



**HAL**  
open science

# A systematic review and meta-analysis of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning

Bastian Betthäuser, Anders Bach-Mortensen, Per Engzell

## ► To cite this version:

Bastian Betthäuser, Anders Bach-Mortensen, Per Engzell. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2023, 10.1038/s41562-022-01506-4 . hal-03954706

**HAL Id: hal-03954706**

**<https://hal-sciencespo.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03954706>**

Submitted on 24 Jan 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial| 4.0 International License

# A systematic review and meta-analysis of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning

Bastian A. Betthäuser<sup>1-4</sup>, Anders M. Bach-Mortensen<sup>3</sup>, Per Engzell<sup>4-6</sup>

**How has the COVID-19 pandemic affected learning progress among school-age children? A growing number of studies address this question, but findings vary depending on context. We conduct a pre-registered systematic review, quality appraisal and meta-analysis of 42 studies across 15 countries to assess the magnitude of the effect of the pandemic on learning. We find a substantial overall learning deficit (Cohen's  $d = -0.14$ , 95% c.i.  $-0.17, -0.10$ ), which arose early in the pandemic and persists over time. Forgone learning is particularly large among children from low socio-economic backgrounds. It is also larger in math than in reading, and in middle-income countries, relative to high-income countries. There is a lack of evidence on learning progress during the pandemic in low-income countries. Future research should address this evidence gap and avoid the common risks of bias that we identify.**

The COVID-19 pandemic has led to one of the largest disruptions to learning in history. To a large extent this is due to school closures, which are estimated to have affected 95 percent of the world's student population.<sup>1</sup> But even when face-to-face teaching resumed, instruction has often been compromised by hybrid teaching, and by children or teachers having to quarantine and miss classes. The effect of limited face-to-face instruction is likely compounded by the pandemic's consequences for children's out-of-school learning environment, as well as their mental and physical health. Lockdowns have restricted children's movement and their ability to play, meet other children, and engage in extra-curricular activities. Children's well-being and family relationships have also suffered due to economic uncertainties and conflicting demands of work, care and learning. These negative consequences can be expected to be most pronounced for children from low socio-economic family backgrounds, exacerbating pre-existing educational inequalities.

It is critical to understand how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected children's learning progress. We use the term 'learning deficit' to encompass both a delay in expected learning progress, as well as a loss of skills and knowledge already gained. The COVID-19 learning deficit is likely to affect children's life chances through their education and labor market prospects. At the societal level, it can have important implications for growth, prosperity, and social cohesion. As policy-makers across the world are seeking to limit further learning deficits and to devise policies to recover learning deficits that have already been incurred, assessing the current state of learning is crucial. A careful assessment of the COVID-19 learning deficit is also necessary to weigh the true costs and benefits of school closures.

A number of narrative reviews have sought to summarize the emerging research on COVID-19 and learning, mostly focusing on learning progress relatively early in the pandemic.<sup>2,3,4,5,6</sup> Moreover, two reviews harmonized and syn-

thesized existing estimates of the effect of the pandemic on learning progress.<sup>7,8</sup> In line with the narrative reviews, these two systematic reviews find a statistically significant negative effect of the pandemic on learning. However, this finding is based on a relatively small number of studies (18 and 10 studies respectively). The limited evidence that was available at the time these reviews were conducted also precluded them from meta-analyzing variation in the magnitude of learning deficits over-time and across subjects, different groups of students, or country contexts.

In this paper, we conduct a comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis of the evidence on COVID-19 learning deficits two and a half years into the pandemic. Our meta-analysis contributes to the existing research in two ways. First, we present a rigorous description and appraisal of the up-to-date body of evidence and its geographic reach and quality. More specifically, we ask (a) What is the state of the evidence, in terms of the available peer-reviewed research and gray-literature, on the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning?, (b) Which countries are represented in the available evidence?, and (c) What is the quality of the existing evidence?

Our second contribution is to harmonize, synthesize and meta-analyze the existing evidence, with special attention to variation across different sub-populations and country contexts. Based on the identified studies, we ask (d) What is the magnitude of the overall effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning?, (e) How has the magnitude of the learning deficit evolved since the beginning of the pandemic?, (f) To what extent has the pandemic reinforced inequalities between children from different socio-economic backgrounds? (g) Are there differences in the magnitude of the learning deficit between subject domains (math and reading) and between grade levels (primary and secondary)?, and (h) To what extent does the effect of the pandemic on learning progress vary across countries with different income levels? Below, we report our answers to each of these questions in turn.

## The state of the evidence

Our systematic review identified 42 studies on the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning. As shown in Fig. 1,

<sup>1</sup>Observatoire Sociologique du Changement (OSC), Sciences Po  
<sup>2</sup>Leverhulme Centre for Demographic Science, University of Oxford  
<sup>3</sup>Department of Social Policy and Intervention, University of Oxford  
<sup>4</sup>Nuffield College, University of Oxford  
<sup>5</sup>Social Research Institute, University College London  
<sup>6</sup>Swedish Institute for Social Research, Stockholm University




Figure 1: Study identification and selection process (PRISMA flow diagram)

79 the initial literature search resulted in 5,153 hits after re-  
 80 moval of duplicates. All studies were double-screened by  
 81 the first two authors. Studies had to use a measure of learn-  
 82 ing that can be standardized (using Cohen’s  $d$ ) and base  
 83 their estimates on empirical data collected since the onset  
 84 of the COVID-19 pandemic (rather than making projections  
 85 based on pre-COVID-19 data). The formal database search  
 86 process identified 15 eligible studies. We also hand-searched  
 87 relevant preprint repositories ( $n = 95$ ) and policy databases  
 88 ( $n = 22$ ). Further, to ensure that our study selection was  
 89 as up-to-date as possible, we conducted two full forward  
 90 and backward citation searches of all included studies on  
 91 February 15, 2022, and on August 8, 2022 ( $n = 42$ ). The  
 92 citation and preprint hand-searches allowed us to identify  
 93 27 additional eligible studies, resulting in a total of 42 stud-  
 94 ies. Most of these studies were published after the initial  
 95 database search, which illustrates that the body of evidence  
 96 continues to expand. Most studies provide multiple esti-  
 97 mates of COVID-19 learning deficits, separately for math  
 98 and reading and for different school grades. The number of  
 99 estimates ( $n = 192$ ) is therefore larger than the number of  
 100 included studies ( $n = 42$ ).

