seventh, and ninth grade in German, Math and for secondary school also Natural Science, and English. Those tests are additional to the VERA tests ("VERgleichsArbeiten" - *Comparison tests*) in grade three and eight, which have been established since 2008 and in which all federal states in Germany take part. Results for those standardized test scores (KERMIT) in third, fifth and seventh grade are observed for each student

¹¹In 2015 12.7% of elementary school children visited a private school and are not observed in our dataset. This number has been declining since and only 10.3% of elementary school children are in a private school in 2021 (Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung IfBQ, 2021).

¹²Figure A1 illustrates that these nationalities accounted for the majority of asylum applications in Hamburg in 2015. We do not consider potential refugees from Albania as there also exists a sizable share of Albanian non-refugee migrants in Hamburg (BAMF, 2017). However, in the robustness section, we include them in Table 10.

(Klitsche *et al.*, 2019a,b, 2020; Musekamp *et al.*, 2020b,a; Thonke *et al.*, 2019, 2020).¹³

Our first outcome measuring educational performance is the KERMIT 5 test which is supposed to give teachers at the new secondary school objective information about the educational needs of their classes. The test is executed by trained external test conductors over four school hours and includes an assessment of the subjects German (written and reading comprehension), English (hearing comprehension), Math, and Natural Sciences. Questions in all subjects are often text-heavy and answered by multiple choice or short one line answers.¹⁴

As a second measure of educational success, we observe the choice of secondary school, so whether the child chooses the academic track at the high school or a city district school. We limit the dataset to a sub-sample consisting of children that arrived in elementary school and attended at least one year of elementary school in Germany. Furthermore, we limit the sample to observations with non-missing values in their RISE development index, country of birth and migration background.

For the schools in our dataset, we complement the administrative student data with neighborhood data from the RWI-GEO-GRID dataset. This data is based on uniformly defined grid by 1×1 kilometer raster cells. The grids are time-consistent and equally spread across the entire territory of Germany. In all areas with residential or commercial properties a rich set of household, demographic, mobility and development information is made available (RWI; microm, 2021).

Table 3 describes the variables contained in our dataset. We observe 1153 refugee children who have participated in one of the KERMIT tests in grade five. The KERMIT score in absolute numbers varies between 480 and 1300 points (in German) as scores below a certain threshold are not considered. We standardize the results with a mean of 0 and a

¹³The matching was realized after the examination of the data protection legitimacy through a crosswalk between KERMIT, the school year statistics and the data of the RWI provided by the trust office of the Hamburg school authority using an anonymous student and school id. The data was made available on request by the trust office of the Authority for Schools and Vocational Training (Vertrauensstelle der Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung) in Hamburg. Since this is administrative data, it cannot be made available on a replication server. Nevertheless, the data sources were cited so that the data could be requested again for replication purposes.

¹⁴Example questions in German can be found here.

standard deviation of 1. The standardized average KERMIT result with a mean of -0.96 indicates that refugee children perform significantly below the average of all students and we see that their performance is particularly bad in German. One in five refugee children attends a Gymnasium after primary school. This number is significantly smaller than the average of 50.14% for all fifth graders in our sample and official statistics of 52.8% for all children in Hamburg in the school year 2017 (Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung, Hamburg, 2020a). Although the decision on whether a child attends a Gymnasium or not is ultimately up to the parents, the gap indicates that by secondary school, refugee children have not managed to catch up to their native peers.

In our dataset, 46% of students have attended a preparatory class and 15% a base class. The share of 46% fits well the average cohort year of 2014.28 which implies that the sample is quite balanced between children who would have entered the first grade in 2013 (and visited a preparatory class if they came in 2015) and 2014 or 2015 (and visited a regular class). Around 77% of children in our dataset have arrived in Germany during the large refugee influx with most children being born in Syria and Afghanistan. Of those children in the regular school system 4.7% are attested a special educational need and the RISE development index of 2.42 indicates that they live in rather average neighborhoods.¹⁵ The majority of refugee children in our sample attend age appropriate grades in secondary school, however, around 35% of them attend lower classes in comparison to the classes they would have been assigned to by age. Regarding school and class controls, Table 3 shows that 80% of children attend schools which offer preparatory classes and the typical school has around 289 students in the three cohorts and an average of 23 students per class. The migrant share in class is composed based on the definition of the micro census as well as the information on citizenship and county of birth. The GRID controls unemployment rate, purchasing power and foreign population correspond to deciles which are balanced at the school level.

Figure 5 illustrates the allocation of our sample in elementary school. We can see that

¹⁵As mentioned above, the RISE development index gives an estimation of the socioeconomic environment the child lives in. The average RISE development index over all observations is 2.82, the average RISE development index over all observations of children which recently migrated is 2.44.

901 students were allocated to a school that offered a preparatory class, and around half of them attended one. The other students attended either a base class or were directly integrated into the regular classroom upon arrival. 391 students started at a school that did not offer preparatory or base classes and therefore visited a regular class.

Figure 6 shows the distribution of children into preparatory classes by grade and cohort. It illustrates that especially for cohort 2013 and cohort 2014 the supply of preparatory classes that was established in short time was limited and the demand for preparation classes exceeded the supply. In particular for children who were at school starting age in 2015, we see some schools establishing preparatory classes for second graders. This gives us both within cohort but also cross cohort variation to evaluate the effectiveness of the parallel preparatory classes.¹⁶

5 Results

Our main analysis examines the effect of students visiting a parallel preparatory class – compared to those integrated directly in a regular school class receiving additional language classes – on their educational outcomes. First, we analyze the effect on standardized test scores in fifth grade. Therefore, we average across the standardized test scores in Math, German, English, and Natural Science in an index (i.e., each test score has an equal weight).

Table 4 presents in the first row the estimates of β , having visited a preparatory class. Step-wise, we include our control variables. In Column (1), we include no controls and find a negative and significant correlation between visiting a preparatory class and the average KERMIT result in grade five. In Column (2), we add individual characteristics. Besides other individual characteristics it holds the students' year of birth, the year of immigration, and the first attended grade in Germany constant. This specification ensures that the time in the German education system is not driving the results. In Column (3), covariates at the school and neighborhood level are included. In Column (4), we control

¹⁶We use the across cohort variation for a robustness check employing the immigration year interacted with the date of birth to instrument for the attendance of a preparatory class.

for the class composition and peer effects with the average test result of the class.

Column (4), our preferred specification, shows that children who attend a preparatory class upon arrival perform 0.19 standard deviation points lower on the standardized test compared to students who are directly integrated into the regular classroom. This effect size is in line with the literature looking at immigrant student integration. Measuring the effect of an educational program in Turkey, aiming to build social cohesion by developing perspective-taking Alan *et al.* (2021a), for example, find that the program improved Syrian students' Turkish test scores by 0.13 standard deviations.

A threat to identification would be if there was any sorting from the SIZ or within schools of low (or high)-ability students into preparatory classes. We, therefore, employ an instrumental variable approach based on the refugee children's exogenous exposure to preparatory classes. The exposure is determined by age at arrival, which defines the grade the child will attend, and immigration year, with the number of preparatory classes increasing over time. In Column (5) of Table 4 we use this increased exposure based on age and immigration year by instrumenting the attendance of a preparatory class with the interaction of birthdate and immigration year. The coefficient of ever visiting a preparatory class using the instrumental variable regression has the same sign as our OLS results. It indicates a significant and negative effect of preparatory class attendance on standardized test scores in grade five, but is larger in magnitude.¹⁷

Furthermore, we can use the increase in preparatory classes, looking specifically at schools that did not offer a preparatory class in earlier years but implemented one later. In Column (6) of Table 4 we use these schools, comparing students that arrived in different years to the same school. By introducing first school fixed effects, we can exclude the possibility that our impact is driven by other school qualities and use only within school variation that comes from preparatory classes only being implemented in later years. Even though our sample size is reduced to almost half, the effect size of a preparatory class visit stays constant. In summary, Table 4 illustrates that children visiting a preparatory

¹⁷The results are similar in magnitude if we interact cohort and immigration year as an instrument for attending a preparatory class.

class for language learning for up to one year prior to integration in the regular class do significantly worse in the standardized test in fifth grade.

