

# Identifying School Climate Variables Associated with Students' Financial Literacy Outcomes

*A Cross-Country Comparison  
Using PISA 2018 Data*

Tony C. A. Tan



Thesis submitted for the degree of  
Master in Assessment, Measurement and Evaluation  
30 credits

Centre for Educational Measurement  
Faculty of Educational Sciences

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Spring 2021



# Identifying School Climate Variables Associated with Students' Financial Literacy Outcomes

*A Cross-Country Comparison  
Using PISA 2018 Data*

Tony C. A. Tan

© 2020 Tony C. A. Tan

Identifying School Climate Variables Associated with Students' Financial Literacy Outcomes

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Printed: Reprosentralen, University of Oslo

敬致父母

To my parents

*Study hard what interests you the most in the  
most undisciplined, irreverent and original manner  
possible.*

*Richard P. Feynman*

# Contents

<b>Contents</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>7</b>





# List of Tables



# List of Figures



# Acknowledgement

Thank-you goes to



# Popular Abstract

This is a press release style abstract.





# Abstract

Repeated economic crises in recent memory have exposed the harsh consequences of financial *illiteracy* shared by high proportions of the general population. Policy makers experienced little resistance when identifying youth as the most effective group for bringing about improvement in citizens' ability to engage with economic and financial matters, but opinions quickly diverge over the optimal approaches for achieving such targeted outcome. Existing literature frequently reports the importance of family environment in cultivating students' financial literacy through the process of "financial socialisation" – [definition goes here] (reference). Such practice, however, encounters interrogation by educators over equity concerns should families remain the main arena for financial literacy development. Schools play vital roles in alleviating inequality in accessing education and training in general but scarce research so far has been devoted into identifying the specific classroom factors that are most effective in advancing students' financial literacy outcomes. The current study therefore attempts to contribute to this enquiry by investigating the relationship between school climate variables and students' financial literacy achievement with an aim of stimulating policy debate about the levers and instruments available to education interventionists for the purpose of improving young people's financial literacy and preparedness as they step into an increasingly uncertain world. Using the 2018 PISA dataset, this paper employs a three-level hierarchical model to conduct cross-country comparisons to highlight school climate variables that are most strongly associated with high financial literacy outcomes.



# Chapter 1: Introduction

Repeated economic crises in recent memory have exposed the harsh consequences of financial *illiteracy* shared by high proportions of the general population. Low levels of financial literacy are observed not only in less developed countries such as India and Indonesia (Cole et al., 2009) but also in advanced economies such as the USA (Huston, 2012), Germany (Bucher-Koenen et al., 2016) and OECD countries (Lusardi, 2015). Amongst the many redress schemes aimed at promoting citizens' financial capability, the return on investment is the highest when intervention is applied early in life. Lusardi and Mitchell (2014) have shown that providing financial knowledge to the least educated before they enter the labour market increases their well-being by approximately 82% of their initial wealth, while the rate of return is around 56% for college graduates—results that are significant both statistically and economically.

Research efforts aiming at advancing youth's financial literacy over the years evolved into two strands: on the design and evaluation of school financial education programs, and on the influence of home environment through the process of financial socialisation—the intentional or involuntary transmission of financial concepts which are required to functioning successfully in society (Bowen, 2002). A recent meta-analysis conducted by Kaiser and Menkhoff (2020) found that while school financial education programs had sizeable impacts on *financial knowledge* (+0.33 *SD*) similar to education interventions in other domains, their effect on students' *financial behaviour* is quite small (+0.07 *SD*). This conclusion added to a list of weak or non-findings regarding the long-term behavioural effect brought about by school financial education programs. Brown et al. (2016), for instance, reported mixed outcome in students' long-term financial well-being depending on the programs received; whereas Cole et al. (2016) observed that traditional personal finance courses lacked any explanatory power in accounting for graduates' financial outcome once the additional mathematics training in which finance topics were packaged has been controlled for. Despite careful controls and thoughtful study designs, correlating classroom interventions and young people's financial literacy outcomes has repeatedly yielded paradoxical results of non-significant or even negative relationship; any positive findings remain small in magnitudes and/or are sensitive to robust analyses.

Optimism, fortunately, runs higher at the financial socialisation camp. Building on the

acknowledgement that families serve as information filters from the outside world (Danes & Haberman, 2007) as well as the foundation for youth's continued financial concept formation, Gudmunson and Danes (2011) put forward a family financial socialisation theory to accommodate both the *process* and the *outcome* for variations in young people's financial capabilities. Using structural equation modelling, Jorgensen and Savla (2010) was able to show that perceived parental influence had a direct and moderately significant influence on financial attitude, did *not* have an effect on *financial knowledge*, and had an indirect and moderately significant influence on financial behaviour, mediated through financial attitude. This attitude(A)–behaviour(B)–cognition(C) conceptualisation of financial literacy (Potrich et al., 2015) continues to influence subsequent research effort. More recently, Moreno-Herrero et al. (2018) continued this line of enquiry by applying multilevel regression analyses to 2015 PISA data and reported that students' financial literacy was associated mainly with understanding the value of saving and discussing money matters with parents. In addition, exposure and use of financial products, in particular holding a bank account, improved students' financial knowledge as well.