101 **The geographic reach of the evidence is limited.** Ta-  
 102 ble 1 shows all included studies and estimates of COVID-19  
 103 learning deficits (in brackets), grouped by country. 15 coun-  
 104 tries are represented: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Colom-  
 105 bia, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands,  
 106 South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United King-  
 107 dom and the United States. About half of the estimates  
 108 ( $n = 149$ ) are from the United States, 58 are from the United  
 109 Kingdom, a further 70 are from other European countries,  
 110 and the remaining 14 estimates are from Australia, Brazil,  
 111 Colombia, Mexico, and South Africa. As this list shows,  
 112 there is a strong over-representation of studies from high-  
 113 income countries, a dearth of studies from middle-income  
 114 countries, and no studies from low-income countries. This

skewed representation should be kept in mind when inter-  
 preting our synthesis of the existing evidence on COVID-19  
 learning deficits.

**The quality of evidence is mixed.** We assessed the qual-  
 ity of the evidence using an adapted version of the Risk Of  
 Bias In Non-randomized Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-  
 I) tool.<sup>50</sup> More specifically, we analyzed the risk of bias of  
 each estimate from confounding, sample selection, classifi-  
 cation of treatments, missing data, the measurement of out-  
 comes, and the selection of reported results. The second au-  
 thor performed the risk of bias assessments, which were in-  
 dependently checked by the first and third author. We then  
 assigned each estimate an overall risk of bias rating (low,  
 moderate, serious, or critical) based on the estimate and  
 domain with the highest risk of bias. In line with ROBINS-  
 I guidance, we excluded all studies rated ‘critical’ ( $n=19$ )  
 from our meta-analysis.<sup>50</sup> Table S2 provides an overview of  
 these studies as well as the main potential sources of risk of  
 bias.

Fig. 2A shows the distribution of all studies of COVID-  
 19 learning deficits according to their risk of bias rating  
 separately for each domain (top six rows), as well as the  
 distribution of studies according to their overall risk of bias  
 rating (bottom row). The overall risk of bias was considered  
 ‘low’ for 15% of studies, ‘moderate’ for 30% of studies,  
 ‘serious’ for 25% of studies, and ‘critical’ for 30% of studies.  
 As shown in Fig. 2A, common sources of potential bias were  
 confounding, sample selection, and missing data. The likely  
 consequence of these sources of bias is an underestimation  
 of COVID-19 learning deficits. Studies rated at risk of con-  
 founding typically compared only two time points, without  
 accounting for longer time trends in learning progress. The  
 main causes of selection bias were the use of convenience  
 samples and/or insufficient consideration of self-selection by  
 schools or students. Several studies found evidence of selec-  
 tion bias, often with students from a low socio-economic




Figure 2: Risk of bias and publication bias. (A) Domain-specific and overall distribution of studies of COVID-19 learning deficits by risk of bias rating using ROBINS-I; includes studies rated to be at critical risk of bias ( $n = 19$ ), which were excluded from the meta-analysis in line with ROBINS-I guidance; (B) z-curve: Distribution of the z-scores of all estimates included in the meta-analysis ( $n=291$ ) to test for publication bias. The dotted line indicates  $z = 1.96$  ( $p = 0.05$ ), the conventional threshold for statistical significance. The overlaid curve shows a normal distribution. The absence of a spike in the distribution of the z-scores just above the threshold for statistical significance and the absence of a slump just below it indicate an absence of evidence for publication bias.

Table 1: Studies and estimates by country

Country	Studies
Australia [4]	Gore et al. 2021 [4] <sup>9</sup>
Belgium [4]	Gambi and De Witte 2021 [2], <sup>10</sup> Maldonado and De Witte 2021 [2] <sup>11</sup>
Brazil [2]	Lichand et al. 2022 [2] <sup>12</sup>
Colombia [2]	Vegas 2022 [2] <sup>13</sup>
Denmark [7]	Birkelund et al. 2021 [7] <sup>14</sup>
Germany [9]	Depping et al. 2021 [4], <sup>15</sup> Ludewig et al. 2022 [1], <sup>16</sup> Schult et al. 2022a [2], <sup>17</sup> Schult et al. 2022b [2] <sup>18</sup>
Italy [11]	Bazoli et al. 2022 [6], <sup>19</sup> Borgonovi and Ferrara 2022 [4], <sup>20</sup> Contini et al. 2022 [1] <sup>21</sup>
Mexico [2]	Hevia et al. 2022 [2] <sup>22</sup>
Netherlands [27]	Engzell et al. 2021 [8], <sup>23</sup> Haelermans 2021 [2], <sup>24</sup> Haelermans et al. 2021 [2], <sup>25</sup> Haelermans et al. 2022 [9], <sup>26</sup> Schuurman et al. 2021 [6] <sup>27</sup>
South Africa [2]	Ardington et al. 2021 [2] <sup>28</sup>
Spain [3]	Arenas and Gortazar 2022 [3] <sup>29</sup>
Sweden [9]	Hallin et al. 2022 [9] <sup>30</sup>
Switzerland [2]	Tomasik et al. 2020 [2] <sup>31</sup>
United Kingdom [58]	Blainey et al. 2021a [12], <sup>32</sup> Blainey et al. 2021b [12], <sup>33</sup> Blainey et al. 2021c [12], <sup>34</sup> Department for Education 2021a [6], <sup>35</sup> Department for Education 2021b [2], <sup>36</sup> GL Assessment 2021 [4], <sup>37</sup> Rose et al. 2021a [2], <sup>38</sup> Rose et al. 2021b [4] <sup>39</sup> Weidman et al. 2021 [4] <sup>40</sup>
United States [149]	Domingue et al. 2021a [8], <sup>41</sup> Domingue et al. 2021b [4], <sup>42</sup> Kogan and Lavertu 2021a [1], <sup>43</sup> Kogan and Lavertu 2021b [9], <sup>44</sup> Kozakowski et al. 2021 [12], <sup>45</sup> Kuhfeld and Lewis 2022 [48], <sup>46</sup> Lewis et al. 2021 [12], <sup>47</sup> Locke et al. 2021 [14], <sup>48</sup> Pier et al. 2021 [25], <sup>49</sup>

Note: Countries and corresponding studies on COVID-19 learning deficits. The number of estimates are shown in brackets, by country (left) and study (right). Full references are indicated by superscript and listed in the bibliography.

background or schools in deprived areas being underrepresented after (as compared to before) the pandemic, but this was not always adjusted for. Some studies also reported a higher amount of missing data post-pandemic, again generally without adjustment, and several studies did not report any information on missing data. For an overview of the risk of bias ratings for each domain of each study see Fig. S2, Table S1 and Table S2.

**No evidence of publication bias.** Publication bias can occur if authors self-censor to conform to theoretical expectations, or if journals favor statistically significant results. To mitigate this concern, we include not only published papers, but also unpublished working papers and ‘gray literature’, such as policy reports. Moreover, Fig. 2B tests for publication bias by showing the distribution of z-statistics for the effect size estimates of all identified studies. The dotted line indicates  $z = 1.96$  ( $p = 0.05$ ), the conventional threshold for statistical significance. The overlaid curve shows a normal distribution. If there was publication bias, we would expect a spike just above the threshold, and a slump just below it. There is no indication of this. Moreover, we do not find a left-skewed distribution of p-values (see p-curve in Fig. S3A), or an association between estimates of learning deficits and their standard errors (see funnel plot in Fig. S3B) that would suggest publication bias. Publication bias does thus not appear to be a major concern.

