

Document de travail du LEM / Discussion paper LEM  
2018- 08 - *version révisée*

# Academic performance of first year university students. Do literacy skills matter? Results from a group-randomized encouragement design experiment

**Estelle BELLITY**

University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée, France; ERUDITE and TEPP-CNRS / [estelle.bellity@u-pem.fr](mailto:estelle.bellity@u-pem.fr)

**Fabrice GILLES**

LEM UMR 9221 / [fabrice.gilles@univ-lille.fr](mailto:fabrice.gilles@univ-lille.fr)

**Yannick L'HORTY**

University Paris-Est, France; ERUDITE and TEPP-CNRS / [yannick.lhorty@u-pem.fr](mailto:yannick.lhorty@u-pem.fr)

<http://lem.cnrs.fr/IMG/pdf/dp2018-08.pdf>

 <http://lem.cnrs.fr/>

Les documents de travail du LEM ont pour but d'assurer une diffusion rapide et informelle des résultats des chercheurs du LEM. Leur contenu, y compris les opinions exprimées, n'engagent que les auteurs. En aucune manière le LEM ni les institutions qui le composent ne sont responsables du contenu des documents de travail du LEM. Les lecteurs intéressés sont invités à contacter directement les auteurs avec leurs critiques et leurs suggestions.

Tous les droits sont réservés. Aucune reproduction, publication ou impression sous le format d'une autre publication, impression ou en version électronique, en entier ou en partie, n'est permise sans l'autorisation écrite préalable des auteurs.

Pour toutes questions sur les droits d'auteur et les droits de copie, veuillez contacter directement les auteurs.

The goal of the LEM Discussion Paper series is to promote a quick and informal dissemination of research in progress of LEM members. Their content, including any opinions expressed, remains the sole responsibility of the authors. Neither LEM nor its partner institutions can be held responsible for the content of these LEM Discussion Papers. Interested readers are requested to contact directly the authors with criticisms and suggestions.

All rights reserved. Any reproduction, publication and reprint in the form of a different publication, whether printed or produced electronically, in whole or in part, is permitted only with the explicit written authorization of the authors.

For all questions related to author rights and copyrights, please contact directly the authors.

# Academic performance of first year university students. Do literacy skills matter? Results from a group- randomized encouragement design experiment

Estelle Bellity<sup>\*</sup>, Fabrice Gilles<sup>†</sup>, Yannick L'Horty<sup>‡</sup>

December 2017

## Abstract

We evaluate the impact of encouraging students to practice literacy skills, as well as improvement in these skills, on students' academic performances in first-year university, which is the most crucial year for graduation. Several previous studies have attempted to understand drivers for academic success in university for students. To our knowledge, none of them focus on directly analyzing the role of literacy skills in explaining academic performance in university. We thus empirically evaluate the effects of literacy skills on students' academic performances. To proceed, we use a group-randomized experiment based on an encouragement design with a group of first-year students in Economics and Management in two French universities. We consider intention to treat and local average treatment estimators. We show that both the encouragement to practice literacy skills and an improvement in literacy test scores positively affect academic performance. First, a better mastery of language skills displays positive impacts on performance in several disciplines, including scientific ones, such as mathematics or statistics. Overall, it increases the probability of first-year university students to complete the first or the second term, and even the full academic year. Second, a greater improvement in academic performances is seen in students who are initially characterized by low literacy skills (men and non-native speakers).

**JEL Classification:** A23, C93, D83, I23.

**Keywords:** literacy, first-year university students, randomized encouragement design, public policy.

This study benefited from financial support from University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region; France) through BQR (French Bonus for the Quality of Research) funds in 2014, awarded to study the relation between literacy skills and academic failure in university students. It also benefited from support from University Lille 1 (Northern France) through funds for Restructuring and Educational Innovations in 2013. We are grateful to Elisabeth Cascio, Emilia Del Bono, Alain Trannoy, as well as to participants in the 65<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the French Economic Association (AFSE, 2016; France), the 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Economics of Education Association (AEDE, 2016; Spain), the 14<sup>th</sup> annual Conference on Evaluation of Public Policies (TEPP, 2016; France), the 8<sup>th</sup> International Workshop in Applied Economics of Education (IWAE, 2017; Italy), and the 29<sup>th</sup> Conference of the European Association of Labour Economists (EALE, 2017; Switzerland). The authors have benefited from helpful comments and suggestions from these audiences. Finally, we would like to thank Laurent Sarfati for his considerable work on our database.

---

<sup>\*</sup> Estelle BELLITY, University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée, France; ERUDITE and TEPP-CNRS (FR 3435), [estelle.bellity@u-pem.fr](mailto:estelle.bellity@u-pem.fr).

<sup>†</sup> Fabrice GILLES, University of Lille, France; LEM-CNRS (UMR 9221) and TEPP-CNRS (FR 3435), [fabrice.gilles@univ-lille.fr](mailto:fabrice.gilles@univ-lille.fr).

<sup>‡</sup> Yannick L'HORTY, University Paris-Est, France; ERUDITE and TEPP-CNRS (FR 3435), [yannick.lhorty@u-pem.fr](mailto:yannick.lhorty@u-pem.fr).

# 1. Introduction

This paper evaluates the impact of practicing literacy skills and of measured improvement of these skills on the academic performance of first-year university students.

In fact, recent descriptive statistics show relatively low levels of graduation in tertiary education. For instance, OECD (2016) mention that in 2013 49 percent of young people graduates at least once, but only 36 percent of people aged less than 30 (12 percent in Luxembourg to 47 percent in Denmark). As well, in 2014, a majority of first-time tertiary graduation earned a bachelor's degree, but only 12 percent a master degree, on average across OECD countries. Over the past 9 years, graduation rates have risen by 12 percentage points on average and this in spite of a large heterogeneity.<sup>4</sup> Moreover (OECD, 2010), considering tertiary-type A programs (BA, MA and Phd), in France, 35 percent graduate from 1<sup>st</sup> degree (UK: 40; US: 37; OECD: 38) whereas 14 percent graduate from 2<sup>nd</sup> degree (UK: 22; US: 17; OECD: 10), and 1.4 percent graduate from advanced degrees (UK: 2; US: 1.5; OECD: 1.4).

Thus, for at least fifteen years, a large strand of literature has developed that has been analyzing determinants of academic achievement in university. Some articles focus on class attendance of students (Arumpalam *et al.* (2012), Chen and Lin (2008), Cohn and Johnson (2006), Delavande *et al.* (2017), Goulas and Megalokonomou (2016), Latif and Miles (2013), and the seminal work of Romer (1993). In spite of the different kinds of course under consideration (principles of economics or microeconomics, public finance economics, introductory statistics course), of the kind of students (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> year university; countries), of identification strategies (randomized trials, panel data methods, instrumental variables), most of those studies show absenteeism impacts negatively academic performance.<sup>5</sup> However, there is a large heterogeneity of situations among students as reported for instance in Goulas and Megalokonomou (2016), who found a positive impact and suggest that students who may have the resources or the human capital accumulation to learn outside the classroom may have lower performance when a strict attendance policy forces them to stay in class.

Other studies analyze the role of student effort (Delavande *et al.* (2017), Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner (2008)) or of teachers (Bettinger and Long (2004), Borjas (2000), Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005), Hoffman and Oreopoulos (2009), Martins and Walker (2006)). As to student effort, considering undergraduate students from a UK university, hours of study as an indicator for student effort and a simultaneous equations approach, Delavande *et al.* (2017) show that active (resp. passive) hours positively (resp. negatively) impacts first-year final mark; instrumenting hours of study with the fact roommate has a video game, Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner (2008) show that study effort improve first semester grade point average of US university students. As to the kind of teacher under consideration, using a dataset of students at public four-year colleges in Ohio and fixed effects models, a value-added instructor model or an instrumental variable strategy, Bettinger and Long (2004) show students taking an "adjunct-heavy" course schedule in their first semester are adversely affected.<sup>6</sup> As well, Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) mention there has been a significant growth

---

<sup>4</sup> For Portugal, graduation rates rose from 9 to 35 percent between 2005 and 2015.

<sup>5</sup> One notable exception is Caviglia (2006) who found results indicating that the attendance policy did not impact grades. GPA prior to taking the course and SAT scores are found to be consistent predictors of performance and have a stronger impact on grades as compared to absentee rates.

<sup>6</sup> In an early draft, the authors suggest that suggest that the effects are small and differ by discipline. Adjuncts and graduate assistants negatively affect students in the humanities while positively affecting students in some of the technical and professional fields.

during the last two decades in the share of faculty members at American colleges and universities that are employed in part-time or full-time non tenure-track positions; using institutional level panel data from the College Board, they show increased usage of these faculty types adversely affect graduation rates at 4-year colleges. Borjas (2000) analyzes the impact of foreign teaching assistants on economics students' performances at Harvard; data suggests foreign-born Teaching Assistants have an adverse impact on the class performance of undergraduate students. Questioning the role of effectiveness of instructors, and considering first and second year university students from a UK university, Martins and Walker (2006) found no significant impact on grades. On the other hand, using student and instructor administrative data from a large Canadian university and fixed effects model, Hoffman and Oreopoulos (2009) analyze the importance of teacher quality at the postsecondary level and distinguish between subjective or objective factors; they show no effect of objective factors (instructor teaches full-time or part-time, does research, has tenure, or is highly paid), but a large and positive one for subjective characteristics of quality: replacing one instructor with another ranked one standard deviation higher in perceived effectiveness increases average grades by 0.5 percentage points, decreases the likelihood of dropping a class by 1.3 percentage points and increases in the number of same-subject courses taken in second and third year by about 4 percent.

Finally, some papers study peer effects (Arcidiacono and Nicholson (2004), Arcidiacono *et al.* (2012), Hoxby (2000), Martins and Walker (2006), Sacerdote (2001)). In particular, considering data on the universe of students who graduated from US medical schools between 1996 and 1998, Arcidiacono and Nicholson (2004) estimate positive peer effects that disappear when school-specific fixed effects are added to control for the endogeneity of a peer group.<sup>7</sup> This result is confirmed by Arcidiacono *et al.* (2012), who, using university of Maryland panel data, find statistically significant positive peer effects on course grades, particularly in courses of a collaborative nature. As well, using data available for freshman and the fact year roommates and dormmates are randomly assigned to from Dartmouth College, Sacerdote (2001) finds that peers have an impact on grade point average at the individual room level. On the contrary, Martins and Walker (2006) found more ambiguous results: there are positive endogenous peer effects that disappear and even become negative when controlling for class characteristics.

Consequently, some programs were adopted to question how to increase academic achievement (Angrist *et al.* (2007); Bettinger and Long (2009)). Sometimes programs aim at improving the quality of students through services or incentives, Angrist *et al.* (2007) implement a randomized field experiment that comprised three kinds of programs was applied to undergraduates at a large Canadian university: the first treatment offered peer advising and organized study group ("services"); the second proposed merit scholarship ("incentives") for solid, but not necessarily top, first year grades; the third combined the two first interventions. The authors found no effect for male students, whereas there were positive impacts of the combined treatment on fall and first-year grades for women for whom service take-up rates were much. Questioning the fact graduate high school students are academically underprepared for college, and considering Ohio university students and an instrumental variables strategy based on variation in placement policies and the importance of proximity in college choice, Bettinger and Long (2009) find that students in remediation are more likely to persist in college in comparison to students with similar backgrounds who were not required to take the courses. ). Other programs try to change school resources, such as class size, or to provide financial incentives (Desjardin and McCall (2006), Dynarski (2002), Garibaldi *et al.*

---

<sup>7</sup> They also find no evidence that peer effects are stronger for blacks, that peer groups are formed along racial lines, or that students with relatively low ability benefit more from their peers than students with relatively high-ability. However, they find some evidence that peer groups form along gender lines.

(2007), Leuven *et al.* (2010)). In general, financial incentives do not systematically impact positively academic achievement: it depends on the kind of incentives that is implemented. For instance, Desjardin and McCall (2006) evaluate the effect of a program that aim to improve access to and success in higher education for low-income and high-achieving minority students by providing them with full tuition scholarships and other types of support; they show the program improves a number of important student outcomes for low income, high ability, and minority students served by the program. As well, Dynarski (2002) considers an aid that requires relatively modest academic performance and provide scholarships to hundreds of thousands of students. She shows that the new programs typically increase the attendance probability of college age youth by five to seven percentage points. The merit programs also shift students toward four year schools and away from two-year schools. Using a regression discontinuity design on data from Bocconi University in Italy, Garibaldi *et al.* (2007) show that an increase of 1,000 euro in the continuation tuition reduces the probability of late graduation by at least 6.1 percentage points with respect to a benchmark average probability of 80%; they conclude suggesting that an increase in continuation tuition is efficient when effort is sub optimally supplied (presence of public subsidies to education, congestion externalities and/or peer effects). Finally, Leuven *et al.* (2010) consider a randomized field experiment where first-year university students could earn financial rewards; they show heterogeneous results: positive effects on achievement of high-ability students, but a negative impact on achievement of low-ability students.

Until now, no paper focuses on the role of basic skills – and in particular of literacy skills – in explaining academic performance of university students. However, it may be of great interest. First, according to Lindblom-Ylanne *et al.* (1996), the best predictor for academic success in BA is the result to an exam that checks the ability of students to understanding while reading and building a summary of an article. Moreover, Coulombe and Tremblay (2006) study the link between the literacy level and the economic growth. They show that measurement of human capital based on literacy scores contain more information than years of schooling about relative growth of countries; human capital indicators may have a positive effect on transitory growth and long-run levels of GDP per head.

Second, as it is so far reported in OECD (2000) on the basis of the IALS survey, a lot of people suffer in most OECD countries from lack in reading or writing literacy skills (orthography, grammar, conjugation among other). Over 1994-1997, in 14 countries out of 20, at least 15 percent of adults have too low reading and writing skills. There is also a great heterogeneity: stronger figures are displayed in countries where there are more people with low education levels. Following the country under consideration, basic requirements would not be shared by one to three out of four people. Besides, on the labor market, low literacy skills' levels are shared by particular socio professional categories (blue-collar) or by people who experience large unemployment spells. The same kinds of statistics are displayed in a more specific way in Reardon *et al.* (2012) or in Daussin *et al.* (2011) for the US or for France.

Third, as reported in Calmant and Hallier (2008) for France, every year, 20 percent of university students (75,000) leave without any diploma; among them, 46,200 drop out before the end of BA (3rd year). Only half students achieve 2<sup>nd</sup> year in French university two years after they begin. A quarter leaves university without any diploma. Students without any diploma suffer more often from unemployment. Thus, the French government implemented in 2008 a policy to improve academic performance in first-year universities. Its aim is fighting

against academic failure of university students, and more particularly to divide by two the academic failure, and reach the threshold of 50 percent of graduated people in university (for each age class). This plan met a relative success over 2008-2012.

Fourth, no analyze focuses on the relation between literacy skills and academic performance at the university level. Therefore, it had become a priority to analyze the empirical relationship between literacy skills and academic performances.

Thus, we evaluate the impact of practicing and improving literacy skills on the academic performance of first-year university students. For this purpose, we implement a (group-) randomized experiment based on an encouragement design (Holland, 1988; Duflo, Glennerster and Kremer, 2007) in a group of first-year university students. Our experiment involved all students entering the first year of university in Economics and Management over 2011-2014 at two French universities, Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée and Lille 1. Each week of the first term of the academic year, half of the students were encouraged to improve their literacy skills through the use of an innovative educational tool, called *Projet Voltaire*, whereas the other half was not encouraged at all, although they also had access to this tool. Moreover, the *Projet Voltaire* allowed us to evaluate the literacy level of students at the beginning and at the end of the first term of the academic year, *i.e.* before and after the literacy training period. We consider a sample of 849 university students, for whom baseline administrative information is available, as well as scores on the two literacy tests, all final exam scores and first year grade averages. We then evaluate the impact both of the encouragement to practice literacy skills and of improving such skills on academic performance. Using local average treatment estimators (Angrist *et al.*, 2000; Angrist and Imbens, 1995; Imbens and Angrist, 1994), we show that increasing literacy test scores has a positive impact on first-year academic results, whether we consider language-based disciplines or more scientific disciplines. In particular, depending on the kind of discipline we consider, learning literacy could increase academic test scores by a half-point to one-and-a-half points. Consequently, it increases the probability of first-year university students to complete the first or the second term, and even the full academic year. Finally, encouragement to practice literacy skills had an increased benefit on students who initially tested at lower levels for literacy skills. These findings hold for both universities, Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée and Lille 1, although student populations at the two universities are quite different.

Our contribution is threefold. First, to our knowledge, this study is the only one to analyze the role played by literacy as a driver of academic success in university students. We thus contribute to the literature that focuses on academic performance of university students. It also contributes to the literature that evaluates programs implemented to improve literacy skills in primary and secondary schools (Aucejo and James (2016), Banerjee *et al.* (2007), Borman *et al.* (2007), Bouguen (2016), Garet *et al.* (2008), Glewwe *et al.* (2002), Glewwe *et al.* (2004), Kim (2007), Rouse and Krueger (2004), Jacob (2016), Machin and Mc Nally (2008), Slavin *et al.* (2009)). Second, our results suggest that public policy goals should include improving literacy skills among university students. In particular, our findings provide

additional empirical support for educational programs that have already been implemented in some countries, but also for the fact they should be targeted on students who were initially tested at lower levels for literacy skills. Third, we also contribute to the recent literature that deals with evaluation in education economics using randomized experiments, either for programs applied to increase success in tertiary education (Angrist *et al.* (2007), Arcidiacono *et al.* (2012), Krueger and Whitmore (2001), Leuven *et al.* (2010), Sacerdote *et al.* (2001)), or for programs that aim at improving literacy skills (Banerjee *et al.* (2007), Borman *et al.* (2007) (“Success for all” experiment), Glewwe *et al.* (2002), Jacob (2016), Kim (2007), Rouse and Krueger (2004)) in primary and secondary schools. For the occasion, and contrary to most past studies, we examine external validity of our results.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 displays descriptive statistics about literacy skills and presents the related literature. Section 3 describes the randomized experiment design we implemented to encourage students to practice literacy. Section 4 presents the empirical strategy used to identify the effects of improved literacy on academic performance of first-year university students. Section 5 displays results. Section 6 questions external validity of our results. Section 7 concludes with recommendations.

## **2. Literacy skills: features in OECD countries and related literature**

In this section, we display recent features on literacy skills in OECD countries. Then we review the literature that has been recently developed to deal with this matter.

### **2.1 Descriptive Statistics**

This part defines literacy and presents recent features on literacy on OECD countries.

#### **2.1.1 Definition and measurement**

According to OECD (2000), literacy refers to the ability to read, understand and use written information at home, at work, and in collectivity in order to achieve personal goals and to increase knowledge. Besides, measuring a literacy degree is not simply considering a threshold beyond that the individual is considered to have a sufficient level to cope with everyday life. In IALS survey, literacy is defined by three kinds of skills: prose literacy (understand and use information from texts); document literacy (the knowledge and skills required to locate and use information contained in various formats); quantitative literacy (the knowledge and skills required to apply arithmetic operations). On this basis, 1<sup>st</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> literacy skills levels are distinguished. Finally, three main groups of skills level are finally built: low, medium and high literacy skills. The low literacy level includes the 1<sup>st</sup> group (people who may not be able to understand the medication label to be given to a child) and 2<sup>nd</sup> group of people (people who are only able to understand easy texts) of the classification. The medium literacy level considers only the 3<sup>rd</sup> group of people (individuals who are able to face private and professional requirements). The highest literacy level includes the 4<sup>th</sup> and the 5<sup>th</sup> groups of people (people who have large literacy knowledge that allow them to manage a large set of information).

#### **2.1.2 Literacy skills in OECD countries: some features**



One of the first set of descriptive statistics on literacy skills in OECD countries was published around the International Adult Literacy Survey – IALS – survey. Conducted between 1994 and 1998, the IALS was the first-ever, large-scale, international comparative assessment designed to identify and measure a range of adult skills and to help assess the impact of literacy in the 20th-century global economies. It covers the 1994-2000 time period and about 20 countries.<sup>8</sup> This survey displays 3 main features about literacy skills in OECD countries (OECD, 2000).

First, in 14 countries out of 20, at least 15 percent of adults have the lowest reading and writing skills. This rate is smaller than 15 percent in only 6 out of 20 countries.<sup>9</sup> Besides, following the country under consideration, basic requirements are not shared by 1 to 3 out of 4 people. Finally, there is a large heterogeneity, because this rate is the lowest in countries with an average low education level.

Second, literacy knowledge depends largely on individual, family and social backgrounds. Indeed, higher literacy skills are associated to larger education, inversely related to age<sup>10</sup>, positively correlated to family background (mainly education of parents), and improve in the long run only through practicing (at home or at work).

Third, IALS makes the link between literacy skills levels and features on the labor market. In particular, literacy skills depend on the socio professional category: executives (resp. blue-collar workers) are characterized by larger (resp. smaller) literacy skills. These are smaller among unemployed people: individuals who experience large unemployment spell are characterized by lower skill levels. Larger literacy levels are more frequently found among workers who achieve secondary school or university.

### **2.1.3 Literacy features in the US and in France**

In this part, we display literacy skills in France and in the US. For the US, Reardon *et al.* (2012) focus on elementary and middle schools. First, they show that only one third of US pupils possess the knowledge-based competences (in the more comprehensive sense). There is no declining performance across time, at least over the past 40 years, but an increase among 9 years old students and it is something flat for 13 and 17 years old students. Second, there is large heterogeneity (age, race, ethnicity and social background) behind these figures. Indeed, 10 percent of seventeen years old students are at the level of the typical nineteen years old pupils. Then, Black and Hispanic students enter high school with average literacy skills three years behind those of White and Asian students. Moreover, students from low-income families enter high school with average literacy skills five years behind those of high-income students. Finally, girls consistently perform roughly two-tenths of a standard deviation higher than boys on reading assessments (elementary and middle schools).

For France, Daussin *et al.* (2011) found similar features. Indeed, there has been an increase in the share of pupils characterized by low levels of understanding written texts. Average literacy skill level (ie. understanding written texts) has been remaining quite stable for 10 years (primary/secondary schools), below the average level of the European Union. Basic reading skills are quite the same, whereas writing skills decrease on average over time. Like in the US, there is large a heterogeneity. Indeed, economic, as well as social and cultural status of parents explains a large part in the decrease in the literacy test scores of students. This part is on average larger in France than in other OECD countries. Like in the US, skills related to understanding written text are greater among girls than among boys. This gap

---

<sup>8</sup> Those countries were not necessarily covered by the survey over the same time period.

<sup>9</sup> Note that Sweden – that is characterized by the highest literacy test scores – includes only 8 percent of adults with the lowest literacy skills.

<sup>10</sup> Older people are characterized by a smaller number of years of education.

between girls and boys has been increasing over time. The same patterns are shared by most OECD countries.

## **2.2 Related literature and programs in primary and secondary skills**

As a consequence of these figures, governments decide to implement several programs either in primary or in secondary school. They aim at improving literacy skills to increase pupil performance.

Among other, within the framework of the “No Child Left Behind act” (2001), the program “Success for all” was implemented in the US in 2003. As well, another program called the “Literacy hour” was adopted in the UK in 1996. This program appeared to be influential in the development of such a policy in the US.

Programs that aim at improving literacy skills gave rise to several evaluations or experiments, mainly in the field of education economics.

No systematic success was found. It depends on the kind of program that was adopted. Indeed, some programs imply spending more on resources (Glewwe *et al.* (2002), Glewwe *et al.* (2004) or Kim (2007)) that found no positive impact of such policy on the level of literacy skills on the whole sample of treated individuals, but often heterogeneous effects. Glewwe *et al.* (2002) aim at evaluating a program through which a Dutch non-profit organization provided textbooks to 25 rural Kenyan primary schools that were chosen randomly from a group of 100 candidate schools; they show the program raised test scores for those students in the top quintile of the distribution of initial academic achievement, but, considering the whole sample of students, after one school year, average test scores did not differ substantially between program and comparison schools. As well, using data from rural Kenyan schools based on a randomized trial and a differences-in-differences estimator, Glewwe *et al.* (2004) provide no evidence that flip charts increase test scores. Evaluating the effect of an reading intervention in which 331 children in grades 1-5 were randomly assigned to receive 10 books matched to their reading levels and preferences during summer vacation, Kim (2007) show no significant difference in reading achievement, although the treatment group reported reading more books and participating in more literacy activities than did the control group.

Other interventions try to implement professional development of the teacher: Garet *et al.* (2008) in particular show no effect of these programs. Indeed, they focus on two professional development interventions on early reading instruction and achievement. They evaluate their consequences on both teachers and students. While the authors found some positive impacts on teacher knowledge of scientifically-based reading instruction and on some teacher instructional practices, they found no significant impact on student reading test scores at the end of the one-year intervention, nor at the end of the next school year.

More recently, considering changes in the content or the pedagogy of teaching literacy, Banerjee *et al.* (2005), Bouguen (2016), Jacob (2017) or Machin and McNally (2008) exhibit more optimistic results toward an increase in reading performances.

On the one hand, Jacob (2017) evaluate the effect of Evidence Based Literacy Instruction (EBLI), a program aims to provide teachers with several instructional strategies to improve reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension and that was developed in Michigan in 2003. At its core, EBLI is a phonics-based reading program. To achieve reading accuracy, EBLI uses awareness of sounds (phonetic awareness) and the different ways the same sound can be spelled. Sixty-three teachers in grades 2-5 in seven Michigan charter schools were randomly assigned within school-grade blocks to receive EBLI training or a business-as-usual control condition. Comparing students in treatment and control classrooms during the 2014-15 school year, Jacob (2017) shows no impact of EBLI on reading performance.