To investigate if a particular subject is driving the result, Table 5 illustrates the results for the preferred specification (Table 4, Column (4)) for the individual subjects separately. The table shows a significantly negative association between having attended a preparatory class and the KERMIT results for all subjects. Most interestingly, the effect is largest for Math and German. The negative results of attending a preparatory class in subjects other than German can be explained by the strong focus on language acquisition in preparatory classes. During the time when refugee children in preparatory classes have German lessons, the children who have been integrated into regular classes have more hours dedicated to other subjects such as Math and Natural Science. Surprising is that children who focus one year on language learning are still doing significantly worse on the German test compared to their peers who joined classes with other German students from the start. With respect to German test results, the effect is stronger for children’s reading skills than for writing skills (see Appendix Table A3).

Table 6 shows the results of the binary outcome whether the child is last observed in high school (Gymnasium). For this analysis, we can use a bigger sample than for the standardized test results, as we can include children who did not participate in the test as well as those who were not observed in the fifth grade, but again later. The table reveals that refugee children that participated in a preparatory class in primary school are significantly less likely to attend Gymnasium as the secondary school track. The small effect size of attending a preparatory class can be explained by the overall low share of refugee children attending a Gymnasium and the parents’ discretion in making the final choice on which school their children attend.

To study the heterogeneity of our results, Table 7 illustrates interaction terms with different characteristics. Column (1) shows the results from our preferred specification (Column (4) in Table 4). In Column (2), we interact having visited a preparatory class with the gender dummy. The coefficient for visiting a preparatory class is slightly more negative for females, but not statistically significantly different from male students. Column (3)

shows the results for interacting the participation in a preparatory class with the country of birth, with children from Syria as the reference group. While children from Iran are doing significantly better than those from Syria when integrated directly in the regular class, they are doing worse when visiting a preparatory class, even though this effect is not statistically different from zero.¹⁸ Columns (4) and (5) exploit possible heterogeneity based on initial conditions at the elementary school the child is allocated to. In Column (4), attending a preparatory class is interacted with the dummy variable of being in a school in a neighborhood with an above-median foreign share. We can see that an above-median foreign share harms students who are directly integrated into the regular classroom; it does not make a difference for students in preparatory classes. Column (5) introduces a quality measure of the first school the child visited. We interact the attendance of a preparatory class with being in a school that performs above-median in the KERMIT 3. Column (5) illustrates that there are no significant differences in the effect of visiting a preparatory class based on this quality measure.¹⁹

5.1 Mechanisms

Surprisingly, despite the focus on language acquisition, students visiting a parallel preparatory class upon arrival score significantly worse in the German standardized test compared to students directly integrated into a regular class. A possible reason could be that students in parallel preparatory classes are surrounded mainly by other immigrant children as their first contact in Germany, and likely many students with the same mother tongue.²⁰ If they form long lasting friendships with other non-German speaking children, they possibly also interact after their integration into a regular class mainly with these other immigrant children and less with German students. Consequently, they speak less German with native speakers in their free time. This interpretation is in line with the literature finding negative impacts for immigrant children that are taught in classrooms with a high concentration

¹⁸Appendix Table A4 shows the results separately for gender and country of origin.

¹⁹Appendix Table A5 shows that the performance on the standardized test is not related to the share of co-nationals in general as well as looking specifically for Syrian and Afghan students in the preparatory or regular classroom.

²⁰On average in preparatory classes around 25% of students have the same county of birth.

of other immigrant children (e.g. Bredtmann *et al.*, 2021; Schneeweis, 2015; Jensen and Rasmussen, 2011,).

While we cannot observe social ties or friendships in our data, Table 8 shows that children who visit a parallel preparatory class are more likely to be in a class with other children from their initial preparatory class than those that were integrated directly in a regular class. A refugee student who has visited a preparation class is observed with 0.17 more children from the initial preparatory class in fifth grade. This effect persists for the last observed grade in 2019, one or two grades later, and is an indicator that children which built social ties in their preparatory class kept them after changing to secondary school. Children who visit a base class (and likely have two extra years before being integrated into the regular class) are not more likely to stay together with children from their initial base class.

In line with the social tie mechanism, we show in Table 9 that refugee children who visit a preparatory class are in classrooms with a higher migrant share in secondary school, both in grade five as well as in their last observed grade. Children from preparatory classes are in grade five in classrooms with 2% more immigrants that arrived in or after 2013. For the share of refugee children, the effect also exists for the last observed grade.

5.2 Robustness Checks

As children who achieve non-sufficient results in the standardized test are classified as missing result, we cannot measure how low the achieved result might have been. While in our main regression analysis we exclude children who do not have at least a result in one subject in the standardized test scores, in Panel A and Columns (1) of Table 10 we set the test score to 450 if it is missing in fifth grade and run a censored regression. As refugee students, on average, perform one standard deviation point (or 91 absolute points) worse, the magnitude of the result is similar to our main analysis although the regression results are not standardized.²¹

In Column (2) we check for the robustness of our results by reducing our sample to

²¹We do not see a difference by preparatory class on whether the children has a test result at all.

refugee children who have not visited a base class. As can be seen in Table 4, children who have attended a base class do significantly worse and our main analysis includes all children that have visited a preparatory class irrespective of whether they have visited a base class before or not. The academic performance of children who have visited a base class is likely to be worse not because of the curriculum of base classes but rather because they have been assigned to base classes because they lag significantly behind. Excluding children that are upon arrival observed in base classes does not change our results.

Around 250 students in our sample were allocated to a school that did offer a preparatory class, but are never observed attending one. As we observe the students only once a year, we do not know if they arrived later and the classes were full, or if the school integrated them directly into a regular class based on their ability. Column (3) of Table 10 shows the impact of having visited a preparatory class excluding those students and using only across school variation. The sign of the effect stays the same and the effect is statistically significant.

We also verify our effect by including the control variable whether the refugee child visited an elementary school that has ever offered a preparatory class. As can be seen in Panel A and Column (4) of Table 10, the results stay the same if we allow for an across school identifying variation.²²

Next, in Panel B of Table 10 we verify the robustness of our results with different sample compositions. Column (1) starts by focusing on children who have been of third or fourth grade age when arriving at a German school for the first time. Our main results could be driven by younger children in first and second grade being both more likely to learn languages easier and adapt quicker to the new school system. Therefore, we run a subsample analysis using only the variation in attending a parallel preparatory class among third and fourth graders. Panel B in Table 10 shows that the negative effect of attending a preparatory class remains when only considering these age cohorts. In the remainder of Panel B, we test if our analysis is robust to different refugee definitions and

²²Table A6 includes in Column (5) also school and schoolyear fixed effects and in Column (6) class fixed effects for the secondary school the child goes to. As this is not possible for the outcome of secondary school track we proceed without including those additional fixed effects.

cohorts. Therefore, we first rerun our analysis with only including refugee children arriving to Germany in or after 2015 and therefore at/after the height of the refugee influx where the randomness in being assigned to a preparatory class was largest. The result proofs the robustness of our main analysis.

After, we define as a refugee not all children that arrived in 2013 and after, but only those that arrived after they were at school starting age. We can see in Column (3), that our sample size decreases only by 116 students to 1037 and the results remain the same.

