



UiO • University of Oslo

Identifying School Climate Variables Associated with Financial Literacy Outcomes in PISA 2018 Data

*A Multilevel Structural Equation Modelling
Approach*

Tony C. A. Tan

Master of Science (Assessment, Measurement and Evaluation)
30 credits

Centre for Educational Measurement
Faculty of Educational Sciences

Spring 2021

Identifying School Climate Variables Associated with Financial Literacy Outcomes in PISA 2018 Data

*A Multilevel Structural Equation Modelling
Approach*

Tony C. A. Tan

© 2021 Tony C. A. Tan

Identifying School Climate Variables Associated with Financial Literacy Outcomes in PISA
2018 Data

<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

| | |
|---|------------|
| Contents | i |
| List of Tables | iii |
| List of Figures | v |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Profiles of Successful Learners | 3 |
| 1.1.1 Social, Economic and Cultural Status | 3 |
| 1.1.2 Immigration History | 3 |
| 1.1.3 Sex Differences | 3 |
| 1.2 Research Questions | 3 |
| 2 Conceptual Framework | 5 |
| 2.1 School Climate | 5 |
| 2.1.1 School Financial Education Programs | 6 |
| 2.1.2 Parental Influence and Financial Socialisation | 6 |
| 2.1.3 School Safety | 7 |
| 2.1.4 School Resources | 7 |
| 2.2 Financial Literacy | 7 |
| 2.2.1 Knowledge Aspect of Financial Literacy | 7 |
| 2.2.2 Confidence Aspect of Financial Literacy | 7 |
| 2.2.3 Application Aspect of Financial Literacy | 9 |
| 3 Methods | 11 |
| 3.1 Sample | 11 |
| 3.2 Measures | 11 |
| 3.2.1 School Climate Variables | 11 |
| 3.2.2 Affective Financial Literacy Measures | 12 |
| 3.2.3 Financial Literacy Performance Measure | 12 |
| 3.2.4 Control Variables | 12 |
| 3.3 Multilevel Structural Equation Modelling (MSEM) | 13 |
| 3.4 Missing Data Treatment | 14 |
| 3.5 Sampling Weights | 16 |
| 3.6 Estimator | 16 |
| 3.7 Model Evaluation | 16 |
| 4 Results | 19 |
| 4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations | 19 |
| 4.2 Intra-class Correlation and Effective Sample Size | 19 |
| 4.3 Intermediate Models | 22 |
| 4.4 Full Model | 22 |
| 4.4.1 Model Fit | 23 |
| 4.4.2 Student-level Relationships | 23 |
| 4.4.3 School-level Relationships | 26 |
| 4.4.4 Contextual Effects | 26 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 5 | Discussion | 29 |
| 5.1 | Overview | 29 |
| 5.2 | Student-level Relationships | 29 |
| 5.2.1 | Financial Education at School | 30 |
| 5.2.2 | Demographic Variables | 30 |
| 5.3 | School-level Relationships | 30 |
| 5.3.1 | School Climate Variables | 30 |
| 5.3.2 | Contextual Effects | 30 |
| 5.4 | Limitation on Causal Inferences | 30 |
| 5.5 | Future Research Direction | 30 |
| | Appendices | 41 |
| A | GDPR Documentation and Ethical Approval | 43 |
| B | Analysis Code, Additional Tables and Figures | 47 |
| B.1 | Data Merging | 47 |
| B.2 | Multilevel Multiple Imputation | 51 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 2.1 | Structure of PISA 2018 Financial Literacy Construct | 8 |
| 3.1 | Summary of Measures and Variables | 12 |
| 4.1 | Descriptive Statistics | 20 |
| 4.2 | Correlations between Variables used in the MSEM Models | 21 |
| 4.3 | Model Parameters and Fit Indices of Multilevel Regressions for the Total Sample | 24 |
| 4.4 | Contextual Effects and Effect Sizes | 27 |
| B.1 | Summary of Participating Countries | 49 |
| B.2 | Scale Reliabilities (Cronbach's alphas) and Item Parameter References for Derived Variables based on IRT Scaling | 50 |
| B.3 | Summary of Diagnostic Plots of Multilevel Multiple Imputation | 54 |

List of Figures

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 3.1 | Path Diagram Illustrating the Two-level SEM Predicting Youth's Financial Literacy Outcomes | 15 |
| 4.1 | Two-level Structural Equation Model Predicting Youth's Financial Literacy Outcomes | 28 |

Acknowledgement

Thank-you goes to

Popular Abstract

Preparing youth for life-long success with numeracy, literacy and science capability has been the foundation for all schooling. The post-global financial crises and post-COVID era, in addition, imposes increasing demand on financial literacy for school leavers. Since 2012, OECD has been a pioneer in measuring 15-year-olds' financial literacy through its triennial Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) cycles. Subsequent analyses using PISA data, however, reported paradoxical results that more classroom interventions tend to be associated with either no differences or even lower scores in students' financial literacy measures. It is in educators' interest therefore to carefully examine the relationship between school climate variables, including the academic, safety, community and institutional environment aspects of students' lives, and their financial literacy outcomes.

[Project summary]

The motivation for this project originates from my confusion over the current stock of literature, which states that school efforts do not matter, even harmful, in bringing about students' financial literacy while homes are better suited for this purpose. This claim is worrisome because if school are committing something wrong, school leaders and policy makers genuinely want to know what, which and where so that harmful pedagogies can be reverted into good practices. Alternatively, it could also be the measurement instrument researchers employed so far that led to such underwhelming results. A closer examination of how school effectiveness is measured would also promote research practice and the resultant policy advice.

Using 2018 PISA financial literacy data, including all 20 participating countries, I was able to examine how school climate variables, namely ACADEMIC, SAFETY, COMMUNITY and INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT each explained the total variation in students' financial literacy outcomes. Using a multilevel SEM with students' finance-related affective variables as mediators, my random intercept model shows that schools' academic practices do matter in advancing students' financial literacy outcomes but only through affective pathways. Cognitive pathways, however, were shown to correlate negatively with financial literacy scores. Since schools' cognitive and affective pathways are similar in size but opposite in signs, combining the two into total effects would have inadvertently resulted in the nonfindings as reported

by prior literature. In addition to this methodological insight, countries that overly focused on accountability through standard testing, tracking and measuring students' financial skills (e.g., the USA) fell prey to this cognitive trap while countries that placed more emphases on cultivating students' affective affinity such as confidence in, and familiarity with, financial matters (e.g., Finland) delivered impressive education outcome in financial literacy.

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 financial literacy was directly linked with negative credit behaviours such as high amount of credit card debt (Meier & Sprenger, 2010), high costs of borrowing, poor mortgage choices and subsequent delinquency and home foreclosure (Hastings et al., 2013). Poor financial decisions made early in life can have profound long-term economic and societal impacts (Montoya & Scott, 2013) such as forgoing medical care (Lusardi et al., 2015) and geriatric poverty resultant from insufficient retirement provision (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2007, 2008).

Even more concerning is the pervasive global distribution of financial illiteracy. 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 (Gale et al., 2012; Huston, 2012; Lusardi et al., 2010), Germany (Bucher-Koenen et al., 2017) and OECD countries (Lusardi, 2015).

Another reason behind the escalating interests in citizens' financial literacy can be attributed to the policy adjustment taking place in the past two decades shifting greater responsibility from the governmental to individual levels, from provision for education and health to retirement planning (Hastings et al., 2013).

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. Four technical features of PISA are crucial for the architecture of this study. First, following statistical theory, PISA designers acknowledged the hierarchical nature of education research data such that students are nested in schools, and schools are further nested in countries. Second, 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. Fourthly, PISA consulted and synthesised multiple schools of thoughts (OECD, 2019a) 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, 2020a) 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.

1.1 Profiles of Successful Learners

1.1.1 Social, Economic and Cultural Status

1.1.2 Immigration History

1.1.3 Sex Differences

Not all high school graduates continue into tertiary education and only a portion of the latter group receive further training in finance-related areas, senior years in secondary education present an ideal interval for introducing financial literacy intervention as it captures the widest participant base (Walstad et al., 2016).

Financial literacy can be seen as an investment in human capital (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014). Today’s young people are growing up in a society in which the financial landscape is complex and the financial responsibilities of citizens are substantial.

1.2 Research Questions

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. More specifically, this project aims to answer these two research questions:

RQ1. To what extent can the variation in students' financial literacy outcomes be accounted for by each of the school climate variables?

RQ2. How does the school environment impact on individual learners' financial literacy acquisition process?

Chapter 2 Conceptual Framework

This chapter provides in-depth explanations of the two concepts underpinning this research project: Wang and Degol’s (2016) school climate framework and PISA 2018’s approach to quantifying students’ financial literacy. In particular, it reviews existing literature on the impact of school intervention (the academic aspect of school climate) and parental involvement (the community aspect) on youth’s financial literacy development in Section 2.1 and how PISA 2018 measured students’ financial knowledge, confidence as well as their application of which into financial decision-making in Section 2.2.

2.1 School Climate

A positive school climate is easier to recognise but difficult to define, even to the present day (OECD, 2019b). When organising school attributes into frameworks, early studies loosely clustered themselves into two camps along the concrete–abstract spectrum. When researching on students’ behavioural problems and emotional distress, for example, Kuperminc et al. (1997) recognised the insufficiency of using observable characteristics of a school as the metric for its managerial success but adopted a utilisation and perception approach based on social-ecological and developmental theories. Such emphasis on school users’ *perception* continued into Esposito (1999)’s study of students’ social disadvantages on their academic outcomes. Freiberg and Stein (1999), on the other hand, took a more idealised view of school climate as “the heart and soul of a school”—the very “essence of a school that leads a child, a teacher, an administrator, a staff member to love the school and to look forward to being there each school day” (p. 11). However broad or narrow the definition, both ends of the spectrum signalled that the ultimate utility of any school climate framework should facilitate our understanding of student development.

With this goal in mind, Wang and Degol (2016) surveyed six theories for the purpose of building a multidimensional school climate framework. Since schooling is an interaction between individuals and every environment immersing them (the bio-ecological theory), students inevitably develop protective and/or maladaptive behaviours (risk and resilience perspective) in addition to all existing bond they formed with parents (attachment theory). Thanks to students’ ever growing capabilities, schools may then encourage learners to connect, invest,

participate and believe in their immediate environment (social control theory), by bridging their motivation towards success criteria (social cognitive theory) and by removing barriers (stage-environmental fit theory) to growth. These theories in combination guided a literature review and coding exercise that led to a four-domain, 13-dimension structure of school climate framework (see Figure 1, Wang & Degol, 2016, p. 318). This research project stood at the domain-level of Wang and Degol’s (2016) ontology and referred the *academic* climate as the overall quantity and quality of the teaching-learning activities; *community* as the engagement and interpersonal ties schools maintain with stakeholders particularly parents; *safety* as the degree of physical and emotional security afforded by schools; and *institutional environment* as the organisational and structural features of schools in particular their educational resource availability. All four branches of the school climate framework extend to strong platforms upon which students’ financial literacy can be constructed.

2.1.1 School Financial Education Programs

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.

2.1.2 Parental Influence and Financial Socialisation

Although financial capability is an important integral of adulthood, the process of acquiring the financial knowledge and skills begins in early childhood. Parents provide a context in which children learn what money is, for instance, and how it is used and saved (Birbili & Kontopoulou, 2015). Whether intentionally or informally, financial intuition is passed around the household through frequent interactions, conversations, and lessons. Consequently, the financial knowledge and skills acquired while growing up at home form the foundation for the financial attitudes and behaviours carried into adulthood (Serido & Deenanath, 2016). Using panel data set from the Dutch DNB Household Survey between 2000 and 2012, Bucciol and Veronesi (2014) reported that parental teaching about savings increased the likelihood of adult saving by 16% and the saving amount by approximately 30%. Similar intergenerational effect was observed from longitudinal studies in the US, linking adolescents’ observation of parents’ responsible financial behaviour to their own good decisions and actions later in life

(Tang, 2017).

2.1.3 School Safety

(Kutsyuruba et al., 2015)

2.1.4 School Resources

2.2 Financial Literacy

In its official publication *PISA 2018 Assessment and Analytical Framework* (OECD, 2019a), the OECD provided an explicit definition of “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)

with emphases on both the thinking and behaviour that characterise such construct and the purposes for developing this particular literacy. Of particular relevance to the current project are the knowledge, confidence and application aspects of financial literacy.

2.2.1 Knowledge Aspect of Financial Literacy

Since poor financial behaviours have been associated with a lack of financial knowledge (Hastings et al., 2013; Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014), the ultimate goal of financial literacy interventions is to ensure students receive the information and support they need to make responsible and appropriate financial decisions confidently, both in their school years and in adult lives (OECD, 2020b). In order to ascertain candidates’ current understanding of finance-related topics, FL164 of the financial literacy questionnaire presented 18 terminologies such as exchange rate, budget, and income tax and asked students to rate their familiarity with each term using a three-point scale: “Never heard of it”, “Heard of it, but I don’t recall the meaning” and “Learnt about it, and I know what it means”. Sum scores of FL164 were used to construct “familiarity with concepts of finance” variable (FCFMLRTY, Chapter 16 of *PISA 2018 Technical Report*, OECD (2020c), p. 23), which is expected to share a positive correlation with students’ financial literacy performance.

