I Z A Institute
of Labor Economics
Initiated by Deutsche Post Foundation

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 16525

Telementoring and Homeschooling during School Closures: A Randomized Experiment in Rural Bangladesh

Hashibul Hassan
Asad Islam
Abu Siddique
Liang Choon Wang

OCTOBER 2023

I Z A Institute
of Labor Economics

Initiated by Deutsche Post Foundation

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 16525

Telementoring and Homeschooling during School Closures: A Randomized Experiment in Rural Bangladesh

Hashibul Hassan
Jagannath University

Asad Islam
Monash University and J-PAL

Abu Siddique
King's College London, IFS and IZA

Liang Choon Wang
Monash University

OCTOBER 2023

ISSN: 2365-9793

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Schaumburg-Lippe-Straße 5–9
53113 Bonn, Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Email: publications@iza.org

www.iza.org

ABSTRACT

Telementoring and Homeschooling during School Closures: A Randomized Experiment in Rural Bangladesh*

Using a randomized experiment in 200 Bangladeshi villages, we evaluate the impact of an over-the-phone learning support intervention (telementoring) among primary school children and their mothers during Covid-19 school closures. Post-intervention, treated children scored 35% higher on a standardized test, and the homeschooling involvement of treated mothers increased by 22 minutes per day (26%). We also found that the intervention forestalled treated children's learning losses. When we returned to the participants one year later, after schools briefly reopened, we found that the treatment effects had persisted. Academically weaker children benefited the most from the intervention that only cost USD 20 per child.

JEL Classification: C93, I21, I24

Keywords: telementoring, homeschooling, COVID-19, school closure, primary education, randomized experiment, rural Bangladesh

Corresponding author:
Asad Islam
Centre for Development Economics and Sustainability (CDES)
and Department of Economics
Monash University
Wellington Rd
Clayton VIC 3800
Australia

E-mail: asadul.islam@monash.edu

* We are grateful to the Editor, three anonymous reviewers, Noam Angrist, Alex Eble, Paul Glewwe, John Hoddinott, Momoe Makino, Chris Neilson, Albert Park, Harry Patrinos, Nishith Prakash, Pieter Serneels, Abhijeet Singh, and Andy Smart, and seminar and conference participants at the AEA Meetings 2023, RISE Annual Conference at Oxford, Asian Development Bank, Field Days 2022 at Cologne, Joint IZA & Jacobs Center Workshop: Consequences of Covid-19 for Child and Youth Development, BRAC Institute of Governance and Development (BIGD), and Impact Evaluation Conference at HKUST for many useful comments. We also thank the volunteer mentors who participated in the program. We are grateful to Global Development Research Initiative (GDRI) for providing excellent research support in the field. This trial is registered at the AEA RCT registry: AEARCTR-0006395, and the ethical clearance was received from Monash University, Australia: project no. 25039. This project has received funding from the Centre for Development Economics and Sustainability (CDES), Monash University, Australia.

1 Introduction

Educational disruptions in low- and middle-income countries are ubiquitous. Natural and human-induced events often damage educational infrastructure and limit school operations, creating significant barriers to the learning of children worldwide. For instance, the 2010 floods in Pakistan affected one-fifth of the country's population, damaging and shutting down schools for months (Eble et al., 2021). Recurring natural disasters in Bangladesh, such as floods and cyclones, force schools to shut down every year (DSR, 2014). In Syria, 40% of schools have been severely damaged and about 2.5 million children have been out of school since the conflict began in 2011 (UNICEF, 2021). In West Africa, the Ebola outbreak disrupted the schooling of about 5 million children for nine consecutive months (World Bank, 2015). Moreover, frequent political unrest and protests, such as *hartals*, in India force schools to operate for nearly one month shorter than the minimum requirement to cover the yearly syllabus (ENS, 2019).

These preexisting problems were exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic when about 1.5 billion students worldwide were affected by partial or full closures of schools (UNESCO, 2021a). School closures in many countries lasted for over a full school year and about one-third of students, primarily in low- and lower-middle-income countries, were unable to study remotely due to the lack of digital connectivity, devices, and effective learning support at home (Azevedo et al., 2021; Bacher-Hicks et al., 2021; Larsen et al., 2021; Parolin & Lee, 2021; UNESCO, 2021b). As many children in developing countries are first-generation learners, their parents usually do not have the ability or confidence to support their learning at home (Agostinelli et al., 2022; Banerjee & Duflo, 2006; Glewwe & Muralidharan, 2016; Hanushek & Woessmann, 2015). Thus, the pandemic has disproportionately worsened the learning of these children and led to calls for better leverages on low-cost and widely accessible technologies, such as mobile phones, to improve educators' engagement with these children and their parents (Muralidharan & Singh, 2021).

This paper evaluates the impact of a multifaceted educational intervention that relied on basic feature mobile phones for treatment delivery. To help with the learning of rural children at home during Covid-19 school closures, we engaged public university students in Bangladesh as volunteers to provide learning support to primary school children and their mothers through phone calls and text messages. Children received weekly tutoring (30 minutes per session) on Mathematics and English—two core subjects that Bangladeshi students struggle with the most—and mothers received homeschooling mentoring over the phone (telementoring hereinafter), which was not otherwise available to them.[1] Support for mothers involved structured guidance through weekly phone calls and text messages to facilitate and improve homeschooling. An over-the-phone intervention in Bangladesh was the most suitable option during this period because about 95% of rural households have access to at least one basic phone, while only 33% have internet access (UNICEF, 2019).

[1] Single and Muller (1999) define telementoring as electronic communications (primarily over the phone) between a mentor and a mentee with a goal to develop and grow the skills and knowledge of the mentee.

Bangladesh also had one of the longest and most restrictive school shutdowns in the world, which lasted for 18 consecutive months.[2]

The design of this multifaceted educational intervention is informed by theoretical and empirical literature on the determinants of out-of-school educational production and human capital investment. The literature on educational production highlights the importance of out-of-school educational inputs, such as private tutoring and parental time, in influencing children's achievement (Hanushek, 1979; Todd & Wolpin, 2003). The intervention involves one-on-one direct tutoring of children, which is recognized as an effective method to boost learning (Nickow et al., 2020). The intervention also aims to augment the effectiveness of parental homeschooling time via several pathways, which can lead to improved learning for children. First, the mentoring of mothers focuses on equipping mothers with skills and resources to effectively homeschool. It addresses constraints that mothers may face, such as gaps in subject knowledge or teaching techniques, and offers solutions to homeschooling challenges. All of these are expected to improve the quality of homeschooling time. Second, the mentors potentially serve as role models for mothers. Witnessing the success and methods used by trained mentors may induce a behavioral change in the mothers, motivating them to replicate these effective teaching methods. Third, the one-on-one nature of mentoring provides a unique opportunity for customization, allowing advice to be tailored to a mother's strengths and weaknesses. This may help increase their confidence in teaching, which in turn lowers the psychological cost of homeschooling and increases the time spent on homeschooling. The literature on human capital investment highlights the important roles that beliefs and expectations play in parents' decision to invest in their children's learning (Attanasio et al., 2020). Mentoring can potentially reshape a mother's expectations and subjective beliefs about the returns to homeschooling and the effectiveness of homeschooling. The altered expectations may promote a more positive attitude and induce mothers to invest more time in homeschooling and set higher goals for their children's academic and emotional growth.

We evaluate this intervention using a randomized controlled trial implemented in 200 Bangladeshi villages. In the treatment group (419 households), mother-child dyads received weekly telementoring, while those in the control group (419 households) did not receive any support. Note that the control group did not have access to alternative learning opportunities, as online/over-the-phone teachings were unavailable and access to television, and radio was very limited in rural areas. The intervention ran for 13 weeks in late-2020 when all schools were closed. One month after the intervention ended (in January 2021), we conducted standardized learning assessments among children and surveys among mothers to evaluate the immediate impact. We then returned to the participants one year later (in December 2021)—when schools briefly reopened—and conducted a

[2] Schools were initially shutdown on March 17, 2020, and then partially reopened on September 12, 2021. Schools were again closed on January 21, 2022, and then fully reopened in mid-March 2022. In total, there are 37 million primary school children in Bangladesh, a country of 165 million people (Alamgir, 2022). Given poor digital connectivity in rural areas, the government used public broadcasting (via television and radio) for asynchronous lessons targeted towards school students (UNICEF, 2020). However, it was largely problematic because over half of rural households do not own a television and only 3% of rural households listen to the radio (UNICEF, 2019).

second round of standardized learning assessments and surveys to evaluate the medium-term impact. All learning assessments and surveys were conducted face-to-face when social distancing rules were relaxed by the government.

We find several important results. One month after the intervention ended (first endline), treated children scored 0.66 standard deviations (SD) or 52% higher in English literacy and 0.56 SD or 33% higher in numeracy relative to children in the control group. The positive impacts persisted one year after the intervention ended: 0.30 SD (19%) higher in English and 0.44 SD (20%) higher in numeracy. To put this in more tangible terms, treated children provided, on average, one additional correct answer in both English literacy and numeracy at each endline. We also find positive spillovers on two other core subjects taught in Bangladeshi schools, Bangla and general knowledge, which were not targeted by the intervention. At the first endline, treated children scored 0.62 SD (37%) higher in Bangla literacy and 0.50 SD (22%) higher in general knowledge relative to the untreated children. In practical terms, this means that the treated children provided, on average, half an additional correct answer in both Bangla literacy and general knowledge. What is particularly noteworthy is that the spillover impacts also persisted. Treated children continued to score higher in Bangla (21 SD or 10%) and general knowledge (0.23 SD or 13%) one year after the intervention ended. Further analysis suggests our intervention effectively forestalled learning loss among children in the treatment group and the treatment effect arises from a significant drop in learning over time in the control group. We also find considerable differences in impacts between academically weaker and stronger children at the first endline, where the treatment effect is larger for children who were academically weaker at baseline. However, this heterogeneity disappears after one year. In other respects, such as gender and socioeconomic background of children, we do not observe any heterogeneity in treatment effects.

We also find significant increases in mothers' daily time spent on their children for homeschooling—an average of 22 minutes per day in the first and 14 minutes per day in the second endline—and activities regarding playing and storytelling. Importantly, increased daily time input neither crowded out mothers' involvement in income-generating activities nor had any negative implications on their mental well-being and leisure. On parenting perceptions, we find that negative parenting (such as frequent punishments and coercive interaction) decreased, self-reported parenting skills increased, confidence in homeschooling increased, and aspirations about children's educational attainment increased significantly following the intervention. Later, using a Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, we address potential social desirability bias concerns pertaining to these subjective outcomes.

Although important findings on their own, positive impacts on homeschooling involvement and parenting also contribute to our understanding of the underlying mechanisms for why children's learning outcomes were positively affected and persisted. Beyond these channels, we investigate several other potential mechanisms for forestalling learning losses using a survey conducted during the second endline. First, mothers in the treatment group reported that children's fathers also began homeschooling, and children themselves began spending more time on their homework from school.

However, self-assisted studying, starting new private tuition, increased tutoring input by existing tutors, etc., were not affected by the treatment and, hence, are unlikely to be potential channels. Second, as the second endline was conducted immediately after schools briefly reopened, we also surveyed teachers about students' school-related activities. According to teachers, treated children appeared more attentive during classroom teachings, but their interest and time commitment to classwork, playing after school, and the ability to catch up and recover from missed schoolwork were similar to those in the control group. Thus, fathers' involvement in learning support and children's improved study habits appear to have played important roles.

The impacts on learning outcomes are remarkable. The persistent effects are likely the result of an interplay of various factors: not just the brief learning support during the health crisis, but also the continued engagement of parents in their children's education, children's own effort, parenting quality and perceptions, as well as the aspirations generated by interactions with the mentors. All these elements may have collectively contributed to the transformative and lasting benefits observed in vulnerable children.

Our intervention provides a unique intersection between volunteer-driven educational interventions and parental involvement in education, particularly for mothers with limited educational backgrounds. Nickow et al. (2020) indicate that randomized interventions focusing on 'parent tutoring' are not common in the literature, but they are highly effective, showing a pooled program effect of 0.23 SD on standardized test scores. Drawing upon the maternal literacy programs explored by Banerji et al. (2017), as well as the parental involvement studies by Avvisati et al. (2014), Islam (2019), and Koepp et al. (2022), our paper innovates by combining these two streams of research. We demonstrate that volunteer-delivered learning support via basic mobile phones can both counteract learning losses during school closures and effectively involve mothers, even those with limited education, in their children's learning.

Our study also contributes to the recent literature on the effectiveness of distance learning and mentoring interventions on students' learning outcomes during the Covid-19 pandemic. For instance, Angrist et al. (2022) show that weekly phone calls and test messages from an NGO to parents of primary school-aged children in Botswana, over five weeks, improved the learning outcomes of children by 0.12 SD. In Brazil, nudges through text messages significantly improved standardized test scores of high-school students by (Lichand & Christen, 2021). Crawfurd et al. (2023) find that fifteen-minute weekly tutoring calls with children from their school teachers in Sierra Leone, over sixteen weeks, increased educational engagement by parents (0.31 SD) and children (0.34 SD), but did not affect test scores. Wang et al. (2023) find that weekly 70-90 minutes of audio lessons accessed via interactive voice response by primary school-aged children in rural Bangladesh, over fifteen weeks, improved their numeracy and literacy scores by 0.60 SD. In the context of developed countries, Carlana and La Ferrara (2021) find that tutoring program via video-conferencing in Italy led to a 0.21 SD improvement in middle school children's learning outcomes. Similarly, Hardt et al.

(2020) find that the use of remote peer mentoring had positive effects on students' motivation, study behavior, and exam registration at a German university.[3]

Our key contribution, relative to these existing studies, is that we show volunteer-delivered learning support via basic mobile phones can be particularly effective in addressing learning losses in poor environments. As more than a quarter of the adult population volunteers their time in many countries, including Bangladesh, they provide a large reserve of manpower in delivering low-cost services to communities in need (Islam et al., 2018). As a result, our intervention only costs USD 20 per mother-child dyad, making it low-cost and policy-relevant. However, this per-unit cost would likely increase if the program were scaled up by building a fully independent infrastructure for implementation and oversight. More broadly, our findings also indicate that telementoring can be a potential remedy for learning disruptions caused by other shocks, such as conflict, political unrest, natural disasters, teacher strikes, and teacher absenteeism, which many developing countries frequently encounter (Banerjee & Duflo, 2006; Chaudhury et al., 2006; Islam, 2019). A further novelty of our study is that we demonstrate both immediate and one-year impacts of an intervention that was implemented and evaluated amid the pandemic. Importantly, all learning assessments and data collection were conducted in person, as opposed to remote surveys or assessments conducted in most aforementioned studies, which allowed us to test a much broader range of skills.