Next, we expand our refugee definition and include more countries of origin. The five additional countries included have been amongst the ten citizenships with the highest inflow of initial applications in 2015. However, these nationalities have also existed as substantial non-refugee immigrants in Germany at the time or have had low acceptance rates. Column (4) in Table 10 shows that our results hold and only change very little in magnitude if we define refugee children based on a broader group of countries of origin.

To reassure that no sorting based on nationality might drive our result we run our main regression only with refugees from Syria who represent the largest group in our sample. Column (1) of Panel C in Table 10 shows for this group a significant negative effect of attending a preparatory class on their test result in fifth grade. Our final robustness test checks if elementary schools that offer a preparatory class are of inferior quality. We, therefore, measure the impact of visiting an elementary school that offers a preparatory class and has at least one refugee student at the school during the whole observation period on German born students' test score. Column (2) of Panel C displays the results from this placebo test. Having visited a school that offers a preparatory class does not have an effect on test scores of German born students in grade five.²³

Table 11 summarizes the robustness checks for Gymnasium attendance as the outcome. Our effect is robust to excluding children in base classes, those whose elementary school offered a preparatory class which they did not attend, and first and second graders (Column (1), (2) and (3) in Panel A). The results are further robust to reducing the sample to different immigration years and larger nationalities (Columns (1), (2), and (3) in Panel

²³The results stay the same if we include immigrants from German speaking countries.

B). However, the results are sensitive and lose significance once we include whether the elementary school ever offered a preparatory class as a control variable in column (3) of Panel A and when we reduce the sample to only Syrian refugees in Panel B. Therefore, the small and sensitive negative effect on high school attendance needs to be interpreted with caution.

6 Conclusion

Increasingly diverse migration flows around the world do not only require receiving countries to ensure a smooth integration of immigrants into the labor market but also their children's integration into the education system. Early academic success is a key determinant of both economic and psychological stability later in life, and the optimal promotion of the potential of immigrant children is in the best interest of both individual immigrants and the receiving country society.

Therefore, this paper addresses the research question of how newly immigrated primary school-aged children can be best integrated into a receiving country's education system. Do newly immigrated children benefit from being taught in parallel preparatory classes where they can focus on language acquisition with teachers which focus on their learning speed? Or do they gain from a fast integration into regular classes where they are immediately exposed to the expected learning content and can interact and learn from their native peers?

Employing unique administrative data from the German federal state of Hamburg, we use the variation in the existence of preparatory classes to study their effect on standardized test scores and the probability of attending an academic track up to five years after the children started school in Hamburg. Due to the unexpected refugee influx in 2015, not all newly immigrated children could be allocated to schools which offer preparatory classes, and children who have randomly been assigned to accommodation centers close to schools without preparatory classes often attended regular classes instead.

Our results show that attending a preparatory class has a negative effect on standardized

test scores in fifth grade. The negative effect is strongest for the children’s test scores in Math and German but also negative and significant for English and Natural Science. The negative results in German are particularly surprising due to the language learning focus of preparatory classes. We further find a lower probability for refugee children who participated in a preparatory classes on attending the academic track. Instead, we show that they are more likely to attend a secondary school with a higher migrant share in their classroom than those who were directly integrated into regular classes. Furthermore, they are more likely to share classrooms in secondary school with students from their initial preparatory class. Both of those mechanisms can be an indicator that the students interact less with native German speakers compared to those that directly join a regular classroom.

Overall, our results reveal that offering preparatory classes for newly immigrated children might not be the best solution for their educational success. While preparatory classes might have been an important tool to manage the large inflow of refugee children without overwhelming the schools, we show that the direct integration of refugee children into regular classes with additional language classes leads to better academic achievement. However, we are unable to test for the psychological advantages of offering newly immigrated children a safe space where they can learn the language first and we do not observe if the negative effect diminishes over time.

In summary, our paper provides causal evidence on an educational integration model for a recent and large immigration inflow. It can serve both policy makers and educational practitioners in their mission to design future school integration schemes for newly immigrated children.

References

- ALAN, S., BAYSAN, C., GUMREN, M. and KUBILAY, E. (2021a). Building social cohesion in ethnically mixed schools: An intervention on perspective taking. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **136** (4), 2147–2194.
- , DUYSAK, E., KUBILAY, E. and MUMCU, I. (2021b). Social Exclusion and Ethnic Segregation in Schools: The Role of Teacher’s Ethnic Prejudice. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, pp. 1–45.
- ALGAN, Y., DUSTMANN, C., GLITZ, A. and MANNING, A. (2010). The economic situation of first and second-generation immigrants in France, Germany and the United Kingdom. *The Economic Journal*, **120**, F4–F30.
- AMT FÜR WOHNEN, STADTERNEUERUNG UND BODENORDNUNG, HAMBURG (2010). Pilotbericht RISE Sozialmonitoring.
- BALLATORE, R. M., FORT, M. and ICHINO, A. (2018). Tower of Babel in the classroom: immigrants and natives in Italian schools. *Journal of Labour Economics*, **36** (4), 885–921.
- BAMF (2016). Das Bundesamt in Zahlen 2015. Asyl, Migration und Integration. *BAMF (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees)*.
- (2017). Das Bundesamt in Zahlen 2016. Asyl. *BAMF (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees)*.
- (2019). The stages of the German asylum procedure. *BAMF (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees)*.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG, HAMBURG (2018). Die Schulische Integration Neu Zugewandelter Schülerinnen und Schüler - Rahmenvorgaben für die Vorbereitungsklassen an allgemeinbildenden Schulen.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG, HAMBURG (2019). Zur Situation der geflüchteten in Hamburg 2016 – 2018.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG, HAMBURG (2020a). Hamburger Schulstatistik 2019/2020.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG, HAMBURG (2020b). Schuljahreserhebung allgemeinbildende Schulen, Schuljahr 2013/14. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ12:Schuljahreserhebung:2013-14>.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG, HAMBURG (2020c). Schuljahreserhebung allgemeinbildende Schulen, Schuljahr 2015/16. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ12:Schuljahreserhebung:2015-16>.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG, HAMBURG (2020d). Schuljahreserhebung allgemeinbildende Schulen, Schuljahr 2016/17. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ12:Schuljahreserhebung:2016-17>.

- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG, HAMBURG (2020e). Schuljahreserhebung allgemeinbildende Schulen, Schuljahr 2017/18. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ12:Schuljahreserhebung:2017-18>.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG, HAMBURG (2020f). Schuljahreserhebung allgemeinbildende Schulen, Schuljahr 2018/19. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ12:Schuljahreserhebung:2018-19>.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG, HAMBURG (2020g). Schuljahreserhebung, Schuljahr 2014/15. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ12:Schuljahreserhebung:2014-15>.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG, HAMBURG (2020h). Schuljahreserhebung, Schuljahr 2019/20. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ12:Schuljahreserhebung:2019-20>.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR SCHULE UND BERUFSBILDUNG IFBQ (2021). Das Schuljahr 2021 / 22 in Zahlen.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR STADTENTWICKLUNG UND UMWELT, HAMBURG (2017). IfBQ Regionaler Bildungsatlas 2018.
- BEHÖRDE FÜR STADTENTWICKLUNG UND WOHNEN, HAMBURG (2021). Sozialmonitoring Integrierte Stadtteilentwicklung - Bericht 2021.
- BOUCHER, V., TUMEN, S., VLASSOPOULOS, M., WAHBA, J. and ZENOU, Y. (2021). Ethnic Mixing in Early Childhood: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment and a Structural Model. *IZA Discussion Paper*, **14260**.
- BREDTMANN, J., OTTEN, S. and VONNAHME, C. (2021). Linguistic diversity in the classroom, student achievement, and social integration. *Education Economics*, **29** (2), 121–142.
- BRÜGGEMANN, C. and NIKOLAI, R. (2016). Das Comeback einer Organisationsform: Vorbereitungsklassen für neu zugewanderte Kinder und Jugendliche. *Netzwerk-Bildung*, **March**.
- BÜRGERSCHAFT DER FREIEN HANSESTADT HAMBURG (2015). Drucksache 21/1532. **September**.
- BÜRGERSCHAFT DER FREIEN UND HANSESTADT HAMBURG (2018). Drucksache 21/14611. **September**.
- BURGESS, S. and PLATT, L. (2021). Inter-ethnic relations of teenagers in England's schools: the role of school and neighbourhood ethnic composition. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, **47** (9), 2011–2038.
- CAMERON, A. C. and MILLER, D. L. (2015). A practitioner's guide to cluster-robust inference. *Journal of Human Resources*, **50** (2), 317–372.
- CHIN, A., DAYSAL, N. M. and IMBERMAN, S. A. (2013). Impact of bilingual education programs on limited English proficient students and their peers: Regression discontinuity evidence from Texas. *Journal of Public Economics*, **107**, 63–78.