2.2.2 Confidence Aspect of Financial Literacy

The positive association between students’ confidence and their academic attainment has also been well documented. By synthesising one decade of large-scale international assessment data, Lee and Stankov (2018) found self-beliefs (labelled “self-efficacy” in PISA and “confidence”

Table 2.1
Structure of PISA 2018 Financial Literacy Construct

| Domain ^a | Content areas | Distribution of score points (%) |
|---------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Content | Money and transactions | 30–40 |
| | Planning and managing finances | 25–35 |
| | Risk and reward | 15–25 |
| | Financial landscape | 10–20 |
| Process | Identify financial information | 15–25 |
| | Analyse information in a financial context | 15–25 |
| | Evaluate financial issues | 25–35 |
| | Applying financial knowledge and understanding | 25–35 |
| Contexts | Education and work | 10–20 |
| | Home and family | 30–40 |
| | Individual | 35–45 |
| | Societal | 5–15 |

Note. This table synthesised Table 5.1 to 5.3 of *PISA 2018 Assessment and Analytical Framework* (OECD, 2019a, p. 155). The PISA organiser used the term “score points” instead of “items” because, by questionnaire design, partial credits can be awarded for some questions.

^a *Content* comprises the areas of knowledge and understanding that are essential in the area of literacy in question; *processes* describes the mental strategies or approaches that are called upon to negotiate the material; and *contexts* refers to the situations in which the knowledge, skills and understandings of the domain are applied, ranging from the personal to the global. (OECD, 2019a, pp. 130–131)

in TIMSS) to be the strongest non-cognitive predictor for students’ mathematics achievement. Similar relationships had also been observed in the realm of financial literacy such as Arellano et al.’s (2014) study using the Spanish portion of the PISA 2012 financial literacy data, and Borges Ramalho and Forte’s (2019) results based on the Brazilian sub-sample of the 2016 OECD/INFE International Survey of Adult Financial Literacy Competencies. PISA 2018 therefore included a set of questions in FL162 asking students about their confidence over six financial activities such as making money transfers, understanding bank statements, and plan their spendings using a four-point Likert scale ranging from “Not at all confident”, “Not very confident”, “Confident” to “Very confident”. A variable “confidence about financial matters” was subsequently constructed using the IRT procedure (FLCONFIN, OECD (2020c), p. 23) and is expected to have a positive association with financial literacy performance in the current study.

2.2.3 Application Aspect of Financial Literacy

Although financial knowledge and confidence forms the very foundation upon which financial capability can be developed, it is individuals' willingness and ability to *apply* their understanding through financial decision-making that counts as the ultimate outcome of their financial literacy (Huston, 2010). The financial literacy application problems were drawn from 43 questions distributed across 24 booklets. The actual test bank remained confidential due to reusability consideration, but the OECD was able to provide examples that were comparable in style and difficulty in the *Analytical Framework* (OECD, 2019a, pp. 133–148). These exemplar questions illustrated the domains and content areas (see summary in Table 2.1) PISA 2018 covered for the purpose of constructing candidates' financial literacy scores (FLIT). In order to succeed in the the bank statement question (Figure 5.1, OECD (2019a), p. 133), for example, students should recognise that the necessary information was presented in multiple locations of the financial document and must be identified amongst distractions then summed together. This question covered the “money and transactions” content area of the “content” domain, the “identifying financial information” content area of the “process” domain, and the “home and family” content area of the “contexts” domain.

In addition to content design, the OECD also paid particular attention to upholding financial literacy as an independent construct. Such consideration was important because one's financial capability was known to covary with both numeracy (Geiger et al., 2020; Ozkale & Erdogan, 2020a, 2020b; Sole, 2014) and literacy (Bay et al., 2014) skills. Empirical studies using diverse samples from the Philippines (Indenfero & Yazon, 2020) to Sweden (Skagerlund et al., 2018) reported correlations between numeracy and financial knowledge/literacy to be between approximately .61 and .52. In order to minimise the impact of numeracy deficiency such as low arithmetic skills (Huston, 2010) on students' financial literacy performance, financial formulæ were never required in any problem solving and students may use the on-screen calculator at any time of the test. Furthermore, stimulus material and task statements were generally designed to be as clear, simple and brief as possible to minimise low reading ability as underperformance in application section. Both constructed- and selected-responses were used in question design and 30 out of 43 items were automatically coded by computers. Finally, “planned missingness” resultant from rotating booklet design was imputed into ten plausible values (von Davier, 2014) centered at 500 with standard deviation of 100 (OECD, 2019a).

Chapter 3 Methods

3.1 Sample

This study drew its primary data source from OECD’s PISA 2018 database. Responses from both student (OECD, 2020a) and school questionnaires (OECD, 2020d) were captured and merged into a master data file using **R**’s (Version 4.0.5, **R** Core Team, 2021) *intsvy* package (Version 2.5, Caro & Biecek, 2017) (see Section B.1 for analysis code) including the following 20 participating countries¹: Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Indonesia, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation², Serbia, Slovak Republic, Spain, and the USA. Twelve observations without school weights were dropped, leading to a sample size of 107,162 students nested in 6,631 schools (see Table B.1 for detailed sample profile). Under PISA 2018 sampling design, all student candidates were born in the year 2002 in international grades 7 or higher (Chapter 4 of *PISA 2018 Technical Report*, OECD (2020c), p. 29) and will be referred to as “15-year-old” in this study.

3.2 Measures

3.2.1 School Climate Variables

Following Wang and Degol’s (2016) framework, this study selected variable **FLSCHOOL** “financial education in school lessons” as an indicator for the academic domain of school climate; **FLFAMILY** “parental involvement in matters of financial literacy” (i.e., “financial socialisation”) for the community engagement dimension, **NOBULLY** (reverse coding of **BEINGBULLIED** such that larger numbers imply safer schools) as an indicator for school safety, and lastly **EDUSHORT** “shortage of educational material” as an indicator of the resource availability aspect of the institutional environment of schools. All four measures were derived variables based on IRT scaling, with good scale reliabilities for most countries and constructs (see Table B.2 for Cronbach’s alphas). In addition, the OECD has applied multi-group concurrent calibrations to all latent constructs using the root mean square deviance below 0.3 criterion (for a technical discussion on RMSD, see Buchholz & Hartig, 2019, p. 244) in order to ensure cross-country measurement invariance (see Chapter 9 of *Technical Report* (OECD, 2020c, pp. 14–15) for analytical details).

¹Australia also participated in 2018 PISA financial literacy but chose to withhold its data from public release and is therefore excluded in the current study.

²Moscow Region (CNTRYID = 982) and Tatarstan (983) have been merged into Russian Federation (643).

Table 3.1
Summary of Measures and Variables

| Analysis level | Exogenous variable | | Endogenous variable | |
|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | School climate (Input, X) | Demographic control | Affective (Mediator, M) | Cognitive (Outcome, Y) |
| School-level ($L2$) | FLSCH00L _B FLFAMILY _B NOBULLY _B EDUSHORT | STRAIO | | FLIT _B |
| Student-level ($L1$) | FLSCH00L _W FLFAMILY _W NOBULLY _W | ESCS IMMI1GEN IMMI2GEN MALE | FCFMLRTY FLCONFIN | FLIT _W |

Note. The within- and between-level components are marked with subscript W and B respectively.

3.2.2 Affective Financial Literacy Measures

The OECD has constructed two variables to measure 15-year-old students' affects towards financial matters: FCFMLRTY “familiarity with concepts of finance” and FLCONFIN “confidence about financial matters”. The former was a non-scaled derived variable by summing up all 18 items from financial literacy questionnaire FL164, whereas the latter was derived based on IRT scaling with good reliability properties (see [Table B.2](#) for reliabilities).

3.2.3 Financial Literacy Performance Measure

Similar to the treatment for reading and mathematics capabilities, ten plausible values (PV1FLIT to PV10FLIT, collectively written as FLIT from here on) were generated as indicators of students' financial literacy cognition capability. All ten plausible values have been used in this study following procedures prescribed by Rubin ([1987](#)).

3.2.4 Control Variables

In the 2018 PISA cycle, the OECD simplified its computation of the students' economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) index by taking the arithmetic mean of three indicators: PARED (parental education), HISEI (parental occupational status) and HOMEPOS (home possessions). Figure 16.4 of the *Technical Report* (OECD, [2020c](#)) visualised this procedure while Avvisati ([2020](#)) further examined the validity and reliability of the ESCS construct. Students' immigration status was determined by synthesising responses from student questionnaire items ST019 (parents' country of birth) and ST021 (students' age of arrival in test country) (OECD, [2019b](#), pp. 212–213) into a categorical variable with levels 1 = Native, 2 = Second-Generation and 3 = First-Generation. This information enabled the derivation of two binary variables

IMMI1GEN and IMMI2GEN to mark first- and second-generation migrants respectively, with natives being the reference group receiving zero entries for both categories. The variable ST004D01T from the student questionnaire (OECD, 2020a) represented students' gender and was transformed into a binary variable with female being the reference group: 0 = female; 1 = male.

3.3 Multilevel Structural Equation Modelling (MSEM)

Conventional multilevel modelling approaches assume the observed group means to be perfectly reliable when individual-level characteristics are aggregated to the group-level—a particularly questionable assumption in current study. Thanks to recent advancement in both theoretical derivations (Lüdtke et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2009) and computation power (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2017), the multilevel latent covariate (MLC) approach has enabled the current project to decompose $L1$ school climate variables FLSCHOOL, FLFAMILY, NOBULLY as well as the cognitive outcome FLIT into their corresponding within- and between-level components (subscript W and B respectively). This doubly latent MSEM approach controls measurement error at both the student- and school-levels as well as sampling error due to the aggregation of $L1$ variables to form $L2$ constructs (Lüdtke et al., 2011; Lüdtke et al., 2009; Marsh et al., 2012). Subscript ij in the MSEM model below represents the within-group component of the MLC decomposition and subscript j stands for the between-group component:

Student-level ($L1$):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FCFMLRTY} &= \alpha_j^{M_1} + \gamma_{11}\text{FLSCHOOL}_{ij} + \gamma_{21}\text{FLFAMILY}_{ij} + \gamma_{31}\text{NOBULLY}_{ij} \\ &\quad + \gamma_{41}\text{ESCS}_{ij} + \gamma_{61}\text{IMMI2GEN}_{ij} + \gamma_{71}\text{MALE}_{ij} + r_{ij}^{M_1} \\ \text{FLCONFIN}_{ij} &= \alpha_j^{M_2} + \gamma_{12}\text{FLSCHOOL}_{ij} + \gamma_{22}\text{FLFAMILY}_{ij} + \gamma_{32}\text{NOBULLY}_{ij} \\ &\quad + \gamma_{42}\text{ESCS}_{ij} + \gamma_{62}\text{IMMI2GEN}_{ij} + \gamma_{72}\text{MALE}_{ij} + r_{ij}^{M_2} \\ \text{FLIT}_{ij} &= \alpha_j^Y + \beta_1\text{FCFMLRTY}_{ij} + \beta_2\text{FLCONFIN}_{ij} \\ &\quad + \gamma_1\text{FLSCHOOL}_{ij} + \gamma_2\text{FLFAMILY}_{ij} + \gamma_3\text{NOBULLY}_{ij} \\ &\quad + \gamma_4\text{ESCS}_{ij} + \gamma_5\text{IMMI1GEN}_{ij} + r_{ij}^Y \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

School-level ($L2$):

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_j^Y &= \alpha_{00}^Y + a_1\text{FLSCHOOL}_j + a_2\text{NOBULLY}_j + a_3\text{FLFAMILY}_j + a_4\text{EDUSHTG}_j \\ &\quad + a_5\text{STRATIO}_j + \varepsilon_j^Y \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

with the residual distribution assumptions

$$\begin{pmatrix} r_{ij}^{M_1} \\ r_{ij}^{M_2} \\ r_{ij}^Y \end{pmatrix} \sim \text{MVN} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{M_1}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{M_2}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_{Y_W}^2 \end{pmatrix} \right], \text{ and } \varepsilon_j^Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{Y_B}^2), \quad (3.3)$$



where $\text{MVN}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\cdot)$ stand for multivariate normal and normal distribution respectively.