Our study also sits within the broader literature on after-school tutoring, remedying education, and targeted instructions (Banerjee et al., 2007; Duflo et al., 2020; Eble et al., 2021). In-person tutoring, with or without fees, has been found to be highly effective in improving learning outcomes (Carr & Wang, 2018; Islam & Ruthbah, 2020; Nickow et al., 2020). Specifically, one-on-one or small group tutoring is particularly beneficial for students that struggle (Ander et al., 2016). The reason is that it allows the educator to target instruction and teach at the right level (Banerjee et al., 2007). Existing studies have also shown that delivering targeted instructions through technology can be highly effective for learning (Banerjee et al., 2007; Escueta et al., 2020; Muralidharan et al., 2019). Aker et al. (2012) assessed the effects of an adult education program in Niger that incorporated mobile phones. They discovered that integrating mobile phones as teaching tools led to higher writing and math scores compared to a conventional adult education approach. However, in-person or distant

[3] Our study closely aligns with Angrist et al. (2022) and Crawfurd et al. (2023) in terms of treatment delivery and context. However, there are several program features that are different from Angrist et al. (2022) and Crawfurd et al. (2023). First, our primary focus was on mentoring and guiding mothers to enhance homeschooling quality and engagement (akin to the CHAMP model in Banerji et al. (2017) but relatively shorter and remote), whereas other studies emphasized directly tutoring children. We opted for a mentoring approach to ensure that children's at-home learning would continue even after our intervention concluded. Providing direct tutoring to the children might have posed a risk, potentially leading to a cessation of home-based learning once the intervention ended. Second, we sent weekly text messages to parents to encourage them to enhance homeschooling quality. Third, for treatment delivery, we recruited highly motivated university students as volunteering mentors, while the aforementioned studies employed NGO employees and school teachers. Fourth, our mentors supported only two mother-child pairs - a ratio significantly lower than in the aforementioned studies. Fifth, in terms of direct dosage, our intervention spanned 13 weeks with a direct dosage of 6.5 hours, in contrast to the 3 and 4 hours in Angrist et al. (2022) and Crawfurd et al. (2023), respectively. Moreover, we also examined impacts beyond the short term, specifically one year after the intervention ended, in contrast to the more immediate results observed 2-4 months post-intervention in the other studies. Finally, while all three studies are set in developing countries, our context saw school closures lasting 20 months, compared to 6 and 7 months in Botswana and Sierra Leone, respectively.

tutoring that requires computing facilities and internet access is often unavailable to children in low-income countries, particularly in rural contexts. Our findings, thus, demonstrate that phone-based distant support can mitigate such instruction delivery challenges.

2 Study design and data

2.1 Experimental design

Telementoring. We partnered with a research NGO, Global Development and Research Initiative (GDRI), to implement and evaluate our telementoring intervention using an RCT in rural Bangladesh. Our sample consists of 838 mother-child dyads distributed across 200 villages in five subdistricts of the Khulna Division (map in Figure A1, Appendix A). Our unit of randomization was individual-level. We recruited student volunteers from various local public universities as mentors to provide learning support to primary school children (grades 1-3) and homeschooling support to their mothers every week for 13 consecutive weeks (from early September to late December 2020). During the intervention period, each mentor called a mother once a week at a pre-determined time and day to provide educational support over the phone. Each session, which lasted roughly 30 minutes, had seven brief steps:

1. Greetings and preparation. The mentor interacts with the child and mother (2 minutes).
2. Setting time commitment goals for the current week's homeschooling. The mentor advises the mother about items for her time diary to reach goals (2 minutes).
3. Previous week's homeschooling challenges and understanding weaknesses, such as identifying difficult problems/questions in textbooks. In this step, the mentor interacts with both the child and mother (4 minutes).
4. Solving problems identified in Step 3 with both the child and mother and then asking the child to solve similar problems (12 minutes).
5. Theme-based discussions (based on the text messages discussed below) with the mother, while the child continues solving problems from Step 4 (5 minutes).
6. Assigning homework based on the current week's problems and advising the mother about how to help with the homework (3 minutes).
7. Setting date, time, and agenda for next week, and saying goodbye (2 minutes).

Through GDRI, treated mothers were also provided with printed solutions to textbook problems and a study plan (i.e., which textbook chapters are to be covered in which week) of the telementoring program at the beginning of the intervention.[4] Printed solutions played an important role in this intervention. Various problems, particularly in math, require the visualization of step-by-step solutions to fully grasp the solving technique. The printed solutions enabled mentors to walk through the steps over the phone while children and mothers followed along, thereby enhancing their understanding of the exercise. In addition, there were ten different weekly themes for text messages and discussions in Step 5. These theme-based text messages were sent to mothers (composed in

[4] For instance, the study plan for grade 2 was on chapters/units 1-10 in the English and Mathematics textbooks.

Bangla) weekly, in weeks 3-12. Themes include positive parenting, gender equality in education, thinking positively about children's future, the importance of following a routine, etc. The objective was to encourage mothers to act upon the themes and facilitate more quality interaction with children. Table B1 (Appendix B) lists these themes and provides a brief overview of the text messages sent. Each text message was sent twice, once before and once after each session.

Mentors only provided support on two core subjects—Mathematics and English—which Bangladeshi students struggle with the most. The tutoring component of the intervention (Steps 3-4) mimics the status-quo private tuition in Bangladesh—tutors help children with problems/topics they struggle with. Thus, tutoring involved solving and explaining problems in children's existing textbooks—problems that mothers could not solve or explain to children in the previous week—as *no* new curriculum or contents were developed for this study. Mentors, however, did not keep records of the problems covered during sessions. Qualitative feedback from mentors suggests it was rare for phone calls to end early. Figure B1 (Appendix B) shows pictures from the intervention.

Recruitment of mentors. In July 2020, we announced a call for volunteer mentors on various universities' official Facebook pages. Initially, 267 university students signed up as prospective mentors. We conducted an introductory training followed by three additional training seminars on education and development in the context of Bangladesh. Training sessions were conducted via videoconferencing on four different days. Two co-authors of this study, Hashibul Hassan and Asad Islam, conducted the training. Eventually, 219 volunteers were recruited as mentors, as the remaining 48 volunteers could not be contacted. Mentors were also given relevant books and solution manuals (in digital format), a 13-week plan outlining the weekly themes, and mentoring guidelines adapted from the guidelines of the Government Teacher's Training College, Bangladesh.[5] A small team from GDRI did support Hashibul Hassan and Asad Islam in the implementation, but their role was limited to distributing printed copies of textbook solutions to treatment households and conducting a rapid survey on the mentors only. Table A1 (Appendix A) summarizes the characteristics of the recruited mentors. On average, they were 22 years old and studied social sciences in their undergraduate degrees. Half of them were female and over three-fourths had tutoring experience.

Sampling and randomization. Our local partner, GDRI, has a survey dataset from a previous research project from 2018/19 that includes contact information on 6,503 households from 223 villages in the Khulna Division. We used households from this existing survey for our randomization because it was not feasible for the NGO to collect mobile phone numbers from new households at the onset of the pandemic. From this list, we randomly selected 1,500 households that met our eligibility criteria: children were enrolled in grades 1-3 at any public primary school and households had at least one mobile phone. We were successful in contacting and inviting mothers from 1,042 households, as the remaining 458 phone numbers were found to be either *switched off* or *invalid*. At the end of the invitation call, we also conducted a rapid survey to check if they still met the eligibility criteria. Only

[5] The mentoring guidelines describe child development stages, ideas for better interactive telephone sessions, time management tips, and the "dos and don'ts" for running mentoring sessions.

838 continued to meet the eligibility criteria based on the rapid survey. We randomly assigned half of 838 households (419) to the treatment arm—those who received weekly telementoring—and the remaining half (419) to the control arm—no telementoring was provided. At the first endline, we were able to conduct standardized assessments and surveys on 814 households (attrition of 3%). At the second endline, this number further dropped to 796 households (attrition of 5%). We have low attrition possibly because the NGO is known to and trusted by households (through past research activities) and is well-regarded in this region. Reasons for attrition are outlined in Figure A2 (Appendix A). Section 2.3 discusses attrition and conducts various checks to address it.

To ensure data quality, enumerators that measured outcomes were kept blind to the treatment status. Also, there were no overlaps between the enumerators of this project and those from the 2019 survey. First, we cross-checked the names of enumerators from this study with those from the 2019 household survey. Second, enumerators at GDRI work on a contractual basis, making overlaps across different data collection periods unlikely. Therefore, enumerators from the current study should not be known to the participating mothers and children.

Mentor-mentee assigning. Each mentor was randomly assigned to two primary school children in the same grade and their mothers (mentees). We allocated 419 mentees to 210 mentors. The remaining 9 mentors were kept as a reserve. During the first two weeks, 22 mentees in the treatment arm dropped out due to problems with mobile phone availability, family issues, etc. Moreover, 13 mentors left in the first two weeks due to personal reasons, leaving us with 397 mentees and 206 mentors in the treatment group.[6] Therefore, we re-organized the mentor-mentee matches after the second week by randomly re-assigning mentees whose mentor left to mentors whose mentee(s) left. From the third week onwards, none of the remaining mentees or mentors dropped out.

2.2 Data

Learning outcomes. Learning outcomes were measured using a standardized one-on-one assessment test: word translation, fill-in-the-blanks, additions, etc. The exact questions asked are given in Table B2 and Table B3 (Appendix B). All test questions were created by closely following existing textbooks developed by the National Curriculum and Textbook Board, Bangladesh.[7] Therefore, the difficulty level of assessments was analogous to that of problems/questions in the textbooks, and the tutoring component of the intervention directly maps into our main learning outcomes. During the assessment, assessors verbally asked questions to children and recorded their answers on a tablet computer. We intentionally did not include any questions that could be partially correct in order to reduce assessment biases. For example, if the assessor asked, "What is the sum of 6 and 0?", then they recorded the answer as correct if the answer was 6 and incorrect if otherwise. There were four segments in the test: English (6 questions, 30 points), numeracy (5 questions, 30

[6] Mentoring was only given to child-mother dyads in the treatment arm while those in the control arm did not receive mentoring; thus, dropping out occurred in the treatment arm only.

[7] Due to school closures and exam cancellations in Bangladesh for over two years, we could not use school administrative data. Instead, we designed our tests to mirror primary school exams, which are closely following the textbooks (but not copied directly). To compare questions, visit this weblink to access English textbooks from grades 1-3.

points), Bangla (4 questions, 20 points), and general knowledge (4 questions, 20 points). We consider English and numeracy as the main learning outcomes, as they were directly targeted by the intervention.

Mothers' involvement outcomes. Each mother's time engagement in their child's learning and leisure activities is measured using two survey questions answered by the mother. One is about the average daily time spent on homeschooling (based on their time diary); the other is about the average daily time spent (in minutes) on leisure activities, such as storytelling and playing.

Parenting perceptions outcomes. We have four measures for parenting: (i) *negative parenting avoidance*, which is the sum of five dummy variables, such as avoiding the use of abusive words and beating. A higher score on *negative parenting avoidance* means a more favorable outcome; (ii) *parenting ability*, which is the sum of 11 items, each answered on a 5-point Likert scale, assesses the perception of the mother in her parenting role; (iii) *future aspirations* about children's education, which is a categorical variable where a higher value corresponds to higher aspirations; and, (iv) *homeschooling confidence,* which is the sum of three 10-point scales regarding the mother's confidence in teaching at home.

Baseline. We also have baseline measures of learning (only literacy and numeracy) and parental involvement in education from the 2019 survey. The remaining outcomes were only measured at endlines. We also use household characteristics sourced from the 2019 survey as our baseline controls.

All learning assessments and surveys were conducted face-to-face. We convert all outcomes into standardized indices following Kling et al. (2007), outcomes of control groups have mean 0 and SD 1.

2.3 Sample characteristics, balance, and attrition

Table 1 reports our baseline sample characteristics by treatment and control status, where children are about 7.5 years old and 50% are female, and parents have about 6 years of education and earn BDT 11,500 (USD 135) per month. Parents' homeschooling time involvement was approximately 135 minutes per day. Also, about 60% of children had private tutors. Importantly, these characteristics are balanced across the two arms (joint F-test $p=0.60$).

Since we had multiple sampling stages, we conduct three different comparisons of household characteristics and present these tables in Appendix A: (i) among 6,503 households from the 2019 survey, 5,003 unselected versus 1,500 randomly selected (Table A2; joint F-test $p=0.25$); (ii) among 1,500 randomly selected households, 662 that were excluded for various reasons versus 838 that participated (Table A3; joint F-test $p=0.13$); (iii) among 1,042 contacted households, 204 that did not participate versus 838 that participated (Table A4; joint F-test $p=0.44$). When compared individually (12 tests per table), we find differences in baseline numeracy and literacy and father's education. However, overall, the characteristics of samples are largely similar, as suggested by the joint tests.

In Table A5 (Appendix A), we also compare household characteristics of those who dropped out after intervention began (N=22) versus those who remained (N=397) and find that characteristics neither individually nor jointly explain dropping out (joint F-test $p=0.84$).

Finally, attritions across the two arms are statistically similar (T-test $p>0.10$). In Table A6, Appendix A, we regress the attrition dummy on treatment, baseline covariates, and their interactions, and find that treatment status does not explain attrition at either endlines. There is also no evidence of differential attrition by baseline characteristics (all joint p-values on interactions>0.10). We also summarize the frequency of attrition at both endlines in Table A7, Appendix A, which shows that 93% of households never dropped out. Given the absence of differential attrition, we do not conduct attrition-bounds analyses.

2.4 Empirical strategy

To investigate the impact of telementoring, we estimate the following OLS regression:

$$\boldsymbol{Y_{ijk} = \alpha + \beta T_{ijk} + \Gamma' X_{ijk} + g_j + c_k + \varepsilon_{ijk}} \qquad (1)$$

where Y_{ijk} is an outcome of mentee i with the child being in grade j, living in union council k, measured at the endline; T is an indicator for the treatment; $\boldsymbol{X}$ is a vector of controls that includes the child's gender, age, birth order, baseline English literacy, baseline numeracy, and access to private tuition, as well as the number of children under 15 in the household, parental education, household income, and religion. g and c are grade and union council fixed effects, respectively.[8] Given the high participation in mentoring sessions (94.6% of the treated mentees participated in at least one session), intent-to-treat effects would be similar to treatment-on-treated effects. We only report intent-to-treat estimates in this paper.