- CHUARD, C., AERNE, A., BALESTRA, S., EUGSTER, B. and HODLER, R. (2022). Ethnic Clustering in Schools and Early Career Outcomes. *CEPR Press Discussion Paper*, **17505**.
- DAMM, A. P., MATTANA, E., NIELSEN, H. S. and ROULAND, B. (2021). Academic achievement and wellbeing of dual language learners: Evidence from a busing program. *Journal of Urban Economics*, **126** (June).
- DANZER, A., FEUERBAUM, C., PIOPIUNIK, M. and WOESSMANN, L. (2022). Growing Up in Ethnic Enclaves: Language Proficiency and Educational Attainment of Immigrant Children. *Journal of Population Economics*.
- DUSTMANN, C. and FABBRI, F. (2003). Language proficiency and labour market performance of immigrants in the UK. *The Economic Journal*, **113** (489), 695–717.
- and GLITZ, A. (2011). *Migration and Education*, vol. 4. Elsevier B.V.
- , MACHIN, S. and SCHÖNBERG, U. (2010). Ethnicity and educational achievement in compulsory schooling. *The Economic Journal*, **120** (546), F272–F297.
- and VAN SOEST, A. (2001). Language fluency and earnings: Estimation with misclassified language indicators. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, **83** (4), 663–674.
- EUROSTAT (2020). Asylum and first time asylum applicants by citizenship, age and sex. In *MIGR ASYAPPCTZA*, European Union.
- FENOLL, A. A. (2018). English proficiency and mathematics test scores of immigrant children in the us. *Economics of Education Review*, **64**, 102–113.
- FIGLIO, D. and ÖZEK, U. (2020). An extra year to learn English? Early grade retention and the human capital development of English learners. *Journal of Public Economics*, **186**.
- FOGED, M., HASAGER, L., PERI, G., ARENDT, J. N. and BOLVIG, I. (2022a). *Intergenerational Spillover Effects of Language Training for Refugees*. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- , —, —, — and — (2022b). Language Training and Refugees’ Integration. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, pp. 1–41.
- and WERF, C. V. D. (2022). Access to language training and local integration of refugees. *CRaM Discussion Paper Series*.
- FRATTINI, T. and MESCHI, E. (2019). The effect of immigrant peers in vocational schools. *European Economic Review*, **113**, 1–22.
- GIANNELLI, G. C. and RAPALLINI, C. (2016). Immigrant student performance in Math: Does it matter where you come from? *Economics of Education Review*, **52**, 291–304.
- GOULD, E. D., LAVY, V. and PASERMAN, M. D. (2004). Immigrating to opportunity: Estimating the effect of school quality using a natural experiment on Ethiopians in Israel. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **119** (2), 489–526.


- , — and — (2009). Does Immigration Affect the Long-Term Educational Outcomes of Natives ? Quasi- Experimental Evidence. *The Economic Journal*, **119** (540), 1243–1269.
- GREEN, C. and VAAG IVERSEN, J. M. (2020). Refugees and the Educational Attainment of Natives. *IZA Discussion Paper*, **13433**, 1–34.
- HOXBY, C. M. (2000). Peer Effects in the Classroom: Learning from Gender and Race Variation. *NBER Working Paper 7867*, **7867**.
- ISPHORDING, I. E., PIOPIUNIK, M. and RODRÍGUEZ-PLANAS, N. (2016). Speaking in numbers: The effect of reading performance on math performance among immigrants. *Economics Letters*, **139**, 52–56.
- JENSEN, P. and RASMUSSEN, A. W. (2011). The effect of immigrant concentration in schools on native and immigrant children’s reading and math skills. *Economics of Education Review*, **30** (6), 1503–1515.
- KANAS, A. and KOSYAKOVA, Y. (2022). Greater local supply of language courses improves refugees ’ labor market integration. *European Societies*, pp. 1–36.
- KLITSCHKE, S., MUSEKAMP, F., LÜCKEN, M., THONKE, F. and BRÄNDLE, T. (2019a). KERMIT 5, Schuljahr 2017/18. Version: 1.0.0. *The Institute for Educational Monitoring and Quality Development. Dataset*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ22:KERMIT:5/2017>.
- , —, —, — and BRÄNDLE, T. (2019b). KERMIT 5, Schuljahr 2018/19. Version: 1.0.0. *The Institute for Educational Monitoring and Quality Development. Dataset*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ22:KERMIT:5/2018>.
- , —, —, — and BRÄNDLE, T. (2020). KERMIT 3, Schuljahr 2016/17. Version: 1.0.0. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ22:KERMIT:3/2017>.
- LOCHMANN, A., RAPOPORT, H. and SPECIALE, B. (2019). The effect of language training on immigrants’ economic integration: Empirical evidence from France. *European Economic Review*, **113**, 265–296.
- MAESTRI, V. (2017). Can ethnic diversity have a positive effect on school achievement? *Education Economics*, **25** (3), 290–303.
- MASSUMI, M., DEWITZ, N., GRIESSBACH, J., TERHART, H., WAGNER, K., HIPPMANN, K., ALTINAY, L., BECKER-MROTZEK, M. M. and ROTH, H.-J. (2015). *Neu zugewanderte Kinder und Jugendliche im deutschen Schulsystem*. Tech. rep., Mercator Institut für Sprachförderung und Deutsch als Zweitsprache und Zentrum für LehrerInnenbildung der Universität zu Köln.
- MATTHEWES, S. H. (2021). Better Together? Heterogeneous Effects of Tracking on Student Achievement. *The Economic Journal*, **131** (635), 1269–1307.
- MORALES, C. (2022). Do Refugee Students Affect the Academic Achievement of Peers? Evidence from a Large Urban School District. *Economics of Education Review*, **89** (102283).

