

the directed acyclic graphs and then used the DAG structure to do a regression analysis.

After learning the DAG structure for the language scores we find that the I and IV groups share most of their parents, the intersection and their values of the fitted regression analysis for the group I is school type (-0.063), school shift (0.048), school density (-0.045) and overcrowding (0.005) with $\sigma = 0.28$. The only non categorical one with a positive relation is density, thus the more schools per area less failures in language tasks. The shared regression parameters for the group IV are school type (0.082), school shift (-0.049), school density (0.038) and overcrowding (-0.007) with $\sigma = 0.32$. The signs are reversed with respect to the ones from group I which is expected as they are the extreme values. It is interesting that no indigenous population variable were directly linked to them and even on the other extreme of the leaves.

1. Brunello G, Checchi D (2007) Does school tracking affect equality of opportunity? New international evidence. *Economic Policy* 22(52):781–861.
2. Heyneman SP, Loxley WA (1983) The effect of primary-school quality on academic achievement across twenty-nine high- and low-income countries. *American Journal of Sociology* 88(6):1162–1194.
3. Schultz TP (2004) School subsidies for the poor: Evaluating the Mexican Progresa poverty program. *Journal of Development Economics* 74(1):199–250.
4. Parker SW, Todd PE (2017) Conditional cash transfers: The case of progresa/oportunidades. *Journal of Economic Literature* 55(3):866–915.
5. Angelucci M, Attanasio O (2013) The demand for food of poor urban Mexican households: Understanding policy impacts using structural models. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 5(1):146–178.
6. Skoufias, Emmanuel (2005) *PROGRESA and Its Impacts on the Welfare*.
7. Galindo-Rueda F, Vignoles A (2005) The declining relative importance of ability in predicting educational attainment. *Journal of Human Resources* 40(2):335–353.
8. Chaudhury N, Hammer J, Kremer M, Muralidharan K, Rogers FH (2006) Missing in action: Teacher and health worker absence in developing countries. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20(1):91–116.
9. Angrist J, Bettinger E, Kremer M (2006) Long-term educational consequences of secondary school vouchers: Evidence from administrative records in Colombia. *American Economic Review* 96(3):847–862.
10. Lamarche C (2011) Measuring the incentives to learn in Colombia using new quantile regression approaches. *Journal of Development Economics* 96(2):278–288.
11. Chmielewski AK (2019) The Global Increase in the Socioeconomic Achievement Gap, 1964 to 2015. *American Sociological Review* 84(3):517–544.
12. Golsteyn BH, Schils T (2014) Gender gaps in primary school achievement: A decomposition into endowments and returns to IQ and non-cognitive factors. *Economics of Education Review* 41:176–187.
13. Alon S (2009) The evolution of class inequality in higher education: Competition, exclusion, and adaptation. *American Sociological Review* 74(5):731–755.
14. Marks GN (2005) Cross-national differences and accounting for social class inequalities in education. *International Sociology* 20(4):483–505.
15. Alon S, Tienda M (2007) Meritocracy in Higher Education. *American Sociological Review* 72:487–511.
16. Brown P (1990) The ‘Third Wave’: Education and the Ideology of Parentocracy [1]. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 11(1):65–86.
17. Duncan GJ, Morris P a, Rodrigues C (2011) Does Money Really Matter? *Development Psychology* 47(5):1263–1279.
18. Attanasio O, Di Maro V, Lechene V, Phillips D (2013) Welfare consequences of food prices increases: Evidence from rural Mexico. *Journal of Development Economics* 104:136–151.
19. Alexander KL, Entwisle DR, Olson LS (2007) Lasting consequences of the summer learning gap. *American Sociological Review* 72(2):167–180.
20. Mare RD (1980) Social background and school continuation decisions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 75(370):295–305.
21. Reardon SF, Portilla XA (2016) Recent Trends in Income, Racial, and Ethnic School Readiness Gaps at Kindergarten Entry. *AERA Open* 2(3):233285841665734.
22. Valenzuela JP, Bellei C, Ríos D de los (2014) Socioeconomic school segregation in a market-oriented educational system. The case of Chile. *Journal of Education Policy* 29(2):217–241.
23. Saw GK (2016) Patterns and trends in achievement gaps in Malaysian Secondary Schools (1999–2011): gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice* 15(1):41–54.
24. Downey DB, Condron DJ (2016) Fifty Years since the Coleman Report: Rethinking the Relationship between Schools and Inequality. *Sociology of Education* 89(3):207–220.
25. Werfhorst HG van de (2018) Early tracking and socioeconomic inequality in academic achievement: Studying reforms in nine countries. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 58:22–32.
26. Reinke L (2004) Globalisation and local indigenous education in Mexico. *International Review of Education* 50(5-6):483–496.
27. Despagne C (2013) Indigenous Education in Mexico: Indigenous Students’ Voices. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education* 7(2):114–129.
28. López-Gopar ME (2007) Beyond the Alienating Alphabetic Literacy: Multiliteracies in Indigenous Education in Mexico. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education* 1(3):159–174.
29. Scott SL, Ip EH (2002) Empirical bayes and item-clustering effects in a latent variable hierarchical model: A case study from the national assessment of educational progress. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 97(458):409–419.
30. Kaplan D (2016) Causal inference with large-scale assessments in education from a Bayesian perspective: a review and synthesis. *Large-Scale Assessments in Education* 4(1). doi:10.1186/s40536-016-0022-6.
31. Gasse M, Aussem A, Elghazel H (2014) A hybrid algorithm for bayesian network structure learning with application to multi-label learning. *Expert Systems with Applications* 41:6755–6772.

In the case of the mathematics task both levels share the same parents, the regression values for the level I are school shift (0.021), school type (-0.056), overcrowding (0.001) and percentage of indigenous language speakers (-0.068) on the other hand for the level IV group we have school shift (-0.033), school type (0.094), overcrowding (-0.003) and percentage of indigenous language speakers (0.173). Again we have the parameters’ signs shifted but interestingly they also are with respect of the same achievement level groups for the language task. Surprisingly the percentage of indigenous language speakers appears as a parent for both of them when it wasn’t for the language ones.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. I want to recognize the work of every community teacher whose labor for closening the gap and work for children’s wellness and rights has inspired this work. Also to all of those who collect and share information.