Using Kaplan's (2009) notation $\mathbf{y}_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j + \mathbf{B}_j \mathbf{y}_{ij} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_j \mathbf{x}_{ij} + \mathbf{r}_{ij}$ for student-level ($L1$) and random intercept $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{00} + \mathbf{A} \mathbf{w}_j + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ for school-level ($L2$), the model equations can be further condensed into a matrix form, with the corresponding path diagram in Figure 3.1:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \begin{bmatrix} \text{FCFMLRTY}_{ij} \\ \text{FLCONFIN}_{ij} \\ \text{FLIT}_{ij} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_j^{M_1} \\ \alpha_j^{M_2} \\ \alpha_j^{Y_W} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \beta_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \text{FCFMLRTY}_{ij} \\ \text{FLCONFIN}_{ij} \\ \text{FLIT}_{ij} \end{bmatrix} \\
 &+ \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{11} & \gamma_{12} & \gamma_1 \\ \gamma_{21} & \gamma_{22} & \gamma_2 \\ \gamma_{31} & \gamma_{32} & \gamma_3 \\ \gamma_{41} & \gamma_{42} & \gamma_4 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma_5 \\ \gamma_{61} & \gamma_{62} & 0 \\ \gamma_{71} & \gamma_{72} & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \text{FLSCHOOL}_{ij} \\ \text{FLFAMILY}_{ij} \\ \text{NOBULLY}_{ij} \\ \text{ESCS}_{ij} \\ \text{IMMI1GEN}_{ij} \\ \text{IMMI2GEN}_{ij} \\ \text{MALE}_{ij} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} r_{ij}^{M_1} \\ r_{ij}^{M_2} \\ r_{ij}^{Y_W} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.4) \\
 \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_j^{M_1} \\ \alpha_j^{M_2} \\ \alpha_j^{Y_W} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{00}^{M_1} \\ \alpha_{00}^{M_2} \\ \alpha_{00}^{Y_W} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & a_1 \\ 0 & 0 & a_2 \\ 0 & 0 & a_3 \\ 0 & 0 & a_4 \\ 0 & 0 & a_5 \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \text{FLSCHOOL}_j \\ \text{FLFAMILY}_j \\ \text{NOBULLY}_j \\ \text{EDUSHTG}_j \\ \text{STRATIO}_j \end{bmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \varepsilon_j^{Y_B} \end{pmatrix}.
 \end{aligned}$$

3.4 Missing Data Treatment

Missing data are the norm rather than the exception in empirical studies and they demand great care from the researchers to ensure analytical validity. While full information maximum likelihood has the benefit of being well understood and readily available in software, the multiple imputation (MI) approach outperforms (a) when the data set contains mixtures of incomplete categorical and continuous variables, (b) when dealing with questionnaire data where items usually come in parcels, (c) when auxiliary variables are required and lastly, (d) when the missing completely at random assumption cannot be reasonably assumed (Enders & Mansolf, 2018). These considerations conclusively directed the current study towards multilevel MI under the assumption that data were missing at random (Little & Rubin, 2019). In addition, since PISA 2018 financial literacy source files contain missing data at both student- and school-levels and in both continuous and categorical variables, the joint modelling approach is adopted under the advisory of Grund et al. (2018). More specifically, ten sets of imputed data were ordered through **Mplus**'s (Version 8.5, Muthén and Muthén (1998–2017)) unrestricted variance-covariance model ("JM-AM H1", Asparouhov & Muthén, 2010b), using the Bayes estimator with uninformative priors and 4-chain Gibbs sampler to verify convergence as per suggestion by Little and Rubin (2019, p. 230) and Lambert (2018, p. 314). Finally, the first 50,000 burn-in iterations were discarded and any two draws were separated by 5,000 iterations to avoid autocorrelation

Figure 3.1*Path Diagram Illustrating the Two-level SEM Predicting Youth's Financial Literacy Outcomes***L2: School****L1: Student**

Note. School climate variables $FLSCH00L$, $FLFAMILY$, and $NOBULLY$, as well as cognitive outcome $FLIT$ are decomposed into the within- and between-components (subscript W and B respectively) using the multilevel latent covariate (MLC) approach. Direct pathways are coloured in red while indirect in blue. Control variables are shaded in gray.

(see [Section B.2](#) for input file)—a safe setting even for moderate to high percentage missings (Grund et al., 2016). See [Table B.3](#) for imputation results and diagnostic plots.

3.5 Sampling Weights

Due to PISA’s two-stage sampling design, schools and students were selected with *unequal* probabilities (Chapter 3, OECD (2009), pp. 47–56). A proper incorporation of sampling weights is therefore crucial for establishing unbiased estimations. This study has made use of both student and school weights. Under the advisory of Asparouhov (2006), *L1* weights were scaled such that they sum to the sample size in each cluster while *L2* weights were adjusted so that the product of the between- and within-weights sums to the total sample size (Muthén & Muthén, 2017, pp. 622–624).

3.6 Estimator

This study accepted **Mplus**’s default setting of pseudo maximum likelihood (MLR) estimator for the hierarchical modelling (Chapter 16, Muthén & Muthén, 2017, pp. 666 & 668). MLR’s robust standard errors are in general Huber-White sandwich estimators (Huber, 1967; White, 1982) with asymptotic standard error corrections using observed residual variances. Literature has long recognised MLR’s robust χ^2 tests and standard errors as being more accurate than the asymptotic tests when data are non-normal and when models are mis-specified (Chou et al., 1991; Curran et al., 1996). In the multilevel modelling context, robust χ^2 and standard errors may also provide protection against unmodelled heterogeneity resanltant from mis-specification at the group-level or from omitting a level (Hox et al., 2010).

3.7 Model Evaluation

Multiple imputation substantially complicates model fit interpretations. It is important to reflect that Rubin’s (1987) rules apply only to *model parameters* under the assumption that over repeated samples, estimates eventually form normal curves peaked at some population values. The distributions of fit indices, on the other hand, are almost always unknown or non-normal, imposing high standards of proof onto any proposed aggregation procedures. Early work such as Meng and Rubin (1992) on pooled likelihood-ratio statistic, the precursor to many model fit indices, has been substantiated by simulation studies more recently with encouraging results that it is feasible to construct pooled information criteria (Claeskens & Consentino, 2008) as well as pooled model fit indices (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2010a) under MI. Enders and Mansolf (2018) further suggested that with large samples ($N > 100$) and low missing rates ($< 30\%$ – 40%), common cutoff criteria such as Hu and Bentler (1999) remain valid. This study took advantage of **Mplus**’s capability of automatically pooling model fit

information in the presence of MI. Supported by large sample size ($N = 107,162$) and low missing rate (maximum 22.08%), conventional cutoffs of $RMSEA \leq .06$, $SRMR \leq .08$, $CFI \geq .95$ and $TLI \geq .95$ are likely to be suitable for model comparison purposes.

Iterations whose model fit indices fell short of the abovementioned cutoff criteria were further investigated using modification indices and (fully standardised) expected parameter change (EPC). Modification indices (ModInd) suggest how much a model's χ^2 statistic would decrease by should a fixed parameter were freely estimated; a ModInd greater than 3.84 (critical value of χ^2_1 at $\alpha = .05$) warrants further consideration for theoretical plausibility (Whittaker, 2012). Expected parameter changes (EPC), in contrast, indicate the estimated value of a fixed parameter if it were added to a model and freely estimated, providing a more direct estimate of the size of the misspecification for the parameters under consideration. Kaplan (1989) compared ModInd and EPC's impact on empirical studies and concluded that the former had a tendency to suggest freeing implausible parameters while the latter were more likely to recommended reasonable candidates to the model. This study made use of the decision rule prescribed by Saris et al. (1987) to freely estimate a parameter when both ModInd and EPC are large. Model modification decisions were applied sequentially under the advisory of MacCallum et al. (1992) and with close consideration to theoretical ground to ensure underlying substantive assumptions were justified.

Two operational concerns were relevant to the current study. Firstly, since **Mplus** Version 8.5 only accepts one data set for the modification procedures, the file containing the first plausible value was selected for the model evaluation purposes. Secondly, three versions of the EPC were reported by **Mplus**: E.P.C. (Saris et al., 1987), Std E.P.C (Kaplan, 1989) and StdYX E.P.C. (Chou & Bentler, 1993). This study adopted the latter most version largely due to its invariance property resultant from both parameter and residual standardisations. Improper solutions with standardised estimates greater than 1.0 and/or with negative variances (i.e., Heywood cases) were ignored during decision-making process.

Chapter 4 Results

4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Table 4.1 presents descriptive statistics of all measures included in the MSEM models. *L1* variable **NOBULLY** and *L2* variable **STRATIO** were highlighted as particularly non-normal due to sizeable disagreements between their means and medians in combination with significant skewness. The MLR estimator introduced in **Section 3.6** explicitly takes non-normality into account when computing robust standard errors, safeguard the validity of subsequent analyses. These asymmetric variables suggested that majority of 15-year-olds experienced safe schools and classrooms overcrowding was uncommon in PISA 2018.

Correlations in **Table 4.2** further suggested that schools and families cared about youth's financial literacy in synchrony ($\bar{\rho} \approx .23$) and both efforts were associated with higher affective outcomes ($\bar{\rho}$ between .17 and .28). Additionally, students' ESCS were positively correlated with both familiarity with ($\bar{\rho} = .23$) and achievement in ($\bar{\rho} \approx .29$) financial literacy. Lastly, there was a positive correlation between familiarity and confidence ($\bar{\rho} \approx 0.23$) and a similar strength existed between confidence and performance ($\bar{\rho} = 0.23$).

Correlations at school-level exhibited interesting patterns. Schools with strong emphases on financial education also tended to have engaging parents ($\bar{\rho} \approx .24$), a relationship similar to its *L1* counterpart in size and magnitude. Although the negative correlation between resource shortage and school safety ($\bar{\rho} \approx -.21$) was expected, it remained counterintuitive that schools that were less safe ($\bar{\rho} \approx -.47$) and were suffering from resource shortages ($\bar{\rho} \approx .31$) tended to be more active in delivering financial education programs. Finally, average performance tended to be higher in safer ($\bar{\rho} \approx .43$) and better equipped ($\bar{\rho} \approx -.44$) schools; while higher levels of school ($\bar{\rho} \approx -.53$) and family interventions ($\bar{\rho} \approx -.36$) have been observed from schools that under-performed in financial literacy.

4.2 Intra-class Correlation and Effective Sample Size

The intraclass correlation ρ_1 can be computed from the random effects ANOVA model ("Null model" in **Table 4.3**):

Table 4.1
Descriptive Statistics

| Analysis level | Variable label | Non-missing sample size | Missing rate (%) ^a | Median | M | SD | Variance | Skewness | Excess kurtosis | Minimum | Maximum |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|-----------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------|
| Student (within, $L1$) | FLSCHOOL | 96435 | 10.01 | 0.126 | 0.018 | 1.020 | 1.040 | 0.189 | -0.343 | -1.564 | 2.317 |
| | FLFAMILY | 95133 | 11.23 | 0.011 | 0.064 | 1.044 | 1.090 | 0.121 | 0.030 | -2.042 | 2.452 |
| | NOBULLY | 83499 | 22.08 | 0.782 | -0.059 | 1.054 | 1.110 | -1.078 | 0.664 | -3.859 | 0.782 |
| | ESCS | 104784 | 2.22 | -0.158 | -0.241 | 1.088 | 1.183 | -0.533 | 0.184 | -7.711 | 4.234 |
| | IMMI1GEN | 103317 | 3.59 | 0.000 | 0.029 | 0.167 | 0.028 | 5.608 | 29.446 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| | IMMI2GEN | 103317 | 3.59 | 0.000 | 0.042 | 0.202 | 0.041 | 4.542 | 18.627 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| | MALE | 107160 | 0.00 | 1.000 | 0.502 | 0.500 | 0.250 | -0.007 | -2.000 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| | FCFMLRTY | 99969 | 6.71 | 7.000 | 7.049 | 5.455 | 29.752 | 0.223 | -1.039 | 0.000 | 18.000 |
| | FLCONFIN | 90130 | 15.89 | -0.027 | -0.072 | 1.017 | 1.034 | -0.084 | 0.355 | -2.210 | 2.322 |
| | FLIT ^b | 107162 | 0.00 | 481.970 | 478.291 | 97.074 | 9,423.320 | -0.089 | -0.340 | 114.256 | 827.977 |
| School (between, $L2$) | EDUSHORT | 6346 | 4.30 | 0.100 | 0.131 | 1.036 | 1.073 | 0.341 | -0.188 | -1.421 | 2.959 |
| | STRATIO | 5626 | 15.16 | 11.886 | 13.873 | 10.171 | 103.449 | 4.021 | 25.425 | 1.000 | 100.000 |

Note. ^a Missing rates were computed based on $N_{L1} = 107,162$ students and $N_{L2} = 6,631$ schools. ^b For descriptive statistics purpose *only*, FLIT was obtained by averaging ten plausible values PV1FLIT to PV10FLIT.