- MUSEKAMP, F., LÜCKEN, M., THONKE, F., DEPPING, D. and ERTÜRK, N. (2020a). KERMIT 7, Schuljahr 2019/20. Version: 1.0.0. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ22:KERMIT:7/2019>.
- , —, —, — and INSTITUT FÜR BILDUNGSMONITORING UND QUALITÄTSENTWICKLUNG (IfBQ) (2020b). KERMIT 5, Schuljahr 2019/20. Version: 1.0.0. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ22:KERMIT:5/2019>.
- NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS (2022). English Learners in Public Schools. Condition of Education.
- OECD (ed.) (2018). *The Resilience of Students with an Immigrant Background: Factors that Shape Well-Being*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- PITTELKOW, C. (a). Press Release: Zuwanderung - So funktioniert Schule für minderjährige Flüchtlinge.
- (b). Press Release: Zuwanderung - Unterricht in der Erstaufnahme.
- RWI; MICROM (2021). RWI-GEO-GRID: Socio-economic data on grid level - Scientific Use File(wave 11). RWI-GEO-GRID. Version: 1. RWI – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research. Dataset.
- SCHNEEWEIS, N. (2015). Immigrant concentration in schools: Consequences for native and migrant students. *Labour Economics*, **35**, 63–76.
- SCHNEPF, S. V. (2007). Immigrants’ educational disadvantage: an examination across ten countries and three surveys. *Journal of Population Economics*, **20** (3), 527–545.
- SPINDLER, W. (2015). 2015: The year of Europe’s refugee crisis.
- STATISTISCHES AMT FÜR HAMBURG UND SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN (2016). Asylbewerberleistungen in Hamburg 2015.
- STATISTISCHES BUNDESAMT (2020). Bildung und Kultur Allgemeinbildende Schulen, Schuljahr 2018/2019. *Fachserie 11 Reihe 1*.
- THONKE, F., MUSEKAMP, F., LÜCKEN, M., BRÄNDLE, T. and KLITSCHKE, S. (2019). KERMIT 3, Schuljahr 2015/16. Version: 1.0.0. Doi:<https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ22:KERMIT:3/2016>.
- , —, —, — and KLITSCHKE, S. (2020). KERMIT 3, Schuljahr 2017/18. Version: 1.0.0. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.25654/IfBQ-BQ22:KERMIT:3/2018>.
- TONELLO, M. (2016). Peer effects of non-native students on natives’ educational outcomes: mechanisms and evidence. *Empirical Economics*, **51** (1), 383–414.
- UNICEF (2020). International Migrant Stock 2020. *United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2020)*.
- VALENTINO, R. A. and REARDON, S. F. (2015). Effectiveness of Four Instructional Programs Designed to Serve English Learners: Variation by Ethnicity and Initial English Proficiency. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, **37** (4), 612–637.

ZORLU, A. and HARTOG, J. (2018). The Impact of Language on Socioeconomic Integration of Immigrants. *IZA Discussion Paper*, **11485**.


7 Tables and Figures

Figure 1: Immigration to Germany



Source: Eurostat (2020)

Figure 2: Secondary School Tracks



Source: Statistisches Bundesamt (2020)





Figure 4: Location of Refugee Accommodations and Elementary Schools in Hamburg



Source: Behörde für Stadtentwicklung und Umwelt, Hamburg (2017) Bildungsatlas Hamburg. Own illustration.

Figure 5: Number of Students Allocated to Different Classroom Types




Figure 6: Grade at First Observation and Attendance in Preparatory Class




Table 1: Summary Statistics of all Refugees by Visit of Preparatory Class

| Variable | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD | N | t-Test |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-------|-----|---------|-------|-------|--------|
| In preparatory class | No | | | Yes | | | |
| <i>Individual characteristics</i> | | | | | | | |
| Base class | 0.18 | 0.38 | 828 | 0.23 | 0.42 | 854 | *** |
| Migrated since 2015 | 0.63 | 0.48 | 828 | 0.95 | 0.22 | 854 | *** |
| Female | 0.51 | 0.50 | 828 | 0.46 | 0.50 | 854 | * |
| Year of birth | 2007.50 | 1.12 | 828 | 2007.31 | 1.21 | 854 | *** |
| Area of birth | | | | | | | |
| ... Middle East | 0.69 | 0.46 | 824 | 0.71 | 0.45 | 854 | |
| ... Africa | 0.0049 | 0.07 | 824 | 0.0094 | 0.096 | 854.0 | |
| ... Asia | 0.30 | 0.46 | 824 | 0.28 | 0.45 | 854 | |
| Cohort | 2014.27 | 0.77 | 828 | 2014.14 | 0.81 | 854 | *** |
| Educational needs | 0.012 | 0.11 | 828 | 0.0047 | 0.068 | 854 | * |
| RISE development index | 2.61 | 0.89 | 828 | 2.66 | 0.92 | 854 | |
| <i>School/class controls</i> | | | | | | | |
| School average KERMIT | -0.23 | 0.41 | 827 | -0.20 | 0.39 | 854 | |
| Av RISE dev index school | 2.60 | 0.69 | 828 | 2.63 | 0.68 | 854 | |
| Children per school | 174.41 | 74.98 | 828 | 181.23 | 75.18 | 854 | * |
| Children per class | 18.09 | 5.64 | 828 | 10.75 | 4.11 | 854 | *** |
| Unemployment 2012 | 6.23 | 2.93 | 828 | 6.13 | 2.90 | 854 | |
| Purchasing power 2012 | 5.33 | 2.87 | 828 | 5.55 | 2.81 | 854 | |
| Foreign population 2012 | 5.81 | 2.89 | 828 | 5.74 | 2.90 | 854 | |
| Acc distance | 4.12 | 1.96 | 828 | 4.19 | 1.94 | 854 | |

Table 2: Sorting of Immigrant Students into Quality of Classrooms (RISE Social Index)

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Refugee share class | 0.12 (1.03) | 1.55** (0.66) | 0.42 (0.27) |
| Share female | | 0.01 (0.14) | 0.05 (0.07) |
| Migrant share class | | -2.13*** (0.09) | -0.24*** (0.05) |
| Children per class | | 0.04*** (0.01) | 0.00 (0.00) |
| Class controls | No | Yes | Yes |
| School FE x Year FE | No | No | Yes |
| R ² | 0.00 | 0.59 | 0.95 |
| Adj. R ² | -0.00 | 0.59 | 0.94 |
| Num. obs. | 1594 | 1594 | 1594 |
| N Clusters | 790 | 790 | 790 |

Note: Estimated regression coefficients of new arriving refugees in regular classes in grade four on third grade RISE social index of students in the classroom. Standard errors clustered at class level. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table 3: Summary Statistics in 5th Grade for Refugee Students

| Variable | Mean | SD | N |
|-----------------------------------|---------|--------|------|
| <i>Outcome</i> | | | |
| Gymnasium | 0.19 | 0.39 | 1153 |
| KERMIT Average | -0.96 | 0.73 | 1153 |
| KERMIT Math | -0.88 | 0.88 | 1130 |
| KERMIT German | -1.12 | 0.93 | 1151 |
| KERMIT English | -0.72 | 0.93 | 1092 |
| KERMIT Natural Science | -1.03 | 0.78 | 1120 |
| <i>Individual characteristics</i> | | | |
| Preparatory class | 0.46 | 0.50 | 1153 |
| Base class | 0.15 | 0.36 | 1153 |
| Migrated since 2015 | 0.77 | 0.42 | 1153 |
| Female | 0.49 | 0.50 | 1153 |
| Year of birth | 2007.35 | 1.02 | 1153 |
| County of birth | | | |
| ... Syria | 0.46 | 0.50 | 1153 |
| ... Afghanistan | 0.32 | 0.47 | 1153 |
| ... Eritrea | 0.0052 | 0.072 | 1153 |
| ... Iraq | 0.10 | 0.30 | 1153 |
| ... Iran | 0.11 | 0.31 | 1153 |
| Cohort | 2014.28 | 0.76 | 1153 |
| Educational needs | 0.047 | 0.21 | 1153 |
| RISE development index | 2.42 | 0.91 | 1153 |
| Age appropriate grade: | | | |
| ... age appropriate class | 0.51 | 0.50 | 1153 |
| ... older | 0.47 | 0.50 | 1153 |
| ... younger | 0.018 | 0.13 | 1153 |
| <i>School/class controls</i> | | | |
| Elem. school w/ prep class | 0.80 | 0.40 | 1153 |
| Children per school | 288.96 | 123.97 | 1153 |
| Children per class | 23.28 | 2.74 | 1153 |
| Migrant share class | 0.63 | 0.19 | 1153 |
| Unemployment 2012 | 5.85 | 2.75 | 1153 |
| Purchasing power 2012 | 5.47 | 2.50 | 1153 |
| Foreign population 2012 | 5.77 | 2.88 | 1153 |