Since we consider a range of outcomes, we correct for multiple hypotheses testing using Westfall and Young (1993) adjustment. The adjustment accounts for correlations across outcomes using sample bootstrapping with 5,000 repetitions. Moreover, we also compute randomization inference (RI) p-values by reshuffling the treatment status 5,000 times following Young (2019). Our results are largely robust to using both adjustments.

3 Results

3.1 Learning outcomes of children

Impacts on learning. We plot the estimated treatment effects using standardized indices in Figure 1 (Panel A), with 99% and 95% confidence intervals, where results in black correspond to estimates from the one-month endline and those in grey correspond to estimates from the one-year endline. We find significant improvements in both aggregate and disaggregated test scores of targeted subjects (all $p<0.01$). Specifically, we find that the intervention led to an improvement in scores of

[8] Not all villages include both treatment and control households. As a result, we use union council fixed effects—the smallest rural administrative unit in Bangladesh, where each union council consists of 9 villages.

targeted subjects by 0.68 SD one month after the intervention ended and by 0.40 SD one year later. Mentors did not keep records of the exact problems covered during sessions, but math questions were generally discussed more often than English questions. This trend is reflected in the treatment effects seen at the one-year endline, where the impact on math scores was greater than on English scores.

Children were also assessed on Bangla and general knowledge. We find positive and significant spillovers on both Bangla (0.62 SD and 0.21 SD at the two endlines) and general knowledge (0.50 SD and 0.23 SD at the two endlines), suggesting our intervention had broader impacts and benefited children through channels outside direct tutoring. However, the largest impact at the first endline was in English literacy (0.66 SD), and that at the second endline was in numeracy (0.44 SD), implying that children benefited the most in subjects targeted by the intervention.

We also report absolute proficiencies in numerical operations in Figure A3 (Appendix A) and Table A8 (Appendix A), which show large and robust effects in absolute numeracy in all domains among the treated.[9] Next, using the Bangladeshi public schools' passing score (40 or above) for 'foundational numerical skills', we also assessed treatment effects on passing this threshold in Table A9 (Appendix A). Treated children had a 21pp higher likelihood of passing at the first endline ($p<0.01$), decreasing to 6pp by the second ($p<0.05$).[10] Finally, our pandemic-adjusted assessment involved verbally asking questions to children, for which they either got full points or none. We define 'mastery' as consistently answering correctly across both endlines. Our results showed significant improvements in 'mastering' topics in the treatment group: 67% 'mastered' addition (against 43% in control, $p<0.01$), 50% 'mastered' subtraction (against 28% in control, $p<0.01$), and 69% 'mastered' multiplication/division (against 49% in control, $p<0.01$).

We also report treatment effect estimates using raw test scores (Panel A, Table 2). We find that the treatment improved the overall test score of treated children by 17.7 points (between 0-100) or 35% higher than children in the control group in the first endline. One year later, the treatment effect persisted as children in the treatment arm scored 8.7 points (or 16%) higher than children in the control arm (*$p<0.01$*). Disaggregated by subject, we find that English literacy improved by 5.6 points (52%) and numeracy by 5.4 points (33%). Moreover, Bangla literacy improved by 3.9 points (37%) and general knowledge by 2.8 points (22%) among the treated in the first endline. One year later, test score improvements of treated children in all four subjects were smaller but remained statistically higher than those of the untreated children. Panel A of Figure 2 also shows the test-score distributions of the treated are considerably to the right of the test-score distributions of the control group, implying

[9] Because of the pandemic, enumerators assessed the children through tablets. Therefore, it is possible that some enumerators are friendlier than others, which could influence how comfortable children felt during assessments. We check the robustness of results reported in Table 2 by adding enumerator fixed effects to the existing set of controls. The fixed effects are applicable because each enumerator collected data from both the treatment and control groups. The results are presented in Table A10 (Appendix A). It is evident from this table that our findings regarding children's learning remain robust throughout.

[10] For robustness, we also introduced a median score benchmark. With this, treated children exceeded the threshold by 16-34pp across both endlines.

large benefits.[11] In a robustness check detailed in Table A12 (Appendix A), we varied the inclusion of covariates, baseline scores, and fixed effects, employing methods like post-double-selection LASSO (Belloni et al., 2014). Consistently across specifications, our results remained both substantial and robust.

Next, we present the comparison of distributions of overall test scores as a percentile-to-percentile mapping of the two distributions in Panel B of Figure 2. One month after the intervention ended, the 30th percentile of the treatment group distribution corresponds approximately to the 60th percentile of the control group distribution. The effect of telementoring intervention is thus equivalent to moving a child from the 30th percentile of the control group to the 60th percentile. One year later, the impact is equivalent to moving a child from the 30th percentile of the control group to roughly the 40th percentile.

Due to pandemic-related constraints, a full baseline survey was unfeasible. Instead, we used 2019 data on children's numeracy (e.g., counting) and literacy (e.g., reciting alphabet) skills as a baseline measure. In this regard, only one question each in English and mathematics (questions 1 and 7, respectively, as shown in Table B2 in Appendix B) from the endline assessments can be vertically linked to the baseline assessment. Using these vertically linked questions, we present the treatment effects in Table A13 (Appendix A). The results remain robust when relying on these questions. Our results also remain robust to excluding English translation questions that could involve elements of recall (see Table A14 (Appendix A)), suggesting that the treatment effects are not likely driven by recall.

Are these impacts due to learning progress or due to preventing pandemic-induced learning losses? In Figure A4 (Appendix A), we plot test scores of English literacy and numeracy at different data collection points. It shows that test scores in the treatment arm remained fairly stable over time, while in the control arm, test scores dropped significantly after the Covid-19 pandemic, implying a large loss in learning in the absence of alternative learning opportunities.

Discussion. Our effects in SD units are larger than studies conducted during the pandemic. However, if we interpret effect sizes as the number of additional correct answers given (see Table A15 in Appendix A), we find that treated children, on average, provided one additional correct answer in both English and mathematics at both endlines. In the untargeted subjects—Bangla and general knowledge—children provided approximately half an additional correct answer per subject at both endlines. We believe presenting the raw effect sizes alongside the SD units offers a more tangible perspective, particularly given the substantial magnitude of the effects in SD units.

[11] Using our baseline, a typical year of learning among these children appears to be around 1.5 points (or 9%) higher than the previous year's test score. See Table A11 (Appendix A). Comparatively, the impact of our intervention at the one-month endline is over triple this benchmark, and the impact at the one-year endline is roughly double. However, this result should be interpreted with caution because learning gains at baseline were not solely from formal schooling but also from home education. By our endlines, students had entered formal schooling, complicating comparisons of treatment effects to a typical year of learning.

We acknowledge that the impacts are fairly large, and it might be due to a variety of factors. First, our intervention placed an important emphasis on mentoring mothers—the primary caregivers of children in this context. This feature is unique and differs from the approach taken by Angrist et al. (2022) and Crawfurd et al. (2023)—two similar studies focusing on low-income countries. See Table A16 (Appendix A) for more program comparisons. Second, our one-to-one tutoring allowed mentors to provide feedback and support at the children's and mothers' learning levels, which can be particularly effective for students who fall behind and parents with limited homeschooling knowledge (Banerjee et al., 2007). The mentor-to-mentee ratio was low in our study (2:1), which likely facilitated higher-quality interactions and reduced psychological strain on the mentors. Third, participants in the control group did not have access to any alternative learning opportunities, as online, over-the-phone, private tuition, or televised teachings were either unavailable or limited in rural areas. In contrast, students in Crawfurd et al. (2023) had access to radio-based lessons. Fourth, it could be due to 'role model effects', as public university students in Bangladesh are considered intelligent (because of the highly competitive nature of public university entrance exams) and role models for many, possibly prompting children and mothers to put higher effort into homeschooling. This aspect differentiates our study, as the aforementioned studies predominantly employed NGO employees and school teachers for tutoring. Fifth, mothers were already allocating approximately 135 minutes daily to homeschooling, indicating a strong value placed on their children's education. Sixth, in contrast to the aforementioned studies, we sent weekly text messages to mothers aimed at enhancing homeschooling engagement, improving parenting behaviors, and bolstering motivation. Finally, our intervention ran for 13 weeks (with a direct dosage of 6.5 hours), which was relatively longer than other comparable studies—almost double the direct dosage provided in aforementioned studies. It should also be noted that the larger effects observed may be partly attributed to the different assessment data used. We conducted our own pandemic-adjusted assessment as schools were closed for around two years and exams were canceled, so administrative data from schools were not available.

Heterogeneity. We examine heterogeneity in learning gains by baseline test scores, children's gender, mothers' education, household income, and mothers' homeschooling involvement at baseline. We find that academically weaker children benefited the most from our intervention one month after it ended ($p<0.05$). We report these estimates in Table A17 (Appendix A). However, this heterogeneity faded after a year. We also do not observe heterogeneity by the remaining characteristics at either endlines, including mothers' homeschooling involvement at baseline (Table A18 (Appendix A)). We also explore heterogeneity in learning outcomes based on mentors' characteristics in Table A19 (Appendix A). Since no mentors were assigned to the control group, our focus is solely on the treatment group. Notably, we observe a correlation between learning gains and mentors' cognitive flexibility and mental health conditions at the one-month endline. At the one-year endline data, children mentored by female volunteers obtained slightly lower scores. Similarly, children mentored by volunteers with prior paid tutoring experience at the primary level also showed

poorer test performance. Otherwise, we observe no correlations based on other mentor characteristics such as age, education, or prior tutoring experience.

3.2 Parenting outcomes

Mothers' involvement. Treatment effects on mothers' involvement are reported in Panel B of Figure 1 and Panels B1-B2 in Table 2. One month after the intervention ended, we find significant increases in homeschooling engagement (0.64 SD) and leisure activities, such as playing and storytelling (0.16 SD). These impacts translate to 22 minutes (26%) more per day for homeschooling and 12 minutes (16%) more for leisure activities than mothers in the control group (both $p<0.01$). These effects also persisted one year after the intervention ended: daily homeschooling by 14 minutes (0.40 SD) and leisure activity engagement by 12 minutes (0.32 SD). However, we do not find these impacts to vary by children's gender, baseline test score, mothers' education level, or household income (see Panels A1-A2 in Table A20, Appendix A). Muted heterogeneity by gender is not surprising as one of the weekly themes during mentoring was gender equality in education, which could have encouraged mothers to put equal input on girls and boys.

A potential concern regarding increased parental involvement, especially during a pandemic, is the crowding out of leisure and employment time, which could have detrimental effects on mothers' mental well-being, leisure, and income. Since daily involvement increased by 25-34 minutes per day on average, we do not believe it had a substantial negative impact on income-generating activities. In fact, only 7.6% of mothers in our sample engaged in income-generating work (while the remaining 92.4% are homemakers) and our treatment had no negative impact on their household income at either endlines (Panel A, Table 3). In terms of mental health, we measure depressive symptoms of mothers at both endlines using the 20-items CES-D scale (Radloff, 1977). Panel A in Table 3 also shows that our intervention did not deteriorate mothers' mental well-being. Moreover, we do not find any negative impact on mothers' self-reported sleep, suggesting mothers did not accommodate additional time for children by sacrificing sleep (Panel A, Table 3). Therefore, mothers were possibly spending their discretionary time on children, as social/outdoor activities were restricted during the pandemic.

Parenting perceptions. Weekly themes during telementoring included topics such as avoiding negative parenting, staying positive about children's education, thinking of oneself as a teacher and maintaining a routine for homeschooling. These themes were sent as text messages and discussed with mothers in Step 5 of each session. Therefore, we pre-registered that our intervention was expected to have positive impacts on several parenting perceptions that are related to the weekly themes. We report these estimates in Figure 1 (Panel C) and Table 2 (Panels C1 and C2). We find that our intervention was successful at: (i) reducing the prevalence of negative parenting by 0.26 SD (22%) at the first and 0.17 SD (16%) at the second endline; (ii) increasing self-reported parenting ability by 0.22 SD (3%) at the first and 0.23 SD (4%) at the second endline; (iii) increasing future aspirations about children's education by 0.18 SD (5%) at the first and 0.27 SD (8%) at the second endline; and, (iv) increasing self-reported confidence in homeschooling by 0.25 SD (20%) at the second endline only, with no significant impact at the first endline. Analogous to heterogeneity results

for parental involvement, we again do not observe heterogeneity by gender or baseline test score at either endlines. However, for parenting ability, we find that relatively poorer households and low-educated mothers experienced increases in parenting ability at the second endline (Panels B1-B2 in Table A20, Appendix A).

Discussion. While the control group mothers engaged in an average of 135 minutes of daily homeschooling at baseline (due to data unavailability we cannot definitively say what activities comprised), time spent on homeschooling dropped significantly over time, likely due to pandemic-related factors. See Figure A5 (Appendix A). Against this backdrop, our intervention not only boosted the quantity of homeschooling time by 25-27% but is also likely to have enhanced the quality of mother-child interactions. These effects were beyond the 22 minutes of direct program engagement and potentially transformative. The decline in negative parenting and improvement in parenting skills also suggest a broader impact on the quality and effectiveness of homeschooling during the pandemic.

Social desirability bias. Parenting outcomes are based on survey responses and might be susceptible to social desirability bias (SDB). We address potential SDB concerns pertaining to self-reported outcomes following Dhar et al. (2022) using a 13-item Marlowe-Crowne scale that records a respondent's too-good-to-be-true traits (a higher SDB score corresponds to a higher chance of giving socially desirable responses), we perform a heterogeneity analysis. Our results hold even among mothers that have a lower tendency to give socially desirable responses. Though these results, reported in Table A21 (Appendix A), support our conclusion, they cannot entirely rule out experimenter demand effect concerns.

3.3 Potential mediators for forestalling learning losses

Parenting can be an important channel through which children's learning can be affected. Existing literature suggests that higher parental investment can affect the cognitive development and human capital accumulation of children with many positive economic consequences later in life (Attanasio et al., 2020; Cunha & Heckman, 2007; Doepke et al., 2019; Francesconi & Heckman, 2016). Therefore, significant improvements in homeschooling-leisure involvements and parenting perceptions might have contributed to the learning gains of treated children. However, there might still be various other potential channels—such as learning activities at home or school—that were also affected by the treatment and complemented parenting input, which as a result affected the learning outcomes of treated children. To explore such potential channels, we surveyed both mothers and school-teachers at the second endline (after schools briefly reopened for 3.5 months) and present these results in Panels B-C of Table 3.