Table 4.2*Correlations between Variables used in the MSEM Models*

| L1/within-level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------|-------------------|---------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|----|
| 1 FLSCHOOL _W | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 FLFAMILY _W | .227*** | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 NOBULLY _W | -.032*** | -.044*** | | | | | | | | |
| 4 ESCS | .054*** | .093*** | -.003 | | | | | | | |
| 5 IMMI1GEN | -.002 | -.001 | .006 | .038** | | | | | | |
| 6 IMMI2GEN | -.009 | .003 | .019 [†] | .040* | -.046*** | | | | | |
| 7 MALE | .049*** | -.039*** | -.071*** | .026* | -.003 | -.006 | | | | |
| 8 FCFMLRTY | .280*** | .174*** | .023* | .230*** | -.009 | -.017 | .029** | | | |
| 9 FLCONFIN | .201*** | .190*** | -.020* | .070*** | .002 | -.029** | .116*** | .228*** | | |
| 10 FLIT _W | -.021 [†] | .021* | .053*** | .288*** | -.029* | .025 [†] | .020 [†] | .230*** | .068*** | |

| L2/between-level | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|--------------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----|
| 11 FLSCHOOL _B | | | | | | |
| 12 FLFAMILY _B | .239** | | | | | |
| 13 NOBULLY _B | -.468*** | -.065 | | | | |
| 14 EDUSHORT | .313*** | .053 | -.207** | | | |
| 15 STRATIO | -.082* | .131* | .026 | -.043 | | |
| 16 FLIT _B | -.529*** | -.356*** | .426*** | -.438*** | -.101** | |

Note. The MLC procedure decomposes school climate variables FLSCHOOL, FLFAMILY and NOBULLY as well as financial literacy outcomes FLIT into their within- and between-components (subscript _W and _B respectively). Correlations at each level refer to the maximum-likelihood estimated within- and between-covariance matrices respectively. All statistics are average results over ten imputed data sets, denoted as \bar{p} in the text.

[†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

$$\rho_1 = \frac{\text{School-level residual variance}}{\text{Total residual variance}} = \frac{\text{var}(\varepsilon_j^{Y_B})}{\text{var}(r_{ij}^{Y_W}) + \text{var}(\varepsilon_j^{Y_B})} = \frac{5240}{6122 + 5240} = 0.461. \quad (4.1)$$

This result suggested that 46.1% of the variation in financial literacy performance was due to the clustering in schools.

For sample size adjustment, Snijders and Bosker (2012) advised to first of all calculate the design effect of one's multilevel model:

$$\text{design effect} = 1 + (\text{average group size} - 1)\rho_1 = 1 + \left(\frac{107,162}{6,631} - 1\right) \times 0.461 = 7.989, \quad (4.2)$$

then compute the effective sample size:

$$N_{\text{effective}} = \frac{N_{\text{original}}}{\text{design effect}} = \frac{107,162}{7.989} = 13,414. \quad (4.3)$$

This result signaled that students from the same school were so similar in their financial literacy outcomes that the sample size of 107,162 used by this study was only equivalent to a simple random sample using 13,414 students. This result not only provided assurance of a sufficiently large sample size required by asymptotic theories but also highlighted the strong effect of schools for understanding youth's financial literacy development.

4.3 Intermediate Models

In order to separate the incremental effect attributable to school-level variables, a student-level only model was first established as a reference ("Single-level model" in Table 4.3). Even with $L1$ -only variables, model fit indices $\text{CFI} = .97$, $\text{TLI} = .927$ and $\text{SRMR} = .016$ jointly suggested that the proposed input (school climate)–mediator (affect)–output (financial literacy cognitive outcome) model was a meaningful one. Next, school-level variables were allowed to covary between one other on top of the $L1$ structure, forming a two-level saturated model. This procedure had an effect of decomposing the total residual variances into student- and school-levels. As a result, $L1$ residual variance reduced by more than a quarter from 7,866 to 5,764, indicating the necessity of the $L2$ structure.

4.4 Full Model

Relationships amongst school-level variables were further introduced at $L2$, transforming the saturated model into the final MSEM model as illustrated in Figure 3.1.

4.4.1 Model Fit

Model fit indices $CFI = .968$, $SRMR_{L1} = .015$ and $SRMR_{L2} = .030$ all satisfied the cut-off criteria suggested by Hu and Bentler (1999) while $TLI = .903$ fell slightly short of being good but still acceptable—a penalty on the growing number of variables introduced. On balance, there was sufficient evidence suggesting good fit between the proposed MSEM model and financial literacy data.

4.4.2 Student-level Relationships

School Climate Variables

All three $L1$ school climate variables shared statistically significant relationships with financial literacy performance ($FLIT$). A safe school environment ($NOBULLY$) was positively correlated with financial literacy via both the direct pathway and through mediation with familiarity ($FCFMLRTY$).

Efforts by schools ($FLSCHOOL$) and families ($FLFAMILY$), on the other hand, had more nuanced relationships with the cognitive outcome. Both variables had strong positive associations with $FLIT$ via affective mediation pathways, but statistically significant *negative* relationships via direct pathways. Such positive-negative pair happened to cancel each other for $FLFAMILY$, leading to a non-significant result should financial socialisation and financial literacy were correlated superficially. The negative cognitive path overshadowed the positive affective pathways for $FLSCHOOL$, leading to a, seemingly paradoxical, negative overall relationship between classroom efforts and financial literacy outcomes.

Demographic Attributes

The strongest covariation identified by this study was between students' ESCS and their financial literacy outcomes. Substantial positive associations have been observed along both the direct and indirect pathways. Having controlled ESCS as a confounder is therefore essential for the study of school climate effects.

The relationship between one's immigration history and their financial literacy performance also delivered important insight. Children who relocated to the host country between births and reaching 15-year-old ($IMMI1GEN = 1$) seemed to possess *less knowledge* in financial matters whereas the offspring of migrants did not show deficiency in knowledge, but in affects.

Meanwhile, school curricula addressing students' affinity towards finance-related topics would likely to benefit not only second-generation migrants but also young girls. This conjecture was made based on the observed “male premium” in financial literacy performance—everything

Table 4.3*Model Parameters and Fit Indices of Multilevel Regressions for the Total Sample*

| Variable — path | Model parameter | Null model Coef | Null model SE | Single-level model Coef | Single-level model SE | Two-level saturated Coef | Two-level saturated SE | Two-level structured Coef | Two-level structured SE |
|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| FIXED EFFECTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Intercept | | 454.154 | 2.690*** | 451.451 | 1.449*** | 445.812 | 2.578*** | 486.820 | 4.500*** |
| Student-level Predictors | | | | | | | | | |
| FLSCHOOL (total) | $\gamma_1 + \gamma_{11}\beta_1 + \gamma_{12}\beta_2$ | | | -0.073 | 0.008*** | -0.036 | 0.011** | -0.036 | 0.011** |
| — direct | γ_1 | | | -0.125 | 0.008*** | -0.088 | 0.011*** | -0.088 | 0.011*** |
| — total indirect | $\gamma_{11}\beta_1 + \gamma_{12}\beta_2$ | | | 0.051 | 0.003*** | 0.052 | 0.003*** | 0.052 | 0.003*** |
| — via FCFMLRTY | $\gamma_{11}\beta_1$ | | | 0.049 | 0.002*** | 0.047 | 0.003*** | 0.047 | 0.003*** |
| — via FLCONFIN | $\gamma_{12}\beta_2$ | | | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.005 | 0.002** | 0.005 | 0.002** |
| FLFAMILY (total) | $\gamma_2 + \gamma_{21}\beta_1 + \gamma_{22}\beta_2$ | | | 0.008 | 0.007 | 0.005 | 0.009 | 0.005 | 0.009 |
| — direct | γ_3 | | | -0.016 | 0.007* | -0.019 | 0.009* | -0.019 | 0.009* |
| — total indirect | $\gamma_{21}\beta_1 + \gamma_{22}\beta_2$ | | | 0.023 | 0.002*** | 0.024 | 0.002*** | 0.024 | 0.002*** |
| — via FCFMLRTY | $\gamma_{21}\beta_1$ | | | 0.022 | 0.002*** | 0.019 | 0.002*** | 0.019 | 0.002*** |
| — via FLCONFIN | $\gamma_{22}\beta_2$ | | | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.005 | 0.002** | 0.005 | 0.002*** |
| NOBULLY (total) | $\gamma_3 + \gamma_{31}\beta_1 + \gamma_{32}\beta_2$ | | | 0.075 | 0.007*** | 0.053 | 0.009*** | 0.053 | 0.009*** |
| — direct | γ_3 | | | 0.064 | 0.007*** | 0.046 | 0.009*** | 0.046 | 0.009*** |
| — total indirect | $\gamma_{31}\beta_1 + \gamma_{32}\beta_2$ | | | 0.011 | 0.002*** | 0.007 | 0.002*** | 0.007 | 0.002*** |
| — via FCFMLRTY | $\gamma_{31}\beta_1$ | | | 0.011 | 0.002*** | 0.007 | 0.002*** | 0.007 | 0.002*** |
| — via FLCONFIN | $\gamma_{32}\beta_2$ | | | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| ESCS (total) | $\gamma_4 + \gamma_{41}\beta_1 + \gamma_{42}\beta_2$ | | | 0.497 | 0.007*** | 0.289 | 0.016*** | 0.289 | 0.016*** |
| — direct | γ_4 | | | 0.445 | 0.007*** | 0.248 | 0.015*** | 0.248 | 0.015*** |
| — total indirect | $\gamma_{41}\beta_1 + \gamma_{42}\beta_2$ | | | 0.052 | 0.003*** | 0.041 | 0.003*** | 0.041 | 0.003*** |
| — via FCFMLRTY | $\gamma_{41}\beta_1$ | | | 0.052 | 0.002*** | 0.040 | 0.003*** | 0.040 | 0.003*** |
| — via FLCONFIN | $\gamma_{42}\beta_2$ | | | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001* | 0.001 | 0.001* |
| IMMI1GEN (direct) | γ_5 | | | 0.004 | 0.008 | -0.040 | 0.012** | -0.040 | 0.012** |
| IMMI2GEN (total indirect) | $\gamma_{61}\beta_1 + \gamma_{62}\beta_2$ | | | -0.003 | 0.002† | -0.006 | 0.002** | -0.006 | 0.002** |
| — via FCFMLRTY | $\gamma_{61}\beta_1$ | | | -0.003 | 0.002† | -0.005 | 0.002* | -0.005 | 0.002* |
| — via FLCONFIN | $\gamma_{62}\beta_2$ | | | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.001 | 0.000* | -0.001 | 0.000* |
| MALE (total indirect) | $\gamma_{71}\beta_1 + \gamma_{72}\beta_2$ | | | 0.004 | 0.002* | 0.007 | 0.002** | 0.007 | 0.002** |
| — via FCFMLRTY | $\gamma_{71}\beta_1$ | | | 0.003 | 0.002* | 0.004 | 0.002* | 0.004 | 0.002* |
| — via FLCONFIN | $\gamma_{72}\beta_2$ | | | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.001** | 0.003 | 0.001** |

Continued

| Variable | Model parameter | Null model | | Single-level model | | Two-level saturated | | Two-level structured | |
|--|---|------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
| | | Coef | <i>SE</i> | Coef | <i>SE</i> | Coef | <i>SE</i> | Coef | <i>SE</i> |
| School-level Predictors | | | | | | | | | |
| FLSCHOOL | a_1 | | | | | | | −0.295 | 0.066*** |
| FLFAMILY | a_2 | | | | | | | −0.225 | 0.057*** |
| NOBULLY | a_3 | | | | | | | 0.233 | 0.069** |
| EDUSHORT | a_4 | | | | | | | −0.292 | 0.038*** |
| STRADIO | a_5 | | | | | | | −0.132 | 0.026*** |
| RANDOM EFFECTS (residual variances of FLIT) | | | | | | | | | |
| Student-level | $\text{var} \left(r_{ij}^{Y_W} \right)$ | 6121.904 | 131.192 | 7866.408 | 114.555 | 5763.677 | 130.133 | 5763.690 | 130.133 |
| School-level | $\text{var} \left(\varepsilon_j^{Y_B} \right)$ | 5240.477 | 202.004 | | | 3264.618 | 193.892 | 1705.616 | 135.044 |
| MODEL FIT INDICES | | Est | <i>SD</i> | Est | <i>SD</i> | Est | <i>SD</i> | Est | <i>SD</i> |
| AIC | | 1253984 | 1093 | 3429058 | 1534 | 3468075 | 1661 | 3468108 | 1650 |
| BIC | | 1254013 | 1093 | 3429566 | 1534 | 3468727 | 1661 | 3468740 | 1650 |
| χ^2 Test of Model Fit | | 2.193 | 1.468 | 304.405 | 13.167 | 187.655 | 10.486 | 201.645 | 11.746 |
| RMSEA | | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.017 | 0.000 | 0.009 | 0.000 | 0.009 | 0.000 |
| CFI | | 0.000 | .000 | .970 | .002 | .970 | .002 | .968 | .002 |
| TLI | | 1.000 | .000 | .927 | .004 | .899 | .007 | .903 | .007 |
| SRMR <i>L1</i> | | .005 | .003 | .016 | .000 | .015 | .000 | .015 | .000 |
| SRMR <i>L2</i> | | .011 | .005 | | | .014 | .002 | .030 | .006 |

Note. All p values in this table are two-tailed.

$^\dagger p < .10$. $*p < .05$. $**p < .01$. $***p < .001$.

else held equal, 15-year-old boys on average demonstrated higher financial capability, an effect fully mediated by affective variables especially through higher confidence.

4.4.3 School-level Relationships

Shortages in either capital or labour resources were associated with lower average financial literacy outcomes at the school-level. The MSEM showed a negative relationship between the fourth element of school climate variable, educational resource shortage **EDUSHORT**, and average **FLIT**. In fact, the association between schools' physical capital and their educational output remained one of the strongest statistical relationships reported by this study, over twice the size of that between labour arrangement (student-teacher ratio **STRATIO**) and financial literacy achievement.