Table 4: The Impact of Preparatory Classes on Average Test Score Results

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Ever in preparatory class | −0.37*** (0.04) | −0.29*** (0.05) | −0.23*** (0.05) | −0.19*** (0.04) | −0.35*** (0.12) | −0.17** (0.08) |
| Ever in base class | −0.38*** (0.06) | −0.34*** (0.06) | −0.32*** (0.06) | −0.26*** (0.05) | −0.25*** (0.05) | −0.25*** (0.08) |
| Female | | 0.04 (0.04) | 0.04 (0.04) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.01 (0.03) | −0.03 (0.04) |
| Education needs | | −0.75*** (0.09) | −0.66*** (0.09) | −0.53*** (0.09) | −0.55*** (0.09) | −0.50*** (0.14) |
| RISE development index | | 0.10*** (0.02) | 0.04* (0.02) | 0.03 (0.02) | 0.04* (0.02) | −0.03 (0.03) |
| Unemployment 2012 | | | −0.01 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | −0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.01) |
| Foreign population 2012 | | | −0.03** (0.01) | −0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.02) |
| Migrant share class | | | | 0.33*** (0.12) | 0.30** (0.12) | 0.33* (0.18) |
| Average KERMIT result | | | | 0.76*** (0.06) | 0.75*** (0.06) | 0.85*** (0.09) |
| Indiv controls | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Area of birth FE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| First School FE | No | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| IV | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Adj. R ² | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.30 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.43 |
| Num. obs. | 1153 | 1153 | 1153 | 1153 | 1153 | 661 |
| N Clusters | 440 | 440 | 440 | 440 | 440 | 331 |
| F statistic | | | | | 48.10 | |

Note: Standardized KERMIT results. Standard errors clustered on class level. Not shown controls: Year of birth, month of birth, children per school, form of full time school, purchasing power, children per class. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table 5: The Impact of Preparatory Classes on Separate Test Score Results

| | Math | German | English | Natural Science |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Ever in preparatory class | −0.21*** (0.06) | −0.25*** (0.05) | −0.13** (0.06) | −0.17*** (0.05) |
| Ever in base class | −0.32*** (0.07) | −0.28*** (0.07) | −0.19** (0.08) | −0.19*** (0.06) |
| Female | −0.19*** (0.04) | 0.22*** (0.04) | 0.07 (0.05) | −0.05 (0.04) |
| Education needs | −0.77*** (0.11) | −0.64*** (0.10) | −0.26** (0.12) | −0.24** (0.11) |
| RISE social index | 0.04 (0.03) | 0.03 (0.03) | 0.05 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.03) |
| Unemployment 2012 | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.01) | −0.00 (0.01) | −0.01 (0.01) |
| Foreign population 2012 | −0.00 (0.01) | −0.01 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.01) | −0.01 (0.01) |
| Migrant share class | 0.49*** (0.15) | 0.33** (0.15) | −0.04 (0.16) | 0.43*** (0.16) |
| Average Math result | 0.80*** (0.07) | | | |
| Average German result | | 0.80*** (0.06) | | |
| Average English result | | | 0.84*** (0.06) | |
| Average Natural Science result | | | | 0.65*** (0.09) |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Birthcountry FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adj. R ² | 0.31 | 0.42 | 0.35 | 0.22 |
| Num. obs. | 1130 | 1151 | 1092 | 1120 |
| N Clusters | 434 | 440 | 432 | 431 |

Note: Standardized KERMIT results. Standard errors clustered on class level. Not shown controls: Year of birth, month of birth, children per school, form of full time school, purchasing power, children per class. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table 6: The Impact of Preparatory Classes on Gymnasium Attendance

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Ever in preparatory class | −0.09*** (0.02) | −0.08*** (0.02) | −0.08*** (0.02) | −0.06** (0.02) | −0.16* (0.09) | −0.07** (0.03) |
| Ever in base class | −0.07*** (0.02) | −0.06** (0.02) | −0.06** (0.02) | −0.03 (0.03) | −0.04 (0.03) | −0.03 (0.03) |
| Female | | 0.01 (0.02) | 0.02 (0.02) | 0.02 (0.02) | 0.02 (0.02) | 0.03 (0.02) |
| Education needs | | −0.21*** (0.02) | −0.20*** (0.02) | −0.20*** (0.02) | −0.22*** (0.03) | −0.20*** (0.03) |
| RISE development index | | 0.02** (0.01) | 0.03** (0.01) | 0.03** (0.01) | 0.03** (0.01) | 0.03** (0.01) |
| Unemployment 2012 | | | −0.01 (0.01) | −0.01* (0.01) | −0.01 (0.01) | −0.01* (0.01) |
| Foreign population 2012 | | | 0.02** (0.01) | 0.02*** (0.01) | 0.02** (0.01) | 0.02* (0.01) |
| Indiv controls | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Area of birth FE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| First school FE | No | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| IV | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Adj. R ² | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.07 |
| Num. obs. | 1299 | 1299 | 1299 | 1299 | 1299 | 803 |
| F statistic | | | | | 6.55 | |
| N Clusters | 741 | 741 | 741 | 741 | 741 | 530 |

Note: Gymnasium attendance in the last observation. Standard errors clustered on class level. Not shown controls: Year of birth, month of birth, children per school in elementary school, form of full time school in elementary school, purchasing power for elementary school, migrant share in elementary school, children per class. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table 7: The Impact of Preparatory Classes on group specific average Test Score Results

| | Base | Gender | Origin | Foreign | Quality |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Ever in preparatory class | -0.19*** (0.04) | -0.16*** (0.05) | -0.16*** (0.06) | -0.23*** (0.06) | -0.20*** (0.05) |
| Ever in base class | -0.26*** (0.05) | -0.26*** (0.05) | -0.26*** (0.05) | -0.26*** (0.05) | -0.26*** (0.05) |
| Female | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.05 (0.04) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.02 (0.03) |
| Birthcountry (Ref: Syria) | | | | | |
| Afghanistan | 0.02 (0.04) | 0.02 (0.04) | 0.03 (0.05) | 0.01 (0.04) | 0.02 (0.04) |
| Eritrea | -0.18 (0.19) | -0.17 (0.19) | -0.02 (0.20) | -0.17 (0.22) | -0.17 (0.18) |
| Iraq | -0.07 (0.06) | -0.07 (0.06) | -0.07 (0.09) | -0.09 (0.06) | -0.08 (0.06) |
| Iran | 0.19*** (0.05) | 0.19*** (0.05) | 0.24*** (0.07) | 0.18*** (0.06) | 0.19*** (0.05) |
| Prep class x female | | -0.06 (0.07) | | | |
| Prep class x Afghanistan | | | -0.02 (0.07) | | |
| Prep class x Eritrea | | | -0.48 (0.43) | | |
| Prep class x Iraq | | | -0.01 (0.12) | | |
| Prep Class x Iran | | | -0.16 (0.11) | | |
| Above median foreign share neighb. | | | | -0.12** (0.05) | |
| Prep class x foreign share | | | | 0.08 (0.07) | |
| Above median KERMIT 3 results | | | | | 0.05 (0.05) |
| Prep Class x KERMIT 3 | | | | | 0.04 (0.07) |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Birthcountry FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| R ² | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| Adj. R ² | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.44 |
| Num. obs. | 1153 | 1153 | 1153 | 1104 | 1149 |
| N Clusters | 440 | 440 | 440 | 432 | 438 |