At home (Panel B), we find that fathers also started homeschooling their children, roughly by 10 minutes per day ($p<0.01$). Treated children also spend relatively more time, by 4%, on their homework than the untreated children ($p<0.01$). However, self-assisted studying other than homework, beginning new private tuition, increased support by existing tutors, and homeschooling support from older siblings or grandparents were not affected by telementoring and, thus, are unlikely

to be possible channels (all $p>0.10$). At school (Panel C), according to teachers, treated children appeared marginally more attentive during classroom teachings ($p=0.09$); however, children's interest in and time spent on classwork, afterschool plays activities with peers, and the ability to catch up and recover from missed schoolwork were not affected by the treatment (all $p>0.10$).[12]

To decompose the treatment effect, we also conducted a mediation analysis following Heckman and Pinto (2015) that considers parents' and children's contributions as mediators. After one year, about 56% of the treatment effect on learning can be jointly explained by these mediators, with observed maternal channels being the most important factors. A detailed description of the analysis and the results are available in Figure A6 (Appendix A).

In all, it is difficult to pin down a specific channel that explains the persistent impact of our multifaceted intervention. However, improved homeschooling input, parenting, and children's own study habits appear to be possible indirect channels. Increases in time spent on homework and class attentiveness also suggest that the intervention might have changed children's study habits by an extensive margin.

4 Conclusion

This study finds that telementoring in low-resource settings had positive impacts on the learning outcomes of children and homeschooling during Covid-19 school closures. These positive impacts persisted one year after the intervention ended. The intervention was low-cost, costing less than USD 20 per child-mother dyad (see the breakdown in Table B4 in Appendix B). Importantly, our benefit-to-cost ratio is relatively higher than that of the vast majority of interventions on education in developing countries (Kremer et al., 2013). However, this per-unit cost would likely increase if the program were scaled up by building a fully independent infrastructure for implementation and oversight.

Our findings have both immediate and long-term policy implications. Telementoring can support low-performing students that frequently fall behind by teaching them at the right level. More importantly, it can supplement education in a world where hybrid formats of teaching and learning are being discussed to address the pre-existing learning gap and pandemic-induced learning loss. Volunteer-delivered in-person tutoring already exists in many developing countries, e.g., JAAGO foundation or BRAC in Bangladesh and Pratham in India. Such existing infrastructure and human resources can also be utilized and scaled up to provide over-the-phone education support in poor environments where school closures due to conflict, political unrest, teacher absenteeism, and natural disasters are ubiquitous and often unavoidable. Due to supply constraints, in addition to volunteers from universities, community-based volunteer teachers that are more readily available could be

[12] In Hassan et al. (2023), we explored an additional, un(pre)registered outcome related to children's mental health, assessed via the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) (Goodman & Goodman, 2009); although symptoms related to conduct problems and hyperactivity/inattention among children in the treatment group decreased at the one-month endline, it disappeared at the one-year endline, allowing us to rule out mental health of children as a channel explaining the persistent effects.

recruited and trained to offer such support. Our study revealed that prior tutoring experience did not affect children's learning differently, emphasizing the potential flexibility in choosing mentors. As we consider the scalability of these programs, we encourage that future research be conducted through independent implementing bodies. This would provide insights into the impact of trainer identity on the success of the program and allow for a comprehensive assessment of associated costs.

References

Agostinelli, F., Doepke, M., Sorrenti, G., & Zilibotti, F. (2022). When the great equalizer shuts down: Schools, peers, and parents in pandemic times. *Journal of public economics, 206*, 104574.

Aker, J. C., Ksoll, C., & Lybbert, T. J. (2012). Can mobile phones improve learning? Evidence from a field experiment in Niger. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 4*(4), 94-120.

Alamgir, M. (2022, April 5, 2022). Pvt primary schools: 14,111 shut down during pandemic. *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from https://www.thedailystar.net/youth/education/news/pvt-primary-schools-14111-shut-down-during-pandemic-2997966

Ander, R., Guryan, J., & Ludwig, J. (2016). *Improving Academic Outcomes for Disadvantaged Students: Scaling up Individualized Tutorials*. Retrieved from

Angrist, N., Bergman, P., & Matsheng, M. (2022). Experimental evidence on learning using low-tech when school is out. *Nature Human Behaviour*. doi:10.1038/s41562-022-01381-z

Attanasio, O., Meghir, C., & Nix, E. (2020). Human capital development and parental investment in India. *The review of economic studies, 87*(6), 2511-2541.

Avvisati, F., Gurgand, M., Guyon, N., & Maurin, E. (2014). Getting parents involved: A field experiment in deprived schools. *Review of Economic Studies, 81*(1), 57-83.

Azevedo, J. P. W. D., Rogers, F. H., Ahlgren, S. E., Cloutier, M.-H., Chakroun, B., Chang, G.-C., . . . Bergmann, J. L. (2021). *The state of the global education crisis: A path to recovery*. Retrieved from https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/184161638768635066/pdf/Executive-Summary.pdf

Bacher-Hicks, A., Goodman, J., & Mulhern, C. (2021). Inequality in household adaptation to schooling shocks: Covid-induced online learning engagement in real time. *Journal of public economics, 193*, 104345.

Banerjee, A., Cole, S., Duflo, E., & Linden, L. (2007). Remedying education: Evidence from two randomized experiments in India. *The quarterly journal of economics, 122*(3), 1235-1264.

Banerjee, A., & Duflo, E. (2006). Addressing absence. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 20*(1), 117-132.

Banerji, R., Berry, J., & Shotland, M. (2017). The impact of maternal literacy and participation programs: Evidence from a randomized evaluation in India. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 9*(4), 303-337.

Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., & Hansen, C. (2014). Inference on treatment effects after selection among high-dimensional controls. *Review of Economic Studies, 81*(2), 608-650.

Carlana, M., & La Ferrara, E. (2021). Apart but Connected: Online Tutoring and Student Outcomes during the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Carr, D., & Wang, L. C. (2018). The Effect of After-School Classes on Private Tuition, Mental Health and Academic Outcomes: Evidence from Korea. *Sociology, 52*(5), 877-897. doi:10.1177/0038038516677219

Chaudhury, N., Hammer, J., Kremer, M., Muralidharan, K., & Rogers, F. H. (2006). Missing in action: teacher and health worker absence in developing countries. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 20*(1), 91-116.

Crawfurd, L., Evans, D. K., Hares, S., & Sandefur, J. (2023). Live tutoring calls did not improve learning during the COVID-19 pandemic in Sierra Leone. *Journal of development economics, 164*, 103114. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2023.103114

Cunha, F., & Heckman, J. (2007). The technology of skill formation. *American Economic Review, 97*(2), 31-47.

Dhar, D., Jain, T., & Jayachandran, S. (2022). Reshaping adolescents' gender attitudes: Evidence from a school-based experiment in India. *American Economic Review, 112*(3), 899-927.

Doepke, M., Sorrenti, G., & Zilibotti, F. (2019). The economics of parenting. *Annual Review of Economics, 11*, 55-84.

DSR. (2014, September 2, 2014). Schools now flood shelters. *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from https://www.thedailystar.net/schools-now-flood-shelters-39761

Duflo, A., Kiessel, J., & Lucas, A. (2020). *Experimental Evidence on Alternative Policies to Increase Learning at Scale*. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w2729

Eble, A., Frost, C., Camara, A., Bouy, B., Bah, M., Sivaraman, M., . . . Gawron, P. (2021). How much can we remedy very low learning levels in rural parts of low-income countries? Impact and

generalizability of a multi-pronged para-teacher intervention from a cluster-randomized trial in The Gambia. *Journal of development economics, 148*, 102539.
ENS. (2019). Hartals affecting schools' quality across Kerala. *The New Indian Express*. Retrieved from https://www.newindianexpress.com/states/kerala/2019/jan/06/insufficient-working-days-affecting-schools-quality-1921198.html
Escueta, M., Nickow, A. J., Oreopoulos, P., & Quan, V. (2020). Upgrading education with technology: Insights from experimental research. *Journal of Economic Literature, 58*(4), 897-996.
Francesconi, M., & Heckman, J. J. (2016). Child development and parental investment: Introduction. *The Economic Journal, 126*(596), F1-F27.
Glewwe, P., & Muralidharan, K. (2016). Improving education outcomes in developing countries: Evidence, knowledge gaps, and policy implications. In *Handbook of the Economics of Education* (Vol. 5, pp. 653-743): Elsevier.
Goodman, A., & Goodman, R. (2009). Strengths and difficulties questionnaire as a dimensional measure of child mental health. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 48*(4), 400-403.
Hanushek, E. A. (1979). Conceptual and empirical issues in the estimation of educational production functions. *Journal of Human Resources*, 351-388.
Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2015). *The knowledge capital of nations: Education and the economics of growth*: MIT press.
Hardt, D., Nagler, M., & Rincke, J. (2020). *Can Peer Mentoring Improve Online Teaching Effectiveness? An RCT During the COVID-19 Pandemic*. Retrieved from https://www.cesifo.org/en/publikationen/2020/working-paper/can-peer-mentoring-improve-online-teaching-effectiveness-rct
Hassan, H., Islam, A., Siddique, A., & Wang, L. C. (2023). *Emotional and Behavioral Impacts of Telementoring and Homeschooling Support on Children.* Paper presented at the AEA Papers and Proceedings.
Heckman, J. J., & Pinto, R. (2015). Econometric mediation analyses: Identifying the sources of treatment effects from experimentally estimated production technologies with unmeasured and mismeasured inputs. *Econometric reviews, 34*(1-2), 6-31.
Islam, A. (2019). Parent–teacher meetings and student outcomes: Evidence from a developing country. *European economic review, 111*, 273-304.
Islam, A., Malek, A., Tasneem, S., & Wang, L. C. (2018). *Can public recognition reward backfire? Field experimental evidence on the retention and performance of volunteers with social-image concerns*. Retrieved from
Islam, A., & Ruthbah, U. (2020). *After-school tutoring in developing countries: Evidence from a large Scale RCTs*. Retrieved from
Kling, J. R., Liebman, J. B., & Katz, L. F. (2007). Experimental analysis of neighborhood effects. *Econometrica, 75*(1), 83-119.
Koepp, A. E., Gershoff, E. T., & Marteleto, L. J. (2022). Parent involvement and children's academic achievement: Evidence from a census of public school students in Brazil. *Child Development, 93*(6), 1744-1759.
Kremer, M., Brannen, C., & Glennerster, R. (2013). The challenge of education and learning in the developing world. *Science, 340*(6130), 297-300.
Larsen, L., Helland, M. S., & Holt, T. (2021). The impact of school closure and social isolation on children in vulnerable families during COVID-19: a focus on children's reactions. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*. doi:10.1007/s00787-021-01758-x
Lichand, G., & Christen, J. (2021). *Behavioral nudges prevent student dropouts in the pandemic*. Retrieved from
Muralidharan, K., & Singh, A. (2021). India's new National Education Policy: Evidence and challenges. *Science, 372*(6537), 36-38. doi:10.1126/science.abf6655
Muralidharan, K., Singh, A., & Ganimian, A. J. (2019). Disrupting Education? Experimental Evidence on Technology-Aided Instruction in India. *American Economic Review, 109*(4), 1426-1460. doi:10.1257/aer.20171112
Nickow, A., Oreopoulos, P., & Quan, V. (2020). *The Impressive Effects of Tutoring on Prek-12 Learning: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Experimental Evidence*. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w27476

Parolin, Z., & Lee, E. K. (2021). Large socio-economic, geographic and demographic disparities exist in exposure to school closures. *Nature Human Behaviour*. doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01087-8
Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied psychological measurement, 1*(3), 385-401.
Single, P. B., & Muller, C. B. (1999). *Electronic mentoring: Issues to advance research and practice.* Paper presented at the International Mentoring Association Annual Meeting.
Todd, P. E., & Wolpin, K. I. (2003). On the specification and estimation of the production function for cognitive achievement. *The Economic Journal, 113*(485), F3-F33.
UNESCO. (2021a). Education: From disruption to recovery. Retrieved from https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse
UNESCO. (2021b). One year into COVID: Prioritizing education recovery to avoid a generational catastrophe. Retrieved from https://en.unesco.org/news/one-year-covid-prioritizing-education-recovery-avoid-generational-catastrophe
UNICEF. (2019). *Progotir Pathey, Bangladesh Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2019, Survey Findings Report*. Retrieved from Dhaka, Bangladesh:
UNICEF. (2020). Students in Bangladesh adjust to remote learning via national TV during COVID-19 lockdown. UNICEF. In.
UNICEF. (2021). Crisis in Syria: What you need to know. Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/emergencies/syrian-crisis
Wang, L. C., Vlassopoulos, M., Islam, A., & Hassan, H. (2023). Delivering Remote Learning Using a Low-Tech Solution: Evidence from a Randomized Controlled Trial in Bangladesh.
Westfall, P. H., & Young, S. S. (1993). *Resampling-based multiple testing: Examples and methods for p-value adjustment* (Vol. 279): John Wiley & Sons.
World Bank. (2015). Back to School After the Ebola Outbreak. *Feature Stroy.* Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2015/05/01/back-to-school-after-ebola-outbreak
Young, A. (2019). Channeling fisher: Randomization tests and the statistical insignificance of seemingly significant experimental results. *The quarterly journal of economics, 134*(2), 557-598.

Main Figures and Tables

Figure 1. Treatment effects on standardized indices



Notes: All outcomes are standardized indices with the control group having a mean of 0 and SD of 1. Therefore, this figure shows where the mean of the treatment groups lies in the distribution of the control group in standard deviation (SD) units, with 95 and 99 confidence intervals. All coefficients were estimated using OLS, while controlling for child's gender, age, birth order, baseline literacy score, baseline numeracy score, access to private tuition, parents' education, household income, religion, and the number of children in the household. Specifications also include children's grade and union council fixed effects and robust standard errors.

Figure 2. Distributions of the total test score and percentile-to-percentile comparisons



Notes: This figure shows our standardized test score distributions (Panel A) and percentile-to-percentile plots (Panel B) by treatment arms. The maximum test score students could get was 100 points. The 45-degree line indicates a zone where there is no difference in percentile distribution between treatment and control groups.