## Results

Having assessed the quality of the existing evidence, we now present the substantive results of our meta-analysis, focusing on the magnitude of COVID-19 learning deficits and on the variation in learning deficits over time, across different groups of students, and across different country contexts.

**The COVID-19 pandemic led to substantial learning deficits.** Fig. 3 shows the effect sizes that we extracted from each study (averaged across grades and learning subject) as well as the pooled effect size (red diamond). Effects are expressed in standard deviations, using Cohen’s  $d$ . Estimates are pooled using inverse variance weights. The pooled effect size across all studies is  $d = -0.14$ . Under normal circumstances, students generally improve their performance




Figure 3: Forest plot showing individual estimates by study ( $n=42$ , averaged across subjects and grade levels), and the overall effect size estimate, pooled using inverse variance weights and a random-effects model. Effect sizes are expressed in standard deviations, using Cohen’s  $d$ , with 95% confidence intervals, and are sorted by magnitude.

by around 0.4 standard deviations per school year.<sup>51,52,53</sup> Thus, the overall effect of  $d = -0.14$  suggests that students lost out on  $0.14/0.4$ , or about 35%, of a school year’s worth of learning. On average, the pandemic has led to a substantial learning deficit.

**Learning deficits arise early in the pandemic and persist over time.** One may expect that children were able to recover learning that was lost early in the pandemic, after teachers and families had time to adjust to the new learning conditions, and structures for online learning and for recovering early learning deficits were set up. However, existing research on teacher strikes in Belgium<sup>54</sup> and Argentina,<sup>55</sup> shortened school years in Germany,<sup>56</sup> and disruptions to education during World War II<sup>57</sup> suggests that learning deficits are difficult to compensate and tend to persist in the long run.

Fig. 4 plots the magnitude of estimated learning deficits (on the vertical axis) by the date of measurement (on the horizontal axis). The color of the circles reflects the rele-

vant country, the size of the circles indicates the sample size for a given estimate, and the line displays a linear trend. The figure suggests that learning deficits opened up early in the pandemic and have neither closed nor substantially widened since then. This would mean that efforts by children, parents, teachers, and policy-makers to adjust to the changed circumstance have been successful in preventing further learning deficits, but so far have been unable to reverse them. As shown in Fig. S6, the pattern of persistent learning deficits also emerges when we restrict our analysis to the three countries for which we have a relatively large number of estimates at different time points: The United States, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. However, it is important to note that estimates of learning deficits are based on distinct samples of students and future research should continue to follow the learning progress of cohorts of students affected by the COVID-19 pandemic to reveal how learning deficits of these cohorts develop in different countries.

**Socio-economic inequality in education increased during the pandemic.** Existing research on the development of learning gaps during summer vacations,<sup>58,59</sup> disruptions to schooling during the Ebola outbreak in Sierra Leone and Guinea,<sup>60</sup> and the 2005 earthquake in Pakistan,<sup>61</sup> shows that the suspension of face-to-face teaching can increase educational inequality between children from different socio-economic backgrounds. The effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning progress is likely to have been particularly pronounced for children from low socio-economic backgrounds. These children have been more affected by school closures than children from more advantaged backgrounds.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, they are likely to be disadvantaged with respect to their access and ability to use digital learning technology, the quality of their home learning environment, the learning support they receive from teachers and parents, and their ability to study autonomously.<sup>63,64,65</sup>

Most studies we identify examine the effect of the pandemic on socio-economic inequality, attesting to the importance of the issue. Because studies use different measures of socio-economic background (e.g., parental income, parental education, free school meal eligibility, neighborhood disadvantage), pooling the estimates is not possible. Instead, we code all estimates according to whether they indicate a positive, negative, or no effect of the pandemic on learning inequality. Fig. 5 displays this information. Estimates that indicate an increase in inequality are shown on the right, those that indicate a decrease on the left, and those that suggest no change in the middle. Squares represent estimates on the effect of the pandemic on inequality in reading performance, and circles represent estimates on the effect of the pandemic on inequality in math performance. The shading represents when in the pandemic educational inequality was measured, differentiating between the first, second and third year of the pandemic. Estimates are also arranged horizontally by grade level. A large majority of estimates indicate an increase in educational inequality between children from different socio-economic backgrounds. This holds for both math and reading, across primary and secondary






Figure 4: Estimates of COVID-19 learning deficits ( $n=291$ ), by date of measurement. The horizontal axis displays the date on which learning progress was measured. The vertical axis displays estimated learning deficits, expressed in standard deviations using Cohen’s  $d$ . The color of the circles reflects the respective country, the size of the circles indicates the sample size for a given estimate, and the line displays a linear trend with a 95% confidence interval.

269 education, at each stage of the pandemic, and independently of how socio-economic background is measured.  
270

271 **Learning deficits are larger in math than in reading.** Available research on summer learning deficits,<sup>58,66</sup>  
272 student absenteeism,<sup>67,68</sup> and extreme weather events,<sup>69</sup>  
273 suggests that learning progress in mathematics is more dependent on formal instruction than in reading. This might  
274  
275

be due to parents being better equipped to help their children with reading, and children advancing their reading skills (but not their math skills) when reading for enjoyment outside of school. Fig. 6A shows that similar to earlier disruptions to learning, the estimated COVID-19 learning deficits are larger for math than for reading (mean difference  $\delta = -0.07$ ,  $t = -4.03$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). This difference is statistically significant and robust to dropping estimates from individual countries (see Fig. S9).




Figure 5: Harvest plot summarizing the evidence on the effect of the pandemic on educational inequality between students from different socio-economic backgrounds. Each circle/square refers to one estimate of over-time change in inequality in math/reading performance ( $n=211$ ). Estimates that find a decrease/no change/increase in inequality are grouped on the left/middle/right. Within these categories, estimates are ordered horizontally by school grade. The shading indicates when in the pandemic a given measure was taken.

285 **No evidence that learning deficits vary across grade levels.** One may expect learning deficits to be smaller for older than for younger children, as older children may be more autonomous in their learning and better able to cope with a sudden change in their learning environment. Fig. 6B shows that, contrary to expectation, we find no evidence of a marked difference in the learning deficits between younger and older students (mean difference  $\delta = 0.01$ ,  $t = 0.58$ ,  $p = 0.565$ ). Note, however, that secondary students were subject to longer school closures in some countries, such as Denmark,<sup>14</sup> based partly on the assumption that they would be better able to learn from home. This may have offset any advantage that older children would otherwise have had in learning from home.