One chief concern for every research project is the quality of its data source. Amongst competing inventories, PISA stands out as a comprehensive and reliable source of data for measuring 15-year-olds' financial literacy outcomes thanks to OECD's careful sampling procedure and attention to construct validity of measurement. Following statistical theory, PISA designers firstly recognise the hierarchical nature of education research data such that students are nested in schools, and schools are further nested in countries. In addition, one student weight is assigned to each observation in order to account for the fact that not all schools in a country are equally likely to be sampled by the PISA organiser; and given a particular school that has been chosen, not every student in this school is equally likely to be asked to participate in the test (Rust, 2014). A third complication arises from the "planned missingness" in students' responses because each participant is only given a small number of questions relative to the entire test bank in order to ensure their responses are not undermined by tiredness (von Davier, 2014), leading to the outcome variables being represented by ten plausible values. Lastly, PISA consulted and synthesised multiple schools of thoughts (OECD, 2019) before constructing financial literacy as

the knowledge and understanding of financial concepts and risks, and the skills, motivation and confidence to apply such knowledge and understanding in order to make effective decisions across a range of financial contexts, to improve the

financial well-being of individuals and society, and to enable participation in economic life. (p. 128)

As a result, 2018 PISA data set (OECD, 2020) provides not only variables measuring *cognitive* outcomes but also *affective* factors such as familiarity with concepts of finance and confidence about financial matters, enabling a nuanced study design involving decomposing the total effect of financial literacy development into its “brain” (cognitive) and “heart” (affective) pathways.

The current study wishes to take advantage of the latest wave of 2018 PISA results and investigate the covariation financial literacy outcomes share with the following four aspects of young people’s daily lives, inspired by school climate literature (Wang & Degol, 2016):

(a) academic training, including any financial education programs received at schools; (b) safety perception about their schools; (c) financial socialisation experienced at home; and (d) their schools’ resource endowment. More specifically, this project aims to answer these three research questions:

- RQ1. Having controlled for demographic characteristics such as socio-economic status, sex and immigration history, to what extent can the variation in students’ financial literacy outcomes be accounted for by each of the school climate variables mentioned above.
- RQ2. How does the total effect each school climate variable carries decompose into cognitive and affect pathways.
- RQ3. How do these effects differ across countries.



# References

- Bowen, C. F. (2002). Financial knowledge of teens and their parents. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 13(2), 93–102. <https://afcpe.buckeyedev.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/vol1328.pdf>
- Brown, M., Grigsby, J., van der Klaauw, W., Wen, J. & Zafar, B. (2016). Financial education and the debt behavior of the young. *Review of Financial Studies*, 29(9), 2490–2522. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhw006>
- Bucher-Koenen, T., Lusardi, A., Alessie, R. & van Rooij, M. (2016). How financially literate are women? An overview and new insights. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 51(2), 255–283. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12121>
- Cole, S., Paulson, A. & Shastry, G. K. (2016). High school curriculum and financial outcomes: The impact of mandated personal finance and mathematics courses. *Journal of Human Resources*, 51(3), 656–698. <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.51.3.0113-5410r1>
- Cole, S., Sampson, T. & Zia, B. (2009). *Financial literacy, financial decisions, and the demand for financial services: Evidence from India and Indonesia* (Working Paper 09-117). Harvard Business School. [http://www1.worldbank.org/prem/poverty/ie/dime\\_papers/1107.pdf](http://www1.worldbank.org/prem/poverty/ie/dime_papers/1107.pdf)
- Danes, S. M. & Haberman, H. R. (2007). Teen financial knowledge, self-efficacy, and behavior: A gendered view. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 18(2), 48–60. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1104367.pdf>
- von Davier, M. (2014). Imputing proficiency data under planned missingness in population models. In L. Rutkowski, M. von Davier & D. Rutkowski (Eds.), *Handbook of international large-scale assessment: Background, technical issues, and methods of data analysis* (pp. 175–201). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b16061-13>
- Gudmunson, C. G. & Danes, S. M. (2011). Family financial socialization: Theory and critical review. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 32(4), 644–667. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-011-9275-y>
- Huston, S. J. (2012). Financial literacy and the cost of borrowing. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 36(5), 566–572. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2012.01122.x>

- Jorgensen, B. L. & Savla, J. (2010). Financial literacy of young adults: The importance of parental socialization. *Family Relations*, 59(4), 465–478. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00616.x>
- Kaiser, T. & Menkhoff, L. (2020). Financial education in schools: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Economics of Education Review*, 78, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2019.101930>
- Lusardi, A. (2015). Financial literacy skills for the 21st Century: Evidence from PISA. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 49(3), 639–659. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12099>
- Lusardi, A. & Mitchell, O. S. (2014). The economic importance of financial literacy: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 52(1), 5–44. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.52.1.5>
- Moreno-Herrero, D., Salas-Velasco, M. & Sánchez-Campillo, J. (2018). Factors that influence the level of financial literacy among young people: The role of parental engagement and students' experiences with money matters. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 95, 334–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.10.042>
- OECD. (2019). PISA 2018 financial literacy framework. *PISA 2018 assessment and analytical framework* (pp. 119–164). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/alfad77c-en>
- OECD. (2020). *Financial literacy data file* (Data set). OECD Publishing. [https://webfs.oecd.org/pisa2018/SPSS\\_STU\\_FLT.zip](https://webfs.oecd.org/pisa2018/SPSS_STU_FLT.zip)
- Potrich, A. C. G., Vieira, K. M., Coronel, D. A. & Bender Filho, R. (2015). Financial literacy in Southern Brazil: Modeling and invariance between genders. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 6, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2015.03.002>
- Rust, K. (2014). Sampling, weighting, and variance estimation in international large-scale assessments. In L. Rutkowski, M. von Davier & D. Rutkowski (Eds.), *Handbook of international large-scale assessment: Background, technical issues, and methods of data analysis* (pp. 117–153). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b16061-11>
- Wang, M.-T. & Degol, J. L. (2016). School climate: A review of the construct, measurement, and impact on student outcomes. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(2), 315–352. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9319-1>



# Appendices