Table 1. Baseline sample characteristics and balance checks

Variables	(1) Treatment *N=419*	(2) Control *N=419*	(3) Difference *N=838*	(4) T-test *p-value*
Child age in years	7.39	7.40	0.01	0.83
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	
Child gender (Boy = 1)	0.49	0.49	-0.00	0.96
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)	
Father's education in years	6.01	6.01	0.06	0.84
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.31)	
Mother's education in years	6.98	6.73	0.21	0.37
	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.24)	
Family's monthly income (in BDT)	11,409	11,342	31.31	0.93
	(279)	(226)	(380.20)	
Number of sibling(s) under 15	0.64	0.63	0.00	0.95
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.05)	
Religion (Islam = 1)	0.77	0.78	-0.01	0.69
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	
Homestead land size (in decimal)	8.40	9.03	-0.74	0.31
	(0.48)	(0.54)	(0.73)	
English literacy score of children (out of 30)	16.12	16.24	-0.07	0.80
	(0.19)	(0.20)	(0.27)	
Numeracy score of children (out of 20)	14.78	14.75	-0.01	0.97
	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.21)	
Negative parenting (dummy variable for coercive interaction)	0.37	0.39	0.01	0.79
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	
Homeschooling time (in daily hours)	2.31	2.27	0.01	0.90
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.07)	
Parenting abilities or skill (15-item scale)	4.33	4.31	-0.00	0.88
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	
Television in the household	0.35	0.34	0.02	0.59
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	
Private tutor	0.62	0.58	0.03	0.34
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)	
Joint F-test *p-value* on individual/ household characteristics			1.00	

Notes: This table reports the background characteristics of children included in the baseline sample. All variables are self-explanatory. The p-value reported in the last column is obtained by regressing the variables on the treatment dummy with grade and union council fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table 2. Treatment effects on non-standardized outcomes

Endlines	Outcomes	(1) Control means	(2) Treatment effects (only Fes)	(3) Treatment effects (Controls and Fes)	(4) FWER *p*-value	(5) RI *p*-value
One-month	**Panel A1: Learning outcomes**					
	Targeted subjects, Aggregate score [60 points]	27.00	11.37***	11.01***	0.00	0.00
		(0.79)	(1.11)	(1.02)		
	Literacy (English) [30 points]	10.76	5.84***	5.59***	0.00	0.00
		(0.42)	(0.62)	(0.57)		
	Numeracy [30 points]	16.24	5.53***	5.42***	0.00	0.00
		(0.48)	(0.63)	(0.60)		
	Nontargeted subjects, Aggregate score [40 points]	23.11	6.89***	6.69***	0.00	0.00
		(0.51)	(0.65)	(0.61)		
	Literacy (Bangla) [20 points]	10.52	3.99***	3.87***	0.00	0.00
		(0.31)	(0.42)	(0.40)		
	General Knowledge [20 points]	12.59	2.91***	2.82***	0.00	0.00
		(0.28)	(0.34)	(0.33)		
	Panel B1: Parental involvement					
	Homeschooling (in minutes/day)	84.41	21.95***	21.81***	0.00	0.00
		(1.68)	(2.77)	(2.73)		
	Leisure activities (in minutes/day)	79.15	12.20***	12.05***	0.00	0.00
		(1.65)	(2.82)	(2.81)		
	Panel C1: Parenting perception					
	Negative parenting [0 to 5 scale]	4.69	0.28***	0.28***	0.00	0.00
		(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.07)		
	Parenting abilities or skills [11 to 55 scale]	48.70	1.58***	1.47***	0.00	0.00
		(0.32)	(0.38)	(0.36)		
	Mother's aspiration – education [1 to 7 scale]	4.87	0.27***	0.25***	0.01	0.00
		(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.08)		
	Mother's Confidence in teaching [0 to 30 scale]	21.41	0.82	0.65	0.13	0.13
		(0.34)	(0.48)	(0.43)		
One-year	**Panel A2: Learning outcomes**					
	Targeted subjects, Aggregate score [60 points]	30.56	6.04***	5.91***	0.00	0.00
		(0.68)	(0.96)	(0.93)		
	Literacy (English) [30 points]	13.24	2.52***	2.56***	0.00	0.00
		(0.42)	(0.61)	(0.59)		
	Numeracy [30 points]	17.32	3.52***	3.35***	0.00	0.00
		(0.40)	(0.53)	(0.53)		
	Nontargeted subjects, Aggregate score [40 points]	23.15	2.63***	2.24***	0.00	0.00
		(0.51)	(0.70)	(0.71)		
	Literacy (Bangla) [20 points]	12.27	1.26***	1.03***	0.00	0.00
		(0.30)	(0.39)	(0.39)		
	General Knowledge [20 points]	10.88	1.38***	1.21***	0.00	0.00
		(0.30)	(0.42)	(0.44)		
	Panel B2: Parental involvement					
	Homeschooling (in minutes/day)	50.99	13.80***	10.03***	0.00	0.00
		(1.72)	(2.64)	(2.43)		
	Leisure activities (in minutes/day)	55.54	11.55***	7.52***	0.00	0.00
		(1.78)	(2.64)	(2.22)		
	Panel C2: Parenting perception					
	Negative parenting [0 to 5 scale]	4.78	0.19**	0.25***	0.01	0.01
		(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.07)		
	Parenting abilities or skills [11 to 55 scale]	47.59	1.92***	1.28***	0.00	0.00
		(0.41)	(0.52)	(0.40)		

Mother's aspiration – education [1 to 7 scale]	4.40 (0.07)	0.36*** (0.09)	0.40*** (0.09)	0.00	0.00
Mother's Confidence in teaching [0 to 30 scale]	9.90 (0.41)	2.00*** (0.60)	2.15*** (0.51)	0.00	0.00

Notes: Treatment effects were estimated using OLS, with the usual set of controls and fixed effects mentioned in Section 2.4. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Columns 3 and 4 report the Westfall-Young FWER adjusted *p*-values and Randomized Inference (RI) *p*-values, both computed using 5,000 replications. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table 3. Potential side effects and mechanisms

Intermediate Outcomes	(1) Control means	(2) Treatment effects	(3) FWER *p*-values	(4) RI *p*-values
Panel A: Potential side effects, reported by mothers at both endline surveys				
Monthly household income at 1-month	9990.49	549.23	0.96	0.27
	(261.15)	(393.1)		
CES-D-20 score ($0 \leq Score \leq 60$) at 1-month	8.63	-0.80	0.96	0.55
	(0.56)	(0.79)		
Depressed (=1 if true) at 1-month	0.16	-0.02	0.96	0.61
	(0.02)	(0.02)		
Monthly household income at 1-year	11344.75	262.2	0.96	0.88
	(322.56)	(870.5)		
CES-D-20 score ($0 \leq Score \leq 60$) at 1-year	11.05	0.98	0.95	0.21
	(0.55)	(0.80)		
Depressed (=1 if true) at 1-year	0.23	0.04	0.95	0.22
	(0.02)	(0.03)		
Daily sleep and nap time (in hours) at 1-year	7.45	0.07	0.96	0.30
	(0.05)	(0.07)		
Panel B: Potential channels at home, reported by mothers at one-year endline survey				
Father's homeschooling time (in minutes/day)	32.39	9.67***	0.11	0.00
	(2.19)	(3.31)		
Self-induced study time (in minutes/day)	83.39	3.29	0.96	0.33
	(2.42)	(3.43)		
Other family member's homeschooling time (5-point scale)	3.44	-0.09	0.96	0.68
	(0.13)	(0.23)		
Private tutor's tutoring time (in minutes/day)	100.22	3.60	0.96	0.49
	(3.73)	(5.35)		
Time on homework by children (5-point scale)	3.66	0.16***	0.19	0.01
	(0.04)	(0.06)		
Started new private tuition recently (=1 if yes)	0.20	-0.03	0.96	0.38
	(0.03)	(0.03)		
Panel C: Potential channels at school, reported by teachers at one-year endline survey				
Time playing after school (in hours/week)	3.30	-0.04	0.96	0.44
	(0.04)	(0.05)		
Catching up with study (5-point scale)	3.15	0.05	0.96	0.28
	(0.04)	(0.05)		
Recovering quickly (4-point scale)	2.41	0.09	0.82	0.10
	(0.04)	(0.06)		
Time spent on classwork (5-point scale)	2.72	0.09	0.91	0.15
	(0.04)	(0.06)		
Interest in class activities (5-point scale)	3.18	0.08	0.91	0.17
	(0.04)	(0.06)		
Attention during class (5-point scale)	3.15	0.09*	0.79	0.09
	(0.04)	(0.06)		

Notes: Treatment effects on the intermediate outcomes (all self-explanatory) were estimated using OLS, with the usual set of controls and fixed effects mentioned in Section 2.4. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. For outcomes other than depression, a higher value corresponds to more favorable outcomes. Columns 3 and 4 report the Westfall-Young FWER adjusted *p-values* and Randomized Inference (RI) *p-values,* both computed using 5,000 replications. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Online Appendix

Telementoring and homeschooling during school closures: A randomized experiment in rural Bangladesh

Hashibul Hassan[†] Asad Islam[‡] Abu Siddique[§] Liang Choon Wang[**]

Table of contents

This document is supplementary to the main paper.

[†] Department of Finance, Jagannath University, Bangladesh. Email: hashibulhassan@fin.jnu.ac.bd
[‡] Centre for Development Economics and Sustainability (CDES) and Department of Economics, Monash University, Australia; and J-PAL. Email: asadul.islam@monash.edu
[§] Department of Political Economy, King's College London, UK. Email: abu.b.siddique@kcl.ac.uk
[**] Department of Economics, Monash University, Australia. Email: liang.c.wang@monash.edu

Appendix A: Additional Figures and Tables

Figure A1. Maps of regions where the intervention took place



Notes: Subdistricts in blue are in the Khulna District and those in green are in the Satkhira District. Our intervention took place in five subdistricts: Assasuni, Tala, Dumuria, Koyra, and Paikgachha. The Koyra subdistrict consists of the Sundarbans Forest, which is why there are relatively fewer households in this subdistrict.

Figure A2. Consort flow diagram of the trial



Figure A3. Absolute proficiencies in mathematics



Notes: This figure shows the proportion of students that can successfully do numerical operations, such as addition, subtraction, and multiplication/division. The differences, with statistical significance and the point of data collection in parentheses, are as follows: (i) Addition: 17pp ($p<0.01$, at one-month) and 13pp ($p<0.01$, at one-year); (ii) Subtraction: 20pp ($p<0.01$, at one-month) and 16pp ($p<0.01$, at one-year); (iii) Multiplication/Division: 16pp ($p<0.01$, at one-month) and 15pp ($p<0.01$, at one-year).

Figure A4. Treatment effects trend of literacy and numeracy score



Notes: These figures show English literacy (Graph A1 & B1) and numeracy (Graph A2 & B2) test scores at each data collection point. Baseline scores are from the 2019 data. Scores of each subject have been normalized to 100%. Note that the pass mark in Bangladeshi public schools in 40% or higher. The gain in the control arm at the one-year endline is possibly because schools re-opened for about 3.5 months when we collected this endline.

Figure A5. Parents' homeschooling over time



Notes: This figure shows the homeschooling involvement of mothers at each data collection point.

Figure A6. Mediation analysis



Notes: The bar charts above report the decomposed treatment effects on learning outcomes at one-month and one-year endlines. For this, we follow Heckman and Pinto (2015) to estimate what proportion of the treatment effects can be attributed to various mediators and what proportion remains unexplained (the residual or other unobserved factors). The residual encapsulates both the direct impact of the program and some unobserved mediators. Our analysis considers nine mediators: six related to mothers (e.g., time-intensive investment in homeschooling, leisure activities, reduced negative parenting, self-reported parenting abilities, aspirations about children's education, and self-confidence in teaching); one related to fathers' time investment in homeschooling (measured only at the one-year endline); and two related to children (measured only at the one-year endline) capturing their motivation: time spent on homework (reported by mothers) and attention in the classroom (reported by teachers). We focus on these two child mediators as they were the only ones significantly affected by the intervention (see Panels B and C in Table 3). Following making standard assumptions, we estimate a production function where the observed mediators and an auxiliary set of baseline variables map into children's learning outcomes. This analysis is exploratory and the effects should not be interpreted as causal. Our findings indicate that about 32% of the treatment effect on learning at one month is explained by observed maternal channels, while the remaining 68% is unexplained. It is worth noting that at the one-month endline, we did not measure fathers' involvement or children's own educational efforts or motivations. At the one-year mark, we introduce these factors, revealing that about 56% of the treatment effects can be explained by the mediators, which is much higher than the 32% at the one-month endline. We also find that mothers' homeschooling involvement and aspirations serve as the most important channels.

Table A1. Descriptive statistics of volunteer mentors

Variables	**Mean**	**Min**	**Max**
Age in years	21.80	18.29	27.69
Gender (Male=1)	0.48	-	-
Cognitive Flexibility Scale (CFS) [Scale range – 12 to 72]	55.35	37	72
Difficulties in mental health (PHQ) [Scale range – 0 to 27]	6.78	0	23
Dummy responses below are % of all mentors			
From urban background		61.81%	
From public universities or colleges		95.48%	
Business and social sciences discipline		85.93%	
Post-graduate level or graduated		15.58%	
Currently earn money from a part-time tutoring job		61.83%	
Prior tutoring experience		76.02%	
Paid tutoring experience with the primary graders		76.38%	
Past volunteering		74.85%	

Notes: CFS is a self-reported assessment that measures a person's ability to switch between different thoughts and actions. As our mentors are coming from different institutions and backgrounds, we use this scale to generalize their cognitive ability. The average score on the CFS among university students is around 55 points. Difficulties in mental health are measured by the 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire. PHQ-9 scores of 5, 10, 15, and 20 represented mild, moderate, moderately severe, and severe depression, respectively.