299 **Learning deficits are larger in poorer countries.** Low and middle-income countries were already struggling with a learning crisis before the pandemic. Despite large expansions of the proportion of children in school, children in low and middle-income countries still perform poorly by international standards, and inequality in learning remains high.<sup>70,71,72</sup> The pandemic is likely to deepen this learning crisis and to undo past progress. Schools in low- and middle-income countries have not only been closed for longer, but




Figure 6: Variation in estimates of COVID-19 learning deficits ( $n=291$ ) across individual- and country-level characteristics: (A) Learning subject (reading vs. math), (B) Level of education (primary vs. secondary), and (C) Country income level (high vs. middle). Each violin plot shows the distribution of COVID-19 learning deficit estimates for the respective subgroup, with the box marking the interquartile range and the white circle denoting the median.

308 have also had fewer resources to facilitate remote learn- 345  
 309 ing.<sup>73,74</sup> Moreover, the economic resources, ICT equipment 346  
 310 and ability of children, parents, teachers, and governments 347  
 311 to support learning from home are likely to be lower in low- 348  
 312 and middle-income countries.<sup>75</sup> 349

313 As discussed above, most evidence on COVID-19 learn- 350  
 314 ing deficits comes from high-income countries. We found 351  
 315 no studies on low-income countries that met our inclusion 352  
 316 criteria, and evidence from middle-income countries is lim- 353  
 317 ited to Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, and South Africa. Fig. 354  
 318 6C groups the estimates of COVID-19 learning deficits in 355  
 319 these four middle-income countries together (on the right) 356  
 320 and compares them to estimates from high-income coun- 357  
 321 tries (on the left). The learning deficit is appreciably larger 358  
 322 in middle-income countries than in high-income countries 359  
 323 (mean difference  $\delta = -0.29$ ,  $t = -2.78$ ,  $p = 0.008$ ). In fact, 360  
 324 the three largest estimates of learning deficits in our sample 361  
 325 are from middle-income countries<sup>28,22,12</sup> (see Fig. 3).

## 326 Discussion

327 Two years into the COVID-19 pandemic, there is still in- 366  
 328 sufficient knowledge about its consequences for the learning 367  
 329 progress of school-age children. This paper makes two main 368  
 330 contributions to better understand the state of the evidence. 369  
 331 First, it systematically reviews the existing literature on the 370  
 332 effect of the pandemic on learning among school-age children 371  
 333 and appraises its geographic reach and quality. Second, it 372  
 334 harmonizes, synthesizes and meta-analyzes the existing evi- 373  
 335 dence in order to examine the extent to which the pandemic 374  
 336 has affected learning, and how this varies across different 375  
 337 groups of students and country contexts.

338 We identify a sizable and growing body of evidence on 376  
 339 the effects of the pandemic on learning. However, exist- 377  
 340 ing studies primarily focus on high-income countries, while 378  
 341 there is a dearth of evidence from low- and middle-income 379  
 342 countries. This is particularly concerning because the small 380  
 343 number of existing studies from middle-income countries 381  
 344 suggest that learning deficits have been particularly severe 382

345 in these countries. Learning deficits are likely to be even 346  
 347 larger in low-income countries, considering that they already 348  
 349 faced a learning crisis before the pandemic, generally im- 349  
 350 plemented longer school closures, and were under-resourced 350  
 351 and ill-equipped to facilitate remote learning.<sup>76,75,72,73,74</sup> It 351  
 352 is critical that this evidence gap on low- and middle-income 352  
 353 countries is addressed swiftly, and that the infrastructure 353  
 354 to collect and share data on educational performance in 354  
 355 middle- and low-income countries is strengthened. Collect- 355  
 356 ing and making available this data is a key prerequisite for 356  
 357 fully understanding the effect of the pandemic on learning 357  
 358 and related outcomes.<sup>77</sup> 358

359 About half of the studies that we identify are rated as 359  
 360 having a serious or critical risk of bias. Future studies should 360  
 361 minimize risk of bias in estimating learning deficits by em- 361  
 362 ploying research designs that appropriately account for com- 362  
 363 mon sources of bias. These include a lack of accounting for 363  
 364 secular time trends, non-representative samples, and imbal- 364  
 365 ances between treatment and comparison groups. These 365  
 366 potential sources of bias may lead existing studies to under- 366  
 367 estimate of learning deficits. 367

368 Our meta-analysis suggests that the COVID-19 pan- 368  
 369 demic has led to substantial learning deficits. The pooled 369  
 370 effect size of  $d = -0.14$ , implies that students lost out on 370  
 371 about 35%, of a school year's worth of learning. This con- 371  
 372 firms initial concerns that the pandemic would cause sub- 372  
 373 stantial harm to student learning.<sup>51,78,79</sup> But our results 373  
 374 also suggest that fears of an accumulation of learning deficits 374  
 375 as the pandemic continues have not materialized.<sup>80,81</sup> On 375  
 376 average, learning deficits emerged early in the pandemic and 376  
 377 have neither closed nor widened. Future research should 377  
 378 continue to follow the learning progress of cohorts of stu- 378  
 379 dents affected by the COVID-19 pandemic to reveal how 379  
 380 learning deficits of these cohorts develop in different coun- 380  
 381 tries. 381

382 The persistence of learning deficits two and a half years 382  
 into the pandemic highlights the need for well-designed, 382  
 well-resourced and decisive policy initiatives to recover

383 learning deficits. Policy-makers, schools, and families will  
384 need to identify and realize opportunities to complement  
385 and expand on regular school-based learning. Experimental  
386 evidence from low- and middle-income countries suggests  
387 that even relatively low-tech and low-cost learning inter-  
388 ventions can have substantial, positive effects on students'  
389 learning progress in the context of remote learning. For  
390 example, sending SMS messages with numeracy problems  
391 accompanied by a short phone call was found to lead to sub-  
392 stantial learning gains in numeracy in Botswana.<sup>82</sup> Send-  
393 ing motivational text messages successfully limited learning  
394 losses in math and Portuguese in Brazil.<sup>83</sup>

395 More evidence is needed to assess the effectiveness  
396 of other interventions for limiting or recovering learning  
397 deficits. Potential avenues include the use of the often exten-  
398 sive summer holidays to offer summer schools and learning  
399 camps, extending school days and school weeks, and orga-  
400 nizing and scaling up tutoring programs. Further potential  
401 lies in developing, improving, advertising and providing ac-  
402 cess to learning apps, online learning platforms, or educa-  
403 tional TV programs that are free at the point of use. Many  
404 countries have already begun investing significant resources  
405 to capitalize on some of these opportunities. If these imple-  
406 mented interventions prove effective, and if the momentum  
407 of existing policy efforts is maintained and expanded, the  
408 disruptions to learning during the pandemic may be a win-  
409 dow of opportunity to improve and extend the education  
410 afforded to children.