On the other hand, Machin and McNally (2008) and Banerjee *et al.* (2005) or Bouguen (2016) find more positive effects of other programs. Machin and McNally (2008) study the impact of

a new reading curriculum that was introduced in English primary schools in the 1990s. Known as “The Literacy Hour,” the new curriculum was highly structured and provided teachers with a much more concrete sense of exactly what and how to teach literacy, including a range of recommended texts for students at different reading levels. Using a difference-in-difference strategy, the authors find that the literacy hour increased the fraction of students reaching proficient levels by 2–3 percentage points relative to a pre-intervention mean of roughly 40 percent. These results confirm that of Banerjee et al (2005). Those authors study effects of two randomized experiments that aim at looking whether or not the content of teaching and the pedagogy of teaching matter for student achievement in a developing country such as India. These two programs are: “Remedial education: the Balsakhi Program” and “Computer-Assisted Learning” (CAL). Banerjee et al (2005) found Substantial positive effect of both programs on children’s academic achievement. In particular, the Balsakhi program led to an increase in test scores in year 1, and also a greater one in year 2; the CAL program induce a rise in math scores in year 1, and a greater one in year 2. As well, Bouguen (2016) finds a positive impact of an intensive in-service teacher training program on reading skills offered to kindergarten teachers in France. The program modifies the lesson content and encourages teachers to adapt instruction to student needs by dividing the class according to initial achievement. The author finds that this professional development program that encouraged kindergarten teachers to divide the class by initial ability and adapt their instruction to a student's current skill level increased student performance with regards to reading literacy skills. Examining the role of basic skills on education, Aucejo and James (2016) study the differential roles of math and verbal skills for educational outcomes. By estimating a multi-period factor model of skills, and using a panel database that follows all students in England from elementary school to university, the authors find that verbal skills play a greater role in explaining university enrollment than math skills.

Some programs implement packages: Borman *et al.* (2007) or Slavin *et al.* (2009) shows positive impacts of such devices. Considering “Success for All”, a comprehensive reading reform model, where schools were randomly assigned to treatment or control group, Borman *et al.* (2007) estimate hierarchical linear model to show that both longitudinal or in-mover samples revealed statistically significant school-level effects of treatment assignment (as large as one third of a standard deviation). Slavin *et al.* (2009) reviews research on the achievement outcomes of four types of approaches to improving the reading success of children on the elementary grades: reading curricula, instructional technology, instructional process programs, and combinations of curricula and instructional process.<sup>11</sup> The review concludes that instructional process programs designed to change daily teaching practices have substantially greater research support than programs that focus on curriculum or technology alone.

Finally, other policy make use of new information technologies to increase literacy skills: Rouse and Krueger (2004) found no significant impact of such policy, whereas Machin *et al.* (2007) showed it may prove to be efficient. On the basis of a randomized study, Rouse and Krueger (2004) look at the impact of an instructional computer program, which is designed to improve language and reading skills; they consider students having difficulty learning to read using four different measures of language and reading ability and there results suggest that computer program may improve some aspects of students’ language skills, it does not appear

---

<sup>11</sup> Study inclusion criteria included use of randomized or matched control groups, a study duration of at least 12 weeks, valid achievement measures independent of the experimental treatments, and a final assessment at the end of Grade 1 or later. A total of 63 beginning reading (starting in Grades K or 1) and 79 upper elementary (Grades 2 through 5) reading studies met these criteria.

that these gains translate into a broader measure of language acquisition or into actual readings skills. In a more recent article, Machin *et al.* (2007) exploit a change in the rules governing ICT funding across different school districts of England to devise an Instrumental Variable strategy to identify the causal impact of ICT expenditure on pupil outcomes; their finding suggest a positive impact on primary school performance in English and Science, though not for Mathematics.

### **2.3 Academic performance in university and literacy skills**

However, until now, there has been no program that was implemented in tertiary education (college or university) to study the effect of basic skills on academic achievement in tertiary education. Nevertheless, as reported for instance in OECD (2007; 2016), there are rather (relatively) low levels of graduations in tertiary education. Thus, a lot of articles focus on determinants of success in university students. So far, no attention was paid to the role played by basic skills in this context. Since there are low literacy levels for many people in most OECD countries, it may be of interest to analyze the relation between literacy skills and levels of graduations or to problems on the labor market (low wages / large unemployment spell). This is what we aim to study in this article.

## **3. A randomized encouragement experiment on literacy skills practice**

To study the potential effect of literacy skills on academic achievement in first year university, we consider a randomized encouragement trial. It was first carried out at University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). It was implemented during tutorial classes whose goal is to teach methodological skills to all first-year university students in Economics and Management. Similar tutorials take place in all French universities. The experiment began at the beginning of the first semester of the academic year, when the instructor would tell the students about an online tool – called *Projet Voltaire* – that they could use to practice literacy skills (orthography, grammar, conjugation and syntax). This tool provides seven ordered levels of exercises for improving literacy skills and includes an application that keeps track of recurring mistakes for a given user profile, thus allowing students who practice to increase their literacy skill level. Once this initial information was given to students, they received differentiated information, according to the tutorial group they belong to.

In half of the tutorial groups, teachers actively encouraged their students to use the *Projet Voltaire* tool more intensively, by following a precise and identical protocol for each of these groups. At each tutorial session, they reminded students about the importance of literacy skills, or spent a few minutes reviewing a few relevant tips and rules. They also gave detailed explanations on how to use the *Projet Voltaire* web platform and reminded students that a test score would be given for this work and would be taken into account to compute final grades for the methodology course unit. We refer to these tutorial groups as the “encouraged” groups. In the other half of tutorial groups, nothing specific was done to encourage students to practice literacy skills via the *Projet Voltaire* web platform following the initial announcement given to all students; we refer to these tutorial groups as “non-encouraged”.

The students were divided and tutorial groups formed based simply on alphabetical order, and teachers were randomly assigned to tutorial groups. This assures that the assignment of students to the encouragement condition was random.

This trial was first implemented with first-year students in Economics and Management at University of Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée for three consecutive academic years between 2011-2012 and 2013-2014. Our final sample includes 526 students entering the literacy skills training experiment for the first year (2011), for whom information from a baseline administrative survey -necessary to the evaluation - is available. The average age of the first-year university student population is 18.5. More than half are male (56.8%) and almost all are of French nationality (94.5%). They are frequently scholarship students (37.6%). In addition, they often hold a baccalaureate with a concentration in Economics and Social Science (58.6%), with a Scientific profile (29.5%), or in Sciences and Technology in Management (8%). Most live in the region around Paris, in one of several administrative departments neighboring the University area, such as Seine-et-Marne (55.6%), Seine-Saint-Denis (24.7%) or Val-de-Marne (15.2%). Moreover, just over half of them passed the baccalaureate school-leaving exam in the Seine-et-Marne department (50.4%).

This random trial was extended in 2013-2014 to first-year university students in Economics and Management at Lille University of Science and Technology (University Lille 1), with some minor differences in implementation due to the local organization of teaching. In this portion of the study, we retained a final dataset of 323 first-year university students. This complementary random experiment allows us to verify the external validity of the results we obtained through the main experiment at University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée.

Our evaluation of the impact of literacy skills training on student academic achievement relies on several types of information. First, we needed access to complete information about the first and second term grades in all disciplines for the entire first-year student group in Economics and Management. The academic performance data were provided by official grade reports for the two semesters by both universities. For every student and course taken, these reports contain final grades as well as grades for the final exam and the in-class assessment component that together make up the overall course grades. In addition to the course grades, they also include the student's overall average in all courses for the semester. Next, we merged this information with data provided by the web platform tool *Projet Voltaire*, specifically extracting the scores from the two literacy tests that all students took before and after the literacy practice period. Table 1 shows that the score of the initial literacy test<sup>12</sup> for first-year students in Economics and Management at UPEM is on average 6.1 points (on a scale of 20). This average level is the same for the two categories of tutorial groups, which also showed no significant differences regarding variables provided by the following baseline administrative information: age, gender, nationality, type of baccalaureate, French

---

<sup>12</sup> The time allowed for each of the two literacy tests is at most 45 minutes. These tests evaluate literacy skills that are supposed to be acquired by students who hold a baccalaureate.

administrative department where baccalaureate was awarded, current department of residence, and scholarship status. This table confirms that students were randomly assigned to the groups, independently of the type of encouragement.

**Table 1.** Testing for differences in sample characteristics between tutorial groups that were encouraged to practice literacy skills and those who were not; all are first-year university students in Economics and Management at University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée.

Characteristic	Encouraged (1)	Not encouraged (2)	Difference (1)-(2) (significance)
Score on first literacy test <sup>a</sup>	6.5	6.4	0.1
Age <sup>b</sup>	18.6	18.4	0.2
Gender (% male) <sup>c</sup>	56.5	57.3	-0.7
French nationality	94.3	94.7	-0.3
Scholarship student	37.8	37.4	0.4
<i>Type of baccalaureate <sup>c</sup>:</i>			
Bac ES (Economics and Social Science track)	56.8	60.8	-2.0
Bac S (Science track)	30.0	28.6	1.4
Bac STG (Technology in Management track)	9.4	6.2	3.2
Other (Literary track; foreign student)	3.7	4.4	-0.7
<i>French department for baccalaureate <sup>c</sup>:</i>			
Seine et Marne	50.2	50.7	-0.5
Seine-Saint-Denis	29.8	27.3	2.4
Val de Marne	10.4	13.2	-2.8
Other (including in the provinces or abroad)	9.3	0.4	-0.9
<i>French department of residence <sup>c</sup>:</i>			
Seine et Marne	54.5	56.8	-2.3
Seine-Saint-Denis	25.1	24.2	0.9
Val de Marne	15.4	15.0	0.4
Other (including in the provinces or abroad)	5.0	4.0	1.0

Source: randomized experiment implemented at University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 526 first-year students in Economics and Management entering the university in 2011-2013, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, in addition to scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: <sup>a</sup> score; <sup>b</sup> years; <sup>c</sup> percentage. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance of the difference at a 1% level (5% or 10% respectively).

Third, we consider data provided by the pedagogical tool *Projet Voltaire*. In fact, *Projet Voltaire* provides us the literacy practice time data over the experimental period (between the first and the second literacy tests), as well as the overall connection time to the web platform. These connection times include the time needed to complete the two literacy tests, as well as the time used by students to do training exercises or to read and learn specific rules in orthography, grammar, conjugation or syntax.<sup>13</sup> Consequently, we have two means of measuring time spent practicing literacy skills: time spent on individual training exercises and overall training time, which is the difference between the overall connection time and time spent to complete the two tests.

<sup>13</sup> The overall connection time also includes the time during which a student is connected without doing any exercises or studying literacy rules. However, this time is rather short because any user connected to the web-platform is automatically disconnected after more than a few minutes of inactivity.

Such information allows us to test the efficiency of the encouragement device. Whatever the given econometric specification or the considered indicator used to measure literacy skills practice time, Table 2 shows a positive correlation between encouragement and practice time. In other words, students who had benefited from encouragement spent more time practicing - 59 to 79 minutes more over the experimental period - than other students.<sup>14</sup>

**Table 2.** Measured effect of receiving active encouragement on the literacy practice time for first-year university students in Economics and Management at University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée, considering different econometric specifications.

Literacy practice time indicator (specification)/ Explanatory variables	Indicator 1 (1)	Indicator 1 (2)	Indicator 1 (3)	Indicator 2 (1)	Indicator 2 (2)	Indicator 2 (3)
Encouragement	58.397*** (11.258)	58.562*** (11.315)	58.989*** (11.088)	78.801*** (15.300)	78.672*** (15.354)	79.146*** (14.934)
Score on first literacy test		-1.984 (2.347)	-6.869*** (2.482)		1.555 (3.245)	-5.045 (3.423)
Age			-0.439 (1.832)			-0.502 (2.411)
Gender (% male)			-68.015*** (12.287)			-94.006*** (16.497)
Scholarship student			18.374 (12.646)			26.752 (17.014)
Scientific Baccalaureate			11.720 (11.967)			18.671 (16.299)
Other baccalaureate			-33.831 (22.258)			-43.384 (26.476)
Intercept	71.983*** (7.095)	84.816*** (17.262)	157.745*** (40.886)	107.493*** (9.982)	97.437*** (23.341)	193.506*** (54.727)
Observations	526	526	526	526	526	526
R2	0.045	0.046	0.121	0.045	0.045	0.123
F	26.91	13.50	11.34	26.53	14.18	12.35

Source: randomized experiment implemented at University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 526 first-year students in Economics and Management entering the university in 2011-2013, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, in addition to scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement on time to literacy practice (OLS estimator). Robust standard errors within parentheses. Time to practice literacy: indicator 1 = indicator provided by platform Projet Voltaire; indicator 2 = overall time spent using platform Projet Voltaire - duration of the 1<sup>st</sup> literacy evaluation - duration of the 2<sup>nd</sup> literacy evaluation. Explanatory variables: score on the first literacy test, student age; student gender (reference=female); scholarship student; baccalaureate (reference= baccalaureate ES, Economics and Social Science track); baccalaureate with merit (reference= baccalaureate without merit). Robust standard errors. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at a 1% level (respectively a 5% or 10%).

Reading: at a 1 percent level, and considering the first-time indicator for literacy training, encouraging students to practice literacy skills implies an increase in literacy practice time of about one hour for first-year students in Economics and Management at University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée.

Finally, at the end of the first semester and before final exams took place, the period for practicing literacy skills was closed and a second literacy test was administered to all students. This second literacy test allows us to build an indicator to measure the increase in literacy skills, namely the difference between the scores on the two literacy tests. This difference goes from -2.9 to +13.6 points (on a scale of 20) and is about the same among the two kinds of students. However, on average, the rise in the literacy scores is 3.72 for students who benefited from encouragement vs. 2.51 for other students. As expected, this variation is larger for students who were encouraged and thus spent more time practicing literacy.

<sup>14</sup> The share of students who did never connect to the web platform is greater in tutorial groups who were not encouraged than in other groups. The difference between the two kinds of groups is equal to 25 percentage points.

Tables A1 and A2 in the appendix show a positive correlation between the increase in literacy test scores and the amount of time students spent practicing literacy skills.

#### 4. Identification

We use our randomized encouragement experiment (Holland, 1988; Duflo *et al.*, 2007) to evaluate the impact of literacy skills on the academic performances of first-year university students in Economics and Management, in particular across disciplines.

Using the framework of the Rubin Causal Model (Rubin, 1974), hereafter RCM, we identify the causal effect using an instrumental variable estimation strategy, following Angrist *et al.* (1996).  $Y_i$  is the outcome variable. It represents the grade for the final exam, the in-class component or the overall course grade for any course taken by student  $i$  in the first year of the Economics and Management program; it may also refer to whether student  $i$  completes the academic period in question (*i.e.*, the first or second semester or the full academic year).  $T_i$  is the treatment, and refers to varying the literacy skill level as measured by the two literacy test scores. We first consider  $T_i$  as taking only two values: either there is an increase in the literacy level ( $T_i=1$ , literacy score is greater for the second than for the first test) or not ( $T_i=0$ ). We then evaluate the impact of increasing the literacy level on first-year students' final exam scores or final grades (for instance) in Economics and Management (*average treatment effect*):

$$ATE=E(Y_{1i} - Y_{0i})$$

Where  $Y_{1i}$  (or respectively  $Y_{0i}$ ) is the final exam score in the discipline in question if there is an increase in literacy test scores (or in absence of any increase, respectively). However, the treatment – increasing literacy skills or not – is endogenous: there are a lot of observed and unobserved variables that affect both the outcome and treatment variables. In particular, increasing literacy skills depends (at least in part) on the amount of time spent on a voluntary basis by students to practice literacy, but also on individual ability. Hence,  $T_i$  is not randomly assigned. One way to identify ATE is to consider instrumental variables estimation. We need an instrument  $Z_i$ , *i.e.* a variable that is correlated with  $T_i$ , but not with the error term – namely ability of individuals – of the equation that describes outcome  $Y_i$ . Finding such a variable is difficult.

A randomized encouragement design experiment makes it possible to solve this problem (Holland, 1988;<sup>15</sup> Duflo *et al.*, 2007). Contrary to the time spent to practice and increase the literacy test score, encouragement can be assigned on a random basis, at least across (tutorial) groups of students.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, it is (not weakly) correlated to time spent to practice and to improvement in literacy skills. Thus, the encouragement design that was adopted in our experiment provides a valid instrument for varying time to practice literacy and thus the literacy test score (or not) between the beginning and the end of the first term. In other words,

<sup>15</sup> Holland (1988) refers to them as a type of “quasi-experimental” design, after Campbell and Stanley (1966).

<sup>16</sup> See for instance Banerjee *et al.* (2007).



whether a group of students is encouraged to practice literacy skills ( $Z_i=1$ ) or not ( $Z_i=0$ ) is assigned randomly and correlated to treatment  $T_i$ .

Nevertheless, within the framework of the RCM and as shown in Angrist *et al.* (1996), the instrumental variables estimator identifies the effect of increasing literacy skills only for compliers, *i.e.* the university students whose probability of improving their literacy skill level increases if they are encouraged, in comparison to a situation where they are not encouraged. This refers to the *local average treatment effect* (Imbens and Angrist, 1994):

$$LATE = E(Y_{1i} - Y_{0i} | c_i) = \frac{E(Y_i | Z_i = 1) - E(Y_i | Z_i = 0)}{E(T_i | Z_i = 1) - E(T_i | Z_i = 0)}$$

Where  $c_i$  corresponds to students for whom the treatment effect is computed, *i.e.* those who comply with the encouragement and increase their time practicing literacy skills if they are in the encouraged group, and  $\Pr(T_1 - T_0) = E(T_i | Z_i = 1) - E(T_i | Z_i = 0)$  is the percentage of compliers in the whole population ( $T_1$  is the value of treatment if  $Z=1$  and  $T_0$  is that corresponding to  $Z=0$ ). Finally,  $E(Y_i | Z_i = 1) - E(Y_i | Z_i = 0)$  is the effect of encouragement to practice literacy skills on the academic performance of first-year university students in Economics and Management (intention to treat). LATE responds to the following questions: by how many points does a student's final grade for a given course increase if the student's literacy skills improve? What is the impact on the probability for students to complete the first, the second term or the whole academic year if literacy levels are raised?

Up until now, we have considered a binary treatment (*i.e.*, improving literacy skills or not). In practice, however, what we observe is the variation in the two literacy test scores for each student, which means the treatment has a variable intensity. According to Angrist and Imbens (1995) who considered a discrete ordered treatment, the local average treatment effect is still the following:

$$LATE = \frac{E(Y_i | Z_i = 1) - E(Y_i | Z_i = 0)}{E(T_i | Z_i = 1) - E(T_i | Z_i = 0)} = \sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j E(Y_j - Y_{j-1} | T_1 \geq j > T_0)$$

with  $\omega_j = \frac{\Pr(T_1 \geq j > T_0)}{\sum_{j=1}^J \Pr(T_1 \geq j > T_0)}$

In this case, for the final grade in a given course, the Wald estimator is an average of effects evaluated for different improvement (variation) intensities in the literacy test scores, weighted by the percentage of the relevant population for the given treatment intensity. Angrist *et al.* (2000) generalize this result in the case of a continuous treatment. LATE then corresponds to the effect of a variation in literacy skills on academic performance for the university students in our study: by how many points does a final grade for a given course increase if the variation in the literacy test scores increases by 1 point? What is the impact on the probability

for students to complete the first or the second semester if literacy levels are raised, and by how many percentage points does this probability increase or decrease?

## **5. Effects of improving literacy on academic performance in university students**

In this section, we begin by presenting results from the randomized experiment that was implemented at University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée. Next, we estimate the effects of practicing literacy skills for different subpopulations, and for all disciplines.

### **5.1 First results**

The main results of our randomized trial are presented in Table 3a and 3b. Effects of both encouragement and measured improvement in literacy skills are reported.<sup>17</sup>

First of all, encouraging students to practice literacy skills raises their scores in several disciplines, ranging from language-based disciplines (e.g., English as a foreign language), to somewhat formalized subjects (introduction to economics or to management), and even very formal subjects (introduction to microeconomics; mathematics or statistics). Final exam scores and final course grades are particularly impacted by literacy encouragement (Table 3a).

Second, the same kinds of results are observed when considering the effect of increased scores on the literacy test. More precisely, improving a student's literacy test score by one additional point implies an increase of 0.5 to 1.0 point (on a scale of 20) in the final exam score, the in-class assessment component or the final grade for a given course. This increase is larger for more scientific or formalized disciplines (0.8-1.0 point) than for other subjects (0.5-0.6 point).<sup>18</sup> For instance, one additional point in the improvement measured between literacy test scores raises the final exam score in mathematics by 0.836 point, and the final grade in microeconomics by 0.769 point, whereas it raises the final exam grade in introduction to economics by 0.552 point and the in-class grade component in management by 0.494 (Table 3a). We obtain similar results if we add baseline administrative variables as explanatory variables, with results that are even more frequently significant.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Only significant results are displayed in Table 3. Tables A3 to A6 in the appendix include detailed complete results.

<sup>18</sup> Machin and Mc Nally (2008) found similar results.

<sup>19</sup> This result was expected because adding relevant explanatory variables reduces the residual sum of squares and thus the standard errors of the estimated coefficients. In particular, at a 10 percent level, one additional point in the improvement measured between literacy test scores would increase the average grade for module 1 of semester 2 by 0.499, and increase Semester 2 grade averages by 0.287 point.

**Table 3a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée.

Discipline	Introduction to Economics (FE)	Introduction to Management (CA)	Mathematics (FE)	Introduction to Microeconomics (GPA)	Introduction to Microeconomic(CA)	Introduction to Microeconomics(FE)	Financial economics (GPA)	Financial economics (CA)	Statistics and computer science (GPA)	Statistics and computer science (FE)	English (Semester 2) (GPA)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)										
Without baseline variables	0.708** (0.335)	0.642*** (0.215)	1.067** (0.443)	1.082***( <i>a</i> ) (0.406)	0.838** (0.392)	0.665 (0.413)	0.587 (0.385)	0.607 (0.379)	0.875** (0.369)	0.448 (0.396)	0.384* (0.230)
With baseline variables	0.683** (0.313)	0.627*** (0.206)	1.036*** (0.387)	1.048*** (0.367)	0.954*** (0.366)	0.828** (0.396)	0.619* (0.353)	0.728** (0.360)	0.807** (0.324)	0.641* (0.365)	0.477** (0.206)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)										
Without baseline variables	0.581** (0.227)	0.511*** (0.173)	0.879***( <i>b</i> ) (0.343)	1.032*** (0.376)	0.845** (0.402)	0.690* (0.420)	0.558* (0.337)	0.578* (0.352)	0.840** (0.335)	0.391 (0.519)	0.600* (0.353)
With baseline variables	0.552** (0.253)	0.494*** (0.167)	0.836*** (0.298)	0.997*** (0.356)	0.867** (0.353)	0.769** (0.368)	0.573* (0.308)	0.640** (0.316)	0.769*** (0.297)	0.607* (0.330)	0.479** (0.231)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014) and Tables A3 to A6 (appendix).

Field: 526 first-year students in Economics and Management entering the university in 2011-2013, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, in addition to scores for the two literacy tests..

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (*a*) at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 1.082 points the score to the grade point average in introduction to microeconomics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (*b*) At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.879 point in the score of the final exam in Mathematics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table 3b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Marginal effects.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.070 (0.137)	0.056 (0.214)	0.083* (0.071)
With baseline variables	0.088** <i>(a)</i> (0.040)	0.062 (0.116)	0.086* (0.051)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.068** (0.024)	0.045 (0.151)	0.071*** (0.002)
With baseline variables	0.073*** <i>(b)</i> ( $<0.001$ )	0.048** (0.041)	0.068*** (0.003)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014). Field: 526 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests. Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level. Reading: *(a)* at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 8.8 percentage points the probability to achieve first-year university for students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). *(b)* At a 1 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 7.3 percentage points the probability to achieve first-year university for students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France)

Finally, the above findings suggest greater chances of students completing the first year of university. As shown in Tables A3-A6 in the appendix, first-year grade averages do not change through the implementation of the encouragement device to practice literacy skills. However, Table 8b shows that encouraging students to practice literacy skills increases the probability of their completing the second term of the first year by 8.6 percentage points, and the full year by 8.8 percentage points, although there is no observable effect on the probability to complete the first term. Further, each additional point in the improvement measured between literacy test scores raises the probability for the students to complete their first year at university by 6.8 to 7.3 percentage points.

## 5.2 Heterogeneous treatment effects

In Section 4.1, we show that raising literacy skills helps in increasing achievement test scores for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream. These impacts can differ if we consider different subpopulations. In fact, Table 4 shows that initial literacy test score is not the same for some subpopulations of students. In particular, initial literacy test score is on average smaller among male students than among female students (6.0/20 vs. 7.2/20). As well, initial literacy test score is on average smaller among students who hold a baccalaureate without any merit, honors or distinction than among other students (6.0/20 vs. about 7.4/20). Finally, there seems to be no differences in average initial literacy test scores between students whose mother tongue is the French language and other students. Hence, it may be interesting to see whether or not the encouragement device is more efficient for some subpopulations than for others.