Table A2. Balance: 5003 households that were not selected versus 1500 randomly selected

Variables	(1) Excluded sample n=5003	(2) Randomly selected n=1500	(3) Difference n=6503	(4) T-test *p-value*
Child age (as of 1/9/2020)	7.40	7.39	-0.01	0.38
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	
Child gender (Boy = 1)	0.50	0.51	0.01	0.57
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	
Father's education in years	5.76	5.87	0.10	0.45
	(0.07)	(0.11)	(0.13)	
Mother's education in years	6.67	6.81	0.17	0.11
	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.11)	
Family's monthly income	11270	11334	139.44	0.42
	(93.26)	(140.34)	(171.78)	
Homestead land size in decimal	8.78	8.67	0.06	0.87
	(0.20)	(0.30)	(0.37)	
Baseline literacy score	16.28	16.04	-0.12	0.32
	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.12)	
Baseline numeracy score	14.73	14.68	-0.02	0.82
	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.10)	
Negative parenting	0.35	0.39	0.04	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Homeschooling time	2.31	2.32	0.02	0.62
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	
Parenting abilities or skill (15-item scale)	4.34	4.34	-0.01	0.29
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	
Television in the household	1.65	1.64	-0.01	0.77
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	
Joint F-test *p-value* on individual/ household characteristics		0.04		

Notes: This table checks the balance between the number of households from the 2019 survey that were randomly selected (column 2) versus those not selected (column 1). The p-value reported in the last column is obtained by regressing the variables on the treatment dummy with union council fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A3. Balance: 662 households that were excluded versus 838 that participated

Variables	(1) Excluded sample n=662	(2) Study sample n=838	(3) Difference n=1500	(4) T-test *p-value*
Child age (as of 1/9/2020)	7.39	7.39	0.01	0.76
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	
Child gender (Boy = 1)	0.54	0.49	-0.04	0.16
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	
Father's education in years	5.66	6.01	0.41	0.07
	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.23)	
Mother's education in years	6.75	6.85	0.13	0.47
	(0.14)	(0.11)	(0.18)	
Family's monthly income	11273	11376	209.70	0.44
	(224.87)	(179.47)	(269.89)	
Homestead land size in decimal	8.60	8.72	0.32	0.58
	(0.51)	(0.36)	(0.58)	
Baseline literacy score	15.86	16.18	0.44	0.04
	(0.17)	(0.14)	(0.21)	
Baseline numeracy score	14.58	14.76	0.29	0.09
	(0.13)	(0.10)	(0.17)	
Negative parenting	0.40	0.38	-0.04	0.25
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	
Homeschooling time	2.36	2.29	-0.04	0.50
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.06)	
Parenting abilities or skill (15-item scale)	4.35	4.32	-0.04	0.10
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Television in the household	1.67	1.62	-0.04	0.20
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	
Joint F-test *p-value* on individual/ household characteristics		0.35		

***Notes**:* This table checks the balance between our study sample (column 2) versus those excluded for various reasons (column 1). The *p-value* reported in the last column is obtained by regressing the variables on the treatment dummy with union council fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A4. Balance: 204 households that did not participate versus 838 that participated

Variables	(1) Non-participation n=204	(2) Study sample n=838	(3) Difference n=1042	(4) T-test *p-value*
Child age (as of 1/9/2020)	7.34	7.39	0.05	0.30
	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.05)	
Child gender (Boy = 1)	0.51	0.49	-0.02	0.58
	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.04)	
Father's education in years	6.48	6.01	-0.39	0.23
	(0.28)	(0.15)	(0.32)	
Mother's education in years	7.11	6.85	-0.24	0.38
	(0.24)	(0.11)	(0.27)	
Family's monthly income	11830.73	11375.66	-459.05	0.38
	(490.38)	(179.51)	(518.57)	
Homestead land size in decimal	9.91	8.72	-1.08	0.30
	(1.02)	(0.36)	(1.04)	
Baseline literacy score	15.22	16.18	0.94	0.00
	(0.32)	(0.14)	(0.33)	
Baseline numeracy score	13.98	14.76	0.73	0.01
	(0.26)	(0.10)	(0.27)	
Negative parenting	0.51	0.38	-0.15	0.00
	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.05)	
Homeschooling time	2.33	2.29	-0.04	0.62
	(0.08)	(0.04)	(0.08)	
Parenting abilities or skill (15-item scale)	4.33	4.32	-0.01	0.79
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	
Television in the household	1.61	1.62	0.03	0.57
	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.05)	
Joint F-test p-value on individual/ household characteristics		0.01		

Notes: This table checks the balance between our study sample (column 2) versus those that did not participate (column 1). The p-value reported in the last column is obtained by regressing the variables on the treatment dummy with union council fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A5. Balance: those who dropped out versus those who remained in the treatment arm

Variables	(1) Remained and treated n=397	(2) Dropped out n=22	(3) Difference n=419	(4) T-test *p-value*
Child age (as of 1/9/2020)	7.39	7.40	-0.02	0.85
	(0.02)	(0.09)	(0.09)	
Child gender (Boy = 1)	0.49	0.59	-0.08	0.45
	(0.03)	(0.11)	(0.11)	
Father's education in years	6.03	5.64	0.60	0.43
	(0.22)	(0.67)	(0.76)	
Mother's education in years	6.99	6.91	0.33	0.62
	(0.16)	(0.58)	(0.66)	
Family's monthly income	11420.65	11204.55	296.13	0.75
	(291.03)	(811.02)	(918.35)	
Number of sibling(s) under 15 years	0.64	0.68	-0.04	0.83
	(0.03)	(0.15)	(0.17)	
Religion (Islam = 1)	0.78	0.68	0.05	0.59
	(0.02)	(0.10)	(0.09)	
Homestead land size in decimal	8.55	5.64	4.05	0.00
	(0.51)	(0.96)	(1.28)	
Baseline literacy score	16.18	15.05	0.78	0.32
	(0.20)	(0.69)	(0.79)	
Baseline numeracy score	14.82	13.95	0.93	0.21
	(0.15)	(0.69)	(0.74)	
Negative parenting	0.38	0.18	0.17	0.07
	(0.03)	(0.08)	(0.09)	
Homeschooling time	2.30	2.41	-0.06	0.78
	(0.05)	(0.23)	(0.23)	
Parenting abilities or skill (15-item scale)	4.33	4.42	-0.00	0.99
	(0.02)	(0.08)	(0.10)	
Television in the household	0.35	0.27	0.11	0.31
	(0.02)	(0.10)	(0.10)	
Private tutor	0.61	0.77	-0.16	0.10
	(0.02)	(0.09)	(0.10)	
Joint F-test *p-value* on individual/ household characteristics		0.64		

Notes: This table checks the balance between participants that dropped out (column 2) versus participants that remained in the treatment arm (column 1). The *p-value* reported in the last column is obtained by regressing the variables on the treatment dummy with grade and union council fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A6. Attrition balance checks

Variables	(1) Attrited in first endline	(2) Attrited in first endline	(3) Attrited in second endline	(4) Attrited in second endline	(5) Attrited at least once	(6) Attrited at least once
Treatment	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.18	-0.01	-0.22
	(0.01)	(0.28)	(0.02)	(0.34)	(0.02)	(0.27)
Gender (1=Boy)		-0.01		-0.00		0.01
		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.02)
Child age		0.04		0.04		0.01
		(0.03)		(0.04)		(0.02)
Birth order		-0.03		-0.04		-0.03
		(0.01)		(0.03)		(0.02)
Grade of study		-0.02		-0.01		0.01
		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.02)
Baseline literacy		0.00*		0.00*		-0.00
		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)
Baseline numeracy		-0.00		-0.01		-0.01
		(0.00)		(0.01)		(0.01)
Access to private tuition		-0.03*		-0.06		-0.03
		(0.02)		(0.03)		(0.02)
Father's education		0.00		0.01		0.00
		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)
Mother's education		-0.00		-0.01		-0.00
		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)
Monthly income		-0.00		-0.00		0.00
		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)
Number of children		0.02		0.04		0.02
		(0.02)		(0.04)		(0.04)
Interactions of variables and treatment	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Observations	838	838	838	838	838	838
R-squared	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.12	0.09	0.11
Joint F-test *p-value* on characteristics	-	0.39	-	0.39	-	0.65
Joint F-test *p-value* on interactions	-	0.47	-	0.63	-	0.82

Notes: Dependent variables in (i) columns 1-2 is a dummy that equals 1 if the respondent attrition at the first endline and 0 if not; (ii) columns 3-4 is a dummy that equals 1 if the respondent attrition at the second endline and 0 if not; (iii) columns 5-6 is a dummy that equals to 1 if the respondent attrition at least once (either at the first or second endline) and 0 if not. All specifications include grade and union council fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A7. Frequency of attrition at endline surveys

	Treatment		Control		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Never attrited at any endline	388	92.60	391	93.32	779	92.96
(2) Attrited in both endline	5	1.19	2	0.48	7	0.84
(3) Attrited in endline 1 but not 2	10	2.39	7	1.67	17	2.03
(4) Attrited at endline 2 but not 1	16	3.82	19	4.53	35	4.18
Total	**419**	**100**	**419**	**100**	**838**	**100**

Notes: This table reports the frequency of attrition at endline surveys. For both endline surveys, all 838 households were approached to conduct the survey. However, there were some attritions due to seasonal migration, lack of interest to participate in the survey, or non-consent issues.

Table A8. Treatment effects on various components of assessment

Outcomes	(1) Control means	(2) Treatment effects (only FEs)	(3) Treatment effects (Controls and FEs)
Panel A: One-month Endline			
Addition	0.64	0.18***	0.17***
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Subtraction	0.50	0.20***	0.20***
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Multiplication	0.66	0.18***	0.17***
	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Panel B: One-year Endline			
Addition	0.71	0.11***	0.11***
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Subtraction	0.54	0.14***	0.15***
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Multiplication	0.66	0.18***	0.18***
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)

Notes: Column 1 reports the control group means. Column 2 reports the treatment effects without any controls, but retains grade and union fixed effects. Column 3 reports treatment effects with both FEs and usual set of controls. Treatment effects were estimated using OLS. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A9. Treatment effects on surpassing benchmark

Variables	One-month Endline		One-year Endline	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	40 marks cut-off	Median cut-off	40 marks cut-off	Median cut-off
Coefficient on the treatment dummy	0.21***	0.34***	0.06**	0.16***
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Control means	0.64	0.35	0.75	0.46
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)
All controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Grade FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Union FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Treatment effects were estimated using OLS. Dependent variables indicated in column headings are the dummy variables that take the value 1 if a child obtain above 40 marks (columns 1 and 3) or above median marks (columns 2 and 4) in the endline tests. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A10. Treatment effects on non-standardized outcomes, with enumerator fixed effects

Endlines	Outcomes	(1) Control means	(2) Treatment effects (Controls and FEs)	(3) Treatment effects (Controls, FEs and Enumerator FEs)
One-month	**Panel A1: Learning outcomes**			
	Targeted subjects, Aggregate score [60 points]	27.00	11.01***	10.64***
		(0.79)	(1.02)	(1.02)
	Literacy (English) [30 points]	10.76	5.59***	5.53***
		(0.42)	(0.57)	(0.56)
	Numeracy [30 points]	16.24	5.42***	5.11***
		(0.48)	(0.60)	(0.61)
	Nontargeted subjects, Aggregate score [40 points]	23.11	6.69***	6.48***
		(0.51)	(0.61)	(0.61)
	Literacy (Bangla) [20 points]	10.52	3.87***	3.77***
		(0.31)	(0.40)	(0.39)
	General Knowledge [20 points]	12.59	2.82***	2.71***
		(0.28)	(0.33)	(0.34)
	Panel B1: Parental involvement			
	Homeschooling (in minutes/day)	84.41	21.81***	21.93***
		(1.68)	(2.73)	(2.62)
	Leisure activities (in minutes/day)	79.15	12.05***	11.93***
		(1.65)	(2.81)	(2.67)
	Panel C1: Parenting perception			
	Negative parenting avoidance [1 to 6 scale]	4.69	0.28***	0.26***
		(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.07)
	Parenting abilities or skills [11 to 55 scale]	48.70	1.47***	1.60***
		(0.32)	(0.36)	(0.33)
	Mother's aspiration – education [1 to 7 scale]	4.87	0.25***	0.21**
		(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)
	Mother's Confidence in teaching [0 to 30 scale]	21.41	0.65	0.77
		(0.34)	(0.43)	(0.41)
One-year	**Panel A2: Learning outcomes**			
	Targeted subjects, Aggregate score [60 points]	30.56	6.04***	5.91***
		(0.68)	(0.96)	(0.93)
	Literacy (English) [30 points]	13.24	2.52***	2.56***
		(0.42)	(0.61)	(0.59)
	Numeracy [30 points]	17.32	3.52***	3.35***
		(0.40)	(0.53)	(0.53)
	Nontargeted subjects, Aggregate score [40 points]	23.15	2.63***	2.24***
		(0.51)	(0.70)	(0.71)
	Literacy (Bangla) [20 points]	12.27	1.26***	1.03***
		(0.30)	(0.39)	(0.39)
	General Knowledge [20 points]	10.88	1.38***	1.21***
		(0.30)	(0.42)	(0.44)
	Panel B2: Parental involvement			
	Homeschooling (in minutes/ day)	50.99	13.80***	10.03***
		(1.72)	(2.64)	(2.43)
	Leisure activities (in minutes/day)	55.54	11.55***	7.52***
		(1.78)	(2.64)	(2.22)
	Panel C1: Parenting perception			
	Negative parenting avoidance [1 to 6 scale]	4.78	0.19**	0.25***
		(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.07)
	Parenting abilities or skills [11 to 55 scale]	47.59	1.92***	1.28***
		(0.41)	(0.52)	(0.40)
	Mother's aspiration – education [1 to 7 scale]	4.40	0.36***	0.40***
		(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.09)
	Mother's Confidence in teaching [0 to 30 scale]	9.90	2.00***	2.15***
		(0.41)	(0.60)	(0.51)

Notes: Column 1 reports the control group means. Treatment effects were estimated using OLS with the usual set of controls, grade, union and enumerator fixed effects (Column 2 & 3). Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A11. Baseline test score comparison

Variables	(1) Grade 1	(2) Grade 2	(3) Grade 3	(4) T-test *p*-value (Grade 1 vs. 2)	(5) T-test *p*-value (Grade 2 vs. 3)
Literacy	15.48	16.88	17.32	0.00	0.29
% of students passed	81.68%	94.42%	94.05%	0.00	0.90
Numeracy	14.12	15.62	15.38	0.00	0.44
% of students passed	95.69%	99.63%	98.81%	0.00	0.38

Notes: Columns 1-3 of this table show the averages of baseline literacy and numeracy test score by the grade of children studying during the intervention. '% of students passed' is an indicator for students that scored 40 or above. Columns 4 and 5 report the *p*-values that compare the columns.