411 Most studies that we identify find that learning deficits  
412 have been largest for children from disadvantaged socio-  
413 economic backgrounds. This holds across different time  
414 points during the pandemic, countries, grade levels, and  
415 learning subjects, and independently of how socio-economic  
416 background is measured. This suggests that the pandemic  
417 has exacerbated educational inequalities between children  
418 from different socio-economic backgrounds, which were al-  
419 ready large before the pandemic.<sup>84,85</sup> Policy initiatives to  
420 compensate learning deficits need to prioritize support for  
421 children from low socio-economic backgrounds in order to  
422 allow them to recover the learning they lost during the pan-  
423 demic.

424 There is a need for future research to assess how the  
425 COVID-19 pandemic has affected gender inequality in edu-  
426 cation. To date, there is very little evidence on this issue,  
427 and the large majority of the studies that we identified do  
428 not empirically examine learning deficits separately by gen-  
429 der.

430 Comparing estimates of learning deficits across subjects,  
431 we find that learning deficits tend to be larger in math than  
432 in reading. As noted above, this may be due to the fact  
433 that parents and children have been in a better position to  
434 compensate school-based learning in reading by reading at  
435 home. Accordingly, there are grounds for policy initiatives  
436 to prioritize the compensation of learning deficits in math  
437 and other science subjects.

438 Our analysis provides important evidence of how the  
439 COVID-19 learning deficit has varied between different  
440 groups of students and across country contexts. Given the  
441 limited reach of the existing evidence, we do not seek to

identify the causal role of specific factors. A fruitful av- 442  
enue for future research will be to use quasi-experimental 443  
designs to reveal how specific factors can account for indi- 444  
vidual and society-level variation in the extent of COVID- 445  
19 learning deficits. The considerable variation in learning 446  
deficits across sub-populations and country contexts that we 447  
find highlights the need to better understand this variation, 448  
and identify mechanisms that can guide policy measures for 449  
limiting and counteracting learning deficits. 450

## 451 Methods

**Eligibility criteria.** We consider all types of primary 452  
research, including peer-reviewed publications, preprints, 453  
working papers, and reports for inclusion. To be eligible 454  
for inclusion, studies have to measure learning progress us- 455  
ing test scores that can be standardized across studies using 456  
Cohen's *d*. Moreover, studies have to be in English, Danish, 457  
Dutch, French, German, Norwegian, Spanish or Swedish. 458

**Search strategy and study identification.** We iden- 459  
tify eligible studies using the following steps. First, we 460  
developed a Boolean search string defining our population 461  
(school-aged children), exposure (the COVID-19 pandemic), 462  
and outcomes of interest (e.g., math and reading). The full 463  
search string can be found in Section 1 of the Supplementary 464  
Information. We used this string to search the following aca- 465  
demic databases: Coronavirus Research Database, Educa- 466  
tion Database, ERIC, International Bibliography of the So- 467  
cial Sciences (IBSS), Politics Collection (PAIS index, policy 468  
file index, political science database, and worldwide political 469  
science abstracts), Social Science Database, Sociology Col- 470  
lection (applied social science index [ASSIA] and abstracts, 471  
sociological abstracts, and sociology database), CINAHL, 472  
and Web of Science. Our initial search was conducted on 473  
April 27, 2021. Second, we hand-searched multiple preprint, 474  
working paper, and policy document repositories (SSRN, 475  
MPRA, IZA, NBER, OSF Preprints, PsyArXiv, SocArXiv, 476  
and EdArXiv) and relevant policy websites, including, but 477  
not limited to, the websites of the Organisation for Eco- 478  
nomic Co-operation and Development, the United Nations, 479  
the World Bank, and the Education Endowment Founda- 480  
tion. Third, we periodically posted our protocol via Twitter 481  
in order to crowdsource additional relevant studies not iden- 482  
tified through the search. Last, to ensure that our analysis 483  
is comprehensive in terms of recent and relevant research, 484  
on February 14, 2022, and on August 8, 2022, we conducted 485  
two comprehensive forward and backward citation searches 486  
of all eligible studies identified in the above steps. 487

**Data extraction.** From the studies that meet our inclu- 488  
sion criteria we extract all estimates of the effect of the pan- 489  
demic on learning progress, separately for math and reading 490  
and for different school grades. We also extract the corre- 491  
sponding sample size, standard error, date(s) of measure- 492  
ment, author name(s), and country. Last, we record whether 493  
studies differentiate between children's socio-economic back- 494  
ground, which measure is used to this end, and whether 495  
studies find an increase, decrease or no change in learning 496  
inequality. We contacted study authors, if any of the above 497  
information was missing in the study. Data extraction was 498



performed by the first author and validated independently by the second author, with discrepancies resolved through discussion and by conferring with the third author.

**Measurement and standardization.** We standardize all estimates of the effect of the pandemic on learning using Cohen’s  $d$ , which expresses effect sizes in terms of standard deviations. Cohen’s  $d$  is calculated as the difference in the mean learning gain in a given subject (math or reading) over two comparable periods before and after the onset of the pandemic, divided by the pooled standard deviation of learning progress in this subject:

$$d = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{s},$$

where

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{(s_1^2 + s_2^2)}{2}}.$$

Effect sizes expressed as  $\beta$  coefficients are converted to Cohen’s  $d$ :

$$d = \frac{\beta}{se} \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}.$$

*Subject.* We use a binary indicator for whether the study outcome is math or reading. One study does not differentiate the outcome but includes a composite of math and reading scores.<sup>31</sup>

*Level of education.* We distinguish between primary and secondary education. We first consulted the original studies for this information. In cases where it was not stated in a given study, students’ age was used in conjunction with information about education systems from external sources to determine the level of education.<sup>86</sup>

*Country income level.* We follow the World Bank’s classification of countries into four income groups: low, lower-middle, upper-middle, and high-income. Four countries in our sample place are in the upper-middle group: Brazil, Colombia, Mexico and South Africa. Remaining countries are high-income.

**Data synthesis.** We synthesize our data using three synthesis techniques. First, we generate a forest plot, based on all available estimates of the effect of the pandemic on learning. We pool estimates using a random-effects REML model and inverse variance weights to calculate an overall effect size (see Fig. 3).<sup>87</sup> Second, we code all estimates of the effect of the pandemic on educational inequality between children from different socio-economic backgrounds, according to whether they indicate a positive, negative, or no effect. We visualize the resulting distribution using a harvest plot (see Fig. 5).<sup>88</sup> Third, given that the limited amount of available evidence precludes multivariate or causal analyses, we examine the bivariate association between COVID-19 learning deficits and the months in which learning was measured (see Fig. 4) learning subject, grade, and countries’ income level, using a series of violin plots (see Fig. 6). The reported estimates, confidence intervals and statistical significance tests of these bivariate associations are based on common-effects models with standard errors clustered by study, and two-sided tests.