**Table 4.** Score to the first written literacy test for first-year university students in Economics and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée. *Considering different kinds of populations.*

Sub-sample	Number of students	Average	Standard deviation
All students	526	6.5	2.4
<i>Gender :</i>			
Men	299	6.0	2.3
Women	227	7.1	2.5
<i>Origin :</i>			
French	315	6.6	2.4
Foreign	168	6.4	2.5
<i>Baccalauréat</i>			
With merit, honours or distinction (pass 60%-70%, pass 70%-80%, pass 80% upwards)	246	7.4	2.4
Pass 50%-60%	182	6.0	2.1
Repeat session	74	5.6	2.3
Repeat a year	24	6.1	2.6
Pass 50%-60%, repeat session, or repeat a year)	280	5.9	2.2

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 526 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Note : score.

First, Tables 5a and 5b show that positive impacts of encouragement and of increasing literacy skills on academic performance are mainly due to improvements among male students. The effects on female students are much smaller.<sup>20</sup> Thus, the encouragement device seems to have preferentially benefited students whose literacy skills were initially weaker, *i.e.* male students.<sup>21</sup>

Second, if we distinguish students according to their native language (French in contrast to any other language), we see that both encouragement and increasing literacy skills have different impacts on these subpopulations. More precisely, positive effects were larger for students whose mother tongue is French; moreover, they do not involve the same disciplines (Tables 6a and 6b).<sup>22</sup>

Third, Tables 7a, 7b, and 7c display results for three different subpopulations of students, depending on whether their baccalaureate was awarded with “merit, honors or distinction”, or awarded without any distinction or not awarded. Although students who hold a baccalaureate without honors demonstrate lower initial literacy skills than other students, the increase in literacy test scores has a positive impact on academic performance for the three subpopulations. However, positive effects do not involve the same disciplines and they are somewhat larger for students who earned their baccalaureate without honors than for other students.<sup>23</sup>

Fourth, as Tables 5, 6 and 7 demonstrate, certain effects are actually negative, and may appear counter-intuitive given the overall impacts discussed above. For instance, for female students specifically, benefiting from encouragement negatively impacts grades in Management for example (considering the final exam and the final course grade). This pattern may be interpreted as a lock-in effect: when students spend time practicing literacy skills, they do not spend the time on their homework in other subjects (like Economics or Management). Thus, for some disciplines, the encouragement device could have led to some negative effects. However, these results are often barely significant (here, at a 10 percent level), particularly

---

<sup>20</sup> Regardless of the experimental conditions received by students, female students spent more time practicing literacy skills than male students (161 to 230 minutes *vs.* 105 to 150 minutes, depending on the indicator used to measure practice time). Literacy test scores also increased more for female students than for males (+4.0 *vs.* +2.5 points). However, as a consequence of encouragement, literacy practice time increases more among males than among female students (+65 to +92 minutes *vs.* +48 to 60 minutes, depending on the indicator used for practice time). Hence, literacy test score increased more among male than among female students (+1.4 *vs.* +1 point) for students assigned to encouragement. Detailed results for male and female students and all disciplines are available on request.

<sup>21</sup> This result confirms those of Machin and Mc Nally (2008).

<sup>22</sup> While students whose native language is not French spent more time practicing literacy skills than native French-speaking students when neither benefited from any encouragement, practice time increases more among students whose first language is not French language than among native French-speaking students (+97 to +113 minutes *vs.* +38 to +60 minutes, depending on the indicator used). In spite of this, the increase in literacy test scores was only slightly larger among students whose first language is not French language (+3.6 *vs.* +3.1 points). Detailed results for these two types of populations and all disciplines are available on request.

<sup>23</sup> Regardless of the experimental conditions they were assigned to, students who held a baccalaureate with merit, honors or distinction spent more time practicing literacy skills. Thus, literacy test score increases more for these students than for others (+3.8 *vs.* +2.6 points). Nevertheless, time practicing literacy skills increases more among students who earned a baccalaureate without honors than among other students (+68 to 95 minutes *vs.* +46 to 57 minutes, depending on the indicator used). Hence, when both categories of students are assigned to encouragement, literacy test scores increased more among students who hold a baccalaureate with a lower score than among those holding a baccalaureate with merit, honors or distinction (+1,5 *vs.* +0,7 point). Detailed results for all disciplines are available on request.

when considering the effects of improving literacy test scores. Hence, lock-in effects may have appeared, but their relevance seems to be very limited.

**Table 5a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée. *Considered sample: male students.*

Discipline	Introduction to Economics (FE)	Introduction to management (GPA)	Introduction to management (CA)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (FE)	Introduction to Microeconomics(GPA)	Introduction to microeconomics(CA)	Introduction to macroeconomics (GPA)	Economics and Finance (GPA)	Economics and finance (CA)	Economics and finance (FE)	General firm policy (F)	Statistics and computer science (F)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)												
Without baseline variables	0.777* (0.335)	0.803*** (0.304)	1.017*** (0.287)	0.860 (0.542)	1.420***( <i>a</i> ) (0.406)	1.440*** (0.525)	0.870* (0.510)	0.946* (0.500)	1.258** (0.519)	0.950* (0.488)	0.584 (0.487)	0.859** (0.429)	1.243*** (0.529)
With baseline variables	0.727*** (0.283)	0.861*** (0.297)	1.009*** (0.291)	0.920** (0.458)	1.471*** (0.525)	1.428*** (0.484)	1.014** (0.495)	0.871** (0.446)	1.270*** (0.480)	1.000** (0.490)	0.772* (0.466)	0.794** (0.397)	1.100*** (0.442)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)												
Without baseline variables	0.585* (0.342)	0.569***( <i>b</i> ) (0.211)	0.723*** (0.228)	0.618* (0.365)	1.051** (0.425)	1.249*** (0.451)	0.832* (0.484)	0.801** (0.393)	1.046** (0.423)	0.828* (0.427)	0.570 (.472)	0.731** (0.353)	1.077** (0.436)
With baseline variables	0.617** (0.314)	0.591*** (0.202)	0.702*** (0.220)	0.659** (0.310)	1.072*** (0.374)	1.243*** (0.439)	0.929** (0.469)	0.750** (0.363)	1.051*** (0.404)	0.848** (0.418)	0.716* (0.440)	0.687** (0.339)	0.970*** (0.384)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 299 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* and \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (*a*) at a 1 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice using platform *Projet Voltaire* increases by 1.420 point the score to the final exam in mathematics for first-year university male students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (*b*) At a 10 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.569 point in the score to the final exam in introduction to management for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table 5b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée. *Considered sample: female students.*

Discipline	Introduction to Management (GPA)	Introduction to Management (FE)	Methodology (CA)	Introduction to Microeconomics (FE)	Statistics and computer science (CA)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)				
Without baseline variables	-0.666**( <i>a</i> ) (0.329)	-1.437*** (0.444)	0.410 (0.283)	0.827 (.598)	0.665* (0.397)
With baseline variables	-0.698** (0.297)	-1.511*** (0.415)	0.450* (0.297)	1.058* (0.615)	0.654* (0.386)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)				
Without baseline variables	-0.661 (0.472)	-1.426*( <i>b</i> ) (0.796)	0.394 (0.283)	0.835 (0.635)	0.606 (0.395)
With baseline variables	-0.669 (0.433)	-1.449* (0.752)	0.419 (0.260)	0.967 (0.603)	0.553 (0.345)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 227 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* and \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (*a*) at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice using platform *Projet Voltaire* decreases by 0.666 point the score to the final exam in introduction to management first-year university female students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (*b*) At a 10 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a decrease of 1.426 point in the score to the final exam of introduction to management for first-year university female students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).



**Table 6a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée. *Considered sample: students whose country of origin is France.*

Discipline	Introduction to Management (CA)	Mathematics (FE)	Dissertation	Introduction to Microeconomics(GPA)	Introduction to Microeconomics(CC)	Introduction to Microeconomics(FE)	Financial economics (CA)	Principles Of law	English language (Semester 2)
Modél	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)								
Without baseline variables	0.730** (0.267)	1.084*(a) (0.570)	-0.463* (0.255)	1.001* (0.510)	0.831* (0.490)	0.619 (0.504)	0.630 (0.472)	0.279 (0.294)	0.252 (0.278)
With baseline variables	0.738*** (0.263)	1.186** (0.498)	-0.370* (0.207)	1.138*** (0.453)	1.155*** (0.456)	0.954** (0.476)	0.894** (0.448)	0.548* (0.301)	0.419* (0.254)
Modél	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)								
Without baseline variables	0.790***(b) (0.354)	1.245* (0.652)	-0.530 (0.404)	1.269* (0.671)	1.105 (0.722)	0.843 (0.704)	0.752 (0.568)	0.409 (0.434)	0.362 (0.416)
With baseline variables	0.727*** (0.305)	1.197** (0.522)	-0.380 (0.270)	1.249** (0.557)	1.185** (0.561)	0.968* (0.536)	0.881* (0.472)	0.590* (0.347)	0.461 (0.312)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 315 first-year university students in Economics and Management entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 10 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 1.084 point the score to the final exam in Mathematics microeconomics for (originating from France) first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (b) At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.790 point in the score to continuous assessment in introduction to management for (originating from France) first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table 6b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée. *Considered sample: students whose country of origin is NOT France.*

Discipline	Introduction to Economics (FE)	Introduction to Microeconomics (GPA)	Statistics and Computer science(GPA)	Statistics and Computer science(FE)	Principles of law	English language (Semester 2)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)					
Without baseline variables	1.643***(a) (0.606)	1.068 (0.725)	1.413** (0.638)	1.355** (0.684)	-0.811* (0.349)	0.704* (0.422)
With baseline variables	1.503*** (0.568)	0.692 (0.661)	1.064* (0.553)	1.313** (0.626)	-0.792* (0.351)	0.801** (0.345)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)					
Without baseline variables	0.966*** (0.367)	0.653* (0.392)	0.868** (0.349)	0.932***(b) (0.430)	-0.576* (0.309)	0.528 (0.334)
With baseline variables	0.959*** (0.383)	0.462 (0.397)	0.705** (0.334)	0.908** (0.402)	-0.580* (0.307)	0.624* (0.327)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 168 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice using platform *Projet Voltaire* increases by 1.643 point in the score of the final exam in introduction to economics for first-year university students (not originating from France) in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (b) At a 5

percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.932 point in the score of the final exam in statistics and computer science for first-year university students (not originating from France) in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table 7a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée. *Considered sample: students who hold a baccalaureate with merit, honors or distinction.*

Discipline	Introduction to Management (CA)	Mathematics (FE)	Methodology (CA)	Introduction to Microeconomics (GPA)	Introduction to Microeconomics (CA)	Introduction to Microeconomics (CT)	Statistics and computer science(GPA)	Statistics and computer science (CA)	Statistics and computer science (FE)	English language (Semester 2)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)									
Without baseline variables	0.557* (0.297)	1.070* (0.643)	0.471* (0.277)	1.512** (0.607)	1.459** (0.568)	1.533** <i>(a)</i> (0.624)	1.246** (0.525)	0.828* (0.426)	1.023* (0.588)	0.652** (0.299)
With baseline variables	0.569** (0.282)	0.923* (0.571)	0.542** (0.262)	1.515*** (0.569)	1.376*** (0.540)	1.581*** (0.615)	1.106** (0.485)	0.721* (0.397)	1.023* (0.551)	0.649** (0.271)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)									
With baseline variables	0.594* <i>(b)</i> (0.339)	1.153 (0.718)	0.493* (0.296)	2.305 (1.406)	2.054 (1.266)	2.461 (1.646)	1.919 (1.193)	1.174 (0.837)	1.676 (1.261)	1.072 (1.876)
Avec variables baseline	0.589* (0.321)	0.955* (0.586)	0.533** (0.274)	2.245* (1.286)	1.782* (1.011)	2.159* (1.214)	1.650* (0.953)	0.901 (0.596)	1.373 (0.851)	0.956 (0.684)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014). .

Field: 246 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: *(a)* at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 1.533 point the score to the final exam in introduction to microeconomics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). *(b)*

At a 10 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.594 point in the score of the continuous assessment in introduction to management for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table 7b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée. *Considered sample: students who hold a baccalaureate without merit, honors or distinction.*

Note	Introduction to Economics (FE)	Introduction to Management (CA)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (FE)	Introduction to Microeconomics(GPA)	Financial economics (GPA)	Financial economics (CA)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)						
Without baseline variables	1.159*** <i>(a)</i> (0.423)	0.723** (0.287)	1.098* (0.571)	1.098* (0.571)	0.777 (0.493)	0.818* (0.470)	0.712 (0.460)
With baseline variables	1.117*** (0.397)	0.700*** (0.288)	0.727* (0.436)	1.167** (0.502)	0.823* (0.443)	0.848* (0.442)	0.758* (0.463)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)						
Without baseline variables	0.788*** (0.319)	0.468** (0.193)	0.457 (0.320)	0.741** <i>(b)</i> (0.358)	0.559* (0.336)	0.596* (0.331)	0.528 (343)
With baseline variables	0.736*** (0.285)	0.449** (0.188)	0.469* (0.267)	0.760** (0.311)	0.585* (0.310)	0.600** (0.307)	0.545* (0.333)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 280 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: *(a)* at a 1 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 1.159 point the score to the final exam in introduction in economics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est

Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (b) At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.741 point in the score of the final exam in Mathematics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table 7c.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée. *Considered sample: students who hold a baccalaureate with pass 50%-60%.*

Discipline	Introduction to Economics (GPA)	Introduction to Economics (FE)	Introduction to Management (GPA)	Introduction to Management (CA)	Mathematics (FE)	Introduction to Microeconomics (GPA)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (F)	Financial Economics (F)	Entrepreneurship (F)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)								
Without baseline variables	0.600 (0.400)	1.033** (0.502)	0.517 (0.371)	0.708**(a) (0.354)	0.665 (0.704)	0.748 (0.624)	0.718 (0.557)	0.935* (0.549)	0.758 (0.465)
With baseline variables	0.717 (0.374)	1.076** (0.476)	0.578* (0.354)	0.725** (0.353)	1.008* (0.615)	0.946* (0.549)	0.955* (0.498)	1.121** (0.524)	0.825 (0.450)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)								
Without baseline variables	0.312 (0.202)	0.552**(b) (0.277)	0.268 (0.180)	0.370** (0.184)	0.355 (0.352)	0.422 (0.324)	0.404 (0.294)	0.525* (0.287)	0.423* (0.246)
With baseline variables	0.366** (0.186)	0.553** (0.257)	0.294* (0.171)	0.375** (0.180)	0.517* (0.292)	0.530* (0.290)	0.533** (0.270)	0.617** (0.276)	0.459* (0.243)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 182 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 1.033 point the score to the final exam in introduction to economics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (b) At a 10 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.525 point in the score of continuous assessment in financial economics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

Finally, the encouragement device and the increase in literacy test scores imply an increased probability of completing a given academic term for first-year university students who are initially characterized by low literacy skills (Tables 8a and 8b; Tables 9a and 9b; and Tables 10a to 10c).

**Table 8a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Male students.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.149** (0.019)	0.104* (0.081)	0.089 (0.155)
With baseline variables	0.159***( <i>a</i> ) (0.009)	0.119** (0.033)	0.090 (0.119)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.100*** ( $<0.001$ )	0.068** (0.011)	0.075** (0.028)
With baseline variables	0.099***( <i>b</i> ) ( $<0.001$ )	0.074** ( $<0.001$ )	0.074** (0.013)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014). Field: 299 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests. Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level. Reading: (*a*) at a 1 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 15.9 percentage points the probability to achieve first-year university for male students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (*b*) At a 1 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 9.9 percentage points the probability to achieve first-year university for male students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table 8b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Female students.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	-0.002 (0.971)	0.008 (0.898)	0.078 (0.253)
With baseline variables	0.012 (0.836)	0.004 (0.945)	0.090( <i>a</i> ) (0.173)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.004 (0.951)	0.012 (0.827)	0.066* (0.060)
With baseline variables	0.016 (0.759)	0.008 (0.868)	0.067**( <i>b</i> ) (0.025)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014). Field: 227 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests. Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level. Reading: (*a*) at any level, encouraging to literacy practice does not change the probability to achieve second term of first-year university for female students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (*b*) At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 6.7 percentage points the probability to achieve second term of first term university for female students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

In particular, encouragement increases the probability for males students to complete the first year of university by 15.9 percentage points, and increases the probability for students whose country of origin is not France to complete the first term by 15.4 percentage points.<sup>24</sup> Further, improving the literacy test score by 1 point increases the probability for male students to complete their first year of university by 10 percentage points. Also, for students from countries outside of France, one additional point in the improvement measured between literacy test scores increases the probability of completing the first semester by 8.2 percentage points. For students who repeat the baccalaureate exam before successfully passing it, the probability of completing their second semester of the first year of university is increased by 7.1 percentage points.<sup>25</sup>

**Table 9a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Considered sample: students whose country of origin is France.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.046 (0.431)	0.027 (0.638)	0.075 (0.201)
With baseline variables	0.085(a) (0.112)	0.032 (0.538)	0.076 (0.159)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.059 (0.287)	0.035 (0.564)	0.078*** (0.006)
With baseline variables	0.078***(b) (0.002)	0.041 (0.371)	0.071** (0.017)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014). Field: 315 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests. Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level. Reading: (a) at any level, encouraging to literacy practice let unchanged the probability to achieve first-year university for students (whose country of origin is France) in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (b) At a 1 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 7.8 percentage points in the probability to achieve first-year university for students (whose country of origin is France) in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

To conclude, we have provided new empirical evidence that encouraging university students to practice literacy skills and increasing their literacy skill levels may help them in completing their first year at university. Therefore, the cost and the failure rate seen in public universities could be reduced efficiently.

<sup>24</sup> It also increases the probability of completing the first term by 10 percentage points for first-year university students holding a baccalaureate with distinction, honors or merit.

<sup>25</sup> Improving literacy performance by 1 point also increases the probability of completing the academic year (or at least one semester) for other types of students, namely those who hold the baccalaureate with honors or merit are more likely to complete the full year, while students of French nationality are more likely to complete the first term and female students are more likely to complete the second term.

**Table 9b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Considered sample: students whose country of origin is NOT France.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.087 (0.290)	0.154** <i>(a)</i> (0.046)	0.092 (0.244)
With baseline variables	0.095 (0.208)	0.150** (0.036)	0.087 (0.252)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.062 (0.181)	0.082*** <i>(b)</i> (0.001)	0.058 (0.142)
With baseline variables	0.058 (0.153)	0.076*** (0.001)	0.052 <i>(b)</i> (0.220)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).  
Field: 168 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.  
Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.  
Reading: *(a)* at a 5 level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 15.4 the probability to achieve the first term in first-year university for students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). *(b)* At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 8.2 percentage points the probability to achieve the first-term of first-year university for students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table 10a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Considered sample: students who hold a baccalaureate with merit, honors or distinction.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.100* (0.068)	0.063 (0.288)	0.137*** (0.032)
With baseline variables	0.108** <i>(a)</i> (0.027)	0.070 (0.167)	0.140*** (0.024)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.096*** ( $<0.001$ )	0.059 (0.168)	0.091*** ( $<0.001$ )
With baseline variables	0.098*** <i>(b)</i> ( $<0.001$ )	0.062** (0.037)	0.095*** ( $<0.001$ )

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).  
Field: 246 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.  
Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.  
Reading: *(a)* at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increase by 10.8 percentage points the probability to achieve first-year university for students (who hold a baccalaureate with merit, honors or distinction) in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). *(b)* At a 1 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 9.8 percentage points in the probability to achieve first-year university for students (who hold a baccalaureate with merit, honors or distinction) in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table 10b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Considered sample: students who got a baccalaureate without merit, honors or distinction.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.060 (0.348)	0.050 (0.415)	0.048 (0.411)
With baseline variables	0.083(a) (0.150)	0.061 (0.287)	0.050 (0.374)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.042 (0.302)	0.033(b) (0.396)	0.035 (0.396)
With baseline variables	0.052*(b) (0.076)	0.039 (0.235)	0.032(b) (0.398)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014). Field: 280 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests. Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level. Reading: (a) at any level, encouraging to literacy practice let unchanged the probability to achieve the first term in first-year university for students (who hold a baccalaureate without any merit, honors or distinction) in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (b) At a 10 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 5.2 percentage points the probability to achieve the first-term of first-year university for students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table 10c.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Considered sample: students who got a baccalaureate with pass 50%-60%.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.035 (0.660)	0.023*(a) (0.077)	0.058 (0.430)
With baseline variables	0.088 (0.232)	0.056 (0.431)	0.081 (0.249)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.020 (0.670)	0.012(b) (0.772)	0.033 (0.418)
With baseline variables	0.047 (0.173)	0.029 (0.424)	0.042(b) (0.230)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014). Field: 182 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests. Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level. Reading: (a) at any level, encouraging to literacy practice let unchanged the probability to achieve the first term in first-year university for students (who got a baccalaureate with pass 50%-60%) in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). (b) At any level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores let unchanged the probability to achieve the first-term of first-year university for students (who got a baccalaureate with pass 50%-60%) in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

## **6. Discussion: external validity**

The results discussed above were obtained through a randomized controlled experiment and are therefore characterized by a high degree of internal validity. The increase in literacy skills often leads to a significant improvement in academic performances of first-year university students in Economics and Management. However, these results might somehow be specific to the University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée, where we carried out the experiment. For instance, they could be related to local characteristics, like the way courses are organized, or the socio-demographic characteristics of students. In order to establish the external validity of our results, we implemented the same kind of encouragement device over the academic year 2013-2014 at another French university, University Lille 1, again with first-year students in Economics and Management. This parallel experiment may help us to generalize the findings we obtained at the University Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallée.

### **6.1 A second randomized experiment at University Lille 1**

As in the experiment at the University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée, the randomized trial was implemented at University Lille 1 over the first term of the academic year. During the meeting with students before the beginning of the academic year 2013-2014, students were informed that they would have access to the web platform *Projet Voltaire* to practice and improve their skills in orthography, grammar, conjugation and syntax. They were also told that their work would be evaluated through a final literacy test score that would be taken into account to compute their overall academic average for the first year in Economics and Management. Just as we did at the University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée, we evaluated initial literacy skills of students through an initial literacy test at the beginning of the academic year.

We also distinguished two categories of tutorial groups. In half of them, students were assigned to receive encouragement to practice literacy skills using *Projet Voltaire*, while the students of other groups were not encouraged. In the encouraged tutorial groups, e-mails were sent every week to the students, to remind them that they could use the *Projet Voltaire* platform and how to access this online tool. They were also reminded of the importance of using the platform to practice and increase their skills in orthography, grammar, conjugation and syntax. Finally, they were told that their work would be evaluated through a second literacy test that will be written at the end of the first term of the academic year, i.e. before final exams took place.

In the “non-encouraged” tutorial groups, nothing was said to students after the very first meeting at the beginning of the academic year, where they quickly heard about the *Projet Voltaire*. As with UPEM, tutorial groups were assigned randomly to the encouragement condition, and we confirmed this through t-tests to see whether or not there are any differences in baseline administrative variables (see Table A7 in appendix). Finally, as with UPEM, the difference between the two literacy test scores is used as a measure for the



increase in literacy skills of the students over the first term, i.e. between before and after the literacy practice period.<sup>26</sup>

Our final sample includes 323 first-year students at University Lille 1, for whom we have the information needed to evaluate the effects of encouragement and of improving literacy skills (variables provided by baseline administrative information, the two literacy test scores and time practicing literacy skills, and final exam scores in first-year university). First-year students in Economics and Management at University Lille 1 are older (on average 19.5 years) than those who study at UPEM. In comparison with UPEM, they are also more frequently male students (65.8%) and less frequently of French nationality (80.8%). More of them are also scholarship students (51.1%). In addition, 50.3% of first-year university students at University Lille 1 hold a baccalaureate in Economics and Social sciences, 31.3% a baccalaureate in Sciences and 9.6% a baccalaureate in sciences and technology in Management. Not surprisingly, almost all students live in the Northern region of France, where the university is located (96.9 %). Despite these demographic differences, the average initial literacy test score is 6.1/20, which is identical to the average score for first-year university students in Economics and Management at UPEM.

Like for UPEM, we find a positive correlation between encouragement and practice time. Students who benefited from encouragement spent more time practicing - 100 to 125 minute more over the experimental period - than other students.<sup>27</sup>

This difference in the literacy test score is of the same order in Lille 1 as in UPEM. It goes from -2.8 to +11.8 points (on a scale of 20) and is about the same among the two kinds of students. However, on average, the variation in the literacy scores is 3.04 points for students who benefited from encouragement vs. 1.41 points for other students. As expected, this variation is larger for students who were encouraged and thus spent more time practicing literacy.

## 6.2 Results

In Tables 11a and 11b, we present the main significant results of the effect of encouragement and of the increase in literacy test scores on academic performance for first-year students in Economics and Management at University Lille 1.<sup>28</sup>

**Table 11a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management in university Lille 1.

Discipline	Introduction to Economics (GPA)	Introduction to Economics (CA)	Introduction to Management	Defining career objectives	Economic History	English language Semester 1 (CA)	Mathematics (CA)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)						
Without baseline variables	0.751* (0.388)	0.665 (0.432)	0.998* (0.529)	1.606*** (0.310)	1.118* (0.575)	1.705* (0.990)	2.008*** (0.732)

<sup>26</sup> We verify that students who were encouraged spent more time practicing literacy skills. Furthermore, there is a positive correlation between the increase in literacy test scores and time spent on literacy skills training. Corresponding tables are available on request.