4.4.4 Contextual Effects

One particular strength of an MSEM is its ability to model contextual effects. In a school research context, there exists a *contextual effect* when school-level characteristics contribute to individual learners' outcomes beyond what can be explained by student-level characteristics. Following Marsh et al. (2009)'s procedure, this study obtained the point estimate of the unstandardised contextual effect for **FLSCH00L**:

$$\text{Unstandardised contextual effect} = \hat{a}_1 - \hat{\gamma}_1 = -49.339 - (-7.078) = -42.261, \quad (4.4)$$

and its standardised solution:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Standardised contextual effect} \\ &= \frac{\text{Unstandardised contextual effect} \times \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}}(\text{FLSCH00L}_B)}}{\sqrt{\hat{a}_1^2 \cdot \widehat{\text{var}}(\text{FLSCH00L}_B) + \widehat{\text{var}}(\text{FLIT}_B) + \hat{\gamma}_1^2 \cdot \widehat{\text{var}}(\text{FLSCH00L}_W) + \widehat{\text{var}}(\text{FLIT}_W)}} \\ &= \frac{(-42.261) \times \sqrt{0.114}}{\sqrt{(-49.339)^2 \times 0.114 + 3226.753 + (-7.078)^2 \times 1.009 + 6576.975}} \\ &= -0.163, \text{ } (-0.142 \text{ if calculated manually due to cumulative rounding errors}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$



while the associated standard error can be obtained using the delta method (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2004). Table 4.4 summarised the contextual effect estimates for **FLSCH00L**, **FLFAMILY**, and **NOBULLY**. These results suggested that students' financial literacy performance was not only affected by individual characteristics and endeavour but also heavily influenced by the larger school environment surrounding the learners. Lastly, the effect size (ES) statistics in Table 4.4 further suggested that the significant contextual effect findings were unlikely to be a mere statistical artifact out of large sample sizes, evidenced by their large sizes ($|\text{ES}| \approx .38$ and $.33$) and robustness against various of calculation methods (conventional ES1 by Tymms (2004) and recent innovation ES2 and ES3 by Marsh et al. (2009)).

Table 4.4
Contextual Effects and Effect Sizes

| Contextual relationship | Contextual effect | | Standardised contextual effect | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------|---|-----------|
| | Est | <i>SE</i> | Est | <i>SE</i> |
| FLSCHOOL | −42.261 | 10.720*** | −0.163 | 0.041*** |
| FLFAMILY | −75.808 | 20.353*** | −0.144 | 0.037*** |
| NOBULLY | 60.071 | 19.673** | 0.144 | 0.046** |

| Contextual relationship | Effect size 1 | | Effect size 2 | | Effect size 3 | |
|----------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| | Est | <i>SE</i> | Est | <i>SE</i> | Est | <i>SE</i> |
| FLSCHOOL | −0.380 | 0.099*** | −0.378 | 0.098*** | −0.369 | 0.092*** |
| FLFAMILY | −0.332 | 0.084*** | −0.332 | 0.084*** | −0.328 | 0.081*** |
| NOBULLY | 0.331 | 0.107** | 0.331 | 0.107** | 0.326 | 0.102** |

Note. Contextual effect computations and standardisations were based on the procedure documented in Marsh et al.'s (2009) [supplemental](#) Model 8. Marked in bold, standardised contextual effect and effect size 2 were recommended for decision-making. Effect sizes 1 (Tymms, 2004) was provided as reference due to its compatibility with Cohen's *d* (Cohen, 1992). More recently, Marsh et al. (2009) advocated for an effect size procedure involving total variances from *both* levels (ES3) over that from only *L1* (ES2) (see Marsh et al., 2009, p. 792). Since consensus so far appears to be with ES2, ES3 was provided for future reference.

Figure 4.1*Two-level Structural Equation Model Predicting Youth's Financial Literacy Outcomes***L2: School****L1: Student**

Note. This multilevel structural equation model predicts youth's financial literacy outcomes using PISA 2018 data, with mediating effects of familiarity with, and confidence in, financial matters at student-level. Statistics are standardised regression coefficients. Dashed lines represent nonsignificant relations at $\alpha = .05$ level. Student-level school climate variables and cognitive outcome are decomposed into the within- and between-components (subscript W and B respectively) using the MLC approach. Direct pathways are coloured in red and indirect in blue. Control variables are shaded in gray.

$^{\dagger}p < .10$. $^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$.

Chapter 5 Discussion

5.1 Overview

“It takes a village to raise a child.” This study thus looked into the dual mechanisms of how 15-year-old students acquired financial literacy and how the school environment enveloping them facilitated such process. By accounting for the hierarchical data structure, sampling weights, missing data imputation, as well as measurement errors and sampling errors, this study was able to ascertain the marginal effects of the four school climate variables: academic, community, safety and resources. More specifically, student-level models revealed key roles safety as well as affective variables played in mediating youth’s financial literacy formation. Individual characteristics such as socio-economic status, immigration history and sex differences all carried significant explanatory power in explaining variations in financial literacy performance. At the school-level, strong capital and labour endowments were both found to be markers for high average performance along with school’s efforts into enhancing learners’ safety.

The study results also revealed key insight that was initially less intuitive. At both individual- and school-levels, the associations between explicit teaching of finance-related topics and contemporaneous financial literacy performance were found to be *negative*. In addition, the relationships between financial socialisation, i.e., parental involvement in cultivating youth’s financial understanding, and performance outcomes were shown to be positive along the affective pathways (the “heart pathways”) but negative along the cognitive pathway (the “mind pathway”). Interestingly, these two effects happened to be similar in size but opposite in sign, leading to an apparent nil result should one superficially correlate parental effort with outcome measure. At the school-level, both classroom activities and parental care, on average, tended to be more visible around students who were yet to demonstrate their mastery of financial capabilities. Sizeable contextual effects further confirmed these negative associations after subtracting individual effects, suggesting schools rather than learners as the source of the observed negative correlations between financial literacy outcome and pedagogical efforts and financial socialisation.

5.2 Student-level Relationships

5.2.1 Financial Education at School

The MSEM results revealed that classroom activities (FLSCHOOL) strongly correlated with higher familiarity with (FCFMLRTY), and confidence in (FLCONFIN), finance-related topics and matters. The positive association between pedagogical practices and financial knowledge was highly consistent with existing literature both in direction and in magnitude (Table 5, Amagir et al. (2018), pp. 67–69; High school subgroup, Figure 2, Kaiser and Menkhoff (2020), p. 5). The slightly weaker but still significantly positive marginal effect between classroom programs and financial confidence was also comparable to earlier experimental work such as Lührmann et al. (2015).

Positive relationship was also observed between financial socialisation and both financial knowledge and confidence.

5.2.2 Demographic Variables

5.3 School-level Relationships

5.3.1 School Climate Variables

5.3.2 Contextual Effects

This observation is important for policy design—while a knowledge-based remedial program would address the urgent needs of some learners with migration background, an inclusive pedagogical intervention needs to be complemented with strategies promoting financial affects.

5.4 Limitation on Causal Inferences

5.5 Future Research Direction

References

- Amagir, A., Groot, W., van den Brink, H. M. & Wilschut, A. (2018). A review of financial-literacy education programs for children and adolescents. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 17(1), 56–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2047173417719555>
- Arellano, A., Cámara, N. & Tuesta, D. (2014). *The effect of self-confidence on financial literacy* (Working Paper No. 14/28). BBVA Research. <https://www.bbvaresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/WP14-28The-effect-of-self-confidence-on-financial-literacy1.pdf>
- Asparouhov, T. (2006). General multi-level modeling with sampling weights. *Communications in Statistics — Theory and Methods*, 35, 439–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610920500476598>
- Asparouhov, T. & Muthén, B. (2010a). *Chi-square statistics with multiple imputation* (Version 2). Muthén & Muthén. <https://www.statmodel.com/download/MI7.pdf>
- Asparouhov, T. & Muthén, B. (2010b). *Multiple imputation with Mplus* (Version 2). Muthén & Muthén. <https://www.statmodel.com/download/Imputations7.pdf>
- Avvisati, F. (2020). The measure of socio-economic status in PISA: A review and some suggested improvements. *Large-scale Assessments in Education*, 8(8), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-020-00086-x>
- Bay, C., Catasús, B. & Johed, G. (2014). Situating financial literacy. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 25(1), 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2012.11.011>
- Birbili, M. & Kontopoulou, M. (2015). Financial education for preschoolers: Preparing young children for the 21st Century. *Childhood Education*, 91(1), 46–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2015.1001670>
- Borges Ramalho, T. & Forte, D. (2019). Financial literacy in Brazil—do knowledge and self-confidence relate with behavior? *RAUSP Management Journal*, 54(1), 77–95. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RAUSP-04-2018-0008>
- 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>
- Buccioli, A. & Veronesi, M. (2014). Teaching children to save: What is the best strategy for lifetime savings? *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 45, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2014.07.003>
- Bucher-Koenen, T., Lusardi, A., Alessie, R. & van Rooij, M. (2017). 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>
- Buchholz, J. & Hartig, J. (2019). Comparing attitudes across groups: An IRT-based item-fit statistic for the analysis of measurement invariance. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 43(3), 241–250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621617748323>
- Caro, D. H. & Biecek, P. (2017). intsvy: An  package for analyzing international large-scale assessment data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 81(7), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v081.i07>
- Chou, C.-P., Bentler, P. M. & Satorra, A. (1991). Scaled test statistics and robust standard errors for non-normal data in covariance structure analysis: A monte carlo study. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 44(2), 347–357. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1991.tb00966.x>
- Chou, C.-P. & Bentler, P. (1993). Invariant standardized estimated parameter change for model modification in covariance structure analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 28(1), 97–110. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2801_6
- Claeskens, G. & Consentino, F. (2008). Variable selection with incomplete covariate data. *Biometrics*, 64, 1062–1069. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0420.2008.01003.x>
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155–159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>
- 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
- Curran, P. J., West, S. G. & Finch, J. F. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 1(1), 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.1.16>
- 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>
- Enders, C. K. & Mansolf, M. (2018). Assessing the fit of structural equation models with multiply imputed data. *Psychological Methods*, 23(1), 76–93. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000102>
- Esposito, C. (1999). Learning in urban blight: School climate and its effect on the school performance of urban, minority, low-income children. *School Psychology Review*, 28(3), 365–377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.1999.12085971>
- Freiberg, H. J. & Stein, T. A. (1999). Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments. In H. J. Freiberg (Ed.), *School climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments* (pp. 11–29). RoutledgeFalmer.
- Gale, W. G., Harris, B. H. & Levine, R. (2012). Raising household saving: Does financial education work? *Social Security Bulletin*, 72(2), 39–48. <https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/ssb/v72n2/v72n2p39.pdf>
- Geiger, V., Yasukawa, K., Bennison, A., Wells, J. F. & Sawatzki, C. (2020). Facets of numeracy: Teaching, learning and practices. In J. Way, C. Attard, J. Anderson, J. Bobis, H. McMaster & K. Cartwright (Eds.), *Research in mathematics education in Australasia 2016–2019* (pp. 59–89). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-4269-5_4
- Grund, S., Lüdtke, O. & Robitzsch, A. (2016). Multiple imputation of multilevel missing data: An introduction to the R package pan. *SAGE Open*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016668220>

- Grund, S., Lüdtke, O. & Robitzsch, A. (2018). Multiple imputation of missing data for multilevel models: Simulations and recommendations. *Organizational Research Methods*, 21(1), 111–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428117703686>
- 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>
- Hastings, J. S., Madrian, B. C. & Skimmyhorn, W. L. (2013). Financial literacy, financial education, and economic outcomes. *Annual Review of Economics*, 5(1), 347–373. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-082312-125807>
- Hox, J. J., Maas, C. J. M. & Brinkhuis, M. J. S. (2010). The effect of estimation method and sample size in multilevel structural equation modeling. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 64(2), 157–170. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9574.2009.00445.x>
- Hu, L.-t. & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Huber, P. J. (1967). The behavior of maximum likelihood estimates under nonstandard conditions. In J. M. Le Cam & J. Neyman (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability* (pp. 221–233). University of California Press. https://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/math/ucb/text/math_s5_v1_article-13.pdf
- Huston, S. J. (2010). Measuring financial literacy. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 44(2), 296–316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.2010.01170.x>
- 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>
- Indenfero, E. E. & Yazon, A. D. (2020). Numeracy level, mathematics problem skills, and financial literacy. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(10), 4393–4399. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081005>
- 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>