Table A12. Treatment effects using alternative specifications

Endlines	Outcomes	(1) Control means	Treatment effects (2) Treat dummy	(3) Only FEs	(4) Baseline scores + FEs	(5) LASSO controls	(6) LASSO controls + baseline scores + FEs
One-month	**Panel A1: Learning outcomes**						
	Targeted subjects, Aggregate score [60 points]	27.00	11.14***	11.37***	11.42***	11.01***	11.32***
		(0.79)	(1.11)	(1.11)	(1.09)	(0.99)	(0.98)
	Literacy (English) [30 points]	10.76	5.86***	5.84***	5.86***	5.59***	5.82***
		(0.42)	(0.61)	(0.62)	(0.61)	(0.55)	(0.55)
	Numeracy [30 points]	16.24	5.28***	5.53***	5.56***	5.42***	5.53***
		(0.48)	(0.65)	(0.63)	(0.62)	(0.59)	(0.58)
	Nontargeted subjects, Aggregate score [40 points]	23.11	7.10***	6.89***	6.93***	6.69***	7.07***
		(0.51)	(0.69)	(0.65)	(0.63)	(0.59)	(0.61)
	Literacy (Bangla) [20 points]	10.52	4.07***	3.99***	4.00***	3.87***	4.10***
		(0.31)	(0.42)	(0.42)	(0.41)	(0.38)	(0.39)
	General Knowledge [20 points]	12.59	3.03***	2.91***	2.92***	2.82***	2.94***
		(0.28)	(0.37)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.32)	(0.33)
	Panel B1: Parental involvement						
	Homeschooling (in minutes/ day)	84.41	22.35***	21.95***	21.97***	21.81***	22.06***
		(1.68)	(2.74)	(2.77)	(2.76)	(2.65)	(2.67)
	Leisure activities (in minutes/day)	79.15	12.83***	12.20***	12.22***	12.05***	11.70***
		(1.65)	(2.73)	(2.82)	(2.82)	(2.72)	(2.79)
	Panel C1: Parenting perception						
	Negative parenting avoidance [1 to 6 scale]	4.69	0.28***	0.28***	0.28***	0.28***	0.29***
		(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
	Parenting abilities or skills [11 to 55 scale]	48.70	1.34***	1.58***	1.59***	1.47***	1.43***
		(0.32)	(0.41)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.35)	(0.37)
	Mother's aspiration – education [1 to 7 scale]	4.87	0.30***	0.27***	0.27***	0.25***	0.26***
		(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.08)
	Mother's Confidence in teaching [0 to 30 scale]	21.41	1.00**	0.82	0.83	0.65	0.80
		(0.34)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.47)	(0.41)	(0.43)
One-year	**Panel A2: Learning outcomes**						
	Targeted subjects, Aggregate score [60 points]	30.56	6.11***	6.11***	6.19***	6.04***	6.21***
		(0.68)	(1.02)	(1.02)	(1.00)	(0.93)	(0.95)
	Literacy (English) [30 points]	13.24	2.59***	2.59***	2.62***	2.52***	2.77***
		(0.42)	(0.64)	(0.64)	(0.63)	(0.59)	(0.60)
	Numeracy [30 points]	17.32	3.52***	3.52***	3.57***	3.52***	3.57***
		(0.40)	(0.55)	(0.55)	(0.54)	(0.51)	(0.52)
	Nontargeted subjects, Aggregate score [40 points]	23.15	2.67***	2.67***	2.71***	2.63***	2.69***
		(0.51)	(0.73)	(0.73)	(0.72)	(0.68)	(0.70)
	Literacy (Bangla) [20 points]	12.27	1.30***	1.30***	1.32***	1.26***	1.22***
		(0.30)	(0.40)	(0.40)	(0.40)	(0.38)	(0.38)
	General Knowledge [20 points]	10.88	1.38***	1.38***	1.39***	1.38***	1.47***
		(0.30)	(0.43)	(0.43)	(0.43)	(0.41)	(0.42)
	Panel B2: Parental involvement						
	Homeschooling (in minutes/ day)	50.99	14.15***	14.15***	14.18***	13.80***	15.08***
		(1.72)	(2.70)	(2.70)	(2.70)	(2.56)	(2.61)
	Leisure activities (in minutes/day)	55.54	11.07***	11.07***	11.19***	11.55***	11.51***
		(1.78)	(2.68)	(2.68)	(2.66)	(2.56)	(2.60)
	Panel C2: Parenting perception						
	Negative parenting avoidance [1 to 6 scale]	4.78	0.20***	0.20***	0.20***	0.19**	0.19**
		(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)
	Parenting abilities or skills [11 to 55 scale]	47.59	1.99***	1.99***	2.00***	1.92***	2.01***
		(0.41)	(0.53)	(0.53)	(0.53)	(0.50)	(0.50)
	Mother's aspiration – education [1 to 7 scale]	4.40	0.36***	0.36***	0.37***	0.36***	0.36***
		(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.09)
	Mother's Confidence in teaching [0 to 30 scale]	9.90	2.00***	2.00***	2.02***	2.00***	2.10***
		(0.41)	(0.64)	(0.64)	(0.64)	(0.58)	(0.59)

Notes: Column 1 reports the control group means. Column 2 reports the treatment effects without any controls. Column 3 reports treatment effects after dropping all covariates and baseline scores, but retains grade and union fixed effects.

Column 4 augments Column 3 by reintroducing the baseline scores. Column 5 reports treatment effects with all covariates chosen via the post-double selection LASSO method (Belloni et al., 2014). Similarly, Column 6 employs the post-double selection LASSO for covariate selection but retains baseline scores and grade and union fixed effects as high-dimensional controls. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A13. Treatment effects on vertically linked questions

Variables	One-month Endline		One-year Endline	
	(1) Literacy (English) [6 Points]	(2) Numeracy [6 Points]	(3) Literacy (English) [6 Points]	(4) Numeracy [6 Points]
Coefficient on the treatment dummy	1.09***	1.08***	1.04***	0.85***
	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.21)	(0.17)
Control means	3.15	3.76	2.88	4.39
	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.13)
All controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Grade FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Union FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Treatment effects were estimated using OLS. Dependent variables are the marks obtained in the vertically linked questions i.e., similar types of questions asked during the baseline, one-month and one-year endlines. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A14. Adjusted treatment effects on assessment test score

Outcomes	(1) Control means	(2) Treatment effects	(3) Treatment effects (only FEs)	(4) Treatment effects (Controls and FEs)
Panel A: One-month Endline				
Targeted subjects, Aggregate score	21.23	8.41***	8.59***	8.32***
	(0.65)	(0.91)	(0.91)	(0.84)
Literacy (English)	4.99	3.13***	3.06***	2.89***
	(0.26)	(0.40)	(0.40)	(0.37)
Numeracy	16.24	5.28***	5.53***	5.42***
	(0.48)	(0.65)	(0.63)	(0.60)
Nontargeted subjects, Aggregate score	21.09	6.04***	5.83***	5.67***
	(0.45)	(0.60)	(0.56)	(0.53)
Literacy (Bangla)	8.50	3.01***	2.93***	2.85***
	(0.25)	(0.33)	(0.32)	(0.31)
General Knowledge	12.59	3.03***	2.91***	2.82***
	(0.28)	(0.37)	(0.34)	(0.33)
Panel B: One-year Endline				
Targeted subjects, Aggregate score	21.08	8.05***	8.14***	8.03***
	(0.66)	(0.95)	(0.90)	(0.85)
Literacy (English)	5.02	2.97***	2.90***	2.79***
	(0.27)	(0.40)	(0.40)	(0.38)
Numeracy	16.06	5.08***	5.24***	5.24***
	(0.49)	(0.68)	(0.64)	(0.62)
Nontargeted subjects, Aggregate score	22.91	6.68***	6.59***	6.49***
	(0.53)	(0.74)	(0.69)	(0.68)
Literacy (Bangla)	10.52	3.87***	3.81***	3.74***
	(0.32)	(0.43)	(0.42)	(0.42)
General Knowledge	12.40	2.81***	2.78***	2.75***
	(0.29)	(0.40)	(0.37)	(0.37)

Notes: Column 1 reports the control group means. Columns 2 reports the treatment effects without any controls. Column 3 reports treatment effects after dropping all covariates and baseline scores, but retains grade and union fixed effects. Column 4 reports treatment effects with FEs and usual set of controls. Treatment effects were estimated using OLS. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A15. Treatment effects on the number of correct answers

Outcomes	(1) Control means	(2) Treatment effects	(3) Treatment effects (only FEs)	(4) Treatment effects (Controls and FEs)
Panel A: One-month Endline				
Targeted subjects, Aggregate score [11 Questions]	4.98	2.08***	2.13***	2.06***
	(0.14)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.19)
Literacy (English) [6 Questions]	2.27	1.20***	1.20***	1.16***
	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.11)
Numeracy [5 Questions]	2.71	0.88***	0.92***	0.90***
	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)
Nontargeted subjects, Aggregate score [8 Questions]	4.62	1.42***	1.38***	1.34***
	(0.10)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.12)
Literacy (Bangla) [4 Questions]	2.10	0.81***	0.80***	0.77***
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
General Knowledge [4 Questions]	2.52	0.61***	0.58***	0.56***
	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Panel B: One-year Endline				
Targeted subjects, Aggregate score [11 Questions]	4.94	2.00***	2.03***	2.00***
	(0.15)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.19)
Literacy (English) [6 Questions]	2.26	1.15***	1.15***	1.13***
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Numeracy [5 Questions]	2.68	0.85***	0.87***	0.87***
	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)
Nontargeted subjects, Aggregate score [8 Questions]	4.58	1.34***	1.32***	1.30***
	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Literacy (Bangla) [4 Questions]	2.10	0.77***	0.76***	0.75***
	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.08)
General Knowledge [4 Questions]	2.48	0.56***	0.56***	0.55***
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.07)

Notes: Column 1 reports the control group means. Column 2 reports the treatment effects without any controls and FEs. Column 3 reports treatment effects with grade and union fixed effects. Column 4 reports treatment effects with both FEs and usual set of controls. Treatment effects were estimated using OLS. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A16. Comparisons with existing literature

Intervention characteristics	**This paper**	**Angrist et al. (2022)**	**Crawfurd et al. (2023)**
Context and school closure	Bangladesh: 20 months	Botswana: 6 months	Sierra Leone: 7 months
Treatment delivery	Phone calls and SMS	Phone calls and SMS	Phone calls and SMS
Control received	Nothing	Nothing	SMS
Target	Mothers and their children in grades 1-3	Children in grades 1-5	Children in grades 1-5
Treatment delivered by	Public university student volunteers	NGO staff (paid)	School teachers (paid)
Tutor-student ratio	1:2	Unavailable	1:36
Dosage	13 weeks, with 6.5 hours total	8 weeks, with 3 hours total	16 weeks, with 4 hours total
Sample size	838	4,550	4,399
Primary caregiver's education	6 years	29% have more than secondary school degree	Unavailable
Follow-ups	1 month and 1 year	2 and 4 months	2.5 months
Assessment in person or remote	In person	SMS and phone	In person and phone
Assessment type	Standardized tests developed in the same manner as textbooks	Modified ASER assessments	Early Grade Reading and Mathematics Assessments and ASER
Main outcomes	Maths and language	Maths and language	Maths and language
Effects at most recent endline	0.44SD in maths; 0.33SD in English. 0.32-0.40SD in parental engagement	0.12SD in maths. 92-95% higher parental engagement	Null on test scores. 0.31SD in student activity and 0.34SD in parental engagement
Prevented learning loss in treatment?	Yes	Not discussed	Not discussed
Cost of phone call treatment per participant	USD 20	USD 19	USD 40

Table A17. Heterogeneity in learning outcomes

Dependent variables	W: Gender			X: Baseline score			Y: Household income			Z: Parental education		
	(1) Boy	(2) Girl	(3) Difference	(4) Above median	(5) Below median	(6) Difference	(7) Above median	(8) Below median	(9) Difference	(10) Above median	(11) Below median	(12) Difference
A: One-month endline												
Total score	0.72***	0.77***	0.09	0.64***	0.89***	-0.26**	0.79***	0.72***	0.10	0.71***	0.81***	-0.14
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.13)
Literacy (English)	0.72***	0.59***	-0.09	0.57***	0.77***	-0.20	0.69***	0.69***	0.08	0.67***	0.68***	-0.03
	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.14)
Numeracy	0.55***	0.56***	0.06	0.45***	0.70***	-0.27**	0.63***	0.45***	0.17	0.47***	0.66***	-0.21*
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.12)
Literacy (Bangla)	0.52***	0.70***	0.17	0.56***	0.72***	-0.16	0.60***	0.68***	-0.05	0.55***	0.70***	-0.21*
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.13)
General Knowledge	0.42***	0.61***	0.21*	0.44***	0.56***	-0.17	0.53***	0.48***	0.08	0.54***	0.46***	0.06
	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.12)
B: One-year endline												
Total score	0.48***	0.35***	-0.09	0.47***	0.27**	0.11	0.43***	0.41***	-0.02	0.48***	0.34***	0.10
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.14)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.15)
Literacy (English)	0.32***	0.28**	0.01	0.39***	0.19*	0.14	0.33***	0.31***	0.02	0.36***	0.21*	0.15
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.15)
Numeracy	0.45***	0.39***	-0.05	0.50***	0.29**	0.15	0.46***	0.35***	0.06	0.53***	0.32***	0.17
	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.14)
Literacy (Bangla)	0.24**	0.22**	-0.01	0.22**	0.14	-0.01	0.19**	0.28**	-0.13	0.26***	0.21**	-0.00
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.13)
General Knowledge	0.40***	0.10	-0.23*	0.23**	0.17*	0.01	0.24**	0.27**	-0.08	0.23**	0.26**	-0.06
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.14)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.14)

Notes: OLS estimates reported. In column-Panel W, column 1 reports treatment effects only among male children, and column 2 reports treatment effects only among female children; column 3 reports the difference between columns 1 and 2 (the coefficient on the interaction between treatment and gender dummies). In column-Panel X, column 4 reports treatment effects only among children whose baseline test scores were above the median (academically stronger), and column 5 reports treatment effects only among children whose baseline test scores were below the median (academically weaker); column 6 reports the difference between columns 4 and 5. In column-Panel Y, column 7 reports treatment effects only among children whose household income was above the median, and column 8 reports treatment effects only among children whose household income was below the median; column 9 reports the difference between columns 7 and 8. In column-Panel Z, column 10 reports treatment effects only among children whose mothers' years of education were above the median, column 11 reports treatment effects only among children whose mothers' years of education were below the median; column 12 reports the difference between columns 10 and 11. All specifications include the usual set of controls, grade and union council fixed effects. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A18. Heterogeneity in children's learning, by homeschooling time

Variables	(1) One-month Test Score	(2) One-year Test Score
Treatment dummy	27.16***	8.82**
	(3.54)	(3.80)
Homeschooling time	0.02	0.01
	(0.02)	(0.02)
Treatment x Homeschooling time	-0.07***	-0.00
	(0.02)	(0.02)
All controls	Yes	Yes
Grade FE	Yes	Yes
Union FE	Yes	Yes