<sup>27</sup> Like in UPEM, the share of students who did never connect to the web platform is greater in tutorial groups who were not encouraged than in other groups. The difference between the two kinds of groups is equal to 40 percentage points.

<sup>28</sup> Complete detailed results are found in the appendix (Tables A8 to A11).

With baseline variables	0.747** (0.359)	0.693* (0.399)	0.938* (0.521)	1.533*** (0.305)	1.225** (0.532)	1.701* (0.946)	2.486*** (0.698)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)						
Without baseline variables	0.460** (0.226)	0.414 (0.258)	0.568* (0.294)	0.974*** (0.234)	0.674** (0.333)	0.993* (0.551)	1.419** (0.561)
With baseline variables	0.486** (0.220)	0.454* (0.248)	0.563* (0.307)	0.984*** (0.247)	0.780** (0.327)	1.057* (0.560)	1.789*** (0.577)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014) and Tables A9 to A11 (appendix).

Field: 323 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 1.225 point the score to the final exam in economic history for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France). (b) At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.486 point in the GPA in economic history for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table 11b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Marginal effects.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.039 (0.490)	0.096* (0.085)	0.009 (0.865)
With baseline variables	0.048 (0.351)	0.100*(a) (0.052)	0.016 (0.748)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.022 (0.554)	0.060** (0.042)	-0.001 (0.976)
With baseline variables	0.028 (0.412)	0.065**(b) (0.022)	0.004 (0.914)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern from France; 2013-2014).

Field: 323 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 10 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 10.0 percentage points the probability to achieve the first term of the first-year university for students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France). (b) At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 7.3 percentage points the probability to achieve first-year university for students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France)

First, improving a student's literacy test score by one additional point between the beginning and the end of the first term implies an increase of 0.5 to 1.5 points in the grade for a given discipline (Table 8a).

Second, as with UPEM, unexpectedly, the measured increase in literacy skills affects scores in a range of different disciplines, whether more literary or linguistic (e.g., English language, economic history, the “defining career objectives” workshop), or more technical (introduction to economics, introduction to management), and even in mathematics. Thus, one additional point in the improvement measured between literacy test scores induces an increase of 0.486 point in the final exam score in introduction to economics, or an increase of 0.454 point in the in-class assessment grade in introduction to management. The increase in grades is the largest for the mathematics in-class component (+1.789 points – Table 11a), followed by “defining career objectives” (+0.984 points).

Third, as in the case of University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée, our initial results for University Lille 1 suggest that practicing literacy through this encouragement device results in greater chances for students to complete the first year of university, or at least one of the semesters (Table 11b). In fact, encouraging first-year students to practice literacy during the first semester increases their probability of completing the first semester by 10 percentage points (at a 5.2 percent level). Moreover, improving literacy test scores by one additional point raises the probability of students completing their first semester by 6.5 percentage points.

Fourth, when we focus on different subpopulations (Tables 12 to 14), we see that the encouragement device does not provide the same level of benefit to all students.<sup>29</sup> In particular, as with UPEM, our findings for the whole population of first-year students are mainly similar to those we get for male students (Tables 12a and 12b). Then, the encouragement device showed an increased benefit on students whose first language is French (Tables 13a and 13b), as was the case at UPEM. Finally, the experiment device appears to provide more benefit to students who hold a baccalaureate without honors (Tables 14a to 14c).

Fifth, for some disciplines, we observe a negative impact of the encouragement device, again for female students who demonstrate higher initial literacy skills than male students (Table 12b). This result suggests a lock-in effect: their time is diverted from other disciplines, although their literacy skills do not require intervention. We observe the same qualitative results as seen at UPEM.

Finally, these findings may be applied to help certain specific populations of students to complete their first year at university (or at least one of the semesters), in particular those students who initially have lower literacy skill levels.

As reported in Tables A12 to A14 in the appendix, encouraging students to practice literacy increases the probability that they will complete the first term of the academic year, by about 13 percentage points for male students, and by about 14 percentage points for university students who hold a baccalaureate without honors. Further, measurable improvements in literacy skills show similar benefits for these kinds of students. In particular, a difference of one additional point in the measured improvement in scores on the literacy test increases the probability of completing the first term at university: by 9 percentage points for male students, by 10 percentage points for students who hold a baccalaureate without honors, and by 13 percentage points for those who hold a baccalaureate with minimal passing score (50%-60%), and by 8 percentage points for students whose native language is not French.<sup>30</sup>

As with University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée, the implementation of the encouragement device may have contributed to raising academic achievement levels for first-year students at University Lille 1.

---

<sup>29</sup> Like at UPEM, the initial literacy test score is on average lower among male students than among female students. It is higher for students who hold a baccalaureate with merit, honors or distinction than for other students. Finally, it is higher for students whose native language is French than for other students. Corresponding tables are available on request.

<sup>30</sup> For female students however, we observe some lock-in effects: the probability of completing the second semester of the first year of university decreases as a consequence of the introduction of the encouragement device.

**Table 12a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management stream: male students.

Discipline	Introduction to economics (GPA)	Introduction to economics (CA)	Introduction to management	Defining career objectives	Statistics (Semester 1)	English language (Semester 1) (CA)	Introduction to Macroeconomics	General accounting (GPA)	General accounting (FE)	Mathematics (F)	Mathematics (Exam 1)	Mathematics (Exam 2)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)											
Without baseline variables	0.697 (0.454)	0.987* (0.517)	1.460** (0.633)	1.596*** (0.403)	0.874 (0.599)	1.118* (0.575)	1.205 (0.749)	0.680 (0.574)	0.660 (0.576)	0.963 (0.626)	0.482 (0.651)	1.142* (0.607)
With baseline variables	0.754* (0.429)	0.981** (0.488)	1.573** (0.653)	1.669*** (0.421)	1.198** (0.558)	3.174** (1.730)	1.386* (0.745)	0.943* (0.559)	0.920 (0.577)	1.492*** (0.549)	0.945* (0.546)	1.616*** (0.521)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)											
Without baseline variables	0.512 (0.323)	0.727* (0.383)	0.971** (0.439)	1.201*** (0.405)	0.636 (0.408)	2.118** (0.901)	0.922* (0.555)	0.523 (0.415)	0.479 (0.399)	0.726 (0.468)	0.372 (0.490)	0.824* (0.433)
With baseline variables	0.544* (0.293)	0.702** (0.346)	1.063** (0.464)	1.224*** (0.406)	0.864** (0.363)	2.089** (0.860)	1.057** (0.534)	0.708* (0.403)	0.668* (0.368)	1.131*** (0.425)	0.744* (0.413)	1.165*** (0.365)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014).

Field: 207 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics stream). For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 1.460 point the score to the final exam in introduction to management for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France). (b) At a 10 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the two literacy tests increases by 0.922 point in the score in mathematics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table 12b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management stream: female students.

Discipline	Methodology (Sem.1)	Defining career objectives	Financial mathematics (F)	English language (Semester 1) (CA)	English language (Semester 1) (FE)	General accounting (GPA)	General accounting (CA)	General accounting (FE)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (Exam 1)	Mathematics (Exam 2)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)										
Without baseline variables	-1.222* (0.644)	1.416*** (0.475)	-1.051 (0.749)	-1.020 (1.624)	-1.348 (1.847)	-1.839** (0.722)	-2.001*** (0.688)	-1.633** (0.791)	-1.511* (0.839)	-2.345** (0.900)	-1.882* (0.841)
With baseline variables	-1.486** (0.608)	1.151*** (0.470)	-1.451* (0.746)	-1.455** (0.676)	-2.410* (1.344)	-1.990*** (0.687)	-2.142*** (0.686)	-1.638** (0.712)	-1.729*** (0.646)	-2.488*** (0.664)	-1.983*** (0.626)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)										
Without baseline variables	-0.703 (0.475)	0.769** (0.299)	-0.597 (0.540)	-0.564 (0.972)	-0.733 (1.082)	-0.998* (0.590)	-1.034* (0.559)	-0.898 (0.600)	-0.783 (0.541)	-1.177* (0.624)	-0.994* (0.582)
With baseline variables	-1.003* (0.607)	0.719** (0.355)	-0.758 (0.692)	-0.916 (1.023)	-1.474 (1.019)	-1.162* (0.643)	-1.189* (0.626)	-0.965 (0.601)	-1.022* (0.559)	-1.336** (0.548)	-1.146* (0.559)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014).

Field: 116 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics stream). For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice decreases by 1.455 point the score to the continuous assessment in English for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France). (b) At a 10 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the two literacy tests increases by 1.162 point in the score to the GPA in general accounting for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table 13a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Lille 1. *Considered sample: students whose country of origin is France.*

Discipline	Introduction to economics (GPA)	Defining career objectives	Economic history	English language (Semester 1, CA)	Mathematics(CA)	Big contemporary economic issues
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)					
Without baseline variables	1.057** (0.503)	1.635*** (0.366)	1.162 (0.716)	2.856** (1.199)	2.201** (0.941)	1.164* (0.606)
With baseline variables	0.973** (0.503)	1.617*** (0.362)	1.214* (0.643)	2.582** (1.123)	2.973*** (0.861)	0.784 (0.596)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)					
Without baseline variables	0.595** (0.263)	0.904*** (0.246)	0.638* (0.377)	1.452** (0.565)	1.397** (0.618)	0.645* (0.344)
With baseline variables	0.559** (0.248)	0.896*** (0.243)	0.673** (0.339)	1.319** (0.529)	1.974*** (0.663)	0.441 (0.334)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014).

Field: 214 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 0.595 point the score to the GPA in introduction to economics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France). (b) At a 10 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.638 point in the score in economic history for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table 13b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Lille 1. *Considered sample: students whose country of origin is NOT France.*

Discipline	Introduction to National accounting	Defining career objectives	Economic history	Functional analysis of organizations	Mathematics (Exam 1)	English language (Semester 2, GPA)	English language (Semester 2, FE)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)						
Without baseline variables	-1.128* (0.594)	1.593*** (0.579)	1.032 (0.982)	-1.625* (0.916)	-1.587* (0.954)	-1.615* (0.861)	-3.120* (1.666)
With baseline variables	-0.724 (0.552)	1.730*** (0.621)	1.521* (0.918)	-1.501* (0.868)	-1.356 (0.818)	-1.454* (0.835)	-3.136** (1.543)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)						
Without baseline variables	-0.829 (0.621)	1.181** (0.571)	0.768 (0.700)	-1.223 (0.919)	-1.329 (1.108)	-1.231 (0.935)	-2.774 (2.215)
With baseline variables	-0.443 (0.378)	1.159** (0.509)	0.970* (0.573)	-1.040 (0.741)	-1.008 (0.743)	-0.992 (0.723)	-2.425 (1.623)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014).

Field: 109 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 10 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice decreases by 1.128 point the score to introduction to national accounting for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France). (b) At a 1 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 1.181 point in the score in "Defining career objectives" for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table 14a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management in university Lille 1. *Considered sample: students who hold a baccalaureate with merit, honors or distinction.*

Note	Introduction to national accounting	Defining career objectives	English language (Semester 1, FE)	Mathematics (Exam 1)	Mathematics (CC)	English language (Semester 2, GPA)	English language (Semester 2, CA)	English language (Semester 2, FE)
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)							
Without baseline variables	-0.897* (0.457)	1.031** (0.424)	-2.360* (1.421)	-1.488* (0.897)	2.455** (1.134)	-1.806** (0.775)	-3.563** (1.489)	-3.445** (1.354)
With baseline variables	-0.621 (0.432)	1.031** (0.431)	-1.298 (1.300)	-0.817 (0.763)	3.556*** (1.095)	-1.343* (0.771)	-3.202** (1.532)	-2.737** (1.211)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)							
Without baseline variables	-0.492 (0.311)	0.552** (0.231)	-1.240 (0.869)	-0.792 (0.563)	1.492** (0.741)	-0.972* (0.562)	-1.975* (1.142)	-1.885* (0.998)
With baseline variables	-0.305 (0.231)	0.493*** (0.201)	-0.626 (0.656)	-0.399 (0.401)	2.012** (0.725)	-0.670 (0.458)	-1.665 (1.021)	-1.398* (0.767)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014).

Field: 136 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 1 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 2.455 point the score to the continuous assessment mathematics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France). (b) At a 10 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.493 point in the score in "Defining career objectives" for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table 14b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management in university Lille 1. *Considered sample: students who hold a baccalaureate without merit, honors or distinction.*

Note	Introduction to economics (GPA)	Introduction to management	Defining career objectives	Statistics	Economic history	English language (Semester, 1, CA)	Mathematics(CA)	Tutorials in economics and computer science
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)							
Without baseline variables	1.268** (0.492)	1.643** (0.679)	1.963*** (0.433)	0.742 (0.537)	1.246* (0.710)	3.110** (1.297)	1.702* (0.917)	0.986* (0.542)
With baseline variables	1.064** (0.475)	1.590** (0.691)	1.824*** (0.438)	0.881* (0.510)	1.300* (0.676)	2.767** (1.286)	1.796** (0.899)	0.906* (0.495)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)							
Without baseline variables	0.917** (0.370)	1.108** (0.470)	1.428*** (0.471)	0.537 (0.365)	0.869* (0.497)	1.942** (0.861)	1.349 (0.822)	0.745** (0.376)
With baseline variables	0.793** (0.351)	1.094** (0.473)	1.365*** (0.454)	0.657* (0.345)	0.938* (0.490)	1.763** (0.849)	1.608* (0.962)	0.696** (0.342)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014).

Field: 187 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 1.590 point the score to the final exam in introduction to management for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France). (b) At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.793 point in the score in introduction to economics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table 14c.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of varying literacy level on academic performance for first-year university students in Economic and Management at university Lille 1. *Considered sample: students who got a baccalauréat with pass 50%-60%.*

Note	Introduction to economics (GPA)	Introduction to economics (CA)	Introduction to management	Defining career objectives	Statistics	Economic history	English language (Semester 1, CA)	General accounting (CA)	Mathematics(GPA)	Mathematics(CA)	Big contemporary economic issues	Tutorials in economics and computer science
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)											
Without baseline variables	1.490** (0.571)	1.015 (0.676)	1.455* (0.851)	2.384*** (0.593)	0.840 (0.724)	0.940 (0.927)	3.355* (1.744)	-1.422* (0.745)	0.620 (0.722)	1.970 (1.188)	1.610** (0.757)	1.139* (0.667)
With baseline variables	1.380*** (0.545)	1.015** (0.597)	1.373 (0.905)	2.153*** (0.614)	1.269* (0.691)	1.107 (0.865)	3.330* (1.820)	-1.149 (0.706)	1.064* (0.568)	2.436** (1.082)	1.356* (0.818)	1.188* (0.633)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)											
Without baseline variables	2.064 (1.290)	1.388 (1.144)	1.776 (1.238)	3.216* (1.927)	1.164 (0.986)	1.277 (1.345)	3.859 (2.577)	-3.182 (3.817)	1.157 (1.585)	4.155 (4.774)	3.903 (4.409)	1.643 (1.138)
With baseline variables	1.673* (0.973)	1.488 (0.961)	1.508 (1.062)	2.601* (1.473)	1.539* (0.857)	1.380 (1.177)	3.300 (2.078)	-2.081 (2.196)	1.627 (1.362)	4.888 (4.994)	2.302 (2.043)	1.456* (0.869)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014).

Field: 118 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 1 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 1.380 point the score to the GPA in introduction to economics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France). (b) At a 10 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 2.601 point in the score in "defining career objectives" for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).



## 7. Conclusion

We have analyzed the impacts of encouraging and improving literacy skills on achieving academic success. We have implemented two randomized experiments in parallel with first-year students enrolled in Economics and Management at two universities: Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (2011-2014) and Lille 1 (2013-2014). The methodology of these experiments consisted in encouraging half of the student population in question to take advantage of an innovative pedagogical tool called *Projet Voltaire* for practicing literacy skills. The other half of our population was not encouraged at all.

Our results demonstrate that improving literacy skills can significantly increase academic performances, not only in language-related fields, but even more so in scientific ones. Depending on the discipline, scores can increase by 0.5 to 1.0-1.5 points on average. Consequently, the probability of students completing the first year of university (or at least one of the semesters) also increases.

We also show that practicing literacy skills provides even more benefit to students who initially demonstrated low literacy skills, such as male students who earned their baccalaureate without honors or students whose native language is not French.

With these results, we have provided concrete evidence that higher literacy skills allow students to improve their academic performances during the first year of university, which is the crucial year for determining future prospects and, the year in which the failure rate is the highest in all the leading world universities. Our results underline the importance of public efforts to support literacy programs at the university level, and we further suggest that severe problems in basic literacy skills should be considered as a crucial factor contributing to academic failure. Consequently, supporting and reinforcing literacy skills at the start of university programs is a key strategic variable that will prove essential to improving the overall success of our educational programs, as well as the results of individual students throughout the path towards post-graduate studies and finally, to increase the chances of life-long success for all students.

## References

- Angrist J. D., Graddy K. and Imbens G. W.** (1996), "Interpretation of instrumental variables estimators in simultaneous equations models with an application to the demand for fish", *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 67, No. 3, pp. 499-527.
- Angrist J. D. and Imbens G. W.** (1995), "Two-stage least squares estimation of average causal effects in models with variable treatment intensity", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 90, No. 430, pp. 431-442.
- Angrist J. D., Imbens G. W. and Rubin D. B.** (1996), "Identification of causal effects using instrumental variables", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 91, No. 434, pp. 444-455.
- Angrist J. D., Long D. and Oreopoulos P.** (2007), "Incentives and Services for College Achievement: Evidence from a Randomized Trial", *IZA discussion paper*, No. 3134.
- Arcidiacono P., Foster G., Goodpaster N. and Kinsler J.** (2012), "Estimating spillovers using panel data, with an application to the classroom", *Quantitative Economics*, Vol. 3, pp. 421-470.
- Arcidiacono P. and Nicholson S.** (2004), "Peer effects in medical school", *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 89, pp. 327-350.
- Arumpalam W., Naylor, R. A. and Smith J.** (2012), "Am I missing something? The effects of absence from class on student performance", *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 31, pp. 363-375.
- Aucejo E. M and James J.** (2016), "The Path to College Education: Are Verbal Skills More Important than Math Skills?", *London School of Economics working paper*, No. 1602.
- Banerjee A. B., Cole S., Duflo E. and Linden L.** (2007), "Remedying education: evidence from two randomized experiments in India", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 122, No. 3, pp. 1235-1264.
- Bettinger E. and Long B. T.** (2004), "Do college instructors matter? The effects of adjuncts and graduate assistants on students' interests and success", *NBER working paper*, No. 10370.
- Bettinger E. and Long B. T.** (2009), "Addressing the Needs of Underprepared Students in Higher Education. Does College Remediation Work?", *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 736-771.
- Borjas G. J.** (2000), "Foreign-Born Teaching Assistants and the Academic Performance of Undergraduates", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 90, No. 2, pp. 355-359.
- Borman G. D., Slavin R. E., Cheung A. C. K., Chamberlain A. M., Madden N. A. and Chambers B.** (2007), "Final Reading Outcomes of the National Randomized Field Trial of 'Success for All'", *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 701-731.
- Bouguen A.** (2016), "Adjusting content to individual student needs: Further evidence from an in-service teacher training program", *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 50, pp. 90-112.
- Calmant J. and Hallier P.** (2008), "Être diplômé de l'enseignement supérieur, un atout pour entrer dans la vie active", *Bref*, No. 253, Céreq.
- Campbell D. T. and Stanley J. C.** (1966), *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Caviglia-Harris J. L.** (2006), "Attendance and Achievement in Economics: Investigating the Impact of Attendance Policies and Absentee Rates on Student Performance", *Journal of Economics and Finance Education*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 1-15.
- Chen J. and Lin T.-F.** (2008), "Class Attendance and Exam Performance: A Randomized Experiment", *Journal of Economic Education*, Summer, pp. 213-227.

- Cohn E. and Johnson E.** (2006), "Class Attendance and Performance in Principles of Economics", *Education Economics*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 211–233, June 2006.
- Coulombe S. and Tremblay J.-F.** (2006), "Literacy and Growth", *Topics in macroeconomics*, Vol. 6, Iss. 2, Article 4, pp. 1-32.
- Daussin J.-M., S. Keskpaik and Rocher T.** (2011), "L'évolution du nombre d'élèves en difficulté face à l'écrit depuis une dizaine d'années", DEPP, Dossier.
- Delavande A., Del Bono E. and Holford A.** (2017), "It's not how much you work but how. The production function for performance among university students", *University of Essex, mimeo*.
- Desjardin and McCall** (2006), "The Impact of the Gates Millennium Scholars Program on Selected Outcomes of Low-Income Minority Students: A Regression Discontinuity Analysis", University of Michigan and of Minnesota, *mimeo*.
- Dynarski S.** (2002), "The consequences of merit aid", *NBER working paper*, No. 9400.
- Duflo E., Glennerster R. and Kremer M.** (2007), "Using randomization in development economics: a toolkit", *Handbook of Development Economics*, Vol. 4, Ch. 61, pp. 3895-3962.
- Ehrenberg R. G. and Zhang L.** (2005), "Do Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Matter?", *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 647-659.
- Garet M. S., Cronen S., Eaton M., Kurki A., Ludwig M., Jones W., Uekawa K. and Falk A.** (2008), "The Impact of Two Professional Development Interventions on Early Reading Instruction and Achievement", IES-NCEE (National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance), 2008-4030, U.S. Department of Education.
- Garibaldi P., Giavazzi F., Ichino A. and Rettore E.,** (2007), "College cost and time to complete a degree: evidence from tuition discontinuities", *NBER working paper*, No. 12863.
- Glewwe P., Kremer M. and Moulin S.** (2002), "Textbooks and Test Scores: Evidence from a Prospective Evaluation in Kenya", *Poverty Action Lab Paper*, No. 8.
- Glewwe P. Kremer M., Moulin S. and Zitzewitz E.** (2004), "Retrospective vs. prospective analyses of school inputs: the case of flip charts in Kenya", *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 74, pp. 251– 268.
- Goulas S. and Megalokonomou R.** (2016), "Swine Flu and The Effect of Compulsory Class Attendance on Academic Performance", *MPRA working paper*, No. 75395.
- Hoffman F. and Oreopoulos P.** (2009), "Professor qualities and student achievement", *NBER working paper*, No. 12596.
- Holland P. W.** (1988), "Causal Inference, Path Analysis and Recursive Structural Equations Models", *Sociological Methodology*, Vol. 18, 449-484.
- Imbens G. W. and Angrist J. D.** (1994), "Identification and estimation of local average treatment effects", *Econometrica*, Vol. 62, No. 2, pp. 467-475.
- Imbens G. W. and Rubin D. B.** (1997), "Estimating outcome distributions for compliers in instrumental variables models", *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 64, pp. 555-574.
- Jacob B.** (2016), "When evidence is not enough: Findings from a randomized evaluation of Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction (EBLI)", *Labour Economics*, Vol. 45, pp. 5–16.
- Kim J. S.** (2007), "The Effects of a Voluntary Summer Reading Intervention on Reading Activities and Reading Achievement", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 2007, Vol. 99, No. 3, pp. 505–515.
- Krueger A. B. and Whitmore D. M.** (2001), "The Effect of Attending a Small Class in the Early Grades on College-Test Taking and Middle School Test Results: Evidence from Project STAR", *Economic Journal*, Vol. 111, No. 468, pp. 1-28.
- Latif E. and Miles S.** (2013), "Class Attendance and Academic Performance: A Panel Data Analysis", *Economic Society of Australia, Economic Papers*, Vol. 32, No. 4, December, pp. 470–476.
- Leuven E., Oosterbeek H., van der Klauw B.** (2010), "The effect of financial rewards on students' achievement: evidence from a randomized experiment", *Journal of the European Economic Association*, Vol. 8, No. 6, pp. 1243–1265.

- Lindblom-Ylänne S., Lonka K. and Leskinen E.** (1996), “Selecting Students for Medical School: What Predicts Success during Basic Science Studies? A Cognitive Approach”, *Higher Education*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 507-527.
- Machin S. and Mc Nally S.** (2008), “The Literacy hour”, *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 92, No. 92, Iss. 5-6, pp. 1441–1462.
- Machin S., Mc Nally S. and Olmo S.** (2007), “New technology in schools: is there a payoff?”, *Economic Journal*, Vol. 117, pp. 1145–1167. **Martins P. and Walker I.** (2006), “Student Achievement and University Classes: Effects of Attendance, Size, Peers, and Teachers”, *IZA discussion paper*, No. 2490.
- OCDE** (2000), “Literacy in the Information Age”, *Report*.
- OCDE** (2016), “Education at a Glance 2016. OECD Indicators”, *Report*.
- Reardon S. F., Valentino R. A. and Kenneth A.** (2012), “Patterns of Literacy among U.S. Students”, *The Future of Children*, Vol. 22, No. 2, Literacy Challenges for the Twenty-First Century, pp. 17-37, Princeton University.
- Romer D.** (1993), “Do Students Go to Class? Should They?”, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 167-174.
- Rouse C. E. and Krueger A. B.** (2004), “Putting computerized instruction to the test: a randomized evaluation of a “scientifically based” reading program”, *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 23, pp. 323–338.
- Rubin D. B.** (1974), “Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and non-randomized studies”, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 66, pp. 688-701.
- Sacerdote B.** (2001), “Peer Effects with Random Assignment: Results for Dartmouth Roommates”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 116, No. 2 (May, 2001), pp. 681-704.
- Slavin R. E., Lake C., Chambers B., Cheung A., Davis S.** (2009), “Effective Reading Programs for the Elementary Grades: A Best-Evidence Synthesis”, *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 79, No. 4, pp. 1391–1466.
- Stinebrickner R. and Stinebrickner T. R.** (2008), “The Causal Effect of Studying on Academic Performance”, *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, Vol. 8, Iss. 1 (Frontiers), Article 14, pp. 1-53.