- Kaplan, D. (1989). Model modification in covariance structure analysis: Application of the expected parameter change statistic. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 24(3), 285–305. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2403_2
- Kaplan, D. (2009). *Structural equation modeling: Foundations and extensions* (2nd ed.). SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452226576>
- Kuperminc, G. P., Leadbeater, B. J., Emmons, C. & Blatt, S. J. (1997). Perceived school climate and difficulties in the social adjustment of middle school students. *Applied Developmental Science*, 1(2), 76–88. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532480xads0102_2
- Kutsyruba, B., Klinger, D. A. & Hussain, A. (2015). Relationships among school climate, school safety, and student achievement and well-being: A review of the literature. *Review of Education*, 3(2), 103–135. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3043>
- Lambert, B. (2018). *A student's guide to Bayesian statistics*. SAGE.
- Lee, J. & Stankov, L. (2018). Non-cognitive predictors of academic achievement: Evidence from TIMSS and PISA. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 65, 50–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.05.009>
- Little, R. J. A. & Rubin, D. B. (2019). *Statistical analysis with missing data* (3rd ed.). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119482260>
- Lüdtke, O., Marsh, H. W., Robitzsch, A. & Trautwein, U. (2011). A 2×2 taxonomy of multilevel latent contextual models: Accuracy–bias trade-offs in full and partial error correction models. *Psychological Methods*, 16(4), 444–467. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024376>
- Lüdtke, O., Marsh, H. W., Robitzsch, A., Trautwein, U., Asparouhov, T. & Muthén, B. (2008). The multilevel latent covariate model: A new, more reliable approach to group-level effects in contextual studies. *Psychological Methods*, 13(3), 203–229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012869>
- Lüdtke, O., Robitzsch, A., Trautwein, U. & Kunter, M. (2009). Assessing the impact of learning environments: How to use student ratings of classroom or school characteristics in multilevel modeling. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 34, 120–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2008.12.001>
- Lührmann, M., Serra-Garcia, M. & Winter, J. (2015). Teaching teenagers in finance: Does it work? *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 54, 160–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2014.11.009>

- 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. (2007). Baby Boomer retirement security: The roles of planning, financial literacy, and housing wealth. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54(1), 205–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2006.12.001>
- Lusardi, A. & Mitchell, O. S. (2008). Planning and financial literacy: How do women fare? *American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings*, 98(2), 413–417. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.98.2.413>
- 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>
- Lusardi, A., Mitchell, O. S. & Curto, V. (2010). Financial literacy among the young. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 44(2), 358–380. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.2010.01173.x>
- Lusardi, A., Schneider, D. & Tufano, P. (2015). The economic crisis and medical care use: Comparative evidence from five high-income countries. *Social Science Quarterly*, 96(1), 202–213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12076>
- MacCallum, R. C., Roznowski, M. & Necowitz, L. B. (1992). Model modifications in covariance structure analysis: The problem of capitalization on chance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111(3), 490–504. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.111.3.490>
- Marsh, H. W., Lüdtke, O., Nagengast, B., Trautwein, U., Morin, A. J. S., Abduljabbar, A. S. & Köller, O. (2012). Classroom climate and contextual effects: Conceptual and methodological issues in the evaluation of group-level effects. *Educational Psychologist*, 47(2), 106–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.670488>
- Marsh, H. W., Lüdtke, O., Robitzsch, A., Trautwein, U., Asparouhov, T., Muthén, B. & Nagengast, B. (2009). Doubly-latent models of school contextual effects: Integrating multilevel and structural equation approaches to control measurement and sampling error. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 44(6), 764–802. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273170903333665>
- Meier, S. & Sprenger, C. (2010). Present-biased preferences and credit card borrowing. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2(1), 193–210. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.2.1.193>

- Meng, X.-L. & Rubin, D. B. (1992). Performing likelihood ratio tests with multiply-imputed data sets. *Biometrika*, 79(1), 103–111. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/79.1.103>
- Montoya, D. Y. & Scott, M. L. (2013). The effect of lifestyle-based depletion on teen consumer behavior. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 32(1), 82–96. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.10.086>
- 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>
- Muthén, L. K. & Muthén, B. O. (2017). **Mplus** user's guide. Muthén & Muthén. https://www.statmodel.com/download/usersguide/Mplus%20user%20guide%20Ver_7_r6_web.pdf
- Muthén, L. K. & Muthén, B. O. (1998–2017). **Mplus** (Version 8.5) [Computer software]. Muthén & Muthén. <http://www.statmodel.com/>
- OECD. (2009). *PISA data analysis manual* (SPSS 2nd ed.). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264056275-en>
- OECD. (2019a). PISA 2018 financial literacy framework. *PISA 2018 assessment and analytical framework* (pp. 119–164). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/afad77c-en>
- OECD. (2019b). *PISA 2018 results: What school life means for students' lives*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/acd78851-en>
- OECD. (2020a). *Financial literacy data file* [Data set]. OECD Publishing. https://webfs.oecd.org/pisa2018/SPSS_STU_FLT.zip
- OECD. (2020b). *PISA 2018 results: Are students smart about money?* OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/48ebd1ba-en>
- OECD. (2020c). *PISA 2018 technical report*. OECD Publisher. <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/data/pisa2018technicalreport/>
- OECD. (2020d). *School questionnaire data file* [Data set]. OECD Publisher. https://webfs.oecd.org/pisa2018/SPSS_SCH_QQQ.zip
- Ozkale, A. & Erdogan, E. O. (2020a). An analysis of the interaction between mathematical literacy and financial literacy in PISA. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020739x.2020.1842526>

- Ozkale, A. & Erdogan, E. O. (2020b). A conceptual model for the interaction of mathematical and financial literacies. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 16(5), 288–304. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2020.277.18>
- 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>
-  Core Team. (2021). : A language and environment for statistical computing (Version 4.0.5) [Computer software].  Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Raykov, T. & Marcoulides, G. A. (2004). Using the delta method for approximate interval estimation of parameter functions in SEM. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 11(4), 621–637. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1104_7
- Rubin, D. B. (1987). *Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470316696>
- 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>
- Saris, W. E., Satorra, A. & Sörbom, D. (1987). The detection and correction of specification errors in structural equation models. In C. C. Clogg (Ed.), *Sociological methodology* (pp. 105–129). American Sociological Association. <https://doi.org/10.2307/271030>
- Serido, J. & Deenanath, V. (2016). Financial parenting: Promoting financial self-reliance of young consumers. In J. J. Xiao (Ed.), *Handbook of consumer finance research* (pp. 291–300). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28887-1_24
- Skagerlund, K., Lind, T., Strömbäck, C., Tinghög, G. & Västfjäll, D. (2018). Financial literacy and the role of numeracy—How individuals’ attitude and affinity with numbers influence financial literacy. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 74, 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2018.03.004>
- Snijders, T. A. B. & Bosker, R. J. (2012). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling*. SAGE.

- Sole, M. A. (2014). Financial literacy: An essential component of mathematics literacy and numeracy. *Journal of Mathematics Education at Teachers College*, 5(2), 55–62. https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1011&context=nc_pubs
- Tang, N. (2017). Like father like son: How does parents' financial behavior affect their children's financial behavior? *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 51(2), 284–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12122>
- Tymms, P. (2004). Effect sizes in multilevel models. In I. Schagen & K. Elliot (Eds.), *But what does it mean? The use of effect sizes in educational research* (pp. 55–66). NFER; Institute of Education University of London. <https://dro.dur.ac.uk/23722/1/23722.pdf>
- Walstad, W. B., Tharayil, A. & Wagner, J. (2016). Financial literacy and financial education in high school. In J. J. Xiao (Ed.), *Handbook of consumer finance research* (pp. 131–140). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28887-1_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>
- White, H. (1982). Maximum likelihood estimation of misspecified models. *Econometrica*, 50(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1912526>
- Whittaker, T. A. (2012). Using the modification index and standardized expected parameter change for model modification. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 80(1), 26–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2010.531299>

Appendices

Appendix A GDPR Documentation and Ethical Approval

This research project discharges its duty imposed by the EEA's general data protection regulation (GDPR) by following Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD)'s [notification test](#) on Friday, 11 September 2020. Both [PISA 2018 Database](#) and the [World Bank Open Data](#) contain only aggregated and de-personalised datasets with no possibility of back-tracing to any particular participant. Resultantly, no identifiable personal data were collected or used at any stage of this research. The NSD's assessment letter outlines the agency's decision of not subjecting this project to the GDPR notification. The NSD decision letter also satisfies University of Oslo's [ethical approval requirement](#) and concludes the approval process.

About us (/personvernombud/en/about_us.html)

Norwegian (/personvernombud/meld_prosjekt/meldeplikttest.html)

NSD (</>) > Personvern tjenester (</personvernombud/>) > Data Protection Services (</personvernombud/en/>) > Notify project (</personvernombud/en/notify/>) > Notification Test

Denne siden på norsk (/personvernombud/meld_prosjekt/meldeplikttest.html)

Will you be processing personal data?

Are you unsure whether your project is subject to notification? Feel free to try our informal Notification test. Note that the test is intended as a guidance and is not a formal assessment.

Will you be collecting/processing directly identifiable personal data?

☐ Yes

☒ No

A person will be directly identifiable through name, social security number, or other uniquely personal characteristics.

Read more about personal data (</personvernombud/en/help/vocabulary.html?id=8>) and notification (</personvernombud/en/notify/index.html>).

NB! Even though information is to be anonymized in the final thesis/report, check the box if identifying personal data is to be collected/processed in connection with the project.

Will directly identifiable personal information be linked to the data (e.g. through a reference number which refers to a separate list of names/scrambling key)?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Note that the project will be subject to notification even if you cannot access the scrambling key (</personvernombud/en/help/vocabulary.html?id=11>), as the procedure often is when using a data processor (</personvernombud/en/help/vocabulary.html?id=3>), or in register-based studies (/personvernombud/en/help/research_methods/register_studies.html).

Will you be collecting/processing background information that may identify individuals (indirectly identifiable personal data)?

☐ Yes

☒ No

A person will be indirectly identifiable if it is possible to identify him/her through a combination of background information (such as place of residence or workplace/school, combined with information such as age, gender, occupation, etc.).

Will there be registered personal data (directly/indirectly/via IP or email address, etc.) using online surveys?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Please note that the project will be subject to notification even if you as a student/researcher cannot access the link to the IP or email address, as the procedure often is when using a data processor.

Read more about online surveys (/personvernombud/en/help/research_methods/online_surveys.html).

Will there be registered personal data using digital photo or video files?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Photo/video recordings of faces will be regarded as identifiable personal data. In order for a voice to be considered as identifiable, it must be registered in combination with other background information, in such a way that people can be recognized.

Show results

Notify project

Do I have to notify my project? (</personvernombud/en/notify/index.html>)

Notification Form (/personvernombud/en/notify/meldeskjema_link)

Notifying changes (/personvernombud/en/notify/notifying_changes.html)

Get help notifying your project

Processing the notification (</personvernombud/en/help/index.html>)

Frequently asked questions (</personvernombud/en/help/faq.html>)

Vocabulary (</personvernombud/en/help/vocabulary.html>)

Research topics (/personvernombud/en/help/research_topics/)

Research methods (/personvernombud/en/help/research_methods/)

Information and consent (/personvernombud/en/help/information_consent/)

Other approvals (/personvernombud/en/help/other_approvals/)

Result of Notification Test: Not Subject to Notification

You have indicated that neither directly or indirectly identifiable personal data will be registered in the project.

If no personal data is to be registered, the project will not be subject to notification, and you will not have to submit a notification form.

Please note that this is a guidance based on information that you have given in the notification test and not a formal confirmation.

For your information: *In order for a project not to be subject to notification, we presuppose that all information processed using electronic equipment in the project remains anonymous.*

Anonymous information is defined as information that cannot identify individuals in the data set in any of the following ways:

- directly, through uniquely identifiable characteristic (such as name, social security number, email address, etc.)*
- indirectly, through a combination of background variables (such as residence/institution, gender, age, etc.)*
- through a list of names referring to an encryption formula or code, or*
- through recognizable faces on photographs or video recordings.*

Furthermore, we presuppose that names/consent forms are not linked to sensitive personal data.