Notes: Treatment effects were estimated using OLS. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A19. Heterogeneity in children's learning by mentors' characteristics

Variables	One-month Endline		One-year Endline	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Average learning if below median	Difference if above median	Average learning if below median	Difference if above median
Age [1 if above median]	66.73	1.14	62.46	-3.15
		(2.24)		(2.38)
Gender dummy [1 if male]	66.13	2.06	61.90	-4.86*
		(2.38)		(2.58)
Cognitive Flexibility Scale (CFS) [1 if above median]	62.94	7.29***	60.20	-1.17
		(2.63)		(2.85)
Difficulties in mental health (PHQ) [1 if above median]	69.58	-4.95*	59.78	1.15
		(2.65)		(2.88)
Urban background [1 if urban]	66.25	-0.64	60.87	-1.13
		(2.30)		(2.45)
Universities [1 if public]	72.44	1.13	73.50	-9.09
		(5.09)		(5.73)
Academic discipline [1 if business and social sciences]	64.14	4.20	60.42	0.27
		(2.72)		(3.04)
Education level [1 if graduated]	65.29	1.66	59.96	-3.79
		(3.19)		(3.42)
Part-time tutoring job [1 if yes]	67.87	-2.94	61.71	-3.40
		(2.50)		(2.57)
Prior tutoring experience [1 if yes]	67.89	-3.33	63.45	-4.20
		(2.93)		(2.90)
Paid tutoring experience with the primary graders [1 if yes]	64.77	-1.07	62.38	-6.31**
		(2.65)		(2.72)
Past volunteering [1 if yes]	66.50	0.14	62.44	-3.08
		(2.95)		(2.72)

Notes: For clarity, we have converted all continuous measures of mentors' characteristics to indicators using a median split, as detailed in the table. In columns 1 and 3, we present the average learning when a mentor's characteristic falls below the median. In contrast, columns 2 and 4 illustrate the gains in learning when a mentor's characteristic exceeds the median. CFS is a self-reported assessment that measures a person's ability to switch between different thoughts and actions. As our mentors are coming from different institutions and backgrounds, we use this scale to generalize their cognitive ability. The average score on the CFS among university students is around 55 points. Difficulties in mental health are measured by the 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire. PHQ-9 scores of 5, 10, 15, and 20 represented mild, moderate, moderately severe, and severe depression, respectively. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A20. Heterogeneity in homeschooling and parenting perceptions

Dependent variables	W: Gender			X: Baseline score			Y: Household income			Z: Parental education		
	(1) Boy	(2) Girl	(3) Difference	(4) Above median	(5) Below median	(6) Difference	(7) Above median	(8) Below median	(9) Difference	(10) Above median	(11) Below median	(12) Difference
A1: Parental involvement – One-month endline												
Homeschooling	0.64***	0.66***	0.02	0.59***	0.68***	-0.14	0.71***	0.60***	0.18	0.72***	0.57***	0.22
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.16)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.16)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.16)
Leisure activities	0.35***	0.38***	0.10	0.41***	0.35***	0.05	0.37***	0.41**	0.08	0.46***	0.26**	0.26
	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.16)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.16)	(0.11)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.16)
A2: Parental involvement – One-year endline												
Homeschooling	0.40***	0.40***	0.01	0.41***	0.43***	0.00	0.44***	0.43***	0.05	0.38***	0.51***	-0.08
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.16)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.15)
Leisure activities	0.23**	0.40***	0.14	0.25**	0.40***	-0.16	0.23**	0.46***	-0.17	0.25**	0.40***	-0.14
	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.15)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.15)
B1: Parenting perception – One-month endline												
Negative parenting	-0.20**	-0.31***	-0.05	-0.17*	-0.33***	0.17	-0.29***	-0.34***	0.02	-0.27***	-0.29***	0.05
	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.14)
Parenting abilities or skill	0.27***	0.16**	-0.10	0.18***	0.25***	-0.14	0.27***	0.23**	0.08	0.15**	0.34***	-0.15
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.12)
Parent's aspiration - child's education	0.21***	0.15	-0.12	0.21**	0.15	-0.00	0.20**	0.17	0.01	0.26***	0.14	0.07
	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.13)
Mother's Confidence in teaching	0.10	0.08	-0.00	0.01	0.17*	-0.21*	0.18**	0.03	0.17	0.08	0.16	-0.01
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.07)	(0.13)	(0.14)
B2: Parenting perception – One-year endline												
Negative parenting	-0.16	-0.17*	-0.04	-0.17*	-0.18*	-0.03	-0.19**	-0.17	-0.10	-0.10	-0.27**	0.22
	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.14)
Parenting abilities or skill	0.21**	0.26***	0.07	0.26***	0.21**	0.06	0.08	0.50***	-0.38***	-0.00	0.58***	-0.58***
	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.07)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.07)	(0.11)	(0.12)
Parent's aspiration - child's education	0.26**	0.33***	0.04	0.32***	0.26***	-0.01	0.23***	0.36***	-0.19	0.35***	0.23**	0.09
	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.14)
Mother's Confidence in teaching	0.38***	0.13	-0.28*	0.35***	0.11	0.19	0.15	0.38***	-0.24	0.26**	0.20*	0.04
	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.15)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.15)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.15)

Notes: See the notes under Table A17. All specifications include the usual set of controls, grade and union council fixed effects. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A21. Social desirability bias checks

Endline	Variables	(1) Home-schooling	(2) Leisure activities	(3) Negative parenting	(4) Parenting abilities or skills	(5) Mother's aspiration – education	(6) Mother's confidence in teaching
One-month	Treatment	0.68***	0.33***	-0.20*	0.29***	0.34***	0.04
		(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)
	High SDB	0.08	-0.00	0.04	0.12	0.13	-0.01
		(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.10)
	Treatment × High SDB	-0.01	0.10	-0.09	0.01	-0.30**	0.19
		(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.13)
	Controls and FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Observations	782	782	782	782	779	782
	R-squared	0.20	0.16	0.12	0.25	0.31	0.26
One-year	Treatment	0.47***	0.39***	-0.20*	0.37***	0.29***	0.33***
		(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)
	High SDB	0.19*	-0.05	-0.26**	0.31***	0.20**	0.22**
		(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)
	Treatment × High SDB	-0.07	-0.17	-0.03	-0.16	0.06	-0.09
		(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.15)
	Controls and FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Observations	796	796	796	796	796	796
	R-squared	0.21	0.17	0.11	0.17	0.26	0.24

Notes: This table uses the 13-item Marlowe-Crowne social desirability bias (SDB) score to carry out a heterogeneity analysis. Using the SBD score, we created a dummy High SDB that equals 1 if the SDB score is above the median value and 0 if below the median. Outcomes in columns 1-2 are the same as outcomes in Panel B1 in Table 2 and outcomes in columns 3-6 are the same as outcomes in Panel C1 in Table 2. All specifications include the usual set of controls and grade and union council fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Appendix B: Data and Intervention

Figure B1. Intervention photos

(a) A mother is responding to the survey

(b) A child is taking part in the test

(c) A child is taking a lesson with the help of a basic phone (and in the presence of her mother) while the mentor was on the call. *Photo credit: Father*

(d) A mentor sends some gifts to a child

Table B1. Weekly mentoring themes (targeted towards mothers)

Week no	Theme no	Weekly Theme	SMS Topics
1	-	None	Notification of selection Second notification
2	-	None	No SMS
3	1	Promoting social responsibility	Notifying the social responsibility of the mentors
4	2	Maintaining daily routine	Importance of routine
5	3	Restraining abusive parenting	Request to stop beating and scolding with abusive language
6	4	Encouraging gender equality in homeschooling	Why both boys and girls need basic education
7	5	Teach your child to share	Tips on teaching sharing behaviour to child
8	6	Encourage child to read storybooks	Advice about reading practices and where to borrow books
9	7	Promoting parents' aspirations about offspring's education	Motivate parents to remain positive about child's education
10	8	Stimulating parents' confidence in providing educational support to children	Explaining the role of parents as a teacher
11	9	Believing in children and letting them know about such feelings	Tips about how to let children know that parents' have faith in them. Advice on positive competition
12	10	Broadening the educational planning horizon of the parents	Explaining return to education
13	-	None	Concluding message, saying thank you.

Notes: These themes were used for text messages and then discussed by mentors and mothers in Step 5 (section 2.1 in the paper). Test messages on all topics were composed in the local language, *Bangla*.

Table B2. Children's learning assessments at the one-month endline

Subject	No	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Marks
English Literacy	1.	Make a word with 'C'.	Make a word with 'M'.	Make two words with 'C'.	6
	2.	Answer this English question: What is your name?	Answer this English question: How old are you?	Answer this English question: What month is it now?	6
	3.	Tell the English of Bangla word – (Hand).	Tell the English of Bangla word – (Window).	Tell the English of Bangla word – (Farmer).	4
	4.	Tell the English of Bangla word – (Book).	Tell the English of Bangla word – (Rose).	Tell the English of Bangla word – (Umbrella).	4
	5.	Tell the English of Bangla word – (Dog).	Tell the English of Bangla word – (Breakfast).	Tell the English of Bangla word – (Flag).	4
	6.	Spell your name in English.	Spell the English word 'Mother'.	Spell 'English Teacher' in English.	6
Mathematics	7.	Which number comes after 6? Does it even or odd?	Name the even numbers in between 1 and 10.	Which number is bigger in 525 and 495?	6
	8.	What is the sum of 3 and 4?	Whether the sum of 3 and 4 is an even or odd number?	There are 6 notes of 20 taka. How much money is there?	6
	9.	If we deduct 3 from 8, what remains?	In a class, there were 16 students. The teacher sends 5 of them for gardening. How many students are left in the classroom?	Whether the sum of 13 and 11 is an even or odd number?	6
	10.	How many minutes in 60 seconds?	How many sides a triangle has?	How many sides a rectangle has?	6
	11.	6+0 equals to what?	There are three fruits on a plate. How many fruits there are in 4 plates?	The price of 5 eggs is BDT 30. How much does it cost to buy 2 eggs?	6
Bangla Literacy	12.	Give an example of one Bangla vowel letter.	Make two words using the Bangla letter ----.	Make one word and a sentence from that word using the Bangla letter (----).	5
	13.	Which two letters come after letters ---- & ----.	Give an example of a word written with joint letters.	What is the antonym of the Bangla word (freedom)?	5
	14.	Make a word with Bangla letter -----.	What is the spelling of the word (Sundarbans)?	What is the spelling of the word (freedom fighter)?	5
	15.	What is the English of ------ (common flower name)?	What is the antonym of the Bangla word (high)?	What is the meaning of the Bangla word (----)?	5
General Knowledge	16.	How many days there are in a week?	Give an example of five flowers.	On which date of 1952, there was a march for the Bangla language?	5
	17.	What are the days come after Saturday?	What is the first month of Bangla year?	What is victory day in Bangladesh?	5
	18.	Give an example of three flowers.	Which season is best for homemade cakes?	Mostafa Kamal is an ----.	5
	19.	What is the national animal of Bangladesh?	What was the pet's name of the national poet of Bangladesh?	How many days there are in the month 'March'?	5

Table B3. Children's learning assessment at the one-year endline

Subject	No	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Marks
English Literacy	1.	Read the following word (CAP)?	Read the following word (FARMER)?	Read aloud this following paragraph (English)?	6
	2.	Answer this English question: What is your name?	Answer this English question: How old are you?	Answer this English question: What month is it now?	6
	3.	Say the English of Bangla word – (Door).	Say the English of Bangla word – (Window).	Say the English of Bangla word – (FARMER).	4
	4.	Say the English of Bangla word – (Book).	Say the English of Bangla word – (UMBRELLA).	Say the English of Bangla word – (WEDNESDAY).	4
	5.	Say the English of Bangla word – (Dog).	Say the English of Bangla word – (BREAKFAST).	Say the English of Bangla word – (FLAG).	4
	6.	Spell your name in English.	Read and say the name of these shapes (picture of the square, circle, triangle, and rectangle).	Match the appropriate description with this picture (match from 4 options).	6
Mathematics	7.	Which number comes after 6? Does it even or odd?	Name the even numbers in between 1 and 10.	Sort these three numbers, smallest to the largest (20, 73, 10, 78).	6
	8.	What is the result of 3+4=?	Sort these three numbers, smallest to the largest (23, 17, 38).	There are 6 notes of 20 BDT. How much money is there?	6
	9.	What is the result of 8-3=?	In a class, there were 16 students. The teacher sends 5 of them for gardening. How many students are left in the classroom?	What is the result of 13+11=?	6
	10.	How many minutes in 60 seconds?	How many sides a triangle has?	What is the result of 2/4+2/4=?	6
	11.	What is the result of 6+0=?	There are three fruits on a plate. How many fruits there are in 4 plates?	The price of 5 eggs is BDT 30. How much does it cost to buy 2 eggs?	6
Bangla Literacy	12.	Read aloud the following letters (first 4 letters from Bangla alphabets)	Make two words using the Bangla letter ----.	Read aloud this following paragraph (Bangla)?	5
	13.	Fill in the gaps (5 Bangla letters with 2 gaps).	Fill in the gap (a line in Bangla from the textbook)	What is the antonym of the Bangla word (FREEDOM)?	5
	14.	Make a word with Bangla letter -----.	What is the spelling of the word (Sundarbans)?	What is the spelling of the word (Bangla of freedom fighter)?	5
	15.	What is the spelling of (Bangla word)?	What is the antonym of the Bangla word (high)?	What is the meaning of this Bangla word (Bangla word from the textbook)?	5
General Knowledge	16.	How many days there are in a week?	Give an example of three red coloured flowers.	On which date of 1952, there was a march for the Bangla language?	5
	17.	What are the days come after Saturday?	What is the first month of Bangla year?	What is victory day in Bangladesh?	5
	18.	Give examples of three fruits.	Which season is best for homemade cakes?	Mostafa Kamal is an ---- (textbook problem).	5
	19.	What is the national bird of Bangladesh?	What was the pet name of the national poet of Bangladesh?	How many days there are in the month 'March'?	5

Table B4. Project costing

Cost item	Unit price (USD)	Quantity	Amount (USD)
Training			1,000
Certificate			495
Cost of preparing and distributing solutions manuals	8	419 HHs	3,352
Mobile talk time	1 per week	219 mentors / 13 weeks	2,847
SMS - mentor	0.0125	12,000 SMS	150
SMS - Parents	0.0125	20,000 SMS	250
Total Cost			8,094
Total Student			404
Cost per student			20.03