## Appendices.

**Table A1.** Correlations between time to practice literacy and varying the literacy test score (difference between the second and the first literacy test scores), for first-year university students in Economics and Management, at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée, considering different econometric specifications.

Time to literacy practice indicator (specification) / Explanatory variables	Indicator 1 (1)	Indicator 1 (2)	Indicator 1 (3)	Indicator 2 (1)	Indicator 2 (2)	Indicator 2 (3)
Time to literacy practice : indicator 1	0.012*** (0.001)	0.012*** (0.001)	0.011*** (0.001)			
Time to literacy practice : indicator 2				0.010*** (0.001)	0.010*** (0.001)	0.009*** (0.001)
First literacy test score		0.096** (0.041)	0.032 (0.046)		0.057 (0.039)	0.002 (0.043)
Age			0.003 (0.041)			0.002 (0.040)
Gender (Men vs. women)			-0.752*** (0.252)			-0.644*** (0.240)
Scholarship student			0.068 (0.228)			0.026 (0.219)
Baccalaureate S			0.305 (0.253)			0.261 (0.241)
Baccalaureate STG			-0.722* (0.429)			-0.707* (0.414)
Other baccalaureate			-0.389 (0.442)			-0.383 (0.415)
Intercept	1.954*** (0.148)	1.323*** (0.315)	2.152** (0.885)	1.721*** (0.137)	1.351*** (0.289)	2.103** (0.835)
Observations	528	528	528	528	528	528
R2	0.281	0.287	0.307	0.345	0.347	0.363
F	92.31	50.04	18.11	144.6	78.43	24.82

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 526 first-year university students in Economics and Management stream, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as the two literacy test score.

Notes: correlation with or without control variables (OLS estimator). Time to practice literacy: indicator 1 = indicator provided by platform *Projet Voltaire*; indicator 2 = overall time spent using platform *Projet Voltaire* - duration of the 1<sup>st</sup> literacy evaluation - duration of the 2<sup>nd</sup> literacy evaluation. Explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; first-year university student age; student gender (reference=female); scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= baccalaureate ES, Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at a 1% (respectively a 5% or 10%).

Reading: at a 1 percent level, and whatever the considered econometric specification, a rise of 83 minutes in the time to literacy practice is associated to a 1 point more increase in the variation of the literacy test score, for first-year university students in Economics and Management at University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée.

**Table A2.** Effect of time to practice literacy on varying the literacy test score (difference between the second and the first literacy test scores), for first-year university students in Economics and Management, at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée, considering different econometric specifications.

Time to literacy practice indicator (specification) / Explanatory variables	Indicator 1 (1)	Indicator 1 (2)	Indicator 1 (3)	Indicator 2 (1)	Indicator 2 (2)	Indicator 2 (3)
Time to literacy practice: indicator 1	0.021*** (0.004)	0.021*** (0.004)	0.021*** (0.004)			
Time to literacy practice: indicator 2				0,015*** (0,003)	0,015*** (0,003)	0,015*** (0,003)
Score to the first literacy test		0.110** (0.043)	0.095* (0.050)		0,045 (0,043)	0,030 (0,045)
Age			0.002 (0.039)			0,000 (0,037)
Gender (Men vs. women)			-0.094 (0.396)			-0,051 (0,380)
Scholarship student			-0.123 (0.264)			-0,155 (0,249)
Baccalaureate S			0.170 (0.280)			0,124 (0,265)
Baccalaureate STG			-0.434 (0.514)			-0,465 (0,473)
Other baccalaureate			0.156 (0.528)			0,051 (0,472)
Intercept	1.029** (0.432)	0.331 (0.513)	0.452 (1.033)	0,870** (0,439)	0,583 (0,455)	0,732 (0,971)
Observations	526	526	526	526	526	526
R2	0.118	0.132	0.127	0,225	0,228	0,223
F	24.39	16.26	10.45	27,48	17,88	11,76

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 526 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as the two literacy test score.

Notes: effect of time to literacy practice (instrumental variable estimates using a Wald estimator instrumenting time to literacy practice using the encouragement dummy. Time to practice literacy: indicator 1 = indicator provided by platform *Projet Voltaire*; indicator 2 = overall time spent using platform *Projet Voltaire* - duration of the 1<sup>st</sup> literacy evaluation - duration of the 2<sup>nd</sup> literacy evaluation. Explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the first-year university student; gender of the student (reference=female); scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= baccalaureate ES, Economics and Social Science). Robust standard errors. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at a 1% (respectively at a 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: at a 1 percent level, and considering the first indicator measuring the student time to literacy practice, an increase of 50 minutes in the time to literacy practice induces an increase in the variation of the 2 literacy tests scores for first-year university students in Economics and Management, at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée.

**Table A3.** Effect of encouragement to literacy learning on academic performance of first-year university students at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée.*Detailed results.*

Variables / Grades	Overall GPA in first-year BA	First semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 1)	Introduction to Economics(GPA)	Introduction to Economics (CA)	<b>Introduction to Economics (FE)</b>	Introduction to Management(GPA)	<b>Introduction to Management(CA)</b>	Introduction to Management (FE)
Encouragement	0.091 (0.202)	0.084 (0.204)	0.256 (0.238)	0.302 (0.291)	-0.293 (0.313)	<b>0.708** (0.335)</b>	0.176 (0.237)	<b>0.642*** (0.215)</b>	-0.470 (0.319)
Intercept	10.341*** (0.150)	10.272*** (0.154)	9.624*** (0.180)	9.191*** (0.215)	11.467*** (0.229)	<b>7.292*** (0.250)</b>	10.024*** (0.186)	<b>11.438*** (0.169)</b>	8.853*** (0.249)
Observations	437	492	516	521	517	<b>512</b>	519	<b>517</b>	518
R2	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.002	<b>0.009</b>	0.001	<b>0.017</b>	0.004
F	0.203	0.171	1.159	1.076	0.874	<b>4.457</b>	0.551	<b>8.875</b>	2.173

  

Variables / Grades	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 1)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (CA)	<b>Mathematics (FE)</b>	English language (GPA)	National Accounting (FE)	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 1)	Methodology (GPA)	Methodology (CA)	Methodology (FE)	Dissertation
Encouragement	0.187 (0.275)	0.533 (0.406)	-0.163 (0.405)	<b>1.067** (0.443)</b>	0.061 (0.237)	-0.286 (0.301)	-0.150 (0.207)	0.125 (0.206)	0.045 (0.199)	-0.001 (0.275)	-0.213 (0.195)
Intercept	9.695*** (0.211)	9.031*** (0.304)	10.601*** (0.306)	<b>7.764*** (0.331)</b>	11.574*** (0.188)	8.739*** (0.228)	11.131*** (0.150)	10.245*** (0.158)	12.262*** (0.142)	8.538*** (0.216)	12.459*** (0.129)
Observations	504	514	507	<b>512</b>	517	516	475	522	516	510	522
R2	0.001	0.003	0.000	<b>0.011</b>	0.000	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.002
F	0.460	1.724	0.162	<b>5.803</b>	0.0662	0.900	0.525	0.368	0.0521	1.48e-05	1.197

  

Variables / Grades	Second semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 2)	<b>Introduction to Microeconomics (GPA)</b>	<b>Introduction to Microeconomics (CA)</b>	Introduction to Microeconomics (FE)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (GPA)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (CA)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (FE)	Financial economics (GPA)	Financial economics (CA)	Financial economics (FE)
Encouragement	0.162 (0.220)	0.356 (0.323)	<b>1.082*** (0.406)</b>	<b>0.838** (0.392)</b>	0.655 (0.413)	0.398 (0.357)	0.074 (0.325)	-0.089 (0.348)	0.587 (0.385)	0.607 (0.379)	0.052 (0.369)
Intercept	10.057*** (0.161)	8.999*** (0.247)	<b>7.502*** (0.308)</b>	<b>9.665*** (0.289)</b>	7.143*** (0.315)	8.691*** (0.279)	11.547*** (0.254)	7.753*** (0.264)	9.178*** (0.302)	11.102*** (0.303)	9.051*** (0.277)
Observations	443	466	<b>493</b>	<b>454</b>	451	492	453	453	488	454	452
R2	0.001	0.003	<b>0.014</b>	<b>0.010</b>	0.006	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.006	0.000
F	0.542	1.215	<b>7.114</b>	<b>4.570</b>	2.519	1.239	0.0514	0.0651	2.323	2.556	0.0197

  

Variables / Grades	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 2)	General policy of the firm (GPA)	Entrepreneurship (CA)	Entrepreneurship (FE)	<b>Statistics and computer science (GPA)</b>	Statistics and computer science (CA)	Statistics and computer science (FE)	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 2)	Principles Of law	<b>English language (Semester 2)</b>
Encouragement	0.240 (0.268)	0.350 (0.302)	-0.085 (0.226)	-0.172 (0.283)	<b>0.875** (0.369)</b>	0.390 (0.292)	0.448 (0.396)	0.131 (0.175)	-0.118 (0.222)	<b>0.384* (0.230)</b>
Intercept	9.517*** (0.204)	9.604*** (0.246)	11.796*** (0.170)	9.313*** (0.217)	<b>8.234*** (0.280)</b>	11.515*** (0.223)	7.152*** (0.288)	11.227*** (0.125)	11.056*** (0.169)	<b>11.457*** (0.165)</b>
Observations	469	491	462	454	<b>489</b>	439	455	447	454	<b>449</b>
R2	0.002	0.003	0.000	0.001	<b>0.012</b>	0.004	0.003	0.001	0.001	<b>0.006</b>
F	0.804	1.344	0.140	0.371	<b>5.640</b>	1.786	1.280	0.557	0.282	<b>2.773</b>

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 526 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered teaching, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* and \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy learning increases by 1.082 points the score to the grade point average in introduction to microeconomics for first-year university students in Economics and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table A4.** Effect of increasing the literacy level on academic performance of first-year university students at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée. *Detailed results.*

Variables / Grades	Overall GPA in first-year BA	First semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 1)	Introduction to Economics(GPA)	Introduction to Economics (CA)	<b>Introduction to Economics (FE)</b>	Introduction to Management(GPA)	<b>Introduction to Management(CA)</b>	Introduction to Management (FE)
Increase in literacy test scores	0.092 (0.196)	0.068 (0.159)	0.203 (0.178)	0.246 (0.228)	-0.238 (0.272)	<b>0.581** (0.277)</b>	0.141 (0.181)	<b>0.511*** (0.173)</b>	-0.404 (0.314)
Intercept	10.072*** (0.803)	10.190*** (0.544)	9.108*** (0.589)	8.569*** (0.740)	12.072*** (0.888)	<b>5.799*** (0.914)</b>	9.666*** (0.606)	<b>10.148*** (0.575)</b>	9.895*** (1.048)
Observations	437	492	516	521	517	<b>512</b>	519	<b>517</b>	518
R2	0.044	0.058	0.099	0.054	-0.135	<b>-0.014</b>	0.083	<b>-0.028</b>	-0.304
F	0.0509	0.1800	1.290	1.160	0.760	<b>4.370</b>	0.600	<b>8.640</b>	1.650

  

Variables / Grades	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 1)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (CA)	<b>Mathematics (FE)</b>	English language (GPA)	National Accounting (FE)	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 1)	Methodology (GPA)	Methodology (CA)	Methodology (FE)	Dissertation
Increase in literacy test scores	0.153 (0.216)	0.428 (0.306)	-0.132 (0.337)	<b>0.879** (0.343)</b>	0.051 (0.195)	-0.243 (0.276)	-0.117 (0.168)	0.103 (0.165)	0.037 (0.158)	-0.001 (0.233)	-0.176 (0.178)
Intercept	9.293*** (0.731)	7.939*** (1.012)	10.942*** (1.126)	<b>5.494*** (1.135)</b>	11.445*** (0.654)	9.366*** (0.911)	11.420*** (0.543)	9.984*** (0.543)	12.168*** (0.514)	8.540*** (0.786)	12.906*** (0.559)
Observations	504	514	507	<b>512</b>	517	516	475	522	516	510	522
R2	0.084	0.120	-0.055	<b>0.122</b>	0.023	-0.156	-0.091	0.063	0.025	-0.001	-0.215
F	0.503	1.950	0.150	<b>6.550</b>	0.475	0.780	0.480	0.390	0.050	0.000	0.980

  

Variables / Grades	Second semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 2)	<b>Introduction to Microeconomics (GPA)</b>	<b>Introduction to Microeconomics (CA)</b>	<b>Introduction to Microeconomics (FE)</b>	Introduction to Macroeconomics (GPA)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (CA)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (FE)	Financial economics (GPA)	Financial economics (CA)	Financial economics (FE)
Increase in literacy test scores	0.167 (0.213)	0.385 (0.324)	<b>1.032*** (0.376)</b>	<b>0.845** (0.402)</b>	<b>0.690* (0.420)</b>	0.377 (0.315)	0.075 (0.325)	-0.093 (0.372)	<b>0.558* (0.337)</b>	<b>0.578* (0.352)</b>	0.055 (0.389)
Intercept	9.575*** (0.734)	7.917*** (1.101)	<b>4.799*** (1.223)</b>	<b>7.242*** (1.385)</b>	<b>5.170*** (1.449)</b>	7.707*** (1.036)	11.332*** (1.137)	8.019*** (1.277)	<b>7.695*** (1.129)</b>	<b>9.455*** (1.251)</b>	8.892*** (1.334)
Observations	<b>443</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>451</b>	492	453	453	<b>488</b>	<b>454</b>	452
R2	0.114	0.143	<b>0.061</b>	<b>-0.026</b>	<b>0.070</b>	0.137	0.031	-0.045	<b>0.154</b>	<b>0.054</b>	0.022
F	0.610	1.400	<b>7.510</b>	<b>4.400</b>	<b>2.690</b>	1.430	0.050	0.060	<b>2.730</b>	<b>2.690</b>	0.020

  

Variables / Grades	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 2)	Entrepreneurship (GPA)	Entrepreneurship (CA)	Policy of the firm (FE)	<b>Descriptive statistics and computer science (GPA)</b>	Descriptive statistics and computer science (CA)	Descriptive statistics and computer science (FE)	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 2)	Principles Of law	English language (Semester 2)
Increase in literacy test scores	0.249 (0.261)	0.329 (0.267)	-0.083 (0.227)	-0.187 (0.326)	<b>0.840** (0.335)</b>	0.395 (0.294)	0.486 (0.407)	0.144 (0.189)	-0.134 (0.260)	0.430 (0.272)
Intercept	8.828*** (0.876)	8.746*** (0.892)	12.029*** (0.773)	9.847*** (1.119)	<b>6.037*** (1.091)</b>	10.371*** (1.035)	5.760*** (1.378)	10.809*** (0.644)	11.442*** (0.889)	10.206*** (0.925)
Observations	469	491	462	454	<b>489</b>	439	<b>455</b>	447	454	449
R2	0.119	0.108	-0.034	-0.145	<b>0.109</b>	0.014	0.105	0.033	-0.076	-0.109
F	0.910	1.510	0.130	0.320	<b>6.270</b>	1.790	1.420	0.570	0.260	2.480

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 526 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline survey is available, as well as the two literacy test score.

Notes: effect of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Robust standard error within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* and \*) stands for significance at a 1% (respectively 5% and 10%) level.

Reading: at a 5 percent level, a rise of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces an increase of 0.879 point in the score of the final exam of Mathematics for first-year university students in Economics and Management at university Paris -Est Marne-La-Vallée.



**Table A5.** Effect of encouragement to literacy learning on academic performance of first-year university students at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée.

<i>Information provided by the administrative baseline survey are used are explanatory variables of the considered score. Detailed results.</i>									
Variables / Scores	Overall GPA in first-year BA	First semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 1)	Introduction to Economics(GPA)	Introduction to Economics (CA)	<b>Introduction to Economics (FE)</b>	Introduction to Management(GPA)	<b>Introduction to Management(CA)</b>	Introduction to Management (FE)
Encouragement	0.203 (0.177)	0.115 (0.171)	0.250 (0.212)	0.290 (0.262)	-0.280 (0.292)	<b>0.683** (0.313)</b>	0.190 (0.213)	<b>0.627*** (0.206)</b>	-0.448 (0.294)
Score to the first literacy test	0.248*** (0.038)	0.280*** (0.038)	0.256*** (0.047)	0.295*** (0.059)	0.253*** (0.064)	<b>0.339*** (0.068)</b>	0.224*** (0.046)	<b>0.160*** (0.043)</b>	0.288*** (0.062)
Age	0.009 (0.064)	0.013 (0.050)	-0.006 (0.068)	-0.000 (0.065)	-0.058 (0.076)	<b>0.113* (0.063)</b>	-0.011 (0.080)	<b>0.017 (0.072)</b>	0.001 (0.091)
Gender (Man vs. woman)	-0.919*** (0.179)	-0.916*** (0.179)	-0.686*** (0.224)	-0.277 (0.277)	-0.439 (0.305)	<b>-0.250 (0.331)</b>	-1.139*** (0.220)	<b>-1.020*** (0.199)</b>	-1.321*** (0.298)
Scholarship student	-0.358** (0.179)	-0.301* (0.174)	-0.328 (0.218)	-0.621** (0.273)	-0.214 (0.308)	<b>-0.884*** (0.324)</b>	-0.065 (0.213)	<b>-0.029 (0.204)</b>	-0.105 (0.298)
Baccalaureate S	0.744*** (0.186)	0.750*** (0.189)	0.500** (0.248)	1.065*** (0.303)	1.271*** (0.333)	<b>0.974*** (0.357)</b>	-0.039 (0.247)	<b>-0.125 (0.225)</b>	0.246 (0.346)
Baccalaureate STG	-2.046*** (0.416)	-1.925*** (0.342)	-1.849*** (0.416)	-2.297*** (0.441)	-2.029*** (0.493)	<b>-1.782*** (0.572)</b>	-1.393*** (0.468)	<b>-0.072 (0.483)</b>	-1.675*** (0.577)
Other baccalaureate	-0.613 (0.788)	-1.642*** (0.616)	-2.112*** (0.670)	-2.638*** (0.814)	-2.779*** (0.945)	<b>-2.073** (0.836)</b>	-1.801*** (0.600)	<b>-0.653 (0.581)</b>	-2.329*** (0.709)
Intercept	8.960*** (1.237)	8.732*** (1.003)	8.647*** (1.338)	7.635*** (1.334)	11.093*** (1.476)	<b>3.375** (1.322)</b>	9.626*** (1.562)	<b>10.736*** (1.409)</b>	7.870*** (1.800)
Observations	437	492	516	521	517	<b>512</b>	519	<b>517</b>	518
R2	0.282	0.308	0.195	0.193	0.152	<b>0.144</b>	0.172	<b>0.109</b>	0.150
F	20.43	29.19	14.76	15.89	11.51	<b>11.36</b>	13.88	<b>6.890</b>	12.92

  

Variables / Scores	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 1)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (CA)	<b>Mathematics (FE)</b>	English language (GPA)	National Accounting (FE)	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 1)	Methodology (GPA)	Methodology (CA)	Methodology (FE)	Dissertation
Encouragement	0.191 (0.230)	0.499 (0.343)	-0.156 (0.343)	<b>1.036*** (0.387)</b>	0.052 (0.206)	-0.219 (0.281)	-0.180 (0.192)	0.129 (0.183)	0.090 (0.181)	0.033 (0.259)	-0.179 (0.168)
Score to the first literacy test	0.313*** (0.049)	0.291*** (0.075)	0.251*** (0.073)	<b>0.335*** (0.087)</b>	0.414*** (0.043)	0.230*** (0.061)	0.238*** (0.038)	0.272*** (0.041)	0.275*** (0.038)	0.318*** (0.058)	0.274*** (0.037)
Age	0.029 (0.064)	0.091 (0.090)	0.037 (0.100)	<b>0.166* (0.095)</b>	-0.028 (0.057)	-0.049 (0.076)	-0.008 (0.033)	-0.052 (0.044)	-0.032 (0.056)	-0.048 (0.042)	-0.012 (0.032)
Gender (Man vs. woman)	-1.080*** (0.237)	-1.550*** (0.354)	-1.541*** (0.357)	<b>-1.429*** (0.396)</b>	-0.367* (0.208)	-0.958*** (0.283)	-0.927*** (0.197)	-0.922*** (0.187)	-0.654*** (0.185)	-1.134*** (0.269)	-0.884*** (0.186)
Scholarship student	-0.505** (0.233)	-0.494 (0.343)	-0.674** (0.338)	<b>-0.066 (0.388)</b>	-0.488** (0.214)	-0.784*** (0.294)	-0.173 (0.206)	-0.236 (0.187)	-0.370* (0.190)	-0.149 (0.264)	-0.113 (0.184)
Baccalaureate S	1.636*** (0.253)	3.569*** (0.386)	3.611*** (0.394)	<b>3.617*** (0.433)</b>	0.336 (0.210)	-0.873*** (0.328)	0.118 (0.208)	-0.016 (0.201)	-0.226 (0.197)	0.228 (0.278)	-0.221 (0.177)
Baccalaureate STG	-2.613*** (0.423)	-3.698*** (0.576)	-3.444*** (0.570)	<b>-3.726*** (0.662)</b>	-1.186*** (0.393)	-2.263*** (0.519)	-0.775* (0.461)	-1.515*** (0.355)	-1.610*** (0.452)	-0.814 (0.532)	-1.615*** (0.578)
Other baccalaureate	-1.999** (0.776)	-1.867* (1.110)	-1.916 (1.188)	<b>-1.435 (1.186)</b>	-2.014*** (0.728)	-2.347*** (0.709)	-0.799 (0.646)	-1.606** (0.649)	-1.300** (0.637)	-1.134 (0.715)	-0.737 (0.551)
Intercept	7.665*** (1.275)	5.812*** (1.798)	8.638*** (1.966)	<b>2.612 (1.907)</b>	9.860*** (1.116)	9.465*** (1.520)	10.392*** (0.671)	10.233*** (0.853)	11.793*** (1.074)	8.072*** (0.887)	11.633*** (0.629)
Observations	504	514	507	<b>512</b>	517	516	475	522	516	510	522
R2	0.317	0.313	0.299	<b>0.277</b>	0.258	0.143	0.165	0.238	0.209	0.144	0.215
F	34.04	36.55	34.30	<b>29.80</b>	21.08	13.25	10.68	15.52	13.22	9.862	15.76