Kind regards,
NSD Data Protection

Appendix B Analysis Code, Additional Tables and Figures

B.1 Data Merging

```
1 | # Import SPSS file into R
  | library(intsvy)
  | finlit <- pisa.select.merge(
  |   student.file = "CY07_MSU_FLT_QQQ.SAV", # file ext in capital
5 |   school.file = "CY07_MSU_SCH_QQQ.sav", # file ext in lower case
  |   student = c(
  |     # Control variables
  |     "ST004D01T", # Student (Standardized) Gender
10 |     "IMMIG", # Index Immigration status
  |     "ESCS", # Index of economic, social and cultural status
  |     # Mediators
  |     "FCFMLRTY", # Familiarity with concepts of finance (Sum)
  |     "FLCONFIN", # Confidence about financial matters (WLE)
  |     # Academic
15 |     "FLSCHOOL", # Financial education in school lessons (WLE)
  |     # Safety
  |     "BEINGBULLIED", # Student's experience of being bullied (WLE)
  |     # Community
  |     "FLFAMILY" # Parental involvement in matters of Financial Literacy (WLE)
20 |   ),
  |   school = c(
  |     "STRATIO", # Student-teacher ratio
  |     "EDUSHORT" # Shortage of educational material (WLE)
  |   ),
25 |   countries = c(
  |     "BRA", "BGR", "CAN", "CHL", "EST",
  |     "FIN", "GEO", "IDN", "ITA", "LVA",
  |     "LTU", "NLD", "PER", "POL", "PRT",
30 |     "RUS", "QMR", "QRT", # Russian Federation and other regions
  |     "SRB", "SVK", "ESP", "USA"
  |   )
  | )
  |
  | names(finlit)
35 | # Throw away columns that I do not need
  | finlit <- finlit[, -c(5, 7:86)] # 5 = BOOKID; 7:86 = resampling weights
  | names(finlit)
  |
  | # Some var need recording
40 | library(car)
  |
  | # Re-code Russian territories to RUS
  | finlit$CNT <- recode(finlit$CNT, "
  |   'QMR' = 'RUS';
45 |   'QRT' = 'RUS'
  | ")
  |
  | finlit$CNTRYID <- recode(finlit$CNTRYID, "
  |   982 = 643;
50 |   983 = 643
  | ")
  |
  | # Input country-level FKI
```

```

55   FKI ← recode(finlit$CNT, "
      'NLD' = 0.940;
      'USA' = 0.937;
      'CAN' = 0.784;
      'ITA' = 0.762;
      'FIN' = 0.724;
60   'ESP' = 0.627;
      'LTU' = 0.613;
      'PRT' = 0.591;
      'BGR' = 0.583;
      'EST' = 0.577;
65   'SVK' = 0.559;
      'POL' = 0.555;
      'LVA' = 0.550;
      'CHL' = 0.544;
      'RUS' = 0.450;
70   'GEO' = 0.424;
      'SRB' = 0.423;
      'PER' = 0.309;
      'BRA' = 0.141;
      'IDN' = 0.122
75   ")

      # Recode ST004D01T from Sex to Male
      MALE ← finlit$ST004D01T - 1

80   # Revert coding direction: bigger number => safer school
      NOBULLY ← finlit$BEINGBULLIED * (-1)

      # Recode IMMIG to 1st and 2nd generation
      IMMI1GEN ← recode(finlit$IMMIG, "
85     1 = 0;
      2 = 0;
      3 = 1
      ")

90   IMMI2GEN ← recode(finlit$IMMIG, "
      1 = 0;
      2 = 1;
      3 = 0
      ")

95   # Stitch spreadsheet together
      names(finlit)
      finlit ← cbind(
          FKI, finlit[, c(2:35)], MALE, IMMI1GEN, IMMI2GEN,
100    finlit[, c(38:41)], NOBULLY, finlit[, c(43:46)]
      )
      head(finlit)
      names(finlit)

105  # Remove cases whose school weights (col #45) are NA
      obs0 ← dim(finlit)[1]
      finlit ← finlit[complete.cases(finlit$W_FSTUWT_SCH_SUM), ]
      obs1 ← dim(finlit)[1]
      obs0 - obs1 # 12 cases contained missing school weights and have been dropped
110  rm(obs0, obs1)

```

Table B.1
Summary of Participating Countries

| Country ID | Country code | Country name | School | | Student | | Male | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|
| | | | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % |
| 76 | BRA | Brazil | 595 | 8.97 | 8,310 | 7.75 | 4,045 | 48.68 |
| 100 | BGR | Bulgaria | 197 | 2.97 | 4,110 | 3.84 | 2,147 | 52.24 |
| 124 | CAN | Canada | 492 | 7.42 | 7,762 | 7.24 | 3,858 | 49.70 |
| 152 | CHL | Chile | 251 | 3.79 | 4,482 | 4.18 | 2,254 | 50.29 |
| 233 | EST | Estonia | 229 | 3.45 | 4,166 | 3.89 | 2,080 | 49.93 |
| 246 | FIN | Finland | 204 | 3.08 | 4,328 | 4.04 | 2,199 | 50.81 |
| 268 | GEO | Georgia | 319 | 4.81 | 4,320 | 4.03 | 2,239 | 51.83 |
| 360 | IND | Indonesia | 395 | 5.96 | 7,132 | 6.66 | 3,454 | 48.43 |
| 380 | ITA | Italy | 539 | 8.13 | 9,182 | 8.57 | 4,706 | 51.25 |
| 428 | LVA | Latvia | 307 | 4.63 | 3,151 | 2.94 | 1,587 | 50.36 |
| 440 | LTU | Lithuania | 349 | 5.26 | 4,075 | 3.80 | 2,060 | 50.55 |
| 528 | NLD | The Netherlands | 151 | 2.28 | 3,042 | 2.84 | 1,549 | 50.92 |
| 604 | PER | Peru | 337 | 5.08 | 4,732 | 4.42 | 2,390 | 50.51 |
| 616 | POL | Poland | 235 | 3.54 | 4,294 | 4.01 | 2,080 | 48.44 |
| 620 | PRT | Portugal | 276 | 4.16 | 4,568 | 4.26 | 2,320 | 50.79 |
| 643 | RUS | Russian Federation | 558 | 8.42 | 9,124 | 8.51 | 4,601 | 50.43 |
| 688 | SRB | Serbia | 186 | 2.81 | 3,874 | 3.62 | 1,951 | 50.36 |
| 703 | SVK | Slovak Republic | 357 | 5.38 | 3,411 | 3.18 | 1,683 | 49.34 |
| 724 | ESP | Spain | 491 | 7.40 | 9,361 | 8.74 | 4,695 | 50.15 |
| 840 | USA | The USA | 163 | 2.46 | 3,738 | 3.49 | 1,871 | 50.05 |
| Total | | | 6,631 | 100 | 107,162 | 100 | 53,769 | 50.18 |
| χ^2 goodness-of-fit test | | | School | | Student | | Male | |
| | | | χ^2_{19} | <i>p</i> | χ^2_{19} | <i>p</i> | χ^2_{19} | <i>p</i> |
| | | | 1,105.8 | < .001 | 16,984 | < .001 | 20.9 | .34 |

Note. Twelve observations with missing school weights were removed. χ^2 goodness-of-fit tests revealed that the data set was balanced in sex, but not all countries contributed equally to school and student counts.

Table B.2

Scale Reliabilities (Cronbach's alphas) and Item Parameter References for Derived Variables based on IRT Scaling

| Country ID | Country code | Country name | School climate variable | | | | Financial literacy |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------|---------|----------|--------------------|
| | | | FLSCHOOL | FLFAMILY | NOBULLY | EDUSHORT | FLCONFIN |
| 76 | BRA | Brazil | .896 | .871 | .794 | .858 | .929 |
| 100 | BGR | Bulgaria | .912 | .836 | .851 | .814 | .927 |
| 124 | CAN | Canada | .904 | .856 | .758 | .816 | .900 |
| 152 | CHL | Chile | .885 | .851 | .784 | .818 | .915 |
| 233 | EST | Estonia | .865 | .833 | .709 | .752 | .872 |
| 246 | FIN | Finland | .883 | .819 | .760 | .783 | .896 |
| 268 | GEO | Georgia | .891 | .834 | .846 | .862 | .920 |
| 360 | IND | Indonesia | .878 | .827 | .756 | .892 | .931 |
| 380 | ITA | Italy | .857 | .798 | .795 | .840 | .898 |
| 428 | LVA | Latvia | .846 | .813 | .703 | .780 | .897 |
| 440 | LTU | Lithuania | .909 | .869 | .846 | .779 | .921 |
| 528 | NLD | The Netherlands | .849 | .792 | .638 | .792 | .874 |
| 604 | PER | Peru | .847 | .813 | .758 | .882 | .903 |
| 616 | POL | Poland | .878 | .830 | .771 | .839 | .913 |
| 620 | PRT | Portugal | .896 | .844 | .775 | .849 | .899 |
| 643 | RUS | Russian Federation | .892 | .855 | .726 | .874 | .911 |
| 688 | SRB | Serbia | .926 | .853 | .838 | .786 | .939 |
| 703 | SVK | Slovak Republic | .874 | .829 | .783 | .799 | .907 |
| 724 | ESP | Spain | .879 | .812 | .779 | .854 | .912 |
| 840 | USA | The USA | .908 | .839 | .756 | .881 | .909 |
| Reference for | | | 16.89 | 16.89 | 16.58 | 16.63 | 16.89 |
| scale reliabilities ^a | | | 16.90 | 16.90 | 16.59 | 16.64 | 16.90 |
| Reference for item parameters ^b | | | 16.93 | 16.94 | 16.61 | 16.66 | 16.91 |

Note. ^a ^b Worksheet names in the associated [Excel file](#) accompanying Chapter 16 of *PISA 2018 Technical Report* (OECD, 2020c).

B.2 Multilevel Multiple Imputation

```

1 TITLE:
    Multilevel multiple imputation using JM-AM H1      ! Unrestricted var-cov

5 DATA:
    file = "~/finlit.dat";

VARIABLE:
10    names =
        FKI CNTRYID CNTSCHID CNTSTUID W_STU          ! Administrative vars
        PV1MATH PV2MATH PV3MATH PV4MATH PV5MATH      ! Plausible values for MATH
        PV6MATH PV7MATH PV8MATH PV9MATH PV10MATH
        PV1READ PV2READ PV3READ PV4READ PV5READ      ! Plausible values for READ
        PV6READ PV7READ PV8READ PV9READ PV10READ
        PV1FLIT PV2FLIT PV3FLIT PV4FLIT PV5FLIT      ! Plausible values for FLIT
        PV6FLIT PV7FLIT PV8FLIT PV9FLIT PV10FLIT
        MALE IMMI1GEN IMMI2GEN ESCS                  ! Demographic info
        FCFMLRTY FLCONFIN                             ! Affects
        FLSCHOOL                                       ! Lat var "Academic"
        NOBULLY                                       ! Lat var "Safety"
        FLFAMILY                                       ! Lat var "Community"
        W_SCH STRATIO                                ! School characteristics
        EDUSHORT                                       ! Lat var "inst. env."
25    ;

    usevar =                                           ! Var to be imputed
        MALE IMMI1GEN IMMI2GEN ESCS
        FCFMLRTY FLCONFIN
        FLSCHOOL NOBULLY FLFAMILY
30    STRATIO EDUSHORT
    ;

    within =                                           ! Amongst which, L1 var are
35    MALE IMMI1GEN IMMI2GEN ESCS
        FCFMLRTY FLCONFIN
        FLSCHOOL NOBULLY FLFAMILY
    ;

    between =                                         ! L2 are
40    STRATIO EDUSHORT
    ;

    auxiliary =                                       ! Var not participating in
45    PV1MATH PV2MATH PV3MATH PV4MATH PV5MATH        ! MI but still to be
        PV6MATH PV7MATH PV8MATH PV9MATH PV10MATH    ! included in final output
        PV1READ PV2READ PV3READ PV4READ PV5READ
        PV6READ PV7READ PV8READ PV9READ PV10READ    ! PVs are already "guesses"
        PV1FLIT PV2FLIT PV3FLIT PV4FLIT PV5FLIT    ! themselves so do NOT use
        PV6FLIT PV7FLIT PV8FLIT PV9FLIT PV10FLIT    ! PVs to guess others
50    FKI CNTRYID CNTSTUID W_STU
        W_SCH                                         ! Admin vars
    ;

55    cluster = CNTSCHID;

    missing = all (-99);

60 ANALYSIS:
    processors = 64;                                  ! Use all cores of HPC

    type = twolevel;
    estimator = Bayes;

65    fbiterations = 50000;                            ! Number of burn-in
    chains = 4;                                       ! Verify convergence
    bseed = 1234;                                    ! For replication study

```

```

70 DATA IMPUTATION:
    impute =
        MALE (c) IMMI1GEN (c) IMMI2GEN (c) ESCS      ! Categoricals have (c)
        FCFMLRTY FLCONFIN
75        FLSCHOOL NOBULLY FLFAMILY
        STRATIO EDUSHORT
        ;

        ndatasets = 10;                                ! To merge with 10 PVs
80        save = FLIT_MMI_*.dat;
        thin = 5000;                                    ! To Avoid autocorrelation

SAVEDATA:
        bpar = bpar.dat;                                ! Capture Bayesian paths
85
PLOT:
        type = plot2;                                    ! For R's MplusAutomation

```

1 **MODEL FIT INFORMATION**

```

Number of Free Parameters                                22

5 Bayesian Posterior Predictive Checking using Chi-Square

    95% Confidence Interval for the Difference Between
    the Observed and the Replicated Chi-Square Values

10        28408.938        28906.315

        Posterior Predictive P-Value                    0.000

Information Criteria

15        Deviance (DIC)                                2100842.641
        Estimated Number of Parameters (pD)            22.054