Standardized Kermit Results, Standard Errors Clustered on Class Level, Refugees are children immigrated in of after 2013 born in Syria, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Eritrea. For migrant share per class migrant background according to microcensus/birthcountry/citizenship is used. Not shown controls: Form of full time school, birthmonth, birthyear, immigration year, first grade, RISE development index, educational needs purchasing power, unemployment, foreign population, children per school, children per class, migrant share class, and average Kermit test score in class. Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table 8: Number of Students from First Grade and Attendance of Preparatory Class

| | 5th Grade | Last Grade |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Ever in preparatory class | 0.16*** (0.03) | 0.14*** (0.03) |
| Ever in base class | -0.02 (0.04) | 0.00 (0.04) |
| Female | 0.05 (0.03) | 0.04 (0.03) |
| Education needs | 0.04 (0.09) | 0.04 (0.10) |
| RISE development index | -0.01 (0.02) | -0.01 (0.02) |
| Unemployment 2012 | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.01) |
| Foreign population 2012 | 0.01 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) |
| Children per class | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.01) |
| Migrant share class | 0.25** (0.13) | 0.19** (0.10) |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | Yes | Yes |
| Area of birth FE | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | Yes | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | Yes | Yes |
| Adj. R ² | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Num. obs. | 1222 | 1226 |
| N Clusters | 460 | 700 |

Note: Number of students from first observed grade and attendance of preparatory class. Standard errors clustered on class level, Not shown controls: Year of birth, month of birth, children per school, form of full time school, purchasing power. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table 9: Refugee or Migrant Share in Secondary School and Attendance of Preparatory Class

| | Recent Migrant Share | | Refugee Share | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | 5th Grade | Last Grade | 5th Grade | Last Grade |
| Ever in preparatory class | 0.02** (0.01) | 0.02*** (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.01) |
| Ever in base class | 0.07*** (0.02) | 0.05*** (0.01) | 0.04*** (0.01) | 0.02*** (0.01) |
| Female | -0.01 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.01) | -0.01 (0.00) | -0.01 (0.00) |
| Education needs | -0.01 (0.02) | -0.01 (0.02) | -0.01 (0.01) | -0.01 (0.01) |
| RISE development index | -0.01 (0.01) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) |
| Unemployment 2012 | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) |
| Foreign population 2012 | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) | -0.00 (0.00) |
| Children per class | -0.02*** (0.00) | -0.02*** (0.00) | -0.02*** (0.00) | -0.01*** (0.00) |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Area of birth FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adj. R ² | 0.46 | 0.41 | 0.38 | 0.32 |
| Num. obs. | 1219 | 1283 | 1219 | 1283 |
| N Clusters | 460 | 730 | 460 | 730 |

Note: Share of recent immigrants and refugees in classroom and attendance of preparatory class. Standard errors clustered on class level, Not shown controls: Year of birth, month of birth, children per school, form of full time school, purchasing power. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table 10: The Impact of Preparatory Classes on average Kermit Results: Robustness

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Panel A: Analysis | Censored | w/o Base Class | w/o non Prep | w/ elem Control |
| Ever in preparatory class | -15.89** (7.75) | -0.22*** (0.05) | -0.14*** (0.05) | -0.19*** (0.05) |
| Ever in base class | -47.74*** (10.24) | | -0.23*** (0.05) | -0.26*** (0.05) |
| Left Censored | 119 | | | |
| Uncensored | 1153 | | | |
| Adj. R ² | | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.43 |
| Num. obs. | 1272 | 980 | 900 | 1153 |
| | | | | |
| Panel B: Composition | 3/4 Grade | 2015 Arrival | Immi Year | Nationalities |
| Ever in preparatory class | -0.18*** (0.05) | -0.19*** (0.05) | -0.19*** (0.04) | -0.18*** (0.04) |
| Ever in base class | -0.28*** (0.06) | -0.28*** (0.05) | -0.26*** (0.05) | -0.26*** (0.05) |
| Adj. R ² | 0.39 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 0.43 |
| Num. obs. | 746 | 893 | 1037 | 1266 |
| | | | | |
| Panel C: Nationalities | Syrian | German Placebo | | |
| Ever in preparatory class | -0.14** (0.06) | | | |
| Ever in base class | -0.30*** (0.07) | | | |
| Elem w/ prep class | 0.04 (0.07) | -0.01 (0.01) | | |
| Adj. R ² | 0.45 | 0.55 | | |
| Num. obs. | 534 | 27952 | | |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Birthcountry FE | (Yes) | (Yes) | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | Yes | (Yes) | Yes | Yes |
| School/Neigh. controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Note: Standardized KERMIT results, Standard errors clustered on class level. Controls: Female, year of birth, month of birth, education needs, RISE development index, education needs, children per school, form of full time school, purchasing power, unemployment, foreign population, children per class, migrant share in class, class average KERMIT test score, * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.


Table 11: The Impact of Preparatory Classes on Gymnasium Attendance: Robustness

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Panel A: | w/o Base Class | w/o non Prep | w/ Elem Control | 3/4 Grade |
| Ever in preparatory class | −0.07** (0.03) | −0.06** (0.03) | −0.04 (0.03) | −0.05* (0.03) |
| Ever in base class | | −0.05* (0.03) | −0.02 (0.03) | −0.04 (0.03) |
| Adj. R ² | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| Num. obs. | 1038 | 1060 | 1299 | 878 |
| Panel B: Composition | 2015 Arrival | Immi Year | Nationalities | Syrian |
| Ever in preparatory class | −0.06** (0.02) | −0.06** (0.02) | −0.06** (0.02) | −0.04 (0.03) |
| Ever in base class | −0.05* (0.03) | −0.04 (0.03) | −0.03 (0.02) | −0.02 (0.04) |
| Adj. R ² | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 |
| Num. obs. | 1025 | 1180 | 1442 | 604 |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Area of birth FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | (Yes) |
| Immigration year FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Note: Gymnasium attendance in the last observation. Standard errors clustered on class level. Not shown controls: Female, year of birth, month of birth, immigration year, area birthcountry, education needs, RISE development index, first grade, children per school in elementary school, form of full time school in elementary school, migrant share elementary school, unemployment elementary school, purchasing power for elementary school, foreign population for elementary school, migrant share in elementary school, children per class elementary school, children per class. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Appendix

Figure A1: Asylum Applications in 2015



Note: Source: Statistisches Amt für Hamburg und Schleswig-Holstein (2016); BAMF (2016)

Figure A2: Birthcountries Sample

2016 HAMBURG SAMPLE




Table A1: Sorting of Immigrant Students fourth Grade and Performance of the Classroom

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| New refugee share class | -1.72** (0.69) | -1.22** (0.53) | 0.04 (0.44) |
| Share female | | -0.22* (0.12) | -0.16 (0.13) |
| Migrant share class | | -0.71*** (0.08) | -0.26*** (0.09) |
| Kids per class | | 0.01 (0.01) | 0.03*** (0.01) |
| Class RISE development index | | 0.26*** (0.02) | 0.07 (0.06) |
| Class controls | No | Yes | Yes |
| School FE x Year FE | No | No | Yes |
| Adj. R ² | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.72 |
| Num. obs. | 1590 | 1590 | 1590 |
| N Clusters | 789 | 789 | 789 |