Variables / Scores	Second semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 2)	Introduction to Microeconomics (GPA)	Introduction to Microeconomics (CA)	Introduction to Microeconomics (FE)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (GPA)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (CA)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (FE)	Financial economics (GPA)	Financial economics (CA)	Financial economics (FE)
Encouragement	0.312 (0.199)	<b>0.508*</b> ( <b>0.298</b> )	<b>1.048***</b> ( <b>0.367</b> )	<b>0.954***</b> ( <b>0.366</b> )	<b>0.828**</b> ( <b>0.396</b> )	0.371 (0.321)	0.241 (0.307)	0.051 (0.334)	<b>0.619*</b> ( <b>0.353</b> )	<b>0.728**</b> ( <b>0.360</b> )	0.262 (0.356)
First literacy test score	0.246*** (0.041)	<b>0.235***</b> ( <b>0.063</b> )	<b>0.282***</b> ( <b>0.082</b> )	<b>0.163**</b> ( <b>0.081</b> )	<b>0.271***</b> ( <b>0.085</b> )	0.343*** (0.068)	0.198*** (0.061)	0.336*** (0.070)	<b>0.258***</b> ( <b>0.073</b> )	<b>0.234***</b> ( <b>0.075</b> )	0.230*** (0.070)
Age	-0.023 (0.073)	<b>-0.028</b> ( <b>0.086</b> )	<b>0.106</b> ( <b>0.086</b> )	<b>0.000</b> ( <b>0.068</b> )	<b>0.066</b> ( <b>0.094</b> )	0.068 (0.106)	-0.035 (0.089)	-0.015 (0.110)	<b>0.090</b> ( <b>0.122</b> )	<b>-0.002</b> ( <b>0.094</b> )	-0.071 (0.141)
Gender (Man vs. woman)	-0.912*** (0.201)	<b>-1.325***</b> ( <b>0.302</b> )	<b>-2.159***</b> ( <b>0.373</b> )	<b>-1.782***</b> ( <b>0.368</b> )	<b>-1.650***</b> ( <b>0.400</b> )	-1.140*** (0.314)	-1.165*** (0.303)	-0.110 (0.334)	<b>-1.609***</b> ( <b>0.354</b> )	<b>-1.557***</b> ( <b>0.365</b> )	-0.720*** (0.364)
Scholarship student	-0.346* (0.203)	<b>-0.269</b> ( <b>0.305</b> )	<b>0.037</b> ( <b>0.373</b> )	<b>-0.069</b> ( <b>0.371</b> )	<b>-0.420</b> ( <b>0.401</b> )	0.030 (0.320)	-0.079 (0.319)	-0.501 (0.333)	<b>-0.444</b> ( <b>0.353</b> )	<b>-0.554</b> ( <b>0.368</b> )	-0.823** (0.361)
Baccalaureate S	0.696*** (0.209)	<b>0.848***</b> ( <b>0.317</b> )	<b>1.881***</b> ( <b>0.405</b> )	<b>2.554***</b> ( <b>0.395</b> )	<b>1.047**</b> ( <b>0.429</b> )	0.683* (0.349)	0.069 (0.342)	1.133*** (0.352)	<b>-0.222</b> ( <b>0.373</b> )	<b>-0.185</b> ( <b>0.392</b> )	-0.349 (0.377)
Baccalaureate STG	-2.157*** (0.438)	<b>-3.036***</b> ( <b>0.605</b> )	<b>-2.965***</b> ( <b>0.666</b> )	<b>-2.412***</b> ( <b>0.816</b> )	<b>-2.846***</b> ( <b>0.782</b> )	-3.378*** (0.623)	-2.838*** (0.617)	-2.339*** (0.653)	<b>-3.462***</b> ( <b>0.659</b> )	<b>-2.286***</b> ( <b>0.664</b> )	-2.815*** (0.798)
Other baccalaureate	-0.468 (0.908)	<b>-1.391</b> ( <b>1.219</b> )	<b>-0.741</b> ( <b>1.289</b> )	<b>0.041</b> ( <b>1.484</b> )	<b>0.104</b> ( <b>1.490</b> )	-2.974*** (1.071)	-2.795** (1.200)	-1.232 (1.002)	<b>-3.238**</b> ( <b>1.295</b> )	<b>-2.018</b> ( <b>1.316</b> )	-2.103 (1.378)
Intercept	9.282*** (1.410)	<b>8.661***</b> ( <b>1.741</b> )	<b>4.577**</b> ( <b>1.778</b> )	<b>8.818***</b> ( <b>1.451</b> )	<b>4.885**</b> ( <b>1.894</b> )	5.964*** (2.082)	11.651*** (1.739)	5.782*** (2.007)	<b>7.291***</b> ( <b>2.383</b> )	<b>10.808***</b> ( <b>1.825</b> )	9.748*** (2.721)
Observations	443	<b>466</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>451</b>	492	453	453	<b>488</b>	<b>454</b>	452
R2	0.240	<b>0.181</b>	<b>0.216</b>	<b>0.183</b>	<b>0.134</b>	0.209	0.133	0.137	<b>0.172</b>	<b>0.117</b>	0.100
F	17.34	<b>12.06</b>	<b>17.60</b>	<b>12.50</b>	<b>8.806</b>	14.70	7.687	10.46	<b>11.82</b>	<b>7.449</b>	6.285

Variables / Scores	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 2)	Entrepreneurship (GPA)	Entrepreneurship (CA)	Entrepreneurship (FE)	Statistics and computer science (GPA)	Statistics and computer science (CA)	Statistics and computer science (FE)	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 2)	Principles Of law t	English language (Semester 2)
Encouragement	0.289 (0.243)	0.294 (0.281)	-0.058 (0.220)	-0.067 (0.281)	<b>0.807**</b> ( <b>0.324</b> )	0.437 (0.269)	<b>0.641*</b> ( <b>0.365</b> )	0.236 (0.164)	0.014 (0.223)	<b>0.477**</b> ( <b>0.206</b> )
First literacy test score	0.289*** (0.051)	0.234*** (0.059)	0.154*** (0.048)	0.201*** (0.063)	<b>0.418***</b> ( <b>0.071</b> )	0.269*** (0.052)	<b>0.452***</b> ( <b>0.078</b> )	0.204*** (0.034)	0.054 (0.045)	<b>0.372***</b> ( <b>0.046</b> )
Age	0.008 (0.089)	0.125 (0.098)	0.053 (0.111)	-0.037 (0.069)	<b>0.134</b> ( <b>0.103</b> )	-0.041 (0.093)	<b>-0.002</b> ( <b>0.125</b> )	-0.106** (0.043)	-0.170*** (0.045)	<b>-0.062</b> ( <b>0.074</b> )
Gender (Man vs. woman)	-0.630** (0.244)	-0.940*** (0.256)	-0.492** (0.216)	-0.478* (0.280)	<b>-0.817**</b> ( <b>0.325</b> )	-0.139 (0.271)	<b>-0.668*</b> ( <b>0.375</b> )	-0.491*** (0.173)	-0.237 (0.228)	<b>-0.553***</b> ( <b>0.209</b> )
Scholarship student	-0.433* (0.239)	-0.108 (0.264)	-0.723*** (0.222)	-0.406 (0.273)	<b>-0.198</b> ( <b>0.318</b> )	-0.533** (0.259)	<b>-0.620*</b> ( <b>0.369</b> )	-0.046 (0.166)	0.053 (0.218)	<b>-0.179</b> ( <b>0.214</b> )
Baccalaureate S	1.062*** (0.254)	0.088 (0.287)	-0.139 (0.230)	0.087 (0.298)	<b>1.677***</b> ( <b>0.363</b> )	1.356*** (0.296)	<b>1.873***</b> ( <b>0.414</b> )	0.233 (0.174)	-0.179 (0.235)	<b>0.486**</b> ( <b>0.227</b> )
Baccalaureate STG	-2.050*** (0.429)	-2.483*** (0.636)	-1.184** (0.490)	-1.169** (0.460)	<b>-3.413***</b> ( <b>0.571</b> )	-2.333*** (0.538)	<b>-3.029***</b> ( <b>0.610</b> )	-1.232*** (0.445)	-1.180** (0.542)	<b>-1.344**</b> ( <b>0.598</b> )
Other baccalaureate	-1.822* (1.050)	-3.244*** (1.115)	-2.409*** (0.898)	-0.589 (1.319)	<b>-2.059*</b> ( <b>1.113</b> )	-1.731 (1.058)	<b>-0.497</b> ( <b>1.286</b> )	-0.415 (0.516)	-0.352 (0.632)	<b>-0.860</b> ( <b>0.587</b> )
Intercept	7.790*** (1.727)	6.617*** (1.898)	10.499*** (2.096)	9.081*** (1.373)	<b>3.386*</b> ( <b>2.044</b> )	10.475*** (1.775)	<b>4.275*</b> ( <b>2.429</b> )	12.063*** (0.839)	14.015*** (0.892)	<b>10.369***</b> ( <b>1.466</b> )
Observations	469	491	462	454	<b>489</b>	439	<b>455</b>	447	454	<b>449</b>
R2	0.211	0.175	0.111	0.064	<b>0.257</b>	0.195	<b>0.205</b>	0.164	0.045	<b>0.227</b>
F	16.89	9.223	5.827	4.543	<b>23.55</b>	13.97	<b>19.91</b>	10.92	2.759	<b>14.82</b>

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 526 first-year university students in Economics and Management stream, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline survey is available, as well as the two literacy test score. Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered teaching, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to FE and CA. Included baseline variables: score to the first literacy test, age of the university student; gender (reference=female); scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). \*\*\* (respectively \*\* and \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy learning increases by 1.048 points the score to the grade point average in introduction to microeconomics for first-year university students in Economics and Management at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France).

**Table A6.** Effect of increasing the literacy level on academic performance of first-year university students at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée.  
*Information provided by the administrative baseline survey are used as explanatory variables of the considered score. Detailed results.*

Variables / Grades	Overall GPA in first-year BA	First semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 1)	Introduction to Economics(GPA)	Introduction to Economics (CA)	<b>Introduction to Economics (FE)</b>	Introduction to Management(GPA)	<b>Introduction to Management(CA)</b>	Introduction to Management (FE)
Increase in literacy test scores	0.186 (0.150)	0.088 (0.124)	0.196 (0.157)	0.234 (0.203)	-0.226 (0.248)	<b>0.552** (0.253)</b>	0.150 (0.160)	<b>0.494*** (0.167)</b>	-0.374 (0.273)
Score to the first literacy test	0.262*** (0.037)	0.285*** (0.036)	0.266*** (0.046)	0.305*** (0.057)	0.242*** (0.068)	<b>0.362*** (0.067)</b>	0.232*** (0.045)	<b>0.185*** (0.046)</b>	0.272*** (0.069)
Age	0.016 (0.062)	0.012 (0.049)	-0.005 (0.064)	0.001 (0.060)	-0.057 (0.081)	<b>0.112* (0.059)</b>	-0.011 (0.078)	<b>0.016 (0.070)</b>	-0.000 (0.097)
Gender (Men vs. women)	-0.608** (0.302)	-0.787*** (0.238)	-0.397 (0.306)	0.077 (0.392)	-0.794 (0.494)	<b>0.570 (0.508)</b>	-0.917*** (0.311)	<b>-0.271 (0.332)</b>	-1.879*** (0.510)
Scholarship student	-0.391** (0.166)	-0.328* (0.171)	-0.383* (0.213)	-0.679** (0.265)	-0.148 (0.330)	<b>-1.024*** (0.327)</b>	-0.106 (0.209)	<b>-0.161 (0.213)</b>	-0.023 (0.336)
Baccalaureate S	0.654*** (0.197)	0.721*** (0.190)	0.428* (0.251)	0.972*** (0.307)	1.366*** (0.369)	<b>0.737* (0.382)</b>	-0.094 (0.255)	<b>-0.335 (0.257)</b>	0.402 (0.399)
Baccalaureate STG	-1.875*** (0.413)	-1.855*** (0.350)	-1.619*** (0.450)	-2.037*** (0.500)	-2.271*** (0.560)	<b>-1.190* (0.708)</b>	-1.213** (0.494)	<b>0.440 (0.500)</b>	-2.098*** (0.669)
Other Baccalaureate	-0.559 (0.748)	-1.567*** (0.599)	-1.910*** (0.638)	-2.413*** (0.788)	-3.011*** (1.034)	<b>-1.616** (0.794)</b>	-1.640*** (0.581)	<b>-0.116 (0.565)</b>	-2.694*** (0.816)
Intercept	8.081*** (1.395)	8.422*** (1.084)	7.926*** (1.441)	6.784*** (1.496)	11.904*** (1.819)	<b>1.440 (1.590)</b>	9.073*** (1.664)	<b>8.987*** (1.561)</b>	9.243*** (2.188)
Observations	437	492	516	521	517	<b>512</b>	519	<b>517</b>	518
R2	0.369	0.362	0.261	0.241	0.051	<b>0.112</b>	0.229	<b>0.030</b>	-0.068
F	22.82	31.02	16.03	16.15	10.49	<b>10.75</b>	15.36	<b>7.098</b>	10.18

  

Variables / Grades	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 1)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (CA)	<b>Mathematics (FE)</b>	English language (GPA)	National Accounting (FE)	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 1)	Methodology (GPA)	Methodology (CA)	Methodology (FE)	Dissertation
Increase in literacy test scores	0.152 (0.174)	0.395 (0.255)	-0.124 (0.278)	<b>0.836*** (0.298)</b>	0.042 (0.165)	-0.182 (0.244)	-0.140 (0.155)	0.106 (0.145)	0.072 (0.139)	0.027 (0.210)	-0.146 (0.148)
Score to the first literacy test	0.320*** (0.046)	0.310*** (0.070)	0.244*** (0.077)	<b>0.370*** (0.081)</b>	0.416*** (0.043)	0.222*** (0.063)	0.229*** (0.039)	0.277*** (0.041)	0.278*** (0.038)	0.318*** (0.057)	0.268*** (0.040)
Age	0.029 (0.062)	0.092 (0.086)	0.037 (0.099)	<b>0.168** (0.084)</b>	-0.028 (0.057)	-0.050 (0.076)	-0.005 (0.034)	-0.052 (0.041)	-0.032 (0.054)	-0.048 (0.041)	-0.013 (0.034)
Gender (Men vs. women)	-0.848** (0.334)	-0.952* (0.504)	-1.736*** (0.564)	<b>-0.190 (0.598)</b>	-0.303 (0.323)	-1.229*** (0.447)	-1.148*** (0.333)	-0.763*** (0.277)	-0.544* (0.286)	-1.094*** (0.403)	-1.108*** (0.303)
Scholarship student	-0.547** (0.226)	-0.601* (0.327)	-0.635* (0.359)	<b>-0.320 (0.375)</b>	-0.499** (0.217)	-0.742** (0.310)	-0.119 (0.236)	-0.264 (0.185)	-0.390** (0.190)	-0.156 (0.265)	-0.069 (0.204)
Baccalaureate S	1.577*** (0.260)	3.419*** (0.393)	3.661*** (0.428)	<b>3.287*** (0.449)</b>	0.319 (0.217)	-0.797** (0.351)	0.183 (0.226)	-0.058 (0.212)	-0.254 (0.201)	0.219 (0.292)	-0.163 (0.201)
Baccalaureate STG	-2.476*** (0.434)	-3.292*** (0.604)	-3.560*** (0.637)	<b>-2.811*** (0.766)</b>	-1.143*** (0.405)	-2.462*** (0.576)	-0.918* (0.503)	-1.392*** (0.352)	-1.526*** (0.466)	-0.783 (0.546)	-1.784*** (0.649)
Other Baccalaureate	-1.861** (0.761)	-1.474 (1.057)	-2.026 (1.242)	<b>-0.717 (1.072)</b>	-1.977*** (0.724)	-2.524*** (0.768)	-0.956 (0.666)	-1.502** (0.620)	-1.239** (0.621)	-1.111 (0.731)	-0.879 (0.593)
Intercept	7.118*** (1.443)	4.368** (2.056)	9.083*** (2.318)	<b>-0.418 (2.152)</b>	9.707*** (1.265)	10.128*** (1.836)	10.853*** (0.880)	9.841*** (0.932)	11.548*** (1.128)	7.979*** (1.137)	12.172*** (0.906)
Observations	504	514	507	<b>512</b>	517	516	475	522	516	510	522
R2	0.373	0.382	0.263	<b>0.328</b>	0.266	0.055	0.081	0.278	0.238	0.151	0.079
F	35.71	38.70	32.44	<b>28.34</b>	21.35	12.02	9.380	16.30	13.66	9.923	13.11

Variables / Grades	Second semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 2)	Introduction to Microeconomics (GPA)	Introduction to Microeconomics (CA)	Introduction to Microeconomics (FE)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (GPA)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (CA)	Introduction to Macroeconomics (FE)	Financial economics (GPA)	Financial Economics (CA)	Financial economics (FE)
Increase in literacy test scores	<b>0.287*</b> (0.171)	<b>0.499*</b> (0.277)	<b>0.997***</b> (0.356)	<b>0.867**</b> (0.353)	<b>0.769**</b> (0.368)	0.351 (0.284)	0.223 (0.276)	0.048 (0.308)	<b>0.573*</b> (0.308)	<b>0.640**</b> (0.316)	0.250 (0.327)
Score to the first literacy test	<b>0.265***</b> (0.040)	<b>0.262***</b> (0.063)	<b>0.323***</b> (0.086)	<b>0.222**</b> (0.091)	<b>0.318***</b> (0.089)	0.354*** (0.064)	0.209*** (0.061)	0.337*** (0.070)	<b>0.284***</b> (0.071)	<b>0.275***</b> (0.076)	0.243*** (0.070)
Age	<b>-0.007</b> (0.065)	<b>0.000</b> (0.085)	<b>0.103</b> (0.073)	<b>0.043</b> (0.079)	<b>0.113</b> (0.097)	0.068 (0.097)	-0.025 (0.088)	-0.012 (0.101)	<b>0.088</b> (0.109)	<b>0.028</b> (0.092)	-0.056 (0.140)
Gender (Men vs. women)	<b>-0.428</b> (0.348)	<b>-0.523</b> (0.543)	<b>-0.519</b> (0.731)	<b>-0.379</b> (0.731)	<b>-0.381</b> (0.729)	-0.565 (0.543)	-0.802 (0.529)	-0.034 (0.575)	<b>-0.700</b> (0.598)	<b>-0.541</b> (0.628)	-0.328 (0.646)
Scholarship student	<b>-0.387**</b> (0.189)	<b>-0.364</b> (0.286)	<b>-0.174</b> (0.385)	<b>-0.163</b> (0.393)	<b>-0.534</b> (0.396)	-0.045 (0.299)	-0.114 (0.304)	-0.509 (0.326)	<b>-0.532</b> (0.335)	<b>-0.632*</b> (0.369)	-0.866** (0.354)
Baccalaureate S	<b>0.558**</b> (0.223)	<b>0.595*</b> (0.348)	<b>1.398***</b> (0.467)	<b>2.202***</b> (0.447)	<b>0.728</b> (0.473)	0.508 (0.372)	-0.041 (0.372)	1.114*** (0.380)	<b>-0.481</b> (0.388)	<b>-0.440</b> (0.404)	-0.455 (0.397)
Baccalaureate STG	<b>-1.818***</b> (0.441)	<b>-2.471***</b> (0.607)	<b>-1.808**</b> (0.760)	<b>-1.369</b> (0.877)	<b>-1.875**</b> (0.872)	-2.980*** (0.630)	-2.632*** (0.637)	-2.283*** (0.673)	<b>-2.769***</b> (0.651)	<b>-1.607**</b> (0.761)	-2.526*** (0.769)
Other Baccalaureate	<b>-0.394</b> (0.854)	<b>-1.206</b> (1.140)	<b>-0.111</b> (1.193)	<b>0.372</b> (1.493)	<b>0.361</b> (1.354)	-2.741*** (1.037)	-2.730** (1.153)	-1.213 (1.001)	<b>-2.808**</b> (1.211)	<b>-1.767</b> (1.198)	-2.001 (1.336)
Intercept	<b>7.838***</b> (1.550)	<b>6.218***</b> (2.293)	<b>0.944</b> (2.111)	<b>4.526*</b> (2.552)	<b>0.964</b> (2.779)	4.707** (2.196)	10.611*** (2.245)	5.548** (2.513)	<b>5.191**</b> (2.465)	<b>7.688***</b> (2.455)	8.506*** (3.221)
Observations	<b>443</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>451</b>	492	453	453	<b>488</b>	<b>454</b>	452
R2	<b>0.324</b>	<b>0.259</b>	<b>0.168</b>	<b>0.065</b>	<b>0.121</b>	0.293	0.175	0.153	<b>0.261</b>	<b>0.103</b>	0.157
F	<b>19.40</b>	<b>13.39</b>	<b>16.48</b>	<b>10.77</b>	<b>8.694</b>	16.41	7.692	10.68	<b>13.79</b>	<b>6.890</b>	6.897

Variables / Grades	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 2)	Entrepreneurship (GPA)	Entrepreneurship (CA)	Entrepreneurship (FE)	Statistics and computer science (GPA)	Statistics and computer science (CA)	Statistics and computer science (FE)	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 2)	Principles Of law and right	English language (Semester 2)
Increase in literacy test scores	0.274 (0.216)	0.274 (0.251)	-0.054 (0.202)	-0.063 (0.268)	<b>0.769***</b> (0.297)	0.402 (0.248)	<b>0.607*</b> (0.330)	0.233 (0.165)	0.014 (0.220)	<b>0.479**</b> (0.231)
Score to the first literacy test	0.302*** (0.049)	0.243*** (0.056)	0.152*** (0.047)	0.198*** (0.063)	<b>0.447***</b> (0.070)	0.298*** (0.056)	<b>0.486***</b> (0.076)	0.217*** (0.036)	0.055 (0.045)	<b>0.398***</b> (0.052)
Age	0.024 (0.083)	0.125 (0.089)	0.050 (0.110)	-0.041 (0.072)	<b>0.134</b> (0.094)	-0.017 (0.069)	<b>0.038</b> (0.117)	-0.093*** (0.035)	-0.169*** (0.044)	<b>-0.037</b> (0.067)
Gender (Men vs. women)	-0.179 (0.420)	-0.487 (0.465)	-0.581 (0.408)	-0.579 (0.529)	<b>0.461</b> (0.590)	0.552 (0.477)	<b>0.294</b> (0.628)	-0.103 (0.322)	-0.215 (0.403)	<b>0.246</b> (0.438)
Scholarship student	-0.481** (0.223)	-0.164 (0.255)	-0.718*** (0.222)	-0.396 (0.279)	<b>-0.371</b> (0.313)	-0.560** (0.263)	<b>-0.701**</b> (0.351)	-0.092 (0.172)	0.050 (0.217)	<b>-0.280</b> (0.242)
Baccalaureate S	0.911*** (0.280)	-0.049 (0.324)	-0.113 (0.253)	0.115 (0.345)	<b>1.271***</b> (0.406)	1.167*** (0.329)	<b>1.593***</b> (0.433)	0.113 (0.206)	-0.186 (0.263)	<b>0.232</b> (0.287)
Baccalaureate STG	-1.739*** (0.453)	-2.172*** (0.619)	-1.243** (0.506)	-1.247** (0.502)	<b>-2.548***</b> (0.657)	-1.783*** (0.563)	<b>-2.268***</b> (0.717)	-0.967** (0.463)	-1.163** (0.566)	<b>-0.811</b> (0.669)
Other Baccalaureate	-1.735* (0.993)	-3.079*** (1.075)	-2.444*** (0.891)	-0.607 (1.327)	<b>-1.601</b> (0.987)	-1.587* (0.950)	<b>-0.259</b> (1.182)	-0.356 (0.477)	-0.348 (0.623)	<b>-0.751</b> (0.563)
Intercept	6.449*** (1.996)	5.631*** (1.901)	10.756*** (2.146)	9.394*** (1.960)	<b>0.586</b> (2.266)	8.361*** (1.868)	<b>1.168</b> (2.899)	10.899*** (1.044)	13.946*** (1.417)	<b>8.027***</b> (1.770)
Observations	469	491	462	454	<b>489</b>	439	<b>455</b>	447	454	<b>449</b>
R2	0.298	0.237	0.099	0.027	<b>0.301</b>	0.179	<b>0.261</b>	0.127	0.049	<b>0.023</b>
F	17.76	9.834	5.758	4.423	<b>23.64</b>	14.78	<b>17.91</b>	10.87	2.802	<b>12.87</b>

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France; 2011-2014).

Field: 526 first-year university students in Economics and Management, entering the literacy learning device for the first year, for whom information from the baseline survey is available, as well as the two literacy test score.

Notes: effect of increasing (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). For a considered teaching, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. Included baseline variables: score to the first literacy test, age of the university student; gender (reference=female); scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). \*\*\* (respectively \*\* and \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: at a 5 percent level, a rise of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces an increase of 0.552 point in the final exam of Introduction to Economics for first-year university students in Economics and Management at university Paris -Est Marne-La-Vallée.

**Table A7.** Testing for differences in sample characteristics between tutorial groups that were encouraged to literacy learning and those who were not, for first-year university students in Economics and Management at university Lille 1.

Characteristics	Encouraged (1)	Not encouraged (2)	Difference (1)-(2) (significance)
Score to the first written literacy test <sup>a</sup>	6.1	6.1	0.0
Age <sup>b</sup>	19.6	19.4	0.2
Gender (being a man) <sup>c</sup>	58.9	67.3	-8.5
French nationality	78.2	82.4	-3.2
Scholarship student	51.6	50.7	-1.1
<i>Kind of baccalauréat<sup>c</sup>:</i>			
Bac ES (Economics and Social Science stream)	52.4	49.2	3.2
Bac S (Science stream)	29.0	32.7	-3.7
Bac STG (Technology stream)	9.7	9.5	0.2
Other (Bac L - Literature stream ; foreign)	8.9	8.5	0.4
<i>French department for the baccalauréat<sup>c</sup>:</i>			
Nord	58.3	62.6	-4.3
Pas de Calais	10.8	9.1	1.7
Other French department	30.8	28.3	2.5
Abroad	17.5	18.2	-0.7
<i>French department for residence<sup>c</sup>:</i>			
Nord	97.6	96.5	1.1
Pas de Calais	1.6	2.5	-0.9
Other (including abroad)	0.8	1.0	-0.2

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014).

Field: 323 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: <sup>a</sup> score; <sup>b</sup> years; <sup>c</sup> percentage. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance of the difference at a 1% (respectively 5% or 10%) level.