**Pre-registration.** We prospectively registered a protocol of our systematic review and meta-analysis in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (CRD42021249944) on 19 April 2021.

**Acknowledgements.** B.B. gratefully acknowledges funding from the Observatoire Sociologique du Changement (OSC), Sciences Po. A.B.M. gratefully acknowledges funding from the Carlsberg Foundation. P.E. gratefully acknowledges funding from the Leverhulme Centre for Demographic Science, The Leverhulme Trust, and the Swedish council for working life and social research (grant no. 2016-07099).

## References

- 1 United Nations. The impact of COVID-19 on children. UN Policy Briefs (2020).
- 2 Donnelly, R. & Patrinos, H. A. Learning loss during covid-19: An early systematic review. *Prospects* 1–9 (2021).
- 3 Hammerstein, S., König, C., Dreisörner, T. & Frey, A. Effects of COVID-19-related school closures on student achievement: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology* 4020 (2021).
- 4 Panagouli, E. *et al.* School performance among children and adolescents during COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Children* **8**, 1134 (2021).
- 5 Patrinos, H. A., Vegas, E. & Carter-Rau, R. An analysis of COVID-19 student learning loss. World Bank, Washington, DC (2022).
- 6 Zierer, K. Effects of pandemic-related school closures on pupils’ performance and learning in selected countries: A rapid review. *Education Sciences* **11**, 252 (2021).
- 7 König, C. & Frey, A. The impact of COVID-19-related school closures on student achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* **41**, 16–22 (2022).
- 8 Storey, N. & Zhang, Q. A meta-analysis of COVID learning loss. EdArXiv (2021).
- 9 Gore, J., Fray, L., Miller, A., Harris, J. & Taggart, W. The impact of COVID-19 on student learning in New South Wales primary schools: an empirical study. *The Australian Educational Researcher* **48**, 605–637 (2021).
- 10 Gambi, L. & De Witte, K. The resiliency of school outcomes after the COVID-19 pandemic: Standardised test scores and inequality one year after long term school closures. *FEB Research Report Department of Economics* (2021).
- 11 Maldonado, J. E. & De Witte, K. The effect of school closures on standardised student test outcomes. *British Educational Research Journal* **48**, 49–94 (2021).
- 12 Lichand, G., Doria, C. A., Leal-Neto, O. & Fernandes, J. P. C. The impacts of remote learning in secondary education during the pandemic in Brazil. *Nature Human Behaviour* 1–8 (2022).

- 597 <sup>13</sup> Vegas, E. COVID-19's impact on learning losses and  
598 learning inequality in Colombia. Center for Universal Ed-  
599 ucation at Brookings (2022).
- 600 <sup>14</sup> Birkelund, J. F. & Karlson, K. B. No evidence of a major  
601 learning slide 14 months into the COVID-19 pandemic in  
602 Denmark. SocArXiv (2021).
- 603 <sup>15</sup> Depping, D., Lücken, M., Musekamp, F. & Thonke,  
604 F. Kompetenzstände Hamburger Schüler\*innen vor  
605 und während der Corona-Pandemie. In Fickermann,  
606 D. & Edelstein, B. (eds.) *Schule während der Corona-  
607 Pandemie. Neue Ergebnisse und Überblick über ein dy-  
608 namisches Forschungsfeld*, 51–79 (Münster & New York:  
609 Waxmann, 2021).
- 610 <sup>16</sup> Ludewig, U. *et al.* Die COVID-19 Pandemie und  
611 Lesekompetenz von Viertklässler\*innen: Ergebnisse der  
612 IFS-Schulpanelstudie 2016-2021. Institut für Schul-  
613 entwicklungsforchung, Universität Dortmund (2022).
- 614 <sup>17</sup> Schult, J., Mahler, N., Fauth, B. & Lindner, M. A.  
615 Did students learn less during the COVID-19 pandemic?:  
616 Reading and mathematics competencies before and after  
617 the first pandemic wave. *School Effectiveness and School  
618 Improvement* 1–20 (2022).
- 619 <sup>18</sup> Schult, J., Mahler, N., Fauth, B. & Lindner, M. A.  
620 Long-term consequences of repeated school closures dur-  
621 ing the COVID-19 pandemic for reading and mathemat-  
622 ics competencies. *Frontiers in Education* **13** (2022). URL  
623 <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.867316>.
- 624 <sup>19</sup> Bazoli, N., Marzadro, S., Schizzerotto, A. & Vergolini,  
625 L. Learning loss and students' social origins during the  
626 COVID-19 pandemic in Italy. *FBK-IRVAPP Working Pa-  
627 pers* **3** (2022).
- 628 <sup>20</sup> Borgonovi, F. & Ferrara, A. The effects of COVID-19 on  
629 inequalities in educational achievement in Italy. Available  
630 at SSRN 4171968 (2022).
- 631 <sup>21</sup> Contini, D., Di Tommaso, M. L., Muratori, C., Piazza-  
632 lunga, D. & Schiavon, L. Who lost the most?: Mathe-  
633 matics achievement during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The  
634 BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* **22**, 399–408  
635 (2022).
- 636 <sup>22</sup> Hevia, F. J., Vergara-Lope, S., Velásquez-Durán, A. &  
637 Calderón, D. Estimation of the fundamental learning loss  
638 and learning poverty related to COVID-19 pandemic in  
639 Mexico. *International Journal of Educational Develop-  
640 ment* **88**, 102515 (2022).
- 641 <sup>23</sup> Engzell, P., Frey, A. & Verhagen, M. D. Learning loss due  
642 to school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Pro-  
643 ceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).
- 644 <sup>24</sup> Haelermans, C. Learning growth and inequality in pri-  
645 mary education: Policy lessons from the COVID-19 crisis.  
646 The European Liberal Forum (ELF)-FORES (2021).
- 647 <sup>25</sup> Haelermans, C. *et al.* A full year COVID-19 crisis with  
648 interrupted learning and two school closures: The effects  
649 on learning growth and inequality in primary education.  
650 Maastricht University, Research Centre for Education and  
651 the Labour Market (ROA) (2021).
- 652 <sup>26</sup> Haelermans, C. *et al.* Sharp increase in inequality in ed-  
653 ucation in times of the COVID-19-pandemic. *PLoS One*  
654 **17**, e0261114 (2022).
- 655 <sup>27</sup> Schuurman, T. M., Henrichs, L. F., Schuurman, N. K.,  
656 Polderdijk, S. & Hornstra, L. Learning loss in vulnera-  
657 ble student populations after the first COVID-19 school  
658 closure in the Netherlands. *Scandinavian Journal of Ed-  
659 ucational Research* 1–18 (2021).
- 660 <sup>28</sup> Ardington, C., Wills, G. & Kotze, J. COVID-19 learning  
661 losses: Early grade reading in South Africa. *International  
662 Journal of Educational Development* **86**, 102480 (2021).
- 663 <sup>29</sup> Arenas, A. & Gortazar, L. Learning loss one year after  
664 school closures. *Esade Working Paper* (2022).
- 665 <sup>30</sup> Hallin, A. E., Danielsson, H., Nordström, T. & Fälth, L.  
666 No learning loss in Sweden during the pandemic evidence  
667 from primary school reading assessments. *International  
668 Journal of Educational Research* **114**, 102011 (2022).
- 669 <sup>31</sup> Tomasik, M. J., Helbling, L. A. & Moser, U. Educa-  
670 tional gains of in-person vs. distance learning in primary  
671 and secondary schools: A natural experiment during the  
672 COVID-19 pandemic school closures in Switzerland. *In-  
673 ternational Journal of Psychology* **56**, 566–576 (2021).
- 674 <sup>32</sup> Blainey, K. & Hannay, T. The impact of school closures  
675 on autumn 2020 attainment. RS Assessment from Hodder  
676 Education (2021).
- 677 <sup>33</sup> Blainey, K. & Hannay, T. The impact of school closures  
678 on spring 2021 attainment. RS Assessment from Hodder  
679 Education (2021).
- 680 <sup>34</sup> Blainey, K. & Hannay, T. The effects of educational dis-  
681 ruption on primary school attainment in summer 2021.  
682 RS Assessment from Hodder Education (2021).
- 683 <sup>35</sup> Department for Education. Understanding progress in  
684 the 2020/21 academic year: Complete findings from the  
685 autumn term. London: Department for Education (2021).
- 686 <sup>36</sup> Department for Education. Understanding progress in the  
687 2020/21 academic year: Initial findings from the spring  
688 term. London: Department for Education (2021).
- 689 <sup>37</sup> GL Assessment. Impact of COVID-19 on attainment: ini-  
690 tial analysis. Brentford: GL Assessment (2021).
- 691 <sup>38</sup> Rose, S. *et al.* Impact of school closures and subsequent  
692 support strategies on attainment and socio-emotional  
693 wellbeing in key stage 1: Interim paper 1. London: Na-  
694 tional Foundation for Educational Research (NFER), Ed-  
695 ucation Endowment Foundation (EEF).