```

20 **MODEL RESULTS**

| | Estimate | Posterior S.D. | One-Tailed P-Value | 95% C.I. | | Significance |
|---------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| | | | | Lower 2.5% | Upper 2.5% | |
| Within Level | | | | | | |
| Means | | | | | | |
| MALE | 0.502 | 0.002 | 0.000 | 0.499 | 0.505 | * |
| IMMI1GEN | 0.029 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.028 | 0.030 | * |
| IMMI2GEN | 0.042 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.041 | 0.044 | * |
| ESCS | -0.241 | 0.003 | 0.000 | -0.247 | -0.234 | * |
| FCFMLRTY | 7.049 | 0.017 | 0.000 | 7.015 | 7.083 | * |
| FLCONFIN | -0.072 | 0.003 | 0.000 | -0.079 | -0.065 | * |
| FLSCHOOL | 0.018 | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.011 | 0.024 | * |
| NOBULLY | -0.059 | 0.004 | 0.000 | -0.067 | -0.052 | * |
| FLFAMILY | 0.064 | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.057 | 0.070 | * |
| Variances | | | | | | |
| MALE | 0.250 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.248 | 0.252 | * |
| IMMI1GEN | 0.028 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.028 | 0.028 | * |
| IMMI2GEN | 0.041 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.040 | 0.041 | * |
| ESCS | 1.183 | 0.005 | 0.000 | 1.173 | 1.193 | * |
| FCFMLRTY | 29.753 | 0.134 | 0.000 | 29.494 | 30.016 | * |
| FLCONFIN | 1.034 | 0.005 | 0.000 | 1.025 | 1.044 | * |
| FLSCHOOL | 1.040 | 0.005 | 0.000 | 1.031 | 1.049 | * |
| NOBULLY | 1.110 | 0.005 | 0.000 | 1.100 | 1.121 | * |
| FLFAMILY | 1.090 | 0.005 | 0.000 | 1.080 | 1.100 | * |

50 **Between Level**


| | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------|---------|-------|-------|--------|---------|---|
| 55 | Means | | | | | | |
| | STRATIO | 13.873 | 0.136 | 0.000 | 13.608 | 14.140 | * |
| | EDUSHORT | 0.131 | 0.013 | 0.000 | 0.106 | 0.157 | * |
| | Variances | | | | | | |
| | STRATIO | 103.514 | 1.948 | 0.000 | 99.805 | 107.425 | * |
| | EDUSHORT | 1.074 | 0.019 | 0.000 | 1.038 | 1.112 | * |

Table B.3*Summary of Diagnostic Plots of Multilevel Multiple Imputation*


| Parameter number | Parameter label | Modelling level | Brief description | Posterior mean | Posterior variance | 95% credibility interval | Chain converged | AR-free chains |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1 | MALE | Within | Whether participant is male | 0.502 | | (0.499, 0.505) | Yes | 4 |
| 2 | IMMI1GEN | Within | Whether participant migrated to this country | 0.029 | | (0.028, 0.030) | Yes | 4 |
| 3 | IMMI2GEN | Within | Whether their parent did | 0.042 | | (0.041, 0.044) | Yes | 4 |
| 4 | ESCS | Within | Index of economic, social and cultural status | −0.241 | | (−0.247, −0.234) | Yes | 4 |
| 5 | FCFMLRTY | Within | Familiarity with concepts of finance | 7.049 | | (7.015, 7.083) | Yes | 4 |
| 6 | FLCONFIN | Within | Confidence about financial matters | −0.072 | | (−0.079, −0.065) | Yes | 4 |
| 7 | FLSCHOOL | Within | Financial education in school lessons | 0.018 | | (0.011, 0.024) | Yes | 4 |
| 8 | NOBULLY | Within | Participant's experience of being bullied (reverse) | −0.059 | | (−0.067, −0.052) | Yes | 4 |
| 9 | FLFAMILY | Within | Parental involvement in matters of financial literacy | 0.064 | | (0.057, 0.070) | Yes | 4 |
| 10 | MALE | Within | Whether participant is male | | 0.250 | (0.248, 0.252) | Yes | 4 |
| 11 | IMMI1GEN | Within | Whether participant migrated to this country | | 0.028 | (0.028, 0.028) | Yes | 4 |
| 12 | IMMI2GEN | Within | Whether their parent | | 0.041 | (0.040, 0.041) | Yes | 4 |
| 13 | ESCS | Within | Index of economic, social and cultural status | | 1.183 | (1.173, 1.193) | Yes | 4 |
| 14 | FCFMLRTY | Within | Familiarity with concepts of finance | | 29.754 | (29.495, 30.016) | Yes | 4 |
| 15 | FLCONFIN | Within | Confidence about financial matters | | 1.034 | (1.025, 1.044) | Yes | 4 |
| 16 | FLSCHOOL | Within | Financial education in school lessons | | 1.040 | (1.031, 1.049) | Yes | 4 |
| 17 | NOBULLY | Within | Participant's experience of being bullied (reverse) | | 1.111 | (1.100, 1.121) | Yes | 4 |
| 18 | FLFAMILY | Within | Parental involvement in matters of financial literacy | | 1.090 | (1.080, 1.100) | Yes | 4 |
| 19 | STRAIO | Between | Student–teacher ratio | 13.873 | | (13.607, 14.139) | Yes | 4 |
| 20 | EDUSHORT | Between | Shortage of educational material | 0.131 | | (0.106, 0.157) | Yes | 4 |
| 21 | STRAIO | Between | Student–teacher ratio | | 103.532 | (99.750, 107.430) | Yes | 4 |
| 22 | EDUSHORT | Between | Shortage of educational material | | 1.074 | (1.037, 1.112) | Yes | 4 |

Note. Notes go here.


Distribution of: Parameter 1, %WITHIN%: [MALE] Distribution of: Parameter 2, %WITHIN%: [IMMI1GEI] Distribution of: Parameter 3, %WITHIN%: [IMMI2GEI]




Distribution of: Parameter 4, %WITHIN%: [ESCS] Distribution of: Parameter 5, %WITHIN%: [FCFMLRT] Distribution of: Parameter 6, %WITHIN%: [FLCONFI]




Distribution of: Parameter 7, %WITHIN%: [FLSCHOC] Distribution of: Parameter 8, %WITHIN%: [NOBULL'] Distribution of: Parameter 9, %WITHIN%: [FLFAMIL']




Distribution of: Parameter 10, %WITHIN%: MALE




Distribution of: Parameter 11, %WITHIN%: IMMI1GE




Distribution of: Parameter 12, %WITHIN%: IMMI2GE




Distribution of: Parameter 13, %WITHIN%: ESCS




Distribution of: Parameter 14, %WITHIN%: FCFMLR'




Distribution of: Parameter 15, %WITHIN%: FLCONF




Distribution of: Parameter 16, %WITHIN%: FLSCHO




Distribution of: Parameter 17, %WITHIN%: NOBULL




Distribution of: Parameter 18, %WITHIN%: FLFAMIL




Distribution of: Parameter 19, %BETWEEN%: [STRATIO]




Distribution of: Parameter 20, %BETWEEN%: [EDUSHORT]




Distribution of: Parameter 21, %BETWEEN%: STRATIO




Distribution of: Parameter 22, %BETWEEN%: EDUSHORT




Trace plot of: Parameter 1, %WITHIN%: [MALE]




Trace plot of: Parameter 2, %WITHIN%: [IMMI1GEN




Trace plot of: Parameter 3, %WITHIN%: [IMMI2GEN




Trace plot of: Parameter 4, %WITHIN%: [ESCS]




Trace plot of: Parameter 5, %WITHIN%: [FCFMLRT




Trace plot of: Parameter 6, %WITHIN%: [FLCONFIN




Trace plot of: Parameter 7, %WITHIN%: [FLSCHOOL




Trace plot of: Parameter 8, %WITHIN%: [NOBULLY




Trace plot of: Parameter 9, %WITHIN%: [FLFAMILY




Trace plot of: Parameter 10, %WITHIN%: MALE




Trace plot of: Parameter 11, %WITHIN%: IMMI1GEI




Trace plot of: Parameter 12, %WITHIN%: IMMI2GEI




Trace plot of: Parameter 13, %WITHIN%: ESCS




Trace plot of: Parameter 14, %WITHIN%: FCFMLRT




Trace plot of: Parameter 15, %WITHIN%: FLCONFII




Trace plot of: Parameter 16, %WITHIN%: FLSCHOO




Trace plot of: Parameter 17, %WITHIN%: NOBULL\




Trace plot of: Parameter 18, %WITHIN%: FLFAMIL\




Trace plot of: Parameter 19, %BETWEEN%: [STRATIO]




Trace plot of: Parameter 20, %BETWEEN%: [EDUSHORT]







Trace plot of: Parameter 21, %BETWEEN%: STRATIO







Trace plot of: Parameter 22, %BETWEEN%: EDUSHORT







1): Parameter 1, %WITHIN%: [MALE] 2): Parameter 1, %WITHIN%: [MALE] 3): Parameter 1, %WITHIN%: [MALE] 4): Parameter 1, %WITHIN%: [MALE]







): Parameter 2, %WITHIN%: [IMMI1GEI): Parameter 2, %WITHIN%: [IMMI1GEI): Parameter 2, %WITHIN%: [IMMI1GEI): Parameter 2, %WITHIN%: [IMMI1GEI







): Parameter 3, %WITHIN%: [IMMI2GEI): Parameter 3, %WITHIN%: [IMMI2GEI): Parameter 3, %WITHIN%: [IMMI2GEI): Parameter 3, %WITHIN%: [IMMI2GEI







1): Parameter 4, %WITHIN%: [ESCS] 2): Parameter 4, %WITHIN%: [ESCS] 3): Parameter 4, %WITHIN%: [ESCS] 4): Parameter 4, %WITHIN%: [ESCS]







): Parameter 5, %WITHIN%: [FCFMLRT): Parameter 5, %WITHIN%: [FCFMLRT): Parameter 5, %WITHIN%: [FCFMLRT): Parameter 5, %WITHIN%: [FCFMLRT







): Parameter 6, %WITHIN%: [FLCONFII): Parameter 6, %WITHIN%: [FLCONFII): Parameter 6, %WITHIN%: [FLCONFII): Parameter 6, %WITHIN%: [FLCONFII







): Parameter 7, %WITHIN%: [FLSCHOO): Parameter 7, %WITHIN%: [FLSCHOO): Parameter 7, %WITHIN%: [FLSCHOO): Parameter 7, %WITHIN%: [FLSCHOO







): Parameter 8, %WITHIN%: [NOBULLY): Parameter 8, %WITHIN%: [NOBULLY): Parameter 8, %WITHIN%: [NOBULLY): Parameter 8, %WITHIN%: [NOBULLY







): Parameter 9, %WITHIN%: [FLFAMILY): Parameter 9, %WITHIN%: [FLFAMILY): Parameter 9, %WITHIN%: [FLFAMILY): Parameter 9, %WITHIN%: [FLFAMILY)







1): Parameter 10, %WITHIN%: MALE 2): Parameter 10, %WITHIN%: MALE 3): Parameter 10, %WITHIN%: MALE 4): Parameter 10, %WITHIN%: MALE







5): Parameter 11, %WITHIN%: IMMI1GEN 6): Parameter 11, %WITHIN%: IMMI1GEN 7): Parameter 11, %WITHIN%: IMMI1GEN 8): Parameter 11, %WITHIN%: IMMI1GEN







9): Parameter 12, %WITHIN%: IMMI2GEN 10): Parameter 12, %WITHIN%: IMMI2GEN 11): Parameter 12, %WITHIN%: IMMI2GEN 12): Parameter 12, %WITHIN%: IMMI2GEN







1): Parameter 13, %WITHIN%: ESCS 2): Parameter 13, %WITHIN%: ESCS 3): Parameter 13, %WITHIN%: ESCS 4): Parameter 13, %WITHIN%: ESCS







5): Parameter 14, %WITHIN%: FCFMLRT) 6): Parameter 14, %WITHIN%: FCFMLRT) 7): Parameter 14, %WITHIN%: FCFMLRT) 8): Parameter 14, %WITHIN%: FCFMLRT)







9): Parameter 15, %WITHIN%: FLCONFID) 10): Parameter 15, %WITHIN%: FLCONFID) 11): Parameter 15, %WITHIN%: FLCONFID) 12): Parameter 15, %WITHIN%: FLCONFID)







); Parameter 16, %WITHIN%: FLSCHOO); Parameter 16, %WITHIN%: FLSCHOO); Parameter 16, %WITHIN%: FLSCHOO); Parameter 16, %WITHIN%: FLSCHOO




): Parameter 17, %WITHIN%: NOBULLY): Parameter 17, %WITHIN%: NOBULLY): Parameter 17, %WITHIN%: NOBULLY): Parameter 17, %WITHIN%: NOBULLY




) : Parameter 18, %WITHIN%: FLFAMILY) : Parameter 18, %WITHIN%: FLFAMILY) : Parameter 18, %WITHIN%: FLFAMILY) : Parameter 18, %WITHIN%: FLFAMILY




i: Parameter 19, %BETWEEN%: [STRAT] Parameter 19, %BETWEEN%: [STRAT] Parameter 19, %BETWEEN%: [STRAT] Parameter 19, %BETWEEN%: [STRAT




Parameter 20, %BETWEEN%: [EDUSH Parameter 20, %BETWEEN%: [EDUSH Parameter 20, %BETWEEN%: [EDUSH Parameter 20, %BETWEEN%: [EDUSH




j: Parameter 21, %BETWEEN%: STRATI) Parameter 21, %BETWEEN%: STRATI) Parameter 21, %BETWEEN%: STRATI) Parameter 21, %BETWEEN%: STRATI



Parameter 22, %BETWEEN%: EDUSHO Parameter 22, %BETWEEN%: EDUSHO Parameter 22, %BETWEEN%: EDUSHO Parameter 22, %BETWEEN%: EDUSHO



Bayesian Predictive Scatter Plot



Bayesian Predictive Distribution