**Table A8.** Effect of encouragement to literacy learning on academic performance of first-year university students at university Lille 1.*Detailed results.*

Variables / Disciplines	Overall GPA in first-year BA	First semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 1)	<b>Introduction to economics (GPA)</b>	Introduction to economics (CA)	Introduction to economics(FE)	Methodology (Semester 1)	<b>GPA of Module 2 (Semester 1)</b>	<b>Introduction to management</b>	Introduction to national accounting	<b>Defining career objectives</b>
Encouragement	0.407 (0.373)	0.564* (0.331)	0.473 (0.330)	<b>0.751*</b> <b>(0.388)</b>	0.665 (0.432)	0.549 (0.522)	-0.393 (0.375)	<b>0.944***</b> <b>(0.338)</b>	<b>0.998*</b> <b>(0.529)</b>	-0.304 (0.314)	<b>1.606***</b> <b>(0.310)</b>
Intercept	9.156*** (0.246)	10.181*** (0.221)	10.594*** (0.218)	<b>10.067***</b> <b>(0.253)</b>	9.890*** (0.266)	9.140*** (0.330)	11.947*** (0.233)	<b>12.353***</b> <b>(0.241)</b>	<b>11.422***</b> <b>(0.358)</b>	13.497*** (0.208)	<b>13.799***</b> <b>(0.227)</b>
Observations	322	323	323	<b>323</b>	319	319	318	<b>323</b>	<b>312</b>	316	<b>315</b>
R2	0.004	0.008	0.006	<b>0.011</b>	0.007	0.003	0.003	<b>0.021</b>	<b>0.011</b>	0.003	<b>0.069</b>
F	1.194	2.908	2.056	<b>3.750</b>	2.370	1.108	1.103	<b>7.787</b>	<b>3.552</b>	0.939	<b>26.80</b>

Variables / Disciplines	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 1)	Financials Mathematics(GPA)	Financial Mathematics(CA)	Financial Mathematics(FE)	Statistics (Semester 1)	GPA of Module 4 (Semester 1)	Economic sociology	<b>Economic History</b>	GPA of Module 5 (Semester 1)	English (Semester 1, GPA)	<b>English (Semester, CA)</b>	English (Semester 1, FE)
Encouragement	0.156 (0.454)	0.040 (0.479)	0.602 (0.537)	-0.506 (0.509)	0.310 (0.479)	0.699 (0.505)	0.591 (0.550)	<b>1.118*</b> <b>(0.575)</b>	0.549 (0.404)	0.184 (0.504)	<b>1.705*</b> <b>(0.990)</b>	-0.624 (1.049)
Intercept	8.215*** (0.296)	8.117*** (0.321)	11.076*** (0.365)	4.973*** (0.336)	8.272*** (0.301)	9.776*** (0.318)	10.138*** (0.348)	<b>9.856***</b> <b>(0.365)</b>	9.979*** (0.264)	9.619*** (0.330)	<b>15.963***</b> <b>(0.657)</b>	20.074*** (0.667)
Observations	323	322	315	312	322	323	310	<b>312</b>	323	322	<b>284</b>	308
R2	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.003	0.001	0.006	0.004	<b>0.012</b>	0.005	0.000	<b>0.010</b>	0.001
F	0.118	0.00702	1.259	0.986	0.418	1.916	1.153	<b>3.775</b>	1.842	0.133	<b>2.964</b>	0.354

Variables / Disciplines	Second semester GPA	GPA of Module 6 (Semester 2)	Introduction to Macroeconomics	Methodology (Semester 2)	GPA of Module 7 (Semester 2)	General accounting (GPA)	General accounting (CA)	General accounting (FE)	Functional analysis of organizations
Encouragement	0.276 (0.449)	0.315 (0.551)	0.487 (0.596)	-0.160 (0.397)	-0.123 (0.520)	-0.188 (0.448)	-0.496 (0.462)	-0.152 (0.460)	-0.139 (0.644)
Intercept	8.104*** (0.292)	9.163*** (0.342)	10.027*** (0.368)	11.514*** (0.261)	8.294*** (0.327)	9.270*** (0.289)	11.782*** (0.285)	7.520*** (0.297)	9.232*** (0.412)
Observations	322	322	269	297	322	301	286	292	277
R2	0.001	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.004	0.000	0.000
F	0.377	0.326	0.666	0.163	0.0559	0.177	1.154	0.110	0.0465

Variables / Disciplines	GPA of Module 8 (Semester 2)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (Exam 1)	Mathematics (Exam 2)	<b>Mathematics (CA)</b>	Statistics (Semester 2, GPA)	Statistics (FE)	GPA of Module 9 (Semester 2)	Big contemporary economic issues	Economic history	Tutorials in economics and computer science	GPA of Module 10 (Semester 2)	English (Semester 2, GPA)	English (Semester 2, CA)	English (Semester 2, FE)
Encouragement	0.283 (0.496)	0.087 (0.500)	-0.501 (0.526)	0.074 (0.485)	<b>2.008***</b> <b>(0.732)</b>	0.133 (0.596)	-0.395 (0.619)	0.684 (0.482)	0.557 (0.497)	0.532 (0.638)	0.620 (0.425)	0.223 (0.496)	-0.414 (0.519)	-0.997 (1.054)	-0.909 (0.942)
Intercept	5.672*** (0.310)	4.368*** (0.324)	4.298*** (0.363)	3.207*** (0.310)	<b>5.875***</b> <b>(0.399)</b>	8.522*** (0.383)	7.177*** (0.404)	9.059*** (0.312)	9.095*** (0.336)	10.107*** (0.432)	10.054*** (0.272)	8.339*** (0.329)	8.971*** (0.339)	16.312*** (0.662)	16.742*** (0.653)
Observations	322	277	284	274	<b>248</b>	292	288	322	278	276	317	322	293	251	273
R2	0.001	0.000	0.003	0.000	<b>0.032</b>	0.000	0.001	0.006	0.004	0.002	0.007	0.001	0.002	0.004	0.003
F	0.327	0.0304	0.906	0.0232	<b>7.524</b>	0.0494	0.408	2.009	1.258	0.696	2.130	0.202	0.634	0.894	0.932

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014) and Tables A9 to A11 (appendix).

Field: 323 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: at a 1 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 0.944 point the score to GPA of Module 2 for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table A9.** Effect of increasing the literacy level on academic performance of first-year university students at university Lille 1. *Detailed results.*

Variables / Disciplines	Overall GPA In first year BA	First semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 1)	Introduction to economics (GPA)	Introduction to economics (CA)	Introduction to economics(FE)	Methodology (Semester 1)	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 1)	Introduction to management	Introduction to National accounting	Defining Career objectives
Increase in literacy test scores	0.250 (0.213)	0.345* (0.185)	0.290 (0.191)	<b>0.460**</b> <b>(0.226)</b>	0.414 (0.258)	0.341 (0.313)	-0.245 (0.246)	<b>0.578***</b> <b>(0.201)</b>	<b>0.568*</b> <b>(0.294)</b>	-0.186 (0.203)	<b>0.974***</b> <b>(0.234)</b>
Intercept	8.800*** (0.486)	9.694*** (0.426)	10.185*** (0.437)	<b>9.419***</b> <b>(0.512)</b>	9.305*** (0.566)	8.657*** (0.689)	12.299*** (0.539)	<b>11.538***</b> <b>(0.474)</b>	<b>10.648***</b> <b>(0.673)</b>	13.760*** (0.462)	<b>12.426***</b> <b>(0.526)</b>
Observations	322	323	323	<b>323</b>	319	319	318	<b>323</b>	<b>312</b>	316	<b>315</b>
R2	0.130	0.159	0.099	<b>0.091</b>	0.065	0.065	-0.112	<b>0.088</b>	<b>0.079</b>	-0.121	<b>-0.300</b>
F	1.377	3.444	2.283	<b>4.098</b>	2.547	1.181	0.982	<b>8.214</b>	<b>3.719</b>	0.830	<b>17.20</b>

Variables / Disciplines	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 1)	Financial Mathematics(GPA)	Financial Mathematics(CA)	Financial Mathematics(CT)	Statistics (Semester 1)	GPA of Module 4 (Semester 1)	Economic sociology	Economic History	GPA of Module 5 (Semester 1)	English (Semester 1, GPA)	English (Semester 1, CA)	English (Semester 1, FE)
Increase in literacy test scores	0.095 (0.271)	0.025 (0.290)	0.373 (0.320)	-0.306 (0.331)	0.189 (0.280)	0.428 (0.292)	0.344 (0.305)	<b>0.674**</b> <b>(0.333)</b>	0.336 (0.235)	0.113 (0.303)	<b>0.993*</b> <b>(0.551)</b>	-0.362 (0.623)
Intercept	8.080*** (0.611)	8.083*** (0.664)	10.545*** (0.744)	5.398*** (0.740)	8.007*** (0.616)	9.172*** (0.645)	9.665*** (0.682)	<b>8.900***</b> <b>(0.733)</b>	9.505*** (0.528)	9.460*** (0.684)	<b>14.505***</b> <b>(1.295)</b>	20.565*** (1.386)
Observations	323	322	315	312	322	323	310	<b>312</b>	323	322	<b>284</b>	308
R2	0.042	0.009	0.067	-0.138	0.079	0.107	0.086	<b>0.106</b>	0.102	0.034	<b>0.104</b>	-0.056
F	0.123	0.00709	1.354	0.851	0.453	2.131	1.262	<b>4.083</b>	2.031	0.138	<b>3.226</b>	0.335

Variables / Disciplines	Second semester GPA	GPA of Module 6 (Semester 2)	Introduction to Macroeconomics	Methodology (Semester 2)	GPA of Module 7 (Semester 2)	General accounting (GPA)	General accounting (CA)	General accounting (FE)	Analyse fonctionnelle des organisations
Increase in literacy test scores	0.170 (0.264)	0.193 (0.327)	0.288 (0.340)	-0.098 (0.248)	-0.075 (0.324)	-0.117 (0.286)	-0.308 (0.310)	-0.092 (0.282)	-0.082 (0.382)
Intercept	7.864*** (0.596)	8.889*** (0.719)	9.569*** (0.812)	11.662*** (0.581)	8.401*** (0.716)	9.446*** (0.663)	12.262*** (0.715)	7.660*** (0.670)	9.363*** (0.931)
Observations	322	322	269	297	322	301	286	292	277
R2	0.079	0.058	0.063	-0.036	-0.034	-0.064	-0.168	-0.044	-0.024
F	0.410	0.347	0.710	0.157	0.0540	0.166	0.983	0.105	0.0454

Variables / Disciplines	GPA of Module 8 (Semester 2)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (Exam 1)	Mathematics (Exam 2)	Mathematics (CA)	Statistics (Semester 2, GPA)	Statistics (Semester 2, FE)	GPA of Module 9 (Semester 2)	Grands problèmes économiques contemporains	Economic history	Tutorials in economics and computer science	GPA of Module 10 (Semester 2)	English (Semester, GPA)	English (Semester 2, CA)	English (Semester 2, FE)
Increase in literacy test scores	0.174 (0.293)	0.054 (0.304)	-0.309 (0.341)	0.043 (0.278)	<b>1.419**</b> <b>(0.561)</b>	0.082 (0.359)	-0.244 (0.404)	0.420 (0.275)	0.348 (0.312)	0.328 (0.382)	0.391 (0.240)	0.137 (0.295)	-0.250 (0.331)	-0.600 (0.676)	-0.529 (0.577)
Intercept	5.425*** (0.647)	4.283*** (0.732)	4.786*** (0.848)	3.140*** (0.675)	<b>3.424***</b> <b>(1.254)</b>	8.399*** (0.835)	7.553*** (0.949)	8.463*** (0.619)	8.533*** (0.769)	9.585*** (0.942)	9.498*** (0.538)	8.145*** (0.677)	9.357*** (0.786)	17.299*** (1.633)	17.541*** (1.431)
Observations	322	277	284	274	<b>248</b>	292	288	322	278	276	317	322	293	251	273
R2	0.069	0.016	-0.110	0.013	<b>-0.143</b>	0.032	-0.107	0.136	-0.005	0.055	0.185	0.051	-0.106	-0.129	-0.109
F	0.351	0.0308	0.812	0.0235	<b>6.355</b>	0.0511	0.364	2.315	1.233	0.733	2.635	0.214	0.568	0.780	0.834

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014).

Field: 323 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: at a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0.460 point in the GPA in introduction in economics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table A10.** Effect of encouragement to literacy learning on academic performance of first-year university students at university Lille 1.  
*Information provided by the administrative baseline survey are used as explanatory variables of the considered score.* Detailed results.

Variables / Disciplines	Overall GPA In first year BA	First semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 1)	Introduction to economics (GPA)	Introduction to economics (CA)	Introduction to economics (FE)	Methodology (Semester 1)	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 1)	Introduction to management	Introduction to national accounting	Defining Career objectives
Encouragement	0.413 (0.338)	0.533* (0.290)	0.428 (0.300)	<b>0.747**</b> (0.359)	<b>0.693*</b> (0.399)	0.574 (0.491)	-0.512 (0.358)	<b>0.889***</b> (0.323)	<b>0.938*</b> (0.521)	-0.283 (0.291)	<b>1.533***</b> (0.305)
Score to the first literacy test	0.427*** (0.068)	0.425*** (0.062)	0.366*** (0.064)	<b>0.348***</b> (0.078)	<b>0.374***</b> (0.090)	0.349*** (0.109)	0.370*** (0.070)	<b>0.297***</b> (0.065)	<b>0.372***</b> (0.107)	0.320*** (0.060)	<b>0.188***</b> (0.056)
Age	-0.151 (0.149)	-0.097 (0.130)	-0.259* (0.138)	<b>-0.260</b> (0.165)	<b>-0.285</b> (0.177)	-0.413* (0.233)	-0.175 (0.139)	<b>-0.135</b> (0.135)	<b>-0.043</b> (0.198)	0.054 (0.125)	<b>-0.163</b> (0.127)
Gender (Man vs. woman)	-0.577 (0.358)	-0.677** (0.313)	-0.097 (0.323)	<b>0.040</b> (0.390)	<b>-0.131</b> (0.414)	0.290 (0.536)	-0.309 (0.369)	<b>-0.890**</b> (0.347)	<b>-1.132**</b> (0.543)	-0.647** (0.314)	<b>-0.791**</b> (0.315)
Scholarship student	-0.748** (0.339)	-0.730** (0.292)	-0.640** (0.302)	<b>-0.784**</b> (0.362)	<b>-0.280</b> (0.395)	-1.372*** (0.487)	-0.306 (0.348)	<b>-0.071</b> (0.327)	<b>-0.290</b> (0.510)	0.027 (0.300)	<b>-0.248</b> (0.310)
Baccalaureate S	-0.045 (0.408)	-0.193 (0.348)	-0.956*** (0.355)	<b>-0.821*</b> (0.438)	<b>-0.310</b> (0.469)	-1.135* (0.584)	-1.201*** (0.397)	<b>-0.472</b> (0.392)	<b>-0.174</b> (0.609)	0.220 (0.361)	<b>-0.058</b> (0.386)
Baccalaureate STG	-2.089*** (0.557)	-2.061*** (0.443)	-1.648*** (0.553)	<b>-2.397***</b> (0.640)	<b>-2.212***</b> (0.671)	-3.180*** (0.842)	-0.091 (0.590)	<b>-1.789***</b> (0.561)	<b>-2.634***</b> (0.922)	-1.287*** (0.485)	<b>-0.797</b> (0.496)
Other baccalaureate	-0.388 (0.748)	-0.771 (0.716)	-0.800 (0.657)	<b>-0.466</b> (0.808)	<b>-1.890**</b> (0.931)	-0.128 (1.077)	-1.777*** (0.660)	<b>-0.189</b> (0.723)	<b>-0.205</b> (1.088)	-0.254 (0.611)	<b>0.758</b> (0.544)
Intercept	10.460*** (2.941)	10.588*** (2.569)	14.314*** (2.752)	<b>13.890***</b> (3.319)	<b>13.796***</b> (3.550)	16.165*** (4.663)	14.018*** (2.720)	<b>14.139***</b> (2.649)	<b>11.250***</b> (3.928)	10.979*** (2.434)	<b>16.495***</b> (2.541)
Observations	315	316	316	<b>316</b>	<b>312</b>	312	311	<b>316</b>	<b>306</b>	310	<b>309</b>
R2	0.220	0.270	0.213	<b>0.180</b>	<b>0.170</b>	0.149	0.157	<b>0.158</b>	<b>0.111</b>	0.148	<b>0.142</b>
F	10.20	14.77	8.860	<b>8.557</b>	<b>8.247</b>	6.882	6.846	<b>6.581</b>	<b>4.257</b>	8.099	<b>7.938</b>

Variables / Disciplines	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 1)	Financial Mathematics(GPA)	Financials Mathematics(CA)	Financial Mathematics(FE)	Statistics (Semester 1)	GPA of Module 4 (Semester 1)	Economic sociology	Economic history	GPA of Module 5 (Semester 1)	Anglais du S1(F)	Anglais du S1 (CC)	Anglais du S1 (CT)
Encouragement	0.262 (0.408)	0.112 (0.435)	0.640 (0.510)	-0.317 (0.452)	0.412 (0.436)	0.636 (0.460)	0.476 (0.512)	<b>1.225**</b> (0.532)	0.451 (0.352)	0.098 (0.434)	<b>1.701*</b> (0.946)	-0.680 (0.882)
Score to the first literacy test	0.452*** (0.086)	0.434*** (0.093)	0.365*** (0.108)	0.462*** (0.097)	0.470*** (0.087)	0.429*** (0.094)	0.464*** (0.103)	<b>0.432***</b> (0.110)	0.585*** (0.076)	0.793*** (0.089)	<b>1.018***</b> (0.197)	1.794*** (0.178)
Age	-0.099 (0.174)	0.023 (0.200)	-0.229 (0.212)	0.105 (0.190)	-0.222 (0.167)	0.122 (0.180)	0.125 (0.197)	<b>0.068</b> (0.199)	-0.112 (0.172)	-0.259 (0.181)	<b>-0.680</b> (0.436)	-0.225 (0.371)
Gender (Man vs. woman)	-0.675 (0.429)	-0.568 (0.462)	-1.014* (0.524)	-0.420 (0.477)	-0.782* (0.449)	-0.990** (0.472)	-1.140** (0.517)	<b>-0.469</b> (0.557)	-0.732** (0.372)	-0.707 (0.437)	<b>-1.715*</b> (0.949)	-0.708 (0.880)
Scholarship student	-1.055*** (0.405)	-1.411*** (0.433)	-1.234** (0.512)	-1.176*** (0.446)	-0.700 (0.427)	-1.043** (0.461)	-0.859* (0.515)	<b>-1.662***</b> (0.524)	-0.840** (0.354)	-1.131** (0.437)	<b>-1.810*</b> (0.940)	-2.367*** (0.862)
Baccalaureate S	2.197*** (0.486)	2.406*** (0.528)	2.370*** (0.603)	2.900*** (0.542)	1.988*** (0.502)	-0.974* (0.527)	-1.391** (0.599)	<b>0.043</b> (0.592)	-0.763* (0.422)	-0.537 (0.500)	<b>-0.837</b> (1.082)	-0.888 (0.977)
Baccalaureate STG	-1.538*** (0.546)	-1.110* (0.592)	-0.149 (0.767)	-1.674*** (0.521)	-1.967*** (0.621)	-3.924*** (0.693)	-3.400*** (0.778)	<b>-4.314***</b> (0.837)	-1.419** (0.598)	-1.762** (0.714)	<b>-1.165</b> (1.788)	-4.800*** (1.339)
Other baccalaureate	1.027 (0.993)	0.846 (1.077)	0.205 (1.197)	1.815* (1.089)	1.208 (0.981)	-2.520** (0.982)	-2.471** (0.973)	<b>-2.134*</b> (1.154)	-1.382 (0.841)	-0.474 (0.944)	<b>-1.201</b> (1.902)	0.207 (1.942)
Intercept	7.648** (3.446)	5.320 (3.959)	13.819*** (4.283)	-0.048 (3.854)	9.971*** (3.289)	6.866* (3.601)	7.049* (3.962)	<b>7.580*</b> (4.013)	9.974*** (3.478)	11.201*** (3.691)	<b>25.247***</b> (8.527)	15.852** (7.523)
Observations	316	316	309	306	316	316	303	<b>305</b>	316	315	<b>277</b>	301
R2	0.245	0.222	0.150	0.252	0.234	0.193	0.160	<b>0.196</b>	0.266	0.299	<b>0.171</b>	0.351
F	13.60	11.05	7.688	15.12	12.38	10.08	7.708	<b>10.14</b>	14.48	21.32	<b>8.593</b>	25.27



Variables / Disciplines	Second semester GPA	GPA of Module 6 (Semester 2)	Introduction to Macroeconomics	Methodology (Semester 2)	GPA of Module 7 (Semester 7)	General Accounting (GPA)	General Accounting (CA)	General Accounting (FE)	Functional analysis of organizations
Encouragement	0.314 (0.425)	0.394 (0.536)	0.642 (0.572)	-0.248 (0.375)	-0.026 (0.505)	-0.104 (0.446)	-0.287 (0.458)	-0.059 (0.458)	-0.052 (0.617)
Score to the first literacy test	0.439*** (0.082)	0.364*** (0.101)	0.388*** (0.118)	0.277*** (0.078)	0.446*** (0.105)	0.302*** (0.088)	0.293*** (0.085)	0.318*** (0.097)	0.520*** (0.137)
Age	-0.194 (0.182)	-0.295 (0.227)	0.135 (0.233)	-0.208 (0.157)	-0.208 (0.230)	0.156 (0.172)	0.130 (0.177)	0.205 (0.183)	-0.095 (0.300)
Gender (Man vs. woman)	-0.431 (0.443)	-0.004 (0.538)	0.598 (0.568)	-1.344*** (0.357)	0.296 (0.521)	-0.668 (0.461)	-0.552 (0.457)	-0.416 (0.492)	0.854 (0.613)
Scholarship student	-0.791* (0.422)	-0.905* (0.533)	-0.872 (0.568)	-0.910** (0.378)	-0.463 (0.492)	-1.014** (0.430)	-0.837* (0.442)	-0.838* (0.444)	-0.399 (0.607)
Baccalaureate S	0.045 (0.510)	-0.661 (0.637)	-0.053 (0.662)	-0.433 (0.441)	-0.213 (0.589)	0.912* (0.504)	1.417*** (0.495)	0.925* (0.523)	-0.817 (0.723)
Baccalaureate STG	-2.107*** (0.726)	-2.188** (0.906)	-2.426** (1.064)	-1.102 (0.748)	-1.773** (0.898)	-0.381 (0.835)	-0.178 (0.853)	0.061 (0.828)	-3.113** (1.287)
Other baccalaureate	-0.010 (0.848)	-0.837 (1.063)	-0.861 (1.171)	0.035 (0.771)	0.212 (1.036)	1.375 (0.895)	0.961 (0.883)	2.238** (0.932)	-0.871 (1.167)
Intercept	10.024*** (3.597)	13.578*** (4.511)	5.226 (4.688)	15.429*** (3.128)	9.828** (4.587)	4.941 (3.415)	7.622** (3.504)	1.757 (3.710)	8.023 (5.942)
Observations	315	315	265	291	315	294	280	285	271
R2	0.160	0.097	0.088	0.134	0.103	0.101	0.103	0.102	0.116
F	6.609	4.091	3.225	5.506	3.706	3.973	5.167	4.010	3.317

Variables / Disciplines	GPA of Module 8 (Semester 2)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (Exam 1)	Mathematics (Exam 2)	Mathematics (CA)	Statistics (Semester 2, GPA)	Statistics (Semester 2, FE)	GPA of Module 9 (Semester 2)	Big contemporary economic issues	Economic history	Tutorials in economics and computer science	GPA of Module 10 (Semester 2)	English (Semester 2, GPA)	English (Semester 2, CA)	English (Semester 2, FE)
Encouragement	0.372 (0.462)	0.402 (0.439)	-0.139 (0.442)	0.272 (0.415)	<b>2.486***</b> <b>(0.698)</b>	0.367 (0.565)	-0.240 (0.587)	0.663 (0.451)	0.592 (0.483)	0.565 (0.611)	0.562 (0.358)	0.168 (0.468)	-0.469 (0.493)	-0.998 (1.037)	-0.903 (0.844)
Score to the first literacy test	0.308*** (0.099)	0.342*** (0.101)	0.453*** (0.099)	0.383*** (0.099)	<b>0.102</b> <b>(0.148)</b>	0.347*** (0.115)	0.340*** (0.121)	0.523*** (0.086)	0.470*** (0.106)	0.332*** (0.125)	0.750*** (0.076)	0.557*** (0.087)	0.561*** (0.097)	0.728*** (0.223)	1.375*** (0.173)
Age	-0.246 (0.182)	-0.089 (0.174)	0.052 (0.172)	-0.085 (0.170)	<b>-0.528*</b> <b>(0.290)</b>	-0.134 (0.223)	-0.075 (0.220)	-0.112 (0.175)	-0.126 (0.188)	0.087 (0.236)	0.091 (0.152)	-0.111 (0.203)	0.195 (0.203)	-0.111 (0.203)	0.287 (0.365)
Gender (Man vs. woman)	-1.322*** (0.480)	-1.130** (0.471)	-1.115** (0.481)	-1.449*** (0.465)	<b>-0.646</b> <b>(0.716)</b>	-1.977*** (0.566)	-1.907*** (0.591)	-0.455 (0.466)	1.589*** (0.503)	-1.474** (0.622)	-0.722* (0.370)	-0.673 (0.496)	-0.988* (0.505)	-1.888* (1.045)	0.044 (0.876)
Scholarship student	-1.020** (0.439)	-1.504*** (0.420)	-1.848*** (0.436)	-1.173*** (0.396)	<b>-1.923***</b> <b>(0.665)</b>	-1.038* (0.547)	-1.336** (0.564)	-0.785* (0.449)	-0.388 (0.476)	-0.946 (0.630)	-0.129 (0.362)	-0.790* (0.471)	-1.116** (0.487)	-1.017 (0.992)	-2.093** (0.860)
Baccalaureate S	2.424*** (0.545)	3.160*** (0.541)	3.962*** (0.572)	3.466*** (0.524)	<b>2.829***</b> <b>(0.833)</b>	1.716*** (0.638)	2.067*** (0.662)	-0.593 (0.542)	-1.183** (0.553)	-0.133 (0.720)	0.160 (0.426)	-0.730 (0.565)	-0.130 (0.579)	-1.001 (1.174)	-0.159 (1.033)
Baccalaureate STG	-2.124*** (0.569)	-1.101** (0.483)	-1.096** (0.514)	-0.981** (0.485)	<b>-1.171</b> <b>(0.978)</b>	-3.142*** (0.853)	-2.905*** (0.863)	-2.043** (0.794)	-1.465 (0.921)	-3.170*** (1.103)	-0.913 (0.717)	-2.409*** (0.906)	-2.596*** (0.856)	-4.258** (1.850)	-4.059*** (1.180)
Other baccalaureate	1.621* (0.931)	1.555* (0.934)	1.905* (0.991)	1.087 (0.723)	<b>1.266</b> <b>(1.266)</b>	2.012* (1.150)	2.433** (1.193)	-0.611 (0.811)	-0.741 (0.855)	-2.677** (1.226)	1.534** (0.727)	-0.433 (0.864)	0.167 (0.949)	-0.016 (2.043)	0.728 (1.833)
Intercept	9.184** (3.632)	4.212 (3.442)	0.688 (3.451)	2.803 (3.336)	<b>15.719***</b> <b>(5.825)</b>	10.222** (4.351)	7.812* (4.313)	9.123*** (3.444)	8.285** (3.690)	8.235* (4.803)	4.114 (2.990)	8.424** (4.024)	3.237 (4.031)	16.416* (8.947)	4.057 (7.198)
Observations	315	271	279	270	<b>243</b>	286	282	315	271	270	310	315	286	245	266
R2	0.217	0.289	0.353	0.339	<b>0.157</b>	0.180	0.188	0.165	0.144	0.104	0.310	0.173	0.186	0.119	0.261
F	11.09	15.16	17.31	16.02	<b>6.835</b>	8.781	8.688	6.895	5.294	3.814	18.68	8.709	8.468	3.992	14.70

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014) and Tables A9 to A11 (appendix).