- 696 <sup>39</sup> Rose, S. *et al.* Impact of school closures and subsequent  
697 support strategies on attainment and socio-emotional  
698 wellbeing in key stage 1: Interim paper 2. London: Na-  
699 tional Foundation for Educational Research (NFER), Ed-  
700 ucation Endowment Foundation (EEF).
- 701 <sup>40</sup> Weidmann, B. *et al.* COVID-19 disruptions: Attainment  
702 gaps and primary school responses. *Education Endow-*  
703 *ment Foundation: London, UK* (2021).
- 704 <sup>41</sup> Domingue, B. W., Hough, H. J., Lang, D. & Yeatman,  
705 J. Changing patterns of growth in oral reading fluency  
706 during the COVID-19 pandemic. PACE Working Paper,  
707 Policy Analysis for California Education (2021).
- 708 <sup>42</sup> Domingue, B. *et al.* The effect of COVID on oral reading  
709 fluency during the 2020-2021 academic year. EdArXiv  
710 (2021).
- 711 <sup>43</sup> Kogan, V. & Lavertu, S. The COVID-19 pandemic and  
712 student achievement on Ohio’s third-grade English lan-  
713 guage arts assessment. Ohio State University (2021).
- 714 <sup>44</sup> Kogan, V. & Lavertu, S. How the COVID-19 pandemic  
715 affected student learning in Ohio: Analysis of spring 2021  
716 Ohio state tests. Ohio State University (2021).
- 717 <sup>45</sup> Kozakowski, W., Gill, B., Lavalley, P., Burnett, A. &  
718 Ladinsky, J. Changes in academic achievement in Pitts-  
719 burgh public schools during remote instruction in the  
720 COVID-19 pandemic. Institute of Education Sciences  
721 (IES), U.S. Department of Education (2020).
- 722 <sup>46</sup> Kuhfeld, M. & Lewis, K. Student achievement in  
723 2021–2022: Cause for hope and continued urgency.  
724 NWEA (2022).
- 725 <sup>47</sup> Lewis, K., Kuhfeld, M., Ruzek, E. & McEachin, A. Learn-  
726 ing during COVID-19: Reading and math achievement in  
727 the 2020-21 school year. NWEA (2021).
- 728 <sup>48</sup> Locke, V. N., Patarapichayatham, C. & Lewis, S. Learn-  
729 ing loss in reading and math in US schools due to the  
730 COVID-19 pandemic. Istation (2021).
- 731 <sup>49</sup> Pier, L., Christian, M., Tymeson, H. & Meyer, R. H.  
732 COVID-19 impacts on student learning: Evidence from  
733 interim assessments in California. PACE Working Paper,  
734 Policy Analysis for California Education (2021).
- 735 <sup>50</sup> Sterne, J. A. *et al.* ROBINS-I: A tool for assessing risk  
736 of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ*  
737 **355** (2016).
- 738 <sup>51</sup> Azevedo, J. P., Hasan, A., Goldemberg, D., Iqbal, S. A. &  
739 Geven, K. Simulating the potential impacts of COVID-19  
740 school closures on schooling and learning outcomes: A set  
741 of global estimates. *World Bank Policy Research Working*  
742 *Paper* (2020).
- 743 <sup>52</sup> Bloom, H. S., Hill, C. J., Black, A. R. & Lipsey,  
744 M. W. Performance trajectories and performance gaps  
745 as achievement effect-size benchmarks for educational in-  
746 terventions. *Journal of Research on Educational Effec-*  
747 *tiveness* **1**, 289–328 (2008).
- 748 <sup>53</sup> Hill, C. J., Bloom, H. S., Black, A. R. & Lipsey,  
749 M. W. Empirical benchmarks for interpreting effect sizes  
750 in research. *Child Development Perspectives* **2**, 172–177  
751 (2008).
- 752 <sup>54</sup> Belot, M. & Webbink, D. Do teacher strikes harm ed-  
753 ucational attainment of students? *Labour* **24**, 391–406  
754 (2010).
- 755 <sup>55</sup> Jaume, D. & Willén, A. The long-run effects of teacher  
756 strikes: Evidence from Argentina. *Journal of Labor Eco-*  
757 *nomics* **37**, 1097–1139 (2019).
- 758 <sup>56</sup> Cygan-Rehm, K. Are there no wage returns to compul-  
759 sory schooling in Germany?: A reassessment. *Journal of*  
760 *Applied Econometrics* **37**, 218–223 (2022).
- 761 <sup>57</sup> Ichino, A. & Winter-Ebmer, R. The long-run educational  
762 cost of World War II. *Journal of Labor Economics* **22**,  
763 57–87 (2004).
- 764 <sup>58</sup> Cooper, H., Nye, B., Charlton, K., Lindsay, J. &  
765 Greathouse, S. The effects of summer vacation on achieve-  
766 ment test scores: A narrative and meta-analytic review.  
767 *Review of Educational Research* **66**, 227–268 (1996).
- 768 <sup>59</sup> Allington, R. L. *et al.* Addressing summer reading setback  
769 among economically disadvantaged elementary students.  
770 *Reading Psychology* **31**, 411–427 (2010).
- 771 <sup>60</sup> Smith, W. C. Consequences of school closure on access to  
772 education: Lessons from the 2013–2016 Ebola pandemic.  
773 *International Review of Education* **67**, 53–78 (2021).
- 774 <sup>61</sup> Andrabi, T., Daniels, B. & Das, J. Human capital ac-  
775 cumulation and disasters: Evidence from the Pakistan  
776 earthquake of 2005. *Journal of Human Resources* 0520–  
777 10887R1 (2021).
- 778 <sup>62</sup> Parolin, Z. & Lee, E. K. Large socio-economic, geographic  
779 and demographic disparities exist in exposure to school  
780 closures. *Nature Human Behaviour* **5**, 522–528 (2021).
- 781 <sup>63</sup> Goudeau, S., Sanrey, C., Stanczak, A., Manstead, A. &  
782 Darnon, C. Why lockdown and distance learning during  
783 the COVID-19 pandemic are likely to increase the social  
784 class achievement gap. *Nature Human Behaviour* **5**, 1273–  
785 1281 (2021).
- 786 <sup>64</sup> Bailey, D. H., Duncan, G. J., Murnane, R. J. & Au Ye-  
787 ung, N. Achievement gaps in the wake of COVID-19.  
788 *Educational Researcher* **50**, 266–275 (2021).
- 789 <sup>65</sup> van de Werfhorst, H. G. Inequality in learning is a major  
790 concern after school closures. *Proceedings of the National*  
791 *Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).
- 792 <sup>66</sup> Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R. & Olson, L. S. Schools,  
793 achievement, and inequality: A seasonal perspective. *Ed-*  
794 *ucational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* **23**, 171–191  
795 (2001).
- 796 <sup>67</sup> Aucejo, E. M. & Romano, T. F. Assessing the effect  
797 of school days and absences on test score performance.  
798 *Economics of Education Review* **55**, 70–87 (2016).