Note: Estimated regression coefficients of new arriving refugees in regular classes in grade four on third grade KERMIT results of students in the classroom. Standard errors clustered at class level. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table A2: Migrant and Refugee Share Regular Class in Elementary School by Preparatory Class Attendance

| | Class Migrant Share | | Class Refugee Share | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Ever in preparatory class | 0.00 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | −0.02 (0.02) | −0.02 (0.02) |
| Ever in base class | −0.00 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.01) | −0.02 (0.03) | −0.02 (0.03) |
| Female | | 0.01* (0.00) | | |
| Education needs | | −0.01 (0.01) | | |
| RISE development index | | −0.02*** (0.00) | | |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Area of birth FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adj. R ² | −0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Num. obs. | 827 | 827 | 827 | 827 |
| N Clusters | 393 | 393 | 393 | 393 |

Note: Standardized KERMIT results. Standard errors clustered on class level. Not shown controls: Year of birth, month of birth, immigration year, area or birth. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table A3: The Impact of Preparatory Classes on German Reading and Writing Skills

| | Reading | Writing |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Ever in preparatory class | −0.28*** (0.07) | −0.22*** (0.06) |
| Ever in base class | −0.19** (0.09) | −0.31*** (0.07) |
| Female | 0.12*** (0.05) | 0.27*** (0.05) |
| Education needs | −0.52*** (0.13) | −0.60*** (0.10) |
| RISE development index | −0.01 (0.03) | 0.06** (0.03) |
| Unemployment 2012 | 0.02 (0.01) | −0.01 (0.01) |
| Foreign population 2012 | −0.03* (0.02) | 0.02 (0.01) |
| Migrant share class | 0.21 (0.18) | 0.36** (0.15) |
| Average KERMIT result | 0.72*** (0.08) | 0.74*** (0.06) |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | Yes | Yes |
| Birthcountry FE | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | Yes | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | Yes | Yes |
| Adj. R ² | 0.37 | 0.34 |
| Num. obs. | 1055 | 1150 |
| N Clusters | 431 | 440 |

Note: Standardized KERMIT results separate for German reading and writing. Standard errors clustered on class level. Not shown controls: Year of birth, month of birth, elementary school offering preparatory classes, children per school, form of full time school, purchasing power, children per class. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table A4: The Impact of Preparatory Classes on Average Test Score Results by Groups

| | Gender | | County of Birth | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | Female | Male | Syria | Afgh | Iran | Iraq |
| Ever in preparatory class | −0.23*** (0.06) | −0.14** (0.06) | −0.14** (0.06) | −0.17** (0.07) | −0.35** (0.14) | 0.02 (0.14) |
| Ever in base class | −0.22*** (0.07) | −0.28*** (0.07) | −0.30*** (0.07) | −0.23** (0.09) | −0.02 (0.15) | −0.30 (0.19) |
| Education needs | −0.54*** (0.12) | −0.49*** (0.13) | −0.45*** (0.12) | −0.37*** (0.11) | −0.65 (0.70) | −0.90*** (0.26) |
| RISE social index | 0.03 (0.03) | 0.03 (0.03) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.03 (0.04) | 0.01 (0.07) | −0.03 (0.06) |
| Unemployment 2012 | 0.01 (0.01) | −0.01 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | −0.01 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.04 (0.04) |
| Foreign population 2012 | −0.02 (0.01) | 0.01 (0.01) | −0.01 (0.01) | 0.02 (0.02) | 0.04 (0.04) | −0.09** (0.04) |
| Migrant share class | 0.25 (0.18) | 0.42*** (0.16) | 0.23 (0.17) | 0.09 (0.23) | 0.26 (0.42) | 1.18** (0.47) |
| Average KERMIT result | 0.66*** (0.08) | 0.86*** (0.09) | 0.74*** (0.08) | 0.68*** (0.12) | 0.86*** (0.19) | 0.54*** (0.20) |
| Female | | | −0.01 (0.05) | 0.06 (0.06) | 0.07 (0.12) | −0.09 (0.12) |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Birthcountry FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adj. R ² | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.40 | 0.37 | 0.41 |
| Num. obs. | 568 | 585 | 534 | 370 | 124 | 119 |
| N Clusters | 314 | 313 | 309 | 231 | 106 | 98 |

Note: Standardized KERMIT results for different groups separately, Standard errors clustered on class level. Not shown controls: Year of birth, month of birth, children per school, form of full time school, purchasing power, children per class. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table A5: The Impact of Preparatory Classes and Co-Nationalities on Average Test Score Results

| | Total | Syria | Afghanistan |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ever in preparatory class | −0.17*** (0.06) | −0.12 (0.09) | −0.09 (0.13) |
| Share same birthcountry (first class) | −0.25 (0.22) | | |
| Ever in base class | −0.22*** (0.06) | −0.26*** (0.09) | −0.25** (0.10) |
| Afghanistan | 0.01 (0.04) | | |
| Eritrea | −0.20 (0.19) | | |
| Iraq | −0.08 (0.06) | | |
| Iran | 0.17*** (0.06) | | |
| Prep class x share birthcountry | 0.12 (0.23) | | |
| Share Syrians first class | | −0.17 (0.29) | |
| Prep Class x Syrian share | | 0.07 (0.31) | |
| Share Afghans first class | | | 0.45 (0.41) |
| Prep Class x Afghan share | | | −0.55 (0.55) |
| Indiv controls | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Birthcountry FE | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Class controls | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| R ² | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.44 |
| Adj. R ² | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.39 |
| Num. obs. | 1153 | 534 | 370 |
| N Clusters | 440 | 309 | 231 |

Note: Standardized KERMIT results. Standard errors clustered on class level. Not shown controls: Form of full time school, birthmonth, year of birth, immigration year, first grade, RISE development index, educational needs purchasing power, unemployment, foreign population, children per school, children per class, migrant share class, and average Kermit test score in class. Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.

Table A6: The Impact of Preparatory Classes on Average Test Score Results including secondary School Fixed Effects

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Ever in preparatory class | −0.37*** (0.04) | −0.27*** (0.05) | −0.22*** (0.05) | −0.19*** (0.05) | −0.17*** (0.05) | −0.18** (0.08) |
| Ever in base class | −0.38*** (0.06) | −0.32*** (0.06) | −0.32*** (0.06) | −0.26*** (0.05) | −0.29*** (0.05) | −0.30*** (0.08) |
| Female | | 0.04 (0.04) | 0.04 (0.04) | 0.01 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.04) | 0.03 (0.06) |
| Education needs | | −0.75*** (0.09) | −0.66*** (0.09) | −0.53*** (0.09) | −0.49*** (0.09) | −0.50*** (0.15) |
| RISE development index | | 0.10*** (0.02) | 0.04* (0.02) | 0.03 (0.02) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.03 (0.04) |
| Unemployment 2012 | | | −0.01 (0.01) | 0.00 (0.01) | | |
| Foreign population 2012 | | | −0.03** (0.01) | −0.00 (0.01) | | |
| Migrant share class | | | | 0.33*** (0.12) | 0.37** (0.17) | |
| Average KERMIT result | | | | 0.76*** (0.06) | 0.82*** (0.10) | |
| Indiv controls | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First grade FE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Area of birth FE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Immigration year FE | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| School FE | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Schoolyear FE | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Class FE | No | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| School and neigh. controls | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Class controls | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Adj. R ² | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.30 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.39 |
| Num. obs. | 1153 | 1153 | 1153 | 1153 | 1153 | 1153 |
| N Clusters | 440 | 440 | 440 | 440 | 440 | 440 |

Note: Standardized KERMIT results. Standard errors clustered on class level. Not shown controls: Year of birth, month of birth, elementary school offering preparatory classes, children per school, form of full time school, purchasing power, children per class. * Significance at 0.1; ** Significance at 0.05; *** Significance at 0.01.