Field: 323 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*, Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 0.747 point the score to GPA in introduction to economics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table A11.** Effect of increasing the literacy level on academic performance of first-year university students at university Lille 1.  
*Information provided by the administrative baseline survey are used as explanatory variables of the considered score.* Detailed results.

Variables / Disciplines	Overall GPA In first year BA	First semester GPA	GPA of Module 1 (Semester 1)	Introduction to economics(GPA)	Introduction to economics(CA)	Introduction to economics(FE)	Methodology (Semester 1)	GPA of Module 2 (Semester 1)	Introduction to Management	Introduction to National accounting	Defining Career objectives
Increase in literacy test scores	0.270 (0.201)	0.347** (0.170)	0.278 (0.181)	<b>0.486**</b> <b>(0.220)</b>	<b>0.454*</b> <b>(0.248)</b>	0.376 (0.306)	-0.337 (0.254)	<b>0.578***</b> <b>(0.207)</b>	<b>0.563*</b> <b>(0.307)</b>	-0.183 (0.196)	<b>0.984***</b> <b>(0.247)</b>
Score to the first literacy test	0.416*** (0.062)	0.409*** (0.057)	0.353*** (0.061)	<b>0.325***</b> <b>(0.076)</b>	<b>0.350***</b> <b>(0.086)</b>	0.330*** (0.105)	0.386*** (0.074)	<b>0.269***</b> <b>(0.065)</b>	<b>0.346***</b> <b>(0.105)</b>	0.329*** (0.062)	<b>0.133*</b> <b>(0.075)</b>
Age	-0.184 (0.131)	-0.141 (0.115)	-0.294** (0.127)	<b>-0.321**</b> <b>(0.154)</b>	<b>-0.339**</b> <b>(0.158)</b>	-0.457** (0.219)	-0.128 (0.157)	<b>-0.208</b> <b>(0.136)</b>	<b>-0.141</b> <b>(0.202)</b>	0.076 (0.134)	<b>-0.276*</b> <b>(0.161)</b>
Gender (Men vs. women)	-0.191 (0.449)	-0.189 (0.384)	0.294 (0.398)	<b>0.724</b> <b>(0.483)</b>	<b>0.504</b> <b>(0.506)</b>	0.815 (0.665)	-0.787 (0.544)	<b>-0.077</b> <b>(0.441)</b>	<b>-0.278</b> <b>(0.716)</b>	-0.918** (0.455)	<b>0.592</b> <b>(0.532)</b>
Scholarship student	-0.687** (0.307)	-0.648** (0.261)	-0.574** (0.278)	<b>-0.669**</b> <b>(0.337)</b>	<b>-0.178</b> <b>(0.378)</b>	-1.287*** (0.452)	-0.388 (0.376)	<b>0.065</b> <b>(0.315)</b>	<b>-0.158</b> <b>(0.488)</b>	-0.008 (0.315)	<b>0.011</b> <b>(0.388)</b>
Baccalaureate S	0.003 (0.374)	-0.122 (0.314)	-0.899*** (0.326)	<b>-0.721*</b> <b>(0.405)</b>	<b>-0.217</b> <b>(0.444)</b>	-1.058* (0.550)	-1.271*** (0.421)	<b>-0.353</b> <b>(0.371)</b>	<b>-0.115</b> <b>(0.589)</b>	0.190 (0.377)	<b>0.063</b> <b>(0.455)</b>
Baccalaureate STG	-1.811*** (0.557)	-1.706*** (0.453)	-1.363** (0.557)	<b>-1.900***</b> <b>(0.624)</b>	<b>-1.672**</b> <b>(0.719)</b>	-2.733*** (0.874)	-0.426 (0.659)	<b>-1.198*</b> <b>(0.619)</b>	<b>-2.015**</b> <b>(0.978)</b>	-1.471*** (0.528)	<b>0.171</b> <b>(0.673)</b>
Other Baccalaureate	-0.515 (0.678)	-0.933 (0.656)	-0.930 (0.631)	<b>-0.694</b> <b>(0.813)</b>	<b>-2.111**</b> <b>(0.873)</b>	-0.311 (1.030)	-1.628** (0.800)	<b>-0.460</b> <b>(0.770)</b>	<b>-0.214</b> <b>(0.984)</b>	-0.141 (0.701)	<b>0.307</b> <b>(0.817)</b>
Intercept	10.467*** (2.618)	10.647*** (2.251)	14.361*** (2.532)	<b>13.973***</b> <b>(3.077)</b>	<b>13.822***</b> <b>(3.189)</b>	16.187*** (4.361)	13.882*** (3.004)	<b>14.237***</b> <b>(2.524)</b>	<b>11.831***</b> <b>(3.743)</b>	10.956*** (2.569)	<b>16.505***</b> <b>(3.134)</b>
Observations	315	316	316	<b>316</b>	<b>312</b>	312	311	<b>316</b>	<b>306</b>	310	<b>309</b>
R2	0.331	0.384	0.292	<b>0.244</b>	<b>0.218</b>	0.203	-0.008	<b>0.178</b>	<b>0.147</b>	0.050	<b>-0.275</b>
F	11.94	17.99	9.747	<b>9.528</b>	<b>8.892</b>	7.387	5.875	<b>6.610</b>	<b>4.442</b>	7.186	<b>4.503</b>

Variables / Disciplines	GPA of Module 3 (Semester 3)	Financial Mathematics(GPA)	Financial Mathematics(CA)	Financial Mathematics(FE)	Statistics (Semester 1)	GPA of Module 4 (Semester 1)	Economic Sociology	<b>Economic history</b>	GPA of Module 5 (Semester 1)	English (Semester 1, GPA)	<b>English (Semester 1, CA)</b>	English (Semester 1, FE)
Increase in literacy test scores	0.171 (0.250)	0.073 (0.274)	0.412 (0.311)	-0.205 (0.304)	0.268 (0.262)	0.414 (0.282)	0.300 (0.307)	<b>0.780**</b> <b>(0.327)</b>	0.293 (0.215)	0.064 (0.275)	<b>1.057*</b> <b>(0.560)</b>	-0.408 (0.538)
Score to the first literacy test	0.444*** (0.082)	0.430*** (0.090)	0.342*** (0.105)	0.470*** (0.099)	0.457*** (0.083)	0.409*** (0.090)	0.452*** (0.099)	<b>0.387***</b> <b>(0.107)</b>	0.571*** (0.073)	0.790*** (0.088)	<b>0.955***</b> <b>(0.192)</b>	1.822*** (0.185)
Age	-0.121 (0.167)	0.014 (0.196)	-0.281 (0.204)	0.137 (0.200)	-0.256 (0.158)	0.069 (0.165)	0.073 (0.189)	<b>-0.037</b> <b>(0.188)</b>	-0.149 (0.160)	-0.267 (0.177)	<b>-0.789**</b> <b>(0.394)</b>	-0.163 (0.384)
Gender (Men vs. women)	-0.435 (0.581)	-0.466 (0.642)	-0.432 (0.747)	-0.724 (0.716)	-0.406 (0.596)	-0.408 (0.604)	-0.675 (0.696)	<b>0.614</b> <b>(0.727)</b>	-0.320 (0.472)	-0.617 (0.576)	<b>-0.145</b> <b>(1.253)</b>	-1.328 (1.245)
Scholarship student	-1.015*** (0.388)	-1.394*** (0.421)	-1.129** (0.495)	-1.206*** (0.460)	-0.637 (0.404)	-0.945** (0.439)	-0.821* (0.489)	<b>-1.438***</b> <b>(0.516)</b>	-0.771** (0.333)	-1.116*** (0.427)	<b>-1.634*</b> <b>(0.880)</b>	-2.441*** (0.881)
Baccalaureate S	2.232*** (0.464)	2.421*** (0.514)	2.437*** (0.568)	2.873*** (0.555)	2.043*** (0.476)	-0.889* (0.503)	-1.372** (0.578)	<b>0.235</b> <b>(0.581)</b>	-0.703* (0.395)	-0.524 (0.499)	<b>-0.769</b> <b>(1.043)</b>	-0.915 (0.998)
Baccalaureate STG	-1.364** (0.599)	-1.035 (0.653)	0.277 (0.826)	-1.871*** (0.600)	-1.693** (0.668)	-3.500*** (0.697)	-3.094*** (0.793)	<b>-3.473***</b> <b>(0.864)</b>	-1.119* (0.634)	-1.696** (0.786)	<b>-0.101</b> <b>(1.884)</b>	-5.191*** (1.502)
Other Baccalaureate	0.947 (0.938)	0.812 (1.057)	0.029 (1.123)	1.798 (1.148)	1.082 (0.889)	-2.714*** (0.954)	-2.480*** (0.871)	<b>-2.390**</b> <b>(1.116)</b>	-1.520** (0.774)	-0.504 (0.914)	<b>-1.786</b> <b>(1.531)</b>	0.313 (2.034)
Intercept	7.677** (3.243)	5.333 (3.834)	13.916*** (4.009)	-0.176 (4.048)	10.017*** (3.025)	6.936** (3.274)	7.356** (3.677)	<b>7.865**</b> <b>(3.742)</b>	10.024*** (3.214)	11.212*** (3.574)	<b>25.003***</b> <b>(7.495)</b>	15.511** (7.745)
Observations	316	316	309	306	316	316	303	<b>305</b>	316	315	<b>277</b>	301
R2	0.302	0.244	0.199	0.176	0.318	0.264	0.215	<b>0.251</b>	0.333	0.314	<b>0.236</b>	0.304
F	14.65	11.30	8.265	13.86	13.98	11.60	8.425	<b>11.14</b>	15.87	21.91	<b>9.499</b>	22.89

Variables / Disciplines	Second semester GPA	GPA of Module 6 (Semester 6)	Introduction to Macroeconomics	Methodology (Semester 2)	GPA of Module 7 (Semester 2)	General accounting (GPA)	General accounting (CA)	General accounting (FE)	Functional analysis of organizations
Increase in literacy test scores	0.205 (0.260)	0.258 (0.332)	0.395 (0.329)	-0.164 (0.250)	-0.017 (0.327)	-0.067 (0.289)	-0.182 (0.298)	-0.037 (0.285)	-0.032 (0.374)
Score to the first literacy test	0.430*** (0.076)	0.353*** (0.096)	0.371*** (0.111)	0.286*** (0.080)	0.446*** (0.103)	0.305*** (0.087)	0.305*** (0.086)	0.320*** (0.097)	0.522*** (0.134)
Age	-0.219 (0.167)	-0.326 (0.210)	0.055 (0.222)	-0.181 (0.161)	-0.206 (0.225)	0.170 (0.182)	0.171 (0.195)	0.212 (0.190)	-0.090 (0.298)
Gender (Men vs. women)	-0.138 (0.578)	0.365 (0.709)	1.238* (0.748)	-1.593*** (0.551)	0.271 (0.737)	-0.771 (0.699)	-0.828 (0.701)	-0.471 (0.724)	0.804 (0.901)
Scholarship student	-0.745* (0.397)	-0.847* (0.505)	-0.813 (0.535)	-0.946** (0.383)	-0.467 (0.493)	-1.032** (0.434)	-0.879* (0.455)	-0.847* (0.447)	-0.405 (0.608)
Baccalaureate S	0.082 (0.480)	-0.615 (0.609)	-0.034 (0.630)	-0.473 (0.454)	-0.216 (0.581)	0.895* (0.505)	1.386*** (0.505)	0.917* (0.520)	-0.821 (0.712)
Baccalaureate STG	-1.897** (0.741)	-1.923** (0.938)	-1.993* (1.082)	-1.270 (0.785)	-1.790* (0.969)	-0.455 (0.917)	-0.362 (0.933)	0.019 (0.916)	-3.145*** (1.326)
Other Baccalaureate	-0.107 (0.784)	-0.959 (1.012)	-1.163 (1.125)	0.110 (0.787)	0.220 (1.052)	1.407 (0.925)	1.049 (0.954)	2.264** (0.961)	-0.854 (1.187)
Intercept	10.029*** (3.322)	13.585*** (4.227)	5.798 (4.339)	15.299*** (3.175)	9.828** (4.538)	4.830 (3.400)	7.260** (3.613)	1.693 (3.655)	8.011 (5.857)
Observations	315	315	265	291	315	294	280	285	271
R2	0.239	0.163	0.164	0.090	0.096	0.071	0.025	0.088	0.107
F	7.299	4.426	3.587	5.227	3.681	3.839	4.693	3.939	3.285

Variables / Disciplines	GPA of Module 8 (Semester 2)	Mathematics (GPA)	Mathematics (Exam 1)	Mathematics (Exam 2)	Mathematics (CA)	Statistics (Semester 2, GPA))	Statistics (Semester 2, FE)	GPA of Module 9 (Semester 2)	Big contemporary economic issues	Economic History	Tutorials in economics and computer science	GPA of Module 10 (Semester 2)	English (Semester 2, GPA)	English (Semester 2, CA)	English (Semester 2, FE)
Increase in literacy test scores	0.243 (0.284)	0.253 (0.264)	-0.087 (0.278)	0.166 (0.243)	<b>1.789***</b> (0.577)	0.231 (0.336)	-0.155 (0.387)	0.434 (0.270)	0.376 (0.300)	0.368 (0.381)	0.374* (0.210)	0.110 (0.295)	-0.296 (0.325)	-0.607 (0.655)	-0.536 (0.521)
Score to the first literacy test	0.297*** (0.092)	0.329*** (0.095)	0.458*** (0.099)	0.373*** (0.093)	<b>0.004</b> (0.150)	0.336*** (0.110)	0.346*** (0.122)	0.504*** (0.079)	0.456*** (0.105)	0.311** (0.121)	0.727*** (0.067)	0.552*** (0.085)	0.575*** (0.102)	0.782*** (0.236)	1.414*** (0.182)
Age	-0.275* (0.167)	-0.142 (0.172)	0.069 (0.179)	-0.116 (0.168)	<b>-0.882***</b> (0.305)	-0.183 (0.224)	-0.046 (0.234)	-0.164 (0.159)	-0.192 (0.192)	0.012 (0.240)	0.040 (0.137)	-0.124 (0.194)	0.250 (0.224)	0.006 (0.510)	0.384 (0.389)
Gender (Men vs. women)	-0.975 (0.665)	-0.742 (0.655)	-1.250* (0.711)	-1.197* (0.666)	<b>2.009</b> (1.262)	-1.619** (0.811)	-2.145** (0.918)	0.165 (0.575)	2.214*** (0.751)	-0.896 (0.795)	-0.184 (0.451)	-0.517 (0.674)	-1.452* (0.756)	-2.793* (1.453)	-0.777 (1.281)
Scholarship student	-0.965** (0.416)	-1.428*** (0.413)	-1.871*** (0.449)	-1.147*** (0.385)	<b>-1.619**</b> (0.776)	-0.978* (0.525)	-1.362*** (0.574)	-0.688* (0.414)	-0.370 (0.469)	-0.904 (0.609)	-0.042 (0.324)	-0.766* (0.457)	-1.173** (0.515)	-1.054 (1.035)	-2.141** (0.904)
Baccalaureate S	2.467*** (0.516)	3.233*** (0.518)	3.941*** (0.562)	3.499*** (0.495)	<b>3.452***</b> (1.013)	1.772*** (0.612)	2.047*** (0.663)	-0.516 (0.497)	-1.159** (0.543)	-0.095 (0.694)	0.224 (0.378)	-0.711 (0.545)	-0.147 (0.599)	-0.982 (1.226)	-0.143 (1.055)
Baccalaureate STG	-1.874*** (0.612)	-0.826 (0.533)	-1.179** (0.580)	-0.774 (0.529)	<b>0.983</b> (1.543)	-2.883*** (0.896)	-3.082*** (0.979)	-1.597** (0.794)	-1.046 (0.983)	-2.741** (1.162)	-0.501 (0.693)	-2.297** (0.936)	-2.918*** (0.979)	-4.819** (2.067)	-4.589*** (1.374)
Other Baccalaureate	1.506* (0.845)	1.450* (0.864)	1.944* (1.029)	1.003 (0.719)	<b>0.622</b> (1.672)	1.889* (1.055)	2.519** (1.265)	-0.816 (0.757)	-1.027 (0.878)	-2.863** (1.213)	1.310** (0.615)	-0.485 (0.830)	0.333 (1.122)	0.518 (2.275)	1.086 (2.146)
Intercept	9.191*** (3.346)	4.603 (3.219)	0.577 (3.435)	3.002 (3.195)	<b>18.019***</b> (5.652)	10.598** (4.123)	7.640 (4.382)	9.134*** (3.098)	8.605** (3.619)	8.791* (4.642)	4.266* (2.562)	8.427** (3.841)	2.913 (4.296)	15.390 (9.779)	3.296 (7.549)
Observations	315	271	279	270	<b>243</b>	286	282	315	271	270	310	315	286	245	266
R2	0.287	0.327	0.334	0.365	<b>-0.152</b>	0.242	0.137	0.277	0.153	0.144	0.442	0.207	0.086	0.019	0.170
F	11.94	15.21	17.11	16.56	<b>4.395</b>	9.457	8.172	8.055	5.432	3.980	24.13	9.162	7.528	3.511	12.78

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern France; 2013-2014) and Tables A9 to A11 (appendix).

Field: 323 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests..

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; OLS estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; Wald estimator). Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). Robust standard errors within parentheses. For a considered discipline, FE stands for final exam, CA for continuous assessment, and GPA for grade point average, computed as the average of both the scores obtained to both FE and CA. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 0,486 point in the GPA in introduction to economics for first-year university students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern France).

**Table A12a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Male students.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.070 (0.326)	0.131* (0.064)	0.064 (0.335)
With baseline variables	0.094 (0.152)	0.136** <i>(a)</i> (0.046)	0.085 (0.172)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.051 (0.309)	0.090** (0.012)	0.046 (0.330)
With baseline variables	0.066 (0.113)	0.091*** <i>(b)</i> (0.008)	0.060 (0.128)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern from France; 2013-2014).

Field: 207 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: *(a)* at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 13.6 percentage points the probability to achieve the first term of the first-year university for male students in Economics and Management stream at university Paris-Est Marne-La-Vallée (Paris region, France). *(b)* At a 1 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a rise of 9.1 percentage points the probability to achieve first-year university for male students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France)

**Table A12b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Female students.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	-0.037 (0.693)	0.016 (0.857)	-0.111 (0.222)
With baseline variables	-0.056 (0.528)	0.005 (0.947)	-0.134 <i>(a)</i> (0.127)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	-0.026 (0.543)	0.006 (0.909)	-0.056** <i>(b)</i> (0.021)
With baseline variables	-0.047 (0.226)	-0.003 (0.950)	-0.070*** ( $<0.001$ )

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern from France; 2013-2014).

Field: 116 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: *(a)* at any level, encouraging to literacy practice let unchanged the probability to achieve the second term of the first-year university for female students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France). *(b)* At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces a decrease of 5.6 percentage points the probability to achieve the second term of first-year university for female students in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France).

**Table A13a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Considered sample: students whose country of origin is France.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.043 (0.542)	0.100 (0.150)	0.006 (0.930)
With baseline variables	0.026 (0.679)	0.069(a) (0.282)	-0.001 (0.989)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.023 (0.571)	0.057 (0.111)	-0.001 (0.974)
With baseline variables	0.013 (0.756)	0.043(b) (0.271)	-0.008 (0.846)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern from France; 2013-2014).

Field: 214 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at any level, encouraging to literacy practice let unchanged the probability to achieve the first term of the first-year university for students (whose country of origin is France) in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France). (b) At a 1 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores let unchanged the probability to achieve first-year university for students (whose country of origin is France) in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France)

**Table A13b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Considered sample: students whose country of origin is NOT France.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.027 (0.784)	0.091 (0.341)	0.009 (0.922)
With baseline variables	0.063 (0.448)	0.126 (0.116)	0.032(a) (0.694)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.013 (0.857)	0.065 (0.218)	-0.002(b) (0.972)
With baseline variables	0.050 (0.371)	0.081** (0.024)	0.027 (0.644)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern from France; 2013-2014).

Field: 109 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at any level, encouraging to literacy practice let unchanged the probability to achieve the first term of the first-year university for students (whose country of origin is NOT France) in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France). (b) At a 5 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces an increase of 8.1 percentage points the probability to achieve the first term of first-year university for students (whose country of origin is NOT France) in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France).

**Table A14a.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Considered sample: students who got a baccalaureate with merit, honors or distinction.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.023 (0.781)	-0.005 (0.945)	-0.039 (0.650)
With baseline variables	0.035 (0.433)	0.035(a) (0.622)	-0.031 (0.713)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.009 (0.842)	-0.002 (0.957)	-0.025 (0.507)
With baseline variables	0.013 (0.756)	0.019(b) (0.633)	-0.027 (0.485)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern from France; 2013-2014).

Field: 136 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at any level, encouraging to literacy practice let unchanged the probability to achieve the first term of the first-year university for students (whose country of origin is France) in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France). (b) At any level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores let unchanged the probability to achieve first-year university for students (whose country of origin is France) in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France)

**Table A14b.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Considered sample: students who got a baccalaureate without merit, honors or distinction.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	0.025 (0.730)	0.147** (0.042)	0.017 (0.782)
With baseline variables	0.019 (0.770)	0.144***(a) (0.037)	0.016 (0.783)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	0.016 (0.768)	0.099*** (0.004)	0.010 (0.830)
With baseline variables	0.012 (0.804)	0.100***(b) (0.005)	0.011 (0.808)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern from France; 2013-2014).

Field: 187 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference= Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 5 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increase by 14.4 percentage points the probability to achieve the first term of the first-year university for students (whose country of origin is NOT France) in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France). (b) At a 1 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces an increase of 10 percentage points in the probability to achieve the first term of first-year university for students (whose country of origin is NOT France) in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France).

**Table A14c.** Evaluation of the impact of the encouragement to literacy learning, or of increasing literacy level on the probability of achieving semester or academic year for first-year university students in Economic and Management. *Considered sample: students who got a baccalaureate with pass 50%-60%.*

Discipline	Academic Year	First Semester	Second Semester
Model	Effect of encouragement to literacy learning (Intention To treat, ITT)		
Without baseline variables	-0.014 (0.884)	0.138 (0.145)	0.003 (0.969)
With baseline variables	-0.010 (0.911)	0.152*(a) (0.095)	0.016 (0.849)
Model	Effect of varying literacy test scores (Local Average Treatment Effect, LATE)		
Without baseline variables	-0.024 (0.841)	0.130*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.999)
With baseline variables	-0.013 (0.895)	0.131***(b) (0.001)	0.015 (0.881)

Source: randomized experiment implemented in University Lille 1 (Northern from France; 2013-2014).

Field: 118 first-year university students in Economics and Management, who participate in the literacy learning device, for whom information from the baseline administrative survey is available, as well as scores for the two literacy tests.

Notes: effect of encouragement to literacy learning (*intention to treat*; probit estimator) or of varying literacy test score (*local average treatment effect*; probit instrumental variable estimator). Marginal effects. Included explanatory variables: score to the first literacy test; age of the student; the student is a man; scholarship student; kind of baccalaureate (reference=Economics and Social Science stream). P-value within parentheses. \*\*\* (respectively \*\* or \*) stands for significance at 1% (respectively at 5% or 10%) level.

Reading: (a) at a 10 percent level, encouraging to literacy practice increases by 15.2 percentage points the probability to achieve the first term of the first-year university for students (whose country of origin is NOT France) in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France). (b) At a 1 percent level, an increase of 1 point in the difference between the second and the first literacy test scores induces an increase of 13.1 percentage points the probability to achieve the first term of first-year university for students (whose country of origin is NOT France) in Economics and Management stream at university Lille 1 (Northern from France).