- 799 <sup>68</sup> Gottfried, M. A. The detrimental effects of missing school: Evidence from urban siblings. *American Journal of Education* **117**, 147–182 (2011).  
800  
801
- 802 <sup>69</sup> Goodman, J. Flaking out: Student absences and snow days as disruptions of instructional time. National Bureau of Economic Research (2014).  
803  
804
- 805 <sup>70</sup> Angrist, N., Djankov, S., Goldberg, P. K. & Patrinos, H. A. Measuring human capital using global learning data. *Nature* **592**, 403–408 (2021).  
806  
807
- 808 <sup>71</sup> Torche, F. Educational mobility in the developing world. In Iversen, V., Krishna, A. & Sen, K. (eds.) *Social Mobility in Developing Countries: Concepts, Methods, and Determinants*, 139–171 (Oxford University Press, 2021).  
809  
810  
811
- 812 <sup>72</sup> World Bank. *World development report 2018: Learning to realize education's promise* (The World Bank, 2018).  
813
- 814 <sup>73</sup> United Nations. Policy brief: Education during COVID-19 and beyond. United Nations (2020).  
815
- 816 <sup>74</sup> UNESCO. One year into COVID-19 education disruption: Where do we stand? <https://en.unesco.org/news/one-year-covid-19-education-disruption-where-do-we-stand> (2021). Accessed: 2022-09-01.  
817  
818  
819
- 820 <sup>75</sup> Azevedo, J. P., Hasan, A., Goldemberg, D., Geven, K. & Iqbal, S. A. Simulating the potential impacts of COVID-19 school closures on schooling and learning outcomes: A set of global estimates. *The World Bank Research Observer* **36**, 1–40 (2021).  
821  
822  
823  
824
- 825 <sup>76</sup> Angrist, N. *et al.* Building back better to avert a learning catastrophe: Estimating learning loss from covid-19 school shutdowns in africa and facilitating short-term and long-term learning recovery. *International Journal of Educational Development* **84**, 102397 (2021).  
826  
827  
828  
829
- 830 <sup>77</sup> Conley, D. & Johnson, T. Opinion: Past is future for the era of COVID-19 research in the social sciences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).  
831  
832
- 833 <sup>78</sup> Major, L. E., Eyles, A., Machin, S. *et al.* Learning loss since lockdown: variation across the home nations. Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics and Political Science (2021).  
834  
835  
836
- 837 <sup>79</sup> Di Pietro, G., Biagi, F., Costa, P., Karpinski, Z. & Mazza, J. The likely impact of COVID-19 on education: Reflections based on the existing literature and recent international datasets. Publications Office of the European Union (2020).  
838  
839  
840  
841
- 842 <sup>80</sup> Fuchs-Schündeln, N., Krueger, D., Ludwig, A. & Popova, I. The long-term distributional and welfare effects of COVID-19 school closures. National Bureau of Economic Research (2020).  
843  
844  
845
- 846 <sup>81</sup> Kaffenberger, M. Modelling the long-run learning impact of the COVID-19 learning shock: Actions to (more than) mitigate loss. *International Journal of Educational Development* **81**, 102326 (2021).  
847  
848  
849
- <sup>82</sup> Angrist, N., Bergman, P. & Matsheng, M. Experimental evidence on learning using low-tech when school is out. *Nature Human Behaviour* **6**, 941–950 (2022).  
850  
851  
852
- <sup>83</sup> Lichand, G., Christen, J. & van Egeraat, E. Do behavioral nudges work under remote learning? evidence from brazil during the pandemic. University of Zurich, Department of Economics, Working Paper (2022).  
853  
854  
855  
856
- <sup>84</sup> Attewell, P. & Newman, K. S. *Growing gaps: Educational inequality around the world* (Oxford University Press, 2010).  
857  
858  
859
- <sup>85</sup> Betthäuser, B. A., Kaiser, C. & Trinh, N. A. Regional variation in inequality of educational opportunity across europe. *Socius* **7**, 23780231211019890 (2021).  
860  
861  
862
- <sup>86</sup> Eurydice. Eurybase: the information database on education systems in Europe (2021).  
863  
864
- <sup>87</sup> Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. & Rothstein, H. R. A basic introduction to fixed-effect and random-effects models for meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods* **1**, 97–111 (2010).  
865  
866  
867  
868
- <sup>88</sup> Ogilvie, D. *et al.* The harvest plot: A method for synthesising evidence about the differential effects of interventions. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* **8**, 1–7 (2008).  
869  
870  
871